MAR 2 1 1961

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 106—PART 1

JANUARY 6, 1960, TO JANUARY 26, 1960

(PAGES 1 TO 1368)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1960

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1960

The 6th day of January being the day prescribed by Public Law 305, 86th Congress, 1st session, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, Vice President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with a new year's beginning, as the gavel falls again in this historic Chamber, even before we talk to one another about the Nation's welfare we would turn to Thee, O Thou God of our salvation—Thou who art greater and higher and deeper and more paramount than the sum of all other facts concerning our universe.

Tenderly and with deep sympathy we think in this hour of the dear ones bereaved by the passing of a stalwart Member of this body since the last session, and of an honored Senator standing this very morning in the poignant sadness of farewell as his lovely companion has so tragically, from our finite viewpoint, been taken from his side and his home.

Give them and us to see that what we call death is but the portal to a larger room in the Father's many-mansioned house.

We would with reverence climb the stairs of this altar of prayer our fathers built so long ago. A nation needs to pray for things it has—for things it has not earned—for gifts from men now dead. A nation needs to pray that in humility we see that greatness is not measured by industrial grandeur, nor by any other things that man may proudly say were made by mind or hand.

And so we pray to be delivered from the tyranny of things. We pray that no cherished resentment, no camouflaged selfishness, no small loyalties, no ingrained prejudice, may choke and clog the channels of public service. Take Thou the dimness of our souls away. Enlarge our spirits. Stretch out our horizons to meet and match the stupendous dimensions of these epic days.

Shall we repeat together the hallowed petitions of the Lord's Prayer?

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to make two brief statements, and then suggest the absence of a quorum, prior to the swearing-in ceremony of our colleague from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas may proceed.

GREETING AND TRIBUTE TO SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, Mr. President, I know that every Senator in this Chamber is delighted to welcome back to the Senate today the distinguished and able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. [Applause, Senators rising.]

It is a great pleasure to have him here with us, fully recovered, and ready to exercise his keen and penetrating mind and the vigor he always demonstrates in his actions in behalf of this great country of ours. His statesmanship has been missed and will be very necessary in the days to come.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

DEATH OF MRS. STROM THURMOND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that most of us have today heard of the great tragedy that came this morning to our colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I know all of us share his deep sorrow in the loss of the lovely lady who was his wife, and whom every Member of the Senate appreciated for the great person she was.

There is little any of us can say that is really comforting at a time like this. But the knowledge that all the Members of the Senate and all of his numerous friends throughout the Nation are thinking of him and praying for him may bring him some solace.

I yield now to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the people and the Nation this morning were shocked and saddened to learn of the extremely untimely death of Mrs. Strom Thurmond, the wife of my distinguished colleague.

We cannot adequately express our grief at the suffering and the agony her husband and her immediate family must endure at this sad hour. I join with people everywhere—as we were joined before in prayer for her recovery—in expressing sympathy to her husband and her family. The loss of this sweet and beautiful woman will be a cause of sorrow to every person who ever knew her.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this opening day of Congress is always one which is marked by the pleasure of meeting again all our friends on the floor of the Senate before we begin consideration of matters vital to the domestic and international welfare of our Nation.

This day, however, is clouded with sadness because of the passing this morning of Jean Thurmond, the beloved wife of our good friend and colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. It is difficult for most of us to realize the sorrow and shock experienced this day by Senator THURMOND, but I am sure all of us want him to know how deeply we feel the loss of a dear lady.

In the short time Jean had been in Washington, she endeared herself to thousands of people in the same charming manner in which she won the love of the citizens of South Carolina.

Mrs. Bridges and I join the many thousands of friends of Jean and STROM THURMOND in an expression of sympathy to a fine Senator and colleague and a devoted husband.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dodd	Hruska
Allott	Douglas	Humphrey
Bartlett	Dworshak	Jackson
Beall	Eastland	Javits
Bennett	Ellender	Johnson, Tex.
Bible	Engle	Johnston, S.C.
Bridges	Ervin	Jordan
Bush	Fong	Keating
Butler	Frear	Kefauver
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Kerr
Cannon	Goldwater	Kuchel
Carlson	Gore	Lausche
Case, N.J.	Green	Long, Hawaii
Case, S. Dak.	Gruening	Long, La.
Chavez	Hart	McCarthy
Church	Hartke	McClellan
Clark	Hayden	McGee
Cooper	Hennings	McNamara
Cotton	Hickenlooper	Mansfield
Curtis	Hill	Martin
Dirksen	Holland	Monroney

Morse	Randolph	Symington
Morton	Robertson	Talmadge
Moss	Russell	Wiley
Mundt	Saltonstall	Williams, Del.
Murray	Schoeppel	Williams, N.J.
Muskie	Scott	Yarborough
O'Mahoney	Smathers	Young, N. Dak.
Pastore	Smith	Young, Ohio
Prouty	Sparkman	
Proxmire	Stennis	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

DEATH OF SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is my sad duty formally and officially to announce to the Senate the death, during the adjournment of Congress, of my late colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, U.S. Senator from North Dakota.

Senator LANGER had a long and distinguished record as a public servant, covering a period of nearly half a century. At the age of 29 he was elected attorney general of North Dakota. Later he served two terms as Governor of North Dakota, and was a member of the U.S. Senate for nearly 19 years.

Senator LANGER was a very able and respected member of this body. I know of no public servant who was more devoted to duty or more courageous in fighting for causes which he believed to be right. He was always to be found on the side of the poor man, the underprivileged, or those in trouble. These and many other fine qualities earned for him the respect and admiration of all his associates.

At a later date, when, as I understand, the Senate will set aside a day on which the Members of the Senate may pay their respects to its deceased Members, I shall have some additional remarks to make in the form of a eulogy. At this time I shall only submit a resolution, for present consideration of which I ask unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) read the resolution (S. Res. 203) as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, prior to action on the resolution, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that I have worked out an agreement with the minority leader that at an early date a time will be set aside, advance notice of which will be given to all Senators, when proper tribute may be paid to the late Senator LANGER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I have the credentials of the Honorable NORMAN BRUNSDALE, who has been appointed to serve in the Senate from now until the election on June 27 of a successor to the late Senator LANGER.

The certificate of appointment was read, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of North Dakota, I, John E. Davis, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint NORMAN BRUNSDALE a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of William Langer, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor John E. Davis, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck, this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1959.

JOHN E. DAVIS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]
BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator designate is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. BRUNSDALE, escorted by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by him.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John J. Sparkman.

Alaska.—E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Barry Goldwater.

Arkansas.—John L. McClellan and J. W. Fulbright.

California.—Thomas H. Kuchel and Clair Engle.

Colorado.—Gordon Allott and John A. Carroll.

Connecticut.—Prescott Bush and Thomas J. Dodd.

Delaware.—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear, Jr.

Florida.—Spessard L. Holland and George A. Smathers.

Georgia.—Richard B. Russell and Herman E. Talmadge.

Hawaii.—Hiram L. Fong and Oren E. Long.

Idaho.—Henry C. Dworshak and Frank Church.

Illinois.—Paul H. Douglas and Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and Vance Hartke.

Iowa.—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Thos. E. Martin.

Kansas.—Andrew F. Schoeppel and Frank Carlson.

Kentucky.—John S. Cooper and Thruston B. Morton.

Louisiana.—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

Maine.—Margaret Chase Smith and Edmund S. Muskie.

Maryland.—John Marshall Butler and J. Glenn Beall.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy.

Michigan.—Pat McNamara and Philip A. Hart.

Minnesota.—Hubert H. Humphrey and Eugene J. McCarthy.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John Stennis.

Missouri.—Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., and Stuart Symington.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield.

Nebraska.—Roman L. Hruska and Carl T. Curtis.

Nevada.—Alan Bible and Howard W. Cannon.

New Hampshire—Styles Bridges and Norris Cotton.

New Jersey.—Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

New Mexico.—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

New York.—Jacob K. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating.

North Carolina.—Sam J. Ervin, Jr., and B. Everett Jordan.

North Dakota.—Milton R. Young and Norman Brunsdale.

Ohio.—Frank J. Lausche and Stephen M. Young.

Oklahoma.—Robert S. Kerr and A. S. Mike Monroney.

Oregon.—Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger.

Pennsylvania.—Joseph S. Clark and Hugh Scott.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and John O. Pastore.

South Carolina.—Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond.

South Dakota.—Karl E. Mundt and Francis Case.

Tennessee.—Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore.

Texas.—Lyndon B. Johnson and Ralph W. Yarborough.

Utah.—Wallace F. Bennett and Frank E. Moss.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Winston L. Prouty.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

West Virginia.—Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and William E. Proxmire.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Gale W. McGee.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the Senate will meet tomorrow and proceed to the other body to hear the President's state of the Union message.

Following the completion of the delivery of that message, the Senate will return to its Chamber and have the regular morning hour for the introduction of bills and the presentation of memorials and petitions, and for such statements as Senators may care to make.

The minority caucus will be held this afternoon.

I have reviewed with the minority leader the several bills which are now on the calendar, some of which have already been cleared for consideration by the policy committee. As to other bills, the policy committee will meet at an early date and act upon them.

We shall have a very heavy workload this session, and if we are to complete our labors by July, when the first national party convention is to be held, it will be necessary, I think, for the committees to meet earlier than usual and to remain in session later than usual, and for the Senate to stay in session in the evenings during some of the period of February, March, and April, which it is not the custom of the Senate to do.

I appeal to each Member of the Senate to cooperate in arranging the schedule so that we can act upon all the proposed legislation which needs to be considered with proper deliberation and dispatch.

Generally speaking, we will consider the bills which are on the calendar in the order in which they appear on the calendar. There will be many exceptions to that in cases of emergency, but that will be the general rule.

Following the meetings of the caucuses and of the policy committee I shall make a detailed statement to the Senate about the kind of proposed legislation it is expected the Senate will have before it next week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply desire to inform the minority Members that the conference of Republican Senators is set for 2:30 this afternoon, in the usual conference room.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And I should like the majority Members to be reminded that we shall have our caucus at 3:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolution previously agreed to, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator LANGER, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the late Senator LANGER, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1960

This being the day fixed by Public Law No. 305, 86th Congress, enacted pursuant to the 20th amendment to the Constitution, for the meeting of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 124: 8: *Our help is in the name of the Lord.*

O Thou who hast opened unto us the gateway to a new year, we are earnestly seeking Thy divine guidance and strength as we enter upon this 2d session of the 86th Congress.

We beseech Thee to lay Thy hands of blessing and benediction upon our President, our Speaker, the Members of this legislative body, and all who are serving our beloved country in whatever capacity.

May our minds and hearts be the sanctuaries of Thy presence and the channels of Thy power.

Grant that when difficult problems and decisions throw all their weight against us we may lean hard upon Thee for help and learn the secret of victorious living.

Hear us as we bow in adoration and unite in offering unto Thee the prayer of the Prince of Peace, our Lord and Saviour.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

SENATE RESOLUTION 203

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

SENATE RESOLUTION 204

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

SENATE RESOLUTION 205

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of Congress:

DECEMBER 31, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the secretary of state, State of New York, my resignation as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 23d District of New York.

Sincerely yours,

ISIDORE DOLLINGER.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abbitt	Dorn, N.Y.	Keogh
Abernethy	Dorn, S.C.	Kilburn
Adair	Dowdy	Kilday
Addonizio	Downing	Kilgore
Albert	Doyle	King, Utah
Alexander	Dulski	Kirwan
Alford	Dwyer	Kitchin
Alger	Edmondson	Kluczynski
Andersen, Minn.	Elliott	Kowalski
	Everett	Lafore
Anderson, Mont.	Evins	Laird
	Fallon	Landrum
Andrews	Farbstein	Lane
Anfuso	Fascell	Langen
Arends	Feighan	Lankford
Ashley	Fenton	Latta
Ashmore	Fino	Lennon
Auchincloss	Fisher	Lesinski
Avery	Flood	Levering
Ayres	Flynn	Libonati
Bailey	Flynt	Lindsay
Baldwin	Foley	Lipscomb
Baring	Forand	Loser
Barr	Ford	McCormack
Barrett	Forrester	McCulloch
Barry	Fountain	McDonough
Bass, N.H.	Frazier	McDowell
Bass, Tenn.	Frelinghuysen	McFall
Bates	Friedel	McGinley
Becker	Fulton	McIntire
Beckworth	Gallagher	McMillan
Belcher	Garmatz	McSween
Bennett, Fla.	Gary	Macdonald
Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	Machrowicz
Bentley	Gavin	Mack, Ill.
Berry	George	Mack, Wash.
Betts	Giaimo	Madden
Blitch	Glenn	Magnuson
Boggs	Goodell	Mahon
Boland	Granahan	Mailliard
Bolton	Grant	Marshall
Bonner	Gray	Martin
Bosch	Green, Oreg.	Mason
Bow	Green, Pa.	Matthews
Bowles	Griffin	May
Boykin	Griffiths	Meader
Brademas	Gross	Merrow
Bray	Gubser	Metcalf
Breeding	Hagen	Meyer
Brewster	Haley	Michel
Brock	Halleck	Miller, Clem
Brooks, Tex.	Halpern	Miller, George P.
Broomfield	Hardy	
Brown, Ga.	Hargis	Miller, N.Y.
Brown, Mo.	Harmon	Milliken
Brown, Ohio	Harris	Mills
Broyhill	Harrison	Minshall
Buckley	Hays	Mitchell
Budge	Healey	Moeller
Burke, Ky.	Hechler	Monagan
Burke, Mass.	Hemphill	Montoya
Burleson	Herlong	Moore
Byrnes, Wis.	Hess	Moorhead
Cahill	Hiestand	Morgan
Canfield	Hoeven	Morris, N. Mex.
Cannon	Hoffman, Ill.	Morris, Okla.
Carnahan	Hoffman, Mich.	Moulder
Casey	Hogan	Multer
Cederberg	Holifield	Mumma
Celler	Holland	Murphy
Chamberlain	Holt	Murray
Chelf	Holtzman	Natcher
Chenoweth	Horan	Nelsen
Chiperfield	Hosmer	Nix
Church	Huddleston	Norblad
Clark	Hull	Norrell
Coad	Ikard	O'Brien, Ill.
Coffin	Inouye	O'Brien, N.Y.
Cohelan	Irwin	O'Hara, Ill.
Collier	Jackson	O'Hara, Mich.
Colmer	Jarman	O'Konski
Conte	Jennings	O'Neill
Cook	Jensen	Oliver
Cooley	Johansen	Osmers
Corbett	Johnson, Calif.	Ostertag
Cramer	Johnson, Colo.	Patman
Cunningham	Johnson, Md.	Pelly
Curtin	Johnson, Wis.	Perkins
Daddario	Jonas	Pfost
Dague	Jones, Ala.	Philbin
Daniels	Jones, Mo.	Pilcher
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Pillion
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten	Pirnie
Dent	Karth	Poage
Denton	Kasem	Poff
Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Porter
Devine	Kearns	Powell
Dingell	Kee	Preston
Dixon	Keith	Price
Donohue	Kelly	Prokop
Pucinski	Selden	Tollefson
Quie	Shelley	Trimble
Quigley	Sheppard	Tuck
Rabaut	Shipley	Udall
Rains	Short	Ullman
Randall	Sikes	Utt
Ray	Siler	Vanik
Reece, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.	Van Pelt
Rees, Kans.	Sisk	Van Zandt
Reuss	Slack	Vinson
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Calif.	Wainwright
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Iowa	Wallhauser
Riehlman	Smith, Kans.	Wampler
Riley	Smith, Miss.	Weaver
Rivers, Alaska	Smith, Va.	Weis
Rivers, S.C.	Spence	Westland
Robison	Springer	Whitener
Rodino	Staggers	Whitten
Rogers, Colo.	Steed	Widnall
Rogers, Fla.	Stratton	Wier
Rogers, Mass.	Stubblefield	Williams
Rogers, Tex.	Sullivan	Willis
Rooney	Taber	Winstead
Roosevelt	Taylor	Withrow
Roush	Teague, Tex.	Wolf
Rutherford	Teller	Wright
St. George	Thomas	Yates
Santangelo	Thompson, La.	Young
Saund	Thompson, N.J.	Younger
Schenck	Thompson, Tex.	Zablocki
Scherer	Thomson, Wyo.	Zelenko
Schwengel	Thornberry	
Scott	Toll	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 4, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of JOHN KYL as a Representative-elect to the 86th Congress from the 4th Congressional District of the State of Iowa, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself at the bar of the House to take the oath of office.

Mr. JOHN KYL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential resolution (H. Res. 398) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PRICE, and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 399) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 400) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridan.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JANUARY 6, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12:12 p.m. on September 15, 1959, and said to contain the Second Semi-annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

MINERAL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Second Semi-annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior prescribed by section 5 of the Act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1959.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JANUARY 6, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12:12 p.m. on September 15, 1959, and said to contain the sixth semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND TRADE FAIR PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1956—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 860 of the 84th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the sixth semiannual report of operations under the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 14, 1959.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 6, 1960.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12:05 p.m., on October 20, 1959, and said to contain the 15th semiannual report on the operation of the mutual security program for the period ending December 31, 1958.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT, MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 231)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the 15th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending December 31, 1958. The report was prepared by the Coordinator of mutual security program, with participation by the Department of State (including the International Cooperation Administration), the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

The essence of our experience during the 7½ years of the program on which reports have been transmitted to the Congress, is that the mutual security system is vital to our national security. If we do not persist in the continuous and vigorous application of military, economic, and technical programs making up the mutual security system, our foreign policy will be rendered ineffective. This ultimately cannot fail to have the most serious consequences for every living American.

If we fail to win the contest in which we are now engaged, the potential destruction of our way of life becomes, by the degree of our failure, more and more a dangerous reality. It behooves us all to keep this peril fresh in our minds.

I trust that this report will provide a yardstick to evaluate the measures we and other members of the great community of nations are taking in the mutual security program to defend our freedoms.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1959.*

WITHDRAWAL AS DELEGATE TO NATO PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OCTOBER 14, 1959.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At the time of your gracious appointment of me as a Delegate to the NATO Interparliamentary Conference, I was not aware that the same would be held at a time when it would be impossible for me to attend because of other responsibilities undertaken for the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

May I respectfully, therefore, ask that someone else for this year of 1959 be appointed in my place.

With deep appreciation of the honor conferred by the appointment and even deeper regret that circumstances beyond my control prevent my attendance, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 12:30 o'clock p.m., January 7, 1960, to a joint session of the two Houses.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS, ETC.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the order of the House of September 12, 1959, empowering him to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on October 29, 1959, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appoint as a member of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

And on December 3, 1959, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 86–380, appoint as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 443) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 443

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JANUARY 7

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, January 7, 1960, it may be in order at any time for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had on the floor on occasion of joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on tomorrow the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain information, and further that in connection with the subject I shall discuss all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD today, and other Members may have 5 legislative days in which to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the American experiment in government from its inception to the present time is the most original and unique in history. From an infant nation our country has steadily progressed until today it is the most powerful and influential nation in the world, and particularly dedicated to peace on earth.

In the making of our history names of great men and women in all walks of life stand out with prominence. In the field of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, great figures are recorded in our history. It is hard to distinguish in the lifetime of any man what his place in history will be. The emotions of living generations preclude the human mind interpreting correctly beyond that one lifetime what place a man will hold in history. That usually lies with the historians of tomorrow. But in our time there is one man we can pick out who stands out in our minds and in the minds of the people as a man of history, particularly on the constructive side of life and the constructive side of history. His birthday anniversary is celebrated today.

I refer to that great American, not only a son of Texas but a citizen of and respected and loved throughout the United States, a man with a heart of gold, our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Our country has been enriched by the services of SAM RAYBURN. You and I and all others who have had the honor of knowing him either as friends or through association with him are better persons because of our friendship and our association with our beloved Speaker. I know, too, that I express the sentiment of all our colleagues and of the American people, whether they know the Speaker personally or not, particularly the people of his own congressional district who have honored him for so many years, when I say that in extending to him our congratulations we sincerely hope that God in His infinite wisdom will continue to bestow upon SAM RAYBURN for many, many years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings, and that he will still be presiding over the House of Representatives. And, in order to make it complete, that he will still be a Member of the House of Representatives.

The following shows the record of Mr. Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas, as Speaker of the House of Representatives as compared to the service of Speaker Henry Clay, of Kentucky:

ACTUAL NUMBER OF DAYS SERVED AS SPEAKER (NOT INCLUDING DAYS OF INTERREGNUM) BY MR. SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN FROM SEPTEMBER 16, 1940, TO NOON, JANUARY 6, 1960

The following compilation shows the actual number of days served as Speaker by Mr. Speaker RAYBURN and does not include days of interregnum (noon, January 3, 1943, to noon, January 6, 1943, 3 days interregnum; noon, January 3, 1955, to noon, January 5, 1955, 2 days interregnum; and noon, January 3, 1959, to noon, January 7, 1959, 4 days interregnum) pending Mr. RAYBURN'S election as Speaker for the 78th, 84th, and 86th Congresses, respectively.

76th, 3d	September 1940	14½	
	October 1940	31	
	November 1940	30	
	December 1940	31	
77th	1941	365	
	1942	365	
78th	1943	362	—Met noon, Jan. 6, 1943 (78th, 1st), 3-day interval from noon, Jan. 3, 1943, to noon, Jan. 6, 1943, when Speaker was elected.
	1944	366	
79th	1945	365	
	1946	365	
	1947	2½	—End of 79th, 2d.
81st	1949	362½	—Met noon, Jan. 3, 1949 (81st, 1st); 2½ days of 1949 was end of 80th, 2d.
	1950	365	
82d	1951	365	
	1952	366	
	1953	2½	—End of 82d, 2d.
84th	1955	360½	—Met noon, Jan. 5, 1955 (84th, 1st), 2-day interval from noon, Jan. 3, 1955, to noon, Jan. 5, 1955; Speaker MARTIN served 2½ days in 1955 (end of 83d, 2d, Jan. 1, 1955, to noon, Jan. 3, 1955); total of 4½ days not served by Speaker RAYBURN in 1955.
	1956	366	
85th	1957	365	
	1958	365	
86th, 1st	1959	361	—Met noon, Jan. 7, 1959 (86th, 1st), 4-day interval from noon, Jan. 3, 1959, to noon, Jan. 7, 1959, when Speaker was elected.
	1960	5½	—86th, 2d, convened at noon Jan. 6, 1960.
		5,581	Actual days served as Speaker.
	plus	9	Days of interregnum.
		5,590	Overall number of days served as Speaker, including days of interregnum.

Speaker RAYBURN has a total of 15 years 106 days' service as Speaker as of noon, January 6, 1960 (based on actual days).

Speaker RAYBURN has a total of 15 years 115 days' service as Speaker as of noon, January 6, 1960 (based on overall days served, including days of interregnum).

Speaker Henry Clay served 3,056½ days as Speaker for a total of 8 years 136½ days.

Difference in days served as Speaker as of noon, January 6, 1960: 5,590 days minus 3,056½ days equals 2,533½ days, or 7 years 80½ days.

Comparison of length of service of Speakers Henry Clay, of Kentucky, and Sam Rayburn, of Texas, as of 12 noon, January 6, 1960

	Clay		RAYBURN	
Congresses	12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 18th.		76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, 86th–1st.	
Number of sessions	10 and 1 fraction (13th, 2d).		15 and 1 fraction (76th, 3d).	
Dates served as Speaker	Nov. 4, 1811–Jan. 19, 1814.		Sept. 16, 1940–Jan. 3, 1947.	
	Dec. 4, 1815–Oct. 28, 1820.		Jan 3, 1949–Jan. 3, 1953.	
	Dec. 1, 1823–Mar. 4, 1825.		Jan. 3, 1955 (through Jan. 6, 1960).	
Number of days as Speaker [1]	3,056½.		5,590 (through Jan. 6, 1960).	
Breakdown by days	November 1811	26½	September 1940	14½
	December 1811	31	October 1940	31
	1812	366	November 1940	30
	1813	365	December 1940	31
	1814	181½	1941	365
	December 1815	27½	1942	365
	1816	366	1943	365
	1817	365	1944	366
	1818	365	1945	365
	1819	365	1946	365
	January 1820	31	1947	2½
	February 1820	29	1949	362½
	March 1820	31	1950	365
	April 1820	30	1951	365
	May 1820	31	1952	366
	June 1820	30	1953	2½

[1] Number of days from election as Speaker to resignation or election of successor. Speaker Clay's service surpassed on Jan. 30, 1951.

Difference in days served as Speaker as of noon, Jan. 6, 1960: 5,590 days minus 3,056½ days equals 2,533½ days, or 7 years 80½ days.

Clay had total overall service as Speaker of 8 years 136½ days.

Speaker RAYBURN has total service as Speaker of 15 years 115 days (overall) as of noon, Jan. 6, 1960.

Comparison of length of service of Speakers Henry Clay of Kentucky, and Sam Rayburn, of Texas, as of 12 noon, January 6, 1960— Continued

	Clay		Rayburn	
Breakdown by days	July 1820	31	1955	362½
	August 1820	31	1956	366
	September 1820	30	1957	365
	October 1820	28	1958	365
	December 1823	30½	1959	365
	1824	366	1960	5½
	January 1825	31		5,590
	February 1825	28		
	March 1825	3½	Sept. 16, 1940, through noon Jan. 3, 1951	3,030
		3,056½	Noon Jan. 3, 1951, to midnight Jan. 29, 1951	26½
			Clay's record equaled	3,056½
			1951 (12:01 a.m. Jan. 30 through Dec. 31)	336
			Jan. 1, 1952, through noon Jan. 6, 1960	2,197½
			Grand total	5,590

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Indiana, the Republican leader of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say at the outset that the ovation tendered to Speaker RAYBURN when he first called the House to order today is clear evidence of the deep affection we all have for him. And so happy am I to join my colleagues on this occasion—this is not bipartisan—it is not nonpartisan; it is just a genuine expression of gratitude and admiration for our great Speaker RAYBURN. I must say that while I heartily put my stamp of approval on just about everything the majority leader has said about our Speaker, I cannot quite go along with his statement that he just be Speaker of the House forever.

But, having said that, may I simply say again that it has been a great pleasure to work with SAM RAYBURN. I have now been here approximately 25 years—not as long as some—but through that time we have all witnessed his very faithfull devotion to his duties as Speaker of the House of Representatives. I have felt the warmth of his personal friendship. Believe me, I appreciate it as I am sure everyone here does.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities and duties of the Speaker of the House of Representatives are appreciated by all of us, but they can be most effectively appreciated by one who has been Speaker of this House. To me, the Presiding Officer of the House of Representatives is one of the great figures of America—no matter what party he is a member of. Every Speaker I have served under has performed his trust in carrying out the rules of the House with fairness and without regard to party or partisan considerations, deciding the questions that arise under parliamentary law in accordance with that law and in accordance with the rules of the House and protecting the rights of all Members. We all pay our respects to our distinguished friend and former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, my dear friend, JOE MARTIN, as a great Speaker who has presided with eminent fairness and justice to all Members.

I now yield to the distinguished former Speaker of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, it is a great privilege to have the opportunity, even for a few moments, to pay my respects to a dear friend, an old friend and a Member whose friendship has lasted over 35 years without a jarring note. It has been my privilege to know SAM RAYBURN all these years, and I can testify, as few men can testify, to his rugged Americanism, his loyalty to country and his intense desire above everything else to maintain the high honor and the integrity of the House of Representatives. There have been many times when other branches of the Government have tried to encroach upon the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, but as long as we have had SAM RAYBURN in the Speaker's chair, we know that the rights of the House have been ably and adequately defended, and that never while he is Speaker will the rights and integrity of the House of Representatives be sacrificed.

As my good friend, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], has well said, Mr. RAYBURN has been a Member longer than anyone else.

All these have been very eventful years. They have been years of great trial; years which, if we did not have men like SAM RAYBURN at the helm, America would not be the forward going, progressive country that it is today. I thank God that we have had SAM RAYBURN as Speaker. His services for his country will never be forgotten.

I want to pay particular tribute to his great service in behalf of constitutional government, a government of laws and not of men. May I wish SAM many happy returns of the day. May he have a pleasant birthday and may the years hereafter bring him the very best of health and may they bring increased opportunity to serve not only his country but all of humanity.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Texas delegation to say "happy birthday" to you and to pay you the deserved tribute to which a great man is entitled. It was my distinction, and one, let me say, of which I am justly proud, to have had you as my Representative in Congress, during the early years of my life. For many years you represented my family, and most recently my mother, who passed away a few years ago. I do not think anyone in any district in this United States of America was more proud of you than my family. I know the same would have been true with every other Member of the Texas delegation who is in Congress today or who has served in the past, or, I may say, who may come in the future. Texas is proud of you, and justly so. You have proven that man can live by law, if those laws are based on fairness, justice, and equity. You have been the exemplification of decency and fair dealing. I think that the history books will record your great contributions in this respect as the outstanding contributions in this era, on achievements that will challenge future generations.

The greatness of most men is measured by plaques, awards, and other material presentations. I am sure you have plenty of those. I know of many. But I think the truest measure of greatness is the respect and devotion which one man bears for another. In your case, a respect and devotion indelibly imprinted in the minds of those men and women who have had the good fortune to know you and have had an opportunity to serve with you. There is no one who knows you or who has ever been associated with you who does not know that when you say you will do something, it will be done.

I do not think any greater tribute can be paid to any man.

As a great American, a great statesman and a great Texan, the Texas delegation is deeply honored to have you as our leader. We wish you a happy birthday, and we are going to look forward to repeating this ceremony for many years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the many emoluments which accrue to us as Members of this body is the association with men from all sections of the Nation—men who have been carefully selected and screened by the inexorable processes of political preferment and who come to us here as representatives of the industry, the geographical area, and the people for whom they speak. Here are developed friendships and associations and influences which remain with us through life.

The friendship of men like Speaker RAYBURN has touched and enriched the service of every man who has served with him. And, in turn, he has, without exception, been the friend of every man who has served with him in the Congress.

It has been my good fortune to be associated with him here longer than any other Member of this House. I was present and saw him sworn in as a Member of Congress for the first time. And have seen him sworn in, or been sworn in by him, in every succeeding Congress.

I have seen 10 Speakers in that chair. All of them men exceptionally qualified for the duties of that high office. And of all of the 10 Speakers with whom it has been my privilege to be personally associated, and with the long line of illustrious men who preceded him and whose decisions it has been my privilege to read, there is none who, in my opinion, ranks higher not only in the discharge of the technical duties of his office, but certainly in those greater attributes of heart and mind which have distinguished all of them than the great Speaker who presides here today and who has occupied that position longer than any other man in American history.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak of SAM RAYBURN as a partisan or even as a member of any one party, because it necessarily follows that as Speaker of the House he is the titular leader of our branch of the Government. He speaks for America. The term of his extended speakership covers one of the most critical periods in world history. He has had to deal with many exacting problems, because the Government during that period has been confronted with some of the most difficult problems in the short history of the Nation. In these critical situations he has represented not only his own party to which he has been always loyal, but all Members of the House and every American citizen. And his record through these trying times has been one of which every Member of the House can be justly proud.

We wish for him many happy returns of the day. And we wish for him and the country many more years of devoted service as Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me. Might I say those of us who do not happen to live in Texas or who have not been there over a period of years take with a grain of salt, probably, some of the tall stories that have been told of Texas and Texans; but let me say that to hear and see the demonstration that today has been accorded to our beloved Speaker leaves no doubt in the mind of anyone that Texas has raised an outstanding No. 1 statesman in the person by the name of SAM RAYBURN. I believe all of us, whether we come from Texas or not, can agree that in the person of the great Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Texas has sent us her greatest man.

Let me say before proceeding further that I can best express myself by simply saying "Amen" to what has been said, to the many fine tributes already paid to you today on your anniversary, and I hope the years ahead will, as they have in the past, fall lightly on your shoulders. This was very forcefully brought home to me when I attended a celebration in my district not long ago for a man who was 100 years old. There was another elderly man sitting at the table behind me. I turned and asked him how old he was. He said he was 90. I asked him if he was enjoying the evening. He said, "Yes, but things are dragging out too long here; I am worried about this old gentleman who is 100 years old." Here we have the example of relativity, for a man 90 was worrying not for himself but about the man who was 100 years old.

It is my personal wish that you may be spared for many, many years of continued useful service, and that you will preside here whenever your party is in power, but aside from politics, as an expression of friendship, speaking for myself, and I am sure for all other Members of this body, we wish you many years of happiness and health, and express our great appreciation of the services you have rendered your State and your country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions of your birthday I have recited to the House the long legislative history of yourself. We have now run out of comparisons. You have exceeded the record of any man who ever served in the House of Representatives. Therefore, the only comparisons now that can be made are with distinguished British parliamentarians, such as Gladstone, Balfour, and Churchill.

But today, for just one moment, rather than delve into history—because you, Mr. Speaker, are already a part of history—I should like to tell the Members that a week ago I had the great privilege of traveling to Mr. RAYBURN'S home district and participating there in a testimonal luncheon accorded him by his constituents. This was a very heartwarming demonstration by the people that Speaker RAYBURN has so well represented for a half century. The testimonial was sponsored by the civic clubs of Sherman, Tex.; and despite the fact that they had the largest place in the city of Sherman, namely, the auditorium, it was impossible for a great many people to obtain seats. As a matter of fact, some of my distinguished colleagues from Texas gave their seats to people I brought from my State of Louisiana.

I think the real tribute was in the fact that the people the Speaker has served for 50 years were willing to turn out and give him this magnificent testimonial. I think all of the people there thought, as I did, as these beautiful speeches were made, that despite the fact this great man has had to make decisions affecting all of mankind in two great wars and under many Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, he has never been too busy to serve the people who have honored him by electing him so many times to high public office.

It was my privilege then, and it is my privilege today, to join with them in saying "Happy birthday to you."

I think a significant thing appeared in a news article in his hometown paper, to the effect that when the heat of debate was over and the session was ended the Speaker never went on a trip. He always went back home.

Happy birthday to you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as the concluding speaker I shall recognize in the performance of my duties as majority leader, I yield to my real right arm, the distinguished Democratic whip, my very dear friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join all Members of the House today in paying tribute to our great Speaker, a giant of a man whose stature grows with each passing year. I refer to his stature as a statesman and not to his physical stature, because as he stated at his press conference this morning he weighs exactly the same today as he did 40 years ago, and that with his winter clothes on.

Along with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, and many other Members of the House and Senate, it was my privilege last week to go to Sherman, Tex., when a tremendous tribute was paid the Speaker by the citizens of that community and of his congressional district. A number of my constituents were also present for the occasion.

I was happy to read in one of the newspapers from my district only this morning an editorial by Ennis M. DeWeese of Hugo, Okla., in the Southeast Oklahoman of December 31, 1959, which I think expresses the attitude of the people of my State.

This editorial is as follows:

> What was said in praise of SAM RAYBURN at the appreciation banquet for the veteran Speaker of the House at Sherman, Tex., Wednesday night was well deserved.
>
> SAM RAYBURN is a big man because he has brains—plain old horse sense to an unusual degree—and he has never lost the common touch.
>
> MR. SAM, to use a homely expression, "knows the human critter and understands what makes him tick." He's the sort of realist for whom the need is ever present.
>
> He certainly deserves to be rated among the greatest men in the legislative branch of Government since the Federal Union was formed.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has referred to an article appearing in the Sherman Democrat of December 29, which contains a splendid portrait of the Speaker, and with leave of the distinguished gentleman, I shall include this as a part of my remarks.

It is as follows:

SAM RAYBURN: A LEGEND IN HIS OWN LIFETIME

WASHINGTON.—SAM RAYBURN of Flag Springs, Fannin County, Tex., and more recently of Bonham, belongs to a rare category of human beings—

He has become a legend in his own lifetime.

For a whole generation national writers have told the story of his records as a public official and the many laws he has fathered to improve the daily lives of the plain people of America in whom he has a passionate, almost religious faith.

Many people know that he has been Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives 17 years—longer than any man in history—and almost twice as long as Henry Clay;

He has served more years in the House of Representatives than any man since this Democracy was born;

He has helped to guide the United States through its two greatest wars, its greatest prosperity, and its greatest depression.

A lot of people know some of his legislative achievements. The REA, which brought electricity to almost all the farms of America; the farm-to-market road program which is lifting the farmer out of the mud; the regulation of Wall Street which protected the savings of millions of people when invested in stocks and bonds; GI insurance and the veterans disability payments which have helped every American soldier and his family since 1917; soil conservation and flood control measures to help save the priceless heritage of the soil so that unborn generations of Americans may continue to eat abundantly—these are a few of the Rayburn accomplishments in the Halls of Congress, which affect the daily welfare of all Americans.

NO PUBLICITY MAN

But in spite of this knowledge of his records and his accomplishments, many people have only a hazy idea of what kind of a human being this man is.

For this RAYBURN himself is largely responsible. Most men in public life seek, even crave, every bit of publicity they can manage.

Not so with RAYBURN.

He has never had a "publicity man" on his staff.

He is probably the only official in Washington who is brusque with news photographers, letting them take 1 or 2 pictures, then ordering them, "That's all, boys—no more pictures."

He has steadfastly refused to write the story of his eventful life.

He seldom makes a speech in Congress.

Once he complimented an associate by saying, "He doesn't run around getting his name in the newspapers."

Well, what kind of a human being is SAM RAYBURN?

First, he is a simple, even old-fashioned man.

He dresses conservatively, hates loud clothes and hats and ties, both for himself and for others.

LIKES PLAIN FOOD

A hearty eater, he finds no pleasure in "frilly" dishes. Once, on his way back from Washington, he phoned his mother. She asked what he wanted for supper that night. "Crumb-in," he said—cold cornbread crumbled in sweet milk. He got it.

Pork shoulder, chicken fried in hog lard, white onions, scrambled eggs, chili without beans, vanilla ice cream, beefsteak, snap beans, toast, giblet gravy on hot biscuits, and always cornbread—these constitute his idea of "real eating."

In Washington he has lived in the same small, comfortable apartment for more than 30 years.

He still drives—and personally dusts and shines—the 1947 Cadillac which the Democratic Congressmen took up a collection to give him nearly 13 years ago.

His conversation is couched in the simple, homespun, Anglo-Saxon words he learned around his father's fireside south of Windom. He intensely dislikes what he calls those five-cylinder words. When he speaks, everyone understands exactly what he means.

IN ROBUST HEALTH

He is one man who has never had any desire to go abroad. When Congress adjourns, there is only one place he wants to go—and does go—home.

SAM RAYBURN has enjoyed an unusual robustness of health.

He has never been in a hospital except to have his tonsils removed.

He has never had a headache.

When Congress adjourned this year, it worked through the entire night and finally called it quits at 6:36 a.m. RAYBURN was up all night presiding over the House of Representatives, yet he was back at his office at 11 a.m., worked all day seeing a constant stream of visitors, and then went to a White House dinner that night. The next day he was at his office bright and early.

Undoubtedly his own health habits have contributed to this robustness. He rarely misses staying in bed 9 hours every night. He eats very temperately. He loves to walk, and if the weather is bad, he gets his exercise by walking back and forth throughout the huge Capitol Building.

HONEY HIS MEDICINE

Sunshine, he believes, is great medicine, and he likes to walk or sit in the sun for long hours.

And honey to him is medicine. Every morning he has honey for breakfast.

When he goes to bed, he goes right to sleep. "If I can't do my job standing up, I danged sure can't do it lying on my back and worrying about it," he explains.

SAM RAYBURN is a man full of restless energy.

Part of this comes from his natural vitality and good health. The rest comes from his training.

He was 1 of 11 children in a poor family. Every member of the family had to work hard in order to make ends meet. He was taught not only that work was necessary, but that it was honorable.

Then he went to Professor Mayo's East Texas Normal, the forerunner of East Texas State College at Commerce. There he fell under the spell of one of the greatest influences of his life, William Leonidas Mayo, an inspired man who gave more Texas boys and girls from poor families a chance to get ahead than any man of record.

LIKES HARD WORK

"During the morning exercises, Professor Mayo was the most inspiring man I ever knew," RAYBURN said 53 years later. "He made a student feel like a criminal if he did not work, and not only that, but work to his utmost capacity."

This habit of incessant work he has never abandoned. On most holidays, when the Capitol is deserted except for tourists, he comes to his office and if there is no mail to answer and no visitors to see, he is restless as a bear and makes some kind of work.

To his staff, one of his trademarks is—"Let's do it now." Often at the end of a tiring day, a staff assistant will say, "I want to discuss this with you, but I'll wait until tomorrow." His stock reply is: "No; let's do it now."

He works quickly, restlessly, tersely.

Most of his telephone conversations, whether they be with the President or a rank stranger, are never over 2 or 3 minutes long. He detests receiving a long letter, and almost never writes one longer than a page. Congressmen come to see him with a complicated problem, but he gives his decision quickly, firmly, and normally the conference is completed in 5 or 10 minutes.

HATES WASTEFULNESS

That is one of the reasons why Washington newspapermen say that he sees more people in a day than any other high official in the Nation's Capital.

Waste, whether it be of time or natural resources or human talent, pains him.

"It just hurts me to see soil washing away," he once told a visitor. "I love the dirt."

Talking of a young man of great talent who had not used it, he commented sadly, "It's a shame, but he just didn't have a program."

He believes religiously that every person should set for himself an aim early in life and then work without ceasing until he has reached his goal.

That was his own program in life. When he was a child, perhaps 8 or 9 years old, in the cotton fields of Fannin County, he made up his mind that some day he was going to make a lawyer and go to Congress and be Speaker of the House. He never let go of the dream.

DEATH BEFORE FAILURE

"I would rather have died than to have failed," he said years later. He firmly believes that every person can achieve his goal in life if he makes up his mind early and never stops working toward it.

To many observers, much of RAYBURN'S success came from his universal reputation for candor and telling the truth.

A newspaperman once said to him, "Mr. Speaker, you see a hundred people a day with problems and you tell them what you will do and won't do or that you'll think about it. But I never see you making notes on what you tell them, yet you never seem to forget. What is your secret?"

RAYBURN'S hot, brown eyes, flashed.

"If you tell the truth the first time, then you don't have to remember," he shot back.

Another time he said: "Tell the truth first and save later explanations."

Presidents and other high officials sometimes find it difficult to get honest opinions because many people try to tailor their advice to what they think the high official wants to hear.

LAYS IT ON THE LINE

Not so with RAYBURN.

When they ask RAYBURN for advice, he lays it on the line. This frankness under all circumstances has made him a much-sought adviser.

Perhaps this explains much of his great popularity with the Washington press corps. Often he will tell newsmen: "I don't want to talk about that," in reply to their questions, but when he does say something, they know it is the complete truth as RAYBURN sees it.

Along with his candor, a frequently mentioned trait is RAYBURN'S fairness.

Many Democrats and Republicans differ with him on political questions, but they are virtually unanimous in praising his fairness. Even, when the House of Representatives is considering a bill to which he is strongly opposed the supporters of the bill are given every break to which they are entitled under the House rules.

"The greatest ambition a man can have is to be known as a just man," he once said.

"Be just—be fair," he says over and over again in advising people.

SPIRIT OF FAIRNESS

"Laws should never be passed to punish someone or to give someone an unfair advantage. Every law should be passed in a spirit of fairness," he frequently declares.

And whenever a bill comes up which he thinks was designed to punish someone, he emphatically votes "No."

This spirit of justice is reflected in his highly successful techniques of leadership in the Congress.

The Speaker possesses tremendous power, second only to the President. His power in the House of Representatives is especially great. If he chose to punish a Member who opposed him, he could embarrass and in some instances, defeat the Member by seeing that his pet bills are killed, that he is kept off good committees, that campaign funds are withheld from him.

That is not RAYBURN's way of doing business.

Instead of punishing, RAYBURN simply withholds future favors, bestowing them on those who are his friends. He stands by those who stand by him, but he never seeks vengeance on those who fail to go along.

TALKS WITH FRIENDS

During the working day RAYBURN is always moving, seeing a constant stream of visitors, very sparing of words, relaxed but always busy.

When the working day is over, his greatest diversion is to sit and talk by the hour with trusted friends. The conversation covers the politics of the day, with his reminiscences of the great and near-great thrown in from time to time.

But the conversation always seems to get around to the topics he loves best—his family, his district, the soil, and his faith in the future.

It is impossible to understand RAYBURN without knowing the family stock from which he came. Basically Scottish in ancestry, the Rayburns exhibit many traits associated with the rugged people who defended their religion and their homes in Scotland's mountains for centuries.

At the age of 47, his father packed up a wife and 10 children and left the east Tennessee mountains to start a new life in the black land country of north Texas. Making a living for this big family—soon there were 11 children—from 40 acres of Fannin County land was a continual struggle. Everybody worked and worked hard. They were poor, but they were happy and the family circle was close and warm.

CLOSE KNIT CLAN

Today five of the children are still alive, and they have always been a very close knit clan. They love best to visit with each other.

Once a man asked Bobbie Phillips, who cooked for the Speaker in Bonham for a quarter of a century, which Rayburn owned a certain piece of property.

"I don't know 'bout that," she replied. "I just know what one of 'em has, they all has."

Thriftiness, candor, simple tastes, a fierce love of each other, their friends, the land, and their country—these Scottish traits are common to the entire family.

Washingtonians for nearly half a century have been learning about the Fourth District of Texas and its people, for the topic comes up at almost every gathering where the Speaker is present, whether it be a state dinner or a private conversation in his small apartment.

PRAISES PEOPLE

He likes to tell of the district's sturdy, hard-working, self-reliant, independent people; of their ambitions for good homes, a good name, and oportunity for their children; of its wonderful, deep, black topsoil; of how its soil is being cared for, its rivers dammed, its towns improved, and the rise in its people's well-being in this century.

"My people have shown me a friendship and a devotion unequaled in any annals," he says wistfully.

Asked once what he considered his greatest accomplishments in the Halls of Congress, he quickly replied, "The REA and farm-to-market roads. Those are things that help the real people."

One of RAYBURN's most noticeable traits is his optimism.

He never sighs for "the good old days"; he thinks people today are living better, have better opportunities, are better clothed, housed, fed, and educated than ever before, and he believes that their life will be even better in the years and decades ahead.

STILL HAVE LIBERTIES

It stirs his wrath to hear people say that "we have lost our ancient liberties."

"What liberties have we lost?" he demands. "The American boy and girl today can think what he pleases, say what he pleases, write what he pleases, and can choose his own way of life freely so long as he does not trespass upon someone else.

"We have amended our Federal Constitution 22 times, but today we have every single liberty we had when the Constitution was written in 1787.

"And as long as every citizen holds in his hand a free and unpurchasable ballot—and uses it—we will keep these freedoms."

RAYBURN flares up when he hears people talking about "the bad boys and girls of today."

He just doesn't believe it.

FINEST GENERATION YET

"I think this is the finest generation we have yet produced. They're smarter than the boys and girls of my generation because they have had better training; they are just as patriotic; they are just as clean, and when the burdens of citizenship come to them I know their minds will be keen enough, their shoulders broad enough, and their hearts big enough to preserve, protect, defend, and perpetuate this great democracy," he says over and over again.

"I have great faith in people. I believe that about 98½ percent of the American people have more good in them than bad and, when properly appealed to, they will do the right thing. I have dealt with hundreds of thousands of people in all walks of life, and I have found that when you treat a man right he will nearly always meet you more than halfway," RAYBURN maintains.

RAYBURN's sad, shrewd face, dominated by his deep, dark brown eyes, often wears a stern, almost forbidding look. This leads some who do not know him well to think that he is hard and perhaps fearsome.

KNOWN FOR KINDNESS

In maintaining order in the House of Representatives or in a political convention, he can be stern and very forceful, and he is the exact opposite of the backslapper.

But those who know the man will remember him longest, not for his achievements nor his commonsense, but for his kindness.

A person in trouble, any person, can count on SAM RAYBURN for understanding and help. About the only people he dislikes are those he calls cruel people. The man with a mean tongue or the man who takes advantage of someone less fortunate, these RAYBURN has no use for.

"I think SAM RAYBURN's outstanding characteristic is that he always has time, or takes time, to help anybody who has a problem," Congressman CLARK THOMPSON, of Galveston, once said.

Any human being who has trouble is entitled to sympathy and help, that has been the RAYBURN creed always.

Life magazine some years ago told this true story:

A young newspaper reporter in Washington lost his teenage daughter through illness. Although he had occasionally attended RAYBURN's press conferences, he barely knew the Speaker.

OFFERS HIS HELP

The morning after the daughter died, the father heard the doorbell, and answering it, found SAM RAYBURN there.

"I just came by to see what I could do to help," he said.

Startled, the father said, "I don't think there's anything you can do. We're making all the arrangements."

"Well, have you all had your coffee this morning?" RAYBURN asked.

"No, we haven't had time."

"Well, I can at least make the coffee." And he did.

The reporter said to him, "Mr. Speaker, I thought you were supposed to be having breakfast at the White House this morning."

"Well, I was, but I called the President and told him I had a friend who was in trouble, and I couldn't come."

GIVEN MANY HONORS

Few men in American history have received so many honors or have heard so many compliments from their contemporaries as has SAM RAYBURN.

But perhaps the finest compliment of all came from an unidentified Hunt County farmer in 1943.

Newspaper reporter Clayton Hickerson asked the farmer about RAYBURN.

"There's always some cantankerous talk 'bout politicians," the farmer said, "but I ain't never heard much 'bout Old SAM. He always sees that we're treated right. I guess he always will."

Happy birthday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we all rejoice that we are given the privilege today to honor our beloved Speaker and wish him a very happy birthday.

Five years ago tonight on the occasion of the traditional birthday party given annually in honor of the Speaker by his close friends, Mr. and Mrs. Dale Miller, of Dallas, Tex., a beautiful song was written and sung by the charming and talented lady, Hank Fort, the composer of numerous songs and folk ballads. Miss Fort is well known throughout the Nation not only because of the beautiful songs and ballads which she has composed but also as a wonderful and attractive entertainer. Miss Fort is from Tennessee, where the Speaker was born.

I know all of us will agree that this wonderful song is one which pays a splendid tribute to the Speaker and is a song that can be sung not only on his birthday, but throughout the year and particularly on the Fourth of July, the birthday of our Nation.

The words to Miss Fort's song are as follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MISTER SAM

Happy birthday, Mister SAM.
We raise a toast to you.
All throughout the land
We know you stand
For the red, white, and blue.

Happy birthday, Mister SAM,
This is a special day.
'Twas a lucky morn
When you were born.
Cause you're Mister U.S.A.

It's great that we can celebrate,
That we're free to shout and sing,
And we all join in thanking you
For making freedom ring.

Every person great and small,
From Maine to Alabam,
Wants to wish you wealth,
Long life and health;
Happy birthday, Mister SAM.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, men have made a greater total impact

than Speaker SAM RAYBURN, on the affairs of our Government during this last fateful half century. It is a privilege to join today in the celebration of his 78th birthday. His great influence has been wielded largely through the House of Representatives and his extraordinary leadership in it. No man is more deserving of having his name memorialized for all time in this Capital City and on Capitol Hill.

It would be especially fitting for the House of Representatives and a grateful nation to pay deserved tribute to SAM RAYBURN, devoted patriot and sterling American, by giving his name to the new office building being built on Independence Avenue, to enable the Members of this House to perform their duties and the work of the House more efficiently. Speaker RAYBURN has been largely responsible for the construction of this building, and I have today introduced a House resolution to designate it the Rayburn House Office Building. All who use it in decades to come will be reminded of the very great service rendered to our country and the world by this noble man and dedicated public servant.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of humility that I approach the intimate subject of your birthday anniversary celebrated today in this House of great living statesmen. Somehow I have a feeling that it would be most sagacious on my part if the subject of age were dispensed with entirely.

Wise men say that the age of a man should be measured by the depths of his intelligence. Alas, the discussion of this facet of the subject would lead me into more delicate numerical determinations—you would not like it.

But may we, who through our experiences in the Congress, reiterate our supreme confidence in your leadership, and further pay homage to your greatness as a patriot and your long dedicated statesmanship to the sacred principles of our Government and its institutions.

We who work with you and accept your leadership thank God that you are among us to guide the Congress of the United States, the future welfare of our Government and its freedom loving citizens. We salute you today to pray for your presence here as Speaker on your next anniversary.

We know that you will continue to serve your Nation in the paths of liberty and justice. Your gavel will protect free institutions against tyrannical and arbitrary legislation. The American people rely upon your leadership too, to guide their destiny. God bless you on this memorable day. May you remain with us forever.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and others in paying tribute to you and to your distinguished record of service and extending best wishes for a happy birthday on this your birthday anniversary. We of Tennessee are proud of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, we have a great love and affinity for Texas and everything Texan. But, I should like to "correct the record" to make it crystal clear that Speaker RAYBURN is not altogether Texan but is in fact a native of Tennessee—indeed, Speaker RAYBURN is all-American. SAM RAYBURN was born in Roane County in east Tennessee which adjoins the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. He has many relatives and friends in my section of Tennessee.

Speaker RAYBURN is honored and respected in my State along with Tennessee's other great sons, Presidents Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk. Certainly it is appropriate as the new Congress convenes today that we should salute and congratulate Speaker RAYBURN, as he has presided over this House longer than any other man in the history of our country. He is to many of us not only Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Congress, Mr. Democrat, and Mr. American.

So I join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to our beloved Speaker on his birthday and in wishing for him many more happy birthdays and a new decade of service to our country.

SPEAKER RAYBURN STANDS FOR A GOVERNMENT OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an illustrious occasion. In paying honor to Speaker SAM RAYBURN today, on his 78th birthday, we are honoring a great American. And we are, at the same time, taking a moment to reflect on and pay tribute to the principles and values which have made our country great, because throughout his illustrious career SAM RAYBURN has been a moving force for these principles and values.

I believe that we are honoring today a man who will go down in history as one of the alltime great molders of history. During his long career he has stood as a sentinel of calm wisdom in many hours of crisis for our country. And in the many less spectacular years of history, he has worked in a quiet and never tiring way for our country's progress and well-being.

It would not be possible—certainly not for me—to describe the qualities of leadership. These are qualities which everyone recognizes and no one can define. But some of the things which account for the greatness of SAM RAYBURN I can describe:

He has stood for a government of laws, and not of men.

He has, to a much greater degree than most of us mortals have the capacity to do, been motivated by his country's welfare in all things, without confusing the country's welfare with personal ambitions, personal pride, and other disturbing emotions.

He has stood for integrity.

He has stood for the democratic processes and, as such, has been respectful of minority views.

He has stood most of all for the dignity and the high purpose of the House of Representatives of the United States. In all matters the House of Representatives has come first, and SAM RAYBURN and the high office he holds has come second.

SAM RAYBURN is himself the embodiment of all these things he has stood for so conspicuously and impressed so clearly in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. It is our good luck, and the country's good luck, that he is young and vigorous in both mind and body.

Like other Members of this body who have served for many years with Speaker RAYBURN, I, too, have an individual, deep, and personal affection for him, and I add my heartfelt personal congratulations upon his 78th birthday.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, our colleague, WALTER ROGERS, has spoken eloquently for the Texas members on this memorable occasion. I wish to join Mr. ROGERS and others here in a word of tribute to our beloved Speaker on this, the anniversary of his birth.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has been a pillar of strength in the House of Representatives throughout my service here. He has been my friend and inspiration. He has been resolute in his determination to be fair in his leadership. He has won and rewon at each succeeding Congress the admiration and respect and the love of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

But the influence of the Speaker has not been circumscribed to the four walls of the House of Representatives. His influence and power have made themselves felt in every corner of the earth. He is not just a statesman of Texas or of the United States; he is a world statesman. His imprint upon the history of our time will linger forever in the annals of our Nation. It has been a great privilege to serve with this good, strong man from Texas. He has borne his honors with a becoming dignity and restraint. The Speaker is not ostentatious; he is simple of manner, modest, forceful, great. Words are such poor vehicles to express our thoughts but it is a heart-warming experience to contemplate the career and character of SAM RAYBURN and to pay tribute to him on his birthday.

I think all Americans would like to join with us today in saying, "Good luck, Mr. Speaker, in the continuation of your great service to America."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, for more years than many of us have been here birthday greetings have been extended on this date to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. It is my hope that for many more years to come birthday greetings will continue to be extended to him as a great Member of this body. There is little I can say here about him that has not already been said or that is not apparent to each Member of the House.

Yet all of it is worth repeating as a reminder of the greatness of this distinguished American and Texan. Having served longer as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress than any other man in history, he is recognized as the greatest parliamentarian and is known as the foremost legislative leader throughout the free world.

But there is more to him than this. No one can surpass his devotion to our great Nation. As devoted as he has been

to his party, he has in every crisis facing our Nation risen above the political and partisan differences of the moment to fight with courage for the security of our country and the lasting freedom of men, women, and children throughout the world.

He has through his leadership insisted that we here conduct ourselves in a responsible manner, and that we provide a legislative program not only responsive to the needs of the people but also one which will deserve and receive the confidence of all of the people of this Nation.

Mr. RAYBURN with all his association with the great of the world has never lost the common touch nor the simple dignity which has earned for him the affection, admiration and devotion of all of us who have the privilege of being associated with him.

Mr. Speaker, there are three essential qualities for great leadership: foresight, courage, and fairness. Mr. RAYBURN personifies these traits to the utmost degree. He has shown himself to be gentle and strong, wise and understanding. I am sure that I do not exaggerate when I say that in the time I have been in this body there is no one who has come or gone who has held and enjoyed a larger measure of the confidence and the affection of his colleagues than has SAM RAYBURN.

On this day of his birth it is not possible to overlook the great contributions he has made to the stability, strength, and honor of our Government.

I hope that we may have his wise counsel at the policy table of our Government for many years to come.

On behalf of the people of my district, I offer him congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. HECHLER. In the company of legislative giants who have paid tribute to our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, I feel a little out of place to add my small voice. But while others have lauded him for his outstanding record performance as the presiding officer of the greatest legislative body in the world, I want to say a word or two about the human qualities of this man.

A little over an hour ago, Speaker RAYBURN held a press conference. In the glare of television lights, bombarded by prying questions which covered the waterfront, he talked about the troubles of the world and the affairs of this Nation with great dignity, humor and humility. His outer office was crowded with friends and well-wishers, big and small. Being his birthday, and also the opening day of Congress, it was probably the busiest day of his life.

Yet this statesman found the time to sit down and chat with a freshman Congressman from the Fourth District of West Virginia for 15 or 20 minutes. It was a great honor for me, not alone to have the chance to take so much of his time, but also to exchange ideas with the Speaker and to share in his wisdom on many different subjects. Unhurried, unselfish, giving always of himself, he displayed the great qualities of depth, perspective and a sharp sense of humor and sense of balance which go to make up the great person he is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I salute you and join with the people of the world in saluting you on your 78th birthday.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, your birthday is always a source of inspiration to those of us who have been fortunate enough to serve under your leadership and during your speakerships.

The Rayburn Library at Bonham, Tex., symbolizes for me at least the character of your leadership and contributions to our Nation. In its outward form it is both handsome and obviously long lived and durable, built not to survive the storms of today or yesterday, but the crises and great issues of future years as well. Inwardly, it encompasses the breadth, the richness, as well as the minor items of historical treasures which make up the history of such a vibrant Nation.

Mr. Speaker, you have meant to many of us not only the dignity of one of the greatest public offices in a great democracy, but you signify that to function best this office must be filled in a democracy by a kind, wise, and intensely comprehensive human being.

We shall look forward to the enjoyment of many days in the future, as we do enjoy and appreciate this one, when we are given an opportunity to wish you the happiest of birthdays and the fulfillment of all your desires in the years ahead.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, every day in every way during these 14 years that I have had the honor and pleasure of being a Member of this legislative body, you have been so fair and just and reasonable and gentlemanly in all of your rulings and in all of your discharge of great responsibilities and heavy loads of official work to me individually, that I feel that in the presence of the eloquent tributes already made by my colleagues to your greatness as our distinguished Speaker that any words I would humbly utter would prove entirely inadequate by comparison.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on this 78th birthday, to you, whom I feel is the greatest Speaker of the House of Representatives in the history of our beloved Nation, I just say directly, as you sit there in the Speaker's chair, happy birthday and many, many more of them.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on this 78th birthday of our distinguished and beloved Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, there is little that any individual can say that has not already been said in glowing terms.

Everyone in this Chamber—and everyone who will read these words—knows that SAM RAYBURN has served for more years as Speaker of the House of Representatives than any Speaker in our history. However impressive that record is of itself, its real significance is that it serves as a testimony to his great character—which is the basis of his constant reelection to the House and to the office of Speaker. Two of the attributes of character essential to his office are integrity and wisdom. SAM RAYBURN personifies these attributes. The confidence freely imposed in him by the membership on both sides of the aisle, as well as by the administration under three Presidents would be jealously withheld from a man who did not possess the integrity with which he is endowed. No one has ever heard of Speaker RAYBURN breaking his word.

As Speaker of the House of Representatives during the trying years of World War II and most of the difficult days since the termination of that conflict Speaker RAYBURN has displayed a wisdom that is unsurpassed in the modern history of the House of Representatives. This coupled with his incomparable leadership has brought about the enactment of laws that are not only necessary and proper but inspired and courageous. This leadership is the manifestation of his unswerving devotion to the Nation and to his party.

I feel privileged to be a part of this body under the speakership of SAM RAYBURN and to be able to join my colleagues in felicitating him and wishing him everything that is good on this anniversary of his birth.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. On behalf of the Wisconsin delegation to this House, and myself, I want to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, our sincere felicitations on the occasion of your birthday.

We are delighted to see you in good health and in such fine spirit, ready to resume the exacting task of presiding over the deliberations of this House.

May the good Lord grant you, Mr. Speaker, many more years of service to your country and your fellow men, and bless you with good health and happiness in this new year and the years ahead.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that the Florida delegation joins in extending warmest personal regards to you, Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of your birthday. There is much that each of us would like to say on this occasion to convey to you our genuine personal regard and our great appreciation for your good works. Yet, so much already has been said by so many who are far more gifted in phraseology that it is difficult to find words to convey the sense of meaning which is felt.

Few men in public life have been as greatly beloved as you. Few men have enjoyed such distinction of outstanding leadership. None have surpassed your record of accomplishments. The combination of these unusual and outstanding achievements is one which is truly unique and found only in the person of our own beloved SAM RAYBURN.

The Nation has been favored indeed in having benefited through these many years from the experience, the wisdom, and the leadership of our Speaker. His warm and pleasant personal guidance has been invaluable to every Member, young and old alike, who has availed himself of the Speaker's counsel, and all of us have done this. It is a great privilege to see a man mature into a living legend during his own lifetime a truly great and outstanding American. That, Mr. Speaker, is the position you occupy

in the minds and hearts of your colleagues and of the people throughout the world.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the majority leader what a privilege it is to participate in this grand event this afternoon. It has been my pleasure to serve with Mr. RAYBURN for better than 17 years and I want to say what a glorious privilege it is to be here and to congratulate our great leader on his birthday.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have served with Mr. SAM for a period of over 37 years and during that period I have come to know the manner of man he is, his integrity, his unfailing leadership, his acute sensitivity to justice.

Mr. SAM has served in this Chamber in war and in peace; he has served in periods of adversity and periods of prosperity. Throughout his service, he has stood as firm as a rock and surmounted all difficulties. He has an enduring faith—in his country, his party, and in his fellow men. We all applaud his loyalty to his friends and his fairness to his foes. He wields the gavel of his office with objectivity and temperance. No one can deny his great influence upon the membership and the impress of his personality and character upon the major issues of our time. Formerly, as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he nurtured bills of major significance that are now law and which bear his honored name, a name which is known and respected through the world.

We are all happier here because of his presence amongst us. It is indeed a privilege to salute Mr. SAM on his birthday.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on this, your birthday, here in this Chamber a great many words are being spoken, by Members of both parties, in your honor and in praise of your long period of distinguished service in the House of Representatives. It is only natural that we who have been fortunate enough to serve in the Congress, under your leadership, and who have benefited and profited by your help, guidance, and assistance, should love you and respect you.

Our Speaker, however, wins hearts wherever he goes. On December 12 we were highly honored when you paid us a visit in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor which appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette on December 19. This letter was written by one of the people who attended the banquet at which you spoke. I think this letter mirrors a noble character—the kind of man our beloved Speaker is.

The letter follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, December 19, 1959]

SAM RAYBURN TALKED PRINCIPLES

To the EDITOR: On December 12 Linn County and the city of Cedar Rapids were highly honored by the presence of one of the greatest living statesmen of these United States—the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives. Mr. RAYBURN has served the United States in Congress for 46 years. In Cedar Rapids he was the principal speaker at a fund-raising dinner for the Democratic Party. His speech was very broad and full of American principles—to anyone who is broadminded and has principles. He told how hard our forefathers worked, with far-reaching vision, to write the Constitution that has stood the tests of time, and serves the country today just as it did the Thirteen Colonies. Through all these years with their many changes, the Constitution has needed only 19 amendments, one of which has been repealed.

He talked about the youth of America and how they must be trained to take over and carry on and uphold the American heritage after we are gone.

He talked about an America so unified, brotherly, and happy that there would be no North and South or East and West.

He spoke about the ups and downs he has seen in this Nation since he first went to Washington, blaming the Republican administration for some of them and quoting statistics to support his viewpoint.

He reminded his fellow citizens that where there is need, there is opportunity; and where there is privilege, there is duty.

He told how the senior Congressmen help the Members who are newly elected to Congress. He told how so many Congressmen's wives help their husbands through thick and thin, and what a wonderful institution marriage is when its obligations are fulfilled.

On the whole, Mr. RAYBURN'S speech was almost nonpolitical; it was a speech of American principles and morals. With very little revision the same speech could very appropriately be delivered to a gathering of Masons, Knights of Columbus, parent-teacher association, chamber of commerce, or any other organization.

I am very glad that I attended the banquet and heard Mr. RAYBURN'S speech and saw him deliver it. I am very proud to be able to say I shook hands with Mr. RAYBURN.

Every citizen owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. RAYBURN or any other statesman who has served this Nation so many years. Let us be respectful to our senior statesmen, whether they are of this political party or that. This United States of America, in order to uphold democracy, must have more than one political party. Let's give credit where credit is due.

E. A. COULTAS.

MOUNT VERNON.

THE LATE CHARLES A. BOYLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, the late CHARLES A. BOYLE, a member of the Illinois delegation, under tragic circumstances in Chicago during the recess, fills our hearts with sadness.

He distinguished himself as a lawyer and a legislator, by his aggressiveness and willingness to work for the minorities and the oppressed. His activities in private life were a succession of accomplishments for those from whom he could expect no reward. His generosity was boundless and his desire to serve his fellow man is recorded in the minds of those he benefited.

CHARLIE BOYLE will be remembered when many of us, occupied with our own concern, have been forgotten, for he never feared to work for an unpopular cause, when in his own conscience he knew it as a just cause. He championed the oppressed, the downtrodden, and the outraged. His efforts at righting wrongs done to men in the service of their country are recorded. His unselfish devotion to the things he believed to be duty will serve better as a monument to his integrity than anything we can say here.

Congressman BOYLE early in life faced obstacles and triumphed over them. His difficulties in gaining an education for the profession of his choice challenge the imagination. His was a spirit that brooked no thought of compromise. Honors came to him and he wore them lightly.

I recall the efforts and long hours that CHARLIE BOYLE expended to become what we know as a good Congressman. He began doing that during his freshmen term, and he never stopped. He worked diligently and conscientiously on all legislation before his committee, and in doing so made a contribution to every committee assignment he ever held. He never lost his objective viewpoint nor ceased to work hard and effectively.

We pay our deep respect to a tireless worker, a delightful character, and above all to a family man whose heart was filled with gratitude for the blessings which were his. His widow and his children have our deepest sympathy for they have suffered an irreparable loss.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the ways of the Lord are inscrutable and not open to question. We must accept, therefore, the sad fate which befell our beloved colleague, Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE, last November, when death claimed him suddenly. All of us were stunned and saddened when we learned of his untimely passing.

CHARLIE BOYLE was a most unusual personality. Traveling as he did in the world of political affairs filled with distinguished men who possessed great charm and friendliness, CHARLIE BOYLE nevertheless stood out as one who owned these fine qualities to a singular degree. His geniality, his warmth, his spirit filled the atmosphere whenever he entered a room.

He was helpful. There was not anything he would not do for any of his colleagues. There was not anything he would not do for his constituents. There was not anything he would not do to be helpful to his fellow men. Never has the 12th Congressional District, which is the neighboring district to mine, been so ably represented as it was by CHARLIE BOYLE. It had never been represented by a member of our party prior to his election in 1954.

So quickly did he gain the confidence of his constituents that even with the history of the district as going toward the opposite party, he was elected and reelected. His constituents knew his talents. They knew his qualities. They knew that here was a man who served them in the way in which they wanted to be served.

One can only think, with the passing of CHARLIE BOYLE, of the poem by the great poet who wrote several centuries ago, John Donne, when he said:

No man is an Island, Intire of itself;
Every man is a peece of the continent,
A part of the maine;
If a clod bee washed away by the Sea, Europe is the lessee,
As well as if a promontory were,
As well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were;
Any man's death diminishes me,
Because I am involved in mankinde;
And therefore do not send to know for whom the bell tolls;
It tolls for thee.

To Mrs. Boyle, to her wonderful family I want to express the sympathy of Mrs. Yates and myself upon their irreparable loss of a wonderful husband and father.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of our friend and colleague, CHARLIE BOYLE, came as a great shock, first because he was a personal friend and secondly, because as a member of the Committee on Appropriations he had rendered invaluable service to the committee, to the House, and to the country.

He was an unusual man. He had been selected a year or two ago as the ideal father in America. And his family life carried out every implication involved in that unusual designation.

He was especially valuable as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He was not only a man of mature judgment, and wide business experience but he was a man of exceptional judgment. He could always be depended upon when we needed sound counsel and advice to bring to us a practical solution of some of the most difficult problems that confronted the committee. The country has lost a great legislator.

I wish to join my friend from Illinois who has just spoken, in tendering to Mrs. Boyle and the children our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I did not know the late CHARLIE BOYLE very well until he became a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. During his service as a member of the Defense Subcommittee I sat with him through the weeks and months of hearings and I became familiar with his brilliant mind and his warm and understanding heart. He was a stalwart friend of defense. I shall never forget his helpfulness in our important work.

CHARLIE BOYLE was a truly great man, a fine legislator, a man who loved his country, who loved his colleagues, and a man who loved his family. We have sustained a great and irreparable loss in the passing of this fine American.

I join my friend from Illinois and others in paying tribute to his memory and expressing words of sympathy to the dear ones he left behind.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of the fifth day of November 1959, following the judicial election in the city of Chicago, I turned on the radio in my home and was shocked to learn that my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, was fatally injured in an automobile accident the night before.

CHARLIE BOYLE graduated from Mount Carmel High School in Chicago in 1925, from Loyola University in 1930, and from Loyola Law School in 1933. He was admitted to practice law in Illinois and was a member of the Chicago, Illinois, and American Bar Associations. To obtain his education he worked in various positions. He was a speaker of note and was the winner of several oratorical contests. He was selected as the Chicagoland Father of the Year in 1952–53 and later was chosen as Mr. Illinois. He was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations and on the Subcommittee on Defense.

Our friend CHARLIE BOYLE was a man of great ability. He was always sincere and forthright. His integrity was such that his word was as good as his bond. We admired him for these sterling qualities; but, more than that, we loved CHARLIE BOYLE because of his great capacity for friendship. He was always kindly, congenial, and helpful. He radiated optimism. His very presence in a room brightened it. It was a joy to be in his presence.

In Congressman CHARLIE BOYLE's death, his State and his country have lost an outstanding public servant and a great statesman. We, his colleagues who knew and loved him, have lost one of our dearest friends.

I am saddened by his death and offer my deepest sympathy to his gracious wife, Helen, and the other members of the wonderful family he has left behind. It is my hope and prayer that they may find some measure of consolation in the fact that a devoted husband and father lived a full and rich life, a life dedicated to the service of his fellow men.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as the roll was called we noted the absence of a dear friend, Representative CHARLES A. BOYLE, of the 12th Illinois District. It is always difficult to resign ourselves to the death of those who were close to us, but sorrow is harder to bear when they are taken from us in the full vigor of their lives.

CHARLIE BOYLE was a young man, rich with ideas that he wanted to incorporate into legislation for the benefit of his constituents and for the Nation.

His keen mind and eloquent voice served his country well. The Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Defense will miss his understanding of the challenge facing our country and how that challenge must be met. His big and generous heart was matched by his faith in freedom. He knew that we cannot mark time. Our economy must ever expand in order to make our Nation strong, and to help other peoples to travel with us along the road of human progress.

Congressman BOYLE was a devoted husband and father, and his deeply religious spirit was expressed every day of his life by respect and consideration for his fellow man.

To his large family we extend our sincere sympathy. We want them to know that their fond memories of a father who gave them a name to be proud of, are shared by those of us who were privileged to serve with him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In every way he earned the reward of eternal happiness.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, grievous at heart, I join with the rest of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, particularly those of us from Illinois, in expressing our great sorrow with the passing of our Illinois Member of Congress, which came about so unexpectedly and was so untimely. Although I may not have known CHARLES BOYLE as well as some other Members of the House, I did know him well enough to become affectionately acquainted with him. I knew him as a man of upright character, one of the friendliest individuals I have ever known in my whole life. It seems he was one individual who enjoyed the good things of life and he wanted others also to share in all good things. One thing about CHARLES BOYLE I must mention, in my many conversations with him, was that never once did I talk with him but that somewhere and sometime during the conversation he would bring up a question about his wonderful family. He was a devoted family man. He was proud of his homelife, his wife and his wonderful children. It always impressed me, knowing that only a man who so loved his family could really and truly be a great man. So along with those of us today who mourn his loss, I say to his fine family, may God give you comfort in the loss you have suffered.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying our respects to the late CHARLES A. BOYLE.

I have known Mr. BOYLE intimately for a great number of years. We were associated in the practice of law, politically and socially. Mr. BOYLE's son graduated last year with my son from Loyola Academy in the city of Chicago.

It was a great shock to me and my family when we learned of Mr. BOYLE's death because I had spent several hours with him the previous day.

The people of the 12th Congressional District in Illinois have lost a truly great Representative and we of the 86th Congress a truly great friend.

My family and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Boyle and her family in their bereavement.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock to read in the morning papers of November 5 last of the tragic passing of my good friend and distinguished colleague, Representative CHARLES A. BOYLE, of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. At the time he was a man still in the full vigor of his life and his fatal accident left me dumbfounded.

CHARLIE BOYLE came to the Congress in 1954 as the first Democrat ever elected to the House from the 12th District of Illinois. We served together as members of the House Committee on Appropriations as the result of which I had a very high regard for his ability and intelligence as a sound legislator. It was my privilege to have enjoyed a close and warm friendship with CHARLIE and I realize that I have lost a good and true friend.

CHARLIE BOYLE was an exemplary family man leaving a lovely wife and eight fine children. In 1952 he was named Chicagoland Father of the Year.

CHARLIE BOYLE will be sadly missed in this House of Representatives and by the people of his district, the State of Illinois, and the Nation. I shall always think of him with fond memories, and express my profound sympathy to his dear wife and his children.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to join my colleagues in eulogizing one of the great Members of Congress, the late Honorable CHARLES AUGUSTUS BOYLE, who for the past 5 years has so diligently represented the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE'S death on November 4, 1959, was as much a loss to the entire Nation as it was to the people of the 12th District, who loved and supported him in his courageous stand toward solving the many problems which confront a republic.

Many of my colleagues will recall how Congressman BOYLE made the motion last September to adjourn the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This was the fifth time that Mr. BOYLE had been selected by his colleagues to conclude the deliberations of Congress, and it reflects the high regard that all of us, on both sides of the aisle in this astute body, had for our distinguished colleague.

The House of Representatives has had many distinguished Members who have made an indelible mark on the course of history. To this group we can all proudly add Congressman BOYLE'S name, for while he had come from a humble background, Mr. BOYLE'S uncompromising attitude toward fairplay and justice has made him a pillar of our democracy.

In his brief career as a Member of Congress, Mr. BOYLE had won the respect of both Democrats and Republicans because he was always in the forefront wherever the traditional liberties of our Nation were challenged. His determined defense of the rights of all American citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, was an inspiration to all of us. His ability to present his views and support them with indisputable facts in defense of justice shall long be remembered by those who have had the honor of working with him.

Mr. BOYLE was the first Democratic Congressman ever to be elected from the 12th District of Illinois, when in 1954 he was elected to the 84th Congress. Because of his dedication to the principles of good government, he was reelected to the 85th and 86th Congresses. Perhaps the greatest measure of the esteem and admiration in which he was held by his constituents was documented when Mr. BOYLE was reelected in 1956, despite the Republican landslide of that year.

Mr. BOYLE'S rise to prominence indeed reflects the full glory of a democracy, which does not judge a man by his background, but rather by his ability.

Mr. BOYLE was born on August 13, 1907, on a farm near Spring Lake, Mich. After leaving the farm, he sold newspapers and worked his way through college and law school as a conductor, a checker, an investigator, a driver, and finally as an inspector for the Chicago Motor Coach Co. Despite the tremendous demand on his time in trying to earn a livelihood, Mr. BOYLE managed to attend Loyola University and Loyola Law School during the evening hours and won his law degree in 1933.

Mr. BOYLE never forgot the plight of the individual American, and because of this deep respect for the rights of the individual, he wrote a distinguished record as a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Appropriations.

In 1955, Congressman BOYLE was sent to Tokyo, Japan, to investigate and report on status of forces agreements and act as congressional observer in the trial of GI's at Maebashi. It was his duty to help make postwar Japan more cognizant of the full concept of jurisprudence and the preservation of individual rights in a nation steeped in its own traditions.

Mr. BOYLE'S wide interests made him a specialist in housing, and in 1937 and 1938 he was appointed zone attorney for 12 States in the Federal Housing Administration. He helped draft much of the legislation, including the rules and regulations for the FHA.

It is with deep conviction that I say here today that Mr. BOYLE'S loss will be felt by the entire Nation, for here was a man who possessed not only great personal ability and dedication to the concept of freedom, but he was also a man with a tremendous heart.

To his wife and eight children we today extend our deepest sympathy. May he rest in peace.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending sympathy to the family of our distinguished colleague, CHARLIE BOYLE. He was a warm, sympathetic, and friendly man; one beloved by all. When the beloved dean of the Illinois delegation spoke of a man's willingness to fight for the oppressed, he certainly described CHARLIE BOYLE.

I remember in 1955 a constituent of his became embroiled in some difficulty in Tokyo as a member of the Armed Forces. CHARLIE BOYLE not only came to his assistance, but at great personal sacrifice traveled across the country to catch a plane and go to the Far East, and interceded personally in Japan in behalf of this boy who was in trouble with Japanese authorities while a member of the Armed Forces overseas. Very few men would go so far out of their way and go to such personal sacrifice as CHARLIE BOYLE did to help a young man. That speaks more eloquently than any words could speak of his willingness and readiness to be helpful to his fellow man in distress or in need or undergoing oppression of any kind.

I am proud of the friendship I had with this fine American and able legislator.

I join with my colleagues in deploring his loss to the Nation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I did not know CHARLIE BOYLE very well until he came on the Appropriations Committee. I was impressed from the start with the fact that he was able to command the great problems that we had confronting us and that many of us perhaps find exceedingly difficult. He was a man of real ability and great force. The country will be worse off because he is gone, but it can also be helped by the fact that we did have amongst us a man of that character.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation in this fine tribute to CHARLIE BOYLE. Word of his untimely death came as a shock to me.

CHARLIE was an energetic, enthusiastic, courageous Member of this House. He had great devotion to duty. He was friend of the little man, a defender of justice at all times. He was my friend, and I shall miss him.

CHARLIE left a wonderful family. It was always inspiring to see him with his children. To them and to Mrs. Boyle I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to add what I have to say to the many fine expressions made here this afternoon by those who loved the late CHARLIE BOYLE.

Much has been said of his friendliness, his wisdom, his industry. But what I was impressed with more than any other of his many fine qualities was his deep belief in justice. He truly foresaw, in his maiden speech here on March 16, 1955, that any steps that we were going to make toward world peace had of necessity to be founded upon justice. I

recall the thrill with which I heard him make that speech in this House. Among other things he said:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be a Member of this House, and I am very happy to be a member of that group who once again asks you and pleads with you to try to do everything possible in both an economic and in a political sense in the interest of peace. We admit we are doing almost everything we can, in a military sense. In our dealings with all nations, it will mean that we must have the modesty to admit that our own national interest is all that we are really capable of knowing and understanding, and the courage to recognize that if our purposes and undertakings here at home are decent ones, unsullied by arrogance or hostility toward other people or delusions of superiority, then the pursuit of our national interest can never fail to be conducive to a better world. Then, by our own conduct, we will be telling the sad and the lonely of the world of the love that is theirs to be, and by the cross of Christ and His passion and the might that is born in brotherhood and unity we will be showing the world that we are doing more than merely paying lipservice to an empty ideal—that we are, in fact, trying to live in the community of nations under God.

I agree with him, and with the words spoken shortly after by his colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], that we had just heard the delivery of one of the great maiden speeches in the history of the House.

This search after justice by CHARLIE BOYLE was displayed in small things as in great. I remember one afternoon when we were all over at Griffith Stadium watching the Senators play a baseball game. The officers in the stadium that afternoon had been very lenient. A number of foul balls hit into the upper tiers had been grabbed as souvenirs by those who were watching the ball game—without any questions being raised. Then, late in the game, another foul ball was knocked up into the upper tiers. It was caught by a little, slight fellow, poorly dressed, someone who was obviously meager in his share of this world's goods. At that point, the official policy seemed to change; the officer came around and demanded the ball, and pocketed it. Although we were sitting some rows away, I thought the slight little man was going to cry, and while I and the others were sitting there, trying to bring this little tragedy into focus, and to decide what if anything could be done, CHARLIE BOYLE, who was sitting next to us, moving with great speed, went forward and went up to the officer. I could see that a heated argument was in progress. Then, suddenly, the officer, with a sheepish smile, gave the baseball to the slight little man. He burst into a great and wonderful smile.

Now, if CHARLIE BOYLE is to be criticized for throwing his weight around, if he did not sufficiently observe the fine line which should be drawn between the functions of the executive and the legislative, I am sure that the Lord will forgive him. So shines a good deed in a naughty world.

His lovely wife, Helen, has lost a loyal husband; his wonderful children have lost a devoted father; and those of us here who loved him have lost a friend who never can be replaced.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise this afternoon to join my beloved dean and other colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the late Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE.

CHARLIE BOYLE and I came to the Congress in the same year and from the first time I shook his hand he was a tower of personal strength to me. He always had a smile and a good word for all.

I think of the words here this afternoon: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

I think that describes CHARLIE BOYLE more eloquently than any words I might utter here today.

To his charming wife and eight children I join the others in expressing very sincere sympathy in the loss of a great father and husband, a great legislator, and a great American.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the others in expressing my sincere and deep appreciation for the great work and qualities of our late colleague, CHARLES BOYLE, of Illinois.

It was my privilege to know him and to work with him. The things that have been said here today about him are true and they reflect the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOYLE was a Christian gentleman; he practiced the philosophy of the dignity of man.

We are the losers at his passing. I express my sympathy to his wife and lovely family.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my happiness to know intimately the late CHARLES BOYLE. During the past summer here when our families had gone home, he along with some other Congressmen—and I was privileged to be in the group—used to go swimming at one of the clubs here. Often we had dinner together.

I found Mr. BOYLE to be a fine friend. He was a man of dedication, he was sincere, he was a person who exemplified the best in family relationships.

I found it was a great privilege to know CHARLES BOYLE and to have his friendship and along with other Members who have spoken here, I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and to his family.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the fatal automobile accident which took the life of my good friend, CHARLIE BOYLE, on election night last November.

I join with my colleagues from Illinois in paying tribute to Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE of the 12th District of Illinois. His constituents and the Nation have lost a true and fearless advocate, a dedicated servant. His widow and family of eight wonderful children have lost a devoted husband and father. I have lost a dear friend.

I have known Congressman BOYLE and his family as friends and neighbors since we came to Congress together. It was my privilege to see the Boyle family in their happiest and most treasured moments—when the children would romp and play and sing with their dad. They were a close-knit, devoted family team.

Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE was a man of many interests. Foremost, however, was his love of home and love of family. In 1952 he was elected Chicagoland Father of the Year and later chosen "Mr. Illinois." Although a prominent Catholic layman, CHARLIE was recently accorded honorary membership in a Jewish synagogue in his district. Such was the measure of this man.

In his work in Congress, CHARLIE BOYLE was dedicated and untiring on every issue. His words and his vote were always recorded on the side of the humanity which he loved.

I know the courageous spirit which dwells in his widow, Helen Boyle, and the family strength which will empower her and the children to successfully make their way ahead.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I join and concur in everything that my colleagues have said about the statesmanship of the late Congressman BOYLE and about his high type of service here in the House. But, as much as we will miss him, I think he will be missed far more by his family, his wife and his eight children, because it has been my privilege to see a lot of devoted and doting fathers in my time, but never one who so constantly had his family in mind as CHARLIE BOYLE did. Therefore, I wish to especially express my sympathy to his wife and to his children, who will miss him greatly in the years to come.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to CHARLIE BOYLE. On November 4, 1959, while driving alone, a tragic automobile accident took CHARLIE away from us in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember his kindness, his friendship, and his automobile. I personally shall miss him very much.

Washington, D.C., can be a cold town, especially to a newcomer. When I first arrived in Washington this town was cold and the evenings were somewhat lonesome. The first warm feeling I received here was after the President's ball in 1957 when CHARLIE took me and my wife to pile in his old jalopy with four other congressional couples. Dressed in tails and evening gowns, we made the town and had a wonderful evening. We enjoyed a cup of hot coffee, while dressed in tails, at the White Tower. This was the first pleasant evening I spent in this town, and I owe it to CHARLIE BOYLE. He showed me that Washington had a heart and that Con-

gress had men of intelligence, warmth, and understanding. Putting 10 people in his car made CHARLIE feel young and very happy. It made him feel as if he were at home with his eight children driving around the country with him. At breakfast or in the cloakroom, when we breakfasted together, which was very often, or when we shared a cup of coffee together, he would frequently talk about his lovely wife, Helen, and his eight children. He often talked about the problem of raising a large family and how difficult it was. He was a loving husband and a devoted father.

Representative BOYLE's prematurely ended career was a classic American success story. Born on a farm in Michigan, CHARLES BOYLE worked his way through college and law school by driving a Chicago city bus for 7 years. After his admission to the bar he practiced law in Chicago. During the late thirties he served as zone attorney and agent for the Federal Housing Administration. His experience on the farm and his life in the city caused him to understand the problems of the farmer and the aspirations of the city cliffdwellers.

As a proven champion of the underdog and orator of note, CHARLES BOYLE was inevitably drawn to a political career. He was elected to the 84th Congress and reelected to the two succeeding Congresses. His record here in Washington was outstanding. Representative BOYLE's character was recognized by his people. His fellow Chicagoans named him "Chicagoland Father of the Year" in 1952. I was fortunate to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and I can attest that he was an excellent legislator and a splendid American.

CHARLES BOYLE passed this way and has gone to the great beyond. Because on the way he touched me, I am richer in experience, wiser in judgment. I am happier in memories. All who met him on his journey through the corridor called life share this feeling and sentiment.

To his wife, Helen, and his children, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, another chapter in Americana has closed. CHARLIE BOYLE represented and lived by the true American tradition. There was no silver spoon in his mouth when he was born, but in his heart was golden treasure and as he grew into childhood the ambition budded to prepare himself for an adult life of service to humanity. Everything that he was to get in this world he had to earn for himself. To take him through college he drove a taxi. He did anything that he could honestly to earn his way and to prepare himself for his destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I think that every man does have a destiny, his mission to perform. CHARLIE BOYLE had his destiny. I always thought that he had a sense of realizing the nature of his destiny. His acts of friendship in this House, his every word and every deed, pinpointed his realization that his was a destiny of service to humanity. Everybody was his friend and CHARLIE BOYLE never failed a friend. In Chicago everywhere they spoke of him, and in the grief that now prevails still speak of him, as warmhearted CHARLIE BOYLE. His heart was as tender as his voice was eloquent, and his brain sharp and keen.

At the close of the last session I stood chatting with him out behind the rail near the coffeeroom. I said, "CHARLIE, you are 52; you are young; you have made a great record in the House; you have served unselfishly and outstandingly your constituents and your country; you have a great future ahead of you. You have an ability that I have never known in any other man to the degree that you possess it—the ability of memory. You are in the prime of life, your national stature already brilliantly established, and your future can lead to any heights."

Once I had introduced a young man to CHARLIE BOYLE. CHARLIE had not seen this young man for 2 years, had had no contact with him, no especial reason for remembering him, yet when again he met him he called him by his first name, "Fred, how are you?" He possessed one of the most unfailing memories for names I have ever known.

He went everywhere. He met people. Such a man in the political world, with his ability, with his dedication—of course, there was a future for him. So I was saying to CHARLIE right out there in this Chamber behind the rail that he had a great future in public life. He said, "No, BARRATT, I do not feel that way." We then talked of the sacrifices men in Congress are called upon to make, sacrifices willingly made and unadvertised, but the toll they take from families. No man ever loved his wife and children more than CHARLIE BOYLE.

I do not know that he had a sense of what was going to happen to him, but I remember that little chat so well, right out there in this Chamber behind the rail, and it came vividly to mind that morning in November when I had turned on the radio to hear the dreadful tidings of his death.

Mr. Speaker, this is another one of those occasions when we realize the inadequacy of words. All of us loved CHARLIE BOYLE, and we have been in this well trying to project something of our feeling, something of our sentiment, something of our grief. But words are inadequate. We feel so deeply within us that there are no words that can measure the volume of our grief.

To that fine wife and to those eight wonderful children I extend my most profound sympathy.

At his funeral, joining our beloved dean, TOM O'BRIEN, and CHARLIE's colleagues from Illinois were HENRY REUSS and CHARLIE VANIK, close friends of the Boyle family. I shall never forget that scene. HENRY and CHARLIE standing among the children, their arms stretched out to embrace them all together, and all weeping. This is how we felt. Warmhearted CHARLIE BOYLE had left us, in the midday of his sojourn; another chapter in Americana had been closed. He had fulfilled his destiny of service to humanity.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my friends in paying tribute to our former colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BOYLE. As Members present today probably know, Mr. BOYLE's philosophy of government and my own were about as far removed as two philosophies could possibly be. But despite that we were very good friends.

It was our privilege to be elected to the Congress in the same year, 1954, and because our wives were both members of the 84th Club, through that association we had considerable social contact with Mr. BOYLE, and it was through that particular medium that I became well acquainted with him.

So many things about Mr. BOYLE impressed me. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] mentioned that he had eight children. Notwithstanding his own family I was impressed with the generosity of Mr. BOYLE's character, by the fact in addition to their own children, they found room in their home and heart for another child. I know of few Members of the House who would have undertaken additional responsibility under similiar circumstances. Any person who is willing to make a place for another child in his own home certainly has manifested his true interest and dedication to his fellow men more than in any other way it could possibly be expressed. I think it was characteristic of Mr. BOYLE's sympathetic nature, his true love of his fellow men, and his dedication to his own responsibility as a father, a citizen, and as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Again may I say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. BOYLE will certainly be missed by all of his colleagues who serve the Congress. We extend our condolences to his wife and his children.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death on November 4, 1959, of our late colleague and my personal friend, CHARLES A. BOYLE, was a shock to me, as well as to my colleagues.

During his service in this body, CHARLIE BOYLE and I became close friends. He was one of the most serious and industrious Members of this body. His ability was outstanding. Those in this body who served with him will long treasure his memory.

CHARLES BOYLE, at 52, was at the peak of his intellectual vigor, and, in his third term in Congress, had achieved the facility of a veteran legislator. In his congressional service, he made full use of the experience gained in his student

days, when, while earning his law degrees, he drove a bus and served in other capacities the Chicago Motor Coach Co. His experience as zone attorney for the Federal Housing Administration, supervising 12 Midwestern States, qualified him to speak as an authority on many matters connected with housing. CHARLIE BOYLE made a name for himself by his eloquence at an early age, winning the Chicago high school oratorial championship in 1924, and in 1930 both winning the Carter Harrison oratorical medal at Loyola University and placing second in the national intercollegiate regional oratorical tournament. Through his legal and legislative career, he had practiced and developed this speaking ability to a high point of excellence.

In his personal relationships CHARLES BOYLE was also notably successful. As devoted husband, and father of eight children, he won recognition in 1952 as "Chicagoland Father of the Year" and "Mr. Illinois." He was a man of many warm friendships, genial, and deeply concerned for the welfare of his neighbors. An American of Irish descent, a communicant of the Catholic church, a man of deep faith, he was always found fighting the battle of the sick, the weak, the oppressed, the persecuted. He opposed and fought bigotry in any form. By word, example, and deed, he lived up to the spiritual truths he so strongly believed in.

He was a strong supporter of newly established nations, and new nations emerging from colonization. For example, he was one of the strongest champions of the recently established nation of Israel. His name will long live in a memorial established by Israel in his honor in 1957, on his 50th birthday—a grove of 1,000 eucalyptus trees near the hills of Judea.

To Mrs. Boyle and her loved ones, his friends and colleagues offer our tribute of honor to his memory, and of sorrow in the passing on of CHARLIE BOYLE.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding the life and services of the late CHARLES A. BOYLE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, God's strength of will foredooms men to the hereafter. And so it was with our distinguished colleague, CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Illinois, whose recent tragic death was bemoaned by his friends, associates, and family.

Throughtout his entire life he chose to serve those who needed most the succor and strength of honest and true leadership in public affairs. He never faltered in his support of liberal doctrines for the protection of the natural freedoms of the oppressed. And with that oratorical brilliancy characteristic of the sages of other years of these Capitol Halls, he forcibly and with pointed language carried the debate to the success it merited.

It is a common fault of most men in political life to stretch their finances beyond their own worldly gains. And so it was with CHARLES BOYLE whose many kindnesses won for him many blessings of the poor and unfortunate.

His youth and early adult life was one of great struggle and sacrifice. He worked his way at various trades, some menial, others skilled, to reach the heights of the legal profession.

As a father he was a worthy example of the true American parent. His heartfelt devotion to his family was a byword among his neighbors.

His love of his eight children is reflected in the many sacrifices that he endured providing for their education and welfare.

He was a Catholic person who lived by his religious precepts. He was happy most in a political scrap—and the Lord knows that he was an expert in a slambang campaign. He was in the forefront in Israel's fight for recognition and freedom. Among these people of religious faith he was admired and supported in all of his undertakings and campaigns. He believed in what he stood for. His was not the stand of a political bigot whose personal opinion betrayed his public position on questions. CHARLES BOYLE was an alert and devoted, dedicated statesman. He was a stanch and loyal friend. Who could ask for more? The people of the Nation, the State of Illinois, and the citizens of Chicago have lost a statesman of great character and national stature in the death of our popular colleague, CHARLES A. BOYLE.

May God bless his familly and dutiful and loving wife, Helen, who with courage and confidence is bravely carrying on. It is with a deep faith instilled in both by their mutual ambitions for the future of their loving children that she is able to go on.

It is our duty to see that time does not dull our interest or memory fade our friendship for this fine family—may his soul rest in peace.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely passing of our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, is a loss to all of us. As a fellow member of the Illinois delegation, I can testify to the tremendous esteem and respect in which he was held in the district he served and by all who associated with him.

We knew him to be a man of great ability, knowledge, and genuine and deep understanding of the problems of human life. In all his activities, he was gentle and unassuming. He was especially dedicated to the interest of the city of Chicago, and he firmly believed and practiced his personal political philosophy in a completely independent mind. In his service in the Congress of the United States, he served his district, his city, State, and Nation with great devotion.

I extend to Mrs. Boyle and their children my deepest sympathy.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of CHARLES A. BOYLE in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing.

I subscribe to every tribute which has been paid him by the Members of the House and especially by the members of our Committee on Appropriations. CHARLES A. BOYLE represented the finest as a gentlemen and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, able, industrious, sincere, and courageous.

The city of Chicago and the State of Illinois suffered a great loss in the death of this outstanding Representative.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in an expression of appreciation of the character of our departed fellow Member, and in the extension of sympathies to his widow and the family.

It was my privilege to have served on the Appropriations Committee with CHARLIE BOYLE. He was always friendly, he always had time for a gracious visit or an intelligent exchange of views on any existing mutual problem. CHARLIE BOYLE was an honest man, and as has been said here many times today, always seeking for the just and the equitable answer. He served with diligence and distinction on our committee and his untimely passing is a real loss to us and to the Nation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of CHARLIE BOYLE has brought real sorrow to all of those of us who were fortunate to be his friends.

His intense loyalty, his always warm and bubbling personality, and his always evident sincerity contributed richly to those who were associated with him not only in an official capacity, but in the many ways in which men come to appreciate and value their mutual friendships.

CHARLIE BOYLE was a lawyer with a keen and discerning knowledge and perception, but above all he was a warm human being who thought in terms of the welfare of people, in terms of the love and affection which he knew from his own family and which he would wish for all other families.

He was a liberal, but not a radical. He was a hard worker who knew the joys of real comradeship.

We shall miss him sorely and I, for one, shall feel his presence and a sort of obligation to strive even harder for those things to which he was devoted for the welfare of his own constituents and his country.

To Mrs. Boyle and all his family go our most heartfelt thoughts and prayers.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to a great American, the Honorable CHARLIE A. BOYLE whose untimely death occurred recently.

During the first session of this Congress I had the privilege of serving with CHARLIE whom I considered a wise counselor, a friend, and a man whom I deeply respected. He has served for many years in this House with distinction and the loss of no longer having the benefit of his keen intellect and judgment will not only be felt by his constituents, but by the entire country.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Boyle and their children in the loss of a

devoted husband, father, and fine American.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, we were all deeply shocked at the news of the unfortunate accident which resulted in the death of our colleague, CHARLES BOYLE, of Chicago, Ill. He had served in three sessions of the House of Representatives and during that period of time had made an outstanding record as an able representative for his district, city, and State. CHARLIE BOYLE attained success in his chosen profession—the law—and also in public service by consistent work, application, and extending liberally of his services and time to the welfare of his friends and constituents. His district has indeed lost a representative in Congress who will be very difficult to replace. While a Member of Congress, he worked long hours to acquaint himself with legislation. He deligently followed up on all requests and demands coming from his community and by reason thereof had built up a personal following in both political parties which would have warranted for him a long service in the Congress of the United States.

CHARLIE BOYLE was the father of eight children and in recognition of his outstanding status as a father and family man he was selected as the "Chicagoland Father of the Year" in 1952 and 1953. His many friends in Chicago and in the Congress will miss him in the coming session and for a long time in the future.

I wish to extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its ablest younger Members and each of us individually a good friend in the untimely death of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Illinois.

CHARLIE BOYLE was a man who shared of himself generously. There was not a problem which any Member faced and with which CHARLIE BOYLE could help that did not get his personal attention. This, regardless of political affiliation. I know. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. BOYLE helped me a number of times with problems which came before that group. He gave unstintingly of his time and effort in these matters.

Later on we both became associated on the Committee on Appropriations and worked together closely as colleagues on the Subcommittee on Defense. All through the arduous hearings of last year CHARLIE BOYLE never failed to preserve his calm, his good nature, and his keen insight into problems both of a national and a personal type which came before our committee.

The House has lost a fine Member; the people of Illinois a fine servant, and I feel the loss of a good friend. Both Mrs. Weaver and I extend to Mrs. Boyle and the fine family our condolences upon their great and troubling loss.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my profound sorrow at the passing away of our late friend from Illinois, the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE.

I had the pleasure of serving with him in this House during these past three Congresses. He was a man of exceptional ability and of firm beliefs. He was a good friend and neighbor and an outstanding legislator. The people of the 12th District of Illinois lost in his death a constant and outspoken champion of their interests.

To his widow and family I wish to extend my sincere sympathy. May they derive some measure of consolation in their bereavement from the thought that the good Lord has called CHARLES to be among His very own.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the Illinois delegation in expressing our shock, our grief, our loss. The death of Congressman BOYLE leaves a void within our ranks that will not easily be filled.

Many would speak with truth of his capacity which was proven here by his rapid rise within our ranks. Many would praise—and rightly so—his devotion to his district, to his city, to his State, and to his country. I could join in each of these expressions with sincerity and wholeheartedness. I, personally, however, wish to call to mind and shall long remember those personal attributes of CHARLES BOYLE which made him a friend to every man. Such a friendly spirit, ever ready and true, is not often found in this world; and the loss of his friendship will be felt by each and every one of us who served with him here. He gave his help, his time, and, indeed, himself, without stint.

With his district I share the sense of loss that comes with the passing of a public servant so dedicated to the services of his people. To his family whom he loved so tenderly I send my deep and understanding sympathy.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois and the hosts of others in the House who have expressed their sorrow over the death of the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, who so ably represented the 12th District of Illinois in this body.

No one could have come in contact with CHARLIE BOYLE without developing a strong feeling of friendship for him because his whole personality generated warmth and affection and led people to know his great capacity to share himself with his fellow man. It was evident in his every action that he wanted to help his fellow man and that he wanted to participate in those things that lead to the achievement of happiness for others.

It has been said here this afternoon that CHARLIE BOYLE gave every indication in his devotion to his work that he thought first of the good he could do for others—for his community and for his country. This was his trademark. He worked night and day, tirelessly, to better the world he lived in. Well grounded in moral philosophy he quickly grasped the types of programs that appeared most likely to point to better conditions for those he represented in Congress.

As a legislator he quickly established himself as an effective leader. Few were more quick to analyze a situation than CHARLIE BOYLE. Few were more aggressive in fighting for worthy causes.

To his wonderful family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a tragic automobile accident on election night in 1959 has taken from us a beloved colleague, the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE. Upon coming to the House of Representatives at the beginning of the 84th Congress, CHARLIE BOYLE quickly made a host of friends among the Members—each of whom was pleased to be considered his friend during his entire service. In this body where oratorical competence is considered almost a commonplace he soon proved himself to be an outstanding and eloquent advocate. His eloquence—far from being an artifice—was simply an outward expression of the depth of his feelings and faith in the causes he espoused.

The energy and industry that CHARLIE BOYLE demonstrated in his congressional career, both in this Chamber and in the Committees of the Judiciary and Appropriations, had its origin in his youth when he worked his way through college. His powers of persuasive speech served him well in his chosen profession of the law which he practiced for a quarter of a century. He was exceptionally devoted to his family and to his professional and other activities and, despite the demands of an engrossing and active life, he never neglected anyone or any cause to which he was attached. His activities included membership in professional, fraternal, and other organizations which he served well.

It was in his family life that the admirable character of our late colleague revealed itself. His dedication to his wife and to his fine family of eight children brought to him the coveted honor of being chosen Chicagoland Father of the Year, 1952–53. To his family and to his countless friends within and outside the Congress I want to offer my sincere condolences. CHARLIE BOYLE will be truly missed.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I have listened to these many words that have been said about our good friend and colleague, the late Honorable CHARLIE BOYLE, of Illinois. I have seldom been as shocked as I was when I heard of CHARLIE BOYLE'S untimely accident. I have seldom felt as deep a sense of deprivation as when I was told that he would not be with us in the future. But I can take some consolation from the memory of his courageous dedication to the principles in which he believed, and his inexhaustible supply of energy and enthusiasm with which he went forth to do battle for the goals his conscience set for him. CHARLIE BOYLE was a great Member of the House. CHARLIE BOYLE'S devotion to his work, and to the people whom he so ably represented, cannot be taken away from the aura that fills this Chamber by his passing. To Mrs. Boyle and their family I extend my deepest sympathy and my very best wishes.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the untimely passing of our beloved colleague CHARLES BOYLE, of Chicago.

CHARLIE was a lovable, capable, sincere, intelligent, fearless, God-fearing, God-loving Member of this great body. He served his constituents with a devotion that truly inspired all of us. His ready wit—grin, and pleasant disposition, will be greatly missed. The Nation and Illinois have lost a noble son—a real Christian—a splendid gentleman and a fine legislator. May God rest his sweet soul in peace and bless his family always.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of the late CHARLES A. BOYLE, Congressman from Illinois who passed away on November 4 during the recess of the Congress.

I was privileged to serve on the Appropriations Committee with CHARLIE BOYLE and learned to admire and respect him greatly. He was an extremely active, capable, and forceful legislator. He served on our committee and in the House with distinction and honor. The news of his sudden and tragic death while the Congress was in adjournment came as a shock and we were all saddened to learn of his passing and his presence will be missed.

To Mrs. Boyle and the members of his family I extend an expression of genuine sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, our early meetings of this session are saddened as we think of old friends who are no longer with us. One loss comes home to me personally with particular force, that of the jovial, the energetic, the eloquent CHARLES A. BOYLE. We shall long miss and deeply mourn the loss of that forceful mind, that great heart. As a legislator, CHARLIE BOYLE was noted for his mastery of some particular fields of interest, growing out of his life experience, such as labor and transportation and housing; but it was for his human qualities that he was most notable. CHARLIE BOYLE loved people, individually, in illimitable numbers. He could not stand to see anybody pushed around, and he would not stand for anybody being pushed around, whether by other individuals, by organized groups, or by governments. He was a one-man task force, doing battle against injustice and tyranny and prejudice wherever he found them. May his soul rest in peace. Our hearts go out to his wife and *eight* fine children in their great loss. May the heritage of courage and vigor, of love and religious faith, which is their legacy from that good husband and father, console them in their affliction, and strengthen them for the hard tasks ahead.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, because Congressman BOYLE and I became close personal friends during the years we served together in Congress, I feel deeply bound to offer these remarks on his passing.

Shortly before the 1st session of the 86th Congress adjourned, I played golf with CHARLIE and later joined him at his home as I had done previously. It was always a great pleasure for me to be with the late Congressman BOYLE's family for it was truly a fine, typically American family. I shall never forget the pleasures of our association, socially and professionally. My late colleague from Illinois was one of the hardest working gentlemen I have known in my life; he was as direct and forthright in his approach to controversial issues as any man. I have never known him to lose sight of his basic objectives nor turn his back upon anyone who needed assistance. Nothing I can say at this time can add to what has already been said by so many others who knew and respected him as a person and a statesman. His untimely death was indeed a shock to all of us and his passing a loss to so many.

His achievements are a monument to his public service and his wonderful family, a reflection of his love for the Christian way of life that is the cornerstone of this great Nation.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the news of the tragic, untimely passing of Congressman CHARLES BOYLE struck us all a stunning and a crushing blow.

Only a short time before that fateful night, we had seen him in our midst—on the floor and in the halls of this great representative body—vibrant, vigorous, and in the full bloom of health and spirit—filled with the zest of life, immersed in his dedicated tasks and duties which he invariably faced and carried through with a seriousness of purpose, a wealth of knowledge, a driving determination, a gifted capacity and a lofty idealism that commanded the respect and admiration of every Member of the Congress and won for him widespread gratitude of the very many he had loyally served with such unfaltering zeal and effectiveness.

CHARLIE BOYLE was beloved by all his colleagues. He was instinctively kind and generous and intuitively responsive to the needs of the people.

Devout in religious beliefs and practices to which he was profoundly devoted, he possessed a broad, tolerant mind which encompassed and harbored in a very unusual degree love of his fellowman. In his generous heart he was the true, practical exemplification of the deeper, hidden meanings of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

A sound thinker, an eloquent talker, an articulate forceful advocate of forward-looking, humane causes, a brilliant lawyer, a painstaking, indefatigable worker, Congressman BOYLE during his tenure in the House served with conspicuous ability, sincerity, and effectiveness.

CHARLIE BOYLE was stricken down at the very height of his powers, with the larger portion of a great and promising career still before him. His lamentable demise has left a deep void in this body and has brought genuine sorrow and sadness to all of us.

We cherished his noble character, his congeniality and warm, good fellowship just as we admired his ability and devotion to duty.

A great American and a great Christian gentleman has been called to his heavenly home. We join his bereaved family and many friends in mourning his loss.

But he has left a legacy of devoted service, and goodness, and kindness and warm fellowship here that will long be remembered, that will leave a deep imprint upon the memories and the annals of this great legislative body.

To his bereaved family, his friends and all those dear to him, with a heavy heart, I tender my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy. In their truly irreparable loss I pray that the Good Lord may solace them and bring them strength and courage to bear his passing with resignation to the divine will.

And may our beloved and dear friend and esteemed colleague, CHARLIE BOYLE, rest in heavenly and eternal peace.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered a great loss in the tragic death of our esteemed colleague, CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Chicago. He was an outstanding public servant, dedicated to his service in the House of Representatives. No one in recent years has served his constituents as faithfully and well. He was loved and admired by all who knew him. He had a host of friends in Illinois, not only in Chicago but downstate as well. He had many, many friends throughout the whole country.

CHARLIE BOYLE was one of the most astute politicians we have ever known in the State of Illinois. He was a very able attorney, a great legislator, and an outstanding father. He had great love for his family and lived by the laws of God. We were always proud to have CHARLIE BOYLE serve with us in the Illinois delegation. He was the type of man we like to have serve with us, and we shall all miss him greatly in the years to come.

I join with my colleagues in extending my sympathy to his gracious wife and his wonderful family. May God give them strength and guide them in the difficult years ahead.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 401).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE STEVEN V. CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding the life and services of the late STEVEN V. CARTER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened last November 4 to learn of the passing of our colleague, STEVEN V. CARTER, who passed from this life exactly 1 year following the date of his election to the Congress from the Fourth Iowa District.

It was a privilege of mine to count STEVE as a friend. I knew him well, for not only had we traveled along the way together in the activities in which we were mutually associated, but upon one occasion STEVE stayed with us for several days in our home here in Washington. It was at this time that I came to know, better than I ever had before, the sterling qualities of STEVEN CARTER.

STEVEN V. CARTER was born in Carterville, Utah, on October 8, 1915. At the age of 14 he moved to the town of Lamoni, Iowa, where he attended and graduated from the Lamoni High School and Graceland College. He later attended the University of Iowa and was graduated from there in 1937 with a B.A. degree in economics and political science. Continuing his education, he graduated from the State University of Iowa College of Law with a juris doctor's degree in 1939. He practiced law in Leon, Iowa, for 19 years. This practice was disrupted by his service in the U.S. Navy in the South Pacific during World War II.

His career as an attorney in the town of Leon was highlighted by his great interest and activity in his community's civic affairs. His interest and faith in the youth of America was demonstrated by his contributions to the Boy Scout activities in his community. He was a member of Grand River Lodge, No. 78, A.F. & A.M., the Lions Club, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the executive board of the Southern Iowa Council of Boy Scouts of America.

The highlight of his life, as far as civic activity and accomplishments were concerned, was that he was elected to the 86th Congress on November 4, 1958, the first and the only Democrat to be elected from the Fourth District of Iowa. Not only did I know STEVE as a friend, but I knew him as one who was a real American.

What I have just presented to you were the facts of his life. These were, in part, some of the accomplishments of his life. But, they do not in total represent the attributes and the values, the desires and the dreams of our friend and colleague, STEVE CARTER. STEVEN V. CARTER had qualities above these mere facts of his life, and he never gave up on anything. STEVEN and I shared, together, in the campaign activities in which we were both interested. I knew STEVE as an ardent campaigner. I knew him to be a hard worker. All of his people were impressed by his courage as a valiant fighter; and, found him to be a gracious and a humble winner. He was a successful attorney, practicing law in his home community. He was a devoted man and was respected in the area in which he lived. But, exactly 1 year after his election, the dread disease of cancer took him from our midst. However, during his year of service in these marble halls, STEVE CARTER made a record. I remember well the day he introduced a bill calling for a crash program against the great diseases of our time—heart disease, multiple sclerosis and cancer. For here, on that day, stood a man who even then was caught in the grasp of a fatal malady—but a man who refused to turn in retreat. It was this kind of perseverance that exemplified the life of this man CARTER. It was this perseverance that was equaled only by STEVE'S mild manner, by his patience, and by his thoughtfulness. STEVE never had an easy life. He knew of life's trials. He had been confronted with life's tribulations. He had experienced, at times, defeat. But STEVE CARTER never gave up, for his life and all of life to him was a challenge. And so he fought on. STEVE CARTER was still fighting for life when he slipped away quietly in the early morning hours of November 4, 1959.

It is true that from our low spiritual level, our dim eyes cannot, through the smoke and fog, see the coming dawn. But, if we climb up to the mountain peaks of faith in the eternal God, we can see above, beyond, and below the horizon where the dappled mists of saffron and purple are blushing into crimson and yellowing into gold. The sun is rising.

> Out of the darkness and night
> The world rolls into light,
> It is daybreak everywhere.

I am sure that this is as STEVE found it. I want today to express my profound sympathy and sorrow to STEVE'S widow, Lucy, and to their two sons, Steven A. and Charles.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there is a sadness in my heart as we begin this new session of the Congress, for I miss keenly the presence of a former devoted Member of this body—a colleague of mine from the State of Iowa—the esteemed STEVEN V. CARTER, who left us last November.

A greater example of dedication to duty has seldom, if ever, been set than that set by STEVE CARTER. Day after day when he should have been conserving his energies, he was in these Halls, and in this Chamber, looking out for the interests of the people of the Fourth District of Iowa and of the Nation. Few men have a finer record.

In the late days of the last session, his tremendous courage and devotion came through when he had to be physically carried to the Chamber to cast his vote on several pieces of very significant legislation. Many Members commented on this strength of purpose which drove a man in his fast failing health to perform to the last ounce of his physical endurance. This expression has been used in reference to many men, but in the case of my dear friend, STEVE, I am convinced that this devotion undoubtedly took several months off of his life.

I consider it an honor to add my voice to others here today in tribute to STEVE and in gratefulness for the privilege of knowing him and working with him. I shall miss him dreadfully in the coming months, but his courage and steadfastness of purpose will forever remain an inspiration to me and to all who knew him.

I sincerely hope that STEVE'S son, Steve, will follow in the footsteps of his father. He has already demonstrated real leadership working at his father's side here in Washington and in Iowa. To the Carters I can say, hold your head high and walk in the knowledge of your husband's and father's great public and community service.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay my respects to our departed friend and colleague, STEVE CARTER. I had never met STEVE CARTER until he was elected to this House of Representatives, but it did not take me long to know that here was a man with deep and wonderful convictions; a devoted father, and husband, a friendly man. There was something big and fine and good about STEVE CARTER that you liked deep down in your heart.

I had many talks with STEVE. I inquired about his health. He always said, "BEN, I think I am going to make it. I am feeling better." Now I am sure he wanted most to make you, his friends, feel better; that was his nature. He scattered sunshine even to the last minute of his good life. He came to this House in a weakened condition when most men would have said, "No. I cannot make it." Not STEVE. He came to the floor of this House of Representatives and cast his vote according to his best conscience, and he did it with a smile. Never did I know a more friendly man than STEVE CARTER. I mourn his passing.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his good wife and children and loved ones.

I attended the funeral of STEVE CARTER, and there I saw the great respect and admiration which his friends and neighbors had for this good man. There they were—a house full of people at his home and a church full of people and flowers heaped high. In fact there were not enough seats in that large house of God to seat the folks who came to pay their last respects to their friend and our friend, STEVE CARTER.

God rest his soul.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I knew STEVEN CARTER for many years. He represented a district where several dozen of my relatives lived. He practiced law in this district in a wonderful, quiet, Christian town called Leon, where he was also laid to rest on the west slope of a hill overlooking a quiet valley. He not only was a leading citizen of that area, but he was also typical of those who live so close to the soil, to nature, and to God, and to life itself.

He was clean, quiet, temperate, and understanding of others. He could disagree without being disagreeable. He was also very persistent, as he quietly pressed forward for the things in which he believed.

He ran for Congress for 10 years before being elected. Each time, becoming known to more people for the man he was. He loved his work and he stood at attention looking straight forward and never yielded to the pain and suffering until he fell.

As he became weaker physically, he became even stronger in his determination to serve as he had promised. He

greatly taxed his remaining strength to come to the House floor and to work for those things he had promised to support. He hoped that his sickness would disappear, but he hoped even more that his colleagues would give all their support to research and other measures to spare others of suffering.

He acquired a wide knowledge of public affairs and his mind was very clear as to the direction he should move. Even when he was suffering with pain, he suffered no difficulty in finding his direction. His attitude was an inspiration to all of us to work harder in our years upon this earth, and a reminder of the value of our time.

Few men have worked as long to serve such a short time, and few Members who served a long time ever did more in a long time than he did in a short time.

The Fourth District of Iowa has lost a constructive and aggressive legislator and though this body has lost his personal affiliation for all time, we have permanently gained from the impression STEVEN CARTER made upon us. Like his family, we have lost from the fact that we can gain no more from his personal association.

To his family, I express my deepest sympathy—our heart goes out to them. May the Lord bless them all.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I most certainly want to add my words of tribute to this fine gentleman with whom we have had the privilege of serving in this great body. While I did not have the privilege many of you experienced of knowing him over a very long period of time, I did get to know him early after he came to this body and learned to respect and to love him because when it was necessary for him to make a decision he found it possible to see what was right and then took his position on that matter.

Our friend and colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] spoke about his tolerance and fairness, and I am sure that we agree with him. I remember one occasion when we were appearing in behalf of an important project in his district and mine and certain statements were made involving another Member of Congress, a member of the other party, one of our colleagues. STEVEN CARTER saw that this was wrong and he took a position then and there to get the record straight even though it concerned a person very high in his party. I cite this to show that he had very deep convictions, and this is one of the reasons I think he was able to make the outstanding record he made even though he served so short a time and under very difficult circumstances. I remember particularly his attitude. Knowing of his condition, like many of you, I went by to pass the time of day almost every day when he was on the floor, and it was refreshing to know that even while in your own heart you felt there was not much chance, yet he had an optimistic attitude about this condition of his, and when inquiry was made about his health, he said: "Well, I believe I am getting along all right, I am going to fight this through; I am getting stronger," and so forth. This optimistic attitude was good, I think, not only for himself, but also was particularly good for his colleagues. It is something that I learned is a good thing and I hope in the future it may stand me in good stead, as I am sure it will with those who have associated with him in this great body.

I noted, especially in my conversations with him, his interest in worthwhile things.

I was pleased to note at the funeral services, which I attended, that the man in charge—I have forgotten his name—called attention to the interest Mr. CARTER had in the Scouts, in the public schools, in the project that meant an improvement for the community, and particularly the youth of the community. This is an outstanding thing to note in a public servant.

Many things could be said about STEVE CARTER that would be an inspiration to all of us. I think it is a good thing for our colleague from the Sixth District of Iowa [Mr. COAD] to take the floor today and give us this opportunity to pay tribute to him and to have these things spread upon the record of the House.

I, too, join with my many colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending sympathy to his fine family who will mourn his loss. But it must be an inspiration for them to know and to realize it was a great privilege of theirs, as it was to us, to know this man and to have lived with and under his influence.

There is a statement on a public building in my town which goes something like this, and I think of it when I think of men like STEVE CARTER:

What a man does for himself dies with him. But what a man does for his country, his friends and his Nation, lives forever.

In that sense this man will live, as many others who have gone before him, are living with us today and have their influence.

I join with my colleagues and with his friends, neighbors, and constituents of the First District of Iowa in extending sympathy to his very fine family.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the speech by Dr. Roy Cheville which he gave on the occasion of STEVE CARTER'S funeral in Leon, Iowa.

MOUNTAINS OF FAITH

Jesus talked to his followers about faith that would remove mountains. In his own daily life he lived by ascending mountains. He never waved a wand to remove some obstructing hill in order to make life easy. He faced life honestly and seriously and recognized there were mountains before him and at times around him. He climbed and from such vantage points saw in eternal perspective what could not have been seen so clearly in the valley. He surveyed life from the summits of mountains of faith. This day, we are reflecting on the life of a friend who faced the blockading effects of life's crags and peaks and climbed them to experience larger vision.

ON A MOUNTAIN

A few years ago a friend and I set out to climb Mt. Tamalpais in California. At the foothills the fog hung low and mists seemed to enshroud us. We met a hiker coming who had turned around when half way up the mountain. "It's wet and you can't see anything," was his warning. We pushed on and at the top, the sun broke through and we saw in glorious perspective the plains and hills. Beyond was the ocean, symbolical of the great unknown. The sun lightened the scene with cheerful warmth. We stood in silence for a while. There is little to say in the greatness of earth's wonders. There were only two of us. We do not take large companies when we climb up mountains of faith. Often we have to go alone. Many times we have to go in faith that the sun will break through.

Once I went with a company of youth to climb Mt. Manitou in Colorado. The hurrying crowd called out, "Who'll get there first?" They scampered away without looking to the right or to the left. On reaching the top they called out, "Who'll get down first?" How little they saw! How much they missed. Some of us walked a while and then looked out over the valley. Then at the top the glorious picture stretched out before us. We have to get up high enough to see life in its totality and in its relationships. Close up to Notre Dame we may see only a gargoyle staring at us. At a distance we see the total historic cathedral in proportion and balance.

THE MOUNTAIN VIEW OF MOSES

In the sunset years of Moses' life, he climbed Mt. Pisgah and saw the promised land. He had given his life to a people who did not understand him. He had dedicated himself to taking his people toward the country that he would never enter. A man of smaller spiritual stature might have complained and given up. Not Moses. He saw with God. This is the simple story.

"And Moses went up from the plains of Moab, unto the mountains of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah * * *

"And the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan * * *

"And the Lord said unto him, 'this is the land which I sware unto Abraham, and unto Jacob * * *

"I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go thither."

Here was faith of the first order. Moses saw his place in an ongoing purpose that was to last beyond his day. A measure of a man is in that to which he devotes his life, for which he gives all he has. Little souls want comforts and awards at the immediate moment. Great souls give themselves to things that may not be realized in their lifetimes. They believe the worthful will come to pass. They are happy in moving forward toward the goodly land.

The letter to the Hebrews refers to the roster of the faithful. It speaks of those who gave because they saw the distant scene that would never be their homeland.

"These all died in the faith, not having received the promises but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them." Hebrews 11:13.

THE PISGAH VIEW

Once Sir John Adams used a term in a class on comparative education that has enriched my life. He spoke of "the Pisgah view." He urged us all to look at things from the mountain view. From this loftier height we would be able to see these ways. (1) In relative importance. Sometimes we are too close to see relative worths. Life becomes, as an Archbishop of Canterbury told students of Oxford, like a store window in which a prankster came in over night and changed the price tags. We get our values confused. With clearer perspective some things fade into insignificance. (2) In long-time perspective. We see things so often in a 5-minute outlook. Reinhold Neibuhr, when accused of being pessimistic, told his friend that he would have a pessimism about the

decades but a faith in the eons. (3) With the procession of explorers. From Mt. Pisgah we see with prophetic spirits who have seen with God. Up here we sense with Flaubert that "the principal thing in this world is to keep one's soul aloft."

BEYOND TIME MEASUREMENT

On the mountains of faith there are no time clocks, no calendars. The eternal process and purpose moves on. We see it moving on and on. We get into it and go forward. Recently, I visited with a professional architect who had lost his eyesight. Day and night meant nothing to him. He was touching reality without these limitations. Still he was dreaming big things. He was climbing the mountains of faith. I say to such as he—

We live in deeds, not years; . . .
In feelings, not in figures on the dial.
We count time by heart throbs.
He lives most who thinks most,
Feels the noblest, acts the best.

Today I am not concerned about how long my friend lived in calendar years. I am not interested in recording mileage. Rather, am I interested in what he saw when he climbed his Mt. Pisgah.

LIVES THAT IMPEL US

Lives of courageous faith stir us to climb. Recently I read the story of Rick Fox who went from Colorado to Baylor University. He was to study medicine. He was the top man of his class the first year. In his second year recurrent pains in his stomach sent him to the doctor. The man of medicine was honest, "Rick, I've got to give it to you straight. You have terminal cancer and you can't live." Rick's reply, "Let me have 30 minutes alone with God." He came back ready for the future. "Use me as a laboratory specimen. I will memo my reactions." To his classmates came this injunction, "Be a good doctor." He wanted to go home to his loved ones in the mountains. Sixty students lined the way to the airport as he was wheeled to the plane. The silver plane was lost in the clouds. Two days later he was gone. These medical students could never forget his word from his mountain of faith, "Be a good doctor."

THESE EXPRESSIONS OF HOPE AND FAITH

Today I hold to the fore these expressions of hope and faith that showed up in the mountains of faith of Steven Carter. (1) The intent to achieve education and professional life. He was not born in wealth and served on silver platters. There were no rich relatives to put him forward in school. There was dogged determination to make his own way. And this he did. (2) The facing of reality. He knew quite well his health hazard. He did not indulge in neurotic escapism. He did not moan, "Why did this have to happen to me?" He did not turn to complaining. He saw things squarely and honestly. With him I associate these lines of Longfellow—

Fear not in a world like this
And thou shalt know ere long,
Know how sublime a thing it is
To suffer and be strong.

(3) The last mountain of faith. In the closing days when departing came nearer, the serenity of faith stood out. There was concern about what matters most in the family, in the political arena, in the personal commitment to God.

AFTER GRADUATION

Out of my educational background I have come to think of death as a graduation day when we move on into the University of Eternity. Only those have right to eternity who find life so full, so short, so that an eternity is needed. For others eternity would be a monstrous boredom with nothing to do. Steven Carter just got well started in the business of living. With his questing spirit, he should find the University of Eternity appealing. From Mt. Pisgah he sees the great stretches of the promised land yet to be explored.

It has been said that those fear death who have lived poorly here and that those who wish death are those who have weakened here. The healthy man neither fears death nor desires death. He lives meaningfully each day and wants more time, but when the trumpet sounds that his present mountain-climbing is over, he stands confidently on Mt. Pisgah, with God at his side and says, "It is well."

THESE WORDS FROM THE MOUNTAIN

Today, let us climb our own mountains of faith. Here let us find release from the pressure of things of passing worth. Here let us see the wholeness of life. Here let us meet the God of Life, as Moses did, and be assured of His concern for us. Here let us dedicate ourselves to things that go beyond our time. We look ahead in hope that something we have done and are doing will be carrying our people on toward the land of promise.

In the quiet we hear what Moses said to Joshua. I hear Steven Carter saying it to his sons—

"The Lord thy God will go before thee."
"Fear not, neither be discouraged."

And we hear what Moses said to his people—

"The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."
"As thy days, so shall thy strength be."

This day from the mountain of faith we hear God pointing us to the land to be, to the life we shall make come to pass, through our common endeavor with God's guidance. We hear Moses' watchword to Joshua as the heritage of Steven Carter to us, "Be strong and of good courage."

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY.]

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all our hearts were saddened by the tragic passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable STEVEN V. CARTER, who died at the Bethesda Naval Hospital on last November 4.

At the time of his passing he represented the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. His short service in the House of Representatives was under the shadow of the dreaded disease of cancer and much of his time was spent in and out of hospitals. He showed great spunk and courage in his efforts to recover from his severe illness. He impressed me as an able and intelligent legislator and he will be sadly missed by the House of Representatives, the people of his district, the State of Iowa, and the Nation.

His wife and sons have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the Iowa delegation in paying this word of tribute to STEVE CARTER. STEVE was a Christian gentleman, he was one of God's noblemen. He was my friend.

Although during the last weeks of his service in this House it was obvious that he was burdened with an affliction from which he would probably never recover, he spread the sunshine of optimism wherever he went. He was a person who never gave up. He was friendly; he was kind; he was courageous; he was considerate, even to those who disagreed with him.

We have lost a fine Member who served with us for only a short time.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and children. May God be with them in their bereavement.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on the sad day of November 4, 1959, after a lingering but valiant struggle, there passed from our midst our distinguished colleague, the Honorable STEVEN V. CARTER, who, for 1 year, had so ably represented the Fourth District of Iowa in the Congress of the United States.

I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to STEVE, only in a small measure because of the fact he was born in my district, the Second Utah Congressional District, but principally because I loved him. He was a great and a noble man.

Congressman CARTER was a man of quiet but indomitable courage. The circumstances of his passing, with which we are all familiar, evoked the spontaneous admiration and respect of every Member of this body.

STEVE was passionately devoted to the democratic processes. In his way of thinking, every citizen had equal responsibility to give expression to his opinions and to invigorate his Government by aggressive participation in its processes on the local level. Whatever was worth believing in was worth fighting for.

In his mind the great champions of democracy were its honest citizens who, without expectation of office or reward, played their part year after year in familiarizing themselves with the vital national issues and in casting honest votes for honest government. His greatest heroes were those who bore arms for the preservation and the advancement of peace.

STEVE was gentle but fearlessly devoted to the accomplishment of his chosen objectives. Although his tenure in Congress was short, his influence was long and penetrating. He affected my own life for the good, and I will remember him affectionately as long as memory continues.

I express my condolences to his lovely wife, Lucy, and to his splendid sons, Steven A. and Chuck.

Mr. Speaker, on November 5, Elder Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and a classmate of STEVE's, gave tribute to him at a memorial service held in Washington, D.C., which I extend at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

STEVEN V. CARTER: MEMORIAL SERVICE, NOVEMBER 5, 1959

(By Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.)

In just a few minutes the Carter family will leave for Iowa. Before they go there should be some acknowledgment of what they have achieved, not only for themselves, but for many others whose lives they touched. I use the word "achieved" purposefully.

STEVEN CARTER, Lucy, and Steven A., and Chuck, have met adversity and turned it into victory. They have fought battles during

this past year such as all mortal men must fight, and out of it all there has arisen, for those who have the eyes to see, a tender love, not confined to their family; a faith tried and refined; and a quality of courage worthy of the great ones who have come to this Nation's Capitol in its finest hours. I call this achievement; not easily won, but a consummation of vision built upon dedication and interwoven with an honest desire to serve one's fellowmen.

STEVE CARTER wanted to serve his country in the Halls of Congress. The privilege was granted but not for a period of long duration. Many of his days during this past year were spent in the hospital. But although the time was short, the force of his life will be felt far beyond the Eighty-sixth Congress; because it is in passing through the valleys of uncertainty and pain that men discover their common humanity and look with gratitude upon those of their number who bear their load without complaining; who can give a sincere smile when the going becomes most difficult.

I have not wanted to picture STEVE as a paragon of virtue—he would chuckle at any such attempt. However, it was my good fortune to know him best in the last few weeks of his life. We had been college friends years ago—but in those easy-going, breezy days, the real dimensions of a person's soul were not probed or measured. It has been in these recent sober times that we, together and with his family, began to plumb the depths of human experience and the understanding love of God. And in this growing fellowship with the Father of us all we found our hearts much more closely joined. Communication can be immeasurably richer when men commit themselves to uncharted areas in the realm of faith and hope and beyond the edge of knowledge. And in this setting there came to all of us with new assurance that "The eternal God is thy dwelling place, And underneath are the everlasting arms."

In these few moments we memorialize not only STEVEN CARTER but most surely those virtues and qualities without which a nation of free men cannot stand. These qualities are forged in the heat of the conflict of good with evil; the opposition of self-centeredness and the common welfare; the struggle between men's aspirations for a better world and their content with the present. I want to say, as the body of STEVEN CARTER leaves this city, that I saw him on a hospital bed reveal in the way he met the most serious issues of life the essential elements of leadership in a democracy.

His going, therefore, is not a retreat but rather a signal to us at a most critical time to reassess the purposes to which we dedicate ourselves during the span of our days. The time is all too short for any one of us. We are called to answer our own commissions. So, let us turn to our unfinished tasks in the belief that "there is a God in heaven who is infinite and eternal, from everlasting to everlasting the same unchangeable God, the framer of heaven and earth and all things which are in them."

It is this faith that gives support to our virtues.

It is in this faith that we find true fellowship.

It is by this faith that we humbly and repentantly seek His benediction for each of us.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we are all going to miss STEVE CARTER. We are going to miss his courage. We are going to miss that gentle voice back of which was a determination and a conviction of steel.

Frequently I used to sit by STEVE CARTER in this Chamber and shared with him some of his hopes and aspirations for his State, his Nation, and for all humanity. I remember very clearly the maiden speech which STEVE CARTER gave in this Chamber. I was sitting next to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] when Mr. YATES said, "Close your eyes a minute and listen." And we closed our eyes and we agreed that the voice of STEVE CARTER sounded very similar to Raymond Massey's famous lines in the play "Abe Lincoln in Illinois." This was not by chance, because there was much of Abraham Lincoln in STEVE CARTER'S philosophy and personality.

Yes; we are going to miss STEVE CARTER, but his spirit will always remain with us.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the memorial remarks I am about to make I shall be very brief, because I think that is the way STEVE CARTER would have wanted it. Coming here in March I was junior even to the short tenure of STEVE'S, and yet sitting here in this Chamber time and time again he was helpful. He pointed out some things that he thought I ought to know that had not been explained to me.

It has been said here this morning that there is something unusual about any U.S. Representative who can represent 300,000 to 400,000 people. But, there was something very unusual about STEVE CARTER. He had a quiet, mild manner, but underneath it all there was a philosophy of life that I enjoyed hearing him express.

I think you can tell something about a man by being at his last rites. There is an old adage that a prophet is not without honor except in his own country, but I saw there that Sunday afternoon at Leon, Iowa, genuine grief expressed, heartfelt grief. No church was large enough to house the assemblage and being the only Member of this body outside of the Iowa delegation there, I observed something that I shall never forget. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people passed by that bier and hundreds more waited outside in that cold temperature, unable to get into the school building, which was filled to capacity.

Yes; this House will miss STEVE CARTER in this ensuing session. I am sure we all extend our sincere condolences to his fine wife, Lucy, to his right arm, Steve, Jr., and to the younger son.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington early in December of 1958 to make some preliminary arrangements, STEVE CARTER was the first new colleague I met. At that time he appeared to me to be in good spirits, in good health, and strong. As time went on, I made good friends with all of the new Members from Iowa. The thing that I remember most about STEVE CARTER was that he was a man who thought, thought deeply, and thought well. He expressed himself well. He stuck to very high principles. Not so many of us are able to shed much light on this world of ours, but I am certain that STEVE CARTER lit a candle and that the candle that he lit will continue to cast a light for some time to come.

I know that I shall miss him. I know we shall all miss him. I extend my sympathy to his family and to the people of his district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my tribute to the heartfelt tributes already paid here today to our beloved late colleague, STEVE CARTER. He was one of the first junior Members of the Congress that I met upon my arrival here last year. I know that early in the year he was making plans for the long pull; even after he knew that the risks were rising he continued to devote himself to the study of the problems facing the country, to the duties of this office and to the best of his strength and ability he was faithful in his performance of his duties of this office.

Late in the year he had high hopes that he had successfully surmounted the illness which beset him. Throughout the entire trying experience of last year STEVE CARTER showed that quiet courage, that patient devotion to duty, that hope for the future, that confidence in himself and in the Congress and in the Nation, and from his example all of us certainly can take renewed hope and renewed heart as we face our duties in the coming year, without STEVE. I wish to add my words of comfort to those who especially feel the loss of our beloved colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the close of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the House of Representatives has suffered a sad loss in the death of our friend and colleague, STEVEN V. CARTER, Democrat, of Iowa. Mr. CARTER, who had just reached his 44th birthday on October 8, died on November 4 at Bethesda Naval Hospital of an illness against which he had been making a gallant fight since 1957. I have been proud to look upon STEVE CARTER as a personal friend, and feel I had come to know him well, even in the brief time he has been with us as a freshman Congressman. He was a man of unselfish devotion to the public good, of high personal ambition and strong party loyalty, faithful to the trust his constituents had reposed in him.

As I said on a previous occasion, I repeat now, "STEVEN CARTER was one of the bravest men I ever saw in public service." The distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives commented on

the same occasion, the return of STEVEN CARTER to his seat in the House in September 1959, speaking for the membership of the House generally: "He has impressed all of us as an earnest, honest and able legislator."

I will never forget his courage and devotion to duty during the closing days of the last session when he came from the Naval Hospital in Bethesda to vote on an important measure that was being considered by the House at that time. His bravery and devotion to duty brought tears to the eyes of many members.

During his service in the House, brief though it was, Representative CARTER was successful in securing substantial benefits for his district, including an appropriation for a dam in the Des Moines River Valley and a missile tracking station, and sponsored several bills of national significance. Among these was a bill for a half-billion-dollar crash program against cancer, heart disease, cerebral palsy, arthritis, and multiple sclerosis. Another was to establish more effective controls over peacetime nuclear tests and over the disposal of nuclear wastes. His, too, is a proposed amendment of the United Nations Charter to promote the rule of law in international affairs.

STEVEN CARTER had served in the Navy in the South Pacific during World War II, and was an active member of both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion. For 19 years he was a practicing lawyer in Leon, Iowa. A major interest of his life was Scouting, and for 15 years he served the movement as scoutmaster, cubmaster, and senior Scout adviser. He also served on the Executive Board of the Southern Iowa Area Council of Boy Scouts of America. His wife, his two sons, may mourn him proudly, as befits the heirs of one whose thoughts were noble, and whose actions brave, and who endured the onslaughts of his final illness with patient fortitude.

To Mrs. Carter and her loved ones, I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep sorrow of the death of our fellow Member and friend, STEVEN V. CARTER.

He was a man of fine ability and strong convictions, and I have never seen greater courage in great physical suffering.

He was devoted to the veterans' cause, and it was fine to work with him. The people of Massachusetts who met him at the time of the hearings on veterans' affairs at the statehouse liked and appreciated him so much.

We extend our sincere and heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, STEVEN CARTER was a marked man from the beginning of his term in the House of Representatives. He had won a signal political victory, then had exhibited for all to see a devotion to duty and courage, in the face of physical afflictions, which are only the gifts of the very great and true men.

Knowing STEVE and sharing with him his beliefs and ideals was a privilege which none who have had it will soon forget. If he was taken away from us before he could complete his work, he should feel assured that he left a host of friends determined to plow ahead. The rich memories which he has left behind will be augmented, Mr. Speaker, by the many thoughtful and generous gifts which, at the wish of STEVE and his family, have been turned into dollars to find a cure for the dread disease that struck him down.

The Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research, to which these gifts have been entrusted, is not only deeply grateful for the thought of STEVE, which the donors have so eloquently expressed, but for the responsibility which these gifts give to that institute to strive in every way to make that help bring to reality through research the cure, or cures, which may lie ahead for thousands in the future.

To all his friends, but especially to his wife and his family, go our warmest and deepest expressions of friendship and sympathy and the hope that the placque which will be erected at the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research in STEVE'S honor will symbolize, in some part at least for them, the many contributions which STEVE made to others during his life.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my Iowa colleagues in expressing deep regret at the passing of my good friend, STEVE CARTER. Although I did not know him before he came to Congress, I soon learned to admire and respect him. His unfortunate illness brought out the best in him. In spite of his pain and suffering he faced life with a smile. During his short service in the House, STEVE CARTER demonstrated his ability as a good public servant.

I attended the funeral of STEVE CARTER where I saw demonstrated, at the large attendance, the love and respect in which he was held by his friends and neighbors, who knew him best. STEVE CARTER well served his day and generation.

Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Carter and all members of the family.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I did not know STEVEN CARTER for a long time. He sat in this body for a single session. But I can say that in that period his demeanor and work made it obvious that his death is a great loss to his district, State, and Nation. I pay tribute to him as a man of devotion to his country who in the space of a year won the esteem of his colleagues and promised to be a great legislator.

STEVEN CARTER served his Nation in many ways: as an officer in the U.S. Navy, as a leader in Boy Scout work, as an active layman in the Christian Church, and as a citizen fulfilling civic responsibility. For 10 years prior to his election he was a worker in the political activity of his district.

I think he will be long remembered here despite his short tenure; and that memory will be one of a fine, outstanding American who gave great service to his Nation. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy for their great loss.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, along with others who have previously spoken, I want to add my word of tribute to the late STEPHEN V. CARTER, who, in the brief time he served in the House of Representatives, did so much to make his mark in this body and to cause us to remember him for many years to come.

It was my good fortune to have our late colleague assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as one of the newly elected Members of the 86th Congress. I named him to the Subcommittees on Administration and Insurance, and, also, he was a member of a special subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MITCHELL], which was appointed to specifically consider three important administrative proposals. Of the three proposals, House bill 6319 became Public Law 86–146 and established new safeguards relative to the acumulation and disposition of certain funds of incompetent veterans. This proposal will result in the saving of large amounts of money to the Federal Government, while, at the same time, protect the rights of all of those unfortunate veterans who have been declared incompetent.

The second proposal upon which the gentleman from Iowa worked was House bill 7106, which was enacted as Public Law 86–222, and which repealed the forfeiture procedure applicable to veterans' benefits and, in effect, ended the double penalty which has been applicable to veterans who made misstatements or gave false information concerning a claim before the Veterans' Administration.

The enactment of both of these proposals was aided by the advice and counsel of the Honorable STEPHEN V. CARTER, and we were looking forward to his same calm, judicial approach to the other matter pending before this subcommittee, namely, judicial review for veterans' claims.

Our colleague was held in the highest esteem, respect, and admiration by all of those who served with him on the committee and this was true regardless of party. His kind manner and his willingness to cooperate in any endeavor to which he was assigned will be cherished by all of us who knew him while he was a member of our committee. To his wife and children I extend my heartfelt sympathy and know that the ability and integrity of this servant of the people is a great source of comfort to his family in their hour of loss.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, although I knew the Honorable STEVEN V. CARTER but slightly, he has left with me a memory that cannot be erased. It was on one of the closing days of the first session. The vote was crucial and it was bound to be close. I looked around and saw, a few seats removed, STEVE CARTER, slightly bent forward, his face chalky white, obviously laboring in great pain. The end was not far away, and he knew it. Yet he was there, at his post of duty, to answer his name when the roll was called. I shall always think of it as one of the sublimest exhibitions of courage, in the challenge of duty, that ever has come to my attention.

My heart goes out to his widow and the members of his family. He left them the inspiration and heritage of a noble life lived nobly, with faith and with courage, to the very last painful moment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the congressional campaign of 1958 I was a political opponent of the late STEVEN CARTER. He was my Congressman the year he served in the House.

In the years I have known STEVEN CARTER he was a Christian gentleman and a man of courage. He was a good father, and his love of young people took his efforts beyond his family to activities with the Boy Scouts and other youth groups. He was a good neighbor, and the support his home people gave him at the political polls is proof of the high regard in which he was held by those who know him best.

For his fine family there should be solace in the fact that his life was dedicated to that which is right, and that he will remain an inspiration for many who had the benefit of his guidance.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 402).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable STEVEN V. CARTER, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE ALVIN R. BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I announce to the membership of the House of Representatives the sudden death of our beloved colleague, ALVIN R. BUSH, of R.D. 2, Muncy, Pa., on Thursday, November 5, 1959, at the Williamsport (Pa.) Hospital.

Following the adjournment of the first session of the 86th Congress, Mr. BUSH, as was his custom, toured a great part of the counties in Pennsylvania which comprised his district—the 17th.

On Monday evening, November 2, he made his annual visitation to the Jersey Shore Rotary Club where he made his last speech.

Tuesday morning, November 3—election day—apparently in good health, he voted in his home precinct. He retired that evening at 10 o'clock.

Mr. BUSH awoke at 4:45 a.m. on Wednesday, complaining of chest pains and he was immediately transferred to the Williamsport Hospital. He suffered another attack that same night and his condition became critical. He passed away on Thursday, November 5, at 12:30 p.m.

AL BUSH, as he was affectionately called, was one of the finest gentlemen that I ever met. He was kind and always considerate of his fellow man.

I became acquainted with AL several years before he came to Congress, and with his election to the seat vacated by former Representative Robert F. Rich, who was not a candidate for reelection, I learned to know him for the gentleman that he was.

Mr. BUSH was elected to the 82d Congress on November 7, 1950. He was reelected every 2 years, and consequently was in his fifth term. During his service in the House he served on various committees, such as the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, and the Committee on Public Works. During the present term of Congress he was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BUSH served his constituency with distinction. His paramount thought at all times was the welfare of his country, his constituents, and family.

Born June 4, 1893, in Boggs Township, Clearfield County, Pa., he attended a country school until he was 13 years old, at which time necessity forced him to go to work in the coal mines.

In 1913 he obtained a job as a mechanic's apprentice in a Clearfield machine shop, after which he opened up a small repair shop in Philipsburg, Pa.

During the First World War, Mr. BUSH served with the Army in France. After his release from the service, he returned to Philipsburg. In 1920 he purchased a small bus line serving the surrounding rural communities. He drove the buses himself and repaired them at night.

Mr. BUSH migrated to Williamsport in 1932 at a time when buses were replacing trolley cars in that city. He, and later his son, Alvin C. Bush, operated the Williamsport Transportation Co. until a few years ago when they sold it.

Mr. BUSH purchased and modernized the Wyno Farms, making it one of the show places of his area. His Guernsey herd is recognized as one of the finest in the country.

He was a member of the Methodist Church, the American Legion, the 40 and 8, Veterans of Foreign Wars, various Masonic organizations, Pennsylvania Breeders Association, and the Consolidated Sportsmen of Lycoming County.

He had been a director of the Muncy Valley Hospital and the Lycoming County Fair Association, relinquishing these because his presence in Washington prevented him from attending meetings.

He was a director of the Lowery Electric Co., and Radio Station WWPA, and served on the Advisory Committee of the Williamsport Salvation Army.

AL and his dear wife, Lucinda, visited at my home, and Mrs. Fenton and I visited them at their home. We shall indeed miss him.

In addition to his wife, Lucinda M., a daughter Shirley, wife of John H. Eck, and a son, Alvin C. Bush, survive; also four grandchildren.

AL BUSH was the type of citizen who is so greatly needed in our country today. A real American, he was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative. There never was a finer exponent of the free enterprise system that has made the United States the greatest country of all. His belief in his fellow man, his strong character, and his will to assist all, endeared AL BUSH to men and women in all walks of life.

AL BUSH'S achievements and success were his own. I feel that in his recent years he found much self-satisfaction in a job well done.

I have lost a real and sincere friend, his community, district, and State have lost a faithful and very able public servant, and our country has lost a capable, conscientious statesman.

Our country has lost a great champion for the liberties and freedoms which we still enjoy, and which, as AL so often said, did so much for him.

I know that God will give Mrs. Bush and her loved ones the strength and fortitude to carry on in the days ahead, and to help keep the Bush name the fine symbol of Americanism that it has stood for in so many years of life and progress.

The heartfelt sympathy of myself and my family go out to Mrs. Bush and her family in their great loss. May God comfort them all is my most sincere wish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, last fall, shortly after adjournment of the 1st session of this 86th Congress, it was my pleasure to visit the 17th District of Pennsylvania at the invitation of our late colleague, the Honorable ALVIN R. BUSH.

I could not possibly have had a more gracious host, a statement all of you here who knew AL BUSH as I did will understand and appreciate.

It was my privilege, during that visit, to serve as guest speaker at a banquet in Williamsport at which AL was honored for his years of service here in the House of Representatives.

As one who had developed a deep affection for our gentle colleague, you may be certain I took full advantage of the opportunity to offer my testimonial to AL BUSH, in his presence and before his people as a dedicated American.

How happy I am now that this opportunity came my way back in October of 1959.

And how shocked and grieved I was to learn, such a short time after this happy experience at Williamsport, that death had come to a wonderful person who had so recently appeared to be in good health, and who so obviously was enjoying the challenge of his career here in the Congress.

The AL BUSH I knew was a hard-working, versatile, and effective Representative who understood his responsibilities and who met them.

But I think the picture all of us will carry through the years when we remember our friend is that of a man who was extraordinarily kind to everyone he met, regardless of station. This was no kindness born of expediency. AL BUSH was kind because he genuinely liked people. And they liked him.

I will not soon forget the warmth of the reception given him by so many of his friends and neighbors at the dinner meeting in Williamsport.

And I shall always be grateful that the chance came my way to take part in such a richly deserved tribute to a dear friend.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to convey in words the loss I have felt with the passing of my friend AL BUSH. As we begin the work of this session, all of us will miss the contribution he invariably made to our deliberations.

AL was a quiet, unassuming man who was always seeking ways that he could be helpful. He loved people, and he had innumerable friends. To him friendship was something to be cherished, and there was not anything he would not do to aid a friend. He was a personal friend of mine whom I shall never forget. I think he was an inspiration to all of us, for whom we had great affection and respect.

AL BUSH was a man of convictions, and he had the courage to express them and to adhere to them, come what may. He sought nothing for himself. He was not interested in fame and glory. He was solely interested in doing that which he thought would best advance the welfare of the people he represented and the country as a whole.

Before coming to Congress he was a successful businessman. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he brought to the deliberations of that committee his knowledge and experience in the field of transportation. At one time he was general manager of the Williamsport Transportation Co. and served as president of the Pennsylvania Bus Association.

When he was called to the Great Beyond and met his Maker, I am sure it was said to him, "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

I extend my sincerest sympathy to his fine wife and family. I hope they can find some consolation in the knowledge that AL left footprints on the sands of time that serve to guide us all for fruitful living. He now lives peacefully in the heavenly temple of the Lord.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, ALVIN BUSH succeeded Robert Rich here. He came from a district which has always had the highest type of representation and he maintained that type himself. He always stood for the legislation which would help the people of the United States and against that tendency that has been so apparent in recent years to waste the people's money and break down our Government. I admired the way he handled himself in his work here and everywhere else very much.

His people suffered a great loss. At the same time we can be thankful that they had a man of such a fine character here.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the loss of ALVIN BUSH we have lost one of God's great noblemen. I felt that AL BUSH was the exemplification of all that was good in this country; one who was able to rise to the heights in this House from an humble beginning; one who never lost humility, which endeared him to all of us.

He came to Congress in the same session that I came here. He was a good and close friend of mine throughout these years. His great concern for so many he cared for is what made him stand apart from others. He had a sister who lives in my district in the State of Ohio, who suffered a tragedy a little over a year ago. AL BUSH came to me at that time and asked me if I would be of service to his sister if the occasion ever arose. She came to me not long ago and told me many things about AL BUSH as a young man, and how he rose, and the things he did. It was a great story of Americana.

I am proud to join with the Members of Pennsylvania in extending to his family our most sincere sympathy, and to his sister who I am sure misses him.

It is hard to fill the place left by so noble a man as Mr. BUSH.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our esteemed and respected colleague, ALVIN R. BUSH, has cast the pall of sadness over this opening session and as we mark his vacant place we are not inclined to question the wisdom of the Master in taking him from us, but instead we pause to ponder the uncertainty of this life's journey and the temporary nature of these associations we hold so dear.

AL BUSH appreciated the privilege of service in this body as must any humble man who had found his greatest joy in the simple companionship of friends and loved ones in a country environment. But AL BUSH, to a greater degree than most, brought to the Congress an awareness of the needs of his people and a determination to preserve for them those fundamental freedoms for which his forebears fought a dictatorial king and his minions.

The ties between AL and myself were unusually close since we represented districts embracing comparable philosophies. In addition, we enjoyed the confidence of each other and a perusal of our voting records will reveal that we saw eye-to-eye on most of the issues. Truly, Mr. Speaker, this House has not sustained a loss since I have been here that has touched me more deeply.

His widow and his children are bravely carrying on as AL would have them do and I know that they have been greatly comforted by the assurance that his colleagues in the Congress are joined with them in mourning the passing of this great and good American. May our guardian and guide have them in His care and keeping.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of genuine sorrow that I raise my voice in brief but sincere tribute to the life and character and public service of Hon. ALVIN RAY BUSH, of the 17th District of Pennsylvania, who passed away on last November 5.

At the time of his death ALVIN BUSH was the third-ranking Republican on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. While I did not have the years of close personal association and contact with him that some of his other colleagues may have had, I nevertheless acquired a very high regard for his character and ability as a legislator. He was a dignified and kindly gentleman, a fine man who always impressed me as one who could appreciate the problems of his fellowman.

I extend to my friend's wife and daughter and son my deepest sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA].

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the remarks covering the life, character, and public service of my friend ALVIN BUSH, and I join in them believing they have been absolutely correct, not an overstatement, but in fact understatements. I think I can qualify as a witness to Mr. BUSH's character for I believe I was closer to him than any Member of this House without making any exception. He was my "ride"—you know what that means—I traveled with him up to Harrisburg and back for 9 years and I got to know him very well. In addition to that I ate dinner with him practically every night we were in town; and some of the boys can attest that we ate lunch together almost every day. In all these trips and meetings, we would have an opportunity for quiet discussion of issues in Congress that seemed to be most pertinent that week. Thus I got to know AL BUSH, and I concur in everything that has been said about him.

One thing in his life that was omitted is the fact that he was also the owner of a bus system serving suburban Harrisburg. At one time they had 100 buses in operation. AL used to tell me how he started work in a clay mine, which is sort of like a coal mine, and how he repaired those trucks at night. It is amazing to think of his building of that bus company in Harrisburg with 100 buses under his operation.

I miss him greatly, and from what I have heard here this afternoon, think that this is the general attitude of many, many Members of Congress.

I extend my very deepest sympathies to his wife and to his daughter, whom he was especially proud of, as well as to his son Alvin, a chip off the old block.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and other colleagues in paying this word of tribute to ALVIN BUSH. Although we sat on different sides of the aisle, he was my friend. There is no aisle between friends in this House.

ALVIN BUSH was a man of few words but of deep convictions. He was a warm friend to all of those who had the privilege of knowing him.

ALVIN BUSH was a valuable Member of this House. He was a great character. This has been testified to today by Members who have had the opportunity to know him longer and more intimately than I.

I shall miss him.

I join in extending sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we pause to honor the memory of our departed colleague, Representative ALVIN RAY BUSH of the 17th Pennsylvania District.

He came to us in 1950 to speak for the people of upper Pennsylvania and served them faithfully until his death in 1959.

To the many of us who are lawyers by profession and limited to the ways of urban life, it was a pleasure to work with AL BUSH who opened our eyes to the enduring values and beauties of the bountiful countryside that he loved so well.

AL was a breeder of purebred Guernsey cattle, and an authority on bus transportation. With this background he was able to bridge the difference between rural and urban problems and give us the benefit of his practical advice.

His assignment to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was a recognition of his painstaking ability to analyze all sides of a problem before making up his mind. And when he did, you could be sure that his opinion was sound.

Representative BUSH was an overseas veteran of World War I, a 32d degree Mason, and a devout member of the Pine Street Methodist Church.

He was as steady as they come, blessed with the self-reliance and the character that constitute the true strength of our people.

To his widow and his children we send the comfort of our sympathy and our gratitude for his services to the Nation.

AL BUSH was a loyal friend and a highly respected public servant.

He has joined the heavenly company of those whose lives on this earth were distinguished by the good they did for others.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in one brief 48-hour period during the first week of last November this body lost three distinguished Members and for myself three very good and very dear friends.

I had the privilege of knowing STEVE CARTER less than a year. I first made his acquaintance when he came to the 86th Congress, and I had the honor of serving with him as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House.

My close friendship with CHARLIE BOYLE and his wonderful family began some 5 years ago when we both entered this body as freshman Members of the 84th Congress. However, my friendship with AL BUSH predates my arrival to this body by many years. My first meeting with Mr. BUSH was not as a congressional colleague or as a political opponent. Our initial association was that of a lawyer-client relationship. As a young lawyer I had the task of guiding Congressman BUSH and his son through an acute crisis in their family bus business. During that case I literally lived in the Bush household. Ultimately the crisis passed. We all survived it, and I not only had the grand and satisfying reward of winning the case but of beginning a close and intimate friendship, a friendship which membership in this House has enkindled and a friendship which political differences never dampened.

Mr. Speaker, as we pause today to pay tribute to each of our departed colleagues who were with us when we adjourned last September and who are not with us today, and as we attempt to extend our condolences to the Bush, to the Boyle, and to the Carter families, I cannot help but note that in each of their untimely passings there is a stern reminder of the task remaining before us. AL BUSH was felled by a heart attack. CHARLIE BOYLE died in a tragic highway accident. STEVE CARTER was a victim of the dread disease cancer. The unanswered challenge to bring under control each of these three couriers of death and suffering and heartbreak, cancer, heart disease, and highway accidents, is a task that lies before us. There is nothing that we can say or do that will return our colleagues to us or to their families and the words we say here will at best be inadequate to console the families in their great loss, or even in paying a deserving tribute to each of our three departed colleagues.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in the days ahead we can here in the Congress do everything that it is possible for us to do to see to it that each of these three scourges which have struck down our colleagues are ultimately banished from our midst so that they will no longer be permitted to impose the heavy hand of sorrow they have visited on the families and friends of AL BUSH, CHARLIE BOYLE, and STEVE CARTER. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in paying this tribute that no more fitting tribute could be paid to three great and good men.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll of Members was called today opening this new session of the Congress, ALVIN BUSH was not here.

Last November 5 this great legislative body lost, by death, a most distinguished Member and I, together with many others, lost a close and dear friend.

ALVIN BUSH was a real Christian gentleman. He was one of the finest men I have ever had the privilege of knowing and one whose counsel and help was always available to any who sought it. He represented the 17th District of Pennsylvania in this Congress for 9 years with distinction and ability. He lived a full and rich life, dedicated to his family and to the unselfish service of his constituents and of his country.

He was a dedicated family man, completely devoted to his lovely wife and two fine children. They have my most sincere sympathy.

It is, therefore, with a heavy heart that I join in these services today for I have lost a loyal friend, his family has suffered an irreparable loss, and Pennsylvania has lost one of its most distinguished sons.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in paying my respects to AL BUSH. I did not have the privilege of knowing him very long, but when I learned of his death I was greatly shocked and very much upset. I had known AL BUSH only in this 1st session of the 86th Congress, but I had learned to love him and respect his judgment. Many days, when trying problems and questions were before us, AL BUSH was a very steadying hand to me and to the Pennsylvania delegation. I know that I, the Pennsylvania delegation and the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives will miss and remember AL BUSH for a long time.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of AL BUSH takes from this body and from among us as individual Members, one of those whom we had learned to love. It was my privilege to enjoy his friendship, and to go to him for counsel and a discussion of the issues over these last 8 years that I have served in Congress.

I considered it a rare opportunity to count him among my personal friends and to realize that his warm friendship was most sincere, that his philosophy was basically entrenched in the great principles upon which this country was built; and that to the extent to which his influence could be felt, these were the principles that he wanted to see maintained as we wrestled with the great problems before this great body.

It was indeed with a distinct personal loss that I learned of his passing. Mrs. McIntire joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Bush and the members of the family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and services of our late colleague, AL BUSH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, universal regrets among all Members of Congress were expressed at the untimely death of ALVIN RAY BUSH. For 9 years he served the 17th Pennsylvania District with credit and distinction. As a man of wide experience in business af-

fairs, his sound, solid judgment was appreciated by all who knew him. He had but a single ambition and that was to serve faithfully and well his native State and the country. A great legislator and a great American died when AL BUSH passed away. Because of our warm friendship, his death was a deep personal loss to me. To his good wife and family I extended my heartfelt sympathy. In their hour of sorrow they can be comforted by the great service he did for mankind.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve during two congressional years with the late ALVIN R. BUSH, of the 17th District of Pennsylvania.

AL was not only a colleague and congressional neighbor but, I am proud to say, a friend as well. Whenever matters of mutual interest to our adjoining districts arose, I was always afforded the courteous and capable cooperation of my friend. He will be sorely missed.

AL had many attributes which I am sure all of us found admirable. Among all those, I shall particularly remember his homespun humor, his constant cheerfulness even under adversity, and, above all, his integrity and devotion to the principle laid down by Henry Clay, in 1829, that, "Government is a trust, and the officers of government are trustees; and both the trust and trustees are created for the benefit of the people."

May I join with my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who were privileged to know AL BUSH there must come the real feeling of having lost a true friend. His was a constructive life and any review of AL BUSH's nearly three score and ten years here discloses all of the fine things that a truly patriotic, community-minded, and home-loving man can do to make this a better place in which to live, progress, and seek wholesome happiness.

We will all miss AL BUSH. I want to join with my colleagues in extending our sincere sympathies to his widow and his family.

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal loss and sadness that I rise to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania's 17th District, the late ALVIN R. BUSH.

He was a good man beloved not only by those who shared his political philosophy, but by those who disagreed.

As a new Member, I profited much by his experience, advice, and understanding.

His untimely death was not only a great personal loss but a loss to the State and Nation he served so well.

I would like to express my heartfelt sympathy to his family.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sorrow in the unexpected and untimely death last fall of our admired and respected friend, ALVIN R. BUSH. Congressman BUSH and I had served continuously on the same committee since I first became a Member of Congress.

He was a pleasant and affable associate in the work of our committee and in the work of the House of Representatives. He was an able and respected Representative of his State and district and a beloved Member of this body. He was a warm, personal friend.

Those of us who were closely associated with him knew him as a man of high integrity and character. He displayed intense interest on legislative matters which came before us, and he made valuable contributions to the legislative work during the entire period of his service as a Representative in Congress.

I shall always remember AL BUSH as a devoted public servant of ability, strength of character, humility and gentle nature. I shall also remember him as a devoted personal friend.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending to Mrs. Bush and their children our deepest sympathy, and we share with them their sorrow.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1959, the Nation lost one of its outstanding citizens in the death of our colleague and my good friend ALVIN R. BUSH, who for many years represented the 17th District of Pennsylvania in a highly efficient manner.

AL, as he was commonly known, was born and reared in Boggs Township, Clearfield County, in my congressional district. Many of his relatives are my constituents and have told me over a period of years of AL's early life in the Clearfield-Philipsburg area in Pennsylvania. Like many successful Americans, AL BUSH began life in humble circumstances—as a matter of fact in the coal mines—and by diligent efforts he advanced himself in the business world and at the time of his death was one of central Pennsylvania's most successful and outstanding businessmen.

AL's experience as a soldier in World War I, his success in the business world, and his willingness to help and understand the problems of his fellow man were recognized by the residents of the 17th Congressional District when they sought a capable successor to former Representative Robert F. Rich upon the latter's retirement from Congress. AL was elected to the 82d Congress, November 7, 1950, and since taking his seat in January 1951 he not only established himself as an able legislator but endeared himself to his colleagues through his friendliness and his love for people.

The death of AL BUSH leaves all of us with a heavy heart because we have lost a loyal friend and distinguished colleague. To Mrs. Bush and the children, I extend my deepest sympathy with the fervent hope that they will receive a measure of consolation in the knowledge that AL BUSH through his exemplary life has left many fond memories that will be cherished by the countless friends who deeply mourn his sudden death.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, ALVIN R. BUSH—one of Pennsylvania's outstanding Representatives. His loss will be keenly felt by the Pennsylvania delegation and our State.

AL, as we called him, was a man who loved his district, State, and Nation; and served them well. He was intensely devoted to the interests of the people he represented.

He was always calm, and strong, and self-confident, and treated everyone with great courtesy. AL was always congenial and affable and by his kind deeds and many useful services he evidenced a great love of people.

He was a humble and kindly man whom one admired as companion and friend; always considerate of everyone; a man who added much to our daily lives with a kind word for everybody.

He was an honest, conscientious, and loyal legislator, always looking after the welfare of his district and State. He was a firm believer in the principles of liberty and our American way of life, with the highest concepts of citizenship.

His devotion to and love of country was something to be admired; always ambitious to uphold and defend the fine ideals and traditions of our Nation. He strove mightily to attain those objectives which he thought were for the best interests of all our people and his work in the House of Representatives was useful and constructive.

In a life such as his perhaps the thing most to be admired was the fact he was a good citizen and a devoted American; a man who contributed much to the building of his community, State, and Nation.

We will miss his fine friendship and companionship and it is with great sorrow we record his passing. To his family I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to take this means of paying a sincere tribute to the memory of our late colleague ALVIN R. BUSH of the 17th District of Pennsylvania who passed away last November 5 during adjournment of the Congress.

I was shocked and saddened to learn of his untimely passing.

For many months ALVIN BUSH and I had offices practically adjoining and I learned to know and love him greatly. He was a remarkable man in many ways—one of fine ability and dedication to his district, State, and Nation. He lived a rich and full life of unselfish service to his family, friends, constituents and country and will be sorely missed by all.

To Mrs. Bush and members of his family I extend an expression of genuine sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it is a human tendency to go along from day to day performing our routine tasks and experiencing intervals of pleasant enjoyment until abruptly we are confronted with the realities of life and death. Such was the shock I experienced upon the sad news of the passing of my good friend, my colleague and office neighbor, AL BUSH.

AL BUSH was a good citizen. In this body of 437 men and women, which we

like to think of as the outstanding institution for self-government by the people of all time, AL BUSH, in his quiet way made a most significant contribution. He was not the flashily articulate exponent of popular causes nor one to engage in the repartee and clash of congressional debate. But, with his friendly smile and a devotion to his country and the principles which he deeply believed would further her best interests, he diligently ministered to the needs of his constituency. Both in his participation in the work of his committees, and in the deliberations of the House itself he cast his votes and made his decisions for the benefit of all Americans.

It would be impossible to dislike AL BUSH. He genuinely liked others, and all of his colleagues, whatever their political views or their personal natures, could not help but return the genuine friendliness of this man.

Mr. Speaker, this House needs orators, it needs pioneers, it needs strategists, but it also needs friendly, right-thinking men and women. That is why we all will miss AL BUSH.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the familiar faces for which we find ourselves looking in vain, as the 2d session of the 86th Congress swings into action, is that of my respected and valued colleague of the Pennsylvania delegation, Representative ALVIN R. BUSH, of the 17th Congressional District. The news of AL BUSH'S sudden heart seizure, on November 4, and death in Williamsport Hospital on the following day, brought shock and sorrow to me, as to all who knew him. AL BUSH was a devoted public servant, putting his business astuteness and his energetic determination into the advancement of the sometimes unpopular cause of governmental economy. Much of our legislation, over the past 9 years, has profited from the vigilance and good sense of ALVIN BUSH. His knowledge and experience in the field of bus transportation were often called upon, in his work with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and with the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics.

It will long be remembered to his credit that he was an enthusiastic supporter of little league baseball, and proud of the claim of Williamsport, in his district, to have founded little league baseball. In the past session, he had sponsored a resolution to establish a National Little League Baseball Week.

We shall miss his aid as a legislator, but more than that, in the days ahead, we shall miss his quiet, friendly presence, and the feeling that, whatever our differences, we were all trying to accomplish a task together, for the common good of our Nation and of our home districts.

To Mrs. Bush, to their children, Mrs. John H. Eck and Alvin C. Bush, and to the many others who knew and loved AL BUSH, I offer my sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to ALVIN R. BUSH, one of the outstanding members of our Pennsylvania delegation. His untimely death brought sorrow to those of us who were privileged to serve with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

AL BUSH was admired and respected for his humbleness and sincerity. He was a conscientious legislator with strong beliefs and courage of his convictions. We will all miss his contribution to our deliberations in the crucial months of this session.

To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in the death of AL BUSH, the country, the Congress, and the people of the 17th Congressional District of Pennsylvania lost the services of a most capable legislator.

AL BUSH was a man of outstanding character, ability, and great courage. His affability and warm smile brightened many days for all of us. Personally, his friendship and consideration will always be one of my precious memories.

Again, I extend to Mrs. Bush and the family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if any Member of the House was more genuinely liked by his colleagues than ALVIN RAY BUSH, his service ended before I entered Congress.

Many, many close friendships are established here on Capitol Hill. Like shipmates in wartime, we forge innumerable and indissoluble fraternal bonds in the course of our meetings and conversations. Our debates may sometimes reach a high degree of intensity, but when we recess or adjourn the combatants walk out together in much the same spirit of amity that prevails at the close of an athletic contest when victim and vanquished join arm in arm as they leave the arena.

ALVIN BUSH and I sat on the same side of the aisle and our political convictions were largely parallel; thus in the 9 years we served together, conflicts in our views on issues to be decided in this legislative body were infrequent. But it would have made no difference if we had never shared the same opinion. His host of friends here today whose voting records show no taint of similarity with that of our departed colleague will concur unanimously.

ALVIN BUSH did not think about a person's pedigree, his background, his party affiliation, or his political philosophy. As he was a good man, he enjoyed associating with good men. Of him it can be truly said "He lived by the Golden Rule." He was a deeply religious man, and his Creator's precept on love of one's fellow man was inherent in his character.

Through a geographical advantage, I was able to spend more time with ALVIN BUSH than most Members of the House found possible. Our families were close and I visited his home and enjoyed many an hour there with him, Mrs. Bush, and their fine children. My life has been enriched by their homelife with its warmth, enthusiasm, and sincerity.

Anyone whose accomplishments are akin to those of ALVIN BUSH could justly be proud of his record, but here was a modest man who discounted what he had done because his only concern was to serve his country and his fellow men so that they and their progeny might live in an atmosphere conducive to a wholesome life in the service of their God. His career bespeaks his ability, determination, and zeal. He went overseas in the defense of his country in World War I, then picked up where he had left off and went on to success as a businessman. With all these interests, he took time to participate in civic affairs and to become active in hospital work. He was a devout church member, and he accepted public service with a spirit of extreme responsibility and dedication.

Our friend has gone to his reward, but his warm personality and inspiring camaraderie will always be appreciated by everyone who ever had the pleasure of knowing him and of sitting with him in this Chamber. God grant him eternal peace.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 403

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable ALVIN R. BUSH, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE WILLIAM LANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess my State of North Dakota suffered a grievous blow. Our senior Senator and the dean of our North Dakota delegation, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, passed away at his home here in Washington, D.C. I believe it is fitting and proper that we here in the House pay tribute to him today.

Senator LANGER'S passing was a loss to North Dakota and its people, but his death is also a loss to the Nation. Few people in history have seen fit to champion the cause of the underprivileged to a greater extent than our senior Senator. His tactics in accomplishing his end objective were sometimes rather spectacular and earned for him the name of "Wild Bill," but to his friends out West this was more of a tribute than a criticism.

BILL LANGER served as Governor of North Dakota in the drought and depression years of the thirties, and earned the lifelong gratitude of North Dakota farmers for some of his drastic actions in keeping farmers from becoming victims of bankruptcy.

My brief remarks today in no way do justice to the stature, the personality, and spectacular career of our Senator LANGER from North Dakota. Those who knew him well will understand what I mean.

Born a North Dakota farm boy, he was endowed with the mental capacity to graduate from Columbia Law School as valedictorian of his class, and voted by his class as their colleague most likely to succeed. His life's record of achievement confirmed the confidence expressed in him by his classmates.

While BILL LANGER's political life was stormy and feeling ran high at times in traditional North Dakota fashion, none of this feeling ever extended to the members of his family. The Senator's wife and four daughters were held in the highest esteem by everyone. Mrs. Langer suffered for many years with cancer and passed away only a few short months before Senator LANGER's death. I know that all of my colleagues join with my wife and me in extending to the Langer girls and their families our heartfelt sympathy in their loss.

An indication of the high regard in which the Senator was held by his home folks was demonstrated when hundreds of North Dakota citizens turned out in below-zero temperatures for his burial beside his wife in their family cemetery at Casselton, N. Dak., only a short distance from where the Senator was born.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to a good friend and highly capable legislator, Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, who died on last November 8.

I held Senator LANGER in high esteem and affection from the time I first came to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress and admired him over the years for his consistent efforts on behalf of legislation beneficial to our postal employees and other Federal workers. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee he played a great part in improving the pay and working conditions of Federal employees. He was one of the principal supporters of legislation which established a new liberalized formula for computing retirement annuities.

Men like Senator LANGER are sadly missed and I shall always think of him with fond memories. He was a great and courageous American and I extend to his daughters my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD regarding the life and services of the late WILLIAM LANGER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of the late senior Senator from North Dakota, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER. He was my close personal friend for many years. In courageous dedication to what he believed to be right, and in the championing of little people whom to defend was to invite the vengeful wrath of publicized respectability, he was matchless. I hope that the story of his life, with its lessons of devotion to duty regardless of the cost or consequence, and its inspiration to faith and courage in the doing of good deeds, will not be lost to succeeding generations. In the life and career of one of the most colorful statesmen in American history, and one of the giant champions of the oppressed in an era now closing, there is rich material for the biographer.

The Nation and all mankind is the loser with the close of an era when after every election the word came over the wires from North Dakota: "Again the people have rallied behind BILL LANGER and Usher Burdick."

To the family of this noble man and of his fine wife, his inspiration and coworker, and by whose side he now rests in a cemetery in North Dakota, goes my deep sympathy.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost a distinguished Senator and North Dakota a great champion on November 8, 1959. On that day, the State's senior Senator, WILLIAM LANGER, died in his sleep at his home in Washington at the age of 72, ending a 45-year political career.

WILLIAM LANGER, who was born on a farm near Casselton, N. Dak., on September 30, 1886, served as State's attorney for Morton County between 1914 and 1916; as North Dakota attorney general between 1916 and 1920; and as Governor for two terms between 1932 and 1934 and 1936 and 1938. In 1940, he was elected to the U.S. Senate and for three terms thereafter.

In 1918, he married Miss Lydia Cady of New York, who stood by his side during his career. She died only 3 months before her husband.

WILLIAM LANGER's name virtually became synonymous with that of the Nonpartisan League, the reform movement known as the political prairie fire. In 1916, he was the league's first successful candidate for North Dakota attorney general.

BILL LANGER, as he was affectionately known by his constituents, had a deep compassion for the underdog. Consistently, throughout his long political career, he carried the standard of the poor and the oppressed against the rich and powerful, without regard to the consequences.

The small farmer, the working man, the small businessman had no better friend.

With BILL LANGER in Washington, North Dakotans knew they had a friend at court, for he conscientiously considered the problems, no matter how trivial, of all his constituents—friends and foes.

For many, BILL LANGER's humanitarianism is best remembered in the troubled 1930's, when as Governor, he took bold action to relieve the terrible burden that depression and drouth had brought to the people.

This vital, interesting personality will be sorely missed but dearly remembered by thousands of people.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 404).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. FENTON), on account of illness.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. LENNON), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

Mr. DIGGS (at the request of Mr. RABAUT), from January 6 to 11, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. ASPINALL (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), until January 12, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the week of January 6, to serve as a representative of the United States on official business in West Africa.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect for our deceased colleagues, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The following executive communications were submitted subsequent to the adjournment of the 86th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Public Law 86–254 and House Resolution 390:

1382. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 14, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Biloxi Harbor, Miss., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 31, 1956, and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 271). October 1, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1383. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 30, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore between Pemberton Point and Cape Cod Canal, Mass., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 272). October 1, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1384. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 11, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of an interim report on Gila and Salt Rivers, Gillespie Dam to McDowell Dam site, Ariz., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 279). November 2, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1385. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 3, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Cheyenne River and tributaries, South Dakota and Wyoming, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Flood Control and Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 19, 1946, May 3, 1946, July 5, 1946, and March 30, 1955, respectively (H. Doc. No. 280). November 2, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1386. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of audit of Inland Waterways Corporation for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 281). November 2, 1959, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 390, agreed to September 12, 1959).

1387. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 15, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Lynn Camp Creek, Corbin, Ky., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted November 13, 1952, and July 29, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 282). December 4, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1388. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 13, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Palm Beach Harbor, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 27, 1952, and June 7, 1952 (H. Doc. No. 283). December 14, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1389. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 24, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Pepperell Cove, Kittery, Maine, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 19, 1954, and June 29, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 284). December 14, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1390. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 24, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Milwaukee Harbor, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 27, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 285). December 14, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1391. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 14, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the gulf shore of Bolivar Peninsula in the vicinity of Rollover Fish Pass, Tex., prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented. (H. Doc. No. 286); December 14, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1392. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 287). December 15, 1959, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 390, agreed to September 12, 1959).

1393. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 30, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on an interim report on Maniece Bayou, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 25, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 288). December 17, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1394. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 20, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted April 24, 1953, and June 24, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 289). December 17, 1959, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations (pursuant to Public Law 86–254, approved September 10, 1959).

1395. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 290). December 29, 1959, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed (pursuant to H. Res. 390, agreed to September 12, 1959.)

[*Submitted January 6, 1960*]

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1396. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the 26th Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration on the work of the Cooperative Farm Credit System (including the report of the Federal Farm Credit Board), covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; paragraph 3, section 4, of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended; the Executive order of March 27, 1933, creating the Farm Credit Administration; and section 6, of the Farm Credit Act of 1953 (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1397. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 41st Annual National Convention, August 24 to 27, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 291); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1398. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and proceedings of the national gathering, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 16 through 21, 1959, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 249, 77th Congress, approved September 18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 292); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1399. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports in compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 263); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1400. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a report from July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959, both inclusive, pursuant to paragraphs 102, 103, 104, and 111 of title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

1401. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report entitled "Orderly Liquidation of Stocks of Agricultural Commodities Held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Expansion of Markets for Surplus Agricultural Commodities," pursuant to section 201(b), Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1402. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of operations, expenditures, and obligations under sections 7 through 14 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the 1959 fiscal year appropriations act (72 Stat. 188), pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937, of the 75th Congress (50 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of August relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U.S.C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1404. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of September relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U.S.C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1405. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of October relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U.S.C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1406. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during September and October 1959 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended, submitted pursuant to provisions of Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1407. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 3 of the act approved February 18, 1929 (45 Stat. 1222, U.S.C., title 16, sec. 715b); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1408. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the monthly report, July 1959, of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including sales and disposals by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the monthly report, August 1959, of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including sales and disposals by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1410. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the monthly report, September 1959, of the General Sales Manager, Commodity Stabilization Service, concerning policies, activities, and developments, including sales and disposals by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1411. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the U.S. Secret Service for "Salaries and expenses," for the fiscal year 1960 has been reapportioned necessitating a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1412. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1960 indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1413. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Department of Justice for "Salaries and expenses, general administration," for the fiscal year 1960, indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1414. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a list of supplemental estimates of appropriation by departments and agencies, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1415. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" for the fiscal year 1960 has been apportioned showing need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1416. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "General operating expenses" for the fiscal year 1960 has been reapportioned necessitating a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1417. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Resources management," Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal year 1960, has been reapportioned necessitating a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1418. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for "Grants to States for public assistance" for the fiscal year 1960, has been apportioned indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1419. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1420. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports covering violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, "Administrative control of appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1421. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of an unintentional violation in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of the amounts allotted from one of the appropriations of this Department, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1422. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of the unintentional violation in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from one of the appropriations of this Department, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1423. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of violations in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of amounts allotted from several of the appropriations of the Department, as of July 31, 1959, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Smith Fork project, Colorado, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the soil survey and land classification of the lands in the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Seedskadee project, Wyoming, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the soil and land classification of the lands in the Hammon project, New Mexico, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1429. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Red Willow unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 1st session, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1430. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of antideficiency violations, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665(i)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1431. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Air Force's report entitled "Semiannual Research and Development Procurement Action," for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1432. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 86-149; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1433. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the quarterly report on the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government as of the end of the first quarter of 1960 (September 30, 1959), pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1434. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 85-685, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1435. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1436. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on September 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1437. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1439. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report by the Department of Defense of the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1440. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report "Real and Personal Property of the Department of Defense," as of June 30, 1959, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1441. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, listing new contracts negotiated under the authority of sections 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1442. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy relative to a proposal to transfer the submarine *Flasher* (SS–249) to the Chambers of Commerce of Groton and Greater New London, Conn., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1443. A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1444. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting the Navy's semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1445. A letter from the Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, transmitting the semiannual report covering the period January 1 through June 30, 1959, indicates those military construction contracts awarded on other than competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, pursuant to Public Law 85–685, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1446. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Fourth Report of the Attorney General on Competition in the Synthetic Rubber Industry, covering the industry's operation under private enterprise in the calendar year 1958, pursuant to Senate Report No. 117, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1447. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 34th report on property acquisitions for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the quarter ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1448. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period January 1 to June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1449. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending September 30, 1959, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1450. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of GSA operations in the production of abaca during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 683, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1451. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 19,000 pounds of crude quartz crystals now held in national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1452. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 141,808 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1453. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transmitting the annual reports of officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, together with a report of audit by Haskins & Sells, certified public accountants, for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 630, 74th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1454. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a report discussing aspects of Government procurement for defense purposes and results of continuing review of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established under section 708(e), and made pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1455. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the "Report on Borrowing Authority for the Quarter Ending June 30, 1959," pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1456. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a revision of table 11 to replace where necessary a page that was assembled in error in some of the June 30, 1959, documents entitled "Report on Borrowing Authority" pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1457. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the "Report on Borrowing Authority" for the quarter ending September 30, 1959, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1458. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 49th quarterly report, covering the third quarter 1959, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1459. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report reviewing selected phases of low-rent housing activities in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, July 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the Housing Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 1435); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms showing military procurement actions completed during the month of June, and in fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1461. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms showing military procurement actions completed during the month of July 1959, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms showing military procurement actions completed during the month of August 1959, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contracts to small and other business firms showing military procurement actions completed during the month of September 1959, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1464. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report (pt. 1 and pt. 2) of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1465. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, covering the quarterly period ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1466. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1467. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the quarterly report to Congress on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund-

Treasury Department activities for the period ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1468. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the quarterly report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund-Treasury Department activities for the period ended September 30, 1959, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1469. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 regarding certain benefits for employees of public international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1470. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 15 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1471. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report showing lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1959, for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital and its environs in nearby Maryland and Virginia, pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress of June 6, 1924 (renumbered sec. 13 of Public Law 592, approved July 19, 1952); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1472. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the 22d semiannual report on the international educational exchange program of the Department of State during the first half of fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402 (80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1473. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting reports relating to the restoration of withdrawn unobligated balances of appropriations, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 701–708; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1474. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of the Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 404(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1475. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a report required by the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–23, in connection with the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts pursuant to the act of July 25, 1957 (31 U.S.C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1476. A letter from the Chief, Accounting Division, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting copies of reports as of June 30, 1959, covering reports prior to restoration of balances as prescribed by Bureau of the Budget Circular A–23 dated June 21, 1957, under act of July 25, 1956 (31 U.S.C. 701–70); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting reports of proposed restorations of certain balances of appropriations and funds previously withdrawn for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress (31 U.S.C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1478. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting reports with respect to restorations, as of June 30, 1959, of previously withdrawn unobligated balances, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1479. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting with reference to the report transmitted to the Congress by the Comptroller General under date of November 24, 1959, entitled, "Review of Management of Leased Private Lines Telephone Facilities in the Department of Defense and Selected Civil Agencies"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1480. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting one copy each of eight reports prior to restoration of balances, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1481. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations under sections 203(j) and 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, for the calendar quarter July 1 through September 30, 1959, pursuant to section 203(o) of that act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1482. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting 17 reports prior to restoration of balances as of June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 798, approved July 1956 (31 U.S.C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1483. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report submitted to the Treasury Department pertaining to the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U.S.C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1484. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a report submitted to the Treasury Department pertaining to the restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U.S.C. 701–708); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1485. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting reports relating to the restoration of withdrawn unobligated balances of appropriations, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 701–708; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1486. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of report prior to restoration of balances, pursuant to the act of July 25, 1956 (31 U.S.C. 701–708), effective June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1487. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report required by the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 647; 31 U.S.C. 701–708), as implemented by the Bureau of the Budget Circular A–23 for restoration to the accounts of the Bureau of Employment Security; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1488. A letter from the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report prior to restoration of balances requesting restoration of funds to appropriation salaries and expenses, 63M0100, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress (31 U.S.C. 701); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1489. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report for the restoration of previously withdrawn unobligated balances of the 1958 expired appropriation, pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1490. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of State, transmitting copies of requests for the restoration of unobligated balances to appropriation accounts of the Department of State, pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of Public Law 798, 84th Congress, and subsequent instructions issued by the Bureau of the Budget in Circular No. A–23, dated June 21, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1491. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of reports of the U.S. Coast Guard and the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts under the control of the Treasury Department, pursuant to section 1(a)(2) of the act of July 25, 1956 (70 Stat. 648) (31 U.S.C. Supp. V, 701 (a)(2)), 84th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1492. A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting copies of reports for restoration under section 701(2) of title 31, United States Code, of amounts necessary to liquidate obligations legally incurred in prior years but which remain unpaid as of June 30, 1959, and also to cover negative balances in expired and merged appropriation accounts resulting from the payment of obligations which were not anticipated as of the date of our last report of obligations under section 1311 of Public Law 663, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1493. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting copies of reports requesting restoration of moneys previously withdrawn from the appropriations, 36MO152, "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses, VA"; 36MO156, "Outpatient care, VA"; and 3670157, "Maintenance and operation of supply depots, VA, 1957," pursuant to Public Law 798, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1494. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of a review of selected activities of the Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1495. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the review of operations of Henry C. Mustin Airfield, Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pa., made in 1957 with a followup review in 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1496. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a letter to the Director, International Cooperation Administration pertaining to the assistance program for Laos; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1497. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for India as administered by the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State, for the fiscal years 1955 through 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1498. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on the examination of U.S. contributions to the European Payments Union, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, covering the past several years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1499. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a short-form report to the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1500. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation activities, New Orleans commodity office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1501. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of Department of Air Force contracts AF-30 (636)-3494 and AF-30(635)-3666 with Northern Radio Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1502. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected aspects of the disability insurance program administered by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1503. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the review of management of leased private lines telephone facilities within the Department of Defense and selected civil agencies completed in September 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1504. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1505. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of management controls of the Department of Corrections, District of Columbia government, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1506. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of the Department of the Air Force contract AF 41(608)-8175 with the Rheem Manufacturing Co., Aircraft Division, Downey, Calif., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1507. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of activities in the northern region (region 1), the Rocky Mountain region (region 2), and the California region (region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, September 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1508. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of Department of the Air Force negotiated fixed-price contract AF-09(603)-32259 with General Motors Corp., AC Spark Plug Division, Milwaukee, Wis., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1509. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report on the audit of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of May 7, 1928 (22 U.S.C. 278a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1510. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of custodianship functions of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1511. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the National Wool Act program, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, August 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1512. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the southeastern power system and related activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), and the Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1513. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the review of selected activities of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1514. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the pricing of certain firm fixed-price subcontracts, awarded to Telecomputing Corp., Whittaker Controls Division, Los Angeles, Calif., by General Motors Corp., Allison Division, Indianapolis, Ind., under Department of the Air Force, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1515. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the research, training, and fellowship grant-in-aid programs administered by the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1516. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of fixed-price subcontracts issued to General Electric Co., Utica, N.Y., by American Bosch Arma Corp., for B-52 bomber fire control under Department of the Air Force contracts, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1517. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the activities of the Washington, D.C., regional office, General Services Administration, relative to the procurement, storage, and delivery of No. 6 fuel oil for the period September 1, 1955, through December 31, 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1518. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected supply activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1519. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of aircraft maintenance and supply activities at the Aircraft and Supply Base, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1520. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the medical charities Freedmen's Hospital programs, District of Columbia government, November 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of vehicle maintenance and replacement costs, Department of the Air Force, fiscal year 1956 through fiscal year 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1522. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of certain operations of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in region 2, Hagerstown, Md., October 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1523. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the policies, procedures, and practices of the General Services Administration relating to the selection of sites for the storage of strategic and critical materials acquired under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98) and other related legislation; reviewed in May 1959 pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1524. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the military

assistance program administered by the Department of the Navy, December 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1525. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report to the Secretary of the Interior on the audit of the financial statements of the Columbia River power system and related activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1526. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the review of the National Reserve Fleet, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App., sec. 1744); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1527. A letter from the Acting Director, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting a copy of a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States pertaining to a report on the examination of the economic and technical assistance program for India as administered by the International Cooperation Administration under the mutual security program for the fiscal years 1955 through 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1528. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, transmitting a copy of a letter to the Comptroller General of the United States pertaining to a report on the examination of U.S. contributions to the European Payments Union, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, covering the past several years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1529. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the second report of the Federal voting assistance program covering the period from July 1957 through September 1959, pursuant to Public Law 296, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1530. A letter from the Vice Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting relative to the preparation of plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, together with recommendations with respect to site, design, and materials, pursuant to Public Law 461, 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

1531. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan to the San Benito County Water District, of Hollister, Calif., for the construction of Hernandez Dam on the San Benito River, pursuant to the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Aug. 6, 1956, 70 Stat. 1044, as amended June 5, 1957, 71 Stat. 48, sec. 4(c), as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1532. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the construction and operation of saline water demonstration plants, pursuant to Public Law 85–883; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1533. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1534. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application for a loan to the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, in San Joaquin County, Calif., pursuant to the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (Aug. 6, 1956, 70 Stat. 1044, as amended June 5, 1957, 71 Stat. 48, sec. 4(c)); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1535. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a finding unfavorable to the development of the Pine River project extension in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico, pursuant to the act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1536. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of the laws enacted by the Fourth Guam Legislature, 1958, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1537. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of five orders to adjust or eliminate reimbursable charges of the Government of the United States as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1538. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to impose certain requirements upon persons engaging in certain activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1539. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe of the L'Anse Reservation of Michigan a tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of revolving credit fund transactions for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 10, Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986; 25 U.S.C. 470); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1541. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an application of the Browns Valley Irrigation District in Yuba County, Calif., for a loan to include a dam and reservoir on French Dry Creek, pursuant to section 10, Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, section 4(c), act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1542. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of the work conducted on synthetic liquid fuels during the 11-year period of 1944–55; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1543. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report of the proceedings relative to the claim of *The Seminole Nation* v. *The United States*, pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1544. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the fourth report of the Attorney General, consenting to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 185, the joint resolution of July 28, 1955; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1545. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1959 on commissary activities outside the continental United States, pursuant to Public Law 390, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1546. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting copies of the 11th interim report entitled "Causes and Characteristics of Thunderstorms and Other Atmospheric Disturbances," referring to studies carried on during the fiscal year 1959, submitted pursuant to Public Law 657, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1547. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934 (as amended) to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (47 U.S.C. 303(q)); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1548. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of June 31, 1959, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1549. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of July 31, 1959, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1550. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of August 31, 1959, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1551. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of September 30, 1959, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1552. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report for the year 1958 of the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, pursuant to Public Law 792, 81st Congress, chapter 956, 2d session (H.R. 5941) section 7; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1553. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Jozsef Kelemen"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1554. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Wiktor Golik"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1555. A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor, U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the audit report for the period July 18, 1958, through July 21, 1959, also balance sheet as of July 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 224, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1556. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1557. A letter from the executive director, Blinded Veterans Association, transmitting copies of audit reports for the periods ending December 31, 1958, and June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 85–769; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1558. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1559. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting an order of the U.S. Court of Claims of October 7, 1959, in the case of *J. Marvin Boyd, d/b/a Jacksonville Garment Company* v. *The United States*, congressional No. 12–54, pursuant to House Resolution 638, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1560. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of the receipts and expenditures in connection with the administration of the act for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 15 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1343); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1561. A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial Inc., transmitting the audit report for the fiscal year April 1, 1958, to March 31, 1959, pursuant to section 13(b), Public Law 85–903; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1562. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting the withdrawal from Congress of certain cases involving the provisions of section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1563. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting the withdrawal from Congress of the case of Robert Gartenberg, A–7298499, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1564. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting several reports concerning individuals admitted to the United States notwithstanding affliction with tuberculosis, pursuant to section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1565. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1566. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1567. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting the withdrawal from Congress of the case of Vince Vukelia, A–10138596, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 19(c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1568. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting the withdrawal from Congress of the case of John De Arthie, A–8897973, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1569. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1570. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting withdrawal from the Congress of the following cases, Yusuf Haikal, A–11004005, Denise Jeanne Haikal, A–11008254, and Leila Feriale Haikal, A–11008253, involving the provisions of section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1571. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1572. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1573. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting correspondence requesting the withdrawal from Congress of the case of Nicholas Parthenides, A–6943747, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 19(c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1574. A letter from the national adjutant-paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting mimeographed copies of reports of the national officers and committee chairman which were presented to the delegates of the 36th annual convention, August 19–22, 1959, also financial report and list of newly elected and appointed national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1575. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the Smithsonian Institution during the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1576. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of a report listing the tort claims approved for payment in the fiscal year 1959 and setting forth the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, and a brief description of each claim, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1577. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, pursuant to section 1211, as of September 30, 1959; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1578. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration, under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from July 1 through September 30, 1959, pursuant to section 13; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1579. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1580. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Federal aid in fish restoration program for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 11 of the act of Congress approved August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 430, 16 U.S.C. 777); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1581. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fourth annual report of operations conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 376), as amended by the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 119); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1582. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting information relating to changes in and the status of various specified positions in the Department under the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1583. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 14(c) of the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U.S.C. supp. V 14); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1584. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, dated October 2, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Corea Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 11, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

1585. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws,' to increase the amounts authorized to be expended"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1586. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, entitled 'Property rights in inventions,' and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1587. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the ninth annual report for fiscal year ended June 31, 1959, of the Subversive Activities Control Board pursuant to section 12(c) of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1588. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending October 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1589. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1590. A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, transmitting the fourth annual report, pursuant to section 114, Public Law 870, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1591. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1592. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during November 1959 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 128, 85th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1593. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports showing military procurement actions completed during the month of October 1959, in compliance with section 10(d) of the Small Business Act as amended (these are Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contracts to small and other business firms); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1594. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1595. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report describing a plan and program for the establishment and operation in Hawaii of a center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West, pursuant to chapter VI of the Mutual Security Act of 1959; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1596. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1597. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report showing the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Commission as of October 31, 1959, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1598. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities under title XIII, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as of September 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1599. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Federal Power Act, approved August 26, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1600. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting the annual report of activities and the annual audit of the books as of June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 15(a) and section 16 of Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1601. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1602. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 26th annual report of activities during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

1603. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of the Council on Public Assistance, pursuant to section 704 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1604. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the report of the Council, with recommendations, pursuant to the 1958 amendments to title IX of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1605. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Cooperative Extension Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959. Totals for activities and results are for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to section 7, Public Law 83, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1606. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1607. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report for the year 1959; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1608. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report on the examination of Department of the Army contracts and subcontracts with Birdsboro Armorcast, Inc., Birdsboro, Pa., submitted on July 23, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1609. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the relocation and alteration of facilities for water resources development projects, Department of the Army, and Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1610. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of certain Department of the Air Force contracts with General Electric Co., Heavy Military Electronic Equipment Department, Syracuse, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1611. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the 1959 conservation reserve program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, June 1959, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1612. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of supply activities for the military assistance program conducted at the U.S. Army Logistical Depot, Japan, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1613. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supervision of oil and gas operations and production on Government and Indian lands by the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, November 1958, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1614. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the 25th annual report for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1615. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year 1959, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U.S.C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1616. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the forest highway study made pursuant to section 3(b), Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, Public Law 85–381; to the Committee on Public Works.

1617. A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, transmitting the ninth annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 12(c) (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1618. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting copy No. 2 of the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1619. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 1 of the act approved June 25, 1910 (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1620. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, relative to five scientific or professional positions which were authorized in this Department by section 12(d) of Public Law 85–462, pursuant to Public Law 80–313; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1621. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the U.S. Air Force flying pay report as of August 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1622. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1959, for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1623. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the provisions of section 15 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 264), and section 114 of the act of September 12, 1950 (31 U.S.C. 66b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1624. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the third annual report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as required by section 6 of the authorizing act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1625. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1626. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the annual report concerning claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 2673, title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1627. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims for the year ended October 3, 1959, pursuant to section 791(c), title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

The following reports were filed subsequent to the adjournment of the 86th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on boron high-energy fuels (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A report on the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 86th Congress, 1st session (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9300. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 9301. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9302. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 9303. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to provide that not more than $50,000 price support shall be extended to any person in a year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9304. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9305. A bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9306. A bill to provide for a temporary agricultural program with respect to wheat in order to reduce the amount of surplus stocks of wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9307. A bill to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9308. A bill to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 9309. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Real Property, the disposal of surplus real property owned by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9310. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H.R. 9311. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9312. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.R. 9313. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to revise the quotas for 1960 in such a fashion as to increase the quota for domestic sugar-producing areas by 350,000 short tons, with corresponding reductions in the quota for Cuba; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 9314. A bill to prohibit the charging of discounts in connection with mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9315. A bill to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 9316. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide life insurance in the amount of $100,000 for individuals while training for or performing the flight of man in space; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9317. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to make it unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an employee by reason of his participation in proceedings brought under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9318. A bill to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 9319. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 9320. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9321. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 9322. A bill to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9323. A bill to amend the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act relating to disability freeze and disability insurance benefits so as to eliminate the age-50 requirement for such benefits, to eliminate the waiting period for such benefits in certain cases, to provide a period of trial work for certain individuals receiving such benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9324. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for constructing school facilities and for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 9325. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9326. A bill to amend section 108(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9327. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9328. A bill to protect and promote the health, safety, and welfare of the public and the members thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9329. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 9330. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to claim a personal exemption for any dependent who is a student and is otherwise qualified, without regard to such dependent's gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9331. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9332. A bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to enable farmers to secure fair prices, to better utilize agricultural abun-

dance in the Nation's interest at home and abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 9333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9334. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 9335. A bill to amend section 12 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for the reduction of liens under that act where awards or judgments against which such liens attach are reduced in bankruptcy proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9336. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 9337. A bill to authorize the dredging of a channel 20 feet in depth in the Merrimack River from Lawrence, Mass., to the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9338. A bill to equalize increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9339. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9340. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGINLEY:

H.R. 9341. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Pony Express; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 9342. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and north Cascades region of the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 9343. A bill to provide increases in compensation for food service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 9344. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9345. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9346. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9347. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9348. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9349. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding and false advertising of decorative hardwood or imitation hardwood products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9350. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the review of administrative regulations by committees of Congress prior to their promulgation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 9351. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall exercise command over the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the special deduction for depletion of natural resources and thereby provide the same tax treatment for mines, wells, other natural deposits, and timber as that which is presently accorded other trades and businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9353. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of certain animals which have been fed, treated, or otherwise implanted with stilbestrol unless they have been branded or marked in a manner designed to show such feeding, treatment, or implantation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9354. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual with 40 years' service may retire regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9355. A bill to amend section 15 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to permit certain enlistments in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9356. A bill to supplement the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act by prohibiting automobile manufacturers from engaging in the businesses of financing and insuring automobiles purchased by consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9357. A bill to fortify the antitrust policy of the United States against concentration of economic power and the use or abuse of that power to the detriment of the national economy by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing the sales of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9358. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act so as to require every agency of the Federal Government to furnish to certain additional persons copies of certain notices or communications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9359. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9360. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress on the advisability of establishing a national park or other unit of the national park system in the central and north Cascades region of the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9361. A bill to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense; to expand ocean resources; to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and facilities; to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments; to enhance the general welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9362. A bill to amend section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9363. A bill to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9364. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 9365. A bill to provide a method for computing parity prices for manufacturing milk and to establish a price support level for manufacturing milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9366. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 9367. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9368. A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus to persons from the District of Columbia who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 9369. A bill to extend the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9370. A bill to increase and make permanent the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9371. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership

opportunities for the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9372. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefit amounts, liberalize the work clause, provide disability insurance benefits without regard to age, and improve the earnings of the social security trust funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9373. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9374. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 9375. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 9376. A bill to prohibit the importation of Cuban sugar for so long as the price which U.S. importers are required to pay for such sugar is above the world market price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 9377. A bill to provide for the protection of forest cover for reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9378. A bill to amend sections 720 and 755 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the investment of the national service life insurance fund and the U.S. Government life insurance fund in obligations bearing current rates of interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9379. A bill to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 9380. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits for individuals disabled before January 1, 1957, after discharge from active duty during the period required to proceed directly home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 9381. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that featherbedding contracts shall be unenforcible and void; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9382. A bill to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Navaho Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 9383. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9384. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Social Security Act to eliminate those provisions which restrict the right of a spouse or survivor to receive benefits simultaneously under both acts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9385. A bill to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 9386. A bill to authorize the improvement of Snohomish River, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.J. Res. 539. Joint resolution regarding the right of self-defense of the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in Forestalling Intervention, Domination, Control, and Colonization by International Communism in the New World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 540. Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.J. Res. 541. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim the Tuesday following the second Monday in June of each year as National Fraternal Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.J. Res. 542. Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the new world, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a living memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, President James Madison, and other past Presidents of the United States, and to provide ways and means of perpetuating our esteem for other distinguished citizens and avoid undue cluttering of the Nation's Capital with statutes of the near-great and forgotten; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Con. Res. 444. Concurrent resolution providing for the reprinting of certain official records relating to the War Between the States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 445. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 446. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 447. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 448. Concurrent resolution favoring a general conference to review the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 405. Resolution extending the greeting and congratulations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the silver jubilee anniversary of the founding of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 406. Resolution to provide for the reporting of 1961 appropriations in one consolidated bill; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 407. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on Russia by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 408. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on the International Geophysical Year (February 1959)"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 409. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 410. Resolution to amend House Resolution 136, 86th Congress, as amended by House Resolution 181, 86th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 411. Resolution providing that the office building presently being constructed for Members of the House of Representatives shall be named the "Rayburn House Office Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 412. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the field of labor-management relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 413. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the consultations entitled "The Crimes of Khrushchev," parts 1, 2, 3, and 4; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly requesting the President of the United States and Congress to establish permanent diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding dairy products price supports; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer land in the Fort De Russy Military Reservation to the city and county of Honolulu for beach park and reclamation purposes and as a public right-of-way to the sea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the 12th Saipan Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to cause the Saipan District special land fund to be deposited with Bank of America, National Trust & Savings Association; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support and enact legislation to give the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect officials to administer their local affairs, to vote in presidential elections, and to have voting representation

in the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the establishment of a center for cultural and technical interchange between the East and West as provided for by the Johnson-Burns Act of the 86th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish permanent diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Fifth Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his sympathetic understanding and assistance to the problems of the Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Fifth Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending to the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, Congressman from Illinois, the warm gratitude of the people of Guam for his unswerving devotion to and interest in the problems of this Territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the granting to the people of American Samoa the right to legislate for themselves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 12th Saipan Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take under serious consideration for future reintegration of the Mariana Islands by incorporating them within the framework of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 12th Saipan Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the political reintegration of the Mariana Islands by incorporating the same within the framework of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of private legislation with respect to title to certain church properties in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such laws, rules, orders, and regulations granting to the Federal civil service blue collar workers and the same hourly rates of pay as are paid to employees of similar classifications resulting from area wage survey applicable to employees of the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in our sister State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways be extended to Hawaii at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting favorable consideration of the interisle ferry system and the Federal highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the location of the proposed Government center in the city of Boston; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to providing for a satellite launching base on the island of Hawaii; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation prescribing any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 9387. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cordasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9388. A bill for the relief of Maria Cusumano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 9389. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Barrio-Alvarez and his wife, Francisca Prado-Zamora de Barrio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9390. A bill for the relief of Byron K. Efthimiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9391. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Casserly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 9392. A bill for the relief of Ivy Gwendolyn Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9393. A bill for the relief of Carey George Delapenha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9394. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Berberian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H.R. 9395. A bill for the relief of Ralph Alves Higuero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9396. A bill for the relief of Marian Gazda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9397. A bill for the relief of Leon Startek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9398. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos Gianniotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9399. A bill for the relief of Bedros Eurdekian, Aghavni Eurdekian, and Zabal Eurdekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9400. A bill for the relief of Kenneth S. H. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 9401. A bill for the relief of Antonio Frezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 9402. A bill for the relief of Evelina Scarpa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9403. A bill for the relief of Carma Pereira de Bustillos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9404. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 9405. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa de la Vega Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 9406. A bill for the relief of William J. Huntsman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9407. A bill to provide for the award of the Silver Star to Cpl. Grover Gordon, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9408. A bill to provide for the award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Sgt. Malcolm L. Scott; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9409. A bill for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 9410. A bill for the relief of Helmut Mund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9411. A bill for the relief of Myrtella F. Motherwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 9412. A bill for the relief of Leentje Oostmeijer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9413. A bill for the relief of Raymond A. Garms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9414. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John C. Chamberlain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9415. A bill for the relief of Francesco Parrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9416. A bill for the relief of Irene Charapis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9417. A bill for the relief of Harry Kaloian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9418. A bill for the relief of Irma T. Demeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9419. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Gromak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9420. A bill for the relief of Mira Kovac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9421. A bill for the relief of Jakob Klajner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9422. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Maud Alcock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9423. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wong Lee Toy Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9424. A bill to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 9425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 9426. A bill for the relief of Mr. Wm. Burnice Joyner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 9427. A bill for the relief of Hans Christian Gunnar Mikkelsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9428. A bill for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9429. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liesel (Emmerich) Rohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9430. A bill for the relief of John Speziale and Francesca Speziale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9431. A bill for the relief of Herbert Otto Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H.R. 9432. A bill for the relief of Maj. Edmund T. Coppinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9433. A bill for the relief of Finkla Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9434. A bill for the relief of Demetre Kotsiris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9435. A bill for the relief of Maria Jozefa Piekosz-Koziol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9436. A bill for the relief of Janusz Dominik Textor-Rolleder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9437. A bill for the relief of Maria Genowefa Koziol-Raczon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9438. A bill for the relief of Yee Tip Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9439. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Won; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9440. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 9441. A bill for the relief of Cine Kalmanskaite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 9442. A bill for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9443. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel B. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9444. A bill for the relief of Hsiao-li Lindsay, nee Li-Hsiao-li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9445. A bill for the relief of Leszek Sharetzsky (formerly Sajdera); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9446. A bill for the relief of Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9447. A bill for the relief of Voldemar Nicalos Landesen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

286. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Governors' conference, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging the U.S. Department of Agriculture to cause to be included in its 1960 budget a request for sufficient funds to carry out an adequate research program for the control of the boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

287. Also, petition of the executive vice president, Association of the U.S. Army, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to several subjects directly related to the national defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

288. Also, petition of the secretary general, Military Order of the World Wars, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress to enact amendatory legislation to Public Law 422 of the 85th Congress to restore the historical relationship between active duty pay and retired pay of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

289. Also, petition of city and county of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to transfer from the Federal Government to the city and county of Honolulu of a hundred-foot strip of land in the Fort De Russy area, for beach park and reclamation purposes and as a public right-of-way to the sea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

290. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Cambridge, Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to condemnation of those officials of our Government who were responsible for the visit and lavish entertainment entailed by it of the head of the Russian State, and to affirm and encourage for all citizens the constitutional right of criticism so zealously guarded for subversives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

291. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution endorsing and supporting the production of a World's Fair in the Los Angeles area in 1963–64; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

292. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution endorsing the holding of a World Fair in the metropolitan area of the county of Los Angeles and in the vicinity of Long Beach in 1963; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

293. Also, petition of James F. McManus, Levittown, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the sale of air transportation and the regulation thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

294. Also, petition of the general manager, German American Chamber of Commerce, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of legislation now pending providing for the release of vested German private property presently held by the Office of Alien Property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

295. Also, petition of the State chairman, Socialist Party, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution declaring the basic steel industry a public utility and to create a public authority to own and manage the basic steel industry in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

296. Also, petition of the clerk, Board of Supervisors of Orange County, Goshen, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making an investigation regarding the alleged use of publicly owned lands in the county of Orange, State of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

297. Also, petition of the president, Junior Woman's Club, Corpus Christi, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution favoring establishment of a National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island to bring together young women interested in subjects of educational, cultural, and humanitarian importance; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

298. Also, petition of the president, New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H.R. 9286 regarding shipment of weapons at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

299. Also, petition of Jodie Aldridge, Nashville, Tenn., relative to requesting repeal of the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

300. Also, petition of the general counsel, Afro-American Congress of Christian Organizations, Chicago, Ill.; petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the rights of Negro citizens of the State of Mississippi and other States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

301. Also, petition of Frank Lee, Dannemora State Hospital, Dannemora, N.Y., relative to congressional redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

302. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to Federal law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

303. Also, petition of Simeon Mongcopa and others, representatives of the Bolo Battalion in the Field, South Negros Sector, Dumaguete City, Philippines, relative to their request for a reconsideration of their claim against the U.S. Government for services during World War II, now filed with the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. Also, petition of the grand knight, Knights of Columbus, Council No. 1349, San Diego, Calif., relative to commending certain officials of the U.S. Government for their efforts to eliminate pornographic and indecent material from the U.S. mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

305. Also, petition of the secretary, Governors' Conference, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to securing and guaranteeing the full 1960 commitments for highway financing as adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference at its 25th annual meeting; to the Committee on Public Works.

306. Also, petition of the secretary, Governors' Conference, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the protection of the national security and the domestic economy in decisions affecting the amount and extent of foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

307. Also, petition of the president, West Covina Chamber of Commerce, West Covina, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting that petty political differences be set aside in the next session of Congress in favor of honest and fair support of the President's appeal to remove the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, city and county of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning favorable consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of H.R. 9233 affecting income tax laws or other legislation of similar import; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the second calendar quarter of 1959 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $797. E. (9) $546.39.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $12,114.60. E. (9) $12,114.60.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,114.60. E. (9) $12,114.60.

A. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge 12, Box 865. Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $100.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $6,520.79. E. (9) $22,307.53.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $233.98. E. (9) $4,808.01.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $388,101.62. E. (9) $7,258.69.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,562.50.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $584.20.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $601.50.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.

A. Frederic A. Baker, 296 Lexington Road, Berkeley, Calif., also 1201 19th Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,125.17.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $74.92.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Commission de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $311.20.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $162.63.

A. E. F. Behrens, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jacob I. Bellow, 4338 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Federation of Labor, Lodge No. 12, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $7.65.

A. Marcia Musicant Bernstein, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,383.73.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $5,648.62.

A. Chester F. Bletch, 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $175.56. E. (9) $627.25.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumstrasse 253, Mulheim Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $168.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $277.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $8,031.29. E. (9) $8,031.29.

A. Brown & Lund, Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $120.85.

A. Mrs. Fred L. Bull, 4312 Rowalt Drive, College Park, Md.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bernard N. Burnstine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Jewelers of America, Inc., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., 701 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Unilac, Inc. and Nestle's Products (Export), Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of the USA, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Mfrs., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8.90.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,163.50. E. (9) $3,736.56.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 W. 5th Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Herman Clott, Rm 600, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,540.50. E. (9) $1,852.35.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service, Employees' Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $133.57.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. A. D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Counsel for Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $251.55.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,227.90. E. (9) $1,227.90.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.

A. Oscar Cox, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,842.50. E. (9) $117.48.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $1,039.75. E. (9) $1,039.75.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $444.40. E. (9) $313.75.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.

A. John F. Deeds, 311 Western Union Building, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Heirs of Frank L. Wilhelm.

A. John F. Deeds, 311 Western Union Building, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Postoffice Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex., and Ralph S. Trigg, Box 1312, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Robert J. Demichelis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,970.20. E. (9) $446.42.

A. Philip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Porter Bros. Corp., Postoffice Box 667, Boise, Idaho.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $40.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.25. E. (9) $72.99.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Douglas, Obear & Campbell, 822 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 W. Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. John W. Edelman, 1025 Vermont Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,192.12. E. (9) $442.19.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.15.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $618.16. E. (9) $15.

A. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $691.59.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,099.96.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $857.40.

A. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $1,319.20. E. (9) $1,319.20.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Clark Foreman, P.O. Box 1275, Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $346.70. E. (9) $1,461.67.

A. O. L. Frost, Jr., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Company of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miss Chloe Gifford, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond V. Hall, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,034.61. E. (9) $2,860.57.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William B. Henderson, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Parcel Post Association, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,503. E. (9) $2,568.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $3.

A. Lewis E. Hoffman, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex.; and Ralph S. Trigg, Post Office Box 1312, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $182.08.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $2,200.

A. Home Town Free Television Association, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,655.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Post Office Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,176.14.

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. David Hume, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $1,353.14.

A. George F. Hussey, Jr., 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Standards Association, 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75.75. E. (9) $29.35.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 1273, Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,661.05. E. (9) $1,661.05.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,291.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,901.24. E. (9) $74.10.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, Inc., 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $286.75.

A. King and Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $757.42. E. (9) $757.42.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,443.47.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $6,199.80. E. (9) $8,267.65.

A. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 200 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell A. Langdon, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $435.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $618.16. E. (9) $25.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $42.55.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C..
E. (9) $584.20.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,329.60. E. (9) $146.40.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,937.50. E. (9) $263.18.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,550. E. (9) $1,057.87.

A. Julia L. Maietta, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $985. E. (9) $1,999.54.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $618.16. E. (9) $20.

A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,060. E. (9) $616.90.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $115.74.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association and Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $300.01.

A. Slator M. Miller, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlanda, Fla.
D. (6) $97.21. E. (9) $100.27.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $82.02.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,613.85. E. (9) $833.71.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,125.63. E. (9) $17,439.97.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65,709.50. E. (9) $13,288.32.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,147.23. E. (9) $1,779.84.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,500. E. (9) $7,096.49.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21,439.35.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235. E. (9) $2,235.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40,000. E. (9) $36,217.51.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $150.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,188.55. E. (9) $2,194.05.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,094.25. E. (9) $11,094.25.

A. National Postal Committee for Educational and Cultural Materials, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $14,903.57. E. (9) $22,520.42.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,149.69.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,614.50. E. (9) $8,408.15.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,449.84. E. (9) $3,824.66.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $3,933.18.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $10.80.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $6.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $81.35.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, 207 Northern Building, Green Bay, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, 46 Escolta, Manila, Philippines.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240.16. E. (9) $592.67.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $681.81.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $212.50. E. (9) $14.29.

A. Geo. F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $4,624.98. E. (9) $636.14.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
E. (9) $1,231.19.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6.50.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $22.20.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $192.70.

A. Morton W. Royse, 2531 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Democratic Central Committee for the District of Columbia, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,424.05. E. (9) $12,000.70.

A. James D. Secrest, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $45.51.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,400. E. (9) $263.34.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 79 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $40.21.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,237.97. E. (9) $928.09.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,342.62.

A. John A. Smith, Post Office Box 9063, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Post Office Box 9063, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $384.40.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,876.74.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $651.40. E. (9) $588.73.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $576.50. E. (9) $1,975.15.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1033 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hume & Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $430.54. E. (9) $556.04.

A. Standard Public Relations, Inc., 45 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $530.68.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laboratory Apparatus & Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Group of Importers of Japanese Oysters, 92 Liberty Street, New York City, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 92 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $4.

A. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $106.11.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,785.

A. George O. Tiffany, Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.
B. Unilac, Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.
E. (9) $1,860.64.

A. Townsend Plan, 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustee for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,476.77. E. (9) $5,530.38.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $809. E. (9) $809.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $355.83.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $19,406.58. E. (9) $92.78.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $8,074.43.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,519.42. E. (9) $2,519.42.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $554.65.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $69.50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $9.09.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $45.37.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $1.38.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $7.84.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Harold M. Williams, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $366.66. E. (9) $40.92.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $129.05.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $67.57.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.
E. (9) $1,828.25.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $1,828.26.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipatted expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D5" (received for services) and "D12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D13" and "D14," since the amount has already been reported under "D5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $532.86.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,677.52. E. (9) $35.50.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washton, D.C.
D. (6) $13,413.96. E. (9) $13,413.96.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,897. E. (9) $9,424.88.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda 14, Md.

A. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,966.70. E. (9) $3,966.70.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $462.81.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,624.51.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $6,990.27. E. (9) $6,990.27.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago 54, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,309. E. (9) $32,309.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $32,941.21.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $167,094.90. E. (9) $9,238.71.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,778.96. E. (9) $12,478.96.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,893.89. E. (9) $5,208.01.

A. American Justice Association, Post Office Box 1387, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $400.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $30,000. E. (9) $12,808.33.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $11,267.05. E. (9) $2,174.45.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $56,618.16. E. (9) $6,894.65.

A. American Optometric Association, care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $2,872.10.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $553.76. E. (9) $553.76.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,894.77. E. (9) $3,173.08.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,494. E. (9) $8,887.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32,172.05. E. (9) $4,429.09.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,606.91. E. (9) $1,606.91.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,229. E. (9) $22,116.51.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $100.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $5,960.51.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $16,837.17.

A. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,562.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,075. E. (9) $1,153.84.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Robert Anthoine, 1065 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Pension Fund of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 113 University Place, New York, N.Y., and Inter-Local Pension Fund, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 204 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $230.15.

A. David O. Appleton, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $299.45.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,713.42.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class One Railroads Operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $136.40. E. (9) $825.97.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $461.65. E. (9) $80.54.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York City.
E. (9) $2,419.90.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,577. E. (9) $8,577.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,218.65. E. (9) $2,218.65.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $520.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Richard W. Averill, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $79.85.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $1,440.74.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,807.04. E. (9) $197.98.

A. Baldwin and Mermey, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,135. E. (9) $16,440.06.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,675. E. (9) $86.97.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U.S.A.

A. E. F. Behrens, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bert Bell, One Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Football League, One Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $421.32.

A. James F. Bell, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $14.33.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $81.77.

A. Jacob I. Bellow, 4338 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge 12, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Company, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $566.85.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $278.09.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, America Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $209.20.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corporation, 720 Michigan Avenue South, Chicago, Ill.

A. A. H. Bishop, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $102.94.

A. David Bishop, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $550.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $916.68. E. (9) $318.80.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,995. E. (9) $71.44.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $213.13.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,159. E. (9) $467.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $520.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $316.95.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $37.34.

A. Charles M. Boyer, Colonel, USAR, retired, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $69.75.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. Vincent L. Broderick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $827.74.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $36.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $133.27.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,432.93.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13.42.

A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $47.52.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $111.01.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $452.64.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $26.80.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $387.43.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $42.90.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,624.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, Room 1212, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42.75.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $9.21.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,286.60. E. (9) $48.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $455.49.

A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Judy Carlile, 228 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $163.76. E. (9) $25.

A. John T. Carlton and M. H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., Suite 502, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $516.94.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $900.

A. Albert E. Carter, 19 Craig Avenue, Piedmont, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,075.33.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $87.08.

A. Jay H. Cerf, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $0,000. E. (9) $1,781.65.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Justice H. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Colodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera De Mexico, Gante 15, Mexico, D.F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S.A. De C.V., Balderas No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F. Mexico.
D. (6) $6,875. E. (9) $1,467.40.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $207.76.

A. Enoch D. Chese, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $8.40.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,024.11. E. (9) $3,533.90.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $90.85.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $483.87.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Cos., 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $64.50.

A. Albert M. Cole, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Savings & Loan League, 1444 Wentworth Avenue, Pasadena.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $246.05.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $217.50.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $943.67.

A. Herbert S. Colton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burl Johnson & Associates, Box 1115, Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $315.75.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $14,790.56.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,996.10.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $13.45.

A. Gen. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 805 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $3,204.34.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $81.49.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $267.56.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $45.86.

A. J. Gilbert Cox, Elliston, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,973.54. E. (9) $2,295.31.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co. Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,203.06.

A. Laurence A. Crosby, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $943.67. E. (9) $943.67.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,159. E. (9) $807.50.

A. Bryce Curry, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,660.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $900.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $656.25. E. (9) $4.88.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,518.89.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,973.54. E. (9) $2,295.31.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Company Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $25,203.06.

A. Dorothy Mondell Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joan E. David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $105.20.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $111.10. E. (9) $88.32.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corporation, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corporation, 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Robert E. Pflaumer, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Royal Jamaica Imports Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. International Exposition, Inc., 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Poultry & Egg Producers Association, Lakewood, N.J.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19.29.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $840.

A. Philip H. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Porter Bros. Corp., Post Office Box 667, Boise, Idaho.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $40.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $179.29.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,724.45. E. (9) $99.45.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $3,329.05. E. (9) $329.05.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,359.98. E. (9) $22,700.93.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL–CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $514.95.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $14,783.19.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $307.50. E. (9) $37.11.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $488.13.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. California Shipping Co., 320 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $651.27.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.01.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $500.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,743.84. E. (9) $120.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11–134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $765. E. (9) $33.09.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2.40.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $186.80. E. (9) $55.24.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $550.80. E. (9) $300.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $359.73. E. (9) $51.39.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,092. E. (9) $76.05.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $32.80.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,305. E. (9) $21.83.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $769.84. E. (9) $12.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16.10.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $7,148.66.

A. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $47,642.30. E. (9) $21,796.46.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $230.50.

A. Bonner Fellers.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,099.96.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor & Aroostook Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 125 High Street, Boston, Mass.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Mrs. R. B. von Courten, 60 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,287.50. E. (9) $9.70.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,989.26.

A. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $902.77. E. (9) $902.77.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,461.01.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $116. E. (9) $116.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,802.64.

A. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 40 Rector Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $18,000. E. (9) $8,400.75.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. The Florida Savings and Loan League, Post Office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,725. E. (9) $9,128.58.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $737.50. E. (9) $40.66.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $115.98.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
E. (9) $625.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,174.

A. W. E. Fravel, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Freedman & Levy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Fred H. Lenway & Co., Inc., 112 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ralph E. French, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, Lodge No. 12, AFL–CIO, Box 865, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $300.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,494.29. E. (9) $5,280.49.

A. O. L. Frost, Jr., Esq., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Garrett Fuller, 1210 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $362.05.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Engler, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.23.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10. E. (8) $3.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $44.25. E. (9) $44.25.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,059.80. E. (9) $98.32.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $206.98.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,762.08. E. (9) $7,546.08.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 77 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $16,100.60. E. (9) $15,198.31.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $44.35.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $9.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
E. (9) $20.75.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.05. E. (9) $668.85.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $263.70.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $201.67.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Haley, Wollenberg & Kenehan, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Home Town Free Television Association, 2923 East Lincolnway, Cheyenne, Wyo.
D. (6) $1,149.70. E. (9) $308.82.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $741.66. E. (9) $6.68.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $166.36.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. George F. Hannaum, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U.S.A.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365. E. (9) $173.10.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $105.76.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,475.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 61 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $403.94.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $264.03.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,824.98. E. (9) $133.44.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $17.20.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,109.79.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $73.15.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $890.83.

Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $508.07.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2089.38. E. (9) $964.38.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $167.60. E. (9) $167.60.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $33.75.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $46.76.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Biulding, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $85.54.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $218.75.

A. Patrick J. Hillings, 315 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Portland Cement Co., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $852.86.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $3.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $300.

A. Lewis E. Hoffman, 800 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex., and Ralph S. Trigg, Box 1312, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $182.08.

A. Frank M. Hoffman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $666.67. E. (9) $1,000.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AMVETS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. George C. Holdrege, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $4,875.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Stanley G. Holmes, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $25.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin H. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,973.54. E. (9) $295.31.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, Merchandise Division.

A. J. Cline House, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99,

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corporation, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $187.86.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
E. (9) $10.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. David Hume, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laboratory Apparatus & Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $965.84.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $298.75.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $326.62.

A. George F. Hussey, Jr., 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Standards Association, 70 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,014.97.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,696.70. E. (9) $15,696.70.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000.03. E. (9) $2,000.03.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $16.98.

A. International Association of Machinists Labor Organization, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,484.94.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $177,073.34.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,321.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $4.80.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $368.40.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $146.

A. Andrew F. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $375.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,901.24. E. (9) $41.73.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N.J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Tennessee Absorbent Co., Southern Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,833.24.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,749.98. E. (9) $512.13.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,685.76. E. (9) $164.40.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, ORC&B Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $11.97.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $271.51.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $69.50.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1600 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Kelly, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $63.80.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. $52.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $259.60.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $68.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $523.84. E. (9) $906.41.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,525.14. E. (9) $1,407.

A. Charles E. Kief, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,093.75.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $221.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,350. (E. (9) $46.90.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $63.37.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,807.66. E. (9) $131.04.

A. Burt L. Knowles, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $32.50.

A. Robert M. Koch., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.50.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Kohler, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $87.76.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,280.30.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,479.33. E. (9) $4,474.85.

A. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,565.84.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Russell A. Langdon, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $435.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $803.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $1,156.07.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $726.25. E. (9) $8.75.

A. Warren Lawrence, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $100.

A. Eltom J. Layton, 4730 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $50.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,187.50 E. (9) $20.93.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21.87. E. (9) $43.97.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $6,130.86.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,349. E. (9) $86.27.

A. G. E. Leighty, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $4,906.69.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013 Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $16.18. E. (9) $16.18.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,535.20. E. (9) $6,535.20.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $24.83.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33.48.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $95.77.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $212.50. E. (9) $155.42.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Acceptance Corp., 1105 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $57.43.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $68.10.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. St. James Lumber Co., Pinewood Acres, Inc., and Gayland, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $375.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N.Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corporation, 415-423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, 210 East 10th Street, Amarillo, Tex.
D. (6) $200.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $365.97.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,087.50. E. (9) $14.53.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $27.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,996.80. E (9) $60.80.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $6.35.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Export Corporation, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $326.61.

A. McClure & McClure, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,739.52. E. (9) $110.40.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $550.80. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $320.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Pennsylvania Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $350.

A. Frederick C. McKee, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $46.66. E. (9) $48.21.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,885.20. E. (9) $54.13.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $787.50. E. (9) $11.74.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc. Development Fund (Legislative), in care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $122.10.

A. MacCracken, Collins & Whitney, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Compagnie de Mines en Bolivie, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $604.05.

A. John W. MacKay, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James B. Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,150.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1833 S. 7th East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law Inc., P.O. Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Arch L. Madsen, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Gracie Terrace, New York N.Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, New York International Airport, Jamaica, N.Y.
B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., New York International Airport, Jamaica, N.Y.
D. (6) $160.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,840. E. (9) $1,274.98.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $201.70.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,797.34. E. (9) $59.34.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $973.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,750.02. E. (9) $980.56.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $84.38. E. (9) $22.25.

A. Lawrence S. Martin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Frozen Food Packers.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $753.04. E. (9) $18.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $72.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,159. E. (9) $1,006.83.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $230.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975.17. E. (9) $356.29.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $238.68. E. (9) $107.77.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $4.45.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $374.99. E. (9) $45.22.

A. Vera Waltman Mayer.
B. National Consumers League, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,187.46. E. (9) $61.13.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,980.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Edward L. Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1530 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
E. (9) $713.16.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1023 L&N Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $299.88.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $79.99.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,345.40.

A. G. R. Milburn, Grass Range, Mont.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $522. E. (9) $635.48.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,025. E. (9) $79.46.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, Inc., 55 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $226.11.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,337.50. E. (9) $205.25.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.; and Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass.
D. (6) $8,300.01.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Good Samaritan Hospital, West Palm Beach, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Hospital, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. St. Luke's Hospital, Amsterdam Avenue and 113th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. St. Mary's Hospital, West Palm Beach, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. John B. Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Mortgage Bankers Association, Post Office Box 358, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,553. E. (9) $767.12.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 375 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,827.99. E. (9) $450.50.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Slator M. Miller, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Kifer, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $94.25.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $73.25.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, care of W. C. Purnell, 300 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $149.66.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $6.36.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, Virgin Islands, U.S.A.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $429.37.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Group Health Insurance, Inc., 221 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $33.67.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Curtis Morris, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $234.12.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,056. E. (9) $205.50.

A. William J. Mougey.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,422.68.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,098. E. (9) $2,098.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $75.43.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $265.91. E. (9) $20,560.62.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $6,560.77.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $968.68.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $116. E. (9) $116.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $119.23.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,500. E. (9) $6,010.78.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,078.25. E. (9) $1,500.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,950.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235. E. (9) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $550.44. E. (9) $232.06.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36,384.47. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Bureau of Lathing & Plastering, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $314,232.65. E. (9) $3,521.61.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,524.50. E. (9) $2,739.68.

A. National Committee To Liberalize the Tariff Laws for Art, 21 West 53d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,005.30.

A. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $200.37.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, Room 601, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,445.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $8,550.74. E. (9) $8,550.74.

A. National Council on Business Mail, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $108.92. E. (9) $876.02.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,312.26.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $662.25.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of First Class Mailers, 210 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,166.23. E. (9) $3,599.73.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $803.50. E. (9) $803.50.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,350.96. E. (9) $1,414.78.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90,292.69. E. (9) $9,715.64.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $208,001.84. E. (9) $22,604.84.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,264. E. (9) $1,264.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,754.89. E. (9) $24,368.51.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $355.75. E. (9) $355.75.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $478.79. E. (9) $1,603.38.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $958.05. E. (9) $4,211.09.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,475.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,823.90. E. (9) $1,454.05.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,927.05. E. (9) $2,927.05.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York City.
E. (9) $737.52.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,656.47. E. (9) $5,895.48.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,444.98. E. (9) $7,444.98.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,912.70.

A. National Rivers & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,658.70. E. (9) $9,661.11.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $910.93.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,876.37. E. (9) $9,110.51.

A. National Shoe Manufacturing Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $485.98.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $5,217.78.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42,555.45. E. (9) $2,533.81.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $25,334. E. (9) $3,730.58.

A. Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,450. E. (9) $14,762.90.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $45.35.

A. William S. Neal, 916 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $2,290.99.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24.35.

A. George R. Nelson.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $382.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George S. Newcomer, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,149.94.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $116.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Northern Building, Green Bay, Wis.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $48.84.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $26.25.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of Calif., 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,390.10.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. E. Leitz, Inc., 468 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $690.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,225.07.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,490. E. (9) $26.75.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $13.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $4,140.72.

A. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $2,065.01.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Ohio Oil Company, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $492.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $681.81. E. (9) $161.20.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $18.75.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.01.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $499.79.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $212.50. E. (9) $3.55.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $56.35.

A. Perry S. Patterson, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers—The Seeburg Corp., The Wurlitzer Co., AMI, Inc., Rock-Ola Manufacturing Corp., United Music Corp.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $593.63.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (9) $239.95.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $342.98.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $200.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $4,400. E. (9) $633.70.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $324.82.

A. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $1,827.76.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $189.26.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $193.40.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.; J. W. Keen, Luke and Eleanore Flood, Frostproof, Fla., and J. Allen Brown, Coral Gables, Fla.
E. (9) $11.90.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $225.24.

A. Piper & Marbury, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Merchantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $1,700.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $2,847.58.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $827.94.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $143.05.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $17.80.

A. Walter I. Pozen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 1211 South Brighton, Dallas, Tex.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $515.62. E. (9) $71.42.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $721.15.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Instituto Cubano de Estabilizacion del Azucar acting as Trustee for: Associacion de Colonos de Cuba and Association Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
D. (6) $2,863.50.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, United Cerebral Palsy Association, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York, N.Y.; National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis Minn.; Association of American Medical Colleges, Evansville, Ill.
D. (6) $9,083.31. E. (9) $5,409.80.

A. Railway Labor Executive Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,425. E. (9) $39.98.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbriar Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Joseph H. Ream, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 506 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $2,020.31.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $221.55.

A. J. B. Reeves, 9th and Jackson, Tokepa, Kans.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $60.51.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $343.69.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $255.61.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers' Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $69,157.19.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,400.20. E. (9) $10,484.77.

A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $386.08.

A. Leon D. Richeson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Robert E. Pflaumer, Chicago, Ill.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,791.45. E. (9) $1,620.70.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,159. E. (9) $547.50.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $975. E. (9) $833.06.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) 348.53.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $147.25.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $84.

A. Harold R. Robinson, 820 Maine Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $39.51.

A. Edward Rodgers, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $660. E. (9) $41.50.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $3.30.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,350.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,454.19.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,093.23. E. (9) $1,075.48.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $410.16. E. (9) $103.91.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $618.75.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $219.30.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $225.74.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $73.70.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N.J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, etc., 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Washington, D.C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 211 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $975.67.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,282.70. E. (9) $8,773.96.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $315.55.

A. Seaboard and Western Airlines, Inc., New York International Airport, Jamaica, N.Y.
E. (9) $280.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $155.66.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $205.62.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $115.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $766.67. E. (9) $106.88.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $119.52.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1615 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $893.

A. Maurice J. Shean, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. City and County of San Francisco.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,177.74.

A. Shearman & Sterling & Wright, 20 Exchange Place, New York City.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co.
E. (9) $4.40.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C., and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,874.87. E. (9) $86.99.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,375.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $820.73.

A. David Silvergleid, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,700.10. E. (9) $350.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $3,561.88.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co., Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $648.36. E. (9) $13.44.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $5.30.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $189.97.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. E. Stratford Smith, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $64.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $209.47.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $973.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $738.33. E. (9) $111.58.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,442.40. E. (9) $4.50.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1150 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1033 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hume & Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,978.75.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $17,419.87. E. (9) $10,330.30.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $21,045.43. E. (9) $150.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $431.78.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $3,450.30.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Co., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $5.50.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D.C.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $5.50.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,536.25. E. (9) $288.22.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,583.33.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $965.84.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,208.33.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $1.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $230.08.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,158.84.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $88.77.

A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,454.18.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $122.14.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $1,013.84.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $75.86.

A. Joseph C. Swidler, 415 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Power Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,725. E. (9) $279.26.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $134.29.

A. Temporary Committee on Taxation of Mutual Life Insurance Cos., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $19,000. E. (9) $42,421.84.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $11,435. E. (9) $6,126.21.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $155.52.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dry Dock Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $176.05.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,082.50.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $313.33. E. (9) $65.88.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,245. E. (9) $20.42.

A. George O. Tiffany, Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.
B. Unilac, Inc., and its subsidiary, Nestle's Products (Export), Inc., Ridgeway Center Building Stamford, Conn.
E. (9) $2,990.77.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $474.39.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,016.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $198.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $55.25.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard S. Tribe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $20.65.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $45.05.

A. J. T. Trullinger, National Bank of Commerce Building, Olympia, Wash.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif., et al.

A. Ernest Allen Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $24.07.

A. Stanley R. Tupper, 154 State Street, Augusta, Maine.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $89.35.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots Association, I.O.M.M. & P., Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C.Z.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $155.75.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $699.34.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 321 West 44th Street, New York City.
E. (9) $1,218.87.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,064.06. E. (9) $1,236.17.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $16,821.36.

A. United States Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $542.09.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $135.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Leland M. Walker, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.34. E. (9) $24.43.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $108.75. E. (9) $2.06.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co's., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $89.62.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,126.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,584.65. E. (9) $6,231.34.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $113.13.

A. J. R. Watson, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I.C.-R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $612.08.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $175.

A. Robert Watson, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City, N.Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Thomas Waters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver and Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Company Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Weaver and Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $1.35.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $438.14.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $187.50. E. (9) $6.48.

A. William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,184. E. (9) $367.96.

A. Donald D. Webster, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,270.84. E. (9) $162.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,874.72.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $799.40.

A. Gene T. West, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,894.72. E. (9) $24.83.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1635 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,044.56.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $158.36.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $35.64.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Edward P. Whitney, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $50.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $19.37.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $11.48.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $83.25.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $26.62.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $6.62.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harold M. Williams, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $145.25.

A. Laurens Williams, 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $7.20.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $407.32.

A. Kenneth Williamson, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750.01. E. (9) $535.44.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 2d Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,507.68. E. (9) $2.25.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $99.34.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $565.98.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank C. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $41.84.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $100.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,619.88.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John C. York, 350 Edwards Drive, Fayetteville, N.Y.
B. Eastern Milk Producers Cooperative Association, Inc., Kinne Road, DeWitt, Onondaga County, N.Y.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $47.52.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,680.

A. John M. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $16.18.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C
D. (6) $3,575.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,624.51. E. (9) $3,281.45.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Anzheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bakery and Confectionery International Union of America, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Barnhard, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 100 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald E. Breeden, West 818 York Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Clifton W. Collins, 119 B Street SW., Ephrata, Wash.
B. Pacific Northwest Community Television Association, 250 South Second, Coos Bay, Oreg.

A. Lloyd Croslin, 615 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.
B. Christine Elliott, Shallowater, Tex.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. International Exposition, Inc., 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas Dixon, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Palo Verde Irrigation District, Blythe, Calif.

A. Freedman & Levy, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Fred H. Lenway & Co., Inc., 112 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
A. P. Irving Grinberg, 15 West 44th Street, New York City.

A. William R. Gruver II, 127 East 69th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Hale, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick J. Hillings, 110 South Euclid, Pasadena, Calif.
B. California Portland Cement Co., 612 South Flower, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westinghouse Electric Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Charles E. Kief, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Rufus King, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. H. Kittrell, 217 Commercial Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries.

A. Milton M. Levin, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Bakers & Confectionery Workers' International Union of America, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. St. James Lumber Co., Pinewood Acres, Inc., and Gayland, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Bryan R. McCarthy, Freitas Building, San Rafael, Calif.
B. West Marin Property Owners Association.

A. McClure & McClure, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia & Reading Relief Association, Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
A. MacCracken, Collins & Whitney, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Compagnie Aramayo de Mines en Bolivie, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Group Health Insurance, Inc., 221 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Curtis Morris, 729 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Henry C. Nelson, Jr., 709 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.
B. South Carolina Railroad Association, 709 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Harold R. Robinson, 820 Maine Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China.

A. Science Materials Center, Inc., 59 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Slater, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 420 Lexington, Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles H. Tower, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Veterans of World War One, Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul D. Yager, 916 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cyrus W. and Lucille M. Manfull, 13152 Wentworth Street, Pacoima, Calif.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a fateful hour, with such vast issues at stake, grant that those here who, by the people's choice, have been called to high places of state may maintain in themselves the fidelity of those who speak for a privileged nation to which much has been given and from which much will be required.

In all the words and actions in this Chamber, help them to remember that we are a part of the past, of the present, and of the future. We belong to all those who in the yesterdays condemned oppression and fought the good fight for freedom.

In the present we are the comrades of those who, across all frontiers and borders, and despising all shackles of the mind, however imposed, strive for the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. And may we remember that we belong to the tomorrows as we live by a faith that sends a shining ray far down the future's broadening way. As by that faith we live, may those who here speak for America sow the seeds of a golden harvest for all mankind in a peaceful world that beckons. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a Senator from the State of New Mexico; HARRY FLOOD BYRD, a Senator from the State of Virginia; HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana, JOHN F. KENNEDY, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts; and RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 6, 1960, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 231)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of

the United States, which was received by the Secretary of the Senate on October 20, 1959, during the sine die adjournment of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the 15th semiannual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending December 31, 1958. The report was prepared by the coordinator of the mutual security program, with participation by the Department of State (including the International Cooperation Administration), the Department of Defense and the Development Loan Fund.

The essence of our experience during the 7½ years of the program on which reports have been transmitted to the Congress, is that the mutual security system is vital to our national security. If we do not persist in the continuous and vigorous application of military, economic, and technical programs making up the mutual security system, our foreign policy will be rendered ineffective. This ultimately cannot fail to have the most serious consequences for every living American.

If we fail to win the contest in which we are now engaged, the potential destruction of our way of life becomes, by the degree of our failure, more and more a dangerous reality. It behooves us all to keep this peril fresh in our minds.

I trust that this report will provide a yardstick to evaluate the measures we and other members of the great community of nations are taking in the mutual security program to defend our freedoms.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 19, 1959.*

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS BY VICE PRESIDENT DURING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 198, 86th Congress, 1st session, the Vice President, on September 30, 1959, approved the appointment of the following Senators to represent the Senate as a special committee at the ceremonies to be held at Honolulu, Hawaii, on November 26, 1959, to commemorate the first official observance of the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State: Mr. MANSFIELD, chairman, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, ex officio, and Mr. LONG of Hawaii, ex officio.

Under date of November 10, 1959, the Vice President approved the appointment of Senator GRUENING as a member of the special committee to represent the Senate at the ceremonies to be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on November 26, 1959, vice Mr. NEUBERGER, resigned.

Under date of November 21, 1959, the Vice President approved the appointment of Senator JACKSON as a member of the special committee to represent the Senate at the ceremonies to be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on November 26, 1959, vice Mr. GRUENING, resigned.

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 114, 86th Congress, 1st session, the Vice President, on October 2, 1959, approved the appointment of the following Senators as a delegation from the Senate to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Australia at the invitation of the Australian branches of the association in November: Mr. FREAR, chairman, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SCOTT.

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, 86th Congress, 1st session, the Vice President approved the appointment of the following Senators to represent the Senate on the Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations: Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. MUSKIE.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The following additional reports of committees were submitted during the sine die adjournment:

REPORT ENTITLED "MONOPOLY AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE SCRAP STEEL INDUSTRY" (S. REPT. NO. 1013)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 28, 1959, Mr. LONG, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on October 16, 1959, submitted a report entitled "Monopoly and Technological Problems in the Scrap Steel Industry," which was printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "PROJECT MERCURY: MAN-IN-SPACE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION" (S. REPT. NO. 1014)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 15, 1959, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on December 16, 1959, submitted a report entitled "Project Mercury: Man-in-Space Program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration," which was printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "DUAL DISTRIBUTION, THE FLAT-GLASS INDUSTRY" (S. REPT. NO. 1015)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 28, 1959, Mr. LONG, on December 31, 1959, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Dual Distribution in the Flat-Glass Industry," which was printed.

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 11, 1959, Mr. MCCLELLAN, on October 23, 1959, pursuant to Senate Resolution 44, 86th Congress, from the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, submitted a report entitled "Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field," which was printed as part 2 of Senate Report No. 621.

REPORT ENTITLED "IMPACT OF SUBURBAN SHOPPING CENTERS ON INDEPENDENT RETAILERS"—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1016)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 28, 1959, Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on January 5, 1960, submitted a report entitled "Impact of Suburban Shopping Centers on Independent Retailers," together with the individual views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] which was printed.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to join with a similar committee on the part of the House to notify the President that a quorum was present and that we were prepared to receive any messages from him has communicated with the President. The President has informed us that he will appear before a joint session today.

I should like to inform Senators that it is expected that the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session at 12:10 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.; and

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 443) that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Charles A. Boyle, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Steven V. Carter, late a Representative from the State of Iowa, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Alvin R. Bush, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right,

title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEATH OF MRS. STROM THURMOND

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, every Member of this body was deeply saddened on yesterday to hear the tragic news of the passing of the young and beautiful wife of our friend and colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

During the period it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of the Senate, I have known no person who was a part of the life of this body whose death has caused more distress and grief.

Mrs. Thurmond's cheery smile and unfailing good nature made her universally known and loved by everyone from the highest officials of Government to the policemen and elevator operators.

My personal friendship with Jean Thurmond was one of the most valued rewards of my Senate service, and I feel a deep sense of personal loss in her passing.

My heart goes out to Senator THURMOND and members of their family in the tragic loss they have sustained. I know that every Member of the Senate joins me in expressing condolences in the passing of one whom many loved so dearly.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the untimely death yesterday of the lovely and charming wife of the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has filled with sadness and grief the hearts of all those who knew her and cherished her friendship.

Jean Thufmond was one of the most gracious, intelligent, and accomplished women it has been my privilege to call my friend. She was a loving and devoted wife, an ever-present and dedicated helpmeet to her husband, a true and loyal friend to her vast realm of acquaintances and admirers, and a devout and practicing Christian whose unselfishness in serving the needs of others earned her the love and respect of all with whom she came into contact.

Senator THURMOND, the State of South Carolina, and the Nation have suffered a great loss. And as I rise today to express my deepest heartfelt sympathy to her husband, her loved ones, and her fellow South Carolinians, I take comfort in the fact that though her departure from this world has made it poorer Heaven is today richer for her presence there.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, having learned of the tragedy which has come into the life of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I wish to offer the sympathy of Mrs. Gruening and myself, which was expressed yesterday in the following telegram:

Dorothy and I are terribly shocked and deeply dismayed by the tragedy which has befallen you, remembering so well, from our days together as Governors, the loveliness and charm of your beautiful young wife, who has graced so many occasions since your coming to the Senate. We are appalled at the thought that she is no longer with us. Our very deepest and most heartfelt sympathy go out to you.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my personal sympathy to our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] in the loss of his beloved and gracious wife.

Jean Thurmond was one of the loveliest women I have ever been privileged to know. Although words are inadequate at such a time, I am sure that all of us have a deep feeling of sympathy for our colleague.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has paid a merited tribute to the departed wife of our colleague, the able junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. The entire Senate has been saddened by the tragic word of the passing away of Mrs. Thurmond on yesterday, on the eve of the convening of this momentous session.

Mrs. Thurmond's grace, her unfailing courtesy to all, her uniform pleasantness, and her whole-souled devotion to her husband in all his activities have been remarked about time after time by Members of this body. In STROM THURMOND'S most difficult battles, she was by his side; and when he was on the floor of the Senate, engaged in sharp debate, she was his watchful and careful listener in the family section of the Senate galleries.

I join with my colleagues in extending our deepest sympathy to the bereaved husband, our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina. The entire Senate has lost from the ranks of the Senate families one of their most charming members. The vacant spot left in the Senate family gallery will not be vacant for STROM THURMOND alone, but for the entire Senate, and for all of us who had observed Mrs. Thurmond and her devotion to her husband, his work, and this body as an institution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I was saddened, as were all of us, by news of the death of the wife of our colleague and friend, Senator STROM THURMOND. All of us came to know quickly the great qualities of Jean Thurmond. She was kind, congenial, and intelligent, and it was easy to see that her attributes emanated from deep religious beliefs and a noble character.

We saw here the devotion and love of Senator THURMOND and Mrs. Thurmond for each other. We know that there is nothing we can say that can bring him solace, but I am certain that the life and memory of Jean Thurmond will bring him comfort in the years that are ahead.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that my wife and I together with Senators and their families on both sides of the aisle, send to STROM THURMOND, a Member of the Senate from South Carolina, our profound condolences on his very great and very grievous loss.

Many times, Mr. President, the Senate has been called a club. To an extent, I think that is true; but the Senate and the Senators and their families together might be called a family—at least, as I see it—and when a sweet and lovely woman, the wife of a Member of the Senate family, was taken, it was an occasion for very great sorrow, not alone by the Thurmond family, but by all Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the minority whip, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and other Senators who on this floor have expressed their sorrow at the passing of Jean Thurmond, the wife of the Senator from South Carolina.

When I came into the Chamber yesterday I looked up at the family gallery. Jean Thurmond was always to be seen in that part of the Senate galleries. Yesterday she was missing. Later, of course, word came that she had passed away. The delicate operation which had been performed on her some months ago had been unsuccessful.

I wish at this time, on behalf of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, to extend to Senator THURMOND our deepest sympathy in his hour of great sorrow and stress. I know that by the untimely death of Jean Thurmond he has lost a partner who will be missed greatly.

May her soul rest in peace.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a House concurrent resolution which provides for a joint session of the two Houses; and I request that after that is done, immediate action be taken upon the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 443), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum; and shortly after I do so, I shall ask unanimous consent to withdraw that suggestion, inasmuch as the House expects the Members of the Senate to leave this Chamber at approximately 12:05 p.m., in order to be in the Hall of the House of Representatives in time to receive the President on schedule.

When the quorum call is suspended, I shall move that, pursuant to the concurrent resolution, the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Following the President's message, the Senate will return to its Chamber, and will remain in session until 3:15 o'clock this afternoon. The majority will hold their caucus at 3:30 o'clock.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 443, I now move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States of America.

(For the address delivered by the President, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m., when it was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN].

LIMITATION OF SENATE DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills, the submission of petitions and memorials, and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in this connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPERTY RIGHTS IN INVENTIONS

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, entitled "Property Rights in Inventions," and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND EXPANSION OF MARKETS FOR SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of Agriculture, entitled "Orderly Liquidation of Stocks of Agricultural Commodities Held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Expansion of Markets for Surplus Agricultural Commodities," dated September 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations, expenditures, and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, together with a report of emergency hurricane and flood damage restoration measures (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the month of July 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the months of August and September 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the months of August and September 1959, there were no significant developments relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the month of October 1959, there were no significant developments relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 74)

A letter from the President, National Forest Reservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORT OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Cooperative Extension Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during the months of September and October 1959, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during November 1959, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering 15 violations relating to overobligation of appropriations in the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the overobligation of appropriations in that Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Three letters from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated October 5, November 10, and December 24, 1959, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation relating to overobligation of an appropriation in the account of the Federal-aid highway (trust fund), 1958, Bureau of Mines, in the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Four letters from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated November 9, November 23, and December 11, 1959, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the neces-

sity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Three letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, dated September 17, September 30, and October 15, 1959, respectively, reporting, pursuant to law, that sundry appropriations in the various departments were reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATEMENT OF JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 72)

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by that court, for the year ended October 3, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

STATUS OF NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS GRADUATES (REGULARS)

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CHIEF AND DEPUTY CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SHIPS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on real and personal property of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENT OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, development or research work, for the period January–June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SUBMARINE TO CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF GROTON AND NEW LONDON, CONN.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Chambers of Commerce of Groton and New London, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer the condemned submarine *Flasher* for display in a submariner's memorial museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF LOAN OF NAVAL VESSEL TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS AWARDED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising during the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF ARMY OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO HEADQUARTERS AGENCIES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Two letters from the Secretary of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of Army officers assigned to the headquarters agencies of the Department of the Army and to the General Staff, as of June 30 and September 30, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FLYING PAY, AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, relating to flying pay, for the period March 1, 1959, through August 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts other than on competitive bidding by that Department, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement), Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and development procurement actions of $50,000 and over, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on semiannual research and development procurement action, covering the period from January 1, 1959, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that for the quarter ended September 30, 1959, there were 2,450 officers of the Air Force assigned to the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CIVIL DEFENSE PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions for civil defense, for the quarter ended June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions for civil defense, for the quarter ended September 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain contracts awarded by that Department for research and development, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, by that Department, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PYRETHRUM

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 141,808 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUARTZ CRYSTALS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 19,000 pounds of crude quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON COMPETITION IN SYNTHETIC RUBBER INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, for the calendar year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT FOR DEFENSE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on procurement for defense, dated November 9, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

Two letters from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, dated June 30, 1959, and September 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the third

quarter, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON AWARDS OF PRIME CONTRACTS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

Two letters from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contracts awards to small and other business firms, for the months of June and July 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the months of August and September 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contracts to small and other business firms, for the month of October 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TABLE II IN REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a revision of table II in the report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended June 30, 1959, transmitted to the Senate on October 14, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bank as of June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS ON LIQUIDATION OPERATIONS, BUSINESS AND DISASTER LOANS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidation operations, business and disaster loans of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as administered by that Administration, for the quarter ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on liquidation operations, business and disaster loans of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as administered by that Administration, for the quarter ended September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Two letters from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, dated October 8 and October 26, 1959, relating to the report of that Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PERMANENCY OF EXISTING PRIVILEGE OF FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CERTAIN INCOME TAX EXEMPTION OF A FOREIGN CENTRAL BANK

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from obligations of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, dated January, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF RENEGOTIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, the Renegotiation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILD WELFARE SERVICES

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, dated December 28, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, legislative commission, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion, up to and including the period ended October 31, 1959 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE FOR THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST IN HAWAII

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the proposed International College for the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii, dated 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 21st semiannual report on the international educational exchange program of the Department of State, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 22d semiannual report on the international educational exchange program of the Department of State, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHANGE OF NAME OF PROPOSED DIABLO DAM AND RESERVOIR ON RIO GRANDE TO AMISTAD DAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, informing the Senate that the Presidents of the United States and Mexico at a meeting on October 12, 1959, at Camp David, Md., had agreed that the name of the proposed Diablo Dam and Reservoir on the Rio Grande, should be changed to Amistad Dam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

APPROPRIATIONS INCIDENT TO PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, for the quarter July 1 through September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS ON RESTORATION OF BALANCES WITHDRAWN FROM APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of $7,290,776.41 to the accounts of the Bureau of Employment Security (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, eight reports relating to restoration of balances of appropriations in that Administration (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on restoration of balances in the accounts of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, 17 reports on restora-

tion of balances in the accounts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on restoration of balances in the accounts of that Department (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances in the accounts of the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances in the accounts of the Department of Agriculture (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances in the accounts of that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on restoration of balances in the accounts of the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances in the accounts of the Department of Defense, as of June 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances in an account of that System (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances in the account of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances in the accounts of the U.S. Coast Guard, under jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances of appropriations in certain accounts in the Department of the Interior (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Governmeent Operations.

A letter from the Chief, Budget and Finance Division, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances in an account under the jurisdiction of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the restoration of balances in certain accounts of that Office (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances of appropriations in certain accounts under the jurisdiction of that Administration, as of June 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances of appropriation in the account "Salaries and Expenses," administered by that Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Chief, Accounting Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restoration of balances of appropriations in accounts administered by that Agency, as of June 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller, Panama Canal Company, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the restoration of balances affecting appropriations made to that Bureau (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on restorations of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, in that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balance, of that Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Disposals of Foreign Excess Property

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Department of Agriculture on the disposals of foreign excess property, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Operations in Production of Abaca

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on operations in the production of abaca, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Followup Review of Assistance Program for Laos

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of his letter to the Director, International Cooperation Administration, dated October 16, 1959, relating to a report to Congress dated July 31, 1959, concerning the assistance program for Laos (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Followup Review of Operations of Henry C. Mustin Airfield, Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on a followup review of the operations of the Henry C. Mustin Airfield, Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pa., during the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Short-Form Report on Audit of Columbia River Power System and Related Activities

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form report on audit of the Columbia River Power System and Related Activities, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Supply Activities for Military Assistance Program, United States Army Logistical Depot, Japan

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply activities for the military assistance program, U.S. Army Logistical Depot, Japan, dated December, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Supervision of Certain Oil and Gas Operations by Geological Survey

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supervision of oil and gas operations and production on Government and Indian lands by Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, November, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Relocation and Alteration of Certain Facilities, Corps of Engineers

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the relocation and alteration of facilities for water resources development projects, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army and Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, June, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of 1959 Conservation Reserve Program, Commodity Stabilization Service

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the 1959 conservation reserve program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, June, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Federal-Aid Highway Program, Region 2, Hagerstown, Md.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the Federal-aid highway program, Region 2, Hagerstown, Md., Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated October 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Selected Activities of Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on a review of selected activities of the Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa., dated November 19, 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Aircraft Maintenance and Supply Activities, Aircraft Repair and Supply Base, U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on review of the aircraft maintenance and supply activities at the Aircraft Repair and Supply Base, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated December 23, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF VEHICLE MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT COSTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of vehicle maintenance and replacement costs, Department of the Air Force, dated December 15, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND PRACTICES OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the policies, procedures, and practices of the General Services Administration, relating to the selection of sites for the storage of strategic and critical materials, dated May 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF LOW-RENT HOUSING ACTIVITIES, PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the low-rent housing activities in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated July 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED SUPPLY ACTIVITIES, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected supply activities of the Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected aspects of the disability insurance program, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED INSURANCE OPERATIONS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT CONTROLS OF DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of management controls of the Department of Corrections, District of Columbia government, dated October 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES IN REGIONS 1, 2, AND 5, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of activities in Northern Region (Region 1), Rocky Mountain Region (Region 2), and California Region (Region 5), Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated September 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT, STORAGE, AND DELIVERY ACTIVITIES, RELATIVE TO NO. 6 FUEL OIL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procurement, storage, and delivery activities, relating to No. 6 fuel oil, Washington, D.C., regional office, General Services Administration, dated February 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF THE MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of selected activities of the Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND FELLOWSHIP GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of research, training, and fellowship grant-in-aid programs administered by the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated February 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of United States contributions to European Payments Union (succeeded by European Fund), International Cooperation Administration, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a reply to the Comptroller General, relating to the Comptroller's report, transmitted to the Senate on November 6, 1959, regarding an examination of United States contributions to the European Payments Union (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN AIR FORCE CONTRACTS WITH GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of Department of the Air Force contracts with General Electric Co., Heavy Military Electronic Equipment Department, Syracuse, N.Y., dated December 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Southeastern Power System and Related Activities, Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, and Southeastern Power Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Custodianship Functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Wool Program, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, dated August 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Commodity Credit Corporation Activities, New Orleans Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, dated January 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SHORT-FORM REPORT ON AUDIT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a short-form report to the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, on the audit of the financial statements of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONTRACT AF 09(603)-32259

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of pricing of Department of the Air Force contract AF 09(603)-32259) with General Motors Corp., AC Spark Plug Division, Milwaukee, Wis. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF AIR FORCE CONTRACT AF 41(608)-8175

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of the Department of the Air Force contract AF-(608)-8175, with the Rheem Manufacturing Co., aircraft division, Downey, Calif. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF AIR FORCE CONTRACTS AF-30(635)-3494 AND AF-30(635)-3666

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of Department of the Air Force contracts AF-30(635)-3494 and AF-30(635)-3666, with the Northern Radio Co., Inc., of New York, N.Y. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE SUBCONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of certain Department of the Air Force subcontracts award to the Telecomputing Corp., Whittaker controls division, Los Angeles, Calif., by General Motors Corp., Allison division, Indianapolis, Ind. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN FIXED-PRICE SUBCONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the pricing of fixed-price subcontracts issued to General Electric Co. by the American Bosch Arma Corp., for B-52 bomber fire control radar, under Department of the Air Force contracts (with an accompanying report); the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT OF LEASED PRIVATE LINES TELEPHONE FACILITIES, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND SELECTED CIVIL AGENCIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the management of leased private lines telephone facilities in the Department of Defense and selected civil agencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., referring to the report on review of Management of Leased Private Lines Telephone Facilities in the Department of Defense and Selected Civil Agencies, transmitting to the Senate on November 24, 1959, by the Comptroller General of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MEDICAL CHARITIES AND FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL PROGRAMS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of medical charities and Freedmen's Hospital programs, District of Columbia government, dated November 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR INDIA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for India, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1955-58 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Director, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of his reply to the Comptroller General, relating to the report of the Comptroller General, transmitted to the Senate on September 14, 1959, regarding economic and technical assistance program for India, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, for the fiscal years 1955-58 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of the military assistance program administered by the Department of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report relating to the renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, as of September 1, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF PINE RIVER PROJECT EXTENSION, COLORADO AND NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an unfavorable report relating to the development of the Pine River project extension in southwestern Colorado and northwestern New Mexico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF SALINE WATER DEMONSTRATION PLANTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that a process has been selected for the fourth saline water demonstration plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROJECT PROPOSALS UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on a project proposal of the South San Joaquin Irrigation District, San Joaquin County, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on a project proposal of the San Benito County Water District, Hollister, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on a project proposal of the Browns Valley Irrigation District, Yuba County, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CREDIT FUND TRANSACTIONS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on credit fund transactions, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

READJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF DEBTS AGAINST INDIVIDUAL OR TRIBES OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, orders for the adjustment or cancellation of debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians, for the fiscal year 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATIONS OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Smith Fork project, Colorado (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Red Willow Unit, Frenchman-Cambridge division, Missouri River Basin project, Nebraska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Hammond project, New Mexico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Seedskadee project, Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO ADJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF INDIAN DEBTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN MICHIGAN TO KEWEENAW BAY INDIAN TRIBE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REQUIREMENTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS ENGAGING IN ACTIVITIES WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to impose certain requirements upon persons engaging in certain activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of Guam, Fourth Guam Legislature, 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINANCIAL REPORT RELATING TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on receipts and expenditures in connection with the Outer Continental Shelf lands, for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLAIM OF SEMINOLE NATION *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of *The Seminole Nation,* Plaintiff, v. *The United States,* Defendant, Docket No. 150 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON COMMISSARY ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the commissary activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from July 1, 1959, through September 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

INTERIM REPORT ON CAUSES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THUNDERSTORMS AND OTHER ATMOSPHERIC DISTURBANCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report entitled "Causes and Characteristics of Thunderstorms and Other Atmospheric Disturbances," for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FEDERAL AID IN FISH RESTORATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal aid in the fish restoration program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, for the fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PERSONNEL MATTERS IN THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Five letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of June 30, July 31, August 31, September 30, and October 31, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on licensed hydroelectric projects and personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 303 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 (as amended) to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SIMPLIFICATION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN JUDGMENTS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOZSEF KELEMEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Jozsef Kelemen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WIKTOR GOLIK

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Wiktor Golik (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period January 1, 1959, through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DR. FERENC DOMJAN AND OTHERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GEORGE E. WILLIAMS AND WILLIAM L. JOHNSON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON PAYMENTS OF TORT CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims by that institution, during the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Treasury Department, during the fiscal year 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Commission, covering the period from July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COURT OF CLAIMS OPINIONS IN CERTAIN CASES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of *Imperial Agriculture Corporation* v. *The United States,* rendered on December 2, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of Thomas A. Hellander, doing business as *Tom Hellander Company* v. *The United States,* rendered on December 2, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of *M. F. Comer Bridge and Foundation Company* v. *The United States,* rendered on December 2, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., referring to the opinion of the court, in the case of *M. F. Comer Bridge and Foundation Company* v. *The United States* rendered and transmitted to the Senate on December 2, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of that Board, for the period

July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the executive director, Blinded Veterans Association, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association for the periods ended December 31, 1958, and June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the corporation agent, Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Legion, for the period July 18, 1958, through July 21, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF JEWISH WAR VETERANS, U.S.A., NATIONAL MEMORIAL, INC.

A letter from the treasurer, Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that memorial, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON ACCOUNTS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that association, for the year 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications of certain aliens found admissible into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS AFFLICTED WITH TUBERCULOSIS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning individuals admitted to the United States notwithstanding affliction with tuberculosis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of several aliens from a report relating to the admission of certain aliens, transmitted to the Senate on September 11, 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Five letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Vince Vukelia, John De Arhie, Robert Gartenberg, Yusuf Haikal, Denise Jeanne Haikal, Leila Feriale Haikal, and Nicholas Parthenades from reports relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on April 15, 1959, January 15, 1959, February 1, 1958, April 1, 1959, and August 1, 1959, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of receipts and expenditures, for the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN COLLECTIONS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON BONDING OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS ON SCIENTIFIC OR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Two letters from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on scientific or professional positions within that Department, for the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON FOREST HIGHWAYS STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Forest Highways Study, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Wilson Dam, Ala., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Authority, for the period July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal voting assistance program, covering the period from July 1957 through September 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institution, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ON PROPOSED STATUE OF GENERAL PERSHING

A letter from the Vice Chairman, the American Battle Monuments Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed erection of a statue in memory of the late Gen. John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO ACCESS TO CERTAIN DATA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 51, A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose legislation prescribing any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons

"Whereas business enterprises are made up of several types of business organizations, including proprietorships, partnerships, corporations and cooperatives, all of which contribute greatly to the tempo of economic activity within the State; and

"Whereas Wisconsin is one of the leading cooperative States of the Nation, and particularly within the rural areas cooperatives have greatly benefited and rendered service to their members; and

"Whereas the tax position of cooperatives has been thoroughly investigated by the Congress of the United States over a long period of time and these investigations have revealed that under the present laws, the cooperatives have faithfully abided by the principles and regulations under which they have been organized; and

"Whereas cooperatives do pay taxes and in many communities of this State are the largest taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended to Congress to require cooperative patronage savings to be paid in cash within 3 years and to draw not less than 4 percent interest, or otherwise to be classified as income to the cooperative and be thereby subjected to corporation income taxes; and

"Whereas this alteration of the present tax status would seriously hamper and restrict the services which the cooperatives are performing within the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is requested to recognize that indebtedness which is owed by a cooperative or any other taxpayer to its patrons or customers is not income to such taxpayer even though it may be income to its patrons or customers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be specifically requested to oppose any measures which would prescribe any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities which are issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

"PHILEO NASH,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE MOLINARO,
"Speaker of the Assembly."

"JOINT RESOLUTION 32, A

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to take steps to restrict the importation of veneer to compete with our lumber industry

"Whereas the wood veneer industry has long been one of the leading industries in Wisconsin; and

"Whereas a good portion of Wisconsin's population derives its sole income from the processing of wood products; and

"Whereas similar wood products from foreign countries are able to compete in the American market because shipping costs are offset by lower labor costs; and

"Whereas this unfair competition has seriously depressed the important veneer industry resulting in widespread unemployment among the people within and dependent upon the industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring*, That the legislature urge the Congress of the United States to give consideration to this problem and to take steps to reduce the foreign competition in the veneer industry; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and each member of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress.

"PHILEO NASH,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE MOLINARO,
"Speaker of the Assembly."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"RESOLUTION 28, A

"Resolution relating to memorializing Congress regarding dairy products price supports

"Whereas the purchasing power of milk has been reduced considerably below the level prevailing in 1952 as a consequence of actions by the Secretary of Agriculture since he took office; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson have recommended further reductions in the minimum price support rate for manufacturing milk to only 60 percent of parity, which would reduce the minimum price support protection to a national average of only $2.40 per hundred pounds, thus making possible a total reduction in milk purchasing power since 1952 of 42 percent; and

"Whereas the total net income of the farmers of Wisconsin has dropped from $3,380 per farm in 1952 to $2,793 per farm in 1958 or a total of 18 percent in 7 years, and milk prices are declining further this year while production costs have been and are mounting steadily; and

"Whereas the surplus inventories of dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation have increased by almost 7½ times in the 6 years, from $8.5 million on December 31, 1952, to $62.5 million on December 31, 1958; and

"Whereas costs and losses to the Federal Government on price support operations for dairy products have mounted to more than 11 times as much during the 6 years of Secretary Benson's term of office as the entire total of all such costs and losses during the 20 preceding years, totaling $1 billion 512 million ($1,512,000,000) in the years 1953 through 1958 as contrasted with only $131 million for the 20-year period 1933 through December 31, 1952; and

"Whereas this severe and unjustified cut in farm income has imposed serious hardships upon farmers and their families, forcing many to sacrifice their investments in farming enterprises and the skills and experience gained over their entire lifetimes and to seek employment in urban occupations already suffering from recurrent and still serious unemployment problems; and

"Whereas the depression thus created on the farms has spread into the small towns and cities and even to major industrial centers which depend upon the farm market for their products and services; and

"Whereas the rural depression severely sharpens the fiscal difficulties encountered by local governments in their efforts to maintain and improve schools, highways, welfare institutions; and other essential public services; and

"Whereas the policy recommended by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson of imposing further reductions in farm prices and farmers' incomes will severely aggravate all of these serious wrongs and difficulties rather than contribute toward their correction, and will if continued result in the destruction of our farming system of family-sized independently operated free enterprises: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to reject the recommendations of President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would require the United States Secretary of Agriculture to increase the price support of manufactured milk to at least $3.50 per hundredweight, which would be somewhat more in line with the present high cost of production and the inflated cost of living, until such time as Congress may adopt a program which will give dairy farmers full parity of income; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States initiate a thorough investigation of operations of the Department of Agriculture during the past 6 years with a view to determining responsibility for and correcting the mismanagement and faulty policies which have resulted in the highest expenditures by the Department in all history in the face of severe and worsening depression conditions for farmers; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to each Wisconsin Member of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the minority and majority leaders of both Houses of Congress and to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

"GEORGE MOLINARO,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the findings of the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee and their engineering committee representing all generating agencies, both Federal and local, show that power use in the region will increase 6,400,000 kilowatts by 1964, requiring the expenditure of approximately $2 billion on the construction of new electrical facilities, at the rate of more than $200 million per year over the next 10 years; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest region as a whole depend primarily upon the utilization of falling water for their supply of electric power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose river projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the region; and

"Whereas it is of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest that the Federal projects now under construction in the region be kept on schedule so that the estimated firm load requirements can at least be met until 1960; and

"Whereas the McNary, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles projects, when completed, will have a combined generating capacity exceeding 3 million kilowatts; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to maintain these Federal projects on a full construction schedule: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to give full recognition to the responsibilities of the Federal Government to make funds available for the completion on schedule of the Chief Joseph, McNary, and The Dalles projects now under construction, upon which the Pacific Northwest unavoidably must rely for its growth requirements during the next 5 years; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by house January 13, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate January 20, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED GOVERNMENT CENTER IN THE CITY OF BOSTON

"Whereas the tax rate of the city of Boston is a matter of grave concern; and

"Whereas the financial condition of the city is precarious; and

"Whereas the provisions of General Laws, chapter 121, sections 26JJ and 26KK, as amended, apply specifically only to substandard, decadent and blighted open areas; and

"Whereas the provisions of General Laws, chapter 121, section 24B, forbid the sale to the Federal Government of land below cost; and

"Whereas the mayor of the city of Boston and the Boston Redevelopment Authority

have entered into an agreement contrary to the intent and purpose of the foregoing statutes, whereby it is proposed that the city of Boston in cooperation with the Boston Redevelopment Authority shall, at a cost approximating $4 million for eminent domain proceedings, and at an additional estimated cost of $1 million for razing the structures, and at an additional estimated cost of one-half million dollars for construction of streets, sewers and utilities, making a total estimated cost of $5,500,000, destroy good and valuable taxable property; and

"Whereas the city of Boston is to receive under this proposed plan in exchange for valuable taxable land and office buildings, bank buildings, Kirstein Memorial Library, and other valuable taxable property between Court, School and Washington Streets, only $650,000 in cash, and a piece of vacant land reportedly appraised at $850,000, making a loss to the city of Boston of $4 million, together with an annual loss to the city of at least $350,000 in taxes; and

"Whereas this proposed plan, if carried out in conjunction with a proposal for the elimination of other taxable real estate, will result in the total elimination of a reported $17 million of taxable property, or approximately a loss of income to the city of Boston of approximately $1,700,000 annually; and

"Whereas the original site chosen in Scollay, Bowdoin, Adams and Dock Squares for the total redevelopment project comprising the Federal, State and city office buildings, was chosen after a 6-months' study by the city planning board, experts and consultants, which site could be fairly described as a 'decadent, blighted and substandard area;' and

"Whereas no legal or practical objection can be made to the location as originally contemplated; and

"Whereas the mayor and the redevelopment authority place the responsibility for the new Washington Street location for the proposed Federal Building on Franklin Floete, Administrator of the General Services Administration; and

"Whereas said Floete denies this fact and has stated in writing over his signature, on August 18, 1959, that '* * * the site in question was proposed to us by the municipal authorities of Boston and the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and that any complaints about the Washington Street location should be addressed to that authority;' and

"Whereas the Boston Real Estate Board has voted that all means be adopted to shift the new proposed site back to the location in the Scollay Square area as originally contemplated by all concerned; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate favors the building of a new government center, including a new Federal building, in the site originally contemplated: to wit, the Scollay, Bowdoin, Dock and Adams Square area; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the mayor of the city of Boston, the Boston City Council, the State housing authority, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Massachusetts, and Franklin Floete, Administrator of the General Services Administration.

"Senate, adopted, September 9, 1959.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"In 1800, the infant Federal Government moved its permanent capital in Washington, D.C., but Maryland and Virginia in completing the cession of the District of Columbia failed to make any provision to protect the voting rights of residents occupying the ceded area. A reasonable assumption is that the state through Congress would provide some method of voting.

"Our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., is unquestionably the home and symbol of the ideal of American representative democracy, yet 831,000 citizens in the Nation's Capital are denied the right to vote for the people they want to represent them—a population greater than that of any one of 12 States.

"There is no 'local' government in the District of Columbia. Local laws are passed by Congress and signed by the President. Congress must approve every cent of local expenditures. The municipal government is an agency of Congress. A number of other Federal bureaus, departments, and agencies have certain functions in the government of the area.

"Since the people of the District of Columbia have no vote, and if taxation without representation is tyranny, then it exists in the Capital of this great land. In addition, it is questionable whether the Congressmen are very conscious of the needs of the people of the District of Columbia since they must first represent their own districts and second, they have thousands of problems relating to the Nation as a whole and the world.

"Originally, this system might have worked if the District of Columbia contained nothing but government buildings and institutions. However, as a result of the great influx of population, Congress must legislate in such matters as zoning, streets, parking, and other services. Again the need for a local government in the District is very evident.

"While thousands of words are heard relating to the sanctity of the right to vote in America in connection with the civil rights debates, the most wholesale voting discrimination in this country is ignored.

"We, the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are strongly in favor of home rule. We believe that Congress should give this right to the people of the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memoralize the Congress of the United States to support and enact legislation to give the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect the officials to administer their local affairs, to vote in presidential elections, and to have voting representation in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"HIRAM G. ANDREWS,
"Speaker, House of Representatives,
"JOSEPH OMINSKY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH PERMANENT DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE VATICAN STATE

"Whereas the President of the United States will meet with Pope John XXIII at the Vatican in Rome on December 6, 1959; and

"Whereas the United States now has more than 39 million Catholics comprising about 22 percent of the population; and

"Whereas the Vatican State, aptly referred to as the central information agency of the world, and numerous world powers already enjoy mutual diplomatic relations, a desirable and accepted means of communication between the Vatican and these nations; and

"Whereas the United States and the Vatican are the undisputed leaders in a joint effort to attain world peace and to alleviate the plight of legions of oppressed peoples of the world.

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully requests the President of the United States to initiate earnest discussions with Pope John XXIII recommending the establishment of permanent diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican State whereby the mutual aims and objectives of both powers toward the preservation of the free world may be better attained; directing the secretary of state to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of both Houses in the Congress of the United States with the request that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in each branch of the Congress for consideration at the next session of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress.

"AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
"Secretary of State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION I

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States

"Whereas the U.S. Government is presently indebted in a minimum sum of $295 billion and the debt increases each year; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government now has to pay approximately $9 billion in interest on the present indebtedness each fiscal year and has now ordinarily to auction off its bonds as the smallest municipality would have to do and the cost of borrowing money continues to increase to the detriment of the U.S. Government, private enterprise and the individual taxpayer; and

"Whereas the value of a dollar continues to decrease, particularly since World War II, largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the Government not only for the Armed Forces, to which no objection is made, but in foreign aid and giveaway programs and tremendous expenditures at home in the civil department of the Government; and

"Whereas the people of Mississippi, as well as the other 49 States; are already bearing a practically confiscatory and excessive burden of taxes particularly from the United States Government; and

"Whereas the basic weapon of communism is to tempt our Government to spend itself into bankruptcy and many activities of the Government are in direct competition with private enterprise; and

"Whereas 'the power to tax is the power to destroy,' and the present level of taxation on the people of Mississippi and the remainder States has reached the point of diminishing returns; and

"Whereas even under President Eisenhower who ran in 1952 under a program of economy, the expenditures of the Government continue to increase year by year in peacetime; and

"Whereas not only is the Federal Government courting bankruptcy but the rights of the States are being day by day endangered by the intrusion of the Federal Government in the fields exclusively reserved to the States under the 10th amendment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Mississippi State Senate, (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and memoralize the Congress of the United States to

propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as provided by article V of the Constitution, which amendment should read as follows, to wit:

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimate of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of the receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimate of the receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until such action has been taken as may be necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Mississippi.

"Adopted by the senate, December 3, 1959.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives December 3, 1959.

"HILTON WAITS,
"Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

"Concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to provide for a satellite launching base on the island of Hawaii

"Whereas plans for a satellite base have been submitted to Federal defense and space authorities by Parsons Engineering Co. of Los Angeles; and

"Whereas the location of the island of Hawaii is particularly suited for directing satellites into polar orbits which would greatly aid in discovering the crucial keys to manned space travel; and

"Whereas Mount Mauna Kea on the island of Hawaii would offer the distinct advantages of: (1) Permitting satellite firings north, south, or east over open water and thus reduce the hazards connected with such firings and allow easier recoveries of failures and boosters; (2) utilizing a remote and isolated area which is close enough to the port and services of Hilo; and (3) taking advantage of the high altitude of Mount Mauna Kea which would permit scientists to lift bigger packages of instruments off into space; and

"Whereas such a satellite launching station would be of inestimable value to the United States of America and to the State of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii in special session assembled (the Senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Defense be respectfully requested to authorize the erection of a satellite launching station on the island of Hawaii;" and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator OREN E. LONG, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, and the Parsons Engineering Co., of Los Angeles.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20

"Resolution requesting the President and Congress of the United States to extend the expiration date for World War II veterans' home loans

"Whereas World War II veterans' home loans which are guaranteed up to 60 percent by the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government expire on July 26, 1960; and

"Whereas Congress has seen fit to amend the veterans' home loan law, Public Law 85–857 (38 U.S.C.A., sec. 1803, 72 Stat. 1205), in this present session of Congress by increasing the interest rates payable thereunder to make such loans easier to finance by veterans; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Hawaii is desirous of issuing bonds in the amount of $20 million for the purchasing of veterans' mortagages for the benefit of all of its veterans; and

"Whereas under the present wording of section 3 of article VI of the State constitution, the issuance of such bonds would jeopardize the funded debt limit of the State of Hawaii and thus prevent the first State legislature from issuing bonds; and

"Whereas statistics show that only 13 percent of Hawaii's war veterans have been able to participate in such loans as compared to 28 percent in the Continental United States; and

"Whereas more of Hawaii's war veterans would be able to participate in such home loans if the date of expiration was extended by Congress; and

"Whereas such a bond issue would be of tremendous benefit to the veterans and the economy of the State of Hawaii and the United States; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First State Legislature of the State of Hawaii in special session assembled (the Senate concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to amend Public Law 85–857, September 2, 1958 (38 U.S.C.A., sec. 1803, 72 Stat. 1205) as amended, by extending the date of the expiration of World War II veterans' home loans; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator OREN E. LONG, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, the United Veterans' Legislative Committee, U.S. Filipino Veterans, Inc., American Legion, Club 100, Disabled American Veterans, 442nd Club, Hawaii Filipino Vets Club, Military Intelligence Service, Reserve Officers Association, 1399th Club, Spanish-American War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS, World War I, Barracks No. 447.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 29

"Whereas the seven islands of American Samoa, containing 76 square miles of land, with a population of 23,000 persons, have been a possession of the United States for 59 years; and

"Whereas American Samoa is administered by a Governor appointed by the President of the United States, who makes the laws and administers them, while the Legislature of American Samoa, composed of a senate and house of representatives, has only advisory powers; and

"Whereas, last spring, the Legislature of American Samoa adopted a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to pass an organic act authorizing the establishment of a democratic government for American Samoa; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Hawaii believe that the right of franchise and self-determination should be granted to all peoples and believe further that the people of American Samoa now are fully capable of legislating for themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, special session of 1959 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to grant to the people of American Samoa the right to legislate for themselves; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Members representing the State of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States, the Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Governor of American Samoa, and the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives of the legislature of American Samoa.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 51

"Whereas the wage rates paid the 'blue-collar' workers in the employ of the Government of the United States are determined through the process known as a 'wage survey,' the legal basis for which is the act of July 16, 1862; and

"Whereas the key factor in these area wage surveys is that of comparability in that the company or industry surveyed shall be comparable in scope or function with that of naval shipyards within the locality and that the particular crafts surveyed shall be comparable to similar crafts in the shipyard with respect to the job duties performed; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii is basically an agricultural community and further, that there is a marked lack of industries or companies or jobs within such private industries or companies which are comparable to those of the naval shipyard in the Oahu labor mar-

ket area to warrant the expense of thousands of dollars to conduct such surveys; and

"Whereas the setting of wage rates for thousands of such blue-collar workers based upon data collected on just a handful of comparable occupations is definitely unfair to such workers employed in the State of Hawaii by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, special session of 1959 (the Senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Hawaii request, and it hereby does request the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such laws, rules, orders, and regulations granting to the Federal civil service blue-collar workers the same hourly rates of pay as are paid to employees of similar classifications resulting from area wage survey applicable to employees of the San Francisco Naval Shipyard in our sister State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the leaders in the U.S. Congress, the Secretaries of Defense, Navy, Army, and Air Force, to our Senators and Representatives to the U.S. Congress, to the Leadingmen's and Quartermen's Association, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, and to the heads of all labor unions within the State of Hawaii.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

"Whereas revenues realized from Federal fuel taxes are appropriated for Federal contributions and subsidies for highway systems in the United States; and

"Whereas appropriations for Federal contributions and subsidies for highway systems in the United States are distributed pursuant to the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code; and

"Whereas the ultimate purpose of the said title 23 is to promote intrastate and interstate commerce and national and civil defense; and

"Whereas Hawaii, as a Territory, was not included with the various States insofar as the provisions of the said title 23 relating to Federal contributions and subsidies for a national system of interstate and defense highways were concerned, despite the fact that its people were subjected to the same Federal fuel taxes as were the people of the various States; and

"Whereas the Highway Appropriations Act recently passed by the 86th Congress of the United States provides in part that:

" 'The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a study of the need for extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within the States of Alaska and Hawaii and report the results of such study to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 4, 1960'; and

"Whereas the establishment of a highway system connecting all of the communities within any State would promote intrastate and interstate commerce and national and civil defense; and

"Whereas there is no highway system connecting all of the communities within the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas a highway system consisting of roads connecting all of the communities in the State of Hawaii is physically impossible because Hawaii 'consists of the most beautiful fleet of islands that lie anchored in any ocean'; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has considered bridges spanning bodies of water, tunnels running beneath bodies of water and the routes of ferries operating over bodies of water as parts of the highway systems of various continental States pursuant to the provisions of the said title 23; and

"Whereas the most feasible method of establishing a highway system connecting all of the communities within the State of Hawaii would involve the establishment of an interisland ferry system; and

"Whereas an interisland ferry system connecting the various islands comprising the State of Hawaii would be a part of its highway system in the fullest and truest sense of the term: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, first special session of 1959 (the Senate concurring), That the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States, the Federal Highway Administrator of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the President of the United States, the Public Works Committee of the Senate of the United States and the 86th Congress of the United States be respectively requested to give favorable consideration to:

"1. Include the State of Hawaii with the other States insofar as the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code relating to a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways are concerned;

"2. Allow the State of Hawaii credit for Federal fuel taxes paid by its people during the period when Hawaii was a Territory and was excluded from the provisions of the said title 23 relating to a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways insofar as future Federal contributions to or subsidies for highways are concerned; and

"3. Include interisland ferry systems connecting the islands comprising the State of Hawaii as a part of its highway system insofar as the provisions of the said title 23 are concerned; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States, the Federal Highway Administration of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the President of the United States, the Public Works Committee of the Senate of the 86th Congress of the United States, U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senator OREN E. LONG, U.S. Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, the President of the U.S. Senate and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate."

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas the citizens of the new State of Hawaii like the rest of the citizens of the great country of ours, pay Federal excise and fuel taxes; and

"Whereas Hawaii and Alaska, unlike the rest of the States are excluded from the benefits of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas Hawaii has paid more than $2 million in fuel and excise taxes than it received in Federal highway aid during the past year; and

"Whereas it is anticipated that Hawaii will be paying more than $3,250,000 during the coming year in Federal fuel and excise taxes than it will be receiving in such highway aid; and

"Whereas this inequitable taxation is further intensified by the fact that some of our larger military bases throughout the State continue to use our existing highways established some 30 years ago without being able to contribute toward the improvement and maintenance thereof; and

"Whereas a tremendous need exists for the construction and improvement of highways in Hawaii to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding population and the demands of the Armed Forces of the United States for a better integrated defense highway system; and

"Whereas by the provisions of section 105 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized and directed to make a study of the need for the extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Commissioner of Public Roads was designated to study this matter so that a report can be submitted to the Congress of the United States before January 14, 1960; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii will be represented at a hearing to be held before the Commissioner during the week of October 12 to 16, 1959, for the purpose of determining whether Hawaii should be included in the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, special session of 1959 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of Commerce of the United States report favorably to the Congress of the United States that the National Systems of Interstate and Defense Highways be extended to Hawaii at the earliest possible date; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce; the Commissioner of Public Roads; the delegates to the National Conference of the American Association of State Highway Officials; the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; the Honorable OREN E. LONG and the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senators from the State of Hawaii; the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, Congressman from the State of Hawaii; Tim Ho, State highway engineer; and John C. Myatt, deputy State highway engineer.

"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate.
"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 106

"Whereas the new State of Hawaii is rapidly becoming one of the greatest tourist centers of the world and the leading gateway to Pacific Ocean travel; and

"Whereas Waikiki is universally famous as a beach and recreation area, and is a focal point of interest for visitors and local residents alike; and

"Whereas the expansion of tourism and the growth of the State's population has created a sharp need for additional sites for tourist accommodations and for more recreational and beach areas, particularly around the Waikiki vicinity; and

"Whereas the Fort De Russy Military Reservation, situated in the Waikiki area and extending from Kalakaua Avenue in said Waikiki makai to the sea, with a frontage on said Kalakaua Avenue of 772.86 feet, and a frontage on the sea, along the mean high tide line, of 1,769.5 feet, comprising a total of approximately 71.982 acres, is most suitable to meet said need; and

"Whereas it has always been the established policy of the State of Hawaii, in the interest of the general public, to establish park and recreation areas wherever possible on beaches at such intervals as will permit the public to enjoy the use of said beaches; and

"Whereas there are not now located on any portion of Fort De Russy Military Reservation any military installations essential to

national security, either now or in the foreseeable future: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, special session of 1959, That the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senators from Hawaii; the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, U.S. Representative from Hawaii; and the Governor of Hawaii be, and they are hereby requested to use their best efforts to obtain for the State of Hawaii as much land in the Fort De Russy Military Reservation as possible, including beach areas, being mindful of the recreational needs of the military in this area, in order that the same may be used by the State of Hawaii for the creation of tourist accommodations and beach park and recreation facilities and for public rights of way to the sea, all in the interest of the visitors to and people of the State of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senators from Hawaii; the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, U.S. Representative from Hawaii; the Governor of Hawaii; each Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress; and the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior of the United States.

"BENNETT F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"HERMAN T. F. LUM,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 1016

"Resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to enact private legislation with respect to title to certain church properties in the Virgin Islands

"Whereas at the time of cession of the Danish West Indies to the United States in 1917, the convention between the United States and Denmark provided in article 1, in part, that there is ceded to the United States all territory, dominion, and sovereignty possessed by Denmark, and that 'This cession includes the right of property in all public, government, or crown lands, public buildings, wharves, ports, harbors, fortifications, barracks, public funds, rights, franchises, and privileges, and all other public property of every kind or description now belonging to Denmark together with all appurtenances thereto'; and

"Whereas article 2 of the said convention provided in pertinent part that 'It is understood that this cession does not in any respect impair private rights which by law belong to the peaceful possession of property of all kinds by private individuals of whatsoever nationality, by municipalities, public or private establishments, ecclesiastical or civic bodies, or any other associations having legal capacity to acquire and possess property in the islands ceded.

"'The congregations belonging to the Danish National Church shall retain the undisturbed use of the churches which are now used by them, together with the parsonages appertaining thereunto and other appurtenances, including the funds allotted to the churches'; and

"Whereas the U.S. Senate in giving its advice and consent to the ratification of the convention, did so on the condition that 'such advice and consent are given with the understanding, to be expressed as a part of the instrument of ratification, that such convention shall not be taken and construed by the high contracting parties as imposing any trust upon the United States with respect to any funds belonging to the Danish National Church in the Danish West Indian Islands, or in which the said church may have an interest, nor as imposing upon the United States any duty or responsibility with respect to the management of any property belonging to said church, beyond protecting said church in the possession and use of church property as stated in said convention, in the same manner and to the same extent only as other churches shall be protected in the possession and use of their several properties'; and

"Whereas the U.S. Senate, as a further condition to the ratification of the convention, specified that this particular matter be made the subject of an exchange of notes between the Governments of the United States and Denmark 'so as to make it plain that this condition is understood and accepted by the two Governments, the purpose hereof being to bring the said convention clearly within the constitutional powers of the United States with respect to church establishment and freedom of religion'; and

"Whereas the foregoing conditions were fulfilled by the exchange of formal notes between the two high contracting parties on January 3, 1917, and, thereafter, the said convention was duly ratified by both Governments and the ratifications exchanged in Washington, D.C., on January 17, 1917; and

"Whereas prior to the cession of the Virgin Islands to the United States, and on April 6, 1906, a Danish colonial law was proclaimed, section 51 of which stated 'The public buildings, and the real and movable property, including articles of inventory, etc., which serve for the purposes of the Government, the military force, and the congregations of the national church, are transferred to the ownership of the state treasury. In case of a dispute as to what, in accordance herewith, becomes the property of the state treasury, the question shall be decided by the King'; and

"Whereas at the request of the board of American missions of the United Lutheran Church in America, a religious organization having affiliations with certain congregations now using properties which might be affected by said law, the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen in 1957 requested advice from the appropriate Danish authorities with respect to title to the properties, hereinafter described in more detail; and

"Whereas by a 'note verbale,' dated November 14, 1958, the Danish officials expressed the opinion that title to certain properties passed to the Danish Government in accordance with the above-quoted section 51 of the Danish Law of April 6, 1906, and, hence, that title to such properties passed to the United States at the time of the Cession of the Virgin Islands in 1917, subject, however, to the specific reservation that the churches were to retain the undisturbed use of such properties; and

"Whereas the properties which were the subject of said note verbale included the following:

"(1) Church property, 7 Norre Gade (including No. 34 Kongens Gade) in King's Quarter in the Town of Charlotte Amalie on the Island of Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, of U.S.A., appearing in the Surveyor's Records for the Town of Charlotte Amalie, Book I, Folio 4, Survey of December 15, 1836;

"(2) Parsonage property, 23 Kongens Gade, in the King's Quarter in the Town of Charlotte Amalie on the Island of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands of U.S.A., appearing in the Surveyor's Records for the Town of Charlotte Amalie, Book I, Folio 52, Survey of March 25, 1843;

"(3) Church property, No. 4 King Street in the Town of Christiansted, on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands, according to the Public Surveyor's Records;

"(4) Parsonage property, No. 51 King Street in the Town of Christiansted, on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands, according to the Public Surveyor's Records;

"(5) Church Property, Nos. 11, 12, 13 & 14 Hospital Street in the Town of Frederiksted, on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands, according to the Public Surveyor's Records; and

"Whereas each of said properties is now being used as church property, and has been so used continuously for a period commencing prior to the enactment of the 1906 law, and in some instances for a period upwards of 150 years; and

"Whereas the congregations which are now using the said church properties are the following:

"(a) The Frederick Lutheran Church of Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, now using properties as described under items (1) and (2) above;

"(b) The Lutheran Church of the Lord God of Sabaoth (now designated as 'Christiansted Lutheran Church'), of Christiansted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands, using properties as described in items (3) and (4) above; and

"(c) Holy Trinity Lutheran Church of Frederiksted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands, now using properties described in item (5) above; and

"Whereas the respective congregations have, ever since the time of the initial occupancy of the respective properties as indicated, considered that they had, and have, full rights of ownership in such properties; and

"Whereas it appears from available land records that it was the intent that title to said church properties be vested in the appropriate church bodies, but such land records are incomplete and a definite uncertainty remains with respect to the title of said properties, particularly by reason of the 1906 law, referred to above, and the opinion expressed by the Danish authorities in the note verbale of November 14, 1958; and

"Whereas the history of negotiations between the Government of Denmark and the U.S. Government clearly indicates an intention to leave undisturbed the rights of private ownership and use of church properties in the Virgin Islands; and

"Whereas it is desirable and proper from the standpoint of both public and private interests that right to use and clear title be conclusively established with respect to all church properties in the Virgin Islands by appropriate action of the Congress of the United States, since title to the said lands may be asserted by the United States by interpretation of some of the foregoing quoted documents: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands:

"SEC. 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact private legislation with respect to the above-specified properties in a manner so that clear and perpetual title in fee simple be established in each of the said congregations to the properties used by each, as follows:

"(a) church property located at 7 Norre Gade (including No. 34 Kongens Gade), and the parsonage property located at 23 Kongens Gade, both in King's Quarter in the Town of Charlotte Amalie on the Island of St. Thomas, Virgin Islands of U.S.A. to the Frederick Lutheran Church of Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands;

"(b) church property located at No. 4 King Street, and parsonage property located at No. 51 King Street, both in the Town of Christiansted, on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands of U.S.A. to the Lutheran Church of the Lord God of Sabaoth (commonly designated as 'Christiansted Lutheran Church') of Christiansted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands; and

"(c) church property located on Hospital Street, including Nos. 11 to 14, inclusive, in the Town of Frederiksted on the Island of St. Croix, Virgin Islands of U.S.A. to Holy Trinity Lutheran Church of Frederiksted, St. Croix, Virgin Islands.

"SEC. 2. That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Congress, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"Thus passed by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands on September 28, 1959.

"Witness our hands and the seal of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands this 29th day of September A.D. 1959.

[SEAL] "WALTER I. M. HODGE,
"President.
"JOHN L. MADURO,
"Legislative Secretary."

Two resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; ordered to lie on the table:

"RESOLUTION 136

"Resolution relative to extending to the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, deep appreciation and sincere gratitude of the people of Guam for his efforts made on their behalf

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam—

"Whereas the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, and member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, has on frequent occasions served the interests of the people of the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas this desire on the part of Senator BIBLE to help the people of Guam is best demonstrated by his cosponsorship with Senator CARROLL of Senate bill 2093, which would, if enacted, award claims to certain Guamanians killed or captured at Wake Island; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Fifth Guam Legislature does hereby extend to the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, the deep and sincere gratitude of the people of Guam for his unstinted efforts made on their behalf; and be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada; to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Governor of Guam.

"A. B. WON PAT,
"Speaker."

"RESOLUTION 138

"Resolution relative to extending to the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, Senator from Michigan, the appreciation of the people of Guam for his interest in the solution of the problems of this territory

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the territory of Guam—

"Whereas the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, Senator from Michigan and member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has rendered valuable services to the speaker of this legislature upon the latter's visits to Washington, thereby demonstrating his warm sympathy and sincere interest in the problems of this territory; and

"Whereas Senator HART has also expressed great interest in the people of Guam, their aspirations and desires: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the Fifth Guam Legislature does hereby, on behalf of the people of Guam, extend to the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, Senator from Michigan, appreciation for the kindness he has shown to the speaker and the interest he has demonstrated in the solution to the problems of this territory; and be it further

"Resolved, that the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, Senator from Michigan, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to the Governor of Guam.

"A. B. WON PAT,
"Speaker.
"V. B. BAMBA,
"Legislative Secretary."

A resolution of the Legislature of Saipan; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION 6

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting and memorializing the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Trustee of the Saipan District Special Land Fund, to cause the said fund to be deposited with the Bank of America, National Trust & Savings Association.

"Be it resolved by the Saipan Legislature—

"Whereas the U.S. Congress appropriate approximately $970,000, designated as the Saipan Special Fund, as and for payment and compensation for the use by the U.S. Government of certain parcels of real property within the Saipan district, all of which moneys are presently deposited with the Bank of Hawaii, State of Hawaii, the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, as Trustee; and

"Whereas according to information and belief, only the income realized from such fund, and not any part or portion of the principal, may be disbursed and utilized for the benefit of the indigenous inhabitants of the Saipan district; and

"Whereas the Bank of America, National Trust & Savings Association, through its Saipan branch, has over the years of its local operation been of enormous aid and assistance to the people of Saipan for real estate and home improvement purchase, by extending credit to the local businesses, by making personal loans to pay for various family emergencies, and by encouraging thrift through savings accounts, all of which practices have not only been of major importance and significance to the economy and stability of the Saipan district but also the welfare and well-being of the people thereof; and

"Whereas the said Bank of America is not only a member of the Federal Reserve System, but also the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, thereby insuring federally its deposits, while the Bank of Hawaii is not a member of either, unless such membership has been recently effected; and

"Whereas in view of the foregoing, it is only fair, equitable, and judicious that the said Saipan District Special Land Fund presently on deposit with the Bank of Hawaii be withdrawn and deposited with the Bank of America, National Trust & Savings Association, Saipan branch, which fund if so deposited will earn interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum and also be fully secured and guaranteed by U.S. bonds, U.S. interest-bearing notes, and other U.S. obligations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the commander, Naval Forces, Marianas, and to the naval administrator of the Saipan district.

"Dated this 1st day of October 1959.

"Olympio T. Borja,
"OLYMPIO T. BORJA,
"Speaker.

"Approved this 1st day of October 1959.

"Ignacio V. Benavente,
"IGNACIO V. BENAVENTE,
"Mayor of Saipan."

A resolution of the Legislature of Saipan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION 7

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting and memorializing the United Nations to take under serious consideration for future recommendation the reintegration of the Marianas Islands by incorporating them within the framework of the territory of Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of Saipan—

"Whereas prior to the Spanish-American War, the indigenous inhabitants of the Marianas Islands were all joined together both politically and geographically, all of one race, known as Chamarros, spoke a common language and observed the same religions and social customs; and

"Whereas prior to the Spanish-American War, the island of Guam served as the capital of the Marianas; and

"Whereas the separation of the other Marianas Islands from the island of Guam by the Treaty of Paris resulted in nearly half a century of anxiety and uncertainty regarding the fate of the people living there and whose history since that separation has been a tragic one of shifting allegiance from one flag to another until our liberation from the Japanese during World War II; and

"Whereas the Fourth Guam Legislature adopted Resolution No. 367 requesting the Congress of the United States, to cause the political reintegration of the Marianas Islands within the governmental framework of the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas, at the present time the Marianas Islands, other than Guam, are governed by a trusteeship under a charter of the United Nations; and

"Whereas, article 76 of the United Nations Charter states:

"'Article 76. The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in article I of the present charter, shall be:

"'a. to further international peace and security;

"'b. to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of such trusteeship agreement;

"'c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

"'d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objective and subject to the provisions of article 80;' and

"Whereas, the trusteeship agreement entered into by the United States with the United Nations contains within it the following article 9:

"'ARTICLE 9

"'The administering authority shall be entitled to constitute the trust territory into a customs, fiscal, or administrative union or federation with other territories under United States jurisdiction and to establish common services between such territories and the trust territory where such measures are not inconsistent with the basic objectives of the international trusteeship system and with the terms of this agreement'; which article indicates that the northern Marianas may be instituted into

the Territory of Guam as part of an administrative union or federation, since such a measure would not be inconsistent with the basic objectives of the trusteeship system but would indeed be the culmination of the desires of the inhabitants of all the Marianas; and

"Whereas the Legislature of Saipan has received an overwhelming favorable response from the people living in the district of Saipan toward the reintegration within the framework of the Territory of Guam; and

"Whereas it is believed by the Legislature of Saipan that should a plebiscite be conducted in the future among the people living throughout the Marianas Islands, the vast majority would favor such reintegrations; and

"Whereas the benefits of such a reunification of the Marianas, aside from the spiritual and moral uplift to be derived therefrom, would also mean a more viable economy for all the islands, with the increased trade and travel meaning more prosperity and economic independence; and

"Whereas this aspiration that all the people of the Marianas be reunited within the framework of one system of free and representative government is a hope that can be shared by freedom-loving people all over the world, since the underlying desire is to permit the government of the Marianas Islands to be 'of the people, by the people, and for the people': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 12th Saipan Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of the Marianas Islands respectfully request and memorialize the United Nations to take under serious consideration the future reintegration of the Marianas Islands within the governmental framework of the Territory of Guam, including the granting of U.S. citizenship; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations undertake the study of recommendations to hold plebiscite throughout the Marianas Islands for the purpose of allowing the inhabitants thereof to freely express their desires and views on this important subject of reintegration; and be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairmen of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate and House, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, to the Secretary of Defense, to commander naval forces Marianas, to the naval administrator of the Saipan district, to the speaker of the Guam Legislature, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Dated this 23d day of September 1959.

"OLYMPIO T. BORJA,
"Speaker.

"Attested:

"JOSE R. CRUZ,
"Legislative Secretary.

"Approved this 25th day of September 1959.

"IGNACIO V. BENAVENTE,
"Mayor of Saipan."

A resolution adopted by the southern Governors' conference, at Asheville, N.C., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate funds for research regarding the cotton boll weevil; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition signed by Moriyasu Tomihara, president, Ryukyu Chamber of Commerce, Eitoku Yamashiro, president, Federation of Ryukyu Agricultural Cooperative Associations, and Sentetsu Taira, of the Federation of Ryukyu Fisheries Cooperative Associations, praying for the enactment of House bill 1157, providing economic assistance to Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Two letters in the nature of petitions from Robert Morris, of Annapolis, Md., relating to a basic, including civilian, defense doctrine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Military Order of the World Wars, in convention assembled at Detroit, Mich., on October 15, 1959, relating to the historical relationship between active duty pay and retired pay of military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, requesting a transfer from the Federal Government to that city and county of a hundred foot strip of land in the Fort De Russy area, for beach, park, and recreation purposes, and as a public right-of-way to the sea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the annual convention of the United States Savings & Loan League, at Dallas, Tex., relating to the preservation of a sound American dollar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the enactment of House bill 9233, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow a taxpayer to deduct for income tax purposes certain special assessments and other charges made against him or his property under local law without regard to whether they tend to increase the value of such property; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Plumbing Brass Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to define the term "ultimate purchaser" which appears in section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the city of West Covina, Calif., relating to the removal of the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers' Association, in convention assembled at Austin, Tex., favoring the retention of the present so-called depletion allowance, for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the southern Governors' conference, at Asheville, N.C., relating to a study of the impact of foreign imports on the national security and the domestic economy; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, Calif., relating to the importation of crude oil; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from B. P. Wisotschin, captain-commander, Order of Former Russian Military, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the visit to the United States of the leader of world communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the National Sojourners, Inc., in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., favoring the assertion by the United States of claims to certain Antarctic areas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, of Orange County, N.Y., favoring an investigation of the alleged use of publicly owned lands in the county of Orange, State of New York, for other than governmental purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to revoke the political independence of the Philippines and to replace it with a dominion status form of government under the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to prospecting and mining in the Death Valley National Monument, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of James F. McManus, of Levittown, N.Y., relating to the sale of transportation, both surface and air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the German American Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of New York, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation for the release of vested German private property presently held by the Office of Alien Property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, relating to the creation of a Standing Committee on Federal Judiciary and the selection of qualified lawyers and judges for appointment to judicial office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the New York City, N.Y., Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., favoring the enactment of House bill 9286, relating to the shipment of unlicensed weapons in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by San Diego, Calif., Council 1349, Knights of Columbus, favoring the commendation of the Postmaster General, the Special Assistant to the Postmaster General, and the postmaster of San Diego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted at the Supreme Convention of the Orders of the Sons of Italy, at Boston, Mass., relating to the immigration and naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by interested citizens of Chicago, and the friends, delegates, officers, and members of the Afro-American Congress of Christian Organizations at a joint public mass meeting in Chicago, Ill., relating to the alleged "do-nothing" actions of the governmental agencies of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorial of E. Koopmann, of Newburgh, N.Y., remonstrating against recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition signed by Gene Leslie, student body president, and Carl George, student body vice president, of the Bob Jones University, Greenville, S.C., relating to the requirement for loyalty oaths for college students who receive Government loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the State executive committee of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation to declare the basic steel industry a public utility; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Edward Reed, Sr., of New Brunswick, N.J., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide hospitalization for the aged; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the New York City, N.Y., Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., favoring the enactment of House bill 9127, the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of La Verne, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for the continuation of flood-control works in that city; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from James T. Barnes, executive director, Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C., enclosing a letter addressed by him, to the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp regarding the problem of motor traffic safety; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the southern Governors' conference, at Asheville, N.C., relating to a continuation of the Federal highway program; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri State Chapter of the American War Mothers, favoring the appointment of a standing committee on veterans' affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, signed by Joseph R. Medor, of Burlington, Vt., relating to the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and Representative Meyer, of Vermont; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A petition signed by Queen E. Lucas and 19 other citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring a modification of Senate rule XXII, relating to cloture; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., relating to the visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Rolling Hills, Calif., supporting the production of a World's Fair in the Los Angeles area in 1963–64; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition signed by Janet R. Landgraf, and sundry other students of the McKinley High School, Honolulu, Hawaii, expressing appreciation to the Congress for its support of statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in the days ahead the Congress and the Nation will need to find solutions to several complex problems affecting a great many aspects of American life.

As always, it is important, I believe, to keep closely attuned to thinking in our States and local communities—in effect, at the "grassroots"—on the factors involved in these challenges.

Consequently, I was recently gratified to receive from the State Legislature in Wisconsin resolutions adopted by that august body, conveying to Congress its views on a variety of topics.

The issues involved in the four resolutions are as follows:

First. Joint resolution memorializing Congress to take steps to restrict the importation of veneer to compete with our lumber industry;

Second. Joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose legislation prescribing any minimum interest rate, or any maximum maturity dates for securities issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage saving payable to their patrons;

Third. Joint resolution urging Congress to relax immigration quota restrictions which bar relatives of Americans; and

Fourth. Joint resolution memorializing Congress to expedite the free flow of high-grade milk in interstate commerce.

As my colleagues are well aware, the subject matters of these resolutions are of great interest not only to Wisconsin but to the whole Nation. Believing that the resolutions reflect significant thinking on problems which the Senate will be facing in the days ahead, I request unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred:

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 51

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to oppose legislation prescribing any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons

"Whereas business enterprises are made up of several types of business organizations, including proprietorships, partnerships, corporations and cooperatives, all of which contribute greatly to the tempo of economic activity within the State; and

"Whereas Wisconsin is one of the leading cooperative States of the Nation, and particularly within the rural areas cooperatives have greatly benefited and rendered service to their members; and

"Whereas the tax position of cooperatives has been thoroughly investigated by the Congress of the United States over a long period of time and these investigations have revealed that under the present laws, the cooperatives have faithfully abided by the principles and regulations under which they have been organized; and

"Whereas the cooperatives do pay taxes and in many communities of this State are the largest taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has recommended to Congress to require cooperative patronage savings to be paid in cash within 3 years and to draw not less than 4-percent interest, or otherwise to be classified as income to the cooperative and be thereby subjected to corporation income taxes; and

"Whereas this alteration of the present tax status would seriously hamper and restrict the services which the cooperatives are performing within the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is requested to recognize that indebtedness which is owed by a cooperative or any other taxpayer to its patrons or customers is not income to such taxpayer even though it may be income to its patrons or customers; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be specifically requested to oppose any measures which would prescribe any minimum interest rate or any maximum maturity dates for securities which are issued by cooperatives in payment of patronage savings payable to their patrons; and, be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin."

To the Committee on Finance:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 32

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to take steps to restrict the importation of veneer to compete with our lumber industry

"Whereas the wood veneer industry has long been one of the leading industries in Wisconsin; and

"Whereas a good portion of Wisconsin's population derives its sole income from the processing of wood products; and

"Whereas similar wood products from foreign countries are able to compete in the American market because shipping costs are offset by lower labor costs; and

"Whereas this unfair competition has seriously depressed the important veneer industry resulting in widespread unemployment among the people within and dependent upon the industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature urge the Congress of the United States to give consideration to this problem and to take steps to reduce the foreign competition in the veneer industry; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress.

"PHILIP NASH,
"President of the Senate.
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.
"GEORGE MOLINARO,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NORMAN C. ANDERSON,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 69

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to expedite the free flow of high-grade milk in interstate commerce

"Whereas dairying is one of the principal industries of Wisconsin; and

"Whereas in 1957 approximately 1,213,899,000 pounds of milk out of a total of 17,412 million pounds produced in this State was shipped out of the State; and

"Whereas such milk should have the same competitive opportunities as milk produced in other States including the State of consumption; and

"Whereas the purity and high quality of the milk produced in this State assures that the consumer throughout the Nation would benefit from its use: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature memorialize the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to remove the barriers imposed by the several States and permit the free flow of high quality milk among the several States; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 66

"Joint resolution urging Congress to relax immigration quota restrictions which bar relatives of Americans

"Whereas many Americans who filed petitions with the immigration authorities of the United States for the entry of their sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters, which petitions are classified in the fourth preference quota of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

"Whereas of the four preference quotas established by the Federal Immigration and Nationality Act, the first, second, and third quotas are allotted 100 percent of the total annual entry quota; and

"Whereas as a result, those persons who fall within the fourth preference section

must depend for entry into this country upon deficiencies in the first three quotas; and

"Whereas there is frustration and despair resulting from the law that gives hope to Americans by permitting them to file petitions, getting them approved, and then compelling them to wait for their kin who may never come; and

"Whereas thousands of discontented people abroad, whose hopes are first raised and then dashed, certainly cannot believe in the good will we try to engender through our foreign policy, and thus become easy prey to the propaganda of unfriendly nations; and

"Whereas Congress has recognized and alleviated a similar problem through Public Law 85-316, which includes a provision for reuniting spouses and minor children of aliens legally residing in this country whose petitions were approved prior to July 1, 1957: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to amend the provisions of Public Law 85-316 to include cases which fall within the fourth preference quota, in order to provide for entry of the many thousands of relatives of Americans, petitions for whom have piled up in prior years; that in order not to create another problem of separated families, those applicants who are married and have families be permitted to bring them; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Congressman and U.S. Senator from Wisconsin."

RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, for some time the Interior Department's Office of Saline Water has been conducting research on conversion of sea water into fresh water at Harbor Island, Wrightsville Beach, N.C., utilizing the International Nickel Co.'s corrosion research facility there.

The North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development recently adopted a resolution commending the Secretary of Interior, the Director of the Office of Saline Water, and the International Nickel Co. for their constructive and farsighted efforts in this project. The contribution made by the Harbor Island operation, I believe, fully deserves this recognition and this praise.

Expansion of fresh water resources is of vital importance not only to the future health of the American people, but also to our continued agricultural and economic growth. Recognizing the substantial progress in research in this field, as well as the urgency of the program, Congress in 1958 approved the construction of five development plants for conversion of saline and brackish water. The Office of Saline Water will shortly choose an east coast site for one of the saline water conversion plants.

In view of its successful experience at Harbor Island and of the demonstrated interest and support of the State of North Carolina, I hope that the Office of Saline Water will give serious consideration to locating this new plant in our State. Such a choice would assure that the development facility, drawing on the skills and know-how available at Harbor Island, would move into operation promptly and successfully, to the benefit of the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred the text of the resolution adopted by the North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development and a letter from the board to Mr. Henry S. Wingate, president of the International Nickel Co.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY AND ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AT ITS MEETING IN CHARLOTTE ON OCTOBER 26 AND 27, 1959

Whereas the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior has made outstandingly significant research and development achievements in processes for economically converting sea water in commercial quantities to pure fresh water in cooperation with the International Nickel Co. Experiment Station on Harbor Island, Wrightsville Beach, N.C., and

Whereas the State of North Carolina is competing with the other States on the eastern seaboard of the United States for one of five authorized experimental commercial conversion plants; and

Whereas appropriate site studies for North Carolina have already been submitted to and accepted by the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior: Now therefore, be it,

Resolved, That:

1. The Board of Conservation and Development of the State of North Carolina express official appreciation to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and to the Director of the Office of Saline Water of that Department for the pioneering research and development work done in developing the above processes for the commercial conversion of sea water to fresh water by that governmental agency in cooperation with the International Nickel Co. within North Carolina on Harbor Island, Wrightsville Beach.

2. An official invitation be extended to the Secretary of the Interior or his representative and the Director of the Office of Saline Water to visit this State as guests of North Carolina for the purpose of determining its suitability as the site for the east coast plant location.

3. A copy of this resolution be sent to the president or board chairman of the International Nickel Co. and to the head of their experiment station at Harbor Island, Wrightsville Beach.

4. The Director of the Department of Conservation and Development be authorized to furnish a copy of this resolution to each Members of the North Carolina congressional delegation in Congress and to any other representation deemed appropriate by the Director of the Department of Conservation and Development.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF
CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT,
Raleigh, November 24, 1959.

Mr. HENRY S. WINGATE,
President, the International Nickel Co., Inc., Copper Cliff, Ontario.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: The people of the State of North Carolina are very much appreciative of the research and development accomplishments of your staff and facilities at Harbor Island, Wrightsville Beach, especially that done in cooperation with the Office of Saline Water of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

I am attaching a copy of a resolution which I was requested to send you by the North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development at a meeting which was held in Charlotte, N.C., on October 26-27, 1959.

When you can find it convenient, please do us the honor of a visit. For your information, Governor Hodges has written Secretary Seaton of the Department of the Interior and Dr. A. L. Miller, Director of the Office of Saline Water, inviting them to visit North Carolina in compliance with the resolution.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. SAUNDERS.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the American Public Health Association, in support of the bill (S. 2009) to provide long-term Federal loans for the acquisition of facilities to approved voluntary health service programs, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH SERVICES FACILITIES

Whereas certain desirable health services facilities, including consumer-sponsored, nonprofit, prepaid, group practice clinics, unaffiliated with any hospital, are at present excluded from Federal financial support; and

Whereas such nonprofit groups provide services that generally have stressed preventive services and rehabilitation, prevented much unnecessary hospitalization, provided basic economies in medical services, and extended the scope of high-quality health services; and

Whereas long-term, low-interest-rate loans usually are not obtainable through any source other than government, and such loans are urgently needed: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Health Association endorse the principle of long-term Federal loans to those nonprofit, prepaid, group practice plans meeting sound professional standards, such standards to be defined and administered by the U.S. Public Health Service in cooperation with State and local health agencies.

RESOLUTION OF TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF GEDDES, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the town board of the town of Geddes, N.Y., requesting the Congress to continue the income from municipal bonds under a tax-exempt status.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF GEDDES, REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONTINUE THE INCOME FROM MUNICIPAL BONDS UNDER TAX EXEMPT STATUS

Whereas at present the income from bonds issued to municipalities is exempt from Federal income tax and it is proposed to tax the income from these bonds in the future; and

Whereas if the income from these bonds is made taxable in the future the interest rate to the issuers of municipal bonds will necessarily increase to cover this tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, upon the motion of Councilman Arthur Tarolli, duly seconded by Councilman Frederick Clisson, and duly passed, That the Town Board of the Town of Geddes, county of Onondaga, N.Y., go on record as being opposed to placing the income from bonds issued by municipalities under a taxable status, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forewarded to the Congress of the United States, State Senators and Congressmen and any other proper agency.

Dated this 14th day of December 1959.

DONALD G. COLE,
Geddes Town Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

REPORT ENTITLED "TAX DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCES ON CAPITAL EQUIPMENT" — SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1017)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Tax Depreciation Allowances on Capital Equipment," which I ask to have printed, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

REPEAL OF RESOLUTION 123, 80TH CONGRESS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, to repeal Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, agreed to June 27, 1947, and I submit a report (No. 1018) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 213) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, agreed to June 27, 1947, is hereby repealed.

MARY G. HOSEY

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 214) to pay a gratuity to Mary G. Hosey, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary G. Hosey, widow of Henry F. Hosey, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

JOSEPH H. STRATTON

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 215) to pay a gratuity to Joseph H. Stratton, as executor of the estate of Elizabeth J. Anthony, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Joseph H. Stratton, as executor of the estate of Elizabeth J. Anthony, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SELMA N. PUCKETT

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 216) to pay a gratuity to Selma N. Puckett, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Selma N. Puckett, widow of Leslie C. Puckett, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EVELYN CLARK

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 217) to pay a gratuity to Evelyn Clark, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Evelyn Clark, widow of Malichia Clark, an employee of the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 218) relating to the terms of Senate Pages, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 14, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to January 13, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than fourteen years of age and who has not completed the eighth grade of school, or is seventeen years of age or older, except that those enrolled in the Senate page school who attain age seventeen may serve as pages through the session of the Senate in which the page-school year terminates."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2739. A bill for the relief of Yu Shu Lin, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Julia Sukkar; and

S. 2741. A bill for the relief of Richard T. K. Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2742. A bill for the relief of Sang Man Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2743. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josef Enzinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 2744. A bill to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2745. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the middle Gila River project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2746. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a deed conveying land to the United States of America in trust for Jay, Yvonne, Lance, and Gregory Olson, Fort Peck Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2747. A bill for the relief of Anees Hanna Kassis (Johnny H. Kassis); and

S. 2748. A bill for the relief of Pablo (Paul) Veyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 2749. A bill to amend section 104(b) of the Postal Policy Act of 1958; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2750. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit the inclusion of military pay in the computation of average salary for annuity purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2751. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2752. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Siat; and

S. 2753. A bill for the relief of Hans Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a foreign student who resides in his home while in the United States attending high school; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2755. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Braha Sundaram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 2757. A bill to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2758. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a spouse's annuity be reduced if the spouse is eligible to receive

certain social security benefits; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2759. A bill to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2760. A bill to establish a library of braille musical scores within the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 2761. A bill to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2762. A bill for the relief of Jean Hansi Subak Steiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2763. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2764. A bill to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations for the Library Services Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. BUSH submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) looking to the prevention of Communist control of countries in the Caribbean, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUSH, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, to the Official Reporters of the Senate debates and proceedings, during the period February 1, 1960, to December 31, 1960, so much as may be necessary, not to exceed $20,000, for the employment of additional office personnel.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERK BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1960, through January 31, 1961, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 209); which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommitee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) research and development, (b) quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, and (c) postal policy;

(2) the effect of postage rate increases on business enterprises and on the national economy generally; and

(3) the administration and operation of the Federal employees' retirement, group life insurance and health benefits programs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES

Mr. KERR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 210); which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Water Resources, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 48, Eighty-sixth Congress, agreed to April 20, 1959, is authorized to expend not in excess of $175,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate for the period from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, both inclusive.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR LANGER OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 211); which was referred to the Commit on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of the Honorable William Langer, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CEREMONIES IN HONOR OF VETERANS OF WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted a resolution (S. Res. 212) relating to ceremonies in honor of veterans of War Between the States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YARBOROUGH, which appears under a separate heading.)

REPEAL OF RESOLUTION 123, 80TH CONGRESS

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 213) to repeal Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, which was placed on the calendar.

MARY G. HOSEY

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 214) to pay a gratuity to Mary G. Hosey, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

JOSEPH H. STRATTON

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 215) to pay a gratuity to Joseph H. Stratton, as executor of the estate of Elizabeth J. Anthony, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

SELMA N. PUCKETT

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 216) to pay a gratuity to Selma N. Puckett, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EVELYN CLARK

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 217) to pay a gratuity to Evelyn Clark, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HENNINGS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 218) relating to the terms of Senate pages, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REQUIREMENT OF DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist production and stabilization, by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of consumer credit.

The purpose of this bill is to require lenders and vendors to tell the truth about interest rates and finance charges.

In too many instances, today, the consumer who signs a document that places him in debt would have to be a lawyer in order to understand the fine print that spells out his rights and liabilities; and he would have to be an accountant or an expert in higher mathematics in order to compute in simple annual terms the cost of the credit. Altogether too often he is deceived into paying a higher cost for credit than he has been led to expect by the huckstering of fast-talking salesmen. True annual rates running as high as 30 to 40 percent are camouflaged in terms of rates which are seemingly modest because they are stated as monthly, rather than annual rates, and are further disguised in the form of fees, charges, discounts, and the like—all of which make up the true cost of credit to the consumer.

The average consumer cannot make rational choices in a free, competitive economy unless he is an informed consumer.

This bill would require that he be given, in writing, two vital pieces of information: First, the total amount of the finance charges he is contracting to pay; and, second, the percentage that such an amount bears to the outstanding balance expressed in simple annual interest.

Mr. President, a consumer credit labeling requirement such as I am proposing would restore consumer sovereignty to the American marketplace, where consumer credit has been transformed from a financing mechanism to a merchandising tool, where loans are disguised as sales—to the detriment of our economy.

Personal debt now amounts to $175 billion, which consumers owe on installment purchases, auto loans, personal loans, mortgages, and the like. During the decade of the 1950's alone, personal debt went up 160 percent. In contrast, disposable income went up only 60 percent. At this rate of growth, personal debt could exceed the national debt in just a few years from now.

It is not my purpose in this bill to control consumer credit. The consumer is generally his own best credit manager, provided he has all the facts about the cost of credit.

I simply ask that the borrower and buyer know the truth about what they are being asked to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD; and also a descriptive article from the Wall Street Journal of January 6, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2755) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and services. The excessive use of credit results frequently from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy.

Sec. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(1) "Credit" means any loan, residential mortgage, deed of trust, advance, or discount; any conditional sales contract; any contract to sell, or sale, or contract of sale of property or services, either for present or future delivery, under which part or all of the price is payable subsequent to the making of such sale or contract; any rental-purchase contract; any contract or arrangement for the hire, bailment, or leasing of property; any option, demand, lien, pledge, or other claim against, or for the delivery of, property or money; any purchase, discount, or other acquisition of, or any credit upon the security of, any obligation or claim arising out of any of the foregoing; and any transaction or series of transactions having a similar purpose or effect.

(2) "Finance charges" includes charges such as interest, fees, service charges, discounts, and such other charges as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may by regulation prescribe.

(3) "Person" means any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or unincorporated organization.

Sec. 3. Any person engaged in the business of extending credit shall furnish to each person to whom such credit is extended, prior to the consummation of the transaction, a clear statement in writing, in accordance with rules and regulations which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall prescribe, (1) setting forth the total amount of the finance charges to be borne by such person in connection with such extension of credit, and (2) stating the percentage that such amount bears to the outstanding principal obligation, or unpaid balance, expressed in terms of simple annual interest.

Sec. 4. Any regulation under this Act may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions as in the judgment of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act or to prevent circumvention or evasion, or to facilitate enforcement of this Act, or any rule or regulation issued under this Act. In prescribing any exceptions hereunder with respect to any particular type of credit transaction the Board shall consider whether in the case of such transaction substantial compliance with the disclosure requirements of this Act is being achieved under any other Act of Congress or the law of any State. The Board shall also exempt those credit transactions between business firms as to which it determines adherence with the disclosure requirements of this Act is not necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

Sec. 5. No person shall extend credit in contravention of this Act or of any regulation prescribed thereunder.

Sec. 6. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation issued thereunder shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for additional cosponsors until Tuesday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 6, 1960]

DEMOCRATS TO ASK BILL TO REQUIRE LABELS FOR LOANS—CONSUMERS WOULD BE TOLD OF TOTAL FINANCE CHARGES, ANNUAL INTEREST RATES—CONTROLS HELD ALTERNATIVE

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—Democrats have devised a legislative spotlight to shine on the issue of high interest rates. They hope to make use of it during the coming session of Congress and possibly in the election campaign that lies beyond it.

Illinois' Senator DOUGLAS, with backing from other important "liberal" lawmakers, is about to introduce a bill to require lenders to inform consumer borrowers of the total finance charges and annual interest rates they pay. Backers claim such costs are higher than most borrowers realize.

Consumer groups long have contended that such legislation is necessary to show the public just how much cash it is forking over when it buys on time. Now the "interest-rate labeling" bill is picking up considerable Democratic backing in both Houses for more political reasons. Some see it as an alternative to the more drastic step of outright Federal controls on consumer credit; others view it as fuel for an expected Democratic "antibanker" campaign leading up to the November election. Because of talk of Federal controls, some Federal Reserve Board economists—who oppose controls—have shown interest in a labeling bill.

Here are samples, not necessarily typical, of the problems now said to exist and of the proposed cures:

A retailer now tells a purchaser only that a new TV set will cost him so much down and so much a month. Under a labeling law, the seller would have to make clear that the installment-plan carrying charges might amount to an exorbitant interest rate, figured annually, such as when a lender charges a rate in excess of 4 percent a month where State antiusury laws don't prevent.

A small loan company now tells a borrower simply that the interest rate on a loan is 3 percent a month. Under labeling, the lender would have to specify that the annual interest rate might amount to 36 percent, varying according to terms of the loan.

MORTGAGE LENDING TERMS

A mortgage lender now informs a home buyer merely that the interest rate on his loan is 6 percent a year. Under labeling, the lender would have to add that finance charges, say, on a $20,000 home loan might exceed $10,000 over a 25-year span.

In any case, the Federal Reserve Board would draft specific regulations. Willful violators would face a jail sentence, a fine, or both.

To be sure, any customer can already ask for the financing facts or figure out the credit costs for himself. Nevertheless, sponsors of the bill contend the man in the street simply doesn't go to that trouble.

Backers will try to sell their bill partly as a logical extension of the pattern of federally imposed labeling—describing the ingredients of food, names of furs and fibers, and the basic prices of automobiles.

But they also will advocate the interest rate proposal as a means of getting people to hold down their borrowings. The Federal Reserve Board has just reported that consumer installment credit, the biggest up-and-down factor in total consumer credit, climbed to yet another record at the end of November; at $38.7 billion, it stood $5.4 billion above a year earlier. If only borrowers realized how much such debt was costing them, the would-be labelers argue, they'd brake their borrowing.

FEAR CONTROLS

The alternative to such action, proponents warn, may be compulsion. And the idea of standby credit controls is picking up some steam, possibly enough to make it a serious threat in 1961. A recent report of the special staff hired by the Senate-House Economic Committee, for example, recommends selective credit controls.

A draft of the interest rate labeling bill explicitly sets out this purpose in its preamble: "* * * Economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and services. The excessive use of credit results frequently from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy." In other words, John Doe might not go into hock to buy that washing machine if he knows how much it's going to cost him in finance charges.

Skeptics claim, however, that once John Doe has decided he wants a washing machine, high credit costs won't stop him. Moreover, even those who consider labeling as a deterrent to consumer borrowing note the plan has no variable factors; they maintain it might inhibit needed consumer purchases during a recession. To this argument, one backer of the bill replies: "Is honesty a variable?"

But any success the labeling plan may enjoy probably will derive from its place in the election-year interest rate fight. "It's all part of the mosaic," asserts a proponent of the plan. Frustrated by the Republican theme of "peace and prosperity," many Democrats believe the best counterattack lies in an attempt to blame the Eisenhower administration for mounting credit costs. Democratic opposition to the Eisenhower proposal to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates for new Government bonds is the key part of this campaign.

These broad political implications may be exploited during congressional hearings on the labeling bills. Sponsors are confident their idea will be publicized at least through lengthy Senate hearings and possibly in similar hearings in the House. And if the bill actually passes, labeling itself would tend to dramatize the Democratic position.

OPPOSITION TO BILL

Opposition to the bill probably will be based on claims that it interferes unnecessarily with the business process and violates States' rights by taking on the job that State antiusury laws are supposed to do. These laws set ceilings on interest costs, usually by limiting monthly rates.

But Republicans, while stressing these objections, may find it hard to oppose the measure. "It's like voting for sin," declares one Democrat. Certainly, many Republicans accepted the Democratic-sponsored auto price labeling law of 1958 without protest; it passed with unexpected ease.

Opposition to credit labeling from the business world, particularly from merchandisers who depend heavily on credit purchases, may be more determined. However, sponsors of the bill say they may get surprising backing from small loan companies wary of being tagged as "loan sharks."

In the end prospects for congressional passage will hinge on the still uncertain attitude of the Democratic leadership. Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON is an advocate of going to the mat with the Republicans over interest rates and so could be considered a potential backer of the bill. But it is understood, Senator JOHNSON is considering an election-year congressional study of the entire consumer credit question, and that could put the labeling bill on the shelf.

For a closeup glimpse of the effects of credit labeling, take a hypothetical case of a customer buying a high-fidelity phonograph on time. The retailer may tell him simply that the phonograph will cost $250—a $50 downpayment and $20 a month for 10 months.

BREAKDOWN OF CHARGES

But the labeling bill would require the retailer to disclose the breakdown between the cost of the phonograph itself and the finance or carrying charges—say, $230 for the phonograph and $20 for financing. More important, the retailer would be required to list the actual interest rate on an annual basis, in this case, 20 percent.

The bill would work much the same way if the hi-fi enthusiast applied to a small loan company or a bank for enough money to buy the phonograph. Assume that after plunking down his $50 downpayment, he borrowed the $180 at 6 percent interest, to be paid back in monthly installments of $15.90. Since the borrower would have the full $180 for only a month, the true annual interest would not be 6 percent but a little over 11 percent, and the 11 percent figure is the one the small loan company would have to present to the borrower.

SPOUSES' ANNUITIES AND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a group of retired Oregon railroad employees last fall requested the introduction of an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act relating to spouses' benefits.

With the assistance of legislative counsel of the Senate, I have prepared such an amendment which I now introduce for appropriate reference.

This amendment is designed to remove the restriction presently found in the Railroad Retirement Act which has the legal effect of preventing a person who is married to a railroad employee from receiving social security benefits to which such person otherwise would be entitled on the basis of his or her own earnings.

When this request was presented by the retired railroad employees, I advised that I would be glad to introduce the type of amendment they desire and that I would ask for early hearings on the amendment in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The railroad retirement law is one of the most complex of the Federal laws now on our statute books. Any amendment to the law, therefore, would have to be subjected to close scrutiny by the committee. Such scrutiny is essential in order that the legal and economic effects of the amendment may be understood by all interested parties.

I urge the committee to which this bill is referred to schedule early hearings so that the proponents and others interested in the amendment may have full opportunity to make known their views on this proposal during the current session of the Congress.

These retired employees believe an injustice is being done to them, and in my opinion there is much merit in their point of view. As chairman of the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee I shall request early hearings on this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and some correspondence in connection with it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2758) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a spouse's annuity be reduced if the spouse is eligible to receive certain social security benefits, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third proviso of section 2(e) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *"And provided further,* That any spouse's annuity shall be reduced by the amount of any annuity to which such spouse is entitled, or on proper application would be entitled, under subsection (a) of this section or subsection (d) of section 5 of this Act."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to annuities accruing under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

The correspondence presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

COMMENT ON PROPOSED BILL

By the Legislative Committee, Portland Unit No. 55, National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees.

The issue of restoring dual spouse benefits to annuitants having social security benefits in their own rights has been introduced a number of times and little consideration given. It is hard to understand the discrimination and injustice in this legislation has been sidestepped.

Dual benefits were restored to employee annuitants in 1954 retroactive to November 1, 1951, and to surviving widows in 1956. The same principle is involved for the beneficiary complies with all requirements of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, pays the required premiums (taxes) for insurance in both agencies, but denied benefits when aged and needed. It is no different than having two annuities, one for example in the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and one in the New York Life Insurance Co. If you pay the premiums they pay the annuities.

It so happens the majority of these spouses were in low paid brackets of annuitants retired a number of years ago, and necessary for them to help support the family, mate, incapacitated or infirm. They qualified for social security but now denied benefits. Is it just? Is the discrimination warranted?

In the 1954 amendments (restoration of dual benefits to employees) H.R. 356, "the removal of inequities from the railroad system is a policy which the Congress adopted in the belief that the elimination of inequities justified the additional cost." In 1955 when H.R. 4744 became a law this principle was sustained by restoring dual benefits to survivors. A widow collects her annuity in full and no deduction by reason of social security benefits in her own rights. The same principle should apply to the spouse.

Recent amendments effective June 1, 1959, the estimated deficit is 0.60 percent of taxable payroll basis or in dollars 34 million. (Cost level basis.) The Railroad Retirement Board's statement released said these amendments placed the railroad retirement fund * * * on a sound basis. Increases in the past have been granted when the deficit was much greater than 0.60 percent. In 1951 it was 1.93 percent, 0.91 percent, and increased to 1.06 percent and in 1955 1.40 percent. In 1959 the deficit was 3.20 percent when corrective measures were enacted into law effective June 1, 1959.

The estimated cost of restoration of dual benefits to spouses having social security benefits in their own rights is 0.2 percent (or 0.20 percent) of the taxable payroll, equivalent to a little over 11 million a year on a level basis as of July 1, 1959. This is borne out by correspondence with the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board (shown below).

Therefore the facts and sustaining figures show to restore dual benefits to spouses having social security in their own rights will not jeopardize the financial status nor create any such deficit as has existed when the last four liberalizing amendments were enacted to the Railroad Retirement Act. We ask in the name of justice this inequity be corrected.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 16, 1959.*

Mr. HORACE W. HARPER,
Member, Railroad Retirement Board,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Will you please give me an estimate of the number of spouse annuitants on the beneficiary rolls as of July 1, 1959, that have social security benefits in their own right, and second—the number of spouses expected to make application for reduced annuities?

Of course, we realize that it would be hard to determine how many of this group would have social security benefits in their own right.

What is the estimated cost of restoring dual benefits to spouses who have social security benefits in their own right?

I am trying to secure data to correct this inequity. Dual benefits were restored to employee annuitants in June 1954, and to widows in 1955. Any information you can give on this subject will be greatly appreciated.

We want to be reasonable in request and not jeopardize the safety of the railroad retirement fund, presenting facts in good faith, and placing benefits where most needed.

Thanking you for consideration, I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

H. P. OLDHAM,
Grand Director.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 25, 1959.*

Mr. H. P. OLDHAM,

Grand Director, National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. OLDHAM: We can only make rough estimates of the information you requested in your letter of June 16, 1959. They are as follows:

1. Number of spouse annuitants on the board's beneficiary rolls on July 1, 1959, who will be receiving social security benefits in their own right—10,000.

2. Number of spouses expected to make application for reduced annuities during fiscal year 1959–1960—25,000.

(We have no basis for estimating the number in this group entitled to their own social security benefits, but do not believe it is fiscal year 1959–60—25,000.

3. Estimated cost of restoring dual benefits to spouses with social security benefits in their own right—about 0.2 percent of taxable payroll, equivalent to a little over $11 million a year on a level basis.

I am glad to be able to help you in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE W. HARPER.

OCTOBER 24, 1959.

Mr. H. P. OLDHAM,

Chairman, Legislative Committee, Portland Unit No. 55, National Association of Retired and Veteran Railway Employees, Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. OLDHAM: In going over my accumulated work, I find your letter of September 21 in which you requested the introduction of a bill for restoration of dual benefits to spouses who are also recipients of personal social security benefits.

As I indicated at the Portland meeting, I shall be glad to introduce a bill of that type and you may be sure that I shall do everything possible to obtain hearings. In all frankness, I should tell you that the likelihood of committee action in what is predicted to be a very short session of Congress is somewhat doubtful, but I shall work to the best of my ability to get hearings and consideration of your amendment despite the odds against committee action.

May I take this opportunity to again express my best regards to the members of your organization. I enjoyed very much meeting with you in Portland.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED AND VETERAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES,
Portland, Oreg., September 21, 1959.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I presume you have received a proposal to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 as amended, from the secretary of Portland unit, No. 55, for restoration of dual benefits to spouses having social security in their own rights.

We feel this inequity should be corrected as soon as can be done to relieve quite a number whose annuities are in the low bracket, and still not overburden the railroad retirement fund, nor need a tax increase to cover.

There are over 700 members in this Portland Unit, No. 55, and we hope to have 750 by the end of the year.

There are some 300 in Eugene, and no doubt Eugene unit will ask Congressman Porter to introduce in House. Roseburg, No. 58, has near 250, I am told, and all these units are enjoying a steady growth.

We know you are chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, our friend, and the proper person for us to ask for introduction. We know the importance of early introduction, as you impressed our committee in conference on this point on a previous occasion. It was my intent as chairman of the Portland unit to submit this proposal when the recent amendments were disposed of. An automobile accident in June grounded me for some time and prevented action.

We do not feel a general increase for all beneficiaries is warranted until it is determined what the effect of last amendments do. I do hope you will comply with Portland unit's request and introduce the proposals.

I hope to see you and confer on this and other matters at an early date.

Sincerely,

H. P. OLDHAM,
Chairman Legislative Committee,
Portland Unit No. 55.

STRENGTHENING OF WHEAT MARKETING QUOTA AND PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the purpose of which is to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program. As a matter of fact, the bill follows largely the conference report which was agreed upon by the House and the Senate during the last session of Congress, with very few changes.

The bill provides for a support price of 80 percent of parity, with a 20-percent cut in acreage for the first year, that is, for the crop of 1961.

For the crop of 1962 the support price would be reduced to 75 percent of parity, with an additional 5-percent cut in acreage.

Thereafter, in subsequent years, the supports would be reduced by 5 percent, until the support price reached 65 percent of parity. Thereafter, the price support would not be further decreased.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2759) to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was received, read twice by its title,

and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that a short explanation of the bill be incorporated in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, with respect to the 1961 and subsequent wheat crops, would—

(1) Provide price support at 80 percent of parity for the 1961 crop, 75 percent for the 1962 crop, 70 percent for the 1963 crop, and 65 percent for the 1964 and subsequent crops;

(2) Reduce each farm acreage allotment by 20 percent for the 1961 crop, and 25 percent for the 1962 and subsequent crops;

(3) Prevent the diversion of such acreage reduction to other price-supported crops in 1961 (by conditioning wheat price support on reducing the acreage of price supported crops below the 1958–59 average by an acreage equal to the percent of reduction;

(4) Provide a payment in kind in 1961 (one-third average annual yield) on acreage equal to such percent of reduction, if such acreage is not harvested or grazed;

(5) Impose penalties on the actual yield of the excess acres (or double the normal yield if the actual yield is not shown);

(6) Increase the marketing penalty to 65 percent of parity (from 45 percent);

(7) Reduce the 15-acre exemption to 12, and restrict it to farms which planted wheat in 1958, 1959, or 1960 and to producers who produce wheat on only one farm;

(8) Remove the 30-acre limitation on the feed wheat exemption; and

(9) Restrict to farms complying with their allotments the right to withdraw wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid penalty.

The bill would also (a) repeal the 200-bushel exemption; (b) prevent an acreage history penalty where, by reason of production failure, the producer has no marketing excess which he can store to avoid such a penalty; (c) repeal authority for price support for noncooperators for any basic agricultural commodity; and (d) repeal a provision requiring the county agent or the local committee chairman to keep an additional copy of the acreage allotment list for each commodity.

BRAILLE MUSIC FOR THE BLIND

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a library of braille musical scores within the Library of Congress.

My bill would make musical scores available on a loan basis to blind residents of the United States and its possessions under regulations prescribed by the Librarian. The bill would further authorize the appropriation of such Federal funds as may be required for this purpose.

Mr. President, the American Foundation for the Blind estimates that as of July 1, 1959, there were about 355,000 persons in the United States who are considered legally blind in that they have no more than 10 percent of normal vision, even with the assistance afforded by correction. Of this number about 13,000 are blind children attending school.

It is a known fact that persons afflicted with blindness are often unusually sensitive to music, and their participation in this universal language has not only brought great pleasure and culture to the sighted but has helped the visually handicapped to lead richer lives and to communicate with others. Furthermore, braille musical scores have enabled many blind persons to become gainfully employed.

It is true that certain regional libraries—eight, to be exact—do lend braille musical scores, but the listings in the catalogs are definitely limited. The lesser known works as well as selections for such instruments as flute, oboe and bassoon are generally not available. It is also true that certain organizations have braille musical scores for sale only, scores that may neither be borrowed nor exchanged. These, of course, are of real value but many, if not most blinded persons are of limited financial means and cannot afford to purchase the braille music library they desire and need.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that a prominent Oregon attorney, Mr. Nicholas Granet, of Portland, who is also vice chairman of the Oregon State Blind Commission, has urged the introduction of a bill for the establishment of a complete braille music library within the Library of Congress for free rental to all blind persons in the United States.

The Oregon State Blind Commission unanimously adopted a resolution suggesting that a bill be introduced in Congress for the establishment of a complete braille music library.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I intend personally to support the recommendations of Mr. Granet, and shall work to the end of accomplishing the goals he has in mind.

It is my sincere hope that this bill will receive favorable and enthusiastic consideration by the Congress in the knowledge that it will not only open the way for many who must otherwise live in darkness, but will also bring pleasure and comfort to those of us who are more fortunate.

Mr. President, I shall work to the end of seeking to bring greater human happiness to these unfortunate people. I shall never place a balanced budget ahead of more balanced lives for our unfortunate blind brethren.

I respectfully request early consideration and hearings on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2760) to establish a library of braille musical scores within the Library of Congress, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

VALIDATION OF MILTON-FREEWATER ORCHARD EMERGENCY PAYMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to provide equitable relief to Oregon farmers in the Milton-Freewater area who were seriously affected in the freeze of 1955.

The Senate will recall that in the 85th Congress legislation was enacted which did much to enable the farmers and fruitgrowers of the area to reestablish themselves and their orchards. Unfortunately, however, a question was raised by the General Accounting Office as to the dates for which payments under Public Law 85–58 could be made. In order to avoid any possible question on this score and in order to make absolutely clear the legislative intent, I requested that the Department of Agriculture provide me with draft legislation which would authorize payments for the emergency conservation measures carried out between January 1, 1956, and June 21, 1957. The bill provides that these payments, if otherwise proper shall not be considered invalid by reason of the fact that they were made for measures carried out prior to the enactment of the public law.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with correspondence from the Comptroller General to the Secretary of Agriculture, dated November 24, 1959, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2761) to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That payments which have heretofore been made under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, under the item entitled "Emergency Conservation Measures, Agricultural Conservation Program Service", for emergency conservation measures carried out between January 1, 1956, and June 21, 1957, shall, if otherwise proper, not be considered invalid by reason of the fact that they were made for measures carried out prior to the enactment of said Act.

The correspondence presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 24, 1959.

The HONORABLE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: By letter of August 7, 1959, Assistant Secretary E. L. Peterson presented for our consideration the question as to whether emergency conservation measures undertaken as far back as January 1, 1956, may be eligible for cost-sharing under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, Public Law 85–58, approved June 21, 1957, under the item entitled "Emergency Conservation Measures, Agricultural Conservation Program Service."

The portion of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, referred to above (71 Stat. 176) provides in pertinent part as follows:

"For an additional amount to enable the Secretary to make payments to farmers who carry out emergency measures to control wind erosion on farmlands or to rehabilitate

farmlands damaged by wind erosion, floods, hurricanes, or other natural disasters when, as a result of the foregoing, new conservation problems have been created which, (1) if not treated, will impair or endanger the land, (2) materially affect the productive capacity of the land, (3) represent damage which is unusual in character and, except for wind erosion, is not the type which would recur frequently in the same area, and (4) will be so costly to rehabilitate that Federal assistance is or will be required to return the land to productive agricultural use, * * *."

The Assistant Secretary advises that upon approval of Public Law 85–58, Supplement 3 to the 1957 National Agricultural Conservation Program was issued authorizing cost-share payments for emergency conservation practices carried out on or after July 1, 1956, and on or before December 31, 1957, the end of the program year of the regular 1957 Agricultural Conservation Program in connection with which the emergency program was carried out. Thus, supplement 3 authorized payment for practices performed prior to approval of Public Law 85–58, that is, work performed during the period from July 1, 1956, the beginning of fiscal year 1957, to June 21, 1957, the date of approval of the act. While the Assistant Secretary indicates that your Department is satisfied that the act authorized payments covering that period, he states that it now has been determined that some of the work for which cost-sharing was paid from the emergency funds appropriated by Public Law 85–58 was carried out prior to July 1, 1956. He further states that, although the regulations specifically stated that practices must have been carried out on or after July 1, 1956, and farmers applying for payment certified that the practices had been carried out in accordance with applicable regulations, investigations conducted by your Department have not disclosed that any farmer who received the payment for practices carried out prior to July 1, 1956, was actually aware that such practices were not eligible under the regulations. The letter indicates that it is the desire of your Department not to demand refund of payments made for otherwise eligible emergency conservation measures carried out prior to July 1, 1956, and supports the propriety of such desire with the contention that, inasmuch as the act authorizing the emergency program was a supplemental appropriation act, the funds appropriated thereby are available for the same period as those appropriated by the basic appropriation act and that, since the basic appropriation act (the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1957, 70 stat. 233) appropriated $227,500,000 for cost-sharing in connection with conservation practices carried out during the period July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1956, the funds here in question should be available for the same period.

Generally, a supplemental appropriation act merely appropriates additional funds for the same purposes and programs as the basic appropriation act and subject to the same conditions and restrictions. The funds appropriated by such an act are at least technically available for the same period of time as the funds for the same purpose appropriated by the basic appropriation act. However, it is obvious that the supplemental funds are not actually available for use until they are appropriated and hence cannot be spent or obligated prior to the effective date of the supplemental appropriation act.

In the present instance, the quoted portion of Public Law 85–58 does not appropriate additional funds for the same purposes and programs and subject to the same conditions as the basic appropriation act but, on the contrary, sets up a separate and distinct program for emergency conservation measures, subject to entirely different conditions. Further support for the separateness of this emergency program, if any be required, is furnished by the fact that subsequent appropriations therefor and references thereto appear in Public Laws 85–170 and 85–766 under the separate heading "Emergency Conservation Measures" in the section for the agricultural conservation program service, whereas the funds and authorizations for the regular agricultural conservation program appear in that section in the subsequent appropriation acts for 1958 and 1959 (Public Laws 85–118 and 85–459, respectively) without the separate heading. Thus, the period of time during which regular conservation program practices could be performed to be eligible for cost-sharing payments from the $227,500,000 appropriated by the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1957, for the regular program has no bearing on the period during which emergency conservation measures could be performed to be eligible for cost-sharing payments from the $4 million appropriated by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957, for the separate and distinct emergency program authorized by the latter act. It should be noted that, while the former act specifically made funds appropriated thereby available to pay for practices carried out prior to its enactment, those practices were carried out under authority contained in the prior appropriation act. This method of authorization and subsequent appropriation has been followed for years in the regular conservation program, whereas the authority for the emergency program is contained in the same act that appropriated funds therefor. Since the authorization for the emergency program did not exist prior to the approval of Public Law 85–58 on June 21, 1957, there does not appear to be any authority to pay for practices carried out prior to that date.

The Assistant Secretary's letter refers to the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, Public Law 357, 83d Congress, approved May 11, 1954, 68 stat. 88, as an example of similar emergency legislation in the past which had been applied retroactively. However, that act did not set up a separate emergency program but specifically stated that the funds appropriated thereby were an additional amount for the regular program previously authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954, and specifically authorized payments "to farmers who carry out emergency wind erosion control measures under the 1954 agricultural conservation program after March 30, 1954." Thus, the program conducted under authority of Public Law 357 is clearly entirely different in nature from that established by Public Law 85–58, which is separate from the regular program and does not contain specific authority to pay for practices carried out prior to its enactment.

It is a well established principle of statutory construction that a statute is for prospective application only, in the absence of specific provision to the contrary. As previously indicated, Public Law 85–58 obviously does not specifically authorize payments for practices carried out prior to its enactment. Likewise there is nothing in the legislative history of the provision in question to indicate such an intention. Even the discussion on the floor of the Senate on April 17, 1957, in connection with House Joint Resolution 310, referred to in the letter of August 7, 1959, from the Assistant Secretary and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 5894, gives no indication of an intention to pay for practices carried out prior to enactment of the legislation. In fact, it tends to indicate the contrary. In response to a question from Senator MORSE as to whether the proposed authority for emergency conservation measures would include a freeze as a natural disaster and thus make the freeze-struck orchardists in Oregon eligible for aid thereunder, Senator HAYDEN answered in the affirmative, referred to the four conditions stated in House Joint Resolution 310 (which are identical with those subsequently enacted in Public Law 85–58 and quoted above), and stated that "under these circumstances the money would be available—if this were a disaster—for land treatment measures." In the same discussion, Senator NEUBERGER stated:

"Mr. President, I particularly wish to join with my colleague in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Arizona, because the orchardists in our State, particularly in the Milton-Freewater area, were caught by the disastrous freeze of 1955, and have never recovered from it. Entire orchards were as effectively wiped out as if a fire had swept them. The answer of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee is very reassuring. I have had many letters from those orchardists in recent weeks who are dependent on such emergency credit to make any start on restoration of their orchards."

This statement indicates an expectation of prospective application of the act and, while it is not completely incompatible with a retroactive application, it affords no positive support therefor.

The appropriation language in Public Law 85–58 was contained originally in H.R. 4249, 85th Congress, on which the following comment is contained in House Report No. 24, 85th Congress:

"A question has been raised as to whether or not authority for payments under this program should be made on a retroactive basis. It has been pointed out that payments for future work to be done gives farmers who have not yet done the necessary work an advantage over farmers in the same area who have already protected their land with such practices at their own expense.

"The committee can fully appreciate and is sympathetic to this point of view. In view of the precedents established on this point, however, it does not believe that authority exists for it to reach back and repay farmers or others for work already done or expenses already incurred.

"The basic legislation supporting this type of activity makes no provision for such retroactive payments. Further, Congress has consistently resisted efforts to enter into retroactive assistance of this kind. Also, such action would raise numerous policy questions such as: How far back should such feature go; who should be included; and what area of the country should be included?"

While the language was justified at that time primarily for the purpose of controlling wind erosion on farm lands, the reasons stated by the committee for denying retroactive payments would be equally applicable to any conservation program under the emergency conservation appropriation. The language was amended on the Senate floor to provide for certain retroactive payments, but the language did not become law and only the original language was included in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, which was enacted as Public Law 85–58.

In our opinion Public Law 85–58 did not authorize payments for emergency conservation measures carried out or expenses incurred prior to the date of its enactment and therefore we cannot approve your proposal.

We have considered the fact that your Department, immediately after passage of Public Law 85–58, advised various Members of Congress and interested committees of your intention to authorize cost-share payments under the act for emergency conservation measures carried out subsequent to

July 1, 1956, and that no objection thereto was raised. Such action subsequent to the passage of the act is not a part of its legislative history and does not afford a proper legal basis for the construction placed thereon by your Department. However, in view of the length of time which has elapsed since the improper payments were made, the nature of the program involved, and the fact that the payments were made in accordance with regulations issued by your Department which neither the officials making the payments nor the farmers receiving them had any reason to believe were not proper, we will not require recovery from the farmers who received otherwise proper payments for emergency conservation measures carried out subsequent to July 1, 1956. Since the payments for measures carried out prior to July 1, 1956, covered a period of time beyond even that contemplated by your regulations, collection thereof must be required. However, in the light of the reported fact that the farmers who received payments for measures performed prior to July 1, 1956, were innocent of any wrongful intent, we will not object to holding collection action in abeyance during the next session of Congress if your Department desiries to request legislation from Congress which would validate these payments.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 5 years the Library Services Act, Public Law 597 of the 84th Congress. This act provides to the States Federal matching grants for the extension and improvement of public library service in rural areas.

Mr. President, because a number of Senators are very much interested in the Library Services Act and in the very human need, which it helps to fill, of bringing information of educational and cultural value to the people of rural areas, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced lie at desk through the close of business on Monday, January 11, for cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 2764) to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations for the Library Services Act, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in this connection, I should like to say that if the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] desires to introduce a similar bill, on his own behalf—and I think it quite possible that he may, because of the fact that he was the author of the present act—I would certainly defer to him, and would be glad to have him take the initiative in this matter, as I am sure he will.

Mr. President, the act of June 19, 1956, is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961. The work contemplated under this act will not have been completed, and the goals planned under the act for the development of State and local rural library services will not have been reached in that time—primarily because the amount appropriated for the program has been substantially less than the amount authorized by the Congress. While I believe it is true that under the able and devoted leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama, chairman of the appropriations subcommittee concerned as well as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which reported the original bill, the Senate has each year increased the appropriation for the library services program, and the Congress has appropriated more than the budget recommendation—and I may say I have consistently urged the full appropriation—yet much remains to be done.

Secondly, I believe it is generally recognized that this work has proved so very worth while, has been welcomed so gratefully by rural people, and has been so effective in encouraging the States to do more to develop library services for all their people, that the act ought not be allowed to lapse.

It is important to extend the act this year so that there will be no gap in annual appropriations, and more particularly in order to insure that an amount for fiscal 1962 will be included in the regular budget recommendations, which will be prepared later this year. As my colleagues know, it has taken several years to bring this Federal assistance up to the full level of $7½ million authorized by the act, which it reached for the first time this year. Extending the Library Services Act at this time should assure continuity of the program, and I hope the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will report a bill to do so. I believe the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will recommend that the act be extended, and that the administration will support this action.

In introducing this bill, I wish to call particular attention to the leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama, the author of the original Senate bill and certainly the person who, more than all others, has been responsible for guiding and encouraging this very human work. I also wish to acknowledge the efforts of the American Library Association, which has given its full support to the act and to appropriations for the program, and the constant support of the Kentucky Library Association, Miss Margaret Willis of the Kentucky Library Extension Division, the Friends of Kentucky Libraries, and the many others who have taken such keen interest in the rural library program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the appropriations for the library service program in each of the past 4 years, together with a statement supporting the extension of the act.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations for Library Services Act

[In millions]

Fiscal	Office of Education request	HEW request	Budget recommendation	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Appropriated
1957	$7.5	$7.5	[1] $7.5	----------	$7.5	$2.05
1958	7.5	5.0	3.0	$5.0	5.0	5.0
1959	7.5	5.0	3.0	5.0	6.0	6.0
1960	7.5	6.0	5.15	6.0	7.5	[2] 6.0

[1] Supplemental request.
[2] Provided allotments on basis of $7.5 million.

Federal allotments and the matching expenditures in effect for fiscal year 1960

States and outlying parts	Federal allotment	Matching expenditure	States and outlying parts	Federal allotment	Matching expenditure
Total	$7,500,000	$6,738,796	New Hampshire	$62,051	$52,582
			New Jersey	103,213	165,991
Alabama	207,576	106,933	New Mexico	73,042	48,715
Arizona	72,485	54,415	New York	249,152	418,637
Arkansas	164,544	84,765	North Carolina	302,331	155,746
California	239,322	398,530	North Dakota	84,291	47,270
Colorado	88,084	82,160	Ohio	270,635	339,041
Connecticut	83,689	169,914	Oklahoma	146,523	98,868
Delaware	51,585	104,733	Oregon	108,365	102,832
Florida	133,235	108,571	Pennsylvania	341,396	364,113
Georgia	223,578	124,674	Rhode Island	52,142	53,816
Idaho	72,729	49,690	South Carolina	170,405	87,784
Illinois	230,178	352,699	South Dakota	82,462	44,520
Indiana	193,574	195,989	Tennessee	219,097	114,080
Iowa	173,427	130,192	Texas	319,792	250,756
Kansas	128,820	102,372	Utah	63,275	45,017
Kentucky	221,203	113,953	Vermont	63,385	44,670
Louisiana	158,010	94,483	Virginia	211,253	150,296
Maine	83,021	59,382	Washington	125,287	139,422
Maryland	110,806	125,858	West Virginia	167,674	98,306
Massachusetts	111,213	146,642	Wisconsin	180,882	164,576
Michigan	221,976	271,853	Wyoming	54,209	53,221
Minnesota	172,203	143,882	Alaska	49,191	25,341
Mississippi	193,061	99,456	Guam	15,495	7,982
Missouri	188,210	175,551	Hawaii	55,087	55,087
Montana	72,427	66,642	Puerto Rico	168,144	86,620
Nebraska	108,519	81,100	Virgin Islands	11,079	5,707
Nevada	46,667	73,361			

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

EXTENSION OF THE RURAL LIBRARY SERVICES PROGRAM

I have introduced today a bill to extend for 5 additional years the program under the Library Services Act (Public Law 84–597, as amended) which provides Federal matching grants to the States for the extension and improvement of public library service in rural areas. According to its original provisions this highly beneficial program will expire on June 30, 1961. Extension of the act is needed, first because the full amount of funds authorized under the act has not been appropriated in any of its first 4 years. Consequently the goals for the much-needed development of library services in rural areas will not be reached, and the hopes of the States to carry out their present plans for this work cannot be realized, unless the act is extended.

Second, the rural library services program has proved so worth while, means so much to thousands of our rural families, and has been so effective in encouraging better State programs, that I am sure the Congress will want to consider extending the program in any event.

To insure that there will be no interruption in the successful development of this useful program, it is important that the act be extended by this Congress. This would provide time for the States to plan for continuation of their programs without gaps or loss of personnel, and should insure that funds for the program are included in the 1962 budget. I hope this Congress will adopt such an extension, which has the support of the administration, of the American Library Association, and of the State library officials and associations as well as the enthusiastic support of the people it reaches.

Since initiation of the program in 1956, notable progress in improving rural library services has been made. Much, however, remains to be done on behalf of the millions of Americans who still do not have library services available. For example, according to testimony presented at last year's hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations by Miss Germaine Krettek of the American Library Association, reports from the States show that 25 million Americans in rural areas with 10,000 population or under have no public library service—and another 50 million receive only substandard service. In fact, there are many whole counties without a single public library. The means should be made available, therefore, to help these people continue to grow in knowledge, to open new fields of interest and opportunity to them, and to provide the flow of information essential to an informed and alert citizenry.

Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, has observed: "Millions of people, in effect, get little opportunity through their lives to do much reading beyond their school textbooks, their local newspapers, an occasional magazine, and perhaps the mail-order catalogs. For most people the public library is the chief—and sometimes the only—means of carrying on their education after they leave school." The public library, he said rightly, "is the adjunct of our free public-school system, and as such is vital to the maintenance of the American tradition of independent thought and action." We cannot afford, I believe, to overlook the need to develop a better read, better informed America in an era of international problems, unprecedented scientific and technological progress, and of great challenge and opportunity.

Before the 84th Congress enacted the Library Services Act in 1956, committees of both Houses heard from the testimony of numerous witnesses the consequences of the neglect of the American public library. It was recognized then, as has been observed many times since, that the school represents only one facet of our educational system, and that we must also assure that public libraries, along with our other educational institutions, operate at a better level of service to the community.

The Library Services Act now authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 annually for 5 years through fiscal year 1961. Funds are allotted to the States on the basis of their rural population, and are matched on the basis of each State's per capita income. To remain eligible for a Federal grant, a State must maintain its expenditures for all public library service at least at the same level as in fiscal year 1956. The law further requires that State and local expenditures for rural public library service must not fall below the 1956 level. Funds under the program may be used for salaries, books, and other library materials, equipment, and operating expenses, but not for the erection of buildings or the purchase of land.

Recent figures from the U.S. Office of Education show that 52 States and territories are participating in the rural library services development program. Over 800 rural counties throughout the Nation, with a rural population of over 11 million, have received new or improved library service as a result of the act. Several hundred bookmobiles and other vehicles have been put into operation by State library extension agencies in Kentucky and other States since 1956, in order to serve the people of small communities.

Over $7 million was expended in the first 2 years of the program to buy books and other informational materials. Moreover, State library agency staffs have been strengthened, and more than 130 county and regional library projects have been organized as the result of the program.

It has also been encouraging to see the States showing a renewed and increased willingness to support their libraries since enactment of the Library Services Act. State funds for the extension and improvement of public library service in rural areas have been increased more than 50 percent since 1956. It is clear that the matching requirement has encouraged State and local governments to efforts they might not have made without this assistance.

Those of us who have watched the operation of the Library Services Act in our own States know what good has, and can continue, to come from it. My own State of Kentucky, for example, has benefited greatly. Many of our rural and even remote communities have been given a long-overdue opportunity to find out what a public library, with or without wheels, can mean to them. Indeed, Kentucky can take great pride in the remarkable progress it has made in developing regional library systems with funds made available under the Library Services Act.

Miss Margaret Willis, of the Kentucky Library Extension Division, with whom I have worked closely in supporting increased funds for the program each year, reported last year:

"A full staff is now giving regional library service in all six regions. These staff members are paid with Library Services Act funds. The books, records, and films are being purchased with Library Services Act funds.

"An intensive educational campaign is going on in these regions to let people know what is being done. It will take time and continued development to sell local communities on the value of considerable local support for these regional libraries."

The tradition of the public library as a "university of the people" is deeply rooted in our American heritage. The public library is a significant force in the educational, social, and cultural life of the community. Adequate library resources provide up-to-date information, inspiration, and profitable use of leisure time. The importance of this kind of self-education in a democratic society can never be overemphasized.

I hope this bill will be passed by the Congress.

DANGER FROM COMMUNISM IN THE CARIBBEAN

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and lie at the desk until Thursday of next week so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas intervention by the world Communist movement directly or indirectly in the affairs of any of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere would threaten the sovereignty and political independence of that nation and other such nations; and

Whereas the free and independent nations of the Western Hemisphere have long since ceased to be objects for domination, control or colonization by other powers; and

Whereas the direct or indirect intervention by the world Communist movement, by whatever means such intervention might be disguised, in any American nation, would constitute in effect such domination, control or colonization by a non-American power, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American nation; and

Whereas any such intervention by the world Communist movement in the affairs of any nation situated in the Western Hemisphere would constitute a threat to the peace and safety of the United States and the other nations of that hemisphere; and

Whereas in the rapidly evolving atomic age the threat presented by any such intervention might develop with such rapidity that there would not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) if one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance should be threatened in any manner with domination, control or colonization through the intervention of the world Communist movement, any other such party would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking appropriate steps to forestall such intervention and any domination, control or colonization of any nation of the Western Hemisphere by the world Communist movement.

(b) If any such defensive measures are taken by any defending nation of the Western Hemisphere, such nation should report promptly the action so taken to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, established in the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, may be organized to provide for the provisional administration of

the nation so defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the world Communist movement should gain control of one or more nations in the Caribbean, the United States would be in deadly peril. The area to the south of us may be the Achilles heel of our defenses against the U.S.S.R.

Indeed, the existence of Communist bases in the Western Hemisphere might, as suggested by Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, distinguished Yale University historian, "tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war."

The resolution I have submitted suggests a formula for preventing such a catastrophe.

Its language is based largely on a draft resolution proposed by Professor Bemis in a forceful article in the U.S. News & World Report for December 28, 1959, in which he calls attention to the hazard created by the possibility of Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Way To Stop the Reds in Latin America," by my distinguished constituent, may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAY TO STOP THE REDS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Samuel Flagg Bemis)

Prof. Arnold Toynbee—in a recent, 1958, brilliant study of "The Eve of War, 1939"—has called attention to the fact that in 1940 no power was threatened on more than two fronts, east and west, whilst now, 1959, each of the two surviving power groups—U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—is threatened on three fronts, east, west, and north, "a first-class revolution in international affairs * * * that is not easily grasped or taken into account."

Now suppose the United States should be threatened on all four fronts, including south as well as north, from the Caribbean, as well as the Arctic? Instead of an expansive and friendly ally like Canada stretching for thousands of miles between us and Soviet jet, submarine, and missile bases, with a double line of distant early warning trips, we suddenly become exposed to such bases almost within sight of our southern coastal cities, and right athwart our naval communications from Atlantic to Pacific by the Panama Canal? Would this not tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war?

Since 1934, the first line of our defense has shifted from Panama to Europe and Asia. In this geopolitical framework the strategical paths over the Arctic regions have indeed become of more immediate significance than the Caribbean. It has even been argued by some strategists that, in the atomic age, the Panama Canal is no longer a lifeline for the defense of this country; that we could well afford to have it neutralized under an international authority, so great is the danger that one atomic bomb could neutralize—i.e., paralyze—it by knocking it out.

Scarcely anything, short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt. It would split our present global strategy into a two-ocean strategy and prevent the Panama Canal's being used by the West as a substitute for a blocked Suez Canal, or to relieve the burden on our flagging railway system in case of war.

The Communist conspiracy is on its toes today in Panama trying to dislodge the United States from control of this still-vital American lifeline.

The United States should make it clear to the world that in the Panama Canal Zone it will continue to act as if it were sovereign, as, indeed, it has an explicit treaty right so to do, and to stick beyond any cavil to the military defenses of that waterway.

MORE THAN THE CANAL CAN BE LOST

Much more than the Canal, and all that means to American defense, can be lost. If international communism is allowed to jump the Atlantic and set up a rule in a state of the New World, the way it recently tried to leapfrog over Turkey into Syria and Lebanon, it would mean not only effective neutralization of the hemispheric lifeline in a strategic sense; it would create an active fourth front for the defense of the United States. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

Latin American Communists schooled in Moscow have studied just how to set up their system in the Americas. They tried it once already in Guatemala, while the United States stood by with arms folded around the doctrine of nonintervention, awaiting the uncertain action of a conference of foreign ministers which, thanks only to the counter-revolution of Carlos Armas, never had to meet.

When, finally, the diplomatic doctors did an autopsy on the fallen Arbenz regime in Guatemala, they found the disease of international communism to be far more deep-seated than they had suspected. In fact, it still lingers as a cancer in the body politic of honest liberalism, not only in Guatemala but in all the States of Central America and the Caribbean. It is festering now in Cuba, in Panama, in Venezuela where they spat on Vice President Nixon. The cancer is spreading.

What is there, within the inter-American peace system—pledged as it is to the doctrine of nonintervention—to prevent such a disaster in the New World?

Nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American peace structure, put into place by the good neighbor policy. In numerous treaties since 1933—subject to honorable denunciation by any of the parties on 1 year's and, in some cases, 2 year's notice—the American Republics have declared inadmissible the intervention of any one of them (1933, 1936) or group of them (1948) directly or indirectly or for whatever reason, within the internal affairs of another American State.

There is, however, one outstanding exception to this sweeping pledge: It does not affect existing treaty obligations. For example, it would not affect the existing treaties of the United States with Panama or Nicaragua by which the United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan canal site; it would not affect our treaty with Cuba giving us the naval base at Guantanamo; it would not affect the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, of Rio de Janeiro, of 1947.

The Rio pact—the first regional alliance of the diplomatic revolution which now binds the United States to defensive alliances today with some 46 countries of the globe—provides for joint intervention, if two-thirds of the American States shall agree to assist in meeting an armed attack against an American State—the group acting within the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty also provides, article 6:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation (of the Organization of American States) shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The Rio Pact of 1947 is the same bond which brought inter-American diplomatic intervention to stop local wars between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It is the same bond and principle which animated the meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs last August, in Santiago de Chile, invoked by four Republics, including the United States—that gentle Pan-American huddle which weakly empowered the Inter-American Peace Commission to watch and study military movements in the Caribbean and report to the next (11th) Conference of American States at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960.

This is the same casus foederis (a case within the provisions of a treaty) to which appeal had been made, upon the insistence of Panama, in the case of Guatemala in 1954, for a meeting of foreign ministers of American States to consider the crisis of Guatemala, but did not meet because of Carlos Armas' successful counterrevolution.

Today it is very doubtful whether the Organization of American States, through its Organ of Consultation, could muster the necessary two-thirds majority of the high contracting parties quickly enough to give a mandate, under the terms of the Rio Pact of 1947, for joint intervention to suppress a Latin-American government gone Communist by infiltration of a popular-front government or capture of a liberal revolution, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American continent.

It might be tried, but, if it failed, what then?

UNITED STATES CAN EXERCISE THE INHERENT RIGHT OF SELF-DEFENSE

There remains the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that interposition by any European powers to extend their system to any region of this hemisphere is dangerous to our own peace and safety. There remains the inherent right of self-defense, both individual and collective, even if it is not agreed on by a two-thirds majority of American States.

"We owe it [therefore] to candor," pronounced President Monroe in his famous message of December 2, 1823, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those [European] powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety—we could not consider any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—which would induce measures on the part of the United States "indispensable to their security."

An important corollary to the Monroe Doctrine since its origin—indeed, a vital dictum of the doctrine since 1869—prohibits the transfer of any colony in the New World

from one European sovereign to another—lest such an occurrence upset the balance of power against the security of the United States in this hemisphere.

This no transfer principle has been bound up in the Monroe Doctrine throughout its history. President Grant officially proclaimed it a part of the doctrine in 1869.

A 1940 PRECEDENT FOR ACTION

As Hitler's armies were overrunning Western Europe and threatening to take over French, Dutch, and British colonies in the Western Hemisphere—i.e., Guadalupe, Martinique, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, the Guianas, Aruba, etc.—a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress of June 18, 1940, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implementing the sense of an earlier declaration by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Panama in September 1939, at the beginning of the war, stated:

"(1) That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"(2) That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Shortly thereafter, a special conference of foreign ministers of the same Republics, facing the danger of Nazi conquest of Europe and England, gave a mandate to any one or more American Republics, in case of the imminent danger of transfer of colonial territory in the American Continents from one European sovereign to another, to step in and act quickly to forestall such a transfer. A special convention provided for an inter-American committee to administer the government of the rescued region, pending its restoration to its inhabitants upon the return of peace.

But the Havana mandate of 1940 looks only to the actual transfer of an existing colony in America from one European sovereign to another European sovereign. It does not explicitly envisage the case of a European sovereign in fact, if not in name, extending its Communist system to a Republic of the American system a la Guatemala—and will it be a la Cuba, a la Panama, a la Venezuela?

The Pact of Rio of 1947 does anticipate such a "fact or situation" endangering the peace and security of any Republic of the New World, but it requires a two-thirds vote of the 21 Republics to give a mandate to one or more Republics to act in time to stop the danger.

It would be nice if there could issue from the 11th meeting of American states, to meet at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960, a declaration on the lines of the Act of Havana of 1940, giving a mandate for individual or joint action to prevent the international Communist system of the Old World extending itself to an American state, directly or indirectly, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Republics.

It is not known whether our Department of State is endeavoring to put such a business on the agenda for the Quito Conference. It ought to be a major goal of our Government to secure this kind of declaration. Such a proposal, incidentally, would be a touchstone to reveal the degree of Communist power within the various delegations.

However, it is not likely, in the present condition of inter-American relations, that such a declaration would be accepted by even a bare majority of the states—and the emergency may be upon us even before the meeting at Quito next February. Already the Cuban dictatorship has announced its intention to buy jet planes from inside the Iron Curtain.

The dilemma of our Latin American policy today is whether, on the one hand, to interpret the inter-American doctrine of nonintervention so as to permit a non-American power to extend its revolutionary system to the New World by capturing a republic in the Caribbean or Central America, now within easy bombing range of the United States and of the Panama Canal; or, on the other hand, to prepare some anti-interventionist action within the framework of the inter-American peace structure that would really prevent the intervention of international communism. That is: Inter-American intervention to prevent non-American intervention, one horn of the dilemma; or the other horn of absolute nonintervention to permit the intervention of international communism to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere.

LET SOMETHING BE DONE NOW TO DETER COMMUNIST INROADS

In 1940, the Congress acted promptly in the face of the danger arising from the war in Europe. Let it now pass an analogous resolution, to make it clear to our friends and enemies, all over the globe, that this Government is determined within its inherent right of self-defense, and within the purview of the pristine Monroe Doctrine, and indeed of the Pact of Rio and the inter-American peace structure, not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the peace and security of the United States, and of all the republics of this hemisphere—indeed, the balance of power for freedom against slavery in the entire globe.

Such a resolution against the intervention of international communism—couched in the language of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, and the nonintervention declarations of Washington (1951) and Caracas (1954), and the recent Declaration No. XI of Santiago (1959)—should provide for the administration of the state thus defended or rescued, by the same inter-American authority and machinery set up in the Havana Convention of 1940 for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America threatened by a transfer of sovereignty.

Thus stipulated, there need be no apprehension on the part of our good neighbors that the United States would be reverting to the old system that characterizd the interventions against European imperialist intervention in this hemisphere during the first quarter of our century.

Such a policy would protect the doctrine of nonintervention against the new technique of intervention by international communism, and would do so within the spirit of the inter-American peace and defense treaties. It would not wait for the accomplished fact of a leap of the Communist revolution across the Atlantic to uproot the Monroe Doctrine in the New World, as it has already destroyed the open-door policy in China. By thus assuming the initiative in the New World, we can also defend the global balance of power on which the peace and security of the United States and of our sister republics of America in the world must depend during the coming decade.

WHY WAIT FOR THE BLOWS TO FALL?

It is too much the practice of the United States, in the continuing world crisis of our time, to let the initiative rest with the enemy, to wait for the blows to fall and only then endeavor to improvise some action to fend them off.

Let something be done now, before it is too late, to deter the action. Congress ought, at the beginning of the next session in January, immediately, on the eve of the Quito Conference to pass a joint resolution analogous to that of June 18, 1940, explicitly pointed at the present fact or situation.

If the Quito Conference doesn't back it up, then the United States, acting under the pristine Monroe Doctrine, must do so. The act of faith known as the good neighbor policy, and the freedom of the New World—but, most essentially, the security of the United States and the blessings of liberty invoked in our Constitution—are now at stake.

CEREMONIES IN HONOR OF VETERANS OF WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution in regard to the death of Walter Williams, the last surviving veteran of the War Between the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 212) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Walter Williams, the last surviving veteran of the War Between the States; and

Whereas this unhappy event, which occurred on December 19, 1959, marks the symbolic passing of all those who participated in that conflict; and

Whereas that tragic struggle between the States was relieved only by the great courage and gallantry displayed by both sides; and

Whereas it is fitting that the Senate should, on the occasion of the death of the last survivor of the War Between the States, memorialize the deeds of all those whose glory redounds to the credit of the whole Nation and unifies us in our prideful memories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate, as a mark of respect to the memory of Walter Williams, set apart a day in the near future for the presentation of memorials in honor of all the veterans of the War Between the States and for the holding of such other ceremonies as are deemed appropriate. Such day shall be designated by the President of the Senate after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in order that the accounts of the last days of Walter Williams, last surviving soldier of Civil War, may be permanently recorded in our National Archives, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following newspaper stories and editorials:

From the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, December 20, 1959, a particularly excellent story by Mr. Marshall Andrews, entitled "Rebel Walter Williams, Last Link With Civil War, Is Dead"; and also an article and an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 20 and 21, 1959, entitled "Last Veteran of Civil War Dies at 117," and "Second Century After."

From the Dallas Morning News of December 20, 1959, two stories entitled "End

of an Era, Old Reb Williams Dies," and "Death Finally Unites Billy Yank and Johnny Reb."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Dec. 20, 1959]

REBEL WALTER WILLIAMS, LAST LINK WITH CIVIL WAR, IS DEAD

(By Marshall Andrews)

Furl that banner, for 'tis weary * * *

It is furled now forever, the starred and barred emblem that flashed through the smoke of battle almost a century ago.

For there's not a man to wave it.

The last of that remarkable army which, under its shadow, earned enough glory for a whole nation is gone. The army is disbanded at last.

When Walter W. Williams died Saturday at Houston, Tex., blind, deaf, and bedridden at 117, the last link with the most impressive and most tragic episode in American history was broken. Of the 4 million men who wore the blue and the grey, he had outlived them all.

Walter Williams was no hero. It is not even clear where and how he served. During his last half-dozen years, when his age and the fact of his survival focused attention on him for the first time in his life, he liked to talk more of his prowess as a deer hunter after the war than of his service for the Confederacy.

He was credited in news reports with perhaps having served in Company C, 5th Texas Cavalry, Hood's Brigade. There was a 5th Texas Cavalry—in fact, there were two of them—but neither was brigaded with that raffish band of daredevils known throughout both armies as Hood's Texicans. Neither, for that matter, served in the Army of Northern Virginia at all.

There was a 5th Texas Infantry regiment in Hood's Texicans, but nobody who followed its flags from Seven Pines to Appomatox would have remembered deer hunting in preference to its bloody and glorious adventures. And there was a 5th Infantry in the Texas State forces, which never left Texas and fought no battles to be remembered.

The internal evidence suggests that he was a member of the 5th Texas Partisan Cavalry, which was used principally on guerrilla service.

Perhaps it is unimportant where Walter Williams served and what he did. Time and his own iron constitution made him a symbol of what they all were and what they all did. He was the last Rebel.

He was a symbol of something never seen before or since on this continent. He was a symbol of a kind and a scale of devotion summed up simply enough by Gen. Robert E. Lee as "unsurpassed courage and fortitude."

Walter Williams was the last of those thousands who bore 4 years of war in a cause few of them bothered their heads about, who fought because it was the only thing a man could do, who called themselves Rebels although they did not hold themselves to be in rebellion.

Much has been written over the years to explain the Confederate soldier and none of it has explained him. Perhaps he cannot be explained. He was trained only in battle, he was well led and he was ill led, he was hungry most of the time, he usually had to take care of himself when he was wounded or sick, he clothed and armed himself from the fat stores of the enemy.

("Just following along behind here," said Gen. N. B. Forrest to a party of recruits who complained that they were unarmed. "We're going to have a fight with them fellows over there and we'll git you some guns.")

He was tall, lean, and unbelievably hairy; he was clean shaven, blond, and dashing. He was as cultured as any man of his generation and he was so illiterate he had to sign with his mark.

He could write from his deathbed: "I am very weak, but I write to you because I know you would be delighted to read a word from your dying son. * * * My grave will be marked so that you may visit it if you desire to do so."

And he could scrawl to a friend even less literate than himself: "I had not a like to a maid out half of yourre words theare is some that I hant maid out yet."

He was profane and the seat of all vices compounded; and his time out of battle could be a long series of prayer meetings. He was impatient of discipline, but he was terrible in battle. Despite his devotion to his nebulous cause, he could not understand why he should not go home to put in a crop when no fighting was imminent—and he often did just that, to the inevitable disorganization of the army.

But with all his faults and all his contradictions he could fight. There was never another soldier quite like him. He could march himself out of his shirt and his shoes, live for weeks on a diet of parched corn, and then go into battle and fight like two of anybody else.

(His diet was so bad that he was afflicted with wholesale night blindness, and he often marched up to battle through the darkness holding onto the belt of the man in front.)

He was devoted to his leaders when they led him well and died for them with blind and futile courage when they led him badly. As to his leaders, he was unfortunate in that he lost so many of the best of them in battle. The toll of company officers was high as always, but the remarkable thing was the price he paid in brigade, division, and corps commanders.

In the Army of Northern Virginia alone, this toll was beyond all reason. Stonewall Jackson and Jeb Stuart both were killed in battle.

James Longstreet was lost to the army in the hour of its utmost travail, terribly wounded in the Wilderness. And before it moved from Petersburg to apotheosis at Appomattox the blood-red battle shirt of A. P. Hill would flame no more along its front.

With his long legs and his rifle, the Confederate soldier gained victories which numbers and circumstances made most improbable, and he took his victories with a fierce pride which led him on to others. He could be defeated, too, and with all his disheartening disadvantages of poor food, wornout clothing, and hand-me-down weapons, he could rebound from defeat as if he had never heard the word.

On their way south from Gen. John B. Hood's annihilating defeat at Nashville, his barefoot troops, marching through the ice of a bitter December composed a lugubrious parody of the popular "Yellow Rose of Texas":

"And now I'm going southward.
For my heart is full of woe,
I'm going back to Georgia
To find my Uncle Joe.
You may sing about your dearest maid.
And sing of Rosalie,
But the gallant Hood of Texas
Played hell in Tennessee."

There was something about him that set him apart from all other soldiers of all armies. He went into battle with a shrill, unearthly yell which became his trademark. He could bring an immense amount of fire to bear with his muzzle-loading musket. His charges were pressed home with a vigor and ferocity which carried him time after time to incredible victories and cost him grievously in victory or defeat. But his drill was execrable and his line of battle would have made the professional soldier of any European army shudder.

(There is evidence of this independence in battle. Col. Walter H. Taylor wrote: "I was wonderfully impressed by the southern soldier and his independent action in battle as contrasted with the mechanical movement of the machine soldier. First one man went forward, then another, then at intervals two or three; then there would be a wavering and falling back when the fire became hot; then there would be a repetition of this; one or two at a time encouraged the others, then small parties advanced, the officers waved their swords and called the men forward and then with a yell the whole line would rush rapidly forward without precision or order, but irresistibly, sweeping everything before them.")

There is nobody living now who remembers the Confederate soldier as he was in his war years. But there are a great many middle-aged men who sat at his knee as little boys and heard from his bearded lips how it was in the great old days. There are many who saw him at his annual reunions in the hot and somnolent southern towns, ancient and feeble, but wearing his gray uniform and brandishing his stick with an air that brought Chancellorsville back again and relegated Appomattox to the limbo where it belonged.

He is gone at last. And perhaps his epitaph was spoken by one of his own, who stood in the last battle line of the Army of Northern Virginia so badly wounded that he could use neither of his arms. His brigade commander rode by, saw him standing there and said:

"What are you doing here? You can't even hold a gun."

"No, sir," the man replied, "but I can still yell."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Dec. 20, 1959]

LAST VETERAN OF CIVIL WAR DIES AT 117—WILLIAMS "PASSES OVER THE RIVER TO REST IN SHADE"

HOUSTON, December 19.—Walter W. Williams, honored as the last surviving veteran of the Civil War, died quietly in the arms of two relatives today.

He simply stopped breathing, worn out after a fourth attack of pneumonia since June.

Death came to the old Confederate—he gave his age as 117—at 4:20 p.m. in the arms of a son-in-law, Ed Bielamowicz, and a grandson, Sydney Boyd.

The President, the Army, and Congress cited him, and historical societies recognized him as the last of the 4 million who fought for the Blue or the Gray.

Williams never fired a shot against the Yankees, although he heard a few, he recalled, when Union troops fired on him one day while he ate breakfast.

Williams was a forager for Gen. John B. Hood's Texas Brigade and later served with Quantrill's raiders.

Texas Governor Price Daniel, using one of Stonewall Jackson's last phrases, said, "Gen. Williams has 'passed over the river to rest in the shade of the trees' with the hundreds of thousands of soldiers in blue and gray who went before him."

Representatives of President Eisenhower, Texas, and a score of other States, both Northern and Southern, are to attend funeral services.

The body will lie in state 48 hours at the Harris County Civil Courts Building. The casket will be draped with the scarlet, blue and white Confederate battle flag which Williams followed. The flag he fought against—the Stars and Stripes—will hang at halfstaff.

Williams first laid official claim to service with the Confederate gray when he applied for a State Civil War pension in 1932. Texas authorities investigated his application and determined that his claim to service was authentic. They granted him a pension.

One newspaperman, Lowell K. Bridwell of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, investigated the records and questioned that Williams served in the Civil War.

But Daniel, Congressmen and descendants of Civil War veterans rallied to support Williams' claims.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 21, 1959]

SECOND CENTURY AFTER

Those who like to see the epochs of history well rounded out had hoped that Walter W. Williams, the last surviving veteran of the Civil War, might live to complete the full century since Fort Sumter. Death has finally cut him down at the fabulous age of 117 about 15 months short of that goal. In some respects, however, his passing "over the river to rest in the shade of the trees" is even more significant than the centennial will be. For the Civil War has now quite definitely passed from the realm of the living to that of history.

Some question has been raised as to whether Mr. Williams ever wore the gray of the Confederacy. His only claim to have participated in the great American tragedy was that he served in Gen. John B. Hood's Texas Brigade as a forager—that he helped to secure food for the fighting forces. Even this modest assertion has been disputed, but the Government recognized him as a Confederate veteran. In any event, the men in gray are now only a memory. The last of the Boys in Blue, Albert Woolson, was buried in Duluth, Minn., more than 3 years ago.

With them have gone most of the passion and fanaticism that for 4 years drained the Nation's blood. Americans of both the North and South now realize that the separation which came so close to being effected would have been a lasting calamity. Now that a century has healed the wounds of war descendants of the Men in Gray can thank God that their ancestors did not prevail. Yet many of the social and economic problems that grew out of the war are still with us, and in many instances there is still a tendency to view them from the traditionally hostile viewpoints of the North and the South.

Here is the challenge that will pass over into the second post-Civil War century. Now that all the participants on both sides are sharing the equality and peace of the grave, it is time to wipe out the lingering vestiges of passion and prejudice that are rooted in the agony of 1861–65. We are one Nation in honoring the men of both sides who fought and died for what they believed to be right. We need also to have greater unity in finishing the work which they began. It should not take another century to bury the last of the regional antagonisms and prejudices in a common grave with the Blue and the Gray.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 20, 1959]

END OF AN ERA—OLD REB WILLIAMS DIES

HOUSTON, TEX.—Walter (Old Reb) Williams, honored as the last surviving veteran of the Civil War, died quietly in the arms of two relatives Saturday.

He simply stopped breathing, worn out after a fourth attack of pneumonia since June.

Death came to the old Confederate—he gave his age as 117—at 3:20 p.m. in the arms of a son-in-law, Ed Bielamowicz, and a grandson, Sydney Boyd.

"He just quit breathing," said Bielamowicz. "He had done that before, and we would just lift him up and he'd catch his breath and start breathing again.

"But this time he didn't start breathing again. There was no struggle, no sound, nothing. He just went to sleep."

Dr. Russell Wolfe, his personal physician, visited the old soldier 30 minutes before his death. Although Williams had been ill with pneumonia, the physician said he had recovered from this ailment.

"He said he died from the natural complications of old age," Dr. Wolfe said.

RELATIVES PRESENT

Other relatives present were Mrs. Willie Mae Bowles, at whose home Williams died, and two other daughters—Mrs. Beatrice Bielamowicz and Mrs. Lola Kintz, both also of Houston.

The family decided to hold funeral services Wednesday, in Franklin, Tex., 128 miles northwest of Houston. Williams formerly made his home there. The body will lie in state here Monday and Tuesday.

Prior to the Franklin rites, a service will be conducted at the South Main Baptist Church here at 11 a.m. Wednesday by Dr. E. H. Westmoreland, the pastor. State and military police will then escort the cortege to Franklin.

CITED BY ARMY

Although some persons later questioned whether Williams served in the War Between the States, the President, the Army, and Congress cited him, and historical societies recognized him as the last of the 4 million who fought for the Blue or the Gray.

Williams never fired a shot against the Yankees, although he heard a few, he recalled, when Union troops fired on him one day while he ate breakfast.

Williams was a forager for Hood's Texas Brigade and later served with Quantrill's Raiders.

"What do you mean, 'What is a forager'?" he once replied to a newspaperman.

"I stole food; that's what."

Toward the end he grew blind and deaf and apparently unconscious of happenings around him.

He approached death without struggle. Commenting once on the passing of a Civil War veteran, he said:

"That's one road we are all going to have to travel."

His final illness began December 5 and he grew progressively worse. It was his fourth attack of pneumonia this year, and his doctor said there were complications. He suffered chills and fever.

Texas' Gov. Price Daniel, using one of Stonewall Jackson's last phrases, said, "General Williams has 'passed over the river to rest in the shade of the trees' with the hundreds of thousands of soldiers in blue and gray who went before him."

He served with Gen. John B. Hood's brigade, originally recruited in south central Texas but soon containing troops from many States, for about 5 months. Subsequently, his pension application stated, he spent about 6 months with Quantrill's Raiders before the war ended.

Williams first laid official claim to service with the Confederate gray when he applied for a State Civil War pension in 1932. Texas authorities investigated his application and determined that his claim to service was authentic.

SERVICE CLAIM

At that time he would have been in his late eighties, and a few variations between the facts he gave then and his later stories could be laid to his elderly state.

One newspaperman, Lowell K. Bridwell of the Scripps-Howard group, investigated the records and questioned that Williams served in the Civil War.

By the time the questions arose, the frail, silver-haired Williams lay gravely ill and never appeared strong enough to offer a rebuttal.

But Texas' Governor Daniel, Congressmen, and descendants of Civil War veterans rallied to support Williams' claims. Original records bearing on his service were lost or destroyed when the South crumbled.

Williams was born in Itawamba County, Miss. His later stories placed the date as November 14, 1842.

He joined the Confederate Army in the fading hours of the South's battle. He was 22 at the time.

His pension application stated he joined the army at Blue Mountain, Tenn., a place name that cannot be identified today.

Williams received the title of last survivor with the death of John Salling, of Slant, Va., March 19, 1959, in Kingsport, Tenn. Salling also wore the Gray.

The last Union soldier, Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., died in 1956.

Williams moved to Texas about September 15, 1870, and established a market in Calvert.

SETTLED IN TEXAS

Later he settled on a 20-acre farm at Franklin in south central Texas and traded cattle.

His first wife died a few years after they came to Texas. They had seven children.

Williams then married Miss Ella Mae Holliday, of Franklin, and they became parents of 12 children. He had more than 200 descendants.

His second wife was 31 years his junior. When they both became ill, they moved to the home of Mrs. Willie Mae Bowles, a daughter, in Houston. He died at her home.

Survivors include 5 daughters: Mrs. Bowles, Mrs. Bielamowicz, Mrs. Kintz, and Mrs. Elizabeth Booth, all of Houston, and Mrs. Carrie James, San Antonio; 5 sons: Bud Williams, Macy, Texas; Jack and Eugene Williams, Franklin; Henry, and B. W. Williams, both of Houston; 40 grandchildren; 86 great grandchildren, and more than 100 great great grandchildren.

The second Mrs. Williams died November 2, 1957, after they had been married 64 years.

His deterioration became very evident in November 1958 when he canceled a planned ride in the Veterans Day parade, annual joy to him. But he rallied this year and rode in the Armed Forces Day parade.

"The parade didn't hurt him and it didn't help him," his daughter, Mrs. Bowles, said.

A little later, he suffered a serious bout with pneumonia. Recovering, he underwent a relapse that sapped his little remaining strength. Then he suffered his third and fourth attacks.

In his first attack this fall, doctors despaired of his life. Mrs. Bowles fed him egg, milk, and water with an eyedropper. But still the rugged oldster clung to a thread of life and rallied time after time.

He received $300 a month from the Texas Confederate pension and a special $135.45 pension from the Federal Government.

Williams was a jolly fellow who liked to hunt fox and deer.

His favorite music was hillbilly and western, and as his deafness increased, so did the volume on his record player beside his bed until it resounded through the neighborhood.

But he was spry until near the end and he suffered few illnesses until he was well over 100 by his own calculation of his age.

PLANE RIDER

At 110, doctors pronounced his heart and blood pressure normal. Occasion for the medical test was his first plane ride.

"I'd ride all day if they'd feed me," he said after the flight.

Some of his statements on how to live long:

"I get up for breakfast, turn around for dinner and go to bed after supper and fox hunt for exercise."

"If more of you would get along with your wives better, you'd live a lot longer."

He liked a nip of whisky. "Makes a person eat hearty. But you don't want to be drinking it all during the day."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 20, 1959]

DEATH FINALLY UNITES BILLY YANK AND JOHNNY REB

(By Robert D. Price)

NEW YORK.—When the Nation observes the centennial of the Civil War, there will be no man alive who truly can say, "I was there."

Walter Williams, last surviving soldier of the Confederacy, died Saturday in Houston. The last Union veteran, Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., died in August 1956; his distinction is commemorated in granite on the battlefield of Gettysburg.

They were the last survivors, for their respective armies, of 4 million men who served for blue or gray. They were the last living links with an era which has been characterized by historians as our supreme national experience. It was an era which has won a place unique in the American heritage. There are many reasons why this has become so, and fact is intermingled with fancy in today's conception of the conflict, but the basic reason must be the deeds and character of the soldiers.

There were only relative trifles of difference between the men of North and South. Both were Americans, they shared the same national traditions, they fought and bled with equal valor. To say that the Civil War was fought by brothers is not idle whimsy.

The great difference was wrought by Appomattox. It is the difference between victory and defeat.

The Union soldier went home to the sound of brass bands and the laurels of the victor. He received a cash bonus—the average was $250—when he was mustered out of service. He speedily gained a powerful spokesman in high places—the Grand Army of the Republic—to argue on his behalf for pensions and for jobs.

The Confederate went home—if he had a home left—as a straggler, afoot and hungry and tattered. He had no government to which to turn for aid. He had no hope of bonus or pension. He was completely and forlornly on his own.

The GAR, founded in the first postwar year, wielded an influence beyond its true power. There was a saying at one time that "the GAR saved the country, now they want it." One of the organization's own historians, Franklin D. Tappan, credited it with "the actual balance of the national political power" for nearly 50 years, even though it never counted more than 32 percent of the Union veterans in its membership.

The symbol of the Confederate soldier, the United Confederate Veterans, was much slower in coming into being. The homecoming southerner's first task was to scratch for a living. The trials of Reconstruction gave him other things to think about. A few State societies sprang up in the passing years but no move was made for a united organization until 1889, when it was discussed at a dinner in New Orleans on Stonewall Jackson's birthday. The first reunion was held in 1890.

The UCV never had any pretensions of political power. It was dedicated to relief work among needy veterans, gathering and preserving the records of the war, cherishing comradeship. It kept an eye on school textbooks and fathered the movement to call the conflict "the War Between the States"—that was about as far as the UCV went in affairs political.

In the relations between the two veterans' organizations, a curious mixture of comradeship and chip-on-the-shoulder feelings developed. On Memorial Day in 1869, U.S. troops guarded Confederate graves in Arlington to make sure that southerners would not decorate them; on the same day, other Union soldiers helped to decorate Confederate graves at Alexandria, Va., a few miles away. A legless Union veteran addressed a UCV reunion at Richmond in 1896 and was "wildly cheered," as the chronicles said, and the GAR supplied an escort for the UCV parade at Washington in 1917.

But, through those same years, several proposals for joint meetings fell down because the southerners wouldn't abide by the restrictions which the GAR sought to impose upon them. As late as 1938, plans for the last North-South reunion at Gettysburg, on the 75th anniversary of the battle, were snagged for a time because a GAR faction refused to let the southerners unfurl their old flags on the field.

All that is history. They fought each other in war and differed with each other in peace, but Billy Yank and Johnny Reb have at last and inevitably become united, in death.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in connection with these stories I desire at this time to express my appreciation of and commendation for the excellent writing by Mr. Marshall Andrews of the Washington Post and Times Herald in his story of Sunday, December 20, in regard to the passing of the last veteran of the War Between the States. Since I have had, I will say modestly, a little military service and since I have read some volumes in regard to combat activity, I think this is one of the finest descriptions of the combat soldier I have ever seen printed in such a short space in any publication. It is a very fine article.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be added as additional cosponsors of S. 2587, a bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government, the names of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress hearings were held jointly by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency on Senate Joint Resolution 116, Senate Joint Resolution 133, and S. 2562, all of which are designed to curb the printing and distribution of pornographic material. A brief hearing on this subject was held in California in November when the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency was there investigating this and other aspects of the problems within its jurisdiction.

It is the hope of the two subcommittees to conclude their hearings on the two joint resolutions and the bill under consideration on Thursday, January 14, 1960, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 457, Old Senate Office Building. If there are witnesses who desire to testify on these proposed amendments or the proposed bill, they may contact Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., counsel, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Room 252, Old Senate Office Building, Capitol 4-3121, extension 5581, or Mr. Arthur Bernstone, counsel, Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Room 241, Old Senate Office Building, Capitol 4-3121, extension 2434.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by Senator KUCHEL before 46th national convention of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at Washington, D.C., on May 14, 1959.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address entitled "Why I Am a Democrat," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, before Bethany College, West Virginia, on December 17, 1959.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Telegram from President Eisenhower to Miss Frances Fuller, director, American Academy of Dramatic Arts, relative to observance of 75th anniversary of the American Academy of Dramatic Arts.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "Staffing Freedom, an Appeal by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK," from the Atlantic Monthly for November 1959.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Artificial Barrier," dealing with tolls on the interstate bridge across the Columbia River on U.S. Highway 99, published in the Oregonian of December 22, 1959.

EDITORS SPURRED STATE TO DAIRYLAND FAME

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as Congress gets underway, we find that we still face perplexing problems in agriculture.

Unfortunately, the farmers and farm organizations have not been able to reach common agreement for a solution. Congress, too, has not been successful in providing all the answers.

Neither has the play of economic forces—except for some commodities—led the way toward a supply-demand balance.

Since this is an election year, the tendency among members of the major political parties, particularly candidates for office, will be to blame the other fellow for the dilemma. Unfortunately, this blame-laying has not as yet been accompanied by recommendations which would provide a final overall solution of the agricultural question.

We recall, of course, that Congress over the years has enacted legislation

to shore up the farm economy. Realistically speaking, economic problems cannot be resolved by legislation. Nevertheless, it has been necessary not only to the farm economy but to the whole country, to guard against a recession in agriculture—historically the birthplace of depressions.

Fortunately, the history of U.S. farming, the greatest food-producing plant in the world, contains impressive records of how individuals and other privately sponsored endeavors have made a constructive contribution to our progress.

Today I should like to pay tribute to one such effort which has become an institution in Wisconsin, that is, the publication entitled "Hoard's Dairyman." On January 23, 1960, this outstanding farm paper will celebrate its 75th anniversary. Called the bible of the American dairy farmer, Hoard's Dairyman has chronicled, and made a great contribution to spurring progress in farming in America, particularly in Wisconsin, during its 75-year lifetime.

Among other things, Hoard's Dairyman, as a strong, influential voice in agriculture, has encouraged and stimulated Wisconsin's transition from a great wheat producing State during the Civil War to the adoption of dairying—elevating the Badger State to the No. 1 milk producer in the Nation.

Recently the Milwaukee Journal carried a splendid article by Lewis C. French reviewing the outstanding way in which Hoard's Dairyman has contributed to the progress of dairying in Wisconsin and throughout the country.

Symbolic of the kind of independent pioneering spirit which has made the United States a great country, this spirit—and I have great faith in it—may ultimately provide the answers for our problems in agriculture.

Believing the article reflects the kind of action of which we need more today, I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR SPURRED STATE TO DAIRYLAND FAME—HOARD'S NEWSPAPER GREW INTO THRIVING CRUSADING MAGAZINE NOW 75 YEARS OLD

(By Lewis C. French)

FORT ATKINSON, WIS.—Hoard's Dairyman, the bible of American dairymen, will be 75 years old January 23.

The swift changes in agriculture, especially the rising tide of dairying in Wisconsin, are recorded from the first issue, a four-page folder. A printer's devil was able to carry that entire issue to the post office under one arm. Now the plant's modern presses roll out 330,000 copies twice a month.

HISTORY IS RECORDED

The pages of the publication record the transformation of Wisconsin from a bankrupt grain State to the Nation's richest dairyland. They chronicle the struggles and triumphs as the Middle West became the Nation's milk jug and began reaching for national and export markets. They show the transition from making cheese and butter in farm kitchens to modern commercial plants. They contain articles on a series of turbulent campaigns to root out diseases that threatened both livestock and humans.

In 75 years, Hoard's Dairyman has had only three editors. Each became a national leader on issues and campaigns that have jolted the dairy world.

William Dempster Hoard, Jr., the general manager, presides over the Hoard family publications. The other is the Jefferson County Union, once a famous weekly and now a bustling daily, which was the genesis of Hoard's Dairyman.

"I WAS SCARED"

The dairy paper has passed from father to son to grandson. William Dempster Hoard, the founder, made Wisconsin supreme in dairying more than any other man.

"You know, I was scared sitting at grandfather's desk when my time came to take the reins," Bill Hoard said recently. "His deeds and accomplishments flashed through my mind. I wondered if I could measure up to the standards of the past."

To understand what Bill Hoard meant one must go back to the pioneering days.

A tall, gangling farm youth of about 14 leaned over the split rail fence on Waterman Simon's farm in Madison County, N.Y., to admire a herd of 50 dairy cows. The boy's father was a circuit riding preacher who earned $400 a year. His grandfather was a God-fearing blacksmith who carried the blood of famous Englishmen. His mother was the best read woman in the county and could tell the best stories.

HE WAS BORN IN 1836

The boy was William Dempster Hoard, who was born in Stockbridge, N.Y., October 10, 1836.

Young Hoard went to work on the Simon farm. He cared for the dairy cattle, learned the art of making butter and cheese.

There was the influence that later changed the agriculture of Wisconsin.

Coming west in 1857 as a young man, Hoard found Chicago a quagmire, Milwaukee a bustling town and made Watertown his first stop. Hoard split rails. He became a singing instructor. He sold pumps for a Waupun factory. He peddled nursey stock.

Acquiring land, the ambitious Hoard jumped into hop raising in the pioneer boom and went broke when the price dropped from 50 cents to 3 cents a pound. It took 20 years before he paid off his debts, right to the last red cent.

CAPITAL WAS $3.50

There were other jobs before Hoard, with $3.50 in capital, a sick wife and three ailing babies, started a weekly newspaper.

He never had set a stick of type in his life. He knew little of advertising or of writing at the time, although he was learned from reading the best books and associating with educated people.

Eventually, Hoard settled his Jefferson County Union in Fort Atkinson, a village of 2,000. At that time the community contained many German Lutherans, a fact that later became important in Hoard's political life. His early weekly was printed half in English and half in German.

In each edition there were three columns or more about dairying. Hoard became known as the cow editor, first in derision in the political campaigns, later in top level national respect.

INSECTS RAVAGED FIELDS

E. D. Coe, who was doing right well publishing the Whitewater Register, saw the interest in the dairy columns and urged Hoard to start a dairy publication.

Under the influence of the Civil War, Wisconsin was a great wheat State. After the war, clouds of insects ravaged the wheatfields.

The settlers were helpless. They had grown wheat so long on the same land that the soil was tired and easily eroded.

Between the two, Wisconsin agriculture was hanging on the ropes. Settlers began moving west to new lands.

Hoard wrote that the story of the decline in Wisconsin farming was warned of by Abraham: "Wheat robs the soil and cattle drop fatness."

HE WAS BOOSTER

The value of using cattle to heal the soil's wounds caused by grain cropping, a technique Hoard learned back in Madison County, N.Y., was applied. Milk replaced wheat in Wisconsin, but it was an uphill struggle.

The doughty editor never stopped boosting the dairy cow and her products. The chinch bug panic gradually was forgotten; green pastures healed the scars.

If there was one thing that W. D. Hoard kept in the forefront of his writing and speechmaking it was a statement that still is the keynote of Hoard's Dairyman:

"The cow is the foster mother of the human race. From the day of the ancient Hindu to this time, the thought of men turned to the kindly and beneficent creatures as one of the chief sustaining forces of human life."

FARMERS PAID ATTENTION

Farmers began to pay attention. They brought in eastern and imported dairy cattle to replace the dual purpose cattle of the pioneers. Wisconsin began to produce more butter and cheese than it could consume, to reach out for new markets.

The crusading cow editor soon attracted attention.

He was shoved into being a candidate for Governor after dabbling in local political affairs and won in 1888. In his administration the first laws were passed to make honest men out of milk processors, to prohibit the substitution of vegetable oils for butter fat and adulteration. Then a dairy and food commission was established to protect consumers.

SCHOOL ISSUE BEATS HIM

But Hoard got tripped up on a school issue. German settlers led by arrogant Prussians seemed determined to make Wisconsin a duchy of the fatherland. The legislature passed and Governor Hoard backed the Bennett law, which did two things. It required youths 7 to 14 years old to attend school and be taught English at least 12 weeks a year.

Those in favor of parochial schools were enraged. The count showed there were 129 schools where no effort was being made to teach English.

Hoard was defeated on the school issue by George W. Peck of Milwaukee. Hoard died in 1918.

Dairy leaders still agree no one man did more to build dairying than the cow editor of Fort Atkinson. His portrait hangs in the Saddle and Sirloin Club at Chicago—the highest honor in American agriculture. More recently, popular subscription put a bronze statue of W. D. Hoard on the University of Wisconsin campus.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR RUFUS C. HOLMAN, OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to note here today the death of the Honorable Rufus C. Holman, of Portland, Oreg., who served with distinction in the U.S. Senate from 1939 until 1945.

Senator Holman was born in Oregon on October 14, 1877. He died on November 27, 1959, while spending the Thanksgiving weekend with members of his family. He was an illustrious native son of Oregon, and the people of the State have mourned his passing.

On December 2, 1959, funeral services were held in memory of Senator Holman at the Riverview Cemetery Chapel near

Portland. Mrs. Neuberger and I attended the services which were conducted with eloquence and simplicity by the Right Reverend Benjamin D. Dagwell, of the Episcopal Church, retired Episcopal bishop of the Pacific Northwest. Bishop Dagwell spoke movingly of Senator Holman's many great services to his State and Nation, of the Senator's love for the majestic outdoors of Oregon, and of his devotion to his family and friends.

STATE HONORS FORMER SENATOR

John Carpenter, of the staff of KOIN-TV, was the soloist at the Holman funeral and Goldie Pos was the organist. Pallbearers were the eminent nephews of Senator Holman, Dr. Charles N. Holman, of the University of Oregon Medical School; Circuit Judge Ralph Holman, of Clackamas County; Herbert Malarkey; Thomas W. Holman; Harold Burkitt, Jr.; Charles Pumphrey; and Donald Holman.

Concluding services were conducted by the Willamette Lodge of the Masonic Order, with which Senator Holman was long affiliated. The Reverend W. Sherman Burgoyne, retired minister of the Methodist Church, read these impressive and solemn rites. Senator Holman's last resting place is in the Riverview Cemetery, overlooking the Willamette Valley and Mount Hood of eternal snows, in his beloved Oregon.

Not long before his death, Senator Holman was honored by the Military Department of the State of Oregon, which presented to him its Oregon Distinguished Service Medal. The late Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Rilea awarded the citation, and this citation was read by Bishop Dagwell as a part of the funeral oration on December 2. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the citation appear in full in the RECORD at this point in tribute to former Senator Rufus C. Holman.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
MILITARY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Salem, Oreg.

By direction of the Governor of the State of Oregon, and pursuant to action of the decorations board, announcement is made of the award of the Oregon Distinguished Service Medal to Senator Rufus C. Holman.

Senator Rufus C. Holman, of the State of Oregon, has performed exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in peace and in war as a member of county, State, and National bodies of the Government of the United States over a long period of years.

Senator Holman began his long career of public service as a member of the Board of County Commissioners of Multnomah County in 1912. In 1921 he returned to private enterprise where he continued tirelessly to work behind the scenes in the development of our State government. Above and beyond this, Senator Holman, at that time, realized the necessity for a strong defense.

As State treasurer of Oregon from 1932 to 1939 the thought was constantly in his mind of building up the Oregon National Guard and the national defense.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate from 1939 to 1945 and acting in important assignments of Committee on Appropriations and concurrently with service on the Military Affairs Committee, his voice was heard unceasingly and unfalteringly in demanding more adequate appropriations and promoting the necessity of the advancement of preparedness for the eventuality that he so clearly visualized. Notwithstanding the fact Senator Holman was a member of the minority party, his outstanding ability indicated and dictated his assignment to these important committees which meant so much, not only to the National Guard, but the Military Establishment of the United States in its entirety.

As a result of his outstanding leadership and contribution to community, State, and Nation, the Oregon Distinguished Service Medal is awarded to Senator Rufus C. Holman.

By order of the commander in chief:

THOMAS E. RILEA,
Major General, the Adjutant General.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, former Senator Holman had many devoted friends among his colleagues in the U.S. Senate, and some of them still serve here. They will want to know that the Senator's gracious widow, Mrs. Norma Holman, still lives in Portland in a lovely home among the wooded hills of Portland Heights. Senator Rufus C. Holman dearly loved his native State. This is why he returned to Oregon after his defeat for renomination in the 1944 primaries, rather than choosing to stay as a resident of Washington, D.C., which so many ex-Senators frequently decide to do.

My State and Nation are the richer for the outstanding career of Senator Rufus C. Holman. They are the poorer for his passing. Senator Holman was our friend and neighbor in Portland, and we often walked over to their home to spend a few moments over teacups before a roaring hearth fire.

Senator Holman was a vigorous supporter of efforts to develop fully the vast power potential of the waterways of the Pacific Northwest, a cause which has meant much in terms of economic betterment, not only to the entire West, but also to the Nation.

I salute his memory in these brief remarks in the Senate Chamber where he spent so many happy and fruitful hours. Although he and I were members of different political parties, there was a warm personal friendship between us. I shall forever be grateful for the courage and rectitude which impelled him to cross party lines in 1954 and to endorse me for election to the Senate. I trust that I shall always prove worthy of this bipartisan support which I received from an illustrious native son and public servant of Oregon and of the United States, the late Senator Rufus C. Holman.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks the distinguished Senator from Oregon has made about the late Senator Rufus C. Holman. I had the privilege of serving with the late Senator from Oregon. I have never known a more earnest man in his desire to serve the people of his State and his country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the eminent Senator from Georgia, particularly because I know that, in his service in the Senate, Senator Holman took the greatest pride in his membership on what was then known as the Military Affairs Committee, where he was associated with his colleague, the able senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], has just made a very fine statement concerning the Honorable Rufus C. Holman, former Senator from Oregon, who died a short time ago.

It is a sad loss to our State that a dedicated public official, Rufus C. Holman, has passed away. He was my opponent in 1944. After a vigorous but fair campaign, I was elected. To demonstrate the fine character and the fair sportsmanship of this man, I should like to have the RECORD show that upon my arriving in Washington, he called at my office, and we had a long and very friendly discussion which started a very warm friendship that lasted over the years, up to the very time of his death. In fact, Senator Holman and I corresponded with great frequency during those years.

In 1956, he was confined in a Portland hospital for a short period of time, and on a visit to him at the hospital, he informed me that he had, prior to my coming, advised the press that although he was a Republican he was endorsing me for reelection as a Democrat in 1956.

He was helped time and time again by his very gracious and able wife, the former Mrs. Lundeen.

As I have said to the people of my State, I say to the Senate today, Oregon has lost a fine citizen, whose most notable contribution in public affairs, in my opinion, was in the field of natural resources. The fact that we saw eye to eye on that great issue was the reason he gave for endorsing me in 1956.

Rufus Holman, during his years of service at the State level, in his capacity as treasurer of the State of Oregon, was one of the men we could always count upon in the great battles for the development of the water resources of the West for the benefit of the people, rather than for the selfish profit dollars of the private utilities.

In behalf of Mrs. Morse and myself, I wish to say that we regret very much the passing of this truly outstanding Oregonian.

MRS. TALMADGE, BUSINESSWOMAN OF 1959

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Members of this body are well familiar with the distinguished record of my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] in the field of public service.

But some may not be aware that his beautiful and charming wife, Betty, not only is a helpmate and political adviser to her husband but has established a highly successful career in her own right in the field of business and commerce.

Mrs. Talmadge is the operator of a growing business in the production and marketing of an exceedingly delectable brand of cured ham which has achieved a national—and even international—reputation under the trademark of "Talmadge Hams."

This is no sideline or hobby for Mrs. Talmadge. It is a vigorous and growing business in a highly competitive field. To those who have feasted on Betty Talmadge's ham, nothing need be said about the culinary perfection of her product.

Mrs. Talmadge directs her highly successful business with all the charm and grace of the lovely southern lady that she is. Nor has she permitted her activities in the world of business to interfere in any way with her duties as the wife of a very busy man and her responsibilities as the mother of two active young boys. Furthermore, she has always found time in her busy life to take an active interest in civic and community affairs, thus marking her as a useful and valuable citizen.

Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to state that Mrs. Talmadge has just been selected as woman of the year in business in Atlanta, Georgia's capital city. A more logical choice for such well deserved recognition and honor could not have been found than the wife of our friend and colleague.

In announcing its choice for the honor, the selection committee had this to say about Betty Talmadge:

Mrs. Talmadge is more than a successful businesswoman. The mother of two children, she long has been prominent in local and State politics. She is both brilliant and charming. She is unusually able as a woman in business, yet also has those qualities of grace, humor, family dedication, and feminine charm that make her truly a woman of the year in the finest meaning of that honor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD two newspaper accounts of Mrs. Talmadge's selection as Atlanta's woman of the year in business. The first is from the Atlanta Constitution of January 6 and the second is from the Atlanta Journal of January 5.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Jan. 6, 1960]

MRS. TALMADGE NAMED BUSINESSWOMAN OF 1959

(By Marjory Rutherford)

Mrs. Herman (Betty) Talmadge, busy wife of a U.S. Senator and former first lady of Georgia, is Atlanta's 1959 woman of the year in business.

The pretty young blond mother of two sons, whose thriving ham business at the Talmadges' farm home near Lovejoy has brought her fortune and international fame, will be honored with women in four other fields at annual woman of the year recognition dinner at the Piedmont Driving Club January 26.

A committee headed by James P. Furniss pointed out that Mrs. Talmadge is a "successful entrepreneur * * * with keen business sense."

Betty Talmadge, who married at 18, admittedly "didn't know a debit from a credit" when she began her unusual business venture.

In 1952 she bought 200 hams on credit from a local packinghouse. She put her husband and others on their 2,600-acre farm to work rubbing a special curing formula into the hams.

Today she employs 23 workers and reports annual ham sales nearing the 100,000 mark. Products of the Lovejoy farm go to 24 States and several foreign countries. (Mrs. Talmadge is especially proud of those sold in the gourmet capital of Paris, France; she herself approached a source there "when I went over with HERMAN last summer.")

When Congress is in session, Betty Talmadge still manages to return to Georgia to spend 5 to 7 days out of each month supervising the Lovejoy operations. She is prouder of a wonderful new stainless steel ham-curing plant than most women are of a new house.

She brushes up on her bookkeeping with courses at a Washington college while her husband is busy in Congress.

But Furniss observed "she is both brilliant and charming. Unusually able as a woman in business, she has also the qualities of grace, humor, family dedication, and feminine charm."

The unassuming Mrs. Talmadge said of her latest honor, "It's pretty breathtaking for a smalltown girl from Ashburn. Everybody likes attention, and I'm as human as the next person."

Other members of the committee naming the woman of the year in business are Roy A. Dorsey, Walter B. Elcock, Jr., Robert L. Garges, Neal Irby, Arthur L. Montgomery, and James T. Porter.

Colonial Stores, Inc., is sponsoring this year's woman of the year event, with President Joseph Seitz as woman of the year chairman. Reservations for the dinner may be made by telephoning Mrs. Jack N. Norris, Jr., TR. 6-2167.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Jan. 5, 1960]

WORKING WIFE—MRS. TALMADGE BUSINESSWOMAN OF THE YEAR

(By Edwina Davis)

The working wife of a U.S. Senator, Mrs. Herman (Betty) Talmadge, is Atlanta's woman of the year in business.

Mrs. Talmadge organized and operates a thriving Talmadge ham business at Lovejoy, near Atlanta. In 1952 she bought 200 hams on credit from a local packinghouse. Then she put her husband, her maid, and others to work rubbing a special formula of salt, sugar, and spice into the hams. The first Talmadge hams went into Atlanta restaurants in the early summer and were an immediate success.

Business has increased until the workers number 23 and annual ham sales approach 100,000.

"When I first started out in the business, they used to kid me that I didn't know a debit from a credit and made the books balance by force," the vivacious entrepreneur said smiling.

Few, if any, would make that mistake now. Mrs. Talmadge is a proven success as a businesswoman. Furthermore, she has brushed up on her bookkeeping through courses in Washington, D.C., while her husband was busy in Congress. Her college training at the University of Georgia was in home economics. She quit school in her sophomore year to get married.

Mrs. Talmadge is one of five women in different fields of endeavor to be honored at the annual WOTY (woman of the year) recognition banquet at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, January 26. Reservations for the banquet may be made by calling WOTY's secretary, Mrs. Jack C. Norris, Jr., TR. 6-2167.

Colonial Stores, Inc., is sponsoring this year's event, with President Joseph Seitz as trophy chairman.

Members of the all-male committee that chose Mrs. Talmadge are James P. Furniss, chairman; Roy A. Dorsey, Walter B. Elcock, Jr., Robert L. Garges, Neal Irby, Arthur L. Montgomery, and James T. Porter.

Learning of her selection, Mrs. Talmadge said: "I don't know that I deserve the honor, but I certainly like receiving it. Everybody likes attention and I'm as human as the next person."

In announcing its selection, the committee said: "Mrs. Talmadge is more than a successful businesswoman. The mother of two children, she long has been prominent in local and State politics.

"She is both brilliant and charming. She is unusually able as a woman in business, yet also has those qualities of grace, humor, family dedication, and feminine charm that makes her truly a woman of the year in the finest meaning of that honor."

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD M. SIMPSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce to the Senate the untimely death this morning of our friend—and I am sure that all who knew him regarded him as a friend—the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, who passed away at the hospital after a brief illness.

DICK SIMPSON, with whom I served in the House for 16 years, represented the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, during most of that time with practically no opposition. He represented the counties of Bedford, Franklin, Fulton, Huntingdon, Mifflin, Snyder, Somerset, and Union.

DICK SIMPSON was born on August 30, 1900, in Huntingdon, Pa. He graduated from the University of Pittsburgh and obtained his law degree from the Georgetown Law School.

He married Grace Metz, who died in March of 1945. He had two daughters by this marriage, Susan and Barbara.

He was a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, representing Huntingdon County for two terms, from 1935 to 1937.

Subsequently he married Mae J. Cox, whose sons are James, Edward, and Joseph Cox. They had a daughter, Kay Josephine.

DICK SIMPSON served in the House since May 11, 1937, and at the time of his death was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was also for many years chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee.

He was a good friend, a devoted legislator, and an able, conscientious citizen. He was a loving father and good husband. His district and the State of Pennsylvania mourn his passing, which is a matter of grief and sadness and sorrow to all of us. I make this statement for the information of the Senate. As of this moment I have no information as to details with respect to the time of the funeral, or other matters. We will learn those details later.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate it has been my extreme honor and pleasure to

have served as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee during the same tenure of office of Representative SIMPSON on a similar committee in the House.

I have always had great respect and admiration for DICK SIMPSON, who, while he devoted his activities in large part to the work of the Republican Party, nevertheless held first in his heart his service to America. In his passing, all of us, not only Congress and the Republican Party, but all America, have suffered a great loss, because dedicated patriots such as DICK SIMPSON are not around in as great profusion as they used to be. I express my extreme regret and sorrow at the passing of this gentleman and fine American.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to pay my tribute to DICK SIMPSON, with whom I served for 8 years in the House of Representatives. He was a noble gentleman, a highly patriotic American, as considerate in his disagreements as in his agreements. He rendered outstanding and distinguished service to his people and his country, and I join in expressing my great respect for him and in honoring his memory today.

I regret deeply that DICK SIMPSON has been taken from us at so relatively young an age, considering the advances of modern medicine.

I join with his family in their sorrow upon his death.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the passing of DICK SIMPSON comes as a real shock. Sometimes one can only inadequately express a sense of shock, distress, and bereavement, and this is such an occasion. The death of DICK SIMPSON marks the passing of an old friend.

I recall when I first served with him in the House of Representatives. I remember also when both of us were vice chairmen of the National Republican Congressional Committee. Together we were engaged in legislative service over a quarter of a century.

I developed a deep esteem and affection for him. If there was one attribute which he had more than any other, it was his amazing and refreshing candor. Candor is, after all, nothing more than a reflection of conviction and inner truth. He spoke his mind and let his spirit utter what was there, freely and without inhibition.

I set him down long ago as one of the great patriots, one of the great Americans, for he served his country, his State, and his constituency well in the whole legislative field.

Fortunately, in all the trying days of his illustrious service, he had the benefit of the advice and counsel of his helpmeet and companion, Mae Simpson, who is by all odds one of the finest persons I have ever known. She, too, had something of the political flair. What a great team they were as they went about the country seeking the welfare of the Nation.

So, truly, we can say today that there is a void, difficult to fill, as a great citizen and a great statesman takes the long and eternal journey.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the sense of loss and shock I experience at the death of DICK SIMPSON is a little difficult to express. DICK SIMPSON came to the 75th Congress, of which I was a Member, in the first year I was a Member of the Congress. As I recall, it was in the spring of 1937 that he was elected to fill a vacancy in his district of Pennsylvania, so his service in Congress has been of practically the same length as mine.

I have thought this morning of the impression he made upon the House of Representatives in 1937. The Republican membership in the House at that session was at a low ebb; in fact, that was the alltime low for Republicans in the House of Representatives. But when DICK SIMPSON came to the House he brought to his Republican colleagues the encouragement of a man battling on the hustings, carefully working his way, and being elected under the difficult circumstances of those days. He soon made his mark in the House of Representatives as a studious, calm person, who could, when aroused, give vent to strong convictions. But he was a man of balance, a man of judgment, and he soon commanded the respect he has held through the years since that time.

Congress and the Nation can ill afford to lose a man of his character, his intelligence, his devoted patriotism, and his fine sense of cooperation with other persons.

I express to Mrs. Simpson, on behalf of Mrs. Case and myself, our deep sympathy.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the expressions of sympathy and tribute in connection with the death of our colleague in the other body, Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

During my service in the House of Representatives I always considered him to be one of the more conscientious and hard-working Members of that body. He had deep-seated convictions about the theories and principles of government. He was articulate and persistent in expressing his convictions, both as a member of his political party and as a Member of Congress. He served and represented well not only his district and his State, but the entire country. He will be greatly missed. His contribution has been a vast and many-sided one. He had entered and had become interested in many fields of legislative activity.

I join in the expressions of sympathy to the survivors of the late Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to express my sorrow at the death of Representative RICHARD SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania. We have lost one of our most distinguished colleagues.

It was my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with Representative SIMPSON for a period of 16 years. For 10 years we served together on the Committee on Ways and Means. He was my personal friend, and my leader in many things.

I admired the man. He possessed great qualities of character. He had an outstanding mind, and he was genuinely patriotic. He was of excellent Christian character.

We have lost a fine and outstanding and helpful member of the legislative branch of our Government.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Simpson and his children and his other relatives my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and of loss that I have received the news of the passing of Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania. Since his election to the 75th Congress in 1937, DICK SIMPSON has been an eminently able Member of Congress. He was endowed with great energy and a personal warmth of feeling which will be cherished by all those of us who were privileged to be associated with him.

I was happy to work closely with DICK SIMPSON during my tenure in the House of Representatives. One of his characteristics which particularly appealed to me, as it did, I think, to most of us, was his broadminded attitude toward those who might disagree with him on this, that, or the other issue. It in no way affected his close personal friendship or his willingness to work shoulder to shoulder on matters on which there might be complete agreement.

I was always impressed by DICK SIMPSON'S high spirit of dedication, which he brought to every public question which commanded his attention.

He was a man of heart and a man of character. His Nation, as well as his district and his State, shares with his wife, his family, and his friends in their great and irreparable loss.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVES HUBERT S. ELLIS AND WILL E. NEAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, following the conclusion of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, and during the adjournment prior to our meeting here on yesterday, West Virginia felt the impact of sadness as a result of the passing of two former Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, Hubert S. Ellis and Will E. Neal. These Representatives, both of whom served from the Fourth District of my State, were members of the Republican Party. One, Mr. Ellis, was a respected business leader. The other, Dr. Neal, was a beloved physician. When both of these citizens came into the forum of public affairs on Capitol Hill, they brought a sense of responsibility, a diligence of effort, and a devotion to constituency. Today, in remembrance, I speak as a former colleague of the late Representative Ellis, and I believe that the esteemed present occupant of the chair, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who served with Representative Neal, would wish to join me in expressing this belief.

West Virginia had, in these Representatives in the Congress of the United States, men worthy of the trust to which they were committed.

DEATH OF WILLIAM C. HULL, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a few days ago, the Civil Service Commission, Congress, and the Nation lost a dedicated and loyal public servant, William

C. Hull, executive assistant to the U.S. Civil Service Commissioners, who died of a heart attack on December 23, 1959, at the age of 68. A longtime career civil servant, Mr. Hull had served in the post of executive assistant to the Commissioners since October 1917.

It was my special pleasure and privilege to work with Mr. Hull on many occasions, and I always found him most cooperative, helpful, and friendly, and highly competent.

Mr. Hull entered Federal service with the Patent Office on September 18, 1908, but after 3 weeks on October 5, 1908, he started work as a messenger for the Civil Service Commission at $30 a month. During his more than half a century at the Commission, Mr. Hull served under 30 of the 48 Civil Service Commissioners in the administrations of 9 Presidents. He celebrated his golden anniversary in Federal service in September 1958.

In the course of his long and capable service, Mr. Hull received many commendations on his work from legislative and executive officials. He was frequently consulted by Members of Congress and high-ranking department and agency officials, as well as by union and veterans' groups because he had observed at first hand most of the important events in the Commission's history.

During more than a half century of distinguished civilian service to his country, many tributes came to William C. Hull. The most recent to honor him were the AMVETS, who voted him their Civil Servant of the Year Award at their national convention on September 11, 1959. In citing him as an outstanding career civil servant, AMVETS echoed many others in praising Mr. Hull for meriting the respect and confidence of congressional leaders, Government officials, civic groups, and the public.

His long and successful record of Federal service was complemented by his equally distinguished record in community affairs. His sense of civic responsibility was reflected by his years of activity for his friends and neighbors.

William C. Hull was a great American, a loyal public servant, and a true friend. We will miss him.

Mr. President, I point to the unselfish career of Mr. Hull as a guide to be followed by other civil servants of the Government, of whom many are dedicated and outstanding in their service. I point to Mr. Hull's fine record as an inspiration and a guide to the younger men and women in this great group of important, necessary, dedicated public officials.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDITIONS IN PERU—ADDRESS BY SEÑORA MIRIAM KROPP DE BELTRÁN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 10, 1959, Señora Miriam Kropp de Beltrán, distinguished wife of the able Prime Minister of Peru, Pedro G. Beltrán, delivered an address at the Hispanic-American Forum of Stanford University.

In a most charming and original fashion, Señora Beltrán provides in her speech penetrating insights into the life of the great neighbor Republic of Peru and wise observations on its relations with the United States. Because of the great interest of the Senate in inter-American relations, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Señora Beltrán's remarks may be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MIRIAM KROPP DE BELTRÁN, HISPANIC-AMERICAN FORUM, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, OCTOBER 10, 1959

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I feel very honored to be asked to represent Peru, a country I love so much, at Stanford University where I spent four of the happiest years of my life. Twice I have been asked to speak on Peru. The first time was about a dozen years ago, when the chairman of the Junior League section on Latin America introduced me thus: "Today we are going to hear about Peru. We had invited Marion Sproul, the daughter of the distinguished president of you-know-what university—the University of California. She wasn't able to be with us, and so Miriam will take her place." Today, it was my husband who was invited to give this speech—and here I am again.

I couldn't begin to tell you of all of the developments in Peru in the last 10 years in the time allotted me. I shall make this talk as short as possible, and invite questions from the floor.

Let me begin by discussing journalism in Peru, as that is the subject with which I am most acquainted. Our paper is called La Prensa, not to be confused with its big sister, La Prensa of Buenos Aires, whose editor, Mr. Alberto Gainza Paz, was president of the Interamerican Press Association during its recent reunion in San Francisco. I shall try to be modest about my remarks on our La Prensa, but I happen to think it is the greatest newspaper in South America. And speaking about being unbiased and objective, objective, nonslanted reporting was unheard of in Peru, until La Prensa initiated it. In a country, one of whose beauties is precisely the passion and volatility of its people, it has been a very difficult job to instill in a newspaperman the necessity of the to-the-point and impersonal approach to news reporting. Too often one used to read in the lead paragraph of how a reporter, taking pencil in hand, leaves the paper on a journalistic assignment, dwells on the beauty of his walk to the apartment house where he has been told he could find a story, and climbs the stairs to find the most prominent political figure in the community murdered by a beautiful and exotic agent of an unfriendly foreign power. We have tried hard and successfully to combat this type of thing. La Prensa is now, of course, a shining example of objective reporting. A recent issue carried a two-column story on the first page, whose headline read: "En La Universidad de Stanford Hablara la Sra. de Boltran." While buried in the same edition on page 23 was the world-shaking news, "Medias Blancas de Chicago Derratoron a Dogers 11 a 0."

Some years ago there was no proper society page in any paper in Lima. Society notes were included among local news items, and were devoted to such gems of information as "Today is Mrs. So and So's birthday, but she will not receive her friends." Other local papers had, and one still does, blacklists, on which you would be put if the publisher didn't like you. Socially, you were dead. One of the more amusing manifestations of this phenomenon occurred in Bogota some years ago. The daughter of Mr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, now Colombia's brilliant President, was about to be married, and a Colombian newspaper in the opposite political camp announced her engagement, noting she was the daughter of her mother, but not mentioning her father among her relatives. Today in Lima we have a newsy, lively society page. Moreover, the other papers have copied us. Also, we were the first to introduce a women's page. For the women of South America, contrary to a common misbelief, are leading active and useful lives in their communities, and some also take part in politics. For example, Peru has outstanding women members in its Congress.

Perhaps the most significant change in Peru since I have known it is that there now exists public opinion. Again, modesty prevents my going into details as to what has brought this about. The mission of a daily in a country where the paper is not only the chief source of information on the day's news, but also takes the place of books and magazines among a people too poor to buy them, is a serious and responsible one. In Latin America the editorial page is much more important than it is here, for it must teach certain basic truths to people who have not had the opportunity of being exposed to much formal instruction. The man in the street has a remarkable thirst for knowledge, and the recent emergence of a middle class is one of the happiest facts in Peru, and argues well for the future of that country. There the average man does not merely glance over his paper at the breakfast table and then depend on the radio, TV, and magazines to add to the sum of his knowledge of world events. He reads his paper thoroughly, and once finished finds it to be in great demand among his friends. For in many cases the cost of a newspaper represents a substantial item in his daily budget. I'm certain that the number of readers per person per paper in Latin America must be about five times higher than it is here.

I must hurry along, for many distinguished speakers follow me, who I am sure have a much more important message to give you. But let me cite one example of what I mean about the educational value of the editorial page. Here at Stanford I majored in social science. But I learned the true nature of inflation and its disastrous effect upon the poor only by living in a country where its results have been so obvious. Our paper has carried on for years an intense campaign against this evil, as well as an educational program to explain exactly its nature and its causes—a campaign sometimes accused of being repetitive and monotonous. Today, few readers in Peru are unacquainted with this problem, and the means of overcoming it, which—reduced to the simplest terms—is to try to live within one's budget and stop printing notes. But let me not dwell too long on this subject. There is a saying in Spanish: "Cada loco con su teme," and this is a favorite and recurring theme on our editorial page.

You would probably be amused, and more amused than pleased, about certain newspaper practices in Peru. There are practically no libel laws in that country, and those which exist are never put into effect. At least, I cannot remember one case where the plaintiff in a libel suit has won a case. Freedom of the press in Peru is carried to an extreme unheard of in this country. Glaring headlines call for the overthrow of the Government, qualify members of the Congress as traitors to their country, and sold to foreign interests. But such liberty has not always been the case. Under the last government, 250 assault troops attacked La Prensa and jailed my husband. They had intended to apprehend only him, but the members of his staff who were still in the building (it was 2 o'clock in the morning) surrounded their boss, and wouldn't let the police get near him. Later they forced their way into the penitentiary with him, to the dismay of the warden, who had but one bed ready. One of the first acts of the Prado government, after taking office as the result of a democratic election that not even its most bitter opponents could claim was fraudulent, was to guarantee freedom of the press in Peru.

Peru is one of the countries in South America where there has never been any real anti-American feeling. You may be surprised by that statement, for many of you will recall that Mr. NIXON had a few stones thrown at him during his stay in Lima last year. This unfriendly act did not represent the feeling of the country toward his person, but was organized by a few Communists and malcontents, the like of which can be found in any country in the world. Let me say here, although I'm sure the story was well covered by the local press, that Mr. NIXON reacted with the greatest dignity, patience, and courage, and that the Peruvian press, united for once, was loud in his praise, and its condemnation of such rowdyism.

Peru looks toward America as her friend and coworker. During Dr. Prado's first administration the United States was drawn into the Second World War. I believe Peru was the first South American country to declare herself on the side of the United States. I wasn't there at the time, and so I am not absolutely sure. But if it weren't the first, it was one of the first. I was there, however, when President Roosevelt died, and our cook, an uninstructed girl from the Andes who had come down to the capital to seek her fortune, but was hardly an expert on international relations, brought in the morning paper one day with the observation, "Senorita, ha muerto el Buen Vecino."

Moreover, American companies are in the vanguard of those with advanced social program, building their employees houses, schools, and churches. Interestingly enough for us here, let me point out that the Marcona mining company is a shining example of this enlightened policy. Among its top executives are fellow Stanford graduates Henry Mudd, Allan Christenson, and Ed Littlefield.

There are times, of course, when the Peruvian press justifiably criticizes the United States. Peru has been hard hit economically in recent years by the drop in the world price of many of its chief export commodities. There was some feeling against U.S. policies in 1958. Let me quote what Mr. Marvin Alisky, also a member of this panel, had to say at the time: "On September 22, 1958, President Eisenhower acted under a section of the Reciprocal Trade Act escape clause never before used. Thus, from October 1, only 80 percent of the 1953–57 Peruvian exports of lead and zinc were permitted to enter the United States. The press of Peru reacted, understandably, against this change in U.S. policy."

It seems to be the vogue now to criticize U.S. Ambassadors all over the world. I can only speak with knowledge of those I have known in Peru. In the last decade, this country has been represented by first-class career men, Harold Tittmah, Elliot O. Briggs, and now Theodore C. Achilles. You will be happy to learn if you don't already know it, that the latter is also a Stanford graduate. A man of high ideals who speaks the language fluently, he tackles Peru's problems with its relation to the United States, not in a routine, halfhearted manner, but rather devotes himself with all his intelligence and energy to improving Peruvian-American friendship.

Another popular misconception in this part of the world, is that which concerns the intentions of the armed forces in Latin American countries. Because of the existence of dictatorships in some countries, and the publicity given the overthrow of the military governments of Perón in Argentina, Rojas Pinilla in Colombia, Pérez Jiménez in Venezuela, and Batista in Cuba, many Americans have the mistaken idea that the armed forces of Latin countries are waiting anxiously for the day to take over the government. Not at all. There are times when the only way to throw off the yoke of a dictator, or a government which is going against the best interests of its people, is by an uprising of the military against that government. Let me make it clear that the military does not rise against the people of its country. Perhaps the case best known is that of Gen. Pedro Aramburu, now on a visit to the United States, where he courageously rose against Perón in Argentina. But he stepped down from power as soon as the country was settled, and made way for free election.

The military man realizes that in these days the main problem facing a government is an economic one, and that by reason of his training and experience he is rarely an expert in economic matters. In Peru, the army contributes to the progress of the country by helping to build roads, and cooperates with the local authorities in remote posts with the campaign against illiteracy. You are familiar with the CARE packages, sent free from the United States to foreign countries in need of such assistance. But once these packages arrive at the country of destination, the government—always hard pressed for funds—must take care of their transportation and distribution, at times a very expensive operation, especially so in a country such as Peru, which is not crisscrossed by highways and railroads. The Peruvian Army has volunteered to use its trucks and personnel to do this job. Also allow me to say that many military men are the first to condemn the ridiculous armament race which afflicts so many countries south of the border and north of it, too.

I am very sorry that, representing my husband here, I do not have time to tell you of the project closest to his heart: the introduction of an overall housing program, and the initiation of an intelligent agricultural reform. Over 3 years ago, he was appointed by President Prado to head a committee of public-spirited men of divergent political creeds. This group has worked hard and long, with no remuneration whatever except the satisfaction of tackling a tough problem and the determination to find its solution. One of the gratifying results of its efforts has been the establishment of a serious and well-organized savings and loan company for the first time, to aid people in the achievement of every man's desire, no matter in what country he lives—a home of his own. Just before I left Peru, my husband not as Prime Minister, but as prime mover of this idea, called together a group of men economically powerful in the community to seek their financial as well as their moral support of a newly established savings and loan association. The first million soles given was donated by W. R. Grace & Co., and many others, foreign as well as local, followed suit. By happy coincidence, a vice president of Grace's, Mr. John D. J. Moore, will address today's luncheon meeting.

I must close now, although I could go on discussing Peru indefinitely, believe me. But I do want to say, that like the United States, Peru is a country founded upon and guided by Christian principles. The great majority of its people are Catholic, and they excuse much, but never a denial of faith. With the grace of God, both of my countries, side by side, will emerge in either a cold or a hot war gloriously victorious. I am sure all of you will join me when I say a fervent "Viva el Peru."

ANTI-JEWISH DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know that so very early in the session we do not generally deal with matters of moment. However, I believe my colleagues will indulge me for calling attention to one situation—namely, the most regrettable and deeply tragic outbreak of anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi manifestations in West Germany on Christmas Eve, and the rash of similar demonstrations and anti-Catholic incidents which have spread to more than a dozen Western countries in the succeeding weeks. Certainly they warrant our grave concern.

They warrant our severest condemnation, and that of civilized men and women everywhere. The significance of the paint smears and scurrility that have marred the walls of synagogues and churches can be minimized only at our peril. They mean that enclaves of totalitarian danger of the extremist right continue to persist here in the free world, waiting to take advantage of any complacency. News reports indicate that ultra-right-wing elements are responsible for these outbreaks, and that their acts represent a kind of probing operation to test the world's reaction. A genuine, widespread expression of public indignation would make clear that we in this day and age will not tolerate the malignant evil of bigotry and prejudice. At the same time, we should extend every support to the German Federal Republic, under Chancellor Adenauer, in its efforts to uproot anti-Semitism and punish the hoodlums responsible for defacing the Bonn government's name. Especially Western Europe can show now support for and confidence in Chancellor Adenauer's determination to establish a new road of interfaith understanding for the German people and of free institutions which cannot tolerate neo-nazism.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Post, the Washington Post, and the Long Island Daily Press, commenting on this problem. I hope that the example set by these splendid editorials will be emulated by public officials, radio and TV commentators, news analysts, and others, and that all of us will express with the utmost vigor our condemnation of these vicious anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic excesses.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 31, 1959]

NEO-NAZI OUTRAGES

As the West prepares to meet Premier Khrushchev at the summit to debate the fate of Germany, that country is suddenly being subjected to what begins to look like a concerted series of neo-Nazi outrages with anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic implications and Communist cross-connections.

Following only scattered incidents after the war, the new outrages began on Christmas Eve with the desecration with swastika crosses and anti-Semitic invectives of a new synagogue and an anti-Nazi memorial in Cologne. They have since spread to at least five other towns and include the similar desecration of Catholic churches, the smearing of swastikas on stores, walls, park benches and war memorials.

These outrages, which revive memories of the Nazi terror, have rightly caused revulsion throughout the civilized world, including West Germany. The German Government, which has outlawed nazism, anti-Semitism and communism, and taken steps to atone for Nazi crimes, joins an aroused public opinion in denouncing the new offenses. The perpetrators of the Cologne outrage have been arrested and the Rightist splinter party which spawned them now faces suppression by the government.

The West Germans have special reasons to take a strong stand in this matter. Regarded by themselves, these incidents may not be very different from similar incidents in other countries, but the West Germans cannot afford to forget that anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism were among the rungs in the ladder on which the Nazis climbed to power and that any new manifestation of their maniacal ideology must compromise both Germany's moral rehabilitation and political future.

There are some indications, including frequent visits of the Cologne offenders to Communist East Germany, that Communists are behind some of these incidents. This would be in line with present Soviet tactics. The Soviets smile on most Western leaders but attack West Germany and especially Chancellor Adenauer as "revanchist," "militaristic" and in effect Nazi-ruled, and neo-Nazi and anti-Semitic outrages could well serve their purpose of discrediting West Germany at this time.

For this reason the West must remain on guard not only against any Nazi revival but against any Soviet scheme to frighten it into ostracizing Germany.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 4, 1960]

SYNAGOGUES AND SWASTIKAS

The outbreak of anti-Semitic demonstrations in Germany, which began with the Christmas Eve desecration of the newly rebuilt Cologne synagogue and has spread to other cities, brings a disheartening echo of a past which that nation is trying to bury. But the reaction to it has also brought evidence of the deep determination that it shall be buried.

There is talk of outlawing the neo-Nazi Party which is suspected of responsibility. Chancellor Adenauer, who had himself delivered an address from the pulpit of the Cologne synagogue when it formally reopened 3 months ago, sent a message to its rabbi declaring that all decent Germans shared his revulsion at the sacrilege. President Luebke, in a New Year's Eve address, declared that "one is deeply alarmed at such brutalization," and called for vigilance "in preventing abhorrent occurrences which injure the defenseless and besmirch the name of Germany." Responsible citizens on all levels have reacted with anger and disgust.

Germany has reason to be especially sensitive about anti-Semitism; its outbreak there touches bitter memories shared by millions, and recalls all too vividly one of the most brutal chapters in the long history of man's inhumanity to man. It stings the conscience of a nation where thousands have made pilgrimages to the mass grave in which Anne Frank lies buried and in which, in city after city, when the play based on her diary swept Germany, capacity audiences sat after the final curtain, sometimes for a full 5 minutes, in silent and remorseful tribute.

But bigots and hate merchants are not the plague of any one nation alone. The outrages in Germany have been copied in other nations (including our own); the United States has had its synagogue bombings and still has its Ku Klux Klan. Such persons, however, speak only for themselves, not for a nation; and it is themselves, not their target of the moment, whom they mark for the scorn of humanity.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 4, 1960]

SWASTIKAS IN THE NEW GERMANY

Chancellor Adenauer and other German spokesmen have risen in prompt succession to denounce the anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic episodes which have marred the German landscape in recent days, evoking dark remembrance of things not long past. Their statements have been blunt and forthright; yet they do not offer total reassurance to a world still haunted by memory of the Hitler nightmare.

For one thing, the shock and surprise exhibited by the German leaders has a disturbing quality. Time and again they had proclaimed that Germany had successfully emerged from the sickness of Nazism; presumably they were convinced the recovery was complete. Now they seem baffled and inept as they seek to cope with the symptoms of recurrence.

It would be both unwise and unfair to exaggerate what has occurred so far. The incidents are still scattered, the perpetrators relatively few, and evidence as to how the new spasm of hatred has been incited remains unclear. But it would be equal folly to dismiss these wretched events as inconsequential. The world has made that mistake before.

Indeed, exactly such evasion may be responsible in large measure for the present condition. As a Bonn dispatch to the Times noted yesterday:

"Repeated incidents have shown that most German schoolchildren know little or nothing of what Hitler and the Nazis did, except perhaps that Hitler built the autobahns and wiped out unemployment. This silence in the schools has been compounded by even tighter silence in the homes."

There have been momentary exhibits of German recollection and remorse, such as the anguished response of German audiences to the showing of "The Diary of Anne Frank." Too many older Germans, however, have seemed to prefer to drop the whole subject, as if they could not bear to discuss their own guilt with their children. The policy of evasion has made it easier for neo-Nazis to return to positions of eminence, both in the schools and other key areas.

We do not question the earnestness of most of the German leaders who have condemned and repudiated these new manifestations of an uncured ailment. Nor do we suggest there are simple remedies. We say only that the warning is clear and that words must be accompanied by deeds—beginning in the schoolroom and extending to many other phases of German life.

Perhaps the most ominous aspect of the current outbreaks is that they occur in a time of rising German prosperity, and seem to reflect an element of contagion. The time for drastic countermeasures is now.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1960]

VIRUS AND EPIDEMIC

The New Year has begun most disconcertingly with a series of anti-Jewish demonstrations, many of them in places where this form of social virulence has never been a serious factor. On the same day incidents have been reported from Melbourne, Milan, Parma, Stockholm, Oslo, Copenhagen, London, Leeds, Manchester, Dartford, Glasgow, Dublin, Antwerp, Amsterdam, Athens, New York, and Los Angeles as well as from Berlin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, and Vienna. All in all about 50 such demonstrations have been reported on three continents.

As to precisely what it all signifies, there seem to be two theories. One of them, apparently shared by many American Jews, is that the more recent incidents are sporadic and spontaneous, the work of individual cranks and fanatics or of sensation-seeking adolescents inspired by the publicity given to the cycle of outrages in West Germany, which began with the desecration of a new synagogue at Cologne on Christmas Eve. The other view, shared by some Jews abroad and by supporters of the Bonn government, is that the demonstrations have been organized for carefully calculated political purposes.

To accept the latter view is of course to raise the question who has organized the demonstrations and why. Some believe them to be the result of an arrangement among the various groups of neo-Fascist extremists which exist under different names in various countries. German sources say, however, that the neo-Fascists, however fanatical, simply do not possess an organization capable of demonstrations on such a scale but that the Communists do; and that the plain purpose is to weaken the support of the Bonn government among its Western allies by reviving memories of the horrors perpetrated under the Third Reich. This view is given a good deal of plausibility by the editorial reaction of the Communist press, which has already begun to denounce the Bonn government for its "indulgence" toward "militarist and Fascist provocateurs."

Up to now the Bonn government has made no direct accusation of Communist collusion with the neo-Nazi demonstrators, and tangible proof of it appears to be still lacking. But "indulgent" is certainly a strange word to describe its attitude of indignation and alarm.

[From the Long Island Daily Press, Jan. 5, 1960]

THE GERMS OF HATE ARE THE WORST

The swastikas painted on two synagogues over the weekend smear the entire Long Island community.

The rock that crashes through the window of a church of any faith injures all decent people—of all races, creeds, and colors.

So do other acts and forms of bigotry.

It is too easy to shrug off such incidents as the work of crackpots or irresponsible young people. Anyone, young or old, who will paint hate symbols on buildings or light fiery crosses certainly is warped in his attitude toward his fellowman, his country and his God, if he has one.

The germs of hate are the worst of all. They must be conquered. This calls for the sternest attention by our police and other officials.

Mayor Wagner summed up public opinion when he said: "The desecration of a religious institution is a shameful and cowardly act. New York has no room—and never will have room—for such Nazi-like tactics. We cannot and will not permit a renaissance of Hitlerism here or anywhere else in the world. We paid too high a price to crush it once before."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield, if I may.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, decent people in every clime are shocked and dismayed and entertain the deepest indignation at the ugly efforts directed by bigots against peoples, because of their religion or because of their race or because of their color, whether undertaken in free America or in any other country of the globe. Surely to the extent that we, who represent free peoples, can indicate our own grave concern, we shall have helped contribute our mite to the elimination in the future of the kind of supremely ugly work to which my friend, the Senator from New York, has just alluded.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] in regard to what appears to be a rising tide of anti-Semitism in various parts of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these brief remarks be printed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from New York and of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, history has a habit of repeating itself. I would point out to the Government and to the people of West Germany and to the governments and to the peoples of other countries where there has been evidence in recent days of a growing anti-Semitic feeling that free men and women everywhere are watching them. For a long time, Mr. President, the free nations of the world were rather reticent in protesting against similar beginnings of anti-Semitism in Hitler Germany. I hope such reticence will not prevail at this time. I hope the free nations of the world will make very clear to those countries in which this anti-Jewish bigotry is rearing its ugly head again that freedom cannot be reconciled with such intolerance.

One of the reasons why I opposed the Eisenhower doctrine in the Middle East was that I could not get the Senate to adopt an amendment which would have required some commitments before the fact on the part of the heads of some governments, which were to be aided under that doctrine, that they would desist from their threats that they would wipe the State of Israel off the face of the map at the first opportunity. Mr. President, there has been no change in that anti-Semitic attitude on the part of those governments.

We have now pending a proposal for a loan to Nasser of Egypt for improvements of the Suez Canal. Mr. President, I am one Senator who protests the investment of a single American dollar in any improvements in the Suez Canal until Nasser reverses himself and changes his attitude with regard to his discriminations against the State of Israel. His insistence on continuing a policy that ships destined for Israel shall not go through the Suez Canal and the free nation of Israel shall not have any privileges to use that waterway disqualifies his canal project for an American loan.

Mr. President, it is well to talk about supporting freedom, but the test is whether we will act in protecting freedom. The request by Nasser for a Suez Canal loan is another opportunity, in my opinion, for us to demonstrate to the world that freedom is not a cliche with us, but is a way of life. We can demonstrate, with regard to the Suez Canal, that we do not intend to support with American dollars a nation which insists upon following an anti-Semitic course of action.

OPPOSITION OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN TO LOYALTY OATH REQUIREMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very proud to inform the Senate that the University of Wisconsin has become the first land-grant institution in America to go publicly and officially on record against the loyalty oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act.

The University of Wisconsin has a long and noble history of dedication to the search for truth and its constant companion the freedom to speak or not to speak, untrammeled by any dictation or domination, even in the name of patriotism.

This action by the faculty of the University of Wisconsin makes this U.S. Senator deeply proud of the State he in part represents and the great State university that continues to serve as such an inspiring moral and intellectual leader for our State.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article reporting the action by the University of Wisconsin on the student loyalty oath be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN UNIVERSITY PROTESTS U.S. LOYALTY OATH

MADISON, WIS., January 5.—The University of Wisconsin today was the first land-grant institution to take a stand against the loyalty oath requirement of the National Defense Education Act.

Faculty members voted to ask the next session of Congress to eliminate the loyalty oath provision as a condition of eligibility for students who wish to borrow money to continue their educations.

The act asks students borrowing money to sign an affidavit saying they are not members of organizations listed as subversive by the U.S. Attorney General's office.

The university so far has received $127,794 under the program.

A land-grant institution is a State university, agricultural or industrial college in the United States receiving Government lands or funds under the Federal Land-Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890.

INTEREST RATE LABELING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I happily call to the attention of my colleagues an enthusiastic, if slightly bemused, endorsement of the proposal of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which I cosponsor, to require interest rate labeling. This endorsement comes from the Nation's leading financial daily newspaper, and argues eloquently for the solid moral value in the Douglas proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from today's Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON DEBT

The Democrats, our Mr. Novak reports from Washington, want to put a legislative spotlight on how the high cost of debt adds to the total cost of things people buy.

The plan, sponsored by Senator DOUGLAS, is to pass a law to require interest rate labeling on consumer installment purchases, mortgages, and the like. Thus, a customer buying a TV set on installments would be told not only the list price and the rate of interest on the balance but also the total cost, including all the interest, over the entire period of the payments.

Well, we don't know that a law will necessarily help matters. But it would certainly be a good thing if more people realized how much it adds to the total cost of anything when the payment is deferred to the future.

Most people would be surprised, we think, to learn how much interest costs add to the total cost of things. When a man takes out a $10,000 mortgage for 20 years, he is usually aware in a general way that he is paying extra each month for the privilege of postponing payment. But how many, we wonder, realize that on a 4-percent mortgage this adds about $4,500 to the nominal price he thinks he's paying for the house? Or that at 6 percent this added cost is nearer $7,000—much more than half again the apparent size of the mortgage?

A good many more people would be surprised, we think, to learn how much of their tax bill—which they may think goes to such worthy enterprises as national defense—is likewise paid in interest on the huge debt which their Government, with the help of these self-same Democratic politicians, has piled up over the years.

Every time our Government decides to do something for us now—build a road, let us say, or a dam—and pay for it later the real cost is a lot bigger than the nominal cost. Because of this cumulative debt from the past, often so casually assumed, the Government this year had to budget more than $8 billion just to pay interest on its debt.

Properly spotlighted, this could prove quite illuminating to the taxpayers. It means that $1 of every $10 the tax collector extracts from him is a present penalty for past indulgence. Or put another way, it means that in a decade the taxpayers must shell out for past debts alone the equivalent of a whole year's $80 billion budget.

It would help, too, if the spotlight was aimed a little bit into the future. Budget Director Stans, for example, has estimated that right now the Government of the United States has piled up future obligations, representing a mortgage against all taxpayers tomorrow, of $750 billion. This is more than twice what the public label shows as the nominal national debt.

We just wish Senator DOUGLAS and the other liberal Democrats, in their zeal for illuminated labels, would start a campaign to spread some light in this direction also.

ELIMINATION OF SPECIAL TAX DEDUCTION FOR DIVIDEND RECIPIENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last session the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], introduced a bill—which passed this body, but died in the House—designed to end the present provision in the tax laws which provides a special tax deduction for dividend recipients. That McCarthy proposal was attacked on the grounds that dividends deserve special consideration for one particular reason. Opponents of the McCarthy bill argued that dividends are already taxed indirectly through the corporation income tax. They argue that the special tax deduction therefore constitutes a partial compensation for the corporation income tax which dividends already bear.

Those of us who supported the McCarthy bill disputed this contention. We pointed out that corporation customers bear at least part of the incidence of the corporation income tax in higher prices for the goods the corporation sells; and that therefore the consumer is as much entitled to a special tax deduction as is the stockholder.

In general, the financial community and its spokesmen took the stockholder side, and argued that the stockholder bore the full incidence of the corporation income tax. Letters from President Funston, of the New York Stock Exchange, for instance, addressed to me and other Senators, did this.

On November 16, the main premise of those of us who supported the McCarthy amendment was supported by a remarkably telling authority under the circumstances. On the front page of the Wall Street Journal, George Shea, the wise and responsible commentator for this great financial newspaper, wrote:

> When there is talk of reducing the corporate tax the alternative frequently suggested is a manufacturers' sales tax. The difficulty is that many people, including this writer, don't see too much difference in the net effect of the two. Corporations must collect the income tax they pay from their customers through the prices they charge them, just as they would have to do with a tax on the goods they sell.

Let me repeat that last sentence from the front page of last November's Wall Street Journal, and let us think of it in terms of who really bears the burden of the corporation income tax:

> Corporations must collect the income tax they pay from their customers through the prices they charge them, just as they would have to do with a tax on the goods they sell.

So says the Wall Street Journal. I say the Journal is right; and if it is, the whole case against the McCarthy bill goes up in smoke. It becomes obvious that if we agree with the Wall Street Journal, then it follows that the special tax deduction permitted dividends is an unwarranted, unjustified, special privilege which results in a lower tax rate for dividend income than for wage income and other income—a special privilege that cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 16, 1959]

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Today hearings will start before the House Ways and Means Committee on possible ways of revising the income tax law, with the laudable purpose of obtaining more revenue through lower tax rates. The idea is to close "loopholes" whereby some groups escape their full tax, which would bring in enough added revenue to lower the rates for those who do pay fully.

Unfortunately, not too much reliance should be placed on the hopes for more revenue through the closing of loopholes. The word loopholes is widely used to mean three different kinds of tax avoidance or evasion, whereas it should properly be applied to only one.

A true loophole is a provision which permits legal avoidance of tax by recipients of income which Congress intended to tax. For instance, years ago it used to be possible for a man with a loss on a stock he wanted to keep, to sell it and buy it back the same day and reduce the amount of his taxable income by the loss on the sale. But Congress stopped that, and over the years has closed many other true loopholes. The few left probably don't account for very much lost revenue.

People who claim there are still big loopholes left usually have in mind two other kinds of income. One is income that illegally escapes tax, such as unreported dividends or unreported savings-bank interest. That's not a loophole, but an administrative problem. Estimates of how much revenue is thus lost run as high as a billion or two, but that is mostly guesswork. In the first place, the larger a taxpayer's income, the less likely he is as a general rule to dare to cheat by failing to report income. In the second place, some so-called unreported income accrues to people with incomes so small they shouldn't pay tax anyhow—such as youngsters who've been given a savings account.

Another kind of tax-free income, or income taxed at reduced rates, which is often falsely called a beneficiary of loopholes in the law, is income that Congress fully intended to treat favorably. One example is the income from producing oil wells to the extent it is untaxed because of the depletion deduction specifically permitted in the law. Another is the joint income of married couples, for whom the law provides a special table of reduced tax rates.

If anyone thinks such income should no longer get favored treatment he is entitled to his opinion. But to call provisions of this sort loopholes is in effect to say Congress didn't know what it was doing when it decided on the provisions after thorough debate.

Furthermore, Congress is hardly likely to be persuaded it made mistakes in these just because someone tries to rename the provisions loopholes. The same thing is true of the tax exemption of interest on State and municipal bonds and other tax freedoms such as those of cooperatives. Maybe some of these will be changed to some extent, but in large part the same political and logical factors which put them in the law will keep them there.

However, none of the foregoing constitutes a reason for abandoning the search for reductions in tax rates. The most popular target for such cuts, among the statements made to the House committee in advance of its hearings, is the schedule of individual income tax rates, which rises to 91 percent and starts at the very high minimum of 20 percent. As mentioned by Roswell Magill, president of the nonprofit tax foundation, this range of rates, as well as the present exemption of $1,200 for a married couple, is almost exactly the same as during World War II, when income tax rates were levied not only to boost Federal revenue but also for the purpose of limiting incomes. This was a valid purpose during wartime shortages, but is the opposite of a proper peacetime policy, when growth is the goal.

As for the chances for any such reductions, they are lessened by the prospect for a Federal budget deficit in the fiscal year 1959–60 because of the steel strike. But there are some favorable factors. The strongest is that everyone wants income tax cuts for individuals, even though opinions differ on whether the low-bracket or the high-bracket rates, or both, should be cut.

Another favorable factor is that the pall on incentives of any income tax rate much above 50 percent is so obvious. Not a few of us personally know individuals of inherently energetic and productive disposition who quit working because the return after taxes has ceased to be worth the effort.

Such men often sell the small businesses they have built up to large corporations. And this very fact emphasizes how much less pressure there is for corporation tax cuts than there is for lower individual tax rates. If a corporation did not find such businesses worth buying in spite of the corporate tax that applies to them once they are bought, it wouldn't buy them.

When there is talk of reducing the corporate tax the alternative most frequently suggested is a manufacturers' sales tax. The difficulty is that many people, including this writer, don't see too much difference in the net effect of the two. Corporations must collect the income tax they pay from their customers through the prices they charge them, just as they would have to do with a tax on the goods they sell. The main difference is that the manufacturers' sales tax would apply only to manufacturers and not directly to other corporations.

The policy advantage (if it may be so called) of the corporate income tax is that it is now so high, at a rate above 50 percent, that almost no one in his right mind would dare suggest it be increased. Thus it, together with the excessively high individual income tax, acts as some sort of ceiling on what the Federal Government can hope to collect with the present forms of tax. And because budget deficits are unpopular, the present system constitutes something of a bar to new spending.

But if the easily hidden manufacturers' sales tax were adopted, it would tend to dissolve this safety factor. A new and rich field of revenue for the spenders to cultivate would be opened up. We might end up with both the corporate income tax and the manufacturers' sales tax.

GEORGE SHEA.

MISMANAGEMENT OF ACREAGE RESERVE AND CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAMS—REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a recent Comptroller General's report in

which our attention was called to the manner in which millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is being wasted through the mismanagement of the acreage reserve and conservation reserve programs.

Based upon this report, 23 million acres have been contracted for under the conservation reserve program. Of this amount, 5,400,000 acres, or 23 percent of the estimated total, either had been devoted to hay and pasture, had been idle or summer fallowed, or had a history of continuous crop failure.

Payments on this land alone would amount to $54 million annually, or about $270 million over the average life of the contract.

These are payments being made to remove from agriculture production land which was never intended to be, and more than likely never would have been, in annual production, anyway.

To prevent abuses of the program, Congress had limited annual rental payments to 20 percent of the agricultural value of the land placed under 1959 contracts; but, according to the Comptroller General, even this liberal limitation has not been effectively adhered to.

In his report numerous instances are cited wherein the annual maximum payment limitation of $5,000 established by the conservation reserve program regulations had been exceeded.

As examples of this mismanagement, the following specific cases are cited:

In the States of New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado it was found that land was being leased at very low rental rates from the States and then being placed in the conservation reserve program at substantially higher rates.

NEW MEXICO

The Comptroller General's office reviewed the ASC records and the records of the New Mexico State Land Office to determine the extent of the conservation reserve participation of lands that had been leased from the State.

Based upon reports from the ASC county offices, about 27,000 acres of land leased from the State had been placed in the conservation reserve program. This land is part of 120 farm units located in 13 New Mexico counties.

It was estimated that the conservation reserve rental payments on this acreage would total about $212,000 a year, or an average of about $8 an acre. The records showed that lease-rental payments paid to the State on this same acreage would be about $6,500 a year, or an average of about $0.24 an acre.

Based on these estimates, the lessees would receive conservation reserve payments of $205,500 a year in excess of their lease-rental payments to the State land office.

COLORADO

A summary prepared by the ASC Colorado State office on April 1, 1959, presents data on the conservation reserve participation of State leased lands throughout Colorado.

This summary shows that about 50 farms in the State, containing about 36,800 acres of land, leased from the State at rates averaging $0.36 an acre for grazing land and $1.83 an acre for cropland, were participating in the conservation reserve in Colorado.

About 8,500 acres of land from these farms were placed in the conservation reserve at annual rental payments averaging over $7 an acre, or a total of about $62,000 a year.

TEXAS

In Texas, based on inquiries sent to the ASC county offices by the State committee, they found that there are 8 farms, containing an estimated 1,550 acres of land, which had been leased from the State or its agencies which had been placed in the conservation reserve program.

Under the conservation reserve program, the Federal Government was paying on this land annual rental payments averaging about $9 an acre; while based on information obtained from the Texas State agencies owning the land, it was being leased for about $0.80 per acre.

NORTH DAKOTA

In North Dakota in July 1956, one farmer purchased about 280 acres of land, including 139 acres of cropland, for $5,000. Substantially all the cropland acres were placed in the conservation reserve under a 5-year 1959 contract. Under this contract, this farmer will receive annual rental payments of $9.70 for each acre of cropland placed in the reserve, or a total of about $6,400 over the 5-year period of the contract. The whole farm cost him only $5,000 in 1956.

I now call attention to another type of abuse.

Section 485.164(b)(4) of the conservation reserve program regulations provides that two or more individuals operating as a group under an arrangement which, although lacking the legal elements of a partnership or corporation, is in the nature of a joint undertaking shall be considered as a producer and that members of the group shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm. Section 485.164(b)(6) provides that individuals having a joint or common interest arising out of their interest in the ownership of the farm as joint tenants, tenants by the entirety, or tenants in common shall not be considered as separate producers on the same farm.

Notwithstanding this intended limitation, one particular family, composed of the father, grandfather, and minor son, age 14, and three other minor children between the ages of 10 and 12, divided the farm into different units and together entered into contracts under the conservation reserve program wherein they stand to collect a total of $165,000. This is broken down as follows:

Father	$50,000
Grandfather	50,000
Minor son (age 14)	15,000
3 other minor children (ages 10 to 12)	50,000
Total	165,000

This was accomplished through a series of transactions wherein the father sold to the grandfather an undivided one-half interest in a portion of the farm and then transferred other portions to the four minor children with the proviso that he would operate as their legal guardian.

Not only are these payments excessive, but here we have three children under the age of 12 being paid $50,000 not to farm.

The Comptroller General's complete report on this transaction I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not detain the Senate with additional examples of these discrepancies. The cases cited are typical of the indefensible manner in which the taxpayers' money is being squandered under the loose management practices condoned by the officials administering this program.

It is apparent that in many areas the public officials administering this program operate on the basis, "Here is some easy money from the Government; come and get it."

These examples represent but a small portion of the millions of dollars that are being wasted under this program.

I strongly recommend that every Member of the Senate study carefully this report of the Comptroller General.

EXHIBIT A

PARTICIPATION OF ONE FAMILY IN TWO STATES

The following case was included in the additional 16 cases discussed with officials of the Soil Bank Division and on which information was given to that division so that administrative review of the propriety of the contract payments could be initiated. Although it is not typical, it is being reported in detail because of certain unusual aspects.

Members of one family participating in the conservation reserve program in two States will eventually receive about $165,000 in total rental payments. The members of the family involved are grandfather, father, minor son, and three other minor children. A summary of the payments to be received follows:

By father	$50,000
By grandfather	50,000
By minor son	15,000
By 3 other minor children	50,000
Total	165,000

In one State, 2,600 acres of a 3,600-acre farm owned by the father was divided into five parcels and sold in February 1957. The sales were contingent upon each purchaser's execution of a 10-year conservation reserve contract. The payment of consideration in each sale is required to be made by endorsing over to the seller annually the conservation reserve payment received by the buyer. About $210,000 is to be assigned by the purchasers over the 10-year terms of the contracts.

The provisions contained in the sales contracts making the sales contingent on conservation reserve participation are quoted in pertinent part below:

"All liability upon its contract is conditioned and contingent upon second parties executing a 10-year conservation agreement with the * * * county ASC, an agency of the Federal Government, under the terms of which, second parties shall receive annual payment of not less than $9 per acre for all cultivated land in consideration of their following the conservation practices set forth in said agreement.

"Upon the execution of such ASC contract, liability upon this agreement shall become fixed."

The father sold to the grandfather an undivided one-half interest in about 679 of the remaining 1,000 acres. The father informed us that he (or he and his wife) was the owner of record on this acreage subject to the contract for deed to the grandfather for a one-half interest. ASC county records show that this 1,000 acres was combined with 480 acres owned by the grandfather and 160 acres owned by another party. About 1,100 acres of this farm was placed in the conservation reserve in March 1957 under a 10-year contract and earns an annual payment of $10,000 a year. This annual payment is shared equally between the grandfather, as owner, and the father, as operator, so that each received the $5,000 maximum annual payment permitted under the conservation reserve program. None of the land belonging to the third party is under contract.

Although title to this land rests as set forth above, the ASC county records show that the grandfather is the owner of this farm unit and the father is the operator.

In a second State, the father had purchased two separate tracts of land. By quitclaim deed dated March 31, 1958, he acquired title to a 320-acre farm. By quitclaim deed of the same date, this farm was transferred to his minor son. The minor son placed 250 acres of this farm under a 1958 conservation reserve contract for an annual payment of $1,500 or a total of $15,000 over the 10-year period of the contract. Practice payments of $2,140 were paid to the minor son on this farm.

In a contract dated January 21, 1958, the father purchased an undivided one-half interest in about 13,000 acres of land in the second State from the grandfather. Prior to this date, the title had been held jointly by the father and the grandfather. By warranty deed dated March 25, 1958, the father transferred 920 acres of this land to his three minor children. The father signed a conservation reserve contract as "legal guardian" for the three minor children, placing 834 acres of this farm under a 1958 conservation reserve contract for an annual payment of $5,000 a year or $50,000 over the 10-year period of the contract. Practice payments of $7,290 were made on this farm.

In our audit we interviewed the father, the grandfather, and a sister of the father. In these interviews, we obtained the following information:

1. The minor son was 14 years of age when he acquired the farm from his father. The other three minor children were between 10 and 12 years of age when they acquired their farm from their father and when their father signed the contract as "legal guardian," placing the farm in the conservation reserve.

2. At the time the conservation reserve contracts were entered into for or by the children, the four children lived in the same household with their father.

3. Conservation reserve payments on the minor son's farm are made directly to the minor son. Conservation reserve payments on the other children's farm are received by the father as legal guardian of the three other children. The father does not maintain a separate accounting for the guardianship funds, but he informed us that he could account for these funds in a court action.

4. The legal guardianship over the three younger children has no legal status other than that derived from his being their father.

5. Separate income tax returns are filed by or for the four children.

6. The minor son had assisted his father in farming but had not operated a farm prior to acquisition of his farm.

This case was discussed with administrative officials of the ASC county and State offices in the second State. They informed us that they did not know that the father was participating in the conservation reserve outside the State, and they did not know the minor son was 14 years old at the time the conservation reserve contract was entered into. They had understood the son to have been 17 years old at the time. They informed us that, had they known the son was only 14 years of age, they would not have approved the contract.

Prior to making the first annual payment on the contract, county office officials questioned the father about the legal guardianship arrangement. He informed the officials that he wanted the proceeds of the contract set aside in a trust fund for the children's future education.

The State officials informed us that they understood, also, that the father's intentions under the legal guardianship arrangement were to establish a trust fund for the children's education with the conservation reserve payments from the farm. The State officials believed that a producer could not purchase land and put it in the soil bank in the name of his children. They further informed us that, had they known of the father's conservation reserve participation in the first State and the correct ages of the children, the State office would not have given its approval to the contracts on these two farms.

We believe that the conservation reserve participation of this family in the two States may constitute a scheme or device to exceed the $5,000 conservation reserve payment limitation.

The Soil Bank Division referred this case to the Office of the General Counsel of the Department on September 8, 1959. On October 22, 1959, the Acting Deputy General Counsel advised that, in the first State, the contract of the father and grandfather was prepared in accordance with the existing program regulations and does not in itself constitute a violation of the $5,000 payment limitation but that, in the second State, the father appears to be directly benefiting from the payments made with respect to the land transferred to his children and the circumstances suggest that the purpose of the transfers was to further the interests of the father and grandfather in preventing the application of the payment limitation to their landholdings. The opinion was expressed by the Acting Deputy General Counsel that, on the facts presented, notice of an indicated violation should be given to the family members involved.

In a letter dated December 14, 1959, from the Administrator, CSS, we were informed that, in the opinion of the Office of the General Counsel, there is every indication that the family violated the contract in the first State by their actions in the second State and that a determination of violation by the ASC State committee would result in the family's forfeiting all rights to compensation under the contracts in the two States during all the years in which the violation existed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Delaware has again displayed his customary ability to ferret out some facts which should be brought to the attention of the American people and the Congress. I shall read the report to which he has referred with great interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

JAMES V. ALLRED: A HELPING HAND FOR THE NEEDY; A FIST AGAINST UNJUST POWER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, not often through the mists of Texas time has a man risen from the masses who at once had a heartfelt and soulful concern for life's "have-nots," and possessed with that concern the iron and fire to fight unjust economic and political power whenever he found it.

James V. Allred, onetime shoeshine boy, sailor, lawyer, attorney general of Texas, twice Governor of Texas, and a U.S. district judge, was such a man. He died at Laredo, Tex., at 4:50 p.m. on September 24, 1959, and millions of Texans are mourning his passing.

Nothing I could say here could begin adequately to eulogize this great Texan and great American who is justly mentioned in the same breath with Sam Houston and Jim Hogg. He had the most sincere concern for the rights and welfare of the individual of any man I have ever known. During his years as attorney general and in his administration as Governor, the depression years of 1935–39, all the people of Texas had fair, able and impartial representation.

It was my honor and privilege to serve nearly 4 years on Jimmy Allred's staff when he was attorney general.

He was sharp in his wit, gentle with his employees, tireless in his work, loving of mankind, and he believed in a God of mercy and justice and charity.

Jimmy Allred will be remembered in history as this generation's most humane governmental leader in Texas.

Damon Runyon, America's master of the short story, wrote a beautiful tale about Dr. Brackett, a kindly country doctor who spent all his time caring for the poor, and who, consequently, was himself short of funds. He had a little two-room office upstairs over a store, and it was marked at the ground floor door by a sign with an arrow which read, "Dr. Brackett, office upstairs."

The doctor treated the needy for years, and finally when he died, there was talk that someone ought to chip in and buy a monument to put over his grave. But if his patients had no money to pay him in life, they had even less to contribute to his memory. His resting place was unmarked for several days until one of his patients brought out the sign from his door which the townfolks agreed was the perfect headstone for him. It was the one with the arrow pointing heavenward that read: "Dr. Brackett, office upstairs."

Such a monument would be fitting for Governor Allred, too, for he was ever a man of deep Christian conviction and principle.

Texas has not seen his like in the past 60 years; Texas may not see his like in the next 60.

Mr. President, thousands of words have been written concerning the life of this great Texan. In an effort to help record his work, I ask unanimous consent to have the following articles printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of September 25, 1959, "Federal Judge Allred Dies of Heart Attack."

From the Austin Statesman of September 25, 1959, "Funeral Set for Allred."

From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of September 25, 1959, by Dave Cheavens, Associated Press correspondent, "Allred's Magnetism Was Hard To Resist."

From the Dallas Morning News of September 26, 1959, by Richard M. Morehead, "Party Was Allred's Last."

From the Austin-Statesman of September 27, 1959, by Dave Shanks, "James V. Allred: He Lived Full Throttle."

From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of September 28, 1959, "Ministers Praise Allred in Ceremony at Capitol."

From the Texas Observer of June 27, 1955, and July 4, 1955, by Ronnie Dugger, "Allred Revisited" and "Tax Fight Is 21 Years Old."

From the Texas Observer of September 25, 1959, editorial by Ronnie Dugger, "James Allred."

From the Corpus Christi Caller of September 26, 1959, editorial, "Judge James V. Allred: Fighting Humanitarian."

From the San Antonio Light of September 29, 1959, editorial, "James Allred."

From the Abilene Reporter-News of September 26, 1959, editorial, "Jimmy Allred's Long, Colorful Career Ends."

From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, "James V. Allred."

From the Houston Chronicle of September 28, 1959, editorial, "State Loses Able Servant in Death of Judge Allred."

From the Houston Post of September 26, 1959, editorial, "James V. Allred Left a Notable Record of Texas Public Service."

From the Austin American, "James V. Allred."

From the Houston Press of September 26, 1959, "James V. Allred."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Sept. 25, 1959]

FEDERAL JUDGE ALLRED DIES OF HEART ATTACK—STRICKEN IN COURT AT LAREDO

James V. Allred, 60, Federal district judge and former Governor of Texas, died of a heart attack in a Laredo hospital at 4:50 p.m. yesterday.

His physican, Dr. John T. Lowry, said Allred had complained Wednesday of severe chest pains and an electrocardiogram was made. But the judge returned to the bench yesterday morning to preside at the September term of court for the southern district of Texas.

At 11:30 a.m. he interrupted court to say he was a "little under the weather" and called a recess until 2:30 p.m. Lowry was called to Allred's hotel room at 2 p.m. and advised the judge to enter a hospital immediately.

He arrived at the hospital at about 4:15 p.m. and died there about 35 minutes later. Mrs. Allred was with him when he died.

SURVIVORS

His immediate family includes his wife and three sons, Capt. James Allred, Jr., 29, an Air Force pilot; David Allred, 25, a member of the Washington staff of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH; and Sam Houston Allred, 22, a student at Southern Methodist University, in Dallas; and a granddaughter.

Funeral services will be at the First Christian Church tomorrow afternoon. Burial will be at Riverside Cemetery, Wichita Falls at a time to be announced. Cage-Mills Funeral Home in Corpus Christi is in charge of local arrangements.

From his headquarters in Corpus Christi, Allred had presided for the past 10 years over Federal court sessions in Victoria, Laredo, Brownsville and here, occasionally sitting in at Houston. Mrs. Allred, the former Miss Betsy Joe Miller of Wichita Falls, who married him June 20, 1927, usually accompanied him on his trips.

Except in emergencies, they returned to their home, 412 Del Mar Boulevard, each weekend. The judge taught a Sunday school class of married couples at the First Christian Church and Mrs. Allred taught a class of Latin American youngsters.

HIS AMBITIONS

Asked once what his ambition was for Corpus Christi and south Texas, Allred answered: "Better understanding and cooperation between the races."

Allred had a reputation as a stern judge, but his sternness often imperfectly concealed compassion. He had known what it was like to be hungry in his youth and never forgot it. In almost every criminal case which came before him he was willing to give a first offender a second chance.

In one case he reprimanded an Internal Revenue Service agent for threatening and intimidating two local taxpayers with revocation of probation if they did not pay delinquent income taxes.

THEFT CASE

In another case he dismissed a charge of interstate transportation of a stolen automobile against a defendant who had been held in jail for more than a month in another State while awaiting trial. Allred ruled that the defendant had been denied a prompt and speedy trial guaranteed him under the Constitution.

After he had given one defendant another chance, he received this letter: "Your true understanding of my situation 2½ years ago straightened out my life. You are a kind and generous man."

Allred was born March 29, 1899, in Bowie, one of six sons and three daughters born to Renne and Mary Allred. His father was a rural mail carrier and a wagonyard operator. He graduated from Bowie High School in 1917, selling newspapers and shining shoes to help support his family. Instead of accepting scholarships offered him by Texas A. & M. and several other schools (he had played tackle on the Bowie High School football team) he decided to attend Rice Institute in Houston.

"It was my first time away from home," Allred said in an interview earlier this year, recalling his youth. "I worked at a service station out on Preston and rode the trolley from school to work and back, an hour each way. I stayed 2 months, got overworked and homesick, and quit."

PEANUT BROKER

He worked for a time with a peanut broker in Fort Worth and then joined the U.S. Immigration Service in El Paso, leaving June 14, 1918, to enlist in the Navy as an apprentice seaman. He received his discharge in 1919. He returned to Wichita Falls, where his family had moved. He worked there at a law office as a stenographer for 2 months before he could save enough money to buy a suit of clothes, wearing his Navy uniform in the interim.

As a boy of 15, Allred had become fascinated by the drama of a courtroom trial and determined to become a prosecuting attorney. In 1920 he enrolled at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tenn., earned his law degree in a year, and returned to Texas to take the bar examination.

"On July 13, 1921, I received a wire telling me I had passed," Allred once said. "I felt like I could have jumped a five-wire fence."

EARLY APPOINTMENT

Gov. Pat M. Neff appointed Allred as district attorney for Wichita, Archer, and Young Counties on December 21, 1923. He was elected to a full term in 1924. In 1926 he ran for attorney general, losing in the runoff by only 4,046 votes. He returned to the private practice of law, but returned in 1930 to run for attorney general and win.

He ran for Governor in 1934, defeating Tom Hunter in the runoff by more than 40,000 votes to become the 13th Governor of Texas and youngest Governor in the Nation at the age of 35. He was reelected to a second term in 1936 and served out his term before accepting a nomination as a Federal district judge.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt stepped to the rear platform of a special train at Wichita Falls in 1938 to announce Allred's appointment as a Federal judge.

The Allred family moved to Houston, where Allred took the oath of a Federal judge on March 4, 1939. But in 1942 he resigned to enter the special election to name a successor to Senator Morris Shepperd, who died in office. He was beaten by W. Lee O'Daniel by 18,000 votes.

STILL ACTIVE

O'Daniel blocked Allred's appointment as a judge to the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, but Allred continued actively in politics and campaigned vigorously for Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON in 1948. He was reappointed Federal judge of the southern district of Texas by President Harry S. Truman, moved to Corpus Christi and took his place on the bench October 29, 1949.

Commenting on his political philosophy Allred said, "I thought I was a moderate, but these history books have made me a liberal. But that's all right."

Looking back over his two terms as Governor, Allred said:

"One of the things I am proudest of is the interstate oil compact, which saved the oil industry from Federal control. The conservatives won't admit it, but I and Ernest Thompson, backed by half a dozen independents, were responsible for getting the oil compact adopted."

NATIONAL HONOR

Allred was selected the most outstanding young man in America in 1935 by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce. He was a 32d degree Mason, Shriner, Elk, Knight of Pythias and a member of the Odd Fellows.

In Stephenville, Governor Daniel had this comment upon hearing of the death of Allred:

"Judge Allred's death is a great loss to the State he loved. He will long be remembered for his years of devoted public service as attorney general, Governor, and Federal judge.

"Mrs. Daniel and I join his host of friends in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Allred and the other members of the family."

[From the Austin Statesman, Sept. 25, 1959]

FUNERAL SET FOR ALLRED

LAREDO.—James V. Allred, Federal district judge and former Governor and attorney general of Texas, died of a heart attack Thursday shortly after being admitted to Mercy Hospital. He was 60.

Allred, who was presiding at the September term here of the U.S. District Court for south Texas, complained of severe chest pains Wednesday and was treated at his hotel by a physician.

He returned to the bench Thursday, but at 11:30 a.m. interrupted a trial at which he was presiding, announced he was "a little under the weather," and adjourned court until 2:30 p.m.

He went to his hotel. Later in the afternoon his court clerk, A. J. Alemia of Edinburg, drove him to the hospital. He died of a coronary occlusion at 4:50 p.m., 35 minutes after being admitted.

Mrs. Allred, who accompanied her husband on his circuits of the large south Texas district, was at the hospital when he died.

Funeral services will be held Saturday afternoon at the First Christian Church, Corpus Christi. Burial will be at Riverside Cemetery, Wichita Falls, at a time to be announced.

In addition to his wife, Allred is survived by three sons, Captain James Allred, 29, an Air Force pilot; David, 25, a member of the Washington staff of U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and Sam Houston, 22, a student at Southern Methodist University, Dallas; and a granddaughter.

Other survivors include a sister, Mrs. Jeff Christian, Fort Worth; and three brothers, O. H. Allred, regional director of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Fort Worth; Ben Allred of Dallas; Renne Allred of Bowie, and Raymond Allred of Odessa.

Governor Price Daniel called Allred's death "A great loss to the State he loved. He will long be remembered for his years of devoted public service as attorney general, Governor, and Federal judge."

YARBOROUGH called Allred "The most eloquent champion of the people of Texas of our generation" and added "We friends who served him will miss him greatly."

Allred was born March 29, 1899, in Bowie, Tex., the son of a pioneer family. His great-grandfather came to Texas from Tennessee. His father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Renne Allred, once lived in a dugout in Childress County, where they took up a land claim. Drought drove them to Grayson County and later to Bowie, where his father was a rural mail carrier and operated a wagon yard.

Young Allred was christened James Burr V Allred for three uncles. Although the "V" stood for no name, Allred was known as "Vee" in his youth.

After graduating from Bowie High School he enlisted in the Navy in World War I. When he came home he shined shoes, sold newspapers, ran errands, and worked as a janitor and stenographer to earn money for his education.

He graduated from Cumberland University with a law degree in 1921 and began the practice of law in Wichita Falls.

When Allred was in the Navy he told friends he was going back to Texas and run for Governor. A talented and fiery lawyer and vigorous orator, he was quickly on his way to a political career that led to Governor and Federal judge.

Gov. Pat Neff appointed him assistant district attorney for Wichita, Archer, and Young Counties in 1923. A year later he was elected district attorney when only 25 years old.

He made his first bid for State office in 1926 as a candidate for attorney general in the Democratic primary. He lost but on his second try in 1930 he defeated the incumbent, Robert Lee Bobbitt, by a substantial majority.

During these busy years Allred met and courted Miss Jo Betsy Miller, of Wichita Falls, an accomplished pianist and graduate of Southern Methodist University. They were married on June 20, 1927.

Allred was reelected attorney general in 1932. During his two terms as attorney general, more suits were filed and tried by his office than any other up to that time.

He filed numerous antitrust suits including one for $17 million against 15 large oil companies and the American Petroleum Institute for alleged violations of the antitrust laws. The State lost, but Allred won many other antitrust cases.

Suits he filed recovered thousands of dollars in cash and valuable lands, including more than $1 million for the public-school fund.

One of his most notable achievements as attorney general was a victory in the U.S. Supreme Court over the right of Texas to control the flow of oil.

In 1934, firmly established on the political scene, Allred won the Democratic nomination for governor in a runoff with Tom Hunter by a majority of 40,000. He was elected to a second term without a runoff.

Allred's two terms as Governor, 1935–39, were maked by an effort to restore prosperity and to correct evils thought to have been responsible for the depression.

The old-age assistance amendment to the State constitution was adopted. It was followed by other social-security measures, including an amendment authorizing teacher retirement.

The old board of pardons was reorganized into the board of pardons and paroles; workmen's compensation was instituted for State employees and the salaries of the Governor, secretary of state, attorney general, comptroller, treasurer, and land commissioner were raised. Politically he was alined with President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It was Roosevelt who dramatically took Allred out of politics temporarily. The President, making a whistle-stop tour in 1938, announced from the rear platform of his special train during a stop in Wichita Falls that he was appointing Allred a Federal judge.

Allred, however, finished out his term as Governor before becoming a judge of the U.S. District Court of South Texas.

Allred was a political foe of former Governor and U.S. Senator W. Lee O'Daniel. In June 1942 he resigned as Federal judge and announced he would oppose O'Daniel for reelection to the U.S. Senate.

O'Daniel won, and early in 1943 President Roosevelt nominated Allred as a justice of the court of appeals.

Objections were raised in Senate committee, and the nomination was withdrawn with Allred's consent.

Critics argued it was a "payoff" to Allred for his race against O'Daniel, a frequent opponent of the Roosevelt administration. Allred denied this, saying that President Roosevelt gave him no encouragement whatever in his senatorial campaign.

Allred practiced law privately in Houston until President Harry Truman appointed him to fill another vacancy on the bench of the U.S. District Court for South Texas.

Although Allred spent much of his time holding court at Laredo, Brownsville, Houston, and Victoria, the Allreds made it a point to return to Corpus Christi each Sunday except in extreme emergencies.

They were members of the First Christian Church there. Allred taught a Sunday school class for married couples and his wife a class for Latin American children.

Allred also received many honors during his life. In 1935 he was selected as the outstanding young man in America by the U.S. Shriners, Knights of Pythias, Odd Fellows, and Lambda Chi fraternity.

Among tributes to Allred, Garland Adair, curator of Texas Memorial Museum, recounted Friday that Allred, as Governor, made the Memorial Museum a reality. Allred in 1935 signed a State $3 million appropriation bill for the 1936 Texas centennial, which included $250,000 for the museum. Then the State secured matching Federal funds to supplement the State appropriation.

"If it had not been for Governor Allred's efforts and leadership," Adair said, "we would never have built Memorial Museum."

[From the Corpus Christi Times, Sept. 25, 1959]

HARD CAMPAIGNER—ALLRED'S MAGNETISM WAS HARD TO RESIST

(By Dade Cheavens)

AUSTIN.—Political writers who followed Jimmie Allred on Texas campaign trails found his personal magnetism hard to resist.

The fiery orator of the late 1920's and 1930's who looked and acted like a young man until the day he died was so persuasive that they had to force themselves to write objectively.

That warmth had a way of radiating through audiences in his days and nights on the stump. Allred really loved people and he loved to talk.

BEST AT RALLIES

In the days before television and when radio speeches were still somewhat of a novelty, the youthful Allred turned all the blazing power of his personality full force into the listening crowd. He was at his best at a rally on the courthouse square.

Allred would build up toward an oratorical climax with all the fervor of a revivalist at such a rally, then appeal to his audience to join with him as "messengers of truth." After the speech, he would leap from the rostrum into the crowd and shake hands and talk as long as anyone would stay.

Then after the drum beating was over, he would sit up for hours in a cafe or hotel lobby and swap yarns with newsmen.

On one of these occasions, he told how he decided to run some day for governor.

It was soon after his graduation from Bowie High School, where he had been a mediocre but eager debater. Allred had quit a draft-exempt job to join the Navy. He and three hometown friends were dreaming aloud of their future in their barracks at San Francisco.

"I was thinking of home and how much I loved Texas," Allred said. "I knew it was a long way off, but I said: 'Some day I'm going home and run for governor.' And I did."

Allred was a package of nervous energy, and driving force.

ALWAYS RESTLESS

He was always restless and impatient of delay. Early in his public career he decided that the way to get things done in government was to challenge young men of ability to join him in public service. One of these, for example, was Bob Anderson, now Secretary of the Treasury.

Anderson was known as the unofficial chief of Allred's Austin "brain trust of bright young men." He had gone into public life originally as an assistant attorney general under Allred.

The Allred administration was trying to pick up the pieces from the depression and one important step was passage of the Unemployment Compensation Commission Act. Anderson wrote it. Helping him was a young legislator named Allan Shivers.

Both Shivers and Anderson alined themselves politically with the Republicans in later years. But politically Republicans were Allred's bitterest enduring enemies.

Allred was a deep-dyed New Dealer.

Franklin D. Roosevelt admired and respected him and named him to the Federal bench in 1939. After an interlude during which he resigned to try unsuccessfully to unseat W. Lee O'Daniel as U.S. Senator, Allred was named by Roosevelt to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals at New Orleans. When objections were raised in Senate committee, Roosevelt withdrew the nomination at Allred's request. President Truman appointed him as Federal district judge in 1949.

During the stormy Democratic split in 1944, Allred was one of the chief behind-the-scenes strategists for the loyalist or New Deal group that ultimately won party control over the conservatives.

Allred was also active in the background as an adviser in Dr. Homer P. Rainey's unsuccessful bid as a liberal for the governorship.

INTEREST NEVER LAGGED

Win or lose, Allred's interest in politics never lagged. Reporters could rely on him for reliable information if he had it. He avoided active participation after he became a Federal judge, but he almost always knew what was going on.

Close friends said one of his most difficult decisions was against seeking a third term

as Governor. But like many another Governor, he was reluctant to close the door on any future action.

When he announced his decision not to try again for Governor, he said:

"Of course, it is my nature to feel the tingle and desire for political conflict. * * * In the future, should the occasion arise, I always shall stand ready to serve the State I love."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Sept. 26, 1959]

PARTY WAS ALLRED'S LAST

(By Richard M. Morehead)

AUSTIN, TEX.—Few people could enjoy a farewell party as James V. Allred did here shortly before his death.

Nobody knew at the dinner honoring Allred here on September 4 that it was a farewell to the dynamic political figure.

But Jimmy—as most friends called him whether he was Governor or Federal judge—was in rare form.

Some 100 of Allred's friends, mostly men and women who served with him as attorney general in 1931–35, dined in the historic Driskill Hotel's Crystal Ballroom.

The black-haired, fast-talking Allred was in rare form. He introduced every guest present, and gave personal reminiscences of many of them. Some of the friendships dated back to his youth. Nearly all had been Allred's friends during his 30 years of public life.

Multiple services have been planned for Allred, 60, who died Thursday shortly after leaving court at Laredo.

The first service will be held in Corpus Christi at 4 p.m., Saturday in the First Christian Church.

His body will lie in state in the capitol rotunda Sunday afternoon. Hundreds of friends from all walks of life are expected to pass by his bier.

Final services are scheduled for 3 p.m. Monday at the First Christian Church in Wichita Falls where he began practicing law in 1921. Burial will follow in Riverside Cemetery there.

Allred's death left Texas with six living ex-Governors. They are William P. Hobby, Houston publisher, Governor in 1917–21; Miriam A. Ferguson, now living in Austin, Governor in 1925–27 and 1933–35; Dan Moody, Austin attorney, 1927–31; W. Lee O'Daniel, now in Dallas, 1933–41; Coke R. Stevenson, Junction rancher, 1941–47, and Allan Shivers, Austin business executive, 1949–57.

Allred symbolized the "New Deal" era in Texas politics. He helped to launch during the depression of the 1930's some of the social security programs that now are fixtures in State government.

These included the Texas Employment Commission, handling unemployment insurance and finding jobs for the jobless; the old-age assistance program now providing 225,000 checks monthly; and the department of public safety, founder of the modern State police department.

Nationally, Allred supported President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his "New Deal." They were good friends personally and politically. Allred was visiting the State capitol when President Roosevelt died, and he wept openly at the news.

In 1939, Roosevelt named him to the Federal bench as judge of the U.S. district court of south Texas. In 1942 Allred resigned and ran unsuccessfully against former Governor and U.S. Senator O'Daniel.

The next year the President nominated him as a justice of the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Objections were raised by O'Daniel and others and the nomination was withdrawn with Allred's consent. Former President Harry Truman appointed Allred as Federal district judge in 1949.

[From the American-Statesman, Sept. 27, 1959]

JAMES V. ALLRED: "HE LIVED FULL THROTTLE"

(By Dave Shanks)

Early in August of 1934, just after the July Democratic primaries, James V. Allred pointed his car toward Dallas. He hoped to muster support for his runoff gubernatorial campaign against Tom Hunter, also of Wichita Falls, and the highest vote getter in the first primary.

Flipping on his car radio, Allred heard an announcer read from his news script an exclusive story that Capitol Correspondent Raymond Brooks of The American-Statesman had broken only minutes before in the afternoon newspapers at Waco.

"Ferguson machine and Klan "X's" are setting up Hunter's campaign," Brooks had reported.

Allred had needed an issue for his campaign. This was to be his. And at 35, he moved from the "little frame cottage on a dusty street (on Avenue F in North Austin)" to the mansion, the second youngest Governor in Texas' history.

Brooks recalls the incident, a part of the lore that grew up in Allred's phenomenally successful career, ended Thursday by death.

Hunter's victory had been so conclusive that his editors decided to send Brooks to Wichita Falls to interview Hunter and his family. He stopped for coffee at Waco's Roosevelt Hotel, where he met an acquaintance, a known Hunter supporter.

The friend had asked if Brooks "was going to the meeting in Marlin?"

"Sure," answered Brooks, "and you can ride with me if you will show me the way."

Brooks was unaware of any meeting, but he ducked through the kitchen, and, following instructions, went to Marlin.

There he saw numerous backers of Gov. Jim Ferguson who thought their meeting was secret and anyone attending surely was invited.

Brooks even served as "secretary," and he stuffed in his pocket the only list of names of the chairmen picked when he began his race to beat the newspaper deadlines at Waco.

In the backview of politics, Allred agreed that the news story tilted the election in his favor. And Hunter, speaking in Austin, oratorically tarred and feathered Brooks.

Others in Austin add to the Allred-ana, a record built during two terms as attorney general and two terms as Governor.

Ed Clark, once Allred's secretary (administrative assistant) and secretary of state, recalls their first meeting, in the courthouse at San Augustine. "He had come to town, running for the first time for attorney general."

"Jimmie was the last of the whirlwind campaigners, one of those who could get out the voters to the courthouse squares in Texas," says Clark.

Allred, says Clark, was one of the few politicians who "believed in being for the little fellow when it wasn't politically popular."

"He had no fear of 17 major oil companies and only asked his assistants in the attorney general's office: 'Are you sure they violated the law?'"

Allred was popular, but he had his political enemies. "Jimmie had strong friends and bitter enemies," says Clark. "There were people in this town who wouldn't speak to him."

With the humor that retrospect sometimes permits, Clark laughs about the speeches Senator T. J. Holbrook of Galveston (now of Austin) made on the senate floor, "Every morning * * *," grins Clark, "but ask the senator about it."

Senator Holbrook acknowledges the speeches. But he and Allred were personal friends. Only recently, at Holbrook's suggestion, a Dallas newspaper had prepared biographies of the seven living governors. Because of this, Holbrook and Allred had recently corresponded.

"He was sincere and had to take up all of the social problems of the State in his administration," recalls Holbrook, who remembers Allred as a person who compiled an "unparalleled political career in Texas."

Clyde Smith, Texas Supreme Court justice, first met Allred in his unsuccessful campaign for attorney general. "Jimmie was driving a Model T," recalls Judge Smith, who admired Allred's ability to "like people and have them like him." He remembers Allred's pleasure in attending the softball games, which the Governor, Gerald Mann and Smith frequently attended.

RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator, a one-time Allred assistant attorney general, says the former Governor and U.S. judge "was a man who walked with kings but never lost the common touch or his interest in the man on the street."

"What higher tribute to Jimmie Allred can Texans pay than to recognize him as a man to be remembered in the same breath with Jim Hogg and Sam Houston?"

Herman Jones, who served in two Allred legislatures and later became a personal friend, credits Allred with using the special session as a legislative tool.

Allred wanted to repeal horseracing in Texas, and the issue had wallowed through two regular sessions. Allred called a special session, flatly rejected all requests for additional legislation "until the bill is on my desk."

As an orator, Jones says, Allred had a voice with a pitch a little higher than normal and it lacked the deep resonance of some of the others.

"It wasn't especially pleasant to hear," he continues, "but Jimmie could make a crowd yell, 'Pour it on 'em, Jimmie,' more times than you can count."

Jones traveled with Allred on some of his speaking tours for the National Democratic Committee.

"Jimmie could never pass by a newspaper * * * he would buy as many as 14 * * * we would laugh about it, and he would say, 'I just haven't read 'em.'"

Allred was a kind man, one who rarely forgot the incidents important to his friends.

Jones remembers a tour the two had planned for the National Democrats into New Mexico. Gov. Clyde Tingley had set up the itinerary, and since he was a candidate himself, he set the course for his own liking.

"It just happened Tingley stood real well in Carlsbad; so, that wasn't on the list of towns."

But Jones, anticipating a letter from a sweetheart, had told her to write him at Carlsbad.

"Allred headed the car south from Roswell, and we made the 110 mile round trip—but didn't find a letter there."

Years later, en route to California, Allred stopped in Carlsbad long enough to write a post card to Jones: "The letter still hasn't come."

Jones observes that Allred served in the executive and judicial branches of the government, but never in the legislative branch.

"Allred was such an advocate of the people that I'm sure he would have served best in a legislature," says Jones.

Said one friend of Allred: "He lived full throttle."

[From the Corpus Christi Caller Times, Sept. 28, 1959]

AUSTIN TRIBUTE—MINISTERS PRAISE ALLRED IN CEREMONY AT CAPITOL

AUSTIN.—Former Governor and Federal Judge James V. Allred was eulogized as a fighter for the underdog in a memorial service Sunday in the State senate chamber.

Ministers conducting the service lauded him as a man of vision, faith, courage, and tremendous energy who lived his ideals.

Allred's body was carried into the capitol, where he served 4 years as attorney general and 4 years as Governor, by an honor guard from the 149th Military Policy Company of the Texas National Guard.

FINAL TRIBUTE

The body lay in state from 2 p.m. until 4 p.m. while hundreds of State officials, former associates and old Austin friends streamed past the casket to pay final tribute.

"The most exciting event in creation is when the goodness that comes from God breaks out in the life of a man," said the Rev. Lawrence Bash, pastor of the University Christian Church.

"We face the core of reality when the goodness of God reveals itself in a man such as Jimmy Allred.

MAN OF INTEGRITY

"His humble beginning made him a fighter for the underdog. He was compelled to live always close to the average man. Allred was a man who preserved his integrity throughout his public career, an integrity which was based on his faith. He was a true Christian and churchman."

Assisting the Rev. Mr. Bash was Dr. John Barclay, pastor of the First Christian Church, of Austin.

Allred died Thursday of a heart attack at Laredo.

The first of three funeral services was held for him Saturday in Corpus Christi.

PAUSE IN AUSTIN

The funeral cortege en route to Wichita Falls paused in Austin for a memorial service attended by more than 300 persons, including high State and National figures.

Under a State police escort, Allred's body was taken Sunday afternoon to Wichita Falls, where final rites will be held Monday at 3 p.m. in the First Christian Church. Burial will be in Riverside Cemetery.

The solemn memorial service in the senate chamber was attended also by many old and close friends, and many who were in State service while Allred was Governor, 1935–39.

Among those at the service were Governor and Mrs. Daniel, former Governor and Mrs. Dan Moody, and Senators Lyndon B. Johnson and Ralph Yarborough.

[From the Texas Observer, June 27, 1955]

ALLRED REVISITED—A TIME TO REMEMBER

(By Ronnie Dugger)

CORPUS CHRISTI.—Jimmy Allred used to be a shoeshine boy and a sailor, an attorney general and a Governor. He used to slam his opponents around and fight the trusts and demand new taxes on oil and gas and sulfur. Now it's Judge Allred, and when he's not hearing evidence or handing down decisions in his Federal court here, he's watering the flower seeds his wife indefatigably plants, or reading novels of the West, or teaching a Sunday school class.

Jimmy Allred has retired from politics, but his time was a time to remember, and this is an effort to.

When he became Governor in 1934, tens of thousands of Texans lived in "the jungles" under the river bridges, on the banks, in the woods. There were 250,000 Texas families on relief. In San Antonio, Maury Maverick helped the homeless organize life in abandoned warehouses, gave them jobs tearing up old freight cars and selling the scrap.

These were the desperate times. Mayor Oscar Holcombe, of Houston, had to tell a legislative committee that unless a relief measure was passed, his police would have to fire on the mobs, but they wouldn't because their brothers would be in the mobs. Oscar Powell, a San Antonio lawyer, turned to a friend and said, "If this thing doesn't pass, I'm wiring my wife to leave town." It passed.

Allred's years as Governor—1935–39—were, as he put it when he stepped down, "the pioneer age in social security in Texas." In one sphere, State policies were miniatures of the New Deal. In another, unresolved conflicts between Allred and the legislature over taxation and control of lobbyists are mirrored in the issues of modern Texas politics.

GUNFIGHTS ON "SMOKY ROW"

Allred's parents, who were from Grayson County, moved in a prairie schooner to a homestead on the frontier of Childress County. They lived in a dugout for a time—it was primitive those days around Childress—and they lost a baby girl on their retreat back to Bowie. Jimmy was born in Bowie in 1899.

He washed bottles for a bottling company, sold newspapers, shined shoes in a barber shop. He saw gun battles on Bowie's famous main street, "Smoky Row." The roughness of his youth conditioned him in a strange way, for later he was to abolish race track betting in Texas and became a teetotaler. In 1935, a news service said:

"Boyish observance of lawless saloons made him a teetotaler * * * His mother's hearty application of the rod when she overheard him and his brothers use the jargon of horse traders made him avoid both profanity and vile speech."

He enrolled at Rice Institute for a time, working as a filling station attendant to meet expenses. The double load was too much for him. He dropped out, got another job, then enlisted in the Navy in 1918. After the war he got a law degree at Cumberland's short-order law school in Tennessee.

He was appointed district attorney of Wichita Falls in the early twenties and brought some Ku Kluxers to trial for floggings. In 1926, a nobody, he ran for attorney general and missed election by 4,000 votes out of 766,000.

Soon thereafter he married Jo Betsy Miller, a music graduate of S.M.U.

A TEXAS TRUSTBUSTER

When the attorney general resigned, Gov. Dan Moody passed Allred by and chose Robert Lee Bobbitt. Allred shook his fist under the Governor's nose and promised to lick the proverbial socks off his appointee in the next election. He did.

As attorney general, he followed some advice that Dr. Robert Montgomery, one of his brain trusters, gave him. Montgomery, professor of economics at the University of Texas, and Vann Kennedy, a political savant also chose to Allred, conferred with the new legal officer 2 days after his election. Montgomery recalls that he advised Allred to pick up where Jim Hogg left off in 1894—monopolies, the trusts, the utilities.

Allred filed an antitrust suit against the major oil producers of the United States on grounds that the oil marketing code permitted a trust and monopoly in Texas in violation of its laws. By 1932 they had been fined $16 million.

He enjoined fly-by-night insurance corporation from operating in the State. That, of course, has a contemporary ring.

He ruled that Negroes could not vote in Democratic primaries—a ruling that was to cause him political trouble later.

Elected to a second term without trouble, by 1934 he had become the dominant figure in Texas politics. His antitrust policy marked him as the kind of economic liberal that was at that time in demand in policy-making councils.

TWENTY-ONE YEARS AGO

Seven men ran for Governor in 1934. The theses and history books are full of the vituperation and mudslinging that is standard equipment in Texas elections, but Allred's platform had a clear, substantive ring to it.

One of the ironies of that year from the present perspective was his condemnation of lobbyists in Austin and the practice of legislators taking retainer fees from private interests.

Here is how Texas Political Historian S. S. McKay recapitulates this plank in his platform:

"He favored a definite fight to relieve the State of lobbyists. His plan was to have all candidates for State office required to file a list of all employments or retainers during the year immediately preceding their announcement; also, that members of the legislature should be required to file at the beginning of their terms of office and once a month thereafter a list of clients by whom they were retained and the amount of retainers they were paid. A further safeguard was suggested * * * whereby all lobbyists should be required to file sworn statements telling the names of their employers, the amounts of money they received, and the manner in which it was spent."

In the 54th legislature, 21 years later, Senator William Shireman, of Corpus Christi, introduced a bill which would have accomplished almost exactly what Allred wanted on retainer fees; and Representative Maury Maverick, Jr., of San Antonio, introduced another one which would have required lobbyist registration almost precisely as Allred had proposed it.

Allred told the legislature in January 1935, that he favored "a real lobby regulation law and a law requiring periodical disclosures under oath by members of the legislature and other State officers as to their employment and retainers."

The legislature, of course, did nothing, even as they did nothing in 1955. At Allred's inaugural in 1937, he said, rather indirectly, that "the hand of privilege must be kept from the halls of government," but apparently by that time he had accepted the facts of Austin life.

READY FOR A NEW CYCLE

The social programs Allred advocated in his 1934 campaign included relief to the needy, an old-age pension system, an expanded education system, and full recognition of the rights of organized labor. He was for full support of President Roosevelt.

Later in the decade, he said he felt that prohibition was not an intelligent solution of the drinking problem, but personally he was a dry. In 1934, he wanted to submit to the people the question of the repeal of prohibition. He also wanted to outlaw racetrack gambling, which had been legalized in Texas in 1933.

He wanted a balanced budget. The State was $10 million in the red. By the time he packed up and left the Governor's mansion 4 years later, it was $20 million.

He was adamant against Federal control of natural gas production. In this he opposed the New Deal.

Dr. Montgomery's counsel was heeded on public utilities, and Allred advocated a utility commission empowered to make rates based on actual investment, to eliminate large sums paid utilities for services, and to set rates.

On January 15, 1935, the 36-year-old Governor told the legislature and 6 million Texans:

"Too many of our citizens are on relief rolls; and fear clutches at the hearts of even those fortunate enough to be employed. * * * We are ready for a new cycle of progress."

[From the Texas Observer, July 4, 1955]

TAX FIGHT IS 21 YEARS OLD

CORPUS CHRISTI.—In 1934, Gov. Jimmy Allred laid down a philosophy of State taxation which to this day polarizes the conservatives and the liberals under the capitol dome.

Allred, now living a relatively peaceful life as a Federal district judge in Corpus Christi, sent a message to the legislature 2 months

after his inauguration appealing for natural resources tax increases, an income tax, and other tax forms which he believed were directed at interests that were making piles of money in Texas without making adequate contributions to the cost of government.

As late as 1955, in the 54th legislature, legislators were arguing about exactly the same taxes Allred proposed 21 years ago.

Not even the urgent financial needs of the depression and a growing State deficit could weaken the legislature's tenacious defense of out-of-State industrial interests.

Allred started from the proposition that property taxes were first levied in a time when most everybody lived on farms but that by 1934 they had become unfairly burdensome on farm and homeowners.

He knew full well that his proposals would provoke the most powerful opposition.

"In equalizing the tax burdens you and I are going to tread on somebody's toes," he said. But something simply had to be done.

Out-of-State chainstores had developed into interstate monoliths, doing huge business without having to pay taxes which businesses organized inside State lines were paying. Allred proposed a graduated chainstore tax, based on the amount of gross revenues and the number of stores in the chain.

NATURAL RESOURCES EYED

Texas was producing almost half of the crude petroleum in the United States. About 85 percent of that crude oil was being consumed beyond the boundaries of Texas. Texas consumers had to pay 4 cents a gallon on gasoline—a sum that did not change until 1955—but out-of-State consumers of Texas gasoline contributed nothing in sales taxes to the Texas treasury.

Allred proposed a study to see if the tax on crude oil should be revised. Depletion of the resources was one factor, he said; so also was the fact that "the oil industry is a moneymaking industry even in the midst of these dark days of economic depression."

He also recommended a flat tax on natural gas of 1 cent per thousand cubic feet, a severance tax of the type which finally passed in 1951, only to be declared unconstitutional.

A large part of Texas natural gas production was, and is, shipped out of State through pipelines. Of the money his natural gas of 1 cent per thousand cubic feet, mated that less than one-sixth would be paid by the citizens of Texas and approximately five-sixths by those outside the State.

Turning to sulfur and pipelines, Allred exhibited some of the antimonopolistic fervor which seems to have been melted by the production emergencies of the war and the postwar boom.

He said that two companies had a virtual monopoly on sulfur production and have made stupendous profits. He wanted their State tax raised—not nominally, but substantially.

"The shocking evil * * * of giant integrated concerns engaged in the production, transportation, and sale of natural gas" was, he said, even more pronounced in the oil business. He pointed out that in 1934, while operating at a loss in the refining and marketing ends of the business, 20 pipeline companies reported to the Secretary of State a total net profit of more than $78 million. One company made $13 million, another $11 million, another $10 million. These profits were—even in 1934—an average of 25 percent profit in 1 year on their investments.

He wanted a franchise tax of 1 percent against the gross assets of pipeline companies, both oil and gas. This would have given the State one seventy-eighth of their combined net profits.

Allred also wanted to increase the inheritance tax rate, and he spoke of a State income tax as "one of the fairest and most equitable levies that the State could make."

INCOME VERSUS SALES TAXES

He contrasted an income tax, based on ability to pay, with a general sales tax, "a tax on poverty."

Under a 2-percent general sales tax, he said, people with an income of $1,000 or less would pay $12.18 per thousand dollars of income, while people with an income of $1 million a year would pay only 20 cents per thousand dollars.

"To illustrate: the chief proponents of a sales tax are the chief opponents of an income tax," he said. "They advocate a 2-percent sales tax which is nothing more than a 2-percent income tax on the average man because he is compelled to spend all he makes for the necessities of life." Lobbyists for the utilities, investment bankers, the Mellon interests and others are the chief forces working for the sales tax, he said.

Allred did not object to a selective luxury tax on retail sales on grounds that it was a tax on privilege and wealth. But he fought a sales tax during his entire tenure as Governor.

The legislature listened to Allred's plan. It was well received editorially. But the legislature, too, knew what would happen. The newspapers of the time do not relate it, but one does not have to be a veteran in Austin to imagine what the lobbyists started doing to protect the interests of their clients.

The legislators did not pass any new natural resources taxes.

They did not pass a graduated chainstore tax.

They did not pass an income tax or increase the inheritance tax.

The chief source of new revenue was new alcohol taxes that poured into the Treasury upon the death of prohibition.

Sales tax forces also failed to put over their program.

The result: a $10 million deficit at the start of Allred's term had become a $20 million deficit when he went out of office in 1939.

There has been no fundamental change in the structure of power politics in Austin since the defeat of Allred's tax philosophy.

In 1955, the legislature refused to raise natural resources levies and passed new sales taxes on gasoline, beer, and cigarettes.

Isolated cries were heard at the House microphones and on the Senate floor that this was the biggest step toward a general sales tax in Texas history.

[From the Texas Observer, Sept. 25, 1959]

JAMES ALLRED

(By Ronnie Dugger)

The death of a great Governor, like the death of a great President, moves us to think on our country, how it is fine, and brings forth and uses its fine people. Jimmy Allred has not been put into many of the books that teach our students their heritage in Texas; he was too lately successful for the many who are forgetful at the expense of the few who remember. But he lived among us, and he was one of ours. We are reassured about our genuine attributes as a people and a Nation, first, that men come forward from among us who are brave, devoted, and unorthodox, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, Houston, Hogg, and Allred; and second, that these men reflect, as they refract, the impulses which hold us together as a people, personal freedom, popular faith, and the righteous fight. Perhaps it is better to have lived in such a man's time, even for those who, after he had done his main work, betrayed it, perhaps it is better simply to have been among those who knew he had done the main work and was living still as a judge in Corpus Christi, than it will be for those who must sense him from the books he will take his place in. People would speak of how he drank coffee in a coffee shop each morning in Corpus, and it was strange, almost wasteful, for he who was so much to the people he lived among to live in any particular way in any particular place. For he, James Allred, did enough for us all, in his time, which chose to use him, and found him true, that we gave to him that highest compliment we have in our power and wisely mostly withhold, our love of the ideal.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller]

JUDGE JAMES V. ALLRED: FIGHTING HUMANITARIAN

There are some who will remember James V. Allred as a crusading district attorney general of Texas. Others will think of him as a reform Governor who eliminated legalized betting on horseracing, set up a liquor control system after the end of prohibition, established the State's first parole supervision plan and led Texas through some of the most difficult days of the great depression.

None will remember him more thankfully, though, than a lot of little people who confronted him in his capacity as a Federal judge. They are the ones to whom he gave the oath of allegiance and conferred U.S. citizenship, a duty he cherished above most others. They are the ones who found him interposing his great power as a magistrate to protect them from the tyranny of a bureaucracy. They are the ones who heard him say, "I'm going to give you another chance," granting them probation rather than sending them to prison.

The humanity that he brought to the courtroom perhaps can be exemplified best by one incident. He had before him a youth who was charged with evading the draft. He dismissed the charge on condition that the youth enter the Armed Forces. Two and one-half years later the grateful youth wrote him: "Your true understanding of my situation 2½ years ago straightened out my life. You are a kind and generous man."

The driving force that took James V. Allred from humble beginnings to the Governor's office never left him when he reached the comparative security of the Federal bench. He drove himself harder than he did the lawyers who appeared in his court. Yet he still found time for a host of church and civic duties. He worked unceasingly for better understanding and cooperation between the races.

The State and Nation will miss an able and dedicated public servant. South Texas will mourn also the loss of a great humanitarian and an outstanding citizen.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Light, Sept. 29, 1959]

JAMES ALLRED

The career of James V. Allred was an example of the opportunity which awaits any intelligent and ambitious young man who is willing to work hard and make sacrifices.

After serving in the Navy in World War I, he shined shoes, sold newspapers, ran errands and worked as a janitor and as a stenographer to pay for his education.

Allred got his law degree from Cumberland University in 1921 and went on to become attorney general, Governor of Texas and a Federal district judge.

Gov. Price Daniel has called the death of James Allred "a great loss to the State he loved" and has said that "he will long be remembered for his years of devoted public service."

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH characterized him as "the most eloquent champion of the people of Texas of our generation."

[From the Abilene Reporter-News]

JIMMY ALLRED'S LONG, COLORFUL CAREER ENDS

Those who remember Jimmy Allred in his heyday as a political figure in Texas will have

no trouble recalling the dynamic personality of the man, his tireless energy, and his way with a crowd. He was in the field of Texas politics pretty much what Jimmy Cagney was at the height of his career as an actor—full of sparkle and as lively as a cricket.

It is hard to realize that he is dead at 60 of a heart attack.

James V. Allred, a native of Bowie, was an assistant district attorney in Wichita, Archer, and Young Counties at 23, and at 25 had been elected one of the youngest district attorneys in Texas. He was still under 30 when he tried for attorney general, but that time he missed. Nothing dismayed, he tried again in 1930 and was elected by a firm majority—the youngest man ever elected to that post, an important one in Texas. He was reelected in 1932, and 2 years later in a crowded field of gubernatorial candidates he went into the runoff with Tom Hunter and came out the victor by 40,000 votes in a ding-dong contest. They were both residents of Wichita Falls at the time, and Allred was the first west Texan ever elected Governor, if our memory is on straight.

On completion of his second term he was named a Federal district judge by Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1942 he resigned the Federal post to challenge an old political foe, W. Lee O'Daniel, for Governor, but "Pappy" won the nomination.

A few months later, in 1943, President Roosevelt again named him to a Federal judgeship, this time the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, but the Senate Judiciary Committee refused a favorable report.

But Jimmy Allred had a habit of coming back. In 1951 President Truman appointed him as judge of the Federal district of south Texas, a position he held at the time of his death.

With his second ascension to the Federal bench, Jimmy Allred took himself out of Texas politics and went about his duties without the fanfare that had marked his earlier career. As attorney general and Governor he was colorful and lively, and never ducked a fight.

Not many men, if any, ever received three appointments to the Federal bench—the second with considerable controversy—but Jimmy Allred did.

In the late 1920's he proved, along with Dan Moody, that a young man of purpose and courage had a place in Texas politics. Like Moody, he served as attorney general and Governor at a time when Texas politics really sizzled.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram]

JAMES V. ALLRED

Within a life span of three-score years, James V. Allred served as Texas attorney general, Governor and Federal judge. Previously he had been an assistant district attorney and district attorney of Wichita, Archer and Young Counties, and in World War I served in the Navy.

In this active career Jimmie Allred, as he was widely known, demonstrated tremendous energy, competitive spirit, outstanding ability and many other traits useful in his service to State and Nation. As attorney general, he was proud of the development of promising young men on his staff. Among them was Bob Anderson, now Secretary of the Treasury.

As attorney general, Judge Allred set a record in filings of suits, and among notable victories was a case in which the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the right of the State to control the flow of oil. As a two-term Governor, 1935–39, he sponsored many recovery measures, and during his tenure the State constitutional amendments for teacher retirement and old age assistance were approved.

Judge Allred twice was appointed Federal judge, resigning in 1942 to make an unsuccessful race against then U.S. Senator W. Lee O'Daniel. He was reappointed to the Federal bench in 1949. Judge Allred made a fine record as a Federal judge, and his death comes at a time when there is a serious shortage of U.S. trial judges.

Judge Allred won many honors in his public career, among them his selection in 1935 by the junior chamber of commerce as the outstanding young man in America. He had a broad circle of friends extending from the White House to the local precinct. As a liberal, his political fortunes varied with the times. His public service was fruitful and above reproach, and Texas has reason to be proud of him.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1959]

STATE LOSES ABLE SERVANT IN DEATH OF JUDGE ALLRED

Although he had been a prominent figure in Texas' turbulent politics for many years, when James V. Allred became a Federal district judge he left politics behind and won the nonpartisan praise of lawyers for his ability and conduct on the bench.

The State has lost a devoted public servant in his death.

The trait which probably was most responsible for Allred's great success in Texas politics was his winsome, forthright personality. He was broadminded and tolerant, respecting the views of others as he wanted them to respect his views.

He was loyal to his friends, even when it was more expedient not to be. He was, however, politically astute and had an unusual ability to gauge public opinion.

Born in Bowie, of a pioneer Texas family, he served a hitch in the Navy after high school, then worked his way through Cumberland University in Tennessee to get a law degree. He was interested in public service when he was still in his teens. He was appointed district attorney in the Wichita Falls district in 1923 and elected to the office in 1924. He ran for attorney general in 1926, lost by a small margin and came back in 1930 to win. Four years later he was elected Governor, serving two terms. A strong supporter of President Roosevelt, Allred was appointed a Federal district judge in 1938, resigned to run for the U.S. Senate in 1942 and lost, then was appointed to the Federal bench again in 1949 by President Truman.

[From the Houston Post, Sept. 26, 1959]

JAMES V. ALLRED LEFT A NOTABLE RECORD OF TEXAS PUBLIC SERVICE

Judge James V. Allred left a varied record of distinguished public service that spanned a period of 36 years. It began in 1923 when, at the youthful age of 24, he became district attorney of Wichita, Archer and Young Counties. It ended Thursday when, as U.S. judge for the southern district of Texas, he died suddenly at the age of 60.

From the springboard of a successful administration as district attorney, he leaped into the 1926 race for attorney general without financial support and almost defeated the incumbent, Claude Pollard of Houston, an established, well-known lawyer and public official.

In 1930 he tried again and won. After serving two terms as attorney general, he was elected Governor, and for 4 hard years grappled with the problems of the depression and its economic aftermath.

At the end of his gubernatorial administration, in 1939, he was appointed U.S. district judge by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1942 he again succumbed to the call of politics, resigning to become a candidate for the U.S. Senate. This time he lost, but 7 years later he was again appointed to the Federal district court by President Harry S. Truman.

In political affairs, as in the legal profession, the virile, handsome Jimmy Allred was an aggressive, colorful contender and advocate. One of his most potent assets in both arenas was his gift of oratory; he was one of the most eloquent speakers in Texas public life. Newspapermen who accompanied him on speaking campaigns said he was one speaker they enjoyed hearing every time he spoke.

The step from the vigorous activities of politics and public service to the calm, impartial deliberations of the judiciary was a sharp transition. But members of the bar praised his fairness, as well as his judicial ability, and his reputation in that respect continued to grow through his years on the bench.

Although Judge Allred and his family moved to Corpus Christi after his second appointment to the judgeship, in order to be nearer the Victoria, Brownsville and Laredo divisions of his district, he was a resident of Houston in two different periods of his career. First, as a student of the Rice Institute in 1917–18, when he worked at a filling station to help pay his expenses. He left to enlist in the Navy in World War I, and thereafter, attended Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tenn.

Upon receiving his first judicial appointment, Allred moved his family to Houston. They lived here for about 10 years, and his gracious wife and three sons, along with the judge, won many friends in Houston.

These friends, with hosts of others over the State, will mourn the passing of one of the notable figures in Texas public life.

JAMES V. ALLRED

Only a few days ago those who had been associated with James V. Allred as attorney general and as Governor, held a reunion in his honor when he revisited Austin to take part in dedication of the Texas Employment Commission Building.

The smiling, buoyant, youthful-appearing 60-year-old U.S. judge renewed old acquaintances and happily mingled with those whom he had appointed to office, those with whom he had served in State government. For all of them, it was their last meeting with the dynamic self-made former Wichita Falls lawyer, who had risen to eminence in State administration and in the Federal judiciary.

His sudden death at Laredo Thursday came as a profound shock.

His life was one of the storybook examples of achievement from humble beginnings through individual effort, initiative, and ability.

When he was a small boy, his family lived in an east Texas sod house. Later the family moved to west Texas, and the story, told in political campaigns, that he as a youngster shined shoes to earn money for school was never denied. He worked his way through a law school and began practice of law in Wichita Falls. He served as attorney general, then won a spectacular race against a fellow townsman, Tom F. Hunter, for Governor. He succeeded Mrs. Miriam A. Ferguson, at the close of her second administration.

He was the only Texas Governor designated as a liberal, in the identification of the term with the New Deal philosophy under which President Roosevelt sought to rescue the Nation, and Allred helped to pull the State from the abyss of the depression.

After he completed two terms as Governor, succeeded by W. Lee O'Daniel, Allred was appointed by President Roosevelt as a Federal district judge. When O'Daniel and others ran for the U.S. Senate, Judge Allred resigned his post and entered the race.

Political charges that there was a trade whereby President Roosevelt was simply giving the young judge a leave of absence from the bench to make the race were refuted when Roosevelt did not reappoint him after the race and Allred's defeat by O'Daniel.

Several years later, President Harry S. Truman gave him a new appointment to the

Federal bench, for the south Texas district. Allred was presiding on the bench this week when stricken with the illness which proved fatal.

Allred became Governor at 35, second youngest in the State's history. Though he had behind him only his service as attorney general in State political office, his two terms as Governor constitute an administration which ranks high in solid and lasting achievements. Many problems of the depression were licked, and his administration saw Texas emerge from the blight of that black period, a growing and prosperous State.

He was a religious man who made his high moral and ethical principles a part of his everyday life and a part of the fabric of State government. In his later life, his service on the Federal bench has been in the best tradition of the judiciary.

James V. Allred, by his zeal, his ability, his integrity and his devotion to his State, has written a fine chapter in the chronicles of State government; his service on the bench has added to the lustre of the judiciary.

[From the Houston Press, Sept. 26, 1959]

JAMES V. ALLRED

James V. Allred—"Jimmy" to most Texans even after he achieved such distinguished rank as Governor of the State or Federal district judge—was a real life success story with few equals.

Jimmy was born of fine Texas people in Bowie and lived the typical life of a farm or small town boy around the turn of the century when small town life was vastly different from life now and while Texas was still Texas in all that name connoted in those days.

After graduating from high school in Bowie, he came to Houston to attend Rice Institute and worked in a filling station to pay his school expenses. Service in World War I followed and then Jimmy went to law school and started the practice of law at the age of 22.

The ability, the vigor and the personality of the young man soon became evident—and few people have ever risen as rapidly in public life as he did—a district attorney at 24—Texas attorney general at 30—and Governor of Texas at 35. At that time he was the youngest Governor in the Nation.

It is generally conceded that Governor Allred was one of the State's outstanding Governors. A vigorous man—a man of warmth—he piled up an outstanding record in depression years when filling the office of chief executive of any State was particularly difficult.

Some idea of what the people thought of him may be had from the fact that when he ran for reelection in 1936 he received more votes in the Democratic primary than his four opponents combined. He polled the largest vote recorded in the State up to that time.

Twice on the Federal bench, he filled that position with dignity and with effectiveness.

Over and above his accomplishments in public office—Jimmy Allred was a man whose personal life was outstanding. His warmth and his friendliness were noteworthy and he will be missed by many.

As a sort of footnote—yet worthy of mention for the great pleasure the idea has brought to millions of people—Jimmy can be considered as one of the founders of the roadside park idea in America.

Back during the depression years, LYNDON JOHNSON, now U.S. Senator and Democratic majority leader, was National Youth Administrator for Texas. LYNDON got the idea that it would be a good thing to have parks along main highways. He discussed the matter with Governor Allred—and as a result of this the roadside park came into being.

SHALL AMERICA'S BIRTHRIGHT BE SOLD FOR POTTAGE?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on December 11, 1959, the erudite and distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] addressed the midwinter meeting of the Georgia Bar Association in Atlanta on the subject, "Shall America's Birthright Be Sold for Pottage?" With incomparable clarity, irrefutable logic, and characteristic eloquence, the Senator exposed the fallacies and dangers inherent in the continuing demands for the enactment by Congress of force legislation to regulate in the name of civil rights even the most minute and intimate details of American life. In view of the certainty that such demands will be made of this session of Congress, I think it would be well for all Members of this Senate to give careful study to the Senator from North Carolina's masterful presentation and, for that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL AMERICA'S BIRTHRIGHT BE SOLD FOR POTTAGE?

(Address of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina, to the Georgia Bar Association at its midwinter meeting in Atlanta on Friday evening, December 11, 1959)

Ladies and gentlemen of the Georgia Bar, I am deeply grateful to your president, Newell Edenfield, for his invitation to be with you. It is a privilege for me to be in a State whose bench and bar share with me the abiding conviction that our governmental and legal systems constitute America's precious birthright.

I take this occasion to pay tribute to three great Georgians, Dick Russell, Herman Talmadge, and Charlie Bloch, who are fighting so gallantly and so intelligently to preserve that birthright for all Americans of all generations and all races.

I also take this occasion to express my appreciation of the judicial labors of the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of Georgia, who know that the late Justice Robert H. Jackson spoke truthfully when he said that there is "no way we can have equal justice under law except we have some law." They merit the thanks of all lovers of constitutional government for their unswerving fidelity to the fundamentals of the law.

I shall repeat here what I have often said elsewhere: DICK RUSSELL is the best qualified man in this country for the Presidency of the United States. Paradoxical as it may be, however, some of the most vocative champions of civil rights maintain that DICK RUSSELL has no civil right to aspire to that high office because his home happens to be in Winder, Ga., rather than Kalamazoo, Mich., or some other place above the Mason and Dixon's line.

Some years ago, Jim's administrator was seeking to hold a railroad company civilly liable for Jim's death on circumstantial evidence. The administrator called to the stand a witness who testified that he was walking along the railroad track just after the train passed and that he saw Jim's severed head lying on one side of the track and the remainder of Jim's body on the other. The counsel for the administrator then put this question to the witness: "What did you do after you discovered these gruesome relics?" The witness replied: "I said to myself, something serious must have happened to Jim."

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM POSES A THREAT TO AMERICA'S BIRTHRIGHT—OUR GOVERNMENTAL AND LEGAL SYSTEMS

If the advocates of civil rights legislation have their way, something serious is going to happen to our governmental and legal systems. They are bent on selling America's birthright for a mess of pottage. I propose to talk to you about this.

In so doing, I am inspired by motives similar to those which prompted Job Hicks to commit the act which resulted in his conviction on the charge of disturbing religious worship in the superior court of Burke County, N.C., around the turn of the century.

John Watts took a notion that he was called to preach. John was skilled in the science of a bricklayer, but was sadly deficient in the art of an exhorter. He was nevertheless expounding the scriptures in a small rural church one Sunday, when Job Hicks, who had partaken too freely of Burke County corn, happened to stagger by. Upon seeing John in the pulpit, Job entered the church, dragged John to the door, and threw him out upon the ground. When Job Hicks was called to the bar to be sentenced for his offense, Judge Robinson, the presiding judge, remarked to him in a stern tone of voice: "Mr. Hicks, when you were guilty of this unseemly conduct on the Sabbath Day, you must have been so intoxicated as not to realize what you were doing." Job made this response to His Honor: "Well, Judge, I had had several drinks. But I would not want Your Honor to think I was so drunk I could stand by and see the Word of the Lord being mummicked up like that without doing something about it."

ADVOCATES OF PROGRAM DISTORT AND EXPLOIT RACIAL MISDEEDS OF SOUTHERNERS

When I became a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I was assigned to its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, which has primary jurisdiction of civil rights bills. As a member of this subcommittee, I have learned some things concerning these bills and those who advocate them.

The constant agitation concerning racial matters and civil rights furnishes a happy hunting ground for opportunists who are willing to sell the truth to serve the hour. I wish to make it crystal clear, however, that I do not question the sincerity of the great majority of those who advocate the civil rights programs. They are undoubtedly conscientious men and women bent on doing what they believe to be good. But candor compels me to say that they do clarify what Josh Billings meant when he made this terse observation: "It is better to be ignorant than to know what ain't so."

The tragic truth is that most of the people who champion the civil rights program "know what ain't so" both in respect to the character of the program and the necessity for it.

The reasons for this are quite simple.

The greater part of these people do not read civil rights bills or study their implications. And even if they should undertake to do so, they would in all likelihood find themselves in a state identical with that of President Eisenhower, who honestly admitted at one of his press conferences that he does not understand "the legal quirks" in the bills. Civil rights bills are exceedingly complex, and can be rightly interpreted only when they are read in the light of history, the Constitution, and the basic rules of law and equity.

These considerations make it plain that most people must base their opinions in respect to the civil rights program on what others say or write, and are without the capacity to distinguish between the true and the false in what they hear or read

concerning it. Much of what they hear or read on the subject is sheer propaganda emanating from those who find it agreeable or profitable for one reason or another to agitate racial problems and advocate civil rights legislation for their solution. As a consequence, many people believe that civil rights bills are as fair as the magic labels they bear, and remain unaware of the multitude of constitutional and legal sins they cover.

It is difficult to realize the injury done to the South and the threat posed to sound government in America by those who make it a profession to agitate the interracial misdeeds of southern whites.

Take the matter of crime. When an interracial or other crime is committed in a city of the North, it is simply a crime to be narrated in small print on page 17 of the metropolitan dailies and left to the criminal court for punishment in the normal course.

But let southern whites commit a crime upon a Negro in a remote region of the South. The professional agitators seize upon it and exploit it to the hilt. They charge all southerners with complicity in the crime, and call on Congress to rob the entire South and her officials and people of basic governmental and legal rights by civil rights laws repugnant to the Constitution ordained for all Americans. And, unfortunately for our country's sense of perspective and proportion, the professional agitators are sometimes aided and abetted by some gentlemen of the press, radio, and television, who ought to know better.

I was first made acutely aware of how much these things are out of joint while serving as a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1956.

For several days those who make it a profession to agitate racial matters appeared before the committee, and vilified all southerners of Caucasian ancestry, charging them with personal responsibility for the atrocious murder of the Negro youth Till allegedly committed by two white men in a rural section of Mississippi some time before. They demanded that the platform of the Democratic Party pledge the enactment of civil rights laws sufficient in tenor to make legal pariahs of southerners, any provision of the Constitution of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

During the period in which these people were haranguing the committee two homicides took place in Chicago paralleling the Till murder in atrocity. These slaying attracted little public attention. Those who were agitating the Till case ignored them completely; and nobody anywhere was so unjust as to charge the law-abiding people of Chicago or other communities north of the Mason-Dixon line with complicity in them.

As I considered these things, I recalled the story of Don Marquis about Archy, the cockroach, who recorded his observations by jumping on the keys of a typewriter when its human owner was absent. On one occasion Archy told a story to illustrate his observation that human beings are past comprehending or explaining.

While going home, a man saw a hungry wolf seize a lamb and attempt to devour it. Incensed by its cruelty to the lamb, the man slew the wolf, and bore the lamb home in his bosom. On reaching home, the man slaughtered the lamb, and cooked it, and ate it for supper. Having had a good meal of lamb's meat, the man sat down before a comfortable fire to meditate. As he was meditating, the man thought of the cruelty of wolves to lambs, and broke down and wept.

SOUTHERNERS WHO WRONG NEGROES AID AND ABET THREAT TO AMERICA'S BIRTHRIGHT

I cannot forbear remarking at this point that those who seek to rob Southern States and their officials and people of basic governmental and legal rights by civil rights legislation incompatible with the Constitution established for all Americans have a fifth column in the South. The fifth column consists of southern whites who wrong Negroes. These southern whites commit a twofold wrong. First, they wrong the Negroes who are their victims; and, second, they lend aid and comfort to those who strive to defeat us in our fight to preserve America's birthright for all Americans of all generations and all races.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM CALLS FOR BAD LAWS—THE WORST SORT OF TYRANNY

Some thirty-odd civil rights bills are now pending before Congress. I give you this sincere and solemn assurance: None of them are wise. None of them are necessary. None of them are compatible with our basic governmental and legal institutions.

My opposition to these bills does not arise out of any matter of race. I have always maintained that all children of all races are entitled to adequate educational opportunities; that all men of all races are entitled to stand equal before the law; and that all qualified citizens of all races are entitled to vote.

Like Ulysses, all of us are a part of all we have met. As his son and law partner, I was closely associated with my father, who was a member of the North Carolina bar for 65 years. He implanted in my youthful heart a love of law and a hate of tyranny. All the things I have met since the days of my youth have intensified this love and this hate. I oppose the civil rights bills simply because bad laws are the worst sort of tyranny.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM UNWISE

The civil rights bills are unwise because they are based, in the final analysis, on the fallacious notion that members of the Negro race can law or legislate their way to first class citizenship and the better life. No man can law or legislate his way to these things. They are the rewards of personal industry and merit, and cannot be bestowed on anyone from on high, even by men wearing judicial robes or sitting in congressional seats. Anybody who maintains the contrary is either deceiving himself or attempting to deceive somebody else.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM UNNECESSARY

The civil rights proposals are not necessary for a very simple reason. There are existing Federal and State statutes sufficient to afford protection to the civil rights of all members of any race who are willing to depend for the protection of their rights upon the same just and uniform rules of law by which the rights of all other Americans are protected.

This observation indicates the fundamental defect, which permeates the whole civil rights program and which is revealed in all its stark reality when the program is read in the light of this wise declaration of the Supreme Court in the civil rights cases of 1883:

"When a man has emerged from slavery, and by the aid of beneficent legislation has shaken off the inseparable concomitants of that state, there must be some stage in the progress of his elevation when he takes the rank of a mere citizen, and ceases to be the special favorite of the laws, and when his rights, as a citizen or a man, are to be protected in the ordinary modes by which other men's rights are protected."

What is the fundamental defect in the entire civil rights program? It is simply this: The program selects certain groups of Americans out of all others on the basis of their race, and demands that members of the groups so selected be made special favorites of the laws and granted legal advantages and privileges which are denied to all other Americans.

This being true, the civil rights program is utterly repugnant to the American legal system, which rests upon the basic principle that laws must confer equal rights on all citizens and subject them to equal burdens if there is to be any justice under law.

Let us consider for a moment how the advocates of the civil rights program attempt to justify their demand that certain groups of Americans be made the special favorites of the laws. They advance the plea of necessity, which William Pitt, the younger, so well described as "the argument of tyrants" and "the plea for every infringement of human freedom."

They say that State and local officials in Southern States habitually deny Negroes the equal protection of the laws; that these officials cannot be brought to justice because southern jurors will not return verdicts adverse to white men in interracial cases; and that for these reasons existing Federal and State laws, which have proved sufficient in times past to protect the constitutional rights of all other Americans, are not adequate to protect the constitutional rights of Negroes in the South. By this unproved indictment of a whole people, they reach this conclusion: To prevent Southern States denying Negroes the equal protection of the laws, Congress must enact into law a civil rights program which makes Negroes the special favorites of the laws and robs State and local officials throughout the United States of the protection of equal laws.

I challenge the validity of this conclusion and the unproved indictment on which it rests.

By and large, State and local officials in the South act just as honorably and impartially as State and local officials in all other areas of the country. Recent verdicts in Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and other Southern States give the lie to the charge that southern jurors will not return verdicts adverse to white men in interracial cases.

To be sure, sometimes State and local officials in Southern States commit wrongs, and sometimes southern juries do not return true verdicts. The same thing can be said, however, of officials and juries in the North, the East, and the West, and everywhere else on earth where the administration of government and justice is confided to fallible human beings.

Despite this, certain things are true. Whenever a State or local official in a southern State denies any American of any race his constitutional rights, the official renders himself liable to civil suit and criminal prosecution in Federal and State courts, whose judges are completely devoted to the concept of the equality of all men before the law. If the litigant in the civil suit or the prosecuting attorney in the criminal prosecution can prove the truth of the charge according to just and uniform legal rules applicable to all like cases, it is just as certain as anything in human affairs can be made certain that justice under law will be done, regardless of the race of the American who has been wronged.

If those who wish to sue or prosecute distrust State courts for any reason, real or fancied, they have an absolute right to go directly to Federal district courts, which usually sit in places distant from the localities in which the deprivation of constitutional rights allegedly occur. Under the prevailing rules, the judges of these Federal courts act as judges of the facts as well as the law in most civil suits of this nature and have the power to tell jurors what they think the evidence shows in all cases, both civil and criminal, where a jury is required. The jurors are drawn from jury boxes prepared by Federal court officials.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM INCOMPATIBLE WITH AMERICA'S GOVERNMENTAL AND LEGAL INSTITUTIONS

This brings me to my claim that the civil rights bills are incompatible with America's basic governmental and legal institutions.

It is, perhaps, inevitable for civil rights bills to embody a multitude of constitutional and legal sins. Those who champion them are somewhat impatient men, who seek easy solutions to hard problems. In so doing, they devise shortcuts to the ends they desire, and are contemptuous of the obstacles they encounter, even though such obstacles be precious constitutional or legal principles. Their impatient zeal seems to blind them to a truth taught by the experience of mankind: Hard problems do not admit of easy solutions, and shortcuts are the most direct roads to disaster.

Their propensity to invent shortcuts is exhibited in graphic fashion by the recent recommendation of three members of the Civil Rights Commission that a 23d amendment be added to the Constitution. The proposed amendment is to abolish the historic constitutional power of the States to prescribe qualifications for voting, and establish a Federal standard for all elections held for any purpose anywhere in the United States. According to the Federal standard to be established by the proposed amendment, any citizen who meets "State age and length-of-residence requirements" is to have an absolute right to vote in any election if he has a living physical body, with or without intelligence and with or without character, and is not actually confined in an institution for mental defectives or a prison "at the time of registration or election."

When all is said, the reason assigned for this proposal to take from all the States their historic constitutional power to prescribe literacy tests and bar lunatics, idiots, and convicted felons from voting comes to this: Such action would make it easy to determine whether Negroes are unlawfully denied voting rights in some southern communities.

I do not deny that it would be easy to determine whether a person is legally qualified to vote if there were no legal qualifications for voting. But I do assert that for Congress and the States to add the proposed 23d amendment to the Constitution would be on a par with using an atomic bomb to get rid of a mouse.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM WOULD VEST IN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL THE ARBITRARY POWER TO MAKE SOME AMERICANS SPECIAL FAVORITES OF THE LAWS AND ROB OTHER AMERICANS OF THE PROTECTION OF EQUAL LAWS

Time does not permit me to enumerate all of the constitutional and legal sins in the pending civil rights bills. I have already pointed out that the entire civil rights program is repugnant to the basic principles upon which justice under law rests. I will confine my remaining remarks in the main to those inherent in the peculiar procedural devices designed to confer upon a single public officer, the Attorney General of the United States, the arbitrary power to make Negroes chosen by him the special favorites of the laws and rob State and local officials selected by him of the protection of equal laws.

If Congress should sanction these procedural devices, the Attorney General would possess colorable statutory authority to make a boast similar to that of the old justice of the peace who was exasperated by the tactics of a young lawyer trying his first case. The young lawyer kept rising and exclaiming: "I object. You are not proceeding according to law." Finally the old magistrate could stand it no longer. He shouted: "Young man, quit jumping up and saying 'I object. You are not proceeding according to law.' I'll have you to understand I am running this court. The law hasn't got a d—n thing to do with it."

The tragic truth illustrated by this story becomes obvious when these procedural devices are tested by our institutions of government and the principles on which they rest.

The men who framed the Constitution were exceedingly wise. They knew that the history of mankind in general and the English speaking race in particular revealed this eternal political truth: No man or set of men can be safely trusted with unlimited governmental power. Consequently, they were determined, above all things to establish a government of laws and not of men—a government in which laws should have authority over men, not men over laws.

To accomplish this end and thus prevent arbitrary action by the Federal Government, the framers of the Constitution used the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers in a twofold way.

They delegated to the Federal Government the powers necessary to enable it to discharge its functions as a central government and left to the States all other powers. It was this use of the doctrine of the separation of powers which prompted Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase to make this classic statement in *Texas* v. *White* (7 Wall. 700): "The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union composed of indestructible States."

In their other use of the doctrine of the separation of powers they divided the powers of the Federal Government among its three departments. They vested the power to make laws in Congress, the power to execute laws in the President, and the power to interpret laws in the Federal courts.

The men who framed the Constitution also knew that tyranny uses the forms of law to destroy those who oppose her will, and for this reason they inserted in the Constitution certain basic safeguards, such as the constitutional right of indictment by grand jury, and the constitutional right of trial by petit jury, to protect litigants from judicial tyranny. Congress subsequently augmented the safeguards for litigants by creating a statutory right of trial by jury in indirect contempt cases where the alleged contemptuous act constitutes a crime under Federal or State law, and the statutory right to the benefit of limited punishment in indirect contempt cases of a similar nature. According to recitations in some of the civil rights bills and the avowals of their supporters the primary objective of the proposed procedural devices is to make effective for Negroes the prohibition of the clause of the 14th amendment which forbids the States to deny to any persons within their jurisdictions the equal protection of the laws.

Under the proposed procedural devices the Attorney General is to be vested with the absolute discretionary authority to bring a new type of civil suit against States and local officials to prevent them from denying Negroes the equal protection of the laws on account of their race. For all practical intents and purposes the proposed procedural devices are to constitute the personal possession of the Attorney General, who is given no adequate standard to guide or control the exercise of his discretion and who may act or refuse to act according to his own unrestrained pleasure.

He may sue in one case and refuse to sue in other like cases. He may sue for some Negroes and refuse to sue for others similarly situated. He may sue some State or local officials and refuse to sue others allegedly guilty of like wrongs.

If the Attorney General elects to sue for certain Negroes he makes them the special favorites of the laws in several ways.

The Attorney General acts as their counsel. All other Americans are compelled to retain their own lawyers.

The cost of the litigation for their benefit is defrayed out of the Federal Treasury. All other Americans are compelled to pay the cost of litigation for their benefit out of their own pockets.

They are excused from compliance with State laws establishing administrative remedies for the wrongs of which they complain. These State laws remain binding on all other Americans who are compelled to exhaust the remedies they provide before they can seek relief in any court. And, finally, the State or local officials whom the Attorney General sues for their benefit are automatically robbed by indirection and an adroit perversion of equity processes of these basic safeguards created by the Constitution and Congress to protect all Americans from judicial tyranny: the constitutional right of indictment by grand jury; the constitutional right of trial by petit jury; the statutory right of trial by jury in indirect contempt cases where the contemptuous act constitutes a crime under Federal or State law; and the statutory right to the benefit of limited punishment in indirect contempt cases of a similar nature.

The civil rights bills which undertake to clothe the Attorney General with such absolute power are utterly repugnant to our institutions of government and the principles upon which they rest, which "do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power." (*Yo Wick* v. *Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356).

They are incomplete and would constitute an unconstitutional delegation by Congress of its legislative power to the Attorney General if they should be enacted into law. This is true because they undertake to vest in the Attorney General absolute discretionary power, without standard or rule, to be exercised as he pleases. (*Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan*, 293 U.S. 388.)

The enormity of this constitutional sin cannot be over-magnified. As the Supreme Court has often declared, the principle that Congress cannot delegate its legislative power to any department of the Government, executive or judicial, is "essential to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution." (*Marshall Field and Company* v. *Clark*, 143 U.S. 649.)

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM INCOMPATIBLE WITH SOUND FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

The civil rights bills which seek to establish the procedural devices under discussion contain another provision of major importance which cannot possibly be reconciled with sensible Federal-State relations or the constitutional separation of the powers of the Federal and State Governments. This is the provision which specifies, in essence, that the persons for whose benefit the Attorney General sues are excused from complying with State laws establishing administrative remedies for the supposed wrongs of which they complain.

This provision is designed to enable the Federal courts to exercise in the first instance powers clearly reserved to the States, and conflicts with the general rule that the Federal Government may not, in the exercise of its powers, prevent a State from discharging its ordinary functions of government. As a simple matter of evidence, it is difficult to understand how any Federal court can truthfully find that any person is being deprived of any rights by any State until such person pursues the administrative remedies created by such State to determine whether he possesses the rights he claims.

Be this as it may, this provision proposes, in effect, that Congress delegate to the Attorney General the power to suspend State laws prescribing administrative remedies. Congress cannot do this. The laws establishing administrative remedies are enacted by the States in the undoubted exercise of the power reserved to them by the 10th amendment and neither the Congress nor its delegates can nullify them.

Whenever a government subjects any of the rights or liabilities of any of its citizens to the mere will of a single public officer, law ends and tyranny begins, no matter how benevolent such officer may be.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM MISCONSTRUES SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

I shall mention one other matter. If the writer of Ecclesiastes had been alive when the most drastic of the pending civil rights bills—S. 810—was introduced, he could not have said that "there is nothing new under the sun."

This bill certainly contains something new under the legislative sun, i.e., a proposal that Congress place its specific blessing upon specific Supreme Court decisions, namely, the so-called school-desegregation decisions.

Is it possible that the proponents of this bill entertain some doubt as to the validity of these decisions, and believe that such doubt can be removed if Congress gives them legislative sanction?

Since the Constitution denies to Congress any power to interpret any laws, there is grave doubt as to the propriety of Congress undertaking to do so in respect to these or any other decisions. Be this as it may it is exceedingly unwise for Congress to undertake to do so because Congress is composed of politically minded men who frequently cannot distinguish between good politics and bad law.

The validity of this observation is sustained by S. 810 itself. After stamping the so-called school desegregation decisions with their emphatic blessing, the proponents of this bill proceed to place upon the decisions their own interpretation which goes many bow shots beyond the decisions and the Constitution.

One of the greatest jurists America has known, the late Chief Judge John J. Parker, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, pointed out "exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided" in *Briggs* v. *Elliott*, 132 F. Supp. 776.

"It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the States. It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains. This, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the State may not do directly or indirectly; but if the schools which it maintains are open to children of all races, no violation of the Constitution is involved even though the children of different races voluntarily attend different schools, as they attend different churches. Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination. It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation. The 14th amendment is a limitation upon the exercise of power by the State or State agencies, not a limitation upon the freedom of individuals."

The proponents of S. 810 ignore the actual holding of the Supreme Court in these cases and propose that Congress give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to send his agents into all the school districts of the Southern States "to expedite the elimination of segregation" in the schools in such districts, regardless of the wishes of the parents of the children of both races residing in such districts.

THE ISSUE: SHALL AMERICA'S BIRTHRIGHT BE SOLD FOR POTTAGE?

A great issue is pending in the United States. When all is said, it is this: Shall the bar and the people of America permit the advocates of the civil rights program to sell America's constitutional birthright for a mess of pottage?

In deciding this issue let the bar and the people weigh these words of Daniel Webster:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

"It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

"But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

"Who shall rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

"Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

"No; if these columns fall they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than ever were shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR NORRIS BROWN, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on the eve of this 2d session of the 86th Congress, one of our former colleagues passed away. I speak of Senator Norris Brown, who served in this body as a Senator from Nebraska from 1907 to 1913. He was the last survivor of those elected to the 60th Congress.

Senator Brown was born in Maquoketa, Iowa, on May 2, 1863. He was admitted to the Iowa bar in 1884. Moving to Kearney, Nebr., 4 years later, he continued to practice law and engage in civic activities. He served as county attorney for Buffalo County, Nebr., from 1892 to 1896 and as the State's deputy attorney general and attorney general from 1900 until his election to the Senate. Following his term in Washington, Senator Brown reentered the private practice of law and was recognized as a leader in the Omaha bar until his retirement in 1943. It was my good fortune to have engaged in matters of general law nature with him and his law firm in my years of active practice.

The Senator from Nebraska marks with sorrow the death of this distinguished American. His life was dedicated to service of his country and State. Both were honored and enriched by his character and career. We shall miss his person and now mourn his passing. Our heartfelt sympathy is extended to the two daughters who survive him, Mrs. R. H. Bailey and Mrs. Frank A. Jones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two news accounts about former Senator Brown's public career and reporting his decease.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Jan. 6, 1960]

INCOME TAX'S SPONSOR DIES

The father of the Constitution's 16th amendment, which legalized the Federal income tax, died yesterday in a Seattle, Wash., rest home at the age of 96.

He was Norris Brown, who sponsored the revolutionary fiscal innovation during the one term (1907–13) he served in the Senate as a Nebraskan Republican.

He was the last surviving Member of the 60th Congress, which included such memorable political stalwarts as Nevada's Key Pittman, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., and Herbert Hoover's Vice President, Charles Curtis. Senator Brown himself was succeeded by Nebraska's "Mr. Republican," the late George W. Norris.

Senator Brown introduced his income tax resolution in 1909 and saw it become the law of the land a month before he left office in 1913, by which time the required number of States had ratified it.

He also lived to see the amendment affect profoundly the life of nearly every one of his adult fellow citizens. There were few enough, however, to feel its financial pinch at the time of the amendment's adoption. The whole national budget for that year was a mere $724 million and the tax rate was only 1 percent on incomes in excess of $20,000.

Mr. Brown was born in Maquoketa, Iowa, the son of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Brown. He took his law degree from Iowa State University. Until his death he was the only living member of the school's class of 1883.

He served as county attorney for Buffalo County, Nebr., 4 years and as the State's deputy attorney general and attorney general from 1900 until his election to the Senate.

His retirement from politics was followed by 30 more years in the private practice of the law, during which time he served as counsel for Omaha's stockyards. He had made his home in Seattle since 1943.

"The President and Congress are responsible for the present welfare and safety of the Americas," he told an interviewer only 4 years ago. "My prayer is that they will continue to protect the freedoms our people have enjoyed for so many generations. I think they will."

The former Senator is survived by two daughters, Mrs. R. H. Bailey and Mrs. Frank A. Jones, both of Seattle.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1960]

NORRIS BROWN, 96, EX-U.S. SENATOR—NEBRASKAN WHO INTRODUCED RESOLUTION FOR INCOME TAX AMENDMENT IS DEAD

SEATTLE, January 5.—Norris Brown, former U.S. Senator who wrote the resolution that led to the 16th amendment, which legalized the Federal income tax died at a rest home here today. He was 96 years old.

Mr. Brown, a Republican, represented Nebraska in the Senate from 1907 to 1913 and was the last remaining Member of the 60th Congress. He introduced the resolution in 1909 that sent the income tax amendment to the States for ratification. It became law in February 1913, 1 month before Mr. Brown left office.

Few Americans were affected then. The entire national budget in that year was only $724 million, and the tax rate was 1 percent on incomes in excess of $3,000 for single persons and $4,000 for married persons.

Mr. Brown was Nebraska State attorney general from 1904 to 1906 and gained fame

by winning a tax suit of more than $1 million against the railroads. The money was used to open schools.

After leaving the Senate, Mr. Brown was counsel for the Omaha stockyards for 30 years. He had made his home here since 1943.

Mr. Brown was born in Maquoketa, Iowa, and was the last surviving member of the class of 1883 at the University of Iowa.

Survivors include two daughters, Mrs. R. H. Bailey and Mrs. Frank A. Jones, both of Seattle; two grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. For the RECORD I wish to add a few words in tribute to the life of Norris Brown. He was a distinguished lawyer and a great legislator. He lived a long time and served the public for many years. His memory is cherished, and I join in extending sympathy and condolences to his two daughters.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGES IN SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress I conferred with judges of the Federal courts of the southern district of New York, with regard to the need for additional Federal judges in the southern district of New York.

NEED FOR FEDERAL JUDGES BILL

A grave national problem which has been of continuing concern to me, and I know to all of us in the Senate, is the continually growing congestion of Federal court calendars; this is especially a critical problem in the southern and eastern district courts in New York. The omnibus judgeship bill now on the Senate Calendar is a clear recognition of the need for additional judgeships to deal with the legal problems of our growing population and the growing complexity of our society. It is in the highest public interest that this bill be called up for early action, so that there will be an opportunity to consider what additional judgeships should be added to the bill to constitute the minimum necessary for the proper operation of the courts.

My own deep concern led me to meet with the Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan and the other judges of the southern district of New York at the end of November, and to hear from them at first hand the problems and needs of the busiest district court in the country. As a result of these conversations I became more convinced than ever of the need for added judgeships beyond those now proposed, and requested the judges to let me have an analysis of their current caseloads, particularly with respect to the long and protracted cases which can tie up a judge for weeks and months at a time. Because of its location at the business and maritime center of the Nation, the southern district has a particularly heavy load of such cases. Just as an example, the southern district has 40 percent of all the admiralty suits pending in the entire country, and about 20 percent of all civil cases in the Federal courts.

Of particular interest to me was the fact that the southern district may well be the forum for many of the cases expected under the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959, an entirely new area of litigation which was not considered in previous recommendations for increased judgeships.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a number of memorandums on these matters submitted to me by Chief Judge Ryan at my request.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
New York, N.Y., December 9, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I refer to the inquiry of your letter of December 2, 1959, and to my promise to send you additional information on the following subjects:

1. The long and protracted suits pending in the southern district of New York.

The latest available analysis of the type of civil litigation pending in the court is as of date of July 1, 1959. It showed a total of 10,937 pending civil suits (which increased by November 30, 1959, to 11,482 pending civil suits). Included in this number were:

Private antitrust suits	129
Government antitrust suits	33
Patent suits	237
Copyright suits	161
Total suits other than in admiralty	560
Admiralty suits	2,376

The antitrust suits (Government and private) totaled 162, all of which are classic long and protracted suits. Experience shows that at least 20 percent of the patent and copyright suits—here, about 79 of the pending suits of this nature also fall within the grouping of long and protracted suits; as do about 3 percent of the admiralty suits, or 71 suits. This makes a total of:

Antitrust suits	162
Patent and copyright suits	79
Admiralty suits	71
Total pending long and protracted suits on July 1, 1959	312

Enclosed is a memorandum on the Govment antitrust suits.

We may anticipate that at least 150 of the 7,100 civil suits to be filed during the current fiscal year will be long and protracted suits. Enclosed are the figures on the filings for the past 5 months, and comparison with last year. Analysis of these current filings show that private (other than Government) suits are increasing; that personal injury suits filings are up 50 percent over last year; that U.S. and admiralty suit filings are down 20 percent.

Of course, I do not want to bog you with statistics; a chief judge should know how the court is functioning without too many reports and figures. All the judges are loaded down with work; more litigation keeps coming in and I do not have enough judges to keep abreast of the tide. I enclose a most recent report.

2. The additional litigation to be expected from the recent amendments to the Labor-Management Act.

Since 1947, the court has had a number of suits filed by the NLRB for injunctive relief pending investigation by it of unfair labor practice charges; the new legislation provides for both civil and criminal jurisdiction in the district courts arising from denial of "rights" to union members and from the financial and other reports now required to be filed.

It is impossible at this time to measure either the number of suits or prosecutions anticipated to be filed or the judicial time which these matters will require. The protection of "rights" of union members will fall within the scope of the work of the NLRB (although there is also provision for private suits); the enforcement of the provisions requiring financial reports will be the duty of the Department of Labor. A recent statement of Secretary of Labor Mitchell indicates that he is setting up a special bureau "to handle the Labor Department's responsibility in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959"; and that "the bureau will receive and analyze about 60,000 reports a year" and will "see that the law's reporting requirements are obeyed." I expect that a substantial portion of these enforcement proceedings will be filed in this court.

I have requested both agencies to endeavor to give me their thoughts on the probable caseload and await word from them. When I receive this information, I shall advise you and Senator KEATING.

With my best regards, I am,
Sincerely,

SYLVESTER J. RYAN,
Chief Judge.

Report on civil cases, July–November 1959

Cases pending close of business, June 30, 1959	10,920
Cases filed:	
July	647
August	550
September	540
October	620
November	542
Total cases filed	2,899
Total	13,819
Cases terminated:	
July	455
August	352
September	333
October	761
November	436
Total cases terminated	2,337
Nov. 30, 1959	11,482

Report on civil cases, 1958

Cases pending close of business, June 30, 1958	10,393
Cases filed:	
July	583
August	491
September	540
October	595
November	466
Total cases filed	2,675
Total	13,068
Cases terminated:	
July	365
August	360
September	325
October	425
November	330
Total cases terminated	1,805
Nov. 30, 1958	11,263

DECEMBER 8, 1959.

Antitrust cases pending in the southern district of New York

[Filed by Washington staffs,

CRIMINAL CASES

Title and case No.	Date filed	Judge assigned if any	Status	Comment
U.S. v. *American Smelting and Refining Company, et al.*, Cr. 159–150.	June 19, 1959			This is a price-fixing case in the field of type metals. 1 defendant has pleaded nolo and the remaining defendant has filed motion to dismiss on the ground that its criminal prosecution was improper because it had earlier entered into a consent decree with the Government. If the remaining defendant loses this motion, it is expected then to plead nolo.
U.S. v. *J. M. Huber and Western Newspaper Union*, Cr. 159–149.	do			This is a price-fixing case in the field of printers' ink. 1 defendant has pleaded nolo and the remaining defendant has filed a motion to dismiss on the same ground as in *American Smelting* above. Again the remaining defendant is expected to plead nolo if it loses its motion to dismiss.

CIVIL CASES

U.S. v. *American Smelting and Refining Co., et al.*, Civ. 88–249.	Oct. 9, 1953	David N. Edelstein	Sub judice	The 2 largest lead producers in the United States were charged with restraining, attempting to monopolize and monopolizing interstate and foreign trade and commerce in production and sale of primary lead. Annual sales involved approximately $55,000,000.
U.S. v. *Pan American World Airways, Inc., et al.*, Civ. 90–259.	Jan. 11, 1954	Thomas F. Murphy	do	The case attacks the common ownership of an airline by a competing airline and a steamship company and charges allocation and monopolization of South American markets. The case is of substantial importance because it affects freight and passenger commerce between the United States and South America, the value of which is estimated at more than $100,000,000 annually.
U.S. v. *Continental Can Co., Inc., et al.*, Civ. 112–387.	Sept. 10, 1956	Frederick V. P. Bryan		Merger case charging Continental Can and Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. with violation of Clayton Act, sec. 7. Continental Can, with total sales of approximately $666,000,000, seeks to acquire assets of Hazel-Atlas, largest manufacturer of widemouth glass bottles and second largest manufacturer of glass containers, with total sales of $80,000,000. It is estimated that trial will take 1 month.
U.S. v. *Continental Can Co., Inc.*, Civ. 114–177.	Oct. 30, 1956	do		A merger case charging Continental Can with acquiring Robert Gair Co. in violation of sec. 7 of the Clayton Act. Continental Can has annual sales of $666,000,000. Robert Gair Co., a major company manufacturing paperboard paper containers and paper packaging products, has annual sales of $134,000,000. It is estimated that trial will take 1 month.
U.S. v. *Loew's Incorporated*, Civ. 119–24.	Mar. 27, 1957	Archie O. Dawson	Consolidated	The central issue in these cases is whether the defendants have licensed certain feature films to television stations on the condition that the station will also take one or more other less desirable films. It is estimated that films worth more than $100,000,000 are involved. The theory of the cases is that television stations have been required to buy unwanted films and thus are showing these less desirable films to the detriment of the viewing public. It is estimated that the trial will take 2 months.
U.S. v. *C & C Super Corp.*, Civ. 119–284.	Apr. 18, 1957	do		
U.S. v. *Screen Gems, Inc.*, Civ. 119–285.	do	do		
U.S. v. *Associated Artists Productions, Inc.*, Civ. 119–286.	do	do		
U.S. v. *National Telefilm Associates, Inc.*, Civ. 119–287.	do	do		
U.S. v. *United Artists Corporation*, Civ. 119–288.	do	do		
U.S. v. *Columbia Pictures Corp., et al.*, Civ. 132–86.	Apr. 10, 1958	William B. Herlands		Involves Sherman Act, sec. 1, and Clayton Act, sec. 7, violations. Charges Screen Gems, Columbia Pictures, and Universal Pictures with price fixing and asset acquisition of 600 pre-1948 feature films for TV exhibition. It is estimated that this trial will take 3 or 4 weeks, excluding formal pretrial hearings.
U.S. v. *Lever Brothers Company, et al.*, Civ. 135–219.	July 8, 1958			This case charges a violation of sec. 7 of the Clayton Act growing out of Lever's acquisition of assets relating to "All" from Monsanto Chemical Co. Lever is one of the Nation's largest producers of detergent products used in the home, having total annual sales of all products of $344,000,000. Monsanto, one of largest chemical companies in the United States, has annual sales of detergent products in the amount of $29,000,000. It is expected that the trial will take 6 weeks.
U. S. v *Standard Oil Company (New Jersey)*, Civ. 86–27.	Apr. 21, 1953	John M. Cashin		This case involves the foreign operations of major international oil companies during the past 25 years. It charges monopolization of U.S. imports and exports and foreign production, refining, transportation, and marketing. The case is of unusual complexity and importance because it touches upon the national security and foreign policy of the United States. It is anticipated that the trial will take 6 months.
U.S. v. *The Hertz Corporation*, Civ. 145–364.	May 1, 1959			Clayton sec. 7 charges Hertz, largest motor vehicle renting and licensing company, with acquiring during past 5 years stock and assets of numerous companies engaged in same business. Operating in various geographical areas of United States. Suit seeks to force Hertz to divest itself of the many acquisitions. It is estimated that the trial will take 6 to 8 weeks.
U.S. v. *Kennecott Copper Corporation*, Civ. 147–231.	June 22, 1959			Charges Kennecott with acquisition of assets of Okonite Co. with Clayton sec. 7 violation. Suit involves highly concentrated copper industry resulting largely from mergers and acquisitions by all leading copper-producing companies. Charges a lessening of competition in the production and sale of copper and copper-content products, and copper wire and cable. It is estimated that the trial will take 6 to 8 weeks.
United States v. *United Artists*, Civ. 150–267.	Sept. 15, 1959	David N. Edelstein		Defendant charged with acquiring approximately 750 RKO feature films from Associated Artists and approximately 750 Warner Bros. feature films from C. & C. Co. for use in television exhibition, in violation of sec. 7 of the Clayton Act. Estimated that Government's case will take approximately 2 weeks.
United States v. *General Motors*, Civ. 151–370.	Oct. 16, 1959		Motion for change of venue pending.	This case charges General Motors with acquiring Euclid Road Machinery Co. in violation of sec. 7 of the Clayton Act. Euclid, prior to acquisition, was the largest producer in the United States of off-highway dump trucks and a substantial factor in the manufacture and sale of other types of off-highway earth moving equipment. Off-highway earth moving equipment is used principally in connection with the Nation's highway building program, the construction of dams, airports, levees, the mining industry and other fields where hauling and other types of heavy equipment are needed to move large quantities of materials, such as earth, rock, ore, and coal. It is a billion-dollar industry. It is expected that trial will take 2 to 3 months.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
New York, N.Y., December 29, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Many thanks to you for your kind letter of December 22.

Yesterday, Senator KEATING paid us a visit. I enclose herewith a copy of a letter the judges of the court have this day sent to Mr. Melvin Purvis. I thought it might be of interest to you.

If at any time you desire any further facts concerning the problems of the court, I will be very happy to give them to you.

With my warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

SYLVESTER J. RYAN.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
New York, N.Y., December 21, 1959.

MELVIN H. PURVIS, Esq.,
Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Committee on the Judiciary, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PURVIS: The judges of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York acknowledge with thanks your identical letters addressed to each of them under date of December 8, 1959. We write this joint response for your convenience for we are united on our appraisal of the urgent needs of this the largest of all the Federal district courts. We are prompted also to write this one letter because action taken on important judicial administrative affairs follows the decision of the judges reached after conference at which all views are fully expressed, carefully considered, and frankly discussed.

We are encouraged by the interest in the court by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and you as chief counsel of the committee. During the past several weeks we have had visits to the court from Senator JAVITS and Congressmen CELLER and ROONEY; we expect Senator KEATING to come within the next 2 weeks. We extend to Senator JOHNSTON, to the members of the committee, and to you a cordial invitation to sit down with us and permit us to tell our situation in an informal talk. We are of the opinion that much can be gained from this manner of approach to our problems.

The root of our congested calendars lies not alone in the enormous volume of civil suits filed but in the type of litigation in this district and our shortage of judicial manpower. With New York City (principally the county of New York, within the southern district) the hub of our national financial, business, economic and shipping activities, we must expect that the major portion of the litigation involving large sums of money and basic legal principles will be filed here. The same observation may be made of the reorganization of great business enterprises, which find themselves in difficult financial situations or in derivative stockholders suits; likewise of Government and private antitrust suits and of patent and copyright litigation. We have endeavored to point out this qualitative situation in our last annual report, copies of which we sent you following the meeting of the Judicial Conference last September.

We know that in the fiscal year 1958–59, a total of 6,549 civil suits were filed. It may be anticipated, judged from current filings for the first 5 months of this year, that there will be an increased filing of more than 600 suits, bringing the expected total for the current year to a minimum of 7,100 civil suits commenced. We started this fiscal year with 10,920 civil suits pending.

It is simple fact that during this current year a total of at least 18,000 civil suits will have to be processed by a court with 18 active judges; a caseload of at least 1,000 per judge. But there are not 18 judges available for this work; at least 4 judges are required for criminal parts and many of the criminal trials run from 1 to 3 months; more than 50 percent of the time of the chief judge is taken up with administrative matters; and, generally, unfortunately, there is at least 1 judge ill. The actual number of judges available then to process these 18,000 civil suits during the current year will be 12½.

But this only presents part of the situation—what appears in a quantitative appraisal.

Of the 10,920 suits pending on June 30, 1959, we find that 237 were patent suits, and 129 were suits filed under the antitrust laws. These are classic, long, and complicated suits. In addition, 736 were diversity suits filed on claims of breach of contract, and at least 25 of these are long and protracted suits. While there is no breakdown of Robinson-Patman Act suits, it is safe to say that about 3 percent of the 891 suits filed involving other than specific Federal questions, are Robinson-Patman Act suits, which are long and complicated suits. A most conservative estimate is that on June 30, 1959, at least 300 of the pending 10,920 suits are long and complicated suits, each of which should have been assigned to a single judge shortly after filing. At this time about 80 civil suits of this nature should be assigned, but this cannot be done because of a shortage of judges.

We may expect that from 2 to 3 percent of the current year filings of the total of 7,000 suits—or at least 150 will be long and complicated suits which should be assigned to a single judge at an early date. This means that during this fiscal year the court will have to process some 450 long and complicated suits out of the total caseload of 18,000. The burden is intolerable and cannot be properly handled with our present number of judges.

When we appraise the situation in terms of the judicial manpower required by the volume and type of litigation in this district the minimum requirement is 24 judges—or 6 more than we presently have.

We know that the volume and the protracted type of litigation will continue to grow and increase; and as our calendars become more and more current, we may expect this increase to be even larger. A court with calendars which are current attracts litigation which might be filed otherwise in another forum where trial will be delayed.

With sufficient judicial manpower, we are confident we can solve all problems of administration.

Respectfully yours,
Gregory F. Noonan, William B. Herlands, Sidney Sugarman, Sylvester J. Ryan, John F. X. McGohey, Irving R. Kaufman, Edward Weinfeld, Thos. F. Murphy, Archie O. Dawson, David N. Edelstein, Alexander Bicks, E. J. Dimock, Richard H. Levet, Edmund L. Palmieri, Frederick v. P. Bryan, John M. Cashin, Charles M. Metzner, Lloyd F. MacMahon.

THERE IS URGENT NEED FOR SIX ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Judicial Conference recommended six additional judges for the southern district; the present proposed legislation provides for three additional judges for the district; the bill should be amended to provide for six, the number set by the conference.

I feel that this situation has not been fully considered and properly appraised.

Although legislation has since 1955 authorized 18 judges for the district, at no time since 1955 have we had our full quota, save since late September 1959. The actual number of judges serving in the district since 1955 has been:

Fiscal year:	
1955	17
1956	[1] 16¾
1957	17¾
1958	17½
1959	16¾

[1] Fractions indicate the portion of year judge has held office.

Presently, we have the following senior judges in the district:

Judge Knox—substantial part-time service, handles most of our condemnation suits and some admiralty suits.

Judge Conger—almost full time, tries civil jury suits, and assists substantially in pretrial and review calendars.

Judge Clancy—full time on nonjury suits.

Judge Bondy—has been unable to sit for more than a year, 90 years old.

Judge Leibell—until June 1959 rendered substantial service on all types of suits save admiralty, now because of health can assist only occasionally on nonjury suits.

Judge S. H. Kaufman—retired on disability, unable to sit for past 6 years.

While these senior judges do give great assistance to the court, their contribution is not of a steady or constant character such as will permit of their regular assignment to any particular trial part or calendar.

We have had some help, too, from visiting judges; during the October 1959 term, Senior Judge Reeves and Judges Boldt and Foley sat with us; during the November 1959 term, we had Senior Judge Reeves and, for a 3-week period, Judge Lynne. All of these judges were assigned to criminal trials and gave help on that calendar. Long and protracted suits cannot be assigned to a visiting judge and experience has shown that ordinarily the assignment of any nonjury suit to a visiting judge is not advisable.

The present criminal calendar requires a regular assignment of four judges on a full-time trial basis. Although the annual number of criminal prosecutions runs to a relatively small number—approximately 1,000 to 1,200—we have an unusually large number of long trials (principally income tax prosecutions, so-called racket prosecutions). We also find that the mandatory sentences in narcotic cases result in many trials where ordinarily guilty pleas might be expected.

The root of our congested calendars lies not alone in the enormous volume of civil suits filed but in the type of litigation in this district and our shortage of judicial manpower. With New York City (principally the county of New York, within the southern district) the hub of our national financial, business, economic, and shipping activities, we must expect that the major portion of the litigation involving large sums of money and basic legal principles will be filed here. The same observation may be made of the reorganization of great business enterprises, which find themselves in difficult financial situations or in derivative stockholders suits; likewise of Government and private antitrust suits and of patent and copyright litigation. We have endeavored to point out this qualitative situation in our last annual report. However, let us for a moment consider only the volume of litigation in this district.

The fundamental statistical justification for additional judgeships has been basically unrealistic. We have sought to support our requests upon the number of civil cases pending per judgeship.

While this is overwhelming, and on June 30, 1959, was 608 civil suits per judgeship, the actual measure should be the annual number of suits required to be processed, supervised, or handled per judgeship.

To illustrate this, let us examine the record, and we find:

Cases pending close of business June 30, 1958	10,393
Cases filed:	
July	583
August	491
September	540
October	595
Total cases filed	2,209
Total	12,602
Cases terminated:	
July	365
August	360
September	325
October	425
Total cases terminated	1,475
Pending Oct. 31, 1958	11,127
Cases pending close of business June 30, 1959	10,920
Cases filed:	
July	647
August	550
September	540
October	620
Total cases filed	2,357
Total	13,277
Cases terminated:	
July	455
August	352
September	333
October	761
Total cases terminated	1,901
Pending Oct. 31, 1959	11,376

We also know that in the fiscal year 1958–59, a total of 6,549 civil suits were filed. It may be anticipated, judged from current filings for the first 4 months of this year, that there will be an increased filing of more than 600 suits, bringing the expected total for the current year to a minimum of 7,100 civil suits commenced. We started this fiscal year with 10,920 civil suits pending.

It is simple fact that during this current year a total of at least 18,000 civil suits will have to be processed by a court with 18 active judges; a caseload of at least 1,000 per judge. But there are not 18 judges available for this work; at least 4 judges are required for criminal parts; more than 50 percent of the time of the chief judge is taken up with administrative matters; and, generally, unfortunately, there is at least 1 judge ill. The actual number of judges available then to process these 18,000 civil suits during the current year will be 12½.

But this only presents part of the situation—what appears in a quantitative appraisal.

Of the 10,920 suits pending on June 30, 1959, we find that 237 were patent suits, and 129 were suits filed under the antitrust laws. These are classic long and complicated suits. In addition, 736 were diversity suits filed on claims of breach of contract, and at least 25 of these are long and protracted suits. While there is no breakdown of Robinson-Patman Act suits, it is safe to say that about 3 percent of the 891 suits filed involving other than specific Federal questions, are Robinson-Patman Act sutis, which are long and complicated suits. A most conservative estimate is that on June 30, 1959, at least 300 of the pending 10,920 suits are long and complicated suits, each of which should have been assigned to a single judge shortly after filing. At this time about 80 civil suits of this nature are so individually assigned and more than 200 suits of this nature should be assigned, but this cannot be done because of a shortage of judges.

In addition, we may expect that from 2 to 3 percent of the current year filings of the total of 7,000 suits—or at least 150 will be long and complicated suits which should be assigned to a single judge at an early date. This means that during this fiscal year the court will have to process some 450 long and complicated suits out of the total caseload of 18,000. The burden is intolerable and cannot be properly handled with our present number of judges.

It is estimated that one suit (civil 105–146) will take 8 months to try. One private antitrust suit seeks damage of $14,382,996 (civil 85–239); another of $87,690,000 (civil 85–258); another of $792,361 (civil 69–217); another of $6,075,000 (civil 144–280); another of $8,125,137 (civil 87–361); and these are only a few of the many. The fields of industries involved in the suits range from bottled baby foods and bananas to copyright music, watches, radio tubes, computers, television broadcasting, color photography, prizefight promotion, and smelting of lead and copper cables.

The admiralty suits numbering 2,376 (which is exclusive of Jones Act and personal injury suits) is 40 percent of the admiralty suits pending in the Federal courts of the Nation. Here, we have most of the major maritime disasters, and these suits involve hull damage, cargo damage, and charter parties (besides personal injury and death claims).

Some criticism has been made of the failure to use pretrial procedures to the fullest extent possible. The judges of the court recognize the benefits of pretrial; it is applied constantly and to the fullest extent possible with our limited manpower.

It is estimated that one suit (civil 105–146) pretry the average lawsuit one judge would be limited in output to a monthly product of not more than 125 pretrials. Indeed, many complicated suits require 1 or more days to pre-try. Taking 125 pretrials as an average monthly output for a judge, with about 600 filings per month, it would take 5 judges just to keep abreast of the current filings. This does not take care of the pretrials required in the pending 11,000 civil suits.

Of course, we should have more intensive use of pretrial procedure but it simply cannot be done with our present organization both on the bench and in the clerk's office.

The need for more judges and larger clerical force is urgent and serious.

When we appraise the situation in terms of the judicial manpower required by the volume and type of litigation, we find that the minimum judicial requirement is 24 judges. The further observation must be made that no special provision has been made for the handling of the long and protracted civil suits; either for pretrial supervision or actual trial. It is hoped that these suits can be worked on and tried by the judges while they are assigned to trial parts. It must be noted, too, that the four judges assigned to pretrials will be kept busy on the current annual 7,100 civil-suit inflow; we anticipate that with the constant trials and incident trial pretrials, the court will be able to bring the discovery pretrials up to current filings within 2 years. The senior judges and the visiting judges will fill in for the regularly assigned judges when ill or when unable to accept their regular assignment because of a long trial or an accumulation of work which requires research, reading, and writing in chambers. Thus, they will function as an emergency corps to relieve and to participate in the disposition of suits on a particular calendar which may be falling behind.

We know that the volume and the protracted type of litigation will continue to grow and increase; and as our calendars become more and more current, we may expect this increase to be even larger. A court with calendars which are current attracts litigation which might be filed otherwise in another forum where trial will be delayed. Experience also teaches that in every period of economic adjustment of recession, private settlements without litigation become fewer, settlement of suits in court slow down, reorganization of business enterprises increase in number, and there are more criminal prosecutions. The greatest impact is felt in the metropolitan districts and particularly in the southern district of New York.

	All civil cases			U.S. civil cases			Private civil cases			Number of judges authorized by statute	Number of judges in service
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30		
1950:											
Southern district of New York	5,210	5,174	11,134	1,374	1,963	2,871	3,836	3,211	8,263	16	16
Total, all districts	54,622	53,259	55,603	22,429	22,765	20,778	32,193	30,494	34,825	208	
1951:											
Southern district of New York	4,946	4,932	11,148	1,249	1,648	2,472	3,697	3,284	8,676	16	16
Total, all districts	51,600	52,119	55,084	19,424	20,700	19,502	32,176	31,419	35,582	212	
1952:											
Southern district of New York	5,453	5,173	11,428	1,403	1,407	2,468	4,050	3,766	8,960	16	15¼
Total, all districts	58,428	53,150	60,362	22,880	20,540	21,842	35,548	32,610	38,520	212	
1953:											
Southern district of New York	5,871	5,531	11,768	1,471	1,556	2,383	4,400	3,975	9,385	16	15
Total, all districts	64,001	57,490	66,873	23,881	22,106	23,617	40,120	35,384	43,256	212	
1954:											
Southern district of New York	4,803	5,582	10,989	1,106	1,383	2,106	3,697	4,199	8,883	16	15¼
Total, all districts	59,461	57,903	68,431	19,949	20,894	22,672	39,512	37,009	45,759	212	
1955:											
Southern district of New York	4,522	5,177	10,334	979	1,214	1,871	3,543	3,963	8,463	18	17
Total, all districts	59,375	58,974	68,832	20,150	21,611	21,211	39,225	37,363	47,621	235	

	All civil cases			U.S. civil cases			Private civil cases			Number of judges authorized by statute	Number of judges in service
	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30	Commenced	Terminated	Pending as of June 30		
1956:											
Southern district of New York	5,033	7,162	8,205	972	1,400	1,443	4,061	5,762	6,762	18	16¾
Total, all districts	62,394	67,700	63,526	21,393	24,944	17,660	41,001	42,756	45,866	235	
1957:											
Southern district of New York	5,790	5,426	8,569	940	1,075	1,308	4,850	4,351	7,261	18	17¾
Total, all districts	62,380	63,568	62,338	19,914	21,109	16,465	42,466	42,459	45,873	235	
1958:											
Southern district of New York	6,727	4,897	10,399	963	997	1,274	5,764	3,900	9,125	18	17½
Total, all districts	67,115	61,285	68,168	21,458	20,717	17,206	45,657	40,568	50,962	236	
1959:											
Southern district of New York	6,549	6,011	10,937	1,161	1,215	1,220	5,388	4,796	9,717	18	16¾
Total, all districts	57,800	62,172	63,796	20,355	21,361	16,200	37,445	40,811	47,596	237	

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. During the adjournment of Congress I also conferred with the judges of the Federal court in the southern district of New York, and I strongly agree with everything my distinguished colleague has said. The situation in the southern district of New York is probably unique in the entire country, from the standpoint of the type of cases which come before the court.

I talked with several judges who stated that they had cases before them, or were about to have cases before them, which would require months, running in some instances into years, of the time of one judge. They included extremely complicated patent cases, antitrust cases, and others.

There is thus a real and pressing need for additional judges in the southern district of New York. I feel that the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, which may provide three or four additional judges for that district, which is probably all that can be realistically expected, will, after its passage, still be inadequate to cope with the situation there.

The length of time between the bringing of a case and the disposition of it has been increasing over the years. That burden falls most heavily upon those who can ill afford it. Indigent litigants or litigants of modest means are often forced to settle litigation because they cannot wait 3 or 4 years to have it determined.

I sincerely and earnestly hope that in this session of the Congress we shall come to grips with this problem. I compliment my colleague from New York for bringing it to our attention at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his eloquent support, and I am delighted to join with him in this effort.

THE INADEQUACIES OF THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Democrats in Douglas County, Oreg., are as are all American farmers seriously concerned over the inadequacies of our present agricultural program.

In a recent convention, they urged that the present program be replaced by one which will benefit all farmers. Because of my work with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I was especially pleased to note that an underlying consideration of the policies advocated by this fine public-spirited group is that our surplus food production be used to advance the cause of world peace and to feed hungry people throughout the world. I certainly share their belief that food instead of armaments will enable our country to maintain leadership in the world and foster good will everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Douglas County Democratic convention farm program which was printed in the January 1, 1960, issue of the Douglas Fir, a news publication of interest to the lumber industry as well as the farm community, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROGRAM

We urge the enactment of a farm program that will benefit every tiller of the soil, to the end that all farm families shall earn a living wage and maintain a decent standard of living. It is necessary that the Eisenhower-Benson farm program be junked, discrimination against the small farmer and in favor of the major basic crops be eliminated, and that a realistic price support program be enacted. With millions of starving people throughout the world and an increase of millions of mouths to feed during this population explosion, we have no need to fear farm surplus in the future.

Our so-called farm surplus must be used to advance the cause of world peace and to feed hungry people throughout the world. We believe that food instead of armaments will enable this great Nation to maintain leadership among all countries and foster good will everywhere.

WHAT CAN WE PAY FOR PLENTY?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Harley Libby, past president of the Oregon Farmers Union, in an article entitled "What Can We Pay for Plenty?" published in the October 15 issue of the Oregon Farmer, has posed some very interesting questions deserving careful attention by the Congress.

When he states "people are important; they should come neither last nor least; they create the problems and the necessity for answers; any solution that allows human values to become submerged in economic issues has missed its basic purpose" he has struck a note that should echo throughout all legislative work to which we commit ourselves in this and every session of the Congress.

Mr. President, because I feel that the article contains much food for thought, I commend it to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN WE PAY FOR PLENTY?

(By Harley Libby)

So much has been said about our farm problems and about subsidies and surpluses that one hesitates to make any addition. But operating on the assumption that TV commercials can't all be wrong and that constant repetition does bear fruit, I offer the following with the hope that it may stimulate some serious thinking.

THE COST OF OUR ABUNDANCE

True, the problems of plenty are real and must be dealt with realistically.

We would do well to decide, first of all, that life is much more kind to people in a land of plenty. To know freedom from hunger and cold should be counted as a blessing and not a cross to bear.

No sound-thinking person believes that we can ever achieve an exactly balanced program of production-to-need. Then isn't it better that the balance be on the side of abundance and that we do have a reasonable food bank to insure against hunger?

And should we not apply business thinking and write off the cost of that insured security as we might car, life or fire insurance?

But surpluses beyond reason do present a real challenge. What have we done about them? Not enough, surely.

The National Farmers Union has long advocated a unit measure of bushels—tons—etc., rather than heavily fertilized acres as the proper measure for production quotas, and a broadening of the basics. It has also asked for a definite dollar and cent limitation on price supports to any one producer. The purpose for both:

(1) to discourage over-production; (2) to stop channeling so much acreage into the few protected crops; (3) to prevent undue individual benefits.

To date Congress, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the national administration have all failed to take a firm stand.

Senator NEUBERGER's proposed food for peace plan, calling for the use of surpluses to feed the hungry peoples of the world certainly has merit. (Incidentally, I was pleased to note the Oregon Farmer's support for this suggestion.) To date we have seemingly preferred to send money and munitions, writing the cost off to national security. Would not food to the hungry create equal good will—and much less suspicion? And wouldn't that be a living demonstration of international humanitarianism and also a contribution to national security?

Likewise, the Oregon Wheat League is to be commended for its excellent work in the field of expanding uses of surplus commodities.

FOOD STAMP FUTURE

The food stamp plan, embodied in a bill by Senator WAYNE MORSE, could also well meet a domestic need and present both a saving and an outlet. With our abundance of food, why have we hesitated so long? Surely we would not seriously disrupt our trade economy by supplying food we cannot sell to those who have no money to buy.

The school lunch program has been an excellent example, not only of food distribution to the right people, but of food promotion. Teachers and those who do the actual contact work in the schools can tell of the increased taste for milk and vegetables so necessary to young growing bodies. (Just think what the brewing industry would give for such an opportunity.)

These programs should become more universal. They will certainly show long-range dividends in national health.

THE SOIL BANK IDEA

The soil bank idea, based on the theory that it is better to store fertility against future needs than to store excess surpluses makes sense. As enacted into law, it has been badly abused but the necessary teeth have now been added.

Many people find it difficult to reconcile the soil bank program with the activities of the reclamation service in bringing in new acres, or with the USDA's regular requests for more money for research for increased yields—to realize the hope of 100-bushels-per-acre wheat, for example. Or with the USDA's advice to further mechanize and to apply expensive fertilizers in greater abundance.

The advice is theirs and I leave the answer to them.

EIGHTY-PERCENT PROSPERITY

Most discussions and articles on the farm problem, particularly if they come from departments which live by legislative appropriations, avoid the matter of what farmers actually receive for their production.

The critics are often more inclined to describe glowingly the growth of vertical integration and the glories of expanded farm operations. In their enthusiasm they temporarily forget what is happening to the countless thousands of farm families without farms that most surely go hand in hand with the growth of vertical integration, contract farming and the decrease of market opportunities.

When the ills of the shrinking farm dollars are discussed they are often cheerfully blamed onto the fickle fancies of the consumer whose changing demands increase cost.

No one denies the changes, but let us look at this last one carefully and put part of the blame where it properly belongs.

The manufacturers, processors, and distributors who do fancy packaging and costly duplication in a competitive struggle to capture more and more of the profit in the consumer's dollar must also share responsibility.

It was not consumers who demanded five name brand bread deliveries at the corner grocery—and of loaves costing 30 cents plus and containing some 3 cents worth of wheat each, for example.

Nor was it you and I who asked for atomic age fishfin fenders and double-jointed tail lights that sent the cost of cars, repairs, and insurance to new heights.

It is well past the time that economists and farm advisers, including our own U.S. Department of Agriculture, need to become farm price conscious. It is time we all join in better acquainting the consuming public with what part of the dollar the farmer actually receives for his commodity at the farm.

Those who would advise should know that there are many young farmers today who face near bankruptcy in a losing struggle. It takes more than efficiency to pay for expensive modern farm machinery at a 100 percent plus parity price with farm commodities sold on an 80 percent of parity market.

It is time to come down to earth and realize that any farmer, regardless of size or volume or efficiency, who produces and markets a commodity at less than the cost of production has about as much chance as a woodpecker above timberline to share in the national prosperity.

It is a small and doubtful honor to be able to prove that by efficiency you were the farmer in your community who lost the least.

PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT

Sometimes I wonder if in our zest to deal with statistics and in our eagerness to enthuse about bigness, we haven't forgotten the human factor that gives all others purpose—the people themselves.

Enough has been said in recent years to inform everyone that the farms of this Nation and the families that live on them are becoming fewer and fewer.

Always, and properly, there has been a constant and voluntary departure of members of farm families to enter other fields, to find employment.

Recently, however, that trend has become an exodus, and certainly not all voluntary. Nor are they all young, employable people. We are informed that about 75 percent of our young people today leave the land, and that about 50 percent of them are working today in organized labor.

Certainly we cannot hold this against them. They are our children. We have done our best to teach them the value of organization. We know that if labor today was as loosely organized as farmers, laborers too would be working for an 80 percent of parity paycheck.

Labor rallied well to meet the revolution of automation in industry by demanding—and receiving—better wages and shorter hours. We as farmers met the challenge of mechanization by producing more and more for less and less.

REWARD FOR EFFICIENCY

We seek no protective wall around inefficiency. Efficiency, good management, and industry are entitled to their just rewards. We know some people will prosper more than others in any vocation.

But many farmers would still remain upon the land, knowing that their economic returns would be a little lower than if they went to the city. They are following a chosen way of life and they would willingly exchange the opportunity to "eat a little higher on the hog" for the many fine intangible benefits of family life on the farm.

But this does not mean that these people should be crowded off into migrant labor status by an unfair economic setup. They are entitled to a fair price for their production. These family farm people are truly the salt of the earth. They believe in the land and what it can do. They live on, and from, the soil, in a partnership with God and nature. If democracy is ever put to the test for final existence, it is here in these country homes that its roots will be found most deeply imbedded and where it will live the longest.

LET'S SUM THIS UP

Freedom from hunger and cold is a blessing. We had best recognize it as such and write off its costs as we would any other sound insurance program.

Excessive surpluses are a challenge but can be made manageable by a varied attack. Production must be controlled to reasonably meet the needs of the day. But production should be limited by intelligent controls—not by ruinous prices.

Any farm program that does not plan for an equitable price for commodities to the producer renders little economic service to American agriculture.

People are important. They should come neither last nor least. They create the problems and the necessity for answers. Any solution that allows human values to become submerged in economic issues has missed its basic purpose.

FARM INCOME DOWN

Net farm income nationally for the first three quarters of 1959 was down sharply from the similar period of 1958, according to the USDA's current farm income situation report. (And many weren't getting rich in 1958.)

Income for the first 9 months of 1959 was reported as approximately $11,500 million; this was $1,500 million under the 1958 period—a decline of 12 percent. However, it was still 4½ percent above the recession year of 1957.

This year's January-August total of cash receipts from livestock and products was 4 percent less than last year's. Although prices averaged higher for cattle, they were substantially lower for hogs, broilers, and eggs.

Total crop receipts in the first 8 months of 1959, however, were reported as about the same as 1958. Receipts from corn, oranges, and tobacco were up considerably, but they were offset by a sharp drop in receipts from sorghum, grain, and wheat.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FONG OF HAWAII

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last fall the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], traveled extensively in the Far East. His was a unique journey. First, he paid for the trip himself. It was unique for another reason also. I believe it has now been generally conceded that in his travels he, as a notable American citizen, dedicated himself to improving amity and happy relations between the people of the United States and those of the countries of the Far East which he visited.

The labors of our distinguished Hawaiian colleague were the basis of a commendatory resolution adopted by the Republican State Central Committee of the State of Hawaii at its meeting on November 7, 1959, in Hilo. A copy of it was transmitted to the Vice President of the United States by Mr. Merson L. Skinner, of the State central committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield to the able junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was in the Far East during the time our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] was there. I did not encounter him there, but I did, on all sides, hear what a great ambassador of good will he was for our country. The fact that HIRAM FONG is of Chinese ancestry and is now serving in the Senate of the United States obviously meant much to the peoples of the Far East, who sometimes may feel that our ties are closer to other countries than to them.

I feel certain that the trip by Senator HIRAM FONG to the Far East will yield rich dividends to our country. I am very happy that the able senior Senator from California has brought this resolution to our attention.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from the Empire State. What the junior Senator from New York has just stated is that the citizenship of this country, which is heterogeneous in character, is able to demonstrate to all mankind that we do believe in constitutional freedom and in equal treatment under law.

As the able Senator from New York has said, the Senator from Hawaii, by reason of his background, has been in a unique situation to advance the cause of freedom.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me on that point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, many of us, as is true of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the very able former Governor of California, Hon. Earl Warren, who first appointed him to the Senate, and who is now the Chief Justice of the United States, and others who have long supported statehood for Hawaii, have come to the conclusion that it was more important for the United States to grant statehood to Hawaii than for Hawaii to receive statehood. I believe the United States is more the beneficiary of the act of admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union than is Hawaii itself.

Except for spiritual gain, embodied in the glorious acquisition of full first-class citizenship, the people of Hawaii have gained in no material way, have in no measure changed their economic status by statehood; but by admitting Hawaii to statehood the United States has demonstrated something that rings to the farthest corners of the earth. It was a peaceable shot heard 'round the world.

It was very heartening to us who supported Hawaii's statehood cause and followed what took place thereafter, to observe that, regardless of party, the five principal candidates who were successful in the Hawaiian election represented five totally diverse ethnic strains.

Governor Quinn is of American-Irish descent; Senator Long is of American-Anglo-Saxon descent; Senator Fong is of American-Chinese descent; Representative Inouye is of American-Japanese descent; and Jimmy Kalealoha, elected Lieutenant Governor, is of American-Polynesian descent. They constitute a typical cross-section of Hawaii's population and a proof of its ethnic democracy.

I think the United States is fortunate in this development and in the fact that the visits of Senator FONG and Representative INOUYE to the Orient as messengers of good-will and living embodiments of our democracy have brought great returns to Uncle Sam in better and truer understanding of what our Nation stands for.

I wish to commend what the senior Senator from California and the junior Senator from New York have just said on the question. I am happy to associate myself with their views.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, that is a worthwhile contribution from a splendid American and a great Senator. I thank him for it.

I believe the fact that the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of this great Union is something in which we can take a great deal more pride and joy than the people of Hawaii themselves can take.

Mr. GRUENING. That is my view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, has been traveling at his own expense through the countries of the Orient; and

Whereas the favorable reaction of the people of these Pacific basin countries has been so uniformly favorable and has resulted in a much friendlier understanding between these countries and ours: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Hawaii proudly commends the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG for the unselfish devotion to his duties as a U.S. Senator representing the State of Hawaii.

VISIT BY SENATOR MUSKIE, OF MAINE, TO POLAND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the investigation which a special Senate subcommittee had undertaken of Russia's development of its vast hydroelectric resources, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], a member of the subcommittee, on his way home, stopped off in Poland. It was his purpose to find the village from which his father had emigrated 59 years before. He wanted to visit his father's birthplace and the graves of his paternal ancestors and, if possible, to find any relative who might still be alive.

On his return he recounted his experience in a news release. In my view, and in that of others who have read Senator MUSKIE's moving account, our beloved colleague from Maine has made a memorable contribution to that enduring literature which embodies the heart and soul of the American idea. It reemphasizes the utterance, some years ago, of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that once all Americans were immigrants. But beyond that, Senator MUSKIE's release makes vivid that we, the descendants of immigrants to America, must be eternally grateful to our fathers and forefathers who had the vision and the initiative to leave the old world and seek freedom and greater opportunity in the new.

Sometimes it would appear that some of our fellow citizens whose pioneering ancestors many generations ago courageously embarked on an uncharted course and left the old world, with its restrictions, rigidities, oppressions and inequalities, may have, to a degree, lost that passion for and understanding of what their forefathers envisioned and sought. But to those whose personal experiences and recollections of what America meant to our forebears are still fresh—the first, second, and perhaps even the third generation of immigrants—EDMUND MUSKIE's message of renewal carries a special significance and poignancy.

I ask unanimous consent that our colleague's inspired narrative be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the newsletter by Senator MUSKIE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I record this I am sitting at my desk at home, relaxed and thoroughly enjoying the American way of life after 35 days away from it. It has been good for me personally to be exposed to the people and the customs and the intellectual, political, and economic climate of the Soviet Union. The experience highlighted those values which make America such a wonderful place in which to live and intensified my appreciation of them. I hope and believe that the experience will be of real value in connection with my duties as a U.S. Senator.

By fortuitous circumstances, Clayton LaVerdiere, of the Waterville Morning Sentinel, arranged with Jane to use excerpts from my letters to her as a report to the citizens of Maine on my travels. I hope they proved of interest. They could not possibly constitute a comprehensive report of all our new experiences and impressions. In particular, I avoided detailed discussion relative to our primary mission, that of evaluating the status and pace of hydroelectric power developments in the U.S.S.R. There is much material to be digested and analyzed in proper perspective before the subcommittee, and its staff will state firm conclusions or consider recommendations. There is no question, however, as to the very considerable momentum which the Soviet Union has developed in this field.

My letters to Jane did not touch upon my 2 days in Poland, it being obvious that I would reach home before any letters which I might write from Warsaw. Yesterday, October 26, for example, my fourth day at home, Jane received a letter which I wrote in Leningrad on October 15th. Airmail has not yet caught up with the jet age. Apparently, also, it takes a little longer for mail to pierce the Iron Curtain.

As you know, my father was born in Poland. He left it 59 years ago at the age of 17 in search of freedom and opportunity. He found both, not only for himself, but also for his children, and for that we will be eternally grateful. At the same time, he always spoke to us warmly of his homeland, its loveliness, and the scenes of his childhood.

Remote as the possibility seemed, I wanted to find the village where he was born, in order that I might trod in his name the soil to which he never found it possible to return in his lifetime. I found it. A tiny rural village called Jasionowka, 20-odd miles north of Bialystok, not too far from the Russian border, at what was described to me by Deputy Foreign Minister Winiewicz as the saddest part of Poland.

To reach it, Frank and Mrs. Jones, of the American Embassy, and I drove 75 miles northeasterly from Warsaw. The main roads in Poland are excellent and we made good time—thoroughly enjoying the flat but pleasant and attractive countryside and the mild and sunny autumn day. As we approached the village, we passed, of all coincidences, a lake with a familiar name, Augusta. At this point, I became profoundly moved as I considered in a matter of minutes my eyes would

see fields, streams, and trees and possibly even faces that my father's eyes had seen last more than half a century before.

We had left the main road and were driving over a narrow, cobbled country road. As we topped a slight rise, there came into view in the distance a large white building, somewhat shabby, but clinging to the shreds of an ancient dignity which I instinctively felt must be the manor house of a nobleman's estate which my grandfather had managed at the turn of the century. And so it proved to be, now converted to a state farm with a new barn, some battered older buildings, ruins of others and a small duck pond which may have been a favorite spot for children in my father's day. A short distance beyond, the pitiful, unpainted, weather-beaten homes of the villagers were clustered about a broad square, dominated by the stately white church which my father attended.

In sharp contrast to the Soviet Union, the Poles are devout in their belief in God and extremely conscientious in discharging their religious duties. It was heartwarming to see them swarming to the church on Sunday morning, walking, on bicycles, or in spotless wagons, behind their horses. Their extremely difficult economic and political circumstances seem simply to strengthen their faith in God's purposes.

With little more than an hour at my disposal, my first objective was to find some trace of my father's family. We proceeded to the local presidium and almost immediately located a friendly girl who recalled an old lady bearing the family name. She escorted us to a drab little house on one of the side streets. We knocked on the door and entered. In a dark little cubby hole of a kitchen, I met the widow of my father's brother, tiny and stooped under the weight of almost 80 years. With her was my father's niece, herself a widow with a young child, her husband killed in the war. Having grasped the almost incomprehensible fact of my identity, my cousin quickly showed me pictures of my father and my mother which he had sent her long years ago and letters he had written. They did not know of his death and accepted his silence over the past 3 years as just another of the burdens which filled their daily lives. The sister my father left behind is also dead, leaving three sons who were away at work and unavailable during my visit. I met the wife of one of them, whose first question related to the possibility of coming to America.

At this point, the local grapevine had spread the word and the street in front of the little house swarmed with villagers. They were obviously delighted to welcome me and wanted to know all about me and my family. A surveillance team had picked us up on the border of Bialystok Province and followed us. The villagers were highly amused when these two representatives of the state police rather shamefacedly refused my invitation to pose for pictures, which I said I wanted to show the Deputy Foreign Minister when I met him that afternoon.

It is difficult to comprehend the economic circumstances of the people in that little village—the bareness of their lives. They have no meat; they stand in line for bread. Their diet appears to consist of potatoes and cabbage. The monthly wage is roughly the equivalent of $10 to $20. Their personal possessions are almost unbelievably meager. This is indeed the saddest part of Poland. But for my father's dream of freedom and opportunity this would be my life—the life of my children.

And what of the people who live this life? They have courage. They have their belief, and their faith in God. They value friendship, and love, and family ties, and derive such happiness as they know from these. Sadly, however, they have no hope that their lot will be improved, and the result is a deep apathy which stifles ambition and interest in the public issues which will shape their future.

Poland is a country in an almost hopeless political and economic dilemma. Its people historically have cherished independence and freedom and love of country above all else. Geographically today they find themselves in such proximity to the Russian colossus that like the turtle, they are forced to withdraw into the shell of their obvious security alliances. Were they free to do otherwise, their hearts and their traditions would take them elsewhere.

Economically, following the war, the Russians, in their own interests, developed an industrial complex in Poland, notably steel and textiles, which make the country almost irrevocably committed to the Soviet Union for the necessary raw materials. It must rely upon coal and agriculture for the exports to balance its international payment, and its agricultural lands are fragmentized into small holdings which are committed to ancient unmechanized methods and practices which fall far short of the production necessary to meet domestic needs and export requirements. These current difficulties, which I have probably oversimplified for sake of brevity, plus centuries of living in the crossroads of war in Eastern Europe, have made my father's village what it is today.

The past and the present have created a far different, more comfortable, and better world for me than they have for my cousins.

Must this be?

What does the future hold?

We speak constantly of a just peace. We pray for it. And what would a just peace mean to my cousins? And there are many, many more millions in the world, living in circumstances no better and, indeed, far worse than they.

Before I left the village, I visited the cemetery in search of my grandparents' graves. There was no trace. As is so often the case in Europe, they are probably at rest two or three layers deep. People have lived, died, for many, many centuries in this part of the world, some with their grinding misery and their fleeting happiness, some with flaming hopes, and others with forlorn hopelessness; some with lives of abundance and others with lives of emptiness.

Europe is an ancient civilization. We are an outgrowth of it, and out of this deep past, its lessons and experience as well as its aspirations, we seek the promise of a brighter future for all mankind. Can we find it? May God will it so.

As we drove away from the village, I caught a last glimpse of the white church, gleaming as it shed its shabbiness in the sunlight and the distance. Suddenly and hauntingly, I felt myself to be the second generation bearer of the dream of freedom and opportunity which prompted my father to leave his home behind him. This is 10:45 p.m. Tbilise time, or 2:45 p.m. Washington time.

A LONG OVERDUE MEMORIAL TO TEDDY ROOSEVELT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this morning it was my honor to have my picture taken before the bust of Vice President—and later President—Theodore Roosevelt, which is located on the principal floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol. My companion for the photograph was Vice President NIXON.

It is fitting that Vice President NIXON, who exemplifies many of the fine qualities of Teddy Roosevelt, should be in the forefront of the effort to establish a suitable memorial to that great leader. In pursuit of this goal, the Vice President today sent the following letter to every Member of Congress:

Enclosed is a copy of the final report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission. We feel that a great deal was accomplished during the year-long observance of the anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth and that we were able to achieve most, if not all, of the objectives laid down by the law which created the Commission.

Let me call your attention to page 47 of the report, however, and to that one major aim which yet awaits action, namely, the completion of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial in Washington.

You may recall that the Theodore Roosevelt Association, 30 years ago, presented Theodore Roosevelt Island, a 90-acre tract in the Potomac, to the American people for the establishment of a suitable memorial. A bill calling for an appropriation of $886,400 for the construction of this memorial is now before the Congress. When it has been approved, this tribute to one of our most distinguished Presidents will be well on its way to realization.

The legislation referred to will come before the Congress for action during the coming session. It is the sincere hope of the members of the Commission that you may lend your support to the creation of this memorial to one of our great American Presidents.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

As a cosponsor of Senate bill 2561, which seeks to provide for the construction of a Theodore Roosevelt Memorial on Theodore Roosevelt Island, in the Potomac River, I am pleased to have this strong backing for a memorial to one of New York's most illustrious sons. Suitable homage from the Nation to which he contributed so much is long overdue, and I am hopeful that in this session of Congress final passage of this measure will be achieved, so that work on the memorial can proceed without further delay.

In this connection, the incomparable Bess Furman, of the New York Times, this fall penned a most interesting article concerning plans for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Furman's article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 29, 1959]

WASHINGTON PLANS FOR ROOSEVELT (T.R.) ISLAND

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON.—Three important structural developments close together, involving the Potomac shore and Theodore Roosevelt Island in the river, are destined to change the face of this Capital City in the area between the Lincoln Memorial and Georgetown, upstream.

These are the proposed Constitution Avenue Bridge, a continuation of Constitution Avenue crossing Theodore Roosevelt Island to the Virginia side, thus seeking to relieve downtown Washington's heavy traffic congestion; the striking National Cultural Center, to rise beside the river at the foot of New Hampshire Avenue between the proposed bridge and the mouth of Rock Creek, facing out toward the beautiful wooded island; and the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. The bridge is to be built on the island, now a bird sanctuary and free of all human habitation.

The bill to construct the three-tiered bridge with its complex approach system seems sure to pass Congress at its next session. The bill will give access to the island and make it one of Washington's showplaces. The memorial will be visible from the bridge.

The cultural center's design, by the New York architect Edward D. Stone, includes an opera house to seat from 3,000 to 4,000; a concert hall, to seat 3,000; a theater of 1,000 to 1,800 capacity, and two smaller auditoriums for plays and lectures. It is to cost $61 million.

As for the memorial project, Theodore Roosevelt Island, about a mile long and half a mile wide, has been the subject of several previous acts of Congress.

TERMS OF BILL

The bill now pending provides "that the Secretary of the Interior shall erect on Roosevelt Island such monument or memorial to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, and related structures, as may be approved by the Theodore Roosevelt Association, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission." It would authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary.

For legislation of modest cost—about $500,000—it could not have more distinguished backing. In the House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, lent his prestige by being photographed with the architect's drawing of the memorial and its chief sponsors, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and LEO O'BRIEN, Democrat, of New York. In the Senate, Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, joined with New York's two Senators, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING, as sponsors.

When completed, the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial will be a blood brother to Rockefeller Center, for it was Paul Manship, the sculptor of the statue of Prometheus there, who conceived the large bronze celestial sphere that will be the principal feature of the memorial. The sphere will be about 40 feet in diameter and about 60 feet high.

BAS RELIEF

At the center of the granite base on which it is to rest there will be a bas relief of Theodore Roosevelt. The sphere, placed beside a reflecting pool, will be at the center of a court 150 feet wide and 200 feet deep, bordered by trees. On 12 granite panels, each 10 feet high and 20 feet wide, spaced on three sides of the court, will be carved Theodore Roosevelt's most famous statements on government. Eric Gugler is the architect.

Erection of the memorial will carry out plans formulated about a quarter of a century ago. These can now be put in effect, because Congress has finally decided where it will put the new bridge. On the island, however, anyone wishing to commune with the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt will have to do so on foot. In honor of that nature lover, only foot trails are allowed there. In any case, the island has had a colorful history.

The Indians, of course, were there first, giving it the name spelled with quaint variations on early maps—"Anticostan," "Analostian," "Anacostien," and later "Analostan," a name it held until the Hoover administration. When the colonies were formed, it was called "My Lord's Island," for it belonged to Lord Baltimore.

In 1717 it was bought by George Mason, the father of the father of the Bill of Rights. It descended to the famous George, the master of Gunston Hall, who willed it to his son, John Mason. The island was a possession of the wealthy and powerful Virginia family for 125 years. So it was "Mason's I," on the maps of early Washington, in which it was included.

The island's most glamorous period began in the 1790's when the building of the Federal city was being started. When John Mason inherited it from his father in 1792, he already was the leading banker of Georgetown, had a monopoly on the ferry to the Virginia shore and possessed large business and property interests in the District of Columbia.

FRENCH PLAN

He had spent much time in Paris looking after the Mason family overseas shipping interests and he envisaged the island as one of those well-barbered rural retreats popular in France. That was the way in which he developed it. The handsome home he erected at its highest spot, commanding a view of building operations at the White House and the Capitol, has been attributed in its design to George Hadfield, one of the early Architects of the Capitol.

The Mason home in its heyday was described by David Baillie Warden, British consul at Georgetown in 1810, in a book published in Paris in 1816.

"Its interior is finished in costly style by its opulent owner," wrote Warden. "The garden is kept in fine order, ornamental trees, shrubs, and rare plants are a source of attraction to botanists."

He described servants' quarters, summerhouses, flora and fauna. He said the snapping turtles grew so big that when General Mason threw one of them in his canoe, "it attacked him so furiously he was obliged to leap into the water." Large turtle eggs, he said, were a staple of diet.

Looking riverward from a summerhouse, he narrated, "We perceive the sails only as if by enchantment gliding through the trees."

HOST TO THE GREAT

John Mason entertained the great men of his time, including Louis Philippe, later King of France, at his island home. A central hall connected the ornamental front stoop and formal back terrace, with a drawing room on one side of the hall and, on the other, a dining room that opened into a bedroom wing, beneath which were basement kitchens and a wine cellar.

It was in this home in 1797 that James Murray Mason was born. He later became a cause célèbre in the Civil War when he was sent with John Slidell by President Jefferson Davis of the Confederacy to negotiate with Great Britain—only to be captured by a U.S. naval vessel and detained for some time at Boston before being allowed to resume his journey to Europe.

It was in January 1805, that Congress passed its first act concerning Analostan Island, a move destined to be disastrous both to Georgetown and the Mason family. It provided that Georgetown would be permitted to build a causeway from the island to the Virginia shore to expedite the stage route and to improve the navigation of the river by diverting the main flow of Little River, along the Virginia shore, to the District of Columbia side of the river.

The city of Georgetown had no intention of building this combined dam and causeway, which was, in fact, a private enterprise project by the owner of the stage line, John Mason. On July 1, 1805, a legal paper was drawn up through which Georgetown empowered Mason to build the causeway 30 feet wide and 8 feet above high tide. It was to be "secured by parapet walls 4 feet high above the top of the dam or base of the said road made thereon."

One local historian has declared that this causeway "caused a gradual filling in of the channel and contributed to the decline of the town (Georgetown) as a seaport." Another noted: "The marshes created by the causeway brought swarms of mosquitoes which rendered the island uninhabitable and the Masons eventually quit it." The fine house went to rack and ruin. Then, in 1869, it suffered a devastating fire.

Meantime, floods washed out the Mason causeway, the mosquito blight abated and colorful events were resumed on the island under various auspices and ownerships. On July 4, 1834, there was a balloon ascension from the island, seen by between 6,000 and 7,000 people. In the 1850's, Mayor William A. Bradley was host there at lavish picnics.

PONTOON BRIDGE

Early in the Civil War, it was said to have served as a Confederate recruiting office. Later, Union forces threw a pontoon bridge across to it, and Mathew B. Brady took a picture to prove it. Hardly was the war over when an annual custom of crowning a Queen of Love and Beauty was initiated. Harper's Weekly of October 7, 1865, describes, with elaborate sketches, the crowning, the tilting of the ring that preceded it, and the dancing in the moonlight that followed.

In the 1880's the Columbia Athletic Club operated the island as a race track and ball field. In the early nineties a sprinter set a record for the 100-yard dash there. In August of 1907, the whole place was almost sold for $100,000 to a New York amusement company to create a new "Coney Island." On January 8, 1932, the Roosevelt Memorial Association bought it from the Washington Gas Light Co., which had planned to use it commercially. The memorial association then offered it to the Nation as a shrine.

Again there was an act of Congress—that of May 31, 1932—accepting the gift and changing the name to Roosevelt Island. The deed was presented to President Herbert Hoover in ceremonies at the White House on December 13, 1932. Already Franklin D. Roosevelt had been elected President. In January 1933, Congress acted once more, making it Theodore Roosevelt Island to clarify for all time which President Roosevelt was being memorialized.

Franklin D. Roosevelt zestfully pushed the memorial plan projected by Olmstead Bros., architects of Brookline, Mass., which neatly dovetailed into a trio of his New Deal projects. The purpose was to transform the island into a natural forest and wildlife sanctuary memorializing the love of Theodore Roosevelt for the out of doors. Specified was creation of openings through the trees to simulate foot-worn forest trails somewhat irregular in width and alinement; construction of a $135,000 overlook and razing of the Mason ruins.

Into Washington from Fort Hoyle, Vt., was brought a Civilian Conservation Corps company, which established a base of operations in November 1934 at the Virginia end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

This was called Camp Arlington, and the main task of its members was the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island. That project was still going strong when President Roosevelt took the King of England to visit Camp Arlington in June 1939.

AUTHOR-WORKER

The first project superintendent, a handy man with camera and typewriter, wrote a 1934–35 historical scrapbook now in the National Archives. The first hard winter the CCC boys crossed over on the ice, when it was safe, at intervals between such chores as clearing superheavy snows from White House drives and the Potomac Park pool for skating.

When the CCC boys cut down and sawed up the trees that the Olmstead Brothers blazed as diseased or unsuited to a forest primeval, WPA workers came in from the city and carted them off to the municipal woodyard run for families on relief.

As many as 40 men from the relief rolls were working at one time, according to the superintendent's scrapbook.

But all did not go well along the irregular, footworn trails that were being looped around the island. Letters in National Park Service files reflected a growing feeling that, despite the setting out of large numbers of appropriate trees, the forest primeval remained academic, and that the plan for an overlook had been too long delayed. Eventually the overlook was abandoned in favor of the Manship-Gugler sphere.

ROADBUILDING

Along came World War II, then a long controversy as to whether a superhighway must be routed across a natural forest and wildlife refuge. Congress decreed that Washington traffic being what it is, that it certainly must—and that Roosevelt Island would just have to adjust.

Meanwhile, any weekend afternoon from June through October, anyone can go to the Wisconsin Avenue waterfront in Georgetown, take a free 3-minute ride to Theodore Roosevelt Island, and see how things are getting along. If he pauses at the orientation station until a small crowd collects, a National Parks Service ranger will show up and give a conducted tour and nature lecture.

The island has added unto itself 18 acres, bringing the total to 88 in the last 100 years. Now the marshlands and swamplands are nearly as long as the island itself, with trees, shrubs, and flowers in striking contrast to those of the hardwood forest on the higher and dried ground where the old house was. The only discernible remnants of human habitation are some beds of English ivy.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S LEGISLATIVE MESSAGE WINS HIGH PRAISE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, frequently I have asserted my strong conviction that the Federal Government should not encroach upon problems which are being adequately handled at the State and local levels. Ideally, the government which is closest to the people should be in the best position to respond to their needs and wishes. The strength of our Republic and the vigor of democracy in this country depend to a large extent on the willingness of the States to meet their own responsibilities.

Yesterday, Governor Rockefeller delivered his annual message to the New York State Legislature. His message outlined for the Empire State a program which is worthy of the widest emulation. In a lead editorial in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, this program is described as reflective of "a progressive dynamic appreciation of this great States needs." In another highly favorable editorial, today's New York Times comments that—

when so many people, even in a democracy, think of government as something to be endured, or at the extreme a costly nuisance, and too often also regard officeholders, including legislators, as unworthy inferiors, the Governor lifts our sights, applies a needed corrective.

These editorials suggest that under the leadership of Governor Rockefeller, New York is one State that will not shirk its responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 7, 1960]

ROCKEFELLER'S DYNAMIC PROGRAM

Governor Rockefeller, entering his second year at Albany, says to the Legislature: "I am happy to report that we have restored fiscal integrity."

New York's financial house is in order, thanks to last year's tough decision to raise taxes. The State is on a complete pay-as-you-go basis. The budget won't be any bigger. Almost needless to say, there will be no new taxes or tax increases. Also, however, no general tax cut.

This stability, in the Governor's view, was prerequisite to practically everything else.

Where then does Mr. Rockefeller lead from here?

Quite properly the Governor concerns himself at length with the growing economy and the individual's share therein. He points to a record number of jobs, but sets nothing less than full employment as his goal. He is still on the hunt for more industry and points vigorously to the need for increased electric power.

He advocates strengthened activity in developing atomic energy. He recommends a public works stockpile and urges undiminished highway construction despite lagging Federal funds. He wants tax adjustments to spur small business. But he also counsels an overall $1 hourly minimum wage as well as increased benefits in unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation.

In short, where the economy is healthy and expanding the individual is served best.

But Mr. Rockefeller's message is by no means all economics. One of the most important sections, to be detailed later, deals with schools. Here the public need is growing fast, and the Governor says bluntly that the localities cannot carry the load by property taxation alone.

His answer is to provide new sources of revenue through the voluntary establishment of federated districts empowered to levy local nonproperty taxes. To broaden the tax base means that the people at home, after getting State aid, can decide for themselves exactly how they would like to obtain the rest of the money.

In civil rights Mr. Rockefeller is clearly sympathetic to the need for doing something about discrimination in private housing. He is also extremcly anxious about middle-income housing and hopes to attract a lot more private capital than has been so far forthcoming. The Governor will spell out his views on both these aspects of housing as the session progresses.

Among many other Rockefeller task-force researches is that on the cost and adequacy of medical service. The Governor says the problem of individual catastrophic expense must be dealt with, but he is careful to point out that this is a national as well as State concern. The forthcoming report should be highly interesting.

Then there are a number of major action programs already offered, such as reorganization of the executive branch, the strengthening of local government as part of a constructive sample of constitutional revision and another go at court reform. Also such relatively noncontroversial plans as the comprehensive attack on juvenile delinquency and the all-out proposals for improving highway safety.

What we have, then, is a progressive, dynamic appreciation of this great State's needs. It demands that government must serve the people effectively and economically, and that such action means progress. The challenges are there to be conquered. In this task Governor Rockefeller has well demonstrated his vision and leadership. And he is doubtless aware that not only New York but the entire Nation is watching.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1960]

THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE

Governor Rockefeller in his second annual message to the New York Legislature places a constructive program for lawmaking within the framework of preamble and conclusion that emphasize the fateful importance, in our time, of governing well and thus strengthening the free world. He does this with eloquence and conviction; as a man now withdrawn from the competition for higher office he can speak of broad principles and not be suspected of politics.

When so many people, even in a democracy, think of government as something to be endured, or at the extreme a costly nuisance, and too often also regard officeholders, including legislators, as unworthy inferiors, the Governor lifts our sights, applies a needed corrective. Looking ahead through the 1960's, he sees a decade that is ours to use, or ours to waste; ours for the sufferance of evil events, or ours for the creation of great events. The public servants of our State, of every State, indeed all responsible officers of every free government in the world, face the stark and immediate challenge of proving that representative government can work, serving all the people, securing freedom and achieving justice for all.

The basic proposition of his message, as Mr. Rockefeller sees it, is that with our abiding concern the worth and dignity of the individual, we must be ruled and inspired by awareness that, in the deepest political sense, all things are one thing. And the one thing so urgently demanded of us is to prove that freedom—its citizens, its leaders, and its laws—can work, can create, can endure, and can avail. "In this high purpose," the Governor adds, "let us know that each of us has his role to play."

Within this setting the Governor approaches the problems of New York. He sees the State's own fiscal integrity as an essential to economic growth; he proposes, by February 1, to submit a budget whose appropriations will not exceed those of the current year and which will achieve complete pay-as-you-go financing. He reports that his revitalized department of commerce has had conspicuous success in encouraging employment increase and industrial expansion. He proposes to assist small business with tax changes.

Much of his message is devoted to labor. He will convene a conference on automation, which "must be faced with realism and understanding." He urges a statutory minimum wage of $1 an hour for workers, with some exceptions. He would increase unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation and disability benefits, proposes important other protections of the individual and family.

The passage on education is, of course, fraught with interest and probable political controversy. He will present a program to authorize the levying of local, nonproperty taxes and the establishment of new federated school districts with tax-levying powers. Convinced that the local cost of education can no longer be met by real estate taxation alone, he advances the theory that "those who spend school funds should participate in the decision as to how they should be obtained." He promises—and this will be read with interest and details awaited with eager suspense—"additional State aid beyond present statutory requirements."

Many important sections have been anticipated. Reorganization of the executive

branch and constitutional revision will be pushed. Highway safety, juvenile delinquency, housing bias, needs of the aged, narcotic addiction, vocational rehabilitation, mental health (with a new research institute for the mentally retarded), middle-income housing, water resources, recreational facilities, an advisory council on the arts—these are among the subjects treated. A number of special messages are promised.

So the legislature has agenda, to which its members will add their contribution, for substantial accomplishment, devoid of sensational innovation, but progressive.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 15: 13: *Now the God of peace be with you all.*

Almighty God, as we go forth into the days of this new year, wilt Thou bestow upon us the blessings of Thy love and grace.

We humbly pray Thee to forgive our sins, emancipate us from all fears, exalt our aspirations, and enlarge our vision.

May our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress be endowed with wisdom and understanding as they face difficult problems for which there seems to be no adequate solution and are called upon to make decisions for which they have no precedent.

In times of turmoil and confusion, when we are tempted to become disheartened, wilt Thou reveal unto us those resources of power which will enable us to be strong and steadfast.

We thank Thee for the life and ministry of Thy servant, one of our colleagues who walked and worked with us for a little while upon this earth. Thou hast opened unto him the gateway to the larger life and received him into Thy nearer presence. Grant unto the members of his bereaved family the consolations of Thy grace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 443. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, January 7, 1960, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 443 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Missouri, Mr. HENNINGS; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure and the high privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 241)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 86th Congress, my fellow citizens, 7 years ago I entered my present office with one long-held resolve overriding all others. I was then, and remain now, determined that the United States shall become an ever more potent resource for the cause of peace [applause]—realizing that peace cannot be for ourselves alone, but for peoples everywhere. This determination is, I know, shared by the entire Congress—indeed, by all Americans.

My purpose today is to discuss some features of America's position, both at home and in her relations to others.

First, I point out that for us, annual self-examination is made a definite necessity by the fact that we now live in a divided world of uneasy equilibrium, with our side committed to its own protection and against aggression by the other. [Applause.]

With both sections of this divided world in possession of unbelievably destructive weapons, mankind approaches a state where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. No other fact of today's world equals this in importance—it colors everything we say, plan, and do.

There is demanded of us, vigilance, determination, and the dedication of whatever portion of our resources that will provide adequate security, especially provide a real deterrent to aggression. These things we are doing.

All these facts emphasize the importance of striving incessantly for a just peace.

Only through the strengthening of the spiritual, intellectual, economic, and defensive resources of the free world can we, in confidence, make progress toward this goal.

Second, we note that recent Soviet deportment and pronouncements suggest the possible opening of a somewhat less strained period in the relationships between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. If these pronouncements be genuine, there is brighter hope of diminishing the intensity of past rivalry and eventually of substituting persuasion for coercion. Whether this is to become an era of lasting promise remains to be tested by actions.

Third, we now stand in the vestibule of a vast new technological age—one that, despite its capacity for human destruction, has an equal capacity to make poverty and human misery obsolete. If our efforts are wisely directed—and if our unremitting efforts for dependable peace begin to attain some success—we

can surely become participants in creating an age characterized by justice and rising levels of human well-being.

Over the past year the Soviet Union has expressed an interest in measures to reduce the common peril of war.

While neither we nor any other free world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance, yet we approach this apparently new opportunity with the utmost seriousness. We must strive to break the calamitous cycle of frustrations and crises which, if unchecked, could spiral into nuclear disaster; the ultimate insanity.

Though the need for dependable agreements to assure against resort to force in settling disputes is apparent to both sides, yet, as in other issues dividing men and nations, we cannot expect sudden and revolutionary results. But we must find some place to begin.

One obvious road on which to make a useful start is in the widening of communication between our two peoples. In this field there are, both sides willing, countless opportunities—most of them well known to us all—for developing mutual understanding, the true foundation of peace.

Another avenue may be through the reopening, on January 12, of negotiations looking to a controlled ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, the closing statement from the Soviet scientists who met with our scientists at Geneva gives the clear impression that their conclusions have been politically guided. Those of the British and American scientific representatives are their own freely formed, individual and collective opinions. I am hopeful that as new negotiations begin, truth—not political opportunism—will guide the deliberations.

Still another field may be found in the field of disarmament, in which the Soviets have professed a readiness to negotiate seriously. They have not, however, made clear the plans they may have, if any, for mutual inspection and verification—the essential condition for any extensive measure of disarmament.

There is one instance where our initiative for peace has recently been successful. A multilateral treaty signed last month provides for the exclusively peaceful use of Antarctica, assured by a system of inspection. It provides for free and cooperative scientific research in that continent, and prohibits nuclear explosions there pending general international agreement on the subject.

I shall transmit its text to the Senate for consideration and approval in the near future.

The treaty is a significant contribution toward peace, international cooperation, and the advancement of science.

The United States is always ready to participate with the Soviet Union in serious discussion of these or any other subjects that may lead to peace with justice.

Certainly it is not necessary to repeat that the United States has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of any nation; by the same token we reject any attempt to impose its system on us or on other peoples by force or subversion.

This concern for the freedom of other peoples is the intellectual and spiritual cement which has allied us with more than 40 other nations in a common defense effort. Not for a moment do we forget that our own fate is firmly fastened to that of these countries; we will not act in any way which would jeopardize our solemn commitments to them.

We and our friends are, of course, concerned with self-defense. Growing out of this concern is the realization that all people of the free world have a great stake in the progress, in freedom, of the uncommitted and newly emerging nations.

These peoples, desperately hoping to lift themselves to decent levels of living must not, by our neglect, be forced to seek help from, and finally become virtual satellites of, those who proclaim their hostility to freedom.

Their natural desire for a better life must not be frustrated by withholding from them necessary technical and investment assistance. This is a problem to be solved not by America alone, but also by every nation cherishing the same ideals and in position to provide help.

In recent years America's partners and friends in Western Europe and Japan have made great economic progress. Their newly found economic strength is eloquent testimony to the striking success of the policies of economic cooperation which we and they have pursued.

The international economy of 1960 is markedly different from that of the early postwar years. No longer is the United States the only major industrial country capable of providing substantial amounts of the resources so urgently needed in the newly developing countries.

To remain secure and prosperous themselves, wealthy nations must extend the kind of cooperation to the less fortunate members that will inspire hope, confidence, and progress. A rich nation can for a time, without noticeable damage to itself, pursue a course of self-indulgence, making its single goal the material ease and comfort of its own citizens—thus repudiating its own spiritual and material stake in a peaceful and prosperous society of nations. But the enmities it will incur, the isolation into which it will descend, and the internal moral and spiritual, economic, and political softness that will be engendered, will, in the long term, bring it to disaster.

America did not become great through softness and self-indulgence. Her miraculous progress and achievements flow from other qualities far more worthy and substantial—adherence to principles and methods consonant with our religious philosophy, a satisfaction in hard work, the readiness to sacrifice for worthwhile causes, the courage to meet every challenge, the intellectual honesty and capacity to recognize the true path of her own best interests.

To us and to every nation of the free world, rich or poor, these qualities are necessary today as never before if we are to march together to greater security, prosperity, and peace. [Applause.]

I believe the industrial countries are ready to participate actively in supplementing the efforts of the developing nations to achieve progress.

The immediate need for this kind of cooperation is underscored by the strain in our international balance of payments. Our surplus from foreign business transactions has in recent years fallen substantially short of the expenditures we make abroad to maintain our military establishments overseas, to finance private investment, and to provide assistance to the less developed nations. In 1959 our deficit in balance of payments approached $4 billion.

Continuing deficits of anything like this magnitude would, over time, impair our own economic growth and check the forward progress of the free world.

We must meet this situation by promoting a rising volume of exports and world trade. Further, we must induce all industrialized nations of the free world to work together to help lift the scourge of poverty from less fortunate nations. This will provide for better sharing of this burden and for still further profitable trade.

New nations, and others struggling with the problems of development, will progress only, regardless of any outside help, if they demonstrate faith in their own destiny and possess the will and use their own resources to fulfill it.

Moreover, progress in a national transformation can be only gradually earned; there is no easy and quick way to follow from the oxcart to the jetplane. But, just as we drew on Europe for assistance in our earlier years, so now do those new and emerging nations that have this faith and determination deserve help.

Over the last 15 years, 20 nations have gained political independence. Others are doing so each year. Most of them are woefully lacking in technical capacity and in investment capital; without free world support in these matters they cannot effectively progress in freedom.

Respecting their need, one of the major focal points of our concern is the south Asian region. Here, in two nations alone, are almost 500 million people, all working, and working hard, to raise their standards, and in doing so, to make of themselves a strong bulwark against the spread of an ideology that would destroy liberty.

I cannot express to you the depth of my conviction that, in our own and free world interests, we must cooperate with others to help these people achieve their legitimate ambitions, as expressed in their different multiyear plans. Through the World Bank and other instrumentalities, as well as through individual action by every nation in position to help, we must squarely face this titanic challenge.

All of us must realize, of course, that development in freedom by the newly emerging nations, is no mere matter of obtaining outside financial assistance. An indispensable element in this process is a strong and continuing determination on the part of these nations to exercise the national discipline necessary for any

sustained development period. These qualities of determination are particularly essential because of the fact that the process of improvement will necessarily be gradual and laborious rather than revolutionary. Moreover, everyone should be aware that the development process is no short term phenomenon. Many years are required for even the most favorably situated countries.

I shall continue to urge the American people, in the interests of their own security, prosperity, and peace, to make sure that their own part of this great project be amply and cheerfully supported. Free world decisions in this matter may spell the difference between world disaster and world progress in freedom.

Other countries, some of which I visited last month, have similar needs.

A common meeting ground is desirable for those nations which are prepared to assist in the development effort. During the past year I have discussed this matter with the leaders of several Western nations.

Because of its wealth of experience, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation could help with initial studies needed. The goal is to enlist all available economic resources in the industrialized free world—especially private investment capital. But I repeat that this help, no matter how great, can be lastingly effective only if it is used as a supplement to the strength of spirit and will of the people of the newly developing nations.

By extending this help we hope to make possible the enthusiastic enrollment of these nations under freedom's banner. No more startling contrast to a system of sullen satellites could be imagined. [Applause.]

If we grasp this opportunity to build an age of productive partnership between the less fortunate nations and those that have already achieved a high state of economic advancement, we will make brighter the outlook for a world order based upon security, freedom, and peace. Otherwise, the outlook could be dark indeed. We face what may be a turning point in history, and we must act decisively.

As a nation we can successfully pursue these objectives only from a position of broadly based strength.

No matter how earnest is our quest for guaranteed peace, we must maintain a high degree of military effectiveness at the same time we are engaged in negotiating the issue of arms reduction. Until tangible and mutually enforceable arms reduction measures are worked out, we will not weaken the means of defending our institutions. [Applause.]

America possesses an enormous defense power. It is my studied conviction that no nation will ever risk general war against us unless we should be so foolish as to neglect the defense forces we now so powerfully support. It is worldwide knowledge that any nation which might be tempted today to attack the United States, even though our country might sustain great losses, would itself promptly suffer a terrible destruction. But I once again assure all peoples and all nations that the United States, except in defense, will never turn loose this destructive power.

During the past year, our long-range striking power, unmatched today in manned bombers, has taken on new strength as the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile has entered the operational inventory. In 14 recent test launchings, at ranges of over 5,000 miles, Atlas has been striking on an average within 2 miles of the target. This is less than the length of a jet runway—well within the circle of total destruction.

Incidentally, there was an Atlas firing last night. From all reports so far received, its performance conformed to the high standards I have described.

Such performance is a great tribute to American scientists and engineers, who in the past 5 years have had to telescope time and technology to develop these long-range ballistic missiles, where America had none before.

This year, moreover, growing numbers of nuclear-powered submarines will enter our Active Forces, some to be armed with Polaris missiles. These remarkable ships and weapons, ranging the oceans, will be capable of accurate fire on targets virtually anywhere on earth. Impossible to destroy by surprise attack, they will become one of our most effective sentinels for peace.

To meet situations of less than general nuclear war, we continue to maintain our carrier forces, our many service units abroad, our always ready Army strategic forces and Marine Corps divisions, and the civilian components. The continuing modernization of these forces is a costly but necessary process, and is scheduled to go forward at a rate which will steadily add to our strength.

The deployment of a portion of these forces beyond our shores, on land and sea, is persuasive demonstration of our determination to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our allies for collective security. Moreover, I have directed that steps be taken to program our military assistance to these allies on a longer range basis. This is necessary for a sounder collective defense system.

Next I refer to our program in space exploration, which is often mistakenly supposed to be an integral part of defense research and development.

We note that, first, America has made great contributions in the past 2 years to the world's fund of knowledge of astrophysics and space science. These discoveries are of present interest chiefly to the scientific community; but they are important foundation stones for more extensive exploration of outer space for the ultimate benefit of all mankind.

Second, our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements.

Third, the United States is pressing forward in the development of large rocket engines to place vehicles of many tons into space for exploration purposes.

Fourth, in the meantime, it is necessary to remember that we have only begun to probe the environment immediately surrounding the earth. Using launch systems presently available, we are developing satellites to scout the world's weather; satellite relay stations to facilitate and extend communications over the globe; for navigation aids to give accurate bearings to ships and aircraft; and for perfecting instruments to collect and transmit the data we seek. This is the area holding the most promise for early and useful applications of space technology.

Fifth, we have just completed a year's experience with our new space law. I believe it deficient in certain particulars and suggested improvements will be submitted to the Congress shortly.

The accomplishment of the many tasks I have alluded to requires the continuous strengthening of the spiritual, intellectual, and economic sinews of American life. The steady purpose of our society is to assure justice, before God, for every individual. We must be ever alert that freedom does not wither through the careless amassing of restrictive controls or the lack of courage to deal boldly with the giant issues of the day.

A year ago, when I met with you, the Nation was emerging from an economic downturn, even though the signs of resurgent prosperity were not then sufficiently convincing to the doubtful. Today our surging strength is apparent to everyone; 1960 promises to be the most prosperous year in our history.

Yet we continue to be afflicted by nagging disorders.

Among current problems that require solution, participated in by citizens as well as Government, are; the need to protect the public interest in situations of prolonged labor-management stalemate; the persistent refusal to come to grips with a critical problem in one sector of American agriculture; the continuing threat of inflation, together with the persisting tendency toward fiscal irresponsibility; in certain instances the denial to some of our citizens of equal protection of the law.

Every American was disturbed by the prolonged dispute in the steel industry and the protracted delay in reaching a settlement.

We are all relieved that a settlement has at last been achieved in that industry.

Percentagewise, by this settlement the increase to the steel companies in employment costs is lower than in any prior wage settlement since World War II.

It is also gratifying to note that despite the increase in wages and benefits several of the major steel producers have announced that there will be no increase in steel prices at this time. The national interest demands that in the period of industrial peace which has been assured by the new contract, both management and labor make every possible effort to increase efficiency and productivity in the manufacture of steel so that price increases can be avoided. [Applause.]

One of the lessons of this story is that the potential danger to the entire Nation of longer and greater strikes must be met. To insure against such possibilities we must of course depend primarily upon the good commonsense of the responsible individuals. It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, incentive for continuous investment and economic growth. Both the Executive and the Congress will, I know, be watching developments with keenest interest.

To me, it seems almost absurd that the United States should recognize the need, and so earnestly to seek, for cooperation among the nations unless we can achieve voluntary, dependable, abiding cooperation among the important segments of our own free society. Without such cooperation we cannot prosper.

Failure to face up to basic issues in areas other than those of labor-management can cause serious strains on the firm freedom supports of our society.

Agriculture is one of these areas.

Our basic farm laws were written 27 years ago, in an emergency effort to redress hardship caused by a worldwide depression. They were continued—and their economic distortions intensified—during World War II in order to provide incentives for production of food needed to sustain a war-torn world.

Today our farm problem is totally different. It is that of effectively adjusting to the changes caused by a scientific revolution. When the original farm laws were written, an hour's farm labor produced only one-fourth as much wheat as at present. Farm legislation is woefully out of date, ineffective, and expensive. [Applause.]

For years we have gone on with an outmoded system which not only has failed to protect farm income, but also has produced soaring, threatening surpluses. Our farms have been left producing for war while America has long been at peace.

Once again I urge Congress to enact legislation that will gear production more closely to markets, make costly surpluses more manageable, provide greater freedom in farm operations, and steadily achieve increased net farm incomes. [Applause.]

Another issue that we must meet squarely is that of living within our means. This requires restraint in expenditure, constant reassessment of priorities, and the maintenance of stable prices.

To do so we must prevent inflation. Here is an opponent of so many guises that it is sometimes difficult to recognize. But our clear need is to stop continuous and general price rises—a need that all of us can see and feel.

To prevent steadily rising costs and prices calls for stern self-discipline by every citizen. No person, city, State, or organized group can afford to evade the obligation to resist inflation, for every single American pays its crippling tax.

Inflation's ravages do not end at the water's edge. Increases in prices of the goods we sell abroad threaten to drive us out of markets that once were securely ours. Whether domestic prices, so high as to be noncompetitive, result from demands for too-high profit margins or from increased labor costs that outrun growth in productivity, the final result is seriously damaging to the Nation.

We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home. Only by so doing can we prevent it from destroying our salaries, savings, pensions, and insurance, and from gnawing away the very roots of a free, healthy economy and the Nation's security.

One major method by which the Federal Government can counter inflation and rising prices is to insure that its expenditures are below its revenues. [Applause.] The debt with which we are now confronted is about $290 billion. With interest charges alone now costing taxpayers about $9½ billion, it is clear that this debt growth must stop. You will be glad to know that despite the unsettling influences of the recent steel strike, we estimate that our accounts will show, on June 30, this year, a favorable balance of approximately $200 million. [Applause.]

I shall present to the Congress for 1961 a balanced budget. [Applause.] In the area of defense, expenditures continue at the record peacetime levels of the last several years. With a single exception, expenditures in every major category of health, education, and welfare will be equal to or greater than last year. In space expenditures the amounts are practically doubled. But the overall guiding goal of this budget is national need—not response to specific group, local, or political insistence.

Expenditure increases, other than those I have indicated, are largely accounted for by the increased cost of legislation previously enacted.

I repeat, this budget will be a balanced one. Expenditures will be $79,800 million. The amount of income over outgo described in the budget as a surplus to be applied against our national debt is $4,200 million. [Applause.]

Personally I do not feel that any amount can be properly called a surplus as long as the Nation is in debt; I prefer to think of such an item as a reduction of our children's inherited mortgage. [Applause.] And once we have established such payments as normal practices we can profitably make improvements in our tax structure and thereby truly reduce the heavy burdens of taxation. [Applause.] In any event this one reduction will save taxpayers each year approximately $200 million in interest costs.

This favorable balance will help ease pressures in our credit and capital markets. It will enhance the confidence of people all over the world in the strength of our economy and our currency and in our individual and collective ability to be fiscally responsible.

In the management of the huge public debt the Treasury is unfortunately not free of artificial barriers. Its ability to deal with the difficult problems in this field has been weakened greatly by the unwillingness of the Congress to remove archaic restrictions. The need for a freer hand in debt management is even more urgent today because the costs of the undesirable financing practices which the Treasury has been forced into are mounting. Removal of this roadblock has high priority in my legislative recommendations. [Applause.]

Still another issue relates to civil rights measures.

In all our hopes and plans for a better world we all recognize that provincial and racial prejudices must be combated. In the long perspective of history, the right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society. Our first duty is to protect this right against all encroachment. In spite of constitutional guarantees, and notwithstanding much progress of recent years, bias still deprives some persons in this country of equal protection of the laws.

Early in your last session, I recommended legislation which would help eliminate several practices discriminating against the basic rights of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has developed additional constructive recommendations. I hope that these will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session. I trust that Congress will thus signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people. [Applause.]

Each year and in many ways our Nation continues to undergo profound change and growth.

In the past 18 months, we have hailed the entry of two more States of the Union—Alaska and Hawaii. We salute these two western stars.

Our vigorous expansion, which we all welcome as a sign of health and vitality, is many sided. We are, for example, witnessing explosive growth in metropolitan areas.

By 1975 the metropolitan areas of the United States will occupy twice the territory they do today. The roster of urban problems with which they must cope is staggering. They involve water supply, cleaning the air, adjusting local tax systems, providing for essential educational, cultural, and social services, and destroying those conditions which breed delinquency and crime.

In meeting these, we must, if we value our historic freedoms, keep within the traditional framework of our Federal system with powers divided between the National and State Governments. The uniqueness of this system may confound the casual observer, but it has worked effectively for nearly 200 years.

I do not doubt that our urban and other perplexing problems can be solved in the traditional American method. In doing so we must realize that nothing is really solved, indeed ruinous tendencies are set in motion by yielding to the deceptive bait of the "easy" Federal tax dollar. [Applause.]

Our educational system provides a ready example. All recognize the vital necessity of having modern school plants,

well-qualified and adequately compensated teachers, and of using the best possible teaching techniques and curriculums.

We cannot be complacent about educating our youth.

But the route to better trained minds is not through the swift administration of a Federal hypodermic or sustained financial transfusion. The educational process, essentially a local and personal responsibility, cannot be made to leap ahead by crash, centralized governmental action. [Applause.]

The administration has proposed a carefully reasoned program for helping eliminate current deficiencies. It is designed to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts. This approach rejects the notion of Federal domination or control. It is workable, and should appeal to every American interested in advancement of our educational system in the traditional American way. [Applause.] I urge the Congress to take action upon it.

There is one other subject concerning which I renew a recommendation I made in my state of the Union message last January. I then advised the Congress of my purpose to intensify our efforts to replace force with a rule of law among nations. From many discussions abroad, I am convinced that purpose is widely and deeply shared by other peoples and nations of the world.

In the same message, I stated that our efforts would include a reexamination of our own relation to the International Court of Justice. The Court was established by the United Nations to decide international legal disputes between nations. In 1946 we accepted the Court's jurisdiction, but subject to a reservation of the right to determine unilaterally whether a matter lies essentially within domestic jurisdiction. There is pending before the Senate, a resolution which would repeal our present self-judging reservation. I support that resolution and urge its prompt passage. [Applause.] If this is done, I intend to urge similar acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction by every member of the United Nations.

Here perhaps it is not amiss for me to say a personal word to the Members of the Congress, in this my final year of office, a word about the institutions we respectively represent and the meaning which the relationships between our two branches has for the days ahead.

I am not unique as a President in having worked with a Congress controlled by the opposition party—except that no other President ever did it for quite so long. [Applause.] Yet in both personal and official relationships we have weathered the storms of the past 5 years. For this I am deeply grateful.

My deep concern in the next 12 months, before my successor takes office, is with our joint congressional-executive duty to our own and to other nations. Acting upon the beliefs I have expressed here today, I shall devote my full energies to the tasks at hand, whether these involve travel for promoting greater world understanding, negotiations to reduce international discord, or constant discussions and communications with the Congress and the American people on issues both domestic and foreign.

In pursuit of these objectives, I look forward to, and shall dedicate myself to, a close and constructive association with the Congress.

Every minute spent in irrelevant interbranch wrangling is precious time taken from the intelligent initiation and adoption of coherent policies for our national survival and progress.

We seek a common goal—brighter opportunity for our own citizens and a world peace with justice for all.

Before us and our friends is the challenge of an ideology which, for more than four decades, has trumpeted abroad its purpose of gaining ultimate victory over all forms of government at variance with its own.

We realize that however much we repudiate the tenets of imperialistic communism, it represents a gigantic enterprise. Its leaders compel its subjects to subordinate their freedom of action and spirit and personal desires for some hoped for advantage in the future.

The Communists can present an array of material accomplishments over the past 15 years that lends a false persuasiveness to many of their glittering promises to the uncommitted peoples.

The competition they provide is formidable. We so recognize it. [Applause.]

But in our scale of values we place freedom first. Our whole national existence and development have been geared to that basic concept and is responsible for the position of free world leadership to which we have succeeded.

It is the highest prize that any nation can possess; it is one that communism can never offer. And America's record of material accomplishment in freedom is written not only in the unparalleled prosperity of our own Nation, but in the many billions we have devoted to the reconstruction of free world economies wrecked by World War II and in the effective help of many more billions we have given in saving the independence of many others threatened by outside domination.

Assuredly we have the capacity for handling the problems in the new era of the world's history we are now entering.

But we must use that capacity intelligently and tirelessly, regardless of personal sacrifice.

The fissure that divides our political planet is deep and wide.

We live, moreover, in a storm of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe.

Police states are called "people's democracies."

Armed conquest of free people is called "liberation."

Such slippery slogans make difficult the problem of communicating true faith, facts, and beliefs.

We must make clear our peaceful intentions, our aspirations for a better world. To do so, we must use language to enlighten the mind, not as the instrument of the studied innuendo and distorter of truth.

And we must live by what we say.

On my recent visit to distant lands I found one statesman after another eager to tell me of the elements of their government that had been borrowed from our American Constitution, and from the indestructible ideals set forth in our Declaration of Independence.

As a Nation we take pride that our own constitutional system, and the ideals which sustain it, have been long viewed as a fountainhead of freedom.

By our every word and action we must strive to make ourselves worthy of this trust, ever mindful that an accumulation of seemingly minor encroachments upon freedom gradually could break down the entire fabric of a free society.

So persuaded, we shall get on with the task before us.

So dedicated, and with faith in the Almighty, humanity shall one day achieve the unity in freedom to which all men have aspired from the dawn of time. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m. the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2 o'clock, today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT, on Monday next, for 1 hour.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, January 14, 1960.

Mr. FLOOD, for 2 hours, on Wednesday, January 13.

Mr. FLOOD, for 1 hour, on January 22.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on February 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLF in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and to include an address by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE, to the fund-raising dinner of the Democratic Party of South Carolina.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. BALDWIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. QUIE in two instances.
Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. HORAN.
Mr. BECKER.
Mr. BALDWIN.
Mr. RAY.
Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.
Mr. CELLER in three instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI in five instances.

THE LATE RICHARD M. SIMPSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy in confirming what most of you already know, and that is the passing of our distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

While we have known that DICK SIMPSON has been precariously ill it has been our constant and fervent prayer that his normal health would be regained and he would be returned to this House which he loved so well and which he served in a manner that brought credit to himself and his country.

Death is a shock at any time but it is doubly so when it comes to someone so close to you.

A tall, rugged, dark-haired man of Scotch-Irish ancestry, DICK SIMPSON's roots were dug deep in the central Pennsylvania soil on which his forebears settled shortly after the Revolutionary War. His paternal grandfather, J. Randolph Simpson, who was wounded in the Battle of Antietam while fighting with the 125th Pennsylvania Volunteers, founded the family's insurance business interests in Huntingdon, which DICK himself ran until he turned them over to his younger brothers so that he could concentrate on bringing good government to Washington.

RICHARD MURRAY SIMPSON was born a "century baby" on August 30, 1900, the first son of Warren B. and Sue M. Simpson, in the central Pennsylvania town of Huntingdon. As a boy, he used to "walk the pole lines" to discover downed wires or other reasons for power failures in electric service furnished by Warren Simpson's Raystown Water Power Co., a business the father founded in 1914 by damming the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River.

Whenever a customer in Huntingdon, Mount Union, and several surrounding smaller towns reported the failure, DICK and a younger brother named Ted would begin at opposite ends of the 8-mile-long powerline and walk toward each other until one of them either discovered a wire that had been downed by weather or other conditions or they met without success midway along the route. When that happened, there was nothing to do but start all over again.

DICK's early schooling was in the Huntingdon grammar schools and at Huntingdon High, from which he graduated in 1918, at the age of 18, to enter the Army as a World War I soldier in the Tank Corps. His Army service was at Raleigh, N.C., and the war had ended before his tank unit had completed training for shipment overseas.

Returning to Huntingdon, DICK worked for the power company and did odd jobs around the J. R. and W. B. Simpson Insurance Co. for several months before entering the University of Pittsburgh in 1919. There his size and speed made him a natural for football, and he played first-string left tackle for Pop Warner's great Pitt teams of 1919 through 1922.

Following his graduation, DICK again returned to Huntingdon to go to work in his father's business. From the start, his father—with the memory of his own terms in the house of representatives at Harrisburg and his ambition to run for Congress fresh in his mind—began to talk a political career for his oldest boy. That and a law school degree for DICK were his fondest hopes; and, though it took many years, he lived to see the fulfillment of both.

It took 10 years, for example, for DICK to actually get around to running for political office—and even when he first ran, he lost a Republican primary fight for nomination to the State assembly in 1933. Two years later he ran again, was elected, and served two terms in Harrisburg before being elected to the 75th Congress in a special election on May 11, 1937. He has been in Congress ever since.

When he came to Congress DICK learned that the Ways and Means Committee to which he was assigned concerned itself primarily with law. At once, he took immediate action which has been typical of his congressional service ever since. In the fall of 1937, he began to study law at Georgetown at night, earning his degree in 1942, 4 years later.

In addition to being the ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, DICK earned a congressional reputation for himself as an expert in tax matters, social security legislation, reciprocal trade agreements, and the tariff.

DICK was vice chairman of the Republican conference of the House, secretary and member of the Republican policy committee of the House, secretary and member of the Republican committee on committees in the House, and chairman of the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. His district, the Pennsylvania 18th, represents 8 south-central Pennsylvania counties, with a population of more than 360,000 people.

DICK's first wife, the former Grace Metz, died on March 6, 1945, leaving two daughters, Susan and Barbara. On June 12, 1948, DICK married the former Mrs. Mae J. Cox, of Seattle, Wash., a widow with three sons, James, Edward, and Joseph. A daughter, Kay Josephine, was born to the Simpson-Cox union. The family resides at 5205 Lawn Way, Kenwood, Md.

DICK SIMPSON's appointment to the most important congressional election job, in the province of his Republican colleagues to bestow, came as no surprise to those who have known and worked with "DICK SIMPSON of Pennsylvania," as he was known to his colleagues both in and out of the House of Representatives.

As a longtime member of the joint Senate-House conference committees on various tax and other legislation, DICK was invaluable to his party, his district, and his Nation.

Congressman RICHARD M. SIMPSON held the love and respect of every Member of this House, be he friend or foe.

DICK was the type of citizen who is so greatly needed in our country today. A real American, and having worked his way up through life, he was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative.

There never was a finer exponent of the free enterprise system that has made the United States the greatest country

of all. DICK SIMPSON's belief in his fellow man, his strong character, and his will to assist all, endeared him to men and women in all walks of life.

The greatest fault and personal handicap of some public leaders is that they lack the courage of their convictions. But this above all could not be said of DICK SIMPSON for he knew there is no "middle of the road," there is only the right or wrong side. DICK SIMPSON always tried to be on the right side. He was a courageous and conscientious crusader in behalf of his community, his State, and his Nation.

DICK SIMPSON's achievements and success were his own. I feel from my close association with him in recent years, that he found much self-satisfaction in a job well done. In his spoken sentiments you could find the touch of something softly spoken, but where forcefulness and aggressive convictions were needed, he operated with great effectiveness. Never was DICK SIMPSON guilty of quiet acquiescence to a wrong—one of the greatest tributes that can be paid to any man.

For years to come DICK SIMPSON's death will be keenly felt in many places, areas which he loved, and which loved him. The Nation has lost an outstanding leader and we have lost a sterling friend.

The heartfelt sympathy of myself and my family, together with that of our Pennsylvania congressional delegation, as well as DICK's countless friends in all walks of life, go out to his beloved family in their great sorrow.

My fervent prayer is that God will strengthen his good wife and his loved ones to carry on in the days ahead and to help keep the Simpson name the fine symbol of Americanism that it has stood for, in so many years of life and progress in our State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the death of my good friend and colleague, DICK SIMPSON, affects me deeply.

DICK, as he has been known to his countless friends, was born and reared not too many miles from my hometown of Altoona, Pa., and for years we have represented adjoining congressional districts. I learned to know DICK SIMPSON during his high-school and college days, and followed his athletic career at the University of Pittsburgh, where he played tackle on the football team under the famous coach "Pop" Warner.

After graduation in 1923, he entered the business field, and at the time of his election to the Pennsylvania State Assembly, in 1935, he was engaged in the insurance and bonding business. Later, upon the death of Representative Benjamin K. Focht, DICK was elected to the House of Representatives, where he has served continuously since the 75th Congress. During his congressional career, DICK found time to study law at Georgetown University, where he received his law degree in 1942.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, DICK established himself as an outstanding legislator giving his time and efforts at all times in discharging his duties on the national scene. He also endeared himself to the membership of the House which earned him the title as a real friend of all his colleagues. To DICK's credit today there are many laws on the statute books in which he played a major part in their enactment. These laws touch many fields of government and are of great benefit to the American people as a whole. They stand as a monument to his efforts as a State and National legislator.

In addition to all the time and effort that DICK applied to his responsibilities as a Member of the House of Representatives he gave freely of his energy in support of the two-party system that is one of the pillars of our form of government. Being a Republican he naturally contributed in many ways to his party, but especially was his outstanding leadership felt by his chairmanship of the Republican congressional committee. His duties in this capacity caused him to travel nationwide as he gave to all of us in the House who are Republicans his encouragement and advice in our political campaigns.

It can be truly said that many of us on the Republican side of the House owe our presence here in a large measure to the interest DICK SIMPSON took in our election campaigns.

Among DICK SIMPSON's many fine attributes is the great love he had for his home and family. As busy as he was, DICK gave to his good wife Mae and the children the devotion of a real father, and they returned his love in equal measure. The passing of DICK SIMPSON while denying his wife and children his companionship has left them a precious legacy of a useful and active life which will be a benediction to them as they reflect on his memory as a husband and father. To his wife Mae and children and to his brothers and sisters, I express my sincere sympathy in the great loss they have sustained. May God grant my good friend DICK SIMPSON eternal rest.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a truly heavy heart that I arise today and attempt to express, with mere words, my sorrow at the death of a longtime and valued friend, RICHARD SIMPSON.

As I look over events of his life, I am struck with the similarity of many to those of my own life.

There was a difference of only a few days in our ages.

We both studied law, both came to the Congress as a result of special elections, and both served as chairman of the Republican congressional committee.

My friendship with DICK SIMPSON dates back to his first campaign days, when it was my pleasure to speak on behalf of his candidacy at a meeting in his hometown of Huntingdon, Pa.

I was impressed from the start with DICK's great vigor, his stalwart refusal to compromise political principles for expediency, and the eloquence with which he put forth his convictions.

However, it is not my purpose at this time to enumerate the virtues or the talents of our departed colleague. DICK SIMPSON, because of his qualities of leadership, was well enough known to the Members of this House so that no such recital is needed from me.

But I do want to say that the fine contributions he made to his district, his party, and his country justified completely my early evaluation of DICK SIMPSON as a potentially outstanding public servant.

I am sure I voice the sentiments of many others here today when I say that for me the loss of DICK SIMPSON is one of those tragedies I simply find difficult to believe.

It is particularly hard to believe because in my mind I always have associated DICK SIMPSON with strength: physical strength; strength of character; strength of purpose. But his death is another reminder to us of man's mortality and that mercifully, perhaps, no one knows who next among us may be called, or when.

Meanwhile, it is our duty to go about our appointed tasks, taking such consolation as we can in the knowledge that great friends such as DICK SIMPSON served their Nation well and that all of us are better for having known their friendship.

To Mrs. Simpson and the family, I offer my heartfelt sympathies in their untimely bereavement.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to pay respects to our departed friend and colleague, RICHARD M. SIMPSON. As a result of learning this morning of the passing of my close friend, the admired and respected ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and our beloved colleague, I am deeply grieved.

We were greatly disturbed when we received word that he had undergone, very suddenly, a serious operation. We devoutly hoped that he would again be at our side when this Congress convened yesterday and we were greatly shocked when we later received some indication of the deep seriousness of his sudden illness. It is difficult for me today to express the depth of my feeling on the loss of my friend.

DICK SIMPSON served his district and his Nation for many years with honor and great distinction. His influence, and the warmth of his friendship, however, extended far beyond the borders of his congressional district.

I had the privilege of working closely with DICK SIMPSON over a period of many years on the Committee on Ways and Means. I came to know him as only true friends can know one another. We reposed great confidence in each other. I do not hesitate to say that I trusted DICK SIMPSON completely and my trust was never misplaced. He was a man of his word, utterly and completely. The depth of his integrity and his sincerity was well known to all of his friends, not only on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House of Representa-

tives, but across the breadth of the Nation.

The Committee on Ways and Means, the Congress, the Nation, have suffered a great loss in the death of DICK SIMPSON. His warm hand of friendship will be sorely missed. His brilliant mind, so quick to grasp the issue, so capable in developing a solution, will be sorely missed. The strength with which he fought for those principles in which he believed constituted a part of his character acknowledged by all with whom he came into contact. Any difference in our views on issues on occasion never exerted any influence on our close personal friendship.

To his dear wife and children, and to his brothers and sisters, I extend my deep, heartfelt sympathy. Perhaps they can take some measure of solace in knowing that DICK left not only a monument of public service to his Nation, but also a warmth of friendship which will be sorely missed by all who were privileged to enjoy it.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, words do not flow easily when I rise to pay tribute to one of my oldest and closest friends. While his death was not unexpected—we all knew for several days how dangerous his condition was—we all hoped that through some miracle he might live. Fate decided otherwise.

To know DICK SIMPSON was to love him. He was a man of the highest character. He possessed a brilliant mind and he was as honest as the day is long. DICK SIMPSON never went back on his word or on a friend in his life. It was these fine virtues that bound him to his friends with a grip of steel.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee he was a resourceful fighter for American industries. Born in the great State of Pennsylvania, he knew the value of industry in providing jobs for the working people, and he was ever a champion of legislation that would keep them strong and vigorous.

Possessing great organizational ability, he was drafted to be chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee. DICK entered into the work with enthusiasm because he believed thoroughly in his party and his heart was in his work. Possessed of great physical strength, he carried both burdens, as well as his own district and congressional work, with minute attention. He loved to work for causes he believed in, and the hours he devoted to his work were endless.

In recent months his task was not an easy one, but DICK bore his burdens without complaint. He fought for what he believed was right even if forced to battle alone. Only in recent weeks it was noticed he was being affected by his work, and he was urged to take a little vacation, but DICK would not quit. He insisted on making a campaign trip to California when it was obvious he should be under check in a hospital.

Today one of our ablest and one of our most beloved Members is dead, and we indeed are sad at his untimely death. He died for his country just as surely as if he fell on the field of battle.

DICK SIMPSON was devoted to his work to the very end.

I recall as if it were yesterday when DICK first came here and from then our friendship started. I had known him in the campaign and was helpful in bringing about his election as chairman of the congressional campaign committee. So, having been privileged to enjoy his friendship from the very first instance, I learned quickly what a great character he possessed. That friendship became stronger as the days passed.

To his sweet and devoted wife, Mae, as well as to all members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy, and I share their great grief. A great American has been called to immortality. This world is richer and better for his having lived. His work will never be forgotten. He will always be remembered by his constituents and by his many associates in his work. He believed in America, and to build a better country he gave his life. So today I join with you in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and bidding a fond farewell to a dead comrade.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the Nation has suffered an irreparable loss in the tragic passing of our esteemed and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, and we stand bereft of one of the ablest and most dedicated Members this House has ever had. In addition we who counted ourselves among his closest friends are heartbroken as we contemplate this going away of one who was constant in his concern for the welfare of others and whose unfailing availability for service to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle was one of the brighter experiences of this congressional assignment.

As man steps back into the wings of this life's stage a Higher Power comes into view and it is in a firm reliance on the Master's promise that we are reassured as our beloved friend crosses to the other shore. We cannot fathom the inscrutable ways of the Almighty but we are comforted by His promise that we shall be reunited with those whom we have loved and lost for awhile.

The one whose going away we mourn was a stalwart citizen and a great friend to have by one's side when the going became rough. We shall never forget his many kindnesses and we know that the great host of his friends will keep his memory forever green.

To his beloved wife and children goes our deepest sympathy and we shall be diligent for their continued welfare as we know our departed colleague would have been for our loved ones had we been in his place. Theirs is the consolation that comes from the knowledge that the one departed served his country with honor and distinction in both peace and war and that in every time and circumstance he reposed an unwavering faith in his God. It is now to that all-merciful Father that we commend his spirit and it is to His care that we commend all those who remain to mourn.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of DICK SIMPSON cast a cloud of gloom over the entire State of Pennsylvania. It will be a long while in lifting.

DICK SIMPSON was known and respected by thousands of Pennsylvanians because of his human character, his honesty and his stanch and abiding belief in the institutions of our beloved Republic. All of us are going to miss DICK's words in debate. Whether we agreed with him or not, we were certain that he enunciated a policy that he believed in and that he sincerely thought was in the best interests of America. The State of Pennsylvania has lost a great son. The Union has lost a wise and experienced statesman. We of the House have lost a beloved friend.

To the members of his family I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, ofttimes it is said that "words are empty." How true that may be on occasion. Today I feel sure that this entire House membership feels an extraordinary loss in the passing of DICK SIMPSON. Words uttered here today come from the heart of all of us on this sad occasion, yet mine seem so empty in trying to convey my feeling of emptiness itself.

DICK SIMPSON was a man. I mean it the way it is stated. He was a man in the fullest sense of the word. He was strong, rugged; a man of principle and convictions on which he was always ready to stand. He plotted his course, and he had the courage to follow the chart. For this we all have admired and respected him. Truly, I repeat, here was a man.

I feel privileged to have been able to have DICK SIMPSON as my personal friend, and for whom I had great affection, respect, and admiration. There is no way, no words to express the loss his passing is to his district that he so ably represented, a great loss to the State of Pennsylvania, and certainly to the Nation. As a true American, he battled for those principles that he believed were good for America. His own personal interests came last. The Republican Party, as well as this great legislative body, have lost a real stalwart from our ranks. As time goes on, our loss will be increasingly emphasized, and we will miss him more and more. May the good Lord bring comfort to his fine wife, Mae, and to all his family. Goodby, DICK. You may be gone from us physically, but you will be with us always in our minds and hearts and what you have meant to all of us is a pattern you have set for gracious living, constructive thinking, and hard work from which we will strive never to deviate.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable RICHARD SIMPSON, leaves us sad and depressed. We will miss him.

DICK was a kind man. He was a hard worker and a real fighter for fairness and justice. He was a most able and efficient public servant and during his long service as a Member of this House he left an imprint that will not soon be forgotten.

As a fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee I got to know DICK intimately. To know him was a privilege and to count him as a friend is a cherished possession.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this world is better because DICK SIMPSON lived. To his devoted wife and family Mrs. Forand and I extend our sincere sympathy and we pray the Lord that DICK will rest in peace and that those who are dear to him may have strength to bear their great loss.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, DICK SIMPSON came to this Congress in the same year that I came, 23 years ago. During those 23 years DICK and I were close personal friends; not only close personal friends, but we believed in and we stood for practically the same program. Of course, I was shocked and dismayed when I learned of his serious illness and his death.

Because I cannot find words to properly express my feelings on this occasion, I shall have to depend upon the words of an unknown poet who expressed so beautifully the consolation and the assurance of immortality that we all need on occasions of this kind. The poem is entitled "There Is No Death":

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine for evermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! Although we grieve
When beautiful familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms,

Although with bowed and breaking hearts,
With sable guard and silent tread,
We bear their senseless dust to earth
And say that they are dead.

They are not dead! They have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here,
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Tho' disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here, and love us yet;
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

DICK SIMPSON was a man. Whence comes such another?

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in a very short time our Committee on Ways and Means has lost some of its stalwart members. In the past few months we have lost Dan Reed, Tom Jenkins, "Eb" Eberharter, Jere Cooper, and now Dick Simpson.

It has been very difficult for me to believe that DICK has left us, because he was a man one never associated with sickness. He was always active and buoyant and happy. He lived a busy life but he had time for the many friendships that he built as he went along.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has said; as Speaker MARTIN has said; as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has said, he was a fighter from the word go. He was a partisan in the best sense of the word, a partisan from principle. And yet there was never anything petty or bitter or mean or little or vindictive about him.

I know that in my own experiences with him which spread over a decade, whenever I had a matter before my Committee on Ways and Means and DICK SIMPSON was on my side I knew that the chance for enactment was good because he brought to any cause tremendous ability, a fine knowledge and a sense of responsibility and dedication. I knew also that if he were on the other side the chance for passage was much dimmer.

He was a warm, warm friend. I had the good fortune of living close to DICK, in our respective residences here in Washington; and I used to see a good bit of him during the off hours, so to speak. He was always relaxed and pleasant.

Sometimes in the heat of the battle, when he had taken a position which may have been contrary to mine, or when I had taken a position contrary to his, both of us always, somehow or another, wanted to try to make it up to the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a sense of great personal loss today. The only consolation I have is that I think this man leaves the greatest heritage that a man can leave, that of a good name, that of having served his party, his Nation, and his family, with honor and integrity. I shall miss him; all of us shall.

To his lovely wife, Mae, and his fine family Mrs. Boggs and I express our deepest sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr Speaker, it was with profound sadness I learned of the passing of my very good and able friend DICK SIMPSON. We have lost an able colleague and a very good friend. It is a great loss to our State and to the Congress. To those of us who have been been close to him and known him well and had shared his friendship, his death carries with it a sense of deep and personal loss.

He was the dean of our Pennsylvania delegation, one of the senior Republican Members of the House of Representatives. His work, as one of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee, was recognized as outstanding.

He was a man who had dedicated his life to the service of his State and Nation. His genius in politics was a genius of a leader; a firm determination and indomitable courage, and tireless toil inspired trust and confidence.

He was a hard, conscientious worker. A man who was greatly admired and respected by all who knew him and by all who were associated with him.

On all problems he responded with a willingness to be helpful in any way that he could.

He had an abiding faith in the principles and ideals of our Government. In all things it can be said he was a great citizen and a great American, and his one ambition was to hand on to posterity and the generations of tomorrow, a greater American than was handed on to him.

So today it is with a feeling of deep sadness we record his passing and we will remember him for the many little acts of kindness that manifested his friendship and good will toward the Members of this House.

He will be greatly missed by the people of his congressional district and the State of Pennsylvania that he so ably represented.

I extend my sincere and deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, words and phrases that come to mind at a time like this are certainly most inadequate to express what is in our hearts. In fact, many of the sentiments and the words that we feel we might utter seem extremely trite. The temptation is almost such as to make one hesitate to speak because of the inadequacy of putting into words one's feelings. But, from my first days in the House of Representatives, I worked intimately with DICK SIMPSON. He was an adviser to me always and a consistent friend. I think all of us found him to be always friendly and considerate, always willing to go out of his way, no matter how busy he might be or how small or trivial our problems might be, to assist us. He was a man, certainly, of firm convictions and principles. Of all the people I have known, I do not think there is anyone whom I would place above DICK SIMPSON in his strong faith in the American political and economic system and his dedication to the preservation of those institutions. DICK really dedicated his life to the service of his people, his country and as well to the service of his colleagues as he did serve so many of us so diligently, and to the service of his party. It is trite to say that we all will miss him. It goes deeper than that, but frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am incapable of putting that feeling into words. Permit me to say that Mrs. Byrnes joins with me in expressing our most profound and deepest sympathy to his wife, Mae, to his children and to his brothers and sisters.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, although I have had several days to resign myself to what doctors agreed was inevitable, the news of DICK SIMPSON'S death this morning came as a profound shock. The loss of a national leader always has a

sobering effect upon the whole populace; when a close personal friend is involved the wound penetrates deeper into the heart.

I knew DICK SIMPSON by reputation long before I ever had the pleasure of meeting him. He was a rugged University of Pittsburgh lineman who helped make the Panthers a national football power in the early 1920's. Back in western and central Pennsylvania, the players on Pitt's football clubs are familiar to grownups and kids alike, and DICK SIMPSON was a hero from little Washington to Erie and from the Ohio line right into Penn State and University of Pennsylvania territory.

When RICHARD M. SIMPSON, then a successful businessman, was elected to Congress in 1937, I was happy for my State. I liked his looks. I liked what he said. As in the case of the voters of his district, I recognized him as a man of character, of courage, of fair play—a man of his word.

DICK SIMPSON substantiated this judgment from his first year in the House. By the time I became a colleague, he had long been established as a tower of strength in the defense of American principle and integrity. To join the State delegation in which he was so active was a distinct honor, and to have the opportunity to associate with him as a friend was a great satisfaction and pleasure.

In this association I found DICK SIMPSON ever increasing in stature. He was fearless, unyielding, and forthright. He was also a warm and considerate person who willingly devoted his life to his fellow man without thought of compensation or credit for his contributions. At Pitt he had been satisfied to stay down in front where the biggest battles were taking place but where comparatively little notice is received. Here in Washington, he served in a similar capacity: always exerting every ounce of energy to assure the Nation of the highest type government and the most equitable laws, yet ignoring opportunities for the personal recognition which he earned and deserved.

DICK SIMPSON was a monument to good government—a solid, immovable man of integrity to whom students of politics of this generation and for every generation hereafter may look for inspiration and for a quickening of their dedication to the flag and the Constitution.

I extend my sympathies to Mrs. Simpson and to their children. They were a happy couple, a God-fearing family that everyone would enjoy as a neighbor. It was my good fortune to have this learned, humble, devout citizen and statesman as my neighbor in Congress. The memory of this rich experience, will, I hope, serve as consolation in the years to come for the great personal loss that has come today with the passing of this fine and fast friend.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, we have all been saddened here today by the feeling of personal loss in the passing of a friend. DICK SIMPSON, in his personal life as well as in his public life, conducted himself and his work and efforts in such a way that his fine mind, his unquestioned integrity and his devotion to his country were clearly evident to all of us who were privileged to know him and to work with him. As has been indicated, there is little that we can say or do here that would correctly express the feeling that is in our hearts or in any way describe the real greatness of this man. I think our inadequacies, however, are softened by the knowledge and by knowing that the principles that DICK SIMPSON stood for will live for a long time and endure as a monument to men such as he. I am one of those who was privileged to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means with DICK SIMPSON and to come to know him well. I shall miss him. I extend to his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Ohio joins with Pennsylvania and with the Nation in grieving over the passing of our great friend, RICHARD M. SIMPSON. I, too, feel a personal loss.

For 21 years or more DICK SIMPSON and I were close friends. We served for a time on the same committee in the House. We had adjoining offices on the same floor in the House Office Building. We served together on the Committee on Committees. I was in touch with him or with his good wife during his illness. He carried throughout these days great interest in what was going on in Washington and in our national political life.

RICHARD M. SIMPSON was a man of great ability, but of even greater character. He was a sincere and honorable man, who had the courage of his convictions. He never failed to fight the good fight for the principles in which he believed and in the best interest of the country he loved.

I join in extending sympathy to his beloved wife, to his children and to his brothers. He has left to them the priceless heritage of a good name, and he has left his many friends, including those of us here in the House, many precious memories of his friendship and of his outstanding public services over the years.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of the untimely death this morning of my dear friend and longtime colleague, RICHARD SIMPSON.

I experience a personal loss in the death of DICK, as he was fondly known to all of us. He was more than a colleague from our State of Pennsylvania. I knew him through the years of our service in the Congress as a sincere friend and gentleman, who, although on the opposite side of the aisle, was always ready to cooperate whenever he thought the case was just or whenever the action would be of benefit to our country and State.

DICK represented with great and conscientious ability a district in western Pennsylvania which adjoined mine. We had many problems of mutual interest and it was good to discuss with him matters and exchange ideas on legislation designed to benefit our constituencies.

DICK was first elected to Congress in 1937. He was loved by the people of his district who respected his ability. This was evidenced by the great popularity he enjoyed.

He was the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee. He served that committee and this Congress with distinction. He was indeed a great American.

DICK was a good man, a sincere, earnest, able, and hard-working legislator. He will be sorely missed not only by this Congress and our State of Pennsylvania, but by the entire Nation. To his widow and his children who survive him, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of my very good friend, RICHARD M. SIMPSON. It has been my rare privilege to have been rather closely associated with him in the Congress during the past 17 years.

RICHARD SIMPSON was an extraordinary individual with dynamic energy and perseverance. He fought for the things he deemed right, honorable, and just, both for his constituents and his country.

RICHARD SIMPSON served with honor and distinction as chairman of the Republican congressional committee for many years. In that assignment, he ever stood ready to help his Republican colleagues in their contests for election. He gave freely of his good advice and always demonstrated a great willingness to help them in every way possible. He will be remembered as one of the best chairmen the Republican congressional committee ever had.

RICHARD SIMPSON was an able legislator, and as ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, he clearly displayed his great knowledge of tax and revenue problems. In his passing, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most able and efficient public servants.

This Christian gentleman has gone to his reward. Although we grieve at his passing, we take consolation in the fact that he served well his day and generation. What more can be said of any man? Personally, and in behalf of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and all members of the family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, this morning at 8:15, when our beloved friend, RICHARD SIMPSON, left us, and when he failed to answer the call of the House today, we were all deeply grieved. However, I know that over the years all of us, when the bells ring calling the

House to session, will remember this highly cultured gentleman, this distinguished man, this good Christian, wonderful father and fine husband—this man who truly loved his country.

In speaking my farewell to my good friend, DICK SIMPSON, I would like to recall the words of the Psalmist:

> The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein.

Do we all realize that we are merely the stewards of our heritage here?

RICHARD SIMPSON accounted well for his stewardship on earth. His wonderful character and record will be written in the big book.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I too share the sadness at the departing of my good friend, DICK SIMPSON. Possibly I knew him longer than any Member of the House. I remember him in the happiest times of his life.

He was a student of the University of Pittsburgh in the class of my brother and sister. He was a frequent week-end visitor at our home, which was in suburban Pittsburgh. I was just 5 years younger than DICK. I remember so well cheering his exploits as a member of the football team. As executive secretary of the Allegheny County Young Republicans, I remember going with a group down to campaign in the special election of 1937 and putting on a telephone campaign for him. We cheered when he was elected. We had occasion to cheer for DICK again when he became chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, and we had reason to cheer when he entered into a second happy family life.

Knowing DICK for these 39 years, the surest thing that comes to my mind regarding him is that he took the talents that God endowed him with and developed them to their fullest.

It is a tragedy that he would be cut down now when he was reaching full maturity and full capabilities.

So I believe that in paying tribute to this great American perhaps the finest thing we can accomplish in memory of this man who died with his plans unfulfilled is to in some degree—we do not all have the potentiality that DICK had—pay tribute to him by being more dedicated to our duties and more patriotically devoted to our country in imitation of him.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we all feel deeply the sudden separation from us of a colleague who has meant so much to everyone on both sides of the aisle, for DICK SIMPSON was loved by many and respected by all.

We long to express our deep and understanding sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and his family but words fail when the heart is full.

So I, like NOAH MASON, turn to one of the ancients to find solace. I would remind us all that—

> Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
> Never was time it was not; end and beginning are dreams;
> Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
> Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems.
> Nay, but as one who layeth
> His wornout robes away,
> And taking new ones, sayeth
> "These will I wear today."
> So putteth by the spirit
> Lightly its robes of flesh,
> And passeth to inherit
> A residence afresh.

Our colleague has thrown from his shoulders garments that were probably outworn and gone to larger fields of endeavor, to an even more satisfying service not only to his country but to his God. May the Infinite receive him tenderly and may He comfort those he loved so dearly by the sure knowledge that life is eternal, separation but temporary.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable RICHARD SIMPSON was a genuine man. He was genuine in character, genuine in his duties, genuine in his friendships. I can think of no finer tribute to express about this great and good American than to say, as I have just said, that RICHARD SIMPSON was genuine in all his thinking, and in all his doings.

I learned to know DICK SIMPSON; I learned to honor and respect him, in the 21 years I had the honor and the privilege of serving with him in this House of Representatives and also in serving on the congressional campaign committee with him for a period of 6 years. DICK was always fair in his dealings with his political opponents. Never did DICK SIMPSON accuse anyone of doing something which they did not do. He never took undue advantage of his political opponents either in his district or in this House of Representatives. He spoke his mind in a calm, collected manner, weighing his words as he spoke; not an orator but a great convincer, so to speak, to his way of thinking.

My heart goes out to his dear, good wife and family. The Honorable RICHARD SIMPSON of Pennsylvania did not answer the rollcall on yesterday here in the House of Representatives. He answered the rollcall up yonder today. God rest his soul.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have been most attentive during these ceremonies. And, in the years that I have been privileged to be a Member of the House, it is moments like this which exemplify best those many qualities that so many of us love about this great institution, the House of Representatives. Here on both sides of the aisle, man after man of both great parties, from their manner of speech, from their tone of voice, knowing them as I know the men who have been speaking, those facts in themselves to me have paid a far greater tribute to the memory of our friend, DICK SIMPSON, than the beautiful words that came from their lips and their hearts, honest and true as were these expressions.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues from Pennsylvania that it is about 2 months ago to the day that DICK SIMPSON went with us to the funeral of our beloved colleague, Al Bush, of Pennsylvania. It was after that that he attended his last public function, when he addressed in my home town the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. DICK sat next to me and said many nice things in his speech about me. During the years that I have seen him here—and I knew him before—I saw him as he came down the aisle from where I now stand, a big man, a strong man.

This man looked like a Congressman and he acted like one. It is fitting and proper that his old friend whom we know as "Doc" FENTON of Pennsylvania comes to the floor today with a heavy heart and joins hands across these aisles with my colleagues in the Democratic Party and in the Republican Party to pay a tribute that we feel so deeply today.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF]

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as ultimately all of us must do, DICK SIMPSON has joined the innumerable caravan which journeys to the undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveler returns. But those who loved him and, by intimate association, had the opportunity to plumb the depths of his spiritual convictions take solace in the sure knowledge that his soul abides in eternal bliss.

DICK SIMPSON was more than a Congressman; he was, in the most honorable connotation of the phrase, a Congressman's Congressman. As busy as always were his mind and body, he always had time to accommodate his colleagues, to perform an act of grace or to speak a word of unadorned but unadulterated kindness.

Perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid any Member of this great legislative body is the one which suits DICK SIMPSON best—he was an American first and a provincial second. While he was always and in all ways devoted to Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District, his constituents were proud of the fact that his concern and his vision took the broader scope. His character was unblemished with sectional bias and his heart was untainted with the punitive motive; and accordingly, the esteem in which he was held knew no geographic boundaries.

My prayer for his bereaved loved ones is that God may comfort, shelter and hold them in the hollow of His hand.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was inexpressibly shocked and saddened today when I learned of the passing of DICK SIMPSON. I knew that he had been

critically ill and that his passing was not unexpected. However, I had not given up hope for his recovery.

I wish to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in paying tribute to our beloved colleague, DICK SIMPSON. He was truly a great American. He was a Member of the House when I first came to this body in 1941, and at that time was recognized as an outstanding Member.

I had great admiration and affection for DICK SIMPSON. He was a real friend. I went to him frequently for advice and counsel. He always had time for a visit and was eager to help. I know he gave liberally of his time to his many friends in the House.

DICK SIMPSON had a most affable personality, and was a man of great personal charm. He made a friend of everyone he met. It was a real privilege to serve with him in Congress, and I shall always treasure happy memories of our association in this body. His passing is a great personal loss to me and he will be sadly missed by everyone who knew him.

DICK and Mrs. Simpson made several trips to Colorado in recent years, and we were always delighted to have them. I know his many friends in Colorado are deeply grieved over his untimely passing.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of DICK SIMPSON is an irreparable loss not alone to his district, and the State of Pennsylvania, but to the entire Nation. Men like DICK SIMPSON cannot be replaced.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins me in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Simpson, the children, and the other members of the family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join in this memorial service today for our brilliant colleague and my friend, RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

DICK SIMPSON represented an eight-county district in the southwestern part of Pennsylvania, in itself unusually well diversified. Yet, it could be truly said of him, as of perhaps few others, that he was everyone's Congressman. His reputation and influence extended far beyond the confines of Pennsylvania, and in this fact we find acknowledged the great measure of the man. His tireless efforts in behalf of good government and his unselfish devotion to duty during a lifetime of service made him an outstanding and great American.

DICK SIMPSON served the 18th District of Pennsylvania and his country well, and with distinction for the 23 years that he was in the Congress of the United States. His first concern always was for the best interests of his own people. His distinguished record transcended local interests, and he made his tremendous ability and statesmanship felt on the national level. Likewise, he was a wonderful bulwark of strength for all of us in the Pennsylvania delegation. We valued his wise counsel and humane regard for others.

DICK SIMPSON was also a dedicated family man, completely devoted to his gracious wife and fine children. He was a friend to whom one could refer problems in the confident and sure knowledge that he would reciprocate with full and complete attention.

Of DICK SIMPSON it truly could be said, "The secret of success is constancy of purpose." We shall feel his loss keenly, but can take comfort in the realization that, during his nearly 60 years on this earth, DICK SIMPSON lived a rich and full life, characterized by unselfish service to others.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, DICK SIMPSON's district and my own are immediately adjacent to each other. Close as we were geographically, however, I am afraid that politically speaking we were quite often many miles apart. Despite the differences in our views on many basic issues I was never blind to the obvious capabilities of the man. He was an intelligent, articulate spokesman for what he honestly believed to be in the best interests of this country.

This Congress as well as his family have suffered a great loss in his untimely passing. Pennsylvania and America have lost a distinguished citizen and a dedicated public servant. In this hour of grief I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and to the members of his family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorrowed by the passing of my longtime friend and colleague, DICK SIMPSON. He was one of my most dependable advisers almost from the first day that I came to the Congress as the result of a special election in 1947, just as DICK had come to the Congress after a special election 10 years before. He continued to be my very good friend and adviser down to the very end.

Principle to DICK SIMPSON was not divisible; and the many principles for which he so courageously fought and saw enacted into law will be lasting monuments to an able, resourceful, and patriotic legislator.

DICK SIMPSON rendered yeoman service to the people of his congressional district, to his State, to his Nation, and to his party. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues and by his innumerable friends everywhere. Mrs. Simpson, his lovely and devoted wife, his children, and his entire family have my deepest sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow and regret at the passing of DICK SIMPSON and to extend my deepest sympathy to his family. I did not have the privilege of knowing DICK SIMPSON before I came to the Congress, but I was here only a few weeks when I recognized his outstanding ability as one of the leaders of the House of Representatives. It is with a feeling of profound sorrow and regret that I pay this last tribute to DICK SIMPSON, who will be missed by all who knew him. He was one of the men who made America great.

Mr. FELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, true things have been said here today about our departed brother.

We have lost a colleague who was guided by kindness, and principle and integrity and the justice that comes from inherent honesty and fairness.

I know whereof I speak for I served on the Republican congressional committee with DICK. Sure he wanted his side to win but I can testify that he wanted that victory to be fairly won without any recourse to tactics that lacked truth or dignity.

I know that DICK SIMPSON believed in the value of the two-party system—that the electorate might know both sides—and thus be guided by the best knowledge available. I know he felt that the preservation of this great Republic of ours must be predicated on that.

The tributes paid to DICK here today by Members of the opposite party bear this out—and it is an inspiration to all of us to hear them and realize what they mean.

I, too, join with my colleagues in the extension of profound sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and the family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we are all stunned today by DICK SIMPSON's passing. Many of us have known him as long as we can remember. We of the Pennsylvania delegation on the Republican side as well as the Democratic delegation from Pennsylvania have lost a real leader and a real friend. We have known DICK so long that I almost cannot remember when I did not know him.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] has just said, we knew him from the early days. At the time of his first election to Congress I was one of the young Republicans who went to Huntingdon to help him get started on his campaign to come to Congress. It was a personal privilege to attend the wedding of his daughter last summer, a wonderful family occasion with so many friends attending. The first time I ever saw DICK, I believe, was when I was 12 or 13 years old, and we were at the dam on the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River in the Pennsylvania mountains near Huntingdon, DICK's hometown. I knew DICK as one of the older boys that everybody looked up to, when we were youngsters at Camp Myler. When I came to Congress, he continued to be a good friend. We of the Pennsylvania delegation have always looked up to DICK and have admired his leadership in Congress. DICK SIMPSON's career has been a matter of great pride to everybody in Pennsylvania.

I close by saying that regardless of party, there are times when everyone in Congress has a sense of loss in the passing of a Member. Each of us has a very deep sense of loss, and I know that we all remember the good things that DICK has done and the leadership he has provided, not only to the Republicans in this body but all the conscientious Members of this House, during all of these years that he has given such serious and devoted service to our good country and our American people. To Mae and DICK SIMPSON and the family we offer our thanks, evidence our pride, and express to your our friendship at this time of change.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I mourn with the members of the great Pennsylvania delegation and all the Members of the House and the people of our country, and I may say of the world, because of the passing of DICK SIMPSON, a man of great character, a great legislator, and a great religious leader.

The last time I talked to DICK SIMPSON was shortly after his lovely daughter's wedding. I had hoped to attend until the last moment, but I could not. At that time I spoke to him about an injury I am sure he sustained as he appeared at a political dinner he attended at a Washington hotel and a part of the head table platform on which many were standing collapsed and I felt sure his foot was crushed under the platform. I had a feeling at that time that it was but he never told anybody about it. He finally admitted it. I tell you that to show some of his physical courage. He had great physical courage as well as moral courage. I am positive that he had physical courage during the last weeks of his service. He must have had great doctors to have the operation that he went through, and yet I do not believe he ever complained to anybody.

I am mindful of the fact that we place a very heavy burden upon our colleagues, a burden upon those who are in charge, as legislative leaders, in positions of trust. I was struck with DICK SIMPSON'S loyalty to the United States and his loyalty to the business interests of the manufacturers and the laboring people of his own district and those of the Nation. His wish was to have the United States a free, prosperous, and solvent nation He used his fine ability to work tirelessly for success. Through his integrity much valuable legislation was passed. He was so wonderful in every way. He was never too busy to talk to any of the Members regardless of party. He always gave us wise advice and helped us in whatever way he could.

It must have taken courage for him to be loyal to certain persons to whom he was loyal because there were those who were constantly pushing him the other way.

To his beautiful wife, who was of such great help to him politically, and to his splendid family I extend my very deepest sympathy. I only wish there was something I could do to help, but I am sure the good Lord will take care of them and comfort them.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of my friend and colleague, DICK SIMPSON. The true measure of life is not its duration, but rather it is found in its contributions of dedicated service. Our Saviour lived upon this earth for only 35 years, and in this brief time contributed more than we can ever appreciate.

So it was with DICK, a man of faith and a man of works. His death may seem untimely, but who can measure time, in years, as God in His infinite wisdom stretches forth His hand and gathers into His arms His little children, and no one knows the time or the place.

With the inexorable passage of time, each of us will be gathered into His kingdom.

DICK'S friendly help and counsel left nothing to be desired. His memory and influence will long be felt in these Halls of Congress where he served the ideals of Americanism and of Christian faith. He did all that was required of him. He loved mercy, he did justly, and he walked humbly before God. Man can ask no more.

To his wife and family, Mrs. Utt joins me in expressing our deep sympathy.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, as a junior Member of this body, and as one who has had the privilege of knowing DICK SIMPSON for only a short time, it was my great privilege to discuss on numerous occasions with him not only the political philosophy of our time but also the economic philosophy that has far-reaching consequences for the future of the economy.

I found in DICK SIMPSON a man who was not only a good politician but one highly equipped in scholarly attainment in the fields of finance and industry, and who possessed an understanding and appreciation of all that was good in our way of life. I join those of my colleagues who have paid tribute to a distinguished son of Pennsylvania, but more especially a son of all the people of the United States for a life of service well done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death of our late colleague and friend, DICK SIMPSON, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most devoted and outstanding Members, and the country a great American. DICK SIMPSON was held in high esteem by his colleagues without regard to political party.

It has been well said that "friendship transcends politics" and this is pointedly so in relation to our late friend.

DICK SIMPSON at all times was a gentleman. As a legislator he held strong convictions based on intellectual honesty. As an American, he loved our country and fearlessly advocated and supported those policies and legislation, even at times when he was in the minority, which he considered were for the national interests of our country and the best interests of our people.

A strong fighter for what he believed in, in disagreement, he respected the views of others.

To me, the best definition of a gentleman is "one who can disagree without being disagreeable."

DICK SIMPSON was such a gentleman.

While he and I differed in many respects on legislation, I thoroughly respected him and his views, because I knew he was intellectually honest. Furthermore, it is well to have represented in the Congress a cross section of American thought, and DICK SIMPSON ably represented in this body any important part of this cross section.

To Mrs. Simpson and her loved ones I extend my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of our late colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in commenting on the passing of a great leader and an outstanding Congressman. As one of the youngest Members on the Republican side, my arrival in the House was at the peak of a session, following a special election. It was a great experience but it was also necessary to seek the guidance of men more experienced than myself.

DICK SIMPSON was a man who, without seeming to direct, helped me to find my way through those first hectic days. He was one of the great leaders of this Chamber whose example served to guide me.

I extend to Mrs. Simpson and to her family the sympathy of myself and Mrs. Goodell, as well as that of the 43d District of New York.

DICK SIMPSON had many friends in that district. It was one of these friends who met him one day on the steps of the House Office Building. As always, DICK SIMPSON greeted him warmly. Chatting about the political life, DICK SIMPSON said, "One of the jobs we have to do is to work for the young people and get them interested in public affairs. We need them."

We needed DICK SIMPSON, too, and we will sorely miss him in the halls and on the floor of this great House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness and shock that

I received word this morning of the death of our admired and respected colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

I had the privilege of serving with DICK SIMPSON on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House of Representatives for many years. We served on different sides of the political aisle, but I wish to pay tribute to the integrity and sincerity of DICK SIMPSON. He was a man who was a stalwart warrior for the causes in which he believed. He was forthright in expressing his opinions, but he always did so without allowing his views on issues to interfere with his personal friendships.

He was admired and respected by all of us on the Committee on Ways and Means and his death will indeed be a loss to the committee and to this House.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences. His service to his district and the Nation leaves a monument of which all of his family and his friends can be proud.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the leadership and service which could have been expected of Congressman RICHARD M. SIMPSON in the days and months ahead, the Nation is vastly poorer for his passing. So too is this House. So too is the political party in whose councils he exercised great and constructive influence. So too are his State and his district.

Yet, it is not for us to question the ways of Providence.

Instead, let us take consolation in the fact that we are vastly richer for the contributions of wise statesmanship, courageous leadership, devoted service and warm friendship he has given during his more than two decades of membership in this House.

I mourn DICK SIMPSON as a colleague and a friend.

Together with Mrs. Johansen, I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and all of the family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to estimate the great loss that Congress and his host of friends have suffered in the death of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, RICHARD M. SIMPSON. He was an outstanding example of honest thinking, of fearlessness, and of devotion to his country. His loyalty to his friends and his helpful sympathy and advice when the going was rough will never be forgotten. He was endowed with a most intuitive mind, sensitive to the feelings of others, that made his friendship a most precious thing. His humility made him a preeminent example of the precept that "he who would be first among you must be the servant of all." He was a gentleman of the first order and devoted his life to promoting that which was good and wholesome. I was privileged to call him friend and there is now a great void in my life which will only be filled by the memory of a great and wonderful man.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his widow and family and may the thoughts and prayers of their many friends support them in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend, the late Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania.

Twice in recent months, death has deprived us of distinguished Members of our Pennsylvania delegation, the late Congressman Alvin R. Bush having left our midst only several weeks ago.

Both these fine gentlemen served our State and Nation ably during their period of service in this body. They will be missed in the crucial days ahead.

I extend my condolences to Mrs. Bush, Mrs. Simpson, and their families.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON deeply saddens all who over his lifetime have had the privilege of his friendship and acquaintance.

The State of Pennsylvania, as well as the Nation, has lost a distinguished citizen of courage and conviction.

During the years we have served together in this House, he has been a warm friend to me, one whose counsel I sought on many occasions.

He supported with earnest endeavor the cause of the Republican Party, and he unselfishly devoted his time and talent to the affairs of the party and those seeking election to office under its banner.

Memory of DICK will remain always as a guiding star to all of us who knew him well. We mourn his passing and our great loss.

MRS. McINTIRE joins with me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and members of the family.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of DICK SIMPSON has brought real grief to all of us who knew him, who were associated with him in the House of Representatives, and who were privileged to be his friends.

The suddenness of his untimely passing has been a shock to all of his colleagues.

DICK SIMPSON was a man of great integrity, sincerity of purpose, and loyalty to his friends. While we served on different sides of the political aisle and did not always agree on the problems which came before the committee and before the House, I had the greatest admiration for the integrity of DICK SIMPSON, his forthrightness, and the warmth of his personality. He will be missed on the Committee on Ways and Means and in this House and by his constituents.

To his dear wife and members of his family go my most heartfelt prayers in their hour of bereavement and my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of profound sorrow that I learned this morning of the death of our colleague, DICK SIMPSON.

No Member of Congress was held in higher regard and respect by his colleagues. We who served with him on the Ways and Means Committee were in a position to know and recognize better than many others his great integrity, fine character, and devotion to the public service. He was a tower of strength, a wise counselor, devoted to those principles in which he so sincerely believed. The Congress, the State of Pennsylvania, and the Nation have lost a valued Representative. We will all miss him greatly. He was a devoted husband and father and a loyal friend. My deepest sympathy goes out to the members of his beloved family.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we meet in sorrow today to pay tribute to the memory of one who has lived and worked amongst us for many years.

RICHARD MURRAY SIMPSON, the son of Warren Brown and Sue Miller Simpson, was born on August 30, 1900.

Following his graduation from high school he joined the U.S. Army to become in 1918 a member of the 301st Company Tank Corps in Raleigh, N.C. After the war he attended the University of Pittsburgh where he got his bachelor of science degree in 1923. Some years later in Washington, D.C., he studied at the Georgetown University Law School for his law degree which was granted in 1942.

While engaged in the insurance and guaranty business which he had entered upon leaving college in 1823, he was elected in 1935 to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, where I had the privilege of serving with him from 1935 to 1937 when he moved to the U.S. Congress.

He early displayed firm convictions in whatever course he believed to be right. and did not at any time hesitate to speak up for what he thought the practical program for legislation; thus, during his first year in 1937 in this House he voted in opposition to proposed legislation granting $1,500,000 for relief in 1938. In the second session of his first Congress he supported a measure for naval expansion and the wage-hour bill.

In the years which followed, he showed himself a man of breadth and understanding in the critical decisions which came before Congress in foreign affairs in general.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee he excelled as a spokesman for his party.

His career extending 22 years in this House was too long and varied for a detailed appraisal at this time when he has left us so suddenly, but all of us here who were privileged to know him and serve with him can bear witness this day of his fidelity to duty, his personal kindliness, and, from first to last, unblemished integrity. It is from such qualities that Congress is able to draw support for the measures which directly serve the best interest of the Nation. Without him and men like him we could not function as a National Legislature upon which, not merely this Nation, but the world depends.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all will join with me in a most sincere expression, both of sorrow and of very great respect for the colleague who has just left us, and extend to his wife and family our heartfelt sympathy and the assurance that in the memory of no living Member of this body will RICHARD M. SIMPSON be forgotten.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken in tribute to DICK SIMPSON, but too much cannot be said about this great public servant. He

and I belonged to the same committee in Congress, the same political party, and the same college fraternity. I had the opportunity to observe him as a member of each and I can truthfully say that I never saw one more loyal and devoted to the causes with which he was affiliated. No one could know him and work with him without being conscious of the fact that he was a great man. Ability, loyalty, and integrity are adjectives we use to express our highest praise, and they all applied to DICK SIMPSON.

I am grateful for the privilege I had of knowing him and working with him. It was an inspiration which meant much to me, and I join my colleagues and his host of friends and admirers in expressing my sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and his loved ones.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, my return to Washington for the new session was immediately saddened by the news of the critical illness of my dear friend, DICK SIMPSON.

Continuously during the 9 years I was privileged to know him my admiration and respect for him increased. DICK was that kind of person—one whose fine qualities and deep sincerity became more apparent with longer acquaintance. His constant and effective battle for those things in which he believed should entitle him to have his epitaph read: "Here lies a great fighter and a great American."

It is most difficult for me to understand why he has been stricken down at the height of a career marked by courage, ability, and integrity. The Congress of the United States has today lost one of its finest Members and the State of Pennsylvania one of the greatest Representatives in its history.

My deepest sympathies go forward to his charming wife and family.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Architect has taken back DICK SIMPSON. Those of us remaining are the losers, although we all benefited by knowing him. We will miss him. He gave unstintingly of himself to others. It seems appropriate to me to think of DICK in the words of my pastor who said that "God works through people." I was greatly privileged to share DICK's friendship as a fellow Congressman, including our joint work on the congressional committee and the Committee on Ways and Means. Those brief 5 years of association with him now comprise a precious and heart-warming memory. DICK, you are gone from us, but will never be forgotten.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I join with Members of the House and others in expressing profound sorrow at the untimely passing of our colleague, Representative RICHARD SIMPSON. When I came to Congress I soon learned to know DICK SIMPSON as a quiet man but ready and willing to give kindly counsel when requested. I cherish the memories of my association with him here on the floor and in party councils during the 5 years I have known him. I found him to be, first, thoroughly devoted to maintaining the great principles of the American form of government and, second, to the Republican Party, whose national congressional committee he headed at the time of his passing.

The Nation has lost a patriot and statesman and Congress has lost a brilliant Member.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, although his committee associates had been saddened in recent weeks by the knowledge that he had been confined to the hospital for major surgery, it was a shock today to receive the word that our distinguished and beloved colleague, DICK SIMPSON would not return among us.

As the leader of the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, he made a notable and continuing contribution to the cause of earnest and sincere legislating. He was an industrious student of the complex areas of the law in which our committee labors—taxation, tariffs, unemployment, old age, survivor and disability insurance.

Whatever the position he concluded was proper on a legislative issue, he came to committee prepared to contend forcefully for it. He was a worthy and respected adversary for those of us who, from time to time found ourselves obliged to differ with his view.

DICK SIMPSON, in the wisdom of the Almighty, has been taken away at the height of his usefulness. The loss is not only that of his family, friends, constituents and party, but of the Nation as a whole, which he sought always to serve in the way he saw as the right. He was a great American.

Our sympathy goes out at this sad time to Mrs. Simpson and the other members of his fine family.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed shocked to learn of the untimely passing of our good friend and colleague, DICK SIMPSON. I came to know DICK in my early days as a Member of the House of Representatives, and my deep respect continued to grow through the years.

I was closely associated with him in the Republican campaign committee, and only 3 years ago he came to our district in Wisconsin to deliver the principal address at a Lincoln Day program.

The 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania and the Nation have lost an outstanding American.

I wish to join with his host of friends in extending my deep sympathy to his widow and to his family.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, as was every Member of the House, when I heard the sad news of the passing of my good friend, RICHARD M. SIMPSON. His passing is not only of grave concern to those of us in the House of Representatives; it should be of concern, as well, to all the people of the United States.

DICK SIMPSON was one of the great men of America. He was a great lawmaker and humanitarian. He was also a leader with an ability and effectiveness matched by few, surpassed by none.

As ranking minority member on the House Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. SIMPSON was capable, just, and true to the trust placed in him. He devoted his energies unstintingly to the work of drafting equitable legislation to provide funds for the Government while at the same time protecting the rights of individual citizens.

As chairman of the House Republican campaign committee, DICK SIMPSON devoted long and arduous hours working for his colleagues in that party. He was unfailingly present and ready to help when called upon by one of his fellow members. He was ever ready to give sound advice to those who sought it from him. His advice was always good and bore fruit when accepted and followed.

However, he was not one to force his will or his advice on any man. He was not the type of leader who prodded or pushed. He was, rather, the type who set an example which others were willing and eager to follow.

The Nation has lost one of its most capable leaders in the untimely death of DICK SIMPSON. I feel a personal loss as must every Member of this House. The people of Pennsylvania and the Nation have lost a servant who has served long and well.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means and in this House in expressing the deep grief and sadness which I experienced when I learned of the death of DICK SIMPSON. It was indeed a shock to me. His district, the House of Representatives, and the Nation have suffered a loss in his passing.

It happened that we began our service here together in the 75th Congress. In the work of the House and of the committee, I came to have the very highest regard for his integrity, his clarity of mind and purpose, and the strength with which he espoused the causes in which he believed. He had many friends, not only here and in his district, but throughout the Nation. He earned the confidence of the members of the committee and of this House. He was a man of great energy and strength. He rendered high public service to his district, the Congress, and the Nation.

I wish to extend to members of his family my deepest sympathy on his sudden and untimely passing. In their bereavement they can perhaps find a measure of comfort in the knowledge that he has left a monument of many years of public service of which they can all be proud.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, the great State of Pennsylvania, and the country at large has lost a great man, a statesman in every sense of the word.

RICHARD SIMPSON was devoted to his duties as a legislator. He was an expert. Members sought his advice. Legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means has shown the imprint of his great knowledge. DICK SIMPSON was a man of unusually high character. He was a man of courage and conviction. His word was absolutely good. Although Members had opposite views from those Mr. SIMPSON advocated, they respected his opinion and his beliefs. He has been described as "a mighty oak that never yielded in the storm."

RICHARD SIMPSON was always glad to give advice to younger Members who sought his assistance. DICK SIMPSON

did not bear any malice to those who disagreed with him. He loved people. He loved his country. He was one of God's noblemen. I join with my colleagues in mourning the loss of a great man who left his imprint upon the world that will not be erased.

A great poet said:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

RICHARD M. SIMPSON has left his imprint on the lives of those who had the privilege of knowing him.

I join with my colleagues today in extending deepest sympathy to the family of our beloved friend, and colleague, RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of my esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, RICHARD SIMPSON.

His death will mean a tremendous loss, not only to the members of his family, but to the people of his congressional district and the Nation as well. Congressman SIMPSON served the 18th District of Pennsylvania for 22 years. The loyalty and respect felt for him by his constituents have been demonstrated by the majorities with which he has been returned to Congress election after election. The loyalty and respect felt for him by his colleagues in this body have been demonstrated by the responsible position he was accorded on the important Ways and Means Committee.

Another measure of this man's greatness is more personal to me. I will always remember his kindness and understanding, particularly at the beginning of my term in Congress. He had the bigness of heart and the greatness of spirit to extend to me—a member of the opposite party—the benefit of his long experience in the House. I am sure that many other freshman Members have been benefited from his counsel.

Although many of the Members on this side of the aisle might frequently have disagreed with his legislative views, Congressman SIMPSON had the devotion and respect of the entire House. His dedication to the principles in which he believed was an inspiration and a source of education to all. His forthrightness and courage in speaking out on legislative matters were a source of admiration.

To Mrs. Simpson and to other members of his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, It has been my privilege to see many well qualified, patriotic Members come to Congress, my regret to see many of them leave. It was my privilege to speak with and for our colleague at Frostburg, Pa., in his first campaign in 1937. From that day to the day he left for the hospital, he was always helpful and instructive.

Our colleague had convictions, he had courage, he intelligently and vigorously pressed for the adoption of legislation which he was convinced would be helpful to the Nation as a whole as well as beneficial to his constituents who, in him, never had a more considerate and capable Representative. That statement is near the ultimate in compliment when we remember the service of Robert Rich who, when an authorization or appropriation bill was before the House, never failed to ask, "Where will we get the money?" A question which is still with us and which apparently our colleague always had in mind, both when consulting us individually or acting as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Our colleague, though a vigorous advocate of the things which he believed to be best for our country, was not only sincere and vigorous in support of his views, but he was modest, he was humble, and—an equally desirable but somewhat rare characteristic—considerate of the views of his colleagues.

Though in the main our views traveled in parallel lines—I can recall no exception—he never failed to be courteous and considerate of the expression of convictions by his colleagues. He never criticized the way they voted—giving to others a charitable evaluation we sometimes did not give to him.

Even though some of us knew, as we adjourned last year, that he was in ill health, his death came as a shock, for with it, each and every one of us who knew him realized we had lost a friend—an able, valuable, public servant. Those he left behind will continue to miss him, but they should take some satisfaction in the fact that he left behind a record of able, vigorous, patriotic service to his district, his State, and the Nation.

Though not closely associated in our work he was my friend and I was his. He left behind a record of faithful service to all and were he with us this afternoon when skies are dark and weather chill, I am sure DICK would have joined us in Tennyson's words and thought:

CROSSING THE BAR

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark.

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, although the passing of our colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, was not unexpected in view of his protracted illness, it nevertheless came as a shock for I had hoped with his many friends that somehow he would be able to overcome his affliction.

As Dr. FENTON has so well said, there was no Member of the House of Representatives more capable of dealing with the problems of our time, and certainly there was no Member possessing, in greater measure the virtues of integrity, determination, and courage.

In the death of DICK SIMPSON the House has suffered an irreparable loss and I have lost a friend.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and the members of their family. May their grief be tempered in the knowledge of the imprint which DICK SIMPSON left in the records of Congress and the high esteem in which he was held by his colleagues.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound shock that I learned of the serious illness of my good friend DICK SIMPSON. I am sure that the prayers and thoughts of all Members of Congress were with DICK during his illness, and are with him now. Those prayers extend to the family of our friend and colleague, asking that the Almighty may assuage their grief and leave them only with the memory of the fine strong man that was DICK SIMPSON, and a solemn pride in his life, his accomplishments, and the niche which he has carved for himself in history and in the hearts of all who knew him.

My association with DICK SIMPSON was primarily in my capacity as a member and secretary of the National Republican Congressional Committee. I was privileged to serve as secretary under DICK'S chairmanship for the last 4 years. He had a fine mind, great resolution, and an outstanding ability to get things done. His devotion to duty was probably the crowning aspect of his entire character. Once he had agreed to do something, it could be regarded by all as having been done.

DICK SIMPSON possessed many virtues. The one which stands out in my mind is his modesty in all things. I have never heard him utter a single word of self-praise, or even one which caused me to believe that he recognized in himself the abilities which others saw in him. Rather, he was full of praise for his fellow workers, and anxious that they should receive the credit for any tasks well done.

The Congress will miss DICK SIMPSON. The country will miss him. The people of Pennsylvania, and particularly of his own congressional district, will miss him. To Mrs. Simpson and the Simpson family, I extend my heartfelt condolences and sincere sympathy, in which Mrs. Rhodes joins me.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the death of RICHARD M. SIMPSON comes as a great shock to all of us who have had the privilege through the years to enjoy his warm and loyal friendship.

I met DICK SIMPSON when I first came to Congress at the beginning of 82d Congress. We became very close and warm friends.

DICK was a man of stalwart character, high integrity, and strong convictions. He had the courage of his convictions and would fight for what he thought was right. Yet, he was always kind and courteous and accorded those who disagreed with him the right of their convictions.

He was an able Congressman, and had the respect and love of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He was never narrowminded or petty. He was devoted to the service of his community, State and Nation. Perhaps it was his zeal in trying to serve his constituents to the best of his ability that hastened his death. The better you knew DICK SIMPSON, the better you loved him; he was indeed a wise and sympathetic counselor.

My life has been enriched, and I am eternally grateful for having known DICK SIMPSON.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened this morning to receive news of the passing of our friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania.

While I was of course aware of Congressman SIMPSON'S recent serious illness and operation, I somehow felt that he might have a normal recovery since he always appeared to be very rugged and healthy. His rapid decline and passing was a great shock to all of us.

I always considered DICK SIMPSON to be a most capable and conscientious public servant. During his long career as a Member of this Body he left a profound imprint on his colleagues and friends. He will be greatly missed by the people of his district, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the entire Nation.

I extend my sincere and deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was awfully sorry to hear of the serious illness and then the death of my dear friend, DICK SIMPSON. Over the years we have talked over many problems before the House and he was always so sound and so kind and considerate to me.

I shall miss him and I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that the able and devoted Representative, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, will no longer be with us. For all our difference of religious affiliation and political loyalties, I have felt very close to DICK SIMPSON, as I have been priviliged to work with him for many years in a common devotion to the welfare of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and of the United States of America. Much has been said on this floor, and in the other body, in exalted praise of DICK SIMPSON'S conscientious dedication to the service of his country, of his sincerity and energy and ability. I shall not attempt to repeat what has been so ably and eloquently said in honor of the memory of DICK SIMPSON, but I should like to comment simply that, to one who knew DICK SIMPSON well, not one word in all this chorus of eulogy has rung false. Nothing but good has been said of him, because there was nothing but good to be said. He was a man who would not condone a wrong or serve a falsehood, whether by act, by speech, or by silence.

Typical of DICK SIMPSON'S driving ambition to serve his country to the best of his magnificent ability is the story of his early years in Congress, when, finding that he was assigned to the House Committee on Ways and Means, and that a knowledge of law would contribute significantly to the value of his work on that committee, he immediately enrolled in the Georgetown Law School, taking night courses in law, while carrying out his legislative duties with undiminished energy, for the 4 years necessary for the achievement of his degree. That is the spirit in which DICK SIMPSON, throughout his life, undertook and carried out all the duties that circumstances laid upon him, and all the duties that he himself perceived and chose to perform. For no personal advantage, for no political loyalty, for no lofty cause, would he do or permit any unfair act, but drove always with resolute determination at the accomplishment of great results by fair and honest means.

I wish to join my friends, and DICK SIMPSON'S friends, in the Congress, in expressing to his wife and their daughter, Kay Josephine, to his two older daughters, Susan, and Barbara, and to his three stepsons, our heartfelt sorrow and sympathy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this morning RICHARD SIMPSON, Representative from the 18th District of Pennsylvania, passed away.

He had been a Member of this House for 23 years and had great ability. He was the ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, and was one of its ablest and most active members.

He stood for the things that he believed in and was one of the most courageous men in the House. He was always courteous. He was one of the best debaters we had on the floor of the House. He was always prepared on the bills that he had to deal with, and his thoughts on them were always forcefully expressed.

It seems too bad that one only 60 years of age should be taken away, yet we must be thankful that we had the benefit of his talents and his character and his devotion to his work for so long a time.

I wish to extend to his widow and his children my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of Congress in expressing the loss that we all feel with the passing of our colleague, Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON.

In my brief association with him, I was impressed by his tremendous political courage and the strength of his convictions. His intense loyalty to the Republican Party, his stalwart conservative convictions and his personal desire to give the best possible representation to the people of his district were apparent in all his actions. His leadership will be missed by those of us who looked to him for counsel and inspiration.

I extend to Mrs. Simpson and their family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of RICHARD M. SIMPSON is a great loss to the Congress and the country.

As a public servant he will long be remembered for his strength of character and unassailable integrity. His sound judgment and keen intellect prompted his elevation to many positions of high responsibility in the House and within his party. These duties he discharged with such quiet efficiency that more and more demands were made upon his time and energy. Until his death he was fulfilling major assignments in a way which commanded the respect and confidence of all with whom he was associated.

He will be remembered for his sympathetic and wise counsel which he generously shared. In all respects he was faithful to his trust.

RICHARD SIMPSON was truly an American patriot, whose services are gratefully recalled and whose spirited devotion to his firm convictions will remain an inspiration.

To Mrs. Simpson and the family, I extend the sincere sympathy of the 34th New York District, trusting that they will be comforted by the enduring blessing of his life so nobly lived.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn several weeks ago of the serious illness of my good friend and colleague, DICK SIMPSON. I hoped and prayed, as we all did, that he would survive the serious operation he had to undergo. Words cannot express how saddened I was to learn that the Lord, in His wisdom, had taken DICK from us.

My association with DICK SIMPSON was a brief one; I came to know him a few short years ago when I was elected to serve in this House. But, I soon learned that he was one of the truly dedicated members of our party. He was sincere in his convictions and he fought for those convictions when the occasion demanded a fight. He communicated this spirit to his colleagues and served his party, his constituency and his country with perseverance and distinction.

The loss of DICK SIMPSON will be felt by all of us who knew and worked with him. He has left a vacancy in this House and in our hearts that will not be easily filled.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and his family. May they take some solace in knowing that so many mourn in his passing with them.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our good friend RICHARD M. SIMPSON, is a great loss to the Congress, to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to our Nation. That he has left our midst is a tragedy to the causes of good government, human liberty, and economic opportunity.

DICK SIMPSON was characterized by his integrity, commonsense, and an unswerving devotion to the principles in which he believed. Those principles are better principles today because of the fact that this American lived.

During the past 7 years that I had the opportunity to know this great patriot, I found him to be a public servant who was devoted to the concept of responsibility; responsibility in office, politics, and in his personal life. It can be truly said of DICK SIMPSON that he thought more of his obligations than he did of his privileges. No finer quality could any man possess.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Republican congressional campaign committee, I became closely associated with DICK, and I

profited time and time again by his wise counsel and by his high courage.

I realize full well the futility of our words at this time to alleviate the sorrow of the Simpson family; however, I want to bring my humble words of condolence to them in the hope and belief that their faith in the will of our Heavenly Father will fill them with the spirit of acceptance and peace that join the faithful now and in eternity.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of DICK SIMPSON the House has lost an honest and hard-working Member and the country a statesman of vision and courage. The accomplishments of this man will not soon be forgotten nor will his leadership and the force of his personality be soon dispelled from those of us in this body who were privileged to work closely with him.

This man was well chosen to carry out his responsibility as a public servant. His recognized abilities and his strength of character elevated him to positions of leadership in his community and then in the House and the Republican Party. His loss will be felt in each of these circles within which he was looked to for guidance and inspiration.

I give my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and to the late Congressman's children. The sorrow they feel at the passing of this loved one is echoed by the entire Nation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic death of RICHARD SIMPSON the Congress has lost one of its great leaders and the Nation is made poorer by his passing. He was a man of stature in the rich tradition of Americans who have dedicated their lives to the service of their country. The principles for which he fought so eloquently sprang from a deep conviction that representative government must be both responsive and responsible. He clearly understood this delicate balance in his untiring efforts for all the people of his country.

DICK SIMPSON was my friend whom I admired for his courage, the clarity of his convictions, and his sincere and unswerving loyalty to principle. Perhaps even more I admired qualities of kindliness and humanity which he possessed in such abundance.

I join with my colleagues here in mourning his loss and I wish to extend to his family my most profound sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing of Congressman DICK SIMPSON has left a vacancy in the House of Representatives which will be impossible to fill.

DICK SIMPSON was a close personal friend of mine, and his sturdy character, high integrity, unquestioned loyalty, and honest conviction commanded the respect of all of his friends and acquaintances.

He was not the type who would yield to expediency and was always ready and willing to use his great influence to protect the people of the district he represented as well as all people throughout the Nation against any attempt to subvert or subordinate the power and dignity of the United States.

It is difficult to express in words the feelings you have for the loss of a close personal friend.

I wish to join my other colleagues in expressing my sincere sympathy to his beloved wife and family for the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great grief and sorrow that Mrs. Bentley and I recently learned of the untimely passing of our beloved colleague, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, who had represented the 18th District of Pennsylvania in the House ever since 1937. We were particularly shocked over the sad news since we and the Simpsons were close neighbors in Chevy Chase, Md., and since one of our own children was a good friend of one of the Simpson boys.

While Congressman SIMPSON's notable achievements both before and since his first election to Congress have been fully covered in the remarks of his sorrowing colleagues, I merely wish to say that I considered DICK SIMPSON as a close personal friend and feel a personal sense of loss at the news of his passing. Mrs. Bentley and I certainly extend our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to the sorrowing members of the bereaved family.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in the Pennsylvania delegation mourn the passing of RICHARD M. SIMPSON, an outstanding and capable legislator and vigorous leader of his party's Congressional Campaign Committee.

A Member of this body for 23 years, DICK SIMPSON was respected by all of his colleagues. He had a most pleasant personality and a strong character. He was kind and friendly. He was able, articulate, and industrious in carrying out the duties of his office. Our State and the Nation will miss his service in these perilous times.

I extend my sincere condolences to his family on their great loss.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the untimely passing of our colleague, RICHARD SIMPSON. I do not know of any man who has served as a Member of the Congress during the 22 years I have been privileged to serve in the House who was more highly respected than RICHARD SIMPSON. He was a tower of strength on the great Ways and Means Committee and both we Democrats and the Republicans could always depend on him to render a sound decision and cast a sound vote on any legislation under consideration by that committee.

Mr. SIMPSON was certainly a leader of the highest caliber and will be missed by every person privileged with his acquaintance. He was never too busy to talk to any Member who had a bill pending before the Ways and Means Committee. RICHARD SIMPSON had just arrived at the age where he could be of some real service to the people of his great State and our Nation. He had the necessary legislative experience and had the respect of every Member of Congress and even though his proposals did not always meet with the approval of every Member of the Congress, they knew that he was expressing his real opinion which he thought would be best not only for his State, but for the Nation.

Mrs. McMillan joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and the entire family. We can ill afford to lose men of RICHARD SIMPSON's caliber here in the Congress of the United States during these critical times.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker with the passing of my long-time friend and colleague RICHARD SIMPSON, DICK most of us fondly called him, the Nation lost a great and able statesman and we who knew him best a kind, companionable and lovable friend.

DICK SIMPSON was gifted with an alert and constructive mind. He dug hard and diligently for facts. Once he possessed them he based his decisions on the facts as he found them and courageously made known his views letting the chips fall where they would.

Because of his forthrightness and courage he held the confidence and respect of friend and foe, if those of different political opinions can be called foes. His influence was great. He was universally liked, admired and respected by all who knew him. DICK SIMPSON will be greatly missed in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we in America have lost a real champion in the passing of DICK SIMPSON, our illustrious colleague from Pennsylvania. DICK SIMPSON epitomized integrity, forthrightness, and responsibility in Government by his every action. His sincerity has always been an inspiration to me.

Through the years that I have known DICK SIMPSON, he always had a moment in his busy schedule to counsel and assist each one of us so that we could better perform our responsibilities as representatives of the people. It is rare to find a man of his character and understanding.

I join with all my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Simpson and his family.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 415), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-three Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members of the Funeral Committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HALLECK, Mr. WALTER, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. MASON, Mr.

FENTON, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. FULTON, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. DAGUE, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. MUMMA, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HOLLAND, Mrs. GRANAHAN, Mr. CURTIN, Mr. LAFORE, Mr. DENT, Mr. NIX, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PROKOP, and Mr. TOLL.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 11, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1628. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1629. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1630. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 34th report on property acquisitions for the quarter ending September 30, 1959, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1631. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1632. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, relative to positions in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress within the purview of subsection (c) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, allocated to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1633. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the calendar year 1959 on positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 as required by section 503, title V, of Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1634. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 73d Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1635. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 25th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1636. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Board, and Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 9448. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the allocation and continuing reservation of noncommercial educational television broadcast channels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9449. A bill to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 9450. A bill to amend the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act relating to disability freeze and disability insurance benefits so as to eliminate the age 50 requirement for such benefits, to eliminate the waiting period for such benefits in certain cases, to provide a period of trial work for certain individuals receiving such benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9451. A bill to amend Public Law 86–333 to provide that the tax exemption granted the property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the District of Columbia shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning on or after July 1, 1959; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9452. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to establish Federal registrars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9453. A bill to authorize the improvement of Little Pass, Clearwater Bay, Fla., for navigation purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9454. A bill to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9455. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9456. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a spouse's annuity be reduced if the spouse is eligible to receive certain social security benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9457. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9458. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 9459. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9460. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9461. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9462. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to spring clothespins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9463. A bill to require annual appropriations to pay the interest on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9464. A bill to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9465. A bill to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9466. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9467. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Showcase of the Arts and Sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9468. A bill to validate payments made for certain emergency conservation measures under the program authorized by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 9469. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 449. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 416. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the cost of foreign aid; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 9470. A bill for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9471. A bill for the relief of Mario Miccossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9472. A bill for the relief of George K. Maglaris and Evelyn Divakos Maglaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 9473. A bill for the relief of Sonia Gregoriades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9474. A bill for the relief of Berch Khachadourian (also known as Bertch Antranik Hadjadourian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9475. A bill for the relief of Giovanni and Ada DeMarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9476. A bill for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9477. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Lester Lee Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9478. A bill for the relief of Maximo B. Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9479. A bill for the relief of EN/3 Hideo Chuman, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9480. A bill for the relief of Ernest Delle Femine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 9481. A bill for the relief of Morris B. Espenscheid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 9482. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jen Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Staffing Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from time to time one of our colleagues writes an article of such unusual thoughtfulness and understanding that I consider it a shame we do not all have a chance to read it. Such an article appeared in the Atlantic Monthly for November, under the title "Staffing Freedom." It was written by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Eloquently, it discusses a subject long close to his heart, as it should be to all of us, the question of how to steer our most important resource; namely, the best and ablest of our young people, into positions where they can help build the kind of creative country in which we want to live, and which we would like to pass on to our children.

The article is subtitled "An Appeal." To help all of us to hear and heed it I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFFING FREEDOM—AN APPEAL BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK

(Pennsylvania's senior Senator and former mayor of Philadelphia, JOSEPH S. CLARK, donated his Bok Award funds, received in 1956, to the American Academy of Political and Social Science for a study of national personnel needs)

What kind of country do we Americans want? What kind of universe do we wish to live in?

Survival in freedom with a reasonable chance for happiness would be the answer for most of us. I think of a creative country in which there is respect for the brotherhood of man.

It is only when we start discussing policies, programs, and procedures that we get into trouble. My concern is with people, not methods. How can we find, train, and hold in the right jobs people needed to create what Walter Lippmann calls the "good society"?

Today we have no national personnel policy or plan. We do not try to steer our best young people into the careers where their brains are needed. We leave the choice to chance and the marketplace. We hope that a sense of dedication will prove more compelling than the dollar reward.

Not only are we short of teachers; too many of those we have are not really good enough. We have plenty of politicians, but many of them are hardly worth the powder to blow them away.

Does it really make sense to siphon our ability into color television, the manufacture and sale of soft drinks, cigarettes, whisky, and cosmetics, and the advertising of these commodities? Hasn't the time come to start thinking about how to put American capabilities into jobs where they can best advance American national interests?

In 1942, Military Occupation Specialty (MOS) determined where one served "the cause of freedom." The planners in the Pentagon decided the necessary qualifications of each GI and each officer required to man our armed services. That was a hot war, and this one is cold. Compulsion would not work today; but persuasion might.

They plan well in Russia. There someone decides where little Ivan is going to work. If, at the age of 11, he seems unresponsive, he goes back to the collective farm. If he shows promise, his education is continued at state expense through technical school and the university. Education and incentives for different occupations are adjusted to meet the personnel needs required by the current 5- or 7-year plain.

In continental Europe and Great Britain, educational and occupational planning is far ahead of our chaotic American hit or miss.

Would we lose our sacred freedoms if we tried by persuasion to get what others achieve by compulsion? I think not. Is it so difficult to inventory our personnel requirements? Ewan Clague, the U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, tells us that the job is already well begun. He has published a handbook estimating the prospects in 600 different occupations.

Surely wise men and women can set tentative priorities among these occupations. A White House conference on national personnel requirements would do more than start people thinking; it could determine empirically how many well-trained people we are likely to need in the next 30 years to achieve our national goals.

The next question is, How can we use both the carrot and the stick to get these young people trained and on their way to where they are needed? How can we get more and better teachers, scientists, priests, politicians, rabbis, ministers, musicians, poets, and social workers? To get them we will have to settle for fewer brewers, nightclub proprietors, and lobbyists.

Perhaps our national sense of values needs a little adjusting. Perhaps the wrong people are making too much money and the right people not enough. How about the status seekers? Can we make it as chic to be a graduate nurse working in a hospital as an interior decorator specializing in drapes?

This realization of shortage should generate a lot of talk, which sometimes in America is a prelude to action. Those old rallying points—the home, the church, and the school—might conceivably resound with fresh words and determination about a boy's future. Such talk could spread to newspaper editors, commentators, comic strip artists, and cartoonists. After a time the talk might result in a national purpose to staff freedom with our best and ablest brains instead of leaving matters to chance. The tools are at hand to do the job once the decision is made. All we need is the will to act. And the "good society" which could result might both confound communism and lift Western civilization to new heights.

Prevention of Tolls on Interstate Bridge Across Columbia River on U.S. Highway 99, Between Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, tolls on the Interstate Bridge across the Columbia River connecting Portland, Oreg., with Vancouver, Wash., were reinstituted on January 4, 1960, on the Federal Interstate Pacific Coast Highway.

Along the entire length of U.S. Highway 99 from the Canadian border to the Mexican border the Vancouver-Portland Bridge is the only toll bridge. Initially, the Portland-Vancouver Columbia River Bridge was constructed and opened on February 15, 1917, and welded Portland and Vancouver into one metropolitan trading area. Tolls were originally charged, but the bridge has been toll free for many years. A new bridge alongside the old one has been opened and tolls are now being charged.

This, I think, is a serious mistake and as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee and the Subcommittee on

Roads and Highways, I have introduced legislation, S. 2404, to provide for a toll-free bridge connecting Portland and Vancouver. This legislation is sponsored by the two distinguished Senators from Washington State, along with my colleague, Senator MORSE.

The basic mistake that has been made was by the Oregon Legislature in 1953, which provided for a new bridge with tolls. If the new bridge had been delayed just several months, it could have been incorporated into the Interstate Federal Highway System and would have qualified for 90 percent Federal aid. Both Mrs. Neuberger and I, as members of the Oregon Legislature at that time, voted against this 1953 bill which has turned out to be such a serious mistake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Oregonian of December 22 dealing with the tolls on the new Interstate Bridge, together with a copy of a letter which I have written to the editor of the newspaper dated January 7, providing my views on this important subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTIFICIAL BARRIER

Thirty-one years ago this coming New Year's Day the tolls were removed from the Interstate Bridge between Portland and Vancouver. This span, built as a joint effort by the people of Multnomah and Clark Counties, had been turned over to the State of Oregon with the firm understanding that when enough tolls had been collected to retire the bonds, the bridge forever after would be free.

Now a new bridge has been built alongside the old one. To help pay for the new bridge, tolls after January 4, 1960, will be collected from the users of both bridges. This arrangement was ordered by the 1953 Oregon Legislature despite the protests of Portland area lawmakers that this was not only of doubtful legality but also was morally indefensible.

Toll bridges are contrary to the policy of the State highway department. All of the bridges built across the wide bays crossed by Highway 101 along the Oregon coast are free. Every State-owned bridge crossing every other river in the State has been financed out of the State highway fund derived from fuel taxes, weight-mile fees on trucks, and vehicle licenses. In the entire length of U.S. Highway 99 from the Canadian to the Mexican border this will be the only toll barrier to free travel.

The people of Portland and Vancouver were farsighted enough to build the Interstate Bridge long before either Oregon or Washington had their present extensive highway networks. Its opening on February 15, 1917, made possible our present Interstate Highway System and the coastwise truck freight carriers that have built up Oregon. It welded the two cities on opposite sides of the Columbia River into one metropolitan trading area, to their mutual advantage.

Since the toll is a modest 20 cents, and heavy traffic on the bridge probably will bring in enough money to retire the bonds and lift the toll by 1970, there is a temptation to shrug off the whole issue. But Portlanders and Vancouverites should not accept this injustice with docility. Any way you look at it, the collection of tolls on the twin interstate bridges is wrong.

There are three possible ways to right this wrong: (1) Challenge in court the right of the State of Oregon to break its promise to the taxpayers of Multnomah and Clark Counties; (2) press in the 1961 Oregon and Washington Legislatures for bills to make the new bridge an obligation of the respective State highway funds; and (3) continue the efforts to make the bridge part of the Federal interstate highway program and thus eligible for 90-percent Federal financing. If those who use the interstate bridges will protest loud enough and long enough, this artificial barrier can be breached.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1960.

To the EDITOR of the OREGONIAN:

Your editorial of December 22, 1959, mentioned that one of the solutions to the levying of tolls on the interstate bridges was to continue the efforts to make the bridge part of the Federal interstate highway program and thus eligible for 90 percent Federal financing.

On July 21, 1959, as a member of the Roads and Highways Subcommittee, I introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate to accomplish this purpose. It is S. 2404. Cosponsors with me are Senator MORSE of Oregon and Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of Washington State.

The chief obstacle to passage of the bill is the opposition voiced by the Eisenhower administration. With a considerable degree of logic, spokesmen for the administration have argued that, if the interstate toll bridges are put on the Federal system, then what about the $2.5 billion worth of toll roads, bridges and tunnels in other States? The administration has argued that payment of such a colossal sum would retard interstate highway construction in every part of the Nation for many years.

In my opinion, the real blunder was made by the 1953 Oregon Legislature and Governor who, with too much haste, imposed tolls to underwrite the Interstate Bridge construction. By waiting a short time, the bridges would have been on the Federal system and thus would have qualified for 90 percent Federal aid. This was the error responsible for the present situation.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

"Why I Am a Democrat"—Address by Senator Randolph, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address, entitled "Why I Am a Democrat," by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], which was delivered recently before Bethany College.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I AM A DEMOCRAT

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, West Virginia, to the Bethany College Convocation, Bethany, W. Va., December 17, 1959)

President Gresham, members of the faculty, and students, I am appreciative of the opportunity to talk on the subject which has been assigned—Why I Am a Democrat.

Representative ARCH MOORE, my personal friend, preceded me on this platform 2 weeks ago and argued the case for the Republican Party. Knowing ARCH as a man of talents, I trust that he compensated in eloquence for that which his position on party may have lacked. Those of us in the Democratic Party ranks are more fortunate. Confident in the knowledge that truth will triumph, we can afford to exercise a measure of forbearance toward those persons who have not yet seen the light.

Therefore, to those of you who may yet be laboring in the shadows and darkness of political philosophy, I address you more with inquiry than censure. To the rest of the young ladies and the young gentlemen who are or will become Democrats, I welcome you into the challenging struggle of the unfinished business of America.

Now, why am I a Democrat?

First, I am a Democrat because I am young. And do not, in your own youth, be unkind to one who still retains the vision of his. Even though the years are magnified, I will be young with the Democratic Party.

THE YOUNGEST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

And the Democratic Party, though the oldest political party in existence, is still the youngest in this country measured by vitality. Ours is the party of youth, for it sees the world in terms of its tomorrows while not relying entirely upon its yesterdays. Ours is the party with eyes in its forehead—not in its hindhead.

In this respect I have sometimes thought that, rather than the elephant, a more appropriate symbol for the other party would be the vain and strutting peacock with a thousand eyes in its tail—all looking backward. However, the elephant, with much memory but little imagination, will do.

It is because the Democratic Party surveys the present in terms of the future that, with only slight interruptions in the past 28 years we have merited the confidence of the majority of the American people. There is justice in this condition, for our party itself has confidence in the citizen and in the American future.

An Englishman once wrote a book "America Is West," a statement which very aptly captures the essential quality of our national strength.

These qualities—of youth, of optimism, of confidence in the frontiers of the future—lie at the heart of the American spirit and of the Democratic Party. It was this spirit which again resulted in the mandate of the electorate having been given to our party in 1958, and enabled us virtually to sweep the congressional and State elections from Maine to California.

It is this purpose which continues to animate the Democratic Party and provides it with new vigor and new ideas.

We hear much today of the need for new faces in politics. But what of the need for new ideas? It is no paradox that the grand matriarch of the Democratic Party, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, is still intellectually one of the most youthful members of our party, looking always for the infusion of fresh ideas to solve the problems of our times.

But the Republican Party, which occasionally brings forth new faces—as it did in 1952—still espouses the time-worn doctrines of the age of McKinley—or, at best, begrudgingly accepts some of the ideas of the New Deal as unfortunate necessity.

The valid concept of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—and most of them were valid—have become an enduring part of our national, political, and economic life, and have prevented the recurrence of the tragedies of the era of the thirties. Just as the great depression tested the assumptions of the philosophy of "let nature take its course"—and found those assumptions insufficient, so has the period since World War II tested the basic principles of the New Deal—and

found them valid. Three times since World War II—in 1949, 1954, and 1958—we have been faced with recession, and on each occasion the reforms of the New Deal have helped turn the tide before it reached a full-scale depression. Thus, the New Deal and Fair Deal programs—social security, protection for bank depositors and investors, wage and hour legislation, expansion of the public works sector of the economy, and agricultural benefits—among many others—have been fully justified.

And yet these three recent recessions have cost the Nation an estimated $400 billion in the loss of production of goods and services—enough to retire the entire national debt, modernize our highway system, provide the necessary schools and hospitals for our people, and cleanse our slums.

FULL-TIME REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET

We can conclude, therefore, that the programs of the past need to be reevaluated and supplemented. The ever-present fact of change brings forth new problems that demand solutions. Part-time attention to full-time requirements will not suffice.

Emerson once stated that "conservatism is a fault of character." The desire merely to hold to what we have—to be satisfied with the status quo—the failure to explore the future for fear of the unknown—are attitudes born of little faith and less vision.

Now I do not wish to imply that there is no place for the function of conservatism. On the contrary, the Democratic Party has its conservative elements which provide the invaluable asset of assuring that all interests will be weighed and considered before party action is taken. The southerners, by and large, represent such an attitude, and not solely on matters of race relations. The farmers, in certain respects, represent another. And even labor, which has its vested interest in maintaining job security as a property right, occasionally acts as a conservative force in the broad sense.

But all of these elements must be balanced by the force of innovation and invention. Conservatism and experimentation in the body politic are paralleled by memory and imagination in the individual. And in both organisms, both qualities are equally necessary for life to proceed at a truly human level.

It is not enough merely to hold the ground established by those who have gone before us. It is not sufficient to rest with the legacy of the past. But, we must know what we want if we are to improve upon the world we have inherited. We must strengthen the foundation of the society we want.

There is a second reason why I am a Democrat: The Democratic Party is not afraid to dare. Our party, since its founding by Thomas Jefferson in 1794, has been willing to experiment in the public interest.

And it is no accident of history that throughout our national life the significant surges of growth toward the realization of the American dream have been associated with the Democratic Party. In the early days of the Republic it was the States-rights agrarianism of Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party which routed the narrow mercantile philosophy of the Federalists. I might add, parenthetically, that although Jefferson's party dropped the Republican suffix in 1828, one still finds a Democrat here and there who has not heard of that simplification.

Later, under what we now call Jacksonian Democracy, the western frontiersmen and the eastern mechanics and laborers joined forces to assert their rights of self-government. They were a vigorous group who challenged the patrician prerogatives of the gentry, but they dramatized the ideal of universal suffrage. Then, as in more recent times, it was fashionable to hold the Democratic Party in contempt in so-called polite drawing room circles. As the future Mrs. Jefferson Davis wrote in astonishment of husband-to-be in the early 1840's, "Would you believe it, he is refined and cultivated, and yet he is a Democrat."

And in the 20th century, the New Freedoms of Woodrow Wilson, the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, and the Fair Deal of Harry S. Truman—all stand as bench marks for the rising tide of American achievement.

A PARTY OF WORLD LEADERSHIP

The Democratic Party has been no less creative in the field of international relations now that the United States has been propelled into the international community. Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, his "self-determination of nations" and his idea of the League of Nations—though defeated by the circumstances of history—served their time in stirring men's aspirations for international peace and justice.

Today, we Americans and the world at large live in debt to Franklin Roosevelt's idea of the United Nations. Nor could this hope have been brought to fruition without the courage and compassion of the Marshall plan and the point 4 program under President Truman. Party loyalties and partisan bias cannot lessen the importance of these achievements.

Before continuing with a discussion of the present challenge to the creativity of the Democratic Party, there is a third reason why I am a Democrat. It is the party which embraces the broadest interests of the American people. And I say, with all respect—and some sympathy for members of the minority party—ours is the only really national party.

The American political party system is not ideologically oriented as are most of the European systems, and, to a somewhat less extent, the British. Our parties are based upon the representation of different geographic, vocational, economic, and ethnic interests rather than political ideologies. But there is a difference between them.

It can be shown from a study of American history that the Republican Party, and its forebears, the Whig and Federalist, have been largely and sometimes almost exclusively concerned with the protection of private property interests. In the 18th and early 19th centuries, when the concept of property was based upon the ownership of land and the mechanisms of a mercantile economy, the Federalists and Whigs dominated the landed gentry and the wealthy merchants.

Later, during the dynamic 19th century industrial expansion the concept of private property became identified with the ownership of factories, mines, and railroads. Thus, after the Civil War it was the powerful industrial and railroad barons who captured the Republican Party and defeated the hopes of Abraham Lincoln.

Finally, during the 20th century, the concept of private property has again shifted under the development of the corporation as the major economic institution. And in this century we have found that the representatives of the major corporations have gained ascendancy in the councils of the Republican Party. The farmer, the small businessman, the worker, the aged and the unemployed may advance their claims only if the budget is balanced to the satisfaction of the dominant business executives.

BELIEVERS IN PRIVATE PROPERTY PRESERVATION

And though some of our opponents in the Republican Party would have you believe otherwise, the Democratic Party is also dedicated to the preservation of private property. The main difference between the two parties in this respect would seem to be that we in the Democratic Party have a broader understanding of the meaning of private property.

The property interests of the corporation are only a segment of the total area of the meaning of property rights. Without a fair price for his commodities, the farmer's property rights become an ironic jest—and a poor one.

Without protection against predatory competition and monopolistic trade practices the property rights of the small businessman are void and meaningless.

Finally, within an economic system in which more and more people are becoming salaried workers, we must recognize that the pattern of property rights must be extended to the right of a worker to secure productive employment, the right of the scholar and the scientist to perform the functions in society.

In thus recognizing a broader definition of property rights the Democratic Party has sought to extend the fruits of democracy to an ever widening number of people. For this reason the Democratic Party continues to attract, in ever increasing numbers, the farmer, the laborer, the small businessman, the intellectual—and all those who look to the future, rather than to the past.

IMPORTANT TASKS CHALLENGE YOUTH

And now, before closing, a few words to you young ladies and gentlemen who are the custodians of the not-so-distant future: The suffrage battles of the 19th century have been won. And many of the critical economic issues of the 20th century have been solved. But much remains to be done today—and history will see to it that there will be ample tasks for your generation tomorrow.

Yet it is not heartening to learn that only one-third of the young men and women between ages 21 and 35 bother to vote, in comparison to two-thirds of the middle-aged and three-fourths of those 60 years and older. To some extent your elders and instructors have failed you by not communicating the meaning of democratic responsibilities. But in a larger sense, if you are among the eligible who do not or will not vote, you have failed yourselves and your community. It is not another's responsibility to lead you by the hand. It is your responsibility and yours alone to learn the meaning of democracy and to give substance to that meaning as a free individual. And to be free, to be truly free, means to be free of ignorance and apathy as well as fear.

This, then, is the first injunction your times lay upon you: To seek, to explore, and to learn the meaning of democracy. Then on the basis of reasoned evaluation—not from habit or inertia—and only partly from self-interest—to make your choices and to take part in the great dialogue of democracy.

The foremost, and the final, issue for each of you is to make your life significant—to participate, at whatever level, in the destiny of your times—and regardless of party affiliations—to make your weight felt for truth and justice and the dignity of the individual.

International Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the fine results of our cultural exchange program in promoting international good will have been a revelation to all. The performing arts, at home and abroad, are a crown of our cultural life and achievement. For 75 years without fanfare, the

American Academy of Dramatic Arts has gone on quietly providing sound and inspirational training in this field. President Eisenhower took note of the celebration of this birthday by sending a commendation. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his telegram printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1959.

Miss FRANCES FULLER,
President, Director, American Academy of Dramatic Arts:

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of the 75th anniversary of the American Academy of Dramatic Arts.

This institution has provided training for a distinguished company of artists in the finest tradition of the American theater. With encouragement and discipline, it has helped them to develop their talents for the benefit of a great audience.

Congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel Before National Convention of National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], speaking before the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D.C., on May 14, 1959, made some very challenging remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by him on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS OF U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL TO THE 46TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1959, MAYFLOWER HOTEL

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to greet you this morning and to welcome you to the Nation's Capital.

We have much in common. You are concerned with water resources and their sound utilization in behalf of all Americans. I share this concern, although I am certain you will forgive me for what may appear to you to be a sometimes parochial interest in the needs of my own State.

In most parts of the country, water is something that is there when and where it is needed, and people simply take it for granted. But to those of us who live in the West, the scarcity of water has been and remains a chronically serious condition that needs constant attention.

California is one of the 17 States generally defined as belonging to the semiarid West. In our part of the continent, water is and always has been the key to survival. Not long ago, a distinguished American historian from Senator JOHNSON's famed State declared that the greatest unifying force in the West has been the great American Desert.

Very early in this century, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Federal Reclamation Act into law. Since the beginnings of that Act, the Federal Government in cooperation with the States has sought the means and techniques needed to meet the ever-increasing demands of the States with the greatest water scarcity.

Storage facilities have been built to conserve the erratic runoff of melting snow water. Great dams have been built, and a natural byproduct, hydroelectric power generation, has followed from these storage dams and reservoirs.

I have said in the Senate and in my State many times that the people of California are indebted to the Federal Government. The Central Valley project represents the difference between economic life and death in the two central valleys. In southern California where my home is, we are indebted to the great Hoover Dam, which was fought through the Senate years ago by the late great Hiram Johnson, who fought against tremendous odds in order finally to win approval by the Senate, and thereafter by the House of Representatives, of a gigantic multipurpose structure which today brings water and hydroelectric power into almost every area of southern California.

But our needs are very great. There must be an assured supply of water for people in our cities and for industrial use. There must be water for irrigation and for the expansion of industry. Since 1940 the West has experienced the greatest population growth of any part of the Nation. It most likely will continue to experience this expansion for many years to come.

It is anticipated that the population of the United States will increase to 225 million people by 1975. Water needs will skyrocket from 185 billion gallons a day in 1950 to 450 billion gallons by 1975. Can there be any doubt that meeting this demand is the proper concern of all Americans?

Spectacular developments may come in finding an economically sound method of converting sea water into fresh water. If so, we may find the earth capable for the first time in human history of providing enough food for all its inhabitants.

Your organization plays a vital role in stimulating a continuing interest in water resources. From your interest may emerge the solution to problems such as that confronting the semiarid West and perhaps, thereby, the solution of water problems on a worldwide scale.

If Peace Were To Break Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today in America, and perhaps throughout the world, the question of the economic effects on the world of a permanent peace is being considered. My good friend and distinguished colleague from Colorado, Mr. BYRON L. JOHNSON, was the author of a very thought-provoking article on this subject which appeared in the December 9, 1959, issue of the Christian Century. Because some Members may have missed this interesting article, I take this opportunity to commend it to them for serious reading at the beginning of this new decade in American history:

IF PEACE WERE TO BREAK OUT—A CONGRESSMAN FROM COLORADO ARGUES THAT THE UNITED STATES CAN DISARM WITHOUT PRODUCING A COLLAPSE IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

(By Hon. BYRON L. JOHNSON, of Colorado)

The current discussion of disarmament carries a tragic undertone. The fearful ask, "Won't this cause a depression?"

The United States is currently spending $46.4 billion on its military program at home and overseas, encompassing mutual security, atomic energy, military construction, and the regular appropriation for the Defense Establishment. This represents almost 10 percent of the annual gross national product which amounted to $484.5 billion in the second quarter of 1959. The national income in the second quarter of 1959 was reported at $403.9 billion.

The Defense Establishment employs directly the 2,525,000 people who are in uniform and a civilian force of 947,600; defense production employs a comparable number. The economy of many communities is tied to defense establishment and defense production. It is not surprising therefore that many citizens express concern that disarmament would eliminate as many as 5 million jobs. They fear that disarmament would cause a severe depression. The persistence of this fear is indicated by the number and variety of audiences that have asked me about the consequences of disarmament. It does no good to argue that our national policy is not decided entirely by our own answers to the question raised by the prospect of demilitarization. The existence of the fear of economic collapse is a fact, and this fact is bound to influence the attitudes of the public and of some policymakers.

I

The fundamental question which must be answered first is this: Are the fears justified? If peace should break out, will there be a new depression? Perhaps you have also wondered about this question. As it happens, I have two reasons for answering the question with an unqualified "no." My first reason is basically personal, for I had to examine the disarmament issue—a very live one at the time—in 1944 as a Budget Bureau staff member. My second reason arises out of my work as an economist and a student of national income. Modern economists know what steps to take to adjust the economy of the United States to the cessation of war production and to general disarmament—and they know how to do this with a minimum of dislocation.

Let's first take a look at economic theory and then go back to examine economic history. Our annual national income is the total result of all the effective demands for goods and services in the market in the course of a year. This demand comes in part from households—for food, clothing, shelter, entertainment, medical care, transportation, etc. It comes from the business community in its demand for goods and services, both consumable supplies and capital plant. Finally, it also comes from government in the effective demand for public service at the local, State, and Federal level. This includes the demand for personal service, new capital plant, materials, and supplies.

Any sharp reduction in the demand of any one of the three sectors—consumers, business, government—without a compensating adjustment in the other two will trigger

some recession in economic activity. Similarly, a sharp increase in the effective demand for goods and services in any of these sectors without an offsetting adjustment in another sector precipitates expansion in the economy. This expansion will normally take the form of increased output. If, however, the economy is fully employed, then to attempt to expand one sector without cutting back another tends largely to create price inflation, rather than to increase total output.

The war period, 1939 to 1945, was a perfect illustration of the inflationary situation. The Federal Government increased its demand for goods and services in astronomical amounts without raising taxes by a like amount. Much of the money which it created to help finance the war was new money created by the banking system. The new money first triggered a recovery from the depression; then when full employment was reached in 1942, it set in motion a significant inflationary pressure.

Let's now take a quick look at the reverse of the process, using the period from 1945 to 1948 as our test case. Total Federal expenditures for all national defense activities amounted to $81.2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. While studying this period early in 1944, I thought it easy to predict what would happen. There were more than 12 million persons in the Armed Forces; it was assumed that most of these would be discharged, and that at least 8 or 9 million persons employed directly in war production would be released from their jobs.

The consequences of peace seemed obvious to almost every economist in Washington with whom I talked at the time. With impending sharp budget cuts and with almost 20 million people to be cut off from their war-related source of income, numerous authorities estimated that the level of unemployment would rise very sharply within 6 to 9 months after the end of the war. The most optimistic expected 6 million unemployed; the pessimistic prophesied more than 12 million unemployed. It was recognized that the GI bill of rights, then being developed, would remove a few of the veterans from the labor market and put them in school. It was expected that some of the aged entitled to retirement would retire, and that some of the working wives would go back into the kitchen. (For some reason, our statistics on labor do not count housewives as employed persons unless they are paid by someone other than their own husbands.)

The businessmen had been queried as to how long it would take them to reconvert from wartime to peacetime production, and had replied that it would be a long period of transition—from 90 days to 9 months. Under these circumstances, some businessmen and economists fearfully foretold that the United States would experience a major recession following the end of World War II.

In 1944, it was difficult for many people to imagine a total Federal budget much larger than $20 billion. A few had predicted that the postwar budget might reach $25 billion. The Federal budget for all purposes in 1939 was $7.9 billion; a $15 billion to $20 billion estimate therefore seemed a high figure indeed. (In actuality the Federal budget after the war never fell below the 1948 figure of $33 billion.)

President Truman, you will recall, instructed Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson to bring the military budget down sharply, and Johnson complied. The Federal budget was cut by two-thirds in 3 short years. The Bureau of the Budget reports that total Federal spending was reduced from $98.4 billion in 1945 to $33.1 billion in the fiscal year of 1948—a reduction of $65.3 billion. Major national security programs were reduced from $81.2 billion in 1945 to $11.8 billion in 1948—a reduction of $67 billion or about 86 percent. Total military personnel on active duty was reduced from 12.3 million on June 30, 1945, to 1.5 million on June 30, 1948. The table below summarizes these facts year by year:

TABLE I.—*Military budget and personnel, 1945–48*

Fiscal year	Federal expenditures for major national security functions	Military personnel on active duty June 30
1945	$81,216,000,000	12,294,647
1946	43,176,000,000	3,056,494
1947	14,368,000,000	1,601,683
1948	11,771,000,000	1,465,773

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1959, pp. 247-248.

II

What about the depression? Where was the depression? What happened? The table shows what happened by quarters for the period from V–E Day through 1948 to the gross national product, to the number of employed and to the number of unemployed.

Remember the wartime book in which a Vice President suggested a postwar goal of 60 million jobs? At the time the cynics hooted in derision. But Henry Wallace was really a piker; we had more than 60 million civilian jobs by June of 1947. Unemployment never reached the levels we feared.

TABLE II.—*Income and employment, 1945–48*

Year	Gross national product	Civilian employment in the United States	
		Number employed	Number unemployed
	Billions		
1945—March	$221.8	53,230,000	590,000
June	220.2	54,570,000	890,000
September	213.4	51,400,000	1,650,000
December	197.1	51,160,000	1,970,000
1946—March	191.7	52,460,000	2,700,000
June	197.0	65,360,000	2,570,000
September	207.5	57,050,000	2,070,000
December	218.6	56,310,000	2,120,000
1947—March	226.4	56,060,000	2,330,000
June	228.3	60,055,000	2,555,000
September	227.9	58,872,000	1,912,000
December	243.8	57,947,000	1,643,000
1948—March	244.9	57,329,000	2,440,000
June	250.2	61,296,000	2,184,000
September	254.9	60,312,000	1,899,000
December	260.8	59,434,000	1,941,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Handbook of Labor Statistics," 1950, p. 35.

How did this development take place? What became of the prophets of doom and gloom of 1944 and 1945? What happened to the warworkers who said on V–J Day, "I suppose this means I lose my job?"

In the first place, the businessmen converted from war to peace more rapidly than they had anticipated they would. In the second place, the backlog of demand by consumers for goods began to express itself immediately. Third, the tremendous supply of liquid assets (Government bonds, cash, savings accounts) in the hands of consumers and businesses provided funds with which they promptly sought to buy more goods and services. Specifically, total bank loans amounted to $28 billion on June 30, 1945, while those for August 26, 1959, were estimated at $129 billion. This represents an increase of 460 percent. In other words, all elements of the American economy—consumers, businesses, and government—worked together to employ additional resources for producing the goods and services desired in peacetime, and this outpouring of effective demand accelerated the process of reconversion. The warworkers found peacetime jobs. Many servicemen found satisfactory employment; others returned to school. Some housewives went back into the kitchen, and some of the aged retired.

Does this experience have any meaning for our present situation? I am reminded by the fearful that our circumstances today are not identical. For example, there has been no rationing, no priorities on housing, and no credit restraint. Many circumstances associated with World War II do not now pertain. Yet this is not the whole story.

While there has been no rationing or priorities to limit output, we still have not built enough houses to keep up with the growth of population and the loss of houses that comes with obsolescence, fire, slum clearance, and new highways. Business firms, in face of the high interest rates now prevailing, have not extended their capital plants as freely as many of them would like. We still have shortages of municipal waterworks, sewage treatment plants, and hospitals for our rapidly growing urban population. Every householder can think of a number of things he would like to buy if he had the necessary income.

We financed much of World War II by borrowing, so that postwar cuts in spending did not permit an immediate cut in taxes. We are financing this year's national budget entirely out of taxes. Therefore, if we could now reduce the level of spending, we could simultaneously reduce the level of Federal taxes. This would immediately increase the funds available to consumers and to business firms for new purchases of capital items and other goods and services.

I am sure all of us would be very happy to have a tax cut. Everyone can quickly think of the things that, as a result of this cut, he would buy with the extra income left in his pocket. Interest rates ought to come down at the same time; then State and local governments would increase their construction of the necessary public facilities.

Thus, if peace were to break out, it would not require a major effort on the part of the Federal Government to restore prosperity. But if such an eventuality did require Federal action, the form of the action would not be hard to imagine. We are now using grants-in-aid in fairly large amounts to build highways. A generous increase in grants-in-aids for public construction would give rise to substantial additional employment.

Similarly, an expansion of Federal services in the fields of health, education, welfare, and recreation would be most welcome. It goes without saying that one of our greatest needs today is the construction of adequate school plant facilities to meet the vastly expanded and still skyrocketing pupil enrollments. And some demographers claim that our population will double in the next 50 years. An acceleration of the present program of urban renewal would permit us to revitalize the American cities now decaying at their core.

III

Finally, if peace were to break out, we should certainly devote a larger portion of our national income to the works of peace. These include greater participation in the education and development of the so-called underdeveloped economies. A program of overseas investment would help provide constructive employment for millions of Americans, both at home and abroad.

More liberal and expanded foreign trade would be another part of this adjustment to peace. Business and agriculture must increasingly produce goods for foreign countries. The more Americans buy from other countries, the more other countries will be able to buy from us.

The results of disarmament therefore should be these: (1) a more peaceful world; (2) the devotion of a larger portion of our national budget to constructive and creative public services; (3) the expansion of the

commercial sector of the American economy to provide a wider variety and a more generous supply of goods and services for the people of America and of the world; (4) a higher standard of living for the American consumer; (5) an international campaign to eliminate hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty from the face of the earth.

If peace were to break out, there should be a new era of prosperity, here and elsewhere. History is on our side in this argument. If peace should break out, if disarmament should come, and we still fail to accomplish these goals, it will be because we do not have the will to accomplish them.

The necessary financial and economic institutions and techniques are available But they will only be used if we have the wisdom, the faith, and the courage to use them. Every constructive step toward a more abundant life deserves our support. The fearful and those of little faith may be among the real stumbling blocks to the accomplishment of the new opportunities of peace. Be ye numbered not among them. Let history, logic, and faith sustain you in undertaking and pursuing the paths of peace.

The Farm Problem Can Be Solved With the Soil Bank Withdrawal Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 I wrote President Eisenhower as follows:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure you remember well when in August 1952 you called me to your western campaign headquarters in the Brown Palace Hotel at Denver, Colo., to debate the question of 90-percent supports for the six basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice versus flexible supports; and almost immediately afterward you announced in your speech at Kansas City that you were for 90-percent supports, at least, so long as that law, which was then in effect, and would be in effect until 1954.

After the flexible parity supports was made law in 1954, it was necessary for the corn and wheat farmers to not only increase their acres, but also to fertilize to the hilt in order to produce enough bushels of cash crops, corn and wheat, in order to have enough dollars to pay increased operating costs—higher machinery costs, taxes, etc.—in the diversified farming section of the United States, "the breadbasket of America." Now, as we all know, since 1954 our corn and wheat surpluses have mounted year after year, which was inevitable under the farm program which has been in effect since 1954, to the end that the costly price depressing surplus of corn for example, has had the effect of not only forcing down the price of corn, but has taken hog, cattle, and poultry prices down, down with it; and unless we put into effect a program which will effectively reduce our staggering corn surplus held by the CCC which now hangs dangerously over the head of all our corn and livestock farmers of the breadbasket of America, nothing can stop the further decline in such prices, and the end result can only be complete disaster for our farmers, and finally for our entire national economy. Let us never forget for a minute that all new wealth springs from the soil, is mined or pumped out of the bowels of the earth, or is fished out of the waters, in the form of raw products, on which every American must depend for employment in producing, transporting, processing, marketing or using the finished product. Also, since that is a fact, it is plain to see our economic growth can only be soundly generated from its source, and our farmers always spend over twice as many dollars, when his dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter, than the rest of us Americans spend on an average for manufactured commodities made by the wage earners of the United States.

Were it not for the fact that we have for the past several years been spending over $40 billion for military purposes, which has in effect created here an artificial prosperity, generated from the top (but which we cannot forever endure) the overall economic effect of our farmers' 80-cent dollar has been offset by employment in the manufacturing of military supplies of every nature; while sound, deep-thinking Americans everywhere are asking, "What will the harvest be if farming, our basic industry, goes down the drain?" Disaster for all, will be our lot.

Now, Mr. President, there is an answer. You had that answer in your address to Congress on January 9, 1956, when the Soil Bank Act was afterward made law, but without your recommendation that it be financed with commodities already owned and paid for by the Government; but your recommendation was ignored, as you well remember. Had your recommendation of 1956 been made law at that time, our farmers would not be in the squeeze they find themselves today. You are no doubt aware that the American Farm Bureau Federation in its convention at Boston, Mass., last December affirmed its support of the soil bank program to retire land from production with payments in kind (in corn and wheat, for instance) from Government stocks for participation in the soil bank program. You will, I am sure, be greatly interested in reading the Soil Bank Withdrawal Plan by Mr. Dave Livingston, our mutual farmer friend of Washington, Iowa, in which he gives facts and figures which prove that by paying very liberally in kind, we can solve the farm problem for the livestock and grain farmers, quickly and effectively.

Respectfully,

BEN F. JENSEN.

THE SOIL BANK WITHDRAWAL PLAN

(By Dave Livingston, Washington, Iowa)

Hog prices are now disastrously low. There are now too many hogs. There is an increase of 5 percent in the Corn Belt in the last 3 years.

Poultry prices are also too low and for the same reason.

Cattle feeders have 20 percent more cattle and calves on feed in the 21 major feed in States over a year ago. Thirteen of these States have a record number on feed as of October 1, 1959.

There is only one reason for all of this and that is the fact that there is too much feed available. The only time we have too many animals is when we have too much feed. Livestock numbers always adjust themselves to feed supplies.

There is, therefore, one answer and only one answer to the whole farm problem and that is to find a way to reduce the surplus feed supply without injuring the whole agricultural setup.

The only way this can be done is to set up a Soil Bank Withdrawal Plan whereby the surplus grain, now in the hands of the Government, as the result of accumulation under the soil bank and previous plans, can be withdrawn to pay the rent on feed grain acreage to be put out of production in 1960.

How can this be done?

First of all the Acreage Reserve Section of the Soil Bank Act should be reinstated for a period of at least 3 years. There never was anything wrong with the Soil Bank Act that could not have been corrected by stopping cash rental payments and paying the rent in grain on a realistic basis of using one bushel of surplus to stop the production of one bushel of new crop.

This would return feed grains to acreage allotments as they were at the close of 1958. In other words, we would start over again where we left off at the end of 1958 but this time we would use the grain surpluses for money to eliminate the surpluses. To quote from President Eisenhower's speech to Congress on January 9, 1956, when the Soil Bank Act was introduced, "It will be financed with commodities already owned and paid for by the Government. Time and shrinkage, storage and other costs are eroding away the present value of these stocks." To quote again:

"There are virtues in the plan.

"It will reduce the massive and unproductive storage costs on Government holdings—costs that are running into a million dollars a day.

"It will reduce the crushing burden of surpluses, the essential precondition for the successful operation of a sound farm program.

"It will provide an element of insurance since farmers are assured income from the reserve acres even in a year of crop failure.

"It will ease the apprehension of our friends abroad over our surplus-disposal program.

"It will harmonize agricultural production with peacetime markets." Unquote.

The same situation obtains now as at the time this original plan was introduced and the above quotes fit the present situation precisely.

Each year beginning in 1960, 10 percent of the corn acreage allotments, as they existed in 1958, should be set aside and seeded and the rent on these acres paid with corn out of Government storage. Beginning with the oldest corn in storage (1952) this offer would be on the basis of 100 percent of the rated yield for each farm on the ASC listing at the county office. If your farm was rated at 80 bushels per acre, then you would be offered 80 bushels of 1952 corn for each acre you seeded down in 1960. When the 1952 corn was gone, then 1953 would be used and so on until all the corn in bins in this county was used up. Of course, the 1952 corn would not have the feed value of new corn, which you would raise, but on the other hand, you would not have the cost of plowing, disking, harrowing, planting, cultivating and harvesting. Therefore, it would be a pretty good deal for any farmer aside from the fact that he would be assisting in the elimination of the greatest problem we have in agriculture today.

It would be voluntary. No farmer would be forced to participate. Each year every farmer would be allowed to bid acreage between 10 and 25 percent of his acreage allotment to put under the plan. This would give each farmer a chance to place whole fields under the plan. In case there were more acres bid than there was corn to go around, then "First come, first serve" just as the conservation reserve is handled now.

All this requires no new law, no new organization and no new expense. All that is required is an extension of an old law to be administered by the ASC committees to use up the corn now owned by the Government. All that is required is to spell out the details more clearly, some imagination and determination and probably some new faces at top levels. To quote again from the President's speech, "It will help remove the crushing burden of surpluses, the essential precondition for the successful operation of a sound farm program."

THE COUNTYWIDE PICTURE

Now take a look at Washington County. Let's see what would happen. This same analysis can be made for the other counties too.

Amount of corn in storage in Washington County by years:

	Bushels
1953 and older	967,509
1954	111,976
1955	87,660
1956	144,090
1957	11,499
1958	11,819
Total	1,334,553

Total corn acreage 1958, 180,558.

Average yield per acre, 71.1 bushels.

This means then that we would take this corn in storage and offer it in Washington County at the average rate of 71.1 bushels per acre to get 10,855 acres of Washington County farmland out of production in 1960. Your allotment would vary one way or the other from the 71.1 figure depending on the rating of your farm in the ASC office. If you wanted to participate you would sign up next spring for the number of acres you would be willing to put under the plan (between 10 percent and 25 percent of your allotment) and then you would get your corn in October in payment.

If you take 10,855 acres out of production at 71.1 bushels per acre then you come up with 771,790 used up in 1960 as money and taken from Government bins and no new corn will be raised to take its place. It would get rid of nearly 80 percent of the 1952 and 1953 corn in this county. And that corn would not have to be shipped away or handled except to get it to the farms in this county. Do the same thing again in 1961 and all the corn in Washington County, now in Government bins, would be used up.

THE STATEWIDE PICTURE

Take a look at the totals for the State of Iowa and here is what you come up with:

1953 and older	67,658,715
1954	24,114,592
1955	36,752,156
1956	47,529,442
1957	13,547,009
1958	9,113,128
Total	198,715,042

Total corn acreage, 1958, 9,979,258.

Average yield, approximately 56 bushels.

Put 10 percent out of production in 1960, 997,925 acres.

At 56 bushels per acre, 56 bushels.

Number of bushels used in 1960, 55,883,800.

When that 55 million bushels is gone it is gone. No new bushels will be raised under this plan to replace them and it costs no new money.

On November 25, 1959, I received the following reply from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 25, 1959.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Exira, Iowa.

DEAR BEN: I have your letter and I shall have your suggestion studied seriously; later you will receive a report of the results.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

Mr. Speaker, just as soon as I can get reprints made of this speech I will send copies to all farm magazines in the United States, many newspapers and radio stations, to hundreds of people in and outside of my district, to Members of Congress, including every member of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely every unbiased, thinking American, including every Member of Congress is concerned about the farm problem and are anxious to have an early, effective, economical solution to it, which can be accomplished with the soil bank withdrawal plan, if Congress does its duty, and quickly.

William C. Hull, Executive Assistant to the U.S. Civil Service Commissioners, September 23, 1891, to December 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Washington in 1921 as a young Member of Congress, one of the men in the Civil Service Commission who was very understanding and always ready to render any service within the limits of the civil service regulations was William C. Hull, the executive assistant to the U.S. Civil Service Commissioners, a position to which he had been appointed under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, and it was with much sadness that I learned of his passing.

Mr. Hull had served during administrations of 9 Presidents and under 30 of the 48 Civil Service Commissioners in the 76-year history of CSC. The occasion of his golden anniversary in Federal service was marked informally by CSC officials and employees in September 1958, with a reception at which Harris Ellsworth, then Chairman of the Commission, paid tribute to Mr. Hull on behalf of the CSC staff.

All but 3 weeks of Mr. Hull's long service had been with the Civil Service Commission. He entered Federal service on September 18, 1908, with the Patent Office, serving there until October 3 of the same year. On October 5, 1908, he started work as a messenger at $360 a year for the Commission. He became executive assistant to the Commissioners on October 18, 1917.

Mr. Hull's long and able service brought him many commendations. Among them was a golden anniversary salute from Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, in an extension of remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "I think every Member of Congress who has had occasion to transact any business with the Civil Service Commission during the time he or she has been a Member of Congress, will agree with me that Mr. William Hull, who has so ably served for a number of years as executive assistant to the Commission, is one of our most outstanding public servants," Representative MCMILLAN said. "Because of his experience accumulated over the years and his close associations with Commissioners, he is a frequent and authoritative source of information to Members of Congress, high-ranking department and agency officials, representatives of union and veteran groups."

The Commission gave formal recognition to his many contributions to the Federal service by presenting him a special citation for outstanding devotion to the public service at the Commission's diamond anniversary awards ceremony on January 16, 1958. He was named "civil servant of the year" by AMVETS in 1959.

Despite his long and distinguished career with the Civil Service Commission, which reflected great credit upon the civil service, he never worried about titles or grades for himself and at the time of his death he still held a grade 14, although he was assistant to the U.S. civil service Commissioners. His one great interest was upholding the dignity and integrity of the civil service itself and interesting himself in seeing that other employees were justly recognized.

A native of Arlington County, Va., Mr. Hull was long active in community affairs. He served on the boards of trustees of the Arlington Community Chest and Arlington Hospital Association and as vice president of the latter, and as secretary of the Leeway Citizens Association. He has been a delegate to the Arlington County Civic Federation and to the Inter-Federation Council, during this time serving as president of the federation and chairman of the council. He was also a charter member of Lodge 32 of the American Federation of Government Employees and a member of Local No. 2, National Federation of Federal Employees.

He is survived by his wife, Gladys, of their home, 2255 North Powhatan Street, Arlington; two daughters, Mildred Page, Annandale, and Marguerite Oakley, Arlington; two brothers and four sisters to whom, I know, my colleagues join in an expression of deep sympathy.

Peace and Jobs for 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the 86th Congress moves into the second session the thoughts and attention of all of us are focused, of course, on the underlying goals and objectives of this legislative period.

In that connection, just before leaving to come to Washington, I released to the people of my district a statement of my own views on the major goals and objectives of this session, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this statement:

At the start of this second session of the 86th Congress I want to express again to all the people of our district my sincere

thanks for the honor of serving as your representative in Washington during the past year.

Many complex and controversial items of legislation confront us in 1960. But two tasks stand out as particularly urgent and important.

First and foremost is the need for more jobs. Congress must pass pending legislation to deal with localized, chronic unemployment such as we have been having in so many parts of our district—especially unemployment directly caused by unfair, low-wage competition from abroad. Besides that we need to make sure that New York, as an established industrial State, is not placed at any disadvantage in attracting new productive facilities or in obtaining our fair share of Government and defense contracts.

Second, we must leave no stone unturned in trying to translate into hard reality the new hopes for some easing of world tensions stimulated by President Eisenhower's recent 11-nation tour. Since in today's world a secure and lasting peace must rest on effective deterrent military power, Congress must also insist that America refuse to accept any second-best consolation prize in the vital race for missile development and the control of space.

Actually jobs and a sound peace go hand in hand. For only by insuring that American productive machinery calls on the full energies of all our citizens can we really make our best contribution to a better, more prosperous, and more peaceful world.

In working in the coming year for these two major goals I sincerely believe that I will be serving not only the best interests of our district but of our Nation.

May I wish all of you a peaceful and prosperous New Year.

The Corn Tassel as U.S. Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, these days there are many decisions Congress is required to make. There are many steps which Congress has an obligation to take. There are many questions Congress is bound to deliberate for the well-being of the country and its people. At the outset, I will say that the question of a floral emblem does not stand in the highest rank in order of priority. But this fact does not make selection of an emblem a lighthearted, gay, jocular pastime for the Congress. It is about the selection of an emblem that I speak today.

I bring it up at this time, Mr. Speaker, because in recent weeks the subject of a floral emblem has been mentioned. Much has been made over the various positions held by advocates of certain flowers, shrubs, and plants. Contradictory views have been expressed over the relative beauty of proposed flowers and growths. I believe that if we decide to take the time to consider an emblem we should give this subject the full deliberation it deserves. For that reason, I have a few remarks dealing with what I believe to be the qualities desired in an emblem.

I believe that selection of an emblem is more important than any ordinary beauty contest. A national emblem is, after all, a symbol of our entire country, its people, its past, and its qualities of character as it faces the future.

For that reason, I believe that the entire nature of a plant—its identification with and importance to America—should be taken into consideration. A Minnesota woman, Miss Margo Cairns, of Minneapolis, has long pointed out the desirability of the corn tassel as our national emblem. She has cited the fact that corn has been identified with America, that it was literally the major crop of the Indian as well as the pioneers, and that our history is replete with examples of human dependency on corn.

Miss Cairns has written:

A national floral emblem must also be distinctively and wholly American. It, too, must be a symbol of the land, the Nation, its people, its history.

1. It must be of American origin, born in the Western Hemisphere, and found nowhere else before 1492.

2. It must have its roots in every State, unifying the Nation.

3. It must serve the Nation, and it certainly has served it well from the first landings on the Atlantic coast to the present.

4. It must not be a flower of mere prettiness, but possess the rare beauty of practicality, or productivity.

5. Its choice as a national floral emblem should be based on gratitude for what it has been, is, and always will be to the people of the United States—a true symbol of this Nation.

Because corn is identified with our heritage, I believe it should be given serious consideration whenever the Congress takes upon itself the matter of a national emblem.

A Typical Story of People Helping People Through Encouraging Thrift Is Symbolized in the 35-Year Career of Myron H. Fox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in a day and age when sound financial institutions are the key to the economic strength of each community as well as the entire Nation, it seems fitting and proper that tribute be paid to those who have played a vital role in this field. The Chicago area is certainly one of the most important financial centers in the Nation. Its banks, stock exchange, and board of trade, together with the many savings and loan and building and loan associations, have been a tremendous pillar of strength in the well-being of its million residents.

Let me direct your attention today to some very interesting facts in one specific field of finance which symbolizes the story of people helping people, and to a resident of my congressional district who has devoted 35 years to this program with success.

There are today more than 6,000 savings and loan associations located throughout the United States with total assets of over $60 billion as of December 31, 1959. Three of the Nation's eleven largest savings and loan associations are in the Chicago area. These organizations have been a vital part of our economy since 1831.

What is a mutual savings and loan association? It is a home-financing and savings institution managed by a local board of directors, elected by the association's savings and mortgage members. Such an institution is organized primarily to promote thrift, and to finance the building, purchase, repair, and remodeling of homes.

These savings and loan associations have their own central reserve system in the Federal home loan bank system, and are controlled by Federal and/or State laws.

Since my remarks are properly a tribute to Myron H. Fox, who is the president of one of these great financial institutions—the Bell Savings & Loan Association of Chicago—it is interesting to mark the history of this association as one which reflects all of the principles and values of a mutual savings and loan system.

It was back in 1925 that Mr. Fox and 12 employees of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co. got together and subscribed their personal savings to 5 shares each in a newly formed savings and loan group. This particular group of employees was having a difficult time in securing mortgages for the purchase and construction of homes. Because the need of financing in their particular case was a mutual problem, they decided in the characteristic American fashion to help themselves by pooling their savings.

This was the humble beginning of an institution which originated with a subscribed capital of $6,500 and which today has resources in excess of $250 million and more than 100,000 customers. Its total earnings distributed to customers by the association during the past 35 years, during which Mr. Fox has served the association, has been more than $46 million. In this 35-year period the Bell organization has made more than 50,000 mortgages in the fast-growing Chicago metropolitan area.

A man such as Myron Fox deserves more than mere commendation. His warm understanding of his fellow employees and of the problems of the customer and his keen business sense have served as a beacon light through 3½ decades of the association's steady growth. His confidence in the future and his vision to foresee the tremendous potential growth of the association mark him as one of Chicago's outstanding financial executives.

Mr. Fox frequently refers to himself as the "last of the Mohicans" because he is the only one of the original founders still engaged in its day-to-day management. He often recalls that his first word of encouragement to form the

savings group in 1924 came from the late Chicago banker, David R. Forgan, who told him: "Young man, the things that succeed today are those things that are properly managed. If you can assure yourself of obtaining proper management of such an enterprise, it should prove successful."

Mr. Fox recalled that the late Bernard E. Sunny, the then chairman of Illinois Bell Telephone Co., with whom Fox discussed the question of organizing such an association, remarked to him: "You should remember this, if you and your group decide to proceed with the organization of a savings and loan association and it proves successful, everyone will take credit for it, but, if it should fail, no one will be blamed but Mr. Fox."

He now admits that the full meaning of Mr. Sunny's remark takes on added significance as the years go by. It is Mr. Fox's belief that "* * * his words have had a great part in impressing all of us here of our growing responsibilities to each saver, and borrower, and to the community."

Myron Fox was born in Rockford, Ill., December 16, 1894. While Myron was still a small boy, the family moved to Springfield, Ill., and here he attended public school and high school. In 1918 he joined the U.S. Navy as a seaman first class and served 16 months in the European theater.

This month in Chicago Myron Fox steps down from his daily administrative responsibility as president of Bell Savings to the position as chairman of the board of directors. His successor is Harold P. Halleen, whose more than 30 years in the field of finance insure continued excellent management for the association in the future.

Mr. Fox has been vice chairman of the board of directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago, is a member of the Board of Savings and Loan Association Advisors to the Department of Financial Institutions, State of Illinois, and a leading figure in other local and national savings and loan activities. As he now takes his place among the industry's elder statesmen, it is encouraging to know that Bell Savings and the entire field of savings and loan management will still have access to his broad practical knowledge and the continuing benefit of his wise counsel.

He and his wife Almah have been residents of Oak Park, Ill., for more than 26 years. They have one married daughter, Mrs. Thomas H. Cloke, Jr., who resides in Glen Ellyn, Ill., with her husband and three children.

Let it be said that Myron Fox is an American in the best and finest sense of the word. He made his own way by virtue of his own abilities and his devotion to high ideals.

He firmly believes that the savings and loan business will continue to grow and he fully expects Bell Savings will grow right along with it. In commenting on this he said: "Our business has made its greatest strides in the past 16 years—the post-World War II period—and as people become more conscious of buying their own homes through savings, the idea of building for the future will become more and more a habit with the American people."

And this, as he himself often remarks, is a clear case of people helping people.

Greed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of last year a reporter asked me, "Why so many harmful strikes?"

My answer: It may be because those controlling large labor unions, other special groups—veterans, postal employees, farmers—yes, and Congressmen—today, the steelworkers—are never satisfied with what they have. Each group, often individuals, want what might be an unfair share of the national income, of special privileges.

AMBITION

Greed is an acquisitive desire beyond reason. It is not a desirable characteristic. Ambition is an uplifting desire to achieve or obtain, and without it neither the individual nor the Nation would make progress. Without it, we would all become stagnant, never better our individual or national status.

PRESENT TREND

Since coming to Washington, I have observed what seems to me an unfortunate development—laudable ambition displaced by an excessive, acquisitive demand for ever higher wages, salaries, prices, and special privileges, which, granted, injure all.

Politically and financially, powerful pressure groups put the heat on legislators, continually increasing power and incomes for their members, with harmful inflation the result. Naturally, we have always had and probably always will have special groups successfully making such demands. But certainly, if successful demands continue, the disparity between those who have and those who do not will grow wider until finally we may drift back into a situation where a few are inordinately wealthy, privileged, while the many are in dire want and without recourse when a degree of their freedom is taken from them.

Powerful pressure groups from State and Nation—yes, and local governments—are getting more and more for their members, with the result that even today there is just not enough to go around. Illustration: From my district come letters from incapacitated and elderly people, who, because of the high cost of living, have extreme difficulty in obtaining the necessities of life. Result: A high wage, income for the few, little for many.

What we all apparently forget is that, if, for example, today's striking steelworkers are to have an increase in wages and fringe benefits, not only those in the steel industry but all will pay the cost. A part of the cost will fall upon each and every one of us and prices will continue to go up—higher cost of living for the needy.

The same is true wherever in any productive industry wages are increased out of proportion to the increase in production, with the net end result that, while a few receive a special benefit, the additional cost falls upon all. There is an ever-widening gulf between members of a few pressure groups and the great majority. And, quite naturally, those who are on the short end want more.

When increasing salaries, wages, compensation, force the cost of production ever higher, the demand, the ability of all to purchase, grows less—depression threatens.

The answer: We will all be forced to disregard our greed, confine our ambition to limits which will not unduly, ultimately, bring harm to all. What do I mean? Less reliance upon fantastic legislation designed to benefit a few, more compliance with nature's law of supply and demand, and sound economic practices.

Progress is fine but ever-increasing wages, salaries, prices—none are ever through legislation—equitably distributed. Ultimately a disastrous depression. That has been the result every time government has attempted to fix prices, distribute wealth. The Egyptians tried it. The Chinese tried it. The Romans tried it. Other nations made the attempt. No people can ever legislate prosperity, happiness, or contentment. The law of supply and demand, while harsh, ultimately prevails.

Civil Rights: Congress and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech of Senator WAYNE MORSE before the Suffolk University Law School Alumni Association in Boston, Mass., on October 29, 1959:

SPEECH BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE THE SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 29, 1959

Mr. Chairman, members of this association, I have chosen as the title for my remarks in response to your kind invitation the subject, "Civil Rights: Congress and the Supreme Court."

Realistic consideration of emphasis and time caused me to omit direct reference to the third constitutional branch of the Federal Government—the Chief Executive and the executive departments—or for the fourth-developed group: administrative agencies, separate administrations, independent boards and commissions, and the like.

Consequently, emphasis is placed upon legislative and judicial duties under our National Constitution in protecting fundamental rights and liberties.

Before I turn to the subject of my lecture, I wish to make an observation concerning our legal profession. My remarks in some respects will not be particularly complimentary of some of the policies and attitudes of the legal profession. There was a time in our history when lawyers as individuals acting through their local bar associations could be counted upon to present a militant front against any invasion or undermining of individual, human, or constitutional rights. This is no longer true to the degree that I think it should be. When I ask myself the question "Why?" I find it difficult to escape from the lurking fear that it may be true that too many lawyers consider themselves private practitioners of the law. I would leave with you the thought that there is in fact no such person as a private practitioner of the law.

If you remember until breakfast time tomorrow nothing that I say today except this point, I will have served a worthwhile purpose in talking to you. The point is this: remember that when you take the oath upon admission to the bar you become forevermore throughout your life in the practice of the law a public officer of the courts. You become a public official in the sense that you are charged with the public responsibility of maintaining a system of government by law. This phrase "government by law" is no empty platitude. It is both the rudder and the propeller of our Ship of State called the Constitution.

As you read the history of the American legal profession, and in reading it you also will be reading important chapters in the evolution of constitutional government in the United States as we have come to know it today, you will take note of the fact that high-principled lawyers of our profession have never considered themselves as the hired men of their clients. They have always recognized their obligations as public officers of the courts. I leave with you the question, "Is the intellectual integrity of our profession threatened today with a tendency on the part of too many lawyers to become the hirelings of their clients? Is it threatened with a tendency to be more concerned with prosecutions that are overturned than with fundamental principles that are upheld?"

It is with that background thought that I move into my subject—"Civil Rights: Congress and the Supreme Court."

When Carl Sandburg wrote about Lincoln's visit to Gettysburg to deliver his epic dedication, he concluded his chapter with the following words:

"[Lincoln] had stood that day, the world's foremost spokesman of popular government, saying that democracy was yet worth fighting for. He had spoken as one in mist who might head on deeper yet into mist. He incarnated the assurances and pretenses of popular government, implied that it could and might perish from the earth. What he meant by a 'new birth of freedom' for the Nation could have a thousand interpretations. The taller riddles of democracy stood up out of the address. It had the dream touch of vast and furious events epitomized for any foreteller to read what was to come. * * *

"For the first time since he had become President he had on a dramatic occasion declaimed, howsoever it might be read, Jefferson's proposition which had been a slogan of the Revolutionary War—'All men are created equal'—leaving no other inference than that he regarded the Negro slave as a man. His outwardly smooth sentences were inside of them gnarled and tough with the enigmas of the American experiment."

Our struggle with those "enigmas of the American experiment" continues today in the courts, in the Congress, in the State legislatures, sometimes even on the streets and in the homes of America. If it is now in a less violent form, it is still as profound and divisive an issue as any of us care to have to deal with in our lifetime.

Out of the conflict of the Civil War came a great turning point in American history and in the history of the human race. The passage of the 13th, the 14th, and the 15th amendments made Jefferson's doctrine a part of our organic law.

I suppose it is not too much to say that in our time we are faced with the problem of making realities of the 14th and 15th amendments. The application of a principle to the realities of daily life, here and now; that is what we are struggling with in the whole debate over civil rights.

Bit by bit and case by case, the Supreme Court has applied those amendments. The cases striking down State-enforced segregation in the public schools should not have been any surprise to anyone familiar with earlier cases striking down federally enforced segregation.

As a lawyer, I am deeply convinced that the preservation of human liberties and civil rights is more dependent upon the courts functioning under the Constitution, including the checks upon the courts to be found within the Constitution, than upon any other branch of our Government.

The great guardian of the Constitution, the legal interpreter of the Constitution, is the Supreme Court of the United States. It is easy for us in the Congress, in the legislative branch of the Federal Government, to assume sometimes that civil rights are for legislative determination. The fact is that Congress does not and cannot create civil rights through legislation; and neither can the courts, for that matter.

Those rights as now existing can change only by constitutional amendment. But it is for the courts to determine the application of the Constitution to particular events and circumstances.

Some in this country would have us think that the Supreme Court has usurped lawmaking powers in striking down State-supported segregation; they would have us think that the Supreme Court has gone amok, has embraced a radical and alien philosophy under which it has exercised a power not rightfully belonging to it.

What is the truth about that allegation? The fact is that the power exercised by the Supreme Court on that occasion dates back to 1803, when a Supreme Court headed by Chief Justice John Marshall handed down its decision in the case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (1803).

Under the doctrine of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, that the Supreme Court shall be the final arbiter of the meaning of the Constitution until such time as the people amend the Constitution, the Court has recently struck down a State prosecution by Pennsylvania for subversion against the United States; it has struck down actions by Federal executive officers in denying passports, and executive orders relating to the rights of Federal employees; and it has struck down a contempt of Congress citation against a witness who had refused to answer questions put to him by a congressional investigating committee on the ground the questions were irrelevant to the inquiry.

These decisions caused a great hue and cry in many quarters. They gave rise to the whole bevy of bills that crowded onto the House and Senate Calendars in the closing days of the last session of Congress to punish the U.S. Supreme Court.

Not all of these situations are identical to those under which Chief Justice Marshall and his colleagues acted in 1803. Their case of 1803 concerned an act of Congress only; but the language of their opinion applies equally to the basis for the Court's action overturning State legislatures, and the Federal executive, as well as the Federal legislature.

This is what the Court of 1803 had to say on the question of judicial reviews, and I quote the pertinent sections of *Marbury* v. *Madison:*

"The question whether an act repugnant to the Constitution can become the law of the land is a question deeply interesting to the United States. * * *

"That the people have an original right to establish for their future government such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. * * *

"This original and supreme will organizes the government, and assigns to different departments their respective power. It may either stop here or establish certain limits not to be transcended by those departments.

"The Government of the United States is of the latter description. The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten, the Constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? * * *

"Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the Nation, and consequently the theory of every such government must be that an act of the legislature repugnant to the Constitution is void. * * *

"It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.

"So if a law be in opposition to the Constitution; if both the law and the Constitution must apply to a particular case, so that the court must either decide that case conformably to the law, disregarding the Constitution, or conformably to the Constitution, disregarding the law, the court must determine which of these conflicting rules governs the case. This is of the very essence of judicial duty."

That is the duty the Supreme Court followed in 1954 when it ruled that State segregation laws must fall before the 14th amendment, for Justice Marshall continued:

"If then, the courts are to regard the Constitution, and the Constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature, the Constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply."

I think many of us are being pretty conservative when we defend and commend the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts for "holding the fort" of constitutional rights against the assaults of Congress, the State legislatures, and the executive branch. We are upholding the same kind of judicial review that was laid down by Chief Justice Marshall a century and a half ago.

At the same time, there is nothing immutable about what the Federal courts have done. Any time the American people want to withdraw the equal protection of the State laws to all citizens, they can do so by repealing the 14th amendment. By the procedures outlined in it they can change their Constitution and with it, the displeasing rulings of the Supreme Court. Several Senators from the South, led by Senator TALMADGE of Georgia, have offered a constitutional amendment to exempt education from the 14th amendment. Of course, I am against that proposal.

Of the thousands of statutes enacted by Congress since its first session in 1789, surprisingly few (less than 80) have been found unconstitutional by the Court. This simple statistical fact can mean several

things. One thing it may mean is that Members of Congress do positively consider the constitutional aspects of legislation during the legislative process—when a proposal is first discussed as to aims and objectives, when the bill is drafted, when it is before subcommittee and congressional committee, reported, and debated in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I think this is a very good thing. I think this is something for which we can all be proud.

But I suggest that the procedure just summarized has not been followed often enough in Congress. Bad legislation, both of unsound public policy and of grave unconstitutionality, has been passed from time to time which a wiser Congress would have rejected. Then, where constitutionality has been an issue, the courts have been the protectors of constitutional rights and liberties. In such cases, the Court has had no choice but to correct errors committed by Congress.

In many instances, the Court is faced with an application of constitutional principles rather than a clear-cut test of constitutionality. In construing statutes, susceptible to various interpretations, the Court must try to apply its understanding of Congress' purpose to the factual and legal situation before it. Then, if Members of Congress disagree—if a majority feels strongly that the Court's interpretation of what Congress meant in the particular legislation is incorrect—Congress may enact new legislation along the lines of this other purpose. This we are called upon to do, from time to time, and I, for one, generally resist such efforts to the utmost, preferring to keep my faith in the Court as the careful guardian of our liberties, particularly when Congress has erred in the first place or the Executive has usurped power never delegated by Congress.

Let us look at a few examples.

Congress, a few years ago, enacted a law to authorize the head of a Government agency to suspend summarily an employee when there was serious question that he might be a security risk. The Court, in *Cole* v. *Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (1956), held that this provision applies only to personnel in sensitive positions, not generally to the millions of Government workers in nonsensitive jobs. I think this is a wise and correct interpretation. A hue and cry arose that this decision would lay the Government wide open to mass Communist infiltrations, that Congress meant—or if it didn't so mean when it first passed the Summary Suspension Act, it should now say it meant—to cover all Federal employees, nonsensitive as well as sensitive, park guides and gardeners as well as Defense Department scientists.

In one way, it is encouraging to know that there is substantial opposition to "*Cole* v. *Young* repealer" legislation in at least the Senate of the United States. But we should not relax our vigilance; we must continue to be alert and prevent any wholesale, unwarranted extension of Government power, in this and other fields.

The plain truth of the matter is that the *Cole* v. *Young* decision has not made the Government vulnerable to Communist subversion. Nothing of the sort is involved. Because, under provision of the 1939 Hatch Act concerning Federal employment, a disloyal person may not be hired nor retained on Federal payrolls. *Cole* v. *Young* stands solely for the proposition that Congress did not grant agency or executive department heads the arbitrary power to summarily suspend suspected employees; the power is granted with appropriate restrictness only over personnel occupying sensitive positions with access to properly classified information. Rightly, such arbitrary power must be restricted to apply only where there may be valid grounds for taking such unusual action. Other employees in nonsensitive positions can be dealt with under regular civil service procedures. However, I still think considerable improvement could be made in permitting personnel to be reassigned to nonsensitive positions, awaiting the outcome of determinations concerning their fitness to occupy sensitive jobs. And the Government should always provide adequate appellate review procedures; it seems to me that the holding in the case of *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33 (1950), is sound legal doctrine for the protection of individual liberties—where there is a hearing, it should be a fair hearing in fact and not merely in name. So, to those who seek to destroy *Cole* v. *Young* and make the reasonable distinction between sensitive and nonsensitive positions meaningless, I say: there has been no showing of necessity for such a total expansion of summary-dismissal power.

This brings me to what I think is an extremely important standard to apply to all legislation and particularly proposals affecting the liberties and freedoms of persons in the United States. The yardstick for measuring these suggestions is quite simple, clear and reasonable—namely, "Is this legislation really necessary? What is the purpose? Can this purpose be accomplished in compliance with the basic requirements of the Constitution?" These questions must be answered affirmatively before I shall agree to the proposals. To date, I have not found any of the anti-Supreme Court or anti-Supreme Court-decisions bills can meet these tests satisfactorily. Therefore, I feel Congress has the constitutional duty and responsibility to refuse enactment of unsound, unwise and unconstitutional laws.

Principles of good government and mature legislative responsibilities require, also, that Congress resist hysterical demands made by the executive branch for reversal of Supreme Court decisions. The outstanding example in this category occurred soon after the Supreme Court decisions holding the State Department exceeded its authority in refusing to issue passports to the world-known artist, Rockwell Kent; the California psychiatrist, Walter Briehl; and the cosmic-ray scientist, Weldon Bruce Dayton. The State Department argued the constitutional power of the President to conduct foreign relations carried with it the subordinate power to regulate the travel of U.S. citizens out of, or back into, the United States, in peacetime as well as during war, and that this point of view was accepted by Congress in numerous laws authorizing the Secretary of State to issue passports, and in a provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, dealing with movement of persons—citizens as well as aliens—during an emergency declared by the President. (Such an emergency has been declared by both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.) The Court refused to accept the asserted powers of the State Department. The Court said Congress had not intended to grant blanket authority to the Secretary of State. The Court held that the Secretary was not justified in claiming power to decide who should receive a passport, under what circumstances, and without adequate opportunity to examine adverse evidence and cross-examine adverse witnesses—particularly since all Americans must have a passport to travel anywhere in the world outside the Western Hemisphere today, by our own laws and by requirements of most of the countries to be visited.

Following these decisions, the State Department promptly issued passports to the three litigants: Kent, Briehl, and Dayton—properly so, I think; State Department compliance with the law in this instance is to be commended. The Department also issued passports to several other U.S. citizens whose applications had been denied, or not acted upon pending the outcome of the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases. But shortly thereafter the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress urging that the Secretary of State be granted broad powers to restrict the use of, and to deny, passports to Americans in several different categories. A special message from the White House, urging enactment of specific legislation, is itself an unusual occurrence. In any year, there are only a few special messages, and they are nearly always on subjects of great magnitude. So it is to be assumed that some officials in the executive branch intended to make Members of Congress believe that President Eisenhower himself attached great significance to the request to overturn the Court's passport decisions. Then the language of the message was further designed to emphasize this impression. The message hammered away at the "urgent" need for legislation and spoke frighteningly of the powerlessness of the Government to deny passports to members of the Communist Party "or to those who have had a long and proven record of Communist activities"—whatever that means.

Well, what are the facts?

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am happy to be a member, refused to be stampeded into recommendation of hastily and ill-conceived legislation to impose travel controls on Americans. By now, everyone who had given serious thought to the issues involved was recognizing a constitutional right to travel which was not to be circumscribed by the Federal Government other than in accordance with constitutional requirements of due process of law, necessarily containing the elements of fair-hearing procedures.

The Foreign Relations Committee held public hearings last year and again this year—and, to date, the State Department witnesses have failed to produce evidence of due consequences predicated unless Congress granted the unprecedented power to the Secretary of State. The House of Representatives, in the closing hours of the last Congress, yielded to administration pressures and voted approval of a restrictive bill. But the Senate, respecting the consideration of all legislation on the subject by the Foreign Relations Committee, declined to approve the House bill.

This year, the Foreign Relations Committee has decided there has been no convincing evidence of a need for restrictive passport legislation. And so the matter rests—for the time being. The Senate did not succumb to hysteria, regardless of the powerful position of the Chief Executive invoked by State Department officials.

Does this mean Congress has acquiesced in leaving the country powerless to deal with the Communist conspiracy? Not at all. Nothing of the sort. What is meant is that Congress—at least the Senate of the United States—demands proof of facts of the Communist menace specifically related to travel abroad today by U.S. citizens and a clear demonstration of how governmental controls on that travel are requirements of intelligent national security. The State Department has been given abundant opportunity to prove its case and it has failed to present convincing evidence.

On two other subjects, Federal legislation has been sought in recent years to overcome the effects of Supreme Court decisions in the cases of *Mallory* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 449 (1957) and *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497 (1956).

Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure requires that an arrested person shall be taken "without unnecessary delay" before the nearest available U.S. Commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. At that time, the Commissioner is required to inform the arrested person of the complaint against him, of his right to retain counsel and of his right to have a preliminary examination. He shall

also inform the defendant that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him. Obviously, then, if there is an unreasonable delay in taking the arrested person before the committing magistrate, he may have lost meaningful use of his constitutional rights. The Court years ago in *McNabb* v. *United States*, 318 U.S. 332 (1943) and recently in the *Mallory* case, held that a confession is inadmissible if obtained during a period of unnecessary delay. This is a most pointed way for the Court to implement the clear statement of rule 5(a); the Court says to arresting officer, in effect: "You are arresting, not judicial, officers. If you delay unnecessarily in taking an arrested person before a committing official as required specifically by rule 5(a), you will not be permitted to use a confession taken from the person during that time. This is good law. This is in keeping with constitutional principles regarding due process and individual liberties. As most lawyers—prosecutors and defense counsel and judges—are painfully aware, all confessions are suspect, more or less. Yes, our system of jurisprudence permits voluntary confessions to be used against accused persons, but the key qualifier is "voluntary." How many confessions are genuinely voluntary? Police brutality, torture, the third degree, to extract confessions, are condemned in all our State courts and in the Federal system, but subtle means of torture, threats of physical violence, intimidation and coercion, though harder to prove, are just as thoroughly rejected by our courts. I suggest we all realize in our hearts that time alone may be a most insidious means of forcing action which is not a person's actual free choice. For all these reasons, the Court interpretation of rule 5(a) amounts to sound law and good common sense in modern society. The burden is where it should be: on the police and prosecuting officers to prove their case by other means than forcing the conviction out of the mouth of the accused.

We should all be sorry to note that bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to overcome the effect of the Court's Mallory decision. It is even sadder to note that some of the sponsors are Members of Congress who should know better, especially since a few of them are pleased to be identified as liberals or advocates of civil rights. Their uneasiness becomes apparent, though, when we examine their accompanying statements, in which they speak of clarifying the Mallory decision and wherein they disclaim any intention of interfering with constitutional rights of accused persons. Well, then, I say: Leave the decisions alone. Leave it up to the police to prove that any delay which occurred was really necessary. Stop trying to encourage the police to relax their respect for constitutional rights; stop trying to make it easier to convict by testimony of a person against himself in place of regular, solid, evidence against him.

I return now to the Steve Nelson case. This case is much simpler than its repealer advocates would have you believe. Simply, the Supreme Court of the United States agreed with the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that Pennsylvania is not authorized to prosecute a person for subversive activities against the United States. This, again, is good law and common sense. Why, in the name of anything that is logical, should a State ever be permitted to bring prosecutions for Federal offenses under State procedures, in State courts, under State rules? Do the proponents of such a method really lack faith in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal crime detection, Federal laboratories, Federal prosecutors, Federal judges, Federal courts? Because that is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from their approach. Many of us are inclined to believe that twisted logic has been at work in connection with the hoary old catch phrase "States rights." Some of the States rights advocates appear to be misleading themselves into feeling that, somehow, if they can succeed in having anti-Federal-preemption laws passed, they will be able to nullify the effect of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), and other Supreme Court school desegregation decisions which held racially segregated schools to be in violation of the equal protection of the laws provision of the 14th amendment and therefore unconstitutional. To you in this audience, this may sound farfetched—but I suggest this is involved in the misreading of the Steve Nelson decision.

Incidentally, I would not like to have the impression left that I am blindly an admirer of the Court nor an unreserved critic of several of my colleagues in Congress. I try not to be blind in either my devotion or my criticism. So perhaps this is a good place in my remarks to interject comment that I feel the majority—5 to 4—reached different conclusions than I would have in two cases this year. I think the better constitutional grasp of the issues is expressed by the dissenters in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 109 (1959) and in *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72 (1959). The two cases involve legislative investigations—Federal and State—of subversive activities. In each case, the defendant is a private individual, not a public official nor the recipient of public funds. The investigators in each case seek to inquire into the defendant's beliefs and associations. Let me quote from the dissenting opinions.

In dissenting in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, Mr. Justice Black, joined by Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Douglas, summarizes the facts and makes abundantly clear the constitutional issues:

"On May 28, 1954, petitioner Lloyd Barenblatt, then 31 years old, and a teacher of psychology at Vassar College, was summoned to appear before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. After service of the summons, but before Barenblatt appeared on June 28, his 4-year contract with Vassar expired and was not renewed. He, therefore, came to the committee as a private citizen without a job. Earlier that day the committee's interest in Barenblatt had been aroused by the testimony of an ex-Communist named Crowley. When Crowley had first appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee, he had steadfastly refused to admit or deny Communist affiliations or to identify others as Communists. After the House reported this refusal to the U.S. attorney for prosecution, Crowley voluntarily returned and asked to testify. He was sworn in and interrogated, but not before he was made aware by various committee members of committee policy to make an appropriate recommendation to protect any witness who fully cooperates with the committee. He then talked at length, identifying by name, address, and occupation, whenever possible, people he claimed had been Communists. One of these was Barenblatt, who, according to Crowley, had been a Communist during 1947–59 while a graduate student and teaching fellow at the University of Michigan. Though Crowley testified in great detail about the small group of Communists who had been at Michigan at that time and though the committee was very satisfied with his testimony, it sought repetition of much of the information from Barenblatt. Barenblatt, however, refused to answer their questions and filed a long statement outlining his constitutional objections. He asserted that the committee was violating the Constitution by abridging freedom of speech, thought, press, and association, and by conducting legislative trials of known or suspected Communists which trespassed on the exclusive power of the judiciary. He argued that however he answered questions relating to membership in the Communist Party his position in society and his ability to earn a living would be seriously jeopardized; that he would, in effect, be subjected to a bill of attainder despite the twice-expressed constitutional mandate against such legislative punishments. This would occur, he pointed out, even if he did no more than invoke the protection of clearly applicable provisions of the Bill of Rights as a reason for refusing to answer.

"He repeated these, and other objections, in the district court as a reason for dismissing an indictment for contempt of Congress. His position, however, was rejected at the trial and in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit over the strong dissents of Chief Judge Edgerton and Judges Bazelon, Fahy, and Washington. The Court today affirms, and thereby sanctions, the use of the contempt power to enforce questioning by congressional committees in the realm of speech and association. I cannot agree with this disposition of the case, for I believe that the resolution establishing the House Un-American Activities Committee and the questions that committee asked Barenblatt violate the Constitution in several respects. (1) Rule XI creating the committee authorizes such a sweeping, unlimited, all-inclusive, and undiscriminating compulsory examination of witnesses in the fields of speech, press, petition, and assembly that it violates the procedural requirements of the due process clause of the fifth amendment. (2) Compelling an answer to the questions asked Barenblatt abridges freedom of speech and association in contravention of the first amendment. (3) The committee proceedings were part of a legislative program to stigmatize and punish by public identification and exposure all witnesses considered by the committee to be guilty of Communist affiliations, as well as all witnesses who refused to answer committee questions on constitutional grounds; the committee was thus improperly seeking to try, convict, and punish suspects, a task which the Constitution expressly denies to Congress and grants exclusively to the courts, to be exercised by them only after indictment and in full compliance with all the safeguards provided by the Bill of Rights."

Mr. Justice Brennan, dissenting, stated:

"I would reverse this conviction. It is sufficient that I state my complete agreement with my Brother Black that no purpose for the investigation of Barenblatt is revealed by the record except exposure purely for the sake of exposure. This is not a purpose to which Barenblatt's rights under the first amendment can validly be subordinated. An investigation in which the process of lawmaking and law-evaluating are submerged entirely in exposure of individual behavior—in adjudication, of a sort, through the exposure process—is outside the constitutional pale of congressional inquiry." *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187, 200; see also *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234; *NAACP* v. *Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449; *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72 (dissenting opinion).

In dissenting in *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, Mr. Justice Brennan—speaking for the same strong four—examines the State investigation in this language:

"The Court holds today that the constitutionally protected rights of speech and assembly of appellant and those whom he may represent are to be subordinated to New Hampshire's legislative investigation because, as applied in the demands made on him, the investigation is rationally connected with a discernible legislative purpose. With due respect by my brothers' views, I do not agree that a showing of any requisite legislative purpose or other State interest that constitutionally can subordinate appellant's rights is to be found in this

record. Exposure purely for the sake of exposure is not such a valid subordinating purpose. *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187, 200; *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234; *NAACP* v. *Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449. This record, I think, not only fails to reveal any interest of the State sufficient to subordinate appellant's constitutionally protected rights, but affirmatively shows that the investigatory objective was the impermissible one of exposure for exposure's sake. I therefore dissent from the judgment of the Court."

I have devoted an appreciable amount of time in these remarks to issues of civil liberties—free speech and association, and due process of law—because I have a deep conviction that procedures are of paramount importance in protecting substantive rights. What of "equal protection of the laws," popularly called "civil rights" in this country ever since the Reconstruction period which saw adoption of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, and enactment of several far-reaching Civil Rights Acts?

The civil rights picture, in my opinion, is not a pretty one. The Court handed down—unanimously—historic decisions in 1954 and 1955, outlawing racial segregation in public education and has since stood fast on this subject, but Congress has been silent. Oh, I know, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 has been hailed as a great achievement: "the first substantial civil rights statute since the days of Reconstruction." But how substantial, really? The record does not disclose that a single American citizen has voted as a direct consequence of the voting provisions of the act of 1957.

The Civil Rights Commission—established by the act—is at best only a study group, however important its suggestions and recommendations may be. Its life was extended, in an offhand way this year, by a nongermane amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill. I look forward with interest to its further studies and recommendations.

Where does this leave us?

With regard to civil liberties, I think we must continue to oppose restrictive and anti-Supreme Court legislation. This is a resistance action.

With regard to civil rights, I think Congress has a long way to go and must soon enact substantial, meaningful statutes to give effective protection to the constitutional right to vote in Federal elections, and for the constitutional right—for all persons in our great country—to the "equal protection of the laws." This is a noble, positive action, and we should not delay. Our consciences should be pricking us, while the eyes of the world, especially of peoples in Asia and Africa, are upon us. We should get on with the unfinished business of democracy.

Extend Soil Bank, Encourage Gradual Farm Bank To Reduce Overhanging Farm Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of this Congress concerns farm legislation. The present overhanging crop surplus constitutes a threat which cuts across every segment of our economy and confronts not only the Nation's farmers but all Americans.

For that reason, I believe that one of the first priorities on the agenda of the Congress is to determine how best to reduce the crop surplus.

One of the Nation's most important farm programs is the conservation reserve, known as the soil bank. This legislation is necessary as one of the most acceptable means of reducing production by placing acres in idleness.

The Soil Bank Act is due to expire. On the opening day of this second session of Congress, I introduced legislation to extend the program for the next 5 years. I believe that we must continue the land retirement program which attempts to balance production with consumption, and in these remarks I would like to detail the various features of this legislation.

The Department of Agriculture has viewed the conservation reserve as an opportunity to remove the greatest number of acres from production with the funds appropriated by Congress. I believe this concept is faulty. To my mind, we should remove not necessarily the greatest number of acres, but the more productive acres, in order to cut down the surplus. An increased effort must be made to retire land of higher productive capacity into the conservation reserve than has been the case in the past. I believe the legislation I have introduced provides the incentive to accomplish this end.

In addition to extending the life of the program for 5 years, my bill would set up a goal for the Secretary of Agriculture of $150 million per year to take in contracts with producers for additional conservation reserve acreage, including cost of materials and services.

Also the bill provides that the Secretary would not "enter into contracts with producers which would result in increasing the number of acres of land in the conservation reserve by more than 10 million acres in any year." This means that it will take from 3 to 5 years for sufficient land to be taken out of production by soil banking entire farms. It is necessary to take this time, so that communities are able to adjust to the program. I believe that this program will be of interest to older farmers who are still active, but planning for eventual retirement.

To my mind, the practice of soil banking entire farms ranks as the most efficient, effective way to cut production. If only a part of a farm is taken out of production, the labor and capital formerly used on the idled portion goes into increased output on the remaining acres.

The practice of retiring whole farms has two great advantages. First, the program is the least expensive one for the taxpayers. Secondly, the program at the same time provides more income to the farmers who will remain in farming.

The legislation I have introduced contains a provision of the 1956 act, to prevent the soil banking of land in reclamation projects and the placing of price supports on any crops raised on such land. I believe that the cost of our farm program could be reduced as well as crop production if vast reclamation projects, bringing new land into production, could be at least temporarily halted.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be endorsed by this Congress and that a program of increasing value to America can continue to operate.

Antitrust Bill To Ban Joint Ownership of Broadcast and News Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in Congress to prohibit the concentration of control of a substantial portion of the radio and television broadcasting facilities and a substantial portion of news publications in any section of the country.

Modeled on the Clayton Act, this bill would add a new section to that act providing that no news publisher shall own or acquire stock or assets of or a license to operate a radio or television broadcasting station where the result would give him control of a substantial portion of the broadcast and news facilities of the section of the country or area. Broadcasting interests would, in similar circumstances, be prohibited from owning or acquiring interests in news publications.

It has recently been revealed that the owners of many important publications are also the owners of TV and radio stations. This raises the entire question of concentration of ownership and control of communications media.

I am convinced that it was never the intention of Congress to sanction the control of radio, and now TV, by newspapers and magazines. Although the Communications Act is silent on this score, the great danger in permitting concentration of a community's media of mass communications in a single ownership is manifest. Newspapers and magazines have always played an influential part in molding public opinion and shaping public policy. Newspapers in this country have enormous power. TV reaches homes to an even greater degree than the press, and perhaps more effectively. Its visual and acoustical penetration is more dynamic than the written word. In any area, the man who controls both press and TV has an inordinate influence over the political, economic, and cultural destiny of that area.

We must ever bear in mind that the strength of democracy lies in the fullness and freedom of exchange in its marketplace of ideas. Limit the availability of ideas and we limit the effectiveness of our political system. Obviously this must be the result where all an area's media of mass communication

are concentrated under one ownership or where there is undue concentration of such media in one entity.

The available spectrum for TV broadcasting is limited. Not every qualified applicant can secure a telecasting station. Hence the FCC must allocate the high privilege of telecasting only where the public interest will be served. What is more, the licensing of TV channels should take into account the basic need of a community for varied sources of information and ideas. The fact that newspapers and magazines control many of the leading TV and radio stations of the country makes manifest that the FCC has not given this principle adequate weight. The danger signals have been raised clearly enough for all to see. There must be a change in the standards for licensing new stations and for the renewal of existing licenses. Heretofore, the renewal of licenses has been virtually automatic. This has given rise to the false notion that a license is equivalent to ownership. The public interest requires that the FCC give great weight to the principle of diversity of control of communications media, both in the granting of new licenses and in considering applications for renewals.

I should again like to make it perfectly clear that this legislation is not directed at newspaper ownership of TV and radio per se. It is directed at those situations where the press of a community also controls a substantial portion of the television and radio available to the community. Where the press-owned radio or TV station is only one of many operating in the community, as in the case of the New York Times ownership of WQXR in New York, the bill would effect no change in that relationship.

I should also like to repeat that this bill does not deal with the question of honesty in broadcasting and telecasting raised by the recent congressional hearings. It is my understanding that members of the investigating committee will introduce bills dealing with this problem. In the event that such bills are not introduced, I shall certainly offer appropriate legislation in the forthcoming session of Congress.

The bill would take effect on the 90th day after its enactment.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Clayton Act (October 15, 1914, 38 Stat. 730) as amended is hereby further amended by adding after section 10 thereof (38 Stat. 734, 15 U.S.C., sec. 20), a new section 10A, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 10A. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no person engaged in the publication of a newspaper or newspapers or other news periodicals or periodicals shall own or acquire directly or indirectly the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital or of the assets of any radio or television broadcasting station or shall own or be granted a license to operate any radio or television broadcasting station where such ownership, acquisition, or grant may result in such person controlling the operation of a substantial portion of the radio and/or television broadcasting facilities and the publication of a substantial portion of the newspapers and news periodicals in any section of the country, and

"(b) no person engaged in operating or licensed to operate any radio or television broadcasting station shall own or acquire directly or indirectly the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital or of the assets of any newspaper or other news periodical where such ownership or acquisition may result in such person controlling the publication of a substantial portion of the newspapers and/or news periodicals and a substantial portion of the radio and/or television broadcasting facilities in any section of the country."

2. Section 11 of the Act of October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 734, as amended; 15 U.S.C., sec. 21) is hereby further amended by substituting for the words "sections 2, 3, 7, and 8 of this Act" wherever they appear, the words "sections 2, 3, 7, 8, and 10A of this Act," and by substituting for the words "sections 7 and 8 of this Act" where they appear, the words "sections 7, 8, and 10A of this Act."

3. The provisions of this Act shall be effective on and after the ninetieth day following the date of its enactment.

Egyptian Piracy Rewarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the World Bank officially announced that it has made an agreement with the United Arab Republic to loan it $56½ million to widen the Suez Canal. The loan was made despite Egypt's anti-Israel blockade and over the protests of 67 Members of the House of Representatives.

The United States is the largest contributor and stockholder of the World Bank. No loan is made without its consent. The U.S. representative, T. Grayden Upton, voted for the loan. Eugene R. Black, American President of the World Bank, arranged the loan. The Eisenhower administration approved the loan on the score that the World Bank does not permit political considerations to influence granting or refusal of loans. Secretary of State Herter reiterated this principle, but no one is so naive as to believe in it.

The administration has conveniently forgotten the pledge that President Eisenhower made in February 1957, when he said that the society of nations should deal firmly with Egypt if Egypt violated the armistice agreement or other international obligations, at the time when the administration was pressing Israel to withdraw from Suez, Sinai and Gaza. He pledged free Suez passage of Israel ships and cargoes.

The World Bank is an arm of the United Nations, which by resolution condemns Egypt and Nasser for refusal to permit Israeli ships to pass through the canal. Thus, the United Nations castigates Egypt, while its agent, the World Bank, gives it comfort. Does morality stop at the entrance to the United Nations? Does the President of the United States approve such immorality?

To add insult to injury, the Eisenhower administration, on December 22, 1959, entered into a new agreement with the United Arab Republic to assist it in the building of a multi-million dollar jet airport at Cairo. The cost will be in the millions. The Federal Aviation Administration will cooperate with the UAR, by sending representatives to Egypt for planning and designing facilities to handle the largest jet planes and to facilitate takeoff and landing problems.

Not only does President Eisenhower's pledge of Suez passage remain unredeemed, but Egypt is handsomely rewarded for her piracy.

Children's Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to increase the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation funds which can be used for the children's milk program during the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years. Under the provisions of my bill, the authorization for this program would be increased from $81 to $85 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and from $84 to $90 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

The increased authorization will be necessary if the children's milk program is to fulfill the bright promise of the program's 6-year history. During the 1954–55 school year, the first that the children's milk program was in operation, 41,094 schools used 449,800,000 half pints of milk. Since that time, both the number of schools participating and the amount of milk consumed have shown a steady and gratifying increase. Throughout the 1958–59 school year, some 80,000 schools and child-care institutions took part in the program, and the children drank 2,175 million half pints of milk.

These figures do not include the summer camps, which became eligible to benefit from the program under the provisions of a bill I introduced and which was enacted into law in 1956. The following year, 2,220 camps participated in the program. By 1958, the number had gone up to 3,026.

Mr. Speaker, as successful as the children's milk program has been during its first 6 years, it still reaches barely half of our Nation's schoolchildren. Nutritionists agree that milk is nature's most nearly perfect food. I feel it is vitally important for the children of our country to be provided with a sufficient amount of wholesome milk in order to strengthen their bodies as they grow to

maturity and take their rightful places in our democratic society.

This can hardly be accomplished unless sufficient funds are made available so the children's milk program can keep pace with rising school enrollment as well as encouraging additional schools to join this worthwhile program. For a school which is considering taking part in the children's milk program, nothing could be more discouraging than the fear that the funds for the program might run out in the middle of the school year—or the fear that the reimbursement rate to the schools might be cut.

At the present time, the Federal Government's maximum reimbursement rate to schools which offer milk to children as a separately priced item is 4 cents per half-pint in schools serving type A lunches under the national school program. In schools serving milk but not the lunches, the maximum reimbursement rate is 3 cents per half pint.

Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed to learn that the funds now authorized for the children's milk program for the 1959–60 school year will not be sufficient to cover the increased number of children and schools participating in the program. As a result, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has announced that, effective March 1, 1960, the maximum reimbursement rate will be cut by half a cent per half pint of milk in both categories.

If the reimbursement rate to schools goes down, naturally the price the schoolchildren or the school districts have to pay for the milk will go up. This will result in a decrease in milk consumption in the schools, particularly among children from low-income families. And they are the children who need the milk the most because they are very likely not getting enough milk at home.

These are not mere conjectures on my part. During the first year the children's milk program was in operation, numerous federally financed research projects were undertaken to discover problems which might hinder the rapid and effective expansion of the program and to explore new and effective ways of increasing milk consumption.

In my home State of Wisconsin, we cooperated in the study of price reduction. The Wisconsin experiment proved conclusively that: First, reduced prices resulted in increased numbers of children drinking milk at school; second, the greater the price reduction, the greater was the increase in consumption; and third, the increased milk consumption at school was new consumption, not a replacement of home consumption.

Mr. Speaker, another study conducted in St. Louis, Mo., during the 1955–56 school year shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that children from low-income families would be hardest hit by an increase in the amount of money they have to pay for milk at school. When the Federal reimbursement to the schools participating in the children's milk program was applied toward the reduction of the price of milk to the children, the pupils in the low-income districts increased milk consumption by 171 percent. Milk consumption by children in the middle-income districts went up 157 percent, but the increase by pupils in the high-income areas was only 44 percent.

We are lucky to live in a land which is blessed with an abundance of food. But this blessing of abundance carries with it a large responsibility. There is little excuse for malnutrition in this country, and even less excuse when it comes to our children. I would not have it on my conscience that I deprived any school kids of needed milk through short-sighted economy. I am sure my colleagues share my feelings and will support my bill to increase the funds for the children's milk program so it can continue the job it has been doing so well.

Problems Facing the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, much has been printed in newspapers and periodicals since the first of the year heralding a booming, exciting, and progressive 10-year period in our future. We hope that all the good predictions will come true. But, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before we can go forward with a new blueprint for the sixties, we must finish some of those tasks left undone in the last decade. In this session of Congress we must not let ourselves be sidetracked by false issues.

Some of the issues with which we must deal effectively are social security, agriculture and food for peace, interest rates and fiscal policy, education and school construction grants, and reevaluation of our defense programs. My views on these problems are outlined below:

1. SOCIAL SECURITY

In my travels through the district, I was struck with the fact that far too many of our older people—those who have made this society great—are not enjoying the wealth and prosperity of our society. We must drastically revise our present social security laws to enable our older citizens who desire to work to be given the chance to work without being penalized. It is becoming increasingly obvious that some form of national health insurance scheme must be worked out which will help all of our older citizens. For example, there are some 4 or 5 million people over age 65 and women over age 62 who are not eligible for social security benefits, although they have contributed to the system for many years, and although they are incapacitated for life. I believe that the present requirement that one must have worked under social security for at least 5 years out of the 10 years before becoming disabled should be revised.

2. INTEREST RATES AND FISCAL POLICY

The Federal Reserve banks and the Treasury Department are following independent and often mutually contradictory policies. Our Federal credit policies must be integrated lest we stifle economic growth while continuing the aimless road to inflation. We must create a national monetary and credit council which would include the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and heads of the other lending agencies.

The policy of high interest rates as set out by the administration are not stopping inflationary tendencies, but they are stifling competition and economic growth. From the little businessman in northeast Iowa to the high-powered economics professor, to the corporation executive who makes $100,000 a year, there is an awareness of the fact that only the giant corporations have easy access to money at all times regardless of interest rates. However, high interest rates destroy the chance for small businesses to borrow, compete, and grow since these groups depend on readily available money at reasonable interest rates in order to be able to borrow for expansion purposes.

The surest way to destroy small business and continue the road to monopoly and the surest way to destroy the small farmer is by encouraging and keeping a tight money program.

3. EDUCATION AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Congress should authorize and appropriate more money for more classrooms and higher teacher pay scales. Nationally we are short some 140,000 classrooms and our teachers are woefully underpaid. If this Congress does not pass the kind of legislation in education which will give this Nation more scientists and engineers, philosophers and social scientists, we will cease to be a first-rate power. This Congress must make the school bells ring loud and clear for better schools and teachers, rather than have those same bells toll for a nation that prefers to spend more on cigarettes and cosmetics than on education.

4. DEFENSE

This year Congress must take a long, hard look at its defense budget. Sixty-seven percent of the taxpayer's dollar is spent on defense and defense-related expenditures. It is clear that we are overspending in some areas and not spending enough in other areas. There are over $34 billion in military goods which have, in the last few years, been taken out of use and circulation by the Armed Forces.

Every dollar that is wasted in our national defense program and every dollar that is unnecessary takes away money which could be better spent in making our society richer and freer than any that has ever been known.

5. AGRICULTURE AND FOOD FOR PEACE

An international food for peace program through the United Nations that will get the food out of the storage bins and into the stomachs of the hungry of the world must be initiated. There is nothing more disgraceful to the United

States than the fact that we have $10 billion worth of food and fiber resources rotting in our storage bins while a billion people are on the edge of starvation.

A thorough investigation is called for in the price structures of food resources. This Congress must explode the myth that the farmer is living off the fat of the land. We must study how it is that with a $10 billion food surplus on hand, paid for by the American taxpayer, the farmer's income has been lower than it has been in 18 years and, furthermore, why the consumer is paying more for food than he has ever paid before.

Mr. Speaker, when we have finished these tasks, then we will be ready for the adventure of the sixties.

Membership Rally of World War I Vets at Peabody, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the John J. Splaine, Jr., Barracks No. 12, of Salem, Mass., is one of the most energetic units of the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A., Inc.

When the national organization announced the beginning of a drive to enroll 1 million members, Barracks No. 12 promptly swung into action. A call was sent out to members of the World War I Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in the eight cities and towns near Salem, to join Barracks No. 12 in a membership drive.

On Sunday afternoon, December 6, 1959, a very successful rally was held at the VFW Hall in Peabody, Mass., under the leadership of the John L. Splaine, Jr., Barracks of Salem.

The senior and junior department vice commanders of Massachusetts were present. George Leary, national junior vice commander, brought the greetings of the national organization; discussed the various pension bills; and gave helpful advice on ways methods to increase the membership.

It was my privilege to give the following address:

Greetings: All of us hoped, and I supposed most of us believed that World War I would be the last major war in history.

That was responsible for our attitude as veterans.

Many of our comrades didn't join any veterans' organization.

They went their separate ways, failing to understand that they would need the group as much as the group would need them to protect the legitimate interests of all veterans.

In December 1941 we suddenly sensed that a new and much larger group of veterans would come out of World War II. Twenty-three years had gone by, and so many things we should have accomplished had been postponed until another year.

When the very generous GI bill of rights was passed by the Congress in 1944 to help the veterans of World War II it made us look old-fashioned and negligent in promoting the unity and protecting the rights of World War I veterans.

Furthermore, we were no longer the last and strongest group of veterans.

And as we looked around at the changing situation it dawned upon us that we had no organization to represent exclusively the men and women who served from 1917 to 1918, and to speak for their special problems.

It was this lack that led to the establishment of the World War I Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc.

Its rapid growth within a few years shows that it is filling a long-felt need. At last we had a group to join that would be entirely our own and where we could share the same memories and the same interests.

Our first objective is to secure a pension for all of our comrades when they reach the age of eligibility.

Our second objective is to bring together all who served in World War I in a fraternity that will promote friendship and sociability.

It takes organizing skill and effort to do this.

We have not reached the thousands who would like to join but who need the helping hand of present members who will welcome them to our ranks and make them feel at home.

We have the incentives and the high morale.

I do not exaggerate when I claim that our group has more get-up-and-go than those groups of younger veterans who are indifferent, as we were at their age.

What we need is a plan of action, and enough volunteers to make it work; checking the records and drawing up lists of potential candidates for membership in our respective communities.

Do you ever stop to think of those classmates who graduated from school with you, who live in the same city or town as you do but whose paths have not crossed yours in years?

The situation is identical with respect to the aging veterans of the First World War.

Our job is to look them up, find them, and invite them to attend a barracks meeting so that they can enjoy a reunion with the buddies of long ago and actually see the programs we are arranging to revive that comradeship and pride of service.

Even a man's family life, with all its fulfillments, does not provide an outlet for this remembered experience which every veteran cherishes in his heart.

Only in the company of other veterans can this fellowship live again.

This rally is the opening of a membership drive by John J. Splaine, Jr., Barracks No. 12 for the benefit of World War I veterans who reside in the nine cities and towns in the vicinity of Salem.

Let us not forget the indispensable role of the ladies in this drive.

Auxiliaries are providing fine cooperation in many other communities throughout the country. When you enlist the idealism, the enthusiasm, and the hard-working support of the women your success will be certain.

We have a goal and we are not going to be detoured from it.

Ever since the Revolutionary War, the Congress has provided pensions for the aging veterans of all wars, and with no income restrictions. These non-service-connected pensions were not based on need, and were not considered as a retirement plan. They expressed in tangible form the Nation's gratitude to those who had risked their lives in its defense.

In the last session of Congress, when Fred Hollenbeck testified before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs he said, and I quote: "The files in our national headquarters are filled with appeals from men who have served in World War I pleading with us to do everything we can to secure for them a pension of $100 per month. These letters indicate that the writers do not have social security or other outside income and that they are in dire circumstances but do not want to go on the public dole to eke out an existence. They are bitter in what they feel is the lack of gratitude on the part of this Nation in not long ago having granted them the same consideration as has been granted to the veterans of all other wars prior to World War I." End of quote.

In that same session, a bill was passed that generally increased non-service-connected pensions for the veterans, widows, and dependents of all wars.

While this was praiseworthy at first glance, it was not altogether pure and beneficent in motive.

For its hidden purpose was to head off and place a barrier in the way of pensions for all World War I veterans upon reaching the qualifying age.

The architects of this bill really fooled themselves. While sidetracking the drive for a World War I pension bill, they forced through a measure that, by taking in the veterans of all wars, will cost more than twice as much as the bill to provide a pension of $100 a month to all eligible World War I veterans.

There are approximately 2,700,000 living World War I veterans.

About one-half are receiving service-connected disability compensation, or non-service-connected pensions.

In both cases, the amount received by the individual veteran is considerably less than $100 per month.

But the other half of this veteran population receive no compensation or pension from the Veterans' Administration.

The total cost of our bill covering the next 40 years will be less than $10 billion, or an average of $250 million a year. But the non-service-connected pension bill for all veterans, providing smaller monthly benefits, and squeezed by income limitations will cost more than twice the total of our bill.

The tactics employed against us have backfired.

Under the guise of economy, they have committed themselves to expenditures far greater than they anticipated in their preoccupation with stopping our pension drive.

Their argument that a pension for World War I vets would cost too much has been contradicted by their own actions.

We intend to go forward with our own bill.

We are determined that the discrimination which has operated against us shall be removed, and that the "forgotten veterans" of 1917–18 shall become the "recognized" veterans of the 1960's and beyond.

Through organizational meetings such as this, we shall increase the strength of our membership and its voice as we make steady progress toward the inevitable goal of a minimum pension of $100 per month for all veterans of the First World War.

Wheat Farmers Are Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, last November, I had the pleasure of participat-

ing in the fifth annual convention of the Washington State Wheat Association held in Spokane, Wash. Delegates to the convention consisted of wheatgrowers, for the most part, and people in related industries. During this convention they were primarily interested in formulating a program that would not only benefit them as wheat producers but also the Nation in general. They were aware that one cannot analyze the farm problem without giving reference to the economics involved.

I am confident that my colleagues will benefit from reading a few of the more important resolutions, agreed to by the convention delegates, which are designed to help solve the farm problem, particularly that of the ever increasing wheat surplus. One resolution was endorsed by a 2-to-1 vote supporting the domestic parity plan for wheat as embodied in the wheat stabilization plan.

I am proud that I was one of the original sponsors of this program in the House of Representatives, because I feel that it is one solution to the acreage restriction program. Also, I believe it is founded on constructive economic principles. Briefly, the wheat stabilization program is designed to accomplish the following:

1. Reduce Government annual expense by approximately $545 million.
2. Reduce surplus wheat stocks by 75 million bushels annually.
3. Maintain the farmer's present net income.
4. Provide 100 percent of parity for the farmer on domestic wheat.
5. Give farmers freedom of decisions for planting.
6. Provide loans at 65 percent of parity.
7. Build up the soil with 20 percent in the soil bank.

This program, Mr. Speaker, is based on a bushelage control instead of the present acreage control, which would definitely stop further buildup of the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks, as well as reduce their present holdings. Washington's wheatgrowers hope this stabilization program will be given a chance because they feel that it would be the answer to the hopes of the farmer and the answer to the complaints of the critics of farm programs.

In the field of marketing and market research, the delegates also recommended and endorsed programs of increased research in the areas of industrial utilization of farm products—agribusiness—alternate crops for diverted or alloted acreage, air classification, and expansion of research involving methods of producing higher quality grains. Legislatively, besides endorsing the wheat stabilization program, the delegates endorsed the action taken in the last session of Congress extending Public Law 480, the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act. They also recommended that wheat foods be made available in greater variety under the food for peace plan initiated by the President in his agriculture message of last year. They particularly recommended a greater variety in the form of bulgour type wheat.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that I am particularly pleased with the results of this convention for they prove that if anyone is sincerely interested in solving the farm problems, it is the farmers themselves. I believe that we should follow their example. It is necessary that we divest partisan politics from the farm problem and strive to enact a constructive farm program. Congress must not shirk its legislative responsibility in this instance, nor must the executive branch fail to carry out its administrative responsibility. Very few defend the farm legislation now on the books, but the fact remains that this legislation was put there by the Congress. And if it is to be changed, it must be changed by the Congress.

A Pioneer Among Pioneers in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Tri-Town Leader as well as copy of my letter to Dr. Walden on December 3, 1959, elaborating somewhat on his accomplishments. Dr. Henry W. Walden is a pioneer in the field of aviation and, last month, the New York Chapter of the Silver Wings Fraternity honored him on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the first successful flight of the first American monoplane. It is fitting that we should pay tribute to this fine American.

The article follows:

[From the Tri-Town Leader, Dec. 17, 1959]

PIONEER AVIATOR IS HONORED ON ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT

The 50th anniversary of the first successful flight of the first American monoplane, which was made at Mineola, L.I., on December 9, 1909, was fittingly observed by the New York Chapter of Silver Wings Fraternity, at Mitchel Air Force Base. Maj. Louis W. Bieser, of Lynbrook, president of the New York chapter, was official host and toastmaster.

The guest of honor on this auspicious occasion was Dr. Henry W. Walden, famous aviation pioneer, who not only designed, built, and flew the first successful monoplanes in America, but who also designed and built the first radio-controlled, air-to-ground missile, in November 1915.

The original model of this missile, together with scale models of the Walden III and the Walden IX monoplanes are on permanent exhibition for historical record, at the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C.

To bring the younger generation of airmen up to date on the country, Dr. Walden gave an illustrated talk on his dedicated work in aviation, beginning in 1908 and in continuing until 1942, in the Brick Theater at Mitchel Air Force Base. His talk was enthusiastically received by a large, attentive audience, who were continually amazed at the daring of the early pioneers of aviation.

Flying personnel of Mitchel Air Force Base; the Civil Air Patrol; Reserve air squadrons in the Long Island area, together with members of the Early Birds; Quiet Birdmen; Long Island Early Fliers and the 0X05 Club joined with the New York Chapter of Silver Wings Fraternity in honoring Dr. Walden on this happy, historical occasion.

Col. Andrew Slough, commanding the 2,500th Maintenance Squadron, extended greeting on behalf of Col. John O. Hall, air base commander, who was unexpectedly called away. Following the colonel's remarks, the following resolution was unanimously passed and sent to the Honorable James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force:

"*Resolved*, That the members of the New York Chapter of Silver Wings Fraternity; the Early Birds; Quiet Birdmen; Long Island Early Fliers; CX–5 Club; the Civil Air Patrol, and Reserve air squadrons based in the Long Island area, here assembled, go on record as unanimously favoring the retention of Mitchel Field as a U.S. Air Force base."

At the conclusion of Dr. Walden's talk, Elmo N. Pickerill, of Mineola, vice president of the Early Birds, presented him with a handsome bronze plaque, commemorating the 50th anniversary of his signal achievement. This was followed by a presentation of a framed engrossed scroll by the Air Force Association.

DEAR DR. WALDEN: I am sorry that I cannot be present today to honor you personally on this important occasion. However, let me take this opportunity to join with the New York Chapter of the Silver Wings Fraternity in congratulating you on your contributions to the development of aviation.

On this day, 50 years after your flight at Mineola, we have gained the perspective to appreciate more fully the significance of that pioneering event. The frontiers of aviation which you explore have now been crossed by a great proportion of the American people, and one of our most important industries has been established there. The early monoplanes you designed and built have since been succeeded by a whole series of monoplanes, including the DC–2, the DC–3, the Atlantic Clipper, the Flying Fortress, the P–51 Mustang, and more recently the Boeing 707 and the DC–8. America has become a nation which flies and which depends on flight for its defense. How much it owes to you, the designer and pilot of the first successful American powered monoplane.

And now in this decade when the air age is being transformed into the space age and our thoughts are suddenly turned to a new world of missiles and satellites, we again discover that you have preceded us. For in November 1915 you achieved another first: the design and construction of the first radio-guided, air-to-land missile.

These first are but two of your accomplishments during a distinguished career in aviation. Therefore, it is altogether fitting that today we should commemorate your Mineola flight and pay tribute to your dedicated and innovating spirt. I send you my warmest congratulations.

Equalized Pay for Retired Members of the Uniformed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 703, designed to equalize the pay of retired

members of the uniformed services. Similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives by 45 other Members.

President Eisenhower has now taken a stand in favor of this legislation. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Thomas S. Gates, on December 11, 1959, also filed the following report addressed to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, endorsing the bill, with the suggestion that a substitute draft bill be adopted to eliminate certain technical deficiencies in the bill without making any substantive changes:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 11, 1959.

Honorable CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H.R. 703, H.R. 2912, H.R. 2973, and H.R. 5113.

The apparent purpose of the bills is to authorize those members and former members of the uniformed services who became entitled to the receipt of retired or retainer pay prior to June 1, 1958, and whose retired or retainer pay was based on rates of pay contained in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to recompute their entitlement to such pay on the basis of the new and higher rates of pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958, (Public Law 85–422). Although the language of the bills is somewhat ambiguous, it appears that the resultant increase in retired or retainer pay entitlement would accrue from the first day of the month following the date of enactment.

An examination of the bills reveals certain technical deficiencies which would prevent them from completely achieving their apparent purpose. Therefore, there is attached for consideration a substitute draft bill which will eliminate these deficiencies without making any substitute changes.

Public Law 85–422 specifically excluded personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958, from the benefits of the new pay rates and in lieu thereof authorized such personnel, except those with less than 2 years' service, a 6-percent increase in their retired or retainer pay. This treatment of retired personnel was a departure from the traditional concept of relating retired pay increases to active duty compensation and operated to nullify certain provisions of title 10, United States Code, which provide in essence that whenever the rates of pay for personnel on the active list are changed, the retired pay to which personnel are entitled shall be recomputed on the basis of the new rates. Also the inevitable result of a cutoff date, such as the effective date of Public Law 85–422, is to produce some disparities in rates of retired pay among personnel of the same grade and length of service, depending on date of retirement.

It should be noted that the proposed pay bill submitted to the Congress last year by the Department of Defense had as its objective a fundamental, sweeping change in the active duty military pay system rather than a pay raise as such. Under that bill some 38 percent of the personnel on active duty would have received no increase in basic pay except for a temporary 6-percent cost-of-living adjustment. Subsequently the House of Representatives passed a new bill which was prepared by the House Committee on Armed Services, concurred in by the Senate with minor amendments and enacted with the support of the Department of Defense to become Public Law 85–422. This law, as enacted, provided in effect a general pay increase of at least 6 percent for all active duty personnel with more than 2 years' service, and, as already noted, extended this 6 percent increase to all but the one category of personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958. Public Law 85–855, August 28, 1958, amended the Military Pay Act of June 1, 1958, and extended the 6-percent increase to those retired with less than 2 years' service.

The Department of Defense has restudied its earlier position on the recomputation of retired pay and after further consideration now believes it only equitable and fair to reestablish the traditional relationship between active duty pay and retired pay. The Department of Defense, therefore, recommends enactment of legislation to achieve these objectives as expressed in the attached substitute draft bill and believes the net result would be of significant value by increasing the morale, efficiency, and effectiveness of our active duty career personnel as well as avoiding discrimination against retired personnel who served their country faithfully and well.

If this legislation were enacted in time to become effective February 1, 1960, the increased cost for the last 5 months of fiscal year 1960 is estimated at $10,500,000. Funds to cover this increased cost were not included in the budget for fiscal year 1960 but it is believed that such cost could be absorbed within funds heretofore made available by the Congress.

Estimated increased costs for succeeding years are: fiscal year 1961, $24,470,000; fiscal year 1962, $23,980,000; fiscal year 1963, $23,500,000.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objction to the submission of this report to the Congress and further that enactment of legislation along the lines of the proposed substitute draft bill is in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, I yesterday introduced the substitute bill proposed by the Defense Department. This bill is H.R. 9304. Since this bill has the approval of both President Eisenhower and the Defense Department, I very much hope that the Armed Services Committee will schedule early hearings upon this and other similar bills so that this legislation can be brought before the House of Representatives as soon as possible. This bill will restore the almost undeviating principle in the military pay and retirement system that the pay of a retired member of the uniformed services should be directly geared to active duty pay of a member of the same rank and length of service. The purpose of this legislation is to reestablish this traditional principle which has come to be considered almost inviolate.

Address of Senator Talmadge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith copy of Senator TALMADGE's speech. On Friday, November 20, 1959, in Columbia, S.C., the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE, delivered the principal address at the South Carolina Democratic Party dinner and rally. The occasion was a fund-raising affair for the Democratic Party of South Carolina.

In his magnificent address, Senator TALMADGE, among other things, called attention to the fact that there are groups in this Nation today determined to divide and plunder the greatest political name a democracy has ever seen. In his address, he has offered to make every effort to work in unity with Democrats from every section of America. He has advised all Democrats that their party cannot win in 1960 by being a house divided against itself. He has called to the attention of so-called Democratic leaders that abuse of the South cannot continue if our party is to prevail as a major segment in our American political life. He has warned all Americans that the South will not continue to tolerate the baseless and irresponsible charges directed against our people by others of lesser stature in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Senator TALMADGE's address is a dignified message to Democrats all over America that the South is willing to march with them in unity but unwilling to march as an unequal or second-class member of a party which must campaign in unity if we are to win the congressional or presidential elections in November 1960.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats should heed the words of the great Senator from the great State of Georgia:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR TALMADGE AT SOUTH CAROLINA DEMOCRATIC PARTY DINNER AND RALLY

Governor Hollings, Senators Johnston and Thurmond, members of the South Carolina congressional delegation, Chairman Pope, distinguished officials, honored guests, and my fellow Democrats, thank you for according me the privilege and pleasure of sharing this great occasion with you.

In these days when one needs a program to tell the difference between a "Paul Butler Democrat" and a "modern Republican," it is refreshing indeed to meet with men and women like you who are proud to be plain, old-fashioned Democrats.

I salute you for your faithful adherence to the ideals and heritage of the party of Jefferson and Jackson and I am pleased to tell you that your Georgia brethren stand with you shoulder-to-shoulder in mutual determination to implement those ideals and to perpetuate that heritage.

We in Georgia feel a close kinship with the people of South Carolina. In many cases—as in my own family—there is a common bond of blood and family ties.

Our States have developed economically and politically along parallel lines.

Our States have shared many common causes.

Our States have stood together in victory and defeat.

And it is my earnest hope that, regardless of what the future may bring, events always will find the people of our States united as one in all matters involving their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor.

South Carolina is blessed with capable, courageous, and stalwart leaders.

Your brilliant young Governor has established himself in the eyes of the South and the Nation as a man of ability, dedication, and integrity from whom much will be heard in the future.

No State has Senators and Congressmen who are more highly respected or who are more consistently effective in serving the interests of their constituents, State, and Nation than South Carolina.

It is an honor to serve in the U.S. Senate with patriots of the stature of OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND. Their constant and vigorous efforts in defense of constitutional government and individual liberty are unmatched examples of statesmanship of the highest order.

Both men have proved themselves worthy successors to the mantle of John C. Calhoun—your States illustrious and incomparable statesman of the 19th century who recently was selected as one of the five greatest Senators of all times.

If we had 50 more men of the caliber and conviction of OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND in the Senate of the United States, this country would not be in the difficulties it is today.

Your presence here tonight bespeaks your abiding faith in the Democratic Party and your intense devotion to the principles upon which it was founded and grew great. It evidences your heartfelt hope that the party can be wrested from the hands of those who would destroy it for personal aggrandizement and restored as an instrument for effecting the will of the masses of the American people.

The Democratic Party was founded as the party of constitutional principle—a party dedicated to the protection and preservation of our great, unique, republican form of government under which government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

The Democratic Party grew strong in its espousal of the right of the individual to manage his own affairs and its insistence upon maintaining at all costs the guarantees of freedom and local self-determination contained in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

The Democratic Party has always held the confidence of "grassroots" Americana so long as it adhered to its founding principles. It has been repudiated only when it lost sight of its aims and allowed itself to become the tool of special interests and pressure groups.

It now stands on the threshold of the greatest opportunity ever afforded to any political party in the history of our Nation.

The results of last year's congressional election prove conclusively that the rank and file of Americans of all regions shares our faith in and hope for the Democratic Party.

If the Democratic Party will only capitalize upon that fact by presenting itself to the electorate next year with candidates and a platform which will command the unified support of Democrats in all States and regions, there is no reason why it should not realize in 1960 the greatest victory for the people since 1936.

The very strength of the Democratic Party lies in the fact that it attracts its supporters from all levels of society and segments of the economy—that within its ranks are represented industrialists and workers, farmers and businessmen, housewives and society matrons and persons of every race, color, and creed.

The Democratic Party represents a true cross section of the United States and that fact sets it apart from any other political party today. From that composition it derives a potentially universal strength which, if properly mobilized, can make it impregnable at the polls.

A proper mobilization of that strength demands nothing more than that Democrats of all shades of opinion recognize realities and meet one another halfway to put our best foot forward by emphasizing our many areas of agreement instead of our few areas of disagreement.

I see nothing impossible or even extremely difficult about that if all Democrats of good will who are earnestly interested in promoting Democratic unity and victory will work together to give the country a ticket and a program which all voters—southern as well as northern, eastern, and western—can support with enthusiasm and in good conscience.

I, for one, am ready to do my part to achieve that end.

I believe I am correct in stating that the vast majority of southern Democrats feels the same way.

However, we must recognize that there are those who presently occupy places of leadership in our party who are not interested in unity or, for that matter, in winning elections. They would rather feather their own political nests by appeasing pressure groups and catering to social and economic extremists than to serve present and future generations by putting a responsible Democratic administration in office in 1961.

Those individuals would like nothing better than to nominate candidates and write a platform so completely obnoxious as to drive southern Democrats from the Democratic Party next year.

Let me state for the benefit of those who may be considering such a course that they will have to drive us out because we Democrats of the South will never leave the party of our fathers voluntarily.

Let me further state for their benefit that, if they do drive us out of the party, they will do so at their own peril.

The Democratic Party cannot win in 1960 without the South.

The Democratic Party cannot win in 1960 without the South because it will have to have every electoral vote the South can give it to offset the electoral votes of the two most populous States from which the Republican Party likely will draw its candidates.

The Democratic Party cannot win in 1960 without the South because, if the Democratic convention drives the South from the party, there will not be just two, three, or four States which will leave—the entire South will go.

Therefore, to those who sit in seats of responsibility in Democratic National Headquarters in Washington, let me make these points clear beyond misunderstanding:

Southern Democrats will go to the Democratic convention to stay in the party.

Southern Democrats will meet their brethren from other regions halfway in any honest effort to resolve the areas of disagreement between us and to present a united front before the Nation.

Southern Democrats will give their support to any candidates nominated and to any platform approved which are not obnoxious or a calculated insult to our States and our people.

Whether southern Democrats stay in the party is up to the convention.

The convention can take one of two courses—it can keep the South in the party and win or it can drive the South from the party and assure another Republican victory.

Southern Democrats fervently hope for the former but they will not be unprepared for the latter.

The Democrats of the South are sick and tired of being rewarded for their consistent support of the party by being cast in the role of party whipping boy.

The Democrats of the South are fed up with being tied to the national stake every 4 years by fellow Democrats to be ridiculed, castigated and punished as the price for the support of those whose stock in trade is racial demagogy, agitation, and exploitation.

The Democrats of the South have learned the hard lesson of not allowing themselves to be taken for granted and are determined that in the future they shall be as vigorous and as vociferous in seeking their due recognition as are the NAACP, the ADA and the other organized pressure groups which are bent upon turning the Democratic Party into their own private shooting preserve.

If we southern Democrats have anything for which to blame ourselves, it is that we have for too long allowed extremists within and without the party to distort and discredit our motives and to misinterpret and malign our since efforts to solve our problems.

We have allowed ourselves to be libeled by the self-serving propaganda of radical political elements.

We have allowed our insistence upon adherence to the Democratic principle of local self-government to be characterized falsely as reaction and inhumanity.

In short, we have allowed ourselves to be placed on the defensive.

It is time that we put the shoe on the other foot.

We of the South do not have to yield to anyone in the sincerity and intensity of our dedication to the Democratic precepts of justice, decency and fair play for all.

We need make apologies to no one for what we profess or practice.

To be sure we have our problems and our shortcomings, but we are trying to do something about them.

We make no pretense at being perfect.

Neither do we presume to sit in judgment on the imperfections of others.

And we do not consider it unreasonable to expect that Democrats of other regions—whose imperfections are no less pronounced than ours—should accord us the same tolerance.

The greatest need of the Democratic Party is a recognition of the fundamental fact that in a nation as large and diverse as ours there can be no single or pat solution to problems involving human relations.

Such problems are so varied and complex that they can be satisfactorily and amicably resolved only by the individuals who are confronted with them.

It would be wonderful indeed if solutions could be realized by the passage of laws.

Were that the case there would be no human problem which could not be solved by the enactment of a new law.

Were that the case everyone could be made healthy, happy, wealthy, wise, and equal by statute.

Were that the case churches, armies, courts, schools, political parties, and all the other institutions and instruments of our imperfect society could be superseded by an omnipotent superlegislature dedicated to the achievement of absolute human perfection.

Unfortunately, complex social problems are not susceptible to so simple a solution.

To the contrary the sum total of the experience of mankind stands as irrefutable proof that human motives and attitudes are not readily amenable to the legislative process.

It is true that change can be accomplished by force so long as that force is applied continuously.

But it is equally true that lasting change for the better comes from the inside of man out—not from the outside in.

True progress in the area of human relations can be achieved only to the degree that the inherent individuality of human personality is voluntarily sublimated to the common good.

To ignore that factor as some leaders of the Democratic Party would have us do is to invite chaos.

Thomas Jefferson recognized that fact when he wrote in the Declaration of Independence that government should derive its just powers from the consent of the governed.

George Mason recognized that fact by providing in the 9th and 10th amendments that

all powers not specifically delegated to the National Government would be reserved to the States and the people.

Andrew Jackson recognized that fact in declaring in his farewell address that "the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere extension of the coercive powers confided to the Federal Government."

That rugged warrior and dedicated man of the people who brought to the Democratic Party a fuller realization of Jeffersonian principles so eloquently and forcefully stated the point I would make that I would like to borrow from his words to do so.

Declared he:

"In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and, therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States. But each State has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property, or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity, are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and may endanger its safety.

"Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference; and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity, and asserting the rights of the human race; but everyone, upon sober reflection, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation."

Andrew Jackson's Farewell Address constitutes perhaps the most masterful statement of Democratic philosophy ever written and the Democratic Party in preparing to meet the electorate next year would do well to heed its admonitions.

If I were delivering the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention next July, I would be sorely tempted to read it to the delegates in full.

I can think of no more effective way to emphasize the inconsistency of those who would claim the name of the party of Jackson on the one hand while on the other hand espousing programs and policies which profane everything for which that great and noble Democrat stood.

The American people are looking hopefully and prayerfully to the Democratic Party to offer them a way out of the disaster of the present Republican administration.

They demonstrated at the polls last year that they are ready to give their ballots to the Democratic Party if it will but offer them something better and respond realistically and vigorously to the challenge to lead the country to restored opportunity and freedom for the individual.

The present administration has failed the American people on every front.

It has failed to maintain our national defense posture and has left us unprepared to meet either the threat of war or the challenge of peace.

It has failed to stabilize the Nation's economy and to restore reason to Federal spending and taxing policies.

It not only has failed the farmers of the Nation but also has been callously indifferent to their worsening plight.

It has failed to uphold constitutional government and has instead embraced the philosophy of judicial and executive usurpation of the constitutional rights of the States and their citizens.

This administration has been one of waste, extravagance, special privilege, high interest rates, high taxes, runaway inflation, tight money and mounting debt.

What it has given the American people has been a far cry from the high-sounding promises which its candidates made to them during the so-called crusade of 1952.

The American people are no longer fooled by an administration and a party which come to them with the voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau.

Americans are weary of bearing the burdens of a national government which has ceased to be their servant.

Americans are weary of tolerating the regimentation of a sprawling bureaucracy which has ceased to be responsive to their will.

Americans are weary of countenancing the extravagances of global planners who have no concern for the welfare of the people here at home.

Americans are weary of listening to the empty promises of false prophets who cry peace when there is no peace and plenty when there is no plenty.

Americans are restive under the yoke of oppressive taxes and irresponsible Government spending which are destroying the economy of this country.

Americans are frustrated by judicial and executive dictation which is robbing them and their children of their heritage of freedom.

From the mail which I receive from all sections of the Nation I am convinced that the average citizen is gravely concerned about the present course being followed by our National Government and the consequences of following it to its ultimate conclusion.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people wants to see the Federal budget balanced and the Nation's economy stabilized.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people wants the United States to cease doing for people in other countries what it either is unable or unwilling to do for our own citizens here at home.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people wants the Federal Government to confine its activities to those areas reserved to it by the Constitution and leave the management of all other matters to local people on the local level.

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people wants above all else for the United States to be made militarily and economically secure and for themselves to be left alone to run their own affairs and enjoy the fruits of their own labor.

The future of the Democratic Party will depend directly upon its ability to translate those desires into positive action and that action in turn into concrete deeds.

The future of the United States may well depend upon how the Democratic Party responds to that challenge.

The kind of program which the American people want and expect of the Democratic Party was outlined by the father of the party, the revered Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address.

He called for:

"Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; and the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigour, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad."

Such a program is one on which all Americans of all States and regions could agree and which all Americans regardless of their place of residence could wholeheartedly support.

Such a program is one which could unify the Democratic Party and make it an invincible instrument of the people's will unparalleled in our history.

Such a program is one which would guarantee a Democratic administration in the White House not only in 1961 but also for as long as the party adhered to it.

I would like to hope, my fellow Democrats, that the party of Jefferson will adopt the program of Jefferson as its 1960 platform.

I am sure I speak your sentiments when I say that we Democrats of the South shall spare no effort in seeking that end.

Senator Lyndon Johnson Shows the Way to Responsible Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the threshold of a new session, a new year and an uncertain new decade, we search the political horizon for a strong ship of state to guide us through this decisive period.

It is, therefore, a very happy privilege for me to be able to introduce for the permanent record of the Congress, a historymaking speech by Senate majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, made at the annual citizens awards dinner of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee in Philadelphia on November 29, 1959.

Every American should read this speech because it charts the course which this country must follow if it is to retain the leadership of the world.

The ovation which followed Senator JOHNSON'S address, made to representatives of every minority group in the land, was thunderous and the words he uttered will never be forgotten by those who were privileged to hear him.

Senator JOHNSON should not be stigmatized as carrying the banner of any particular State or territory. When he speaks, he speaks for and on behalf of our great Nation and for that reason he enjoys, as majority leader of the highest legislative body in the entire world, the confidence of Senators who represent every segment of our population. Both Democrats and Republicans recognize his leadership ability, respect his judgment and admire his courage. All the people have benefited from his warm and generous heart.

I recall one vivid example of his humanity for all men. In a segregated hotel in Houston, Tex., Senator JOHNSON threatened to stay away from a dinner in his own honor if Negro ticketholders were refused admission. His firm insistence was responsible for the breaking of precedent in that city. This and many other incidents have caused him to be labeled in the South as a Roosevelt liberal. I know Senator JOHNSON is proud of that label because he was instrumental in placing on the statute books most of the great liberal legislation sponsored by the Roosevelt administration.

In fact, the record will show that without his drive, without his leadership, none of the legislation so vigorously supported by northern Congressmen could ever have become law.

Senator JOHNSON is a genuine and not a fair-weather friend of labor, with a real sense of the national interest. It was he who masterminded the original Kennedy-Ervin labor bill through the Senate by a vote of 89 to 1. Had that bill been accepted by the House, it is now conceded by all labor leaders, it would have been much more beneficial to labor.

Senator JOHNSON has also assured me that he will lead in the passage of improved minimum wage and civil-rights legislation during this session of Congress.

The question has often been asked, "Why doesn't Senator JOHNSON travel around the country, or the world for that matter, as other Senators do?" The answer is simple—as majority leader he has to be in Washington to guide legislation. This is his job and the reason he was elected majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, it would indeed be unfortunate for the American people if the full dynamic ability of this great statesman should be restrained merely because of his place of birth. It is my hope that during the volatile sixties before us, the unchallenged leader of the Congress of the United States will be drafted to greater service on behalf of our Nation.

The text of Senator JOHNSON's address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATE MAJORITY LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON, CITIZENS AWARDS DINNER, NATIONALITIES DIVISION, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., NOVEMBER 29, 1959

THE ISSUE IS RESPONSIBILITY

I am proud—as I know you are—that we live in a land where we can hold to our own origins without our origins being held against us. I am proud to be a member of a party that opens its doors to all men—and closes its heart to none.

Tonight we meet in the name of that party.

We are drawn together—not by special interests in where we came from but by overriding interests in where we are going—as free men, as Americans, and as Democrats.

THE MOST DECISIVE DECADE

Tonight we are 32 days away from the 1960's.

In history's most decisive century, the 1960's will be the most decisive decade. The world will make its choice. Either we shall—together—turn up the road toward universal freedom. Or we shall—together—turn down the road toward universal slavery.

In the 1950's the world has stood at a stalemate.

In the 1960's the world will stand no longer.

The world will choose.

The world will move.

Free men will be the movers—or they will be moved aside. That is the choice: clear, simple, final. The decision the world reaches in this next decade will decide the century. That decision must be won by free men.

THE LEADERSHIP WE OFFER

The decision will turn on one thing: leadership.

Either the world will choose the leadership we offer.

Or the world will choose the leadership communism provides.

In this next decade, our capacity for leadership will be as vital as our capacity for arms. The strategies of leadership will be more important than the strategies of the battlefield. This is precisely the area where we are challenged today—by Mr. Khrushchev personally and by all the energy of the Communist world.

OUR RESPONSE

What is to be our response?

How is America to lead as America must lead?

We cannot lead by waggling our finger under the nose of the world and arguing our cause with angry words. We cannot lead by wringing our hands and biting our nails and agonizing over the decline of America's character. We cannot lead by busying ourselves with divisions of race or religion or birth or occupation.

America has the strength to keep its composure.

America has the character to justify its confidence.

And America has the capacity and commonsense to perfect the unity of its people.

If America is to lead, America must speak from the bottom of its heart and not from the top of its head.

The language of world leadership is the language of the heart. This is what moves men. This is what leads.

THE ROAD TO AMERICA

Let us look back for a moment—back along the road that has brought us together in this assembly tonight. Up that road to America—over the past 140 years—have come 40 million men and women.

Forty million men and women have surrendered what the human spirit surrenders most reluctantly to come here. Forty million gave up birthplace, homeland, family to cross the seas to America.

What moved these millions?

What led them to America?

They were moved by their dreams.

And they were led to America by faith that here those dreams had promise of fulfillment.

Those two facts should be fixed in our minds and in our policies.

THE DREAMS OF THE WORLD

No force is as powerful in moving men as their dreams, their hopes, their yearnings. No appeal America offers has ever been so strong in leading other men as the promise of fulfillment for those dreams and hopes and yearnings.

If America is to lead now, Americans must understand the dreams of the world—and America's policies and purposes must be understandable and understood by the peoples of the earth.

Those policies and purposes are not understandable now.

Here—in the Western Hemisphere—we have half the world's annual income. Here—in America—we have lived during the postwar years 4 times better than the Europeans, 5 times better than the Russians, 9 times better than the peoples of Latin America, 20 times better than the African, 30 times better than the Asian.

Half the workingmen of the world take home less in a year than our workers—in many instances—may take home in 2 weeks.

CAN WE AFFORD OUR DREAMS?

Yet with all this wealth—all this advantage—our national leadership today tells the world that Americans cannot afford their dreams.

That leadership pleads impoverishment amid plenty.

That leadership signals stop to America just as the world aspires to go.

That leadership argues that we cannot meet the needs of our people for houses, the needs of our young for education, the needs of our aged for dignity and decency.

America may be understood by the readers of the financial pages—but America is not understood by the world.

THE STATIC AMERICA?

The party which holds the Executive position has cut the people's dreams out of the budget of its concerns. On the edge of the century's most dynamic decade, they have embarked upon a course which can only lead to a static America—a static economy—a static Nation.

Some men say there is no issue.

I say there has never been a greater issue.

Freedom is a road to travel—not a parking lot. America must not stop just as the world is beginning to move. If America is to move the world, America itself must move. Or else America will be moved aside.

MOVING AMERICA FORWARD

Throughout the history of the national parties, the Democratic Party has been the party that has moved America forward. This is the role to which we shall continue to dedicate our efforts.

Twenty-five years ago the people of this Nation began the most dramatic movement forward that history has yet to see.

At the helm of the Nation stood a great American who had the heart to be responsive and the courage to be responsible—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Fifteen years ago—at the end of a great war—that forward momentum of the American people was sustained and carried upward to new heights.

Once again, at the helm of the Nation, stood a great American who had the courage to be responsible—Harry S. Truman.

A BETTER DEAL

Today, once more, we stand at a moment when America can move forward to heights we have never attained before or sink back to depths we have never known.

The opportunity is ours.

The moment has come for the Democratic Party to offer the people of America and the people of the world a better deal.

The people of America and the world want peace. We shall work for the strength to secure that peace with honor and without fear.

The people of America live under a Constitution. We shall work without hesitation, without compromise to secure for every American his constitutional rights in full measure.

The people of America want homes for their families, food for their babies, employment for their abilities, health for their bodies, and education for their minds. We shall work to fashion a society and an economy and a Government from which these things will flow in more generous measure.

FREEDOM MUST HAVE A FLOOR

The peoples of the world yearn in their hearts as we have yearned. We shall heed those yearnings. We shall commit ourselves—in this decade of commitment—to the leadership of an effective world order in which there is a parity of dignity and opportunity for all men who would be free.

Freedom must have a floor on which free men can stand together as they reach for the heavens in this age of space.

We speak simply because this is the language the hearts of the world understand.

I want to read to you a report I have received from one of the most outstanding young Senators and outstanding young Americans I know—ED MUSKIE of Maine. Senator MUSKIE's father came to this country from Poland. This fall Senator MUSKIE went behind the Iron Curtain to seek out the village of his father's boyhood.

This is what he wrote of the people he found there in that land which has so long burned with flames of liberty:

"It is difficult to comprehend the economic circumstances of the people in that little village—the bareness of their lives. They have no meat; they stand in line for bread. Their diet appears to consist of potatoes and cabbages. The monthly wage is roughly equivalent to $10 to $20; their personal possessions almost unbelievably meager. This is indeed the saddest part of Poland. But for my father's dream of freedom and opportunity, this would be my life—the life of my children."

This is the world we live in.

This is the world we must lead toward freedom.

The issue for 1960—the issue for our times—is responsibility. The American people are responsible people. They know responsibility when they see it. They will choose responsibility when it is offered. That is what the Democratic Party has offered. That is what the Democratic Party must continue to offer.

Some say that responsibility will not win.

I say to you that in these times nothing but responsibility will win—for nothing less is worthy of us as free men, as Americans, and as Democrats.

Our Challenge for 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is the annual message which I delivered to my constituents, Sunday, January 3, over station WIND:

OUR CHALLENGE FOR 1960

Thank you—next Wednesday, the 2d session of the 86th Congress will reconvene in Washington and for the next 6 months efforts will be made to translate into law the soundings which most Members of Congress garnered from their constituents during the 14-week recess. In a sense, this will be a rather historic session if for no other reason than that it will be the first time Congress will assemble in the new decade of the 1960's. But there are other reasons why this session could become historic. We as a free people in the United States—through our Representatives in Congress—must attempt to strengthen our traditional formula of freedom and well-being at a time when the surface of the world is stirring; when entire continents are surging; when time itself is being telescoped. Everywhere throughout the world there is movement; awakened hopes—new horizons. And all of this springs from the knowledge, no longer subject to suppression, that human life should mean more than a deadening subsistence. The time bomb of human expectancy is loudly ticking. Those who close their ears to it shall have them rudely opened by its explosion.

It is neither my purpose this evening to be an alarmist on the one hand nor an ignoble quiescent on the other. Rather, I should like to discuss with you briefly this evening on "Congressional Report," the problems which confront our Nation and the world as we begin this new decade of the 1960's. I am certain that many of you may have mentioned some of these problems as you toasted in the new year yesterday. But I am equally certain that many of you, more comfortable than ever in your day-to-day existence, have not given them even a fleeting thought. In my brief career as a Representative in Congress, I have found that many people are anxious to discuss the great challenge which lies ahead, if America is to survive as a republic—governed by free people. But I have also found that many of our citizens do not want to face up to reality—do not want to hear anything which may in the slightest disturb the placid calm of their very comfortable existence. Paradoxically, after spending the last 3 months talking to thousands of people, I have a feeling that the ranks of this second group are increasing at an alarming rate. I've found that many of our citizens want to do nothing which might disturb the status quo. This indeed is tragic. For it is my firm conviction that the dynamics of a democracy such as we have, and which has made our Nation the most prosperous in the world, cannot afford the luxury of relaxing when the entire world is on the move. I am deeply concerned about the widespread apathy—the total conformity—which dictates the spirit of so many of our people here in America at a time when leaders throughout the world are inspiring their people into various ventures—some designed for good and, unfortunately, some designed for evil.

Frequently, however, it is difficult to be frank in this type of atmosphere. I should like to recall for you an ancient legend about the Locrians in Greece who reportedly gave the first expression to free speech, but at a price that many considered too costly. The Locrians would permit any person to address an assembly on any subject he or she wished but under one condition. A rope was placed around the speaker's neck and if the audience did not agree with what he said, he was promptly hanged. I have recited this story because I hasten to assure you, that as a Member of Congress who must take a position on controversial issues, I frequently understand and appreciate how some of these Locrian speakers must have felt as they faced their audience. While millions of Americans can very easily avoid the fate of the Locrians simply by not engaging in the debate of issues confronting our Nation, a Member of Congress cannot shirk this responsibility. I should like to assure you there is no more lonely place in the world than in the well of the House of Representatives or the Senate when a Member of Congress must stand up and be counted by casting either a "yea" or "nay" vote on a controversial issue. For you see, even after a Congressman has listened to all of the arguments pro and con on an explosive issue; even after he has read all of the editorial comments; studied the mail from his constituents; heard out the lobbyists—he, and he alone, must make the final decision on his vote. Because the world, and our own Government in it, have become so fantastically complicated, I can assure you that a Congressman's final decision frequently is a most difficult one to make.

I shall not go into detailed analysis of the fifties which we laid to rest only yesterday and which in my own humble opinion were to a great extent unproductive. I would rather address the limited time I have this evening to the problem which we as Americans must resolve as quickly as possible during the 1960's if we are to survive as a nation. It is my very firm conviction that overshadowing all else is the great challenge that we as Americans must face in dealing with the growing menace of international communism. Bluntly stated, you and I—and millions of other Americans like us—must decide whether we shall have the courage to stand up against the spread of international communism or whether we shall idly sit back and wait—like the ancient Chinese who never did find a way to deal with the locust—until it devours us. As U.S. News & World Report pointed out in a leading article last week, at some time, not many years from now, the American people are likely to be offered this choice: surrender or fight a nuclear war. And, the article points out, the way things are going, the United States could lose that war. What is the basis for this pessimism at a time when optimism appears to be bursting out on all sides and world leaders are talking of peace and disarmament? Three reports prepared by Americans whose entire lives have been devoted to studying the powerful forces at work in the world—reports prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—may give us a partial answer. The first report was prepared by a research group at Johns Hopkins University; a second report was prepared by the Stanford Research Institute, and a third by experts operating under the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Add to this the views of highly informed Government officials and these conclusions emerge:

(1) The United States is now open and vulnerable to a direct attack by nuclear missiles and this country's vulnerability is steadily increasing.

(2) There can be no guaranteed security in the world when rival systems of government exist, each possessing the means of mass nuclear destruction. As more nations develop their own nuclear devices, the horror of nuclear war may prove no deterrent if a showdown comes; just as possession of poison gas by both the Western Powers and Nazi Germany proved no deterrent to World War II.

(3) The indisputable trend in the world today is toward dominance in the world by a single power. Let there be no mistaking of Khrushchev's beguiling smile for a sincere desire to work out the problems of the world. For those who might be tempted toward those conclusions, let me remind them that international communism has made fantastic gains in 72 nations of the world in the last decade and that the Communist Party—even though operating from the sewers of the underground, is more powerful and effective in America today than at any time in the history of our Nation. My basis for this statement is a recent report issued by the head of our own Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover.

(4) As U.S. News & World Report points out, the United States, at the end of World War II, was in a position to assume world domination. That opportunity was rejected. The United States, ever since, has been retreating gradually from one position after another. Soviet Russia, on the other hand, is demonstrating a determination to rule the world. At the end of World War II, Russia was prostrate. Today, only 15 years later, she is able to challenge America. There is no precedent in world history of such a reversal of positions of nations in such a short

time. This Russian success breeds Russian confidence and strengthens Russian determination to push ahead. There are those among us who still cling to the naive belief that an uprising in Russia may reverse this threat, but on the basis of best available information which I have received in Washington, such a move is highly doubtful. Forty years of Communist tyranny in the Soviet Union have destroyed any possibility of revolt among the Russian people and today they stand firmly behind their leadership. In tragic contrast, compare how badly divided is the free world on its own aims. The suggestion in Paris last week by the heads of state that a series of conferences be held with the Soviet rulers should make it clear to all of us that the leaders of the free world are unable to agree on their aims and, in effect, they will let Khrushchev suggest the final decision at the summit.

Finally, No. 5, Soviet Russia, because of her gains, while the United States and her allies draw back under a policy of peace at any price, is tilting the balance of power steadily in her own direction. When the tilt appears to Russia's rulers to be decisive, she then will be tempted to offer the United States the fateful choice—surrender or fight a nuclear war. There undoubtedly will be much testing of strength and alarms—such as the Berlin crisis—before the final showdown comes.

My most bitter indictment of the past decade is that the constant threat of nuclear destruction—used so effectively by the Communists and also, unwittingly, by many decent Americans—has become a form of nuclear blackmail. This 2d session of the 86th Congress will have to put our Nation's entire foreign policy under a scrutinizing spotlight and see whether we have the wisdom and courage to find an answer. I know this: the free world has always won when it had the courage to stand up for its traditional faith in the truth of human freedom and justice. It is my firm conviction that the unprecedented reception given President Eisenhower on his recent tour of 11 nations in Europe and the Middle East was a manifestation of how deeply the people of these nations rely on the United States to provide courageous leadership in the struggle with international communism. If we as Americans can only accept the doctrine that there is vastly more vigor in defending a right rather than fighting a wrong, we shall destroy Khrushchev's hopes for world domination. Lamentably, however, I fear that the formulators of our foreign policy have already written off the captive nations of Europe—Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and East Germany—as belonging to the Soviet sphere of influence even though the announcement has not been made official. Khrushchev and his followers, I am certain, will retreat only when we make the liberation of these enslaved nations the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

There are many domestic issues which we Americans must face up to if we are to fulfill the real meaning of democracy. This session of Congress will have to deal with legislation which will give America the educational tools with which to wage intellectual war against the Soviet Union. I believe passage of the Federal aid to education bill is a must on our agenda when we reconvene. We will have to deal with nationwide strikes so that our economy can meet the growing challenge of foreign trade but here again we are faced with the great problem of trying to avoid nationwide work stoppages without destroying the collective bargaining rights of the American businessman or the American worker. In this next session we must attempt to rewrite our archaic tax structure so that there will be a more equitable distribution of fiscal responsibilities by eliminating many of the tax loopholes now in existence; we will have to meet the ever-increasing need of adequate medical and hospital care for our senior citizens; we will have to help our great cities—including Chicago—rebuild the core of their metropolis so that dead property now considered unproductive slums can be placed back on the tax rolls. In my own 11th Congressional District on Chicago's Northwest Side, thousands of homeowners are paying excessive real-estate taxes because the city now collects little if any tax yield from the slum areas of the city; we must in this session produce effective farm legislation which will end the national scandal under which we are spending $6 billion annually for farm support programs and finally we must produce a budget which will eliminate deficit spending. This is the great challenge for the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

In closing may I again thank station WIND for making this time available and to assure all of you that not only I but every Member of Congress shall direct his efforts in this next session toward meeting the great challenge facing America. I will be most grateful, however, if you will be good enough to send me your own views on the problems I have discussed addressing your letter to Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, 11th District of Illinois, Washington, D.C. May I take this opportunity to wish you all a very happy, healthy, and prosperous new year.

Parity in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to present to the readers of the RECORD a thoughtful and constructive address delivered by the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican of Wisconsin, before the American Farm Bureau Federation at its meeting in Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1959:

PARITY IN POLITICS

(Address of Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican of Wisconsin, before the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., December 16, 1959)

I would like to point out this morning what I believe are some alarming developments in our national internal life and to suggest the role that you can play in helping our Nation to meet these challenges.

As I do so, I hope I can avoid either the undue optimism of a Pollyanna or the unwarranted pessimism of a modern Cassandra. Rather, I hope to approach my theme with the attitude a modern farmer goes about his business, bringing to my task the same practical outlook, the same careful weighing of assets and liabilities and the same refusal to be governed by either false hope or fearful gloom.

At the start, I should make clear that I am basically an optimist. In the past few months, I have had the opportunity to travel the length and breadth of our land and, once again, I was reassured by what I saw. We live in a marvelous country. As one leaves the hothouse atmosphere of Washington and goes out among the people, one cannot help but be deeply impressed by the basic strength of our country. That strength is reflected in our abundant resources, in their dynamic development, and, above all, in our energetic, freedom-loving and God-fearing people.

I have no fear for the future of such a nation and such a people. I believe they can meet and conquer any problem once they understand the nature of the problem and its significance.

It is in this area, the area of recognizing our problems, of understanding them and of choosing the right solutions, that we face our greatest challenge, and it is here where my basic feeling of optimism is tempered by a few nagging doubts. They are brought on by a number of warning signals in our economic and political life which we cannot afford to ignore any more than can the farmer when he finds the first evidence of disease in his livestock.

As a prospering, highly developed nation, we face the same danger which has confronted every successful nation or civilization since history began. Our danger is that, as we enjoy our strength and prosperity, we neglect, and thus weaken, those very institutions and principles which made us strong and prosperous and free. Our danger lies in complacency, selfishness, ignorance, and irresponsibility.

And, while my message today is that it need not happen here, let us not delude ourselves. It can happen here. Just because in our lifetime we have seen our Nation move from one plateau to the other, each higher than the last, until we now stand the greatest Nation in the world, let us not think that we cannot fall.

I have often thought that perhaps the first thing which should be taught in the civics and political science courses in our schools is the story of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. The story of a nation which became the undisputed ruler of the world and then collapsed so utterly and so completely that it plunged the civilized world into darkness for centuries, should be studied by every American.

We would learn that just because an economy and a civilization rises to spectacular heights is no reason it is going to stay there.

We would learn that stupidity, selfishness, and ignorance on the part of the population and its rulers can bring on not just a temporary reversal but a collapse so complete as to wipe out the whole structure with all of its accomplishments. The Roman Empire collapsed because it became rotten within. It became rotten because the people and the government failed to preserve those virtues which had led to its strength and because its citizens refused to apply any restraint to their demands upon the government. Literally, the Roman Empire tore itself to pieces through the weakness and demagoguery of its rulers and the enormous burden of expenses they incurred in meeting the demands of a citizenry which forget the public interest in its selfish fight for the fruits of national prosperity.

The comparison between our Nation and the Roman Empire is not a perfect one, but we cannot ignore the warning signals which are flying today.

As a nation, in spite of the heaviest tax burden in its history, we appear to be constitutionally unable to restrain our expenditures below the level of our income. We have balanced our budget (lived within our income as a government) in only 5 out of the last 29 years. We appear unable to reduce our tremendous national debt which now stands at $290 billion. Interest on that debt alone amounts to $9 billion dollars each year which is more than our total annual expenditures for every purpose only 20 years ago. As a result of this profligacy with our national wealth, coupled with the selfish demands of the more highly organized segments of our economy, we are fighting a losing battle against inflation. The cost of goods and services is going up. The value of our money is going down. In that struggle the victims are those who are least able

to protect themselves, including the farmers of our Nation. We are witnessing, as one result of inflation, a flow of gold from our country which has not yet become a flood but which carries grave implications for the future stability of our currency and confidence in it.

These results, however, grave though they may be, are but the symptoms of what I believe to be a far more serious defect in our national life. I refer to the growing tendency of our people, encouraged by demagogs whose only principle is a lust for power, to take the easy way out. We know, each of us in our own hearts and minds, that the right way is not always the easy way and that no nation which has consistently taken the path of least resistance, including the Roman Empire, has ever survived. The easy way, if it is the wrong way, leads only to the misery of retraced steps or the finality of disaster. Yet, what are our constantly recurring deficits, which is our huge debt, what is our inflated currency—if they are not the symptoms of a people and a nation which have fallen into the habit of taking the easy way out?

The hard way, we know, is to rely on our own individual initiative and self-reliance for the solution of our problems. The easy way is to pass these problems on to government. The easy way is for the local units to pass them on to the State government and for the State government, in turn, to pass them on to the Federal Government.

Too many of our politicians and self-appointed leaders seem to find it politically expedient to suggest that the solution to any problem should rest on government. And no politician has found it difficult, or has lost any votes, by suggesting that the solution for any State or local problem was the responsibility of the National Government. How simple and easy it is to shift responsibility to government. It is also much less risky, from the politicians' point of view, to remove a problem from the careful scrutiny of the folks back home and dump it in the legislative pit of the National Congress where its costs, complexities and waste are hidden in a multitude of other Federal activities.

This is the easy way to avoid responsibility. This is the path which our people are being encouraged to take by those who think more of the next election than they do of the next generation.

If you think I overstate the case, examine the proposals that are being advocated daily for the solution of most of our problems. Pass a Federal law, create a new agency, appropriate billions. That ends the problem. Let me give you one concrete example.

In my book, and I confess I may be old fashioned, it is the responsibility of each citizen, either as an individual or banded together with others in a local community, to take care of his personal refuse in a manner which will not endanger the welfare of his neighbors. At one time, in this Nation of ours, we felt it was the responsibility of local units of government to dispose of sewage created by their own citizens. This was a basic, essential function of the local government. That is no longer true. Those who prefer the easy way have won out and the National Government, along with the multitude of other problems confronting it, including the very survival of the Nation, now has been given the job of helping to build local sewage plants. It will shortly be costing the Federal Government over $100 million a year.

It is not a question of the need for the program or project. We all recognize, for example, the necesity for treatment of sewage and the need for preserving our water resources and protecting their cleanliness. The tragedy is that we have succumbed to what we have been led to think is the easy way of meeting a recognized need. The demagog has no difficulty in selling us on the idea of using Federal funds, which incidentally must be borrowed by a bankrupt Government, in preference to raising the funds locally, probably through increased taxes. There has been spread across our land the idea that there is some magic in Federal money and that its supply is somehow unlimited. The demagog is not concerned with the true facts of our precarious fiscal position. He is interested only in providing painless benefits for his greater glory.

The demagog, and those like him, have also discovered that it is easier to influence one legislative body, the Federal Congress, than it is 50 State legislatures or thousands of local governing bodies. He knows the National Government is further away from the close scrutiny of the people. He knows he can bring to bear on the National Legislature the heavy influence of powerful pressure groups. It is no coincidence that one of the reasons which the so-called liberal advances (but generally on the quiet) for Federal intervention is the rural influence in the State legislatures which tend to look upon his grandiose schemes with healthy skepticism.

The net result of deluding ourselves into believing that the easy way can safely be traveled is not alone the financial and fiscal difficulties it inevitably creates. In the process, we not only weaken our basic economic strength through lavish and uncontrollable expenditures, but we weaken ourselves as individuals and we weaken our local and State governments. Weakness and lack of power is the invariable consequence of the constant sloughing off of responsibility to someone else. If we choose to lose those attributes of self-reliance which made our Nation great, and if we choose to make figureheads of our local governments whose function, under our constitutional form of government is to help preserve our individual liberties, then we have laid the basis for the complete concentration of power in the Federal Government and its inevitable corruption into absolute tyranny.

We observe the same trend—the trend toward the easy way out—in other fields. It is perhaps most apparent in the one in which you are primarily interested—agriculture. It takes the form of seeking easy political solutions for tough economic problems. It is embodied in the successful effort of the demagog to convince us that we can safely substitute for the rigors of the marketplace the rockingchair complacency of governmental guarantees.

In agriculture, we have so entangled in politics the economic problems which confront our farmers that I often despair that we will ever unravel the mess which has been created. We have gone so far in the direction of political intervention that the main political effort is no longer directed toward the solution of the agricultural problem. It is aimed at achieving the maximum political benefit in partisan politics.

We have, for example, urgent and critical problems in the field of agriculture which should be acted upon during the next session of Congress. Yet, it would be a brave man who would predict to you today that any concrete legislation will be written into law in the election year of 1960. When the people of this Nation embarked upon political solutions for the problems of agriculture, it was truly a sorry day for the American farmer. No longer is the farmer his own master. He is instead either the beneficiary or the victim of political decisions over which he has less and less control.

I do not mean to give the impression that I believe government should play no role in the development and maintenance of a sound agricultural economy. The power of government, if wisely used, can assist and should assist in the orderly marketing of agricultural products by providing protection against radical changes in the market place. This, I believe, was the original conception of the price support program. We have moved far from that concept and we have been led by those who maintained that there was an easy way to agricultural prosperity. If support at orderly marketing levels can be justified, they told us, why not move on to ever higher levels? Let us disregard any self-restraint. Let us substitute government guarantees for the working of the cruel market place, they said, and their plea was again successful. The test of the successful farm politician then became which could offer the higher price supports and the test of the successful political party was its ability to fasten the blame for the inevitable cycle of rigid supports, price-depressing surpluses and price collapse upon its political opponents.

With the bankruptcy of the high price support program, the demagogs are now seeking another easy way out. The latest solution proposed by the Governor of one of our greatest agricultural States, is simplicity itself. He suggests that we simply ignore the market place entirely and guarantee each farmer a minimum income. Let me warn you that all the demagogs are not holding political office. There are some who have found their way into leadership in a certain farm organization with which you are acquainted. They are urging the same thing but camouflaged under such high-sounding names as "compensation payments," "deficiency payments," "stabilization payments," "equalization payments," etc. If some kind of income guarantee program should be adopted, and it is being seriously considered by important forces within the party which controls our National Legislature, then I can easily predict the next political contest. It will take the form of seeing which candidate in the farm areas can promise the highest minimum income. The other side of the coin is, of course, that it may also take the form of candidates from the urban areas engaged in a contest as to who can promise the lowest minimum farm income. In a nation where a vast majority of the population lives in urban areas, you can guess where this will leave the American farmer.

I wish I could stand here today and tell you I had an easy answer to the problems which confront American agriculture. Instead I must say I believe there is no easy answer. Before we get out of the mess we are now in, we have a long, hard road to travel and, before we can even begin to travel that road, we must come to the realization that the adjustment will be difficult and that it cannot be made if political rather than economic considerations are going to continue to dominate and dictate our decisions.

I have spoken pessimistically of the various aspects of what I have described as the tendency of a prosperous and successful people to rest on their oars, to avoid difficult decisions, and to take the easy way out of their difficulties. I have spoken of it in terms of our fiscal difficulties, in terms of its dangers to our liberties and, specifically, in terms of its relationship to the problem in which you are primarily interested. I have suggested that a continuation of this trend to its logical conclusion can only lead to the collapse of our Nation. I have said this collapse is possible, and I call to your attention, as another reminder, the work of the British historian, Toynbee, whose study led him to the conclusion that of the 26 major civilizations in world history, 16 are now dead and buried and the remaining 10 are rapidly losing their character.

But early in my remarks, I said I was an optimist, that I had great faith in the basic strength of our Nation and that, while it can happen here, it need not happen here. Whether it does or doesn't depends on you and me and every citizen in this land. It is up to us to determine whether we will continue to forever adopt the easy solution, the

expedient answer and the least distasteful course of action, or whether we will pursue the right course, the sound solution and the intelligent program regardless of how difficult they may first appear to be.

Several centuries ago, the Italian poet, Dante, put it this way: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintain their neutrality." My plea to you today, as leaders in a great national farm organization, is to discard your neutrality in this period of moral crisis and to enlist in the fight to preserve our Nation and its institutions.

But I would be derelict in my duty if I merely summoned you to battle and left it at that. Certainly, you are entitled to a knowledge of the nature of the struggle and to my ideas as to the kind of strategy and tactics which must be employed by those who choose to fight for the right rather than the easy way.

When I speak of a summons to battle, let me make clear what I mean. I call upon you, as individual leaders in your communities and in agriculture, and call upon your great organization to take part, with enthusiasm, with courage, and with determination, in the political life of our Nation. I do not refer to political theorizing or polite discussions on a high plane amongst yourselves; I refer to the down-to-earth, backbreaking job of nominating and electing candidates to political office. I refer to the only kind of political action which has any meaning if we are to reverse the trend I have described today. I refer to the defeat of those who oppose everything for which you stand through the victory of those who will work shoulder to shoulder with you on behalf of the principles which brought greatness to America.

I can give you one word of encouragement at the outset. It is my considered opinion, as one who has spent most of his life in American politics, that the principles of government in which you believe are held by a majority of the American people. If the cause of commonsense conservatism, with its dynamic urge to preserve the best American institutions, has suffered in recent years, it has not been because of any change in the basic philosophy of the majority of Americans. It has come about instead because radicalism and the proponents of the easy way have done a vastly better job of mobilizing their strength and in hammering home their something-for-nothing philosophy. You know that is so without my telling you. The really effective political action groups in this Nation are in radical hands. They are working the soil which produces the most abundant harvest. They are developing and electing candidates who will promote their viewpoint. The radical farm leader, the union boss, the leftwing political leader, have all developed highly effective political organizations which are producing results when the votes are counted. While I violently disagree with their philosophy and with many of their ruthless methods, I am not one to stand on the sidelines and criticize their activities. Fundamentally, they are doing what every citizen should do in a representative republic. They are taking part in the basic process of representative government. They are electing officeholders who will advance their views and the answer to this activity is not criticism. The answer to radical political action is conservative counteraction, and the sooner we realize that fact the sooner we can restore the balance of power in our internal political life.

What I am saying, I believe, has particular meaning for you and your splendid organization. I hold you in high regard, but I would be less than a friend if I did not ask you frankly today whether the American Farm Bureau Federation has not, in the crucial struggle for the preservation of our institutions, taken the easy way out by an excessive preoccupation with political neutrality? That is a question which every conservative group in our Nation should now be asking itself.

I have said here today, and I know it is a basic tenet of your beliefs, that we must remove the agriculture problem from politics. Yet, I frankly tell you today that you will never get politics out of agriculture until agriculture gets into politics with both feet.

Let me put it another way—and I believe this most sincerely—the farmer must get into politics to get politics out of farming.

We hear a lot about parity. There is certainly a lot of politics in parity but then there is also such a thing as parity in politics.

Political parity cannot be achieved by well-meaning attempts to influence men who have already been elected to office. That is the easy way, but, unfortunately, like many other expedient methods, it just does not work. The finest feed ever produced will not sprout if it is sown in a bed of concrete. Your efforts to achieve political parity cannot be harvested in the legislature unless you have prepared the soil in the precincts at home.

Frankly those who believe like the Farm Bureau have been less than diligent in assuring that they and their views maintained parity in politics, and the battle is being lost.

Let me be specific. The most important agricultural bill before the Congress was the omnibus farm bill, H.R. 12954. This was opposed by the Farm Bureau. The Secretary of Agriculture labeled the bill an "economic monstrosity." Do you know that 55 of the Members of the House who voted in accord with the policy of the Farm Bureau on this legislation were not Members of the House the next year. That's over 12 percent loss. In the Senate last year probably the most important agriculture bill was Senate Joint Resolution 162. The Farm Bureau opposed this measure. Of those supporting the Farm Bureau position, 15 or 15 percent were not around when the new Congress convened last January. Now, I'm not analyzing the reasons these Congressmen and Senators weren't back. Suffice it to say that they weren't.

If you think the vote of a few Congressmen or a couple of Senators isn't important, let me point out that in this last session, the McClellan amendment providing a bill of rights for labor in the labor bill was adopted by a vote of 47 to 46. Only 1 vote difference between legislation that had some meaning as against a gesture, and in the House of Representatives the vote on substituting the Landrum-Griffin bill for the weak committee bill was 201 to 229—only 28 votes difference between an effective bill and a tap on the wrist.

But let me get back to my point. You are losing your parity in politics.

What is called for, I sincerely believe, is a decision on your part, both as individuals and as members of the Farm Bureau, to renounce political neutrality during elections and to bring your entire individual and organizational strength to bear on behalf of candidates who meet your rigid specifications of honor and outlook.

As individuals, you have the responsibility and duty to become actively engaged in partisan politics. I am not here as a recruiter for the Republican Party, although I will be glad to take membership applications at the door. What I am saying is that you cannot, as individuals, expect to achieve concrete political results if you are unwilling to join and work for the party of your choice. It is only within a party that you can help to determine party policy, help select candidates for party nomination and work for their eventual election. It is only within a political party that you can till and fertilize the soil which will produce the kind of legislators who will, for example, get the farm problem out of politics. I can count on the fingers of one hand the number of farm bureau members in my district who are working actively in a political party and the same goes for farm bureau leaders in my State. If this is true across the land, then I say the Farm Bureau Federation has no complaint when it finds the halls of our legislatures slowly filling up with those whose views are diametrically opposed to its own.

I will go even further and say that, beyond your clear call to duty as individuals, your federation, if it hopes to be effective in promoting its program, must take an active interest, as an organization, in the nomination and election of legislative candidates. You can deliberate in this convention and devise the finest program in the world and all of your efforts will go for naught if your organization is willing to stand on the sidelines and permit the election of legislators who are diametrically opposed to your basic philosophies. The day has long since passed when you can confine your political efforts to education after the elections have been held. How, I ask you, can even the most efficient Washington staff sell farm bureau philosophy to a Congressman who owes his allegiance to Walter Reuther or Jim Patton? I think your Washington staff has been doing a splendid job but you give them an impossible job if you do not also play your fullest part in trying to send to the Congress men who will work with your Shumans, Flemings, Lynns, and Triggs, rather than working against them.

I am not suggesting that your organization become the farm branch of one of our political parties. I hope, however, that I have made it crystal clear that I believe your organization cannot afford to be neutral in any political contest where one candidate is for and the other against everything for which you stand. Nor indeed, do I see much hope for America if our best citizens and our most respected groups stand smugly aside while the real struggle is being fought and permit victory by default for those whose policies can lead only to the collapse of our Nation.

The 18th century British statesman, Edmund Burke, said: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." He also said that "the people never give up their liberties but under some delusion." The gravest danger confronting our Nation today is that the people delude themselves into believing there is an easy way out of all their difficulties. The triumph of such evil can only come about if good men stand idly by. Let it never be said that you and I were among those who, in a period of moral crisis, maintained our neutrality and did nothing.

New York State Banking Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the forthcoming session of the New York State Legislature, efforts will again be made by a few giant New York City banks to amend the State banking law so as to eliminate the State branch bank district lines that have safeguarded competitive independent banking in this State.

A concurrent effort will be made by the same group to prevent the New York

Legislature from continuing the legislative freeze on bank holding company expansion within the State.

For your information I have prepared a statement on this subject. The statement demonstrates that if independent banking, through the competition of numerous small unit banks, is to be preserved in New York State and a monopoly in banking avoided, we must assure, one, that the present branch bank district lines are not changed; and, two, that the current freeze against the expansion of bank holding company operations is continued. I do hope that you will find this statement helpful in your consideration of this most important problem.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON PROPOSED CHANGE IN NEW YORK STATE BANKING LAWS

In recent years the giant New York City banks annually have sought to amend the law and eliminate the State branch bank district lines that have safeguarded competitive independent banking in this State. Every year these big city banks have sought, thus far unsuccessfully, authority to extend their dominion over all of the New York State banking business. They try to do this either through vastly expanded branch banking operations, or, in the alternative, through the use of the bank holding company device to operate by means of a multitude of subsidiaries throughout the State.

It is certain that their efforts will be repeated in the coming session. Both Governor Rockefeller and his assistant, G. Russell Clark, the State superintendent of banks, announced shortly after the State senate rejected on March 24, 1959, last year's omnibus bank bill, that bank legislation would be given first priority.

Another aspect in the banking picture is equally important. The current freeze on bank holding company expansion, which the New York Legislature has imposed since January 29, 1957, is due to expire on February 14, 1960. If nothing is done, if prompt action is not taken, the large New York City banks will be in a position, through the holding company device, to swallow up all of the little banks in the State.

In my considered judgment continuation of independent banking in New York State is dependent upon (1) the defeat of any bill that would change the present State branch district lines, and (2) the passage of a bill that would extend the current legislative freeze on bank holding company expansion.

BRANCH BANK DISTRICT LINES

The banking system of New York State traditionally has relied for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Nevertheless, there has been in recent years a discernible trend in New York State toward concentration of the banking business into fewer and larger hands. Indeed, in New York City, the four largest banks now control over 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. What is more, the two largest—Chase Manhattan and First National City—control almost 42 percent of the city's banking assets.

Present statutory branch bank district lines were drawn in 1934 in the shadow of the bank holiday in order to arrest undue concentration of banking facilities. The single most important reason for such geographical restrictions was to prevent banks with head offices in New York City from establishing branches in the suburban counties of Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk and thus to protect independent unit banks outside of New York City from the encroachment of the giant money market institutions located in the city.

In addition, it was felt that control and ownership would not and could not meet the needs of the community as efficiently as locally owned and operated banks. This is as true today as it was in 1934 when the branch bank district lines were first established.

Owing to the increase in concentration among the city's banking institutions in the past 20 years, it is even more important now to guard against the encroachment that the big banks desire. There seems to be little doubt that if giant banks in New York City are allowed to penetrate into the suburban areas, the small unit banks there would be placed in far greater jeopardy. For one thing, their means of competing would be hardly comparable to those available to their huge city rivals. Indeed, to suppose that entry by the giant financial institutions of New York City into the suburban areas might have no adverse competitive effect on the independent banks located in these areas is to suppose that a chicken could dance with an elephant and come out unharmed. With the present district line obliterated, the suburban banking communities would soon be transformed into an area overwhelmingly dominated by a few large city institutions.

Last year the legislature rejected the omnibus bank bill which would have obliterated the branch bank district lines between New York City and the outlying suburban areas of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties. This change would have permitted branch bank expansion throughout the entire new district. It is essential that we assure that this type of legislation or some similar legislation does not get enacted during the next session of the State legislature.

EXPANSION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

State branch bank district lines can also be circumvented and their safeguards against banking monopoly destroyed through the use of the bank holding company device. Geographic limitations can be avoided by the simple expedient of forming a holding company to acquire control of banks throughout a State without regard to district lines.

This whole issue of holding company circumvention of branch lines came dramatically to life in New York State when the First National City Bank applied to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to form the largest bank holding company in the Nation. Initial objective of First National City was to acquire control of the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N.Y., the dominant commercial bank in Westchester County, and thus pierce the branch line separating New York City and Westchester. In short, through the device of forming a holding company, the same management which was restricted in its operation under a bank charter to New York City, sought to acquire a unit bank in another district, operate it in the same manner a branch would be operated, and flout the expressed will of the legislative body of New York State regarding the establishment of banks. Moreover, there was every prospect that the First National City Bank plan would initiate a chain reaction until ultimately a handful of giant New York City banks, through the holding company device, would be in control of nearly every sizable bank in the State of New York. Success of the plan would have meant that the day of independent unit and regional banking would have passed and that money and credit in New York State would be largely controlled by a few gigantic banking institutions.

For these reasons, I testified at length before the Federal Reserve Board calling attention to the alarming competitive consequences of the proposal. You will recall that the Federal Reserve Board after hearing exhaustive testimony on this proposal by all affected parties, concluded that approval of such transaction would be detrimental to competition and contrary to public interest.

In addition, I testified in the early part of January 1957 before the State of New York Joint Legislative Committee To Revise the Banking Laws and pointed out the necessity of amending the State's banking laws to prohibit any bank holding company from acquiring in the future any bank located outside the district prescribed for branch banks.

It is gratifying that Governor Harriman and the New York Legislature recognized the threat to the State banking structure implied in the First National City plan. This was evidenced by adoption on January 29, 1957, of stopgap legislation, effective until May 1, 1957, prohibiting any bank holding company from acquiring a bank located outside the branch banking district. It has been reaffirmed by subsequent legislative approval of measures extending this legislation until February 16, 1960.

It must be remembered that the proposal to expand bank holding company operation seeks to employ an ingenious device to accomplish indirectly that which is prohibited by the State in establishing branch district lines. It thus effectively dissolves bank district lines.

It is my view that practically speaking a holding company system is a substitute for a branch system and the difference between branch banks and subsidiary banks in a holding company system is a difference without a distinction. Bank holding company groups and branch banking systems both accomplish the same thing—the operation of a number of banking units under one control and management.

You will recall that the omnibus bank bill, which the legislature rejected last year, would have established two bank holding districts in the State, the first consisting of New York City, Long Island, and Westchester and Rockland Counties, the second of the balance of the State. That bill would have allowed a bank holding company to acquire banks anywhere within the district. Beyond that the bill would have permitted a holding company formed by a bank in the second district to acquire banks in the first district if the first district banks constituted 45 percent or less of the holding company's total assets.

If the State legislature had ratified this bill, as Governor Harriman previously had stated, on November 20, 1956, there would have been "ignited what may be the greatest chain reaction in recent banking history" the effects of which "will go to the very roots of the entire banking structure of New York State" with the "distinct possibility" of "concentration of banking assets in the hands of a few institutions."

In his comments on a holding company proposal similar to the one in the omnibus bank bill, Mr. George A. Mooney, the former superintendent of banks of the State of New York, had this to say on December 12, 1956:

"The very existence of a number of large bank holding companies would create competition amongst them for future expansion in other communities. If the many unit banks found it impossible to resist the holding company movement, we could expect in short order a heavy concentration of banking assets, facilities, and credit in a handful of giant statewide bank holding company systems."

The argument has been advanced that if future bank holding company expansions are to be limited to branch district lines, the effect would be to create a monopoly for the Marine Midland banking system. I am not aware that this system constitutes a serious

threat to the competitive banking system of New York. But if this is, or even threatens to be the case, legislation limiting bank holding company acquisition to branch districts, could well be made applicable to the existing Marine Midland system.

The fact that no such suggestion has been made gives rise to the conclusion that existence of the Marine Midland group is seized upon as an excuse for permitting statewide expansion of banks through the holding company device. Moreover, the problem raised is not a new one by any means. Congress was faced with an essentially similar problem in connection with a provision in the bank holding company bill prohibiting future interstate expansion by bank holding groups. The act as adopted, you will recall, does not affect interstate acquisition of banks by holding companies which were completed prior to the act's passage. Therefore, a bank holding company's interstate status, accomplished prior to the act's adoption, is frozen.

To follow the rationale advanced here to its logical conclusion, once a company obtains dominance, no action of any kind should be taken against other companies which attempt to obtain similar monopoly status. If this contention were to be followed by the Congress, no action would have been taken in December 1950 to adopt the Celler-Kefauver Anti-Merger Act, which you will recall, amends section 7 of the Clayton Act to forbid corporate mergers, regardless of how accomplished, where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. And if this contention were to be followed, the Federal Government would have taken no action to prevent the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger on the basis that the United States Steel Corp. has assets exceeding the combined assets of the merging companies.

It may also be noted that a number of States, including Illinois and Georgia, have enacted legislation recently, prohibiting bank holding company groups from acquiring 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of two or more banks. Again, such legislation does not apply to stock of bank holding companies acquired prior to passage of the measure.

It has also been contended that unless bank holding companies are permitted to expand on a statewide basis, the hands of supervisory authorities would be tied in any future period of economic decline. It is stated that if weak points in the banking structure developed in a district in which there was no bank strong enough to acquire the failing institution, the supervisor would not be able to call in a holding company from another district.

What must be recognized is that the situation today is entirely unlike that which existed during the last bank depression. Today, the FDIC Act and other measures adopted in the middle or late 1930's, serve to insulate depositors from financial loss. In any event, if this is now a matter of serious concern, there is no reason why legislation limiting bank holding companies to the geographic area in which banks are permitted to operate branches, could not contain an exception so as to allow a holding company in appropriate cases to acquire a bank in another district, if this is necessary to save a failing institution. It is one thing to incorporate such an escape clause in legislation. It is quite another to seize upon the failing bank argument to justify statewide expansion of bank holding companies.

One final point needs comment. It has been contended by advocates for certain city banks that the Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 has preempted the field and that there is no area for permissible State action in respect of bank holding companies. The argument, in short, is that continuation of the State freeze on bank holding company expansion is futile in light of the Federal statute. This, it is evident, is entirely fallacious.

The provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act coupled with its legislative history make it crystal clear that there has been reserved to the States wide latitude to adopt appropriate bank holding legislation. Thus, section 7 of the Bank Holding Company Act specifies that "the enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof."

I turn to legislative history which explains in detail what that section means. The report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee[1] makes this comment:

"Another provision of this bill expressly preserves to the States a right to be more restrictive regarding the formation or operation of bank holding companies within their respective borders than the Federal authorities can be or are under this bill. Under such a grant of authority each State may, within the limits of its proper jurisdictional authority, be more severe on bank holding companies as a class than (1) this bill empowers the Federal authorities to be or (2) such Federal authorities actually are in their administration of the provisions of this bill. In the opinion of the committee this provision adequately safeguards States rights as to bank holding companies."

Beyond that, Senator ROBERTSON, sponsor of the legislation in the Senate and chairman of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee which considered the measure, pointed out in Senate debate that "each State may * * * enact legislation to regulate bank holding companies."[2] As an example of the type of legislation States were empowered to enact, Senator ROBERTSON inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a bank holding bill recently passed by the Georgia Legislature,[3] preventing any bank holding company incorporated under State law or doing business in the State, from acquiring 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of two or more banks. Illinois enacted similar legislation.[4]

The decision of the Federal Reserve Board on July 10, 1958, denying the application of the First National City Bank to establish a holding company to acquire the County Trust Co. of Westchester, in nowise derogates from these conclusions. On the contrary, the Federal Reserve Board made it clear in its decision that it assumed the validity of the New York State freeze on bank holding company expansion. The Board ruled on the merits of the application holding that while the validity of the New York State statute freezing bank holding company expansion must be assumed, that statute was temporary in nature and there was not certainty that it would be further extended beyond its expiration date. The following excerpts from the opinion of the Federal Reserve Board in the First National City matter are relevant in this connection:

"The extent of the 'power and jurisdiction' of the States in the field of bank holding company regulation is, of course, not a matter for this Board's decision; nor may the Board undertake to determine whether the New York statute represents a valid exercise of that States power. These are matters for determination by the courts. Unless and until a court of competent jurisdiction holds the New York statute to be invalid, the Board must assume its validity."

The foregoing makes it clear that the Federal Bank Holding Company Act in nowise precludes the New York State Legislature from continuing the present freeze on bank holding company expansion.

[1] S. Rept. No. 1095 (84th Cong., 1st sess.), p. 11. See also Senate hearings, p. 48; House hearings, p. 98.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6752.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Mississippi outlaws bank holding companies while Vermont bars any corporation whose primary business is the holding of stock in other corporations. Wisconsin law provides that any corporation controlling a majority of stock in a State bank is to be deemed engaged in the business of banking and subject to supervision of the State banking department.

Library of Congress Gives History of Makeup of the American $1 Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, for years before I first came to this Congress about 14 years ago I was interested in the makeup of the American dollar bill. That interest continued and increased until recently I asked the Library of Congress to answer my letter of August 10, 1959, copy of which is hereinafter set forth, about the American dollar bill. I believe it of such common interest and information among the American people that I am herewith presenting the report of the Library of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1959.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Legislative Reference Service,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR FRIENDS: Will you please send to me, in duplicate please, a statement which I can insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—or otherwise use—as to the history and significance and why are they used, etc., of each of the items appearing on the face of the $1 bill of the United States of America, and on the reverse side thereof. For instance, the great seal of the United States. Why is the pyramid there? What does the wording mean and what language is it?

Make it as clear and complete as you can so that folks reading it can sort of get the picture of what it is and why.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

THE AMERICAN $1 BILL

Over 150 years ago, Benjamin Franklin, colonial champion of liberty and freedom, observed that "in this world nothing can be said to be certain, except death and taxes." This famous inventor, statesman, and philosopher could not possibly have foreseen that the new Nation—to whose creation he had contributed so much—would develop such basically sound currency. The first United States paper currency—the demand notes—were issued in 1861. These demand notes and most other issues since that time are still legal tender at their face value. Some issues will actually be redeemed by the Government at higher than face value.

The preservation of the integrity of American currency has been fostered through sustained faith in the solemn word of the Government, as well as the specie supporting

it. The Secret Service of the Treasury Department guards and protects against any losses through counterfeiting; and a system of strict internal checks is maintained at the Bureau of Engraving to pinpoint the responsibility of each operating section. Special ink, prepared within the Bureau, is used for printing all bills. The currency paper, composed of 50 percent cotton and 50 percent linen embedded with small red and blue fibers, is a special formula paper produced by a commercial establishment under close Government supervision. You can be sure that the statement on our currency—"This certificate is legal tender for all debts, public and private"—is more than a slogan—it is an oft-proved fact.

Some of the design features of our $1 bill, and other paper currency, are purely ornamental. Others are devised as security checks, and still others are ornamental but also protect against counterfeiting. For example, the etched borders (known as the conventional geometrical lathe design) around both the face and the reverse side of a $1 bill are attractively intricate in design—it would not be easy to duplicate the pattern in the design. The word "one" and the arabic numeral "1" appear numerous times on both the face and the reverse of the $1 bill adding to the attractiveness of the design, but also acting as a safeguard. On our $1 bill the designation "one" in varying form, can be found in 25 instances. On the face, or obverse side, "one dollar" appears twice; there are 8 notations of "one" and five arabic numerals "1". On the reverse side of the $1 bill the notation "one dollar" appears once; "one" is noted 5 times and the arabic numeral "1" appears 4 times.

All U.S. paper currency is printed in black ink on the obverse and green ink on the reverse, regardless of denomination. The serial number of the bills appears twice, in blue ink, on the face of the bill; once, to the upper right of the centered portrait of George Washington; and once, to the lower left of the portrait. A series note, the date bill, and other paper currency are small lettering to the left of the portrait.

The items enumerated above, along with the designations, silver certificate, "This certifies that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States of America one dollar in silver payable to the bearer on demand," and the signatures of Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasurer; all testify to the denomination of the currency and to the authority of the issuing body, but they do not have any particular historical significance.

On the other hand, there are some items with historical interest and meaning. Among these is the great seal of the Treasury. This seal is found in one form or another on every piece of paper money issued since the demand notes of 1861. Older than the Constitution of the United States, it has been affixed to official Treasury documents since 1782, although the exact date of adoption is not known.

Working as a committee, John Witherspoon—a New Jersey educator, Gouverneur Morris—Pennsylvania statesman and one of the signers of the Constitution; and Richard Henry Lee—Virginia statesman and great-grandfather of Gen. Robert E. Lee, supervised the design of the great seal of the Treasury. Some historians give full credit for the design to Gouverneur Morris, but the Treasury Department credits all three men with the creation of the seal.

The resulting design consists of a shield bearing the scales of justice; a key, symbolizing official authority; and 13 stars representing the original States. The seal is enclosed by a circle which bears the Latin legend—"Thesaur. Amer. Septent. Sigil.", an abbreviation of "Thesauri Americae Septentrionalis Sigillum"—"The Great Seal of the Treasury of North America." All silver certificates ($1, $5, and $10 denominations) carry the seal stamped in blue, immediately to the right of the appropriate portrait. U.S. $2 and $5 notes carry the seal in the same position, in red. The $100,000 gold certificate seal is stamped in yellow and the seal on the $5 to $10,000 Federal Reserve notes appears in green. On each denomination a different portrait appears, but the same Treasury seal—in the colors noted—is an integral part of every piece of paper currency.

Beginning with bills issued in 1935, $1 silver certificates have carried the obverse and reverse of the great seal of the United States. Unlike the great seal of the Treasury which appears on all paper money, the great seal of the United States is found only on $1 silver certificates.

Everyone is familiar with the American eagle as a national emblem of the United States. Since ancient times, the eagle's form has been utilized in art and symbolism. Ancient Roman armies used the eagle as a standard and early Christian art used the eagle to personify St. John, the evangelist. To this day, the eagle remains a symbol of war and triumphal trophies. The face of the great seal of the United States is built around the American eagle.

History does not record the date or time when the eagle was first used as a symbol of our Republic, but it appeared on several versions of the great seal which were submitted to conform with the Founding Fathers' resolution of 1776—"That Dr. Franklin, Mr. J. Adams, and Mr. Jefferson, be a committee to bring in a device for a seal for the United States of America."

On June 19, 1782, William Barton, artist and heraldry expert of Philadelphia, presented the completed replica of the seal, having modified the artwork and description turned over to him by Charles Thomson, Secretary of Congress. The final version of the great seal of the United States as we know it today, was presented to Congress by Mr. Thomson on June 20, 1782, and accepted on that same day. Mr. Thomson had been designated to review and revise the entire collection of proposals submitted to the Congress for approval. Thus, these two men are credited with utilizing to the best advantage all of the various ideas submitted by the many minds and hands having a part in the creation of the great seal of the United States. The great seal was again ratified after the Constitution was adopted in 1789.

The reasons for the use of the symbols found on the seal set forth in the authors', Thomson and Barton, explanation of the design are particularly interesting. Mr. Barton noted that the 13 vertical stripes appearing on the eagle's shield (which are red and white on the full color seal) represent the 13 States supporting the blue chief "which unites the whole and represents Congress." In other words, it is the union of the Thirteen Original States under Congress. The eagle appears in what is termed as the "displayed" attitude; that is, with wings and feet spread. Mr. Barton explained that the displayed eagle reflected the fact that "the American States need no supporters but their own virtue, and the preservation of their Union through Congress."

The eagle grasps an olive branch in its right talon; and a bundle of 13 arrows in the left talon—denoting the power of peace and war. From the beak of the eagle a streamer flows which carries the Latin words, E Pluribus Unum, "Out of many, one." For the crest, which is a basic part of any coat of arms, a circular field containing 13 stars appears above the head of the eagle. The description of this crest is graphically described in the law regarding the design of the seal. It reads thus:

"For the crest. Over the head of the eagle, which appears above the escutcheon, a glory, or a breaking through a cloud, proper, and surrounding 13 stars, forming a constellation, argent, on an azure field."

With regard to the reverse side of the seal the law reads as follows:

"Reverse. A pyramid unfinished. In the zenith, an eye in a triangle, surrounded with a glory proper. Over the eyes these words, 'Annuit Coeptis.' On the base of the pyramid the numerical letters MDCCLXXVI. And underneath the following motto, 'Novus Ordo Seclorum.'"

It was the thought of the authors, Thomson and Barton, that the unfinished pyramid represent strength and duration, and that the eye represent the eye of Providence. The Latin phrase Annuit Coeptis, translated means "He [God] has favored our undertaking." The phrase Novus Ordo Seclorum, means "A new order of the ages."

In the broadest sense, money is but a representation of wealth. The paper on which it is printed has virtually no intrinsic worth—its value comes from the fact that by common consent it can be exchanged for something of value, such as an automobile or food. By common consent and the solemn faith in the word of our Government the American $1 bill is a reliable medium of exchange, not only in the United States but throughout the world.

Correspondence on U.S.-U.S.S.R. Cooperation in Outer Space Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a series of letters and correspondence which I had in recent weeks. It deals with a most important subject, namely, cooperation between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of its Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, I am strongly of the opinion that such cooperation be established for the purpose of peaceful exploration of outer space. All of mankind stands to benefit immeasurably by international cooperation in this field, while the lack of such cooperation contains the seed of humanity's destruction at some future date.

The world today both fears and yet depends on the United States and the U.S.S.R. for guidance in the new space age. Both of these nations working separately would not only bankrupt each other, but may ultimately bring destruction upon themselves and the rest of mankind. Working together, in a spirit of cooperation, they can help bring about a better life on earth for all peoples. Together they can explore and exploit outer space for the benefit of all mankind, so that no one on earth need ever be in want.

Working in unison in this field, the United States and the U.S.S.R. can make a joint contribution to strengthen the permanent committee of the United Nations and eventually bring all nations into a world program of outer space re-

search and ultimate expansion toward other planets of the universe, thus guaranteeing an abundant life for all peoples.

Mr. Speaker, briefly stated, joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. cooperation in outer space exploration would accomplish the following:

First. It would accelerate progress in space exploration.

Second. It would save billions of dollars for both countries which could then be diverted to education and raising the standard of living of all peoples of the world, provided it is undertaken as a joint or multilateral operation.

Third. It would prevent waste and unnecessary duplication of effort.

Fourth. It would make possible an exchange program of scientists specializing in the field of outer space exploration.

Fifth. Better safety measures could be developed and applied.

Sixth. Joint outer space operations could be undertaken, as was done to some extent in the Antarctic during the International Geophysical Year projects. Among such joint operations could be the following: Sending a man or a team of men to make a landing on the moon; research of cosmic rays; worldwide communications; weather control; exploration of other planets; safe travel through space and safe reentry into the earth's atmosphere, and others.

In the meantime, our own research program in this field must continue so that we can catch up and surpass the achievements of the Russians, which would enable us to have a stronger position in our negotiations with them and in our efforts to obtain the kind of joint or multilateral cooperation which would provide and assure peace.

I urge our Government, through the Department of State and in cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to enter into immediate negotiations with the Russians on the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space.

Included in the correspondence which I am today inserting into the RECORD is a reply to me from the Chargé d'Affaires of the U.S.S.R. Embassy in Washington, Mr. M. N. Smirnovsky, which seems to me to be a clear indication that the U.S.S.R. is ready for such negotiation. The letter specifically states:

> The Soviet Government regards favorably the idea of concluding a bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of outer space. If the Soviet Union receives definite proposals to start negotiations on this question, we will be prepared to express our attitude toward them. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate not only on a multilateral basis, as in the U.N. Committee, but also on a bilateral basis, when such cooperation is based on mutually advantageous conditions.

Following is the text of the letters in the exchange of correspondence in the matter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., December 15, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: First, I want to thank you for your recent reply to my letter of August 26, 1959, on international cooperation on the peaceful uses of outer space within the framework of the United Nations. I am glad to note that progress is being made in this direction.

I was also pleased to learn that on November 24, 1959, the United States and the Soviet Union officially entered into an agreement for a cooperative program of nuclear research. This step augurs well for the future of mankind, and both countries deserve to be commended for it.

As a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of its Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, it seems perfectly logical to me that these two nations should extend their cooperation into the field of outer space. Let us apply the same spirit of cooperation as exemplified in the agreement reached in nuclear research toward the attainment of a United States-Soviet Union agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space.

Under such an agreement, it is not too difficult to visualize the early exchange of scientists who are specializing in the exploration of outer space, as well as an exchange of research information in this field. Similarly, the two nations can jointly undertake specific research projects of various kinds, such as the launching of satellites to sample certain physical phenomena of the universe, the establishment of joint tracking stations to keep flight articles under continued observation, joint operations in regaining control of space capsules returning to earth and their safe reentry into the earth's atmosphere; later, when man is introduced into the space environment, there could be joint logistic support for control and recovery operations and similar other joint efforts.

Such an arrangement would be most advantageous to both countries. At the present time, each country is conducting a vast research program of its own, which is costly, time consuming, and a duplication of effort. Naturally, such duplication is a great waste of money, effort, and brains, much of which can be saved if the scientific plans and projects in outer space undertaken by the two countries can be fully coordinated. There is no doubt that progress in space exploration would be greatly accelerated through such international cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I should further like to propose that the information obtained by our two countries regarding outer space be made available to other interested nations as a mark of our peaceful intentions and our desire to make available to mankind whatever benefits may accrue from this cooperative program.

I earnestly urge you to give full consideration to these proposals and to request the responsible officials in both countries to undertake early negotiations toward the attainment of an agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space.

The same letter is being forwarded to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, of the U.S.S.R.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 15, 1959.

Premier NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV,
Chairman, US.S.R. Council of Ministers,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

DEAR MR. PREMIER: First, I want to thank you for your recent reply to my letter of August 26, 1959, on international cooperation on the peaceful uses of outer space, within the framework of the United Nations. I am glad to note that progress is being made in this direction.

I was also pleased to learn that on November 24, 1959, the United States and the Soviet Union officially entered into an agreement for a cooperative program of nuclear research. This step augurs well for the future of mankind, and both countries deserve to be commended for it.

As a member of the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of its Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, it seems perfectly logical to me that these two nations should extend their cooperation into the field of outer space. Let us apply the same spirit of cooperation as exemplified in the agreement reached in nuclear research toward the attainment of a United States-Soviet Union agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space.

Under such an agreement, it is not too difficult to visualize the early exchange of scientists who are specializing in the exploration of outer space, as well as an exchange of research information in this field. Similarly, the two nations can jointly undertake specific research projects of various kinds, such as the launching of satellites to sample certain physical phenomena of the universe, the establishment of joint tracking stations to keep flight articles under continued observation, joint operations in regaining control of space capsules returning to earth and their safe reentry into the earth's atmosphere, later when man is introduced into the space environment there could be joint logistic support for control and recovery operations, and similar other joint efforts.

Such an arrangement would be most advantageous to both countries. At the present time, each country is conducting a vast research program of its own, which is costly, time consuming, and a duplication of effort. Naturally, such duplication is a great waste of money, effort, and brains, much of which can be saved if the scientific plans and projects in outer space undertaken by the two countries can be fully coordinated. There is no doubt that progress in space exploration would be greatly accelerated through such international cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I should further like to propose that the information obtained by our two countries regarding outer space be made available to other interested nations, as a mark of our peaceful intentions and our desire to make available to mankind whatever benefits may accrue from this cooperative program.

I earnestly urge you to give full consideration to these proposals and to request the responsible officials in both countries to undertake early negotiations toward the attainment of an agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space.

The same letter is being forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisenhower of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

DECEMBER 15, 1959.

Dr. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEITH: I not only approve, but will vigorously support, your request for more funds to increase our efforts in the space program. You know that I opposed cuts last year which have unquestionably retarded our progress.

I sincerely hope that you will use some of the money to expand your international cooperation section, because I am convinced that money alone in an all-out race into space will not solve the problem. In such a race, without international cooperation, we could impoverish our Nation, without attaining the peace and the strength we desire.

I fought for international cooperation in the establishment of a permanent committee for that purpose within the United Nations. I am glad to see progress being made

in that direction. I am now following the same procedure to seek a joint agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the peaceful uses of outer space by writing to both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

The only way I know of attaining peace is working for peace. If the two nations which have made the greatest advances in the exploration of outer space work together by directing their discoveries toward peaceful uses, which can create a world of abundance and bring all nations closer together, then the number of experiments in outer space could be expanded and at the same time result in savings of billions of dollars.

I want to develop this idea with you in hearings before my subcommittee.

With best wishes for a more fruitful new year, I am,

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VIC: In the President's absence, this will acknowledge your December 15 letter in further regard to international cooperation on the peaceful uses of outer space.

Your interest in the advancement of space exploration is appreciated, and you may be sure that the specific proposals you set forth in your letter on this subject will have consideration.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: Thanks so much for your thoughtful letter of December 15. I am sure that you will be interested in the progress we have made in developing a program of international cooperation. We will be happy to discuss this in hearings before your subcommittee and with you personally before that date if you so desire. Naturally, I am grateful for your vigorous support of the total space program. Only with congressional interest and support can we make the progress which we must make in this area of national endeavor.

Kindest personal regards and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 31, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: I refer to your letter of December 15 to the President discussing the possibility of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the field of outer space. In this connection, it is significant that during the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States and the Soviet Union reached agreement concerning participation in a new United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and in an international scientific conference to be held under United Nations auspices during 1960 or 1961. Further, on an informal technical basis, exploratory talks were conducted by scientists of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Soviet scientists during a visit by the latter to this country in November. Technical talks have also been held with scientists of a number of other countries. Such steps as these should provide the basis for an increasing degree of international cooperation in outer space activities.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION
DECEMBER 31, 1959.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: In response to your letter of December 15, 1959, addressed to N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, I have been instructed to inform you of the following:

The Soviet Government and its head N. S. Khrushchev appreciate your efforts toward further development of cooperation between our two countries.

The Soviet Government regards favorably the idea of concluding a bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of outer space. If the Soviet Union receives definite proposals to start negotiations on this question, we will be prepared to express our attitude toward them. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate not only on a multilateral basis, as in the U.N. Committee, but also on a bilateral basis, when such cooperation is based on mutually advantageous conditions. As is known the Soviet Union has already more than once made proposals on cooperation on the outer space problems. I have been also instructed to inform you that satisfaction is being expressed in the Soviet Union that XIV session of the U.N. General Assembly, which ended not long ago, decided to establish a United Nations Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union will take an active part in the work of the Committee.

Sincerely,

M. N. SMIRNOVSKY,
Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the U.S.S.R. in the U.S.A.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for your letter of December 31, 1959.

Yesterday I was handed the U.S.S.R. response to my letter of December 15, 1959. For your information I am mailing you a copy of the letter as well as the translation.

I believe this is a good sign and I trust the Department will immediately engage the Russians in talks regarding the same.

I am at your disposal in anything I can do to cooperate.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1960.

Dr. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEITH: Thank you for your letter of December 17, 1959.

Yesterday I was handed the U.S.S.R. response to my letter of December 15, 1959. For your information I am mailing you a copy of the letter as well as the translation.

I believe this is a good sign and I trust your agency in cooperation with the Department of State will immediately engage the Russians in talks regarding the same.

I am at your disposal in anything I can do to cooperate.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, enable, we pray, with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might, those who in these fear-haunted times are here entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's life.

In our debates we face the things that divide this troubled world and set people against people, as their selfish interests clash. In prayer that is true and searching, we face Thee and ourselves, in Thy light.

Give us to see that the pride of nations, their greed, their lust of power, their aggressiveness against the lives of others, their deceitfulness and hypocrisy, are the very evils that corrode our own souls. And so we pray for ourselves, create in us clean hearts, O God.

Breathe on us, breath of God,
Fill us with life anew,
That we may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do.

Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JOHN ALBERT CARROLL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the

Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. William Langer, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Richard M. Simpson, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-three Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Under the provisions of the foregoing resolution, the Presiding Officer (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) appointed Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the calendar today under the rule was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act relating to the importation of adult honey bees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITION, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of that Office, for the quarter ended September 30, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH BIRDSBORO ARMORCAST, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated December 31, 1959, relating to his report on examination of Department of the Army contracts and subcontracts with Birdsboro Armorcast, Inc., Birdsboro, Pa., submitted on July 23, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STUDY RELATING TO RESPONSIBILITIES OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY IN EVENT OF WAR

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress made relating to responsibilities of that Agency in the event of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, GS–17, AND GS–18

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1959, on positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. F. A. Tinker, of Harrisville Heights, Ogden, Utah, relating to the protection of Rainbow Bridge from the water of Glen Canyon Dam, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, at Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the public ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Comemrce.

The petition of Charles S. Ballinger, of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of B. D. Diaz, of Brawley, Calif., relating to child education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees, of New York, N.Y., signed by Joseph Ecker, secretary, relating to the death of the late Senator William Langer of North Dakota; ordered to lie on the table.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS FOR FLORAL TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Lydia Langer Irwin, expressing appreciation to the Senate for the floral tribute in memory of

the late Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, which was ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original bill to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts, and I submit a report (No. 1019) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2778) to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts, reported by Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2765. A bill for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2766. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Hans Christian Gunnar Mikkelsen; and

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Shahrokh Basseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey land in the town of Cascade, El Paso County, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2773. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2774. A bill to foster the national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guarantee of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of efficient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2775. A bill to promote just and lasting peace by amending section 3 of the act of January 5, 1905, incorporating the American National Red Cross, so as to include among the purposes of such incorporation the prevention of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2776. A bill for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.; and

S. 2777. A bill for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2778. A bill to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2779. A bill relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2780. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) to clarify and protect the right of the public to information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2781. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Cellhorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2782. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act to further protect the right to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2783. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections against denial on account of race, religion, color, or national origin, by providing for the appointment of Federal registrars by the President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 2784. A bill to protect against deprivation of the right to a fair trial by lynching and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2785. A bill to provide for the retention, preservation, and production of Federal election records, papers, and ballots; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 2786. A bill to provide for permissive intervention by the United States in cases involving the denial of equal protection of the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 2787. A bill to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2788. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years, and to amend such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to erect a municipal fish market at the waterfront in Southwest Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution providing for the designation of Tuesday following the second Monday in June each year as National Fraternal Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution designating the American Marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 219) relative to the death of Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 220); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities; rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to

January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN V. CARTER

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 222) relative to the death of Representative STEVEN V. CARTER, of Iowa, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALVIN R. BUSH

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 223) relative to the death of Representative ALVIN R. BUSH, of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. BOYLE

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 224) relative to the death of Representative CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Illinois, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AIR CARGO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create an emergency airlift through a system of Government-insured loans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk for 2 days for possible additional sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection the bill will lie at the desk for 2 days, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 2774) to foster the national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guarantee of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of efficient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice, by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, during the closing days of the last session of Congress I discussed at some length the problems of modern military air transportation and the proper role of the Military Air Transport Service and the civil air carriers in providing the airlift necessary to an adequate national defense.

I suggested at that time that MATS could not maintain the immediate readiness required by its wartime mission if it continued to perform all routine military logistics in its own aircraft, nor without modernization of its fleet. I pointed out at that time that neither MATS nor the commercial carriers have modern cargo aircraft capable of intercontinental movement of significant quantities of fully equipped troops and military equipment. Since these remarks were made, we have had confirmation of this analysis from others with far more knowledge and experience than I in military affairs.

I suggested last year that the solution to these problems was apparent and attainable:

First, an orderly transfer of the routine logistics function from the MATS fleet to the civil carriers, to the extent of their present capacity to perform it; second, a comprehensive program to develop and encourage the civil carriers to procure modern cargo aircraft to provide the capacity required to perform the air logistics function in time of peace and permit its expansion in time of emergency; third, modernization of the MATS strategic transport fleet in terms of its primary hard core mission, and not in terms of its former airline mission.

It is my hope that before this session of Congress is concluded the reorientation of MATS toward a more effective military role will be well advanced. It is also my hope that during this session the Congress will receive from the Department of Defense recommendations for a comprehensive modernization and reequipment of the MATS strategic transport fleet. But these are fields in which the Congress can do little but propose and in which ultimately the executive branch must dispose.

It is in terms of the second step in this three-point program that the Congress can take the most significant and the most immediate action. We can enact legislation to develop and to encourage the civil carriers to procure modern cargo aircraft to provide the logistic capacity required by our Military Establishment in peace and the reserve airlift required in war.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to do just this. It proposes that the Civil Aeronautics Board be authorized to guarantee the repayment of loans for the purchase of cargo aircraft by the Nation's commercial airlines.

This approach to adequate airlift is offered as the result of almost 3 years of study by the members of the Aviation Subcommittee and the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Military Air Transport Service of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The details of the proposal are equally the result of consultations within the executive branch over a period of some 10 months. I commend it to my colleagues as an indispensable step in the development of a truly modern military establishment in the United States. I ask that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks for the information of the Congress.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in order to insure an adequate air cargo capacity to meet the needs of national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, and to promote the development of air commerce in the United States and abroad: (1) to encourage the development by United States aircraft manufacturers of new, efficient and modern cargo aircraft which will provide economical air cargo transportation; (2) to facilitate the acquisition of such aircraft by United States certificated air carriers; (3) to encourage the use of such cargo aircraft operated by such carriers for the movement

of commercial and Government cargo, and mail; and (4) to insure the immediate availability of such aircraft to meet military requirements in time of war, national emergency, or whenever a military situation requires. In furtherance of this policy, it is in the public interest that provision be made to assist such air carriers to acquire sufficient numbers of such cargo aircraft by providing guarantees of loans, for purchase thereof, on such terms as to insure their military availability.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(b) "Air carrier" means an air carrier as defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

(c) "Board" means the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(d) "Cargo aircraft" means a newly developed modern civil aircraft of the United States, including spare engines and parts, and other specialized components of a cargo airlift system directly associated with flight line cargo handling, designed exclusively for the carriage of property or mail, or emergency carriage of combat forces or materiel.

(e) "Cargo aircraft purchase loan" means any loan, or commitment in connection therewith, made to a United States certificated air carrier for financing the purchase of United States-manufactured cargo aircraft, and shall include loans to certificated air carriers or any other person engaged in flight line cargo handling, for financing the purchase of specialized components of a cargo airlift system.

(f) "Certificated air carrier" means an air carrier holding a currently effective certificate issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board authorizing it to engage in air transportation.

SEC. 3. For a five-year period after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with any lender guaranteeing him against loss of principal or interest on any cargo aircraft purchase loan made by such lender subject to the following conditions:

(a) The Board shall require that such cargo aircraft be adequately insured against loss or damage for the duration of the guaranty, and shall require that the applicant execute or agree to execute a suitable instrument or instruments to secure the cargo aircraft purchase loan. The Board may consent to the modification of the provisions of any such cargo aircraft purchase loan as to the rate of interest, time of payment of interest or principal, security, or other terms and conditions, or to the renewal or extension of any such guaranty, whenever the Board shall determine it to be equitable to do so: *Provided*, That such modification, renewal, or extension is not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

(b) No guaranty shall be made:

(1) Extending to more than the unpaid interest and 90 per centum of the unpaid principal of any cargo aircraft purchase loan;

(2) On any cargo aircraft purchase loan or combination of such loans for more than 75 per centum of the purchase price of the cargo aircraft;

(3) On any cargo aircraft purchase loan whose terms, modification, renewal, or extension thereof does not require repayment, in substantially equal principal payments no less than annually, to be completed within ten years after the date on which the loan is first made;

(4) In any case where it would make the total face amount of such cargo aircraft purchase loan, together with any other such loan or loans to the same air carrier, or corporate predecesor air carrier or air carriers, then currently guaranteed and outstanding under the terms of this Act, exceed $75,000,000: *Provided, however*, That no more than $10,000,000 in total face amount of any cargo aircraft purchase loan or loans shall be guaranteed for any one air carrier, or other eligible persons, for the purchase of specialized components of a cargo airlift system;

(5) Unless the Administrator shall have certified that the characteristics of the cargo aircraft as defined in this Act to be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan conform to the general design and performance criteria established by him, and that the guaranty will further the objectives of this Act;

(6) Unless the Secretary of Defense shall have certified that the cargo aircraft to be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan has design and performance characteristics which satisfy the criteria of suitability for military use established by him;

(7) Unless the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Board that the borrower has executed a contractual undertaking to the Department of Defense that the cargo aircraft in respect of which the guaranty is made (i) will, in the event of war, a national emergency, or whenever a military situation requires as determined by the Secretary of Defense, be made immediately available to the Department of Defense during the period of this guaranty, on reasonable terms including pricing criteria and arrangements for operation of the cargo aircraft agreed to prior to the making of the guaranty, and (ii) will not during the period of this guaranty be disposed of, except to a United States certificated air carrier: *Provided, however*, That the borrower, with the consent of the Secretary of Defense, may, for the purpose of fulfilling the foregoing undertakings substitute for any cargo aircraft on which a cargo aircraft purchase loan has been made hereunder a newer, more efficient, and modern cargo aircraft eligible for a cargo aircraft purchase loan and guaranty pursuant to this Act;

(8) Unless the Board shall have received a contractual undertaking satisfactory to it that the cargo aircraft be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan will be used primarily during the period of the guaranteed loan for the carriage of property or mail;

(9) Unless the Board shall have found (i) that, without such guaranty, the air carrier or other eligible person would be unable to obtain necessary funds for the purchase of such cargo aircraft on terms which are reasonable and compatible with efficent and profitable operation, (ii) that the prospective earning power of the air carrier or other eligible person furnishes reasonable assurance of the air carrier's ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor, (iii) that the value of the cargo aircraft covered by the guaranty will reasonably protect the interests of the Government in the event of default, and (iv) that the type and number of cargo aircraft proposed to be purchased by the air carrier will improve the economy and efficiency of the carrier's operation.

(c) Such guarantee shall be made in such form, on such terms and conditions, and pursuant to such regulations, as the Board deems necessary and which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any guarantee made pursuant to this Act shall provide that the sole recourse of the United States, as assignee of a defaulted loan, against the defaulting borrower shall be limited to repossession of the cargo aircraft and the receipt by assignment of insurance claims, and that the obligation of the borrower to the United States shall be satisfied and discharged by the surrender of the cargo aircraft and all right, title, and interest therein to the United States: *Provided*, That such cargo aircraft shall be (i) free and clear of all liens and encumbrances whatsoever (other than the lien of any instrument executed to secure the cargo aircraft purchase loan) and (ii) in as good order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as when acquired, except that any deficiencies may, to the extent covered by valid policies of insurance, be satisfied by the assignment to the United States of claims under such policies. Where the conditions of the foregoing proviso have not been met, the United States shall retain all of its rights and remedies.

SEC. 5. No payments required to be made as a consequence of any guarantee by the Board under this Act shall be made unless the lender has assigned all his right, title, and interest to the cargo aircraft to the United States.

SEC. 6. The Board shall prescribe and collect from the lending institution a reasonable guaranty fee in connection with each loan guaranteed under this Act.

SEC. 7. (a) To permit the Administrator, the Board, and the Department of Defense to make use of such advice and services as each may require in carrying out the provisions of this Act, each is authorized to use available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with their consent and on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act, including an immediate and orderly transfer of increasing quantities of routine Government sponsored air cargo traffic to the certificated air carriers.

SEC. 8. (a) Receipts under this Act shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(b) Payments required to be made as a consequence of any guaranty by the Board under this Act shall be made by the Board from funds hereby authorized to be appropriated in such amounts as may be necessary for that purpose.

(c) Administrative expenses under this Act shall be paid from appropriations to the departments and agencies concerned by administrative expenses.

SEC. 9. Any sale or other transfer of any cargo aircraft, on which a guaranty loan is outstanding, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, any regulation issued hereunder, or any undertaking required to be entered into pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this Act shall become effective upon its enactment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, briefly, the bill would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to guarantee the repayment of loans for the purchase only of approved modern cargo aircraft. The loan could not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of the aircraft and would have to be repaid within 10 years. Ninety percent of the unpaid balance would be guaranteed, and repossession of the aircraft would be the sole recourse of the Government in the event of default. Loans to any one carrier could not exceed $75 million.

Because the purpose of this proposal is not simply to permit civil carriers to acquire more aircraft, but to facilitate their acquiring a particular type of aircraft which meets military requirements, the bill provides that before the CAB can guarantee a loan the Secretary of Defense must certify that the cargo aircraft to be purchased with the proceeds of the loan is one which has design and performance characteristics which make it suitable for military use in an emergency. On the other hand, in order to insure that the aircraft is also suitable

for commercial use, the bill requires a similar certificate from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I am happy to report to the Senate that discussions between the military and civilian aviation agencies of the government looking toward a set of mutually acceptable design characteristics are already well advanced. I am also happy to report that it is the consensus among those most competent in this field that the development of a workhorse aircraft meeting both the needs of commercial and military aviation is now perfectly feasible.

Not only would this bill insure that the aircraft to be purchased from the proceeds of a guaranteed loan is suitable, but it would insure the availability of the aircraft to the Department of Defense in the event of a military emergency. On this score the bill is clear and unequivocal. It requires that the Secretary of Defense certify to the CAB that he has in his possession an executed contract with the borrower guaranteeing first, that the aircraft will be made immediately available to the Department of Defense in the event of war, or national emergency, or whenever a military situation is determined by the Secretary of Defense to require it; and second, that during the period of the guarantee the aircraft will not be disposed of by the borrower except to another U.S. certificated air carrier.

The responsibility for guaranteeing the loan and satisfying itself of the carrier's ability to repay it within the time fixed, and of insuring that the Government will be adequately protected by the value of the aircraft in the event of default, lies with the Civil Aeronautics Board. These and other detailed provisions of the bill will, of course, be the subject of thorough hearings, and Senators will have an adequate opportunity to study the details of the proposal.

I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the time has come to deal in the realities of today's military situation. I suggest that it is inexcusable that the greatest and richest Nation in the world let itself continue in a defense posture which makes it incapable of responding to anything but all-out thermonuclear war.

I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the indispensable element in preparedness for limited war situations is mobility and that in the decade of the sixties, military mobility means military airlift.

I am convinced that a substantial part of such airlift must be provided in a strategic fleet of military aircraft. I am equally convinced that a substantial part must be provided by a strategic reserve fleet of aircraft bought and used in peacetime by commercial carriers, but whose usefulness and availability to the Military Establishment in time of emergency is assured.

I believe that this bill is the means to achieve that reserve fleet. I believe that there is no greater contribution toward an adequate defense which can be taken at this session of Congress than the passage of this legislation.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ADD WORLD PEACE TO THE INTERNATIONAL MISSION OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, considering the degree and the dangers of a thermonuclear world disaster threatening the very annihilation of the human race, man must strive relentlessly in his quest for peace. No stone should be left unturned, nor should any idea which may help the cause for peace go unexamined. This fact is more apparent today than ever before. For when we look back to 1945 when the atomic bomb was used on Hiroshima, we can remember that this 20-kiloton bomb, the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT, caused 150,000 casualties in an area of 5 square miles. It is important to remember, however, that today, this weapon is small as compared to the largest weapons in our present stockpile. Furthermore, the dread radiation resulting from these large bombs, should ever a thermonuclear war break out, would cause irreparable disaster not only to the many thousands of people in the immediate vicinity of the explosion, but perhaps would cripple and maim future generations. In such a war, no true victor could emerge. As a result, all our strategy and efforts should be directed toward the prevention of such a war.

Now as never before, our threatened world must have peace, and now as never before, men of good will everywhere must rise to the challenge of possible annihilation and contribute their talents, the world over, for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, it is with this thought in mind that I am pleased to introduce a worthy bill which was introduced earlier by my distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, of Vermont. Representative MEYER's bill, H.R. 9027, introduced September 2, 1959, would amend the charter of the American National Red Cross so as to authorize the organization "to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

Section 8 of the American Red Cross charter reserves to Congress the right to amend or repeal the purposes of the organization as outlined in section 3 of the charter. This bill would provide a new clause to be added at the end of section 3, which would read as follows:

Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

RED CROSS COULD HELP PROMOTE PEACE

Mr. President, the first three purposes of the American National Red Cross relate solely to activities in time of war, mainly to furnishing aid to the sick and wounded. The fourth purpose permits voluntary relief and communication between the people and the Armed Forces in time of peace as well as in time of war. Only the fifth clause of section 3 of the charter refers to nonmilitary matters, and it refers to nonmilitary matters only. It permits peacetime relief of "the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities." This clause does permit preventive work for the calamities mentioned, but it does not include any reference to war or military matters. And since the other four clauses, which refer to war and military matters, do not contain any preventive measures, the bill I am introducing is needed to permit the Red Cross to engage in measures designed to prevent war and promote peace.

Naturally, the Red Cross may be reluctant to engage in the activities permitted by this proposed legislation, but it is important to note that this bill permits—but does not direct—the officials of the Red Cross to take on this additional responsibility. Whereas the original Red Cross was essentially a remedial agency, it has continually broadened its functions, until it has reached today a point where it has never had a greater prestige. It has now become a very important educational, health-protecting organization, as well as giving substantial assistance to individuals with misfortunes of many kinds. It administers first-aid and water-safety programs, and it has home nursing courses, blood banks, rural health centers, youth organizations, and generally does a great many things which otherwise would be left undone.

Although the President of the United States is ex officio the head of the American Red Cross, and although the Red Cross cooperates closely with the Government, it is independent of the Government. The Red Cross has never been involved in politics, for humanity knows no favorites. In delicate international situations, the Red Cross has performed valuable services, and through its continued nonpolitical nature, it has continuously promoted better understanding among peoples and thereby promoted an attitude of peace.

RED CROSS HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL

Mr. President, the International Red Cross is the most influential humanitarian lay organization in the world today. It has 125 million individual members, and as good loyal citizens of the 80 or more member countries, this ever-growing membership has been playing a vital part within the political, educational, religious, and other social organizations of their own countries.

The enactment of this bill would have a powerful effect throughout the world. The fact is that the American Red Cross, acting without political involvements, could do much toward the establishment of a just and lasting peace. The amendment to the charter would be an example of the peaceful aspirations of the American people, and it might well stimulate positive action by other countries in this same direction.

Mr. President, in the past the Red Cross has been in the background ready to act in case of a war. Today, however, the Red Cross cannot prepare for any next world war, as it prepared for

World War I and II, for a single 20-megation hydrogen bomb carries more explosive power than all the bombs put together that were dropped during the entire Second World War. Since it would be impossible for the Red Cross to adequately prepare for a nuclear war, it can only prepare for a genuine world peace.

This proposal which I am cosponsoring with Representative MEYER is not a new proposal. In 1955, some 87 members of the Harvard Class of 1900, headed by Conrad Hobbs, retired Boston merchant, sent an open letter to President Dwight D. Eisenhower advocating the creation of a commission similar to the Red Cross for the study and promotion of world peace. This open letter suggested that the President appoint a commission of perhaps 20 men and women, from the industrial and financial leaders of the United States, from the clergymen, scientists, lawyers, farmers, labor leaders, educators, statesmen, philanthropists, historians, publicists, and others preeminent in their fields, who would make an exhaustive study in quest of a durable peace.

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT SUPPORTS PROPOSAL

This open letter was followed in 1958 by a petition signed by more than 150 outstanding Americans, asking President Eisenhower to recommend a charter amendment authorizing the American National Red Cross to work for the prevention of war and for the promotion of peace. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who has become synonymous in our time with humanitarian and good deeds, is among the many prominent signers of this petition. Among the other distinguished signers are Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, past president of the American Medical Association; Sarah G. Blanding, president of Vassar College; H. J. Gezork, president of Andover-Newton Theological School; Rev. Dana McGreeley, president of the American Unitarian Association; Samuel B. Gould, president of Antioch College; Robert J. Johnson, president of Temple University; William E. Stevenson, president of Oberlin College; Wesley A. Sturgis, dean of the Yale Law School; Miller Upton, president of Beloit College; Ralph Lowell, president of the Lowell Institute of Boston; and Dr. Robert H. Ellis noted retired physician of Portland Oreg.

The petition points out that "it has become obvious that bolder steps than ever before must be taken if this universal longing for peace is to be realized." It then argues that the Red Cross has unique qualifications in this field and that with its membership of millions on both sides of the iron curtain its prestige everywhere and its dedicated leadership and unequaled record in the relief of human suffering it is the ideal organization for creating an atmosphere favorable to the establishment of peace throughout the world.

NEED IS NOW IMMEDIATE

Mr. President, now as never before men of good will everywhere must rise to the challenge of possible annihilation and contribute their talents for a durable peace. This proposal I am introducing today would amend the American National Red Cross charter so as to authorize this great humanitarian organization to engage in activities for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace. This responsibility, if taken on by the Red Cross, would admittedly be a huge task. But, it is consistent with the lofty purposes of this organization which in 1959 celebrated, throughout the world, its 100th birthday, and it would be a natural extension of the humanitarian causes already served by the agency. Although the final measures for the establishment of a durable peace must come from the governments of the world, the preliminary work, and the establishment of conditions favorable for peace must come from the people themselves. As the petition to the President of the United States of America concludes:

A long, long step forward could be taken under the leadership of the Red Cross.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I have just introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2775) to promote just and lasting peace by amending section 3 of the act of January 5, 1905, incorporating the American National Red Cross, so as to include among the purposes of such incorporation the prevention of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American National Red Cross", approved January 5, 1905 (36 U.S.C., sec. 3) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the open letter to the President of the United States by members of the Harvard class of 1900, the petition to the President of the United States in 1958 to which I have just referred, together with an editorial from the Boston Herald of September 17, 1959, entitled "New Task," supporting enlargement of the Red Cross charter.

There being no objection, the letter, petition, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the spirit of your repeated declaration that no stone should be left unturned in the quest for a durable peace, we wish respectfully to suggest that you appoint a commission of perhaps twenty men and women, preeminent in their fields, to make an exhaustive study of this vast and complex problem.

The problem, as we see it, encompasses far more than lies within the field of the Government, which is concerned, primary, with its military, diplomatic and political aspects. It reaches in to the fields of religion, racial prejudice, nationalism, economics, mass psychology and many other fields.

We all know that heretofore the search has been fruitless; that wars have persisted with cumulative and aggravated horrors. But we cannot admit that the futility of past attempts foreshadows failure for fresh efforts. We cannot concede that man is biologically and inherently a destructive, suicidal creature. The certainty that another major war would inflict on all mankind, on victors as well as vanquished, on civilians as well as combatants, on children and women, the most cruel calamity in history, impels us to plead for sympathetic consideration of this new approach.

We recommend that you muster the proposed commission from both the business world and the professions—industrial and financial leaders, clergymen, scientists, lawyers, farmers, labor leaders, educators, statesmen, philanthropists, historians, publicists, and others. We believe that the coordinated, matured judgments of the clearest minds might provide a program for the country at large, a program that would supplement and fortify the comprehensive efforts which the Government is making. Under your inspiring leadership, Mr. President, far more could be done in every community in the land—by study groups, debates, lectures, forums and the like; far more in schools and colleges; far more by the radio and TV and the press. Millions could be spent with profit on such endeavors.

We recommend that this Commission be asked to give serious consideration to the establishment of an agency, somewhat similar in structure to the American National Red Cross, which is a nongovernmental body yet closely associated with the Government. The Red Cross has its charter from the Congress of the United States; its Honorary President is the President of the United States; eight of its Board of Directors are appointed by the President. But, at the same time, in its operations it is autonomous; it raises its funds from the people (in its fiscal year 1953–54 well over $85 million) and it carries on its multifarious activities largely by the work of its volunteers, in its 7,700 branches and chapters throughout the country. Furthermore, it has taken a leading part in the creation of similar institutions in 70 other countries, joined together in the League of Red Cross Societies.

Such steps would give further evidence to the world that our vast military machine must be maintained, only because we live in a world of international discord and anarchy, from which we have, so far, been unable to escape. Such an undertaking, we submit, might have many far-reaching benefits:

It might stimulate to positive action many segments of our people who today, without leadership, participate only passively in the search for peace.

It might stimulate other countries to take similar action, as has the Red Cross.

It might lead the way for a spiritual and moral resurgence throughout the country and perhaps the world.

It might, in fact, prove the catalyst which would bring all these and many other forces together in such an overwhelming demand for peace that no government would dare ignore their mandate.

To be sure, many individuals and organizations are hard at work on this problem, but no one, to our knowledge, has proposed a definite, feasible plan so far reaching and so likely to gain the cooperation and support of our countrymen.

Nearly a hundred years ago, an obscure Swiss businessman crossed the bloody battlefield of Solferino the day after the battle and, viewing the abandoned wounded, dying, and dead, vowed that such inhumanity must

no longer be endured. From that day forth, Henri Dunant, renouncing all else, began sowing the seed which became the great farflung humanitarian organization the Red Cross is today. Does not our proposal present to you, Mr. President, a similar opportunity for a great organized movement of our people, leading, under God, to a lasting peace?

Respectfully,

Members of the Harvard class of 1900: Prof. Edward L. Adams, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William H. Armstrong, Amherst, Mass.; Dr. Floyd G. Ballentine, Lewisburg, Pa.; Dr. J. Dellinger Barney, Boston, Mass.; W. Lee Beardsell, Belmont, Mass.; Dr. Conrad Bell, Waltham, Mass.; Alfred A. Benesch, Cleveland, Ohio; Carroll M. Bill, East Weymouth, Mass.; George W. Billings, Milford, Mass.; Earl D. Bond, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Henry C. Boynton, Trenton, N.J.; Dr. Thomas D. Brown, New York, N.Y.; Frank M. Buckland, West Hartford, Conn.; Freeman F. Burr, Wayne, Maine; Frank W. Buxton, Brookline, Mass.; Dunbar F. Carpenter (deceased), Winchester, Mass.; Dr. George O. Clark, Newburyport, Mass.; Albert A. Cobb, Lakeland, Fla.; John F. Cole, Somerville, Mass.; Harry F. R. Dolan, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis M. Dougan, Middle Granville, N.Y.; Harold T. Dougherty, Westfield, Mass.; Arthur Drinkwater, Cambridge, Mass.; Walter Prichard Eaton, Sheffield, Mass.; William Edmunds, Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Dr. Robert H. Ellis, Portland, Oreg.; Owen David Evans, Prospect Park, Pa.; William P. Everts, Cambridge, Mass.; Dean Floyd Field, Atlanta, Ga.; Maj. Gerald F. Furlong, Hampton, New Brunswick, Canada; Arthur M. Goodridge, Cambridge, Mass.; George W. Harrington, Providence, R.I.; Duncan G. Harris, New York, N.Y.; Edmund Heard, Mathews, Va.; A. Stedman Hills, Washington, D.C.; Conrad Hobbs, Boston, Mass.; Byam Hollings, Concord, N.H.; Llewellyn Howland, South Dartmouth, Mass.; Gardiner G. Hubbard, Barcelona, Spain; Herbert L. Hunt, Guethary, B.P., France; Frank L. Jewett, Austin, Tex.; William N. Johnson, Mattapoisett, Mass.; Walter D. Lambert, Canaan, Conn.; Aubrey E. Landry, Washington, D.C.; Frederic W. Lane, Tacoma, Wash.; Samuel W. Lewis, Lancaster, Mass.; Walter Lichtenstein, Cambridge, Mass.; Robert Livermore, Topsfield, Mass.; Edward F. Loughlin, West Concord, Mass.; Marklove Lowrey, Utica, N.Y.

Albert G. Mason, Milton, Mass.; Wilbur Morse, Long Beach, Calif.; James H. Morss, North Abington, Mass.; Walter G. Mortland, New York, N.Y.; Clifford Norton, Chatham, N.J., John H. Page, Phoenix, Ariz.; George W. Presby, Melrose, Mass.; Dr. Richard R. Price, Hutchinson, Kans.; C. Newton Prouty, West Brookfield, Mass.; Wynn M. Rainbolt, Pine Valley, Calif.; Montgomery Reed, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. James A. Richards, Winter Park, Fla.; Avery Robinson, New Lebanon, N.Y.; Herbert G. Robinson, Aurora, N.Y.; George F. Root, Concord, Mass.; Dr. Ernest Sachs, North Haven, Conn.; Robert A. Sanborn, Brookline, Mass.; William N. Seaver, Melrose, Mass.

T. Mott Shaw, Concord, Mass.; Homer H. Smith, Gloucester, Mass.; Frank H. Stevens, Marblehead Neck, Mass.; Ralph W. Stone, Harrisburg, Pa.; William B. Swinford, Norman, Okla.; Harold Tappin, Far Hills, N.J.; Cecil H. Taylor, New Milford, Conn.; Myron E. Terbush, Utica, N.Y.; George A. Towns, Atlanta, Ga.; Fred H. Train, Orange, Mass.; Rev. Arthur L. Washburn, Siena, Italy; James Otis Watson II, Fairmont, W. Va.; Ralph H. Watson, Greenwich, Conn.; Charles F. Wellington, Boston, Mass.; Ross K. Whiton, Springfield, Vt.; George A. Whittemore, East Orange, N.J.; Frederick M. Wilder, Port Hueneme, Calif.; Charles R. Woods, Southboro, Mass.; Stanley Woodworth, Seattle, Wash.

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned, respectfully petition that, as honorary president of the American National Red Cross, you recommend to Congress an amendment of its charter, whereby it will be authorized to engage in activities for the prevention of war. The amended portion (sec. 3, par. 5) would then read as follows:

"And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, as well as measures for the prevention of war."

We submit this petition to you in the spirit of your inspiring address to the Peoples-to-Peoples Conference, in which you said: "The problem of permanent peace is for the people to get together; to lead governments; if necessary, to evade governments; to work out not one method but thousands" in the endeavor to establish peace throughout the world.

It has become obvious that bolder steps than ever before must be taken if this universal longing for peace is to be realized. The Red Cross has unique qualifications in this field, qualifications far superior to those of most governments and private organizations.

The Red Cross has a membership of millions on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in its 75 national societies. Its prestige is high everywhere. Under dedicated leadership its members could form the nucleus of a mighty army of workers for peace. Its unequaled record in the relief of human suffering indicates clearly what it might accomplish in this new field.

It is no disparagement of other agencies to assert that they lack the organization and the facilities possessed by the Red Cross to stimulate to action millions of people who have been passive heretofore. As a war-preventive agency, the Red Cross would rivet the attention of mankind. An undertaking of this kind would be typical of the ever-widening scope of the Red Cross since it was established over a century ago to relieve the sufferings of soldiers lying wounded and uncared for on the battlefield of Solferino.

We do not venture to submit a bill of particulars for the Red Cross in this new and by far most important service it could render to mankind. That must be left to the directors of the Red Cross and to the committees which they would set up; and as you have pointed out, Mr. President, there are a thousand methods which could be employed, and the Red Cross is particularly well equipped to put many of these into operation. If the minds of millions of people could be directed to the problem of establishing peace throughout the world, is it not reasonable to expect that some far-spreading, deep-reaching programs, not yet developed and not foreseeable, might emerge, to the blessing of all mankind?

As it is not from huge armaments that freedom from war and from the fear of war will come, so it is that any expenditure of money, however large, is not only justified but necessary. Billions are spent annually for defense and, in present circumstances, these must continue. But can we not also afford to expend millions in an attempt to remove the conditions which make these heavy outlays unavoidable? We should not falter at spending vast sums in an attempt to arouse throughout the world a public opinion so strong that no government will dare to ignore the mandate.

The final formal measures for the prevention of war must come from governments, of course. The preliminary work, however, the establishment of an atmosphere for peace must come, as you have said, Mr. President, from the people themselves. A long, long step forward could be taken under the leadership of the Red Cross.

Respectfully,

John R. Alden, Durham, N.C.; Philip R. Allen (Retired), Boston, Mass.; Samuel F. Ashelman, Jr., Brinklow, Md.; Professor Thomas A. Bailey, Stanford, Calif.; Sam W. Banks, M.D., Chicago, Ill.; John Bardeen, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; James M. Baty, M.D., Brookline, Mass.; Rev. David Nelson Beach, New Haven, Conn.; Conrad Berens, M.D., New York, N.Y.; Walter L. Bierring, M.D., Des Moines, Iowa; Gordon B. Bilderback, president, Investment Trust, Champaign, Ill.; Roy A. Billington, Evanston, Ill.; Sarah G. Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; Lyman J. Briggs, physicist, Washington, D.C.; Donaldson Brown, Port Deposit, Md.; Donald L. Burdick, M.D., New York, N.Y.; Allan M. Butler, M.D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; Frank W. Buxton (Retired), Brookline, Mass.

Charles C. Cabot, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. Raymond Calkins, Cambridge, Mass.; Thomas P. Callaghan, Boston, Mass.; Oliver C. Carmichael, New York, N.Y.; Hamilton M. Chase, Old Greenwich, Conn.; John Chipman, Winchester, Mass.; Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Boston, Mass.; Rabbi Beryl D. Cohon, Brookline, Mass.; Donald Comer, Sr., manufacturing, Birmingham, Ala.; Kathleen Costello, editor, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Merle Curti, Madison, Wis.; Arthur C. Curtis, M.D., Ann Arbor, Mich.; Francis W. Davis, Belmont, Mass.; Dr. Lewis Dexter, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Theodore A. Distler, Washington, D.C.; Prof. Stuart Carter Dodd, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Stanley E. Dorst, M.D., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Truman Douglass, D.D., New York, N.Y.

Robert D. Dripps, M.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Marriner S. Eccles, banker, Salt Lake City, Utah; B. M. Edwards, banker, Columbia, S.C.; Robert H. Ellis, M.D., Portland, Oreg.; Gertrude Ely, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Kenneth C. Farnsworth, M.D., Weston, Mass.; Mrs. Donald F. Fenn, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Frederick A. Figi, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; Frances Fenner, Afton, N.Y.; Paul C. French, executive director, CARE, New York, N.Y.; Douglas VanArden Frost, Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill.; Frothingham Channing, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Lawrence H. Fuchs, Weston, Mass.; Dr. Claude M. Fuess, Brookline, Mass.; Leonard T. Furlow, M.D., St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. James L. Gamble, Brookline, Mass.; Herbert J. Gezork, president Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton, Mass.; Prof. Clinton S. Golden, Solesbury, Pa.; Thomas R. Goethals, M.D., Brookline, Mass.; Rev. James Gilkey, D.D., Weekapaug, R.I.; Francis G. Goodale, LL.D, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, D.D., Boston, Mass.; William C. Greene, Center Sandwich, N.H.; Samuel B. Gould, president, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Samuel R. Guard, editor, Louisville, Ky.; Luther H. Gulick, city administrator, New York, N.Y.; Trygve Gunderson, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. Basil Hall, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Lorraine W. Hall, Cambridge, Mass.; Oscar Hammerstein II, Doylestown, Pa.; Rev. S. Ralph Harlow, Northampton, Mass.; Oscar W. Hausserman, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Alexander B. Hawes, LL.D., Washington, D.C.; Edmund Heard, Mathews, Va.; Marion H. Hedges, Washington, D.C.; Andrew H. Hepburn, architect, Concord, Mass.; Ogden B. Hewitt, New York, N.Y.; Conrad Hobbs (retired), Boston, Mass.; George C. Holt, Woodstock, Conn.; Mrs. Robert Homans, Boston, Mass.; Mark A. DeWolfe Howe, author, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Kenneth Howes, Framingham Center, Mass.; Mrs. Llyewellyn Howland, Weston, Mass.; Palmer Hutcheson, Sr., LL.D., Houston, Tex.; Maynard Hutchinson, investment counselor, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. T. J. Jemison, Baton Rouge, La.; Robert J. Johnson, president, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Jacob

J. Kaplan, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Burton S. Kaufman, Brighton, Mass.; Nicholas Kelley, LL.D., New York, N.Y.; Henry P. Kendall, manufacturer, Boston, Mass.; Edward A. Kitlowski M.D., Baltimore, Md.

Leon J. Kowal, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; David B. Lackman, scientist, Hamilton, Mont.; Dr. John H. Lamb, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Rev. John Howard Lathrop, Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. Charles N. Leach Newfane, Vt.; Wyland L. Leadbetter, M.D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; John C. Leonard, M.D., West Hartford, Conn.; Samuel R. Levering, orchardist, Ararat, Va.; Alfred B. Lewis, Mount Vernon, N.Y.; Clarence C. Little, biologist, Trenton, Maine; Ralph Lowell, banker, Boston, Mass.; J. Franklin McElwain (deceased), manufacturer, Boston, Mass.; Thomas H. Mahoney, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Julius A. Migel, Charlestown, R.I.; Prof. Perry Miller, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis Mumford, author, Amenia, N.Y.; Charlton Ogburn, LL.D., New York, N.Y.; A. H. Parker, Jr., banker, Boston, Mass.; Miles Pennybacker, manufacturer, Norwalk, Conn.; Rev. Palfrey Perkins, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Ernest C. Pervier, East Templeton, Mass.; Clarence E. Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.; Walter B. Pillsbury, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Mrs. Abraham Pinanski, Boston, Mass.

Perry T. Rathbone, director, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.; B. F. Reed, Drift, Ky.; Frank H. Reichel, Villanova, Pa.; Robbert H. Reno, LL.D., Concord, N.H.; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Hyde Park, N.Y.; John H. Rubel, Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif.; Harold Russell, AMVETS, Natick, Mass.; Mrs. William Scheft, Newton, Mass.; R. Minturn Sedgwick, investment counselor, Boston, Mass.; Harry H. Semmes, Washington, D.C.; Hans Christian Sonne, financier, New York, N.Y.; C. Maxwell Stanley, manufacturer, Muscatine, Iowa; William E. Stevenson, president, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Dr. Wesley A. Sturgis, dean, Law School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; William Warren Sweet, Dallas, Tex.; Norris P. Swett, M.D., Hartford, Conn.; Dr. Jan H. Tillisch, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; Edward C. Tolman, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Miller Upton, president, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.; George H. Utter, Westerly, R.I.; H. Gerry Voorhis, executive director, Co-op League of U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.; Harold E. Wagoner, architect, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Earl Walker, M.D., Baltimore, Md.; James P. Warburg, author and lecturer, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Alfred H. Washburn, Denver, Colo.; William Van N. Washburn, Boston, Mass.; Prof. Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; James White, investment counselor, Boston, Mass.; James Chapin, artist, Glen Gardner, N.J.; Gunnar Gundersen, M.D., LaCrosse, Wis.; Rensselaer W. Lee, historian, Princeton, N.J.

Paul Dudley White, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Prof. George H. Williams, Arlington, Mass.; Stillman P. Williams, Lexington, Mass.; Mrs. George B. Wislocki, M.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; Herman Wouk, author, New York, N.Y.; Arnold S. Zander, AFL–CIO, Madison, Wis.; Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary, National Council Prevention War, Washington, D.C.; Mark Van Doren, author, Falls Village, Conn.; Rabbi Dudley Weinberg, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Standish Weston, Boston, Mass.

[From the Boston Herald, Sept. 17, 1959]

NEW TASK

Is peace attainable?

Intellectually, most of us say "No." But in our hearts we answer differently. For us and ours, we say, it must be attainable. There must be a way.

A few people—too few—try to reconcile these points of view. They keep looking for some intellectually satisfactory expression of the universal peace urge. They haven't found it yet, but they deserve our support. They are at least headed where we all want to go.

Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, of Vermont, has just introduced a bill in Congress to amend the charter of the American National Red Cross authorizing the organization "to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

It doesn't sound like a very imposing step. And the Red Cross itself isn't enthusiastic about it. But the legislation is permissive and it just might lead to something valuable. Locally, Mr. Conrad Hobbs and fellow members of the Harvard Class of 1900 have been advocating the same step on the ground that the Red Cross is the private international organization best equipped to take the assignment on.

Why not? What harm could come of it?

Dr. Jean S. Pictet recently observed: "The Red Cross is the only great idea in whose name men have never slain; it remains one of the few reasons for not losing hope; its work during many years offers the certainty and proof that love is stronger than death."

The task is a huge one, but it is consistent with the lofty purposes of the Red Cross. It is a natural extension of the humanitarian causes already served by the agency. Perhaps in this, its centennial year, it should assume a new responsibility.

The Meyer bill at least represents a forward step. Peace will certainly be no less attainable if it is passed. We join the call for an enlargement of the Red Cross charter.

RAYMOND THOMASON, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize Raymond Thomason and his wife, Pauline, to adopt a third Korean orphan. Oddly enough, under the law only two such orphans can be brought into the country by them. The third orphan has already been adopted, and is in an orphanage in Korea; and they wish to bring this orphan into the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2776) for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GEORGE E. WILLIAMS AND WILLIAM L. JOHNSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in the nature of a claim against the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2777) for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for some time the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been considering freedom-of-information legislation in connection with its study of the extent to which constitutional rights are being infringed by undue secrecy in government.

In the 85th Congress the subcommittee considered two freedom-of-information bills which I introduced: Senate bill 921, the language of which became Public Law 85–619; and Senate bill 2148. The subcommittee received and published the views of executive departments and agencies on S. 2148, but because of the press of other business was unable finally to consider and report the legislation before the Congress expired.

In the present 86th Congress, I introduced Senate bill 186, a bill identical to Senate bill 2148. Although this bill was referred to the newly established Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee continued its work on this proposed legislation with the agreement of the chairman of the other subcommittee, who is also a member of this subcommittee, and during the first session of the 86th Congress held hearings on the proposal.

A majority of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has voted to report a clean bill which follows the lines of the proposed legislation above, referred to, with strengthening and clarifying amendments shown to be desirable by the subcommittee's study and hearings.

I now introduce this clean bill for the subcommittee, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2780) to amend section 3 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In order to provide adequate and effective information for the public—

"(a) ORGANIZATION RULES AND FORMS.—Every agency shall separately state and promptly file for publication in the Federal Register and for codification in the Code of Federal Regulations: (1) Descriptions of its central and field organization, including statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, delegations by the agency of final authority, and the established places at which, and the methods whereby, the public may obtain information or make submittals or requests; (2) all procedural rules; (3) all other rules; (4) descriptions of all forms available for public use and instructions relating thereto, including a statement of where and how such forms and instructions may be otbained; and (5) every amendment, revision, and revocation of the foregoing.

"(b) ALTERNATIVE METHODS.—An agency may, pursuant to a published rule, use an alternative method of publishing the in-

formation specified in subsection (a) or of communicating it to all interested persons, when to do so will achieve economy and expedite dissemination of information to the public. No information published by such alternative method shall be relied upon or cited against any person who has not received prior, reasonable, and actual notice thereof.

"(c) ORDERS AND OPINIONS.—Every agency shall promptly publish its orders and opinions or make them available to the public in accordance with published rule stating where and how they may be obtained, examined, or copied.

"(d) PUBLIC RECORDS.—Every agency shall promptly make available to the public, in accordance with a published rule stating where and how they may be obtained, examined, or copied, all records, files, papers and documents submitted to and received by the agency, including but not limited to applications, petitions, pleadings, requests, claims, communications, reports or other papers, and all records and actions by the agency thereon, except as the agency by published rule finds that withholding is permitted by subsection (f) hereof. Every individual vote and official act of an agency shall be entered of record and made available to the public.

"(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PUBLISH.—No rule, order, opinion or public record, shall be relied upon or cited by any agency against any person unless it has been duly published or made available to the public in accordance with this section. No person shall in any manner be bound by or required to resort to any organization or procedure not so published.

"(f) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of this section shall not require disclosure of subject matter which is (1) specifically exempt from disclosure by statute, (2) required to be kept secret in the protection of the national security, (3) submitted in confidence pursuant to statute or published rule, or (4) of such a nature that disclosure would be a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; however, nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this subsection."

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have five bills to introduce on the subject of civil rights. As I understand the rule, I am allowed 3 minutes on each bill. If the Chair will indulge me, I shall try to wrap them up together in less than 10 minutes.

I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a group of five civil rights bills, including three measures to further protect and secure voting rights for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. The bills are keyed to the major recommendation of the President's Civil Rights Commission that a system of Federal voting registrars be established in areas where there is valid proof of denial of the right to vote for discriminatory reasons. Another bill would make lynching a Federal crime where it deprives an individual of his right to a fair trial, subjecting violators to a fine, imprisonment, or both. The remaining proposal introduced today would permit the U.S. Attorney General to take part in those civil cases where an individual charges that he is being deprived of one of his constitutional rights.

I am introducing these measures as bills, even though the ideas have previously been proposed by me as amendments to other bills. I think the time has come to give them bill status, and to provide for their reference to appropriate committees. I believe that the question of the committees to which the various bills are referred will have a considerable influence upon what happens to them.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower commended to the Congress for action this session the civil rights legislation sent down by the administration almost 12 months ago and the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission made last September. He called upon us to signal the world, by our action on this legislation, that "our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people."

To me, his words—particularly as they stressed the historic importance of every citizen being able to exercise his constitutional right to vote—hammered home the point that civil rights is the number one domestic issue of 1960 before this Congress.

In 1957 the Senate debated the Civil Rights Act directly when it came over from the House of Representatives. The test of the Senate rules made at that time demonstrated that this was an effective and expeditious procedure particularly adapted to the situation we face of long delayed committee action in the Senate on civil rights matters.

A drive is being made now in the House of Representatives to bring up the civil rights bill for consideration by the discharge petition route. I am urging all the members of my party in the House to favorably consider the advisability of signing this discharge petition, notwithstanding a normal and understandable reluctance to sign discharge petitions.

In the first place, I believe this reluctance to join in a discharge petition is far less applicable as a principle to the minority, though we all know that in this instance Speaker SAM RAYBURN has practically invited signing of this discharge petition by the majority. Also, it is clear that Republican signatures are essential in view of the large number of Members from the South on the Democratic side. Hence, the discharge petition may well prove to be the crucial test of whether a Member has sought effectively to get essential civil rights legislation enacted in the House of Representatives at this session .

If the past events of 1957 are prolog to the civil rights debate scheduled to start on the Senate floor no later than February 15, according to the assurances of the majority and minority leadership, there will be spirited debate on both sides. For, as we must all realize, the climactic fight is at hand and the Senate Chamber will be the critical battleground. Here it will be determined whether a meaningful civil rights legislation is to pass the Congress in 1960, or whether complacency, and campaign fever will prevail to postpone effective and desperately needed civil rights legislation.

While civil rights is our number one domestic issue, it is also supercharged with international implications affecting our world position. Premier Khrushchev would probably much prefer to sit down at the Summit Conference this coming May with President Eisenhower in an atmosphere in which the U.S. Congress had turned deaf ears on the report of the Federal Civil Rights Commission and the words of the President's message urging civil rights action. As leader of the Free World, the U.S. in the person of President Eisenhower will be the spokesman at the summit for a free world which is more than two-thirds nonwhite. It is of vital importance to us that these populations educate themselves to the priceless heritage of ruling themselves while making economic progress in freedom. If the voting conditions which exist today in at least 32 counties in 5 of our own States, according to the Civil Rights Commission, were to prevail in these predominantly nonwhite areas of the free world, then only about 5 percent out of a population of more than 1 billion people would be able to vote in their own national elections. The total vote in the countries of the non-Communist world whose total population is already six times that in the U.S. would not even add up to the number of U.S. voters in the 1952 or 1956 national campaigns. No society can hope to remain strong enough to sustain democratic institutions for very long when only 1 out of every 20 citizens does or can go to the polls to vote for candidates pledged to support them. Instead of allowing discriminatory practices to limit the size of our electorate, this is the beginning of a new decade when in the interest of our own national strength and survival, every citizen must have maximum opportunity to develop his talents, through education, to train for and work at the kind of job for which he is best suited by his skills, and to back the candidate of his choice at the polls, regardless of race, creed or color.

To quote the President again from his message last Thursday:

> The right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society * * * our first duty is to protect this right against all encroachment.

The same day those words were spoken by the President, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator HENNINGS, announced that later this month or early in February, public hearings will be held on proposals which would authorize the President to appoint temporary officials to register qualified U.S. citizens to vote in Federal elections. I hope that when they are held, testimony will be heard pertinent to three voting measures I am introducing today, which were originally submitted late last session as amendments to other civil rights bills previously introduced.

One of these measures provides for the retention of voting records in Federal elections for at least a 5-year period as recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. It reported that the unavailability of such records seriously hampers efforts to investigate alleged denials of

voting rights. A second bill in the voting rights series implements another of the Commission's recommendations that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 should be amended to safeguard an individual's right to vote in cases where boards of registrars and other public officials attempt to deny voting rights by failing to fulfill their legal duties to meet at specified times for the purpose of registering voters and by other means without legal justification.

This is the much discussed proposal to have Federal voting registrars.

In that connection, there are two small straws in the wind, in the form of events which took place since the report of the Civil Rights Commission was issued. I do not elaborate upon them as being great points, but they are small straws in the wind.

Since the Civil Rights Commission recommended a system of Federal voting registrars in its report to the President and the Congress this September, new developments have taken place in Southern States which affect voting rights. One new law, the Commission reports, gives the local registrars in Alabama statutory authority to devote some of the time which was formerly allocated for the purpose of registering qualified voters for other time-consuming clerical duties. It could be used to facilitate the closing of registrars' offices in the face of Negroes who might wish to register. Also, the Civil Rights Commission reports that in Harris County, Tex., the county tax assessor-collector has started to use a long-standing practice of registrars in Louisiana—it requires those paying poll taxes to swear to their identity and place of residence, and upon challenge to produce witnesses whose qualifications are to be determined solely by the local registrars.

The third measure which I am introducing deals with the subject covered by part 3 of the 1957 bill. I think it meets a great many of the objections which have been made to part 3, and at the same time retains the essential proposition that where the individual is facing the machinery of an entire State, an entire county, or an entire community, and is being deprived of civil rights, he is entitled to have the majesty and authority of the United States asserted, in a case which has widespread implications of civil rights being denied to many people.

Since 1960 is a national election year, it is a paramount importance that every eligible citizen be encouraged to register and vote. We would stand an excellent chance of having a really high record vote this year if a bill such as the Federal Elections Voting Rights Act which I am introducing today is enacted during this session of Congress. It would be of major importance in those areas where a disproportionately small number of nonwhites have registered in the past. Henceforth when nine or more complainants about denial of voting rights in one locality during the same year are received and substantiated, the President would be authorized to appoint a local Federal official to act as a voting registrar for as long as discriminatory practices jeopardized individual voting rights in that locality.

The permissive intervention legislation I am also submitting today is designed to do away with one of the most serious weaknesses of the 1957 Civil Rights Act as it was finally approved by the Senate. By permitting the Attorney General to enter into civil cases brought by persons charging denial of equal protection of the law, individuals of the most modest circumstances will not be prevented from appealing directly to our Federal courts when they believe, for example, that they are being deprived of the right to vote, to ride on desegregated public transportation and, of course, to attend a desegregated public school.

The final bill to make lynching a Federal crime is one of several proposals put forward since the lynching of a Negro, Mack Charles Parker, in Poplarville, Miss., where he was in jail awaiting trial on a charge of criminal assault, at a time when we had a right to hope that no similar lynching would take place in any part of our country.

At present, a Federal grand jury has been called to review the case following the failure of a local jury to bring an indictment, to call a single witness or even review the extensive FBI report of its investigation into the lynching. The first report that a gang of masked men dragged Parker out of his cell and killed him was a severe shock to all of us, regardless of what section of the country we live in. Although lynchings in the United States have reportedly been few and far between in recent years, the need for a strong Federal antilynch law is more urgent than ever for one such tragedy of mob violence leaves the kind of open wound on our national conscience which can take years to heal. We cannot tolerate the angry scars with which discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or national origin can disfigure a society. The enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation at this session of Congress will enormously strengthen us in our determination to work together to win freedom at home and abroad.

Finally, it must not be underemphasized that what we do about civil rights in our country is critically important, in connection with what takes place in the rest of the world. We are going into a summit conference in May with Khrushchev. In that connection, we shall be the spokesmen at the summit for a free world which is more than two-thirds nonwhite. If voting took place in other countries where we are seeking self-determination of peoples as it does among many of the nonwhite populations of our Southern States, there would be less than 5 percent of the population of 1 billion people able to vote in their own national elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills I am introducing today may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2782. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act to further protect the right to vote in Federal elections.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) as amended by section 301 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) is further amended by inserting at the end of subsection (b) the following:

" 'Nor shall any person or group of persons, under color of State law, arbitrarily and without legal justification or cause, act, or being under duty to act, fail to act, in such manner as to deprive or threaten to deprive any individual or group of individuals of the opportunity to register, vote and have that vote counted for any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate or Commissioner for the territories or possessions, at any general, special or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate.' "

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 2783. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections against denial on account of race, religion, color, or national origin, by providing for the appointment of Federal registrars by the President.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Elections Voting Rights Act'.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'Federal election' means any general or special election held solely or partially for the purpose of electing any individual to, or any primary election held solely or partially for the purpose of selecting any individual as a candidate or nominee for, any of the following Federal offices:

"(1) The Office of President or Vice President of the United States;

"(2) The office of elector for President or Vice President of the United States;

"(3) The office of Member of the United States Senate;

"(4) The office of Member of the House of Representatives of the United States; or

"(5) The office of Delegate or Commissioner of any territory or possession of the United States representing such territory or possession in the House of Representatives of the United States.

"(b) The term 'registration district' means a county, parish, district, or other political subdivision of a State which, under State law, is authorized to provide for the registration or qualification of voters, living within such county, parish, district, or other political subdivision.

"SEC. 3. Any individual who—

"(1) believes that he is qualified under the laws of the State in which he lives, to vote in Federal elections held in such States;

"(2) within one year before the date of filing a petition under this section, has been denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have his vote counted in such elections after having attempted to do so in the manner and at the time and place provided for by the laws of such State; and

"(3) believes that the sole reason he was denied such right was because of his race, religion, color, or national origin,

may file a sworn statement with the President of the United States alleging that he has been denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have his vote counted in such

elections solely because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, and petitioning the President to appoint a temporary Federal registrar for his registration district. Such sworn statement shall be filed in such form and manner as the President may by regulations prescribe and shall contain a detailed account of the facts upon which the allegations contained therein are based.

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever there shall, within a period of not more than one year, have been filed with the President not less than nine petitions under section 3 by individuals from the same registration district, the President shall refer such petitions to the Commission on Civil Rights (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(b) The Commission shall conduct an investigation with respect to any such petitions referred to it for the purposes of determining whether or not the allegations contained in such petitions are true. If the Commission, on the basis of its investigation of such allegations, determines that citizens of the United States living in the registration district of the petitioners are being deprived of the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have their vote counted in Federal elections solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin, the Commission shall certify that fact to the President. The Commission shall also certify to the President and to any temporary Federal registrar who may be appointed for such district the names of any petitioner living in such district whom the Commission believes to be entitled, under the laws of the State in which such district is situated to vote in Federal elections held in such State.

"(c) Upon receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (b) with respect to any registration district, the President shall appoint, from among Federal officers or employees living in or near such district, an individual to serve as a temporary Federal registrar for such district. Any such Federal registrar shall serve until such time as the President determines that citizens living within the registration district for which such registrar was appointed are no longer being denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have their vote counted, in Federal elections solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

"SEC. 5. The Federal registrar for any registration district shall accept vote registration applications from all individuals living within such district who allege that they are being denied the right to register to vote in such district solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin. All applicants whom the Federal registrar finds to have the qualifications requisite, under the laws of the State wherein such district is so situated, for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of such State shall be registered by him as being qualified to vote in Federal elections held in such district, and the Federal registrar shall certify to the appropriate election officials of such State the names of all applicants registered by him and the fact that such applicants have been so registered.

"SEC. 6. Any individual who is registered under this Act by a Federal registrar to vote in Federal elections shall have the right to cast his vote and have such vote counted in any Federal election, and any election official who willfully denies him such right shall be fined not more than $300 and imprisoned for not longer than six months, or both."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2784. A bill to protect against deprivation of the right to a fair trial by lynching and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 1509. Deprivation of right to a fair trial.

"'(a) The Congress finds that willful interference with, or obstruction of any process or proceeding of a State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, for the apprehension, confinement, trial, and punishment of any person charged with a crime or held for investigation or as a material witness through acts or threats of force by persons not acting under lawful authority constitutes a deprivation of rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed to such person by the Constitution of the United States, including such person's right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The Congress further finds that such interference or obstruction threatens the administration of justice of the several States and thereby imperils their republican form of government which, under the Constitution of the United States, it is the obligation of the United States to guarantee.

"'(b) Whenever two or more persons shall knowingly in concert for the purpose of depriving any person, either directly or indirectly, of his right to a fair trial or his right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law, willfully interfere with or obstruct any process or proceeding of a State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, for the apprehension, confinement, trial, and punishment of any person charged with a crime or held for investigation or as a material witness through acts or threats of force, then anyone who knowingly instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or participates in such action shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided, however,* That where such action results in death or maiming or other serious physical or mental injury, constituting a felony under applicable State, Territorial, or similar law, any such person shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"'(c) Any officer or employee of the United States or any State, Territory, or subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty, or shall have possessed authority in his official capacity, to prevent actions punishable under subsection (b) of this section and who shall have refused or knowingly failed to make diligent efforts to prevent them; or who, having custody of any person or persons shall have neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make diligent efforts to protect such person or persons against the actions made punishable under subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.'"

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 2785. A bill to provide for the retention, preservation, and production of Federal election records, papers, and ballots.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of five years from the date of any general, special, or primary election at which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives are voted for, all records and papers which come into his possession relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other act requisite to voting in such election, except that, when required by law, such records and papers may be delivered to another officer of election and except that if a State designates a custodian to retain and preserve these records and papers at a specified place, then such records and papers may be deposited with such custodian, and the duty to retain and preserve any record or paper so deposited shall devolve upon such custodian: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall require the retention and preservation of ballots for a period of more than 18 months from the date of any such election. Any officer of election or custodian who willfully fails to comply with this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"SEC. 2. Any person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, who willfully steals, destroys, conceals, mutilates, or alters any record or paper required by section 1 to be retained and preserved shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 3. Any record or paper required by section 1 to be retained and preserved shall, upon demand in writing by the Attorney General or his representative directed to the person having custody, possession, or control of such record or paper, be made available for inspection, reproduction, and copying by the Attorney General or his representative.

"SEC. 4. Any record or paper demanded pursuant to section 3 shall be produced for inspection, reproduction, and copying at the principal office of the person upon whom such demand is made or at any other location mutually agreed upon by such person and the Attorney General or his representative.

"SEC. 5. Unless otherwise ordered by a court of the United States, neither the Attorney General nor any employee of the Department of Justice, nor any other representative of the Attorney General shall disclose any record or paper produced pursuant to this Act, or any reproduction or copy, except as is necessary in the performance of his official duties, including presentation of any case or proceedilng before any court or grand jury.

"SEC. 6. The United States district court for the district in which a demand is made pursuant to section 3 or in which a record or paper so demanded is located, shall have jurisdiction by appropriate process to compel the production of such record or paper.

"SEC. 7. As used in this Act, the term 'officer of election' means any person who, under color of any Federal, State or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, authority, custom, or usage, performs or is authorized to perform any function, duty or task in connection with any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in any general, special, or primary election at which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives are voted for."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2786. A bill to provide for permissive intervention by the United States in cases involving the denial of equal protection of the laws.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by inserting a new section immediately following section 2403 as follows:

"'§ 2403A. Intervention by United States: Loss or threat of loss of equal protection of the laws.

"'In any action, suit, or proceeding in a court of the United States to which the United States or any agency, officer, or employee thereof is not a party, wherein any person alleges on oath or affirmation that

he is subject to or threatened with loss of his rights under the Constitution of the United States to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, the court shall certify such fact to the Attorney General, and shall permit the United States to intervene for presentation of evidence, if evidence is otherwise admissible in the case, and for argument on the question of whether such person is subject to or threatened with loss of his right to equal protection of the laws and the relief to be granted. The United States shall, subject to the applicable provisions of law, have all the rights of a party and be subject to all liabilities of a party as to court costs to the extent necessary for proper presentation of the facts and law relating to the questions of whether such person is subject to or threatened with loss of his right to equal protection of the laws and the relief granted by the court'.

"SEC. 2. Such chapter is further amended by inserting in the analysis at the beginning of such chapter, immediately following section 2403, the following:

"'2403A. Intervention by United States: Loss or threat of loss of equal protection of the laws'."

LIABILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH ACCIDENTS INCIDENT TO CERTAIN AIR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill itself, together with an explanation thereof, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2787) to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"As used in this chapter and sections 1346(b) and 2401(b) of this title, the term—

"'Federal agency' includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, but does not include any contractor with the United States.

"'Employees of the government' includes officers or employees of any Federal agency; members of the military or naval forces of the United States and, while engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, members of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(2) of title 32; and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States whether with or without compensation.

"'Acting within the scope of his office or employment', in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or, while engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(2) of title 32, means acting in line of duty."

SEC. 2. Section 2733(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

(1) a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service who is serving with the Navy or the Marine Corps, or a member of the National Guard who is engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, shall be treated as if he were a member of the armed force concerned; and

(2) a person employed by the National Guard under section 709 of title 32 who is engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, shall be treated as if he were a civilian officer or employee of the military department concerned.

SEC. 3. Section 710 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Notwithstanding subsections (b) and (c), each State and Territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia is relieved of accountability and pecuniary liability for military property issued by the United States to its National Guard for air defense activities on tactical sites that are under the control of the Army or the Air Force, except for loss or destruction of, or damage to, that property attributable to an officer, employee, or agent of that State or Territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, who is not engaged in those activities."

The statement submitted by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Amendment of Federal Tort Claims Act to extend liability of the Federal Government to cover accidents incident to air defense activities of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard, thus relieving the States of liability

The New York Army National Guard, and the National Guard of other States, has been requested by the Department of the Army to man missile bases on tactical sites. They will replace units of the Regular Army on such bases and they will be employed in the tactical defense of the United States against enemy air or missile attack.

The Department of the Army has presented to New York State a form of agreement for the manning of such missile sites. The form of the agreement is generally unobjectionable and the defense of the United States against enemy attack is a mission which the New York Army National Guard is qualified and glad to perform and is within the scope of its duties as the first line Reserve component of the U.S. Army. However, the manning of a missile base could give rise to an untold amount of liability in the event of the accidental explosion of a missile on such a site, such as happened in New Jersey several years ago.

In order to avoid the assumption of such liability, New York State has suggested that the appropriate Federal authorities include in the proposed contract a form of indemnity agreement whereby the Federal Government would indemnify and hold harmless the State of New York and its Army National Guard units and personnel with respect to any liability which may arise out of acts or incidents in connection with the manning of such a missile base. While the Federal Government admits in its contract that the Army National Guard units so employed will be an integral part of the U.S. Army, the Federal Government has refused to execute the indemnity agreement requested.

Since the defense of the United States against enemy attack is a Federal mission and the Army has accepted the Army National Guard as an integral part of the Armed Forces of the United States while so employed, it is felt that any liability resulting from an act or incident in connection with the operation of such a missile base may be ultimately determined to be a Federal responsibility. However, in the absence of a statute, such liability would probably be determined only after a long period of litigation. In order to avoid the necessity for litigation to determine financial responsibility for damages which may result from an accident or incident in connection with the operation of a missile base, legislation to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act is urgently necessary. A bill to accomplish this purpose is submitted herewith.

It will be noted that the provisions of the proposed bill include the potential liability of the State, not only with respect to the manning of missile bases by Army National Guard units, but also the employment of units of the Air National Guard in the tactical defense of the United States against enemy attack. Air National Guard units, for many years, have performed a Federal mission in that they have had jet planes constantly on a 24-hour alert to intercept any enemy air attack. Since these planes are armed with air-to-air rockets and missiles, the arguments set forth above with respect to the possible exposure of New York State to liability for the accidental explosion of a ground missile are equally applicable to the air-to-air mission of the Air National Guard.

THE MARIGOLD AS OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the present occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] will be interested in at least the opening paragraph of my remarks.

I believe it is in Ashland, Ohio, that there is a marker to Johnny "Appleseed" Chapman. He was one of the dedicated persons who in the early days in the Middle West, gathered and scattered apple seeds. While others were foraging with guns and fighting with Indians, Johnny "Appleseed" Chapman went about with a canoeload of apple seed, if he could contrive it. He left a very rich heritage; and I suppose the genetic offspring of some of those apple trees are still extant in the great Buckeye State, together with the wholesome fruit they provide.

It seems to me that in every generation there are such people. They are unselfish and devoted, even as Johnny Appleseed was.

I consider David Burpee, of Philadelphia, a member of a long line of very distinguished seedsmen, as a person of that kind. Interestingly enough, he is a cousin of the late Luther Burbank. So, much of his life has been devoted to techniques which make the great complex of sun and soil and moisture produce more abundantly, and even im-

prove upon nature, and, particularly, produce flowers of great beauty and perfection. In so doing a vast improvement on natural processes has been brought about.

For two generations, David Burpee has experimented with flowers, in the hope of producing one that is of American origin, and so hardy, so lovely, so easy to grow, so diffused, so long-blooming, that it might properly claim a place as the national floral emblem of this country.

At long last, he felt that the marigold, a flower first discovered by the explorer Cortez in Mexico, the seeds of which Cortez took back to the Old World, was the flower that should rightly become our national floral emblem.

I emphasize the term "our national floral emblem" because, of course, a floral emblem must be in the form of a flower. In the West they have been presenting the cause for the corn tassle as the national flower. I am not enough of a plant geneticist to know exactly whether it is a flower. The experts disagree about that.

In any event, this flower from the New World, which was taken to the Old World, and improved upon, was in those days used for church functions and was called Mary's gold. Subsequently it became the marigold.

I can say I have taken real delight in producing a few prize marigolds.

Over the years, David Burpee has worked tirelessly to improve the marigold and develop greater ranges of color, larger flowers, greater hardiness, and foliage with a more agreeable scent, so that it might with the least effort be produced in every part of the United States and be rightly considered as our national floral emblem.

I am not insensible to the fact that selection of a flower as our national floral emblem has been a matter of high controversy. The rose, the carnation, the corn tassel, the aster, and others have all been advanced for consideration.

I believe that an outstanding seedsman and florist who has devoted incalculable hours and untold sums of money to research in this field is fully entitled to have the product of a lifetime of effort properly considered.

To that end, I assured him, when he was in my office, that, by request, I would be glad to introduce a measure to designate the marigold as our national flower.

We have a national bird—the American eagle. We have a national emblem—the Stars and Stripes. Sometime Congress may wish to designate a national floral emblem; and by joint resolution, I formalize, for consideration, the marigold, at the request of a great seedsman and a great florist, David Burpee. I introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 146) designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Thursday, January 7, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] introduced Senate bill 2764 to extend the Library Services Act. I wish to announce my cosponsorship of that bill at this time, and to commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his work on this proposal.

It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and who was the author of the original Library Services Act, is planning to submit a more comprehensive bill on this subject in the near future. I will fully support that measure when he finds it appropriate to bring it to the attention of the Senate, because it is clear that this basic library program is of tremendous educational and recreational benefit to millions of Americans in all walks of life.

Action will be required soon, since the present act is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961.

This bill fills an important gap in our educational system. It brings to the rural areas the books and other library services that are so vital to self-improvement beyond the basic educational requirement. It helps extend to each of our citizens, no matter how remote from the urban centers of communication, the tools for being an intelligent and well-informed citizen.

Mr. President, because of Texas vast geographical area and substantial rural population, the Library Services Act constitutes an important adjunct to our basic educational program. It is a program which thousands of Texans have come to use and to appreciate.

Mr. Witt B. Harwell, the distinguished State librarian of Texas, informs me that nearly 50 Texas counties are now being served through this program and that officials of several dozen other counties have given notice that their citizens also want and need this excellent library service. In its first year, the Library Services Act resulted in the formation of several local permanent libraries in Texas and otherwise greatly increased the circulation of existing libraries. I am grateful for the opportunity to add my name to cosponsorship of this fine bill.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, ariticles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address on economic trends, labor and management conferences, and the steel strike, delivered by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the Economic Club of Detroit on January 11, 1960.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address entitled "Citizenship Versus the Power Groups," delivered by George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., before the Commonwealth Club of California on September 4, 1959.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Another Tom Dooley," from the Milwaukee (Oreg.) Review of November 19, 1959, commenting on the Criss award of the Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co., to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley.

PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING EMPLOYEES AND EXPENDITURES OF SENATE COMMITTEES; TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has two resolutions which he would like to have considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I wish to call attention to two Senate housekeeping resolutions, so to speak, which require immediate attention.

One of them is Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213, which provides for repealing the resolution requiring the semiannual publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of certain information concerning employees and expenditures of Senate committees. The resolution which would be repealed was adopted by the Senate in 1949. The same information is now furnished 4 times a year in a separate publication, and then annually in the report of the Secretary of the Senate.

The other resolution relates to six Senate pages who have attained age 17; and it is the desire of all concerned that they be allowed to finish their school term.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask about the resolutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The first resolution provides for repealing the resolution which requires publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of certain information in regard to employees and expenditures of Senate committees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to inquire about the resolution which relates to pages.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a very simple resolution, and I shall read it:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 14, 81st Congress, agreed to January 13, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years of age and who has not completed the 8th grade of school, or is 17 years of age or older, except that those enrolled in the Senate page school who attain age 17 may serve as pages through the session of the Senate in which the page-school year terminates."

There are at the present time, three Republican pages and three Democratic pages who are, or are about to become, 17 years of age. The resolution adopted in 1949 provides that when pages attain

age of 17 they must be removed. This resolution allows them to continue in the service of the Senate to the end of the page-school year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to know whether they can be appointed at age 17 and can continue in the service until they are 21.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the rule will remain that they cannot serve after they are 17—except if they are already in the service of the Senate, they may finish out the school term. The page school is in fact a high school and those who graduate from it are qualified to pass college entrance examinations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They can only finish the school term; that is all?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 213) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 123, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 27, 1947, is hereby repealed.

TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1052, Senate Resolution 218, which relates to the terms of Senate pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 218) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 14, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to January 13, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than fourteen years of age and who has not completed the eighth grade of school, or is seventeen years of age or older, except that those enrolled in the Senate page school who attain age seventeen may serve as pages through the session of the Senate in which the page-school year terminates."

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Forrest Rozzell, who is executive Secretary of the Arkansas Education Association. Recently he visited Russia; and he has written a very enlightening article about education as it is carried on in Russia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Arkansas Education]

NOTES FROM RUSSIA

(By Forrest Rozzell)

When the AEA Board decided to send me on a trip to the Soviet Union, I immediately began asking myself some questions. Why am I going? What purposes do I have for making the trip? What purposes should I have? Of what value can my experiences be to the cause of education in Arkansas? What shall I look for? How shall I interpret what I observe? Do I have blind spots, stereotype concepts, or prejudices that need to guard against to help me in being more objective? How important are the details of school organization, administration, finance, curriculum, methods, etc.? As I thought about these and other questions I concluded that three assumptions and their logical implications would provide the guidelines for making the most out of my experiences.

The first assumption was: It is impossible to understand or appraise the educational system of any human society except within the total context of that society; therefore, I would try to observe and learn as much as possible about the political, economic, social, and moral aspects and principles of the Soviet system as a prerequisite to understanding and interpreting what I observed about the Russian educational system.

The second assumption was: Details are relatively unimportant in contrast to the philosophy, purposes, and objectives that motivate and give direction to the actions that are taking place in the schools of the Soviet Union. The important point is not where the Soviet system is now, but rather where it is going. Even though our opportunities to observe political, economic, social, and educational conditions would be limited, we should be able to see, hear, and read enough to draw some reasonably valid conclusions about the great and sweeping changes that have been and are taking place in the Soviet Union.

The third assumption was: Great truths, great ideals, are many times stated in sentences so simple that we lose sight of their greatness. As a result of constant repetition we are prone to permit the utterance to replace the realization. As a consequence a person cannot fully understand and appreciate the culture of which he is a part unless he studies it in relation to or in contrast with other cultures; therefore, out of the trip I hoped to secure sufficient rational knowledge about the Russian culture—including its educational system—to establish points of reference for deeper insights and understanding of American education and its role in the preservation and extension of our great ideas, ideals, and institutions.

This report on my observations and their interpretation should be evaluated in the light of the foregoing assumptions and their logical implications.

RATIONAL KNOWLEDGE, FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

One of our great ideals is freedom of thought, speech, and conscience—the right to think as one wills and to speak as one thinks. This right can be negated as effectively by a paralyzing fear of criticism as by a paralyzing fear of the Soviet's secret police. It would be easy to make a factually accurate report of my observations and conclusions that would be entirely consistent with the stereotyped concepts of Russia that prevail too extensively in the United States today, but such a report would be unbalanced; and rational knowledge, accurate and balanced, is the only secure foundation for freedom. Security from criticism is neither a Judeo-Christian nor democratic ideal, and no individual or nation that seeks it has ever made, in the seeking, a contribution to the elimination of tyranny of any kind. Unmistakably the basic issue in East Germany, Poland, and the Soviet Union is tyranny—a monolithic, doctrinaire system engulfing every form of human thought and behavior.

What I write is based upon my convictions, now more firmly entrenched than ever, that the basic ideas and ideals of our heritage can compete successfully with any and all others in winning the minds and loyalties of peoples everywhere, provided we do not encrust our ideals with an American orthodoxy that stifles their creative force and universal appeal, and provided also that we do not encrust those of other cultures with stereotyped concepts that deny their humanistic appeal.

The big job facing us is to convince ourselves as well as the uncommitted peoples of the world that what free men have to offer in terms of the good life is far superior to that which the U.S.S.R. is pushing. Ignorance of their system can be fatal; ignorance of our own as an example of what free men can accomplish can be equally fatal. In this struggle I am convinced that the Soviet Union cannot win; but we can lose through our failure, because of irrational fears, to counteract Communist doctrines through the intelligent use of factual and authentic knowledge about its aims and methods, its strengths and weaknesses.

POLICY OF SELECTIVE IGNORANCE

I have never been able to understand why anyone in America should object to teaching about communism in our schools and colleges. I have felt that the failure to do so constituted a policy of selective ignorance which is completely incompatible with the philosophy, objectives, and processes of education in a free society. I am now firmly convinced that the failure to teach about the aims and methods, the strengths and weaknesses of communism, both the theoretical kind and the Russian variety, is sheer folly. There is no reason to fear Communist doctrines and methods when there is a free intercourse of ideas, ideals, and processes. I have no fear of the Communist brainwashing our children and youth. On the contrary, I wish every youth and adult in America could visit the Soviet Union and see first hand communism in operation, and no special guardians of our faith would need to accompany them.

By visiting Berlin, both the eastern and western sectors, and Warsaw before visiting the Soviet Union, we had an opportunity to see first hand the Soviet variety of imperial communism at work. The overriding purpose behind every thought, every plan, and every act in East Germany and Poland, the same as in the Soviet Union, is to instill and inculcate Communist doctrines, to develop the Communist state, and to secure its acceptance by the people—all in accordance with the teachings of "Father Lenin." This forthright identification of purpose in East Germany and Poland with the Soviet Union was a surprise to me. While I knew that the influence and power of the Soviet Union were behind what was happening in the satellite countries, I thought that there would be some effort to be subtle about it.

PROPAGANDA AS A TECHNIQUE

Wherever the Communist dictators have the power, symbol-manipulation as a means of changing ideas, attitudes, and actions along predetermined lines—propaganda—is one of its major techniques. But we too use propaganda as a means of mass persuasion; however, the weakness of the appeal of ours may result from our failure to recognize that propaganda always has a setting within a social, cultural framework, without which neither its psychological nor its cultural features can be understood. We do not have a corner, either on slogans and cliches or on ideals and platitudes, but one significant difference is that those of the Soviet appeal to a future hope, while ours appeal to the preservation of the status quo. Reality is always at a disadvantage when competing with hope.

The Communist leaders have usurped for their evil purposes words that throughout history have symbolized the hopes and aspirations of mankind: peace, democracy, liberation, love, happiness, freedom, education. Through suggestion and related psychological techniques these symbols are manipulated within the social-cultural framework

of the people to whom they are directed. On the contrary, our manipulation of these symbols is almost exclusively confined to our own social-cultural framework. As a consequence, we do not make ourselves understood by the uncommitted peoples of the world.

BATTLE FOR LOYALTIES OF YOUTH

One fact that was demonstrated more clearly in East Germany than in Poland or the Soviet Union is that the great battle of our time is for the minds and loyalties of children and youth. In East Germany the Russian dictators know they cannot win the minds and loyalties of the adults of the present but they believe that they can win the children and youth. Thoughtful Germans fear they can also—"Hitler did, why can't they?"

One German, a major in the last war, definitely anti-Communist, told us that his nephew, 9 years old, who lives in East Germany, visited him a few weeks before. His parents are anti-Communists, but he believes that Khrushchev is the greatest leader and defender of the working people in the world today and is doing more to promote world peace than anyone else.

The situation poses the question: Can a free system that is dedicated to the enhancement of universal, individual freedom, dignity, and welfare compete successfully with a totalitarian system that subordinates the individual to the state? The Russians, the people as well as their leaders, obviously believe that it cannot. They think that time is on their side.

CONTRASTS IN EAST AND WEST BERLIN

We were all amazed by the contrasts between the Eastern and Western sectors of Berlin. The impact of the contrasts cannot be fully described. There are, of course, significant material differences such as the vast amount of rebuilding in the West and the shoddiness of that in the East; the difference in the amount and quality of consumer goods and the number of cars; the presence of so many policemen and soldiers in old Nazi uniforms in the East; but the most impressive contrasts were in the number, the attitude, and the looks of the people.

To me, the most discouraging experience of our whole trip was in East Berlin. What is happening in East Germany today convinced me that tyranny over the mind of man cannot be eliminated by force. Force merely replaces one form of tyranny with another form. What we saw in East Germany in 1959 had a sickening similarity to that which prevailed in the 1930's under the Nazi. The basic motives of the leaders, the motivations of the people, the methods employed, and the symbol-manipulations are the same; only "the devil" has been changed. The "American capitalist" has been substituted for the "Jew." Here communism is revealed for what it is—a technique of power, a system of state organization based upon political rather than economic determinism, tyranny.

The vast majority of East Germans are most anxious to keep West Berlin free. It is a symbol of hope for reunification; it provides an opportunity for concrete comparisons between life in the free zone and life in the Soviet zone; it provides a source for merchandise needed by individuals; and it provides a final refuge, if life becomes intolerable in the Eastern sector. Many East Germans do fear, however, that the West Germans are becoming so prosperous that they will forget the 17 million Germans living in the East.

THE YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

One East Berlin woman to whom we talked has a 15-year-old son whom she wishes to have religious training. While such training is not directly prohibited, the boy cannot become a member of the "Youth Organizations" if he takes it. The future outlook for any youth outside the "Organizations" is not very bright. East German youth are very much confused and frustrated by the conflicting information they receive from East and West Berliners by word of mouth, by the few newspapers smuggled in from the West, and by radio. There is no way the East German leaders can jam the West Berlin radios without doing the same for their own.

On October 7, the day we left Berlin, in East Germany they were celebrating the 10th anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic. There was a huge crowd in East Berlin, but there should have been; all workers were compelled to attend In each establishment meetings were held to inform the employees as to what was expected of them. On the day of the celebration all employees met at their place of work and marched as a group in the parade. When asked what would happen to anyone who failed to do so, we were told that he would be called in and asked to explain. If the explanation was not acceptable he would suffer inconveniences.

During our brief visit to East Berlin the party line was evident everywhere. Even then party line was a term of derision to me—something parroted by the people without conviction. After 2 days in Warsaw, the term began to have a different meaning; after 21 days in the Soviet Union, I no longer think of it as a term of derision—while it may be something parroted by the people, they do it with conviction.

POLAND AND THE U.S.S.R.

Warsaw was a city approximately 90 percent destroyed during the war, with a death list of 800,000 people; yet it has done a remarkable job of building, rebuilding, and restoring. The largest building in the city, the one that can be seen from almost every point in the city, is a gift from the U.S.S.R., the Palace of Culture. This, of course, is dedicated to "peace and friendship."

What has happened and is happening in East Germany and Poland was made possible by the ravages of war. This is a point we should never forget. In both places, after the war, the most compelling objective was the satisfaction of the basic needs of the people: clothing, food, shelter. Only the governments, and they were naturally under Soviet influence, had the power and resources to act, and they did. This they did in accordance with Communist doctrines. Because of different circumstances, more obvious force was required in East Germany than in Poland; consequently less has been done in East Berlin than in Warsaw in satisfying the basic needs of the people, particularly the housing needs.

Poland, like East Germany, is a Communist state; the kind that is far different from those operations in the United States that are characterized as communistic in the cliches of some individuals and groups. In Poland, as in East Germany and the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, a self-perpetuating hierarchy, is the Government. Practically everything is under its control: it builds and assigns apartments; it provides jobs, sets hours, wages, and prices; it determines national and foreign policy; it determines and supervises the implementation of educational policy.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS

In bringing about the sociopolitical and economic changes that are now and have been taking place in Poland, it appeared to me that the Government is capitalizing on at least four psychological motivations of the people: (1) Their abhorrence of war. The Poles want peace at almost any price so long as their basic needs are fairly well satisfied. Peace is constantly emphasized. (2) Their hatred of the Nazis. With just cause the Poles hate the Nazis. They are constantly reminded of this by plaques and monuments which perpetuate the crimes and atrocities of the Nazis. This is quite a contrast with the Palace of Culture, which reminds them of the friendship of the Soviets. (3) Their national cultural pride. At first I wondered why a utilitarian state would spend so much time, effort, and money in the restoration of the old town, the palaces that house the university, the art collection, and others. But all of these promote pride in their own national culture. At the same time the former insignificant role and low status of the people is preserved. The restoration is designed to say to them "Yes, we can take pride in our cultural heritage; we can preserve the good in it, but at the same time we can all become a more significant part of it, and we and our children can benefit more from it." (4) Their religious heritage. Approximately 90 percent of all Poles are members of the Roman Catholic Church. In contrast to Berlin, both East and West, practically all the churches of Warsaw have been restored, some by the state. As a result of an agreement between the Vatican and the Polish Government, a definite effort is being made by the Communists to make accommodations to the religious traditions of the people. This effort can lead to unrealistic interpretations in spite of evident seeds of conflict.

Because of these unifying influences, which do not prevail in East Germany except a desire for peace, there is not so much evidence of the police state in Poland as in East Germany. Nevertheless, the tyranny over the mind is just as great, perhaps greater, because there is no counter force such as West Berlin. This does not mean that the Poles are anti-American; they are not. But they are pro-U.S.S.R. And why shouldn't they be with Russia breathing down their necks?

HUMAN FREEDOM FOR HUMAN WELFARE

The U.S.S.R. is a vast and complex land of many nationalities, languages, and cultures characterized by contrasts, commitment, change, control, and confidence. Since 1917, under the rigidly planned and systematically executed control of the Communist dictatorship (always with little or no regard for human freedom and many times by methods which violate every principle of human justice) the Soviet Union has been moving steadfastly toward the perfection of its cultural revolution.

In many respects the results are remarkable. While objective analyses by competent authorities have tended to prove that the same or greater results in terms of human welfare could have been achieved without sacrificing human freedom, the controls of the party over thoughts and communications of all kinds are such that this proposition is now and will likely remain as long as the party is in power, an issue about which the vast majority of the citizens of the Soviet Union are completely oblivious. To them the party is due the credit; not one denies that the party is the government, in fact, they boast of it.

The people have been convinced that it is necessary to sacrifice human freedom in order to secure human welfare. They have no opportunity to learn about the "great American proposition" that human welfare and human freedom are mutually attainable goals, or about the extent to which we have achieved both in the United States. They are not aware of the fact that the "robber baron capitalism" of the 19th century no longer prevails in the United States. Their understanding of the American "system" is a projection of that which the Communist Manifesto was directed against—an understanding based upon almost complete ignorance of the facts of the 20th century. On the other hand, they are aware of the changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union which are making for a better material life for millions of people and holding

out the same promise for millions of others. The extent of the benefits in comparison with the propaganda of "the party" is, to say the least, debatable. While it is evident that a facade has been constructed to impress visitors and natives as well, the fact remains that the progress being made combined with the systematically planned and propagandized promises for the future and the rigid controls that are exercised are such as to retain for the foreseeable future the commitment of the people to the system.

EDUCATION AS KEY FACTOR

The rise of the Soviet Union to its present position of power would have been impossible without the phenomenal development of its educational system. This program of organized education, planned and executed by the Communist Party, is a key factor in understanding what is happening in the U.S.S.R. The leaders have marshaled all the forces of organized education, including many more than the schools and institutions of higher learning, to achieve their purposes and advance toward their ever-expanding goals. It is axiomatic that every human society perpetuates itself through organized and unorganized process of education and learning. If at any time these processes are interrupted for any extended period, the group loses its heritage and perishes. But in the Soviet Union the heritage-preserving role of education has been relegated to secondary status, and no role is left for unorganized learning and education. Education is an instrument of national policy, not to maintain the status quo, except for the leadership of the party, but to change the course of history and the nature of man.

Education in the Soviet Union is extremely broad in concept and in practice. It embraces the entire cultural apparatus, especially those agencies dealing with the conscious induction of ideas, opinions, and values in the minds of both young and old. It includes the schools from the nursery to the graduate schools of the university. For all practical purposes, it includes newspapers and periodicals, books and libraries, as well as radio and television. It includes all agencies of amusement and entertainment, and especially the political and cultural aspects of all organizations, particularly those for children and youth.

INFORMAL EDUCATION

The Soviet Union has an extraordinary program of highly organized after-school activities which are conducted in a more relaxed informal fashion than the school program. This supplementary program which makes learning fun may be an important key to the success of the Russian schools. Participants in these after-school activities are divided into three groups: the Octoberists include children ages 7–10; the Pioneers include children ages 10–15; and the Komsomols(the young Communist League) include young people ages 15–26.

The primary group in this movement is the Pioneers, a mass Communist organization for children who have pledged themselves to be true to the teachings of Lenin. The work of the Pioneers is closely coordinated with the school program: "The basic unit of Pioneer work is the Pioneer detachment in the school and cannot be separated from the work of the teacher." The work in the Pioneer palaces and houses is carried out by full-time employees who have the same qualifications as those who teach in the schools.

We found a school program in a state of flux in response to the law adopted by the Supreme Soviet in December 1958. To understand the Soviet school system, it is necessary to take into consideration the role of the State Planning Commission. This commission determines the immediate and long-range economic goals for the Union and then determines the resources, material and human, needed to reach these goals. The school program is then structured to produce the predetermined manpower needs.

CHANGING EMPHASIS IN EDUCATION

While the Communists seem never to tire of boasting about their schools, it is now apparent that the system in operation prior to 1958 had not produced the desired results in terms of Communist doctrines and goals. They have found that a 10-year school program devoted to a single academic curriculum is incompatible with the goals of universal education, even in a totalitarian state. In addition to the academic emphasis, which until recently has been almost exclusive in the Soviet general education schools, a drastically new emphasis is now being introduced. In a statement which preceded the enactment of the new school law Premier Khrushchev was quoted in Pravda as follows: "The most important and fundamental defect of our secondary and higher schools is their isolation from life. Our 10-year school at the present time has not solved the problem of preparing young people for life, but prepares them only to enter higher establishments."

"Preparation for life" appears to mean chiefly acquiring the ability and will to do skilled manual labor. Therefore, the 10-year school that has had the acclaim of some critics of American education is being replaced by a compulsory 8-year school which includes labor skills in its program. Students who have finished the 8-year program may (1) continue for 3 more years in a secondary school in which 2 days of the 6-day week must be spent on the job at production training, or (2) he may go to work full-time and continue his schooling for 3 more years in the evening, or (3) he may discontinue school altogether.

Perhaps the single greatest difficulty Americans face in trying to understand the Russian school system is their upgrading of educational nomenclature. They have no vocational training; they have production training. They have no general science; they have various levels of physics, chemistry, and biology; and auto mechanics is applied physics. There are no such subjects as the social sciences or economics in the sense that we use and teach them. Driver training is not a frill, it is production training.

EDUCATION FOR MANPOWER NEEDS

The educational programs of the universities and colleges are also structured to meet the manpower needs as determined by the State Planning Commission. The number of students who are permitted to study engineering, law, medicine, the various sciences, teaching, and so forth, is determined by present and future manpower needs. College students are members of a select group whose future is filled with hope for status in the new order. Competition is keen both to get in and stay in. Tuition is free and students are paid a stipend while attending. If their work is superior, they are given bonuses in the form of added stipends and even paid vacations. However, only about one out of every four students who qualify for admission to college is admitted.

When he finishes college, the graduate is assigned a job, and a resident of Moscow may be assigned a job in Siberia. While he is not required to take the assigned job, if he does not, he will find it almost impossible to secure another.

INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

The business of organized education is regarded far more seriously in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States. The highest authorities pay close and constant attention to it, and they pay more than attention, since approximately 10 percent of the total national income is devoted to education. The top political leaders of the Soviet Union are dedicated to and use organized universal education as the single most important instrument of national policy. At the same time, however, they rely on professional educators to plan, organize, and administer the educational programs with a minimum of nonprofessional interference, so long as Communist doctrines are not violated.

There is a dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. today in the most imaginative and ruthlessly calculated sense of the term. Undergirded by an abiding faith in the magic of science, it is relentlessly driving to perfect its cultural revolution. There are those who contend that the Communist seizure of power has turned out to be a revolution of method rather than substance. While this judgment may prove to be correct in the course of history, I do not agree as of the present, and it is not so believed by a vast majority of the Russians today.

RUSSIAN SYSTEM AND ETHICAL VALUES

The greatest mistake we could make, I am convinced, is to attempt to write off or seal off the Russian system as solely atheist materialism which will somehow fall of its own shortcomings or from the wrath of God. Even though "religion" has been rejected as a motivation, and "religious institutions," as a source of power competing for the minds and loyalties of the people, are not permitted; even though religious doctrines and faith are being supplanted by Communist doctrines and faith through a systematic plan of indoctrination; in spite of this the Russian system is neither amoral nor lacking in a social ethic.

In terms of human welfare one must admit that in moral and ethical values the current regime has more to offer the people than that against which the revolution, in its inception, was directed. This is evident in the contrasts. One example we saw was a sixth century monastery, high upon a mountain, inaccessible to the people, and a power dam at the foot of the mountain presided over by a huge statue of Lenin. This is only a single example of the contrasts, many of them deliberately contrived, that the dictatorship is using as visual aids to secure acceptance of and commitment to Communist doctrines.

To understand the Russian system one should consider factual observations, even when they might be distasteful. We have, unfortunately I believe, developed a mindset wherein there can be no acceptable morality, ethics, or motivations which do not bear the imprimatur of Judeo-Christian traditions and institutions. I hold no brief for any phase of the tyranny that prevails in the U.S.S.R. today. On the contrary, I detest all of it. I hope, however, that my detestation will not lead me to the uncritical rejection of knowledge essential to logical thinking and sound judgments. Only the devotees of a monolithic system contend that their system is wholly good and that all others are wholly bad. Regardless of extenuating qualifications, this is tyranny. The fact is, no system is entirely good and no system is entirely bad.

POSITIVE MOTIVATIONS

While Communist doctrines as they are taught and observed in the Soviet Union recognize neither the essential dignity of the individual nor the desirability of individual liberty, which to me are all important they do appeal to many compelling, positive motivations. Among these are: peace, friendship, concern for mankind everywhere (the brotherhood of man); a sense of national destiny reminding me of that which the ancient Hebrews felt for Israel; ethical humanism with an emphasis upon human welfare (the good life for all); equality of all as well as equality of opportunity and consideration (all men are created equal); man is master of his own fate; educational de-

velopment as the key to national as well as individual success; appreciation for the cultural arts and skills (this does not apply to the creative arts); forthright recognition of the pragmatic necessity for planning for desired results in a complex world; science holds the key to the supernatural. Before explaining these away on the grounds that in terms of Communist purposes and methods they have entirely different meanings from the ones we attach to them, we should try to understand their appeal to the peoples of the Soviet Union in their current and past environment. When we do, we may understand better what is happening and what needs to be done to offset their appeal.

HOW TO COUNTERACT SOVIET POWER

As I see it, the basic issue posed by the Soviet system—and organized education is a key factor in this system—must be divided into two phases: the immediate and the long-range. The immediate phase is to counteract Soviet power and its potential use for world domination. This is a task for the experts, but not exclusively the military experts who, in our society, are morally obligated to a policy of defensiveness; and defensiveness in the affairs of men in the contemporary world is not a sufficient reason for action. The present potential for human devastation possessed by both the Soviet Union and the United States raises serious doubts as to whether or not military approaches and solutions even in a cold war can possibly be beneficial to either of these nations or the world. The military approach, wherever it is used, inevitably resolves the growing conflict between the private person and the social group—the conflict between the moral individual and the military state—in favor of the latter. We desperately need the counsel of scientists of all kinds, especially the social and political scientists; we need the counsel of economic, educational, and religious experts as well. As a Nation we need help in discovering the practical and moral reasons for being responsible for others—reasons which are more than the parroting of the pat prescriptions of the church and the military establishment—rational, logical, dynamic reasons which emerge in response to the urge of the responsible reforms our liberal arts and religious training call for. We need help in learning the current realities of human conditions throughout the world. We need help in realizing that the ultimate human goal is moral and social solidarity in the family of man in a spirit of responsible freedom rather than in a spirit of monolithic, doctrinaire orthodoxy. There can be no free society without free men, and in a free society the people must ever assume the responsibility for the decisions of their government and the consequences of those decisions.

Whatever is done to counteract Soviet power must take into consideration the long-range phase of the basic issue. This is not one of "isms"; it is not communism versus Americanism; it is not communism versus capitalism; it is not atheism versus Protestantism or Catholicism. Freedom is not the byproduct of any system or "ism." Fundamentally, the long-range phase of the issue is intellectual freedom; the right to believe, to think, to speak, to act, to seek for, to plan, and to use all methods and resources for the universal development of the creative capacities and powers of the mind of man and the free use of these powers to develop, refine, and redevelop those processes and systems—economic, political, social, religious, and educational—that will best meet the needs of man in a changing environment—the fulfillment of the spirit of man. No monolithic, doctrinaire system of indoctrination can do this, regardless of its avowed objectives.

UNIVERSAL FREE EDUCATION, MAN'S HOPE

I am now more convinced than ever that the ultimate hope of man lies in universal free education that is wide enough in range and scope, thorough enough in content, and challenging enough in quality to provide for each individual, within the limits of his capacities, enough knowledge—accurate and balanced—to give a sufficient understanding of the nature of man and his environment that will make it possible to develop and use all necessary and democratic means of controlling man's nature and environment for the good of mankind. But this is becoming an increasingly difficult task because we are living in a rapidly changing, highly complex, and frustratingly confusing world.

The Russian people believe profoundly in the truth of their way of life, and they are supremely confident that their methods provide the only sure means for the final fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of mankind everywhere. Do we possess as profound a belief in our way of life? Do we have as great confidence in our methods? Are we still dedicated to a proposition? Are the truths of the American dream still self-evident? Are we still aspiring, striving, fighting for what we believe—for the fulfillment of our proud ethical, moral, and political ideals and traditions?

DEDICATION TO DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

What is desperately needed in America today is a revival of faith in and dedication to freedom, the self-evident truths of the American dream, the absolute necessity of free, universal education, and faith in the dedication to democratic processes. With such a revival of faith and dedication, organized education in the United States would become a key instrument of national policy—policy which is consistent with our ideals, traditions, and purposes. In implementing this policy the Congress of the United States would enact legislation which would allocate to the several States financial support on the basis of an objective formula, leaving the discretion to no Federal officer or agency to determine the amount, and then permitting the already established educational officers and agencies in the several States to administer these Federal funds for educational purposes under State laws and constitutions. We can have a national policy which recognizes the importance of the role of organized public education by granting substantial financial support to it and at the same time do no violence to the principle of State and local autonomy in the control and management of our public schools. To contend otherwise is to deny the effectiveness and reliability of democratic processes.

The best example of the lack of faith in democratic ideals and processes in America today is provided by the persistent refusal of the Congress and the administration to do anything of significance to bolster our lagging, inadequate public education program and to offer as the excuse for their failure the cliche "Federal support means Federal control." By our actions we proclaim to the uncommitted peoples of the world that the people of the United States, the bastion of the free world, can do nothing through their Federal Government to support free public education because in the process the Government of the United States will become a freedom-destroying monster. This is not true. The Congress of the United States can provide substantial financial support for our public schools in a way that will not do violence to any cherished principles at any time that it sees fit to do so. It will do so only when the people of the United States insist upon it.

NO INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS

In the United States, what we decide to do we can do. There are no insurmountable problems. The Russian people believe that no sacrifice is too great so long as it helps in the furtherance of Communist doctrines and objectives. They have the energy, the drive, the dedication; in contrast, we seem to be drifting in aimless confusion, lacking in courage and a sense of responsibility. We have ample resources—material, human, ideological—to win the struggle for the minds and the loyalties of the uncommitted peoples of the world. What is lacking is the desire, the impulse, the will to act. We need a program, and public education is an essential aspect of any such program, that will tap the vigor and will challenge the faith and imagination of people everywhere, but the beginning must be with the people of the United States. We must accept as the basis of responsible action the implications of our own faith. In the United States, with sufficient concern and conviction on the part of the people, policy and action by the Government will automatically follow, if not immediately, then assuredly after an election or two.

OUR MISSILE AND SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of four articles which recently appeared in the Washington Post. They concern our missile and space program. The articles are extremely well written, and, I think, contain information which should be of profound interest to all Members of this body, as well as the public. I believe it is well worth while to bring them together in a consecutive arrangement that is convenient for all to read.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 1960]

SPACE LAG A PUZZLER WITH ATLASES STANDING

BY

(By Edward Gamarekian)

A babel of charges, denials, explanations, and counter charges is expected in Congress when the Senate and House Space Committees get down to a reexamination of this country's space program in the next few weeks.

There is little tangible evidence that the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union is being closed, and some now think that it is actually being widened.

More than 2 years have passed since the launching of the first sputniks and the United States has yet to match what the Soviets did at the very start. Sputnik II, launched November 3, 1957, weighed 1,120 pounds. The largest payloads the United States has placed in orbit are the 440-pound capsules of the military satellite project Discoverer.

The Russians have launched three lunar probes, weighing, respectively, 797, 858, and 614 pounds. Each completed its apparently intended mission, the first passing close to the moon and going into orbit around the sun; the second hitting the moon close to the center and the third going behind the moon to take photographs of the far side.

The largest lunar probe launched by the United States weighed only 39 pounds and it went only one-third of the way to the moon. A 13.4-pound unit was sent past the moon into orbit around the sun.

From the timetable announced by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this country will not attempt to match the Soviet accomplishments before late 1960. Why is it taking so long?

During the past 2 years the American people were told that this country was behind because it did not have the large rockets needed to send large payloads into space. This reason no longer holds. The 360,000-pound-thrust Atlas missile has been ready for several months.

Although it doesn't have quite as much thrust as the Russian rockets, it can loft comparable and even larger payloads with the right upper stages. Why isn't it being fed into the space program at a rapid enough rate to achieve some notable success? Because the administration says it cannot afford it.

Only two Atlases were scheduled for use in the space program in 1959. One was fired in a reentry test of the Mercury satellite which is expected to carry a man into orbit around the earth in 1961. The other was scheduled for a moon shot but blew up in a preliminary test.

AN UNSPOKEN REPLY

When the Russians made a lunar flight with the camera-carrying Lunik III in the first week of last October, a third Atlas was suddenly allocated for another try at the moon. The 130-pound instrumented payload that was supposed to go into orbit around the moon—something not yet done by anyone—barely got off the ground before electronic trouble led to failure.

The NASA says it doesn't know whether it will use one of its small 1960 supply of Atlases for another attempt. It has only six for its entire 1960 program. Four will be used for suborbital tests with the Mercury capsule. The other two will be used for a new rocket vehicle capable of launching payloads slightly larger than those already sent up by the Soviets.

If the new vehicle succeeds, American prestige may be restored by late 1960—provided the Soviets haven't done something more spectacular in the meantime. If there are some mishaps, our prestige will have to wait until more vehicles are available in 1961.

That is what has some people in this country disturbed. The reliability of a launching vehicle is always low. A million things can go wrong, and there may be several failures before all the bugs are worked out.

To place the responsibility for national prestige on a new, untried vehicle and then gamble on success with only two units is reckless, they argue.

Those who feel that drooping American prestige demands the launching of sizable satellites and space probes at the earliest possible date are bitterly attacking the Administration for not making a greater effort. Charges of "niggardliness" and "no sense of urgency" are being made in many quarters.

An official of the important NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Dr. Eberhardt Rechtin, Chief of the Telecommunications Division, put it this way in a recent address in Los Angeles:

"At the present time, one of the most remarkable features of the U.S. position is the almost complete lack of urgency in the space program. The NASA budget is now somewhat less than what the United States pays to ship and store surplus wheat. Our space program costs less than $10 per year per U.S. adult, or, roughly, one evening's entertainment per year."

QUESTIONS OF BALANCE

The administration is defending its position by arguing that more Atlas missiles cannot be diverted to space projects without upsetting the Nation's defense and that an additional supply of the $4 million units cannot be procured without upsetting the budget. (The number of Atlases allocated to the military satellite program has not been disclosed.)

The "no sense of urgency" charge is also being thrown at the administration for not spending more on the Mercury man-in-space program and the 1½-million-pound-thrust boosters Saturn and Nova.

The Senate and House space committees are getting ready to give NASA a rough going over when Congress reconvenes. Last session, NASA officials kept insisting that they had enough money and couldn't use any more. They will have a hard time explaining their present plight without admitting that they underestimated the situation.

When NASA is asked if it needs more than the $800 million being budgeted for fiscal 1961, it will have an even more difficult time explaining that this, too, will be enough. It will have to try, however, on orders from the top.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1960]

UNITED STATES FAILS TO PARE RED ARMS LEAD—CRITICS OF REGIME NOTE SERIOUSNESS OF WEAPONS GAP

(By John G. Norris)

Ever since Sputnik I roared into the skies to tell the world the United States could be attacked by Russian-based rockets almost without warning, the Eisenhower administration has been trying to explain away the Soviet lead in missiles.

A combination of soothing sirup, secrecy, and Soviet smiles last year blunted the impact of the news that the U.S.S.R. will get a commanding superiority in operational ICBM's during the early 1960's.

But the hard fact of the "missile gap" and all it portends is still there. And events—since Congress went home last summer—make it plain that the Russian lead is widening rather than narrowing, and may be even more serious than administration critics then charged.

These developments include a still unannounced Pentagon upgrading of the accuracy and reliability of the ICBM and some little publicized happenings here and in the Soviet Union that downgrade the manned bomber.

Last winter, Neil H. McElroy, then Secretary of Defense, admitted publicly that if the Russians build all the ICBM's they can and if the United States produces the number it now plans, the U.S.S.R. will maintain a three-to-one lead through the early 1960's.

In explaining this unhappy ratio, he said it stemmed from an administration decision not to try to "match Russia, missile for missile" but to rely on American superiority in Air Force and carrier-based bombers, plus available ICBM's, IRBM's, and Polaris submarines.

Those who argued at that time and since that such a policy was too risky won support from an unexpected quarter yesterday. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, who, while Army Chief of Staff, contended that the United States had too much "massive deterrent" and too little conventional war strength, confessed that he has "reluctantly" come to accept the "reality and significance of the so-called missile gap."

GENERAL TAYLOR'S WARNING

"Somehow it must be made clear to our citizens that the Nation will face a serious crisis beginning about 1961," he said in a just-published book. "For a period of years thereafter, the balance of military strength will tip dangerously in favor of the Communist bloc unless we take drastic action now."

The clock is ticking but few pay attention. A responsible group, the Johns Hopkins University Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research, warned in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that the United States today is "both open and vulnerable to direction and devastating attack." Everyone yawned.

No responsible officials now in Government speak out in public to inform America of the dangerous drift.

Not one of them attempts to correct the impression given earlier by the administration that Soviet ICBM's were inaccurate. Yet since August, a series of successful American Atlas tests have demonstrated greater accuracy and reliability for ICBM's in general than most top officials anticipated.

The Atlas "CEP"—the "circular error probability" or margin by which it may be expected to miss a target—has been cut from 4 to 3 miles and may be dropped to 2. Considering the terrific blast of a thermonuclear warhead, this means that fewer missiles will be needed to assure destruction of a key target.

RUSSIA ALSO IMPROVES

Intelligence and missile-montoring evidence of Soviet T–3 ICBM tests lead officials to credit Russia with equivalent improvement in its bigger missile.

No one in Government has said publicly that this increased danger to Strategic Air Command bomber bases has altered the administration position before Congress last year that SAC can be relied on to knock out Russia. But last fall there was an official, though curiously veiled acknowledgement that Russian defenses against B–52s and B–47s had so improved that those SAC bombers no longer could expect to get through to their targets in Russia using long-accepted high level bombing tactics.

SAC spokesmen made the important admission in disclosing new and elaborate plans for alternate "tree top" approach bombing at Federal civil aviation meetings to explain the necessity of reserving air space corridors for such "Braille bomber" training.

It may be that SAC still will be able to do its job, but a recent top level Pentagon evaluation now concludes that the ICBM will achieve equal effectiveness with manned bombers in 1962, earlier than expected. And by 1966, bomber effectiveness may be degraded to limited use only.

Many measures can be taken to prolong the effective life of the U.S. bomber strong cards, but as a result of the administration's ironclad budget ceiling, it has been decided to take an additional gamble on a "bomber gap" on top of the "missile gap."

The administration has—

Canceled production of the missile-firing B–52B supersonic bomber.

Cut production of the B–58A bomber and stretched out production of the few which will be built.

Gone ahead with plans to deactivate B–47 squadrons the B–58's were to replace.

Canceled production orders for a highly sophisticated electronics-counter-measures system for B–52's, substituting some "more modest"—and cheaper—systems designed to help SAC bombers get through the Soviet air defense system.

Virtually dropped the 2,000-mile-an-hour B–70 program, designed to locate mobile or unknown Soviet missile sites. It will be continued only as an experimental plane.

Many of these actions were admitted only after word of the cancellations and cutbacks leaked out from industry.

Even with these cuts, by 1962–63 SAC's bomber force probably will be double that of "SUSAC"—the Russian strategic air force. But by then, the U.S.S.R. may have three to five times more ICBM's than the 200 American ICBM's now ordered.

Besides these "first generation" Atlas and Titan ICBM's now planned, the United States is working on a second-generation, solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM. But it will be 1964–65 before a major force of 600 to 700 Minutemen can be in service.

By then, if Minuteman can be made mobile and/or a sizable number of U.S. Polaris submarines are on station and there

is no war, the Nation's major trouble may be over. For truly secure deterrent nuclear force would solve many problems.

POLARIS A YEAR AWAY

But the United States will not have its first Polaris craft operational for another year and can have only 9 of the 16-missile subs in service by late 1963. But no more are being laid down this year or funded in the 1961 budget.

Moreover, Russia is presenting an ominous submarine-based missile threat. NATO's Atlantic commander, Adm. Jerauld Wright, said recently that there is conclusive evidence the Russians will have a significant ballistic missile sub threat against the United States within a year and a dangerous one in subsequent years.

American officials are confident that the Soviet subs, at first, will be greatly inferior to the Polaris nuclear craft. But numbers could count.

In other missiles, Russia is way ahead of the United States. The Soviets have several hundred medium range missiles of 600- to 1,200-mile range, plus some of 1,800 miles and well over a thousand with 300-mile range or better. Most of them are mobile.

In contrast, the U.S. picture is dismal. Forty American-built 1500-mile Thors are becoming operational in Britain. Turkey recently agreed to accept a squadron of 10 IRBM's, but Italy—the only other U.S. ally which will accept this fixed base, "soft" missile—has done little to install the 20 American IRBM's it agreed to take last March. Some dozen 200-mile U.S. Army Redstone ballistic missiles are in Europe.

Last winter, McElroy told Congress that Russian IRBM's did not figure in the American-Soviet missile comparison, as the U.S.S.R. "had not risked" moving them into the Red satellites, where they could reach American SAC bases in Britain, Spain and Morocco. Now the Pentagon admits to clear evidence that mobile Soviet IRBM's are in East Germany. It has not yet corrected the public record on this, however.

CRASH PROGRAM OUT

As to an ICBM defense, the Defense Department again last fall turned down urgent Army pleas to start crash construction of the Nike-Zeus, while continuing its development. This means no ballistic missile defense at least until the middle sixties, although ICBM radar warning stations should be ready by early 1962.

In face of all this, what is the administration doing?

There are some plans, but mighty little cash so far to finance them.

An Air Force plan to put some 60 Atlas or Titan ICBM's in dispersed, underground sites during the next 3 years has met tentative administration favor. So have preparations for an around-the-clock B–52 air alert to assure that a surprise Russian missile would not destroy all of SAC's retaliatory force on the ground.

Proposals to put more Atlases on "soft" sites and 1,200-mile Polaris missiles on surface warships have been rejected. The Pentagon cannot see where the extra billions to pay for the limited number of additional "hard" ICBM's and air alert is coming from out of the ironclad $41 billion budget, much less to try to bridge the missile gap.

As a result, the once all powerful American ability to wreak massive retaliation on an aggressor is fast declining.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1960]

SOVIET ARMS GAIN LAID TO U.S. POLICY—ARMY CUTBACKS HIT AMERICAN POTENTIAL FOR LIMITED WAR

(By John G. Norris)

At a meeting of the National Security Council in July 1957, the then Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson declared that the Nation's basic military policy was to "maximize air power and minimize the foot soldier."

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, then Army Chief of Staff, who reports the incident in a just published book, said his words were accepted by all present as a "correct if colloquial" description of the Eisenhower administration's military strategy.

Wilson was arguing for a further reduction in the Army, which has suffered a cut in divisions from 20 to 14 and a slash in manpower from 1,500,000 to 870,000 since General Eisenhower became President.

Some reduction from the Korean war level was expected, of course, but Taylor and his predecessor, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, left office embittered over the way President Eisenhower treated their service. They believed a million-man Army to be essential—925,000 at rock bottom—but were most incensed over what they considered "starvation" in weapons modernization funds.

For the Eisenhower "bigger bang for a buck" program provided precious little for Army conventional warfare capabilities. (Hindsight shows that the Army might be better off today if it had not put so much into the Jupiter IRBM, later given to the Air Force. But where would the U.S. space program be today without the Jupiter rockets?)

The Army's frustration over this starvation was heightened by a succession of annual Moscow May Day parades showing off a wide variety of new Soviet Army weapons. During the 1950's, in fact, the Red army has remedied almost all of its wartime weaknesses.

During this time Russia also has cut army manpower to about 2,500,000 men but, with many fewer service troops than the United States, it has retained 175 active combat divisions.

Some of these—like America's 17 Army and marine divisions—are under strength, but the Soviet Union's tough, 3-year draft has produced several million young and ready reservists to fill up their ranks quickly.

Russian conscripts get longer, tougher training than American draftees. The Soviet GI, noncom, and junior officer are less able to exercise initiative than their U.S. counterparts. But U.S.S.R. difficulties in maintaining mechanical and communications equipment which American experts expected reportedly have not shown up in maneuvers.

Because of its modernization, the big Red Army is more powerful today than ever. Strong in armor and cross-country mobility, the Red army and its integrated air force is well prepared to fight either an atomic or conventional war.

As a result of the "minimize the foot soldier" policy, however, the U.S. Army is in a relatively weaker position today vis-a-vis Russia than was true 7 years ago. This is the case with respect to U.S. conventional war capability in general.

Unless Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev really meant what he said about drastically cutting the Red army—and the skeptics are legion—this situation may grow worse. For despite a slight increase in Army weapons modernization funds after the retirement of Secretary Wilson and of Adm. Arthur W. Radford as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff there is talk of another large Army cut in 1962.

ARMY RELIES ON TAC

The Army, of course, is not the only American instrument of limited warfare. It relies on the separate Air Force Tactical Air Command for airlift and close air support; but TAC has not fared very well, either, under the Eisenhower administration's emphasis on massive deterrent forces.

The Navy and Marine Corps, however, represent a major exception to the increasing Soviet conventional warfare lead—the one bright spot in an otherwise dismal picture.

American seapower surpasses that of Russia. The combination of the Navy's aircraft carriers, amphibious ships and integrated Marine ground-air forces provide an effective way of dealing with many cold and limited war situations. But other potential trouble spots are inaccessible by sea and the Soviet Union has built large submarine and land-based air forces to oppose the American Navy.

Furthermore—and this gets to the heart of the Pentagon infighting over strategy—the Marines are not big enough to fight a sizable limited war.

PENTAGON'S POLICY

The Pentagon rationale for cutting the Army is found in the oft-repeated statement that the United States will never fight another Korea. This reflects current policy that the United States will employ its tactical atomic weapons or even bigger nuclear bombs to make up for its lack of manpower and conventional firepower in anything more than a small brushfire.

The fallacy of this stand, many believe is that American decisionmakers might well shy away from use of nuclear weapons—as at Dienbienphu. For the Soviets may well have as many tactical A-weapons as the United States, if not more. This is a field in which the Pentagon has lagged so much that Atomic Energy Commission Chairman John A. McCone had to prod the military a year ago into listing its requirements.

This lack of superiority in tactical A-weapons and the disinclination to use them could mean a greater likelihood of nonnuclear limited war, either between allies or satellites of the two major world powers or with one or the other directly involved.

It is here that the relative capacity of conventional or dual-purpose American and Soviet weapons becomes important. For one thing, both have been arsenals for their respective worlds.

U.S. armor—more important today than ever before—probably suffers most by comparison with the U.S.S.R.

The Red army is numerically stronger in tanks—unit for unit—than the American Army, and with over 100 tank or mechanized divisions in being, many times stronger overall.

Qualitatively, Soviet tanks are superior. Russia's chief battle tank, the T–54, has much greater cruising range than the current American Patton, yet is 12 tons lighter. The T–54, though slightly inferior in fire control and ammunition, outguns the Patton.

A not-yet-operational replacement for the Patton—the M–60—will have much greater range and a good, new British gun, but is disappointly heavy. The Army is utilizing what is essentially the old Patton chassis to save money rather than designing a completely new tank. Some experts question whether it will be much superior to the 9-year-old T–54.

STORY OF A FAILURE

The story of the Ontos tank-destroyer flop—another attempt to build a cut-rate weapon—is illuminating. It is especially so because outgoing Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy, in his final news conference, cited the Marine Corps' Ontos as an example of American progress in conventional arms.

This couldn't be further from the fact. The Ontos (the word means "the thing" in Greek) sounds and looks impressive. It was developed by the Army in the pre-Korean economy days when its recoilless rifles—beefed-up bazookas—seemed like a cheap alternative to a costly postwar tank program. After the Defense Department Weapons System Evaluation Group rejected Ontos for many reasons, the Marine Corps took it over simply because nothing else was in sight for beachhead use. Already, however, the Marines are evaluating West German and French replacements for the still in delivery Ontos.

In infantry and artillery weapons, the Soviet Union has produced a whole new

family to replace inferior World War II types. It has exported many of these weapons to its satellites and even to some Arab nations it has been courting. American forces, and most of the Allies too, are still equipped with pre-World War II Garand rifles and field artillery—and World War I-type machineguns and automatic rifles.

EFFECTIVE BUT TOO HEAVY

American light arms now in the hands of the troops are effective but overly heavy. U.S. artillery is good but largely still truck-towed rather than tracked and self-propelled. Soviet small arms are lighter though of shorter range. And the Russians have more self-propelled artillery, probably still inferior, however, as to fire control.

To move ahead of the Soviet Union in light weapons and artillery, the United States has developed an improved light arms family and an excellent new series of self-propelled aluminum-light mounts for its artillery.

The new M–14 rifle and M–60 machinegun are in limited production only. There is no production money at all for the new artillery mounts or automatic rifle. It will take 6½ years to fill initial Regular Army needs alone for the M–14 rifle under current production.

There are bright spots in the U.S. Army weapon picture. Concentrating its money on the newer weapons, the United States probably is technically ahead in battlefield missiles such as the good Lacrosse, but the Soviet Union has more such missiles and more of them on mobile mounts. With the Hawk, the United States is technically ahead in protection against low-flying planes. The Soviets rely on large numbers of new rapid-firing guns. In armored troop carriers, the United States has better but fewer weapons.

RUSSIAN GAINS IN AIR

The picture in the air, as far as conventional forces are concerned, is equally if not more dismal.

In tactical air, the Soviet Union has built far more fighters, better adapted to rough fields, than the United States has built of its more sophisticated craft. Russia is exporting them.

In airlift, the Russians are bringing in much bigger helicopters, big global T–114 turboprop transports and other craft while the United States is concentrating on plush jet airlines for the commercial trade.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

In a look at the rival Soviet and American conventional forces, this is apparent:

The Soviets have modernized the Red Army and its tactical air force all along the line, avoiding the American concentration on perhaps more exotic new weapons, like missiles, recoilless rifles, and battlefield radar "seeing eyes," while letting lag basic improvements in tanks, artillery and other conventional arms.

The result is an ever increasing disparity in conventional forces—and in an age in which the psychological bar against the first use of nuclear weapons is growing, not diminishing.

The Soviet motto seems to have been well put by one Russian officer who reportedly declared: "There is too much at stake—the future of communism—to economize on the Red army."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1960]

U.S. IMAGE ABROAD—WE CAN STILL RIGHT UNHAPPY BALANCE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

A nation's ability to influence the course of world affairs, even its ability to survive, is dependent both on the reality of power and on the public image others have of that power.

The first three articles in this series have pointed out a central feature of the Eisenhower years—the massive decline in U.S. military power and the para-military power of space science in relation to the rising military power of the Soviet Union.

Shifts in the military power balance are inevitable and have occurred throughout history as capable men in one nation or another have produced new weapons or other elements of force. The power pendulum swings back and forth.

On the basis of the evidence in the preceding articles there is no reason to believe that the United States cannot right the balance, not to the extent of the early post-World War II years in which it enjoyed a nuclear monopoly, but at least to the extent of creating both an adequate massive deterrent and a flexible conventional warfare capability.

SKILL NOT LACKING

It is evident enough that it is not technical skill that is lacking in the United States to do these things.

The problem in Washington is one of attitude. It is an attitude which attempts to comfort those at home who are alarmed at the military slippage by talking about "balanced forces" and about not competing with the Russians missile for missile.

It is an attitude toward the other free nations of the world which the United States professes to lead in the East-West struggle, an attitude in which budget balancing and the sanctity of the dollar appear supreme.

It is an attitude of annoyance on the part of President Eisenhower as expressed in answer to a press conference question about a Soviet claim of ability to hit any point in the world, precisely and accurately, with an ICBM having an H-bomb warhead.

"They also said," he snapped, "that they invented the flying machine and the automobile and other things. Why should you be so respectful of this statement this morning, if you are not so respectful of the other three?"

It is an attitude which often still seems not to have comprehended the meaning of the first Soviet sputnik.

Millions of words have been written about the totality of Communist efforts, embracing not only military but psychological, economic and political tactics in the East-West struggle. Yet the night that first sputnik soared around the earth, one of the then military service Secretaries confessed that in earlier intra-administration arguments over American plans for a satellite he had said that he never had heard of any more damned foolish idea. The night of Sputnik I he expressed total amazement at world interest in the accomplishment.

PRESIDENT'S COMMENT

As recently as last November, during the shilly-shallying over military or civilian control of space work, the President could comment that "for the life of me, I cannot see any reason why we should be using or misusing military talent to explore the moon."

Most important, the attitude in Washington has created an image around the world of a United States fast declining in military power and space science—and therefore in diplomatic power with which to enforce its will and its hopes and expectations.

In such a context it is no wonder that much of the world believes Nikita S. Khrushchev won his invitation to the United States by nuclear blackmailing this Nation over Berlin. All the talk from Washington about the invitation being part of a new Eisenhower peace offensive cannot counter such an interpretation.

The simple fact is that much of the world now believes Khrushchev's talk about military superiority. All the Pentagon releases piled as high as the Washington Monument and all the fine words from the White House will not rub out the impression that this administration has accepted a second-best military-space status for the United States.

What so often counts is not only the facts but what people think are the facts.

AMERICANS UNEASY

That Americans are uneasy, in many cases downright alarmed, about the state of the Nation's military defenses is evident. That there is an uneasy stir in the land is also true.

The United States today is powerfully armed. If war should come tomorrow, America's Armed Forces doubtless would give an excellent account of themselves. Much fine work is being done by various arms of the administration to improve the defense posture. Many, many men work beyond the call of duty to help protect and defend the Nation.

Still, the image of America is not a happy one. The President, by his recent three-continent tour and by his other often eloquent statements about the American desire for peace, has done much to counter the Communist-inspired picture of a warmongering United States.

But that is only part of the solution. The other part is to create a reality and a consequent worldwide image of strength on which American diplomats can count when they meet the Communists across the conference tables. This requires both more military preparedness and a greater leap into the age of space.

The administration's proposals for the final Eisenhower year are about to be made public. From what is known in advance they will not substantially alter the present pace in either field. Perhaps the Congress can do something additional but in an election year there is likely to be more sound and fury than action.

The result, as many public officials both in and out of the administration are saying today, is that the President who enters the White House a year and 2 weeks from today will face tasks of heroic proportions. Hence the choice of that man by the voters this November 8 will be supremely important for the United States and the free world.

CRITICISM OF SETTLEMENT OF THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, lest it be thought that the settlement of the steel strike was unanimously approved, I wish to raise one small voice in dissent.

This is by no means the first time in this administration that the high phrases and principles enunciated by the Chief Executive have finally resolved themselves, when it came to the practicalities, into something considerably lower.

In his column of January 5, Walter Lippmann characterized the settlement as "a political fix." I am very glad to be able to quote this eminent journalist, who is a master of English prose, rather than try to find descriptive words from my own more limited vocabulary.

It will be recalled that the President repeatedly and emphatically denounced any possible settlement which would result in price increases or would be inflationary. Yet there is not the slightest assurance that this settlement will meet the President's specification. On the contrary, the only speculation is when the increases will occur. There seems to be some tentative arrangement, based upon the fact that the wage increases will not become effective until December 1, that noticeable price increases may not occur until about that time, or, perhaps, after the second Tuesday in November—a date to remember for other reasons.

The very reliable Wall Street Journal said, on January 5, that there is an unwritten understanding with Vice President NIXON and Labor Secretary Mitchell that the companies will forgo any general price increase for several months, possibly through 1960. But I hazard a prediction that the anxiety of the steel companies to maintain their honored tradition of continuous and unremitting price increases, with or without excuse, will overcome their not quite equal anxiety to contribute to the welfare of the Republican Party and its candidate. There are about as many ways to increase steel prices as there are to skin a cat, and some of these can be used without equivalent outcry. I predict "adjustments" and "definitions" and "reclassifications" of the multitudinous steel products. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], has pointed out, steel prices were increased to the small buyer even before the strike, by changing the method of computing quantity discounts.

If one believes, even to the slightest degree, the claims made by steel company executives during the long negotiations, postponement of price increases after this settlement would represent a great sacrifice. This, if it occurs, ought to be classified, under the Corrupt Practices Act, as a campaign contribution to the Republican Party. But in the long run, the $1 billion estimated cost of the settlement will surely be paid by the general public, in the form of increased prices throughout the economy, with something extra added for the steel companies.

Another high-sounding principle of the President which was swept under the rug was his determination to rely on free collective bargaining. If anyone believes that this settlement was achieved by any such means, he ought to be disillusioned. The settlement was achieved by political maneuvering. Spokesmen of one party, controlling the executive branch, threatened negotiators with what another party, controlling the Congress, might do. Another bitter fruit of divided government.

Another great problem swept under the rug is that of providing adequate machinery for dealing with such strikes. What of all the agonizing about the deficiencies in our labor-management laws to handle such paralyzing conflicts? It has gone by the board, perhaps all too soon to return again when the national economy is next brought to its knees by another such combination of labor-management power.

What about our competitive position in world trade, the concern of the administration over our imbalance of payments, the crucial problem which impels us to impose Buy American policies on our development assistance program, the concern which impels us to increase interest rates to prevent gold and dollar outflow? How is this great problem ameliorated by the steel settlement? There was already concern that in some industries we were pricing ourselves out of world markets; and although there was undue concern about our balance of payments, the one industry most vulnerable was the steel industry.

In November 1959, the Commerce Department published an analysis of changes in U.S. shares of export markets for manufacturers, 1954–1958. I emphasize that it was an analysis of percentage shares of individual regional markets for exports, rather than dollar amounts of exports, so that the study reflected U.S. exports in terms of aggregate world trade. The study determined that the overall U.S. share had indeed been reduced, but that the supposition of general decline was unsupported. The general decline was explained by serious losses centered in a few items—most notably motor vehicles and steel.

In the same period, 1954–58, steel imports doubled. Automobile imports increased several times over.

Last year the steel companies asked for tariff increases on steel wire, and were turned down. It will be interesting to see what new tariff protection they ask, and what they receive, again at the expense of the consumer.

Inexorably, in spite of increased steel ingot capacity of 26 percent between 1953 and 1958, and in spite of increased efficiency, the price of steel moved upward: $3 a ton in 1954, $7.35 a ton in 1955, $8.50 a ton in 1956, $6 a ton in 1957, $4.50 a ton in 1958—during the recession. Prices of finished steel rose 34.1 percent between 1953 and 1958, as against 8.3 percent for all commodities.

Upward moved profits—from $9.07 per ton in 1953 to $17.46 per ton in the first half of 1959.

Labor's wages went up from a minimum of $1.57 in 1954 to $2.03 in the Nixon settlement, not including cost-of-living increases of 17 cents an hour.

All this, the increased wages and the increased profits, came out of the pockets of the general public, in the form of higher costs.

There was an opportunity for statesmanship in the steel strike. Industry could have resisted further wage costs with a promise to reduce its exorbitant prices and profits. Our capitalistic system is rationalized, at least in part, upon the theory that the consumer shares the benefits of increased labor productivity and capital investment in the form of more and better goods at lower costs. But instead, we have a triumph of political expediency over statesmanship. The beneficiaries are big labor, which gets a substantial wage increase, big business, which undoubtedly will receive higher prices, and the Republican Party, which will enjoy the political fruits—all of these at the expense of the unsuspecting public.

Let me close with a quotation from the President's state of the Union message on inflation:

> We must prevent inflation * * * to prevent steadily rising costs and prices calls for stern self-discipline by every citizen. No person, city, State, or organized groups can afford to evade the obligation to resist inflation, for every American pays its crippling tax.

Mr. President, there have been many searching criticisms of this strike settlement. Among these are two columns by Arthur Krock, the distinguished scholar and writer of the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that two columns, one of January 6 and one of January 7, 1960, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

In order to complete the data, I also ask unanimous consent that a table of wage increases and two articles, one by Peter Edson and one by Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Washington Post of January 7, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO MR. TRUMAN IT MUST SEEM LIKE YESTERDAY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 6.—Since neither the Eisenhower administration nor a visible majority of Congress is prepared to challenge the basic monopoly power of an industry-wide trade union, it is obvious that any Government-impelled strike settlement accepted by industry and labor must inevitably be a capitulation to most of the striking union's demands. Therefore, if the judgment is sound that the steel-strike settlement longer deferred would have been even more costly for the industry, then the compliments for their successful intervention now being lavished on Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell are merited chiefly on the consideration that "it might have been worse."

But if and when the new inflationary prod of the settlement is registered in subsequent labor contracts and in the higher price level usually incident to increases in the cost of steel, American consumers may see more plainly that they are being constantly exploited by the politicians and the labor leaders who combine to maintain the laws by which big unions control the labor supply of nationwide industry. And so long as this power, which no other economic group possesses, continues to have the sanction of law, settlements of nationwide strikes will always be political and prounion.

This fact has often been demonstrated since organized labor was uniquely exempted from the antitrust laws. But apparently the population at large, which is the victim of this arrangement, doesn't know how to engender the pressure on both major parties that would produce an equitable system. Or the American people require the shock of currency inflation of the postwar European disaster type and the rising unemployment that would be the consequence of successful foreign competition in the world markets before they will move effectively to protect themselves from the alliance of politics and big labor.

The impotence of the unorganized conmers against this combination has been promoted by its bipartisan nature. This Republican administration has been as one with its Democratic predecessor in declining to attack the root of the union labor monopoly—the immunity from the antitrust laws by which the steelworkers, for example, were able to shut down a nationwide industry by withdrawing its labor force. No sooner had their strike settlement been reached when Secretary Mitchell announced the administration would seek no new power over strikes that paralyze the economy. And this is the second time (the first occasion was in 1956) in President Eisenhower's tenure that Government pressure has been applied to the steel industry for capitulation to the union.

"In the current settlement," commented Iron Age, "the union won about everything it wanted except a complete carbon copy of the 1956 package. * * * The steel firms * * * settled for about one-half that cost. * * * [Hence], if there is a price increase, as expected, it will be a moderate one. * * * The thing that hurts most is that twice Government pressure has come from a strong

[sic] Republican administration. And most painful of all: the steel industry could have had a cheaper settlement last July when Mr. NIXON offered to lend a helping hand to both sides."

The Vice President has this justification to cite for the compliments he is receiving. And also according to Iron Age, NIXON's first effort to settle the strike early last July only missed by an eyelash. But the odds against the industry were insuperable: the union's legalized control of its labor supply, subject only to the temporary restraint of a Taft-Hartley injunction; and the prospect, which finally materialized, that the administration would follow the pattern of intervention, bound in existing circumstances to be pro-union, which the Republicans assailed President Truman for applying.

Suppose, after a long abstinence from effective action and instead of intervening himself, Mr. Truman had turned the job over to his political heir-apparent and to a Cabinet member who wanted to be Vice President. And suppose, after these officials had ended a strike, the latter had immediately announced the administration would abandon all its huffing and puffing about new laws to strengthen public power to sustain the economy. Republican shouts of a political deal would have shaken the heavens.

What's the big difference?

THE STATE OF THE UNION AND GEORGE MEANY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 7.—President Eisenhower in his constitutional message to Congress today verified the prediction of Secretary of Labor Mitchell that, with the steel strike settled, the administration would propose no new legislation in the labor-management field. According to some behind-the-scenes workers in the steel dispute, the President's omission of any such legislative recommendations also verified a provisional forecast to this same effect conveyed by Vice President NIXON and Secretary Mitchell to the companies and the union—the proviso being that these principals would agree on terms.

But even more significant was the fact that President Eisenhower's substitute for legislation was approximately the proposal formally made to him in November by President George Meany of the AFL–CIO. This proposal was that, prior to the development of nationwide labor disputes into a strike status, there should be periodic joint management-union talks "under White House auspices * * * to develop guiding lines for joint and harmonious labor-management relations." And President Eisenhower today adopted it as his entire 1960 labor program in the following words:

"One of the lessons [of the steel strike] is that the potential danger to the entire Nation of longer and greater strikes must be met. To insure against such possibilities we must, of course, depend primarily on the good commonsense of the responsibile individuals. It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth."

This formula, if it can be called that, leaves totally undisturbed the legalized power of a nationwide union to paralyze the economy indefinitely by withdrawing the entire labor force of a nationwide essential industry. It continues to leave the Government with only the ineffective device of an 80-day Taft-Hartley interruption of such strikes, after which the union may again withdraw the entire labor force. And it maintains union domination of the so-called collective-bargaining table inherent in this monopoly of the labor market, a domination which generally compels an acceptance by industry of most of a union's demands when Government stands aloof, and always when Government intervenes.

Nevertheless, a Republican President has accepted the AFL–CIO position that the industrywide strike problem be left wholly to the workings of the good will, the good commonsense, self-discipline and responsibility of the parties, although these factors have been conspicuously absent in past disputes between big labor and big business. And, when one party has a power monopoly denied to the other by law, it is quite confiding of the President to base labor policy on the hope that the first will cease exploiting this power to the utmost when it passes under the lintel of the White House.

But that was the arrangement on which the steel union was induced, and the industry was compelled by Government to agree on terms that, the President remarked comfortably, percentagewise were "lower than any prior settlement since World War II." And, since the only Democratic criticism is that the union might have taken less if the administration had wielded its club and offered its sugar earlier, the people have no political recourse.

The claim of the AFL–CIO to the origin of the administration's new labor policy is thoroughly established in the record. At the University of Wisconsin, November 1958, its general counsel, Arthur J. Goldberg, proposed "a labor-management assembly, modeled after the United Nations * * *, as an instrument for bringing together (under the auspices of the Government) the leading figures in American industry and the leading figures in the American trade union movement for a periodic examination and discussion of the issues which affect us all and in which we find so little common ground."

Secretary Mitchell was viewed as blowing cold on this at the time. But when Meany formally laid the plan before President Eisenhower a year later, the President made it unanimous by answering that this was just what Mitchell "repeatedly had called for."

STEEL PRICES AND WAGES

PITTSBURGH, January 4.—Here is a table showing the increases in steelworkers wages and steel prices at the dates of successive contracts since the Steel Workers Organizing Committee—now the United Steelworkers of America—negotiated its first contract in 1937:

Year	Strike length	Minimum pay	Hourly increase	Steel price increase per ton
	Days			
1937		$0.625	$0.10	
1941		.725	.10	$11.00
1942		.78	.055	
1946	26	.965	.185	5.00
1947		1.09	[1] 1.16	5.00
1948		1.185	[1] 1.13	9.34
1950		1.36	[1] 1.16	5.50
1952	59	1.435	[1] 1.16	5.00
1953		1.52	.085	4.00
1954		1.57	.05	3.00
1955	[2] 12	1.685	[1] 1.15	7.35
1956	34	1.82	[1] 1.105	8.50
1957		1.89	.21	6.00
1958		1.96	.07	4.50
1959	[3] 116			
1960		[4] 2.03	[4] .07	

[1] Denotes hourly increase which was included in "package" spread over the various job classifications, and not exactly matched in the minimum pay rates.

[2] Hours.

[3] The strike lasted from July 15 until Nov. 7, 1959, when workers returned to the mills under a Taft-Hartley injunction. But the labor settlement was not reached until Jan. 4, 1960.

[4] Includes reported but unannounced wage increase of 7 cents an hour effective Dec. 1, 1960.

Minimum pay and hourly increase figures do not include a total of 17 cents an hour that workers received between 1956 and 1959 in cost-of-living increases under the last contract signed in 1956. The cost-of-living increases brought the 1958 base pay to $2.13 an hour.

The composite price of steel was estimated at $160 a ton last June.

STEEL UNION REAL VICTOR

(By Peter Edson)

All the cheering over Vice President NIXON's and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell's "great victory" in settling the steel strike drowns out and is in complete contradiction to what President Eisenhower said all last year about the dangers of inflation it involved.

Close study of the contract terms as finally announced shows that the real victor was United Steel Workers Union.

But the steel companies didn't do so badly in the deal either. For they are now completely free to raise prices as much as the traffic will bear—with Government blessing.

This is the one thing they lacked—up to the final week

Steel management in the past has always been free to raise prices to cover wage increases—and then some. So what you have is big business and big labor as usual, without change.

As far back as last May—before the strike—President Eisenhower was telling his press conferences: "I would again insist that the whole 175 million of us ought to make clear that we are concerned about this matter and this is not something where we are standing aside and seeing ourselves hurt."

He said this repeatedly but it did no good.

After the strike and the injunction which sent the steelmakers back to work, in his nationwide broadcast December 3, before leaving on his 3-week mission to 11 foreign countries, the President called for around-the-clock bargaining to see that the public interest is as carefully protected as the interests of stockholders and employees.

There wasn't and it wasn't.

In his press conference the day before, the President had declared that "I do believe that the day we abandon free and collective bargaining, it is going to be a sad day for the United States."

A case can be made that free collective bargaining was abandoned when Vice President NIXON and Secretary Mitchell intervened—with obvious White House approval. So this must be a sad day for the United States. While they did not dictate the terms of settlement, they created the atmosphere which made settlement possible.

Management and labor were scared into settlement by fear of what Congress might do if they didn't agree. What they came up with was a face-saving formula that may have the delayed-action effect of an inflationary time bomb.

Management originally proposed a 1-year wage freeze. It got what appears on the surface to be an 11-month freeze—no outright wage increase until December 30, 1960.

But company assumption of all health and welfare costs gives the employees the equivalent of an immediate 6 cents an hour increase in take-home. So there's no freeze.

Labor asked for a 15-cent-an-hour increase in each year of a 3-year contract. It settled for 7 cents an hour and up increase in each of the last 2 years. So the total take-home increase is 20, instead of 45 cents.

This again looks good on the surface. But when the fringe benefits are included, it looks different. The union turned down management's original offer of a 24- to 30-cent an hour package increase. It got a 39- to 41-cent package.

So no matter how you slice it, it still looks inflationary. The bad news will come later. For almost every steel industry source now concedes prices will have to go up.

INGLORIOUS ENDING

(By Walter Lippmann)

The steel strike has been called off in a way which leaves the public without any means of determining whether the result is just or unjust, wise or unwise. It is evident that the companies lost the strike. But there does not exist any impartial and dependable report on the issues which enables anyone from the President down to know whether the companies have conceded more than they could afford to concede. For the President has steadfastly refused to countenance official factfinding as the basis for a settlement. As a result, no one really knows what the Nixon-Mitchell settlement means.

The President, so he said last July, has been acting on the notion that there must be no Government intervention because "we have got thoroughly to test out and use the method of free bargaining." We have now had the test. What happened in the test? What happened was that the Government intervened in the person of the Vice President. He used the carrot for the union and the stick for the companies. He coerced the companies into yielding not all but most of what the union was fighting for. Moreover, it would appear, he induced them to agree that they will not raise steel prices until after the election. The strike was not settled by free bargaining. It was settled by a political fix.

The President, whose mind has no doubt been on other things, seems never to have realized that in this struggle the process of free bargaining was exhausted very early in the day—almost certainly by July when the strike actually began. It was evident from the beginning that the two great monopolies were committed to a test of power, not to a process of bargaining. The test was which of them could hold out the longer against the other.

In July when the strike began there were reasons for thinking that the companies were the stronger. Their customers had large stockpiles. Labor unions were unpopular as a result of the McClellan exposures. The public was opposed to another round of wage-price increases. And there was some question whether Mr. McDonald was in solid control of his union. But as time went on the balance of power began to favor the union chiefly because, I imagine, it was increasingly evident that if Congress had to intervene to settle the strike, it would not be very tender with the companies. It is significant that the Nixon-Mitchell intervention succeeded because they were able to threaten the companies with the certainty of congressional action.

So we have come to a crude and embarrassing ending to an inglorious and mismanaged policy. I have reason to know that it is denied in official quarters that the strike could have been settled any earlier. But I think it is arguable from the record that a settlement on the Nixon-Mitchell terms could have been had at any time. All that was required was to give labor the carrot of the concessions and then to do to the companies what Mr. NIXON did to them, to use the big stick of a threat of special legislation in Congress leading to some kind of compulsory arbitration.

If the President had realized that the period of free bargaining had ended even before the strike began, the threatened strike could have been handled by measures which were rational, which protected the public interest, and enlightened public opinion. By July there should have been an official factfinding report on the issues and official recommendations for the settlement. When that report had been debated, and a predominant public opinion had been formed about it, the next step would have been to enforce the findings by calling on Congress to grant the power to do so.

Presumably, it would not have been necessary to go so far as to call Congress into special session or to use the powers if Congress were called and the powers were granted. The Nixon-Mitchell deal shows that the threat to do all these things would probably have been sufficient.

In acting in this fashion the administration would have stood on the solid basis of an impartial report, and this report would have had to deal with the crucial question that Mr. NIXON has left up in the air. This question is whether or not the concessions to labor are inflationary in that they justify and require a rise in steel prices. If the report had found that the concessions were inflationary but that some smaller concessions would not be, the union would have been forced by the threat of compulsory arbitration to accept the lower terms.

All in all, we can be glad that the strike is not to be resumed. But there is nothing else to be glad about.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WISCONSIN NATIONAL MORAINE PARK—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation of our natural heritage—particularly the areas of historical, scientific, biological, and scenic significance—is a continuous challenge before the country.

Our increasing population, growth of industry, mushrooming of cities—all of these make ever-greater demands on our resources, and threaten to wipe out the remaining vestiges of our natural out-of-doors.

Consequently, it is essential that, wherever possible, efforts be made to prevent unnecessary deterioration of such lands, particularly when they contain topographical features of particular significance.

In Wisconsin, for example, we have a moraine area approximately 500 miles long which contains unique, glacial-produced formations.

Recognizing the historical significance of these features, the State of Wisconsin has established the Kettle Moraine State Park.

Because of the overall importance of the area, however, the inclusion of more of the moraine area into a national park now seems advisable.

To accomplish this, I have introduced a bill, S. 894, to establish an Ice Age National Park.

I am happy to point out that the proposal has received broad-scope support from a great many of our citizens and organizations in the State. Among these has been the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Wisconsin. Not long ago the department adjutant-quartermaster, Edward J. Schmidt, forwarded a resolution adopted by the VFW, urging enactment of the legislation to establish a national park. As an example of the wide support for the proposal, I request unanimous consent to have the resolution by the VFW printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 59–25

Resolution supporting establishment of Wisconsin Moraine National Park

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the 86th Congress of the United States calling for the creation of a national park in Wisconsin from the meandering glacial moraines located in some 26 counties of the State, the nucleus of this area being the Kettle Moraine State Park; and

Whereas the last of the four great glaciers was called the Wisconsin Glacier because in no other place in America did the glacier leave clearer evidence of its existence; and

Whereas this natural feature of our State should be perpetuated in the form of a national park; and

Whereas Wisconsin does not have a national park; and it is proposed to create the Ice Age National Park from this area; and

Whereas this moraine area has no economic value because of the very thin topsoil and underlying gravel, but is ideal for recreational purposes, such as skiing, hiking, camping, and so forth; and

Whereas as this proposed park, 500 miles long, about one-fourth mile wide, and totaling 125 square miles or 70,000 acres, will enhance the recreational, scenic, and business aspects of this state; and create parkways, waysides, trails and shelters across Wisconsin; and

Whereas it is well established that recreation areas must be set aside now to take care of the needs of our increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, duly assembled at its 38th annual convention at Wausau, Wis., during the period June 24–27, 1959, that we go on record to enthusiastically support the Ice Age National Park proposal, that we urge all posts and auxiliaries to write to their respective representatives in Congress expressing support of such a national park in Wisconsin, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and to all Wisconsin Congressmen.

Adopted at the department convention, VFW, at Wausau, Wis., June 24–27, 1959.

SERMON BY MOST REV. LEO F. DWORSCHAK AT FUNERAL OF LATE SENATOR LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Leo F. Dworschak, auxiliary bishop of Fargo, at the funeral of our late and esteemed colleague, Senator William Langer, was one of the most powerful and soul searching I have ever heard. It is a sermon which I am sure every Member of the Senate would like to read. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON AT THE FUNERAL OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER, ST. LEO'S CHURCH, CASSELTON, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 14, 1959, BY THE MOST REVEREND LEO F. DWORSCHAK, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF FARGO

Bereaved mourners and kind friends, in this solemn hour we have offered the holy sacrifice of the Mass for a Christian soul. It is here that the democracy of the church is made manifest. She performs this same rite

for all her children as they pass from time to eternity, from this world to the unending hereafter. For poor and rich alike, for the famous and the obscure, her prayer is the same, her essential offering is the same. For in death, which has been described as the great leveler, we are all one in our need.

We have offered the holy sacrifice for William Langer. Beyond that it actually is of little moment now to his soul that we should speak at any length in praise or blame of his character and his life's achievement. In the end death came to him quite suddenly. But it did not find him unprepared. After the passing of his beloved wife he seemed to have a premonition that his own step into eternity would also have to be made soon. He strengthened himself spiritually by receiving the sacraments of the church, and in correspondence with the pastor of this parish as recently as October 30 made it plain that the consolations of his religion gave him the strength to face the prospect of meeting his Creator soon without hesitation and without fear. Hence he now stands in no need of the praise of men. If he has gained for himself God's praise, he needs no other.

And yet, before the last blessing of the church is performed over his mortal remains, we will do well to pause a moment and dwell on just one thought suggested by his career. In my opinion, the most striking facet of his character as a public servant was his unshakable adherence to his convictions. There were times when he stood almost alone on an issue and no consideration of practical politics nor pressure from others could induce him to recede from the stand he had taken or to compromise what he considered just and right. I did not always share his convictions; but he did have positive convictions and steadfastly refused to compromise them for reasons of political expediency or personal gain. In an age when expediency rather than principle is so often made the supreme law of statesmanship, business practice, and personal conduct, it is a refreshing experience to see an example of unshakable faithfulness to conviction and loyalty to the truth as he saw it.

We are reminded of the scene described in the 18th chapter of St. John's Gospel. Jesus stands before Pilate to be judged by him. The Roman governor seeks desperately to extricate himself from an awkward position by questioning the accused in an effort to wring from Him some admission that would justify either a sentence of death or an acquittal—anything to get off a bad spot.

The subject of kingship is mentioned, and Pilate eagerly follows it up with the question, "Then You are a King after all?" Jesus replies, "You are right. I am a King. For this purpose I was born, and for this purpose I came into the world—to give testimony to the truth. Only he who is open to the truth gives ear to My voice." With a sneer, Pilate says to Him, "What is truth?" and returns to the balcony to face the multitude.

There is an undertone of tragedy in Pilate's question. Here he was in the presence of Him who had said: "I am the way; I am truth and life." (John 14: 6.) For a brief moment he had a brush with immortality. But he turned away; he was not open to the truth. He was not at fault for having asked the question. He was at fault because he refused to wait for an answer. In our generation a growing number of people go a step farther. They say there is no answer.

That viewpoint was spelled out quite clearly and concisely in June of 1951 by the late Chief Justice Vinson. "Nothing," he wrote, "is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the circumstances which gave birth to the nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending danger by encasing it in a semantic straitjacket we must reply that all concepts are relative."

These words were a part of the decision in which the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of 11 top-flight Communists. If the principle enunciated by Mr. Vinson in those two sentences were universally adopted and carried to its logical conclusion by the people and the Government of the United States, it would, in my opinion, do more harm to this Nation than all the activities of all the Communists on either side of the Iron Curtain. Deny the possibility of absolute truth and absolute values and you destroy the basis, not only of our Government but of our very nature as free beings.

Our Founding Fathers established this Nation upon the principle that certain absolute and self-evident truths are the foundation upon which our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rests. If human language can have any meaning at all, the Declaration of Independence means just that. If there are no absolute truths or values, there can be no justice and we can have no inalienable rights. A nation is powerful and its citizens are truly free in the degree in which they possess and are loyal to the truth. That is what Our Lord meant when He said: "If you make my teaching your rule of life, you are truly my disciples; then you will know the truth and the truth will make you free." (John 4: 31–32)

Denial of the truth or the possibility of discovering it goes contrary to every instinct of our nature. In the last analysis truth is reality. It simply is fact. And facts are absolute. When a fine china teacup falls off the table and is shattered, that is a fact. You could conceivably mend it; but you could not change the fact that it had been broken. No process of reasoning or sophistry can change or nullify objective truth or fact. It makes no difference whether the truth pertains to the physical, intellectual, or spiritual realm. In every case truth is reality. Truth is divine because truth is the essence of God's nature.

There is something rigidly inflexible about truth. Let us say that a hostess sets the table for dinner. She arranges two places on each side. No matter how loudly she may protest that there are no absolutes, she will not be able to seat five guests so long as she has only two places on each side of the table. If she wants to seat the fifth guest she must bring up another chair. That is the force of logic and the tyranny of truth. It is basically as simple as that. Such an objective and immutable quality is found in every truth, be it scientific, ethical, or theological.

There are timid souls—and in this respect our generation is becoming more timid by the hour—there are timid souls who fear the truth precisely because objective truth is rigid, unchangeable, eternal. They fear that adherence to truth implies a degrading slavery or subjection which destroys our dignity as free, intelligent beings. To them subjection of any kind is an insult to our hope of being our own masters. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

It is true, of course, that many men are slaves. Probably many more today than in ages past. Some are slaves because they are victims of brute force; but more are slaves because they are victims of their own cowardice or selfish desire for security. A slave, in Aristotle's definition, is a man whose choices are made for him by others. He may even enjoy comfort and security beyond a free man's wildest dreams, like the slave of a wealthy merchant in ancient Athens. But he is a slave nonetheless because his choices are forced upon him by a cruel master or by the tyranny of circumstances.

But there are forms of subjection which are not degrading, a subjection which is the fulfillment of our dignity as man. There is the subjection of a creature to his God, of citizen to valid authority in the state, of child to parent. Those are forms of subjection which nature itself demands in the hierarchy of values for the perfection of the human individual. The most perfect, the noblest of all human beings in the end will be he who was most completely subject to God, he whose life was most nearly in conformity with the divine will of the Creator.

In matters of truth, the mind which is more subject to reality is the more perfect mind, the more accurate interpreter of objective reality. Surely we are not degrading the dignity of the child when we teach him the inflexible logic of the multiplication tables. We are not degraded by the law of gravity, even though he suffers injury who tries to ignore it.

Neither do we do violence to the hopes and aspirations of a free man if we insist that he conduct himself according to the moral law implanted in him by the Creator. The laws of physics, of logic, of ethics—each is an element which the Creator used in weaving the fabric of what we call human dignity. The pattern of conduct proposed to man in the divine plan may be likened to a road map. When we are on a journey the map guides us to our destination. It does not shackle our freedom.

In one sense truth may be tyranny. It is eternal and immutable, and as such places some limits on our freedom of action. But these are rational limits which spring from our nature as intelligent beings. To defy those limits is to invite disaster. Dostoyevsky summed it up perfectly when he said: "To begin with, unlimited freedom is to end with unlimited despotism."

One of the most tragic episodes in the Korean war was the treasonable conduct of some of our men who had been taken captive by the Red army. These men were spoken of with derision by a large sector of the American people. But such condemnation was unfair to them. Their conduct was not so much a crime on their part as an indictment of the society which failed to impart to them an understanding of objective truth and laws of morality, and instill in them unshakable convictions regarding the foundations upon which our democratic society rests. If there is no such thing as objective truth, if there are no absolute moral values why should a man refuse to compromise the principles of justice and decency in face of death by torture or starvation. In such circumstances no man can remain strong without the support of firm convictions. In fact, such support is necessary for every man whether soldier or statesman, politician or captain of industry, farmer or day laborer.

Hence if there is any thought that the life and career of William Langer would inspire in us, it is the importance of loyalty to our convictions. There may be other roads to wealth or fame or pleasure. There is no other road to happiness and freedom. With that thought we sum up our tribute to the memory of William Langer.

To you, members of his family and his official household, who knew him best and therefore loved him best, we extend our sympathy in this hour of bitter pain. May yours be the comfort of all good Christians who trust in the everlasting mercy, and through your tears look meekly up to Christ, the God of all consolation.

William Langer will long be remembered by us, and never forgotten by Holy Mother Church. Until time shall be no more she will number him among those countless souls for whom she prays unceasingly: "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them. May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen."

STEPS TAKEN BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GATES TO PREVENT INTERSERVICE DISPUTES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in last Thursday's New York Times describing the steps taken by Secretary of Defense Tom Gates to head off interservice disputes.

Mr. Gates has announced his intention to participate actively in the decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whenever there is in fact, or appears to be imminent, a disagreement among the heads of the military services as to a matter of their joint policy.

Secretary Gates' plan should be widely acclaimed. It has been recommended for many years by leading authorities in the field of military organization. It is a direct, concrete step toward greater civilian control of our Military Establishment, and will bring our Nation's chief defense policymaker into the important daily decisions of our military chiefs.

Knowing Mr. Gates well, I can say to the Senate that his decision will undoubtedly go a long way toward resolving some of the time-consuming, bitter, and wasteful interservice quarreling which has marred our defense organization in the past. Because of Mr. Gates' familiarity with the problems of the military services and because of his long experience in the Defense Department, and his keen understanding of our Nation's defense needs, his personal contributions with the Joint Chiefs of Staff will, I know, add much to our military decision-making process and will further insure the formulation of sound policies for our Nation's security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two news articles on the subject be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GATES ACTS TO NIP POLICY DISPUTES OF JOINT CHIEFS—DEMANDS THAT DIFFERENCES BE REPORTED SO HE CAN SIT IN ON SESSIONS

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, January 6—Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., announced plans today to intervene swiftly when the Joint Chiefs of Staff failed to agree on military matters.

The Defense Secretary disclosed that he had issued a memorandum to the chiefs demanding that he be informed as soon as there was an inkling of policy differences among them.

He said he would sit with the chiefs in formal session, rather than wait for them to present their differences to him through the chairman.

If necessary, he continued, he will quickly advise President Eisenhower whenever the chiefs are unable to resolve their disputes, as has often happened.

RETURNS FROM MEETING

Secretary Gates referred to the new piece of paper upon his return from a 2-day meeting at Atlantic Fleet headquarters, Norfolk, Va., with the chiefs, the service secretaries, and field commanders from all over the world.

He shrugged off most efforts to elicit comment on criticisms of the United States defense readiness. But when asked about one of these criticisms made in New York today by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, retired Army Chief of Staff, the Secretary snapped:

"I guess I am not as wise as General Taylor."

The specific charge that prompted Secretary Gates' acid rejoinder was that the Soviet Union was 2 years ahead of the United States in long-range ballistic missiles.

There were other demands today for the strengthening of U.S. defenses, indicating a point of major interest for Congress this session. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut, who is a member of the Armed Service Committee, said this country's defenses must be "impregnable" until "an effective, controlled disarmament is negotiated."

PROPOSED BUDGET CRITICIZED

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and a member of the Appropriations and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees, said the proposed defense budget "fails to make needed increases" for military programs.

In discussing his memorandum, which was issued last week but made public only today, Secretary Gates emphasized that he wanted to do all in his power to perfect the Joint Chiefs and preserve them as a body because "I believe in it."

The Secretary thus confirmed that his memorandum dealt with one of the major criticisms of the Pentagon. General Taylor, in his book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," called for an end to the Joint Chiefs and their replacement by a single chief.

General Taylor said that from 1955 to 1959 there were at least 23 split papers presented to the Secretary of Defense by the Joint Chiefs.

General Taylor also complained that the chiefs only infrequently had access to the President and almost as infrequently had the opportunity to discuss problems at length with the Secretary of Defense.

Some notable differences among the Joint Chiefs have concerned the size and deployment of ground forces, the amount of investment in strategic nuclear power, the structure of a proposed Middle East Command, the extent of authority of the Continental Air Defense Commander, the need to establish a unified strategic command to take over all strategic weapons, and the proper investment in certain types of air defense weapons.

Secretary Gates, in his memorandum, called attention to the existing responsibility of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to keep the head of the Defense Department informed on matters before the military body, including divergencies.

"It is logical to assume that occasional divergencies in view will continue to be experienced within the Joint Chiefs of Staff," he went on.

"In view of the fundamental nature of matters which come before the Joint Chiefs of Staff for study, such divergencies are understandable. It is important, however, that such problems be resolved promptly in order that orderly planning may proceed and, where required, prompt action taken.

CONSULTATIONS URGED

After requesting in the memorandum that he be promptly advised of "any issue on which a difference of opinion is developing," the Secretary pointed out his intention for himself or deputy to meet with the Joint Chiefs when they discussed the memorandum in a formal session.

"I would like to emphasize," Mr. Gates said in his memorandum, "that the above procedure should not be interpreted as precluding any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from bringing to my personal attention any matter affecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff or a single service."

This appeared to refer directly to some of the complaints of General Taylor and other high Army officials in the past.

"I look upon such discussions as matters of the highest priority within the Department of Defense and will gladly make time available in my schedule for such meetings regardless of any schedule I may have."

Secretary Gates told newsmen that, as Deputy Secretary, he had undertaken such consultations with the Joint Chiefs but that the new memorandum had made it a formal requirement.

THE GATES' MEMORANDUM: SECRETARY CLEARS WAY FOR DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The memorandum announced in Washington yesterday by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., may influence an expected congressional debate on defense reorganization.

Several Congressmen have urged further changes in the Pentagon. Some would abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Others would create a single Chief of Staff over all the services. Some would merge all the services. Support for these proposals, never likely to be strong in an election year because of lack of voter appeal, may be considerably weakened by Mr. Gates' announcement.

The memorandum, which requires that the Defense Secretary or his deputy sit with the Joint Chiefs whenever differences develop among them, will tend simultaneously to strengthen the Joint Chief and civilian control.

URGED FOR SOME TIME

The simple procedure ordered by Mr. Gates had been urged for some time by high-ranking officers in the Pentagon and other experts on defense organization.

Neil H. McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, who retired last month, occasionally attended meetings of the Joint Chiefs during the last part of his regime. But the procedure was not regular, either in his case or in that of any other Secretary of Defense.

Some observers believe that Mr. McElroy and other Secretaries postponed or compromised decisions when there were divergencies between the services, or made decisions on the basis of inadequate firsthand knowledge of the problems involved.

The procedure that Mr. Gates has now required, that he is known as a hard worker, and the importance he attaches to intimate face-to-face meetings with the military chiefs would seem to insure that the new Secretary will have all the facts necessary to make decisions.

MAKES IMPRESSION

This, in itself, represents a strengthening of civilian control at the top level. Moreover, Mr. Gates' implicit recognition of the desirability of some divergencies in strategic thought sets him squarely in opposition to those who advocate a single military "party line," or a single military chief for all the services.

Some officers were particularly impressed by the Secretary's emphasis on his accessibility to all the service chiefs at any time.

Thus, the memorandum is being hailed by some officers as a milestone for the immediate future in the evolution of Defense Department organization.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to concur in the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and to say I think a most progressive, forward step has been taken by a very

capable Secretary of Defense in determining that he will sit in on decisions when controversies develop, because it emphasizes civilian control over the Military Establishment, for one thing, and it will have a rather chastening effect when differences may arise from time to time. I noted with great satisfaction that this step was taken.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I may add that as the Senator knows and I know, when a fire starts it is much easier to put it out when it is small, and before it gets too big and spreads; and I hope the action the Secretary has announced he will take will have a comparably salutary effect.

ROCKET TESTS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, we shall not improve our position in world opinion by protesting to the Russians against their making rocket tests over lonely spaces in the Pacific while we do the same thing.

If my understanding of the situation is correct, what the Russians propose to do is what we have done. Moreover, it is what we have asserted our right to do even when the Japanese protested. The area involved, as I understand, does not embrace any islands mandated under the United Nations. It is open, uninhabited ocean. The notices Russia has given are similar to those we have given to guard ships and planes against accidents.

I have just returned, Mr. President, from a 31-day trip around the world, during which I made 18 stops at oversea points. If travel does anything for a man, it exposes him to as many tides of world opinion as wash the shores of the places he visits. Moreover, it makes him realize that there are many people in the world, and that the United States is not the only country with pride and honor.

Nor can we be indifferent to what happens elsewhere. I visited the lower house of the parliamentary body in India the day Prime Minister Nehru replied to critics of his China policy.

He reminded them that China and India are big powers and that a military conflict between them would hardly be a police action; that a little war between them would not stay little; that war between India and China would engulf the world.

We sometimes forget that India, with 400 million people, and China, with more than 650 million, comprise half the population of the world. Aroused, modernized, mobilized, their manpower and their resources would be impressive and would be complicating for every major power on earth. It gave this member of the U.S. Senate pause for reflection to hear parliamentarians in New Delhi debate issues on the basis of war involvement for the United States.

Mr. President, at a later date I hope to review some of the matters which came to my attention in countries visited, where I went over both military and economic aid programs to the extent that time permitted. At this time, however, I merely wish to point out that there are many people in this world, and we do not impress them by seeking to deny for other countries privileges we assert for ourselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had to say about the freedom of the seas. It is true, of course, that the high seas are free to all nations, but the use of that freedom in an arbitrary fashion to the detriment of other nations is irresponsible and provocative.

The recent Russian announcement of the intention to use the Pacific for a missiles testing range is arbitrary. Hence, it is both irresponsible and provocative.

It is arbitrary because—

First. No known prior consultation was taken with nations whose interests are deeply involved in the Pacific.

Second. A large section of the ocean was set apart, close by missile-measurement, to islands which are the property of or the responsibility of other nations.

Third. The nations of the world were brusquely advised to stay out of the area.

Fourth. No ships or planes have been provided to patrol the area in order to warn the unwary away from the danger zone.

Fifth. No consideration has been given to nations whose fishing and transportation industries may be damaged by the arbitrary interference.

Sixth. Other areas—the Arctic, for example—are available for testing. These are remote areas of little economic importance, areas of minimal interference with the rights of others.

Seventh. The test, coming as it does at this time in an ocean of great signifiance to American security and commerce, is bound to be interpreted as casting doubt on the peaceful professions of Mr. Khrushchev. It is, to say the least, to use a Russian phrase, not in the spirit of Camp David.

Eighth. The arbitrary setting aside of an unpatrolled area in the Central Pacific by the Russians is not in the same category as our use of similar areas for testing. In those cases, we acted only after attempting to get agreement on international control of weapons. Moreover, we used areas for the tests close to territories under our control, and we patrolled them. And when damage was done to others, we paid for the damage. These tests, finally, have not been resumed for 18 months. We are trying now to obtain a multilateral ban not only on such tests but on all nuclear tests.

Ninth. Nor is the Russian-announced missile test similar to the Canaveral range tests. The latter are far from the vital interests of the other missile powers. These tests can, in no way, be considered provocative. They were in process long before the spirit of Camp David came into being. Moreover, the Canaveral range operates with the approval and cooperation of nations whose territories neighbor upon it.

I have before me a magazine entitled "Aviation Week," containing an article entitled "Space Technology," in which is shown the location of the tracking stations in the Carribbean and the South Atlantic. It is my understanding that agreements have been reached with every foreign country having a direct interest in the matter. The area has been placed in little danger, although there have been, if my memory serves me, test missiles which have gone off their course. Those countries did not receive a notice only 8 days before the missile tests were supposed to start. There was no arbitrary action.

No consideration is given to the feelings of this country; to others who have regular navigation routes; to the feelings of the Japanese, who have fishing rights. No consideration is given to the feelings of the people who occupy the general area of that vast expanse of the South Pacific.

If international law is deficient in this respect, I think it ought to be corrected, so that regulation can be applied to all nations which have a vested interest in international law, in the waters of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Montana, I did not know until after I had prepared a part of my statement this morning that the Senator had made any statement on this subject. My remarks were prompted by the statement which I saw the other day which was attributed to former President Truman.

After reading the morning newspaper, I called the State Department earlier today to find out the facts. I was told that so far as they had been able to determine the facts, what the Russians are proposing is what we did in the Pacific—what we did and asserted our right to do after the Japanese had protested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The time of the Senator has elapsed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are not conducting any experiments of this nature of which I am aware in the vicinity of the Kamchatka Peninsula or the Bering Sea.

So far as this particular incident is concerned, I would have hoped that the Soviet Union would have discussed it with the nations which have a vital interest in that area of the world. It appears to me that what the Soviet Union is doing is setting aside something on the order of 27,000 square miles—an area in extent, I believe, approximately 200 miles wide and 300 miles long—and saying, in effect, "This is Mare Nostrum. This is our sea; and here we are going to carry on these tests."

If we are to have international comity, and if we are to have summit meetings to consider these matters, then I think we ought to get together ahead of time and, if need be, call a special meeting of the United Nations, at which meeting there could be devised some means of working out an agreement to regulate and to control international waters, except for the littoral of the countries

concerned. Or, if there is to be a summit meeting, we could make this one of the top items on the agenda for consideration at that time.

There is obviously a need for some international regulation of the use of the high seas by all nations for any purpose of this kind; that is, the testing not only of nuclear devices but of missiles as well.

The rights of all nations become involved in this matter. The destruction of fish, the inconvenience to transportation affects all, however limited or indirect the effect may be on some. If these tests are to go on, the need is for them to proceed in a regularized fashion so as to minimize the inconvenience to others, so as to reduce their provocativeness, so as to avoid damage to others and to provide compensation for it when it occurs by accident.

SCHENECTADY UNEMPLOYMENT HEARINGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just returned from Schenectady, N.Y., where on Friday the Senate special Committee on Unemployment Problems held hearings on economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley area. These hearings were highly successful, and I am hopeful that they will provide guidelines for Congress in dealing with unemployment problem areas throughout our land.

The Mohawk Valley is a fine area, with a proud cultural and historic heritage. Its economy is diversified. There is found there an excellent and highly skilled labor force. The valley has a pleasant climate, and many wonderful recreational and cultural assets. At the moment, unemployment in the area is high, but certainly not critical.

The people of the Mohawk Valley are by no means discouraged. They are working hard to solve their present difficulties. Cities throughout the valley have cooperated closely with the New York State Department of Commerce in the Department's efforts to attract new industries to the State. Furthermore, they themselves have organized intensive programs of self-help to revitalize their economy and to attract new industry into the area. Their efforts are meeting with heartening success. The economy of the valley is moving forward. Employment is on the rise. Optimism is the spirit of the day. Although much hard work remains to be done, I am confident that the people of this area will be fully successful.

As an illustration of the worthy efforts being made on the part of the people of the Mohawk Valley, I call attention to the work of the Schenectady industrial development program. This program has a very unique and certainly appropriate name—GUTS, Inc. Spelled out in action, GUTS means "Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady." This is an attitude which I greatly admire. It allows no room for defeat or lethargy.

Mr. President, I salute the leaders of GUTS and the many men of action from other communities throughout the valley for the fine work they have devoted to the strengthening and rebuilding of the economy of the Mohawk Valley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by Mr. Lewis B. Harris, its general chairman, describing the work of GUTS, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUTS, INC.—"Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady" is a communitywide self-help movement with the objective of creating economic opportunity for Schenectady citizens by—

(a) Making existing businesses so outstandingly effective that they capture a share of America's growing markets.

(b) Attracting new businesses to Schenectady.

A specific GUTS goal is 10,000 new jobs by 1963.

GUTS is different from efforts of thousands of competing communities in that the responsibility for creating economic opportunity is not relegated to a few affluent citizens or institutions but is in fact a cause being vigorously pursued by business, government, clergy, labor, education—everybody, demonstrating the truth of the GUTS slogan "150,000 people with a purpose."

GUTS is carefully organized with specific responsibility assignments and thorough orientation of all individuals assigned to GUTS positions so that they precisely know their own responsibilities, the overall organization objectives, and the relation of their own assignments to the other positions in the organization.

The community spirit and purpose is seen in the fact that in the traditional American spirit of community "barn raising," all local services, materials, facilities, and human effort required by GUTS are being provided at no charge. The GUTS office pays no rent. Its staff are all volunteers. Ads and commercials are run free by local newspapers and broadcasters. Its brochures are prepared and printed free. Prospective employers, when in Schenectady, pay no hotel fees. Their meals, transportation, and entertainment are provided at no charge, and so on.

GUTS believes and Schenectady County intends to demonstrate that in the final analysis the success of a business depends not on technology or location, but on people—skilled, intelligent, outstanding people who are enthusiastic about their jobs and their employers—people who expect to be well paid and intend to be worth it.

In a country in which the traditions which made it great are all but forgotten, GUTS represents a return to the old values; 150,000 people are reaffirming their belief in making their own opportunities; in working skillfully, intelligently, enthusiastically in preparing themselves and their community to make the maximum contribution to businesses who see their opportunity in the community's energy.

Many businesses apparently have been finding newer, industrially speaking, sections of the United States more attractive than the older sections of which Schenectady is an example. We believe that in such action they will find themselves on the same road they are hoping to avoid but simply at an earlier place in time—a road characterized by self-seeking groups who will relentlessly pursue their partisan interests without concern for others or the total system of which they are a part.

What is needed is a new road entirely different from the one habitually followed of late. This new road is characterized by cooperation and a demonstration that individuals and groups can find a way to develop and pursue a common purpose without subordinating individual and group purposes and losing individual and group freedoms.

All new roads must begin somewhere. It is GUTS' contention that the start of a new road which emphasizes America's treasured values is to be found in Schenectady.

GOOD NEWS ON CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an article written by William L. Laurence and published in the New York Times of Sunday, January 10, 1960, contains heartening news on the progress of research on cancer being conducted by the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Cancer Research. In his excellent analysis of a report published by the institute, Mr. Laurence states:

> The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

Mr. President, this is wonderful news. The American people can be proud of the fine work being done by scientists of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and of many other similar research organizations, to find a means of curing and preventing one of man's most dreaded diseases. Undoubtedly, a great deal of hard work lies ahead in the battle against cancer. In this light, we must consider the good news from Sloan-Kettering as an indication of the need to dedicate our maximum effort and the fullest possible resources to this great battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Laurence's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOAN-KETTERING INSTITUTE REPORTS ON 2 YEARS OF CANCER RESEARCH

(By William L. Laurence)

The Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, one of the world's major centers dedicated to the search for means to control mankind's second greatest killer, made public its biennial report last week. It contains a general picture of research in progress, based on more than 700 scientific reports published by the institute's staff during the 2-year period from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959.

Among the liveliest projects in current cancer research is the quest for means to stimulate the body's natural defenses against invading cancer cells.

When bacteria or viruses attack the body a multitude of defenses are summoned. All of the known forces that the body calls into action in its own defense are components or products of a group of related cells found in the spleen, liver, bone marrow, and lymph nodes, known collectively as the reticuloendothelial system, or RES.

ANTIBODY REACTION

The best known products of this system are antibodies, special protein molecules shaped specifically by the body to react with a particular foreign material and immobilize it. Other defensive elements include white blood cells with various functions, such as the phagocytes which eat up offending particles and the fibroblasts which wall them off, and defense-promoting chemicals such as complement and properdin.

Scientists in the solid tumor section of the institute's experimental chemotherapy division have been studying the effects of cancer growth on the vital defense network of the RES.

The test subjects are mice implanted with sarcoma 180, a vigorous, rapidly growing, readily transplantable mouse cancer. During the first few days of the cancer's growth, the report states, RES cells multiply in visible numbers, "apparently responding to the threat of the growing cancer." Other invaders, however, are handled more swiftly and efficiently during this period. Then, as the aggressive tumor continues to grow, the tide turns. The defense system, exhausted by the unequal struggle, begins to break down and finally fails completely. Bacteria, always present in the body, but ordinarily held in check, begin to multiply and finally take over. In these animals, as in cancer patients, infection is often the direct cause of death.

If, before the RES is exhausted, it is given a sudden boost, "it may be able to overcome the cancer implant," the report says.

The most effective booster tried so far is Bacillus Calmette-Guérin (BCG), which has been used for years to stimulate resistance in children exposed to tuberculosis. BCG injections, the report states, "have produced 100 percent recovery from sarcoma 180 implanted in laboratory mice." Studies are now in progress of animals with spontaneous cancers, to discover whether these have the same effect on the defense system and whether stimulation of the defenses can slow or stop their growth.

PLANTED IN EGGS

A technique has been developed in the embryology section of the experimental chemotherapy division for planting fragments of human cancer on the membrane of the fertilized egg. Depending on the type of cancer, the cells may spread throughout the embryo and young chicks may be hatched with widespread human cancer. Most of the chicks die within a few weeks, but some survive; as these mature "something within their bodies begins to destroy the cancer."

Similar studies are being carried out on cancer defenses in the rat. When untreated rats are injected with minced human cancer, the foreign cells are rapidly destroyed in the rats' bodies. Blood and tissue samples were taken from the animals 7 days after an injection with a type of human cancer now grown widely in laboratory animals and test tubes by methods developed at Sloan-Kettering. Fresh human cancer tissue was exposed to these blood and tissue samples for 1 hour and then implanted into rats pretreated with cortisone and X-ray.

"Ordinarily, in rats so treated," the report states, "injected human cancers will grow—hundreds are grown this way every week—but these human cancers do not. They had been killed by antibodies manufactured in the body of the rat."

BROKEN CELLS

In a second group of experiments, the human cancer cells were broken by grinding and then separated into five fractions containing different cell components by whirling in the ultracentrifuge. Each of the five fractions was injected into a different group of animals, but blood samples from only two of the five groups were toxic to the cancer cells. These blood samples not only killed cells in the test tube but, when injected into animals, killed cancer cells planted in them 2 or 3 days previously.

These two active anticancer fractions are the only two containing fragments of a canal-like system known as the endoplasmic reticulum, a network believed to connect the cell's outer membrane with the nucleus and other key chemical control points. "Do these canals, and perhaps the membrane itself, contain some specific substance that spells 'foreign' or 'cancer' to the body and signals it to mobilize its defenses?" the report asks.

What may turn out to be the most significant studies of all are those of cancer defenses in man, which in many ways parallel those going forward on laboratory animals. Human cancer cells were implanted in two groups of volunteers: healthy inmates of the Ohio State Penitentiary; and advanced cancer patients from the James Ewing Hospital of the city of New York.

"In the healthy men," the report states, "the cancer implants promptly evoked a strong defense reaction. There was some initial growth but within 4 weeks all the cancer had been destroyed. In contrast, in the patients with advanced cancer, the implanted cancer cells grew vigorously. Clearly, healthy persons have a resistance to implanted cancer that is weak or lacking in patients with advanced cancer.

"Second implants of cancer cells were made in both groups of volunteers. In both, the cells were rejected with greatly increased vigor. Thus, additional resistance could be induced to implanted cancer, just as it can to a viral or bacterial invader.

SECOND IMPLANT

"When cancer cells of different types were used for the second implant, the reaction was less vigorous than with the same type, but more than that seen on the initial implant of cells. This was particularly interesting and important information; it meant that the resistance is partly specific for the particular type of cancer, but all cancers so far tested (the total is now seven) do share some common resistance-evoking factors.

"Even when killed, the cancer cells retain these factors, just as killed or inactivated virus particles, as in the Salk polio vaccine, may evoke resistance to disease carried by the live virus. Injection of the killed cancer cells produces no characteristic nodule under the skin and no inflammation, but when a second implant is given, the rejection response is as prompt and vigorous as if the first had been made up of living material."

The defense-evoking factors shared by the cancer cells were "clearly not present in the normal cells the investigators were able to study, but the studies are not yet adequate to permit generalization," the report states. The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress a number of citizens of my home State of Kansas conferred with me regarding the matter of an additional Federal judge for the district of Kansas.

There is pending on the Senate Calendar an omnibus judgeship bill which includes an additional judge for our district, and I sincerely hope that we may get early action on it.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas for many years was presided over by a single district judge. Authorization in 1945 for an additional temporary judicial position expired within a year, because of the death of Judge Helvering. An additional permanent judgeship was finally authorized in 1949. However, the business of the district has continued to expand, and in April 1954 the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended the creation of a third judgeship for the State. This recommendation has been renewed annually for the last 5 years.

Since 1941, the number of civil cases commenced annually in the district of Kansas has tripled. In that year 291 civil cases were filed compared with 954 in 1959, as is shown in the table from which I shall presently quote. For the last 9 fiscal years the civil caseload has risen almost steadily, and the backlog has also increased, but at a somewhat lesser rate. This is due not only to the hard work of the resident judges, but also to the use of visiting judges from other districts who have been sent in to handle the large volume of business. The civil cases filed, terminated, and pending at the end of each year for the last 9 fiscal years has been as follows:

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending on June 30
1951	554	578	336
1952	555	505	386
1953	661	584	463
1954	792	665	590
1955	736	798	528
1956	800	787	541
1957	727	775	493
1958	940	880	553
1959	954	948	559

The civil caseload of 477 cases per judge commenced in this district in the fiscal year 1959 was the second largest nationally, and compares with the national average of 215 such cases. Diversity of citizenship cases and habeas corpus proceedings instituted by petitioners in the Leavenworth Penitentiary are important factors in the business of the district. Habeas corpus cases on the average do not require much time for hearing, but often the decision of the constitutional questions involved and the writing of opinions are burdensome. On the other hand, the diversity cases weigh heavily upon the time of the judge because a considerable proportion of these cases reach trial.

In addition to this heavy civil caseload the district has a slightly heavier than average load of criminal cases. Excluding the immigration cases which occur only in volume in the 5 districts touching the Mexican border, and which by and large require very little time per case for disposition, the criminal caseload per judgeship of 139 cases in Kansas is larger than the national average of 108 criminal cases. The criminal caseload has remained at approximately the same level for the past 3 years.

While population per judge is by itself not the sole criterion of the number of judges needed in a particular district, it is a factor which should be taken into consideration. Kansas, with 2 district judges, had an estimated population in 1959 of 2,140,000. The population of other States having three judges is as follows:

Estimated population, July 1, 1959

State:	
Wisconsin	4,010,000
South Carolina	2,417,000
West Virginia	1,965,000
Oregon	1,766,000
Arkansas	1,744,000
Delaware	454,000

The population of Kansas was less than that of two of the States listed and larger than that of four of these States.

The State of Washington, with a population of 2,823,000, has 4 judges; and Oklahoma, with a population of 2,276,000, has 5 judges.

There can be no question in my mind that the workload in the Kansas Federal court district is such that in the interest of those who have suits pending before that Federal district court and who are entitled to early decision of their cases an additional district judge should be provided.

PROPOSAL THAT THE SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE BE MADE UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am informed that yesterday my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], said on the TV program "Meet the Press" that the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force should be made Under Secretaries of Defense—to strengthen the organization of the Department of Defense, and to contribute to the security of our country.

I call to the attention of my colleague and old college classmate, Senator SYMINGTON, and to the attention of the Senate the fact that on February 3, 1958, and again on September 15, 1959, I introduced in the Senate bills to accomplish what he proposed yesterday; that is, to make the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Under Secretaries of the Department of Defense. Senate bill 2728 is now before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and I am hopeful that the interest of the Senator from Missouri will be shared by other members of the committee, and that they will seriously consider it. I must say that the proposal has attracted interest in many quarters, as evidenced by editorials previously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the Congress and throughout the country, there is much talk about the inadequacy of our defense structure. Many seem to be looking for some magic solution, or rely solely on the expenditure of billions of dollars. I point out that the bipartisan Hoover Commission report of February 28, 1949, on the Organization of the Department of Defense, and the letter of former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett to President Truman on November 18, 1952, as he went out of office, and the reports of the Rockefeller Commission in 1953 and 1958 pointed out the divided authority between the Secretary of Defense and the three Department Secretaries, and stated that unified authority of the Secretary of Defense should be assured.

The Hoover Commission recommended, as my bill proposes, that the service Secretaries be made Under Secretaries of Defense for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I recall that there served on that Commission, in addition to Mr. Hoover, former Secretary of State Acheson; the Commission was truly a bipartisan one. In addition, Senate bill 2728 would give authority to the Department of Defense to centralize procurement now divided wastefully between the departments. More important, it would give authority to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, now Dr. York, to take charge authoritatively of the functions of research and development, now split between the three Departments, with resulting duplication and waste.

The present organization has been described as a "federation," with the Departments exercising autonomous power, and with the Secretary of Defense often limited to the function of coordination—when he ought to be in charge. It is obvious that the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, although patriotic and able men, must be champions of their services, if they are to have their support; and, as civilians, they must rely in great part on the information supplied by the military services they represent. This division of authority might have been tolerated years ago; but today, when the defense budget approximates $40 billion and may go higher, and when, more important, the very security of our Nation and the prospect of peace depend in great measure upon an effective defense structure and upon rapid progress in research, the people of the Nation cannot tolerate duplication in research, waste in procurement, and the split interests of the military departments.

I welcome the support of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]; and again, I ask the Committee on Armed Services to consider seriously this proposal, which I have advanced now for 3 years.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

DR. OMER CARMICHAEL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on September 11 a little over 3 years ago, President Eisenhower said:

> I think Mr. Carmichael must be a very wise man. I hope to get some advice from him because he pursued the policy that I believe will finally bring success.

The President did meet a few days later with Dr. Omer Carmichael, then serving in his 11th year as superintendent of the Louisville, Ky., city school system. While this recognition of his work was one of the highest honors bestowed on Dr. Carmichael, it was typical of him that he had said: "I've never sought honors nor do I want them. I just want to do a good job."

In his quiet but firm and supremely able way, Dr. Omer Carmichael did an outstanding job in whatever tasks lay before him—of which the desegregation of our schools was but one among his efforts to provide the best education possible for the children in his charge.

Now Dr. Carmichael is dead. But the life of the community he helped to shape will continue to do honor to his perseverance and resolution of character, to his sense of duty, and to his calm nobility—just as his work will go on in the finest of living memorials, the daily work of the hundreds of men and women who owe, in part, their education to him.

At this time, I know the people of Kentucky extend their sympathy to Mrs. Carmichael, and to their three children. I wish to pay my own respects to a man whom I knew as a conscientious, thoroughly professional, and warmly human educator—a man of spirit and purpose.

Dr. Carmichael was born on a cotton farm at Hollins, Ala., in 1890, and financed his own education at the University of Alabama, where a cousin, Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, later served as president. His degree in mathematics, his knowledge of Latin and Greek, his experience as a teacher, his work as a superintendent of schools in Alabama, Florida, and Virginia, gave him broad background for his 14 years of service as superintendent of the Louisville schools.

On the day the Supreme Court announced its decision in the Brown case in 1954, Omer Carmichael said:

> It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep—no effort by subterfuge or sharp practice to defeat the purpose of the Court.

And while his accomplishment of quiet desegregation of the Louisville public schools may be recognized by the Nation as his crowning achievement, Kentuckians will also mourn a fine educator, a valued adviser, and a good friend—a man of principle who held the respect of his city, his State, and his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial regarding Dr. Carmichael, from today's Louisville Courier-Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

OMER CARMICHAEL: A DEDICATED ORDINARY MAN

Omer Carmichael would have been the last person to wish to hear himself described as an extraordinary man. Indeed, he typified the ordinary man at his best; the decent, unassuming, conscientious American who so often confounds the skeptics by rising to meet a challenge, moral or physical, with bravery and an unswerving instinct for the right thing to do.

It was thus that Mr. Carmichael, until 1954 a good but unremarkable superintendent of a good but unremarkable public school system, rose to meet the challenge of integrating the white and Negro schools of Louisville. Most of his fellow superintendents, many of them, it is true, lacking the consciousness of public approval and support that Mr. Carmichael knew could be counted upon here, retreated in confusion and postponed the inevitable day of reckoning.

Omer Carmichael met the challenge simply and directly. Immediately the Court's decision was made known, he announced: "It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep, no effort by subterfuge or sharp practices to defeat the purpose of the Court."

For 2 years thereafter, he talked, explained, listened, and prepared. The result was that Louisville's integration of schools, when it came, was a model for the Nation. It was quiet, dignified, without ugly incident. And the one man to whom most credit accrued was the superintendent of schools.

This was not the only accomplishment of Omer Carmichael's career in Louisville. Our school system steadily improved under him.

The lot of the teacher, the education of the student, have advanced in the years he spent here. But the story of school integration in Louisville will remain his accolade. Here was a southerner by birth and upbringing, who realized at once that the habits and prejudices of a lifetime could not be allowed to stand against the law of the land. A good man has left us, and he is sincerely mourned.

PRESERVING PADRE ISLAND AS A NATIONAL SEASHORE: A PLACE OF TRANQUILLITY AND NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in the New York Times of Sunday January 10, 1960, serves to remind us that soon the Senate and the House will have an opportunity to act on legislation designed to preserve several national seashore and park areas, and that the time in which to preserve these areas is short—the need critical.

Among the projects under consideration is S. 4, a proposal to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island—a 117-mile-long island with a beautiful sand beach stretching along the coast of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico.

Last month in considering the Padre Island Park proposal, Texans from all walks of life were highly pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee staff, hold public hearings in Corpus Christi. They did an unusually outstanding job of gathering the facts. They inspected the island from the air and heard testimony from more than 40 witnesses.

Among those who testified was the Honorable Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. He has since informed me that the hearings constituted one of the most overwhelming endorsements for a park project he ever has attended.

The editorial in yesterday's New York Times correctly points out that "only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best such areas—like Padre Island—which still exist." The editorial also states the challenge to us as a people. Are we to be less mindful of our natural heritage than were those of the boss-and-corruption-ridden 1870's and 1880's, when the park system was started and Yellowstone preserved?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of January 10, 1960, entitled "Room To Breathe."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOM TO BREATHE

When Yellowstone was established as the first national park in a remarkable burst of prescience by the 42d Congress in the unlikely year 1872, the American domain seemed to be limitless, stretching over thousands of uninhabited miles and untouched country. Yet in the decades since then almost all of the great wilderness has disappeared, the forests have been cut, the rivers polluted, the mountains defaced, the grasses burnt, the game decimated, the long, clean, white miles of ocean beach contaminated and exploited.

This has been the sorry story of our country's physical development—inevitable, perhaps, but nonetheless destructive of so much of the natural beauty and inherent recreational and spiritual values that belong to the American land. Now the forces of expansion and destruction are increasing their pressures with spectacular speed and intensity on the little that remains of untouched tranquillity and natural peace in the open spaces of America.

Only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best of such areas that still exist. Years of investigative and survey work by public and private agencies have determined where they are: the upper Potomac, Cape Cod, several places on the Great Lakes, an island off Texas, two or three spots on the Pacific coast, the Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Great Basin of Nevada, and so on. The National Park system must be expanded to include such areas, and a national wilderness system must be established by law to insure their permanent preservation. The legislation is prepared; we are confident that public sentiment is behind it.

The exploiters are, as usual, a major stumbling block. Will the 86th Congress of 1960 be more timorous, more subject to pressures of special interests, more reluctant to take bold affirmative steps for the public good than that old Congress in the corruption-ridden, exploitative days of 1872?

RAVENSWOOD, W. VA., POSTAL FACILITY IS DEDICATED; AUTOMATION AND POLITICAL PATRONAGE DISCUSSED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, January 9, 1960, to participate in dedication ceremonies for the new U.S. post office facility at Ravenswood, W. Va., The gathering was presided over by the Honorable John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, and chairman of the Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce dedication committee. Also present was another former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Chapman Revercomb. These West Virginians are, of course, well known to many of my colleagues.

Walter J. Purdy, a member of the chamber of commerce dedication committee, delivered the address of welcome in the stead of Mayor Pearl O. Milhoan, of Ravenswood, who was unable to attend. The program chairman was introduced by Ravenswood's acting postmaster, W. James Blackburn.

Kenneth L. Rabidoux, Assistant Director of the Post Office Department's Real Estate Division, spoke as the official representative of the Department, and told those who attended the dedication event that the new Ravenswood Post Office "is one of approximately 3,000 built by private enterprise and leased to the Department under the unique commercial leasing program initiated by the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield." And he said that "12,000 more of the Nation's 35,000 post offices must be replaced because of obsolescence and deterioration, in order to make this Nation's postal service fully adequate to meet the future postal requirements of its citizens."

Mr. Rabidoux had earlier pointed out that "last year Americans mailed 61 billion pieces of letter mail and over one billion parcels. Combined, these figures represent two-thirds of the world's mail and represent an increase in volume of 120 percent in 20 years," he said, and remarked that, in order to keep ahead of this continuing growth, a gigantic overhauling of postal facilities has been initiated. Then he pointed out that in "the massive overhauling" are provisions for mechanizing the handling and distribution of mail in the so-called "gateway" post offices. Mr. Rabidoux called the "metro-mail" coordinated program still another breakthrough in mail handling.

Representative KEN HECHLER, of the Fourth West Virginia District, the other scheduled speaker on the dedication program, declared that "political patronage, political jobs, and political influence ought to be cleaned out at all levels of government, and I'm going to do my best to see that it is done, whether in the post office or the taking of the census or anywhere else."

Stating that "the only place where political appointments should be made is at the very highest level of government, where policymaking positions should be filled by those who are in accord with the program of the elected executive," the diligent and capable Representative further asserted:

Postmasters ought to be taken out of politics, postal employees should be promoted on merit, and if I have anything to say about it I'm going to put a stop to these political hacks running around with pieces of political litmus paper to stick in the mouths of Government employees.

I also advocate that in West Virginia the 1960 census be taken by unemployed West Virginians instead of by "political hangers-on" At a time when West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation and thousands are suffering, it would make a lot of sense to award these census jobs to those in need, instead of based upon "political pull" dictated by a political boss (the Republican State chairman) in Clarksburg, W. Va.

What large business would survive today, Representative HECHLER asked, "if its president insisted all employees belong to his own lodge or graduated from his own school and belonged to his church? Honestly, ability, and efficiency are not confined to one political party. America was founded as a land of equal opportunity and if we forget that fact we may become a second-rate power.

The Ravenswood High School Band, under Director James F. Porter, provided music for the event, while Reverand Walter Elwood, pastor of the Ravenswood First Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Paul Bell, pastor of the Ravenswood First Baptist Church, prayed the invocation and benediction. The color guard for flag-raising ceremonies was furnished by Ables-Rayburn Post No. 118 of the American Legion.

Ravenswood, situated along the beautiful Ohio River—one of our country's most important inland navigable streams—is a progressive and rapidly developing community, the principal industry of which is the large Kaiser aluminum facility nearby. Kaiser's Ravenswood Reduction Works and Rolling Mill afford employment for more than 3,000 in the production of primary aluminum sheet, plate, circles, foil and building products. This enterprising

organization has brought growth and stability to the economy of the Ravenswood community, and has been a most timely and welcomed addition to the West Virginia industrial complex.

The Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce has been aggressive and diligent in developing the potential of its area of influence and representation, and Ravenswood's interests are likewise well represented in the State legislature by State Senator Paul R. Moore of that city, and Delegate Wayne W. Hughes. Both Senator Moore and Delegate Hughes were present for the post office dedication ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

WE MUST HAVE THE B–70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, within recent weeks, while Congress was in the adjournment period, the Department of Defense announced that in response to a Presidential budgetary directive, the development program for the B–70 bomber has been "stretched out" and "cut back" to the point where it no longer represents any serious attempt to develop and produce this bomber as a weapons system.

I rise to question the wisdom of this decision, to suggest in fact that it is a blunder which may have the gravest consequences to our national security, and to urge that the decision be reversed.

At the present time, and throughout the first half of the next decade, the Soviet Union possesses and will possess a commanding superiority in operational ICBM's, the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Last winter, the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, admitted that if the Soviets produce missiles at what we believe their capability to be, and we produce those we now plan to, the Soviets will maintain a lead of approximately three to one throughout the early 1960's.

In addition to this, we know from the accuracies we have achieved with our present ICBM, the Atlas, that it is possible to pinpoint a target many thousands of miles away with almost incredible precision.

The President of the United States mentioned that the other day in his state of the Union message. It is a fact that we have even greater precision than the President stated in his state of the Union message.

We have absolutely no reason to believe that the Soviets are behind us in this field. We must assume that it is possible for them to achieve a circular error probability at least as good as that which we can achieve.

This accuracy, without revealing any classified materials, is such as to convince me that the Soviets soon could pinpoint an attack on Vandenberg and the other missile bases we have built and are building and completely obliterate them all in the first strike, leaving us without any retaliatory strike force in the missile category after that first blow.

What I am saying is that while the President of the United States was calling attention to our accuracy in the missile field, we have to assume that the Russians have the same accuracy. If the Russians have the same accuracy they can knock out the Vandenberg Base on the first strike, and they can knock out the missile bases being built in Wyoming and in other places, because the Atlas sticks up like a church on fire.

Until we develop and have operational a large force of ICBM's which either are mobile, or can be hidden, we will not have that indestructible missile retaliatory strike force which is the keystone of our security.

We are working on such missiles now, but they are not yet perfected.

And until the time when we have an operational force of sufficient Minuteman missiles in service with a number of them operating from mobile bases, and until we also have a fleet of nuclear submarines fitted with operational Polaris missiles at their stations, we must depend upon the manned bomber capable of delivering nuclear bombs to potential enemy targets as a major part of our deterrent force. In fact, many authorities believe we will always need to maintain manned aircraft as part of our total deterrent force.

Currently we depend on the B-47 and the B-52, and we may count on their capabilities being improved in the years ahead by such advances as air-to-surface missiles and improved electronic countermeasures. We are building a handful of B-58s.

But we also know that a large portion of Soviet scientific and military effort is devoted to defense against the manned bomber. We have every reason to suspect that such are and will be the improvements in their defenses that year-by-year effective penetration by these aircraft will become more and more difficult, until at some point they will cease altogether to be an effective deterrent.

I have reason to believe that our present bombers are becoming less and less useful because of the greater perfection in the Soviet defenses.

If we are to maintain the manned bomber as part of our deterrent force, we must have a long range supersonic bomber with cruise and target speeds of at least mach 2.5 and a range of more than 7,000 miles. We must have the B–70.

The B–70 will have a cruise and target speed of mach 3, triple that of the B–52, cutting target time from continental U.S. bases from 8 to 12 hours to 2 to 3 hours, at an altitude of 80,000 feet, compared to only 50,000 for the B–52. A B–70, or a squadron of B–70s in the air over the North Pole could deliver payloads to Soviet targets, such as Moscow, in 20 minutes. The B–70, according to the most reliable information which I can gather, would be at least four times as effective in penetrating defenses as the B–52, can be operated from existing B–52 bases with an equal reaction time, and can be employed on airborne alert.

The B–70 will make obsolete Soviet defenses designed to counter present subsonic aircraft. The very knowledge that we are seriously developing such a weapons system will enormously complicate the Soviet defense problem. It will complicate it in at least two ways—by forcing diversion of scientific manpower to a new and presently unnecessary task, and by forcing an expenditure of rubles to defend against the B–70 far larger than the amount it will cost us to develop and build it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri, who has a very broad fund of information on this subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from California for his remarks with respect to the B–70 airplane. I had hoped to stay and listen to all of the Senator's address, but unfortunately have an engagement uptown. However, I did want to listen to as much of his discourse today as possible.

It is true, is it not, that if this B–70 program goes through as now planned by the administration, in effect the plane is being written off?

Mr. ENGLE. I should say that the B–70 is being "scrubbed" as a weapons system. I shall point out later in my remarks that it is intended to build a prototype, but that that project will be stretched out. What I am saying is that we need the B–70 now, because we shall need it during the period of time when we shall not have an indestructible retaliatory missile capability.

The President said the other day in his state of the Union message that we can hit within a 2-mile circle. We can do a little better than that. So can the Russians—now or soon. That would knock Vandenberg Air Force Base flatter than a flitter. Anyone who knows anything about intercontinental ballistic missiles must be aware that after the first strike we would have nothing left in missiles.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true therefore, is it not, that today the U.S. Air Force does not have under research or development a single airplane?

Mr. ENGLE. I think that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never thought I would see the day when that statement would be made on the floor of the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator upon his address and hope our colleagues will carefully read the able exposition he is giving today of this serious problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I wholly concur in the statement which he made on a television program last night, with respect to the reorganization of the Defense Department.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to my friend for saying that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The answer which the junior Senator from California has just given to the junior Senator from Missouri must be measured, it seems to me, beside the fact that, as I understand, not one plane was flown in World War II which was not already on the drawing boards when World War II broke out. I ask the former Secretary of the Air Force if that is not true, if the Senator from California will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To my knowledge, the statement of the able Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct.

Mr. GORE. The timelag, then, between the actual effectiveness of a plane and its completion on the drawing board raises a very serious question for the early 1960's, so far as modern, efficient, comparable air power is concerned. Is that true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There can be no question about it.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that if we went to work on the B–70 we could have it in inventory and in operation by 1964. That is about when we shall need it.

What I am saying is that today we do not have a bomber which can be sure of penetrating the Soviet defenses. The capability of the B–52 and the other bombers to get through is limited. So the President of the United States says to us, "We can drop an intercontinental ballistic missile into your hip pocket." We certainly can; and so can the Soviets. The Atlas, sitting like church steeples on Vandenberg Base and in Wyoming, or wherever else they may be, would be knocked as flat as the country around them; and we would not have a thing to strike back with that we can depend upon to get through. We are scrapping the B–70.

I referred to some of the assets of the B–70. I said it would complicate the problems of the Soviets in two particulars. It would require them to divert some of their scientific manpower into that field. It would require them to divert money to perfect their defenses against the B–70, which would make obsolete their present defenses against the present type of manned bomber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from California to say that at the present time we do not have an American bomber that can penetrate the Russian defenses.

Mr. ENGLE. No. What I said was that it is becoming more and more difficult for our bombers to get through, that they are becoming less and less useful. Within a very short time the competence of present bombers to reach their targets wil be under very grave question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad I raised the question, for two reasons. I think the statement I made is the statement of a correct impression which I believe the Senator's language left in the RECORD. I am glad to raise the question for that reason.

I raise a second question. Do we know whether or not Russia at the present time has bombers which can penetrate our defenses?

Mr. ENGLE. I think we do; and I think we know that some of them could get through. But I will say also that some of us believe that the Russians have spent more time and money on air defense than we have. There is no defense now against an ICBM. No one has designed a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile. There is no way to stop it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from California for this speech, because I think we find ourselves in a somewhat paradoxical situation, in which we, as Senators, owe a duty to educate the American public.

We all know that the ultimate goal is the goal of disarmament. But the paradox, I think, is that in order to assure our best chances for disarmament, we shall have to put ourselves in such a position that Russia will recognize that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of the mad armament race. I have taken that position for several years in the Senate. Not so many years ago the Senator from Missouri and I were 2 of 11 Senators who voted for defense expenditures which we insisted were necessary. Subsequent events proved us to be right.

So I think the American people need to face up to the fact that we have the responsibility for placing our air defenses in such a situation that they will be conducive to a real foolproof, inspection-proof, complete disarmament, a program which in my judgment is the only hope for peace.

The paradox in this situation is that if we continue the kind of armament race in which we are now engaged in we shall end up in a nuclear war.

The text is, Where is the stopping point? I happen to think that we cannot reach the stopping point until we can first demonstrate that we have missiles that can penetrate the Russian defenses, and until Russia understands—as I believe we had better understand, too—that if two great powers continue in this mad nuclear armament race, we may lead mankind to disaster.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon. A further paradox is the citation of the accuracy we have with our missiles, by the President in his state of the Union message, as an evidence of our strength, when actually, if we turn the case around, and realize that the Soviets must have the same kind of accuracy, what it boils down to is that until we can harden the bases for the Atlas—and that will be attempted—or until we can get the Minuteman, which can be put on a railroad train and shuttled around, so that there will be no way to catch it, the Russians have the capability of knocking out our missile bases. We have wondered why it would not be possible to keep secret the location of the missile bases. In a country like ours it is not possible, because too many people are working on them. Everyone knows where the Vandenberg Base is. Everyone knows where excavation is in progress for the bases in Wyoming. All the Russians would have to do would be to zero one or two of their continental ballistic missiles on several of our bases, and the retaliatory force of America, so far as the ICBM is concerned, would be wiped out. That is why I am saying, with respect to the B–70, that with the decreasing capability of the present bombers, it is necessary to the defense of America to have a supersonic bomber.

It is true that an ICBM, even though it cannot be recalled, may be destroyed in flight, provided that the gear to accomplish this does not malfunction, but at least the missile and its warhead are gone forever. A series of planned false alarms preceding a real attack could conceivably find us without missiles because, substantially they had been expended in vain.

The B–70, unlike an ICBM, is recallable. Its mission can be aborted. This characteristic permits us to launch the B–70 on less than conclusive information, but still withhold the ultimate decision pending the receipt and evaluation of additional information. The presence of B–70's at 80,000 feet on airborne alert over the Arctic, only minutes away from enemy targets at mach 3 speed, would make it possible for us to evaluate more carefully actions taken by the Soviets, while still remaining poised to strike an almost instantaneous retaliatory blow in the event of attack.

Moreover, the B–70, as a manned aircraft, is a recoverable weapon, which a missile is not, and can be used over and over again in subsequent strikes against residual targets. Furthermore, a manned aircraft has the power to discriminate between targets; to seek alternate targets in the event primary targets have already been destroyed; and can be employed in the role of reconnaissance to assess the effectiveness of initial strikes and provide the essential data for planning subsequent operations.

Even this is not the full story of why we need the B–70.

The B–70 could also be employed in low-level attacks at nearly mach 1; it could be used as a satellite intercepter; it could be used as a recoverable booster for launching high payload space vehicles.

The B–70 could be a first-rate military transport, capable of delivering material to any point on earth in only a few hours.

The B–70 could be the prototype, and the experimental design which will pave the way for the 2,000-mile-an-hour commercial transport.

If the United Nations ever acquires a world police force, the force to put out the brush fire wars before they become major conflagrations, the B–70 would be the ideal global police cruiser.

Now where do we stand at this moment with regard to the development and production of this remarkable aircraft?

The brief announcement made by the Air Force on November 30, while Congress was in adjournment, spoke of the B–70 program "being reoriented to a

prototype aircraft program" and that this so-called reorientation involved "deferment of major subsystem development."

What this means in plain English is that the program to develop the B–70 as a weapons system has been gutted.

When I talk about a weapons system, I refer to the composite, that is, the airframe—the bird itself—plus the necessary electronic equipment for bombing, navigation, and any other activities.

What is now proposed is that we build exactly two "bare bone" vehicles, and absolutely no matched subsystems involving radar, navigation and bombing, air data, electronic countermeasures, mission and traffic control, and power pods.

In other words, we propose to build two airplanes and then fit them out with gear designed for planes of only one-third their speed, which will cut the B-70's capability practically to the point where we might as well not have it at all.

In my opinion, this decision is one more example of how this administration is willing to gamble our very national survival in an attempt to balance its budget. In the fiscal year 1961, this decision will save about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of our defense spending. In return for this relative pittance, we are trading away at least one, perhaps several, year's development time on a weapons system which might well be the critical factor in our deterrent force, years of precious time which all the money in the world cannot buy back for us once they are gone.

No one hopes more fervently than I that the day will never come when it will be necessary to use a nuclear warhead, whether via missile or manned bomber.

But we do not advance the cause of world peace, nor the cause of successfully negotiating with the Soviet Union on steps toward that peace by refusing the advantages which our technology offers us.

Mr. President, I say this decision virtually to eliminate the B–70 as a weapons system is absolutely wrong. I call upon the Congress to make it clear to the administration that full-scale development of the B–70 and all its essential subsystems be continued full speed, properly funded, even if this involves some reorientation of priorities by this administration.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from California for the fine comments he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Ironically, I am about to make an address pertaining to the subject of disarmament, which I believe is the most important problem that faces the world today.

I could not concur more heartily with the Senator from California when he points out, as he has so ably done on the floor of the Senate today, that, so long as peace rests on a balance of deterrents, we must maintain an adequate retaliatory force. I believe that the case he has made for the B-70 bomber is one that makes it incumbent upon the administration to come forward to justify, if it can, the decision it has made to scrap this weapon.

I should like to say also that, in addition to the serious situation which may confront this country in the next 2 or 3 years, the Senator from California has made a case for the B-70 bomber as a supplementary weapon which could be useful in the United States even after the missile gap has been closed.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct; because there is still need for reconnaissance; it is still necessary to go forth to see what the situation is. We will have to have airplanes with which to do it. The B-70 could do it.

The F-108 was scrapped. I regretted that action very much. It too could have been used for reconnaissance as well as a fighter. The B–70 certainly can be used for reconnaissance. And the B–70 would still be a very useful airplane, with which America could maintain its lead in the field of aviation. We initiated that field, not the Russians. I certainly hope that we will not see the Soviets produce the first supersonic commercial airplane. One of these days there will be commercial airplanes which will fly at 2,000 miles an hour. We are likely to have subsonic commercial airplanes when that time comes, if we are not careful. Therefore, the building of the B–70 is necessary and beneficial to America beyond the point in time that I have made, in the decade of the 1960's.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to add one other comment, which seems to me to be very important. It is this: One of the greatest dangers, it seems to me, confronting the world is the possibility of an atomic war being started by accident. The Senator from California in his address has alluded to this possibility.

It seems to me that the B–70 airplane might contribute to a lessening of this possibility if it were available in numbers to be used as the first arm of American retaliation. As the Senator has so well pointed out, such an airplane could be recalled from its mission, whereas missiles could not be recalled. Thus a miscalculation, which led to the use of missiles, in the absence of an alternative, could very well cause an atomic war by accident, which would be the ultimate folly.

So I commend, again, the fine statement which the Senator from California has made. I think it has contributed much to our understanding of this very sensitive, important problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. I would say, in concluding, that the problem of whether we ought to build a B–70 weapons system is a question of priority inside the Defense budget. What I am asserting today is that that weapons system does have the priority which warrants its building, because for a while we will have nothing else to initiate a retaliatory strike if war starts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

NEW PROPOSAL TO PREVENT A DEADLOCK IN THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the Senator's permission, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tomorrow in Geneva, Switzerland, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union will resume their negotiations for a treaty covering the controlled cessation of nuclear weapons tests. These negotiations have been going on with brief recesses for some 14 months. A treaty has not been signed, but significant advances toward a treaty have been achieved.

My purpose in speaking today is to assess the possibilities for a test ban agreement. I also wish to inform the Senate of a proposal I have made to the Secretary of State regarding a possible way to prevent a deadlock in the negotiations.

We must recall, before discussing the details of the nuclear test ban negotiations, what is their purpose. Why have we been laboring so long and so patiently for an agreement?

First and foremost, I believe it is because of the desire of the United States to make concrete progress toward the goal of controlling and reducing the world's armaments. We know that another world war would be fought with weapons of hideous destructiveness. The possibility is extremely slim that any nation could survive a nuclear war without large portions of its population dead, maimed, or otherwise afflicted with the scourge resulting from high doses of radioactivity.

Knowing what another war would be like, the major nations of the world, nevertheless, continue to invest something over a hundred billion dollars each year in producing, developing, designing,

and testing weapons of war. They continue to produce these weapons because the world is divided into rival blocs separated by distrust, suspicion, and fear. No nation wishes to reduce its arms unless it is convinced that its rivals are also reducing theirs. The test ban negotiations, therefore, represent an effort to make a significant start toward the eventual but cherished goal that man may live in peace, relieved from the burden of expending vast sums and devoting enormous energies upon massive and unproductive armaments.

Another vitally important reason exists why negotiations continue for an agreement to end tests of nuclear weapons. This is apart from the need to progress toward effective arms control measures. As all of us are well aware, nuclear weapons tests produce radioactive fallout which can result in a serious health hazard. We know, at the very least, that past tests have already inflicted genetic damage upon a part of the living. Morally we have no right to bequeath disfigurement upon future generations, if this can be avoided. Moreover, the hazard from fallout will grow as newcomers, like France, add their part to the spread of nuclear tests.

The Geneva test ban negotiations, in short, have a dual function. If successful, they start the world a first step along the road toward reducing the burdens and the dangers of heavy armaments, while at the same time they free the world from the health hazard posed by further contamination from radioactive fallout.

STATUS OF THE GENEVA TALKS

The extent of progress in the Geneva test ban negotiations may be measured by looking at what has been accomplished and what remains undone. What are the points of agreement and what are the points of difference?

The three nuclear powers have agreed to 18 parts of a treaty. Many of these are purely procedural. Others, however, represent solid substantive accomplishments toward the drafting of a successful and adequate treaty.

But we must frankly admit that the issues that remain constitute the toughest obstacles to the completion of a treaty. These issues are primarily political, although some important ones are technical.

Last February, in a letter to the Secretary of State, I listed the three main roadblocks the Soviets were then placing in the path of a treaty:

First. They were demanding a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

Second. They were insisting that the requisite control posts be self-operated; that is, dominated by nationals of the countries within which the posts are located.

Third. They were calling for complicated procedures that would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

It is gratifying that the Soviets have come a long way since that time toward removing the first two of these roadblocks. On a number of items, they have receded from their demands for a veto; on others, they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I was not aware that the Soviets had come a long way in that respect. It seems to me that their suggestions have more form than substance. Would the able Senator from Idaho mind spelling out just how the Russians have come a long way?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I shall be happy to indicate to what extent the earlier roadblocks have been eliminated or reduced during the months between the time when I last spoke on this subject and the present time.

A year ago the Russians were demanding the right of a veto on a broad spectrum, in regard to different matters. For example, the Russians demanded the right of veto on any revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to do so, I should like to go down through the whole list and compare the Russians' position then with their apparent position now.

As to the first item—namely, revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto—the Russians have now indicated their willingness to rescind their demand for a veto. Accordingly, the proposed International Control Commission could recommend treaty revisions or amendments, not subject to any veto, although any actual revision of the treaty or amendment to the treaty could not be placed into effect without the full concurrence of the three contracting powers. This is not a matter of major importance, but it is one place where a previous demand for a veto on the part of the Soviets has been rescinded.

Second, a year ago the Russians demanded the right of veto against any accusation which might be made by the Commission against any nation, for a violation of the treaty. Now the Russians have removed their demand for such a veto; and I take it that their new position is that such accusations can be made whenever it is felt they are warranted, and that they can be made without being subject to veto on the part of any of the signatory powers.

Moreover, it has been established by the negotiations that any signatory to the agreement has the right to withdraw unilaterally from the agreement upon the detection of any violation. That is one of the grounds for rescinding the agreement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. That would then vitiate the agreement. So in one respect I say that, as I have followed the development of the negotiations, I find some difficulty in measuring the so-called concessions which the Russians advertise they are going to make with what they have actually said and the positions they have actually taken.

I will not impose further upon the Senator. I know he is making an important speech to which I am listening with great interest; but I did want to indicate that, as I have followed these negotiations carefully, I have noticed the pattern of a press statement by Mr. Tsarapkin, the chief Soviet delegate, suggesting great concessions. But when one reads the fine print of the actual position taken in the negotiations, it is a little difficult to find the two meaning the same thing.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr President, I should like to go on with the fine print, because I think it is important to read now into the RECORD, inasmuch as the question has been raised, the extent to which the position of the negotiating parties seems to have changed on the matter of a veto during the past year.

To continue, a year ago the Russians were demanding the right of veto over the appointment of the administrator. I will say with respect to this matter that their position has not changed, though ours has. In the interim, we have indicated that we feel that the matter of the appointment of the administrator is one upon which all three of the negotiating powers ought to agree, and that the administrator should be selected unanimously, provided the incumbent administrator remains until a new administrator has been selected.

A year ago the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the adoption of a decision to dispatch inspection groups for onsite investigation of any event suspected of being a nuclear explosion. This went to the heart of the reliability of the inspection control system. At the time of my speech to the Senate last year, this was the main reason why it appeared that the negotiations were deadlocked, and that we would soon have to abandon our efforts to reach agreement.

Since that time, however, the Russians have made a contingent offer. They have indicated that if the nuclear powers could agree upon a quota of onsite inspections that could be made in a given year, which would furnish them with some assurance that they would not be overrun with inspection teams—and now I am expressing this proposition in terms of their argument, not mine—then they, in turn, would withdraw their demand for a veto over the right to dispatch inspection teams into Russian territory.

A year ago, the Russians were demanding a veto over revision of existing methods, and approval of new methods, for observation and for types of apparatus to be placed at control stations.

The Soviets have since receded from that demand, contingent upon whether an agreement can be reached in later negotiations with respect to such new equipment as should be installed.

So I think that in these matters important changes have occurred in the course of negotiations.

Since I have gone this far into the list of particulars, I think I should add the final two particulars with respect to which significant changes have been made.

On January 30 last year, the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the determination of location sites of the control posts and of the routes for control aircraft flights. From this position they have now indicated they will recede if the location can be predetermined by the governments, while, on our part, we believe any such determination must be subject to review and approval by the control commission.

Finally, last year the Soviets were demanding a veto over budgetary, financial, administrative, and economic matters connected with the control organization's activities, including matter relating to the recruitment and dismissal of the supporting and auxiliary personnel.

Now, with respect to the budgetary matter, the Soviets have receded from that position and have agreed to withdraw their demand for veto if the nuclear powers in turn will agree on the composition of the control Commission and budget adoption by a two-thirds vote. This becomes very complicated and I think, in this particular, their change of position is not so great as one might be led to believe.

But I do think the total list does indicate that a significant change of position on matters of importance has occurred in our negotiations during the last year.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the proposal which the Russians advertise as a great concession, and which they wish the world to interpret as a great concession, is that, instead of a veto, the Commission be composed of three Iron Curtain members, three members from the free world, and a neutral member, but that all decisions be subject to a two-thirds majority vote. If the Senator will use his mental arithmetic and find that a two-thirds majority of 7 is 5, he will see that what the Soviets propose is not a matter of substance, but of form; they still would retain a veto.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not agree more fully with the Senator; but I want to point out this relates only to the matter of budget determination of a control Commission, and not to all the activities of the control Commission. My understanding of the present position of the Russians is that, in determining the amount of the budget, they want to have adoption by two-thirds vote, which I concede gives them a veto power. However, that veto power relates to only one function of the Commission, namely, the determination of the annual budget. Therefore, the point ought not to be extended to the other matters and powers of the Commission which go to the heart of the Commission's reason for existence.

So, although I agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee when he raises this question I also wish to emphasize that it relates only to the establishment of the Commission's budget.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I concede that, but I also wish to suggest to the able Senator that it is typical of the clever moves of the Soviets to advertise a concession and claim they have made a concession when in fact what they suggest is no concession at all.

Mr. CHURCH. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am fully mindful of the wily ways of the Russians. I think our negotiators at Geneva are mindful of them, too.

I would be the last ever to propose that the United States should become a party to any treaty which did not give us full assurance of protection. I am sure that we will not enter into a treaty which contains pitfalls of that kind.

In the course of my address this afternoon I expect to look at the present status of our negotiations in an objective way, and appraise very carefully the Soviet position. My purpose is to suggest a possible proposal which the United States might make should all else fail at Geneva, in the hope that we can accomplish at least a part of the objective we had in mind when we went to Geneva.

So, Mr. President, if I were to summarize the changes which have occurred in the position of the Soviet Union in the course of the past year, I would do it in this way: It seems to me that on a number of items the Russians have receded from their demands for a veto, while on others they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

On the question of staffing the control posts, the Soviets have offered to accept our proposal, in the main, provided that we accept their offer on the budget and the composition of the control Commission.

On the third roadblock, that of the need for a certain amount of onsite inspection, little progress has been made. It was in this area of the negotiations that the hope for rapid progress toward the drafting of a comprehensive treaty, that is, a treaty covering the cessation of tests in all environments, received a setback last month. A technical working group of scientists from the U.S.S.R., United States, and United Kingdom, which met to discuss the question of the detection and identification of underground tests, failed to reach agreement on all the items on its agenda. The purpose of the technical working groups was threefold:

First. To review all new data regarding the detection and identification of underground events;

Second. To consider possible improvements in technics and instrumentation in the control system; and

Third. To determine the criteria by which an unidentified event might be selected by the control Commission for onsite inspection.

Although the scientists did reach agreement on possible improvements in techniques and instrumentation, they did not reach agreement on the other important questions. The scientists, for example, could not agree on the criteria to distinguish earthquakes from explosions for the purpose of eliminating the former as being subject to inspection. Without such criteria it is difficult to see how an agreement with respect to onsite inspections can be reached.

Unfortunately, it was not only the lack of technical agreement that hurt the prospects for a treaty. The Soviet scientists accused their American colleagues of bad faith and questioned their integrity. These unwarranted accusations have added to the difficulty of reaching reasonable solutions to these vexing problems.

PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION

If the scientists and the diplomats of the three nuclear powers fail to reach agreement on the question of inspection for possible underground nuclear tests, what course should the negotiations then follow?

Of one thing I am sure.. The United States cannot pack up its bags and go home without first exhausting all reasonable possibilities for agreement. We must be certain that if failure comes the guilt must rest with the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, I have written to the Secretary of State, outlining my views as to the course the United States might follow if the failure to reach agreement on the problem of inspection produces a deadlock.

Last February, when it looked as though the conference was deadlocked, I urged the United States to attempt to salvage something of value from the negotiations by calling for a suspension of all further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, enforced through an international control system sufficient to detect any violations.

I wish to say at this point, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had previously made a proposal calling for our unilateral suspension of atmospheric tests. This proposal was very similar to mine, except that I hoped such an atmospheric ban could be reached by agreement among the three nuclear powers, and could be enforced by an international control system.

Last year it was my pleasure to discuss at length on the floor of the Senate with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee his proposal and mine, and, with respect to the position we then took, we found ourselves very much in accord.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator for his generous reference.

I would hope that any stoppage of tests made by the United States would be concurred in by other countries.

In view of the fact that the United States was the first nation to conduct nuclear tests, was the only power to use a nuclear weapon, and conducted more tests than any other nation, I thought that our moral and political position in the world would be strengthened by a forthright, dramatic act on the part of the President of the United States, taking the position that, whatever other powers did, the United States was not

only willing to stop contaminating the world atmosphere but had stopped doing so, and by inviting other powers to join for a given but extended period of time.

I still think there is great merit to this position, and I suggested it to the President by telegram only a few days ago when the subject was under consideration at Augusta. I think it has merit now because of the propaganda "pitch" of Mr. Khrushchev for total disarmament, which everyone desires but which all reasonable men know, in the context of the world tension today, is unachievable and, therefore, impractical and political.

I learned in a recent visit to many countries that the Russian leader had achieved an image of peace of which I was unprepared to learn. I think there would be a great merit in having the President of the United States take the initiative in a dramatic way, by calling a halt for an extended period of time to the kinds of tests which contaminate the world's atmosphere and the kinds of tests which can be detected no matter by what power conducted.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much impressed by the arguments advanced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee last year, as I continue to be impressed by those arguments.

It was for that reason that I proposed last year that the United States take the initiative at Geneva to seek a ban on atmospheric tests in the hope that we could salvage that much out of the negotiations, and in the hope that the Soviet Union might agree to such a ban on the tests which contribute most to the contamination of the air, and which could be policed by control stations already in existence on either side of the Iron Curtain.

Such a ban, I then said, would curtail further poisoning of the air, while we continued to seek acceptable ways to police a ban on tests in other environments.

Moreover, I wrote to Mr. Herter, who was then Acting Secretary, that the commencement of an international control system to detect atmospheric nuclear explosions is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. This is so, even though a control system for such tests is much less complicated than a control system for a comprehensive ban.

On April 13th, the President, by letter to Chairman Khrushchev, said that the United States was prepared to consider a ban on atmospheric tests. He said:

> Could we not, Mr. Chairman, put the agreement into effect in phases beginning with a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere? A simplified control system for atmospheric tests up to 50 kilometers could be readily derived from the Geneva experts' report, and would not require the automatic onsite inspection which has created the major stumbling block in the negotiations so far.

This, of course, was essentially the proposal I had made in February. I was gratified that this was so, and, although the Soviets rejected the proposal, that they reacted to it by making the important concessions I have previously mentioned.

Notwithstanding that progress was made in the remaining months of 1959, we find the conference again in a position very similar to that which existed 11 months ago. Once more, the prospect is for failure or stalemate at Geneva, unless something is done.

The same concern, which caused me to make the proposal I did in February, has moved me to write once again to the Secretary of State. In a letter which I sent to him Friday, January 8, I broadened my proposal for a staged test ban agreement. I added two important modifications which I felt were dictated by the present status of the negotiations.

We must continue, I told the Secretary in my letter, to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I urged that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

> (1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and
>
> (2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I suggested that such joint underground tests might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and that qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited to participate.

As I wrote the Secretary, I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase a grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the onsite inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the nuclear club, but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, moreover, that the series of joint underground tests could represent the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration on the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

My suggestion for joint tests stems from the realization that in the science of seismology areas of uncertainty exist. The tests to be jointly conducted would advance the general knowledge about the problems of identification and detection of underground tests. I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

It may be that the Russian negotiators will rebuff the suggestion for joint underground tests. But it is well to remember that the Russians were a suspicious people long before the Communists came to power. The czars maintained their own Iron Curtain. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], rightly said, following my mention of this fact to the Senate last March, than an understanding of this puts the matter in perspective and gives us more hope for the future than if we attribute all difficulties simply to the present regime. We cannot know, in any case, that the Soviets would rebuff the proposal unless we make it.

The United States has always been dedicated to the cause of peace. We are answerable to our own trust. We ought not anticipate failure as a reason for abandonment of new proposals even before making them.

My proposal, I repeat, is an alternative to stalemate and deadlock. Perhaps some unexpected move by the Soviets will change the situation. But there is little that can change the fundamentals of the situation—the need to make a start toward disarmament, to end the threat of further contamination by fallout, and the desirability of extending knowledge in the matter of identifying underground disturbances.

Mr. President, good conscience commands that we do our utmost at Geneva.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to Secretary Herter be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Tuesday next, January 12, the Geneva negotiations for a

treaty to end nuclear weapons tests will resume. Although the resumption is not auspicious, and prospects for success seem gloomy indeed, there is cause for hope in the progress already made, and more reason than ever for not permitting impatience or frustration to jeopardize continued efforts toward agreement.

The unresolved issue remains inspection. The inability of the recent technical conference of scientists from our country, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to reach agreement on such matters as the significance of the Hardtack data for the detection of underground nuclear tests, and the criteria to determine when the source of a signal registered at a control post can be investigated by a mobile inspection team is, of course, a formidable obstacle to successful negotiations.

Last February, I wrote to you urging that the United States, without slackening its efforts for an end to all nuclear tests, seek a limited ban on atmospheric tests to stop pollution of the air.

Such a proposal was made to the conference at Geneva following the Easter recess. Although the suggestion was rejected, the Soviet Union made significant new concessions which enabled the conference to continue to move forward.

I still beleive that the United States must do everything in its power to prevent the test ban negotiations from ending in a stalemate. They are not only important in themselves. Their outcome has significance for the entire future of disarmament. If the United States and the Soviet Union cannot agree to end their tests of nuclear weapons under effective inspection safeguards, then upon what can they agree? Surely almost any other disarmament proposal would have even less likelihood of acceptance than a ban on tests of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must continue to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I would urge that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

(1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and

(2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase the grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the on-site inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the "nuclear club," but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this, the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, however, that the series of joint underground tests, which might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and to which qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited, could represent the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration of the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

I respectfully submit these suggestions to you, Mr. Secretary, as a possible proposal to present to the Russian negotiators. I do so with the conviction that we must continue to demonstrate to the world that if the test ban talks fail, the Soviet Union must bear the guilt.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator upon his learned address and upon his dedication to the cause of peace, which must be based upon international understanding and confidence.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that in the matter of the Geneva negotiations we have shared a common interest, and that the counsel and thinking in this matter of the Senator from Tennessee have always been of great importance to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR BOULDER CITY, NEV.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, January 4, 1960, is a date of lasting significance to Nevada, for it marks the emergence of Boulder City as a municipality within the framework of our State, and its severance as a federally controlled city.

Laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as a model American community, Boulder City owed its existence to the construction of the great dam on the Colorado River.

Since 1932, it was administered by the Federal Government; yet there was a growing demand upon the part of the residents for home rule. Along with my colleagues in Congress, I was privileged to assist in legislation which paved the way for the transfer of the city from its Federal status to local control.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the many outstanding citizens of Boulder City who worked long and faithfully for the goal of municipal freedom. At the same time, I believe it only fitting and proper to commend the Bureau of Reclamation for the outstanding job it did both in administering the affairs of the bustling community of 4,000, and in cooperating wholeheartedly in the orderly transition of government.

At this juncture, in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made at Boulder City's inaugural ceremonies by the Honorable Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada, and Robert Broadbent, mayor of the new city, along with appropriate editorials which appeared in the Boulder City News and the Las Vegas Review-Journal, and a news story published in the Las Vegas Sun.

There being no objection, the remarks, editorials, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER

Mayor Broadbent of Boulder City, Acting Regional Director West, Federal, State, county and city officials, and Mayor Broadbent of Ely, I welcome this opportunity of celebrating with you this long awaited moment—as Boulder City takes her place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

Also I bring warm greetings from one of you who shared the difficulties and long wait involved in bringing home rule to Boulder City. I am speaking of Dick Ham, who is now executive director of the department of employment security and is busy in Carson City preparing his department's legislative program for the coming session and, therefore, unable to be here with you tonight.

Too many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course. There can be no danger of this in Boulder City. This day marks the end of a 20-year effort to remove this city from Federal control and give it incorporate status. And this day marks the beginning of a bright future for this city, as you yourselves guide its destiny. The story of this transitional period is well known to you here, but permit me to trace the progress of this effort.

Boulder City started as a tent community in 1931 with the beginning of construction on Boulder Dam. Growth was rapid but controlled and the guiding hand of the Bureau of Reclamation is evident in the modern, well-planned community in which you live today.

It was some 20 years ago that Government officials realized Boulder City had outgrown its role as a construction and operating camp. It was agreed that the city should be turned over to the people for self-government. The machinery was put in motion with the approval for studies of the transitional problem.

In 1949, Dr. Henry Reining, Jr., then professor of public administration and political science at the University of Southern California, was engaged to make a survey and submit specific recommendations for a solution. His report a year later was the basis of an order issued by the Secretary of the Interior in 1951 which administratively separated Boulder City from the Boulder Canyon project. The Boulder City Act of 1958, under which incorporation has been achieved, generally followed Dr. Reining's recommendations.

That act provided an orderly method for the Federal Government to relinquish ownership and control of certain properties in the community not required for continuing Federal activities in the area and permitted you to establish self-government under Nevada law.

Director West has informed me that the Bureau has disposed of all its residential properties within the city, totaling 179 housing units. These units, appraised by FHA at $1,225,000, were sold to Federal employees who were priority purchasers. This property is being placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

He also told me the Bureau of Reclamation is transferring ownership of the 33 square miles of land provided by the Boulder City Act to the incorporated city. This land also will be placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

I note also that Boulder City has been the recipient of neary $3 million worth of electrical, water, and sewerage systems, municipal buildings, streets, sidewalks, and curbs, parks and parkways.

In short, Boulder City is ready to do business. It begins, not as a municipal infant crying for recognition and struggling for success, but as a community that has added much to the lore of Nevada and whose citizens have helped make the State what it is today.

With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000 persons, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world.

From the individual's faith in his own worth, to his voluntary role in his own free community, to his own community's service to his nation, and to his nation's dedication to the common cause of all free men—thus is the force of the faith of freedom steadily raised to a higher power.

We can serve freedom elsewhere only as we practice it in our own lives.

We cannot speak of a common law for all nations of the world, unless our own laws faithfully serve the needs, and guard the rights, of our own citizens.

We cannot speak of equality, both of men and nations, unles we advance the flag of social equality in our own community. We cannot be aghast at poverty in distant lands, if our own citizens are in want.

We cannot hope to spur economic progress and prosperity in the world unless such a State as Nevada can itself help to lead America toward new horizons of equal opportunity for all our citizens.

We cannot pretend to help inspire new nations in the way of freedom if our own schools do not give our own youths the chance to become enlightened citizens.

We are called upon to conduct ourselves like free men with the will and the wisdom to make freedom work. We do this not simply by what we say—but by how we live. This is your challenge. I know you can meet it.

I mentioned education, the value of which cannot be overemphasized. America must work, perhaps hardest of all, on the field where the future can be won or lost: in our schoolrooms. We must attack the problems of juvenile delinquency.

Perhaps in this field the rest of the Nation can look to Boulder City for guidance. The rate of juvenile delinquency here is one of the lowest in the Nation. In Boulder City, youth is not hidden or apologized for, it is proudly displayed.

A crash-emphasis on education hit the country following the Soviet Union's achievements in rocketry. We heard a spate of alarms calling for more mathematics, scientists, and technicians.

But Boulder City didn't wait for sputnik to call for emphasis on education for its young people.

Mr. Elbert B. Edwards, your widely known high school principal, reports the percentage of Boulder City High School graduates going on to college tops 70 percent.

Nevada has seven young men in the selective Air Force Academy. Four of them are from Boulder City—Mike Hyde, David Lyon, Scott Wood, and Roger Likens.

In any National Merit Board or National College Board test, Boulder City is sure to be represented at the top levels. And in the area of education, all eyes will be on Boulder City with the construction of the new experimental educational facility—a multipurpose building designed to meet the needs of all school districts. It will be the only one in the country. Now in the hands of the architects, the building is the result of millions of dollars put into research and engineering by the Ford Foundation, and contributions by the New York and Stanford educational facilities laboratories.

From education in the schools, we proceed to education in government. In this your city officials are the instructors and the pupils. I could take the time to point out the good qualities of your new officials and how the future of the city is safe in their hands, but I won't. One of the blessings of a small community is that you intimately know your candidates and have a solid basis for their election. You know what kind of a performance to expect from them.

To Mayor Broadbent, City Manager Curtis Blyth, Assistant Mayor Dr. Thomas White, Councilmen Morgan Sweeney, Albert Franklin, and Joe Manix, City Attorney Alvin Wartman, and all the others, I offer as advice, in a purely nonpartisan way, the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said:

"New ideas cannot be administered successfully by men with old ideas, for the first essential of doing a job well is the wish to see the job done at all." I know these men have the wish to see the job done and I feel sure new ideas will always find a welcome at city hall.

This is a happy time in Boulder City. It's a new year for a city with a new look. Right now things look rosy and the future's problems are faint. You've won a long, hard struggle for independence, but the time for rest is far distant. Your real struggle lies ahead. Things which are minor and a matter of routine will present problems here because you'll be encountering them for the first time.

Your municipal path won't always be smooth. Mistakes will be made in the natural course of things. Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress.

You are fortunate in that many of the mistakes open to you have been made before and you will have the chance to profit by the missteps of others.

There will probably be times when you wish you had never heard of home rule. When this time arrives, I advise a look at the words of James Gould Gozzens, who said:

"Every day is a miracle. The world gets up in the morning and is fed and goes to work, and in the evening it comes home and is fed again and perhaps has a little amusement and goes to sleep. To make that possible, so much has to be done by so many people that, on the face of it, it is impossible. Well, every day we do it; and every day, come hell, come high water, we're going to have to keep on doing it as well as we can."

On behalf of the rest of the citizens of the State, I bid Boulder City welcome to its rightful place. Congratulations to Nevada's newest city.

REMARKS BY ROBERT BROADBENT, MAYOR

It is an honor, as mayor of Boulder City, to be privileged to accept the contract to effectuate the Boulder City Act of 1958, on behalf of the city council and citizens of Boulder City, Nev.

By accepting this contract, we, the citizens of Boulder City, are embarking on the challenging road to self-government. The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Many have contributed greatly to bring about the realization of Boulder City, incorporated. Our appreciation and sincere thanks are extended to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and Mr. Arleigh West, the acting regional director of region 3, for their fine cooperation, assistance, and the advice they have given in the months in which we have been so diligently working on the transfer of Boulder City.

Our city manager, city attorney, city clerk, and the members of the many boards and commissions appointed by the city council have worked hard—with untiring effort—to help make it possible for us to take over the operation of our city today.

Each individual in Boulder City has contributed toward our goal. It is they who make our city what it is and what we hope it will be.

Digressing briefly, I should like to personally and publicly thank my wife and family, and the wives and families of all who have been required to be away from the responsibilities of home, for so many, many hours during this transition period.

We, the officials of our city, are grateful for our fine citizenry and with honor and humility solicit full and continued cooperation to the end that we may enjoy through our united efforts an honest, forthright, economical city administration capable of expanding with the growth of our community.

Boulder City has been unique among her city sisters. It is our sincere desire that this uniqueness will be added to in the future.

We have all the basic needs for growth and development—fine people, good resources. With diligence and united effort, Boulder City will be Nevada's city of dreams come true.

[From the Boulder City News]

MORRY'S STORY

(By Morry Zenoff)

This newspaper today records for posterity Boulder City's first official day of freedom—January 4, 1960—and the signing by its mayor, Robert Broadbent, of the city's own declaration of independence.

From 2 p.m. Monday when the little band of city officials gathered in Arlie West's conference room on the hill, there to observe Broadbent's actual signing of transfer documents—until 9 p.m. that evening, when some 300 interested citizens crowded into the grade-school gym to witness solemn ceremonies celebrating the occasion, it was one series of historic happenings.

Every phase of it was photographed by Government and private photographers—and the best of the shots were collected and engraved and included in this freedom edition—which some day for sure will be studied by your children and your children's children, and ours too, as a symbol of democracy in action in the 20th century.

Every word spoken officially from script was collected by our staff and set up on the linotype machines, then placed in pages, locked up and printed on the pages you're now reading.

The newest laws of the city, passed by special council action minutes before midnight of the transfer date—January 4—are contained, too, in this souvenir edition under legal notices—detailing to the populace the law of the land which is now and forevermore in effect.

No longer will the will of the minority rule; no longer must the citizenry rush to

Washington to seek favor or license; no longer must a community turn to the hill for regulation or interpretation.

Today, the laws of the State of Nevada and a charter written by the elected representatives of the community, and ordinances drafted by an elected city council—these all run the city—through home rule—by majority vote, by citizen control.

At every step of Monday's thrilling walk to freedom—familiar faces were evident everywhere—the oldtimers who came before us (12 years ago) and the newtimers who came here since us—all taking in every word, each experiencing the fine fresh air.

Those who fought against home rule and incorporation now stood shoulder to shoulder with those who fought for it—a fine symbol indeed of what the future will offer in the way of unified work toward the common goal of all—a continued beautiful Boulder City.

The speakers of the day—from the Governor, through Dr. Henry Reining, to the mayor—all were as thrilled to be taking part in our day of history as were the spectators in watching and listening to them play the roles given them.

It was a wonderful day for everyone who lived it. It will be a wonderful city now—for those who live in it, or near it.

Surely, none will forget January 4, 1960—emancipation day for Boulder City, Nev.

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal]

WELCOME TO THE FAMILY

Nevada welcomed a strapping teenager into the family of cities this week when the erstwhile Government community of Boulder City severed its ties with the Federal control and branched out on its own as a true Nevada city.

Boulder City was established back in 1931, when the Government began the task of constructing Boulder Dam. It was laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as the "model city" and it became just that when it was completed around 1932. Since that time, until January 4, 1960, it was operated as a Government community with the citizens having little to say about its government.

Now, the burdens of government have been taken over by the citizens of the city. They have elected Robert Broadbent as the community's first mayor. From now on the problems of growth will be in the hands of the new mayor and his city council.

In the decade which is just starting, it is probable that many changes will be noted in the operation of Boulder City. Undoubtedly it will grow much as the other cities in southern Nevada have grown. It has all the potentials of becoming a recreational city and for establishing some light industry in the area around the city's fringes.

Growth has been almost completely stymied by the Government restrictions which were clamped on Boulder City. For many years property in the community could only be secured on short-term leases. None could be purchased. Recently longer term leases were developed and, as a result of this move, more and more construction was done.

Now, with all restrictions removed, it is entirely possible that capital can be enticed to make investments in the sector. Every indication points to a decided building boom in Boulder City.

As with all growing cities, there will be problems to be faced. While the liquor and gambling issues probably will not be raised in the immediate future, they are bound to come and there will be some bitter fights resulting. Other issues will be raised which will see the city split down the middle. It has happened in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas and Henderson and undoubtedly will occur in Boulder City.

The citizens of Boulder City must have faith, not only in the future of the community itself, but its elected officials as well. The latter are going into a very complex job and, being human, they probably will make mistakes. However, they all are respected citizens of Boulder City and will have the future of the city at heart. Unless they get too far off the deep end, the citizens should give them tolerance, cooperation and confidence. Theirs will be a tough job. They will have to set the policies upon which the future will be built. If they build solidly, which we believe they will, the future of the city is assured.

Operation of the city as a civic entity rather than under governmental control, will be a tough transition. We are confident, however, that the people of Boulder City will be able to make the bold step.

We welcome Boulder City into the family of Nevada cities, and hope the future continues as bright as it is now.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 5, 1960]

GALA CEREMONY BEGINS BOULDER HOME RULE

(By Laura Bell)

BOULDER CITY.—With high hopes for a bright future and every promise that the hopes will be fulfilled, Boulder City was launched on the American way of home rule at ceremonies in the elementary school gymnasium last night.

For the 29 years of its existence up to yesterday it was under Federal control as headquarters for Hoover Dam.

The Federal Government represented by A. B. West, region 3 director of the Bureau of Reclamation, signed over the pretty little model community to Gov. Grant Sawyer of the State of Nevada and Mayor Robert Broadbent, youthful first mayor of the new incorporated city.

West extended the best wishes of Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton and Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy, whose schedules did not permit them to be present for the ceremony.

He also noted that Senators ALAN BIBLE and HOWARD CANNON and Congressman WALTER BARING had sent word that they were unable to attend because of the beginning of the new session of Congress this week.

"Many of you have joined with the Department of the Interior, your Members of Congress and State and local officials in working diligently many years for this day on which we officially sever Boulder City from Federal apron strings," he said.

The complicated and controversial problem was not easily solved and took many years of effort, he noted; but said he was convinced that the efforts which culminated in passage of the Boulder City Act of 1958 will pay off bountifully.

"We of the Department of the Interior feel that the Federal Government is turning over to the incorporated citizenry the finest little city in the world," he said.

Accepting the contract for the State of Nevada, Governor Sawyer commented on the beauty and high quality of Nevada's newest city and said the State was proud to accept such an addition.

Governor Sawyer welcomed Boulder City to her rightful place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

"Though many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course," he noted, "there can be no danger of this in Boulder City" because of the 20-year effort to bring about home rule.

Boulderites were warned by the State's chief executive, "With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

"But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world?"

Residents were advised not to expect perfection from their new city officials since mistakes will be made in the natural course of things.

"Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress," Governor Sawyer observed.

Mayor Broadbent noted that, in accepting the contract, the citizens are embarking on a challenging course.

The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTY POLICY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, many scholars and students of government have written and spoken upon the operations and responsibility of our two-party system. This concern of the party system arises from the fact that it is only through the operations of the two-party system that the mass of our people have a meaningful choice and method of giving direction and mandates to their government. It would follow, then, that the policies of our two major parties, the manner of their formulation and execution, and the responsibility of the parties and their agencies are of vital concern to all citizens.

Party policy, both of the majority and the minority, is surely a matter of vital concern to all Members of Congress and to the people of their constituencies.

Almost from the beginning of the organization of government under the Constitution, the democratic process in the United States has been characterized by the formulation of public policy and the molding of public opinion through a strong two-party system. Almost throughout our history the Congress has been led by a majority party, but with a strong and challenging opposition from a minority party. Third parties have had little success and surely play no significant role now.

Like many others, I have been concerned with the formulation of the policies of the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate. I have expressed this concern in speeches on the floor of the Senate and in other ways. It seems to me that a method of formulating party policies in the Senate that is representative of and responsive to the majority will of the Democratic Senators is necessary to a responsible performance by the Democratic Party.

That is particularly true now, when the President of the United States is a member of the Republican Party. Unless the Democratic Party in Congress

has some orderly way of formulating legislative policy, the only organ I know of which undertakes from time to time to announce party policy to the country is the advisory committee to the Democratic National Committee, most members of which do not hold an office to which they have been elected; whereas in the Senate there are 65 Members who have been chosen as the nominees of their party in their respective States, and who have been elected by the people of their States to this responsibility.

This subject has been a matter of legislation. It has been a matter of frequent debate in the Senate. I debated the matter in the Senate last year. It is a matter of public interest. It is surely a matter of interest to every Democrat in the United States. More than that, it is a matter of concern to every citizen, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of the party and of the operation of the two-party system, in which all people, as I have said, have a concern.

I say these things in a general way, Mr. President, because I am concerned with a current interpretation of the purpose and role of the Democratic senatorial policy committee, by some, that this committee is merely an arm of the Democratic leadership of the Senate. I do not accept this interpretation. It does not comport with the purposes for which the policy committee was created. It neither comports with democratic procedure nor complies with the principle of responsibility of an agent to a principal.

In my view, the Democratic policy committee is, or should be, an agent of the conference of Democratic Senators.

The Senate Democratic policy committee should represent all the Democrats in the Senate, not merely one. The Democratic policy committee of the U.S. Senate should operate in the study and in the formulation of policy, working with all the Democratic Senators. It should be elected by the Democratic Senators. This goes to the heart of democratic procedure within the Democrat Party.

One can understand, then, Mr. President, why at the conference of Democratic Senators last Thursday, I found it impossible to accept the dictum that the Democratic policy committee is "an arm of the leadership."

Perhaps it would be helpful to review briefly the history of the Democratic policy committee, the purposes for which it was created, and the manner of its creation. The Democratic policy committee had its genesis in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It was this committee, which was headed by the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and then Representative, but now Senator, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, which recommended the Reorganization Act of 1946, by the terms of which Congress now operates. The committee held long hearings on the problems of the Congress and the manner in which it could be more representative of, responsive to, and more effective in implementing the public will and party policy.

I should like to read two sentences from the recommendation of this committee.

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority and minority policy. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

From this, Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the Monroney-La Follette committee recommendation which gave birth to both the Republican and Democratic policy committees in the U.S. Senate did not envision the policy committee as a mere "arm of the leadership." Quite to the contrary, the report clearly recommends the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would meet at frequent intervals "to formulate the overall legislative policy of the two parties." Moreover, as I have already said, it recommended that these committees be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences. Perhaps it would be appropriate to read the entire section of the joint committee report with respect to this particular subject. That I shall now do.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEES

Strong recommendations were made to your committee concerning the need for the formal expression within the Congress of the main policies of the majority and minority parties. These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

These recommendations were based on the theory that in a democracy national problems must be handled on a national basis. Only through the expression of the will of the people by their support of political parties on the basis of their platform pledges can the majority will be determined. Likewise the minority viewpoint is also expressed in support of the minority platform.

No one would claim that representative democracy as we know it today could exist without majority and minority parties. The 435 voices of the House and the 96 of the Senate would be confused babel of conflicting tongues without party machinery. Instead of unorganized mob rule where the strength of varying viewpoints cannot be measured or determined, party government furnishes a tug-of-war in which the direction and strength of opposing viewpoints can be more or less accurately measured and weighed.

Under the American party system there are always two main groups, each checking the other and offering the choice of alternative courses of action. Around these two groups Congressmen can rally and express themselves, helping in party caucuses to determine the policy for their group.

Your committee recognizes the need for freedom of action on the part of the individual Member of Congress and his right to vote at any time against the announced policy of his party. But we feel that if party accountability for policies and pledges is to be achieved, stronger and more formal mechanisms are necessary. The present steering committees, an informal and little-used device, seldom meet and never steer.

We recommend that these be replaced with the formal establishment in the House and the Senate of majority and minority policy committees. The majority policy committees of the two Houses would meet jointly at frequent intervals, as would those of the minority, to formulate the over-all legislative policy of the two parties. The majority policy committee of each House would also hold frequent meetings to consider its role in expediting consideration and passage of matters pledged to the people by their party.

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

1. CREATION OF POLICY COMMITTEES

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority policy and minority policy. Each of these four committees would be composed of seven members appointed in its entirety at the opening of each new Congress. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

We feel that in the establishment of such policy committee, the Congress chosen at the last general election should be controlling and that the policy-committee membership should therefore be chosen at the beginning of each new Congress. Membership on all policy committees would automatically expire at the close of each Congress.

Mr. President, the minority party at the time of that report was the Republican Party, but it became the majority party the following year. The majority leader was the late Senator Taft, of Ohio. As I understand, the Senate Policy Committee of the Republican Party follows those recommendations rather closely. I find it rather strange that the procedure for determining legislative policy within the Republican Party in the Senate is more democratic than the procedure for determining party policy—if we have such procedure—within the Democratic Party in the Senate.

Upon the recommendation of the Monroney-La Follette committee the Senate passed a bill which contained the following provision:

SEC. 244(a) It is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the majority party and the principal minority party in the respective Houses should each at the beginning of each Congress appoint a policy committee, consisting of seven members, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each policy committee the sum of $30,000 for the maintenance of a staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations. The members of each such staff shall be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, but no such compensation shall be fixed at a rate in excess of $8,000 per annum.

The above provision was not accepted by the House, but the Senate proceeded promptly upon its own to establish its own majority and minority policy committees. The Senate included in the legislative appropriation bill—passed within a few days after the reorganization bill became law—legislative provi-

sions which, in effect, authorized the establishment of policy committees and the employment of staffs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield; or does he prefer to proceed at this time?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been reading from the text of the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that text it is provided that the majority party and the principal minority party shall appoint the policy committees. It does not say that the majority leader and the minority leader shall appoint the committees; the text states that the parties shall appoint the committees. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore the Senator from Tennessee is laying the basis for indicating that it was the intent of the Senate that the policy committee should be the agent of the party.

Mr. GORE. That is clear, it seems to me, from the report of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, from the bill S. 2177, 79th Congress, as introduced in the Senate, from the bill as passed by the Senate, and also from the measure which finally became law, the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 which was based upon the committee's recommendation, and which is the legislative basis for the Senate policy committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I merely wanted to raise this question, in order to point out, at the very least, the original intent of the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator from Illinois. The provision was contained, as I have read it, in the bill which passed the Senate. The provision was not accepted by the House. When the House would not accept the provision, the bill was passed without it.

But to show the intent of the Senate, the Senate proceeded within a very few days to attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill; and that rider did, in effect, authorize the establishment of policy committees in the Senate and the employment of staffs therefor. I should like to read that provision, which was contained in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947, and which was passed in August 1946. I shall now read the provision, which today is the law:

> For maintenance of a staff for a majority policy committee and a minority policy committee in the Senate, consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, at rates not to exceed $8,000 per annum in any case, $15,000 for each such committee, in all, fiscal year 1947, $30,000, to be available at the beginning of the 80th Congress.

Note, Mr. President, how closely the language of the provision which became law followed the provisions of the bill recommended by the Monroney-La Follette committee, and adopted as a portion of the reorganization bill which was passed by the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to remain in the Chamber, to listen to all of the Senator's speech, for I am greatly interested in what he has to say. However, several persons are waiting for me, in my office.

So at this time I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I know he will have a good answer to it, and therefore I wish to give him this opportunity to answer it: In light of the fact that the whole matter of how the policy committee should be selected is on the agenda for tomorrow, to be discussed behind closed doors, at a caucus called for that purpose where we of the Democratic Party can determine what action we should take with respect to this entire problem, I am curious to know why the able Senator from Tennessee wished to make this speech today, here on the floor of the Senate, in public, before all the press, as he is now doing. I am curious about that.

Mr. GORE. I was sure the junior Senator from Florida would be curious about it, and I shall be very pleased to satisfy his curiosity.

For one thing, this is a matter about which I am deeply concerned; and this is not the first time I have expressed such concern on the floor of the Senate. The people of Tennessee have honored me with an opportunity to be a United States Senator. In consequence of that honor and that office, I have the privilege of speaking in this forum; and that is one of the greatest privileges which can come to a man. Here one can be heard. Behind closed doors one can be steamrollered.

This is an issue which I think concerns all the people, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of our parties; it goes to a method of determining party policy.

I should like to point out to the Senator that last year, without party policy, one committee dealt in one way with the interest rate problem; another committee dealt in another way with that problem. No one could tell us what the policy of the Democratic Party was, unless one wished to acknowledge that the advisory committee to the National Committee constituted such an authoritative organ for policy.

I take it that the Senator does not recognize that group as an authoritative spokesman for the party. Where, then, is there to be, and how is there to be, a formulation of legislative policies of the Democratic Party? As a result of the lack of party policy, as a result of the constant compromise of principle, we ended the last session in virtual rout on the economic issues.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I want to satisfy the Senator's curiosity. I think this is important to every American, not just to the Senators who are going to meet behind closed doors tomorrow. Yes, I will have an opportunity to have my say there, and I will say some things there that I will not say here—perhaps——

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Just a moment, and I will yield. But I have some things to say here as I have the opportunity which I feel it is my duty to say to all who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not a matter for the sole determination of Senators behind closed doors. Every Democrat in Florida should be interested in this, and I hope every Democrat in Tennessee is interested in it. I will certainly undertake to interest them in it.

Now I yield further.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator knows nobody questions his right to rise in the Senate and discuss anything about which he has convictions.

Mr. GORE. I understand the Senator has not quesitoned my right; he has expressed his curiosity.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was interested in your discussion in light of the fact that we know proposals were made for caucuses, having an opportunity to settle this type of question at them. I remember an argument made against the caucuses was that we could come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and debate the problems. I remember the argument was made in opposition to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania that we really did not have to have a caucus, because a Senator could come to the floor and speak, as the Senator from Tennessee is doing, without inhibition, or limitation and to the whole world. But, the counterargument was made—and it prevailed—that we should argue things that have to do with party workings, washing our dirty linen, in our own party caucuses. I sort of subscribed to that practice, and I understood the Senator from Tennessee did. Therefore I have been at a loss to understand why he comes on the floor now. That is the reason why I was curious.

Mr. GORE. In the first place, I do not regard this question as being purely and strictly one of concern to Democratic Senators. As I have said, I think this is of interest to all our party members. Indeed, it is of interest to many independent citizens in the United States who do not have an affiliation with either party, because it goes to the heart of the operation of our two-party system. As our population continues to grow, multitudinous as it is, with 180 million people, it will be only through clear-cut choices, if there are any clear-cut choices any more between the two parties, that the American people will have a meaningful, constructive way of expressing a choice and giving direction and a mandate to their Government.

If we compromise with principle, if we wind up with the Democratic Party almost indistinguishable from the administration's party, then how, I ask, will the American people have a clear-cut choice?

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Florida tell us what the

Democratic Party policy is with respect to any issue which he wishes to choose, how that legislative policy has been determined in the Senate, and what means we have now to determine such policy.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would say, irrespective of whether we do or do not have such means, that the whole debate involves a matter of mechanics and machinery. At least, that is what I thought. I thought that was the reason why we were to go into caucus tomorrow. That is the reason why I have felt, and many other Senators have felt, that from time to time we should have a caucus, as the Republicans do, which, as the Senator from Tennessee has explained, appear to be successful. However, I have not noticed that they stand on their side of the aisle and air their particular divisions for the whole world to see. Yes, I think they discuss them in caucus. I have not been invited to them. I have not been privileged to learn what they think their problems are. And I think they are wise in not advertising them.

I doubt the wisdom of once again pointing out, as I think everybody recognizes, some divisions in our own party, and the additional problem of how we should proceed to determine policy. I understand that the real purpose of the caucus was to state our positions, which naturally could be stated more freely in caucus, without the necessity of saying the same thing on the floor of the Senate, and without having it misunderstood as it goes out over the wires or radio and television.

If we are to argue the issues here on the floor today, there is no sense in arguing the same things in caucus tomorrow. May I mention this one complimentary thing?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I know the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely sincere about what he is doing here. I know he has deep convictions about it. I know he is a loyal and dedicated Democrat and patriot. I understand all that. I think what he is talking about in the realm of determining policy has merit to it. I just wonder about the wisdom of rising on the floor of the Senate at this time and talking about it, and now broadcasting it to the public, in light of the caucus which has been called for tomorrow to determine these questions among ourselves. That is what aroused my curiosity.

Mr. GORE. I will have some further comments to make about that in a few moments. But the junior Senator from Tennessee asks the junior Senator from Florida to name one legislative policy of the Democratic Party, to outline, if he can, any formal procedure the 65 Senators belonging to the Democratic Party in the Senate have for determining a policy.

The Senator from Florida responded to my question by saying, "Irrespective of that situation," and then he proceeded to make a statement. I wonder if the able Senator from Florida would be able to tell me—and I am entitled to curiosity the same as the junior Senator from Florida is——

Mr. SMATHERS. Surely.

Mr. GORE. I am curious to know what he regards the policy of the Democratic Party with respect to housing to be.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say, in answer to the able Senator from Tennessee, that one of the great virtues—or vices, I do not know which——

Mr. GORE. Well, now, there is a good deal of difference.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is a great deal of difference between them, but I am not sure whether in this instance what I am going to say is a virtue or a vice. I will leave that to the good judgment of the Senator from Tennessee. But one of the good things about the Democratic Party is that we cannot tell a Member what to do. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico said he did not care—and I applaud him for his position—how many Members got together and stated what they considered the Democratic Party's position and tried to tell him the way he should vote. He said the people of New Mexico sent him here and no Senator was going to bind him nor dictate to him as to how he was to vote.

I join with him in that noble sentiment. I was not sent to the U.S. Senate to go into any room with any group of people, even fellow Democrats, and have them tell me how I should vote on housing, agriculture, debt management, or on anything. The only people to whom I am responsible are the people of my State of Florida, who elected me to come here to represent them in the best possible way I could.

I ran on the Democratic ticket. The Democrats voted for me, I am delighted to say, and then sent me here to do that which I thought best for them and the Nation as a whole.

I do not know of a single Senator present who feels as though he is going to be bound by any statement of an advisory council, or of a caucus of any nature, or anything else. The whole purpose of the caucus, as I understood, is to converse about these matters, to see what is the middle ground and to see if there is anything upon which most of us can agree.

It would obviously always not be correct to assume that we could get the senior Senator from Illinois, who sits here, for example, to agree with the able senior Senator from Virginia. We could not get the Senator from Mississippi and the senior Senator from Minnesota to agree about civil rights. We could not get the Senator from Rhode Island to agree with the Senator from Oregon about farm problems. We have considerable division about these things.

We do not even have a policy with respect to reclamation which represents 100-percent unanimity.

However, we try to get together as best we can as they do in any legislative body, to give and take, to see what course we can follow with which most Senators will agree. That is what we have been doing.

I think we have been pretty successful, because even though a President of one party won by a tremendous margin of votes in 1952 and again in 1956, we have nonetheless been able to increase our representation in the House and Senate, despite having to contend with this great personality. We have been able to do this, in my opinion, because the people believe the Congress has been reasonable, responsible, and sensible. The people have voted for our candidates, for our platforms, and for our course of action, as vague as they may sometimes appear to be. The people have voted for us, in the final analysis, and that is the test.

The Senator says, "Look at the Republicans; they have been perhaps a little more democratic than we." I can only say I doubt they have been, but certainly their course has not been as effective as ours, because we have been defeating them in every election.

I make these remarks with deep affection for my friend, who knows I mean sincerely what I am saying. I have the utmost admiration for the Senator from Tennessee. I am in sympathy with what he is saying. I think he is ringing a bell, but I do not think he is ringing it at the right address, on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I thank the able junior Senator from Florida for his generous remarks.

The Senator said he would leave it to me to judge whether in his remarks he was describing a situation which could be considered a vice or a virtue. I choose to apply the word "virtue" to the freedom of choice which my friend says every Senator must have.

I should like to read from the report of the Monroney-La Follette committee, which I read before the distinguished Senator entered the Chamber, on this particular point:

> On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each Member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. President, I have asked the able junior Senator from Florida to name one instance in which he knows the legislative policy of the Democratic Party in the Senate—to show one way we have of developing in a formal way an effective and meaningful policy. The Senator has not answered.

We have a way of developing one. I shall answer my own question to some extent by saying that in the caucus, or in the conference, we can develop one. This is one effective and meaningful way to develop a policy and to announce formally the policy to the country.

Then the junior Senator from Tennessee would have to accept his responsibility, with the Democrats in Tennessee, as to whether he followed such a policy or whether he did not. As the

situation is now, there may be a coalition of a few Democrats and enough Republicans to bring a bill to the Senate even though the bill does not represent the view of the majority of the Democrats in the Senate. As a result of the coalition, a bill may be enacted into law without any yardstick ever having been established to show that it was contrary to the legislative policy of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate.

Before yielding further, I should like to amplify my answer to the Senator as to why I consider this to be a proper subject for debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Could the Senator help me by answering one question on that point?

Mr. GORE. I will answer further, and then I will yield.

For one thing, what we are discussing is a matter of legislation. The genesis of the policy committee, the authorization for its establishment and for the payment of its staff, is a matter of legislation. The membership is said to be seven. How did the number come to be more? I do not complain about there being more members. I think there should be more.

I think the rank and file of our party ought to know that on the Democratic policy committee of the Senate there is only one member from north of the Alabama line and east of the Mississippi River, the very distinguished and able Senator, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I think we should have a policy committee which is something more than an arm of the leadership. We should have a policy committee which performs the functions and assumes the responsibilities envisioned in the Monroney-La Follette committee report.

Furthermore, I think the membership of the committee should be increased so that the committee will be more truly representative of all the Democrats in the Senate and of their constituents and so that it will be representative of all the great geographic sections of our country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Florida has one additional question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have only one question.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Even if somebody wished to agree with everything the Senator from Tennessee has been saying, with respect to the verity of his argument about policy and how to get it, I think, however, that person could also logically say that this forum in which we speak today is not a caucus and is not a conference of Democrats, where these intraparty matters are supposed to be decided. On the contrary, this is the floor of the Senate of the United States, where we are bringing out into the open once again the washing, so to speak, our "dirty linen."

Mr. GORE. This is not "dirty" linen; it is simply faulty linen.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well; faulty linen. If this were a Democratic caucus we would not see the able and distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] sitting here. We would not have a room full of people. We would not have a crowded press gallery looking down on us.

Perhaps we could decide this question in a party caucus. In a caucus each member would be free to vote as he saw fit. Perhaps we could decide some issues but I do not believe we Democrats are going to be able to decide anything on the basis of what we do this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator wished to ask me one further question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not have another question. I merely wished to make that observation, in all good conscience and good spirit.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As I say, I am not unsympathetic with the argument he is making. I am only a little doubtful whether the forum in which he is making it is the correct forum. I have been wrong before. I may be wrong in the future, and I may be wrong now. But I do not believe I am.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the first place, the Democratic Party is the party of the people. I do not mind the people knowing my views on this subject. I do not mind the people knowing whether the party has or has not a means of formulating Democratic policy in the U.S. Senate. I want my constituents to know my views on this question, and this is the proper forum for a Member of the U.S. Senate.

I say again to the able junior Senator from Florida that this problem cannot be interpreted as purely a problem to be decided within the Democratic caucus, because the Congress enacted a law on the subject.

Furthermore, the Democratic Party in the Senate must go back to the basic legislation, containing the authorization for the payment of the staff of the committee. Therefore, the problem cannot be dealt with exclusively in the Democratic caucus.

There is one further point. I am not so naive as to think that this problem will be settled in the right way if no public notice is given as to the existence of the problem. I have been in public life for a few years. What little accomplishment it has been my opportunity to achieve has been in direct ratio to the extent of public information as to my efforts. Therefore, I am glad to accept the impeachment of the Senator's curiosity, and I am pleased to tell him that I am speaking as a Member of the U.S. Senate on a problem which goes to the very heart of the operation of the two-party system in the legislative branch of our Government. I do not think that is exclusively the privilege of either the Republican caucus or the Democratic caucus.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall now prove a point in connection with what I said in the conference the other day, namely, that if three Democrats get together, it is impossible to get two of them to agree with the third.

With all due deference, and with no personalities whatsoever being involved, I shall remain on the side of my good friend from Tennessee this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel that we can settle more party policy on this floor than in a million conferences.

Our friends on the other side—and I note the presence in the Chamber of my good friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL]—are supposed to be democratic in their way of thinking. They meet every day; but look at them.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope my friend is not referring to my facial expression. [Laughter].

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; nothing like that at all.

We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have housing legislation. We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have civil rights legislation. We are not going to determine in a party conference whether we are to have progressive legislation and liberal legislation. The only time I ever had an opportunity to vote on liberal legislation was when I entered a big fight with my good friends from the South on the fair employment labor practices bill. At that time I occupied the seat in this Chamber now occupied by my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I handled the legislation from my committee.

Party policy, so far as Democrats are concerned, will be determined here. Let us get to work and vote for the legislation by which we intend to make policy. To become irritated after listening to someone talk does not accomplish anything.

I repeat, that no party conference is going to bind me. I wish to find out what I am voting on, and not what the members of a party conference may think or say behind closed doors. I want the public to know the facts. I want the people of New Mexico to know how I stand and how I vote.

I, for one, am glad that the Senator from Tennessee is making the speech which he is delivering, even though I do not agree with him entirely.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that it is difficult for Democrats to get together. If I wished to live in perfect harmony with all members of my political party, I would join the Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. That would be a mistake.

Mr. GORE. But I do not want to be a Republican. I want to be a Democrat.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is one important difference between the original voting position of the able senior Senator from New Mexico, and that of the very able Senator from Tennessee. When the question was first discussed the other day at our Democratic conference the able Senator from New Mexico said he did not believe any caucuses were necessary, because Senators could come to the floor and do exactly what the Senator from Tennessee is doing. But the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators said no, or implied that they did not agree, but that we should have a caucus, and there discuss such questions. That is the basic difference. I was one of those who agreed to a great extent with the able Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. GORE. But the Senator did not vote that way.

Mr. SMATHERS. On the contrary, the Senator from Florida did vote that way. As a matter of fact, there was no vote, but the Senator from Florida was prepared to so vote.

The point is that when the issues which are considered in the caucus are eventually brought to the floor of the Senate for debate, we can then get up and speak our piece, and let the people know where we stand. And we do not have to be bound by any discussion in the caucus, but we have had the benefit of it.

The type of meeting which I envisioned at the caucus was a meeting to decide when to bring issues to the floor of the Senate, and the most strategic way to bring them up. There was no effort to close the door on any Senator. All that was involved in the conferences which some Senators wanted was getting together on a policy which most of us could follow, and then bringing the issue to the floor of the Senate, so that every Senator could speak his piece.

That is why I applaud the able Senator from New Mexico, because he is consistent in his position.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if my good friend will bear with me momentarily, in order to keep the record straight.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like Al Smith, I say, Let us look at the record.

This is not the first time that the question of a conference or policy committee has been discussed. Let me say to my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that I remember when we were in the minority, not so long ago. On February 4, 1953, we met behind closed doors in a minority conference of Senate Democrats. At that time my good friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is at present the majority leader, was then the minority leader.

He and I had a little colloquy, and I should like to quote from it:

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with all due deference to the minority leader, I, as one Senator, would like to find out from the President what his ideas are. I am willing to use my own judgment in trying to cooperate with him in his desire to carry out his ideas. However, the point I should like to make is that the decision of the minority policy committee is not the decision of the minority. After all, I do not want the minority policy committee to make a decision for me. I should like to use my own judgment.

After all, the President of the United States is entitled at least to a fair chance to try to carry out what I consider to be the mandate of the American people. However, I should like to ask the minority leader at this time if it is expected by him that what the policy committee decides is to be the decision of the minority Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the minority leader merely read to the Senate the statement which was adopted by the minority policy committee. He did not attempt to speak for any Member of the Senate other than the members of that committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know, but what——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator will read the statement and then assume the same position which the nine members of the committee assumed, well and good. If he does not care to do so, of course, the Senator may—and I know he will—express his own personal viewpoint.

In other words, the way I understood the minority leader's answer at the time was that he was expressing only the opinion of those who had met with him as members of the policy committee, and did not intend in any way, shape, or form to bind individual Members of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the RECORD to be clear that the minority leader at that time, the Senator from Texas, did not at any time try to contend that they represented the majority of the Senate, or that they wanted the majority to be bound by their decision.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I should like to make one further suggestion to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I was not one of those who originated the motion in the conference the other day for regular Democratic conferences. I was one of those who felt that we should not ignore the sentiment of so many of our colleagues who wished to have more Democratic get-togethers and discussions. I did not share the enthusiasm and hopes for party conferences which some of my colleagues expressed or felt. I thought, since they desired them, we should have some. However, I would not want in any respect to have the junior Senator from Florida take from me the privilege of discussing a public issue on the floor of the Senate, an issue which I have discussed many times heretofore on the floor of the Senate, just because I thought we should accede to the wishes of so many of our colleagues for some Democratic conferences.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from New Mexico in commending the Senator from Tennessee for taking the floor this afternoon. I am delighted that all of this is coming out in the open, not being leaked from behind closed doors supposedly clothing conferences or caucuses of Democratic Senators.

In that connection I should like to say that I was very much surprised to read in the paper this morning after last week's conference or caucus that there was literally a rebellion going on against the leadership on the Democratic side. It just was not so. I told the reporters who spoke to me about it that it was a harmonious meeting. One of the people who did the most to maintain a great degree of harmony was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. That is how I got into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right. I believe that caucuses are a waste of time. I believe we would lose more votes than we would probably gain, because stories will get out of the conferences which will overemphasize something of perhaps a somewhat spectacular nature, or contain only partial truth.

If we discuss issues in which we are interested, such as housing, aid to education, civil rights, and so forth, down here on the floor of the Senate, the newspaper people up there in the gallery will get an accurate report of what is said down here. I would hope that we would do our arguing and our quarreling and our debating out in the open.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee says—and I quote him—"This is the proper forum." I believe we will accomplish a great deal more here on the floor than in caucuses, from which stories are bound to be leaked. Those stories will contain half truths, and the result will be that the Democratic Party will be set against itself, and we will be furnishing fodder to the Republicans, who are sitting over there just laughing and enjoying themselves no end. I do not blame them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand——

Mr. GORE. I understood the Senator from Montana to say that in his opinion caucuses would do that, and not what the junior Senator from Tennessee said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that the Republican Party has been holding caucus after caucus during the last 5 or 6 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that they have been having luncheon after luncheon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And they have lost man after man because of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Democrats have been gaining Members in the Senate because of the responsible and constructive way we have conducted ourselves.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I understand that the Senator from South Carolina is suggesting that here is some type of undercover urging by the Senator from Tennessee that the holding of caucuses could

defeat more Senators on his side in the next election?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All I know is that as a result of caucuses held by the Senator's party, newspaper stories have been printed about Republican Senators fussing among themselves in the caucuses, and that some of the Senators who came up for election later were defeated for some cause or other.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for not more than thirty seconds for another statement.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. On that point I should like to say that I have been admonished by some of my fellow Republicans on this side of the aisle to be very careful about accepting any recommendation from the other side of the aisle as to how we can increase our membership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is good advice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say once again that I am not one of those who believes that frequent conferences of the Democratic Party will solve all our problems, or even, necessarily, develop a party policy. What I feel very strongly about is an effective, working Democratic policy committee performing the functions for which it was created. That is my concern. My concern is with an effective Democratic policy, perhaps above the necessity or the desire for having so many party conferences. That, I will say to the Senator from Montana, is my principal concern.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I go into my next topic, I should like to express the hope that, if we have a conference tomorrow, the members of the press will be in attendance, so that they can get a true and accurate story of what goes on, and not what is leaked out to them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee in his discussion has been very accurate in his historical background of the legislation and the proposals emanating from the Monroney-La Follette idea for the reorganization of Congress—as far as he goes.

However, I believe there is another point I should bring out, and that is that on January 2, 1947, the next year, there was a meeting of the Democratic caucus under the leadership of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. I now read from the minutes of the conference:

Senator Barkley then stated that the conference should discuss and determine the procedure to be followed in connection with committee assignments and questions relating to the steering committee and the minority policy committee, created by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress (1st Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1937).

Senator Barkley stressed the importance of the newly created policy committee—

Incidentally, I think the committee is misnamed—

stating that while, of course, it was necessary to work as closely as possible in cooperation with the majority, it would necessarily follow that the policy committee as a group would work in close association with the President.

A Democratic President.

Senator Barkley suggested that the conference first discuss the question of the minority committee assignments. Senator McKellar, of Tennessee—

The predecessor of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee—

stated that in his opinion the minority policy committee should be elected by the conference.

Mr. GORE. That shows that Tennesseans can be right twice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, but wrong when it comes to the votes.

Senator Barkley stated that the question of how membership on the policy committee should be filled would be taken up later in the meeting.

* * * * *

The conference then discussed the minority policy committee heretofore referred to, and Senator Barkley repeated his previous statements regarding the committee. Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, recalled the suggestion previously made by Senator McKellar that membership on the minority policy committee should be filled by election by the conference. Senator O'MAHONEY addressed the conference and submitted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of the conference be authorized to appoint the membership of the minority policy committee, provided for by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress, and that he is hereby named chairman of such committee."

The resolution offered by Senator O'MAHONEY was adopted by voice vote. (Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, voting in the negative.)

I thought the Democrats ought to know that, because that was done by the democratic action of the Democratic conference.

Mr. GORE. I do not think the record should be necessarily interpreted as indicating that there was only one vote in the negative. The usual custom is that, when there is a voice vote, no one's vote is recorded except when an individual says he wishes to be recorded either in the affirmative or the negative. I do not know whether on the voice vote in question there was only one negative vote, and the record does not say.

My esteemed predecessor, in my view, was right. He was a great Democrat, and he advocated democratic procedure within the Democratic Party. I am proud to be following in his footsteps in this particular regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee is just as distinguished in his own right as was Senator McKellar.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend from Montana.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding. I would be happy if I could have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana, in his remarks a few minutes ago, indicated that there had been leaks from the conference last week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Leaks which had given an improper indication of what took place at the meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington newspapers, the New York newspapers, the Philadelphia newspapers, and other Pennsylvania newspapers quite carefully. In my judgment, there was nothing in any of those news accounts which incorrectly reported what took place at the conference.

The majority leader, in my presence, was interviewed by reporters immediately after the conference. With his permission, I sat with him. The account which he gave of the conference was completely accurate. With his permission, I made a slight addition, which he thought was equally accurate. So far as I am concerned, there was nothing in any of the newspapers which gave the slightest reason for believing that anything had been done or said which could be construed as an attack upon the majority leader, either before the conference or afterward.

Neither do I think there was any reason to infer from any of the press accounts that there was a wide split in the Democratic Party which was causing difficulty.

I myself think—the junior Senator from Montana was there, and he will have his own view—that the conference was conducted in a mature, orderly manner; that everyone was in good humor; that there were no voices raised; and that there was just the kind of democratic discussion of important issues which, in my judgment, should take place far more frequently in the future than has been the case in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, it was a harmonious meeting.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I said. But did the Senator see what some of the newspapers said, did he read what the Washington Post said, that there was an indication that there was an uprising against the majority leader? But the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Baltimore Sun made no such statements.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington Post, and I saw nothing in the article which was inaccurate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator read the headlines? I read the article, too. But it is the headlines which attract attention to the news accounts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had intended to make one thing perfectly clear before I finished. I think now is the time to do it.

My motion in the Democratic conference does not arise out of any hostility to the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [LYNDON JOHNSON]. I have stated these views previously. He and I had a debate on this subject last year. My esteem for him as a Senator, as a man, and as a leader has been expressed on the floor many times, and in many other ways and many other places. I think the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, is the ablest Democrat who has served as Democratic leader in

the Senate in my lifetime. Should there be any further question? This is a matter of principle; it is a matter of party responsibility, party policy, and party performance. It is not a matter of personality. I would certainly resist any such interpretation being placed upon my efforts.

I wish to make one other point clear. I have no objection to the present membership of the Democratic policy committee. Each member is my personal friend; each is the object of my esteem and affection. My concern arises out of my desire to see the Democratic Party have a fairly effective way of formulating policy and announcing that policy to the country, and then letting each Member consider his own responsibility in voting. But let the rank and file of our party and the people of the country have a yardstick by which to measure any Senator's party loyalty.

Unless there is some sense of party responsibility, the workings of the two-party system will break down in its end goal, which is to give to the people clear-cut choices.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I was not in Washington at the time the discussions took place, which have been mentioned. All I know is what I have read in the newspapers, except what I have heard today. I should like to put a question to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I want to ask the Senator from Montana about the resolution passed in the 1947 Democratic conference. I think the Senator has read it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. How have the policy committees been appointed since 1947? Was it by virtue of some resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; by virtue of some resolution and by virtue of the fact that each majority leader appoints to any vacancy which may exist.

I point out that the present majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has appointed two members, and only two, of the present policy committee. One is the senior Democrat in this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the other is my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. In the latter respect, I believe I am correct—and I observe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on the floor; he can correct me if I am in error—in stating that the majority leader went to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to former Senator Lehman, and other Senators, and asked whom they wanted to have named to the policy committee. If I am correct, it was on their recommendation to the leadership that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was placed on that committee. Am I correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is substantially true. My memory is not perfect, but I think that is substantially true.

Mr. CARROLL. At the time the resolution was passed, was the Democratic Party in the Senate the majority or the minority party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was the minority party. I think we had 43 Members, if I remember correctly. But the President was of the Democratic Party.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask a further question in regard to the caucus, about which I received notification only this morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The notice was sent out only on Saturday morning, on the initiative of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and before a letter—supposedly being sent—was received by the leader or anyone else; I refer to a letter asking that a conference or caucus be called.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the way the matter was reported by the press in Colorado.

I want to commend the leadership for calling the conference. After listening to the colloquy, I suppose we are discussing some of those questions at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say I think the Senator from Tennessee has performed a real public service by bringing out this matter on the floor. I hope that we Democrats never arrive at the point where we have to reach our decisions behind closed doors. Let us use this public forum, and thus let all the people know of our differences and how we reconcile them.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say that I agree with the Senator from Montana.

I have listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Montana. Certainly there is no dirty linen to be washed here. The Senator from Tennessee has said we are dealing with basic principle, and that is the question here. There is nothing to hide. But we should not be afraid to air or ventilate or fumigate if it becomes necessary. I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his purpose today to discuss broadening the membership of the policy committee.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and if possible to spur its functioning in accordance with the responsibilities and the purposes for which it was created.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, as I read the law and as the Senator from Tennessee has indicated, it contains nothing which states that a Democratic caucus cannot elect the members of the policy committee. But because of a resolution which was adopted by a Democratic conference some years ago, and which seems to be continuing in nature, some of us who were not here at that time are bound by its provisions.

Today our party is in a different position. It is no longer a minority party; it is now the majority party, and has a majority of almost 2 to 1. As some Member has said, since the resolution was agreed to, the population of the country has increased by 20 million persons. So far as I know, never before has our party had so large a majority.

Our own majority leadership talks about responsibility. Certainly we have responsibility—not only to the Nation, but also to the people who form the Democratic Party.

Is there any reason why intelligent men cannot sit down and discuss who they wish to have serve on the policy committee?

Mr. GORE. I know of none.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there now any reason why intelligent men cannot enter the caucus room, and invite there the newspaper reporters, if necessary, to talk about something which I believe is more fundamental than the membership of the policy committee—namely, the membership of the steering committee? This is the crux of the matter. Such decisions should not be made by only one man or by a small group of men. All of us have had sufficient experience to know that it is our job never to permit too much power to be placed in the hands of one man or in the hands of a small group of men. The essence of democracy is the diffusion of such power; and the way to diffuse it properly is to have democratic representation, by means of voting. The Senator from Tennessee knows that to be true.

In the House of Representatives, where I formerly served, I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. The Democratic members of that committee were selected by the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, not by only one person. I do not know how the Republican members of that committee were selected; but the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had to run for that office. In those days, there were approximately 200 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives; and the procedure followed was to have them vote on candidates for the important Ways and Means Committee. They acted and proceeded through the Committee on Committees, which had the power to appoint the members of the other committees. The members of the Committee on Committees represented various zones. I remember that, because in those days I represented Colorado, Missouri, and, I believe, New Mexico.

I believe we can discuss this matter further in our meeting tomorrow. The discussion we have had here today is certainly in no way a reflection on the conduct of the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Certainly I have not intended it to be.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Tennessee has said so clearly.

We have nothing to hide. Why cannot we open up this matter to the public? Certainly the Senator from Montana is 100 percent correct. We do not have to hide anything when we discuss party issues and party measures.

No skullduggery is involved in connection with these problems; but if there were some, it should be brought out into the open.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, we are United States Senators, and we did not come here to bow before any-

one. If we have to fight over such matters, we will fight, if that is necessary.

Mr. GORE. And multiply.

Mr. CARROLL. I had not heard about this matter before today.

I commend the majority leader for calling the conference tomorrow; and at the conference tomorrow, if it is not feasible immediately to hold elections, it should be feasible immediately to broaden the base of the policy committee; and after we broaden its base and have more chance to express our views, then we ought to move into the next phase, which is to determine how elections ought to be made to the steering committee.

I have a basic interest in that matter; I refer, not to the membership of the policy committee, but to the membership of the steering committee and how its members are selected. This issue goes to the central power of the political body.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I had finished, and I am prepared to take my seat, unless the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee for his masterful presentation, and I desire to ask him several questions about his position.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically agree with the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee. However, I wish to ask several questions in regard to the way he has presented his position.

I take it that his purpose is to arrive at an orderly, systematic method of formulating Democratic policy. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is very correct. Unless we have some guidelines by which the standing committees can operate, some guidelines for individual members, we have to "play by ear"; and in that event I fear that the rendition will not be a very harmonious one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the second place, the Senator from Tennessee is urging that the policy be formulated in such a way that, as he has stated the matter, there can be a greater sense of party responsibility on the part of all the Democratic Members of this body, and a better understanding of what our party stands for and what it seeks to do.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee has brought out most effectively, in the course of his colloquy with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the point that, first of all, we Democratic Senators do not know what the party policy is; and, in the second place, he has pointed out that the policy of the Democratic Party should be arrived at by some representative procedure, that is, by persons who represent us. He also emphasized that the policy should be formulated, not for our direction, but for our information and guidance.

Mr. GORE. And I want to be the first—well, not actually the first, because all Members who have spoken on this subject have proclaimed their independence and their reservation of the right to vote as they please. That I will do, but I want to have formulated a legislative policy of the Democratic Party. That legislative policy cannot be formulated by the advisory committee to Mr. Paul Butler. It cannot be formulated by Mr. Butler. He has not been chosen by the ballots of the people. Here in the Congress, where the Democratic Party has a two-thirds majority of the House and the Senate, chosen by the people as Members of the two bodies and as representatives of the Democratic Party, we have the most responsible spokesmen and officials of our party on the national level. Surely this group can devise some way of formulating a policy for the party, within the legislative branch. That is what I am pleading for. I think it is necessary. Without that, the vision of the Democratic Party is blurred; without that, and with one compromise after another, we would stand before the country as a party with an indistinct position.

For instance, I favor the passage of one housing bill. After careful consideration of the views of the President, the views of the Federal officials, the views of each member of the Democratic Party, the views of my constituents, and the views of the industry involved, and after having carefully determined the provisions of a housing bill supported by the Democratic Party, I favor sending it to President Eisenhower, and then letting him determine, for himself, whether he will veto it or whether he will sign it into law. I would not "weasel" one time after another until we stood for nothing except compromise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Tennessee is reflecting, vigorously and properly, I think, on the recommendation which was contained in the Monroney-La Follette report, as follows:

> These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

I should like to say further that the distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], as the spokesman for the leadership, has asked us—and I am sure he did not mean this to be a definitive answer—why we do not arrive at decisions like this on the floor of the Senate. I presume he believes the conference is no way to arrive at them. He was not asked his opinion, so it is not fair to imply he feels we could arrive at such decisions on the floor of the Senate, in contradistinction to the policy committee.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he thinks we can arrive at a party decision on the basis of this discussion on the floor today?

Mr. GORE. I hope the discussion will contribute to that end.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps I mistook the implication of the Senator from Wisconsin. I was not speaking for the leadership; I was speaking in my own capacity as a Senator from Montana, as I could speak only in that capacity, and as I always will. So far as getting anything accomplished in caucuses is concerned, it is my considered judgment that less will be accomplished in a caucus than will be accomplished in the open and through having a discussion in the forum where the ideas of Senators may be made known to the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the junior Senator from Wisconsin made it emphatically clear last year on at least three occasions that he believed it was desirable to come to the floor of the Senate and speak one's convictions on these matters, but I did not say this was exclusive in any sense. I think the Senator from Tennessee is eminently correct in carrying the public's business to the people through their forum. I think it is also correct, however, as some of us contend, that these decisions—I repeat, decisions of Democratic Senators can only be made in conference of Democratic Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that it is correct to bring these matters to the floor of the Senate, which is what we have been doing for many years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right, but I do not see why that excludes our deciding that and other matters in conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not do so at all, but to be perfectly frank, in my opinion, the name "policy" does not apply to that committee. It is a misnomer. The closest parallel one can give is the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives, which acts as a traffic cop on all kinds of vital and necessary legislation. But I challenge anyone to point to one piece of legislation which was held up by the policy committee, at least in the past 7 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. I think this is a point the Senator from Tennessee has made very well. The name "policy committee" is a misnomer. It is not a policy committee. It performs a very important function, but it is not the policy committee of the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee is calling this matter to our attention, and what we are trying to do is infuse responsibility and policymaking authority into the policy committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate wants that, it can set up a policy committee and define its functions.

Mr. GORE. It has done so. I think the policy committee ought to be more than a traffic-control body. I want it to operate as it was intended. I want it to perform the functions for which, according to the record, it was created.

A part of its functions may well be to advise the majority leader in the scheduling of bills; but its functions are, or were intended to be, far broader than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a veteran of more than 20 years' service, and of really distinguished service, in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He knows where policy is made. It is made in the legislative committees and is determined by a majority of the members of the committees. The policy committee, so-called, cannot go against the wishes of the legislative committees. All the policy committee can do is to expedite legislation, and we have done so very effectively. Again I say I do not know what further this committee can do. But if the Senator is interested in creating a bona fide policy committee, that can be done by majority vote of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. At the risk of repeating comments I have made earlier, I suggest that the able junior Senator from Montana read the recommendations of the Monroney-La Follette committee, because I think there it was envisioned that this policy committee would be selected by the Democratic Senators and that it would be a smaller group, a working group, to confer with all Senators, to meet with the caucus from time to time, but to formulate what in its opinion, after careful consideration, was the proper legislative position for the Democratic Party. Then each standing committee could be advised thereof. It was envisioned that this policy, once formulated, would be proclaimed to the world, to the Senate, in the Journal, and in the records of the Senate. Then each committee, each subcommittee, each individual Senator could perform its or his duties in the light of this promulgated policy.

As it is now, as it was last year, we dealt with the interest rate problem in one way in veterans' housing legislation and in another way in the other housing bill, and in a still different way in proposed legislation from the Senate Finance Committee, all without any determination of party policy on this very important question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was there discrepancy insofar as interest rates were concerned in the passage of legislation affecting housing, veterans, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So how could we formulate a policy——

Mr. GORE. We raised interest rates on veterans' housing, and refused to do so on long-term Government bonds. We gave way piecemeal, but not wholly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There were differences.

Mr GORE. But we still have no policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To get back to the position which was adopted in the Monroney-La Follette report, it states:

> For maintenance of a staff * * * consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed—

And so forth.

I can repeat that policy is made in the regular legislative committees. Then their recommendations are brought to the so-called policy committee, which is really a rules committee, and our job is to expedite the legislation proposed whether or not we are in accord with it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is accurately describing the present procedure; I am undertaking to say we should proceed further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then we ought to have a new committee which would really be a policy committee. It is really the rules committee of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is not the purpose for which it was created.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say it has been so interpreted by Senate leaders from Mr. Barkley down.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I should like very much to yield the floor. I have been speaking a long while. But I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his courtesy. I should like to ask him two questions.

Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be that which was set forth in the Monroney-La Follette committee report and subsequently written into law in the appropriations bill about 10 years ago?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, if the Senator's view should prevail in the conference, it would be the duty of the policy committee to formulate overall legislative policy, with a staff to assist in the study of, analysis of, and research on problems involved in policy determination, and not merely to be a rules committee?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I am trying to follow, but I did not quite understand the last part of the statement.

Mr. CLARK. I merely read from the provisions of the act and asked the Senator whether he agreed that is what the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be, and he said he did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. My second point is this: I should like to associate myself with the view of the Senator from Colorado that the steering committee is almost as important as the policy committee, and that it, too, should be chosen by a majority of the members of the conference. This seems to me to be of substantial importance this year, but it will be of absolutely vital importance next year, when we hope to have a Democratic President, who will want to have his policy, in accord with our party's platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention in July, carried into effect by the Congress. I see no way of doing that through the democratic process unless both the Democratic policy committee and the Democratic steering committee are selected by the members of the Democratic Party in the Senate of the United States.

I should like to commend my friend from Tennessee for a very able and reasoned presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for raising this very important issue not merely on the floor of the Senate, but before the Nation. There are, probably, certain aspects of this question which can be best discussed inside a Democratic conference, but the general proposition which the Senator from Tennessee has developed, namely, that the policy committee should be the arm of the Senators of a given party and not the instrument of the leadership of that party, seems to me to be indisputably sound. I commend the Senator for presenting that point of view with great ability.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the remarks of my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a very few words?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the Senator from Tennessee. This has been a helpful discussion.

Especially I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], because he has contributed much wisdom to the discussion today.

Mr. GORE. I should like to thank the junior Senator from Montana, the whip, for his presence and for his participation. I am grateful for the presence of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and for the presence of other Senators.

I hope this has been a helpful discussion. The Democratic Party is our party. The operation of the two-party system is a necessary part of our democratic procedure. Perhaps from this discussion will come an improvement of it. I hope that will be true.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is one point I should like to make. I have learned one or two simple facts, which I had not known before. Our present majority leader did not establish this policy; it was established before he became the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was established by Mr. Barkley and the Democrats.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; but that was some years ago. At that time we had control of the executive branch of the Government, but were in the minority in the Congress.

There has now been a change in the situation. The distinguished junior Sen-

ator from Montana said that we all know from experience we cannot have a policy committee which can set definite standards. Why is that so? It is because we operate under the committee system. This is why I emphasize that the steering committee represents the crux of the problem.

Suppose I were to be chosen as a member of the policy committee. I could name many Senators who would be excellent candidates. But who is so wise that he could formulate a policy which could bind the Democratic Party? This is why the committee has limited powers.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has stated, matters would come to the committee, as is done in the House, and it would act more or less as a traffic cop. The majority leader has to have some leeway, so that he can sense when the body can move and when it should move. The policy committee must be a group which will cooperate.

The point the Senator from Tennessee makes is a good one. This being true, let us broaden the base. Why should we do that? There are 10 more Democratic Senators who have come from the West. They were not Senators when the Barkley resolution was adopted. The junior Senator from Montana in the interim period has been made the whip of the Democratic Party in this body.

We have heard many arguments which, in commonsense, should be agreed with. We ought to broaden the base of the policy committee. That ought to be done tomorrow, without any argument.

Secondly, but of more importance, we ought to establish a little larger group. We can call it, not a policy committee, but a steering committee. The committee would be a Democratic representation of 65 Senators, to help in committee appointments and to help in policy matters. There would be no criticism against the majority leader or against anybody else if we broadened the base of our operation.

I understand that is what the Senator from Tennessee has been talking about today. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for a very brilliant presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GRUENING and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, has the Senator from Tennessee yielded the floor?

Mr. GORE. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me for a minute and a half?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement at this point, where it will follow the very fine speech of the junior Senator from Tennessee, as it relates to it.

There seemed to develop in the course of the colloquy this afternoon a feeling that conferences might be unwise for a number of reasons. I subscribe to the view that there are very great difficulties in having successful conferences in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

As one who championed conferences last year I want to go on record as stating that I would be satisfied if we could develop a policy committee which was representative of all Democrats, a policy committee which would meet and determine policy and which would permit all Democrats to be present when it met and when it discussed the important legislative policies at which the committee decided it would like to arrive. I think that would provide the principal objective I was trying to obtain when I championed conferences last year.

Therefore, I think there is no real or substantial difference between the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee this afternoon and the position I have consistently taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alaska yield to the Chair for a moment?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it should be brought to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin that when proposed legislation is considered by the policy committee the Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation can appear before the policy committee.

Furthermore, during the past year and extending into this year there have been three additional members of the policy committee; namely, the members of the calendar committee, which is composed of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The Chair simply wanted to mention that fact.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is aware of that fact, and is aware of the fact that Senators are urged to appear before the committee if there is proposed legislation in which they are interested which is important in regard to policy. I am simply saying that if the policy committee became the kind of policy formulating body which it is not now but which the Senator from Tennessee suggested, and if all Senators could attend the meetings, it would serve the purpose of the caucus, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be glad to yield to either Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely desire to have two resolutions from the House of Representatives laid before the Senate, with respect to deceased Members.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am interested in one of those resolutions, Mr. President, but I should be happy to have my colleague offer a resolution first.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, OF IOWA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 402), as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
January 6, 1960.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BUSH, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 403) from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BOYLE, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 401) from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SEAWAY ROBBERY—A PLEA TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SUPPORT HIS OWN STAND AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the State of Alaska is now engaged in a fateful contest, which represents yet one more battle in a perennial war which it has long fought for the life of its economy. Our opponent in this struggle is a familiar one, one with which we have contended for many years. It is the conference of steamship lines on which Alaska depends for its existence, the most powerful member of which is the Alaska Steamship Co.

Since the passage of the Jones Act in 1920 the State of Alaska has been the victim of ever increasing costs of water transportation which, while stifling the economy of the former territory, have, at the same time, resulted in benefits to the dominant carrier which, I venture to say, are unparalleled in the experience of common carriers. Under the benign management of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors, which passes for regulation of water carriers, the Alaska Steamship Co. has obtained one increase in its rates after another. The last, an increase of 15 percent was granted in 1958. Now, less than 2 years after receiving this tribute from the consumers of Alaska, the same carrier, from the same agency, has obtained another increase of 10 percent, which became effective yesterday. So, in this short period of time the Alaska Steamship Co. has added 26.5 percent to the burden of unduly inflated transportation costs with which Alaska has long been afflicted.

For a long time, and increasingly in recent years, the people of Alaska have been victims of what I think can only be described as seaway robbery. It is a crime in which the policeman, the Federal Maritime Board, has more often than not helped point the gun and pick the pocket.

This is not the first time the scandal of seaway robbery of Alaskans in the form of exorbitant shipping rates has been brought to the attention of the Congress. Time and time again, committees of Congress and this entire body have been told, with documentation, that shipping rates to Alaska are the highest in the world, with the least justification. Time and time again the Congress has had explanations of the manner in which this situation has continued under the supervision, and indeed, with the aid of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies.

Once again, I call the attention of the Congress to the way in which the interest of the public has been flouted and completely disregarded by the arbitrary and capricious action of the only agency upon which Alaskans may rely for protection against unjust, unreasonable, and illegal freight rates of water carriers operating from the other States.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Alaska to say that freight rates to Alaska have increased by 36½ percent?

Mr. GRUENING. By 26½ percent within less than 2 years.

Mr. CHURCH. And that a further 10-percent increase has been granted without benefit of a hearing?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, without benefit of a hearing. It was granted yesterday, as I shall develop in a moment, despite the urgent plea of the Alaska delegation to withhold action until hearings could be held and the case of the people of Alaska demonstrated.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the distinguished Senator from Alaska not regard this action as highly inconsistent with the oft-stated position of the administration against inflation?

Mr. GRUENING. It is not merely inconsistent; it is absolutely contradictory; and, as I shall develop, it goes directly counter to the words which the President uttered in his state of the Union message. Almost simultaneously with the fine references to his policy to fight inflation as one would fight a fire in one's home, that policy was being violated by one of the executive agencies, all of whose members were appointed by the President.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator not agree that that is another flagrant example of the way this administration has been combating inflation with pious platitudes?

Mr. GRUENING. It is a perfect illustration of that contradiction.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I think he is rendering a great service to the people of Alaska by bringing this question to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope it is a service not only to the people of Alaska, but to the people of our entire Nation. I think it is highly important that we see the great disparity between the fine words which are uttered on high and the actions which are so completely contrary to the noble sentiments expressed.

In accordance with the law and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board the State of Alaska petitioned the Board that a hearing be held upon the issue of the proposed rate increase and that the 10-percent increase be suspended and not allowed to go into effect pending such a hearing and a final order of the Board. The petition cited, at length, the old familiar facts of monopolistic shipping practices of the carrier, the outrageously high price of shipping to Alaska, the need of Alaska for relief from such an intolerable burden, and the fact that the carrier would suffer no damage and would, in fact, retain its presently high earnings if the rates were not increased at all. It pointed out that the basis upon which the carrier has asked for this increase is unrealistic, cannot be substantiated, and is not an accurate reflection of the economics of the case. It pointed out that, contrary to the representations of the carrier, it can expect, as its current rates, not a decline in earnings in the coming year in Alaska, but, instead, a substantial increase in profits after taxes. In brief, the State made such a case it could under the circumstances, to show that the rate increase must be suspended at least until such time as the carrier would be required to come before the Board in public hearing and justify its position.

I remind the Senate that, at this stage of the proceeding, the State is limited to the most meager information concerning the financial status of the carrier. It does not have available the invaluable weapons of interrogation, of discovery, and of cross-examination which can be obtained only with the machinery of a public hearing under established rules of procedure.

As for the Federal Maritime Board, it has before it the bare statement of the carrier that it must add another 10 percent to its already astronomical rates. There has been no hearing, no examination of evidence, no interrogation and cross-examination of witnesses. In short, no process of factfinding at all.

And yet, without having had a hearing, without having given the State of Alaska, which is the most important party in interest in this matter, an opportunity to present its case, the Federal Maritime Board has issued an order by which it refuses to suspend the rate increase.

It has granted a hearing, yes. But to the people of Alaska this is small comfort. In fact, it is a farce. Even should the 10-percent increase be found exces-

sive as a result of the hearing, the people of Alaska are faced with an immediate and unjustified addition to the already scandalously high cost of living in the 49th State. Had the increase in rates been suspended for the 120-day period for which provision is made in the law, the people of the State of Alaska would have, at least, been saved from its inflationary effects for that length of time. They would have had an opportunity to put the Alaska Steamship Co. to its proof of the need for an increase. They would have had an opportunity to present their case and to challenge that of the carrier.

But this was not allowed Alaska.

Rather, the Board has already allowed the increased rate to go into effect.

In effect, the State of Alaska has lost this case.

Immediately, prices for commodities sold in Alaska will increase and the increase will come from the pockets of every member of the community. There is no way this can be recovered. The prices will not go down if the rate increase is disapproved, after hearing, in whole or in part. There may be a windfall to the shippers if the rate increase is not approved. But there is no possible way in which the citizens of Alaska, the consumers of Alaska, can recover.

They are in the position of one who has been made to serve a sentence in jail; and, even if later found innocent, have already served their time. Except, for Alaska, there is really no end to the effects of this failure to suspend the rates. The increased costs to the shippers occasioned by the higher rates will simply be passed on to the merchants who will pass them on to the consumer, with inevitable snowballing all along the way. The tragedy of this is that the individual Alaska consumer, on whom the full burden falls, has had no opportunity whatever to protest or to avoid effectively the consequences of the action of the Federal Maritime Board.

There is another aspect of this freight rate increase which is particularly unfortunate, distressing, and ironic. All of us listened attentively last Thursday in the Chamber of the other body when the President of the United States in his address on the state of the Union solicited our cooperation in the struggle to prevent inflation. To quote the President, "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

At that very moment, before the echoes of the President's words were stilled, one of the agencies of his administration was busy pouring fuel on the fire of inflation. The Federal Maritime Board, every member of which was appointed by this administration, was taking the most inflationary of actions and doing so without even looking at the evidence.

The President of the United States on Thursday described the inflation as "an opponent of so many guises that it is sometimes difficult to recognize." There is no difficulty involved in recognizing the direct inflationary effects of a general 10-percent increase on top of a 15-percent increase less than 2 years ago, in shipping costs to an area like Alaska which depends for its existence on ocean transportation.

Mr. President, if the State where this large increase fell were California, or Texas, or Massachusetts, there would be alternatives by which the citizens could in some measure adjust their operations so as to lessen its consequences. They could turn to other means of transportation. They could ship by railroad, or by motortruck. But in Alaska, except to a degree and to a limited area which make their effect immaterial, these means of transportation are nonexistent. Every man, woman, and child in Alaska depends on water transportation to a degree which is unknown in any other State except Hawaii. When water transportation rates go up, the cost of living goes up, immediately and for everyone.

The action of the Federal Maritime Board in permitting this 10-percent increase in Alaska freight rates to go into effect without a hearing is the most inflationary action which has been perpetrated in my part of the United States in the past year. In the preceding 12 months, the most inflationary action affecting Alaskans was the 15-percent freight rate increase of 1958. Both of these calamities were permitted, presided over, and even endorsed by a board appointed by the same President Eisenhower who has so often urged the rest of us to fight inflation. The President's fine sounding words will have a hollow ring throughout the 49th State whose entry into the Union in the very same message the President both hailed and saluted as one of our two new western stars. We wish his administration's actions would correspond with his fine words. Certainly the way in which the 10-percent increase which became effective yesterday was permitted without the necessity of any proof of need amounted to an open invitation to the carriers to do it again—and do it any time you like.

To demonstrate the effects of this action somewhat more graphically, let me tell you what this will mean in dollars and cents to Alaska, and to the steamship company.

Based on the company's own estimated projection of its 1960 revenues, the allowance of this 10-percent increase will result in an increase in its revenues of more than $1,600,000 this year. The State of Alaska, finding that the basis upon which the company's estimate is unrealistic, estimates that this increase to the company will amount to nearly $1,900,000. This increase, in conjunction with the 15-percent increase previously allowed, places a burden of some $4 million annually on the people of Alaska.

It fairly staggers the imagination, to say nothing of one's sense of justice and democratic government to think that this intolerable tax for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. was imposed upon the people of Alaska by a Federal agency without their having had the slightest opportunity to protest effectively. I say here that the Federal Maritime Board has acted in this instance without any regard whatever for the public interest. It has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, and with a cavalier disregard of the dismaying results of its action which is shocking.

I wish to emphasize that the law provides for suspension of such a rate increase for a maximum period of 120 days. The Federal Maritime Board could, in its discretion, have taken the action which I believe to be wise and proper, and could have suspended this increase long enough for the people of Alaska to make their case. It refused to do this when specifically requested to do so in the public interest.

It occurs to me that the reasons for such procedures and such decisions by this agency constitute a fitting subject for congressional investigation. The action of the Board was, to be sure, in accord with the procedures permitted by law. The aspect of the matter that is most troublesome is that, having the discretion to act in the public interest by suspending the rates, the Board instead acted only for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. There is, at this time, no way of determining the mechanics by which such action was taken. But I think we can all agree that the Congress cannot look with equanimity upon the spectacle of a public body, which ought to act in the interest of the public, taking action which favors only the interests of a steamship company, an action which it has taken again and again.

Now, had there been some overriding reason for the failure to suspend the rate increase, this action could be explained. But in this case there is none.

This is not the case of a poor, struggling company which, in the interests of the public, should be saved from starvation or bankruptcy. The Alaska Steamship Co. is not losing money. Quite the contrary.

According to the statement of the company itself it was not losing money in 1959. In fact, its own statement of profits after taxes, partially on a projected basis, shows that in 1959 it earned profits of some $99,617.

The company bases its need for an increase in rates on increases in costs which would cause losses if—and this is the most serious fallacy in its calculations—tonnage carried by the company in 1960 is at the same level as tonnage carried in 1959. Such a projection is without meaning.

As it happens, the year of 1959 was marred, in Alaska, by the occurrence of a prolonged carpenters' strike, which continued from June until September—the prime construction and business season in Alaska. Its effects there were more pervasive, and devasting, than were those of the recent steel strike on the Nation. Construction in Alaska, a major factor in the economy, was almost completely halted, thus depressing severely the economy of the State, and, consequently, diminishing the amount of tonnage carried to Alaska by the Alaska Steamship Co.

But, even in 1959, taking into account the depressed conditions flowing from the carpenters' strike, the Alaska Steamship Co. made money.

And in 1960 there is no likelihood whatever of the conditions which prevailed in 1959. In fact, all estimates for economic growth and development in 1960 indicate a more prosperous year by far than 1959. This will, inevitably, result in an increase in tonnage carried by the Alaska Steamship Co., consequently

an increase in its revenues despite rising costs.

However, we Alaskans do not want to prejudge the case. It may be that the increases will be found on examination to be justified. Certainly, if a way to justify them can be found, we may count on the Federal Maritime Board to do so. My remarks today go to another issue. It is the issue of rendering of a verdict before the evidence has been heard. Of this the regulatory agency in this instance is guilty.

The Federal Maritime Board has said, in answer to protests over its failure to suspend this rate increase, that its primary consideration in this action was the welfare of the carrier.

Mr. President, I submit that the welfare of the carrier has had quite enough attention. It is now time to give attention to the welfare of the public, something which this administration seldom does.

So that the President may not be wholly unaware of what is going on in his administration, the Alaska delegation to Congress, Senator BARTLETT, Congressman RIVERS, and myself have sent him the following telegram:

January 9, 1960.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

We are profoundly shocked that even as you delivered your state of the Union message, which included an urgent plea that "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home," the Federal Maritime Board, constituted wholly of appointees of your administration, has just poured gasoline on the fires of inflation, not merely imperiling but beginning to consume the homes of all Alaskans. The Board has granted a 10 percent increase in water freight rates immediately effective without a prior hearing requested by the State government of Alaska, its congressional delegation, and virtually every public body in the State, although the Board is permitted by law to suspend such increases for 120 days.

The burden which runs into several millions of dollars falls not only on the homes of Alaskans but also on the Federal Government which is likewise an important shipper. The implications of the Board's action are known to it because they were explicitly explained to it as late as Friday afternoon by the entire Alaska congressional delegation. It is wholly pertinent that in this very same message, where you so dramatically urged the fight on inflation, you also said: "Neither we nor any other free-world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance." We call upon you, therefore, respectfully to back up your words on inflation by performance and to request the Federal Maritime Board to rescind its order and suspend the rate increases ordered as of tomorrow, January 10—

This telegram having been sent on Saturday—

for the 120-day period permitted it by law and give Alaska an opportunity to present its case before being convicted and our whole economy drastically penalized by the fires of inflation.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.
E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator.
RALPH J. RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I think it will be interesting for the American public to see whether the President is willing, in view of his repeated and vigorous declarations against inflation, to join us in fighting the contemporaneous conflagration which imperils our homes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for an argument and presentation to which I believe there can be no successful rebuttal. I believe his logic is unassailable. As one who supported statehood for Alaska for a number of years, the junior Senator from Louisiana became convinced that the problems were so great and so varied, and the injustices to Alaskans so many in number, that it would be absolutely impossible ever to have these matters straightened out, with justice and fairness to all, unless Alaska was represented in the United States Congress by members who would fight for Alaska and point out the injustices which were being done.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska, not only for the work he is doing here today, but also for the work he has done in the past in writing books and articles and making speeches, explaining the great number of instances in which there has been unfair discrimination against Alaskans, contrary to the will of the great majority of the American people.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana, who has been helpful to us for many years in our fight to achieve equality. I appreciate his support this afternoon.

I point out to him what will be increasingly evident as the story of Alaska unfolds: That although Congress has granted Alaska statehood, and we have equality on paper, the economic consequences of 90 years of colonialism are still with us. This is a striking example. The same carrier which was given special privileges and a monopoly by congressional action 40 years ago still persists, to the detriment of Alaska, in seeking to extend its monopoly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I might offer a prediction, I believe that if Alaska continues to get the kind of able representation it has been receiving in Congress since it became a State, it will not take a great number of years to correct most of those practices.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the Senator from Alaska for his remarks on the floor today. I, too, have felt the effects of discriminatory freight rates. I well remember that in 1934, when I was elected Governor of South Carolina, I found to my utter disgust that the freight rates imposed against what was known as the South—anywhere below the Mason-Dixon line—were from 35 to 40 percent higher than the freight rates paid in the other areas of the United States. I found that to ship a box of shoes from Boston, Mass., to South Carolina cost from 35 to 40 percent more than to ship the same box of shoes from Boston to any other part of the country.

The Governors of the Southern States, at my suggestion, held a conference and began to work on the matter of freight rates. The result was a saving to the South of hundreds of millions of dollars in freight rates. That conference caused a saving of that much in freight rates.

The Senator from Alaska is to be commended for what he is doing, at the first sign of a move to increase freight rates on shipments to Alaska without a proper hearing being afforded before the courts.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I congratulate him on his leadership in freeing the South from the burdensome and unjust freight rates which had been imposed on that region of the country.

But I call his attention to the fact that, in addition to the extortionate maritime rates, a precisely similar situation exists with respect to rail rates. It may be of interest to the Senator from South Carolina to know, and for the Senate as a whole to know, that we in Alaska are charged more for the shipment of an article destined for Alaska over the same railroad than if the identical article is sent to any other place bordering on the Pacific. For instance, if a refrigerator is bought in Detroit and is destined for Fairbanks or any other city in Alaska, the freight rates on that article from Detroit are much higher than if the identical article were tagged for some place in Japan, Australia, the west coast of South America, or almost any other place in the Pacific. That is due to the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission, against which we have to date protested in vain. But we will continue our fight, stimulated by the experience of which the Senator from South Carolina has spoken concerning the fight by the South against similar unjust practices.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska upon his splendid speech. I have had the opportunity to study and read it as well as to hear a large part of it.

I think the Senator is eminently correct. There may be some kind of case for a 15-percent sales tax—that is what this really is—although I doubt it. It is a tax on virtually everything which Alaskans have to buy. All of us are proud of Alaska. We are proud that it is now a State. There is no question in the mind of anyone that as a State Alaska offers richer potential resources for development than any other part of the United States of America. Whether those resources will be developed or not depends to a very great extent on whether they can be made commercially attractive today. The great penalty and the great problem which the two Senators from Alaska understand so well is the very serious substantial transportation cost.

When the Federal Government raises freight rates, as the Senator from Alaska

says, within a very few hours of the time when the President made his strong speech against inflation, and imposes a 15-percent addition on the cost of the transportation of freight shipped to Alaska, there is no question that such action should be protested vigorously.

I think the Senator from Alaska deserves great credit for what he is doing.

Mr. GRUENING. We greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to ask him whether, in view of the fact that within 2 years the freight rates have been increased by 26½ percent, he knows of any other situation, anywhere under the flag, which justifies an increase of that proportion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly do not.

I think the last point which the Senator from Alaska made, namely, that it costs more to ship freight to Alaska than to any other point on the Pacific, points which are farther away, points which are not under the American flag, is a most telling point, one which is most shocking.

Above all, to put this increase into effect without a hearing is something which I simply cannot understand.

Mr. GRUENING. I call attention to the fact that the higher rates, the exorbitant rates, charged by the maritime cargo carrier, are particularly flagrant in that, as I pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], they are higher—sometimes as much as 140 percent higher—than the rates charged for precisely the same services involving the same type of articles shipped elsewhere in the United States.

It is hard to believe that if an Alaskan wishes to buy a certain article and if the shipping tag on the article shows that it is destined for Alaska, he has to pay up to 140 percent more, in certain cases, for shipping the article to Alaska, whereas if the article is marked for shipment to Australia or any other area in the Pacific, including even Communist China, if the article could go there, a lower rate is available.

That situation is protested by the General Services Administration, which is interested in saving the Government money.

Thus it is that the people of Alaska are confronted with a terrible dilemma.

Let me say that I greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin and the support of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to say, in conclusion, that in effect, the Maritime Board is imposing a tax on the people of Alaska. Actually, it is a rate increase; but in effect it is a discriminatory tax increase. It is most unfair; and I think the Senator from Alaska is eminently correct in protesting it as vigorously as he has.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject which has so properly engaged the attention of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I join the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in commending my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] for his speech, which very much needed to be made.

Mr. President, this is a story which I very much regret to have to tell in sequel to the remarks already made by my colleague from Alaska. It is a story about inflation. It is a story about administrative procedure in which the voice of the public has been stilled.

On December 10, 1959, the members of the Pacific Coast-Alaska Freight Conference, which operate as carriers by water between Pacific coast ports and Alaska, filed tariff supplements with the Federal Maritime Board. The tariff supplements called for a general freight rate increase of 10 percent in the Alaska trade. The carriers published the new schedules to become effective on January 10, 1960, 30 days after filing.

Responsible Alaskans expressed concern. Dedicated to the development of an area whose economic progress is vital to the well-being of our Nation, Alaskans saw in the proposed freight-rate increase a new threat to our efforts to check inflation and to promote the growth of the 49th State.

But the concern in Alaska, Mr. President, was not tantamount to panic. We Alaskans anticipated an adversary proceeding under the practices and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board. Governor Eagan, of Alaska, directed Alaska's attorney general, John Rader, to fly here to the Nation's Capital, and to act appropriately to protect the public interest. The resources of the people of Alaska were ready to be marshaled in the anti-inflation cause. Responsible Alaskans did not prejudge the rate demands of the carriers; but responsible Alaskans did look forward to a quasi-judicial proceeding in which these demands could be assessed after a hearing of all interested parties and after the presentation of evidence. To be sure, we were puzzled to note that the carriers predicted a 1960 freight volume no greater than the volume in the year just ended. As residents of a growing area of America, we realized that 1959 was an abnormally poor year in the history of the Alaska economy. Our construction was brought virtually to a standstill by a labor-management dispute. Our salmon pack reached a low point in its cycle. In fact, the salmon pack was the smallest on record. There was general agreement that the economic prospects for 1960 were bright. Some Alaskans, too, challenge the method by which the carriers calculated their rate base. But Alaskans anticipated that the reasonableness of the carriers' computations of their volume and of their rate base would be the subject of an impartial hearing before the Federal Maritime Board.

The expectations of the Alaska people followed reasonably from the previous practices of the Board on matters affecting the Alaska trade. We recalled, for example, that as recently as 1958, these carriers sought and obtained a 15-percent freight-rate increase. We remembered that the 1958 increase was granted after a hearing, and that no increase was imposed until the hearing was completed. With confidence in our State administration and the abilities of State experts, we looked ahead to the 1960 hearings in the belief that the interests of the Alaska consumers would be represented adequately and that the hearings would be fair to the people and fair to the carriers. Fairness to all concerned was our desire.

Moreover, Mr. President, the people of Alaska were heartened by the decision of the General Services Administration to participate as an ally of the State of Alaska in challenging the proposed new rate schedule. The General Services Administration agreed with us—who called upon the agency to participate—that the Government of the United States, as the principal shipper of goods to Alaska, has an important stake in the prevention of increased freight costs. All Americans are alerted to the dangers of inflation. We may as practical men disagree about some of the causes of inflation; but no one can dispute the fact that a 10-percent freight-rate increase will raise the cost of living and doing business in Alaska, not only for Alaskans, but for American taxpayers everywhere.

Mr. President, on January 5, the Alaska Senators and Representative sent a telegram to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board. Our telegram called for suspension of the proposed rate increase until full hearings could determine the reasonableness of the proposed new tariff. We warned that "The interests of the people of Alaska cannot be adequately protected in any other manner." Our request was consistent with the Board's previous procedure in its regulation of the Alaskan trade. Our request was consistent with the law and the regulations. Our request was consistent with commonsense concepts of fairplay.

I wish that I could advise the Senate, the President, and the people that our expectations were fulfilled and that our warning was heeded. Instead, I must report that the Board, on January 7, ordered the new rates to become effective on January 10, and directing an investigation of them sometime in the future.

So the new year begins with still more inflationary pressure upon the Federal budget, and, in particular, upon the Alaska householder, housewife, and businessman who suffered, only 2 years ago, at the instance of these carriers, a 15-percent rate increase.

The cost of moving goods by water to or from Alaska, then, has risen over 25 percent in 2 years. The people of Alaska are asked to absorb these increases without even having an opportunity to challenge their essentiality.

Mr. President, the imposition of the latest increase made a sad anniversary for my State, which on other counts might review its first year of statehood with satisfaction. Alaska has been handed an anniversary present it does not want, and cannot protest—an anniversary present whose effects cannot be undone.

Mr. President, I can hear already the contention that should the Board's future investigations prove the new tariff to be unwarranted, the Board will require the carriers to make refunds to the shippers of the money paid to meet the

higher rates. But, who, Mr. President, makes refunds to the housewife? Who keeps records to make whole the consumer in Alaska?

For such a procedure and such a ruling as the Board has issued, there ought to be some justification. Here is a procedure that allows a challenge of the higher rates only after they are imposed. Here is a procedure that promotes the inflation which all Americans are committed to resist. Here is a procedure that discourages the development of an area strategic in location, vital in its natural and human resources.

Mr. President, the Alaska delegation to Congress met with the three members of the Federal Maritime Board on Friday afternoon last. We expressed our shock and dismay. We called for justification.

Justification No. 1 was that the practice of allowing rate increases prior to hearings, even in situations in which challengers assert a public interest against the increase, is followed in other administrative agencies. Such an argument deserves little comment except to say that it indicates with what frequency the regulators—or some of them—are seeing the interests of the public and the interests of the regulated through the wrong end of the telescope.

Justification No. 2 was that the carriers in the Alaska trade are in such dire condition that to continue to perform until May 10, 1960, under the old schedule would be disastrous for the trade. May 10, of course, is the latest date, under the regulations, to which the Board could have suspended the imposition of the new tariff.

This conclusion, Mr. President, is unsupportable, unless the carriers have been so irresponsible, so imprudent, and so heedless of the public interest and the interest of their stockholders, that they have waited until the eleventh hour to file new tariffs to save themselves from economic disaster.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will not impose at any length on the time of the Senate, but I have been listening to the able addresses by both the senior Senator from Alaska and the junior Senator from Alaska.

It was my privilege and opportunity to serve in Alaska during much of World War II and to have visited Alaska on many occasions thereafter. If my recollection serves me correctly, very often when one asked why the price of so many necessities of life, such as food, lodging, medical services, and other essentials, was so grievously high in Alaska, almost invariably he would be told, "It's the freight rates." The distinguished Senators from Alaska have heard that comment on many more occasions than I have.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a common phrase used in Alaska.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Now there is to be a further justification for this phrase, to the extent of 25 percent.

It seems to me if this great frontier, which has just been granted statehood, is to prosper, something is going to have to be done about increased freight rates. Evidently this administration has decided that that something is for freight rates to go still higher.

I join my colleagues from Alaska in protesting against these ever-increasing freight rates and I shall be happy to join with them in any action which they think might possibly bring about a diminution of spiraling freight rates which can only make it more difficult for industry and business to succeed in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank my friend, the Senator from Oregon. I would say that there is something the Federal Maritime Board might do, instead of acceding, almost automatically, to every request for freight increase made by the carriers serving, if you please, not only Alaska, but Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is the most comparable situation to that which we have in Alaska.

I would say it is the duty of the Federal Maritime Board to evolve a plan for presentation to the Congress to take care of a shipping situation which differs so radically from that which we find in the foreign trade and that which we find in the intracoastal and intercoastal trade. But, to the best of my belief and knowledge, the Federal Maritime Board has given no consideration at all to solving this vexing and very real problem. Instead, it appears that the Federal Maritime Board is content to sit in its offices downtown and merely approve whatever rate increases are asked for by the carriers, whenever they are requested. The time has come, in my considered opinion, when this procedure will no longer do.

The people of Alaska cannot survive economically forever in a situation of this kind, which, in 2 years, has seen a freight rate increase of 25 percent. How is it expected that an economy can maintain its own, much less develop, under that sort of accelerated increase?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have some constituents in Oregon who are investing some of their capital, if I am not mistaken, in developing a sawmill and related forest industry in Wrangell.

Mr. BARTLETT. They are. We welcome them. They are doing a good job.

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are doing an excellent job. Increases in freight rates make it more difficult for those who invest their capital there to compete with the forest products industry elsewhere. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. That statement follows as a matter of course. Alaska is a State of great and many natural resources. From Alaska we obtain some raw materials fractional in amount compared with those available for use for the benefit of the Nation. But if production costs—and freight rates constitute a very considerable segment—continue to mount faster than they do else where, it is obvious we cannot expect to have new mines, new sawmills, new pulp mills. We will have to forget that to which we looked forward so confidently—an era immediately ahead of us of expanding economic growth. That era can still come if the Federal Government will see to it that freight rates are not exorbitant, and the Federal Maritime Board, as apparently is the case now, does not make every possible contribution toward an increase in those rates.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I conclude by emphasizing again that I wish to join with the Senators from Alaska in such action as they recommend in trying to remove from around the neck of Alaska this albatross of ever-increasing maritime freight rates.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I had noted a belief that it is scarcely likely the steamship companies did not know, before the date they filed tariffs for higher rates, that they might require increases. My view, rather, is that the carriers were prepared for a suspension of rates, in accordance with the Board's own precedents, and that they had planned far ahead of the present time. My view is based on what we are entitled to expect from management in a great industry. I note, too, that the leading carrier predicted a loss of $228,000 in 1960 if the new rates were not imposed. Even assuming that the loss for the first 120 days of 1960 would be one-third of this 1960 loss figure, and even assuming the accuracy of the loss figure itself, it is clear—by the computations of this carrier—that suspension of the rates for not longer than 4 months would have worked no irreparable hardship upon the industry. The procedure adopted, however, does cause irreparable harm to every Alaskan.

At the conference held on Friday between my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], Representative RIVERS, and myself on the one side and the members of the Federal Maritime Board on the other side, we invited the members of the Board to reconsider their decision and to suspend the imposition of the new tariffs until all of the facts could be heard. We were promised careful consideration and review of the matter. The Board members parted from us upon that assurance. Within minutes, Mr. President, a telephone message was left for us advising that the Board would adhere to the order of January 7.

Our request was rejected. As a matter of fact, I should note that this is only a rumor so far as I am concerned, to date, but it is a rumor which comes from a good source. The telephone call was made to the office of my colleague from Alaska. The members of the board did not have the courtesy to call me.

The promise of careful consideration and review was nothing more, clearly, than a retreat from an indignant Alaska public. The careful consideration and review—at most—became a quick nose count in a taxicab between the Senate Office Building and Maritime Board headquarters.

So, Mr. President, the first phase of the story has ended. The losers are the Alaska consumers, the American taxpayers, the soundness of administrative process, and, I might add, the justice of administrative process.

Let us resolve that in the second phase of this story we shall scrutinize the per-

sonnel, the practices, the procedures, and the policies of these agencies so that the public interest will be paramount, as it ought to be.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at a later date I intend to present for the RECORD the speech President Eisenhower made in Columbia, S.C., when he was running for the office of President of the United States. The speech he made there will show why I am making these few remarks at the present time.

Mr. President, the state of the Union message delivered by the President of the United States last week was a masterful political speech which leaves no doubt that although Mr. Eisenhower is President, he is also still general.

He was generally misleading. He generously dealt in generalities and he generally left out half the facts about nearly every general subject he spoke upon. I must say, however, his address was much clearer than some of his press conferences.

When the President spoke about the $290 billion debt, I could not help but think of the $30 billion that have been added to the national debt since Eisenhower became President. He did not say anything about that.

And I could not help but remember his campaign speeches of 1952 when he attacked the Democratic administration of that day for not having reduced the national debt, ignoring the fact that we had just finished a world war and were in the midst of fighting another war in Korea.

In 1952 the President promised to halt inflation, to reduce the national debt, to eliminate farm surpluses, and to maintain 90 to 100 percent of parity. He also promised to keep our defenses strong, and he promised practically everything else necessary to capture votes.

What is his record? In two terms he has failed completely not only to halt inflation, but even to do anything to try to stop it. He increased the national debt in each of the 7 years he has held office, and during this period has promoted other inflationary policies such as huge nonmilitary oversea spending and high interest rates. Mr. Eisenhower's administration has raised the national debt approximately $30 billion since it has been in office.

His tight money policies accompanied by high interest rates on all Government loans, both as lender and borrower, have resulted in runaway inflation. In his speech of general terms the President said he wanted a "freer hand" in debt management.

He spoke, as usual, in general terms. But what the President wants to do specifically, as we all know, is to increase interest rates even higher, thereby spiraling the cost of debt management higher, thus hiking the national debt. All this would be at the cost of the taxpayer, with the benefit reaped by the moneylenders.

Interest rates under Eisenhower's administration in many areas have more than doubled since he took office. If he succeeds in getting his "freer hand" in debt management, I predict interest rates will go higher and inflation will run away with some more of the public's pocketbook before he leaves office.

I am afraid the big economic boom for 1960 that economists are talking about will be confined to inflation and interest rates, and will not include take-home pay for working people if Eisenhower has his way this year on fiscal matters as he has had for the past 7 years.

The administration's handling of farm problems has not varied during its 7 years in office. The President has been a rubberstamp for Mr. Benson, who has promoted programs which have done nothing for the farmers except to lower their net income and to raise their debts. Instead of keeping his promise to maintain high parity, the President bowed on every occasion to Mr. Benson's various jack-leg farm proposals. In doing so, the President knocked the props out from under nearly every program in the books. This shotgun approach to farm problems succeeded in skyrocketing the amounts of surpluses in Government warehouses and the costs of maintaining them.

While he has reduced parity to the lowest possible point on every basic farm program in existence except tobacco, which he could not touch because of the way the law was written, he has allowed the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain the parity for wool at roughly 110 percent throughout his tenure of office. Of course, the people grow wool out where Mr. Benson comes from.

Moreover, the administration closed warehouses in many parts of the country that were storing food surpluses at reasonable prices and shifted the storage to more costly warehouses. Storage costs have skyrocketed under Mr. Benson. Under Eisenhower's farm programs the cost of all farm programs to the Government, including salaries, storage of surpluses, giveaway programs, and everything else amounted to more than $7 billion in 1959 alone.

Under President Truman, in 1951, the last year before he left office, all these farm programs cost less than $700 million, or only one-tenth of what they cost under Benson and Eisenhower last year.

In all of Mr. Truman's administration, all farm programs cost approximately $14 billion, while under Alibi Ike's administration the farm programs have cost roughly $40 billion. At least under Mr. Truman's administration the farmer was getting 90 percent of parity for his products and could pay his taxes and bills and feed his family. Under Ike the farmers cannot even hold onto their land, much less make a living. Farm incomes have, and still are, steadily dropping, while costs of operation continue to rise, along with what the housewife has to pay for what the farmer grows. I, for one, want no more of the so-called realistic approaches to the farm problems that Eisenhower spoke of in his address on the state of the Union.

His economies are a big farce. His military glitter is not much better than sequins sprinkled on gummy paper, and his budgeting program is about as sound as a hollow log.

The President's boastings concerning our military missile accomplishments are about as astonishing to responsible thinking people who know the facts as will be the firing of an atomic bomb by France or the invention of a submachine gun by lower Slobovia. It is good that we have developed what we have, but it is a tragedy in our history the way we lag.

I have nothing personal against the President of the United States. I recognize the fact that his job is a most difficult one to perform. But I cannot sit complacently by and let Mr. Eisenhower's high-fidelity speeches send us all into a dream world while the realities of life go by.

It is impossible for me to be as optimistic about the future on every score as the President, and I refuse to accept his state of the Union message as any realistic picture of our situation in the world today. For the welfare of our Nation I hope the President himself knows all the facts that he left out of his half-factual state of the Union message.

Mr. President, there is one final thought that I would like to get over. The President predicts that in 1961 the Nation will have a surplus of more than $4 billion in the Treasury.

In making up this surplus, he will reduce no wartime taxes. He will also ask for additional taxes, in order to produce a surplus. I doubt whether the Congress will grant them. Very likely a request for supplemental appropriations will be made in a very few months, amounting to probably $1 or $2 billion.

The same thing will be true in 1961. I ask Senators to watch that prediction, and see if it is not borne out.

There will be an election between now and 1961, and I presume that there will be a partisan Republican like Mr. Eisenhower running for presidential office this fall. To predict this surplus on paper is good politics, but before we count our chickens, let us wait for the old eggs to hatch.

If President Eisenhower succeeds in raising the interest rates on money borrowed by this country and fails to do anything to halt inflation, I fear that the surplus of eggs he has glowingly predicted will hatch to be nothing but higher debt ceilings, bigger national debts and similar creatures he has been laying and hatching for us for the past 7 years.

The total interest paid today on money borrowed by this country is approximately $9½ billion. The amount of interest paid has been approximately doubled since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office.

Again I say that I do not share the President's delight over his record of the past 7 years nor his optimistic glowing over the future of his last year in office.

SPECIAL SENATE SHOWING OF THE MOTION PICTURE "ON THE BEACH"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I know it is impertinent for a Republican to comment on the matter which has occupied the attention of many of my colleagues this afternoon, the question of Democratic policy meetings. However, I should like to suggest, after sitting here for most of the afternoon, that I am in favor of more of them, because if they are held during the session of the Senate, there will be time for a Republican to be recognized before a quarter to 6 in the evening.

The failure to get timely recognition bothers me a little tonight, because the subject on which I wish to speak had a kind of deadline at 5 o'clock.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because his remarks may be very important.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the Senator from Alaska will not go through with that suggestion, because the effect of it would be to delay me another 20 minutes before I would have an opportunity to make the remarks I should like to make.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] had thoughtfully arranged for a special showing today at 5 p.m. of the motion picture "On the Beach," for Senators and members of their staffs. I hope that many Members of the Senate were able to take advantage of this opportunity to view a motion picture which is both interesting and thought provoking.

However, I should like to sound a note of warning. I think this film could do a great deal of harm. In my opinion it paints a distorted picture of what a nuclear war would probably be like, and I believe it is important that those who see it should accept it for what it is—an imaginative piece of science fiction, a fantasy, and not a dramatization of what would probably happen in the event of nuclear war.

Let me make two things crystal clear at this point.

First, I do not minimize the wholesale destruction which is implicit in an all-out nuclear attack. The loss of life and property would far surpass anything the world has ever seen, and the prevention of such a holocaust is the biggest job facing the diplomats of the world today.

Second, I do not criticize the motion picture on dramatic or esthetic grounds, and I do not challenge the right of the author to create any fictional situation, however unrealistic it might be, for dramatic purposes. But I think it should be made clear that the situation, as well as the plot, is fictional.

As most Senators know, the situation involves the contamination of the atmosphere by radioactivity, which engulfs the earth over a period of months, wiping out all human life.

In fairness to the author of "On the Beach," Mr. Neville Shute, let me say at this point that I believe the novel made it clear that this situation did not result from the kind of nuclear war which might be fought with existing nuclear weapons, but that it could result from what we might call a technological breakthrough, which made it possible for cheap atomic bombs to be made by the thousands, so that even the tiniest countries had large supplies, including bombs of far greater radioactivity than those we now have.

The picture does not make this point clear. It creates the impression that a major nuclear war, if there should be one in the near future, would be the sort depicted. It does not go into the "ifs, ands, and buts" which are prerequisite to that situation.

To take this kind of motion picture literally is to invite catastrophe. If we assume, as the picture does, that civil defense measures are completely worthless, as they would be in the fictional situation of "On the Beach," we will make no effort to take cover, to protect ourselves from fallout, to resist the attack as best we can. And if an enemy knows we have that attitude, he will be that much more likely to attack.

In some respects, this situation is reminiscent of the "Invasion From Mars" staged by Orson Welles two decades ago. In that case, as in this, a conceivable but highly unlikely situation was accepted as fact by many Americans. In that case, however, the error was easily corrected; in this case, it is very difficult to set the record straight.

Let me reiterate that I am not saying that nuclear war is as remote a possibility as an invasion from Mars. I am saying only that the kind of nuclear war contemplated in the movie, with a 5- to 20-year blanket of lethal fallout all over the globe, is at present in the realm of fantasy.

This is not merely a personal opinion. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have sat through many hearings on radioactive fallout, and just this morning I consulted with several radiation experts from the Atomic Energy Commission on this subject. I think there is no question about the premise of the movie being unrealistic.

God forbid that we shall ever witness the use of nuclear weapons in international conflict. But if, despite our best efforts, we should become involved in that kind of catastrophe, I hope—and I believe—that the human race will retain the will to live, the innate courage which keeps us going against seemingly insurmountable odds.

The black death, which took the lives of one-fourth of the people of Europe in the 14th Century, must have been just as frightening at that time as nuclear war is today—and it was just as deadly. The 25 percent of the population it killed compares roughly with the 30 percent we would probably lose in a heavy nuclear attack, if no one took cover. But unlike the medieval Europeans, we have the knowledge to reduce that 30 percent figure to 3 percent by taking proper precautions. And this, of course, is assuming the worst. Our real hope lies in finding some way to assure that there will never be a nuclear war.

So I hope that some of those who see this movie today will keep in mind that it is science fiction, and that the situation it assumes is not to be taken as one based on scientific fact.

The science in it is just as fictitious as its characters. Unless the picture is viewed against this background, it can only result in confusion, misunderstanding, and perhaps unjustified resignation to a seemingly inevitable doom.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a note which indicates that the picture which was shown at 5 o'clock, in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, will be shown again at 7:30 tonight. I think it is worthwhile for Members of Congress and their staffs to see the picture, if they approach it with the proper background. However, if they view it with the idea that it is a scientific presentation of the actual effects to be expected from an atomic attack, and if their reaction is the same as that of many of the characters in the picture, namely, complete resignation and acceptance of inevitable death, then the picture can have very serious effects.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolutions previously agreed to, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Richard M. Simpson, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, the memory of the late Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa, the memory of the late Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the memory of the late Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois, I move that Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Richard M. Simpson, the late Representative Steven V. Carter, the late Representative Alvin R. Bush, and the late Representative Charles A. Boyle, adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

Robert Bernerd Anderson, of New York, to be governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Robert Cutler, of Massachusetts, to be an executive director of the Inter-American De-

velopment Bank for a term of 3 years and until his successor has been appointed.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, vice Robert D. Murphy, resigned.

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Livingston T. Merchant, elevated.

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany, vice David K. E. Bruce, resigned.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines, vice Charles E. Bohlen, reassigned.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea, vice Walter C. Dowling, reassigned.

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland, vice John D. Hickerson, reassigned.

William P. Snow, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma, vice Walter P. McConaughy, reassigned.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, vice Lester D. Mallory, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

Dennis A. FitzGerald, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1962, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Rufus H. Fitzgerald, term expired.

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense, vice Neil Hosler McElroy, resigned.

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., elevated.

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice W. J. McNeil, resigned.

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice James H. Douglas, elevated.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert Kramer, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William H. Webster, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Harry Richards, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

William K. Holt, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, for the middle district of Georgia, vice Billy E. Carlisle, resigned.

FOREIGN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Thomas W. S. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, vice Whitney Gilliland, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Robert A. Forsythe, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Elliot Lee Richardson, resigned.

Dr. Winchell McKendree Craig, of Minnesota, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Aims C. McGuinness, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John C. Meiszner, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., vice Frank Peska, resigned.

Harold W. Reeves, of Florida, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., vice Merrill D. White, term expired.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice Edson O. Sessions, resigned.

Bert B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice John M. McKibbin, elevated.

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice E. George Siedle, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Sigfrid B. Unander, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961, vice Ben H. Guill, resigned.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962, vice Louis J. Hector, resigned.

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1965.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms expiring August 3, 1963:

Dr. Theodore Robert Van Dellen, of Illinois.
Dr. Warner Lee Wells, of North Carolina.
Dr. Maynard Kiplinger Hine, of Indiana.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, vice Wendell B. Barnes, resigned.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Carroll C. Hincks, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

William H. Timbers, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice J. Joseph Smith, elevated.

Charles F. Paul, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Herbert S. Boreman, elevated.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Benjamin H. Littleton, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Joseph S. Bambacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for a term of 4 years, vice Lester S. Parsons, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

James H. Somers, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years, vice William B. Somers, deceased.

Robert E. Stockdale, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for a term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

Hobart K. McDowell, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo to be director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Horace Freeman Bigelow, O18775, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Albert Watson, 2d, O18105, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, O29844, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Hawn Brucker, O18793, U.S. Army.

Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812, U.S. Army.

Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, U.S. Army.

Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., O19109, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, U.S. Army.

Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, U.S. Army.

Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282, U.S. Army.

Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965, U.S. Army.

Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, U.S. Army.

Col. James Richard Winn, O19491, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, O30271, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, O15968, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the rank of general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clement Franklin St. John, O18258, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Breckinridge Duff, O18438, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Earle Fremont Cook, O18450, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert Barrett Skinner, O18917, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

Col. Russell McNellis, O18935, Veterinary Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3037:

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Clio Edwin Straight, O24337, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors

Tansey, Robert F., O27496.
Uhland, Herbert W., O85381.
Vann, John P., O38485.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Barrett, William T., O85289.
Beaulieu, Gary P., O85875.
Bickley, James B., O87476.
Bolt, Richard R., O85907.
Bready, Robert J., O75053.
Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., O85301.
Drummond, Louis A., O85414.
Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., O85161.
Finch, Arthur L., Jr., O87515.
Fisher, Paul D., O85535.
Gaines, Merrel E., O85543.
Gallagher, Joseph P., O86167.
Geczy, George, Jr., O86175.
Guba, Howard J., O85552.
Hampton, Emery W., O85760.
Harris, Robert W., O86230.
Higgins, George R., O85568.
Johnson, Donald K., O85776.
Klingbeil, Richard C., O85781.
Lemes, Ralph V., O87544.
Mason, Arthur W., O86467.
McMillan, Druery C., O84924.
Meyer, Clyde E., O85214.
Mills, Robert R., Jr., O87568.
Musial, Walter F., O85355.
Nash, Harold F., Jr., O86568.
Nelson, William J., O85794.
O'Connor, John H., O86585.
Pugh, John W., O86605.
Schiefer, Henry J., O85611.
Schmidt, Guy L., O86730.
Simons, Robert J., O87616.
Tamminen, David L., O85676.
Tuszynski, Andrew J., O86879.
Wallace, George C., O85690.
Walters, Charles O., O85691.
Yoos, Robert E., O86968.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bayne, Calvin, O85722.
Bryant, Robert J., O85946.
Casasanta, John J., O85736.
Clegg, George J., O87708.
Cornwall, Ralph W., O86014.
Heriot, Richard M., O86250.
Hull, Donald R., O86288.
La Luzerne, Ronald J., O85784.
Otterstedt, Charles C., Jr., O86601.
Pantalone, Julius D., O86605.
Pitts, William P., O86649.
Romero, Daniel J., O87600.
Shaw, Dale L., O86751.
Van Nus, Frederick, O86889.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Hanson, Carol L., N2865.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Daughtry, Barney A., O16902.

To be lieutenant colonel

Tapper, Gordon U., O52314.

To be captain

Carrig, Stephen J., O60378.

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Galloway, Marie S., N511.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Leonard, Margaret W., N212.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be second lieutenant

Krimmer, John A., O76314.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Gray, Stephen E., O28683, Infantry.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Roysden, Brunn W., O62867, Artillery.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade, and where applicable the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants

Allen, Charlie J.
Alley, Glen D.
Barton, David C.
Brennan, Robert G., Jr., O5308613.
Brooks, Lawrence E.
Chen, Robert.
Connor, George H., Jr., O5005052.
Dayhuff, Charles H., III.
Degner, Herbert L.
Durbin, Jerome A.
Evans, Kenneth A.
Gonzalez, Manuel.
Graham, Michael L.
Halbert, Edward, O5209558.
Hawkins, Cyril A., Jr.
Huntington, William L.
Langdale, Daniel T., O5308688.
LaSala, Robert J.
Lydum, Robert D.
Lee, George B.
Martin, Robert G.
McNeil, Charles B.
Miner, James F.
Miner, William H., O5508377.
Ouimet, William C., Jr.
Overby, Gordon J.
Pruitt, Fleming S., Jr.
Rabon, Jim D.
Riley, Donald A.
Robe, Edward S.
Robinson, Charles D.
Rydberg, Carl R., O5510076.
Shine, Joseph P., O5002878.
Smith, Wayne A.
Symons, John W., O5507754.
Tanner, Junius I.
Van Zee, James L., O5703881.
Weatherly, Emory D., Jr.
Weber, Bowman H.
Wesneski, Carl A.
Williams, Cary E.
Zutler, Gerald M.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Grider, Donald A., O5207991.
Howard, Vance F.
Opitz, Arthur C., Jr., O5510302.
Schlaak, James R.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Beganie, Henry R., O1054476.
Bowden, James A., O1284818.
Brice, Emmett T., O400663.
Brigden, Douglas A., O1036874.
Cahill, James P., O439258.
Enteles, Theodore L., O1035247.
Fields, Hampson H., O2034515.
Fluckiger, Fred, Jr., O1101439.
Gildersleeve, Robert E., O1314903.

Graham, Albert W., Jr., O1041352.
Harding, Claude D., O1636005.
Henry, James E., O1634878.
Hill, James A., O520069.
Hostetler, Jerome K., O1574260.
Kearns, Thomas C., O1110591.
Knuepfer, Dieter C., O1037106.
Konvicka, Henry H., O1330082.
McClain, John W., O1292378.
Minton, William, O1638092.
Moeller, William H., O1648612.
Puleo, Albert, O1638314.
Purkhiser, Harry R., O1100290.
Ramsburg, John H., O2018758.
Sadler, John F., Jr., O2037589.
Sanders, Leo F., O889061.
Sinko, William A., O1115417.
Smith, James R., O1185598.

To be captains

Abood, Edmond P., O993776.
Allred, James H., O977646.
Atwood, James P., O1924626.
Bludworth, Donald G., O2263191.
Boardman, Donald R., O422595.
Booth, James W., O2002747.
Bowman, James E., O2208729.
Bradley, Joseph S., Jr., O1919141.
Brambila, Robert M., Jr., O928865.
Clark, Donald T., O989771.
Cleveland, Edwin I., O1849761.
Cranford, Charles R., Jr., O2005162.
Dawson, George R., O1883024.
Desaulniers, John J., O1820959.
Doster, Robert W., O959314.
Duncan, Conrad L., O1893706.
Engle, John F., Jr., O1702264.
Ericsson, Eric A., O536172.
Finch, Edward B., Jr., O1924833.
Fiorelli, Michael C., O2018671.
Gallagher, Charles P., O2265061.
Galloway, Jesse M., O1877318.
Geiges, Elmer B., Jr., O2266073.
Gendron, Alvin J., O1913355.
Goosman, John F., O1917737.
Green, James E., Jr., O998174.
Gutzmann, Leslie E., O1684942.
Hall, Robert L., O1321180.
Haney, Leslie D., O968432.
Haygood, Jack L., O1341544.
Henry, Henry N., Jr., O2263770.
Hill, James F., O2204032.
Hoagland, Dale N., O2028376.
Hojnacki, William J., O1925635.
Hunt, Jim I., O85333.
Hyne, Merrel E., Jr., O2103327.
Jackson, Hal G., Jr., O1341432.
Jackson, Luther H., O1917846.
Jacobs, Norman P., O85334.
Johnson, Albert A., Jr., O959750.
Jones, Leon C., O1587348.
Kean, John J., O2011474.
Lamastus, Robert L., O1888289.
Langford, Richard J. E., Jr., O2021645.
Levy Walter, O2201220.
Little, Andrew E., O1885625.
Love, John A., O833357.
Maddox, Chesley B., Jr., O1935659.
Mancinelli, Thomas B., O984313.
Manross, Theodore D., O1889928.
Mattingly, Joseph G., Jr., O2033934.
McKee, Dewey E., O1918958.
Melcher, Ralph W., O1186906.
Miller, Lewis, O1640743.
Mojecki, John A., O1933685.
Monyhan, William J., O2200218.
Moore, Wallace D., O1935979.
Morton, Karl R., O1341114.
Myron, Harold L., O1648064.
Nickolls, Charles E., O1932098.
Nunnelee, Billy R., O2207862.
O'Brien, George F., O1876731.
O'Brien, James J., O1932406.
Okarski, Gerald M., O1935669.
Owens, Welvin B., O996042.
Pannier, Leon G., Jr., O88302.
Perkins, John R., O1702291.
Powell, Alfred J., O543947.
Rust, Henry W., Jr., O2021278.
Schumacher, David J., O87608.
Shimon, Walter W., O1593843.
Sieger, Norman J., O2096829.
Skipper, Powell H., O2090793.
Slocum, Robert D., O1934865.
Smith, Dane M., O1311062.
Snyder, Charles L., O2209172.
Sorg, Creighton D., O1877044.
Stahling, Joseph M., Jr., O2014556.
Sullivan, John L., O982283.
Sweet, Thomas G., O2208049.
Tate, Wallace L., O87635.
Thompson, Robert J. E., O1639728.
Threadgill, Frank G., O1920051.
Tilton, William S., O1110293.
Tubbleville, Billy C., O2014635.
Van Horn, Vannah E., O1699941.
Vorisek, Robert B., O2014747.
Watson, Robert G., O2206543.
Whatley, Wayne B., O87664.
Wheeler, Dougles E., O1875420.
Wild, Donald J., O1937306.
Woods, Jack C., O1186838.

To be first lieutenants

Abrahams, Edwin G., O4071197.
Abt, Irwin E., O4064578.
Adams, John E., O4006583.
Allen, Charles B., O4016275.
Allen, James H., Jr., O2264117.
Antkowiak, Robert S., O4036057.
Ault, William E., O4016119.
Barrere, Richard P., O4030717.
Barron, William T., O4012287.
Bell, Alexander D., O1940195.
Benoit, William R., O4030718.
Bernhardt, William R., O1917725.
Blascak, Donald W., O4069723.
Bowman, Joseph R., O4001557.
Brickwell, Wilbur D., O2288711.
Bryan, Richard L., O4068199.
Burton, Glenn E., O1888969.
Caprio, Daniel W., O4042789.
Cashman, James D., O1875339.
Cawley, John H., Jr., O4045000.
Chandler, John R., O4010448.
Chapman, Joseph M., O4059063.
Cheesborough, Richard S., O2295164.
Child, Paul W., Jr., O2287189.
Christensen, George F., O4049870.
Clark, Denzel L., O2003825.
Clark, Jon M., O4060087.
Clayberg, Richard P., O4050203.
Collins, Harry D., O4033169.
Collins, Howard L., O4009245.
Curran, Kenton W., O4056411.
DeRouen, Milton, Jr., O4023500.
Diener, Everett P., O4014114.
Dilday, Colbert L., O4043071.
Draper, Leo, O1941151.
Duffy, Henry A., O4076013.
Eberhard, Floyd, O1930279.
Erickson, Charles A., O4057964.
Eubanks, James M., O4006629.
Ewing, Leroy B., O2021024.
Fambrough, John A., O4049081.
Flynn, James J., O4052275.
Foradori, Harry L., O4006610.
Fritchman, Lynn V., O4017256.
Fronczak, Theodore J., O4015707.
Furney, Robert M., O2272292.
Gallagher, Robert J., O2021927.
Gallagher, Thomas M., O4009812.
Green, Robert E., Jr., O4069469.
Gregg, Dale P., O4043077.
Hallmark, Robert C., O4006733.
Handback, Henry C., O4083540.
Haney, Charles H., Jr., O2205857.
Hartman, Donald F., O4019327.
Heikkinen, Kenneth L., O4050121.
Hendricks, Thomas E., O4062568.
Herring, Shelby D., O4005681.
Hertz, Sanford G., O4069429.
Hoffmann, Theodore H., O4069357.
Holt, Bill V., O4076450.
Hubp, Frank, O4017002.
Jackson, James C., O4029291.
Jhung, Bryson, O4031317.
Johnson, William M., O1887999.
Jones, David W., O2203150.
Jones, Ronald A., O1926283.
Kay, Joseph V., O4006736.
King, Gregory N., O4010616.
Lacy, James F., O4012389.
Lauthers, David E., O4049708.
Leonard, Dan S., O4003631.
Lilley, Walter G., O4010702.
Liscinsky, Robert A., O4065889.
Long, Arthur W., O4030298.
Long, Kenneth D., O4059764.
Looney, Robert C., O4042117.
Mackey, William C., Jr., O1940600.
Magness, James L., O4026021.
Marini, James L., O1938058.
Martin, John R., O270406.
Martin, Quinton T., Jr., O4009524.
McGraw, John F., Jr., O4023955.
McGregor, Harold W., O4025659.
McKee, Kenneth J., O4009423.
Metzger, Ronald W., O4004091.
Miller, Leonard L., O4031242.
Miller, Richard D., O4010622.
Moore, Robert J., O4032512.
Moran, Hugh F., Jr., O4051398.
Morse, Guy P., O4051873.
Moulton, Rodney F., O4053064.
Nadworny, M. Joseph, O4006596.
Neal, Charles A., O1941061.
Neil, Arthur G., Jr., O4058663.
Nix, Eddie M., O1880539.
Noble, George E., O4045398.
Nork, William G., O4038860.
Norton, Albert L., O4013324.
O'Connor, James J., O4031983.
Okita, Harold K., Jr., O4004821.
Pack, Kenneth L., O2292185.
Paradiso, Richard A., O4065253.
Parks, Hugh W., O4048332.
Peden, Ronald L., O4071271.
Rexroad, William P., O4035438.
Plencner, Francis B., O4009635.
Price, Oscar G., Jr., O2264427.
Principe, Martin A., O4025749.
Pritchard, Donald H., O4070039.
Puig, Joseph P., Jr., O4048756.
Ragovis, George, O4043013.
Raymond, Henry J., O4041734.
Riviere, George L., O2030440.
Rodenhiser, Carl L., O1927349.
Sands, Clifton A., O4000689.
Saunders, LemRoy L., O4044987.
Schaefer, John R., O4001446.
Selig, Clyde P., O4074549.
Silvanic, George, O2268699.
Sisk, Isaac R., O4026292.
Snyder, James E., O4050487.
Sontag, Paul D., O1941173.
Stamper, James M., Jr., O4009923.
Starkey, James E., O4006221.
Stevenson, Joseph M., O1886937.
Sullivan, Andrew J., O4038219.
Swoboda, Edward A., O4041479.
Tanner, Lester W., O4009654.
Tenny, Roy L., O1931508.
Thaxton, Billy J., O4010999.
Thomas, Max E., O4017872.
Thomas, Richard W., Jr., O4031708.
Tobiasen, Richard D., O4057595.
Tomlin, James R., O4059235.
Top, John J., O4025602.
Treece, Ausby J., O4076189.
Vavra, George R., O1940982.
Waibbe, Leo C., Jr., O4036712.
Walter, Paul B., O4010186.
Watkins, Edward A., Jr., O4069104.
Wedemeier, Terry T., O4028368.
White, Harry S., Jr., O4069455.
Wilson, Charles E., O4025350.
Woodard, James O., O4058877.
Young, Lawrence B. H., Sr., O2275024.

To be second lieutenants

Abbuhl, Willmott, O5000215.
Adams, James G., O5700525.
Addy, Buford W., Jr., O5302450.
Adriaansen, Leslie I., O4066988.
Allen, William L., O5701181.
Ammons, David C., O5305931.
Anderson, Joseph M., O5305768.
Arcari, Joseph J., O4085751.
Arndt, Terrance L., O5505860.

Aylward, James J., Jr., O4085390.
Baker, John P., Jr., O5400135.
Barkett, John S., O5304948.
Beavers, Guy M., O1935614.
Beck, John A., O5702387.
Behnke, James E., O5304173.
Bennett, James C., O5405155.
Berry, William W., O1928172.
Bingham, Ellis D., O2289430.
Blankenship, Donald K., O4042227.
Boccard, Richard A., O4060284.
Bosway, Stephen G., O5203347.
Bowen, Guy P.
Bower, Duane M., O5507696.
Bowman, Roy R., O5701734.
Braa, Emery W., O4041851.
Brantley, John T., O5203271.
Braspenninckx, Harold J., O5503386.
Brassfield, Bobbie A., O5701047.
Brett, William J., O5000553.
Brock, Robert J., O5201498.
Brown, Elbert L., Jr., O5401597.
Bruck, Harold A., Jr., O5200797.
Brumbaugh, Larry W., O5503320.
Burke, Sib H., O4071320.
Burton, Dawson L., O5300117.
Campbell, Jerry K., O5401240.
Cancienne, Louis G., O4071996.
Carnahan, Ronald J., O5503447.
Catlett, Charles, O5201859.
Cauthen, Tommy E., O5302114.
Chapman, Ruthven H., RA18527787.
Chaudrue, Robert G., O5200992.
Chesak, Charles D., O5400596.
Clark, Dennis J., O5700989.
Clark, Donald P., O4036422.
Clark, Richard A., O5205313.
Clark, Richard M., O5000223.
Clary, William T., O5305244.
Cole, Leslie W., O5304939.
Cooney, Terrence P., O5304307.
Cox, Wallace R., O5401448.
Craig, Sammy W. II, O4042243.
Craighead, Clyde V., O5201924.
Cullins, Thomas E., O5503625.
Cunningham, James G., O4083204.
Daly, George M., O4034136.
Dalzell, Gary W., O5700329.
Davis, George C., O5402261.
Davis, Philip A., O5305345.
Dedman, Richard O., O5301595.
Dendtler, Robert B., O5204630.
Dennen, David W., O2289824.
Digh, Ned P., O5301745.
Dolby, John F., O5400380.
Drewett, George S., O5302984.
Duncan, Robert D., O5700300.
Dyer, Donald E., Jr., O4084905.
Erickson, Curtis C., O5503574.
Farley, Dennis S., O5506301.
Fassl, Laverene F., O4085639.
Faulkner, Gordon K., O5201411.
Flesher, Dale D., O5200767.
Florey, Richard R., O5503636.
Flynn, Thomas F. X., O5203040.
Fowler, Darrell V., O4085869.
Friend, Stephen G., O5503421.
Frink, Robert K., O5203408.
Gardella, John L., O5701846.
Geddings, Cecil C., Jr., O5302154.
Geiger, Arthur H., O4065943.
Gilbert, John C., O5204384.
Gilliam, Glen L., O5205462.
Goodchild, Gerald B., O4066289.
Gordon, Dudley J., O4031466.
Gosnell, Carlos D., O5202097.
Gray, David W., O4076047.
Gray, Harlen E., O4049167.
Gruber, Lee C., O5300528.
Guillory, Kenneth R., O5404902.
Haas, Gaylord P., Jr., O5505007.
Hackney, Edward C., O4009353.
Hall, John M., O5301862.
Hallmark, Billy J., O4072241.
Halverson, Jay G., O5503468.
Harwood, Michael S., O4077222.
Hittner, Leon B., O5701960.
Hodge, Charles D., O5201964.
Holland, Gerald R., O5405137.
Hollingsworth, Jerome L., O5502852.
Hovanec, Vincent J., O5002575.
Howard, Lee N., O5505486.
Hull, Arthur V., O54[illegible]798.
Hummel, Theodore W., O5504884.
Hunt, James W., Jr., O5304953.
Hurley, William P., Jr., O5206705.
Iaconis, Emil P., O4085980.
Iori, Richard A., O5700921.
Jackson, Raymond F., O5504544.
Jacobson, Walter R., O5001075.
Jankiewicz, Edward J., Jr., O5206707.
Jansen, Edward F., O2289823.
Jennings, Richard P., O5201513.
Keville, Clarence H., Jr., O4069211.
Killian, Howard J., Jr., O5000665.
Kinnison, Harlen W., O5202147.
Kondi, Albert J., O4084488.
Kuehn, Walter, Jr., O4085210.
Kuntz, George R., O5300184.
Kurtz, Robert W., O5503266.
Kwak, John J., Sr., O5300545.
Lacy, Paul J., O5402030.
Ladden, Richard M.
Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., O5401891.
LaMarche, Bertrand D., O5405290.
Lane, George H., Jr., O5302412.
Lanzillo, Eugene R., O4071702.
Lauby, Robert F., O5301986.
Lawn, William J., O5302951.
Lee, William E., Jr., O4076054.
Lide, Theodore A., Jr., O5300665.
Loker, Jon O., O5206285.
Long, Glenn W., O4075512.
Long, Melvin D., O5504731.
Longoria, Ezekiel, O5405224.
Louney, Patrick D., O5505842.
Lovell, Austin L., O5404951.
Lowe, James I., O5400183.
Lowry, Louis L., O5502619.
Lufburrow, Robert P., O5300965.
Luisi, Gerard H., O4067181.
MacLellan, John A., O5701056.
Maffett, Fletcher H., O5405035.
Maloney, Mark L., O5702618.
Marsella, Louis J., O406674.
Marshall, Wesley B.
Martin, Alfred L., Jr., O4061885.
Martin, Bruce A., O5401129.
Martin, Willard L., O5303257.
Mason, William B., O4010586.
McCloskey, William B., Jr., O5201493.
McGinnis, Michael J., O5302819.
McGivern, Parlan L., O4034165.
McHugh, Charles W., O5402867.
McInerney, Bernard M., O5206732.
McKenzie, Peter P., O5502966.
McKibben, Clifford F., O5200408.
McKenzie, George J., O5403501.
McMullan, Frank W., O5302715.
McWaters, John R., O5305914.
Meininger, Herbert N., O5504133.
Meister, Jerome F., O4085527.
Messineo, Joseph F., O5305478.
Mickelson, Roger W., O5505933.
Mitchell, Richard G., O5305154.
Mixter, Wilbur R., O4060476.
Moates, James T., Jr., O5302451.
Morgan, Jack E., O4063810.
Moriarty, Donald P., Jr., O5400187.
Morris, Dannie B., O5305205.
Morris, Ellis R., O5300299.
Murray, Lark R., O5402801.
Neely, Cecil N., O5304050.
Nichols, James M., Jr., O5303831.
Nilsson, John A., O5405209.
Olsen, Norman W., O5700398.
O'Neill, Charles F., O4014990.
Otto, James W., O5504361.
Parker, David M., O4020977.
Patterson, James L., O5405182.
Pearce, William E., O5411055.
Phelan, Arthur J., O4085437.
Poach, James R., III, O5001105.
Porter, Ronald E., O5200251.
Price, Robert D., O5303011.
Proeschel, Donald L., O5201035.
Radcliff, William A., O4075743.
Rambo, James E., O5400824.
Reagan, Jerry E., O2292210.
Reese, Thomas D., O5400362.
Resa, Philip E., O5701728.
Reynolds, James A., O4048129.
Richardson, Joseph B., O5305412.
Rider, Charles R., O5402704.
Roach, Armand D., Jr., O5506571.
Robinson, James B., O2288000.
Rooney, Lawrence A., O5203113.
Rorie, Forest G., O4071537.
Rosamond, John B., O5303649.
Rose, Rocco V., O4064447.
Sarbanes, Anthony S., O5205409.
Saunders, Richard G., O5303024.
Schroder, Romayne E., O5507546.
Schroeder, William M., O5702039.
Schuetze, Raymond A., Jr., O5401231.
Schultz, Gary E., O5503510.
Schultz, Norman O., O4085111.
Scott, Richard L., O5304153.
Searl, Peter H., O4085046.
Serna, Albert I., III, O5400437.
Shanahan, Edward J., Jr., O5702328.
Shearer, David L., O4017510.
Sheldon, William W., O5201358.
Shelton, James E., O5200928.
Sherwood, Donald L., O5701935.
Siderius, Robert R., O5405227.
Siegel, Eugene E., O5700991.
Siler, Samuel M., O5302206.
Sims, Charles O., III, O4076204.
Sisak, James C., O5200953.
Slocum, Neil R., O5506884.
Smith, Robert T., Jr., O5302101.
Smith, Robert W., O4052803.
Smith, William J., O5400843.
Smitherman, Joe V., O5401861.
Speicher, William F., O4071508.
Stamps, Doyle W., O5411157.
Stedman, Robert W., O5405267.
Surprise, Lyle G., O5504481.
Symons, Frederick E., O5201763.
Taylor, Alfred E., O5201700.
Taylor, Paul W., O5507554.
Taylor, Thomas W., O4048851.
Teasley, Harry N., Jr., O4070824.
Tebo, Robert J., O5206313.
Thomas, Charles R., O5505307.
Thomas, Robert H. B., O5206291.
Tomei, Giancarlo A., O5302669.
Totin, John R., O5000017.
Tudhope, Lawrence K., O5000207.
Turner, Peter J., O5702640.
Walker, Clifford M., Jr., O5305891.
Walsh, Richard J., O5000444.
Walton, Warren J., O5305746.
Ward, James J., O5502219.
Ward, Leonard M., Jr., O5303259.
Waring, Mowton L., Jr., O4047538.
Watkins, Thomas D., II, O5201912.
Wenthe, David H., O5503084.
Wesley, Clemon H., O5400417.
Westbrook, Tommy R., O5402195.
White, Jewel G., O4074762.
Widell, Carl A., Jr., O5302255.
Widmer, Edwin R., O5505049.
Wilson, John P., Jr., O5302138.
Wise, Paul E., O5203206.
Wizbowski, Walter L. P., O5201048.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Dental Corps

DiJoseph, Benjamin J., O1725596.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Pratt, Daniel W., O409089.
Runcik, Karel, O1938781.
Van Hoorn, Jacob Z., O4050911.
Wilson, William E., O339921.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Bryan, George R., O1547555.

To be major, Chaplain

Fiser, James H., O932724.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Cunningham, Dillard, N805293.
Grech, Anna A., N804991.

Rogers, Janet A., N805675.
Rothrock, Lois R., N805389.
Utt, Yvonne M., N804679.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bellerose, Gilbert A., O4039780.
Civjan, Simon, O976661.
Cote, Robert R., O4039821.
Cutright, Duane E., O2275909.
Deane, Clarence E., Jr., O1891409.
Guilford, Harold J., Jr., O2276997.
Hatchett, Robert K., O4069284.
Jensen, John G., Jr., O4050802.
Paul, William H., O2282502.
Peppe, Isadore O., O2200527.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Baughman, Charles H., O5407693.
Blakely, Lee A., Jr., AO3043100.
Busch, Edwin S., O2097338.
Cadigan, Francis C., O2288687.
Campbell, John J., O4071114.
Erickson, Darroll J., O5500033.
Finnerty, Paul E., O1875309.
Garrison, James M., Jr., O2202671.
Goodner, John W., O5301143.
Luttrull, John W., O5204049.
Munson, Wayne M., O2283406.
Newman, William R., O4064895.
Rank, William B., O4070963.
Roberts, Howard H., O5407569.
Schaefer, Glennon S., Jr., O5500115.
Snyder, Donald L., O5300559.
Swedenborg, Samuel W., O5701338.
Uhrig, Henry T., O2042052.
Wheby, Munsey S., O4068014.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Kershner, Edward C., O1933729.
Oestereich, Orlyn C., O2096839.
Wells, Robert J., O981665.

To be captains, Chaplain Corps

Christoph, Edward J., O2275879.
Miller, Alfred A., O979869.
Remark, Phillip B., O965432.
Siege, John C., O2273677.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Lara, William K., O1688636.
Movsesian, Anthony A., O2272583.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Bray, Lydia M., L1010074.
Niblack, Sarah F., L201642.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Dobbs, Eunice R., M3081.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Fess, Dorothy E., N804229.
Hanover, Gloria A., N901225.
Johnson, Ellen, N902661.
Joyner, Mary E., N901913.
Learned, Grace, N901907.
Littlefield, Jaclyn, N902336.
Nellis, Virginia M., N902294.
Reed, Della K., N805768.
Shoemaker, Vera E., N804842.
Supplee, Jeanne L., N900110.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Brunton, Donald A., Jr., O2298969.
L'Homme, Paul R., O4067424.
Swain, Marshall M., O2298908.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Agnew, Hall W., O2289689.
Ballard, Michael D.
Beck, William L., O2289695.
Bowman, John A., O5203180.
Bybee, Paul R., O2289785.
Collins, Delano M., O2298649.
Genest, Aloria S., O5301327.
Gilroy, Francis J., Jr., O4020403.
Hazlett, David R., O4029546.
Kahane, Stanley B.
Kolbert, Gerald S.
Kriz, Frank K., Jr., O2295078.
Levy, Joel V.
Massad, Louis B., O4032505.
Park, Robert C., O2291916.
Pating, Roger, O4003421.
Peterson, Richard B.
Reiss, Walter E., O2289712.
Sokoloff, Burton Z., O2291342.
Spaulding, Abbot G.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bourland, Gene M., O2277877.
Clark, Scott W., O4006878.
Hoen, Warren K., O2272280.
Lawrence, Frank P., O2272804.
Levy, Louis B., O4071307.
Liedtka, Frederick A., O4065685.
Stevens, Clarence O., O2296674.
Van Straten, James G. O4041617.
Van Wyck, William E., O1893380.
Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., O4078132.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Chandler, Harold K., O4070772.
Eckermann, Edgar H., O1941806.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Ambrose, George Jr., O2287008.
Brooks, Tommy C., O2288091.
Cook, Richard G., O4031909.
Degl, Joseph, Jr., O4055852.
Forrest, Alfred T., O4071146.
Garner, Calvin H., O2288104.
Graber, Howard M., O2292747.
Green, John E., O2287291.
Hartman, Richard W., O4014519.
Johnson, Charles M., O1888257.
Knowlton, Robert L., O2289435.
Kovacic, Francis, O2284334.
Lapp,, Ernest D., O2291874.
Logan, John D., O4045781.
Lyon, Wilson L., O2266823.
Magalee, John E., O2291949.
Martin, William A., O2277859.
McCloy, Charles H., Sr., O2275272.
Moss, Ira G., O2287039.
Nagata, William M., O2014595.
Ninedorf, Robert W., O5407853.
Nybro, Richard, O4039584.
O'Shea, Edward L., O2295026.
Polhemus, David W., O4018076.
Stanford, James A., O2287061.
Stover, Earl F., O2289466.
Swager, Robert G., O4055837.
Tate, David F., O2285535.
Tibbetts, Alan C., O2286804.
Trobaugh, William P., O2289746.
Wright, Wendell T., O4043693.
Yarbrough, Jimmie W., O2289265.
Young, Willis F., O4051144.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alford, John R., O5202043.
Alley, Wayne E., O1927603.
Davis, Bruce E., O4032219.
Drake, Walter H., O4058529.
Harvey, Alton H., O1926050.
Henson, Hugh E., Jr., O5005784.
Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., O5202068.
Lassiter, Edward A., O4058690.
Miller, Harold L., O4049009.
Miller, William T., Jr., O4026038.
Wells, Jerry E., O2296341.
Wold, Pedar C., O5505832.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Maybin, Patricia J., L1010823.

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hall, Mary S., M2291388.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Diener, Dolores E., N2293428.
Jones, Addie B. L., N2293993.
Michael, Marbeth G., N2293294.
Paulsen, Margaret J., N2297063.
Teele, Kathryn M., N2295081.
Tinklenberg, Esther J., N2291615.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Ashwood, Carl R., O2297880.
Barber, Leroy M., Jr., O4065526.
Belcher, Lillard F., O4005059.
Boston, Lester E., Jr., O2297511.
Braddock, Thomas E., O2298258.
Burkett, Samuel L., Jr., O5400103.
Carroll, William F., O5702981.
Clark, Robert C., Jr., O2296712.
Curtis, Michael R., O5508157.
Davis, John F., O5201274.
Eberwine, James A., O4047659.
Fields, Robert E., O2285197.
Fletcher, Oliver K., Jr., O2297364.
French, George R., O4052493.
Gilliland, Bobby E., O2297855.
Goodman, Dorris C., W3150352.
Hayes, James H., O5302088.
Heller, Kyle M., O5507158.
Hopkins, Richard L., O5203645.
Hucks, John A., O2290111.
Hudson, James F., O2283672.
Jessen, Gary C., O2298068.
Jones, Donn C., O5502527.
Keim, Walter H., O2297605.
Kelly, Peter C., O4033283.
Lander, Robert J., O5207097.
Lawson, James L., O2296108.
Litman, Leon H., O2295177.
Locklear, James P., O2296710.
Loring, Douglas M., O5504077.
McDermott, Frank E., O4060268.
McLeod, William R., O5504024.
McMahon, Robert P., O5504025.
McNulty, William J., Jr., O4051865.
Merritt, Thomas E., O2298269.
Murphy, Joseph H., Jr., O2294032.
Murphy, Robert J., O5402238.
Pacheco, Miguel, O4071266.
Picha, Norbert O., O5507642.
Powell, Harold W., O4072035.
Rockwell, John H., O2296250.
Rumley, Richard E., O5303231.
Scanlan, William H., O2297451.
Silvas, Manuel M., O5400624.
Sorem, David N., O2297218.
Stavish, Peter J., O1933295.
Tilmon, George W., Jr., O1894067.
Vann, Lawrence K., O5700750.
Walls, Neal H., O4048437.
Webb, Charles L., O5301816.
Wilburn, James H., O4070229.
Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., O4072036.
Wunder, William H., O5500454.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., L2287358.
Hallman, Jane L., L2293803.
Lipner, Lois, L5004360.
Nelson, Nancy L., L2297842.
Phillips, Charlotte E., L5004342.
Thornton, Dorothy J., L2297021.
von Metnitz, Carol, L2293800.

(NOTE.—These officers were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 86th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major, USAF (medical)

John S. Flint, AO3001359.

To be captain, USAF (medical)

Don T. Mosher.

To be captain, USAF (dental)

Patrick J. Mulligan.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (medical)

John W. Barrett, AO3078021.

To be captains, USAF (dental)

William J. Clark, AO3045259.
Robert G. Hutfliess, AO3045784.
Robert C. Johns, AO2261789.
Edward W. Rogers, AO3042518.

To be captains, USAF (chaplain)

Milton H. Allen, AO679010.
Ramon W. Blach, AO2253838.
Jefferson E. Davis, Jr., AO2255133.
Homer E. Gardiner, AO2072688.
Willis H. Newton, Jr., AO2261827.
Erwin R. Ray, AO709752.
Neil F. Wolfe, AO2255072.

To be captains, USAF (judge advocate)

Harold Howell, AO1865855.
Robert E. Johnson II, AO928335.
Hilleary D. Moore, AO2251284.

To be captains, USAF (veterinary)

Jerry Fineg, AO2261564.
Norman D. Heidelbaugh, AO3000951.
William L. Jones, Jr., AO3000899.
Robert M. McCully, AO3001710.
Albert D. Wright, AO2213774.

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Elvira C. Bakken, AN2244221.
Mary C. Warner, AN2244344.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Henry J. Schmitt, Jr., AO3079279.
R. J. Black Schultz, AO3075130.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Rufus C. Hargrove, Jr., AO3091985.
Wayne T. Harris, Jr., AO3077945.
Arthur F. Mello, AO3077151.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (chaplain)

Alfred J. Abernethy, AO3059581.
John J. Benda, AO3060502.
William G. Boggs, AO3059647.
Newton V. Cole, AO2235689.
Arthur L. Eves, AO2275862.
James E. Flinn, AO3060625.
William D. Franks, AO3075244.
Vancil V. Gibson, AO2255148.
Leo J. Lyons, AO3059735.
Vincent A. Meskenas, AO3059718.
Edward E. Shoupe, AO3059682.
Rufus G. Smith, AO3059714.
James R. Taylor, AO3059382.
William J. Vaughn, AO2251309.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (judge advocate)

Fred L. Bowden, AO3059969.
Maurice F. Ellison, Jr., AO3059941.
Jerome R. Isenberg, AO3010617.
Frank T. Moniz, AO3060312.
Roy A. Olson, AO3013634.
Julius C. Ullerich, Jr., AO3032492.
Joseph N. Wiltgen, AO3059899.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (veterinary)

Harold W. Casey, AO3078659.
Dean E. Ewing, AO3078832.
Charles E. Fuller, AO3000600.
Lea R. Hutchinson, AO3078770.
Charles C. King, Jr., AO3043368.
Joe E. West, AO3078282.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

James H. Auburn, Jr., AO3045093.
Robert A. Bauer, AO3056325.
John L. Bluhm, AO3043320.
Donald C. Choisser, AO3030999.
Horace A. Corley, AO2235975.
Phillip H. Darling, Jr., AO3030011.
William J. DeMuth, Jr., AO3011284.
Charles E. Deramus, Jr., AO2235858.
John L. Gildner, AO3049509.
Thomas J. Harn, AO3043362.
Richard L. Insley, AO3000141.
William G. Jacobsen, AO3000087.
Marvin E. Kennebeck, Jr., AO1930406.
Paul F. Kratzsch, AO3043383.
Adolph A. Lindsley, AO3008843.
Charles W. Martino, AO2262081.
Robert T. McIntyre, AO3008611.
John P. Meade, AO3050065.
Joseph C. Monk, AO3009207.
Curtis G. Park, AO3030728.
Albert Podkin, AO3000015.
Marvin Podkin, AO939255.
Jerry H. Schussele, AO2237018.
Daniel H. Seal, AO3000089.
Gordon R. Shaw, AO3002199.
Jack L. Shelton, AO2262065.
John A. Skinner, AO3000258.
Marion J. Stansell, AO3075317.
Herbert E. Straughn, AO3002346.
Bertram D. Targove, AO3075605.
Harold O. Walker, Jr., AO2248249.
James R. Wedding, AO3000251.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Josephine M. Candella, AN3076551.
Susie A. Florence, AN3075439.
Beatrice J. Hale, AN2243042.
Frances A. Hamilton, AN2243239.
Anna M. Kreasky, AN3078672.
Barbara L. Legalle, AN2242933.
Ruth A. McMurdo, AN2242463.
Elizabeth L. Park, AN2243363.
Loretta V. Petersen, AN2242500.
Dolores J. Scribner, AN2242740.
Carolyn M. Wagner, AN2243181.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical specialist)

Mary F. Golson, AM3043826.
Carolyn T. Page, AM3075734.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Gary L. Adams, AO3078665.
Rex D. Gaede, AO3051752.
John R. Gillis, AO1863568.
Wayne P. Kirchoffer, AO3088795.
John C. Kuchta, Jr., AO3078362.
Donald G. Silva, AO3073054.
Robert W. Suiter, AO3078396.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Delia F. Greer, AN3079309.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284, of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates

William D. Bryden, Jr., AO3102407.
James A. Dewey, AO3102494.
Fredric S. Fitzsimmons, AO3102360.
Philip W. Handley, AO3102496.
Reginald A. Hearn, AO3102327.
Robert A. Martin, AO3102277.
Richard E. Read, AO3102319.
Dwight E. Roach, AO3102341.
Ronald L. Selberg, AO3102384.
Belford M. Spurlock, AO3102329.
Alden R. Starkey, AO3102441.
Carl E. Steingrebe, Jr., AO3102345.
Joe T. Stockett, AO3102537.
Rodney A. Upton, AO3102293.
Bruce E. Wilcox, AO3102330.
Norman D. Wilson, AO3102312.

Distinguished officer candidate graduates

Donald P. Bahr, AO3101287.
Charlotte M. DePuy, AL3101944.
Harold E. Eaton, AO3101618.
Lawrence M. G. Enomoto, AO3101425.
Oscar W. Hall, AO3101823.
Robert W. Hultslander, AO3101840.
Allen J. Montecino, Jr., AO3101875.
Thomas E. Straight, AO3101904.
John B. Stueve, AO3101908.
Harry A. Thomas, Jr., AO3101912.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Harold C. Alger.
Thomas N. Arnold.
Albert H. Collins.
Troy G. Dobbins.
Gerald L. Fuller.
Wingate A. Jackson III, AO3095881.
William D. Jones, Jr., AO3098666.
Leon B. Newman.
Charles L. Rackley, AO3099045.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Manuel J. Asensio, 324A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, 592A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, 23161A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, second 5231, the following-named officer for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy.
Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.
*Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Ephraim P. Holmes	James M. Farrin, Jr.
John T. Hayward	George H. Wales
Vernon L. Lowrance	Edward J. O'Donnell
Charles C. Kirkpatrick	Andrew M. Jackson, Jr.
Alfred G. Ward	

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Kleber S. Masterson
Marshall E. Dornin
Robert L. Moore, Jr.
Frank L. Johnson
Lot Ensey
Denys W. Knoll
John W. Ailes, III
Robert J. Stroh
James W. Davis
Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
Joseph C. Clifton
Allan L. Reed
Ernest C. Holtzworth
Ray C. Needham
Robert M. Reynolds
Lloyd M. Mustin
Francis D. Foley
Ignatius J. Galantin
Thomas H. Moorer
Frederick V. H. Hilles
Alexander S. Heyward, Jr.
Jack S. Dorsey
Frank B. Miller
Raymond N. Sharp
Emmet O'Beirne
Edward E. Colestock
Elonzo B. Grantham, Jr.

Medical Corps

James L. Holland
Cecil L. Andrews

Supply Corps

Howard F. Kuehl
Joseph M. Lyle
James S. Dietz

Civil Engineer Corps

Eugene J. Peltier
Henry G. Clark
Norman J. Drustrup
James R. Davis

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Line

William T. Alexander
Leroy J. Alexanderson
*Grant G. Calhoun
*Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

Supply Corps

*Levi J. Roberts

Civil Engineer Corps

Edward Denbo

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Alvan Fisher
Herman Reich
John E. Harlin
Arthur A. de la Houssaye
John W. McElroy
Richard O. Patterson
Victor Hicks

Medical Corps

Joseph S. Barr
William L. Rogers
Francis J. Braceland
Robert A. Ross
Wendell G. Scott

Chaplain Corps

William E. Collins

Civil Engineer Corps

Edwin N. Blackwood

Dental Corps

William M. Burns

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Alan Shapley
Robert B. Luckey
Arthur F. Binney
Thomas G. Ennis
Carson A. Roberts
James P. Berkeley
Donald M. Weller
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Charles H. Hayes

*Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps, to be quartermaster general of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1960.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Alpha L. Bowser
Harvey C. Tschirgi
Avery R. Kier
Sidney S. Wade
James M. Masters, Sr.
Ralph K. Rottet
Samuel R. Shaw
John P. Condon
Frank C. Tharin
Robert E. Cushman, Jr.
Richard G. Weede
Lewis J. Fields
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.
Paul R. Tyler

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

James E. Howarth, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

*William W. Stickney

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

*Charles H. Cox
*George E. Tomlinson
*Harry R. Van Liew
*John L. Winston
*Charles O. Clark
*William H. Klenke, Jr.
*Harry N. Lyon

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virgil B. Huff, Brundidge, Ala., in place of V. B. Huff, transferred.

C. Burley Finch, Detroit, Ala., in place of Flora Ballard, retired.

Jimmy R. McWhirter, Dolomite, Ala., in place of Gladys Reaves, retired.

Mabron L. Compton, Elkmont, Ala., in place of W. S. Morris, removed.

J. Fred Wilcutt, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson, retired.

John D. Lassiter, Hartford, Ala., in place of M. F. Ward, retired.

Hugh F. Penn, Hartselle, Ala., in place of J. T. Cooper, retired.

Mary D. Putnam, Lexington, Ala., in place of A. M. Campbell, removed.

Joe A. Hamilton, McCalla, Ala., in place of N. T. Waldrup, retired.

Ramon N. Days, Sr., Magazine, Ala., in place of Zada Davis, resigned.

Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.

Thomas O. Rudder, Stevenson, Ala., in place of E. O. Mann, retired.

Albert T. Tucker, Sweet Water, Ala., in place of W. F. Beverly, retired.

J. Carson Whitson, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegree, resigned.

Jessie W. Hagood, Town Creek, Ala., in place of J. W. Davis, transferred.

Charles F. Brantley, Troy, Ala., in place of L. J. Ledbetter, transferred.

Doctor F. Gibson, Wadley, Ala., in place of M. M. Pearson, retired.

Samuel W. Carpenter, Jr., Wedowee, Ala., in place of J. F. Wilson, retired.

ALASKA

Virginia L. Simonds, Annette, Alaska, in place of G. A. Cobb, resigned.

Alice P. Harris, McGrath, Alaska, in place of O. S. Felmley, resigned.

Norma I. King, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of Elvira Hehr, resigned.

Hardy A. Peters, Tanana, Alaska, in place of W. H. Thompson, resigned.

ARIZONA

Jack Meeker, Coolidge, Ariz., in place of F. E. Morris, deceased.

Agnes M. Young, Dateland, Ariz., in place of J. M Collins, resigned

Paul E. Violette, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.

Ernest E. Castleberry, Bono, Ark., in place of O. E. Wyatt, retired.

Cline C. Pile, Charleston, Ark., in place of C. W Spiller, retired.

Devoe Bollinger, Jr., Horatio, Ark., in place of A. T. Cowden, retired.

Oscar H. McKamey, Jr, Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.

Wilburn Gale Hanna, Luxora, Ark., in place of F. R. Rogers, transferred.

Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomasson, deceased

Hubert C. Robbins, Jr., Piggott, Ark., in place of H. M. Jinks, resigned.

Jake M. Dunn, Pocahontas, Ark., in place of Myrt Walrond, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William G. Moore, Atascadero, Calif., in place of G. N. Southwick, retired.

Florabelle Rominger, Bangor, Calif., in place of V. H. Conger, deceased.

Richard J. Williamson, Camino, Calif., in place of A. B. Peirsol, resigned.

Ruth H. Burkett, Cedar Glen, Calif., in place of B. B. Malcom, retired.

Gay Nell V. Mentzer, Coulterville, Calif., in place of V. E. Sackett, retired.

Paul A. Helms, Culver City, Calif., in place of P. H. Jarrett, retired.

Laurence D. King, Del Mar, Calif., in place of M. A. Kibler, retired.

Helen M. Lowey, Downieville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costa, retired.

William F. Evans, Ducor, Calif., in place of M. L. Stewart, retired.

Leslie V. Sims, Fallbrook, Calif., in place of J. L. Sims, retired.

Donald F. Cox, Hollister, Calif., in place of R. A. Hubbell, retired.

Lulu Ellen Spradlin, Homeland, Calif., office established December 16, 1949.

Shirley J. McLean, Keene, Calif., in place of C. E. Wilson, transferred.

Eva C. Edwards, Littlerock, Calif., in place of M. A. Wallace, resigned.

Walter T. Robinson, Mariposa, Calif., in place of W. C. Quigley, retired.

Harold E. Purpus, Millbrae, Calif., in place of J. H. Meyer, retired.

John A. Black, McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., in place of L. F. Barksdale, retired.

James W. Thoms, Mojave, Calif., in place of B. T. Finnin, retired.

Merritt L. Carroll, Montgomery Creek, Calif., in place of Phoebe Vickroy, retired.

Minnie P. Lynn, Rio Oso, Calif., in place of J. E. Butler, resigned.

Ray E. Taylor, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.

Jewel D. McQuaid, San Ardo, Calif., in place of M. F. Fluker, deceased.

Nancy M. Baranger, Santa Fe Springs, Calif., office established September 1, 1958.

Vera V. Wood, Smartville, Calif., in place of L. W. Colling, deceased.

Carol B. Gamble, Suisun City, Calif., in place of M. R. Wolfskill, retired.

Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana, Calif., in place of D. M. Benedict, retired.

Robert W. Dixon, Thornton, Calif., in place of J. E. Hambleton, retired.

COLORADO

Howard W. Cross, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of R. T. Ellington, retired.

Harold W. Best, Larkspur, Colo., in place of J. U. Mixer, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Philo J. Perham, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.

William B. Blackman, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.

Sarah B. Friedman, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.

Jared A. Pratt, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Guptill, deceased.

Peter Perun, Middlefield, Conn., in place of R. A. Chadsey, resigned.

Salvatore J. Puglisi, Middletown, Conn., in place of R. J. Wamester, deceased.

Herbert R. Trolle, Springdale, Conn., in place of J. H. Fahey, retired.

Peter A. Koops, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.

Doris M. Madden, Vernon, Conn., in place of F. L. Foley, resigned.

Donald C. MacDonell, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.

Arthur Manzi, Woodbury, Conn., in place of P. F. Cassidy, removed.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

DELAWARE

Martha E. Armstrong, Cheswold, Del., in place of M. W. Vaughn, Sr., transferred.

Martin M. Williams, Kenton, Del., in place of H. W. Pratt, deceased.

FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.

George C. Coker, Bartow, Fla., in place of L. C. Olive, retired.

Harlow J. Schutt, Boynton Beach, Fla., in place of E. S. Pierce, retired.

Robert T. Arnold, Brandon, Fla., in place of R. A. McIntosh, retired.

Robert K. Tillman, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.

Jay R. Shattuck, Deerfield Beach, Fla., in place of E. V. Morrow, resigned.

Johnny V. Boling, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., office established January 1, 1958.

James F. Rylant, Fernandina Beach, Fla., in place of Louis Goldstein, retired.

Marion M. Woolley, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.

Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.

Charles T. Perry, Maitland, Fla., in place of J. T. Stover, retired.

Arthur R. Van Valkenburg, Pinellas Park, Fla., in place of M. M. Stevenson, retired.

Lorence E. Brandon, Saint Petersburg, Fla., in place of W. H. Bowes, resigned.

Gordon J. Burris, Sebring, Fla., in place of R. N. Durrance, retired.

Joseph William Penrod, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.

Edward S. Raymond, Venice, Fla., in place of R. E. Shallberg, retired.

GEORGIA

Manor B. Folsom, Jr., Barney, Ga., in place of C. R. Lanneau, transferred.

Larree Johnston, Cartersville, Ga., in place of J. C. Nelson, retired.

Henry R. Taylor, Cumming, Ga., in place of W. P. Hughes, retired.

Henry R. Bennett, Darien, Ga., in place of R. H. Manson, retired.

John F. Craft, Doerun, Ga., in place of L. J. McPhaul, deceased.

Horace J. Healan, Hoschton, Ga., in place of J. P. Pirkle, retired.

Wilfred W. Rivers, Jr., Leesburg, Ga., in place of R. C. Harris, deceased.

Pauline T. King, Sea Island, Ga., in place of M. D. Cate, retired.

Robert L. White, Trenton, Ga., in place of E. L. Raulston, retired.

IDAHO

Albert W. Miller, Gooding, Idaho, in place of M. H. Shotwell, retired.

Wayne S. Shaeffer, Nezperce, Idaho, in place of R. L. Anstine, retired.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Clarence P. Siebert, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.

John W. Dehmlow, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struwing, removed.

Rex H. Carter, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.

Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.

Glenn E. Jones, Bulpitt, Ill., in place of M. N. Ceyte, deceased.

Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Delbert H. Pittman, Cisne, Ill., in place of Gordon Perry, retired.

Christian M. Willman, Jr., Deerfield, Ill., in place of J. J. Welch, retired.

Carl S. Yates, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.

Irma L. Dodds, Eola, Ill., in place of G. L. Dodds, transferred.

Clarence B. O'Marah, Eureka, Ill., in place of R. E. Duncan, resigned.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.

Milton L. Farney, Forrest, Ill., in place of H. O. Franklin, retired.

Robert M. Maller, Geneva, Ill., in place of A. N. Modaff, resigned.

Kenneth L. Pflaum, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.

Loren C. Bowman, Greenup, Ill., in place of R. A. Carrell, retired.

Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Albert C. Marchi, Hines, Ill., in place of H. M. Gerhard, retired.

Richard R. Michelsen, Huntley, Ill., in place of W. L. Donahue, transferred.

John L. Knight, McLeansboro, Ill., in place of M. L. Hunt, retired.

Harry R. Johnson, Madison, Ill., in place of R. O. Johns, retired.

Ellen M. Manuel, Mansfield, Ill., in place of W. H. House, declined.

Albert L. Edwards, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.

Charles H. White, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.

Frank D. Talley, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.

Clyde H. Steffee, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.

Joseph A. Gossett, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.

Robert F. Baker, Oakwood, Ill., in place of E. R. Chestnut, resigned.

Raymond C. Foley, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.

John Craig Templeton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of T. A. Denton, transferred.

Raymond R. Yahnke, Plainfield, Ill., in place of L. V. Keeley, deceased.

Gerald W. Sears, Piano, Ill., in place of I. W. Nelson, retired.

Benton Pullen, Princeville, Ill., in place of R. P. Callery, deceased.

Joe M. Stoddard, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Robert L. Kupferschmid, Rankin, Ill., in place of G. H. Sloan, transferred.

James A. Blender, Raritan, Ill., in place of F. E. Overstreet, declined.

Leonard E. Kaffenberger, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.

Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.

Arthur M. Mulford, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.

Leonard A. Graham, Shobonier, Ill., in place of O. W. Morell, transferred.

Chester C. Heindel, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.

Lester Lippincott, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.

Howard M. Welsh, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.

Charles W. Weaver, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.

Wendell C. Kepner, Warren, Ill., in place of V. C. McGinnis, retired.

Walter E. Rose, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.

Paul H. Eberle, Wonder Lake, Ill., in place of Arthur Hay, removed.

INDIANA

Hayward A. Claybaugh, Argos, Ind., in place of N. D. Thompson, retired.

Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.

Harry R. Shidaker, Bremen, Ind., in place of H. G. Carbiener, retired.

Robert E. McKain, Carthage, Ind., in place of J. E. Porter, removed.

Arthur R. Wilkerson, Commiskey, Ind., in place of Fred Corbin, Jr., resigned.

Harold E. Newberg, Donaldson, Ind., in place of C. C. Garrison, retired.

Lloyd Goodwin, Edwardsport, Ind., in place of M. F. Shepard, retired.

Jack S. Brown, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of L. J. Britton, deceased.

Philip Earl Buecher, Jasper, Ind., in place of Albert Rumbach, deceased.

Vernie J. Wright, La Crosse, Ind., in place of C. D. Watson, retired.

J. George Bascom, Lynn., Ind., in place of D. B. Mann, deceased.

Norval W. Chamness, Marshall, Ind., in place of H. E. Delp, retired.

Harold H. Scott, Monterey, Ind., in place of C. A. Good, retired.

Harry E. Fields, Norman, Ind., in place of C. M. Bowman, retired.

H. Earl Himes, North Webster, Ind., in place of R. A. Richwine, retired.

Charles E. Inks, Plymouth, Ind., in place of Jesse Yoder, retired.

Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.

Vita J. Hutchison, Oakville, Ind., in place of B. E. Garrett, removed.

Mary L. Butler, Pershing, Ind., in place of C. E. Rodenberg, deceased.

Jack V. Porter, Roachdale, Ind., in place of W. E. Etcheson, retired.

Geraldine Z. Marsteller, Russellville, Ind., in place of I. C. Bain, deceased.

Lynn A. West, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of Avis Carlile, retired.

Ernest D. Chambers, Springport, Ind., in place of W. C. Bunner, deceased.

Warren W. Robinson, Tippecanoe, Ind., in place of A. B. Rhodes, retired.

J. Howard Hetzler, Wabash, Ind., in place of A. E. Reynolds, deceased.

Charles E. Carey, Whitestown, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.

Lowell W. Rush, Windfall, Ind., in place of M. E. Martin, transferred.

IOWA

Donald E. Trees, Armstrong, Iowa, in place of M. E. Daries, removed.

Norman P. Nelson, Britt, Iowa, in place of J. M. Townsend, retired.

Dick W. McCauley, Carlisle, Iowa, in place of O. K. Owens, transferred.

David H. Crenshaw, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.

Kenneth F. Halverson, Fenton, Iowa, in place of J. A. Schwartz, retired.

Russell R. McLarty, Kingsley, Iowa, in place of F. J. Spain, deceased.

Gloria L. Pool, McCausland, Iowa, in place of Arline Darland, resigned.

Kenneth A. Jensen, Massena, Iowa, in place of T. D. Casey, transferred.

Lewis F. Paisley, Sherrill, Iowa, in place of A. G. Haberkorn, deceased.

Oliver H. Wisgerhof, Sully, Iowa, in place of Harry De Jong, retired.

Willard E. Leiran, Waterville, Iowa, in place of M. A. Slattery, retired.

Elijah L. Simpson, Wesley, Iowa, in place of H. H. Gerdes, retired.

KANSAS

Boyd W. Ensley, Cambridge, Kans., in place of H. K. Lundy, retired.

William S. Stevenson, Clay Center, Kans., in place of S. V. Hemphill, deceased.

Clarence H. Lang, Cuba, Kans., in place of M. F. Jehlik, retired.

William D. French, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.

Delmar F. Loe, Glasco, Kans., in place of C. E. Brown, transferred.

Roland I. Kraft, Lecompton, Kans., in place of L. W. Crady, deceased.

Lorn R. Lahey, Sr., McCune, Kans., in place of C. E. Mansfield, retired.

Howard J. Chambers, Minneapolis, Kans., in place of L. E. Harvey, retired.

Lois A. Mitchell, Rose Hill, Kans., in place of R. B. Dunlap, retired.

Gottfreid W. Staub, Jr., Saint John, Kans., in place of M. M. John, Jr., transferred.

Donald L. Long, Sylvia, Kans., in place of Victor Gibson, retired.

Lloyd W. Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

Thomas B. Standard, Winona, Kans., in place of A. F. Goebel, retired.

KENTUCKY

Freeman Fitch, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

Sally M. Conniff, Clermont, Ky., in place of C. B. Riley, retired.

William E. Wilson, Columbia, Ky., in place of Ray Flowers, retired .

Irene M. Mullins, Cromona, Ky., in place of Esther Branham, deceased.

James S. Hinton, Jr., Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of Gilbert Adams, retired.

Edwin P. M. Hamby, Fort Campbell, Ky. Office established June 1, 1959.

James H. Easterling, Grayson, Ky., in place of W. L. Horton, removed.

Ada Lee Davis, Hardyville, Ky., in place of Donald McDonald, transferred.

William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.

M. Elvadine Riggs, Loretto, Ky., in place of M. H. Buckler, retired.

William B. Mathews, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.

William H. Smith, Owenton, Ky., in place of H. C. Thomas, transferred.

Smith C. Ledford, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of K. L. Walker, retired.

Jean C. Hall, Viper, Ky., in place of M. H. Brashear, retired.

Amanda N. Blackford, Wilmore, Ky., in place of C. W. Mitchell, retired.

Paul R. Simmons, Worthville, Ky., in place of Nellie Clubb, retired.

LOUISIANA

John T. Baldwin, Jr., Bernice, La., in place of M. M. Baldwin, retired.

Bobby Ray Holley, Dubberly, La., in place of Joe Butler, transferred.

Everett Hill, Pitkin, La., in place of C. W. Carson, retired.

Herman P. Louque, Paulina, La., in place of P. B. Cambre, deceased.

MAINE

Karl T. Spruce, Bradley, Maine, in place of A. F. Barton, retired.

Pauline L. Sawyer, Cambridge, Maine, in place of R. C. Whitney, retired.

Katherine I. Bowden, Castine, Maine, in place of C. W. Richardson, Jr., retired.

Eugene P. Duran, East Corinth, Maine, in place of G. L. Hawes, retired.

Hartley O. Nelson, New Sweden, Maine, in place of W. W. Anderson, retired.

Robert C. Fisher, Oakfield, Maine, in place of G. M. Sullivan, deceased.

Louis W. Bowden, Orrington, Maine, in place of E. A. Spencer, deceased.

Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine, in place of M. B. Manson, deceased.

Edward T. White, Vinalhaven, Maine, in place of O. V. Drew, retired

MARYLAND

G. Carlton Powell, Berlin, Md., in place of G. E. Boston, retired.

Raymond C. Strine, New Windsor, Md., in place of W. D. Lovell, Jr., retired.

Ethel M. Grover, Solomons, Md., in place of G. W. Condiff, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

A. Eugene Feio, Central Village, Mass., in place of C. M. Brackett, retired.

Hugo A. Taglieri, Haverhill, Mass., in place of R. V. McNamara, retired.

Edward B. Walker, Millbrook, Mass., in place of L. A. Freeman, retired.

Alice F. Donovan, Pinehurst, Mass., in place of W. F. Eggo, retired.

Joseph H. Boucher, South Carver, Mass., in place of L. W. Jenney, retired.

William H. Evans, Webster, Mass., in place of Alexander Wylie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Milton R. Hein, Ada, Mich., in place of T. M. Lampert, retired.

Budd A. Goodwin, Adrian, Mich., in place of P. F. Frownfelder, retired.

Aulbirt D. Cox, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.

Kenneth S. King, Cassopolis, Mich., in place of O. J. Breece, retired.

Harriet E. Burditt, Cement City, Mich., in place of L. M. Taggart, removed.

Byron B. Borgman, Conklin, Mich., in place of H. D. Harrison, retired.

Morris E. Parish, Coopersville, Mich., in place of R. A. McLellan, resigned.

Otis E. Howe, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.

A. Ray Krider, East Lansing, Mich., office reestablished February 1, 1955.

William R. Brazell, Fair Haven, Mich., in place of V. M. Meyer, retired.

Louis Gee, Farwell, Mich., in place of J. R. Littlefield, retired.

Charles H. Pratt, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.

Paul Richard Conklin, Fremont, Mich., in place of J. E. Davis, retired.

Winifred M. Buss, Galesburg, Mich., in place of J. C. Lane, resigned.

Oscar A. Ohman, Gladstone, Mich., in place of B. M. Micks, retired.

Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais, Mich., in place of E. L. Mulligan, retired.

James Patejdi, Harbert, Mich., in place of O. W. Tornquist, retired.

Otto Klein, Jr., Harrisville, Mich., in place of C. F. Riebow, deceased.

Kenneth E. Scripsma, Holland, Mich., in place of Harry Kramer, retired.

Shirley E. Thorne, Horton, Mich., in place of Velma Strait, retired.

Urho J. Koski, Houghton, Mich., in place of J. C. Healy, removed.

Frederick J. Goossen, Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of W. K. Peters, resigned.

Selden W. von der Hoff, Interlochen, Mich., in place of R. J. Buller, retired.

Edwin L. Gillespie, Jr., Jonesville, Mich., in place of B. A. Dobson, retired.

John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.

Frederick E. Reyer, Marshall, Mich., in place of M. C. Kibler, deceased.

Robert H. Gorsline, Milford, Mich., in place of V. E. Boyle, removed.

Georgia E. Larsen, Newaygo, Mich., in place of C. C. Larsen, Jr., deceased.

Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.

Carl T. Redding, North Adams, Mich., in place of B. F. Taylor, retired.

Richard E. Jackson, Palmyra, Mich., in place of A. C. Johnston, transferred.

Robert C. Miller, Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L. Stockwell, retired.

Frank E. Rodman, Quinnesec, Mich., in place of Emery Massie, retired.

Cecil L. Erfourth, Rudyard, Mich., in place of P. C. Carr, retired.

Erwin H. Kubath, St. Joseph, Mich., in place of E. M. Evans, retired.

Charlena Shaver, Silverwood, Mich., in place of L. P. Temple, deceased.

Addison L. Pauley, Tuscola, Mich., in place of H. M. Aldrich, resigned.

Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.

Robert W. Curtice, Wells, Mich., in place of V. C. White, removed.

MINNESOTA

W. Stanley Sevaldson, Albert Lea, Minn., in place of H. C. Day, retired.

Raymond R. McAloney, Breckenridge, Minn., in place of L. L. Drey, retired.

Marvin E. Michelson, Buffalo Lake, Minn., in place of J. G. Williams, transferred.

Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.

Marion G. Berge, Castle Rock, Minn., in place of D. W. Burton, deceased.

John P. De Greeff, Chandler, Minn., in place of C. C. Moret, retired.

Clarence M. Whiting, Clitherall, Minn., in place of H. V. Nelson, transferred.

Mildred E. Mester, Coleraine, Minn., in place of W. L. Franti, deceased.

Donald C. Carrigan, Cosmos, Minn., in place of D. W. Anderson, transferred.

William E. Kieren, Gilbert, Minn., in place of Herman Frajola, retired.

Leslie M. Olson, Hartland, Minn., in place of I. C. Stensrud, retired.

Herbert P. Venske, Howard Lake, Minn., in place of F. C. Larson, retired.

Leo J. Redig, Ivanhoe, Minn., in place of J. L. Gilson, retired.

Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.

Richard C. Zimmerman, Kent, Minn., in place of L. C. Clark, transferred.

Herbert F. Zelmer, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.

Hardin H. Kindler, Lynd, Minn., in place of A. H. Roloff, retired.

Frank M. Thompson, Maynard, Minn., in place of W. L. Huber, retired.

Harry E. Maki, Menahga, Minn., in place of A. P. Nunn, retired.

Harry A. Smith, Mound, Minn., in place of R. E. O'Donnell, deceased.

Everett M. Viitala, Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of H. H. Schur, resigned.

Carmen J. Curtis, Noyes, Minn., in place of A. A. Rustad, retired.

William Vedders, Jr., Pease, Minn., in place of F. R. Greenfield, deceased.

Charles T. Trane, Pelican Rapids, Minn., in place of H. N. Halvorson, retired.

Conrad J. Christle, Royalton, Minn., in place of H. L. Fisher, transferred.

Robert L. Penne, Saint James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.

Lawrence E. Hanson, Santiago, Minn., in place of G. M. Wold, resigned.

Sherman A. Granberg, Scandia, Minn., in place of E. M. Hawkinson, resigned.

Eino R. Latvala, Tamarack, Minn., in place of D. W. Brekke, transferred.

Howard K. Uhren, Vining, Minn., in place of P. A. Nyberg, transferred.

Henry J. Maertens, Wabasso, Minn., in place of T. C. Franta, resigned.

Earle Henry Welty, Winona, Minn., in place of C. B. Erwin, retired.

Dennis H. Kilmartin, Zimmerman, Minn., in place of S. E. Jones, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam L. Mansell, Camden, Miss., in place of R. W. Castens, deceased.

Thomas H. Buford, Holly Springs, Miss., in place of H. H. Orr, retired.

Norman J. Stockstill, Picayune, Miss., in place of T. R. Pearson, retired.

Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.

Levi C. Jenkins, Jr., Sallis, Miss., in place of H. A. Robertson, deceased.

Faban S. Clark, Ripley, Miss., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.

James C. Wiggins, Sidon, Miss., in place of O. L. McMath, retired.

Frank L. Middleton, Woodland, Miss., in place of Bessie Abernethy, retired.

MISSOURI

Forrest H. Forderhase, Berger, Mo., in place of H. C. W. Strothmann, deceased.

Robert C. Greenwood, Brunswick, Mo., in place of A. J. Clayton, retired.

Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.

Wanda P. Wilson, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of E. S. Spencer, deceased.

Norman E. Paul, Chilhowee, Mo., in place of L. H. Inglish, retired.

David C. Baumann, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhart, transferred.

Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Kansas City, Mo., in place of A. F. Sachs, retired.
Willard R. Mohns, Lee's Summit, Mo., in place of J. F. Stevenson, retired.
Harold F. Courtois, Mineral Point, Mo., in place of P. C. Walton, retired.
John W. Aufder Heide, Owensville, Mo., in place of E. E. Smith, retired.
William H. Lea, Steelville, Mo., in place of J. D. Marsh, deceased.
Wilbert Haux, Sturgeon, Mo., in place of F. F. Hulett, retired.
Harold E. Williams, Waynesville, Mo., in place of V. V. Long, retired.
Leroy A. Vanzandt, Washburn, Mo., in place of G. B. Windes, retired.
Loyd V. Howell, Wyaconda, Mo., in place of E. W. Kurtz, retired.

MONTANA

Kenneth M. Hall, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulston, deceased.
Leonard E. Eriksen, Hungry Horse, Mont., in place of H. D. Howell, resigned.
Phyllis A. Lea, Inverness, Mont., in place of E. M. Shults, deceased.
Sherman S. Cook, Jr., Lincoln, Mont., in place of Elsie Didriksen, retired.
Lee M. Enochson, Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of N. P. Miller, retired.

NEBRASKA

Warren W. McBride, Archer, Nebr., in place of W. P. Hansen, retired.
Raymond W. Pettinger, Burchard, Nebr., in place of E. J. Pepperl, transferred.
Dale W. Farmer, Callaway, Nebr., in place of C. B. Benger, retired.
Marvin J. Capoun, Dwight, Nebr., in place of J. H. Novacek, resigned.
Carl J. Mann, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of G. E. Fletcher, deceased.
Lora B. McQuay, Keystone, Nebr., in place of L. L. McQuay, resigned.
Marie A. Bodzek, Linwood, Nebr., in place of F. F. Thomas, retired.
Harry A. Simmon, Miller, Nebr., in place of W. B. Brown, transferred.
Kenneth L. Mussman, Ohiowa, Nebr., in place of F. C. Sieckman, retired.
M. Ruth Shaver, Primrose, Nebr., in place of V. J. King, retired.
Helen M. Ilg, Raymond, Nebr., in place of J. E. Schulling, retired.
C. Clifford Dame, Tekamah, Nebr., E. G. Brune, retired.
John R. Baumert, Walthill, Nebr., in place of C. J. Mullaney, deceased.
Carroll L. Falk, Wilcox, Nebr., J. W. Brawner, retired.

NEVADA

William A. Leno, Owyhee, Nev., in place of R. R. Archuleta, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Phyllis M. Coniaris, Hollis, N.H., in place of D. H. Goodwin, retired.
Marjorie A. Kimball, South Danville, N.H., in place of M. M. Heath, retired.
Earle W. Ladd, West Stewartstown, N.H., in place of L. Y. Ladd, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

William F. Anderson, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.
Klaus E. Schmidt, Allentown, N.J., in place of W. F. Rue, retired.
William T. Minkoff, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.
Samuel H. Rifkin, Dutch Neck, N.J., in place of H. R. Tindall, resigned.
Herbert J. Engelhardt, Egg Harbor City, N.J., in place of M. R. Stone, deceased.
Walter Hamilton, Jr., Fieldsboro, N.J., in place of Elizabeth Hamilton, deceased.
John R. Wert, III, Hopewell, N.J., in place of M. J. McAlinden, retired.
Marie J. Holloway, Magnolia, N.J., in place of J. M. Schmidt, retired.
Michael Czahlo, Montville, N.J., in place of Floyd Smith, retired.
Paul W. Haller, Moorestown, N.J., in place of R. G. Shreve, deceased.
Stanford B. Tidaback, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.
Joseph L. Yearly, Riverton, N.J., in place of M. E. Haas, retired.
Albert G. Gleckler, Rockaway, N.J., in place of M. S. Malone, retired.
Charles T. Camp, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.
Merrill M. Tucker, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.
Marjorie E. Houghtaling, Vernon, N.J., in place of A. E. Baldwin, deceased.
Shirlee W. Thompson, Vincentown, N.J., in place of H. S. Elbert, removed.
Jesse W. Landon, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.
A. Robert Deter, Woodbridge, N.J., in place of L. E. McElroy, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Romeo A. Ortiz, Bernalillo, N. Mex., in place of C. C. Montes, retired.
Charles S. Stanfield, Clovis, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Manson, retired.
Robert W. Prunty, Red River, N. Mex., in place of E. C. Simion, resigned.
Leon F. Dryden, Ruidoso, N. Mex., in place of O. J. Hull, retired.
Laudente T. Quintana, Jr., Wagon Mound, N. Mex., in place of H. M. Vigil, transferred.

NEW YORK

George M. Wood, Allentown, N.Y., in place of W. A. Withey, deceased.
Ethel Gowdey, Bloomingburg, N.Y., in place of C. E. Hagan, retired.
Lyle S. Vannatta, Cochecton, N.Y. in place of W. J. Porr, retired.
Robert S. Freeman, Constableville, N.Y., in place of H. M. Bintz, retired.
Jean N. Van Kleeck, Cragsmoor, N.Y., in place of N. C. S. Garritt, resigned.
Kenneth R. Smith, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.
Mae M. Gibbs, East Nassau, N.Y., in place of P. J. Marsh, resigned.
John J. Hogan, Flushing, N.Y., in place of F. J. Cassidy, retired.
Nellie M. Rice, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.
John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.
Theodore J. Palcic, Gowanda, N.Y., in place of P. W. Christenson, retired.
Hamilton C. Fish, Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.
Ellen M. Newman, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.
Edward A. Byrnes, Haverstraw, N.Y., in place of E. A. Ganson, resigned.
Roy E. Jenne, Hermon, N.Y., in place of A. E. Cook, deceased.
Gerald W. Reamer, Kendall, N.Y., in place of M. F. Drennan, deceased.
Raymond D. Ingram, Knowlesville, N.Y., in place of G. B. Clapp, deceased.
Hazel M. Carr, Lisbon, N.Y., in place of E. E. Jones, deceased.
Elaine L. Bruce, Moira, N.Y., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.
Mildred T. Wadsworth, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.
Norman T. Sullivan, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.
Muriel M. Bonini, Oscawana, N.Y., in place of D. L. Clair, deceased.
Rosoe C. Odell, Pleasantville, N.Y., in place of L. D. Olmsted, deceased.
George L. Clemons, Port Henry, N.Y., in place of L. J. Hollister, Jr., retired.
Howard B. Stikney, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.
David W. Jayne, Remsenburg, N.Y., in place of H. I. Raynor, retired.
Clifford D. Nellis, Saint Johnsville, N.Y., in place of E. S. Bierman, retired.
William J. Dunson, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.
Dorothy E. Burr, Savona, N.Y., in place of E. E. Mulliken, deceased.
Angelo P. Rizzieri, Seneca Falls, N.Y., in place of T. J. Riley, retired.
Joseph F. Patrick, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.
George H. Martin, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.
Bessie M. Sischo, Stockton, N.Y., in place of B. C. Putnam, transferred.
Lucy B. Manglass, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.
Joseph N. Vogel, Wallkill, N.Y., in place of C. H. McLean, retired.
Joseph J. Giordano, West Islip N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.
Dorann E. Oldenburg, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard G. Crissman, Aberdeen, N.C., in place of E. E. Maurer, removed.
Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N.C., in place of Galusha Pullium, removed.
Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.
Alfred B. Woodard, Bayboro, N.C., in place of H. A. Miller, resigned.
Glenn O. Pasour, Bessemer City, N.C., in place of R. M. Kiser, deceased.
Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N.C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.
Melvin H. Crisp, Brasstown, N.C., in place of Iowa Green, retired.
Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N.C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.
Ray Wright, Bryson City, N.C., in place of W. T. Martin, retired.
James R. Frady, Candler, N.C., in place of B. E. Brenton, resigned.
Clarence W. Burrell, Canton, N.C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.
Arlie R. Cox, Central Falls, N.C., in place of A. M. York, retired.
J. Howard Crowell, Concord, N.C., in place of B. E. Harris, resigned.
Maude M. Gulledge, Culberson, N.C., in place of C. T. Hagood, retired.
Clifton W. Crispe, Cullowhee, N.C., in place of B. B. Long, retired.
Jay T. Baker, Dallas, N.C., in place of G. L. Friday, resigned.
Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.
Raymond H. Hoots, Edneyville, N.C., in place of J. W. Nesbitt, retired.
Sion Chester Rogers, Elizabethtown, N.C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.
John O. Gettys, Ellenboro, N.C., in place of W. C. Stockton, resigned.
Alton B. Parker, Fairmont, N.C., in place of T. S. Teague, retired.
Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N.C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
Willard W. Reavis, Hamptonville, N.C., in place of B. F. Gough, retired.
Wallace K. Crawford, Hayesville, N.C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N.C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.
Maude T. Brown, Hillsboro, N.C., in place of T. E. Bivins, resigned.
Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N.C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.
Roby J. Maley, Lexington, N.C., in place of S. J. Smith, retired.
Kirby W. Greene, Jr., Linwood, N.C., in place of F. H. Shoaf, transferred.
Wayne Jefferson Edwards, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.
F. Ray Frisby, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.
Erlean S. Stevens, Mayodan, N.C., in place of J. V. Highfill, retired.
Harveleigh M. White, Method, N.C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.
Lucile R. Eagle, Misenheimer, N.C., in place of C. A. Dry, resigned.
Worth T. Hendricks, Mocksville, N.C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.

Katie B. Miller, Moyock, N.C., in place of M. F. Dunston, retired.
Elvin C. Cox, Ramseur, N.C., in place of C. B. Craven, removed.
Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N.C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
Carroll O. Jenkins, Robbinsville, N.C., in place of W. G. Carver, removed.
Carl G. Underwood, Sr., St. Pauls, N.C., in place of B. R. Stone, resigned.
Edward V. Gore, Jr., Shallotte, N.C., in place of I. B. Parker, retired.
Charles C. Small, Sophia, N.C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.
Maxwell G. Rush, Southern Pines, N.C., in place of A. G. Pierce, resigned.
William V. Langley, Staley, N.C., in place of M. I. Siler, retired.
Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N.C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
Don D. Cogdill, Jr., Sylva, N.C., in place of T. W. Ashe, retired.
Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N.C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N.C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.
Josiah A. Maultsby, Jr., Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.
Joseph Howard Revis, Whittier, N.C., in place of M. P. Williams, retired.
Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N.C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.
Charles M. Taylor, Winnabow, N.C., in place of J. J. Henry, resigned.
M. Vance Hickman, Winston-Salem, N.C., in place of W. B. Booe, resigned.
Joseph H. Poindexter, Yadkinville, N.C., in place of W. F. Van Hoy, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Albert Maier, Ashley, N. Dak., in place of M. B. Johnson, retired.
Johnnie H. Halvorson, Glenfield, N. Dak., in place of Lottie Posey, retired.
Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.
Verna L. Becker, Inkster, N. Dak., in place of M. F. Scouton, transferred.
Louis J. Wanner, New England, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Kenny, retired.
Albert E. Storhoff, Nome, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bakke, resigned.
Frank V. Jansky, Ross, N. Dak., in place of L. T. Breeling, retired.
Clifford W. Hackett, Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George, retired.
Hazel F. Elness, Sterling, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Ryan, resigned.

OHIO

Edward E. Bickhard, Antwerp, Ohio, in place of M. E. Bakle, retired.
Orlan L. Hines, Ashville, Ohio, in place of S. L. Smith, deceased.
Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.
Harriett R. Vasbinder, Brinkhaven, Ohio, in place of M. A. Power, retired.
Charles A. Roemer, Brunswick, Ohio, in place of Jeanette Long, retired.
Richard W. Olinger, Dayton, Ohio, in place of G. H. Mundhenk, retired.
Harold T. Deselms, Freeport, Ohio, in place of K. E. Caldwall, transferred.
Thomas S. McCrea, Fresno, Ohio, in place of C. H. Barth, transferred.
Ernest W. Jones, Glouster, Ohio, in place of D. P. Mooney, retired.
Virginia G. Bortel, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.
Irven E. Scott, Kinsman, Ohio, in place of J. W. Fulton, Jr., resigned.
V. Kathryn Whisler, Laurelville, Ohio, in place of L. M. Lappen, retired.
Richard J. Neuhardt, Lewisville, Ohio, in place of C. R. Pollen, removed.
Charles R. Scott, Lodi, Ohio, in place of V. A. Miner, retired.
Frederick B. Gatch, Milford, Ohio, in place of F. W. White, retired.
Paul F. Thomas, Millersport, Ohio, in place of H. D. Bowers, retired.
Robert J. Davis, Minerva, Ohio, in place of C. A. Hart, retired.
C. Emil Sidle, Nashport, Ohio, in place of W. A. Brailer, retired.
Dorothy B. Smith, New Burlington, Ohio, in place of E. G. Miller, retired.
James W. Speakman, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.
Leo C. Blackburn, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of F. E. Smith, resigned.
Marvin D. Wolford, Rawson, Ohio, in place of Pearl Burket, retired.
Orvil C. Hoover, Salem, Ohio, in place of L. D. Beardmore, deceased.
Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.
Robert L. Rhodes, South Charleston, Ohio, in place of J. L. Carr, retired.
Vernon J. Burkett, Jr., Sullivan, Ohio, in place of T. U. Kerr, deceased.
Gordon R. Lanker, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.
Harold H. Haggard, Urbana, Ohio, in place of P. H. Gifford, deceased.
Clair R. Guthrie, Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of L. L. Newland, deceased.
Russell H. Miller, Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of H. J. Grote, retired.
Chester W. Bailey, Youngstown, Ohio, in place of J. E. Doyle, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

N. Berniece Henderson, Braggs, Okla., in place of L. B. Williams, retired.
Marguerite L. McDonald, Bokoshe, Okla., in place of O. C. Broking, retired.
Jetie E. Kirby, Eufaula, Okla., in place of J. L. McKinney, retired.
David L. Ratliff, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of T. E. Henderson, transferred.
E. Herman Evans, Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of L. B. Rogers, deceased.
Virgil W. Morris, Gotebo, Okla., in place of C. B. Bolar, transferred.
Tom F. Bonner, Idabel, Okla., in place of Mona Rawlings, transferred.
Edward E. Weeks, Indianola, Okla., in place of J. H. York, resigned.
Henry D. Friend, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of F. M. Shaw, deceased.
Geral D. Carlin, Picher, Okla., in place of G. E. Raouls, retired.
Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.
Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

OREGON

Martha H. Anderson, Gardiner, Oreg., in place of V. A. Grubb, deceased.
William H. Fair, Stayton, Oreg., in place of G. E. Neibert, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carl J. Tonkin, Akeley, Pa., in place of L. J. Hale, deceased.
Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNelis, retired.
Arthur J. Rodgers, Jr., Blue Ball, Pa., in place of H. B. Bower, retired.
Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
Robert J. Talley, Chadds Ford, Pa., in place of W. E. Miller III, transferred.
Edwin K. Oaks, Cherry Tree, Pa., in place of J. C. Dunlap, retired.
John M. Harshaw, Jr., Conneaut Lake, Pa., in place of J. I. Cleveland, retired.
Margaret E. Fink, Conyngham, Pa., in place of R. A. Reisenweaver, resigned.
Robert G. Burgan, Cresson, Pa., in place of C. R. Tobin, removed.
Emma Jane Kimmel, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.
Curtis A. Miller, Dillsburg, Pa., in place of R. K. Hartman, resigned.
William C. Hoffman, Dingmans Ferry, Pa., in place of L. S. Seymour, deceased.
Stanley H. Ward, East McKeesport, Pa., in place of G. J. Hoke, deceased.
Lyle T. Streeter, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Shultz, retired.
Warren S. H. Reppert, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.
Jacob G. Appler, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.
Edna Mae Harrison, Gwynedd, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Tramontina, resigned.
Robert C. Yeagley, Holtwood, Pa., in place of A. E. LeFever, resigned.
Leonard Farkas, Hostetter, Pa., in place of C. R. Andros, resigned.
Carl E. Duble, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Fisler, retired.
Donald R. Springer, Hunkers, Pa., in place of L. J. Biggerstaff, resigned.
Margaret Jane Knight, Industry, Pa., in place of A. W. Ewing, retired.
Nancy H. Houston, Jamison, Pa., in place of M. C. DeCurtis, deceased.
Victor J. Westerberg, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.
Lawrence C. Viehdorfer, Karthaus, Pa., in place of Leslie Ditty, removed.
Harry E. Himes, Jr., Kittanning, Pa., in place of J. P. King, retired.
George K. Bilger, Kreamer, Pa., in place of C. G. Hummel, removed.
Joseph J. Damiano, Lattimer Mines, Pa., in place of W. H. Hunsinger, deceased.
Donald J. Hart, Laughlintown, Pa., in place of I. M. Ziders, retired.
Marie J. Schoppy, Locust Gap, Pa., in place of J. J. McDonnell, removed.
William G. Fultz, Jr., Mammoth, Pa., in place of J. M. Tarosky, removed.
Charles V. Jones, Marysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Raisner, removed.
Steward H. Hartman, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.
Gorman Lester Dull, Mill Run, Pa., in place of E. S. Colborn, retired.
L. Ramond Moore, Modena, Pa., in place of E. E. Morris, retired.
Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
John A. Schultz, Neshaminy, Pa., in place of P. M. Severns, retired.
Eleanor M. Johnston, New Alexandria, Pa., in place of M. H. Miller, retired.
Miller L. Kerr, New Castle, Pa., in place of W. R. Hanna, deceased.
Raymond Carlson, New Stanton, Pa., in place of E. A. Cox, retired.
Samuel H. Auman, Paxinos, Pa., in place of S. F. Snyder, retired.
Paul R. Buehler, Port Carbon, Pa., in place of E. J. Donahue, retired.
Glenn I. Gegogeine, Reno, Pa., in place of Susan Breene, retired.
Robert V. Webster, Roaring Branch, Pa., in place of W. L. Holmes, retired.
Henry H. Arnold, Robertsdale, Pa., in place of Margaret Truax, resigned.
Lester I. Heist, Robesonia, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
Dorothy S. Hull, Rutledge, Pa., in place of Viola Cleland, retired.
Lisle Robert Johns, Shelocta, Pa., in place of M. E. Thomas, resigned.
Harry K. Barnett, Sipesville, Pa., in place of C. E. Holder, resigned.
Rudolph Simitz, Spinnerstown, Pa., in place of Laura Lancaster, resigned.
John M. Holland, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.
Edgar F. Benner, State College, Pa., in place of R. J. Miller, retired.
Norman W. Abbott, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of H. A. Rathburn, retired.
Robert A. Yeager, Sunbury, Pa., in place of Charles Kline, retired.
Robert C. Guth, Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of G. E. Reed, retired.
Charles W. J. Whitcroft, Villanova, Pa., in place of M. J. Winters, retired.
Leona P. Waters, Wiconisco, Pa., in place of S. R. Klinger, resigned.

Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.
James J. Brogan, Sr., Woodlyn, Pa., in place of S. C. K. Miecznik, transferred.
William J. Zepp, York Springs, Pa., in place of P. E. Trump, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Anardi Agosto Baquero, Canovanas, P.R., in place of Carmen Villalobos, retired.
Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P.R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.
Enrique Pardo, Ensenada, P.R., in place of J. C. de Vidal, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Robert S. Hirst, Ashaway, R.I., in place of J. E. Murray, deceased.
Raymond A. Piccolo, Bradford, R.I., in place of T. F. Eldridge, deceased.
Henry K. Mook, Charlestown, R.I., in place of G. W. Short, resigned.
Edward C. Borders, Foster Center, R.I., in place of H. A. H. Nichols, deceased.
Antone Marion, Jr., Little Compton, R.I., in place of P. W. Martin, resigned.
Donald C. Shemick, North Scituate, R.I., in place of E. L. Clark, retired.
Reginald L. Campbell, Tiverton, R.I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.
Richard J. Vitullo, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry F. Rucker, Bath, S.C., in place of M. K. Ricker, resigned.
H. R. Ford Cherry, Jr., Enoree, S.C., in place of L. O. Thornton, retired.
W. Robert Cooper, Jr., Lane, S.C., in place of J. A. Montgomery, retired.
Louise R. McLeod, Rembert, S.C., in place of T. M. Moore, retired.
Herbert H. Crosland, Jr., York, S.C., in place of G. C. Cartwright, retired.
Earle W. Crosby, Jr., Smoaks, S.C., in place of W. A. Linder, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eldon H. Robbins, Carthage, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Coughlin, retired.
Cecell L. Fitzgerald, Rockham, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Dean, retired.
Clarence L. Grohnke, Warner, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Wulff, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lee N. Ruch, Belvidere, Tenn., in place of Clyde Zimmerman, transferred.
Allie Louise W. Anderson, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.
Paul D. Tolley, Decaturville, Tenn., in place of J. W. Stout, retired.
Reuben P. Taylor, Gleason, Tenn., in place of W. L. Newberry, retired.
Howard F. Newell, Harrison, Tenn., in place of L. G. Wilson, resigned.
E. Neil Muzzall, Henry, Tenn., in place of M. B. Curry, transferred.
Leon W. Crews, Hollow Rock, Tenn., in place of W. R. Rice, retired.
Dorothy M. Hunter, Huntland, Tenn., in place of A. E. Staples, retired.
William F. Parrott, LaFollette, Tenn., in place of J. M. Carden, Jr., removed.
Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.
M. Frances Long, Palmer, Tenn., in place of E. R. Overturf, retired.
Basil Hubert Nunley, Riceville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Higginbotham, retired.
Robert A. Emerson, Saulsbury, Tenn., in place of E. L. Goddard, deceased.
Clarence H. Davis, Signal Mountain, Tenn., in place of Harry Robinson, retired.
Thomas R. Carothers, Wartrace, Tenn., in place of A. S. Shriver, retired.

TEXAS

Jasper L. Ellison, Abernathy, Tex., in place of W. A. Richter, resigned.
George D. FitzSimmons, Jr., Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen, removed.
Dudley B. Lawson, Alto, Tex., in place of J. B. Thorn, Jr., transferred.
Albert A. Hubbard, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
John Clarence Stockton, Alvord, Tex., in place of W. E. Howell, transferred.
Harold S. Roberts, Andrews, Tex., in place of M. M. Burkett, retired.
Sam E. Henderson, Atlanta, Tex., in place of W. S. Clements, transferred.
James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
Earl F. Stubblefield, Bogata, Tex., in place of W. G. King, retired.
Whittaker D. Bains, Jr., Brookshire, Tex., in place of W. D. Bains, retired.
Benjamin W. Pearce, Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns, deceased.
Charles L. Jones, Chandler, Tex., in place of B. C. Bass, retired.
Carroll L. Byrd, Childress, Tex., in place of J. A. Hilburn, retired.
Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
Arlene M. Morris, Colorado City, Tex., in place of S. A. Palmer, retired.
Thurmon O. Storey, Deport, Tex., in place of C. H. Nobles, retired.
Homer R. Granberry, Douglassville, Tex., in place of E. E. McMillian, Jr., removed.
John D. Zahn, Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey, resigned.
Wilbur W. Mueller, Flatonia, Tex., in place of W. J. Bludworth, retired.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
James D. Wheeler, Jr., Garland, Tex., in place of F. B. Crush, resigned.
Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose, Tex., in place of W. E. Porter, retired.
Charles M. Martinson, Jr., Jasper, Tex., in place of H. R. Hancock, transferred.
J. Austin Rigney, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.
Montie F. Cameron, Kirkland, Tex., in place of R. L. Toft, transferred.
Percy J. Bergeron, League City, Tex., in place of G. M. Wright, transferred.
Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
John H. Garrett, Lone Star, Tex., in place of A. C. Mestayer, resigned.
Chester E. Maxey, Lorenzo, Tex., in place of L. M. Laird, deceased.
Eugene Mallory, Mineola, Tex., in place of D. S. Lankford, retired.
Issac J. Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of B. W. Newman, transferred.
Lloyd A. Adams, Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
Horace W. McAdams, Muleshoe, Tex., in place of A. J. Gardner, transferred.
Hugh Clifford Ryan, Pasadena, Tex., in place of C. T. Coolidge, retired.
Ralph R. Richardson, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.
Henry W. Lester, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of G. L. Fowler, deceased.
Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.
John J. Hanna, Jr., Quanah, Tex., in place of C. G. Conley, deceased.
Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
Jess W. Cole, Ranger, Tex., in place of A. E. Crawley, retired.
William H. Brown, Red Oak, Tex., in place of V. G. Evans, retired.
Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
Corolee J. Wismar, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of D. F. Wiess, resigned.
James D. Baldwin, Seagoville, Tex., in place of C. O. Bruce, retired.
Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.
Edgar Harris, Timpson, Tex., in place of J. J. Compton, retired.
Clara P. Landers, Van Horn, Tex., in place of C. M. Bean, retired.
Charles Allen, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.
Viola D. Hamby, Wimberly, Tex., in place of Rena Snodgrass, retired.
David F. Renfro, Zavalla, Tex., in place of C. A. Barge, Jr., transferred.

UTAH

Mable A. Wilstead, Castle Gate, Utah, in place of J. W. Nielsen, retired.
Myrtle H. Davis, Mexican Hat, Utah, in place of office established March 9, 1957.
Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VERMONT

Esther L. Sweatt, Craftsbury Common, Vt., in place of B. W. Farrar, retired.
William H. Jenks, Danville, Vt., in place of M. R. McDonald, retired.
Paul T. Williams, East Corinth, Vt., in place of L. L. Worthley, retired.
Donald R. Dayton, East Middlebury, Vt., in place of C. M. Morgan, retired.
Winston M. Churchill, Graniteville, Vt., in place of A. J. Carbonneau, resigned.
Velmore O. Forest, Lunenburg, Vt., in place of D. W. Brown, retired.
Wendell E. Morse, North Ferrisburg, Vt., in place of S. M. Hicks, deceased.
Alden F. Atwood, Orwell, Vt., in place of M. D. Wolcott, deceased.
Lyndell C. Wood, South Royalton, Vt., in place of G. M. Goodrich, retired.
Virginia A. Peterson, South Ryegate, Vt., in place of G. F. Rabaioli, resigned.
Ellery G. Giles, Wardsboro, Vt., in place of T. P. Staples, deceased.
Sheridan P. Dow, Waterville, Vt., in place of O. P. Shattuck, deceased.
Chanley H. May, Wilmington, Vt., in place of C. M. Hall, retired.

VIRGINIA

Winfrey W. Grizzard, Amelia Court House, Va., in place of L. O. Scott, deceased.
Richard L. Wingfield, Appomattox, Va., in place of E. L. Smith, retired.
Bessie C. Townshend, Bluemont, Va., in place of R. E. Denny, resigned.
Mary E. Lynch, Bowling Green, Va., in place of F. G. Beale, retired.
Carroll D. Harrison, Cartersville, Va., in place of L. A. Baker, retired.
Wilbur F. Fitzgerald, Cheriton, Va., in place of W. M. Upshur, Jr., deceased.
Franklin C. Wilson, Churchville, Va., in place of R. H. Bear, retired.
John M. Corstaphney, Clifton Forge, Va., in place of J. N. Cahoon, retired.
Beulah J. Skeens, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
Noble Conley Bishop, Duffield, Va., in place of E. P. Tompkins, retired.
John R. Pritchard, Jr., Emporia, Va., in place of R. M. Owen, deceased.
Charles W. Harris, Jr., Fairfax, Va., in place of S. S. Swart, retired.
Jo Pierson Horne, Fort Blackmore, Va., in place of E. C. Turner, resigned.
William C. Deming, Front Royal, Va., in place of A. O. Haley, retired.
Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.
Martin Luther Garraghty, Goode, Va., in place of J. S. McCauley, retired.
Virginia G. Kiser, Grundy, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.
Charles H. Arrington, Hayst, Va., in place of I. M. Baker, retired.
John C. Raiford, Ivor, Va., in place of E. W. Pittman, transferred.
Thelma E. Addington, Nickelsville, Va., in place of R. L. McConnell, retired.
Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.

Willie W. Smith, Sedley, Va., in place of M. V. Owen, retired.
James M. Rodgers, Shipman, Va., in place of M. W. Sherman, retired.
William R. Holt, South Boston, Va., in place of C. B. Lovelace, retired.
Carl A. Parsons, Jr., Sugar Grove, Va., in place of E. M. Calhoun, deceased.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Charles E. Clarke, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Adele Berg, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Cloyce G. Johnson, Dayton, Wash., in place of C. H. McCauley, resigned.
E. Beth Williams, Hadlock, Wash., in place of M. M. Learned, retired.
Gordon W. Rux, Lake Stevens, Wash., in place of E. F. Pardee, deceased.
Elma M. Sarchet, Lamont, Wash., in place of D. J. Sarchet, deceased.
Harold P. Dow, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of W. K. Munson, deceased.
John C. Morgan, Jr., Suquamish, Wash., in place of L. C. Tompkins, retired.
Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.
Allen H. Grant, Tracyton, Wash., in place of E. E. Riddell, retired.
Orville K. Allen, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret M. McCormick, Anawalt, W. Va., in place of Wash Hornick, Jr., resigned.
Ruby L. Teets, Aurora, W. Va., in place of G. R. Mason, resigned.
Amos L. Whittington, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of E. K. Beitz, resigned.
Sally L. Eller, Capels, W. Va., in place of M. A. Arnold, resigned.
Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.
Nettie L. Hurd, Craigsville, W. Va., in place of S. B. Herold, retired.
Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.
Veon C. Cox, East Rainelle, W. Va., in place of U. W. Grimes, retired.
Helen L. Buchanan, Gilbert, W. Va., in place of H. A. Buchanan, resigned.
Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.
Edward L. Chrisman, Kearneysville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Hammond, retired.
Mason H. Myers, McComas, W. Va., in place of B. S. Watts, retired.
Ernest M. Townsend, Madison, W. Va., in place of A. T. Miller, retired.
Carl F. Nichols, Middleborne, W. Va., in place of H. H. Crumrine, deceased.
Erva Winston Cooper, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.
Dodd M. Fisher, Mount Storm, W. Va., in place of T. E. Schaeffer, retired.
George B. Jordan, Ripley, W. Va., in place of H. E. Starcher, removed.
Claude G. Pownall, Romney, W. Va., in place of C. J. Powell, retired.
Dillard R. Walker, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of W. L. Warden, resigned.
Margaret E. Martin, Stirrat, W. Va., in place of S. S. Goode, retired.
Victor J. Robinson, Tams, W. Va., in place of R. F. Wildey, resigned.
Harold R. Wiles, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.
Robert C. Fenton III, Williamstown, W. Va., in place of J. L. Henderson, retired.
George O. Mauk, Yolyn, W. Va., in place of Geraldine Chambers, removed.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.
Milton L. Dickinsen, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.
Ellsworth L. Thompson, Black River Falls, Wis., in place of P. W. Dickey, retired.
Raymond E. Anderson, Deer Park, Wis., in place of L. A. Eiden, retired.
Roy L. Fergot, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.
Phoebe J. Pinkley, Fountain City, Wis., in place of W. R. Hartley, retired.
Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.
Roland J. Anderson, Hazelhurst, Wis., in place of H. C. Lowe, retired.
Elmer E. Lidicker, Jefferson, Wis., in place of A. F. Hammes, deceased.
Raymond F. Fredrickson, Junction City, Wis., in place of L. B. Kitowski, resigned.
Kenneth R. Jacobs, Knapp, Wis., in place of J. D. Purvis, transferred.
Richard C. Coffen, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of E. L. Saykally, deceased.
John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.
John F. Whitmore, Madison, Wis., in place of E. C. Cooper, retired.
Shirleigh L. Collins, Melrose, Wis., in place of E. D. Young, resigned.
Delmer A. Vesely, Milan, Wis., in place of J. J. Schreiber, retired.
Harley L. Prell, New Richmond, Wis., in place of L. N. Hughes, retired.
Harry V. Cooper, Patch Grove, Wis., in place of Grace Harper, deceased.
Beverley J. Farrell, Readstown, Wis., in place of O. L. Prestegard, transferred.
Arnold W. Langner, Sr., Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of R. N. Bowser, failed to return from military duty.
Sylvester J. Penning, Stockbridge, Wis., in place of K. M. Pottle, retired.
Robert C. Herman, Thorp, Wis., in place of W. S. Wagner, retired.
Earl J. Murray, Webster, Wis., in place of R. D. Fahland, retired.

WYOMING

Johnnie A. Thon, Lusk, Wyo., in place of A. B. Mills, retired.
Charles R. Sheehan, Rawlins, Wyo., in place of H. S. Cashman, resigned.
Harold V. Baas, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. R. Gage, resigned.
Warren H. Moore, Worland, Wyo., in place of P. F. McClure, deceased.
Marguerite A. Braziel, Yoder, Wyo., in place of C. V. Malone, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 8: *The word of our God shall stand forever.*

Almighty God, whatever the duties and responsibilities may be ours during this day, wilt Thou bestow upon us the blessings of Thy constant care and Thy unfailing presence.

Wilt Thou free our minds from anxiety and our hearts from fear, lifting them by Thy grace out of doubt into faith and out of despair into hope.

Help us to see and lay hold of the treasures of each passing hour and inspire us to share them cheerfully with Thy needy children.

When night draws nigh and the evening shadows gather round about us may we have the blessed remembrance of Thy companionship and the joy of knowing that we have had some part in building a better world.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1960, was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS A. JENKINS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme sorrow that I announce the death of former Congressman Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ironton, and the 10th Ohio District, on December 21, last.

Mr. Jenkins served for 34 years as a Member of this House, retiring because of ill health at the end of the 85th Congress. It is my understanding he served longer in the House of Representatives than did any other Member from Ohio.

Born in Oak Hill, Jackson County, Ohio, on October 23, 1880, of poor but honest and humble Welsh immigrant parents, Tom Jenkins' life was one of accomplishment, which again demonstrates the opportunity America and our system of government afford to all who wish to work hard and live an honest and upright life.

As a boy, Tom worked in the coal mines to earn money for an education. Graduating from Providence University, he taught school for a while, then studied law at Ohio State University, and was admitted to the bar in 1907. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County for two terms, and later—in 1922—was chosen to serve as State senator. It was my honor and my privilege, as Lieutenant Governor, to swear Tom Jenkins into office. Two years later, in 1924, he was elected by the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, to represent them in the 69th Congress, where he continued to serve until his retirement. At that time he was the second ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It had long been his desire to live to become chairman of that great committee, and to thus follow in the footsteps of another great Ohioan, once chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—William McKinley.

In his early career in Congress, Mr. Jenkins served as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee and was the author of several legislative measures of importance in connection with our national welfare. He was also a member of the Insular Affairs Committee and for a short time a member of the District of Columbia Committee. He was named chairman of the Food Study Committee, and during the time he served—from 1944 to 1946—did splendid work. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Jenkins was also a member of the very important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Always taking a deep interest in his party's affairs, Tom Jenkins served as a delegate to many State conventions in Ohio and to several Republican national conventions. For years he was the beloved dean of the Ohio delegation.

He was a kindly man, yet a frank and forthright individual. He had the courage of his convictions and the ability to convince others that his was the right position. Long one of the leaders of the House of Representatives, he served his State and country well. A man of character, ability, and with a great record of accomplishment, his name will long live in our State and national history.

At the time of death, Tom Jenkins left behind him his beloved wife, Mabel, and one sister. To Mrs. Jenkins and to his sister, we of the Ohio delegation—and I am sure I speak for the full membership of the House—extend our sincere sympathy in the great loss which has been theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members of the House who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, like those who have preceded me I also admired and respected our late colleague and friend, Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. He always greeted me with a warmness and friendliness that was characteristic of his fine spirit and personality.

His passing is met with sorrow by those who knew and respected him as a friend and colleague.

I should like to join with others in conveying an expression of sympathy to Mrs. *Jenkins* and the members of his family in their bereavement.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to put into words the thoughts that rise in one's mind when trying to write out something to say about a man you had such deep and sincere affection for as I had for Tom Jenkins. He was one of the finest men I met when I came to Congress and a real deep and true friendship, founded on instant respect for each other, was started. He was a man who accomplished much because he knew that to be a leader he had first to be the servant of all. His courage and courtesy were matched only by his wisdom and knowledge of men and his efficient and effective service was crowned by his humble spirit. He wanted to help wherever he could and he did help many.

I glory in having had his friendship and as time goes by his wisdom and his gentleness will always be precious memories.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed brother, the Honorable Tom Jenkins, of Ironton, Ohio. In my book, Tom Jenkins was one of nature's noblemen. I knew him when I first came to Congress, 17 years ago, because Tom has many relatives in my hometown of Wenatchee, Wash.

Tom Jenkins was one of the kindest men it has ever been my privilege to know, and he certainly wrote a record in his 34 years of service here in this House.

I wish to join the rest of my colleagues in extending heartfelt sympathies to Mrs. Jenkins and Tom's family.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in paying tribute to one of Ohio's most beloved political figures—and a man whose long and distinguished service in this body was rivaled only by yourself and a few other members—the late Thomas A. Jenkins.

Tom represented the district which is just across the Ohio River from mine, and I truthfully believe that he was almost as well known in West Virginia as he was in his homeland. One still hears much favorable mention of his name and devoted career of public service on both sides of the river.

Tom Jenkins rose from humble beginnings in his hometown of Oak Hill, Ohio, to render almost three generations of loyal service to the American people, and his district, his State, and his Nation will miss him.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House in eulogy of the late Honorable Thomas A. Jenkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join with my colleagues from Ohio and indeed with all those who knew the Honorable Thomas Jenkins in paying tribute to his memory in this Chamber where he served for so many eventful years.

It was I who succeeded Tom Jenkins as the Representative from the 10th District of Ohio when he was, regrettably, forced to retire because of the illness which eventually led to his death only slightly more than 2 weeks ago. If I have learned one thing since I stepped into his office—I do not say his shoes for they will remain unfilled—it is that if I can learn to serve the people of my district as he served them I need have no fear when I am called upon to look them in the eyes or to shake their hands. For his countless friends in our eight counties of Ohio did not wait until his passing to impress upon me the high regard they held for his qualities and his character. The esteem and affection with which he was universally regarded shone through wherever his name was mentioned and in whatever company. There was no conscious effort to so impress me. It was simply an honest and deep-seated feeling of admiration and friendship which showed itself spontaneously and which, as with all true emotion, could not be repressed.

Tom Jenkins' devotion to his people knew no bounds of party, of station in life, of religion, or of color. This I know from the testimony of those who knew him and who learned to love him because of this very quality. In every nook and corner of the 10th Ohio District I have met people, strangers to me, who felt themselves indebted to him because of some favor, large or small, or of some accomplishment he performed for them or for their area. Such testimony to his service came from Democrats and from Republicans and from those with no party affiliation; it came from Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and those with no professed religion; it came from farmers, from pensioners, from workmen, from businessmen, from politicians, from lawyers, and from clergymen. There were few indeed who did not have reason to thank Tom Jenkins for something he had done in his 34 years of service in the House of Representatives.

Whether it was a little back country road which needed resurfacing or the building of a huge dam and reservoir, no job was too large or too small for Tom Jenkins to lend his support if it could be shown that it was needed by a few or many of his constituents. The Tom Jenkins Dam which backs up Burr Oak Lake and provides recreational facilities and water supplies for thousands of our people stands as a monument to his memory. So too do a great many small projects which he pushed to completion. The mighty Ohio River has felt the impress of his achievements, but equally important to many of those he served were the conservation and improvement works he sponsored along its tributaries and back waters. But it is not only in these enduring physical works that his memory will remain alive in our district. He will be remembered longer for the works of mercy, of charity, and of service to humanity which stand as his monument in the hearts of those who loved him and whom he loved.

Tom Jenkins first came to Washington 35 years ago as a young man in his forties. He lived to be reelected 17 times through good times and bad; through wars and depressions; through the Democratic landslides of the New Deal days, when in 1936 he was the only Republican Congressman elected from Ohio, and the Eisenhower victories of the fifties. No combination of political, economic, or international circumstances could shake Tom Jenkins from the seat which was his because he held it by the birthright of faith and love.

His closeness to the people who voted for him unfailingly stemmed from his birth as 1 of 13 children of a Jackson County farmer and miner, from his own initiation at the tender age of 10 into work as a miner in the local mines, from his early teaching career in the county schools, from his self-supported education at Ohio State University, from his practice of law among his own people, and from his long engagements in political campaigns on the premise that he wanted to serve people rather than party and justice rather than personal gain.

That is the legacy Tom Jenkins leaves behind him. It is a legacy of faith and love. While he had no children of his own to share in it, it will be treasured by the several generations whom he cared for as though they were his own—for in a larger sense they were his own. Not the least among those who will nurture this legacy in his fond widow, Mrs. Mabel Wynne Jenkins, to whom I extend my deep sympathy. Mrs. Moeller and I join with her in honoring the cherished memory of her beloved husband.

Mr. Speaker, as a fitting conclusion to these remarks I include in the RECORD an editorial of eulogy to Tom Jenkins which appeared in the Wellston, Ohio, Telegram on December 24, 1959, the date

on which his earthly remains were committed to his native Ohio soil:

PEOPLE HAD FAITH IN TOM JENKINS AND HE NEVER FAILED THEM

The passing of Thomas A. Jenkins in a Columbus sanitorium Monday night, marked the end of an era in this 10th District. Really, it came to a close a year ago, when he was stricken. He tried to withdraw his candidacy for 18th term, but the day was late: all he could do was ask the people who had honored him so often, to spare him now and vote for some other candidate. Even so he lacked little more than 600 votes of being nominated. They knew full well he could never serve again, but they were loathe to leave him.

He went to Washington the first time in 1924, a young man in his early forties. Who could forget that campaign while he was striving to upset Congressman Israel M. Foster's political applecart. And so he did upset Izzie.

For 34 years thereafter he kept that seat among the mighty in Washington. To win 17 elections in a row in a district firmly committed to the two-term tradition was a great achievement. He was not without opposition by others ambitious to serve in Washington, sometimes Republicans, often by Democrats. He wintered through the New Deal landslides unscathed, when Republican Congressmen were being knocked out like tenpins.

How did he do it?

Tom Jenkins was no intellectual prodigy, and he himself would be first to concede it. Once at a political rally in Wellston when Attorney General Gilbert Bettman was running for U.S. Senator, Jenkins stole the show. Bettman belonged to the intelligentsia and made an address filled with political profundities. Then came Tom's turn:

He made it short, telling that among the 450 Congressmen in Washington, he was just average, "no professor of U.S. history, no great authority on constitutional law," he admitted, "but just a smalltown lawyer. I excel in one thing only" he said, "all Representatives in Washington would agree that none take care of their constituents' interests so well and so promptly, as Tom Jenkins."

And the audience stood up and cheered him, because Tom Jenkins had the political sense to appear no better than his audience. He knew almost every voter in this district and could call him by his first name.

So he went back every 2 years, time and again; always accumulating seniority, that invisible asset that gives a few old-timers the best committee assignments, that puts their bills ahead for an early vote. That is the difference between a one-termer and Tom Jenkins' 17 terms.

For many years he was a member of the all-powerful Ways and Means Committee that keeps tight control of the purse strings. It writes the tax bills that provides the money for most Government activities. He was on other powerful committees. Yet he introduced few bills, and his name rarely labeled any new law.

But when he wanted something he usually got it in due time. Probably his greatest accomplishment was as a member of the joint committee on new post office buildings in Washington.

Once several years ago, we were standing with him in his reception room in the House Office Building, looking out of a west window toward the White House a mile distant. It was an inspiring view. Two broad avenues, Constitution and Pennsylvania, traversed the green Mall as straight as a gunsight. Magnificent buildings of everlasting granite were spotted here and there to shelter Government departments. There were other buildings too, the National Archives, and the National Art Gallery.

It was far different from the Washington of 40 years before when these avenues were lined with rows of shoddy stores and shabby little one-story structures.

Then Tom spoke his thoughts: "If we never did much else, I know how much we did in making Washington over, in making it the most beautiful capital in the world." And for that he deserves to be forever remembered. As long as those granite blocks stand one on another, and the green grass grows, and the flowers are blooming between, Tom Jenkins' impress on Washington can never fade.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all grieved by the passing of our late colleague and beloved friend, Thomas H. Jenkins, of Ohio. Tom Jenkins was one of the most serious-minded Members of this body, a man of great capacity, who made his marked contribution to the deliberations, consideration and accomplishments of this great body. Over and above that, he was a gentleman at all times. His outlook on life was one of understanding mind. He possessed a nobility of character that profoundly impressed his colleagues.

Tom Jenkins and I served on the Ways and Means Committee before I was elected the leader of my party in this body. Throughout the years our friendship has been very close, a friendship that I valued very much and which I shall always treasure.

To his loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement. I know they derive great consolation from the fact that he served in this body with such distinction. He was truly a great American who earned the respect, the confidence, and the friendship of all his colleagues.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Tom Jenkins was part of the Ohio political scene for 50 years and in that time he made many friends and few, if any, enemies. This was because of his sterling character and rugged individualism. On the national scene he was respected and admired for the same reasons. As a member of the important Ways and Means Committee for 25 years, he contributed much to significant tax legislation.

I shall always remember him for his intense devotion to Congress and particularly the House of Representatives. He believed that it was the most important part of our Government because it was in closer touch with the people. He was an honest, dedicated public servant and I join with his host of friends in mourning his loss and expressing my sympathy to Mrs. Jenkins.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened when I learned of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. I knew that he had been ill and that his passing was not unexpected. However, we are never ready for news of this kind.

I first met Tom Jenkins when I came to this House in the 77th Congress. At that time he was looked upon as one of the outstanding leaders of the House, due to his long and brilliant service. I came to rely upon him for advice and counsel and always found him anxious to be of any help possible.

He had a brother who had formerly lived in Colorado, and who served as manager of the chamber of commerce in Pueblo, which is in my district. He was always interested in Colorado and matters affecting our State.

Tom Jenkins was a real friend and I shall cherish happy memories of our association together in Congress. I had the highest respect and admiration for his character and ability. He was a genial person and I have greatly missed his presence with us.

I consider Tom Jenkins one of the most distinguished Americans it has been my pleasure to meet. It was a real privilege to serve with him in the House. His passing is an irreparable loss to all of us.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Jenkins, the sister, and the other members of the family.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, an intimate association of more than a third of a century ended last month with the death of the late Congressman Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. We entered the House at the same time, the beginning of the 69th Congress after being first elected on the same day in November 1924. During the 34 years of his service, Tom Jenkins became one of my closest and most beloved friends. He was a man who possessed great talents, yet never lost the common touch.

Tom Jenkins came up the hard way. As a boy, he worked in his neighborhood coal mines to earn money for an education in college and law school. He understood the problems of the ordinary citizen and was ever mindful of their needs. His schooling for the public service was obtained as prosecuting attorney and as a State senator before being elected to the House. During his long service in this body, I watched his progress up the ladder of experience. He became a high ranking member of the great Ways and Means Committee and in the latter part of his service, I was glad to select him for service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He was a plain man. He cared little for the tinsel of social life. The completeness with which he devoted himself to his work for his constituency, the State of Ohio and the Nation was an inspiration to many of the younger Members of the House.

A great public servant has gone to his reward. To his beloved wife and his sister, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these first days of the new session, we have been shocked at the news of the death of former Congressman Thomas Jenkins who from 1924 until 1959 represented Ohio's 10th District here with great distinction.

Tom Jenkins became a legend in his own lifetime. The people of his district admired, respected, and loved this man who served them with courage, devotion, and imagination through a tumultuous and crisis-ridden three and one-half decades in his Nation's history. Their feelings were fully shared by all

of us who had the honor to serve with him here.

The problems and issues of importance in Tom Jenkins' district are the same in many respects as those which interest the people of the neighboring seven counties of Ohio's 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. When I came to Congress 5 years ago, this interest in common problems served to bring us together immediately. Tom's helpful advice drawn from his rich experience in public service and his friendship were of lasting value to me.

I wish to pay tribute to this dedicated statesman who gave so much to the people of his district and to the Nation. To Mrs. Jenkins and his fine family I want to join with my colleagues here in offering my sympathy in the profound loss they have suffered.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of last month the Nation sustained a serious loss in the passing of a great and patriotic statesman, our friend and colleague, Thomas A. Jenkins. He had served with distinction, devotion, and wisdom in the House of Representatives for a period of 35 years. His public service actually convered a span of a half a century because of the previous offices he held as prosecuting attorney and State senator in his beloved State of Ohio.

It was my rich privilege to serve with this great American as one of his colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means. During the time of our mutual service I had opportunity to observe Mr. Jenkins' able work and I found him to be a man who addressed himself to his duties with compassionate understanding of the problems of all our citizens and with a dedicated comprehension of the basic concepts of human freedom, economic opportunity, and national strength—concepts that were inherent in the founding of our Republic that have been strengthened because of Tom Jenkins' work in our midst.

One important principle that motivated the endeavors of this great American was his insistence on fairness and equity for all the people. He worked diligently and with ability to try to improve our Federal tax structure so that its application to our citizens would be without discrimination and without unwarranted burden. In this connection it was my privilege to serve with him as a cosponsor of legislation that was known across the breadth of the land as the Jenkins-Keogh bill. This legislation was designed to alleviate the discriminatory treatment contained in existing law against self-employed individuals in providing for their retirement security. Tom Jenkins believed with conviction in the principle embodied in this bill because he recognized its justness and the merit it contained for the benefit of the American farmer, storekeeper, professional man, and the millions of other self-employed Americans.

Mr. Jenkins and I first joined in sponsoring this legislation in January 1953 at which time Mr. Jenkins introduced H.R. 10 and I was privileged to cosponsor H.R. 11. After years of perseverance and work in behalf of this constructive measure, we now seem to be on the threshold of what I hope will be the enactment of this proposal into law. If we are successful to this end, a large measure of the credit must go to our esteemed late colleague, Tom Jenkins.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that Tom Jenkins will not be able to continue to serve in this distinguished body on the occasion of the final approval of his bill. I regret, Mr. Speaker, this great American's untimely passing, but I am grateful for the privilege that was mine in serving with him.

THE LATE HONORABLE HUBERT ELLIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Representative Hubert Ellis, who died on December 3, 1959, and who represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia for three terms from 1943 to 1949.

The Honorable Hubert Summers Ellis was born in Hurricane, Putnam County, W. Va., July 6, 1887. He attended public schools and went on to attend Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va.

Between the years before World War I, 1910–17, Mr. Ellis was engaged in banking and selling. During the First World War he served overseas as first lieutenant in the 150th Field Artillery, 42d Division. He was first elected to Congress in 1942, and served in the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Hubert Ellis served his country effectively in both war and peace. After being in uniform during World War I, and serving in this body during World War II, Representative Ellis played an outstanding role in veterans' affairs. He was one of those outstanding citizens who felt that the veterans in peacetime have a continuing obligation to their country.

Hubert Ellis was one of the early members of Huntington Post 16 of the American Legion. That splendid post has had a most interesting history of special leadership in the community of Huntington. An example of that leadership is the fact that it was the post which helped spearhead the movement for a statewide high school band festival, held regularly in Huntington for many years.

Mr. Ellis served as West Virginia Department Commander of the American Legion in 1933 and 1934.

In his home city of Huntington, Representative Ellis is especially remembered for his successful efforts in laying the groundwork for the erection of the splendid new Federal office building there. He secured a congressional appropriation for the purchase of the site, and when this amount proved too small, he helped raise locally by subscription the required additional amount for the purchase of the land.

Mr. Ellis was instrumental in securing the location in Huntington of a war plant of the Navy, which was leased to the Sylvania Electric Products Co. After the war, he was one of the earliest advocates of securing full peacetime use of the Sylvania plant, on which the General Services Administration is now accepting bids.

Mr. Ellis was a spokesman for his home community in securing the initial Federal approval of funds for what is today the magnificent Tri-State Airport, a facility which is continuing to be developed as a key air transportation facility serving the States of West Virginia, Kentucky and Ohio.

Hubert Ellis was a patriot, a man of sober judgment, a man who was not found wanting for the attributes which go to make a great Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join in the sentiments expressed by Congressman KEN HECHLER concerning the recent passing of the Honorable Hubert Ellis, a distinguished West Virginian, who enjoyed the privilege of representing West Virginia's Fourth Congressional District in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Ellis served with my late husband. His passing is a great loss to our home State, and I extend sincerest sympathy to his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Ellis was a very dear friend of mine. We came to Congress at the same time and were sworn in together on January 3, 1943. Hubert was a very sincere and hardworking Member of this body.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Ellis and to the Ellis family.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this small, but nonetheless sincere, tribute is offered in memory of a famous West Virginian who passed away last month—former Congressman Hubert Ellis, born in Hurricane, Putnam County, W. Va.

After an interesting career in banking and selling, and serving overseas as a 1st lieutenant in World War I, he came to Congress as a Member of the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Although I never knew Congressman Ellis personally, I have great respect for his devotion to God and country, and the good works he did in Congress.

To his family I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regretted the death of our good friend and colleague, Hubert Ellis, of West Virginia. He was a rugged American patriot, who served his country well in both war and peace. Serving overseas as an artillery lieutenant in World War I, he was closely associated with veterans' affairs. Following his election to Congress in 1943, he was elected to membership on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs where he rendered outstanding service. He believed our country had a continuing obligation to the men who fought to defend America and was intensely interested in their welfare. He was deeply devoted to the progress of West Virginia and was an able advocate wherever its interests were concerned.

In the death of Hubert Ellis, West Virginia and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him have lost a dear friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Hubert Ellis, who died on December 3, 1959.

Mr. Ellis represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia in the 77th, 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses. It was our privilege to serve together in the 79th Congress.

Hubert Ellis was a warm and considerate man, a highly respected public servant, who served faithfully his State and the country.

To Mrs. Ellis and the other members of his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILL E. NEAL

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to report to my colleagues the passing of a distinguished Member of this body during the 83d and 85th Congresses, Dr. Will E. Neal, of Huntington, W. Va., who died on November 12, 1959.

Dr. Neal was born October 14, 1875, in Lawrence County, Ohio. He was graduated from Proctorville High School in 1894. He was awarded the bachelor of science degree from National Normal University, Lebanon, Ohio, in 1900. He received his medical degree at the University of Cincinnati in Ohio in 1906, after which for more than 50 years he was engaged in general practice of medicine in Huntington.

It is typical of Dr. Neal's human sense of balance and sense of humor that in his official biography in the Congressional Directory he should have included this phrase, "general practice of medicine in Huntington since 1907 with a rest period of 3 years as mayor of Huntington and occasional foreign travel periods since 1945." Of course, Dr. Neal was being facetious when he referred to a "rest period" since he never rested in his unselfish effort to help his fellow man, whether as a healing physician or in the art of statesmanship.

Representative Neal was a long-time member of the Huntington Park Board, 1931–52; a member of the West Virginia Public Health Council, 1936–40. At the age of 75 he was elected to the House of Delegates of the West Virginia Legislature, being the only Republican on Huntington's five-member slate who was elected to the house of delegates in 1950.

He served in this body from 1953 to 1955, and again from 1957 to 1959. During the period when he was out of Congress, Dr. Neal served as a medical consultant to the Foreign Operations Administration in Afghanistan and Nepal.

Dr. Neal in his service to his community, State and Nation was proud of the fact that he was a constructive conservative. He had deep and rocklike convictions. Yet he had that rare quality of being able to disagree without being disagreeable. I never knew a man with so many friends—warm friends whom he collected over many years. I do not think there is or was a single man in Huntington, W. Va., who had more friends, and he made friends by his unselfish service and also through the gentle words and kind deeds with which he cheered and strengthened those he met along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I include the fine remarks of Rev. Garrett H. Evans, of the First Methodist Church of Huntington, at the funeral of Dr. Neal:

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to a truly great man Dr. Will E. Neal. You know that, in part, far better than I do. Many of you were his patients, and are aware of the fact that he practiced medicine as a calling and as an art, lifting it far above mere professionalism. Many of you worked with him as he gave himself as a public servant. With dedication, devotion, and humor he brought to politics the integrity which it deserves.

One reads with awe of the many accomplishments and interests of this man, remembering, too, that he was a devoted husband and father. It is with gratitude that we remember his integrity and his compassion.

William Channing once wrote: "The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution; who resists the sorest temptations from within and from without; who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully; who is calmest in storms; and is most fearless under menace and frowns; and whose reliance on truth, on virtue, and on God is most unfaltering."

By these or any other standards, Dr. Will Neal was a great man. He was great because he never sought greatness. From the brief period in which I knew him, and from the things you his friends have told me, I am sure I can say that here is a man who found himself because he lost himself, in the sense that Jesus used that figure of speech.

I am sure, too, that Dr. Neal was able to do all that he did because he took into account the reality of God. He was a man of faith. He obviously believed the Biblical teaching that at the center of the universe there is a righteous power to whom every human being owes allegiance as the source of life and law. No man is perfect, and undoubtedly Dr. Neal made mistakes—but no man ever questioned his integrity, for he took into account the divine will that is forever present and at work in our world.

Now death has closed one chapter of his life. A poet, upon the death of her father, wrote:

"A giant pine, magnificent and old,
Stood stanch against the sky and all around
Shed beauty, grace and power. Within its fold
Birds, safely reared their young. The velvet ground
Beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade
Gave cheer to passers-by. Its towering arms
A landmark stood, erect and unafraid,
As if to say, 'Fear naught from life's alarms.'

"It fell one day. Where it had dauntless stood
Was loneliness and void. But men who passed
Paid tribute—said, 'To know this life was good
It left its mark on me. Its work stands fast.'
And so it lives. Such life no bonds can hold—
This giant pine, magnificent and old."

The memory of the living man remains, and shall have its influence. But greater than that, his soul lives. We can bury the body, but we cannot bury the soul. You have heard read in the ritual today the great expressions of our Christian faith as recorded in the Scriptures. In the wisdom of Solomon, an apocryphal book, this truth is repeated:

"For God created man to be immortal, and made him in the image of his own eternity—the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there can no evil touch them. In the sight of the unwise, they seem to die, and their going from us is thought to be destruction; but they are in peace, and their hope is full of immortality; for God hath proved them and found them worthy of himself."

Here is the comfort for the family that bears a loneliness which can never be removed. Here is the hope that transcends any despair. Here is the challenge that brings us all face to face with the ultimate reality of both life and death. We are grateful for the promises of God: and we are grateful for this man who demonstrated them in his life. We know that "God has proved him, and found him worthy of himself."

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point in the RECORD the statement of the Governor of the State of West Virginia, The Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, on the passing of Dr. Neal:

Dr. Neal represented my district in Congress. In addition to being my Congressman and a colleague in the house of delegates in 1951, he was a close personal friend. He was a distinguished physician, a dedicated public servant and a man who understood people and their problems. West Virginia will miss him. Mrs. Underwood and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Neal and family.

Mr. Speaker, one of Dr. Neal's personal traits is worthy of mention at this point because it so typified the man and his nature. So many of us have experienced the thrill of walking down the street, having Dr. Neal take us by the arm, and share his friendly greeting with scores of others as we walked along. That was symbolic of his whole life as he took countless others by the arm and helped them, unselfishly, cheerfully, and tirelessly.

I extend my deepest personal sympathy to his widow, the former Miss Susan Witten, and his three sons, Dr. William L. Neal, Dr. Thomas E. Neal, and Joe Neal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I fully and completely agree with the feelings expressed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman HECHLER, in connection with the recent passing of Dr. Will Neal, an outstanding legislator, who formerly represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia.

I had the honor to serve with Dr. Neal, and his passing is a grievous loss to each of us. He will be greatly missed by his many friends. To Mrs. Neal and his family I can only extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that today I bespeak the sentiments of a majority of West Virginians here on the floor of the House, as well as an impressive number of fellow citizens in my native State, when I rise to the sad privilege of trying to put into weak words the tremendous sense of loss we all feel at the passing of the Honorable Will E. Neal, for two terms a Member of this House.

Our late and beloved colleague was a man who had a long and honorable service to his fellow man.

By profession he was a medical doctor, a proud and happy man in the certain knowledge that from the moral earth which has nurtured so many of our distinguished men of affairs he had risen through his own efforts to an outstanding place in his chosen profession.

By avocation, he was a humanitarian, intensely interested in the spiritual equation as well as the medical diagnosis and its eventual prognosis. His avocation was no better stressed than at one time when he answered a critic who had crossly emphasized that he wasted too much time with people who were politically incapable of helping further his public career.

His reply to the critic expressed, I think, his philosophy of life and living, in amity and harmony with his fellow men and women.

You never waste time when you are dealing with men and women and the problems of all human existence.

He was born October 12, 1875, in modest circumstances in Lawrence County, Ohio. From the outset of his mature life, he demonstrated a natural gift for hard work, close application to the old precepts of moral living, and close study of the best to be found in the outpourings of the great minds of the past.

He very early demonstrated his interest in politics when, on the first occasion he was privileged to exercise his vote, he walked during his lunch hour from the country school where he was teaching to vote for President William McKinley.

This political awareness continued throughout his life, and, if he had any regret of which I am aware, I would say he deplored and was dismayed at the manner in which small men in high public office, both locally and otherwise, tended to debase the ideals of the Republic's Founding Fathers and serve their own ends, ambitions, and tastes at the expense of the basic essentials of our free system of self-government.

After obtaining his medical education at the University of Cincinnati, from his home he commuted weekly to tend to a small grocery store at Hanging Rock, Ohio. Later he moved across the Ohio River from his place of birth to nearby Huntington, W. Va., a city of promise and youthful vigor.

His rise was rapid in his profession. He was regarded by his peers in medicine as an outstanding physician. He was firmly established in his chosen work and he and the former Miss Sue Witten, of Marietta, Ohio, were busy at the task of raising a family, taking part in civic affairs jointly, and savoring the strength and phenomenal growth of the city of Huntington, when the first call to public service came.

He was chosen for two successive terms as Huntington's mayor.

It is here that I would like to recite the story from one of his intimates of the unfortunate aftermath of his first venture in politics.

He had retired from the mayor's office just as the great depression of the late twenties arose to plague all of our people. As the story comes to me from one who knows, Dr. Neal related that he found, at the conclusion of his last term, that he had endorsed obligations for his friends to the extent of a figure slightly less than $80,000.

"I stayed up for an entire night," he related in his mild fashion, "debating whether or not to stand by my commitments, or to take the easy way of repudiation. My honor won the night and within 2 years, I had retired those debts at the expense of often working around the clock."

It was the mark of this man that he never took the easy way but honored his commitments to the fullest extent, not only in his professional capacity but in his personal and political life, as well.

Just prior to the great war with the Axis, Dr. Neal retired—in a sense. However, he could always be located in his office, at the rolltop desk he had first purchased as a young medical man. And it is no secret that his waiting room was always full.

Then came the days of the conflict, and Dr. Neal returned to active practice just as before, vigorously, compassionately, and with the innate skill of the born physician.

After the war, his pursuits were varied. He and Mrs. Neal visited the battlefields of France where one of their four sons had been lost on D-day in Normandy. They traveled extensively elsewhere, and, as always, our late colleague continued to demonstrate his keen curiosity about how the rest of humanity fared.

His travels included a visit to Australia and adjacent regions. He could discuss with great clarity and authority the problems of people and places far beyond the ordinary mind.

In 1950, he was once again called to the task of public service. At the importunities of many of his friends, he sought and won a term in the West Virginia House of Delegates. His career there was distinguished by his consuming devotion to his duty and his abounding concern with the time-tested principles of the Republic.

Two years later, he was called to an office which, in my belief and in his as well, constitutes one of the most important in our Nation—Member of the House of Representatives.

During his first term, he was a member of the House Committee on Public Works. From this position, he was a diligent advocate of constructive public works programs in the Nation. He was farsighted enough to see that ill-advised public works programs are false economy and those who temporarily benefit eventually rue the day they proposed schemes which impair the public credit, create inflation, and, in a great sense, erode still further the people's will to self-reliance in their ability to solve their own collective problems.

His record during the second session he served here is well known to most of you. You will remember his unfailing courtesy, his gentle manner of speaking in public speech and private conversation, and the courtesy which always shines strongly when it is inborn and not artificially acquired.

Friends are scarce to come by. It is a sad thing, but too few of us can assess properly the scope and circumstance of our real circle of friendship.

But it is my pleasure, in the sense of a sad duty, to note for the RECORD and the stimulation of the memories of my colleagues of the life and career of a man who fought a good fight, ran a swift and fair race, and kept in mind, always, the words of the poet, Scott:

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Will Neal was a member of the same committee as myself for a number of years.

There I had a chance to know of his character and integrity in the many ways that are given to Congressmen.

Many of these sessions were closed to the public. In those sessions, usually a man's inner thinking comes out. From all of my experiences with Dr. Neal, I came not only to respect him but to love him for the kind of person that he really was.

He came to Congress late in life. However, in spite of this, his mind was always open to ideas and new avenues of progress for America. I have never known a man more sincere in what he believed was good for his country.

I know many of us missed Dr. Neal when he failed to return to the Congress in January. On one vist to Washington since then, he came to see me and reflected the same sweet temperament which always characterized him while a Member of Congress. I know that many of us who knew him so well will miss him, not only as a Member of Congress, but as a friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. Will Neal who we all knew so well and loved so dearly.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Neal and the Neal family.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Will C. Neal came to Congress after a successful career in the practice of medicine and after devoting a good deal of his time from year to year to public service.

He was a straightforward man, one who was always on the job meeting his responsibilities and looking after the interests of his people. He was a very fine, high-grade citizen, and one whom it was my privilege to know very well.

I was very sorry to hear that he had passed away, and I wish to extend to his widow and his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest respect and admiration that I recall the days when former Congressman Will E. Neal walked these halls of Congress. During his service in the 83d and 85th Congresses, he worked diligently and stood fast on his convictions. Although we were not of the same political party, I nevertheless appreciated his sincerity and devotion to duty. As a comember of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee he impressed me with his warm personality and ability to understand and work with his colleagues.

Dr. Neal left this world last November. I miss his quiet manner and his gentle words of wisdom, but I shall long remember him and be grateful that he passed my way. My sincere sympathy goes to Mrs. Neal, who, I am sure, was the doctor's inspiration; and to his three sons and several grandchildren.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, It is with a tone of sadness and sincere regret that I join with my colleagues this afternoon to pay tribute to our former colleague and my good friend, Dr. Will Neal. Many of you in the Chamber this afternoon served with Dr. Neal in the 83d Congress, but it was not my privilege to know him until he was elected in the 85th Congress.

My association with him was quite close as we served together as minority members on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Not only did we serve together, but we were seated side by side during many of the hearings and it was through my acquaintance with him in that way that I developed a profound respect and admiration for him. Doc Neal was a kindly person. I never knew him to be critical to another Member's point of view nor to even slightly antagonize a witness before the committee, even though the witness was presenting a position in direct conflict to the philosophy of our departed friend. With this kindness though was a conviction of standing by what he thought to be in the best interest of his constituents and to be right in his learned judgment.

Further, he was a well informed Member of Congress. The wealth of his experience in dealing with people as their family doctor gave him a keen insight into human nature that better qualified him to understand people and to appreciate their problems. His expert ability to combine this infinite understanding of people with the knowledge he was ever seeking imminently qualified him to be a Congressman.

Dr. Neal's professional experience also enabled him to make an unusual contribution to the subcommittee upon which he served. This was subcommittee No. 3, having jurisdiction over health and science. All members of the full committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were eager to have the personal views of Dr. Neal, especially upon legislation from the subcommittee dealing with matters affecting public health. We could rely on his judgment and recommendations as being impartial based on complete information and further substantiated by his long professional experience as a general practitioner.

We certainly missed this gentle but persuasive voice in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. We shall further miss that voice and counsel knowing that we will not see him again in this world. Even though he will physically not be with us, the memory of his service and fine association will remain forever in the minds of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but further than that to the entire membership of this House.

As a friend, I want to extend my sincere condolences to his wife, children and grandchildren and also to his many close personal friends in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of serving in this body with the late Dr. Will E. Neal have been saddened by the news of his death. A distinguished physician, he carried on the general practice of medicine in his home community of Huntington for more than 50 years. A deep interest in public affairs led him to stand for election as mayor of his city, an office which he held for 3 years. Further service in the West Virginia Legislature led to his first election to Congress. He served with distinction in the House for two terms. During this time his associates learned to appreciate his sterling character, his fine abilities and his devotion to the work of the House. West Virginia and the Nation have lost a fine citizen, and we, his former colleagues, have lost a good friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I express at this time my condolences to Mrs. Neal, the wife of our former colleague, Dr. Will E. Neal and to say that it was with sadness and regret that I read of his passing.

Quiet, meditative, gentle and compassionate, he typified that combination of human qualities so seldom found in one person, namely the characteristics of the statesman and the physician.

Keen of mind, sound of judgment, and rich in years, he served his constituency and his country with dedication and devotion.

I shall miss his friendly presence in the House and I shall think of him often for he was a fine gentleman who one long remembers.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I join in paying tribute to our late colleague, Dr. Will E. Neal, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia during the 83d and 85th Congresses.

A hard, conscientious worker, Dr. Neal was an outstanding public servant, a man greatly admired and respected by all who knew him and by all who were associated with him. By formal training, he was a doctor, a profession which he practiced with honor for over 50 years. His complete, unselfish interest in the welfare of others led him into public service where he served with distinction his community, his State, his Nation.

As a young man, after completing his medical studies, Dr. Neal established himself in the growing city of Huntington, W. Va., across the Ohio River from his place of birth. From his busy medical practice, he found time to devote to the civic affairs of his community. He served his city as mayor for two successive terms. In 1950, at the age of 75, he was elected to the West Virginia Legislature. From 1953 to 1955, and again from 1957 to 1959, he was a Member of this body.

Will Neal loved people. He loved his country. His life was dedicated to his fellowman and exemplified the true meaning of the word "humanitarian."

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Neal and the other members of his family.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Will E. Neal symbolized an unselfishness that needs to be popularized and perpetuated if America is to reap the full advantage of her human potential. Dr. Neal practiced medicine for 45 years before becoming a Member of the House of Representatives. Rather than turn to an easy life of retirement, he chose to serve where his experience and aptitude might be of further value to his community, his district, and his country.

Dr. Neal's terms of office were in the highest tradition of one who devotes his life to the brotherhood of man. His mature thought, careful deliberation, and independent conclusions produced a record of outstanding contributions in Congress. I often talked with him about matters before the House which he insisted upon considering from all perspectives, with careful study and hours of pondering constitutional implications, so that his final decision would be certain to be in the interest of the general welfare. He did not respond to hard sell approaches to issues because he felt that careful diagnosis of every problem was a prerequisite to proper voting on all legislation.

Our departed colleague was a gentleman, a scholar, and a patriot. His equanimity, judgment, and sincerity were respected by everyone regardless of party affiliation.

The thought occurs to me that Dr. Neal's life needs to be portrayed more thoroughly among our peoples, if only to dispense with the notion that a person's active participation in business, government, and the sciences should normally cease when he reaches the twilight of his career on earth. Here was a man who had passed the three-quarter-century mark before his election to Congress the first time. His keen intellect and quick step belied those years, while, unfortunately a vast majority in our midst resign themselves to a life of inactivity long before they approach that age level. By assuming Dr. Neal's vigorous attitude and optimistic temperament, countless others might find far more enjoyment and opportunity for accomplishment in their upper years.

With the passing of Dr. Neal we have lost a firm friend, a solid Christian, and a dedicated patriot. He will be mourned far and wide, not only by the multitude of men, women, and children whom he attended in his extensive medical practice, but by every American who appreciates his devotion to duty while a Member of the Congress of the United States.

FEDERAL RESERVE'S PAYMENT TO THE TREASURY OF $266 MILLION OF SURPLUS FUNDS REPRESENTS ONLY PARTIAL REFORM—INTRODUCING A NEW BILL TO CANCEL $15 BILLION OF FEDERAL SECURITIES AND BRING ABOUT OTHER REFORMS IN THE HANDLING OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to cancel $15 billion of Federal securities. These securities are in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks, and they have already been paid for once. If we cancel these securities, we will save the taxpayers huge amounts of unnecessary interest charges which the taxpayers are now paying. We will also make it impossible for the taxpayers to be required to pay for these debt obligations again when they become due.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Federal Reserve System took a step which it should have taken years ago. It made a payment to the Treasury out of one of its so-called surplus funds. In this instance the payment amounted to $266 million, and the receipt of payment by the Treasury will, it appears, enable the Treasury to balance its budget in the fiscal year ending June 30 and possibly even end the year with a surplus.

Actually, the amount of this payment represents only a short step. The Federal Reserve should have paid, and should now pay all of its surplus funds into the Treasury. In this case the Treasury would receive not just $266 million, but approximately $1 billion.

For several years now I have urged that the Federal Reserve's practice of building up surplus funds be stopped and that its surplus already built up be paid into the Treasury where the funds can be used to help balance the budget and possibly retire some of the national debt. In the present Congress the bill introduced by me on this subject—H.R. 8301—on July 20 of last year calls for the Federal Reserve System to make a total payment of $1 billion from its surplus funds. This bill is still needed and should be enacted. While the voluntary reform which the Federal Reserve people have now announced is good as far as it goes, it does not go far enough. And by stopping short, with a $266 million payment when they should have made a $1 billion payment, the Federal Reserve people have shown considerably less than a full understanding of the Treasury's need for its money, and considerably less than a full understanding of good management of the public's money. These surplus funds lie idle and uninvested at the very time the Treasury is deeply in debt and paying a fabulous rate of interest on the borrowed money.

THE FED HAS NO NEED FOR SURPLUS FUNDS

The Federal Reserve System has no need for any surplus funds whatever. There is no conceivable emergency which could arise by which it would need surplus funds. This fact has been more than amply demonstrated by testimony of almost all members of the present Board of Governors, including Chairman Martin. It has been my privilege to ask these gentlemen about the need for surplus funds, and none of them has been able to think of any real need for them. The best argument they have been able to give for keeping surplus funds is that it looks nice to have the System's published balance sheets show a surplus, because the general public is accustomed to seeing a surplus of some amount reported in the condition statements of the private banks and in the balance sheets of the nonfinancial corporations. Thus the essence of the argument is this: Since those members of the general public who spend their time reading the balance sheets expect private corporations to be holding surplus funds at any given time, these people should have the pleasure of seeing a surplus item in the Federal Reserve's balance sheet, even though in the case of the Federal Reserve holding the surplus funds serves no other purpose and is making a dent in the pocketbooks of the taxpayers, including the taxpayers who may read the Federal Reserve's balance sheet.

THE FED'S INCOME IS SEVERAL TIMES AS GREAT AS ITS NEEDS

How do these surplus funds arise?

In the first place, the Federal Reserve System receives its income from interest payments made by the Treasury on Government bonds and other Federal obligations which the Federal Reserve is holding. It is holding at the present time approximately $27 billion, face value, of Federal debt.

From these current interest payments, the Federal Reserve meets its expenses, which are mostly the cost of providing free services to the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. Even so, the Federal Reserve has each year huge sums left over after expenses. In fact, its annual interest income is several times the amount of its annual expenses. Consequently, at the end of each year it turns back to the Treasury most of its income after expenses. In fact, in recent years it has followed the practice of turning back 90 percent, but holding out 10 percent which it puts into a surplus fund.

It seems to me that good management of the public's money dictates two reforms:

First, all of these surplus funds should, as I have indicated, be paid back to the Treasury and paid back promptly. There is no excuse for the Federal Reserve's holding public money idle and unused when the public is having to pay interest on borrowed money.

Second, the Federal Reserve System should not collect such huge amounts of interest payments in the first place. It is now collecting these payments and holding them until the end of the year before returning them to the Treasury, which means that the taxpayers are paying a year's interest on the funds by reason of the fact that the funds are being held idle when they could, instead, be used to retire an equivalent amount of debt. At the end of last year, the Federal Reserve System turned back to the Treasury $645 million of interest payments accumulated throughout the year.

NEW BILL WOULD SAVE THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY IN TWO WAYS

Today I am introducing a bill which calls for the Federal Reserve System to turn over to the Treasury for cancellation $15 billion of U.S. bonds and other debt obligations which it is holding. The bill would also require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to the Federal Reserve System, in place of these interest-bearing obligations, a non-interest-bearing demand note in the amount of $15 billion.

Several good practical effects would result from the passage of this bill:

First. As has been indicated, the bill would bring about a reduction in the cost of the debt. It would allow the Treasury to use, on a current basis, funds now going to make interest payments on $15 billion of debt. It would thus save the taxpayers the interest costs on an equivalent amount of money over the long period which the Federal Reserve holds this money before returning the money.

Second. The bill would have some tendency to reduce the general level of interest rates, for the simple reason that the Treasury would have less debt outstanding and, in carrying on refunding operations, would be less at the mercy of the operators of the so-called money market.

BILL WOULD PROVIDE AN IMPORTANT SAFEGUARD AGAINST THE FEDERAL RESERVES GIVING AWAY PUBLIC ASSETS

Third. The bill would provide an important safeguard against the possibility the Federal Reserve System might transfer some of its Federal securities to the private banks. Any reduction in the amount of Federal debt obligations which the Federal Reserve is holding necessarily amounts to a free gift of these securities, or the free gift of an equivalent amount of the securities, to the private banks. Acquiring Government debt obligations involves no cost to the private commercial banks. It does, however, make a difference to the taxpayer whether the Federal Reserve holds Federal debt obligations or whether the private banks hold them. In one case the interest payments come back into the Treasury, and in the other case, the interest payments go into bank profits.

Last year the Federal Reserve authorities recommended a bill to revise the reserve requirements of member banks—the so-called vault cash bill—which, as originally recommended, would have given the Federal Reserve both the mechanical authority and the moral support of Congress for transferring huge quantities of the securities it is holding over to the private banks. Any such transfer would, as I have indicated,

necessarily be on a cost-free basis to the private banks. In passing the vault cash bill, however, Congress tacked on expressions of legislative intent which condemn any idea that the Federal Reserve might reduce its holdings of Federal securities. Nevertheless, the present Federal Reserve authorities have a way of taking the bit into their own teeth and doing what they please to do, notwithstanding laws and expressions of congressional intent. They have come to believe that the Federal Reserve System is a fourth branch of the Government which stands over and above the three constitutional branches of the Government. They have, in fact, openly declared themselves to be independent of the Government, and they have had considerable support for this view from the head of the executive branch. And in many other ways their actions suggest they feel they are not subject to the laws that govern mortal men. So, just in case the Federal Reserve authorities get it into their heads to reduce their holdings of Federal securities despite the recent and clear congressional mandate to the contrary, having $15 billion less of marketable Government debt obligations would make such an idea much less tempting. At least there would be $15 billion less of Government securities which could be given away. Since the new obligations which the Federal Reserve would receive in exchange for these $15 billion of securities would be non-interest-bearing, there would be no temptation to give them away and no temptation to the commercial bankers to try to acquire them.

The bill would reduce the amount of the Federal debt subject to the debt limitation by $15 billion, since only interest-bearing obligations are subject to the debt limitation.

In conclusion, H.R. 8301, to require the Federal Reserve to turn its surplus funds back into the Treasury, is a badly needed piece of legislation. And the new bill which I have introduced today to cancel $15 billion of the Federal debt held by the Federal Reserve System is also a badly needed piece of legislation. I hope it will be given favorable consideration.

The bill I have introduced today is as follows:

H.R. 9511

A bill to provide for the retirement of $15,000,000,000 of the interest-bearing debt of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall direct each Federal Reserve bank to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount of interest-bearing obligations of the United States held by it such that the aggregate book value (the value at which such securities are carried on the books of the Federal Reserve banks as assets) of the obligations so transferred shall equal $15,000,000,000. Such transfers shall be effected not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel and retire the obligations transferred to him pursuant to the first section of this Act, and shall issue to each Federal Reserve bank a nontransferable, non-interest-bearing demand note of the United States payable to such bank in an amount equal to the book value of the obligations of the United States transferred from such bank.

The Wall Street Journal of last Thursday, January 7, carried a lucid account of the Federal Reserve's payments to the Treasury from its surplus funds and from its excess income of last year. I will insert this in the RECORD for those who may be interested in the details this account contains:

FEDERAL RESERVE PAYS TREASURY $266 MILLION—IT MAY BALANCE BUDGET—RESERVE BANKS TURN OVER SUMS THEY DECIDED AREN'T NEEDED IN THEIR SURPLUS ACCOUNTS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Reserve System handed the Treasury a year-end bonus of $266 million that will help the administration balance the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30—and might even result in a surplus.

The $266 million comes from a decision by the Federal Reserve Board, in consultation with the 12 Reserve banks, to pay the Treasury certain amounts of money they decided were over and above their surplus needs.

Treasury officials insisted they were not told about the payment until about a week ago, so that the money is a "windfall" for the administration.

In November, administration officials were taking a gloomy view of their chances to balance the budget for the current fiscal period. While spending had been calculated, as of mid-September, at $78.9 billion and revenues at $79 billion for a $100 million surplus, officials figured the 116-day steel strike had knocked the budget in the red by as much as $600 million.

Since then, as business has snapped back better than expected in the wake of the steel strike, these same officials have been sounding a happier note. Lately, they have been figuring they either would hit a balance or come close to it.

With an extra $266 million in their laps, however, their chances of balancing the budget—or even ending up with a surplus—are that much improved.

The $266 million windfall came about because the Reserve System decided it had been putting more money than needed into the surplus accounts at the Reserve banks.

The Federal Reserve System regularly pays the Treasury all of its net earnings that are left after dividends and after provision for building up surplus to 100 percent of subscribed capital at those banks where surplus was below that amount. This latter provision amounts to about 10 percent of net earnings.

The Reserve Board concluded that keeping surplus at the level of subscribed capital would be enough. So it changed the practice of adding about 10 percent of the annual net earnings of the Federal Reserve banks to the surplus accounts, and to pay to the Treasury the amounts by which surplus accounts topped subscribed capital.

This meant, a spokesman said, a payment to the Treasury for 1959 of $911 million instead of the $645 million it ordinarily would have received.

LOYALTY OATH

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I received a letter which I presume was mailed to every other Member of Congress soliciting support for legislation seeking repeal of that provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires a loyalty oath and an affidavit disclaiming belief in or support of any organization which seeks the overthrow of the the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

At this time I want to go on record as being unequivocally opposed to the repeal of that portion of the act under which this Congress has authorized and appropriated money for the use of students.

As I wrote in reply to the letter I received:

Any American should welcome the opportunity to proclaim and/or reaffirm his loyalty to the Unitd States of America and I cannot help being suspicious of those who for any reason would attempt to avoid such expression.

Mr. Speaker, instead of attempting to find ways to discourage public expression of the support of our Government, I feel that we should encourage our young people particularly to have a deeper sense of loyalty, and a greater appreciation of the heritage which is theirs to nurture and preserve.

Each week at service club meetings and at thousands of other meetings and gatherings throughout the land, millions of Americans are proud to stand, facing the flag, and repeat together the pledge of allegiance to the flag. On such occasions we are reminded of the freedoms which we enjoy as Americans, and I believe all true Americans are inspired as they repeat:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

And inclosing, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and other Americans, what possible objection can anyone who claims or professes to be a loyal American citizen, have to signing this oath which states:

I, ————, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

And what stigma can be attached to the affirmation contained in this affidavit:

I, ————, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I do not believe in, and am not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

CAN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ADJUST TO ARMS REDUCTION?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the economic consequences associated with possible disarmament have attracted much attention.

I commend to the attention of the Members the January 4 release of the National Planning Association, which provides a very affirmative answer to the question: "Can the American economy adjust to arms reduction?" which follows:

JOINT STATEMENT ON CAN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ADJUST TO ARMS REDUCTION?

The National Planning Association has repeatedly stated that the American economy is productive enough to afford those national security programs which may be needed both to deter a major attack and to prevent local incidents. We believe it is of equal importance to emphasize that the American economy can also stand substantial arms reduction.

Currrent negotiations related to world arms limitations may or may not lead to dependable international controls and reduced military budgets. We will argue in this statement that plans should be developed for dealing with the economic consequences of material arms reductions.

These considerations are intended to establish that there is no valid economic argument that arms reduction would bring about economic depression. The potential increase in nondefense supply of goods and services due to economic growth could be several times larger than the increase due to a substantial reduction in armaments. In this statement we shall state the reasons why we believe the task is manageable and enumerate four phases which we believe require detailed study and planning.

1. Let us assume that an agreement providing for substantial arms reduction could become effective, for instance 5 years from now. We are now spending $46 billion per year for national security. Within a 5-year period, with no change in present programs, this amount may well exceed $50 billion annually (in present prices). Even a total disarmament would not mean that these $50 billion would disappear entirely from the budget. There would be expenditures for the liquidation of contractual obligations. Quite possibly a national and an international police force would be established which would require financial support. And in all likelihood there would be substantial expenditures for international inspection and control machinery.

At present there are large expenditures classified under national security which would have to be continued and perhaps increased in the event of arms reduction. National security expenditures now include roughly $5 billion in support of research and development activities. This represents almost 90 percent of all Federal research expenditures and more than half of all research outlays, private or public, in the United States. Many of these research projects have peacetime aspects and could be reoriented. Also the whole nuclear energy program (including the nuclear power program) and the mutual security program are classified as national security expenditures and would be continued, although with a change in emphasis.

Thus, even a comprehensive agreement regarding the reduction of armaments would not mean a complete elimination of what are now termed the national security expenditures from the budget. It would not be unreasonable to assume that with substantial reorientations, such expenditures would be reduced by only one-half (to a total of $25 billion) by 1965.

2. There are a great many urgent programs in fields other than national security in which only slow progress is being made due to budgetary limitations. It has been widely recognized that education, health, and training programs are deficient and that our programs for conservation and development of water and other natural resources do not begin to meet the prospective needs (in part, because of the high cost of national security).

While we have embarked on a comprehensive road construction program, our airports and other air facilities are still far from meeting the requirements of the jet age, not to speak of the rocket age.

The spectacular metropolitan and suburban developments have created manifold problems which require an imaginative approach for which no precedence exists in any of the present programs.

The following tabulation presents estimates of cumulative outlays over a 5-year period by Federal, State, and local areas if deficiencies in a few selected areas are to be wiped out and if needed improvements are to be made.

Cumulative expenditure requirements for selected nondefense Government programs over the next 5 years

	Billions of dollars
Education:	
Classroom construction	16
Current operation	14
Total	30
Highways and skyways	75
Urban renewal, slum clearance, low-cost housing and community redevelopment	100
Water supply and conservation	60
Health and hospitals	35
Other programs (air pollution, research and development, etc.)	30
Total	330

We do not pretend that these estimates are precise. They represent an evaluation of what would be required to overcome existing backlogs, to provide for anticipated needs over the next 5 years and to allow for essential improvements in these program areas. The estimates are based on reports and studies of private organizations and government agencies for these particular fields. They are quoted to give an idea of the order of magnitude.

Present spending of the Federal, State, and local governments on these programs amounts to about $30 billion per year. Continuation of this same rate of spending would still leave us at the end of a 5-year period with glaring deficiencies. Even assuming continuation of present national security programs some increase in outlays for these nondefense programs would be possible. It may well be that increased spending on all nondefense programs five years hence may rise from the current level of about $50 billion to almost $80 billion without any substantial reduction in armaments. With arms reduction total nondefense outlays may well be increased to $90 billion. Reduction in armaments, therefore, would make it possible to devote $10 billion per year more to those purposes where serious deficiencies exist than would be possible if present defense programs had to be continued. Of the $25 billion reduction in national security expenditures, $10 billion might be offset by an increase in highly desirable, nondefense related programs.

3. There is a possibility that arms reduction might be associated with a greatly expanded program for credits and technical assistance in support of foreign economic development. Such support may in part take the form not of offsetting budget expenditures but possibly of an increase in public or private capital export. We have no basis for estimating a particular magnitude for such an item but the possibility of such an increase in outlays offsetting a part of the reduction in defense spending should be kept in mind.

4. After reorientation of some of the national security programs and increases in nondefense programs, $15 billion would be left for increases in private expenditures. Our projections of private expenditures for individual consumption, domestic business investment, and capital export in 1965 (assuming continuation of present national security programs) amount to $500 billion. Therefore, a 3-percent increase in these private expenditures would be needed to bring about a complete offset for the reduction in armament spending. Considering that the total Federal, State, and local budgets would be reduced by $15 billion, a tax reduction of about 7 percent would become feasible. There seems to be little question that with tax reduction an increase in private spending or capital investments would be very likely. Assuming that the whole amount would be available for additional consumer spending, this would make a difference of 2 percent between spendable income, with and without disarmament in 1965.

If politically feasible, a reduction in armament would be highly desirable economically. It would allow the shift of resources from defense production and defense services to urgent peacetime tasks and would permit tax reduction along with the resulting increase in greater consumer satisfaction. However, the magnitude, seen in the perspective of the economy as a whole, should not be exaggerated. With a satisfactory rate of growth (let us say 4 percent per year) production of goods and services in 1965 should be more than $100 billion (in present dollars) above present levels. This means that with defense expenditures remaining at present levels, $100 billion will be available for additional consumption, business investment, or nondefense Government services. With a reduction in national security expenditures as detailed in this statement, the possible increase in these goods and services would not be $100 billion, but $125 billion. But economic growth would lead to an increase in the potential supply of nondefense goods and services several times larger than the increase resulting from a substantial reduction in armaments.

This reasoning should not be interpreted, however, as suggesting that the transition from an armament race to disarmament would be an easy matter. First, our estimates imply shifts of production from one industry to other industries, often also from one region to another with all ensuing problems of readjustment. These shifts will not come about easily. We need a careful exploration of the areas in which high priority Government programs could take the place of defense procurement and defense employment. There should be advance planning in each of the crucial areas in order to prevent hardship and serious dislocations. There should be consideration as to which of these programs could best be done by the Federal Government, which best by State and local governments. Also the problem of tax resources would require consideration. A reduction in defense spending might permit Federal tax reduction while a considerable part of the increase in nondefense programs might be in areas which were under the traditional jurisdiction of State and local governments.

Some people may feel that disarmament is such a remote possibility that it is not worth while to spend any effort in that direction. To that we answer that none of this work would be in vain. In a period of protracted high-level armament we must make some progress on these nondefense programs anyway. The main difference is merely one of the speed with which we can proceed.

Moreover, unless we have a convincing economic plan for disarmament we cannot

forcefully answer the argument that we fear arms reduction because it may cause a breakdown of our economic system. In the contest between the rival economic, social, and political systems at times the threat of increased armament will be used, at times the promise of disarmament will be used and has been used. Competitive coexistence requires us to be prepared for both strategies.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND STANDING COMMITTEES SIGNING THE STATEMENT

H. Christian Sonne, chairman of the board, president, South Ridge Corp.

Frank Altschul, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co.

Stanley Andrews, executive director, National Project in Agricultural Communications, Michigan State College.

John A. Baker, director, legislative services, National Farmers Union.

Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL–CIO.

William L. Batt, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America.

Murray R. Benedict, professor of agricultural economics, University of California.

D. O. Bowman, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

J. A. Brownlow, president, metal trades department, AFL–CIO.

Otis Brubaker, director, research department, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO.

Robert K. Buck, Waukee, Iowa.

Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis, Minn.

T. C. Carroll, president emeritus, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Ways Employees, AFL–CIO.

Jacob Clayman, international representative, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

Harlan Cleveland, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

Myron M. Cowen, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Craven, Washington, D.C.

Harry W. Culbreth, vice president, Nationwide Insurance.

August Dahme, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Robert W. Dowling, president, City Investing Co.

Mrs. Katherine Ellickson, assistant director, department of social security, AFL–CIO.

Guy Emerson, Samuel H. Kress Foundation.

Grover W. Ensley, executive vice president, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

Ray Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp.

Arval L. Erikson, economic adviser, Oscar Mayer & Co.

Robert Faegre, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.

Joseph Fichter, farm consultant, Oxford, Ohio.

Sander Genis, manager, Minnesota Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Paul S. Gerot, president, the Pillsbury Co.

Carter Goodrich, professor of economics, Columbia University.

W E. Hamilton, director of research, American Farm Bureau Federation.

J. B. S. Hardman, New York, N.Y.

Rufus C. Harris, president, Mercer University.

A. F. Hartung, international president, International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO.

Albert Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO.

Leland Hazard, director-consultant, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

August Heckscher, director, the Twentieth Century Fund.

Oscar Heline, Marcus, Iowa.

H. Struve Hensel, Washington, D.C.

A. C. Hoffman, vice president, Kraft Foods.

H. M. Horner, chairman of the board, United Aircraft Corp.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

David Kaplan, New York, N.Y.

E. W. Kieckhefer, editor and publisher, the Daily Plainsman.

Alan Kirk, chairman of the board, Mercast Corp.

O. A. Knight, president, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers' International Union.

Albrecht M. Lederer, president, A. M. Lederer & Co., Inc.

D. M. Levitt, president, D.C.A. Food Industries, Inc.

J. L. Locke, president, Fisher Flouring Mills Co.

T. G. MacGowan, director of advance planning, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus Co.

John K. Meskimen, Director, Office of Labor Affairs, International Cooperation Administration.

Donald Murphy, director, editorial research, Wallaces Farmer.

George Nebolsine, Coudert Brothers.

Lowry Nelson, professor of rural sociology, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University.

William H. Nicholls, chairman, Department of Economics and Business Administration, Vanderbilt University.

R. J. Odegard, O. J. Odegard Potato Co.

Charlton Ogburn, New York, N.Y.

Lithgow Osborne, president, the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

Charles Palmer, president, Palmer, Inc.

James Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

Miles Pennybacker, president, Voltarc Tubes, Inc.

Eric Peterson, Bradenton, Fla.

Charles Phillips, president, Bates College.

Clarence Pickett, honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.

Emil Rieve, chairman of the executive council, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL–CIO.

Beardsley Ruml, New York, N. Y.

Stanley Ruttenberg, director, Department of Research, AFL–CIO.

Adolph Schmidt, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons.

James Schramm, vice president, J. S. Schramm Co.

Ted F. Silvey, AFL–CIO Research Department.

Fred Smith, vice president, the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Lauren Soth, the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Charles Symington, chairman of the executive committee, Symington Wayne Corp.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Heathsville, Va.

Lazare Teper, director, Research Department, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL–CIO.

Fletcher Waller, vice president, Bell & Howell.

J. Carlton Ward, Jr., president, Vitro Corp. of America.

Ralph Watkins, director of economic studies, Brookings Institution.

William Wavmack, Adel, Iowa.

George Weaver, assistant to the president, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO.

Frank Welch, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky.

Walter Wheeler, president, Pitney Bowes, Inc.

Robert Whitney, president, Marketing Audits Institute.

David Williams, director, research and education, Americans for Democratic Action.

David Williamson, Chestertown, Md.

David Winton, chairman of the board, Winton Lumber Co.

Obed Wyum, Rutland, N. Dak.

Ralph Yohe, editor, the Wisconsin Agriculturist.

Arnold Zander, international president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO.

HON. GORDON CANFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, GORDON CANFIELD, announced he would not run again for reelection, the thousands of people who love and respect him were a bit stunned and perplexed. They felt that as he had played such an active role in the affairs of our Government, it was unthinkable he should not continue as a part of it. For 17 years he served as secretary to the Member of Congress whom he succeeded and he is now completing his 20th year as an elected Member. A total of 37 years of association with Congress is a long time. He will be sorely missed but his example of courage, honest thinking, sense of fairplay, and his heart of friendship will long endure. His departure will be a loss to the Nation as well as to his many friends in Congress.

The people of his State of New Jersey recognize his worth and the loss to the State that his decision will mean and I am pleased to insert as part of my remarks editorials from the following New Jersey newspapers: Paterson Evening News, Passaic Herald News, Bergen Evening Record, and Newark Evening News:

[From the Paterson Evening News, Dec. 16, 1959]

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES "A CHAMP"

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least, in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation, and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his "boss," the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus, for well-nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD'S beneficences and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the CANFIELD juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD'S dedicated service and, in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again, in spite of the void he will leave

and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD's unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it—touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The "little man" was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped aboard a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him "nay"?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service we were his stanch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth, "Well done, thou true and faithful servant."

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Dec. 16, 1959]

GORDON CANFIELD'S RETIREMENT

The retirement of GORDON CANFIELD at the conclusion of his present term in the House of Representatives will mark the end of an era for thousands of Passaic County voters. Mr. CANFIELD'S principal asset during a political career which dates back to 1924 has been an ability to make deep and lasting friendships. To many Democrats as well as Republicans in the Eighth Congressional District, the man they know as "GORDON" is a dear friend in whose reelection they have always taken a personal interest.

The same warm feeling toward Mr. CANFIELD is evident in the Congress. In 1955, upon his return after a lengthy absence due to illness, touching tributes were paid to him by Congressmen of both parties. They also like the unassuming, hard-working, and always helpful GORDON CANFIELD.

Mr. CANFIELD began his Washington career as secretary to the late Congressman Seger, of Passaic. He had been a reporter on the old Passaic Daily News. When "the chief" died, Mr. CANFIELD was recognized as the logical successor. In 1958, Mr. CANFIELD was reelected for his 10th consecutive term. Even though his district is smaller than Passaic County, West Milford and Ringwood being in another district, Mr. CANFIELD polled nearly 10,000 votes more than the top vote-getter among the county candidates, a striking testimony to his popularity. The only time he ever came close to defeat was in 1948 when Charles S. Joelson trailed him by a mere 150 votes.

The legislative interests of Mr. CANFIELD have been the kind that do not make headlines. His particular fields were appropriations, the postal service, the Coast Guard, narcotics, and social security. He is credited with being responsible for the first appropriation to send Government narcotics agents abroad to fight the illicit narcotics traffic at its sources. He was in the forefront for years of those who advocated postal rates.

Mr. CANFIELD is better known for his helpfulness than for his legislation. He helped Clifton to obtain part of the Federal Government's quarantine station tract for a school site. His selection of candidates for appointment to the service academies by means of examinations and interviews conducted by outstanding citizens had popular approval. He was instrumental in unraveling redtape for refugees. One of Mr. CANFIELD'S Democratic opponents helped to win his reelection by charging Mr. CANFIELD with only doing little things for little people.

Mr. CANFIELD will take with him into retirement at the end of next year the best wishes of a host who prize GORDON as their friend.

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., Dec. 19, 1959]

AN OUTSIZE PAIR OF SHOES

Passaic County, as almost everyone knows, has gone Democratic almost all the way—freeholders, assembly, State senator. Yet for 10 consecutive terms the Eighth Congressional District, which embraces all of Passaic County except Ringwood and West Milford (in the Seventh), has returned GORDON CANFIELD to Congress, often by impressive majorities.

There's a reason of course. It can be simply stated. GORDON CANFIELD has been a good Congressman. He has just announced he will not run for reelection after his term expires next year. And, while he has earned the right to retirement, Passaic will lose the services of a valued and capable official.

Mr. CANFIELD typifies why party labels do not mean much when voters select their Congressman. Yet few present Members of Congress have been so peculiarly qualified, so carefully prepared for the position. Mr. CANFIELD, a former newspaperman, was secretary to the late Representative George Seger (Republican, Eighth). Mr. Seger coached him painstakingly as his successor apparent; so when Mr. CANFIELD finally did become a Member of the House he knew at the start more about the job than most Members ever learn. And he knew the value of prompt replies to mail, of patient listening, of constant mixing, of elaborate personal interest in every constituent's least contact with government.

Mr. CANFIELD may rarely have been spectacular, but he is thoroughly sound. In all the good connotations of the words, he is the old pro.

[From the Newark Evening News, Newark, N.J., Dec. 21, 1959]

AFTER 10 TERMS

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, the Passaic County Republican who is retiring from Congress after 10 terms, knew a lot about his job before he took it over. He had put in 17 years as a congressional secretary, and his experience paid off in service to his constituency.

When the dean of the New Jersey delegation leaves Washington next year the State will lose an influential voice on the House Appropriations Committee, where he is recognized as an expert in Treasury and Post Office Department matters. He ranks high not only in seniority, with all of its effectiveness in Washington, but in esteem as well.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his colleagues, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. WALLHAUSER, and Mr. RODINO, all from New Jersey, may extend their remarks immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in one respect, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute today to our colleague, GORDON CANFIELD. We are not saying goodby quiet yet. We shall have him with us for many months to come—to enjoy the warmth of his friendship, the richness of his experience, the generosity of his thoughtfulness and kindness.

I speak from a wealth of personal experience when I cite these qualities. On numberless occasions during my 3 years as a Member of this body, I called on GORDON CANFIELD for help, advice, and information. Never did I come away disappointed. On the contrary, each experience served to impress upon me more deeply an awareness of a really remarkable person—a man who combines the highest ideals of public service with a practical, working wisdom in the ways of politics and government.

I have never known an instance, Mr. Speaker, when GORDON CANFIELD did not know exactly what he was doing and exactly why he was doing it. In a legislative body where procedures are necessarily complex and involved, our colleague has the sure and certain touch, the precise sense of timing, the unerring aim of a skilled parliamentarian.

Despite his mastery of legislative methods, however, GORDON CANFIELD has never sacrificed the purposes and ends of government to the means. His skills have always been in the service of his ideals and the interests of the people he represents. This is the hallmark of responsible politics, the test of effective representative government.

Mr. Speaker, rather than anticipate the tremendous loss to this body that GORDON CANFIELD'S departure will mean, it behooves us today to salute a great Congressman and to congratulate ourselves that he will remain with us throughout the crucial session ahead.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I heard of the retirement at the end of this session of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, through an editorial

appearing in the Paterson Evening News on December 16, 1959.

This was a beautiful editorial, and has been entered in the RECORD by one of my colleagues of New Jersey. GORDON CANFIELD has been one of my dearest personal friends in my few years in Congress. As a younger member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, I have gone to him from time to time for guidance and help. With his years of experience, his kind and considerate personality, and his smiling radiance, his advice was sound, logical, and always given with a pat on the back, and I felt better after talking with my dear friend, GORDON.

While he was one of the busiest Members of Congress, he somehow found more time than the rest of us to be on the floor of the House so that invariably when we of our New Jersey delegation would appear in the middle of procedure or debate, it was GORDON CANFIELD who would brief us with a short rundown of what was occurring.

The Nation and the State of New Jersey are going to suffer a great loss upon the retirement of Representative CANFIELD, and we of the New Jersey delegation, who have looked to him as our leader, are going to find it difficult to carry on without him.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one proceeds through this life the cementing of fine human relationships becomes most important to many of us, and I feel that I have been accorded a high privilege and rare honor to have met, and I hope to have formed a fast friendship with the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, who has just announced that he will not stand for reelection to this august body after 37 years of service divided between his membership and service to a Member.

I have benefited—as I am certain many others have as well—from his advice and good counsel. However, more important than this, is the outstanding dedicated service that he has rendered to his constituents, to the State of New Jersey, and to the Nation. I salute him as the dean of the New Jersey delegation in this body.

My hope and prayer for him for the future, in which Mrs. Wallhauser joins me, is that he may enjoy years of continuing service to his fellow man and that he and his family will enjoy good health and all of the things that a man of his good character so richly deserves.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my regrets that my very good friend, GORDON CANFIELD, has announced his intention to retire at the end of this session.

Congressman CANFIELD is the dean of our New Jersey delegation. For 20 years he has served in Congress with the highest sense of duty and responsibility. He has been known to all of us as a valued friend, a conscientious legislator, and a dedicated public servant.

To his district, he is known as one whose greatest concern has always been the people and their welfare. His constituents regard him not only as their Representative, but as their devoted friend. They know that he will spare no effort in their behalf, and that he is always ready with a sympathetic ear and a helping hand.

Congressman CANFIELD has earned his retirement, and we cannot begrudge it to him. But we in the House, and particularly those of us in the New Jersey delegation, will miss his presence and comradeship.

Though he, too, may miss his friends in the House, and the legislative life of which he has been so much a part, it is my earnest hope that he enjoys this new period of his life to the fullest. He will now be able to spend more time with the charming Mrs. Canfield, and to do all those many things which Congressmen miss. We wish him success and fulfillment in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest experiences of my first year in the Congress of the United States was my association with GORDON CANFIELD, dean of the New Jersey delegation. I soon found the personal qualities which for over 37 years endeared him to the people of the Eighth District of New Jersey. His patience, understanding of human nature, his willingness to help wherever possible, his very real love of his fellow man, combined with personal integrity, knowledge of law, devotion to duty, and reverence for the ideals of the American system of government and way of life make him a truly great representative of the people.

I personally shall miss his sage advice and warm comradeship but, more important than my personal loss, is the loss to those whom he served the best—his constituents, his State, and his country.

Speaking for myself and as the Representative of all of the people of the First District of the State of New Jersey, I extend to GORDON CANFIELD our thanks for his outstanding accomplishments in the Halls of Congress and our best wishes for health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I heard last month that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. CANFIELD, has decided to terminate his services on Capitol Hill after 37 years as Congressman and secretary.

When I first came to the Hill 20 years ago, as a secretary myself, I had the privilege of living with GORDON at the home of the late, and deeply lamented, former Clerk of the House of Representatives, John Andrews, who was born in my hometown of Salem, Mass.

Many deep associations on the Hill are formed as the result of long tedious work together on committees. GORDON and I did not have such an opportunity. Our relationship was a personal one that evolved into a deeper one with the passage of time. His life with its share of sorrows and blessings became sources of concern and delight for me as he faced different experiences.

He will be missed by all who knew him. He was most friendly, considerate, and cordial in his relations with others. Yet, he was of an independent mind and tenacious in his honest convictions. He was ever ready to listen to any contrary view but remained firm in his former belief if the arguments to the contrary were not persuasive. There will always be room, and there will always be a great need, for men in the Congress like GORDON CANFIELD.

It is my hope and prayer that he, his charming wife, Dorothy, and his family have many long years of health and happiness ahead. It would be a fitting reward for a man who gave too much of himself in an effort to serve his constituency and his country while he labored here.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative program for the balance of this week. We are going to meet every day at least until Thursday—I will not go beyond that—because there is a very important discharge petition on civil rights on the Clerk's desk, so that all Members, both Democrats and Republicans, will have an opportunity to sign the petition.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I inquire whether there will be a session on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there will be a session on tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. HOEVEN. There will be no legislative business on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative business for the balance of the week. Members may govern themselves accordingly. The important business is, if they are going to sign the discharge petition, they may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I inquire with reference to Tuesday for the reason a Republican conference is to be held in this Chamber at 2 o'clock. I hope we may have finished our business by that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Every effort will be made to cooperate.

Mr. GROSS. What about the home rule petition; is that unimportant?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. All discharge petitions are important. I particularly refer to civil rights because President Eisenhower stressed it so strongly in his message on the state of the Union the other day. We would welcome at least 50 Republican Members signing the petition. At least that number would be welcome.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to find out who is entitled to credit for settling that steel strike.

THE LATE WILLIAM C. HULL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on December 23 of last year, the United States lost one of its most competent and dedicated public servants with the death of William C. Hull, who had filled the post of executive assistant to the Civil Service Commissioners since October 18, 1917. Bill Hull, who served under 9 Presidents and 30 Civil Service Commissioners, became a true friend and trusted adviser to innumerable key Government officials and Members of Congress during his 52 years in Washington. I myself have counted Bill Hull among my close friends for many years.

Having started as a $360-a-year messenger in 1908, Bill Hull advanced rapidly, and was appointed executive assistant only 9 years later. His competence was matched only by his enthusiasm for his job. He turned down all suggestions that he accept some higher paid position with the statement: "I've loved my work, and I've never thought of changing or retiring."

Bill Hull's dedicated service did not go unnoticed. He gained countless friends and became generally known as "Mr. Civil Service." Washington veterans knew, and newcomers soon found out, that Bill Hull had the answers to all civil service questions. He received frequent, lavish, and deserved praise from superiors, colleagues, Members of Congress, and civic organizations, all of whom found him very agreeable to deal with, as well as absolutely authoritative.

In private life, Bill Hull was a very active and public spirited citizen of Arlington. He worked for the community chest and the Red Cross, and was secretary of the Leeway Citizens Association and past president of the Arlington Civic Federation. In addition, he was vice president of the Arlington Hospital Association at the time of his death.

Bill Hull's death leaves a gaping void in the lives of his family and of his many friends. It also leaves a memory, however, that will serve as an inspiration to future generations of Government employees.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to establish a Congressional Elections Commission composed of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than two members of this Commission shall belong to the same political party and membership thereof shall be representative of the various geographical areas of the United States. Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for 9 years.

The Commission is authorized to make and maintain temporary and permanent registers of voters having qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated, to participate in primary, special, and general elections in the various congressional districts. Qualifications, however, shall be uniform for all persons and without regard to race, color, or national origin.

The Commission is authorized to conduct registration of voters pursuant to the act and to conduct primary, general, and special elections for the Senate and the House of Representatives, first, whenever requested by duly empowered officials of the State in which the congressional district is located, or, second, when the Commission determines that, unless such election is conducted by the Commission, persons having the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated are likely to be denied their right to vote in such primary, special, or general elections and to have their votes fairly counted.

Whenever the Commission conducts such election it shall be the sole primary, special, or general election for the congressional district for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and shall be made without limitation by State, local laws or ordinances regarding elections, election procedures, and so forth, the results thereof to be final, subject only to adequate provision for judicial review of elections to protect the rights of all parties.

This legislation is identical to that introduced by Senators HART, MCNAMARA, and others. It is the only way to really guarantee full and adequate protection to all citizens of their right to vote in elections so essential to democracy.

Other measures pending will not attack the problem of guaranteeing citizens both the right to vote and their full civil rights so well or completely as this measure. Enactment of this bill will be the most significant advance possible in the field of civil rights and will make sure that citizens will have a right to vote in congressional and senatorial elections.

There is adequate basis in the Constitution and laws of the United States for this legislation. Elections to the Senate and House of Representatives are constitutionally the province of the Federal Government, and only by reason of inaction of the Federal Government and delegation of authority have been conducted by the States. Legislation of this sort was recommended by a substantial majority of members of the Civil Rights Commission, including some from the South.

In many States qualified voters are being denied the right to vote. Legislation of this sort is now imperative, 90 years after the adoption of the 15th amendment guaranteeing the rights of all citizens to vote without regard to race, color, or national origin. I intend to push vigorously for enactment of this legislation during this session of Congress and will seek to have it appended to the civil rights bill now pending before the Rules Committee when it comes to the floor for amendment and vote.

THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN AND THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas was the host to the American Medical Association's national convention in Dallas December 1. On that day several thousand doctors from all States in the Union were welcomed by two distinguished Texans, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the House, and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate.

The speakers were presented by Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the AMA. In his address, Speaker RAYBURN told the doctors that in all his experience in Congress he had "never seen a man or a woman in that Congress that would acknowledge or say that he or she was for socialized medicine."

The Speaker stated frankly, however, that he had been disturbed and had been a little bit out of humor over the term "socialized medicine," which, he added, "nobody can define."

"There are enough people in the House of Representatives and in the Senate who are opposed to these things to stop them always," he said, "but sometimes there has to be an alternative, and that is when we would like to sit down with you and discuss it with you."

The Speaker urged the doctors to speak for themselves and not through some "hired man" in appearances before congressional committees, because the committees and the House of Representatives "are the best juries that I have ever seen a person tried before."

Doctors, he said, should be more active in civic affairs and politics; should "study your Government" and strive to get better government, by getting "good men and women" elected at the polls.

The Speaker's address, which follows, was direct and the doctors gave him a tremendous ovation at its conclusion. Republican and Democratic doctors alike showered him with compliments on his forthrightness.

REMARKS TO THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION BY THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, DALLAS, TEX., DECEMBER 1, 1959

Mr. Chairman, President Orr, Senator Johnson, and members of this great association, as was indicated here, I have been around quite a while. People have been good to me and I love them for it. Whether I have been good to them is a matter for

them to decide. I am 39 past. I was never sick in my life, but if there was ever a place where I thought it would be fortunate to become ill it would be right here this morning.

How they would argue across my bed I don't know, but lawyers do that right across the table from each other.

I am happy to be here, and I am happy that you came to Texas.

LYNDON said something about long speeches, and I told him I would take a very few minutes. He said, "Well you said that one time and I was sitting there and you took 30 minutes."

I am glad to speak this morning. To tell the truth, I would rather speak before breakfast than after dinner. I go to many meetings where there is a head table with 30 or 40 people, and I would have to introduce all of them. Some of them want to make a speech, because sometimes there are a good many of their constituents there. Many times I have sat until 11 o'clock, and at that time of night your food is dead in your body, and physically and mentally you are numb.

I was very much interested in President Orr's remarks. I served on one committee in the Congress of the United States for 24 years, a very important one. I was chairman of it 5 years. When I became Speaker I gave up committees.

What we were searching for in that committee all the time was information, and there are groups that come before the committees that are the hardest people on earth to get any information out of because, in the case of these great big concerns, the men who have built those concerns up don't come; they hire some fellow who comes to make a speech to be published in the journal that comes out next to make them a reputation, and they give the committees of Congress little or no information.

Every time a man establishes the reputation of giving the committees of Congress meat when he comes there, he is listened to and he is always welcomed back.

I shouldn't say this because they have been too good to me, but the committees of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives are the best juries that I have ever seen a person tried before. Those of us who have been there a long time and who love the institution want everybody that comes there to make good. They absolutely suspend judgment on them, give them a fair opportunity and a sympathetic hearing, and when they have had their opportunity, those who hear them are not off many percent in their judgment.

It is the same way with you gentlemen coming before the Congress of the United States. Come yourselves—don't send somebody—because if you do not understand the questions that affect medicine and its practice, some fellow sitting in an office somewhere can't understand it right quick.

I have been more or less disturbed and a little bit out of humor about some talk that has been going around the country for several years, people talking about something that nobody can define. I have served with more than 2,700 men and women since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives in a little more than 46 years. I have never seen a man or a woman in that Congress that would acknowledge or say that he or she was for socialized medicine. And yet sometimes there come out of Chicago documents accusing a whole party of being for socialized medicine.

The first time I talked to one of your presidents, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, I believe I referred to this matter, and he said it is a wornout, frazzled-out term. He said, "I never have used it, and I never intend to."

There are enough people in the House of Representatives and in the Senate who are opposed to these things to stop them always, but sometimes there has to be an alternative, and that is when we would like to sit down with you and discuss it with you.

Medicine is not static, because when you are static you are not moving any way except backwards, and medicine, I will say to you, in my opinion has made great progress in the discovery and treatment of diseases in the last several years, greater discoveries in its field than any profession that I know anything about.

I am sorry that it is so hard for brilliant young men to get into medical schools. I don't know exactly why it is, but they write me all the time and ask me to give them a recommendation as to character because I have known their fathers and mothers, that they may establish a character to get into medical school.

I don't know what you are going to do about it. I don't know whether you have the teachers that are competent, whether you can get them together, whether you have the accoutrements, whether you have the rooms in these medical schools, to take in more pupils, but I say this to you, that I think something has got to be done about it. What it is I don't know. Maybe I need your advice about it.

The other sciences and the other professions are bidding high, very high, for the brilliant young men and young women who come out of our colleges and our universities, and they are going to take that line which is very attractive. It is very attractive in compensation—any of the sciences now are. I hope that out of this group of brilliant young men and women that are doctors there will be formed a program that will get these people to make doctors.

I have had something to do with doctors all my life. I had a brother who was a country and a town doctor. He went in a buggy or on horseback in the backland lanes of north Texas any time they called him. He didn't have any office hours, but he had a telephone, and they could get to him.

Of course, now you have got to take people to hospitals, if there are hospitals, and there are not enough of them, and many of your communities will not provide them.

I want to speak to you about another matter for a moment. I was happy that your president referred to it. Just the same as I said before about coming before the committees of Congress yourself, not by some hired man, the same thing applies to politics and government. Don't read and believe some leaf that comes to you, probably written by some prejudiced person. Most of them, of course, would be Republicans, but some of them might be Democrats. I do not free all Democrats from that category, either, because there are a few of them that I don't agree with on everything.

Time was when everybody was a politician. When this Government came into existence, the man on the farm, the man in the shop, the man in the office, was a politician. He knew something about it. We had a simple government, and I often marvel at what was done in Philadelphia in 4 short months, from May 1787 to September.

What would you think today if a group of men having to do with something that affected the people, a political issue, were to meet in a room like this, 59 of them, lock the doors, and not let a picture be taken in there or a stenographer be present or a radio or a television? They would say that they were trying to put something over on the people. But if it had not been for James Madison and his notes published 30 years after the convention adjourned, we would have had no history of the happenings in that convention.

They met there with the great Washington as their chairman, and somebody one time said that wherever George Washington sat, there was the head of the table. Thomas Jefferson quarreled with Alexander Hamilton across the desk from Washington for a time, but he said that when George Washington had the facts he had the most unfailing judgment of any man he had ever known.

They brought forth a document there, as I have said, in four short months, and it was done by young men, too.

There was one old man in the convention, and that was Benjamin Franklin. He was 81. The great lawyer, Wilson, from Pennsylvania, was 65. George Washington, covered with honors and gratitude by all the people, was 55. James Madison, known as the father of the Constitution, was 36. He came to that convention having read every constitution that had ever been written in any time before that. Alexander Hamilton was 30 years of age. A man named Pinkney from South Carolina came to that convention with a completed proposal for a constitution in his pocket. He was 29 years of age.

They had lived, they had studied, they had thought about politics and government.

I speak to thousands of young people every year. They come to Washington by the thousands, senior classes from high schools and colleges and universities, and one of the saddening things to me is that there are fewer good historians in the United States, even about United States history, than any other thing I know. I tell them, You should study United States history and government in the grade school, in the high school, in the college, in the university and in the rest of your life, and then you won't know too much about it.

You know, the great British statesman Gladstone said that our Constitution was the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man. I agree with that a hundred percent.

Do you know something? Every time somebody starts out to do something for what I call "the folks" without demagoguery, somebody says, "You are pushing the country into socialism" or "You are changing our form of government."

The people of this country have been so wise that they have not changed that Constitution in its fundamentals one iota. The first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights were agreed upon by many of the leaders before all the colonies, the 13, ratified that Constitution, and since then it has been amended only 12 times. One of the amendments, the famous 18th amendment, has been repealed. Not one of those amendments affected one particle the principles written into our Constitution in 1787 because our fathers started out a new theory and a new practice in government.

Oh, the Greeks one time thought they were going to have a democracy. They called everybody in, and they tried to write laws and they found out that could not be done. A pure democracy wouldn't work. But these American men said, "We are going to have a democracy in a republic; we are going to have a representative democracy; we are going to fix it so that everybody doesn't go to a convention or a legislature, but we will fix it so that they can choose their representative to go to the legislatures and to the Congress and there represent them and write their laws."

If they are not pleased with that House Member they elect, they can take him out in 2 years. If they are not pleased with the President they can take him out in 4 years. If they are not pleased with a Senator they can take him out in 6 years.

They so arranged it that a third of the Senators come up for election each 2 years. That truly is what they dreamed and what they wrote, they made this a representative government.

Again I say to you, men of intelligence, men who have made their marks in their communities as you have, men who are trusted and men who are loved, if you will

allow your constituents to love you, you can be a great force, a great influence for better government. What you have to do to get better government is to get good men and good women voted for and elected at the polls.

There are a lot of things I could talk to you about, but I do hope you study government. Do not take someone else's word for it. You are as smart and maybe smarter than they are.

I could talk about our international situation, about which I am considerably humiliated and disappointed. I know this, that if I run for office it does not do me any good to be second because I am never sworn into that office.

The Congress of the United States has appropriated billions to make us first, and we are not. We have some bickering among the various departments in Washington, in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps. We thought we would stop that by passing a law that we thought was going to unify the services and maybe have one man at the head of it.

Of course, the President has the high responsibility over the Secretary of Defense. But there are still jealousies, there are still bickerings. I have been hoping that when we gave them all the money they asked for; gave them the kind of law they asked for, and put a man at the head of it who is supposed to be the head, that someday some man will get in there who will take these warring factions by the scruff of the neck and say, "Get together or get."

Well, I am happy to be with you. I say I have always liked doctors. I had the finest brother that ever lived who was a doctor. I think in all probability the doctor is the first man I ever saw, and I have been seeing them ever since. As I say, I have not needed them because I have never been sick in my life, and I can give you a prescription to give some of your folks, the greatest medicine in the world, and that is a reasonable amount of exercise, all the sunshine you can take, and all the rest you can take away from your labors.

When I am in Washington my burden is pretty heavy. I have 436 other fellows and women to deal with every day. Fifty of them are standing on the floor of the House clamoring for recognition at one time, and I have to study which one I am going to turn loose first, but the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives are just a cross section of the people of the United States who sent them. They are just as good and no better. They are supposed to express their will and their sentiments, and I say if they do not, they take them out every 2 years. But it is your responsibility, it is the responsibility of every citizen under the flag to go to the polls every opportunity he has and vote and elect men and women who will carry out your hopes, your aspirations, and your ambitions, and to rear a group of young men and women in this land whose shoulders will be broad enough, hearts big enough, minds keen enough to know this Government, to carry it on, to serve it, to protect it, and to perpetuate the finest and the freest government that ever blessed mankind.

PROPOSAL TO CANCEL GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has just remarked that we should cancel $15 billion worth of bonds now held by the Federal Reserve bank on the grounds that they had been paid for.

It is true that they have been paid for but by whom? They have been paid for by the Federal Reserve bank and are therefore owned by the Federal Reserve. If we had the authority to confiscate Federal Reserve funds why not confiscate the social security bonds and all other bonds owned by Federal agencies.

The Treasury does not own the bonds any more than it owns your bonds or my bonds or any workers' bonds or any insurance company's bonds.

It would be completely illegal and unconstitutional to confiscate these bonds.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 540 APPLIES MONROE DOCTRINE TO COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced a joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs where I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

Under date of December 30, 1959, I wrote President Eisenhower requesting administration support for the joint resolution and asked him to endeavor to place a declaration of its doctrine on the agenda of the 11th meeting of American States. This meeting was originally scheduled for Quito, Ecuador, next month, but has since been postponed to an indefinite date.

Simply stated, the joint resolution does the following:

First. Recognizes the vital danger to all American nations of a direct or indirect intervention by international communism into any one of them.

Second. Reaffirms the Monroe Doctrine's warning to European nations to keep hands off the two American continents.

Third. Applies the Monroe Doctrine to international communism, whether operating openly or under subversive disguise.

Fourth. Labels any direct or indirect intervention by international communism anywhere in the New World as a danger to peace and security of all American states justifying immediate exercise of these nations' inherent right of self-defense.

Fifth. Authorizes immediate individual or collective self-defense action by the American nations to forestall subversive intervention by international communism anywhere in the Americas.

Sixth. Provides for an inter-American administration of any American nation so rescued from international communism pending restoration of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Threats by international communism to leapfrog the Atlantic and take over countries of the Western Hemisphere both by infiltration of existing governments and by seizing control of liberal revolutionary movements constitutes a clear and present danger. The joint resolution embodies a program of action to meet that danger.

If the Communist efforts to control countries on the American Continents are not thwarted, the United States will become subject to destructive sneak attack from Red missile bases almost within sight of our own southern cities.

Communist regimes in the Caribbean, Central or South America, or any of them, would not alone imperil the United States and its American neighbors. By thus exposing the United States to attack from the south, the relative power of the free world and the Communist empire would be so drastically unbalanced that all Western nations and thus Western civilization itself could be overwhelmed and destroyed.

Each year hundreds of Latin Americans receive revolutionary training in Moscow and are sent back to work ceaselessly to subvert their lawful governments and replace them with regimes dominated and controlled by the international Communist conspiracy.

Their work is apparent today in Panama where our sovereignty over the vital canal is being harassed. The Cuban revolutionary movement daily evidences greater and greater subservience to agents of international communism. The cancer of communism in Latin America was exposed to world view in Peru where Vice President NIXON was mobbed and in Venezuela where he was stoned and spat upon.

The manipulations of international communism in the New World approach closer and closer to obvious intervention upon our continents.

For too long we, as a nation, have left the initiative to Communist enemies dedicated to our destruction. We have waited for their blows to fall, and then only improvised some hasty action to fend them off. In this atomic age only a few microseconds of attack warning may be available to defenders. They are far too short for us any longer to tolerate the possibility of military surprise from missile bases south of our borders controlled by international communism.

This Nation must develop, enunciate, and pursue forthright and effective policies within the inter-American peace structure that will actually keep international communism off the American Continents. In asking for prompt congressional and prompt administration action

on the doctrine of the joint resolution, I am seeking U.S. initiative and action to stop the Reds now, before it is too late. Unless we do so, we permit the stage to be set for a series of Red "back door" takeovers that eventually could engulf not only the Americas, ourselves, but the entire free world as well.

It is our duty to act now and to act decisively to forestall this threat.

It is in our tradition of initiative to achieve and preserve freedom begun in 1776 that we do so.

It is possible for us so to act wholly within the framework of accepted international law and principles.

The joint resolution was carefully drafted with that duty, that tradition, and that possibility in mind. It was conceived by Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, Yale University, an outstanding historian and authority on diplomatic relations of the Americas.

The joint resolution incorporates and extends to present facts and situations a long series of inter-American diplomatic policies and declarations from the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 onward.

As did the Monroe Doctrine at its announcement, so today this new doctrine might well boldly symbolize the decisive leadership and firm determination by the United States that alone can forward President Eisenhower's magnificent crusade for peace and friendship in freedom.

Rooted basically in the Monroe Doctrine declaring any attempt on the part of European powers to extend their systems to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to U.S. peace and safety, the joint resolution also draws on article 51 of the United Nations Charter recognizing the inherent right of national self-defense and upon inter-American treaties and diplomatic precedents.

The joint resolution spells out clearly what has not been clear before. Namely, that intervention in an American state by international communism is not a mere internal matter pertaining to the victim nation alone, and thus subject to the good-neighbor policy's inhibition against interference by one American state in the internal affairs of another. The joint resolution recognizes and declares that in law as well as in fact such action constitutes a foreign intervention prohibited by the Monroe Doctrine. As such, it is clearly labeled by the joint resolution as a threat to peace and security, and thus subject to counter-intervention and restoration of a free government to the people.

A corollary to the Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1859 by President Grant prohibiting transfer of any existing European New World colonies between them, lest such transfer upset the balance of power against the security of the United States.

Implementation of this corollary by the American states when Hitler's armies overran Europe furnishes precedent for a portion of the joint resolution. In 1939 the American foreign ministers announced there would be no recognition of German claims to occupied countries' New World colonies. In July 1940 Congress enacted a joint resolution carrying out the foreign ministers' pronouncement. Later, in 1940, the foreign ministers met again, at Havana, and gave a mandate to any one or more of the American Republics on their own initiative to step in, act quickly, and forestall any attempted German takeovers. By convention they also provided for an inter-American committee to administer the rescued territory pending restoration of a free government. These "prompt action" and "provisional government" precedents are found in the joint resolution.

Postwar, by 1947, the need became apparent for orderly procedures to meet certain new dangers to the sovereignty and political independence of American states. These dangers were, first, aggression from each other, or from outside the continent, which is not an armed attack, and second, any other fact or situation that might disturb the peace of the Americas. Based on the self-defense provisions of article 51 of the United Nations Charter, appropriate procedures were adopted for consultation through the Organization of American States, to be followed by such action as might be decided upon by two-thirds agreement. They were made part of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947, commonly known as the Rio Pact.

The joint resolution incorporates the Rio Pact's acknowledgement that aggression may exist even though it is not in the form of armed attack, and its acknowledgment that other facts or situations also may exist which are dangerous to American peace.

The joint resolution also takes cognizance of the declaration of Washington, 1951, and the declaration of Caracas, 1954, which characterize direct or indirect intervention of international communism in any American state as constituting colonization by a non-American power and thus a violation of its sovereignty and political independence.

However, the joint resolution rejects as inadequate to cope with present dangers the Rio Pact's cumbersome procedure of meeting, deciding, and ratifying a course of action by two-thirds of the foreign ministers of the American states. Delay in forestalling intervention by international communism might well be fatal. Realistically recognizing this, the joint resolution returns to the 1940 Havana precedents for a legal basis for immediate forestalling action to be taken before, not after the fact. It also is this Havana precedent upon which I have based my request to the President to place the joint resolution's doctrine before the Quito Conference in February.

The foregoing review—from the Monroe Doctrine onward—of 137 years of decisive and effective action by the American Republics to protect themselves from dangers from without presents a clear pattern of developing and extending basic policies to meet new and altered threats. It also presents a precedent, a basis in law and an inspiration for equally courageous and intelligent action today. To that end I seek U.S. action both by the Congress and by the President to implement the doctrine of the joint resolution.

The text of the proposed joint resolution is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 540

Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control and colonization by international communism in the New World and for other purposes

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States hereby

Resolve, That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Just 2 days ago a violent attack both upon the proposed joint resolution and me was made by the semiofficial Cuban newspaper Revolucion. This quick and violent opposition to a proposal to keep international communism from leapfrogging the Atlantic has but two interpretations. Either it stems from irresponsible oblivion to the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion in the Americas, or, it represents the official Communist negative reaction to any proposal to thwart its aggressive designs on the New World.

Both the dialectic in which the Cuban newspaper's verbal attack was couched and the quick heat with which it was made reveals the Castro regime has been hit at a sensitive, vulnerable spot. No American nation fears or objects to the Monroe Doctrine's warning to European nations to keep hands-off American

countries. None should fear or object to applying the same warning specifically to international communism operating under subversive disguises.

The source of this attack on the joint resolution is an argument for its prompt passage as well as cumulative evidence of a degree of non-Cuban control and domination of that nation's originally liberal revolutionary movement.

STRIKING AT THE TRUTH IN THE STEEL SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to share with my colleagues some of our feelings and thoughts about the settlement of the steel strike—not from the viewpoint of the terms per se of the settlement, but rather from the viewpoint that the political claims and overtones flowing from the resolution of the strike are patently misleading and, indeed, unfortunate. The steelworkers and the steel union settled and won the strike, and nobody else. But it could have been done so much earlier with so much less cost and suffering except for the unyielding stubbornness of management and a national leadership willing to play politics with our economic welfare.

Perhaps I can best sum up my views by saying it is another striking example of a leadership which is willing to take the second-best course and is attempting to offset this by claiming singular or first-class accomplishments.

Let me say at this point that I believe that the important thing in this election year is not to place before the American people a false, shallow image, but rather to make sure that the American people realize that if they are willing to accept second-best decisions, they will be placing their stamp of approval on a policy of assuring that as a nation we will be second best, instead of best, in virtually everything. I am not willing to accept this second-best philosophy of doing things along the lines of least resistance, and I join my colleagues who feel as I do in fighting against approaches, programs, and concepts of leadership which will have America assuming a second-best posture. We will document this in many fields in the weeks to come.

The steel strike was an example of what I mean. It took place in a basic industry affecting the vitals of the American economy. And it would have been logical, at the outset, for the administration to have acted resolutely and with real leadership. We were faced with the fact months ago that the leadership was failing to evaluate the facts for the American public. To be sure, figures were furnished. However, publishing cold, impersonal figures without proper analysis and application does not do the job of qualitative leadership the American people have a right to expect, and which was certainly demanded in this needlessly drawn out labor-management dispute.

The administration had wittingly or unwittingly given the steel industry its main propaganda weapon behind which it hid—the false issue of inflation, unexplained. And, indeed, the administration's priority push in 1959 for harsh, restrictive labor legislation, in which it met with success, no doubt stiffened the determination of the steel industry. The industry undoubtedly thought that organized labor had been discredited enough for the public to view labor's leadership proposals with lack of sympathy and even suspicion, and that this attitude had likewise seeped down into the pores of the union workers in the steel plants.

This, of course, did not happen. When the fact became crystal clear from polls both by management and the union that the striking union members supported the union leadership, then the settlement was achieved, at a cost to the steel companies much greater than would have been the case if an earlier settlement had been concluded—as witness the Kaiser settlement. Some of you may have read the story in the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1960, by correspondent Lee M. Cohen.

Not only did the stubbornness of management prove ill advised, but this stubbornness was dramatically costly to the workers involved in the shutdown, and also to thousands of others affected by it, especially small business concerns.

There is a truism in labor-management relations that we should not overlook or slight in our thinking. It is this: A labor union, in negotiating a perishable item, that is, the daily wages and working conditions of men and women, never gets more, however arrived at, than the strength the union commands. And if this truism is recognized, then I think it becomes patently clear that the situation is being twisted in an effort to give the steel settlement a political flavor to enrich certain political fortunes. Let no one be misled that the United Steelworkers of America was handed a favorable decision on a silver platter by certain men in public life. It would, in my opinion, be a grave error for union members themselves and the public in general to fall into such a pattern of thinking.

Yet, no one can deny that a well-planned effort has been made, and will continue to be made, to give, as I have said, a political flavor to enrich certain political fortunes. And I cannot help but believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the public realizes that a great national dispute involving a great national industry was so unashamedly maneuvered, at a high sacrifice to the Nation, that the ultimate effect will be public resentment against such a second-rate leadership job.

Mr MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the statement he is making in regard to the political propaganda over who should take credit for settling the steel strike.

The minds of the American public must well remember the pleas of the steel union leaders 6 months ago for the President to appoint a factfinding board so the public would know the true facts involved. Ex-Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, George Allen, and other steel officials were advising the White House to not interfere with negotiations that were completely one sided. Six months ago Big Steel was spearheading the drive to starve out the workers. They thought that after 116 days plus 80 days under Taft-Hartley injunction the steelworkers would gladly accept the company's last offer when the election took place. By December steel management realized the steelworkers were solid behind their union.

I recall when I went home after the Congress adjourned I attended a mass meeting of steelworkers in my district on Labor Day. I was told then that pressure was being brought to bear on the families of the steelworkers to urge a back-to-work movement in the steel industry. Millions and millions of dollars were spent in the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television to cause the families of the steelworkers to accept the companies' last offer after the Taft-Hartley law was invoked.

They were making fair progress on this until the steelworkers over the Nation realized the terrific pressure that was being brought to bear to defeat and ruin their union in this negotiation fight.

I will tell you when the steel strike was really settled. It was not Vice President NIXON, it was not the Secretary of Labor that settled the steel strike; it was the steelworkers themselves that brought about the settlement of the steel strike.

It started when Orville Kincaid, the subdistrict director of northern Indiana Steelworkers Union, called a mass meeting at Memorial Hall in Gary, Ind. David MacDonald spoke at this mass meeting. There were over 5,000 steelworkers in that hall. A vote was taken on accepting the companies' last offer. Out of the approximately 5,000 steelworkers in the hall, 3 steelworkers stood up in favor of accepting the companies' last offer.

Then is when management was convinced that the steelworkers were going to stick by their union and support their union in its fight for a fair contract involving wages and working conditions.

Let me say this, I only wish the Vice President and the White House had come into the picture last August. It would have saved thousands of steelworker families the privations and suffering they went through during this period of time.

I am glad to hear the gentleman from California take the floor today and outline the real, true facts regarding the steel labor dispute. I really believe that after the landslide vote was taken in Gary, Ind., that the companies' last offer was going to be rejected, right then is when it was decided by big steel to get the Republican candidate for President into the picture.

The White House and the Republican National Committee may think that this

political strategy may offset their all-out support for the Landrum-Griffin bill of last session.

Millions of workers throughout the Nation, especially steelworkers, cannot forget the lobbying pressures by the White House and members of the President's Cabinet preliminary to the votes on the Landrum-Griffin legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield very briefly?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am always happy to yield to my friend very briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If what the gentleman from Indiana says is factual, and I assume it is, and we are very near neighbors over in the Methodist Building and have been for years, I cannot understand why the Democratic Party and its spokesmen make so much fuss over this attempt to claim credit due, it has been said, to a Republican candidate. You just give it publicity in arguing about it—create the implication that a Republican really did settle the steel strike. Some of us, myself, for example, did not know that our candidate for Vice President, Mr. Mitchell, had settled that strike. Now you come along and are denying something that I have never heard charged. Or did I hear or read something to that effect? Of course, I have not been around all the time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan. I am quite sure the gentleman from Michigan is in the very, very small minority, if he did not know or hear about it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, who certainly, of all the people I know, is probably the most expert witness of the truth of what he just said.

In actuality, of course, the politicians did not dictate the terms of the settlement though they are willing to give this impression. If accepted as fact, this might, at a later time, be used as a bad or ill-advised precedent, because political or leadership responsibility is not to assume the actual task of settling the terms of a dispute but to assume the responsibility to see that collective bargaining really works.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I feel we should strive to work for an improved system of labor-management relations. This cannot come about when national leadership is turned off and on for short-term political advantage to the detriment of a long-term national proposition.

Mr. Speaker, a nation is no more outwardly strong than the true sum of its inner strength. Let the day never come when we or our children will say "it might have been different if only we had known." Our people do not want to be second best to anyone in anything. Our duty, with the help of others, is to be sure they can know in time to do something about it in 1960.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, first I want to announce for those who do not know it that I am a member of Local No. 1272 of the United Steelworkers of America. In 1936 I helped to organize the steelworkers of America.

Who settled the 1959–60 steel strike?

In Washington we hear of many claiming credit for this—and in the papers and over the airways names are being dropped continuously.

Actually the answer is very simple, but very few have mentioned it at all.

The 500,000 members of the United Steelworkers of America settled the strike.

The wives of those steelworkers—like the wives of the mineworkers of former years—stood by their husbands, encouraged them, recognized the need for united action in order to maintain job security in the mills, and managed to feed and clothe their families for the duration of the strike. These women cooperated 100 percent with their husbands in the struggle for principles.

The elected officials of the local unions are to be commended too, for they kept their members informed of the facts, aware of the pitfalls, and united to the last man. They proved, by their leadership and their help, that they were worthy of the confidence the members had placed in them.

The district directors and their staffs never hesitated in assisting the local unions in their districts and were available at all times to cooperate and counsel when needed, and they served as a direct line to the international offices in specific instances.

And last, but not least, the international leadership, under the direction of McDonald, Hague, and Abel—these men awakened the public in general as to the real issue of the strike, not inflation, but "work rules and job security."

These are the people who settled the steel strike.

Management, in its effort to "inform the public of the facts," did not hesitate to spend millions of dollars. They took full-page advertisements in the Nation's newspapers, their financially sponsored newscasts never hesitated to slant certain angles of the news, both on TV and the radio. They invested heavily in propaganda.

Management even went to the membership of the union with "personal letters" in which they said they wanted "our workers to have the true facts."

The leaders of industry knew there was a difference of opinion within the union, and they did their best to capitalize on that difference. They maligned the international leaders of the union, they agitated at local union levels, they even tried to promote a back-to-work movement by the wives. All of this, however, was to no avail.

They were not successful in their attempt to brainwash either the public or the membership of the union.

What management did not know or realize was that, although a new generation of steelworkers now comprised the membership of the union, most of the present-day members are sons of former steelworkers and former mineworkers, and their wives come from union homes, too.

The leaders of industry did not count on the solid front they found in the union. They did not know that today's union membership recognized the old saying of "solidarity forever, our union makes us strong" just as fervently as did their fathers and uncles in the yesteryear.

They were so wrong, these men of management, in underestimating the strength of the union and the loyalty of the members.

Starting last June, before the contract had expired and before the strike was called, Messrs. McDonald, Hague, and Abel asked President Eisenhower to appoint an impartial board to investigate the facts on both sides of the dispute and make the facts public. The President refused their request then and again in September and in October.

Mr. Blough, of the United States Steel Corp., had continually stated that he wanted no interference from "an uninterested third party," and so the President agreed to let "collective bargaining follow its normal course."

However, when the Taft-Hartley Act was finally invoked and a board of inquiry was appointed by injunction, there was no objection by Mr. Blough or the other members of industry. But that board could not do the impossible; it was not able to move the immovable Mr. Cooper and his associates, for they believed they could destroy the union.

For some reason industry and management still felt very confident that once the men returned to the mills and work they would remain there; they would not want go out again, nor would their families permit them to do so. The negotiating team for industry was sure that with the secret vote the leaders of the union would be repudiated and the companies' last offer would be gladly accepted.

The union sent out a sample vote ballot and the industry did a little checking of its own, too. The companies were amazed with the outcome of their survey. The men in the mills were overwhelmingly with the union leadership and they were going to refuse the last offer.

So the companies were forced to do, in January, what they had refused to do last June—they turned to the Government for help. I think it safe to say that in order to save face they appealed for intervention by a third party.

Who settled the steel strike?

The dues-paying members of the United Steelworkers of America, with the help of their wives and families and their faith in their union leadership—that is who settled the strike.

Now let us all join in singing "Men of Steel."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I will yield for a short question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just one little question. It is somewhat like a

hypothetical question. I understand you have intimated that politics has been injected into this settlement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not intimate it. I meant to say it frankly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That stimulates my perhaps inactive mind. I have not finished the question. Recalling that in what was thought to be a somewhat tight campaign the Democratic Party received from John L. Lewis $850,000, my question is: Is there anything unusual about politics or politicians or labor leaders becoming involved in labor disputes in an election year?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that the circumstances are quite different. I am sure if we go back to ancient history we could go on for some time, and I would rather talk about the present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes? The answer is obvious.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], also a member of the committee.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

I join my colleagues today only to make a few observations on the implications of the steel settlement insofar as they affect the American way of life.

We are happy to see the steelworkers back at work and more than happy to know that it means a little more of life's comforts for the steelworker and his *family*.

No one can take away from the workers the credit for their victory. It was an example of sacrifice and courage. No one makes money during a strike and yet, even the most severe critic must admit that the high standard of American wages has been set through the process of collective bargaining which has had to resort to the strike procedure in almost every breakthrough to higher ground in our national scale of living.

However, this is no time to review the history of the American labor movement or the trials and tribulations of the men who have headed the historical strikes and negotiations of the past two generations.

It is sufficient to say that Dave McDonald was faced with one of the toughest situations in our recent labor-relations history.

The steel strike, either by design or accident, came hard on the heels of the greatest expose against labor unions in our entire history. For months, the public had been hammered with stories of corruption, wrongdoing, malpractice and almost everything that would tend to create the belief that labor leaders were selfish, arrogant, crooked, detestable and un-American.

Congress, always willing to be reelected, and seeking the popular side of an issue, overwhelmingly passed the Landrum-Griffin version—the Kennedy labor reform bill.

In the face of all this public reaction against labor unions, fomented by the McClellan committee activities, McDonald and the steelworkers ran into a stonewall attitude on the part of steel management who had worked up a program based upon the expediency of the moment.

This program was aimed at cutting the heart out of all future labor contracts. The fight was based upon an attempt to take away from the unions any right to discuss, negotiate or in any way interfere with work rules, layoffs, job changes, production quotas, age limits, seniority preferences in job selections and others heretofore subjects of labor-management relations.

This was not a single effort on the part of the steel companies. It was and is part of a well conceived, well financed plan of action by organized management that extends beyond the borders of this great country.

Following are just a couple of stories out of Business Week, November 28, 1959, issue:

DU PONT SUBSIDIARY IN ARGENTINA SETTLES STRIKE WITH 30 PERCENT

A U.S. chemical subsidiary lost a lot of production this fall when it got caught in a crossfire between the Argentine Government and labor. The uproar quieted down this week, and output has resumed.

President Frondizi's regime is committed to holding the line against inflationary wage increases. Last June, when employees of Ducilo S. A. du Pont's synthetic fiber producer, demanded wage increases, the company offered a 30 percent across-the-board raise, if accompanied by changes in work practices that would increase productivity.

* * * * *

The union refused the productivity demand but did not strike until September, when 2,500 workers went out as part of the general textile strike called by the Argentine textile workers union to protest government economic policies. Before the strike, slowdowns practically paralyzed the company.

The Argentine Government ordered the Ducilo workers to negotiate an agreement, but union leaders refused to show up for mediation meetings. The Minister of Labor then declared the strike illegal.

Last month Ducilo dismissed the workers. When the company started recruiting a new labor force strikers lit bonfires on roads to the plant, stoned buildings, and attacked job applicants.

Later in the same issue we read this:

British labor's campaign for a shorter workweek (Business Week, Nov. 7, 1959, p. 138) moved forward on one front this week but got stopped cold on another.

Ford Motor Co., Ltd., agreed to cut the work week from 42 to 41½ hours without loss of earnings. The company refused to grant a third week of vacation with pay and asked the union to cooperate in getting better output and workshop discipline.

In contrast, the shipbuilding industry turned down union demands, saying labor had not shown readiness to eliminate restrictive labor practices.

In the past, the industry, threatened with a strike, has given in to labor demands. This time, observes believe management will be adamant.

You will note the parallel lines in the situation here, in Argentina, and in England. Governments, holding what they call the line against inflationary wage increases, management dealing for complete control over production, hours, quotas, and so forth.

It appears that American producers who have moved into foreign countries are going to use their concessions in other countries to break down the American standards of labor-management relations as we know them to be.

If Big Steel could succeed in their organized plan to take the unions out of management practices where they affected the welfare of the union member, then it would not be long before the union member awakened to the practical fact that his union membership was more of an honorary membership than a forceful, mutually beneficial association of fellow workers.

With laws pertaining to minimum wages, maximum hours, unemployment compensation, injured workmen's compensation, social security, retirement benefits, unfair labor practices plus Walsh-Healey, Taft-Hartley, Davis-Bacon, and the Landrum-Griffin statutes, a labor union has only wages and working conditions to really bargain for.

If management can get a few more Federal laws on seniority, vacations, maximum pay schedules to hold the imaginary inflation line and then get the steel companies' formula on production practices about the only thing the unions will have left will be the right to hold a parade on Labor Day.

While all of this was going on, the public knew little of the terrific pressures McDonald and his steelworkers were under. Almost every medium of public expression was yelling for a settlement at any price—preferably the company version.

Men in the labor movement, members and officers alike, know the hard facts behind the strike. They knew that the wage issue was secondary to the issue on fundamental jurisdiction on work practices.

Knowing this, the workers suffered great personal financial hardship with a strike of over 3½ months. In my extension of remarks, I expect to cover this more fully.

Then came the tussle of overinvoking the compulsory work clause of Taft-Hartley. The companies finally won the court tests and the workers were ordered back to work.

In the meantime, the company position started to disintegrate and more and more of the producing companies started individual negotiations with McDonald and the steelworkers.

Seeing their position slipping away from them, the steel companies had to have a graceful way out.

Lo and behold, America woke up one fine morning and found the strike settled. Who settled it? Who pulled the miracle? Who was the genius who got the union a raise and made the steel companies back down?

According to radio, TV, and the press, it was none other than the Republican candidate for President of the United States—the country, not the steel company—RICHARD NIXON, that great broken-political-field runner whose training in California politics running against Helen G. Douglass and his wit-matching episode with Nikita Khrushchev and his ability to dodge Venezuelan hecklers made him a qualified negotiator in a situation such as this, particularly in an election year.

How did he settle this great issue? Well, according to the TV broadcast last Thursday morning that I listened to, he did it by "laying the cards" on the table and pointing out what would happen to both labor and management if they did not sign before Congress passed some sort of a labor bill, probably an antitrust, compulsory arbitration, and a prohibitive measure against strikes in so-called basic industries.

In the face of this kind of a threat and the political advantage that would accrue to their candidate, the steel companies backed up—to a well prepared fortification in the rear—and signed up.

Labor, of course, was jubilant and McDonald won his point without losing a man.

Some partisan politicians are condemning labor for allowing the Republican candidate to grab all the glory in this great strike settlement. However, that was before McDonald disclosed that the father of the announced Democratic candidate, Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, had also played a very important behind-the-scenes part in the negotiations.

This made it nonpartisan, but it did not wipe out the grave and serious precedent set by the front page stories that could establish a new basis for settlement and negotiation in labor disputes.

I agree with McDonald of the steel union when he said "everybody likes a little help," and I also agree and applaud the help given by both NIXON and Mr. Kennedy.

But he might have been following the advice given years ago to a young man, who is in this room today, when he was seeking election to an executive position in a large international union. The only man who had enough votes to elect him was particularly and personally obnoxious to this individual. And, he did not want to seek his help. However, in speaking to an oldtime labor leader who had been successful in his own field for many years, he was given this advice. He said, "Whether you like the man or not has nothing to do with it, because in getting the election that you are after, you will be able to do some good. So, my advice to you is, deal with the devil to win, then kick the devil out." He might have been listening to that advice.

The point I want to make though is that, if the basis of the settlement was the fear of congressional action and the threat by a high Government official, that unless an agreement was reached, reprisals in the form of abusive or restrictive legislation would be invoked, then sirs, we have drifted a long way from free enterprise and free labor.

I would be first to applaud a settlement of a strike, but by the same token, I would be the first to condemn the injection of governmental threats as a common practice in labor disputes.

We would soon get the same kind of labor relations that Russia and other freedom-suppressing nations have if the elected officials in this Government of ours can threaten any labor organization with reprisals by law and force a settlement with any industry. Today, yes, according to all that we hear, labor has gained a point. Tomorrow they may lose a point. This is not the kind of negotiation where threats ought to be made by anybody.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for yielding to me and also for obtaining this time to comment upon the settlement of the steel strike.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to review the fact that the President repeatedly over a period of 106 days said that "we have got thoroughly to test out and use the method of free bargaining." Through those 106 days the steel strikers each lost an average of about $2,000, for what he thought was his economic right.

Now, I ask you if the steel companies themselves lost anything during those 106 days, and I will let the financial reports of the steel companies and the Wall Street Journal tell the story of their year's profits for 1959. I think you will find out that those profits as related in the Wall Street Journal will show you that the steel companies did not lose money in 1959, due to the accelerated production of steel in the first 6 months of 1959 and due to the monopolistic control of steel prices. If I buy a steel beam from the Kaiser company at Fontana, 60 miles from my home in Los Angeles, I pay the same price for it that I pay for the same type of steel beam that comes from Pittsburgh. You can call it monopoly, you can call it Pittsburgh plus, f.o.b., or anything you want, but the fact remains that there is a managed price in the steel industry which has brought to them the greatest profits that they have ever had in the history of their operation. In 1959, when they only operated at 58 percent of capacity, they made more profits than they made in any previous peacetime year, and they did not cut their price one dime. Under your old law of supply and demand, when your supply becomes plentiful, you cut prices so that you can get bigger distribution in the market, but this does not seem to hold true in the steel companies.

I want to compare the President's position that "we must not interfere with free collective bargaining in the steel strike," when he waited for 106 days while the steel companies and the wholesalers made extraordinary profits on their inventories, and the steelworkers suffered a loss, with the shipping strike where, in exactly 6 days after the shipping workers went on strike, the President invoked the Taft-Hartley Act. Six days in one instance, while he was talking about free collective bargaining, and 106 days in the other. I would like to have someone explain the consistency of the President's position in letting free collective bargaining work for 106 days in one instance and then preventing it from working after 6 days in another instance.

There is a very simple answer to that. The steel companies were not hurting during those 106 days, but you cannot stockpile shipping services. The shipping firms were hurting. That is the basic difference between invoking the Taft-Hartley Act in the case of the shipping strike and not doing it in the case of the steel strike. In my opinion, this shows the completely hypocritical position of the administration.

Now there is the question of who settled the strike. That is going to be dwelt upon at length today. We know the newspapers gave two gentlemen who may be the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the Republican Party the credit for settling this strike. The newspapers are owned by Republicans and you can expect that.

I happened to ride back from Los Angeles—I think it was on the third day of January—on the same plane that carried the candidate for president of the Republican Party. The plane made a world's record of 3 hours and 39 minutes. What did the headlines say? The headlines did not carry the fact that the Boeing 707 jet made a world's record of 3 hours and 39 minutes. It carried the fact that the Vice President of the United States was riding on the plane that made the record. This is just a foretaste of what you are going to have all during 1960. Every instant, every event will be twisted to a headline in favor of the presidential candidate on the Republican ticket.

The real fact is that a poll was taken just before the settlement of the steel strikers and 96 percent of them said that they were going out on strike when the Taft-Hartley period was over.

The next thing is that certain people do not want a strike in 1960, because that is an election year and it will not set well with the people of the United States to have the theme of peace and prosperity disturbed. So undoubtedly there was some pressure upon Mr. Blough and some of the other gentlemen of the steel companies. But I want you to note very carefully that Mr. Blough and others said that, "We do not have any present plans to raise steel prices." No; they will not raise prices, in my opinion, until after the election in November. And then you are going to get your steel price rises. Do not think for a minute that you are not going to get them.

I advise any of my friends who want to read something good, to look at the January 7 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, an article entitled "Steel Executives Scowl at Contract." In one of the paragraphs it says:

> In fact, it now is pretty obvious that the companies have signed new contracts at a price that would have brought settlements much sooner, and without a strike.

That is the real guts of the situation. One of the senior Senators on the other side of the Capitol quoted a noted commentator as follows:

> The strike was not settled by free bargaining. It was settled by a political fix.

Mr. Lippmann was the commentator and his complete article is worth reading.

The American people are not going to be fooled in 1960, in my opinion, by the Madison Avenue publicity men.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my colleague from California.

May I say in conclusion that so far as I am concerned the important thing for us to remember from this steel strike is not just a negative attitude but a positive attitude. There can be no question that there is a serious problem that faces the Nation to improve management-labor relations with respect to collective bargaining.

I think the important thing to remember is that if we go into this or settle this on the basis of threats or on the basis of political advantage we will be doing our country a tremendous disservice. If, on the other hand, we can approach management-labor and Government's part in these proceedings from the point of view of bringing the machinery up to date in order that it may match machinery created in other countries, and achieve greater productivity in our country, more efficiency, and a higher standard of living, then I think we will have done our job for future generations.

BOMBING ATTACKS ON SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge once again that the Congress recognize the fact that our Nation's most basic and sacred principles are being challenged and threatened by the continuing predilection of an increasingly insolent lunatic fringe to settle differences of opinion by dynamite.

According to an excellent study that was published jointly by the American Friends Service Committee, the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and the Southern Regional Council, 30 homes, 4 schools, 7 churches, 4 Jewish temples, and a YWCA building were bombed in the South during the period from 1955 to 1959. In addition, there were a few bombings in the North, several unsuccessful bombing attempts in the South, and an epidemic of macabre bombing hoaxes throughout the country. The study does not include the most recent outrages, such as the bombing of the Little Rock school board last September. The sickening outbreak of swastika signs on synagogues in Germany and in the United States within the holiday season—when the spirit of good will toward men should be strongest—underscores the gravity of current conditions.

It is obvious that we are dealing with more than just a few isolated outbursts of madness. We are dealing with a small but determined group that seeks to introduce alien methods into the political and social life of America. Our Nation is deeply committed to the precept that controversies among ourselves can and must be solved peaceably within our legal framework, in which reason prevails. This precept is now being challenged by men who are contemptuous of the law and bereft of reason. They know that they cannot convince the reasonable and the civilized with their wild, incoherent harangues. Consequently they have decided to attack civilization itself with the most destructive weapon at their disposal: dynamite.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no other logical explanation for these attacks on schools and houses of worship. Such buildings are symbolic of the very essence of our civilization. The barbarians who attack them are on their way down to the level of totalitarian bully boys whose favorite hobby is the desecration of cemeteries.

The ominous nature of the destructive crimes under discussion is in itself enough to make these acts a matter of national concern. There are, however, more concrete reasons for Federal intervention. In the first place, dynamite is not an item that is likely to be readily available in most communities. It may be safely assumed that the perpetrators of the bombing crimes bring their dynamite in from remote sources, and that the explosives cross at least one State line before they reach their target. We do not permit dope to circulate freely in this country; there is no reason to be any more complacent where dynamite is concerned.

In the second place, police have found that many of the bombings are the work of dynamite experts. The conclusion is inescapable that these merchants of destruction travel from State to State in the pursuit of their evil objectives.

Nevertheless, it has been said that Federal intervention is unnecessary since the States are capable of handling the problem without Washington's assistance. Unfortunately, the record does not support this point of view. The wave of major and minor bombing incidents that started in 1954 shows few, if any, signs of abating. It is difficult to say whether local measures have been halfhearted or inept; the fact remains that they have been largely ineffective. There have been few indictments and even fewer convictions. In many instances, there is overwhelming evidence of police laxity. The record shows, for instance, that the home of a Southern lady, who had the audacity to suggest publicly that extremism might not be the only approach to race relations, was three times the target of bombing attacks in a period of four days. The first two bombs failed to explode, but the third bomb did severe damage to the lady's home. It is impossible to believe that this depravation could not have been prevented if local authorities had been adequately vigilant. It is also difficult to understand why there were no convictions in this case and in so many other cases.

The bombing epidemic is not confined to the criminals who actually put their evil theories into practice. On the fringes, there are countless shadowy figures with wicked or warped minds who perpetrate bombing hoaxes in order to disrupt classes, break up religious services, and to spread fear and terror. They, too, must be stopped.

It is up to the Congress to take the lead in ending the bombing epidemic and all its side effects. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 465, which I introduced during the first session, will enable the Federal Government to deal effectively with those who would replace the rule of reason with the tyranny of terror. The bill would make it a Federal crime to import, or transport in interstate commerce, any explosive with the knowledge that it is intended for illegal use. It would also make the possession of such explosives punishable by Federal law. In addition, the bill provides for Federal prosecution of persons who knowingly impart false information regarding attempts to commit acts that are prohibited by this legislation.

Enactment of this bill will take the dynamite out of the hands of the lunatic fringe; it will restore the exclusive rule of law and order; and it will prevent the catastrophes that are bound to occur if the school and church bombers go unchecked. The situation is critical. We cannot afford to let it simmer any longer. We must act rapidly and decisively. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we do so by enacting H.R. 465.

CUBA: PATIENCE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the island of Cuba is an independent nation close to the United States in many ways. The Cuban people have the right to choose their own form of government, their governing officials, and to enact and enforce their own laws.

By revolution they sought a form of government free from oppression with guarantees of free speech, free press, free elections, and laws that would afford justice to all.

A year ago the world received word that the Castro revolution was successful, and Dr. Castro proclaimed "a new day for the people of Cuba." Everyone was hopeful, knowing, however, that there was obviously a tremendous task ahead. Constructing a free government from the rubble of civil war and the high-pitched emotions that ensue is no easy task; certainly not a part of the victory to be accomplished overnight. Such success would only emanate from justice, patience, and fortitude through the prudent leadership of responsible governing officials whose aims and actions were intelligently directed in consort with unexcelled moral conscience and acknowledged practices of good government.

Friends of Cuba and freedom-loving people the world over have watched and waited hopefully for evidences of freedom, stability, organization, and administration. Dr. Fidel Castro, the great revolutionary general, still maintains the primary responsibility for carrying out his promises. Although there have been many signs and words that have left encouragement in this regard, other actions and statements have created a state of consternation.

Recently there have been numerous cases of the questionable arrest and detention of Cubans, American citizens, and others. One such incident shocked the entire free world when Jim Bu-

chanan, a staff writer for the Miami Herald, a Knight newspaper published at Miami, Fla., was detained, imprisoned, tried, and convicted while in Havana, Cuba, covering a news assignment. After being imprisoned for 12 days without charges in a freezing cold prison cell with light rations of horrible food, Mr. Buchanan, on the 13th day, was driven some 100 miles to Pinar del Rio. There he was tried an hour after arrival and by midnight found guilty of "concealing information." A military tribunal rendered a 14-year sentence. This was suspended on condition that Mr. Buchanan, a frequent visitor and longtime friend of Cuba, leave Cuba, never to return.

Maybe the Cubans have gained much through some of the Castro reforms. I certainly hope so. But continuation of "revolutionary methods" by an administration which is extremely popular at home hardly seems justified after a period of 1 year.

Certainly the doings of our closest neighbor are of concern to all of us. Cuban-American relations have always been of particular interest to me, more so since I serve on the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Miami is the gateway to Latin America. Our people have prided themselves in understanding the people of Cuba and Latin America. It is this bond which has kept me from speaking before and I speak now only with compassion and hope, for we are bound historically and on fundamental principles of government. But how patient can we be? For how long? Perhaps it is better to say, how patient can the Cuban people be?

Our relations may be strained, but we as a matter of policy did not make them that way. As John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Knight newspapers says:

> We must never be tempted into believing that United States-Cuban relations have deteriorated to the point of no return. Historically, the two nations have long been friends. As so it must be again.

Top newspapers throughout the world have given page 1 prominence to a series of articles written by Jim Buchanan following his return to this country. The articles were available to the Associated Press clients over the world. The worldwide printed accounts attest to the interest in Cuba's struggle for freedom for her peoples, the freedom of the Cuban press, as well as the world's press.

Here is the story as told by Jim Buchanan in his day-by-day prison diary and articles:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1959]

DOES CASTRO KNOW THE FEAR HE IS CREATING?—INSIDE VIEW OF GROWING CUBAN STATE

(By James Buchanan)

If you're uncertain but concerned about the road the new Cuba is taking, come with me inside one of Fidel Castro's secret police jails.

Let me introduce you to some of the Cuban citizens who have lost their liberty, their property, and may lose their lives—because of a "crime" we in the United States wouldn't recognize.

Their crime?

Nothing more than being accused of anti-Castro-activity or displaying their anti-Castro sympathies.

Not all the stories I heard night after night lying in a secret police cell block are true, of course.

Some were deliberately planted by cell "stool pigeons" to gain my confidence and see if I'd confide my thoughts about Castro's new regime.

But the stories I'll relate of neighbor spying upon neighbor in a campaign of fear and suspicion are the ones I have been able to check and authenticate since leaving my Cuban jail.

Cuba isn't yet a police state, but the network of spies and jails is being organized in a pattern that threatens to smash the hopes and prayers of thousands of Cubans.

I first began to know and love Cuba and her people 2 years ago, when a tyrant named Fulgencia Batista held an iron grip on the island and the two Castro brothers were trying to rally support in the hills of Sierra Maestra.

Eighteen months ago I lived as a newsman in those hills with Raul Castro and his troops—heard them talk of their dreams and ideals.

I was on hand in happy Havana last New Year's Day when Batista at last had fled and the people prepared to welcome a new leader with hope in their hearts.

During the past 12 months I have visited Cuba often as a reporter and noted an increasing concern that she may have traded one dictator for another, though a much more popular one.

That concern was emphasized during those first few hours after my arrest on December 10, after I had found and interviewed Austin Frank Young, an escaped anti-Castro adventurer before Cuban authorities knew his whereabouts.

I sat and waited for what I expected to be my early release.

As I waited, I got the shock of tactics once used by German SS police under Adolf Hitler getting a replay in this Cuban secret police headquarters just 90 miles from Key West, United States.

I saw long lines of informers patiently waiting, as they did night after night, to tell stories about their neighbors to Castro agents.

I saw a 14-year-old boy thrown into my cell and confined for 4 days, because a woman had accused someone with a similar name of being a member of the hated "Tiger" army, the private strong arm of ex-dictator Batista.

I watched tears come to the eyes of once respected businessmen-prisoners, as they saw their property confiscated by the government because they had spoken out of turn about the Castro regime.

Let's look first at the case of 14-year-old Armando Cruz Gonzalez. His name was supplied by a woman informer and his address given as a certain block in downtown Havana.

Armando was picked up at home and tossed in our cell. His protesting parents simply were told Armando had been a longtime member of Batista's Tigers.

I looked at our cellmate Armando, and wondered. He was a scared, fuzzy-cheeked 14-year-old.

For 4 days he was in our cell. No charges. No attorney. No visitors. And no questioning by police.

Finally, on the fifth day, he was released.

"We have been unable to find your accuser," secret agents told him simply.

There are other, more frightening cases I'll discuss later.

But as I looked at Armando I wondered—does Fidel himself know how far his subordinates have gone in carrying out his every emotional whim?

It did not make me bitter, only disturbed that the men the world had hoped could lead Cuba from the tyranny of Batista are feeding their revolution with the old fires of hate and distrust.

They are fires that are starting to kill free speech, cripple the free press, and may set Cuba back where she was in 1958 under Batista—afraid to talk, afraid to listen, afraid to act, and almost afraid to live.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 28, 1959]

CUBAN JUSTICE BASED ON UNSUPPORTED ACCUSATIONS—INFORMERS GET IN LINE TO BETRAY NEIGHBORS

(By James Buchanan)

I can look back and see them even now in Cuba:

Men and women and children standing in line outside secret police headquarters in suburban Havana to tell officials of a neighbor's infidelity to Premier Fidel Castro.

They'll be there tonight just as they were every one of the 13 nights I watched them from the barred door of my cell.

You can roughly determine, just by looking at the length of the line, how many persons will be jailed the following day.

Jose Arago was one of these persons trapped by this frightening system of neighbor spying upon neighbor.

An intelligent, middle-aged man who owned a theater on La Rampa, Havana's fashionable shopping street, Arago made two mistakes one morning.

As he told me about it in our cellblock one night, here is how he got into trouble in less than 10 minutes:

Arago, a permanent guest of the Habana Hilton Hotel, walked into the dining room carrying a copy of the outspoken Cuban newspaper, Avance, whose Editor Jorge Zayas is one of the few newspapermen who doesn't hesitate to criticize Castro.

That was mistake No. 1, for a hotel waiter told Arago he was reading the wrong newspaper.

Mistake No. 2 came when Arago, a Columbia University student for 3 years, declared he was entitled to his own opinion.

The same afternoon he was arrested by DIER (Cuban secret police) as a counter-revolutionary.

The next morning in our cell he read in the newspaper Revolucion, Castro's official mouthpiece, that his theater had been confiscated by the government. The action came under a new law announced by Castro permitting his regime to take over the property of anyone arrested for counter-revolutionary activities.

At that, my cellmate proved to be more fortunate than some. A few days later Arago was permitted to walk out of jail, following his "lesson" on the new Cuban Government's justice.

He never was officially charged, never tried. Yet he lost his property for daring to speak critically of the Government to a hotel waiter.

Incredible?

Perhaps it is. But cases like these are happening hourly. The list of confiscated Cuban property is growing.

Who are these secret police with such terrible power?

They are known officially as members of the Departmento Investigacion Ejercito Revolucionaro, and more informally as DIER, the revolutionary army's investigative department.

These men have the power to arrest at will, the authority to search without warrants, and the Government-given right to hold a prisoner incommunicado without charges for months without end.

Eberdo Calderon was another of my cellmates. He looked 65 but would admit to only 58 years. For 22 of them he had been a guard in the Presidential Palace, through many of Cuba's quick changing governments.

He was the type who usually runs the elevator or checks passes, the type the girls call "Pop," and the men call "Dad."

Calderon was under arrest by secret police for the fourth time since Fidel Castro moved in behind the January 1959 revolution. Calderon has yet to be charged with any crime, has yet to be told specifically why he has spent more than 6 months in jail.

His only apparent crime is that he was a palace guard under Batista, as he had been during previous regimes for 22 years.

"When I get out this time I won't try to get a boat for the United States—I'll swim," Calderon told me.

The stories of Arago and Calderon are typical, not unusual, among the thousands of similar cases which keep Cuba's jails full to overflowing.

Those chivatas who appear nightly at the jail where I was imprisoned are asked only four questions as they line up before secret police interrogators to inform on their neighbors:

"What is the name of the person you are accusing?"

"What is his address?"

"What did he do?"

"What is your name?"

Arrest follows for the accused, without any investigation of the accusations. With the arrest comes loss of liberty and property.

Caught up in such a carefully organized campaign of suspicion and hatred, freedom-loving Cubans find that a revengeful neighbor can hold their fate in his hands.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 29, 1959]

TEENAGERS KEY TO WEIRD SYSTEM OF FAST JUSTICE

(By James Buchanan)

Those teenage kids strolling down Havana's Prado today in their baggy-kneed jeans, scuffed shoes and dirty shirts, aren't Cuban beatniks.

They're DIER agents, the gumshoes for Fidel Castro's new secret police.

While they look and act like juvenile delinquents, they are the ground roots of a new espionage system designed to pit Cuban neighbor against neighbor in a campaign of suspicion and hatred.

And while these ex-high school youngsters play detective in Havana, their much more suave counterparts represent Castro's growing police state in key cities in the United States.

They belong to a new and vindictive breed of secret police under the banner of Departmento Investigacion Ejercito Revolutionaire, Castro's investigative department, the dreaded DIER.

These DIER agents are part of a unique network which passes for a judicial system in Cuba today.

It's a system in which accuser, arresting agent, jury and judge make up a closely knit team, all coached by the same man—Fidel Castro himself.

Castro's secret police—DIER—makes the arrests. Castro's military tribunals—often made up of bearded revolutionaries with no legal training—conduct the trials, render verdicts and pass sentence.

It's a judicial system in which the fix can be put in simply on signal from the boss or one of his associates—as we'll see later.

As those who take the first step in Cuba's new system of justice, making the arrests, DIER agents are the key to Castro's growing police state.

And they are impressionistic youngsters being trained in service for their master—much as Adolf Hitler organized the youth of Nazi Germany two generations ago.

It was agents of DIER who arrested me December 10 after I had located and interviewed Austin Frank Young, an anti-Castro adventurer who had escaped from Cuban jail.

In Cuba, DIER agents number in the hundreds. They bragged to me during my forced confinement that they have 100 agents working in Miami and another 50 in New York.

Those appear to be exaggerations. But DIER is extremely active in the United States. Sources in Miami say there are 35 to 50 DIER agents working here. They prowl Flagler St. and the scattered Cuban colonies near the downtown area.

In New York, an estimated 20 to 30 well-trained agents gumshoe along Amsterdam and Broadway in the 103d St. area. Similar agents are on the job in other U.S. cities with large Latin or Cuban populations.

Their assignment: to make sure the same thing doesn't happen to Castro that happened to his predecessor, Dictator Fulgencio Batista.

ADVANCE VERDICTS GIVEN

During Batista's regime, Castro and other anti-Batista elements in Cuba obtained nearly all their weapons and supplies illegally through New York and Miami. Fidel remembers that well, and doesn't intend to trust U.S. customs alone with stopping movement of anti-Castro weapons.

In Cuba itself, the most disturbing thing about the operation of the new system of justice is that little or no investigation follows arrests by DIER agents.

DIER's big brother, the military tribunals, sits in trial on the accused, often after they already have the signal for a preconceived verdict.

Take my arrest and my "trial" as an example.

Folllowing my arrest by DIER, I sat in a secret police cell for 12 days, with no formal charges filed.

The Cuban Supreme Court had been asked to decide whether a civilian or military court had jurisdiction in my case.

On the seventh day of my imprisonment, while the Supreme Court was studying my case, Castro attacked me in a television appearance and announced that a military tribunal would try me.

"If the courts condemn Buchanan, he will be detained here. Or perhaps, what is better, the courts will order him deported, never to return to Cuba to molest us any more," Castro said.

ONLY TIMING REMAINS

The military tribunal had the signal for my case. The only question remaining was the timing.

On the 13th day of my imprisonment in Havana, I was hustled out of my cell at 4:30 p.m. and escorted to Pinar Del Rio military prison, 100 miles away.

Only after I arrived at Pinar Del Rio was I told my trial would start at 8 p.m.

I met the attorney who was to defend me just 50 minutes before my trial began.

Five military "judges" heard my case. Only one of them had any legal training. All were below 30 in age.

For 4 hours they staged a "show" for public and press to witness. At the trial's conclusion, the five judges deliberated less than 20 minutes, including the time it took to type up a lengthy explanation of their verdict.

That verdict: exactly what Castro had suggested 6 days earlier—expulsion from Cuba.

WEIRD CUBAN JUSTICE

Prosecutor Oscar Fernandez Jordain, in asking the tribunal to give me a suspended sentence on condition I leave Cuba said:

"In the interest of humanity, I ask the court to suspend sentence on this newspaperman so that he can report how honest and fair our trials are over here during the revolution."

My case was a testimonial that when the boss speaks in Cuba these days, even the judges listen.

This is the weird sort of Cuban justice that is gradually putting an umbrella of fear over Cuba's citizens today.

The disturbing thing for the Cuban people—the same sort of coached military tribunals that handled my case have this year ordered more than 500 Cubans executed in the bloodiest purge in their country's history.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 30, 1959]

WORLD FREE PRESS ON TRIAL IN CUBA

(By James Buchanan)

When the Cuban guards searched me that first night in their secret police jail, they overlooked one thing—a small fountain pen filled with red ink.

Somehow this oversight became one of the most important things in my 14 days of imprisonment.

With that pen, I scratched out notes as each day ended, and even wrote a letter to my wife that I managed to smuggle out of jail.

But in the long hours I had to think about Fidel Castro's new Cuba, that pen took on a symbolic significance, too.

It helped remind me that I was the eighth newsman arrested during the past 6 months of Castro's regime—yet Fidel had been unable to lift himself above the freedom of expression.

Since my expulsion from Cuba, two other newsmen have been arrested, bringing the 6-month total to 10.

In each case, the motive for the arrests apparently was the same—to harass the newsmen in the hope it would suppress their writing about the unpleasantries of the Castro regime.

Any doubt that I was to be another guinea pig in Castro's intense campaign against the press was erased shortly after my arrest on December 10 following an interview with anti-Castro fugitive Austin Frank Young.

While I was seated in the headquarters of DIER, Castro's secret police agency, I spotted an old friend entering the building.

He was Maj. Manuel Pineiro, one of Raul Castro's close associates with whom I had spent time in the hills of Sierra Maestra as a reporter covering the Castro buildup in mid-1958.

I tried to throw my arms around Manuel in a typical Latin greeting, feeling certain he would obtain my quick release from jail.

But this man who had welcomed me as a newsman at the Castro hideaway 18 months ago, and confided in me about his dreams and ideals for the new Cuba, now turned his back on me.

In my same broken Spanish that Manuel and his friends had understood so well before, I explained to him about my unwarranted arrest for going after a touchy news story.

"Is not the same now," Manuel told me. "Is now we are in times of stress."

He walked away and in my 14 days of imprisonment, I never saw Manuel again. It was obvious he understood that the Castro regime intended to make an example out of me to teach newsmen a lesson.

Days later I heard Castro-coached Prosecutor Oscar Fernandez Jordain orate in his summation at my military trial:

"The foreign press must be taught that it cannot come to Cuba and undermine our revolution."

It was not just a scared Jim Buchanan, but the entire foreign press on trial and being warned.

Then, a few minutes later, my own attorney, Orlando de la Bordilla, showed that the courage of freedom still exists in Cuba.

A Pinar del Rio associate of the nonpolitical Havana law firm of Mario Lazo, the attorney told the tribunal:

"Cuba should be thankful for the foreign press and stop being so hypersensitive. Newspapermen must be permitted to write about what they think is bad as well as about what is good."

The military judges disagreed, of course, and found me guilty of "concealing information." My sentence, on an obvious advance signal from the boss, was expulsion from Cuba.

Commenting on that sentence the next day, Jorge Zayas, editor of Avance in Havana, and one of the few Cuban editors with the courage to criticize Castro, wrote:

"American news agencies and newspapers may soon find themselves without experienced personnel to send to this country if the Cuban Government continues to arrest foreign correspondents and prohibit their return home."

In my case, Castro made sure I would not return by holding a 14-year suspended prison term over my head.

In other cases, involving foreign newsmen, he has been less forceful but nearly as effective in trying to stifle a critical press.

Ian Aitken, London Express reporter, was arrested and held overnight at the same time I was in prison.

When he was released the next day, the Express asked him to leave Cuba for his own safety.

Earlier, Jules DuBois of the Chicago Tribune, an outspoken Castro critic, had been declared persona non grata in Cuba, although not officially expelled.

The threat of physical danger to DuBois became so great his newspaper withdrew him from the country.

But while the growing Cuban police state concentrates on intimidating the foreign press, a handful of courageous editors at home are becoming more outspoken.

"Buchanan is totally innocent" of the charges, the newspaper Avance wrote during my imprisonment. And Editor Zayas chided Castro for thinking he could afford to hold me to teach a lesson to the press.

Also, in the highly respected Diario de la Marina and the hard-hitting English-language daily, Havana Times, the Cuban people got the truth about my case.

Such support, from a small but stanch segment of the Cuban press which does not have the safety of distance between it and Fidel Castro, can make an American newsman very humble.

And it makes 14 days in jail a small price to pay to alert the world that once again Cuba is in danger of having force replace free discussion.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 31, 1959]

MY LAST LOOK: HOPE—OR FEAR, IT'S UP TO FIDEL

(By James Buchanan)

The last time I saw Cuba I was escorted to a waiting plane by an armed military guard, just 7 days ago.

A youngster who serves as a DIER (secret police) guard asked me before I boarded the plane: "Are you angry with the Cuban people now?"

"No," I told him, thinking of the Cuban people as a whole, "I'm just sorry for you."

I remember now my first look at the new Cuba last January just after Dictator Fulgencio Batista fled and Fidel Castro took over.

What a change has crept over the lovely Caribbean island in these 12 months. My thoughts take the form of a letter.

I HAD HOPED TO BE WITH YOU

To the Cuban people:

This is New Year's Eve of 1959, and I am in Miami.

Weeks ago I had intended to be back in Havana tonight to celebrate the coming of the new year and the anniversary of your revolution.

But, instead, I have been banned from your country and told that I can never come back.

A year ago I reported your hopes and ambitions for the new Cuba. On January 21 I wrote in the Herald:

"Cuba's face has been lifted.

"She looks and acts like a young girl today, and not the haggard, fearful thing of less than a month ago.

"Change is apparent everywhere in the island and in every walk of life. There's happiness, and gaiety, and most of all—hope."

Those were the days when foreign newsmen were welcome in Cuba.

You were free to talk, the press was free to report. It was a calm, friendly time, and a government secure in the good wishes of its people found no reason to limit freedom of expression.

CRITICS TREATED LIKE TRAITORS

What has happened to your country since then?

In the spring, the cooling-off period began.

On June 30, Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz resigned as the chief of the air force, charging Communist activity in the Government. He fled the country.

On July 17, President Manuel Urrutia was forced to resign after Fidel charged him with being a traitor to the revolution.

On October 21, Maj. Hubert Matos, a longtime Castro buddy and one of the revolutionary favorites, resigned his army post, charging Communist influence in the Government. He later was tried as a traitor and sentenced to 20 years.

On October 27 Maj. Camilio Cienfuegos, army chief of staff and second only to Fidel in popularity with you Cuban people, vanished under mysterious circumstances. The antigovernment whispers grew louder.

As the tide swung away from the regime, new laws made it possible to confiscate your property merely if you were arrested, not convicted, of counterrevolutionary activity.

Your newspapers were told they must print a statement denouncing all foreign news which is critical of the revolution.

I could go on, but the pattern is clear.

No longer secure as the crises mounted, your Government resorted to more forceful attempts to stifle all criticism.

You have virtually lost your freedom to talk, except when you agree with your Government. I have lost my freedom to report because I did in your country what newspapermen have done traditionally all over the world—gone after a good news story, even when it involved someone unfriendly to the political leaders.

My editors intend to appeal my verdict and ask for exoneration by the Cuban courts. We all know, of course, that this could be granted only on signal from Fidel.

Newspaper clippings take me back on this New Year's Eve to last February, when I wrote:

"Right now Cuba is vibrant and excited, and, most important, it is speaking. * * *

"No man fears he will be pointed out as an informer merely through the spite of a neighbor. The new Government and new army are demanding proof to go with the accusations."

But in these past months your speech has become guarded and neighbor is spying on neighbor. Your year of liberation threatens to become a year of destruction.

Few men have had the opportunity to make a nation great as has Fidel Castro.

The opportunity is still there.

A few months from now the end of this chapter in the hopeful new Cuba may well be written.

Fidel himself must decide what the outcome will be—

The hope that the revolution promised all of you in January, or

The fear and hostility that many of you and I found in December.

My New Year's wish to you, my friends, is that, in spite of the disturbing trends of the last few months, Fidel may yet make the right choice for the future.

MY JAIL DIARY—JAMES BUCHANAN KEPT A HIDDEN DIARY DURING HIS 14 DAYS IN A CUBAN JAIL—HIS NOTES PROVIDE A GRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF CUBAN CELL LIFE

(By James Buchanan)

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, FIRST DAY

I'm in jail. Tossed in at 10:30 p.m. after hours of sitting in half a dozen DIER (military police) offices. They say I helped (Austin) Young escape and was trying to get him out of the country. They're nuts.

U.S. consul says it looks like deep trouble. I'm freezing in this 9- by 20-foot cell with six other guys. No blanket, no lights, sandwich for dinner. Other prisoners must have been here a long time—they look like hell. Where did I get the idea I'd be out in 5 hours?

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, SECOND DAY

Hauled me out at 8:30 a.m. to see newspaper people. Sleepless night—put me in a cellblock, this time with Young. Spent an hour looking for a hidden microphone and sizing up the six other prisoners. At least one's a DIER man hoping Young and I will talk. We aren't. Nothing to hide, anyway, but just try to tell them that. Guards like to stare at me. First prison food: black beans and rice, roots or vegetables. No appetite. Hugh Kessler, of Embassy, told me I'm to go to Pinar del Rio and be jailed there; DIER agent says it'll be La Cabana fortress. I don't go anywhere, just sit on cot and stare back at the people.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, THIRD DAY

Beard's beginning to itch and no talk of letting me out. Got a blanket now so last night wasn't so cold—but my clothes are getting crusty.

Made my own coffee this morning when stuff they gave us was sour and couldn't drink it. Built newspaper fire on cell floor, heated water in tin can and poured it over coffee grounds held in a handkerchief. Not bad. Awfully thirsty. Only water comes from tap alongside toilet in corner of cell. Fellow newsman visiting from the Herald brought oranges and they help.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 13, FOURTH DAY

Some prisoners angry today because not permitted to attend mass. Guards are bringing their girl friends and relatives to stare and giggle at us through the bars. Wonder what would happen if I threw a shoe in their faces?

Other prisoners shaving but they've refused razor to Young (the man interviewed by Buchanan) and me. Wasn't there supposed to be an office party in Maimi tonight?

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, FIFTH DAY

Friend from Herald brought me peanut butter and jelly sandwiches * * * tasted better than filet mignon.

Guards are feeding my visitors rumors about where I'll go, knowing it will get back to me, thinking it will worry me. It does. These never-washed blankets give us something to do each morning. Takes 30 minutes to pick the fuzz off my trousers.

Tonight when guards shook down our cell they slipped something under my mattress. When they'd left I found an empty matchbox. What's their idea? Anyway, I burned it immediately.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, SIXTH DAY

How many more? Feel filthy. Guards claim a radio broadcast this morning said Young's conviction had been set aside. Just propaganda to keep you on the mental rollercoaster.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, SEVENTH DAY

Young has guards crazy. Just showed them how to make a bomb from matches, mattress wadding, and a tin cup. Claims he's going to blow door off the cell next.

Dorticos' (President of Cuba) answer to the IAPA plea for my release doesn't sound too good. But is there any other profession in the world that backs up its members like the newspapermen fighting for me?

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, EIGHTH DAY

One Cuban newspaper says I'll be tried in civil court, another says it will be a military tribunal. Whichever it is, I wish they'd get moving. Wonder if people still eats eggs and bacon for breakfast?

A political prisoner is known by the sacks he keeps by his bunkside. I have five. That makes me a big wheel.

More questioning by the DIER. At least this time it was by an adult, not the punk kids who make up most of this secret police.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, NINTH DAY

Had my first shave—ouch!

Found out how you file fingernails in jail. Rub them against metal side of your bed. Do only one or two a day, that way you have something to do tomorrow.

Four of new arrivals were arrested in a church. Waiting for owner of a boat to pick them up—DIER came instead. Somebody's wife talked too much.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 10TH DAY

Austin Young's birthday; he's 39. He says "Friends are requested to send saws."

Tough to sleep at night. DIER seldom makes arrests before midnight, and racket goes on until 4 in the morning.

Funny how quick you can get accustomed to Cuban cigarettes. I'd give $10 for a big hamburger with onions and a bottle of beer.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 20, 11TH DAY

Is this the 10th day or the 11th? I'm losing count. How long will it be before I do like the others and start figuring a break?

Something new on menu today—fried chicken. Looked like it had been cooked by a flame thrower as it ran across the farmyard.

They're giving me, the "up" treatment today. Lieutenant Alvarez told Kessler (of U.S. Embassy) my case would be resolved with 2 to 3 days. Tomorrow they'll tell me my file has been lost. That's the "down" treatment.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 12TH DAY

More prisoners, more monotony. Even the worst pocketbook makes good reading now.

One prisoner lost his theater, another expects to lose his alcohol plant. Fidel's confiscation scheme.

More questioning by DIER, this time by lieutenant who was jailed in Miami. He loves me. Really got mad when I wouldn't sign a statement written in Spanish.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 13TH DAY

Well, no Christmas at home for sure now. They've closed the courts until January 2 or 7. Some of these guys are talking about going over the wall Christmas Eve.

I've saved a can of peanuts for a Christmas treat * * *.

(Buchanan's diary ends here. Moments later he and Young, the man he interviewed, were sped 100 miles to Pinar del Rio, where he was tried an hour after arrival, found guilty by midnight of concealing information, and ordered to leave the country. He was deported the next day, and returned to his wife in Miami 2 days before Christmas.)

The following editorials by John S. Knight and one by the Miami Herald editorial staff are objective and I think very well reflect the American attitude:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1959]

NEWSMEN MIGHT SUCCEED WHERE DIPLOMATS FAILED

(By John S. Knight)

Miami Herald Reporter Jim Buchanan came home for Christmas, and a good one it was.

Only a few days ago, Jim was sure he would be spending the holidays in a Cuban jail. For despite widespread protests against Buchanan's arrest and detention on a trumped-up charge of "concealing facts" about the escape of anti-Castro fugitive Frank Austin Young, the wheels of justice were turning slowly.

Then suddenly and without warning, Jim was rushed before a military court in Pinar del Rio and given a 14-year suspended sentence. In the same pronouncement, a five-man military court told him to get out of Cuba within 24 hours.

Reporter Buchanan's immediate reaction was a sigh of relief. "Thank goodness," he said, "I didn't understand enough Spanish to know I had first been sentenced to 14 years at hard labor on the Isle of Pines."

Previously Buchanan had told the military tribunal: "I was never guilty of anything but being a newspaper reporter."

But in Fidel Castro's regime, all newspapermen who report the truth are suspect.

SPEAKING OUT IN CUBA TAKES MAN OF COURAGE

Our gratitude goes to William H. Cowles, president of the Inter-American Press Association and Russell Wiggins, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, for their prompt intervention in behalf of Jim Buchanan.

We are grateful to Jorge Zayas, courageous publisher of Avance, for his attempts to gain Buchanan's release. And to Diario de la Marina for speaking so forthrightly of the Buchanan affair.

These two newspapers, together with Prensa Libre, are fighting bravely to preserve press freedom in Cuba.

Editors in the United States who are free to criticize anyone from the mayor to the President without fear of physical retaliation. should know that it takes real guts for a Cuban editor to oppose the policies of Fidel Castro.

Publishers such as Jorge Zayas have endured violent attacks over Cuban television networks by the Government. Vicious smear campaigns to frighten away advertisers are constantly in motion.

A new law, not yet invoked, makes newspaper editors liable to imprisonment for 6 to 18 years for publishing anything that "tends to limit the independence of the nation or provoke violation of existing laws."

But Herald Reporter E. V. W. Jones says that Revolucion, the Government's official organ, is "free to deify Castro, propagandize the revolution, shape Cuban public opinion—and pour hell's fire and brimstone on the United States."

Fortunately, Publisher Zayas has not lost his sense of humor. He told Eddie Jones of a Cuban saying to the effect that if you are afraid, you buy a dog.

"I have bought a dog," he added with a wry smile and pointed to a puppy playing on his office floor.

MODERATE APPROACH SEEMED RIGHT COURSE

We appreciate the many offers of assistance that have come through various sources.

Some of them contained very useful suggestions which now need not be employed. Others were critical of my letter to Dr. Fidel Castro on the ground that it was too moderate.

A few thought the United States should bring Castro to his knees by reducing the quota of sugar we buy from Cuba.

But at no time did it seem wise to involve the U.S. Government, other than requesting our Embassy personnel to keep in touch with Buchanan and give him such assistance as was feasible and possible.

WE MUST BE FRIENDS WITH PEOPLE OF CUBA

We must never be tempted into believing that United States-Cuban relations have deteriorated to the point of no return. Historically, the two nations have long been friends.

And so it must be again, Castro or no Castro.

The point at issue in the Buchanan case is the right of a newspaperman to seek information and report it objectively. This convention is generally recognized in all free nations although periodic censorship is still employed in many.

The Castro government was hell bent upon teaching foreign correspondents a lesson, and Jim Buchanan's "indiscretion" in buying a bandage for a fugitive's injured leg provided the needed excuse to clap Jim in jail.

Jose A. Maestri, of the Havana Press Association, said as much when he declared: "Some Americans seem to feel they possess a freebooter's license authorizing them to commit any offense. The Buchanan case is one more instance of this."

PERHAPS DR. CASTRO CAN SEE THE LIGHT

We hold no bitterness toward Premier Castro and the members of his government for their incredible treatment of Buchanan.

Jim is home, and for the moment, nothing else seems important.

But a longer view suggests that the Inter-American Press Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors should move constructively to bring about a better understanding between the government of Fidel Castro and the press which reports the facts of Cuban life.

I offered to discuss the problems of journalism, as they relate to Cuban press coverage, with Premier Castro but to my regret he has not seen fit to reply.

Possibly the ASNE, which entertained Dr. Castro in Washington last April, could arrange a meeting with the Premier in Havana for the purpose of clarifying in Castro's mind the traditional role of a reporter in a foreign land.

If we are to seek better understanding and promote the cause of press freedom in this hemisphere, such discussions with national leaders are at times imperative.

We shall gain nothing by denouncing Dr. Castro in bitter editorials as the enemy of freedom until such time as our press has made a constructive effort to have him see the light.

THEN WE WILL KNOW WHERE FIDEL STANDS

Perhaps a joint request by leaders of the ASNE and the IAPA to confer with Premier Castro would be productive.

It is far more important for a responsible press to seek such an understanding than to sit at a safe distance and berate Dr. Castro for the indignities heaped upon a reporter who was merely doing his job.

Should Castro grant such an audience, perhaps some barriers to understanding could be removed.

If the suggestion is spurned, we will know that Castro's words in Washington about press freedom were hollow and meaningless.

But let the effort be made.

Perhaps newspapermen can succeed where the diplomats have failed.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 30, 1959]

THE YEAR OF CASTRO—AN ANNIVERSARY IN CUBA

The revolution of the barbudos has a birthday Friday.

Just 1 year ago the henchmen of the defeated and discredited Batista were running for their lives while Castro's young men streamed down from the hills to take over Cuba.

Hope flamed in the breast of the campesinos, and the Habaneros lined the ancient streets to shout hosannas to their savior. Never had any victorious general entered so happily into his kingdom.

"I bring you freedom, and justice for all," said Dr. Castro. "This is the dawn of a new day for the people of Cuba."

The people of the United States applauded. The old bonds of friendship were strong. There was a general feeling among North Americans that the little man of Cuba would get a better deal, at last. They waited for the bright dawn.

It has been slow in coming.

First were the drumhead trials of the Batista followers. Many were convicted under the eyes of the mob and hurried to death by bullet beside the open graves. More than 500 perished before the blood bath was over.

Dr. Castro answered worldwide shock with the argument that it was necessary to stamp out the seeds of cruelty and death left by Batista to sprout again.

The program of agrarian reform had what seemed a laudable purpose. Castro planners wanted to root out the sugar plantation economy which benefited a few landowners. They moved to break up the estates and give land to the peasants.

U.S. interests, which had large holdings in sugar and cattle, complained that payment was inadequate, and was in 20-year bonds redeemable in pesos at that.

The new government reduced rents and utility rates, raised salaries and froze jobs. It moved vigorously into a program of social welfare, education, and medical care. Cuba's schools had been notoriously poor, but now there was improvement at all levels.

Talk grew of Communist influence. Schoolbooks were rewritten to advocate new beliefs. Leaders known to have Red leanings appeared in high places.

Castro repeatedly denied that he was a Communist or that Communists had undue influence. On at least one occasion, in a spectacular showdown fight for control of the labor unions, the Communists were defeated.

Castro moved steadily toward one-man rule, changing presidents, ministers, and Army leaders at will. Those who opposed him were traitors. He whipped up mob sentiment by marathon television speeches. Once he resigned, to resume office by mob acclaim.

The first year of Castro rule ends with United States-Cuban relations at an alltime low. Cuban economy is on the floor. Its tourist trade is almost destroyed, and unemployment spreads. Cuba's interference in the affairs of neighboring countries has cost it friendship in the Latin American community.

But the common man of Cuba has gained much. He has more money to spend, a better standard of living, and better prospects for his children.

Whether Castro can build a strong economy as a base for these social gains remains to be seen. Whether the people of Cuba can regain their liberties and free institutions, elect their own leaders and decide their own destiny are things for the sixties to reveal.

These are the questions as Cuba moves into the second year of the Castro era.

Whatever the answers the people of the United States have only good wishes for the people of Cuba. The hope for the new year is that the Cubans survive their trial by fire and emerge a prouder, stronger, and happier nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the aspirations of a friendly people. Perhaps the second year in Cuba will be a better one. We Americans want for the Cubans the free government and the better way of life promised them. We hope these are achieved with dignity and responsible action.

BOTH MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD BE KEPT APPRISED OF NEGOTIATIONS AND DELIBERATIONS NOW BEING CARRIED ON BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give notice of a recent recommendation that I have made to the President.

The year of 1960 will be a presidential year and it is entirely possible that 1961 will see a Democratic administration, including a Democratic President and a Democratic Secretary of State.

Unfortunately, however, the international problems of the United States are not bounded by the calendar or by the limitations of our political party organizations and these problems will be just as complicated and difficult of solution in 1961 as they have been in the past. In fact, in delicacy and complexity in many ways they will exceed those of the past.

For this reason, it is more important than ever that both major political parties be kept apprised in detail of the negotiations and deliberations which are presently being carried on by the President and the Secretary of State. If there should be a shift of administration in 1961, the times are too fraught with peril to permit a period of inaction while a new administration is learning the details of the negotiations which are now being carried on. And, the inability to make a prompt, well-informed decision at this time might well have disastrous results for the United States.

The President is now involved in negotiations on a summit meeting and discussions relating to future talks with Premier Khrushchev in Russia. The effects of these talks will last far beyond the end of this year, and I have stated to President Eisenhower my opinion that the welfare of the country would be served by the Presidential appointment of a member of the Democratic Party as a participant in these discussions. By such an appointment, the Democratic Party could be kept informed of the details of negotiations and would be much better able to act in the event that Democratic candidates are successful at the polls in November.

I realize that Senator DODD recently made a somewhat similar suggestion when he recommended that President Eisenhower take a prominent Democrat on his recent trip to Europe and Asia. In that connection, however, I could also see certain practical objections to the proposal. In this instance, however, there would be no possible partisan objection and only benefit could result.

As James Reston so well indicated in the New York Times of January 3, 1960, the President has already on other occasions taken Democrats into his confidence in various foreign policy matters and in this way has set a precedent.

I would make no particular recommendation as to a person who might be appointed but I will content myself with saying that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee would be the type of key person who might well be considered in this connection. There are, of course, numerous other prominent Democrats who have had widespread experience in international affairs who could serve with distinction.

This suggestion is not made with the intent to embarrass, nor is it submitted with the idea of gaining political advantage. It is a proposal for a practical solution to a substantial problem which is inevitably presented by the periodic termination of the term of our national administrations.

I sincerely hope that the President will give every possible consideration to this proposal because I believe that he will be acting in the best interests of the country if he takes such a step.

ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, after most careful and lengthy consideration on the merits and demerits of having additional attention focused on the matter, I have decided to take the floor to comment on the subject of the desecrations of places of worship which have been taking place in several nations. I am chiefly concerned with the recent anti-Semitic incidents in Germany. The possible implications in this area are, of course, horrendous. There have been incidents also, I am sad to note, in many nations including England, France, Norway, the United States, and, most recently, distant Australia.

There have been incidents recently in my congressional district in New York City, and in several other cities in this country.

Leaders of the various religious faiths have been quick to state their firm conviction that in the United States these incidents do not represent organized and growing anti-Semitism or other intolerance, but rather malicious mischief and hoodlumism. In Germany, however, as was stated by Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, these incidents "cannot be looked upon as isolated acts, but must be viewed against a nation's history."

The German Government under the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, has acted responsibly and promptly. The

German Government has made anti-Semitic activities a punishable crime and we have every reason to expect that the matter will be dealt with adequately on a legal level. From all reports it was hardly necessary for our Government to express its grave shock and concern, as German leaders themselves were quick to express shock and concern. The Adenauer government has given every assurance that it recognizes that such incidents are not consistent with a society that is democratic in concept and practice, and it is fully aware of the damage that these incidents have done to its world image. It is obvious that Chancellor Adenauer has an abiding respect and affection for the United States and depends upon the United States. I can only imagine the anguish that this matter is causing him, knowing the concern that it raises in the hearts of many of our countrymen. Immediately following the desecration of the Cologne Synagogue on Christmas Eve, Dr. Adenauer said: "I heard with revulsion of this atrocious deed which all decent Germans join me in condemning." The German people are united in their condemnation of this kind of thing. Witness the parade of 40,000 youths in Berlin last Friday, in protest of such acts.

The most frightening consequence of this matter is that it serves to divide the NATO countries. Obviously, if tensions can be re-created between France and the lowland countries and Germany it serves the purposes of the Communists. This is not to say that these incidents have been inspired by the Communists, because as yet there is no proof, but it does serve, wittingly or unwittingly, the Communist purpose in that it creates a break in the solidarity of the free world against Communist purposes.

I have heard it said on several occasions that the less said about this subject the better, as publicity serves only to incite sick minds who see it in the press or on TV to commit similar heinous acts. Perhaps so. But this is not a problem that can be ignored or swept under the rug, nor will it disappear by itself. It seems to me that its needed correction requires the close attention of all governmental bodies. We expect the free German Government to take action in Germany and our religious leaders have so stated, quite properly. Can we expect less of our own Government here in the United States? Free people everywhere, and all people who cherish and pray for liberty, will look to our example.

In New York City, I am pleased to note that Police Commissioner Kennedy has increased his vigilance.

In Washington, I would hope that the Department of Justice would undertake an immediate examination of acts of desecration that have occurred in several cities, and of course the FBI may do so without attendant publicity in order to determine whether or not the matter is of an organized nature and interstate, and if so whether Federal crimes are involved.

Simultaneously, it seems to me entirely appropriate for the Civil Rights Commission to make its own inquiry into the matter. The reasons are as follows:

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 established the Commission as a factfinding and investigatory body with a primary purpose to collect and accumulate information on matters of race, color, religion, or national origin so that a more comprehensive approach can be made by the Congress in protecting the rights of all citizens. In this context the Commission's authority should be invoked so that we in the Congress may have ample opportunity to gain insight into this problem. These deplorable incidents should be carefully scrutinized with a view toward swift and stringent remedies. We need facts immediately so that we can understand and approach this vital problem now.

These instances of vandalism in all probability will prove to be malicious mischief perpetrated by a few malcontents; but on the other hand such activities have been known to trigger hatred and violence on a grandiose scale.

I do not wish to be an alarmist in these matters but I am convinced that the harbingers of racial and religious hatred should be checked here in the United States and abroad before they can gain any foothold.

RED TIDE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE REMEDY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 3 years I have devoted much time and study to the threats now rapidly mounting in the South: the rising Red tide in Latin America, the turmoil in the Caribbean, and the crucial question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

These developments cannot be viewed as isolated incidents but together constitute the gravest threat to the Western Hemisphere since 1823, when President Monroe, in his famous message to the Congress, announced what has become known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Though some publicists have presented accurate pictures of individual incidents and their significance, none have approached the problem from the perspective afforded by a lifetime study of history with a view to supplying the remedy. Thus, I read with fullest gratification an illuminating article in the December 28, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report by Dr. Samuel Flagg Bemis, distinguished American historian.

Accompanying his article, Dr. Bemis outlined the draft of a proposed resolution which he urges the Congress to adopt. Using this as a base on which to start, I have prepared and introduced today House Concurrent Resolution 450. This measure, together with House Concurrent Resolution 33, introduced in the last session, would clarify the present situation and provide a historically based policy for putting an end to the current piecemeal conquest of the Americas.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to echo the extremely pertinent question of Dr. Bemis: "Why Wait for the Blows to Fall?" We should lead now before it is too late, for the ultimate fate of the United States and constitutional liberty are at stake.

In order that the notable thesis of Dr. Bemis may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, the indicated article, the editor's biographical sketch of its author, and a copy of my House concurrent resolution are included as parts of these remarks and commended for perusal by all concerned with the question of hemispheric security, especially Members of the Congress.

The article, biographical sketch, and resolution follow:

A WAY TO STOP THE REDS IN LATIN AMERICA—A NOTED HISTORIAN SETS A COURSE FOR QUICK ACTION BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Samuel Flagg Bemis, professor, diplomatic history and inter-American relations, Yale University)

Prof. Arnold Toynbee—in a recent, 1958, brilliant study of "The Eve of War, 1939"—has called attention to the fact that in 1940 no power was threatened on more than two fronts, east and west, whilst now, 1959, each of the two surviving power groups—U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—is threatened on three fronts, east, west, and north, "a first-class revolution in international affairs * * * that is not easily grasped or taken into account."

Now suppose the United States should be threatened on all four fronts, including south as well as north, from the Caribbean, as well as the Arctic? Instead of an expansive and friendly ally like Canada stretching for thousands of miles between us and Soviet jet, submarine, and missile bases, with a double line of distant early warning trips, we suddenly become exposed to such bases almost within sight of our southern coastal cities, and right athwart our naval communications from Atlantic to Pacific by the Panama Canal? Would this not tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war?

Since 1934, the first line of our defense has shifted from Panama to Europe and Asia. In this geopolitical framework, the strategical paths over the Arctic regions have indeed become of more immediate significance than the Caribbean. It has even been argued by some strategists that, in the atomic age, the Panama Canal is no longer a lifeline for the defense of this country; that we could well afford to have it neutralized under an international authority, so great is the danger that one atomic bomb could neutralize—i.e., paralyze it—by knocking it out.

Scarcely anything, short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt. It would split our present global strategy into a two-ocean strategy and prevent the Panama Canal's being used by the West as a substitute for a blocked Suez Canal, or to relieve the burden on our flagging railway system in case of war.

The Communist conspiracy is on its toes today in Panama trying to dislodge the

United States from control of this still-vital American lifeline.

The United States should make it clear to the world that in the Panama Canal Zone it will continue to act as if it were sovereign, as, indeed, it has an explicit treaty right so to do, and to stick beyond any cavil to the military defenses of that waterway.

MORE THAN THE CANAL CAN BE LOST

Much more than the canal, and all that means to American defense, can be lost. If international communism is allowed to jump the Atlantic and set up a rule in a state of the New World, the way it recently tried to leapfrog over Turkey into Syria and Lebanon, it would mean not only effective neutralization of the hemispheric lifeline in a strategic sense; it would create an active fourth front for the defense of the United States. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

Latin American Communists schooled in Moscow have studied just how to set up their system in the Americas. They tried it once already in Guatemala, while the United States stood by with arms folded around the doctrine of nonintervention, awaiting the uncertain action of a conference of foreign ministers which, thanks only to the counterrevolution of Carlos Armas, never had to meet.

When, finally, the diplomatic doctors did an autopsy on the fallen Arbenz regime in Guatemala, they found the disease of international communism to be far more deep-seated than they had suspected. In fact, it still lingers as a cancer in the body politic of honest liberalism, not only in Guatemala but in all the states of Central America and the Caribbean. It is festering now in Cuba, in Panama, in Venezuela where they spat on Vice President NIXON. The cancer is spreading.

What is there, within the inter-American peace system—pledged as it is to the doctrine of nonintervention—to prevent such a disaster in the New World?

Nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American peace structure, put into place by the good-neighbor policy. In numerous treaties since 1933—subject to honorable denunciation by any of the parties on 1 year's and, in some cases, 2 years' notice—the American Republics have declared inadmissible the intervention of any one of them (1933, 1936) or group of them (1948) directly or indirectly or for whatever reason, within the internal affairs of another American state.

There is, however, one outstanding exception to this sweeping pledge: It does not affect existing treaty obligations. For example, it would not affect the existing treaties of the United States with Panama or Nicaragua by which the United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan Canal site; it would not affect our treaty with Cuba giving us the naval base at Guantanamo; it would not affect the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, of Rio de Janeiro, of 1947.

The Rio Pact—the first regional alliance of the diplomatic revolution which now binds the United States to defensive alliances today with some 46 countries of the globe—provides for joint intervention, if two-thirds of the American States shall agree to assist in meeting an armed attack against an American State—the group acting within the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty also provides, article 6:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation [of the Organization of American States] shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The Rio Pact of 1947 is the same bond which brought inter-American diplomatic intervention to stop local wars between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It is the same bond and principle which animated the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs last August, in Saniago de Chile, invoked by four Republics, including the United States—that gentle pan-American huddle which weakly empowered the Inter-American Peace Commission to watch and study military movements in the Caribbean and report to the next (11th) Conference of American States at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960.

This is the same casus foederis [a case within the provisions of a treaty] to which appeal had been made, upon the insistence of Panama, in the case of Guatemala in 1954, for a meeting of Foreign Ministers of American States to consider the crisis of Guatemala, but did not meet because of Carlos Armas' successful counterrevolution.

Today it is very doubtful whether the Organization of American States, through its Organ of Consultation, could muster the necessary two-thirds majority of the high contracting parties quickly enough to give a mandate, under the terms of the Rio Pact of 1947, for joint intervention to suppress a Latin-American government gone Communist by infiltration of a popular-front government or capture of a liberal revolution, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Continent.

It might be tried, but, if it failed, what then?

There remains the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that interposition by any European powers to extend their system to any region of this hemisphere is dangerous to our own peace and safety. There remains the inherent right of self-defense, both individual and collective, even if it is not agreed on by a two-thirds majority of American States.

"We owe it [therefore] to candor," pronounced President Monroe in his famous message of December 2, 1823, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those [European] powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety—we could not consider any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—which would induce measures on the part of the United States "indispensable to their security."

An important corollary to the Monroe Doctrine since its origin—indeed, a vital dictum of the doctrine since 1869—prohibits the transfer of any colony in the New World from one European sovereign to another—lest such an occurrence upset the balance of power against the security of the United States in this hemisphere.

This "no transfer" principle has been bound up in the Monroe Doctrine throughout its history. President Grant officially proclaimed it a part of the doctrine in 1869.

A 1940 PRECEDENT FOR ACTION

As Hitler's armies were overrunning Western Europe and threatening to take over French, Dutch, and British colonies in the Western Hemisphere—i.e., Guadalupe, Martinique, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, the Guianas, Aruba, etc.—a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress of June 18, 1940, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implementing the sense of an earlier declaration by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Panama in September 1939, at the beginning of the war, stated:

"1. That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"2. That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Shortly thereafter, a special conference of foreign ministers of the same Republics, facing the danger of Nazi conquest of Europe and England, gave a mandate to any one or more American Republics, in case of the imminent danger of transfer of colonial territory in the American continents from one European sovereign to another, to step in and act quickly to forestall such a transfer. A special convention provided for an inter-American committee to administer the government of the rescued region, pending its restoration to its inhabitants upon the return of peace.

But the Havana mandate of 1940 looks only to the actual transfer of an existing colony in America from one European sovereign to another European sovereign. It does not explicitly envisage the case of a European sovereign in fact, if not in name, extending its Communist system to a republic of the American system à la Guatemala—and will it be à la Cuba, à la Panama, à la Venezuela?

The Pact of Rio of 1947 does anticipate such a fact or situation endangering the peace and security of any republic of the New World, but it requires a two-thirds vote of the 21 republics to give a mandate to 1 or more republics to act in time to stop the danger.

It would be nice if there could issue from the 11th meeting of American States, to meet at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960, a declaration on the lines of the Act of Havana of 1940, giving a mandate for individual or joint action to prevent the international Communist system of the Old World extending itself to an American State, directly or indirectly, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Republics.

It is not known whether our Department of State is endeavoring to put such a business on the agenda for the Quito Conference. It ought to be a major goal of our Government to secure this kind of declaration. Such a proposal, incidentally, would be a touchstone to reveal the degree of Communist power within the various delegations.

However, it is not likely, in the present condition of inter-American relations, that such a declaration would be accepted by even a bare majority of the states—and the emergency may be upon us even before the meeting at Quito next February. Already the Cuban dictatorship has announced its intention to buy jetplanes from inside the Iron Curtain.

The dilemma of our Latin-American policy today is whether, on the one hand, to interpret the inter-American doctrine of nonintervention so as to permit a non-American power to extend its revolutionary system to the New World by capturing a republic in the Caribbean or Central America, now within easy bombing range of the United States and of the Panama Canal; or, on the other hand, to prepare some anti-interventionist action within the framework of the inter-American peace structure that would really prevent the intervention of international

communism. That is: Inter-American intervention to prevent non-American intervention, one horn of the dilemma; or the other horn of absolute nonintervention to permit the intervention of international communism to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1940, the Congress acted promptly in the face of the danger arising from the war in Europe. Let it now pass an analogous resolution, to make it clear to our friends and enemies, all over the globe, that this Government is determined within its inherent right of self-defense, and within the purview of the pristine Monroe Doctrine, and indeed of the Pact of Rio and the inter-American peace structure, not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the peace and security of the United States, and of all the Republics of this hemisphere—indeed, the balance of power for freedom against slavery in the entire globe.

Such a resolution against the intervention of international communism—couched in the language of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, and the nonintervention declarations of Washington (1951) and Caracas (1954), and the recent Declaration No. XI of Santiago (1959)—should provide for the administration of the state thus defended or rescued, by the same inter-American authority and machinery set up in the Havana Convention of 1940 for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America threatened by a transfer of sovereignty.

Thus stipulated, there need be no apprehension on the part of our good neighbors that the United States would be reverting to the old system that characterized the interventions against European imperialist intervention in this hemisphere during the first quarter of our century.

Such a policy would protect the doctrine of nonintervention against the new technique of intervention by international communism, and would do so within the spirit of the inter-American peace and defense treaties. It would not wait for the accomplished fact of a leap of the Communist revolution across the Atlantic to uproot the Monroe Doctrine in the New World, as it has already destroyed the "open door" policy in China. By thus assuming the initiative in the New World, we can also defend the global balance of power on which the peace and security of the United States and of our sister Republics of America in the world must depend during the coming decade.

WHY "WAIT FOR THE BLOWS TO FALL"?

It is too much the practice of the United States, in the continuing world crisis of our time, to let the initiative rest with the enemy, to wait for the blows to fall and only then endeavor to improvise some action to fend them off.

Let something be done now, before it is too late, to deter the action. Congress ought, at the beginning of the next session in January, immediately, on the eve of the Quito Conference, to pass a joint resolution analogous to that of June 18, 1940, explicitly pointed at the present fact or situation.

If the Quito Conference doesn't back it up, then the United States, acting under the pristine Monroe Doctrine, must do so. The act of faith known as the good-neighbor policy, and the freedom of the New World—but, most essentially, the security of the United States and the blessings of liberty invoked in our Constitution—are now at stake.

EDITOR'S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

Samuel Flagg Bemis, 68, is widely recognized as an outstanding historian and authority on the diplomatic relations of the Americas.

Professor Bemis, now sterling professor of diplomatic history and inter-American relations at Yale University, has taught at many of the leading universities in the United States and in Latin America.

Among his many books is "Diplomatic History of the United States," which is regarded as a classic on the subject. Professor Bemis won the Pulitzer Prize in history in 1927. His "John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy" received the Pulitzer Prize for biography in 1950. He has been described as a scholar who has "developed a continental and hemispherical, and finally a world outlook on American history."

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American Continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)—

(1) That any such subversive domination or threat of of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. FASCELL, for 15 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLIER, for 15 minutes, on Monday, January 18.

Mr. STRATTON, for 1 hour, on Wednesday.

Mr. ULLMAN, for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 10 minutes, on each day this week the House is in session.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and a resolution.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. COFFIN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, January 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARR.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in two instances.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BENTLEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. FASCELL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1637. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1959, pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1638. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report relating to the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to Public Law 692, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1639. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on a violation of sec-

tion 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pertaining to the budgetary allotment made from the appropriation "Operations, 1960" to the regional operations director, Cincinnati, Ohio, which was overobligated for the postal quarter ended October 16, 1959; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1640. A letter from the executive secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 46th annual report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1641. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1642. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the same, and the balance, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to section 84 of title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

1643. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of progress pertaining to the Federal Aviation Agency, pursuant to section 302 (e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 746); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1644. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 1, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Gilbert Run, Md., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 9483. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 entitled "Property Rights in Inventions," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9485. A bill to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount which corporations may deduct for tax purposes for charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9486. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit the concentration of control of a substantial portion of the television and radio broadcasting facilities and a substantial portion of the news publications in any section of the country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9487. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9488. A bill to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9489. A bill to permit visitors from abroad to bring a limited amount of gifts into the United States free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9490. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to permit residents of the United States who are engaged in transporting persons or property between the United States and foreign countries to bring into the United States articles for personal or household use free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (by request):

H.R. 9491. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 9492. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey a portion of Fort Adams, Newport, R.I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9493. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9494. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years, and to amend such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 9495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that rebuilt parts and accessories shall be exempt from the manufacturers excise tax on automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9496. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9497. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 9498. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditures for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9499. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9500. A bill to provide that a motorized wheelchair shall be furnished veterans who have suffered the loss, or loss of use, of both legs by reason of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9502. A bill to provide for greater competitive distribution throughout private industry of the economic benefits flowing from preparing the Nation's defense, to improve the opportunities for small business concerns to participate as subcontractors in Government procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9503. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Showcase of the Arts and Sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9504. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9505. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9506. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 9507. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9508. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Bong Air Force Base, in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend section 709 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the effective date of national service life insurance applied for by members of the Armed Forces on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9510. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for the widows and children of veterans disabled 30 percent or more while engaged in armed conflict or in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9511. A bill to provide for the retirement of $15 billion of the interest-bearing debt of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 9512. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9513. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 9514. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9515. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9516. A bill to authorize and direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on the East Pass Channel at Destin, Fla., with a view to widening, deepening the channel at its present or at a different location, and constructing rubble mound or other type protective jetties; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9517. A bill to determine the need for a navigable channel in Black Creek, a tributary of the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of the Liberty-Franklin County lines; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9518. A bill to determine the need for a navigable channel across the Santa Rosa Peninsula to connect East Pass with Santa Rosa Sound, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9519. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9520. A bill to make permanent certain temporary increases in rates of compensation of employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9521. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States shall be made a part of the Saguaro National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 9522. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9523. A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9524. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9525. A bill to encourage the creation of original designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 544. Joint resolution providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 450. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense and judgment of the Congress with respect to Canal Zone sovereignty; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecration of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lednicky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9527. A bill for the relief of Jack R. Darling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 9528. A bill for the relief of Efstrrtios Handrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H.R. 9529. A bill for the relief of David Baker; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 9530. A bill for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9531. A bill for the relief of Yukie Arita Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 9532. A bill for the relief of Wang Li Chuang-nan, Wang Pai, Wang An, Wang Kang, and Wang Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9533. A bill for the relief of Marie Jeanne Fehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9534. A bill for the relief of Jovito Batas Bacugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9535. A bill for the relief of Hideo Iwasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 9536. A bill for the relief of Joao Ferreira and Maria Ercila Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9537. A bill for the relief of Julian Osuna-Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9538. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susie Lacacio and her son, John Peter Lacacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

309. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Richard J. Taggart, Purcellville, Va., relative to a redress of grievance, calling for a government of, for, and by all of the people, all of the time, in lieu of the present government by a part of them; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

310. Also, petition of Charles S. Ballinger, Chattanooga, Tenn., relative to a redress of grievances against the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley Receives Criss Award for Outstanding Medical Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1950 the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award was established by V. J. Skutt, president of Mutual of Omaha, in honor of the late Dr. C. C. Criss, founder of the company. The award consists of $10,000 and a gold medal, and is presented to the individual or individuals who, in the opinion of a distinguished board of judges, has made an outstanding contribution to public health and/or safety. This board of judges includes Dr. Charles W. Mayo, Mayo Clinic, who serves as chairman; Lt. Gen. (Ret.) James Doolittle, chairman, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.; Irene Dunne, actress; Henry Ford, II, president, Ford Motor Co.; Philip M. Klutznick, honorary president, International B'nai B'rith; William L. Lawrence, science writer for the New York Times; Harold Lloyd, actor; Don McNeill, radio personality; Dr. Louis M. Orr, president, American Medical Association; Dr. Thomas Parran, president, Avalon Foundation; Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council; A. E. Stoddard, president, Union Pacific Railroad; and DeWitt Wallace, editor, the Reader's Digest, all of whom have made outstanding contributions to public health and/or safety.

RECIPIENTS OUTSTANDING

Drs. Philip S. Hench and Edward C. Kendall were the first winners of the award which they shared jointly for their work in the development and use of cortisone, a drug which has great value in the control of arthritis. The second award went to a man distinguished in a number of fields, the eminent medical editor of the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk. The award was given for his outstanding success in rehabilitating the physically handicapped. In 1954, Mr. W. Earl Hall, editor of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette, and past president and member of the National Safety Council, received the Criss Award for his distinguished work in the area of safety education. In 1955, the world famed Dr. Jonas E. Salk received the award for his selfless contribution to the development of a vaccine against polio.

Mr. President, on November 10, 1959, this distinguished group of men was joined by Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the American doctor who has devoted his career to caring for stricken natives in the jungles of Laos and Vietnam.

I have spoken before in the Senate of the humanitarian dedication of Dr. Dooley, and I have written in magazines of this great American's courage, his skill, and tender care. Here is a man, now only 32, who has become the symbol of lifesaving, selfless Americans. He is the antithesis of "The Ugly American." His good deeds have helped conquer the barriers of custom, language, and hate—good deeds that made him become, as the President of Vietnam said, "Be-

loved by a whole nation." Dr. Dooley is truly a great person.

Mr. President, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley is the type of man whom our country needs for its ambassadors abroad—indeed, he is the type of man whom all humanity needs.

The Milwaukie Review, of Milwaukie, Oreg., on November 19, 1959, published a very thoughtful and eloquent editorial discussing Dr. Dooley's outstanding medical achievement, and his receipt of the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial from the Milwaukie Review, entitled "Another Tom Dooley," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER TOM DOOLEY

Not too long ago there was a maudlin ballad about one Tom Dooley who was about to be hanged. Teenagers adored this character. His praises were heard wherever a jukebox blared, in adoration that was never clear. This teenage idol was a killer—and stupid, to boot.

This week another Tom Dooley should have become the idol of young people everywhere. In one place, he already is. In far off Laos, young Tom Dooley, now only 32, and 27 when he first came as a naval medical officer to the Orient, has become the symbol of life-saving, self-less Americans. He is the antithesis of the "ugly American."

Not financed by the Government, in fact at first scarcely financed at all, Dooley's outpost medical aid station in the tropic, disease-infected wilderness of Asia, became the hope of life itself for men, women, and children otherwise condemned to a hideous and inevitable death.

Dr. Dooley is an angry man. A young, ordinary, ambitious graduate medical student, he did a bitter internship in the rigors of the Korean war and its aftermath of refugees, of flood, famine, and disease. He couldn't forget the misery, the need, the swollen, dying children. He went back and stayed. With modern medicine and with his own talent and that of his recruited associates, he performed miracles.

This week, young Tom Dooley, M.D., received a coveted award. An award received in the past by such as Jonas Salk. It was the Criss Award of the Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co. for outstanding medical achievement. Young Dr. Dooley had thought he would have to use the $10,000 he received to pay for his own recent cancer surgery, but that was subsidized. So he contributed it to another outpost in the wilderness, Africa.

Albert Schweitzer told Dr. Tom Dooley when he was so honored, "All the world should love you for what you do."

Hey, kids, how about this new Tom Dooley?

Citizenship Versus the Power Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, during the fall recess, I had the opportunity of reading one of the most challenging critiques of the current state of the American political system that I have come across. It was an address by the Honorable George Romney, the dynamic president of American Motors Corp., to the Commonwealth Club of California. It was delivered on September 14, 1959.

The thesis of Mr. Romney's excellent address is that economic power or pressure groups have all but taken over from the individual citizen the control and direction of our political system and institutions. This power grab by the power groups, as Mr. Romney sees it, involves both of our great political parties. He seems to fear that the arena of American politics has, to a large and dangerous degree, become the exclusive battleground of big labor versus big corporations. The rights of the individual citizen and the general welfare of the country have been ignored in this battle of the giants.

Mr. Romney has an answer for the dilemma facing the American political system. He urges a revival and resurgence of participation and responsibility by the individual citizen in the political affairs of the Nation. This is the only hope for cutting the big power groups down to size.

Mr. President, I have long been alarmed by the growing power and influence of the political pressure groups over our Government. I have warned time and again that these groups are exerting power and influence out of all proportion to the numbers they purport to represent. Even worse, they callously disregard the general welfare of the country as a whole in the interest of their own selfish and narrow end.

Mr. President, these pressure groups do not confine their activities to the economic field; they operate in virtually every area of our national life. They appeal to the noble instincts of our people, to their patriotism, their devotion to their country, and the like; while actually they are seeking to impose their selfish philosophy on the Government.

I am delighted to hear an outstanding American business leader speak out frankly and courageously against the growing menace of the pressure groups. Mr. Romney's Commonwealth Club remarks amount to a ringing call to citizenship. I believe every Member of this body could profit by reading Mr. Romney's remarks and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP VERSUS THE POWER GROUPS

(By George Romney, president, American Motors Corp.)

Some years ago, Justice Brandeis, one of the most thoughtful and probing observers of the American scene, declared:

"It is not good for us that we should ever lose the fighting quality, the stamina, and the courage to battle for what we want when we are entitled to it."

Today, I think we have lost a great deal of that "fighting quality." The majority of our people have few flaming interests that they are willing to struggle for. In many important areas of our national life, the individual is being engulfed in vast organizations and power groups. In larger and larger numbers, he is transferring his rights of citizenship to the corporation or the union, or idly watching his responsibilities drift to Washington.

To a very large extent, the people owe their security to corporations or unions which are concerned with the most important single interest that individuals can gain from such association—the individual's economic interest. As long as this is reasonably secure, people have no burning interest that would move them actively into political participation. On the contrary, large numbers of them consider it safer to be nonpolitical.

Without personal interests or convictions, they remain nonpolitical because the ways in which politics operate on them are so generalized and so remote that they consider it all but impossible to interfere.

There are three major dangers from this renunciation of politics:

If the people as citizens are unable to fill the role in politics traditionally assigned to them, we will be confronted with a vacuum in political power and leadership.

Impersonal economic interests are replacing and eliminating political and citizenship interests. The substitution of economic citizenship for direct political citizenship could be the doom of our way of life.

Parallel economic and political conflict would destroy the social unity vital to society as a whole.

Today, I would like to deal with these fundamental problems. As the basis of discussion, let's review briefly the established principles of our American democracy.

First, the moral principles.

1. The rights and basic responsibilities of man are derived from the Creator, in whose eyes each man is an individual, created with equal rights and responsibilities and in perpetual brotherhood.

2. Each man in meeting his responsibilities has the right to all freedom that does not infringe on the rights of others.

3. Freedom can be a reality only with separation of church and state. Religious freedom is the key to all the others. If the civil and ecclesiastical governments were joined, the latter would necessarily have to dominate, since it could point to an authority higher than the people.

4. The state derives all of its authority from the people and should be responsive to their control.

With the moral principles established, the mechanics of the social order become the prime consideration, requiring basic agreement among citizens as to principles of government.

I believe these are the essential elements of that agreement:

1. A system of representative democracy most effectively insures individual liberty.

2. Government must limit itself to those rights specifically assigned to it by the governed.

3. The authority of government should be divided to provide cross-checking and dispersion of power.

4. Government should be as close as possible to the people it serves, therefore State and local governments should have adequate responsibility.

5. The people assume responsibilities to be met by voluntary means, in order to avoid excessive reliance on government and the consequent abridgement of liberty to obey or disobey their Creator.

6. The mainsprings of progress should be individual action or the voluntary cooperative action of free individuals.

7. The state should do for the people only those things they cannot do at all or as well for themselves, either individually or in cooperation with each other.

8. Economic and nonreligious social institutions derive their authority from the people and should be responsive to their control. As organizational magnitude and complexity grow, the state becomes for the people a joint instrument of economic and social control. Properly used, the purpose of the state is to maintain the ability of the

people to exercise direct ultimate control—as in the case of economic control through antimonopoly laws to enforce competition.

9. The exercise of direct ultimate economic and social control by the people requires the division and dispersion of economic and social power. Power concentration in one place fosters it in others. It diminishes control by the people, and thereby limits their freedom, responsibility, and development.

Taken together—these moral principles and principles of government are the foundation stones of our society; the authority of the Creator * * * the sanctity of the individual * * * the brotherhood of man * * * the state as the creature and servant of man * * * the dispersion of power, that freedom may be insured * * * that men should compete and cooperate and be rewarded on the basis of what they contribute to society.

Have these principles changed in any way? I can't see that they have. But circumstances change, affecting not the validity of the principles but their freedom to work. When the system fails in some degree or another, it is not the fallacy of principle but the failure of techniques or the failure of men.

Our techniques will continue to fail from time to time if we freeze them, if we fail to recognize that the American Revolution is a continuing process of applying our basic principles to new problems that arise out of new experience. The fact that new problems arise is in itself almost sufficient proof of the strength of the system, which is fluid rather than static. It produces new successes, new situations and, naturally, new challenges. As Whitman observed, the fruition of each success brings these new challenges, making a still greater struggle necessary.

In the early days of our Nation, it was hardly possible to foresee that our revolution would also embrace other revolutions, particularly in technology. Nor was it possible to anticipate our phenomenal growth, our ascendancy to world power, the enormous economic changes, the growth of the corporation and union concepts * * *. To name only these, is it possible to conceive of an ideal inflexible system? Or to deny the living character of our revolution?

Failure to modernize our techniques as we have moved along has created some severe problems, none of which, in my opinion, has exceeded the problem of power concentration.

This strikes at our basic principles. We fought against the power concentration that made our liberty and independence impossible. The weak state of the original Confederation reflected the peoples' fear of concentrated authority. The Constitution itself, while providing for a strong central government, bristles with safeguards against excessive power held in the hands of a few. Jefferson defeated Hamilton and his ideas, Jackson defeated the Bank of the United States, Teddy Roosevelt defeated the trusts, Franklin Roosevelt divided the power of big finance and big business. We are ignoring the problem when we allow the Federal Government, or unions and industry to assume too much responsibility.

I think one of the most regrettable aspects of American life today is a situation in which union power and employer power can be concentrated to the point that an industry which is basic to the economic welfare of the total nation can be shut down as a result of the position of either group. I think that is an unheard-of concentration of private economic power. I think it's going to be impossible to solve the economic problems of this country without dealing with that hard reality of excess economic power. I think any time we permit a few men in labor or a few men in industry to reach the point where they can cripple the economy and adversely affect the public interest, we have created a condition completely contrary to the spirit of America. The employer and union power in the steel strike is a present example. I do not agree that it will impress Khrushchev favorably. I think it will impress him as an abusive exercise of excess private economic power.

When I have discussed concentration in labor and industry on previous occasions, some have remarked that I am seeking increased government regulation. Quite the contrary. We do not need more law but modern law. Neither our labor laws nor our anti-trust laws are up to date. Bear this in mind: when law is not clear or specific or up-to-date, either the problems grow or the intervention of government must necessarily be increased. Vague and outmoded laws are difficult to observe and to enforce. Our present anti-trust laws make their criterion the intent to use power wrongfully—opening up an endless field of litigation and legal interpretation. How can intent be proven and judged with accuracy in the field of business? As in the case of our Constitutional safeguards, the criterion should be the ability to wield power to excess. In the case of labor, our inconsistent laws encourage the fostering of labor monopoly and the creation of a concentration of power that could be matched only by a massive coalition of industrial power. The collision between these two excessive forces is confronting us with the necessity of intervention of government to protect the people as consumers—and the end result of the road we are on will be some form of totalitarianism.

The attitude of outspoken people toward highly centralized government may be divided generally into three categories: those who believe in the idea of social "drift" that, like a raft on a Gulf stream, society will somehow get where it's going. Another view is that big centralized governments are necessary for big societies, and that comfortable countervailing forces will keep the balance. A third view is that concentration of power ought to be fought wherever it exists or the individual will be smashed—one way or another.

I take the latter view. Certainly big societies, especially those in competition with other big societies, need strong—even big—governments and strong—even big—unions and corporations. But their power can and must be dispersed. The ultimate control can and must be in the hands of the people.

This will be impossible unless we recognize that it is morally and economically wrong for either unions as unions or corporations as corporations to get into politics directly or indirectly.

To me, it is wrong for the very simple reason that it is wrong for any American to transfer his personal rights of citizenship to an institution, and wrong for an institution to act in any way to encourage the relinquishing of such rights.

There is little difference in principle between the present excessive political influence of unions and the earlier excessive political influence of business denounced by both Roosevelts. One excess is as wrong as the other. Both are obstacles to political freedom, economic justice, and individual development. The creation of union power was a desirable offset to business power. Economic power is better distributed now between unions and business than it was earlier when exercised largely by business. Current union political activity does not differ in principle from earlier business political activity. Unions can try to justify their programs on that basis, but the question is whether in a democracy based on political freedom and the rights of the individual, economic organizations should be permitted to participate directly or indirectly in political affairs.

Let me be clear. I am not referring to individual union leaders or members participating in political activity. I do not mean individual business leaders or white-collar employees participating in political activity. Nor unions or businesses presenting economic facts to political bodies or to private citizens' groups. What I am talking about is direct or indirect political activity on the part of economic organizations, whether they are union organizations, business organizations, or other organized forms of economic endeavor.

Before church and state were separated, unquestionably church participation in politics and government exerted a direct influence on the political attitudes of church members. Similarly, political activity by a company is likely to cause an executive to feel that his economic opportunity in the enterprise is affected by his political support of company political thinking. Conversely, the attitude of many American businesses has resulted in political inactivity on the part of its executives.

The same thing is true of unions. How could union members or union officers fail to feel that their treatment by the union would be affected by conformity or opposition to union political programs?

I believe we must prohibit economic organizations from direct or indirect political activity and expenditures. What right have they to use the funds of stockholders or members to support specific political candidates or partisan issues? What right has either to create an atmosphere where a member's or employee's economic status can possibly be thought to depend on his political views and convictions—as long as they conform to the basic principles on which our free society depends to protect individual freedom and inalienable rights?

With the difficulty being experienced in securing competent candidates for local, State and even some Federal offices, it is obvious we must overcome the lack of political participation by individuals, whether they be corporate employees or union members. I believe that corporate officials and union officials should participate personally, as individuals, in political affairs * * * but I think they should take every possible step to assure members and employees that this right is a personal right not to be abridged in any manner, and to encourage others to use it.

We must bring back to life the feeling that each individual can participate with effectiveness.

One businessman wrote me the following question: "How can a public-spirited individual be effective or influential unless his energies are combined with similar energies of other individuals?"

He cannot. He must work with others. But his work must be personal and direct, not by proxy. He must be directed by what he believes in, not what his corporation or his union believes in. He must speak for himself, and not suffer his voice to be drowned in the loudspeaker of an institution. The instrument available to him for the combination of his effort with those of others is the political party, when the party system is functioning properly.

Unfortunately, our political parties at present have given victory at the polls such engulfing preeminence that neither will take a position that might offend any sizable segment of voters. The result is a close similarity between stated party objectives, with very little choice left to the voter. Attention is focused on money and organization power rather than broad citizen participation and sincere spontaneous support.

The parties have allowed themselves to a large extent to become the captives of dominant economic groups. In Michigan, for example, one party is largely under the control of big labor, while the other is largely in the hands of big business. The dominance of these power groups, expressed

through organizations and not individual citizens, resulted in a 7-month deadlock that thwarted the progress of the State. The individual has a sense of frustration and helplessness.

To combat this, we are developing a nonpartisan citizens' program identified as Citizens for Michigan. It is made up of individuals acting for themselves and not as representatives of any organization of any type.

Through this effort, we hope, first, to establish a means by which an influence greater than the minority economic groups now dominating our two political parties can be created; second, to acquaint enough citizens with the facts on the State's problems and the means for their solution to secure essential political and governmental action; and, third, to restore citizen belief in the effectiveness of individual political participation.

The success of our program can provide the basis for releasing the political parties from their captivity and restoring to the people these necessary instruments for self-government.

To encourage an increase in political participation, we must have two political parties with programs and methods that provide the people a clear choice. At least one should be devoted to the interest and welfare of all Americans. At least one should be more dedicated to the principles of human liberty and justice than to political victory at any cost through economic power, subsidy and advantage.

Individuals of character and principle, working as free citizens with others of like mind and purpose, can achieve this. Individuals working politically as units of business or labor can only intensify special interest party domination and increase the magnitude and scope of our present economic conflict, while personally giving up the rights, responsibilities and respect of citizenship.

There are three important things we must do to stop the drift toward increasingly massive centralized government.

One, to make certain, by modernized law, that power outside government is dispersed and kept dispersed. Surely the principal way to reduce the size and power of centralized government is to disperse power that only big government can hold in check and increase the influence and control exercised directly by the people.

Two, to improve the character of State governments and modernize the smaller government units, such as the parish or the county, that were set up on the basis of travel and population distribution in a frontier country.

Three, to revive the political participation of the people in control of the government by dramatic steps that would bring back to life the feeling that they can participate with effectiveness.

The most effective means of putting some hope and zest back into political participation would be for the political parties to reject economic power group participation, reach out for citizenship participation, put less emphasis on dollars and more emphasis on people. The give-a-dollar-to-the-party-of your-choice campaigns would be more effective with a give-an-hour campaign. The method today is too much one of guarded exclusion rather than participation. The parties are not going to get participation if the people feel they have no opportunity to choose anything but the word that is passed from the smoke-filled room. Widely publicized open forum-type meeting would put excitement and opportunity back into the political area at the local level.

Participation on an effective basis would arouse the interest of people who are today without interest. It would simulate people to take stands on issues and it would generate issues. One of our problems today is issueless politics, with a tragic simplicity between party positions that give the voter little choice. How can a citizen help but vacillate between parties and be ill attracted to either in such circumstances?

We need to bring our political parties and the people together, if our democratic system is to continue to be truly representative. When the people have no choice, they are powerless to act, and control is defaulted to willful power groups that can be arrogantly unaccountable to a listless electorate.

Today, the power groups are rapidly extending control over the people, the political parties and the state. The individual must use his citizenship to bring the power groups under control, not primarily through the state but primarily through making them responsive to the people. The unions should be primarily responsive to the control of citizens who are members. The corporations should be primarily responsive to the control of citizens who are stockholders and consumers. The citizen must fight for his citizenship, or he will find himself enslaved by the power groups or an all powerful state that is exercising his inalienable rights on the premise that the state must protect him from the excesses of the power groups. The internal struggle of our age is citizenship versus the power groups.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt talked to your club on September 23, 1932, he discussed the necessity of curbing the barons of business, as it had once been necessary to curb the barons of feudalism. He led in releasing the forces that created the barons of unionism. This division of power was better than its unilateral exercise, but the existence of two sets of barons and their widening contest for economic, political, and social power threatens our future at home and abroad. The union barons and the business barons must be curbed anew. When both are so strong that separately or jointly they can jeopardize the interests and rights of the Nation as a whole, citizens are face to face with the age-old struggle to keep power in any form from becoming excessive.

Greater exercise of citizenship is an essential factor in America's future.

We need to reawaken the idea, I believe, that America has some important unfinished business. The American Revolution was not a distant explosion from which the dust has long since settled. It is a continuing process, and we should never forget this.

We must continue our revolution by restoring faith in the individual and helping the individual to restore faith in himself and his citizenship.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to supplement what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said with respect to George Romney, the president of American Motors. He is not only one of the most courageous and dynamic and forthright leaders in American industry, but some years ago George Romney was associated with one of the senatorial committees, as I recall.

I remember that when he appeared before the Judiciary Committee at one time, he made some observations with reference to his committee experience on Capitol Hill. Therefore he sees the whole picture, not only from the standpoint of industry, but also from the basis of his experience in the legislative branch as a sort of working member of a committee. I share the high esteem which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has of Mr. Romney.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not recall ever having met Mr. Romney, although it is entirely likely that he was associated with a committee during the time that I have served in the Senate. It so happens that during the adjournment of the Senate I have more time to spend in my office than I am able to do when the Senate is in session, and therefore have more time to read material which comes to my desk. I read Mr. Romney's speech, and it impressed me tremendously.

I am confident that he points to one of the real threats to our system of government. It is the fact that the pressure groups operate in almost every area of our life, and in doing so they make more noise and receive more credit and claim more strength than they are entitled to, and exercise more influence on the operation of our Government and on the making our laws and the enforcement of our laws than their numbers and the merits of their case would justify.

Economic Trends, Labor and Management Conferences, and the Steel Strike Settlement—Address by the Secretary of Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, before the Economic Club of Detroit, today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT, DETROIT, MICH., JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. Chairman, members of the Detroit Economic Club, distinguished guests, some 2 years ago I was invited to luncheon with you and, as some you may recall, I had to do it at that time by telephone, neither nutritious nor personally satisfactory.

I am happy to be here myself this time, and I want to thank you for again extending an invitation to me.

I have been asked to speak on the question: "Where are we and where do we go from here in the labor-management relations?"

I don't think that I can return a responsive answer to that question without indicating first what I believe to be important evolutionary changes in our economic life. For labor-management relations exist in a context of change.

It seems that the evolution of our economic life is leading toward larger concentrations of economic power within institutions—power based not on the ownership of wealth but on the control of wealth.

These institutions are various: corporations, of which 500 now account for two-thirds of our total industry; pension and trust funds, already totaling some $40 billion and growing at the rate of $4 billion

annually; labor unions, supported by 16 million members; mutual funds, trusts, insurance and banking firms and so on.

It has been estimated that 50 million citizens are now sharing in the profits of the 500 largest corporations, directly and indirectly. Since 1952, the number of direct stockholders in public corporations has risen from 6.5 million to 12.5 million.

In the United States more and more people are enjoying greater and greater degrees of wealth.

At the same time, the control of economic wealth is concentrated in greater degree in our economic institutions, and in the hands of the managers, administrators and leaders of those institutions.

Outside a free society, this might be a dangerous condition, but inside a free society it has an opposite effect; it places in the hands of private citizens both the power and the resources to attain the social and economic goals they set for themselves.

A free society, has within itself the weapon to curb injustice that might result from a selfish or blind use of economic power; that weapon is the political power that the people have reserved for themselves.

We are all familiar with the use of political intervention, from antitrust laws through the regulation of transportation and broadcasting the regulation of labor-management affairs.

Intervention usually results when economic institutions have not lived up to the responsibilities that society has expected of them, either through incompetence or willful mismanagement and abuse of control.

We have, in America, a rapidly growing society, one with impressive needs, and even more impressive wants.

America will be looking to its private institutions to initiate and support positive programs for social and economic advancement.

At the same time intervention by political power has the latent danger of sapping the vitality of private responsibility, frustrating private initiative, and, most importantly, creating a drift toward vesting government with more and more controls over private affairs.

When political power and economic power are joined, as they are in Russia, it can be devastating to the ambitions of freedom.

At the same time, the vigorous and expanding society of tomorrow will not hesitate, I believe, to exert its political power if the needs and the wants the people feel are not met by private means.

That is one of the reasons why it was all-important that the recent steel strike be settled voluntarily—to preserve these vital institutions from political regulation.

And that is one of the reasons why more has to be done in the private sector to solve the social needs represented by the older worker, by the minority group—and on down a long list of problems waiting for remedies.

I disagree vigorously with those who believe that government is the only institution committed by nature to a forwarding of the common good.

We have estimated, at the Department of Labor, that the population of the United States will increase to 226 million by 1975. The labor force in that period will grow to 95 million, an increase of 23 million. Eight million of that increase will be men and women over 45 years of age.

At present, because of senseless prejudices, because of changes in business technology, the older worker is often excluded from employment. He finds that his age has erected invisible barriers around him, cutting him off from participation in the active economic life of his society.

Well, whose problem is this?

Is it the problem only of the mature worker himself, and one that he can meet only by recourse to his political power?

In New York and in other States there are now laws on the books that prohibit discrimination in employment because of age. Is it possible, unless the managers and the leaders of our centers of private economic power realize that this is their problem too, that a national law might someday be on the books—and it will be there not because the Government is seeking to control but because millions of people, frustrated in their desire to join into society in an active way, have demanded such control.

The fact that this economy will be called upon for a maximum response to meet domestic needs and international commitments makes it plain that the maximum utilization of human resources is not a choice but an imperative.

And it is plain to me that business management and labor unions have prime responsibility to get this job done.

A corporation must exist for larger ends than the mere accumulation of profit, the production of goods or the payment of wages. It must also use its economic power to further national goals and serve society's purposes.

It can't do this of it has, for example, discriminatory employment policies in regard to minority workers.

It can't do this if color is made a condition of employment.

I think you will agree with me that the clamor for general use of political power to meet social ends is based on a vote of no-confidence in the ability, and the intention, of the private sector of our economy to assume the responsibility.

I do not mean to give here the impression that the private and public powers stand at opposite poles. On many of the social needs of today they must join. Certainly the problems afflicting those areas of chronic unemployment require such a dual approach—legislation by government and action by the private economy.

The older worker, the minority worker, the area of chronic unemployment—add to these urban renewal, educational facilities, civil rights, housing and health. These, and many more, are problems of total society, and total society solves them in its own way, using the instrument that works best.

I believe that the concentrations of economic power in America have a responsibility to the common good, and that many of our needs can best be met through the exercise and the initiative of that private responsibility.

This is one of the reasons why there must be wider, better, more profound, more continuous communication between those in whom the power to control resides.

Last Thursday, in his state of the Union address, the President spoke of "voluntary, dependable, abiding cooperation among the important segments of our own free society."

Such cooperation rests upon voluntary, dependable, and abiding communication.

The time for labor and management to start talking to one another is now.

To forward this end, I have been suggesting for some time now that labor and management provide a means for communication outside the bargaining table. I suggested this need to the construction industry when I met with them in New York a few years ago, and I am happy to see that a committee has been formed within that industry, with representatives from labor and management, to address itself to mutual problems.

The President announced last week that it was his intention to "encourage regular discussions between labor and management outside the bargaining table to consider the interests of the public as well as their mutual interests in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth."

We hope to encourage labor and management themselves to begin communicating with each other. For in order for anything practically useful and sound to come from such communication, it seems to me that the parties themselves must first want to communicate.

Without that desire for understanding, without that condition of good will, they are "doomed before they take the vow."

Certainly none of you sitting here this afternoon need an engraved invitation from the White House to talk out mutual problems with your employees or your employer.

It is true that the Government has been talking, and will continue to talk, with men in both labor and management, encouraging them to get together. It is my hope that this encouragement will prompt the representatives of labor and management to initiate conferences in every industry—without waiting for Washington to fire the starting gun.

The advantages of open, continuous communications outside bargaining are, it seems to me, clear. Problems not susceptible to bargaining can here be met—the impact of research and development on employment, any practices that may be detrimental to labor or to management or to an entire industry, the impact of foreign competition and the maintenance of a high order of productivity. I am sure that many things come immediately to your minds as well.

And I would hope, finally, that out of these industry conversations, both labor and management will agree to the principle that owners, workers, and consumers are all entitled to a fair share of the fruits of increasing productivity.

And, in line with my previous remarks, it would be a demonstration that the public welfare can be forwarded by private interest.

It is my hope that eventually the bargaining table will become not an isolated battleground upon which hereditary opponents infrequently meet for an often-bitter Indian wrestle over the size of shares but the logical culmination of a continuously developed understanding, where the public interest and the welfare of the industry find their formal expression and their most positive fulfillment.

I was pleased that the steel agreement provides for a Human Relations Research Committee that will recommend solutions to mutual problems in the areas of wage and benefit adjustment, job classification, wage incentives, seniority and medical care.

In regard to the total steel settlement, there have been many misleading reports as to its cost.

I am sure that all of you are interested in the cost aspect of the settlement, and I would like to clarify it for you.

Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has said that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from this settlement will be 3.5 to 3.75 percent.

This is in contrast to other steel settlements during the postwar period, during which hourly employment costs have been rising, according to Mr. Blough, at an average of 8 percent a year.

The steel companies and the steel union, in the present settlement, have cut the postwar trend by half.

A comparison of the average annual increase in hourly earnings between the steel and other major settlements shows the following:

Aluminum, 5.2 percent; can, 4.5 percent; Kaiser, 3.82 percent; steel, 3.75 percent.

When compared with other wage settlements reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1950, the steel wage increase of 7 cents—which does not go into effect until next December—is less than the average. As a matter of fact, 65 percent of wage increases in 1959 exceed that figure.

What this means is that the steel wage settlement is in line with others negotiated this year, and thus cannot set off a wage pat-

tern with highly inflationary effects, as has happened sometimes in the past.

A great part of the misunderstanding about this settlement is due to news accounts that failed completely to take into account the fact that the steel settlement has been described in terms of total employment costs while other major settlements have been described in terms of wages and benefits to employees.

Thus, to say that the reported steel package of 39 cents is comparable to the reported aluminum package of 28.2 cents is not only untrue but meaningless. The steel package figure describes total employment costs to the companies; the other is a description only of the wages and benefits received by employees.

Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, in comparing recent major settlements in terms of employment costs, said: "* * * the effect on our employment cost of the contractual arrangements we made is from 3½ to 3¾ percent per year. We estimate the can, aluminum, and Kaiser settlements would have approximated 4½ to 5 percent if they had been accepted by the steel industry, or nearly 30 percent more."

On the basis of this settlement—I am convinced that if management and labor mutually seek, as I know they will, to increase the rate of productivity in the steel industry, Mr. Blough's statement that there will be no price increase at present will be good for some time to come.

Certainly no one can predict price stability indefinitely because other cost factors than wages enter into the determination of price policy.

With good will and good sense, and with awareness that an economic institution like a steel corporation or a labor union must serve the public interest as fully as its own interests, it could be possible—on the basis of this settlement—that the United States will have seen its last major steel strike.

It has always been the pride of our people that we have been worthy of freedom. That is because we have turned power to the use and the betterment of the individual; we have made free decision and voluntary cooperation the touchstones of a system that serves and honors the highest ends of society—the elevation of each man toward wider horizons.

The issue before us is the old test of freedom with the new forms of power. It is an issue we should meet with full confidence in our private institutions, and in the ideals of reliance and service that have brought us successfully to this new decade. Thank you.

A Review of the Activities of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy During the 1st Session of the 86th Congress and a Look Into the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to attend the meeting of the nuclear energy committee of the National Association of Manufacturers held in New York City, at 10 a.m., on Friday, October 23, 1959.

The program consisted of a review of NAM policies in the nuclear field and a general discussion of the Federal-State relationships in this field.

During the course of the program, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I delivered the following address in which I discussed the activities of the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress as well as the prospects for the 2d session.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE NUCLEAR ENERGY COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, OCTOBER 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the distinguished chairman of your nuclear energy committee, Mr. Fairman, in his letter of invitation, suggested that I speak today on the activities of the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress as well as the prospects for the 2d session.

With all due respect to your distinguished chairman, I believe he has given me quite a large order.

As you will see, the activities of the Joint Committee during 1959 ranged all the way from radioisotopes to reactors, and from the genetic effects of fallout to the fine print in insurance policies.

Our committee held hearings on waste disposal, employee radiation hazards, workmen's compensation, patents, liability, Federal-State relationships, atomic power, new weapons, nuclear war, our nuclear submarine program, and a host of other subjects.

The testimony varied from atomic energy regulations in local communities all the way to international atoms-for-peace agreements, Euratom, and the Geneva negotiations with the Russians for cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

Our committee, and its various subcommittees, held a total of 84 public hearings and 77 hearings and meetings in executive session.

Some 25 publications, consisting of reports and hearings were printed by the Joint Committee during the first session, amounting to over 11,000 pages.

And so I say, Mr. Chairman, you have given me a fairly good sized order.

But, with your indulgence, I will try to touch briefly on most of the activities of the Joint Committee during this past session, and then look into my crystal ball for 1960, as you requested.

I am very glad to begin with the 1959 amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit greater participation by State and local governments in regulating the atom, because I understand it is on your agenda this morning.

The 1946 and 1954 Atomic Energy Acts both set forth comprehensive frameworks for regulation of the atom by the Federal Government, but were silent as to the role of State and local governments.

As the peacetime uses of atomic energy spread throughout the country, a growing crescendo of interest by State and local officials developed.

In particular, radioisotopes began to find more and more applications in the fields of biology and medicine, agriculture, and industry.

By 1959 the AEC had outstanding over 4,500 radioisotope licensees, spread throughout our 50 States and in almost every community.

In May of 1959, the Joint Committee held 4 days of public hearings and received testimony from representatives of the AEC, Public Health Service, State and local governments, industry, and labor.

As a result of these hearings, the Joint Committee made a number of changes in the bill originally proposed by the AEC.

After a number of committee meetings, we then unanimously reported out the bill, with amendments, together with our committee report.

Let me quote briefly from some of the comments of the Joint Committee in its report:

"2. The approach of the bill is considered appropriate, in the opinion of the Joint Committee, for several reasons:

"(a) The approach is on a State-by-State basis. * * * The bill does not authorize a wholesale relinquishment or abdication by the Commission of its regulatory responsibilities but only a gradual, carefully considered turnover, on a State-by-State basis, as individual States may become qualified.

"(b) The bill applies to some, but not all, atomic energy activities now regulated exclusively by AEC."

It applies principally to radioisotopes, whose use and present licensing by AEC is widespread, but whose hazard is local and limited.

Licensing and regulation of more dangerous activities—such as nuclear reactors—will remain the exclusive responsibilty of the Commission.

When the bill was considered on the floor of the House, it was my privilege, together with my colleague, Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, to explain its purposes and intent to the other Members of the House.

After explaining some of the provisions, I summarized for the House as follows:

"In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill would help the States assume independent regulatory jurisdiction in areas which are now regulated exclusively by the Federal Government under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

"It would assist the States to prepare themselves for assuming such responsibility by increased training and programs of assistance for the States.

"As pointed out in the Joint Committee report, this would increase the protection of the public health and safety because most citizens look to their local health officers for advice and protection against hazardous materials used in the community."

I am happy to say that the House, as well as the Senate, passed the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee.

It was signed by President Eisenhower on September 23, 1959, as Public Law 86-373, and is now the law of the land.

The AEC is developing regulations under the new law and has entered into discussions with representatives of at least one State (New York) leading, we hope, to an agreement whereby that State will begin to assume some of the regulatory responsibilities of atomic energy applications.

I think most of you will agree with me that this new law to shift some responsibility out of Washington and to the States represents an important and healthy development.

All of us realize that it is going to take a number of years to develop commercially atomic energy, especially atomic power.

But some day we will have atomic power stations, as well as research reactors and radioisotopes, spread throughout the country.

It's time now for our State and local governments to start preparing to assume increased responsibilities in understanding and controlling this new force.

I would like to emphasize three things about this legislation.

First, it attempts to provide, for any given operation, that either the Federal Government will be responsible, or the State government, but not both.

From the point of view of industry, this should tend to prevent over regulation.

The Joint Committee put it this way:

"3. It is not intended to leave any room for the exercise of dual or concurrent jurisdiction by States to control radiation hazards

by regulating byproduct, source, or special nuclear materials. The intent is to have the material regulated and licensed either by the Commission, or by the State and local governments, but not by both."

Secondly, the bill, as amended, tries to encourage uniform standards.

On this point the Joint Committee said:

"5. The Joint Committee believes it important to emphasize that the radiation standards adopted by States under the agreements of this bill should either be identical or compatible with those of the Federal Government. The committee recognizes the importance of the testimony before it by numerous witnesses of the dangers of conflicting, overlapping, and inconsistent standards in different jurisdictions, to the hindrance of industry and jeopardy of public safety."

Third, this is only the first step toward increasing State and local responsibility.

The committee's final comment, number 7, in its report was:

"7. The bill recognizes that this is interim legislation. The committee believes that the uses of atomic energy will be so widespread in future years that States should continue to prepare themselves for increased responsibilities."

Related to, and prior to, the Federal-State hearings, the Joint Committee held hearings on industrial radioactive waste disposal, and also on employee radiation hazards.

Disposal of radioactive wastes from reactors is recognized as one of the growing problems in atomic energy.

We therefore wanted to assess the extent of the hazards, the quantities of wastes being generated now and estimated in the future, and explore the new research on treatment and disposal now underway in our AEC laboratories.

We held 5 days of hearings and received testimony from 52 scientists and experts working in this field.

As finally printed, the waste disposal hearings, including the technical papers for the record, run over 3,000 pages in length, and consist of four volumes.

They are without a doubt the most complete library yet compiled on this important subject.

I have copies of our committee's summary analysis of the hearings here with me if any of you would like one.

The hearings in March on employee radiation hazards also explored workmen's compensation problems.

In the past, workmen's compensation has always been handled at the State level, but there are suggestions now that a Federal workmen's compensation law for radiation injuries should be considered.

We found certain areas of agreement and certain areas of disagreement growing out of our hearings.

We then listed 10 possible future courses of action in the summary-analysis which we prepared after the hearings.

The Joint Committee took no action on this subject this year, but it will no doubt be before us again when we return in January.

The Joint Committee also held hearings this year on insurance and liability problems.

Nuclear reactors are designed with every possible safety device and precaution, and the record of the AEC and industry in operating reactors to date has been fantastically safe.

However, there is always the remote possibility of an accident which could cost hundreds of millions of dollars of damage.

Private insurance companies managed to put together pools totaling $50 or $60 million.

Above that amount, the Congress in 1957 enacted, as recommended by our committee, the so-called Price-Anderson amendments to the Atomic Energy Act to provide governmental indemnity and limitation of liability.

This year we reviewed the operation of these indemnity amendments, including international liability problems, and possible insurance and indemnity coverage for nuclear powered merchant ships.

In general, the indemnity amendments seem to be working well.

There has been no major reactor accident, and no call upon the governmental indemnity funds.

The best insurance, of course, is preventive insurance, and to this end we receive an annual report from the members of the advisory committee on reactor safeguards.

One bad accident would set this industry back many years in terms of public confidence.

We must continue our efforts to prevent this possibility.

After hearings on liability and reactor safety, we held hearings on fallout.

We read in the papers every day about the dangers of radioactive fallout, and it is a difficult subject to evaluate.

In 1957 the Joint Committee held voluminous hearings on this subject and in 1959 we wanted to bring ourselves up to date.

We therefore heard statements from the leading scientists and experts in the field as to the hazards, and as to our program to protect the public against fallout.

The Joint Committee then prepared a summary-analysis of these hearings, following our usual practice.

In general, I think we are in agreement that the fallout caused by debris from past bomb tests, both on the ground and still in the atmosphere, does not constitute a hazard to our public.

If we were to resume atmospheric tests, however, levels of strontium 90 could become uncomfortably high.

We said in our report:

"Thus for testing already conducted, man's exposure to fallout radiation is and will be relatively small compared to the normal background radiation or the standard recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP).

"Assuming successive cycles of testing over the next two generations or less, following the same pattern as the past 5 years, the predicted average concentration in bone will be about 48 strontium units.

"This is close enough to the maximum permissible body burden of 67 strontium units recommended by the ICRP to suggest that a hazard to the world's population could result during this period."

This suggests the advisability of tests underground rather than in the atmosphere.

This is, of course, one aspect of the prolonged and difficult negotiations with the Russians now taking place in Geneva.

Many military experts believe we may need to resume testing in order to improve our weapons program, including development of small, low-yield tactical weapons.

If the President should decide that we need to resume testing in the interests of national defense, it may be possible to reach an agreement with the Russians to conduct all future nuclear tests underground.

I think we would be willing to do this, and underground tests cause no fallout, of course.

But we have been talking with the Russians on this subject for almost a year now, and it is difficult to predict what, if anything, they will agree to.

Our final hearings this year were on the biological and environmental effects of a hypothetical nuclear war.

For the purposes of the hearings, the subcommittee set up an assumed attack pattern of nuclear weapons by an enemy against the United States.

We received testimony from military and civil defense experts, medical doctors and scientists.

After the hearings, the joint committee met to discuss the results.

Our summary-analysis of these hearings on the effects of a nuclear war are also available, and if any of you would like a copy, I will be glad to send one to you.

I think that you would find it very interesting reading.

The attack pattern assumed for the purposes of the hearings was that the enemy had delivered 263 nuclear weapons in 1, 2, 3, 8 and 10 megaton sizes, with a total yield of 1,446 megatons on 224 targets within the United States.

An additional 2,500 megatons were assumed to be detonated elsewhere in the northern hemisphere in attacks on overseas U.S. bases and in retaliation against the aggressor homeland.

Some of the subcommittee's conclusions were as follows:

"Probably the most significant finding presented to the subcommittee was that civil defense preparedness could reduce the casualties of the assumed attack on the United States from approximately 30 percent of the population to about 3 percent.

"The provision of shielding against radiation effects would at the same time protect against blast and thermal effects for the vast majority of the population.

"The cost of providing high-performance shelter protection for 200 million people was estimated at between $5 billion and $20 billion.

"The main conclusion presented to the subcommittee was that the country must have a national radiological defense system if the Nation is to withstand and recover from an attack of the scale which is possible in an all-out nuclear war."

We all hope to avoid a nuclear war, of course, but we have been less successful in some past years in avoiding a congressional war on another subject: The development of atomic power.

For the past 2 or 3 years before 1959 this had become an annual slugfest.

We used to debate, warmly and with some feeling, the issues of public versus private power, the rate of atomic power development, comparison with other countries, the role of government and industry, the advantages of different reactor types, and so forth.

However, this year, primarily because of the excellent relationships between the new AEC Chairman, John McCone, and our distinguished chairman, Senator CLINT ANDERSON of New Mexico, the Joint Committee and the Commission, after hearings, were able to reach agreement on a balanced atomic power development program for this fiscal year 1960.

This year the AEC authorization bill was approved unanimously by the committee, after a number of amendments to which the Commission consented.

The bill was then passed by both the House and Senate in the exact form recommended by the Joint Committee.

I hope that this spirit of harmony and cooperation will continue, and that we can find means for the Government and industry to work together to develop commercial atomic power.

The Joint Committee also held hearings in April of 1959 on the subject of atomic energy patents, and I know that this is a subject of considerable interest to your committee.

The AEC recommended, and the committee and the Congress approved, after our hearings, a 5-year extension of the so-called compulsory licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

The Commission testified while the industry is still in its infancy, the "reserve

power" of the compulsory licensing section should continue to be available.

The compulsory licensing provision has never been invoked since enactment in 1954.

We wrote in many limitations and restrictions on its use, and it is truly a "reserve power" which I doubt will ever be used.

Our hearings disclosed, I am glad to say, that the number of applications and patents by private inventors is steadily increasing.

In 1947 AEC filed 282 patent applications, and others 110.

Ten years later, by 1957, AEC filed 260 patent applications, and 715 patent applications were filed by others, mostly private industry.

The other patent amendments requested by the AEC are still pending before the committee and will be considered further next year.

One of the most interesting problems is in the international field.

It presents the question whether AEC contractors should receive preferential patent rights abroad on research and development financed by the Commission.

I am not a lawyer—and I can assure you that this subject is very complicated.

But we will continue to try to follow policies of encouraging inventions and development by private industry, and at the same time making any technology developed by AEC financing available to all of industry generally.

Now for the crystal ball.

What will be the activities of the Joint Committee in 1960?

First of all, we normally begin each year with hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry, under section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act.

That section provides for annual hearings by the committee during the first 60 days of the session, with testimony from representatives of industry, labor, science, and the public.

I hope that some of the industry leaders in this audience will take advantage of this opportunity to make known to the committee your views, either by written statement or by oral testimony.

The "202" hearings are scheduled for February 1960.

Also on the docket for next year will probably be further discussions of radiation standards and allocation of responsibility between the AEC, Public Health Service, and other agencies in formulating standards of protection.

In the past, the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement has recommended standards which have been adopted with only minor changes by the AEC.

In 1959 the President established by Executive order a Federal Radiation Council to review these standards and to advise the President as to policies in the radiation field.

Our committee, in the Federal-State bill which I mentioned earlier, established by statute the Federal Radiation Council, adding the Secretary of Labor as a member, and providing that the council should receive the best possible technical advice.

This year I am sure we will be concerned with the operations of the council and the Federal agencies in developing new radiation policies and standards.

These will, of course, be very important to the atomic energy industry, as well as to labor groups and the public.

We can also look forward next year to a review of the atomic power program.

I believe that the Federal Government should devote its efforts primarily to research and development, and that private industry should concentrate on construction of reactors.

The building of atomic power stations is a very complicated and expensive business.

It requires dollars for bricks and mortar and standard generating equipment which industry should provide.

But new atomic power stations also require heavy research and development expenditures, as Mr. Fairman can testify.

The Commission can, and should, stand ready to bear some of the research and development expenses, in order to accelerate our atomic power program.

Government construction of some small prototypes of new reactor types will probably also be necessary.

New reactor types are being developed, and further refinements and advances are being made in some of our older reactor types, such as the pressurized water and the boiling water reactors.

The committee will review the entire atomic power program thoroughly again next year, probably in connection with AEC authorization bill, since Government assistance in this program requires annual congressional authorization.

I think we can look forward to an interesting year, but it is still too early to predict what reactor types, if any, the committee will add to the Commission's recommended program.

Finally, it is likely that the committee will make an overall review of our international atoms-for-peace program next year.

Many of our friends abroad are fascinated with the atom, and there are many ways that we can work with them to mutual advantage.

Many of them are naive and do not realize the technical, financial, and legal problems involved, but all of them are anxious to work closely with the United States, and to improve their atomic know-how.

But how do our 48 bilateral agreements, our cooperation with Euratom, and our participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency all tie together?

What were the original objectives of each type of program?

What has been accomplished?

Should we redefine our objectives in our international atoms-for-peace programs?

These are all interesting questions which grow out of the past, but also have real significance for all future policies.

So you can see that we have not been idle in 1959, and that we have a very interesting agenda to look forward to in 1960.

The atom was developed during wartime and under conditions of secrecy, but is now finding more and more peaceful uses, with increasing possibilities for bettering the future of mankind.

I hope that this association will keep up its good work, and will make known its views to our committee during the forthcoming year, so that our committee can carry out its responsibilities in formulating policy, both with respect to the military and the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

A Possible Solution of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly publicized issues facing this session of Congress is the ever present farm problem. Constant reference is made to the mounting surplus of grain and the tremendous cost to the taxpayers of the subsidies involved. Since none of the past or present programs have solved the problem, I have introduced a bill which I hope will be given consideration as a possible solution. Briefly it provides for living off the surplus rather than increasing it. It applies only to wheat, is purely voluntary, and would replace the present cash subsidies. Any farmer desiring to enter the program would agree to take out of wheat production a number of acres equal to the average number of acres planted to wheat by the producer for 1958, 1959, and 1960. In return he would receive a certificate entitling him to 50 percent of his average annual production of wheat during the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. He could accept the wheat, or he could endorse the certificate and deliver it to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The endorsement would authorize the Corporation to sell the wheat to which he is entitled at the market price and remit the proceeds to the farmer.

I have limited the provisions of the bill to wheat and for a period of 2 years, simply as an experiment to see if it works. It has a twofold purpose of reducing the surplus and relieving the taxpayers of the present burdensome subsidy. I have discussed it with some farmers in the district I represent and they believe it has some merit.

It is not intended to be the perfect answer or a cure-all. However, it has the virtue of being new and different and I hope it may serve as a contribution to the solution of the farm problem.

Raising the Philippine Quota in the Next Revision of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the 1956 amendments of the Sugar Act the Philippines alone received no increase in quota. It is hoped that in the present Congress when consideration is given to a further extension of the act more equitable provision for the Philippine sugar producers will be made.

Indeed such action in behalf of the Philippines has been promised. When the President signed the law in 1956 extending the Sugar Act for 4 years, he expressly indicated that when new amendments were being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to increasing the Philippine share of U.S. sugar consumption. A press release to this effect was issued on May 29, 1956, which I take the liberty of quoting in full:

MAY 29, 1956.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved H.R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

In addition to extending the Sugar Act for 4 years, the bill restores to the domestic

areas the right to supply 55 percent of this country's increased requirements of sugar. The amendments also permit foreign countries to supply as much as they have been, plus 45 percent of the increases in our requirements. These increases will be most important relatively for the countries that heretofore have been minor suppliers.

It was not considered feasible to recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. I believe, therefore, that when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption, as is now provided for other foreign countries by this bill.

H.R. 9378—Requiring a Fair Return on Veterans' Life Insurance Trust Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the session I introduced H.R. 9378. This bill was introduced to make changes in the procedure for investing the national service life insurance trust fund and the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund.

The national service life insurance trust fund exceeds $5,625,000,000 and this fund is invested in special issues of the Treasury, with 5-year maturity periods, bearing 3 percent interest. The U.S. Government life insurance trust fund exceeds $1,120,000,000. This fund is invested in special issues of the Treasury, with 1-year maturity, and bearing interest rates of 3.5 percent. It is the responsibility of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury to supervise investment of these funds. In my opinion, these officials have failed to discharge their obligation and are investing the veterans' life insurance trust funds at interest rates below the current market.

The investment policies of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have been reasonably satisfactory until recently, but the administration's hard-money policy has changed the situation. As a result of calculated policies of the administration, interest rates have risen steadily for the past few years. During 1959 the Treasury issued obligations for sale to the public throughout the year with maturities varying from 1 year to 21 years at interest rates varying from 3¼ percent to 5 percent. On June 30, 1959, $1,111,000,000 of the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund was invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1-year certificates at 3½ percent. On the same date, $2,689,000,000 of the national service life insurance trust fund was invested in 5-year certificates at 3 percent. About this same time the Treasury was offering securities to the public for sale at considerably higher interest rates. In May 1959, issues with 1-year maturity and interest rate of 4 percent were offered. In July 1959 the Treasury offered securities to the public with 4-year 10-month maturity at 4¾ percent. In October an issue with a 4-year 10-month maturity was offered at 5 percent.

Despite the fact that the interest rates have been rising steadily, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have shown no disposition to secure for the veterans' trust funds interest yields commensurate with the current market. Despite the lack of initiative demonstrated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the administration to secure for veteran policyholders a fair return on their trust funds, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the administration have been very aggressive in urging legislation to lift interest-rate ceilings on home loans for veterans. During the last session of Congress, when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was considering legislation to raise interest rates on veterans' home loans, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs insisted that the interest-rate ceiling on veterans' home loans be lifted because, according to the Administrator, such action "was urgently needed to insure an active and fully effective loan guaranty program. In other words, the administration has been keenly aware of the rising interest rates and has shown no hesitation in demanding high interest rates in instances where the veteran pays; however, the administration has shown a marked lack of interest in securing better interest returns where the veteran is on the receiving end.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, I must observe that this situation is not confined to veterans' programs. Comparatively speaking, the veterans' life insurance trust funds have faired better than some of the other similar trust funds. On November 30, 1959, the civil service retirement fund had $8,813,974,000 invested in special issues of the Treasury at an average interest rate of 2.58 percent; the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund had $15,891,845,000 invested in special issues of the Treasury at an average interest rate of 2.56 percent; and the Railroad Retirement Fund had invested $3,428,174,000 at an average interest rate of 3 percent. In my opinion, there is cause for concern about the low interest yields being paid to these funds. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the administration has shown a great determination in its program to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds, while on the other hand shows a considerable apathy for this side of the interest-rate picture.

It appears the administration is perfectly happy to see the bankers and private investment institutions of America receive high interest returns on their investments, but have little interest in securing equitable treatment for the trust funds which back up our social security program, Federal civil service retirement program, the veterans' life insurance program, and other similar retirement plans, which affect millions of ordinary Americans.

We all know that from time to time there has been considerable concern expressed for the actuarial soundness of the civil service retirement fund and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance fund. From time to time the administration has taken a negative position on proposed changes to these programs on the basis the changes would endanger the actuarial soundness of the funds. One of the best ways to improve the actuarial soundness of these funds, or any trust fund for that matter, is to see they are properly invested at the highest yield available.

As I pointed out, the Treasury is paying 3½ percent on the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund and 3 percent on the national service life insurance trust fund. At the same time, the Veterans' Administration is loaning money to veteran policyholders at 4 percent. This practice demonstrates the unfairness of the Administration's policy. In other words, if a veteran borrows his own money back from the Veterans' Administration, using his life insurance policy as security, he must pay 4 percent, yet the Secretary of the Treasury has the use of the bulk of these funds at a 3-percent interest rate.

Mr. Speaker, these trust funds which I have been describing are in the nature of captive funds. In the case of the veterans' insurance trust funds, these matters are left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. There is no need for a change in legislation to insure the veterans' life insurance trust funds receiving fair treatment. Legislation has become necessary because the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have failed to act. It is for this reason I have introduced H.R. 9378. I have notified the Veterans' Administration and the Treasury I expect to begin hearings on this legislation on February 2.

Congressional Action on the President's Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the last session of Congress, the 85th, and the 1st session of this Congress, the 86th, have been labeled by partisans and propagandists as "reckless spenders" by those who would seek political gain by this misrepresentation. As we begin this new session and again undertake the serious and demanding undertaking of appropriating necessary and adequate fund needs to assure the continued progress of our Nation, I think it is appropriate that we review the actions of the Congress on budgetary matters in the past and in particular during the last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, first let us look at how our national spending has increased through the years as our country has grown and as we have faced grave crises both internally and nationally.

For almost three decades, preceding the turn of the century, the budgetary appropriations by the Congress were at a $300 million level. Then in 1891, the 51st Congress appropriated for the first time funds totaling more than half a billion dollars. The Federal budget remained at approximately this level until 1398 when it reached almost $900 million.

The 60th Congress in 1908 was the first Congress to break the $1 billion mark and I am sure that there were those in 1908 who labeled the Members of that Congress "reckless spenders."

Financing World War I made it necessary for the 64th Congress, 2d session, to appropriate the largest percentagewise jump from one year to the next that the Nation has ever known when the total budget jumped from $1.6 billion for the year preceding to $18.8 billions for fiscal 1918.

As the country grew internally and as World War II approached the budgetary appropriations continued to grow until the 2d session of the 77th Congress—in the midst of World War II—appropriated the largest sum ever appropriated when the budget figure stood at $147 billions for fiscal 1943.

After the war spending was reduced sharply and hit a postwar low in 1946 when the 2d session of the 79th Congress appropriated $35.7 billions.

Mr. Speaker, now let us look at what has happened to the budget during the last 6 years—since the Eisenhower administration has been in office. The budget estimates and requests for fiscal 1955 was $60.77 billion. The Congress cut and reduced this by some $2.6 billion and appropriated $58.16 billion. Again for fiscal 1956 the Congress cut the President's budget by more than $2 billion as his estimates totaled $66 billion and the actual appropriations totaled only $63.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Congress has consistently cut the President's requests for appropriations and has made substantial reductions each and every year. The largest cut was made by the 85th Congress when more than $5 billion was slashed by the Congress from the President's request for $78.1 billion of appropriations. That year $73 billion was actually appropriated by the Congress.

Last year alone $1,881,410,083 was cut from the President's budget. Thus, the Congress during the last 6 years has cut the President's appropriations requests by approximately $12½ billion. These are the true facts.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, the Congress during the last 6 years has cut and reduced the administration's request for appropriations by approximately $12½ billion. This vividly demonstrates and should make it clear to all that the Congress is not the heavy wild spender that the partisans, both in and out of Congress, the President and the propagandists would lead the country to believe. The misrepresentation that has been made in this area has been made, I repeat, for political gain.

The true facts are, the President over the past 7 years has repeatedly asked for larger and larger appropriations, for bigger and bigger spending. The Congress has exercised its collective judgments on these big spending programs and consistently cut and reduced them as the record indicates.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues, the press, and the public generally a concise and accurate report—Senate Document No. 67, 86th Congress, 1st session—relating to "Congressional Action on the President's Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority"—a statement by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate.

In this connection, Senator JOHNSON comments that the Congress has consistently made cuts in the President's budget, and regarding the so-called backdoor financing. The report points out that the President has either advocated bills approving new obligational authority before the Congress acted or else they were approved by him after the Congress acted.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this report be reproduced in the RECORD following my remarks hereon. The report and appropriation tables follow:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS AND NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

COMPLEXITY OF FEDERAL BUDGET

The Federal budget and budgetary procedures are very complex and difficult to discuss or explain in simple fashion. It is easy to see why this is so, from the simple fact that the budget document for fiscal year 1960, submitted to the Congress at the beginning of the session, was the size of a metropolitan telephone book, weighing over 5 pounds and containing over 1,000 pages—most of which consisted of detailed statistical and fiscal tables.

Even this document presented only a portion of the facts. The congressional committees dealing with the various programs involved in the budget held hundreds of hearings—and printed tens of thousands of pages of testimony—in an effort to get at all the facts and have a basis for sound legislative action.

Apart from the problems arising from the very size and scope of the Federal budget, there is a very real problem in talking simply and intelligibly about the budget because of the many technical details involved. For example, no money can be placed under contract (obligated) or spent unless the program has first been authorized by the Congress. In some cases this authorization is in a separate law, which must be followed by a specific appropriation act. In other cases, the authorization is contained in an appropriation act. In still other cases, the authorization act itself provides the contracting and spending authority. Finally, there are some cases, such as interest on the debt, where permanent authority exists and whatever amounts are needed become automatically available each year, without any action by the Congress.

AUTHORIZATIONS VERSUS APPROPRIATIONS

If this sounds complex and confusing, the actual budgetary procedures are even more tangled than indicated by the above description. For example, there is no requirement that the amounts authorized to be appropriated in an authorization act be matched by actual appropriations. The fact is that many billions of dollars have been authorized which have not been appropriated. Consider these examples:

1. Rivers and harbors and flood control: Between fiscal years 1936 and 1959, projects totaling $17,811,405,000 were authorized for rivers and harbors and flood control projects. Actual appropriations, however, totaled $9,987,622,000. This means that appropriations have not been provided for authorized projects involving $7,823,783,000.

2. Reclamation: Since fiscal year 1902, authorization has been enacted for projects involving $7,906,092,000 Actual appropriations, however, total $3,509,869,000, leaving an unfinanced balance of $4,396,283,000.

3. Military construction: During the past 8 years, authorizations have been enacted for military construction projects involving $13,021 million. Appropriations have totaled $11,784 million for this same period, or $1,237 million below the amounts authorized.

4. Mutual security (foreign aid): During the past 8 years, a total of $34,005 million has been authorized to be appropriated for the mutual security program. Actual appropriations, however, have amounted to $29,229 million, or $4,776 million below the amounts authorized.

In these four areas alone, actual appropriations have been $18¼ billion less than the amounts authorized. Despite this clear evidence that authorizations are not the same as appropriations, a good deal of misguided information has been released to the public in which authorizations and appropriations are lumped together as if they were one and the same thing.

DISTORTION OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON BUDGET

Because of the complexity of governmental budgeting, it is easy to understand why people who are not expert in this difficult field can make honest mistakes in interpreting the facts. Getting the true story, however, is made even more difficult when the facts and figures are manipulated or distorted to prove a political slogan. This is what has happened in the incredible campaign to convince the American people that the Congress is a collection of irresponsible spenders and that only the executive branch stands like Horatius at the bridge to stem the onrush of the congressional spenders.

CONGRESS DOES NOT PRESCRIBE EXPENDITURES

Despite impressions to the contrary, the Congress does not prescribe the amount to be spent in any given fiscal year. Instead, the Congress provides spending authority, a large part of which remains available indefinitely until it is spent. In carrying out the various programs authorized by the Congress, the executive branch has exercised considerable latitude in determining both the rate and manner of using this spending authority. This extends from outright refusal to use funds provided by the Congress for specific purposes—as in the case of a large part of the $1.3 billion increase in defense appropriations last year—to the other extreme of spending at a deficiency rate.

In addition to this latitude, there are certain important areas of spending over which the Congress exercises no direct control. Thus, the executive branch has just announced that spending for interest on the debt during the current fiscal year will be $1 billion greater than had been estimated in January 1959. The Congress found out about this only when it was announced to the general public.

In truth, it is impossible for anyone to dissect the amounts spent in any fiscal year and determine with any degree of accuracy exactly how much the total spending has been increased or decreased by actions of the Congress or of the executive branch. This would be as accurate—and as rewarding—as unscrambling an omelet. Yet some people persist in trying to do this, apparently assuming that few people would realize the degree to which any such estimates are really slanted guestimates.

Bills providing appropriations and other new obligational authority, 86th Cong., 1st sess.

TABLE I. APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Final amount approved	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
	1959 SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 5916	2d Supplemental	$2,864,954,526	Mar. 20	$2,479,522,494	Mar. 24	$2,657,402,994	$2,900,799,370	Apr. 18	$2,820,040,054	Apr. 30	$2,843,902,805	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990	May 20	86-30
	1960 APPROPRIATIONS														
	SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 7978	Supplemental	888,931,417	June 26	632,568,845	June 29	609,843,845	1,218,090,555	July 31	1,076,186,108	Aug. 3	1,076,186,108	977,345,608	−240,744,947	Sept. 1	86-213
H.J. Res. 439	Temporary (July)		June 25		June 30			June 30		June 30				July 1	86-76
H.J. Res. 475	Temporary (August)		July 24		July 29			July 29		July 29				July 31	86-118
H.J. Res. 510	Temporary (September)				Aug. 31					Aug. 31				Sept. 3	86-224
	REGULAR														
H.R. 5676	District of Columbia	(246,698,000)	Mar. 13	(237,186,112)	Mar. 16	(237,186,112)	(245,900,000)	May 21	(241,569,402)	May 28	(241,702,402)	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)	July '23	86-104
	Federal payment	34,218,000		27,218,000		27,218,000	34,218,000		29,218,000		29,351,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000		
H.R. 5805	Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	Mar. 18	4,628,097,000	Mar. 20	4,628,097,000	4,688,327,000	May 21	4,663,158,600	May 28	4,664,027,600	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000	June 11	86-39
H.R. 5915	Interior	491,101,400	Mar. 20	472,198,800	Mar. 23	472,198,800	491,101,400	June 5	487,211,025	June 8	487,211,025	481,809,100	−9,292,300	June 23	86-60
H.R. 6769	Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	Apr. 28	3,915,084,181	Apr. 30	3,915,084,181	3,756,848,581	June 23	4,124,460,581	June 24	4,124,460,581	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400	Aug. 14	86-158
H.R. 7040	Independent offices	6,586,418,000	May 8	6,441,069,800	May 11	6,459,887,800	6,586,418,000	June 22	6,561,578,600	June 23	6,561,578,600	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800	Sept. 14	86-225
H.R. 7175	Agriculture	4,081,364,863	May 15	3,939,165,498	May 20	3,939,165,498	4,081,364,863	May 28	3,975,505,148	June 3	3,975,774,848	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190	July 8	86-80
H.R. 7176	General government	13,608,500	May 15	13,338,500	May 27	13,338,500	13,608,500	June 22	13,568,500	June 24	13,568,500	13,463,500	−145,000	July 8	86-79
H.R. 7343	State-Justice-Judiciary	682,387,600	May 21	649,896,700	May 27	651,896,700	682,387,600	June 22	650,674,700	June 23	650,924,700	648,941,200	−33,446,400	July 13	86-84
H.R. 7349	Commerce	732,191,000	May 25	674,687,300	May 28	675,297,300	732,191,000	June 16	715,328,500	June 18	715,328,500	712,672,900	−19,518,100	July 13	86-88
H.R. 7453	Legislative	105,460,005	May 28	100,279,350	June 1	100,279,350	133,648,180	June 16	128,797,380	June 18	128,797,380	128,797,380	−4,850,800	Aug. 21	86-176
H.R. 7454	Defense	39,248,200,000	May 28	38,848,339,000	June 3	38,848,339,000	39,248,200,000	July 7	39,594,339,000	July 14	39,594,339,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000	Aug. 18	86-166
H.R. 7509	Public Works	(1,185,406,259)	June 2	(1,185,406,259)	June 9	(1,185,906,259)	(1,185,406,259)	July 8	(1,265,565,559)	July 9	(1,265,565,559)	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)	Vetoed	
H.R. 8283	Atomic Energy	2,718,715,000	July 17	2,660,529,000	July 21	2,660,529,000	2,718,715,000	July 30	2,711,829,000	Aug. 3	2,711,829,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000	Aug. 18	86-164
H.R. 8385	Mutual Security	4,436,277,000	July 24	3,209,782,000	July 29	3,191,782,000	4,824,484,137	Sept. 8	3,691,269,508	Sept. 14	3,692,262,137	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000	Sept. 28	86-383
H.R. 8575	Military Construction	1,563,200,000	Aug. 7	1,285,002,700	Aug. 10	1,285,002,700	1,563,200,000	Aug. 20	1,428,178,700	Aug. 21	1,428,178,700	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800	Sept. 16	86-275
H.R. 9105	Public Works	1,185,406,259	Sept. 4	1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,406,259		1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,309,093	−97,166	Veto overridden	86-254
	Total regular	70,323,723,208		68,049,996,922		68,053,424,922	70,740,118,520		69,960,426,335		69,962,940,664	69,235,752,364	−1,504,366,156		
	Total, all bills	74,077,609,151		71,162,088,261		71,320,671,761	74,859,008,445		73,856,652,497		73,883,029,577	72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093		

TABLE II. NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED OUTSIDE THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS (SO-CALLED BACKDOOR FINANCING)

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
H.R. 4452 S. 1094	Bretton Woods Agreement Act	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 25	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 19	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000		June 17	86-48
S. 57	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 27	(1,975,000,000)	May 21	(*)	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 3	(2,625,000,000)	Feb. 5	(2,525,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(−$350,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2539	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 25	(825,000,000)	Aug. 27	(825,000,000)	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 13	(825,000,000)	Aug. 18	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(−825,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2654	Housing Act of 1959	1,650,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	1,650,000,000	Sept. 8	925,000,000	Sept. 9	925,000,000	925,000,000	−725,000,000	Sept. 23	86-372
S. 1 H.R. 1011	Aid to airports	200,000,000	Mar. 2	297,000,000	Mar. 19	297,000,000	200,000,000	Feb. 5	565,000,000	Feb. 6	465,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	June 29	86-72
H.R. 2256	Veterans' Housing Loan Act		Jan. 29	300,000,000	Feb. 4	300,000,000		Feb. 3	300,000,000	June 16	100,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000	June 30	86-73
H.R. 3460	Tennessee Valley Authority bond issuance	750,000,000	Apr. 14	750,000,000	May 7	750,000,000	750,000,000	July 2	750,000,000	July 9	750,000,000	750,000,000		Aug. 6	86-137
	Total	7,150,000,000		6,822,000,000		6,822,000,000	7,150,000,000		7,090,000,000		6,790,000,000	6,451,000,000	−699,000,000		

*Authorized $1,975,000,000 to be appropriated.

NOTE.—Amounts shown represent total new obligational authority actually provided by each bill. Differences in amounts may include changes in scope of programs and differences in time periods covered by various versions of each bill.

Grand total, all bills, tables I and II	$81,227,609,151		$77,984,088,261		$78,142,671,761	$82,009,008,445		$80,946,652,497		$80,673,029,557	$79,428,598,352	−$2,580,410,093		

CONGRESSIONAL CUTS IN BUDGET REQUESTS

This does not mean that there is no way of determining accurately what the Congress has done in acting on the President's budget. What the Congress has done in acting on the President's requests for spending authority is a matter of public record and can be documented beyond question. This should be well known to those who prefer—for reasons of their own—to present a distorted picture of what the Congress has done. Perhaps this is the reason why such persons persist in proving their misconception with figures attained by scrambling together appropriations, authorizations, expenditures, backdoor finances, failure to enact tax proposals, and other ill-assorted and unrelated fiscal concepts.

Just what are the facts concerning action by the Congress on the President's requests for appropriations and other spending authority? The facts concerning the last session are summarized in two tables printed on the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All the figures in these tables have been compiled by, or verified by, the Bureau of the Budget.

These tables, which are reprinted in this document exactly as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, show:

1. The Congress cut the President's requests for appropriations by a whopping $1,881,410,093.

2. The Congress cut the President's requests for new obligational authority contained in bills other than appropriations bills (this has been politically referred to as backdoor financing) by $699 million.

3. Thus, the Congress cut a total of $2,580,410,093 from the President's requests for new spending authority.

BACKDOOR FINANCING

Perhaps a few additional words should be said about the so-called backdoor financing. No one knows exactly who coined this phrase but it succeeds in giving the impression that there is something wrong with providing spending authority outside of an appropriation bill. This just is not so. Regardless of whether spending authority is provided by an appropriation bill or by an authorization bill, the same congressional and Presidential action is required to enact the spending authority into law. The only real difference is that the preliminary work is handled by a different set of committees before the bill in question is acted upon.

Perhaps those who imply that there is something sinister in the so-called backdoor financing are unaware of these significant facts:

1. During the 6½ years of the Eisenhower administration, the President has requested the Congress to enact 24 separate bills involving backdoor financing of $20,029 million.

2. The Congress has enacted 38 bills involving new authority of $25,726 million.

3. The President has approved 36 of these bills, involving new authority of $25,289 million.

In short, of the more than $25 billion of new authority that has been enacted into law outside of appropriation bills during the present administration, every cent was either advocated by the President before the Congress acted, or else approved by him after the Congress had acted.

CONGRESS HAS CONSISTENTLY CUT PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The cut of more than $2½ billion in the President's requests for new spending authority clearly demonstrates that it is a sheer fabrication to describe the 86th Congress as a group of reckless spenders. Because of the widespread circulation given to this charge, however, some people may wonder whether the record of the last session was a "fluke" and think that the Congress normally votes for increased spending.

The fact is that the Congress has consistently cut the President's requests for appropriations each and every year. In addition to the $1,881,410,093 cut from the President's budget in the past session, the Congress cut over $10,600 million from the appropriation estimates in the preceding years. Thus, the Congress has cut the President's appropriation requests by approximately $12½ billion during the last 6 years.

These reductions are shown in detail in the following table:

Congressional reductions in the President's appropriation requests

Congress and session	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Decreased by Congress
83d Cong., 2d sess.	$60, 770, 315, 686	$58, 160, 445, 563	$2, 609, 870, 123
84th Cong., 1st sess.	66, 023, 089, 195	63, 947, 281, 321	2, 075, 807, 874
84th Cong., 2d sess.	73, 298, 859, 629	73, 041, 364, 417	257, 495, 212
85th Cong., 1st sess.	78, 108, 417, 112	73, 064, 958, 328	5, 043, 458, 784
85th Cong., 2d sess.	81, 737, 060, 999	81, 119, 818, 276	617, 242, 723
86th Cong., 1st sess.	74, 859, 008, 445	72, 977, 598, 352	1, 881, 410, 093
Total budget cuts by Congress in last 6 fiscal years			12, 485, 284, 809

The NATO Parliamentarians Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during the week of November 15–21, the Fifth Conference of NATO Parliamentarians was held in Washington, with the general assemblies held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building and committee meetings in various committee rooms.

Members of the 14 visiting delegations told me that they thoroughly enjoyed the visit to Washington, which was appropriately held here in the 10th anniversary year of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Much of the credit for the successful meeting, together with the arrangements for extending the hospitality of the U.S. Congress to our visiting colleagues, should go to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, chairman of the House delegation to the conference, and the U.S. member of the NATO Parliamentarians Standing Committee. Mr. HAYS served 1 year as president of the Conference and is presently a Vice President. His work with the NATO Parliamentarians Conference has brought great credit to the United States and to the U.S. Congress among our allies in NATO.

The Parliamentarians meeting here was very successful from the standpoint of discussion of some of the critical problems which face the NATO alliance. The Military Committee, for example, recommended in a resolution approved by the entire Conference immediate action to improve the air-defense system in Western Europe. The gravity of this problem has been made clear in the Council of Ministers meeting and in the conferences in which the President participated last month.

It is now conceded by all concerned that if NATO is to fully meet the challenge to strengthen Western unity, there must be far greater cooperation in political, economic, and cultural fields among the members of the alliance. I think the NATO Parliamentarians Conference should receive a major share of the credit for the impetus given this idea since the Parliamentarians meetings began. Most of the practical proposals for more fully coordinated activity in these broad fields were originally given responsible support in the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

Challenges and Problems Facing the United States in the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I have been attempting to define some of the issues facing the United States in the next decade—the sixties. Frankly, I am not certain what the answers will or should be. But certainly the first step is to define the problem.

Representing the 11th Congressional District of Indiana is not easy. We have one of the largest, richest, and most intelligent districts in the country. I have found that one very helpful way to represent this great district and to work through a problem is to ask for advice from my own people in Marion County, Indiana.

Listed below are two challenges and 10 problems that concern me. I am inserting this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that my voters will study it and then give me their advice on these issues.

CHALLENGES AND PROBLEMS FACING THE UNITED STATES IN THE SIXTIES

DOMESTIC

I believe that our domestic challenge is roughly this: "Can we establish an economic climate that will provide job opportunities and a chance for every worker to earn his fair share of his productive contribution to this Nation?"

Under the challenge I see these specific problems:

First. What can we do about an agricultural policy that is clearly a failure from the standpoint of the farmer, the taxpayer, and the consumer?

Second. What can we do to encourage the savings that must finance the approaching technical and population explosion? (Both demand exorbitant

amounts of new capital.) A stable population and a technology that is not changing require very little savings or capital.

Third. What should we, or can we, do to soften the blows of industrial strife—management-labor conflicts?

Fourth. Is our tax structure just and equitable? Does it provide a reliable source of national revenue? Does it dampen out, or does it exaggerate the swing of the business cycle?

Fifth. Can we afford to react to foreign competition by crawling back into a high-tariff box?

Sixth. Are we getting our money's worth from the $45 billion a year defense expenditure? Is interservice rivalry getting out of hand and hampering our defense efforts?

INTERNATIONAL

In my opinion the international challenge is basically, "How can we achieve peace in the world without surrendering our rights and our dignity as free men?"

The problems underlying the challenge seem to be:

First. Can the United States encourage the NATO nations to shoulder a more realistic share of the military burden?

Second. Can we shift to the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Bank, and the International Development Association the burden of assisting the underdeveloped nations of the world attain a measure of economic sufficiency?

Third. Can this Nation somehow get its agricultural surpluses out of expensive storage and to the starving peoples of the world?

Fourth. In spite of a shortage of exportable dollars can this Nation step up its assistance in technical, agricultural, and medical counseling to the underprivileged peoples of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia?

CONCLUSION

These are the areas of policy that concern me. I know that there are probably other problems in which my constituents are also interested. Their opinion on these and other issues will be welcome!

The Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an organization which is performing a very valuable service to our Nation. I am speaking of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, founded 51 years ago this year. This organization has expanded to include 170,000 members of more than 3,400 clubs who are dedicated to community service, to helping those who are in need, and to improve the working conditions and opportunities in the business world for womankind.

In my own home State of Michigan, the federation has conducted numerous research projects which have proved of great value to some of our Nation's leading universities and to research agencies of our Federal Government.

The efforts of the federation in my own congressional district of Oakland County, Mich., have been outstanding. Many civic projects would never have come to pass if it had not been for the dedication, the hard work and the ability of the members of this group of business and professional women's clubs. In every worthy cause, these ladies are in the forefront.

It is well for all of us to pay tribute to the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, to recognize the valuable contribution which these clubs and their respective members have made to our society, and to let them know that we appreciate their efforts.

A Bill To Increase Social Security Benefits, Improve Trust Fund Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9372, a bill making a number of important changes in the Social Security Act, including improving the earnings of the social security trust funds, and increasing social security benefits.

I am confident that the Congress will make social security improvements in 1960. I hope that the improvements will be comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, and will correct not just one but many of the shortcomings of the present law. I believe that H.R. 9372 fits that description.

Of vital importance is that provision of my bill which will increase the earnings of the social security trust funds, to permit payment of more realistic benefits and to insure soundness and fairness in the social security system.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14390, I pointed out that the social security trust funds were being short changed by some 260 million a year, and introduced H.R. 8407, a bill to insure an adequate return on the social security trust funds by removing the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee of the social security trust funds, substituting for him a person without conflicting interests, and requiring a return on the trust funds as near as possible to the return being realized by regular investors in U.S. Government securities.

The situation which I described last July has not changed. I have therefore incorporated the provisions of H.R. 8407 in the new bill.

The Treasury is still depriving the social security trust funds of interest earnings amounting to about $260 million a year.

While private investors average more than 4 percent interest on Government securities, the Treasury Secretary, who manages the trust funds, has invested virtually all of the $20 billion in social security funds in Government securities earning only 2½ percent.

We can correct this situation by reconstituting the Board of Trustees of the social security funds and requiring the new board to take all needed steps, including proposing legislation if necessary, to bring the interest yield on the social security funds up to the level of earnings from Government securities of other investors.

In addition, H.R. 9372 will improve social security in the following ways:

First. A 10 percent across-the-board increase in old-age, survivors and disability insurance benefits, with a minimum increase of $5 a month.

Such an increase is needed to restore the dollar power which steady inflation has taken from our elderly citizens and others dependent on social security payments as their financial base.

Although Congress has several times raised benefits, they have never caught up to overall cost increases in our economy. A 10-percent increase will put social security payments back in a fair, realistic relationship to the cost of living in 1960 and, we can hope, long after that.

Second. An increase in future benefits by raising the earnings ceiling for contribution and benefit purposes from the present $4,800 to $6,000 a year.

No matter what a person earns in any year, only the first $4,800 of income is counted for social security purposes. This means that social security benefits are limited by that figure.

In 1939, the earnings limit was $3,000. That was fine then, because 97 percent of all workers covered by social security earned $3,000 or less. Today, however, more than 25 percent of covered workers earn more than the present earnings ceiling of $4,800. Unless that ceiling is raised, the future benefits of millions of retired workers will be considerably less than realistic in relation to the actual wages they had been earning. Raising the earnings ceiling to $6,000 will produce realistic future benefits for more than 90 percent of covered workers.

Third. Repeal the existing requirement that a disabled person must be at least 50 years old before he can qualify for disability insurance benefits.

As an army of experts has testified to congressional committees, there is absolutely no justification for denying disability benefits to persons under 50, who otherwise meet the requirements of the law. The younger disabled man needs help just as much, and sometimes more, than the older. For example, the disabled person of 35 or 40 is less likely to have children old enough to help support the family than is the man over 50. This arbitrary disability age should definitely be removed.

Fourth. Permit persons receiving benefits to earn up to $1,800 a year, instead of the present $1,200, from outside sources without a reduction in benefits.

Many older men and women are able and eager to work part time and feel they are contributing to society in a productive way. The present limit on outside earnings penalizes many such persons unduly. I believe that a modest increase, letting a person earn up to $150 a month without a cut in social security payments, is justified.

Fifth. Increase the maximum family benefit by removing the present arbitrary ceiling of $254 a month. The bill would increase the maximum family benefit to 80 percent of average earnings. This would mean a maximum of $320 a month under the present earnings ceiling—$4,800—and $400 a month under the proposed $6,000 ceiling. The existing $254 ceiling deprives large families of the full survivorship benefits to which they are entitled.

According to figures supplied by the Social Security Administration, the proposed additional benefits, offset by the increased earnings of the social security trust funds, would require an increase in the social security tax of only one-half of 1 percent in the employer's and employee's respective contributions.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I have had the pleasure of introducing a bill to establish an emergency 2-year program for Federal aid to the States and localities for school construction. This bill, it is no secret, is a companion measure to the bill which has been reported to the other body by that body's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The fight for Federal aid to education is an old one, Mr. Speaker. As in so many other legislative areas, the friends of the schools have marched up many a hill, only to fall a vote or two short of the summit. In assessing causes for the defeat of previous school legislation, I believe no single factor can be given greater weight than the constant and well-publicized willingness of the administration to give courageous and unstinting support to any school aid bill—any bill, that is, except the specific bill that happens to be before the House at any given moment. In past sessions, the House, having failed to pass a generous school aid bill sponsored by Democratic Members, has turned its efforts to inadequate bills offered by the administration. In most, if not all cases, the administration's ardor, even for its own "teeny-weeny" bills, suddenly cooled.

In this 2d session of the 86th Congress, in this closing year of the Eisenhower era, I hope the Congress will be able to enact some kind of legislation to assist our public elementary and high schools meet the desperate challenge which this age has thrust upon them.

There are those of us who believe that education is a sufficiently important and proper sphere of governmental activity to be federally supported in its own right. But there are many who will point, with some justice, to the titanic struggle for existence in which the free world is engaged, and suggest that all our energies should go into this struggle. In a sense I agree. All of our energies, developed to their highest degree, should go into the fight to maintain the future of freedom. I would differ completely with those sincere Members of this House who feel that only our military energies, or only our military and propaganda, or even only our military, propaganda, and scientific energies ought to be put into the balance against the challenge and the threat that is communism. I say that unless we develop our full intellectual armory, our weapons stockpiles will be useless. Unless we utilize our resources, including our financial resources, to help men learn ..hat it means to be free, what it means to be educated, what it means to be fully alive, then we have little left to defend. If our schools fail to meet the challenge which has been thrust upon them—and it is a different challenge than the challenge Soviet schools are meeting with success—unless they meet this challenge, then the free way of life is doomed. I believe this with all my heart. I hope and trust that my colleagues in the Congress agree. I trust that we will not let the "budget firsters" again frighten us away from our plain and inescapable duty to the future of the Nation.

In this context, I ask unanimous consent that a penetrating editorial recently printed in the Pendleton East Oregonian, be printed at the end of my remarks.

This editorial does not mince words or dodge issues. It points to the Federal control bugaboo as the phony issue it is. The editorial refutes this argument in telling and persuasive terms. It is a good text from which to begin this year's debate on Federal aid for education—the most important legislation before this Congress.

[From the Pendleton East-Oregonian, Dec. 8, 1959]

OF NATIONAL CONCERN

Whenever somebody tells us that Federal aid to education is as dangerous as the bubonic plague we suggest that he take a look at Hermiston High School, talk to teachers and administrators at Hermiston High School. That school received substantial Federal aid while McNary Dam was under construction and a lesser amount thereafter. There isn't a speck of evidence that anybody in Washington, D.C. has ever attempted to dictate to Hermiston High School.

The Oregon State Board of Education revealed this week that 31 of Oregon's 36 counties are getting Federal aid under the National Defense Education Act. In the current year, $711,000 will be spent in 133 Oregon school districts to improve teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The act also offers Federal aid to districts that want to improve their counseling service to students, and several districts are accepting that aid.

We doubt that any school district that is participating in the National Defense Education Act program has had any unpleasant experiences with it. We doubt that any has lost control of its educational processes.

Education is a matter of national concern. If a school district is doing less than an adequate job the entire Nation suffers. If a school district is doing an above-average job the entire Nation benefits. It is as important to you that a boy in Mississippi who has a high IQ is properly prepared to go to college as it is to his school district in Mississippi.

The fight against Federal aid to education is phony. The opponents place their emotions ahead of good sense.

Proposed New Veterans' Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a veterans' housing bill which I hope will revitalize the veterans' housing program.

The bill which I am introducing makes substantial changes in the veterans' housing program. These changes have become necessary since the veterans' housing program is becoming inoperative as a result of the administration's hard-money policy. Last year the Congress raised the interest rate on veterans' home loans from 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent. This action did very little to improve the supply of mortgage financing for veterans' home loans. The rapid rise in interest rates resulting from the policies of the administration exceeded the increase in interest rates authorized by the Congress. Very little additional mortgage financing became available as a result of the interest rate increase. The situation has become progressively worse. High discounts are being charged throughout the country in connection with veterans' loans. These discounts range upward to 12 points and increase the interest yield to the lender to rates of 6 percent and above.

Interest rates have increased rapidly as a result of the administration's hard-money policy, and are now conflicting with the usury laws of the various States. Suits are now pending in local courts to determine whether the high interest rates being charged, together with large discounts, are a violation of State usury laws. This has resulted in many institutional lenders withdrawing from the mortgage financing field until the issue is settled. The administration has offered, as its only solution to the shortage of mortgage financing funds for veterans' home loans, increases in interest rates. It is apparent this is not the solution, since lending practices based on present high interest rates are now being questioned in the courts as violations of State lending laws.

In a recent survey by the committee, the loan guaranty officers of the Veterans' Administration in offices throughout the country have estimated that if the current tight money condition continues the Veterans' Administration will make only about 150,000 home loans in 1960. These same offices estimate that if mortgage financing were available, with moderate or no discounts, the veterans' home loan program would increase to 368,000 loans during 1960.

There is no prospect that there will be a change in the near future in the Administration's hard money policy and there appears to be little likelihood an increase in interest rates would produce the desired result. The bill which I have introduced makes several major changes in the housing program and seeks other sources for veterans' home loans.

This bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue debentures for sale with maturity varying from 10 to 30 years at an interest rate of not less than 4½ percent. These debentures will be offered for sale to the general public; however, they are designed to appeal to the major private trust funds of the Nation, such as union trust funds, welfare trust funds, private estate trust funds, and trust funds developed through the retirement programs of the various States and municipalities for public employees. The debentures to be issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will be guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the U.S. Treasury. The funds obtained through the sale of debentures will be utilized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for veterans' home loans.

The bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may loan these funds any place in the United States where a shortage of mortgage financing exists. The maximum loan is to be $17,500. Discretion is left with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as to downpayment; however, 100 percent loans are permitted under the bill. The bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to charge the veteran borrower a 1-point fee at closing. Builders or sponsors who receive a commitment will be required to pay a 2-point fee for a fund commitment or fund reservation under the bill. These funds will be deposited by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in a revolving fund to protect the Government from loss. The bill provides that the Administrator may sell debentures at 4½ percent. The interest rate for the veteran's loan will remain the same as provided in the existing program—5¼ percent. The Administrator will have available the margin of three-quarters of 1 percent to offset his administrative costs in placing and servicing the loans.

The bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may sell not to exceed $5 billion in debentures in any one fiscal year. It provides that the Administrator may invest not to exceed 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund in the debentures. The bill extends the housing program for World War II veterans until February 1, 1965, so that the World War II program will be scheduled to expire on the same date with the program for Korean veterans.

This bill does not alter the guaranteed home loan program in any way. Private lenders may continue to participate in the veterans' guaranteed home loan program. It is intended that the program of home loans to be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through funds obtained by selling debentures will supplement the guaranteed home loan program which is presently operating through private lenders for World War II and Korean veterans.

It is expected that early hearings will be scheduled on this legislation since the outlook for mortgage financing for veterans' home loans is very bleak for 1960 unless a solution can be found. The direct loan program, which has depended on appropriations directly from the Treasury, will not be continued past its scheduled expiration date of July 25, 1960. It is not expected that this program will be necessary if funds become available through sale of debentures.

Young and Old Fogeys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, senior Senator of Minnesota, was one of the principal speakers at the national convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in Toledo, Ohio, November 17 to 20, 1959. He addressed the convention on the subject of "Young and Old Fogeys." As chairman of the convention, I had an opportunity to witness the great enthusiasm with which his speech was received and given and so that those who were not among the 2,000 delegates at the convention may read his remarks, I under unanimous consent, include excerpts from his remarks in the RECORD:

YOUNG AND OLD FOGIES

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

I take particular pleasure in addressing this national convention of Young Democrats, for as far as I'm concerned, what America needs most today is to regain its youth.

America is showing distressing signs of middle age.

And there's a very simple reason for it: The Republican administration in Washington today is made up of old men.

As a matter of fact, some of us have been thinking of rechristening the Cabinet the "Ten Old Men."

Now when I say "old" I don't necessarily mean old in years. I mean old in spirit. All of us know men who are old at 30—and we also know lots of men who are still young at 75.

A great former President we all love has more youth in him at 75 than this whole administration put together—yes, I mean our own special young Democrat, Harry S. Truman.

When I say that America and this Republican administration are showing signs of middle age, this is what I have in mind:

It's a sign of middle age when the obstacles loom larger than the challenge of overcoming them.

It's a sign of middle age when you can think only of reasons for not doing things, instead of discovering ways to do them.

But that, unhappily, is the spirit of '59 in Washington today. And when that is the spirit in Washington—in the White House, if you will—it spreads through the country like an epidemic.

I find it sad to think of America, the richest Nation in the world, making excuses to the world and to her own people that she can't afford to help other nations build their economies and can't afford to build proper schools for her children or proper houses for her slum dwellers.

Incidentally, you may have heard a lot of talk about the anti-intellectual atmosphere in Washington. But you shouldn't believe everything you hear. It's no longer considered subversive to have an idea in Washington—so long as it doesn't cost any money.

I am ashamed when I think of the millions of people throughout the world, barely staving off starvation, while America complains of the burden and cost of storing huge surpluses of wheat and corn and cotton.

I am embarrassed to think that America, the Nation that led the technological revolution, the Nation that produced the atomic bomb in a brief 5 years, has been surpassed not just once but many times by a nation that 40 years ago had no science, had no technology, and had virtually no industry.

What has happened to America? What has happened to our muscle? What has happened to our will to achieve, to create, to progress?

What has happened, I ask, to the America of the 1930's—an America beset with problems that make today's difficulties pale by comparison?

Today Washington worries about a balanced budget. Twenty-five years ago Washington worried about an entire national economy out of balance, about 10 to 13 million people without jobs, about dust bowls and breadlines.

That was a time that cried out for leadership—and the leadership was there in the person of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

That was a time that cried out for new ideas—answers to problems new and old. And the answers were found.

And why? Because there was a will to find them, a will to sweep aside obstacles and move on to get the job done.

Do you remember the CCC—the Civilian Conservation Corps? In the 1930's America needed the CCC and America got it, and thousands of young men went into our forests and parks and went to work conserving some of our greatest natural resources.

Well, America needs another CCC—and that's one of the things I have worked to get passed this year. But what does this Republican administration say to that? They say it costs too much. They say it will unbalance the budget.

Of course, this administration doesn't seem to mind giving billions to bankers by raising interest rates. That sort of spending it can afford. But it can't afford to spend a few million dollars to build human and natural resources through a Youth Conservation Corps.

The era of the 1930's, the era of the New Deal, was an era of youthfulness for America. We were challenged, and we rose to meet the challenge.

Today again we are challenged, but the youthfulness of our response is gone. This Republican administration is so beset by worries about bankrupting the country that it cannot even make the prudent investments that will add to the Nation's wealth. It is so beset by its concern over subversion

at home—a leftover from the McCarthy days—that it throws a cloak of conformity over America and discourages new ideas.

The Republican Party has always been known as a party of old fogies.

But this, we are told, is the era of modern Republicanism. The Madison Avenue boys would like us to believe that the old guard is on the wane and that the young Turks are in the saddle.

Of course, all they're really saying is that the old fogies have been replaced by young fogies.

And there are some Republicans who are sounding these days more like Democrats than anything else. But let's not be taken in. It is still the party of the fogies, and if the GOP bosses pick someone who looks liberal, because they know it will take a liberal to win, they're not fooling anyone. You'll still have an administration of Republican fogies—the Republican Party will see to that.

My friends, we are not going to send rockets to the moon as long as we are led by a bunch of fogies—old or young.

And we're not going to close the science gap or the space gap or the missile gap with the Russians as long as we're led by fogies—young or old.

I have met with Mr. Khrushchev face to face, and I can tell you that whatever else he may be, he is young in spirit. No challenge is too great for him—whether it be the challenge of the free world or the challenge of his colleagues in the Kremlin for supremacy in the Soviet Union.

I shudder at the ruthlessness of the methods he uses to meet those challenges, and I do not propose for a moment that we imitate them.

I merely ask that we recognize that we are up against an adversary who is bound and determined to meet challenges and surmount obstacles and solve problems.

We can't meet Khrushchev's youthful spirit with America's middle age.

America had better begin thinking less about how we can't do this and can't afford that, and begin thinking more about how we can use our full powers and energy using the methods of free people, in the cause of freedom.

So I think America's hope lies in its young people. And I think the Democratic Party's hope lies in its young people, too—in every one of you young Democrats at this convention.

You know, a party can suffer from middle age, just as a nation can. And I sometimes wonder if our party hasn't lost some of the scrap and youthfulness that once characterized it.

Now I am not one to pick a fight solely for partisan advantage. No one gains from such a fight. The country suffers; our party suffers.

But I deeply believe that the Democratic Party has not only a right but a duty to draw issues. Our party is one of youth and controversy. Out of both we draw the vigor and the issues to go to the people and win elections.

Our job in the Democratic Party is to fight bad public policy wherever we see it, no matter how popular the man behind the policy; to fight for good public policy—for the people if you will—whenever we have a chance to do so; and to write a record, a Democratic record, that every voter in the country can recognize that has the stamp "Made by the Democratic Party" clearly written on it, for all to see.

For only on the basis of such a clear-cut record can we give the voters a clear-cut choice next year—a chance to express themselves so clearly that neither the next President of the United States, nor the 1961 Congress of the United States, can mistake the mandate.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment Visited Altoona, Pa., October 26, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of gathering firsthand information on the unemployment situation in the central Pennsylvania area a Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment, composed of Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania, as chairman, and Senator HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, as a member, visited Altoona October 26, 1959, taking testimony from over a score of witnesses at both a morning and afternoon session held in Altoona's city hall. Those testifying represented a cross section of business, labor, and industry.

It was my privilege to not only make the following statement to the committee on the unemployment conditions in the three counties of my congressional district but I was accorded the privilege of sitting with the committee in listening to the testimony of other witnesses, many of whom shared my concern over the unemployment situation in my congressional district.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years it has been my privilege to appear before numerous congressional committees in support of area redevelopment legislation.

As a matter of fact, I am among a group of Representatives in Congress who are recognized as pioneers in this particular field.

My congressional district comprises the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, and has been plagued with chronic unemployment for years due to depressed conditions in the coal and railroad industries. At times as much as 18 percent of our total labor force has been unemployed.

Therefore, the residents of the 20th Congressional District know the meaning of ghost towns and the misery that follows in the wake of unemployment as we watch good American families being forced to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Speaking of surplus commodities as of October 1 in my three-county area there are 36,758 persons eligible for surplus food or 12.6 percent of the overall population.

In fact, in Clearfield County nearly 20.1 percent of the population are recipients of surplus commodities and dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time in the two labor forces in my congressional district, here is the picture.

As of October 1, 1959, in the Altoona area, out of a labor force of 53,700 there were 4,600 unemployed, or an average of 8.6 percent of the labor force; while in the Du Bois-Clearfield area, out of a labor force of 35,400 there were 5,300 unemployed, or an average of 15 percent of the labor force.

Therefore, the unemployment situation in my congressional district is simply this. Out of a labor force of nearly 90,000, there are 10,000 unemployed, or 9 percent of the labor force.

As I have said before, unemployment in my congressional district has been as high as 18 percent of the labor force. One point I want to emphasize is that unemployment conditions are not temporary or seasonal nor can we see any improvement in the coal and railroad industries.

As a matter of fact, employment in these industries is still on the downward trend and nobody dares to predict when employment will level off.

For an illustration my hometown of Altoona is principally a railroad town because it is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Early in 1951 these shops employed 14,361; while August 1958 employment dropped to 2,500.

According to information at hand employment is expected to level off at 7,000 as it was on October 1, 1959. This means that in the city of Altoona alone, there has been a loss of over 7,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this situation in Altoona is duplicated in the city of Du Bois where hundreds have been furloughed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Instead of having around 1,200 employees, as of October 1, 161 were employed with the expectation that employment in Du Bois will level off at 600, which means that 50 percent of the B. & O. labor force will be jobless.

I have been pinpointing unemployment in the railroad industry in an effort to show the permanent loss of jobs. Similar facts reveal that the same condition exists in the coal, brick, and related industries in my congressional district.

One often hears the question: "Why is it that these areas of chronic unemployment cannot help themselves?"

The answer is that while some 1,800 communities throughout the country have active area redevelopment corporations, I can only speak for my own congressional district where such groups have been active for years and have enjoyed a measure of success.

For example, since 1946 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa., as a result of an active industrial redevelopment group that raised nearly a million dollars mostly through voluntary payroll deductions, 11 new industries have been brought into the Altoona area solely through community, State, and Federal effort.

These new industries have provided 3,600 new jobs and a $12 million increased annual payroll.

Seventy percent of the new jobs are for men.

This highly successful effort stems from what is commonly known nationally as the Altoona plan.

Mr. Chairman, in attaining this remarkable record the Altoona group like other groups in my congressional district has borrowed at the banks to the legal limit.

In addition, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, as well as the Small Business Administration, have assisted to their legal limit.

Therefore, in my congressional district these area redevelopment groups are in need of further financial assistance such as is provided for in the area redevelopment legislation now before Congress.

I think I can speak for all area redevelopment groups in my congressional district when I say that they do not want any Federal handout.

What they need primarily is additional borrowing power which coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in the pending bills will enable them to assist in wiping out these pockets of unemployment and their human wastage.

In achieving this objective, we will not only rehabilitate our economy through diversification of industry, but we will, in effect, be barring a repetition of this chronic unemployment that we have been faced with for years.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat a question constantly asked by many of my constituents—"Why is it that Congress sends billions of dollars to so-called underprivileged nations yet ignores the plight of good American citizens who through no fault of their own are unemployed?"

The answer to this question is that Congress too long has ignored "the pockets of unemployment" that have brought suffering and despair despite national prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for those who quibble and employ delaying tactics over the cost of area redevelopment legislation. Since we have billions to pour into foreign aid, we certainly have a moral obligation to care for the needs of America's unemployed.

The fact that area redevelopment legislation is fully justified makes it pertinent to ask, "Why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the pending Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill of the 85th Congress?"

Frankly, it will not be difficult for me to support the Douglas-Flood bill, but I must confess the possibility of another veto is a cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration, nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed-area legislation. In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overriden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore, looking the facts right in the face, when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Chairman, to improve the chances of enacting depressed-area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

(1) Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

(2) Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

(3) Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

(4) Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is $389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is $53 million.

By ways of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

In connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment at times as high as 18 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the 159 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

Extension of Rural Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have today had the pleasure of introducing a bill to extend the Library Services Act of 1956 for a period of 5 years, and to make certain technical amendments which will not change the effect of the act, but which will, rather, simply take cognizance of the admission of the States of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and to leave in abeyance until the Congress has before it the results of the 1960 decennial census, certain policy decisions in regard to the communities covered by the act, as extended.

Let me briefly explain the purpose of my bill. The Library Services Act, as passed by this Congress in 1956, provided for a program of grants-in-aid to the States to stimulate and assist in the provision of Library services to the residents of rural communities. Under the original act, $7,500,000 per year was authorized to be appropriated, to be divided among the States wishing to participate on the basis of a formula recognizing the State's share of the rural population of the Nation as the major factor. The original act further provided that no community with a population of more than 10,000 would be eligible for assistance under the act.

Generally speaking, the first 4 years of this act's history have justified the high hopes those of us who originally sponsored it had for its effect upon the spread of library services to rural communities.

Forty-nine of the fifty States are now participating in this act, and these States have all increased their rural library services programs, not only to the degree made possible by the allocation of Federal funds, but out of their own resources, with the Federal funds serving largely as stimuli, and as a symbol of the national interest in this matter.

State activities in aiding public libraries have increased by 54 percent in

the 4 years of the life of this act. Thirty million Americans living in rural communities now have library services available to them which were either not available at all, or not to the present degree, as a result of the working of the act. Sixty-five counties and an equal number of New England towns, which formerly had no library service, are now receiving such service. Two hundred new bookmobiles are in service under the Library Services Act. Two hundred and eighty separate projects were included in the State plans for 1959. Over 5 million books and other informational materials have been added to the library resources of rural communities.

This much has been done, Mr. Speaker, under the Library Services Act in its first 4 years of operation. But, it should be pointed out, this is only an indication of what could have been done, if the act had been allowed to operate at its fullest. The Congress has not been reluctant to appropriate funds for this program, but the Budget Bureau has seen fit, here, as in so many other areas, to pursue its standard policy of penny wisdom and dollar folly. In the 4 years of the act's history, a total of $30 million could have been appropriated, under the authorizing legislation. But in no one of those years was the full amount requested or appropriated. In fiscal 1957, $2,050,000 was appropriated; in fiscal 1958, $5 million; and in the last 2 fiscal years, $6 million each. As a result of action taken by the Congress, allocations to States were made on the basis of the full authorization in the last fiscal year, but the growing needs of our rural libraries might well have come much closer to fulfillment, had the full amount been available through the appropriation process each year. It is too soon to tell what funds will be available in the fiscal 1961 budget, which will be the last appropriation under the initial authorization. But so far, only 63 percent of the total funds authorized have actually been appropriated, and even if the full amount is requested and appropriated next year, nearly $11 million of authorized funds will have been denied this important and profitable program.

The amendments contained in the body of my bill, Mr. Speaker, are simple, and do not change the policy of the original act. The first subsection simply extend the life of the act for an additional 5 years. Subsections (b) and (c) make technical amendments reflecting the fact that Hawaii and Alaska have been admitted to the Union and are already subsumed under the term "State." The final subsection, in effect, freezes the present coverage of the act. Under the present act, no assistance can be extended to a community with a population of more than 10,000. The Department, in issuing its regulations has taken the 1950 decennial census as its guide. The extension bill retains the 1950 census as the guide for eligibility. In this way, the communities now being served will continue to be eligible; none will suddenly be excluded from the act by population growth reflected in the 1960 census.

Mr. Speaker, the Rural Library Services Act is not the most extensive or the most costly of the Federal grant-in-aid programs. But this program is surely one of the most rewarding, one of the most encouraging, and one of the most productive of the educational grant programs. The experience we have had in the first 4 years surely augurs well for what can be accomplished in the next half decade, as library doors swing open for more and more of our people.

Fate of Young Hungarian Freedom Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following exchange of correspondence with the White House regarding the fate of the young Hungarian freedom fighters facing execution by the Communist regime:

DECEMBER 9, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D.C.:

I have been asked by certain Hungarian friends and constituents of mine to request your personal intervention with respect to the youthful Hungarian freedom fighters who are allegedly facing execution by the Communist regime of that country. I am aware that this subject is presently being debated by the General Assembly of the United Nations but feel that a personal statement expressing your horror at such a report might be helpful in marshaling world public opinion against this barbaric undertaking.

Respectfully yours,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON,
December 14, 1959.

Hon ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress,
Owosso, Mich.

DEAR AL: For the President this will acknowledge and thank you for your December 9 telegram respecting your plea in behalf of the 350 Hungarian freedom fighters.

While the State Department has no information at this time concerning this matter, you can be sure that we will continue to follow the situation in Hungary with close attention. In this connection you may wish to have the enclosed statements by Ambassador Lodge on the question of Hungary.

Kindest regards and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely yours,
JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON NOVEMBER 25, 1959, ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY

Mr. President, the United States supports the recommendation by the General Committee that an item entitled "The Question of Hungary" be included on our agenda.

Last year in Resolution 1312 the General Assembly declared that the United Nations will continue to be seized of the situation in Hungary, in view of the fact that the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the present authorities in Hungary are disregarding earlier resolutions of the General Assembly. By the same resolution, the General Assembly appointed Sir Leslie Munro to represent it for the purpose of reporting on developments relating to the implementation of the Assembly resolutions on Hungary.

Sir Leslie Munro has now requested the General Assembly to consider the Hungarian situation. He reports that there has been no improvement of conditions in Hungary and calls attention to the refusal of the Hungarian authorities to cooperate with the United Nations in any way in this matter. In these circumstances, the United States also requested inscription of this item. I may say in our opinion the request of the Representative of the U.N. on Hungary would have been enough.

Nothing we know today leads us to believe that the States concerned have ceased their defiance of resolutions which were adopted by overwhelming majorities at previous sessions. As recently noted by the United Nations Representative on Hungary, foreign armed forces remain in Hungary and the framework of repression remains unchanged. In the shadow of continued trials and executions of Hungarians whose only crime was their barehanded fight for independence against Soviet tanks in 1956, and in the shadow of the continuing reports of impending executions, it is clear that the end of the reign of terror is not yet in sight. It seems clear to the U.S. delegation, therefore, that we must inscribe this item and that we must consider the Report of the United Nations Representative on Hungary.

As I explained in my statement in the General Committee on November 23, we regret the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity for inscribing this item. Recent events encouraged us to hope that there might be real relaxation of international tensions and improved international cooperation, which are, of course, the goals for which this very international organization was established. We still hold to that hope, Mr. President, but we must set down that to attempt to sweep crimes like these under the rug will not cause these hopes to be fulfilled and will not promote peace. We accordingly urge members to join in supporting the inscription of this vital question.

STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, IN THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY, NOVEMBER 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn this meeting there are certain fallacies which have been expressed here which I should like briefly to rectify. I took some notes during Mr. Kuznetsov's speech, and I noted some of these phrases: "Dirty work," "sordid assignment," "mouthpiece for slander," "puppet," "slanderous assertions and concoctions" in my letter.

Now, I am not fortunate enough to be familiar with the Russian language, and maybe these are ordinary, routine phrases in Russian. But I have some familiarity with English and with French, and I can say that in those two languages these are extremely violent words. If Mr. Kuznetsov is really interested in lessening the cold war, he could very easily prove that fact by using parliamentary language in a parliamentary assembly. I say that to him in as bland a tone as I can use.

Then he also referred in his speech to the conversations between Chairman Khrushchev and President Eisenhower which were held at Camp David and which in a press

release the other day the Soviet delegation characterized as the spirit of Camp David.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we prize—we in the United States—prize what was achieved at Camp David, and none are more opposed than we to doing anything which would destroy it.

One way to live up to that spirit is to conform with United Nations resolutions.

I feel that perhaps I have some right to talk about Camp David for the simple reason that I was there. In fact I was present at all the meetings which took place. These meetings were adequately summed up in the communique which is well known and I can assert that there is nothing in that communique or in what happened at Camp David to justify the declaration that the very modest action on Hungry which we are discussing today is against the spirit of Camp David.

What is against the spirit of Camp David Mr. Chairman, is the subversion of small countries.

What is against the spirit of Camp David are acts which turn a brave little country into a moaning colonialist slum.

What is against the spirit of Camp David is any behavior which makes a veritable mockery of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Chairman, nothing happened at Camp David which requires us to condone evil.

Nothing happened at Camp David which requires us to pass by in silence on the other side of the street when a brutality is being committed.

Nothing happened at Camp David to prevent us from acting like human beings made in the image of God when cruelty is being practiced.

The spirit of Camp David was not intended to be a soporific to peoples in the democracies to put them to sleep in the belief that this dangerous world—which we all hope may some day be safe—has actually been made safe.

No one looks more eagerly than I do for the day when the United States and the Soviet Union can work regularly together for the peace of the world. This is an end devoutly to be wished and I shall always work for it.

But we work against such a day when we distort the spirit of Camp David into something which was never meant at all and which no one present thought that it meant.

I realize that there may be colleagues of mine here in this room who think that in speaking as I am now doing I am striking a false note. But I do not agree.

We can only build a peaceful world on truth—and the spirit of Camp David never told us to close our eyes to the truth.

We can only build a peaceful world on deeds—deeds of justice—and the spirit of Camp David never told us not to do such deeds.

Instead of criticizing this proposal, why don't you do something to show that you really believe in the true spirit of Camp David? Why don't you take down the barbed wire and the observation towers which now divide the poor Hungarians from Austria and the free world and which have turned Hungary into a vast human cage? Why don't you chain up the savage dogs which roam along the border to catch the miserable human beings who are seeking freedom?

It is by deeds such as these that we can best live up to the spirit of Camp David.

Let me say in conclusion that the Camp David communique states "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation." If, therefore, we are really to live up to the spirit of Camp David, Sir Leslie Munro ought to be admitted into Hungary, the United Nations resolutions adopted by overwhelming votes should be carried out in Hungary, and the Soviet Union, instead of working against the United Nations, should work with the United Nations. That would be really carrying out the spirit of Camp David.

The United States supports the request of the United Nations Representative on Hungary that an item of an important and urgent character entitled "The Question of Hungary" be inscribed in the agenda of the 14th General Assembly. The United States as a member of the General Committee has itself also requested the inscription of the item.

This request, Mr. President, was necessitated by the resolution on Hungary adopted by the 13th General Assembly and the continued defiance by the present Hungarian regime and the Soviet Union of the General Assembly resolutions on Hungary.

Resolution 1312 declared "that the United Nations will continue to be seized of the situation in Hungary in view of the fact that the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the present authorities in Hungary are disregarding the above-mentioned resolutions of the General Assembly." By the same resolution the General Assembly decided "to appoint Sir Leslie Munro to represent the United Nations for the purpose of reporting to member states or to the General Assembly on significant developments relating to the implementation of the Assembly's resolutions on Hungary."

On July 9, 1959, the United Nations Representative on Hungary in a public statement revealed that his patient and quiet efforts to gain admission to Hungary in order to obtain firsthand information concerning the implementation of the Assembly's resolutions had been rebuffed by Soviet and Hungarian authorities. Sir Leslie Munro announced his intention of submitting a full report on his activities to the 14th General Assembly.

In the explanatory memorandum attached to his request for inscription, the United Nations Representative on Hungary has stated that foreign armed forces remain in Hungary and that the framework of repression remains unchanged. In spite of public assurances of the representative of the present Hungarian regime that reprisals against Hungarian patriots who fought in the 1956 uprising have ceased, the explanatory memorandum records the harsh fact that trials and executions of Hungarian freedom fighters have taken place since the last General Assembly. Apparently, the end of the reign of terror is not yet in sight, for there are disturbing rumors that more executions are pending.

The United States supports the initiative of the United Nations Representative on Hungary. We deplore the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity for this important and urgent request. All members should hear what Sir Leslie Munro has to report and consider appropriate further steps to achieve the objectives of the United Nations.

Transportation Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana, as well as many other Western States, depend to a very great extent on the airlines, the railroads, and the bus companies to provide fast and dependable transportation between our cities which are separated by great distances. For more than 15 years our citizens have been taxed every time they used these vitally necessary common carrier facilities. At present this transportation tax is 10 percent but by virtue of the passage of Public Law 86–75 in the last session of Congress, beginning July 1, 1960, this tax will be reduced to 5 percent.

I was very pleased with this progress but I sincerely feel that during this session we must abolish the remaining 5 percent. What was the original purpose of this tax? Certainly the raising of wartime revenue was one consideration, but the primary purpose was to discourage nonessential travel during the emergency thereby freeing our facilities for military and defense use.

I feel that it is self-evident that this purpose no longer exists. On the contrary, one of the paramount objectives of our national transportation policy is to foster and encourage travel to strengthen our transportation companies.

Only by increased passenger patronage can the airlines carry out the massive jet conversion that is presently under way and for which over $2¼ billion of capital investment is committed. The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board has urged the repeal of this tax on the ground that it deters travel and depresses airline revenue.

Similarly, the Interstate Commerce Commission has urged repeal because "the tax on passenger travel tends to discourage the public from using common carriers, it thereby aggravates the ever-mounting passenger deficit."—ICC Docket No. 31954, page 70. We all know the plight of the railroad passenger operation and we all know that the only real answer is more passenger revenue.

The bus situation is no different. The number of inter-city busline companies declined from 2,858 in 1950 to 1,700 in 1957; revenue passengers declined from 815 million to 516 million; and busline employees declined from 66,570 to 52,900 during the same period.—Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, page 571.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that continuation of a 5 percent excise tax designed to discourage travel is against the national interest and extremely unwise. As the ICC stated in the Railroad Passenger Train Deficit Case:

> In strongly urging that the Congress take action to repeal the tax outright, we are not unaware of the efforts which various members of the Congress have made and are presently making in this regard. We are also not unmindful of the revenue needs of the Government. We are, however, convinced that any possible loss of revenue would be more than offset by the public interest in strengthening and preserving a transportation system capable of meeting adequately the country's need for service both in peacetime and during emergencies

in conformity with the national transportation policy as declared by the Congress. (p. 70).

I realize that any proposed legislation which would eliminate a source of Federal revenue should be subjected to close scrutiny. However, I am convinced that repeal of the remaining 5 percent tax will not result in any substantial net loss of revenue.

It is widely recognized that the some $110 million gross that the fact that a high proportion of common carriage travel is business in nature and the amount of transportation tax paid is taken as a corporate income tax deduction.

In addition, an offset would result if the tax were removed by virtue of increased taxable income resulting from increased travel once the deterrent tax is removed.

In the airline industry the Federal government pays some $60 million in subsidy per year to make up operating losses of local service and helicopter companies. Yet this tax discourages passengers from traveling on these carriers.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it appears that on the merits no one can justify this tax and everyone agrees it is harmful and outdated. The only question is whether we should sacrifice a revenue source. But even on this score it appears clear that the net yield is not substantial and would probably be more than offset by increased corporate income taxes and by subsidy savings.

The Full Potential of Educational Television Must Be Realized Without Prejudiced Obstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment months of Congress several members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted an extensive field study on educational television and its present and future place in our American system of education. This study was done in western, middle-western and southern States and covered all phases of educational work now being done through the facilities of television on both an in-school and home study basis.

One of the principal benefits cited in favor of educational television and its expanded use is the opportunity offered to equalize educational opportunities between areas with scattered populations, limited financial resources and inadequate or smaller schools with the better resources of other larger and better equipped schools. A second major argument for the expansion of educational television is one which must be given conscientious and unbiased evaluation, namely its wider use of superior teaching skills in the sciences and foreign languages. Subjects such as Spanish, Russian, German, chemistry, biology, physics, an mathematics may now be included in school curriculums through the use of educational television by expert teachers who become a part of the daily schooling in several classrooms at the same time. The number of students who seek instruction in highly technical subjects, like advanced mathematics, physics and chemistry, is constantly increasing, thus opening the door to a greater use of superior teaching skills through the medium which can be made available in practically every village and hamlet across the country.

As in any other field where established and conventional methods are employed, a wider and more effectual use of educational television is likely to encounter initial opposition in some quarters because of the normal tendency to resist changes from that which is customary. Progressive educators in some areas have moved forward with enthusiasm in this field. One very interesting presentation which I heard personally during the field study came from Mr. Joseph Hall, superintendent of the Dade County Public Schools, who pointed to an actual savings of $3 million in capital outlay in classrooms. Most interesting in his testimony was the following statement:

> By using the large groups (300–400 students) involved in the television program and the extended school day, we are able to accommodate 30 percent more pupils in a building than we can otherwise handle. It works in this manner: Approximately one-third of the pupils report to school at 7:30 a.m., another one-third at 8:30, and another one-third at 9:30 a.m. They leave school at 2:15, 3:15, and 4:15 p.m. This means that for four periods during the middle of the day, the entire group of students is present in the building. In this period, by utilizing our school auditoriums for the large groups, we are able to accommodate a much greater number of pupils within the same facility. With the program we now have involving only a limited number of our schools, we feel that we have saved at least $3 million in capital construction. To provide for the number of pupils in the established pattern for education that we now have in our buildings would require an immediate capital outlay program of at least $3 million. We believe as we involve other schools that the amount of capital savings will be increased far beyond this point.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of hearings in which I participated, I had an opportunity to go into several classrooms during the televising of a variety of in-school programs. In a biology class, for example, we watched youngsters intently observing the disecting of small animal life which had been magnified to a greater degree than would ever be possible under a normal microscope. We saw fourth- and fifth-grade youngsters who had learned Spanish through daily in-school television instruction carry on classroom conversations fluently in that language. We spoke to both grade school and high school youngsters in schools to get their reaction to the value of learning through this medium. We saw the specialized teaching personnel of the stations which work in the ETV studios. We studied with them their financial problems and the potentiality of expansion.

The work of the committee and the statements of a parade of witnesses was far too vast and detailed to permit a complete presentation at this time. It will, of course, be available to every Member of Congress when the subcommittee report is issued in the near future.

However, there is one conclusion that must be recognized. In-school educational television has a tremendous potential. It is now and can become an effective tool for better education, particularly in specialized fields. Every obstacle of prejudice must be removed so that its full potential, its advantages and its disadvantages, can be fully realized.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, Before the AFL-CIO Legislative Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives has been blessed by having many good and great Members.

The mark of a great public servant is the ability to be able not alone to think and act in the public interest but even more so to be able to so express himself that little doubt is left as to his position on any public subject or under any given circumstance.

Recently I was privileged to be in attendance at a meeting where the great bulk of American labor was represented.

Many speakers graced the speakers' list and all of them were capable, able, and articulate. However, it remained for a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to make the greatest contribution in oratory, in facts, in logic, and finally in sound common sense.

I speak of our esteemed, able, and forthright majority floor leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

His speech is so full of the kind of advice and information so badly needed in today's confused atmosphere of politics, labor, and the people's problems that, under the unanimous consent of the House, I include it in the RECORD in order that all the Members can have the same privilege granted to all of us who heard Mr. MCCORMACK deliver it at the conference held at the Willard Hotel, this city, January 11, 1960:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN MCCORMACK, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE AFL–CIO LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 11, 1960

President Meany, my fellow Americans and outstanding leaders of labor from the various

sections of the country, ladies and gentlemen and friends. I have a great admiration for Congressman FORD and he and I are personal friends, so that any remarks that I make, of course, have no direct application to him, particularly on the level of friendships. I just want to make a few observations before making some brief remarks about his speech of admonitions to labor and his very fine general platitudes about rededicating ourselves—everyone here is a dedicated American—and also about the Modern Republican philosophy of government. If any exists, I fail to see it.

I do not feel strange in this gathering because I come from a working district and a working family. I think the philosophy of government and practical operations that you entertain and I entertain are the same. I think an examination of my voting record would show that fact. My voting record is the result of my own thoughts and considerations about our Government in practical operation. For years, I stood shoulder to shoulder with the late Franklin D. Roosevelt agreeing with him and his philosophy of government and also a great former President Harry S. Truman.

Broadly speaking my philosophy of government is to strengthen the family life of America. I think that's the dedicated duty of a legislator and I did that as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature and in my 31 years as a Member of Congress. The very strength of any government or any society is based upon these little units called the family life. Your family, my family, the other person's family, and the strength or weakness of a government is dependent upon the strength or weakness of family life, those little units that collectively make up the very broad foundations of any government and in our case of American government and American society.

I can go back to when I first came here, when 5 cents an hour was paid to human beings in wages in certain sections of the country. I can go back to the dramatic fight of minimum wage, when we tried to get a minimum of 25 cents through and it was riddled to pieces on the floor of the House under the leadership of Mary Norton, great legislator, great girl, recently passed away. It was riddled so badly, we voted to send it back to committee, rather than pass it. Then a couply of months later we got another bill out and finally got it through, struggling to get something on the statute books that represented progress. I can remember social security; I was one of those who drafted it. I remember all those fights. In many of these fights—damaging amendments, that's where the damage is done. The thing to watch in Congress are the amendments that are offered. And the motion to recommit with an amendment which, if adopted, would destroy, practically destroy the bill and let only a title go through.

My philosophy of government in practical operation is that government functions for the weak. The strong don't need it. That doesn't mean we destroy the strong, but we lift up the weak. And the weak is a broad class. It isn't only those out of a job. It might be the small and independent businessman, if he is discriminated against by too many contracts being given by the Defense Department, for example, to a certain large group of companies. It might be the failure to pass an adequate small business administration act.

The philosophy of the government of Roosevelt and Truman was to look forward, to recognize that government is not a status quo institution, because when government becomes status quo it begins to decay and disintegrate. With all regard to my dear friend, the record of the Democratic Party shows that we're the party of the people. I can't say that for every member of the Democratic Party—I wish I could—but I can say it for the great majority of the Democratic Party. We are the party of the people and the party of progress.

The record of the years that have gone by clearly show that fact. Minimum wages, starting at 25 cents, now a dollar; and when President Eisenhower recommended the last increase to 90 cents, we made it a dollar. I am confident we can get another increase through this session, if there's teamwork all around.

My dear friend talks about the national economic growth. I agree with him. I remember, not too many years ago, when Harry Truman said the goal is a $500 billion national economy and my Republican friends laughed and stomped him. It is now up to $485 billion. And if we didn't have the tight-money policy carried on to the extent that it is, the high-interest policy, the tight-money policy, our national economy today would be $550 billion, in my opinion.

My dear friend didn't talk about business. I don't know many businessmen who vote Democratic. They have a right to vote Republican, but when my friend admonished, particularly labor in Michigan, for supporting the Democratic Party, I didn't hear my dear friend make any references to the big businessmen throughout the country who vote Republican. They have a right to do so as individuals. Nevertheless, whatever is goose for the gander is also goose for someone else.

I think you are more interested in knowing—coming down to 1960—about this session of Congress. Knowing some of the things that might happen, some of the things I'd like to see happen and without proper assistance might not happen. Now the Republican Party has its responsibility. The Republican Party owes an obligation to the people to act constructively, to constructively oppose, constructively propose, and constructively criticize. That's the role of a minority party under the constitutional role of the Government, not to be a blind party of opposition. Each individual Republican is elected by the people of the district they represent, Republicans, Democrats, and independents in the Congress, and they have their individual responsibility to vote and not hide behind the cloak that this is a Democratic Congress. Whenever they pass over their responsibility, they are simply adopting the roles of a party of blind opposition, not the role properly that should be adopted by a minority party, not under parliamentary government, not under constitutional government such as we enjoy.

The most important question confronting us is the survival of America. What good is a constitution, what good is anything, if we have Communists in control of our country? We have got to have an America not only for ourselves but for the generations to come, the youngsters who are walking the streets now. Their fate is involved in what is being decided today. Not only you and I of today, but the generations to come, that of young Americans, their fates and their lives. The kind of life they are going to lead—your children, your children's children—is being decided today and history is being made while you and I are sitting here. The first thing we've got to do is to preserve America; to be sure we maintain this government of laws of ours and it doesn't turn into a government of men. That depends upon human leadership, wisdom, sagacity, ability, foresight, vision, courage.

So far as I am concerned, if I'm going to err in judgment, in the world of today, I'd rather err on the side of strength and on the side of wisdom. And I'd have felt happy if the President, in his message of a few days ago, had recommended more taxes for greater national defense. I think that would have appealed to the American people to make sacrifices and certainly it would have been the wisest thing to do, because America is second best in the world today. We are certainly second best, particularly in the field of outer space.

One of the things we can bring up this session—one of the things we should bring up is civil rights. The Democratic leadership is determined to bring up a bill this year. The President recommended it strongly in his message. In all our hopes and plans for a better world, we all recognize that provincial and racial prejudice must be combated as it goes along. He says "I hope there will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session—civil rights legislation."

While I am talking on civil rights legislation, let me make this observation which cannot be contradicted. The first civil rights bill that ever passed Congress since the Civil War, close to 90 years, was passed by the 85th Congress, a Democratically controlled Congress. We had a split in our party. You know it; I know it. But it put it through just the same with the Democratically controlled Congress. Yet only 4 years before in the 83d Congress, controlled by the Republican Party, both in the House and the Senate with President Eisenhower in the White House, complete control of our Government, not divided control, complete control, the Republican Party did not even report a civil rights bill out of committee in the House and the Senate.

So we have the fact that the 86th Democratically controlled Congress put the first bill through, even with a division. The Republican Party, 4 years before, with their promises contrasting with their performances, failed even to report a bill out of committee.

Civil rights is now out of the House Committee on the Judiciary before the Rules Committee. You and I know the practical situation. There are eight Democrats and four Republicans, four Democrats from the North and four Democrats from the South; there are Republicans from the North. The Republican Party is a sectional party. If we get three Republican votes in the Rules Committee and they ought to give them to us, we can get that rule or resolution out of the Rules Committee. And if that resolution comes out of the Rules Committee, Speaker RAYBURN and I will bring it up immediately thereafter for consideration by the House of Representatives. The Republican Party has their responsibility, we have ours. If they don't give us those three votes, we will have to resort to a discharge petition.

Only this morning JOHN BYRNE, who is the chairman of the Republican policy committee, said he was confident there would be civil rights legislation this session, but he held there was no reason to rush special tactics. The old delay. What they want is to try to have the Senate act on the bill. I know what they want. They know if the Senate acts first on the bill, the Democratic leadership has more difficulty in bringing that bill out under Senate rules than if the House passes the bill. If the House passes the bill first, the Democrats, under the rules of the Senate, have much more freedom in calling it up for consideration of the Senate than if they are forced to take the Senate bill.

Another important bill we expect to get up this year is an increase in the minimum wage and an extension of its coverage. We'll

get it out of committee, but again when it goes to the Rules Committee, we need seven votes. On that bill, the Democratic leadership does not ask the Republicans to give us three votes. All we ask is that they give us one Republican vote on the Rules Committee. On that we have six Democratic votes. We are sure of six Democratic votes. Another bill is the depressed area bill. That bill has passed the Senate. We brought it out of the House committee. It's now before the Rules Committee and all we ask our Republican friends who have a responsibility, is to give us one vote, just one vote in the Rules Committee. That's all we want.

Another housing bill is to be reported out. You remember the housing episode of the last session. The President vetoed the bill we put up to him. It wasn't as broad as I would like, but we didn't want to put something before him that would be vetoed. Then nothing would go through. So we tried to consider the thing practically. But the President vetoed the bill, so we put another bill up to him which he signed. It was identically the same as the first bill he vetoed with one exception. We deleted $50 million in loans for classroom facilities in colleges and universities of our country. We put that in there so that they could borrow money from the Government at reasonable rates of interest in connection with the scientific field in particular in connection with this great race in science that is going on now between our country and the Soviet Union.

We are going to have a housing bill and all we need is one vote from the Republican members of the Rules Committee. That housing bill will include urban rehabilitation and community facilities. We are going to bring up a school construction bill. We will try to improve the social security law. But we need one vote—one Republican vote—in the Rules Committee. We've got six Democratic votes. I can state that with confidence. All we ask JERRY, again, is one vote—one Republican vote on the Rules Committee.

Water pollution, important to many parts of our country, purifying the streams and rivers of our country, not only connected with business but with the health of our people, the bill has passed the House, passed the Senate, come back to the House to go to conference, objected to in the last session. We have to go the Rules Committee to get a rule out to take to the Speaker's desk to send to conference. We have six Democratic votes and all I ask of our Republican Party is to assume their responsibility to the people. Show their good faith by performance, not by promise, and give us one Republican vote on the Rules Committee.

We are going to increase the money for a revolving fund for small business administration. Well, I think we might get one or two votes, Republican votes, in the Rules Committee on that. Another bill is the unemployment compensation standardization bill. We are going to try to get it out of committee. We need your help. We would like to get 2 Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee out of 10.

Is that asking too much? Are there not two of them that feel that they represent the people? Are there not two of them that come from laboring districts? Or districts where the people are essentially workers? We need two votes—Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee. We could have gotten it out last session if we had gotten two Republican votes. Again when the bill comes out we are going to do everything we can, but we need your help. We need the teamwork we have a right to. We would like to get two Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee, and when it comes to the Rules Committee all we ask is that they give us one Republican vote. Is that asking too much? You, the people, that's the minimum they should give us.

There is going to be health legislation, extending the Hill-Burton Hospital Act. Additional hospitals are a crying need of our country. The Hill-Burton Act has done immeasurable good and should be broadened. Furthermore, we are going to try to increase the appropriations—and in this I say JERRY fought shoulder to shoulder for the increases—increase the appropriations for medical research in the field of medical research.

Last year, we increased the President's budget, I think about $75 million. We have as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations one whom I consider one of the greatest Americans I've ever met, one of the greatest legislators I've ever met, one of the finest gentlemen I've ever met, and thank God we have him there. I refer to JOHN FOGARTY of Rhode Island.

JOHN FOGARTY's name will go down in history as a man who has done more to contribute toward increased appropriations for further medical research, beneficial to the health of our people here and people abroad, unfortunate human beings who are sick, holding out to them the hope of the future. He has made a greater contribution than any Member of Congress that I have ever served with. JOHN FOGARTY'S name, in my opinion, will go down in the legislative history of our country as making one of the greatest contributions in this field than any legislator in the entire history of our country.

Now, I want to make another observation, on the broad scale. I'm alarmed, my friends, at the complacency and the apathy that exists among our people. It reminds me of the days before Pearl Harbor under Hitler. When you talked about Hitler then, they thought you were a warmonger. Now if you talk about communism, some people look at you blankly. I'm capable of interpreting the thoughts of people from my years of experience. Oh, they give me a polite hearing when I talk about communism. I'm not talking about labor, I'm talking about the people generally, they listen to me with attention but I cannot get across an idea to the great majority of those I'm addressing. They're living in a dream world of hope. That was the world we lived in before Pearl Harbor. When we tried to put a bill through to extend the selective service 3 months before Pearl Harbor, it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 203 to 202. Every Member who voted against that bill was just as good an American as John McCormack who voted for it, who led the fight for it.

I wouldn't want to see another day like that come in the history of my country where the margin was so close on a bill that it might involve the very preservation of our country. Complacency and apathy existed widespread, you know that as well as I do, in the days of Hitler before Pearl Harbor. We find in America today the same spirit. Complacency and apathy, dangerous because that's construed by the dictator as weakness and fear just as Hitler did. When they allowed him to get away with the Ruhr they said they hoped he would be satisfied. He wasn't. Then he moved into Sudetenland. Oh, he will be satisfied, we hoped so. He wasn't. Then he moved into Austria. They said they'd let him get away with it, they hoped he would be satisfied with it. He wasn't. Then he moved into Czechoslovakia. They let him get away with it. Then Munich, and after that, the raping and the invasion of Poland. I hope we don't take that journey again.

Throughout the country there is today that complacency and apathy, and it's growing. Right at our back door we find communism attacking us in the Caribbean. If you think there's nothing to that, you'd better awaken. The situation is very acute there. I was one who opposed Khrushchev addressing a joint meeting of Congress, and I think that's one of the finest things I did during my 31 years as a Member of the Congress. I'm not afraid of him.

I say negotiate them and negotiate them. I've told the Assistant Secretary of State to keep on negotiating with him, but I didn't think Khrushchev should be permitted to travel the country, using the United States as a sounding board for the circulation of Communist propaganda throughout the world. I said it before the fact. I'm not saying that now after the fact, I said that before the fact.

We have to realize that the only thing that the Communists respect is what they fear. The one thing they fear is military power greater than they possess themselves. There's the record. You know the record of the Republican Party. There are some progressive members in it and I take off my hat to them. But the progressive element of the Republican Party is liquidated for political purposes. They have no influence. As a matter of fact, I think one of the contributing factors in Rockefeller's announcement—I said so last January—I said then he wouldn't let his name go into the convention because I knew the Old Guard was in control of the Republican Party though the great rank and file of the Republicans throughout the country in spirit supported the Old Guard. Last January I expressed the opinion because Rockefeller was too progressive, and would not be accepted. I think that's one of the main reasons that he made the decision he did because in his trips throughout the country, he couldn't separate the professionals in the party, the Old Guard from the people—the rank and file of the Republicans. He realized he was running up against a stone wall. You have the record of both parties. I'm not appealing to you to be Democrats. It's a matter of which party serves the American people the best. With all of our weaknesses, the great majority of the Democratic Party are representing the people. The great majority of the Republican Party represent the vested interest in big business. I'm not saying all of them do, it wouldn't be fair, but the great majority does. I see it on the floor of the House. You see it. We have the record of the past.

We are not going to confine ourselves to the program I have just stated to you. We need help, we need one Republican vote in the Rules Committee on most of these measures with the exception of civil rights, where we need three. We need a couple of Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee on the unemployment compensation standardization bill. We need help from you, we need help from other interested Americans who are interested in progressive, visionary, forward-looking government. We also need help from the American people.

America is strong. If the day ever comes when the Soviet Union can hit us, and we lose our retaliatory power they'll not wait for us to catch up. We are already 3 to 5 years behind in outer space. We might be 5 to 7 years behind when they unfold what they plan in the Pacific.

We've got to preserve America—not as Democrats, not as Republicans, not as independents, but as Americans. We have much to do; we must work together and when we come on to the legislative level, the best interests of America calls for progressive government. The record of both parties shows that the Democratic Party is the party of progress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 1: 37: *For with God nothing shall be impossible.*

Most merciful and gracious God, grant unto us more of inner strength and peace that we may meet the challenges of our day with untroubled hearts.

We penitently confess that we have failed Thee so often even when Thou hast given us a clear vision and command as to what Thou art calling us to be and do.

Show us how we may dispel the confusion and chaos of these perilous times in which mankind is groping.

Gird and empower us by Thy holy spirit that we may help to direct the wills of men in the ways of truth and righteousness.

Reveal unto us the wonder and glory of that eternal kingdom which Thou art seeking to establish upon this earth through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

SENATE RESOLUTION 219

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard M. Simpson, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SENATE RESOLUTION 222

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, late a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SENATE RESOLUTION 223

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SENATE RESOLUTION 224

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

PANAMA CANAL: POTENTIAL VICTIM OF SUBVERSIVE FORCES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for many months the people of the United States have watched with growing concern the rising Red tide in the Caribbean immediately to the south of us, which is now converging toward the Panama Canal and aimed at wresting its control from the United States.

Tomorrow, under a previous order of the House, our distinguished colleague from my own State of Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] will address this body on the most timely and gravely important subject of the Panama Canal as the key target of what now amounts to a fourth front.

As you know, he has made extensive studies of isthmian problems, especially those of diplomatic and juridical character. I am sure that his address will be highly informative, definitely constructive, and delivered in his usual brilliant form.

The tragic attempts of Panamanian mobs on November 3 and 28, 1959, to invade the Canal Zone, incidents that bear the stamp of the Red pattern, have made the Panama Canal a topic of worldwide interest, and a potential victim of subversive forces. Thus, it is of the utmost importance that the Congress, which is the ultimate authority for the determination of policies relative to the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals, generally should be fully informed on all the weighty problems connected therewith.

CIVIL RIGHTS PETITION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President in his state of the Union message recommended that this House accept a civil rights bill.

The Speaker and the majority leader commendably have made statements to the effect that Members might well sign the discharge petition so that the House can work its will on this bill despite the intransigence of certain members of the Rules Committee.

I think Members on both sides of the aisle should come forward and be counted. The Nation is alert. The voters are watching. Failure to sign may be detrimental to some and fatal to others, if the bill cannot be considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge that Members sign this petition.

SAM HUFF: COAL ATHLETE OF THE YEAR

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Coal Policy Conference honored one of West Virginia's favorite sons, Robert Lee "Sam" Huff, by naming him "coal's athlete of the year." The award presentation was made by Mr. Joseph E. Moody, conference president, in a ceremony at the small coal-mining community of Farmington, W. Va., which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

I would like to call attention to this ceremony because it serves to dramatize one of the unique contributions made by the coal industry to the national scene, specifically, to the world of sports.

As sports fans everywhere know, Sam Huff is an outstanding defensive star for the New York Giants of the National Football League. As a college student, he was an all-American lineman at West Virginia University. By championship performance on the athletic field and by exemplary conduct in private life, this young West Virginian has become a source of pride to his State and to the coal community where he was born and raised.

But Sam Huff, whose father and brother are bituminous coal miners, is merely one of many championship competitors from the Nation's coal region's young men who have over the years excelled in athletics. It is said that our coal-producing areas produce, in addition to our No. 1 energy source, the finest athletes in the world. To support this statement, the National Coal Policy Conference has also drawn up a professional football team composed solely of players from coal regions.

This mythical "all-coal-all-pro" team includes 13 Pennsylvanians, 4 West Vir-

ginians, and 1 member each from Ohio and Illinois. In addition to Sam Huff, the team lists eight other champion performers from coal areas who will participate in the all-professional game at Los Angeles this weekend. They are Gino Marchetti, Smithers, W. Va.; Lou Groza, Martins Ferry, Ohio; Jesse Richardson, Scranton, Pa.; Stan Jones, Altoona, Pa.; Bill George, Waynesburg, Pa.; Walt Michaels, Swoyerville, Pa.; Jim Schrader, Carnegie, Pa.; and John Unitas, Pittsburgh, Pa.

And in addition to these athletes, the all-coal team includes 10 other outstanding players from coal areas, 2 of them, Bruce Bosley, from Green Bank, and Madison Nutter, from Huntington, coming out of my own State of West Virginia.

As a representative of a coal-mining area, I would like to venture an opinion as to why young men such as Sam Huff excel in their athletic endeavors. I believe that he, for one, has learned from the example of his coal-mining father the benefits of perseverance, a high degree of skill, devotion to duty, and pride in doing the best of all possible jobs. These are the essential characteristics of a champion athlete, and they are also the attributes of America's coal miners. To be sure, they are the very qualities which give life to the American system.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Sam Huff for this latest distinction and commend the National Coal Policy Conference for giving recognition to the fundamental human contribution which makes the American coal industry the greatest in the world.

DISCHARGE PETITION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. First I want to thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], for his kindly consideration in giving us time to sign the petition to bring to the floor the bill on civil rights. I do not know just what that is.

Will the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary explain whether that bill, if it is enacted, will protect my seniority rights on the Republican side to appointment on committees; or does it fail to go that far?

Mr. CELLER. In general it protects the rights of everybody. I do not know if it goes as far as that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The rights of Congressmen—minority Members?

Mr. CELLER. The political and economic rights of everybody; and if the gentleman will offer an amendment to protect rights of seniority, I would not offer any objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman accept that amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I would accept the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman any idea whether his acceptance would be helpful to me?

Mr. CELLER. I do not know about that. If the gentleman will sign the petition and vote for the bill, I certainly would be willing to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have done many things that I have regretted; maybe I will, but I cannot promise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question the gentleman raised concerning seniority within his own party, whatever his party agrees upon in that regard, we Democrats will protect his civil rights.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When they have kicked me around, the Speaker has protected me when he could. It is my understanding that as a rule he goes along with the recommendation of the leadership on my side.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman noticed what I said; whatever his party decides, we Democrats will protect his civil rights.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard the gentleman the first time. But cannot understand just why my civil rights should be denied by one or two ambitious Republicans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

THE LATE FRANK SMITH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I picked up the Chicago Sun-Times of Monday to learn of the passing of Frank Smith, a noted war correspondent, one of the finest journalists Chicago ever produced and one of the sweetest personalities I have ever known.

He was 56, and his death from a heart ailment was sudden. I had been with him and Alvin Rose, onetime city editor of the Sun-Times, now head of the Public Housing Administration in Chicago, at the Chicago Press Vet's banquet in November, and he seemed in the pink of health. His unexpected passing is a keen personal blow to me, a great loss to the fourth estate, to which he was such a credit, to the city of Chicago, and to our country. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his widow and his children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and that any Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Frank Smith, wartime correspondent and reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times, was a shock to his many friends and admirers. He was loved by all who knew him. His work among the veteran organizations endeared him to thousands of servicemen.

He was a quiet, gentle, and polite person who was always ready to befriend the unfortunate. He disliked to write ill of anyone. Yet his reputation for truth in his news articles was a trademark. As a war correspondent he parachuted with the troops and wrote vividly of the action on the scene. He was a fearless and courageous individual. No war hero deserved greater acclaim.

We will miss his timely advice and sincere interest in our affairs. The political fraternity has suffered a great loss and the veterans a true friend. He was a great patriot and an honest American. To his dear family we send our heartfelt sympathy and condolences. In times of sadness we seek the solace of prayers. May God rest his soul.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of Frank Smith, and to his widow and children I extend my sympathy in their great loss. During the war Frank Smith's dispatches from the battlefronts were widely read in my district, and throughout Chicago, especially because of the many references in them to the GI's in the ranks. He was a fine man and had a host of friends.

Mr. MURPHY. I join with my colleagues in expression of grief and in tribute to the memory of Frank Smith. He was my friend for many years, going back to the time when he was a football star at Loyola and Northwestern. As a war correspondent he covered the foxholes, as well as the posts of high command, and his dispatches were always filled with personal items about GI's from our city whom he had mingled with on the battlefronts. In recent years he had covered the county building in Chicago. He was a great journalist and, above all, a fine lovable human being. My deep sympathy goes to his widow and children.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illlinois, Congressman O'HARA.

The death of Frank Smith was indeed a great loss to the entire journalistic fraternity of America. In my 20 years as a writer and reporter in Chicago, seldom have I met a man who was more dedicated to the highest traditions of American journalism than Frank Smith.

Frank Smith was uncompromising in his determination to bring his readers a clear picture of the community in which they lived: its shortcomings and its attributes; its problems and the best formula for their solution.

He was a newspaperman's newspaperman—the sort of reporter that the entire profession respected.

I recall how before the war Frank Smith pioneered in the field of exposing deplorable conditions which existed in the Nation's mental institutions. The people of Chicago to this day remember

his penetrating series entitled "Seven Days in a Madhouse," when Mr. Smith infiltrated the State hospital at Kankakee, Ill., and spent 7 days posing as an inmate to bring his readers the grim story of how inmates were treated and the archaic, inhuman methods that were being used at that time to treat the mentally ill. It was his devastating series that started the first reform movement in Illinois to improve the treatment of the mentally ill in State institutions.

During the war, Frank Smith was one of the great American war correspondents who insisted that in order to write about the great tragedies, privations, and hardships of armed conflict, a reporter must himself participate in that conflict. It is no surprise, then, that Frank Smith joined thousands of other young Americans in the first paratroop invasion of the Pacific. Although much older than the physically fit young men of the paratroop division, Frank Smith made the same jump in a parachute as the combat soldiers, and for this daring act, he had been singled out not only by the journalism profession, but also by military agencies throughout the world.

Mr. Smith had the unique facility for bringing home to thousands of Chicagoans a vivid picture of what their sons were enduring during the Pacific campaign. Upon his return to the Chicago Times after the war as veterans editor, Frank Smith's name became legion among tens of thousands of reading veterans who had marveled at his courage during the war.

In the most recent years, Frank Smith had been assigned to cover the county building in Chicago, and men in public office from both parties have always extolled Frank Smith's fair, honest, and objective reporting.

I worked with Mr. Smith for 20 years. I can personally testify to the fact that he has symbolized the very essence of American journalism. His deep devotion to honest and fair reporting has been an inspiration to reporters and writers who have joined the ranks of Chicago journalism during that period.

The Chicago Sun-Times, his longtime employer, has suffered an irreparable loss in the death of Frank Smith. To his wife and to his children, may I add my own deepest sympathy and express my sincere desire that he may rest in peace. Although not a soldier, Mr. Smith lived a soldier's life and deserves the same commendation as any of America's glorious heroes who died in the defense of our country. His weapon had been his pen and typewriter, and because of men like Frank Smith, we Americans today can have a better appreciation of the true meaning of peace.

"ON THE BEACH"

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, KENNETH KEATING, now a distinguished Member of the other body, thoughtfully arranged yesterday for a special Capitol Hill showing of Stanley Kramer's "On the Beach," a movie that purports to show how mankind succumbs to atomic annihilation not with a bang but a whimper.

Some may carp about terrestrial winds, rate of fallout, dissipation of radiation, and lack of obvious protective measures, but none can deny the picture's basic factual premise, namely, mankind now possesses, primed, cocked, and pointed weapons that can destroy most, if not all, of mankind.

"There is still time, brother," was the message emblazoned on the banner over an outdoor religious meeting of a doomed city. Crowds were shown in ever smaller numbers and, finally, a completely deserted scene, with papers blowing and the banner flapping forlornly.

Is there still time, brother? While there is life, salvation through religion is always possible. But is there time to change the direction of events from certain disaster for the human race?

These are questions properly put to Members of Congress, many of whom attended the showing of "On the Beach" yesterday in the new Senate Office Building. They are the ones to decide whether the Humphrey resolution repealing the Connally reservation will be passed, whether the Clark resolution for United Nations Charter review will be passed, whether we will use our considerable powers on behalf of nuclear test cessation, controlled disarmament, and a world under law.

There is time, brother, but not much.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTEREST RATES ON TREASURY ISSUES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 294)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium-term and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore, that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1960.*

THE DANGER OF INFLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the settlement of the steel strike, of course we cannot criticize anyone yet because we do not know up to date who is entitled to credit for the settlement, but the question that occurred to me was, Are we really bright or even smart when we approve of a course of action which will cut the value of our savings, in fact of anything we have, as we will be doing if the companies increase the price of their product? And we settle other strikes on the same basis. We have been told that the companies will not increase the price of their merchandise. On that I could not express a worthwhile opinion because I have no information as to just how they are going to sell their product without reducing their dividends, which of course the stockholders do not want, or cutting the salaries of the officials of the corporations involved while increasing wages.

It is not at all likely company officials would take a voluntary cut in their compensation or fringe benefits, if they have any, or in their vacations.

Certainly we know that if things go on in a normal way workers throughout the country intend to ask for an increase in pay. As a matter of fact, it is fair to assume that Federal employees will get an increase in compensation.

Then we note, too, that other organizations want more. I do not know whether the farmers want more or not, but probably they will accept an increase as it comes along and this being an election year they have a chance to get more. Of course the veterans want more. In fact, everybody wants more. That is a laudable ambition.

There is a difference, I guess, between greed, which is an unjustifiable ambition, and ambition itself, without which we could not get along very well; but if we are to have an increase in prices, then we have gone exactly contrary to what the President asked us to do sometime ago. I recall that earlier in the session the President told us that we would have to hold the line on wages and prices or else we will have serious trouble. Perhaps I am at fault. It was my memory that the Democratic leadership, and the members of the Democratic Party too, for that matter, suggested that wherever the President was sound

in his recommendations they intended to go along. Certainly the necessity for holding the line is obvious. From what the papers here print the majority party seems to have concluded that the settlement in the steel strike was a good one. But whether you are to favor granting further increases which will give us still more inflation we do not yet know. It is quite obvious, at least to me, that we are not holding the line. So this being a political year, I guess that from this time on the President will not get very much help from the Democratic leadership or party. The war is on. That is apparent since the settlement of the steel strike. Political advantage seems to be the objective. Secretary of Labor Mitchell is given the credit for the settlement. Yesterday I heard two or three Members, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] was one. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] was another, and so on down the line. I heard Members say the union members themselves brought about the settlement. That is it was said they were so unanimously in favor of the proposed settlement that industry was forced to agree to their demands, and therefore the union members are entitled to the credit. I assume, this being a political year, that both party leaders and both parties will claim credit, but what puzzles me is the answer to this question: Is it a good settlement? The Chicago Tribune, a stanch and tireless advocate of Americanism, the day before yesterday, said, and it expresses the sentiment of the people of the Midwest, and do not make any mistake about that, that the Labor Department was quoted as having said that inflation would be less. Let us hope the Department is right.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I have not read and I do not know whether the gentleman has read the actual contract that was entered into. But, I did hear Mr. Blough, I think, say that there would be no increase in the price of steel at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is at this time, but in December. Or it may be the day after the November election.

Mr. WILLIS. And Mr. McDonald indicated that the contract could well result in no more strikes for a long time. I wonder if those two elements are in the contract itself?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not seen the contract, but we know very well that they could not make a contract that there would be no more strikes that would bind others. We have been told there is a strike on the railroads coming up. Read the Young and Jerry Kluttz articles in our local papers. We know very well that Federal employees cannot strike, but they can demand an increase. This being an election year their prospects are good. And so on down the list. What about the strike in the meatpacking industry in Minnesota against Wilson & Co. where the Governor, a Democrat, Mr. Freeman, calls out the militia—the State troops. He sent them down to the struck plants to help the picket line that was trying to close the factory. He authorized the commanding officer to order the company and the press not to publish any statements giving the company's view. Then what happened? Then three Federal judges told the Governor to call his boys off. Of course, he did. Then what did the unions do? They transfer their goons from the picket line and the company plant to the homes of those who desired to work.

Inasmuch as my reference has been to a Governor who is a Democrat, I wonder why you do not call my attention to what happened in 1948, when Governor Youngdahl, a Republican, did practically the same thing. He is now a Federal judge, sitting in Washington. Are you a little slow in passing that back to us? But that is what happened. When will we all quit letting labor leaders kick us all over the lot and get around to protecting the general public, the average citizen, the little fellow that so many of us are always talking about?

Permit me to condense and restate what I have been trying to say.

WHY CHEAT OURSELVES BY INCREASING THE COST OF LIVING? BY CUTTING THE DOLLAR IN HALF?

Pointing to the obvious danger of inflation, we were told to hold the line on wages and prices; that, if wages and prices continued to advance, Government control of both would become necessary. The Chinese tried that and failed.

We were all dead tired of the steel strike which was increasing unemployment, hindering business, costing millions every day. Politicians in both major parties now claim credit for forcing the settlement, which gives no promise of reducing featherbedding, added between 30 and 40 cents per hour increase to wages in the steel industry, where workers now receive an average of $3.10 an hour. That in no way holds the line.

Now we all know that that increase will be inflationary, further cut the value of your savings, if—and I emphasize the "if"—it is added to the price of steel. I express no opinion as to whether it will be. You may. Will it be added to cost?

But this we do know. Not only is foreign competition creating unemployment in the steel industry here, but, if and when the wage advance is added, we will all, including the steelworkers, be paying more for everything in which steel is used. And where is the factory or the business which does not use steel in some form?

Let the kids answer. After the evening meal, have the children, if you have any, gather around, name a business or a product, and award a prize for the answer which shows where steel is not used in connection with your job, your business, your profession. A higher cost of living never lags far behind an increased wage.

Is there a nationwide industry, or a governmental agency, where the employees or the stockholders are not asking, in one form or another, for an increase in salary, wages, or dividends? Over the years, you have denied yourself and saved; the inflation we now have has, in purchasing power, cut in half the value of every bond, insurance policy, and dollar you own, every dollar you are earning. Want an additional cut?

The Chicago Tribune of January 10 said:

> The Labor Department said Sunday that figures show the new steel pact to be less inflationary than other recent major labor settlements.

That is equivalent to saying that the pain from the ulcerated tooth which was torturing you yesterday does not hurt quite as much today. Fine, but the ulcerated tooth is still there. Infecting others?

Settlement of the steel strike did not end nor minimize the danger of inflation. Other demands for increased wages—continued featherbedding—are coming up.

What can be done about it? Well, Congressmen might, but they will not—they will kick me for even suggesting it—take a 20-percent cut in salaries and allowances, and insist that others "hold the line" on wages and prices. By legislation, insist that free competition be made available to all; let the law of supply and demand operate. End subsidies, special privileges—ever-increasing wages and salaries for a minority—each means an increased cost of living for all. Permit a man to work where he has an acceptable job. We might then be on the way toward solving our major domestic, financial difficulties.

TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the passage of Public Law 86–75—H.R. 7523—approved June 30, 1959, provided in part, that effective July 1, 1960, the present 10-percent tax on transportation of persons would be reduced to 5 percent.

While the reduction of this tax to 5 percent must be regarded as definite progress and an important step in eliminating an unfair, harmful, and unproductive tax, the fact remains that only half the task is done. This job should be completed this session by a complete repeal of the tax.

As this session begins, the administration is seeking a $80 billion spending budget. Federal spending continues to increase and an ever larger need for revenue exists. But this is no justification for continuing an unfair and economically harmful tax. Because fiscal considerations seem to be in the spotlight these days I want to emphasize that complete repeal of this tax will improve, not harm, this country's financial condition.

At the most, the 10-percent tax on the transportation of persons produced a gross yield of about $225 million per year. But this figure does not represent the net yield to the Government.

First of all the cost of all business travel is taken as a tax deduction by corporations and business organizations

as a business expense. Thus, every dollar spent by business to pay the transportation tax produces only 48 cents of net revenue because it provides a 52-cent deduction as a business expense under the current 52-percent corporate tax rate. In 1958 it was estimated that the gross yield of the transportation tax was reduced by over $70 million by this factor alone.

Of even greater significance is the fact that one of the main purposes of the tax was to create a monetary deterrent to public use of transportation at a time when wartime travel was stretching our transportation capacity to the breaking point. There is no question but that this tax is deterring travel today and it is especially discriminatory against lower income classes. Chairman James Durfee, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, testified before the Senate Independent Office Appropriations Subcommittee last session that abolition of this tax "would produce a substantial increase in traffic" and "increase revenues to trunklines." The Interstate Commerce Commission has likewise gone on record confirming that considerable increases in traffic would result which would help to offset the ever-mounting passenger train deficit experienced by the Nation's railroads.

In 1958 the domestic transportation industry earned approximately $7 billion in passenger revenue. If removal of this deterrent tax resulted in only a 2-percent increase in net taxable income, then the amount of corporate income taxes would more than offset the yield produced by the transportation tax.

Moreover, this tax harms our international carriers as well. Although the tax applies only to travel within the United States the fact remains that if a citizen of France, for example, bought a ticket from Paris to Dallas he would pay this tax for the domestic portion of his trip if he buys his ticket from a U.S.-flag carrier but would not pay the tax if he buys from a foreign-flag carrier. Our international carriers are therefore losing untold amounts of business to foreign competitors which is not only unsound transportation policy but unsound as a fiscal matter since the taxable earnings of the international carriers are less than would otherwise be the case.

Finally, the subsidy paid by the Federal Government to the local service air carriers has been steadily increasing. In 1955 it amounted to some $21 million while today it is expected to exceed $50 million by the end of 1960. CAB Chairman Durfee testified in the Senate Appropriations hearings that abolition of the transportation tax would increase traffic in the local service industry as well and that "it would have that inevitable effect, to some degree, to reduce subsidies to local service carriers."

I do not for a minute believe that an unfair and obsolete tax can be justified on the ground that the revenue it produces is necessary as a fiscal proposition. But in the case of this transportation tax there is no fiscal justification. The plain fact is that it is an unproductive tax and I am convinced that more revenue would be forthcoming and important Federal expenditures would be saved if it were completely abolished.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS PERSONNEL ACT OF 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am herewith submitting a report on the activities of the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS PERSONNEL ACT OF 1959

The subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 6324, a bill to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service through revision and extension of some of the statutory provisions relating to retirement, appointment of personnel, and other related personnel matters.

In the course of the hearings, which were held on April 16, 1959, the subcommittee heard testimony from Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, and other witnesses, all of whom testified in favor of the legislation.

It is expected that the improved retirement benefits provided for in this legislation will attract into the Regular Corps and the Active Reserve Corps additional physicians, dentists, sanitary engineers, and other needed professional health personnel. It is further expected that the improved retirement benefits will cause present members of the Regular Corps and the Active Reserve Corps to remain in service for additional periods of time.

The improved retirement benefits are substantially identical with retirement benefits provided by earlier legislation for commissioned personnel of the Armed Forces.

The legislation is recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

On August 20 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported in lieu of H.R. 6324, on which hearings had been held by the subcommittee, S. 2220, which is substantially identical with H.R. 6324 and which was passed by the Senate on July 24, 1959.

In view of the late date on which the legislation was reported from the full committee, action on this legislation was postponed until the beginning of the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

INDIAN SANITATION FACILITIES

The subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 23 and other bills—H.R. 849, 966, 1338, 1768, 1979, 2349, 2546, 3188, 3342, 3998, 6151. S. 56 reported in lieu from subcommittee and full committee; approved July 31, 1959—Public Law 86-121—dealing with Indian sanitation facilities.

The bill would clarify the authority of the Public Health Service to carry out programs relating to Indian sanitation facilities. The legislation is an outgrowth of the transfer of responsibility for Indian health from the Department of Interior to the Surgeon General and its primary purpose is to authorize the Surgeon General to construct, improve, and maintain essential Indian sanitation facilities; to acquire the necessary lands; to make agreements with appropriate public authorities, and with the Indians to be served by such facilities; and to transfer any such facilities to any State or subdivision thereof or to any Indian tribe.

The hearings extended over 2 days—May 5 and 6, 1959—and the subcommittee heard testimony in support of this legislation from representatives of the Association on American Indian Affairs and the Friends Committee on National Legislation; the Governor of the State of New Mexico, and the governor of the Indian Pueblo of Laguna, who also spoke for 19 other pueblos of New Mexico which are organized in the All-Pueblo Council. A representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified in favor of this legislation which had been recommended by the Department.

INDIAN SANITATION FACILITIES

The legislation was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and the full committee—House Report No. 589—June 29, 1959, and was signed into law on July 31, 1959—Public Law 86-121.

H.R. 6325—EXTENSION OF TRAINEESHIP PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC HEALTH PERSONNEL AND PROFESSIONAL NURSES

The subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 6325 which provides for extension of traineeship programs for public health personnel and professional nurses. In the course of the hearings, which were held on June 8, 9, and 10, 1959, the subcommittee heard testimony from representatives of the Association of Schools of Public Health, National Conference on Public Health Training; American Nurses Association; Association of State and Territorial Health Officers; American Public Health Association; the Department of Health of New York State and the State of Maryland; and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill on which hearings were held included not only H.R. 6325, but also H.R. 6871, introduced by Congressman RHODES of Pennsylvania, and companion bills to the Rhodes bill introduced by other Members of Congress—H.R. 6872, H.R. 6873, H.R. 6913, H.R. 6922, H.R. 7064, and H.R. 7249. H.R. 6871, which is still pending before the committee, deals with schools of public health and other aspects of public health training. In view of the urgent need for the enactment of the bill, H.R. 6325, the subcommittee decided to report this bill and to give further separate consideration to H.R. 6871.

The full committee reported the legislation on June 29, 1959—House Report 590, 86th Congress, 1st session—and the bill became law on July 23, 1959—Public Law 86-105.

INTERNATIONAL HEALTH

The subcommittee held hearings on June 21, 22, 23, and August 4, 5, and 6, 1959, on Senate Joint Resolution 41 and other substantially identical bills—House Joint Resolutions 211, 237, 293, 361, 370, and 443—designed to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research. In the course of these hearings the subcommittee heard testimony from several sponsors of these bills, many persons prominent in science and public life, representatives of numerous organizations concerned with public health and representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition, numerous statements were submitted to the subcommittee with regard to this legislation by organizations and persons interested in this legislation.

On August 28, 1959, Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, announced that in view of the lateness of the session, the committee would not take any further action during this session on Senate Joint Resolution 41. Therefore, this legislation will be taken up in executive session by the subcommittee and the full committee when Congress reconvenes in January 1960.

SAFETY LEGISLATION

In the subcommittee reorganization at the beginning of the 86th Congress, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety assumed jurisdiction over matters in the field of safety, including highway traffic safety, which in the 84th and 85th Congresses had been handled by the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] was chairman.

During the first session, the subcommittee conducted hearings on five bills on the subject of motor vehicle safety. Two of these bills were reported to the full committee and were passed by the House.

Taking advantage of data developed in the detailed hearings held by the special subcommittee in the 84th and 85th Congresses, the subcommittee inquiry in the traffic safety field was concentrated on legislation concerning vehicles in an effort to make safer automobiles available and thereby to cut down the traffic accident death toll of nearly 40,000 persons a year. The subcommittee favorably reported H.R. 1341, introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee, to establish minimum safety standards for Government passenger-carrying motor vehicles, and H.R. 8238, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], amended to direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study of the effect of motor vehicle exhausts on human health and report to Congress within 2 years. Both bills have passed the House and are pending in Senate committees.

In the field of aviation safety, also under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, a meeting was held in executive session with Administrator Quesada, of the new Federal Aviation Agency to discuss progress in safety rulemaking under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which transferred this responsibility from the Civil Aeronautics Board to the new Agency. Members of the subcommittee participated in the investigation of the accident in New York February 3, 1959, when 65 lives were lost in the crash of a new-type turboprop aircraft. Members of the subcommittee also participated in the investigation of the aircraft noise problem and attended the hearing held at New York International Airport September 7 to study the problem in that area.

The subcommittee held hearings on air pollution and favorably reported H.R. 7476—House Report 960—to extend the Federal aid program for air pollution, control, and abatement. The bill was passed by the House September 1 and went to conference. The conference report—House Report 1187—was agreed to September 14 and the bill signed into law September 22—Public Law 86-365.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the question of Canal Zone sovereignty has a long history. Before the secession on November 3, 1903, of Panama from Colombia and the diplomatic intervention of the United States in isthmian political events at that time, the sovereign of the isthmus was Colombia. After the Panama Revolution of 1903, sovereign over the area later granted to the United States was Panama.

This transfer of sovereignty from Colombia to Panama was confirmed in the preamble of the Hay-Buanau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 as being "actually vested in the Republic of Panama." This description was obviously used not to establish the sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone after its acquisition by the United States, but to show the transfer of sovereignty over the area from Colombia to Panama as a result of its secession from Colombia.

In the 1903 treaty, Panama granted to the United States in perpetuity complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for purposes of construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection, with "all the rights, power and authority within the zone which the United States would possess and exercise if it were sovereign of the territory and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority."

All jurisdiction of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications on February 26, 1904, of the 1903 treaty, after which the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. Since that time, the symbol of sovereignty has been the flag of the United States.

Recent pronouncements emanating from the Department of State have been to the effect that the United States, for more than 50 years, has recognized that Panama retains a "titular sovereignty" over the Canal Zone under the 1903 treaty, that the United States cannot afford to refuse to admit the "legal situation obtaining between the two countries," and that the United States should display "visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone." As evidence of its interest in the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, Panama has formally requested authority to fly its flag alongside the flag of the United States in the Canal Zone.

Such views, Mr. Speaker, reflect demands of the Panamanian Government, which, as you know from recent events on the isthmus, is mob-dominated with respect to the formulation of its foreign policy. Its leaders are not thinking of their just claim for "reversionary" interest in the Canal Zone territory, in event of failure of the United States to discharge its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal, but of "sovereignty."

The aims of the current isthmian agitations are: First, to fly the flag; second, to obtain dual sovereignty; and finally, nationalization by Panama.

The Secretary of State has recently written me that in recognizing "titular sovereignty" no surrender of sovereignty on the part of the United States is or can be involved.

Any such view, Mr. Speaker, reflects a naivete that is incomprehensible. The foreign policy of Panama for the last 50 years has been to obtain for Panama conditions similar to those that were contained in the 1903 treaty with Colombia, which amounted to a dual control. Today, the ultimate Panamanian aim, abetted by Communist monitors, is complete control.

The hoisting of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone would not be an empty gesture and would not be accepted as such by Panamanian radicals who dominate their government. Its effect would be catastrophic, for the day it is formally hoisted marks the beginning of the end of exclusive U.S. control over the Panama Canal.

Here I wish to stress that where grave responsibility such as that involved in the treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal must be accompanied by undiluted authority. Hoisting the Panama flag would be the symbol for such dilution.

Finally, may I ask, How could the United States carry out its responsibility under the treaty and the provisions of the Panama Canal Act for vesting supreme control over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone Government during war in the commanding general of the U.S.

Army on the isthmus if there were other than exclusive jurisdiction?

To all such questions an opposite view is absolutely incomprehensible.

In view of the vital need for clarification of the Congress, position on Panama Canal Zone sovereignty, I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Resolution expressing the sense and judgment of the Congress with respect to Canal Zone sovereignty

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Buanau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States *should abandon* the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring):

(1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

HIGHER BENEFITS UNDER THE LONGSHOREMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to bring the weekly benefits provided under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act into line with the basic purposes of this law. Early introduction of this measure will permit, I believe, sufficient time for committee study. I am hopeful that those who agree with the intent and purpose of this proposal will introduce similar legislation, and, indeed, I am hopeful that those who do not agree will find an opportunity to discuss this matter with me.

The brief explanation that follows will show the need for this measure and establish clearly why Congress should act favorably on it.

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act covers some 500,000 workers engaged in maritime employments. Included under its coverage are longshoremen or stevedores, ship repairmen, ship servicemen, harbor workers, and other employees engaged in employments on the navigable waters of the United States, but not including seamen. The Longshore Act is also the basic compensation act for employees privately employed in the District of Columbia and for employees of contractors holding contracts with the Government whose operations take place outside continental United States.

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act is the only Federal compensation statute applying to workers in private industry. The other Federal statute in this field, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, embraces Government employees.

The main purpose of my bill is to reconcile the maximum weekly benefit allowable under the Longshore Act for disability with the established principle that benefits should equal two-thirds of average weekly earnings. This principle was basic to the establishment of compensation insurance throughout the country. It is clearly enunciated not only in most State laws, but also in many provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Unfortunately, the original intent of compensation insurance has been seriously undermined by the inclusion in most of these laws of a dollar ceiling on weekly benefits. In the early years of compensation insurance, such ceilings did not present a critical problem, since the average ceiling was generally above the amount necessary to provide a benefit of two-thirds of weekly earnings. Thus, when the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act was passed in 1927, the $25 ceiling compared with average earnings of less than $30 weekly, so that the overwhelming majority of affected employees got what the act intended. Today, however, the dollar ceilings in the Longshore Act as well as in most State laws deprive workers of their proper benefits.

The present ceiling in the Longshore Act, which was set in 1956, is $54 weekly. This is far too low in relation to actual wage levels prevailing in most trades covered by the act. For example, figures made available on earnings of longshoremen in the New York area show that over 50 percent of the men are earning on an annual basis more than $81 weekly, the figure used for the present $54 benefit. On the West Coast, according to available information, better than 70 percent of longshoremen are making earnings which figure out to a weekly average above $81. Ship workers and similar crafts with wage levels close to longshoremen are likewise in a position where most are unable to obtain a full benefit. In short, the present dollar ceiling shortchanges the majority of covered employees when they are disabled.

To correct this inequity now applying to benefits under the Longshore Act, I am proposing that the same dollar ceiling used in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act be incorporated in the longshore statute. This ceiling, which is set at $525 monthly, was approved by Congress as far back as 1949. Translated into a weekly equivalent which drops the fractional part of a dollar, this ceiling is $121, which is the figure I am using in my bill. Such a maximum would bring a genuine two-thirds benefit to over 90 percent of the workers covered by the Longshore Act.

At this point, it is important to understand that establishment of the ceiling I am proposing does not mean that covered employees will receive that much in weekly benefits. They will only be eligible for two-thirds of their actual average weekly earnings, up to a maximum of $121 weekly. Workers in the low brackets, as are many in maritime and in the District of Columbia, will get benefits equivalent to two-thirds of their weekly pay. My proposal will not mean any windfall, but only what is proper under the two-thirds formula.

The basic policy on which my amendment is based was clearly stated in the report of the House Committee on Education and Labor when it sponsored the 1949 amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The report said this:

> Any flat monthly maximum, the effect of which inevitably in some cases prevents the employee from receiving a fair proportion of his wage loss in total and partial disability cases, is, by its very nature, unrealistic and inequitable.

With that policy I thoroughly agree, and I am sure every forward thinking leader in the field of social insurance shares a similar belief. It is now only just and fair that Congress should apply that policy to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act by revising its present unrealistic and inequitable ceiling.

This action aside from providing maritime employees with what they are entitled to under the law, has a larger significance. Traditionally, the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, like other Federal welfare legislation, has served as an example for State compensation laws. The 1956 increase in

the Longshore Act benefits subsequently brought improvements in most local statutes. Just this last year, some 29 State legislatures, according to the Department of Labor, increased weekly benefits under their compensations laws. My own State of California boosted the weekly maximum for temporary total disability to $65 weekly. Such justified improvements will be accelerated and brought to their proper levels by favorable action on my bill.

In addition to revising the maximum and minimum ceiling in the Longshore Act to correspond with the figures set in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, I am proposing several other related changes.

The computation of death benefits would be revised to correspond with the new maximum and minimum. Likewise, the present dollar limitation on total benefits as set forth in section 14(m) would be repealed. Finally, benefits would be retroactive to the date of injury if the disability exceeds 21 days, instead of the existing period of 28 days. These additional amendments would bring the affected provisions into line with the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

The changes proposed under my bill add up to simple equity for the more than half a million employees affected by the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. My bill will restore the original premise that underlies benefits in workmen's compensation—that they should equal two-thirds of weekly loss in wages. I commend this bill for serious study by my colleagues, and it is my hope that it will receive early and favorable consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor.

A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE THE LEVEL OF TELEVISION AND RADIO BROADCASTING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 9549, a bill intended to improve the level of television and radio broadcasting in the United States.

I would briefly summarize the major aims of H.R. 9549 as follows:

First. To establish minimum standards of public service programing for all TV and radio stations.

Second. To stimulate the broadcasting of educational and cultural programs.

Third. To establish a system of competitive bidding for broadcasting licenses.

Fourth. To set higher standards for the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Congress are deeply disturbed—and justly so—at what has been going on in the commercial broadcasting industry.

Recent disclosures of rigged quiz shows and "payola" are but two shocking symptoms of a deep-seated ailment. Sensational as they may be, they are merely today's surface outbreak of more basic difficulties built up over the years in an industry that has grown too fast and too profitably to catch up with its responsibilities to the public.

One of the basic problems has been the failure of the broadcasting industry itself, and of the Federal Communications Commission which oversees its operations, to accept fully the fact that a grant of the use of the public airwaves for commercial broadcasting carries with it a responsibility to advance education and culture and to bring the best programs, and a balanced diet of programs, to the people of the United States.

FORGOTTEN PROMISES

In times of trouble, such as now, the industry and the FCC pay lipservice to these ideals. The broadcasting industry promises to clean its own house. The FCC promises to make the industry do just that, or at least to help it.

Yet after each of these agonizing reappraisals, we seem to come out with just as many—if not more—westerns, private eyes, diskjockey shows, and old movies as we had before. Maybe they are better westerns or private eyes, with new formats, new faces, and bigger budgets—but the diet served the public continues to be beamed at the lowest common denominator of public taste.

The broadcasting industry—and the FCC goes along with it—appears to have set two main goals for itself: to make money, which they do very well, and to entertain, which they sometimes do very well.

But, with a few exceptions, the goal of contributing to education, to information, to culture, is far down the industry's list—if it is there at all. Just because the good guys always beat the bad guys—usually after several killings—does not make a program educational, or even true.

Our present broadcasting laws speak often of the public interest. The industry and the FCC, as a result, have spoken of public service programs, but without requiring them or defining them. It is my belief that if we both define and require public service programing for all broadcasting stations, we will be on our way to improving the level of television and radio broadcasting, without harming the commercial broadcasting industry or the other industries which depend upon it.

Since that is the intent of my bill, and since that also happens to be what the broadcasting industry and its friends claim to want, I expect to have their support for this legislation.

DETAILS OF THE BILL

In detail, H.R. 9549 proposes the following changes in the Federal Communications Act:

First. To declare that Congress created the FCC not only to make available an adequate communications system, but also "for the purpose of assuring that broadcasting stations shall be operated in the public interest and in such a manner as to advance education and culture in the United States and to bring the best programs, regardless of kind, to the people of the United States."

Second. Direct the FCC to establish minimum standards of public service programing for each broadcasting station.

(a) The bill itself would require each station to devote at least 20 percent of each broadcast day to public service programs, of which not less than 1 hour per day must occur between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m., the prime evening hours.

(b) The FCC could establish higher minimum standards in any community, based upon public comment, investigations or public hearings in a community.

(c) The bill establishes a broad definition of public service programs: "programs of which the content tends primarily to advance education and culture, or to inform the public of events or issues of local, State, National, and international importance."

Third. To assist the FCC in further defining public service programs and in establishing minimum standards of public service programing, the bill would create an Advisory Board on Education and Culture. The United States Commissioner of Education would be the chairman. Six members representing the general public, and not connected with the broadcasting industry, would be appointed by the FCC Chairman.

MONITORING OF STATIONS

Fourth. Direct the FCC to monitor broadcasting stations to determine whether minimum standards of public service programing, and other requirements, are being fulfilled.

Fifth. Establish a system of competitive bidding for broadcasting licenses.

(a) The bill would establish priority categories for license applicants—first, priority to an applicant "predominantly locally owned" with no interest in other mediums of mass communication; second, priority to an applicant "predominantly locally owned"; and, third, priority to all others.

(b) If a single applicant for a particular license stood alone in a higher category than all other applicants, the FCC would grant the license to him, if otherwise qualified under the law.

(c) If two or more applicants for a license fell into the same high category, and were otherwise qualified, the FCC would call for competitive bids.

(d) The bill provides for bids in two parts: First, bids in terms of public service programs; second, bids in cash amounts. The FCC would give "such weight as it may determine appropriate to each part of the bids of the applicants," then award the license to the highest bidder.

AN EDUCATIONAL FUND

Sixth. Funds received from successful bidders would go into a special educational and cultural television and radio fund, from which the FCC, with the advice of the Advisory Board on Education and Culture, could make loans or grants to nonprofit broadcasting stations or organizations "for the purpose of furthering the presentation of educational and cultural television and radio programs in the United States."

Seventh. Establish higher standards for the FCC.

The bill would repeal a provision permitting FCC members to accept honorariums; enact a code of ethics for the FCC which would prohibit accepting favors from the broadcasting industry; and prohibit anyone from outside the FCC from consulting "except on the

public record with any member of the Commission or its staff upon any question of fact or law in issue" in any proceeding before the Commission. The bill would also increase the terms of FCC members from 7 to 14 years, raise their salaries by $2,000 a year, require Commissioners to be of known integrity, and states that neither membership nor nonmembership in a political party should be a criterion for appointment to the FCC.

The provisions relating to the FCC itself were part of a bill which I introduced in April 1958 following disclosure of scandals involving FCC members. Such changes to uplift the FCC are still necessary.

But I want to emphasize that the main purposes of my bill introduced today are to improve programing, to emphasize education and culture, and to set up a bidding procedure for broadcast licenses between qualified applicants who, because of local ownership, are most likely to serve the best interests of their own communities.

The text of H.R. 9549 is as follows:

H.R. 9549

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to establish minimum standards of public service programing for broadcasting stations, to further the broadcasting of educational and cultural programs, to establish a system of competitive bidding for broadcasting licenses, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "Communications Act Amendments of 1960."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by inserting, after the words "through the use of wire and radio communication", the following: "for the purpose of assuring that broadcasting stations shall be operated in the public interest and in such a manner as to advance education and culture in the United States and to bring the best programs, regardless of kind, to the people of the United States,".

SEC. 3. Section 4(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by deleting "; but this shall not apply to the presentation or delivery of publications or papers for which a reasonable honorarium or compensation may be accepted"; and by adding at the end of said subsection the following: "Members shall be of known integrity, and neither membership nor nonmembership in any political party shall be a criterion for selection".

SEC. 4. Section 4(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "seven years; except" and substituting the words "fourteen years; except"; and by adding at the end of said subsection the following: "The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to persons appointed after the enactment of this Act".

SEC. 5. Section 4(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Each Commissioner shall receive an annual salary of $22,000 payable in monthly installments, and the Chairman, during the period of his service as Chairman, shall receive an annual salary of $22,500. All necessary expenditures incurred by the Commissioners in attending not more than two communications industry conventions in any given calendar year shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission or his designee."

SEC. 6. Section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(p) It is deemed contrary to the policy of this Act for a member or employee of the Commission to—

"(1) engage, directly or indirectly, in any personal business transaction or private arrangement for personal profit which accrues from or is based upon his official position or authority or upon confidential information which he gains by reason of such position or authority;

"(2) accept, directly or indirectly, any valuable gift, favor, or service from any person with whom he deals on behalf of the United States;

"(3) discuss or entertain proposals for future employment by any person outside the Government with whom he is dealing on behalf of the United States;

"(4) divulge confidential commercial or economic information to any unauthorized person, or release any such information in advance of authorization for its release;

"(5) become unduly involved, through frequent or expensive social engagements or otherwise, with any person outside the Government with whom he deals on behalf of the United States; or

"(6) act in any official matter with respect to which there exists a personal interest incompatible with an unbiased exercise of official judgment.

"(7) fail reasonably to restrict his personal business affairs so as to avoid conflicts of interests with his official duties."

SEC. 7. Section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(s) Monitor each broadcasting station to determine whether the minimum standards of public service programing established for such station are being fulfilled and whether all other requirements of this Act and of Commission regulations are being complied with."

SEC. 8. Section 308 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to information required by the Commission under section 308(b), the Commission shall establish minimum standards of public service programing for each broadcasting station, and shall refuse to consider applications for broadcasting licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof, unless each such application meets or exceeds such minimum standards:

"(1) The following types of programs may be defined by the Commission as public service programs: programs of which the content tends primarily to advance education and culture, or to inform the public of events or issues of local, State, National, or international importance.

"(2) To assist the Commission in defining public service programs and in establishing minimum standards of public service programing, there is hereby created an Advisory Board on Education and Culture, to be composed of a chairman and six members, none of whom shall be a member of or in any way connected with the broadcasting industry. The United States Commissioner of Education shall be the chairman of the Advisory Board. The six members of the Advisory Board shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, shall serve at his pleasure, and shall represent the general public. The Commission shall furnish from its staff such technical and clerical assistance as the Advisory Board may require.

"(3) In establishing minimum standards for public service programing, the Commission shall require each broadcasting station to devote not less than 20 percent of each broadcast day to public service programs, of which not less than one hour of each broadcast day shall occur between the hours of 7 p.m. and 10 p.m.

"(4) Nothing in this Act shall prohibit the Commission from requiring higher minimum standards of public service programing than specified in section 308(d)(3). In making such a determination, the Commission shall invite public comment on the broadcasting needs of each community being served or to be served by one or more broadcasting stations, and may conduct investigations or hold public hearings in any community if deemed necessary."

SEC. 9. Section 309(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by substituting in lieu thereof the following language:

"(a) (1) The Commission shall examine applications submitted under section 308, and shall consider only such applications as will, if granted, serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity, and where the applicant meets the requirements, set up by this Act and by Commission regulations, as to citizenship, character, and financial, technical, programing, and other qualifications and standards. From among such applications, the Commission shall then classify them into one of the following three categories: (1) first, priority, where applicant is predominantly locally owned, and has no interest, directly or through its owners, in other mediums of mass communication; (2) second priority, where applicant is predominantly locally owned; (3) third priority, all other such applicants. The Commission shall then grant the permit or license to the applicant in the highest priority category: *Provided,* That where there is a more than one such qualified applicant in the category, the Commission shall, pursuant to regulation, call for bids from all qualified applicants in the category. The Commission shall invite bids from each such applicant in two parts: (1) bids in terms of public service programing; (2) bids in cash amounts. Giving such weight as it may determine appropriate to each part of the bids of the applicants, the Commission shall grant the permit or license to the highest bidder. The cash amount paid pursuant to any such successful bid shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund, established by this Act to be known as the Educational and Cultural Television and Radio Fund.

"(2) The Commission, with the advice of the Advisory Board on Education and Culture, shall have authority to make loans and/or grants from the Educational and Cultural Television and Radio Fund to nonprofit broadcasting stations and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of furthering the presentation of educational and cultural television and radio programs in the United States."

SEC. 10. Section 309(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by striking the first four sentences, and substituting the following: "The Commission, in carrying out its responsibilities under section 309(a) hereof, shall notify all applicants and other known parties in interest of all objections made to the applications as well as the source and nature of such objections. Following such notice, the applicant shall be given an opportunity to reply. If the Commission, after considering such reply, shall be unable without further consideration to award the permit or license sought, it shall formally designate the applications for hearing, and shall notify the applicants and all other known parties in interest of such action and the grounds and reasons therefor, specifying with particularity the matters and things in issue but not including issues or requirements phrased generally."

SEC. 11. Section 310(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by substituting a semicolon in lieu of the final period thereof, and by adding the following: *"Provided,* That where a person in a higher priority classification under the priority categories established in Section 309(a)(1) is willing to make an offer as advantageous as that of the proposed transferee or assignee, the transfer to the proposed transferee or assignee shall not be approved."

SEC. 12. Section 409(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(4) In any proceeding, whether rulemaking or adjudication, no person outside the Commission shall consult except on the public record, with any member of the Commission or its staff upon any fact or question of law in issue. Any Commissioner or staff member receiving a communication relating to any proceeding, whether rulemaking or adjudication, shall place such communication (or a memorandum stating the circumstances and substance of such communication if such communication was made orally) in the public record."

TODAY THE U.S. TREASURY WILL GIVE THE MONEYLENDERS THE BIGGEST BARGAIN IN HISTORY: WILL SELL 1-YEAR OBLIGATIONS AT AN INTEREST RATE OF 5 PERCENT OR ABOVE IN A SQUEEZE PLAY ON CONGRESS TO OBTAIN REMOVAL OF THE 42-YEAR-OLD LEGAL CEILING ON INTEREST RATES; CONGRESS MUST ACT TO CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE IN THE LAW BY MAKING SHORT-TERM BORROWING SUBJECT TO THE INTEREST RATE CEILING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the day is over the Treasury will give the moneylenders the biggest bargain in history. Furthermore, our money managers in the Treasury, in the Federal Reserve System, and, of course, in Wall Street are so anxious that Congress and the general public be aware of this bargain that they have been advertising in advance. This is part of the campaign to make the American people believe that such giveaways of their money are necessary because Congress refuses to repeal the legal ceiling on interest rates at which the Treasury can issue long-term bonds.

THE GIVEAWAY IS ADVERTISED—WITH THE BLAME GIVEN TO CONGRESS

This advertising is in the form of newspaper analyses, columnists' reports, private financial letters, and so on, of which we have been seeing a great flood over the past week. All advise what the price will be of the securities which the Treasury is putting up for auction today—after the bids have been made and the Treasury has made its decision as to the lowest price it will accept. All advise that the price of the securities to be sold today—which is to be $1.5 billion of Treasury bills maturing in 1 year—will top 5 percent, and perhaps go as high as 5¼ percent. Thus the New York Times of last Sunday carried a feature article by one Paul Heffernan which states in highly attractive tones what the price of these securities will be, after the moneylenders have submitted their bids, and the Treasury has decided which bids it will accept. And, of course, this article follows the custom of the day and blames the whole matter on Congress, refusal to lift the 4½-percent ceiling on long-term issues.

If the rate on these 1-year loans turns out to be as predicted, it will be even more fabulous than the rate the Treasury gave on the famous "magic 5s" which it issued last September at a fixed rate of 5 percent. The "magic 5s" were for a period much longer than the bills being issued today. In fact, they carry a maturity date of 4 years and 10 months—just short of the 5 years at which time they would have had to comply with the legal ceiling.

MONEY MANAGERS ARE DEMANDING ONLY THE BLUE SKY TO LIMIT INTEREST RATES

For more than a year now Congress has been the target of the most vigorous and concerted campaign ever waged against a Congress during my years here, all in an effort to force repeal of an interest rate law which has stood unassaulted and unchallenged through wars, depressions, market crashes, and other crises which this Nation has weathered in the past 42 years. And if there are limits to which our money managers will not go in their determination to rid themselves of a Woodrow Wilson reform and turn the clock back to pre-World War I, those limits are not now visible even with the aid of long-distance radar.

How high do they plan to push interest rates?

They will not say. They will give no assurances whatever. They demand the blue sky as their ceiling. They do not ask that the legal ceiling be increased to 5 percent, 6 percent, 10 percent, or even 20 percent. They demand that it be removed. And they feel so confident that they can force Congress to yield to their demands, they do not even bother to promise a stratolayer which they will refuse to exceed.

I have inquired of the Federal Reserve authorities if they would offer some assurance as to what the probable maximum rate would be if the ceiling were removed, and they have refused to specify any maximum.

Similarly, I recently asked Secretary Anderson what assurance he might have from the Federal Reserve people, if any, as to how high they would raise the long-term rate if the ceiling were removed. His answer, which was given in a letter just last month, is to the effect that he has no assurance whatever that interest rates will not be raised above any specified maximum if the ceiling is removed.

EPITAPH FOR A 10-PERCENTER

My own estimate is that our money managers are really shooting for 10 percent, and I am reminded of the epitaph which appears on the tombstone of a gentleman who for many years was the local banker of a small town out West. This banker was notorious for having extracted a 10-percent interest rate from the community. His epitaph reads:

Here lies old "Ten Percent."
The more he made, the less he spent;
The more he got, the less he lent.
He's gone, we don't know where he went;
But if to heaven his soul has went,
He'll own the place and charge them rent.

And, of course, there have been other famous bankers who have extracted even greater interest rates, and our history records varying experiences and episodes growing out of such practices. There was, for example, one banker out toward North Dakota who gained local fame as a "40 percenter," and during the Green Corn Rebellion he was the first man to be shot at.

HIGH INTEREST IS GOOD FOR YOU?

Even today if a local banker looked his customers in the eye and told them he is about to jack up interest rates because this will be good for them and will stop inflation, I doubt that he would fool anybody. But, of course, things have become much more complicated as greedy manipulations have become more remote and impersonal, originating with decisions in Wall Street and carried out with the help of a misguided Government in Washington. Interest-rate greed is now presented as something good for the country. It is the subject of a great crusade and is surrounded with all kinds of inspiring slogans and quick, pithy little arguments thought up by the public relations experts.

The principal argument being shot at us these days today is to this effect: Since interest yields on long-term bonds—bonds to mature in 10, 20, or even 30 years—are considerably less than 5 percent, and even less than interest rates being paid on money borrowed for only 3 months, the Treasury could manage the debt cheaper if only Congress would repeal the 4¼-percent rate on long-term bonds. According to this charming little argument, the Treasury could then borrow money for 10-, 20-, or 30-year periods at a lesser rate than it is paying for 1-year money, and even 3-month money. "Shift more of the debt to long-term," we are told, "and interest rates will come down." What nonsense.

Is there a Member of Congress who supposes that at a time when fertilizer prices have gone sky high, any sensible farmer would enter into a contract at such a price to purchase his fertilizer requirements for the next 20 or 30 years? No, I think not. Any half-bright farmer would buy only his immediate requirements at such a price. He would wait for the price to come down before making a long-term contract, if ever.

Yet the administration and the big bankers are today telling us that just the opposite policy is the only sound and sensible policy for the Government to follow. We are being urged to permit, aid, and abet a massive refinancing of the Federal debt from short-term issues to long-term issues, not just at the recordbreaking rates now prevailing, but at even more fantastic rates which are not now possible under existing law.

Repeal the existing law, and the people who have driven short-term rates up into

the stratosphere will promptly launch long-term rates into the stratosphere.

IS SHORT-TERM DEBT MORE INFLATIONARY THAN LONG-TERM DEBT?

Another quick, condensed, and slogan-like argument we are hearing is, of course, that issuing short-term debt is more inflationary than issuing long-term debt.

And why is issuing short-term debt more inflationary than issuing long-term debt?

One of the quick answers is that when the banks buy short-term issues, they can take these into a Federal Reserve bank and borrow on them—a process that increases the money supply. More nonsense.

The member banks of the Federal Reserve System are now holding more than $50 billion of Federal securities. No one of these securities is any more or less eligible for a Federal Reserve loan than any other. Furthermore, if bank borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks were limited only by the banks' willingness to borrow and their ability to pledge Federal obligations as security the entire $50 billion of their holdings would have long since been pledged to secure an approximately equal amount of Federal Reserve loans. Yet the record shows that as of last week, the member banks had outstanding only slightly more than $1 billion of loans from the Federal Reserve banks.

The essential point being overlooked in this propaganda argument is that the banks have no automatic privilege of borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks on Government securities, nor on anything else. The limit on such borrowing is not the amount of Federal securities which the banks could pledge nor the banks' willingness to borrow at the current discount rate. The limit to such borrowing is fixed solely by Federal Reserve policy. In other words, the amount of loans which the Federal Reserve banks will make is predetermined by Federal Reserve policy, and this is the amount of the loans the Federal Reserve banks make.

ARE SHORT-TERM ISSUES "MORE LIKE MONEY"?

There is another quick explanation of the slogan that issuing short-term debt is "more inflationary" than issuing long-term debt. It is that short-term securities are "more like money" than long-term securities. More nonsense.

True, in issuing a new obligation the Treasury may, and sometimes does, decide that it will make the issue eligible for purchase by the commercial banks. This is the case of the 1-year bills being auctioned today. And in this case, the commercial banks add to the money supply an amount of new money equal to the amount of the securities they purchase. In other words, the commercial banks create the money with which they buy the securities; but this is no more true of the banks' purchasing short-term securities than it is of their purchasing long-term securities. Both are precisely the same. And the Treasury is equally in a position to decide how much, if any, of a new security it will allow commercial banks to purchase.

So the frequent statement that short-term debt is "more like money," used in the context in which it is being used, is simply another one of those unfounded and misleading slogans. Such is the nature of the propaganda arguments made in support of the idea that the Government should do what the local banker would not do in plain view of the customers who support and patronize the local bank.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT A CEILING ON SHORT-TERM INTEREST RATES

Certainly one thing is clear: Congress should stand firm against the proposal to saddle the Federal Government with high interest rates for the next 10, 20, 30 years, or longer. Assuming that Congress is willing to go along with high interest rates for periods of up to 5 years, then I say let the present administration contract the Government to pay these high rates for periods up to 5 years, but no longer. But as for my part, I would not go even that far. Good sense, I think, should lead us to disapprove the present high rates on short-term loans.

The duty of issuing money and regulating the value of money is a duty of Congress. It is reserved to Congress by the Constitution. This is our problem. The Congress has, of course, delegated these duties, under certain conditions and limitations, to the Federal Reserve System, which is supposed to be an arm of the Congress. Now we sit idly by and watch the Federal Reserve raise interest rates greatly beyond what many of us would approve. The Federal Reserve people have been able to do this simply because they have found a legal loophole in the limitations and conditions previously laid down by Congress. I doubt that anyone thought, when the limit on long-term rates was established, that short-term rates could as a practical matter be driven and held above the long-term rate. Nevertheless, the technical loophole is there; the law is silent on short-term rates, and, as has now been demonstrated, the loophole can be exploited.

Consequently, it seems clear to me that Congress should now amend the law to close this loophole. It should enact a ceiling on short-term rates and thus require the Federal Reserve to carry out the delegated responsibilities of Congress in a way which will permit the Government to live within that ceiling.

A BIGGER HIGH-INTEREST CRUSADE IS COMING

The signs are now clear. The crusaders are upon us. Short of such an affirmative action on the part of Congress, we are going to be in for a great deal more pressure of the same kind as has already been applied, except that this pressure is going to be intensified and increased—if that is possible.

Already the financial journals are predicting that the Federal Reserve will soon raise its discount rate above the already fantastic rate of 4 percent. Such a report appears in the Wall Street Journal of this morning. And, of course, we have recently seen in the daily press an account of the confidential letter issued by the Investment Bankers Association to its members, giving its informed and expert judgment that another increase in the discount rate is coming. A discount rate above 4 percent will signal a general level of interest rates higher than anything we have yet seen at any time during this administration. And, of course, the present rates on short-term Treasury issues are already well above anything we have previously seen during this administration. The crusaders are quite determined. They have in mind a goal which will mean millions, even billions, to the lucky few, but which, unfortunately, represents a raid on the pocketbooks of 99 percent of the American people.

For those Members who may have overlooked the press reports I have referred to, I will insert in the RECORD the New York Times article of Sunday and the Wall Street Journal article of this morning:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1960]

TREASURY OFFERS ITS BEST BARGAIN—BILLS UP FOR SALE TUESDAY ARE LIKELY TO YIELD ABOUT 5¼ PERCENT TO INVESTORS

(By Paul Heffernan)

Unless people have lost all interest in arithmetic, the 12 Federal Reserve banks should be flooded tomorrow and Tuesday with subscription checks for the Treasury's newest public offering of debt securities—$1,500 million of discount bills to come due in a year.

This 1-day sale is the best bargain ever offered in Treasury securities. Because of extraordinary conditions momentarily prevailing in the Government securities market, the bills up for sale Tuesday are likely to yield to subscribers an investment return of more than 5 percent—perhaps even more than 5¼ percent.

This is even better than the deal investors got last fall from a new issue of Treasury notes—the "magic 5s"—bearing 5 percent interest. The 5s now are selling above 100, with the result that the yield to maturity comes to about 4.8 percent.

Moreover, the 5 percent notes will not be paid off until August 1964, while the discount bills up for sale Tuesday will come due within a year. Besides, no secondary market commission expense need be incurred in subscribing to the new issue. Most banks will enter subscriptions willingly in behalf of customers.

The Federal Reserve System district banks, as fiscal agents for the Treasury, will take subscriptions direct. The district banks of the Reserve System are in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco.

BIDDING COMPETITIVE

The bills will be sold at competitive bidding, with yields to buyers depending on the discount cost incurred by the Treasury. Subscriptions for less than $200,000 on a noncompetitive basis will be received, with the price being determined by averaging the competitive tenders. Even subscriptions of only $1,000 will be received.

Yields of 5 percent or more on Treasury bills are an experience new to this country. They first appeared last year. Last week, 13 of the Treasury's 32 outstanding issues of bills sold at discount rates yielding buyers 5 percent or more.

There are two major reasons. One has to do with economic fundamentals; the other with the arbitrary continuing application of long-term debt-cost legislation adopted by Congress during World War I and not since amended.

The economic forces pressing short-term interest rates to high levels stem from the industrial and population boom in which the postwar world is caught. In periods of broad and sustained economic expansion, the greatest pressure falls on short-term lending rates. Savings in even the economically advanced countries in such periods tend to be outstripped by demand for capital, with the result that borrowers are driven to the traditional lenders at short term—the commercial banks.

When the demand for credit begins to deplete the reserve funds that the banks must maintain, the deposit institutions replenish reserves by selling prime investments, such as Treasury securities. As they run out of these, the competition for short-term money becomes intense. Short rates rise sharply as borrowers bid for the shrinking supply of available bank money.

Under such boom pressures, relief is not to be looked for from central banking institutions, because of the inflationary danger attached to diluting a money supply whose purchasing power is threatened with deterioration. This is the financial side of the U.S. economy today. By and large, the same goes for the world's other money centers.

Relief from pressure on the short-term market is usually available in such periods through the expedient of borrowing at long term. This is done anyway by private corporations, if only for the sake of maintaining a balanced debt structure.

The Treasury could probably borrow at less than 5 percent at long term except for legislation adopted at the time of World War I, imposing a cost ceiling of 4¼ percent on any borrowings of more than 5-year term.

This ban is probably the major reason why certain Treasury securities of under 5-year terms now yield more than 5 percent. Until Congress lifts the 4¼ percent cost ceiling, the Treasury has no choice but to continue to offer short-dated obligations.

Washington says it is likely that the cost ceiling will be raised by Congress this year. Congress can be expected to be aroused by the Treasury's incurring costs well above 5 percent at short term when it could raise the money at long term for materially less.

If the long-term cost ceiling does not last much longer, it is conceivable that the high yields now available on discount bills will not last, either. But even if the present tightness in bank money should continue, and even if the high yields of the short market should be exceeded later this year, it is hard to see how individual investors of modest means would be imprudent in joining the growing army of subscribers to the Treasury's short-dated discount-bill debt.

It is possible, of course, that the basic economic problems of the future may carry and keep the short-term interest structure even higher than the levels of today. Forces the world over are engendering demands on the capital markets for which there is little precedent.

There is a constant expansion of consumer demand, one fed by the achievement of the capitalist system in bringing bank and finance company credit on a rationalized basis to the door of the humblest workman. The Communist nations are attempting to adapt this to the socialist system, and, if they succeed, consumer demand will be broadened spectacularly.

The technological dividends of World War II have involved industry in a state of permanent revolution marked by an insatiable demand for new capital.

Finally, underdeveloped nations are resolved to escape from stone-age practices and join the modern world of advanced industrialization. Such a transformation requires the sympathetic understanding of the advanced nations but it needs their capital even more.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 12, 1960]

INVESTMENT BANKERS EXPECT DISCOUNT RATE TO BE RAISED BUT ARE UNCERTAIN ON TIMING

A majority in financial circles is convinced a rise in the Federal Reserve Board's discount rate is in the cards—the only question is in the timing.

A weekly letter of the Investment Bankers Association advised members yesterday that rumors of an increase in the discount rate—the fee Federal Reserve banks charge on loans to member commercial banks—"appeared to be well founded," the Associated Press reported from Washington.

Asked about the AP dispatch, an IBA official said the letter was a private weekly report prepared by an economist of the trade group for its members and did not represent any official IBA policy.

The discount rate moved up to 4 percent from 3½ percent last September. The IBA letter noted that 3-month Treasury bills have been selling recently at yields topping 4½ percent. It noted the Federal Reserve Board normally doesn't like to keep the discount rate below the bill rate for any length of time, on the ground that, theoretically, at least, banks could borrow from Federal Reserve banks at the discount rate to invest in higher yielding bills.

The letter said also a rise in the prime lending rate, the rate charged the biggest customers with the best credit ratings, currently 5 percent, "may take place soon." "Under these circumstances," the letter was quoted as saying, "the Fed [Federal Reserve Board] could not hold the discount rate at 4 percent for long."

The letter noted that the Federal Reserve may want to hold off on any discount-rate move so as not to interfere with a series of Treasury borrowing operations which will run through next month.

In New York a weekly letter by Aubrey G. Lanston & Co., Inc., dealers in U.S. Government securities, noted that an increase in the discount rate "has been talked about for some weeks."

"We would not dare to predict that the discount rates of the Federal Reserve banks will not be raised either this month or next, although we think that the prospects for an increase are not exactly cut and dried," the Lanston letter commented.

The settlement of the steel labor dispute last week was at first considered inflationary and yields on Treasury bills climbed, the letter said. But later analyses indicated the cost of the settlement to the steel companies is about one-half of that experienced in previous postwar settlements, the letter added. "If true, the significance of the steel settlement to future Federal Reserve policy actions is less than was assumed in the market last Wednesday," the Lanston firm said.

The Lanston letter also suggested that rather than increasing the discount rate to bring it in line with other interest-rate levels, Federal Reserve authorities might consider becoming more selective about lending funds to member commercial banks at the so-called discount window.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for an indefinite period, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. SLACK), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HERLONG, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), on tomorrow, for 1 hour.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS and to include a speech.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOSCH (at the request of Mr. MOORE).

Mr. SCHENCK, to place in the RECORD an address made by Mr. ROBERTS before the annual meeting of the Royal Automobile Club of Canada last week.

Mr. HEALEY.

Mr. GARMATZ.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12:30 o'clock p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 13, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1645. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 214 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1646. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 14, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a survey of Little Pass, Clearwater Bay, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1647. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Bureau of Customs covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts, pursuant to section 1(a)(2) of (70 Stat. 648) (31 U.S.C. 701(a)(2)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1648. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Commodity Credit Corporation activities of the Evanston (formerly Chicago) Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1958, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 53 and 31 U.S.C. 67; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1649. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on the activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for the period January 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959, pursuant to title IV, section 404(d), the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1650. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to 20 Stat. 108; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1651. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4248 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the termination of custody of mentally incompetent prisoners"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9539. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 9541. A bill to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 9542. A bill to amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to extend until June 30, 1960, the period within which applications for payments thereunder may be made by former enlisted members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 9543. A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Stones River National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9544. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make real estate mortgage loans on leased lands in Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9545. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in certain Communist-controlled countries or produced from raw materials originating in such countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9546. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9547. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1956, to promote continued efficient and economical operation of the public transportation facilities of the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area by amending or repealing certain provisions of that act requiring D.C. Transit System, Inc., to abandon streetcars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 9548. A bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to Federal ship mortgage insurance, in order to include floating drydocks, graving docks, and basins under the definition of the term "vessel" in such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9549. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to establish minimum standards of public service programing for broadcasting stations, to further the broadcasting of educational and cultural programs, to establish a system of competitive bidding for broadcasting licenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9550. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9551. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in recognition of governmental and private efforts to promote highway safety; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9552. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9553. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 9554. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 9555. A bill to establish a separate appropriation for the Office of Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves, Department of the Navy, for expenses necessary to explore, prospect, conserve, develop, use, and operate the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 9556. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 9557. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 545. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to present to the Senators and Representative in the Congress from the State of Hawaii the first official flag of the United States bearing 50 stars and which is flown over the west front of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9558. A bill for the relief of Sada Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 9559. A bill for the relief of Milos Vujaklija; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9560. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 9561. A bill for the relief of Eftyhios Karalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 9562. A bill for the relief of Antonio Angiuli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9563. A bill for the relief of Josef Enzinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 9564. A bill to provide tax relief to the District Council No. 19 Welfare Fund, now known as Painters District Council No. 19 Welfare and Pension Fund and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9565. A bill for the relief of Anastasios Nastatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 9566. A bill for the relief of Fritz Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Wiktor Golik and Jozsef Kelemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tribute to Hon. Isidore Dollinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 2d session of the 86th Congress there is one colleague whose absence is especially felt by me. I refer to my very dear friend, Isidore Dollinger, who served New York's 23d Congressional District with distinction from the time of his election in 1948 until his recent resignation from Congress.

Isidore Dollinger will be deeply missed by all of his friends here in the House, but especially by those of us from New York who have been closely associated with him. He was very helpful to me when I first came to Congress and I am grateful for his friendship and our association in Congress. I consider it an honor to serve in his place on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He is respected and liked by all who know him and his fine record in public service and politics have earned him his new position as district attorney of Bronx County. I know he will continue to serve the people of the Bronx in the same capable way he did in the U.S. Congress.

I do not know of anyone who does not consider our new district attorney of the

Bronx an outstanding and distinguished gentleman. It is my pleasure to join his many other friends in the House of Representatives in wishing him good luck and happiness.

Dictograph Products, Inc., Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in November 1959, Dictograph Products, Inc., located in my congressional district, celebrated its 50th anniversary in the field of internal communications.

American business can give much of the credit for its rapid growth and highly efficient operating methods to the dramatic advances in the vital area of communications. A significant contribution to this area has been made by companies which have engineered electronic means of voice transmission to fit the varied and complicated needs of individual firms. One of the pioneers in this field is Dictograph Products, Inc.

On its 50th anniversary it received congratulations from U.S. Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller and was presented with a certificate of merit from the city of New York in honor of the occasion.

In tracing the history of Dictograph Products and its founder Dr. Miller Reese Hutchison we can see how American inventiveness built a company that in turn has aided and fostered the growth of hundreds of businesses, small and large, throughout the country.

When Dr. Hutchison perfected and commercially produced his dictograph internal communication system at the turn of the century it was the first of its type ever marketed. The philosophy behind the system is the same today as it was then. In short, the system aimed to supply to the management and operation of every business a means of two-way communication which would be fast, private and flexible enough to fit any organizational plan.

Recognizing its wide application companies such as Sears Roebuck, Pacific Gas & Electric, and Monsanto Chemical became early users of the system. In the 1920's Supreme Court Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes used the system to coordinate his tremendous volume of office work. As these companies and many like them expanded, their intercommunications expanded. Today Dictograph is used by 89 percent of America's leading companies, by more than 30,000 other successful companies and by military installations and Government agencies such as the Pentagon, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

But Dr. Hutchison did not confine himself to one area. He perfected other acoustical devices. The best known of these is the Acousticon hearing aid—the first commercially manufactured electrical hearing device. For this invention he received the Reward of Merit for Scientific Investigation and Invention from Queen Alexandra, of England. He received the medal because of the success of his acoustic appliance in aiding her hearing. Other medals and awards Dictograph has received include the Universal Exposition Medal, the Silver Medal at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, the famed Diplome Bruxelles Exposition Universelle et Internationale, the Grand Prix de Paris, and the Grand Prix Gold Medal Hors Concours.

Today, the company under the leadership of its president, Malte J. Carlson is devoting considerable time, effort, and money to research and further perfection of its products. In conjunction with its golden anniversary in the intercommunications field it introduced a new transistorized system which was heralded by newspapers throughout the country as a major step in humanizing internal communication.

It is fitting that we should focus attention on Dictograph Products, Inc., on completion of its 50th year in the intercommunication field and give recognition as well to its pioneering efforts and contributions in the development of devices to aid the hard of hearing. I am proud to join in paying tribute to this company.

Swastika Vandalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed in recent weeks renewed manifestations of that loathsome affliction called anti-Semitism. The news stories from large cities in the United States and in different parts of the world report acts of vandalism and desecration of Jewish homes, institutions, monuments, and places of worship. I regret to say that my own city of Baltimore is one of these cities.

West Germany, of course, has gotten the most attention, since the current rash of anti-Jewish activities seems to have broken out after two young hoodlums in Cologne defaced a synagog on Christmas Eve.

I trust that those who perpetuate these offenses will be dealt with promptly and sternly, and will be punished to the full extent of the law. Where the laws are inadequate, new laws should be enacted without delay.

The New York Times of Sunday, January 10, 1960, reports that Chancellor Adenauer will ask the Bundestag to amend the penal code with the aim of curbing anti-Semitic activities. The same newspaper also reports that a Labor Member of the British Parliament—Sir Leslie Plummer—is drafting a bill to impose jail sentences up to 6 months for painting swastikas on buildings.

The West German Government has a special obligation and responsibility to deal with this matter, for it must show to the world that the evil spirit of Hitlerism is not rising again from the dead ashes of World War II. I believe Chancellor Adenauer recognizes full well that if Germany fails to do its proper duty, it will forfeit the respect and confidence that the Federal Republic has gained in the free world for its hard work of postwar reconstruction, its contributions to NATO defenses, and its diligent effort to make amends to the surviving victims of Nazi persecution and tyranny.

There have been some attempts, in Germany and elsewhere, to discount the recent actions of racial vandalism as Communist maneuvers to discredit the Federal Republic of Germany and the Chancellor and thereby to serve Moscow's propaganda line in advance of the summit talks. While the Communists are quite capable of resorting to such techniques, so far there has been no real evidence of a Communist plot.

There are indications that the German youth has not been taught in school what the Hitler regime has done in its monstrous assault on humanity. The Federal Republic of Germany would do well, even at this late date, to reexamine its educational policies as well as its laws, in order to extirpate the Nazi influence from German life.

We in the United States need not be smug about the problem. There are many acts of violence and depredations against people and property in the United States caused by racial and religious animosities. We have our own hoodlums and delinquents who paint swastikas and burn crosses and even throw bombs. Sometimes the depredations are against Negroes, sometimes against Jews, Catholics, Protestants, or others. Religious bigotry and race hatred are malignant social diseases which can spread throughout the body politic unless they are treated skillfully and in time.

Many of the reports and news stories depict the offenders as juveniles engaging in a new kind of prank called swastika vandalism. Among those who play these ugly games we might expect to find crackpots, fanatics, professional agitators, psychopaths, and other emotionally disoriented persons. If youngsters are taking a fancy to this evil sport, then I fear that juvenile delinquency is assuming a form even more dangerous than street fights, robbery, and mayhem. For actions which associate youth with religious and racial prejudice strike at the very vitals of American life and freedom. America's future is dark indeed if its youngsters become infected with the virulence of religious and race hatred which has torn nations and continents apart and led to mass murder and frightful wars. We can ignore the crackpots and fanatics but we cannot ignore the youth of America.

Next month Americans will salute Brotherhood Week. I hope that the

President of the United States will find time, in recognition of Brotherhood Week, to make a nationwide appeal to the American people to spur their efforts, individually and through their civic, religious, and local government institutions, to promote good will and understanding amongst all Americans. We owe it to ourselves, to our children, and to the future of the country to condemn the offenses to which I have referred and to hold up the offenders to national scorn and disgrace as betrayers of the free way of life.

Man of the South, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a high honor to wir the award as "Man of the South." This honor was bestowed upon one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. Norman A. Cocke, of Charlotte, N.C., chairman of the board of Duke Power Co., for outstanding accomplishments in 1959.

Mr. Cocke was presented his award at a banquet held at the Charlotte Country Club on December 14, 1959. The Honorable SAM J. ERVIN, JR., senior U.S. Senator from North Carolina, presented the award to Mr. Cocke.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the significant remarks of Senator ERVIN on that occasion:

ADDRESS BY HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Our friend has been chosen to receive this, the Man of the South for 1959, award by the vote of those who know the vast contributions which he has made to the industrial, educational and religious development of the Carolinas.

It is not often that one has an opportunity to express publicly his admiration and affection for a friend whom he has known for many years. Even though the task is simply that of presenting the award, I shall trespass upon your time for a few moments to say something concerning him whom we honor.

On an occasion such as this, we are conscious of the inadequacy of words. We long for the power to use what the poets have called the language of the heart. This is a silent language which finds its expression in deeds rather than words. You spoke the language of the heart when you laid aside your exacting labors and came to this meeting to manifest your love for him whom we honor.

I am compelled, however, to use mere words on this occasion. For this reason, I shall use words which come closest to the language of the heart—the words of a poet—to describe our friend. They are the words which are used by a great poet of free enterprise, Rudyard Kipling, to describe a great American. They are a fitting description of Norman A. Cocke:

"Leal servant, loved master,
Rare comrade, sure guide."

Mr. Whitaker, Mr. Sutton, Dr. Edens, the Reverend Mr. Blair, and Mr. Robertson have recounted to us in well-chosen words the vast contributions of Norman Cocke to the industrial, the educational, and the religious life of the Carolinas.

They have given eloquent expression to the fact that Norman Cocke has been a servant to the people of the Carolinas. I love the old Scotch adjective "leal," and apply it to Norman Cocke because he has certainly been at all times a true-hearted servant to our area.

During the course of his career, Norman Cocke has attained solely upon his own merit positions of high responsibility. For this reason, he can also be fittingly described in the words of the poet as a "master." In his capacity of "master," he has always applied to those subject to his authority the golden rule. As a consequence, all of those who have labored under his supervision join me in declaring that he is a "loved master."

Those of us who are privileged to enjoy Norman Cocke's friendship know that his great qualities of head and heart make him a rare comrade, and that his unerring integrity and sense of the rightness of things make him a sure guide.

This brings me to this question: What makes Norman Cocke a "leal" servant, a loved master, a rare comrade, a sure guide?

It seems to me that the answer to this question is crystal clear. Norman Cocke walks among us in simpleness, and gentleness, and honor.

I use the word "simpleness" to describe Norman Cocke's complete freedom from affectation, from artificiality, and from duplicity.

I do not use the word "gentleness" to imply that he lacks in any respect the characteristic of firmness in circumstances which call for the exercise of that characteristic. I use it to indicate the considerate and kindly attitude which arises out of his inborn love for people of all sorts.

Norman Cocke walks among us in honor because of his complete integrity of thought, word, and deed.

For these reasons, Norman Cocke was well chosen to be the Man of the South. It is my happy privilege to present to him at this time the physical symbol of his selection as such.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, following is my newsletter of January 9, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 9, 1960.

"I, JOHN KYL, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I about to enter. So help me God."

Thus did the Speaker swear in the year's first new Member, JOHN KYL, of Iowa. Not only were all Members reminded of their oath taken a year earlier, but also of the relentless toll that time takes from the ranks of Congressmen. Since Congress adjourned, Representatives Boyle (Illinois), Carter (Iowa), Bush (Pennsylvania), and Senator Langer (North Dakota) have passed on. The total loss since the 86th Congress first convened in January of 1959 now is seven Representatives and one Senator. This saddening experience was heightened by the demise of Dick Simpson (Pennsylvania) Thursday morning. Dick, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means, was a 22-year veteran of Congress. There was no question about the sincerity and depth of feeling of members of both parties paying tribute to his memory.

The reconvening of Congress January 6 was accompanied by a spontaneous and enthusiastic camaraderie as, milling about, Members exchanged greetings on the House floor. The Speaker's birthday the same day was the cause of even more good will as all united in wishing the best for Speaker RAYBURN. Earlier many Members had joined the President and Vice President at the traditional church service.

The President delivered the state of the Union message, as usual, before a joint session of the House and Senate in the House Thursday. Present also were Supreme Court Justices, the President's Cabinet officers, and the foreign ministers, including the Russian Ambassador. The smiling Mr. Menshikov looks surprisingly American in appearance and conduct. Vice President NIXON (President of the Senate) and House Speaker RAYBURN jointly presided. The Speaker introduced the President, who looked fit and happy.

The state of the Union message, 40 minutes long, covered a lot of ground, alternately dealing in generalities and then in specifics. The President spoke with unmistakable forcefulness and confidence. His two themes of peace and freedom struck just the right note, it seemed to me. Particularly pleasing was his stress of freedom, not only in the accepted sense as freedom from oppression between nations, but also as a domestic matter within our Nation, where legislation and the role of Federal Government can jeopardize our personal liberties, as we are forced to pay the tax price and suffer the bureaucratic control of Federal Government programs. For example, the President specifically reminded us that the growth problems of cities must be handled within the traditional balanced framework of Federal-State Government, not "yield to the deceptive bait of the easy Federal tax dollar." Equally satisfying was his emphasis on the need for Government living within its income, that is, a balanced budget. The big surprise of the day was his forecast of a $4.2 billion surplus which he recommended as payment against the national debt. Freedom and individual liberty took on new significance and meaning through this treatment of domestic matters. The Federal Government's legislative action obviously affects each individual's personal freedom—as viewed in specific programs mentioned by the President as warranting Congress' attention, such as labor-management relations, agriculture, education, civil rights, and finally in the inflation which may result from governmental action.

Peace, as freedom from aggression and oppression, received major attention. The President laid the responsibility for today's uneasiness squarely at Russia's door. Our efforts are directed to maintaining peace for ourselves and others, backed up by overpowering military strength. As the President put it, the Soviet threat could be competitive incentive to us, not a fear, with our system, not the Soviet's, offering the only worthwhile prize—freedom.

To accomplish our objectives, the President appealed for cooperation from Congress, noting that he has been politically opposed by Congress more than any other President. There was a significant lack of applause by Democrats throughout the speech. For my part, I thought the message excellent. How-

ever, it is necessary to receive the later, more detailed messages to understand his specific recommendations. The particular areas he mentioned briefly which need further explanation, as I see it, include foreign aid, labor-management relations, agriculture, aid to education, civil rights, and the International Court, all of which reminds me as it may you, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and we must all pay that price, certainly your Congressman.

My efforts to inform the people of their Government will include regular weekly television (WFAA–TV), Sunday, 10:30 a.m., weekly radio (KLIF), occasional daily radio reports, the weekly newsletter (available to all who want it), and the yearly questionnaire.

Let's Bring Social Security Up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, statistics tell us that 8.8 percent of our national population will be over 65 years of age this year. That percentage means 15,805,000 men and women.

In my State of Oregon the percentage of the population over 65 will be 9.2. Of a total of 1,863,000 persons, 172,000 will have passed their 65th birthdays.

These cold statistics concern human beings who have given generously and warmly of themselves. They have fought for democracy. They have helped pull our Nation from the depths of depression. They have unstintingly paid for improvements for all of us.

They have done more than their share. What have we done for them?

It is too easy to condemn the older citizen for not having saved enough money to retire. Well, how many of us have enough money to retire?

We forget that costs have jumped higher and higher. The adequate pension of the thirties and forties is hopelessly inadequate in the sixties, just as it was in the fifties. How much can the woman retiree at age 62 who receives $26.40 buy? How much can the man receiving the minimum retirement of $33 at age 65 purchase?

These questions should not have to be asked.

I believe there are inequities in the present social security laws. These laws are important and complex. It is vital that the system be operated on a sound and fair basis. The system must be under constant study. Here are some changes I believe should be made:

First. Elimination of minimum age for persons receiving disability insurance.

Second. End of discrimination in hiring and paying of persons because of age.

Third. Enactment of the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act of 1959 which passed the House March 16, 1959, and is now pending in the Senate.

Fourth. Removal of restrictions as to the amount of outside earnings a person receiving social security may have.

Fifth. Passage of the Forand bill for hospitalization for retirees.

Sixth. Increase in minimum social security payments at ages 65 and 62 which now are inadequate.

Seventh. Reexamination of the payment system under social security, bringing it up to date to meet current costs.

Throughout the country citizen groups are organizing to help improve existing conditions. In Oregon there are at least two such organizations.

I have never endorsed the program of any particular group. I do believe citizen groups can help point up inequities and can help the Congress write better legislation. I favor any steps through which citizens can inform themselves more fully and organize for political action.

I am concerned, however, when I receive letters such as was written to me last month by a constituent in Mapleton, Oreg. To set the record in order I am, under leave to extend my remarks, placing in the RECORD the communication from Mrs. Laura Atterberry, State secretary for the Social Security Clubs of Oregon, Inc., along with my reply to Mrs. Atterberry.

Changes in the existing law are needed. I am hopeful the Congress will be able to start making them this session.

The letters follow:

SOCIAL SECURITY CLUBS OF OREGON, INC.,
Mapleton, Oreg., December 14, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES PORTER.

DEAR SIR: The United Social Security, Inc., are going over the State showing letters supposedly written by yourself, WAYNE MORSE, and RICHARD NEUBERGER, endorsing their program to those who have a great deal of respect for your views.

——— ——— is now working the Florence area with copies of these letters, saying the original is with the president, Grover Slayter, at 1185 Chambers Street, in Eugene, Oreg.

We of the Social Security Clubs of Oregon, Inc., would like to know if you endorsed their program for $150 a month at age 62 and gave them permission to use it as they are really making money off our elderly people by getting them to join up at $10 a year membership for the first year, dues are not yet set for 1960, but their bill according to the letters are to get real consideration from our Oregon lawmakers in 1960.

——— ——— told, and we have it in writing also, an agent selling memberships receive $4 for from 1 to 10 memberships in a week, from 10 to 20, $4.50 each, and from 20 on they receive $5 each, ——— ——— told sold over 600 memberships in the month of November, we know the older people join because of the letters shown them as well as they are supposed to have a Washington, D.C., office.

Our organization, the Social Security Clubs of Oregon, Inc., would like to know if they have such letters from our Oregon lawmakers or if they have the right to use your good name among our voters to rob our old folks of $10 they cannot afford. Would you send me an article with your written permission to have it published in the Register-Guard and Siuslaw Oar on this matter.

Mr. PORTER, please have this stopped if untrue, for your sake and that of our elderly people, we need a more adequate social security, but not at the expense of our people who need every dime they now receive. I have worked with trying to get better benefits for our aged people for several years. I've yet to receive a dime for my services, our dues are $2 a year and we do not show letters from important people to receive the several hundred members we do have.

The United Social Security, Inc., is advertised as a nonprofit organization but the president gets a wage and each agent receives his commission, is that nonprofit? Please let me hear from you on this matter.

Respectfully yours,
LAURA ATTERBERRY,
State Secretary for Social Security Clubs of Oregon, Inc.

JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mrs. LAURA ATTERBERRY,
State Secretary, Social Security Clubs of Oregon, Inc., Mapleton, Oreg.

DEAR MRS. ATTERBERRY: Thank you for your recent letter relative to the United Social Security, Inc.

I have talked with members of the Social Security Clubs of America, Inc., and with members of the United Social Security Organization, Inc., which I believe you referred to in your letter. As you know, I am doing all within my power to correct existing inequities in the social security laws.

These laws are important and complex. It is vital that the system be operated on a sound and fair basis. It must be under constant study. Here are changes I believe should be made:

1. Elimination of minimum age for persons receiving disability insurance.
2. End of discrimination in hiring and paying of persons because of age.
3. Enactment of my Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act of 1959, which passed the House March 16, 1959.
4. Removal of restrictions as to amount of outside earnings a person receiving social security may have.
5. Passage of the Forand bill for hospitalization for retirees.
6. Increase in minimum social security payments at ages 65 and 62, which now are inadequate.
7. Reexamination of the payment system under social security, bringing it up to date to meet current costs.

You mention in your letter that a campaign is under way to sell memberships in one organization and that my name is being used to endorse the program of this group. I have never endorsed the program of any particular group.

Citizen groups can help point up inequities and can help the Congress write better legislation. I favor any steps through which citizens can inform themselves more fully and organize for political action. Please let me know whenever I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,
CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Government's Role in Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 12, 1960

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1960, our colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], delivered an address at the annual meeting of the Royal Automobile Club of Canada, held this year in Montreal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert this address so

every Member can better understand the role of government in promoting highway safety:

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN HIGHWAY SAFETY

You have honored me by your kind invitation to meet with this distinguished group to discuss one of the most important problems facing your country and mine.

For, in my judgment, we cannot overestimate the importance of this problem of highway safety which we face today. Meetings such as this are of great significance because this is a problem that we, as individuals, can do something about. Too many of our space-age problems seem, at least, to be beyond our reach as we go about the routine of our daily lives.

But not so this problem of traffic safety. Here is a problem that, in a manner of speaking, is on our own front doorsteps, crying out for attention.

Not that we as individuals can solve the problem. Not that the problem can ever be completely solved. But we all can help to reduce the appalling toll of life and limb being taken daily in traffic accidents.

I do not pretend to be familiar with your problem here in Canada but I understand that in many respects that our problems are similar. I do know that the two countries are working together closely. I am told that 3,104 lives were lost in traffic accidents in Canada in 1958. In the United States, between 38,000 and 39,000 are being killed each year.

Canada can ill afford to lose 3,000 citizens a year. The United States can ill afford to lose 39,000 a year, especially when you remember that nearly half of them are being cut down at the very crest of their productive years, in the age bracket between 15 and 44.

I don't want to leave the impression that we have made no progress. The fact that during the last 15 years our fatality rate in the United States has held between 35,000 and 40,000 a year, in spite of the greatly increased mileage driven means that the rate per vehicle-mile has gone down. But a look at the accident statistics shows no cause for complacency. There is much that can and should be done.

The emphasis being placed on safety in this annual meeting is proof you see of the need for action to reduce the traffic toll.

If, by reviewing briefly some of the findings of the congressional subcommittee of which I am chairman, I can throw some light on this problem of ours, it will be the source of much satisfaction to me.

For this is your problem as well as mine. This problem of traffic safety is one that concerns us all. For each of us will have to contribute to the solution of the problem before we get very far in our efforts to reduce this appalling slaughter. It is not enough that we become better drivers. We must give our encouragement and support to those who seek and apply the necessary remedies. That support is going to cost us money. This support may mean a certain curtailment of some of our freedom of action. It may mean that some of those who enjoy driving may have to give up driving. It may mean sending some wornout and unsafe cars to the junk pile. It may mean putting a little less pressure on the accelerator, especially in heavy traffic.

I don't want to bore you with statistics. You are all familiar enough with the facts and figures to know this is a serious problem.

Just for the sake of emphasis let me outline briefly some of the facts brought out in the hearings held by my subcommittee.

These facts are a warning and a challenge to every one of us. And by us, I don't mean those working on this problem. I mean everyone who drives an automobile, or rides in one, or walks across the road here in Canada, or in the United States, or anyplace, anywhere that automobiles are operated.

You don't have to be a driver to be concerned. The toll of pedestrians killed or injured in the United States is appalling.

The problem for the pedestrian is worldwide. I am reminded of a remark made by the late Fred Allen after a visit to Paris. He said that one reason there is a church on almost every corner in Paris is so that the pedestrians can go in and pray before trying to cross the street.

But let me outline briefly the situation in the United States.

Accidents of all types, including traffic accidents, are the third leading cause of death in the United States, being exceeded only by cancer and diseases of the heart and circulatory system.

We are justified in referring to traffic accidents as a major public health problem in the United States.

The death toll from cancer and heart trouble is the cause of much concern, and justifiably so. But the auto traffic death toll is more heartbreaking. Deaths from cancer and heart disease generally occur in the later decades of life. Traffic deaths are striking down the youth of the land who are just entering their productive years.

Of all the young men aged 15 to 24 who died in the United States in 1957, 40 percent died in motor vehicle accidents. One-fourth of the fatalities among young women in the same age bracket resulted from traffic accidents.

As stated earlier, in the United States we are killing around 39,000 people a year in traffic accidents.

Startling as that figure is, it gives only part of the story. That is the dramatic, headline-making part of the story. But behind and beyond is tragedy multiplied many thousandfold in maimed and broken bodies, in families denied the services of a bread winner—sometimes for months, sometimes for life.

In 1957, the best estimate the subcommittee could get from private sources on the number of traffic accident injuries was 1,400,000.

Then, on recommendation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Congress directed the U.S. Public Health Service to make certain statistical studies. That study revealed that the true figure on traffic injuries was nearer 5 million persons, nearly four times the private estimate.

Five million injuries means 25 million days in bed in hospital or home. It means 125 persons injured for each person killed.

Half of those hospitalized for accidents in the United States are traffic victims.

Besides the loss of life and the 5 million injuries, there is a staggering property loss, important in striking a balance when we consider the cost of the measures needed to reduce the traffic toll.

In the United States, the property loss from auto accidents amounts to between 5 and 7 billion dollars a year. In addition the cost of auto liability insurance runs to $3 billion a year, or more.

In a report prepared for Congress last year, the U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that traffic accidents cost $116 for each registered vehicle, which averages 1 cent for each mile driven, or roughly 12½ cents for each gallon of gasoline consumed.

We had warm debates in Congress last year over increasing the gasoline tax to help finance the National Highway System.

Yet, we pay scant attention to this 12.5-cent-a-gallon toll levied by highway accidents. That is worse than a tax. At least, we are getting roads and other benefits from the tax. We are getting nothing but heartaches and shrunken bank accounts from the accidents.

Now, anyone who came along with a proposal that would reduce our gasoline tax even half a cent a gallon would get a respectful hearing.

I think it is possible, if we work together and are willing to make the necessary adjustments, that we can reduce this auto accident levy a lot more than a half a cent for each gallon of gasoline we burn.

Now, I don't believe you are going to improve the situation much merely by asking motorists to stop killing and maiming one another.

We are not going to stop this needless slaughter with slogans. Lectures are not enough. Good intentions are not enough.

Unfortunately, we cannot prevent all accidents. We must accept that.

We can prevent some of the injuries and many of the deaths without preventing the accidents. One way to do this is to give the public safer motor vehicles. During the last session of Congress, I got a bill through the House that will help give us safer vehicles. In a moment, I want to go into more detail on that but now I want to digress a moment to discuss some of the things my subcommittee has discovered regarding this problem of highway safety.

This problem has concerned us in the United States a long time. Back in World War I, we drafted a code of rules for the road.

In 1924 we organized a cooperative movement to promote safety. That was headed by Herbert Hoover, later President. That first conference urged the adoption of uniform traffic regulations. A committee was appointed to draft a model code. In 1926 a model code was approved by a national conference. A model traffic ordinance was drafted in 1928.

No one doubts the importance of a uniform code in reducing traffic accidents in a country as vast as the United States, with people moving rapidly from one jurisdiction to another by the thousands daily.

But, after all these years, we are still trying to get the uniform traffic code adopted.

It is apparent that persuasion is not enough. Something more than logic is needed.

In 1956, in the face of the mounting traffic accident toll, I became convinced that the time had come for the Federal Government to take a hand, if to do nothing more than to outline the problem and suggest steps to improve the situation.

Accordingly, I presented a resolution calling for a congressional investigation.

As a result, I was appoined chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety. Immediately we set to work to learn what we could about traffic safety. We heard leading experts in the safety field. We visited manufacturing plants. We talked with industry safety engineers. We met with medical men whose gruesome job it is to try to save as many of the accident victims as possible. We talked with law enforcement officers who try to prevent accidents.

We came up with certain recommendations. The efforts of 3 active years are included in the subcommittee reports presented to Congress and which have had a wide distribution among people working in the traffic safety field.

We have urged more aggressive action by local communities and the States in carrying out certain basic recommendations of the President's Highway Safety Conference. We urge expanded research into the cause of accidents. We urge the States to adopt the uniform traffic code. We urge that driver examining and licensing procedures be strengthened.

We urged the industry to drop emphasis on speed and horsepower and concentrate on building safer vehicles. They stopped advertising speed and horsepower but kept right on building bigger and more powerful automobiles until the buying public, by turning in increasing numbers to the smaller

domestic and foreign models, forced the Big Three to take a second look.

Our recommendations regarding research are important, in my judgment. We need to know where we have been and where we are going and how best to get there.

Already I have pointed out the inadequacy of the accident statistics available to our subcommittee in 1957. The figures we were given were merely guesses, and not very good guesses at that.

In large and important areas we still are guessing. Research costs money. For some reason, perhaps because of our fatalistic attitude toward auto accidents in general, it has been difficult to get money needed for research.

We were told, for example, that the auto industry has been spending about $5 or $6 million a year on research. All the smugness was taken away from that statement, however, when it was pointed out that this is only a very small drop in a very big bucket when you remember that the industry is selling around $11 billion worth of new automobiles each year.

Last year the U.S. Public Health Service spent $1 million in doing research on all accidents, even though accidents are the third leading cause of death in the United States. That amounts to about $2.50 for each traffic death. On the other hand, we have been spending $40,000 a year on research for each polio death. For each cancer death, we are spending around $360 a year. For each death from heart disease, we are spending around $87 a year on research.

As a result of our subcommittee study, last September I introduced a bill in Congress to establish a National Accident Prevention Center to concentrate upon this important public health problem.

Previously I had introduced a bill to provide Federal aid for driver training. No one questions the importance of proper driver education in reducting the accident toll, especially among our younger drivers. Yet only 16 States provide State aid for driver education programs. It is my belief that a little aid from the Federal Government will encourage the States to establish programs which will far more than pay their way in reducing accidents. Here, in my judgment, is one sure and easy way to reduce this 12.5-cent-a-gallon levy from accidents.

Earlier I mentioned my bill to promote the manufacture of safer vehicles to reduce deaths and injuries. That bill would require that all passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government must meet certain minimum safety standards set by the Secretary of Commerce. It is my belief that this would result in the production of better automobiles for the public by forcing the manufacturers to adopt as standard, or perhaps optional equipment, the safety features required by the Federal Government. The bill was bitterly opposed on the floor of the House on the grounds that it would increase the cost of motor vehicles bought by the Government.

My answer to that is that the cost of these essential safety features largely could be absorbed by eliminating some of the chrome and frills which serve no useful purpose. Even if the safer vehicles cost more money, we can, in the long run, save money by reducing that 12.5-cent accident toll levy.

My subcommittee has favorably reported and the House has passed another important bill. This would require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make a study of the effect of automobile exhaust gases on human health and report to Congress within 2 years, with recommendations, if any, regarding steps necessary to protect the public health. Legislation to attack the exhaust problem is sponsored by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable PAUL SCHENCK, the ranking Republican member on the subcommittee. I mention this to show that there are no party politics in the subcommittee's efforts to reduce the auto accident toll.

There is a growing feeling that auto exhaust gases, in addition to contributing to the dreaded smog which is an increasing menace to urban areas in the United States, is a serious health menace and perhaps an important contributor to certain types of motor vehicle accidents.

It was with the greatest reluctance that I came to the conclusion that we need the legislation mentioned, and other measures.

I am from the South, an area where we cherish the time-honored Anglo-Saxon concept of the importance of protecting the rights and liberties of the individual from arbitrary and capricious government. We have held to and defended that concept of freedom from arbitrary rule for many generations.

We follow the doctrine of State rights. Essentially that means local self-government. It means government by the people for the benefit of the people concerned. It means protection of the rights of the individual to enjoy life and the fruits of his labor as long as he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbor. It means freedom from arbitrary rule, imposed by an absent bureaucracy with little or no knowledge of local conditions.

But absence of government does not mean freedom. It means anarchy.

As a nation we abhor regulation. In view of our similar backgrounds I am sure the same is true here. We resort to legislation only as a last resort. We like to see things done voluntarily.

We want those who have responsibility to use it. The States and local communities, by legislative action, could accomplish many of the things that must be done if we are going to reduce the traffic toll. They could pass legislation to require higher safety standards for vehicles sold within their borders. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce in his report to Congress last year, recommended that the States do this. The point is that in view of the record can we afford to wait for the States to do this?

As pointed out a while ago, with convincing arguments to back up our case, for more than 30 years we have been trying to get a uniform traffic code adopted by the various States. Some progress has been made, but we have a long way to go.

Now, I am not advocating that Congress impose by law a uniform traffic code on vehicles moving in interstate commerce. But there are certain things the Federal Government is going to have to do if we are going to make much progress in the near future.

The Federal Government must help the States with driver education programs. We must do more in the field of research. We must promote the production of safer vehicles by requiring that passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Government meet certain safety standards.

It may be that we shall have to go further than that in enacting Federal legislation.

My point is that if we are going to get the job done, we cannot self-righteously hide behind the cloak of State rights, or reject steps which are going to cost money. If we are going to reduce that 12.5-cent-a-gallon levy we may have to add a few cents to our tax bill. We will have to buy a little more research. We may have to pay a few dollars for safety devices. We may have to hire more traffic patrolmen and pay them better salaries. We may have to spend a few dollars in keeping our cars in repair. Some of those now driving may have to stop driving. After all, driving is a privilege and not a right. No one who endangers the life and property of his neighbor has a right to drive.

I don't think you can catch every drunk driver before he wrecks himself or someone else. But, with proper enforcement, we can keep a lot of drunk drivers off the roads.

I don't think you are going to stop drivers from going to sleep just by passing laws.

There always will be careless and thoughtless people behind steering wheels.

Adequate vehicle inspections will keep many unsafe vehicles off the roads.

Still there will be accidents. We can't stop all these accidents but, as I said a moment ago, we can reduce the number of deaths and injuries without stopping the accidents.

How? By giving the driver and his passengers a safer package in which to ride. We need safer automobiles. Reluctantly, I am convinced that the quickest way to get these safer automobiles is by legislation.

That is not my opinion alone. It is supported by leading specialists who have worked in this field. Its soundness is shown by the studies made by the crash injury research project of Cornell University under the able direction of John Moore, who is well known to many of you in this audience.

My position is supported by the American Medical Association, which has gone on record in support of legislative action in this field. The association presented the subcommittee an impressive list of essential safety features our doctors would like to see built into our automobiles.

My position that safer cars will cut the traffic toll was supported by leading engineers and safety experts who appeared before the subcommittee, including such well-known figures as Dr. T. P. Wright, the distinguished vice president for research of Cornell University, and formerly head of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

To get legislative action, we must have public support. The public must be convinced of the need before they will support legislation to tighten up on driver licensing procedures, to require adequate motor vehicle inspections, to spend tax money on driver education and research, to tell the industry they must build safer vehicles which meet certain minimum safety standards.

As I said before, as a Nation we abhor regulation. We don't like taxes. What is true in the United States likewise is true in Canada, I am sure.

But we have to think of those 39,000 people dead upon our streets and roads. We have to think of the millions of injured.

And, if we want to stop to consider the cost, we must think of that 12.5-cent a gallon levy we pay because of these accidents.

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly the major things I think we must do, and soon, to reduce the traffic toll.

1. We must have legislation to establish minimum safety standards for passenger-carrying motor vehicles bought for Government use.

2. More emphasis must be placed on driver education, both to combat lawlessness which contributes to juvenile delinquency, and to reduce the accident toll in the age bracket where casualties are heaviest.

3. We must continue to urge the adoption of uniform driving rules to apply from coast to coast in both our countries to eliminate dangerous confusion and to plug loopholes contributing to the accident toll.

4. We must spend more on research. Only by research have we made substantial progress against epidemics and mass killers in the public health field and here we are dealing with one of the major public health problems of our time.

Again, let me thank you for your kind invitation to meet with you. My very best thanks go to all of you for your kind hospitality.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in a world so greatly engrossed in the pursuit of material goals and so largely under the tyranny of things, we would keep clear the path to a hallowed temple of the spirit where, in all our concern for the Nation and the world, we bow in humility and reverence, guarding with unceasing vigil the sacred flame of faith, and hope, and love on the altar of the unseen and eternal.

Give us to know with a solemnity that awes our spirits that if a nation values anything more than freedom under God, it will lose its freedom; and that if it is comfort or luxuries, security or money, that it values more, in the long run it will also lose them. So, in this day of contending values gird us at any sacrifice to incarnate and exemplify the faith we proclaim and to be ever loyal to the deathless principles for which even the stars in their courses fight. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

STROM THURMOND, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 11, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2755) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], lie on the desk for the remainder of the session today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SENATOR GREEN OF RHODE ISLAND NOT TO SEEK REELECTION TO THE SENATE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, out of the city of Providence last Monday night there came an announcement that reached into every nook and corner of our State of Rhode Island with a note of regret and a richness of recollection.

I am sure the same sentiments are aroused in all of us in the Senate today.

The announcement was by my colleague, U.S. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, that he will not run for reelection.

It was as though a curtain were being drawn across a great chapter in the history of Rhode Island—yes, and our country's history—by the hand of the only man who could and would make that decision.

The name of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has been inseparable from the fortunes of the Democratic Party in the State of Rhode Island for all the years of this century.

If I seem to speak in a political vein, it is with no sense of partisanship, but merely to record the clear history of our times.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was a Democrat when it was not traditional for a person of his wealth and position to enlist in the then minority party of Rhode Island. But it was consonant with his principles.

No man did more than he to make it the majority party.

Twenty-eight years ago he led his party to power in the State of Rhode Island as Governor. As Governor, he brought a fresh point of view—human and modern—to State government.

For 24 years he has graced this floor as a Senator from Rhode Island. These Halls have been abundant witness to his statesmanship in these critical decades of our Nation's dangers and destiny.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN rose to the heights of dedicated service and personal sacrifice when, last year, he surrendered the prestige and power of the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

He did this in order that his temporary physical handicaps might not impede full progress in a year critical in our international responsibilities.

On Monday night my colleague took another noble step—the voluntary surrender of his assured return for another 6 years in this Senate. This is the Senate that he loves. It is a Senate that loves him, as his associates have demonstrated on more than one occasion.

He has surrendered the rigors of a campaign—the call of the hustings to which he was always delighted to respond—and the thrill of victory which has been his constant reward.

What nights of victory they were—1954—1948—1942—1936—1934—1932.

How those dates, decisions, and issues stir the hearts of all of us.

It has been my good fortune to have shared many of these nights of victory with him and to witness the happy hysteria of the milling crowds, cheering to the echo the ever greater victories of their beloved THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

If there seems a touch of loneliness in the contrast between the crowds cheering a victory and the solitude of sacrifice, let no one misunderstand.

Today the hearts of all Rhode Island are with their neighbor, our colleague. Party lines have never stood against him as a candidate. Party lines melt into one glad acclaim for him as a citizen.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is a man who gives and commands loyalty. Here in the Senate Senators have made their own assessment of his abilities by the honors and responsibilities they have placed upon him.

For him no task was too intricate, no journey too arduous, in fulfilling his obligations. He made himself familiar to and familiar with the far corners of our earth in order the better to discharge his duties.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN never ceased to be the student. He never ceased to be the servant of every good cause, educational, social, philanthropic.

In law, banking and business he lent the wisdom of his experience and the depths of his logic which we have often seen exercised here. Even the most modest account of his life sets something of a record in our official directory. This is altogether fitting his 92 years and his generous investment of them in public service.

Brown University—the school of his heart—continuously and continually honors him; and thus sets the pattern of recognition by all the facets of Rhode Island community existence in which Senator GREEN is a factor and a fixture.

I am sure that the announcement is not a signal of retirement from all this community responsibility.

There is no complete leisure for a man of his loyalties.

It is my hope that Senator GREEN may find time to record for posterity something of the personal history of his times. It will be an invaluable part of the Rhode Island and American record.

It will be an invitation to imitate; it will be a challenge to emulate the achievements of a great American.

As a living document it would continue to be an inspiration to those who had no opportunity to be close to him in the ever-growing years of his ever-expanding life.

This closeness has been the proud privilege of his colleagues of the Senate.

I know Senators join me in this prayer—

May God grant many more years of health, happiness and helpfulness to our beloved colleague—THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that all of us felt a sense of loss when we learned of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to retire from the Senate at the end of this term.

No Member of this body has ever been held in greater affection by his colleagues than has THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and no man has ever given more selflessly of great talents and great patriotism to his country.

The outstanding characteristic of THEODORE GREEN is that he is a kindly man who always has a desire to help others. I shall never forget how helpful he was to me, when I was a freshman Senator, in guiding my footsteps along paths of prudence.

THEODORE GREEN may retire from the Senate, but I know that in a real sense he never will leave the Senate. I believe his genial spirit and his sense of courtesy and fairness and justice will always dominate these Halls, and his friends will always be with him in heart wherever he may go.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in his salute and tribute to our very distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Let me say to the majority leader that I have always regarded Senator GREEN as certainly one of the most gracious individuals I have ever encountered in my life. He has been gracious on every occasion, both early and late, no matter what the circumstance, no matter what the provocation. Along with that, he has preserved great acuity and interest, which are indeed notable characteristics.

How richly we have been blessed and how this body has been enriched by his continued presence here. I value and esteem his friendship. May his days continue in great abundance, and may the new year bring him its choicest blessings.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to join in the tributes which have been voiced on the Senate floor to that grand American, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that it mattered not whether a man was old in years if he were young in heart, because that is what really counts. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is young in heart. In fact, he is far more progressive and more enlightened than many who are barely half his age.

I consider it a great privilege to be able to salute THEODORE F. GREEN in person here today and to express my great admiration for his distinguished career. I wish him all possible happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add a brief and perhaps more personal word regarding the retirement of our colleague from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I knew him first when he was Governor of Rhode Island. Following that, I knew him when he was a U.S. Senator, at the time when I was Governor of Massachusetts.

I have had many associations with him, through mutual friendships, and many occasions social in character. I have always found him to be an able and interesting conversationalist. I have always felt that if I gave him a little "dig" of a personal character or affecting his State of Rhode Island, I would get back an even better one. He has never failed me as the years have gone by.

I look forward to many more opportunities of friendly association and discussion with him. I shall miss Senator GREEN when he leaves this body, where he has been a very distinguished and honorable Member for many years.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senators who have paid their tributes to our comrade of many years, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I served with Senator GREEN on the Foreign Relations Committee when he was its chairman. He always was a most courteous and level-headed presiding officer, and he did an extremely fine job.

I became acquainted with him many, many years ago, when he and I traveled far into the West to attend the funeral of a Senator. On our return on the train, I first became acquainted with this distinguished citizen of Rhode Island. Since that time there has been a close tie of friendship and understanding between us.

Of course, I realize that when this year has ended, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN will no longer be a Senator in active service. But he will always be a Senator in another sense, and we shall always be glad to see him.

So I join with the other Senators who have spoken in paying the highest of compliments to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is a remarkable combination of many virtues: ability, integrity, love of fellow man, sense of humor. I know of nothing I could say uncomplimentary about the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, even if I were sorely pressed to do so. He is beloved by all his colleagues.

When we repair to the little room where only Democratic Senators have lunch, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island has a chair at the head of the table. Many a time I and others have gathered around, to partake of his wisdom, to enjoy his mirth and fellowship.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate, he has provided vigorous and progressive leadership. He has demonstrated wisdom. He has been foresighted. He has been compassionate and understanding. Never once have I heard an ill-tempered word from him; on the contrary, always he addresses himself to the merits of an issue, and does so with a vision far greater than most of us are privileged to have.

I regret that Senator GREEN is to leave the Senate. We shall miss him greatly. We wish him Godspeed. Wherever he goes, he will take with him the love, the affection, and the best wishes of all his colleagues.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a very recently elected Member of the Senate, I wish to join in the kind and very true words which have been spoken by my senior colleagues with respect to the services of our good friend, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who has treated this new Member of the Senate with consistent courtesy, and has proffered the hand of friendship, and has guided me on many matters of important policy. His departure from the Senate will be a real personal loss to me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my genial neighbor from Rhode Island, Senator GREEN. It was with much regret that I noted he did not intend to run again for office as a Senator of the United States.

To all Senators he has been an example of real durability. I think there is no precedent in the history of the Senate for service such as his, since he was originally elected at the age of 70, and is retiring some 22 or 23 years later.

I certainly congratulate him upon his remarkable accomplishments, and on his outstanding service to his State and his country; and I wish him the best of good health and happiness in the years to come, which I hope may see him attain the age of 100.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to the voices of those paying tribute to the senior Senator from Rhode Island. As one of the most junior Members of this body, I think I can offer an observation to one of the most senior Members that comes from experience as well as from the heart; that is, as one newly arriving in the Senate, looking for new ideas and for inspiration, the junior Senator from Wyoming found them in the person of the senior Senator from Rhode Island. I want him to know what his young ideas have meant to a relatively young Member of this body. I pay my very deepest respects to him for his inestimable service in the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as a Senator from a New England State and as a neighbor of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, I wish to add my voice to the voices of my colleagues in expressing my appreciation, respect, and affectionate regard for our beloved colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in wishing good health and happiness to our friend and colleague, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island.

To his colleagues in the Senate he is a joy and an inspiration. His example is an indication that there must be something about the air in this Chamber which gives men a zest for living and

enjoyment in dealing with the Nation's problems, if they but know how to deal with them. The Senator from Rhode Island knows how to do it. I congratulate him for his honored presence in this Chamber for so many years.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues in conveying best wishes to Rhode Island's first citizen, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

The newspaper article which I read stated that Senator GREEN would not be a candidate for reelection this year and that his decision was reached because he felt that his health would not permit him to serve another 6-year term. For a brief time last evening I was inclined to agree with that account, because when I was driving home I saw Senator GREEN standing on a loading platform, waiting to take a street car to his place of residence, instead of walking, as he usually does. But upon reflection, I was willing to excuse him because it was then almost 7 o'clock in the evening, and I knew personally that he had started his working day very early.

Seriously, these Legislative Halls, Rhode Island, and the Nation have profited by the fact that when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who was born 92 years ago, reached manhood, he decided to place his talents, energy, and ability at the disposal of the people of his State, and then of the people of the Nation.

During his service at home in Rhode Island and during his service here, he has made, as all of us so well know, a magnificent contribution to the public welfare.

I, too, wish him many more years, each of them happy and rewarding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with great regret that I read the news stories yesterday of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not to seek reelection to the Senate when his term expires this year. I had hoped and expected that he would stay with us until he reached 100 years of age. I thought that was the general understanding of all his colleagues. But he has changed his mind.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is, I believe, the only man in the history of the U.S. Senate to have been honored with the title of chairman emeritus, following his retirement as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Except for the interlude of the 80th Congress in 1947–48, Senator GREEN has served on the Foreign Relations Committee since a few months after he entered the Senate in 1937. He and I have served together for the last 10 years, and it was my difficult task to succeed him as chairman last year, when, despite the unanimous protests of members of the committee, he sought relief from that exacting assignment.

When Senator GREEN retired as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee last year, he lost not one whit of his interest in the committee or his devotion to its work. I have a particular personal debt to him for his great assistance to me and for his never-failing readiness to relieve me in presiding over the committee and to undertake any assignments which were appropriate to the occasion.

Senator GREEN has brought to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee the wisdom which comes only from long experience, the knowledge which comes only from personal acquaintance with most of the world's statesmen, and the courage of his convictions. All of these things he has combined with a gentle yet penetrating humor which on many occasions has illuminated an issue at the same time that it has enlivened a tedious meeting.

As all of us know, Senator GREEN has traveled widely throughout the world. In fact, I believe he has traveled far more than has any other Member of the Senate, and he probably knows more of the leading citizens of the world than does any other Senator.

Senator GREEN has indefatigably sought to find out for himself. If there is any aspect of human affairs in which he is not interested, I do not know what it is. He is equally at home poking into archeological ruins in the jungles of Cambodia or discussing world politics in a European chancellory.

He has likewise been equally at home and equally successful as a college professor, as a lawyer, as a businessman, as a politician, and as an amateur wrestler.

I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues on the committee when I say we will miss Senator GREEN very much, next year; and we look forward with interest to learning which career he will choose to pursue next. Whatever it is, I am sure it will be a great success. He will take with him our wishes for every happiness.

Mr. President, I anticipate a very busy session this year, and I look forward to Senator GREEN's active assistance and participation in the work of the committee during the remainder of this Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join with the other Senators who today have spoken on the subject of the retirement from this body of our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

I first heard about Senator GREEN's proposed retirement over the radio, the night before last. Actually, I could hardly believe that news. In fact, when I saw Senator GREEN yesterday morning, I told him that I felt that he had let me down, because 5 years ago, immediately following his last election, he had told me that he intended to serve in the Senate until he was 100 years of age; and I remember that at that time he said, "The only thing that disturbs me about doing so is that in order to serve that long, I shall have to run for election twice more, because when I finish my next term, I will be only 99."

On yesterday, I said to him that I had told many groups about that statement by him, and I had added to it, "And I will be willing to wager that he will be there, too." But now he is taking himself away.

I wish to say that one of the highlights in my service in the Congress of the United States has been the privilege of enjoying the friendship and the fellowship of this wonderful man.

Since he retired from the active chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee—in fact, Mr. President, I do not quite know what that really means, because even as chairman emeritus of the committee, he has been about as active as he was when he was the chairman of the committee—but since he has given up the responsibility of the active chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee, it has been my privilege to sit by him in the committee. I have enjoyed my service with him in the committee and here on the floor of the Senate, during the years I have had that privilege. And, of course, I have especially enjoyed also the privilege of his friendship.

Mr. President, there are very many other fine things that can be said about this very estimable gentleman. After all, a great many things add up the total of the wonderful, genial companion and man that Senator GREEN is.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has referred to Senator GREEN'S travels. He has traveled to many parts of the world; and some of us have had the privilege of traveling with him, as I have done. I remember that in 1951, nine members of the Foreign Relations Committee, under his chairmanship—at that time he was the senior member of the committee who took the trip, although he was not then the committee chairman—went to Europe, where we visited several of the NATO countries, and held hearings and made a study, over a protracted period of time. I had heard a great deal about Senator GREEN'S stamina on trips, and I saw it manifested then. Many of us thought we were young fellows; but many a time we would seek the opportunity to take a midafternoon rest, during the heat of the day in some of those countries. But not so Senator GREEN. He was always ready and on the go.

I remember that on one occasion, when we were in the city of Athens, the weather was very warm. We had lunch that day at a yacht club; and after the lunch, we were told that it might be well for us to return to our hotels and rest during the hot part of the day, and then late in the afternoon go to the Acropolis. Most of us took that advice. But did Senator GREEN? No, Mr. President; quite the contrary. Later, when I talked with a young Foreign Service official who was accompanying Senator GREEN, he told me that Senator GREEN almost worked him to death. First of all, when returning to the city, the road led along a beautiful stretch of water; and Senator GREEN stopped there and took a swim. Then, while the others of us were resting in the cool of the hotel, Senator GREEN was out in the city, visiting some of the excavations of the ancient ruins, studying archeology.

In the late afternoon we went to the Acropolis; and as we were going up to it, we heard someone climbing behind us. When we turned around and looked back, we saw Senator GREEN rapidly climbing the hill; and the young man who was

accompanying him was several steps behind him, with his tongue virtually hanging out.

Many other stories could be told about the stamina and the durability of Senator GREEN. Much more could be said of his great interest in a host of subjects. He is a wonderful person.

I have known Senator GREEN best during the course of my service on the Foreign Relations Committee. He is a magnificent Senator and a priceless friend.

It is with genuine regret that I think of his retiring from membership in this body.

Wherever Senator GREEN goes, whatever occupation he takes up, even if he decides to get married, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has suggested as a possibility—for Senator GREEN is the most eligible bachelor in the entire Senate, and perhaps in the country at large—whatever his future endeavors may be, I certainly wish for him, and I am certain this is equally true of all the other Members of this body and of all other persons who know him, many, many years of great happiness.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Good Book tells us that when a man has lived a life span of 3 score years and 10, the time then comes when he can rest on his laurels and spend his declining years enjoying well-earned rest and retirement. It is a rare privilege to rise today to honor a man who began a completely new, vigorous, and demanding life at the time he reached 3 score years and 10. I say with confidence that the record he has made will never be duplicated in the history of this country. Now, at the age of 92, he has served 23 fruitful years in the U.S. Senate.

THEODORE GREEN has played a large part in charting our Ship of State through the most perilous periods this country has ever known. Next to the occupant of the White House and his Secretary of State, no individual has a more responsible and demanding position in regard to the external affairs of the United States than does the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As a member or as chairman or chairman emeritus of this committee, Senator GREEN has served with three Presidents and seven Secretaries of State. The duties and responsibilities that were inherent in this position would have taxed both the physical and mental facilities of even the youngest of men. No man, regardless of age or intellect, could have done a better job than has been performed by Senator GREEN in this long period of service.

Our country is most fortunate when it has public servants whose driving motivation is based solely and alone on a passionate love and devotion for the welfare of this country. Senator GREEN is one of those rare individuals to whom emoluments of office and material gain have no attraction whatsoever. His reward could only be the self-satisfaction of a job well done and the knowledge that his efforts contributed substantially to the security, welfare, and future of this country.

When the 87th Congress convenes next January, there will be a void that will be keenly felt by every present Member of the U.S. Senate. Not only do we love and respect THEODORE GREEN, but we have learned to rely on his acumen in so many fields of legislative effort. He is an elder statesman who never became an elder. No man in public life today and few that will come tomorrow will ever deserve of their country a higher niche in the honor, adulation, and respect of all the people of these United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a very just and much deserved tribute to the illustrious and distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Senator GREEN has been described this morning by my colleagues in most illustrative and definitive terms. The Senator from Arkansas spoke of him as a teacher, as a businessman, as a Governor, as a political leader, as a statesman, and as a wrestler—an amateur wrestler, but with the qualities of a professional, I should add. And this great man has wrestled with many a problem and, insofar as my memory recalls, he has always pinned those problems to the mat.

Senator GREEN is an example of a forever youthful spirit, not only here in the Senate, but in all his many activities. I have admired this man much, not only because of his attention to detail in the Senate, his dedication to public service, his remarkable qualities, character, and integrity, but I have admired him because he has had such a full life. He is interested in everything in God's creation.

He has always attracted great public attention, not because of some particular twist of a phrase, even though he is very capable of that, but primarily because of his wholesome activities, his diversity of interests, and the vigor and vitality with which he throws himself into these many areas of activity.

Senator GREEN is a partisan, too, and he is a good partisan. He is a real Democrat, with a capital "D" and a small "d." I know of no man who has a more progressive and liberal record in Congress, and yet he maintains the respect of persons of every political persuasion.

He has apparently no doubts, either, about his votes. I myself have many times been concerned as to how I should vote. That doubt was resolved when I looked over and heard Senator GREEN vote, with a true tone and with complete confidence and understanding and assurance. He has said either "yea" or "nay," and there has not been even a quaver in his voice when he has spoken his judgment. The trumpet is certain, not uncertain.

Though a great partisan, he has been a great public servant, and as a Governor of his State he attained the respect of other Governors, both before and after he was Governor. He was a political leader who built a political organization in the State of Rhode Island that was the envy of political leaders in every State in the Union.

Of course, I think one of the finest demonstrations of his great leadership and qualities is a gentlemen who followed in his footsteps, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and I say this most sincerely and respectfully. Of course, the junior Senator from Rhode Island has his own standards and leads his own life, but he has told his colleagues and friends of his profound respect and admiration for Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I therefore pay my respects to this man who has decided to do something else, who has decided to turn over his place in the Senate to someone else, so that he can return to amateur wrestling, business, teaching, or whatever he desires. I know it will be something, and it will be interesting and it will be done well.

Of course, I am not sure whether he will change enough to cease being the Nation's most eligible bachelor. I know this man can adapt himself to anything. I merely wish to say to him that now, his duties as a Senator having been fulfilled, this Nation's most eligible bachelor will be more eligible than ever.

So I pay my sincere respects to a wonderful man and a fine friend. I should like in this message to extend to him the respects of one of his lady friends, Mrs. Humphrey, who thinks very well of him. On one occasion I found them both standing on a street corner, ready to get into a cab together, until I interfered. I think the fact that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island would want to escort her is as nice a compliment as could be paid to any lady. He has done that for other ladies, but, of course, I have not told this to Mrs. Humphrey.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I rise to salute the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, and to add my inadequate words to the tributes which have been pouring in from all over the Senate floor this morning.

First, I wish to say that I am sorry to note this depletion in the ranks of us younger Members of the Senate, because in spirit the Senator from Rhode Island has more vigor, more imagination, and more drive than any of us who are members of the so-called freshman class.

I appreciate fully that the Senator from Rhode Island is a distinguished national figure. I particularly appreciate, from the tributes which have been paid to him this morning, that he has a warm place in the hearts of his colleagues in the Senate. At the same time, I should like to claim a part of him for our common region of New England. His life, his career, and his accomplishments have a particular meaning for us in that six-State region of the country. He is a New Englander and a New England figure, radiating warmth, great capacity, humility, and deep concern in regard to the needs of New England, as well as the overriding problems of our country.

I have a personal regret, in that my service with him in the Senate will be

so brief. I have looked forward to the 8 years which the distinguished Senator from Alabama believed would be available to us of his service in the Senate, as an opportunity to learn from his great experience. I regret deeply that I shall not be able to share much longer the companionship which many of our other colleagues in the Senate have enjoyed for a long time.

Speaking for my own State of Maine and for New England as a whole, I should like the Senate to know, if there is any doubt—and I am sure there is none—that we admire Senator GREEN, we love him, and we regret his decision to terminate his service in the Senate.

Because of the fact that I come from a State which for a very long period had not elected members of my party to office, I have had to admire him, up until last year, from afar. As a Democrat I took considerable satisfaction from the fact that he was among those who led the Democratic Party in Rhode Island out of the wilderness. We undertook to emulate his fine example in the State of Maine, with some small measure of success, which I think he also enjoyed.

So I say to Senator GREEN, it is with great personal regret I note his decision to terminate his service in this great body.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I think one of the greatest forces that is met in the experience of a Member of this body is pressure. The senior Senator from Rhode Island, in my opinion, is immune to pressure. He has proved that for 92 years.

However, now that he intends and plans to give up his membership in the Senate, I doubt if he will be quite so immune to pressure. On many occasions I have stood in amazement and listened to how he has resisted the pressure of matrimony. Now that he has shown in the Senate so many fine traits and characteristics, which many of us would like to emulate, and henceforth his duties will be less onerous and burdensome, there will be more pressure. I am sure Mrs. Humphrey is not the only person who has had designs on the senior Senator from Rhode Island. I can speak for a 17-year-old daughter who cherishes more than any other picture in her collection one she had taken on a birthday with the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

We have in our hearts a certain sadness because of his determination to retire. There is also, however, a feeling of gratefulness for the service he has performed. He will leave the duties of the senior Senator to a qualified and respected Member of this body, Mr. PASTORE.

All of us wish that the future life of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island will be one of continued happiness and pleasure, and that in whatever activity he may engage after his retirement from the Senate, it will be not only statewide, but also national and international.

I am very happy for the few years I have had the pleasure of being in the body with him, for the many moments I have had at the lunch table with him, and for the sound advice which he has so generously given.

So to you, Senator GREEN, many, many years of continued good health and happiness.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I too wish to join with other Senators in expressing my sadness and regret on hearing the announcement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island that he does not intend to be a candidate for reelection in 1960.

He is indeed a rare man—a great man—and I consider it a privilege to have the honor of serving with him throughout the sessions of the 86th Congress.

It is noteworthy, Mr. President, that the senior Senator from Rhode Island is a frequent user of the Senate gymnasium facilities, where he exercises with remarkable vigor. Whether in the gymnasium, the Senate floor, or wherever he may be approached, he is never too busy or too preoccupied to discuss a problem or offer advice to his colleagues. We hold him in the highest admiration.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that last year, shortly after the 1st session of the 86th Congress commenced, a seminar was organized to aid newer and younger Senators of what we call the class of 1958. We would meet on Monday evenings in the Old Supreme Court Chamber and have a social hour. Following dinner, we would listen to an address by some distinguished American. The purpose of this was to help us, as Senators, to better understand the problems of the Nation and the world, so that we could serve our constituencies and the Nation more adequately.

Among the younger Senators who frequently attended those seminars was the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

His devotion to duty, his long experience in both executive and legislative office, and his unrelenting efforts in the interests of our country will be sorely missed. His achievements will be long remembered. There is no finer example of patriotism than his. In this day and age, with so much emphasis and value placed upon power and influence, he voluntarily stepped down as chairman of one of the most powerful standing committees of the Senate, despite the unanimous vote of the committee members that he remain as chairman.

If the Senator from Rhode Island cannot be prevailed upon to change his mind, I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow at his decision, and in wishing him a happy retirement, knowing, as all of my colleagues do, that the senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, will always be available to the Nation for counsel and advice.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in what I know is the unanimous feeling of regret on the part of our colleagues in the Senate at the retirement of our very esteemed, beloved, and distinguished colleague [Mr. GREEN], our alltime senior Member. His departure will be a great loss to this body.

I do not know of any man who is more universally loved, respected, and admired. The fact that he has no enemies is not due to any lack of determination or courage, or forthrightness of expression. He has been a leader in the field of his interests. He has contributed to the information and enlightenment of his colleagues in all the discussions in which he has participated. He will be missed.

He leaves behind him a distinguished career of service which will never be forgotten, and which will be inscribed indelibly in the annals of this body.

I really do not know why the very youthful senior Senator from Rhode Island wishes to retire. A man of his years, who has retained the viewpoint and spirit of youth, ought not to take this conservative position. It is the first time I have ever known him to make such a serious error.

I know that if he were to change his mind in the next few months and decide to remain with us, his decision will be universally applauded. I hope his decision is not irrevocable. I think he will be prepared to live to be a hundred, and serve very usefully here or outside the Senate.

We love you, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, and we regret to see you go.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and all my other colleagues in expressing deep regret upon the announced departure from the Senate of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Senator GREEN has been chairman of two of the most important committees of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am sorry to know that he is voluntarily retiring at the end of his present term, because I know his loss will be felt, the advice which he has always so generously given will be missed, and the humor which he has always displayed will be lacking. He has performed great service, not only in behalf of his State, but also in behalf of our country and the entire free world.

I express the hope that even though our distinguished and lovable colleague is retiring on a voluntary basis, he will not forget us but will come back many times to see us, so that we can partake of his wisdom and advice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and other Senators who have preceded me in expressing my very great pleasure at having been privileged to serve in this body with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and my regret that he has announced that at the end of the current session he will not be a candidate for reelection.

It has been one of the great pleasures of my life to know a man of his character and vigor, and who has made so great a contribution to good government at home and abroad, throughout a long and useful life. I shall remember with great pleasure the privilege of serving with him here and of being with him, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said, on one occasion in a

foreign land, when he was the youngest member of the group; of seeing him, as another Senator said, in the gymnasium; and in all the other fields of our activities.

I have had many contacts with him. It has been an inspiration to have served with a man who, though old in years, is young in vigor and spirit.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to add my voice to the very fine tributes paid today to THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island. It was with a profound sense of regret I learned of his decision not to seek reelection.

Regardless of political affiliation, I am sure all of us are very sorry that this distinguished public servant and statesman has decided not to attempt to return to the U.S. Senate. He has served his State and our Nation with distinction, both as a State official and as a Federal official. To all his activities he has brought wisdom and sound judgment rarely equaled. He has been a particularly astute student of international affairs, and in his work as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations he contributed substantially to this Nation's efforts to solidify the free world alliance in the cold war struggle with international communism.

It is reassuring to know that his keen intellect and sage advice will be available to the Senate throughout this session. I am confident that in the many years which lie ahead for our beloved colleague, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN will continue to work for those causes he feels best serve the welfare of the State of Rhode Island and of the United States. He would have it no other way. All of us are the richer for having had the privilege of working with him and knowing him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Member of the United States Senate is held in higher esteem by his colleagues than the distinguished and beloved senior Senator from the State of Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Lawyer, educator, scholar, State legislator, successful businessman, elected and reelected chief executive of his own State, and elected to the U.S. Senate, he has served the public with distinction for many years.

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has carved for himself a long and unique chapter in his life of service to the people. During every moment of it he has held steadfast to the principles of good government as he saw them, and to all his work he has always brought a smile and a whimsical outlook which has delighted his colleagues and all others who have had the privilege of hearing him.

At a time when most persons would have long since been in retirement, THEODORE GREEN determined to become a candidate for the Senate; and at the age of 70 he held up his hand and commenced 22 years of honorable service here.

I have known him in the short 7 years I have served in the Senate, as an able presiding officer over the Foreign Relations Committee when I would go there and listen to the deliberations of that important group of the Senate. I have also had the honor of being associated with him as a fellow member of the delegation from our country to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization parliamentary conference on three occasions, in which capacity, as here, he gained the respect of those who knew him and worked with him.

I am one more Republican to speak in praise of the record of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. Other Republicans may speak for themselves. Each of us may speak for himself. I am happy to join our Democratic colleagues in wishing THEODORE the best of health as he retires, looking forward, nevertheless, to his friendly counsel and his visits to the Capital of our beloved Nation again and again and again.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, like the other Members of the Senate and the hundreds of other friends and admirers of Senator THEODORE GREEN, of Rhode Island, I read the announcement of his planned retirement with deep regret.

Few men in the history of our Nation have served so actively, so capably, and so long as has Senator GREEN. His public service goes back before the turn of the century and includes military and civilian service during four wars and other periods of crisis of our Nation. His almost three-quarters of a century of service could never be completely appraised or evaluated, but I know we all can agree that Senator GREEN, throughout his public life, has treated public office as a public trust.

The confidence which the people of Rhode Island have in their senior Senator is shared with the rest of the Nation.

I sincerely regret that he is retiring from the Senate, but I am confident we will be hearing from him right along, even past the centenarian point of his life.

I hope Senator GREEN will have many more years in this world, and I hope he will continue to serve in the future as he has in the past. I know that he will do that.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to join with the group of distinguished Senators who have paid tribute to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. When I first had the privilege of coming to the National Capital to work in behalf of statehood for Hawaii, I found him to be not only courteous, but most helpful.

In the new State of Hawaii, we are rather proud of the basis on which the people of every racial group and every cultural background live. We refer to it as the spirit of aloha. I think of our distinguished colleague as one who in his thinking, in his speaking, and in every other way exemplifies that spirit. It is a privilege to pay tribute to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to add my tribute to the many which have been bestowed upon the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

It was with great sorrow that I received the news of Senator GREEN's decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. His keen perception, outstanding foresight, and brilliant mind will be sorely missed by those of us in the Senate and by Washingtonians generally. His wisdom, character, and vigor have been demonstrated on innumerable occasions throughout his successful career. Senator GREEN's friendship is treasured by all those who know him.

I welcome the statement by this great gentleman that his decision not to seek reelection is not equivalent to retirement from public life. I trust that his invaluable service will continue to be available to the people of Rhode Island and of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the Senate today in expressing respect and affection for Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. I became a Member of the Senate long after Senator GREEN had earned his place as the "Grand Old Man" of the Senate. But to Senator GREEN age differences have never been important. He has always been as interested in the work of a freshman Senator as of a senior Senator. From my first day in the Senate I always felt I could turn to him and receive wise advice and helpful encouragement. I count it one of my great good fortunes that I will have been in this body during 8 of the 24 years of Senator GREEN's tenure.

Senator GREEN's life spans the greatest period of change America and the world have seen. It is startling to realize that the Civil War had ended just 2 years before he was born. Great events have happened since, and Senator GREEN's career has matched those events.

In one lifetime he has done enough to satisfy the ambitions of several other men. He has been soldier, statesman, politician, lawyer, banker, teacher, philanthropist, and Senator. When he entered the Senate, he had already achieved the greatest success and honor in at least seven careers. Perhaps this helps to explain his youthful approach as a Senator, for he tackled this new challenge with all the vigor and enthusiasm of an ambitious and capable man, determined to make his mark in the world. And make his mark he did.

If the Senate was THEODORE GREEN'S eighth life, and if he is limited to the proverbial cat's nine—although this seems unlikely, considering the subject—then we must look with interest and some envy to his new achievements and honors.

Mr. HENNINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, at the outset I should like to say that I regret I was called from the floor during the period of time when tributes were paid to the distinguished dean of the U.S. Senate, our beloved friend and colleague, the great Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I hope, at an appropriate time in the next few days, to make a more complete statement, in an effort at least partially to express some of the admiration, the affection, and the appreciation which, together with all my colleagues, I have for Senator GREEN, and to express again, as I have to him personally, my deep regret that he has come to the decision at which he has arrived.

He will always be one of us in spirit, even if he is not always with us, sitting on the floor and in committee, as he has been for these many years.

During the greater part of his life, Senator GREEN has devoted himself to

the public service, as Governor of his State, as a U.S. Senator, as a member of the board of Brown University, and in many other activities which I shall later mention.

I should like to say that I have had the opportunity and privilege of serving with him for 10 years on the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that it was when he relinquished the chairmanship of that committee that I became chairman of it. I am making every effort to follow in the path which, as chairman of that committee, he so well delineated. I have been guided and influenced and immeasurably assisted on many, many occasions by his unfailing good counsel and his expression of friendship and statesmanlike courage on so many matters which have come before that committee, this body, and the Democratic policy committee, on which I have served for 7 years with Senator GREEN. I look forward during the remainder of this year to continue to be guided and assisted by his presence and his very active participation, indeed, in the deliberations of that body as well.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Mr. President, unfortunately, I was unable to be in the Chamber when, earlier today, the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and many other Senators joined in tributes to the beloved senior Senator from Rhode Island, the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and mentor and friend of a generation in the Senate, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

But I cannot let this day pass without adding my voice to this chorus. Senator GREEN and I have had our names linked frequently since I have been here, representing as we have the two poles of chronological age in the Senate. I have been pleased and proud when this has happened. When we shared a birthday cake for the photographers once, the twinkle in his eye and the cheer of his smile made him look the younger.

I served under him on the Committee on Foreign Relations when he was its chairman, and his kindliness and wisdom will be cherished by me always.

His friend, a friend of the Senate, William S. White, paid a wonderful tribute to Senator GREEN in the Washington Star today. He has spoken, I think, for all of us who have known and worked with Senator GREEN, for a long or for a short time, in characterizing him as a "combat soldier, and not a talking soldier."

We all shall miss him when he retires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Senator GREEN Nears Retirement," written by William S. White, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 13, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN NEARS RETIREMENT—RHODE ISLANDER LAUDED AS TRUE LIBERAL, AND YOU KNEW WHERE HE STOOD

(By William S. White)

The old, old man is going at last from the Senate.

In the 93d year of his life, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, has announced he will not seek reelection to his fifth term because he does not feel well enough.

He is not, of course, indispensable. And a man can work only so long as strength remains. Too, his State will have no trouble in finding a replacement.

All the same, when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN leaves, the Senate will be the poorer, in the strictly human sense, anyhow, for his departure. For, oddly, in this correspondent's time it has been mainly the very old men there who have given a special quality to the place.

There, more often than not, it is the very old who will take the greatest risks. Who are the least influenced by today's universal urge for personal security. Who are the most ready to run forward to meet the possibly menacing tomorrow. They are, again more often than not, the best of the individual men, the free and fighting spirits who make the youngsters look rather like conscientious objectors.

To be sure, the problems of the aged—which is a Nice-Nelly phrase admitting that society tends to throw the aged upon the ash heap—exist in the Senate, too. Even there, men can grow too old to go on any more—but happily it takes an awfully long time to grow that old in the Senate.

Senator GREEN at a mere 70 carried not simply a full load but a great load, as a personally aristocratic and privileged man who went all the way with the Roosevelt New Deal. Senator GREEN at a ripe 80 was tough enough and strong enough to take on one of the hardest and most thankless jobs the Senate had handed out in this century.

This was to serve on the first committee that investigated Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's charges of communism in the State Department. Nobody could hope to win in that mare's nest—nobody but, in the short run, Senator McCarthy himself. For fear and suspicion were loose in a country that had suffered great and undeniable setbacks from imperialist communism. The Nation was ready for a devil hunt; it was all there to be exploited.

But old Senator GREEN, unlike some of his committee colleagues, faced the unalterable facts with the special candor and realism of the Senate's aged men. He knew Senator McCarthy and his associates were making a bitter brew that at length would spill over on the Republicans as well—as it did when the Eisenhower administration came to power. But he knew that, first of all, Senator McCarthy was reaching for the throat not simply of President Truman and Secretary Acheson, but of the Democratic Party which Senator GREEN loved.

So, full of the self-honesty of the old Senate types, T. F. GREEN from the first moment made no pretense to an objectivity that could not exist here. From the first moment he hit Senator McCarthy with everything to which he could lay hand.

He was a true liberal, as distinguished from a knee-jerk liberal. And he was a loyal liberal, instead of a cut-and-run liberal.

He stayed with Mr. Truman in the good times, and also in the bad times. In the times, indeed, when some of the knee-jerk liberals were self-righteously rushing into print (to coin a sparkling phrase) to run out on a liberal President who had represented the views which they had always said were also their own. But this was a President who also now had the bad luck to get into trouble. So though they were just terribly, terribly liberal, they also managed to be terribly, terribly safe.

It was only the true liberals like old Senator GREEN, plus some nonliberals who believed in most but not all of what he was doing, who stood with Mr. Truman when the heavy firing about corruption and cronyism broke out.

Mr. Truman has never hated, or even much disliked, all those who had fought him from conviction, the Republicans and the ultraconservative Democrats. But he has an unforgettable contempt for those who really agreed with his policies but prudently left the firing line when it became evident that his troops were going to be overborne.

Old Senator GREEN may have been intellectually wrong in staying in the line to the end. But he was a combat soldier, and not a talking soldier. He had guts.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to the retirement of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, THEODORE GREEN.

Certainly a man who has managed to serve ably and well at the most advanced age a Senator has ever attained in this body has achieved a distinction; but to have served so ably and well with such great good humor, such energy, and such a desire to discharge to the fullest his responsibilities as a Senator marks him as perhaps one of the most unusual and one of the most devoted Senators it has ever been my pleasure to know.

Senators will remember that because of his advancing age and a diminishing of his faculty of sight he voluntarily called into session the great Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he had the honor to be the chairman, and announced his retirement from the chairmanship. This marked Senator GREEN, I believe, as a man who put the love and performance of duty far ahead of any personal desire for power, standing, attainment, or continued control of this very vital activity of the U.S. Senate. Knowing that he would probably later relinquish control, he wanted to help pass it on at an earlier time to younger hands, so that the younger hands could gain experience, with the passing of time, in order to properly direct the great committee.

Senator GREEN is an unselfish man, a man of great personal wit and humor and charm. He is a man whom every one of the 99 other Senators is proud to call a friend.

The only act he has performed during my long acquaintanceship with him which I did not like and approve of was to announce his voluntary retirement at the end of his present term. I should like to see him continue to serve, and I still hope perhaps he may change his mind and decide to follow the wishes of his friends and again serve in the great U.S. Senate.

He is a man whom history will record as having attained new heights in many, many ways. We will miss him deeply.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of my many colleagues who this afternoon have paid tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, that unforgettably courageous and dedicated Democrat, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Few men in the history of this Nation have had the iron will and fortitude to proudly swallow defeat after defeat at the polls and return again and again in subsequent elections until the people learned that in him they had oppor-

tunity to elect a dedicated public servant. Courage and tenacity characterized his fight to serve the people, and once he attained office, he used that same courage and tenacity almost invariably to stand on the side of the people.

In fact, it should be considered by all of us, I believe, that that same courage marks his decision of retirement, for the temptation must have been very great for him to simply return to the Senate. And there is surely no question that his millions of friends would have seen to it that he came back to Washington for as long as he wished. But as a man who had the courage to fight for what he believed in, he still has the courage to face up to the realization that his health would be further impaired by adding to his already long and great record of public service.

All of us who know what a fine, friendly, devoted, kindly, scholarly gentleman he is, all of us who have had the great benefit and pleasure of his warm friendship and support, will miss him a great deal. And our hearts go out to him for many, many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think my colleagues in the Senate will realize that this is an embarrassing moment for me. I have sat here and listened to descriptions purporting to be of myself, but which I could hardly recognize. I have however, found the occasion to be very pleasant.

After listening for some time I began to wonder whether or not a great mistake had been made. My mind wandered a little, and I thought of myself as lying in a coffin in front of the dais of the Presiding Officer, with my colleagues going by and dropping a flower or two as they passed.

I do not believe very much in that sort of thing. I am afraid I do not bestow compliments as often as they are deserved. Today I certainly have received them far beyond my deserts.

Various speakers have referred to incidents which I had almost forgotten, and which they recalled to my mind, much to my pleasure.

There is one impression I wish to correct. It should not be assumed that because I had said I would not be a candidate for reelection in the next election, I was retiring from public life. I do not want that impression to get abroad, especially in Rhode Island. I am ready to serve my friends the people—who really are my friends—whenever they feel that they need me.

However, because of physical infirmities which are creeping up on me in my advanced years, I do not feel that I can adequately represent, for another 6 years, my people of Rhode Island, the State of Rhode Island, or the United States of America, as I should.

I am very happy in my life here. I am very happy in the associations which have been formed. I have found them to be most stimulating, even when my colleagues have disagreed with me, which has often been the case. It has been a wonderful experience, which relatively few men can have. I am very grateful for the way my colleagues have learned to put up with the objectionable features of their colleague in formal oratory, discussion, or conversation.

I have made many good friends. I hope I have not lost any previously made. It is a wonderful experience to be a Senator of the United States. It is an office which calls for every mark of kindness and friendship which one human being can show toward others.

I highly cherish my service in this body, for what it has done for me. Judging from what I have heard today on the floor of the Senate, it is thought by some that I have done something for my countrymen.

I am very grateful to the people of my State for having given me this privilege. I am very grateful to Almighty God, Who has kept me in good health and enabled me to take advantage of my opportunities here. I promise that the remainder of my life shall be heartily devoted to the service of the people, for at least 1 year more in the Senate, and after that just as heartily at home.

I thank my fellow Senators heartily for what they have said. Though undeserved much of it may have been, it was very pleasant to hear it. I want them to feel free at any time to call on me for any service I can render them, or which they think I can render them, and to forgive anything I may have said or done in the past to which they have taken exception.

Again thanks to all of them for what they have said this morning, in addition to what they have been to me in the years past. [Applause, Senators rising.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Loans

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Statistical Supplement to Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret statistical supplement to stockpile report for the period ending June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.

A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., Baltimore, Md., reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of that company for the calendar year of 1959; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report Prior to Restoration of Balances, Bureau of Customs

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Customs covering restoration of balances withdrawn from appropriation and fund accounts in that Bureau (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Evanston Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Commodity Credit Corporation activities, Evanston Commodity Office, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Disposal of Foreign Excess Property, Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property, for the period January 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Rules and Regulations Relating to Boating

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the rules and regulations published in the Federal Register, dated December 29, 1959, relating to boating (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Amendment of Section 4248, Title 18, United States Code, Relating to Termination of Custody of Certain Prisoners

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4248 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the termination of custody of mentally incompetent prisoners (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Inc.

A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that association, dated March 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Extension of National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Within Alaska and Hawaii

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within Alaska and Hawaii, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

Report of Permanent Committee for the Oliver Holmes Devise

A letter from the chairman, Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that committee, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact organic legislation establishing a civil government for our country

"Whereas our people expressed a keen desire for organic legislation in a petition signed by all our leaders, the matais of Tutuila and Manu's, at a general assembly held in 1945 at Gagamoe, a historical meeting place of our people; and

"Whereas a committee consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior, recommended to the President of the United States in 1947 the enactment of organic legislation for our territory as a step toward the fulfillment of the obligation assumed by the United States under article 73 of the United Nations Charter; and

"Whereas in 1949 the Department of the Interior, with the strong support of the President of the United States, recommended immediate enactment of organic legislation for our country in order to extend to us U.S. citizenship, a bill of rights, local legislative powers, an independent judiciary, and a representation by a Resident Commissioner in the U.S. Congress; and

"Whereas we firmly believe that the enactment of organic legislation for American Samoa is the most effective and satisfactory way to discharge the responsibility of the United States under the United Nations Charter and to maintain fully its traditional role as the champion among nations of dependent people, of representative government, of justice under law, and of fundamental rights and human freedoms for everyone everywhere; and

"Whereas with respect to organic legislation, it is the policy of the Department of the Interior to support such legislation when our people desire it and are ready for it, and our people, through their duly elected representatives, are asking for such legislation, believing firmly that our people are ready to begin their God-given right to make their own local laws; and

"Whereas the enactment of organic legislation for our country will not only furnish our people the fruits of democracy but will also serve notice to all nations in the Pacific Ocean area that the right of self-determination and freedom from oppression are granted by the Constitution of the United States by acts as well as by words; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to enact H.R. 4500, introduced in the House of Representatives of the 81st Congress of the United States of America, as the same will be amended by the Sixth Legislature of the Territory of American Samoa and approved by a convention of the people of American Samoa called for that purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the 86th Congress, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of American Samoa."

Two petitions, signed by Thomas Hugh Latimer, executive vice president, Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., relating to Communist domination of independent people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Bronxville, N.Y., praying for the adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recognition of the grave of Samuel Wilson, progenitor of the symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES, FREE SYNAGOGUE, FLUSHING, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Free Synagogue, of Flushing, N.Y., relating to the defacement of synagogue property.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of trustees of the Free Synagogue, of Flushing, N.Y., at its regular meeting held at the community house of the synagogue last evening, January 4, 1960, unanimously adopted the following motion concerning the recent defacement of synagogue property with symbols of religious bigotry:

1. The board registers its indignation and dismay at the recent defacement of the property of the Free Synagogue of Flushing, as well as other houses of Jewish worship and Jewish institutions in the city and elsewhere, with swastikas, the infamous symbol of religious bigotry and hateful intolerance;

2. Approves and applauds the prompt and determined efforts of the mayor of the city of New York in activating the forces of law and order and religious amity to detect and prosecute the perpetrators of these foul acts of ignorance and intolerance; and

3. Pledge themselves, collectively and individually to do all within their power to aid and cooperate in all lawful efforts to prevent the recurrence of such incidents of infamy.

RESOLUTION OF TOWN BOARD OF SOUTHOLD, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Town Board of Southold, N.Y., relating to an infestation of the golden nematode.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Town Board of the Town of Southold, Suffolk County, N.Y., being apprised of the increase of golden nematode infestation of the farmland of Southhold Town and also in the farmland of other towns of Suffolk County, and furthermore, that this infestation poses a serious threat to the economy and well-being of the residents of Southold Town and the other towns of Suffolk County: Be it

Resolved, That the Town Board of the Town of Southold does strongly urge that the State of New York and the U.S. Government, not only continue the present program for the control and eradication of the golden nematode but also expand and expedite this program so that this serious threat to the agriculture of this area as well as the whole Nation may be speedily and permanently eliminated; furthermore be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Assemblyman Irving Price and State Senator Elisha Barrett, Congressman Stuyvesant Wainwright and U.S. Senators Kenneth Keating and Jacob Javits, and also to the Board of Supervisors of Suffolk County so that the rest of the towns of the county may be apprised of the serious situation and take appropriate action.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, WYANDANCH, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of education, Union Free School District No. 9, of Wyandanch, N.Y., relating to aid to education.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas too much of the cost of education is now on the shoulders of the local homeowners;

Whereas any new scheme of local taxation, such as local sales taxes, will only increase the burden on homeowners with large families, families with small incomes, etc.; and

Whereas such plans will lessen the sense of responsibility on the part of the State government and Federal Government toward contributing a fair share of the cost of education: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York increase State aid to at least $409 per pupil.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 5887. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list (Rept. No. 1020);

H.R. 6132. An act relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies (Rept. No. 1021); and

H.R. 7456. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of casein (Rept. No. 1022).

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226) providing for an investigation of national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems ad-

visable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENTS IN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICY IN AFRICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to developments in military technology and foreign policy in Africa, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on United States Strategy and Foreign Policy," and 3,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy "Africa," issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON ASIA AND WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy, "Asia," and 1,000 additional copies of the committee print United States Foreign Policy, "Western Europe," issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON WORLDWIDE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 229) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on worldwide and domestic economic problems and their impact on the foreign policy of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations 3,000 additional copies of the committee print "Worldwide and Domestic Economic Problems and Their Impact on the Foreign Policy of the United States," 2,000 additional copies of the committee print "Possible Nonmilitary Scientific Developments and Their Potential Impact on Foreign Policy Problems of the United States," and 2,000 additional copies of the committee print "Basic Aims of United States Foreign Policy," all issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing a study of the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further study and examination of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislative or other measures, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in justly and expeditiously adjudicating or determining the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 232) to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected

shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The commttee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing a study of administrative practice and procedure in Government departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES ARISING FROM FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235) to investigate problems of certain foreign countries arising from flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems in certain Western European nations, and in certain Near Eastern, Middle Eastern, and Far Eastern countries, created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and also the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider bills affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $65,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237) to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employees; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $116,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing an

investigation of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws;

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $425,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duty authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; *Provided,* That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agences of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 240) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 241) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other asistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAW AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement

or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $239,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 2789. A bill to amend the effective date of section 2(b) of Public Law 86-376 relating to, inter alia, subchapter S of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2790. A bill for the relief of Ritsuko Mori (Susan Belinda Luther); and

S. 2791. A bill for the relief of Yukio Nobuta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2792. A bill for the relief of Luigia Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2793. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2794. A bill for the relief of Chin Hee; and

S. 2795. A bill for the relief of Georgios Tzotzolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2796. A bill to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2797. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of Mijo (Mike) Sipusic; and

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Santo Scardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 2800. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2801. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in Marengo County, Ala., to the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2802. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study of the disposition of claims for just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal programs through condemnation proceedings or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 2803. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2804. A bill to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2805. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2806. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an access road thereto, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2807. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Shao Fong Sha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF HEARINGS ON INQUIRY INTO SATELLITE AND MISSILE PROGRAMS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 80); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services one thousand additional copies of part I of the hearings held by that committee on an inquiry into the satellite and missile programs.

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 226) providing for an investigation of national penitentiaries, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENTS IN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICY IN AFRICA

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 227) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to developments in military technology and foreign policy in Africa, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.").

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON ASIA AND WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 228) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE PRINTS RELATING TO FOREIGN POLICY ON WORLDWIDE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 229) to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on worldwide and domestic economic problems and their impact on the foreign policy of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) minerals, materials, and fuels;

(2) irrigation, reclamation, and power development;

(3) public lands;

(4) Indians;

(5) Territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution which shall not exceed $200,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 231) authorizing a study of the Federal judicial system, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 232) to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 233) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing a study of administrative practice and procedure in Government departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES ARISING FROM FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 235) to investigate problems of certain foreign countries arising from flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 236) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 237) to investigate matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing an investigation of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 239) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original

resolution (S. Res. 240) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the Patent Office, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 241) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY LAWS AND MATTERS RELATING TO ESPIONAGE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON INCOME UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the earnings limitations on the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

Mr. President, I point out this is a bill with regard to which the late Senator Langer, our dear departed colleague, was the principal sponsor and I was a cosponsor. In a sense, I am picking up the torch from the place where the late Senator Langer because of an act of divine providence laid it for someone else to pick up and run with.

At the present time, women over 62 years of age and men over 65 do not receive full benefits under the old-age and survivors section of the Social Security Act if they earn more than $1,200 annually, or more than $100 in any month, until they reach the age of 72 when the earnings limitation no longer applies.

In order that this important amendment to the Social Security Act which was previously introduced by our distinguished former colleague, the late Senator Langer, may be actively pursued in this body during the current session, I am submitting it this year. The House Ways and Means Committee is reported to be scheduling early consideration of social security amendments and this bill, introduced in the other body by several Representatives, is pending before it so that there is every reason to hope for action on it in the near future.

The Social Security Administration estimates that 2 million persons would benefit if this amendment were adopted. That is the approximate number of individuals who, although they or another wage-earning member of their family have already contributed the full amount required by law, are not receiving their full social security payments because either by choice or, more likely, by necessity, they are continuing to work full or part-time. They get a sum below the average annual payment of about $850 which is received by the social security beneficiaries or their dependents who are fully retired.

If an individual's wages exceed the modest annual figure of $2,080, he is not eligible to receive a single dollar in social security payments despite the fact that he is paid up in full under the system until he attains the age of 72.

In view of the impact of inflation on our economy resulting in a marked increase in the cost of such basic items as food costs, rent, clothing, and particularly hospitalization and medical care which are of special concern to older age groups, the present earnings limitations under social security are unrealistic and impose a severe hardship on many of our senior citizens who continue to contribute their talents and service to U.S. business and industry.

By adopting this proposed amendment, the Congress would be removing an inequitable provision of the Social Security Act and at the same time be taking full cognizance of the needs of our older citizens who have devoted their working lives to the upbuilding of our Nation and its economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2793) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia be set aside in a special fund to be used by the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to defray in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art and cultural programs of the District.

There can be no doubt that the city of Washington is truly one of the most beautiful in the entire world. All who come here are impressed by the city's lovely tree-lined streets, beautiful parks, and its public buildings.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have consistently supported measures to improve the city of Washington and to make it an even more beautiful and pleasant city in which to live. I shall continue to support such programs because I believe it is in the best interest not only of the city of Washington but the United States itself. After all, Washington is a picture window through which the people of other nations look and draw their judgments about America. Washington should represent the artistic and cultural aspirations of the American people.

Unfortunately, all too little has been done to promote the arts in the Nation's Capital. I was most interested in the study prepared last year by the Library of Congress for Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, of Delaware, which revealed that Washington's budget has allotted for civic cultural event only $16,000—of which about $10,000 helps to support the Watergate concerts. As compared with Washington, New York spends $2,600,000, Philadelphia $824,000, and Baltimore $448,000. The small city of Hagerstown, Md., only a short distance from the Nation's Capital, gives its Museum of Fine Arts $12,500 out of its regular annual budget—only $3,500 less than the entire amount that Washington spends out of its more than $200 million budget.

To date, the promotion and financing of opera, ballet, orchestras, and theaters has been left primarily up to the citizens of Washington itself. Precious little has been given by the District Government to promote the arts. If any city in the United States should be spending money to promote the arts, it should certainly be Washington, the Capital of the United States. I, therefore, believe it is time that Washington join with other cities of our great country to promote the arts by providing that at least a small portion of tax revenue go for such programs.

Under my bill, 1 mill out of every dollar of tax revenue of the District of Columbia, would be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States. The money in such fund would be made available to the Recreation Board for the District of Columbia to help in defraying at least in part the expenses of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs.

We can be proud of our fine National Symphony Orchestra and of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, but we in the Congress can take little pride in the fact that we as the City Council of Washington have done precious little to promote these institutions and other cultural programs of the District. We have an obligation to join with the citizens of the District to give financial support for the fine arts of Washington.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the study made by the Library of Congress at the request of Representative McDOWELL, to which I have referred, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Akron, Ohio	$36,000	General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility).	Art museum.
	$5,000,000	Direct tax construction cost	Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena."
	1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program	General fund (part of "recreation program")	Band concerts.
Atlanta, Ga	$7,500	General fund	Atlanta Symphony Guild.
	$6,000	do	Atlanta Pops Concert.
	$5,000	do	Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars.
	$10,000	do	Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art.
Baltimore, Md	1959 appropriations:		
	$25,594	do	Municipal Museum.
	$119,994	do	Bureau of Music.
	$288,000	Endowment funds (estimated income)	Walters Art Gallery.
	$15,000	General funds (pensions)	
Birmingham, Ala	$90,000 (this year's appropriation)	General funds	Birmingham Museum of Art.
Buffalo, N.Y	Appropriated in 1958–59:		
	$73,430	Real estate tax and other current revenues	Albright Art Gallery.
	$30,000	do	Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc.
	$27,300	do	Kleinhans Music Hall.
Chicago, Ill	Calendar year 1958:		
	$232,405.87	Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago.	Art Institute of Chicago.
	$232,369.11	do	Museum of Science and Industry.
	$232,405.92	do	Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum).
Dallas, Tex	$80,000	General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax."	Fine Arts Museum.
Detroit, Mich	1959–60 gross appropriation, $543,081	Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues	Arts Commission.
Evansville, Ind	1959 contribution, $9,200	Civil City of Evansville	Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
	1959 contribution, $9,200	School City of Evansville [1]	Do.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
Hagerstown, Md	$12,500 (provided for in annual budget)	General revenues	Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
Houston, Tex	$19,500	do	Museum of Natural History.
	$20,000	do	Museum of Fine Arts.
	$3,000	do	Civic Theatre.
	$25,000	do	Houston Symphony.
Kansas City, Mo	For fiscal year ended Apr. 30, 1959:		
	$21,211	General fund; park funds	Nelson Art Gallery (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$9,925	General fund	Philharmonic Orchestra (free rent).
	$42,830	General debt and interest fund	Starlight Theater (debt service for facility developed by park department).
	$48,231	General fund	Museum (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$33,592	do	Liberty Memorial (operation and maintenance).
Los Angeles, Calif	Appropriation for fiscal 1959–60: $196,998	General revenues	Department of municipal art: bureau of music.
Newark, N.J	1959 appropriation: $525,426	Tax and general revenues	Newark Museum.
New Orleans, La	$40,000 annually	Appropriated by city	Delgado Museum of Art.
	Appropriated "this year":		
	$5,000	do	New Orleans Philharmonic Society.
	$2,500	do	New Orleans Opera House Association.
	$875	do	Crescent City Concerts.
New York, N.Y	$944,525 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Metropolitan Museum of Art.
	$904,989 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$1,329,559 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	American Museum of Natural History.
	$1,071,985 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
	$125,140 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Children's Museum.
	$95,866 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	do	Brooklyn Institute of Brooklyn Academy of Music.
	$69,510 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$127,000 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Museum of the City of New York.
	$50,250 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
Norfolk, Va	$2,000	General revenue	Norfolk Symphony Orchestra.
	$69,083	do	Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Oakland, Calif	1958–59:		
	Salaries for a professional staff of 6 plus $2,000 allowance for books and $500 for pictures.	Annual appropriations by city council to library department from which library and museums commission adopts an operating budget.	Art and pictures department of main library.
	$70,377	do	Oakland Public Museum.
	$57,212	do	Art Museum.
	$31,577	do	Snow Museum.
Philadelphia, Pa	$25,000	General revenues	Academy of Fine Arts.
	$75,000	do	Robin Hood Dell.
	$25,000	do	Philadelphia Grand Opera.
	$624,760	do	Philadelphia Art Museum and Rodin Museum.
	$30,000	do	Johnson paintings.
	$10,000	do	Philadelphia Art Festival (every 2 years).
Pittsburgh, Pa	$35,000 (1959)	General revenues (through specific appropriations each year).	Pittsburgh Symphony.
	$20,000 to $30,000 (annually)	do	Free summer band concerts.
	$25,000 (approximate cost to city annually)	do	Arts and Crafts Center.
Providence, R.I	Current appropriations:		
	$24.877	General revenue	Museum in Roger William Park.
	$1,500	do	Band concerts.
Reading, Pa	$140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959)	General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs).	Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.).
	$3,028 (1959)	do	Bureau of parks weekly band concerts.
Richmond, Va	$5,000	Direct appropriation	Valentine Museum.

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Con.

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Rochester, N.Y.	1959–60 expenditures:		
	$10,000	General revenues or real estate taxes	Civic Music Association.
	$20,000	do	"Opera Under the Stars."
	Not indicated	Not indicated	Museum.
Sacramento, Calif.	1959–60 budget amounts:		
	$4,500	General ad valorem taxes	Philharmonic Orchestra.
	$4,000	do	Park band concerts.
	$66,866	do	Crocker Art Gallery (city-owned).
	$17,000	do	Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department).
St. Louis, Mo.	1958 Revenue: $320,007.53	Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907).	St. Louis Art Museum.
St. Paul, Minn.	1959 city budget appropriations:		
	$13,500	Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget."	St. Paul Gallery and School of Art.
	$10,000	do	St. Paul Civic Opera.
San Antonio, Tex.	$81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year)	Supported primarily by general fund	Witte Museum.
	$81,000	do	2 municipal auditoriums.
	$1,500	do	San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions).
San Diego, Calif.	1959–60 city budget:		
	$57,159	General revenues	Fine Arts Gallery.
	$19,289	do	Serra Museum (local history).
	$48,715	do	Natural History Museum.
	$45,949	do	Museum of Man (anthropology).
	$10,000	do	San Diego Symphony.
San Francisco, Calif.	1958–59 budget:		
	$158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other, $37,700)	Budget of the city and county of San Francisco	Art commission.
	$35,493 (taxes)	do	War Memorial Art Museum.
	$255,456 (taxes, $254,856; other, $600)	do	California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art museum).
	$367,942 (taxes, $367,692; other, $250)	do	De Young (art) Museum.
Scranton, Pa.	An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years.	General funds	Everhart Museum.
Seattle, Wash.	$233.37	City's annual budget funds without regard to income source.	Art commission.
	$34,097.55	do	Art museum.
	$18,000	do	Public music.
	$62,743.57	do	Art division of the library department.
Springfield, Mass.[2]	$33,127.93	General tax revenues	Museum of Natural History.
	$31,092.45	do	George Walter Vincent Smith Museum.
	$18,161.40	do	William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum).
	$1,267	do	Springfield Museum of Fine Arts.
	Not indicated	do	Fine arts department of library.
Syracuse, N.Y.	$25,000 appropriation annually	General tax levy	Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).

[2] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that two letters to the editor, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of December 23, 1959, and which deal with this subject, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHORTCHANGING ITSELF ON CULTURE?

I want to commend the Star for the excellent article about the Corcoran Gallery of Art by John McKelway on Sunday, December 13. It is good to have the Star assure us that the Corcoran is vigorously alive on its 100th birthday and looking forward to its second century of service in art and the associated field of education.

But, naturally, along with many other people, it is Mr. McKelway's discussion of what will be needed during these coming years that holds my deepest concern.

To begin with, one point should be fully understood. It is useless and, indeed, misleading to compare the income of the National Gallery of Art with that of the Corcoran. These two great galleries represent two quite different setups. The National Gallery is federally owned and largely federally supported; the Corcoran is not and never has been, nor did William Wilson Corcoran intend that the gallery which bears his name would be a Federal Government institution.

The comparison, rather, should be between the Corcoran and, say, New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, and with other municipal museums throughout the country. These museums are greatly assisted by municipal tax funds and couldn't continue to remain open without such financial assistance.

According to a recent study made by the Library of Congress for Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., Democrat, of Delaware, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1959, this city spends far less on cultural activities than any of the other 38 cities surveyed. Our budget for the fine arts is only $16,000, as compared with New York's $2,600,000, Philadelphia's $824,000, and Baltimore's $448,500.

Why, Hagerstown, Md., gives its Museum of Fine Arts $12,500, which is provided out of its regular annual budget, only $3,500 less than the entire amount the Nation's Capital spends out of its more than $200 million budget.

The Star says the Corcoran Gallery needs a little outside help. No; what it needs is inside help, and judging from Mr. McKelway's remarks about lack of heat, of air conditioning, and of peeling walls and canceled exhibitions, more than a little help is needed.

Representative MCDOWELL has introduced a bill to provide 1 mill out of each tax dollar for art and music programs. The bill is cosponsored on a bipartisan basis by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Representative JOHN R. FOLEY, Democrat, of Maryland; and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana. Also, the intent of this bill has the support of a wide range of groups including the American Federation of Musicians, the AFL–CIO, and even the Washington Board of Trade.

The plan suggested in this bill is one currently in use in scores of cities where their appreciation of the value of their art galleries, museums, and symphony orchestras produces significant civic support and action. Why should not such help be sought, and given, by Washington, D.C.?

We need not try to compete with the ancient capitals of Europe and Russia. We are still in the process of making our world. But let us compete with our fellow American cities so we can take our proper place in the growing cultural life of these United States.

HORTENSE AMRAM.

The Star's Sunday feature article, "The Corcoran, at 100, Is Still Looking Ahead," is commendable, but the Corcoran Gallery should have been compared, not with the National Gallery of Art, but with the Nation's local, city-aided museums and galleries.

The Star points out that the National Gallery receives a yearly grant from the Federal Government of $1,853,000. This is true, but information on the amount of financial support given local museums by U.S. cities would have been more apropos and significant—and helpful.

Baltimore contributes $303,000 to the Walters Art Gallery; Buffalo gives $73,430 to the Albright Art Gallery; Chicago gives the Art Institute of Chicago $232,405; Dallas gives its Fine Arts Museum $80,000; Houston its Museum of Fine Arts $20,000; Kansas City its Nelson Art Gallery $21,211; Newark (N.J.) gives the Newark Museum $525,426; New Orleans gives its Delgado Museum of Art $40,000; New York gives the Metropolitan Museum of Art the magnificent sum of $1,849,514; Norfolk gives its Museum of Art $69,083. Philadelphia gives the Philadelphia Art Museum $624,760; Pittsburgh gives its Arts and Crafts Center $25,000; St. Louis gives its Art Museum $320,007; San Diego

gives its Fine Arts Gallery $57,159. San Francisco, with a population of 775,000, gives its three city-aided art museums a grand total of $658,891.

Washington, D.C., with a population greater by 100,000, and one of the wealthiest cities in the United States per capita, doesn't give its splendid local art museums, such as the Corcoran Gallery, one red cent.

The District of Columbia Commissioners have requested $10,000 for the Watergate Concerts for the past 2 years and Congress has gladly appropriated this sum. There is every reason for believing that if the Commissioners requested an equal or greater sum for the Corcoran Gallery from local tax revenues Congress would gladly appropriate this also.

It is high time the Commissioners displayed a concern for cultural matters at least equal to that of other U.S. city governing groups.

WILLIAM A. GRANT,
National Committeeman, Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2796) to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and other nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the act of April 29, 1942, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXPANSION OF SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve and expand the special school milk program.

Generally, the bill would increase funds available as follows: The allowable $81 million for fiscal year 1960 would be increased to $85 million; for fiscal year 1961 and successive years, $90 million would be made available.

The proposal, too, would establish the special milk program on a permanent basis.

Overall, this program has provided a constructive outlet for surplus milk, as well as made a real contribution to better health of the children of America.

In fiscal year 1959, over 2.2 billion half pints of milk were distributed to children in nursery schools, child care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

As I understand, funds for the current year are running low. Although the Department may not spend more than the allowable $81 million, the administration of the program requires elbow room for its operations. Unless additional funds are provided, the Department of Agriculture informs me that there will need to be cutbacks in the program beginning March 1, 1960.

Fortunately, a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee has scheduled hearings next week on this situation. I would respectfully urge that the Senate committee consider the recommendations in this bill as early as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2797) to increase and extend the special milk program, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COMMISSION TO STUDY COMPENSATION FOR LAND CONDEMNED UNDER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in recent years the Federal Government has instituted programs under which millions of acres of land have been acquired from private owners. While much of the land has been acquired by purchase, a great deal has been acquired through condemnation proceedings; and in the cases in which voluntary sales were effected, the threat of condemnation proceedings was in the background.

These Federal programs include some in which Federal agencies use the land directly—for example, in the military programs; in other cases, the land is owned by State or local agencies—for example, in most road programs; and, in other cases, the land may be resold for private use—for example, in the urban renewal program. But regardless of these differences in the purpose of the taking or the use to which the land is put, the individual or business dispossessed or otherwise affected by the acquisition suffers the same loss.

Probably the biggest acquisition program has been that of the military. I am advised that in 1940, the War and Navy Departments used about 2½ million acres of land. By the close of the war, these two Departments had the use of 52 million acres—about equal in size to Kansas or Utah.

By June 30, 1955, the land used for military purposes by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the AEC, amounted to more than 23 million acres—about the size of Indiana, Virginia, Kentucky, or Tennessee. Other Federal programs have acquired or are acquiring substantial amounts of land.

In the urban renewal program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the first 400 projects have called for the clearance of about 15,000 acres, not including streets and alleys. Unlike much of the land used for military programs, these 15,000 net acres are located in urban areas, and consist mostly of developed land. The Federal highway programs also call for the acquisition of large areas, including both expensive developed land in cities, and farmland and wasteland outside cities. For the Interstate Highway System, $621 million—of which the Federal share will be $418 million—is authorized for the acquisition of rights-of-way during the fiscal year 1959. Under the regular Federal highway programs, $126 million—of which the Federal share will be $65 million—is authorized for acquisition of rights-of-way during the fiscal year 1959. Other Federal programs, such as the public works programs, involve the acquisition of large areas.

The acquisition of land in this volume is very different from the Federal acquisition of land during the 19th century, or even during the 20th century, up to World War II. The problems created when, under Federal programs, thousands of acres of land is acquired in rural areas, or scores of acres are acquired in developed urban areas, are different, both in kind and in degree, from the problems created in earlier days, when Federal acquisitions of land amounted merely to taking enough land for the construction of a post office, an arsenal, or even an army post. And the problem becomes particularly acute when an urban-renewal project cleans out an entire section of town—the houses, stores, office buildings, movie theaters, banks, churches, and all other structures.

The Banking and Currency Committee has heard testimony which has set forth in dramatic detail the problems facing businesses, both large and small, which have been wiped out by urban-renewal projects or by Federal highway projects. Three bills on this subject have been introduced: S. 1340, by Senator HUMPHREY; S. 1351, by Senator BEALL; and S. 1777, by Senator CLARK and Senator JAVITS, which would provide for loans to small business concerns affected by the highway and urban-renewal programs.

The problem, of course, is not limited to small businesses or to these two Federal programs. The problem affects all sizes of business, and it affects all Federal programs under which land is acquired—particularly, of course, when the land acquisitions are very extensive. It was, I think, for this reason that the Banking and Currency Committee did not take action on any of these three bills in connection with either the small business legislation or the housing legislation.

It seems to me the question is a matter of much broader concern, and one which basically goes back to the requirement of the fifth amendment to the Constitution that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Over many years, this constitutional requirement has been spelled out in judicial decisions and in statutes within the framework of the constitutional requirement. For the most part, this occurred before acquisitions of land by the Federal Government were substantial or had drastic effects upon wide areas. As I have said, there is a difference in kind, as well as a difference in degree, between acquiring enough land for a Federal office building, or even acquiring the Federal Triangle, and acquiring a square mile of city land for an urban-renewal project or acquiring a whole valley for the purpose of flooding it in connection with the construction of a dam.

It is because of this change in the nature and the effect of land acquisitions under Federal programs, either by condemnation or under threat of condemnation, that I think it desirable to make a thorough and impartial study of condemnation under Federal programs. This study should be broad

enough to cover land acquisition under the highway program, under public works programs, under urban-renewal programs, under military programs, and any other Federal programs. It should also be broad enough to cover all the effects of land acquisition, including its effects on owners, on tenants, and on nearby property and businesses. The study should be made in the broad spirit of the just-compensation provision of the fifth amendment. It should not be limited to a determination of the legal bounds of that provision or of any particular statute. Instead, it should cover the broader subject of the extent to which the cost of Federal programs is paid by individuals or firms whose property is taken or whose property or business is either destroyed or is reduced in value by the taking of neighboring property, and the extent to which it would be feasible and proper to compensate these individuals and firms for the losses they suffer by reason of the Federal program.

Accordingly, I introduce a bill which would establish a bipartisan Federal Commission on Property Condemnation Compensation, to consist of 15 members, 7 to be appointed by the President, 4 to be appointed by the Vice President, and 4 to be appointed by the Speaker. The Commission would make a thorough study of compensation in connection with the condemnation of land, and would file a report with the Congress by December 31, 1961.

In introducing this bill, I do not, of course, wish to take the position that any particular judicial awards have been either too high or too low; nor do I wish to take the position that any condemnation statute now on the books needs to be amended. But the testimony, which has been presented to the Banking and Currency Committee, on the effects on individuals and businesses of the widespread land acquisitions under Federal programs convinces me that this matter should be thoroughly reviewed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2802) to provide for a comprehensive study of the disposition of claims for just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal programs through condemnation proceedings or otherwise, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to present to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley III, in the name of Congress, a gold medal in recognition of his heroic services to the peoples of Laos and other newly developing countries. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the joint resolution lie at the desk until Tuesday of next week so that other Senators may become cosponsors if they so desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the gallant and unselfish public service rendered by Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in serving the medical needs of the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Laotian jungles, and of peoples in other newly developing countries, the President of the United States is authorized to present to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Dr. Dooley's private crusade to help his fellow man has captured the imagination of the free world. His dedication and his determination to fight disease and ignorance in newly developing countries is one of the great humanitarian efforts of our time.

A part of this may be found by reading Dr. Dooley's books, which are available at the Library of Congress, under the titles, "The Edge of Tomorrow"—1958, and "Deliver Us From Evil"—1956.

Much has been accomplished by this inspired man within a few years. In 1954, Dr. Dooley participated in the U.S. Navy effort to evacuate over 600,000 refugees from Communist encroachment in North Vietnam. He became so appalled at the stark poverty and misery of the thousands of refugees, that he decided to devote his entire energies in bringing them medical assistance.

His successful program in Laos has led to the establishment of medical centers in other parts of the world. He set up a nonprofit voluntary organization known as Medico, which promotes the establishment of medical centers in places where medical care is nonexistent. Medico already has medical teams in Cambodia, Vietnam, Kenya, Belgian Congo, Jordan, Peru, and Haiti.

Through a recent personal fund-raising effort, Dr. Dooley has obtained enough private subscriptions to Medico to enable him to plan the establishment of medical services in 23 countries where governments have requested teams of medical specialists.

Communist propagandists have vilified Dr. Dooley, but those among whom he works refer to him with affection as "Dr. America." He has done much to create good will for America, particularly among the uncommitted countries of the world.

Dr. Dooley seeks no Government grant in connection with his work, nor is he solicitous of any personal aggrandizement.

In recognition of his unselfish public service and his great spirit of humanitarianism, I propose that Dr. Dooley be given a national award symbolic of the respect and admiration of his fellow Americans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to yield, if I may.

Mr. JAVITS. I know Dr. Dooley. I admire him greatly. I would like the privilege of joining in sponsorship of the joint resolution, which I think the Senator from Connecticut has taken splendid initiative in introducing today.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask that it be noted that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joins in sponsorship of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVENTION WITH CUBA FOR CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on September 12, 1959, there was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Douglas Dillon, to the President of the Senate, submitting a draft bill, "to give effect to the Convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Habana, August 15, 1958."

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of the message and that the message be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTION ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. HENNINGS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were

ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2673) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which is Calendar No. 1045.

These amendments, Mr. President, would amend Senate bill 2673 so as to provide for an additional Federal district judge in the district of Massachusetts, raising from five to six the total number of judges authorized.

Since September 1956 the Judicial Conference has recommended an additional permanent judgeship for this district both to meet the heavy caseload and to bring all of the dockets of the court to a current status. The civil caseload in Massachusetts is well above the national average and in many instances litigants and the Government are forced to wait excessive periods before a case is brought to trial. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum which has been prepared for me by Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr., in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, be printed, with tables attached, explaining the necessity for this additional permanent judgeship.

The efficient and orderly disposition of cases before the courts in Massachusetts demands that Congress include this district in its omnibus bill for permanent judgeships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

The district of Massachusetts has five judges all of whom reside in Boston and hold court in that city. From time to time trials have been held in Springfield, when there was sufficient business to warrant a term of court there. The last judgeship for the district was established in 1954. There have been no vacancies in office of any duration in the last 15 years, although one of the judges has been disabled by a heart condition which has kept him away from the court on various occasions.

In the years since the Second World War the civil business of the district has mounted steadily. In 1957 the private civil caseload reached a peak of 894 cases compared with 331 in 1941. Last year, however, as the result of the new statute curtailing the jurisdiction of the district courts in diversity of citizenship and certain Federal question cases, the private civil caseload decreased almost 30 percent from 831 in fiscal 1958 to 581 in fiscal 1959. On the other hand, suits to which the Government was a party increased from 596 to 645 and the criminal caseload of 216 cases in 1959 was about the same as the 227 cases commenced in 1958.

But even with the decrease in civil filings, the civil caseload per judgeship in Massachusetts remains well above the national average. In fiscal 1959 the total civil cases commenced per judgeship were 245 compared with 215 civil cases commenced per judgeship nationally. The criminal caseload, except for certain protracted cases, has always been light in this district. In fiscal 1959, there were 42 criminal cases begun per judgeship compared with the national average of 108 cases per judgeship.

Reduced civil filings in 1959 have enabled the court to cut down somewhat on the backlog of civil cases from 1,658 on June 30, 1958, to 1,495 on June 30, 1959. Numerically the reduction amounted to 163 cases, or a little less than 10 percent of the total pending backlog.

The delay in getting cases to trial because of the sizable backlog is shown by the time requisite for the trial and disposition of cases terminated after trial in 1959. The median time interval from filing to disposition was 14.5 months, a little less than the national median time interval of 15.3 months. The median time from issue to trial of 13.1 months, however, was greatly in excess of the national median of 10.3 months.

As compared with the desirable interval of 6 months from the time of the filing of the average civil case until trial, as suggested by the Judicial Conference of the United States, half of the civil cases tried in the district of Massachusetts in fiscal 1959 had been pending more than 13½ months at the time of trial.

The Judicial Conference of the United States first recommended an additional permanent judgeship for this district in September 1956, both to cope with the heavy caseload and to bring all of the dockets of the court to a current status within a reasonable period.

Complete statistical tables showing the judicial business of the district for the last 19 years are attached.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, Jr.,
Attorney, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

JANUARY 12, 1960.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE 1.—*Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	849	761	855	1948	1,021	1,191	1,205	1955	1,242	1,230	1,907
1942	811	729	937	1949	981	962	1,224	1956	1,233	1,480	1,660
1943	655	762	830	1950	1,201	1,054	1,371	1957	1,349	1,344	1,665
1944	796	854	772	1951	1,269	1,289	1,351	1958	1,427	1,434	1,658
1945	1,284	1,077	979	1952	1,636	1,424	1,563	1959	1,226	1,389	1,495
1946	1,978	1,653	1,304	1953	1,552	1,241	1,874	1960			
1947	1,492	1,421	1,375	1954	1,185	1,164	1,895				

PRIVATE CIVIL CASES

1941	331	358	400	1948	515	525	489	1955	841	784	1,300
1942	372	355	417	1949	463	406	546	1956	883	929	1,254
1943	194	323	288	1950	490	393	643	1957	894	926	1,222
1944	204	220	272	1951	568	500	711	1958	831	907	1,146
1945	280	220	332	1952	736	583	864	1959	581	759	968
1946	320	287	365	1953	844	589	1,119	1960			
1947	460	326	499	1954	856	732	1,243				

TABLE 2.—*U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

U.S. CIVIL CASES (UNITED STATES A PARTY)

[Price and rent control cases are in parentheses [1]]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	518	403	455	1948	506 (148)	666	716	1955	401	446	607
1942	439	374	520	1949	518 (169)	556	678	1956	350	551	406
1943	461 (59)	439	542	1950	711 (325)	661	728	1957	455	418	443
1944	592 (184)	634	500	1951	701 (379)	789	640	1958	596	527	512
1945	1,004 (599)	857	647	1952	900 (493)	841	699	1959	645	630	527
1946	1,658 (1,298)	1,366	939	1953	708 (272)	652	755	1960			
1947	1,032 (608)	1,095	876	1954	329	432	652				

[1] Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*—Continued

CRIMINAL CASES

[Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	334	332	185	1948	243	249	87	1955	363	389	164
1942	321	314	192	1949	193	223	60	1956	234	301	119
1943	388	364	216	1950	238	241	76	1957	249	248	135
1944	484	481	219	1951	332	236	168	1958	227	249	119
1945	514	334	399	1952	248	352	71	1959	216	230	107
1946	231	469	161	1953	208	155	137	1960			
1947	202	290	79	1954	311	251	202				

TABLE 3.—*Cases commenced per judgeship*

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]		Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]	
		Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]			Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]
1941	4	212	164	83	82	84	153	1951	4	317	204	142	111	83	106
1942	4	203	168	93	77	80	161	1952	4	409	236	184	126	62	112
1943	4	164	158	49	58	97	174	1953	4	388	261	211	146	51	114
1944	4	199	169	51	56	121	184	1954	5	237	210	171	127	61	103
1945	4	321	295	70	57	129	176	1955	5	248	212	168	126	70	104
1946	4	495	321	80	70	58	142	1956	5	247	225	177	135	46	102
1947	4	373	271	115	109	50	134	1957	5	270	236	179	151	47	105
1948	4	255	205	129	117	61	123	1958	5	285	259	166	167	44	108
1949	4	245	238	116	121	48	123	1959	5	245	215	116	129	42	108
1950	4	300	222	123	113	59	116	1960							

[1] This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.

[2] Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

TABLE 4.—*Time elapsing in civil cases tried* [1]

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		Massachusetts	National median	Massachusetts	National median			Massachusetts	National median	Massachusetts	National median			Massachusetts	National median	Massachusetts	National median
1945	56	11.5	9.0	8.0	5.3	1951	125	12.9	12.2	9.1	7.3	1957	156	18.2	14.2	15.3	9.0
1946	86	10.7	8.9	7.6	5.0	1952	141	12.3	12.1	9.4	7.0	1958	183	15.4	13.9	12.8	8.9
1947	74	10.9	9.0	9.4	5.1	1953	116	13.4	12.4	10.8	7.4	1959	153	14.5	15.3	13.1	10.3
1948	148	11.7	9.9	7.8	5.8	1954	117	14.5	13.5	11.8	8.1	1960					
1949	93	12.7	10.4	9.9	5.9	1955	138	20.0	14.6	16.8	9.1						
1950	107	17.0	11.2	12.5	6.7	1956	158	18.9	15.4	15.7	10.3						

[1] The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL TRIALS COMMENCED, BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal		
		Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury
1951	106	106	62	44			
1952	121	114	47	67	7	2	5
1953	128	120	52	68	8	1	7
1954	164	128	51	77	36	13	23
1955	159	128	57	71	31	1	30
1956	200	172	79	93	28	4	24
1957	181	160	60	100	21	8	13
1958	235	214	97	117	21		21
1959	179	158	65	93	21	1	20
1960							

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL TRIALS COMMENCED PER JUDGESHIP

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]	Massachusetts	National average [1]
1951	4	27	39	27	28		11
1952	4	30	40	29	27	2	13
1953	4	32	44	30	29	2	15
1954	5	33	40	26	25	7	15
1955	5	32	41	26	26	6	
1956	5	40	43	34	29	6	14
1957	5	36	40	32	27	4	13
1958	5	47	42	43	28	4	14
1959	5	36	40	32	28	4	12
1960							

[1] This column includes 86 districts.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Wednesday, January 20, 1960, at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a public hearing on four conventions and an optional protocol on the law of the sea.

These items are as follows: Executive J, "A Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone"; Executive K, "A Convention on the High Seas"; Executive L, "A Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas"; Executive M, "A Convention on the Continental Shelf"; Executive N, "An Optional Protocol of Signature Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes."

These conventions and the protocol were formulated at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva from February 24 to April 27, 1958. They were signed on behalf of the United States on September 15, 1958, and on behalf of a number of other states. They were transmitted to the Senate by the President on September 9, 1959.

Persons interested in presenting their views on this subject should notify the clerk of the committee.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

MINERAL AND WATER RESOURCES OF WYOMING (S. DOC. NO. 76)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the document entitled "Mineral and Water Resources of Wyoming," prepared by the staff of the United States Geological Survey, printed as a Senate document, with illustrations. In view of the concern of the Senate, as demonstrated by the adoption of Senate Resolution 48, and the subsequent work of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, of which I am a member, I think the distribution of this study as a Senate document would be highly appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 7 and January 13, 1960, the names of Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, BUSH, HUMPHREY, MUSKIE, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, LONG of Hawaii, GRUENING, MOSS, CHURCH, JACKSON, and KEFAUVER, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2755) to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. ENGLE) on January 7, 1960.

AIR CARGO TRANSPORTATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 11, 1960, the name of Senator SYMINGTON was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2774) to foster the national defense, the Postal Service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guaranty of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of efficient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY on January 11, 1960.

CONVENTION OF DELEGATES FROM ATLANTIC DEMOCRACIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor to a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, which I submitted last year on behalf of myself and other Senators, in support of a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to greater cooperation and unity of purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS W. S. DAVIS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, January 20, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thomas W. S. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, vice Whitney Gillilland, resigned.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]; and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE, TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Thursday, January 21, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Benjamin H. Littleton, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and myself, as chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement of committee hearings.

I wish to announce that on Monday next, January 18, the Committee on Rules and Administration will begin hearings on the subject of temporary Federal election registrars. The hearings will continue on the 19th and 21st and will be held in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, room G–308, beginning at 10:30 a.m. each day. The hearings will probably be continued into the following week. The committee has not determined these dates as yet.

Three bills dealing with this subject have been referred to the Rules Committee. These bills are S. 2684, 2719, and 2783. In addition, there are two other bills related to this subject which have been referred to the committee, S. 2535 and S. 2722.

Since some of these legislative proposals have bearing on the civil rights legislation which the majority leader has indicated will be called up for action in the Senate in the middle or latter part of February, it seems urgent for this reason, as well as a proper consideration of these bills on their own merits, that our committee schedule the necessary hearings as soon as possible.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its report issued September 9, 1959, recommended legislation concerning the appointment of temporary Federal registrars. Having this in mind the committee hoped originally to commence the hearings with the testimony of the distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Dr. John A. Hannah, president of the Michigan State University; the Vice Chairman of the Commission, Dean Robert G. Storey, of Southern Methodist University Law School; and the Honorable John S. Battle, a distinguished former Governor of Virginia, who dissented from the recommendations of the Commission concerning this subject. Because of a meeting of the Joint Defense Board in Florida the next day, Dr. Hannah has informed us he will be unable to attend, but that the Commission's views will be fully presented by Dean Storey. Dr. Hannah has agreed to appear at a later date. I hope to hear within a day or two that Governor Battle will be able to accept our urgent invitation that he present his dissenting views to the committee.

Beginning on the 19th, the committee plans first to hear from those Senators who have introduced bills on this subject referred to the committee and then from other Senators who wish to present their views and then from other informed and interested witnesses.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Address delivered by him in Chicago on December 15, 1959, before the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Correspondence between him and the Secretary of Commerce in regard to the Federal highway program.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "The Obligations of Freedom," delivered by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, to Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 629, Fairmont, W. Va., January 10, 1960.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article by him relating to Adlai Stevenson's attitude toward Red China, and editorial from the United Daily News, of Taipei, Formosa, of December 19, 1959.

By Mr. CLARK:

Article entitled "Security With Solvency," written by Senator SYMINGTON and published in the November 26 issue of Reporter magazine.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address dealing with the international cultural exchange program, delivered by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, before the American Educational Theater Association.

FRED FLORENCE, TEXAS CIVIC LEADER, AWARDED PAPAL MEDAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the time the Congress was in adjournment, a distinguished Texas civic leader, Mr. Fred F. Florence, of Dallas, received the highest award the Roman Catholic Church can bestow on a nonmember.

The award received by Mr. Florence is the gold Benemerenti Medal. The word "benemerenti" means "one deserving well." All who know, as I am privileged to know, of Fred Florence's unselfish service to humanity realize that here, indeed, is a man who deserves well.

Mr. Florence was singled out by Pope John XXIII to receive the medal because of his longtime efforts on behalf of community projects, and especially his support of Catholic institutions in the diocese of Dallas-Fort Worth. His name is synonymous with civic work in the Dallas area.

Mr. Florence is chairman of the executive committee of the Republic National Bank of Dallas. He is past president of the American Bankers Association, the Texas Bankers Association, and the Dallas Clearing House Association.

On behalf of Pope John, Bishop Thomas K. Gorman, of the Dallas-Fort Worth diocese, presented the Benemerenti Medal to Mr. Florence at a banquet in Dallas largely attended by citizens who have an intimate knowledge of the man and his works.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Bishop Gorman's remarks and the citation awarding the Benemerenti Medal to Mr. Florence be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BISHOP THOMAS K. GORMAN ON OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE BENEMERENTI MEDAL TO FRED FARREL FLORENCE—SEPTEMBER 15, 1959

Esteemed honoree, distinguished guests, a very happy purpose has summoned us to break bread together this evening. We have come to witness the bestowal of a decoration of merit upon an admired leader in our community, Fred Farrel Florence. This well-deserved honor naturally points directly to the well-known merits of our honoree, yet I think you will agree with me when I say it goes beyond merely personal greatness of a great leader to achieve a truly community-wide significance. Will you not bear with me for a few minutes, therefore, while I strive to point out why Pope John XXIII, in honoring one of our leaders in the person of Fred Florence has recognized the stalwart character and effectiveness for good of the type of leadership with which the community of Dallas is blessed.

A city, be it large or small, may enjoy an important place in the world for a variety of reasons. It may have had a rich and varied history through the centuries, during which it contributed to the development of our civilization. It may have been and still continues to be the center of great institutions of national and world importance, civic, artistic, scientific, educational, recreational, industrial, religious. It may be a center possessing vital potential necessary for the growth and development of all these things in the years that lie ahead.

A city, too, may be powerful for a variety of reasons. Its geographical situation can give it enormous strategic advantages. It may be the center of a powerful political entity. It may possess enormous population, supported by great agricultural, mineral, industrial, and banking operations. All these things and many others of a material nature make for growth, wealth, power.

Yet, my friends, you and I well realize that a great city with all these resources may still be a destructive, materialistic brute, unless possessed of an ennobling, vivifying soul. Such a soul it gets and can only get from the spiritual, humanitarian leadership of the citizens who direct its destinies toward the common good and the noble life.

Our Dallas has grown important and powerful and great in the finest sense because it has such a soul breathed into it by its first citizens. Many who have had a hand in creating this living, vital, human city, I see here before me tonight. They and their fellows in the work of forming the soul of Dallas, of making the community a good place in which to live and work and play and worship may well view with pride the honor that comes tonight to one of their fellow Dallas soul builders, a coworker in the magnificent program through the years to create the spirit that is Dallas.

What need for me to retail here for you the lifelong services rendered by Fred Florence to this community in business and banking, in civic and charitable welfare. You know the stature he has achieved in his chosen banking field, both locally, statewide and nationally. You are aware of his services to various projects for our industrial and business development. You know well his untiring labors on behalf of the Community Chest, the National Foundation, Southern Methodist University, the State Fair of Texas, and the Texas Research Foundation. He is an active member, too, of the Congregation of Temple Emanu-El, which he serves as a member of its board of directors and treasurer.

What I do want especially emphasized here tonight, as giving point to this gathering and the presentation to follow, are the many years and understanding and generous cooperation with our Catholic educational, charitable, and welfare activities by Fred Florence.

Through the years his has been warm friendship for Mother Clement and a helpful, generous cooperation with Mount St. Michael and the program of the sisters there for underprivileged girls.

Fred Florence serves as chairman of the lay advisory board of St. Paul's Hospital. He it was who, in cooperation with Karl Hoblitzelle, a previous Dallas recipient of the Benemerenti Medal, laid the early foundation, stimulated the community interest, and led an enthusiastic group of civic leaders to the successful completion of the campaign for funds to build the new St. Pauls Hospital, one of the most effective and fruitful fund-raising efforts in the history of this community.

Mr. Florence and his family visited Rome a little over a year ago. They were received in private audience by Pope Pius XII, just a few months before his death. It was to the late Holy Father that the civic and charitable merits of our honoree were pointed out. He died before he could act in the matter and thus there was delay while new medals were being designed and struck. Thus the citation comes from John XXIII and bears his friendly likeness rather than that of the inspiring Pius XII whom Fred had met.

It may be of interest to note that Fred Florence is surely among the first, if not the first, in the United States or anywhere to receive the Benemerenti Medal of the reign of the dynamic John XXIII.

Fred Farrel Florence, it now becomes my honor and privilege, standing a friend among your friends and associates, your fellow creators of the soul that is Dallas, to read the citation and present the medal indicating that you are deemed to merit well by the practice of civic, charitable, and religious virtues to so notable a degree. We are, therefore, pleased to join Pope John XXIII in felicitating you and praying for you and your dear ones many long years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

THE CITATION

"His Holiness Pope John XXIII has deigned to decree and to bestow upon Mr. Fred Florence the gold medal established for one who merits especially well with regard to affairs of the church and gives to the same the faculty of adorning himself with this decoration."

THIRTEEN NATION CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a momentous 13 Nation Conference, of vital interest to the United States at a critical time in its trade and political history, opened in Paris yesterday, at which Mr. Dillon, our Under Secretary of State, is comporting himself with distinction.

The nations present are: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Conference is dealing with two questions:

First. The problems created for international trade, and indeed for Western unity, by the existence of two economic entities in Europe, the Inner Six, consisting of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg; and the European Free Trade Association, the Outer Seven, consisting of Britain, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal.

Second. The need for accelerating the free world effort to aid the newly developing nations and areas by increasing economic aid and technical assistance—beyond that now afforded bilaterally by the United States and other countries, multilaterally through the United Nations, and through other international agencies like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Finance Corporation.

For this effort, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to which the Congress adheres, and which held its fifth annual conference in Washington last November, is heavily responsible. Specific resolutions of the Conference were adopted at its plenary session in Washington on November 20, 1959, on these two subjects, upon the recommendations of the Conference's Economic Committee, of which I had the

honor to be the Chairman, and of which the other U.S. delegation member was Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE—FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, ECONOMIC COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION 1

Resolved, That pending further consideration of a NATO Economic Council or an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation the member countries should achieve within the framework of the OEEC more effective coordination of their economic policies and programs based on the existing groupings of the European Economic Community, the proposed European Free Trade Association, and the United States and Canada as represented in the North American Ministerial Committee on Economic Problems.

RESOLUTION 2

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommends:

That no new barriers to trade be allowed to rise between member countries of NATO;

That the six member countries of the European Economic Community develop an understanding with the other Western countries envisaging an outward-looking solution of trade problems with Western Europe and North America; and

That governments should work to assure the development of harmonious relations between member countries of NATO and the creation of conditions which would serve to expand international trade.

RESOLUTION 3

Resolved, That urgent attention should be given to the problems of underdeveloped regions in the NATO countries and that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommend to the European Economic Community and the proposed European Free Trade Association that the improvement of the economy of these regions should be a prime consideration in their present and continuing negotiations and in their activities.

RESOLUTION 4

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—

(i) Emphasizes that the accelerated development of the less developed areas throughout the world is a proper and desirable concern of the industrialized countries;

(ii) Considers that acceptable progress in the further development of the less developed areas requires the NATO countries and other more developed countries to do more than they are doing now to help accelerate such further development;

(iii) Calls attention to recent studies of the less developed areas, the present efforts of the economically more developed countries to help in such development and their capabilities to do so, and recommends that a definitive assessment should be urgently carried out with a view to formulating a program, which will command the support and the active participation of all the countries of the free world, as determined in detail by a commission of outstanding independent economists convened by the OEEC from both the developed and the less developed countries; and

(iv) Notes with approval the proposed establishment of an International Development Association.

RESOLUTION 5

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference endorse the initiative of the OEEC in undertaking studies concerned with an International Convention for the Protection of Foreign Investments to be adhered to by all member countries, and consider such code or declaration to be highly desirable in the encouragement of private investment in the less developed areas, and offer its assistance and cooperation in the promulgation of such a code or declaration.

RESOLUTION 6

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference welcome the increase in the resources of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and urge member governments to meet rapidly their commitments to the Fund and the Bank.

RESOLUTION 7

The NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommends that, to take full advantage of the U.S. Government's undertaking to contribute 40 percent to the United Nations Special Fund and the expanded program of technical assistance, and to bring the resources of these programs to $100 million, the member countries should make their proper contributions to the Special Fund.

RESOLUTION 8

Resolved, That the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—

(i) Recommend that the member governments of NATO investigate what additional ad hoc assistance it may be possible to give to producing countries facing difficulties in respect of their particular primary commodities through structural market changes or technological advances which may necessitate some form of adjustment assistance;

(ii) Urge the member governments to investigate what can be done in the field of primary commodity markets stabilization, bearing in mind also the work of GATT and the various schemes described in the U.N. World Economic Survey; and

(iii) Emphasize the economic and security interests of the NATO countries in the stabilization of primary commodity prices and supplies.

RESOLUTION 9

Resolved, That, following the conclusions of the Atlantic Congress, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference recommend that the NATO countries give watchful attention to any international trading activities which may constitute dumping, intentional disruption of markets, or economic warfare; and further

Resolved, That the NATO countries should be guided by the principles of the GATT, as criteria to determine whether activities of such a nature are taking place; and further resolved that the NATO countries through the Committee of Economic Advisers consider what further measures might be needed to insure against the effects of such activities.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the other U.S. delegation members were Representative FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, Representative SELDEN, of Alabama, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], all of whom are close friends of many of us.

It must be recognized that unlike certain other diplomatic negotiations, this Congress and the parliaments of the other NATO countries are deeply concerned with the conference in Paris. Whatever is done in Paris will either require legislation or will have a material impact upon legislation which we will be considering. It is extremely important, therefore, that from the very outset Congress be fully informed as to the negotiations and the proposals which result and be kept in the closest touch with what is taking place. The effort is so significant for world trade and economic relations, too, that through their parliaments the peoples of the respective countries need to have a very material and direct knowledge of what is taking place.

What is done in Paris will have a direct and perhaps even immediate economic effect upon us, too. For many years the United States enjoyed a favorable trade balance. In 1958 and 1959, the drain on the U.S. gold reserve totaled $3.2 billion. The time has come to stem this outflow. There are several ways to accomplish this end:

First. European customers should reduce their remaining protective trade barriers against the United States;

Second. The United States should accelerate its efforts to sell its products abroad by greater productivity, greater efficiency, by longer term credit, by better salesmanship, by superior goods;

Third. Accelerating the development to newly developing areas;

Fourth. Developing new capital sources in partnership with the other free world industrial countries.

The new challenge facing the NATO alliance is to give it depth and content as we are phasing out of the cold war and into the economic struggle, and the corollary weapons competition between the free world and the Communist bloc, which is likely to distinguished the decade of the 1960's. This will call for a reevaluation of the role of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and perhaps its reorganization; it will also call for acceptance by the NATO parliaments and the publics of the NATO countries of support for some form of economic integration between the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association, and the North American members of the alliance, the United States and Canada.

Best wishes for success go today to Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon and the representatives of the United States in Paris in their vital mission.

Mr. President, I desire to speak upon another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

ALIEN ORPHANS' BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the program by which American families have been able to adopt alien orphans has been one of the important humanitarian services developed out of the miseries of World War II. Ways and means are presently being discussed and explored whereby the program can be continued on a permanent basis under which alien orphans less than 14 years of age who have been adopted or will be upon their admission to the United States are granted nonquota immigrant status.

Under proposed legislation which I introduced last year, extension was assured until June 30, 1960, of the statutory

authority for the admission of these orphans, namely Public Law 85–316, approved September 11, 1957.

I have participated actively in regard to legislation assuring continuation of this program for many years, first as a Member of the House of Representatives and more recently as a Member of the Senate. The alien orphans' program was begun as a part of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and has been extended by the act of July 29, 1953, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Public Law 85–316 and Public Law 86–253. It has enriched the lives of thousands of childless American couples and brought happiness and a chance for full productive lives as Americans to the parentless waifs whom they have adopted.

Regrettably, certain unforeseen abuses in this highly commendable program developed as the result of the activities of a few unscrupulous and irresponsible persons. It has therefore been found desirable to establish safeguards to prevent commercialism in proxy adoptions and also in assuring that the prospective adoptive parents are fit persons.

I have encouraged study in the jurisdictional and other problems involved to the end that measures which will have the effect of eliminating the undesirable results under Public Law 85–316 will be formulated. I am happy to report that substantial progress has been made.

I am hopeful that a solution which meets the needs and requirements of all interested parties will be reached in the very near future.

I expect I shall soon be able to introduce appropriate proposed legislation so that this program can then be made a permanent part of our law.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

GEORGE WALBRIDGE PERKINS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the passing of a very dear friend, a great American and an outstanding public servant, George Walbridge Perkins of New York, whom I had the honor to know for more than 15 years and who served with me in the Army as an officer in the Chemical Corps.

By President Eisenhower's appointment Mr. Perkins became the U.S. permanent representative, with the rank of Ambassador, on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1955. He was an Assistant Secretary of State who rendered unusual and outstanding service in the administration's policy regarding the Soviet Union and in our relations with nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Perkins also saw action as a colonel in Europe and in the Pacific, receiving the Legion of Merit medal for his war service. He was a director in the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris and served the United States in the formation of NATO in its early stages. He had a luminous career, but was taken from us at the relatively young age of 64.

I feel my colleagues would wish to have the passing of a citizen of such distinction, who has served so ably and effectively as a businessman—he was a leading executive of Merck & Co. for many years—as a statesman, as a representative of our country diplomatically, and as a soldier, signalized to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary notices from the New York Times and from the New York Herald Tribune be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the obituaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 12, 1960]

GEORGE PERKINS, EX-U.S. AID, DIES—ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, 1949–53, SERVED NATO—HAD BEEN MERCK OFFICIAL

George Walbridge Perkins of 1 East 66th Street, former Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, died Sunday at home of a heart attack. His age was 64.

Mr. Perkins, a Republican, was appointed to the post by former President Harry S. Truman in 1949. He served until 1953.

In 1955, President Eisenhower appointed Mr. Perkins U.S. permanent representative with the rank of Ambassador on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He was succeeded on the Council in 1957 by W. Randolph Burgess.

That year Mr. Perkins, who had become associated with Merck & Co. in 1927, returned to the concern as a director. He was executive vice president of the Merck organization and a director of its Canadian subsidiary when he received a leave of absence in 1942 to serve with the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army.

Mr. Perkins saw action as a colonel in Europe and the Pacific and received the Legion of Merit for his war service. He returned to Merck in 1945.

Three years later he severed affiliations with Merck to accept an appointment as director of the industry division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris. A year later, as an Assistant Secretary of State, he was the U.S. representative in the formation of NATO.

ADVISER TO ACHESON

Mr. Perkins also aided the administration's policy regarding the Soviet Union and other countries behind the Iron Curtain. He served as adviser to former Secretary of State Dean Acheson at several international meetings of foreign ministers.

He is said to have started this country's friendlier attitude toward Spain. He announced the new official policy to a group of labor leaders at a luncheon in Washington in 1950, explaining that it would not mean approval of the Franco regime.

He also helped to win from Congress financial aid for Yugoslavia in 1950. He explained then that the grant from the United States would be a weapon of economic warfare against the Soviet Union.

Mr. Perkins was born in Riverdale, the Bronx, on May 2, 1895. He attended the Hill School in Pottstown, Pa., and graduated from Princeton University in 1917. On his return from service with the Army in World War I, he became executive secretary of the Princeton Endowment Fund Committee. In 1921 he received a master's degree from Columbia University.

Later that year he went to Washington as executive secretary to the Postmaster General. In 1922 Mr. Perkins was named assistant treasurer of the Republican State Committee of New York.

SERVED PALISADES COMMISSION

At his death Mr. Perkins was president of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, of which he had been a member since 1922. He was a trustee of the Hill School and Robert College in Istanbul, Turkey, and a former trustee of Princeton. He had been president of the New York Presbyterian Foundation and of the Young Men's Christian Association of New York.

He was a former director of the City Bank Farmers Trust Co. He belonged to the University, Union League, and Princeton Clubs in New York and the Down Town and Century Associations.

Mr. Perkins also had a home in Cold Spring, N.Y., where he had served as president of the board of education.

He is survived by his widow, the former Linn Merck; a son, George W., Jr., of Millbrook, N.Y.; two daughters, Mrs. William B. Wilson of West Chester, Pa., and Mrs. Francis H. Cabot of New York; his mother, and a sister. His first wife, the former Katharine Trowbridge, whom he married in 1917, died a year later while he was serving in France.

A funeral service for Mr. Perkins will be held tomorrow at 11 a.m. in the Brick Presbyterian Church. The Reverend Dr. Henry P. van Dusen, president of the Union Theological Seminary, and the Reverend Stanley E. Niebruegge of the Brick Church will officiate.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 12, 1960]

GEORGE W. PERKINS DEAD, EX-OFFICIAL IN STATE DEPARTMENT

George W. Perkins, 64, former executive vice president and director of Merck & Co., Inc., chemical manufacturers, and an Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs in former President Truman's administration, died Sunday at his home at 1 East 66th Street.

Born in Riverdale-on-Hudson, N.Y., Mr. Perkins attended Hill School and was graduated from Princeton University in 1917. The following 2 years he served as a private, regimental supply sergeant and second lieutenant with the 1st Army Division in France.

In 1920 he returned to civilian life to take graduate studies at Columbia University's Teachers College, where he received a master's degree. That same year he became a director of the Boy Scouts Federation of New York and in 1921 was made an honorary vice president of the Honest Ballot Association.

HEADED YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Active in Republican politics, Mr. Perkins in 1922 was assistant treasurer of the New York State Republican Committee and president of the New York Young Republican Club. He also was made secretary of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission. He became president of the commission in 1945.

In World War II, Mr. Perkins served in the Army Chemical Warfare Service as a colonel in both the European and Pacific theaters. When he again returned to civilian life he became chief of the industries division of the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris in 1948 with the rank of Ambassador. In 1949 he became Secretary of State for European Affairs and served until the end of the Truman administration.

ACTIVE IN CHURCH, YMCA

Mr. Perkins was associated in an executive capacity with Merck & Co. from 1927 through 1948. He was active in the Presbyterian Church in New York and was a member of the board of managers of the Bronx Union branch of the New York City YMCA. From 1923 to 1945 he served on the church extension committee of the Presbytery of New York.

He also interested himself in overseas educational programs. He was a member of the finance committee of Robert College in Turkey and a vice president and member of the executive committee of the Near East College Association.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Lima M. Perkins; a son, George W. Perkins, Jr.; two daughters, Mrs. William B. Wilson and Mrs. Francis H. Cabot; his mother, Mrs. George W. Perkins, Sr., and a sister, Mrs. Edward W. Freeman.

A funeral service will be held at 11 a.m., tomorrow at the Brick Presbyterian Church, Park Avenue and 91st Street.

VOTING RIGHTS OF NEGROES IN LOUISIANA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on Monday, the U.S. District Court for Louisiana handed down a historic and far-reaching decision—the first positive result of the powers given the Attorney General under the Civil Rights Act of 1957—when Judge J. Skelly Wright ordered the restoration of 1,377 Negroes to the voting rolls of the State. The effort by which these voters, long qualified to participate, had been struck from the rolls through the efforts of a citizens' council shows exactly why we need law to back up the other such efforts to assure that people shall enjoy such civil rights as voting.

In an editorial appearing today, the New York Times makes it clear that this important step must be followed by effective legislation when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of civil rights bills next month. Certainly a most effective means for assuring the consideration of such legislation in its proper parliamentary framework would be passage by the House of the bill now bottled up in the Rules Committee, and I again urge the members of my party to join in making this possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from this morning's New York Times printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO GREATER OFFENSE

Restoration to the voting rolls of 1,377 Negroes in a Louisiana parish by order of a Federal court is the first positive result of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. After this it will be impossible to say that the power given under this law to the Attorney General to institute civil suits to protect voting rights is ineffective or meaningless. The law certainly does not yet go far enough to insure the quality of citizenship that the American system demands; but it does represent a forward step—which must and will be followed by other and larger steps in the same direction.

Just what Congress proposes to do about additional civil rights legislation at this preelection session is not yet clear. Majority Leader JOHNSON is committed to bringing up a bill next month; the question is: What bill? A moderate civil rights bill was reported by the House Judiciary Committee last summer and has been pigeonholed since then in the Rules Committee. If it should be forced out by petition (or by politics) and passed by the House in the next few weeks, the Senate would have something to go on—not much, to be sure, but better than the nothing it will get from its own Judiciary Committee headed by Senator EASTLAND.

The Civil Rights Commission made its contribution to the picture in its report last September, recommending that Federal registrars be used to insure Negro voting rights where necessary; but the President gave this idea scant backing in his state of the Union message the other day, urging merely that Congress "seriously" consider this along with his own previous, less far-reaching, proposals.

Meanwhile, the decision in Federal district court in New Orleans by Judge J. Skelly Wright will stand as a minor landmark in the long struggle to gain the franchise for Negroes even in the Deep South. Judge Wright held that the 1,377 Negroes purged from the registration rolls were clearly victims of racial discrimination; and he has taken unusual judicial steps to insure that future registrations in the affected parish are untainted by racialism. "In a democratic society," this vigorous judge points out, "there is no greater offense than illegally depriving a citizen of his right to vote." The Citizens Councils of Louisiana and elsewhere ought to take these words to heart.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES MERIT A PAY INCREASE BASED ON ADMINISTRATION-SPONSORED PAY RAISE FOR STEELWORKERS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 11, 1960, a letter was addressed by me to the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission asking what plans are underway by the Eisenhower Administration to provide pay increases for Federal employees generally and for employees of the Post Office Department.

My inquiry was prompted by the very generous wage and fringe-benefit increases recently sponsored by high officials of the administration for the steelworkers, who already were among the highest paid industrial workers in the Nation.

Any valid comparison of the wages received by steelworkers and Federal employees will demonstrate the greater average earnings of steelworkers.

STEELWORKERS EARN MORE THAN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In 1958 the average steel production employee earned $5,616, as contrasted with $5,193 for the average Federal employee and only $4,809 for the average employee of the U.S. Post Office Department. Furthermore, the pay of steel production employees has increased some 127 percent since 1946, as compared with 94 percent for all Federal employees and but 77 percent for postal employees.

On top of this, many leading authorities believe that the settlement reached in steel will add to the inflation in consumer prices generally, and of course this will affect Federal employees and all other people in the Nation. In its issue of January 18, U.S. News & World Report has stated that "steel prices are not to be raised immediately but higher costs are expected to force prices up later. The steel wage boost will affect other industries.

ADMINISTRATION MIGHT FAVOR INCREASE IN PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

And so I have asked the administration what it intends to do for its own employees, now that this same administration has sponsored such substantial gains for the steelworkers. I have voiced the inquiry to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in my capacity as the member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who held detailed subcommittee hearings several years ago on the entire question of Federal pay scales.

The cost of steel enters into every single item from baby buggies to trolley fares. The wages paid to the steelworkers enter into the cost of steel. Now that the administration has gained the credit for the settlement favoring the steelworkers, can the administration shirk the problem created in other industries and, indeed, in the Federal Government itself? Millions of families will find their pocketbooks and budgets disturbed by the steel settlement, which has gained such plaudits from the Steelworkers Union for the Eisenhower administration officials who negotiated it. But with plaudits come responsibility, and I have asked Chairman Jones of the Civil Service Commission the very simple and direct question of whether or not the administration has any plans for its own Federal Government employees which are parallel to the bonanza discovered by the administration for the steelworkers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my letter of January 11 to Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, together with the cryptic reply which I have received from the Chairman. I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an excellent article from the New York Times of January 10, 1960, by Joseph A. Loftus, "Steel Accord Stirs Fears of Inflation," which discusses the possible inflationary impact of the recent steel wage settlement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 11, 1960.

Hon. ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that the administration has taken the lead in sponsoring and promoting a handsome pay increase for the steelworkers, I should like to inquire as to the plans of the administration regarding its own Federal Government employees.

Let me call your attention to the fact that, in 1958, the average steel employee earned $5,616 as contrasted with $5,193 for the average Federal employee and only $4,809 for the average employee of the U.S. Post Office Department. Furthermore, the pay of steelworkers has increased some 127 percent since 1946, as compared with 94 percent for all Federal employees and 77 percent for postal employees.

In view of the administration leadership which resulted in the substantial pay increases recently negotiated for the steelworkers, I naturally assume that this administration has somewhat parallel plans underway for those who serve the administration directly, in the general departments and agencies of Government and in the Post Office particularly. Such a pay increase could be effective July 1, 1960, or January 1, 1961, but in either case would require congressional approval this year.

We must remember that the weapon of the strike, used with such effectiveness by the steelworkers, is not available to men and women who serve the U.S. Government. Yet this does not make any less urgent their problems of supporting their families in a period of ever-increasing living costs. I must again emphasize that the administration has been a good deal less than hesitant in claiming credit for the large wage and fringe-benefit increases recently won by the steelworkers. This certainly places upon the administration an obligation to tell the American

public how it proposes, under such circumstances, to treat its own postal workers and other Federal employees.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I shall await with interest your recommendations in this respect. I had assumed that the administration desired to "hold the line" on so-called pay increases. However, in view of the administration's own active role in promoting the very substantial salary increases obtained by the steelworkers, I now presume that Federal employees will receive somewhat similar gains. The cost of steel, after all, is a vital and integral feature of the cost of living of all Americans, including Federal employees.

May I hear from you at an early date?

With all good wishes for the new year, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 11, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In response to your inquiry of January 11, as to the position which the administration will take with respect to pay raises, it is my understanding that the President will discuss this issue in his budget message, now scheduled for presentation to Congress on January 18.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

STEEL ACCORD STIRS FEARS OF INFLATION BUT NOT ALL ECONOMISTS AGREE ON THE DEPTH OF ITS IMPACT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—President Eisenhower this week compared the nagging specter of inflation to a fire in the old homestead. Everybody, particularly government, must fight it, he told Congress.

Since the war, price inflation has halved the value of the dollar. More recently, the rise has been called a "creep" and many economists accept it as the price of a booming economy.

The Consumer Price Index, loosely called the cost of living fever chart, is the principal indicator of the creep. Except for a pause in the latter half of 1958, the index has moved up slowly but steadily. So with the wholesale price index, if farm products and food are excluded from the count.

Inflation is the consequence of many factors—government spending in excess of income, excessively cheap consumer credit that makes demands on the supply of goods, wasteful work and managerial practices leading to low productivity, and profiteering, to use an old wartime epithet.

The upward pressure of the labor contract is being watched closely by the economists. No contract is considered more important in this context than steel, and the settlement in that industry has prompted a reappraisal of the general outlook.

If the steel companies follow the pattern of their own statistics, prices will go up about $3.75 per ton per year.

This is not a prediction. It is a statistical implication in the speech of Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., to the Nation on Monday night. He said that for the last 20 years steel's employment costs have risen an average of 8 percent a year. The price rise of steel averaged 5.5 percent a year.

Since the employment cost rise under the new 3-year labor contract, according to Mr. Blough, will be less than half of the 20-year average, one might conclude that the price rise will be less than half the average, or 2.5 percent a year. The price of steel per ton averages $150. A raise of 2.5 percent would yield $3.75. This is small, as steel price increases have gone in the postwar years.

EMPLOYMENT COST

Any price projection involves assumptions. This projection assumes that 1960–62 will be average years. That could be wrong. Certainly 1960 is expected to be better than average in terms of total production. When production is high, employment cost per unit of output falls.

An assumption that productivity will not rise any faster than it has in the past is probably wrong, certainly for 1960. Data for the first half of 1959, when the mills were running close to capacity show a sharp rise in productivity.

Union cooperation and employee morale are important in the future price picture. As Mr. Blough said in that context, "the steel industry can witness one of the greatest improvements in its productive efficiency that it has known in modern times."

Since foreign steel and substitute products made at home are a threat, as Mr. Blough reported, the steel companies no doubt will consider these factors in making price policies.

So, political angles aside, it is possible that the steel industry will find 1960 so much better than average that it will be able to defer price increases until December 1, when the second step-up in employment costs takes effect. This, too, is no forecast.

STEEL'S EFFECTS

How do steel prices affect the rest of the economy?

In August 1956, Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, observed that the 6¼-percent rise in steel prices then would have a negligible effect on the Consumer Price Index because the amount of steel in the consumer dollar is tiny.

Prof. Jules Backman of New York University told the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee in 1958 that his analysis "supports Mr. Clague's 1956 appraisal and that conclusion would be equally applicable today."

Not all authorities accept this method of measuring the impact of steel prices.

Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm, two economists who did a special steel-inflation study for the Joint Economic Committee, said the Consumer Price Index "is particularly poorly suited to reflect the significance of steel."

They noted, for instance, that capital goods are completely excluded from the index, though in the long run they enter into consumer prices. Also excluded are the cost of Government purchases.

Besides, the impact of steel prices on other prices cannot be attributed wholly to the steel industry. About a third of the price increase in steel is attributable to higher prices paid by the steel industry for materials, transportation, and other items purchased from other industries.

Steel prices are sometimes credited with a psychological impact on the economy. As a basic industry, it is thought of as a bellwether. Yet, in the last 7 years the major steel consuming industries have not raised their prices as fast as basic steel prices went up.

The immediate effect of the wage settlement on the stock market was to drive up steel shares. Then these prices fell back, although other considerations appeared to have entered into the drop.

With the threat of another steel strike dissipated, it is hard to see any block to the flow of consumer goods to meet the rising demand.

PRICES HELD

The extent that production costs tend to push up prices, improved productivity (rates of production) will tend to hold down prices. The outlook for this is generally good.

Rising imports, though they may create other problems, will tend to hold down prices.

As the experts hereabouts look ahead, the rise in the general price level, in the next year probably will not exceed 2 percent if it goes that high. In 1959, the Consumer Price Index went up 1.5 percent.

If steel is the key, that forecast surely should stand up. For, to go back to the beginning, the steel settlement is less costly than previous settlements, far less than the 3-year pact made in 1956.

If President Eisenhower's hopes are realized, we will reach June 30, 1961, with a $4,200 million surplus in the Federal till. This is a deflationary force.

Tight money, which seems to be the current policy of the Federal Reserve, tends to brake the spiral, though an excessive use of such a brake could manufacture a recession.

Taken together, the pressures may not entirely dissipate the specter of inflation but the experts are not worrying about anything so real that it will burn the house down.

OUR STAKE IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead, Congress will be faced with significant decisions on the direction and scope of the mutual security program.

The program—one of the most controversial in the postwar era—has served, nevertheless, as the foundation for free world efforts to combat communism.

As a unique effort in history by one nation to assist other nations in facing a common enemy, however, the program, unfortunately, has suffered, prestigewise, from the inevitable mistakes of the "trial and error" road.

Despite the difficulties involved in successfully meeting a great challenge, however, mutual security nevertheless has experienced a large degree of success—not only in withstanding the pressure of expansionist communism; but also, to go one step further, in reducing—through economic and technological assistance—the areas of poverty and substandard living which serve as the breeding places for trouble in the world.

Today, changing conditions in the world require adjustments in the program. Particularly, there is a real need for assumption of greater responsibility for assistance to less developed nations by those countries—particularly Western Europe—which are now on their feet economically.

These nations, I believe, can well afford both in their own national, and the free-world interest, to assume greater responsibilities in this field.

Although there is a recognizable need for improvements in the program, however, mutual assistance still continues to be an essential part of our foreign policy.

Recently, the Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration, D. A. FitzGerald, gave an informative address on foreign aid at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis., entitled "Our Stake in Foreign Aid."

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STAKE IN FOREIGN AID

(Address by D. A. FitzGerald, Deputy Director for Operations, International Cooperation Administration, at the Institute on U.S. Foreign Aid, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1959)

The subject which has been assigned to me for this evening is "Our Stake in Foreign Aid." I wish that the mutual security program had no future, that we had no stake in it. The greatest news for all of us would be an announcement by the President that this program could come to an end—that it was no longer needed.

Such an announcement would mean that the military threat to the United States no longer existed; that no defense partner of ours had a larger defense burden than its economy could reasonably bear; that there was no need for outside governmental financial help for economic and social development anywhere in the world; that each nation, new or old, had enough of the knowledge and skills it needed for progress; that emergencies such as famines, floods, fires, or political upheavals could be handled without U.S. Government assistance.

Unfortunately, this millennium is not within sight, much less within reach. In its absence, or any reasonable facsimile thereof, we will need, in our own national interest, a mutual security program to deal constructively and imaginatively with the hard facts of international life. Which are the most important of these facts? I shall deal with three.

1. The fact of tremendous military power in unfriendly hands.

2. The fact of surge for economic and social progress in the underdeveloped nations.

3. The fact of growing U.S. dependence on oversea trade.

1. Military power: Despite the talk of peace, negotiation, and coexistence, we still face a most formidable military problem. Milwaukee is only 15 minutes away from Moscow—by intercontinental ballistic missile, which the Russians say they possess. The conventional airpower of the Sino-Soviet bloc consists of about 25,000 planes in operational units and it is a well-known fact that Russian jets are good. In the Russian and Chinese armies are some 400 line divisions, totaling more than 6½ million soldiers. The naval strength includes some 3,000 combatant vessels, of which about 500 are submarines. There has been no reduction in the Sino-Soviet military power. These forces still exist and are being equipped with better weapons every day.

We are still faced with international communism devoted to an often-stated purpose of taking over the world. Mr. Khrushchev has never, for 1 minute, budged on this point. It is an article of faith with him that communism will follow capitalism as night follows day. The only apparent change is in tactics, and we do not yet know whether this relatively new phenomenon will be a permanent change, or only a temporary one.

In the past, the Sino-Soviet bloc has proved, over, and over, and over again, that it will not hesitate to use armed force or threats of armed force to achieve its goals. The record of military occupation to install puppet governments in Eastern Europe; the record of the Berlin blockade; the record of the takeover of China; the record of Communist-abetted insurrections in Greece, Malaya, Indochina, the Philippines; the record of aggression in Korea—and now in India; the dismal record is on the books—clear for all to see.

It took time to realize that the Sino-Soviet bloc would keep on using armed forces to gobble up its neighbors unless stopped by military power. It took more time, working with our defense partners, to put together the free world defense strength to stop that outward march. I do not know any way, at present, to keep the Sino-Soviet bloc from engaging in further military action except for us to make it too risky for it to do so. We have made that risk too great and we must maintain this position until such time as we get workable and enforcible agreements which can bring about real peace and disarmament.

It is not the U.S. defense forces alone; it is not the defense forces of our allies alone; it is not the air and naval bases made available to us—none of these individual defense items could have done the job. But a free world collective defense, with many partners working together, helping each other—with all partners undertaking burdensome expenditures, all partners putting great numbers of young men into armies, navies, and air forces; all partners devoting large amounts of materiel to defense—all this has done the job.

2. Economic and social progress: I turn now to the second hard fact we face—the surge for economic and social progress. The tens of millions, indeed the hundreds of millions of people, in the underdeveloped parts of the world in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are no longer content merely to exist. As communication improves and brings knowledge of the outside world to great masses of these people, their conviction grows that their lot can and indeed must be improved. This demand for progress is particularly insistent in the 21 new countries with a population of 720 million people who have obtained their political independence since the end of World War II. Other new countries, perhaps as many more, will appear on the scenes during the next decade.

In all the underdeveloped countries, whether new or old, annual incomes are likely to average less than $100 a year. Illiteracy, disease, and malnutrition have been the rule rather than the exception. The leaders of these countries, either on their own or because of the pressure from within, or both, are committed to advance the well-being of their people. Whether this economic development takes place under a political system which is compatible with ours, a system which is based on the freedom and dignity of the individual, is vitally important to the security of the United States.

Let me stress that even though we may have convinced the Sino-Soviet bloc that the risk of military aggression is too great, we should not be lulled into believing that other forms of competition with international communism no longer exist or are declining. Indeed, it seems clear that the situation is exactly the reverse. As the advance of the retaliatory power of the free world makes the prospect for the achievement of the goal of world domination through overt military aggression more and more costly, the U.S.S.R. and its satellites are turning more and more to other means for achieving their ultimate goal.

During the past 3 years or so, the Communist bloc—largely the U.S.S.R.—has entered into agreements for the provision of $2.4 billion worth of economic assistance to 21 countries, primarily underdeveloped countries on the periphery of the bloc itself. The bloc is probing—and probing deeply—on the economic front all over the free world and appears to be eyeing with increasing interest the great continent of Africa and its many newly emerging countries. As the productive capacity of the Sino-Soviet bloc grows, particularly in the U.S.S.R., we can confidently expect a continuous increase in Communist efforts at economic penetration and political subversion.

3. U.S. economic need: The third important fact of life in the international world today is the increasing dependence of the United States on the rest of the world for raw materials and other imports to meet its ever-growing internal requirements, on the one hand, and as markets for its products, on the other. During the past two decades our imports have increased fivefold and our exports sevenfold. The latter amounted to nearly $21 billion last year and exceeded our imports by nearly $3½ billion. Nevertheless, this surplus in our trading account has not been sufficient to offset the red ink in our invisibles, principally the U.S. military expenditures abroad; the U.S. Government grants, loans, and other capital outflow; and private capital outflow for investment.

It is clear that the United States cannot run a balance-of-payments deficit of the current size indefinitely. Recently the Secretary of State commented on this matter as follows:

"The problem is to see to it that the deficit is reduced by means which enlarge international trade and do not restrict it—by methods which promote competition and the flow of development capital rather than restrict them. If this approach is to succeed, action is required of other countries, particularly Western Europe and Japan, to open their doors to American exports and to provide additional capital to the development of hungry nations of Asia, Africa, and the Near East and Latin America. At the recent meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the United States called for an end to the discriminatory restrictions which many foreign countries had been compelled to maintain against American exports in earlier years, but which are no longer needed. Our request received gratifying support on all sides. Both the Fund and GATT institutions recorded the view that discriminatory restrictions can no longer be generally justified on balance-of-payments grounds and many countries have taken action to eliminate discriminations."

The United States has been built upon the energy and initiative of individuals and upon the belief that, under the broad rules of fair play, free competition and initiative are the sinews of our economic and political strength. This holds true of our international activities as well as our domestic affairs.

But let us make no mistake about it. If through indifference and lack of understanding on our part we ignore the legitimate requirements of the free world for the resources to help it make economic progress and it turns elsewhere for this help and if, as a consequence, it adopts the political and economic practices of communism, our present balance-of-payments difficulties will fade into insignificance.

Free, friendly, and forward-moving countries are not only our best markets, our best sources of supply for the mutual benefit of all of us, but are essential to the maintenance of our way of life. As our experience with the Sino-Soviet bloc demonstrates, freedom of trade and commerce and private competition are incompatible with Communist ideology.

As long as these three major facts of international life face us, the United States will have to have, in its own interests, a mutual security program of some kind and of substantial magnitude. No doubt there will be changes in direction and emphasis, and in character and composition, as the facts of international conditions require, and the U.S. interests demand.

The biggest single cost element in our mutual security program today is that involved in the maintenance of the extensive military strength of the free world—the strength needed to deal with the first fact of international life—the threat of overt Communist aggression. We undertake to provide military assistance to deter this threat for exactly the same reason that we have our

own domestic defense program—to help build up and maintain essential defensive strength. And let me emphasize we are only helping to maintain the military strength of our allies. Our allies contribute over $6 to our mutual defense for every dollar of military assistance the United States provides to them. I am no military man, but let me quote the President of the United States, who certainly has a reputation in the military field. Here is what he said to the Congress in submitting last year's mutual security program:

"These two requests, one for own defense forces, the other for our share in supporting the collective system, are but two elements in a single defense effort. Each is essential in the plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for our national security. Each is recommended to you by the same Joint Chiefs, the same Secretary of Defense, and the same Commander in Chief.

"Dollar for dollar our [military] expenditures for the mutual security program, after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures for our own forces."

Some of our allies, particularly our NATO partners, have made rapid economic progress in the last decade. Not only are they in a position to reduce the dollar discrimination to which I referred earlier, but they are in a position to, and are indeed, carrying more of the burden of our mutual defense.

But our military allies are not limited to the advanced countries of Western Europe, nor is the military threat limited to this area. Our allies in the Far East and Asia—Korea, Nationalist China, Pakistan, and Turkey, for example—are not capable of maintaining the military establishments that are needed in our mutual interest, and military assistance from the United States must be provided.

Korea and Nationalist China have the fourth and fifth largest armies in the world, exceeded only by the armies of Red China, the U.S.R.R., and the United States. As long as the military threat continues, I can see no possibility of the United States discontinuing some military assistance to these countries. We can hope that it will become less as time passes. But we must be realistic, and the cost of modern armies is going up and not down.

In addition to direct military assistance, we are providing a dozen of our allies with economic assistance to help them to maintain these same military establishments and hopefully some modest economic growth. U.S. military assistance is limited to materiel and training. There are other costs to supporting military establishments—troop pay, subsistence, etc. These costs for such countries as Korea, Nationalist China, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, and Vietnam are larger than can be met from their own resources. So in 12 countries, in addition to the provision of direct military equipment, the United States is also providing modest economic resources to help the country carry the burden of the military establishments which are needed for our protection as well as theirs.

We have a vital interest in the economic progress of these countries, in addition to our military interest in their defense establishment. If with our help these countries can gradually increase their rate of economic growth, thus eventually taking on more of the cost of carrying their own military establishment, then we can indeed look forward to the time when this component of the mutual security program can be reduced and, hopefully, eliminated.

These two components of the mutual security program—military assistance for our allies, and defense support economic aid for 12 of them—make up almost two-thirds of the mutual security program appropriations for this year—over $2 billion out of a total $3.2 billion.

I now turn again to the second international fact of life—the demand for progress in that vast area of the world characterized as "underdeveloped," and the vital importance to the United States that this progress be made under political and economic conditions which are compatible wtih those of the United States. Perhaps we can hope that Soviet leadership, as Secretary Herter recently said, "is reaching a conclusion similar to our own—that unless the course of events is changed and changed soon, both sides face unacceptable risks of general nuclear war, which would approximate mutual suicide." But even if, in fact, this turns out to be the case there still will be no basis for relaxing our efforts in the nonmilitary field. Indeed, in view of the growing economic strength of the Soviet Union, we will need to redouble—not relax our efforts. Mr. Khrushchev still makes no bones about his ultimate aims. They are the same as ever, even though the means perhaps will be different.

So within the framework of mutual security we must be concerned with development as we are concerned with defense. Most of the balance of the mutual security appropriation, the remaining one-third, is used to help the underdeveloped areas of the world to develop both their human resources and their physical resources. It is my personal conviction that lack of trained human resources is more likely to inhibit economic, political, and social progress than the lack of physical resources.

An utterly essential prerequisite to development in this day and age is literacy. Yet in underdeveloped areas of the world as a whole the literacy rate is less than 25 percent. In addition to basic literacy, economic progress is dependent upon an adequate supply of trained manpower all the way from skilled workmen through private and public managers to nuclear scientists. By and large these trained human resources are either woefully inadequate or missing entirely.

One component of the mutual security program is devoted to helping train these human resources. This is our technical cooperation, frequently called point 4 program. Today we have some 3,500 American technicians and consultants abroad helping and advising in agriculture, industry, public administration, health, education, and transportation, while annually we are providing training in the United States or other more developed countries, for some 8,000 nationals of the less developed parts of the world, in the same broad fields of human knowledge and endeavor.

We are not alone in this activity. The United Nations technical assistance program is operating in this field as are many other more developed countries in bilateral programs of their own, along with many American foundations and religious groups.

In the field of higher education, we in ICA have been calling more and more upon American universities to provide help and guidance in the establishment of similar institutions overseas. As of today we have 90 contracts with 53 American universities for help in 33 countries.

But the need is enormous, and education, whether narrowly or broadly defined, takes time—it takes a great deal of time. I am convinced that, no matter what progress may be made in our efforts to find a solid basis for coexisting with international communism, we will find it in our very direct interest to continue for the foreseeable future the technical assistance—point 4—component of our mutual security program.

The second component on the development side of our mutual security ledger is help in providing the physical resources needed for economic development. Currently these resources are provided largely through the Development Loan Fund, first authorized by the Congress about 3 years ago. This Fund is authorized to make resources available on a long-term-repayment basis, in local currency if the situation requires, for sound development projects for which no other reasonable source of financing is available.

The Development Loan Fund is not the only, indeed not even the major, source of capital resources for economic development. Others include the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, resources from other more developed countries, particularly those in Western Europe and over the horizon, an Inter-American Bank to help meet the needs of our Latin American friends and the International Development Association. Nevertheless, even with all these potential resources in sight, the economic progress of vast areas of the world is inadequate to meet the challenge of the times or explicitly the security interests of the United States.

There is a considerable body of opinion in the United States that the U.S. contribution to this development must be sharply increased. One recent study prepared by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, proposes that the U.S. Government for a 10-year period, starting in the fiscal year 1961, devote one-fourth of its additional production each year over and above present levels of assistance, to the economic development of less developed areas. In monetary terms this would contemplate something in the order of an additional $4 billion worth of assistance immediately and, as our own production grows during the decade, $6 or $8 billion a year a decade from now.

However, I am convinced, for the reasons elaborated earlier, that through one means or another we will need to continue for some time to contribute substantial resources to economic development in the less developed areas of the world. Much of this assistance cannot be on standard and traditional terms of repayment. Some of it should be provided initially as an outright grant and some more should involve flexible repayment provisions which permit the discharge of the obligation in local currency rather than convertible foreign exchange.

Let me remind this audience that in the early years of the United States, indeed through much if not all of the 19th century, this country relied heavily for its economic development on capital resources from abroad. Even today a major midwestern railroad—the Northwestern—runs on the left rather than the right—a heritage of its British origin. But, some will say, these investments were made on a business basis by private investors. True, but many of the enterprises defaulted on the bonds and thus in effect the project became a gift to the country.

One alternative proposal not infrequently advanced is that the U.S. Government, and thus the American taxpayer, should get out of the business of helping economic development overseas and permit, indeed encourage, American private investment to do the job. Nothing would please me better, but the possibilities must be looked at in perspective. The great underdeveloped areas of the world are the arc of Asia and Africa. I am sure it will surprise you to know, as it certainly surprised me, that U.S. private investment, exclusive of investments in oil, in all of Africa, in all the Near East and in all of South Asia and the Far East has amounted to less than $60 million a year during the past 5 years. The total for this vast area is less than the annual budget of Montgomery County, Md., where I live.

In saying this I have no intention of being critical of the American private investor. He wants reasonable security for and reasonable returns on his investment. Everyone in this audience could think of many countries in which he would be not

only hesitant but completely unwilling to make any investments. But yet these countries are very likely indeed to be countries in which, from the point of view of the interest of all Americans, economic development is the most vital.

The U.S. Government is working hard at its job to make the climate overseas attractive to American private investors, through treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, tax treaties and the like. We in ICA for 10 years have been offering for a modest fee to guarantee the American private investor against losses from either expropriation or inconvertibility. More recently the Congress has extended this coverage to include damage resulting from war. The past year or so our coverage expanded sharply and now amounts to $432 million. Much of this guarantee coverage was, however, in the more advanced countries. During the past session the Congress limited this guarantee authority, effective January 1, 1960, to underdeveloped countries.

We are most anxious to have private investment take on more of the responsibility. In addition to our investment guarantee program, we have established a senior officer with staff to devote his attention exclusively to the job of encouraging and facilitating American and other foreign private investment in underdeveloped areas of the world.

We believe also that the countries of Western Europe, and now perhaps Japan, can, both bilaterally and multilaterally, contribute more to this economic development. It seems to us clear too that the contribution of other developed countries must also include a larger component of noncommercial grants and loans and it is for this reason the United States recently proposed the formation of the International Development Association which under the expert management of the most successful International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, can help provide more of the noncommercial requirements for development.

Now before closing I should like to turn briefly to one other aspect of the mutual security program, namely its administration. The mutual security program seems to generate, for reasons not wholly clear to me, more than the usual number of charges of poor administration. Of course we make mistakes. The only person who never makes a mistake is one who never makes a decision.

The International Cooperation Administration in helping to carry out more than 1,000 projects every year, scattered in 60 countries, where working conditions, local standards of conduct of managerial capacity and of business experience are completely different from those existing in the United States. Despite these additional handicaps, I am wholly satisfied that our batting average is very high. We have a loyal, competent, devoted staff who take pride in getting things done well under conditions which would, I can assure you, baffle and frustrate many of us. But to repeat, we do make mistakes and I can have no legitimate complaint when these mistakes are reported fully to the American public. Obviously the taxpayer is entitled to this knowledge. I could wish that the successes were as widely publicized as are our mistakes, but perhaps this is too much to hope.

About 2 years ago we devoted the time and effort necessary to investigate and report on a list compiled by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of charges which at that time were being commonly made against the mutual security program, including allegations that we were giving iceboxes to Eskimos and dress suits to Greek undertakers. The committee listed some 96 of these charges. Some of these like the two I mentioned were pure fiction. Eight did not apply to the mutual security program at all; some 20 were errors in fact; over one-half were misinterpretations or differences in judgment. Not one represented an error or mistake not corrected. I have here in my hand part 6 of the hearings before that committee. The list of questions and the responses thereto occupy 55 printed pages. How many of you are aware, I wonder, that such a list had been compiled, analyzed, and made publicly available?

There is in Wisconsin, I believe, an organization which around the turn of the year annually makes awards for the tallest "tall story" of that year. I am seriously considering entering in this contest some of the fabrications dealing with the mutual security program. I feel confident that one or more of them would win the award hands down. The regular entries in the competition are submitted in the spirit of good clean fun and are accepted and understood for what they are. No harm is done. Unfortunately, incorrect reporting, or even worse, pure fabrications, on the mutual security program could be seriously detrimental to the security of the United States.

Now to return to the main theme. In summary the major components of the current mutual security program or some alternative thereto will in my opinion have to continue in some magnitude for the foreseeable future. This program does cost money—does require U.S. resources that might otherwise be used for different purposes but in our concentration on costs we have many times I fear lost sight of value. The real question about the mutual security program is not "What does it cost?" but "What is it worth?" Value and price are not the same; nor is a thing automatically good because it is cheap and bad because it is expensive.

What is it worth to the United States that the balance of power for peace remains with the free world and has not been moved to the Communists' side of the scales? What is it worth to the United States to have strong and willing partners for defense? What is it worth to the United States to have the use of air, naval, and communication bases at strategic spots around the world? What is it worth to the United States to have strong trading partners able to stand on their own feet and pay their own way? What is it worth to the United States to have prevented economic and perhaps political collapse in Western Europe and in countries like Iran, Turkey, Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Pakistan? What is it worth to the United States that most of the developing nations turn first toward the West when they look for outside help in developing their resources and their institutions? What is it worth to this country that there are being created, by and large, whole societies whose institutions, of government and business, are compatible with our own? What is it worth to the United States that we do not have to go it alone and do not have to incur increased taxes and draft calls to supply U.S. Armed Forces equal to free world totals?

These are the kinds of questions we should be asking ourselves and we should try to find out what part the mutual security program has in the answers. We should go further. In this era of change we should ask if there are available better or less costly alternatives for achieving the goals we have set ourselves. Even should the need for defense disappear completely there will still be need for development programs for years to come. We would have an interest in these programs even should there be no competition from international communism. In the years ahead I am convinced that the economic and technical parts of the mutual security program will become even more important than they have been up until now.

Tomorrow you will hear from several distinguished gentlemen on various aspects of the subject before the conference. From the information you receive, from the points of view presented, you can then draw your own conclusion about our stake in foreign aid.

UNIVERSITY OF THE AIR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in our current discussions of television, it is imperative that we consider some of the substantial and unique contributions that medium has made to our society.

Through the wonders of electronics an experiment was undertaken 9 years ago this month which has helped enrich the lives of people in four States. "The University of the Air" was founded, in cooperation with 22 leading colleges and universities, to offer college-level training for anyone motivated enough to flick a dial.

It began on station WFIL–TV, the Triangle television station in Philadelphia, and is now carried also by the following Triangle stations: WNBF–TV, Binghampton, N.Y.; WFBG–TV, Altoona-Johnstown, Pa.; WNHC–TV, Hartford-New Haven, Conn.; WLYH–TV, Lebanon-Lancaster, Pa.; and KFRE–TV, Fresno, Calif.

Participating colleges and universities include: Albright College, Reading, Pa.; La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.; Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.; Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Division of School Extension, School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.; Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa.; Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.; Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.; Pennsylvania State University, Ogontz Center, Abington, Pa.; Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.; Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.; the Pennsylvania State College of Optometry, Philadelphia, Pa.; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pa.; Glassboro State College, Glassboro, N.J.; Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Pa.; New Jersey Education Association, Trenton, N.J.; Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rider College, Trenton, N.J.; St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.; Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; the Philadelphia Textile Institute Foundation, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

In the semester now ending the "University of the Air" has offered its 188th course. Its audience has been estimated at more than 250,000 "students" who see one or more shows each week.

Today the "University of the Air" is the oldest and largest continuously run adult education program in commercial television. It has been called television's most ambitious program of mass education.

This ninth birthday of the "University of the Air" is a good occasion to remind ourselves that commercial television, when in the hands of intelligent, civic-minded people, can make an important contribution to the culture of our society.

ARTICLE FROM FOREIGN AFFAIRS QUARTERLY BY HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly great leaders of this era, both in our Nation and in the world, is

former Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois. Governor Stevenson has a profound knowledge and wisdom regarding foreign affairs and international questions. In the January 1960 issue of Foreign Affairs, Adlai Stevenson has contributed an article, "Putting First Things First." In this thoughtful and informative article, Governor Stevenson has called attention to our great responsibilities in maintaining freedom in the world and in expanding economic opportunity for underdeveloped nations. He has rallied us to the urgency of the sacrifice which is necessary if we are to survive. Anybody reading this article will realize anew that Adlai Stevenson has the stature, integrity, and intellect to head our Nation at a time of world crisis. Because Governor Stevenson's message is so important to all Americans generally and to those who sit in the Senate and the House in particular, I ask unanimous consent that his splendid article from Foreign Affairs for January be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Foreign Affairs, January 1960]

PUTTING FIRST THINGS FIRST—A DEMOCRATIC VIEW

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Peace is the most imperative business in the world today. It is the world's most universal desire and most powerful force. The mass of humanity seems to understand better than its rulers the idiocy of war and its mortal danger to the human race. Everywhere I travel the people appear to know that all their aspirations for freedom and dignity and a better life are going to be destroyed if mankind ever fights a modern war.

The United States has been the source of the most revolutionary and glorious concepts of human and political freedom. It had been my hope that in this revolutionary century the United States, which first split the atom, would be the tireless, fearless, indomitable leader of the cause of freedom from war. And I still think that to seize that role and pursue it with passion should be the top priority of American foreign policy.

Why haven't we really led the postwar world since the Korean war? Why are many Americans fearful that we have lost our sense of national purpose? Why is there confusion about intellectual and moral values? Why is there a slackness about public problems and a wholesale retreat to the joys of private life? Why is balancing the budget a greater national concern than exertion, self-denial, and hard work? Have we confused prosperity with security? Why is there a growing uneasiness over the contrast between a society like that of the Soviets which believes in its destiny and our own which seems to regard itself as fulfilled?

Personally, I think the trouble is not in the Nation's energy, its will, or its nerve; and if wealth and comfort have softened us I am sure we are not yet beyond repair. The root of the trouble lies in this: the Nation faces a series of massive changes in the world scene; they call for new ways of looking at the world; for new policies; for increased efforts. But since Korea our political leadership has not clearly and insistently acknowledged this fact. American policy has thus moved further and further away from the reality that surrounds us. Unchallenged by the realities, Americans have turned their energies and idealism to second-order business.

The main lines of American military and foreign policy are still those of 1947–52. Although Messrs. Dulles and Eisenhower crusaded for a policy of liberation and denounced containment as immoral in operation their policy was to construct a chain of military alliances around communism and to attempt to restrain the spread of Soviet power wherever it threatened. Oddly enough, Mr. Dulles' faith that communism would disintegrate from its own internal contradictions resembled Lenin's conviction that capitalism would do the same.

But to win such an endurance contest we must have superior endurance. Yet instead of making massive efforts to improve or preserve the balance and to encourage attrition or benign change on the Soviet side, we emphasized conservative policies and fell behind on all fronts, while the Soviet Union, and other industrial areas, forged ahead at a rapid pace.

In short, while our Government adopted the Dulles foreign policy it did nothing to make it effective. Indeed, it was not long ago that Vice President NIXON saw something disloyal in my warnings about the Soviet rate of economic growth. (It is now double that of the United States.)

So for the most part the response of the United States to the great changes of this century has been only negative and defensive. An administration which has defined its overriding task as keeping the budget down has dealt with them more with rhetoric than action. And unwillingness to acknowledge reality has led to a progressive erosion of the American stature on the world scene. (Sometimes I thank God for Russians—their rapid progress may even make economic growth, risk, and adventure essential, if not respectable, here.)

But it is not my purpose to indict the small aims and large fears of the Eisenhower-Dulles era. Things had to change, and I applaud Secretary Herter for the recent signs of more enterprise and flexibility in the conduct of our foreign policy. I hope, however, that we Americans do not mistake the President's ceremonial travels for negotiation and settlement.

What are some of the realities we must face in this age of many revolutions? The old colonial order has all but vanished. New nations—and new imperialisms—strive to fill the vacuum in a vast political revolution. Most of these new nations seek to bring their economies through the sound barrier of modernization in a few decades. This is the economic revolution. But they do so against the background of exploding population which will double the inhabitants of underdeveloped areas in the next generation. This is the biological revolution. Meanwhile, supersonic flight, atomic energy, and the missile have opened up two opposite possibilities of equal magnitude—the exploration of planetary space and self-extermination within the space of this planet. This is the scientific revolution.

What lies ahead of us in this bewildering century is invisible but it may be even more significant. In the past the North Atlantic nations dominated the world. But they could not control themselves, and after their great world wars the power and influence of Europe declined; Russia and the United States suddenly emerged as the two dominant powers. Already the brief day of two-power domination is passing and new centers of power are rising from old ashes in Asia. By the end of the century China and India will be industrialized, and China's population will be close to a billion. Then, as Europe becomes more unified, it too will reemerge as a great center of power. And who can doubt that regional unification is going to take place in Latin America and emerging Africa?

So, this is not the beginning of the American century, or anyone else's. It behooves us to face the reality that we Americans are not going to be alone at the center of the stage very long—and that modesty is always becoming. But if our tradition does not require us to be the world's boss, it does require us to keep alive and vigorous the great traditions of political freedom and legal order which underlie Western society.

To guide us through these uncharted seas, to comprehend and direct the prodigious forces now shaping the new world, is going to make heavy demands on our resources of wisdom, leadership, self-discipline, and magnanimity. I would say that this reality belongs at the top of the list, because it has not yet been proved that democracy and the processes of persuasion can match the efficiency of central planning and dictatorship.

Multiple and universal change is thus the setting for policy in this age. Another reality we have been slow to admit is the present advantage this gives to the Communists. They did not invent the world's revolutions. All of these were, wittingly or unwittingly, launched in the West. But communism, in itself a philosophy of change, exploits them worldwide. It uses all the anti-imperialist jargon and proclaims the brotherhood of—Communist—mankind. To our everlasting shame it has led the way through the frontiers of space and even pinned the Soviet colors on the moon. It proposes its own sweeping totalitarian planning as the only way out of economic stagnation, and the Soviet example of how to modernize and grow strong quickly has a powerful appeal to backward countries.

Mr. Khrushchev states his purpose plainly. He says, let's throw down our arms and we will beat you at peaceful competitive coexistence. He says that Russia will outstrip the United States in production and that one by one the neutrals will fall in line, while the Communist system spreads around the globe, and finally surrounds and isolates capitalism's last refuge in the United States. The Soviet planners expect that, as in China, the non-Communist regimes in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and parts of Latin America will be unable to solve the problems of modernization and economic growth and will turn to the Communist alternative, encouraged no doubt by Communist trade, aid, and penetration.

This, I am convinced, is the route to world power which the Soviets now regard as the safest and surest. And I was impressed by Khrushchev's confidence, shown both in his country and ours, that history is working with him and that the system under which Russia became so strong so quickly is the system which other countries must follow. We refused to believe that Hitler meant what he said, to our sorrow. We should not do ourselves the same injury again.

To me the two most dangerous realities we now face are the multiplication of nuclear weapons and the disparity in living standards between the rich nations and the poor. So I suggest we must meet the crises of our time in four major areas: First, we must end the growing gap between wealth and poverty. In doing so, we must create new supranational patterns and institutions of cooperation. Thirdly, as long as nuclear weapons exist, the danger of their use exists. We must work for a disarmed world under law and organized police power—the only final answer to the threat of annihilating war. And, lastly, we must extend as far as lies in our power the concept of an open world. For it is in our acceptance of variety and differences, harmonized but not suppressed, that we in our turn work not only with the trend of history but in accord with the ingrained diversity of mankind. Our faith is that in the long contest the totalitarians will gradually be converted to our way of thinking rather than we to theirs. Our goal is not just to win a cold war but to persuade a cold world.

These are, of course, statements of high generality. We turn them into policy only

by specific application and negotiation. Some aims we can pursue with like-minded nations, and we should proceed with them at once. Others depend on Communist assent and may take years of stoic negotiation.

The beginning of wisdom in the West, I think, is to have our own creative policy—not just a negative policy to stop the Communists, but one that reflects our own vision of a viable world society and our own understanding of the revolutions through which we live. The voluntary ending of colonialism by most of the Western colonial powers, the Marshall plan, Europe's moves toward unity, and the various programs of economic aid, are creative innovations already to the West's postwar credit.

Once we know what we want, what our aims are, then we shall have to pursue them by every means with the same resolution and sacrifice that the Communists pursue theirs. It will not be easy to agree on them in view of the divisions among the Western Powers, combined with the fact that Russia controls Eastern Germany and, therefore, the possibility of German unification. I suspect the hardest task will be to pursue our aims resolutely in common with our partners. For in peacetime democracies are at a particular disadvantage. Immediate domestic concerns take precedence over distant national goals. Too many selfish, thoughtless people prefer the easy option and too many ambitious politicians prefer office to duty. But we cannot live by tail fins, TV, and a sound dollar alone. Somehow we must lift our sights to the level of the tasks. I will try to suggest some of them.

II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The average annual income in the United States is more than $2,000 as against less than $100 for a third of the world's population. And the worst thing about this disparity is that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor poorer. Happily, there is, at long last, a growing realization here and among our friends that these are the decisive areas and that we must assist the underdeveloped peoples to advance to self-sustaining growth while preserving their independence and some hope of evolving a political democracy. Without an alternative to Communist methods of development, we face grim prospects indeed in poor countries where literacy is low, hunger high, and the gap between resources and population widening.

Five conditions of success are, I think, clear. We shall be engaged on this program for at least 40 years. We shall require a professional staff, with the languages and skills needed in this whole new field of activity. Informed opinion tells us that at least $5 billion a year is needed—from all sources, public and private, domestic and foreign. We shall have to coordinate all aspects of the effort with other nations—not only investment but opportunities for trade, international liquidity, and so forth. To get the maximum results the developed nations must all cooperate. The time has certainly come for other countries to share more of the common burden of assistance. In such circumstances the United States cannot expect to have full control of the use of all its expenditures for development purposes.

These five conditions are not yet fully understood, let alone accepted. There is still more than a hint that if the Communists would behave, the economic development program could be canceled. Partly as a result, our staffing policies are haphazard, our linguistic programs inadequate, and we are acquiring so many competing agencies, both national and international, that policies tend to be tangled and obstructed at the base and overlapping and bewildering in the field.

I regret that the administration rejected the recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last winter for a soft loan fund of about a billion and a half dollars for about 5 years. With Europe prosperous and dollars flowing to that area, Europe should mobilize an equivalent sum. With something like $3 billion a year available for public investment, with the West's great resources of skill and experience, and working with the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, and the new International Development Association, we should be able to plan an effective, concerted attack upon all aspects of backwardness—lack of capital, lack of skills, low reserves, single-crop exports and fluctuating world prices.

It is difficult to establish priorities, but I believe there is general agreement that the whole political future of free Asia may depend on the success of India's great experiment. Certainly, too, the need is obvious for more rapid modernization and economic cooperation in Latin America. And the vision of a common market for the Western Hemisphere is even more exciting if it points toward economic federation in the whole non-Communist world.

For years I have urged that the United States put economic development on the same level of urgency as national defense, and press other advanced countries to join in a concerted effort. That in actuality we have no such joint program for world investment and growth springs in part from another weakness—our failure to develop an organic Atlantic community with common institutions and purposes. The ghost that has haunted every NATO conference for 10 years is the ghost of the emperor without clothes. "The wise men," committees, resolutions—all have spoken of NATO's positive tasks. We still have to find them. Worse, even the present measure of unity is being fretted away.

III. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Beneath the surface there are dangerous cross-purposes within our alliance. They are not to be overcome by ceremonial travels and by hasty diplomacy in preparation for meetings with Mr. Khrushchev.

The reconciliation of France and Germany is an historic achievement of postwar diplomacy. The Common Market is a creative effort to pass beyond narrow nationalism in the search for economic and social well-being and finally political union. But the price is high if France by moving closer to Germany moves away from Britain, and if the Common Market of the six nations and the free trade associations of the seven between them divide Europe into rival trading groups behind rising economic barriers which embitter not only commerce but politics as well. Nor do the divisions affect Europe alone. The frictions will be spread to Africa as a last divisive legacy of colonialism.

I believe it is a profound interest of American policy to see these nascent divisions overcome. We should urge the six and the seven to return to negotiation to mitigate tariff discrimination and liberalize trade. The United States and Canada should also cooperate systematically with the six and the seven to enlarge and use our influence vigorously to help solve in common the tough problems of commercial policy, including such questions as the stabilization of commodity prices in which the industrialized countries must of necessity take the lead. The last 3 or 4 years have demonstrated how even our own trade is becoming dependent upon European prosperity and how policies on each side of the Atlantic vitally influence the rest of the community. The unfavorable American balance of payments and fears for American reserves are already leading to a new isolationism, to creeping protectionism, to reduced foreign aid, and to further divisions in our unity and strength. The administration's "Buy American" policy in our lending will have negligible effects on our exports, and it repudiates the liberal trade and payments policy which we have been urging on our allies at the very moment they are adopting it.

Nor can we safely confront the Communist challenge with inferior military deterrent capability. If we fall too far behind or reduce our military strength—without equivalent Soviet concessions—we may find Mr. Khrushchev's interest in negotiation has diminished. We must not tempt the Russians with weakness. The possibility that they could destroy our retaliatory power at a single blow must never appear to them to be realistic. Even then, the only safe assumption for us to make is that the Soviet Union may use force, as in Hungary or East Germany, wherever there is no risk of general war. As I said to Mr. Khrushchev, equality of strength and equality of risk are the only starting points for disarmament discussions.

In maintaining the military balance pending a reversal of this senseless and bankrupting arms race, Western Europe also should play an expanded role and assume a larger burden. The cooperative control and use of atomic weapons may now be the best way to prevent the divisive, costly, and inefficient duplication of nuclear capabilities. Each one of the European nations cannot develop defenses capable of countering the Soviet threat, and should not try. I think we must take a hard, fresh look at our common military problems. I don't see why we cannot distribute the nuclear, the naval, and the conventional burdens more economically and efficiently. The objective should be an interdependent military system in which each nation's role would be geared to its full technological and economic capabilities.

Let us, then, recognize the fact of our economic, military, and political interdependence formally. An Atlantic Council with real powers could formulate joint policies for sharing our responsibilities and bringing about the genuine and equal partnership between the United States and Western Europe which our successes in the past—notably the Marshall plan—make feasible and the greatest challenge we have ever known now makes necessary.

I believe a North Atlantic Conference should be held to outline new common policies for defense, disarmament, space exploration, monetary reserves, tariffs, and a larger economic sphere, and aid to the underdeveloped areas, giving, I hope, new terms of reference to NATO and to other organizations. I think Europe should take the initiative toward creating some such new organization to deal with our great and growing problems and to promote more systematic Western cooperation.

Meanwhile, if our partners, including Japan, are to mitigate the harmful political pressures building up in the United States, a number of steps—toward which, I am glad to say, some progress has already been made—should be taken promptly.

Discrimination against dollar imports from the United States and all quantitative restrictions should be eliminated.

I have long urged that the nations whose economies the United States has helped to restore should assume a much larger share of the burden of aiding the underdeveloped countries.

The heavy task of maintaining large forces overseas aggravates America's balance of payments deficit; our European allies should now assume greater responsibility for the defense of the West.

While our balance of payments deficit may be a short-range problem, the liquidity shortage of the trading nations is not, and the West should move to correct this deficiency promptly.

A working cooperative Atlantic system would do more than enhance the basic strength of the West. It would demonstrate to other areas—to Latin America, for instance, or to free Africa—methods by which political autonomy can be combined with supranational cooperation. In any case, the alternative is to see the centrifugal

forces which are always at work between separate national entities pull us ever further apart. One thing is sure—we cannot deal with the Communist challenge divided and in disarray.

IV. ARMS CONTROL

Most of all, a stronger Atlantic community will show the way to disarmament and peace. The implications of war and of the nuclear stalemate are as visible in Moscow as in Washington. After talks with Mr. Khrushchev in Russia and America, I have the feeling that some fixed Communist attitudes are changing; some, at least, of the Russian leaders seem to have concluded that the capitalist countries do not conform in all respects to the Marxist blueprints of misery and despair; Mr. Khrushchev has even changed his mind about the established Communist conviction that the United States could not cut arms spending without bringing on a depression. (I confess I get indignant when I listen to some of my fellow Americans who seem less confident than Khrushchev is about our economy's resilience, especially when we have so many neglected tasks at home to which we could turn our energies and resources.)

The more the Communists see of the realities of Western society, the better for truth and so the better for us. Knowing something of the frightening darkness in which most Russians have to live, I favor the widest extension of exchange programs and cultural contacts. I would like to see the United States take the initiative in bringing Western and Soviet teams together in joint work. The principle of the Geophysical Year should be extended to a joint international Geophysical Commission. Other fields are Antarctic exploration and control, oceanography, medical and atomic energy research, exploration of outer space, and even joint operations in certain areas of economic aid. Such communion of scholars and technicians could do more than awaken Communists to the reality of Western life and to the possibilities of an open world society. They could be forerunners of supranational cooperation and organs of international control.

There is no difficulty in finding reasons why peace is so precious to the Russians after the desolation and destruction of two world wars. In addition, they now have much to lose, and their taste for the good life is rapidly developing. It is said that the Soviet defense effort takes about 25 percent of the national income as against 10 percent in this country. So for them another weighty reason for reducing the arms burden is to release more manpower and resources to improve the living conditions of the long-suffering Russian people and to strengthen the Soviet potential for economic competition and the paramount struggle for the uncommitted countries.

I am confident that some, at least, of the Russian leaders are anxious to halt testing and development of nuclear weapons before the danger becomes even more uncontrollable. But I wish I could be more sanguine that the Soviet Union was equally ready for the kind of inspection and control that would make possible any general arms reduction, let alone total disarmament. I suspect the conversion of the Soviet Union from a closed to an open society is still a long way off. But we should not hastily and cynically dismiss Mr. Khrushchev's disarmament proposals as propaganda and insincere. The question is not whether Communists are sincere but whether they are serious.

The root of East-West tension is fear. Whether it is rational or irrational, justified or not, hardly matters. It exists, and the peoples, especially Americans and Russians, have been indoctrinated with this fear of one another—these devil images—for years. Arms are a symptom of the fears and tensions between nations. Therefore, the argument goes, disarmament is impossible until political settlements have been reached and confidence restored.

I disagree. I believe the nuclear arms race with weapons of mass destruction is a new element and in itself a cause of tension. Of course, as I have said, we must try everlastingly to improve relations by exchanges, negotiations, common projects, trade, and agreements when possible. But fear will not vanish until the arms race is arrested. We will have to proceed on all these matters simultaneously. As Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, of Great Britain, said in presenting the British plan for comprehensive disarmament which preceded Mr. Khrushchev's: "If we get political settlements it will make agreement on disarmament easier; and if we get an agreement on disarmament, it will make political settlement easier."

From what he said to me, I think Mr. Khrushchev agrees too. And I am much encouraged by evidence from many quarters that the Russians are genuinely worried about the political and technical dangers and cost to the U.S.S.R. of continuing the arms race indefinitely. Moreover, the United Nations disarmament resolution, agreed to, mirabile dictu, by the United States and the Soviet Union, recognizes that disarmament itself will promote trust between nations and declares that disarmament is the most important question facing the world today.

In short, it looks as though controlled disarmament was back at the top of the world's agenda where it belongs. I am sorry that the United States did not take and hold the lead as I urged in the 1956 presidential campaign. The recent proposal by some of our leaders that the United States resume underground nuclear tests, just when the first break in the arms deadlock seems possible, shocked me. I can think of few better ways to chill the prospects, deface our peaceful image, and underscore the Communist propaganda that they are the peacemakers and we the warmongers. We should extend our test suspension so long as negotiations continue in good faith and Russia maintains a similar suspension. The good faith of the negotiations is decisive, because indefinite suspension amounts to a test ban without inspection.

Whether Mr. Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin really mean business depends on agreement to two main principles: (a) That conventional and nuclear disarmament must go hand in hand, so that the balance of security between nations is not upset, and (b) that progress at each stage must be subject to effective international control.

If universal and total disarmament should ever take place, a third need will arise: a supranational force of some kind, as I have insisted to Mr. Khrushchev, in order that the sheer weight of such powers as Russia and America—or China—may not intimidate smaller neighbors. The composition, control, and use of such a force, of course, present a host of further questions.

Meanwhile, pending the disarmament millennium, we must, as I have said, make good the deficiencies in our defenses to keep at least an equality of strength with the Russians. And I think it would be naive to assume that they are yet ready to embark on the kind of positive cooperation in other respects which would establish real collective security. The conspiratorial tradition is very old and deep rooted in Communist thinking, and when they talk of peaceful competition, for example, I suspect that most Communists would include under that label political subversion, coups d'état, and even revolution under Communist Party leadership.

Nevertheless, I think we may be approaching the time when the arms race with Russia can be arrested. Once a revolutionary regime leaves behind its adolescent fanaticism, risk, and cost become powerful considerations. I believe they exercise genuine influence in Moscow today and that we should do what we can to encourage the trend.

V. CHINA

In Peking, however, I doubt if cost and risk are decisive factors. At this stage, pressure from "foreign devils," real or contrived, provides excuses for the austerity and brutal repression involved in the massive modernization. In this mood, China might conceivably be ready to risk a war which could involve its more prosperous Communist neighbor in disaster. Today, Moscow can still perhaps limit Chinese aggressiveness by control over its military aid. But as China develops, the influence will dwindle. Has Russia therefore an interest in establishing some form of control now while her influence is still sizable? We do not know, but we must try to find out. And if we are going to make any important progress on disarmament, Russia will have to accept responsibility for bringing China in.

While there is little prospect of reasonable dealing with Red China at this time, it is apparent that Asians have become disillusioned and distrustful because of her imperialistic attacks on her neighbors and disregard for the "five principles of coexistence." I see hope in the fact that Mr. Khrushchev used Peking as his sounding board when he warned Communists not to use force against capitalism. I see further hope in his proposal—ignored by Peking—for an atom-free zone in the Far East. And even at this late date I suggest we explore with him the possibility of pacification in the area based upon a broad settlement of issues—including Formosa—by negotiation, not force.

On the Communist side, the concessions would include the extension to China of any system of international inspection of disarmament, ending the threat of force against Formosa and subversion in Indochina, a peaceful frontier settlement with India, free elections under United Nations supervision in Korea, and acceptance of the right of the inhabitants of Formosa to determine their own destiny by plebiscite supervised by the United Nations. On our side, concessions would presumably include an end to the American embargo on China's admission to the United Nations (not to be confused with diplomatic recognition), the evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu, and the inclusion of Korea and Japan in the atom-free zone and area of controlled disarmament.

Perhaps neither the Russians nor we ourselves are yet prepared to talk in such concrete terms. Yet it is clear that no general control of disarmament has any value unless it includes China, and it is difficult to see how China can accept international control when it is not, formally, a member of international society. Moreover, as a member of the United Nations, Communist China, with a quarter of the world's population, would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast.

In the long run, the degree to which Russia is willing and able to moderate China's imperialistic designs will be a major factor in world peace. And it is likely that in its diplomacy as in its internal development Moscow is reaching the point where Mr. Khrushchevs' peaceful coexistence with the West must grow into positive cooperation. The Russian door to the West must be pushed wider open—or slammed shut again.

VI. EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The areas of the world where the interests and security of the great powers collide are the areas of tension where negotiation must be concentrated if it is to be effective. I do not believe that local military blocs, directed against the Communists, always provide the answer. If we seek military clients, Russia

can play that game, too, and more cynically. Moreover, she is not embarrassed by ties to the former colonial overlords. I do not mean that endangered countries should be left unprotected. The Eisenhower doctrine is hardly more than a restatement of our commitment under the United Nations Charter and the Truman doctrine to come to the aid of a victim of direct aggression. If the Soviets were directly to invade Iran, though it is not likely, American intervention would be unavoidable. And that is precisely why it is not likely. But Iran is no more secure because of military links with Pakistan, and the fate of Iraq shows how easily an unpopular alliance can be exploited to undermine a pro-Western regime.

I believe that we must look rather to disarmament and nonalinement, to political and economic collaboration, in the areas where great-power interests collide, as in the Middle East. We still have a little time, for atomic weapons are as yet in the possession of only three powers. Ten years from now, who knows how many local dictators may have them—to the detriment not only of our security but of Russia's as well. Here may be another common interest to explore. We might examine the possibility of an atom-free zone for the Middle East. We might also reconsider an earlier suggestion of an embargo on arms shipments into the Middle East—a plan which the Soviets have endorsed.

Neither Russia nor the Western nations have gained much from their recent policies of intervention in the Middle East. I suggest we now give organized nonintervention a trial. Some international problems are never solved; they just wear out. And the Arab-Israeli conflict may wear out before it is worked out. But meanwhile the United States should call upon the Soviet Union and everyone in the United Nations again and again to use their influence to harmonize relations between the Arab States and Israel and end this prolonged and useless hostility.

In the immediate future, however, the critical point of tension lies in Europe and Germany. There we have a perilous deadlock from which neither side can disengage without grave risk. On our side the fear is paramount that any withdrawal either from the exposed enclave of West Berlin or from West Germany would prove the first step in a general retreat from "positions of strength" in Europe. The end of the process could denude the Continent of American forces and undermine the defenses against a Russian advance to the channel.

But the Soviets have comparable fears. The withdrawal of their troops to Russia would imperil the insecure Communist governments friendly to Russia and lead to the resurgence of a powerful and potentially hostile Germany. After suffering two shattering invasions in a generation, Russia's deep-seated fear of a rearmed Germany should not be hard for us to understand.

Russia's risk is probably greater than ours. After 15 years of communism, East Germany and Eastern Europe are still probably hostile to Russia. On our side, communism has steadily lost ground. A Europe free to choose its destiny would not be Communist, and could be very anti-Russian. For this reason I believe we in the West play from strength in Europe.

I agree with Dr. Adenauer that the key to settlement in divided Europe lies in controlled general disarmament. The only satisfactory settlement for divided Berlin will be the unification of divided Germany. The road to unification lies through a reduction of fear in Russia and the West. And fear will subside only when there is progress toward disarmament with adequate controls. I doubt if we can reach more than provisional settlements or postponements of the problems of divided Europe until then.

With summit conferences soon to take place, I think it would be improper and useless for me to discuss proposals that have been made for an atom-free zone in central Europe, scaling down of Berlin garrisons and occupation armies, security guarantees, and the other detailed components of possible interim solutions.

VII. A SENSE OF PURPOSE

In all of these great issues of international policy—whether they concern a world investment program for the underdeveloped countries, or methods of closer association with Europe, or the creation of communities of common work and interest with the Soviets, or the whole long arduous search for controlled disarmament—the first priority for the West is to recover the initiative. Out of a perpetually defensive attitude no lasting gains can come. Surely the West, which has been preeminently the challenger in human affairs since the dawn of the modern age, should not let the initiative slip from its hands.

Today, let us be clear, we do not have the initiative. Having caught up with us in weapons, it is the Soviet Union that is shouting about disarmament and peaceful competition; and it is the Soviet Union, strong and self-confident, that is now usurping the role of leader in the efforts toward peace. Mr. Khrushchev is the challenger—from outer space to inner Berlin. We react to his policies and conduct the world's dialog on his terms. Between hasty improvisations and snap decisions we seem largely to have lost our own sense of direction.

We are ourselves to blame for this. The truth is that nations cannot demonstrate a sense of purpose abroad when they have lost it at home. There is an intimate connection between the temper of our domestic leadership and the effectiveness of American influence in the world at large. President Wilson gave a profound new direction to international thinking because he was a pioneer of the new freedom at home. President Franklin Roosevelt's universal prestige as a liberal force in the world was deeply rooted in the New Deal, and this was the tradition carried on by President Truman in such great ventures as the Marshall plan and the point 4 program. The link is no less vital today. If we cannot recover an aspiring, forward-looking, creative attitude to the problems of our own community, there is little hope of our recovering a dynamic leadership in the world at large. By our default as much as by his design, Mr. Khrushchev is enabled to continue dictating the terms of the world's dialog.

I see little sign of any challenging approach in positive terms to our problems at the present time. In the most radical and revolutionary epoch of man's history, the dominant concerns of our leadership have been almost wholly defensive. We have not been urged and spurred on by the positive opportunities of world building and nation building inherent in our position as the most fabulously endowed people mankind has ever seen. On the contrary, our foreign policy has been dominated by fear of communism, our domestic policy by fear of inflation. Economic assistance programs have been sold to the American people chiefly as a means of checking the Communists, never as our creative part in extending our technological revolution to the rest of mankind. The spur to our exploration of the solar system has not been our restless desire to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. It has been the irritation of seeing the Russians hit the moon first. Our interest in greater excellence in research and education flared up not because we want every free citizen to exercise to the full his innate talents and capacities, but because the Russians are producing more scientists and technologists than the West.

Even where we accept the Soviet challenge—as I assume we do in defense, science, and education—our sense of urgency is not yet sufficient to override our obsessive fear that, in some way, in spite of having a gross national product of almost $500 billion and a per capita income almost twice as high as any other country's, we are staring bankruptcy in the face. How otherwise can we explain the fact that, with over twice the Soviet Union's national income, we have let them outpace us in arms, in space research, in proportional spending on education? How else are we to explain why our leaders see their most urgent task not in telling us the realities of our world and the duties and opportunities that lie ahead for a great and confident nation, but in warning us of all the insidious ways in which it can spend itself into penury?

The time has come to put an end to this unnatural timidity. There are other ways of securing a "sound dollar" than by stunting our national growth or—much worse—stunting our aspirations and our confidence in the great aims of our own society. Let us not measure our essential security, our standards of education, and our public needs by what we can afford. This is a static concept. What we could afford with a national income of $250 billion is not the same as our capacity today with nearly double the figure. Nor does it measure what we could afford if our rate of growth were purposefully increased.

Let us rather assess our needs—our need to maintain equality of strength, in missiles and men, until controlled disarmament takes its place, our need to double our spending on education, our need for wider research, our need for decent and gracious cities where segregation and delinquency give ground in the wake of redevelopment and renewal, our need to conserve our national resources—above all, water, the most basic of them all.

All these needs—domestic, foreign, and military— will cost more money, at least until we can make some progress with disarmament. But keeping the budget down is not as imperative as keeping our heads up. It is worth noting that before the Korean war thoughtful men solemnly declared that if the military budget rose above $15 billion capitalism, democracy, and the American way of life were doomed. Then came the war. The military budget was tripled. And now, once again, the present level of spending is being defended with the same ideological fervor.

I think our needs could be covered by existing tax rates at higher levels of economic growth. But I am sure that if our political leadership defines the tasks with clarity and conviction, we will approve what is necessary to fulfill our national purpose whatever the sacrifice—higher taxation in years when the private economy is running at full stretch, for instance, budgetary deficits in times of slack, restraint upon wages and profits to slow down inflationary pressure, less emphasis on sectional interests, more on the common good. The recompense will be to see American society once more the pace setter in human affairs, to see freedom once more the great challenger on the human scene.

For this, surely, is the crux. An attitude of unadventurous conservatism cannot stand for long as the creative image of freedom. I tremble for our future—and for the world's future—if growth, thrust, initiative, and the vast new frontiers of science are felt to be the prerogative of Communist discipline and drive—if "the shot heard round the world" has been silenced by the shot round the moon.

Freedom is not an ideal, it is not even a protection, if it means nothing more than freedom to stagnate, to live without dreams, to have no greater aim than a second car and another television set—and this in a world where half our fellow men have less than enough to eat. Today not rhetoric but

sober fact bids us believe that our present combination of complacency and apprehension, of little aims and large fears, has within it the seed of destruction, first for our own community, and then for the larger hope that, as science and technology bring the nations inescapably together, freedom, not tyranny, will be the organizing principle of the society of man.

I end where I began. I believe the United States is ready for a new awakening and the achievement of greater goals. Within it are the moral and material elements of new purpose and new policy. It is the task of leadership to marshal our will and point the way. We had better start soon for time is wasting.

BENEFITS FROM AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM TO ABSENTEE OR CORPORATE-TYPE FARMING OPERATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on several occasions I have emphasized that a substantial part of the benefits of our present agricultural program accrue to the large corporate-type or absentee farming operations.

Today I am incorporating in the RECORD a list of the 1958 crop price-support loans on cotton of $100,000 or more as compiled by the Department of Agriculture.

Three of the largest of these received more in price-support loans on cotton than did all of the farmers of the four States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania on all of the crops they produced in that same year.

The large firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. received $707,907.71 in Government loans on cotton it produced. This is nearly twice as much as was received by all the farmers in the States of Delaware and New Jersey on all crops they produced that year.

One of these large corporations, the Delta & Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., which received price-support loans of $1,212,699.80 on its 1958 cotton crop, is a wholly owned British corporation.

Why should this wholly owned British corporation receive more assistance in the form of price-support loans on its 1958 cotton crop than did all the farmers of the great State of Pennsylvania on all the crops they produced?

Why should our taxpayers support this British-owned corporation in its farming operations here in America? Remember, all this is being done under legislation enacted in the name of our small farmers.

It is argued that the taxpayers do not lose under this program because these price-support loans are often repaid to the Government as the cotton is moved into commercial channels. That is ridiculous. In many instances the cotton is turned over to the Government as full payment for the loan, and remember that on that portion which is sold in commercial channels and where the loans are repaid by the producer those sales are subsidized by the U.S. Government. Under its cotton subsidy export program, our Government is buying through commercial channels this same cotton at artificially high prices and then subsidizing at the taxpayers' expense its exports.

In the past 3 years the Government, under its export subsidy program, has purchased over 16 million bales and then exported this same cotton at a direct loss to the American taxpayers of over $800 million.

This is an average loss of over $20 for every bale of cotton which has been produced in America during the past 3 years. Therefore, the fact that many of these loans are being repaid does not mean that the Government is not losing money on these transactions.

These loans are being repaid by sales in commercial channels only by reason of the fact that the Government is spending nearly $300 million annually in supporting our domestic cotton market at its artificially high level.

Nor is this extravagant program actually helping the cotton farmer. In addition to wasting millions in paying for those subsidies, under our present programs we are seeing our domestic market for cotton goods destroyed.

Synthetic fibers are replacing our cotton and wool fabrics. Foreign imports are replacing our domestic products. The final result is that the cotton industry and our American textile industry are both being destroyed.

Last year I sponsored an amendment which the Senate adopted placing a limitation on the amount of support loans any one individual could obtain. This amendment will be in effect on the 1959 crop year; however, I regret that in conference this amendment was watered down in such a manner as to create a grave doubt as to its real effectiveness.

Our whole farm program needs a complete overhauling. Congress by failing to face this situation and by continuing these high price supports on cotton and other crops long after the war ended and long after our need of increased production had passed has created a monstrosity, and now it has a responsibility to correct the situation. But it cannot be corrected by any piecemeal legislation.

There can be no justification for continuing support at the taxpayers' expense of these million dollar farm operations whether they be in cotton or in any other crop.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a list of the 1958 crop cotton price support loans of $100,000 or more as furnished by the Department of Agriculture. This tabulation includes only loans made on the 1958 cotton crop. Many of the companies listed in this report also received price support loans on other commodities.

Also, in order that other States may see what assistance their farmers get under this program as compared to the assistance given some of these large corporate-type operations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a chart giving a breakdown by States on all loans made on the 1958 crops.

There being no objection, the list and chart were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of $100,000 or more, by producer

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount	Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
	ARIZONA				ARIZONA—continued		
Church, Bruce, Inc.	Yuma, Ariz.	2,887	$487,460.50	K. and Clarence Skousen	Chandler, Ariz.	913	$153,564.80
A. S. & R. Farms, Inc.	Marana, Ariz.	2,204	427,181.57	L. D. Ulmer	Marana, Ariz.	858	151,324.91
Morrison Bros.	Higley, Ariz.	2,376	400,851.38	Holland & Ladd	Coolidge, Ariz.	732	151,116.50
J. L. Hodges	Buckeye, Ariz.	2,136	368,063.70	J. G. Waggoner	do	868	149,032.82
Y. F. Ranches	Stanfield, Ariz.	1,707	317,372.52	Empire Farms	Eloy, Ariz.	879	148,296.61
Howard Wuertz	Coolidge, Ariz.	1,710	295,903.00	J. Boyd White	Casa Grande, Ariz.	810	147,448.78
Phillips & Ellsworth	Mesa, Ariz.	1,731	294,763.06	L. E. Anway	Marana, Ariz.	721	147,019.23
Chas. Urrea & Sons	do	1,731	289,520.37	Jackson & Perkins Co.	Peoria, Ariz.	872	147,011.50
W. R. Neely	Chandler, Ariz.	1,705	286,535.10	A. & C. Hill	Chandler, Ariz.	841	145,872.07
Hooper & Rugg	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,648	285,878.66	Wilbur Wuertz	Casa Grande, Ariz.	844	144,799.50
Smith & Enke	do	1,641	282,903.00	Phelps and Palmer	Mesa, Ariz.	847	143,562.50
Bing K. Wong, Inc.	Marana, Ariz.	1,519	269,212.08	Jack Crain	Casa Grande, Ariz.	811	137,988.40
J. B. Collerette	Vicksburg, Ariz.	1,390	236,140.77	J. S. Hoopes	Chandler, Ariz.	810	137,730.95
H. L. Holland	Coolidge, Ariz.	1,308	236,022.21	J. D. Johnson	Mesa, Ariz.	840	136,496.41
Crouch Bros.	Maricopa, Ariz.	1,365	230,139.00	Eloy Farms	Stanfield, Ariz.	770	135,754.50
C. S. Anderson	Phoenix, Ariz.	1,320	228,618.88	Pinal Farms	Casa Grande, Ariz.	743	133,191.17
J. G. Boswell Co. Corp.	Litchfield Park, Ariz.	1,263	227,361.85	C. S. C. Farms	Florence, Ariz.	782	132,809.54
Herman Diwan	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,288	218,841.57	E. A. Wing	Coolidge, Ariz.	714	132,808.44
B. Riggs & Son	Chandler, Ariz.	1,247	212,539.30	C. R. Johnson	Eloy, Ariz.	749	132,542.16
C. W. Neely	Gilbert, Ariz.	1,235	209,146.22	S. L. Claridge and Morris Bros.	Safford, Ariz.	571	131,850.23
John Kai	Marana, Ariz.	1,073	208,826.91	Donald Ellsworth	Queen Creek, Ariz.	757	130,620.35
Wilker S. Conner	Maricopa, Ariz.	1,162	201,696.90	Ott Bros.	Yuma, Ariz.	752	130,457.44
Power Bros.	Higley, Ariz.	1,176	200,796.58	C. P. Peterson	Mesa, Ariz.	762	129,917.87
Westside Ranches	Glendale, Ariz.	1,187	200,450.16	R. D. Beebe	do	743	128,138.75
Frontier Farms	Casa Grande, Ariz.	1,163	197,277.82	Max Nichols	Casa Grande, Ariz.	737	127,075.23
Double S. Ranches	Chandler, Ariz.	1,126	193,908.90	Harlan Russell	do	739	124,435.60
Cecil W. Howe and R. W. Drake	Litchfield, Ariz.	1,043	176,472.15	R. P. Anderson	Collidge, Ariz.	717	123,441.04
Barney & Mecham	Queen Creek, Ariz.	1,011	170,918.32	H. L. Early	Casa Grande, Ariz.	656	121,345.16
L. Ellsworth	do	988	170,704.80	Kempton & Snedigan	Tempe, Ariz.	688	118,904.88
H. C. Dobson	Mesa, Ariz.	966	165,887.75	Collier and Evans	do	692	118,236.54
Fred Jones	Coolidge, Ariz.	922	165,843.45	Otto B. Neely	Gilbert, Ariz.	679	117,923.40
G. and V. Ellsworth	Mesa, Ariz.	939	159,996.90	Holland and Thompson	Casa Grande, Ariz.	677	116,946.56

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of $100,000 or more, by producer—Continued

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
	ARIZONA—continued		
L. R. Layton	Chandler, Ariz	686	$115,891.10
B. & W. Farms	Coolidge, Ariz	565	110,435.87
C. P. Gould	Litchfield, Ariz	631	107,464.16
Oscar Walls	Tempe, Ariz	634	107,385.06
W. L. Rice	Mesa, Ariz	637	107,235.52
A. and W. Bartlett	Coolidge, Ariz	616	106,609.26
Glen J. Layton	Thatcher, Ariz	445	105,964.49
Grant E. Peterson	Coolidge, Ariz	617	105,645.80
Jerry Montierth	Elfrida, Ariz	527	105,358.25
C. L. Kenworthy	Coolidge, Ariz	541	103,835.50
Ricks Ranch	Queen Creek, Ariz	603	102,544.00
Maryvale Land Cattle Co	Phoenix, Ariz	579	100,656.22
	ARKANSAS		
J. G. Adams & Son	Hughes, Ark	2,550	402,050.89
Tillar & Co	Tillar, Ark	1,766	253,486.90
S. C. Chapin	Truman, Ark	1,276	215,772.15
Miller Lumber Co	Marianna, Ark	1,091	184,815.41
E. H. Clarke Co	Hughes, Ark	912	144,676.09
Lindsey Mercantile Co	Caldwell, Ark	780	141,653.22
J.C. Ellis	Blytheville, Ark	720	129,816.80
	CALIFORNIA		
Westlake Farms, Inc	Stratford, Calif	8,473	1,442,595.00
Kern Land	Bakersfield, Calif	4,505	761,408.20
Anderson, Clayton & Co	Los Angeles, Calif	3,900	707,907.71
Shannon & Sons	Tulare, Calif	3,314	563,822.08
Salyer Land Co	Corcoran, Calif	2,964	522,189.01
McCarthy & Hildebrand	Bakersfield, Calif	2,967	506,362.30
Giffen, Inc	Huron, Calif	2,830	494,353.97
Wheeler Farms Co	Bakersfield, Calif	2,634	448,654.88
Wilco Produce Co	Blythe, Calif	2,546	428,876.32
R. M. Mettler & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif	2,188	373,722.09
David Bryant, Jr	Pond, Calif	2,022	355,839.07
Robert Farms	McFarland, Calif	2,034	348,519.89
F. and J. Garone	Bakersfield, Calif	2,046	346,642.40
Murray Land Co	Hanford, Calif	2,037	345,070.10
Waldo W. Weeth	Coalinga, Calif	1,936	331,717.99
W. E. Young	Calipatria, Calif	1,704	318,734.33
Robert Pelletier	Bakersfield, Calif	1,762	318,038.23
Buller & Neufeld, Ranch 1	do	1,877	316,865.99
A. Shrier & Sons	Delano, Calif	1,809	311,332.56
Bidart Bros	Bakersfield, Calif	1,765	302,918.20
R. A. Hildebrand	do	1,698	295,491.50
J & R Enterprises	Blythe, Calif	1,663	280,499.12
Cerro Bros	Bakersfield, Calif	1,619	278,723.52
Jones Farms	Stratford, Calif	1,627	273,734.00
E. O. Mitchell, Inc	Arvin, Calif	1,584	267,407.50
A. H. Wegis & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif	1,559	264,469.55
Circle L. Farms	Stratford, Calif	1,562	263,806.18
Mirasol Co	Buttonwillow, Calif	1,549	262,561.54
F. McCarthy & Sons	Tulare, Calif	1,514	259,154.96
A. H. Karpe	Bakersfield, Calif	1,480	252,714.52
Gilkey Farms, Inc	Corcoran, Calif	1,334	238,180.09
Parsons Ranch	Buttonwillow, Calif	1,341	231,232.80
Boyett Farming Co	Corcoran, Calif	1,220	221,763.41
O. Fry & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif	1,282	218,904.91
Hudson Ranches, Inc	Calipatria, Calif	1,264	216,976.80
John Norton Farms	Blythe, Calif	1,210	203,420.55
Mitchellinda Ranches, Inc	Alpaugh, Calif	1,178	203,403.80
C. Est. Graham	Calipatria, Calif	1,184	199,846.30
S. Stamoules & Co	Mendota, Calif	1,161	196,850.56
Davis & Mabry	Tranquillity, Calif	1,090	189,502.75
John C. Conn	Coalinga, Calif	1,087	188,915.50
Chicca Bros. Twin Farms	Buttonwillow, Calif	1,071	183,891.04
Porter Land Co	Bakersfield, Calif	1,061	180,965.61
Scott & Knappenberger	Blythe, Calif	1,041	177,306.70
Richland Farms	Corcoran, Calif	957	176,482.80
A. and F. Palla	Buttonwillow, Calif	1,042	176,472.06
Cheney Ranch	Tulare, Calif	988	170,846.04
C. C. Passmore	Ripley, Calif	1,010	170,734.04
Coelho Farms	Riverdale, Calif	984	168,057.36
Delta Farming Co	Corcoran, Calif	923	167,841.94
Fanucci Bros	Bakersfield, Calif	983	166,941.30
K. Malofy & Son	Shafter, Calif	944	162,770.10
Air-Way Farms, Inc	Fresno, Calif	909	159,228.48
Blythe Melon Growers	Blythe, Calif	949	158,033.60
Derby Farms	Arvin, Calif	912	157,822.78
A. L. Suckut	Bakersfield, Calif	926	155,890.48
Kenmar Farm	do	920	155,619.40
Fox & Williams	Shafter, Calif	897	155,135.98
Earl Royer	Strathmore, Calif	887	152,410.82
Baker Bros	Earlimart, Calif	895	151,210.25
G. Delfino & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif	877	150,639.70
Arnold Kirschenmann	do	875	147,637.78
Robert Neuman & Sons	Shafter, Calif	851	145,044.32
M. L. Rogers	Strathmore, Calif	845	144,063.14
Redferm Ranches	Dos Palos, Calif	838	143,338.08
Eastside Farms	Stratford, Calif	832	142,434.09
Albert Angus Ranch	Arvin, Calif	816	140,471.90
Kennedy & Stephens	Bakersfield, Calif	808	139,809.00
Fabbri Bros	Wasco, Calif	820	139,594.82
William E. Glotz	Tranquillity, Calif	823	138,409.75
J. E. Harelson	Calexico, Calif	816	137,260.18
Freeborn Bros	Buttonwillow, Calif	802	137,113.00
Harry R. Wiley	Los Angeles, Calif	803	135,779.30
Kagler & Roberts	McFarland, Calif	782	134,396.20
Rex L. Neely	Chandler, Calif	763	132,480.60
B. S. Baldwin & Sons	Bakersfield, Calif	768	131,861.20
J. B. Hawkins	Fresno, Calif	709	128,488.38
W. J. Williams	Blythe, Calif	743	127,937.16
Bruce Kratka	Ripley, Calif	804	$127,067.64
Brock Ranches	El Centro, Calif	742	124,945.20
Wedderburn Bros	Lemoore, Calif	739	122,989.58
E. I. Baublitz	Buttonwillow, Calif	708	121,806.40
Sierra Dawn Farms	Firebaugh, Calif	660	121,782.93
Benson Bros	Tulare, Calif	698	120,089.30
Raven Land Co	Selma, Calif	703	119,566.82
L. C. Kreim	Delano, Calif	697	117,737.24
Sandrini Bros	McFarland, Calif	693	117,033.20
Meridian Farms, Inc	Arvin, Calif	684	116,891.00
Baldwin & Sourex	Bakersfield, Calif	676	116,767.64
W. K. Ring	Wasco, Calif	670	115,051.06
E. O. Ehlers	Blythe, Calif	671	114,515.98
Lakeview Properties	Bakersfield, Calif	675	113,966.06
M. and W. Snow	Buttonwillow, Calif	660	113,871.06
Virgil Boyd	Tipton, Calif	647	111,674.24
Cooper & Hutsell	Tulare, Calif	654	111,559.91
Vista Farms	Buttonwillow, Calif	655	110,372.06
J. H. Maurer	Shafter, Calif	642	110,009.12
C. E. Slaughter	Tipton, Calif	652	109,844.36
Finni & Janelli	Visalia, Calif	643	109,612.44
James Taylor	Brawley, Calif	630	108,519.60
Orlando Torrigiani	Bakersfield, Calif	622	107,774.04
Nagatani Farms	Delano, Calif	672	107,300.41
Torrigiani Bros	Buttonwillow, Calif	619	105,948.60
L. Neufeld	Wasco, Calif	625	105,715.56
Martin Dairy	Hanford, Calif	626	105,293.20
John X. Bettencourt	Tipton, Calif	624	105,075.01
Riccomini Bros	Buttonwillow, Calif	616	104,118.03
Raymond O'Connell	Brawley, Calif	619	104,078.56
W. L. Smith	Bakersfield, Calif	611	103,970.54
Robert Burhans, Jr	Wasco, Calif	600	103,847.99
Floyd Griffeath	Earlimart, Calif	611	103,354.03
Rancho Poco Dinero	Blythe, Calif	606	103,068.36
Wayne Dill	do	598	102,225.20
John C. Johnston	Bakersfield, Calif	587	102,015.03
D. M. Steele	Delano, Calif	592	101,100.56
Manuel I. Rocha	Tulare, Calif	594	100,935.92
J. O. and Oscar Cooper	Fresno, Calif	586	100,613.20
Ludy Bros	Pond, Calif	578	100,466.00
Archie Swindle	Dos Palos, Calif	583	100,131.20
	LOUISIANA		
Deltic Farm & Timber Co	Epps, La	1,046	176,270.66
George B. Franklin & Son	Holly Ridge, La	716	121,613.36
M. P. Utz Estate	Tallulah, La	595	100,454.74
	MISSISSIPPI		
Delta & Pine Land Co	Scott, Miss	7,326	1,216,699.80
S. H. Kyle	Clarksdale, Miss	1,990	335,480.98
D. Seligman	Shaw, Miss	1,870	331,449.95
Yandell Bros	Vance, Miss	1,642	267,546.48
C. S. Whittington Planting Co	Greenwood, Miss	1,417	225,598.69
M. S. Knowlton	Perthshire, Miss	1,311	217,471.44
B. W. Smith Planting Co	Louise, Miss	1,166	211,971.39
Kline Planting Co	Alligator, Miss	1,155	209,433.07
O. F. Bledsoe Estate	Greenwood, Miss	1,263	204,604.10
W. P. Scruggs	Doddsville, Miss	1,164	199,703.71
Cameta Plantation	Anquilla, Miss	1,222	199,150.27
S. A. Arnold, Jr	Tunica, Miss	1,179	197,492.85
J. Levingston Estate	Ruleville, Miss	1,089	195,945.85
B. F. Harbert Co	Robinsonville, Miss	1,027	195,409.41
Hood & Block	Dundee, Miss	1,072	175,449.08
Whittington Planting Co	Greenwood, Miss	1,052	173,900.61
Smith Murphey Co	Sumner, Miss	1,046	170,989.19
W. M. Duncan	Inverness, Miss	969	169,019.62
Keith Bros	Leland, Miss	1,005	163,284.98
Race Track Plantation	Greenwood, Miss	889	151,507.70
J. R. Smith	Merigold, Miss	849	148,308.93
Billups Plantation	Greenwood, Miss	855	145,047.10
C. P. Owen	Robinsonville, Miss	895	144,421.45
Home Place	Benton, Miss	782	142,589.76
M. L. Earnheart Co	Tunica, Miss	864	143,022.43
Equen Plantation	Minter City, Miss	771	135,626.63
Lyndale Planting Co., Inc	Gary, Miss	813	132,613.68
Delta Co	Belzonia, Miss	869	135,484.78
E. D. Rayner	Merigold, Miss	748	132,330.69
Stovall Farms	Stovall, Miss	831	131,633.88
Refuge Plantation, Inc	Greenville, Miss	795	129,920.28
R. W. Owen	Tunica, Miss	791	129,309.66
Torry Wood & Son	Hollandale, Miss	670	127,930.24
Runnymeade Plantation	Itta Bena, Miss	715	126,167.59
Circle X Plantation	Indianola, Miss	789	125,717.87
Husbandville Plantation	Holly Ridge, Miss	828	123,112.29
T. G. Flowers	Mattson, Miss	838	122,549.26
Garr Planting Co	Clarksdale, Miss	715	114,106.33
Oasis Plantation	Stovall, Miss	751	113,143.12
T. O. Earnheart Co	Tunica, Miss	674	112,788.38
A. G. McLemore	Greenwood, Miss	721	111,112.56
Mascot Planting Co	Clarksdale, Miss	645	108,761.32
Halbrooke Farms	Belzoni, Miss	625	107,935.80
Roy Flowers	Mattson, Miss	768	107,447.29
J. T. Fargason & Son, Inc	Lyon, Miss	716	107,419.21
Vickland Plantation	Nitta Yuma, Miss	648	106,330.93
Helena Plantation	Rolling Fork, Miss	619	105,917.16
W. O. & E. E. Shurden	Drew, Miss	625	104,316.31
Travis H. Taylor, Jr	Friars Point, Miss	577	104,216.25
Dockery Farms	Cleveland, Miss	646	104,125.96
S. W. Owen	Tunica, Miss	649	103,454.06
M. Grundfest	Gary, Miss	611	103,323.89
Maynard Bros	Clarksdale, Miss	604	103,117.64

1958 crop cotton price-support loans of $100,000 or more, by producer—Continued

Producer	Address	Number of bales pledged	Amount
	MISSISSIPPI—con.		
Couch & Parker Farms	Drew, Miss.	610	$102,810.54
L. M. & W. F. Erwin	Duncan, Miss.	548	101,768.55
Sunrise Dairy	Cleveland, Miss.	580	101,132.61
Prairie Planting Co.	Stovall, Miss.	649	101,002.19
Egypt Planting Co.	Cruger, Miss.	605	100,785.35
	NEVADA		
E. S. Bowman & Sons	Pahrump, Nev.	784	132,310.85
	NEW MEXICO		
R. H. Wamel	Animas, N. Mex.	787	150,094.91
Richins Farms	do	811	148,173.79
J. F. Apodace	La Mesa, N. Mex.	518	112,193.54
	OKLAHOMA		
Wayne Winsett	Altus, Okla.	1,015	172,551.91
	TENNESSEE		
C. B. Box Trust	Memphis, Tenn.	1,318	223,841.80
	TEXAS		
F. H. Vahlsing, Inc.	Mathis, Tex.	2,208	389,484.56
Rio Farms	Edcouch, Tex.	1,903	$345,727.86
Crews Farms	Pecos, Tex.	1,345	250,257.19
Davis & Gandy Farms	Edinburg, Tex.	1,371	230,945.30
Kesey Bros.	Pecos, Tex.	1,165	228,792.36
Ralphs Farms	San Elizario, Tex.	915	224,108.67
Bell Bros.	Elsa, Tex.	1,225	220,933.10
Island Farms	Fabens, Tex.	907	214,647.38
Mike Maros	do	859	202,876.81
Clark & Roberts	Pecos, Tex.	992	188,147.08
Beckwith Farms	Weslaco, Tex.	978	187,774.64
Helen E. Stegle	Elsa, Tex.	893	155,796.72
M. N. Lettunich & Sons	Clint, Tex.	694	153,573.17
A. J. Hoelscher	Pecos, Tex.	683	131,953.21
Peppy McKinney	do	654	126,174.22
Clark & Davis	do	652	123,545.52
John J. Dorr	do	682	122,692.43
Gul Bant Singh Gil & Sons	El Paso, Tex.	510	116,887.85
S. Y. Wilson and E. A. Strout	do	527	115,737.56
George Lutich	Fabens, Tex.	511	115,390.24
R. O. Wade	LeVilla, Tex.	599	111,524.45
Walter J. Waters	Rio Hondo, Tex.	626	108,905.49
Rolla D. Smith	Raymondville, Tex.	583	107,034.04
R. E. Hart	Sinton, Tex.	612	106,217.64
E. B. Adams	Harlingen, Tex.	605	105,577.55
C. C. Slaughter Farms	Morton, Tex.	755	103,069.60
James B. Toone	Pecos, Tex.	517	103,011.94
J. T. McKinney	do	539	102,717.55

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SCHEDULE 11.—*Loans made on 1958 crops, by States, through Oct. 31, 1959*

State	Wheat		Corn		Barley		Oats		Soybeans		Cotton		All other	Total
	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bushels)	Amount	Quantity (bales)	Amount	Amount	Amount
Alabama	770	1,023	329,079	$388,530			27,598	$18,894	57,525	$117,025	276,926	$50,488,869	$60,579	$51,074,920
Arizona	94,929	132,558	11,586	13,672	346,351	$344,458					458,410	82,735,548	2,820,458	86,046,694
Arkansas	115,876	213,448	30,501	33,605	5,531	4,585	272,553	184,237	10,376,210	21,591,250	388,000	69,437,477	16,347,355	107,811,957
California	2,251,649	4,409,283	443,778	530,497	6,721,478	7,003,955	187,289	127,198			848,480	149,302,306	6,150,181	167,523,420
Colorado	22,595,485	40,563,358	726,273	752,230	889,908	717,290	87,141	54,899					5,147,629	47,235,496
Connecticut													224,348	224,348
Delaware	14,855	28,827	72,671	108,419					3,066	6,255				143,501
Florida			10,003	11,285			780	585	203	408	2,399	408,064	2,092,396	2,512,738
Georgia	65,224	125,872	621,190	766,493	12,064	12,042	696,387	484,071	88,294	176,502	287,645	52,368,306	19,048,510	72,981,796
Idaho	12,522,217	19,575,960	106,897	117,246	1,395,462	1,087,625	1,813,948	1,031,599					1,943,918	23,756,348
Illinois	5,707,343	10,870,110	60,247,893	78,840,424	31,957	31,949	278,767	169,630	24,384,517	51,602,647	24	3,700	94,719	141,613,174
Indiana	1,529,558	2,870,317	15,085,354	18,987,164	7,508	7,293	63,702	39,467	4,320,335	9,069,103			47,390	31,020,733
Iowa	1,830,621	3,551,143	110,640,592	125,372,126	154,467	150,139	5,245,045	3,087,340	40,030,781	80,905,398			5,419,607	218,485,752
Kansas	180,153,745	335,557,159	7,677,099	9,343,606	3,231,883	2,780,076	154,209	96,813	1,304,613	2,611,395			75,000,703	425,389,756
Kentucky	468,260	853,583	1,754,093	2,357,826	1,189	1,139			446,091	910,314	3,261	560,665	7,372,949	12,056,472
Louisiana									86,445	178,694	110,453	19,111,427	4,824,062	24,114,188
Maine							133,496	93,038						93,033
Maryland	340,142	671,554	99,040	139,547					3,446	6,826			720,752	1,538,676
Michigan	3,218,849	5,984,372	2,498,368	3,060,241	74,163	70,579	292,303	184,285	635,916	1,328,260			5,775,580	16,403,317
Minnesota	7,128,400	13,512,661	38,070,303	41,104,848	12,162,894	11,335,336	16,619,108	8,561,587	21,466,012	42,307,571			5,037,902	121,859,905
Mississippi	1,749	2,379	181,531	198,028			239,805	161,212	2,029,475	4,093,804	581,319	102,337,094	7,306,348	114,098,865
Missouri	8,015,708	15,822,640	10,351,224	13,124,272	108,683	104,934	94,524	58,983	9,803,699	20,319,430	132,345	23,044,136	8,479,737	80,954,132
Montana	31,522,917	51,101,726	1,926	2,022	9,845,996	7,417,146	276,117	147,048					406,552	59,074,494
Nebraska	56,292,001	106,166,174	80,258,805	95,294,342	915,589	844,167	891,664	509,630	2,115,733	4,201,804			58,765,824	265,781,941
Nevada	6,617	9,353			1,494	1,255					2,118	371,462		382,070
New Jersey	128,178	258,329	24,575	36,660	963	982			8,731	17,911			1,937	315,819
New Mexico	2,634,578	4,563,675	27,967	31,606	23,194	19,914	12,894	9,026	21,922	41,632	177,939	32,628,648	1,967,047	39,261,548
New York	995,088	2,015,652	137,318	157,915	17,127	17,774	63,955	44,769					114,624	2,350,734
North Carolina	39,176	76,103	246,588	335,909	11,591	11,315	45,958	32,151	93,286	190,249	161,344	28,706,635	88,107,640	117,460,002
North Dakota	49,380,563	90,837,051	1,066,890	1,168,078	38,014,567	33,140,844	13,630,769	6,919,646	1,446,255	2,781,500			23,373,557	158,220,676
Ohio	3,318,517	6,026,426	4,485,057	5,655,257	16,203	15,555	186,220	120,807	3,559,213	7,388,005			5,900	19,211,950
Oklahoma	54,953,238	100,177,618	12,404	13,473	3,205,652	2,918,892	1,684,554	1,055,952	538,924	1,061,579	226,271	36,583,142	1,054,761	142,865,417
Oregon	11,089,783	19,270,087	131,312	152,876	2,697,208	2,475,575	1,987,123	1,325,746					160,885	23,385,169
Pennsylvania	465,415	869,704	148,336	196,422	12,582	11,757	12,528	8,801	2,266	4,567			1,459	1,092,710
South Carolina	29,493	56,871	334,234	356,401	5,799	5,741	838,692	586,309	1,325,606	2,646,471	120,077	21,717,146	62,627	25,431,565
South Dakota	30,756,430	56,908,403	10,077,833	9,779,308	3,767,250	3,446,900	16,392,889	8,530,056	653,468	1,277,123			10,338,769	90,280,559
Tennessee	104,522	194,001	136,313	178,551			1,616	1,147	1,039,461	2,078,427	236,841	43,611,480	2,894,984	48,958,590
Texas	43,477,771	80,685,817	63,331	69,320	2,285,540	2,156,094	8,979,899	6,028,389	673,617	1,321,843	2,814,435	452,850,919	144,588,149	687,700,531
Utah	415,198	631,458	1,383	1,645	46,362	36,195	2,842	1,989					22,064	693,351
Virginia	422,334	808,932	20,459	29,146	2,418	2,368			128,252	255,693	3,590	621,281	5,268,643	6,986,063
Washington	30,643,483	49,808,009	484,408	558,092	3,995,235	3,274,382	1,069,598	617,855					5,760,253	60,018,591
West Virginia			6,406	7,666										7,666
Wisconsin	26,926	52,255	411,879	483,916	2,479	2,447	188,427	114,195	125,548	260,314			47,833	960,960
Wyoming	1,848,173	3,269,962	56,746	59,044	132,559	102,393	146,528	87,111					2,836,659	6,355,169
Puerto Rico											46	11,964	692,511	704,495
Not allocated											2	17,875,156		17,875,156
Total	564,605,781	1,028,533,853	347,091,645	409,817,708	90,143,346	79,553,096	72,618,928	40,494,465	126,768,910	258,752,000	6,831,925	1,184,775,444	520,387,801	3,522,314,367

NOTE.—Insofar as possible, loans are shown according to the location of producers receiving the loans. However, loans made on peanuts, tobacco, and naval stores to cooperative associations for the benefits of members have been distributed according to the location of the association.

SOME PERTINENT FACTS ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC POLICY AND STEERING COMMITTEES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, while the question of the selection and makeup of the Senate Democratic policy committee, and the steering committee appears to be settled for this year, it will be little short of catastrophic if we do not reorganize these committees next year if, as we hope, we will have a Democratic President urging a liberal legislative program on the Democratic Senate. With this in mind I should like to reiterate for the Members of the Senate and call to the attention of the press some pertinent facts about the present composition of the policy and steering committees.

There were several points in the course of the discussion yesterday which were not reported by the press, and I believe it to be desirable to call to the attention of the Senate and members of the press certain facts relating to the present composition of the policy and steering committees.

On the policy committee the States north of Alabama and east of the Mississippi River, which contain 58 percent of the national population, are represented in the Senate by 23 of the 65 Democratic Senators, and have 297 out of 537 electoral votes. On the policy committee they are represented by one Senator out of the seven members, or one out of nine if the two ex officio members of the committee are included—or two out of 12 if the members of the calendar committee, who sit with the policy committee, are included. While these five Senators meet with the policy committee, it is not clear whether they have the status of voting members. Taking the maximum possible representation, these 21 States are represented by my distinguished and beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. GREEN] and our youthful and energetic colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

On the steering committee the States north of Alabama and east of the Mississippi River are represented on the 15-man steering committee by 3 Senators, the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

These committees are obviously neither representative of the Democratic majority in the Senate nor the Democratic majority in the country.

It is also obvious that, while it has been decided that the policy committee is not to formulate policy for the Democratic Party in the Senate, there is at present no other mechanism short of the conference itself. The standing legislative committees cannot make policy for the Democratic Party; in many instances the standing committees give an opportunity to Democrats clearly not in accord with the Democratic majority in the Senate or in the country to join with members of the minority party and the administration in frustrating the legislative program of the Democratic majority.

Now that it has been decided that conferences will be held more frequently than in the past, it is imperative that the conference be used as a device for formulating Democratic Party policy on major issues.

It is of the first importance that a Democratic Senate be prepared to cooperate with the next Democratic President in passing a liberal legislative program. We must, therefore, consider making those changes in the policy and steering committee next year which we have failed to make this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a tabulation of the States east of the Mississippi and north of the Alabama line showing the number of electoral votes and the number of Democratic Senators.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Electoral votes	Democratic Senators
Connecticut	8	1
Delaware	3	1
Illinois	27	1
Indiana	13	1
Kentucky	10	0
Maryland	9	0
Massachusetts	16	1
Maine	5	1
Michigan	20	2
New Hampshire	4	0
New Jersey	16	1
New York	45	0
North Carolina	14	2
Ohio	25	2
Pennsylvania	32	1
Rhode Island	4	2
Tennessee	11	2
Vermont	3	0
Virginia	12	2
West Virginia	8	2
Wisconsin	12	1
Total	297	23

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator has said about the representation north of the Alabama line and east of the Mississippi is correct. However, I think he should also make it plain that so far as the policy committee is concerned, it does not make policy. All it does is to expedite legislation which has been agreed to in the proper legislative committees.

Mr. CLARK. That subject was discussed yesterday. The name is being changed now, as I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], agreed to the motion by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that consideration should be given to this subject, in order that the true duties of this committee may be made plain.

To me it seems immaterial from what part of the country a Member comes, if legislation is expedited. Again I say that, so far as I am aware, there has been no holdup of legislation. I believe that, in comparison with similar committees elsewhere, this committee has really made an excellent record.

The Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned another item which I intended to discuss with him. I have forgotten what it was, but it had to do with the second or third paragraph of the statement which the Senator made.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator refer to the steering committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I refer to a portion of the Senator's statement preceding his discussion of the steering committee.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to engage in colloquy during the morning hour, if I may have unanimous consent to proceed further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What I had in mind was the statement that the Senator did not know whether the members of the calendar committee, who have been sitting with the so-called policy committee for more than a year, had the right to vote in the committee. They do have the right to vote, in the same sense as have the secretary of the Senate majority, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Montana, who sits with that committee as majority whip. In other words, their views are taken into consideration. They are asked to make their views known, and when the time comes for a vote, it is taken by the full committee, and not by the majority leader. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] do vote. I wished to make that clear.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to have that elaboration of information from my friend from Montana. I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with him. I am sure this will be one of the few times during the present session when we shall be in disagreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the Senator in disagreement about? I have stated the record as the Senator endeavored to do when he made his statement.

Mr. CLARK. I take it my friend from Montana is not in accord with the statement I made for the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not accurate. The Senator made certain statements, and I added something to them. The Senator stated that he wished the press to have the true story about the policy committee, what its functions are, and what responsibilities its members have, including the three members of the calendar committee who were added to it last year.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to learn that we are not in disagreement.

THE INTEREST CEILING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently said in his address before the joint session of Congress:

> In the management of the huge public debt the Treasury is unfortunately not free of artificial barriers. Its ability to deal with the difficult problems in this field has been

weakened greatly by the unwillingness of the Congress to remove archaic restrictions. The need for a freer hand in debt management is even more urgent today because the costs of the undesirable financing practices which the Treasury has been forced into are mounting. Removal of this roadblock has high priority in my legislative recommendations.

Will the Congress of the United States change its attitude, or will it continue in its stubbornness?

Already our failure to act has created what one writer said was "one of the catastrophes of the century." "Nothing like it," this writer said, "was ever perpetrated by the politicians of either party."

Now, who is this writer? He is our old friend David Lawrence, one of the shrewdest columnists and evaluators of facts this country has produced. He calls attention to the fact that the Democratic National Committee called this 5-year, 5-percent new issue a bankers' loan.

But it did not turn out that way. The general public and the people outside the financial houses bought up this issue.

In other words, it was not the banks, it was the people who saw that this was a good buy. But it cost the Government at least a half percent more than it would have had to pay if, as David Lawrence said, the Treasury could have sold a 10-year bond.

The money which was put into this recent issue, as we said, came by and large from the small investors. As a result, there was interference with funds which otherwise would have been available to the small businessman and private borrowers.

I think, Mr. President, we ought to get down to business and face this problem head on, before we find ourselves in the same boat with the Canadian Government, whose securities are selling at 6 percent and the British Government who had to pay 7 percent at the banks. If by our failure to act we put the Treasury into a straitjacket we had better act and get the Treasury out of the straitjacket.

I ask unanimous consent that David Lawrence editorial be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FRAUD ON THE TAXPAYER—INTEREST CEILING HAS RAISED THE COST OF MONEY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Few people are noticing it—largely because it's difficult for them to get the facts—but the taxpayers of America are suffering a huge financial loss.

More of their tax money will be used because the politicians of the Democratic Party in the last Congress wouldn't permit the Government to sell its long-term bonds above a 4¼-percent interest rate.

This is one of the catastrophes of the century. Nothing like it was ever perpetrated by the politicians of either party. It's a deliberate interference with financing the national debt.

The Democratic National Committee, anticipating the criticism that is bound to ensue, declares that the latest offering by the Treasury of 4-year 10-month notes at a 5 percent interest rate is a bankers' bonus and that the notes would be bought largely by bankers.

But it turns out that the general public, and buyers outside of financial houses, came flocking to the Treasury to buy the new issue. The non-institutional buyers gobbled up the bonds and asked for more. They recognized that it was a good purchase.

The tragic fact is that the Treasury could have sold a 10-year bond for a 4½-percent interest rate if the Congress had only authorized the Treasury to use its own discretion in meeting the market.

What the politicians have done is to compel the Government to concentrate on issues of securities that will mature in less than 5 years. This means that the Government will have to pay higher and higher rates to refinance in the next 12 months some $76 billion of short-term securities.

Certainly this is going to cost the Government more. The Democratic Party's advisory committee is right in claiming that this will influence other interest rates—on house purchases and other long-term buying. This needn't have happened.

Actually, the Treasury is being forced to interfere in the realm of borrowing where consumers and small businessmen need credit. The Government thus absorbs short-term funds that otherwise would be available to private borrowers, at lower interest rates.

If the Congress had not yielded to the unsound doctrines of a few of its low-interest zealots, who thought they saw good political issue in keeping the ceiling on interest rates, the Treasury could gradually have reduced the amount of short-term debt. It could have put much of the borrowing on a longer-term basis. This would have stabilized the entire interest-rate structure and held inflation in check, and strengthened the dollar.

The crisis in interest rates is not confined to America.

The Canadian Government is selling securities at 6 percent, and recently England had a 7 percent borrowing rate at the banks. With such conditions internationally, it was a grave mistake for Congress to put the U.S. Treasury in a straitjacket.

It will do the Democrats no good to cry out that the administration is boosting interest rates to help the bankers. The impression building up now is that the Democrats are irresponsible.

The bungling of the interest-rate problem has done more to hurt the Democratic Party in 1960 than being charged with excessive spending and an unbalanced budget.

AMERICAN SAMOA: REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. POLICIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the close of the first session of the 86th Congress last year, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], requested the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], to serve as chairman of a subcommittee to study the problems of American Samoa. The Senator from Hawaii subsequently traveled to Samoa for an on-the-spot view of Samoa's conditions.

The trip of the Senator from Hawaii and his report are particularly significant at this time since New Zealand has agreed to grant complete independence to West Samoa by 1961. Thus we are faced with the necessity of reappraising U.S. policies in neighboring American Samoa.

The Senator from Hawaii summarized his findings in an article written recently at the request of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. In order to call it to the attention of all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by the Senator from Hawaii be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE BY OREN E. LONG, U.S. SENATOR FROM HAWAII

(NOTE.—Senator LONG has written this article at the request of the Star-Bulletin to sum up impressions and comment on American Samoa, which he visited recently on a swing that took him to Australia and New Zealand on the south and Manila, Philippines, on the west. A resident of Hawaii since 1917, he has been superintendent of public instruction, secretary of Hawaii, and held many other important public posts. President Truman appointed him Governor of Hawaii in 1951 and he served until February 1953, when he was succeeded by Samuel Wilder King. He was elected U.S. Senator in the first Hawaii State election last July.)

When anyone hears his family praised he experiences a glow of satisfaction. This is equally true when a citizen of a nation hears his country praised.

It has greater significance when the words of approval come from a people whose expression of faith is based on actual experience.

I recently had this satisfaction. At the close of the first session of the 86th Congress the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, asked me to serve as chairman of a subcommittee to make a study of American Samoa.

He stated that since I represent Hawaii, the State nearest Samoa, and particularly since I was the only member of the entire committee who had firsthand knowledge of this important community in the South Pacific, I was the logical member to conduct the study.

Because of the nature of his request and of my longtime interest in Samoa, I was pleased to accept the assignment.

CHANGES IMMINENT

Important governmental changes in the Samoan group are imminent. This made it urgent that the situation in American Samoa be reviewed at this time.

The people of the Samoan Islands, although a single ethnic group and of the same general culture, are divided socially, politically, and economically.

West Samoa with a population of approximately 100,000 is British (under a New Zealand trusteeship) and American Samoa with a population of 23,000 is under American control.

A development of international importance is now under way in West (British) Samoa. For a long period of time the people here have aspired to independence.

Under the wise tutelage of the New Zealand Government they have made great progress.

Their economy is self-sustaining; roads and other public improvements have been developed; educational facilities are far advanced.

DESIRE INDEPENDENCE

Of greater importance, they have demonstrated considerable ability to govern themselves and are united in a desire for independence.

In this aspiration they are following an age-old tendency. They feel as did our forefathers that "* * * they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights,

that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Holding this view it is only natural—and proper—that they should wish to institute a government of their own to assure that these rights will be secured.

The New Zealand Government has endorsed their hopes and has agreed that complete independence should be granted in 1961.

Naturally, there are critics of this action. Such critics hold that the people are not yet ready.

The emergence of a new nation is an inspiring event. Time will surely show that the West Samoans are ready to begin the great experiment.

NO REASON TO WAIT

During the last half century 22 new nations have been born. If each had waited for complete readiness there would not have been any change in the family of nations.

Independence presupposes experience in self-government, but complete constructive independence is never attained on a certain day. It is the result, rather, of experience and growth.

The chairman and members of the Interior Committee, the committee charged with the responsibility for governing territories and possessions, have naturally asked this question:

"What effect will the granting of independence to West Samoa have on the people of East Samoa?"

POSSIBLE RESULTS

They could see three possible results:

1. The people of American Samoa might see in the independent status being attained by their brethren in West Samoa an opportunity to unite all Samoans into one social-political group by their joining the new nation to form a Greater Samoa. This would seem to be a logical development.

2. The people of American Samoa, inspired by the fact that West Samoans are attaining their independence, might desire to become an independent nation, either now or sometime in the future.

3. The people of American Samoa might wish to remain American, working out their social and economic problems within the American system, but with a greater degree of self-government than they have been granted heretofore.

It was these three possible developments that I wished to discuss with Gov. Peter Coleman and his staff, with members of the legislature, and with the chiefs.

STAY WITH UNITED STATES

Their attitude was all the same. There is absolutely no thought of any political future apart from the United States.

This viewpoint was set forth eloquently by every speaker, whether a chief was speaking or a member of the legislature.

Rapi Sotoa, president of the senate, and A. P. Lauvao, speaker of the house, were equally forceful and clear in their interpretation of the desire of their people to be always a part of the United States.

They pointed out that the American influence has been strong in East Samoa since 1839 when Capt. John Wilks first visited the island.

President Sotoa said, "We are American. We were born under the American flag. Our homes, our churches, our schools are in the American pattern.

"We want to participate in the affairs of the nation—to help others. We aspire to the same place that other Americans have."

The various leaders with whom we conferred, spoke forcefully, not only in relation to their devotion to America; they also spoke pointedly in presenting their ideas as to what they expect under the American system.

WANT CONSTITUTION

They are especially interested in the following:

1. A constitution at the earliest possible date. They feel they are too much governed by men rather than by principles laid down in governmental documents.

2. The new constitution should protect the Samoan in the ownership and control of the land. This is of supreme importance in view of the limited land area and the unfortunate examples in other parts of the Pacific of native peoples losing their land.

3. Pending the adoption of a constitution, legislative powers should be granted to the legislature. The present two-house legislature serves only in an advisory capacity to the Governor.

This falls far short of the ideal of self-government and is no longer satisfactory.

This is true particularly since the people of West Samoa and also the people of the Cooke Islands have legislative control over all local questions, including local taxation.

4. More aid should be given by the U.S. Government, particularly in connection with education and health, roads and airports. This seems reasonable in view of the extensive aid that is given to the various States of the Union and to foreign nations.

5. Assistance is needed in developing a more adequate economy. The completion of the new runway for jet planes will have a bearing on tourism.

The present fishing cannery which employs 450 people can be enlarged.

The greatest need is for financial assistance in providing fishing boats capable of competing with the fishing craft used by other fishermen in Samoan waters. They hope that a carefully selected committee will make an on-the-spot study of the economic possibilities of the island.

AID PROGRAM

I am already working actively to promote a legislative program designed to give assistance to East (American) Samoa. Many people who know that situation feel that since the Navy withdrew in 1951 the economic situation has deteriorated.

While in New Zealand for conferences with officials responsible for governing territories, I met Congressman SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts.

He spent almost a year in Samoa during World War II. He has kept in touch with developments there and feels strongly that the United States should be more concerned about the welfare of the people.

Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, whom I met in Fiji as he was returning from an inspection trip from Little America at the South Pole, expressed a similar viewpoint. He feels there should be a greater interest in this group of loyal Americans.

The Samoans need help to plan their economic future. The Civil Aeronautics Board should be more active.

The Fish and Wildlife Service (Bureau of Fisheries) should be of assistance. The services of agencies concerned with the planning and building of roads and the improvement of education and health facilities should be made more available.

There are two specific areas where the Federal Congress should act during the 86th session:

1. Provide adequate financial support to assure the completion of the runway now under construction which is designed to handle jet planes.

2. Assist the Samoan authorities in the completion of the constitution on which they are already working and secure its adoption. A new constitution granting greater powers to the legislature is a necessity.

If these accomplishments are brought about, two important steps in relation to the development of Samoa will have been taken.

Of greater importance, these people who for generations have thought of themselves as being a part of America will feel they are receiving something of the consideration which they merit.

I thoroughly enjoyed the privilege of meeting old friends in Samoa and of making new ones.

Anyone who has been there will remember the beauty of the scenery, the colorful kava ceremonial which is always provided, the friendliness of the people; but most of all he should be aware of an opportunity for America to assist a people who believe in the United States and who want to be a part of it.

INCREASED MARITIME FREIGHT RATES FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this is the fourth day since increased maritime freight rates were imposed upon Alaska and Alaskans by a verdict of the Federal Maritime Board. The Alaska carriers, as was explained to the Senate on Monday by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and myself, waited until the forepart of December to ask for a 10-percent rate increase. The State of Alaska, under the auspices of Gov. William Egan, intervened and asked the Federal Maritime Board to withhold any action until a public hearing had been held—a hearing, if you please, which would give an appropriate basis for a judicial determination.

Instead of acquiescing in that appropriate and proper request, the Federal Maritime Board allowed the rate increase to become effective January 11, and simultaneously allowed a public hearing, but said that if at a later date the increases are found to be unjustified, the money will be returned to the shippers.

My question is: What about the consumers in Alaska, who have a principal interest and a principal stake in this action? Will the increases they pay ever be returned to them? Of course not; that would be mechanically impossible.

Yesterday, as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is the chairman, I listened to General Quesada, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, testify. I should like to quote one paragraph from his statement:

> By the very nature of things, however, the special interests of many of these groups are often in conflict with each other. More importantly, they are often in conflict with the "public interest." Our job, then, often becomes one of balancing the equities among these groups and the great body of the general public, which, incidentally seldom has a vocal supporter. The public is traditionally silent and must often look to Congress and the bodies it creates to pursue their interests.

Mr. President, I can only express the wish now that the Federal Maritime Board had been equally solicitous about the public interest in the maritime trade of Alaska.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 7, I introduced, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], a bill to make additional Commodity Credit Corporation funds available for use in the special milk program for children for the remainder of this fiscal year, 1960, and to provide additional funds for 1961 to meet the natural expansion of the program. The bill asks that $5 million be authorized to bring 1960 available funds to a total of $85 million, and that the 1961 authorization be increased to $90 million.

Mr. President, the special milk program has been one of the most successful programs to be authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of Agriculture in recent years. It was initiated in 1954 in order to expand the market for the abundant production of the dairy farms of this country, and at the same time fulfill our responsibility to improve the nutrition of our schoolchildren by providing them ample supplies of milk.

In 1959, the children in more than 81,500 schools, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps, and other child-care institutions, drank 2.2 billion half-pints of health-giving milk provided under the special milk program. This fact in itself is convincing proof of the need for this program.

In the spring of last year, the Department of Agriculture found the authorization of $75 million inadequate to maintain the program at the established rate of Federal reimbursement to the participating institutions. Congress acted immediately to authorize an additional $3 million so that children would not be forced to pay higher prices or possibly be denied an adequate supply of milk.

At that time, I asked that the appropriation for the special milk program be increased for each of the 3 years, 1959, 1960, and 1961, at an expanding rate to meet the growing number of children enrolled in our schools.

The actual administration of this law by the Department of Agriculture has been excellent. Administrative procedures have been worked out to encourage broad participation by schools and institutions. The policymakers of the Department of Agriculture, however, have attempted to hold the program back—in their own words, "to stabilize the program" by holding expenditures at the level of $75 million annually. Such action would not result in a stabilization of the program. It would mean a gradual diminishing of the program in real terms, since the number of schools and number of school children continue to rise. Even though successful, the program at present reaches only about half of the schools. Instead of being satisfied at this level, we should be seeking ways and means to reach more and more child-care institutions.

The bill which was approved by Congress did not meet my original recommendations. As enacted into law, it provided $78 million for fiscal 1959; $81 million for fiscal 1960; and $84 million for fiscal 1961. The inadequacy of last year's legislation was revealed in November, when the Department of Agriculture informed the schools and institutions taking part in the special milk program that on March 1 of this year the reimbursement rate would be cut by half a cent per half pint of milk because funds were insufficient to maintain the Federal share of 3½ and 4 cents per half pint of milk.

The bill introduced by myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] last Thursday would prevent this planned reduction in the reimbursement rate by making immediately available $5 million from Commodity Credit Corporation funds for program operation during the remainder of fiscal year 1960. The special milk program for children would continue to operate at its present level. Children would not have to pay more for the milk they drink. Schools would not have to reduce their participation in the program, or juggle their funds to meet the need for milk by cutting down on other essential activities.

Also, this proposal would, by providing an increased authorization for 1961, prevent the necessity for Congress to be faced with the same situation 1 year from now.

Representative LESTER JOHNSON, champion of Wisconsin's dairy farmers and chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. Hearings on the proposal will be held by his subcommittee later this month.

Mr. President, I am sure that all of us know that this program is of tremendous value, both to the health of our schoolchildren and to the welfare of our dairy farmers. We need to act promptly on this proposed legislation in order to insure the continued successful operation of the special milk program.

OLD AGE WITHOUT FEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note that more thought and study is being given to the problems of our aged citizens. Due to the wonders of modern medicine and pharmacy, the lifespan of citizens has been steadily increasing. With these great advancements, however, new problems face us as to how we may best provide happy and secure lives for the elderly.

An excellent series of articles reporting on the problems of the aged and on current efforts to meet the needs of these people, appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune. The author of the articles, Daniel J. Hafrey, is a Minneapolis Tribune staff writer who specializes in reporting on welfare matters. I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Hafrey for this excellent series of articles, and also the Minneapolis Tribune for giving this issue the attention which it deserves.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROW OLD WITHOUT FEAR—CLEARER VISION FOCUSES ON AGING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—With the White House Conference on Aging scheduled for early 1961, the Nation is giving increasing attention to its growing number of senior citizens. This is the first of a series of articles on recent developments in the field of aging.)

(By Daniel J. Hafrey)

Donald K. will be 65 the day before Christmas. New Year's Eve he will leave the lathe he has tended 35 years for the last time—never to return to work.

And Donald K. is not afraid of retirement and old age.

The modest home in north Minneapolis is paid for. With the children gone long since, it is a little big, but Mrs. K. loves her flower beds, the nearness to the church where they were married 41 years ago, the familiar stores in the shopping center where she knows what shelf to find the things she needs.

She wouldn't think of moving to an apartment. Years ago Donald K. lightly suggested moving in with their oldest married daughter when he retired. She almost blasted him out of the house and he hasn't spoken of it since.

Mrs. K. has a bad back and can't do the heavy cleaning. But two daughters and a daughter-in-law take turns helping her with that. For the rest she takes a fierce pride in keeping—by herself—as spotless a house as any of the younger women.

Donald K. has high blood pressure and two fingers are gone from his left hand—a memento of a careless moment at the machine many years ago. But he sleeps well, has a hearty appetite, enjoys an occasional nip and keeps up with the younger men on hunting and fishing trips.

PENSION MODERATE BUT ADEQUATE

The savings are meager. With modest wages, three children to put through college, Mrs. K.'s mother to be kept in a nursing home the last 8 years of her life, a small lake cottage near Alexandria and a reasonably new car to be maintained there wasn't much left to put by.

But between his company pension and social security, the K.'s will be getting $245 a month. He has $15,000 in life insurance. And both will remain covered by the Blue Cross and Blue Shield health insurance policies taken out through K.'s employer.

Active in their church since newlywed days, the K.'s hope to continue working for it. Mr. K. plans to put in more time in his garage woodworking shop. Mrs. K. has a passion for old-country embroidery work and her eyes still are good and keen so she can keep it up. There are relatives to visit in several parts of the country.

Donald K. and the 1,000 other Americans who will turn 65 on his birthday—some 360,000 a year—are among the vanguard of our citizens beginning to reap the benefits of our maturing approach to the problems of aging.

For the first time the country is beginning to grasp the size of the needs of the aging, today as well as tomorrow, confident that it is well within our capacity to meet it.

CLEARER PICTURE OF NEEDS EMERGES

No longer are thoughtful people overwhelmed by the mushrooming numbers and demands. The dust of exaggerated worry, fear and concern is settling and a more realistic, factual picture of our senior citizens and their needs is emerging. Instead of chaos there is beginning to be understanding and planning. To be sure, this is only the very beginning.

A tremendous amount needs to be done. In many cases we are only glimpsing the direction in which we should move. In many others we haven't even found the direction yet. There are mountains of heartache, privation, illness, and loneliness on the part of hundreds of thousands of oldsters.

Yet, the most vital fact in the lives of America's 15,500,000 citizens over 65 today is that for the first time in history real grinding poverty—extended hunger and cold and inability to get medical care—largely has been banished.

Over the past 10 years there has been a veritable revolution in the way retired persons maintain their income: while 10 years ago 2 out of every 10 retired workers got social security, veterans benefits, or Government pensions, 7 out of 10 get such payments today.

Thus for the first time in history the majority of a nation's oldsters are dependent for their support neither on children and relatives, nor yet on the Government, but on a retirement fund they and their employers have financed.

PENSIONS SHOW GENERAL INCREASE

In addition to social security, more than a million retired workers also are getting private employer pensions.

The average social security benefit today is $72 a month. Three out of every 5 persons 65 or older have an income of less than $1,000 a year. Obviously, this doesn't go far in these days of 69-cent ground beef and 27-cent cigarettes.

But more and more thought is being given to gearing social security benefits not just to earnings in the long-ago past but also to the current price level—which would maintain purchasing power—and even to the wage level—which reflects the rising American standard of living.

A number of reputable economists agree that the American economy, with its rising productivity, can support a 50-percent increase in the income of the retired without missing a step.

And, finally, a determined attack is being launched on the most stubborn financial problem of old age: the high cost of medical care.

Nor are the moves slowed by the growing respect for the political power of the over-65 group. More than half the States now have offices dealing with problems of the aged. In 1961 a nationwide White House Conference on Aging will be held.

AGED REPRESENT POLITICAL FORCE

The retired today command 15 percent of the votes. They have been described as a political force second only to the farm bloc.

This comparison may be more apt than appears at first glance. For the slipping power of the farm bloc in Congress illustrates in some ways the different nature of the power of the aged.

It is not the naively crude Townsend movement of the 1930's, setting the aged apart as a pressure group whose interests are opposed to those of the rest of the population.

The power of the aged today is much more subtle. For America appears to be turning away just a bit from its worship of youth, physical vigor, and productive work. Note is being taken of the assets of other age groups.

It is only the barest beginning. Too commonly, as Dr. Maurice E. Linden, of Philadelphia, Pa., has said, there is a widespread tendency among people to regard progress through life as an uphill development from infancy to some vague plateau or prime called middle age, followed by a general decline.

There is a slowly growing realization that the older person, though declining physically, has a unique contribution to make to society through greater experience and wisdom, that mental development can continue past the physical prime.

The view toward which we may be moving hopefully has been expressed by Bernard Baruch, who calls retirement the greatest achievement of our scientific civilization.

The stereotype of the older person who is ill, penniless, and in need of help slowly is being displaced. Dr. Wilma Donahue, of the University of Michigan, and Clark Tibbitts, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who have done pioneer work in bringing on this change, make this point:

Age does not mean sickness and poverty. The new view of aging is that it can be a great social achievement.

As the educational level of those retiring rises and as more persons reach 65 who have had leisure time during their working life, the problem of how to spend retirement time becomes more manageable. It long has become plain that fishing and sitting in the rocking chair are not enough—and increasingly those reaching retirement have more varied interests.

GOLDEN AGE NOW OBJECT OF RESEARCH

As revolutionary as any of the recent changes is the growing recognition that old people are not all alike and cannot be treated as one uniform lump of "golden agers." It is accepted now that a personality at 65 is the result of development all through life and that personality differences between two 72-year-olds may be more important than their similarity of age.

The scientific tools of research and experimentation which have been so spectacularly successful in other fields now are being turned on the question of what "meaningful maturity" is, how to provide a useful and valuable substitute for work which will permit the retired person to hold up his head in pride.

Retiring at the end of this year, the Donald K.'s can expect to enjoy a period of retirement—maybe half as long again as their working life—with a reasonable income.

With better working conditions they enjoyed while employed, with better nutrition and easier homemaking, with radical new steps in preventive medicine and rehabilitation they have an even chance of fair health.

The likelihood of either one of them having to go to an institution such as a nursing home or home for the aged is only 1 in 33. And the chances that they may live out their lives without a disability which would interfere with normal activity is better than 4 in 10.

RETIREMENT AGE FUEL FOR DEBATE ON PROPER TREATMENT OF AGED

Should men and women be permitted to go on working at 65 or should they be forced to retire?

The extreme positions in one of the most hotly debated issues in America's attitude toward its aging today can be summed up thus:

Pro: The only fair way to end a man's working life is by fixed retirement age—say 65, or 67, or 68. Then everybody is treated equally, without favor or prejudice.

Con: A fixed retirement age is an irresponsible waste of the Nation's valuable manpower. And it may do shameful injury to a man who is perfectly capable of turning out good work for years. The only way to retire is to judge each person individually.

While there are some signs that Americans are beginning to accept other values beside those of productive work, holding a job still is the badge of self-respect for an overwhelming majority.

The urgency of the question is underlined by these figures: in 1890, more than two-thirds of all American men 65 and older still were in the labor force. By 1955 this proportion was just a little over one-third. For women this figure had risen from 7.6 percent to 10.3 percent.

The U.S. Census Bureau has figures indicating that older men in the work force will be less than a third by 1975 and that their proportion will continue to decline. The proportion of older women may stabilize around 11 percent.

HOW TO MAINTAIN INCOME IN OLD AGE

What every man of 65 facing retirement knows has been stated thus by Philip M. Hauser, University of Chicago sociology chairman:

"The great increase in the number of older persons and decrease in their productive activity poses, of course, the major economic problem in respect to old age—the problem of maintaining income flow in later years."

This holds true despite vast increases in social security and other pension coverage. For even under the best circumstances they provide only a fraction of the income a worker and his family have gotten used to during his working life.

There are many reasons for the drop in the share of older persons at work. The numbers of self-employed craftsmen and small businessmen who in the past worked as long as they could lift a finger have dropped sharply.

In largely agricultural 19th century America there was room for a man to gradually quit work, so that a farmer of 65 or 70 or 75 could work as little or as much as his strength permitted. In today's urban economy a man generally is fully employed or out of work.

The urban way of life, which has so vastly increased the proportion of the aged in the population by reducing birth and death rates, also has broken down traditional patterns of respect, affection, and often prestige which the elderly enjoyed in rural America.

SKILLS OF OLDER PERSONS DEVALUED

Workers now approaching retirement age have lived through profound technological changes which may have made their job skills, once commanding good pay and status, valueless.

At the same time scores of new jobs have sprung up for which the older worker is completely unprepared. As the educational level of the general work force rises the older worker again is at a disadvantage, for he often quit school early or had no schooling at all.

In all, Hauser says, "Urbanism as a way of life has tended to leave the older person relatively insecure, dependent and with an ill-defined position in the social order."

While the family and community supports which the elderly enjoyed in a more stable rural society have been weakened, the practice of enforced retirement has spread. Increasingly employers, particularly the large industrial concerns which employ such a large share of American workers today, adopt the fixed retirement age.

To a degree, this mirrors depression demands to put older workers "out to pasture" to make room for the young. Today as well, union inflexibility at times makes it hard for the older worker to transfer to an easier job or part-time work.

And all this doesn't start the day a man turns 65. The problem of the older worker often starts at 40.

FORCED RETIRING CALLED LEVELER

Persuasive arguments have been made against forced retirement. Maybe the best comes from Dr. Walter Alvarez, himself forced to retire from the Mayo Clinic because of age, who has made a successful second career in his seventies as a writer.

Retirement, Alvarez says, should be an individual matter and geared to the health, vigor and productivity of each individual worker. Tests can be set up to measure these things, he says.

Clark Tibbitts of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare calls the mandatory retirement age the "bulldozer which levels all men."

In many cases, he says, it needlessly deprives a man of work; it is bad for his mental and physical health, takes away his right to live in decency and self-respect and violates the concept of individual differences between men. For work today, Tibbitts notes, still is the "core around which our lives are organized."

He also points out that the fixed retirement age keeps people working who really should quit. By making retirement age flexible, he argues, those who really aren't capable of producing even a few years before reaching 65 would get out sooner.

On the other hand, H. G. Kenagy, who now teaches at Texas A. & M. college after retiring from a successful business career, argues that no board today really is competent to judge whether one man is more capable to go on working than another.

U.S. NONPRODUCTIVE RATIO HAS DROPPED

And, he asks, what happens to the self-respect of a man who is told that he must retire while a man of his age with whom he may have worked 30 years is permitted to stay on?

He challenges the belief, anyway, that most people want to go on working indefinitely. There comes a time in life, he says, when enough is enough and a person should be entitled to do what he pleases instead of going on with the drudgery of a lifetime job.

The Federal Government just recently has contributed some ammunition to backers of fixed retirement.

Opponents of fixed retirement have argued that the national economy could not remain in good health if a shrinking number of productive workers (ages 20 to 64) have to support growing nonproductive age groups (below 20 and over 65).

Recent figures by the census bureau have brought out that this proportion has dropped rather than risen. While there were 94 nonproductive persons for 100 productive ones in 1900, the figure now is 82 for 100.

This is because the average worklife of the individual, with longer life and better health, has been extended by 10 years and large numbers of middle-aged women have entered the work force.

FEWER JOBS SEEN FOR THOSE RETIRED

Various attemtps are made to increase employment of the over-65. Some States, such as Massachusetts, have laws prohibiting job discrimination because of age. A similar proposal failed in the last Minnesota legislature. Numerous public and private commissions also are working in the field.

On the whole, though, it looks as if employment of the elderly will continue to go down. With retirement income becoming more adequate, the elderly may have to look for their satisfaction elsewhere than in work. Says Alvin M. David of the Social Security Administration, who has as much to do with the subject as anyone:

"A great deal has been said to the effect that work is necessary for health and that retirement, for many, leads to deterioration, unhappiness, and illness. We are not so sure as we once were that this is true.

"In a recent Cornell University study it was found that the typical correlation between retirement and health is that people in poor health tend to retire, and not that retirement adversely affects health. The conclusion of the study was that retirement does not typically have an ill effect on the individual."

MORE WORK NEEDED ON SECURITY PLANS FOR THE AGED

This will be your financial picture if you reach 65 in 1970 and become one of America's 19 million retired persons:

Nine out of ten of the retired will be getting social security, veterans benefits, or other Government pensions.

The average social security payment will be $100 a month, almost half as high again as today's $72 average. Maximum family benefits may be as high as $350.

There will be health insurance for all over 65, to pay hospital, nursing home, and medical bills.

In the last 10 years America has become the first society in history where long-term, starvation poverty has been banished from the lives of most older persons.

Yet, President Eisenhower said in his 1956 economic report: "Too many families and individuals still have to get along on incomes that are inadequate by American standards. The Federal Government can do a great deal to help people who have been left behind in the onrush of progress."

Few are more likely to be left behind by that progress than the elderly, a group which has emerged in large numbers for the first time only with industrialized, urban society, and medical progress.

INCOME OF AGED SHOWS INCREASE

In 1957 half the aged living alone or with nonrelatives had an income of $900 a year or less. Eighty percent had $2,000 or less.

But even that is tremendous progress compared to 25 or even 10 years ago. In 1934 the elderly, forced to quit work by illness or company policy, could turn for support only to children, relatives, charity, or public relief.

The great revolution in income maintenance has come with social security which by 1950 supported 2 out of every 10 retired persons.

Today some 9,300,000 persons 65 and older are getting social security. Another 1,600,000 are entitled to it when they or their husbands quit work. This makes 7 out of 10.

Eligibility to get social security benefits at age 65 has grown from 75 percent of the work force in 1952 to 90 percent now. It still is spreading. And as coverage grows, old-age assistance and other relief programs decline.

Private pension plans have grown apace. By the end of 1957 about 17,700,000 workers were covered by private plans. A million and a quarter were getting benefits, many in addition to social security.

WITH INCOME GOES INDEPENDENCE

Thus for the first time the great majority of the retired will have an assured income which they themselves have helped build up. And for the first time they will be able to say proudly that they are dependent on no one.

Savings are not likely to play much of a role in financing retirement. Savings of the retired are skimpy, with half the social security recipients in 1957 having assets of $600 or less, outside of the home they may own. At today's prices, especially the prices of medical care, this doesn't go far.

Now that the income floor, the avowed goal of the social security system, has been reached for a majority of the aged, thoughtful people are beginning to look beyond.

WELFARE EXPERT SEES CHALLENGE

Wilbur Cohen, of the University of Michigan, who helped set up the social security system in 1934 and is one of the Nation's leading public welfare experts, says boldly that the challenge before us now is:

How to expand social security coverage so it will cover everyone who works regularly.

How to expand the program so that every retired aged person is eligible for benefits.

How to raise the level of benefits so that every aged person will be able to live in a manner reasonably close to the standard of living of other groups in the community.

How to finance hospital and nursing home insurance coverage and other medical care protection for every aged person.

The Nation's growing productivity should make possible more generous treatment of our aged without shortchanging education, aid to the disabled, children, highways, foreign aid, and other essential programs.

A 50 percent increase in social security benefits, Cohen says, would be in line with an expected 50 percent expansion in the national product by 1970.

PRESSING NEED: MEDICAL FUNDS

The most pressing need of the aged today is how to meet medical costs. The over-65 age group is about three times as prone to illness as the younger groups. With their reduced means, the average yearly cost of medical care for retired Americans is $125 a year now.

But only 40 percent of the aged, compared to 70 percent of the general population, have health insurance. While it can be expected to grow, coverage likely will fall far short of taking in all those needing it.

There is strong feeling now that all the aged will have health insurance one way or the other soon. If private enterprise will provide it, so much the better. But if private enterprise won't, the reasoning goes, Congress won't be able to resist the pressure for enacting the Forand bill or a similar law.

Representative AIME FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, now has a bill in Congress to provide nursing home, hospital and physician's insurance to all those covered by social security. It would cost 1 added percent of payroll to finance a program of limited benefits. The key is that it would be paid for in advance, during the worker's productive years, for use after 65.

In testimony last month, the Eisenhower administration opposed the bill.

GROUPS ARE AGAINST GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

The American Medical Association, the Blue Cross and Blue Shield organization and the private insurance industry are moving ahead to head off some of the pressures for a Government program. They are testing ways to provide cheaper medical care and cheaper insurance coverage for the aged.

The chief difficulties with commercial insurance programs are: Often those who need it the most are the poorest insurance risks and can't get it; and often an individual is covered only while he remains with the employer who took out the policy in the first place.

While there is general pressure for broadening social security benefits, few of those who know the needs best favor removal of the retirement test.

Cohen agrees with Alvin M. David, Assistant Director of the U.S. Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, that there are more important priorities. Only 20 percent of those now getting social security would benefit from the removal of the test.

Present law limits benefits which can be paid to a person earning $1,200 a year and bars benefits to anyone earning $2,080 or more.

BENEFITS RESTRICTED TO LOWEST INCOMES

About 300,000 persons now earn between $900 and $1,200 a year and presumably restrict their earnings in order to get full social security. Another 200,000 have earnings between $1,200 and $2,080 and get partial benefits. Then there are 1,400,000 persons over 65 who still work full time and have earnings large enough to exclude them from social security.

If the present retirement test were removed, most of the extra money would go to the latter group. A sizable increase in social security contributions would be required to finance this. And while it might be argued that these people are entitled to living as well as they can, David says, there are needier groups.

The most urgent need, he and Cohen agree, is more adequate benefits to widows. Aged women outnumber men in this country and of all women 65 and over today, 55 percent are widows.

With an average social security grant of $72 a month, widows now get 75 percent of the primary grant, or $54. It is felt that this should be raised to 80 or 85 percent immediately and up to 100 percent as soon as possible. There also is backing for reducing the age at which a widow can start getting benefits.

More liberal benefits will be financed partly by the scheduled increase in social security tax. Five percent of covered payroll today, it will go to 9 percent in 1969. In addition, Cohen advocates raising the portion of wages subject to social security from the present $4,800 a year to $9,000.

Good Health, Self-Sufficiency Brighten Future of Aged

No longer does age mean infirmity and illness for everyone.

Men and women reaching 65 today may look forward to living in retirement half again as long as their whole working life, in many cases in reasonably good health and self-sufficiency.

The 1957 national health survey found that 43 percent of all persons over 65 had no illnesses or disabilities which interfered with their normal activities. Only one out of every six was severely enough disabled to require assistance with daily living.

While there still is too much ill health and suffering among the aging and aged, only 3.1 percent of the Nation's 15,500,000 persons over 65 live in institutions such as nursing homes, State hospitals, and tuberculosis sanatoriums.

Medical science, which first extended our average life span to 70 years by conquering infectious disease, now is not only seeking cures for the chronic, degenerative diseases of old age but finding ways to head them off.

Two big areas in giving better health to the aged now are preventive maintenance and rehabilitation.

Preventive Medicine Can Save You Years

How preventive maintenance works was described to the University of Michigan's recent conference on aging by Dr. C. John Tupper of the university's medical faculty.

The periodic health appraisal examination for university employees which Tupper heads has turned up 848 unsuspected defects among 563 professors over the past 2 years. Age of the professors ranged from 31 to 81 and about half of the defects required immediate attention, Tupper reported.

Just as an example, the periodic exams uncovered 13 cancers in 12 of the professors. Two of these men are dead today, but 10 are well, according to all medical evidence, thanks to early treatment.

"Medicine today is not capable yet of dealing with the degenerative and neoplasic (cancerous) diseases of advancing age," Tupper said. "Hence the great need for early detection and prevention."

Nor is it enough to start thorough medical exams when a person approaches 65, he stressed. Degenerative diseases develop gradually over a person's life. And the earlier they are tracked down, the better are the chances of cure.

The need for regular medical examinations starting in early middle age cannot be overemphasized, he concluded.

Rehabilitation Can Provide New Outlook

Rehabilitation and physical medicine are another aspect of health maintenance, explained Dr. Max K. Newman, director of the Detroit Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

Eighty-five percent of chronic complaints—caused by strokes, arthritis, and rheumatism, among others—can be removed by giving a person early rehabilitative treatment. Amputees, too, of whom there are sizable numbers among the aging, can benefit greatly from rehabilitation.

"If we see a stroke victim early enough," Newman said, "he will never show up in a nursing home. And oldsters who once used to die after hip fractures, we now have walking in 7 days."

Rehabilitation and physical medicine are ways of helping the patient use his physical faculties to the fullest possible extent. They include physical and occupational therapy, heat treatments and various baths, social service, speech therapy, vocational counseling and psychological help. Instruction in the use of artificial limbs also is included.

Rehabilitation should help a patient with chronic tendencies before they become a "way of life," said Newman. "Some older patients are glad to accept a disability as an excuse for 'giving up.' A good rehabilitation service can cope with that, too."

Close integration of rehabilitation with a hospital's psychiatric service is important in such cases, as well as a number of others, Newman added.

Physicians Study the Nature of Aging

Britain, where physical medicine is part of many general hospitals, is considered the leader in this field today.

In the United States it has been pioneered by such men as Dr. Frank Krusen of the Mayo Clinic, Dr. Howard A. Rusk of New York and Dr. Frederic J. Kottke, head of physical medicine at University of Minnesota.

The American Medical Association now favors inclusion of physical medicine services in all general hospitals. Minneapolis' Fairview Hospital has been the leader among Twin Cities private hospitals in this field.

While the practical day-to-day work to make the aged healthier goes on physicians are deep in research in order to understand better the nature of aging.

One of the most ambitious projects is the regional center for the study of aging at Duke University, financed by a substantial grant from the National Institutes of Health. Under the direction of Dr. Ewald W. Busse, Duke psychiatry head, the total resources of all the university's departments are focused of fundamental research.

Much can be done to maintain the health of the aged by a proper diet, said Dr. William D. Robinson of the University of Michigan Medical School. Nor is it always true that appetite wanes with increasing years.

One study in an old-age home, he said, found that the residents ate as much bread as recruits in a navy boot camp, once they were given all the soft, attractively presented bread they wanted.

Tea-and-Toast Diet Has Led to Senility

The importance of a properly balanced diet to mental health also has been stressed by Dr. William F. Sheeley, head of psychiatry at Minneapolis General Hospital. While head of Hastings State Hospital he observed that many of the aged patients who had been committed as senile bounced right back once they started eating properly.

Their only trouble, he says, was that they had lived too long on a tea-and-toast diet.

Following up on this idea, the Community Welfare Council of Hennepin County and the Minneapolis Gas Co. have run nutrition clinics for the elderly which have attracted large and enthusiastic audiences.

New insights are being gained into other causes of the high rate of mental disorders among the aged. Men and women who are perfectly well while engaged in their jobs and busy daily routines collapse mentally under the strains that come with retirement, said Dr. Moses M. Frolich, University of Michigan psychiatrist.

The increasing stresses of giving up a job, losing friends and associates and having to adjust to the lower social status of idleness often lower a person's capacity to cope with the world, he said.

As America learns to accept the worth of a life of retirement, as more meaningful activity is found for such a life, we can expect the rate of mental illness among the aged to decline, Frolich concluded.

Finally, Dr. Frederick A. Coller, noted Detroit surgeon and emeritus professor at the Michigan Medical School, made the point that the lives of many aged persons are extended and made happier by surgery that never would have been considered even 20 years ago.

"We can do almost any surgery now with safety up into the seventies, eighties, and nineties," he pointed out.

Much of this, he said, is due to vastly expanded experimental medicine and the development of special surgical teams, such as the world-famous Lillehei team at University of Minnesota for heart surgery.

Inadequate Housing Is a Plague to Aged

Frank and Agnes D. are in their early seventies, with married daughters in California and Texas and a son with the Regular Army in West Germany.

They live in their southeast Minneapolis home, which they bought for $5,400 in 1938 and have long since paid for. When Frank D. retired from his salesman's job they started taking in two to three University of Minnesota students as boarders.

"We're going to stay right here as long as we can," says Frank D., "unless I can talk the wife into buying a trailer and trying one of those Florida retirement villages."

Catherine F. is 78, widowed 7 years. Her arthritis gives her quite a bit of trouble and the steps in her two-story home near Lake Street and Bloomington Avenue sometimes are too much for her to manage.

For a few years after her husband died, Mrs. F. had an elderly cousin from Willmar, Minn., living with her. But there were disagreements over what to cook, how to clean house. And Mrs. F.'s friends didn't feel comfortable with the cousin. So she went back to Willmar.

Mrs. F. knows she can't stay alone in that house much longer. Her married daughter in Richfield wants her to come live with her, her welder husband, and their three children.

"I like them too well for that," says Mrs. F. "I'm going to sell this house—the children don't want it—and move into Ebenezer Home. Several of the women from my church live there and like it well."

John R., who is 74 and never married, is recovering in a nursing home from a broken hip. He broke it when he fell on the badly lighted stairs of his near-downtown boarding house. He's going back to the dingy, overcrowded bed-sitting room and kitchen.

But not for long. John R. has his name on the waiting list for one of the high-rise apartments in the Glenwood redevelopment area. There he'll be paying $32 a month for an airy, modern efficiency apartment.

"It's a good chunk out of my $71 relief check," he says. "But it's a sight better than what I have now."

HOUSING IS PRESSING NEED FOR U.S. AGED

There has been growing recognition that decent, suitable housing is one of the most pressing needs of the Nation's 15,500,000 over-65 group.

"Studies have shown that social problems, such as disease, extended illness, suicide, accidents, mental illness, and isolation occur in high proportion among populations living in deteriorated housing and disorganized neighborhoods," says E. Everett Ashley 3d, of the Federal housing and home finance agency.

"The need for a good living environment is especially important for the elderly who, because of the nature of the aging process, are especially vulnerable to the disturbing influence of unsatisfactory surroundings."

The housing conditions of the elderly were outlined thus to the McNamara subcommittee of the Senate this summer by Dr. Wilma Donahue, chairman of the University of Michigan division of gerontology:

Half of them can't afford the minimum decent housing. As many as 1,200,000 couples live in three-generation families "and most report that they regard this arrangement as undesirable."

"Middle-aged and older people," she explained, "usually capitulate to living with their children only when forced to do so because of long-term disabling illness, absence of income or devastating loneliness brought on by the loss of spouses or other social contacts."

Forty-six percent of the elderly are living as married couples in their own households; another 24 percent are not married but serve as heads of households; the other 30 percent live in homes for the aged, State hospitals, with relatives or adult children or make some other arrangements.

More than three-quarters are well enough to go on living independently, with only 1 in 5 needing specialized housing where they get help with the activities of living.

INDEPENDENCE IS DILEMMA OF AGED

Only about 3 percent live in institutions. Sixty-eight percent of persons over 65 live in their own homes, mostly paid for. This is the highest home ownership ratio among all age groups. But a larger part of the homes owned by the elderly are in unsatisfactory condition.

Industrialization, the trend to the city and greater mobility have greatly loosened the close ties that used to exist between generations in a family where the old, the middle-aged and the young had a place and useful function. More and more, the average family is made up of young-to-middle-aged parents and their children.

At the same time, people have children earlier, stop having them earlier and live longer. Today the average couple is no more than 50 when the youngest child leaves the home. At that point, the man has a life expectancy of 27 years and the woman of 31.

Thus a third of the lives of a married couple will be spent in a two-person household needing a much smaller home, Dr. Donahue concluded. And almost inevitably one spouse will spend years alone after the death of the other.

Only about 10 percent of those reaching retirement age leave their home community. But even that fraction provides a booming market in retirement villages and trailer camps for the sunshine States of Florida, California and the Southwest.

Increasingly it is becoming clear that the elderly want to continue an independent household as long as possible. And the general public expects them to do so, rather than moving in with their children.

Stiff-backed independence may not be the best thing for the older person, involving, as it must, not only material hardships but the much greater suffering of years of loneliness. Joseph M. Britton of Pennsylvania University, whose research findings support the stress on independent living, has described the dilemma of the elderly thus:

"Present opinion hardly makes acceptance of a helping hand (i.e. living with children or relatives) a graceful thing to do, even when the hand is extended with sincerity and a genuine spirit of loving or friendly assistance.

BUILDERS SEEK TO MEET BASIC NEEDS OF AGED

"And yet, almost inevitably in old age, unless an individual dies suddenly, he becomes less self-sufficient and to a greater or lesser degree dependent upon others. This is a reality of life in these later years."

Since little can be done to change these Puritan-inspired values of our society, there is much we should do to let more of the elderly live by themselves and make it more pleasant for them, he said.

A survey of the New York State division of housing found that one in five elderly patients in New York City hospitals could go home—if they had a decent place to go home to. If they had that, the hospitals could provide home nursing care for them—at a great saving in labor, money and self-respect of the elderly patients.

One of the main stumbling blocks to their return home is this, according to Richard W. Hill, Jr., of the division:

"Almost half of the patients have limited mobility and most of them are shut in due to the lack of elevators in the buildings in which they reside. In most cases these people do not live on the ground floor level. Over 70 percent live on the second floor or higher. On the other hand, only 13 percent live in buildings with elevators.

"This block to their mobility can hardly be overstated."

Ability to get outside, home care services for temporary illness, and partial homemaker services are some of the things housing for the elderly should have.

Other desirable features are: complete dwelling unit, including bathroom, on one floor; absence of thresholds and other tripping hazards; doors wide enough to let a wheelchair pass; nonslip surfaces; hand grips by all toilets and bathtubs; a kitchen arrangement which makes stretching and stooping unnecessary.

Housing for the elderly should be located near public transportation, shopping, medical, hospital, and recreational facilities; free from major traffic hazards; in a neighborhood free from urban blight and slums; and in familiar surroundings near the occupant's usual circle of friends.

We know of some of the needs. And much is beginning to be done to meet them. There is a lively boom in construction of a variety of housing for the aged, ranging from a high-rise apartment building for retired teachers in Omaha, Nebr., to the Evangelical Lutheran Church's string of olde-age homes across the country, to the independent family units of Detroit's model Presbyterian village.

Following pioneers such as New York City; San Francisco, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio, and Toronto, Canada, Minneapolis by fall will have 180 efficiency and one-bedroom apartments at low rents in the Glenwood redevelopment area. The elderly will have preference in renting them.

HOW U.S. HELPS MEET HOUSING NEED

A tremendous boost to providing more ample housing for the elderly was given by Congress in 1956 when it made possible, for the first time, for single elderly persons of low income to be admitted to low-rent public housing projects.

Congress gave authority to the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to underwrite 90 percent of mortgage loans on projects sponsored by nonprofit groups. The 1956 law also made it easier for persons 60 and older to qualify for FHA-insured loans.

Private homebuilders also are moving into the market. One, Carl T. Mitnick, president of the National Association of Homebuilders, has built 800 units and financed many for retired persons in North Cape May, N.J.

Senior citizens, Mitnick has found, are excellent credit risks.

The scope of the continuing need has been indicated by Mitnick, who says the elderly need 150,000 new housing units annually. And Herbert M. Rosenthal, a Chicago builder, says that housing for the elderly will represent a billion-dollar-a-year market over the next 10 years.

ONCE PHYSICAL NEEDS ARE EASED, BIG QUESTION BECOMES LEISURE

Reasonably good health, enough income to live in self-respect and a decent place to live—these are the foundations of life after 65 to which men and women can look forward without fear.

Although much still remains to be done before these goals are attained, we are moving toward them. But that is only the beginning. The big question now is: once the minimum of physical comfort is assured, what to do with these later years?

Shuffleboard, outings, golden age clubs, checker tournaments, gardening, reading, radio and television take up a good part of the extra time which retired persons have on their hands—at times weighing heavily on them.

A vast community effort is under way across the country to provide activities and entertainment for those who have worked in their fruitful years and now are ready to enjoy the rewards of the high standard of living they have helped create.

For many of the aged this is enough and, if the other conditions of physical comfort are present, they live out their declining years pleasantly and with satisfaction.

But with many others of the aged, Dr. Wilma Donahue of the University of Michigan feels that under their efforts to engage in recreation there is a sense of "filling an inner vacuum which has been created by the leisure time that has been thrust upon them."

The dilemma of the aged in western society, and especially in the United States, is this, says Dr. Donahue who heads her university's division of gerontology:

"Our society has been, and very largely continues to be, family and work-centered. We have assigned roles and social positions in terms of parenthood and work. Now we have created an economy in which these responsibilities are completed while many years of life remain. We invite people to retire. Adult children have little or no need for their parents in the home. But what position have we assigned to these people? How shall they use their energy, time and experience? How shall they satisfy their needs for belonging, usefulness, recognition and orientation?"

Very few are self-sufficient enough to do merely what they think is right and let the opinion of those around them go hang. Almost all of us need the approval and acceptance of those around us, the praise, the pat on the back, the knowledge that we are doing what is considered worth while.

In ancient Greece and most of the non-western civilizations almost up to the present, leisure was a respectable way to fill one's time. The old Greeks put a low value on productive work. They believed that the most worthy use of time was to deal with people through government, service, religious worship and conversation.

But in western society since the Reformation, the stress has been on productive work as the most valuable use of time. It is the

Calvinist-Puritan tradition, what the sociologists call the Protestant ethic, of hard work, self-reliance and independence which has built our technological civilization of abundance.

Ironically, it is that very devotion to productive work, which has created the highest standard of living in history and has extended our life span to 70 and more, which now strikes back at the elderly.

For, though there are beginning to be some signs of change, in our society it is hard to win public respect for a man who doesn't work any more, who has been put on the shelf.

"Work has given a man more than income," says August Hecksher, director of the 20th Century Fund which has done pioneer research in the field of aging. "In numerous ways it has provided satisfactions and answered needs, and now the real objective must be to find, not activity in general, not business for its own sake, but activities which specifically fill the void which the ending of the job has left."

MATURE LIVING MAKES DEMANDS

Other societies have accorded positions of respect and honor to their aged, have looked up to their greater experience and wisdom. America, too, with its attitudes still largely moored in a youthful pioneer society, will have to change its approach to age if it is to come to terms with a group that is becoming increasingly important as voters, consumers and setters of public tastes.

Not all the changes have to be made by the younger age groups. To be respected an older person must be more than just old. And the rocking chair-fishing routine as the end-all of retirement is not likely to make a place of honor for the aged in our communities.

Mature living, which has become possible on a large scale for the first time in our lifetime, makes demands on the middle-aged and older persons, too. Woodrow W. Hunter of the University of Michigan's division of gerontology has outlined some of the most important ones:

Selflessness or the capacity to serve one's fellow man. Too often the elderly become preoccupied with their own affairs to the exclusion of everything else. The retirement years, when the cares of earning a living and raising a family are over, present a unique opportunity to serve those less fortunate, including the sick and the institutions serving them and children and youth.

Social expansiveness or the capacity to reach out and create new and satisfying social relationships. One of the great causes of loneliness and separation from the community for the aged is their refusal to make new friends and acquaintances as the old ones, inevitably, pass away.

Other attributes making for a more satisfying retirement are mental alertness, inquisitiveness, flexibility, active citizenship, self-sufficiency in thought, initiative, and the ability to set and realize goals for the remaining years of one's life.

Not enough factual research on what the elderly themselves want to do with their retirement time has been done so far. And much valuable insight into what makes a well-adjusted retirement can be expected from some of the research projects now being carried on.

But one thing is certain: Efforts to do everything and decide everything for the elderly, however well intentioned, are off the mark.

Leonard Z. Breen, Purdue sociologist, has warned against letting the professional organizer make the elderly "public property—fair game for all those who manipulate them" and who think they know best what is good for the elderly.

"We must not take a man out of the pool hall and make a new man out of him at age 65 just because he is 65," he says. "Old people, after all, are only young people grown older. To impose a new, foreign and arbitrary set of values and standards is undemocratic and unfair in any case for no other reason than a man has reached a certain chronological age.

"Let each individual derive from his own life his own satisfactions with appropriate assistance and guidance, but with individual and personal dignity and freedom."

'MEANINGFUL MATURITY' IS PRODUCT OF PLANNING

One of the most persuasive appeals against regimentation of the aged, for consideration of each one as a separate individual was made at the University of Michigan's recent conference on aging by Mrs. Mary C. Van Tuyl.

A retired clinical psychologist who has taught and practiced in California and Michigan, raised six children and now lives at Presbyterian Village in Detroit, Mrs. Van Tuyl made these points:

"The longer I live within a group of older people, the more I am inclined to stress their differences instead of their similarities.

"The range of differences in background and present status is so variable that any generalization is more than likely to be untrustworthy. The amount of economic resources of the older individual, the extent and quality of the formal education he has had, even the character of his childhood and youth, his professional and work history, his present physical and mental health—has he been married? divorced? is his partner living? has he had children?—his church background and his present religious thinking, his personality and temperament, his tastes and appreciation resources, his adaptability to the necessities of change, his degree of independence, of tolerance of other ways of thinking and acting, even the time and the rate at which the most conspicuous physical manifestations of aging appear—all of these are important characteristics that simply pile up to make unique individuals of older men and women."

The richness of resources for meaningful satisfactions that are built up in early and middle life, she stressed, are likely to be the basic reservoir for satisfactions in later life. The whole previous life is a preparation for the later years.

In spite of what others can do for the elderly, she said, the individual's own responsibility for his life plan in the end is paramount. And she concluded her views on meaningful maturity with this story:

"Not long ago I had dinner with a woman recently retired from a successful small business. She was talking of her present activities as if they were giving her great satisfaction. When someone asked her about the difficulties of retiring, she said with some impatience, 'It seems to me that about half the country is trying to teach the other half how to retire. With me,' she said, 'I just gave up going to work 6 days a week plus some evenings and began to do some things I had always wanted to do.'

"The matter probably was not as easy as this comment would indicate, but, she continued, 'If we have handled our affairs well up to this age of 60 or 65, it's quite likely that we can plan for the later years.' "

SCOREBOARD OF AMERICAN SCIENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune an excellent series of articles by Victor Cohn, entitled "Scoreboard of American Science."

Eight years ago Victor Cohn wrote the first series of articles on Russian science in any American newspaper and he stated, "We are badly underrating Russian science." In 1958, Mr. Cohn spent 5 weeks in the Soviet Union and made the following grim observation:

The first year since sputnik the Russians have advanced more in science than we. At the present pace, they will lead us in most important fields of science in 10 years, in the opinion of many informed Americans.

Last year, Mr. Cohn was assigned by the Minneapolis Tribune to see how far the United States had come in science and education since Russia had launched sputnik over 2 years ago. The excellent series of articles which Mr. Cohn prepared is must reading to anyone who is concerned about our scientific status today.

I highly recommend this excellent report, and I ask unanimous consent that the series of five articles along with a chart entitled "A Scoreboard of American Science," which sums up the progress we have made in the last few years, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Victor Cohn)

WASHINGTON.—How can we wake up America?

On October 4, 1957—2 years ago today—Russia launched her first sputnik.

Today many leading American scientists are still saying: "How can we wake up America?"

This is the main conclusion this reporter has reached after talking to many scientists, and working with science officials in Washington to compile the first "scoreboard of American science."

This scoreboard appears on this page. It is an attempt to show some of the things we have done and not done since the first sputnik's beep-beeps signaled a new kind of race for world leadership.

The National Science Foundation gave the Minneapolis Tribune generous help in compiling many of this scoreboard's figures and estimates. But several come from other sources, and any errors are ours.

The scoreboard and many recent interviews now show that:

Our Government—by act of the Congress that just adjourned—will increase spending on all scientific research and development in the next year by 6½ percent. An authoritative Washington estimate is that the Russians are increasing theirs by between 11 and 16 percent every year.

Two years ago we were warned that the Russians were spending 8 percent of their national income on education, while we were spending 4 percent. The U.S. Commissioner of Education now estimates that we are spending 5 percent; the Soviet Union, between 10 and 15.

Russia's moon rocket reminds us how far behind we remain in sheer rocketpower. One finds general uneasiness among scientists about our many failures on the launching pads.

There is even sharper worry among our scientists, however, about American basic research and education—for example, about the number of bright youngsters still not getting college educations in fields important to the Nation's survival. We are increasing our scientific and technical manpower supply by 3 to 4 percent a year. Russia is increasing its by 6 to 7 percent.

Our spending on basic research, which after sputnik leaped forward from shamefully low levels, has already started to level off sharply. Most scientists believe it is leveling off before even approaching the level that they believe vital to prevent future surprises like sputnik in unforeseen fields.

Congress—as one example—just put off voting either a go-ahead or starting appropriation for a crucial research tool: a 2-mile-long $105 million Stanford University accelerator or atom smasher. The President in May personally asked approval. Congress did make available about $1 million in AEC (Atomic Energy Commission) operating funds for preliminary design studies. Scientists and the AEC had asked a starting fund of $3 million to $4 million, and urged a congressional commitment to prevent destruction of team-scientists' morale, future delays and loss of keymen.

While trimming a few million here, a few million there from basic sciences, Congress voted the National Institutes of Health—the Government's medical research Institutes—$400 million for the coming year. This is up 36 percent from 1958–59. It is $105,700,000 more than the President asked of Congress. It is more than the Institutes themselves had asked of the President.

The Government's total basic research spending meanwhile goes up this year from $488 to $494 million—a little over 1 percent.

These are some of the reasons why many scientists still worry. Much, they are aware, has happened since sputnik. America's educational support and support of science have moved far ahead.

Science has begun to have a Washington voice. We are building several telescopes, atom-smashers, and laboratories.

We still lead the world in most fields of science, though the Soviet Union's upward pace is ominously faster. Our space satellites have garnered far more new facts than Russia's. Congress last year passed the National Defense Education Act to help some worthy students go to college.

The question is still raised: "Are we doing enough?"

In August 1958 Dr. Alan Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, wrote President Eisenhower that "only a beginning" had been made, and said "we shall rapidly lose in competition" with other nations unless we show greater effort.

Waterman said a few weeks ago:

"We've made some progress. But I still feel very strongly along these same lines. I don't know how we can bring home to people that there's still a real emergency."

He is worried about real and urgent needs for many fundamental research facilities (like the Stanford accelerator) and for millions of dollars' worth of new labs and equipment.

"I'm still very unhappy about the extent of results in education," he added. "Where I get most unhappy is the lot of the high school teacher. Who's raising his salary and status?

"It's true, New York State has jacked up its schools. So have California and Oregon. Here and there things are happening. But it's awfully slow. We can't wait 10 or 20 years. We haven't got time."

Dr. Bowen Dees, the Science Foundation's Assistant Director for Scientific Personnel and Education, said: "We need to improve education for science at all levels.

"For example, many people in education would point to the thing that resulted in two Presidential vetoes this year—Federal aid for building college classrooms. And we're going to have increasing trouble in education because of increasing population."

On science and education, Dees said: "We still have a very long way to go, not only to catch up with the Russians but to realize our own potential, which, after all, is the American dream."

Economists have begun to stress this point. Disregarding any competition, we are still failing to do enough research and training to increase productivity.

"By and large the Government has shown a grossly inadequate appreciation of the importance of research," said Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard economist who died last week, to a Washington conference last year.

True, he pointed out, research spending has grown, but it has been mainly military, and Government support of other research remains "only a small fraction of the amount that would yield enormous results."

Dr. George Kistiakowsky, new science adviser to President Eisenhower, said in September that we still and regrettably fail to recognize that science must grow faster than industrial production, or production will falter.

In the past year the warnings like these have piled up and up—none of them big stories at the time, some of them just a few lines in a speech, but all of them together making a powerful message.

Dr. Joseph Kaplan, U.S. International Geophysical Year chairman, said that "in spite of the impact of sputnik, no one as yet has stated the magnitude and character of the task." He believed we might have to spend twice as much on science to survive.

Lloyd V. Berkner, chairman of the new space science board of the National Academy of Sciences, asked, "Have the measures since sputnik been adequate?"—and answered: "No."

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., the President's science adviser until a few months ago—a conservative, mild-spoken man—said in his final official speech in July:

"We still pour too much of our money into development and too little relatively in basic research."

"We face implacable, able competition * * * While recognizing our present strength, we must also recognize that we could lose the race."

"The military, economic and technological competition of the Soviet bloc"—meaning Russia and Red China—"may require us to make some hard choices between growing comfort and leisure on the one hand and self-denial and hard work on the other."

"Our vitality and sense of purpose are under test."

UNITED STATES NEEDS MORE BASIC RESEARCH

WASHINGTON.—Could the United States turn out to be the most cancer-free defeated nation in history?

This kind of question is being asked rather sadly by many fundamental scientists in this country today as the result of their nagging difficulties in getting financial support, compared with medicine's far easier lot.

Many scientists are particularly concerned this fall about the recent experience of two Government agencies: the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

NIH—consisting of a national cancer institute, a national heart institute and others—was established both to do research and to allot research grants. For 7 consecutive years Congress has voted it more money than the President recommended.

The Congress that just adjourned gave NIH $400 million for 1959–60, 36 percent over 1958–59, $105 million more than the President budgeted, and more than NIH itself sought.

A few weeks ago Science—the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—said of this: "It may not be possible to spend so much money so quickly without significantly lowering present research standards."

It said many observers will praise the NIH cancer-treatment program, but will find that fundamental biological studies—the kind that medicine needs for future progress—are being short-changed.

The national science foundation was the brainchild of the scientists who gave the United States World War II radar, antisubmarine weapons and the A–bomb.

They began saying in 1945 that if we wanted future strength, we must not do research on weapons alone but must do basic research—the dreaming and thinking and searching for facts that lead both to knowledge and practical payoffs.

Dr. Vannevar Bush, wartime science chief, said in 1947 that NSF should be established immediately and that its support of American research should grow to $125 million in 5 years.

NSF was not established until 1951, and its total research support now totals only $76,800,000, including dollars for research facilities. In almost every year NSF requests have been cut twice, once by the Budget Bureau, then by Congress.

A year ago NSF asked the Bureau to allot it $206 million in the President's 1959–60 budget. This was cut to $160 million. Then Congress this summer voted $152,700,000, having cut out $6,617,000 in basic research funds and $800,000 for a Southern Hemisphere astrograph.

This is a proposed telescope to photograph large sky areas. It was called "vitally and urgently needed" by Dr. Alan Waterman, NSF director. Northern Hemisphere studies now give our astronomers only half the data they need to analyze the motions of stars and planets.

The House of Representatives unsuccessfully sought to cut even more NSF money—$17 million in all. Of the House vote on this, Chemical and Engineering News—organ of the American Chemical Society—observed:

"There was little debate. Nobody urged the House to restore the cuts made by the Appropriations Committee. As he presented the committee recommendations, Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said:

" 'The committee is impressed by the importance of science in the modern world, but it does not believe we should issue a blank check to the Foundation.' "

Most scientists think that instead of a blank check, basic science has been issued one of Washington's barest purses.

This reporter was told by NSF's Waterman a few weeks ago: "Last year we were able to support about 35 percent of the worthy research proposals we received. This next year it will be about the same, maybe a little more."

Of $7,700 million which Washington agencies will spend on scientific research and development—to a huge extent on rocket hardware—in 1959–60, only $494 million or 6 percent will be for basic research. This is the same percentage as 2 years ago, the year Russian science shocked us with sputnik.

Russia spends between 10 and 20 percent of its research and development money on basic research, estimates a Washington official who follows Soviet science.

The Atomic Energy Commission's basic research program is inadequate, its top science advisers found in March, at a secret meeting at Savannah River, S.C.

Navy support of basic research should be doubled to make sure of future naval and national strength, said an advisory committee to the Navy in April. The Navy has actually been by far the heaviest basic research supporter among the services.

After sputnik, Lloyd V. Berkner, then a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, estimated that U.S. research funds ought to grow 5 to 10 times "in the

next few years." Basic research spending was indeed nearly doubled in the 2 years following October 4, 1957, when sputnik went up. But now it is leveling off.

Science has become a more routine Washington item this year, and no longer an urgent one. The NSF—for example—was just given a first $2 million to begin to remodel and retool college graduate research laboratories (by 50–50 matching).

This is just the beginning, of course, of what should be a long-range program, but one NSF official still calls it "a pea in the dish." NIH has a 3-year-old, $30 million-a-year program to do the same sort of job for the medical labs.

Most basic research sums are not large as Washington figures go.

"Basic research doesn't cost much," said Waterman. "In fact, doing basic research first is the most economical approach."

Where we fail to do early research and development—as in space—we wind up spending billions to much less avail on crash programs later.

Dr. Charles S. Sheldon, II, technical adviser to the still-weak House Committee on Science and Astronautics, said: "Early research is always cheap, and time is something almost impossible to buy back later, even with almost astronomical spending. Look at our rocket program.

"This House committee has been trying to point out that even a few years' delay in an important science can hurt us very badly later. But getting this across is very hard."

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Army missile scientist, was quoted to Congress by Waterman: "For years we have been talking too much about hardware and too little about filling the vat of knowledge. We have been taking from that vat for years and putting little or nothing back in. Now we are scraping the bottom."

"I think a breakthrough by us is highly unlikely because our research programs are so terribly underfed. A breakthrough by the Russians, putting them even farther ahead, is much more probable."

Many scientists think there are still not enough scientists in high places in Washington to say: "Basic science is important."

This situation, all agree, has improved hugely since sputnik. Before sputnik, Washington's top scientific body—the President's Science Advisory Committee—was an unheeded voice. It met infrequently and did not even report to the President.

After sputnik it began frequent meetings—some of its members are still in Washington almost continuously—and it got the President's ear.

He named a personal science adviser, who became the committee's chairman. In December 1958 a new Federal Council of Science and Technology was named, representing all agencies dealing with science.

A minority of scientists—but only a minority—still think there ought to be a United States Department of Science. Most top scientists disagree.

Many, however, think it foolish that Washington still has less than a handful of scientifically trained men at any decision-making levels, with none in the Cabinet and none on the National Security Council (though Dr. George Kistiakowsky, the science adviser, often sits with it).

In Congress, science as a whole is only beginning to find any place to turn. Before sputnik, there was none. Then both Houses feverishly named special committees concerned mainly with space, though the House group had a broader outlook.

The House this year made its committee a standing Committee on Science and Astronautics (chairman, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, Louisiana).

The Senate still has what is in effect only a space committee with limited authority (chairman, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, the majority leader).

Many scientists would like to see a joint Senate-House committee on science with the energy and prestige of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Many Americans today think that they are supporting science because they read that we are well on the way to putting a billion dollars a year into space research and development.

"I'm going to Washington to look into the support for basic research," I told a friend, a well-informed citizen, in September.

"Oh," he said, "you mean space stuff."

A psychologist at a scientific meeting this September said: "Man is always looking for a good fairy to solve his problems, and this time the good fairy is dressed in a space suit."

But space science is not all of science, any more than atomic energy was all of science when it was the glamor field 10 years ago. Some other field could be the hot field 10 years or 5 years from now.

America's scientists do not know which field it will be, but they are saying that it's foolhardy and perhaps suicidal for us to continue to leave a large number of gaps.

RUSSIA'S SECRET WEAPON: LACK OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—We do not know how to make the rockets that we will be needing within a few years.

We do not know how to make future nuclear reactors.

We do not know how to make a practical atomic airplane engine.

We do not know these things, American scientists have been disclosing, because of a lack of fundamental research in what has turned out to be a crucial field: materials. This includes metallurgy, the science of metals.

"My belief is that this is an area where the Russians have more first-class people than we and are training more," Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Department Research and Engineering, told this reporter.

We have other serious weaknesses. We do not know as much as the Russians about the bottom of the ocean—the terrain of any future undersea war—because we have not done as much fundamental research as they in oceanography.

We did not have the information we needed at Geneva disarmament talks on the potential effects of underground atomic shockwaves. Our scientists had to cull Soviet scientific literature for information on conversion of energy into wave motion in the earth, because of a sharp Soviet lead today in seismology, the science of earth shocks and quakes.

In all of these areas—competent scientists have told this reporter—the Russians are either ahead of us or nearly up to us, and in all they are moving and training faster.

"We are generally lacking information in materials and the whole science of solids—in high-temperature chemistry, high-pressure phenomena, solid state physics and advanced metallurgy," reported Dr. John H. Williams, new scientist-member of the Atomic Energy Commission (and University of Minnesota professor on leave).

This is now showing up in lack of materials to do many present and future rocket and space jobs. Lack of advanced materials for an aircraft nuclear reactor was disclosed this September as one reason why we are still far from the flight of an atomic plane, though nearly $1 billion dollars so far has been spent on this project.

"We don't have appropriately trained people; we don't have basic facts," said Dr. John Kincaid at the Pentagon's Advanced Research Projects Agency. "This is true despite the fact that the Defense Department spends at least $500 million a year and probably a billion on materials development, as part of the contracts for many jobs. This is fantastically wasteful."

So last December a new coordinating committee was named, headed by Williams. It has charted a new program to finance university research and training. Its plans were too late for the 1959–60 budget, but the Defense Department is about to divide $15 million immediately between 20-some universities to start some broad programs.

In oceanography, Russia is operating a fleet of big ships, where we have had mostly converted yachts. Russia also has rebuilt a Navy submarine—the *Severyanka* or Northern Maiden—into the world's first underseas research vessel. A large part of its job is to study fish movements, which made Khrushchev refer to it as "our herring catcher" during his American visit.

But it can also rest on the ocean bottom for scientists to get soil samples. A Washington official who follows Soviet progress said: "In submarine oceanography, I can tell you that they know much more about the area close to the United States than we know about the area close to Russia."

In February 1959, therefore, a committee on oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences said we must double our support of deep-sea research in 10 years or face economic, military and political penalties. It called for a $615 million, 1960–70 research budget, and 70 new ocean-research vessels of all types.

This too came too late for the Washington machinery to crank into fiscal 1960 planning. However, the Navy has converted a submarine buoy-tender—bigger than a sailing yacht, at least—for ocean research, and another is now being converted. The Navy also has $3½ million for a new 1,150-ton vessel, and the National Science Foundation, $2 million.

Seismology—detection of earth shocks, natural and atomic—suddenly became a hot field when Nevada underground A-bomb tests showed we did not really know enough to detect far-away underground A-tests reliably. The President's Science Advisory Committee last December named a panel on seismic improvement headed by Lloyd V. Berkner, who grew up in Sleepy Eye, Minn.

The panel reported in March that our present activity was modest at best. The Soviet Union, however, was emphasizing seismological research and "enjoying a position superior in many respects to our own." We needed specialists and modern computing methods.

The panel urgently recommended a 2-year research and detection program costing $10,800,000 the first year, $7,400,000 the second, plus $12 million a year worth of underground atomic and conventional explosions to help develop detection.

Again, most of this has been left for future action.

Seismology and oceanography are only two fields of geophysics or earth science. Here in general the Russians are moving swiftly, while support here has been meager.

In meteorology—weather—and the atmosphere, there is about to be published a new National Academy of Sciences report. It will still call this "one of the most neglected sciences of our times," and note that our average number of new Ph.D.'s is about 10 a year, where 50 or 60 are needed.

These things remain true, despite a chain of recommendations started by a National Academy of Sciences 1958 study headed by Lloyd Berkner. The new report will note with

approval that basic research support is gradually being increased in line with the Berkner report recommendations.

But more still seems to be needed. A new University Corp. for Atmospheric Research representing 14 institutions called in February for a $1,100,000 1959–60 appropriation toward a new $33 million National Institute of Atmospheric Research. This institute would tackle the big atmosphere-study jobs. It would maintain its own planes to send into storms and approach the kind of research job Soviet institutes are already doing.

"We must reckon with the possibility that some degree of control of the weather ultimately can be achieved," this report warned.

This institute, too, must now await 1960 action, though it will get a $500,000 feasibility study by the National Science Foundation.

There are other weak and underfinanced areas of American science. The President's Science Advisory Committee last December also singled out biophysics, radio astronomy, inorganic chemistry, continental geology, linguistics, social psychology, and several basic life sciences like microbiology, genetics, growth, and the neurological foundations of behavior, as well as sophisticated analytical engineering to precede development billions in many fields.

Obviously several areas of science will be seeking new millions in 1960.

The Government's science agencies are now seeking backing for these from the administration and Bureau of the Budget. Then Congress will face the figures in January.

Many of the new programs, Americans will find, will require a whole new degree of support of graduate training in American colleges. There is an emergency here that has had little attention.

"It is this," said John Williams at the Atomic Energy Commission. "Today it costs on the order of $100,000 to train a Ph. D. in high-energy physics."

It costs between $60,000 and $100,000—depending on the college—to train a Ph. D. in physics, metallurgy, geophysics or any advanced science.

"It's becoming harder and harder to get States to vote money to train Ph. D.'s," Williams said. "And you can understand why. These boys may get their training, then leave for parts unknown.

"I think we have to face the fact that they are national assets. Yes, $100,000 is very expensive. But it is very cheap compared with how much it costs to train a jet pilot."

Dr. Hugh Odishaw—executive secretary of the U.S. International Geophysical Year Committee and of the National Academy of Sciences' new Space Science Board—said: "The colleges are poor. They're in trouble financially. But they've got to expand. Only the universities can bring up the next generation, and somebody's got to help them."

The leaders of science in Washington would like to see far more support of research and education by private givers and industries, so all the money does not come from Government. They have been vainly urging adoption of tax credits to encourage corporate and individual contributions.

The Government would lose some taxes by these credits, but gain more—believe the scientists—by luring some private dollars for activities it might otherwise have to finance 100 percent.

In any case, however, the leaders of science recognize that the Federal contribution is going to have to grow.

Off the record a few weeks ago, one put the situation this way:

"We have had piddling support of basic science long enough now in the United States. And 1960 will be the real test.

"You see, sputnik woke us up a bit in October 1957. But the budget requests for 1958–59 were already in, and they could only be revised piecemeal, though many were drastically changed.

"Then many scientific panels went to work on many problems. In 1959 they started making reports—but too late for appropriations for the fiscal year that started July 1. This is why the crucial tests will be what the administration does to budget requests now, then what Congress does in 1960.

"We'll find out then whether we're going to make any attempt to stay ahead of the Soviet Union in science. We'll find out then whether we're going to fish or cut bait."

RUSSIA MOVES AHEAD OF UNITED STATES IN MANY FIELDS

(By Victor Cohn, Minneapolis Tribune staff writer)

WASHINGTON.—A puzzle about the Soviet space program continues to stump many American scientists:

Why has Russia, despite its great rocket power, despite its new moon rockets, put only 3 earth satellites into orbit, compared with our 12? This has permitted us to lead in gathering scientific facts—for example, about the unexpected Van Allen radiation layers ringing the earth.

Dr. Herbert F. York—director of defense research, and engineering, top scientist in the Pentagon—gave a surprising new answer in an interview here:

"I don't think the Russians have as big a space program as we have.

"They must be putting money into other things—into missiles and other weapons. Into research and development on submarines, nuclear power, metallurgy, building steel mills, education.

"We know they have more submarines. They must have more tanks, more chemical warfare. As a matter of fact, all these things worry me much more than the sputniks.

"I believe too large a percentage of our increased support and attention has been centered on the glamorous things. When I'm questioned in Congress, everyone asks, 'How do we stand in space?' 'When are you going to have as big a rocket booster as Russia's?'

"They don't ask: 'How do all our weapons stack up against theirs—our aircraft, communications, optics?' They don't ask: 'When are you going to have a better submarine? As many cannons? Better antisubmarine warfare?'

"If the only thing we're doing is space, then we're only running a circus."

Russia, it has become increasingly apparent in the past year, has been moving ahead in many things, not just in space.

A report was produced this spring by a high level naval research advisory committee headed by Dr. C. Guy Suits, vice president and research director of General Electric.

The committee included the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the vice presidents or research directors of Douglas Aircraft, Union Carbide, American Telephone & Telegraph, and International Business Machines; the heads of Buffalo, Stanford, and Pennsylvania State Universities; and three members or recent members of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

This report has had little public circulation. It says in plain language:

"The U.S.S.R. appears to be the first nation to fully appreciate the importance of science"—as seen, for example, in its effort in education and the high share of national product spent on research and development.

"The current policy of the Soviet Government appears to be to direct the development of its science and technology toward achieving military, political, and economic supremacy over the United States.

"It appears that currently the United States leads the U.S.S.R. in most areas of physics, mathematics, medicine and chemistry." Russia seems to be "on a par" with us in aviation-space medicine, metallurgy, combustion, theoretical physics, meteorology and oceanography. Russia leads in physical chemistry and many areas of geophysics.

"The important problem, however, is the future." Russia is now training basic research scientists at a rate about 50 percent greater than ours. "Thus, the Soviet potential is increasing relative to ours at an alarming rate."

This conclusion was printed and was being circulated in Washington at about the same time that Vice President NIXON and party were returning from Russia in August.

One of the news magazines reported then that a "new assumption" was "bound to be cranked into high-level U.S. policy decision" as a result of what the Nixon tour saw. This, it was said, was the assumption that "despite sputnik, the Soviet drive to scientific advance is not as far advanced as many Americans believe."

This is far from what most competent American scientists have been saying.

It is true that Soviet achievement is still spotty. Some of her labs are good, some poor. Almost all stand in unbelievably shabby buildings, and such things can puzzle visitors.

But here are some items from recent reports and estimates of Soviet prowess:

1. American visitors have begun finding surprisingly outstanding Soviet work in electronics, which underlies computers, automation and weaponry. At a U.S. war college recently, two TV sets were placed side by side, one a good commercial American set, the other the standard set being sold to Soviet consumers.

The two were turned on. The Russian set's picture was sharper and locked into focus faster, without wavering.

"We build this quality only into our military electronics," said the scientist who told this story. "We have to concede that Russian progress in electronics in the last 10 years has been phenomenal."

2. One Soviet application may become the first successful machine translation of languages. The full scope of Russian research here appears almost incomparably greater than American research, Sonya G. Machelson, of the Library of Congress, told the American Chemical Society in September. In 1955, she said, there were two Soviet institutes active in this field. Now there are 79.

3. A report made for official eyes here covers Soviet solid-state physics, which underlies progress in electronics, materials (for rockets or nuclear reactors) and harnessing the H-bomb reaction for power. "It is difficult to avoid the conclusion," this report says, "that in another 5 or 10 years their basic research output will exceed ours."

4. Another report covers quantum field theory; the mathematical fundamentals of the atom's elementary particles. It says: (1) New understanding here could "provide a basis for the actual manipulation of these forces" exceeding man's manipulation of them to date; (2) "If, as seems likely, the study of quantum field theory continues to attract relatively more physicists in Russia than in the West, the quantity of Russian efforts will outweigh those of the West in the near future."

5. Four astrophysicists who toured Russia reported in April 1959 that Russia is now turning out twice as many astronomers as we, and might overtake us in 15 years in this field where we suffer an acute shortage of people.

Dr. Gerald F. W. Mulders, astrophysicist who is chief scientist of the office of naval research branch at Pasadena, Calif., believes we will be overtaken in astronomy in 10 years unless we make all-out effort.

6. Even on scientific data gathered by space rockets and satellites—where we have been leading—John W. Townsend of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency wrote last January: "At the next international gathering—say, a year or so from now—the Soviet result will be on a par with our results. After that, unless conditions change, the Russians will be ahead."

So go many reports.

Dr. W. A. Nash, professor of engineering mechanics, University of Florida, visited institutes in his field in Moscow, Leningrad, Tbilsi and Kiev.

Then he wrote in the journal, Industrial Laboratories, of decrepit buildings but excellent equipment; of many unique test machines that do not exist here; of teaching-lab equipment that far surpasses that in our best universities.

He said: "We did not find the highest level of basic research in mechanics any better in the Soviet Union than in the United States." But its quantity is now 2 to 3 times ours, and Russia is training so many students that it is almost certain that within 5 to 10 years their efforts will perhaps be of the order of 10 times our present effort.

"Unfortunately, the current indications are that our research effort during that period will increase only by a very modest amount," he added.

This professor's field—mechanics—means the behavior of matter under force. What American observers like him are saying is that the Soviet Union will forcefully manipulate matter, while we do much less.

Future Soviet achievements, then—in the manipulation of matter or the biology of life—may eclipse even moon rocketing.

We are being warned of this plainly. Soviet scientific and technical advances in many fields are likely to be coming with greater frequency, Gen. Charles P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said in August.

Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, predicts:

"Ten years from now Russia's position as the world leader in science will be unquestioned. Nothing we can do will change that. All we can hope to do is regain our lost leadership at some later date."

Many scientists are not this pessimistic. But most of them are deeply concerned.

SCIENTISTS WONDER IF UNITED STATES HAS THE STUFF

WASHINGTON.—"My grand concern is for the decline and fall of the West," said Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, in his office at the Pentagon.

"The rewards in America are just greater for being an advertising man than being a scientist.

"The enthusiasm and rewards in Russia are for getting ahead of the United States."

York and many other American scientists are more concerned today about the American spirit than about any of our gaps in research or schooling. They ask the basic question: "Do we have the stuff for a new kind of world?"

One of our leading space scientists was brutally frank about our attitude in a speech last week. He described what has become "a fairly typical pattern of American response" to new Soviet feats like moon rockets.

"First," said Dr. W. H. Pickering of NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration)—head of the jet propulsion laboratory at California Institute of Technology—"there is a near-hysterical demand that the Government do something.

"Next, we try to buy our way out of the situation. We form new agencies, appropriate new funds, conduct congressional investigations.

"Finally, the crisis gradually fades away, the public becomes somewhat bored with the whole activity, the new agencies struggle for support, and another scientific achievement is quietly relegated to the history books."

A congressional aid agreed. "People here get excited about something the week the Russians do it," said Dr. Charles Sheldon II, technical adviser to the House Science and Astronautics Committee. "Then they forget about it—people in general and in Government."

Many practical things are worrying our scientific leaders besides spirit.

One is certainly our schooling. A panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee said (on May 23) "doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal."

In the face of this, a prominent technical journal—Chemical and Engineering News—accurately reported early in the year: "Science education bills will have rougher going this year * * * 'Congress let off its steam for science education last year; it's out of fashion this year.' That's how one committee aide puts it."

Sure enough, little new educational support was voted, though critics noted that the Nation is still short 190,000 teachers, and nearly 75 percent of all high schools are considered too small to support needed courses.

The National Defense Education Act—Congress' and the administration's 1958 response to sputnik—was continued this year at about what in 1958 was called its starting level.

This act was intended to spur production of research scientists as one crucial goal. It has come to the attention of the President's Science Advisory Committee that of $4.5 million in fellowships to some 1,000 graduate students, just 52 percent have wound up in the hands of students of science, mathematics, and engineering.

Graduate fellowships in other fields are necessary too, responsible scientists agree. Colleges must expand in all fields to teach all students broadly. But there is certain to be new argument for doing much more about training research workers than our starting, postsputnik level.

What of public education? The things most scientists now seem to be urging are: (1) continued citizens' action, school district by district, for better schools. ("We have seen how effective this can be," says the National Science Foundation's Director, Dr. Alan Waterman); (2) some move toward statewide minimum standards, to prevent the many laggard school boards from lagging forever; (3) new Federal aid.

Debate about Federal aid to schools has practically ended among scientists. Science—official organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science—wrote a September 18 back-to-school editorial flatly backing Federal help for school construction.

Support for basic research worries our scientific leaders. The head of American science's big 1957–58 Antarctic program—Dr. Laurence M. Gould, president of Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.—says: "2 years have passed since sputnik, and still our basic research is terribly inadequate. We're spending billions on technology and applications—rockets and missiles—but we still haven't awakened on fundamental research."

There is also concern about many practical applications. There is a large—if largely hushed—amount of concern still about the state of American weapons, in case of large or small wars. The President's Science Advisory Committee has been spending half its time on military matters.

Many scientists as well as military men are concerned with the fact that we have apparently accepted permanent Soviet superiority in many military branches. At this August's American Legion convention in Minneapolis, the Navy's deputy chief of operations for fleet operations and readiness said: "Our budgets have not permitted us to build sufficient new ships to replace World War II ships." He warned of the huge Soviet submarine fleet.

The Marines' deputy chief of staff for plans said: "The condition of the amphibious ships now in the fleet is deplorable." He said the marines have new "vertical assault" methods—using helicopters, aircraft carriers and amphibious vessels—but lack the vessels to use them.

The Army's Vice Chief of Staff described new weapons developed by scientists, but said there are not enough of them or enough men to use them.

At the Pentagon, Herbert York, the Chief Scientist, made it clear that he is aware both of the needs and the fact that someone has to make choices.

"We need a lot more work on weapon development," he said. "We haven't done so much.

"One problem is budgeting. People always say, 'This idea would only cost $100 million. That's a pretty small amount for the United States.'

"But there are 50 such ideas to examine. To do them all we would have to increase the defense budget 50 or 100 percent. I'm not sure that's a bad idea. It might be a good idea. But it's not about to be done."

The decision on how much money to spend on America—on weapons, on education, on science—is not scientists' but everyone's. Many scientists, however, are still asking: "Are we doing enough?"

York said: "We are still ahead now in most things. We are showing some signs of waking up. But whether we actually wake up enough to remain permanently ahead, or only wake up enough to put off the evil day, I don't know. Russia has more people, working harder, on more important things—and it's hard to see how that won't pay off."

So men like York plead for a reawakening of many basic American values: spirit, patriotism, sacrifice, and work.

Some of them have begun to stress a need for one more thing: thought, translated into broader national planning than we have been accustomed to so far.

One speaker along these lines has been Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice chancellor for research of the University of Buffalo, who is more worried about the Soviet Union's industrial threat—and 1965–70, "when their industrial capacity will approach 75 percent of ours"—than about Russian rockets and submarines.

He believes we need:

"National purpose"—"to decide what we stand for" and get out and sell it.

"Positive, dynamic, long-range foreign policy"—to replace passive, defensive foreign policy—including greatly expanded foreign aid "even if it hurts."

Accelerated military preparedness, "even if it hurts."

More money for education and scientific research, "even if it hurts."

"We have the resources to respond to the challenge," says the Space Agency's Dr. Pickering, "We can survive," says Ewell, "with honor and freedom."

However—he and many other American scientists are now convinced—"we have only a few more years of grace."

A scoreboard of American science

[Copyright 1959 Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.]

	1956–57 (last Government fiscal year before sputnik)	1957–58 (year of the 1st sputnik)	1958–59	1959–60 (appropriations and estimates for Government fiscal year that started July 1)	Comment
Percent of national income spent on education.		In fall 1957, Washington estimated we spent 4 percent of our national income on education; the Soviet Union, 8 percent.		On Sept. 5, 1959, the U.S. Office of Education said the United States is now putting about 5 percent of national income into education; the Soviet Union, between 10 and 15 percent.	All U.S. education—public and private, including colleges—now costs us about $20 billion a year.
Number of new scientists graduated from universities:					
B.S. degrees	38,967	42,453		Science and math graduates should total some 45,000 in June 1960. Engineering schools are now worried because fall 1958 enrollment was down about 8,000—13 percent—from fall 1957, though total college freshman enrollment was up 7 percent.	Russia graduated 70,000 to 75,000 bachelors in science in 1958, and 6,400 "kandidats" (like our Ph. D's) in the 3 years, 1957–59. It graduated 94,000 engineers in 1958, 106,000 in 1959, and gave 3,300 engineering kandidats' degrees in 1957–59. This means Russia is training about 2 scientists and 3 engineers to our 1.
Master's degrees	9,427	10,664			
Ph. D. degrees	4,168	4,193			
Number of new engineers:					
B.S. degrees	31,211	35,332	June 1959 bachelors' degrees: about 47,000.		
Master's degrees	5,232	5,788			
Ph. D. degrees	596	647			
Number of able high school graduates still not going to college.			200,000 able high school graduates every year fail to go to college, estimates Rexford G. Moon, Jr., director of College Scholarship Service, agency of the College Entrance Examination Board; 3 in 4 come from low-income groups. Various reports agree between 100,000 and 200,000 graduates in the top quarter of their class are not showing up at college because they lack funds.		
Total college scholarship and loan funds available.			It is estimated there are now "at least" a half a million college scholarships of 1 kind or another available in the United States—and that 1 million of our 3¼ million students get $300 million a year in nonfamily support from jobs, loans, and scholarships.		In the Soviet Union almost all college students are subsidized.
New Federal loan program for students.			Congress passed the National Defense Education Act a year ago as the result of President Eisenhower's post-sputnik request. It includes what started out as a scholarship fund but was changed by Congress to a loan fund. This provided $30.5 million last year and will provide the same this year. About 100,000 students may borrow something from it this year. Graduates going into teaching for 5 years are forgiven 50 percent of their loan.		Many scientists still urge new scholarships, charging loans will encourage students to get into high-paying jobs fast, rather than to fill needed research and teaching jobs, which is the act's purpose.
Dollars for scientific research and development (R. & D.).	$8.86 billion worth of scientific research and development (that is, application and engineering) by Government, industry, colleges and others.		$10 billion worth, estimated Alan Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation.		Two important points here: 1. Uncle Sam pays for more than half the country's R. & D., and even the wealthiest colleges depend on the Federal Government for about half of their research funds. 2. Spending went up sharply after sputnik made us realize our efforts in many fields were inadequate. But our extra effort has already started leveling off.
R. & D. financed by—					
Government	$5.23 billion or 59 percent of total.				
Industry	$3.4 billion or 38 percent of total.	$5.54 billion	$7.23 billion	$7.7 billion	
Colleges	146 million or 2 percent of total.				
What percent of above is basic research?				This figure has consistently been running between 6 and 7 percent, both for the Nation as a whole and the Government. This low figure appalls scientists who know that only the basic search for facts tells how to make new things: rockets, miracle drugs, weapons, or fertilizers. American industry spends only 3 percent of all its R. & D. funds on basic research.	
Federal dollars for basic research.	$254 million	$331 million	$488 million	$494 million	A marked leveling off.
Dollars for the National Science Foundation:					
Basic research	$15.2 million	$19 million	$45.9 million	$65.2 million	Dr. Vannevar Bush believed in 1947 that NSF support should grow to $125 million a year in 5 years. NSF research dollars still have reached hardly half this level.
Research facilities	$5.3 million	$6 million	$15.5 million	$11.6 million	
Science education	$14.7 million	$19.4 million	$62 million	$64.3 million	
Total	$40 million (total)	$49.7 million (total)	$130 million (total)	$152.7 million (total)	
Dollars for military R. & D.				$3.8 billion, including $113 million for basic research.	The Defense Department is still basic research's biggest supporter.
Dollars for space R. & D. (not including military missile work).	$55 million	$93 million	$730 million	$882 million, with $210 million of this charged to research, $672 million to development.	
How are Federal research dollars spent?				(These figures include both basic and applied research but not development)	
For basic biological sciences	$67 million	$70 million	$93 million	$103 million	The physical sciences include basic physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, geophysics, metallurgy, etc. The engineering sciences also take in many fields—as electronics and computers, just for two. This means the single field getting the most money in the U.S. is medicine. We are beginning to fall behind the Soviet Union in some physical sciences—which that country emphasizes.
For medical sciences	$156 million	$214 million	$276 million	$282 million	
For agricultural sciences	$56 million	$60 million	$63 million	$64 million	
Total for all life sciences	$138 million (total)	$343 million (total)	$432 million (total)	$449 million (total)	
For physical sciences		$333 million	$502 million	$533 million	
For mathematical sciences		$40 million	$48 million	$56 million	
For engineering sciences		$278 million	$414 million	$509 million	
Total	$602 million (total)	$651 million (total)	$964 million (total)	$1,096 million (total)	
Federal support of some tools of science:					
Accelerators (atomsmashers) and related atom studies.	$26.1 million	$36.5 million	$59.9 million	$80.1 million	Congress failed to vote starting funds for the mile-long Stanford accelerator that President Eisenhower asked.
University science and engineering laboratories.				$2 million (for graduate research laboratories only).	University laboratories are starved for new and expensive modern equipment. Many Soviet laboratories are far better equipped.

INTEREST RATES ON TREASURY ISSUES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 294)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium-term and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1960.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to introduce a bill.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP ACT OF 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am very grateful for this recognition for the purpose of introducing a bill for appropriate reference to committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2803) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia," introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in sending the bill to the desk I announce that it is introduced in behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], my colleague and present occupant of the chair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and myself.

The bill is a proposed amendment to the Apprenticeship Act of the District of Columbia. We believe that the transfer of the program from the U.S. Department of Labor to the District of Columbia government will be in the interest of economy and will further the effective administration of the act of 1946, which I was privileged to sponsor when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] sponsored in the Senate.

When an Apprenticeship Act for the District of Columbia was first proposed, it was contemplated that the U.S. Department of Labor would be responsible for supplying the Apprenticeship Council, to be established under this law, with trained technical and administrative personnel until such time as the planned apprenticeship program under minimum standards was soundly established and able to operate on its own.

Public Law 387, 79th Congress, popularly known as the Bridges-Randolph District of Columbia Apprenticeship Act of 1946, was passed by Congress without opposition and signed by the President on May 21, 1946. The proposed act had the full endorsement of local management and labor unions.

By letter dated August 9, 1946, the Secretary of Labor advised the President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners that in accordance with provisions of the Apprenticeship Act, he was appointing the District of Columbia Supervisor for the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as "Director of Apprenticeship for the District of Columbia," with instruction that he was to "be guided in the performance of his work by the policies and program of the Apprenticeship Council to be appointed under the Apprenticeship Act by the Commissioners."

This program established a six-member labor-management Apprenticeship Council to formulate minimum standards of employment and craftsmanship and operational policies within the framework of the law.

Under the guidance of this labor-management council, within a space of 4 years, the District of Columbia planned apprenticeship program became the most outstanding in the country.

Since 1950, statistics issued by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, the District of Columbia has had more registered apprentices for each 1,000 journeymen craftsmen reported by the U.S. Census, than any other State or Territory.

Over the past 9 years, the District of Columbia has averaged over 60 apprentices per 1,000 journeymen each year, 20 higher than Connecticut, the second ranking State, and nearly four times the national average.

Under the circumstances, it is felt by those interested in the future of planned apprenticeship in the District of Columbia area that the program is now soundly and permanently established and that it is to the advantage of the future of the program that the Director and his staff should be transferred from the U.S. Department of Labor to the District of Columbia Government, as proposed in this amendment to Public Law 387, 79th Congress.

The proposed amendment was drafted by the Solicitor of Labor at the request of the Secretary of Labor, and has been endorsed by local management and labor unions as being in the best interest of the District of Columbia area and its future industrial skilled labor needs.

In addition, the suggested amendment is also in accordance with the long-standing Federal policy of turning over to the States and Territories those functions and responsibilities which properly belong to local governments and can best be carried out by such governments.

This amendment will permit a fuller and closer integration of the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council's program and operations and those of the Director and his staff with other District of Columbia government agencies and programs involving the training of skilled and other workers on the job by giving the Council more direct control over local activities. It will also permit the Director and his staff to concentrate all their interest and energy on apprenticeship and on-the-job training problems peculiar to the District of Columbia area in carrying out the Council's policies and directives, and would eliminate all possible conflict between local and national apprenticeship promotional interests.

Furthermore, as the proposed amendment merely involves the transfer of regularly appropriated funds to provide the District of Columbia Council with staff from the U.S. Department of Labor's annual appropriations to the government of the District of Columbia appropriations, it will involve no additional cost to the taxpayers and may even result in a small saving.

In a letter dated January 30, 1959, from James E. Dodson, Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor, the budget officer of the District of Columbia was advised that the U.S. Department of Labor had appropriated $27,700 for the District of Columbia staff for fiscal year 1959, and $27,800 for fiscal 1960. The present staff consists of a Director, GS–12; a field representative, GS–11; a registrar, GS–5; and a secretary, GS–4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further request for recognition during the morning hour?

THE INCOME TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last week there were many accounts in the press throughout the country of the death of former Senator Norris Brown, of Nebraska. The central theme of these accounts concerned the part played by the then Senator Brown in introducing in the U.S. Senate the income tax amendment to the Constitution.

While I do not want to take from former Senator Brown, or his memory, any of the credit for his part in this legislation, I was somewhat surprised to see little, if any, mention in press accounts of the part played in the income tax fight by the late Cordell Hull of Tennessee. He was a recognized leader in the fight to impose taxes on the basis of ability to pay. Toward this end, he waged a long and eventually successful fight for income tax legislation.

Mr. President, there appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for January 11, 1960, a column on this subject by one of the feature writers for that great newspaper of the midsouth. I ask unanimous consent that this column by Mr. Paul Flowers be printed in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL FLOWERS' GREENHOUSE

An almost hidden news story Thursday, under the heading "Tax Is His Monument," told of the death of Norris Brown, Republican Senator from Nebraska from 1907–13, and hailed him as the man who introduced the income-tax amendment in the U.S. Senate.

Which is all right, except that it is slightly misleading if it implies that he was more than a fellow toiler in the crusade for the income tax, or that he deserved more than a nominal part of the credit (or blame).

The story sent me back to Cordell Hull's "Memoirs," published in 1948, in which the great Tennessean, father of the good-neighbor policy and diplomat par excellence, who walked with kings nor ever lost the common touch, spelled out the record in Congress for imposition of the levy which now reaches into practically every pocket in the land.

On December 19, 1907, Cordell Hull, according to his own record, introduced into the House of Representatives a comprehensive income-tax bill. As he tells it:

"This was in the face of the fact that all statesmen acquiesced in the view that income tax was probably dead legislatively since the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1895 declaring the income-tax law invalid. This view was based on the belief that income taxation could not be enacted except through constitutional amendment. 'And with special privilege in supreme control of both Houses of Congress, there appeared to be no chance to secure the submission of an amendment * * * even if ratification by the requisite number of States proved possible.

"By introducing the bill I accepted a challenge. The Republican campaign book of 1894 had stated:

" 'In this country an income tax of any sort is odious and will bring odium upon any party blind enough to impose it. Prepare for the funeral of the political party which imposes such a burden.' I was willing to risk both the odium and the funeral."

Mr. Hull went on to tell how he had been influenced by the ideas of Benton McMillin, Member of Congress from Tennessee, who had embraced the income-tax theory and was author of the tax provision in the Wilson Tariff Act which the Supreme Court had declared unconstitutional.

When President Cleveland bypassed McMillin for chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee, the Tennessean determined to retaliate by pushing the income tax over on the East. He was chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the income-tax provision; he forced a caucus and got his provision adopted.

Cordell Hull believed, in 1907, that wealth was shirking its share of the tax burden. He felt so strongly that he plunged in to revive the whole issue, hopeful that absence of Justice Shiras from the High Court bench had altered the situation. Mr. Hull admits that he got nowhere in the 60th Congress, but he wasn't the type to quit.

He kept talking income tax so often to some fellow members that they were no longer willing to listen. Even John Sharp Williams and Champ Clark, he recalls, although in favor of the tax, would turn and walk in another direction when they saw him coming.

When Cordell Hull made his maiden speech on the floor in March 1908, he came out for the income tax, at the risk of odium and political death.

A year later, he introduced his income tax bill on the 1st day of 61st session, in March 1909. Again in January 1910, he thundered:

"The wonderful flexibility and certain productiveness of this tax enables it to meet every requirement of peace or war emergencies." He quoted Gladstone about a similar levy, "an engine of gigantic power." He told how England had used it to conquer Napoleon; how it had been imposed for the relief of a depleted U.S. Treasury in the Civil War.

Followed years of political maneuvering; on February 3, 1913, the constitutional amendment on income tax, so long advocated by the Tennessean, was ratified, and it became effective on February 25.

Cordell Hull does not mention Senator Brown's part. In summation, he wrote:

"After I had written the final draft it went before the House practically as I wrote it. It fell to my lot to handle the income tax provision (of the Underwood Tariff Act) on the floor of the House. The measure was at no time in danger. The provision became law as part of the Underwood Tariff Act (as implementing legislation) on October 13, 1913. The United States now had a regular income tax as a permanent part of our fiscal system. No time was lost in applying it."

So now, as time nears for annual income tax returns, perhaps somebody may care to recall that a rangy, outspoken Tennessean earned whatever odium may accrue from the world's most fabulous governmental revenue producer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to say that like the late, great Cordell Hull, I am a firm supporter of our income tax laws. I hope they will be strengthened and made more equitable by the closure of many of the loopholes which have crept in during recent years.

I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

THE CONFERENCE OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion in the RECORD to thank my Democratic colleagues for the very, very courteous and considerate audience they gave me yesterday afternoon in the Democratic caucus. I could not have asked for more attention or more consideration, and I am grateful to have had the opportunity to discuss with my colleagues a problem of deep concern to me. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of the motion which I offered but which was not accepted by the Democratic conference.

There being no objection, the motion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTION OFFERED BY SENATOR GORE AT THE CONFERENCE OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

I move, Mr. Chairman—

That all vacancies occurring hereafter on the Democratic policy committee be filled by election by a conference of Democratic Senators,

That the membership of the policy committee be increased so as to be more truly representative of the Democratic Senators, the major geographic areas of the United States and of the national character and interest of the Democratic Party,

That the Democratic policy committee undertake the development and formulation of legislative policies of the Democratic Party in the Senate to be submitted to the conference of Democratic Senators for its consideration and action.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. If the Senator from Tennessee has a brief statement to offer I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that we are still in the morning hour. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Virginia, but the Chair did not understand that the Senator from Virginia wished to make a statement of more than 3 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do not wish to impose upon my good and distinguished friend from Virginia. I have only one additional statement to make. Will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized in the morning hour.

THE INTEREST RATE CEILING

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to Congress another message in which he demands the removal of the interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds.

Mr. President, I opposed the removal of this ceiling last year. I continue to oppose it.

The bond interest rate question is not one which can be considered in isolation. It is part and parcel of the much larger question of overall economic policy. Unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration has tended to center all economic policy around the central theme of tight money and high interest rates.

We have seen repeated failures to keep our economy in balance by raising interest rates and tightening up on the supply of money. This will be the result again and again. Already the housing industry is in a precarious position, and other segments of our economy are sorely pressed with high interest rates and tight money.

I shall soon address the Senate at greater length on the broad economic issues which confront us. I shall show how the interest rate on Government bonds is related to other economic issues. For the time being, let me say that my studies to date have convinced me that it would be a great disservice to the American people for the Congress to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

Last year the Congress adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 and thereby authorized the Joint Economic Committee, headed by the foremost economist in the Congress, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to make a study of employment, growth, and price levels. The interest rate on Government bonds, along with related economic issues, has been considered by that committee. The report of the committee will be submitted

prior to the end of this month, and I await it with considerable interest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been concluded. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SPACE PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe editorials published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 6, 1960, and the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 7, 1960, speak for themselves in indicating why this country cannot ignore the importance of our space programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 6, 1960]

THE GREAT ISSUES OF 1960—SPACE: A RACE WE MUST WIN

Suppose the Soviets landed an expedition on the moon, then declared that the arrival there of any other expedition would be regarded by the missile-armed Soviet Government as an unfriendly act—what would we do?

The new Congress should be asking itself this sort of question as it reviews the scope, organization and priority of the Nation's space program.

Present indications are that unless we quickly and markedly accelerate our own efforts, the Soviets will be first on the moon—and also, despite our dramatic Mercury astronaut program, that the first man in orbit is quite likely to be Russian.

Whether we like it or not, we are in a race—a race we cannot afford to lose.

Conventional military minds may argue that we have our ICBM; that the much greater power represented by, say, the 1.5 million-pound-thrust Saturn project has no immediate military application, and that therefore its development is not of crucial importance in terms of national survival.

But the potential military significance of reconnaissance satellites, space platforms, even moon bases, is only beginning to be explored. Power of the Saturn magnitude, and greater, is needed to hurl aloft the quantity of hardware needed for real space exploration. And operating as it does on the frontiers of knowledge, concerned with the massing and control of vast energies, the venture into space holds the possibility of discoveries the significance of which we can only guess at—and even our guesses will probably fall short of reality.

The space lag could hold a far greater threat to national survival than even the missile lag. We at least have the comfort of alternate deterrents, such as SAC, to set off against Soviet missile power. But against the still unknown threat from future Soviet firsts in space we might have no defense, and not even a good counter offense.

More than the direct military significance of space, however, is involved in our race to get there.

We live in an age in which diplomacy and propaganda, military, scientific, and economic strength all are bound up inextricably together, and in which an anxious world is looking both to us and to the Soviets for leadership.

At the heart of the Soviet Union's drive toward supremacy is its effort to establish an image of the Soviet system as the wave of the future. Spectacular triumphs in space have played a key role—and a highly effective one—in this effort.

If anyone doubts the effect of such triumphs, let him reflect on how the popular image of the Soviet Union has changed in this country since Sputnik I shot aloft, shattering our ill-founded complacency, forcing us at last to recognize the dynamics of Soviet growth.

Our national space agency this year has a budget equal to only one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product, while vital space programs have been deliberately delayed for lack of funds. The U.S. space effort is still hamstrung by inadequate financing, by divided authority, by lack of a clear affirmation of national purpose.

From a late start, we have made impressive gains which should not be minimized. But they have still not been enough. We are second, and not even second among equals; we still are getting there—into space—lastest with the leastest.

We can't win unless we start running.

The free world has a right to demand more vigorous leadership than it has gotten from the United States in the competitive conquest of man's ultimate frontier.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1960]

CHEAPSKATE

The richest country in the world thinks that it cannot afford to compete with the Soviet Union in space exploration. That is the flat implication of the series of articles this newspaper has published recently about the space and missile lag, and it would be an appropriate takeoff point for the new Senate investigation.

Of course the problems of space exploration can be vastly oversimplified, and doubtless there are many factors in the American deficiency beyond mere lack of money. But it is really shocking that the reason given for the failure to use more large-thrust Atlas missiles in the lunar aspect of the space program is cost. Seemingly the administration has not yet fully emerged philosophically from the attitude it exhibited at the time of Sputnik I, which it attempted to pass off as an interesting trick but nothing to get excited about and certainly nothing to warrant greater effort or expenditure.

Very much the same approach has characterized the attitude toward the defense program ever since 1953. The new look, massive retaliation, the bigger bang for a buck all have been essentially rationalizations for getting by on the cheap—with the result that today the United States has relatively little except the big bang. The placid, passive resignation to the missile gap represents a new phenomenon in American history—something bordering upon defeatism which is sometimes candied up with explanations to make it look like one of Hitler's victorious advances to the rear.

The plain, simple, elementary, and obvious fact is that the United States is going to have to spend more money—a lot more of it—in order to assert parity, let alone primacy, in defense and space programs. Better organization and more efficiency no doubt would accomplish something, but there is no use looking for panaceas or regarding waste and duplication as scapegoats. More money for defense space and other national needs is going to require tax adjustments and very possibly higher rates.

Perhaps we can continue to skimp and drift for another year, at which time the efforts to catch up will be more painful. But we are in great danger meanwhile of giving the world, and patricularly the Russians, the impression that we are indeed soft and flabby and that we value our luxuries over our sinews. It will do no good, however, for Congress merely to bemoan the dilemma and use it as a political club against the administration. Congress has the power of the purse and can do something about the problem if it wishes.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 86th Congress much consideration will be given to the question of housing. We already have had statements from the chairman of the Senate and House Housing Subcommittees in which they have set forth their views on this subject. Both of them have taken the position that there is need for additional legislation to promote housing during the sixties.

Until legislation is introduced, the discussion on the subject of housing must be on general lines. But even though my comments are general, I think it is appropriate to set forth some simple facts which we should keep in mind in considering housing legislation this year and in succeeding years.

In the first place, the number of housing starts is high and gives every indication of continuing high, though probably not as high as in 1959. The prewar peak of new housing starts, 937,000 in 1925, was about equaled in 1948, and beginning in 1949 the number of new dwelling units started in every year exceeded 1 million, as shown in the following table:

Estimated total nonfarm new dwelling units

[Thousands of starts]

1949	1,025.1
1950	1,396.0
1951	1,091.3
1952	1,127.0
1953	1,103.8
1954	1,220.4
1955	1,328.9
1956	1,118.1
1957	1,041.9
1958	1,209.4
1959 (preliminary estimate)	1,375.0

It is not easy to make any flat statements about whether this volume of housing is adequate to meet the need for new housing. Many factors enter into the question of need.

The most specific, of course, is the need arising from increases in population and new family formation. The Census Bureau reports that between March 1950 and March 1958 the average annual increase in the number of households was about 850,000.

During the 5 years from July 1960, to July 1965, the Census Bureau's estimates of the average annual increase in the number of households ranges from 643,000 to 1,018,000, varying with different assumptions for population growth and the establishment of households. Apparently, we are more than keeping up with the need from this point of view.

New housing also is desirable in order to upgrade the level of housing and particularly to eliminate substandard housing. It has been pointed out that in 1950, there were about 16.5 million substandard homes, while in 1959 there were about 12 million of these substandard

units. This is not satisfactory progress in meeting the need for adequate housing.

However, new construction is, in many cases, neither the quickest nor the cheapest way to eliminate substandard housing. If a dwelling unit is substandard because it needs repairs or because it needs running hot water, it may be far quicker, cheaper, and more efficient to install a hot water heater or to put on a new roof than it would be to build a new building.

Between 1950 and 1956 about 3.4 million substandard dwellings were upgraded. Unfortunately, about 1.3 million dwellings which were satisfactory in 1950 had become substandard by the end of 1956. Greater attention to upkeep would have prevented much of this deterioration. The problem of substandard housing will not be most effectively or completely solved just by more new construction; perhaps as much as 9 percent of the 10 million new units built between 1950 and 1956 were classified as substandard in 1956, due in part at least to lack of proper maintenance.

The need for housing, of course, is related to the public's desire for new housing and its willingness to spend its money to get the new housing, instead of spending it for other purposes. A family may prefer a second automobile to a recreation room; some may even prefer an automobile to a third bedroom.

In any discussion of housing, we must keep clearly in mind that money has been made available in huge and almost constantly increasing quantities for home mortgages. The following table shows the amounts of mortgages recorded in the last 10 years, and the net increases in mortgages outstanding.

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Nonfarm mortgage recordings of $20,000 or less				Increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties			
	Total	FHA	VA	Conv.	Total	FHA	VA	Conv.
1950	16.2	2.5	3.1	10.6	7.6	1.7	2.2	3.7
1951	16.4	1.9	3.6	10.9	6.5	1.1	2.9	2.5
1952	18.0	1.9	2.7	13.4	6.8	1.1	1.4	4.3
1953	19.7	2.3	3.1	14.4	7.6	1.2	1.5	4.9
1954	23.0	1.9	4.3	16.8	9.6	.8	3.2	5.6
1955	28.5	3.1	7.2	18.2	12.6	1.5	5.3	5.7
1956	27.1	2.6	5.9	18.6	10.8	1.2	3.8	5.8
1957	24.2	2.3	3.8	18.2	8.6	1.0	2.3	5.3
1958	27.4	4.6	1.9	21.0	10.1	3.2	—.3	7.2
1959	[1] 32.0	[1] 6.0	[1] 3.0	[1] 23.0	[1] 13.0	[1] 4.2	[1] —.3	9.1

[1] Estimate.

Source: Various issues of the Federal Reserve Bulletin, as revised. Figures for 1959 are estimates supplied by the Federal Reserve.

Total nonfarm mortgage recordings of $20,000 or less have grown from $16.2 billion in 1950 to an estimated figure of $32 billion in 1959. The increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties went from $7.6 billion in 1950 to an estimated $13 billion in 1959. And even in 1957, when there was a decline in housing starts and mortgages, there still was a figure of over $24 billion for nonfarm mortgage recordings—$8 billion more than the figure in 1950—and there still was a net increase in mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family properties of $8.6 billion, $1 billion more than the net increase in 1950.

Throughout the postwar years, net flows of funds into mortgages have represented an extremely large share of the total net flow of funds into capital markets.

Net flow of funds into capital markets

[Amounts in billions]

Year	Net capital market flows [1]	Residential mortgage flows	
		Amount	Percent of total net capital market flows
1948	$15.6	$5.9	37.8
1949	15.9	5.3	33.3
1950	17.4	8.7	50.0
1951	18.7	7.8	41.7
1952	24.7	7.5	30.4

[1] Includes flows of funds into corporate securities, State and municipal, and Federal obligations, and mortgages.

Net flow of funds into capital markets—Continued

[Amounts in billions]

Year	Net capital market flows	Residential mortgage flows	
		Amount	Percent of total net capital market flows
1953	$26.1	$8.2	31.4
1954	25.3	10.2	40.3
1955	28.2	13.4	47.5
1956	26.9	11.4	42.4
1957	28.6	9.2	31.8
1958	40.5	11.6	28.6
1959 (estimate)	43.5	14.7	33.8

Source: "Study of Mortgage Credit," Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 190; 1958 figures and 1959 estimates from Federal Reserve System.

This table compares only the net flow of funds into corporate securities and State, municipal, and Federal obligations with the flow of funds into mortgages. It does not, for example, take into account the flow of funds into consumer credit, which rose from $21 billion in 1950 to almost $50 billion in October 1959.

Those proposing an increase of funds into the mortgage field, over and above the large amount and the large porportion now going into mortgages, should think carefully where it is to come from. Funds going into corporate securities are the source of our long-term growth in productivity. New factories, to produce additional raw materials and manufactured goods, are expensive, and money to finance them must be raised somehow if we are to have increasing production. Funds going into local, State, and Federal securities provide roads, dams, airports, schools, hospitals, and meet the deficits in Federal budgets which so frequently follow the adoption of lavish spending programs. And while funds flowing into consumer credit do not directly increase future productivity, they provide an incentive for manufacturers to increase their plants, and they represent a choice by the consumer in favor of automobiles, television sets, washing machines, and the like, as compared with housing or anything else they could spend their money on.

The increased demands for funds for consumer credit, for mortgages and for corporate and governmental purposes had the result of increasing interest rates. These increases in interest rates were not confined to the mortgage field. Interest rates, and yields in the case of securities whose interest rates are fixed, have risen to the highest point in about 25 years. It would indeed be surprising if interest on mortgages had not followed suit.

The general rise in interest rates hit especially hard FHA and VA mortgages, where the rates were fixed by law. The table showing mortgage recordings and increases in outstanding mortgage debt illustrates this. The amount of conventional mortgages recorded has increased gradually but steadily, the only decline being from $18.6 billion in 1956 to $18.2 billion in 1957. In contrast to this, FHA mortgage recordings rose and fell repeatedly. VA mortgages rose and fell even more violently. The same contrast between conventional mortgages and FHA and VA mortgages is shown in the table giving increases in mortgage debt outstanding.

The Joint Economic Committee's recent staff report on employment, growth, and price levels at page 365 takes the position that the fixed interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages is the cause of the pronounced fluctuations in mortgage funds available for these programs:

> Due to ceilings on the interest rates that may be charged on mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, a rise in yields on other competitive types of investments, such as corporate and Government securities, has tended to attract the supply of investment funds away from these mortgages. On the other hand, when credit conditions have eased and yields on competitive investments have fallen, the supply of investment funds has tended to flow back into the Government-supported mortgage programs.

The report takes the position that "a continuing high degree of sensitivity seems likely as long as the ceilings on FHA and VA interest rates remain in effect." An occasional increase in the statutory interest rates for VA and FHA mortgages, invariably too little and too late, does not eliminate the problems caused by the statutory fixed rate.

However, even if the statutory interest rates for VA and FHA mortgages were

eliminated, the housing industry would still be so dependent upon credit that changes in the credit situation—changes in the supply of credit and changes in the cost of credit—would necessarily have a substantial effect upon the industry. The housing industry would still have to compete with other uses for money.

One method of helping housing in this competition would be for the Government to subsidize housing directly or indirectly. This means that the taxpayer sooner or later must reduce his expenditures, on things he wants to buy for himself, in order to supply housing to the beneficiaries of the subsidy. This is what is done in the public housing program and what would be done in any program involving direct loans at a lower rate of interest than what the Government must pay to get the money. I have opposed these programs, and I expect to continue to oppose them.

Another method of making money available for housing is to impose selective controls or direct controls on other activities which compete with housing. On paper, it would be easy to reduce consumer credit by direct controls on it so as to make the money now flowing into consumer credit available for housing credit. In 1958 more than $40 billion of installment credit was extended. Only a fraction of this would serve to even out the flow of money into the mortgage field. But I would not favor this. Important as housing is, I would not favor the use of selective credit controls in order to protect housing against fluctuations in the supply of credit.

The most effective way, I think, for the Congress to reduce the ups and downs in housing, aside from the elimination of the statutory interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages, would be to balance the Federal budget. An unbalanced Federal budget means that the Treasury must go into the capital market and borrow billions of dollars, in competition with other users of money. The $12 billion deficit of the fiscal year 1959 imposed on capital markets a drain which could not help but push interest rates up substantially.

If the Congress will eliminate the inflationary drain on capital markets of an unbalanced Federal budget, I am convinced that the housing industry can compete on equal terms with other users of credit. There still will be occasions when it will be necessary to tighten up on credit generally, in the interest of a sound and stable economy; and there still will be occasions when it will be necessary to relax credit, in the interest of a sound and stable economy. As a user of credit, the housing industry should be subject to the general policies applicable to the use of credit.

In closing, I want to make it clear, as I did at the beginning, that these comments on the subject of housing are general. No housing legislation is before us at the moment. When such proposed legislation is introduced and is under consideration, it will, of course, be necessary to have each proposal made considered on its merits and in the light of the general economic background.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee on his presentation, which contained a great deal of helpful information. I thank him and commend him for it.

In this connection, let me say that the Senator from Virginia, as chairman of the full Banking and Currency Committee, has always been most helpful in connection with the enactment of good, strong, dependable housing legislation. I thank him for his outstandingly fine work.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama very sincerely for his kind words.

I yield the floor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 571, Senate bill 2436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. VAN PELT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the settlement of the steel strike was the answer to the prayers of millions of Americans—not only steelworkers and their families, but the entire population. It was generally admitted that the steel strike was a threat to our entire economy. At its peak, over 1,200,000 workers were out of jobs. Many industries and the workers in nearly all industries were threatened. For weeks, there was an impasse. Then, light came through the clouds. A settlement was reached. Millions of Americans took a sigh of relief, and felt gratitude in their hearts.

The Vice President of the United States was given credit for playing a principal role in the settlement; and, at first, no one seemed to begrudge him this honor.

Then, when the first flush of victory passed, politics raised its ugly head. Members of one party said: "Hey, wait a minute. Our opponent in the next presidential campaign is getting too much credit. We have been stymied by President Eisenhower's popularity; we have not been able to attack him. And now comes his successor, getting general acclaim. How can we head that off, in this election year? Why, in only one way: by saying that the settlement was not such a great one, after all. We can say that the settlement was unfair to the steel companies, even though they are satisfied. We can say the settlement is inflationary, even though it is not."

But the opposition got its wires crossed. Before word was passed along to criticize the settlement, instead of praising it, one member of the opposition proclaimed that the father of one of their candidates deserved credit for the settlement.

Political opponents of Vice President NIXON say that the steel strike settlement is inflationary. Let us look at that statement. Under the settlement, the average earnings per year will rise less than 3¾ percent. Compare this with the 3.82 percent increase under the separate Kaiser Steel Co. settlement, 4.5 percent for the can industry, and 5.2 percent for the aluminum industry. These other increases average nearly 30 percent more than the steel settlement increase. Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has verified the fact that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from the steel strike settlement will be 3.5 to 3.75 percent. This is in contrast to the increases under other steel settlements during the postwar period, during which hourly employment costs have been rising at an average of 8 percent a year. Thus, by means of the steel strike settlement, the postwar trend has been cut in half. The steel wage increase of 7 cents which goes into effect December 1960, is less than the

average increase. As a matter of fact, 65 percent of the wage increases in 1959 exceed that figure.

What this means is that the steel strike settlement is in line with—or, I should say, below the line of—others negotiated. It cannot be any excuse for setting off an inflationary wage pattern.

Newspaper reports of the settlement were misleading. There was no 40-cents-per-hour wage increase. That is an exaggerated gross figure related to total overall costs. A table which I shall insert in the RECORD shows the breakdown of the overall figure. The 40-cent figure would represent more than a 10-percent increase, while, as a matter of fact, the average increase under the settlement is less than 3.75 percent per year—much less than the average increase covering all industry.

One of the main issues in the steel strike settlement had to do with the work rules aspect. The settlement set up a union-management committee, to be headed by an impartial third party representing the public, to set work rules. Steel company executives tell us that this is what they wanted and what they insisted upon, that it is a victory for management, and that it will, without doubt, improve work rules, to the end that there will be more efficiency and more productivity. Labor and management thus combine to increase the pace of productivity gains.

The figures I have used in this statement are taken from statements by R. Conrad Cooper, chairman of the steel companies coordinating committee, and Roger Blough, chairman of the board of U.S. Steel, one of the companies for which "the bleeding hearts" are bleeding.

I would like to ask those who have criticized the steel settlement: Would you have preferred no settlement? What kind of settlement did you propose? Or, if you did not propose anything, what kind of settlement would you have proposed?

Mr. President, I feel rather sorry for the opposition. For a long time they have been overawed by President Eisenhower's tremendous popularity; and now they have had a taste of Vice President NIXON's outstanding ability and the public recognition of that ability. I suppose we can expect more of the sort of unjust criticism and distraction which we have witnessed the past few days, but I do not believe that the people will be so easily fooled. They know that there was a steel strike; and they know that it was settled in a manner satisfactory to the parties concerned, including the public; and they know that Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Vice President NIXON played leading roles in the popular settlement.

My thanks and the thanks of millions of other Americans go to Secretary of Labor Mitchell and to the President of the Senate, Vice President NIXON, for their part in the steel strike settlement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, two tables which show the steel strike settlement terms, as compared with the terms of other settlements. The tables were prepared for me by the Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—*Steel strike settlement terms, compared with those of other settlements*

	Unit of quantity	Steel	Can	Aluminum	Kaiser Steel
Value of package on comparable wage and benefit areas (including cost of living).	Cent	32.8	34.2	35.08	20.4
Length of settlement	Month	30	34	32	20
Number of retroactive months	do	[1] (−2)	2	4	0
Average annual increase in hourly earnings resulting from these packages.	Percent	3.75	4.5	5.2	3.82
Average annual increase in employment cost of settlement package if applied to steel industry.	do	3.5–3.75	4.7	4.7	5.0

[1] There were approximately 2 months' production under prior contract terms.

TABLE B.—*Supporting data*

Increase in	Steel	Can	Aluminum	Kaiser
Wages plus increment	7 plus 1.2 7 plus .6	7 plus 1.2 7 plus 1.2 7 plus 1.2	4.8 7.15 8.86	7 plus 1.2
Cost of living (maximum)	.6	6.0	6.0	3.0
Insurance	13.44	1.5	5.64	6.9
Pensions	3.0	2.0	2.63	2.3
Holiday pay		.1		
Total	32.8	34.2	35.08	20.4
Newspaper estimates	40.0	[1] 28.2	[1] 28.5–[1] 30.0	[2] 22.5

[1] Excludes 6 cent cost-of-living allowance.
[2] Includes incentive effects and SUB.

NOTE.—Estimates in table, aside from newspaper estimates, all exclude effect on incentive earnings, indirect effects on overtime, etc., and SUB.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON, OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am moved to share with the Senate the profound sorrow and the deep sense of loss with which all Maine citizens reacted to the untimely death of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson in the early morning hours of December 30, 1959.

The dimensions of our loss are spelled out, not simply in political terms, nor in terms of the abruptness with which his dedicated service to Maine was terminated—great as it was by these standards—but, more broadly and meaningfully, by the warm, human qualities which esablished a close, personal relationship beween him and the people he served so well.

"Doc," as he was known to all of us, was a kindly man. He was a genial man. He was a sympathetic, understanding, and compassionate man. The problems of others, whatever their station in life, were his problems. He gave unstintingly of his time, his energies, his attention, and his heart to those who sought his counsel and assistance. He was available to all. He denied himself to none.

It was these qualities which prompted one of our Maine newspapers to say editorially, with a voice which spoke for all of us, "losing him hurts a great deal."

In the memorial service to Governor Clauson, the Reverend Kenneth Lloyd Garrison spoke in these words movingly and eloquently of this man who was so beloved of his people:

> Clinton Clauson was a man of the soil who never did and never wanted to shake from his soul the color of the farm that gave him birth. Yet he combined with this rural warmth, an urban sagacity.

It was not in his nature to pretend to be anything but what he was. He was above corruption. He could look any man in the face without seeing a ballot box in one eye and a dollar sign in the other. This made people trust him. This made the rank and file of the citizens of Maine want him to be their chief executive. He was honest.

He was a public servant who could never separate his vocation from his avocation. Blessed is the man who is able to say that his work is his fun. He shook hands with people the first time because it was his job; the second time because it was his wish yet he loved them on both occasions. No journey was too far, no group too small, no occasion too insignificant—but that he went to share his convictions of good government. He was dedicated to his work.

Clinton Clauson never thought too highly of himself. His companions knew both more and less than he. From the former he learned; with the latter he never felt superior. He walked the tight rope of constant self-analysis. He was a humble man.

Of his friendliness one need not speak. It was once said of this public servant: "Show me a man who dislikes Doc and I will show you a man who hates himself."

He had so little chance, so governed was he by circumstances and time, to write his name boldly upon the business records of the State, yet, of where he stood, and what he wished to do there seems to have been no doubt. Men differed with him but they were his friends. He battled issues, yet in all his fellow men he saw the spark of God that made him love them.

The Governor was born on a farm in Mitchell, Iowa, 64 years ago. After receiving chiropractic training in his home State, he moved to the State of Maine while still a young man, settling in the city of Waterville. In his new city, he found the lovely bride, Ellen Kelleher, who was to be his partner in a lifetime of public service. Their family life was both devoted and tightly knit as their

son and daughter grew up and, in later years, as grandchildren joined the affectionate family circle.

Governor Clauson was interested in Democratic politics, at first as a hobby, ever since he was old enough to cast his first presidential ballot for Woodrow Wilson. After military service in the First World War, he returned to Waterville and developed a lifelong, serious interest in the activities of his political party. He served at all levels of party organization, first as ward chairman, then as chairman of his party's city committee, and from 1928 to 1932 as a member of the Democratic State committee at a time when his party was victorious at the State level. He resigned from active participation in politics when he was appointed collector of internal revenue for the State of Maine in 1933. He served conscientiously and ably in that capacity until 1952, earning statewide approval of the quality of his work.

Once again Dr. Clauson had an opportunity to serve the people of his community through the avenues of active political participation. He served as mayor of Waterville, Maine, in 1956 and 1957, and was elected Governor of Maine in 1958, the first Governor in the history of Maine elected to a 4-year term, and the first Democrat to be elected following another Democrat in more than a hundred years.

His qualities as a man were reflected in Governor Clauson's approach to his duties as chief executive of Maine.

He believed he should know his people and that they should know him—intimately and personally. He believed that only in this way could government be responsive to their needs, and so he moved among them constantly, meeting them, talking to them, listening to their views. And they responded to him, and trusted him, and believed him when he said that his one objective was to contribute to the building of a State which would serve their needs better.

There is no doubt that he was dedicated to that task. His work, his programs, his words, and his actions were pointed to it.

It is a tragedy that he was cut down at the threshold of greater accomplishments in the interests of his beloved adopted State, and that the people of Maine were thus deprived of the full measure of that service which he gave so unstintingly and well.

His loss is deeply mourned by all citizens of Maine, regardless of party. His humility, his human warmth, his love of life, family, and fellow man, his years of devoted public service, have left a lasting imprint on the State of Maine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Maine congressional delegation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE MAINE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION ON THE LATE GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON

Whereas the State of Maine has been saddened by the death of its Governor, the late Clinton A. Clauson; and

Whereas the members of the Maine congressional delegation held the highest respect and affection for Governor Clauson, both as an individual and as a dedicated public servant; and

Whereas the members of the Maine delegation have the deepest sympathy for the bereaved family of Governor Clauson: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Maine congressional delegation hereby note its profound sorrow over the passing of Clinton A. Clauson; and that copies of this resolution be sent, with the delegation's deepest sympathy, to the widow and family of the late Governor.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator.
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
Member of Congress.
FRANK M. COFFIN,
Member of Congress.
JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I feel inadequate in undertaking to describe for my colleagues who did not have the privilege of knowing Governor Clauson the qualities of this man, and so I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD various items which will speak more eloquently than I can: The full text of the memorial service by the Reverend Kenneth Lloyd Garrison; the text of the funeral prayer by the Reverend John I. Daniel, of Waterville, Maine; and various editorials and newspaper comments upon the passing of this devoted servant and adopted son of my great State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE HONORABLE CLINTON A. CLAUSON, GOVERNOR OF MAINE, JANUARY 2, 1960

(By Rev. Kenneth Lloyd Garrison)

On the Ides of March in 44 B.C. an assassin cut short the life of Julius Caesar, the ruler of Rome. William Shakespeare, in romanticizing it in his play, puts the following funeral oration upon the lips of Mark Antony.

"Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears;
I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him.
The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones;
So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus
Hath told you Caesar was ambitious;
If it were so, it was a grievous fault,
And grievously hath Caesar answered it.
Here, under leave of Brutus and the rest—
For Brutus is an honorable man;
So are they all, all honorable men—
Come I to speak in Caesar's funeral.
He was my friend, faithful and just to me:
But Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honorable man.
He hath brought many captives home to Rome
Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept:
Ambition should be made of sterner stuff:
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And Brutus is an honorable man.
You all did see that on the Lupercal
I thrice presented him a kingly crown,
Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?
Yet Brutus says he was ambitious;
And, sure, he is an honorable man.
I speak not to disprove what Brutus spoke,
But here I am to speak what I do know.
You all did love him once, not without cause;
What cause withholds you then, to mourn for him?
O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason. Bear with me;
My heart is in the coffin there with Caesar,
And I must pause till it come back to me."

On the 30th day of December 1959, another assassin cut short the life of Clinton Amos Clauson, the Governor of Maine. Now we have come to bury him because we must. But we have come to praise him because we wish.

The task is fraught with high emotion because he was our friend and we did love him, and our hearts are in the coffin with him. It would be best to await another day to set a value upon such a man; a day when reason returns and tributes carry not the scent of flowers.

Yet here he lies within our midst and honor, duty, and desire command our tethered minds. How flimsy a vehicle of true expression is a funeral eulogy. If a man is evil, in such an hour, we would not take advantage of the sorrow of his loved ones to cast aspersions on his name. But if a man is good, as this man was, how powerless we are to add one cubit to his stature.

What, therefore, we say today is not to be construed alone as praise of this, our friend, the servant of the State, but rather it is to call to our remembrance those attributes—which, though a man may differ strongly with others by conviction—will make them sadder and poorer when like the proverbial Arab he folds his earthly tent and steals away into the night of eternity.

It is not required that a public servant be the most politically astute of men—but it is required that he be honest.

It is not necessary that he possess the wisdom of Solomon—but it is to be expected that he will be dedicated to his task.

It is not essential that he be puffed up with tinted arrogance—but it is beneficial to the State if he is humble.

It is not dictated that he give a glad hand to every potential voter—but it is wholesome if he is warm and friendly.

Clinton Clauson was a man of the soil who never did and never wanted to shake from his soul the color of the farm that gave him birth. Yet he combined with this rural warmth an urban sagacity.

It was not in his nature to pretend to be anything but what he was. He was above corruption. He could look any man in the face without seeing a ballot box in one eye and a dollar sign in the other. This made people trust him. This made the rank and file of the citizens of Maine want him to be their chief executive. He was honest.

He was a public servant who could never separate his vocation from his avocation. Blessed is the man who is able to say that his work is his fun. He shook hands with people the first time because it was his job; the second time because it was his wish, yet he loved them on both occasions. No journey was too far, no group too small, no occasion too insignificant—but that he went to share his convictions of good government. He was dedicated to his work.

Clinton Clauson never thought too highly of himself. His companions knew both more and less than he. From the former he learned; with the latter he never felt superior. He walked the tight rope of constant self-analysis. He was a humble man.

Of his friendliness one need not speak. It was once said of this public servant: "Show me a man who dislikes Doc and I will show you a man who hates himself."

The reflections of posterity will more properly evaluate the contributions made by this kindly man. We attest that, virtuously speaking, he was a good Governor.

History will assign him the place that he merits among the leaders of men.

There was so much that he wanted to do. So much left undone. A homely American poet has summed it up well:

"Oh, never we reach to our fullest height,
And never we do our all;
We must turn away at the close of day
When the tools from our fingers fall.
But it isn't a failure to hold a dream
That never on earth comes true,
For the tasks of worth that we miss on earth
Are reserved for our souls to do."

He had so little chance, so governed was he by circumstances and time, to write his name boldly upon the business records of the State, yet, of where he stood, and what he wished to do there seems to have been no doubt. Men differed with him but they were his friends. He battled issues, yet in all his fellow men he saw the spark of God that made him love them.

I know of no more fitting final testimony to this first citizen of Maine than those words supplied by Frederick J. Gillman shortly after the Civil War:

"God send us men whose aim 'twill be,
Not to defend some ancient creed,
But to live out the laws of Christ
In every thought and word and deed.
God send us men with hearts ablaze
All truth to love, all wrong to hate;
These are the patriots nations need,
These are the bulwarks of the State."

(Selections read from Holy Scripture: Psalm 1: 27, 121; Romans 8: 13–39; Matthew 25: 34–40; Psalm 23.)

Clauson Funeral Prayer Text

The following is the text of the prayer prepared by the Reverend John I. Daniel, of Waterville, for delivery at Gov. Clinton A. Clauson's funeral this afternoon:

"Father in Heaven, we thank You for the privilege of having known in this life, Clinton A. Clauson. Some of us have known him many years, as a private citizen; others only more recently amid his responsibilities as mayor of Waterville, or as Governor of our great State; but all of us who have experienced his warmth and friendliness, have felt a spark of the Divine shining from his human eyes.

"Once more, O Lord, we raise the cry of 'Why?'—Why must there be heartache and frustration, sickness, anguish, separation—death? And while our eyes cannot penetrate the cloud of mystery, or our ears detect an auditory answer, we thank You for the knowledge that You sent Your son into our world to suffer with us; accepting all that man knows of heartache, anguish, misunderstanding, violence, death.

"We thank You for his words, 'Because I live, you shall live also;' and for the wonder of divine forgiveness expressed in Christ's promise to the criminal crucified beside Him on the cross, 'Today shalt thou with Me be in paradise.' Grant us that honest penitence for our sins, O God, we pray, whereby we too may lay hold upon our Master's promise of forgiveness.

"We thank You that love is that which is common to this world and eternity. Grant that we may surrender our fears, anxieties, resentments—every negative thought which blocks the flow of love through the channels of our hearts. O God, may we become more sensitive to others. May we become more understandingly aware of those whom we encounter on life's journey, even as Governor Clauson was so humbly aware. Grant us the largeness of heart and sufficient holy imagination to realize that probably everyone does the best he can under the circumstances, if only we can be understanding enough to realize his circumstances.

"Bless, we beseech Thee, the loved ones of Governor Clauson. Bless his wife, his children, grandchildren, and his many grieving friends.

"Grant that all of us may keep the candles of memory lighted on the altars of our hearts for those dear ones whose voices are now silent. Forbid that we should think of them as merely resting—but rather that they have been called from out our midst to greater responsibilities, more dynamic and creative labors than while they were with us; purged of their infirmities, and working amid the vital presence of Jesus.

"Even as our faith makes known to us that love is immortal, O God, so would we be mindful that death is only a horizon, the limit of our sight. Lift us, that we may see farther, illuminate our eyes that we may see more clearly. Draw us closer to Thyself, that we may know ourselves nearer to our beloved who are with Thee.

"And now in these years, or months, or days which remain to us, may we lay hold upon that love which is eternal. Grant, O God, that when a voice speaks to us, as it has so recently spoken to Clinton Clauson, it may say to us, as to him: 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things. Enter, thou, into the joy of thy Lord. Amen.'"

Clauson Tributes Pour in From State, Nation

Tributes to Governor Clauson's warmth, kindliness, and devotion to public service keynoted the comments on his unexpected death Wednesday.

Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, a 1960 Democratic presidential nomination hopeful, spoke of Clauson's ability and human qualities and deplored the loss of his wise counsel.

The Democrats' national chairman, Paul Butler, said the news "is a source of great sorrow to Democrats everywhere."

Republican National Committee member Bradford H. Hutchins, of Waterville, said Clauson was "a friend of everybody who knew him."

The man whom Clauson defeated for the governorship—ex-Governor Horace Hildreth, Republican—said he was "an exceedingly kindly man" whose untimely death is "a tragic event which saddens all the citizenry of Maine."

Clauson's predecessor in Blaine House—Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat—said it was tragic Clauson couldn't give the people "a full measure of the service he gave so unstintingly and so well."

Excerpts from other comment:

State Senate President John H. Reed, now the Governor: "I considered him a true friend and join with thousands of others who mourn his passing."

Maynard C. Dolloff, who lost to Clauson in the 1958 Democratic primary: "Maine has lost a tremendously dedicated and sincere citizen."

Ex-Gov. Percival P. Baxter, Republican: "Governor Clauson was a fine, honest, able Governor."

Congressman Frank M. Coffin, Democrat: "His 1 year as Governor was distinguished by two words which to him were always a keynote—responsible progress."

Connecticut's Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat: "A grievous loss. I found him to be a warm individual and a man of great integrity."

Mayor Albert Bernier, Democrat, of Waterville: "I feel that he represented more thoroughly than possibly any Governor all the people of all walks of life."

Frederick N. Allen, of Portland, chairman of the public utilities commission: "I have known the Governor for many years and have always found him willing and eager to lend his hand in any way in which he was needed. During the past year he has shown a real interest in the working of all governmental departments * * * always striving to keep abreast of any problem and offering constructive advice and full cooperation."

Said Gov. and Mrs. Wesley Powell of New Hampshire: "Mrs. Powell and I express to you our heartfelt personal sympathy in the passing of your good husband and fine public servant. I extend also, the sympathy of the people of New Hampshire to you personally and through you to the people of Maine."

Vermont Gov. Robert T. Stafford said he was "deeply shocked to learn of the sudden passing of Gov. Clinton Clauson, of Maine."

Stafford said, "In the past year, Governor Clauson has worked closely with the other New England Governors to promote the social and economic growth of the region."

He said Vermont Personnel Director Frederick Downing, former director of the Maine State Employees Association, will represent him at the funeral of Clauson.

Gov. Foster Furcolo, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said that the death of Gov. Clinton Clauson, Democrat, of Maine, "will be felt severely by his friends everywhere.

"He was one of the most friendly, capable, and dedicated men I have ever known and a credit in every respect to his great State and to his country.

"Mrs. Furcolo joins me in extending our sympathy to his family," Furcolo added.

Richard J. Dubord, of Waterville, Democratic national committeeman: "His brief year in office gained him many new friends and prophesied a brilliant career. Our State has lost a beloved leader."

Mrs. Ellen Thomas, of Anson, vice chairman of the Republican State Committee: "Governor Clauson's death brings sadness to all the people of Maine regardless of partisan belief. He was a kindly man with the interest of his State foremost in his heart."

Governor Clauson—He Was a Most Happy Fellow

(By Peter M. Damborg)

"He was a most happy fellow."

Those are the words of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson's administrative assistant, Maurice Williams, describing how the late chief executive appeared as he ended his statehouse day Tuesday—8 hours before his unexpected death in the Blaine House.

Perhaps Williams' description best summarizes the spirit, the contagious affability of the man who came to head his State, despite the predictions of all but the most devoted of his many friends.

It certainly fits the personality of a Governor who, possibly more than any other man in modern times, appeared to be beloved by all who met and knew him—perhaps by all the people of Maine.

He was not a great politician. He personally knew and acknowledged that he was not a dynamic leader. He was far from being a spellbinding orator. And he had a lot to learn about State government.

But "Doc" Clauson—the nickname he liked best—knew people. And the people liked his way of getting across to them that he recognized his limitations. It has been said that it's doubtful that he made a single enemy while Governor.

"Doc" Clauson thought about running for Governor in 1954, the year that Edmund S. Muskie—another Waterville political success—threw his lot against Gov. Burton M. Cross (Republican of Augusta) and won.

I interviewed him early that year and his attitude was something like this:

"I'd like to be Governor, I think any man would who feels he could contribute something and who loves his State as you and I do.

"But I like to think I am a practical man and I just don't think this is the year for it. My party has little organization strength. The odds would be pretty heavy—and besides, Mrs. Clauson isn't too well right now and my son (Neil) and I are getting a good start in the oil business.

"I won't give up the idea, though, and you can be sure I'll let you know whenever I make up my mind to run, if I do."

Four years later, "Doc" Clauson called to remind this writer of his promise "to let you know."

His philosophy then—less than 2 years ago—was in this vein:

"I think the time is right now, I guess I should have run before, but I didn't and we've had a wonderful Governor since and the party has grown tremendously.

"I don't know whether or not I can make it, but I'm going to try. There's no harm in that. If I lose, I'll make a lot of new friends and have fun seeing old ones along the way."

This same "I hope I can, but I won't be mad if I don't" Clauson spirit prevailed through the 1958 campaign. It was a rough one—two, in fact, because he had to defeat a well known State grange master, Maynard C. Dolloff who had the public blessings of a big majority of the "new" Democrats.

Time after time, he would call me aside, after a campaign speech, and ask: "How am I doing?" And when the answer was "pretty good but why not try speaking off-the-cuff? You're better at that than reading a script," he would smile and reply: "I'm not a public speaker. All I'm trying to do is get my message across and meet the people and hope I'm accepted."

That he was accepted now is a matter of record. He defeated former Governor, ex-U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Horace A. Hildreth, by 10,000 votes.

He enjoyed those campaign days which often began at 6 a.m.—like the mornings he met with the Lewiston Public Works Department employees, going to work.

Following U.S. Senate Candidate Muskie through industrial plants, he looked as though he was trying to tie onto the lanky Governor's coattails. But as the drive for votes for the two came close to an end, it was apparent that "Doc" was keeping up with Muskie, that folks were sensing his down-to-earth, almost nonpolitical approach.

Sunday night, the eve of the September election, "Doc" and Mrs. Clauson dropped in to the Portland Press Herald office, along with the Muskies and the Olivers and the Coffins. They had finished their last television appearance. Mostly, the office crew look to Muskie. But, Clauson too "did the handshake rounds."

Mrs. Clauson came over to my desk. She smiled, and said: "Well, it's all over now. I'm glad because you know, I think Doc is awfully tired. He doesn't believe it, though. What do you think will happen tomorrow or don't you think you should say?"

The reply was as soft as possible: "I honestly don't think it looks too good but you shouldn't give up hope." She smiled, sweetly, and answered: "I don't think so, either, but that's all right. It's been fun and he's really enjoyed it."

When it was all over, both Clausons wore the same smile they showed the night before the election that appeared so doubtful. And it was these smiles that continued to earn them more and more friends.

Clauson went into office knowing he had a lot to learn—but happy. He learned, he surrounded himself with top men in their fields.

But—he appeared continually to disprove his wife's contention that he tired from constant activity. He accepted almost all invitations to speak, to appear at both public and private functions. And before his first legislative session was over, he was talking about stumping the State again.

"I want to show my friends who supported me that I meant it when I said I was coming back," he told me in private one day. "I'd like to revisit every plant and shop that I covered during the campaign.

"And, besides," he chuckled, "it would be good politics, now wouldn't it?"

He did go back over some of the same ground of the 1958 campaign but his State duties prevented complete coverage, coupled with his combined business-social calendar.

A youngster met the Governor not too long ago and said, with child-like simplicity: "You don't look like a Governor; you look like a grandfather."

A State house janitor yesterday paused and said: "It is a shock. He was a fine gentleman."

"Doc," "Clint," Governor Clauson—a grandfatherly gentleman who earned the love of the people of his State because he was honest, humble, friendly, and their kind of man.

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Dec. 30, 1959]

GOVERNOR CLAUSON'S UNTIMELY DEATH

The death of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson this morning came as a great shock to the people of Maine. The Governor seemingly enjoyed the best of health and only last night was a guest of honor in Lewiston at a dinner given by Paragon Glass Co. to express its thanks to those who helped in the firm's relocation in Maine.

Words always are and always will be inadequate when it comes to expressing sympathy. All we can do is to extend sincere expressions of regret, knowing full well that similar sentiments pouring in from all over Maine in no way will ease the sense of loss felt by the late Governor's family.

Clint Clauson, as he was known to his friends, attained the governorship against considerable odds. He was not expected to win the Democratic Party nomination in the primary election, and there was much doubt over his ability to defeat former Republican Governor Horace Hildreth.

The Clauson personality had much to do with his political achievements. The Governor had a warm, kindly personality that won him a host of friends. He was a man virtually everyone "took to." Political opponents and opposition party members found it impossible to dislike him, even when in disagreement with him.

Governor Clauson did not live to complete a full year of his 4-year term of office. During his first year he had the satisfaction of seeing the Republican-controlled legislature enact a budget closely corresponding to the one advocated by him for the biennium. This same period found him doing a workmanlike job as chief of state.

Once again we wish to extend our deepest sympathy to Governor Clauson's family.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Dec. 30, 1959]

GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON

Death early this morning robbed Gov. Clinton A. Clauson of the chance to display as the State's chief executive the outstanding administrative ability which had marked his performance in every public office he has held.

Governor Clauson had nearly completed the first year of the first 4-year term in Maine history. It was a year of study, for he had to overcome the handicap of no legislative experience. It was a year of getting his feet placed in the giant footprints of his predecessor, U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, certainly the greatest Democratic votegetter in Maine history and one of the State's most popular Governors.

It was a year marked by inevitable differences with the executive council, and by the longest legislative session in the State's history, and by unusual budget difficulties.

It was a year, too, in which he emerged from the shadows of those who had been politically more prominent to gain full partnership with the State's other Democratic leaders, Senator MUSKIE and U.S. Representatives FRANK M. COFFIN and JAMES C. OLIVER.

Governor Clauson considered politics only a hobby when he first became interested more than 40 years ago in Waterville. Twelve years later he sold his chiropractic practice to enter public service and he never returned to his profession. He was Maine collector of internal revenue for 19 years and was mayor of Waterville the 2 years prior to his election as Governor.

Governor Clauson was widely known as a man who had the courage of his convictions and those who have watched executive councils assume what seemed to be many of the Governor's powers, particularly in the appointive area, were willing to wager that he would have tamed the council within the 4 years. If he hadn't succeeded, council personnel at least would have known they'd been involved in a battle to the bitter end, said those close to the Governor.

For Governor Clauson was a humble man, as all his friends will attest, but he was determined and independent and he had a fierce pride in his office and in its prerogatives. He had a serene confidence, too, and this never was displayed to better advantage than in his decision to become a gubernatorial candidate in defiance of the wishes of the State's new Democrats, who wanted a younger man.

It is a matter of record now, of course, that Governor Clauson defeated their candidate in a hotly-contested primary election; and then went on to become Governor in an amazing Democratic landslide in the State elections. Then he set about healing the party wounds, for with Muskie and Oliver and Coffin in Washington, it was apparent that the welfare of the Maine Democratic Party would be Governor Clauson's responsibility.

This task of reunifying the party wasn't too difficult for Governor Clauson, who cast his first vote for President Wilson in 1916 and had been active in Maine Democratic councils ever since. His reputation for sincerity and integrity never was questioned. He was remembered, too, as one of those who helped to fashion the surprising Democratic victories of the early 1930's, when Louis J. Brann became Governor. And so this long and uninterrupted service to his party, which provided a link between the old Democrats of Brann and Harold Dubord, and the current new Democrats, added weight and dignity to his peacemaking efforts.

Governor Clauson never indulged in personalities in any political contest. His advisers time after time urged him to take off the gloves in his recent gubernatorial campaign against his Republican opponent, but he adamantly refused. Even in the heat of the primary battle, when he was the target for some bitter criticisms, he stuck to issues and problems.

He refused 5 years ago to run for major political office for a reason any father can understand. His son, Cornelius K., in 1954 had purchased an oil distribution business in Waterville and the Governor decided to pass up the political invitations to help his son get started in the business. Two years later, with young Clauson well established, Governor Clauson was his party's champion in the Waterville mayoralty race. He won easily.

Governor Clauson's loyalty to the national Democratic Party remained unshaken though

he was an innocent victim of the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service. Nineteen years of faithful service went by the board, though it might have been expected that he would remain in the position until retirement, when directors were chosen by civil service examinations and he was replaced by a career man. These changes were made during the Truman administration and so it was Governor Clauson's searing experience to be jettisoned by his own party.

The reorganization appeared to be a necessity in the national interest, the Governor told friends who didn't hesitate to voice their bitterness. His loyalty never wavered.

The State lost a competent and dedicated servant when death so suddenly took Governor Clauson, and his party lost a great leader.

[From the Augusta (Maine) Kennebec Journal, Dec. 31, 1959]

CLINTON A. CLAUSON

The State of Maine has lost a good Governor, the capital city has lost a good friend and neighbor, in the sudden passing of the Honorable Clinton A. Clauson.

He was really one of us, a man who entered wholeheartedly into the life of the community. During his years of service as chief of the Internal Revenue Service here he had been closely associated with Augusta people. He was a former president of the Augusta Rotary Club. Augusta knew him in those years and during his more than 11 months of residence in the Blaine House, as a good neighbor—as one of the best.

He liked people—liked them so genuinely, so sincerely, that people could not help liking him. And their politics had nothing to do with it.

Governor Clauson did his level best to be a good Governor of this State—and he succeeded in that determination. The conservatism with which he approached problems of State finance and government at first surprised and soon delighted those who, being in the opposing political camp, had looked with foreboding on the accession of another Democratic chief executive.

Taxpayers found themselves applauding the firm restraint Governor Clauson brought to State fiscal planning. His budget message to the legislature last January demonstrated a realistic awareness of Maine's economic needs—and of the ability of Maine taxpayers to meet those needs. And that message won applause from one end of the State to the other, from Republicans and Democrats alike. People who, until then, had not been well acquainted with this man, breathed sighs of relief. The State, it appeared, was in capable hands.

And so it was. Governor Clauson was enthusiastic about his position as chief executive. He liked people and wanted to help them. He loved this old State, and he served it to the best of his ability. An intensely loyal party man, he nevertheless put State above party, when it came to that. No words are adequate to express the statewide sense of loss and of grief at his passing.

[From the Portland (Maine) Thursday Morning, Dec. 31, 1959]

FOR GOVERNOR CLAUSON

As a man Clinton A. Clauson possessed humility, dignity, humanity, integrity, and morality. To the governorship of Maine he brought all these traits of character and, what is truly the measure of this dedicated public servant, kept them whole. It would not have occurred to him to do anything else.

Candor compels recording that Dr. Clauson fought for the office of Governor as an underdog. He won. Once elected many of the troubles of the underdog beset him still. Yet, endowed as he was with high character and a deep concern for Maine that sprang from simple affection, he set about governing with the best there was in him. When he died he had grown familiar with a milieu that had at first been strange to him. In short he was repeating the history of his election. He was winning again.

It was always pleasant to meet Governor Clauson—and always easy, for he had no love of remoteness. Maine people knew it because he went among them as often as he could. Newsmen knew it particularly well because their work put them in frequent contact with him and the experience was consistently gracious. People in government and politics knew it too, and more than once their personal fondness for him was enhanced, if anything, by their official opposition.

Politically Maine has lost a Governor whose administration was still evolving and therefore could not yet be judged for the final record although the evolution was distinctly upward. But there is no doubt whatever concerning Clinton A. Clauson the man.

Losing him hurts a great deal.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram, Jan. 3, 1960]

CLINTON A. CLAUSON—A GENTLEMAN

"Isn't he a nice man?" This was the reaction of so many persons on meeting Clinton A. Clauson.

"A most happy fella." His closest associates borrowed this phrase with which to describe him.

"You don't look like a governor. You look like a grandfather." This was the opinion of a 5-year-old who, like all small children, knew perfectly well that all grandfathers are nice men.

To those who knew him briefly as "Governor," and those who knew him for many years as Doc, Clinton Clauson was a kind, warm, friendly man—a gentleman. But the genial Governor was not one to let his desire to like and to be liked override his judgment. He would stand firm for a cause he believed to be just.

It was not given to Clinton Clauson to serve his State long as chief executive. Indeed, so few were the days of his stewardship that his mark as Governor is not clearly defined. But standing plain for all to see is the mark of a man. A nice man. One does well to live out his allotted span and leave behind so many to share in such a eulogy.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague in the tribute to the late Clinton A. Clauson, who served as Governor of the State of Maine. He was a personal friend of mine for nearly 20 years.

At this point, I read for the RECORD my telegram to Mrs. Clauson and my statement to the newspapers about his untimely passing:

Mrs. CLINTON A. CLAUSON,
Blaine House,
Augusta, Maine:

My heartfelt sympathies to you and the members of your family on the untimely passing of a great American and one of Maine's most beloved citizens. Your grief is shared by all people of Maine. I am grateful for the 20 years of friendship we had.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Following is my statement to the press at the time of the Governor's death:

The death of Governor Clauson is a great loss to the people of Maine. It is a personal loss to me because we have been good friends for 20 years.

In his one year as Governor he not only demonstrated ability and fairness, but he truly became a chief executive beloved by the people of Maine.

I extend my heartfelt sympathies to our gracious first lady of Maine, Mrs. Clauson, and the members of the family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to a good man and a good Governor, who has passed on in the service of his people.

Gov. Clinton A. Clauson of Maine loved people, and was loved in turn. He made friends throughout the State because he was willing to listen to their problems, and because he was willing to walk an extra mile to help them find a solution. The men and women Clinton Clauson had befriended responded in 1958 by electing him Governor, to succeed the distinguished junior Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE. And now death has cut short his career of public service.

I know that I express the sentiment of all my colleagues when I extend to his family and to the people of Maine my most sincere condolences.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join the people of Maine in mourning the loss of an outstanding public servant and a great gentleman. The recent death of Gov. Clint Clauson ended a career of able service to the people of his State. Those who knew him as Governor will miss the vision and the integrity which he brought to his work. Those of us who knew him as a friend will miss his warmth and kindness.

I was with Clint Clauson for the first time last Spring during a trip to his State. It did not take long to see why he was such a leader, and why he was so highly respected by his colleagues of both parties. Mrs. Symington and I could never forget the gracious hospitality extended to us by the Governor and his wife.

It was an honor to know Governor Clauson and to be among his friends, and it is with deep sadness and a sense of loss that my wife and I join in paying tribute to Governor Clauson, and in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

INCREASE IN RATES BY ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is not my desire to come before the Senate every other day to call attention to actions by administration officials and agencies affecting my State which run directly counter to policies proclaimed by the President of the United States. Unhappily, I feel it is my duty again to call such a development to the attention of the Congress.

On Monday my able colleague and I reported that the Federal Maritime Board, all of whose members were appointed by the President of the United States, had just allowed a new 10-percent freight rate increase on shipments to Alaska to go into effect without even hearing the evidence. This followed by but a few hours the appearance of the President of the United States before Congress to tell us in his state of the Union message of the dangers of in-

flation and to urge us that "we must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

I regret that with only 1 day intervening it is now my sad duty to report another departure by administration officials from the anti-inflationary policies so repeatedly proclaimed by the President himself. This departure is even more shocking than that which preceded it. In the case of the water freight rate increase, the interests of private carriers were involved. The regulatory agency—so called—went along with them. The new event is more shocking, and less excusable, because it it perpetrated by an administration agency, for an administration agency alone and unaided.

The Alaska Railroad, owned by the Federal Government and administered by the Interior Department, is also raising its rates. No private interests are involved. The railroad has no stockholders. It has no competitors. It is subject to no regulatory agency. It is a part of the administration. Ironically it is part and parcel of the same administration which keeps telling us that we must fight inflation.

The story of this most recent and most unconscionable inflationary action is told in a telegram which I have today dispatched to the Secretary of the Interior. The telegram is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1960.

HON. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

I have just learned with dismay that the Alaska Railroad apparently either has or is proposing to put into effect an increase in rates which will cost shippers an estimated $100,000 a year. I learned this from a newspaper account which did not say when the described increase would go into effect. Because of the complete absence of information, or even notification, I am unable even to speculate on whether the reported rate increase is necessary or just.

I think this is the first time that an action by a Federal Government agency seriously affecting a large number of my constituents has been taken since I have been in Congress without the Government officials involved even having the courtesy to notify me. As you know, things would be quite different if the Alaska Railroad were, like all other railroads, subject to Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction, which some are urging. It would then, at least, be required that the railroad would have to file public notice in advance when changes in its tariffs were planned.

To me it seems incongruous and shocking that at the very time President Eisenhower is addressing the Congress urging that "we must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home" an agency of his administration is, without consultation of any kind, taking an action which is highly inflationary and doing it presumably with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior appointed by him.

I ask that you move immediately to stop this further attack on the living standards of Alaskans, coming as it does on top of a 10 percent increase in water freight rates to Alaska which the Federal Maritime Board has just permitted to go into effect following a 15 percent increase less than 2 years ago. I urge action by you not only on behalf of the people of Alaska, but also in accordance with the repeatedly proclaimed policies of the Eisenhower administration against inflation which I assume you embrace and would desire to carry beyond words into action which is meaningful for our fellow-citizens.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, I assure you I get no pleasure or satisfaction out of appearing here for the second time in 3 days to call attention to actions by Federal Government agencies which undeniably are inflationary and against the public interest. In discussing just 2 days ago the freight rate increase allowed by the Federal Maritime Board in ocean freight rates I felt compelled to refer to the action as "seaway robbery." Now we have a case of "railway robbery" perpetrated by an executive agency of the very administration which inveighs against everything inflationary.

It is difficult, Mr. President, for the Congress to fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home when these executive agencies are so busy piling on more fuel.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND BALANCED BUDGETS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, from time to time some persons have been heard to say that those in and out of the administration who are concerned with balancing the budget ought to recognize that national defense is more important than balancing the budget.

If that were the choice, one would be disposed to agree with them, but the choice is not so simple. Our concern must be not only with an adequate national defense but also with a balanced budget, which, in my judgment, can be obtained within the range of the budget statement referred to by the President in his state of the Union address.

We have for this point of view a high precedent, which I should like to quote:

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

That is an excerpt from the Farewell Address of President Washington. It is still a good standard—paraphrasing President Washington—to which the lovers of liberty may repair. It is well to remember that national defense will indeed crumble under a continuous and too-long-extended unbalanced budget, because a stable and secure nation is one of the pillars of national defense.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

ANTIRELIGIOUS OUTBREAKS EMPHASIZE IMPORTANCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND ANTIBOMBING LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is with dismay and revulsion that I read of the current outbreak of anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic agitation. The situation has all the overtones of an international nightmare. The things people normally hold dear are no longer sacred and apparently sane men, women and children are behaving as if they were demented.

These developments call up the ugly memories of the 1930's and 1940's when the specter of Adolf Hitler stalked through Europe, slaughtering, defiling, and destroying. Although the situation today is not nearly so critical as it was 25 years ago, we cannot help but think that if mankind had acted more emphatically in the 1930's, perhaps some of the horrible bloodletting would not have occurred later.

The current outbreak of antireligious activity apparently began with the desecration of a synagogue in Cologne on Christmas Eve and has since spread to many places in Germany and from there to other countries.

This vandalism against religious buildings, both Jewish and Catholic, points up the concern many world leaders have expressed for the past 2 years about other trends in West Germany.

There have been an unprecedented outcropping of anti-Semitic literature, a series of cemetery and synagogue desecrations, smuggling of convicted Nazi offenders to Egypt, and a general softening toward former Nazi officials and toward neo-Nazi youth organizations.

Recently a survey was taken of West German students between the ages of 15 and 17. According to the study, 9 out of every 10 students either knew nothing about nazism or believed that, on the whole, Hitler was good for Germany.

I know that the West German Government is concerned about the recent outbreaks and that it is acting promptly to prosecute the offenders. But I urge that it go even further and undertake an educational campaign. The young people of Germany must understand that the rights of all persons are sacred, that any attack against a minority is an attack against the entire system of free government, and that antireligious and antiracial activity eats away at the very foundation of civilization.

But we who deplore antireligious activity abroad must accept full responsibility for the things which are happening within our own borders.

We must make it clear that our people, our Government, and our courts are on the side of human liberty. There is civil rights legislations before the Congress today which should be enacted.

The administration's seven civil rights proposals, of which I am one of the cosponsors, should be enacted promptly. I urge the Congress further to enact the bills which would restore title III to the Civil Rights Act and which would make bombings of houses of worship a Federal crime—both of which I have also cosponsored.

Mr. President, I call attention particularly to the antibombing measure. The vandalism committed against churches is just a step removed from bombings. I venture to say that it is in large part done by the same type of people, but those who might not have ready access to explosives.

We are dealing with people poisoned by hate. Each time they commit one act of violence they are encouraged to try another. We must protect our houses of worship from those demented persons.

Finally, I urge the Postmaster General to examine carefully the material which is being sent through the mails. These hate sheets are stimulating the vandals and the bombers. If we can prevent pornographic material from passing through the mails, we should be able to take similar action against other kinds of filth.

Mr. President, we in the United States have no past history by which we can explain away the things which have happened in the United States in the past 2 weeks. We have no unreconstructed elements which we believe some day will die off. We can make no excuses for swastikas smeared on synagogues, smashed windows in churches, and violent literature which urges our citizens to hate and defile.

We are a people who hold human rights to be sacred. We have a history of advancing the dignity of the individual. We must act promptly and thoroughly under the law to assure all peoples, including ourselves, that we are worthy of the traditions of our forefathers.

SPECIAL PRAYER SERVICES UPON CONVENING OF CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, upon the convening of Congress a number of churches in Washington held special prayer services. In times such as those in which we are living, it is apparent that the eyes of the God-fearing men and women of America are upon the Government of the United States, and frequently on the Congress.

We are also reminded that "unless the Lord build the house he labors in vain who builds it."

I have received a very fine letter from the pastor and assistant pastor of the Bethany Lutheran Church of Omaha, Nebr., concerning a special prayer service upon the opening of Congress. This service was held in Omaha. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with a copy of the prayer thereto attached, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and prayer were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHANY LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Omaha, Nebr., January 5, 1960.

The Honorable CARL CURTIS,
Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: Back here in our good State of Nebraska we are thinking of you this week as a new session of the Congress convenes, and our thoughts are directed as prayers to the throne of God, asking His blessings upon you and your work of representing our good people in the Senate of the United States.

We recognize the tremendous problems that face our country, and thus face you as a Member of our highest legislative body. These many and varied problems in the economic field, in social relationships, and in foreign relations with other countries just cannot be solved by human ingenuity alone. Nor can human wisdom see a way out of the many dilemmas in which our beloved country finds itself. God's help and blessing is needed, and His wisdom must guide and direct us through these difficult days.

We are sure that in these busy and decisive days, you will be helped to know that the prayers of many of your constituents go to God's throne in your behalf. Therefore, we are enclosing a copy of the prayer which we used in our worship services last Sunday, January 3d, remembering particularly also, the beginning of the new Congress in Washington this week.

God bless you in your work and give you strength, health, and courage for your tasks.

Yours in Him,

LLOYD BEHNKEN,
Pastor.

DAVID LUDWIG,
Assistant Pastor.

Faithful God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, humbly we acknowledge our sins and shortcomings of the year now past and ask You to forgive them, for the sake of our Savior who died for them on the cross of Calvary. Be with us to bless and guide us in the year that is ahead. Grant us renewed faith, greater trust, and more abundant love for You and Your work, that this new year may truly be a year of grace in which, through worship and study and service, we draw ever closer to the fires of your love and grow day by day into better Christians, and more devoted disciples. On the pastors and teachers of Your word throughout the world give wisdom and understanding that they may preach Your word with power and teach it in its truth and purity. Bless the missionaries throughout the world who take Your word for us to others, and cheer them in their difficulties and moments of danger. Bestow Your special blessing also upon the students and servicemen of our congregation who have been home for the holiday season, and are now returning to their places of study and duty. Guide them all, absent from us in the service and away at colleges and universities, that they may recognize that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and that they may feel Your presence always to sustain and bless them. Bless our country and guide our President and his advisers in these trying and difficult days, that we may be led in paths of peace with all nations, and live in the respect and good will of others, through the righteous and upright conduct of our affairs. Give wisdom to Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA and Congressman CUNNINGHAM who represent us in the Congress soon to convene in our Nation's Capitol. Guide their consideration of the economic problems before our land, the social problems that beset us, and the domestic and foreign relationships of our Government. We ask not, O Lord, only for superiority in arms and armor, in scientific advancement, in atomic research, and in space exploration, but for the humility and trust and responsibility to use the wisdom and power which You give in a way that will benefit mankind and honor You and Your will, and help us to live at peace and in security with freedom among all men. Let us all be Christ's men from head to foot in this new year before us, that recognizing the necessity and opportunity of the days in which we live, we may wake up to our call into your service and to the realities of life as You have given it to us. This we ask, O Lord, in the name and for the sake of our Lord and Savior, whom You named Jesus to remind us that He would save us from our sins. Amen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on July 23, 1959, as chairman of the Committtee on Rules and Administration, I reported to the Senate from that committee an original bill which was entitled "The Federal Elections Act of 1959." There is a long history behind the culminating fact of the reporting of the bill and its appearance before the Senate for consideration today. I shall not burden the RECORD with too many particulars with respect to the history of the bill, but I wish to emphasize at the outset that what is before the Senate today, together with several amendments which will be offered, is the product of extensive hearings on several bills which have been reported, this being the third since 1955.

I think I can speak with some particular feeling, if not with a great measure of expertness, upon election matters, in view of the fact that I probably have served more time on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections than any other Member of the Senate, with the possible exception of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to whom we are paying tribute today. I do not know how long the Senator from Rhode Island served on that subcommittee. I served almost 6 years and then resigned because of my candidacy for reelection in 1956. But I served on that subcommittee from the time I came to the Senate to 1956, a part of the time as chairman of the subcommittee.

During that time we were engaged in many inquiries with respect to Federal elections and, indeed, several contests,

complaints, examinations, and hearings. It was a very busy committee for a number of years, and our work really forced some of us, I feel certain, to the views and conclusions which are embodied in the proposed legislation and the several amendments which are expected to be offered.

The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who succeeded me as chairman of this subcommittee, did yeoman work in connection with the investigations relating to the campaign of 1956, to which I shall refer more specifically later. I wish to compliment him, too, upon his earnest devotion to this work, which is more or less a thankless and certainly not a spectacular job among the many jobs assigned to us who serve on many committees in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am deeply grateful for the very generous compliment of my able and distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Missouri. The subject matter of the proposed legislation which he has brought before the Senate is a vexatious one, indeed; but it constitutes an area in which the right of the people to control the fate of their government, to give mandate and direction, must be safeguarded, else the power of the pocketbook may exercise an undue influence.

I have serious doubt that the bill as presented by the able Senator's committee is as strong as it should be. During the course of the debate, I shall offer amendments which will seek to strengthen the bill, as indeed, I understand, the chairman of the committee also proposes to do.

Mr. HENNINGS. I propose to offer several amendments. The Senator from Tennessee and I have discussed these matters several times, so many of the amendments will be the result of our composite thought and efforts.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I shall be laboring by his side, I am sure, in behalf of most of the amendments which he will present, although that may not be true in all cases.

I congratulate the Senator from Missouri upon the long, diligent, sustained study, interest, and effort which he has devoted to this subject. I hope his efforts will be crowned by the enactment of satisfactory legislation.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his contribution to the discussion.

It might be observed, as an inevitable corollary, that no one as an individual really takes too kindly or too enthusiastically to regulating himself; and the same thing is true of legislative bodies. The same thing may also be said in regard to bureaus and agencies of the Federal Government and in regard to private and other organizations.

But, Mr. President, at the outset I wish to point out that in the year 1960, in many respects the bill constitutes a great liberalization of the so-called, and certainly misnamed, Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, because here we are, 35 years later, undertaking to operate and invoke the same rules, procedures, and limitations which were in force back in the year 1925. The bill before us increases by five times the amount which a Senator may spend in connection with his election; and likewise increases by five times the amount which the 1925 act permitted to be spent in connection with the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

Let us bear in mind, too, Mr. President, the change in the value of the dollar. Obviously the amounts provided in the bill were not arbitrarily selected. We had to arrive at some ceiling, some point beyond which we thought election expenses should not go.

But presently the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 is as obsolete as the brass-bound Ford, and is as unworkable, as unmanageable, and as out of date as most of the other products of that period. Certainly the fiscal limitations which could properly be applied to such elections in 1925 are not at all adequate for application to the elections in the year 1960.

Mr. President, I believe I would be remiss if I did not extend and present my thanks to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] of Texas and the other members of the policy committee of the majority party for unanimously clearing this bill for Senate floor consideration.

I may say in all candor that on yesterday I indicated to the members of that committee that certain amendments would be offered; and I undertook to suggest what those amendments would be. Nonetheless, the bill was unanimously cleared by the majority policy committee for consideration on the floor.

Mr. President, I also believe it appropriate to thank the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who joined with all the other minority members of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the effort to bring the bill to the floor, for Senate consideration.

So the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and it has received a unanimous vote by the majority policy committee, for Senate consideration.

Many of us think that it is, indeed, good for the bill to be made the first order of business in this very important election year.

Certainly the bill is not, by its terms, in any respect that I can conceive, partisan in nature; and certainly it is not intended to be such.

The new clean elections bill—as it might be referred to—was adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration after an exhaustive study in a series of executive sessions. This new legislative project is thus the outcome of thorough examination; and, as I have suggested, it bears the imprint of the spirit of compromise which brought together divergent, and often contrary, views.

In the course of my remarks, Mr. President, I shall point out parts of the bill with which I do not agree, and which I would like to see amended by the Senate. At this point, however, I wish to emphasize that this unanimously reported bill is a testimonial and an expression of bipartisan recognition that the basic Federal elections statute—the so-called Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—is hopelessly out of date in some of its important aspects, and that in many, many instances, it has been contemptuously and flagrantly avoided, evaded, and disregarded.

As all of us know, under the Constitution, Congress is given extensive powers to regulate Federal elections. The Constitution grants to the States the power to determine the qualifications of electors who vote for congressional candidates, and the manner of appointing presidential and vice-presidential electors. However, Congress is granted the power to regulate the time and manner of electing Senators and Representatives. Congress can also change the places of choosing Representatives. Moreover, Congress is given the exclusive power to judge election returns and the qualifications of its Members. In addition, the "necessary and proper" clause places at the disposal of Congress adequate legislative means to make effective the specific grants in the field of elections.

The Supreme Court of the United States has fully recognized the power of Congress to regulate Federal elections, and especially to pass laws for the control of campaign financing, so as to prevent the corrupt use of money to affect elections. In *Burroughs and Cannon v. U.S.* (290 U.S. 534, 1934), the Court said:

> The importance of his [the President's] election and the vital character of its relation to and effect upon the welfare and safety of the whole people cannot be too strongly stated. To say that Congress is without power to pass appropriate legislation to safeguard such an election from the improper use of money to influence the result is to deny to the Nation in a vital particular the power of self-protection. Congress, undoubtedly, possesses that power, as it possesses every other power essential to preserve the departments and institutions of the general government from impairment or destruction, whether threatened by force or by corruption.

In that decision, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed its earlier pronouncements sustaining the constitutionality of the first comprehensive Federal statute—the Enforcement Act (16 Stat. 44)—so far as it relates to congressional elections. (Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371 (1880).)

When, in 1894, Congress repealed almost all of the provisions of the Enforcement Act (28 Stat. 36), it was a matter of political decision, not a matter of determining the right or the authority of the Congress so to legislate.

A new period in the history of Federal regulation of national elections began in 1907 when Congress passed the Tillman Act prohibiting national banks and corporations from making contributions in connection with Federal elections (34 Stat. 814). In an amended form which includes labor organizations within the prohibition, as well as expenditures along with contributions, the Tillman

Act appears today as a provision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I mention this in order to remind Senators that the present bill does not deal with this provision of Taft-Hartley. I know full well that this statute and even the soundness of its underlying principles have been questioned and debated. Nevertheless, the issues raised have not been sufficiently investigated, and it is certainly my confirmed conviction that any legislation touching section 610 would be at this point premature. The administration of this statute by the courts has, up to now, satisfactorily resolved the controversies involved.

In 1910, Congress enacted a comprehensive statute which was the model of the existing Corrupt Practices Act. In subsequent years, the statute of 1910 was amended, and in 1925, the existing law, the so-called Corrupt Practices Act, was passed.

Many years ago when I served in the House of Representatives, it became clear to me, as it certainly did to many others, that the existing election law was completely inadequate and that a thorough revision was absolutely necessary.

As I said, when I first came to the Senate in 1950, we embarked on the so-called Maryland investigation in the first week of my term of office; and from then on the committee of which I was a member was exceedingly active in matters relating to Federal elections.

For several years, I was chairman of this subcommittee which deals with our election laws. My experience in investigations of elections and complaints, as well as in election contests, confirmed my views that we needed a much stronger statute.

Mr. President, with the thought that we need a much stronger and a much more realistic elections law, on January 21, 1955, together with other Senators, I introduced the first of a series of so-called elections bills. At that time the urgency of the need for a new Federal elections act was not widely recognized.

However, hearings were held from April 12 to May 18, 1955, on that bill by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The hearings were lengthy, and, I may say, among other witnesses, the then chairman of the Republican National Committee and the then chairman of the Democratic National Committee appeared and testified. After these hearings, it seemed fully demonstrated that there were great deficiencies in the existing law. Those hearings included virtually anyone who had anything to say upon this subject.

It was a matter of great satisfaction to me when, subsequently, on June 22, 1955, the full Committee on Rules and Administration acted on the recommendations of the subcommittee to report the bill to the Senate. It was disappointing, however, that in its action, the committee split along party lines.

I think many of us have now come to believe that questions of revising Federal election laws should lie outside the area of partisan politics, as that phrase is generally understood.

Yet my disappointment did not end there. It was disheartening that the Senate, as a body, never acted on the bill. The sense of urgency was obviously lacking. There was no keen realization of the dangers inherent in election laws inadequate for the existence and development of democratic institutions in this country.

Gradually things have changed for the better. The press has done a great deal to call attention to the various weaknesses of our election laws, as have political scientists, leaders of various groups, and others who have taken the interest citizens should take in their Government, and especially in this vital, and indeed critical area, of regulation, in order that democracy may be fulfilled at the very fount from which springs the power of the people in this country, and that is in the elections of those who are to represent them and who occupy places of trust and confidence in our system of government.

There were also two special investigations by the Senate. I refer to the hearings held by the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying and Campaign Contributions in the fall of 1956; and to the hearings and statistical study conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections at the same time. The findings and recommendations of those committees were contained in the final report of the special committee and the report of the subcommittee, entitled "1956 General Election Campaigns."

These reports supplied valuable, though to some extent cumulative, information, but they certainly helped to alert and to form public opinion and to advise Congress on the desirability of a revision—and a speedy revision—of our antiquated, outmoded, archaic Federal election laws.

It was in this atmosphere of public interest that on May 23, 1957, I introduced another clean elections bill. The Committee on Rules and Administration, under my chairmanship, spent several weeks considering that bill.

The final action of the committee indicated that times had changed. Unlike the 1955 bill, the bill of 1957 was reported by a large bipartisan majority of seven against an equally bipartisan vote of two. It was thus demonstrated that, whatever our philosophy of government and legislative position, in matters of election law we were beginning to reach a common understanding as to the desirable shape of the new statute. The preponderant bipartisan support certainly indicated that the flagrant inadequacies of the existing law had become a matter of general recognition. The progress we made was indeed remarkable. I think we may all take satisfaction in the progress which was made.

However, in 1957 the first result was no different. Some of us believed that we should stay with this problem and that it should not be allowed to continue to gather dust and have nothing done about it. So we have before us today this new bill, reported with such unanimity by two agencies of this body.

Mr. President, the existing law rests upon the idea that the integrity of the election process can be safeguarded by keeping political contributions and expenditures within certain prescribed limitations, and, further, by requiring a disclosure of data involving the financing of political campaigns.

These are the basic principles of elections legislation. The new bill has imbedded in it, certainly, these tenets as its basic philosophy.

But the limitations imposed by the Corrupt Practices Act are hopelessly out of step with the rise in prices and cost of services, especially if we consider the cost of broadcasting and the ever-increasing importance of radio and television in political campaigns. Those instrumentalities were not factors in 1925, when the law under which we are now supposed to be operating was enacted. Certainly, the economic changes of the last decades have unhinged the entire scheme of limitations prescribed by existing law enacted 35 years ago, in 1925. It is indeed almost impossible to wage an adequate political campaign within the ceilings permissible under the existing law.

The present system, in view of the factors I have undertaken to outline, is hypocritical in the extreme, from beginning to end.

In pointing out some inadequacies, I do not wish to convey the idea that I consider money used in political campaigns a wicked and undesirable thing in itself.

We all know that the figures with regard to funds used in the elections have reached astronomical proportions in the great elections of today. These do not especially concern or disturb us. As elsewhere in public affairs, our concern is with secrecy and inadequacy of disclosure. When the light of publicity fails to illuminate all these happenings, about which the public has a right to know, there will always be some suspicion of corruption, even though there may be in fact none. There is always the danger that even an unjustified suspicion may tend to corrode the trust of the people in their representatives in government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my able friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Missouri. Does the Senator not think there is also a danger that by an undue weight of the pocketbook, an undue influence of money—particularly in regard to the use of mass media—the true will of the people, if truly ascertained, would be thwarted.

Mr. HENNINGS. Not only do I agree with that statement, but I also wish to say that there have been several elections cases, as the Senator well knows, in regard to which the Senate itself has determined excessive expenditures did influence the elections.

I know the Senator is a student of the precedents in regard to elections and recalls the cases to which I refer, without

mentioning the names of the men who were elected to the Senate, who are now gone. We know that in at least one campaign it was found by the Senate that the excessive use of money did influence the election and that in fact the election was bought. That person was not seated as a result of the finding by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is aware of those cases.

Is the situation not more dangerous now, with the greater facility for influencing public opinion? Is there not greater danger that money may unduly influence elections and thereby thwart a genuine popular will?

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, I wish to say, briefly, we know that science has made great progress in the media by which the messages of the parties and the candidates may be conveyed to the public. I speak, of course, of television and radio. I do not intend to exclude the ingenious devices of advertising for promulgating the sale of products by the clever and adroit use of words and pictures, by the creation of desires in people who perhaps have not thought they needed some of the things advertised, and probably do not know what to do with them when they get them, except to have a hard time meeting the payments on them.

We know there has developed in this country since 1925 a very large group of ladies and gentlemen who are known as members of the profession of advertising, which is, indeed, a legitimate American enterprise. They have had to be controlled and stepped upon occasionally by the FTC and other regulatory bodies, because of the manner in which they have represented the advertised products or ideas to the public.

We know there have been many who have devoted considerable time since 1925, and theretofore, perhaps, to various techniques of persuasion and influence.

On the other hand, I would not like to suggest that I believe there is any diminution in the ability of the American citizen to think for himself. I do not despair of the elective process simply because of the invocation of the techniques which have been suggested by the Senator from Tennessee. I think it does raise, seriously, the question of one candidate having adequate money and the other candidate having relatively little, and the question to what extent the latter candidate is able to project himself, his principles and his views, to the people to whom he is offering himself as a candidate, as compared to the man of unlimited means.

We know from history that in the old days in this country there were no restrictions whatsoever upon campaign expenditures. It was not until 1870 that some legislation on this subject was enacted. That legislation dealt with bribery, among other things. There was no registration of voters in the old days. There were very primitive practices at polling places. Somehow or other the Republic has survived and burgeoned in spite of these many things. I attribute that fact to the essential strength of the great republican form of government which we have in this democracy.

Sometimes we do pay a price for freedom. We believe in freedom of speech. We believe that the press should be able to print the advertisements of candidates. We believe that billboards should display their messages, and that television and radio should carry them. Within the limitations of fair comment, provided a candidate does not transgress the injunctions against libel, we allow very free and frank and candid discussion. I am all for that; and I do not for one minute wish to suggest that in the presentation of a candidate's case, either by himself or by others, any candidate should be any more severely restricted than he has been in the past, except to say that the weight of the moneybags should not be preponderant in determining the course of elections, especially when disclosure of the sources of the funds is not made.

From time to time there have been suggestions that there be no limitations at all upon campaign expenditures, but that full publicity be given to them. I would not say that my mind is closed to such a suggestion. However, some of us thought, at the beginning of a revision of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, that we should try to arrive at some reasonably realistic basis for campaign expenditures, within which a candidate could campaign, within which he could be honest when he reports, within which there would not be under-the-table, undercover money, within which, as one of the amendments I propose to offer will suggest, there could not be 100, 200, or 300 committees set up in a given State in order to avoid and evade what I think is one of the primary purposes of the act. The purpose is to avoid a proliferation or multiplicity of committees set up for the purpose of receiving funds to avoid the limitation upon campaign contributions.

When we get down to the essential basis, what we are trying to do is to help everyone be a little more forthright, considerably more realistic, and certainly less hypocritical when it comes to the business of campaigning. In my own experience, if I may be forgiven one illustration, I have run in six primaries. I have been nominated six times and elected six times, three times to the House, once as a district attorney of my State, and twice to the Senate. I know a little about what goes on in campaigns in a State of almost 5 million people. I have served on campaign finance committees, as have many other Senators. We have served on campaign committees for our friends. We have spent a great deal of our time in being reelected, and we have given of our time and efforts to others in the course of our lives.

We know that, by and large, the 1925 provisions in practice are not observed in spirit, even if they are in letter. There is no use in our trying to indulge in any pretension that people are living within the 1925 dollar value, in the light of 1960 campaign costs, any more than we live within the 1925 dollar in terms of anything else. But that is only one point I should like to mention at this stage of the preliminary discussion of the bill.

I do not know whether I have answered the question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I took a long time to do it. I did not intend to take so long.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has answered fully.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, this is one of those things which do not lend themselves especially to simplicity, unless great effort is made to be simple. That is what I am trying to do.

Many sections of the bill require reading, rereading, and close study. However, I have undertaken to outline the broad and basic philosophy of the bill.

As I have said before against the background of existing law, the new elections bill represents vast improvement. It puts an end to the pretense that election campaigns can be run within the ceilings of permissible expenditures established 35 years ago in a vastly different economic situation.

The existing law permits a candidate for Senator to spend $10,000 and a candidate for Representative $2,500.

Imagine that. I do not know what the population of the State of Maine is. I should say that the State of the distinguished occupant of the chair has a population of approximately 600,000. Some of us come from States with little larger populations. My State happens to have a population of nearly 5 million. A candidate could not begin to campaign in the city of St. Louis for that amount if he had one committee and spent only $10,000 in a campaign for the Senate, much less a candidate for the House of Representatives campaigning for $2,500.

We have seen some of the statements filed under the present Corrupt Practices Act, showing that candidate A or candidate B says he spent $22 to be nominated and $85 to be elected. That is the sort of thing that the proposed legislation is designed to stop, by making contributions public, putting people on notice as to who makes the campaign contributions, when they are made, and in what amounts.

I suppose there are some very good citizens who might contribute $5,000 to a candidate and expect nothing whatsoever in return for it. There are a number of citizens who have contributed $5,000, more or less, and who have been exceedingly disappointed when they found they were not getting anything in return for it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is not the distintinguished Senator from Missouri aware of the fact that frequently an equal amount is contributed to both candidates for the same office, in order——

Mr. HENNINGS. Indeed.

Mr. KEATING. In order that there may be, particularly in a close election, no doubt afterward?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly right. He has been in many campaigns. Some of us know from experience that the president of a company

might make a contribution to a candidate—for example, perhaps to my opponent—and the vice president would make a contribution to me. What some of them expect, we do not know, but I believe it is only consistent with human nature to face the fact that not a great many people give enormous amounts to individual candidates without expecting some personal benefit from making such a contribution, or, indeed, expecting some benefit from having given to the party in the majority in the Senate or in the House, or, indeed, in the White House. By that I do not mean merely for the promotion of good government. I mean other and sometimes sinister things.

The Senator from New York was not in the Chamber earlier when I undertook to compliment him as one of those who had worked with us on the bill and had helped us to submit a unanimous report on it, and who has associated himself with me, or I with him, in the offering of at least one amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those remarks. If the Senator will yield further, his view is somewhat similar to mine, that it is very necessary to legislate in this field. I am happy that the bill has been brought before the Senate, and I shall support it. In certain respects, however, I believe it could be improved, as does the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate my friend's remarks. I think we agree that, in the ultimate, it is better to have this bill than no bill at all, and to bring us at least somewhere past the mid-20th century. Some of us hope for considerable and substantial improvement in the bill, and will offer amendments representative of our views.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once again?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator from Missouri has referred to the investigation which a subcommittee under my chairmanship conducted into campaign expenditures and contributions in the 1956 election. The findings which that investigation disclosed dramatically demonstrated that some of the influences which the late Senator Taft in his statement made public recently said brought about his defeat for the presidential nomination, materially brought about the election of President Eisenhower in 1952.

I shall, in the course of the debate on the pending bill give some details which I believe will prove interesting in that regard.

Mr. HENNINGS. I might say that the Senator from Tennessee sent out a number of questionnaires during the 1956 campaign to all the candidates in that election. The replies buttressed and supported us in our belief as to what really goes on behind the scenes when an important Federal election is taking place.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will recall that for the first time in the history of the country we cataloged in black and white $33 million—who contributed it, who received it, and what was done with it.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. We have those records, and the figure of $33 million was cataloged, as the Senator says, and, under his supervision, was illuminated in all particulars.

Along with these $10,000 and $2,500 limitations the existing law provides also a formula under which congressional candidates may spend an amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast in the last general election for all candidates for office which the candidate seeks. This formula, however, is subject to an overriding overall ceiling which limits a candidate for Senator to $25,000 and a candidate for Representative to $5,000.

Under the new bill, the ceiling is raised to $50,000 for a candidate for Senator and to $12,500 for a candidate for Representative. Under the alternative formula of the bill, the ceilings are ascertained by multiplying 20 cents by the first million of votes cast in the last election, or persons registered to vote in the present election for that particular office, and by multiplying 10 cents by such votes or registered voters in excess of 1 million. Furthermore, the ceillings of the existing law are subject to the ceiling provisions of State statutes, whereas, under the new bill, the Federal ceilings are controlling.

Similarly, the new bill provides for an increase of maximum contributions to, and expenditures by, interstate political committees. Under the existing law, political committees are not permitted to receive contributions in excess of $3 million, and the same ceiling applies to expenditures. As against this, the bill under consideration, the elections bill of 1959, establishes ceilings limited by the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the highest number of voters casting votes for all candidates for the office of presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office. Judging by the available figures, the amount of political contributions and expenditures under the bill would be about $12,500,000.

As I have said, the reporting provisions, dealing with the publicity to be given to contributions and expenditures, are exceedingly important.

Under the existing law, political committees and candidates for Representative file a report with the Clerk of the House, and senatorial candidates with the Secretary of the Senate. Under the new bill, the originals of all reports are to be filed with the Clerk of the House and copies of reports of senatorial candidates and political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, and Senator are to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate. Furthermore, under the new bill, copies of all reports are to be filed with the clerks of the U.S. district courts or authorized State officials.

The reason for the latter provision cannot be overemphasized. We all agreed on it.

Under the existing law, the reports are not readily available to the people of the States and congressional districts. By contrast, there is being established, under the new bill, the dissemination of reports on the local level where the election is being held, which would lead to a wide dissemination of information on the financial transactions of candidates and political committees, so that people locally may have access to these reports in the clerk's office or from State officials authorized by State law to keep such records.

Another provision of the new elections bill requires that every candidate must make—and I quote from the bill—

> Every reasonable effort to ascertain what political committees, or other committees, associations, or organizations of the State or district are supporting him by publication of advertisements in newspapers or other periodicals, by publication of pamphlets or circulars, by providing printed material, by radio or television broadcasting or by providing billboards or posters.

The bill further requires the candidate list such committees or organizations with the names and addresses of their officers. It provides that such listing shall not be construed as a ratification on the part of the reporting candidate. It gives him the opportunity to repudiate in his report any of the committees or organizations listed.

He does not have to say that he approves of the support of any organization, but he is given the opportunity to repudiate, in his report, any of the committees or organizations listed. He may candidly say, "I do not want the support of this, that, or the other group," even though he may be getting it. That would largely happen, of course, if he felt either that the support was from a source of which he did not approve or that the support was more of a burden than an aid.

The disclosure value of these provisions speaks for itself. I wish only to point out that these listing requirements cover intrastate as well as interstate committees.

Equally important for safeguarding the public knowledge in matters of campaign financing is the increase of time during which reports should be preserved. The existing law requires that recipients of reports should preserve them for a period of 2 years, and political committees should preserve the supporting data of their reports for a period of at least 2 years.

Under the new bill, those who receive reports—that is, U.S. district courts and other such public officials—will preserve them for a period of 6 years, and those who file reports are charged with the duty to preserve them for a period of 1 year.

Also helpful is the reduction in the number of reports by political committees. The existing law requires four reports annually in off-election years. Two additional preelection reports are required in election years. By contrast, the new elections bill requires only semiannual reports in off-election years which are due on June 30 and December 31. In election years, the bill requires

one preelection report as of the 10th day next preceding the date of election and one post election report due on the 30th day following the election.

Mr. President, the importance of election law cannot be sufficiently emphasized. The elective process is the very source of our national life, the controlling force of our society. It is my strong conviction that we cannot afford to be negligent in matters which go to the foundations of our American democracy. Election reform is urgently needed and it will have to come. Therefore, I urge that the Senate approve the Elections Act of 1959, with certain amendments to be offered later.

The amendments which I intend to offer cover primaries, intrastate committees, an overall limitation on contributions, and the reporting of direct expenditures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri finished?

Mr. HENNINGS. I was about to begin to offer amendments. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. No. When the Senator from Missouri is through with his presentation, I desire to make a brief general statement on the bill. Since the Senator wishes to proceed, I shall wait.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to preclude the Senator from Nebraska, who has been so cooperative in the Committee on Rules and Administration, from making any statement he wishes to present.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the Senator about to offer amendments?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have amendments which I had hoped might be taken up at this time. Has the Senator from Nebraska any amendments to offer?

Mr. CURTIS. No; I have no amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, with the understanding that, by unanimous consent, I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration for his courtesy, not only today, but also throughout the consideration of this measure in committee.

I wish to preface my remarks by paying tribute to another member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], about whom many kind words have been spoken today. It has been my pleasure to serve with him on the committee. I hope he will have many fine days ahead. It will be a pleasure to have him here for the remainder of this year.

Mr. President, clean and honest elections are an objective of all. There is no dispute concerning the desirability of improving our elections and obtaining the widest possible citizen participation.

There is a difference of opinion on the methods and procedures for obtaining the desired objective. There is a difference of opinion wherein the responsibility should be lodged for the policing of political campaigns, including the financing thereof.

Problems are not necessarily solved by placing them in the hands of the Federal Government and, thus, removing them farther from the electorate. An addition to the Federal bureaucracy for any laudable purpose is not, per se, a solution to a problem. Individual citizens, local communities, and the sovereign States have a basic responsibility. There is no State in the Union which cannot have honest elections, including the complete and honest reporting of campaign expenditures, if a majority of the citizens of that State so desire.

Candidates for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are required, under existing law, to file a statement of their contributions and expenditures. That requirement is continued in S. 2436. Under existing law, only those committees which operate in two or more States, or are a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, are required to file a Federal report. S. 2436 continues with the same definition of a committee.

The Committee on Rules and Administration was faced with a considerable divergence of opinion about extending the Federal reporting requirement to intrastate committees. I think it would be a great mistake to do this. As a compromise, in the committee we agreed on the following language:

> It shall be the duty of every candidate to make every reasonable effort to ascertain what political committees or other committees, associations, or organizations in his State or district are supporting his candidacy by means of (1) publication of advertisements in newspapers or other periodicals, (2) publication of pamphlets or circulars, (3) providing printed material, (4) radio or television broadcasting, or (5) providing billboards or posters.
>
> The candidate shall enclose with the reports required to be filled a list of names of all such committees, associations, or organizations, together with the names and addresses of their chairmen and treasurers. Such lists shall be cumulative.
>
> The listing of committees, associations, and other organizations and their officers shall not be construed as a ratification by the candidate of any action by them and the candidate may, at his option, note in any such report a repudiation of the support of any such committee, association, or other organization.

This section should not add any undue burden to the candidate, because it refers to committees engaged in activities in connection with which the present law provides that someone must take responsibility for such acts.

The committee was in disagreement as to whether the Federal reporting requirements should be extended to primary elections. The committee decided not to include primaries, and I concur in that decision.

The law prohibits political expenditures on the part of corporations, national banks, and labor unions. There are widespread abuses, particularly in reference to enforcement of this provision as it relates to labor unions. It suffers from poor administration and poor enforcement.

These provisions of law should be enforced, not as antilabor or anticorporation activities, but because we favor individual rights. No stockholder should have his money spent without his consent in a political cause in which he does not believe. No laboring man or woman should be compelled to give financial aid directly or indirectly to candidates or to a political party not of his or her choice. But this is happening today. Some of our wage earners are compelled to support candidates and parties in order to hold their jobs even though they may be in total disagreement with the political principles which they must support. Some courts, as well as enforcing officers, have bowed to the great power of unions and have turned their backs on individual rights in this field. They should take a new look at the existing statute, and should interpret it in the light of the principle that an individual's right to choose whom he shall support politically is a basic American right, and should be totally free from coercion or compulsion.

In many of the States of the Union, compulsory union membership is permitted under the law. This means that an individual must stay in the union and must pay his dues or else he will lose his job. Most certainly in those cases, such an organization, with its power of compulsory membership, should not be engaged in politics. To do so is to trespass upon one of the most sacred rights that an individual has—namely, the right of choice in political matters.

If this bill is to be opened up for amendment, this problem should be dealt with. Among other things, the definition of "contribution" and the definition of "expenditure" should include "provision of paid manpower and paid personal services other than bona fide volunteers." We should also provide that if any union hereafter obtains a contract which calls for compulsory membership, the union shall take no part, directly or indirectly, in politics, because it is no longer a voluntary association.

Senate bill 2436 does raise the limit on the amount of money which can lawfully be spent by a candidate or a political party. This is commendable. Existing laws is antiquated in this regard. Present day campaigning, with the addition of television, is very expensive; and the limits on spending set forth in existing law are far too low. They are conducive to the use of a multiplicity of committees and a lack of centralization and responsibility in election spending.

Mr. President, the measure now before us is a compromise. It contains some good provisions, principally those in regard to raising the limits to practical amounts.

I suggest that the bill be passed without amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to commend the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration for the statement he has made. He has

stated what I understand to be the provisions of the pending bill. It is not a bill which suits everyone; but it is a compromise—the best we could work out.

I am sure the Senator from Nebraska feels as I do, namely, that the antiquated statute now on the books should at this time be brought up to date to the extent that we can do so by means of agreement here in the Senate.

If attempts are now made to add to the bill provisions not now in the existing law, perhaps a bill on this subject will be passed, but perhaps it will not be passed. Therefore, I shall oppose any such attempts; and I assume that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska feels the same way that I do about that matter.

Mr. CURTIS. I do; and I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, again I wish to extend my thanks and my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], not only for his cooperation throughout the course of the committee's work on this measure, but also for the statement he has just concluded in this Chamber.

I have already paid my tribute to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has been a very great help in enabling us to get this measure out of committee.

However, Mr. President, I am constrained to say that I believe some strengthening amendments should be adopted.

I am advised by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that he proposes to join me in regard to one amendment—that relating to political activities in primary elections; and I believe that there may be other amendments on which other Senators may reach agreement.

But I am thoroughly in agreement with my friend, the President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. HAYDEN], who has worked so diligently on this committee, of which he has been chairman, and also on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, when he says that the passage of some bill on this subject is certainly better than the failure to pass any such bill.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe we are faced with the prospect of failure to pass such a bill, or else I would not undertake to hazard the offering of amendments. I believe that some amendments at least will improve the measure as reported. It was reported because of the desire of all of us to bring to the floor of the Senate a measure for consideration and for ultimate passage.

At this time I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we are presented with a historic opportunity to bring up to date the clearly outmoded provisions of the Federal election law. Enactment of Senate bill 2436, with appropriate amendment, will go a long way toward making fairer and more effective the election of Federal officeholders. I hope we do not let this chance escape us.

Anyone who has studied the provisions and the practical application of the Corrupt Practices Act recognizes that it has serious shortcomings. Many are attributable to the simple fact that the statute was enacted in 1925, and has not been amended since then.

In the interim the value of the dollar has declined sharply; the national population has increased greatly; and the use of television, air travel, and other developments has mushroomed the cost of political campaigning. It is high time that we modernized these obsolescent provisions of the act.

My basic philosophy with regard to measures regulating the election of Federal officials can be rather simply stated. It is my conviction that public disclosure of activities connected with the nomination and election of Federal officeholders is a basic part of the public's right to know about the operations of their Government. Such reporting will help prevent improper use of funds to influence elections and will raise the national level of campaigning. I believe that there are dangers inherent in the undisclosed and unregulated use of money in political campaigns, which may lead to temptations for corruption and chicanery.

I am sure we all agree that realistic limitations on campaign spending and contributions are necessary. None of us wants elections controlled by large expenditures from a few individuals or organizations. Such domination is clearly contrary to the basic concepts of our democratic system.

Starting from these basic premises, it is my position that limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures, combined with public disclosure of such matters—public disclosure is so important—offers the best antidote to possible misuse of such funds and to spoliation of the electoral process.

S. 2436 reflects this philosophy in large part and is therefore, in my judgment, a commendable step in the right direction. I do not believe for an instant that this measure, or any other measure, even if we amend it as I feel we ought to, contains all the answers. Unscrupulous people will still seek out loopholes and will exploit weaknesses in the law, and we must be ever vigilant to correct those shortcomings as they appear.

Nevertheless, passage of this bill will make the task of the dishonest a great deal harder and can improve substantially the Federal election process. I therefore support it strongly and urge its adoption, with at least one amendment which I shall discuss in a moment.

I am mindful of the fact that the passage of any legislation in this field is extremely difficult. As I have noted, no changes have been made in the Corrupt Practices Act since it became law in 1925. It is true that language was included in the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 relating to elections, but that was, as we all know, in a rather limited field.

It is therefore significant that the bill before us was reported unanimously by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, and I join the Chairman's commendation of the members of this committee, on both sides, for that action. As a member of that committee, I supported this proposal because I felt it was headed in the right direction and because I felt confident to a considerable degree that improving amendments could be added on the floor of the Senate. I shall deal with these changes later on.

Whenever legislation in this field is discussed, the question of the constitutionality of such actions is brought up—and perfectly properly so. My study of this aspect convinces me that there are firm constitutional foundations for congressional statutes relating to Federal elections.

The principle of checks and balances restricts both the States and the Federal Government in this field. Broadly speaking, the States exercise jurisdiction over the qualifications of voters, the manner of appointing presidential and vice-presidential electors, and the times, places, and method of elections for Members of the House and Senate.

The Federal Government, under the Constitution, is given the power to change such laws, with the exception that Congress does not have the power to change the places of choosing Senators. Congress clearly has the responsibility to judge elections, returns, and qualifications of Members of both bodies, and McCulloch against Maryland establishes the principle that the "necessary and proper" clause of the Constitution permits Congress to utilize its legislative function to put into effect specifically granted powers.

Congress thus has a rather wide field in which to legislate with regard to Federal elections, and while I am sympathetic to those who are concerned about the rights of States in this matter, I do feel it is incumbent upon Congress to lay down certain regulations and guidelines.

The specific provisions of the bill before us today will go a long way toward eliminating many of the bad practices which have arisen under the outmoded Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

First, the bill significantly broadens the scope of the reports required of candidates and political committees. The number of off-election year reports is reduced from four to two, annually. In election years, instead of the two additional preelection reports, S. 2346 requires one before the election and one after. There are also various streamlining changes with regard to who must file reports, and a 3-day period of grace is provided for the filing date.

The bill, secondly, expands the dissemination of data on campaign spending with the requirement that copies of reports be filed on the local level. Under the existing law, political committees and candidates file with the Clerk of the House or with the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be. Under provisions of this bill, the originals of all reports are filed with the Clerk of the

House and copies of reports by candidates for the Senate and political committees supporting nominees for President, Vice President, and Senator are to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate. In addition, copies of all reports are to be filed with the clerks of the appropriate U.S. district courts—in other words, in the district of residence of the candidate or the district where the principal office of a political committee is located, if it is a political committee that is doing the filing. In States where some State official is authorized to perform such duties, the bill requires that the copy be filed with that State officer.

The net effect of this aspect of the bill is to increase the opportunities for the public to know the facts about local campaigns in the areas where the campaigns took place.

The third major part of this bill raises the ceilings on contributions and expenditures to more realistic levels. These provisions will permit more effective campaigning and presentation of issues without the need to resort to devious means of financing.

S. 2436 raises substantially the ceiling on expenditures for congressional candidates. Under the present law the limit is $10,000 for the Senate and $2,500 for the House. This bill raises the ceiling to $50,000 for a Senator and $12,500 for a Representative.

S. 2436 also changes the alternate formula for campaign spending. The existing law permits an amount to be determined by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for the office which the particular candidate seeks. This sum is not to exceed $25,000 for candidates for the Senate and $5,000 for candidates for Representative or Resident Commissioner under the present law.

Under the alternate formula of the bill before us, a candidate may spend an amount equal to the higher of two formulas. One is found by multiplying 20 cents by the total number—not in excess of one million—votes cast in the last general election for that office, plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such votes in excess of one million. That is one of the alternatives. The second amount is determined by multiplying 20 cents by the total number—not in excess of one million—of persons registered to vote in the general election for the office the candidate seeks, plus the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of persons in excess of one million. One has a choice as to which formula one wishes to employ in arriving at the ceiling for his campaign. There is no maximum set by this method in the bill.

I might also point out that this bill does not cancel out, and does not exempt, any candidate from complying with pertinent State laws, unless those laws are directly inconsistent with the Federal statute. This measure also clarifies the relation between Federal and State ceilings and makes clear that the Federal limitation is paramount.

S. 2436 also deals with the problem of maximum contributions to and expenditures by interstate political committees. The present law provides a flat ceiling of $3 million for expenditures by a political committee in any calendar year. Such a limit is no longer realistic, as I have previously pointed out.

This bill substitutes for a definite ceiling a formula for political committees operating in two or more States. Under this formula, the ceiling is determined by multiplying 20 cents "by the highest number of voters casting votes for all candidates for the office of presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office."

Mr. President, in broad outline these are the major provisions of the pending bill. I realize they are not perfect and that they do not provide answers to all the problems in this extremely complex field. I do contend they are far more realistic than the provisions of the present law and that they deserve our wholehearted support as steps in the right direction.

Enactment of this measure will mark, it seems to me, significant progress along the road to a modern and workable elections statute which will be fair to all concerned and which will make possible the fullest and frankest presentation of the issues to the American electorate by candidates for Federal office. I trust it will gain the wide support in this Chamber it so richly deserves.

Mr. President, in commending the bill to the favorable consideration of my colleagues, as I said before, I feel that at least one amendment is distinctly necessary. It is an amendment which I offered last August. It is printed and is on the desks of the various Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill as a whole is laudable and is worthy of support. I shall support it, whatever may happen in the amendment stage, but it does seem to me that the bill is seriously deficient in that it expressly excludes from its purview primary elections and conventions and caucuses where political candidates are nominated. This is not a fatal flaw, but it is a near-fatal flaw which should be eliminated by amendment.

It is a well-known fact that in roughly one-third of our States today success in a primary is tantamount to election. In these States, obviously, the choosing of candidates is the only thing that counts, and to permit such selections to proceed without the same Federal regulations which govern elections in other States is both unjust and unfair.

If we are going to pass limitations on the conduct of Federal elections, let us not do a halfway job. In my view, it would be folly to pass this bill without including within its coverage general, special, or primary elections, including preferential primaries, and conventions or caucuses of political parties which are held to nominate candidates. That is just what this amendment would do.

Mr. President, I understand the amendment is about to be offered by my distinguished chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. I join him in offering it, if his amendment is the one we shall act upon.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to intervene at that point?

Mr. KEATING. I should be happy to.

Mr. HENNINGS. I simply wanted to reassure the Senator, as I did in the committee. The Senator will recall that I offered such an amendment in the committee, and it was voted down.

Mr. KEATING. By a very close vote.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from New York supported the amendment. The amendment was voted down, I think, by a margin of one. At any rate, I expect to have a few words to say upon the amendment.

When the Senator from New York concludes, I propose to offer the amendment. As I understand the situation, it is proposed that before we have further debate, and certainly before we have a vote on the amendment—and we expect to ask for the yeas and nays—there may be some other subject matters dealt with by other Senators who desire to speak this evening, so that tomorrow the amendment will be the pending business, and we hope we can proceed with consideration of it.

Mr. KEATING. I will say to my chairman, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I hope we shall be able to convince the Members of the Senate of the merit of the amendment. I am happy to join with my colleague in offering the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to have the strong right arm of the distinguished Senator from New York, who is one who advocates the amendment. I would not undertake to describe the amendment as being absolutely essential to the bettering of conditions by the bill of 1959, compared to that of 1925, but certainly, as the Senator suggested, this is most eminently desirable. We should face up to the entire elective process, which some of us believe includes primaries as well as general elections. We know that the selection of a candidate in a primary precedes the election of a candidate in the general election. All of this is part of the broad and general process of election.

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. For that reason some of us feel very strongly that to fail to acquire a provision relating to primaries would be a grievous mistake, and one which the Senate would have occasion to regret in the future. We know opportunities do not come to us very often to deal with proposed legislation affecting the manner and means by which Members of this body and other collateral and related bodies are elected. This may be the last chance for a long time to do anything about this matter. I hope we can embrace it and face up to it and recognize the ultimate and pervasive importance of it, as the Senator so well suggested.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those remarks, Mr. President. I wish to make it very clear, lest it be misunderstood, that my position with respect to this is no way intended to impute that there are irregularities in those areas where nomination means election. It is simply

based on a deep belief that our democratic system of elections functions best when the people are privy to all the facts and on the idea that when information is unnecessarily kept from the electorate there is cause for concern. Our system functions best when the vigilance of the people is based on full information.

The proposed amendment which would rectify this shortcoming is extremely simple. It merely includes within the definition of "election" in the bill primaries and nominating conventions or caucuses, and inserts at the proper places in the bill language to insure that such activities are included in its purview.

Mr. President, only by adopting this amendment can the Senate fully carry out the purpose of this bill to eliminate corruption and dishonesty at all levels in the selection of Federal elected officials, and give the American people full information about the electoral process from beginning to end. I hope it will win wide support.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If no point of order is made, the Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator if he would object to modifying the amendment to require the States to have primary elections. I can think of no more undemocratic process than that followed in States like New York, where there are no primary elections, where politicians may get together in smoke-filled rooms and select a candidate. The people have no real opportunity to say who the candidate of the party shall be. I should like to submit a proposed modification of the amendment, to require that the States have primary elections, so that the public can say who the candidate shall be. It is idle to talk about honest elections when bigwigs get together and the public at large has no real opportunity to say who the candidate shall be.

Mr. KEATING. My friend from Louisiana makes an interesting suggestion. He comes from a great State. I can understand his complete knowledge about the electoral process. In that State, as we all know, unusual events happen from time to time. We consider that in our great State of New York we have fully as democratic a system as has the Senator's State. Candidates in New York are selected by a State convention, and the delegates to that State convention are elected by the electorate.

Speaking for the junior Senator from New York, he was not chosen in any smoke-filled room. The only other person in the room with him at the time was the distinguished Governor of New York; and the Governor of New York does not smoke. So there was no selection in a smoke-filled room. The Governor of New York made the request that the junior Senator from New York join him on the ticket, and it was left to the convention to make the decision. If the convention had not agreed with the Governor of New York, the present junior Senator from New York would not be here. In my judgment, it is just as democratic to select candidates through delegates who are elected by the people as it is to have the candidates elected in a primary election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not let the people vote?

Mr. KEATING. Are there no Republican primaries in Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. They select a candidate and place his name on the ballot. The point is that candidates should be required to fight for their offices, and be approved by the public. The Senator wishes to regulate our primaries. Would he be willing to submit himself to a primary? If so, I should like to prepare an amendment——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if all these races and runoffs are not somewhat exhausting, both physically and financially, to a candidate, who then must confront a strong, vigorous Republican organization, standing in immutable opposition to the Democratic Party.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We do not complain about it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then he is required to go through a grueling ordeal, a trial by fire, a contest with the strong semblance of the Republican Party in the State of Louisiana. It is very trying.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a difficult thing, indeed.

Consider our situation in Louisiana. Eleven men ran for Governor. Then there was a runoff between the top two. One man who ran for the Democratic nomination for Governor 4 years previously could not get into the runoff in the Democratic primary election. He joined the Republican Party. Now the Democrat who was nominated must fight all over again. The candidate to whom I refer, who has joined the Republican Party, has a sidetrack to go into the final race, without ever having to submit himself to the public for approval.

If we are to have all these regulations providing for honest elections, why not provide for a primary election? The Senator from New York will not even submit himself to the kind of election we have in Louisiana.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe we are to make the expenses of the caucus, which the distinguished Senator from New York has discussed, one of the elements of this amendment. The expenses of conventions and caususes are also to be limited and to be reported. So whether there are smoke-filled rooms, or rooms otherwise filled, for whatever purpose, all those expenses will be reported, under the terms of the amendment I am about to submit.

Mr. KEATING. Including the cost of cigarettes and all other smoke-producing materials.

I believe this is the most heartening thing I have heard about the Republican Party in recent weeks. I had not realized how much the distinguished Senator from Louisiana fears the forthcoming campaign against the Republican candidate in Louisiana. I had no idea of the seriousness of the threat to the present Democratic nominee for Governor, who has gone through so many campaigns and is so exhausted. It is heartening to hear that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana supports us. I am sure the Senator from Missouri is as happy as I am that he supports us, and that we shall have his strength behind the amendment. If he wishes to offer an amendment to it, we shall have to pass upon it when the time comes. But to hear him say that he will support our amendment is very heartening.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the distinguished Senator from New York believes we should have an honest election, the first thing to do is to get the election. Here is a Senator who wishes to regulate elections, but he does not wish to submit himself to a primary election such as we have in our State. He would like to dictate how someone else is to be elected. I am for that, provided he subjects himself to the same type of contest which we face.

I am willing to run, Mr. President. That is the way I got here, and I expect that that is the way it will have to be. However, while I am willing to run against Republicans and Democrats, I believe it is not fair that my friends from the Republican side should come into my State and require Democrats to run in our campaigns in accordance with all these details and by going through all these machinations. I believe it would be fair if the Senator from New York would submit himself to the same problems that we have in my State, which he would like to regulate, and have him first run against Republicans and get the majority vote before he runs against a Democratic opponent. Of course, I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from New York would be elected without any opposition, but why not prove it? He could do it if he would agree to accept an amendment I propose to offer to his amendment, to the effect that it would not be possible to have caucuses to nominate a candidate, or provide for a convention to nominate a candidate, but that it would be necessary in the parties for candidates to submit themselves to a primary, subject to the regulations that he could recommend. He should be willing to run under the rules he would recommend.

Mr. KEATING. I fear the Senator from Louisiana has not carefully read the amendment which the Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from New York are offering. The amendment applies to both political parties. It is not directed against any one party. It requires for both parties that if there be a primary contest they would have to report what they spend in the primary election, just the same as they are required to report what they spend in the general election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am not quarreling with the reporting provision. The Senator from New York was not

named in caucus. He said that Governor Rockefeller called him into his office and told him he was the nominee for the Senate on the Republican ticket, because Governor Rockefeller thought he should be elected. Why not have a Republican vote on it? It seems to me that it is much more undemocratic for the Governor of a great State to put a man on the ballot than it is to hold an election, even though the election may have some imperfections.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will interrupt the colloquy, although I do not wish in any way to limit the discussion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I be permitted——

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like at this time to offer an amendment on behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, to revise the Federal election laws. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to have the amendments reported now so that they will be the pending business before the Senate tomorrow. I have no desire to interrupt any further colloquy.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 2, strike out lines 4 and 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates.

Page 2, line 8, after the word "for" insert the words "nomination for, or".

Page 2, line 8, after the word "as" insert a comma.

Page 3, line 2, after the word "is" insert the words "nominated or".

Page 13, line 1, at the beginning of the line insert the following: "primaries, nominating conventions, caucuses, and".

Page 13, line 7, after "(2)" insert the following: "in the case of an election other than a caucus or nominating convention".

Page 15, strike out lines 20 to 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates.

Page 15, line 24, after the word "for" insert the following: "nomination for, or".

Page 15, line 24, after the word "as" insert a comma.

Page 16, line 2, after the word "is" insert the words "nominated or".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether he desires the amendments to be considered en bloc or separately.

Mr. HENNINGS. I ask that they be considered separately. The Chair is referring to the amendments I am offering, I assume. There are two amendments at the desk, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment read by the clerk is in several parts.

Mr. HENNINGS. There are other amendments at the desk. I am asking that the ones just read be considered en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is referring to the amendments which the clerk has just read.

Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before I——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to detain my colleagues, but I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments which have just now been offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the distinguished Senator from Louisiana reserve his right to object?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall not object if——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So as to keep the record straight, I believe the Senator from Louisiana objected to the request of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I reserve my right to object, because I should like to protect myself regarding these amendments. I shall offer amendments to the amendments just offered. In other words, I will offer amendments to require that there be primary elections, which the Senators would seek to regulate.

That is why I entered an objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc. Perhaps I shall withdraw that objection if I find that I have protected my rights. Under the circumstances, I would like to protect my rights. I will object unless it is agreed that amendments may be offered to the pending amendments. If that is agreed to, I shall not object to the consideration of the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe objection was made on the basis that it would be withdrawn if the rights of the Senator from Louisiana were protected and with the understanding that he could offer an amendment to the pending amendments.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I have a ruling by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I must object, unless I have an understanding that any amendments I might offer to the amendments at the desk would be in order.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether under the parliamentary rules I have the right to make such an agreement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any amendments I might wish to propose to these amendments may be in order. That is all I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Before proceeding with a discussion, tomorrow, of the so-called primary election-convention-caucus amendment, I shall undertake to yield to all Senators who desire to have the floor for various purposes. I first yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished assistant majority leader to announce to the Senate that there will be no votes during the remainder of the session today.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTEREST RATES ON TREASURY ISSUES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today the President has sent us a message on debt management. At this time I should like to read the message to the Senate:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium-term and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore, that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1960.*

Mr. President, it is my understanding that such action by the Congress at this

time would be contrary to the understanding we had at the close of the last session with the leadership, namely, that the Congress would not take up the matter of an increase in the interest rate on the public debt or other matters relating to suspension of the historic interest-rate ceiling on the debt until we had received a report following a long study by the committee, headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of the Banking and Currency Committee. I am advised that the report is nearing completion.

So it would seem inappropriate for the Finance Committee—which has jurisdiction of the proposed legislation which the President is now demanding and insisting upon—now to begin the hearings without having the advice of the Senate committee which has specialized in this field and has spent considerable time in studying it. Then we can consider whether it is necessary to take action contrary to a principle which has been observed since the days of George Washington, namely, that the Congress has the right to set a statutory ceiling on the interest rates on long-term Government debt.

I think this matter should be understood by the country, as the President casually calls this an "archaic restriction on flexible debt management." Let me say that I believe we are already being "flexed" to death by the constant escalation—by means of administration-inspired moves, which have broken all records in recent history—of the cost of money on the short-term market. I, for one, am unable to understand how the action now requested would lower the interest charges on the money Uncle Sam borrows, which already is running in excess of $9 billion a year, on what Calvin Coolidge used to call "the rent on the money."

Such expenditures really produce nothing for Uncle Sam. Today our interest cost is more than $4 billion a year above our interest costs in 1953, and increased by $1 billion during the last year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Oklahoma inadvertently referred to the study being made by the committee headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a study being made by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, whereas, as a matter of fact, the study is being made by the Joint Economic Committee, which includes among its members distinguished Members of the other body, as well as distinguished Members of the Senate.

A staff report on this whole subject has already been printed and distributed. I am happy to note that the staff report takes the same general position as the one the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is taking, although in the press the report has been widely misquoted.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for that clarification.

Mr. President, certainly the step proposed by the President would be one of the most dangerous steps which the Congress could take, and I believe the issue involved is one of the most important to come before the Congress this year.

I do not know how much more strain in connection with the administration's high-interest-rate policy it will be possible to bear. The administration complains about the cost of borrowing the necessary funds. Yet the administration, through its various agencies, has done everything within its power to create the situation we now face and yet it now requests unlimited authority—authority never before enjoyed by any President in the history of our country. President Eisenhower asks for authority to wipe out all control over the interest rate on the long-term Government debt. Thus, in the dying days of this administration, we could be faced with Eisenhower bonds totaling hundreds of millions or billions, bearing a 5½ percent or 5¾ percent interest rate and running over 25 to 30 years.

If such a development were permitted to be made, if the Congress were foolish enough to yield to the request which now has been made of it, then, Mr. President, for the next 30 years the people of the country would have to pay the cost of that kind of mismanagement.

I do not think the Congress will buy that kind of a pig in a poke. I do not think the Congress intends to permit this administration—which claimed it wanted to inject business methods into Government operations—to do exactly the reverse of what every corporate manager would do. No corporate manager ever would attempt to finance long-term obligations at a time when interest rates were at their highest. Private business finances such long-term obligations when interest rates are low. At times when interest rates are at their peak—and at the present time they are virtually jumping over the moon—private business refinances its obligations on a short-term basis, and proceeds to use short-term financing until such time as the interest rates become lower.

Yet, Mr. President, today the administration is literally trying to drive the Congress—and let me say that I know of some of the pressures which have been put on the leaders of both congressional bodies—to pass the bill the President this year insists he needs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield again to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Oklahoma agree that if this effort by the President, on behalf of the bankers and money lenders of the country, is successful, it will inevitably result in mortgaging the future of our children and our grandchildren, by loading on the country an entirely unnecessary burden of high-interest-rate debt?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely right. It is asked these bonds be issued, without limit. The President does not suggest any limitation. He says, "Just trust me. Just trust our advisers"—these wonderful men who have made the interest rate jump over the moon, the very ones who have brought about the high interest rate crisis. We are asked to trust in them and told they will be able to manage the debt, which has been so grossly mismanaged until it is reaching a point almost of disaster.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall, will he not, that during a number of years of the Eisenhower administration, and in particular shortly after Mr. Robert Anderson became Secretary of the Treausry, interest rates were held down and that at that point it would have been entirely possible to refinance the long-term debt at interest rates hardly more than half of what they are now; and yet the Eisenhower administration never moved once to refinance the long-term debt? It waited until the interest rate was at the highest point before it asked for this move. I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for the speech he is making in opposition to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

The reason given by the administration at that time was that we were in a sort of Eisenhower recession—which was not a recession in the eyes of the Republicans—and that we should not withdraw money from the market because the credit was necessary for business expansion. I know what the market was then. Money was free, loose, and ready to be loaned; but the administration did not take advantage of it, and we are now paying the price in terms of the very interest rate about which the President is screaming.

The President is now asking us to invade the long-term market at a time when money is tighter than ever, when the Federal Reserve Board should have tried to relieve the demand for money. Meanwhile, twiddling their thumbs in their ivory tower, the Federal Reserve Board has been going blissfully along, tightening up credit, making it more difficult for the smaller businesses to borrow at reasonable rates. Because the interest rate is much higher than the rediscount rate which exists in the prime money market, small business is suffering; and each rise in the discount rate by the Federal Reserve Board tells all the money lenders, who always wish to receive the maximum possible interest that can be charged, that they should demand higher and higher interest for the offerings Uncle Sam makes.

So we have a chain reaction because the men who are running the fiscal policies and financing the Government, which already has a debt of about $280 billion, are allowing interest rates to escalate upward; and the end is not in sight.

Now the administration asks us to put ourselves into a 20- or 30-year debt so that we may be able to pay off, in 20 or 30 years, the folly and stupidity of a policy which we hope after January 20

next year will not be carried over into the new administration. I feel the history of the Democratic policy has shown that it has always tried to prevent exorbitant interest rates both for the Government and other borrowers.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Will not the Senator agree that if the increases are made in bond rates now to be paid for the next 20 or 30 years, they will create security and stability for the Wall Street group?

Mr. MONRONEY. They will create security and stability and also windfall profits for them, because Wall Street is not dumb when it comes to making money for themselves; but a policy which means money for them means the outpouring of tax dollars by the public. If Wall Street investors can get their hands on new offerings of bonds that pay 5 percent or more, they will be able to sell them at a great premium once the new administration takes office and reverses the escalation of interest rates.

Wall Street does not have to keep the investments for 20 or 30 years. It can sell the bonds at premium rates and get windfall profits, in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars, for taking advantage of the present tight money market—tight because this administration planned it that way—and at the same time it is nailing us to the cross of $4 billion in additional interest cost.

The administration's policy is resulting in higher interest rates to private business all over the country, because it is the Government rate that fixes the cost of borrowing money. No individual can hope to borrow, no matter how good his project nor how good his security, at a lower rate than the Government pays. This is the prime rate, because it represents the security and faith of the United States.

Mr. McGEE. Will the Senator agree that Wall Street can get more security out of such a policy by allowing that security to trickle down to those who have less security?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have never found that to be the case. It seems to me the trickle always ends when it leaves Wall Street.

Mr. McGEE. Is not this the philosophy that is offered in providing such an approach?

Mr. MONRONEY. We have always had tight money in Republican administrations. That kind of policy goes back through the history of our country, to the days of Andrew Jackson, when he had to move in and compete with the Bank of the United States, under the Biddle regime.

It always has been the policy of the Democratic Party to see that that trickle-down theory—which has always been discredited—is reversed. The Democrats have always followed the policy that prosperity must come from the ground level, and that from small business and wage earners comes a genuinely healthy prosperity, as nature nourishes the trees, foliage, flowers, and grain from the ground.

Mr. McGEE. Would not such a policy pursued for the benefit of Wall Street tend to save the people from inflation?

Mr. MONRONEY. That way of saving people from inflation is rather difficult for me to understand, because we have been told countless times that if we dared appropriate $50 million above the budget for a public health project or for cancer research or for the development of our natural resources, the expenditure of $50 million or $100 million would be inflationary.

We have been told we must not spend such additional amounts of money because they would increase the strain on the budget and create inflation—but at the same time we have been getting these lectures, every hour on the hour, because of our banker friends who run this administration, we have been increasing the budget—$1 billion even—during the last session of Congress by added interest costs. The cost of interest increased the budget $1 billion during the last session of Congress. That added to the cost $4 billion over the total sum for which the Democrats were handling practically the same amount of public debt.

So if it is appropriations that create inflation, as we have been told, then how do we escape inflation by an additional $4 billion cost for interest resulting from an erroneous and discredited policy? Yet the very men who have engineered that policy are asking us to give them power which no President since George Washington has ever had, and that is the power to issue long-term bonds without limitation as to interest, which they say is in the national interest.

We have found that some of the things which have been proclaimed by this administration to be in the national interest have been against the public interest. An additional interest cost of $4 billion to the taxpayers in the form of additional taxes certainly does not seem to me to be in the public interest.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for singling out what I think is the central question for the people to face in this very critical year. We can talk about peace. We can do wishful thinking about many other things. However, I think there is no greater issue at stake for the public to decide forthrightly than that of the whole economy of the country, which in effect has been strangled, as stated so well by the Senator from Oklahoma, by a tight money policy which is more concerned with the future security of a few in a very narrow area of the United States than with the productive capacity and the general welfare of the many.

I want to commend the Senator for his courage in bringing this subject before our people.

Interest rates also mean something to the people of Oklahoma and of Wyoming. These rates mean $200, $300 or $400 extra on the purchase of an automobile. They mean several thousand extra dollars on the purchase of a house. I think houses and automobiles and human necessities are far more important in bringing about increased productive capacity for the Nation than the securing of the highest possible interest rates for the bankers of Wall Street.

Again I commend the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend for his valuable contribution, because, as he says, the added $4 billion which we must spend annually now, because of the excessive cost of interest under this administration, could be used to improve the productivity of our country, the condition of our small businesses and of our farmers. It could be available so that money could be lent at a reasonable rate. However, since it is being used for interest alone it is denied use for any other purpose.

If the Congress did not exceed the President's budget estimates and the interest costs could be reduced to the levels which the Democrats maintained before the Republican administration took over—I hope the Senators will understand this, because it is important—the very same $4 billion of excessive added interest rates we are paying today would be available to us to reduce the public debt. We therefore would drive down the interest rates, because we would be liquidating $4 billion of public debt each year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Republican administration, by getting the interest rate higher instead of liquidating the debt, compel the Government to keep spending more and more and more for the rent of the money, instead of retiring the debt itself.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would not the action which the Senator advocates have retarded the inflationary forces and given us an opportunity to put the brakes on inflation, about which the President is so interested?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would have been the greatest single contribution which could have been made toward retarding inflation in a way which would not have been destructive. It would have meant taking out of circulation $4 billion in bonds—taking it out of the monetary base, for which the banks can issue credit of about 6 to 1 of their holdings of these bonds. Consequently, we would have been acting in a wise way and we would have been reducing the strain on the taxpayer. We would have eliminated not only $4 billion of outstanding debt, but the interest that must be paid each year on the additional $4 billion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the spiraling interest rate, conversely, have a very inflationary effect?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should say it does, because if the interest rate goes up, as it has gone up, for small business, for

industry, for automobile manufacturers, for automobile buyers, and for all the various others who are affected by spiraling interest rates, there is an addition to the cost of living, to the cost of the product the customer buys, to the cost of equipment the small businessman buys, to the cost of the home the GI buys, and on through the chain. All of this must be reflected, because the wages of money, the same as the wages of the people, have to be accounted for in the ultimate price.

Despite this, the administration, which rails at the idea of increasing the minimum wage to a bare living existence amount, claiming it to be inflationary, thinks nothing about the added steps of inflationary cost for the interest component, for the wages of money, which business is paying, or which the finance companies are exacting as they finance the automobile so necessary for the workman's transit to and from work, or the home a man needs to live in, or many other factors which go into the cost of living.

Mr. McGEE and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall yield first to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who was previously questioning me.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, nothing more eloquently attests to the truth of the Senator's observation or to the point of the question of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee than the fact that the present administration is deploring inflation at a time of tight money. What better illustrates the fact that tight money does not obviate the fears of inflation?

I think this is a process involving considerably more than the inflating of the cost of a GI home. This process also inflates the cost of a Senator's home. Senators are people, too.

Mr. MONRONEY. And Senators buy their homes on time, I will say.

Mr. McGEE. I should like to give the Senator some figures which I think may be interesting at this point.

When I came to Washington a year ago I had to buy a house at what I suppose one would say was an inflated Washington, D.C., real estate price. It was a very simple house, but it cost, nonetheless, $27,000. Had I been able to finance my house in Washington, D.C., at the rate of interest which was the rate under the Truman administration instead of the rate of interest we are talking about now, which is being required by and requested by this administration, I would have been able to finance my house for approximately $9,000 less. I am not referring to eliminating interest charges; I simply refer to $9,000 less of interest charges. This is the result of the spiraling of interest rates.

This is why it seems to me the time has come to call a halt. Instead of being concerned, as the White House has been, about increasing maximum interest rates, I think the time has come to fight for maximum production rates, in contrast.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He is absolutely correct. This interest bite goes from the very lowest to the very highest, for living expenses, for payments on homes, and everything else.

I think the figures show that in the case of the average GI home the cost of interest has gone so high that the GI must at least sacrifice one room, and possibly one and a half rooms, if he is to have a house for the same money and for the same monthly payments; or, if he wishes to carry the loan longer, he can make payments for an additional 10 years, and finally own the same home.

This is the present, this is the gift, this is the legacy of a discredited policy which is being imposed upon the Government and which has been imposed upon the people of the country. Now we are being asked to compound the error. We are being asked to remove the historic ceiling which has existed through two world wars, through the war in Korea, through the great major depression, and through a whole series of minor Eisenhower recessions.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma regard it as an accurate statement that the President expressed dismay in his state of the Union message about the fact that in this year the total interest charges on our national debt will exceed $9 billion, and then went on to prescribe as his solution still higher interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. The higher interest rates are to be paid to lower the Government's interest costs. This is the neatest trick of the week, or of the year.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not also an accurate statement that in 1953, when this administration took power, one of its first official acts was deliberately to increase the interest rate on the national debt?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator have available the figures to show what the total added cost has been to the taxpayers of the United States resulting from the increase in interest rates which has occurred since 1953, when this administration made that deliberate decision?

Mr. MONRONEY. I could get that information. I do not have it at this time because there was a quorum call, and I was not able to obtain it.

The figure now is $4 billion plus, perhaps $4½ billion added cost for the current year. It was about $3.5 billion last year. The cost has progressed upward with accelerating speed.

The more accustomed the bankers become to the friendly environment, shall we say, of big business in this administration, the greater has been the greed, the greater has been the insistence, and the greater has been the management of Government finances in behalf of these people, with a very valued assist downtown from every single agency of Government which has anything to do with the issuance of Government securities or of Government-guaranteed securities.

These are the Siamese twins. The nearest thing to a Government bond is a Government-guaranteed security; yet the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and many other Democratic Senators have consistently called attention to the escalation of the Government guaranteed home mortgages, the GI home loans, and the FHA mortgages.

They started at about 4 percent. Gradually, with each session with the excuse that they wished to end the vicious discounting system, administration officials succeeded in persuading the homebuilders and building and loan people, and others, that the way to loosen up money, the way to avoid a vicious discount system, was to raise the interest rates on these GI loans. They had statutory authority to raise the rates on FHA loans. But as the interest rates on the GI loans were raised, it was necessary to raise the interest rates on FHA loans because they are so closely connected. But with each raise in the case of Government-guaranteed mortgages, which are most nearly comparable to Government bonds, they acted as an escalator to pull higher and ever higher the interest rates on Government bonds.

So the housing loans, which run into billions of dollars a year, find themselves again after the raise in competition with an escalating interest rate because of Government policies. So the administration comes back to the Congress and recommends a higher interest rate, an increase of one-half of 1 percent, or three-quarters of 1 percent, on guaranteed housing loans. That request is granted, and the Government bonds move up to their proper ratio with the legislated increase in the housing loans, which are guaranteed almost as though they were genuine Government securities.

So we have had the merriest song of escalation, to the great delight of Wall Street, those who control the limited amount of long-term investment capital.

No one has shown, in the Treasury's presentation, that anything done in raising the interest rate will bring a greater flow of long-term investment capital. The nearest we can come to relating long-term investment capital to Government bonds is that U.S. bonds draw from the same pool of long-term money from which Government guaranteed home mortgages, under the FHA and GI loans also are financed.

After being taken for a buggy ride four or five times, on the theory that raising interest rates would cause money to flow in, we find that they must be increased again and again. That theory should be discredited by now; yet we are asked to do it again.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the Senator from Oklahoma is rendering a great service today in bringing this subject to our attention on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that his service is in closest conformity with what has been the traditional role of the Democratic Party, as a party of the working people, of the farmers, of the small independent businessmen, who have opposed high interest rates.

By the same token, it seems to me that if Rip Van Winkle were to go to sleep at any given period in the history of this country, when he woke up all he would need to do would be to ask, "How high are the interest rates?" If they were up near the ceiling, he would know that the Republicans had taken over the national administration.

True to that kind of behavior, the present Republican administration undertook, as one of its first official acts, a deliberate move to increase the interest rate on the Federal debt.

As the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has so well pointed out, both with respect to the Government debt and with respect to the VA and FHA loans, each year the administration has come back to the Congress and said, "Do not be alarmed about the present interest rate. The real problem is to channel money in, to refinance the debts, to obtain the necessary capital for the FHA and Veterans' Administration loans. The solution to the problem is to increase the interest rate still further."

Here we are, 7 years later. None of these problems is solved, and the President of the United States expresses his dismay when he observes that the interest on the Federal debt in the present year exceeds $9 billion. His prescription is to raise interest rates still further. This seems to me to prove that these gentlemen cannot learn by experience. Let us hope that the Congress can. If our experience demonstrates that raising interest rates will solve none of these problems, but will merely aggravate them still further, let us profit by that experience.

Mr. MONRONEY. I could not agree more thoroughly with what my distinguished colleague from Idaho has said. He has been in the forefront of the fight against the great policy of error which is creating a crisis. We must understand that under this administration the things which happen in the administration are not necessarily known to the President.

Although his administration has been in power for 7 years, and is nearing the end of its term, he has only now become acutely aware of the fact that he has been able, through his policies and those of his administration, to double the interest cost, on approximately the same amount of public debt.

Then he says that the way to remedy the situation is to be able to pay more for interest, and to cement the high interest rate as a legacy, so that we shall never forget President Eisenhower as we pay off the 6, 7, 8, or 10 percent Government bonds which, over 30 years, is the answer to the Wall Street dream. This is better than "The Night Before Christmas." This is actually "The Night Before Christmas" throughout the year, or throughout the remainder of the present year, and up until January 20, 1961, when we hope an administration with fiscal sanity will take over and readjust.

We should put the Federal Reserve Board and the bank, as an agency of stabilization of this Government, at least on speaking terms with the facts of life. Today the Federal Reserve Bank holds practically no bonds which mature in less than 1 year, and this in a period of time when there is the greatest pressure on the long-term market, and when the Treasury is urging long-term investments and is willing to break the historic ceiling on the interest rate in order to get more money. But the Federal Reserve Board, an arm of the Government, is withdrawing from this element of investment.

I was amazed to read, on the New York Times financial page, the record-breaking interest rates, and the bargains which were available. The Federal Reserve could go into the open market and buy, at tremendous discounts, these very same Government bonds.

According to the New York Times of January 5, at the close 13 issues of Treasury debt were selling at prices to yield more than 5 percent. Eight issues were discount bills due from next June to October. The others were as follows: 2½s of November 1961, 5.2 percent; 3¾s of November 1962, 5.03 percent; 2¼s of August 1963, 5.09 percent; 2⅝s of February 1963, at 5.10 percent.

It would seem to me—and I do not have the total amount of this outstanding debt—that, if these issues are pending on the market, perhaps it might depress the interest rates demanded if the Federal Reserve were to make a few investments in the greatest and most stable credit in the world, the U.S. bonds, which are kicking around at this great discount. However, I suppose that would not be quite sporting in Republican circles, or that it might be called unfair, because it would be evidentiary material for the Wall Street bankers to advise, "We must bid above 5 percent so long as these terms are pending in these various issues."

They have been doing everything within their power to force up the interest rates. Consequently, we are in the dilemma of being asked to violate a course of action which has been in existence since George Washington's time and to give to President Eisenhower authority to put us deeper into debt.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Constitution is very explicit in giving Congress the right to regulate our money?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. That is one of the prime duties of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As a matter of fact, the Constitution specifies that power in article I, section 8, subparagraphs 2 and 5, I believe. Is it not a fact that the President is asking us to relinquish the only remaining power we have over interest rates, when he asks us to raise the 4¼-percent interest limit.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. Until 1918 Congresses held the power with respect to the rate of interest and the power to set the amount of the debt issue. Under Carter Glass, in order to speed the financing of World War I Congress yielded its power to fix the debt issue amount and never got it back. Very few people know that Congress had that power or that it was traditional. Carter Glass was permitted by Congress to handle the financing of the war as to bond issue amounts but Congress fixed the long-term interest ceiling at 4¼ percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We talk about the erosion of legislative power. Would this proposal not be a surrender by Congress of a very important power which it still retains and which the Constitution explicitly and directly gives to Congress? Would it not be a surrender of that power to the Executive?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true. Beyond that, it would be putting this power into the hands of whoever the President's designee was. I am sure it would not be the President himself, because I am confident he is even less familiar with this subject than he is with others. He would designate someone to exercise these powers. It would not be the Secretary of the Treasury, because he is busy with other things. It would be delegated to an old-fashioned, orthodox banker. There has been a quarantine in Government on new ideas which have been suggested even by Republican Members. The ideas which have been suggested to modernize savings bonds have been quarantined. As a matter of fact, in the case of savings bonds, we are still issuing a 1939 package in the year 1960. That has been the case with respect to the suggestion made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to revise the interest rate payments, so that they would carry a level rate, instead of the present payments.

Instead, they are following the orthodoxy of a past time, and thus we find ourselves without any new ideas on that subject. It is strange indeed that in a job of such magnitude so little marketing advice has been called in from the outside, other than from the moneylenders themselves. The rates that are suggested for these bonds come from the moneylenders themselves from the big Wall Street financiers. I do not believe that is in the best interest of the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator has referred, as have several of our other colleagues, to Wall Street. I am sure that when the Republicans hear us refer to Wall Street they think that the Democrats are reverting to it as a political symbol. We do not mean that at all.

I know that the Senator from Oklahoma and our other colleagues are conscientious and sincere, and certainly I could not be more serious in that regard. During the last congressional recess, while I was in my home State of Wisconsin, I made it a point to visit the small bankers. As a matter of fact, the

Wall Street Journal and the New York Times said that President Eisenhower was calling on the bankers and others to talk to Senators and Representatives, to persuade them that the 4¼ percent limit should be eliminated.

I made it a point, while I was in Wisconsin, to talk to every smalltown banker in the towns I visited during the recess. As a result of my talking with these smalltown bankers I found that either they had no interest in the subject or they supported our position and were opposed to the position of the President of the United States.

They said, "If these interest rates continue to rise, we will be damaged, and we will lose money. Of course, it is true that we will receive more money on our loans, but we will be damaged."

The smalltown bankers have 50 or from 65 to 75 percent of their deposits in time deposits, against which they have to pay interest. The Wall Street bankers have only 3 or 4 or at most 6 percent of their deposits in time deposits. Their deposits are overwhelmingly in demand deposits.

Naturally the interest proposal is wonderful for Wall Street, but it does not help the small bankers at all. It does not help the local country bankers at all.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely right. Just as my colleague said earlier in the debate, "They have planned it that way." It was done by the "Humphrey-Dumphries," and has resulted in the present dilemma. If a small banker held $100,000 of these bonds at par, and they go down to 85—as has happened—they lose $15,000 by Mr. Humphrey's act. A burnt child hates fire. At the same time the Treasury cannot understand why small bankers, having been burnt by the bear raid by Wall Street on the "Humphrey-Dumphrey" issues, are not willing to buy more Government bonds.

They cannot understand why so many small bankers, at the very prospect that Congress might be willing to give what the President is asking for, should say, "Don't try to talk to us about any more bonds. We have had our bath. We have taken our licking. We do not want any more manipulations of this kind in Government bonds, We do not want any further decrease in the value of our bondholdings. We cannot afford to hold them." They are not prepared to take that kind of loss.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The small bankers are deeply concerned with the action of the Treasury inflating the 10-month 5-percent issue. I found in many cases they were deeply concerned. I do not wish to detain the Senator any longer or to interrupt him further, but I should like to address a few more remarks to him.

I should like to point out that the effect on the independent businessman and the home buyer and the car buyer is a kind of selective inflation. It is true that some economists believe that there may be some effect with respect to diminishing inflation if interest rates are increased. That theory has been advanced. However, the best that can be said for it is that it is channeling inflation into areas where it is necessary to borrow money to pay for money in order to make purchases.

It channels inflation into home buying and automobile buying, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said so well, and also, and particularly, into school construction and hospital construction. There is no question in my mind that the cost of the present hard-money policy to school construction has been greater than the benefit which would be received by the most generous proposal that has been made on the floor of the Senate to benefit school construction.

The increased cost to localities for building schools has simply been devastating because of the hard-money policy. The cost has increased 20, 30, or 40 percent, as the interest rate has increased since 1952.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the communities will be paying that debt for 20 or 30 years, because they are issuing long-term bonds at recordbreaking interest rates. It is a travesty on the future educational policies of the country to tie the smallest and least able communities to these bonds for 20 or more years because they are retirable only serially; they cannot be picked up and refinanced, as many of the blue ribbon or blue chip debentures can be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It means also that many schools which should be built are not being built. Many hospitals which should be built are not being built. We talk about the importance of growth in our economy. All of us want it. Republicans and Democrats alike. But it is perfectly obvious that when 4, 5, or 6 percent of the working force of the Nation is unemployed, and a large part of our resources are unemployed, high interest rates are preventing us from getting the kind of production growth we need.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct. Has it ocurred to him—I am sure it has—that this policy is also doing a great disservice to our country, because it is becoming increasingly possible to accelerate the combinations of huge businesses by the liquidation of small business?

During the depression, I ran a small business. During times of tight money, the ability of small businessmen to borrow for their inventories, to carry their accounts, or perhaps to provide for expansion, is meager indeed. The banker is tougher and more grim looking. He wants a greater degree of security. With tighter money, he can be more selective. He can favor the rich, those more able to pay, those having the largest reserves. So it is often a psychological thing.

I have heard from many of my small-business friends, who say to me, "I am simply throwing in the sponge. I know the bank does not wish to carry me, because every time I renew my note, I am told I must reduce the amount materially, since money is tight, and interest rates are going up."

Many fine banks do not put the squeeze on their customers, particularly country banks and smaller banks, where the personal relationship has existed from father to son, and so on. But they are compelled to ask for an earlier liquidation of the loans. So after a few trips back and forth to the bank, and having the favor of renewal, and hearing a lecture from the banker of how tight money is, the borrower is told, "I do not think we will be able to renew the note the next time."

So the vision of what he can throw overboard in a liquidation sale makes that man's mind up that there is no place in this administration for small business. Bankruptcies are bad enough; but the voluntary liquidations which are taking place because of the tight money policy, and because of the cruel attrition in the financing, which was available under Democratic administrations to carry small business, are numerous.

Has the Senator noticed the increased number of appeals to see if anything can be done to help get a loan from the Small Business Administration? My mail has increased 10 times over what it was 10 years ago in this respect, because the normal sources of credit have been drying up, and in a last gasp of desperation borrowers are seeking to keep their small businesses alive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have, indeed, noticed that. I am the chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, so I am very conscious of the fact that the demands on the Small Business Administration have, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, increased greatly. It is a serious question as to how this problem can be solved. Obviously, the Small Business Administration cannot do it. This is but a tiny fraction of the number of businesses which need help. The great majority of small businesses may feel that no agency in Washington can help them. There are only a few which are active and aggressive and can do the job. The number of small businesses which need help, as the Senator has pointed out, constitute many hundreds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Has it occurred to the Senator from Wisconsin that the tight money policy can help create inflation? Let us say that all interest payments are deductible from the income tax. An interest payment of $1,000 by a person who is in the 25-percent bracket has small value as an income tax deduction. He gets some credit for it. But the people who are borrowing large sums today, and are willing to pay all the interest which is necessary to get the money—and suppose it runs 8 percent or 10 percent—and happen to be, as I am not, in the $200,000-a-year income bracket.

They can afford to pay 8 or 10 percent for the money. If they are in a high income tax bracket, such as the 90-percent bracket, they can deduct most of interest cost. So their net cost if they paid interest on a 10-percent basis, and were in the 90-percent bracket, would be only 1 percent. The Government would be subsidizing them for 9 percent. Yet these are the very sources of inflationary investment and expansion which exists today.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And there is discrimination. It is an advantage to the man who has an enormous income, and a disadvantage to the man who does not have it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The greater the income, the larger the tax subsidy, we might say, through the ductibility of the interest rate he pays. If he is in a high bracket, he can certainly do well. No wonder those who deal in big money are pushing the interest rates up, because they are freezing out the ribbon clerks. They are making it easy for those of wealth, particularly if Uncle Sam is footing nine-tenths of the bill for the interest rate they pay.

Small, hard-pressed corporations, like United States Steel, Bethlehem Steel, and Aluminum Corp. of America, with their huge earnings and their correspondingly large profits, are, through interest deductibility, letting Uncle Sam pick up 51 percent of the cost of all the interest they pay. So if they are borrowing money at 6 percent, the going, net rate to them is less than 3 percent. But the Government is "Uncle Sap." When he pays 5 percent, he is paying a real 5 percent. He cannot deduct as a business expense his own interest rate. He cannot deduct it from the budget or anywhere else. United States Steel, Aluminum Corp. of America, General Electric, and any other of the large corporations, and many of the medium-sized corporations, because of the deductibility feature with respect to interest, are actually borrowing money cheaper than Uncle Sam can borrow it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware, of course, that we Democrats are often branded by our colleagues across the aisle as reckless spenders. Is it not fair to say that most of those who so brand us are avowed backers of the Republican tight-money policy?

Mr. MONRONEY. I think all the test votes have shown that there are very few deviations from the Republican school of higher interest rates and tight money.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator suppose that if those very gentlemen were given carte blanche authority to proceed to cut waste and to trim the fat from all the activities of the Government in every feasible way open to them, they could possibly effect a saving which would be so great as what their tight-money policy has cost the taxpayers of the country?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad the Senator from Idaho mentioned that. There is no means by which they could save in appropriations the $4 billion of extra added interest cost to Uncle Sam, let alone save the $20 billion or $30 billion it is costing the taxpayers, because of the higher interest rates they too must pay.

Perhaps it has occurred to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who has been very much interested in this subject, as well as in others, that the earned income from interest is of a peculiar type. Perhaps the internal revenue laws were planned in that way; I do not know.

But if there is an $18 billion or $20 billion income from agriculture, as it increases, the tax is paid on the relative increase in the profits made. On the other hand, in the case of interest, there is somewhat of a difference. I think the Federal Reserve Board is estimating the amount of income from interest now at nearly $20 billion a year. The cost of $50 billion of our debt is relatively small, because the Government pays a low-interest rate to the American citizens who buy the defense bonds. Incidentally, they are the ones who have the greatest faith in the Government; they demonstrate that by their purchases of those bonds with their small savings. But they are receiving the lowest rate of interest. At a time when Wall Street is charging 5.1 percent or 5.9 percent or more, the American citizens who buy the defense bonds are accepting the low interest rate which those savings bonds bear. They have faith in Uncle Sam. The interest they collect usually is taxed as personal income, often in the 25- or 30-percent bracket.

On the other hand, the large amounts of short-term Government high interest obligations are held by insurance companies, savings institutions, and other large concerns; and the interest they receive on the Government obligations they purchase rarely gets back into the tax stream which results from the ordinary interest income. So the Government not only loses as a result of the tax deductibility of personal or corporate interest expense available to such large personal incomes, but the Government also fails to collect a full measure of taxes on the interest earned by those who can claim special privileges such as mutual insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and so forth, who have special tax privileges.

So we find that it all adds up to the establishment of a very favored position or a very nice, cozy little club, let us say.

However, there are some good signs. For instance, yesterday I was delighted to read in the New York Times that finally the great mystery of where one goes to buy a Government bond other than a defense bond is being solved by the small investors. I think that is important, because those who usually have controlled the strategy in connection with the merchandising and the marketing of such Government bonds have been rather secretive about the practice followed, and very few persons who had $1,000 or $2,000 or $5,000 to invest in other Government bonds seemed to know how to go about buying such securities.

So I was indeed delighted to read in yesterday's edition of the New York Times the following:

PUBLIC DISCOVERS U.S. BILL MARKET—INSTITUTIONS ARE SWAMPED BY INQUIRIES FOR THE NEW TREASURY ISSUE

(By Albert L. Kraus)

The public discovered the Treasury bill market yesterday and sent bankers scurrying to textbooks to help explain how it operates.

Mr. President, the dispatch came from New York—not from Oshkosh or Kalamazoo or Okmulgee, Okla.—and was published in the New York Times. From the article we learn that when the people demanded an opportunity to purchase the 5-percent Government bonds, in many cases it was necessary for the bankers to consult the textbooks, in order to determine how to explain just how the procedure operated.

I read further from the article, which was published in the New York Times on January 12:

Lured by predictions that the Treasury's special offering today of $1,500 million of 1-year bills might be sold at prices to bring investors 5 percent and possibly 5¼ percent, investors flooded banks, savings banks, and investment houses with inquiries about the issue.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, where bids will be accepted until 1:30 p.m. today, reported hundreds of telephone calls and a lineup of investors, cash in hand, ready to buy.

Mr. President, certainly that beats Macy's bargain basement. The public has found out what is going on in Wall Street, and they want in on the new, high yield, 5-percent Government bonds, which have so long been such a great mystery to the small investors who wanted to buy them.

I read further from the article:

By way of contrast, the regular weekly bill auctions yesterday occasioned only the routine interest of Government securities dealers and other professionals.

Mr. President, I have heard about professional wrestling being fixed; and now we are hearing about these professionals, according to the New York Times.

I read further:

Bankers, in many cases, were forced to confess to depositors who wanted to shift funds from savings accounts into the new bills that they weren't entirely sure how the auction worked. After a bit of quick research, however, a number were able to explain that—

Unlike other Government securities, which are usually sold at $1,000 and bear interest in regular installments, Treasury bills are sold at a discount from their redemption price. An investor realizes his return by appreciation of the bill to $1,000 at maturity.

Bills are sold at auction, with prices and return to investors determined by the strength of the bidding, in contrast to other Government securities which are offered at fixed interest rates. Thus, in contrast to the Treasury's offering last October of its "magic 5"—5-percent, 4-year, 10-month notes—the return to investors on today's bill offering won't be known until all the bids are in and tallied. This may not be until a late hour tonight.

Small investors may buy $1,000 to $400,000 in bills ($200,000 in the regular weekly auctions) without naming a price merely by indicating on their bids how many they want. This indicates their willingness to accept the average price determined in the competitive bidding.

These noncompetitive bids are then awarded in full. Competitive bidders, usually professional, have to take their chances with what is left.

Because of the considerable interest in today's issue, Government securities dealers estimated that the noncompetitive bidding might total $500 million, compared with their earlier estimates of $300 million. They guessed that this might cut the rate discount on the new issue to 5.05 to 5.10 percent.

Bankers said that while investors were flooding them with inquiries, withdrawals

were smaller than those in October to purchase the "magic 5s." The Bowery Savings Banks, for instance, reported 60 withdrawals totaling $327,000. On the first day after announcement of the "magic 5s," it lost $3,400,000.

The article shows that if the public are let "in" on how to buy such Government bonds, they will not exact the last ounce of blood, by trying to reach the very top of the interest rate available.

In connection with this matter, about which even many of the New York bankers are uncertain at a time of crisis in obtaining funds to finance the Government.

Why has not our great Government, explained its fiscal facts of life? It has propaganda agencies by the score. In every department and agency in Washington they have writers who could get this information into the newspapers, and on the radio, and the television. This way they could show the people of the country how they, too, can enjoy a 5-percent return on a Government bond for 5 years or slightly less.

So, Mr. President, I think it high time for the Congress, after the report of the committee headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to hear from the Treasury. I am sure they will ask some very searching questions about why someone has not been "tending the store," why someone has not been taking affirmative action to reverse the ever-accelerating trend to stratospheric interest rates.

Two men could do that very easily. I venture to say that two speeches, if made in earnest, and if they demonstrated a determination to do something about this matter, could reverse this ever-accelerating trend that is leading to higher and higher interest rates. If President Eisenhower would state, in a speech, that this process has gone on long enough, and that the Government intends to move to break the bottleneck on the Government's financing and the ever-increasing exaction of interest; and, second, if Mr. Martin, the head of the Federal Reserve Board, would state in a speech that the Board is ready to go back into open market operations, which served the Government so well during the gigantic financial operations necessary in World War II—such action would lower the interest rates; and once they started to go down hill, I think they would continue to go down hill, because the operation that is keeping the interest rates at these high levels is more or less an artificial "bear" raid.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say that the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, by changing their present policies, could lower the interest rates, without any substantial inflationary effect, by supporting the Government bond market?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly say so; and I would say that they themselves have the power, with the degree to which they go into open market operations where these bonds are placed, to limit in any way they wish the inflationary impact by their very operations.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator not agree with me that it would be most unwise for the Senate of the United States to consent to an increase in the interest debt ceiling unless and until the present monetary and fiscal policies of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury were drastically changed?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would certainly say that is true; and I would say that putting this unlimited power in the hands of the men who have gotten us into this position would be foolish in the extreme. They have not demonstrated the competence to manage the public debt; and to give them the power to saddle us with such a recordbreaking interest rate for another 20 or 30 years would be the most tragic disservice to this Nation and to our children and children's children, who would have to pay for this folly, that the Congress could do.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has long been an expert on the subject of residential housing and construction. Does not the Senator agree that these high interest rates operate adversely on the construction of housing which is badly needed by the families of America?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree; and I have the testimony and communications from almost all the homebuilders in my State, who now say the interest-rate cost and the shortage of money and the continued discounting of Government guaranteed mortgages are literally wrecking the homebuilding industry and denying the man with an average income the opportunity to buy and to provide for his family a home of minimum standards.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is familiar with the fact that there is a special subcommittee to investigate the subject of unemployment, the chairman of which is the Senator from Minnesota. I have the honor to serve on that committee. Will not the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that reemployment and employment are being actively deterred by tight money and high interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do, because the larger the percentage of the cost of buying or building that flows into interest, the lesser the amount that can flow into construction of housing or purchase of goods. It is obvious that the greater the diversion of money which must be made to pay "rent" on the money, as I have stated, the lesser the amount that can be paid for construction of houses or purchase of goods.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree that tight money and higher interest rates are inhibiting desirable increased national economic growth?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that, and agree to it, and also say that policy has added to the inflationary impact. There has never been during this period, while we have continued to have inflationary increases in our living costs, a shortage in supply of any single basic item I know of.

Mr. CLARK. So we do not have a situation of too much money chasing too few goods?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no "classic inflation." Yet the administration, while every sign or scrap of evidence indicates this is not a "classic inflation," is giving us the remedy that is prescribed in the books on economics to treat "classic inflations." That is the same as giving a person a vaccination for smallpox when he has mumps.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oklahoma has made reference to banks, with relation to the high interest policy. I wonder if he will join me in a unanimous-consent request that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the January 3, 1960, issue of the New York Times, entitled "Banks Will Show Record Earnings," from which it appears that 1959 was the most prosperous year in history for banks, and that was due largely to the interest rates?

Mr. MONRONEY. That must have been the segment of our economy to which the President referred when he spoke about the prosperity of the economy. He was not looking beyond Wall Street.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKS WILL SHOW RECORD EARNINGS—A HIGHER RETURN ON LOANS IS THE RESULT OF RISING RATES OF INTEREST—GAIN HERE PUT AT 13.8 PERCENT—1959 PROFIT INCREASE OF 9 PERCENT FOR BIG INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER AREAS SIGHTED

(By Albert L. Kraus)

Banks across the Nation will begin this week to report record operating earnings for 1959.

Unlike 1958, when the Federal Reserve permitted an increase of $15 billion in bank loans and investments, the improvement will reflect chiefly the banks' ability to clear a higher return on their portfolios.

For, although earnings assets rose less than $6 billion in 1959, rising interest rates permitted the banks to improve substantially their return on loans. From an average of 4.17 percent, the 1958 low point, interest rates on short-term business loans in 19 large cities had risen to 5.27 percent by September. In New York City, the rise was from 3.88 percent to 5.15 percent.

Not only have rising interest rates benefited banks' incomes, but the banks have continued to shift out of lower yielding Government securities into higher yielding business and consumer loans. In 1958, the banks added $8,200 million to their holdings of Government securities and those of Federal agencies. Last year, they sold $7,200 million. At the same time, they increased their loans to business $5,600 million, their mortgage loans and their consumer loans $2,700 million each.

SOME FEEL SQUEEZE

All banks, however, have not shared equally in the improvement in operating earnings. For "retail banks"—those dependent on the business of small savers and borrowers—the rising cost of savings deposits, of branch system operations and of promotion have kept expenses cheek-to-jowl behind climbing gross income.

For the "wholesale banks"—those dependent on large business customers—the tendency of corporations over recent years to hold their deposits to a minimum, to shop competitively for bank services, and to turn

over their funds more rapidly has produced a similar squeeze on earnings.

On balance, however, the banks in the major money centers—and among these the "wholesale" banks—should show the greatest improvement for 1959. For one thing, although their return on loans tends to fall more rapidly than that of retail banks in a period of declining interest rates, it tends to rise more rapidly in a recovery. For another, their break-even points are lower.

BANKS HERE FARE WELL

M. A. Schapiro & Co., bank stock dealer, estimates that the 8 New York City banks among the 25 largest in the Nation should show a 13.8 percent increase in net operating earnings for 1959 over the level of 1958. In contrast, the other 17 banks—among them the big retail branch system banks on the Pacific coast—are expected to show a gain of only 9 percent.

The New York banks report capital funds equal to 11.8 percent of their deposits, the other 17, to 8.9 percent. Because of this relatively greater capitalization, the New York banks continue to show an operating return on capital funds smaller than other banks in the top 25, 9.38 percent against 10.73 percent. M. A. Schapiro & Co. notes, however, that the New York banks' return on capital has risen from 5.77 percent over the last 10 years.

Operating earnings do not tell the whole story of how the banks are doing. By definition, they exclude profits and losses on securities. And most banks will show sizable losses in their bond accounts for 1959.

But this is an entirely normal occurrence. As interest rates rise, the market value of securities in a bank's portfolio declines. Because the bulk of these securities are U.S. Government obligations, there is no question about their ultimately being redeemed at full value.

A bank may hold its bonds to maturity and avoid losses, but to do so will mean some sacrifice of return. Or it may realize its bond losses, obtain a tax benefit, and switch into higher yielding securities. The banks that show the largest bond losses, thus, often show the sharpest rise in operating earnings.

The choice between holding bonds to maturity and switching often is not simple. For some banks, realization of bond account losses may require dipping into undivided profits, part of the bank's capital funds.

For institutions unable or unwilling to raise additional capital, this means that acceptance of a lower rate of earnings growth sometimes is preferable to going outside the organization for funds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have a request from the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to have printed in the RECORD a statement in which he expresses his regret at being unable to be on the Senate floor at this time, and which is a commendation of the Senator from Oklahoma for the splendid address he has been making in the Senate this afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I regret that I am unable to be on the Senate floor at this time to commend the Senator from Oklahoma for the presentation he is making today.

The request of the President for higher interest rates on long-term Government bonds and on savings bonds is but another step in the direction of the tight-money, economic restriction policy his administration has continuously pursued. It was in February of 1953 that I became one of the first Senators to rise in the Senate to protest the interest rate boost announced by the newly inaugurated administration. Since then, its tight money policy has hampered the economic development of the entire Nation. Its adverse effect upon housing and consequently upon the lumber industry with which we are so concerned in Oregon has been documented time and again. Yet we are again being served up more of the same.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has led the fight in the Senate for an interest rate policy on the financial transactions of the Federal Government which would encourage the steady economic growth of the Nation. He has been a wise and valiant leader in the interest of the American people on this matter, and I wish to associate myself with the views he is expressing.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma for the fine address he is making and for the thorough manner in which he is calling the attention of the people to the deleterious effect on our general economy of the unconscionable increase in interest rates.

I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the homebuilders of Texas have stated to me that the effect on homebuilding in my State is exactly the same as that which the Senator stated it was in Oklahoma. It is interfering with housing construction. It is depriving many families of the opportunity to acquire homes. That is one phase of the problem.

I express my appreciation for the excellent and thorough manner in which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is bringing this matter to the attention of the Nation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. Mr. President, finally, in closing, I would merely like to say that, in addition to all the other things I have said about the lack of wisdom of giving this unlimited authority to the administration to pay higher interest rates in order to reduce the Government interest rate, another very cogent reason exists for not giving the President this authority. It is that the administration has never tried to use the 4¼-percent interest rate for which authority has been granted since 1918. How does the administration know it cannot sell bonds at 4¼ percent interest?

We know that in a rather tight market, on a short term slightly under 5 years, the "magic 5s" were tremendously oversubscribed.

Certainly without finding out what we should pay, in ways other than accepting the unverified word or perhaps the guess of those who manage the money market in New York, it might be wise to try out the 4¼-percent figure before we give President Eisenhower and the people who have put us in this fix authority no other President of the United States has ever had.

RECESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1960:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Ward P. Allen, of Virginia.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
William D. Wright, of the District of Columbia.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph Mintzes, of Pennsylvania.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America:

Merritt N. Cootes, of Oregon.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harold E. Howland, of Virginia.
Norman F. Johnson, of Maryland.
Barney B. Taylor, of Michigan.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

George A. Landry, of New Hampshire.
T. Howard Peters, of Washington.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry W. Kemp, of Pennsylvania.
Harry Kushner, of California.
Thomas E. Summers, of California.

Now Foreign Service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Chris C. Pappas, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Spiros A. Siafacas, of Florida.
Miss Anita R. Wharton, of Florida.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Frances L. Adams, of Arizona,
Mrs. Ethel Balashova, of California.
Roger A. Provencher, of Colorado.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David Anderson, of New York.
Rodney E. Armstrong, of California.
Donald P. Black, of California.

Richard L. Bowen, of South Dakota.
Thomas Gordon Brown, Jr., of New Mexico.
John Allen Buche, of Indiana.
John B. Connely, of California.
John P. Crawford, of Ohio.
Douglas James Harwood, of Connecticut.
Marvin W. Humphreys, of the District of Columbia.
Robert E. Kaufman, of the District of Columbia.
Kenneth A. Kurze, of Rhode Island.
Paul L. Laase, of Nebraska.
Stephen J. Ledogar, of New York.
Jon S. Lodeesen, of Tennessee.
Edward V. Nef, of the District of Columbia.
Jack R. Perry, of Georgia.
Paul B. Remmey, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Schaller, of Wisconsin.
Lincoln F. Stelk, of Illinois.
Charles H. Thomas II, of New Hampshire.
Joseph W. Twinam, of Tennessee.
Thomas H. Walsh, of Texas.
E. Allan Wendt, of Illinois.
A. Norman Williams, of Michigan.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul general of the United States of America:

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Valentin E. Blacque, of Minnesota.
Seymour Chalfin, of New York.
Ross L. Collins, of Missouri.
Daren J. Flitcroft, of Virginia.
Albert W. Hennig, of Massachusetts.
Philip G. Hodge, of Connecticut.
Eric Neff, of the District of Columbia.
Michael Pavlyak, of Virginia.
John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.
Philip B. K. Potter, of Connecticut.
William H. Strong, of Virginia.
Rutherford T. Walsh, of California.

A Foreign Service Reserve officer to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alex A. Cohen, of California.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Charles J. Baker, of Virginia.
Christopher H. Ballou, of Vermont.
Robert B. Clark, of Massachusetts.
George L. Coale, Jr., of California.
James R. Connelly, of California.
Richard K. Cooke, of Texas.
John W. Hennessy, of Connecticut.
John A. Holizna, of Pennsylvania.
Starr M. King, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James F. Shea, of Maryland.
Joseph P. Sherman, of Michigan.
Jack Stewart, of Illinois.
Robert L. Taylor, of New York.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William T. Brown, of New Jersey.
Ralph W. Stephan, Jr., of Ohio.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edgar J. Applewhite, of the District of Columbia.
Howard W. Bovee, of Wisconsin.
Edward P. Brown, of Virginia.
Dudley R. Burris, of Texas.
Robert G. Caldwell, Jr., of Virginia.
Laughlin A. Campbell, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur C. Close, of Virginia.
Raymond H. Close, of New Jersey.
Richard J. Cornish, of Kansas.
Aldo D'Alessandro, of New York.
Philo Dibble, of Utah.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of New York.
Charles L. Duthie, of Colorado.
Mrs. Virginia H. Emmons, of Michigan.
John F. Fay, of Virginia.
John S. Foster, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Goodwin, of Utah.
Tucker P. E. Gougelmann, of New York.
Charles C. Hall, Jr., of Virginia.
John J. Hicks, of Virginia.
Leo J. Horvath, of Pennsylvania.
Boris Ilyin, of Virginia.
George A. Ives, Jr., of North Carolina.
Hans J. Jensen, of California.
Thane A. Kuhlman, of Michigan.
George V. Lauder, of Connecticut.
Lawrence G. Leisersohn, of the District of Columbia.
Richard M. Long, of Colorado.
Edward S. Lynch, of Maryland.
Joseph A. Minott, Jr., of Oregon.
Nicholas A. Montesano, of New York.
Duncan Purcell, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph H. Redford, of Utah.
Carl J. Schoepe, of Ohio.
Edward H. Splain, of Virginia.
Richard F. Stolz, Jr., of Vermont.
Clifton R. Strathern, of Massachusetts.
John M. Turner, of Georgia.
Frederick D. Vreeland, of New York.
Frederick U. Wells, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

K. Marshall Berg, of Iowa.
Edmund R. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Max W. Kraus, of Maryland.
Miss Ellen I. McCullough, of New Jersey.
Stephen N. Sestanovich, of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 9: 10: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*

Almighty God, may we now approach Thy throne of grace not only with our own individual needs and longings but with those of all mankind.

In penitence we confess that our prayers, so often in days gone by, have seemed to have been unanswered.

Inspire us to wait before Thee in deeper reverence and humility.

Purge our minds and hearts from doubts and misgivings and lift them by Thy spirit to the heights of courage and hope.

Help us to believe that nothing we ask and do in accordance with Thy divine and holy will shall pass away unheeded and unnoticed.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1960.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 417) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1960, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $5,300 per annum for the services of a special assistant superintendent of the House Press Gallery: *Provided, however*, That the authorization and appropriation herein contained shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs in the position herein created.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUBA—PATIENCE?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Americans should not be surprised that the Castro government has for the present rejected the formal protest by the U.S. Government of the seizure of American properties in Cuba without normal, legal processes and without any clear understanding as to reimbursement of the owners. We have previously given Cuba two notes on property confiscation and this third and last protest was delivered in the hope that the Castro government would discuss the situation. Instead, the Castro revolutionary government has promised to study the protest in due time.

No one can deny the sovereign right of the Castro government to establish a land reform program and to take properties to accomplish these purposes. In fact, the United States has long fostered and encouraged land reforms. However, law and justice dictate that the taking be equitable and that the property owners shall be fairly reimbursed for their investments.

Even the Cuban constitution declares that expropriated property should be paid for in cash at amounts fixed by the courts, and paid for in advance of expropriation.

Until now, the Castro government has claimed it cannot pay in cash and that

payment for properties taken would be made in 4½ percent bonds, payable over 20 years in Cuban currency.

The United States protest does not deny the sovereign right of expropriation, but it does legitimately complain about seizures which violate every right and law, even Castro's law.

Since Dr. Castro has for the present refused to discuss this matter and has not given reasonable assurances regarding reimbursement for the properties taken, it is fair to assume, in fact I think it is quite clear, that he may never do so. Through various subterfuges the Castro government will rationalize its position of seizing property without fair and proper payment.

The planned Castro pattern is old, simple, brutal, and effective. Bite off one piece at a time; build up fictitious government liens against the property; the government takes the property when the liens cannot be paid. The owner is lucky to end up with his life. The Nazis did it to the Jews before World War II.

The only safe assumption which this country can make on further actions in Cuba is that Dr. Castro and his government will continue to follow the party line. This party line, among other things, includes continued anti-American feelings. Page 9 of the Russian political handbook calls this a necessary diversionary tactic designed and calculated to make you feel your oats.

Since the Castro government is sovereign, we must recognize the method of operation. The Doctor intends to amputate at once without anesthesia for the United States. Anesthesia for Cuba will be planned anti-American vilifications and tirades to cover up harsh and illegal acts; inequitable procedure; and justify national social reform which is liberal and which is opposed by the "Yankee imperialist." It is really unfortunate that Dr. Castro does not care or understand that those shopworn phrases are not original with him. Even worse, it appears that our good friends, the Cuban people, are clearly being driven down a blind alley—the orbit of a freedom-loving peoples republic according to a planned and prepared script.

One act of this play calls for Dr. Castro to become a martyr. The United States must be taunted into taking retaliatory military or economic action. This then will justify to the Cuban people, and the world, Dr. Castro's right to seek help and assistance from Cuba's real friends—the Communists.

Of course, it should surprise no one if Castro has already asked for that help and received assurances that he would get it.

In addition, he can then proceed with the completion of the peoples revolution and the establishment of the new order—the classless society. The hated foreigner and property owner would be gone—in fact all property owners would be gone. The campesinos workers are then armed and become mighty rulers. This idyllic play then comes to a screaming climax when the ruler and the ruling group of this classless society is properly rewarded.

Does this play sound familiar? It should; because it is as old as Marx and Lenin. But Castro thinks he wrote it with a new wrinkle and for Cubans only. But everyone else knows the real author of the tragedy. Since we all know what is going to happen in acts III and IV, we Americans must take steps necessary to insure that equity and justice will be had with respect to American property owners.

But we must not be trapped into ill-advised or hasty emotional action.

There is a great deal more involved than the $1 billion invested by Americans in Cuba. The freedom of the Cuban people is involved, and just as importantly, our freedom is involved.

Annually we buy millions of tons of sugar from Cuba. There are about 162 sugar mills operating in Cuba of which 51 are American-owned. We annually purchase from Cuba over 3 million tons of sugar. By law we guarantee an amount which Cuba may ship and sell in the United States at a favored price which is higher than that which can be obtained on the world market. Over 500,000 of the Cuban labor force receive take-home pay from this industry, and about 50 percent of Cuba's sugar is sold in the United States. Sugar is admittedly a major economic factor in the life of Cuba.

Since the United States is the largest sugar-consuming market in the world, we should consider several business propositions:

First. That Congress do not fix a quota for the importation of sugar into the United States but delegate that authority to the President of the United States.

This would give us more flexibility and would be a basis for negotiations between our two countries.

Second. Hold back funds paid for our sugar purchases from Cuba.

The price we pay Cuba fluctuates between 5 and 5½ cents per pound. The world price is approximately 3 cents per pound. We could hold back the differential of 2 cents a pound or $140 million a year. These moneys could be held in trust for the reimbursement of all American properties taken in Cuba at a fair value to be fixed by impartial appraisers.

Of course, there is always the possibility that Dr. Castro will, by way of retaliation, refuse to sell sugar to the United States.

If necessary, we can produce all the sugar the United States needs in the United States, or obtain it readily from other sources. In no time at all any sugar deficiency could be made up. The price might be higher for a while, but I am sure all Americans would be willing to make that sacrifice.

The sugar normally sold to the United States cannot today be absorbed on the world market. Dr. Castro then would be free to follow the planned and prepared party line by selling all of Cuba's sugar to the Communist bloc. The Red bloc would make good use of this deal by keeping these large amounts of sugar over the heads of Cuba. This would insure a course of conduct or to break their economic back at some other time more suitable to their international purpose.

But Castro's cohorts would much rather tell Cuba, the world and Dr. Castro that America forced him to turn to Cuba's friends. So America must not now be the instigator of doing away with the quota or refusing to buy Cuban sugar.

One thing remains clear. As conditions get worse in Cuba, the speeches will become more abusive; the Americans will be blamed for everything; one violent act will be followed by another; and turmoil will not subside in Cuba.

Planned politics has dictated this pattern, not Dr. Castro. The Cubans themselves, while willing to follow a great revolutionary movement and hero, like Dr. Castro, will with each passing day see for themselves that the revolution has not terminated.

REDEFINITION OF THE TERM "DISABILITY" IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress, I have been very much interested in the operation of our social security system. It has been my conviction for many years that one of the greatest pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress was the law setting up a program of social security benefits for the American people.

During the years since the enactment of the law, millions of men, women, and children have benefited by its provisions. Today social security is an accepted and integral part of our economic life.

There is one area within the framework of our present social security law that I believe the Congress should reexamine with a view to correcting a hardship that is being worked on thousands of our elderly disabled men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the present requirements in the law that must be met before a person can qualify for disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze. Under the rigid provisions of the present law and the decisions made thereunder by the Social Security Administration, it is impossible for many thousands of people otherwise considered totally disabled by competent medical authority and employers to secure disability insurance benefits or to qualify for the disability freeze.

If a person can perform any work, regardless of what it is or where it is or whether he has ever engaged in it, that person is precluded from disability benefits under the present law and the decisions made pursuant to it.

I realize that there must be some sound medical and employment rules to govern the determinations that are to be made in social security disability cases. However, from the countless cases that I have observed during the past several years, I feel that our present standards are too rigid and are impossible for thousands of deserving claimants to meet.

I have, therefore, Mr. Speaker, introduced today a bill which I believe will correct some of the main sources of inequity in the administration of our present social security system.

The bill does not change the definition of disability in the present law other than to provide that an individual shall be deemed unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity if he is unable, by reason of his physical or mental impairment, to engage in the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such physical or mental impairment.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, when a person has been determined to be totally disabled from performing the duties necessary for the job or profession for which he is trained and in which he has worked for many years, he would, under the provisions of my bill, become eligible for disability benefits and the disability freeze.

Thousands of our people every year become totally disabled to perform their regular work. Many of these people have no other skills nor can they find employers willing to hire them if there should be some job they could possibly fill. As a result, these people suffer undue hardship and in many instances must turn to local welfare agencies for support.

I have observed numerous cases like this, and I am sure that my colleagues in the House have had the same experience.

The proper care of our elderly people is a duty that our country cannot shirk in this era of rapid industrial, social, and economic progress.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House will join me in passing this measure, which, if it becomes law, will offer a measure of hope for the security and well-being of many thousands of our people who cannot at the present time qualify for total disability benefits or the disability freeze under existing law.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE L. GARRETT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to officially announce to the House the death of the Honorable Clyde L. Garrett, a former Member of this body and a distinguished predecessor of mine, who died at Eastland, Tex., on December 18, 1959.

Many of you who served with him in the House will receive the news of the passing of Judge Garrett with a profound feeling of sorrow. You will remember him as I knew him personally, a kindly and considerate man who served his constituents, his State and his country with integrity and dedication.

Clyde L. Garrett had an illustrious career in public office. He was honored many times by the electorate in the community where he was born and reared and where people knew him intimately. This is always a great compliment to any man.

He served Eastland County, Tex., as county clerk and as county judge. While a county judge, he was president of the County Judges and Commissioners Association of Texas, a very high and signal honor.

He served in the U.S. House of Representatives in the 75th and 76th Congresses and, of course, those of you who served with him will remember him best in this period.

Subsequent to his leaving Congress, he held a highly responsible position with the Veterans' Administration as a loan guaranty officer, and retired in 1955 to return to Eastland, Tex., to be among his lifelong friends and to further contribute to the community life of that area.

His most recent activity prior to his death was that of president of the Eastland County Lyndon Johnson-for-President Club. In this capacity he had plans for active work in behalf of Senator JOHNSON for the Democratic nomination in 1960.

Our Nation, his community, and his neighbors have lost a valuable friend and a devoted leader in the passing of the Honorable Clyde L. Garrett.

I know that those of you who knew him here in the Congress will join with me in expressing deepest regrets and sincere sympathy to Mrs. Garrett, his two sons, Carl L. and Clyde W., and his three daughters, Mrs. L. E. Maley, Mrs. John Seeling, and Mrs. Paul Pate. It is our hope that they may find some consolation in the memory of a husband and father whose life was well spent in honorable service, and in knowing that a host of friends grieve his passing.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague in expressing sorrow by reason of the death of the Honorable Clyde L. Garrett.

I served with Judge Garrett in the House of Representatives for the 4 years he was a Member. I came to respect and admire his devotion to duty, his integrity and his courage.

He was a man who was exceedingly attentive to the problems of others and was always willing to lend a helping hand to his friends and to causes and problems in which they were interested.

In those days between 1937 and 1940, the issues of our Nation were acute and changed rapidly. Just prior to the war years there were many instances in which it was tremendously difficult to know what was right and what was wrong. It was a time when a thing may appear right as of today, and tomorrow would prove wrong, and vice versa. They were troubled times and times which required the most conscientious judgment. It was a time of change, a time of what might be termed adventure into the uncharted events which we now know were seriously confronting us. He met the issues of the day with the courage, the determination and convictions which identified him as one of the most able and most respected Members of this body.

I join with others in extending deepest sympathy to his very fine family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of our late colleague, Mr. Garrett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, when Judge Clyde L. Garrett, of Eastland, Tex., died this past December 18, I lost a personal friend, and his community lost a man who had contributed much to it over the many years which he served the people.

I came to Congress with Clyde Garrett in 1937, and had that close relationship which all of you recognize when you belong to the freshman class. It is natural that Members who started their service in the Congress together are drawn a little closer and have a feeling of affinity in the common experience. Before coming to the Congress, I claimed Clyde Garrett as a personal friend, and that friendship was cemented more closely during the 4 years he was a Member of the House. He had for years been the respected friend of my wife, whose family home was in Eastland, and of all of the members of our family. Continuously through the years that friendship has matured and grown to the very end of his life.

I attended the funeral of Judge Garrett in Eastland, Tex., and there witnessed the host of friends who came to pay their last respects. At that time, as during his life, he manifested a touch of greatness by reason of the friends about him. Every acquaintance knew Judge Garrett to be a loyal and sincere friend, and an outstanding Christian citizen.

It is with a profound sense of loss and a time of mourning which I feel at the loss of this friend.

I associate myself with you who have expressed similar sentiments, and in this way express my sympathy for his wife and the fine sons and daughters who survive him.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and other colleagues in taking note of the passing some time ago of the Honorable Clyde L. Garrett, a former colleague from Texas.

I knew Clyde Garrett before I came to Congress. I learned to know him intimately during his service here. He and I and our families were warm friends. While serving here, he demonstrated a devotion to duty and principle which marked him as a worthy and able servant of the people of his district and of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Garrett was an humble man who sought diligently to do his job as a repre-

sentative of the people. It was my privilege to cooperate with him on many matters of general interest to the people of west Texas. He served the people with devotion and effectiveness. I recall most pleasantly our associations together.

Mr. Garrett had the respect and confidence of his colleagues. He liked people and people liked him. Mr. Garrett was proud of his family and devoted to them. I pay tribute to our departed friend and join my colleagues today in words of sympathy to his loved ones left behind.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. BONNER, BOYKIN, GEORGE P. MILLER, TOLLEFSON, and VAN PELT.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to the fact that one of the members of the Rules Committee: namely, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BROWN], my very dear friend, stated that I have not as yet requested hearings before the Rules Committee on the civil rights bill.

The gentleman from Idaho, [Mr. BUDGE], made a similar statement.

I regret to state that both of these gentlemen are in error. They are just as wrong as a 2-foot yardstick.

On August 21, 1959, I wrote to the chairman of the Rules Committee, and, among other things, stated:

> Pursuant to authorization of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am writing to request the Rules Committee to grant a rule for the consideration of this bill on the floor of the House. We would appreciate being given a hearing before your committee at the earliest convenient date.

Also the excuses given by some Republicans, especially the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK], for failure to sign the discharge petition to my mind are useless, just about as useless as trying to grow hair on my bald head.

WEST VIRGINIA IS GETTING SHORTCHANGED—XIV

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, last year on numerous occasions I spoke before this House about the shameful way in which my State of West Virginia has been discriminated against in the allocation of Federal spending and employment.

I pointed out that West Virginia was a dead last among the 50 States in Defense Department employment and total payroll. I further presented figures to indicate that the Commerce Department similarly neglected the Mountain State to the preferential treatment of all others.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that my State is not looking for a handout, nor for any undeserved treatment from any government agency. We want nothing more than fair and equitable treatment.

I hardly need to point out again that the State of West Virginia still is locked in the paralyzing coils of a great economic recession, and that the rate of unemployment is higher in our state than in any other in the Nation. It would seem that federal spending could reasonably be channeled when possible into such blighted areas—but instead, West Virginia actually suffers from a lack of installations and facilities that is grievously unfair.

Today I want to place new evidence of this fact before this House, to offer ample proof that Defense and Commerce are not alone in neglecting our most sorely depressed State.

Among the independent government agencies, this pattern of discrimination remains evident. I can offer facts to indicate that at least 15 Federal agencies have facilities scattered about the country—but none whatever in the State of West Virginia.

For example, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board operates in 32 States. It has no employees in West Virginia.

The Federal Communications Commission has facilities and employees in 26 States. It has no West Virginia facilities or employees.

The National Labor Relations Board has a payroll encompassing employees in 24 States. None of them are in West Virginia.

There are others. None of the following agencies have a single worker in West Virginia, although their operations are scattered about the country.

Securities Exchange Commission, 14 States.

National Mediation Board, 9 States.

General Accounting Office, 18 States.

Government Printing Office, 5 States.

Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization, 11 States.

Department of State, 21 States.

Atomic Energy Commission, 31 States.

Civil Aeronautics Board, 7 States.

Federal Communications Commission, 26 States.

Federal Power Commission, 5 States.

Federal Trade Commission, 11 States.

Government Contracts Commission, 2 States.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 4 States.

I have ignored several other agencies which would not be suited for West Virginia location because of geographical, historical, or other considerations. But I believe that this does indicate that West Virginia is being short-changed by these agencies, as well as a regrettably large number of others in the Federal Government, and that this shameful neglect deserves to be dragged into the spotlight of congressional and public scrutiny until remedial action is taken.

INTEREST ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all noted with great interest that portion of the President's State of the Union message in which he refers to the fact that he expects to have a $200 million surplus this year, and he looks forward to reducing the national debt. In the same message, we heard him urge, as he did again on yesterday, that we give the Treasury Department the right to increase the interest rate on long-term bonds. Why, he does not know, and he will never be able to tell us.

Let me point this out to you. If we increase the interest rate on the existing Government debt by only 1 percent a year, that means an increase in the annual expenditure of Government for interest alone of $2.9 billion, and if we succeed in reducing the national debt by the $4 billion that he talks about, the 1-percent increase in the cost of carrying that reduced debt will be two billion eight hundred sixty million dollars more a year.

He reminds me of our former colleague who, day after day, used to get up on this floor and shout—where will we get the money from?

I never thought I would be around here long enough to hear a President tell us in the same message he is going to reduce the national debt, create a budgetary surplus, spend as much as last year for Government except for defense. Where he will spend more, all by living within our means, and by keeping expenditures below revenues—all of this and at the same time increase the interest rate on Goverment debt. He did not say so, but that means billions of dollars of more expense per year to the Federal Government.

Magic, indeed, or, to use his own words "a storm of semantic disorder."

NEWS AND VIEWS ABOUT CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous request that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a synopsis of a lecture delivered at Hood College for Women, Frederick, Md., by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., associate editor of World Affairs and a specialist on inter-American affairs. It is good to note that myths about Fidel Castro's Cuba are being exploded, thanks to good reporters who dig up the facts and relate them without fear or favor.

The synopsis follows:

DR. THORNING CRITICAL OF MATTHEWS REPORTING

Addressing Town Hall, Hood College, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographical Institute of Brail, noted what he called the sharp contrast between the excellent, factual reporting of Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips, chief, the New York Times Bureau in Cuba, and the misleading dispatches and erroneous interpretations about Fidel Castro furnished by Herbert L. Matthews, a member of the editorial staff of the same great newspaper.

The Maryland author, educator, and diplomat added:

"There was a midsummer climax in what was something like a 'war between the States' within the ranks of New York Times newspaper people when, on July 16, 1959, Mr. Matthews wrote what was a virtual whitewash of the Castro dictatorship. The ink was hardly dry on this solvenly dispatch when the night managing editors of the Times had to rush down to the composing room and rip Matthews' story out of the later editions of the newspaper. It was this story that a Frederick County resident analyzed in a complete column in the Times on August 18, 1959.

"Since that date, as has been widely noted in national magazines, reviews, and the metropolitan press, the byline of Herbert L. Matthews has not appeared. Questions have been raised about this development. Most of these doubts can be resolved by emphasizing that there are plenty of responsible, topflight newspaper people on the Times staff. They realize that Mr. Matthews is not a good reporter. Consequently, not wishing their paper to become the laughing stock of the journalistic world, they have protested, apparently with no little effect, against Mr. Matthews taking over any news assignment.

"On the other hand, the name of Mrs. Ruby Hart Phillips is very much in evidence and the reports she is sending from Havanna indicate 'the triumph of the extreme left in the Cuban Government' as a result of the appointment of Maj. Ernesto Guevara to the post of president of the National Bank of Cuba.

"To be sure, unsigned editorials in the Times continue to reflect the news of Herbert L. Matthews. Some day, we may hope, this highly emotional, imaginative writer will recognize the Marxist nature of the Castro regime and do a better job on Cuba than he did in describing Italian Fascist victories over the innocent Ethiopians and in predicting the triumph of the leftwing forces in Spain during the Civil War. Mr. Matthews can learn a great deal by assimilating the facts reported by Ruby Phillips."

TITLE I PROJECT WINDFALLS

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1959, in a formal letter of complaint to the Administrator of the Federal Housing and Home Finance, I charged that the Soundview title I project in New York City had the smell of a windfall and that the present owner of record for the land to be redeveloped was a dummy for a syndicate which stood to make a neat profit of one-half million dollars if the deal went through.

I also challenged the city slum-clearance committee's classification of this particular site as a slum area. I urged disapproval of this project, because the serious questions I raised regarding this land deal placed it under a cloud of suspicion.

Thereafter, on June 19, in a letter to the chairman of the Special Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I asked that a full and complete investigation be undertaken by his committee. In that letter, I pointed out several glaring examples of the shameful mismanagement of our urban renewal program in New York City. I concluded that the need for a congressional committee to dig into and clean up the entire title I mess was urgent.

On July 3 the minority members of this Special Housing Subcommittee, in a joint statement, expressed deep concern over charges of windfalls and conflicts of interest and demanded a thorough study of the program. They said that "these charges are of such serious nature as to make imperative an immediate investigation by the House Banking and Currency Committee."

Mr. Speaker, although more than 6 months have elapsed since I made my charges and requests for Federal and congressional investigations, and although additional evidence of political favoritism, windfalls, conflict of interest, fantastic profits and other questionable dealings has been uncovered, nothing has been done to clean the air which continues to get more and more polluted with each shameful disclosure of wrongdoing under this program.

In order words, Mr. Speaker, while the reek of scandal continues to seep out of this slum clearance program in New York City and while the stink grows stronger and stronger, the title I program in New York moves merrily along with complete disregard of the rights of the American taxpayers. This, to say the least, is shocking and disgraceful and must be stopped at once.

The people are entitled to all the facts and since the slum-clearance program is conducted with public funds—hard-earned tax dollars of our wage earners—the U.S. Government has a direct and prime interest in knowing what is going on, how the money is being spent and to whom the money is going.

The public is entitled to know what is wrong with the whole title I program. We have seen evidence of too many tenants on condemned sites getting kicked around instead of receiving relocation help; we have seen people getting pushed from one slum to a worse one; we have seen high-priced luxury housing going up instead of middle-income housing which title I was supposed to provide; we have seen where a member of the slum clearance committee had his bank finance sponsors in title I developments; we have seen prominent members of the underworld chosen as sponsors. In short, we have seen too much to be satisfied with mere explanations and excuses.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand how a Federal agency responsible for the proper administration of this title I program can close its eyes and do nothing to correct this deplorable situation in New York City. It is also hard to conceive that a congressional committee fully apprised of the many irregularities and scandals under this program would do nothing to straighten out this mess. All I can say is that our failure to take firm and definite action in this shocking problem has had the effect of granting the city of New York a license to whitewash the whole mess and sweep all the dirt and filth under its political rug.

Mr. Speaker, only an immediate top-to-bottom investigation of the multi-billion-dollar program will clear the foul air. The stench is too strong to ignore, even by this Congress. Only a congressional probe will unearth the many scandals and correct the tremendous abuses under this program. No amount of insults, abusive attacks and name calling from the supporters of the program will remove the need for a complete congressional investigation in order to restore public confidence in the title I program.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we have a duty to the American people to look into every aspect of this whole title I program and we cannot shirk this responsibility.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I should like the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for a moment. The paper and the radio this morning tell me there was no coalition between the southern Democrats and the Republicans on a labor bill last year. That was news. Is there a Member of the House who does not

know the opposite is the fact? Now, this is the question I am asking. Is the administration—and I assume the gentleman from New York knows—in favor of the civil rights bill, so-called?

Mr. CELLER. If we may judge from the state of the Union message of the President delivered here the other day, I would say the President and the administration are in favor of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I also understood from the paper that our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] will not sign the discharge petition, and the majority leader is somewhat of the same situation. I assume that is because they think the regular procedure of going through the committees of the House should be followed.

I do not intend to make a deal with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] because a deal is supposed to be a crooked thing and should not be made. But sometimes there may be a legitimate understanding between statesmen, even between some who are not recognized as statesmen.

Mr. CELLER. Why can you not make an honest deal?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In my opinion, I think you can, but as I understand, the committees of Congress are of the opinion that any deal is or may be crooked. There seems to be a sort of presumption along that line—the way they act sometimes. Is the gentleman honestly of the opinion that if I signed that petition—not today, because I do not want to be hasty, but some time later—he can and will help me out in getting my seniority rights protected?

Mr. CELLER. I shall always say a kind word for the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman sure?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

CASTRO, TRUJILLO, AND TURMOIL

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post for January 16, 1960, is an article by Daniel James entitled "Castro, Trujillo, and Turmoil." It deserves the attention of Members of Congress and, under unanimous consent, I am appending its full text to these remarks.

Fidel Castro, most observers agree—

Writes James—

is not a Communist but a left-nationalist with a pronounced anti-American bias and the temper of an extremist. But whatever his political beliefs may be, he is pursuing policies inside Cuba as well as outside which serve the Communist cause.

However, as the author points out, he is still popular with his people although "some disenchantment has set in."

There are good as well as bad points about the government which replaced the Batista dictatorship, but I do not intend to set them forth in these remarks.

James writes:

Many Cubans cling to Castro fearing that the Dominican dictator may move in and impose a dictatorship under some former Batista chieftain like Gen. Jose Eleuterio Pedraza, who is even now training a force in the Dominican Republic to invade Cuba at the propitious moment. Trujillo is not only boss of 2,500,000 people of the Dominican Republic but the acknowledged leader of the forces of dictatorship in Latin America.

James says that "Trujillo is feared and hated not only by Cubans but by all his Caribbean neighbors," but that the tension in the Caribbean "that he did so much to foster is working against him." There is, he reports, much discontent among the Dominicans themselves.

"Must it be Castro or Trujillo in the Caribbean?" James says "No." There is a third alternative we hear too little about: Venezuela. In this country, where Dictator Perez Jiminez was ousted January 23, 1958, there is "rapid evolution, not revolution."

Its remarkable President, Romulo Betancourt, and his coworkers deserve great credit for the progress in Venezuela.

Mr. James concludes by recommending strongly that the 11th conference of the Organization of American States, originally scheduled for Quito, Ecuador, February 1 and then postponed, be held as soon as possible. The problems posed by Castro and Trujillo need action, he believes, through the establishment of a stronger Inter-American Peace Committee.

Castro and Trujillo are American problems in the broad, correct sense of the word "American." They are also American opportunities to promote the aims of the Organization of American States.

Americans, whether of the north, central or south portions of the hemisphere, are confronted with difficult problems in their relationships, and in connection with the survival of the free world. As with other problems, the best way to overcome them is to face them squarely.

It is encouraging to know that the President will visit South America in February. How wonderfully appropriate should he add to his schedule a visit to Caracas, Venezuela, where he can see for himself how a real democracy is evolving from a dictatorship.

The text of Mr. James' article follows:

CASTRO, TRUJILLO, AND TURMOIL

(By Daniel James)

Ever since the great American naval strategist Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan felicitously called the Caribbean an "American Mediterranean" 62 years ago, our military defenders have heeded his teaching. Down the years, throughout the great arc of islands stretching from Florida to Venezuela, we have built up a long chain of naval, air and military bases—including missile-tracking stations—without which our shores would be vulnerable to attack.

Up till now the long chain of defenses, stretching across the world's second largest sea to Central and South America, seemed more than adequate.

But no longer. From Cuba to Panama, the sun-drenched Caribbean Sea is being churned into an unprecedented frenzy of revolution and riot, rivalry and intrigue. True, revolutions and riots and intrigues are not altogether new to this area of the world. But the situation today is something new. The chain of our defense never before has been cracked. But today such a crack has appeared.

The crack is in Cuba. The situation in Cuba today presents the gravest kind of threat to the United States because on that island we maintain our chief Caribbean naval base, at Guantanamo. For half a century Guantanamo has been the core of our Caribbean defense system. Its harbor can take our biggest warships and its airfield our biggest planes. From them we can patrol the great watery expanse where already Soviet submarines dare to prowl, as Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, has revealed.

A treaty we signed with Cuba in 1934 gives us the right to use Guantanamo indefinitely, but now Cuban Premier Fidel Castro threatens to abrogate it. In an unprecedented speech before 1 million Cubans last October 26, Castro charged that we had sent planes to bombard Cuba. Castro then proceeded to whip up sentiment for our expulsion from Guantanamo. Alluding to our occupation of the base, Castro made the astonishing statement:

"How is it possible that in exchange for the risks we incur by the presence of that military base in our territory, the houses of our peasants, our sugar mills and our population are exposed to incendiary bombs and shrapnel from airplanes coming from North American territory?"

President Eisenhower stated the second day after the speech that he was puzzled by these charges, because the Cubans have traditionally been our friends. The State Department issued a long denial of the charges as preposterous. Mr. Eisenhower's puzzlement is shared by the whole American people. What has happened to the Cubans?

Last New Year's Day they celebrated the first anniversary of their successful revolution against the two-time dictator of Cuba, Gen. Fulgencio Batista. North Americans no less than Latin Americans greeted that revolution, led by the idealistic young Castro from the Sierra Maestra mountains, as a major step toward democracy. Yet today, 1 year later, Cuba appears as far from democracy as she was under Batista. Her economy is fast going downhill, her relations with the United States have been strained to the breaking point, and her leaders keep the whole Caribbean in an uproar. Most alarming of all, Cuba is permitting her revolution to be exploited by international communism.

For the past 6 months the Castro government has been conducting a feverish campaign against the United States. This campaign has become the center of Cuban policy. The campaign has mounted in intensity as Cuba's internal problems have grown painfully acute, and the conclusion is inescapable that the Americans—many of whom now know they were sadly in error when they greeted the Cuban revolution with optimistic pronouncements—are being made the scapegoat for Castro's failure to solve Cuba's problems. The revolution that was to have transformed Cuba into a prosperous democracy apparently itself has been transformed into an international conspiracy to defame a friendly neighbor.

Conspiracy is the word, for there is no doubt that behind the anti-American campaign there is the long arm of communism. Moscow and Peiping realize better than most Americans how vital the "American Mediterranean" is to our national interests. They

have been making use of the Cuban revolution to throw the Caribbean into a turmoil and to turn the Caribbean peoples against us. While American leaders have been preoccupied with Berlin and Laos, the Kremlin and the Red Chinese have brought the cold war to our very doorstep.

In my opinion, based on months of careful reporting, Cuba has been converted into international communism's chief Caribbean base—a distinction formerly enjoyed by Red-dominated Guatemala. But the brain directing the operations of the Communist Caribbean conspiracy is located far behind this base. It functions in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City. That Embassy, the writer is in a position to reveal, directs a swarm of agents who shuttle from Mexico to Cuba with clocklike regularity. Some of them are Russians, but the majority are of other nationalities: Chinese, Poles, Czechs, Cubans and other Latin Americans. They usually travel to Cuba as diplomats or businessmen.

One diplomat who frequently rides the Mexico-Cuba shuttle is a Czech accredited to the Communist Czechoslovakian Embassy in Mexico. This man was recently designated to act as commercial attaché to Cuba. Ostensibly interested in selling Czechoslovakian machinery in exchange for Cuban sugar, this attaché makes regular trips to Havana where he confers with Communist contacts. Another Iron Curtain "diplomat" in Mexico, who has suddenly been accredited to Cuba as a commercial attaché and thus has reason to travel there often, is a Pole, Leon Kolarski. What industrial products agrarian Poland could conceivably sell Cuba no one seems to know.

The Cuban Government is up to its neck in the Mexico-Cuba shuttle. Cuban officials who are dispatched to Mexico on special missions, or who live there, make it a point to confer with members of the Soviet Embassy including the Soviet Ambassador, Vladimir Bazikin.

An example was provided not long ago by a trusted aide of Castro, Capt. Armando Torres, who is the Cuban Premier's ace diplomatic trouble shooter and second in command of the Cuban army's G–2 section. Torres was sent to Mexico last September to represent Cuba at the anniversary of Mexico's independence celebration, his main function being to try to win over the critical Mexicans. On the morning after his arrival, Torres made a beeline for the Soviet Embassy.

The Cuban Ambassador to Mexico, Salvador Massip, is frequently in the company of Soviet Ambassador Bazikin—and this is not because their embassies happen to be near each other. The Soviet Embassy in Mexico supplies money as well as couriers and instructions to communism's Cuban base. Last spring this Embassy sent $200,000 to Cuba.

The Red Chinese are almost as active as the Russians in the Caribbean conspiracy. In Havana the writer met five Red Chinese journalists who had been touring the island to observe the Cuban revolution. Their real object was to organize cells inside Cuba's Chinese colony of 40,000 and to establish liaison with susceptible Cuban revolutionaries, including Castro's younger brother, Raúl, a dedicated Marxist, Defense Minister, and designated as successor to Castro in the event of Fidel's death.

Raúl Castro and other Cuban leaders well to the left assiduously foster the idea that China and revolutionary Cuba are comrades-in-arms. Thus Raúl, as chief of the Cuban armed forces at the time officially greeted the Red Chinese journalists in these words: "Mao Tse-tung is one of the figures most respected by Latin-American youth. Cuba and China have much in common. China had a Chiang Kai-shek and Cuba a Batista, and the enemies of both countries were aided by the same international reaction."

The Moscow-Peiping axis went to work in Cuba well in advance of Castro's anti-American campaign and prepared the ground for it. Last May, reports the Deputy Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. C. P. Cabell, USAF (retired), the Kremlin "sent under alias to Cuba a Soviet intelligence officer, Vadim Kotchergin, as a member of a Soviet trade-union delegation. His assignment was to give guidance to Cuban Communists." The same Kotchergin turned up again in Cuba last November as a fraternal delegate to the annual convention of the Cuban Confederation of Workers, accompanied this time by another agent, also a fraternal delegate.

It is a striking fact that during the months after Kotchergin's first trip to Cuba last May—June, July, and August—an unprecedented rash of invasions and revolutions broke out all over the Caribbean and precipitated the crisis that the area is experiencing now. It is equally striking that some of these upheavals were led by leftists friendly to the Communist bloc, if not members of it.

The Organization of American States investigated the first of the invasions—the one directed against Nicaragua on last May 31 and June 1—and turned up some extraordinary documents. It found a letter written on Cuban Government stationery which solicited from "the civil and military authorities" of Cuba, "every form of help and cooperation" for the invasion. The letter was signed by Maj. Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, as commander of the key Havana fortress, La Cabaña. This is the same violently anti-American Guevara who today is economic czar of Cuba as head of the national bank. Only last month he showed his hand by demanding that all business firms in Cuba take on and train Castro army officers in running the businesses.

Guevara and Castro's brother, Raúl, are the Cuban Premier's two most trusted confidants. Guevara is not only Cuba's economic czar, but he is a leader in revolutionary activities outside Cuba. He has been the chief planner of most of the invasions attempted during these last 8 months.

The way Guevara operates was revealed to the writer by Caribbean exiles who have had dealings with him. In one case a group of young Haitians who sought arms and money to overthrow their government were invited to Guevara's headquarters on the Isle of Pines. Haiti is a strategic pawn in Caribbean politics as it lies between Cuba and the Dominican Republic, whose dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, Castro has sworn to destroy. Guevara was therefore eager to help his Haitian visitors. But he insisted on one condition: they must not promote capitalism in their country. The Haitians rejected this condition, regarding it as outside dictation. So that invasion did not come off.

Guevara's favorite technique is to make invasions of other countries seem like native revolutions organized by exiles. But the exile groups he uses are invariably leftist fronts operating under his orders, though he himself has repeatedly stated he is not a Communist. The abortive Nicaraguan invasion was prepared by something called the Block of National Unity for the Liberation of Nicaragua, a Communist front based in Havana. The three invasions of the Dominican Republic last June, following the Nicaraguan affair, were all launched from Cuba by another front, the Dominican Liberation Movement.

If this Dominican Liberation Movement succeeds in overthrowing Trujillo, that will put the Dominican Republic under the domination of Castro. Formed in Havana last March, the Dominican Liberation Movement claims to be a coalition of Dominican exile groups, but other Dominican exile organizations charge that it is Red-controlled and will have nothing to do with it. The Dominican Popular Socialist (Communist) Party is an open member of the coalition.

Why is Castro permitting Cuba to be used as a base for Communist operations in the Caribbean? Is he himself a Communist or sympathizer?

It so happens that the aims of Castro and the Communists in the Caribbean coincide. Castro fancies himself the Simón Bolivar—the Liberator—of the Caribbean peoples. He is obsessed with the idea of destroying the old-line dictatorships, especially Trujillo's, and is willing to accept Communist aid to do so. The Communists, on the other hand, are eager to help Castro. They feel sure that, if the old regimes in the Caribbean fall, the governments replacing them will be anti-American and will challenge our right to maintain defense bases in the area.

Fidel Castro, most observers agree, is not a Communist but a left-nationalist with a pronounced anti-American bias and the temper of an extremist. But whatever his political beliefs may be, he is pursuing policies inside Cuba as well as outside which serve the Communist cause.

His attacks upon the United States externally are paralleled by a systematic campaign within Cuba to liquidate American interests there. Americans have a huge $850 million stake in Cuban commerce, industry, and agriculture. Castro is in the process of forcing them to give it up regardless of what that may cost the Cuban economy.

Thus although Cuba's income is derived largely from sugar, Castro is implementing a ruinous agrarian reform with the main objective the expropriation of the big, mostly American-owned sugar estates. Granted that Cuba is too dependent on sugar and her economy is unbalanced because of it, necessitating some sort of reform, expropriation of the industry can only cut her income drastically and cause unemployment. Equally unjustifiable is the expropriation of the big cattle ranches—one of the biggest, the 35,000-acre King Ranch, is American-owned—another major aim of the agrarian reforms. This not only reduces the country's income but also could result in a meat shortage.

Castro is flogging industry—Cuban as well as American—equally hard all along the line. An early revolutionary decree cut rents up to 50 percent in order to augment the purchasing power of some 800,000 tenants. But the main result has been to discourage new construction and spread unemployment. Then Castro sharply reduced electric and phone rates, also to aid the masses. This has made the American and Foreign Power Co., the chief electric utility, hold back on a $15 million expansion program and caused the International Telephone and Telegraph, which supplies phone service, to consider pulling out of Cuba. Most recently, Castro has slapped a 5 percent tax on mineral production and one of 25 percent on mineral exports, striking a blow at the $75 million Moa Bay Mining Co., an American firm which mines nickel and cobalt, and at other American mine operators in Cuba.

These assaults on industry have started a chain reaction which is seriously injuring all branches of the Cuban economy. No cruise ships will touch Havana this winter, and tourism is dead. New investment is practically nonexistent, while on the other hand unemployment has soared to an estimated 500,000—plus 200,000 underemployed—out of Cuba's 6 million population. Cuba's 1959 deficit is estimated at around $200 million, while her dollar reserves are at the dangerous low of perhaps $100 million. Where Castro will get the money to stave off bankruptcy in 1960 is anyone's guess.

Despite a year of endless blundering, the Cuban Premier is still popular with his people. Most Cubans believe in him because they have nothing else to believe in—they

have been disillusioned so often that they cannot face another disillusionment. "Fidel gave us our only chance to make something of ourselves," a Havana housewife said, expressing the general attitude.

Nevertheless, some disenchantment has set in. The defection last October of Maj. Huberto Matos, the revolutionary leader who was regarded as just below the Castro brothers and Guevara in importance, may have been the turning point of the Cuban revolution. Since then, disaffection has been eating away at the regime's two chief bulwarks: the rebel army and the official 26th of July movement.

The way the trial of Major Matos was conducted intensified anti-Castro feeling. It was held in an army movie theater. Premier Castro was the principal witness for the prosecution, demanding death by firing squad for Matos. Castro strode to the stage, turned his back on the judges and lawyers seated thereon, and for 7 hours made a speech to the spectators and press in which he accused Matos of being a traitor. The court found Matos guilty of counterrevolutionary activities against Castro and sentenced him to 20 years' imprisonment.

As a result of such things as this, with the moderates in the Castro government growing more and more concerned at disaffections, the question being asked in Cuba is: "How long can Fidel last?"

How long depends on forces outside Cuba as well as inside, chief among them Trujillo. Many Cubans cling to Castro fearing that the Dominican dictator may move in and impose a dictatorship under some former Batista chieftain like Gen. José Eleuterio Pedraza, who is even now training a force in the Dominican Republic to invade Cuba at the propitious moment. Trujillo is not only boss of the 2,500,000 people of the Dominican Republic but the acknowledged leader of the forces of dictatorship in Latin America.

Trujillo is feared and hated not only by the Cubans but by all his Caribbean neighbors. If Castro seeks to become the Bolivar of the Caribbean, Trujillo's lifelong ambition has been to become its Napoleon. Since he came to power nearly 30 years ago he has more than once tried to overturn other Caribbean governments. Last summer he made an abortive attempt to unseat Castro via a fifth column inside Cuba, and he is constantly working to subvert Venezuela's revolutionary regime as well as Cuba's. Trujillo is thus as basic a cause of the Caribbean tension as Castro, and in that role antedates the Cuban revolutionary.

The Dominican dictator possesses the strongest and best trained armed forces in the Caribean. He is a power to be reckoned with. When he made himself dictator in 1930, the Dominican Republic, which the U.S. Marines had not long before vacated, was economically and politically bankrupt. Trujillo soon paid off the national debt, made the sugar industry profitable, encouraged foreign investment and built a reasonably stable economy. He also eradicated much disease, and his capital, Ciudad Trujillo, is one of Latin America's cleanest and most orderly.

But for his services Trujillo exacted a price from the Dominican people which history may judge exorbitant. He saddled them with a permanent reign of terror that renders life in the Dominican Republic uneasy, to put it mildly. He deprived them of many liberties, including the right to change jobs. He appointed himself czar of the economy, with power to decide who may own property or go into business. He shamelessly enriched himself and his family at the expense of the people. He operated, in short, a thoroughgoing police state for his own personal profit.

But Trujillo is not as secure as the trappings of his police state would make it appear. The tension in the Caribbean that he did so much to foster is working against him. It has frightened away investors, strained his budget through record expenditures for the armed forces, and produced something like an economic recession for the first time since he seized power. These and other factors, notably the example of Castro's overthrow of Batista, have aroused much discontent among the Dominicans; and Trujillo now has this new problem to face, as well as the pressure from without generated by Castro and Guevara. Some Caribbean observers are betting that, in this dilemma, the aging dictator may find it expedient to risk a diversionary adventure.

Must it be Castro or Trujillo in the Caribbean? During a 2-month tour of 10 Caribbean countries this reporter found that there is a third alternative to the 2 extremists, represented by a country we hear little about: Venezuela.

This month Venezuela, like Cuba, also will be celebrating the anniversary of a revolution against dictatorship. But there the resemblance ends. Since the Venezuelans ousted their dictator, Gen. Marcos Pérez Jiménez, on January 23, 1958, they have been moving toward a new kind of democracy in the Caribbean. While Castro, more than 1 year after his revolution, continues to find excuses for not holding the elections he promised during his fight against Batista, Venezuela held elections scarcely 10 months after Pérez Jiménez was overthrown. Today Venezuela has a democratically elected government headed by a veteran political leader, President Rómulo Betancourt. This government in contrast to Cuba's is not tearing the Venezuelan economy asunder but instead is planning its complete reconstruction over the next 5 years at a cost of $5 billion—the most ambitious program ever conceived in Latin America.

An army of experts, including three private American firms specializing in personnel and administration problems, is working under Betancourt's chief of planning, Dr. Manuel Pérez Guerrero, to complete the program by this spring. "The program," stressed Pérez Guerrero, "will be keynoted to rapid evolution, not revolution." Further explaining that its twin long-range objectives are to diversify and decentralize industry, and to effect a sound agricultural reform, he gave the writer a preview of the program which is released here for the first time.

Venezuela is at the mercy of a single product, oil, and of the fickle oil market. In 1958 oil accounted for 91 percent of her exports and, directly and indirectly, for nearly that much of her total revenue of about $1,500,000,000. Result: Most of the wealth derived from oil flows into the capital, Caracas, which has become a swollen metropolis of 1,500,000 souls squeezed into an 18,000-acre valley hemmed in by great mountains. The rest of Venezuela's 6,500,000 inhabitants are spread thin over 352,000 square miles outside the capital, and they live, for the most part, under primitive conditions. This imbalance makes the country susceptible to political extremism. Betancourt's program aims to alter this imbalance between Caracas and the provinces.

The program's boldest step forward calls for the creation of an industrial complex deep in the jungle region of Guiana, near the great Caroní River and the famed "mountain of iron," Cerro Bolívar. The Caroní, which flows into the Orinoco, is capable of providing 3 million kilowatts of electric energy, and a plant already built there by Betancourt is now producing an initial 300,000 kilowatts. The Cerro Bolívar, owned by United States Steel, claims an almost unlimited supply of iron, as it consists entirely of iron ore. Around these two resources the Government is building Venezuela's first steel mill, with a capacity of 600,000 tons, as a magnet to attract other industries.

"We want to stimulate private enterprise," says Dr. Raúl Leoni, president of the Venezuelan Senate and a close Betancourt associate.

The Government, accordingly, is encouraging new industries everywhere in an all-out attempt at diversification. Pillsbury Mills has formed a mixed American-Venezuelan corporation which is putting up a $3 million plant in Maracaibo to produce 200 tons of flour daily. Alcoa and the Italian industrial giant, Montecatini, are building a plant to make aluminum tubing. Container Corp. of America is erecting a factory to manufacture cardboard.

Some foreign businessmen question the Venezuelan Government's attitude toward foreign capital. One big American concern has circulated a confidential letter criticizing the key Minister of Mines and Hydrocarbons, Dr. Juan Pablo Pérez Alfonzo, because he is organizing a state-owned oil company which it fears may lead to nationalization. But the Minister declares unequivocally: "We have no desire or intention of nationalizing any properties owned by existing private companies, and expect to develop new fields on land owned by the state. We shall in no way compete with private industry."

The 5-year program's decentralization phase involves the creation of satellite towns around Caracas, to which industries will be moved. Three satellites are going up within a 25-mile radius of the capital and others are planned. To link satellites and capital, Betancourt is spending $200 million to build new roads and repair old ones.

Venezuela's agrarian reform is, unlike Cuba's, moderate. Instead of rushing into the expropriation of big land holdings just because they are big, the Venezuelans will expropriate only lands that are idle and uncultivated, regardless of whether they are large or small. The central aim of the reform is to bring more land under cultivation, not to punish bigness. Unproductive lands will be distributed among the 80 percent of Venezuela's peasantry who are landless and among 20,000 Caracas unemployed, who will be settled in the countryside. Furthermore, the distributed land will belong to its new owners unconditionally and in perpetuity, whereas in Cuba it can revert to the state. There will be no communal ownership.

The Venezuelan Communist Party is furiously opposed to Betancourt's agrarian reform, as it is to his whole economic program, on the ground that it is too moderate. Although the Venezuelan Communist Party is far stronger than its Cuban counterpart, Betancourt is no Castro to yield to Red pressure. He defiantly "thumbs his nose" at the Communists, As he declared in his inauguration speech in February 1958, "The Communist philosophy does not accord with the democratic structure of the Venezuelan state." And so the nearly 50,000-strong Communist Party and its 100,000 sympathizers are excluded from the government.

Betancourt has more cause to traffic with the Communists and dislike the United States than Castro. He began his political career more than three decades ago as a Communist who hated the American oil companies. He blamed the United States for backing a military coup which overthrew the democratic regime of novelist Rómulo Gallegos, who had succeeded him in power—Betancourt had been provisional President—in 1948. During a subsequent exile which lasted nearly 10 years, Betancourt talked and wrote against the United States and threatened to nationalize oil.

But today this ex-Communist proudly claims, "Nelson Rockefeller is one of my best friends," displays cordiality toward the United States, and is not gunning for the oil companies. What accounts for his transformation?

The answer is, Two men: ex-President José Figueres of Costa Rica, and Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico. Betancourt spent

most of his exile as the guest of those two leaders, and they persuaded him that he could put Venezuela on the path of true political and economic progress without the Communists—and without becoming a "tool of Yankee imperialism." Betancourt watched how Figueres, as Costa Rica's President, negotiated a pact with the giant United Fruit Co. (instead of expropriating it), which put money into the national treasury and set a pattern for all Central America. And he saw how Muñoz-Marín, through his world-famed Operation Bootstrap, attracted U.S. industry to Puerto Rico and within a mere decade transformed it from an impoverished and corruption-ridden island into a thriving democracy. These deeds convinced Betancourt that the Figueres-Muñoz-Marín road was best for Venezuela, and that country is now demonstrating that the "third alternative" to Castro and Trujillo is best for the Caribbean.

Will the Caribbean adopt the Venezuelan way? It may, if some means is found first to make the Caribbean caldron simmer down and give Venezuela a chance to prove itself. Peace, in short, is what is needed at present. Is peace in the Caribbean possible?

This question may be answered to some extent when the 11th conference of the Organization of American States is held—if, indeed, it is held this year. It originally was scheduled to be held at Quito, Ecuador, on February 1. Then last December 18 Ecuador suddenly asked that the conference be postponed indefinitely. Various reasons were given for the postponement, including the statement that the Legislative Palace and hotel being built to accommodate the conference would not be completed in time. Officials of other countries called these and other reasons for postponement neither serious nor real.

We and some other member nations want to hold the conference as soon as possible to press for a much stronger Inter-American Peace Committee, with the power and authority to act whenever any member nation is threatened. The fight for such action is sure to produce plenty of fireworks. Cuba, because of Castro's plans for liquidating Trujillo, will oppose the move bitterly.

The longer the conference is postponed, the fewer the chances of empowering an Inter-American Peace Committee with real authority. If such a powerful committee is established then there is some hope for peace in the Caribbean. But if the conference is long postponed or if Castro should prevail at such a conference, it is certain that things will get a lot worse before they get better—worse for the peoples of the Caribbean and worse for us as well.

THE PANAMA CANAL: SYMBOL OF A FOURTH FRONT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain documents and pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the morning of November 4, 1959, the people of the United States were surprised to read press dispatches from Panama about Canal Zone border violence on the previous day under large headlines, such as, "U.S. Troops Guard Canal Zone Against Mob." This news was not surprising to those in close touch with isthmian developments.

As a Representative in the Congress from the great State of Pennsylvania and a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations charged with the formulation of supply bills for the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and related agencies, the discharge of such duties has caused me to become a close student of Panama Canal problems. These questions include those relating to increase of transit capacity and improvement of operations of the canal, also matters relating to the sovereign control of the Canal Zone.

Even though my studies made it possible to foresee the disorders that occurred on November 3, 1959, and to warn proper authorities of the executive departments as well as the Congress far in advance, it is indeed a sterile satisfaction to state that those grave disturbances occurred precisely on the day as predicted; precisely in the manner prophesied; and precisely with the results expected. It would have been far better had timely action by the Congress or Executive been taken to prevent this distressing incident from occurring.

Unfortunately, the events of that tragic day and the long series of developments leading to them have not been adequately presented by our mass media to the people of this Nation—a failure that has the savor of a conspiracy of silence. Because they are fundamental and transcend all lesser considerations, their adequate clarification is imperative and requires some reiteration and frank speaking.

In so doing, I wish to emphasize that I am not an enemy of Panama, nor of any just aspirations of its people, among whom I have made numerous and treasured friendships extending back many years. I sincerely trust that what I say today will add to public knowledge in both Panama and the United States, and lead to better understanding of the issues involved. To this task, I now direct myself with the special request not to be interrupted until the end of my address.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Knowing the purpose for which the gentleman asks me to yield, I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONNER. Anticipating the situation, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian Herter, on January 6, 1960, pointing out that certain situations existed in the Panama Zone that were the cause of great concern to me.

I asked what the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the Panama Canal and other isthmian canals might do to assist the Department of State and I asked for a report from the Department of State as to whether or not we have a firm policy on this subject. I also pointed out that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has a special subcommittee of five of the most outstanding engineers in America studying the Panama Canal, and studying the feasibility of its improvement and whether or not there might be a new or alternate canal constructed in some other part of the isthmus.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this letter to the Secretary of State be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I am sure you are aware, developments in worldwide commerce in recent years have made it apparent that the Panama Canal, in its present state, will soon be incapable of handling the increasing demands of traffic. While the general problem has been recognized for some time it has become accentuated not only by the unprecedented numbers of ships transiting the canal in the postwar period, but by the growing trend toward larger and larger ships in the bulk trades. The huge, new super-ore-carriers and combination oil and ore carriers which require special traffic control within the canal area lend emphasis to the situation. According to our best information, the next decade would be critical unless ways and means are found and put into effect to increase traffic-handling ability.

In recognition of the foregoing, our committee has called upon a distinguished group of technical and economic consultants to study the operations of the existing canal, to review previously proposed alternatives, and to evolve plans for adequate isthmian transit facilities to meet reasonably anticipated needs for the future. The alternatives being considered involve either complete reconstruction of the present canal or construction of a sea level canal on the present site or elsewhere in Central America. The Panama Canal Company, viewing the same problems, has prepared plans for modernization of existing facilities and procedures to assure prompt transits for the future.

On the basis of studies made by our own board of consultants, as well as those made by the Panama Canal Company, it appears that in order to insure continued efficient functioning of the canal and keep it abreast of currently growing traffic requirements, the expenditure of some $60 million for modernization will be required. To meet long-range needs, it is conservative to state that minimum requirements will equal or exceed the original construction cost of the present canal.

This country has, of course, a great stake in the Panama Canal as an investment, a crucial defense asset, and as a facility of inestimable importance to our commercial and economic well-being. Accordingly, in the light of our knowledge as to impending need for expenditures of very large sums for modernization of trans-isthmian transit facilities, this committee is greatly concerned over the present unrest and continued pressure by the Republic of Panama for privileges and concessions not included in or contemplated by the orginal treaty. In other words, serious questions have been raised regarding the justification for the expenditure of large sums in an area which appears to be, at present at least, extremely unstable.

In order to assist the committee in its studies of this vitally important subject, I would appreciate it very much if you would submit to me your views concerning our international policy, if any, in dealing with the demands of the Republic of Panama with respect to concessions not included in the

original treaty covering cession of sovereignty rights over the Canal Zone and the construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal. If there is no such policy, we would welcome your views with respect to justification for future expenditures of the magnitude indicated herein in the light of presently apparent trends toward restriction of United States right and privileges in the Canal Zone.

With kindest personal regards and every good wish.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am delighted that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], chairman of the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has legislative jurisdiction over the Panama Canal has written that letter. I hope the committee will proceed with hearings. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this week the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Central and South America of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, has been conducting hearings. I was invited to appear and did appear for several hours yesterday before that committee.

JURIDICAL BASE OF U.S. ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY

The foundations of our Isthmian Canal policies are rooted in four centuries of history and rest upon three important canal treaties:

First. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, which facilitated construction of the Panama Canal. In this agreement, Great Britain relinquished its own rights for construction and control of an Isthmian Canal and recognized the exclusive rights of the United States thereto. The United States, in assuming this obligation, adopted the main points of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 for the operation of the Suez Canal as the rules to govern the operation and management of the American canal. These provide that the canal shall be free and open to vessels of commerce and of war of all nations on terms of entire equality with tolls that are just and equitable. It also provides for the United States to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

Second. The Hay - Bunau - Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States. On the part of Panama, this convention granted to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of the the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, and, most significantly, as if the United States were the sovereign of the territory and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority. On the part of the United States, the main points for the purpose of this address were that it guaranteed the independence of Panama, which had just seceded from Colombia and whose existence depended on the protection of the United States and the success of the canal undertaking. The United States also was authorized to enforce sanitary ordinances and to maintain public order in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon and in the territories and harbors adjacent thereto in event of failure of the Republic of Panama to do so, as well as to acquire property within these cities and adjacent areas for canal purposes through the exercise of the right of eminent domain.

Third. The Thomson-Urritia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, the sovereign of the isthmus prior to the Panama revolution of November 3, 1903. This treaty aimed at removal of all misunderstandings growing out of the political events in Panama in November 1903, restoration of the cordial friendship that had previously existed between Colombia and the United States, and definitions and regulation of their rights and interests with respect to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad.

The negotiations of these three treaties were the contributions of some of the ablest men of their times. They knew the history of the Isthmus as a land of endemic revolution and political instability. They understood the lessons of the Suez Canal, and benefited by them in adopting policies for administering the Panama Canal. They knew the difficulties experienced in the negotiations with Colombia for a satisfactory canal treaty, which was finally rejected by the Senate of that country, and thereupon determined to solve permanently the problem of sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

With duality of control as originally proposed in the rejected Hay-Herran Treaty removed, the framers of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were justified in feeling that what would have been a perpetual cause of conflict and recrimination, which always accompanies extra-territorial rights, had been eliminated forever.

The Canal Zone is a constitutionally acquired domain of the United States. Under our Constitution, the treaties and statutes that relate to its acquisition, the subsequent construction of the Panama Canal, and its perpetual operation, are "supreme law of the land." Moreover, the framers of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were far visioned. They discriminated between the "grant" of the Canal Zone "in perpetuity" and the "life of this convention," which they realized would probably be modified. They even provided against the possibility of Panama entering "any union or confederation of states, so as to merge her sovereignty or independence," in which case the treaty provides that "the rights of the United States shall not be in any respect lessened or impaired."

CANAL ZONE: U.S. GOVERNMENT RESERVATION

Despite the clear wording of the Panama Canal treaties, so many misconceptions of their key features have characterized press coverage in recent years, even including some of the most respected encyclopedias, that clarifications are essential. In this, the first fact of importance to note is that the original recommendation to secure control of the Canal Zone "in perpetuity" was made by the Isthmian Canal Commission in early 1902. This was followed by the Spooner Act, approved June 28, 1902, authorizing the President to secure by means of a treaty the "perpetual control" of the Canal Zone for the construction and "perpetual" maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

It is true that the preamble of the 1903 treaty acquiring the Canal Zone describes the "sovereignty of such territory as being actually vested in the Republic of Panama." This description was used, however, to show the transfer of sovereignty over the area from Colombia to Panama as the result of the secession of Panama from Colombia and thereby to show the authority of Panama to cede to the United States that jurisdiction for canal purposes. Certainly it was not used for the purpose of establishing the sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone after its occupation in 1904 by the United States.

The fact that U.S. sovereignty over the Zone is absolute was clearly indicated by Bunau-Varilla, Panama's Minister to the United States and one of the principal draftsmen of the 1903 treaty who stated:

After mature thought, I recognized that if I enumerated in succession the various attributes of sovereignty granted, I ran the risk of seeing in the (U.S.) Senate, some other attributes asked for.

To cut short any possible debate I decided to grant a concession of sovereignty en bloc.

The formula which seemed to me the best one was to grant to the United States in the Canal Zone "all the rights, power, and authority which the United State would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory; to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power and authority."

Thus, it is definitely established that the Canal Zone was not sold, ceded, or leased, but granted in perpetuity to the United States for perpetual operation of the Panama Canal. Not only that, all privately owned properties in the Canal Zone were bought by the United States, and these included the Panama Railroad.

In addition to the titles thus secured, Colombia, in the Thomson-Urritia Treaty, recognized the title to both the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely" in the United States "without any encumbrances or indemnities whatever."

Moreover, President Taft, by Executive Order of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the 1903 treaty of the Panama Canal Act of Congress, declared that all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary to the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal, and the sovereignty of the United States of America.

Nobody had more to do, including the great Teddy Roosevelt, with the Panama Canal, or longer to do with it, than President Taft. All these points, Mr. Speaker, and many others could be stated remove all doubt as to the sovereign control of the entire Canal Zone.

Its status is that of a U.S. Government reservation, with a full, entire, and exclusive sovereign control vested in the United States of America. And, Mr. Speaker, since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, the only authorized symbol among nations of the world of sovereignty and of such absolute authority is the flag of that nation. In this case sovereignty in the Canal Zone is exhibited and displayed and can only be exhibited and displayed by flying the flag of the United States of America.

The Government of the Republic of Panama states that between the exclusion and ratification of the treaty and the opening of the canal—and this is from the language of the Government of Panama, February 26, 1904—these were the languages and the exchange of the ratification between sovereign states—Panama declared its jurisdiction ceased over the zone.

Moreover, President Taft, by Executive order of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the 1903 treaty and the Panama Canal Act, declared that "all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection, and sanitation of the Panama Canal."

All these points, Mr. Speaker, and many others that could be stated, remove all doubt as to the sovereign control of the entire Canal Zone. Its status is that of a U.S. Government reservation with full and exclusive sovereign control vested in the United States. The only authorized symbol of such absolute authority is the flag of the United States.

SECRETARIES HAY, TAFT, AND HUGHES: CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY VIEWS

The current agitation about the sovereign control of the Canal Zone is not a new issue but an old one periodically dragged out of its tomb for political purposes. Notwithstanding the fact that this subject has been repeatedly clarified, recent references to Panama as the "titular sovereign" of the Canal Zone, or whatever that is, by high officials of our State Department and others, cannot be dismissed as effusions of the ignorant, for they have been presented as reaffirmations of the views enunciated in 1906 by Secretary William Howard Taft. What are some of the key facts in the history of this matter?

Secretary of Government Tomas Arias of Panama, one of the revolutionary junta of 1903, in a note dated May 25, 1904, addressed to Gov. George W. Davis of the Canal Zone stated:

> The Government of the Republic of Panama considers that upon the exchange of ratifications of the treaty for opening the interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama, its jurisdiction ceased over the Zone.

Ratifications of this treaty, it may be stated, were exchanged on February 26, 1904.

In spite of this clear, unequivocal declaration, Secretary Arias later presented the sovereignty question to the United States. In a comprehensive reply to the Panamanian Government on October 24, 1904, Secretary of State Hay asserted that "the great object to be accomplished by the treaty is to enable the United States to construct the canal by the expenditure of public funds of the United States—funds created by the collection of taxes" and that "the position of the United States is that the words 'for construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and the protection of the said canal' were not intended as a limitation on the grant, but are a declaration of the inducement prompting the Republic of Panama to make the grant" of the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity.

What more do you need?

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been a series of statements by Secretary Taft, when he was Secretary of War, and when he was President of the United States, and by Mr. Theodore Roosevelt when he was President of the United States, by President Hayes, by General Grant when he was ex-President of the United States, by Mr. Hay, and a long series of Secretaries, establishing what I have just presented. It is incomprehensive to me that the Secretary of State of the United States today would write me a letter saying for 50 years the United States has recognized titular sovereignty, whatever in the world that is, to Panama. And, these people have tortured—tortured, I say—and taken completely and entirely out of context—a matter which is disgraceful—the words of great Presidents, great American Cabinet members, great Secretaries of State, for reasons that I cannot understand, to say there is a titular sovereignty, if that makes you feel better, in Panama. What is that? Throwing pearls to swine. That is not the forthright way to deal with a sister sovereign state whose people have been friends for generations.

And, may I add, Mr. Speaker, there is a series of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States establishing this position and brushing aside as the merest technicality or obiter dicta technical language contrary to the position I am establishing.

Mr. Hughes states:

> It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any administration, no matter what it was, any President, or any Secretary of State, at any time, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903.

Shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of William Taft, shades of Charles Evans Hughes, who, in their hearts, believed that no administration of any party, no President, no Secretary of State, any time, any place, anywhere, for any reason, would surrender any part of our sovereignty.

But, ah. Well, we are trying to. This Congress will not permit it.

Now, in view of the facts, Mr. Speaker, the best case—and as a trial lawyer I like to say it this way—the best case that can be made for Panama's claim of sovereignty over the Canal Zone is that of a reversionary character. In the sole event that the United States should cease to maintain and operate the canal, should that ever occur, the United States of America undoubtedly would offer no objection to reassumption by Panama of her sovereign control of the Canal Zone, if that is what she wishes. Meanwhile, to encourage Panamanians, our friends and our neighbors, to think that the beau geste of titular sovereignty is something that it absolutely is not is lacking in fair dealing and is contrary to the best interests not only of Panama but of the United States of America.

DIPLOMATIC DIKE IS BROKEN

The completion of the Panama Canal within the cost and time estimates, its successful maintenance and its operation every minute under the treaty since the opening to traffic in 1914 form one of the most brilliant chapters in the history of the United States. Former President Theodore Roosevelt always considered that this was of importance comparable to the Louisiana Purchase. He and other great statesmen who contributed to the success of the enterprise had every reason to be proud of their achievement.

For many years this project went ahead on the force of its initial impetus. The giants of the early years gradually passed from the scene and the conduct of our isthmian policies fell into much less capable hands. Even so it required the impact of the great depression of 1929–32 and the Cuban revolution—mirabile dictu—this time in 1933, to start a chain of events at Panama that are still in motion.

In this connection it should be recalled that until the abrogation of the Platt Amendment of the Cuban Constitution, by treaty on May 31, 1934, following a period of great violence in Cuba, the United States of America up until that day had the right to intervene for the "preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

It was after this policy of abandonment in Cuba that the Hull-Alfaro Treaty in 1936 between Panama and the United States was negotiated. Here is where the erosion begins. Here is the beginning of the end unless this Congress speaks.

In the first article it abrogated Article I of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, by which the United States had undertaken to guarantee and maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama, a provision included in the Panama Constitution and known to Panamanians as the Platt Amendment of Panama. Regardless of what was done, which I deplore, it was done properly, it was done constitutionally, it was done by amendment and ratification and exchange and deposit of ratifications between sovereign states and approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States. So whether you like what they did or not they at least did it constitutionally.

Now, they invoked the guarantee of the United States to maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama and a provision was put in the Panama Constitution, known by the Panamanians as the Platt Amendment of Panama. This treaty was the first breach in the juridical foundation for the Panama Canal enterprise.

Other surrenders in the 1936 treaty include loss on the part of the United States of important sovereign powers and rights affecting the Panama Canal, especially that of eminent domain within the Republic of Panama, all without adequate compensation to the United States, which had borne all costs of construction, sanitation, and defense. But the erosion did not stop there.

After prolonged secret negotiations started in 1953 the process was further advanced in the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty of 1955. While in nowise abridging the sovereign authority of the United States over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal granted in articles II and III of the 1903 treaty, the 1955 treaty went much further in its surrenders than the 1936 treaty.

The 1955 treaty in the Senate of the United States had practically no debate at all. I doubt if most of you in the House have even heard about it.

Anyhow, it gave away additional rights and properties of the United States and increased the Canal annuity from $430,000 allowed in the 1936 treaty to $1,930,000. Do not delude yourself, Mr. Speaker, that one dime of that increase from $430,000 to $1,930,000 ever went to raise the standard of living of one little Panamanian Indian or citizen. It went to the members of 20 great aristocratic families in Panama. Do not be deluded—not a dime.

Among its most remarkable features was the surrender to Panama—this you will not believe—without any proper investigation, with no authorization by or consulting with the Congress, of the valuable railroad properties in the cities of Panama and Colon, including the designed terminal freight yards and the passenger stations in those cities, valued at $24 million. Not only that, but the 1955 treaty even contemplated the abandonment of the railroad itself.

Do you know how that was stopped? I had a hand in that. A general of the Corps of Engineers who had been Governor of the zone was testifying before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Panama Canal. In justifying a line item of his budget before that subcommittee he talked about trucks, saying they needed so many trucks. Out of a clear blue sky, for no reason at all, I said to him, "What do you want so many trucks for?" "Oh," he said, "didn't you know? We are going to abandon the railroad." "Oh," I said, "is that so? Well, I have news for you. You are not going to abandon the railroad."

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], on my request referred this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. They sent a special subcommittee to the Canal Zone and held extensive hearings. I was invited to appear before that subcommittee and cross-examined this great general. The sum total of the whole thing is that the Congress of the United States prevented them from giving away the railroad, but do you know what happened? While we in the House were saving the railroad, which we did, the Senate gave away the terminal yards and stations. Now you have a railroad but "You ain't got no terminals," unless you buy them back for probably $50 million now from the Republic of Panama. You would not believe that, would you? But that is what happened.

The overall results of our sustained surrenders at Panama have been the withdrawal of U.S. activities to the Canal Zone and a series of abandonments in the zones. The costs involved will have to be borne by American taxpayers and the interoceanic traffic paying tolls, but even more important, we have been giving away all of our bargaining power with the Republic of Panama.

Mark this as well, the results of these diplomatic failures are not accidental. These things are part of a well calculated plan. This was revealed by Ambassador Ricardo M. Arias of Panama, Dicky Arias, in a major political address on April 29, 1958. Where? Here in Washington. Would you believe that? I am going to read you the language spoken by an ambassador of a foreign state in your Nation's Capital at the Foreign Service School of Georgetown University on that day—replete with hostile propaganda against the United States—an ambassador. Now listen to this. I quote:

> The foreign policy of my country during the last 50 years has been to exert every effort in order to obtain at least for Panama conditions similar to those granted by the United States to Colombia in 1903.

Do you know what that means?

This pronouncement of Panamanian policy, Mr. Speaker, should not be taken lightly but as a serious warning. Its objectives are rescission of the perpetuity and sovereignty provisions of the 1903 treaty, early establishment of dual sovereignty over the Canal Zone, and finally nationalization of the Panama Canal. It is no wonder that many North Americans have become concerned about the Panama Canal and wish to know how the present turmoil and uncertainty were ever allowed to develop.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE NOT AN OCCUPIED TERRITORY

The era of great American giveaways began at Panama with the 1936 treaty already mentioned.

World War II commenced in September 1939, which was shortly after the 1936 treaty was finally ratified by the U.S. Senate. In preparation for possible involvement, the United States had to obtain sites for defense installations in the Republic of Panama, all necessary for protection of the Panama Canal. Because of the loss of the right of eminent domain in the Republic of Panama, the United States was denied that method for securing bases and had to obtain them through diplomatic channels amidst mounting difficulties and exorbitant demands for rentals. It was not until May 18, 1942, that a defense sites agreement was at last signed.

After the war, anti-American clamor erupted, with unanimous demand by the Panama National Assembly for evacuation of all sites. The President of Panama was quoted as demanding that the 1936 treaty be made "more effective in terms of benefits for Panama." All of this agitation led to negotiations between Panama and the United States for a defense base treaty.

On December 9, 1947, Foreign Minister Ricardo J. Alfaro of Panama resigned in protest against his Government's agreeing to extend the leases on the most important bases still held by the United States.

Now, Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, here is the way to run a place. Listen to this:

Following this lead of the Foreign Minister, the National Assembly of Panama was surrounded by thousands and thousands of anti-American mobs. They threatened to lynch any Member of the Assembly voting to lease bases to the United States. What do you think the Panama Assemblymen did? They went along with the mob. They unanimously rejected the treaty. Government, foreign policy by mob rule, repeated on November 3, November 28, 1959; the same town, the same place; a slight change in the cast of characters, due to time; nothing else.

The United States had no recourse except to evacuate all bases. Many Panamanians, I assure you, deplored that action of its Congress.

Now, it was in the course of these very negotiations that I have just mentioned in Panama that a more threatening event occurred. Where? Right here in Washington. In November 1946, the State Department, following a vicious Soviet-Russian attack in the United Nations against the United States—this was one of the first and most violent Soviet attacks in the United Nations against the United States, while negotiations were going on in Panama, Soviet Russia charged that the American defense bases around the world were evidences of aggression, and do you know what the State Department did? You will not be surprised, but I will just say it out loud. They sent to the United Nations a report of American bases throughout the world, and do you know what they listed the Panama Canal Zone as? United States Occupied Territory. Do you believe that? Is there any wonder that our own State Department classed one of the most vitally important constitutionally acquired domains as "occupied territory," and that we should have trouble in this year of our Lord 1960 in defending the legal status of the Zone as a grant of sovereignty in perpetuity? Of course not.

Now, a few facts of juridical history. Oh, listen to this. Watch the left hook in this one; literally and figuratively. If this is all true, if you will act on a juridical treaty this way, then it would be just as logical, because the circumstances are identical and on all fours, to list Alaska as "occupied territory."

Mr. Speaker, certainly there could be no turning back of the clock of history. Do you think it will not come based upon this precedent that Soviet Russia will not attack your treaty of purchase of Alaska just because you made a mistake? You think she will not? Here is her precedent. She set it up; she set it up.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. What kind of precedent should this afford on the question of the lands we have acquired from Indian tribes by treaty?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Oklahoma, of course, is my pet authority on that. It is a rhetorical question. Now, you answer that yourself; you should know.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does the gentleman agree with me that it might lead on to the further conclusion that we should return to these Indian tribes the lands we now occupy as States because we acquired them by treaty?

Mr. FLOOD. Juridically you have a treaty with an Indian tribe which they entered into as a sovereign power. That is the law and your answer, Q.E.D. Yes, but Russia, even I say, was not worried about your little old Indian tribes. But she is worrying since an American whose body lies buried in the walls of the Kremlin, who led the American Communist Party at the time of the great Bolshevik revolution, who in 1917, at the time of their first conquest proposed the importance of taking the Canal from the United States. When the Communists were tossed out of Franco Spain the Communists in Spain came to Latin America, to the Caribbean, to Panama.

The minute Nasser took the Suez Canal, in 2 weeks' time, Panamanian officials were in Cairo; 2 weeks after that Egyptian engineers and financiers were in Panama City, and they have been meeting back and forth ever since.

Fly the flag of Panama, will you? Oh! It is just a gesture to keep those funny little people happy. It does not mean anything? So is your old man! They know what it means, and I know, and I know that in your heart you know.

Despite the generous treatment afforded Panama in the 1955 treaty already discussed, events having a great impact on the isthmus did not stop. On July 21–22, 1956, Presidents of the American nations met at Panama City in the Republic of Panama, attracting world attention to great canal project on which the economic well-being of Panama largely depends. While public interest was thus focused toward the West, events of far greater significance were in making in the Near East.

Four days later, on July 26, Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal. Officially indorsed by the Government of Panama, this seizure of the Suez Canal started a chain of events affecting the Panama Canal, which accelerated trends already evident. Nationalization thus became the battle cry of radical elements in Panama, especially by students at the Panama University, where, backed by Communist influence, they proudly displayed a large sign: "The canal is ours."

Foreseeing the pending dangers and realizing the imperative need for a congressional reaffirmation on our isthmian canal policy, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 205, 85th Congress, on June 27, 1957. In the light of subsequent developments, it is indeed unfortunate that no action was taken on it. This failure was interpreted on the isthmus as lack of leadership and psychological weakness. It served to encourage radical agitators to continue on their course.

The next step in the erosion is a carefully organized raid. Oh, now, the fangs are beginning to show.

There is no more talk. Let us go and take it. This is a sop for Communist operations. Now we get the activists in a carefully organized raid into your Canal Zone on May 2, 1958. What did the Panamanians call it? What name did they give to this? Operation sovereignty. Do you think they are kidding? They do not.

These are students and, boy, you will be surprised how old looking, as Vice President NIXON said, how awfully old looking, these South American students are. You know what I mean. You take a course in flower designing, 1 hour a week, and you are a member of the student body for 100 years.

They planted 72 Panamanian flags in places of prominence, including a big one right smack in front of the United States of America Canal Zone Administration Building. They raised the flag. You did not even know what was going on. There were little quips, little lines in the paper, not much more.

This was an eventuality I had foreseen. I had brought this very detail to the attention of the executive department and all the proper officials in Washington. I told them exactly what was going to happen, the day it was going to happen, where it was going to happen, what flags they would use, the size of the flags, where they would be set up. Everybody thought it was a great big joke. They said that FLOOD must be drinking again and, you know, I have not had a drink in 30 years. What a joke, some little funny people having fun, a schoolboy prank, exuberant students, about 50 years old apiece.

Though this highly provocative incident was witnessed by all Canal Zone authorities and by U.S. officials, the trespassers were not interfered with by the Canal Zone police. Nobody said or did a thing. They were allowed to leave the zone without obstruction. The Canal Zone police went around, picked up all the Panamanian flags, carried them back down to the border and gave them back to the nice little college boys.

This 1958 flag-planting Communist mob invaded the Canal Zone, constitutional sovereign territory of the United States, an extension of your coastline. Well, the schoolboy angle was the official Department of State and Canal Zone Government explanation.

This received the most extensive coverage in the papers in all of Asia, all of Europe, also every paper in Central and South America gave it great publicity. The Soviet press made a murder case out of this. What did this do? This emboldened the agitators to more mob violence.

Let me tell you it is significant it was this very same week and month that the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON and his lovely lady, during the latter part of his visit of good will to Latin America, were subjected to the grossest forms of indignity, also perpetrated by students of Peruvian and Venezuelan universities, with the ruthless skill of the trained leadership and the characteristic Red pattern of the graduates of the school at Prague where, by the way, Castro's kid brother graduated before he went to Russia. Nice crowd, these students.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his excellent presentation and on alerting the Congress and the American people to this perilous situation that exists in Panama today. I want to ask the gentleman just one question, if it is not his opinion, from his long study of the controversy that he has been describing in the Canal Zone, that as long as we continue, as we have in the past, to grant concession after concession to the Panamanian politicians, these demands are going to continue and continue until there is an internationalization of the Canal Zone irrespective of what we do?

Mr. FLOOD. I have tried for 2 hours to say that, and the gentleman has said it in 30 seconds better than I could ever say it. Of course, that is it. That is it. Of course, I am no politician. I am a statesman myself, you understand. A statesman is a washed-up politician. But, you are right. My friend is right. This current mess is nothing as of today, after a long chain of causation. The proximate cause is what you said. But, the immediate parenthetical cause, the impetus of today, is the effort of a discredited Panamanian demagog and politician, the former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd, who had no more chance of being elected President of Panama than your grandmother, until he found this pigeon. Now he is a 10-to-1 bet to win in 90 days. He led the invasion. He carried the Panamanian flag into the Canal Zone.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FLYNN. I want very, very much to commend the gentleman for his almost single-handed defense of one of the greatest assets that this country has, not only now, but over a long period of time. I visited Panama within the past few weeks. I was there when the disturbances were going on. I saw firsthand automobiles turned upside down and burned by the mob that invaded the Isthmus of Panama. I saw the damage caused to the railroad. I saw the barricades in the streets when the mobs invaded and came over to do great damage to our possession. I was there when they went to the home on that night of the chief justice of our supreme court in Panama and threatened to do him great bodily harm and how he came to the door alone, ready to go with the mob, and but for the personal prestige that he had, he would have been the sacrificial lamb of the mob that invaded the isthmus to do great damage to the American Republic. I want to say that the gentleman who is speaking is held in the highest regard by every American

citizen—I refer not to myself but to one who has reserved the time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. He is held in the highest regard by every American citizen in Panama. I can state that ever word he utters upon this floor goes over the wire to Panama at full rate to six newspapers edited in the Republic of Panama. He is about the only American citizen who is fighting for the preservation and defense of the Republic of Panama. He has carried on this fight alone, and only the effects of the last few weeks are bringing some of the rest of us to his defense and to his aid and assistance. I can say that we have a wonderful man in charge.

I am referring to General Potter. There was never a better man in charge of the Panama Canal. He understands the situation and all the ramifications of it.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me interrupt the gentleman to say this. I must compliment the citizens of his great congressional district. If I were there I would certainly vote for him. Let me say that I wish he, with his eloquence and his great knowledge of this problem, would join hands with other Members, such as my distinguished friend from this side of the aisle who spoke a few minutes ago, so that there may be a mass protest in this RECORD of speeches and statements.

I have a resolution before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have a resolution before the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. And my friend from Maine whom I see sitting here was in the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday when I testified there. They are going to have a hearing on this as soon as the gentle lady from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] regains her health, which I hope and pray will be soon. So I think we have lit a fire.

But let me say again that I am concerned with the Constitution and the law. If the Congress of the United States in its wisdom and through the propriety of its channels sees fit to amend the treaty with Panama as between one sovereign nation and another, and permit Panama to fly its flag or to have the canal, or whatever Congress wants to do, that is the way it must be done. No President, no Secretary of State by administrative action can impinge upon the sanctity of a treaty or upon the law of the land, which a treaty is under that constitution.

The President of the United States had no right to send his brother, Milton, to hold conferences with officials of a foreign state. These meetings took place at Milton Eisenhower's residence in Baltimore with the Finance Minister of Panama. He had no right to discuss sovereignty. The President, himself, has no such right. That can be acted on only by the Congress of the United States with the Senate as an arm of this body by a two-thirds vote ratifying such a change, or as the supreme law of the land, through any bill of Congress executing that treaty, must be acted upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. Only the judicial and/or the legislative can act, never the executive. And it is about time that the legislative arm of this Government asserts and establishes its equality as one of the three branches of government, because, my friends, you are slipping fast. You do not look as good here as you did 50 years ago. Let us begin all over again. Report out these resolutions. Pass this concurrent resolution.

Why a concurrent resolution? Why did I make it a concurrent resolution? Because a concurrent resolution does not call for any executive fiat. I deplore the practice of chairmen of subcommittees and committees of this House who, when a Member introduces a resolution or a concurrent resolution or a bill, write immediately to some Federal bureaucrat who writes back a letter and says, "I don't like it," and that is the end of the bill or the resolution. Let us put an end to that. Let us stop that here.

I made this a concurrent resolution because I could not care less what the Executive thinks about what my concurrent resolution says. I could not care less. And all praise to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], and his chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], who held these hearings without consulting the Executive on this important problem, in the best tradition of this great body of the Congress. I hope the precedent is followed.

Mr. Speaker, just to show you how silly this question can get, the Republic of Panama by action of its General Assembly unilaterally extended the 3-mile limit of its seacoast to 12 miles around the Panama Canal, making the canal another Berlin. I objected here on this floor, you may remember, and demanded that my Government protest. Do you know what happened the next night in Panama City? The Congress of Panama in its might and majesty upon a motion of its Foreign Minister declared the gentleman from Pennsylvania Panama's public enemy No. 1. My, they play rough. I do not think I have many Panamanians in my district, anyway. Come to think of it, I never thought of that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAYS. Did they give the gentleman a medal along with that? They should have. That seems to be quite an honor on this, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand Cuba and my bewhiskered friend is about to do the same thing, not that I can win popularity here but I can sure win it down there.

Mr. HAYS. I would say that to be so honored by the whiskered moron who is presently the dictator of Cuba should enhance the gentleman's stature considerably.

Mr. FLOOD. I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Let me emphasize this: I am not the enemy of the people of Panama. I am not a damned Yankee. I was born and raised in St. Augustine, Fla., from the time I was 2 years old until I went to college. I went to Panama with my grandfather as a boy, and I have been going there all my life; how long is none of your business, but it is a long time. So I am not a Johnny-come-lately.

I love these people. These are wonderful people, friendly, polite, warm and charming. There are no bad people anywhere. People are not bad, Mr. Speaker, it is governments and the nations' leaders that are bad. There are no bad Chinese people, there are no bad Russian people. The German people are not bad. The Japanese are not bad people. It is in the leaders that evil lies. These people are my friends. I want to help them.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another observation?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the politicians, the leaders of Panama, have been derelict in their duty to the people of Panama of whom the gentleman is talking? When they divert the attention of the people of Panama from their own shortcomings and their own derelictions they use the United States as a whipping boy.

Mr. FLOOD. As Dean Pound of the Harvard Law School used to say to me when I answered a question for about 15 minutes, "Mr. FLOOD, you have stated the question."

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman has stated what has been happening. Has it not been that recently a few Communist agents have taken advantage of these alleged grievances against the United States?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, sure. Get me right.

Mr. SCHERER. They have injected themselves into this situation.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not say the Reds started this business. They just moved in when it got nice and hot. They always do that. They come in there with the old stick and stir it up, if you know what I mean. Sure. My southern friends know what I mean. That is all they are doing.

Mr. SCHERER. The basic agitation arises from what the gentleman says is not necessarily the Communists, but the Communists in the last few months have taken over.

Mr. FLOOD. They have taken it over.

Mr. SCHERER. Did they not direct the techniques that were used in the recent invasion of the Canal Zone?

Mr. FLOOD. Let me just read this to you. I will skip about 25 pages here to read this.

In the Republic of Cuba while all this was going on during the dates that I stated just prior to our discussion, this great island country which is on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the canal, a revolution was coming to an end. Its recognized government was overthrown by a radical group headed by Fidel Castro. His administration now revealed as Communist slanted—if I can be polite—is engaged in the process of liquidation by firing squads. Now international communism previously entrenched in Veuezuela is on the southern flank of the Panama Canal. Here you have control by this foreign, alien ideology and these revolutionary systems converging on both

flanks like pincers on the canal. I say foreign, alien ideology because I have a resolution before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in which I declare that under the Monroe Doctrine foreign aggrandizement or infiltration by vis-et-armis, as this is, calls for the Congress of the United States to enunciate under these facts and circumstances that this constitutes and is thereby an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to the Western Hemisphere in this case of foreign intervention. In 1960 it does not have to be by vis-et-armis. And mark you, in this foreign intervention from Soviet Russia and her trained allies into these endemic revolutionary and politically disturbed neighbors and friends of the South, we must declare ourselves.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another observation to support just what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. This assault upon the Caribbean is not only taking place in Cuba and Panama, but in all Central America and Puerto Rico; is that not correct?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. It takes in the Caribbean, the whole area.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; it has occurred in the entire Caribbean. The Committee on Un-American Activities sat just a month or so ago, or less than a month ago, in Puerto Rico and we had a demonstration again of the Communists injecting themselves into a local question.

Mr. FLOOD. I have the report on that. I know what my friend is talking about.

Mr. SCHERER. The Nationalists want indepence for Puerto Rico and, of course, have a basic disagreement with the United States, and again the Communists have injected themselves into that question.

Mr. FLOOD. This is a pattern. My colleague knows, of course, that this is a pattern. He is not surprised at all by any of this, of course.

Mr. SCHERER. I am just trying to get it into the RECORD.

Mr. FLOOD. I appreciate that very much and earnestly hope that my colleague will put all of that information, or as much of it as he can, in the RECORD so that all may read it. My colleague, I know, is very serious about these questions and I thank him for the valuable contribution he has made. I repeat, I hope that my colleague can get all this information into the RECORD.

Mr. SCHERER. I will try to do so.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me tell you. With reference to this Cuban business. What happened? I am giving you the chronological sequence of events and the hour and day and month and year—from the beginning of 1902. On April 26, 1959, armed mercenaries from Cuba in collaboration with Red elements in Panama invaded the Republic of Panama. One part of their avowed plan—and we have the documents from the captured prisoners, was to send their first bombing squads to the constitutional government and territory of the United States. Their plan was to occupy the Canal Zone. Do you know that? The plan of the invaders threw the political leaders of Panama into hysteria. Many of them with their families ran across the Avenue of the Fourth of July. I see sitting here a former Member of this body, and former distinguished Governor of the Canal Zone, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher of Kentucky, who knows well of what I speak. He has a right to sit here. He was a great Member of this body.

Let me read to you what the President of Panama said that this invasion was. I read to you now the statement of President Ernesto de la Guardia of Panama. I quote:

> This was not just a group of adventurers from our country or even Cuba. These people were mostly Cubans, but directed and led by militant Communists. Their ambition is the long-stated one of taking over the Panama Canal.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be more positive and clear cut than this statement by one in a position to know. How can I make this plainer? President de la Guardia's opinion is supported by overwhelming evidence. The formation of Communist-oriented governments in the Caribbean on both flanks of the Panama Canal approaches and recent attempts to invade several isthmian countries constitute serious threats, not only to the United States but also to all the Americas.

As such, they are clear violations of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. It has been my observation that had this succeeded, and had these people occupied the Canal Zone, in view of the way the State Department has handled the situation in Panama and Cuba thus far under the present protection of the Latin-American countries, they would have said, "It belongs to them. We had better let them have it."

Mr. FLOOD. I am afraid you are right. I am sick at my stomach, but I am afraid you are right. I believe you. I do not know what is going on.

Now, what was next?

Though this highly provocative incident was witnessed by Panama Canal authorities, the trespassers were not interfered with by Canal Zone police and were allowed to leave the Zone without obstruction.

This 1958 flag-planting mob invasion of the Canal Zone, Mr. Speaker, was not a simple student prank as some of our officials tried to explain, but a calculated move in worldwide psychological warfare of Communist pattern against the United States. It received extensive coverage in Latin America, and also in the Soviet press, further emboldening Panamanian agitators to plan new measures of mob violence. It is, indeed, significant that in this same month of May 1958, that the Vice President of the United States, and his wife, during the latter part of his visit of good will to Latin America, was subjected to the grossest forms of indignity, also perpetuated by students of Peruvian and Venezuelan universities, with the ruthless skill of the trained leadership so characteristic of the Red pattern.

It is extremely pertinent, Mr. Speaker, to state at this juncture that had the United States in the 1936 treaty not abandoned its 1903 treaty obligations for the maintenance of public order in the cities of Panama and Colon, the May 2, 1958, mob invasion would have been unthinkable. As it was, the wolves of disorder had tasted blood.

Subsequent to these grave disturbances, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the President and president of Johns Hopkins University, visited the Isthmus as a special representative of the U.S. Government. What useful purpose his visit served is not clear, but we shall hear of him later.

CONGRESS FAILS TO REASSERT U.S. ISTHMIAN POLICY

The situation on the isthmus, meantime, did not stabilize. In a Panamanian enactment signed by President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., on December 18, 1958, Panama, by unilateral action, attempted to extend its territorial boundaries by sea from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit. This extended area completely encircled the Canal Zone and, in fact, was aimed at making the Panama Canal another Berlin. Because I so described it in an address to the House of Representatives of the United States, I was formally declared by the National Assembly of Panama as "Panama's No. 1 gratuitous enemy."

Here I wish to assert again that I am not an enemy of Panama and that, if Panama has any enemy No. 1, he is among its own radicals, demagogues, and revolutionaries who seem willing to bring their country to the brink of ruin in order to enhance their own political fortunes.

In a note to Panama, delivered on January 7, 1959, the United States refused to recognize the Panamanian claim for wider territorial seas. In addition to the technical objections raised by the State Department to the attempted extension, I would say that it is a clear violation of the sovereignty provisions in Articles II and III of the 1903 Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, which because of their basic importance I shall quote in part for ready availability:

ARTICLE II

> The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal of the width of 10 miles extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the centerline of the route of the canal to be constructed; the said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 3 marine miles from mean low water with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities * * * shall not be included within this grant. * * *

ARTICLE III

> The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned and de-

scribed in article II * * * which the United States would possess and exercise if it were sovereign of the territory * * * to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

It is well here to point out that in 1903, when the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty was ratified by Panama, the limits of the territorial waters of the Republic and the Canal Zone were coterminus. No subsequent agreement has changed these limits. Any change in them would necessarily apply to the Canal Zone as well as to the Republic.

The Department of State acted wisely in refusing to recognize the Panamanian claim for which action it deserves to be commended.

On the same day on which the U.S. note was delivered to Panama, January 9, 1959, I again introduced a concurrent resolution to reaffirm our Isthmian Canal policy, House Concurrent Resolution 33, 86th Congress. A concurrent resolution, it should be stressed, does not require Executive approval but is an expression of the sense and judgment of the Congress. Despite this fact, the cognizant committee referred it to the executive department for consideration and recommendation. Of course, Mr. Speaker, under the prevailing attitude of appeasement here, appeasement there, and appeasement everywhere, the response was negative and the Congress was not given an opportunity to vote on a measure to declare its own sense and judgment concerning this crucial question.

Thus, radicals in Panama had the way cleared for further advancement of their plans in a situation which could only end in tragedy for all concerned.

PANAMA RADICALS CREATE SERIOUS INCIDENTS

Meanwhile, in the Republic of Cuba, the great island country on the northern flank of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal a revolution was nearing the end. Its recognized government was overthrown by a radical group headed by Fidel Castro. His administration, now revealed as Communist slanted, has engaged in the process of liquidation of its enemies by firing squads and extensive confiscation of American property by expropriation. With international communism previously entrenched in Venezuela on the southern flank, the conquest of Cuba through subversion saw both flanks of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama area controlled by alien revolutionary systems, which now are converging toward the canal itself.

Thus, it is not strange, Mr. Speaker, that nearly a year after the 1958 Panamanian flag-planting mob invasion of the Canal Zone, on April 26, 1959, armed mercenaries from Cuba, in collaboration with radical elements in Panama, invaded that Republic. One part of their plan was to make token occupation of the Canal Zone; another, to overthrow the constitutional government of President de la Guardia. But underlying all was the ultimate objective of driving the United States from its control of the Panama Canal.

The landing of the invaders threw political leaders and the upper class Panamanians into hysteria and confusion. The man in the street became apprehensive because of the obvious anxiety of government leaders. They would have become far more deeply concerned had they known that some top Panamanian government officials moved their families into the Canal Zone—an area that has so often served as a political sanctuary in times of crises in the Republic.

Fortunately, the attempted invasion proved abortive, with the invaders surrendering to Panamanian authorities after intervention by the Organization of American States and the United States. But they were released with practically no punishment. Will there be more invasions of the American isthmus? The indications are that there will.

Who were those invaders is a question frequently asked. The best answer to that query was supplied by President de la Guardia himself, who, after the invasion stated:

> That was not just a group of adventurers from our country or even from Cuba. These people were mostly Cubans, but directed and led by militant Communists. Their ambition is the long-stated one of taking over the Panama Canal.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be more positive and clear cut than this statement by one in a position to know. Moreover, President de la Guardia's opinion is supported by overwhelming evidence. The formation of Communist-oriented governments in the Caribbean on both flanks of the Panama Canal approaches and recent attempts to invade several isthmian countries constitutes serious threats, not only to the United States, but also to all the Americas.

Unfortunately, the moves in the conquest of Latin American countries through infiltration and subversion have been made with such skillful secrecy as to beguile our people with a false sense of security. But they should no longer be taken by surprise by seemingly sudden invasions, disorders, and extreme nationalistic agitations.

Mr. Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, recently stated:

> "Nationalism," as a slogan for the breaking of the ties of friendship between us and the countries of this hemisphere, was the line given the Latin American Communist leaders who attended the 21st Party Congress in Moscow last February (1959). Details for the execution of this policy were then outlined to these leaders and some of the fruits of this planning can be seen today in Panama, Cuba, and elsewhere in this hemisphere.

By the time the impact of the April 26, 1959, invasion of Panama was over, the stage was being set for the next move. This was to be a peaceful occupation of the Canal Zone on November 3, 1959—the 56th anniversary of Panama's independence from Colombia.

The leaders for this were Aquilino Boyd, a former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama and now a candidate for President, also Ernesto J. Castillero. They published their plans. Thus, it is not remarkable that it was possible for me to address this body on July 29, 1959, warning against exactly what was to occur, also again to notify proper executive authorities of the pending danger.

Yet these various and most grave incidents and threats seem to have made no impact on the minds and consciences of those in positions of responsibility in the executive departments or even in the Congress itself.

NOVEMBER 3 AND 28, 1959

Independence Day celebration in Panama started normally with President de la Guardia, the officers of his Government, and the diplomatic corps attending colorful ceremonies in and near the historic Panama Cathedral. In the suburbs of the city all was quiet, but alongside the Panama Canal Zone border at the Pacific end of the canal radical demonstrators were gathering in defiance of what the Panamanian Government had advised.

Canal Zone authorities had taken precautions against the entrance of unruly groups into the Canal Zone, with police and firemen ready for eventualities. A demonstrator made a grab for the pistol of a Canal Zone policeman who plucked him from a marching group, and the worst boundary violence in Isthmian history was under way.

Pummeled with rocks and insulted with profane and obscene epithets, Canal Zone police used remarkable restraint in repelling the assault. But they and the firemen alone were not strong enough to withstand the attack, which forced the Governor of the Canal Zone to call upon the U.S. Army to take over the task of protection against the mob.

Frustrated in their designs, the mob then turned upon American property in Panama. They burned a Panama Railroad passenger car in the railroad terminal, looted stores, and, with Aquilino Boyd among them, stormed the U.S. Embassy, where they tore the American flag from the Embassy mast, ripped it to pieces, and instead, hoisted the Panamanian flag. Lesser disturbances occurred at the Atlantic end of the canal.

It is indeed regrettable that the Panama National Guard did not make timely attempts to maintain order on that fateful day. It was later learned that it had received orders not to appear.

Further details of these disorders are not needed for presentation here, for they are covered comprehensively in the papers of Panama. They were generally ignored in the press of the United States, which has long maintained a near blackout of important news from the Isthmus.

Did the U.S. administration issue a prompt and courageous statement backing up Canal Zone authorities to the hilt and warning that further efforts to invade the Zone would be repelled by force if Panamanian authorities were unable or unwilling to hold radicals and their Communist monitors in check? It did not.

Instead, the President, at his news conference of November 4, minimized the disorders as "really only an incident" and later sent a diplomatic emissary to Panama to appease those stirring up the trouble. Is there any wonder that the Panama National Assembly, by resolution on November 5, condemned Canal

Zone authorities and vowed "not to rest until the Panama flag is raised on our territory on the Canal Zone."

Finally, on November 28, Panamanian mobs attempted to invade the Canal Zone a second time. On this occasion, the U.S. Army initially repelled the invaders until, at U.S. Army request, it was joined in restoring order by the Panama National Guard. The Panamanian forces won prompt public commendation from U.S. Government officials who had not seen fit to commend American authorities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House of Representatives and speaking from a knowledge gleaned from the press of Panama, both English and Spanish, as well as from an extensive correspondence with witnesses, I wish to express my high admiration for the manner in which Canal Zone authorities, both civil and military, stood their ground during these crucial tests, especially the members of the Canal Zone Police and Fire Departments and the soldiers of the Army. They fought with their backs to the wall and measured up to the highest traditions of patriotism and service, also with the restraint and forbearance that comes with responsibility and power.

I will say that, at least. Nobody else wants to.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to join with the gentleman in paying respects to the Governor of the Canal Zone, General Potter.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Ohio knows him long and well.

Mr. BOW. For the excellent job he has done. I join with the gentleman in his praise of General Potter and the others in the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. FLOOD. I knew the gentleman would, and I am delighted to have my friend, who is a student of this problem, who I am proud to say sits alongside of me on the Panama Canal Subcommittee, take this position. He knows little Joe Potter. He is a great guy. We love him more, and I am grateful for those words of the gentleman from Ohio.

I do not feel lost, Mr. Speaker. I will sleep happy tonight. I thought I was alone. I knew this House would see the light. This is not political. I have given you a recitation through five Presidents of all parties. This is not partisan. That is why it is nice and warming to see this House exhibit itself at its best when it knows the facts. The people of this Nation have always, when they know the facts, done the right thing. They always have when they know.

I am just a mouthpiece for you to tell them, to tell you. Everybody cannot do all this work. You have your own things to do.

Mr. Speaker, this was an ugly situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In reference to this statement that you cannot do all our work. Many of us find that we have plenty to do and we have to rely on the gentleman and other Members to tell us.

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Personally, I want to express my gratitude for the work the gentleman has done. It has been very, very helpful.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very grateful to the old warhorse from Michigan. He has been my friend and I have admired him for a long time. Those are heartwarming things to hear.

"TITULAR SOVEREIGNTY" AND THE PANAMA FLAG

Meanwhile, amid a tremendous buildup in the Panama press, a State Department emissary arrived on the isthmus for a series of conferences. What special qualifications he had for such a mission are not shown by his record. But after 3 days of discussions, on November 24, he asserted that the United States "reiterated U.S. recognition, 'stated more than 50 years ago,' of Panama's titular sovereignty over the Canal Zone," which was not acceptable to Panamanian demagogues. Canal Zone residents were shocked by the implied surrender of American sovereign rights without the authorization of the Congress. And, I should add, this emissary was acting under orders of the Secretary of State.

Of special interest, Mr. Speaker, were some unexpected revelations that events on the isthmus at this time were to stimulate. One was that on November 3, 1959, Panama was expecting a declaration by the United States acknowledging Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and that this expectation was based on conversations of the Minister of Finance, Fernando Eleta, with Dr. Milton Eisenhower on September 13, 1958, at Dr. Eisenhower's home in Baltimore.

So startling was this disclosure that the State Department was apparently constrained to issue what seemed to be a formal denial that Dr. Eisenhower had made "any statement which could be construed to commit the U.S. Government to any course of action."

Such an assertion, Mr. Speaker, was not a forthright denial of the statement attributed to the brother of the President, but a cleverly worded phrasing that is definitely misleading. Of course, the United States cannot be bound by the statement of a private citizen even though he is the brother of the President. Nor, may I say, can any official of our Government abrogate surrender or annul the solemn obligations of our treaties with other nations. That, under our Constitution, can be done only by means of new treaty provisions promulgated by and with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Otherwise, chaos would follow.

Thus, a controversy over what the President's brother said has added so much fuel to the flames of the ugly situation in Panama that nothing short of open declaration on the subject of sovereignty will meet the situation presented. Because the State Department has made such a complete fiasco over many years on this matter, this question is raised: What are the influences that have been controlling, and still seem to be controlling, the State Department's actions? Regardless of what the intentions may have been, they give aid and comfort to the avowed enemies of the United States, and, indeed, of the entire free world, at a most critical hour, and render our country's task of maintaining this great waterway for the shipping of all lands and the defense of each and every country of the Western Hemisphere more difficult.

We have competent, courageous, and well-informed people on isthmian questions in this country.

Why is it that these exceptional men and women are not being used for the exceptional situations instead of relying on routine underlings, totally anonymous advisers. I cannot find out about them, and the ones I do find out about nobody has ever heard of. These surrenders we are making on the advice of these incompetents. These people in the State Department, as far as I am concerned, are just as good Americans as you or I. I do not believe all of this hogwash and nonsense. They are good Americans. They are honest men, they mean well. But they are stupid. They make mistakes and they are wrong. But that is something else again. I can remember that a few years ago I made a mistake. So there you know it can happen. These are not un-Americans. These are not evil people. They are not very bright, but you can do something about that. These are simply history lessons.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the feeling of the residents in the Canal Zone when they read about that meeting on December 21, 1959. Who advised the President of the United States, this great and good man, and I think he is a great and good man, the greatest general we ever had or that any other nation ever had. I knew him when he was a buck colonel. I worked with him for years. Who told Ike this? He did not know it. How could he know? Nobody but God Almighty could do the job of President of the United States. No man can do it, no human being. He is doing the best he can. He did not know these things. If he had he would never have said that the United States of America will recognize the titular sovereignty of Panama. That came from some striped-pants guy. He has to depend on people.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Of course, after the way we acted in the Suez crisis, somebody in the State Department helped the takeover there, and probably they were just trying to be consistent in saying that if the Panamanians want the canal, there is not much we can do but say, "It is yours."

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. Of course, we paid for it.

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. We kept it up. They did not have a dime invested in it.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, say, by the way, in all these conversations, in all these negotiations about what we should give

them, and ultimately give them the canal, nobody talks about dough at all. We are not to be compensated if and when—God forbid that would ever happen. You know that.

Mr. HAYS. Do you think you or I could do this with the Riggs Bank, by simply just going down and taking over?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think they ever heard about the Riggs Bank.

Mr. HAYS. I am not sure they ever heard about any one of us, but by the same token, we could say "This belongs to us, and we are taking over."

Mr. FLOOD. And the only thing I know about the Riggs Bank is what I read one day, that Daniel Webster had an account there.

Mr. HAYS. It is no more ridiculous in walking to the Riggs Bank and saying "We are taking over" than saying to the Legislature of Panama that it belongs to them.

Mr. FLOOD. That is classic logic for which the House recognizes the gentleman from Ohio. Of course, that is right. My trouble is, I cannot say the things as aptly. It takes me two hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One other trouble you have, and that is in knowing so much and telling us about it. That must disturb some folks down the street.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, I do not know about that. The gentleman has been here much longer than I have. I have been here 15 years, and I think the last people before you were the Indians. So, I believe you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have not learned anything since I have been here, but you have, and I certainly appreciate what you said today.

Mr. FLOOD. Nobody works harder here than the gentleman from Michigan. In all things he does a good job. I do not agree with him very often, but certainly I regard him highly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if once in a while I get your recognition, that is good enough.

Mr. FLOOD. I will settle for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As long as the voters return me.

Mr. FLOOD. That is right.

Now, nationalization is not the only issue here. There are strange vascular groups who want to internationalize. You have to twist your face out of shape from now on and go from nationalization to internationalization. This is a new one. Somebody wants to internationalize it. Then, do you know what happened in the last couple of months? Now somebody wants to regionalize the internationalization. And, you think you have gobbledly-gook in Washington. Aye, aye, aye. Only these fellows are not fouling. You have a great sense of humor here today; these fellows do not have any. These are some of the long-haired, flat-heeled friends who dream up these things. They are do-gooders. They mean well, you know, but hold your watch.

Now, Fidel Castro and his agents sit upon these international boards. You internationalize this canal, and it goes to the Hague tribunal upon a motion by Panama, and the recently appointed member of the court at the Hague tribunal is a former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama. Happy New Year. Well, that is the way it is.

Now, one thing more, Mr. Speaker. We have done a lot for these people, and we should. Much time has been lost in our giving away this bargaining power. There have been defaults on the part of the obligations by Panama. They did not maintain order in Colon and Panama as they are required by treaty. But, basic to the proper action is an understanding of our mission in the Panama Canal—just what I am talking about here. This is an interoceanic public utility operated and maintained by the United States pursuant to treaty as a mandate for civilization and the world. And, it is part of your coast line. That is what we are talking about. This is no game for boys. I am not talking about that lower 40. Panama Canal operations must not be weakened and confused through ill-advised policies of placating these people. Our position is one required by law and international law pursuant to the treaty to be so self-sustaining with tolls that are just and reasonable for the transit of vessels of all nations at all times.

And I hope Nasser hears that.

We are operating this canal under the Concordat of Constantinople of 1888 under which the Suez Canal is supposed to be operated. We are abiding by that Concordat. We are not stopping anybody's ships, even Jewish ships. Ah, he makes a point of that.

Now, these are the facts. We reorganized this management. This is a successful, going business and a fair profit is being made. This is an arm created by this Congress. This is a corporation created by Congress. You are on the board of directors. I do not think you will get very rich in it, but you are on the board here. You ought to know what is going on. Your businesslike operation of the canal is one thing but, Mr. Speaker, relief for the Republic of Panama is something else. The two must never be confused. The Panama Canal must never be allowed to degenerate into a relief agency for the Republic of Panama. It was never intended that way. Nobody but the Congress of the United States can make it that way. You can do anything you want with it; it is your baby—but only you.

PANAMA CANAL: SYMBOL OF FOURTH FRONT

We cannot view this as an isolated question separate and quarantined from the world and everything else in it. This is related directly to events all over the world as every action today on the face of this earth is interrelated and interbalanced. There is no place to hide, not any more.

For many months the nations of this hemisphere have watched the steadily rising Red tide in various parts of Latin America, especially among the countries of the Caribbean. It is indeed significant that there is a campaign of the communistically controlled press in Cuba to end immediately the occupation of our Guantanamo Naval Base. "Yankee, get out of Guantanamo." You have no worse or more bitter enemy in the world than Williams in Trinidad. "Get out of Chaguaramos." "Get out of Guantanamo." "Get out of the canal." "Yankee, go home." This is Red patter.

This does not come from the hearts of the Panamanians or the Cubans or the nice people in Trinidad—no. I will never believe that to my dying day. I know them.

Prior to World War II the great fear of the nations most likely to be involved was that of a two-front war—East and West. As to that danger, the United States was protected by two ocean barriers, patrolled by the Atlantic and Pacific fleets with provision for a quick shifting of forces between the oceans by means of the Panama Canal.

Since World War II, Mr. Speaker, that strategic setup has changed radically, incident to the advent of powerful aircraft, nuclear submarines, ballistic missiles, and other modern weapons. The protective barriers once afforded by the vast expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the icy wastes of the Arctic have in substantial degree been overcome, making them avenues for attacking the United States from three directions. To provide defenses on these three fronts the Congress has appropriated billions. I just came from a hearing of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense where the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Tom Gates, our new fine Secretary of Defense, from the great State of Pennsylvania, of course, were giving us these new details in the new budget.

This is not Buck Rogers business, this is not tomorrow, it is last night, today.

While thus preoccupied what has happened in our backyard to the south? In the vital area of the Caribbean, the forces behind the world revolutionary movement have focused on countries there with oft-repeated aim of bringing about the destruction of the United States and our system of constitutional liberty. Encouraged by the formation of communistically oriented governments in Cuba and other Western Hemisphere countries, these forces, recognizing the Panama Canal as the strategic center of the Americas, have concentrated on the Isthmus of Panama.

In this light, Mr. Speaker, the Panama Canal has become the principal target and symbol of a fourth front in a situation comparable to that which, in 1823, was faced by President Monroe when he proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine. The time has certainly come to extend that doctrine to guard against the intervention of international communism by means of penetration and subversion. To that end, the United States, as the most powerful leader among the nations of the free world, should make clear to our friends and enemies all over the world that, in the exercise of our inherent right of self-defense and in the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, we are determined not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the

peace and safety of our Nation or of other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that under no circumstances at any time and for no reason must the flag of the Republic of Panama be permitted to be placed by the Republic of Panama over constitutionally sovereign territory of the United States of America unless by constitutional action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I compliment the gentleman on his very excellent address, which shows a great deal of study and work. It is apparent that the gentleman is a student of the situation not only in Panama but throughout the Caribbean.

I am delighted that the gentleman in his address has made it amply clear that he is making no attack upon the people of Panama, that he is making no attack on the people of Trinidad, and, of course, not on the people of Cuba.

I think the gentleman will join with me in the thought that the countries to the south, in Latin America, whether in Central America, the Caribbean area, or South America itself, are a bulwark of great strength for our Nation. There are many, many people who love the United States and who would defend us if the necessity came.

I think it is imperative that we on the floor of the House confine ourselves to actions such as the gentleman has taken so that we recognize the people to the south as our good friends. I wish it were in the power of many of us to be able to travel in South and Central America to learn the real friendship and the warmth of the hearts of those people. When you hear people talk about anti-American feeling, I do not believe it is anti-American feeling. I think the feeling of those people sometimes is one of neglect, that we have looked to the East and to the West.

We have given of our Treasury to the East and West and we have neglected to look to the South where we have such a great potential of friendship.

Mr. FLOOD. I wish I had said that. My colleague has said it so well, I wish I had said that.

Mr. BOW. It seems to me, as we go to the East and to the West in our troubles that we are looking back over our shoulders at history. But, when you go to the South, where we have this great potential of friends, you are looking forward to the horizon of a possible new day of great strength in this hemisphere. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the hope that the Department of State and the Congress and our Executive will bend every effort to see that we tap this great reservoir of friendship with the peoples of Latin America.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, how I join you in that hope and how I thank you.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for making this fine address to the Members of the House. I hope those of the Members who were not able to hear the gentleman's speech will read it. I express the further hope that I will have the opportunity to support the gentleman's resolution which is now pending before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, who sits with me on the defense appropriations' subcommittee, and we know the gentleman as an expert on naval affairs, I would like to see the gentleman use his influence and knowledge of the navy over a period of so many years to reactivate at a Caribbean station the old Caribbean unit—the Special Service Squadron to show the flag to our friends—and not as the great Yankee from the north, but as my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, has stated to build friendship and better understanding between us.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I would like to add my commendation to that of my other colleagues for the great contribution the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made here today to my personal thinking, and I am sure to the thinking of most of the Members of Congress and the thinking of the people of the United States. This is a much greater danger than even many of us thought. We are grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing these facts out before this great deliberative body. I might add that while this last invasion of the sovereign territory of the United States, which links East and West, and which is vitally needed not only for the defense of our Nation but for the defense of the whole free world—while these plans were being laid, Khrushchev was in this country parading arounding accepting the hospitality of the people of this great country. I would like to point out today that these plans are continuing to be laid even when we have summit conferences at Camp David and other places to subvert the national defense of this great Nation and its leadership of the free world that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Alabama and others are so ably working on and trying to protect and defend.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, when this fellow Khrushchev came here, I was not here. The Congress adjourned at 6:20 a.m., and I left town at 6:21 a.m.—and I will give you five guesses why. Khrushchev came in at 10 o'clock. I do not think my colleague from South Carolina was here either.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I left, too.

Mr. FLOOD. My friend and colleague the gentleman from South Carolina was named after the great William Jennings Bryan, who, as Secretary of State, enunciated many of these things that I have mentioned here today about the Panama Canal. My friend was well named.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I, too, would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] on his magnificent statement which has just been made on the state of the Union as it appears and as it is in Panama. My friend has forgotten more accidentally than I will ever know on purpose with respect to this particular problem. But I can say this—and I know this for a sure thing: I have always wanted to go to Panama, but I have always been too busy, as the gentleman pointed out when he said that we have been too busy to go south of the border, so to speak. But I did take it upon myself this past October to go to Panama and see firsthand just what is happening and what is going on down there. I can say this to you this afternoon: Every word that you have uttered is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I can say that for the very simple reason that while I was there I could see this thing fomenting. It was going on at that time. They were preparing for a showdown, if you please, on November 3. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made with respect to General Potter. I think the gentleman did a magnificent job—a beautiful job. I am proud of him as an American.

I think he ought to be promoted. It is LPD.

Mr. FLOOD. I just promoted him an hour ago.

Mr. CHELF. I am for that. I am for promoting him again.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with that. Well, you are just an old broken down World War hero, having had your stomach shot out. So I know how you feel. You are telling the truth.

Mr. CHELF. We will rue the day that we let them fly the Panamanian flag alongside of ours.

Mr. FLOOD. That is true. You are made of the right stuff.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. I would like to go on record, as all of my other distinguished colleagues, I think it is very significant that from both sides of the aisle we have commendations for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]; this is no sectional or partisan issue about which we are speaking. We are all sincerely interested in the welfare of this country. I wish to associate my remarks with the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken in commendation on this fine argumentation you have presented, and in asking for further study at all levels of government. It is a serious problem. I wish to go on record as opposing any recognition of

any Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, titular, or otherwise. In association with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] and as a former member of the Armed Forces of this country, we will oppose forever the flying of any flag above that of the United States of America in the Canal Zone.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the first time I ever heard you make a speech in Congress. That was fine. I could not have done any better myself.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who is chairman of the Subcommittee of Latin America of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. I certainly shall yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SELDEN. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated, the subcommittee to which he referred is conducting hearings at this time on the situation in the Canal Zone and our relations with the Republic of Panama. On Saturday last I wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, in which I pointed out the possibility of permitting the Panamanian Flag to be flown in the Canal Zone was a matter of grave concern to many Members of Congress. I asked him to delay a final decision on that question until the subcommittee had had an opportunity to go into this matter fully. Assistant Secretary of State Roy R. Rubottom, Jr. appeared before the subcommittee on Friday. We had the privilege of hearing the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] yesterday. We expect to hear a representative from the Department of Defense on Friday. Also, we have issued an invitation to General Potter, as well as a representative of American citizens of the Canal Zone to appear.

Mr. FLOOD. I will wager you that Tom Gates, Secretary of Defense, will leave no opportunity for flying the flag in that military area. I will bet on that.

Mr. SELDEN. Certainly the gentleman's testimony before the subcommittee yesterday and the fine documentation presented today gives the members of my subcommittee as well as Members of Congress information that should be extremely helpful.

Mr. FLOOD. Will you please do this? I will yield to you if you will ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks your letter to Secretary Herter.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of January 9, 1960, to Hon. Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, be inserted at the end of the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter that I wrote to the President of the United States with respect to the Panama Canal problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

(Copy of letter follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C. November 16, 1959.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to my attention that the Panamanian Government has officially requested the removal of Maj. Gen. W. E. Potter, the Governor of the Canal Zone. I have been informed that this demand has been made because Governor Potter used the necessary force to stop certain riots, the destruction of American property on Canal Zone territory and the actual tearing down and tearing up of our American flag on November 3 by well-intentioned Panamanians but who unfortunately were led and inspired by Communists and several local "freeloading" Panamanian politicos who would barter their mother's soul for a vote on election day.

Mr. President, it just so happens that I was in Panama and in the Canal Zone for about 10 days just prior to these riots. Everywhere I went, even with my limited Spanish, I could hear and understand that there were going to be demonstrations against the United States on November 3, Panama's Independence Day. It was even in the local newspapers that trouble was mounting day by day and apparently the present Panamanian Government took no steps to prevent it. The best evidence of this, of course, is that the rioting went off exactly on schedule and at the places designated previously. Governor Potter, in my estimation, acted wisely, calmly and in the best interests of peace, decency and of the United States of America. For this great leader to be removed, reprimanded, or even unkindly spoken to about this matter would be a travesty on justice. It would injure a fine officer and gentleman for doing his duty and, what's infinitely worse, it would be coddling those few selfish politicos of Panama who, with the help of Communists and Communist sympathizers, started the whole insurrection for their own personal and political aggrandizement. Those same flea-bitten, cheap Communist demagogs who are hellbent upon starting trouble with the United States and the freedom loving, God-fearing Panamanians, have been furnished a blueprint and a complete pattern as to just how Colonel Nasser did the job in the Suez Canal with the British. Unfortunately, Mr. President, I am told that the lawmakers in the National Assembly of Panama are now insisting on flying the Panamanian flag over our U.S. property in the Canal Zone, which is ours by solemn treaty. By doing this they are unwittingly giving aid, comfort, and support to these Communist safeblowers who would again crucify our Lord, Jesus Christ, if given the chance. If this attitude continues, as a Member of Congress, I shall have to vote to cut down on all of our appropriations affecting Panama because we must let it be known that the American people are sick and tired to the quick of being "used" and then attacked. We absolutely cannot tolerate any future support for the leadership of any country that allows itself to be swayed by a few radical incompetents whose aim is to foment trouble between the great Panamanian people and their strong ally and longtime friend, Uncle Sam.

This is the time and the place to vigorously support Governor Potter and all of our splendid Americans in the Canal Zone more than ever before.

Mr. President, you and I, and the entire world for that matter, know that the United States has been one of the best friends that Panama has had. We gave them more than a just trade for the original Canal Zone by and through a fair and honorable treaty. We ended yellow fever, completed the job the French had left undone and started the ships moving in the Panama Canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. Since that time we have upped our commitments to the Panamanian Government, and even in 1955, under your own administration, the United States voluntarily agreed to grant Panama many more concessions. A $30 million bridge was given to them, plus many new assists to their economy. Unfortunately our kindness to Panama has been seized upon by ambitious and lying politicos as a weakness.

While I was in the Canal Zone I learned that our Army, Navy, our U.S. employees, and all of our enterprises in the Canal Zone together pump into the economy of Panama nearly $180 million per year. Without this amount of money this fine little nation could not survive or exist because even with it there is much poverty. It is amongst these poor unfortunates that selfish Communist politicos have plied their trade. Mr. President, I have met and I have talked with many good, substantial, salt-of-the-earth Panamanians who are deeply grateful to our country for what we have done and we are now doing for Panama. I have visited with these good people in their homes, have talked to them in their shops and business centers, and in every conversation I have had with these wonderful people I was asked not to judge the real Panamanian people by these Communistic politicos who are not only without a conscience but who are daily trying to gain or regain office by using Uncle Sam as the big bad wolf; who is responsible for everybody's troubles all over Panama and the world. Mr. President, I could tell you much I saw and heard recently in Panama but in the final analysis suffice it to say that Governor Potter and the entire complement of our Army, Navy, and civilian employees in the Canal Zone are doing a magnificent job. I am proud of them. As a Member of Congress I commend them to you as their Commander in Chief. I salute them for their loyalty, devotion to duty, patriotism, and their courage in representing the United States of America in the best possible tradition.

I send my best wishes to you for success on your forthcoming trip. May a permanent peace, happiness, and prosperity emanate from it.

Sincerely your friend,

FRANK CHELF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. For that purpose, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 445, which embodies the language and principles of our historic foreign policies. This measure, Mr. Speaker, is not based on a blind devotion to the past, but on a realistic appraisal of the present with a view of the future.

PROGRAM FOR ISTHMIAN SECURITY

The history of the United States-Panama relations since 1936 conclusively shows that they have not been improved by sustained surrenders. Rather, they have progressively worsened in proportion to these surrenders.

The time has come for all appeasement to end and for positive measures because the Panama Canal is a symbol

of U.S. power and prestige. To that end, we must be definite and firm.

The program, which I would suggest, should include:

First. Reaffirmation of our historic policy of exclusive sovereign control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal along the lines outlined in House Concurrent Resolution 33, 86th Congress.

Second. Announcement that no hostile or other provocative demonstrations or invasions will be tolerated in the Canal Zone or within the strategic vicinity of the Panama Canal.

Third. Reactivation under the direct control of the Chief of Naval Operations, of the Special Service Squadron for continuous display of the flag in the Caribbean area and other missions of diplomatic character.

Fourth. Proclamation by our Government that the Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired territory by the United States.

Fifth. Extension of the Monroe Doctrine to include penetration and subversion by means of a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

As to the urgency for action on this program, the unfortunate events at Panama November 3 to 28, 1959, and recently in Cuba, speak far more eloquently than anything I can say. The questions that I have described are not local, but developments in a worldwide movement focusing on Panama. So far, the forces for undermining U.S. authority have had a virtually unobstructed field, with no organized counterforce. We must supply the countermeasures now, and, in doing so, we act not only for the just and indispensable rights of the United States to discharge its treaty obligations to all the world with respect to the Panama Canal, but as well to safeguard the peace and safety of the world.

One more final remark, Mr. Speaker, starting on November 14, as a result of the attempted Panamanian mob invasion of the Canal Zone, I made a series of press releases dealing with various aspects of the recent canal crises as they developed. The releases follow, together with House Concurrent Resolution 33 and House Concurrent Resolutions 445 and 450, of the present Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, January 9, 1960.

Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been informed that the question of permitting the Panamanian flag to be flown in the Canal Zone, and on ships transiting the canal, is currently under consideration in the Department of State, but that no decision has yet been made.

The possibility of permitting the Panamanian flag to be flown in this territory in which the United States possesses and exercises, under treaty, the powers it would have if it were the sovereign of the territory—to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such powers or authority, is currently a matter of grave concern to many Members of the House of Representatives, a number of whom have spoken to me on this subject.

When the 1955 treaty was under consideration in the United States Senate, the Department of State explained at that time in some detail why permission to so fly the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone had heretofore been denied.

The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has started executive session meetings to study the situation in the Canal Zone and our relations with the Republic of Panama.

As chairman of the subcommittee I am writing respectfully to request that no final decision on the question of permitting the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone be taken until the subcommittee has an opportunity to go into this matter further.

With very best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include the following releases and concurrent resolutions:

RELEASE OF SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1959

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD said today that the power of the Congress should be used to support Gov. W. E. Potter, of the Canal Zone, in his continuing battle with individuals from Panama who are asking that Potter be kicked out of his high position following the outbreak of November 3 when large groups of Panamanians invaded the Canal Zone, tore down and destroyed the U.S. flag in front of the U.S. Embassy, and committed other acts of violence to U.S.-owned property.

Potter countered this outrageous conduct by requesting U.S. Armed Forces to chase the rioters back over into the Republic of Panama from where the march originated, a march ostensibly to mark the anniversary of Panama's independence from the Republic of Colombia, but, in reality, has been characterized as a politically inspired blackjacking and blackmailing method to squeeze more and more concessions from the United States in the way of higher annuity payments and other considerations.

In fighting this unprovoked attack upon territory which the United States holds in perpetuity under a treaty signed with Panama earlier in this century, Potter has been castigated in some of the leading newspapers in Panama and in speeches made by some public officials and others there. They have asked that he be ousted from his vital job as Governor of the Canal Zone and replaced by someone more to their liking.

When FLOOD got these reports from Panama, he immediately dispatched a letter to Potter in which he expressed his support of Potter "100 percent" and told Potter not to be unduly concerned by these "radical pronouncements" because "your friends, in and out of Congress, will stand behind you in your battle against these forces of evil."

"Now that the November 3 crisis has abated," FLOOD stated in his communication to Potter, "I wish to extend my heartiest commendation for the successful meeting of what I consider the most serious challenge ever made with respect to U.S. control over the Panama Canal, and especially the effective manner in which the mob invasion was repelled.

"Let us hope that the precedent thus created may prove a turning point in our relations not only with Panama, but also with all Latin America in general for I believe this to have been the first time in many years that we have stood our ground as we should."

FLOOD warned, however, that even though the more radical elements in Panama have been temporarily frustrated by U.S. action of November 3, "they can be expected to exert their efforts in other directions" to thwart U.S. operations in the Canal Zone.

"Beware of sabotage," FLOOD warned Potter. "Soviet-trained saboteurs, who have been sent all over the world to lurk behind the scenes and to bring about destruction in some form or other, may attempt to damage or destroy vital features of the Canal and other U.S. installations on the Isthmus."

In his interest in the Panama Canal and the sovereign rights of the United States there, FLOOD speaks from a position of wide and detailed knowledge as he has been the leading speaker in Congress on this subject for a number of years and, further, is closely related to the problems of the zone in his capacity as a Member of the House Appropriations Committee where Federal funds are determined annually for the operation of this enterprise.

RELEASE OF WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1959

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, today released the following statement regarding the crucial situation at Panama:

"President Eisenhower's proposed order that would prohibit U.S. military post exchanges and commissaries in the Panama Canal Zone from making lowest price open market purchases is truly shocking. Not only is this a gross violation of the rights of our servicemen and dependents there, but also is an ignominious abandonment of sound business practice in an effort to appease radical agitators in Panama and is a shameful submission to political blackmail, all of which will inevitably have worldwide consequences involving heavy costs to all servicemen overseas as well as to the American taxpayer.

"While it is all right to give Panamanians preference where they meet open competition and inspection safeguards, it is altogether wrong to make purchases from them where they are unable to meet fair competition and such standards. Under the policy proposed it is inevitable that prices will be raised to inordinate figures which U.S. purchasing authorities will be forced to accept in violation of the principles upon which rests the act of 1950 placing the Panama Canal on a self-sustaining and sound business basis. The possibilities for evil thus involved are great, among them the question of tolls and the cost of provisioning of vessels at Canal Zone ports.

"It does seem that the State Department before attempting to deal with this subject should have conferred with congressional leaders concerning the purpose and effect of such policy. In the last analysis, the Congress is the ultimate authority and as such enacted the 1950 legislation and thereby bound the executive to comply with its provisions.

"The consequences of the tragic failures of the present administration since 1953 with regard to Panama Canal sovereignty and related questions reached a high point on November 3, 1959, in an attempted Panamanian mob invasion of the Canal Zone, undoubtedly of Communist inspiration, which was rightfully repelled by U.S. authorities. Instead of issuing a statement backing up the Governor of the Canal Zone to the hilt and warning agitators in Panama that further efforts to invade the zone would also be repelled by force if Panamanian authorities were unable or unwilling to hold radicals and their Communist sympathizers in check, the administration sent to the Isthmus a special diplomatic representative in an effort to appease those stirring up the trouble.

"As a further act of appeasement, he made the public statement that Panama retains 'titular sovereignty' over the Canal Zone, whatever that means. This statement was not satisfactory either to Panamanian or to U.S. executive authorities.

"However, he made no public statement commending the action of Governor Potter

and zone military authorities in repelling the attempted November 3 invasion of the Canal Zone. Thus, the State Department continues its long-established, weak, and fatuous policy in dealing with Panama Canal problems.

"The crisis at Panama is focal and cannot be ignored. The disorders there on November 3, 1959, that required the use of force to protect U.S. interests also require that this incident be thoroughly looked into by a full-fledged congressional investigation to determine the facts and to place responsibility for the long series of policy failures preceding it. Succumbing to blackmail can only lead to greater extortions.

"For years the overall policy of our State Department has been appeasement; appeasement here, appeasement there, and appeasement everywhere—with the result that the most precious rights of our Nation are being liquidated everywhere while at the same time Communist aggression is permitted to flourish."

RELEASE OF TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1959

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, today released the following statement concerning the policy of our State Department in dealing with Panama Canal problems:

"The significant disclosure in the press of Panama reporting Dr. Milton Eisenhower as having stated to a high Panamanian official and political leader that the United States would recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone has jolted all patriotic Americans and constrained the State Department to issue what has the appearance of a formal denial.

"The cleverly worded assertion by the State Department that Dr. Eisenhower did not make 'any statement which could be construed to commit the U.S. Government to any course of action' is misleading. It is not a forthright denial of the statement attributed to the brother of the President.

"The impression evidently intended was that Dr. Eisenhower's statement was being denied. However, instead of making a clear-cut denial of the alleged statement, the State Department's press release only declares that the United States is not bound thereby. Naturally, the U.S. Government cannot be bound by a statement of a private citizen even though he is the brother of the President and his former special representative during a good will tour of Latin America in mid-1958. And neither, I may add, can any official of our Government, whether in or out of the State Department, abrogate, surrender, or annul the solemn obligations of our treaties with other nations. Such action can only be taken by new treaty provisions ratified by and with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Chaos would follow any other procedure.

"Moreover, the increasing of the muddle in Panama by controversy over what the President's brother has said is adding fuel to the flames of an ugly situation. The relations between Panama and the United States constitute a serious part of our deplorable international relationships because it is being used by forces allied with Russian Communists to create distrust and hatred between the peoples of the two countries, the latest incident being a second attempted mob 'invasion' of the Canal Zone on Saturday, November 28, 1959, and requiring the second use of force to protect the zone.

"At this stage of the Panama crisis nothing short of an assumption of authority by the Congress to control this matter will be a safe course for the United States. Since the State Department has made such a complete fiasco in its handling of isthmian matters, this question is raised: What are the influences that have been controlling, and still seem to be controlling, the State Department's actions?

"So far, it appears that the responsible U.S. authorities, in and out of the Canal Zone, including congressional leaders, have not had any voice in the attempted settlement of these grave questions. The State Department even fails and refuses to approve the wise and courageous actions of Canal Zone civil and military authorities in repelling the reckless and communistically inspired 'invasion' attempts on November 3 and 28.

"While the President exercises general authority in conducting our foreign relations, he must act within the framework and provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States, including treaties duly ratified by the Senate. Certainly, neither the State Department nor any of its underlings can bind our Government in contravention of express and important treaty provisions and legislative enactments, well illustrated by recent ill-advised pronouncements that can only serve to undermine both the 1903 treaty acquiring the Canal Zone and the act of 1950 placing the Panama Canal enterprise on a business basis. Yet in the instant situation it appears that both such attempts are being made.

"In dealing with Latin American affairs the State Department seems unable or unwilling to decide grave issues on the basis of merit but only on considerations of expediency and appeasement. It is indeed significant that Dr. Eisenhower, whose advice on Latin American matters has been described in the press of Panama as of 'dubious value,' has been appointed as a member of the newly created President's National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs.

"The constant acts of appeasement and surrender through many years by our Department of State, especially at Panama where our huge 'giveaway' program started in 1936, well entitle that agency to be called the Department of Appeasement."

RELEASE OF THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1959

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, today released the following statement concerning further threats of invasion of Panama:

"Recently reported preparations in Cuba for launching another invasion of the isthmus have caused Panama to make a formal protest to the Government of Cuba in an effort to ward off that danger.

"The present Cuban Government over a period of months, by both actions and words, has revealed itself as an agent of Moscow-directed international communism. Thus, any invasion of Panama by forces staged from Cuba would be an overt act in extension of the communistic system in this hemisphere and a matter of grave concern for the peace and safety of all the Americas.

"Moreover, it would not only violate the principle of nonintervention of the 1947 Rio Pact setting up the inter-American security system, but also the Monroe Doctrine.

"Our neighbors to the south recognize the dangers involved and look to the United States to lead in defense against current threats to the Western Hemisphere, with prompt announcement of the Monroe Doctrine as applying to any attempt from Cuba to invade Panama or other Latin American countries, especially those of the Caribbean area."

RELEASE OF SUNDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1959

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in an open letter to President Eisenhower on the eve of the latter's departure on his worldwide "peace with justice" mission, vigorously assailed the administration's appeasement policy in connection with anti-American violence in the Panama Canal Zone.

FLOOD coupled his detailed and historically backed condemnation of the administration's soft Panama policy with a personal appeal to President Eisenhower "to apply the full force of your position toward safeguarding the U.S. interests in Panama—and, thereby, the entire world."

The Pennsylvania Congressman, who is widely recognized as an outstanding spokesman for the full protection of American rights in Panama, as guaranteed "in perpetuity" in a treaty between the two nations, made the open letter appeal to President Eisenhower, he stated, because of the views expressed by the Chief Executive at his press conference on last Thursday.

Because of the imminent departure of the President, FLOOD had his communication on the problem hand delivered to the White House Thursday evening. FLOOD wrote that all the circumstances warranted, he felt, embracing his views in an open letter to the Chief Executive.

Remarking that "the Panama Canal has long been a prime target for Communist political attack, dating back to the 1917 Russian revolution," Congressman FLOOD cited the "disturbing disorders" that have taken place in recent weeks in Panama.

"There has been a virtual blackout of important news from the isthmus in the major press of the United States in line with the desire expressed by you soon after the event to minimize the significance of the incident 'as one episode in a long period of favorable relations.'

"As to this, Mr. President," FLOOD wrote, "the Spanish language press of Panama has not missed the significance of these disorders. Neither have residents in the Canal Zone nor thoughtful nonpolitical Panamanians who witnessed the assaults endured by our Canal Zone police and Army units in protecting U.S. interests."

FLOOD was frankly critical of the Eisenhower administration's handling of the violence-marked situation which developed in the wake of recent anti-American demonstrations in the Canal Zone.

"Instead of a prompt and courageous announcement backing up Canal Zone authorities, civil and military, to the hilt and warning that further efforts to invade the zone would be repelled by force if Panamanian authorities were unable or unwilling to hold radicals and their Communist monitors in check," FLOOD wrote, "the administration sent a diplomatic emissary to appease those stirring up the trouble. The result was inevitable; a second attempt to invade the Canal Zone on November 28, with far greater numbers involved and renewed violence."

The Pennsylvania legislator, who is directly concerned with Panama affairs as a member of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee with responsibility for supply purposes for Panama, then boldly charged the Eisenhower administration with a serious error of omissions, policywise.

"It is indeed regrettable that neither you nor any official in the State Department has publicly commended Canal Zone or U.S. Army authorities for doing their duty. They have, however, commended the National Guard of Panama and issued statements foretelling appeasement to mobsters whose ultimate aim is nationalization."

Continuing in this vein, FLOOD wrote:

"Not only have your statements, Mr. President, served to undermine important provisions of the 1903 treaty acquiring the Canal Zone and providing for the construction of the Panama Canal and its operation, but also to negate the 1950 act of Congress placing the canal enterprise on a self-sustaining and businesslike basis. These are matters in which Congress has a prime interest and responsibility."

FLOOD struck hard at the administration's suggestion for admitting the display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone, asserting it would be a "psychological Pearl Harbor." Continuing, FLOOD claimed: "Furthermore, if the Panama flag ever flies officially in the

Canal Zone, this will open up a veritable Pandora's box of controversy, conflict, and chaos. The extremists who have been inciting Panamanian mobs to violence and have thus been establishing the foreign policy of Panama have as their immediate aim a duality of control which the great leaders at the start of the century thought had been forever prevented. The ultimate aim is Panamanian nationalization."

Earlier in the year, FLOOD charged the efforts of Panamanians to nationalize the canal, if successful, would "Berlinize the Canal Zone and thus be a dagger thrust at the heart of America."

In his letter to the President, FLOOD further stated:

"The acquisition of the Canal Zone in 1904 and undertaking the Panama Canal enterprise are highlights in American history, always looked upon by President Theodore Roosevelt as comparable in importance to the Louisiana Purchase. The policies leading up to them flowed from the minds of such eminent leaders as Secretary of State Hay, Senator Spooner, John Bassett Moore, Elihu Root, Adm. John G. Walker, John F. Stevens, and William H. Taft, as well as Roosevelt; and fully confirmed by Secretary of State Hughes.

"The treaty provisions for exclusive sovereign control of the Canal Zone in perpetuity to the entire exclusion of the exercise of any sovereign control by the Republic of Panama were based on realistic considerations involved in the conduct of a great project in an area of endemic revolution, and political instability. The perpetuity requirement is based on 1902 recommendations of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Spooner Act."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 3, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is motivated by the fact that I am a Representative in the Congress from the great State of Pennsylvania and a member of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations charged with the duty of formulating supply bills for Panama Canal purposes; and by the further fact that the discharge of the duties thus imposed has caused me to become a close student of canal problems. These are the reasons for thus addressing you concerning your statements in the Presidential news conference of December 2, 1959, relative to Panama Canal matters.

My feeling in the present situation is one of the deepest concern, and therefore I speak frankly, but, I assure you, with the respect due your office and person. Also, because of the circumstances and your absence from the country, I take the liberty of making this an open letter for the reason that thereby—in some measure at least—the American people and the Congress may be warned of the dangers involved in the current situation at Panama. I am in nowise an enemy of Panama or of any just Panamanian aspirations.

The acquisition of the Canal Zone in 1904 and undertaking the Panama Canal enterprise are highlights in American history, always looked upon by President Theodore Roosevelt as comparable in importance to the Louisiana Purchase. The policies leading to them flowed from the minds of such eminent leaders as Secretary of State Hay, Senator Spooner, John Bassett Moore, Elihu Root, Adm. John G. Walker, John F. Stevens, and William H. Taft, as well as Roosevelt; and fully confirmed by Secretary of State Hughes.

The treaty provisions for exclusive sovereign control of the Canal Zone in perpetuity to the entire exclusion of the exercise of any sovereign control by the Republic of Panama were based on realistic considerations involved in the conduct of a great project in an area of endemic revolution, and political instability. The perpetuity requirement is based on 1902 recommendations of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Spooner Act.

DECEMBER 3, 1959.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The record of violence, revolution, political intrigue, and instability in Panama since 1904, culminating in the attempted mob invasions of the Canal Zone on November 3 and 28, 1959, are ample proof of the wisdom and vision of those who framed our historic policy of exclusive sovereign control, both Americans and Panamanians. Nothing could be more fatal to the welfare of Panama than for the Canal Zone or canal to become Panamanian political footballs.

While it is true that the preamble of the 1903 treaty acquiring the grant of the Canal Zone in perpetuity describes "the sovereignty of such territory being actually vested in the Republic of Panama," this statement was obviously made to show the transfer of sovereignty over the area from Colombia to Panama as a result of the secession of Panama from Colombia. It was not for the purpose of establishing the sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone after ratification of the treaty. Thus, for you as President to state that the United States "has recognized the titular sovereignty of Panama" over the Canal Zone for more than 50 years is not only inaccurate but definitely misleading. In addition, for you also to suggest that there should be "visual evidence that Panama does have titular sovereignty over the region" is incredible. It plays directly into the hands of those whose ultimate aim is wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States.

The only possible claim that Panama can justly make is one of reversionary character that can never be exercised so long as the United States meets its treaty obligations with respect to the canal. Therefore, the Canal Zone is constitutionally acquired domain of the United States subject only to treaty provisions.

What has been most disturbing since the disorders of November 3, 1959, has been the virtual blackout of important news from the isthmus in the major press of the United States in line with the desire expressed by you soon after that event to minimize the significance of the incident as "one episode in a long period of favorable relations." As to this, Mr. President, the Spanish language press of Panama has not missed the significance of those disorders. Neither have residents in the Canal Zone nor thoughtful nonpolitical Panamanians who witnessed the assaults endured by our Canal Zone police and Army units in protecting the United States interests.

Instead of a prompt and courageous announcement backing up Canal Zone authorities, civil and military, to the hilt and warning that further efforts to invade the zone would also be repelled by force if Panamanian authorities were unable or unwilling to hold radicals and their Communist monitors in check, the administration sent a diplomatic emissary to appease those stirring up the trouble. The result was inevitable: a second attempt to invade the Canal Zone on November 28, with far greater numbers involved and renewed violence.

DECEMBER 3, 1959.

Mr. PRESIDENT: It is indeed regrettable that neither yourself nor any official in the State Department has publicly commended Canal Zone or U.S. Army authorities for doing their duty. They have, however, commended the National Guard of Panama and issued statements foretelling appeasement to mobsters whose ultimate aim is nationalization.

Not only have your statements, Mr. President, served to undermine important provisions of the 1903 treaty acquiring the Canal Zone and providing for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual operation, but also to negate the 1950 act of Congress placing the canal enterprise on a self-sustaining and businesslike basis. These are matters in which the Congress has prime interest and responsibility.

In this connection, please do not overlook that the Panama Canal has long been a prime target for Communist political attack, dating back to the 1917 Russian revolution.

As to the State Department's reputed statement that the "admission of the Panamanian flag into the zone" would be of "immense psychological importance," that is true. It would certainly be a psychological "Pearl Harbor" for the United States. Furthermore, if the Panama flag ever flies officially in the Canal Zone, this will open up a veritable Pandora's box of controversy, conflict, and chaos. The extremists who have been inciting Panamanian mobs to violence and have thus been establishing the foreign policy of Panama have as their immediate aim a duality of control which the great leaders at the start of the century thought had been forever prevented. The ultimate aim is Panamanian nationalization.

Concession after concession in the nature of important benefits has been made to Panama by way of appeasement and the most solemn and paramount rights of the United States surrendered without any balancing considerations while your recent statements on these matters have been made in a further effort to appease—and doubtless from recommendations of underlings in the State Department or others not grounded in the Panama situation—no action has been required of Panama to make any withdrawal of its recent enactment seeking to extend its territorial waters around the Canal Zone, thus making the canal another Berlin. In fact, all these concessions have produced an adverse effect so far as the United States is concerned.

The succession of surrenders over many years of vastly important indispensable American rights to operate the Panama Canal for the benefit of the world at large is a matter of the gravest concern. We must stand by our treaty obligations and not permit this great interocean link to become the victim of Panamanian or any other political maneuvering.

DECEMBER 3, 1959.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The flying in the Canal Zone of the Panamanian flag would symbolize another striking instance of the liquidation of the just authority of our Nation, while Communist aggression so largely responsible for the liquidation has been permitted to flourish in a manner far beyond any precedent of history.

The tragic muddle at Panama, Mr. President, is conclusive evidence that you cannot safely rely on those who since 1953 have been advising you on Panama Canal sovereignty and treaty questions. The whole policy has been one of sheer appeasement, and evidently, against the views and recommendations of those in immediate charge of the operation, maintenance, and protection of the canal. However overgenerous some of the recent concessions might have been, they are far better than any action which would impair or subtract from the full authority of the United States over the Canal Zone. Without such authority this Nation could not discharge its obligations in operating the canal.

The official display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone as evidence of Pana-

manian jurisdiction is not an insignificant gesture of good will. Instead, it will pave the way for ever-increasing and impossible demands in behalf of Panama led by extremist radicals who under no circumstances will ever be friends of the United States regardless of what we may do.

Finally, I can think of nothing that would have a stronger appeal to the people of our country than for you to apply the full force of your prestige toward safeguarding United States interests in Panama—and, thereby, the entire world. If you should thus act, our people will support you in the best tradition.

With best for yourself and the cause of peace on the forthcoming trip to the Old World, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

RELEASE OF FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1960

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD today called upon Secretary of State Christian A. Herter to make a forthright statement supporting the sovereign position of the United States in the Panama Canal Zone and in the operation of the canal, both of which have been targets in recent months of radical elements in Panama whose purpose is to oust the United States from this part of the world or, at least, to make impossible demands upon this country with regard to annuity payments and other matters.

FLOOD has contended for several years in speeches before the House that the United States will continue to face serious difficulties at Panama so long as an appeasement policy is followed by those whose responsibility it is to establish policy with regard to United States-Panama relations in general and the Canal Zone in particular.

Developments in recent months have borne out the Congressman's concern in this matter, with two outbreaks, led by revolutionary mobs, in November, and the prospect of further violence if these same groups do not obtain their ill-considered demands, including the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, in the near future.

FLOOD stated in a communication with Secretary Herter that titular sovereignty does not mean joint or equal sovereignty by Panama over the Canal Zone nor does it express the precise situation involved, the term "titular sovereignty" recently being enunciated at Panama by a U.S. State Department official following the November outbreaks and was his way of describing Panama's position vis-a-vis the United States in the Canal Zone. FLOOD said at the time that this State Department official did not serve the best interests of the United States in making such a characterization of Panama's position and the position, established by a 1903 treaty, of the United States in the Canal Zone and in the operation of the canal.

Continuing, FLOOD told Herter that so long as the United States maintains and operates the Panama Canal in accordance with its treaty obligations, Panama cannot rightfully exercise any kind of sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

On the flag matter, FLOOD stated the official display of the Panama flag over Canal Zone territory as an evidence of any kind of Panamanian sovereignty, "would only complicate the situation and would be the basis for further and ever-increasing and impossible demands on the part of Panama with respect to both the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal."

"The radical elements in Panama which, in fact, formulate its foreign policy, would never rest with such display, whatever agreement might be formally reached between the United States and Panama on this subject," FLOOD stated to Herter.

Such a display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, FLOOD continued, "would inevitably add to tasks in the operating and defense forces of the Panama Canal" and, he stated, "any person entertaining a contrary view, in the light of isthmian history is absolutely naive."

In conclusion, FLOOD said that he strongly believed that a forthright statement by our Government on this subject in harmony with the enunciations of former Secretaries of State, including John Hay and Charles Evans Hughes, as well as President-elect William Howard Taft, to name a few, "would do much to clarify the situation and to restrain communistic and radical elements in Panama whose ultimate goal is nationalization at whatsoever cost."

FLOOD also posed these questions to Herter:

Why feed the dangerous flames of fanaticism with unwise appeasements, which in the last analysis would be a vast disservice to both Panama and the United States?

Why should we fail to stand up for our just, legitimate, and indispensable rights and authority in the Canal Zone?

FLOOD announced that he will make another in his long series of addresses on this subject before the House of Representatives the week of January 11.

The title of his address will be: "Panama Canal: Symbol of Fourth Front."

FLOOD's continuing interest in the U.S. position at Panama is heightened by his membership on the House Appropriations Committee and that committee's responsibility in providing supply bills and other necessary funds for the operation and maintenance of the canal and the Canal Zone.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 445

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control

over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who wish to do so may extend their remarks on this subject at the end of the other insertions made on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DR. TOWNSEND'S 93D BIRTHDAY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 93d birthday anniversary of a distinguished American who has for many years been in the forefront of the fight for economic justice and security for the millions of senior citizens of this Nation. I refer to Dr. Francis E. Townsend, founder and president of the Townsend plan.

Dr. Townsend was born on January 13, 1867, in Fairbury, Ill., the son of George Warren Townsend and Sarah Harper Townsend. He graduated from Franklin, Nebr., Academy in 1893 and received his medical degree from Omaha Medical College of the University of Nebraska in 1903.

He married the former Mrs. Minnie Bogue in 1906 and became the father of three children, the eldest of whom is Robert, long associated with his father in Townsend plan activities and who now serves as vice president and treasurer of the Townsend organization.

Dr. Townsend practiced medicine in South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana, also serving as a 1st lieutenant in the Medical Corps during World War I. Following the war, he moved his practice to Long Beach, Calif. Here he served as assistant health officer of the city of Long Beach and devoted much of his time to caring for the indigent. For more than a generation he has been a vigorous advocate of the Townsend plan to provide decent pensions to all persons at age 60.

Throughout his life, Dr. Townsend has been the champion of the sick, the disabled, the underprivileged, and the economically distressed persons in our midst. It is a pleasure to salute this great American humanitarian on this, his 93d birthday.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more difficult position for a Member of this House to be placed in than to have to follow the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania in the presentation of any point of view on the floor of this House.

Incidentally, the very able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just disclosed his broad knowledge and ability in the field of foreign affairs as it relates to the Panama Canal and the Republic of Panama, it also happens is one of the leading forces on the subject on which I am about to talk to you for a few moments; and I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be here for at least part of this period so that we can have the advice and the recommendation which I know he is so well qualified to give.

SCHENECTADY UNEMPLOYMENT HEARINGS DEMONSTRATE URGENT NEED FOR PASSING DISTRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. Speaker, last September when the 1st session of the 86th Congress adjourned, one of the most important items of unfinished business left on our agenda was the so-called area redevelopment bill or the distressed areas bill, of which I am proud to be a sponsor. This bill is designed to deal with the urgent and pressing problem of chronic unemployment that has plagued so many sections of our country even at a time when we are being told as the President of the United States said again in his state of the Union message, that the Nation is experiencing the greatest prosperity in its history. Mr. Speaker, for millions of people in many sections across the country, including my own congressional district in New York State, there is no prosperity; there is instead the specter of unemployment, uncertainty, the loss of jobs, and general economic demoralization.

Although the area redevelopment bill pased the other body in the last session and also was favorably reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency of this body, it has remained in the Committee on Rules without further action being taken. Fortunately, just before the adjournment of Congress last year the other body created a special committee to look into the whole subject of unemployment. That committee was appointed under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, a former Member of this body, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY. In the months that have passed since the first session of Congress ended, Senator MCCARTHY and his colleagues have gone from one section of the country to another examining the areas of unemployment and of underemployment, and under the terms of the resolution creating their committee they are now scheduled to make a full report to the other body, together with their recommendations for appropriate corrective legislation, on January 31.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to try to jump the gun on the official report which will be submitted by the distinguished McCarthy committee. But last Friday this committee came into my own district in New York State and into my own home city of Schenectady and held a day-long hearing there into the problem of unemployment in our particular area. And on the basis of that hearing and the information developed there, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge all of the Members of this body to join with me in insisting that the House of Representatives move quickly to get action on the area redevelopment bill so that we may demonstrate conclusively that this Congress has at least as much concern for the problems of unemployed areas on this continent that it has for unemployment areas and underdeveloped areas thousands of miles away on other continents.

I believe that the distressed areas bill is one of the most urgent pieces of legislation that we could possibly adopt, and I believe that the information which was developed at the hearing in Schenectady last Friday, which no doubt duplicates in many ways information picked up in many other parts of the United States during the course of this committee's inquiry, makes it clear why this legislation is so important.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in Schenectady the committee went into one of the old and established industrial sections of the United States. Schenectady itself is the home of one of America's largest and most powerful corporations, the General Electric Co. Within a few miles is located the great city of Amsterdam, the center for many years of the carpet industry in the United States, and just to the north of Amsterdam lie the cities of Gloversville and Johnstown, the center of the great glove-making industry in this country. Today, Mr. Speaker, throughout this area, the picture, as these hearings developed, is a bleak one. Schenectady, this great home of one of America's greatest corporations, is suffering heavily from unemployment, although through a fluke in the statistical reporting methods it has just been removed from the list of areas of most serious unemployment. Believe me, as the testimony developed at this hearing, the situation in Schenectady has not improved; only this morning in the Schenectady Gazette I read a report that even more people are expected to be dropped from the employment rolls at the Schenectady plant of the Alco Products Co., Inc. In fact, the situation is likely to get worse before it gets better. In addition, Amsterdam, Gloversville, and Johnstown are all currently listed as areas of chronic unemployment. In fact, these two areas are the two areas in New York State which have the very dubious distinction of being so designated.

Now what is the cause of this situation in Schenectady? Well, according to information presented at the hearing by a representative of the General Electric

Co. our area is still suffering from a recession. This recession was not referred to as in the past but actually in the present. In fact, based on the testimony presented to the committee, I gather that there is some question, at least, as far as the whole electrical industry is concerned, whether the recession of 1957 and 1958 has even now come to an end. Certainly it has not come to an end in our area, and the great manufacturing plant of the General Electric Co. in Schenectady is today operating at something between 40 and 60 percent of its normal productive capacity. In addition, the situation has been further complicated by the fact that the company over the past few years has gradually been moving many of its operations out of the established industrial area of New York State into the areas of the South and the West.

The committee was given these facts with regard to the resulting local employment situation. During the past 5-year period, while overall employment in the United States was rising from 61.2 million to 65.5 million, employment in the city of Schenectady dropped from 46,192 to 23,520, or, in other words, a drop of 22,672, or nearly 50 percent of the working force. In fact, the committee was informed that it now takes almost 17 years of service in the General Electric Co. to qualify even for a sweeper's job. The same kind of a shift has also been taking place with regard to the other large industry in Schenectady, the Alco Products Co.

These shifts have had a devastating effect, as can be imagined, on the community itself. As Rabbi Solomon S. Bernards put it in his testimony:

> Imperceptible at first but traceable now, a spirit of demoralization began to set in in our community about 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have received great help from Members on both sides of the aisle on this area redevelopment plan. It, too, is completely nonpartisan. Men on both sides of the aisle have worked for years to make this law. I must say that the gentleman now speaking to us from the well joined this fight the day he came to the House. He has been at my right hand ever since. At all of our steering committee meetings, caucus meetings, and debate and what not he has been my strong right arm. I am proud to report that to the people of his district, which is equally distressed economically as is mine in the anthracite coalfields of Pennsylvania. Now, I anticipate what my friend is going to say. I know he is going to cover all of the problems that have been discussed with my colleagues both on the right and the left from States who have this same problem. I am sorry I cannot remain here, because I am an hour late for the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee hearing. The Secretary is testifying. I think you would like to know that I have talked about this matter with my friends on both sides of the aisle, and I am going to try again. I went to the Speaker and asked his cooperation and help. He assured me he wants this kind of a law and that he will help us in any way he can to have this law and that he will program it immediately if and when it reaches the floor of the House from the Committee on Rules. I know he wants to help us, and I am sure that makes my friend who is speaking feel much, much better about that. I feel that we have the votes in the House to pass this bill, and I believe we will pass the bill. The administration has a bill of its own. I do not say there is anything sacred about my bill. I will stand by, listening to the rule of reason and compromise, because you know that settlement is better than any lawsuit, anyhow. So, I congratulate you for taking this time. I see many friends here to help you, and I wish you would excuse me.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments and very generous remarks. As is ever the case, the gentleman has been more than generous in his words for me. Let me say that it has been a real privilege for me to be one of the many followers of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his very able fight in this regard. I am delighted to know that he has had these assurances, and I feel certain on the basis of information developed by the committee in the other body that we will muster the votes needed to put this bill across. I must also say that I was pleased to read in the paper the other day a report that I interpreted as being a statement from the President of the United States that he was now prepared to support some legislation of this type, although in his form rather than our form, as the gentleman indicated. I think this is certainly a significant advance and it makes me very optimistic about the future. And, I agree with the gentleman that we certainly want to get a bill out in one form or another and will be prepared to make any reasonable and proper compromise. I will go along with the gentleman's leadership on that.

Mr. Speaker, in these Schenectady hearings, the mayor of the city of Schenectady joined in expressing regret for the effect which these movements of industry have had on our city, particularly when they have come at a time when the country as a whole was experiencing a general economic drop.

Two additional points: Testimony at the hearing developed the fact that foreign competition has been an increasingly severe factor to be reckoned with in the electrical industry; and the vice president of the Alco Products Co. further testified frankly that the only way to improve the situation was to increase productivity, which he acknowledged would mean even fewer men required to build the same number of locomotives.

In spite of these difficulties, Mr. Speaker, the people of Schenectady are making an almost superhuman effort to help themselves. Within recent months there has been established a citywide organization, which has called upon leaders in every phase of community life, government, business, labor, the church, and so on, to mount a communitywide effort to attract new industry and to create the conditions under which new industry can be brought into the community and in which a greater number of jobs can be found for existing industry. This great community organization, which has already received nationwide attention, is known, rather uniquely but succinctly, as GUTS, Inc. I am myself proud to be a member of the GUTS organization; in fact I am in charge of the sales organization designed to sell my home community to prospective industrial applicants, and I will be happy to meet at the conclusion of these remarks with any of you or any of your constituents who may desire to move into our area.

I am certain that this kind of action is one of the first steps that is necessary before a community can arrest the downward trend. But I also feel that we should not allow these local activities to blind us to the fact that what we are confronted with here is not just a local but a national problem and we cannot escape the responsibility for dealing with it as a national problem, too.

In the city of Amsterdam, once one of the textile centers of the Nation, there is the same basic problem. Some years ago the Bigelow Sanford Carpet Co., one of the big employers in Amsterdam, moved to the South. As a result, textile employment in Amsterdam, which stood at 15,600 in 1951, is now down to 8,600, according to testimony presented to the committee. A former mayor of the city of Amsterdam testified that this move was undertaken because of low wages and cheaper power in the Southern States of our Nation and also because of the difficulty which unions have found in organizing to protect the wages and working conditions of their members in that section of our country. Today Amsterdam is listed as suffering from 13.5 percent of unemployment, and this in spite of the fact that this great community has also mobilized its resources in an effort to attract new industry.

Comparatively speaking, this organization, known as Industries for Amsterdam, has been highly successful, having attracted some 19 new plants into the city of Amsterdam in the past 6 or 7 years. And yet, at best, as the testimony demonstrated, this community self-help effort had brought in less than half of the 4,000 jobs that moved out of the city of Amsterdam when the Bigelow Sanford plant went south. In spite of the fact that this community self-help spirit in Amsterdam resulted, as the present mayor of the city testified, in the raising of some $400,000 from its own citizens to support this new industries' drive and to construct needed industrial plants, the problem has not been licked. In fact, the community, as the mayor himself expressed it, needs outside help. He testified to the Senate committee that the city has industrial prospects interested in moving in but help is needed to build plants to accommodate these prospects.

As the Amsterdam Recorder phrased it in an editorial:

> We need help. What we need is assistance in making our community attractive to outside industry in search of new locations.

Even more seriously hit is the glove industry in Fulton County just to the north. For many years the glove industry has been affected by foreign competition. In the past 5 or 6 years this competition from abroad has reached staggering and frightening proportions. Today Gloversville has 21.3 percent unemployment, with some 5,000 of its 23,450 people unemployed. It is listed as a chronic area of unemployment, and one witness testified that at best the workers in the glove industry average only 7 or 8 months out of a year of employment. The rest of the time they subsist on unemployment insurance. As the mayor of the city of Gloversville testified, retail sales in this community have gone down 7 percent in the past year while retail sales in the rest of the Nation have been rising by 8 percent. This is what we mean, Mr. Speaker, by chronic unemployment. In fact the size of this economic problem of foreign competition can perhaps best be appreciated by the testimony which indicated that 70 percent of the knit glove manufacturing put onto the American market today comes in from Japan. As a result of this situation the glove industry is scheduled to appear before the Tariff Commission on Tuesday next to appeal for substantial relief. As one witness testified to the Senate committee, "The glove industry in Fulton County has come to the very last phase of its erosion, and now, unless the practice is reversed, the last remnants will disappear." Referring to the Nation's "unrealistic tariff policies," the executive secretary of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers said bluntly:

> The county of Fulton is powerless to restore healthy employment.

He added:

> More than kind words are needed to help the area.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the situation in one important area of this country. I am sure that other Members of this body could cite statistics and conditions to demonstrate that it can be duplicated in many other parts of the country, and I am sure that the report of the distinguished committee from the other body will also demonstrate this fact clearly. Unemployment is more than an economic problem, Mr. Speaker. As several witnesses indicated it is also a social and an educational problem. Desertion and marital discord are on the rise in areas of increasing unemployment. Young men and women are in many cases dropping out of school early in order to try to find a job to help the family tide over their economic situation, and many youngsters who have been educated at substantial cost by the community are leaving the community and moving elsewhere, thus depriving the community of the investment in their education and development for which they had contributed so heavily. Even more serious are the prospects for the future. Not only are we unable to supply the jobs for the young people who are looking for them today, but what about the opportunities for those increased numbers of young men and women who will be coming into the labor market in the next few years as a result of the so-called population explosion which we have been hearing so much about? Are these people permanently to be denied employment? Are we to close down areas of our own country and mark them permanently as contaminated and unfit for human habitation and too hot to handle because of our inability to develop jobs in these locations? Are we to leave our country splotched and blotted with ghost towns from one end to the other in a time of national prosperity?

Mr. Speaker, this problem is not just a local problem. I submit that it is clearly a national problem. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message the other day, said that he would not recommend the expenditure of Federal funds for any local problems but only for those of national concern. Mr. Speaker, a cancer in one part of the body can ultimately destroy all of the body, and in my judgment the economic cancer of unemployment in one area of the country can ultimately damage the economic fabric of the country as a whole. This is a national problem, and I believe that we must move swiftly and decisively to deal with it on a national basis. We cannot possibly take pride in our prosperity as long as this level of unemployment is allowed to exist in so many parts of the Nation.

One of the most disturbing factors of all about this situation is the comparison between this country and countries abroad which have been the beneficiaries in the past few years of so much financial aid from the United States. As one of the members of the subcommittee put it, there is a level of unemployment in this country of 6 percent. One of the witnesses testified that he would consider the reduction of this level to even 3 percent as highly favorable. By comparison, the level of unemployment in countries of Western Europe, which have been heavy beneficiaries of American aid is well below 2 percent. Can we not do as well for our own people as we do for those abroad?

The representative of the General Electric Co. for example, testifying before the committee, pointed out how contracts in the heavy electrical goods industry awarded in just the past year to foreign firms had meant the loss of over a thousand jobs for a full year in the city of Schenectady alone. In fact, this representative, Mr. A. C. Stevens, was concerned not only with the problem of foreign competition but the even more serious problem that to meet this demand industry may gradually be forced to move abroad in order to stay competitive, thereby taking away even the small number of jobs that still remain. Indeed this movement has already started in many of our industries and especially in glove industry, and as Mr. Stevens himself phrased it, there is substantial danger that this movement may turn into a full-scale "stampede."

Mr. Speaker, this is the shape of the problem we face. Even though the people in my district are brave people and are deeply optimistic, and even though they have done everything possible to assist themselves, it is clear, as this hearing brought out, that they desperately need help from the outside. They need help to help themselves. They need help to attract new industries into their area and to provide these new industries with facilities that would make their established community an industrially attractive one. They need help to counteract some of the concessions that are being offered by local governments in other areas of the country. They need help to retrain workers from skills that have been established over many years to new skills that would be needed for new industries, a job which very few industrialists are prepared to undertake and finance themselves.

There are many other pieces of legislation that, in my judgment, are required to deal fully with this problem in all of its aspects, including, as I have already indicated, legislation to meet the serious problem of foreign trade and our unrealistic tariff policy. But the first and most important step in my judgment would be the adoption of the bill which already has passed the other body and which has received the overwhelming support of the Committee on Banking and Currency in this body, a bill, in fact, which passed both Houses of Congress in the 85th Congress and then unfortunately was vetoed by the President of the United States, the area redevelopment bill. This bill would make funds available to communities like Schenectady and Amsterdam and Gloversville and Johnstown which are already moving to help themselves by establishing community industrial development organizations. It would make funds available to retrain workers from one type of productive activity to another. It would help to build the industrial buildings that the mayor of Amsterdam has said his community needs if it is going to lick its own chronic unemployment problem.

I want to appeal to all of the Members of this body to join with me to get this bill out of the Rules Committee and onto the floor of this House. I believe there were indications at the end of the last Congress that a new effort would be made early in this session to accomplish just this objective. Now is the time to act. And I was most encouraged, Mr. Speaker, just the other day, to read a press account which indicated that even the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States have expressed their desire to support this kind of distressed-areas legislation. There may be some quibbling over the amount of money, but I do not see how there can be any quibble over the need for action at the highest level of Government to eliminate this economic cancer and to recognize our responsibility to restore the economic health of our own people, especially if we can so easily provide billions of dollars for unemployed and underdeveloped countries abroad.

If a visit to these foreign countries can so move people that they recognize that the challenge of poverty and lack of opportunity is a titantic challenge, as the President of the United States indicated just the other day, then I think there is an equally titanic challenge for us to

meet in the problem of lost opportunities, of failure to utilize our full resources, of poverty and economic stress in our own country.

"Look homeward, angel." Let us not lose sight of the responsibilities and the needs in our own community and our own Nation as we meet the needs of world leadership abroad. Let us not sacrifice our own economic health in trying to restore the health of our friends abroad. Let us not take away our own jobs as we try to create jobs in other countries.

I believe the area redevelopment bill is the first and necessary step in facing up to this serious and threatening problem of unemployment here at home, and I hope those Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who worked together in the last year under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will join together again this year to produce a piece of legislation that will move to meet what in my judgment is the Nation's gravest economic threat.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include following these remarks testimony which I presented before the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the other body, and also to include following that an extension of remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who has asked that his remarks on this subject be included in the RECORD following my own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, the several requests are granted.

There was no objection.

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN SAMUEL S. STRATTON BEFORE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT, SCHENECTADY, N.Y., JANUARY 8, 1960

Mr. Chairman members of the committee, I want to extend first my appreciation to the committee for accepting the invitation which I extended to the committee, with the support of the Schenectady Board of Supervisors and local No. 301 of the International Union of Electrical Workers, to include a study of the conditions in Schenectady and the Mohawk Valley area in your survey of the overall national unemployment problem.

I believe your appearance here today is of great importance. Many of the problems of unemployment, after all, are particularly well exemplified by conditions that exist in the established industrial areas of the Northeast. During the course of your hearings you have collected a great deal of evidence. No doubt many of the facts that you will learn of here will duplicate information which you have obtained elsewhere. But I also believe that you will find certain features of our local situation which may be somewhat unique and which will help to amplify the reasons for the painful and paradoxical economic distress that is occurring in the midst of apparent prosperity in other parts of our Nation.

For your purposes, the 32d Congressional District can be divided roughly into two sections. First, the situation in Schenectady growing out of the activities of the General Electric Co. and to a lesser extent the Alco Products Co. Secondly, the situation in areas like Amsterdam and Fulton County where the depressing impact of foreign imports has been especially significant.

Schenectady has long been one of the great industrial centers of the State and the Nation. This, of course, is the home of the great General Electric Co. At the peak of the Korean war, 7 years ago, some 40,000 persons were employed at Schenectady General Electric. Today the employment figure is closer to 20,000. Alco Products Co., formerly the American Locomotive Co., employed some 10,000 people back in 1951; today their employment is in the neighborhood of 2,000. The unemployment situation in Schenectady has stemmed largely from these changes.

As far as General Electric is concerned, I believe Schenectady has been part of an economic trend that is not perhaps unique in our city, namely, the gradual shift of industry from established industrial areas of the Northeast into the South and the West. The company first announced plans for this shift back in 1953. They have been going on gradually since then, although the recession of 1957 and 1958 made the situation even more acute than the company had anticipated.

The situation with regard to Alco is somewhat different. It stems largely from a decline in the railroad industry generally, plus some readjustment in production activities of the company outside of Schenectady, though in this case not outside of New York State. Local real estate taxes, by the way, have added to Alco's difficulties—a situation that is not uncommon in other communities hit by unemployment and declining populations.

I believe the committee may want to explore somewhat further the reasons for these shifts. No doubt there is a general desire today on the part of many companies to decentralize operations, with not so much volume of production in a larger number of cities, rather than a higher volume in a few cities in which the company is the overwhelming sole employer. Perhaps there is also a desire to move out of established areas into areas where labor is less well organized, where living standards are lower, and where social legislation and the benefits provided by State law are not as progressive as they have become in New York State. In any event, the result of this shift has been to place the emphasis in Schenectady today almost entirely on heavy industry, that is, the production of turbines and turbine generators. Lighter industry, the consumer products, have almost all moved out of Schenectady. And since heavy industry notoriously lags behind the general economic trend, Schenectady is today witnessing the strange phenomenon of people being thrown off the job even as new orders for turbine manufacturing are coming in. But it takes more than a year to plan a turbine, and the production workers are laid off the job while the preliminary planning is under way.

In Amsterdam in the carpet industry, and in the glove industry of Fulton County, the situation is one that has gone on for a longer period of time. Representatives from these areas will give you more details and fuller figures; but the blunt and simple fact of the matter is that in promoting the industrial growth of other countries such as Germany, Italy, Japan, and the Philippines, we have also succeeded at the same time in undermining the jobs of people in Amsterdam, Gloversville, and Johnstown. This trend has been going on, as I say, for many years, but it has become especially severe in the past few years and as a result both of these areas are now listed as chronic unemployment areas, in fact they are the only two chronic unemployment areas in New York State. Certainly we cannot sacrifice our own people in helping those in foreign countries.

One other feature has been added to the problem, and that is the decision on the part of the Federal Government last year to close down the U.S. Naval Supply Depot at Scotia. This decision was unfortunately taken without regard for the already depressed economy of the area, and involved the loss of some additional 675 jobs.

Now what are my recommendations to the committee for legislation to deal with this problem?

(1) I believe there is a need for legislation to assist communities like Schenectady, Amsterdam, Gloversville, and Johnstown which are already seeking to help themselves in bringing in new industry to fill in the job gap. The so-called distressed areas bill, of which I am proud, incidentally, to be a cosponsor, is legislation which would be extremely helpful in this direction. Amsterdam has had substantial success in organizing a community undertaking of its own to attract new industry; similar community endeavors are under way in Schenectady and in Fulton Counties. Yet it is not always possible for communities which are economically hard hit to find all of the ready funds that might be needed to purchase industrial parks, erect industrial buildings, or do other things to bring in new industry. Likewise there is no fund readily available to help in the retraining of personnel from one type of business to another, something that is often needed before a new industry can be helpful. This the distressed areas bill would do.

(2) The committee should recommend adoption of a bill which I introduced in the last session of Congress, H.R. 5559, to provide a measure of Federal tax relief for businesses which move into an unemployment area or which expand in such an area. With such legislation on the books areas like our own would be in a better position to compete with some of the concessions now being given by areas in States which do not have the same progressive level of legislation we have in New York. Such a bill would help us keep the industry we already have, which is just as important as bringing in new industry.

(3) Some legislation, similar to bills I have introduced, to cut down on foreign imports of gloves, and to give the U.S. Tariff Commission greater power in adjusting tariffs and quotas—as in the carpet and glove industries—to help local industries being driven to the wall by foreign competition.

(4) Some insistence on the part of the Federal Government that reductions in military bases be made only following a careful study of the impact of such closings on the local economy, and be adjusted to such local conditions. In fact I have already recommended that the House Armed Services Committee undertake such an inquiry, so as to avoid in the future just the sort of thing that has happened here at Scotia. As a result of concerted action by all members of the New York State congressional delegation, additional defense contracts have been coming into New York State. But unfortunately not many of them have come in here because, as I have mentioned, most of the defense production has been moved out of Schenectady. Developmental contracts employ engineers and scientists, but they do not employ production workers.

I don't need to reiterate in detail to the committee the social impact of unemployment. Younger people are being forced to leave our cities and go elsewhere in search of work. This means that the money we have already invested in their education will not come back to us in terms of their contribution to local community life and achievement. Retired persons are also forced to leave the community because of the absence of some other breadwinner in the family to help them meet expenses after retirement. Increased real estate taxes which inevitably result from the destruction of established industrial properties also promote the flight of individuals out of our area and complicate the problem of attracting new businesses in. The social impact of families supported by a working mother with the father out of a job. And no family

wants to go through the agonizing decision of whether to take the children out of school and sell the family homestead and move into some other area on the outside chance that jobs may be more plentiful somewhere else, rather than sticking it out here until things pick up.

One final word with regard to some of the statistics in connection with our area. According to the press Schenectady has recently been removed from the area of substantial labor surplus and has been classified as an area of only moderate labor surplus. Actually in these determinations Schenectady is always included with Albany and Troy. It is hard for me to see how these figures have been arrived at because unemployment has certainly not been arrested in Schenectady. In fact I am informed the situation here will get worse before it gets better with further layoffs expected in the turbine industry in the very near future.

Perhaps better prospects in Albany have brought up the overall total of the Tri-City area, but it would be most unfortunate if for this reason Schenectady were therefore legaly barred from receiving any help under the distressed areas bill. Actually much of the unemployment in the chronic areas of Amsterdam and Gloversville is directly tied into the Schenectady situation. Many of the husbands of women who work in the glove industry in Fulton County or the carpet industry in Amsterdam have been employed in the turbine plant in Schenectady, so that assistance provided to the Schenectady area could well have a substantial effect in improving the economy of Amsterdam and Fulton County. I hope the committee will recommend changes in this legislation which would make such assistance possible in spite of such statistical anomalies as those I have mentioned.

Let me close by saying that I believe firmly that the problem we are faced with here is not merely a local problem. It is a problem of clearcut national concern. A cancer growing in any one portion of the body can ultimately be fatal to the body as a whole. A disease raging in one area of a city can eventually spread to other areas. Similarly I believe that unless we move swiftly to check the cancer of unemployment and underemployment in established industrial areas like our own in the great Northeast, the prospect of other areas will likewise be seriously impaired. For all these reasons I believe the Congress and the Government of the United States have a responsibility and a duty to act to arrest this economic cancer.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, for several years now many Members of Congress, myself among them, have introduced legislation designed to alleviate chronic unemployment and underemployment in the many economically depressed areas of this country. This legislation is of paramount importance if we are to keep faith in the true American fashion with all of our citizens—fortunate and unfortunate alike. For today, even though we have emerged strongly from the recent recession, there are many areas in this Nation where vast numbers of people are out of work. This is true of both urban and rural areas. These areas and the people in them need assistance. These people are hungry. The areas are in a depressed economic condition. The answer lies in these areas being able to acquire or rehabilitate industrial facilities for new businesses. If the financial assistance to accomplish this end is not furnished to these sections, we will simply be perpetuating mass unemployment, which is already the Nation's biggest problem. We will also be in the dangerous position of creating throughout the country pockets of chronic unemployment and economic depression.

I am sure that all this is obvious to everyone here today. And yet the legislation aimed at alleviating this situation has not been permitted to reach the floor for debate and a vote. You may recall the one bill of this type which successfully passed both Houses was vetoed by the President in the summer of 1958. Since that unfortunate occasion, the persistent unemployment has continued in certain sections of the Nation. The need for this type of assistance has been even more clearly apparent during the past year. I exhort every Member of Congress to give careful consideration to this problem. Those Members who have this situation prevalent in their own States and districts are well aware of the crying need for remedial action. Those more fortunate Members who do not face this problem at firsthand may well have to do so one day. Whatever the situation may be back home, every Member should certainly be allowed to hear debate on this matter and have the opportunity to vote as his conscience dictates. Yet this opportunity apparently is not forthcoming.

I am from Detroit—one of the great industrial centers of this Nation—and I have seen this problem at first hand for longer than I care to recall. At the time of the Presidential veto of the depressed area bill in 1958, the unemployment in Detroit had reached 18 percent of the work force. Eighteen percent. Sounds unbelievable, does it not? But true. All too true, sadly enough. I myself have introduced legislation of this bent for several Congresses now. The unemployment is still there. And yet I find myself unable to cast my vote in the interests of the people I know to be in serious need of assistance. This is not right. The current bill was passed by the Senate in March of last year and was favorably reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee in May of last year. It has not yet been permitted to come before the full membership for a vote. This is wrong and unjustifiable.

The concept of furnishing the necessary aid to these depressed areas is not simply high-flown altruism. A quarter century ago we accepted as national policy the premise that unemployment is not a local problem but a national one. This was the philosophy underlying the Social Security Act. The assistance provided is realistic and practical, as written in the current bill. It takes the form of long-term, low-interest loans to the hard-hit communities for launching new industries. It also provides for technical assistance, vocational retraining, and funds needed for public facilities to accommodate the new industries. These facets fit together into a sort of package plan that relieves the communities of several burdens. This assistance will buttress the local economic base by bringing new industries and businesses. It will reduce the local unemployment problem by supplying many new jobs in the new plants. But the relief does not end here. There are many other ways in which this assistance will help the localities. It will greatly diminish many of the heavy traffic problems that plague cities today by providing industrial sites with ample parking space for all employees and by establishing these sites within the very localities where the workers reside. This will eliminate the necessity for the now prevalent long drives to and from places of employment. Furthermore, by placing these new industrial plants in places where such public facilities as traffic lights, sewer and water lines, sufficient power supply and other utility necessities already exist, a tremendous burden is lifted from the already harassed area governments. These are considerations about aid to depressed areas which are all too often overlooked. They are certainly of great import to the sections in need of aid and should be kept clearly in mind.

All of this represents assistance that is desperately needed in many areas of the United States. To deny such assistance would indeed be shameful. But to deny to the Members of this body even the chance to decide this matter is unfair and unforgivable. In conclusion, therefore, I should like to urge strongly that every Member of this House do everything he can to get this legislation onto the floor.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I arise to add my voice to that of my colleague from New York, and to associate myself with him in his efforts to obtain immediate action on S. 722, the area redevelopment bill. This bill has been in the control of the House Rules Committee since last May.

The time has come to speak frankly. Last September 14, the day before adjournment, I called attention to this very situation. I said then, that failure to deal with the problem of the distressed areas was the only large blot on the record of this Congress. I said also that consideration of S. 722 should be the first order of business at this session. I repeat both statements.

The conditions existing in certain parts of the country, which create a need for this legislation, have been discussed in more than 200 speeches before this House since last January. These conditions have since been investigated and verified by the field hearings of the Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems, which toured the country during the recess.

The long-term chronic unemployment problem which we had in September remains with us today. The glowing predictions of prosperity to come, and the settlement of the steel strike have not affected and will not touch the hard core of our unemployed who have been jobless for 26 weeks or more. Each succeeding monthly tabulation of statistics reveals the same percentage of long-term chronic unemployment.

Our millions who have exhausted unemployment compensation benefits, and drag out a bare existence with the help of surplus agricultural commodities, are still with us. There is no significant decline in their numbers.

Anyone who read the press reports of the President's reply to an inquiry by Senator COOPER, regarding administration plans for the distressed areas can only conclude that from past performances we cannot expect help from the White House. Indeed, on the basis of attitudes expressed recently it is doubtful that we can even expect comprehension of the problem at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

If the regular course of legislative activity, bearing on a grievous national problem, is to be stymied by ordinary human whims, unsupported by constitutional authority, perhaps a flair for drama will support the cause. Perhaps a caravan of ragged children from depressed mining districts should be paraded before the doors of the committee room. Perhaps our spokesmen for food-for-peace programs should be required to travel through depressed portions of the United States as a preface to any consideration of the needs of the Asiatic and African peoples.

There is no hope for assistance for these unemployed and their families outside this Chamber. If we do not act, no one else will. The language of S. 722 does not make the bill a cure-all, but it offers a first step in an inevitable program to place the power and prestige of this Government behind corrective action for the benefit of its most sorely tried citizens.

We have the right to listen and debate. I say that, in this instance, any of us who lay claims to Christian convictions and conduct must rise up to demand that right.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] for his statement. I may say I agree with him that we have to continue the fight he has suggested in order to make sure that this bill comes out of committee in spite of the reassuring words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I may say in connection with the gentleman's reference to the President of the United States that the press references that I saw were a little ambiguous and there is some doubt as to whether the President is behind this bill or not. I took the report in its best light, but it may well be that the gentleman's interpretation is closer to the facts. However, in any event, I am sure there will have to be ample adjustment before we can count on getting the bill approved at the other end of the avenue.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the very able gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for opening up this issue.

With reference to the remarks the gentleman just made about the President, I would think that all of us should join in an invitation to President Eisenhower to visit some of the distressed areas of the country in order to get a first-hand picture of what these conditions are. His visit abroad was a very dramatic thing and it did a great deal of good in inspiring the people abroad. But I think also we should look homeward. I would like to issue an invitation to President Eisenhower to visit West Virginia, and I am sure the Representatives of other States would like to have him come and see conditions in their States so that some action may be taken on this long overdue area redevelopment bill.

In West Virginia conditions have not improved very much. In some sections the situation is worse than in the darkest days of the depression of the 1930's.

Recently the Unemployment Subcommittee held hearings in Welch, Beckley, Fayetteville, and Wheeling. The hearings were chaired by my able and hard-working colleague from the other body, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. I testified before that committee, as did Mr. MOORE, my colleague, who I understand made a special trip back from Denver to testify, because of the urgency of the situation. My other colleagues, Messrs. SLACK, BAILEY, and STAGGERS, and Mrs. KEE also testified. Many people have exhausted their unemployment benefits. The younger people are leaving the State in great numbers.

We need action, Mr. Speaker. The bill is confined to that great gas chamber which is the Committee on Rules. Why do we stand by and wait while the gas chamber, like the crematories of Buchenwald silently dispose of the bill in the nether regions of the Capitol, while we, its friends and relatives, weep over the starving people of our States. We need action on this bill.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his helpful remarks. He has certainly painted the picture in dramatic terms.

I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for the manner in which he has developed the story concerning the depressed areas legislation.

I join him in another regard, Mr. Speaker, that is, the attitude that he has developed since coming here to the Congress concerning the tariff laws and policies of this country of ours. For a long time past I have been a strong advocate of a change in the tariff policies of the country. I am hopeful that his constituents who are going to the Tariff Commission next week to lay before that Commission the facts that their industry is being seriously depressed as a result of importation of foreign goods, that they will receive a unanimous report from the Commission favorable to their industry. Further that it will be the decision of the State Department and the President to accept that decision graciously. This has not been the case, Mr. Speaker, in so many of the instances which have been presented on behalf of American industry in the past before the Tariff Commission.

With respect to the depressed area legislation, I have previously introduced a bill which is the administration bill in this regard; and I had hoped for serious consideration of that legislation by the Banking and Currency Committee. That committee, however, has seen fit to report to the Rules Committee S. 722. Whether that legislation in itself is going to be the answer to all of our problems, that is those of us who have a serious depressed area problem, I cannot say. I can say, however, that the part of West Virginia I have the privilege to represent is not touched by this legislation now pending. Seventeen counties in our State would receive benefits under this legislation now pending before the Rules Committee. However, as a West Virginian, as a Representative from a State that has a severe problem in the field of depressed areas and in the field of unemployment I feel it is my duty as a Representative here in the Congress to add my voice to that of my fellow West Virginians, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from New York, to do all that I possibly can to bring to the floor of this House S. 722 in order that the House may work its will.

I certainly want to compliment the gentleman for taking the time here this afternoon to spell out the need for the legislation which has been so dramatically over the years brought to the attention of the House, but apparently not with such force or vigor as to convince those who occupy positions on the Rules Committee that we ought to have a chance to work our will.

So I want to join the gentleman from New York and my colleagues from West Virginia in bringing to the attention of the House this afternoon the condition that exists and the status of the depressed areas legislation.

Mr. STRATTON. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from West Virginia for his very generous remarks. His comments bear out what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said a moment ago. We have a genuine problem to solve. This is not a matter of party, it is a matter of recognizing a problem that cuts across party lines, and I sincerely hope we will be able to meet it with suitable legislation.

I would agree with the gentleman that no one bill is probably going to provide the complete answer to this problem. There will have to be other pieces of legislation.

With respect to the Tariff Commission, as the gentleman well knows, you go to the Tariff Commission and even if you are fortunate enough to get a favorable decision, there is still a possibility of a veto by the State Department for international reasons. I have joined with other Members of this body, and I think the gentleman from West Virginia has too, in introducing legislation that would remove that power so that when you cross the first hurdle and get a recognition by those who are particularly qualified to judge on this matter of whether or not domestic industry is being hurt, their findings based on the realities of the situation cannot then be vitiated by someone else who is not so familiar with the economic problem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. It certainly seems silly to me to appoint six individuals to the Tariff Commission and pay each of them $20,000 per year for the specific purpose of sitting and listening to evidence presented by American industry on unfair competition they are encountering in the tariff field from foreign goods, have these members of the Commission adopt a report unanimously finding that the American industry is entitled to some relief, and then have the executive branch of the Government utterly disregard in so many instances that unanimous finding of the Commission. It just does not make sense to me.

Mr. STRATTON. I agree emphatically with the gentleman and I thank him for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ARE INVOLVED IN STRIKE SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is evident there must be an end to strikes that not only tie up production in a basic industry like steel, but shut down other factories which cannot operate while a strike continues.

If one group after another, as is now threatened, can create a situation as did the steelworkers—see the President's statement and the Supreme Court's decision—*United Steelworkers of America* v. *United States of America* (No. 504, November 7, 1959)—when they threatened to imperil the national health and safety, Congress cannot escape its duty to write and enforce legislation which will destroy the power of any group to compel others to pay the wage, grant the benefits demanded. The steelworkers' demands were, in the main, met.

Such a power, an example of which we have just witnessed in connection with the steel strike, is no less than tyranny. Means, if continued, the end of our freedom—of our form of government.

Most humble, most respectful, and most earnest, is my suggestion that Mr. NIXON, who is my ideal of what an American—a President—should be, and the able, equally patriotic Senator KENNEDY, give prayerful consideration to the situation, suggest means to lighten the burden which now rests upon the Congress.

GAMBLING IN NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this hallowed spot to present to the American people the continued and shocking disregard of law and order in my city, unfortunately, and in my district in particular.

I include as a preface to my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Times of January 10, 1960, written by Emanuel Perlmutter:

NEW YORK NUMBERS RACKET IS BIG BUSINESS—CRACKDOWN FOLLOWS POWELL CHARGE OF BIAS AGAINST NEGRO OPERATORS

(By Emanuel Perlmutter)

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., stirred up his Harlem district last week by charging that white racketeers have driven Negroes from control of policy, or numbers, gambling in that area. He accused the police of permitting the white syndicate forces to operate while arresting Negroes.

Police Commissioner Stephen B. Kennedy denied the charge and his men followed up by staging large-scale roundups in which they arrested more than 150 persons in Harlem, mainly low-echelon policy employees. The race of those arrested was not disclosed.

The charge made by Representative POWELL that more Negroes than white men have been arrested in Harlem is true. But this is explained by the police as follows:

Eighty-two percent of those arrested on numbers gambling charges in Harlem last year were Negroes. This approximates the Negro percentage of Harlem's population.

However, it is also true that the Negro bankers who once controlled numbers gambling there have either been driven out by the white racketeers or are now working for them.

The policy game is the simplest and most popular form of gambling in New York City. It is the most difficult for the police to control, as well as the one offering the most opportunity for police graft.

ONE-HUNDRED MILLION A YEAR

Betting on the numbers is a poor man's hobby. Wagers are for small amounts—many for as low as a nickel or a dime, although occasionally an affluent player may invest $100 on a number. In the most common form of policy gambling in this city, the player places his bet on any combination of three numbers. He wins if the three numbers he has chosen correspond to three numbers appearing in the same order in a previously designated portion of the day's parimutuel betting total at a selected racetrack.

The police and New York prosecutors estimate that about 1,500,000 persons in the metropolitan area play the numbers each day and that they wager about $10 million a year.

The usual payoff is at 600 to 1 odds. However, the player usually gets only 500 to 1, the remaining 100 being kept as commission by the man who took his bet. In addition, the policy operators lower the odds further on the most popular numbers. Players also can make their wagers in candy stores, bars, restaurants, and other retail establishments known as drops.

Bets made with runners and at drops are picked up by an employe called a collector. He brings the slips with their bets to a controller, who can be likened to the branch manager of a bank. The controller in turn delivers the slips to the "bank," which is headquarters of the betting ring.

The banker may be a powerful individual operating on his own or the representative of a syndicate. Today most numbers banks in New York are controlled by an Italian syndicate. An average bank does about $15,000 a week business. The large ones average $100,000. Bank locations are changed regularly to avoid police detection.

The runners and drop employees receive a percentage—usually 15 to 20 percent—of the money bet with them. (They also get a cut of any lucky client's payoff.) They are paid by the controller, out of his 35 percent of the take. The remaining 65 percent goes to the banker, who puts up the capital for the operation and takes care of the graft payments. In addition to the field men, the policy-ring personnel includes clerks and bookkeepers who work in the bank tallying the bets and payoffs. There are also security members of the ring whose main job is to circulate in the vicinity of controllers' branches and the banks on the lookout for the police.

PLAINCLOTHES FORCE

Gambling and vice investigations in New York City are handled solely by plainclothes policemen. There are 457 of the department's 23,897 policemen assigned to this work. Because of the graft temptations to which the plainclothes men are exposed, they are subjected to periodic shakeups. Such a wholesale housecleaning took place in 1958, when the entire Harlem plainclothes division was transferred as a result of bribery disclosures.

Despite the strict disciplinary regulations imposed by Police Commissioner Kennedy, policy gambling continues to increase. This is indicated by arrest figures. There were 9,459 policy arrests in 1956; 11,206 in 1957, and 13,252 in 1958. For the first 11 months of 1959, the total was 12,870. A projection indicates that last year's gambling arrests were higher than those in 1958 or any other previous year. These figures are construed by most observers as reflecting increases in gambling rather than improved police work.

I must commend the Journal-American for their series which is continuing, edited by three outstanding reporters, one of whom, Dom Frasca, wrote a most authoritative book on the maffia.

Several months ago a former police sergeant by the name of Luberda was arrested for drunken driving in a nearby county to New York City. In his car was not only discovered $19,495 in cash but also a series of sheets listing the names of the major number bankers and their addresses and the amount of money they were paying off each week. These sheets have never been made public. I hold in my hand photostatic copies of them.

The Journal-American printed these sheets last week, but when they received the sheets the addresses of these various racketeers were erased. I would now like to read these addresses and names and the amount of the payoff into the RECORD.

Louis the Gimp, who operates in front of my church, has five drops in Harlem and allegedly paid off $750 a week. We have another sheet where the payoff is only $100 a week to people lower down the scale.

The addresses are 539 Lenox Avenue; 466 Lenox Avenue; butch, 677 Lenox Avenue; candy, 582 Lexington Avenue; Carter at 133d Street and 5th Avenue; and Richys, 146th and 8th Avenue.

I would like to read the rest of the names of the number bankers and their addresses:

Candy, 258 West 148th Street.
Candy, 310 West 145th Street.
Uncle Bill, 312 West 145th Street.
Greystone Restaurant, Eighth Avenue.
Danny's, 134 Street and Eighth Avenue.
Raython, 169 West 133d Street.
Marshall, 2200 Seventh Avenue.

Sid, 140th Street and Lenox Avenue.

Benedetto, 134th Street, Seventh and Lenox Avenue.

T & C, 139th Street and Seventh Avenue.

Henry's, 148 Eighth Avenue.

Leo-Sunshine Grocery, Eighth Avenue.

Lou, 95th Street and Second Avenue.

Mattie, 135th Street and Eighth Avenue.

Rose's, 140th and 8th Avenue.

Popp Tailor, 139th and Lenox.

Here is an operation which I do not think is connected with the Maffia:

Gibel, 308 137th Street, 459 Lenox, 117th and 133d.

Then comes barber, 326 135th Street or 145th Street.

Roxy's grocery store, Eighth Avenue.

Scottie, 143d and 8th Avenue.

Sully, 171 West 135th, candy.

Oliver's, 147th and 8th Avenue.

Karl, 144th and 8th Avenue.

Red, 25 138th Street.

Charley White, 142d Street and 8th Avenue.

Stick's, 154th Street and 8th Avenue.

Now, from the other payoff sheet these are additional names:

Joe Pellegrino, phone number at that time, TR 6–9280. He operates, not in my district, 108th Street and Park Avenue.

Then come the Black Bros., 118th Street and Lenox Avenue.

Bill Sherrit, 115th and Lenox.

Bryal Carnion, 113th and 8th Avenue.

Moe and Nack, 125th Street and Madison.

Then come three first names: Lou, 95th and 2d Avenue; Tom, 102 2d Avenue; Danny, 134th and 8th Avenue.

Lou Gimp, reprinted again, no need in repeating his name.

Then comes Artie, 145th and Broadway.

Then comes Wiz, 142d and 8th Avenue.

Jack Berger, 2020 Seventh Avenue.

Manny, 126th Street and—it looks like Madison Avenue.

Robbie, 150th and 8th Avenue.

Bobby Lloyd, 111 East 125th Street.

I have just received an anonymous phone call which gives me another operation in upper Harlem, not in my district. The bankers in charge of this operation are Nick Angelo and Louie B. They hang out in the Riverview Restaurant and Bar at 3543 Broadway.

Then comes another banker, Tony D'Amato, 509, 522, and 526 West 147th Street.

Tony Plait at 529 and 531 West 151st Street. These names have been phoned in to me.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a sermon delivered by me this past Sunday at both of the services of our church, as reported by the press, to 6,000 people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SERMON BY ADAM C. POWELL, JANUARY 10, 1960, 10 AND 12 NOON

Since I spoke out against the numbers 1 week ago today, the community of Harlem has saved at least $1 million. The numbers have only operated one day since then because on Tuesday morning the police of this city closed down every place arresting over 100 of the petty members of the number racket. The estimated amount of money that is played in my district each week is around $1 million.

One of the unanswered questions that I would like to pose today is how is it possible for the police department to say that they do not know the places, and they do not know the number operators yet, on a 36-hour warning from this pulpit, were able to close down every place in this area and arrest over 100 people? I said to the press on Tuesday morning, January 5, in the presence of the deputy chief inspector and his staff that the police department knows every single name that I have and every single place that I would produce, but they have not been apprehended nor closed down.

Now there has been a lot of conjecturing as to why I did what I did. I have held conferences through the years with various police commissioners, including the present one. I have pointed out the invasion of Harlem by white musclemen, resulting in beatings and even sometimes the killing of Negroes who stood in their way. The unchallenged fact which the deputy chief did not answer on Tuesday in front of the press: there is not operating anywhere in Harlem, a single Negro banker. The entire operation is totally in the hands of people who do not reside in nor are connected with my community.

I have been advised by some people that there is a resentment in some quarters, even in the Negro community, that I have deprived them of their habit of playing the numbers and have deprived the petty number runners of their illegal livelihood. Mention has been made that this might even cause political repercussions. Now I would like to state unequivocally that this has only served to strengthen my resolve and purpose. I am determined more than ever before to pursue what I started out with, not only in this area, but in the lower East Harlem Puerto Rico area, in Brooklyn, Bronx, and wherever I can get the cooperation of the people.

For me to withdraw because of possible political repercussions would be a confession of moral weakness on my part; and, also, for me to withdraw would mean that this community is so morally decadent and degenerate that it would be hopeless for me to pursue this matter. I have stood in this community for 30 years as a leader. I need nothing more and if what I am going to do is going to hurt me personally, I welcome the consequences.

I am not afraid of the Maffia, the syndicate, the gangsters and hoodlums. I have specifically asked the police department not to provide me with any bodyguards.

I would like to emphatically state once and for all, including my assistant ministers, that no one at any time, in any way represents me. I understand that there have been efforts made by the underworld to reach me through some of my self-called associates. I have no associates in this endeavor. If other individuals want to help, it is up to them. But nothing that anyone does can in any way, directly or indirectly, be attributable to me. And, furthermore, if any individual in any way claims they represent me and are trying to intercede in this issue I will be the first one to agree with the press that they are liars as far as I am concerned.

The police department of this town needs a citizen who can speak from this pulpit and the pulpit of Congress; who is not afraid and who can lay before the American public this continued and shocking flaunting of law and order.

I am not charging anyone with anything, but I am stating one unchallengeable fact, that the Maffia and the syndicate are in complete control of Harlem and that Negroes are the ones who are arrested while the whites go free. May I point out here that Deputy Police Commissioner Arm should apologize to me and to this community or be removed immediately by the commissioner for his out-and-out lie in the newspapers of last Wednesday, for he said, and I quote from the daily papers. He was asked by the press: "What was the percentage of whites and Negroes arrested in the Tuesday raids?" He said, "I am not playing POWELL'S game, we do not issue any statistics based upon race." Yet, just a few paragraphs later in the same news story, Deputy Chief Burns said "Eighty-two percent of those arrested were Negro." This indicates clearly that the deputy police commissioner was lying. I would also like the press of this city to investigate the lawyers' names that appear on misdemeanor slips in the magistrates' and special sessions courts of those who are arrested for numbers. Find out through the proper authorities who pays them for representing the numbers runners arraigned in the local courts. I am sure that they will find out that a high official within the New York City government is involved in this as a lawyer.

I come today at this hour of spiritual emphasis to stress the moral implications of the policy racket in this community and for that matter in any other community.

SECTION I

If this low-income community has drained from it between $3 million and $4 million a month, then the first fact I wish to point out is that the numbers is pauperizing Harlem.

SECTION II

Deputy Chief Inspector Burns has said that roughly 4,500 people were arrested last year for numbers in the 10th division, Harlem. The Library of Congress is researching this for me. That means, over the past 12 years, there have been 50,000 arrests in this community, and I would double that figure for five boroughs. In other words, 100,000 Negroes have been arrested during the past 12 years. This means that this community is being criminalized. Once a person is arrested it is almost impossible to receive private employment any more. There have been many, many tragic incidents of those who had civil service jobs who were forced to resign because at some time they had been arrested for the misdemeanor of being connected with the numbers.

SECTION III. WHAT SHALL WE DO?

In the first place, I warn the police department and alert the citizens that there shall not be a reign of terror in this community. It is possible that some members of the police department who may have been on the payroll of the policy barons out of sheer desperation and anger will resort to brutality, illegal entry of homes, and unlawful arrests. I strongly condemn the police department now for their failure to arrest whites this past Tuesday, January 5, for their failure to carry out similar numbers raids in lower East Harlem, and the Bronx, and Brooklyn; they knew the places and the individuals. I strongly condemn Police Commissioner Kennedy now for his failure to have at the top in police headquarters, a Negro and remind him that I not only asked that if one of the police commissioner deputyships could not be a Negro that a Negro be named secretary of the police department. This he has refused to do and the position is still vacant. The mayor should intercede now and demand that qualified Negroes be appointed at command levels.

In the second place, I call on the mayor of the city of New York to appoint a special commission with supena power to investigate the numbers and everything with it and I offer myself, even though I have more than I can do now, to serve on this commission.

Third, I have this day sent a wire to the Governor of New York State asking him to institute a special investigation of numbers

in this city through State law enforcement agencies, through a special commission, through the State attorney general or through all three.

Fourth, I ask the Governor in this wire to call for legislation giving him the power not just to pardon people because of felonies, which is now the law, but to be able to pardon people who have been convicted of misdemeanors. I ask our local representatives in Albany to introduce the appropriate legislation immediately.

SECTION IV. WHAT CAN WE DO AS INDIVIDUALS?

In the first place there is a need for a moral reawakening in this community. The playing of numbers is not due to any inherent racial weakness, it is due to the fact that far too many do not receive wages sufficient for their needs and feel that through the easy way they can hit the numbers and provide that margin now. This of course is factually impossible. A sucker never wins, only the combine, syndicate, and maffia. All this points up the need for moral reawakening. It may take a little time but just think that every day we keep the heat on the police department and keep the heat on the bums that infected this community. Every week we do this we are saving a million dollars. Just think what $50 million in 1 year could do for Harlem. Think of the banks, housing, churches, private hospitals.

In the second place, we need to realize that we as a community are sick. Just as narcotics becomes habit forming for the individual, so has the numbers become habit forming for about 50,000 people in this area. We need to "kick the habit."

Instead of the old symbols of "get rich quick," "do it the easy way," we need the new symbol of "stand together." Take these pennies, nickels, dollars that we have been squandering, deposit them in our banks, pool our resources and let's lift ourselves up.

All of the heritage of the Negro people is now being aborted, squandered and dissipated. Here we find our community lower in income than nearly any other community in New York and yet each year we are sending out $50 million of our money to support another community.

Here we are face to face with a new birth of equality in our educational system. Next month hundreds of Negro children are moving out of Harlem going to a new school in Yorkville. All the forces of society are now moving toward a better day for Negro people with better education. How can we be worthy of this new day? How can our children be respected and respectable as long as they come from these homes that have been pauperized and criminalized by the sickness of their parents?

And finally, I call for an individual catharsis. We as individuals need to take a mighty force into our own beings to purge us of the weaknesses and the accumulated sicknesses and to individually say that by the grace of God, I am going to stand firm. I will not go back. I will take my place as a member of society. I refuse to allow myself to be pauperized and criminalized by the sickness of gambling and the sinister forces of the Maffia. I plead with the Department of Justice, the Governor, the mayor, the five district attorneys to go to work and clean up this festering cancer forced on us by the outside elements.

Mr. POWELL. In this sermon I gave to the law enforcement agencies of New York two leads on how to discover the maffia and track them down. All the arrests are of the petty numbers runners and collectors, nearly all Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Not a single banker has been arrested in New York City at all. They go free. They can track them down as follows:

The 13,000 who went before the gamblers courts—both the magistrates and special sessions—last year are represented all the time by virtually the same lawyers. Speaking only of the Borough of Manhattan 90 percent of the 4,500 who were tried last year were represented by the same lawyers; one lawyer uptown and two or three downtown. One of these lawyers is a New York City official and his name, as all the other names of the lawyers, appears in the records of the courts. When a defendant comes before the court he must state the name and address of his counsel who is present.

These numbers people arrested do not pay their lawyers. The lawyers work for the combines, the syndicate and the Maffia, and have a flat charge of $25 a head. They are not paid by the person who is arrested.

So the first thing I am requesting is that the proper authorities—county, city, State, or Federal—shall find out from these lawyers whose names are a matter of record, who pays them.

The second lead I would like to give is this: The bail bond business for these arrested people is almost totally in the hands of one individual. They do not pay for their bail bond. A $500 bond, under standard practice, costs $25 to obtain. This is paid for them by the maffia or the syndicate or combine, whichever group they are working for. Therefore, if the authorities are really interested in this, they can put under oath this bail bondsman and find out who pays him.

I would like to say that everything I am saying was backed up last Monday by the meetings of the Interdenominational Ministers Conference of New York and the Baptist Ministers Conference of New York before whom I appeared. They are backing me unanimously, and represent some 514 churches in our town.

Why have I brought this before this body? Because of the fact that this situation has been in existence in my community and in New York for years and continues to get worse. At a press conference held last Tuesday, the deputy chief inspector, Mr. Burns, in charge of my area, and his staff were present. In front of the New York press I challenged him. I said, "Every name and every address that I have, you know." He knows them. The police department knows them. And the proof of it is that when I delivered this warning from the pulpit at 5 o'clock on Sunday, January 3, within 36 hours the police had closed down many numbers places in my congressional district and had arrested 105 people. So they knew the names and the places. But they only did it in my congressional district, not touching any in any other district. That is why I am bringing in the other names and places in the districts nearby.

I am appealing from this pulpit here for some agency to really get to work on this problem that is pauperizing and criminalizing the poor of New York.

I have complete confidence in the mayor of our town, Mr. Wagner, as an individual. I have complete confidence in the police commissioner of our town, Mr. Kennedy, as an individual. I have confidence in the five district attorneys as individuals, one of whom is our former colleague, Representative Dollinger, now the district attorney of the Bronx. But I do not have confidence in everyone underneath them. The events of the years showing that this operation can go on and showing that, according to the authoritative book on the maffia, the numbers in New York is the backbone of the Maffia in this country, the fact that it can continue and these people go unarrested and these places go unchallenged, means that someone somewhere down the line in a responsible position must be taking big payoffs. Judge Mullen said this in sentencing Sergeant Luberda.

I would also like to take this opportunity, and will follow it up with suitable correspondence today, to ask the Department of Justice to investigate every name I have presented today and to see whether the gambling stamp tax has been paid. The gambling stamp tax legislation was passed by this body and signed October 20, 1951 and became law November 1, 1951. I would like each name checked for each year since, to see if they have paid their gambling stamp tax. If they have not, then the Federal Government has an opportunity to move into this problem.

This is just the beginning of many such talks I will make, one a week, revealing more names as they come to me, hoping that some agency of our Government, local, State, or Federal will stop letting its hands be tied by these vicious gangsters, operating not only in my town but operating in nearly every major city in this country. Maybe what I say here each week revealing the names and addresses will put enough heat under the proper city, county, State, and Federal authority, and put enough heat under the lawless element itself, so that if we cannot drive out gambling we can subdue it so it will not be as flagrant as it is now.

Naturally, I have received many threats over the phone and through the mails, but these do not interest me one bit. I will be here, with God's help, next week to put more names and more addresses into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE LATE GOVERNOR CLINTON A. CLAUSON, OF MAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, today my two colleagues from Maine, Mr. OLIVER and Mr. MCINTIRE, and I wish to share a loss which our State has suffered with this House. In so doing, we intend more than a formality. We speak out of deep sorrow, but also out of a sense of pride.

On December 30, 1959, our Governor, Clinton A. Clauson, died. His death was wholly unexpected and has been deeply mourned by the entire State. The impressive ceremonies attending the decease of a head of State are now history; the eulogies have been delivered; the appreciative editorials have been written; the wheels of government roll on; and the family and friends are left alone with their emptiness, which only memories and time can banish.

It remains for us in both Chambers, Maine's official family in Washington, to add our words of sorrow and of affection. I said we speak today from a sense of pride. In this combative era, where politics and government are often characterized by high octane individuals and elaborate apparatus for public relations, our friend, Clinton A. Clauson, stood out in refreshing contrast. He allowed himself to be himself. He required no apparatus other than his own hands, his feet, and his ready smile. No one liked people more, or was more liked by people.

His secret weapon, which enabled him to win the governorship against heavy odds, and which helped him write an excellent record of service during his year in office, was friendliness. It was not the type of friendliness which was dispensed only to friends or to those who conceivably might become friends. It was equally generously bestowed on avowed foes. Because of this, the word "foes" is really inappropriate; for Governor Clauson had no foes. Outsiders, until they had become aware of the kindly character of Maine's late Governor, could not understand why political differences were discussed in Maine without generating more heat.

We suspect that a source of solace to a bereaved family lies not only in an enviable record of achievement, but, even more, in the knowledge that in the memory of the loved one there is a momentum, a living influence, which will affect the course of the future. Such an influence is our legacy. It is not only a legacy of the power of kindliness, but of love of family, concern for the humblest of people, and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the late Governor Clinton A. Clauson, of Maine, whose victory and election as chief executive of Maine, electrified the country, had served his State and her people with great ability, distinction, and courage. His untimely death is a source of great regret. His death takes from our midst a statesman and leader in public and governmental life that is sadly needed.

To Mrs. Clauson and her loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of the Governor of Maine, the Honorable Clinton Clauson, on December 30 last, took from among us a man who in 1 year in office had become a familiar figure throughout the length and breadth of the State of Maine. Many persons, including myself, were not extended the privilege of personal acquaintanceship until after his election to the governorship.

I had occasion to meet him many times and to share speaking programs with him. I knew him as a kindly man, one who was interested in the welfare of his adopted State.

The Houlton Pioneer Times, of Houlton, Maine, a community in the Third Congressional District, makes an appraisal of the Governor in an editorial of its January 7, 1960, issue, and this editorial follows:

GOV. CLINTON A. CLAUSON

In the sudden and untimely passing of Gov. Clinton A. Clauson, the State of Maine has become deprived of the unselfish service of a dedicated public servant who had a sincere devotion to his duty and a total disregard of any possible consequences of being tirelessly on the job day and night.

Probably no Governor in Maine's history, certainly not in recent years, labored so diligently and was so unceasingly on the go all over Maine, as Governor Clauson was during his first year in office. And this does not subtract one whit from the tremendous service that his predecessors rendered to their State while in office.

Many adjectives have been called into play to apply to the late chief executive and all of them seem to be quite aptly descriptive of the man. He was, above everything else, a person of extreme kindness toward his fellow men and was one of the easiest men to meet that one will encounter in many a day.

His manner was always affable, his demeanor gracious and his personality charming. He had a way of getting along with people of all ages and his easy handling of the hordes of schoolchildren that were forever pouring through the statehouse, was a delight to watch. One couldn't help but wonder how a man, subjected to such constant pressure, could maintain such an even disposition and display a constant charm of manner while shaking hundreds of hands during a busy business day.

He has been called a humble man and this he seems to have been to a considerable degree. He had all of the characteristics of a person constantly conscious of the prestige of his office but never, during 1959, was he ever noticed to use the weight of that office in any other way than fairly and justly.

He was intensely loyal to the political party of which he had been a member all of his life. No fairminded person can or should quarrel with such allegiance which is the private and personal privilege of every man, whether in public life or not.

By the same token, he had a deep devotion to his adopted State of Maine as his constant labors in behalf of its welfare so emphatically attested. As he contributed to the State of Maine while on the job in Augusta, so, too, did he become an ambassador of good will while traveling beyond its borders.

Members of both political parties must agree that he graced the office he held, that he did credit to the State he served, and that his gracious and charming manner will be missed in the statehouse.

Mr. Bernard Esters, the editor of the aforementioned publication, is a member of the all-Republican Governor's Council, and he has, I believe, very well expressed the feelings of all citizens of Maine.

Mr. Esters wrote another column in the same issue of the Houlton Pioneer Times which is of interest and follows:

THOUGHTS AND AFTERTHOUGHTS BY THE EDITOR

I suppose, going back over Maine history, there may have been at some time a funeral display of flowers equal to that which was made possible by the floral tributes that came from everywhere to grace the funeral services of the late Gov. Clinton A. Clauson. But I cannot remember just when that could have been.

The Augusta Armory in which the services were held is several times larger than the Houlton Armory. I would estimate the width to be at least 100 feet in addition to the huge stage which is recessed into the north end. The entire width of the back wall was almost obscured up to 10 feet by the three rows of flowers that stretched from one wall to the other. Added to this was a like number of rows of wreaths, sprays, and bouquets across the back of the stage and spectacular blankets and other arrangements that stood in easels on the floor of the stage.

But even this large area was not sufficient to accommodate a profusion of flowers that certainly dwarfed anything that I have ever seen before at such an occasion. At the back of the hall, opposite the stage and near the doors entering the building, additional bouquets and wreaths were scattered because there was no room for them near the stage. It was no small task to arrange this floral exhibit and it was done with excellent taste.

The armory is supposed to seat 1,500 and it was packed to its capacity. I doubt if another person could have found a place to sit down to listen to the hour-long services as the State of Maine paid its last respects to its chief executive, the second Governor of Maine to die in office in this century.

It probably has happened before to another State in the modern history of this country but one cannot help but wonder how many Commonwealths in this Nation of ours have been administered by four Governors in a single year. When John H. Reed, of Fort Fairfield, was sworn into office last Wednesday night he became the fourth Governor of Maine to serve the State during 1959.

When the then Governor Muskie resigned on January 3 of last year, Robert N. Haskell, of Bangor, was sworn in to serve a short term of 5 days until the official inauguration of Governor Clauson. Governor Clauson, of course, served until his death early Wednesday morning, December 30, and Governor Reed was sworn in as Maine's chief executive the following day, still during 1959.

B.E.E.

Citizens of the Third Congressional District of Maine join with Mrs. McIntire and me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Clauson and the family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of the morning of December 30, my friend, Clinton A. Clauson, Governor of Maine, died. It was a sudden and wholly unexpected death. The shock was great and almost unbearable. His devoted wife, Ellen, discovered her faithful teammate of 40 years of wedded life, breathing his last few unconscious minutes of life, without any even remote chance of recovery. It was a tragic and bitter experience.

It was even more tragic and bitter because of its impossibility of human explanation or understanding.

Here was a man of apparent iron constitution. His powers of endurance and his stamina, tested to the utmost during 7 months of the most intensive political campaigning during the primary and general election campaigns of 1958, appeared to be limitless. I, personally, Mr. Speaker, have observed "Doc" Clauson, as our people of Maine affectionately called him, extend himself for hours and days, continuously, as he met and shook hands with thousands of Maine citizens during those grueling campaigns. It was always with a smile of warmth and sincerity to which the people of every rank and station of life responded spontaneously. The political odds were against my friend and he knew it. This only made him the more determined to win. Hard work, long hours, and his friendly personality overcame the odds. He was elected in spite of the odds.

He entered upon his duties immediately after the election, even though his responsibility of office did not officially start until January 7. The interim months were spent at budget hearings and in other wearisome details of making himself familiar with his gubernatorial responsibilities. He took no time off to rest. "Doc" was the type of man who never would shrink from duties and obligations.

Then, after being sworn in as Governor, he continued conscientiously, as always, to administer the affairs of Maine and to deal with a legislature predominantly controlled by the opposition party. He made his opponents not only respect him but also like him. This, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is one of the greatest attributes of successful leadership. Governor "Clint" was just at the start of a career of political leadership which would have entrenched in Maine the two-party political system which is fundamentally necessary for good and responsible government.

This phase of the late Governor's capacity, Mr. Speaker, points up, as I see it, the real public tragedy inherent in his passing. Public affairs suffer real loss when men of such stature die.

It will be most difficult to replace him in our governmental and political picture. It is impossible to replace him from the family standpoint. With Ellen, his wife, and with Anne and Neil, his daughter and son, and with his grandchildren, we deeply sympathize. As a close political and personal friend, we mourn over his decease. Our only comfort and solace is to determine to carry on in our feeble efforts to emulate him and to help do the job with which he was struggling in order that Maine people might prosper as "Doc" envisioned that they should.

FIGHT OR SURRENDER?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOOLEY. The provocative article entitled "Fight or Surrender?" which was published in the December 21, 1959, issue of the U.S. News & World Report provides several viewpoints on the current struggle for world supremacy between the United States and Russia.

The comparative ease with which a nation can be destroyed by means of nuclear attack is frightening to contemplate, and there seems to be no answer to the dilemma in which nuclear armed nations currently find themselves. The power to destroy is offset by the danger of being destroyed by the opposing nation.

The article follows:

THE COMING CHOICE FOR UNITED STATES: FIGHT OR SURRENDER?—STORY OF THE BLACKMAIL BEHIND THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR WAR

(Despite the talk of peace and disarmament, military experts, key officials are worried about the safety of this Nation; balance of terror is seen as no longer an assurance against a nuclear war; Russia—ahead on missiles, gaining in power, dedicated to world dominance—is in a position to blackmail the United States under threat of a nuclear attack; a new official report says the United States is vulnerable, if that attack comes; here are the facts about the danger—from the studies of experts and the analyses of men in a position to know.)

At some point, not many years from now, the American people are likely to be offered this choice: Surrender or fight a nuclear war. And, the way things are going, the United States could lose that war.

These are the studied conclusions of some key officials in the innermost councils of the U.S. Government.

Why? What accounts for this pessimistic attitude at a time when optimism is bursting out on all sides and the world's leaders are talking of peace and disarmament?

The answer, as given by Americans whose lives are spent in assessing powerful forces at work in the world, is complex. It is given in part by a study made for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a research group at Johns Hopkins University. This report was made public December 6. A second study, published by Stanford Research Institute on December 8, gives another part. Yet another study came on December 7 from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

Add to these reports the views of highly informed Government officials, and the full answer emerges. It is based upon the following conclusions:

1. The United States is now open and vulnerable to a direct attack by nuclear missiles—and this country's vulnerability is steadily increasing. This was the warning contained in the December 6 report of the Johns Hopkins University research group, whose conclusions are presented later in this text.

2. There can be no guaranteed security in the world when rival systems of government exist, each possessing the means of mass destruction. Nuclear weapons are a fact. Nothing—no agreements, no treaties, no end to tests—can wipe out that fact or can stop science and the human mind from developing weapons of even greater destructiveness. Nuclear weapons, within a few years, will be possessed by many more nations than at present. And the horror of nuclear war may prove no deterrent if a showdown comes. This is brought out in the Stanford Research Institute study of December 8. Another warning that "the possibility of war must be faced" is contained in the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report, the conclusions of which are set forth below.

3. In the world of today, the inexorable trend is toward dominance in the world by a single power. Rival powers or rival groupings of powers inevitably will develop antagonisms—military or economic—and those antagonisms are likely, in the future as in the past, to lead to a test of strength. Only through world dominance by a single power can assurance of safety from nuclear war be established.

4. The United States, at the end of World War II, was in a position to assume world domination. That opportunity was rejected. The United States, ever since, has been retreating gradually from one position after another. Soviet Russia, on the other hand, is demonstrating a determination to rule the world. At the end of World War II, Russia was prostrate. Today—only 15 years later—she is able to challenge America. There is no record in history of such a reversal of positions between nations in so short a time. This Russian success breeds Russian confidence and strengthens Russian determination to push ahead.

5. Soviet Russia, pushing out as United States draws back, is tilting the balance of power steadily in her direction. When that tilt seems to her rulers to be decisive, she then will be tempted to offer the United States the fateful choice: surrender or fight a nuclear war. There may be much testing of strength and many alarms before that showdown comes.

Said an official who sits in the top councils of the U.S. Government:

"I hold the deepest pessimism concerning this Nation's future. The American people appear to lack interest in the life-or-death problem they face, and appear to lack the will to make the sacrifices that their safety calls for. The American Nation seems to lack any tangible objective other than that of making life easier and more enjoyable.

"The American Government, to hold power, is forced to direct its effort toward satisfying the voters' desire for more and more of the good things of life instead of toward assuring safety for the Nation through a dominant position in the world.

"Soviet Russia, by contrast, is hard. As a nation, its objective is fixed. Every move, every action, all the nation's power is directed toward reaching that objective of world domination. Sometimes its progress is slow. Sometimes there are detours. But always the objective is to tilt the world's balance of power against the United States. Today, Russia's challenge is reaching cautiously into Latin America. It is beginning to be felt in Africa. The tide keeps running."

Leading where? As this man and other key thinkers on the power balance of the world see it, the answer is: Toward a time when the United States will be in a corner, facing a choice of surrender or nuclear war.

THE SHIFT THAT KHRUSHCHEV BROUGHT

Soviet Russia, these men say, has rejected the doctrine that a nuclear war is too horrible to contemplate, or that a balance of terror makes nuclear war too dangerous for either side to start. This rejection was made at the time Khrushchev took power. Soviet policy, as now being assessed, is based on the beliefs that nuclear war would not necessarily mean mutual annihilation, that one nation could emerge as a real winner, and that the odds increasingly favor Russia as that winner.

A hard, factual appraisal of what nuclear war might mean, both for Russia and for the United States, is given in the study published by the Stanford Research Institute. According to that study, it would be possible for Russia, striking first, to weather a nuclear counterattack with no more damage than she suffered in World War II.

It is this analysis of Russia's nuclear philosophy that underlies much of the pessimism of American planners.

But isn't disarmament now in the air? Haven't both United States and Russia stopped testing nuclear weapons? Isn't President Eisenhower going to talk again with Nikita Khrushchev to help ease tensions in the world?

The answer to these questions is: Yes. But military men whose business it is to delve deeply into problems of national security say this: Things are not what they seem on the surface. No dictator with a goal and making progress toward that goal ever has given up his advantage—or ever will. No agreement ever will be made by a Soviet dictator that does not involve a gain for him, or what he thinks is a gain for him. Only the United States, among powers which have had the opportunity to accept world direction, has shrunk from that responsibility and drawn back, leaving the field to a dangerous rival.

NO END IN SIGHT FOR THE NUCLEAR RACE

Even while disarmament talk goes on, alarms are being sounded of arms developments to come that will add to war dangers in the years ahead.

Missiles of awesome power and accuracy are being perfected. France today is on the verge of producing atomic weapons, preparing to test those weapons in the Sahara Desert. West Germany now possesses the know-how and probably the means to produce atomic weapons. In one way or another, the Germany of the near future is seen as certain to possess all the modern weapons of mass destruction. So, probably, will Japan.

It is being predicted that Communist China will join the circle of nuclear powers within 10 years. If Red China gets nuclear weapons, then India will feel that she needs them, too.

An official, who is deeply versed in the whole subject, commented:

"There is no way to stop men from thinking. The knowledge needed to produce nuclear weapons is widely held by scientists in nations large and small. In spite of any agreements or treaties, those weapons will be devised and, if necessary, will be tested."

This further statement was made by the same official and supported by others:

"The talk of preventing nuclear war by banning tests of nuclear weapons is deceiving. Its effect is to lull the American people into a false sense of security.

"The facts are simply these: The United States and Soviet Russia both possess large stockpiles of nuclear weapons. The stockpile of the United States at this time almost surely is larger and more varied than that of Soviet Russia. But Russia's stockpile is sufficient to destroy most of America's biggest cities. A ban on tests will not destroy those stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

"The means thus exists for each side to inflict tremendous damage on the other. A stop to testing will not remove that fact.

"Both sides, too, possess the means to deliver those weapons on targets in the other's territory. The United States holds an edge in delivery by manned aircraft. The Soviets hold an edge in delivery by ballistic missiles.

"If nuclear war is really to be curbed, the only way that it can be curbed in today's world is by destruction of every means of delivering nuclear weapons.

"Politicians are not even talking about destroying all aircraft and all missiles and all other possible means of placing nuclear weapons on targets.

"Thus, this whole exercise of talks between United States and Soviet Russia about ending nuclear tests is misleading. Soviet Russia sees an advantage in it for herself, or she would not be sponsoring this deception."

But isn't Russia behind the United States in number and variety of atomic weapons? Would not this indicate that, from Russia's viewpoint, it would be better for tests to continue, so she could catch up? What is the advantage that Russia sees in agitating for an end to tests? Just what is the Kremlin's game?

Here is the answer given by one American analyst:

"To anyone not blinded by wishful thinking, the basic motives of current Russian tactics seem quite clear. They grow out of the simple fact that all of the Soviets' aggressive aims could be achieved more easily if they encountered no nuclear opposition.

"The Soviets, therefore, have every reason to stop all testing and development of nuclear weapons. Look what they could gain thereby:

"First, halting tests would slow or stop the development of nuclear weapons which could be used defensively by the United States against missile attack. This would insure the continued vulnerability of America to nuclear attack.

"Second, by blocking the use of nuclear weapons Russia would free its own superior conventional forces for blackmail or military aggression.

"Third, Russia would slow the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations on which it has designs, and thus hamper their resistance to bullying tactics of aggression. What if there had been a way to arm the Hungarians with nuclear weapons in their revolt?

"Fourth, ending tests would stop our development of 'discriminate' nuclear weapons—clean ones which could be used in limited wars against minor Communist aggressions.

"Even if the United States remained technically ahead on nuclear weapons, such an edge would have no significance so long as the Soviets gained tactical advantages of the kind just listed."

Assuming that the spread and development of nuclear weapons cannot be stopped, as these experts believe: Who suffers the most thereby?

Here is one analyst's answer on that:

"Of course, the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers has disadvantages for both Russia and the United States. But, on balance, the Soviets have much more to lose thereby than we. The Soviets, in their aggressions, would be forced to move much more cautiously in the face of possible opposition by nuclear weapons. The United States, with no aggressive aims, would not have this problem.

"If the spread of nuclear weapons is inevitable, slowing it down is clearly to the Soviets' gain."

WITH BETTER MISSILES, MORE DANGER

What about missiles?

Most analysts agree with this man's size-up:

"It is in missiles that the armament race really centers now. We already have the nuclear warheads on hand. As you improve the means of delivering those warheads to their targets, the danger of nuclear war increases.

"Also, with missiles, the potentialities of nuclear blackmail become enormous. A powerful nation can be held in terror of a sudden surprise attack for which there is, so far, no defense—only retaliation.

"When it comes to blackmail, the Russians have a tremendous advantage over the United States, or any other free and democratic nation. Dictators are able to threaten and blackmail far more effectively because they don't have to be concerned about the morality of their acts or the attitudes of the voters.

"Can you imagine President Eisenhower threatening to create a nuclear holocaust over Berlin or Formosa? Yet the Soviets did this over Suez, when Britain and France attempted to move in there in 1956. And this year they appeared to be doing it again over Berlin. Khrushchev, just a few days ago, declared that Russia has enough nuclear-armed rockets 'to raze to the ground all of our potential enemies.'"

On missiles, though, the United States is considered to be behind, Russia is conceded a lead. Then why doesn't Russia agitate for an end to missile tests, instead of an end to nuclear tests, in order to freeze its missile advantage and keep the United States from catching up?

In answer to this question, you get from some experts another question:

"Suppose Russia gets an agreement with the United States to halt nuclear tests and then follows up by proposing an end to missile tests. Would the United States be in a position to accept that challenge—and thus accept a permanent disadvantage in missiles? Yet, if the United States refused, Russia would then have the same propaganda advantage on the missiles issue that it has had on the nuclear-test issue."

Then there's this question: Can the development of missiles really be stopped, any more than you can stop the development of nuclear weapons?

Key analysts say: "No. What you are really up against is the impossibility of stopping human thought.

"Who is going to keep Communist China, as one example, from driving ahead to develop these weapons? Who is able to police China's vast territory to make sure that this is not being done? If Communist China gets such weapons, is it likely that India will be willing to overlook the dangers involved?"

This further point is made: John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, was guided by one simple conclusion—that the United States cannot be secure so long as a dictator rules a powerful nation, heavily armed and operating in secrecy behind an iron curtain.

It is reported that the late Senator Brian McMahon, who was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when Russia acquired the atom bomb, wrote to the then President Harry S. Truman, warning him of the dangers that this development generated. According to these reports, Senator McMahon urged that the United States should tell Russia either to agree to an effective plan for control of atomic weapons or to expect attack. This suggestion was not followed.

Today, weapons are much more powerful than then, the ability to develop these weapons is widely dispersed through the world, and no real chance is seen of stopping this development.

Then what is the answer? Is there any alternatives to the prospect, for the United States, of surrendering or fighting a nuclear war in which there is grave danger of defeat?

It is here that you run into a sharp difference in official views.

View 1: This is the present official view of the White House and the Department of State. It is based on the concept that you can do business with Soviet Russia, that it is possible to reach agreements which will permit a stopping of nuclear tests and then lead to gradual disarmament.

It is in keeping with this view that the United States is now negotiating with Soviet Russia and Great Britain at Geneva, seeking a formula for effective inspection and enforcement of an agreement to halt bomb tests.

It is recognized by the U.S. Government that halting tests is of itself no disarmament move. But the hope is that an agreement on tests will be a first step, that, if mutual confidence and cooperation can be established in this field, then further steps toward actual disarmament can follow. This is the real meaning of the Geneva talks.

View 2: This is largely a military view. It rests upon evidence of rapid expansion of the Soviets' missile capacity and recurring new evidence of the Soviets' threatening policy of expansion.

Said an exponent of this view:

"The only solution, it seems to me, is for the United States to get into this arms race with both feet and win it. And to tell the Russians frankly what you are doing. Leave them in no doubt about your determination.

"The main element in our weakness has been the lack of determination—determination to stand up to Khrushchev every time he makes a threatening move. This is not advocating preventive war. It is just advocating a realistic view of the world situation. It is facing up to the fact that, the way things are going, the United States some day is likely to be faced with the choice of fighting or surrendering under threat of nuclear destruction."

View 3: This view is tending to grow among those in Government—both military and civilian—who are closest to strategic problems. It is a pessimistic view: That it is impossible for the United States to overtake the Soviet advantage in missiles without an all-out effort. But that, instead of making this all-out effort, the United States is tending to restrict its arms effort in the interest of avoiding a rise in Government spending and an increase in taxes.

The position that Soviet Russia holds in the arms race is encouraging her to be bold in her maneuvers abroad. The policy of deterrence by a "balance of terror" is seen as losing its effectiveness as Russia's missile capabilities increase. The possibilities for Russia to impose its will upon the United States by nuclear blackmail are seen as growing enormously, in a situation where she holds an arsenal of missiles against which there is, so far, no real defense.

This warning is being heard with increasing frequency: If the United States fails to realize what is happening, and prefers to take the easy road, she may find the power balance tilting so far in Russia's direction that it cannot be righted in time. It is then that a Soviet dictator most probably would issue his challenge.

All this is why the optimism that is so widespread with the American public appears not to be shared by many of those whose business it is to assess the U.S. future.

The two reports that follow, each made independently, bear on this whole problem:

"WHY RUSSIA WOULD RISK NUCLEAR WAR ON UNITED STATES—WILL THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR RETALIATION BY UNITED STATES REALLY DETER RUSSIA FROM A SURPRISE ATTACK ON THIS COUNTRY?—A STUDY OF NUCLEAR WAR AND ITS PROBABLE EFFECTS SUGGESTS THAT RUSSIA WOULD BE WILLING TO RUN THE RISK

"(Herman Kahn, an experienced analyst of defense problems, warns that Russia may not share the view that a nuclear war is too horrible to contemplate—or consider a surprise attack on the United States as too dangerous to attempt. Herman Kahn is a physicist. For 5 years, as an employee of the Rand Corp., he has been making studies of strategic systems of defense, mostly for the U.S. Air Force. Mr. Kahn, 37, was educated at the University of California at Los Angeles and at California Institute of Technology. Mr. Kahn's views are based on intensive studies with the Rand Corp. and at the Center of International Studies at Princeton University. In these studies, Mr. Kahn has had access to much official information. The following excerpts are from an article by Mr. Kahn in the Stanford Research Institute Journal for the fourth quarter of 1959, released on December 8. That article summarizes a book by Mr. Kahn, 'Three Lectures on Thermonuclear War,' which is to be published next spring by the Princeton University Press.)

"(By Herman Kahn)

"We are now entering the 15th year of the nuclear era. We are becoming increasingly aware that much is still to be learned about the likely effects of a nuclear war and the conduct of international relations in a world in which force is tending to be increasingly less usable. Basic foreign policies formulated earlier in the nuclear era require review and examination.

"First, and perhaps most important, doubt has been cast recently on the widely accepted theory that existence of nuclear weapons has created a reliable balance of terror. The theory most commonly held indicates that a thermonuclear war would mean certain and automatic annihilation of both antagonists, if not the end of civilization.

"In many ways, this concept has been comforting. It makes plausible that, as soon as governments are informed of the terrible consequences of a nuclear war, they will realize that there could be no victors and, therefore, no sense to such a war; therefore, no sane leader would ever start one. Hence the hope that the very violence of war would deter it.

"Many proponents of the mutual-annihilation view believe that it is important to emphasize the horror and impracticability of thermonuclear war in order to establish the urgent necessity to settle our differences by peaceful means and to remove temptation from adventurers.

"The success of such a program depends on the fears thus generated being mutual and reliable. * * * The mutual-annihilation theory can be successful in forestalling an all-out nuclear attack only if both sides completely accept it.

"If only the West buys it and because of this drops it guard, the negligence can be incredibly dangerous. Even mutual belief in the automatic-annihilation theory can still lead to trouble. It is an open invitation to blackmail of the Munich type.

"Therefore, to the extent that the theory may not be true—or the Communists think it isn't—we should not weaken ourselves to the point where we are courting either 'Pearl Harbors' or 'Munichs.' It is important to understand this problem objectively even if analyses aimed at doing so give an impression of callousness.

"The mutual-annihilation view is not unique to the West. Malenkov [former Soviet Premier Georgi M. Malenkov] introduced it in the Soviet Union several years ago. * * * A different view seems to have been held by Khrushchev and the Soviet military. They agreed that war would be horrible, but argued that this was no reason for the Soviet Union to drop its guard—that, with sufficient preparations, only the capitalists would be destroyed. With some modifications their views seem to have prevailed.

"So much depends on this notion of the balance of terror. Is it really true? Would only an insane man initiate a thermonuclear war? Or, are there circumstances in which a nation's leaders might rationally decide that a thermonuclear war would be the most preferable of the possible alternatives?

"Perhaps, not surprisingly, one can conclude on examination that, with current technology, there are plausible, even probable, circumstances in which the leaders of a country might decide that war was the best alternative. Equally unsurprising, many people get very annoyed or angry at anyone making such a statement, although recognition of a situation is not necessarily endorsing it.

"To indicate how this conclusion about the feasibility of thermonuclear war was reached, it is necessary to describe a thermonuclear war and the kinds of risks that can arise against which the decision makers must compare the alternatives of going to war and not going to war.

"What all-out war would be like

"Genetic effects: Many biologists and geneticists are worried about the genetic effects of even the peacetime testing of nuclear weapons: some even talk as if the future of the human race is being jeopardized by exploding a few bombs a year in the Pacific Ocean or the Soviet Arctic. It is certainly true that a lot of bombs exploded inside a country would be far more dangerous than a few exploded farther away. But would it be cataclysmic?

"Calculations in this field are inherently uncertain. In addition, experimental evidence is insufficient to be conclusive about some of the important effects. One can, however, make orienting studies. One study indicated that the survivors of the war might average about 200 or 300 roentgens of radiation to their reproductive organs before age 30. This is an enormous amount of radiation. It is about 1,000 or 2,000 times as much as people in the United States would receive as a byproduct of the test program. It is about 50 to 100 times as much as they would normally get from natural sources. It is a large and frightening dose. It would result in much damage, but there is no evidence that it would be annihilating.

"If present beliefs are correct, the most serious genetic effect of this amount of radiation would be to raise the number of children born seriously defective about 25 percent, or from the current 4 to a new level of 5 percent of the total. This is a large penalty to pay for a war, and, more horrible still, one might have to continue to pay a similar though smaller price for 20 or 30 or 40 generations, but it is still far from annihilation. * * *

"Medical problems: There are medical problems other than the genetic ones, for example, the bone cancers and leukemias that might be caused by strontium-90, and the other life-shortening effects of the internal and external radiation from fission products.

"Here, again, examination indicates that, while the problems are horrible, they may well be within the range we are accustomed to. * * *

"The situation devolves to this: More and closer bombs will cause more trouble than fewer and further ones—but not necessarily that much more. If a country is hit hard—hundreds of bombs more or less on target—but people take advantage of the moderate protection that is available in existing buildings and take other simple measures—things which the Russians, for example, seem to be doing or thinking of doing, today—then both the long- and short-term effects of fall-out are mitigated drastically. With such preparations and some advance warning (the more preparation the less warning is needed) most people can survive the short-term fallout effects. The long-term effects are less avoidable. The war might result in an average life shortening of less than 1 or 2 years, for those who were lucky, and 5 or 10 for those who were not. In any case, life will go on.

"Economic recuperation also looks more feasible than is generally supposed. Most people—laymen and some experts—looking at the highly integrated character of a modern economy, argue that a nation is like a body; destroy the heart or other vital organs, and the body dies. * * *

"This view is questionable. Suppose the United States were divided into two countries—an A country with the largest 50 to 100 cities, and a B country the remainder. The A country cannot survive without a B

country, but the B country, as far as we can see, can survive without the A country. Further, B has the resources and skills needed to rebuild A in, say, 10 years. In other words, a country should not be considered analogous to a body, but rather considered as two semi-independent pieces that trade with each other.

"Further, it is possible, by utilizing existing construction and otherwise improvising fallout protection to prepare the B country to receive evacuees from the A country and protect them reasonably satisfactorily. If preparations have been made, then, for most of the year, either the Soviets or the United States could improvise fallout protection on just days' or hours' notice. * * *

"Current (1958) Russian civil defense manuals indicate that they are making such preparations. In addition, the Russians claim to have given every adult in Russia something between 20 and 40 hours of instructions in civil defense followed by a compulsory examination. Perhaps most important of all, their program seems to include preparations for evacuation to improvised fallout protection.

"How effective would such an evacuation be?

"About 50 million Russians live in the largest 135 Soviet cities. If they evacuated, say, 80 percent of these 50 million to their B country and left the remainder to operate the cities, all essential functions would be maintained while exposing only about 10 million citizens. Also, having evacuated most of the urban population, it would be possible to evacuate those remaining comparatively easily.

"As long as our ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) force is small they don't even have to do the evacuation before they launch an attack. They have time to do so before our retaliatory bomber force reaches the majority of these cities.

"Under these circumstances, if the Russians strike first and are reasonably successful, our attack should kill not more than 5 or 10 million Russians, probably much less, unless things go incredibly badly for them. Thus, they might lose only a fraction as many people as they lost in World War II.

"Calling a Soviet bluff

"In some tense situation the Soviets could deliberately evacuate their A country in order to put the pressure on us. By this they make it credible that they intend to go to war unless we back down. While this gives us a sort of warning, we may not act on the warning. We may resolutely refuse to be "bluffed." In any case, unless we are willing to accept a Soviet retaliatory blow, the only practicable counteraction we may have might well be to back down or to put our SAC (Strategic Air Command) on alert and to evacuate our own cities—an action, incidentally, for which we have made almost no realistic preparations—in order to try to make them back down. The other possibility—to make the assumption that they don't mean what they seem to mean—may be too risky.

"Such maneuvers are risky for the Soviets because we may attack first. But the probability of such an attack is small and they might be willing to face this prospect. If we don't attack or back down, they may go to war. In particular, the Soviets could start such a war in any circumstances in which the risks of not going to war appear larger to Khrushchev than going to war.

"Consider a very plausible circumstance, the Hungarian revolution, which the Russians bloodily suppressed. Much pressure was applied to the United States to intervene. * * *

"Assume that we had acceded to that pressure and intervened. The Russians would then have been faced with three fairly serious choices:

"1. They could do nothing. This could almost automatically mean a Polish and East German revolt. Such a revolt would mean serious political repercussions within Russia, which we know worries them.

2. Secondly, they could fight a limited action. But that too, is risky. If we fight a limited action with conventional high-explosive weapons, we would lose, just by the sheer weight of numbers. If we go to atomic weapons, it is still doubtful that we would win and even more doubtful that the war would stay limited. In particular, the Soviets might easily believe that we were quite capable of suddenly expanding the scope of the war with a surprise attack at their strategic forces.

"3. The third possibility might appear safer. Rather than wait for the satellites to revolt or for the limited war to erupt into a general war at a time chosen by the Americans, they might decide to hit us right away. They could argue that this guaranteed them the all important first strike, at least if they hurried.

"It is clearly possible that such potentially dangerous situations could arise again, and in some of them we may be deeply, if involuntarily, involved. (Consider an East German revolt in which a rearmed West Germany felt obligated to intervene, or a United States-Chinese war which became all out.)

"Our retaliatory capability must always be good enough that, even if the Soviets evacuate their cities, they will still feel that it is more risky to strike than to accept whatever alternative seems in store. * * *

"Even, or especially, if the 'balance of terror' theory is correct and we don't have to worry about a deliberate Soviet attack on the United States, we are still faced with important strategic problems. In 1914 and 1939, it was the British who declared war, not the Germans. Such a circumstance might arise again, but, if the 'balance of terror' were correct, then we are as likely to be deterred as the Soviets; it is doubtful that the United States would resort to an all-out attack on the Soviets, even to correct or avenge major Soviet aggression in Europe.

"Consider a hypothetical situation in which American defenses were so weak and Soviet retaliatory forces so strong that, if the United States responded to a Soviet ground attack on Europe, the Soviet counter-retaliation would kill all 177 million Americans. Suppose, also, that the Russians have forced us to think for a day or so as to whether to start a thermonuclear war in cold blood in the full consciousness that the Russian retaliatory blow will mean the annihilation of every American.

"Who, if he were President of the United States, would initiate such a blow? Under such conditions it would not be surprising if neither the Europeans nor the Soviets found the U.S. promise to come to the aid of Europe credible.

"If the Soviets and the Europeans would not believe that we would honor our commitments to our allies if it means 177 million American deaths, what level of casualties do they believe we would accept? How many, indeed, if the decision were yours, would you accept? One hundred million? Fifty million? Ten million? One million? It's a hard question.

"I have discussed this question with some Europeans, asking them to guess how the American President would act. I have found no European who believed we would initiative a war if the casualties would be much over 20 million, and some believed we would be deterred at less than 2 million. One thoughtful critic thinks we would be deterred just at the prospect of the Russians destroying 5 or 10 empty cities.

"Published unclassified estimates of the amount of damage that the United States would suffer in a war generally run around 50 to 60 million. If these estimates are relevant—which is doubtful, since they generally assume a Soviet Union surprise attack on an unalert United States—then we are already deterred from living up to our alliance obligations. If they are not relevant, then we ought to make relevant estimates for both now and the future.

"The critical point is whether the Soviets believe we can keep our casualties to a level we would find acceptable, whatever that level may be.

"If so, they will be deterred from very provocative aggressions, such as a ground attack on Europe or evacuating their cities and presenting us with an ultimatum.

"But if they do not believe we can keep casualties to an acceptable level, the Soviets may feel safe in undertaking these extremely provocative military adventures. Or at least the Europeans may feel that the Soviets will feel safe, which creates an extremely dangerous pressure and blackmail situation.

"But what deters the Russians from a series of Koreas and Indochinas? It is probably less the fear of a direct U.S. attack with our current forces than the probability—in response to such crises—that the United States and its allies will greatly increase both their military strength and their resolve.

"The deterrent effect of this possibility can be increased by making explicit preparations for a capability for increasing our strength very rapidly whenever the other side provokes us. For example, in June 1950 the United States was engaged in a great debate whether our defense budget should be 14, 15, or 16 billion dollars. Along came Korea. Congress quickly authorized $60 billion, an increase by a factor of 4.

"No matter what successes the Russians had in Korea, that authorization represents an enormous military defeat for them. However, it was almost 3 years before that authorization was fully translated into increased budgets and increased military power. It is very valuable to have a capability to increase our defense expenditures, but this capability becomes many times more valuable if authorizations can be translated into military strength in a year or so.

"If the Russians know that, if they allow international relations to deteriorate, we will probably go into an effective crash program, then they may be much less willing to let international relations deteriorate.

"The problem, of course, is: 'Would we have the time to put in a useful program?' For example, the basic military posture—including installations—must be of the proper sort if it is to be possible to expand it, within a year or so, to the point where it is prepared to fight a war in addition to being able to deter one. Our current posture is probably far from optimum for doing this.

"Particularly if these preparations were at least moderately expensive and very explicit, the Russians might find it credible that we would initiate and carry through such a program if they were even provocative, say, on the scale of Korea or even less. The Russians would then be presented with three alternatives:

"1. They could strike the United States, before the buildup got very far. This might look very unattractive, especially since the buildup would almost certainly be accompanied by an increased alert and other measures to reduce the vulnerability of SAC.

"2. They could try to match the U.S. program. This would be very expensive.

"3. They could accept a position of inferiority. This would be serious, since we would now have a 'fight the war' capability as well as a 'deter the war' capability.

"In all cases the cost and risk of their provocation would have been increased, and it is not at all unlikely that the Soviets would take these extra costs and risks into account before they attempt provocation. If

they were not deterred, then we could launch into the crash program so that we would be in a position to correct the results of their past provocation or at least so that they would be deterred, in the future, from exploiting these results.

"Need: 'Limited-war program'

"It might be particularly valuable to have credible and explicit plans to institute an adequate civil-defense program and a limited-war program. The institution of a crash program would make it very credible to the Russians, our allies, and neutrals that we would go to war at an appropriate level if we were provoked again.

"It is important to understand that we have this asset, the ability to spend large sums of money rather rapidly.

"Let us, for example, assume a new Berlin crisis * * * It would be most improbable that we would wage a war if the Russians gradually put the squeeze on Berlin. Nevertheless, in all likelihood State Department negotiators negotiating with the Russians will try to tell them that they couldn't afford to push us out of Berlin because in some vague way we will do something very violent; that we would use our military forces. But our negotiators would be afraid to spell our threat out, for nothing that they could spell out would be credible.

"Even today the Russians have told us that, if we send soldiers, they will kill them; that, if we send tanks, they will burn them, and that they can deter us from an all-out war, because they have rockets trained on our cities. The Soviets are saying that, at any level of violence that we care to use, they can either meet that level on the spot or promise such a severe punishment that we will be deterred. The Russians have also pointed out that Berlin is a chess game, not a poker game; that everybody can see what our position is.

"If the Soviets are right, that our only alternatives are violence or defeat—where defeat would be an acceptance of some new and unsatisfactory status of Berlin—then the Soviets could probably be successful in talking us into adopting a face-saving method of losing Berlin, rather than one which made it clear to all that we have suffered a serious defeat.

"In actual fact, we have some very strong cards to play, but if we do not know what these cards are we may be tricked out of playing them.

"If we refuse to accept a face-saving defeat and, in fact, force the Russians to rub our noses in the dirt, then it would be clear to all in NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] and the United States that, unless we do something spectacular to recover the situation, the NATO nations can no longer rely on us for any kind of protection.

"Under these circumstances the U.S. Government would have to go into enormous defense budgets, probably close to at least $100 billion a year level. These defense budgets would be designed not only to implement our current forces but also to buy large limited-war forces, and to buy things like civil defense and the corresponding military forces that would give us a credible capability for initiating a war if a humiliating crisis should be repeated.

"There will also, under these circumstances, be enormous pressure on the NATO nations to combine into an even tighter alliance and to mobilize their resources for their defense also. This would mean that, as in Korea, even if we lost Berlin in the military sense, the Russians would have lost this particular campaign. While Berlin is important both ethically, politically and even resourcewise, its loss would not compare to the greatly increased power on the side of the West.

"This is the threat we have against the Russians. If we don't know that we have this threat, if we believe that increasing the budget by a factor or two really would mean some sort of immediate bankruptcy or other financial catastrophe, then the Russians can present us with alternatives which may in the end result in their getting the diplomatic, political, and foreign-policy victory. It is important that we understand our own strength.

"Conclusions

"Even if we have acquired the highest quality deterrence capability, we must still have a capability for fighting and surviving wars as long as it is possible to have such a capability. This is true not only because it is prudent to take out insurance against a war occurring unintentionally, but also because we must be able to stand up to the threat of fighting a war or even be able to credibly threaten to wage war ourself. We must have an "alternative to peace," as long as we don't have a world government and as long as it is technologically and economically possible to have one.

"Under current programs the United States may not be willing in a few years to accept a Soviet retaliatory blow, no matter what the provocation. The occurrence of such a situation is equivalent to breaking our alliance obligations and signing a nonaggression treaty with the Soviets—a nonaggression treaty with almost 200 million American hostages to guarantee performance.

"Since it now seems most unlikely that the Soviet menace will go away by itself and since we have eschewed preventive war as a possibility, we must seek the solution to our problems along the path of some degree of coexistence or collaboration.

"If we are to do this effectively, we must appear extremely competent to the Soviet leaders. They must feel that we are putting adequate attention and resources into meeting our military, political, and economic problems. This is not a question of attempting to bargain from strength, but one of looking so invulnerable to blackmail and aggressive tactics that Soviet leaders will feel it is worth while to make agreements and foolish not to.

"How Russians see U.S. leaders

"One gets the impression that up to about 1956 or 1957, the average senior Russian did have an enormous respect for U.S. planners and decision makers—a respect which they have now begun to lose. Many of the comments they make on remarks that some of our military and political leaders have made are contemptuous—and, a sober examination indicates, properly contemptuous. In the precarious present and the even more precarious future it would be well to go to some trouble not only to be competent as an antagonist to the Russians, but to look competent.

"Ideally, winning the cold war would mean the establishment of peaceful democratic and prosperous nations everywhere and the complete elimination of all international conflicts of greater significance than those that, for example, occasionally plague United States-British relations.

"No sober student of the international scene visualizes anything of this sort occurring. Even a more limited objective, the attainment of a physical security that is independent of Soviet good will, is probably unattainable. * * *

But the situation is worse than this. It is most unlikely that the world can live with an uncontrolled arms race lasting for several decades. It is not that we could not match Soviet expenditures; it is simply that, as technology advances, as weapons become more powerful and more diverse, it is most likely that there will have to be at least implicit agreements on their use, distribution and character if we are not to run unacceptably high risks of unauthorized or irresponsible behavior.

"No matter how inimical the Soviets feel toward us, they have common interests with us in this field. This does not mean that they will not try to use the common threat to obtain unilateral advantages: it just means that there is an important area for bargaining here and one which we must fully exploit.

"As a prerequisite to exploiting it we must do our homework. We must know what we are trying to achieve, the kind of concessions that we can afford to give, the kind of concessions that we insist on getting from the Soviets. All of this will require, among other things, much-higher-quality preparations for negotiations than have been common.

"Aside from the ideological differences and the problem of security itself, there does not seem to be any objective quarrel between the United States and Russia that justifies the risks and costs that we subject each other to. The big thing that the Soviet Union and the United States have to fear from each other is fear itself. * * *

"But, even if it were conceded that all we have to fear is fear itself, this would not imply that the problem is simple or easy, or even that it can be eliminated by any kind of arrangements that are practical for the next decade or so; it is only to say that there do not seem to be any fundamental blocks to making things more manageable and safer than is the current arrangement, namely, an almost uncontrolled arms race ameliorated by some vague implicit agreements and unilateral practices.

"Progress is so fast, the problems are so unprecedented and the lead times for cultural assimilation so long that it is difficult to believe that muddling through will work. We will need much better mechanisms for forward thinking, for imaginative research into problems of strategy and foreign policy, for anticipating future developments and for planning to meet them than we have had.

"These mechanisms can be made available. The tools actually or potentially available to the analyst, planner, and decision maker, both organizational and technical, are many orders of magnitude better than anything we have had before; it is just barely possible that, with a determined effort by large numbers of responsible people, we can achieve enough to make a significant difference. The survival of our civilization may depend on this effort being made. Let us hope that it can be done."

"UNITED STATES NOW FACING ITS GREAT DANGER—THIS WARNING IS CONTAINED IN A NEW OFFICIAL REPORT: THE UNITED STATES IS NOW OPEN TO A DEVASTATING NUCLEAR ATTACK—RUSSIA'S LEAD IN MISSILES IS SEEN AS CONFRONTING THE UNITED STATES WITH THE GREATEST DANGER IN ITS HISTORY

"(Here is an official report on the peril that menaces this Nation in this age of missiles and nuclear bombs. It was made for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of Johns Hopkins University. Researchers at Johns Hopkins have been making studies of military problems for the U.S. Government for many years. Following are excerpts from the report, released by the Senate committee on December 6, 1959:)

"The military position of the United States has declined in the short span of 15 years from one of unchallenged security to that of a nation both open and vulnerable to direct and devastating attack.

"This decline coincides with the rising military power of the Soviet Union, but the Soviet challenge could not have been made with such swiftness and success were it not for developments in military technology enabling that nation to threaten the security of the continental United States.

"The advent of the nuclear-missile weapons generation, heralded by the Soviet ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile] test of August 1957 brought a drastic compression of the time required for the delivery of nuclear explosives at intercontinental ranges and a corresponding reduction in the attack warning time available to the victim of strategic aggression.

"These effects, added to the fact that there is as yet no active defense whatsoever against an intercontinental ballistic missile in flight, have gravely increased the temptations to strike first in a nuclear war.

"They have also made an opponent's manned-bomber force highly vulnerable to surprise attack by the side that first achieves a comprehensive strategic missile arm.

"Should the Soviets be the first to do so—and this now appears likely—the marked first-strike advantage now attributed to our Strategic Air Command would transfer to them.

"It is this possibility that disturbs those who see in the missile gap of the early 1960's the greatest danger to its security that the United States has ever faced.

"It is unlikely that the United States could close the anticipated missile gap, or appreciably shorten this dangerous transitional period, merely by accelerating the production of our present strategic weapons.

"Progress in military technology will continue at an accelerating rate during the next decade, increasing both the performance of individual weapons systems and the number of systems that it becomes feasible to develop.

"The arms race is likely to be of such scope and intensity as to provide each of the two great adversaries with repeated chances to seize an important lead in areas to which they assign priority.

"It does not now appear possible to develop active or passive defense systems capable of fully protecting large areas from nuclear attack, or even to provide those point targets whose locations are known to the enemy with invulnerability to multimegaton weapons.

"A high degree of national security is therefore likely to remain a goal unobtainable by military means alone during the next decade. The protection of retaliatory power will continue to depend heavily on the multiplication, dispersal and, later, the mobilizing of strategic-weapons systems.

"To assume that the level of mutual destruction now possible from a total nuclear war, or the magnitude and intensity of the accompanying radioactive fallout, is sufficiently high to make nuclear war suicidal—and therefore impossible—is but to evade the most serious military problem that this Nation has ever faced.

"The initiation of total war may be made increasingly hazardous for the potential aggressor, but it will remain a course open to him for at least the next decade.

"The United States, as the potential victim of such an attack, should have the ability to fight such a war in a rational manner and should give the most serious consideration to those civil-defense measures requisite to the protection and recovery of its population.

"Foreseeable progress in nuclear engineering will make possible a reduction in the costs, and consequent increase in the availability, of fissile materials.

"Such achievements can be expected to facilitate the nuclearizing of small wars, the nuclear arming of allies, and the spread of nuclear power to additional countries.

"It seems unlikely, however, that these effects will be significantly asymmetrical in their impact on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. power equation.

"Progress in chemical and biological weaponry is still far from the point where toxicological warfare could be considered of strategic decisiveness.

"These agents present ancillary civil and military defense problems, and may add to the difficulties of arms control, but their present military utility has been exaggerated.

"What United States can gain in space

"Operational satellite and satelloid space systems promise to become available in considerable numbers and sophistication during the next decade.

"Their military employment for reconnaissance missions, attack warning, and the facilitation of communications, navigation and weather prediction will be of relative advantage to the United States in view of its existing needs for intelligence of the Soviet Union and the management of globally deployed forces.

"Their use for these missions will, however, sharpen existing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union and provide fruitful sources of new ones.

"It appears highly unlikely that these problems can be avoided, or solved, by a distinction between military and peaceful uses of space.

"The employment of manned orbiting vehicles, and of such maneuverable spacecraft as may be developed in this period, appears capable of radically altering the present strategic balance only under conditions which do not, as yet, appear probable.

"The unprecedented level of destruction that even the aggressor must expect to suffer in a thermonuclear exchange is the principal stabilizing factor in the strategic equation today, and is likely to remain so for the decade ahead. There may remain great military advantages in striking first, but, while the aggressor must accurately deliver a large number of weapons on military targets to triumph, a much smaller number of weapons landing on his industrial and civilian complexes may rob him of the fruits of victory.

"Opposing this stabilizing influence, however, are structural instabilities stemming from the characteristics and interaction of modern weapons systems, instabilities arising from differences of timing in the development or deployment of weapons, policy instabilities resulting from the use of war threats by powerful adversaries, and instabilities inherent in the spread of strategic nuclear weapons to a growing number of nation-states.

"Characteristics of today's strategic-weapons systems which tend toward instability include their vulnerability to surprise attack, the relatively low effectiveness of active defense systems, and the hair trigger characteristics of warning and reaction systems that make possible a war by accident or miscalculation.

"Differences between adversaries in the time-phasing of weapons systems may tempt an aggressive power to exploit a temporary but powerful military advantage before it evaporates or transfers to his enemy.

"The fact that modern strategic-weapons systems take many years to develop and deploy in adequate numbers makes it difficult to avoid such instabilities through prompt compensatory action.

"The United States could do much to achieve a substantial degree of nuclear stability in the decade ahead regardless of what the Soviet Union does, or does not, agree to do.

"Means appropriate to this objective would include the variegation, dispersal and protection of United States retaliatory weapons to reduce the Soviet temptations to strike first; mechanical safeguards to moderate the dangers of accidental war, and changes in our policies and military capabilities that lessen the free world's present dependence on nuclear threats for its security.

"Proposals for total disarmament, such as those recently made by the Soviet Union, should be approached in this regard with caution.

"Maximum disarmament, down to the level of national police forces, is not synonymous with maximum stability and may in fact be inconsistent with it.

"In a totally disarmed world, even a small number of secreted or clandestinely manufactured nuclear weapons could disrupt the international order and allow one power to dominate its more trusting adversaries.

"It is doubtful that any devisable, much less agreeable, inspection system could disclose such violations with a sufficient degree of certainty.

"International disputes over vital political and economic issues would, in any event, be likely to lead to the resumption of a hectic arms race and, in the final analysis, military power and technology would still decide the outcome.

"It is highly unlikely that any foolproof arms-control and inspection system can be devised or that absolute stability is attainable by the most strenuous of efforts in this direction. But there are sound reasons for believing that it is in the interest of the United States, the Soviet Union, and other members of the world community to achieve as high a degree of nuclear stability as possible in the next decade.

"As Russia's strength grows

"Increasing Soviet strategic capabilities are reducing the deterrent value of U.S. strategic nuclear power.

"The possibility of a Soviet surprise attack on the United States cannot be ruled out as long as the American retaliatory force, composed predominantly of manned bombers on unhardened, immobile, and unconcealed bases, remains extremely vulnerable to a missile attack.

"While the Soviets may never achieve an assured ability to knock out SAC [Strategic Air Command], conceivably they might prefer someday to risk the damage a crippled SAC could inflict on them rather than to risk the dangers of not striking first at the American strategic force.

"Even during the period of its great vulnerability, American retaliatory power retains considerable deterrent value because of the uncertainties discouraging a Soviet first strike.

"However, American security must remain precarious unless SAC's present vulnerability is remedied within a short period of time."

ROCKEFELLER STUDY—"POSSIBILITY OF WAR MUST BE FACED"

The danger of Soviet superiority in arms is discussed in a report on "The Mid-Century Challenge to U.S. Foreign Policy," published December 7 by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. It is based on a study by a panel headed by Dean Rusk, former Assistant Secretary of State. Excerpts follow:

"A foreign policy which devoted itself exclusively to avoiding war would neglect the constructive aspects out of which a true peace must develop. A free nation which sought nothing but peace would gain peace only at the price of its freedom. * * *

"The possibility of war must be faced. * * * The nature of the present situation offers no escape.

"The possibility cannot be ruled out that the Soviet leadership, if it secures a clear superiority in the arms race, will use this advantage to blackmail or to attack its major opponent without warning. That possibility must at all costs be forestalled.

"Under present conditions, and for as long as necessary, the strength of the Western deterrent must be maintained, with clear realization that this cannot be done easily or once and for all.

"The abolition of arms has been once more proposed by the Soviet Government. Whether the proposal is serious is open to doubt. * * *

"Negotiations must test whether there are sufficiently significant changes in the Russian position to make it possible to move toward a mutually acceptable plan for disarmament. * * *

"Persistent and unremitting efforts to achieve step-by-step control and reduction of arms should not blind the United States to the really fundamental issues involved. If the control of arms becomes effective on a broad scale, it will almost certainly be because international institutions will have developed greatly in scope and authority over the coming years.

"This underlying, basic Soviet danger [of expanding Communist power and isolation of the United States] has not been as well understood in the United States as it should be. Certainly the situation will not be changed by a lull in the crises which have served to keep the United States awake. * * *

"In any case, the free world, as a basic tenet of policy, must not permit the Communist states to extend their rule.

"The United States cannot accept, under the guise of compromise or the easing of tensions, measures which would abandon West Berlin to Communist rule, dissolve NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], allow West Germany to fall within the Soviet orbit, or otherwise undermine the free states of Europe. * * *

"Possibilities must be kept open, but the West cannot afford to accept illusory agreements."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks an address given on December 6, 1959, in New York City by Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University and Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights. Dr. Hannah's address was the first in the series of Jacob M. Alson Lectures sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League and is indeed an excellent and comprehensive speech on the problem of civil rights.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. HANNAH, PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, AND CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, ALSON LECTURESHIP, ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 6, 1959

It is a great honor to be permitted to inaugurate the Jacob M. Alson Lectures, and this, the first in the series, is presented in the hope that it will contribute to a better understanding of the whole complex problem of civil rights, and help to justify the founder's belief that wisdom will grow out of understanding.

Your officers were generous in their demarcation of the area for discussion. They reflected the broad interests of this organization, which has stood for so long in the forefront of the struggle to free men's minds of the intolerance and prejudice which are at the root of our civil rights problems.

This lecture will be in two parts. The first will deal briefly with the Commission on Civil Rights. The second will be an attempt to give historical perspective to today's situation. Some knowledge of history makes it easier to account for some of the attitudes taken, the opinions held, the courses of action proposed in 1959.

There is risk in this approach for we find ourselves balancing precariously on the narrow line between a maze of legal technicalities on the one hand, and a mass of generalities on the other.

I. THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The establishment of the Commission on Civil Rights is of itself of real significance in history inasmuch as the act creating it approved by the Congress in 1957 was the first national civil rights bill passed since 1875. The act, while much compromised during the enactment process, does represent a determination to come to grips with a thorny problem that has been with us for more than 300 years.

There is cause to wonder why 82 years should pass after 1875 before we again turned our attention as a nation to this vexsome issue, for the matter of civil rights concerns the fundamental precepts and principles upon which our democratic system is being painfully built, day after day and year after year. Until these issues are finally resolved, we cannot truthfully claim that our idealistic, courageous experiment in self-government has been wholly successful, nor predict that the American dream will ever be fully realized. Perhaps the very complexity of the issues, or their emotional overtones, have made us reluctant to face up to the fact that there has indeed been a serious hiatus between promise and performance in our democracy.

However that may be, the Congress did take a meaningful if tentative step forward in passing the Civil Rights Act of 1957. And, as if anticipating that subsequent debate might grow too violent without the restraining force of fact, it created the Commission on Civil Rights as a fact-finding body with authority and responsibility to inquire and to report, but without authority to take corrective or enforcement action. Realization that the Commission is thus restricted in its activities is essential to any fair appraisal of its work to date. It has no other answer to those who are critical because it has not done something to ameliorate the situation.

The Congress specifically directed the Commission to make inquiry into repeated allegations that some citizens were being deprived of their right to register, vote, and have their votes counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin, and to make appropriate recommendations for action if these allegations were found to be justified by fact.

By this directive, the Congress indicated that voting is a key issue. If government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and votes are the accepted expressions of the people's will, then denial of the right to vote constitutes an intolerable subversion of national self-interest.

There is no need to labor this point. All intelligent, objective Americans will subscribe to this philosophy, for they appreciate how precious the right to vote is to them. I believe that most of us understand, even though dimly at times, that when one man's right to vote is denied, every man's right to vote is thereby jeopardized.

Suffice it for our purposes today to say that on the basis of affidavits, investigation, and hearings, the Commission found and reported to the President and the Congress that qualified Americans—and many, many thousands of them—are in fact being denied the right to vote because they are members of the Negro race, and for no other reason. This deprivation is being accomplished through the creation of legal impediments, administrative obstacles, and sometimes through positive discouragement engendered by fears of economic reprisal and physical harm.

Were there time I could cite a great many instances in which distinguished citizens with doctor of philosophy degrees earned in some of America's foremost universities have been denied the right to register and to vote on the flimsiest of excuses, the actual reason being that they are Negroes.

We learned of doctors, lawyers, schoolteachers, registered nurses, and successful businessmen being denied the right to register and to vote, simply because they are Negroes.

We learned of courageous young men who have fought in our country's defense, and who will carry crippling battle scars all of their lives, who are being denied the right to vote, just because their skins are black.

It should shock you to learn that today, in December 1959, there are at least 16 counties in the United States in which one-third or more of the population is nonwhite in which not a single nonwhite is permitted to register to vote. In a far larger number of counties with very substantial numbers of Negro citizens, only a token—and a very small token—number are permitted to vote.

These nonwhite citizens live useful lives, pay taxes, serve in our military forces, and yet they are denied the right to any voice in the conduct of a Government they support with their taxes and are willing to defend with their lives if need be.

This is indefensible. The record is clear. The facts are undisputed. The case has been made. It remains to be seen whether we will have the courage and good sense to do something about it.

Early in its work, the Commission decided to concentrate upon two other areas in which there was substantial reason to believe that equal protection of the law was not being extended to all citizens equally. These were education and housing.

This decision was taken deliberately in full realization that there were many other areas worthy of attention, including the use of public accommodations, the administration of justice, the content of school curriculums in which civil rights are studied, employment practices, discrimination in transportation and in labor union membership, to name a few.

But the lifetime of the Commission then being limited to some 16 months, it was decided to undertake extensive investigation into voting as spelled out by the congressional edict and two other areas of education and housing only. The Commission felt that these were key areas.

Now that the life of the Commission has been extended for another 2 years, it proposes to venture into some other areas but will continue to place its first emphasis on voting, education, and housing.

How shocking the situation is in one of the areas to which the Commission proposes to address its attention—the administration of justice—was vividly portrayed recently when the Attorney General of the United States reported an exhaustive investigation into a murder of a Negro in a State in which the grand jury failed to take any action despite the fact that all the evidence necessary to indict the participants in this revolting crime had been submitted to local authorities.

The Commission turned its attention to education for a number of pressing reasons. The first was that great public interest had been aroused by the Supreme Court's decision against school segregation; and in matters of public policy, public interest is an essential to informed public action. The second was because, in the words of the report, "The American system of public education must be preserved without impairment because an educated citizenry is the mainstay of the Republic and full educational opportunity for each and every citizen is America's major defense against the world threat to freedom." The third, unexpressed but none the less compelling, was that traditionally we have

looked to education to free men's minds of intolerance and prejudice, and we must look to education to work its slow but certain miracles in the whole broad area of civil rights if we are to make substantial progress toward achievement of our national ideals. The fourth was because the Commission felt that it could make a valuable contribution by identifying the factors and influences that resulted in public acceptance of school desegregation in some communities and commotion and chaos in others.

Here, too, the Commission made findings of the fact and submitted recommendations to the President and the Congress.

The report states that "the problem is how to comply with the Supreme Court decision while preserving and even improving public education. The ultimate choice of each State (and community) is between finding reasonable ways of ending compulsory segregation in its schools or abandoning its system of free public education."

Events and developments of recent months have verified the validity of that analysis.

Let us turn quickly now to a brief comment on the housing problem, the third area of major concern to the Commission in the early months of its operations. Voting rights and school segregation have long been recognized as issues of paramount importance, but it was not until comparatively recently that we recognized that how men live is affected to a great degree by the extent to which equal protection of the law is extended to them. Our concern is heightened by the evidence coming in day after day as to the effect of poor housing on juvenile delinquency, crime rates, and other social ills.

Housing conditions and practices are of particular importance because abuses here do not tend to be concentrated in one section of the country, but are plainly evident in most of our large cities everywhere. Housing is no sectional problem; it is one with which all of us are immediately and uncomfortably concerned. I say "uncomfortably" because as Julius Pringle of South Carolina said to his northern countrymen in the days just before the Civil War:

"To preach distant reform is very cheap philanthropy—the cheaper in proportion to the distance. The feeling of self-satisfaction exists without the necessity of personal sacrifice."

All of us know how much easier it is to say "they should do something about it" than to admit "we should do something about it." In housing, all Americans have the problem on their doorsteps or in their front yards, and here more than Negroes are involved. Here in New York, for example, you have the matter of the Puerto Ricans as well as of the Negroes in your midst, and members of this organization certainly know well that religious as well as racial discrimination may play a forceful role in deciding who shall live where. Chicago, as an example, has its problems with more than 1 million Negroes living within its city limits, including a very large number who have fled the discrimination of the South to find little improvement in the North. The west coast, where our Commission will hold hearings late next month, wrestles with the additional troublesome task of dealing equitably with large numbers of Mexican-Americans and Americans of oriental descent. Some communities find themselves troubled by the records of their treatment of American Indians. Housing is a problem of greater diversity and range than perhaps any other in this whole civil rights area.

The problem is epitomized in one passage from the Commission's report that I would like to call to your attention.

Housing, it is pointed out, seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay. It would be an effront to human dignity for any one group of Americans to be restricted to wearing only hand-me-down clothing, or to eating the leftovers of other's food. Like food and clothing, housing is an essential of life, yet most nonwhite American families have no choice but secondhand homes in the most congested and least desirable sections of our cities. The results can be seen in high rates of disease, fire, juvenile delinquency, crime, and social demoralization among those forced to live in such conditions. A nation dedicated to respect for the human dignity of every individual should not permit such conditions to continue.

In making its preliminary recommendations for correction of abuses in the field of housing, the Commission was encouraged by its observations of what has been accomplished in some places, including here in New York and in Atlanta. There are high walls of racial and religious bigotry still to be torn down, but this is one area in which we can justifiably hope for substantial improvement in the years immediately ahead.

One basis for this justification is that the Federal, State, and municipal governments are so intimately and actively concerned through slum-clearance and rehabilitation programs of such size as to be heavily influential. We have recognized slums as an intolerable social disgrace, and we are setting about eliminating them. Machinery already in motion and likely to be put in motion bid fair to bring about a great improvement in the housing situation in the foreseeable future. Another reason for optimism results from the fact that the Federal Government is so heavily committed in the financing and mortgage guaranteeing of such a substantial proportion of all new housing—and certainly there is no justification for our Government itself practicing or encouraging housing discrimination.

In the few busy months of its existence, the Civil Rights Commission has learned that the basic problem is one of securing the full rights of American citizenship to those being denied in any degree "that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws." It has learned that, by and large, the problem is a racial problem. The children and grandchildren of the waves of immigrants from the nations of Europe, reared and educated as Americans, have dispersed and strengthened our communities everywhere. Discrimination, once widespread and victimizing Americans for reasons of race, religion, national origin, and economics, is now largely concentrated upon our 18 million Negro citizens.

It is not surprising that this is so, for many social philosophers have pointed out over the years that the existence of a sizable Negro minority has been "the acid test of American democracy."

In part this is the old problem of the vicious circle. Slavery, economic discrimination, and second-class citizenship have demoralized a considerable portion of those suffering these injustices, and the consequent demoralization has then been seen by others as an excuse for continuing some of the very conditions that cause the demoralization.

The fundamental interrelationships among the subjects of voting, education, and housing make it impossible for the problem to be solved by the improvement of any one factor alone. If the right to vote is secured but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing, the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance. If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums.

Let us turn now to a consideration of a few of the historical facts without which we cannot hope to understand the true nature of the situation in which we find ourselves as we approach the close of our second century of existence as a Nation, born in revolution and dedicated to the evolutionary process as a political philosophy.

II. CIVIL RIGHTS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

An enlightened audience such as this must be presumed to have familiarity with the great basic documents of American history, but at times great public debates over issues of general concern drive us back to our books to refresh our memories and to adjust our perspectives. Such is the case today when the American people are coming to grips again with the matter of how to make practice fit theory in the field of civil rights.

What, they properly ask, is our fundamental philosophy in this matter? What do the documents say? What does the record show?

Basic to all our political thinking is the Declaration of Independence, the revolutionary manifesto that still amazes us by its daring, its eloquence, its timelessness.

You will recall that the Declaration opens with what the leaders of the revolution against kingly tyranny considered to be a catalog of fundamental human liberties as they understood them to be after years of studying the writings of the social philosophers who gave to those times the name of the Age of Enlightenment. They asserted flatly and unequivocably their fundamental belief in one Creator who had endowed His human creatures equally. They declared that from this endowed equality there flowed political rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They espoused the theory that governments have no inherent powers, but derive them from the consent of the governed.

The second great controlling document is, of course, our Constitution. Its preamble dedicates the Constitution to the establishment of justice in the new nation, and to securing the blessings of hard-won political liberty to the people of the new country. These had been cataloged in general terms in the Declaration of Independence.

The great American experiment in democratic self-government has always had a fascinating attraction for political scientists and social philosophers in other lands. We have attracted many foreign observers to our shores, and we have found our full share of critics among them. Some of the observers—notably the Frenchman de Tocqueville and the Englishman Lord Bryce—have themselves contributed to our store of knowledge about ourselves, and their works have in time become listed among our basic American documents.

More recently, a renowned Swedish social scientist, Gunnar Myrdal, has contributed to foreign observation of the American scene. His study of the Negro in American society, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation and published in 1944 under the title of "An American Dilemma," bears the significant subtitle, "The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy." This is a monumental work well worth reading. Its opening chapters bear especially on the matter of historical backgrounds of social conditions as he found them to be in the course of his scholarly study. Myrdal is important to us because his is the most recent comprehensive study by a competent foreign observer of one facet of the question with which we are dealing today.

He is another of those who sees the Negro problem as central to the whole issue of the eventual success of our democratic experiment. In his words "the Negro problem in

America represents a moral lag in the development of the Nation, and a study of it must record nearly everything which is bad and wrong in America." Because of the recency of his study, and because the disinterested though friendly analysis he makes is so appropriate, I will draw heavily upon his report.

Myrdal pays his sincere tribute to what he terms the American Creed which, he says, is so generally approved and applauded by all citizens that it explains the periods of torment through which we pass periodically as we try our honest best to make reality out of idealistic theory. "America," he writes, "is continuously struggling for its soul."

He says later that "for practical purposes the main norms of the American Creed as usually pronounced are centered in the belief in equality and in the rights to liberty" as expounded in the Declaration, in the Constitution, and in the Bill of Rights. Our blueprint for national existence was, he declares, the most liberal and enlightened charter yet devised.

Lawyers often appeal to the Constitution in their contests in the modern day, but in the courts of public opinion the appeal is more often to the principles of the Declaration and even beyond to what for want of a better term has often been cited as "the higher law." The Declaration itself appealed to "the laws of Nature and of Nature's God" and "to the Supreme God of the World for the rectitude of our intentions."

Looking at these living documents in retrospect, we of this day can clearly see that what the founders of our Nation did was to set up for their new country a set of standards—of ideals—so lofty as to be almost beyond attainment but so attractive that they would serve as a constant challenge to men of good will, so promising that they would inspire heroic efforts to achieve them, so closely in harmony with that which is divine in thinking man that any discordant notes would leave him unhappily dissatisfied and discontented until he had found a way to silence them forever.

The Founding Fathers were not content with voicing lofty idealism. Being eminently practical men who had risked their lives in revolution against a powerful king and growing empire, they installed the basic elements of a political system by which these ideals might be achieved in time. They believed in the perfectability of man, and so believing, they trusted those who would come after them to work out the differences, resolve the conflicts, settle the issues that were bound to arise in a new and expanding country.

Both their idealism and the practicality were put to the test at the outset. Slavery was an established institution, and slavery was inconsistent with their ideals of human freedom and dignity. Being practical men, they arrived at a compromise, which was to forbid importation of slaves after a specific future date in the hope and belief that with the supply of human chattels cut off, the institution itself would eventually wither away in the heat and light of public discussion.

That they were wrong we know now; the political machine broke down when it was called upon to deal with this issue, and our country resorted to war to settle it, perhaps needlessly.

All this serves to emphasize the fact that the Negro problem has been with us from the beginning of our country, and that our success or failure in dealing with it has always been and continues to be the measure of our success or failure in making practical reality fit our theoretical idealism.

All of our history, speaking generally, is a reflection of our constant concern that we have not as yet achieved the ideals to which we officially and traditionally aspire. This accounts, as Myrdal points out, for our propensity to self-criticism, which sometimes amazes and pains our friends and gives aid and comfort to our enemies, as today when world communism capitalizes upon our struggles with our own racial problems.

But viewed in retrospect, our history is one of great overall progress toward the idealistic goals which we hold constantly before our eyes.

Take as one example the extension of the voting franchise. At the end of the Revolution we were a nation of approximately 3,250,000. More than 1 million were not free—they were slaves or bondsmen. Of the 2 million free citizens, not more than 120,000 were allowed to vote. The others were disenfranchised becaues they were women, or did not own property of sufficient value, or for other reasons.

Today, the right to vote in most of America is almost universal. Property qualifications have been eliminated save for token poll taxes, and women have won the right to the ballot. Indeed, the lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which to be proud. By this margin do we still fall short of our goal.

We could cite many other significant advances in social reforms: child labor laws, the abolition of flogging in the military services, our changed penological practices, our more humane treatment of the insane, provisions for care of the indigent at public cost, social security laws, labor legislation, public support of education and scholarly research, and many others. It is a record justifying both pride in what we have done as a people, and hope that we will continue to make steady progress toward our lofty goals.

One of Professor Myrdal's most penetrating observations is that as a people, we are marked by a high degree of disrespect for the law. He points out that when we as individuals think a law is wrong, oppressive or unjust, we tend to disobey it, and feel no particular twinges of conscience, justifying our behavior on a sort of built-in system of appeals to a higher unwritten law.

We need look no farther back in our history than to the 18th amendment for the classic illustration. That was added to our Constitution in perfectly proper legal form, and prohibition became the law of the land. But many people thought the law was wrong and proceeded to disobey it willfully. Such corruption of society developed that in time it was repealed. In this instance, we proved that our political machinery for social reform could work in either direction.

But it is of more significance to look to the record of the North's reaction in the days before the Civil War to the Fugitive Slave Laws and the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court.

The abolitionists were outraged, and those who did not then share their violent sentiments were aroused by appeals beyond the courts and the Constitution to "the higher law."

Dwight Lowell Dumond, in his "Antislavery Origins of the Civil War," gives us a succinct account of the reaction of the Northern States. Some of the actions and language seem strangely familiar today. For example, laws were passed by many Northern States clearly intended to nullify Federal law; "interposition" was proposed and advocated widely; the use of State and county jails for the detention of fugitive slaves was prohibited.

One provision of the Fugitive Slave Laws is conceded to have stirred much of the opposition in the North. It specifically forbade testimony by those alleged to be fugitive slaves, and hence the free Negro was practically defenseless against plain kidnaping, even in Northern States. The North was beginning to learn the lesson of the indivisibility of freedom. As Dumond remarks, "so long as these acts remained on the statute books, the rights of free men were in jeopardy." Zealousness to protect those rights earned converts to the antislavery cause, and events rushed on to the ultimate disaster of war.

One might apologize for injecting so much history into this discussion were it not that the problems of today are inextricably tied into events and developments of the past. Indeed, we need look back to ancient Greece for some of our references, for it was Aristotle who proclaimed that some men were natural slaves, fit for no other role in life. His ideal State was ruled by an elite leisure class of small size, its wants and necessities supplied by slaves and a middle class of artisans skilled in their crafts but not in politics.

The influence of Aristotle's thinking was enormous. This philosophy was such convenient comfort to those who wanted to rationalize conquest, plunder, and empire-building.

We are told by Lewis Hanke in his new book, "Aristotle and the American Indians," how a great debate was staged in Spain in the middle of the 16th century in an attempt to reconcile divergent views towards treatment of the Indians being encountered by soldiers of the Spanish King in their conquests in the New World. Was it right to make war upon and enslave the heathen Indians? Some said it was, and cited Aristotle as the great authority. Others disputed this view on grounds of humanitarianism, some even daring to claim that the Indians had a respectable culture and religion of their own, and were responsible human beings deserving to be treated as such.

Quite incidentally, we find something of Aristotle's view coloring today the arguments of those who seem to be otherwise intelligent Americans who would have us educate only an intellectual elite and who would have us set up an intellectual aristocracy on the questionable theory that only the brilliant should inherit the earth.

But enough of history. It is hoped that these sketchy references will suffice to prove that we are not dealing with new problems and hence are not cursed by fate beyond all previous generations. We are instead in the stream of history in this as in all other human affairs, and shall have to make our way as best we can, given the benefit of the experience of those who have gone before us and who have contributed their full share to the solution of mankind's besetting problems.

Your officers have been so kind as to suggest that an attempt to look to the future would be in order. This is risky business at best when we are dealing with what are essentially human relations, which are governed by so many emotional and cultural influences which laws cannot easily control.

But reading of history, and observation of the current scene, lead to the inescapable conclusion that our great ideals still stand before us as bright and shining as ever, and that they may be seen even more clearly today because as a people we have moved much closer to them than our fathers were. Moreover, the machinery of free public discussion and decision, on which the founders placed their hopes, is not only unimpaired, it is much improved over the first machinery they first designed.

In the current controversy and debate, we have the advantage of more widespread education and better media for the transmittal of information than ever before. For this we may well be thankful.

Dumond is of the opinion that the fact that the Deep South of prior to the Civil War was sealed almost hermetically against the intrusion of Northern thought and opinion led almost inescapably to the test of arms. He contends that had ideas been left free to compete, the decision might have evolved less painfully.

To those who are impatient with the slowness of progress, we can point to the lesson of history that great social changes do not come overnight or totally; they come as the result of the interworking of many forces, among which one of the most powerful is the inherent desire of most people to be decent.

Dumond, in an enlightening paragraph on this general topic, says: "We are accustomed to speak of public opinion as influencing our legislative bodies, our executive officers, and even our judiciary. It is only a partially correct observation. Changes in the basic philosophy of a people are as imperceptible but fully as irresistible as the ebb and flow of the tides. Institutional changes—constitutions and constitutional interpretations, religious doctrines, political alinements, and governmental policies—follow with equal certainty and precision. Public opinion rises, falls, and changes in course with the fitfulness of the winds, ever sensitive to fortuitous circumstances and the vagaries of the hour. It is indicative of the direction, though not of the degree, of a changing philosophy, and the intellectual ferment produced by its tornadic disturbances leaves an indelible impression upon that philosophy. The lag gives stability to our institutions, and pain to our reformers."

Most of all, I find comfort and hope in our lively national conscience, which leads us to engage in wars for the freedom of mankind, give and lend billions to nations less well endowed or more unfortunate than our own, contribute hundreds of millions to private charity, and in the face of the free world's applause for the humanitarianism of our actions, still leads us to undertake another searching inquiry into why we have not done better by some of our people here at home. If the Commission on Civil Rights does nothing more than to prick that national conscience until it will give us no rest as a people so long as some human wrongs go unrighted, then it will have justified its existence.

We see many signs of this stirring of conscience. We find great newspapers and national leaders preaching the inescapable truth that when the rights of one are threatened, the rights of none are safe. In time, our people will come to believe as one that when a synagogue is bombed, no Christian church is safe; that when one public school is bombed, no school is steady on its foundations; that when one man is lynched, the security of each of us is diminished by so much; that when one man is denied the right to vote, our own freedom of decision is compromised.

The indivisibility of freedom is the shield of all other liberties. Our political system is still capable of repairing the errors in the social order that deny us that indivisibility. In that knowledge lies our principal hope.

Judge Harold R. Medina, himself the victim of cruel persecution, had this to say recently:

"Freedom is the study of a lifetime. Our Bill of Rights, which looks so simple when we first read it in school, is a dynamic, flexible, ever-expanding and growing definition of our fundamental rights. Like the search for truth, the ultimate in freedom is always just over the horizon or just beyond our grasp. The trick is not to lose it, or any part of it, but rather to get as much more of it as we can properly assimilate."

Finally, we must remember that we are dealing with human beings and their emotions, and we must be patient in that knowledge, for man is fearfully and wonderfully made. Swinburne suggested something of the complexity of man when he wrote:

"Before the beginning of years
There came to the making of man
Time, with the gift of tears;
Grief, with a glass than ran;
Pleasure, with pain for leaven;
Summer, with flowers that fell;
Remembrance fallen from heaven,
And madness risen from hell;
Strength without hands to smite;
Love that endures for a breath;
Night, the shadow of light,
And life, the shadow of death."

Nothing gives me greater hope than the very experience of being here today and the freedom I, as a Protestant Christian, have to bring to you who are of the Jewish faith, the message of a great American Catholic as a fitting conclusion.

Father Theodore Hesburgh, the president of the University of Notre Dame, appended these eloquent words to the report of the Commission on Civil Rights, of which he is a member who has served superbly well. Let them serve as a summing up and, if you will, a clarion call to duty for those who truly believe in the essential dignity of all individuals.

"No one who really believes in full-fledged citizenship for all Americans should delude himself today regarding the true personal price involved in achieving it. The price will be nothing short of heroism in certain areas. Because of the deep emotional overtones of the problem, and its existence in every phase of American life, no American can escape taking a stand on civil rights. * * * Each of us must choose to deepen the anguish of the problem, by silence and passivity, if nothing more, or must take a forthright stand on principles that give some hope of eventual solution."

The lines are forming all over America; on which side shall we stand?

HIGH INTEREST NOW THE ADMINISTRATION'S TOP PRIORITY PROGRAM—BIG BANKERS HELP TO PLAN NATIONAL HOUSE-TO-HOUSE DRIVE TO LAUNCH "CITIZENS' CAMPAIGN AGAINST INFLATION"—PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SUGGESTS MILLIONS OF LETTERS, TELEGRAMS, AND PHONE CALLS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's first special message to this session of Congress, which we received yesterday, renews the administration's plea for removing the 42-year-old ceiling on interest rates which the Treasury can pay to issue bonds. Of all the vital issues facing this Nation, including those on which our national survival may hinge, the administration has given top priority to its ambitions to achieve further increases in interest rates. The Wall Street Journal this morning put it this way:

Eisenhower puts priority on end of bond rate limit.

Yesterday I discussed some aspects of the organized squeeze play which is being put on Congress in an effort to obtain a further boost in interest rates. The most obvious part of the squeeze play has been the part played by the Federal Reserve. There is a loophole in the interest-rate law. The law mentions only marketable bonds and says nothing about a ceiling for Treasury bills, certificates, and other forms of short-term borrowing. This has provided the Federal Reserve a means of bringing about a most unusual phenomenon—it has driven short-term interest rates up above long-term interest rates.

The topic of immediate interest yesterday involved a question of what the interest rate would be on a new issue of 1-year bills on which the Treasury was taking bids yesterday. The financial press was stating in authoritative tones that the rate would top 5 percent, and might possibly go as high as 5¼ percent. The financial press was calling the new predicted rate on these bills the "biggest bargain in history." As I pointed out, the financial community was advertising the bargain in advance. Congress was being blamed for the giveaway of the taxpayers' money, and apparently all concerned wanted the public to know this.

Furthermore, the predictions of yesterday turned out to be highly accurate, the price at which the Treasury sold these bills gives a yield of 5.05 percent, on the basis of the way the Treasury computes the yield on bills. Actually the interest yield is much higher for two reasons: First, the bills are discounted in advance; and, second, the yield is computed on the basis of a year of 360 days. The real interest yield on the bills sold yesterday is equivalent to an interest yield of 5.36 percent on a Treasury bond.

It should not be necessary to elaborate on my remarks of yesterday concerning the phony arguments which are being used to try to justify removing the 4¼ percent ceiling. Certainly two things are clear: First, if the ceiling is removed, all interest rates will be boosted, and the average interest rate which the Government will have to pay will be boosted; second, the propaganda slogans which are to the effect that issuing short-term debt is "more inflationary" than issuing long-term debt do not have a factual leg to stand on.

Today I should like to call attention to some of the other aspects of the organized squeeze play which has been planned for this session of Congress.

SMALL CONTRIBUTORS ASKED TO HELP PAY ADVERTISING COSTS

Last November the heads of many big financial, banking, and insurance organizations met with the President and Vice President here in Washington and laid plans for a renewed drive in support of what is called the President's "campaign against inflation." The renewed crusade planned at that time, according to news reports, was to include a national house-to-house drive and a solicitation of funds in small amounts of $1 to $10 from millions of American families, to help pay for leaflets, billboard advertising, and so forth, calling for support of the administration's "fight against inflation." This national house-to-house drive was to begin shortly after the first of this year.

The dignitaries who helped launch the new crusade include the heads of such organizations as the New York Stock Exchange, the Investment Bankers Association, the American Bankers Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and others.

In his address to this assemblage, President Eisenhower suggested that:

"I for one hope that you will not forget what telegrams, letters and phone calls coming in by the millions can do to help the Congress, and the President and the entire organization he heads, in doing the right thing. This, I would feel, would be one of the great services you can now accomplish for the United States."

We all know of course that the great crusade against inflation is not confined to efforts to boost interest rates. The crusade is directed at other things such as appropriation measures which the administration does not like. But high interest has been an intimate part of the crusade at all times, and recently it has become the first and foremost objective of the crusade.

It occurred to me that it might be of interest to Members, and perhaps even helpful in analyzing some of their mail problems, if they had a fresh review of some of the newspaper reports written at the time the renewed and more invigorated crusade was launched last November. I invite the Members' attention to two such reports; one from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, written by Richard Dudman, and the other from the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by S. Oliver Goodman. These are in part as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Nov. 3, 1957]

NATIONAL HOUSE-TO-HOUSE DRIVE AGAINST INFLATION AND SPENDING BACKED BY EISENHOWER, NIXON—GROUP ORGANIZED BY SOME OF COUNTRY'S TOP BANKERS AND INSURANCE MEN WHO WILL SEEK CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ADVERTISING AND PLEDGES TO SAVE MONEY

(By Richard Dudman)

A house-to-house crusade against inflation was organized yesterday with the backing of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON.

The organizers, a non-Government group including some of the Nation's top bankers and insurance men, plan to open the campaign shortly after the first of the year.

They plan to seek contributions of $1, $5 or $10 from millions of Americans to finance leaflets and billboard advertisements attacking inflation, supporting a sound dollar and advocating less private and public spending.

They also hope to persuade 10 million to 15 million Americans to sign pledge cards promising to work for sound Government fiscal policies, to save more money and spend more wisely, and to increase their individual productivity.

H. Bruce Palmer, president of the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. of Newark, N.J., explained the program to reporters after speeches by the President and Vice President and a day of planning and discussion.

He said the idea was his own. After sounding out several national organizations, he asked and obtained the cooperation of W. Allen Wallis, executive vice chairman of the Cabinet Committee of Price Stability for Economic Growth, headed by NIXON.

* * * * *

Attending the meeting were 85 persons representing 48 national organizations in fields including banking, insurance, advertising, farming, private power, investment, real estate, veterans' affairs, and home building.

Those present included G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange; Harschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange; John D. Randall, president of the American Bar Association; Martin B. McKenally, national commander of the American Legion; Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the American Medical Association; Erwin D. Canham, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; John C. Hagan Jr., president of the Investment Bankers Association of America, and Kenneth R. Miller, general manager of the National Association of Manufacturers.

* * * * *

In addition, the group hoped to form an economic advisory committee of "carefully selected, capable, competent economists," Palmer said.

The President and Vice President endorsed the general principles of the campaign, rather than its specific details.

Mr. Eisenhower assured the group of his "respect and admiration of what you are trying to do." He suggested that they not forget "what telegrams, letters, telephone calls coming in by the millions can do to help the Congress, and the President and the entire organization that he heads, in doing the right thing."

NIXON urged the group to support a balanced budget, whenever this is appropriate, and to support wise management of the national debt.

Another speaker, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, warned that the apparent current price stability could be misleading.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1959]

CAMPAIGN AGAINST INFLATION LAUNCHED WITH APPEAL BY IKE

(By S. Oliver Goodman)

Leaders of 48 national organizations started the wheels rolling yesterday to organize a citizens' campaign against inflation.

They acted after hearing an appeal from President Eisenhower to help mobilize public opinion in support of a sound dollar. They also heard Vice President NIXON declare that price stability and economic growth are essential to meet the Soviet's challenge to the free world.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, gave his blessing to the group's plan of action in these words:

"I fervently hope that your studies will lead to practical measures" needed to preserve the soundness of the Nation's monetary system.

ARRANGED BY PALMER

The 1-day economic conference, held at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here, was arranged by H. Bruce Palmer, president of the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

At a breakfast session, Eisenhower discounted any idea that the Government or any particular group is principally responsible for inflationary trends and said:

"Since there are many factors that are common to an economy—and if they are not operated and devised correctly will ruin us—then public opinion must do it, which means self-discipline must do it.

"Otherwise you will have control by Government and imposed discipline. In the long run * * * imposed discipline is dictatorship."

PUBLIC PRESSURE URGED

He discussed means by which public opinion can make itself felt and added:

"I for one hope that you will not forget what telegrams, letters, and phone calls coming in by the millions can do to help the Congress, and the President and the entire organization he heads, in doing the right thing. This, I would feel, would be one of the great services you can now accomplish for the United States."

NIXON, in a luncheon address, emphasized that "unlike the few in the Soviet who make the decisions, ours is a nation where millions of individuals work together in drafting decisions."

Thus, he added, it's necessary to mobilize public opinion in support of Government fiscal policies to combat inflation.

ROBERTSON'S VIEWS

Senator ROBERTSON told the conference that the Federal budget must be kept balanced even if it means additional taxes. He also said: "We should permit the Treasury Department to pay the going rate of interest which will enable it to manage the long-term debt in the most efficient manner."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BOLLING, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 26.

Mr. COFFIN, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, January 26.

Mr. COFFIN, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCINTIRE (at the request of Mr. COFFIN), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLIVER (at the request of Mr. COFFIN), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 1 hour, on January 26, following Mr. COFFIN.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on February 16, following the close of legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day, conditioned on the fact that there is no session of Congress on the 15th of February.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. STRATTON), for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. GUBSER and to include a speech.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a speech by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

Mr. BREEDING.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, the following Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

(At the request of Mr. STRATTON, the following Members to extend their re-

marks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 14, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1652. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the review of the military assistance program for Pakistan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 53 and 31 U.S.C. 67; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1653. A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the special helium production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the Amendatory Helium Act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U.S.C. 164); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1654. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pertaining to certain lease agreements for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 85-493; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1655. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1656. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 14th Annual Report of Operations under the Federal Airport Act, prepared in accordance with the provisions of section 18 of the Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1657. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for more effective management of the public debt by removing the remaining interest rate restrictions on public issues of Government securities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1658. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the rules and regulations pertaining to the Federal Boating Act of 1958, which were published in the Federal Register dated December 29, 1959, pursuant to the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 527d); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1659. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the 32d annual report of the work and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 3 of the act of Congress approved on May 7, 1928 as amended (22 U.S.C. 278a) (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1660. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 295); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Ninth Annual Report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9568. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9569. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9570. A bill to provide for the free transmission in the mails of magazines sent by certain nonprofit organizations in the United States to similar organizations overseas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9571. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 9572. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9573. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9574. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9576. A bill to place on a permanent basis certain temporary increases in rates of basic salary for employees of the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 9577. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Kalamazoo, Mich., by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9578. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 9579. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Guard Association of the United States in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 9580. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9581. A bill to incorporate the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 9582. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held by them in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 9583. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9584. A bill to establish certain qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9585. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9586. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways" as revised, codified, and enacted by Public Law 85-767, so as to provide for effective competition in the construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9587. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 9588. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9589. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9590. A bill to require the U.S. Veterans' Administration to amend its regulations and rating schedule to provide that a hospital rating of 100 percent will be continued as a convalescent measure until the veteran concerned is given a final and complete discharge from the hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9591. A bill to amend section 211, title 38, United States Code, to provide a court to which appeals may be taken from the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9592. A bill to amend section 314, title 38 of the United States Code, by adding a new subparagraph (r) to provide a statutory award for former prisoners of war under certain conditions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9593. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9594. A bill to amend section 523(b), chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to enable certain veterans to receive both the full rate of disability compensation found payable and also a proportionate amount of disability pension under a specified formula; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 9595. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 with respect to the proration of quotas in the case of Cuba; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 9596. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9597. A bill to lessen the dependency of the United States upon foreign sources of minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9598. A bill to secure the United States from losing essential mineral reserves and to preserve an adequate mineral reserve stabilization base for emergencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9599. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9600. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer of certain personal property to State and county agencies engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9601. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 547. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications for election to the offices of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.J. Res. 548. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 549. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 452. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecration of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to continuation of the U.S. moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9602. A bill for the relief of Jean Rogers Crestani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9603. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Mansourzaidan Douaihy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9604. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9605. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank McLaughlin Countryman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9606. A bill for the relief of Agnes Schoberl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9607. A bill for the relief of Meliton Sipin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9608. A bill for the relief of Abramo Dalfior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 9609. A bill for the relief of Tomas Casarez Melendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9610. A bill for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9611. A bill for the relief of Halina Leszczynska and her sister, Krystyna Leszczynska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 9612. A bill for the relief of Sale Kurg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9613. A bill for the relief of Agnes Nicol Colquhoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 9614. A bill for the relief of Mina Erian Mina and Sara Li Mina, nee Li Wenshiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9615. A bill for the relief of Sebastian Hermosilla Sanches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9616. A bill for the relief of Krystallia Sanderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9617. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Lester Lee Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 9618. A bill for the relief of Miss Yoko Kaneda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9619. A bill for the relief of James E. Moree, Sr., and Ruby Hellen Moree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 9620. A bill for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9621. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Crosley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9622. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land in Madera County, Calif. to Mary Saunders Moses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 9623. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9624. A bill for the relief of Guido Guidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.J. Res. 550. Joint resolution to authorize the U.S. Maritime Commission to loan the *Leilani*, a passenger liner, or other suitable ships, to the University of the Seven Seas, Inc., for educational purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

311. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to grievances against Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER of Ohio, the American Express Co., and former Cabinet member Charles Sawyer, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an exchange of correspondence between the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, and myself, in regard to the Federal highway program.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 21, 1959.

Hon. FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The law requires you to make a new estimate of the Federal highway program situation in all its aspects and report your findings and recommendations to Congress immediately after it is convened in January 1961.

This letter is in anticipation of that report. My observations are based on long experience in positions closely connected with the Federal highway program since its inception and 50 years of work for sound progressive highway systems.

I have operated toll roads at a profit when that was not easy. As a Governer, I have planned public highway systems, financed them and administered them. I have helped legislate for them at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal.

Congress in the recent session enacted legislation increasing the Federal gas tax

and diverting general revenue to the highway trust fund. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I was called upon to help steer this bill to passage.

I want you and the country to know that I did this job reluctantly; there were two reasons:

1. The legislation was essential to preserve the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government which had been impaired by reckless highway financing policies recommended by the administration and enacted by Congress in 1958; and

2. Both the 1-cent gas tax increase and the general fund diversion were for temporary periods—the gas tax increase to July 1, 1961, and the diversion from that date for 3 years thereafter.

Anticipating your report, I trust you will find: This temporary gas tax increase should not become permanent or the introduction to further increases, temporary or permanent; this temporary diversion of general revenue to the highway trust fund should not become permanent or the introduction to further raids on general revenue taxation, temporary or permanent; that these are special assessments to pay for the sins of profligacy which should come off fully and finally when they expire, if not before; and that with maximum efficiency and economy and a minimum of nonessentials and profiteering, continuing sound progress can be made in meeting our highway transportation requirements on a pay-as-we-go basis.

To me hard experience has proved two fundamental guides to sound, progressive public highway development; they are separate but complementary; they are:

1. No highway system in this country will ever be perfect, or even complete. Highway transportation requirements are not static; they change continually, sometimes rapidly, in terms of location, use, speed, structure, safety, etc., and

2. It is wise to build highways to developing needs on a pay-as-we-go basis. This is the best way to keep abreast of continuing change and build the most modern roads for highway dollars.

I have seen the hazards in trying to anticipate requirements too far in advance and build whole systems too fast on borrowed money. Such practices use highway funds to pay interest instead of building roads, open up wasteful crash program pitfalls, and produce highways which are obsolete before they are paid for.

Mindful of recent experience, I should hope your report will follow these guides. Your Under Secretary, Hon. John J. Allen, Jr., on October 8, said "* * * Past legislation made it possible, unwisely, for us to incur more liability than we have resources to pay;" and "* * * We have just been through the 'morning after' the 1958 binge."

He was referring to the fact that last year, in the name of recession, Federal spenders abandoned the highway pay-as-we-go policy and gorged themselves on authorizations and allocations knowing full well they were exceeding the ability of the trust fund to meet the bills.

No one involved with the suspension of the highway pay-as-we-go policy or the exploitation of the suspension can escape blame for what was done. The administration approved it. Congress enacted it. States were amenable and let the contracts. Contractors bid on the proposals. They all knew they were bankrupting the fund.

Our great highway programs were never before precipitated into such an inexcusable mess. The trust fund was broke and the integrity of the Federal Government was impaired. State highway programs all over the country were seriously disrupted and threatened with chaos.

In further anticipation of your report: I hope it will search out any troubles building up in our Federal-State highway programs as the result of the Interstate System legislation with its 90–10 matching formula—the Federal Government putting up $90 for each $10 supplied by the States.

This is in contrast with the 50–50 matching formula for construction on the so-called ABC system, the backbone of American highway transportation facilities. The temptation to take $90 for $10 is great and the evils of this temptation may be devious.

This is temptation gilded with tremendous Federal funds available to the interstate program. More than $9 billion has already been made available in 5 years for 90–10 matching. The program now seems to be of indefinite duration. And to date the interstate activity has shown many of the loose and wasteful characteristics of a crash program.

It would be unfortunate if some States, seeking more Federal dollars for less State money, yielded to the temptation to divert their funds from 50–50 ABC roads to 90–10 interstate projects. Among other considerations, this could overlook the high cost of many interstate projects where 10 percent may exceed 50 percent of the cost of many ABC projects.

In addition, the States forever must bear the full cost of maintenance for these expensive and complex Interstate System roads. And this is a big permanent cost item which must be calculated in the use of State highway funds in the future.

Rights-of-way acquisition costs are proving to be a tremendous item, running to billions of dollars in the interstate program. The temptation to grab land, hike prices and profiteer is inherent in such a multibillion-dollar, multiyear, 90–10 program. And there is the possibility of collusion and fraud.

Witnesses took the fifth amendment more than 200 times in Senate hearings on land-grabbing on only a few projects in one State. There is evidence in some cases elsewhere that courts have been at least generous with 90–10 money in condemnation cases.

The Comptroller General of the United States has found need for better rights-of-way acquisition policies and better application of existing policies by both the Federal and State Governments. In a program of this magnitude this is especially important for the protection of both the public and the property owner.

Highway engineers generally are highly competent in their profession. They are usually dedicated to building the best if not the ultimate in good roads. But there is temptation to regard this multibillion-dollar, multiyear, 90–10 interstate program as a windfall and a license to go all out with dream designs without limit on expenses.

The Comptroller General has reported that "examination in 11 selected States disclosed considerable variation in design." I suspect this is the Comptroller General's cautious way of saying he has found what he regards as extravagances in so-called geometric design.

I understand geometric design, loosely defined, in contrast with structural design, embraces everything in the highway area which can be seen. In a program of the Interstate System dimensions this is a vast field for expensive highway gingerbread and nonessentials.

There is reason to exercise closest vigilance over all possibilities for irregularity in such a vast undertaking as the interstate program offering so many opportunities for lucrative practice. The need for such vigilance becomes even greater when the program is rushed.

I am sure you are aware of the comment and advice of the Comptroller General on such matters as qualification of bidders, advance information on engineering estimates, overpayment on bond-financed projects, etc. And there is need to watch overlapping with the urban renewal program involving another set of Federal grants along with loans.

Administration of the Federal-State highway programs is extremely complex. Jurisdiction, financing, and engineering frequently are split at all levels of government—State, local, and Federal.

I hope your report will deal frankly with the size and expedited schedule of the Interstate System and the possibility of overtaxing the financial, technical, and administrative facilities at all three levels.

I hope strengthening financial control throughout all levels of government will not await your 1961 report.

I am advised there is good working relationship and cooperation between the Bureau of Public Roads and the U.S. General Accounting Office, and between both Federal agencies and the State governments. This is encouraging. I hope it will be maintained and increased. Otherwise, I fear for the entire program.

I am writing to you in this manner and at this time because I have deep interest in our highway system, and as matters now stand I have deep concern.

I sincerely hope that you and the States will get on top of this interstate program, shake all excessive costs, planning and crash aspects out of it, and report in January 1961 that reasonable progress can be made at reasonable cost.

You will recall that the Clay Commission in 1954 estimated the Interstate System basically would cost $23 billion. This estimate was revised to $27.6 billion in 1955. Now the program has been revised and the estimate raised to $39.9 billion to complete 40,000 miles in the system.

This is an increase of $16.9 billion, or more than 73 percent in 5 years. And State highway officials have testified that only about a fourth of the increase has been due to the 12-percent rise in costs of materials and labor. The rest has been due largely to change in designs and expansion of the program.

On the basis of the kind of experience we have had with the Interstate System to date, it is not difficult for me to foresee costs rising to a point in excess of $50 billion by 1975, the presently scheduled completion date.

The present estimate is too much. I trust you find it can be reduced.

With my high personal regards.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

NOVEMBER 13, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in further reply to your letter of October 21 which I acknowledged briefly on October 22 expressing my general accord with your philosophy of highway policy. I take this opportunity to comment further on your very fine letter.

The events of the past year have taught many of us a great deal about highway problems, and have shown us the need for more thoughtful consideration of the fundamental background of highway policy. These considerations, of course, have been common knowledge to you for a long time, and as I read your letter I began to realize fully the depth of experience from which you speak on highway policy; an experience that spans the entire period of Federal highway aid at the three levels of our American system of government.

During the past year, as you have observed, our main problem was to get out from under the chaos resulting from the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, an act which suspended your provision for pay-as-you-go financing and which raised authorizations for highway aid far beyond the revenue capacity of the Highway Trust Fund. You will recall the sponsorship of that legislation by members of the majority party of the Congress, against your advice and

the warnings issued by spokesmen of this Department during the hearings. You will also recollect the misgivings of the President when he finally decided to approve the bill, in order to avoid the greater evil of not having any highway legislation. Early this year the administration promptly sought to put the highway program on a sound financial basis through a tax increase proposal. A part of what you describe as an inexcusable mess was caused by the procrastination of many responsible leaders of Congress in facing the highway issue. It was only the determination of the administration and the support of conservative leadership including your own valued support that finally brought about a change in attitude in the final days of the session.

We cannot afford to allow another such highway crisis. To avoid another such affair we must bend every effort to improve the direction of highway policy and to revamp the entire system of financial management. The entire administration is dedicated to an effort to bring about these improvements in the highway program.

From our experience of the past session we all realize that the highway program has become so big that the former methods of highway policy determination no longer suffice. It cannot, as in former years, be considered exclusively the affair of one committee in each House, or of one bureau in the executive branch. Highways and Federal highway expenditures touch the fiscal policy of the Nation in a major way, they touch the basic formulation of budgets and appropriations, and they affect our national transportation policy as well as our whole manner of national living.

In the Congress highway policy has become a major concern of the Committee of Finance and Ways and Means, the Appropriations Committees, and from these important committees the concern of the leadership of the entire Congress. In the administration, highway policy has claimed an increasing share of the attention of the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, the White House staff, and the President himself. Each major development in highway policy is a serious public issue for which our national leadership is now held responsible.

In the narrower field of management there is also a new factor which affects highway administrative actions, including the historic Federal-State relations in this field. The new element is trust fund financing.

Whereas in former years, a small highway program was guaranteed by the vast resources of the General Fund of the Treasury, the present large highway program is guaranteed by a rather limited group of special tax revenues. Inherent in such a financial arrangement is the need for a tighter process of financial controls in which the scope of programs of construction is geared specifically to forward estimates of available cash in the Highway Trust Fund. The circular memorandum which I attached to my previous letter may serve as the first step in the development of such a system of financial controls, in addition to its present function of meeting the immediate crisis in the Highway Trust Fund. This Department is cooperating with the staff of the Bureau of the Budget in perfecting this "controllership" system of financial management.

In addition to the financial management improvement just noted, the Department and other parts of the administration are doing important work in the broader field of highway policy evaluation with the objective of putting our national highway system on a sounder basis.

I should first mention the study provided in section 210 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1956, which is in addition to the cost estimate for the Interstate System which you noted in your letter. The section 210 study, due in March 1961, is intended to provide recommendations for a sounder policy for financing highways, including the appropriate amounts, the distribution among jurisdictions, the types of revenues, and the equity of their assessment among groups of taxpayers. This study was intended to overcome the most serious deficiency in the 1956 Highway Act, the lack of an adequate financial structure for the augmented highway construction effort. The revenue structure thrown together in 1956 has not been adequate to carry us through even this initial period, and even without the added difficulties posed by the 1958 Highway Act, we would have had to reduce interstate apportionments this year. The 1961 report will raise serious questions, not only with respect to financial resources, but also of program emphasis due to financial requirements and proper responsibility among jurisdictions and user groups for highway costs. Some of these problems are being reconsidered in the administration even now.

The White House staff, the Bureau of the Budget, and this Department are engaged in a general progress review of the interstate highway program, seeking to determine if the present program emphasis is in line with the original intent or if new factors have developed which require modification of the program. We are concentrating in the difficult area of urban construction. Here we are looking both at the responsibility of the 90–10 interstate program for specified types of construction and the engineering standards and criteria that are being used. Out of this administration study we hope to gain some insight into the problems you raised in your letter, whether there are extravagances in geometric design and whether some of the costs of specific designs are more properly chargeable to other programs than the Interstate System.

While we are busy with our evaluations of strictly highway matters, we in the Department are not unmindful of our responsibility for national transportation policy in the executive branch and the relation of highways thereto. In his last budget message the President charged the Secretary of Commerce to make a fundamental study of national transportation policy to assure that none of our activities in the transportation field are working at cross-purposes. One of the important phases of that study, now nearing completion, is an evaluation of the methods used in programing public investment in transportation facilities, both from the standpoint of sound methods and relation to general transportation needs. You should be pleased to know that our principal consultant on this phase of our project is from the University of Virginia.

The field of transportation policy, particularly the part where public investment is essential, requires an unrelenting effort in behalf of sound management. The sums involved are a constant temptation for self-serving ends, while the technical nature of much of the activity tends to remove it from the immediate attention of the legislative leader or the administration policy leaders. I believe that the Department of Commerce is in a unique position to make a contribution to sound management in these fields, being specialized enough to supervise the technical aspects of these programs and yet concerned enough with the general policy to see that the public interest is served. As Secretary of Commerce, I hope to be able to perfect our departmental machinery to serve both ends.

This coming session of Congress may see many attacks made on the objectives of sound policy in the highway field. With the preparations I have described, the administration and the Department of Commerce will not enter this expected battle unarmed. From your past record in behalf of sound management, I know you will join with other stalwart supporters of sound policies to fend off the attacks on our solvency, regardless of the odds. Let us hope that our combined efforts can be used effectively to preserve a sound highway policy.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Security With Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able article entitled "Security With Solvency," written by our colleague the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and published in the November 26 issue of the Reporter magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY WITH SOLVENCY—A DEMOCRATIC LEADER'S CRITIQUE OF THE UNBUSINESSLIKE "BUSINESSMAN'S ADMINISTRATION"

(By Senator STUART SYMINGTON)

Can the United States maintain an adequate defense and insure the well-being of its own people without jeopardizing its economy? This question arose time and again during the recent session of Congress—a session in which concern for a balanced budget and fear of deficit financing dominated nearly every debate on public expenditures.

It is a vital question. To provide security—in the broadest sense of that term—while maintaining national solvency poses a challenge to our skill in self-government. With the great burden that our defense program makes necessary, we have reason to make all the economies that are possible by sound and able management of our Government programs. I believe it is possible for Republican and Democrat alike to agree on this even though they may still disagree about whether the present level of Government expenditures is a sacrosanct figure revealed from on high as the absolute measure of the Nation's needs.

HOW MUCH IS WASTED?

From its beginning the Eisenhower administration has paid lipservice to the concept of security with solvency and, as a businessman's administration, promised to conduct the affairs of Government on an efficient, economical basis. Judged by its own criteria, it has been a colossal and expensive failure. It has not only cut into the bone of essential programs without achieving necessary economies; its mismanagement has positively contributed to wasteful expenditures that could have been used to good purpose. Despite rumblings of protest from many in a position to know, the policies and programs of the present administration are wasting tens of millions of the taxpayers' dollars every week. Billions of dollars are being squandered that otherwise could be invested in the public facilities needed to keep abreast of our growing population. As a result, worthwhile programs for schools, dams, highways, medical research, etc., are dismissed by the administration as contributing to budgetary imbalance.

When a government finds its expenditures crowding its revenues, and senses popular

disapproval of tax increases, it can embrace one of two solutions. The first is retrenchment. This has been the answer of the present administration, which has drastically pared social-welfare programs and decreed no new starts in public facilities.

The second solution is more difficult. It involves more patient effort, discipline, and leadership. It means that the conflicting interests which pull government programs in different directions must be met with decisions instead of wasteful compromises. It means the constant weeding out of inefficient practices in government departments. It involves rejection of the prevalent notion that waste must be tolerated as an inevitable part of the cost of any public enterprise.

The application of management principles to government is difficult, but its dividends are great. The money thus saved, I believe, could go a long way toward providing America with the investments it needs.

Let us consider four areas of present expenditure: agriculture, government finance, foreign aid, and defense. I select these four because they make up some $62 billion of this year's expenditures, or about 80 percent of the total budget. These four areas pose a common indictment of the waste brought on by the Eisenhower administration's decisions, or just as wasteful, its failure to make decisions.

1. In agriculture

Since assuming office in 1953, Ezra Taft Benson has spent more money than was spent by all of the previous Secretaries of Agriculture put together since the Department was established in 1889. He has managed to do this without raising farm income or lowering food costs to the housewife. The farm problem has grown into what has been called "the most critical, perilous, unresolved domestic problem facing the United States."

The $31 billion spent on the farm program since 1952 has involved increases in many areas. Administrative costs of the price-support program since that year have multiplied more than tenfold from $34 million a year to $364 million. The number of employees in the Department of Agriculture has increased from 66,000 to 85,000.

But the greatest increase in spending—running into billions of dollars—comes from the Government's failure to manage agricultural surpluses properly. This in turn results from failure to understand the business operation of the typical family farmer who operates the great majority of the farms of America.

The administration has followed a policy of lowering price supports on the theory that this would reduce production. Any true understanding of the way farmers operate would show that it has the opposite effect. Farmers have fixed costs—mortgage payments, farm machinery, installment payments, and the like—most of which have increased with the cost of living and the cost of money. In order to meet these higher costs when price supports are reduced, they must produce more. Unless there are effective controls on production, they take advantage of technological advances to increase production as much as possible.

Under the administration's policies this is precisely what has happened. In each of the last 6 years, farm production has increased, leaving the Government holding an inventory of farm commodities which has cost over $9 billion and which by January 1961, will be over $12 billion. Storage costs alone on this inventory amount to a billion dollars a year.

This sad situation was foreseeable and correctible. Why then did it happen? The unavoidable evidence is that the administration has stooped to play politics with the farm program time after time, has refused to impose meaningful production controls, and, despite continuing criticisms by Congress, has never come up with a concrete program to correct the situation.

Instead, makeshift actions have only aggravated the problem. Last year, for example, with Government warehouses and bins stuffed with a billion and a half bushels of surplus corn, the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a corn program that not only removed all limitations on production but actually increased the price support on more than 90 percent of the corn produced in the United States. The Department now estimates that its new program will result in the record-shattering production of 4.5 billion bushels this year; at least 500 million additional bushels will end up in Government warehouses.

This year, Congress passed a wheat bill that would have reduced wheat production by 20 percent and cut down Government wheat inventories by hundreds of millions of bushels. The savings to taxpayers would have been at least $260 million annually—enough to build 6,500 needed classrooms. But the President vetoed the bill.

The handling of this enormous food inventory has been mismanaged. The administration, by its own admission, has negotiated and signed contracts for the storage of grain without first studying what this storage would cost. It has sold commodities from Government stocks to private companies at a low price, and then allowed those same companies to sell them abroad at much higher prices, in transactions the Government itself financed.

The irony is that the administration's policies have hurt the farmer, particularly the small farmer, instead of helping him. In fact, though farm families constitute 12 percent of the Nation's population, their share of the national income has now fallen to 3.5 percent, a new low.

2. In Government finance

By January of 1958, the Nation had already been through the first 4 months of what was to prove a prolonged economic recession. Some of the clearly predictable effects of a recession upon Government finance are shrinkage of anticipated tax revenues and increased demands for expenditure upon the Government. These were not reflected in the budget for the next fiscal year, to begin in less than 6 months, that the President submitted to Congress on January 13. Instead, it contained an estimate that the Government would be operated at a budget surplus of about $500 million. This estimate turned out to be in error by approximately $13 billion. Instead of a surplus of $500 million, the Government incurred the largest peacetime deficit in the country's history, even though Congress appropriated $617 million less than the President had requested.

During the past 5 fiscal years, the Federal Government has been operated at a net deficit of about $17 billion. This also is far above any deficit ever experienced in this country over a comparable period during which we were not at war. Despite the widely held belief to the contrary, this deficit was not the fault of Congress, which in these years appropriated $10.6 billion less than the President requested.

The increased Government borrowing resulting from these years of deficit has increased the national debt from $266.1 billion at the end of the fiscal year 1953 to the present figure of about $290 billion. If the taxpayer is to be protected, such a large debt must be managed with great care. Like any prudent business concern, the Treasury should try to finance its debt at the lowest possible interest rates.

But from the beginning, the Treasury of this administration has violated this simple rule of debt management. Early in 1953, the Treasury Department raised the interest rate on Government bonds to 3¼ percent. This was substantially above the minimum interest rate needed to sell the bonds. Even 2 years later, in spite of a general upward trend of interest rates, potential buyers oversubscribed a 40-year Government bond issue offered at the lower rate of 3 percent.

This imprudent practice has been followed time and again during the last 3 years. Offerings of the Treasury at lower rates than the present limit were oversubscribed by the public, but the Treasury continued its policy of issuing a far smaller amount of bonds than the evidence showed the market would absorb. Only last March, for example, the Treasury opened the subscription books for a 4 percent 12-year bond. The public offered to buy $1.5 billion worth, but the Treasury had limited the subscription to only $619 million. Again in February, 1958, investors made bids totaling $6 billion on a subscription of a 3 percent 8½-year bond. But the Treasury had limited the sale to only $1.5 billion.

Of course, no one can state with absolute certainty what the money market will accept. But the administration has shown a continuing hesitancy about getting a good bargain for its bonds. Its own sense of insecurity has created insecurity in the market—has, in fact, helped push up the price of money. When the Treasury appealed to Congress this June for authority to increase interest rates, it did so despite the fact that many times during the last 2 years it passed up the chance to refinance the debt at lower rates.

With such management, is it any wonder that the interest cost of the national debt has increased from $6.6 billion in the fiscal year 1953 to an estimated $8.6 billion for the fiscal year 1960? If our financial management had been conducted on a businesslike basis during the past 6 years, I believe the interest burden to the taxpayer would be at least a billion dollars less a year.

The other important phase of financial management is the collection of taxes. There is a great deal of evidence that if our collections were handled more efficiently we could be raising billions more in taxes at current tax rates. In fact, earlier this year, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue told Congress that $25 to $26 billion of income each year was not being reported by taxpayers. The Commissioner also testified that every new tax-enforcement agent brings in, in 1 year, 10 to 15 times his salary for searching out this unreported income.

Faced with such a sure prospect of increased revenue, any prudent businessman would work hard to collect it. But not this administration. Since 1952, it has actually cut 3,000 enforcement personnel from the staff of the Internal Revenue Service. The staff is so small today most returns cannot even be checked to see if they were computed correctly. Fewer than 5 percent are given a thorough audit. Nevertheless, on the grounds of economy, this year the administration, in a prize example of false economy, continued to oppose all but the smallest increase in funds for additional enforcement.

3. In mutual security

Over the past few years reports have come from abroad about great waste in the administration of our mutual security program. These reports have come not just from the opponents of foreign aid. Senator FULBRIGHT, perhaps its greatest champion in the Senate and as knowledgeable a man on international relations as we have, has cited various examples of his own. They include a $5 million hospital in France that was built but never opened.

Most of this waste is not due to corruption, and bad management by our overseas personnel is far from the whole explanation. Many of our foreign-assistance programs have gone wrong because the people in charge of them could not plan projects beyond the limiting 12-month period. Public-works

projects start, then stop and hang in abeyance waiting for word from Washington whether the new budget will allow them to proceed. Underdeveloped countries have been reluctant to request loans for the most important wealth-producing projects, such as dams and railroads, because these require longer term financing than our aid program has offered.

Largely for this reason, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposed this year to put the Development Loan Fund on a long-term basis, with authority to borrow from the Treasury. Such long-term planning is one of the simplest requirements of any successful business. If a private corporation could not plan confidently beyond a 12-month period, its development would be bogged down in uncertainty and waste. It would be judged guilty of exceedingly bad management.

This principle of fiscal foresight is already recognized in other programs of our Government. At least 13 public agencies borrow from the Treasury in this manner. Nevertheless, the administration opposed granting such authority to the Development Loan Fund. As a result, we will spend almost a billion dollars a year in this field without the kind of long-term planning that will make it effective and economic.

4. In Defense

For our own military forces we are now spending about $41 billion a year—more than half our total budget. Nearly $5 billion more is being expended annually for such additional national security items as atomic energy, military assistance to other countries, and strategic stockpiles. Not many Americans realize how heavy is the price the taxpayer is paying for the duplication, service rivalry, inefficient organization, and *resultant waste* now characteristic of our defense operations.

One example: During fiscal 1959 alone, the three services together spent more than $4 billion for the development, production, and manning of a continental air defense system against possible enemy bombers. In other words, we spend almost $11 million a day for defenses against a small number of Soviet bombers. But these defenses are useless against such modern offensive weapons as long-range ballistic missiles or shorter-range guided and ballistic missiles launched from submarines.

By far the greatest waste in government today can be traced to the obsolete organizational structure of the Department of Defense, an organization that cannot possibly function efficiently. Most of our prominent military leaders, including General Eisenhower until he became President, have asserted that unless our defenses are reorganized on the basis of progress rather than tradition, this Nation could well go broke.

As an illustration, we are currently being obliged to support a variety of air forces: the Army air force, the Navy air force, the Air Force air force, the Marine air force, plus the Military Air Transport Service. In addition we support, in whole or in part, various reserve components such as CRAF (civil air reserve) and the Civil Air Patrol. Instead of one group of land combat forces, we support two, the Army and the Marine Corps, plus the reserve components for both of them.

As a result of the waste all this duplication entails, the taxpayer is getting a very small combat force at very high cost. These various organizations are in active competition in weapons systems, in the bidding for skilled personnel, and in the struggle for the most desirable engineering and production facilities.

Despite the fact the science of warfare has changed more in the last 15 years than in the previous thousand, we have not conducted a genuine weapons-system evaluation since the end of the Second World War. That failure in itself has cost the American taxpayer tens of millions of dollars a week. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on each of many specific weapons systems. Then the projects have either been drastically curtailed or canceled. In most cases the cancellations and curtailments have not been based upon evidence that the weapons systems were not needed; they have been the result of the overriding priority given fiscal objectives by this administration.

To cite just a few of the numerous examples:

The Navy spent almost $400 million on the development of the Seamaster (P6M)—a long-range amphibious bomber. This project was canceled in August of this year, during the early stages of the preparation of the fiscal 1961 budget.

The Regulus II is a Navy supersonic air-breathing missile, which the Chief of Naval Operations called the best of its kind in existence. It was developed, proven, and then produced in small quantities. After several hundred million dollars had been spent, the project was canceled during the last stages of the preparation of the fiscal 1960 budget.

The Air Force and the Navy spent about $250 million on facilities and materials for the development of fuel applications of boron. After such expenditures, the new facilities have been left idle, and the project has been reduced to a small-scale research operation.

It is not hard to understand why this start-and-stop financing takes place. Each service is trying to prepare itself to wage any possible future war by itself. The duplication and waste resulting from such loose management is costing us billions.

Failure to reorganize for the nuclear and space age has compounded the waste of funds and skills. A prominent member of this administration warned that unless the friction and duplication between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Defense Department were eliminated soon, the taxpayers would be losing at least $3 billion annually in that field alone.

Last spring, after examining the Government's organization for space activities, a Senate subcommittee issued a unanimous report with nine specific recommendations for improving administration. It stated: "Failure to act promptly on the above-listed inadequacies will not only result in additional waste of time, money, and skilled personnel, but also will impair both our national security and our international prestige." The final conclusion in this unanimous report was: "Space activities within the Department of Defense cannot be managed effectively by changes in the organization and administration of the space program alone. Such changes can only be effective if they are an integrated part of a further unification of the services within the Department of Defense."

This present ineffective organization and management brings into disrepute the entire military structure of the country. Direct and indirect derogatory publicity degrades the competence and missions of the rival services. But what is more important, it does not give us the security we should be buying with such a large expenditure.

The transition to the nuclear space age will not be cheap. But a first step that any prudent management should attempt is to make certain that the Government's dollar is being well spent.

The savings possible in the four areas I have discussed could total $10 billion. Among other things such funds could finance:

The slum-clearance and urban-renewal program of the U.S. Conference of Mayors ($600 million).

The expenditure of the original Murray-Metcalf aid-to-education bill ($4.4 billion).

Twice the Senate's recommendation for medical research ($800 million).

A doubling of authorized funds for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program ($420 million).

The maximum Senate-committee programs for depressed areas ($400 million) and modernization of airports ($115 million).

Governments have no profit-and-loss guidelines, nor are they as limited in the ways they can meet the demands of creditors. The concessions and compromises of the political process often induce duplication and flabby practices. I believe, however, that our Government could perform its proper functions, far more effectively and with solvency, if in our approach to the problem we would emphasize better management instead of retrenchment. With a hard new discipline, and with a policy of taking the people in as partners in knowledge of the true nature of our problem, it can be done.

Mr. McGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Security With Solvency," written by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, and published in the December issue of Reporter magazine.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I may advise the Senator from Wyoming that I placed that article in the RECORD earlier today.

Mr. McGEE. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my request and only reiterate, in commendatory language of my own, the wisdom of reading with care Senator SYMINGTON'S forthright, direct assault on some of the embarrassing fiscal policies which confront the country today.

The International Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many times in the past I have been proud to associate myself with the legislation on arts and culture introduced by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey. In particular, I recall our bill passed by the 84th Congress to ensure that the President's international cultural exchange program would become permanent policy.

It is to the administration of that law—Public Law 860–84—that the distinguished Representative from New Jersey referred in a speech before the American Educational Theater Association on December 28, 1959. Representative THOMPSON said:

Under the current program of the President's international cultural exchange program as administered by the Department of State, of 115 attractions which have been sent abroad, only a half-dozen or less than 6 percent, have been educational talent—

university or college theater or music groups. * * * This program is so weighted with professionals that it might justly be called the 6 percent program rather than the President's international cultural exchange program. It should also be noted that there is no cultural exchange in the program at all.

Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker in Delhi have requested the State Department to send young educational talent in the arts to Russian and India, hoping to repeat the success of Van Cliburn, for example. However, the administration has only talked about this exchange and no young talent has been sent to either of these countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine speech on recruitment of educational cultural talent for our exchange program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THEATER ASSOCIATION, DELIVERED IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON DECEMBER 28, 1959

Dr. Young, Dr. Cole, Dr. Selden, Dr. Morrison, distinguished friends and guests, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to discuss with such a select group some of the pressing problems and suggested solutions which this 23d annual convention of the American Educational Theater Association must deal with. My remarks might well be titled "Democracy Needs a Broader Cultural Emphasis," since they are especially directed to the need for stimulating a more widespread cultural awareness in the United States and in sharing this enthusiasm with people throughout the world. I think it particularly important that we understand that our approach to the arts must be one of sharing them with other peoples, rather than one of using the arts for political ends. For if our primary purpose in our national policy is political we shall fail. Political results may very well follow as a result of sharing the arts, as indeed they have followed the educational exchanges authorized by the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts. But in the arts as in education, it must be primarily a matter of exchanges, and this is something that is entirely missed in Washington these days due to a belief that everything from breakfast cereals to our way of life can be "sold."

The American Educational Theater Association can exert a tremendous force for the stimulation of a significant cultural impact which could be felt both in this country and abroad. Through positive action your association in effective cooperation with other cultural organizations, can with imagination, purposefulness and hard work, effect a cultural renascence. This will require your wholehearted direction, support, and effort—for as Walter Lippmann has pointed out "the renascence will have to come from men of learning"—men who know, because they live the intellectual life, what a renascence would be. However, before we can achieve this goal of a fuller cultural awakening there are obstacles to be overcome. It is my desire today to discuss some of the areas, nationally and internationally, in which your particular kind of leadership is specifically required.

Just recently, for example, Richard B. McLanathan, who was the curator of the U.S. art exhibit at the Moscow Fair (now director of the community arts program of the Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute at Utica, N.Y.), reported to the United States Information Agency and other Government agencies that he found throughout Europe and the U.S.S.R. that people were looking to the United States for cultural leadership. People are looking for evidence that the United States will not only take up Mr. Khrushchev's challenge regarding economic competition, he said, but that we also will demonstrate more fully than we have done so far that we have "a lot to spare in the aesthetic and cultural field as well.

Mr. McLanathan further reported, I am told, that people throughout the world believed that the United States and its allies could withstand any economic or political pressures which the Soviet Union and its satellites might exert. We can do this, they are convinced, only if we are strong culturally. According to Mr. McLanathan, the people of the world believe the United States and the U.S.S.R. offset each other in the economic area. Their decision to follow either the United States or the U.S.S.R. ultimately will depend, he thinks, on the balance sheet evidence of cultural resources and leadership. History clearly documents the fact that civilizations are remembered more for their contributions to the fine arts, to music, the theater, to literature, to painting and sculpture and architecture than they are remembered by the battles which they have fought. It is my belief, and I know it can be documented, that one of the major ways in which we can turn reluctant and uneasy military allies—and the millions of uncommitted people of the world—into friends is to earn their respect through our own respect for our own cultural leadership and achievements in the deeply related fields of education, science, and the fine arts.

As we know, President Eisenhower is a leading exponent of this point of view. In his speeches in India, for example, he called for a massive interchange of mutual understanding through exchange of students. I might add, parenthetically, that he also took the lead in forming a very effective Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower in the fall of 1956.

For a number of years, 10 in fact, the great value of exchanging students, the leaders of tomorrow's world, has been proved by the successful Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs. A massive expansion of these and other programs will be a welcome and valuable step toward creating the international understanding so essential to a permanent peace. Dare we hope that the forthcoming budget message of the President will request the funds which will be needed to finance the President's massive exchange? I look forward anxiously to the opportunity to vote for such a program. My colleagues and I would, I am sure, be much more willing to appropriate the additional funds needed to implement these massive exchanges if the State Department shows the same good judgment it has displayed in the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs and work with and through our country's major educational organizations for the implementation of these new exchanges which the President has called for.

I am concerned, however, that the President has endorsed massive exchanges as a grand design because I question how well this will actually be carried out in the field of exchanges in the arts—your association's particular interest—as long as all public funds for cultural and artistic exchanges are channeled through one organization, the American National Theater and Academy, and no other organization, even the American Educational Theater Association, or the National Music Council which—like ANTA—has a congressional charter, is permitted to develop any know-how in this vital area because of the restrictive practices of the Department of State. Yet, at the same time, the leading educational organizations such as the American Council on Education and the National Education Association, and the Institute of International Education, are given a major role by the State Department in the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

To illustrate what I have in mind, under the current program of the President's international cultural exchange program as administered in the Department of State by Mr. James Magdanz of 115 attractions which have been sent abroad only a half dozen, or less than 6 percent, have been educational talent—university or college theater or music groups. In my opinion, and also in the opinion of such important national groups as the National Education Association, the National Association of Schools of Music, the National Music Camp at the University of Michigan, the Music Educators National Conference, the National Art Education Association—to name only a few—this program is so weighted with professionals that it might justly be called the 6-percent program rather than the President's international cultural exchange program. It should also be noted that there is no cultural exchange in the program at all, as there is in the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs. So we now find that many of the Nation's most talented performers, its young artists, who could be our country's most successful cultural ambassadors, witness Van Cliburn, are actually used less than 6 percent of the time.

For the record I will read from some of the glowing newspaper and official reports on the success of the performances of our university theater groups who have toured abroad just in case Mr. Magdanz and Mr. Robert H. Thayer, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations, missed them. The reaction of people in Latin America, India, and parts of Africa was significant. These accounts prove beyond a shadow of a doubt the great and lasting impact America's talented young artists are making wherever they are given the opportunity to appear by our cloistered policy-makers.

"The visit of the University of Minnesota players to Sao Paulo was a success from every point of view," we are advised by the American Consulate General. "They attained a level of the best professionals in many countries in Latin America," according to the Diario de Sao Paulo.

The American Embassy, New Delhi, reported home that the Wayne State University Players were "a fine group and did an amazing job in the face of many vicissitudes while they were in Delhi. Their performances were excellent. They met people well and were eager and enthusiastic in their contacts with Indian students and other play groups. They made an outstanding contribution, with a grueling schedule, to the feeling of good will and in the advancement of knowledge about the American university drama."

The American Embassy in Ghana reported that the Florida A. & M. University Players "had a net effect favorable to the United States. * * * The players were quite effective in their social relations with Ghanaians before and after their performances, and left many fast friends behind them when they left Ghana." This report is supported by the comment in the Ghanaian that "Their visit is a fine example of what can be done by actors who love the theater and are willing to give their spare time to not only the glamorous side of it but also to the equally exacting tasks of stage management and general organization."

Clearly, talented groups of this type can be a major asset to the United States in its program to give the peoples of the world a broader understanding of America's culture and purposes. As you know so well, since

you pioneered it, the Department of Defense sends a large number of college and university drama and music groups abroad to entertain our troops in distant theaters of operation. These groups are much more popular with our troops than most professional entertainers. When they are abroad on these tours why doesn't the State Department and the U.S. Information Service cultural affairs officers schedule them for appearances before young people of the countries in the countries they are visiting, including university audiences, thus saving tax money and spreading America's message at one and the same time?

I think it is significant to note that early in October at the very time that Mr. Robert H. Thayer (special assistant to the Secretary of State) was speaking in New York City to the President's Music Committee about the difficulty of including young educational talent from our institutions of higher education in the President's special international cultural exchange program he was advising Members of Congress that Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson had requested that such young educational talent in the arts be sent to Moscow. Ambassador Thompson was moved, no doubt, to make this request by the astonishing success of Van Cliburn, a Juilliard graduate, who, by the way, received absolutely no financial help from the President's program. His expenses were paid with funds raised by the Institute of International Education from the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund. Mr. Thayer also told us that Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker had requested that young educational talent in the arts be sent to India. What then becomes of the classic defense of the Department of State of its present program's virtual exclusion of young people: that American cultural affairs officers and top Embassy people *have demanded* the great professional groups and don't want educational talent? The State Department, by the way, has done nothing to date about these significant requests by the American Ambassadors in the U.S.S.R. and India except to study them.

The agreement for cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union includes a provision for "university exchanges of faculty and students," and clearly this agreement doesn't rule out educational talent in the arts. There is no reason why we cannot work out this particular type of exchange of educational talent with the U.S.S.R. and other Iron Curtain countries, just as we have with so many other countries under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs where between 3,000 to 4,000 of the 35,000 to 40,000 exchangees during the past 10 years have been in the arts. That this is so is shown by a New York Times article of December 25, 1959, to the effect that one of the U.S. students who went to the Soviet Union last September is studying at the Moscow Musical Conservatory. The New York Times says:

"The U.S. Government is understood to be strongly in favor of continuing and enlarging the student exchange program. Officials remark that the American students during their academic year in Moscow or Leningrad are able to befriend more Russians than any American diplomat or news correspondent can do during his entire service in the Soviet Union.

"Young Americans and Russians are reported to be establishing personal contacts in lecture halls, libraries, cafeterias, and dormitories of Soviet institutions of higher learning with ease and eagerness. This alone, in the opinion of United States officials, would be sufficient for justifying the entire exchange program and advocating its expansion. * * *

"Kenneth Holland, president of the Institute of International Education here, declared that 'it is important for us to have students who know the U.S.S.R., even if they do not advance in their specific fields in the course of their Russian year.

"Mr. Holland talked with many American students during a visit to the Soviet Union earlier this year. He said he was impressed with their knowledge of Russian affairs and had found that despite the limitations they were encountering their experience was invaluable."

If President Eisenhower's call for massive exchanges is to be carried out with maximum effect then the United States should embark upon a broad program to provide two-way cultural exchanges with all nations, with particular emphasis on young people. You will be pleased to know that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Democrat, of Delaware, and I have introduced legislative proposals (S. 1827; H.R. 6876 and H.R. 7533) to put this type of program into effect. We want to see the Humphrey-Thompson Act (Public Law 860, 84th Cong., which made the President's special international cultural exchange program permanent) amended to specifically provide for more widespread cultural exchange of young artists and art groups, and we think that at least 50 percent of the funds appropriated for this program should be devoted to young Americans if the President's call for massive exchanges is to have any real meaning. We hope President Eisenhower will support this, and that he will call in his budget message next month for an immediate raising of the present picayune $2 million to an amount respectably nearer the $20 million which he annually requests for the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

I was very pleased to hear that the Young Democratic Clubs of America, at their recent national convention, adopted a resolution which urges the Republican adminstration to utilize the power they have been given not only to send throughout the world our large artistic groups and universally accepted artists whose appeal is primarily to the sophisticated audiences of the world's capitals, but also the groups with fine artistic merit who would represent our local creativity and to include in the exchange program, as was intended by the sponsors of the legislation, young artists of great merit.

I completely support the idea that we should create and help finance with Federal funds university circuits at home and abroad. Such programs would certainly more fully display our cultural achievements and assets as well as help us learn more about the people of other nations. Here the sharing of our cultural resources with the people of other nations, which I mentioned earlier, would have significant meaning and results. In my considered view, the question of whether one or another great American orchestra plays with that extra shade of polish, and is a fraction better in its technique than a similar great aggregation in Europe or the Soviet Union cannot compare with the importance of reaching and influencing the leaders of tomorrow's world through our young American student exchanges in all fields.

For this reason, the national showcase program which my colleague, Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., has recently espoused, and which passed the House of Representatives with the help of the leaders of the American Educational Theater Association in 1952 and was passed over without prejudice in the Senate at the same time, is a plan which has my wholehearted support. For years I have wanted to see our talented young American artists given more recognition on the national scene and particularly through a program in the Nation's Capital by which their talents could be displayed to the Nation and the world.

As a corollary, then, to a national showcase program there should be a worldwide Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences held regularly in Washington, D.C., which would afford competition between talented young people from all nations. Such an arts and sciences competition could sponsor contests for awards in piano, cello, violin, youth orchestras, choral and chamber groups, ballet, folk dancing, and other forms of the dance such as ballet in which the U.S.S.R. excels, painting, sculpture, readings, and drama and poetry presentations. It is also desirable that under this program comparable talent competitions in the Nation's Capital be held in mathematics, physics, biology, and the other sciences. These Olympiads should be judged by an international jury of renowned artists and specialists in the various fields. The winners would immediately attain international recognition and be awarded substantial prizes. It is quite reasonable to assume, I have been advised by Dr. Oliver J. Caldwell, Assistant Commissioner for International Education, U.S. Office of Education, a long-time and able advocate of the proposal for a worldwide Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences, that such an international Olympiad program, if carefully planned, would be as significant as the Nobel Prize Awards in the years to come. As President Eisenhower said at Delhi University in India:

"More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources, and rewards of their common destiny.

"Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clearer knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace."

As we go forward, then, along this great highway into the future to a less troubled era I believe we can be resourceful enough to find the best possible methods to surmount any roadblocks which may be planted by those with axes to grind. I have in mind, for instance, the fact that the American Educational Theater Association already has a committee for U.S. touring by foreign university dramatic groups. I understand that this committee is at work seeking private engagements in the United States for educational groups from other countries, and it should have—if it is to really accomplish its great objectives—both status and public funds comparable to the program the American National Theater and Academy carries on for the Department of State.

A word about the little matter of the double expense in presenting performances of professional foreign artists in our country because of union policy that American artists must be paid during such a performance even though these American artists are not performing in the attraction. Here a bit of statesmanship is required on the part of top State Department officials. My, my, if they can't develop a policy to surmount such a roadblock, how can they possibly negotiate successfully with other nations.

My own suggestion, for what it is worth is as follows: If there are to be standbys, then why not react to this situation by providing, under the President's cultural exchange program, that such matching funds be utilized in a way similar to the funds of the music performance trust fund which is managed by representatives of the American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO, the broadcasting industry, and the public. Standby funds could and should be used to provide increased employment of American artists and, at the same time, cultural attractions could be offered under the fund's auspices throughout the United States. Cooperative arrangements could undoubtedly be worked out by the Department of State, with the

blessing of the Congress, between the theater and music industry, the Federal Government, and such powerful unions as Actors' Equity Association, the Associated Actors and Artistes of America, AFL–CIO, the American Guild of Musical Artists, and the American Federation of Musicians, or whatever the unions involved. All it takes is good will on both sides and I know this is present.

In my opinion, if we are to capture the imagination and the minds and hearts of the peoples of the free world as well as the millions of uncommitted peoples—the United States must more definitively supply the energy, the resourcefulness, the creative power and talent which is ours to give than it has done so far. If this is to take place then several steps must be taken by the American Educational Theater Association in cooperation with other national educational organizations concerned with the arts in education. You must work together toward—

1. The establishment of a permanent division at the State Department in the Bureau of International Cultural Relations to handle the massive exchanges in the arts which must be developed as a central and integral part of this massive exchange program which President Eisenhower has called for. Such a permanent division must be headed by a distinguished educator, and must be staffed by leaders drawn from the arts departments of our colleges and universities. At the same time, the Advisory Committee on the Arts established by the Humphrey-Thompson Act (Public Law 860, 84th Cong.) must be reorganized and strengthened with the addition of leading educators from our college and university art departments. For several years now, every time the White House appointed people to an art commission in Washington, the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, and the Advisory Committee on the Arts at the State Department are examples, the names of George Murphy and Robert Montgomery—from Hollywood via the Republican National Committee turned up. The names conspicuous for their absence, even from the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the National Cultural Center were those of Dr. Howard Hanson, director of the Eastman School of Music, and president of the National Music Council, other officials of the National Music Council, and distiguished art educators generally. At the present time the official directly in charge of the President's cultural exchange program at the Department of State is Mr. James Magdanz who has no background at all in the arts. He is a former budget officer, and no doubt a good budget officer. However, many of the present limitations of this vital program, for instance, its virtual exclusion of educational talent, is directly due to an astounding lack of familiarity with today's significant fine arts programs in our Nations' colleges and universities on the part of leading State Department officials. (H.R. 6876, THOMPSON; H.R. 7533, MCDOWELL; and S. 1827, HUMPHREY, go to the heart of the problem sketched here.)

2. The status and quality of our cultural affairs officers abroad must be sharply raised, and legislation will be offered soon to do this.

3. The establishment of a worldwide Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences and a national showcase program in our Nation's Capital has been developed by Representative MCDOWELL and will be introduced early in January 1960 by several sponsors in both Houses.

4. The establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Sponsors include Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY; PAUL H. DOUGLAS; and JAMES E. MURRAY; and Representatives EMANUEL CELLER; JOHN V. LINDSAY; JAMES G. FULTON; SEYMOUR HALPERN; STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT; LEE METCALF; CARROLL D. KEARNS; EDITH GREEN; DOMINICK V. DANIELS; ROBERT N. GIAIMO; CARL ELLIOTT, committee chairman; and JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., and FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

5. The establishment of the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations has passed the Senate under the sponsorship of Senators J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. House sponsors include Representatives WAYNE L. HAYS, STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, JOHN V. LINDSAY, JAMES G. FULTON, and FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

6. If the American National Theater and Academy is to continue in the future to enjoy its special privileged status as sole professional manager of the State Department's cultural exchange program with other nations then ANTA's reorganization must be sought. As you know, ANTA was chartered by the Congress in 1935 as a theater organization and it is undoubtedly rendering as great a service to the American theater and to American drama as the National Music Council—likewise chartered by the Congress—is rendering to American music.

When the State Department selected ANTA in 1954 for the important role of professional manager of the President's cultural exchange program which was authorized by the Congress in July of that year, ANTA set about creating advisory panels in music, the dance, and so on and more recently has established academic screening committees to advise it on outstanding talent in our colleges and universities in the performing arts. These latter committees are: The overseas touring committee of the American Educational Theater Association, and the academic screening committee of the music panel. After 5 years the time has come, I am convinced, to expect ANTA, in fairness and justice to the other art fields, to elevate these advisory panels and academic screening committees to a position where they are an integral part of ANTA itself, and in full charge of their respective fields of interest in the arts. These panels and committees should, at the same time, be broadened to provide the American Educational Theater Association, the National Music Council, the Music Educators National Conference, and the National Association of Schools of Music and other similar groups a more significant role in keeping with their importance in our society. ANTA would be a true arts council.

Alternatively, the American Educational Theater Association and the National Council of the Arts in Education should be contracted with directly by the State Department to manage our developing program of educational exchanges in the arts of the theater. For ANTA to continue to manage our cultural exchange program for the State Department without such significant internal changes would be comparable to the Department of Defense contracting with General Motors to manage its entire procurement program covering everything from submarines and airplanes to tanks and trucks. You can well imagine what giant aircraft companies like Douglas and Boeing and great automobile manufacturing companies like Ford and Chrysler would think of this. If it became known that the Defense Department was even considering establishing the kind of arrangement the State Department has with ANTA the outcry occasioned by Defense Secretary Wilson's remark that "What is good for General Motors is good for the country" would seem like a lark by comparison.

There are other areas directly relating to the arts fields which I want to discuss with you also—and briefly because of the time limitation. For several years I have urged that the status of our cultural affairs officers be raised and given a status equal to that of cultural affairs officers of other nations. I have introduced legislation to effect this change. We must create a career foreign service system in the U.S. Information Agency equal to that in the Department of State—of which it was originally an integral part to insure the ability to recruit high caliber people. Abbott Washburn, Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency, recently urged the need for legislation to correct the present deplorable situation. He pointed out that—

"The system under which we continue to operate is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. Americans in our overseas service may hold appointments only as Foreign Service Reserve or Foreign Service Staff officers. Chiefly because of the lower ceiling on staff salaries, the Agency's most important and valuable officers—our public affairs officers and other top officials overseas—hold appointments as Foreign Service Reserve officers which in no sense meets our needs for a career service system. Reserve appointments are authorized under the Foreign Service Act for temporary service not to exceed 5 years. While Reserve officers are accorded the same salary and allowances as Foreign Service officers, the limitations on tenure make the Reserve category an antithesis of a career service. In addition, Reserve officers have no job security. Under the law, they may be separated at any time for any reason.

"As you know, many of our posts are located in areas where work is demanding and living is hard. Moreover, the work, itself, whatever the location, requires experience, expert knowledge, and a high level of ability and character."

Cultural affairs officers are, indeed, key men in the long-range program of presenting America's cultural image to the world. They surely deserve to be recognized as permanent career officers. I intend to continue to push for legislation which would accomplish this necessary change.

When the Congress convenes I am very hopeful, too, that we will act quickly to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. In my opinion this would represent a significant cultural step forward on the part of the Federal Government. A Federal Advisory Council on the Arts would formally recognize the essential role of the Government in promoting the arts. "There should be a Federal advisory agency as provided in several bills now pending before Congress," a resolution adopted by the Democratic Advisory Council on December 7, 1959, says, "with general authority to assist in formulating plans to develop the cultural resources of the United States, and to promote general appreciation of the beauty and educational value of works of art, literary and musical compositions and of the contribution of performing artists in all fields."

It is interesting and significant, I think, from a long-range point of view, in our Nation's cultural development that the bills in the Congress to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, and to carry out much of the legislative program I have outlined in my remarks today, now have the support of strong elements in the Democratic Party at the national level. The Young Democratic Clubs of America at their Toledo, Ohio, national convention in November 1959, and the Democratic Advisory Council at its New York City meeting on December 7, 1959, endorsed the bills in the Congress in support of the fine arts.

It will be interesting and important to observe if the organizations of the Republican Party follow suit, with regard to the fine arts legislation in the Congress—much of which has been sponsored by individual members of the Republican Party—including the bill for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts which President Eisenhower first recommended to the Congress in his message on the state of the Union in 1955. The fine

arts must have bipartisan support, just as our foreign policy does. Unfortunately, the Republican Party has tended to regard the arts in a more personal light as a handmaiden of political advantage. I need only remind you that the Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Eisenhower (CASE) established in the fall of 1956 had as its purpose, not the advancement of the fine arts, but the election of a leading official of the Republican Party. Such a committee can only discount the great purpose which the fine arts have in any democratic society. Certainly Thomas Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers never conceived of the arts in this particular context.

We in the Congress would deeply appreciate hearing much more than we do at present from the cultural leaders of our States and districts just as we presently hear from representatives of labor, agriculture, commerce, and industry. How many of you have contacted those sponsors of fine arts legislation in the Congress to tell them you appreciated their introduction of fine arts bills in the Congress? I'll wager not many, yet this is an essential part of the democratic process.

The need for greater understanding and support of the cultural activities of the Federal Government must be developed at the grassroots level, and must be given wider publicity. I would hope that the American Educational Theater Association will, as a part of its work here in its annual convention, adopt strong resolutions in support of some of the matters which I have discussed with you today in order that we as a nation may move forward in 1960 along the hard and difficult road to artistic and cultural maturity.

More of our citizens must come to know about the forthcoming $60 million fund drive for the National Cultural Center and the exciting plans of Architect Edward D. Stone for it which are now sorely threatened by a road-and-bridge complex developed by the Republican-controlled city government of the District of Columbia which doesn't have to account to the voteless citizens of Washington for its actions and which has had no firm direction from President Eisenhower who appointed its members. There is the added riddle of what the National Cultural Center will do about the educational fine arts. Despite the law which specifically lists the educational fine arts, including even the children's theater, there is little evidence that the present movers and shapers of the National Cultural Center have any plans for educational theater. Few of the country's leaders in educational drama and music have been appointed to positions of influence, and few men of wealth have been appointed to the board of trustees. We can only hope for the best, but the American Educational Theater Association should certainly call for appointments of leaders from the fields of the educational fine arts to the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the National Cultural Center, and condemn by an outright resolution the present plans for a bridge-and-road complex which the Commission of Fine Arts has found unacceptable.

I would like to say a word about the 45-room hospitality mansion which the American Council on Education, with which the American Educational Theater Association is affiliated, has purchased with Ford Foundation Funds ($500,000). The AETA is a real grassroots group and the Nation's most representative and powerful theater group. Certainly the AETA should have a special position at the new headquarters of the American Council on Education commensurate with its special and deserved position in our country's cultural life. In the past there has been no adequate headquarters for the reception of such special groups as were intent on learning about America firsthand, such as professors, students, correspondents, and others from nations across the face of the earth. Certainly in such an exciting program the American Educational Theater Association must and should have a role equal to that of the recently formed Institute of Contemporary Arts which is local and confined to the District of Columbia in its operations.

In closing, let me say that we must turn the spotlight on the arts by dramatizing across the Nation, through all the various media of communication, the exciting possibilities of our cultural resources. The stage is set for action, the players are on hand—only your direction will assure effective performances. The times in which we live demand that democracy's show must go on.

Address by Hon. Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, Before the American Farm Bureau Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I made before a meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago on December 15, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored to be among those on the program of this 1959 meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is always a pleasure for me to participate in Farm Bureau meetings.

I take pride in being a conservative. Sometimes I am called old fashioned; but this is not the worst thing I have been called over a period of 50 years in public life. Let me tell you some of the things I believe.

I believe sound progress should be a primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is a source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of the theory of checks and balances which has been so useful in our form of government.

Our form of government is the greatest and most productive the world has ever known. The fundamentals on which it was founded must be preserved. I have always fought wherever they were being attacked. They guarantee our freedoms and nourish our free enterprise system under which it is possible for every American to start at the bottom and work to the top.

I believe it is the individual initiative and national strength developed under our system that have brought this Nation to world leadership in relatively few generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds—even thousands—of years. I want ours to be the longest and best.

I believe our form of government, our system and our freedoms can and would be destroyed by continuing centralization of government. Excessive centralization of government will inevitably lead to excessive Federal regulation, competition and taxation. In short, it will lead to State socialism.

I believe our people want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically the requirements are simply honesty and individual initiative, independent attitude and hard work, constructive production and free competition, and progressive development with sound financing. How well are we measuring up?

This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. Our form of government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. I pray none of us will live to see the fall of our great free enterprise system; but our freedoms are already being weakened.

We are in serious need of character and fortitude to restore, develop, and defend the sources of national strength which raised this country to world leadership. I urge your attention to these conditions today because we are in an historic turning point in world history.

We are entering a new era of atomic energy, rocketry, space, etc. Our population is increasing. Our resources are great. Our productive know-how and capacity are yet unsurpassed. Representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly on these elements for the good of all mankind.

I firmly believe that with responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness there could be no fear for the future. Wihout these there can be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. These are simple requirements. But we are showing weakness at many points.

Our strength has been sapped by paternalism in Federal bureaucracy grown too big, usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court grown too mighty, and force of labor leaders grown too arrogant. These have undermined our system, changed our attitudes, and hobbled our will for freedom.

We are faced today with more deficits, more debt, growing inflation, sinking foreign trade balance, dwindling gold reserves, Russian gains in the continuing race in scientific, military and economic fields. These are serious weaknesses. They are dangerous conditions which must be reversed.

Federal deficit financing has been the rule for more than a quarter of a century. But the fiscal situation in the United States Government deteriorated faster in fiscal years 1958–59 than in any comparable peacetime period during my 26 years in the Senate.

In the short span of 6 months we moved from estimates of virtually balanced budgets to combined deficits of $15.4 billion. In the same period we were forced to raise the statutory limit on the Federal debt twice. In fact, it has now been raised the third time in 2 years.

During the past fiscal year Federal debt passed the World War II peak, and Federal spending and deficit financing reached levels exceeded only in years of all-out global war emergency. There will be more debt and deficit this fiscal year. Budget Director Maurice Stans sees rising expenditures in the future.

Today, December 15, 1959, the Federal debt is at its all-time peak in the history of this Republic. The debt is now $292½ billion and it is expected to be a billion dollars higher this time next month. There are no plans to begin paying off this astronomical debt.

As of this date, I foresee another deficit this fiscal year of $1 to 2 billion. A $95 million surplus is the official estimate. But the spending estimate is too low and the revenue estimate is too high. Spending up to $80 billion and revenue not exceeding $78 billion would not be surprising.

Deficit financing is a heavy factor in continuing inflation. Purchasing power of the dollar has dropped an average of a tenth of a cent a month for the past 7 months. It is down to 47.3 cents on the 1939 index. Think of this in terms of insurance you bought 20 years ago for protection of your family. And all indications point to continued cheapening of our currency.

Interest on the Federal debt this year will cost $9.1 billion. This figure should stick in the mind of every taxpaying citizen of this Nation, especially farmers. The Department of Agriculture is now estimating the combined net income of all farm operators in the United States this year at $9.6 billion.

Not only does interest on the Federal debt nearly equal net income of farm operators, but it approximates total annual Federal, State and local highway expenditures, and it is equivalent to far more than half of all State and local expenditures for public school education.

Interest on the Federal debt is averaging about 3 percent. New issues of recent months are costing nearly 5 percent. Should the whole debt of nearly $300 billion ever be refinanced at the new rates the interest cost would be upward of $15 billion, compared with $9.1 billion now—an increase of $5 to $6 billion, or more than 50 percent.

The terrible burden of this terrific debt is the result of 24 deficits in the past 29 years. Half of these deficits were incurred during years when we were fighting neither war nor depression. There have been four deficits totaling $23 billion since the Korean war was stopped. And the end is not in sight.

There was reason to expect runaway new Federal spending authorizations during the past year. This is where the Farm Bureau Federation stepped in so effectively to help sustain the President in his efforts to reduce spending by vetoes. Only one veto was overridden. I urged the Presidential vetoes; more will be needed in the coming year.

The total cost of Federal Government in the United States has gone up nearly $16 billion since the Korean war. This is a tremendous increase. It is 23 percent; it amounts to nearly $100 per capita; more than a billion and a quarter dollars a month; more than $43 million a day.

It may surprise you to know that the great increases in this period were not for military and foreign aid. They were in domestic-civilian programs and these too frequently involve multiyear or permanent commitments for heavy spending in the future. Increases in these programs are continuing.

But in the past 6 years domestic-civilian program spending increased nearly 83 percent to $34.9 billion; housing, highways, and commerce from less than $1 billion to nearly $7 billion; agriculture from $2.6 billion to more than $6 billion; labor and public welfare nearly doubled to $4.4 billion.

Much of this domestic-civilian spending is for subsidies through all kinds of Federal loans, grants, and payments. These not only increase Federal spending; they contribute to inflation. Inflation is destructive of fixed incomes, provident investment, prudent business, sound financing, national security, and free enterprise.

Nearly 40 million people will receive payments from the Federal Treasury this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families these 40 million people could easily reach a number equivalent to half our population. In this connection, there are now 90 Federal programs for subsidy payments to States, localities, individuals, etc., totaling more than $9.5 billion a year.

In addition to increasing direct expenditures and debt, the Federal Government has underwritten nearly $275 billion in contingent liabilities in the form of insured and guaranteed loans, insurance in force, etc. This is an increase of $70 billion in contingent liabilities assumed since the Korean war.

The Federal Government is now subsidizing business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals, etc. And when they take their subsidies they give up independence and freedom. They submit to bureaucratic control.

And where does this money come from? Taxes are the Government's only source of revenue. To borrow the money simply takes more taxes. And wherever there is debt—public or private—cold terms of mortgage are grim reality. How can we disregard this?

Subsidies and inflation feed on each other, and both of them feed paternalism. Paternalism centralizes power in Washington bureaucracy. By the process of cheapening our money and centralizing power we have descended to a level of state socialism which is obvious if not admitted.

Social democracy undermines sound government and stifles constructive enterprise. Its evils have been proved wherever nations have stooped to it. We know these things, but responsible citizenship in this country today seems insufficient to hold back the growing demand for more.

Irresponsible attitudes with respect to Federal spending are bad enough, but they are epidemic. They have spread to State and local governments. They have permeated the whole economy and society. They are evident in both public and private pursuit. Take our great highway programs for example.

Perhaps more than any other group, farmers have reason to be interested in good roads and highways. Few people have worked longer and harder for them than I have. In Virginia we are proud of our 52,000 miles of State highway systems—all developed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I think there should be an interstate highway system. I appreciate traffic problems in urban areas. But like you, I know the basic requirements for farm-to-market roads, and I think all who benefit from them—at both ends—should think twice before they do anything to impede their continuing development.

I am certain essential requirements of both the regular Federal-aid primary and secondary roads, generally referred to as the ABC system, and the Interstate System can be met in an orderly way on a pay-as-you-go basis without excessive taxes. This was the purpose of the so-called Byrd amendment in the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Under that act Federal gas taxes and revenue from other highway sources were segregated into a trust fund for use in construction on both the regular Federal-aid roads and the Interstate System. The Byrd amendment put the whole Federal program on a firm basis by writing the pay-as-you-go policy into the law.

As you know, the time-proved ABC system roads are constructed with funds matched equally, on a 50–50 basis, by the State and Federal Governments, and the States retain dominant control. But it is generally understood that interstate roads are built with 90 percent Federal money and 10 percent State funds.

Under such a Federal formula it is easy to see how interstate projects may be very enticing. But like so many other Federal programs, this one, too, needs further examination. And if it is not watched closely and controlled carefully, it can result in more harm than good in highway development.

Take a look at the experience to date. We superimposed this Interstate System over our well-tested ABC system, and the weaknesses and temptations came quickly to light. The estimated cost of the system has gone up 73 percent since its inception, and on present schedule the program still has 15 years to go.

At best these are extremely expensive roads. It is not difficult to find interstate projects where 10 percent of the cost exceeds 50 percent of the cost of equally important ABC projects. And once interstate roads are built the States forever assume 100 percent of their high-cost maintenance.

Furthermore, the interstate highways are almost invariably limited access roads. In many areas the States must construct paralleling roads to get traffic on them, off of them, and on the other side of them. This places another heavy burden on State highway funds.

In short, it is easy to see how 90–10 Federal highway money may tempt States to divert their funds from ABC roads of higher priority to interstate projects. And once Interstate System roads are built they eat up State funds in expensive maintenance and construction duplication.

With its high ratio of expenditures on interstate roads, the Federal Government is now spending twice as much as the States on highway construction—$3 billion to $1.5 billion. In this situation, as you can imagine, the Federal Government has begun dominating the programs.

Excited by the temporary recession in 1958, Congress abandoned the Federal pay-as-you-go provision by repealing the Byrd amendment and went on a spending spree. Our great highway programs were thrown into an inexcusable mess. State programs were seriously disrupted and threatened with chaos. The trust fund was broke. The integrity of the Federal Government was impaired when the cost of contracts awarded exceeded funds available.

We were forced to raise Federal gas taxes. But we managed to make the increase temporary and reinstate the Byrd pay-as-you-go amendment. But I can tell you there is need for vigilance if we are to avoid making the gas tax increase permanent and raiding general fund revenue for the Federal Interstate Highways.

You know the importance of both systems. Your position for sound financing is traditional. Farm bureaus all over the Nation have intimate knowledge of highway requirements. The federation can be of great constructive service in keeping these programs in proper balance and within our ability to pay for them.

Raising Federal gas taxes is an example of how, in the process of centralizing power, the Federal Government usurps State and local revenue sources at the same time it encourages greater expenditures at all levels. Like the Federal Government, States, and localities are now finding it difficult to pay their bills.

Both are trying to push more of their costs on the Federal Government—States sacrificing their sovereignty and localities their autonomy. Taxpayers, pinched by levies at all levels, look for tax loopholes and avoidance at the expense of their self-respect.

We have increased total debt in the United States nearly $200 billion in 5 years. Most of this increase is private. The American people now have nearly a trillion dollars in debt on their backs; more than $350 billion in public debt, and more than $550 billion in private debt.

When individuals become insolvent they take bankruptcy and dispose of their obligations. When governments become insolvent their money becomes worthless and they go through a revolution wringer. The nature of the revolutions may vary, but change in the form of government in inevitable.

I do not imply that this Nation or the Government is insolvent. But make no mistakes. Profligate spending has strained our fiscal position. And in this condition we are vulnerable to insidious attacks on the fundamentals of our form of government.

Ours is a government originating in the sovereignty of the States. Under our Constitution the States gave certain powers to the Federal Government and kept the rest. And constitutionally the Federal Government is in the form of three separate

branches—they are coordinate, but each is independent of the other.

The checks and balances in this system are obvious. Their purpose is to protect the fundamentals on which our form of government and our enterprise system are based and the freedoms they require. And we had better start defending against those who would destroy the things which have made this Nation great.

In our present condition and state of mind, the Warren Supreme Court has usurped legislative powers and executive authority, struck at State sovereignty, deprived citizens of traditional freedoms, and set free those convicted of Communist subversion.

By destructive decree and naked force the Warren Court has violated our fundamentals, undermined our institutions, and invaded our privacy. Its decisions are called "law of the land." Our Constitution empowers only Congress to make Federal law; and there is reason for this. Members of Congress are elected by the people and are answerable to them.

Without the great strength developed in this Nation in earlier days, it would be difficult to survive this latter-day Federal bureaucracy and judiciary. Federal usurpation, combined with abuses by irresponsible labor leaders, curtail sound progress, and insidiously sap national strength.

I am glad to learn Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN will be among the speakers at this meeting. No one has done more to reveal corruption at high union levels and misuse of power by arrogant labor leaders. This takes courage, and JOHN MCCLELLAN has got it. He has contributed great service to his country.

Senator MCCLELLAN has a fine legal background. He has keen insight. He has studied labor legislation. His advice to you on this subject will be the best. And if the steel strike is not settled when the injunction expires next month, demand for more legislation is certain to come soon.

When he speaks tomorrow I hope he will tell you how Harry Bridges, the Communist Longshoreman's boss, and Jimmy Hoffa, the Teamsters' boss, planned a worldwide boycott. That plan demonstrates the power and danger in present labor leadership. He told me 232 witnesses "took the fifth amendment" in hearings before his labor rackets subcommittee.

You heard and saw those witnesses before the committee. Did you imagine so many thugs, gangsters, and racketeers were out of jail? "Taking the fifth," their silence was indisputable evidence of weakness in our national fiber. We all know they should be restrained from the practices to which they were witness.

You have shown your knowledge of this weakness. I supported all labor legislation the federation recommended in the past session. I am the only member now in the Senate who voted against the Wagner Labor Act in 1939. This act gave special privileges to labor unions. I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and against the Truman veto. I supported the strong labor bill last session. I would vote for a stronger bill now.

I have always conceded to the good citizens in the rank and file of labor unions the privilege of organizing. I was among the first to concede to legitimate labor unions the privilege of collective bargaining when they are bona fide representatives of their membership.

But when irresponsible labor leaders have the power virtually to shut down the country, our national security is imperiled; when they have the power to stop production and wages, our economy is impaired; when they have the power to force wage increases unjustified by increased production, they create inflation.

We hear a lot about issues in strikes today. Usually there are only two. One is an inflationary wage increase unjustified by increased production. The other is more authority to tell management how to run the business. More power for the labor leaders usually is the big objective, with little regard for others.

I am sure you have noted the dangerous competition among today's labor leaders. When one gains in a strike, the others think they must do better. If McDonald wins in steel, Reuther will think he must strike the automobile industry for more, and so on it will continue.

Not only can irresponsible labor leaders choke off vital production in critical periods; they can ruthlessly control the livelihood of millions of people. The costly steel strike ran 116 days before it was stopped by court order. Who can measure the price to be paid either by steel worker families or the Nation?

That strike alone stopped production for nearly 4 months by a half-million workers employed in steel plants. Work stopped for thousands more in dependent industries. At the same time lesser strikes stopped work for tens of thousands more in the butcher, mine, mill, smelter, glass, shipyard and other industries.

More than 60 million man-days of labor have been lost this year as a direct result of strikes. Strikes almost invariably increase production costs. We feel some of the undue production costs directly, but much of the damage is hidden. For instance, our products must compete in foreign trade markets.

This is a matter of great importance at this time. The comparative level of our imports affects our balance of payments with other countries. We are in balance-of-payments difficulty now. Serious imbalance siphons out our gold. This, among other things, involves the value of our money.

The level of imports is not the only factor in the problem; others include dollars spent out of the country by our far-flung military operations; we are still dumping billions abroad in foreign aid programs, etc. But it would help the situation if our prices were more competitive.

The Secretary of the U.S. Treasury appeared before the International Monetary Fund asking that certain nations stop discriminatory trade practices against us. I know this action would not have been taken unnecessarily.

In 10 years we have purchased abroad, invested abroad, and given away abroad 17 billion in gold and liquid dollars more than we have earned from foreign nations through exports of goods and services. This deficit in the current year is running at the rate of $4 billion. Last year it was $3.4 billion.

Such deficits cannot continue indefinitely. Foreign countries are now holding more than 17 billion in liquid dollars. More than half of this is in official accounts, and the governments holding these dollars can call upon us to convert them into gold if they wish. They will do this if the dollar is not kept strong.

There is need to protect our gold reserves. In this situation you can see there are reasons for balanced budgets and reduction in debt that do not readily meet the eye. Keeping our currency sound, and protecting its purchasing power at home, is a major factor in preserving free world confidence in the U.S. dollar.

The Secretary of the Treasury needs backing at home. He needs the cooperation of the Government, labor unions, and business—by all of us, including farmers. Failure to adjust our balance of payments will be a continuing threat to our gold reserves.

The Government should balance its budget, reduce its debt and stop inflation. It can start by reducing foreign aid expenditures. Over the last 14 years we have dumped $75 billion of foreign assistance into 85 countries. And many of these have become our serious competitors in world markets.

Labor leaders have great responsibility for rising prices and inflation. Industry has its responsibilities in this matter, too. The fact is that many of our products have been priced out of foreign trade.

Agricultural products have been about 22 percent of our total merchandise exports during the past 10 years. Actually, this is a somewhat smaller percentage than it was before World War II; and about one-third of the farm exports are now being sold for "soft" currencies abroad under Public Law 480 programs and section 402 of the Mutual Security Act.

Most of our payments abroad are in dollars, many of which accumulate in foreign reserves. But farm exports sold for soft local currencies, bartered or given away do not earn for the United States either gold or dollars. This type of export is of little help in efforts to correct our balance of payments deficit. We know the Public Law 480 program has been exploited for use not intended. Perhaps it could be constructively reviewed.

I know the Farm Bureau Federation wants to make our agricultural products more competitive in world markets, and less dependent upon Government at home. I hope you will redouble your efforts to bring about that highly desirable condition. You can count on my enthusiastic support.

Our tolerance of increasing Federal paternalism and spending, increasing usurpation of power by the Supreme Court, and increasing arrogance by labor leaders is a clear sign of national weakness developing among us. These are three menacing subversions of our system which must be brought under control.

Our complacency about such fundamental matters is amazing. In contrast, last year when a recession cloud appeared on the horizon, Congress was deluged with spending demands that made the Nation appear hysterical—approaching panic. Our idol seems to be a fast buck; not a golden calf.

In my opinion too much Federal control and spending are at the base of most of our trouble. Easy money through Federal paternalism, and an economy continually doped up with inflation will never produce national strength. They are destructive of character and initiative.

We shall be moving for national strength when we demand—and get—elimination of paternalistic programs and deficit financing, reduction in debt, halt in inflation, and sympathetic allegiance to fundamentals throughout the Nation, including the Federal Government and the judiciary.

We shall be moving for strength of character and constructive initiative when we stop requesting nonessential new programs and expenditures; when we revitalize our State and local governments; and when we assert the fundamental freedoms and independence which are our heritage.

When these things are done we shall merit our position of leadership in the free world. Unless and until they are done we shall be working for the Communist objective publicly declared in Moscow last May Day when the Russians said their primary purpose is to outgain capitalism in minimum time.

We have to admit they are achieving impressive gains in many fields. Their gains have made our weaknesses clearer and more ominous. We know what our weaknesses are. We know where they are. We know in our conscience what should be done. We know in our minds what must be done.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has taken the lead before in proving the judgment of our people is basically sound and can be made to prevail. I urge you to renew your efforts now for the good of our country at the grassroots and in high places.

Among other things which must be done, I think the American Farm Bureau Federation can render especially effective leadership in:

1. Stopping expenditures in excess of our income by eliminating nonessential spending;

2. Reducing the Federal debt; this would be a great deterrent to inflation for the present and lift some of the burden we are loading on generations of the future.

3. Watching and controlling the Federal highway programs, to keep the Interstate System from running wild at the expense of farm-to-market and other important State roads;

4. Conducting a constructive review of the Public Law 480 farm product export program; and

5. Curbing the excesses indulged in by labor leaders, without destroying the right of collective bargaining.

I shall be with you all the way to the fullest extent of my capacity and energy.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, at the annual dinner of the New England Society in the city of New York, on Thursday, December 3, 1959.

In his speech, Mr. MARTIN related the fine progress of the New England States in the new industrial age. He also discussed the menace of inflation and the need for action to prevent the destruction of the value of the dollar.

There is a message in this address which I consider extremely timely and of great importance to the American people. It is important from the viewpoint of the economic soundness of our country.

The address follows:

It is a great privilege to come to this fine gathering of people who, while now a vital part of the great Empire State, have not forgotten the part of the country to which they trace their origins.

This is the 154th annual dinner of your society. Its very age is conclusive evidence of the ties of affection which a New Englander always bears to the land of his origin. While I still live in the bustling town where I was born, I have traveled far, and whether it was in California, Hawaii, or even the Orient, people of New England origin never fail to grasp the chance to reminisce about the State of their birth and yearn to relive the old days.

One hundred and fifty-four years old. What mighty changes have come to New England, America—yes, to the world in this span of time. In the early days of this society, we were a struggling nation, a nation whose people were mostly loyal to some particular section, as your founders were to New England. Now while we are properly loyal to and cherish the State of our birth, our supreme loyalty is to the Nation itself. It is this love of country which has made us the mightiest Nation of all time. It is this loyalty that will make it possible for us to meet the challenge which will unfold in the future.

If there is any fault to be found with New Englanders, it is that we do not extol more vigorously our past contributions to the Nation, the contributions we are making today, and those we expect to make in the days ahead.

Texas never tires of telling of the wonderful achievements of that great State in the Southwest. Virginia takes just pride in its historic past and the great part it had in the formation of the Republic. California properly boasts of its tremendous growth and of its great future. New York likes to remind us of her eminence in trade, commerce, and banking. This is the spirit which makes it possible for us to look to the future with great expectancy.

We New Englanders have every reason to speak up about our contributions to the early history of our country, our busy present days, and the promise of the future. It is because that, as a people, we are of a modest nature many have come to believe we are slipping backward and that we are a declining section of a great nation.

This concept is far from the truth. New England is still forging ahead—a little slower perhaps than the newer sections, but still progressing at a healthy rate. We hope to accelerate that rate in the days ahead.

New England has been forced to redirect its course on several occasions. The early days were the maritime era. It was in New England where the American Navy was born and where it was stimulated in the critical days of the Republic. Our clipper ships sailed the seven seas, bringing the wealth and produce of the world to the new land. The beautiful homes of the old sea captains upon Cape Cod and the north shore still remind us of this great era.

Then started the industrial age. The Government nurtured the new industries with the tariff to protect our infant industries, and simultaneously there was a decline in shipping. Quick to adapt itself, New England turned to the factories for a livelihood.

The first cotton mill in America, the first iron foundry, and one of the first General Electric plants were just a few of the early contributions.

Those were the days of water power. It was not long before every river in New England was dotted with a little factory giving employment to hundreds of workers and prosperity to many little villages. Far removed from the sources of raw material, this progress was remarkable. These industries blazed the way for the great industrial empire of the United States.

In later days, new conditions arose. Many cotton mills went South to be close to the sources of raw material, to obtain cheaper labor and operating costs. Dominance in the cotton textile trade, for years a bulwark of New England economy, was no longer to be found here. This was a painful period of readjustment to many of our cities and towns. But happily that period has passed. We have come through this crisis with customary New England courage and determination, and we can now see brighter days ahead.

We have grasped the opportunities of the new age, the age of nuclear power, the age of electronics and plastics. The coming nuclear power will give New England a great advantage in the future, an advantage we have not had in the past. Today new factories are springing up everywhere. Wonderful modern plants are replacing the old factories. People are working at better wages than ever. I can tell you good people there is no gloom or despair in New England.

We face the future fully confident that the people of our section will measure up to their historic past.

How, I ask you, can we fail? Here in New England is the wealth, greater per capita than any other section. We have the brains and the industrial leadership to direct that wealth. And above all, we have great educational advantages and research centers in our many fine universities and colleges. Every year these schools are turning out the best-trained minds in the world to meet the industrial challenges of our times. We must continue to maintain and expand our great schools of learning. They are one of our greatest assets.

Years ago, when taunted in the Halls of Congress by a colleague with the inquiry: "What does New England produce?", Daniel Webster thundered back with his great voice—"New England, sir, produces men."

It is because we produce able men and women, the most skilled workers, the best-trained leaders that we go forward to further glorify your New England heritage.

We have many handicaps in New England, such as a hard soil to cultivate, and remoteness from the sections where raw materials are produced. But we do have distinct advantages. Within a radius of 500 miles is a market containing a population of 52 million consumers, the richest buying market in the world.

New England is the mecca of people from all parts of the Union who want to get away from the heat of other sections and enjoy the opportunities for a refreshing summer vacation under excellent climatic conditions. Every year the list of summer visitors grows, and Cape Cod is sometimes called the Florida of the summer season. It is unnecessary to mention the possibilities this provides to increase the earning opportunities of our section. Thousands are already profiting from the evergrowing tourist trade.

We do not forget the deeds of the Pilgrims and the Puritans who, along with the cavaliers of Virginia, built this great American heritage. It was built by hard work and loyalty to the State. We must not stray from these principles. They are still the foundation upon which the safety of our great Republic rests.

The Pilgrims in Plymouth taught us early that communism or socialism would not work in the New World. They briefly tried this system of regimentation, but it ended in failure. They were quick to cast aside the experiment and to substitute instead the system of profit for work accomplished. They knew that, if the new land was to flourish and grow, it must have the stimulus of individual opportunity and initiative.

The lesson is most timely today when a powerful nation asks the world to embrace the ideology of communism. The Pilgrims knew better and so must the people of today if they are to enjoy the blessings of progess, happiness, and human dignity that are available only when freedom prevails.

The Pilgrims knew, too, the value of a democratic government. They realized that free men and women are supposed to run the Government, and it should not be the function of government to manage the private lives of the people. Chaos and confusion generally result from too much government interference.

Today we are drifting away from those principles. I hope this trend will not go too far and that the people of New England will remain true to their traditions and sturdily resist the tendency toward a powerful bureaucracy which seeks to manage the details of our lives. This eventually would mean the loss of our liberties and finally the end of the American way of life.

To those who constantly seek Government aid for private projects, I might remind them that the Government in Washington has no

secret source of revenue. It has only the money it takes from the people in taxes. When the Federal Government is given the assignment of spending your money, it levies a huge brokerage charge for doing so. Thus it can readily be seen you are paying more when you ask the Federal Government to pay for a project than if you did it yourselves.

The people of America have many grave, challenging problems today. We must solve them properly or risk the danger of a serious blight on our future. Above all is the need of preserving peace. Closely associated with the need of peace is the need of controlling the forces of inflation.

The curbing of inflation should be the grave concern of every American, regardless of economic status. But its ravages are felt especially by the poor. In fact, the lower an individual is on the economic ladder, the more he suffers from the effects of rising prices. For the poor, a sound and stable dollar makes the difference between a decent meal and hunger. That is why the achievement of a stable currency must be our goal.

The little people of our land—those owning modest insurance policies, savings accounts, Government bonds, and those old folks living on small pensions and social security—are rightly worried by the gradual whittling away of the value of money in the devastating course of "creeping inflation."

In a rising and expanding economy, the accomplishment of price stability becomes a difficult and a complex problem. It is economic history that, in periods of high and rising demand for goods and services, prices tend to go up. There is no easy solution to the problem, such as the passage of a law. The truth is that the most effective laws we can employ to combat the menace of inflation are the laws of commonsense.

The practice of reasonable self-restraint on the part of management, labor, and the general public is inherent in the success of this undertaking.

It would be a sad day for America to resort again to a system of Government controls. Such controls are destructive to competitive enterprise, and they are destructive to individual liberties. What is even worse, for the most part, they do not work.

A system of price controls would be unworkable without wage controls, profit controls, and the rationing of goods. This would mean the creation of another gigantic bureaucracy in Washington to run the Nation's business, when the bureaucracy is already too big. Moreover, controls lead to the inevitable black markets and the loss of freedom on which our prosperity has been built.

The problem we face, therefore, is to maintain a growing, expanding economy, providing jobs for our increasing population and at the same time to maintain a stable dollar. It is unthinkable that we should reconcile ourselves to a continuous vicious spiral of inflation where wages and prices chase each other ever-upward.

Dilution of the value of the dollar discourages people from saving. They see little incentive to save dollars which would steadily decline in value each year. Of course, under such conditions, the little people on pensions and fixed incomes find it impossible to save anyway. Declining savings would mean that capital to finance normal growth would become scarce, making it more costly to borrow money as interest rates go up. This could result in cutbacks in programs for business expansion and improvement; and that, of course, creates unemployment and recession.

For the past 20 years, the dollar has been declining in value as a result of the inflationary process. There have been variances from year to year in the rate of decline, but there has been no essential change in the pattern of decline. Thus, a dollar in the period from 1935 to 1939 was worth 48 and a fraction cents by the year 1958.

We have seen other nations go through the wringer of inflation. We have seen Germany, for instance, after World War I so debase its currency that it was literally necessary for a housewife to carry a wheelbarrow full of paper money to buy her groceries.

The experience of France furnishes further testimony of the havoc wrought by runaway inflation.

Typical is the story of the thrifty Frenchman who sold his house in Normandy and bought life annuities that at the time of purchase would have provided himself and his wife a minimum of security for their old age. That was in 1927. Thirty years later, the cost of living had gone up 37 times what it was in 1927. The pound of butter she could have bought for 10 francs in 1927 now costs her 410 francs. This tragic widow was reduced to buying one egg at a time, a little milk every other day, and a slice of ham once a week.

France has experienced the disastrous results of a paternalistic government which went too far toward socialization. The French have learned the bitter lesson that government cannot give its people anything it does not take away from them in the first place. The people rebelled against paying for their social reforms in taxes. So they are paying for them in the destruction of the value of their money. Here again, of course, it is easy to see that the poorest people are the hardest hit.

But we do not have to go beyond our own shores to realize the evils of inflation. The decline in the value of the American dollar graphically tells the story.

An American with an income of $3,000 a year in 1939 needed an income of $7,370 for exactly the same amount of purchasing power in 1957.

An individual who had an income of $5,000 a year in 1939 needed an income of $13,004 in 1957 to maintain the same standard of living.

If the same trends should continue from now until 1975, the person who had a $3,000 income in 1939 will need an income of $16,867 to live in the same manner as he did in 1939.

One does not have to be much of a prophet to see that, if the present trend continues unabated, this country is on a joyride to a disastrous crash. It must be prevented. It will be prevented if the people do a little serious thinking.

There are numerous reasons for this inflationary process, but the heart of the problem lies in Federal deficit spending and a mounting Federal debt.

In 22 of the last 27 years, the Federal Government has spent more money than it has taken in taxes.

What should be done to control the destructive forces which in 20 years have cut the value of the dollar in half and which threaten to diminish it still further?

The first sound approach to this problem is to discontinue this now accepted practice of deficit spending and to operate on balanced budgets in all years except years of national emergency.

One method of balancing our budgets would be to increase taxes. But this method should be rejected because taxes already absorb too great a proportion of the citizen's dollar.

Studies made by the Tax Foundation show that in an 8-hour day the average $4,500-a-year wage earner must work for the Government 2 hours and 29 minutes. This is more than he must work to pay his food bill, which is 1 hour and 39 minutes; or his housing, for which he must work 1 hour and 25 minutes; or for clothing, for which he must work 37 minutes. The average man already pays out one-third of his income in direct and hidden taxes. That is too high. Reduced taxes are vital to stimulate our economy.

The only other method of balancing the budget is to reduce Federal spending. And this is the sound and sensible approach. If this country is to wage a successful battle against ruinous inflation, it is obligatory on the part of the administration and the Congress to begin now a system of progressive reduction in our budgets each year.

We often hear it said that you cannot cut military spending—that to do so would endanger our national defense. I cannot subscribe to this belief. And the fact that military spending accounts for such a large part of the whole budget is often cited as an excuse for not reducing spending anywhere at all.

Spending for national defense should be scrutinized as carefully as any other forms of expenditures. Enormous savings can be made in the armed services without in any way impairing their essential strength and their defense potential. We need to give all that is necessary for the preservation of peace and our security, but not a cent more.

The responsibility for drastic cuts in spending is not the responsibility of the Congress alone. Far from it. Equal responsibility rests upon the administration and the executive departments. Too often the Appropriations Committees of the Congress are the innocent victims of inflated budget requests sent up to the Capitol by the executive branch. The administrative people, feeling their requests may be cut down, often overstate their needs in order to get what they want. This is wrong. Those who run the departments would render a real patriotic service and help to control inflation by putting their own houses in order and keeping their budget demands down to a minimum instead of a maximum which has grown to be a rather general practice.

There is not a single department, including the military, which could not run for substantially less money without impairment to any essential public service if there is the will and determination to do so.

The maintenance of peace and the need of cooperative relations with the other nations of the world demand our closest attention. Without peace no nation can expect to attain the progress its people pray for. With peace we can all expect an expanding economy, prosperity, and a better world for all.

The real guardianship of peace in the immediate years ahead will primarily rest with the United States. We are the one nation whose resources and strength make other nations pause before engaging in a war that would be disastrous.

It is because of that great responsibility we are spending over $40 billion for national defense. Your national administration would much prefer to use these funds to balance the budget, cut Federal taxes, and direct great sums to humane activities.

But as long as the threat of communism exists we must continue to spend huge amounts for missiles, aircraft, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We must be so strong that our strength will guarantee peace. We spend these vast sums for peace and not for war.

It is the same story with our aid in the building up of the "have not" nations of the world. We help other nations build their military strength because we want them to be able to resist aggression and contribute to the defense of the free world.

We spend for economic aid so that other nations may live better, and we know that will contribute to our own prosperity through the purchase of goods that could not be bought otherwise.

We help the little nations of Asia, Africa, and South America because we know that if we do not the Communists may well do so.

We want them as friends and voluntarily on the side of the free world.

In the past we have been neglectful of South America. We have taken these countries too much for granted. The Communists, noticing that neglect, have not been slow to stir up strife through their insidious propaganda. Fortunately, the South American Republics know full well that they can expect no permanent good from the Soviet world. They want freedom; they want to build strong nations; and from our past history they know the United States is the one country that can and will help them. So it is incumbent upon us to invest a little money in building up South America. It will yield great dividends of good will and cooperation and, from a business point of view, will open tremendous markets for American goods.

Wisely administered, we can well make these foreign expenditures profitable to both the recipient of the aid and to our own country as well. South America knows, as indeed the whole world must know, that our country is not selfish in its aid. It seeks neither territory nor domination in any part of the world. It wants all nations and all people to be free, independent, and prosperous.

The future is full of hazards, and the picture is cloudy. But I believe we will meet these difficult problems at home and abroad with the courage and determination demonstrated by our New England forebears when this Nation was born. With courage we can meet the challenge given to us by the other nations of the free world.

We can and must avoid war, and we must make our dollar sound. If we do there will be a more abundant life not only for the people of America but for the other free nations of the world as well.

May the Almighty guide us in the great tasks which lie ahead.

Address by Hon. Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, to Membership Dinner of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 629, Fairmont, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by him at the membership dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 629, Fairmont, W. Va., on January 10, 1960. The subject of the address is "The Obligations of Freedom."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBLIGATIONS OF FREEDOM

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 629, Membership Dinner, Fairmont, W. Va., January 10, 1960)

Commander Jack W. Bunner, officers and members of the Fairmont Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the topic which you have asked me to discuss is not only one of cold war implications. It is one which bears upon our hearts and minds and embraces the very nature of the meaning of freedom and the duties of free citizens to maintain it. But, as Dr. Karl Menninger said of the virtue of humility which disappears when one lays claim to it, freedom tends to disappear when it is confused with license.

The absolute and unabridged right to do as one pleases and to pursue personal pleasure and profit do not in themselves represent the liberty of men and women in a free society.

Freedom imposes its own obligations upon the citizen. The first of these is to understand the nature of freedom itself, the second to understand the nature of its opponents. Since each veteran here has contributed a portion of your life, and some have given blood in the defense of freedom, I know you have more than an average understanding of the cause of freedom. It has been suggested that I indicate ways in which such patriotic organizations as yours can best contribute to the common defense.

Let me devote a few words to defining the face of the evil with which we are confronted.

DIRECTOR OF FBI EXPLAINS GROWTH

One hundred years ago communism was a theory of history and economics coveted by a handful of men in Europe and England. Some 40 years ago, at the time of the Bolshevik revolution, communism commanded a small but militant force of some 80,000 followers. Today, it claims a total world membership of more than 33 million, with active party units located in 83 nations, according to J. Edgar Hoover, who has acted with courage and zeal in the uncovering of Communist schemes.

In addition, while the Soviet Union holds forth the olive branch of peaceful coexistence, international communism, aided by followers working within, has subjugated 17 countries with a population of over 900 million people or about one-third of those on this planet. While Khrushchev extends the hope of lessening world tensions, his Chinese partners are engaged in shipping contraband arms to North Africa, fomenting disturbances among their neighbors, and threatening the peace of Southeast Asia.

Though the capacity of the individual American citizen to affect the tide of events in these areas is limited, each of us can contribute by keeping ourselves informed on foreign affairs and by supporting the kind of military and economic aid programs which will strengthen our friends abroad.

But I interpose the declaration here that we have a double obligation to provide adequately for our domestic needs if we would keep our country strong.

The challenge on the domestic front, however, is one which can be accepted by each individual in his capacity as a citizen in a free society. And we must all make sure that our voices are heard and that our rights of suffrage are exercised.

As the primary target of worldwide communism, the United States is the chief objective of Soviet espionage. Again, according to FBI Director Hoover, Soviet defectors indicate that between 70 and 80 percent of Russian officials in the United States are members of the Red intelligence services. The importance which the Soviet Union attaches to the value of these agents is vividly pointed up by the sharp increase of Soviet diplomatic personnel in our country. In May 1954, there were 212 Russian officials in the United States; 5 years later, that number had increased to 313—or almost 50 percent.

SOVIET SEEKS TO SECURE SECRETS

Soviet espionage activities in this country expose their disregard for the doctrine of "peaceful coexistence." A 10-year "peace offensive" is but a brief episode within the "permanent revolution", as many of us believe. Just as this revolution continues unceasingly, so do the Communist espionage efforts in the United States. Using blackmail, bribery, and similar techniques, Soviet agents—many with diplomatic immunity—continue in their efforts to obtain our military, scientific and industrial secrets.

Aiding and abetting them is the Communist Party, U.S.A., an integral part of the international Communist conspiracy. It is composed of the disciples—the hard-core militants for the Soviet Union—who sing the praises of Communist Russia despite the dreadful inhumanity to man inflicted in much of the world by the Soviets and their satellites.

These are the people so blinded by their commitment to the false doctrines of communism and so indoctrinated in their hatred of the United States that they still give their allegiance to the Communist Party despite the Soviet brutalities in Hungary, the herding of countless millions of Chinese into the degradation of the communes and the rape of Tibet.

Within the United States there are certain groups which—because of the roles assigned them by the science of Marxism-Leninism—are targets for infiltration and indoctrination by the Communist Party. Five of these groups are of prime importance.

The first group is the working class, through which, according to Marxist ideology, capitalism prepares its own doom. During the 1920's the party's efforts in this field were spearheaded by the Trade Union Educational League. But in 1935, in accordance with a new party line of the united front, boring from within became the order.

And from 1935, when the CIO became the chief target, to 1949, when the Communist-dominated unions were expelled, the party was astonishingly effective in making its inroads. In a factual and carefully written book by Max M. Kampelman, "The Communist Party Versus the CIO," is this passage: "Assuming that of this number (70,000—the largest number of Communist Party members in recent years) one-half belong to the unions, * * * they would have had a maximum numerical strength of twenty-four ten-thousandths of the 15 million labor union members. Yet at the height of this power drive within the CIO, they dominated 12 to 15 of the 40 international CIO unions."

LOYAL LABOR UNIONS OPPOSE COMMUNISM

The final victory of the millions of loyal union members under the inspired and courageous leadership of such men as Philip Murray and Walter Reuther is now the source of much well-won wisdom and strength within organized labor. As a result, the American labor movement today is one of the strongest bastions against communism.

A second permanent target has been the Negro community. According to one of the tenets of Leninism the underprivileged minority group is ripe for revolution. Though time does not allow me to go into detail here, the failure of the Communist efforts among Negroes has been more conspicuous than in any other area. This has been due not only to the militant opposition to communism by the NAACP but also, and more fundamentally, the Communists have attempted to exploit rather than solve the problems of the Negro.

The third target group is the Armed Forces, which Lenin said must be infiltrated, subverted, and made ready for mutiny before a revolutionary situation could develop. Though the party no longer expects to bring about such a situation within the foreseeable future, it does exploit every event in the

peace offensive in a concerted effort to influence servicemen, their families and draft-age youth. These efforts, and the cries to bring the boys home are designed for both psychological and practical weakening of our defenses.

The fourth target is the youth group—because, under Marxist-Leninist doctrine, to win the youth for communism is to win the future. Here the party attempts to capitalize on youth's uncertainty in today's world, on its lack of knowledge of our country's history and traditions of democratic institutions, and on youthful idealism and the desire to join an appealing cause.

To combat this we must seek to lead our young people to a deeper understanding of democratic values and provide them with the kind of challenges in community and national life which will harness their idealism.

The final permanent target group is that of the intellectuals. The party achieved some notable successes in this field, particularly during the 1920's and 1930's, though even then it was but a small minority of the total number. However, during the late 1940's and 1950's most of these defected from the party—and though some have simply adopted another kind of authoritarianism, many have become effective sources of strength in the anti-Communist effort.

COMMUNISTS FAIL TO FIND VETERANS AID

Since World War II there has emerged another group which has become a prime target of the Communist Party, U.S.A. That is the veterans group. The party has adopted several techniques in this respect, but whether through establishing its own front organizations or by trying to infiltrate such loyal organizations as the VFW and the American Legion its aims have been the same—to influence veterans to support the peace offensive and to press immediate demands for the solution of all the veterans' problems.

These then are the main groups which the Communist Party seeks to infiltrate, divide, and subvert to its own purposes. We know their aims and purposes to be illegal; but often their methods are legal. We thus have the problem of how to combat this conspiracy without sacrificing the legal safeguards and moral principles that underwrite our own freedom.

The answer to our problem is certainly not to turn into a nation of amateur detectives and informers, each suspecting his neighbor at the slightest show of nonconformity in thought and action. Nothing could serve the Communist purpose better than the development of such a divisive national temper.

ALL DEMOCRATIC AND FREE PEOPLES CAN AID

I would suggest five general principles that we might observe in combating the threat of international communism.

First, maintaining our regard for the Anglo-American tradition of law. When the respect for law begins to crumble the people become the victims of the perversion of power. The intemperate attacks on the Supreme Court we have sometimes witnessed do not serve the cause of freedom, whatever one might think of some of the Court's decisions.

Second—and this is the cornerstone of Western civilization—is the traditional respect for the individual. Nowhere in the lexicon of communism is the word "individual" acknowledged as meaningful—always it is the masses, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie, the capitalist, the progressive, or the revisionist—never is it the average sensible man or woman who experiences the fullness of the emotional and spiritual life.

And now to the third principle, which is to maintain the integrity and the spontaneity of the good life of friendship, compassion, and love—the very antithesis of the class hatred which the Communists seek to inculcate.

Fourth, we must seek to extend the principles of civil liberties and economic and social justice to all of our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed. Only thus can we present to the world at large the true America. And let us not forget that approximately two-thirds of the world's population are composed of people of color—most of whom have only recently been freed from the white man's dominance.

Finally, we must seek to extend these ideals to other nations within the international community and to live with knowledge of the aspirations of others beyond our shores. The true and really "permanent revolution" was that of 1776—a revolution in the spirit of man, and not in the ownership of the means of production. If we but maintain the faith in the Revolution of 1776 we will have the necessary armament to combat the Communist onslaughts, whether psychological, political, economic, or military.

Happy 93d Birthday to You, Dr. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, today, Wednesday, January 13, marks the 93d birthday of Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the father of the Townsend plan for retirement pensions for our senior citizens.

It has been my privilege to know and work with this great American over the past 25 years. These years, Mr. Speaker, have found him working tirelessly and courageously for justice for our elderly people. Many congressional leaders over the years have attributed to Dr. Townsend substantial credit for the Federal recognition through congressional action of the principle of social security for the American people. Knowing of his great contribution to the action and work necessary to arouse the people in support of any proposal in the general welfare, I can personally testify that this contribution of his has been even more than substantial. The elderly citizens of America owe Dr. Townsend a debt that can never be repaid.

It is only rarely that a man crusades as he has crusaded for a cause in the interests of people without hope of personal gain for himself or family. Dr. Townsend has been this type of a champion. He conceived of the idea that the great resources of America could and would support a social dividend for the retirement income of all of our citizens. He believed that this income, since it would be immediately and fully expended by its recipients, would serve as the continuing stimulus which our economy needs to employ our full resources, both human and material. In part, his idea has been proved during the recent recession. Many economists have stated that the built-in stabilizer of social security payments made a great contribution to the stability of personal income, thereby acting as a cushion for the decline in our economy, during 1957–58. Certainly, more stabilization through the larger pension payments of the Townsend plan would have been even more effective.

Having been one of the 97 Members of Congress who voted for consideration of the Townsend plan in the 76th Congress, I feel that Dr. Townsend has been justified in every way in making the efforts which he has made and in the observations which his organization has made available over the years to the citizens of the Nation, as well as the Congress of the United States.

Sincerity, strength of one's convictions, sympathy for one's fellow beings and dedication to a basic cause in the interests of the American people, together with devoted and unwavering action to reach the objective, symbolize the crusading stature of a man.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend measures up to these specifications and far beyond in my estimation. I have been and am proud to have been closely associated with him and his work. On his 93d birthday, I extend my warmest personal regards and rededicate myself to his goal.

Happy 93d birthday to you, Dr. Townsend, and may there be enough years left for you to see the realization of your dream; namely, justice for all of our senior citizens.

Anti-Semitism—Prank or Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my voice to the ever-mounting chorus of protest to the widespread and deplorable acts of anti-Semitism and/or vandalism which have sickened responsible people throughout the world.

Since the Christmas Eve desecration of the Synagogue of Cologne, Germany, the world has been witness to a series of actions which has touched the shores of this Nation and penetrated to the District of Columbia, the seat of freedom and democracy in the world today.

Some of our colleagues already have risen in this Chamber to lend official volume to the sickness at heart we all feel at these actions which deny the existence of morality.

On Friday, January 8, 1960, there were reports in the Miami Herald, Miami, Fla., and in the Washington (D.C.) Daily News concerning acts of vandalism and of anti-Semitic natures. In Miami, Tampa, and Jacksonville, Fla., 14 painted Nazi swastikas were found; and in Miami 2 bomb threats were made against a synagogue. Four swastikas were splotched crudely on the same Jacksonville synagogue that was damaged by a bomb blast in April 1958.

In Washington, swastikas were smeared on the walls of two buildings in the Northwest section.

Now, it is not for me to say which of these despicable actions were planned to harass and deprecate, and which were acts of vandalism motivated by widespread publicity given preceding incidents.

However, it is for me and for all my distinguished colleagues to take note of these happenings, to protest against them and to explore thoroughly the problems they create with an eye toward answering the question, "What can be done about it?"

Honor for Representative Pillion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year during the past decade Buffalo's 10 most outstanding citizens have been chosen by the Buffalo Evening News.

It is my honor and privilege to call to the attention of the House the inclusion of one of its Members among those chosen for the 1959 roll of honor. Cited for outstanding achievement is my esteemed colleague from Erie County, the Honorable JOHN R. PILLION.

In selecting Mr. PILLION, the News said:

An able and effective champion of western New York interests in Washington and a rugged individualist whose outspoken and informed opinions are respected, Mr. PILLION, representing the 42d New York District in the Congress of the United States, has a wide range of interests which, nevertheless, do not divert him from personal service to his constituents and an active concern for the Niagara frontier. He labors without fanfare. His accomplishments are many.

During 1959, Mr. PILLION was one of the few to recognize the potential danger of Russian expansionist efforts in the Antarctic. To bolster his opinions the Congressman visited the Antarctic and endured innumerable hardships in order to weigh the vast, down-below continent's strategic importance.

Information he provided and arguments he advanced prompted administration policy which will preserve U.S. interests in the Antarctic in concert with other nations. The Antarctic will not fall under the domination of any single ideology.

Congressman PILLION can take pride in this accomplishment, among others, and future generations may have reason to be thankful that he had the foresight and the will single-handedly to press his case. His effort and ultimate success on the Antarctica issue alone is worthy of the plaudits of his constituents and the populace of western New York which he serves.

Also named outstanding Buffalo citizens in 1959 were:

Robert B. Abram, 45 Penhurst Place, for outstanding service as a merchant and as a community leader in sparking the rejuvenation and revitalization of the downtown Buffalo area.

Dr. Edgar C. Beck, 33 Gates Circle, for community service as an associate professor of medicine at the University of Buffalo Medical School, for his work in the field of diabetes detection, for his leadership in organizing medical alumni support for the university's basic science departments.

Judge Charles S. Desmond, Eden, for outstanding achievement in his chosen field of law, who was the bipartisan nominee for chief judge of the New York State Court of Appeals, first resident of Erie County to occupy this high court position.

George M. Frauenheim, 697 LeBrun Road, Eggertsville, for community service, as a Roman Catholic layman whose tireless efforts for the Buffalo diocese have brought aid and comfort to thousands of persons of all races and creeds, who in 1959 led both the successful Catholic charities appeal and the successful seminary fund drive.

Dr. James T. Grace, Jr., 19 Kimberly Drive, Williamsville, for outstanding achievement as a noted cancer research surgeon and as assistant director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute for leading a team of researchers in a significant discovery of a virus in certain human cancers.

James P. Kavanaugh, 2415 Seneca Street, for community service as executive secretary of the city planning board, in directing significant civic improvements like rebuilding the Ohio Street Bridge, and coordinating major rail and highway route changes to fit the city's future.

T. Emerson Murphy, 33 Gates Circle, for community service as a leader in work for underprivileged and handicapped children, as president of the Fresh Air Mission summer haven, and executive committee chairman for the Buffalo Evening News-Rotary Club crippled children's camp fund.

Ralph J. Petersen, Strykersville, for outstanding achievement as an industrial executive, and for community service as chairman of the 1959 Community Chest and Red Cross appeal which surpassed its goal—first time since the drives were combined 5 years ago.

Paschal A. Rubino, 25 Woodley Road, for community service as a leader in education, as a dedicated member of the board of education, and for his work with youth, with the boys club, the police athletic league, and with personal sponsorship of several teenage athletic teams.

Testimonial Dinner Tendered Louis G. Feldmann, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Hazleton, Pa., December 12, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 12, 1959, nearly 600 friends of Louis G. Feldmann, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, packed Genetti's Pennsylvania Room at Hazleton, Pa., at a testimonial dinner in his honor. Guests representing all walks of life and from every section of the United States were in attendance and joined in paying a well-deserved tribute to one of Hazleton's prominent citizens.

It was my privilege to deliver the following address at the testimonial dinner.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING LOUIS G. FELDMANN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 12, 1959

This is indeed a happy occasion when we can gather to pay a well-deserved tribute to a local boy who has made good in so emphatic a way.

Hazleton, Luzerne County and Pennsylvania, are justly proud that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has honored Louis G. Feldmann by electing him as commander in chief.

We are taking this opportunity to tell Lou Feldmann that we are glad of the honor that has come to him, that we confidently accept his leadership, and that we intend to aid with all our power the efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under his command, to promote loyalty among Americans and peace and good will throughout the world.

It is an accepted fact that invariably every successful man owes a debt of gratitude to a woman whether it be his mother, wife, or sweetheart for the encouragement he receives in the daily battle of life.

Therefore, it is fitting that we pause in this tribute to Lou Feldmann and salute his good wife, Ann, who keeps the home fires burning as Lou moves through the air and over the highways and byways of the Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as we all know, is one of the major veterans organizations of the country, numbering almost 1½ million members.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars with other similar veterans organizations, represents a large segment of the American population since the veteran population today numbers approximately 23 million persons.

In fact, veterans, with their immediate families, have recently been computed to comprise approximately 45 percent of the total population of the United States.

As veterans we have no interests and no wishes that separate us from the local and national community.

Like our neighbors, we receive the benefits and share the burdens of government.

We are of many races, creeds, and national origins.

We are of varying economic positions, and belong to different political parties, and to different schools of thought in many other respects.

Nevertheless, we share a common citizenship, and a common intensity of American patriotism.

The love of country that we all share, we have had occasion as veterans to prove by our deeds—yes, we have proved our love of country by labor and obedience, by bravery in the face of danger, by undergoing hardships and imprisonment, sickness and wounds, in the service of America.

With this history, we join to give effect to our concern for the general good of the Nation, to exercise our influence, to give leadership to the community, and particularly to the young.

In fact, we of the veterans organizations wish to make of our group a citadel of

patriotism whose first concern is the welfare of all citizens.

It is, therefore, most fitting that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, should have chosen for its commander in chief such a man as your friend and my friend, Louis G. Feldmann, whose character and career are typical of the ideal citizen.

Like many of you, Lou Feldmann is my own good friend and longtime associate.

Therefore, I can speak of him with much pleasure because like you, his neighbors, I know and admire his many fine qualities.

Lou Feldmann's career has been divided, as his professional life now is, between the two towns of Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton.

He was born in Wilkes-Barre, and spent his childhood there, attending St. Mary's Parochial High School.

Then he went to the University of Pennsylvania, earning the degree of bachelor of science in economics and then staying on for graduate work.

He studied law at Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, where he received his law degree.

As you know, he now lives in Hazleton, and practices law in both Hazleton and Wilkes-Barre.

Between the study of law and the practice of it, however, occurred the same essential interim occupation that commanded the attention of so many of us in the early 1940's.

With the strong sense of civic responsibility already evident in his choice of economics and law as studies, Lou Feldmann could not hold back from the fight upon which our national existence depended.

As a result, early in World War II he enlisted as a private in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Lou's talent for leadership was soon recognized, and he was assigned as a drill instructor at the Parris Island Marine Base, where he had the responsibility of training thousands of recruits for combat duty.

On January 13, 1945, he went overseas with Company G, 9th Regiment, 3d Marine Division, for service in the Asiatic-Pacific theater of operations.

Upon the conclusion of the war in the Pacific he was returned to the United States and discharged with the rank of sergeant.

Of course as we all know, the rank of sergeant in the Marine Corps—as the marines would say—compares favorably with that of a general or admiral in other branches of the service.

What the marines have in mind is that the authority of a sergeant in the Marine Corps is unequaled regardless of rank or rating in our Armed Forces.

If you doubt this interpretation let me suggest that you talk to any leatherneck after graduation from basic training at either Parris Island or San Diego.

So tonight we salute you, Sgt. Lou Feldmann.

Returning to Lou's biography, he resumed his interrupted civilian occupation, and soon passed his bar examinations, after which he was admitted to the Pennsylvania bar.

As we all know our honored guest ex-Marine Sgt. Louis Feldmann is an attorney of high professional standing and reputation, being a member of county, State, and National bar associations, and admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In his professional career, Lou has behind him an excellent record of public service, as district attorney of Luzerne County from 1951 to 1955.

Such a career is enough to keep any man busy, and reduce his community and organizational activity to a minimum, but Lou Feldmann has been so active in organizations, local, State, and National, that some people would probably be surprised to hear that he is a practicing lawyer.

Here in Hazleton, he is a member of the advisory board of the Salvation Army.

Chairman of the board of Catholic Charities, and a member of the Hazleton Educational Council.

He has been president both of the Hazleton Kiwanis Club and of Hazleton Mental Health, Inc., an organization devoted to the problems of mental health and their solution.

In 1956, at the request of Gov. George M. Leader, Lou served as a member of a State conference concerning mental health.

Strongly conscious of the danger to our country inherent in the current tendencies of juvenile delinquency and neglect by parents and other adults of their social and civic responsibilities our distinguished guest has given of his time and energy in touring the Nation in behalf of an energetic and practical approach to these problems.

He has gained national prominence in urging wider participation by citizens in public affairs on both the community and national levels.

In short, he has pleaded for a sympathetic and positive approach to the problems of youth.

But, though these activities would seem to make a more than full career for any man, it is within the organization of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States that Lou Feldmann has been most active and outstanding.

Shortly after his return from overseas duty in World War II he joined the local post, No. 589, of the VFW and was soon elected its commander.

Proving his outstanding leadership he later became commander of the Anthracite Counties Council.

The representative of Pennsylvania VFW then recognized Lou's ability and understanding of the veteran problem by electing him as judge advocate of the Department of Pennsylvania, then vice commander of the Department of Pennsylvania, and finally in 1950 he was elected commander of the Department of Pennsylvania.

In 1951–52 he served as a member of the national council for administration, representing the Departments of New York and Pennsylvania.

In 1957, he was elected as junior vice commander in chief.

He became senior vice commander in chief in 1958.

In September of this year at Los Angeles the delegates representing nearly 1½ million oversea veterans selected him unanimously as their leader.

Therefore, tonight we honor Lou Feldmann as the commander in chief of a group of fighting men who compose the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

In bestowing upon Lou Feldmann the highest honor possible the membership of the VFW recognized particularly the extraordinary leadership that he demonstrated for 8 years as chairman of the VFW National Loyalty Day committee.

As chairman of this committee he distinguished himself as the leader of a group of patriots in the battle against communism in America and in the promotion of loyalty and responsible citizenship by our people.

As a symbol of this patriotic ambition—through Lou Feldman's efforts—it was my privilege to sponsor in Congress Loyalty Day legislation and to have the pleasure of seeing the measure enacted into law by proclaiming May 1 annually as Loyalty Day.

Like most veterans, our friend Lou Feldmann is well aware that our patriotism, like our family feeling, is best if it spreads out beyond narrow limits.

Therefore, he has been a leader, as chairman of the VFW Loyalty Day committee, in promoting the VFW pilgrimage projects that, in 1955 and 1957, were carried out in conjunction with President Eisenhower's "people to people" world friendship program.

Scores of VFW members visited countries of Europe and Latin America, under these projects, helping to promote better understanding between the United States and other free nations.

Under Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann, it is comforting to know that we can look to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to continue as a mighty sentinel in the United States, yes. A mighty sentinel advocating responsible thought and feeling for meeting the problems of a divided world, and for leading the free world both to greater freedom and to security and peace.

The Nation needs, I believe, more men of the energy, the high morality, the sense of neighborhood and public responsibility that characterize Louis G. Feldmann.

When I contemplate his character and career, I am reminded of the noble words of the poet, Josiah Gilbert Holland, in his prayer for great men to meet the needs of our country in a time of little men and widespread corruption and selfishness:

"God give us men. A time like this demands strong minds, stout hearts, true faith and ready hands; men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who express opinions and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie."

The Suez Canal and the World Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in this, a year in which many critical issues face the Congress of the United States and in which there will be less time than usual for consideration, there exists a danger that many important questions will not get the attention they deserve.

One such important question deals with the $56 million loan recently granted the United Arab Republic by the World Bank. The money was sought for the widening and deepening of the Suez Canal, and was granted despite the U.A.R.'s flagrant disregard of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 and other agreements whose purposes are to guarantee freedom of use of the waterway to the vessels of all nations.

There is widespread concern in the Nation today over this loan and the State Department's favorable attitude to it. There is concern because the State Department's posture in this matter seems to contradict the February 20, 1957, statement of President Eisenhower which said that if Egypt violates the U.N. armistice agreement or other international obligations, "this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations."

The fact today is that Egypt will not allow passage of Israeli shipping through the canal. And, in return for its illegal blockade, the U.A.R. receives $56 million from an international lending agency in which the United States is one-third owner.

Now, we all are aware that the Government of the United States has no direct relationship with the World Bank. U.S. participation in the Bank was

authorized by the Congress and the United States holds about one-third of the stock; but the Bank is an independent institution, and there really is nothing the Congress can do with regard to the granting, or refusal of a loan.

At the same time, however, it would have been possible for the Eisenhower administration to make a realistic appraisal of the implications of an attitude favorable to the loan. The State Department has defended its attitude by saying that to inject noneconomical considerations into the World Bank's assessment of credit worthiness of an applicant would endanger the Bank's integrity.

This is a debatable proposition. However, I cannot help but believe that many people in the world find it difficult to square the U.S.-announced position of upholding the principle of freedom of transit through the Suez Canal with a position of no resistance to a loan of this size made to the nation that restricts freedom of passage.

Paul O. Peters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a beloved figure is absent from Capitol Hill as we begin this session of Congress, and there are many of us who miss him deeply.

Paul O. Peters passed away, quietly, at his home in Arlington on December 30 and now is resting in Arlington National Cemetery.

For the past 10 years he has edited a daily news bulletin to which many of us subscribed. His skillful analysis of Government budgets and agency programs have often appeared in the pages of the RECORD. We will miss his daily calls and the service he rendered.

Paul Peters will be missed also in the great American conservation movement, of which he was a leader for many years. He was known throughout the Nation for his speeches and writings on conservation subjects. He served for many years as a national director of the Izaak Walton League and was instrumental in the establishment of the excellent Izaak Walton League facilities in nearby northern Virginia.

He will be missed by many who knew him only as "Porcupine, Jr.," the nom de plume he used in witty political columns that appeared in a number of journals.

His was a long and remarkable career. I have known few men who had as vast and varied a fund of knowledge or used their knowledge as wisely.

Mr. Peters' memory will be especially cherished in my home area by reason of his great generosity to the College of Wooster at Wooster, Ohio. Late last spring he announced his decision to give his library of some 90,000 volumes and various historical and art objects to the library of that college. He traveled to Wooster to announce that decision, and on his return expressed to many of us his great satisfaction with the institution.

Earlier he had been fearful that his collection, one of the most complete in existence on governmental and political subjects, would be dispersed at his death. It gave him great pleasure and satisfaction to know that it would be held together and made available for students of government and politics not only of the College of Wooster but many others who may be expected to visit Wooster to refer to the collection.

A new library is under construction at the college and special provision is being made for the Paul O. Peters Room which will house his collection. At the time of his death he was looking forward to consultations with the architect on the design of that room. He had already arranged the shipment of a part of the library.

One could recite many highlights of a long and useful life. Mr. Peters' investigations of political corruption in St. Louis won his newspaper a Pulitzer prize. His service as an investigator for the Small Business Committee of the House, under the chairmanship of Hon. Walter C. Ploeser, and later for the General Accounting Office, saved Americans many millions of tax dollars.

I like to recall an investigative trip he made to Alaska shortly after World War II. Though he was gone several weeks, his expense voucher asked for only $18. He did not believe in wasting tax dollars and he wasted none himself. He had made the trip hitchhiking on military aircraft, bunking in military barracks, and spending only a few dollars for film and cabfare.

He was one of the founders of the Outdoor Writers Association about 20 years ago and regularly attended its meetings.

Though his many friends miss him acutely, we take satisfaction in knowing that his many contributions in the various fields that interested him have built a memorial that will never fade.

Stevenson and Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this is in the nature of a plea that American public figures be aware of the impact of their statements upon our friends and allies abroad.

Last month, the United Daily News of Taipei, Formosa, carried an editorial commenting on Mr. Adlai Stevenson's recent article in the magazine Foreign Affairs. Mr. Stevenson suggested recognition of Red China, if the Reds grant certain concessions.

These suggestions have shocked the people of the Republic of China, and the newspaper asks whether his utterance is a reflection of his personal opinion or that of the American Democratic Party. I think Mr. Stevenson owes the people in free China at least that much explanation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the editorial.

To clarify my own position in this matter of recognition of Red China, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I wrote recently and which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin and other newspapers, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMENT ON STEVENSON'S RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE FAR EAST

Mr. Adlai Stevenson, leader of the American Democratic Party, recently published an article in Foreign Affairs, a quarterly magazine, dealing with the current American foreign policy. In this article, the two-time U.S. Democratic presidential candidate, aside from making an overall review of the present American foreign policy, advanced some absurd recommendations concerning American policy to be pursued in the Far East.

Mr. Stevenson said: "World peace appears an unattainable goal as long as Communist China is barred from international society." "It is clear that no general control of disarmament has any value unless it includes Communist China, and it is difficult to see how Red China can accept international control when it is not formally a member of international society." He further suggested: "The West, through Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, explore the possibility of peace in the area threatened by Red China through a broad settlement of issues—including Formosa—by negotiation, not by force." As to how this goal can be reached, he suggested that both sides make concessions. The concessions he expected the Chinese Communist regime to make include the following: (1) Accept the international disarmament control; (2) end the threat of force against Formosa and infiltration and subversion in southeast Asia; (3) accept a peaceful settlement on border controversy with India; (4) agree to a free election under U.N. supervision in Korea; and (5) agree to a plebiscite held under U.N. supervision for the inhabitants of Formosa to determine their own destiny. In exchange for these Communist concessions, he suggested that the West: (1) End American embargo on Red China's admission to the United States (not to be confused with diplomatic recognition); (2) persuade the Chinese Nationalist Government to evacuate from Quemoy and Matsu; and (3) include Korea and Japan in the atom-free zone and area of controlled disarmament. In other words, Mr. Stevenson's recommendations imply a sacrifice of Quemoy and Matsu, of the government of Free China in Taiwan, and of our right of representation in the United Nations as a means of inducing the Peiping Communist regime to give up its expansion policy and achieving an overall settlement in the Far East.

Back in September of 1952 when Mr. Stevenson first took part in the American presidential election, he proposed in a speech he made in the State of Oregon that, upon cessation of the Korean war, the United States accord diplomatic recognition to Red China. In another speech he made in a Democratic Party meeting held in Chicago on September 16, 1953, upon his return from a global tour, he said: "If we are to negotiate with Communists, we must have sincerity." Since then, we

have not heard Mr. Stevenson utter any strong opinion in regard to China. We presumed that he, after he had been twice defeated in the American presidential election, must have realized the true desire and wish of the American people, and that he therefore refrained from making any further utterance on the China problem. The fact that he made the above-mentioned recommendations in a recent speech shows that he still adheres to his appeasement policy toward the Communists. It also shows his lack of farsightedness and personal prejudice toward China. His recommendations are even worse than the contents of the much-criticized Conlon report recently published by U.S. Congress.

We do not wish to evince our disrespect toward a prominent party leader of our most close ally nor shall we criticize him with stinging words. Nevertheless, we do regret that Mr. Stevenson as a leading figure in American politics should have advanced such absurd recommendations of policy toward a nation to which his own country is allied by a mutual defense treaty. Whether his utterance is a reflection of his personal opinion or that of the American Democratic Party as a whole, we solemnly say that such opinion is erroneous, unrealistic, and impracticable.

SENATORS DEBATE FOREIGN POLICY—SCOTT SUPPORTS STAND ON CHINA

(By Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, Pennsylvania)

The foreign policy of the United States is a continuing thing. Its principal objective—and it may seem strange that this needs saying—is to protect and further the best interests of the United States.

The vast body of Americans and most leaders of both political parties have supported the basic objectives of American foreign policy as they have been enunciated by President Eisenhower over the past 7 years.

But our foreign policy has its critics and they come bubbling to the surface most vigorously during election years when some candidates are forced to reach far out into left field in order to create issues.

Since we have very important elections scheduled for November of 1960, all citizens would be well advised to observe carefully criticisms which do arise on foreign policy and judge the statements accordingly.

I remember when I was running for election to the U.S. Senate last year I had to defend some administration policies which by now are generally accepted as being the wisest that could have been followed at the time. "The island of Quemoy is threatened but the issue transcends the value of one island off the China coast," I said in one Pennsylvania address, "The issue is whether the Reds will be able to shoot their way into all of Asia. The Communists understand strength and we are showing that in the Formosa Straits."

Those who, a year ago, urged that we yield the tiny island of Quemoy to the Red Chinese because it was a "liability" are very silent today. Our policy of meeting force with force sobered up the trigger-happy Communists.

Instead they turned their guns and saboteurs on countries like Tibet, Laos, and India where opposition was not so certain nor so dangerous to the Communist aims.

IN DIFFERENT FORM

The Red China issue is coming up again, but in a different form.

Some people are urging our Government to grant diplomatic recognition to Red China (which we have not done since that regime came into power after a bloody revolution in 1949), and to agree to admit that country into the United Nations. (The Republic of China on Formosa, not the Red regime, is a U.N. member.)

These people maintain that recognition of the Red regime in China would tend to bring it into the "family of nations," that this would exert some control over the Reds' actions, that evidence of good will on America's part would tend to encourage good will on the part of the Reds, that the Russians would begin to "come around" and why not the Red Chinese?

All of these arguments are false and I am strongly opposed either to admitting Red China into the U.N. or to granting them diplomatic recognition.

Red China is still at war with the United Nations. It still has not yet accounted for some American prisoners. In addition to barbarism against its own people, it has been guilty of grossly immoral international actions. If we did swallow our moral and ethical principles and grant recognition to the Red Chinese, what would we be accomplishing?

We would enhance their prestige. We would be delivering a body blow to the Republic of China on Formosa. We would shake the confidence of those independent nations in Asia which still have the courage to resist the Communists.

When Great Britain recognized the Red Chinese regime, this did not stop the Communists from confiscating immense British investments. And India, which has been scrupulously neutral in the East-West disputes, has for its good intentions only a growing border conflict and dead Indian soldiers.

GREATEST THREAT TO PEACE

The Red Chinese regime today is in no mood for negotiation. It wants conquest.

This regime, because of its expansionist aims and fanatical policies, constitutes probably the greatest single threat to peace in the world today.

When the leaders of a nation—any nation—act like civilized human beings our Government is ready to cooperate. President Eisenhower has said repeatedly that he is willing to go anywhere at any time—if by so doing he could promote the cause of peace.

In the past several months we have seen considerable evidence of that policy. When Mr. Khrushchev indicated that he wanted to talk over some problems which are causing international tensions, the President immediately invited the Russian Premier to visit the United States.

General Eisenhower now plans to visit Russia himself in the near future. But we need real evidence of good intentions and the Red Chinese leaders have only to indicate their sincere desire to negotiate and they will not have to look far to find our representatives.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

We must understand that just as there is continuity to American foreign policy, so is there continuity to international problems.

The "cold war" with which we have lived for some 14 years will probably continue in one form or another for many years more.

This is not a pleasant thought. It is like being told by a doctor that we have chronic bronchitis.

We could disregard the condition or we could seek fast cure-alls. Either course of action would be foolhardy and might kill us.

Or we could learn to live with the condition and put our minds and energies to work in an all-out effort to solve the problem over whatever period of time it might take. This is the philosophy of the Eisenhower administration and I subscribe to it.

When we examine the record of President Eisenhower's two terms of office—which American voters will be doing intensively during the coming year—we must list his success in preserving world peace and justice as perhaps the greatest accomplishment of his years as President.

General Eisenhower extricated this Nation from the Korean war, kept us at peace while not yielding at any point to international communism, and now has brought the world closer to a realistic settlement of major international issues than it has been at any time since World War II.

Political Science and Physical Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the Third Industrial Nuclear Conference at Chicago, Ill., by Hon. CRAIG HOSMER, member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PHYSICAL SCIENCE

In commencing a talk, the usual order of things is a salutation of some kind. Most commonly "ladies and gentlemen" suffices. Perhaps semi-unrelated circumstances at this particular time might indicate I should start out by addressing you as "comrades." But I cannot bring myself to that.

Possibly the most accurately descriptive salutation I could use today, to this group, would be "pioneers and adventurers," since in the true and large sense—and both in relation to the economics of peaceful applications of atomic energy and the vast horizons for man's betterment just beginning to appear from the light of new knowledge—you are, indeed, and in the true sense, this modern day's "pioneers and adventurers."

Before discussing it, however, I would like to express my appreciation to the directors of the conference for permitting me, representing the membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to express my personal views on these matters of mutual concern. And, particularly, to thank Dr. Alvin Weinberg for so graciously exchanging our speaking dates here to accommodate my schedule to be with the Joint Committee at the International Atomic Energy Agency's General Conference. Al's stimulating analysis of the problems of "Burning the Sea Versus Burning the Rocks" is a treat for which I apologize for your having to wait 2 more days.

His discussion—this Industrial Nuclear Conference—in fact, any real awareness of the nonmilitary applications of atomic knowledge were not grasped by a stunned world when in 1945 this great new force burst so explosively and destructively to public view.

It came not in a gradual, evolutionary manner as have other vital forces which are part of our civilization—in a manner which man could prepare his institutions and his thinking to control, direct, harness, and accept as part of his culture—it came, rather, as a full grown technology—suddenly, from behind a secrecy curtain—to confront a vast audience—a world, which was more prepared, even, to accept a man from Mars as reality, than the apparently terrifying monster it found before it.

Fortunately, the so-called monster, for the first 5 years of its public life, at least, had a kind and benevolent keeper—the United States of America.

During these years the world knew that its destructive power would not be irresponsibly unleashed upon it. During these years the awareness gradually grew that this great

new force need not necessarily be a monster unless man made it so.

During these years—and since—man's "political scientists" have had opportunity to develop doctrines and philosophies which may fit this great force developed by man's "physical scientists" into our civilization and its cultural patterns as a factor for great good, rather than one for great evil.

I have emphasized the words "physical scientists" and "political scientists" because ask a physical scientist the question: "Where are scientific discoveries taking us?" and he will say he does not know. Often as not, he will tell you, "Ask the statesmen, the legislators, and the politicians."

Science can inform the culture to which it belongs, can contribute the tools to enhance understanding, can constantly remind of the universal nature of knowledge and of knowledge's refusal to be fettered. But it cannot take over control of a democracy without destroying the democratic spirit. The rules and regulations have to be worked out, in the main, by students and practitioners of the law, the political scientists.

Underlining this point of view—and in pleading both for public understanding and for public courage as our power over nature increases—Teller and Latter, in their book "Our Nuclear Future," explained it thusly:

"The real source of important decisions in our country is the people. We believe that this is rightly so, and we believe that it is not proper if scientists take over any essential part of these decisions."

And so, as it has been enunciated in theory—so has it been put to practice in our country.

Hardly had the wraps of military secrecy been taken off the atom, when in 1946 the Congress of the United States, representing the people, created within itself the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as the legislative instrumentality to deal with the task of interweaving nuclear science and political science.

The task has proved both constant and complicated in the past. Undoubtedly it will continue to merit those same adjectives for many years to come.

Without exhausting, but merely hinting at some of the factors which make it so, let me list now—and later examine—just a few of them.

First, proper allocation of responsibilities between Federal, State, and local governments.

Second, adequate provision for health and safety.

Third, maintenance of proper economic relationships in a competitive society.

Fourth, protection of the public's stake in the Government's investment.

Fifth, the necessity for accelerating peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Sixth, considerations of defense and international relations.

And, incidentally, let me caution, that although these and many more factors may be conveniently listed as separate items, they are, in fact, often as numerous, interdependent and interrelated as the parts and pieces of a nuclear reactor.

The political scientist in conceiving workable legislation and policies often faces a task in his work comparable in complication and exactitude to that of the naval reactor designer about which Capt. R. V. Laney told the Joint Committee:

"Each naval reactor project has a specific end in view. Because the building time for the ship and for the reactor, and the reactor plant components are different, the ship is partly built when the plant and its components are still being designed. The ship's characteristics are frozen in advance. Her power requirements are very sharply defined. The myriad of parts, pieces, controls, and equipment must, the first time they operate in unison, operate correctly. There is a very high premium on success."

And so, indeed, there is a very high premium on success for the highly complicated operations in the field of political science carried on by the Joint Atomic Committee.

It was for this reason, combined with necessary weapons security that the committee was established as a Joint Committee of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, composed of nine members from each body, rather than as separate committees of each body as is the normal procedure. These considerations also had something to do with the size of the Joint Committee, which is about half the number of members of the usual congressional committee.

This kind of organization has led to infrequent changes in committee membership and has permitted the buildup of a tremendous reservoir of knowledge and practical experience amongst its membership, five of whom have served on the committee since its inception.

Our chairman, Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico, combining position, knowledge, long experience, seniority, and legislative skill is one of the world's acknowledged leaders in this field. And, I can pay him this tribute sincerely, since we are members of opposing political parties.

By law, the Joint Committee is required to make continuing studies of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy.

The committee also has a duty to investigate and report to the Congress—and thus to the people—recommendations with respect to matters within its jurisdiction. It is in compliance with this requirement that the Joint Committee regularly holds hearings which, to the greatest extent possible within the bounds of security, are open to the public—and thus give the public at large an opportunity to become knowledgeable of the available facts and special problems in the atomic energy field.

Not all of our hearings can be open, of course. Security requirements necessitate that about half of them be held behind closed doors in executive session. In most instances, however, when executive sessions involve major policy decisions, after deletion of classified information, a record of the committee's deliberations is published and distributed.

Realistically, the Joint Committee would still perform an invaluable public service if it performed no further function than such dissemination of authoritative information to the American public and to the people of the world—information which permits laymen to stabilize their hopes and their fears at some realistic point between the depths of utter despair and the heights of unreasonable expectation, which, too often, have alternately characterized the public approach to problems of the nuclear age.

At this point—after such a buildup for the Joint Committee—I would be less than candid if I did not make the frank admission that neither is the Joint Atomic Committee's chambers a latter-day temple for 18 living gods—nor do the committee's 18 members regard themselves as such—at least, there is an honest division of opinion on the matter.

The ground to be covered in exercising the committee's responsibilities is of such magnitude that, in carrying out other legislative duties, members may be well informed, although they may not always be as expertly informed upon particular matters at hand for action as they would like to be.

This gap is filled reasonably well in two ways: By the breaking down of the committee into several subcommittees, allowing certain specializations amongst members, and, by the assistance of an able committee staff, supplemented from time to time by outside consultants and experts from various government departments and agencies.

Although the Joint Committee has often exercised remarkable vision and imaginative leadership in formulating national nuclear policies—an outstanding example of which was its insistence upon development of nuclear fusion—it has sometimes overlooked action on more mundane and less dramatic problems, which, nevertheless, deserve attention.

In this category—and purely as a personal opinion—I submit the organizational problem of the Atomic Energy Commission itself, as well as the Joint Committee's relationships with the Commission.

Perhaps I am wrong, and again I emphasize it is my own, and not the committee's opinion, but possibly we should be thinking in terms of an atomic energy agency, or even a department—rather than an Atomic Energy Commission to direct the executive department's administration of atomic energy functions.

From the management standpoint, multiple membership bodies generally have proved less able to direct effectively than where a single head is provided, with perhaps an advisory board to assist in policy matters as distinguished from sharing exercise of administrative authority.

Again, expressing personal opinion, I sometimes feel that as between members of the Joint Committee and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, there exists only a shadowy and blurred understanding of which policy matters are to be decided by the committee and which by the Commission, even sometimes as to what are matters of policy and what are matters of administration. This needs clarification by force of law rather than force of personalities and custom.

A need also exists for a clearer definition of the relative precedence between the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, various ad hoc committees, advisers and others in speaking with and advising the President on atomic energy matters.

Unfortunately, my criticism as to these points, and other which I have not mentioned, are subject to a fatal fault—I do not have the authority of pat solutions at hand to backstop them. But perhaps, the validity of the criticism, as well as the solutions if any are needed, could become apparent if our committee finds time to delve into the matter by way of its usual complete and thorough hearings procedure.

The process of these hearings is a somewhat interesting one. Some of you have testified before the committee—always with skill, but often with trepidation—others may have been in one way or another influenced by their outcome.

Annual hearings are held in connection with the AEC's yearly expenditure authorization. Also, the Atomic Energy Act requires during the first 60 days of each session of Congress hearing to receive information concerning the development, growth and state of the atomic energy industry. These are the so-called "202" hearings named for the section of the act requiring them. It is the chairman's prerogative to select additional subjects of inquiry, either in support of particular legislative proposals, or of a more general nature.

The committee staff carefully lines up the panel of witnesses. It aims at obtaining the best informed experts who should be heard, as well as permitting those who insist upon being heard to testify.

The somewhat anomalous position of the Joint Committee—being a creature of neither House, but of both—has thus far prevented it from obtaining a regular room for public hearings. As a consequence rooms must be borrowed from other committees, accounting for your inconvenience and ours

in shifting between numerous rooms during the course of any extensive hearing.

Usually, before the hearing starts, the committee meets in executive session for a preparatory skull session. During the hearings, those of you who have attended, have noted that seldom does a witness proceed very far before he is interrupted by questions and possibly even a longwinded discussion among the committee itself.

This may be either on the subject at hand, or all too often—being the political animals we are—on something more related to the day's political headlines. Nonetheless, it is usually a fairly well informed discussion, irrespective of the subject.

I can assure you that the Member of Congress is not—repeat, not—a member of our committee—and this really happened—the one who listened very intently to a learned briefing on atomic energy—then, being the question period, asked:

"Doctor, what is the native habitat of the atom?"

Following a hearing, the staff prepares a draft report summarizing the information obtained and setting forth the committee's proposed conclusions and recommendations. I believe you would be amazed to see the care and attention committee members devote to this document. Many, many long hours are spent refining them around the green-clothed table in the somewhat shabby committee executive room in the Capitol at the base of the cornerstone laid by President George Washington.

Every effort is made to write a report that is acceptable to all members, that is fair, knowledgeable, and of benefit to some phase of our nuclear effort. Only when a somewhat fundemental divergence of philosophical opinion arises, do we issue a report containing separate or supplemental views to those expressed by the majority of members.

Well, so much for the processes of these political scientists—I would like to turn now to those complicated factors with which they deal that I listed earlier.

The first two I mentioned concern problems of health and safety and the proper division of responsibilities between Federal, State, and local governments under our constitutional system. These I will discuss together, both because of their interrelation and because discussing them together is a particularly forceful way to emphasize that solving most problems of the nuclear age is not a matter of totally new concepts, but rather, one of adapting old institutions and old cultural patterns to new forces.

In their wisdom and their fear of power concentration, the Founding Fathers not only split and divided the functions of Government between legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, but made a further division of power between the Federal Government and the States.

Development of nuclear weapons was clearly a function of the Federal Government under its constitutional responsibility "to provide for the common defense." Under conditions through 1945, it was clearly a Federal responsibility to corral and nationalize every gram of fissionable material going into these devices, from mining the ore to the finished product.

All aspects of the production flow, including the health and safety of workers and the public at large, were thus clearly an exclusive function of the Federal Government.

With the advent of peace and the projection of atomic matters into the civilian side of our life, this clear-cut delineation of exclusive Federal authority faded—and faded fast.

If nuclear materials were to be utilized in civilian pursuits, they had to be placed in civilian hands. The law had to be changed, and it was changed to permit this.

In civilian hands, health and safety consideration pertaining to fissionable material came to an area where the States and other subdivisions—not the Federal Government—commonly exercised the major health and safety responsibilities. Pressures built up for such a shift of responsibilities to the States.

In order to exercise them, State and local authorities had to acquire knowledge and techniques that theretofore had been a Federal monopoly. This was permitted.

On the other side of the coin, certain factors appeared mitigating against this transfer to the States. American business and industry, seeking to employ the new technology throughout the country, could not stand a burden of complying with 50 separate, differing State health and safety regulations, let alone the multitudinously complex situation if all America's town councils were to come up their own unique ideas of what is safe and what is not safe conduct with regard to atomic energy—and each town cop could, in his turn, decide whether or not industry was complying.

It seems almost impossible that an answer could be found adapting our old institutions to this kind of situation. Yet, it is being found, gradually applied, and, I think, rather successfully.

Congress has just passed enabling legislation and today—at AEC headquarters in Germantown—groundwork is being laid for the initial transfer of regulatory authority over AEC licensed isotope applications to the States as rapidly as each State can show it is equipped to do the job and agrees to do it.

In order to avoid nonuniformity, it is required that a State's regulation must be either identical or compatible with AEC's. There must also be an adequate, trained staff at the State level, which AEC will help to prepare through recruitment and training programs. Once an official transfer is accomplished, there will be no dual, Federal-State jurisdiction in the field covered.

From this pattern of responsibility shift in the field of isotope application, it is easy to project similar shifts in the future with respect to reactors, fuel processing and in other appropriate areas.

Turning now to two more of the difficult factors faced by the political scientists in adjusting our lives and institutions to the nuclear age, we again find that discussing them together is more valuable and more feasible than trying to analyze them separately. They are the economic relationships of nuclear industries in a competitive society, and, the protection of the people's vast investment required to bring about the nuclear age.

To date, some $25 billion have been invested in nuclear science by the people of America. This does not include other billions buried in related Government programs. It is just the money appropriated to date to the Manhattan District, and its successor, the AEC.

How, and in what manner can the knowledge and the hardware so expensively acquired be utilized so that the people receive back the maximum return on their public dollars?

Can, and should, this return be made in dollar amounts, or is it better and more practical that it filter back, somehow, through improved living standards, better food and medical care, better and possibly cheaper products of industry, and in other ways?

Should the Government seek to monopolize, say, the nuclear-electricity production field, and recoup those $25 billion by a surcharge over the cost of power production?

Could it do so if it wanted to?

How, and in what manner, can this Government pass on to competitive American industry knowledge and technology of nuclear application in a manner that gives no one corporation a practical monopoly, but stimulates amongst industry the normal competition basic to a free enterprise economic system?

These questions open up a Pandora's box of problems that make the Federal-State jurisdictional question elementary in comparison. Yet they are the questions that inhere in—and require either the answering or the ignoring—each time Congress deals with almost any aspect of industrial development of atomic energy by free, competitive enterprise.

In these regards, applications involving radioisotopes have been amongst the easier with which to deal.

Cost of production, plus capital and overhead price tags can be calculated and affixed to products supplied by Government installations. Thus a fair return to the public Treasury can be assured.

Although general industrial, medical and other peacetime isotope applications are expensive, their price in relation to most of American industry's ability to pay is not exorbitant. There is also the practical assurance that when it is paid, the investment will make a profit. Thus, in this field, the factors exist which stimulate competition and stifle monopoly, all to the good of the American public which enjoys the fruits of this remarkably productive economic system.

But when you get over into other atomic energy applications by American industry, the situation changes. For instance, economic production of electricity from nuclear fuels. It is a tremendously expensive proposition, not only in the research and development stages, but in capital plant costs. Some of the needed research and development already has been done in Government laboratories or under Government contract. Industry may build on that—but how—and how much should it pay for it?

Even if some one industrial giant could carry the whole accomplishment from beginning to end—with its own capital—acquiring its own patents, the result would be that giant's monopoly, which is contrary to the interests of a competitive society. How is this to be avoided?

I have raised more questions than I have answered on these points—simply because there seems to be no universally applicable solutions that can be painted on with a legislative brush. Each time Congress has dealt with the subject, whether it has been on the question of patents, of the various reactor demonstration rounds in the nuclear power program, or otherwise, it, too, has had to leave to time the answer to parts of both the economic competition and the protection of the public's stake questions.

This has not been wholly because those problems are, in and of themselves, insoluble. But often because—in a broad view of the national interest—their solution has deserved a lesser priority than the fifth complicating factor I listed in the political scientists' labors—that involving a necessity to accelerate peacetime uses of atomic energy.

That point needs no belaboring before a group such as this. There is not only a humane necessity that mankind be brought all the peaceful benefits of the atom at the soonest possible moment, but there is a vitally compelling necessity to do so in this era of deadly competition for survival between us, the inheritors and beneficiaries of Western Civilization, and those behind the Iron Curtain to whom freedom, liberty, and justice are evils to be ruthlessly exterminated.

Thus it is that many of our programs, much of our public expenditures, and an overriding consideration in our approach to peaceful atomic energy application, stems from this basic, though regrettable fact of international life. These positive and peaceful applications of nuclear force are as fundamental to ultimate victory as is the effec-

tive capability to use that power in weapons configurations if should ever the need arise.

My mention of the committee meeting almost half its time in executive session is ample indication that defensive weaponry and international relations deserves a major position in the list of complications confronting the political scientist dealing with nuclear science.

What precise part the Joint Committee plays in the weapons program neither can—nor should—be discussed outside its constantly guarded committee room. It is suffice to say that not only is the membership currently and fully informed of all developments—technical, tactical and strategical—but it also exercises a considerably inventive leadership as regards them.

There is full appreciation that without the added power of nuclear weapons capability the free world cannot match the Communist bloc's overwhelming manpower superiority in the use of conventional weapons.

It was upon this premise that the committee took the leadership in suggesting—and assumed the burden of obtaining public concurrence—to the recent exchange of information with NATO allies which will allow them effectively to use nuclear weapons supplied by the United States if hostilities should break out. Yet, which does not afford the nonnuclear power technical information which might permit them to join the Nuclear Club.

At the same time, the committee has exercised its influence with respect to test-ban negotiations, and related disarmament negotiations, so that within the requirements for sufficient strength to resist either nuclear or conventional blackmail by the U.S.S.R., this Nation can not only follow, but as well proudly lead in the effort to relax world tensions.

In conclusion let me say this: I have dwelt long upon the political scientist's place and responsibilities in this modern age of unique opportunity and unique danger. I have done so simply because I lack the technical background to discuss with you, the physical scientist, your own work, on your own terms, in your own language. Your work—the physical scientist's work—is that which is true and basic to mankind throughout the ages past and the ages to come.

My work—the political scientist's—is more transitory in effect, and as a consequence less meaningful to mankind.

I salute you for your accomplishments—I thank you for your dedication.

Area Redevelopment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the flight of industry from many of our larger cities is a problem of increasing proportion. If we are to sustain these cities as healthy and profitable economic and industrialized complexes, it will be necessary that we establish programs for modernization and rehabilitation of facilities which have long since outlived their usefulness.

Unless we do this, we may find that before too many years these cities with their large populations will have reached the point of industrial decay where they will be unable to support the large number of our citizens who continue to live there.

These facts demand a prompt and realistic program such as would be authorized by the area redevelopment bill.

I am hopeful that this bill will be brought to the floor for a vote in the very near future.

Wheat Stabilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of this body a letter which I directed to the Secretary of Agriculture on January 5, 1960, calling for a wheat stabilization plan for agriculture. The letter is as follows:

LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

During the congressional recess, it was my privilege to talk with hundreds of wheat producers not only in Kansas, but in other great wheat growing States.

I returned to Washington with one definite and strong impression; Wheat growers believe that something should be done to help correct the present wheat situation, and at least 75 percent of them believe this can best be accomplished by the passage of a wheat stabilization program.

Many taxpayers are very unhappy with the present wheat surplus, which is stored in warehouses at a great cost to them. They want Congress to act.

I am convinced that wheat farmers will overwhelmingly and enthusiastically support legislation to put into effect a wheat stabilization plan such as that developed by the National Association of Wheat Growers, and introduced in the Congress last year.

In all honesty, I must also report that my talks with hundreds of farmers failed to uncover any significant support for your plan to abolish the parity concept and base supports on the average price of the past 3 years, resulting in a price of about $1.30 a bushel for wheat.

But farmers will fight hard for a wheat stabilization program which provides: (1) Quotas and allotments based on a bushelage basis; (2) full parity supports for wheat going into domestic consumption; and (3) no supports at all for all other wheat.

This plan has several advantages. It affords the farmer an opportunity to receive true parity for that part of his crop sold on the domestic market, where he must pay full parity for everything he buys. It enables him to sell on the world market at world prices. It curtails surpluses and sizable storage costs to the Government. And it should return wheat production to the historic wheat-producing areas.

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to support a wheat stabilization program. Congress will pass such a plan easily with administration support. I am sure the threat of a veto would be sufficient to kill the legislation.

We need wheat legislation. It is evident Congress is not going to approve a bill such as you have recommended. And the administration has indicated time and time again it will not accept a program based on high fixed supports.

Therefore, it seems to me the wheat stabilization plan offers the basis for getting together on a workable program. The National Wheat Growers Association and State associations throughout the wheat area have endorsed such a plan. I believe the National Grange will gladly support the program, as well as the Farmers Union. Unfortunately, officials of the American Farm Bureau Federation continue to oppose the plan, despite its strong support among rank-and-file members.

If you would recommend legislation of this type, I believe it could be passed by Congress in short order and we would dispose of a troublesome and vexing problem in a manner that would be fair to the farmers and to the taxpayers.

But if you insist upon recommending once more your plan for lower prices without any hope of great production in the near future, I am sure the present stalemate will continue. No one can benefit from a continued stalemate.

I urge you to give this proposal serious consideration. It offers one way of achieving positive results.

The Pennsylvania Electric Co. in Cooperation with the Pittsburgh Section of the American Nuclear Society Sponsored Teachers' Day at Erie, Pa., October 3, 1959, and Altoona, Pa., October 10, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of orienting the science teachers of Pennsylvania's high schools in the field of peaceful uses of the atom, the Pennsylvania Electric Co., in cooperation with the Pittsburgh section of the American Nuclear Society, conducted two interesting symposiums, one at Erie, Pa., October 3, 1959, and the other at Altoona, Pa., October 10, 1959.

Both of the symposiums were well attended and consumed the entire day. As a participant in these two symposiums it was my privilege to deliver the following address titled "Human Energy: A Necessity in the Atomic Age."

HUMAN ENERGY: A NECESSITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(By Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, on the occasion of Nuclear Science Day sponsored by the Pittsburgh section of the American Nuclear Science Society, Altoona, Pa., Saturday, October 10)

When a Member of Congress speaks to a gathering of science teachers about atomic energy, it seems to me only fair that he should first describe the margin of his authority.

I cannot pose as an expert on the theory of atomic energy, but am simply a Member of your National Legislative Body who has enjoyed special advantages in serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and has continued under subsequent legislation to make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy.

Our committee is kept fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.

Legislation relating primarily to the Commission or to atomic energy matters is referred to the committee.

The membership is composed of nine Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House of Representatives.

The release of atomic energy presented to mankind perhaps the greatest challenge of all time.

Either we must rise to heights of international cooperation undreamed of in the past, or we shall see our civilization, and a great part of all humanity itself, wiped out in a new war in which the atomic bomb will be the chief, perhaps the only, weapon; a war which, in horror, will be beyond imagination—more terrible than anything mankind has experienced in the past.

And conversely, if we can manage to live peaceably together, the energy the atom will give us will become a limitless source of power.

The cost will be slight in proportion to the usefulness.

The arrival of the atomic age made most of our past thinking about military and naval strategy obsolete.

Yet if we can only manage through the years to use atomic energy for constructive and not destructive purposes—what a vision of the future we can see.

The scientists who worked on the bomb devoted themselves strictly to that task.

It was the consensus among them that engines using atomic power were not more than 10 or 20 years away.

They were entirely correct.

I recall that following a meeting of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee held aboard the *Nautilus* on March 20, 1955, I predicted that nuclear-powered submarines soon would replace most surface warships other than carriers and cruisers, and that large surface craft such as carriers and cruisers would be powered by nuclear engines.

You explain to the young folks in your classrooms that the atomic energy of a pound of coal exceeds its energy, when it is burned, by more than a billion to one.

Someone has pointed out that the atoms in a dime would drive a train a thousand miles; a glass of water would send the *Queen Mary* half a dozen times across the ocean—and so on.

We cannot forget, ladies and gentlemen, that we must walk before we can run.

We cannot solve the stupendous new problems which confront the world unless we prove ourselves capable of solving the lesser, stubborn questions which were facing us before the first atomic bomb went off on that rainy July morning in New Mexico.

For long and weary years we have been devoted to defensive purposes.

We have been trying desperately, and much of the time against heavy odds, to keep alive human freedom and the dignity of the individual.

In the past decade the United States has taken enormous strides in technological development.

Whole new vistas have been opened as a result of these advances and consequently the demand for skilled talent in almost all fields of endeavor is unprecedented.

This has been particularly evident in the fields of science and engineering where shortages in some instances have reached the critical stage.

At a time when science and technology are the key both to military superiority and to economic strength, the popular consciousness of the need for men and women to man the laboratories, the drawing boards, and the production lines is essential and understandable.

These statements form the basic opinion of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As a member of that subcommittee, I have been vitally interested in the solution to our shortage of scientific and engineering manpower.

In April and May of 1956, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings and subsequently has issued several reports.

It is important that we recognize our serious shortages are not entirely signs of failure.

There are indications of success.

A way of life has been created in which the demands made for superior skills in every field have become so tremendous that growth and expansion have become constant elements in our normal pattern of living.

A society has been created in which progress is not simply a matter of occasional spurts and short-term crises.

Rapid progress has become a normal part of our national life.

The skilled manpower to keep up with this steadily and rapidly advancing march of progress will be in demand for years to come.

I think it is important that we understand the basic principles which have guided Congress in the formulation of the legislation that has created and given authority to the Atomic Energy Commission, particularly in the light of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission was established by the Atomic Energy Act to effectuate the declared policy of the United States that, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security, the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to promote world peace—improve the general welfare, increase the standard of living, and strengthen free competition in private enterprise.

The Atomic Energy Act provides for the following major programs relating to atomic energy:

1. A program of conducting, assisting, and fostering research and development in order to encourage maximum scientific and industrial progress;

2. A program for the dissemination of unclassified scientific and technical information and for the control, dissemination, and declassification of restricted data, subject to appropriate safeguards, so as to encourage scientific and industrial progress;

3. A program for Government control of the possession, use, and production of atomic energy and special nuclear material so directed as to make the maximum contribution to the common defense and security and the national welfare;

4. A program to encourage widespread participation in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes to the maximum extent consistent with the common defense and security and with the health and safety of the public;

5. A program of international cooperation to promote the common defense and security and to make available to cooperating nations the benefits of peaceful applications of atomic energy as widely as expanding technology and considerations of the common defense and security will permit; and

6. A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies and programs, with international arrangements, and with agreements for cooperation, which will enable the Congress to be currently informed so as to take further legislative action as may be appropriate.

The amendment of 1954 to the original act laid down the principles that have guided our Government's policies and actions in fostering development of a private atomic energy industry, and in furthering worldwide cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The revision of the basic atomic energy law was sought for three reasons:

1. To permit the entry of private enterprise into the field of atomic power.

2. To make it possible to give the Nation's allies sufficient information to train troops in the use of atomic weapons.

3. To pave the way for the international atomic energy pool previously proposed by the President.

Under the amended law, private companies may apply to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for permission to construct atomic powerplants.

The Atomic Energy Commission has relied upon industry to exert its initiative in the atomic energy industry and, as the record shows, private companies have moved ahead in many aspects of the industry.

Moreover, industry at all times has supported the Commission through consultation and advice in planning actions and policies to encourage further participation by industry.

All the research programs of the Commission, except for those areas primarily of military importance, are conducted in support of the progress in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

This includes:

(a) The broad underlying structure of research in biological and medical fields which contribute to safety and health.

(b) It includes the fundamental work in the fields of chemistry and physics—of metallurgy and materials—of controlled thermonuclear reactions.

(c) It includes research on fundamentals of reactor design, reactor materials and processes, and reactor safety, as well as in the specific fields of attaining economic power.

We are, in essence, engaged in a battle for brainpower.

The price of progress and prosperity continues to be an increasing effort to develop our intellectual resources to the maximum.

It is almost universally conceded that there is a critical shortage of technically trained manpower in this country.

But the nature of the crisis is not generally understood and the remedies frequently suggested tend to deal with the superficial and immediate problems rather than the more basic causes of the shortage.

In the interim report of the subcommittee on research and development on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower, we came to the sharp conclusion that the fundamental problem is not that the United States lacks manpower in one limited, clearly separable area.

Modern defense is total.

It cannot be achieved in the ancient manner of putting up a few strong, scattered forts.

To the contrary, it demands strength throughout the entire fabric of national life.

And further, it requires the kind of cohesion and total national well-being that no military or peacefully competitive contest of the past has ever demanded.

The important fact is that the shortages of educated, skilled brainpower extend to all areas—from the drawing boards to distribution—from engineering to management—from the laboratory to the classroom.

There is an unprecedented demand for more skilled, educated brains.

The demand will increase for many years to come.

Therefore, the shortage will become more critical.

But it would be tragic if—as the committee was warned—the United States is stampeded into shortsighted action.

The committee was reminded of widespread forecasts made shortly after World War II, which predicted an oversupply of engineers and, at least by implication, encouraged high school guidance counselors to steer young people into other vocational channels.

These estimates were not inaccurate—at the particular time and based only on the immediate, short-range picture.

But our committee determined they were tragically wrong in terms of the future.

The point, therefore, is that the critical shortages of manpower should be considered a total shortage of trained individuals in every field, and that in our efforts to remedy short-term deficiencies we should be careful not to create imbalances which will threaten our overall strength in the long run.

With clarity of vision, the Founding Fathers realized that our form of government could not survive without education, and the infant Republic set its face toward a goal of free and universal education.

According to our present standards that goal has not been perfectly realized, but the principle is established and we have moved steadily forward toward its achievement.

The urgency of education becomes preeminent if human freedoms are to survive.

But education for freedom in the atomic age takes in much more territory than education for freedom in the horse-and-buggy age.

World War II had a tremendous influence upon education and educational methods.

Men had to learn well and to learn quickly.

The GI bill of rights opened the doors of higher educational institutions on a more common basis than ever before in our history.

Men who raised the flag on Iwo Jima or stormed the beaches of Normandy brought a grim determination to their studies.

The development of atomic energy affected education because of our realization that educational opportunities had to be broadened and educational methods had to be improved if we are to save our heritage of freedom.

Atomic energy is toil saving only for certain groups.

It may make it possible for the stoker to lay aside his shovel, but it will not permit the scientist to leave his laboratory, or the public servant to forget the cares of his office.

Most emphatically, it will not permit the schoolchild to discard his books.

The schoolboy and schoolgirl must learn geography and mathematics and economics and physics and chemistry and biology—and all the rest—to a degree of thoroughness never before approached.

Now I should like to bring to your attention the words of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, of the Bureau of Ships, and more specifically—Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion.

Admiral Rickover was also head of the atomic powered submarine projects—the *Nautilus* and the *Seawolf*.

For the past 11 years his work has been in the field of nuclear power.

His concern has not only been with the problems of developing the new source of energy—atomic energy—but he has recognized, and has expressed before our committee, his awareness of the larger problem—how to provide the trained men and women to maintain the momentum of our rapidly expanding technical civilization.

His approach has been realistic and I should like to quote the following remarks he made before our committee in 1956:

"The failure in education is not the fault of the educators alone.

"It is the fault of all of us in not recognizing the impact of the 20th century scientific revolution and taking the necessary measures in time."

Admiral Rickover said further: "First, we must see to it that every young man and woman who is qualified obtains a college education.

"Today less than half of those capable of acquiring a college degree enter college.

"Sixty percent of the best students graduating from high school do not go to college.

"This is a tremendous loss of talent amounting to 250,000 students each year.

"And nearly half of all those who do start college do not graduate."

In addition, Admiral Rickover stated that, "for every high school graduate who eventually earns a doctoral degree there are 25 others who have the intellectual ability to achieve that degree, but do not.

"We simply cannot afford a waste such as this."

Admiral Rickover has reminded us, and again I quote, "Unless we quickly remedy the present treatment of our teaching and scholarly resources we will inevitably have morally and intellectually incompetent teaching staffs."

He continued by saying, "The United States, if it is to succeed in its role of world leadership, must produce citizens who have the wisdom, the vision, and the knowledge to grapple successfully with world problems; citizens who can see critically through conventional values and who are able to subject to principle and to reason all claims to power.

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is lost.

"It will matter little what other educational institutions possess if they neglect to recognize and to foster high ability wherever it is found."

My friends, we are continually led to the basic fact that there is no single or final solution to the shortage of skilled manpower and that the efforts of all—Government and private—will be required if we are to make progress.

The shortage of scientific and engineering manpower is only part of a larger national problem.

It involves the need for trained and competent people in all fields of endeavor.

Our main objective should be the development of all our intellectual resources.

No longer do we stand merely at the threshold of atomic power development.

Vague promise has now turned into reality the perplexing problems which accompany a complicated technique.

Scientific advances are coming so fast that it is difficult to predict the ultimate place of nuclear power.

All of man's freedoms have come into existence only as results of his conquest of the power beyond that in his own muscles.

In recent centuries the tempo of civilization can be linked directly to the amount of energy man has had available to him for carrying on his activities.

When coal gave us a large increase in available energy, we went forward through a rapidly expanding phase of civilization.

Now, as atomic energy becomes available, we are going forward with a resounding crescendo.

We must remember that even though a man has fine ideals of citizenship, is thoroughly socialized, always votes, and appreciates the need for learning to live together, if he is ignorant, he is a poor citizen.

If he has not learned much subject matter in his schooling, he will add little or nothing to our Nation's needs for trained manpower.

Therefore, we look to you, the science teachers, for much guidance.

You and I know that nature's laws and the inventions based upon them are not in themselves evil.

It is only the use which men make of these things that leads to constructive or destructive results.

In closing, I would leave with you a short quotation from "The Education of Henry Adams," which wisely asserts that "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my salute to you, with the added hope that the years ahead will be marked by increased cooperation between nations in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

American Credo Stamp Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield launched the American credo stamp series designed to revitalize famous quotations from great American patriots.

The first of these new 4-cent stamps honors George Washington and carries the advice contained in his Farewell Address of 1796: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations."

Postmaster General Summerfield's comments in dedicating this stamp deserve wide reading. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of the Postmaster General:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AMERICAN CREDO STAMP CEREMONY, MOUNT VERNON, VA., JANUARY 20, 1960

There could be no more appropriate place to dedicate the American credo stamp series than here on this hallowed ground of Mount Vernon.

Here lived the man whose creed became the guiding inspiration of every generation that has followed, most certainly including our own.

The lives of great Americans lie behind us; but the immortal principles they expressed in words stand vitally before us.

In these treasured words we find the shining ideals by which our Nation has grown and prospered in freedom. By these words are formed the great and timeless credos that light our way forward.

We need to keep them before us, to emphasize their spirit, and to offer to share their universal truth with all the people of the world.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we have created the series of American credo stamps, the first six of which will be released in the months ahead.

As we join with you to launch the first of them today, we are inspired by the magnitude of the purposes they may serve. No other special stamps have received such warm and wide acclaim.

Our distinguished Citizens' Advisory Committee began consideration of this series over 2 years ago. At that time, we asked 100 prominent Americans—leaders in public life, historians, presidents of State universities—to state their opinions.

We presented a list of 24 expressions by great Americans, and proposed that they rate them according to their own evaluations, and add any which they believed to be more meaningful.

We received an almost 100-percent response. All heartily endorsed the endeavor. And with their vote and suggestions, and our own judgment, we arrived at the six which are to inaugurate this series.

There was almost unanimous agreement as to the first. It is the admonition

enunciated by George Washington in his Farewell Address to "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations."

As you will recall, President George Washington announced his unequivocable decision on September 19, 1796, to relinquish his high office when his second term ended in March the following year.

In a Farewell Address on this occasion, the vigorous but aging First Citizen culled from his long life a series of principles which, summarizing his deep "solicitude for your welfare" chartered the course for the then infant United States of America.

No document save the Constitution has been quoted more often in political debate and whether the arguments from it are used pro or con in the heat of political controversy, Washington's Farewell Address is rightfully regarded as one of the most significant political testaments ever made.

Of all the national policies advocated by our first President in the farewell document, the precept "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations" is without question the most abiding.

We hope it can be said that over the course of 170 years, we have followed this counsel devotedly. It has been our guiding light; and today, it is the very essence of our international policy and desire.

Some may say that this ideal is easily and completely applicable as far as the free world is concerned. But what about the ideologies that are hostile to our very way of life? What about those who strive for world domination?

What, in short, about the Soviet Union and Communist China?

The counsel of Washington still applies, as surely as it did to the tyrannies of his day.

We can only hope for good faith in others as we demonstrate it ourselves. We must assume that the leaders of the Soviet Union, of Communist China, and other totalitarian regimes will eventually understand justice the better if justice prevails as the overwhelming world force of their time.

Let us observe good faith toward all nations, including those whose motives we dare not, at this juncture, fully trust. Let us impress upon their peoples the clear fact that we are as dedicated to freedom for all mankind as our fathers were in those fateful years when General Washington and his tattered legions fought to establish liberty as man's God-given right.

In practicing good faith, we must of course be prepared against bad faith at the same time.

As President Eisenhower expressed it so clearly in his recent state of the Union message: "Neither we nor any other free world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance."

And until this test is conclusive, we must follow the further wise advice of our first President, in his view that: "To be prepared for war is the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

We should not forget, either, the extent to which Washington gave of himself to insure that the precepts set forth in his Farewell Address would be realized.

Let us not forget that Washington and the men around him, not only his fellow Americans, but supporters from other countries like Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben risked everything, including life, in the cause for freedom.

George Washington was a wealthy planter, with a life of ease and comfort before him, if he so chose, when the call to duty came.

He accepted that call without hesitation. He suffered with his troops at Valley Forge. He endured all manner of hardship, even including the attacks of some of his own short-sighted countrymen.

And while he was leading the way in costly war and turbulent peace, he cast much of his own fortune into the struggle, never to be recovered.

His later years, here at Mount Vernon, were shadowed by debt and economic problems—a sharp contrast to his earlier life.

Thus George Washington set the challenge for us to meet today. It is for us to pledge ourselves to serve wholeheartedly, and to sacrifice as need be, in the preservation of the incomparable heritage we enjoy.

May this postage stamp carry our message of American hope, trust, and purpose throughout the world. May this stamp, as it expresses this great and noble ideal in 120 million printings, be a force of historic value in our own unity as a people; in the advancement of good will and understanding between ourselves and the peoples of today's closely knit world.

Other great Americans whose credos will be illuminated by these American credo stamps include: Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Francis Scott Key, and Abraham Lincoln.

We hope that each of these stamps, so beautifully designed by the noted artist, Frank Conley, will provide a means and an occasion for schools and patriotic and civic groups to commemorate these credos as they apply today.

Let me say that the Post Office Department will be happy to cooperate to the fullest extent possible in all activities so designed.

We believe that, in this undertaking, there is the basis for great good to be accomplished beyond the reach of the stamps themselves.

The ideals of liberty, courage, and faith were never more vital. All that we can do to implant them, as individuals, and as educators and public leaders, will be critically important to our future.

It is in this solemn spirit that we here dedicate this series of American credo stamps and wish them Godspeed in bearing their messages not only throughout our country, but to the people who would observe good faith and justice in all parts of the earth.

The New York Times in its "Topics" column on its editorial page of January 20, 1960, made some apt observations about the significance of this new stamp. This news comment reads as follows:

TOPICS

INAUGURATION IN AN OFF YEAR

If 1960 were an inauguration year instead of an election year, someone would be taking the oath of office as President of the United States today. Whoever that someone may be, next year he will be only the fourth man to be inaugurated on this date; Franklin Delano Roosevelt became the first when he entered his second term in 1937, but all of the 30 men who preceded him in office during nearly a century and a half took the oath on March 4. This year January 20 has been chosen for a different kind of inauguration. Today at Mount Vernon, Va., the post office is issuing a new kind of postage stamp inscribed with eight words over the facsimile signature of "G. Washington."

POSTAGE STAMP CREDO

There is nothing new or unusual about the size of this stamp; it represents 4 cents' worth of postal service paid for in advance and has adhesive on the back for the usual purpose. However, instead of a portrait or a pictorial design, the eight words from Washington are set in a border of decorative panels printed in red and blue on white paper. This is the first in a projected series of stamps announced last September and planned to give prominence to wise words of Founding Fathers and later statesmen. The general idea is that as the series continues these periodic phrases from the past will form a kind of progressive creed for Americans. To affirm this each stamp will carry the word "Credo" in one of the border panels, and quotations selected will embody a basic principle of national policy.

WISE WORDS NEVER SPOKEN

The words selected from Washington are the antithesis of anything to do with inauguration, coming as they do from his last utterance as Chief Executive rather than from his first. The admonition with which this new patriotic creed opens today is "Observance of good faith and justice toward all nations," the opening words of a paragraph midway in the Farewell Address composed by Washington, with help from Alexander Hamilton, over a period of 3 or 4 years and finally corrected by Washington for printing in the Philadelphia Daily Advertiser in September 1796. He dated the manuscript pointedly without designating his office or even the city in which he completed the document, but simply wrote "United States." Although it is entitled an address as is always so cited, there is no record that Washington ever delivered it orally. It must not, of course, be confused with his Farewell Address to his officers at Fraunces Tavern at Broad and Great Dock (now Pearl) Street on December 4, 1783, an occasion marked chiefly by good food, few words, and strong emotions carefully suppressed among fellow officers "gentlemen of the old school."

FAITH, JUSTICE, PEACE

Washington's admonition to "observe good faith and justice" toward other nations is followed in the original document by the words "cultivate peace and harmony with all." It is this passage in the address that contains his sound and thoughtful advice against too much love or too much hate for any other nation. Writers and speakers seeking to discourage close ties with foreign governments by this country have drawn upon it heavily. Often they associate with it the well-known phrase about avoiding "entangling alliances" which is not Washington's but Thomas Jefferson's expression and may be found in his First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801. The whole tenor of Washington's thought on this point is to preserve a dignified, friendly balance between close attachment and strained relations; this course, he believed, would be especially wise for a small, new nation trying its way in the world.

WISDOM IN BRIEF

In the context of news at the opening of 1960 with high-level state visits behind us and before us and with summit meetings scheduled, few brief sentences could be selected which might describe more concisely the posture of this country on the world stage. As the serial parts of the new thumbnail-sized creed appear in wisdom and brevity through an election year, one may hope that statesmen now living, especially those ambitious to serve their fellow citizens in elective offices, might take the hint and recognize that words which live after a great man are often more admirable and memorable when found in such small gems as these.

Samuel M. Cohn, of Altoona, Pa., Honored for His Outstanding Service by the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the petroleum industry's nation-

wide observance of the centennial year of the oil industry a banquet was held at Altoona, Pa., November 4, 1959, by the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania.

During the course of the evening's program it was my privilege to deliver the principal address and to participate in the presentation of a plaque to Mr. Samuel M. Cohn, president of the Independent Oil Co. of Altoona, honoring him for his many years of outstanding service.

It has been my good fortune to know Sam Cohn and his family for many years and I regarded it as a special privilege to be selected as the principal speaker on such a joyous occasion.

Prominent officials of the oil industry in Pennsylvania journeyed to Altoona to pay tribute to Sam Cohn, not only for his many fine qualities but for the worthwhile contributions he has made over the years as an aid in the progress of the petroleum industry. In addition Sam was warmly commended for his interest in civic affairs and for his humanitarian efforts as one of the founders of the Kiwanis Health Farm—a project in which he has devoted much time and effort.

As a further and well-deserved tribute to my good friend Sam Cohn, I wish to include at this point in my remarks a copy of the fine editorial that appeared in the November 6, 1959, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, together with a copy of my address.

The editorial and address follows:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Nov. 6, 1959]

CITED BY INDUSTRY

Samuel M. Cohn, of Altoona, who is more widely known as Sam Cohn, was most deservedly honored this week at a complete surprise tendered by State and area petroleum industries representatives. At the Altoona celebration, marking the 100th year of the industry, the Altoonan was presented a plaque for outstanding service.

Mr. Cohn was designated as "outstanding man of the central Pennsylvania area" in a program sponsored by the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania, Dayton P. Clark and W. F. Richardson, State officers, being on hand to honor the Altoonan.

Presentation of the handsome plaque was made by Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, who delivered the address of the evening to a gathering of oil industries officials from central State counties.

The honored guest was lauded as a "product of the grassroots and a graduate of the school of hard knocks." His name is synonymous with the industry in this area, and with his brothers he has carried on the oil business launched by his father. He is a pioneer in this area.

"Sam is truly a self-made man," stated Congressman VAN ZANDT as he lauded the city leader. "He is symbolic of the industry. As president of the Independent Oil Co., he is never too busy to play his part in the community as a leader in club, bank, and hospital board activity and in promotions for the city betterment. He is one of the founders of the Kiwanis Health Farm. He comes from sturdy stock. He is friendly to all. Tonight we honor not only him, but his loved ones, his family, and his associates," concluded the speaker in his tribute and presentation.

The commendation was entirely unexpected, and Mr. Cohn was really surprised as he was greeted by his friends and industry leaders of many years' standing.

Altoonans also heartily congratulate Sam Cohn and laud his activities, also thanking the industry in this State for bestowing the fine honor on one of its sons and leaders.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE CENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE OIL INDUSTRY BY THE ASSOCIATED PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES OF PENNSYLVANIA, NOVEMBER 4, 1959, ALTOONA, PA.

It is a pleasure to accept the invitation of the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania and to join you in this observance of the centennial year of the oil industry.

This year the air has been filled with events celebrating 100 years of progress in America's most revolutionary of all industries, the oil industry.

Along with the excitement of this centennial comes the opportunity for quiet reflection upon the many ways this invaluable product has affected our lives.

Surely such reflection brings an added awareness of how lucky we, in the United States, are to have been able to reap the many benefits of abundant supplies of oil.

So important and versatile is this exciting product in itself, that sometimes we overlook the fact that it was the mind of man that enabled us to discover and extract petroleum, and that it is the mind of man that discovered and continues to discover ever-new uses for it.

For the story of oil is the story of genius, ingenuity, daring, determination, and unbridled initiative.

These are the qualities that made this industry great, and this is what I wish to talk about this evening.

However, before we give modern man all the credit for making use of oil, we ought to look a little further back than the mere 100 years we are emphasizing in A.D. 1959.

Oil was to make its imprint upon history and our lives several thousand years earlier.

Noah used pitch, which was the abundant and widely distributed "rock oil" in making his ark.

Again we might ask the question: "Where would we be now if it weren't for oil?"

Pitch served as a mortar in building the Tower of Babel.

Moses' mother used it to coat the "Ark of Bulrushes" that carried her son down the River Nile to the Egyptian princess.

Nebuchadnezzar used asphalt to pave his roads and to build his palace in sixth century B.C. Babylonia.

In the ancient land of Sumer, a physician gave his patient a "petroleum prescription" for healing a sore, which was made of asphalt kneaded to form a salve.

A myriad of both major and minor uses of the substance that men found seeping to the surface of the earth reveals that petroleum had penetrated deeply into the economic life of the ancient countries of the Middle East.

The ancients had two uses for oil that have not found their way into modern life.

A law in Assyria stated that delinquents must submit to having molten bitumen poured over their heads as punishment for their crimes, and it was used in magic as a means of keeping out the evil spirits.

However, if keeping out evil spirits could be dressed up and given a more sophisticated interpretation, it would apply equally well today.

If evil spirits could be equated with economic stagnation, depression, and poverty, the oil industry could then truly be said to have kept them out of the United States.

One of the first Americans whose enlightened curiosity and penetrating insight led him to the conclusion that the material he saw bubbling from the earth might be of value was George Washington.

In 1753, over 100 years before Drake's successful drilling, Washington was visiting western Pennsylvania and saw the oil springs.

He felt that they must have some industrial importance and acquired some land on which there was a "burning spring."

He listed this in his will as his most valuable holding.

The world waited another century to see this vision realized.

It was actually a citizen of Titusville that supplied the initial momentum to the events leading to the first commercial oil well, aptly called "the hole that changed the world."

Dr. Francis B. Brewer, a physician, was convinced that the curative properties of petroleum were truly remarkable and declared that as long as he continued in his profession, he would keep it in constant use.

He gave a bottled sample to his uncle, a professor at Dartmouth.

It was at Dartmouth that it was seen by a young New York lawyer, George H. Bissell.

Bissell was supposed to have immediately seen the similarity between coal oil and petroleum and deduced that petroleum might be exploited as an illuminant.

He was further encouraged by a chemist, Benjamin Silliman, Jr., whose report predicted that "rock oil" had many uses and a great commercial future.

This opinion added stimulus to efforts to finance a project to extract petroleum in large quantities.

Such a story is typical of the important discoveries and developments of our country—flashes of intuitive insight backed up by determined efforts to see the idea carried to a successful conclusion.

And so the story of the first well continues along the same lines.

It was such a flash of inspiration that prompted Edwin L. Drake to bore, rather than dig, for oil.

After the insight occurred, Drake undertook the rest of the project with methodical and deliberate determination.

These were the qualities that allowed Drake to back up his theory that petroleum could be drilled for and obtained in substantial quantities.

An accomplishment such as this removed the major barrier to the development of this new industry.

Fortunately for the destiny of the product, there was an already pressing need for an ingredient to replace whale oil when the first oil started flowing from Drake's well—some 20 barrels a day.

Whale oil was the best lighting fuel of the day, but it was growing scarce and becoming expensive.

So while whaling captains were searching for Moby Dicks, less practical men were drilling for the material that was to replace the product of such adventures.

Others were developing new refining techniques to improve the process of the production of kerosene, such as the invention of Luther Atwood for the development of a process of "cracking" crude oil in 1860 which made the mass production of oil for illumination economically feasible, and the subsequent improvement by William M. Burton in 1913.

Not all the inventions, however, could be counted on to aid the petroleum industry, and when Thomas Edison perfected the incandescent electric lamp in 1879, kerosene began to be replaced as the main form of artificial illumination.

After all, we do have to give some other industries a break, too.

But rather than viewing this use of electricity as a setback to the industry, the inventive spirit of the Americans was employed to develop new uses for this versatile substance.

In 1870 asphalt was first used as a paving material in the United States.

It was the material which paved the street in front of city hall in Newark, N.J.

In 1879 George B. Selden applied for a patent on an automobile driven by an internal combustion engine and in 1893 Charles E. Duryea manufactured the "horseless buggy."

The year 1900 saw the first automobile show, and 3 years later the first cross-country automobile trip was made.

When, in 1909, Henry Ford had standardized his model T and announced that he would "make a motor car for the multitude," the gasoline market was off to a roaring start—and the following decade was appropriately named "the roaring twenties."

By 1924 Ford got his price for a model T down to $265, and secondhand cars could be found for as little as $25.

American initiative and enterprise were also leading to another great development which was ultimately to require large amounts of fuel from the petroleum industry.

The Wright brothers made the first successful flight at Kitty Hawk, N.C., in 1903, and Lindbergh flew from New York to Paris in 1927.

Without oil, the Wright brothers might still be trying to get off the ground.

Thus, the history of the oil industry itself and those industries dependent on oil is replete with examples of the outstanding progress made possible by the environment of the age, with its emphasis on individualism and initiative.

Oil first gave us something to read by, then something to grease our wheels and equipment with, and something smooth to ride on.

As a fuel for vehicles and machines, it has formed the basis for the vast mechanization that changed the entire way of life of our country.

The transportation industry, with its trucks, diesel locomotives, airplanes, was revolutionized by oil.

And finally, the petrochemical industry, with its multitude of beautiful and useful products, has modernized our homes, offices, clothing, and has even made its contribution to the beautification of the fair sex in the production of cosmetics.

Every facet of American life has been touched and touched again by the magic of oil.

In a quite different way, oil is touching the lives of almost every country—especially those same lands that put it to use in ancient times.

In the Middle Eastern country of Saudi Arabia, it is almost the sole source of income; in Iraq it is by far the most important one; and the surrounding Arab lands are directly affected by pipeline or canal transport.

Oil is giving our Latin American neighbor, Venezuela, the opportunity to prosper.

This resource is so vital to these lands that any changes in American oil policy will of necessity have serious, and possibly worldwide, repercussions.

Two and one-half years ago the world held its breath when a chain of events led to the Suez crisis.

Last year, Vice President NIXON held his breath when angry mobs shouted and threw stones at him in Venezuela.

These countries are too impatient to wait for the evolutionary developments that characterized the rise of the industry in this country.

Of such overriding importance is this one material, that oil, which has given mankind such great benefits, has come dangerously close to plunging the world into war.

This new and uncomfortable role for petroleum presents a challenge to the men in the industry, as well as to the policymakers in Washington.

The mind of man that so brilliantly developed new means of producing and using this material is now faced with this crucial problem—a problem that the industry itself has given rise to.

So far the oilmen have done a most credible job in their international dealings—perhaps the Washington policymakers could learn a few lessons from their public relations policies throughout the world.

The problems oil poses in the field of international relations are of the most serious and urgent nature.

These are questions that the oilman is not asked to solve by himself.

In many cases, decisions made in Washington that affect him directly are entirely out of his hands.

I don't believe that it is unfair to speculate on the course history would have taken had the views of the representatives of the oil industry been considered in the relations of the United States with the oil-producing countries of the world.

I am sure such events as the Suez crisis, that threatened the peace of the world, would have been avoided.

Our brief review would not be complete if we didn't mention just one more role that oil has played in the history of the world—that is its role in warfare and in national defense.

Oil was the lifeblood of the mechanized Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Without oil, the machineries producing the materials of war would have come to a grinding halt; the arms and heavy equipment and artillery would have been rendered useless; and all means of transportation—the airplanes, ships, motorized vehicles, would have been helplessly relegated to idleness.

Even the supermodern atomic and hydrogen weapons are dependent upon means of delivery fueled by oil.

Ballistic missiles will employ other types of fuel, but as long as the debates continue on the possibility of limited or total wars, the weapons and aircraft using oil will continue to be produced.

Turning back to the domestic scene to review the history of the development of the oil industry, with its emphasis on individual daring and determination, leads us to speculate upon the future course the industry will take.

Estimates for the next decade all indicate that the Nation's consumption of energy of all kinds will increase at least 50 percent.

The Chase Manhattan Bank, in its studies of the petroleum industry estimates that domestic petroleum consumption will increase from the almost 20 million barrels a day in 1957 to around 30 million in 1967.

They estimate that oil will capture 48 percent of the Nation's energy market.

So the oil industry, as large as it looms in relation to the other industries in the country, is destined to get bigger and better.

I can still say "better," although I realize that it is inevitable that much of the color and the rugged individualism that was so typical of the early development will be subdued.

In an environment where many factors are at work to make the individual seek security rather than adventure, where the opportunities seem to lie in working for someone else rather than in the attempt to strike out on your own, it naturally follows that this industry, too, will wear a more conservative cloak.

I am sure that many of you here have witnessed this change and have felt its effects.

Perhaps you have wondered, along with many of us in other fields, if this attitude will retard the future technical and economic progress that the oil industry has contributed to the growth of the United States.

The answer is emphatically "No," because as long as the oil industry continues to produce leaders like our own Sam Cohn of Altoona the future is in safe hands.

It is fitting and proper that you have decided on this occasion to tender a well-deserved tribute to Sam Cohn.

You are to be highly commended for selecting Sam as the outstanding oilman of the central Pennsylvania area because he is a symbol of the success that can be achieved by honest and persevering efforts.

Very few in this room know Sam Cohn as well as your speaker does.

We grew up together in this city of Altoona.

To let you in on a little personal side of Sam's life we really got acquainted when Sam visited my neighborhood while courting his wife.

He is truly a product of the grassroots and a graduate of the "school of hard knocks."

Along with his father and brothers, Sam is a pioneer of the oil industry.

Today when you discuss oil in the Altoona area the name of Sam Cohn is symbolic of the progress and place oil occupies in the American way of life.

Always a "busy bee," Sam applies himself daily to his task as president of the Independent Oil Co.; yet he is never too busy to play his part as a community leader whether it be as a director of the bank, a member of the board of hospital trustees, or the president of the Altoona Kiwanis Club.

As an indication of the great interest he has in the underprivileged, it was during his presidency of the Kiwanis Club in 1928 that the Kiwanis Health Farm for Children was established in Scotch Valley.

Sam is truly a self-made man, that type of an American which has made our Nation what it is today.

So many times we forget to acknowledge the ones who have played an important part in the lives of those fellow citizens whom we honor.

Therefore, let me mention the sturdy stock represented by Sam Cohn's father and mother and the guidance they gave him.

Then, too, there is another person—Sam's good wife Margaret Mattas Cohn.

"Mag" as we knew her in her girlhood days has played the part as an ideal wife and her inspiration has played a great part in the success Sam has achieved.

Therefore, tonight as we present to our honored guest, Sam Cohn, a scroll as the outstanding oilman of the central Pennsylvania area we honor not only him but his loved ones and especially his wife, Margaret.

Before presenting the scroll to Sam let me emphasize that only in America can you find a product of the grassroots whose ingenuity, initiative, and perservance have elevated him to the high position he occupies in the business world.

Therefore, it is with great honor that I present this scroll on behalf of the Associated Petroleum Industries of Pennsylvania to a true American, an outstanding businessman, a community leader, your friend and my friend, Sam Cohn.

Government Lamb Grading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 13, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this week there have been committee hearings on the question of Government lamb grading. I would like to place in the REC-

ORD at this point a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, and two letters which came to me from the State of Iowa, pointing out the necessity for continued Government grading of lamb.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 14, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I had planned to submit a statement on my views concerning the need for Government lamb grading to be included in the hearings on this subject.

This morning, however, I received in the mail two letters which so eloquently state the case for the small packing plant, that I decided instead to submit these letters for inclusion in the printed hearings. I endorse wholeheartedly the position taken in the two letters which follow.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD G. WOLF,
Representative in Congress.

SOMEWHERE IN IOWA,
January 12, 1960.

Congressman LEONARD WOLF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: One reason why there is so much controversy over lamb grading, and this I have seen, is when Swift & Co. (or any of the other large companies) kills a large bunch of lambs, their grader, not the Government grader, goes through the lambs first and puts "Swift's Premium" on all the best ones; then they want the Government grader to grade the second best "Choice" and naturally the Choice ones have already been picked out and branded with "Swift's Premium." Then they accuse the grader of not giving them the Choice grade and then tell the producer that the Government grader is too tough. When the Choice or Prime have been picked out, there is nothing left for the grader to work on except the inferior ones. This I have seen, but I could lose my job over this letter, so please don't use it publicly unless I have protection on it.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

SOMEWHERE IN IOWA,
January 12, 1960.

Congressman LEONARD WOLF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WOLF: I am writing to you relative to Mr. Benson's order to suspend grading of lambs as of February 6. I thought you would be interested in knowing that if this happens hundreds of small packers will go out of business. This I know for certain as it happened to us when we lost Government grading in our packinghouse. From 1945 until about 1954, we had Government grading. In 1954 or thereabouts new laws were put into effect making it mandatory that we spend at least $50,000 remodeling and enlarging our killing floor so that we could qualify for grading.

Since we did not have the necessary money we were unable to remodel and, consequently, lost our grading. Thereafter we were unable to sell our product at competitive prices as the butchers told us that they could not pay us as much for ungraded meat as they would for graded or highly advertised brands, as their customers wouldn't pay as much for an unknown quality. They further stated that they would just as soon buy our meat if it were graded as they would meat of a highly advertised brand, as people knew they were getting the same quality if it were Government graded. We felt that this law was caused to be put into effect by the big packers to eliminate competition. In our case it worked, as we had to get out of the packing business.

Now the big packers are trying to get the grading taken off lambs so they can in the same way eliminate competition. It seems to me if they do not want grading they should not object to others having it as it is strictly their own choice and the small packer pays for the service if he wants it and can discontinue it at any time. As you already know the grading service is entirely self-supporting and does not cost the taxpayer 1 cent.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

P.S.—Since World War II there has been lots of small packers that have started up because they have had a product equivalent to the large packer, mainly because they have had the U.S. standards to help them sell their products. In other words, they have had "U.S. Choice" or "U.S. Good."

Now if a large chainstore buyer had to buy a carload of lamb or beef and he called the packinghouse, whose name was, say, Jones, and said "What have you to offer?" the packer, if he has U.S. Choice or U.S. Good, can state that he has the certain grade at a certain price. But if he has no U.S. graded meat, he would have to say, "We have a load of Jones' Choice." Now, which do you think the big buyer would buy?—Jones' Choice, or Swift's Premium, or Armour's Star, or Wilson's Certified, or Morrel's Pride? These big packers are all nationally advertised and naturally the buyer would buy the nationally advertised brand. But when the small packer has Government grading, he has the same quality to sell as the others have because everyone knows the U.S. grades are the same in every packinghouse.

If the large packer doesn't want Government grading he can tell the Government he no longer wants it, as the grading doesn't cost him anything if he doesn't use it. But why take it away from hundreds of small packers, as the packer pays for the service if he wants it and it doesn't cost the taxpayer anything. There is just one answer. As long as the small packer has Government grading he is a threat to their business, and they are trying to eliminate him.

As I have stated before, we had to give up our business because we lost our U.S. grading, and we know this is happening to other small packers. Also, on the other side of the picture, when we had the packinghouse we killed a few mutton and lambs. A few market operators used to buy old mutton and advertise it in the paper as weekend specials, at cutrate prices, as genuine lamb. Most housewives do not know a lamb from a mutton unless it is so graded and marked.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 13, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who with Thy kindly light followest us all the way, we come conscious of the cloud of witnesses who look upon us as we face our tasks—those pioneers of the spirit who nobly fought in days long past, and who in times as baffling as ours refused to nurse their disappointments, to brood over their defeats, or to be browbeaten by their fears.

When it seems to us that our times are too perplexing and oppressive, and that evil casts too great a shadow over all our dreams for humanity, remind us that so it seemed to those who went before us, and that we can find—as they found—that the prayer for wisdom, for vision, and for courage is the prayer that never goes unanswered. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 13, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 296)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

CERTAIN TRANSFERS FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying transfer plan, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 299)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 298)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

(This report delivered to the House of Representatives.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the administrative assistant, Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the special helium production fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REMOVAL OF INTEREST RATE RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLIC ISSUES OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for more effective management of the public debt by removing the remaining interest rate restrictions on public issues of Government securities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 295)

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF REVIEW OF FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION AT GRANITE CITY ENGINEER DEPOT, ILLINOIS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of family housing construction at Granite City Engineer Depot, Granite City, Ill., Department of the Army, dated January, 1960 (with an accompany report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

A letter from the President, Conference of State Societies, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Conference, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PERMANENCY OF TEMPORARY INCREASES IN RATES OF BASIC SALARY OF EMPLOYEES IN POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the temporary increases in rates of basic salary provided for employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes (with an acompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Thomas Hugh Latimer, of Chicago, Ill., relating to an investigation of the nature of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Thomas Hugh Latimer, of Chicago, Ill., favoring an investigation of all tax-exempt groups which advocate racial and religious agitation and hatred to cause social disorder; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Student Senate of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., protesting against the disclaimer affidavit required of applicants for educational loans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Glenn C. Skinner, of St. Petersburg, Fla., relating to the consolidated balance sheets and income statements for the year 1958, as set forth in the annual report of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 221. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate certain matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 1023); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. Res. 220. Resolution providing additional funds for the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 1025); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DIGNITARIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 245) providing assistance to Members of the Senate in the discharge of their responsibilities in connection with visits to the United States by foreign dignitaries, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1024) thereon; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1960, through January 31, 1961, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed $5,000 from February 1, 1960, through January 31, 1961, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period July–November 1959, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request unanimous consent that the summary be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the summary and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1959, and comparison with July 1959, and pay for October 1959, and comparison with June 1959*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	July	Increase	Decrease	October	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	87,594	98,254		10,660	$38,897	$38,296	$601	
Commerce [1] [2]	62,969	32,289	30,680		15,947	15,558	389	
Health, Education, and Welfare	59,909	59,467	442		27,099	27,039	60	
Interior	51,058	55,552		4,494	25,507	25,748		$241
Justice	30,087	30,282		195	17,178	16,996	182	
Labor	6,216	5,963	253		3,236	3,171	65	
Post Office	560,269	552,094	8,175		227,226	218,458	8,768	
State [3]	36,270	[4] 35,842	428		16,455	15,762	693	
Treasury	74,413	75,097		684	38,278	38,557		279
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	407	405	2		244	236	8	
Bureau of the Budget	434	437		3	334	327	7	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1		27	26	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	72			33	28	5	
National Security Council	61	62		1	44	44		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,760	1,759	1		1,111	1,065	46	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	4	5		1	3	3		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4			4	4		
Independent agencies:								
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	496	514		18	84	84		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,703	6,796		93	4,312	4,277	35	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	607		9	348	349		1
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2			1	1		
Career Executive Board [5]						3		3
Civil Aeronautics Board	728	718	10		464	451	13	
Civil Service Commission	3,621	3,748		127	1,920	1,996		76
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	6		1	4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	3	1		3	2	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	75	86		11	40	48		8
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	3	4		1	6	3	3	
Development Loan Fund	90	75	15		63	54	9	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	222	225		3	146	149		3
Farm Credit Administration	824	848		24	491	491		
Federal Aviation Agency	33,983	33,905	78		19,136	18,677	459	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	3	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,275	1,295		20	768	756	12	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,231	1,245		14	709	693	16	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	957	957			546	544	2	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	345		2	267	263	4	
Federal Power Commission	837	874		37	510	510		
Federal Trade Commission	738	747		9	486	486		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	46	52		6	35	48		13
General Accounting Office	5,047	5,169		122	2,757	2,841		84
General Services Administration [6]	27,321	27,868		547	11,627	11,906		279
Government Contract Committee	30	27	3		17	15	2	
Government Printing Office	6,532	6,514	18		3,199	3,432		233
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,003	11,132		129	5,964	6,120		156
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	4		1	3	2	1	
Indian Claims Commission	16	15	1		14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,304	2,288	16		1,332	1,305	27	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	6	5	1		4	3	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,525	9,303	222		5,702	5,550	152	
National Capital Housing Authority	325	314	11		134	130	4	
National Capital Planning Commission	43	36	7		25	21	4	
National Gallery of Art	314	311	3		119	121		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,579	1,493	86		918	891	27	
National Mediation Board	117	110	7		84	92		8
National Science Foundation	562	512	50		315	262	53	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	35	21	14		20	10	10	
Panama Canal	13,876	14,042		166	5,948	3,844	2,104	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,328	2,503		175	1,113	1,183		70
Renegotiation Board	293	296		3	211	225		14
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	170	168	2		96	101		5
Securities and Exchange Commission	936	941		5	568	564	4	
Selective Service System	6,275	6,405		130	1,764	1,819		55
Small Business Administration	2,098	2,033	65		1,184	1,047	137	
Smithsonian Institution	1,091	[4] 1,116		25	461	456	5	
Soldiers' Home	1,012	1,037		25	302	290	12	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	36	22	14		22	9	13	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	29		2	22	23		1
Tariff Commission	236	234	2		153	154		1
Tax Court of the United States	150	148	2		104	105		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,117	14,374		257	7,616	7,481	135	
Texas Water Study Commission	31	21	10		20	7	13	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission [7]						1		1
U.S. Information Agency	10,811	10,787	24		3,614	3,830		216
Veterans' Administration	[8] 173,167	172,103	1,064		67,212	67,035	177	
Virgin Islands Corporation	622	675		53	124	100	24	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,316,387	1,292,732	41,708	18,053	564,736	552,201	14,285	1,750
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			23,655				12,535	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,802	1,786	16		1,256	1,223	33	
Department of the Army	387,632	405,249		17,617	175,430	180,381		4,951
Department of the Navy	350,692	356,815		6,123	168,189	168,276		87
Department of the Air Force	316,319	314,112	2,207		140,855	141,751		896
Total, Department of Defense	1,056,445	1,077,962	2,223	23,740	485,730	491,631	33	5,934
Net decrease, Department of Defense			21,517				5,901	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [9]	2,372,832	2,370,694	43,931	41,793	1,050,466	1,043,832	14,318	7,684
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,138				6,634	

[1] November figure includes 186 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] November figure includes 29,389 enumerators for the census of agriculture.
[3] November figure includes 13,274 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 13,089 in July, and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 3,193 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 1,942.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.
[5] Expired June 1959.
[6] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[7] Expired October 1959; last paid employment reported May 1959.
[8] Subject to revision.
[9] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1959, and comparison with July 1959*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	86,581	97,070		10,489
Commerce [1]	62,424	31,664	30,760	
Health, Education, and Welfare	59,464	58,947	517	
Interior	50,609	54,908		4,299
Justice	29,801	29,913		112
Labor	6,126	5,849	277	
Post Office	559,057	549,979	9,078	
State [2]	8,829	8,761	68	
Treasury	73,877	74,214		373
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	407	405	2	
Bureau of the Budget	434	437		3
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	72	72		
National Security Council	61	62		1
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,760	1,759	1	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	4	5		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	4		
Independent agencies:				
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,662	6,755		93
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	607		9
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2		
Civil Aeronautics Board	728	718	10	
Civil Service Commission	3,618	3,736		118
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	6		1
Commission of Fine Arts	4	3	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	75	86		11
Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	3	4		1
Development Loan Fund	90	75	15	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	222	225		3
Farm Credit Administration	814	838		24
Federal Aviation Agency	33,145	32,379	766	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,273	1,281		8
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,229	1,243		14
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	957	957		
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	345		2
Federal Power Commission	837	874		37
Federal Trade Commission	738	747		9
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	46	52		6
General Accounting Office	4,972	5,093		121
General Services Administration [3]	27,317	27,820		503
Government Contract Committee	30	27	3	
Government Printing Office	6,532	6,514	18	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,862	10,952		90
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission	3	4		1
Indian Claims Commission	16	15	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,304	2,288	16	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	6	5	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,523	9,300	223	
National Capital Housing Authority	325	314	11	
National Capital Planning Commission	43	36	7	
National Gallery of Art	314	311	3	
National Labor Relations Board	1,555	1,469	86	
National Mediation Board	117	110	7	
National Science Foundation	562	512	50	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	35	21	14	
Panama Canal	394	403		9
Railroad Retirement Board	2,328	2,503		175
Renegotiation Board	293	296		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	170	168	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	936	941		5
Selective Service System	6,119	6,227		108
Small Business Administration	2,079	2,005	74	
Smithsonian Institution	1,081	[4] 1,106		25
Soldiers' Home	1,012	1,037		25
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	36	22	14	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	29		2
Tariff Commission	236	234	2	
Tax Court of the United States	150	148	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,115	14,374		259
Texas Water Study Commission	31	21	10	
U.S. Information Agency	2,723	2,686	37	
Veterans' Administration	[5] 172,071	170,938	1,133	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,259,271	1,232,965	43,210	16,904
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			26,306	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,757	1,739	18	
Department of the Army	336,934	348,503		11,569
Department of the Navy	328,557	323,652	4,905	
Department of the Air Force	286,060	282,077	3,983	
Total, Department of Defense	953,308	955,971	8,906	11,569
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,663	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,212,579	2,188,936	52,116	28,473
Net increase, including Department of Defense			23,643	

[1] November figure includes 186 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] November figure includes 1,879 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,902 in July.
[3] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.
[5] Subject to revision.

NOTE.—Beginning in August 1959 employment in the State of Hawaii has been reported in this table. Formerly employment in Hawaii was reported outside the United States in table 3 of this report. August employment in Hawaii was 21,893.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1959, and comparison with July 1959*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,013	1,184		171
Commerce	545	625		80
Health, Education, and Welfare	445	520		75
Interior	449	644		195
Justice	286	369		83
Labor	90	114		24
Post Office	1,212	2,115		903
State [1]	27,441	[2] 27,081	360	
Treasury	536	883		347
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	482	500		18
Atomic Energy Commission	41	41		
Civil Service Commission	3	12		9
Farm Credit Administration	10	10		
Federal Aviation Agency	838	1,526		688
Federal Communications Commission	2	14		12
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	75	76		1
General Services Administration	4	48		44
Housing and Home Finance Agency	141	180		39
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2	3		1
National Labor Relations Board	24	24		
Panama Canal	13,482	13,639		157
Selective Service System	156	178		22
Small Business Administration	19	28		9
Smithsonian Institution	10	10		
Tennessee Valley Authority	2		2	
United States Information Agency	8,088	8,101		13
Veterans' Administration	[3] 1,096	1,165		69
Virgin Islands Corporation	622	675		53
Total, excluding Department of Defense	57,116	59,767	362	3,013
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			2,651	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	45	47		2
Department of the Army	50,698	56,746		6,048
Department of the Navy	22,135	33,163		11,028
Department of the Air Force	30,259	32,035		1,776
Total, Department of Defense	103,137	121,991		18,854
Net decrease, Department of Defense			18,854	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	160,253	181,758	362	21,867
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			21,505	

[1] November figure includes 11,395 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 11,187 in July. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 3,193 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 1,942.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Subject to revision.

NOTE.—Prior to August 1959 employment in Hawaii was reported in this table. Beginning in August 1959 employment in the State of Hawaii has been reported in table 2 of this report. August employment in Hawaii was 21,893.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1959, and comparison with July 1959*

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,296	3,343		47
Commerce	2,020	1,491	529	
Interior	6,481	7,079		598
Treasury	5,142	5,292		150
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	152	172		20
Federal Aviation Agency	780	742	38	
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,215	1,195	20	
Government Printing Office	6,532	6,514	18	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,525	9,303	222	
Panama Canal	6,931	6,934		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,360	11,549		189
Virgin Islands Corporation	622	675		53
Total, excluding Department of Defense	54,069	54,302	827	1,060
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			233	

Department or agency	November	July	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,050	[2] 139,069		2,019
Outside the United States	[1] 8,400	[2] 8,718		318
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	202,067	201,323	744	
Outside the United States	522	5,306		4,784
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	158,985	157,696	1,289	
Outside the United States	1,714	2,029		315
Total, Department of Defense	508,738	514,141	2,033	7,436
Net decrease, Department of Defense			5,403	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	562,807	568,443	2,860	8,496
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			5,636	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1959 and comparison with July 1959*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	November	July	November	July	November	July	November	July
Belgium	11	12					11	12
England	3,449	3,502					3,449	3,502
France	21,789	22,282	17,120	16,966			4,669	5,316
Germany	81,749	81,644	69,380	69,581	57	59	12,312	12,004
Japan	64,158	65,727	21,175	21,883	16,750	16,868	26,233	26,976
Korea	5,799	7,997	5,799	7,997				
Morocco	3,901	3,408	2	6	833	884	3,066	2,518
Netherlands	43	41					43	41
Norway	23	23					23	23
Saudi Arabia	1						1	
Trinidad	541	546			541	546		
Total	181,464	185,182	113,476	116,433	18,181	18,357	49,807	50,392

Personnel and pay summary, July through November 1959

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In July numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In October was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,372,832	2,370,694	+2,138	$1,050,466	$1,043,832	+$6,634
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,316,387	1,292,732	+23,655	564,736	552,201	+12,535
Department of Defense	1,056,445	1,077,962	−21,517	485,730	491,631	−5,901
Inside the United States [2]	2,212,579	2,188,936	+23,643			
Outside the United States [2]	160,253	181,758	−21,505			
Industrial employment	562,807	568,443	−5,636			
Foreign nationals	181,464	185,182	−3,718	22,752	22,997	−245

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Prior to August 1959 employment in Hawaii was reported outside the United States. Beginning in August 1959 employment in Hawaii has been reported inside the United States. August employment in Hawaii was 21,893.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 2,138 during the period July through November 1959. The total in July was 2,370,694. In November there were 2,372,832 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net increase of 23,655 during the period from July through November 1959, increasing from 1,292,732 in July to 1,316,387 in November. The November figure included 29,389 enumerators for the census of agriculture. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense decreased 21,517 during the same period, dropping from 1,077,962 in July to 1,056,445 in November.

In the Department of Defense white-collar employment decreased 16,114 from 563,821 in July to 547,707 in November, and industrial employment decreased 5,403 from 514,141 in July to 508,738 in November.

In June the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of $12,526 million and in October it was running at an annual rate of $12,606 million.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures since Congress adjourned September 15, 1959.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under U.S. military agencies overseas, excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 185,182 in July and 181,464 in November, a decrease of 3,718.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2809. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2810. A bill amending the National Labor Relations Act with respect to emergency labor disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2811. A bill to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

S. 2812. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia):

S. 2813. A bill to provide for more effective management of the public debt by removing the remaining interest rate restrictions on public issues of Government securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2814. A bill to assure individuals residing in the various States of the right to register in order that they may exercise their right to vote for President and Vice President and for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2815. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Katopodis (also known as John Cadis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2816. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2817. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Paquette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2818. A bill to provide that credit may be allowed under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by certain persons in American Samoa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 2819. A bill directing the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Newport, R.I., certain property situated in Newport known as the government landing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 2820. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Stanislaus River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2821. A bill for the relief of Kristina Selan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2823. A bill to provide for Federal contribution to the cost of election campaign of candidates for Federal offices, conditioned upon effective control and publication of other sources of financing such campaigns; to encourage small individual campaign contributions and to reduce the importance of large contributions in Federal elections; to provide Federal financial assistance for State voters' and campaign pamphlets; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2824. A bill to make certain benefits provided by the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957, approved August 21, 1957, applicable to widows and certain surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or who died in the service of any of the said organizations prior to the effective date of such act of August 21, 1957; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2825. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2826. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Holt and Alice Bergen Holt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 2827. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2828. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2829. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of May 13, 1954, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional member to the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLARK, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HART, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. BUSH, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2830. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2831. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 2832. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

NATIONAL JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the past several years I have submitted in the Senate, and the Congress has adopted, a concurrent resolution requesting the President to declare a week in late January or early February as National Junior Achievement Week. I am submitting a similar concurrent resolution today. Time is short between now and the week chosen by Junior Achievement, Inc., as the period for celebrating the efforts of the thousands of junior achievement companies in America.

It is my hope that the responsible committees of both Houses, and the Senate and House as well, can complete action on the concurrent resolution in time for the President to issue his proclamation declaring the week of January 31–February 6 as National Junior Achievement Week.

By this concurrent resolution, the Congress expresses its commendation of the

work Junior Achievement is doing to help young people learn the skills and responsibilities that make up a free enterprise economy. I hope we may provide that commendation again this year.

Mr. President, I send the concurrent resolution to the desk for appropriate reference. I submit the resolution on behalf of myself and the very able and distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas it was the initiative, the sense of individual dignity, and the determination to mold their own futures that motivated those who founded this Nation; and

Whereas Junior Achievement, Incorporated, through its learning-by-doing program, is inculcating those ideals in American youth by helping them to set up and operate their own small-scale business enterprises; and

Whereas their experience in running Junior Achievement companies will provide these young people with a heightened understanding of the privileges and duties of citizenship and better prepare them to assume the responsibilities of community leadership; and

Whereas thousands of American businessmen voluntarily give unstintingly of their time, their counsel, and their expereince for the benefit of the members of Junior Achievement; and

Whereas it is understood that the week beginning January 31, 1960, and ending February 6, 1960, will be observed as National Junior Achievement Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 31, 1960, through February 6, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

EXTENSION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BIBLE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 82), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems created by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby continued through September 30, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1960, through September 30, 1960, which shall not exceed $25,000 to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 243), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics; and
(10) fisheries and wildlife.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 244), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas a sound national transportation system is essential to the continued economic development and defense of the United States; and

Whereas fair and equitable Federal policies are necessary to assure such a sound national transportation system; and

Whereas hearings held by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have disclosed there is urgent need for a comprehensive study of such transportation policy and related problems by the Congress, to the end that sound policies may be evolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. the need for regulation of transportation under present-day conditions and, if there is need for regulation, the type and character of that regulation;

2. the area of Federal policy dealing with Government assistance provided the various forms of transportation and the desirability of a system of user charges to be assessed against those using such facilities;

3. the subject of the ownership of one form of transportation by another;

4. Federal policy on the subject of consolidations and mergers in the transportation industry;

5. policy considerations for the kind and amount of railroad passenger service necessary to serve the public and provide for the national defense;

6. the problems arising from action by the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting the charge of more for a short than a long transportation haul over the same line in the same direction;

7. the adequacy of transportation service to and from rural communities in the United States, and the effects of the curtailment of such service in recent years upon the economy of such communities and of the Nation as a whole and upon the national defense and security; and

8. additional matters of Federal regulation (and exemption therefrom) and Federal promotional policy in regard to the various forms of transportation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS IN RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DIGNITARIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 245) providing assistance to Members of the Senate in the discharge of their responsibilities in connection with visits to the United States by foreign dignitaries, and for other purposes, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

LIBERALIZATION OF EXTRA EARNINGS ALLOWANCES UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to

increase from $1,200 to $1,800 annually the allowable extra earnings for persons on social security.

The proposal would allow those who now are receiving modest benefits under social security to increase their extra earnings, in instances in which they are ready, willing, and able to work, and jobs are available.

Today, nearly 16 million persons in the country are over 65. Unfortunately, far too few of them have been able to lay away a nest egg for retirement. More than 14 million folks, including over 320,000 in Wisconsin, are receiving social security benefits—often at a very modest level—which have helped to "keep the wolf away from the door."

We recognize, of course, that it is often difficult for folks in their maturing years to find jobs—for which there is ever-greater competition these days.

Under circumstances in which jobs are available, however, I believe it is absolutely unrealistic to prevent these folks—who have helped to build this great country—from improving their standard of living and maintaining as great a degree of economic independence as possible.

To brighten the outlook for these senior citizens, I believe that the increase in allowable extra earnings—not only providing larger incomes, but also encouraging them to continue to contribute to community life—would be not only in their best interests, but also in the best interests of the country.

My colleagues will recall that I have introduced similar bills in previous sessions of Congress.

Recently, it was a real pleasure to note that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare endorsed the principle of allowing increased earnings by those who are obtaining social security benefits.

I am hopeful, therefore, that Congress will take expeditious action to provide this much-needed improvement in our social security program. Overall, it would serve to brighten the outlook for a great many of our senior citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2809) to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES ACT OF 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President in the event of a national emergency labor dispute to appoint a public factfinding board which would make recommendations for settlement. Following such action, the bill provides that where the national health and safety is involved the President may direct the Attorney General to go into court and request the appointment of a special receiver who would take possession of the affected facilities in the name of the United States and operate them to the extent required to protect the Nation's health or safety.

Under the terms of the bill, the President would invoke either the existing factfinding and injunction procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act, the new factfinding section in this legislation—which provides for a 30-day cooling off period following the issuance of the Board's recommendations—or a combination of both when labor disputes of a national emergency nature arise. When such means prove unsuccessful in achieving a settlement, the President may declare a national emergency to exist and direct the Attorney General to go to court to seek the appointment of a special receiver to operate the plant, mine, or other facility.

In fulfilling his function of operating the facility to the extent deemed necessary to protect national health and safety, the special receiver could utilize the facility's regular management and production personnel. During this period, the receiver would maintain existing wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. However, the court may direct that adjustments be made while the facility is in the Government's possession within the framework of recommendations which might have been made by the factfinding board. Ordinarily, the receiver would operate the facility for the account of the employer, unless the employer exercised the option to request compensation for the temporary use of his facility. In that case, the net proceeds of the operation would be turned over to the Government and the employer would exercise his right to receive just, fair and reasonable payment as rental, taking into account the effect the labor dispute had on the rental value of the facility involved.

The recent national steel dispute, lasting 173 days from the time the strike began until the settlement was finally announced, demonstrated with unmistakable clarity that our existing means of dealing with national emergency labor disputes are inadequate to cope with the necessities of life in modern America. Our research shows that since 1862 Congress has enacted 18 separate statutes which recognize the necessity for the Federal Government to take possession and to operate industrial and other facilities in order to meet special emergency needs. However, those four which remain on the books today have a very limited application.

We must devise new methods to deal with disputes which can so severely affect employment and production levels throughout the whole U.S. economy that they may precipitate a national crisis. The overriding national interest in such disputes is the paramount factor in any major struggle between opposing economic forces in any industry.

However, in the establishment of new methods to protect the national interest in such situations, we must strive to maintain and strengthen the traditional American means for settling disputes through the essential tool of collective bargaining. The imposition of a decision on both sides through compulsory arbitration, which has been suggested, seems to us to be undesirable since it tends to force the two parties in the dispute farther apart instead of bringing them closer to a mutually acceptable agreement.

Under our proposal, the National Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1960, the terms of final settlement are completely within the bargaining power of both parties, and neither can gain from refusing to bargain in good faith since any adjustments involving the employees made by the special receiver are only in force for the period during which he is in possession of the plant for the Federal Government. Possession of the plant or other facilities is not restored to the employer until labor-management relations compatible with the national health and safety are established.

This proposed legislation adapts a technique of the Railway Labor Act which was originally used with considerable success—it is that which provides for the drawing up and releasing of recommendations by a public factfinding board in a labor dispute and, following their public issuance, the commencement of a 30-day "cooling off" period during which negotiations continue. Also, the State of Massachusetts reports that it has found most effective a State law which authorizes the Governor to take possession of facilities where an immediate interruption of services threatens public health and safety. From 1948 through 1953, the Governor announced on six separate occasions that he would invoke the law and move to have the State take possession of the affected facility. However, in three of those instances a voluntary agreement to continue operations, pending settlement of the dispute, was reached shortly after the Governor announced his intention. In the three other cases, a settlement was reached through collective bargaining while the State government was operating the facility.

The measurable loss to our economy during the steel strike was staggering. Our gross national product, which was expected to rise under normal circumstances by some $13 billion from July 1 through September 30, 1959, decreased instead by some $6 billion. The U.S. Treasury estimates that its tax loss from all sources as a result of the steel strike was about $710 million. Another $3.3 billion was lost in steel sales, and about $632 million was lost in terms of overhead, depreciation, and other steel wages.

The total amount of money lost to steelworkers was $1.1 billion, while each striking steelworker suffered an average loss of $2,200.

Although other major industries involved in trade, commerce, transportation, and communication may not approach the steel industry as to total employees—some 500,000—the economic impact of a prolonged interruption in their functioning could prove devastating. At least, there was some forewarning in the steel industry and an effort was made to stockpile steel in advance of the strike deadline. However, it is

impossible to "stockpile" indispensable services, such as those performed by hospital workers, by manufacturers and distributors of perishable commodities, by public utilities, and by those working on most modern weapons where a stoppage could endanger national security. It is with these considerations uppermost in mind that we are today introducing national emergency labor dispute legislation.

The Communist bloc, under the leadership of the Soviet Union, has challenged the political and economic institutions of the free world under the leadership of the United States to a life-and-death struggle which may well be waged for decades to come. Our system of private enterprise is being put to its supreme test, and it is therefore in the self-interest of U.S. management and labor that the process of free, collective bargaining which has so vitalized our industrial capacity be utilized to the fullest extent possible, commensurate with the national interest.

Mr. President, in support of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD together with a study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service on the operations of the Steel Industry Fact-Finding Board of 1949, which suggested amendment of the law to permit recommendations to be made; a legal memorandum prepared by William H. Davis, a New York lawyer, former chairman of the National Defense Mediation Board and the War Labor Board during World War II, and finally, a list and analysis of the previous seizure statutes prepared by Justice Felix Frankfurter in connection with the steel seizure decision of 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, study, memorandum, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2810) amending the National Labor Relations Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The study, memorandum, and analysis presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Emergency Labor Disputes Act of 1960".

SEC. 2. The National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By adding immediately following section 205 the following new section:

"PUBLIC FACTFINDING BOARDS

"SEC. 205A. Whenever in the opinion of the President, a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several states or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce will, if permitted to occur or continue, imperil the national health, safety, or welfare, and the settlement of such dispute through collective bargaining will be assisted by such action, the President may appoint a public fact finding board to inquire into the facts with respect to such dispute and, if the President so direct at the time of appointment of the board or thereafter, to make such recommendations to the parties as to the settlement of the dispute between them as it may deem appropriate. The provisions of section 207 of this Act shall be applicable to the appointment, powers, and compensation of such board. Within thirty days from the creation of such a board it shall make a written report to the President, which shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position, and if the President has so directed, recommendations to the parties for the settlement of the dispute between them. The President shall file a copy of such report with the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Service, and shall make its contents available to the public. Neither party shall be under a duty to accept in whole or in part any recommendation of settlement made by the board. After the creation of such board and for thirty days after such board has made its report to the President, no change except by agreement shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose."

(b) By adding immediately following section 210 the following new section:

"SEC. 210A. Whenever the President finds with respect to a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, transmission or communication among the several States or with foreign nations, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, after (a) he has invoked the provisions of section 205A or sections 206 through 210 withut settlement of the dispute thereunder, or (b) he has determined that the procedures under the provisions of section 205A or sections 206 through 210 are not applicable to such dispute, that the exercise of the powers and authority provided by this section are necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety, he is authorized to declare a national emergency relative thereto by Executive order and to direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the employer, for the appointment of a special receiver to take immediate possession in the name of the United States of any plant, mine, or other facility which is the subject of such labor dispute and to use and operate such plant, mine, or other facility in the interests of the United States, and if the court finds that the exercise of the power and authority provided by this section is necessary to preserve and protect the national health or safety, it shall have jurisdiction to appoint such a special receiver and to make such other orders as may be appropriate: *Provided, however,* That (1) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver only to the extent which in the opinion of the court is necessary to protect the national health and safety of the United States or of any material portion of the population or territory thereof; (2) the possession and operation of such plant, mine, or other facility shall not render inapplicable any State or Federal law concerning health, safety, security, or employment standards and the special receiver while operating such facility shall comply with such laws as if it were privately operated; (3) the wages, hours, conditions, and other terms of employment effective at the time of taking possession by the special receiver shall be maintained without change: *Provided,* That the court may, if a public factfinding board appointed under section 205A shall have recommended changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, or other conditions of employment, direct the special receiver to make such recommendations effective in whole or in part in any plant, mine, or other facility which is being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation: *And provided further,* That if no such board shall have been appointed, the President may in his discretion appoint a special board which shall be subject to the provisions of section 207 of this Act and shall make such recommendations concerning changes in rates of pay, wages, hours, and other conditions of employment for the period of operation by the special receiver as it may deem appropriate and which the court may direct the special receiver to make effective in whole or in part in any plant, mine, or other facility which is being operated by the special receiver during such period of operation; (4) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be returned to the employer as soon as practicable, but in no event later than thirty days after the restoration of such labor relations in such plant, mine, or other facility that the possession or operation thereof by the special receiver is no longer necessary to insure the operation thereof required for the protection and preservation of the national health and safety; (5) such plant, mine, or other facility shall be operated by the special receiver for the account of the employer: *Provided further,* That the employer shall have the right to elect, by written notice filed with the court within ten days of such taking of possession, to waive all claims to the proceeds of such operation and to receive in lieu thereof just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the period of such possession and operation by the special receiver, to be paid by the United States as follows: (A) The President shall ascertain the amount of just, fair, and reasonable compensation to be paid as rental for the appropriation and temporary use of such plant, mine, or other facility while in the possession of or operated by the special receiver in the interest of the United States, such determination to be made as of the time of the taking hereunder, and taking into account the existence of the labor dispute which interrupted or threatened to interrupt the operation of such plant, mine, or other facility and the effect of such interruption or threatened interruption upon the value to the employer of the use of such plant, mine, or other facility; (B) If the amount so ascertained is not acceptable to the employer as just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property taken hereunder and as full and complete compensation therefor, the employer shall be paid 75 per centum of such amount and shall be entitled to sue the United States in the Court of Claims or in any district court of the United States in the manner provided for by sections 1357 and 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code to recover such further sums as when added to the amount so paid shall make such amount as will be just, fair, and reasonable compensation for the appropriation and temporary use of the property so taken. In the event such notice of election is filed with the court, the special receiver shall pay over to the United States the proceeds of the operations of such plant, mine, or other facility while in his possession."

THE 1949 STEEL LABOR DISPUTE AND THE PRESIDENT'S STEEL INDUSTRY FACTFINDING BOARD

(By Vladimir N. Pregelj, Economics Division, Library of Congress, December 1, 1959)

BACKGROUND OF THE DISPUTE

In early May 1949, the wage-policy committee and the executive board of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO) formulated demands to be presented to the steel companies under reopening clauses, added in 1948 as amendments to the 1947 contracts. The 1948 supplemental agreement provided that "60 days prior to July 16, 1949, either

party may serve notice on the other of its desire to negotiate: (a) for a general and uniform change in rates of pay and/or (b) for life, accident, health, medical, and hospital insurance benefits."

On May 16, 1949, the union served notices on the various companies of its desire to negotiate both a change in wages and insurance benefits mentioned in the 1948 amendment. In addition, the union, in separate letters, also indicated that it desired to negotiate on the subject of pensions.

Collective-bargaining conferences began on June 15, 1949, in Pittsburgh. Steel companies refused to grant a wage increase, and, with the exception of Inland Steel, also rejected the demand for negotiating a pension plan on the grounds that such a proposal was not bargainable under the reopening clauses of the 1948 amendment. In the matter of social insurance, however, several companies made counterproposals. In view of the position held by the companies and the equally adamant demands for larger benefits presented by the union, there was virtually no progress made in the collective-bargaining sessions during the 3 weeks from the opening of negotiations till July 7.

In view of the deadlock, Cyrus S. Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, on July 7, 1949, invited the representatives of both sides to meet with him in Washington on July 11. Both joint and separate conferences were held on July 11, but no headway was made as both parties to the dispute held fast in their original positions. With the failure of conciliation efforts and prospect of work stoppage as of July 15, 1949, Mr. Ching, on July 12, reported the dispute to the President, and suggested that he request a 75-day maintaining of the status quo and appoint a three-member board to investigate the issues in dispute and to make recommendations for its settlement.

CREATION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE STEEL INDUSTRY BOARD

As suggesed by Mr. Ching, President Truman, on July 12, 1949, sent a telegram to the union and six major steel companies, requesting that, in view of its vital role in the national economy, the steel industry continue operating under the terms of existing contracts for a period of an additional 60 days. Mr. Truman also stated that he would appoint a three-member factfinding board to investigate the issues and submit a report with recommendations for the settlement within 45 days from July 16.

The President's request was immediately accepted by the union. The companies, however, showed considerable reluctance to agree to such procedure. The United States Steel Corp. contended that Presidential intervention, if necessary at all, should have been within the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, authorizing the creation of a factfinding board without the power to make recommendations. On behalf of the President, Mr. Ching replied to the United States Steel Corp. and requested a definite reply as to the acceptance of the President's proposal. He also stated that "experience under the Labor Management Relations Act has demonstrated that factfinding in major disputes without recommendations usually results in delay but does not promote settlement." He added that the President's proposal was made with the objective in mind of the great help which recommendations suggested by factfinding boards can offer toward the settlement of disputes. On July 15, 1949, the United States Steel Corp. consented to the President's proposal. It stated, however, that it would not consider itself bound by findings or recommendations issuing from such a board. Similar reservations were contained and problems of individual companies requiring special consideration were pointed out in replies made by other steel companies.

The Steel Industry Board was formally established on July 15, 1949. Its members were: Carroll R. Daugherty, professor of business economics at Northwestern University, chairman; Samuel I. Rosenman, former New York Supreme Court justice; and David L. Cole, attorney, of Paterson, N.J.

The Board conducted its hearings in New York. At the first meeting, on July 26, 1949, procedural matters were discussed, and hearings on substantive issues began on July 28 with union's testimony. Initially, 8 days of testifying were allowed to either side in the dispute; these periods were subsequently extended slightly and two recesses were granted to allow further testimony by the companies.

During the presentation of its case, the union estimated that the total increase in cost of its demands would be equivalent to 30 cents an hour, divided as follows: 12.5 cents in wages, 11.23 cents to establish a $125 monthly retirement benefits fund for workers over 65 years of age, and 6.27 cents for a noncontributory (company-paid) life and health insurance plan. It was claimed that the companies could well afford paying these benefits without price increases in view of the large profits made during the previous several years. The union also contended that wage increases were necessary to increase the workers' purchasing power and thus help reverse the downward trend in business.

The representatives of the industry testified that the companies could not increase their labor costs at the time when the demand for steel was declining. They contended that such action would only serve to increase steel prices with the result of further reducing the demand for steel. The union's demands were characterized as highly inflationary and impossible to bear financially by the companies which had largely reinvested their high profits of preceding years. The contention that the demand for a pension plan was not bargainable at this time under the 1948 contract renegotiation was again unequivocally repeated.

In view of the extensions granted during the course of testimony, the hearings were not concluded until August 29, 1949, and a postponement of the reporting date to September 10, originally set for August 30, was granted. On the last day of hearings, the Board proffered its service as a mediator in the dispute, but withdrew the offer the following day.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD

In its report to the President, submitted on September 10, 1949, the Board, in analyzing its own activities, reaffirmed the feasibility of utilizing factfinding boards, but suggested an enlargement of the Taft-Hartley Act provisions so as to include making recommendations as a statutory function of the factfinding boards established under that law. After a detailed presentation and analysis of its own discussions as well as the arguments presented by both disputants, the Board recommended that "under present conditions"—and this qualification was strongly emphasized—no general increase in wage rates was indicated. In regard to the social insurance, the Board recommended that noncontributory plans at a cost to the companies of 4 cents an hour, be established or, where such plans already are in existence, be increased to that amount. The Board found pensions not to be bargainable under the 1948 contract, but considered them bargainable under the Taft-Hartley Act. It recommended a noncontributory plan costing the companies 6 cents an hour and enabling the workers to receive upon retirement after 65 years of age monthly benefits of about $100, including those payable under the Social Security Act.

In making its recommendations in regard to social insurance and pension plans, the Board held that "the concept of providing social insurance and pensions for workers in industry has become an accepted part of modern American thinking." Its recommendations for sole company financing rested on the opinion that "social insurance and pensions should be considered a part of normal business costs to take care of temporary and permanent depreciation in the human machine in much the same way as provision is made for depreciation and insurance of plant and machinery." It was also based on the estimate made by the Board that the total 10-cents-an-hour cost of both plans would amount to no more—and more likely to less—than 2½ percent of total cost of operations, and could, therefore, be easily afforded by the companies without an increase in steel prices. The details and specific benefits were to be determined through collective bargaining between the union and each company.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS AND SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE

Because of the late submittal of the report and in order to allow more time for a thorough study of it, the parties agreed, at the request of the President, to extend the truce, first to September 25 and later to October 1, 1949.

The recommendations contained in the report elicited varied response from the disputing parties. While the union declared itself willing to accept the Board's proposals as the basis for settlement of the dispute, the steel companies—relying on the earlier assurance that the Board's findings would not be binding—agreed only to treat them as the basis for further negotiations. The companies expressed their willingness to study and bargain for a pension plan at a later date, but refused to be the sole contributors to pension and insurance plans. The union, however, insisted on noncontributory plans, stating that the workers did actually contribute because the cost of the programs was considered in union wage demands.

On September 16, 1949, the disputing parties were again invited to meet in Washington with Mr. Ching. The meetings were held separately on September 19 through 21, but no progress was made. Collective bargaining between the union and the companies resumed on October 23 in Pittsburgh, with the positions of the disputants essentially unchanged. Some new proposals and counterproposals were made during the first week of resumed bargaining. United States Steel, the industry leader, offered a 10-cent raise as recommended by the Board provided the employees also contribute. This was rejected by the union. A counteroffer by the union to drop pension demands in favor of a 30-cents-an-hour wage raise was rejected by the companies. On September 30, the last day of truce, Mr. Murray, president of the United Steelworkers of America, declared that the strike scheduled for the next day would be for the original 30-cents-an-hour package.

On October 1, 1949, some 500,000 members of the United Steelworkers of America walked out. Some 400,000 struck at at least 50 basic steel plants, about 12,000 at iron ore mines in the Mesabi range, and the remainder in allied industries. The strike paralyzed about 90 percent of total steel producing capacity of the Nation, but did not go into effect at the American Can Co. and two small steel producers which settled on basis of Board's recommendations before the strike deadline, and several larger companies whose contracts were to expire in October, as well as at a few plants at which existing contracts were extended for additional periods with or without temporary modifications.

During the first week of strike, Kaiser Steel Corp. (on October 5) and three small steel companies (on October 7) settled the dispute by accepting the Board's plan. Realizing that negotiations with United States Steel Corp., the usual leader in steel labor contracts, were for all practical purposes deadlocked, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service which had been throughout the dispute actively if unobtrusively working for a settlement, invited Bethlehem Steel Corp., the second largest producer of steel, to participate in mediation conferences in hope that an agreement might be reached with a major producer. During the second week of the strike, seven more small and medium-size producers of basic steel and fabricators settled on the basis of Board's recommendations. On October 17, the strike spread to plants of the Aluminum Company of America, involving 16,000 additional USWA members.

On October 20, 1949, the Copperweld Steel Co., which had reached a partial agreement already on September 30, settled on even better terms than the Board's proposal. The union won a noncontributory package of 13 cents, of which 6 cents were allotted for pensions and 7 cents for insurance program. Two days later the union announced that during the third week of the strike 18 small companies, mostly fabricators, signed new contracts on Board's terms. Negotiations with "Big Steel," however, remained deadlocked and were temporarily broken off. This impasse prompted the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to invite the representatives of Jones and Laughlin, Republic Steel, and Youngstown Sheet and Tube to participate in mediation talks which began on October 29. During this time two more minor companies accepted the terms of the Board's proposal.

The first major break in negotiations occurred on October 31, 1949, when Bethlehem Steel Corp. signed a new contract with the union, thus becoming the new pattern-setter for steel, a role traditionally played by United States Steel. Bethlehem contract provided for noncontributory pensions of a minimum $100 a month for workers with 25 years of service and 65 years of age. Since, however, monthly benefits were to include social security benefits, the pension program was actually contributory to the extent of workers' contributions to the latter plan. Total cost of the package was about 12 cents an hour.

On November 1, the strike spread to the plants of Allegheny-Ludlum Steel Co. whose contracts expired on October 15, and on November 4, also to the Timken Roller Bearing Co. whose contract had also run out.

Meanwhile, Bethlehem settlement spurred talks with other major producers. On November 8, Jones & Laughlin and a medium-size company settled by accepting Bethlehem plan, while Newport Steel Corp. new contract followed the Board's recommendations.

On the same day Republic Steel Corp. followed suit by accepting Bethlehem plan in regard to pensions and set up its own contributory insurance program costing the workers 3.5 cents an hour and the company 2.5 cents an hour. On November 9, Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. signed on the basis of Bethlehem plan, and negotiations resumed with United States Steel. Two days later, Bethlehem plan was accepted by United States Steel Corp. and by Inland Steel Co. The strike which still continued at several other steel plants, lost its national character.

During the week following the "Big Steel" agreements, or shortly thereafter, practically all minor producers and fabricators and the last of the 19 leading companies signed new contracts patterned after the Bethlehem plan. The sole exceptions were the agreements reached on November 13 by Oliver Iron & Steel Corp. and on November 14 by Mackintosh-Hemphill Steel Co. which provided for a 10-cent package of which 6–7 cents would go to the pension fund and the remainder for the insurance program to which the workers would also contribute 2 cents an hour. By the end of November, steel industry was operating at over 85 percent of capacity.

Alcoa and Timken settled, following Bethlehem pattern, on December 7 and 12, respectively, with the exception that Alcoa contract provided for noncontributory insurance program.

AFTERMATH

Despite the fact that the steel industry board agreed with union's contention that the cost of the new concessions could easily be absorbed by the companies, a wave of steel price increases followed in the wake of the newly negotiated contracts.

Less than 24 hours after the signing of the labor contract, Central Iron & Steel Co., of Harrisburg, on October 8, 1949, raised the price of steelplates by $5 a ton. On November 28, Sharon Steel Corp., the Nation's ninth largest producer, increased the price of hot strip products by $5 a ton, but emphasized that the new labor contract was not a factor in this increase. On December 11, Mahoning Valley Steel Co., a customer of Sharon Steel, announced $10 a ton increase for all products and justified it by claiming higher raw material and operation costs.

Price increases in "Big Steel" began on December 15 when United States Steel announced a $4 per ton increase on a wide range of products due to actual and approaching changes in production costs, including that of the new welfare plans. On December 19, Republic Steel and Armco Steel increased their prices $4 per ton, or approximately 4 percent. Bethlehem Steel, Jones & Laughlin, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Wheeling Steel, and Pittsburgh Steel followed on December 20 with an average increase of $4 a ton, or 4 percent. Allegheny-Ludlum also joined the price hiking. On December 21, National Steel increased its prices by $3.50 a ton, Great Lakes Steel by $4 due to rising costs, Sharon Steel—this time on cold strip products—by $3. Timken's alloy steel went up 4 percent and bearings 3.3 percent, while Babcock-Wilcox began charging for its products 3 to 7½ percent more. The last major producer to increase prices was Kaiser Steel Corp., which, on December 23, announced 4 percent increases due to recent advances in steelmaking costs.

(Sources: Facts on file yearbook, 1949 (vol. 9); Monthly Labor Review, vol. 69, No. 2, vol. 70, No. 2 (August 1949–February 1950); New York Times, October–December 1949; U.S. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2d annual report, fiscal year 1949; U.S. Steel Industry Board, report to the President of the United States on the labor dispute in the basic steel industry, Sept. 10, 1949; White House press release, July 12, 1949.)

MEMORANDUM ON THE STEEL STRIKE

The article on "Government and Labor" published in The Nation on November 21, 1959, of which I was the author, discussed emergency action of our National Government as a last resort to meet a real national emergency—a clear and present danger imperiling our social structure.

I wish I could have succeeded in more clearly evoking that picture; in calling to the reader's mind in sharpest context such an emergency strike on the one hand and on the other hand the ordinary strike which is a most useful instrument, actually or potentially, in everyday collective bargaining.

Facing this sharp contrast in my own thinking, and accepting the fact that the steel strike created such a real emergency, my suggestions were:

(1) That the first governmental step must be to restore normal production.

That for this purpose the Congress should entrust to the Executive, by appropriate legislation, the power by proclamation to commandeer all production facilities for national use so long as the emergency lasts, and to require all employees in the steel industry—all production employees and all management employees—to resume their occupations forthwith.

2. That such legalized taking of private property for such use would, under the fifth amendment, make the United States liable for just compensation.

Assuming initial compensation for services of employees and for the use of facilities at rates prevailing at the time of seizure, the Government would have to determine whether such prevailing rates were, and whether they remained, just compensation. This would mean the fixing of wages, prices, and rentals by Government, presumably informed by the findings of compensation boards after investigation by due process of law.

THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THE IDEA OF SEIZURE

This idea of seizure of private property would, one might suppose, be unpalatable in a system like ours devoted to the free enterprise system. But in fact the idea of seizure seems to be generally acceptable in the face of a national emergency due to prolonged interruption of production caused by a failure of organized employees and organized employers to agree on terms and conditions of employment, as in the steel case. Perhaps this somewhat incongruous response reflects a conscious or subconscious recognition of the fact that such a failure of free collective bargaining removes the affected industry from the ranks of free enterprise; that in such a case seizure for public use can no longer be thought of as an encroachment on the free enterprise system.

However that may be, and as further evidence that the response to the idea of seizure is not what might have been expected, it is worthwhile to recall that in February 1949, when the proposal outlined in The Nation article of November 21, 1959, was developed in testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor, the idea of seizure was expressly approved by Senator Taft, although he preferred that the seizure should be done by Congress and perhaps by ad hoc legislation appropriate to the particlar emergency rather than by the President.[1]

Another item of such evidence is that the Governor of Massachusetts is authorized[2] in the event that an unsettled labor dispute threatens "the production or distribution of food, fuel, water, electric light or power, gas, or hospital or medical services" to take possession of and to operate any necessary plant or facility, and to appoint emergency boards to hold hearings and make recommendations concerning the rates of pay, wages, hours, and terms, and conditions of employment during the emergency. During these emergency conditions "concerted cessation of work or other concerted activities threatening to interfere" with the operation of such

---

[1] "Senator TAFT. Mr. Davis, you have outlined more or less the kind of special statute I had in mind for Congress to pass when the emergency occurred. That is, I mean you have said, or asked, did we have an ace in the hole? Well, what you describe is very much the kind of thing that I had in mind to be done by Congress, only my theory was that it ought to be done by Congress for a particular emergency to apply only to that particular emergency" (transcript p. 897).

[2] Mass., Acts, 1947, chapter 596, General Laws 150B, "Peaceful Settlement of Industrial Disputes Dangerous to Public Health and Safety."

plant or facility, is forbidden. This carefully drawn law not only evidences the appropriateness of seizure in such emergencies but, in defining as essential services the distribution of food, fuel, water, electric light or power, gas, and hospital or medical services, it evidences the widely recognized fact that such services interruptions call for immediate and effective action by the constituted authorities.

It is clear, however, that seizure must be resorted to only as the final and unavoidable step.

It is fundamentally important that the availability of seizure in a national emergency must not be permitted to reflect back into the normal procedures of collective bargaining to diminish the persuasive values of a strike or lockout under normal conditions. Whatever the Government does in a national emergency should lead back to, not away from, normal collective bargaining procedures.

These considerations lead me to suggest that there is available an intermediate procedure which retains to a substantial degree the civilizing values of freedom of choice. That is the procedure of the Railway Labor Act. It provides for a Mediation Board authorized to investigate labor disputes on the railroads, to mediate, and to suggest voluntary arbitration to the parties. If those things fail the President is authorized to appoint an Emergency Board, separately in each instance, to investigate the facts and report to the President within 30 days from the date of its creation. From the date of appointment of such an emergency board to 30 days after its report to the President—60 days in all—"no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy as to the conditions out of which the dispute arose." This procedure, inappropriate and unnecessary in the normal processes of collective bargaining, became necessary and appropriate because of the essential relation of railroad transportation to interstate commerce and community welfare. In its consideration by the Congress railway management and railway labor were consulted. The law was passed with their approval during the Coolidge administration in 1926.

As this is written the Presidential Board of Inquiry has completed its factual study and its public hearings and is preparing its report for submission to the President on January 6. However, under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, that report will not include recommendations. Congress is about to reassemble and may do so in uncertainty as to whether the steel dispute will or will not be settled and uncertainty as to whether a failure to settle it will or will not result in a recreation of the national emergency. The country does not know with any clarity what the questions in dispute really are. The contest as it has been carried on in the press, radio, and TV has been a hodgepodge of assertions, denials, recriminations, and name calling, devoid of any responsible statement of the issues and any report of responsible collective bargaining.

We can be sure that the report of Dr. Taylor's Board of Inquiry will be at least a clear and comprehensive statement of the issues and of the negotiations.

It seems almost to suggest itself that the Congress has immediately at hand at least one way to ward off the peril. That way would be an act of Congress prior to January 26 modeled on the Railway Labor Act, extending the status quo in the steel plants for say 60 days, and authorizing a board—possibly the Taylor Board—to make recommendations as an emergency board does under the Railway Labor Act.

If such a course were backed up by further congressional enactment of the power to seize I think the people would understand that whatever happens their redeemer liveth; and that the country would much appreciate that assurance.

YOUNGSTOWN CO. *v.* SAWYER

Frankfurter, J., concurring

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
1. Railroad and Telegraph Act of 1862, 12 Stat. 334. Enacted Jan. 31, 1862; amended, 12 Stat. 625, July 14, 1862.	Not "in force any longer than is necessary for the suppression of this rebellion."		President may "take possession of" telegraph lines and railroads; prescribe rules for their operation; and place all officers and employees under military control.	a. "When in his [the President's] judgment the public safety may require it." b. President may not "engage in any work of railroad construction."	None	President shall appoint 3 commissioners to assess compensation to which the company is entitled and to report to Congress for its action.
2. Sec. 120 of National Defense Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 166, 213; 50 U.S.C. sec. 80, as amended. Enacted June 3, 1916.	No time limit		President, through the head of any department, may seize any plant and may operate plants through the Army Ordnance Department.	a. Exercisable "in time of war or when war is imminent." b. Plant is equipped for making "necessary supplies or equipment for the Army" or "in the opinion of the Secretary of War" can be transformed readily to such use. c. Owner refuses to give Government order precedence or to perform.	None	Compensation "shall be fair and just."
3. Army Appropriations Act of 1916, 39 Stat. 619, 645; 10 U.S.C. sec. 1361. Enacted Aug. 29, 1916.	No time limit		President, through Secretary of War, may take possession of and utilize any system or part of any system of transportation.	Exercisable "in time of war." [1]	None	Compensation "shall be fair and just."
4. Naval Emergency Fund Act of 1917, 39 Stat. 1168, 1192, 1195; 50 U.S.C. sec. 82. Enacted Mar. 4, 1917. (Cf. Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, infra.)	No time limit		President may— 1. "take over for use or operation" any factory "whether [or not] the United States has * * * agreement with the owner or occupier." 2. "take immediate possession of any factory" producing ships or war material for the Navy.	Exercisable "in time of war" (or of national emergency determined by the President before Mar. 1, 1918). a. Owner fails or refuses to give precedence to an order for "ships or war material as the necessities of the Government"; refuses to deliver or to comply with a contract as modified by President. b. Exercisable within "the limits of the amounts appropriated therefor."	None None	President shall determine "just compensation," if the claimant is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 50 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of "just compensation."

[1] Government possession of the Nation's railroads taken on Dec. 28, 1917, was specifically terminated by statute on Mar. 1, 1920, prior to the end of the "war." See sec. 200 of the Transportation Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 456, 457.

YOUNGSTOWN CO. v. SAWYER—Continued

Frankfurter, J., concurring

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
5. Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, 40 Stat. 182. Enacted, June 15, 1917.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire, 40 Stat. 182, 183.	Repealed after 3 years, sec 2(a)(1), 41 Stat. 988, June 5, 1920.	President may— 1. "take over for use or operation" any plant, "whether [or not] United States has * * * agreement with the owner or occupier."	Exercisable within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None	Same as next above, except that the prepaid percentage when the owner is dissatisfied is 75 percent.
			2. "take immediate possession of any * * * plant" "equipped for the building or production of ships or material."	Failure or refusal of owner of shipbuilding plant to give Government orders precedence or to comply with order.	None	
6. 1918 Amendments to Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917. A. 40 Stat. 535. Enacted Apr. 22, 1918.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire.	Repealed after 2 years, 41 Stat. 938, June 5, 1920.	President may— 1. "take possession of any street railroad."	a. The street railroad is necessary for transporting employees of plants which are or may be hereafter engaged in "construction of ships or equipment therefor for the United States." b. Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None	Same as next above.
B. 40 Stat. 1020, 1022. Enacted Nov. 4, 1918.	To 6 months after peace with the German Empire.	Repealed after 1½ years, 41 Stat. 988, June 5, 1920.	2. extend seized plants constructing ships or materials therefor and requisition land for use in extensions.	Exercisable "within the limits of the amounts herein authorized."	None	
7. Food and Fuel Act of 1917. 40 Stat. 276. Enacted Aug. 10, 1917. Sec. 10, 40 Stat. 276, 279. Sec. 12, 40 Stat. 276, 279.	To end of World War I with Germany.	----------	President may— 1. requisition foods, fuels, feeds, etc., and storage facilities for them.	The requisitioning is "necessary to the support of the Army or the * * * Navy, or any other public use connected with the common defense."	None	President "shall ascertain and pay a just compensation;" if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue in the district courts, which are hereby given jurisdiction, for the rest of "just compensation."
			2. take over any factory, packinghouse, oil pipeline, mine, or other plant where any necessaries are or may be "produced, prepared, or mined, and to operate the same."	a. President finds "it necessary to secure an adequate supply of necessaries for * * * the Army or * * * the Navy, or for any other public use connected with the common defense." b. President must turn facility back as soon as further Government operation "is not essential for the national security or defense."	President may make regulations for "the employment, control, and compensation of employees."	Same as in the Emergency Shipping Fund Act of 1917, supra.
Sec. 25, 40 Stat. 276, 284.	To end of World War I with Germany.	----------	3. "requisition and take over the plant, business, and all appurtenances thereof belonging to such producer or dealer" of coal and coke, and may operate it through an agency of his choice.	Producer or dealer— a. Fails to conform to prices or regulations set by the Federal Trade Commission under the direction of the President, who deems it "necessary for the efficient prosecution of the war," or b. Fails to operate efficiently, or conducts business in a way "prejudicial to the public interest."	President may "prescribe * * * regulations * * * for the employment, control, and compensation of the employees."	Same as next above.
8. Joint resolution of July 16, 1918, 40 Stat. 904.	"During the continuance of the present war."	Terminated on July 31, 1919, by repeal, July 11, 1919, 41 Stat. 157.	President may "take possession * * * of [and operate] any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system."	President deems "it necessary for the national security or defense."	None	Same as next above.

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
9. Sec. 16 of Federal Water Power Act of 1930, 41 Stat. 1063, 1072; 16 U.S.C., sec. 809. Enacted June 10, 1920.	No time limit		President may take possession of any project, dams, powerhouses, transmission lines, etc., constructed or operated under a license from the Federal Power Commission and may operate them.	a. President believes, as "evidenced by a written order addressed to the holder of any license hereunder [that] the safety of the United States demands it." b. Seizure is "for the purpose of manufacturing nitrates, explosives, or munitions of war, or for any other purpose involving the safety of the United States." c. Control is limited to the "length of time as may appear to the President to be necessary to accomplish said purposes."	None	Owner shall be paid "just and fair compensation for the use of said property as may be fixed by the [Federal Power] Commission upon the basis of a reasonable profit in time of peace, and the cost of restoring said property to as good condition as existed at the time of the taking over thereof, less the reasonable value of any improvements * * * made thereto by the United States and which are valuable and serviceable to the [owner]."
10. Sec. 606 of Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1064, 1104, 47 U.S.C. sec. 606(c). Enacted June 19, 1934.	No time limit		President may "use or control * * * any such station and/or its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe."	a. President proclaims that there exists— (1) war or threat of war or (2) a state of public peril or disaster or other national emergency, or b. It is necessary to preserve the neutrality of the United States.	None	President shall ascertain just compensation and certify it to Congress for appropriation; if the owner is dissatisfied, he shall be paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue, subject to existing law, in the district courts and the Court of Claims for the rest of just compensation."
11. Amendments to Communications Act, 56 Stat. 18, 47 U.S.C., sec. 606(d). Enacted Jan. 26, 1942.	No time limit		Same power as in sec. 606(c), Communications Act of 1934, next above.	a. President proclaims a state or threat of war. b. President "deems it necessary in the interest of the national security and defense." c. Power to seize and use property continues to "not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war" or than a date set by concurrent resolution of Congress.	None	Same as next above.
12. Section 8(b) of National Defense Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 676, 680. Enacted June 28, 1940.	No time limit	Repealed in less than 3 months, Sept. 16, 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 893.	Secretary of Navy, under President's direction, may "take over and operate such plant or facility."	a. Secretary of Navy deems any existing plant necessary for the national defense. b. He is unable to reach agreement with its owner for its use or operation.	Secretary of Navy may operate the plant "either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms."	Secretary of Navy may "fix the compensation."
13. Sec. 9 of Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 885, 892, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 309. Enacted Sept. 16, 1940; amended by War Labor Disputes Act, 57 Stat. 163, 164, q. v., infra.	To May 15, 1945, 54 Stat. 885, 897.	Extended to Mar. 31, 1947, 60 Stat. 341, 342.	President may "take immediate possession of any such plant." (Extended by amendment to "any plant, mine, or facility" capable of producing "any articles or materials which may be required * * * or which may be useful" for the war effort, 57 Stat. 163, 164.)	a. Plant is equipped for or capable of being readily transformed for the manufacture of necessary supplies. b. Owner refuses to give Government order precedence or to fill it.	None	"The compensation * * * shall be fair and just."
14. Sec. 3 of War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, 57 Stat. 163, 164, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 1503. Enacted June 25, 1943.	To termination of this act by concurrent resolution by Congress or of hostilities. Plants seized previously may be operated until 6 months after termination of hostilities.		President may "take immediate possession" of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required * * * or which may be useful" for the war effort.	a. Finding and proclamation by the President that— (1) there is an interruption on account of a labor disturbance, (2) the war effort will be unduly impeded, (3) seizure is necessary to insure operation. b. Plant must be returned to owner within 60 days "after the restoration of the productive efficiency."	Same "terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time [of taking] possession," except that terms and conditions might be changed by order of the War Labor Board, on application. Secs. 4, 5, 57 Stat. 163, 165.	Same as next above.

YOUNGSTOWN CO. *v.* SAWYER—Continued

Frankfurter, J., concurring

APPENDIX I.—*Synoptic analysis of legislation authorizing seizure of industrial property*—Continued

Statute	Duration		Scope of authority	Limitations on its exercise	Terms and conditions of employment during seizure	Compensation
	As enacted	As extended or repealed				
15. Title VIII, "Repricing of War Contracts," of Revenue Act of 1943, 58 Stat. 21, 92, 50 U.S.C. App. (1946 ed.) sec. 1192. Enacted Feb. 25, 1944.	To termination of hostilities.	----------	President may "take immediate possession of the plant or plants * * * and * * * operate them in accordance with sec. 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."	a. The Secretary of a Department deems the price of an article or service required directly or indirectly by the Department is unreasonable. b. The Secretary, after the refusal of the person furnishing the article or service to agree to a price, sets a price. c. The person "willfully refuses, or willfully fails" to furnish the articles or services at the price fixed by the Secretary.	None----------	Same as next above.
16. Selective Service Act of 1948, 62 Stat. 604, 625, 626; 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 458. Enacted June 24, 1948.	No time limit----	----------	President may "take immediate possession of any plant, mine, or other facility * * * and to operate it * * * for the production of such articles or materials."	a. President with advice of the National Security Resources Board determines prompt delivery of articles or materials is "in the interest of the national security." b. Procurement "has been authorized by the Congress exclusively for the use of the Armed Forces" or the AEC. c. Owner refuses or fails to give precedence to Government order placed with notice that it is made pursuant to this section, or to fill the order properly.	None----------	"Fair and just compensation shall be paid."
17. Sec. 201(a) of Defense Production Act, 64 Stat. 798, 799, 50 U.S.C. App. sec 2081(a). Enacted Sept. 8, 1950; amended, 65 Stat. 131, 132, q.v., infra.	To June 30, 1951. But see sec. 716(a), 64 Stat. 798, 822.	Extended to July 31, 1951, 65 Stat. 110. Extended to June 30, 1952, sec 111, 65 Stat. 131, 144.	President may "requisition equipment, supplies or component parts thereof, or materials or facilities necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or component parts." 64 Stat. 798, 799. Restricted in the main to personal property by sec. 102(b), 65 Stat. 132.	President determines that: a. its use is "needed for national defense," b. the need is "immediate and impending," "will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply," c. other reasonable means of obtaining use of the property have been exhausted.	None----------	President shall determine just compensation as of the time the property is taken; if owner is dissatisfied, he shall be promptly paid 75 percent of the amount determined by the President and may sue within 3 years in the district courts or the Court of Claims, regardless of the amount involved, for the rest of "just compensation."
18. Sec. 102(b)(2) of Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951, 65 Stat. 131, 132, 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 2081 (b). Enacted July 31, 1951.	To June 30, 1952, 65 Stat. 131, 144.	----------	Court condemnation of real property in accordance with existing statutes.	President deems the real property "necessary in the interest of national defense."	None----------	Under existing statutes for condemnation. Immediate possession given only upon deposit of amount "estimated to be just compensation," 75 percent of which is immediately paid without prejudice to the owner.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PERSONNEL MATTERS IN U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2811) to amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend certain sections of title 14, United States Code, relating to personnel matters in the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The general purpose of this proposal is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Coast Guard by improvement in certain statutes relating to and governing Coast Guard organization, composition, and personnel administration. In broad terms, this proposal would serve to (1) increase the present limitation of 4 years applicable to extensions of enlistments to a new limitation of 6 years; (2) increase the present limitation of 3,000 commissioned officer personnel to a new limitation of 3,500; (3) improve the organization and composition of both the civilian teaching staff and the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Coast Guard Academy; (4) improve the organization and composition of the top command by eliminating the present statutory position of Engineer in Chief; eliminating the present statutory term of 4 years for

the Assistant Commandant; and providing for the increased grade of admiral for an officer while serving as Commandant, and of Vice Admiral for an officer while serving as an Assistant Commandant; and (5) repeal certain pertinent portions of title 14 which would be rendered obsolete by the substantive changes proposed.

The memorandum attached sets forth in greater detail the need for and nature of this proposal and an explanation and analysis of each provision of the proposed bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED BILL "TO AMEND CERTAIN SECTIONS OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PERSONNEL MATTERS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

The general purpose of this proposed legislation is to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Coast Guard by improvement in certain basic statutes relating to and governing Coast Guard organization, composition and personnel administration. As noted in the letter of transmittal hereto, this proposal seeks to amend certain applicable provisions of title 14, United States Code, pertaining to—

The administration of enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard;

The administration of commissioned officer personnel of the Coast Guard;

The administration of the Coast Guard Academy; and

The administration of the Office of the Commandant at Coast Guard Headquarters.

There follows a detailed explanation and analysis of each of these major areas of consideration.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF THE COAST GUARD

Section 365 of title 14, presently provides for voluntary extensions of enlistments by enlisted personnel of the Coast Guard for a total period of not to exceed 4 full years. This proposed legislation would serve to increase this limitation to a period of not to exceed 6 full years.

The introduction of new weapons, electronic devices and systems in the Coast Guard today and the various training programs involving technical skills require enlisted personnel having considerable background, experience and training. In order to provide such training and be assured of the benefits resulting therefrom, it is necessary that such enlisted personnel have obligated service of from 1 to 6 years prior to being accepted for additional training. Individuals may obtain the necessary obligated service either by extension of enlistment or reenlistment for a stipulated number of years. However, in many cases, as a result of the existing restriction on extensions of enlistment, the individual member may acquire sufficient obligated service only by being discharged early for the convenience of the Goverment and immediately reenlisting for the required number of years necessary to qualify him as eligible for the desired specialized training. Early administrative discharges of this type are often undesirable to both the individual and the Coast Guard. It may be undesirable to the individual member since an early discharge from a prior enlistment for which a reenlistment bonus has been paid requires a pro rata return of that portion of the bonus for time not actually served in the previous enlistment. The Coast Guard also would prefer a simple extension of enlistment in lieu of early discharge inasmuch as the administration work required in the case of a discharge and subsequent reenlistment is necessarily considerably greater.

Therefore, in order that highly qualified personnel may be attracted to advanced training programs without loss of benefits and also to permit more economical and efficient administration by the Coast Guard, this change in the extension of enlistments has been recommended.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICER PERSONNEL OF THE COAST GUARD

Section 42 of title 14 presently fixes a limit of 3,000 on the total number of commissioned officers on the active list of the Coast Guard, including permanent, temporary, temporary service, and Reserve officers on active duty, but excluding commissioned warrant officers. The amendment to this section proposed would increase the limit to 3,500.

The authorized commissioned officer billets in the service on December 1, 1958, showed 2,885 persons. The military personnel billet plan in support of the Coast Guard's fiscal year 1960 budget includes a commissioned officer strength of 2,957. Not included in this latter figure is a tentative increase of 42 commissioned officers required as an initial increment for implementation of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–911) and approximately 52 more for the loran A and loran C program expansion in fiscal years 1960 and 1961. It is estimated that on July 1, 1959, a total of 2,978 commissioned officers will be required in the service for all purposes, and that thereafter, due to expansion of the loran programs alone, this total requirement will exceed 3,000 at some time during the latter part of fiscal year 1960 or the early part of fiscal year 1961. The permanency of the programs undertaken which require additional officers leaves no alternative but to request of the Congress an increase in officer strength. The Nation's Naval Establishment could well use these additional trained officers during an emergency. The increase requested is reasonable, necessary, and urgent.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Presently, sections 186 through 191 of title 14 make provisions for the composition, organization, method of appointment, grade level, credit for service, and retirement for both the civilian teaching staff and the permanent commissioned teaching staff at the Coast Guard Academy. This proposed legislation would serve to improve the overall administration of the Academy by making appropriate modifications in certain existing statutory provisions, applicable to both the civilian and permanent commissioned teaching staffs at the Academy.

Currently, appointments to positions on the teaching staff at the Academy are made subject to the competitive provisions of the civil service laws and regulations. Many desirable individuals are reluctant to compete for a teaching position at the Academy for various reasons. Such a requirement unduly restricts the appointing authority in his selection of applicants and does not conconform to the manner of selection and employment utilized at the U.S. Naval Academy and leading higher institutions of learning. The restriction on the number of civilians so employed to eight has hampered the administration of the Academy. The need for more civilian teachers has increased with the gradual expansion of the Academy to fulfill the growing needs of the service. There has not been the necessary accompanying flexibility in the employment of civilian members of the teaching staff. The term "civilian instructor" has been broadened to "civilian member of the teaching staff" to include all forms of civilian teaching employment and the various titles of these members, and to conform to the group nomenclature utilized in describing the permanent commissioned teaching members in sections 187, 188, 189, and 190 of title 14. This term has been utilized also in describing a similar group of teaching individuals in title 10 of the U.S. Code, which relates to the U.S. Naval Academy.

With the increased need for commissioned officers in the service over the past decade the number of graduates from the Academy has increased, necessitating a larger permanent commissioned teaching staff with flexibility in its composition to permit adjustments when demands upon the academy change. The current restrictions on the number of professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors preclude expansion and appropriate distribution of the teaching staff to conform to patterns of teaching staffs adopted at modern contemporary institutions.

The descriptive adjective "commissioned" has been deleted when reference is made to an instructor on the permanent commissioned teaching staff inasmuch as the descriptive term applies to all the teachers in this group and is misleading when used only before the word instructor. The change has been made for purposes of clarity.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE COMMANDANT AT COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS

There are four items included in this general proposal, as follows:

1. Elimination of the present requirement for the statutory appointment of the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard.

Section 47 of Title 14 presently provides for the statutory appointment of the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard; section 48 provides for the permanent grade and placement on the active list of an officer whose statutory term of service as Engineer in Chief has expired; and section 49 provides for the retirement of an officer who has served as Engineer in Chief for a specified period of years. This proposed legislation would abolish the statutory office of the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, and repeal the provisions of Title 14 applicable to this office.

The requirement for the statutory appointment of the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard is a relic of the days when the Coast Guard had an engineering "staff corps". The abolishment of this "staff corps" some years ago and the progressive organizational development of the Coast Guard since that time have, together, logically removed the need for a continuation of this requirement.

Today, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard is the Chief of the Office of Engineering, and in Coast Guard organization as now defined, he has exactly the same stature as the other Chiefs of Offices of the Coast Guard (Operations, Personnel, Merchant Marine Safety and Comptroller). It has never been necessary to provide for statutory appointment of the Chiefs of Headquarters Offices, nor is there any remaining valid reason for the continuation of the statutory appointment process in the case of the Engineer in Chief.

On the other hand, there is obvious good reason for the Commandant of the Coast Guard to have the same administrative flexibility in selecting, assigning, and determining the tour of duty of the Engineer in Chief that he presently possesses in respect to all

other headquarters chiefs of offices. Each of these officers, including the Engineer in Chief, is a principal staff assistant to the Commandant under the Assistant Commandant; each has a comparable place in the basic organization of the Coast Guard; and each has equal responsibility in his respective staff area. It follows logically, then, that each of these officers should be subject to the same process of designation and assignment.

2. Elimination of the present requirement for a fixed 4-year term upon appointment of the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, and statutory provision, instead, for the administrative selection and designation of such officer.

Sections 47, 48, and 49 of title 14 relate to the appointment, subsequent active service retirement of the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard. This proposed legislation seeks to eliminate the present requirement for a fixed 4-year term of office for this officer, but at the same time it would continue to provide for his administrative selection and designation. This change would follow the procedure prescribed by law (title 10) in administrative assignment of the Vice Chiefs of Staff, U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force, the Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps and the Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy.

The Assistant Commandant is the immediate and primary assistant to the Commandant and, as such, is the second senior officer in the Coast Guard. Under present (and proposed) law, the Assistant Commandant performs such duties as the Commandant may prescribe and acts as Commandant during the absence or disability of the Commandant. This is an important and responsible position in Coast Guard organization.

Administratively, no special advantage or benefit is attached to the requirement for a fixed 4-year term of the Assistant Commandant. An officer normally chosen for the position of Assistant Commandant will have already undergone close screening by the usual procedure prescribed for selection and promotion to senior grade, and with the further close screening envisioned by the proposed legislation it is not considered that the fixed term will serve any further useful purpose.

On the other hand, however, it is extremely desirable that the Commandant and the Secretary have adequate administrative flexibility in designating an officer to this post. There is evident merit in being able to prescribe the tour of duty of an Assistant Commandant to coincide precisely with administrative needs at any given time. This is not now possible since under the present statutory requirement this officer must be appointed for a specified tenure of office. This can preclude sufficient "stagger" in assignment for continuity of administration and might lead to a situation in which a Commandant is unable to terminate the services of an officer in the position of Assistant Commandant, though this officer may lack capability or suitability for continuance in this office.

Under the proposed legislation sufficient safeguards would be provided for these contingencies. The present requirement for the statutory appointment of the Assistant Commandant to flag grade has been retained. The revised wording of this section also provides that the officer so designated to serve as Assistant Commandant be selected from among those officers on the active list holding a permanent commission as captain or above. Presently, an officer with the grade of commander could be appointed as Assistant Commandant. This is inconsistent with the existing requirement that an officer must hold the grade of permanent captain to be promoted to the grade of rear admiral.

3. Provision for the increased grade of admiral for a Commandant of the Coast Guard, while so serving.

Section 44 of title 14 presently fixes the grade of an officer while serving as Commandant of the Coast Guard as vice admiral. The legislation proposed would serve to increase the grade of a Commandant to that of admiral. There are several significant considerations which prompt this proposal.

First, there is the important consideration of proper composition and organization of the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard, as is true of the other Armed Forces, can be likened to a corporation doing substantial business, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard can be readily compared with the president of a large corporation. As Commandant of the Coast Guard, an officer while so serving has on the order of 35,000 personnel, both military and civilian, under his command and supervision; he is responsible for the operation and maintenance of some 1,750 separate Coast Guard facilities located within the continental United States and in many oversea areas; he has in his custody and good keeping Government property valued at nearly $2 billion; he controls and administers Government spending on the order of about a quarter billion dollars each year; and his total job encompasses some 20 to 30 separately identifiable duties, demanding a wide range of experience, knowledge, and know-how. Moreover, as "president of the corporation," he is in close and continuing contact with many of the top echelons of industry and of Government (both military and civilian). He must also maintain contact with many individuals in private enterprises. In some instances, these business contacts are at the international level. In these respects the scope and content of responsibility involved and associated elements such as prestige are job factors which cannot be regarded lightly.

Second, it is important to emphasize that the present proposal to give the Commandant of the Coast Guard the higher grade of admiral is not without precedent. During World War II and until 1950, the Commandant did hold the grade of admiral. Basically, this higher grade was a product of the war and a direct result of the mobilization requirement attendant thereto and, as such, was prompted partly by the Coast Guard's increased wartime strength. Despite this, there is little doubt but that the decision at that time to provide the Commandant of the Coast Guard with the four-star grade of admiral was founded also on the logical desire to afford the Commandant suitable rank status within the Navy. It is significant, also, to note that the higher grade of admiral was first held by the Commandant during the war years when the Coast Guard was serving as a specialized but subordinate service under the Navy, rather than in its present-day status of an independent branch of the Armed Forces under the Treasury. Moreover, in the event of mobilization it would be desirable to have the Commandant in an equitable rank status with the chiefs of the other Armed Forces.

Third, there are the related considerations of rank-to-strength ratio and promotional opportunity in the Coast Guard, as viewed in terms of parity with other Armed Forces. Justification for the increased grade of the Commandant of the Coast Guard should not be based simply on a me-to parity with the other services; nonetheless these are strong, contributing considerations. Generally speaking, the basic statutes governing the other Armed Forces provide in respect to each of these services that about 15 percent of the total number of flag or general officers in the respective services may serve in the three- and four-star grades of vice admiral and admiral or lieutenant general and general. This means, in effect, that in the other services the ratio of officers serving in grades above rear admiral/major general to those serving in those grades is about 1 to 7, hence it follows that each officer serving in a two-star grade has about 1 in 7 opportunity for further promotion to the three- or four-star grades. This is not presently the case in the Coast Guard. In terms of the Coast Guard's flag strength of 17 officers, the ratio of officers serving in a grade above rear admiral to the number of officers in that grade is presently 1 in 16, since only the Commandant now holds a grade higher than two stars. This ratio is, of course, substantially less than that in the other Armed Forces, which is 1 in 7. However, if the changes advocated are accepted, the Coast Guard will then be allowed a ratio similar to that of the other services. There would then be 15 officers serving as rear admirals and 1 each as vice admiral and admiral. The promotional opportunity of rear admirals would then compare favorably with their contemporaries in the other Armed Forces.

Finally, section 44 of title 14 presently provides that a Commandant may be appointed from among those officers on the active list who hold the permanent grade of commander or above. Here again, as has been pointed out earlier, this requirement should be revised to be consistent with the requirement that only captains are eligible for promotion to flag rank.

4. Provision for the increased grade of vice admiral for an Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, while so serving, and his retirement.

Section 47 of title 14 presently fixes the grade of an officer while serving as Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard as rear admiral (upper half). The revision of this section being proposed would serve to increase this grade to that of vice admiral. Justification for this proposal should be evident from earlier discussions in this memorandum relating to the increased grade of the Commandant.

In addition, inasmuch as the Assistant Commandant ranks next after the Commandant and is the second senior officer in the Coast Guard, the duties and responsibilities of the Commandant's office devolve upon him during the absence or disability of the Commandant or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Commandant. It is obvious that the total job of the Assistant Commandant is similar to that of the Commandant. In view of the weight of responsibility imposed upon the Assistant Commandant and the vital nature of his position, it is only appropriate that he should hold a grade commensurate with his job, that of vice admiral.

With the Commandant serving in the grade of admiral and the Assistant Commandant serving in the grade of vice admiral, there would be a natural and logical grade separation between the Commandant, the Assistant Commandant and staff office chiefs and top line commanders (rear admirals). At present, the Assistant Commandant as a rear admiral is indistinguishable from all other rear admirals, gradewise. This is not a proper recognition of his real status. The proposal to increase the grade of the Assistant Commandant to vice admiral would result in an executive pattern following accepted principles of sound organization and management.

Finally, increasing the grade of the Assistant Commandant to vice admiral would give him equitable status with the second senior officer (the Assistant Commandant) of the Marine Corps, and more suitable status with the second senior officers in the other Armed Forces, all of whom serve in 4-star grade. Retirement of the Assistant Commandant

in 3-star grade would be permitted only after 2½ years' service in this office or physical disability while in office, otherwise eventual retirement of this officer would be in his regular permanent grade unless entitled to a higher retired grade pursuant to other provisions of law except section 243 of title 14.

The proposals to eliminate the requirement for the statutory appointment of the Assistant Commandant and the Engineer in Chief would not become effective until the expiration of the present terms of appointment held by the present incumbents. The proposals to increase the grades of the Commandant and the Assistant Commandant would become effective on the first day of the month following enactment of this act.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislation will require only an insignificant increase in Coast Guard (Treasury Department) appropriations. The added annual cost for the proposals contained herein would total approximately $8,900. This figure would include the future increased retired pay of an average of two retired Commandants and two retired Assistant Commandants, this being the average number of officers in those categories over the past several years.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT RELATIVE TO PAINTING AND ILLUMINATION OF RADIO TOWERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission requesting the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2812) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1959.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission wishes to recommend again for the consideration of the Congress the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934 (as amended) to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission (47 U.S.C. 303(q)).

The Commission previously recommended this amendment and H.R. 6746 and S. 1874 were so introduced in the 85th Congress. Attached is a copy of the bill as we drafted it as well as the justification.

The Bureau of the Budget advised the Commission that "there will be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration."

The Commission considers the enactment of this legislation of importance for facilitating a solution in the problems raised by the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries so as to minimize the hazards to aviation safety. It is therefore hoped that this proposal will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. DOERFER,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 303 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 (TO REQUIRE THAT ABANDONED RADIO TOWERS CONTINUE TO MEET THE PAINTING AND LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS THAT WOULD BE APPLICABLE IF USED PURSUANT TO LICENSE), 47 U.S.C. 303(Q)

The Commission wishes to recommend at this time for the consideration of the Congress the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission, 47 U.S.C. 303(q).

Concern has been expressed by aviation interests, both Government and non-Government, and by the general public, over the steadily increasing number of tall antenna towers, particularly those over 1,000 feet, which if left unmarked and standing at any future time, would present a serious hazard to safety in the field of aviation. The current trend toward many high radio antenna towers presents a much more acute problem than that which has existed in the past, due to the much greater speeds attained by modern aircraft and due to the fact that towers built in the past are as a general rule of much less height than those currently being constructed. Furthermore, radio towers, being of latticed construction, are inherently less visible than solid structures such as buildings, water towers, smokestacks, and the like.

This concern about the present potential hazard to aviation safety prompted the Air Coordinating Committee to establish a Joint Industry/Government Tall Structures Committee (JIGTSC) to investigate the problems raised in the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries, and to recommend appropriate action establishing the position of the Federal Government in this matter. One of JIGTSC's recommendations was that "the FCC require the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of unused or abandoned towers if it has such authority, and if such authority does not exist * * * that the FCC seek appropriate legislation to obtain this objective."

This Commission, after study and consideration of this JIGTSC recommendation concluded that it would be of public benefit to require the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of radio towers, both during and subsequent to their use for radio transmitting purposes.

Section 303(q) of the Communications Act currently provides:

"SEC. 303. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Commission from time to time, as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires shall—

"(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation."

The criteria which have been adopted pursuant to this authority against which aeronautical hazard is gaged in particular cases are set forth in part 17 of the rules of this Commission, "Concerning the Construction, Marking, and Lighting of Antenna Towers and Supporting Structures." In general, these criteria provide that radio towers exceeding 170 feet in height require obstruction marking irrespective of location, and under these criteria the number of radio towers that can be approved without obstruction marking greatly exceeds those requiring such marking. The painting and lighting specifications imposed under part 17, as amended from time to time, provide an adequate vehicle for the protection of aviation interests and otherwise meet the Commission's responsibilities under present law; however, these criteria are applicable at this point only to towers used in connection with authorized radio station operation. Accordingly, these criteria would not be applicable under present law and regulations to towers which have at one time been licensed for use in connection with the transmission of radio communications, but which become no longer licensed for that purpose. These towers, in this sense, become abandoned towers and create the particular problem now sought to be remedied.

Abandonment can occur by voluntary act of the licensee, as when the license is permitted to expire or is submitted for cancellation, or when the licensee fails to contest an order to show cause, in consequence of which the license is revoked. Involuntary abandonment normally results from bankruptcy, death, or other legal disability affecting the licensee. Since the events leading to abandonment normally coincide with expiration, cancellation, or revocation of the station license, the Commission is at that juncture powerless to compel continued obstruction marking by invoking the administrative sanctions normally available to it, except those cases where other radio licenses are outstanding in the name of the same person.

Further, the FCC is the Federal agency which has final authority to authorize the construction of towers to be used as part of a licensed radio station operation and has the authority to require the painting and/or illumination of such towers. In addition, the newly formed Federal Aviation Agency, which is the Federal agency having primary responsibility over the navigable airspace, recognizes the FCC's authority in the field of antenna towers. On page 12 of the "FAA and Airspace," issued by the Federal Aviation Agency, August 1959, it states:

"Airspace matters in which FAA has an interest but does not make the final decision."

The types of airspace cases which fall into this category are:

"1. Applications to the Federal Communications Commission for construction of radio or TV transmitting towers which may involve or create an aeronautical hazard. The final action on these cases is taken by the Federal Communications Commission."

Therefore, it is logical, and orderly administration would appear to dictate, that the FCC deal with the problem of assuring to the greatest extent possible that radio antenna towers be properly lighted and painted at all times—i.e., both during and subsequent to their use for radio transmitting purposes.

The Commission considers the enactment of this legislation, which has been coordinated with the Air Coordinating Committee and its member agencies, of the utmost importance for facilitating a solution to the problems raised by the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries so as to minimize the hazards to aviation safety.

REMOVAL OF THE INTEREST RATE CEILING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the other Members of the Senate who have expressed support for the President's pro-

posal to eliminate the arbitrary ceiling on interest rates for long-term Government bonds.

In this connection, Mr. President, I am today joining the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in introducing for appropriate reference a bill which will carry out the objectives of the President's recommendations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2813) to provide for more effective management of the public debt by removing the remaining interest rate restrictions on public issues of Government securities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think there is any more pressing problem confronting this Congress than that of acting upon this proposed legislation. I do not think this is a question of whether the individual Members of the Congress are either for or against high interest rates or whether they approve or disapprove of the policy of the Federal Reserve System. The question which is confronting us is, Are we going to give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to carry out the normal functions of his office, which include the financing of the public debt in the best interests of the American people?

Unless we pass this proposed legislation to remove the interest rate ceiling on long-term bonds we will force even higher the short-term interest rates on Government securities. Interest on short-term money is already as high as 5 percent, and continued concentration of all our financing in this one range will force even higher rates of interest.

If we fail to remove this arbitrary ceiling the Secretary will be confronted with two choices. Either he will have to finance our public debt with short-term bonds, which is, in effect, a trend toward monetizing our debt; or he will have to sell long-term bonds which have a stated 4¼ percent interest at a discount. The latter procedure is not good debt management. The Secretary has said he will not resort to it, and I commend him for that position. This is a serious situation which confronts us. Congress cannot afford to play loosely with the finances of this Government. The security of the American dollar is at stake, and our failure to take proper action may well precipitate serious economic repercussions both at home and abroad.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

I am very glad to see the Senator introduce the bill. Does the Senator agree with me that in maintaining a ceiling upon interest rates for the long-term bonds we are not really maintaining a ceiling on interest rates at all? Within this very week the Treasury has sold bonds at interest rates in excess of that ceiling. What we are maintaining is a ceiling on maturities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. We are in effect saying, "You cannot sell any bonds with more than a 5-year maturity."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the net effect of our action.

Mr. BUSH. That is exactly what we are doing. It is not an interest rate ceiling at all, so far as the Government credit is concerned; it is simply a case of tying the Government's hands and saying, "You cannot sell any bonds for terms longer than 5 years."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Unquestionably the Senator is correct. If this arbitrary ceiling on these bonds were removed and we could finance the debt as it should be financed with the long-term issues, I feel sure interest rates would actually be lower than they are today. Today we are paying 5 percent for maturities of less than 5 years.

Mr. BUSH. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those who speak out against raising the interest rate ceiling are defeating their own purposes when they tie the Secretary's hands.

After all, I think we should remember that the Secretary of the Treasury does not appropriate the money. The Secretary of the Treasury is not responsible for the fact that we had $10 billion or $12 billion deficit to be financed. We in Congress appropriated the money. The Secretary is charged only with the responsibility of paying our debts and arranging for financing if it has to be borrowed. We are in an indefensible position in the Congress if we do not give the Secretary the power to administer the functions of his office.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not true that at the time the Treasury sold some of these short-term issues at 5 percent interest the Treasury could have sold the longer term bonds at the same rate of interest?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Treasury could have sold the longer term bonds at lower rates of interest. The long term Government bonds today are quoted in the Wall Street Journal at a quarter to a half point in interest rates lower than the amount being paid for the 2-year and 5-year bonds.

Mr. BUTLER. Would that not be very much to the advantage of the Government and to the advantage of every American citizen?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, It would save the American taxpayers money in regard to interest rates. By concentrating all of the Government financing in the short-term money market, we are creating a shortage of short-term money and a surplus of long-term money.

Besides, short-term debt is much more inflationary. It canot be denied that the American taxpayers are actually paying more in interest on our public debt under the present system than they would pay if the arbitrary ceiling were removed.

Mr. BUTLER. So what we are doing, in reality, is forcing the Treasury into a tight-money market more frequently, which has the effect of constantly increasing the rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true. Another point is that we are breaking down the confidence of the international banking system in the willingness of the American Government to face the facts of life and finance our debt as it should be financed. This threatens the stability of the American dollar.

Short-term money is inflationary. It is recognized as such by all parties concerned. I do not believe there is anything we are doing that could contribute more toward inflation than rejection of the President's proposal. This point should be made clear, then let the responsibility rest on those who dare to oppose this proposal of the President.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator. I am very happy to support the bill, and I shall fight side by side with him to see that it is made law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that the bill being introduced jointly by the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will deal with probably the most important issue to come before the second session of the 86th Congress.

I listened to some of the speeches on the floor of the Senate last night on the monetary question. There seems to be a tendency to try to divorce all these issues from certain realities. There has been an outflow of gold. There is so much gold earmarked for foreign account in the Federal Reserve Bank in New York. There has been a deficit in our trade balance, and it involves, as the Senator from Delaware has so rightly said, confidence, both at home and abroad. When we encounter a situation in which, by the stroke of a pen, the gold could leave us, and billions of dollars worth of securities could be dumped, on the theory that we as a people will not face up to the situation and undergo the sacrifices which are necessary adequately to manage a $290 billion debt, then we have come to a very serious pass, indeed. I believe that by all odds this is the most important problem and the greatest challenge before the country at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a member of the Joint Economic Committee. I have noticed something which may interest the Senator, and I would appreciate the Senator's comment upon it.

It seems to me that what is being attempted here is to hold down the result of the disease—inflation and high interest rates—on the theory that that will cure the situation, whereas, as a matter

of fact, it may have exactly the opposite effect, as the Senator has described.

The Senator will agree that many of us, including myself, have objections to the way in which monetary and fiscal policy has been handled. We believe that if it had been handled differently, the result might have been lower interest rates. However, the fact is that to try to correct the situation in this way is only worsening it, because we are trying to prevent the issue from breaking out and the situation being sooner remedied. We are kidding ourselves. That is exactly what is being done by those who think they are going to bring about lower interest rates, because they frustrate the process, and the result is higher rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree. I pointed out earlier that I do not believe the question before us is whether we approve or disapprove of the interest policies of the Federal Reserve. That question can be debated as a separate issue. The question with which we are confronted is, Will we give to the Secretary of the Treasury adequate authority to finance properly the public debt?

I cannot conceive of any company in America which would limit the president of the company to the point where he could borrow money only on a 1-year or 2-year basis. Certainly the directors would give him the authority to finance the debt of the company on a more favorable basis, on the basis of long-term debt, if the opportunity were offered.

We as Members of Congress are the directors of a large operation—our Government. The Secretary of the Treasury is charged with the responsibility of financing a $290 billion debt. The least we can do is to give to the man charged with the financing of that debt adequate authority to carry out the functions of his office in the best interests of all the American people.

As I pointed out earlier, we are paying a higher interest rate for short-term money today than we are on 20-year bonds. This is a complete reversal of all past experience. The President was certainly right when he strongly recommended that we take prompt action.

In conclusion, I ask that the President's brief message to Congress of last Tuesday be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. Immediately thereafter I ask that there be printed a table which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal, showing that long-term Government bonds, even under existing conditions, are selling at discounts whereby their yield is far in excess of the 4¼ percent ceiling.

These statistics completely refute any argument that congressional refusal to raise the present 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds will keep interest rates down or will save the taxpayer's money. I call particular attention to the fact that rates on the longer maturities are lower than the intermediate terms, and they are all lower than the 5 percent recently paid by the Treasury on a 4½-year note.

There being no objection, the message and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

As I said in my state of the Union message, the Treasury is being prevented from taking debt-management actions that are fully consistent with the public interest because of the artificial interest rate ceiling on new Treasury medium and long-term issues.

In a special message to the Congress on June 8, 1959, I urged the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management. Congressional inaction on that request has resulted in a much more rapid increase in short-term debt than would otherwise have occurred. As a result, short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades and the ability of debt management to operate in a manner consistent with sound principles of sustained economic growth has been seriously undermined.

I deem it imperative, therefore, that this restrictive ceiling be removed. I am asking the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the Congress proposed legislation designed to attain this objective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1960.*

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

(Over-the-counter quotations: Source on request)

Wednesday, Jan. 13, 1960

Treasury bonds	Bid	Asked	Previous bid	Yield
2¼s, 1959–62 June	93.24	93.28	93.24	4.97
2¼s, 1959–62 December	92.22	92.26	92.22	4.93
2½s, 1960 November	98.1	98.3	98.0	4.47
2¾s, 1960–65 December	95.22	95.30	95.22	3.51
2¾s, 1961 [1] September	96.12	96.16	96.14	4.96
2½s, 1961 November	95.16	95.20	95.18	5.02
2½s, 1962–67 June	85.10	85.18	85.20	4.84
2½s, 1963 August	91.26	91.30	91.28	4.98
2½s, 1963–68 December	82.28	83.4	83.8	4.85
3s, 1964 February	92.26	92.30	92.28	4.92
2½s, 1964–69 June	82.0	82.8	82.12	4.87
2½s, 1964–69 December	81.26	82.2	82.6	4.80
2⅝s, 1965 February	89.18	89.22	89.18	4.94
2½s, 1965–70 March	81.8	81.16	81.14	4.83
2½s, 1966–71 March	80.26	81.2	81.2	4.70
3s, 1966 August	90.8	90.12	90.12	4.71
2½s, 1967–72 June	80.14	80.22	80.26	4.54
2½s, 1967–72 September	80.2	80.10	80.10	4.56
2½s, 1967–72 December	80.12	80.20	80.24	4.49
4s, 1969 October	94.30	95.6	95.8	4.62
3⅞s, 1974 November	92.30	93.6	93.10	4.51
3¼s, 1978–83 June	83.10	83.18	83.24	4.37
4s, 1980 February	93.22	93.30	94.2	4.47
3¼s, 1985 May	82.26	83.2	83.8	4.35
3½s, 1990 February	84.26	85.2	85.12	4.39
3s, 1995 February	80.24	81.0	80.26	4.01

[1] Partially tax exempt.

NOTE.—Fractions represent 32ds; 101.1 means 101 1/32.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have been intensely interested in what the Senator has said, and what others of my colleagues have said during the past few moments. Will the Senator indicate how he would accurately define a short-term Federal Government obligation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Federal Government classifies as a short-term obligation any note with a maturity below 5 years. Such Treasury obligations are classified as Treasury notes, with less than 1-year maturity they are classified as bills. When they move beyond that point, to 10, 15, or 30 years, they are classified as bonds or long-term obligations. That is the classification generally used.

As the result of the 4¼ percent arbitrary ceiling the Secretary is now confronted with a situation in which he can sell only obligations of the Government with a maturity of less than 5 years. Recently he paid 5 percent on an issue of 4 years and 11 months.

There is no ceiling today on short-term obligations. The Secretary can pay 6, 8, or 10 percent on short-term obligations. What we are doing is forcing him to concentrate all his new borrowings or refinancing into the short-term money market. There is only a limited amount of money available in the short-term market. Certain groups of investors will buy only short-term securities. Other types of investors want to put their money in longer term securities. We are denying to the Secretary of the Treasury the opportunity to dip into the long-term money market to finance any part of our debt.

The ironical part of it is that the financing could be done on the basis of a quarter to a half of 1 percent lower interest rates than we are now paying.

For the benefit of our friends on the other side of the aisle who are bewailing the high interest rates, I invite attention to the fact that our failure to act on this proposal sooner is costing us from a quarter to a half of 1 percent more interest than we would have been required to pay had the ceiling been removed a year ago.

Mr. KUCHEL. What our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing is forcing the Government of the United States to borrow money solely on a short-term basis, and to that extent adding to the fires of inflation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware and other Senators who have participated in the colloquy. I endorse this philosophy wholeheartedly. I intend to have more to say on the subject later.

CONSTRUCTION LOANS FOR BRACKISH WATER CONVERSION PLANTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Government loans to cities and communities that are faced with the problem of expanding their municipal water supplies, and where, because of deficient or brackish underground supplies, or where surface supplies are not readily available, they find it an economic necessity to purchase saline water conversion equipment to obtain sufficient potable water to meet their growing municipal demands.

This bill will serve the very important function of bridging the gap between saline water conversion research and the

practical application of the processes that have been developed.

To purchase the necessary conversion equipment, the only course of action now open to most cities and communities facing this problem is to raise the necessary funds through a general obligation or revenue bond issue. Because of the semiexperimental nature of saline water conversion equipment, bonds issued to purchase this type of equipment would undoubtedly bear a high interest rate which, in turn, would substantially increase the cost of the product water.

This bill is designed to permit the cities to purchase the necessary conversion equipment through a Government loan, thereby assuring lowest possible interest rates which, in turn, will be reflected in the rate the city must charge its customers for this basic commodity.

Although considerable progress has been made by the Office of Saline Water in developing low-cost conversion processes, water obtained by this method is still relatively expensive. The citizens of cities and communities that have no other choice but to turn to converted sea or brackish water as their source of supply are, without question, entitled to obtain that water at the lowest possible cost.

Throughout the Nation our demand for fresh water is growing at an alarming rate. In 1900 we used about 40 billion gallons of water per day. By 1940 our daily demand had reached 135 billion gallons per day. Since that time our uses have more than doubled. A report just released by the U.S. Bureau of Mines shows an estimated total water use of 195 billion gallons a day in 1958, and the U.S. Geological Survey predicts we can expect this figure to more than double in the next 20 years, reaching a total daily use of 597 billion gallons per day.

The impact of the growing demands we are placing on our available water supplies is clearly evidenced by the number of cities and communities that asked to be considered as a site for one of the five saline water conversion demonstration plants authorized by Public Law 85–883. The Department of the Interior has received nearly 200 applications from every State on the coastal perimeter, except Delaware, from Alaska, Hawaii, and from 12 inland States.

I am deeply concerned by the number of cities and communities that are seeking to have one of these plants located in their area because they are desperate for additional supplies of fresh water. It is unmistakably clear that the Federal Government must take positive and immediate action to eliminate a problem that is rapidly reaching critical proportions in many areas of our land.

The bill permits any State, territory, possession, political subdivision thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization to apply to the Secretary of the Interior for a loan to finance the design and construction of a sea water or brackish water conversion plant. The loan may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of design and construction—excluding land and water costs—or $1 million, whichever is smaller.

If the Secretary finds that the construction is feasible and that the loan would be a reasonable risk, he may approve the application and transmit it to Congress. If Congress does not disapprove the application by resolution within 60 days, an appropriation may be requested and if the appropriation is made the loan may be completed.

The loan must be repaid in 40 years, with interest at a rate that is fixed by estimating the average annual yield on Government obligations with a 15-year or longer maturity date.

The bill also permits the Secretary to contract with the borrower for the use of the borrower's plant facilities for further research and demonstration, and reasonable compensation for such use may be made by a credit on the borrower's loan.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to congratulate my able friend from the State of Colorado for the introduction of the bill dealing with the problem of saline water and the problem of Federal assistance through credit to the political subdivisions in the country which are interested in building conversion plants. I wish to say to my friend that I had hoped, prior to his introduction of the bill, that I might have been able to discuss the matter with him. However, having listened to his fine statement, I simply wished to ask his consent to be joined with him and his other colleagues as a co-sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate that statement very much. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and I make the further request that it may lie on the desk through January 26, to permit other Senators, who may desire to do so, to join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk through January 26, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 2816) to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to stimulate the construction of plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water, of water that is suitable for municipal or other beneficial consumptive uses, and thereby make maximum use of the research for the development and utilization of saline waters that was authorized by the Act of June 22, 1955 (69 Stat. 198), and maximum use of the demonstration program that was authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706).

SEC. 2. (a) Any State, territory, possession, political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization, hereinafter called "organization", may submit to the Secretary of the Interior in such form as the Secretary may prescribe an application for a loan, or an offer to sell to the United States securities of the organization, to finance the design and construction of a plant to produce, from sea water or brackish water, water that is suitable for municipal, industrial, domestic, or other beneficial consumptive use.

(b) Such application shall include a showing (1) that the organization already holds or can acquire all lands and interests in land and rights, pursuant to State law, to the use of water that are necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and (2) that the organization is ready, able, and willing to finance by other means the portion of the cost of design and construction that is not covered by the loan application or offer to sell securities.

(c) An application for a loan or an offer to sell securities may not be made in accordance with the provisions of this Act in an amount that exceeds 90 per centum of the estimated cost of design and construction (exclusive of land and water costs), or $1,000,000, whichever is smaller.

SEC. 3. (a) At such time as the Secretary approves an application or offer after finding that the construction is feasible and that the loan or purchase of securities would be a reasonable risk, he shall transmit to Congress the application or offer, his approval, and his findings.

(b) No appropriation shall be made for a loan to, or a purchase of securities from, the organization prior to sixty calendar days (which sixty days shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the date on which the Secretary's findings and approval are submitted to the Congress and then only if, within said sixty days, the Congress does not approve the application or offer by resolution.

SEC. 4. Either concurrently with the submission to Congress of an application or offer, or after the time for congressional disapproval has expired without the adoption of a resolution of disapproval, the Secretary may negotiate and execute an agreement with the organization which shall set out, among other things:

(a) The maximum amount of the loan or the securities to be purchased.

(b) The time and method for making the money available to the organization.

(c) A plan for the repayment of the loan in not more than forty years in periodic installments that need not necessarily be in equal amounts, and for the payment of interest on unamortized balances, beginning three months after the plant first commences operation, or at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Interior by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the agreement is executed; or, in the case of an offer to sell securities, a plan of redemption that is consistent with the foregoing requirements with respect to a loan.

(d) Provisions for assuring and securing the prompt repayment of the loan and interest or for the redemption of the securities.

(e) Provisions making the liability of the United States under the agreement contingent upon the availability of appropriations for the purpose.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with a borrower under this Act for the use of the borrower's plant facilities to further the sea and brackish water research and demonstration programs authorized by the Act of June 22, 1955 (69 Stat. 198), and the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706), and to provide in the contract for a credit on the organization's loan, or for a cancellation of its securities, in an amount up to 25 per centum of the original amount thereof that represents reasonable compensation to the borrower for the research and demonstration use made of his facilities.

SEC. 6. No loan or purchase of securities shall be made pursuant to this Act if the Secretary determines that in his judgment the organization can obtain funds on reasonable terms from other sources.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and all such appropriations shall remain available until expended.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to say to my friend from California that I appreciate very much his interest in this bill.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING: LET US TREAT THE DISEASE, NOT THE SYMPTOMS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, S. 2436 is grossly inadequate as a vehicle for reforming present Federal campaign spending laws.

It does not deal with primary elections or conventions of political parties; in a number of States, nomination is tantamount to election.

It does not cover intrastate committees, yet such committees play a highly significant role in election financing.

It places no effective limitation on individual campaign contributions.

It does not limit campaign expenditures.

But it is in philosophy, not procedures, that the bill's major fault lies.

S. 2436 would attempt to plug up reporting loopholes and to establish more realistic contribution and expenditure limitations. However, the problem we confront in campaign spending is not one which can be solved by new reports or recognition of the fact of inflation. This is treating symptoms without curing the disease.

LARGE CONTRIBUTIONS REAL ISSUE

The real issue involved in campaign spending is inherent in the simple fact that candidates for Federal elective office are increasingly forced to rely on large contributions to bring their candidacies before the voters.

Mr. President, it is reported that in 1846 a Whig candidate running for Congress in Illinois was given $200 by friends to enable him to campaign. Following his successful race, the candidate returned $199.25 with this comment: "I did not need the money," he said. "I made the canvass on my own horse; my entertainment, being at the houses of friends, cost me nothing; and my only outlay was 75 cents for a barrel of cider, which some farmhands insisted I should treat them to."

The candidate referred to, Mr. President, was Abraham Lincoln.

Campaign costs have increased vastly since Abraham Lincoln's campaign for Congress in 1846.

In 1958, candidates for the House and Senate reported personal spending of $3,382,655 and organizations reported a total of $8,675,466. One can only guess at the amount of money expended but not reported in House and Senate contests in 1958. It has been suggested costs of a campaign for a Senate seat in a small State are as high as $200,000, and about $1 million in a big industrial State. The authority for this is the noted William S. White, author of Citadel.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS COSTLY

An expert in the field of campaign spending, Prof. Alexander Heard, has estimated that the two leading parties spent $140 million during the presidential campaign in 1952. The 1956 presidential race involved estimated expenditures of over $200 million.

An examination of the amount of money spent on radio and television in recent campaigns is illustrative of the magnitude of the financing required for political campaigns.

In his study "Television and Presidential Politics," published by the Brookings Institution and concerned with the 1952 presidential election, Charles A. H. Thomas reports that, "Prior to the Republication convention, the NBC network alone carried 9 broadcasts for various Eisenhower sponsors, totaling 7½ hours of broadcast time at a gross-time charge of $118,938.73." The magazine Advertising Age stated in 1952 that Republicans spent between $1.3 and $1.5 million on radio and television spots in an 11-State area.

SIX MILLION DOLLARS SPENT ON TV

The Thomas study indicates that in 1952 Republicans spent approximately $3.5 million for all radio-television campaigning, including some $2.1 million for network time, while Democrats spent about $2.5 million with $1.5 million devoted to network time.

Today, 30 minutes of prime television time on a nationwide hookup costs about $70,000.

In 1872, 2 years after adoption of the first comprehensive Federal statute dealing with election corruption, cost of electing a President was $200,000—less than the cost of 180 minutes of prime television time today.

Everyone agrees that modern election costs have made present limitations on campaign spending unrealistic, and that they are in fact dead letters.

Excesses in the collection and expenditure of modern campaign funds are largely the result of unrestricted competition for public attention through extremely expensive media, particularly television, radio, printed materials, and signs. As long as candidates must raise from private sources the vast sums needed for this expensive competition, it will be futile to try to curb by legal limits and penalties their reliance on large campaign contributions, with all the attendant dangers to true representative democracy.

PUBLIC SHOULD SHARE COST

The large expenditure needed for a modern campaign has multiplied many times in the years since this country was founded. The time has come to recognize that in a democracy the presentation of political candidates and issues to the voters in a campaign is not something done for the candidates, but for the public who must exercise as informed a choice as they can among them. The expense of making this information equitably available to the electorate is a legitimate cost of democratic self-government.

President Theodore Roosevelt told Congress in 1907 that—

> The need for collecting large campaign funds would vanish if Congress provided an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties, an appropriation ample enough to meet the necessity for thorough organization and machinery, which requires a large expenditure of money.

In his annual message to Congress in that year, Mr. Roosevelt declared that—

> The stipulation should be made that no party receiving campaign funds from the Treasury should accept more than a fixed amount from any individual subscriber or donor; and the necessary publicity for receipts and expenditures could without difficulty be provided.

Mr. President, I believe that the suggestion advanced by President Theodore Roosevelt is a sound one. As he pointed out to Congress and the Nation more than 50 years ago:

> Under our form of government voting is not merely a right but a duty, and, moreover, a fundamental and necessary duty if a man is to be a good citizen. It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to presidential or national campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures. There is, however, always danger in laws of this kind, which from their very nature are difficult of enforcement; the danger being lest they be obeyed only by the honest, and disobeyed by the unscrupulous, so as to act only as a penalty upon honest men. Moreover, no such law would hamper an unscrupulous man of unlimited means from buying his own way into office.

I wish to suggest today that this country now heed Theodore Roosevelt's advice.

The problem we face is well stated by Jasper B. Shannon, of the University of Nebraska, in his book, "Money and Politics":

> The basic problem of political leadership in representative government is to discover a means by which officials may be selected to act as the State's men—politicians—who be aware of and sensitive to the various interests of a political society without being politically and personally dependent for livelihood upon private interests.

We reject the concept that elective public office is only for the rich. Yet the difficulties experienced by those who are not independently wealthy and desire to enter public service are annually

compounded by the increasing cost of political campaigns. Without large financial resources of his own, faced with the practical problem of amassing a large campaign fund from thousands of small contributions, the prospective officeholder must either forget his laudable ambition or turn to the "fat cats" to gain his backing. In either case, the public loses; political competition is decreased or the danger of special interest representation is increased.

PROTECT POLITICAL DEBATE

The essence of the American political system is the presentation of alternatives through political debate. We subsidize our magazines and newspapers as a matter of public policy on the theory that the dissemination of information and ideas will assist in educating our citizens on the issues of the time. Surely it is of equal if not greater importance to insure that the principals in the arena of political debate are not left to beg for a hearing.

Salesmanship, not statesmanship, has become the prime prerequisite of a candidate seeking office today. He must merchandise himself to those with funds to back him before he can appear before the voters through the costly media which technology and population expansion have made essential.

What are the dangers involved in present campaign financing methods?

Today candidates for political office must frequently rely on large contributions provided by a few donors. The Senate Subcommittee on Elections found that, in the 1956 elections, a fraction of 1 percent of the American people provided the $33,185,725 which was the total for which the committee could account. One family, the du Ponts, gave more than the total of contributions from 13 Southern States.

DOES MONEY BUY ACCESS?

If large campaign contributions do not involve a quid pro quo, they certainly are directly connected with the question of "access" to the politically successful recipient. Prof. Alexander Heard states the case well when he declared in his 1956 study of this topic that—

> The number of cold bargains that are struck for campaign funds are negligible. The real influence derived from big contributions is a latent one, exercised through access—large contributions pave a sure road to the decision-making centers of government for those who want to present their case, which is often all they need.

"One man, one vote" becomes only an unrealistic textbook phrase when money can buy entree. In a free country no responsible party should have to keep one eye on the bank balance while drawing up its platform program for America. Democrats should feel at ease to disagree with labor unions. Republicans ought to be able to challenge the ideas of utility and oil companies.

Political exchequers of unequal size are inconsistent with the theme of political equality. The Senate Subcommittee on Elections found that in 1956 reported campaign contributions totaled $20,685,376 for Republican candidates and $10,977,790 for Democratic candidates.

MONEY CREATES INEQUALITY

In a country of untrammeled opportunity, we cannot expect equality of character, integrity, and ideas between candidates. Furthermore, there are subjective qualities rarely capable of tangible measurement. But disproportion in money is something else. Can public office be bought? Should it be bought?

As financial costs of campaigning increase and communication technology advances, individual participation in the process tends to decrease. Voters increasingly tend to believe that, without a money bag in their hand, their ideas will go unheard in the politician's office. Prospective candidates view the great disparity between campaign costs and salary and decide that the ratio rules out running for public office; the vast volume of small contributions needed to finance the race may make collection costs prohibitive, and unless he is independently wealthy, or has rich backers, his ambition must be relinquished.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION ESSENTIAL

Mr. President, I have proposed five ways to meet essential costs of our national election campaigns from public funds. They are:

First. Government-paid television and radio time for presidential tickets and congressional candidates.

Second. A reasonable amount of public funds to help meet other legitimate campaign costs, such as travel, printing, and office rent.

Third. Federal matching funds for State voters' pamphlets, such as my own State of Oregon sends to every registered voter, in which space is given equally for information about all candidates and ballot measures.

Fourth. A Federal income tax credit for one small political contribution each year to aid in private fund-raising efforts such as that of the American Heritage Foundation.

Fifth. Creation of an independent agency to administer Federal election laws.

ENABLE REALISTIC APPROACH

Once the principle of public assumption of much of the cost of public access to candidates and their views is accepted, and the necessary burden of collecting campaign funds correspondingly reduced, it will become possible for the first time to deal realistically with controls of the evils of large private contributions and excessive expenditures. Withholding of the public funds, or loss of the privilege of tax credit, would be far more effective deterrents than unenforceable criminal penalties for evasion of reasonable limits. Also, the knowledge of access to at least a fair minimum of campaign costs from public funds will free candidates to make a virtue of compliance, and will make excessive expenditures from large private contributions unacceptable to the public and unprofitable to candidates.

FOUR BENEFITS POSSIBLE

I believe that the overall impact of this program would be to—

Give the public a more nearly equal opportunity to see and judge competing candidates for public office and their platforms and programs.

Eliminate the unhealthy and undemocratic significance of candidates' dependence on large campaign contributions.

Make a virtue of staying within the prescribed normal limits in the competitive use for the expensive modern media and techniques of campaigning, which have driven the cost of running for public office out of sight for the average citizen without large financial support—and thus to reduce excessive spending.

Display more clearly the nature of the support of candidates, insofar as individuals and groups are limited in making contributions to political candidates or committees and thus driven to participate openly in campaigns in their own names.

No tinkering with regulatory laws will reform the evil of dependence on large campaign contributions until the heavy inevitable costs of bringing a modern election campaign to the public's attention is borne in part by the public itself. No reform could be a better investment in the democratic process which is our greatest national pride.

WOULD CREATE ELECTION OFFICE

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry out the reforms which I have advocated here today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2823) to provide for Federal contribution to the cost of election campaigns of candidates for Federal offices, conditioned upon effective control and publication of other sources of financing such campaigns; to encourage small individual campaign contributions and to reduce the importance of large contributions in Federal elections; to provide Federal financial assistance for State voters' and campaign pamphlets; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My proposal would establish in the Federal Government the Office of Election Finance, to be administered by a Director appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate.

The Director would hold office for a period of 15 years, but could be removed at any time by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Responsibility of the Director would be to implement provisions for Federal reporting and Federal financing contained in my bill.

The bill provides that any legitimate candidate for nomination or election to a Federal elective office is entitled to receive one-half of the cost of broadcast time purchased for use in the campaign.

However, such broadcast time could not exceed a total of 30 minutes on radio and a total of 15 minutes on television in a primary election campaign; amounts of time would be doubled for general elections. To qualify for a Federal contribution, the candidate could not purchase additional broadcast time in excess of the amount to which the Federal contribution applies.

SYSTEM OF CHECKS PROVIDED

Government payments would apply to facilities, or combinations of facilities, necessary to cover the State or congressional district in which the candidate is seeking nomination or election.

Candidates would also be entitled to receive an amount, not to exceed 5 cents multiplied by the average vote in the State or congressional district in the last two elections for the same office, for payment of cost of printing, films, recordings, advertising space, broadcast time, office rent, equipment and supplies, postage, telephone service, telegrams, and transportation directly connected with his campaign.

The bill would establish a system of checks on all candidates. All candidates would be required to post a bond equal to one-half of the Federal contribution for which application is made. Should the candidate receive less than 10 percent of the total number of votes cast for all candidates, the bond would be forfeited.

The bill would authorize payment to any State preparing and distributing a voter's pamphlet to registered voters a sum equal to one-half of the net cost, plus a $10 tax credit for political contributions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my bill together with, first, textual and tabular materials dealing with major party expenditures in presidential elections since 1860, second, the minor party vote in national elections, and third, State published publicity pamphlets in election campaigns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

DUAL STANDARD EMPLOYED

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Government should finance political campaigns. Men and women ought not to enter high office obligated to private contributors, be they in big business or in labor unions.

We would not think of permitting corporations or unions to pay the salaries of our public officials. Why, then, allow them to provide their campaign treasuries?

Today as much as $200 million may be spent in a single national election. We get excited about a public official accepting a deepfreeze or vicuna coat, but we are indifferent to the acceptance of millions of dollars in campaign contributions.

This is why I think candidates should get their campaign funds from the same source from which their salary will be paid if they are victorious—from the Public Treasury.

Some taxpayers may worry about the sums involved. These sums are trivial compared to the savings which will result if men and women can enter office without being fettered to special interest and private factions. Puerto Rico has public financing of its political campaigns. Governor Muñoz has told me that it had meant a rebirth of true political freedom in that island realm.

COST ACTUALLY LESS

And as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] pointed out in an extremely cogent article in the Atlantic Monthly:

> The people now pay, after an election, many times over, the actual costs of the campaign. As we have seen, the big contirbutors make huge profits as a group upon their investment in both the candidates and parties. For the people, it would be far cheaper if the Government met the costs of the campaign, since then the elected officials and parties would not be under obligation to the big contributors.

Mr. President, I believe that the approach which I have outlined moves in the direction in which we can expect to accomplish real reform in campaign spending. It presents definite problems of implementation, but I do not think that they are problems which cannot be resolved. I hope that the Senate will hold hearings on my proposal so that this idea may be explored in detail.

NEW APPROACH REQUIRED

The direction in which I have suggested that we move in the area of campaign spending legislation is a definite departure from the concepts we have attempted to employ since passage of the first corrupt practices legislation in 1870. As Theodore Roosevelt noted in 1907:

> It will take some time for people so to familiarize themselves with such a proposal as to be willing to consider its adoption.

Therefore, I do not intend to offer my bill as an amendment. But I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this idea, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced today remain at the desk for 1 week so that Senators wishing to add their names as consponsors may do so.

We cannot claim to the American people that we have materially advanced the cause of "clean elections" by passage of the bill before us today, even with adoption of suggested amendments. It is the system which must be changed. The independence of the most honest person on earth can be imperiled by multi-million-dollar political campaigns. That is why I am introducing this bill today—to make it possible for people who are independent and honest, by nature, to exercise those qualities as they think best in the public interest. I know of no other adequate way to free candidates from the fetters of big contributions than to have the Federal Government take a major role in the financing of Federal election campaigns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the end of my remarks an article by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, endorsing my proposal for Government financing of campaigns for Federal office, and a news story reporting former President Harry S. Truman's support for the principle of Federal funds for presidential campaigns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Fair Election Finance Act of 1959".

Statement of findings and purposes

SEC. 2. Congress finds that it is in the national interest that voters in elections for Federal offices should have opportunities to judge competing candidates and their programs on fair and equal terms before choosing between them, and that the dominant importance of large, private campaign contributions should be eliminated from such Federal elections.

Free and untrammeled representation of the public interest is possible only when men and women in high Federal office are not indebted for large financial campaign gifts to private donors who feel a special interest in the election results.

Disproportionate inequality among candidates, with respect to campaign financing, imperils the democratic premises of free and informed choices by the citizen, particularly in an era when access to the most compelling media of public information is increasingly decisive and costly.

Government contributions to the essential costs of major election campaigns as recommended in 1907 by the then President of the United States, in direct partial assumption of certain costs and in tax incentives for small, individual contributions, offer the most effective means to assure citizens of exercising their choice of government on fair and equal terms, to prevent private persons and groups of great wealth from unduly influencing the conditions of that choice, and to eliminate the undesirable and undemocratic significance of candidates' dependence on large, private campaign gifts.

Definitions

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, unless the context otherwise indicates—

(1) The term "candidate" means a person who has met qualifications necessary to have his name presented on the ballot in any election for nomination for, or election to, a Federal elective office, and who is legally qualified to serve if elected; but only while the person remains eligible for the election in question, and provided he does not publicly deny or withdraw his candidacy.

(2) The term "election" means a regular, special, general, or primary election for Federal elective office, with respect to which the names of two or more candidates for nomination or election to the office have been and remain qualified for presentation on the ballot, and including the election of a slate of presidential electors by votes cast for the names of candidates for President and Vice President and including a presidential preference primary, but does not include a convention of a political party or a caucus held for the purpose of nominating candidates, or the vote of the electoral college.

(3) The term "Federal elective office" means the offices of President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States.

(4) The term "financial agent" means a campaign manager, party official, committee chairman, treasurer, or any other individual publicly designated by the candidate as his authorized agent with responsibility, along with the candidate, for all financial arrange-

ments, receipts, disbursements, reports, certificates, accounts, and other transactions of the candidate's election campaign.

(5) The term "Director" means the Director of Election Finance provided for by title III of this Act.

(6) The term "State" includes also any Territory, District, Commonwealth, or other area in which an election may take place.

(7) Terms defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, shall have the meaning assigned to them in that Act.

TITLE I—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO ELECTION FINANCE

Election finance fund

SEC. 101. The Director of Election Finance is authorized to make payments toward meeting election campaign expenses incurred by or on behalf of any candidate in an election in the manner and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth. For this purpose there shall be established in the Treasury an Election Finance Fund, administered by the Director, to which appropriations shall be made for disbursements under the authority of this Act.

Federal contribution to broadcast time

SEC. 102. (a) Upon application by or on behalf of a candidate in an election, accompanied by duly authenticated bills or vouchers, the Director is authorized to pay to licensees under the Communications Act of 1934 one-half of the cost of broadcast time purchased for use in the candidate's election campaign, not exceeding a total of 30 minutes on radio and a total of 15 minutes on television in a primary election campaign, and not exceeding a total of 60 minutes on radio and a total of 30 minutes on television in a general election campaign, over each of such facilities or combinations of facilities as may be necessary to cover the State or congressional district within which the candidate is seeking election. The selection of broadcast facilities, times, and materials shall remain completely beyond any control, interference, or influence of the Director.

(b) To qualify for a Federal contribution to broadcast time under this section, the application shall certify, in addition to compliance with the other conditions required under this Act, that there will not be purchased or used in the candidate's election campaign, in his name, with his participation, or by any person, committee, or organization associated with his campaign or under his control, additional broadcast time more than equal to the maximum total amounts of broadcast time for which Federal contribution is allowable under subsection (a) hereof.

Federal contribution to general expenditures—Formula

SEC. 103. (a) Upon application by or on behalf of a candidate in an election, accompanied by duly authenticated bills or vouchers, the Director is authorized to make payments for expenses incurred in the candidate's election campaign, in a total amount not exceeding 5 cents multiplied by the average vote in the State or congressional district for the contested office, as determined under subsection (b) hereof. The objects of such payments may include, but are not limited to, expenditures for printing or other reproduction of campaign materials, films, and recordings, advertising, space or facilities, broadcast time, office rent, equipment and supplies, postage, telephone service and telegrams, and the candidate's own transportation, hotel, and other travel expenses; but they shall not include payments to any individual for personal political activities. Payments may be made directly on the bills or vouchers submitted or, if these have already been paid from other campaign funds, by reimbursement to the candidate's financial agent.

(b) For every contested election for which a request for Federal contribution has been made, the Director shall determine and declare the average vote, for the purposes of this section, in accordance with the first applicable of the following computations:

(1) The average of the total vote cast in each of the last two elections for all candidates for the same nomination for, or for election to, the office.

(2) If there has been only one prior such election, the total vote then cast for all such candidates.

(3) If there has been no prior election for the same nomination for, or for election to, the office, the number of voters registered or otherwise actually eligible to vote in the particular contested election for which the request is made.

In presidential elections, including preference primaries, each person voting shall be considered to have cast a single vote for a candidate for President, irrespective of the number of electors or delegates to be elected.

(c) Payments under this section shall be made currently as bills or vouchers for expenditures in a candidate's election campaign are submitted, accompanied by all necessary certificates in compliance with conditions and regulations under this Act, and verified; but not more than two-thirds of the total amount of Federal contribution to a candidate's election campaign allowable under this section shall be paid prior to the election. The balance shall be payable only upon completion and review of all reports required by law or regulation concerning election finances, and upon a determination by the Director of compliance with all requirements and conditions under this Act.

General conditions for Federal contributions

SEC. 104. (a) Any application for a Federal contribution under this title shall be accompanied by—

(1) Designation by the candidate of a financial agent within the State or congressional district;

(2) A certificate that there will not be expended in the candidate's election campaign by the candidate, with his participation or consent, by his financial agent, or by any person, committee or organization associated with his campaign or under his control, funds from private sources in a total amount more than equal to the maximum total amount of the Federal contribution allowable under the provisions of this title;

(3) A certificate that there has not been and will not be accepted or used in the candidate's election campaign by the candidate, by his financial agent, or by any person, committee, or organization associated with his campaign or under his control, any gift, loan, or other contribution of money or property, exceeding $100 from any individual;

(4) A bond in an amount equal to one-half the amount of Federal contribution under this title for which application is made, payable to the United States and conditioned upon the candidate's receiving in the election not less than 10 per centum of the total number of votes cast for all candidates for the same nomination for, or for election to, the office;

(5) A certificate that within 30 days after the election there will be filed with the Office of Election Finance a complete and accurate report showing compliance with applicable law and regulations and containing an account, in such detail as the Director may by regulation prescribe, of all contributions, both Federal and private, and all expenditures made in the candidate's election campaign;

and payment of any Federal contribution shall be conditional upon compliance with the certificates submitted.

(b) Applications for Federal contribution may be signed either by the candidate or by his financial agent. All certificates, reports, affidavits, or other undertakings or statements of fact which may be required under this Act shall be signed by the candidate's financial agent and by the candidate, except that the signature of candidates for President or Vice President shall not be required.

SEC. 105. Upon a determination by the Director that there has occurred, in a candidate's election campaign for which Federal contribution has been allowed under this title, any expenditure or contribution from private sources in excess of the limits required to be certified under section 102(b), 104(a)(2), or 104(a)(3) hereof, the total allowable amount of Federal contribution shall be reduced by the amount of the excess expenditure or contribution. The United States shall be entitled to recover from the candidate or from his financial agent the amount of any Federal contribution already paid in excess of the amount remaining allowable under this section, with court costs, in a civil suit brought by the Director in any court of competent jurisdiction.

TITLE II—STATE VOTERS' PAMPHLETS—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

SEC. 201. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, to be expended as provided in this section, such amounts as may be necessary to pay one-half the net cost incurred by any State in preparing, printing, delivering, and distributing to each registered voter State voters' pamphlets for any election at which candidates for any Federal office are to be nominated or elected.

(b) To qualify for a Federal contribution under this section, a State voters' pamphlet must be found by the Director to—

(1) be an official publication issued by or under the control and supervision of, and in the name of, an agency of a State;

(2) be distributed free of cost to every registered voter in the State; and

(3) make available information about, or space for presenting statements of program or of support, pictures, or other election campaign information about, all candidates for the same office on equal terms and under equal conditions.

SEC. 202. (a) The Director of Election Finance shall make annual estimates of the amounts to be paid to any State under this title, based on reports filed by the highest State official responsible for the State voters' pamphlet and containing his estimates of the net cost required to be incurred for such pamphlets during the next year, and shall certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to each State the amounts certified to him by the Director to be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, subject to the conditions that the use of such amounts shall be properly accounted for, and any part of such amounts not needed shall be returned to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 203. Official State voters' pamphlets referred to in this section, when designated as such by the responsible State agency, shall be free of postage, whether transmitted individually or in bulk, in the United States mails.

TITLE III—OFFICE OF ELECTION FINANCE—AUTHORITY AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

Office and personnel

SEC. 301. There is created an establishment of the Government to be known as the Office of Election Finance, independent of the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 302. (a) The Office of Election Finance shall be under the control and direction of a

Director of Election Finance, assisted by a Deputy Director of Election Finance, both of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, and who shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $22,500 and $20,500, respectively.

(b) The Deputy Director of Election Finance shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Director, and during the absence or incapacity of the Director, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as Director. The Director shall designate an employee of the office to act as Director during the absence or incapacity of, or during a vacancy in the offices of, both the Director and the Deputy Director.

SEC. 303. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this section, the Director and the Deputy Director shall hold office for fifteen years and shall not be eligible for reappointment. The Director or the Deputy Director may be removed at any time by concurrent resolution of Congress, after notice and hearing, when in the judgment of Congress, the Director or Deputy Director has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient or guilty of neglect of duty or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. Any Director or Deputy Director removed in the manner provided in this section shall be ineligible for reappointment to that office. When a Director or Deputy Director attains the age of seventy years, he shall be retired from his office.

(b) Any Director who shall be so retired for age after serving at least ten years in his office, or who completes his term, shall receive an annuity during the remainder of his life equal to two-thirds of the salary payable for his office at the time of retirement or completion of term, except that the annuity of any Director who completes his term shall be reduced by one-fourth of 1 per centum for each full month he is under the age of sixty-five at such completion. Any Director who becomes permanently disabled from performing his duties shall be retired and shall receive an annuity during the remainder of his life equal to two-thirds of the salary payable for his office at the time of retirement if he has served at least ten years therein or equal to one-half of such salary if he has served less than ten years. The annuities provided for herein shall be paid by the Office of Election Finance. No person receiving benefits under this section shall receive any other retirement benefits under any other law of the United States.

SEC. 304. The Director shall in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 305. All laws relating generally to the administration of the departments and establishments shall, so far as applicable, govern the Office of Election Finance. Books or records of account or minutes of proceedings of the Office, and properly authenticated copies or transcripts of any books, records, papers, or documents of the Office, shall be admitted as evidence with the same effect as the books, records, and minutes and the copies and transcripts referred to in section 1733 of title 28, United States Code.

Regulations, enforcement, and penalties

SEC. 306. The Director is authorized to promulgate such regulations as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; and he may issue official schedules and forms for filing applications, certificates, affidavits, proof of election campaign contributions, receipts, expenditures, or other transactions, reports, accounts, bonds, or other documents which may be required by law or by regulations hereunder.

SEC. 307. All regulations, rules, orders, or determinations under this Act shall be made, and shall be judicially reviewable, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Investigations and reports

SEC. 308. The Office of Election Finance shall make from time to time thorough audits and field investigations with respect to election campaign contributions and expenditures to which this Act or the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, is applicable, to statements filed under the provisions of these Acts, and to alleged failure to file any statement required under the provisions of these Acts. On the request of the Director of Election Finance, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the consent of the Attorney General, and the General Accounting Office, with the consent of the Comptroller General, are authorized to render such assistance as the Director may require in any instance to carry out an audit or investigation under this section in a complete and effective manner.

SEC. 309. The Director shall make an annual general report, and from time to time such particular reports as may be appropriate, all of which shall be public, concerning operations under this Act, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and, in instances involving possible violation of law, to the Attorney General.

Penalties or enforcement

SEC. 310. (a) No candidate, financial agent, or other person shall apply for or use any part of any funds which may be obtained under this Act in the form of a Federal contribution or private contributions entitled to Federal tax credit, except in compliance with all applicable regulations, certificates and other conditions required under this Act. Violation of this section by any person, committee, or organization associated with a candidate's campaign with his consent, or under his control, shall also be a violation by the candidate's financial agent and by the candidate, with the exception of candidates for President or Vice President.

(b) Any violation of this section, including the filing of any false certificate, report, account, or other statement concerning a candidate's election finance required by law or regulation, or the failure to file any such statement so required, shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

SEC. 311. Federal contributions to a candidate's election campaign expenses under title I of this Act shall not be considered for the purpose of limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures fixed in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925.

Appropriations

SEC. 312. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE IV—INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Amendments to Internal Revenue Code of 1954

SEC. 401. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 38 as 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. Contributions to political parties and candidates.

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of an individual over 18 years of age, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount, up to a maximum of $10, equal to any contributions of money made by the individual to a National or State organization which is recognized under the laws of any State as a political party for the purpose of nominating candidates for presentation on an election ballot in any State, or to a candidate or a candidate's financial agent as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Fair Election Finance Act of 1959.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Application with other credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest), and section 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(2) Verification.—The credit under subsection (a) shall be allowed, with respect to any political contribution, only if the taxpayer submits with his return for the taxable year a receipt or other verification prescribed by the Director of Election Finance under section 403 of the Federal Fair Election Finance Act and which for purposes of this title shall be considered a part of the taxpayer's return for the taxable year.

"(c) Cross Reference.—

"For disallowance of credit to estates and trusts, see section 642(a)(4)."

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out:

"SEC. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 38. Contributions to political parties and candidates.

"SEC. 39. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 642(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax for estates and trusts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) Political contributions.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the credit against tax for political contributions provided by section 38."

SEC. 402. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 made by this title shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to contributions made on or after such date.

SEC. 403. (a) The Director of Election Finance shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Treasury, prepare, prescribe, and issue a form or forms of receipt or other verification of individual political contribution qualifying for tax credit under section 38 of IRC of 1954 (as added by section 401 of this Act) which will conveniently and inexpensively—

(1) assure that tax credit for a contribution may only be claimed by and allowed to the actual contributor, and protect against transfer of the privilege of tax credit to a person other than the actual contributor;

(2) facilitate the verification requirements prescribed by section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by section 401 of this Act); and

(3) provide a record by which recipients can account for and report contributions for which tax credit may be claimed by the contributor.

(b) The Director of Election Finance and the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish annually a joint report stating as accurately as may be practicable, based upon available records, reports of recipients of political contributions, and estimates, the total amount of contributions made for which tax credit could be claimed, and the total amount of tax credit so claimed and allowed under the provisions of this title.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Major party expenditures in presidential elections since 1860

Year	Parties	Expenditures
1860	Republican	$100,000
	Democratic	50,000
1864	Republican	125,000
	Democratic	50,000
1868	Republican	150,000
	Democratic	75,000
1872	Republican	250,000
	Democratic	50,000
1876	Republican	950,000
	Democratic	900,000
1880	Republican	1,100,000
	Democratic	355,000
1884	Republican	1,300,000
	Democratic	1,400,000
1888	Republican	1,350,000
	Democratic	855,000
1892	Republican	1,850,000
	Democratic	2,350,000
1896	Republican	3,350,000
	Democratic	650,000
1900	Republican	2,500,000
	Democratic	425,000
1904	Republican	1,900,000
	Democratic	1,200,000
1908	Republican	$1,655,518.00
	Democratic	900,000.00
1912	Republican	1,076,549.00
	Democratic	1,134,848.00
1916	Republican	2,441,565.00
	Democratic	1,684,590.00
1920	Republican	4,022,902.00
	Democratic	1,590,638.00
1924	Republican	3,063,952.00
	Democratic	1,230,214.00
1928	Republican	4,065,000.00
	Democratic	3,157,000.00
1932	Republican	2,041,000.00
	Democratic	1,993,000.00
1936	Republican	6,892,000.00
	Democratic	4,531,000.00
1940	Republican	2,242,000.00
	Democratic	2,197,000.00
1944	Republican	2,829,000.00
	Democratic	2,056,000.00
1948	Republican	2,736,000.00
	Democratic	2,127,000.00
1952	Republican	2,937,549.54
	Democratic	2,602,651.23
1956	Republican	2,841,032.78
	Democratic	2,727,313.59

Major party expenditures in presidential elections since 1860—Continued

NOTES

1. Figures from 1860 through 1924 are taken from Odegard, Peter H. and E. Allen Helms, "American Politics: A Study in Political Dynamics." New York, Harpers, 1938. p. 643. The authors explain that the sums shown are national committee expenditures only and "must be heavily discounted for the years prior to 1912."

2. Figures from 1928 through 1948 are taken from Bone, Hugh A. "American Politics and the Party System." New York, McGraw-Hill, 1949. p. 622. These sums are listed as national committee expenditures only.

3. The 1952 totals are for the national committees only, and they mean very little as far as total campaign expenditures are concerned. They are taken from the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Oct. 2, 1953. This publication further states that the Republicans spent $13,814,997 on the presidential and congressional campaigns and that the Democrats spent $6,159,844 in an attempt to win these offices. By law, no single committee can spend more than $3,000,000 in campaign funds in any single year. This has led to the formation of many special groups, such as Citizens for Eisenhower and Volunteers for Stevenson; and an exact sum spent on a presidential campaign is now regarded as virtually impossible to obtain.

4. The 1956 totals are for the national committees only They are taken from the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1957. This publication further states that the Republican Party reported spending $20,685,387 from Jan. 1 through Nov. 30, for 1956 general political activity, or 62.3 percent of total spending and the Democratic Party reported 1956 political spending of $10,977,790, or 33.1 percent of the total spending reported.

The minor party vote

Year	Party	Percent of vote [1]	Other minor parties [2]
1958	Liberal	0.7	Unity for Justice, Taxation With Representation, Independent, Keep People Working, Independence for Economy, Freedom Through Victory, Light a Candle, Progress-Integrity-Economy, Taxpayers Only Friend, Decency and Vigilance, United Taxpayers, Socialist, Socialist Democratic, Constitution.
1956	do	.5	Prohibition, Socialist, Socialist Labor, Socialist Workers, Constitution, A.C.P. of Iowa Party, States Rights, Mississippi Black and Tan Grand Old, Conservative, American Third, The New Party, For America, Militant Workers, Virginia Social Democrats.
1954	do	.6	Prohibition, Socialist Labor, Progressive, Socialist Worker, Militant Worker, American Labor Party, Virginia Social Democrat.
1952	Progressive	.2	Socialist, Socialist Labor, Socialist Worker,
	Prohibition	.1	Christian Nationalist, Constitutionalist, Peoples, America First, Poor Man's, Liberty, Social Democratic.
1950	Progressive	.3	Socialist Worker, Constitutionalist, Social
	Prohibition	.1	Democratic, Democratic Farmer Labor,
	American Labor	.6	Christian Nationalist, States Rights Demo-
	Liberal	.7	crat.
1948	States Rights	2.4	Prohibition, Socialist, Socialist Labor, Social-
	Progressive	2.4	ist Worker, Christian Nationalist, Green- back, Vegetarian.
1946	American Labor	1.2	Communist, Socialist Labor, Prohibition,
	Liberal	.3	Socialist, Good Government, Justice, Decency, Independence, Workers, Veteran's Victory, Constitutionalist Government, Veteran's-Farmer.
1944	Texas Regulars	.3	Socialist Labor, America First, Democratic
	Socialist	.2	Farmer Labor, South Democrat, Inde-
	Prohibition	.2	pendence Democrat.
1942	American Labor	1.3	Socialist, Communist, Prohibition, Socialist
	Progressive	.6	Labor, Townsend, American Progressive,
	Farmer-Labor	.5	Nationalist Recovery, Nationalist Prohibition, Independence Labor, Citizens Progressive.
1940	Socialist	.2	Communist, Socialist Labor, Progressive,
	Prohibition	.1	Independence Democrat, Industrial, Independence Government, Jeffersonian Democrat.
1938	Total figures not available.	----------	American Labor Party, Socialist, Communist, Industrial Government, Prohibition, Pathfinders, State Rights, Good Government, Progressive, Townsend, Farmer-Labor, Union.
1936	Union	1.9	Independence, Royal Oak, Third.
	American Labor	.6	
	Socialist	.4	
1934	Farmer-Labor	1.2	Socialist, Communist, Progressive, Veterans,
	American Labor	.6	Old Age, Independent Citizens, National-
	Socialist	.4	ist Progressive, Prohibition.
1932	do	2.2	Liberty, Farmer-Labor, National Industrial,
	Communist	.3	Independent Communist, Jacksonian, Jobless.
1930	Farmer-Labor	1.1	Communist, Liberal, Commonwealth, So-
	Socialist	1.0	cialist, Liberty, Peace, American National- ist, Socialist Labor, Prohibition, Workers, Nationalist Prohibition.
1928	do	.7	Workers, Socialist Labor, Prohibition, Farmer-Labor, Industrialist.
1924	Progressive	16.6	American, Socialist Labor, Commonwealth-
	Prohibition	.2	Land, Workers.
1920	Socialist	3.4	Farmer-Labor, Socialist-Labor, Single Tax,
	Prohibition	.7	American.
1916	Socialist	3.2	Socialist Labor, Progressive.
	Prohibition	1.2	
1912	Progressive	27.4	Socialist-Labor.
	Socialist	6.0	
	Prohibition	1.4	
1864			
1860	Bell	12.6	
	Breckinridge	18.1	
1856	American	21.6	
1852	Free Soil	5.0	

[1] In Presidential years, this is the percentage of the vote cast for President. In other years, this figure is based on the total vote for Representatives in Congress.
[2] This list is not exhaustive.

Sources: Clerk of the House of Representatives, Statistics of the Congressional and Presidential Election (biannual since 1920) has been used for data since 1920. Previous figures come from Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States.

PUBLICITY PAMPHLETS IN ELECTION CAMPAIGNS—STATE PUBLICATIONS

OREGON

Citations are to Oregon Revised Statutes.

Primary election pamphlets

Statement by candidate: Any candidate and the friends of any candidate for nomination to any State or district office may file with the secretary of state, for publication, not later than the 70th day before the primary, his portrait cut and a signed statement containing the reasons why he should be nominated. He shall be allotted one page of printed matter (sec. 255.030).

Statement by adversary: Any persons opposing the nomination of such candidate may, not later than the 70th day before the primary, file with the secretary of state their signed statement, accompanied by proof, by affidavit, or sheriff's return, that they have caused a true copy of the statement to be served upon such candidate in person. They shall be allotted one page of printed matter (sec. 255.030).

Material excluded: No statement for or against a candidate shall be accepted for printing in the pamphlet which contains vulgar, obscene, scandalous, libelous, or defamatory matter, or language advocating or inciting hatred or ridiculing any person or group because of race, color, or religion, or language or matter prohibited by congress (sec. 255.040).

Political parties: A separate pamphlet shall be printed for each political party (sec. 255.050(3)).

Distribution: At least 20 days before the primary the secretary of state shall mail to every voter who registered as a member of one of the political parties required to nominate their candidates by primary, a copy of the pamphlet (sec. 255.060).

Allotment of space and cost: Each candidate who has filed his statement shall pay for at least 1 page of space as follows: (1) U.S. Senator, Representative in Congress, Governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, each $100; (2) Justice of the Supreme Court, superintendent of public instruction, Attorney General, each $75; (3) Commissioner

of Labor, circuit judge, district attorney, each $50; (4) senator or representative in the legislative assembly, each $10; (5) any other office for a district consisting of one or more counties, or State office, each $25. Any candidate may have additional space for $100 per page (sec. 255.070).

General election pamphlets

Statements: Not later than the 70th day before the general election, the State executive committee of a political party (and independent candidates) may file with the secretary of state portrait cuts of its candidates and statements and arguments for its candidates and against candidates of all other parties. No cuts or statements shall be filed in behalf of a candidate who is the sole nominee for any office (sec. 255.210).

Matter excluded: Same as in primary election pamphlet (sec. 255.220).

Authority: In the foot margin of every page in the pamphlet shall be shown the authority for the statements contained therein (sec. 255.240).

Allotment of space and costs: All portrait cuts and statements of all the political parties and independent candidates shall be bound together in one pamphlet. No political party shall have more than 24 pages, nor an independent candidate more than 2 pages. Payment shall be at the rate of $50 per page. Space devoted to candidates for the legislature, in addition to the 24 pages used by political parties, shall be $10 per page and no more than 1 page shall be allowed to each candidate (sec. 255.250). Candidates for the U.S. Senate or for Representatives in Congress may have 4 extra pages at $100 per page (sec. 255.260).

Distribution: The secretary of state shall mail a pamphlet to each registered voter in the State on or before the 20th day before the election (sec. 255.230).

President and Vice President

Primary: Candidates for President and Vice President may use not more than four pages of space in the pamphlet of their political party, at $100 per page. Any elector of his party who opposes his nomination may have four pages at the same rates (sec. 255.080).

Candidates for delegates to a national nominating convention and for nomination as presidential elector may have one page in their party's primary election pamphlet for $50, and not exceeding three additional pages at $100 each (sec. 255.090).

General election pamphlet: Candidates regularly nominated by a political party for President and Vice President may have four pages without charge (sec. 255.260).

Voting information: All pamphlets, both primary and general election pamphlets, shall contain (1) voting qualifications, (2) information as to reregistration, (3) absentee ballot information, and (4) registration information (sec. 255.025).

Specifications: All pamphlets shall be 6 x 9 inches in size and shall be printed in specified type (sec. 255.060 (3)).

IDAHO

Citations are to Idaho Code, 1959 supplement.

Primary and general election pamphlets

Statement by candidate: Not less than 30 days before the primary or general election, any candidate for nomination or election to the office of President or Vice President of the United States, United States Senator, United States Representative or for Governor, or any other State office, may file with the secretary of state, a portrait cut of a candidate with a typewritten statement setting forth the reasons why such candidate should be nominated or elected (sec. 34–106).

Material excluded: The secretary of state shall submit said material to the attorney general who shall reject any statement or other matters which contain any obscene, vulgar, profane, scandalous, libelous, or defamatory matter or any language which in any way incites, counsels, promotes or advocates hatred, abuse, violence, or hostility toward or which tends to cast ridicule or shame upon any person or group of persons by reason of race, color, or creed, the circulation of which through the mails is prohibited by Congress or other statement which in his opinion would be defamatory in its application. No candidate is entitled to display in the pamphlet any cut showing the uniform or insignia of any organization which advocates or teaches racial or religious intolerance (sec. 34–108).

Distribution: Not more than 20 days before an election, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the auditors of the several counties of the State, sufficient copies of such pamphlet for every legal voter upon the registration of the respective counties, and such auditor shall, immediately thereafter, transmit by mail with postage fully prepaid, to every voter in his county whose address he may have, one copy of such pamphlet (sec. 34–111).

Allotment of space and cost: No candidate shall be allowed more than 2 pages in said booklet for any election, and he shall pay in advance the sum of $150 per page (sec. 34–107).

Specifications: The secretary of state shall the power to make reasonable regulations as to the filing, the acceptance and redemption of certain materials, and the arranging thereof in the booklet (sec. 34–109). He shall cause all the copies and statements relating to one election to be joined in a pamphlet. All the printing shall be done by the State as provided by law, and the pages of said pamphlet shall be numbered consecutively from 1 to the end, and shall be 6 by 9 inches in size, and the printed matter therein shall be set in 8-point Roman-faced solid type of not to exceed 9-point body in 2 columns of 13 ems in width each to the page with 6-point dividing rule with the appropriate headings and printed on a good quality of paper 25 by 38 inches, weighing not more than 50 pounds to the ream (sec. 34–110).

MONTANA

Section 94–1428, Rev. Code, 1947, contains the following provision: "No sums of money shall be paid * * * by any candidate who has received the nomination to any public office * * * in this State, except such as he may contribute toward payment for his political party's or independent statement in the pamphlet herein provided for * * * in excess of * * *" Section 94–1427 exempts from limitation expenses which candidate may pay "to the State for printing, as herein provided" in his campaign for nomination.

[The pamphlet herein referred to was authorized by secs. 6 and 7, initiated by act of November 1912; these sections were repealed by act of March 3, 1919, c. 88, laws 1919.]

NORTH DAKOTA

Citations are to Revised Code of 1943.

Primary election pamphlet: A publicity pamphlet is to be published before a primary election, by the secretary of state only if an initiated or referred measure or a proposed amendment to the State constitution is to be submitted to the electors of the State at such primary election (sec. 16–1901).

Statement by candidate: Not later than 50 days before such primary election, a candidate for any nomination to a State or district office may file with the secretary of state a portrait cut and a signed statement containing the reasons why he should be nominated (sec. 16–1903). He shall be allowed 1 printed page (sec. 16–1904).

Statement by adversary: Statements against a candidate may likewise be filed (sec. 16–1906).

Material excluded: There shall be excluded from the publicity pamphlet advertising matter having no bearing upon the candidacy of any candidate or upon any measure to be submitted to the electors (sec. 16–1902).

No picture, statement, or argument for or against any candidate for nomination shall be included in the copy of the pamphlet going to any county where such candidate is not to be voted at (sec. 16–1906).

Distribution: At least 20 days before the primary election, the secretary of state shall mail a pamphlet to each voter in the State (sec. 16–1908).

Allotment of space and cost: Each candidate who has filed a statement shall pay for 1 page of space as follows: (1) U.S. Senator, Representative in Congress, Governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, and State auditor, each $100; (2) judge of supreme court, commissioner of insurance, superintendent of public instruction, attorney general, commissioner of agriculture and labor, and tax commissioner, each $75; (3) district judge, $50; (4) public service commissioner, lieutenant governor, county judge, register of deeds, county auditor, county treasurer, State's attorney, sheriff, clerk of court, and county superintendent of schools, each $25; (5) senator or representative in the legislative assembly, each $10.

Any candidate for State office may have additional space, not to exceed 3 pages, at $100 per page; and a candidate for a county or legislative office may have additional space, not to exceed 2 pages, at $25 a page (sec. 16–1905).

Specifications: All pamphlets shall be 6 by 9 inches in size and shall be printed in specified type (sec. 16–1907).

Statements for the same office shall be published on successive pages and shall be arranged alphabetically; and all statements filed for or against all the candidates for nomination to each office shall be printed in the order in which the names of the candidates are grouped on the ballot (sec. 16–1906).

EXHIBIT 2

[From the American Federationist, April 1956]

THE LOBBY PROBE

(By George Meany)

A special Senate committee has been authorized to undertake a full-scale investigation of political contributions by big business. This investigation was touched off by sensational disclosures regarding the lobbying activities of gas and oil interests. President Eisenhower found these activities so reprehensible that he vetoed the bill freeing natural gas producers from Federal price regulation on that very account.

The AFL–CIO heartily supports this Senate investigation. Despite the law forbidding political contributions by corporations, it is common knowledge in Washington that big business interests have financed political campaigns of individual candidates and political organizations through various legal loopholes.

Frequently these contributions have been made in the name of corporation executives and members of their family. It was not until Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota told the Senate he had been offered a $2,500 campaign contribution by a lawyer representing a gas producer, in the expectation that the Senator would vote for the bill desired by the gas lobby, that the scandalous nature of big business influence upon the legislative process was brought forcibly to public attention.

Since the Senate investigation was authorized, it has been stated in the press that the committee would inquire into political contributions by labor organizations as well as

big business. One of the committee members, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, has publicly announced that he will insist that the investigation be broadened to include unions.

Labor welcomes such an investigation. The AFL–CIO, in accordance with the law, files with Congress a complete record of all funds it receives in $1 voluntary political contributions from its members and all expenditures from those funds. There is nothing secret in these activities, which are completely open and aboveboard.

Before the merger both the AFL and CIO maintained separate political committees which collected campaign contributions from members and made expenditures in behalf of candidates from both parties who received labor endorsements. Since the merger the AFL–CIO has established the committee on political education to carry on the same work.

We are proud of the records of these committees. With the help of State organizations, they have endorsed candidates for public office with outstanding records of public service.

Perhaps an attempt will be made to indicate that labor's campaign contributions to candidates, in the aggregate, matched those of business contributors. Such efforts will be doomed to failure, because the fact is that labor has never succeeded in raising by voluntary contributions more than a small fraction of the total amounts expended in any campaign.

It is to the best interests of democracy that the cost of campaigns be financed by as many voters as possible, because this helps to arouse the political consciousness and responsibility the great masses of the Amercican electorate. It is also obviously in the national interest to prevent a few large campaign contributors from dominating the selection and election of candidates for public office.

Might it not, therefore, be a good idea for Congress to provide by law for Government financing of campaign for Federal office, as proposed in S. 3242, a bill introduced by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and cosponsored by Senators MORSE, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, SPARKMAN, MANSFIELD, LANGER, and HUMPHREY? If Congress refuses to adopt such a law, might it not then consider limiting all campaign contributions to a maximum of $1.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 3, 1958]

TRUMAN URGES ELECTION SUBSIDIES—CAMPAIGN HELP WOULD CUT GRAFT

Former President Harry S. Truman said Tuesday that he favors Government subsidies for presidential campaigns because "it takes some of the graft and corruption out of it."

Mr. Truman, in Chicago to address the American Legion's national convention Wednesday, explained that what he meant by "graft and corruption" was that special interests have been subsidizing the Republicans recently.

But, he added, "they never gave us [the Democrats] any."

GOLDFINE ISSUE SEEN

Mr. Truman told a news conference in the Blackstone Hotel that he has no doubt that the Bernard Goldfine influence peddling case, involving Sherman Adams, Presidential aide, will be an issue in the congressional elections.

He also said that he hoped the Democrats weren't becoming overconfident.

"That's the worst possible disease," he said. "That was proved in 1948."

Mr. Truman referred to GOP hopes for their presidential candidate of that year, Thomas Dewey, former New York Governor.

Mr. Truman won that year.

PLEDGES ACTIVITY IN 1960

The ex-President promised he would be "just as active" in the 1960 presidential campaign "as this old man can act."

"I point to 1948 and I don't feel any older today," he added.

Mr. Truman was emphatic in his assertion that he doesn't intend to say anything critical of the Office of President or anyone occupying the Office.

"I'm not answering any questions that will reflect on the President of the United States," he told one newsman.

He said his refusal to attack President Eisenhower was based on his respect for the Office.

UPHOLDS 85TH CONGRESS

Asked for his opinion on the record of the recently closed 85th Congress, which set an all-time peacetime high for spending, Mr. Truman replied: "I'm satisfied with the record. I think it was a good one. A lot of people say that it was too much to spend to save the country."

Mr. Truman was reluctant to voice any opinions on how the current Far East crisis should be met.

Of the Red Chinese bombardment of Nationalist-held islands, he said: "The situation will have to be met."

He added, however, that Nationalist-held Formosa is "one of our frontlines of defense."

A MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me to introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregan [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a bill which provides for honorable and tangible commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Mexican independence. By its terms, the Secretary of State is "requested and authorized to procure a monument appropriately commemorating the attainment of independence by Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico."

Mr. President, it is altogether fitting that the people of the United States should mark this important occasion in Mexico's history by a suitable monument erected in the beautiful capital city of our great neighbor to the south. Through this symbolic object, the people of Mexico and the American visitor will be reminded of the common bond that unites us with our great good neighbor to the south. That bond is the love of freedom. While both Republics, the United States and Mexico, have moved steadily toward the objective of a Democratic society broadly based, politically mature, and responsive to the collective wills of the governed, the road to Mexican independence in bygone days was frequently mined, and many are the scars and pitfalls marking its evolutionary course.

In our Senate bill we seek to commemorate the first of what may be called the three major revolutions in Mexican history. This was the one that freed Mexico from Spain; and just as we celebrate the Fourth of July, so Mexico salutes those who threw off the iron band of colonial oppression. But the others, in the eyes of most Mexicans, should share the honored position. The second one occurred later in the 19th century, when Benito Juárez led the mestizo class to political power on a program of liberalism and anticlericalism. And the last one, which started in 1910, and is still going on, stood for land reform, gains for labor, and economic nationalism.

While Mexico is commonly thought of as the gateway to Central and South America, it is no less true that Mexico is the gateway from Latin America to the United States, and the broad influence of the one cannot fail to have its impact upon the other.

There can be no doubt that the spectacle of a burgeoning and prospering democracy to the north must have reacted powerfully on the aspirations and political theories of men in the Spanish colonies who did not find things to their mind. The freedom virus of the American and French Revolutions was in the air. It did not take long to spread.

The first serious movement toward separation from Spain was begun by Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, the green-eyed, white-haired creole curate of the village of Dolores, in the Province of Guanojuato. Hidalgo, benevolent, scholarly, worldly, and shrewd, had more than once been in trouble with the Inquisition, for he harbored heretical views as well as political ideas born of the French Revolution. The revolt which he led took place on September 16, 1810. According to tradition, the launching of the movement was marked by the ringing of the bell of the Dolores church; and the uprising was given something of the fervor of a crusade by the fact that Hidalgo chose as his standard a sacred banner bearing the Virgin of Guadalupe. From the banner came the religious note in the battle cry, known as the Grito de Dolores: "Long live our Lady of Guadalupe. Long live independence." For a time the revolt spread rapidly, and gained a considerable creole following from those disgruntled over recent events. But by the following January, the rebels met with serious defeat; and a short time afterward Miguel Hidalgo, the father of Mexican independence, was captured, tried, and executed by a firing squad.

But the spark of freedom ignited by Hidalgo's rebels in 1810 could not quite be extinguished. The revolution was continued, however, by another priest, a Mestizo named José Maria Morelos, who had served under Hidalgo. Much of the country south of the capital fell under his control; and on November 6, 1813, a congress which he called at Chilpanango drew up a declaration of independence from Spain. The next year the gathering adopted a provisional constitution; but there was no opportunity to put it into effect, for the royalists rapidly gained control. Morelos was captured, given a speedy trial by the Inquisition, unfrocked, and condemned to death; and on December 22, 1815, he was, like his former leader, executed by a firing squad.

Not even these disasters could end the movement for independence, launched by Miguel Hidalgo. For the next 5 years, unorganized fighting of the guerrilla type continued in various parts of the country against the royal government. Independence from Spain was not realized until September 27, 1821, when revolutionary forces which had broken Spanish resistance in surrounding parts, entered Mexico City, under the leadership of Iturbide, who was enthusiastically hailed and received.

The diplomatic relations of the United States with Mexico may be said to have begun January 27, 1823, when, by the appointment of Mr. Joel R. Poinsett, as minister, the republic's independence was recognized. From that time to the present, there has been no period when our State Department has not been vitally interested, directly or indirectly, in our nearest Latin American neighbor.

Perhaps the most outstanding evidence of this interest occurred in the 19th century, when Mexico and the United States joined to keep this hemisphere free.

The time was the spring of 1864, a year of peril and crisis for both nations. Our country was torn by the War Between the States. In France, Napoleon III was busily organizing his project of a Mexican Empire for Maximilian. In London, Maximilian was being received incognito by Queen Victoria. And in Mexico, the struggling young Republic faced an uncertain future, as European determination to end its independence gained momentum.

It was in the midst of this hour of crisis that the United States and Mexico had to plan and act together. Both our Secretary of State, Seward, and the young Mexican Minister to the United States, Matías Romero, shared the objective of preventing a European power from establishing an empire in this hemisphere. Public opinion was solidly behind this objective.

During a dinner at the famed Delmonico's, in New York, called by influential private citizens to obtain support for the Mexican position, William E. Dodge, Jr., declared that—

> When our own civil war shall be over, there will not be a city, nor a town, nor a village which will not immediately arm a company of soldiers to fly to the aid of our sister Republic, now making so glorious a fight.

Romero replied that while it was true that Mexicans had once believed the United States was chiefly concerned with enlarging its own territorial areas, a new era had dawned. He said:

> Our common interest, political as well as commercial, will give us a common continental policy which no European nation would dare disregard.

That their joint efforts were crowned with success is a historical fact. Romero's heroic work to preserve Mexican independence entitles him to be forever remembered among his country's patriots. As Secretary Seward observed, there had been developed the "creation of mutual moral alliance, to the end that all external aggression may be prevented throughout the whole continent."

Mr. President, Mexico, like its sister Latin American States, was absorbed for nearly the entire course of the 19th century in establishing a working government under suitable constitutional restraints. It is fair to say that this noble objective was not fully achieved until the constitution of 1917 came into being. The end of the long rule of Porfirio Diaz marked the beginning of a new and more promising era in the political and social history of Mexico, ushered in by the revolution of 1910–11, a revolution which in many respects is still in progress as Mexico moves forward.

Long exploited by the Spanish, held in colonial bondage by the military power of its Spanish conqueror, exploited for centuries for the benefit of the mother country, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of living, once the shackles of colonialism were thrown off, Mexico's achievements to date in promoting a better life for all her people have been spectacular. It is well for us to remember that we were able to establish a constitutional government by 1787, and could, therefore, concentrate our energies on other concerns. The acorn from which our system sprang was ripened on the British oak, and we did not suffer the crippling effects of a sharply stratified society. But in spite of the many obstacles, democracy in Mexico has flourished.

Today, we share with Mexico a great deal more than our 1,935 miles of a common border. We have entered upon a new era of mutual cooperation and respect. The recent visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico and the official visit of Mexico's distinguished President, Lopez-Mateos, to the United States are indicative of this era. The forms of our cooperation may take many guises. It may involve a joint commission to wipe out a destructive hoof-and-mouth disease or any other hindrance which distresses both peoples. It may take the form of that unique and enduring monument to Mexican-United States cooperation, the mighty Falcon Dam, constructed and built by the two governments on the Rio Grande, 75 miles downstream from Laredo. Or it may take the form of a cultural exchange program. But whatever the nature of cooperation between our two countries, we labor toward a common goal: to advance the cause of peace with honor among all peoples of the world.

Mr. President, let this monument to Mexico's 150 years of independence stand as a mute reminder of how long and hard the road to freedom has been. We hope that it will serve to strengthen the ties that bind us in a common purpose.

Mr. President, the inscription on the Hoover Library on War, Revolution and Peace, located on the Stanford University campus, in my native State says: "Let the winds of freedom blow." Mr. President, may the monument we erect in Mexico City forever remind us that our common goal, reached by different means, is to do just that: let the winds of freedom blow, for ourselves and for all men.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of our bill be set forth in full at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill be held at the desk until Monday, before being printed, in the event that any other of my colleagues desire to join in sponsoring the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 2827) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and requested to procure a monument appropriately commemorating the attainment of independence by Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico in commemoration of the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico. Such monument shall be prepared only after the design, plans, and specifications therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of the cost of such statue, the design and construction of a suitable pedestal therefor, transportation, including insurance, and traveling expenses of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present such statue, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico.

ADDITIONAL MEMBER OF ADVISORY BOARD OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the appointment of one additional member to the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Indiana is the only State bordering on the Great Lakes or the St. Lawrence Seaway which has never been represented on the Advisory Board or in one of the positions of authority authorized by the St. Lawrence Seaway Act. The other seven States have been represented. The five-member Advisory Board has been, and is, composed of citizens representing the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The States of Illinois and Minnesota had representation in that individuals from these States were appointed Administrator and Deputy Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Indiana, alone, remains as the only State bordering on the Great Lakes and the Seaway which has never had representation.

I have introduced this proposed legislation today with the hope that the additional member authorized will be selected from Indiana.

Much remains to be done in the development of the Seaway. When consideration is given to further improvements I want the State of Indiana to be represented. We have a real stake in this and I earnestly hope that this legislation will receive early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend section 2 of the act of May 13, 1954, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional member to the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State in a letter to the Vice President of December 31, 1959, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President with regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State—

(a) The sum of $10,514 for payment by the United States of certain contributions for the support of the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property for the period beginning July 1, 1950, and extending through the fiscal year expiring June 30, 1959; and

(b) Such sums, not to exceed $7,250 annually, as may be required thereafter for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of said International Bureau.

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 31, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. The legislation would increase the annual U.S. contribution from approximately $1,767 to approximately $7,250 and authorize the payment of certain additional contributions for the years 1950–59, a period when other members were supporting its activities on the basis of a higher budget than called for in the Industrial Property Convention.

U.S. participation is by virtue of the fact that it is a party to the Convention of Union of Paris of March 20, 1883, for the protection of industrial property, as revised at Washington on June 2, 1911 (38 Stat. 1645; TS 579), at The Hague on November 6, 1925 (47 Stat. 1789; TS 834), and at London on June 2, 1934 (53 Stat. 1748; TS 941). In accordance with article 1 of the convention, the countries to which the convention applies constituted themselves into a Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The convention provides basically that each country shall accord to nationals of other member countries the same protection with respect to industrial property rights that it accords its own nationals. Nationals of member countries are also accorded, throughout the Union, certain special rights and advantages, such as the right of priority and protection against arbitrary forfeiture of patents, if not immediately worked. The provisions governing priority are particularly important. Under these provisions, when an American inventor has filed for a patent in the United States or a member country on a given date, he has a 1-year period from the date of his first filing to file a corresponding patent application and acquire appropriate protection in other member countries. A similar 6-month right of priority applies to trademarks.

The convention also establishes an international office known as the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property which performs the following administrative functions: (1) Serves as a clearinghouse for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws; (2) serves as a medium to promote the ratification by members of revisions of the convention and the adherence of new members; (3) collects and publishes information relating to matters of general usefulness to the Union, and prepares a periodical paper concerning matters of interest to the Union; (4) holds itself at the service of members of the Union in order to supply them with any special information they may need on questions relating to the international system of industrial property; (5) handles the preparatory and administrative work of the conferences of revision.

The Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property provides that the budget of the International Bureau shall not exceed 140,000 Swiss francs. This is made up of a limitation of 120,000 Swiss francs upon the ordinary expenses of the Bureau and a limitation of 20,000 Swiss francs upon certain extraordinary expenses not covered under the ordinary budget. In addition, article 13 of the convention (53 Stat. 1781) provides that the ordinary expenses might be increased, in cases of necessity, by a unanimous decision of one of the conferences provided for by article 14.

For many years the United States has been paying its share of the expenses of the Bureau calculated on the basis of the stated 140,000 Swiss franc limitation. This has been so despite the fact that this amount had proven inadequate as early as 1950, and other members of the Union have been supporting the organization on the basis of a higher budget than called for in the convention.

At the recent Diplomatic Conference at Lisbon for revision of the convention, the United States delegation was prepared to support a unanimous decision of the Conference in accord with article 13, substantially to increase the Bureau's maximum expenditures in the light of a clear demonstration of the great inadequacy of the present level. However, the Conference was unable to reach unanimity on this point because of the interjection of a totally extraneous issue. The Soviet bloc members of the Union maintained the position that unanimity on this issue was impossible because of the absence of East Germany, not invited to the Conference although it had tried earlier to adhere to the convention. The Conference, under the leadership of the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, was unwilling to accept any wording of the resolution on funds which would carry with it the implication that this was a valid argument. Prolonged negotiations were fruitless and no wording could be devised which would have the force of a unanimous decision of the Conference as required by articles 13 and 14 of the convention. As a compromise, the following resolution was adopted: "The Conference * * * invites the countries of the Union to raise their contribution, beginning on the 1st of January 1959, in order to bring the funds of the International Bureau to the amount of 600,000 Swiss francs annually."

The Department is of the view that it is in the best interests of the United States to accept the invitation to raise its annual contribution to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property in order that the extremely valuable and important services performed can be continued. The benefits to the United States from its membership far exceed the funds contributed annually toward the support of the Bureau. It is also considered in the best interests of the United States to make certain contributions constituting the difference between the amounts already paid by the United States, calculated on the basis of the 140,000 Swiss franc limitation, and the amounts it would have paid had it been able to contribute toward the actual costs of the operations of the Bureau for the years 1950–59. The United States has been receiving the additional benefits from the activities of the Bureau but has not been paying its fair share of the cost for the years involved. Practically all of the members of the Union have been paying on the basis of a higher budget than the United States. It does not improve the U.S. Government's posture with the Bureau or its relations with other members of the Union to be the recipient of the benefits of the increased activity and services of the Bureau paid for by increased contributions from other member states.

It is hoped that the Congress will be able to take action on this request during the current session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Most sincerely,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

INCREASED TRAVEL ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 5196) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, which is now pending before the Committee on Government Operations.

As this bill came from the House of Representatives, it increases the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business from $12 to $15 and the mileage rate from 10 to 12 cents per mile. I am informed that the bill does not increase the mileage rates for U.S. marshals and their deputies, and it is the purpose of this amendment to make the U.S. marshals and their deputies eligible for the increased mileage rate.

I am informed that the Department of Justice has suggested such an amendment to the Committee on Government Operations, and I hope that it will be adopted when the committee considers the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BENNETT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PREVENTION OF COMMUNIST CONTROL OF COUNTRIES IN THE CARIBBEAN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 7, 1960, the name of Senator SPARKMAN was added as an additional cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) looking to the prevention of Communist control of countries in the Caribbean, submitted by Mr. BUSH on January 7, 1960.

AGREEMENT WITH AUSTRIA REGARDING RETURN OF AUSTRIAN PROPERTY, RIGHTS, AND INTERESTS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from executive A, 86th Congress, 2d session, an agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria regarding the return of Austrian property, rights, and interests, signed at Washington on January 30, 1959, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria regarding the return of Austrian property, rights, and interests, signed at Washington on January 30, 1959.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Acing Secretary of State regarding the agreement.

The agreement provides for the return of certain Austrian property in the United States which was taken under control by the Office of Alien Property during World War II under the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act. The property or proceeds thereof will be turned over to the Austrian Government for delivery to the individual claimants.

By article 27 of the Austrian State Treaty, signed on May 15, 1955, the United States declared its intention to return such property. This agreement will enable the United States to fulfill its obligation in that regard.

I recommend that the Senate take favorable action with respect to the agreement.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FURTHER PUBLIC HEARINGS ON WIRETAPPING, EAVESDROPPING, THE RIGHT OF PRIVACY, AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to announce, as chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, that public hearings will be resumed in connection with our continuing study of wiretapping, eavesdropping, the right of privacy, and the Bill of Rights, on Tuesday morning, February 16, 1960, at 10:30 a.m. in the caucus room—room 318—of the Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Witnesses to be heard are representatives of American telephone companies.

In the course of the subcommittee's hearings in December 1959 questions arose about what telephone companies do, if anything, to protect subscribers' telephone lines from wiretapping. American Telephone & Telegraph Co. officials subsequently indicated a desire to amplify views presented to the subcommittee at our first hearing on this subject in the previous Congress. Accordingly, we are happy to give them this further opportunity to testify.

Witnesses scheduled are Mr. Wellington Powell, vice president, operations, of the New York Telephone Co.; accompanied by Mr. John Quisenberry, general solicitor of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON MILITARY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SOVIET BLOC DURING THE PAST YEAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that Mr. Allen Dulles will appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session at 2 p.m., on Monday, January 18, to discuss military and economic developments in the Soviet bloc during the past year.

I also wish to say that efforts have been made on the part of the committee to arrange for a similar meeting with Secretary Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Twining, to discuss with the Committee on Foreign Relations the state of readiness of our domestic Military Establishment insofar as that has a significance to the conduct of foreign policy. The Department of Defense has informed the committee, however, that the schedules of Secretary Gates and General Twining are so full that they will not be able to meet with the committee for this purpose until possibly late February.

Secretary Herter is scheduled to testify before the committee in executive session at 2 p.m., on Thursday, January 21, to review foreign policy developments during the period of the congressional recess.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17 BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I announce that on Tuesday, January 19, at 10 a.m., in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building, the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a public hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, favoring a convention of delegates from Atlantic democracies looking to a greater cooperation and unity of purpose.

As this hearing is next Tuesday, persons wishing to present their views should get into immediate touch with the clerk of the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS OF G. FREDERICK REINHARDT TO BE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AS ENVOY AND MINISTER TO THE KINGDOM OF YEMEN, AND TYLER THOMPSON TO BE AMBASSADOR TO ICELAND, BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nominations of G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy and Minister to the Kingdom of

Yemen, and Tyler Thompson, of Maine, to be Ambassador to Iceland.

In accordance with the committee rule, the pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER H. HODGE TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled on the nomination of Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge, district of Alaska, for 10:30 a.m., on Friday, January 22, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL BROADCASTING AGREEMENT AND BROADCASTING AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, notice is hereby given that the Subcommittee on the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the Broadcasting Agreement With Mexico will hold a public hearing on January 25 at 10 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, to receive the comments of interested agencies and representatives of the industry on the subcommittee's interim report of August 1959.

Persons desiring to comment on the report are asked to notify the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations as soon as possible. Testimony should be confined to the alternative courses of action set forth on page 6 of the interim report.

After these hearings, it is the intention of the subcommittee to reach a final decision on the disposal of the two broadcasting agreements.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

Letter from him to Senator BENNETT of Utah, dated January 12, 1960, relating to the motion picture "On the Beach."

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Questionnaire on political subjects mailed by him to 27,000 North Dakota people.

PRESIDENT HITS SPREAD OF BIGOTRY AND PREJUDICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the establishment of a lasting peace is the No. 1 challenge before the world.

Historically, mankind has been faced with a cycle of threats to the dignity and freedom of its people—indeed, to life itself. Yesterday, they would be threatened by Hitlerism. Today, the menace is communism.

To counter these threats, a vast volume of resources, manpower, and brainpower has been dedicated.

If we are to establish a lasting peace, however, the world must go further toward improving human and national relationships than resolving economic differences and stopping military offensives. We face fundamental tasks of promoting better real understanding among peoples, including the eradication of prejudice, bigotry, race hatred, interclass violence, and other such forces which threaten to disrupt peaceful relations among men within countries and between nations.

Regrettably, even as we mobilize our forces to fight communism, the world now finds that there are reappearing on the horizon old foes to freedom.

Specifically, I speak of the Nazi-sponsored anti-Semitic waves that have hit Western Germany.

I sincerely hope that the actions of an irresponsible minority in Western Germany will not reflect unfavorably upon the tremendous effort which the West German people are making toward democratic processes and the protection of freedom for themselves.

Particularly, I was gratified to see my longtime friend, Chancellor Adenauer, as a great patriot, serving not only the German people but world peace, speak out forthrightly against the anti-Semitism.

However, the reappearance of anti-Semitic swastikas signals to the world that there still exists, even within nations outside the Communist orbit, the seeds of evil that can destroy freedom, and if provided the opportunity probably would ultimately do so.

We recognize, of course, the great, and perhaps eternal challenge to reform humanity into a real brotherhood. Only the future can tell how far we are from the time when men can really and truly live with each other in peace.

Meanwhile, our task as freedom-lovers is to be alert against the tremendous damage which not only the flare-up of anti-Semitism in West Germany, but also interracial clashes in nations around the globe, can have on the cause of freedom and on the ultimate hope of mankind for a lasting peace.

As could be expected, the Communists are alert to take advantage, for exploitation purposes, particularly in counterpropaganda, of internal conflicts in the Western World.

In the January 13 edition of the Washington Evening Star there was published an article which outlines the views of President Eisenhower and other national leaders against the waves of bigotry and prejudice.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT HITS SPREAD OF BIGOTRY, PREJUDICE

NEW YORK, January 13.—President Eisenhower, noting recent anti-Semitic vandalism, says "the virus of bigotry" must not be allowed "to spread one inch."

In a message read last night at an emergency meeting of the American Jewish Congress, Mr. Eisenhower said that when bigotry "becomes rampant it can cause the destruction of freedom and decency everywhere."

"In this age, when so much is expected and required of America, we can ill afford to waste a single day combating bigotry or prejudice at home," the President declared.

The message was addressed to the National Conference of Christians and Jews in reply to a telegram last Thursday from representatives of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. They voiced concern to the President over the threat of religious bigotry in politics and the anti-Semitic outbreaks.

In a note read at the meeting, a White House aide, Gerald D. Morgan, said: "Like you, the President has been concerned about the recent outbreak of religious intolerance and views it with deep loathing."

ROCKEFELLER STATEMENT

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller wired the American Jewish Congress:

"The recent outbreak of vandalism of synagogues and churches is shocking. Every thinking person is indignant at these shameful acts and those responsible for these depredations in various parts of the world."

At the Jewish Congress emergency meeting Protestant and Catholic leaders deplored the recent vandalism. A message from Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, said: "I know I speak for millions of Catholics when I offer my prayerful sympathy to our Jewish friends and neighbors."

Bishop James A. Pike, of the Episcopal Diocese of California, said in a message that every effort must be made to stamp out the anti-Semitic acts. He said they constitute a "reflection on the inadequacy of the teaching of Christians and others in regard to brotherhood and the common religious and ethical foundations of Judaism and Christianity."

The Right Reverend Horace W. B. Donegan, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, a principal speaker at the meeting, noted that the huge Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine here recently had been smeared with the Star of David. With the mark was the inscription "An eye for an eye."

"The prankster, neurotic, or misguided individual" responsible for the marking would "scarcely have bothered," said Bishop Donegan, "had he known that the Star of David appears more than 100 times in the cathedral."

COMBINED MEETING

An official of the American Jewish Congress said the meeting was the first time that leaders of the major religious faiths in the Western Hemisphere discussed from the same platform the wave of synagogue defacements.

The president of the American Jewish Congress, Dr. Joachim Prinz, warned against underestimating the significance of the swastika daubings.

They should not be dismissed, he said, as a mere "fad like the hula-hoop or rock-'n'-roll. The cry of 'death to the Jews' embodied in the swastika is a dangerous lyric for a rock-'n'-roll number."

INTEREST RATES AND INFLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the President of the United States has again sent to Congress a recommendation that the

interest-rate ceiling on long-term Treasury marketable bonds be removed.

Mr. President, this has become one of the most important domestic issues facing the Senate at the present time, if not the most important; and I hope that, in light of events which have transpired since Members of Congress went home in September, those who are opposed to this recommendation may take a different view and realize that the credit of the Government of the United States, upon which our national security and the security of the whole free world depends, is involved in this particular issue.

I point out again, as I have before, that compliance with this recommendation is a move for lower, not higher, interest rates. Indeed, if we do not accede to the President's recommendation, the inflationary forces which will continue to be generated can very seriously endanger our national defense effort by greatly increasing the cost thereof.

Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of today there appeared a short editorial entitled "The Inflation Seekers," which comes to grips with this issue in a very succinct and acute way. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INFLATION SEEKERS

Many Democrats in Congress are reportedly asking themselves this question: How can they vote now to end the arbitrary interest-rate ceiling on new offerings of longer term Government bonds and then in the fall campaign turn around and attack the administration's high-interest-rate policy?

It is an interesting political question, but essentially it is an unreal one.

In the first place, a vote to end the ceiling is not a vote for higher interest rates. In his brief urgent message to Congress this week, President Eisenhower said early removal of the ceiling is "imperative" for the sake of sound debt management.

Why? Because this archaic, artificial obstruction forces the Treasury into inflationary short-term financing. "As a result," the President said, "short-term Treasury borrowing costs have risen to the highest levels in several decades.

Thus a vote to remove this large impediment might well be, in effect, a vote for some lower interest rates. Certainly its continuation is not bringing the lower rates so many Democrats profess to cherish; quite the contrary.

In any case, high interest rates are not the administration's policy. The cost of borrowing money has risen because the demand has risen; the Treasury, for its part, would be glad to get its money cheaper. The only thing this administration and the Federal Reserve Board have not been prepared to do is deliberately start a vast new inflation in the hope of forcing interest rates down in defiance of market forces.

These election-minded Democrats doubtless know all this (if they don't, it's a pretty sad reflection on them). So the suspicion must grow that they are not primarily concerned about the alleged political dangers of acceding to the President's eminently sane request in this particular case.

Instead, it looks as though they are just bound and determined to do nothing whatever that might stand in the way of the inflation they seek.

BIRTHDAY OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today the world celebrates the 85th birthday of Albert Schweitzer, missionary-doctor, scholar, philosopher, musician, and humanist.

Dr. Schweitzer has won universal acclaim because of his work, and his career has been devoted to the service of his fellow men.

From the heart of Africa, where in 1913, he founded a mission hospital which today has become a great health-giving center in which more than 500 patients are treated each month, his spirit has radiated to all parts of the world.

He has written:

It seems to me a matter of course that we should all take our share of the burden of pain which lies upon the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, editorials on Dr. Schweitzer's birthday, which were printed today in the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 14, 1960]

ALBERT SCHWEITZER: A LEGEND IN HIS TIME

(By Herbert Kupferberg)

For many years the world at large was content to leave Albert Schweitzer to the admiration of African natives and European scholars. But today his 85th birthday is a matter of universal celebration, with heads of state among those raining messages of congratulation upon his hospital headquarters in the African jungle.

Even the man in the street, that mighty if mythical judge of human stature, has an idea that the aged missionary-doctor is among the great men of earth. In a Gallup poll last month the American public rated him No. 3 among the most admired men in the world today, right behind such unassailable heroes as Dwight D. Eisenhower and Winston Churchill.

It was not always thus, for Schweitzer for many years was known mostly in narrow fields. He was always highly regarded in the limited worlds of philosophy, theology, and music, all of which he had long ago enriched with his writings. He was respected by those who knew of his decision, at the age of 38, to give up a brilliant European career to become a missionary-physician in Lambaréné, a few miles above the Equator on the Ogowe River in French Equatorial Africa.

Yet it is only in recent years, when the airplane has turned Lambaréné almost into a place of pilgrimage, that Schweitzer's name and fame have become universal. Photographers have journeyed to Africa to make movies of him at work; sound engineers have set up equipment in his native town in Alsace to record him playing the organ in the village church.

A dozen biographies of him have appeared in the last dozen years; books he himself wrote decades ago, such as "The Quest of the Historical Jesus" and his critical biography of Johann Sebastian Bach, have undergone a revival of interest. His pronouncements upon the dangers of nuclear radiation are received with respect, even though there are those who would dismiss as impractical the man who with his own hands fashioned a hospital from a jungle and brought help, hope and relief from pain where none had been before.

Much of Schweitzer's current fame, particularly in the United States, began with a visit—his only one—he made to this country in 1949. Typically, his journey illustrated still another facet of his astonishing career, for he was invited to lecture at Aspen, Colo., upon the bicentenary of Goethe's birth.

As a news event, a doctor arriving from Africa to give a talk on a dead German poet might seem to have its limitations. But Schweitzer, to his own astonishment no less than others', was swamped by a large turnout of shipboard reporters, including photographers who addressed him as "Doc" as they hustled about the ship's deck.

It was a mass interview never forgotten by those who participated in it. One reporter even deliberated whether to break an unwritten rule by bringing along one of Schweitzer's books to be autographed. Fearing a ribbing from his journalistic colleagues, he decided against it. He was chagrined to find other newspapermen eagerly thrusting note pads and sheets of copy paper at the patient, walrus-moustached, elderly man in the old-fashioned frock coat. Schweitzer not only signed his name on each scrap of paper, he courteously wrote an extended inscription upon it—while the reporter who had left his book home stood by in silent frustration.

It was at this press conference that Schweitzer discovered he was expected to express views upon most of the problems confronting humanity, ranging from communism and the atom bomb to his impressions of the United States. Asked how faith could best be opposed to communism, he said: "These questions do not exist in the forests and jungles of Africa. The best thing with which to oppose communism is non-communism—to give all possible liberties, material and spiritual, to all individuals."

On the atom bomb, he declined to make any comment at all, although in later years he was to have a good deal to say about it. When he was asked what he thought of America, he chuckled and replied: "I swore when I left Europe I wouldn't answer that. Those who know America should answer it."

Incidentally, someone told him a few years later about the reporter who hadn't brought the book down to be autographed. He forthwith wrote him a litle note saying: "How often do I think of you, unconsciously, when I remember the friendly welcome of the gentlemen of the press in New York."

This is to tell him that the warm memories are reciprocated, and to wish him happy birthday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 14, 1960]

SAGE OF LAMBARENE

It is a pleasure to extend best wishes to Dr. Albert Schweitzer on his 85th birthday anniversary. Incontestably, Dr. Schweitzer is a great and good man, and the world will enjoy one of its rare moments of unanimity today in hoping that this voice out of Africa will be heard for a long time to come. It would, however, be perfectly in character for Dr. Schweitzer to ignore the hubbub and continue—as he has for half a century—his simple round of tasks at Lambarene, his mission in the new Gabon Republic of what used to be French Equatorial Africa. One of the marks of his character, and perhaps a secret of his greatness, has been Dr. Schweitzer's indifference to the nudge of convention.

This trait showed itself early in Dr. Schweitzer's life. In 1905, at the age of 30, he stunned his friends by renouncing his three careers—all successful—as a theologian, organist, and biographer of Bach. He began training as a doctor, and soon left his native Alsace the better to serve mankind in the dense jungles of Africa. There, as director of a medical mission, he flourished, and the world has been the richer for what once

seemed a foolish gesture of renunciation. His credo of reverence for life has acquired a force far beyond that of any battalion.

But, as John Gunther observes, "Schweitzer would be intolerable if, together with his overwhelming intellectual and moral virtues, he did not have his defects." The defects are there; Gunther notes correctly that in Dr. Schweitzer's attitude to the African, the old doctor sometimes displays the irritation and despair of a European colonial. It does not diminish his stature to concede the justness of the reproach. But it does help to point up that the colonialists' contribution to Africa is not wholly a record of shame and exploitation. Cruel masters and selfish investors did come to feed on Africa—but with them came men like Dr. Schweitzer. This is something of which the world, not only the white man, can rightly be proud.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, in order to remind them of the fact that upon the occasion of the birthday of Robert Frost, the great American poet, the Senate adopted a resolution, which was a very kind and nice thing to do. So I should like to talk with them, if they will be kind enough to think about the possibility of doing something of that sort in regard to the 85th birthday of Albert Schweitzer. I think the suggestion is worth considering from the point of view of whether it would be proper, appropriate, and desirable for the Senate to take action to commemorate the remarkable career of this great man.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from New York, that as he knows—and he is always a delightful conversationalist—I always welcome counsel from him.

I have not explored the matter to which he has referred, and I do not know what can be done about it. However, there is no Member of the Senate with whom I enjoy working more than I do with the Senator from New York. So I shall enjoy conferring with him and with the minority leader and other interested Senators; and I shall be glad to make whatever contribution we can under the circumstances.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague.

The only reason for my mentioning it publicly is that I know he, like all of us, admires Dr. Schweitzer, and would wish to join in all I have said about him.

WITH NO BILL OF RIGHTS TO PROTECT THEM, INDIVIDUALS FARE BADLY IN DEMOCRACIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in government, as in any of life's activities, something which is good in a proper quantity almost inevitably becomes something bad if it is employed to excess. This truth applies in government even to democracy and freedom, for it is possible that democratic methods can be used to destroy freedom.

Although this statement may surprise some legislators today, it would not in the least have surprised the Founding Fathers of this Nation, who established not a democracy, but a Republic.

The American form of democracy was not intended to equalize men economically and socially by statute, and, in my conviction, should not be so used today.

The American form of democracy was intended and should be used to provide equal opportunity for individual endeavor—a fair chance to get ahead.

Mr. President, I do not intend to make a speech. Instead I should like to draw to the attention of all my colleagues an editorial on this timely subject. It is entitled: "With No Bill of Rights To Protect Them, Individuals Fare Badly in Democracies," and it appears in the January 9, 1960, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH NO BILL OF RIGHTS TO PROTECT THEM, INDIVIDUALS FARE BADLY IN DEMOCRACIES

(By Oscar Ibele)

Liberty is the absence of coercion of a human being by any other human being or beings. Democracy by definition presumes a system of government in which the power to decide upon major public policies is vested in the people. Democracy and liberty have come to be regarded as indispensable to each other, like "love and marriage." But just as lovers occasionaly bludgeon each other, so democracy can become the enemy of freedom. Without constitutional restraints, the will of the majority would show small concern for the basic rights of minorities and individuals.

How can democratic methods be used to destroy the substance of liberty? The answer lies in the way democracy has been extended beyond its traditional dimensions. The democratic system is continually being pressed to become an instrument for the forcible redistribution of wealth and the expansion of government.

As conceived by the founders of the American form of democracy, government was to provide political and legal equality of citizenship. All qualified citizens should be able to vote and hold office and enjoy equal protection before the law. Modern demagogs pervert this to mean economic and social equality, equality by statute. To our Founding Fathers equality meant an equal opportunity to try, not a right to the fruits of the success of others. Our second President, John Adams, contended that, while moral equality might exist at birth, different talents and efforts would inevitably create strata in wealth and social prestige. "Make all men Newtons," he said, "or if you will, Jeffersons, or Taylors, or Randolphs, and they would all perish in a heap."

The Founding Fathers were acutely conscious of the perils of demogogy inherent in popular government. In the Constitution, therefore, they established not a democracy but a republic, with built-in safeguards against unrestrained mass rule, such as separation of powers, checks and balances, a federation of States, in order to protect the talented "forgotten man" from the aggressive propensities of his common fellow citizens. Since 1789 these qualifications and protective restrictions have been progressively eroded by judicial interpretation or swept away by constitutional amendment. Thus the way is left open for all sorts of welfare schemes, many of doubtful constitutional or financial legitimacy.

Senator MCCLELLAN, head of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, reported in 1957 that there was a tremendous ground swell of public sentiment for economy in Government. At the same time he admitted that testimony from the public is rarely, if ever, received in the committees of Congress, which make the big decisions on Government fiscal policy. Economy-minded voters are effectively frustrated at the critical stages of legislative procedure by well-heeled pressure groups and governmental bureaucrats, who tend to overawe congressional committee members with their pleas for ever-larger expenditures for all sorts of schemes, from subsidizing unwed mothers to urban renewal.

What the Government subsidizes it can also control. As its power increases, our freedom diminishes. Many vigilant persons recognize this peril to their liberties, but in the face of the tremendous voting power of the pressure groups and other recipients of free Federal money, the odds are increasingly against them.

De Tocqueville was right. It is possible for the people to vote themselves into bondage. We shall be fortunate if this doesn't happen to us.

FIRES OF FREEDOM—EDITORIAL BY FRANCIS H. BUFFUM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in these days, when there are those who would have Americans think they are sinking into a second-class nation, and that the only way to overcome our so-called weaknesses is to pile bureaucracy on top of bureaucracy with a centralized government in control of all individuals, it is like a breath of fresh air to find a voice which acknowledges our strength.

Mr. Francis H. Buffum, in his column "Fires of Freedom," appearing in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader of January 6, 1960, states:

Just as the value of the forest depends upon the fiber and growth of the trees that compose it, so the value of a society depends upon the character of the individuals who constitute it.

He asks:

How then does a society develop in the individual?—by submerging him in a national socialistic mass administered by a Federal bureaucracy?

He brings out the point that liberty of the individual was what produced the American character and made America invincible, until the early part of this century when the individual began leaning on his Government for support and relinquishing his rights to the bureaucrat. This, he says, the Communists are well aware of, and they are doing everything in their power to promote it.

Mr. President, because so much truth is contained in this article, I commend it to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRES OF FREEDOM

(By Francis H. Buffum)

"The most urgent present need of America at this critical juncture is not more mechanization but more character."—James H. Breastead.

The above statement was made before the Red tide of communism threatened to inundate the world and destroy our present civilization. It was doubtless true when written. Is it true today?

Would Mr. Breastead now consider character more important than machines at this critical juncture? We are all so deeply involved in this question—in the comparative importance of mechanization and character—that it will pay us well to take a good look at it.

No one who is in the know will question America's urgent need of the best machines and scientific instruments that the genius of our scientists can invent and our artisans can produce for self-defense. The Russians are keenly aware of all this, and have concentrated on it in their bid for world domination. But they have discarded something which, if understood and used to its full potential by us before the 11th hour strikes, will spell their doom; and if neglected by us, will spell ours. Their hope of defeating us lies in our having forgotten and neglected the prime factor of our strength.

I refer to something more than being good technicians and fighters. Presumably the Russians would be able to match us in both of these categories in course of time, and do it under Marxist rules if technical skill alone could determine the outcome of this now global contest. But the battle will not go "to heathen heart that puts its trust in reeking tube and iron shard."

Reason leads us to accept Mr. Breastead's estimate of the relative importance of character, and to do so without belittling our industrial achievements. Let us beware, however, of thinking that Americans have a monopoly on it. In fact, our commercial success has had a tendency to make us neglectful of some of its finer attributes which men elsewhere have acquired. But character in general, as Mr. Breastead evidently means it, has achieved a more robust and widespread growth in America than in any of the other so-called great nations. Why?

Just as the value of a forest depends upon the fiber and growth of the trees that compose it, so the value of a society depends upon the character of the individuals who constitute it.

How then does a society develop character in the individual—by submerging him in a national socialistic mass administered by a federal bureaucracy, and finally in a socialistic world dominated by the United Nations?

The answer to this question is to be found in our history, not in the textbooks of theorists. Reduced to its simplest terms American history is the record of a people who prized liberty well enough to pay for it in the long, hard school of experience and who, through centuries of struggle, had so far developed a capacity for self-government that when they found a land where they might put their dreams to the test, produced in three centuries the greatest and most prosperous nation of all time.

Liberty of the individual, hard earned and jealously guarded, was what produced the American character and made the American Nation invincible until the individual, soon after the turn of the century, began leaning on Government for support and relinquishing the open market to the dictation of bureaucrats.

The Communists are well aware of this tendency and are doing everything in their power to promote it. They know that America is the last major bastion of freedom in the world, and that America's strength lies in the character of its freedom-loving people. Until ready for the final blow they will avoid awakening them to their danger.

At this critical juncture nothing serves the Kremlin's purpose better than a cold war of subversion—cold enough to keep the fires of freedom-loving patriots from breaking into flame.

Above all, Uncle Sam-son must not be awakened by gunfire until the Communist Philistines, with the connivance of Delilah—patron saint of traitors—are upon him.

DEFINITION OF U.S.S.R.

"The complete record of Russia of the past 40 years shows conclusively that, in spite of the Soviet flag, the nature of the Soviet regime is truly bourgeois-capitalist and anti-labor. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is neither a union, because it is a completely centralized state; nor is it Soviet, because it has no free workers' councils; nor Socialist, because it represses labor and accentuates class differences; nor a republic because it is an unlimited autocracy. The U.S.S.R. stands more properly for the Union of Sweatshop Runners."—From "The Secret Name," by Dr. Lin Yutang, Farrar, Straus, & Cudahy, New York, 1958.

SOVIET HAND IN ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, during the past 5 years anti-Semitic incidents have been reported in several non-Communist countries.

An answer as to who may be responsible is provided by David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report, in his Washington Evening Star column of January 7. He points out that the Communists are trying to wreck the prestige of West German Chancellor Adenauer. Further, he asks why no anti-Jewish acts took place in East Germany until after the press had commented about this strange fact.

Mr. Lawrence's article furnishes a factual backdrop to these incidents, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

Also, Mr. President, William Loeb, the distinguished publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, agrees with David Lawrence about the probable origins of these recent anti-Jewish acts. In a signed editorial on January 5, William Loeb got to the heart of this vicious matter when he said, "The nation to gain the most by these outrages is Communist Russia."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this point. This country is very fortunate to have publishers such as William Loeb, who, like Daniel Webster, believe, "There is nothing so powerful as the truth"—the slogan which appears on the masthead of his newspaper.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington, (D.C) Evening Star, Thursday, Jan. 7, 1959]

SOVIET HAND IN ANTI-SEMITISM—WIDESPREAD, SIMULTANEOUS OUTBREAKS CALLED RED DRIVE AGAINST ADENAUER

(By David Lawrence)

The finger of suspicion begins to point more and more toward Communist responsibility for the wave of anti-Semitism which now has broken out sporadically in countries as far apart as Canada and Australia and Sweden and South Africa.

Even in Israel—which is the last place one would expect to see any anti-Semitic demonstrations—swastika insignia were found in a synagogue and in a labor exchange building.

Much of this has been brushed off as "crackpot activity," just as those who daubed paint on West German synagogues were promptly labeled "hooligans." But when anything occurs that is as widespread as has just been reported in the press dispatches from all parts of the world, it is apparent this is no accidental occurrence but, as the West German Government itself now declares, a well-concerted plan.

Dr. Karl Ibach, chairman of Resistance Fighters Against the Nazis, is quoted in a United Press International dispatch as having told Chancellor Adenauer there is an underground anti-Semitic movement and that its two centers in Sweden and Vienna are in contact with former Nazi leaders who have fled to Egypt. Recent reports indicate some of the anti-Semitic demonstrations in the southern part of the United States might have had their origin in certain Arab countries.

It is significant, moreover, that, although there must be a considerable number of anti-Semites in East Germany, no demonstrations occurred there for several days. Then, when the fact was noted in the press, the East Germans managed to join the procession with the painting of swastikas on walls in a small town near East Berlin.

Obviously the Communists are playing a double game. During the last 10 days, they suppressed in the Soviet press the news of the anti-Semitic demonstrations but unhesitatingly filled the air waves in the West with denunciations of West Germany as being dominated by former Nazis and Fascists.

Plainly, the Communist strategy is to injure the prestige of the Adenauer government in the free world and to weaken the influence of the Chancellor in the forthcoming summit meetings on the Berlin problem. The objective is to convince people in the West that it would be a mistake to reunify Germany. For, despite their boasts about relaxing tension, the Soviets have not given up their idea of forcing the Western Powers out of Berlin altogether.

Just why should anti-Jewish "hate paintings" appear simultaneously since Christmas Day, not only in West Germany, but in Britain, Australia, Belgium, France, Greece, Sweden, Austria and Italy, as well as in remote parts of the world? It seems incredible that the former Nazis should suddenly find themselves possessed of enough money of their own and a big enough international apparatus to carry out such a scheme. The answer probably is that there are some right-wing groups which have secret ties with the Communists, though outwardly they profess hostility to each other.

The West German Government has just declared through its press chief, Felix von Eckhardt, that, while there is no positive proof as yet that the incidents were organized and controlled by a single organization, "we hope to have the proof soon." He added that there were "definite conclusions that the incidents had been organized by some central group."

Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has just declared that he has information from unassailable confidential intelligence sources showing that Communists are behind the recent anti-Semitic outbreaks in West Germany. He says the trouble is Communist-inspired for the purpose of attempting to discredit the West German Adenauer government.

The fact is that a hard core of several thousands of Communists are stationed, not only in the United States, but in all countries of the free world. Millions of dollars annually pass into the hands of Communist agents from headquarters in Canada and Mexico as well as in Argentina. In the United States, itself, the same technique has been used in the last few years in the South by painting synagogues and otherwise defacing churches.

The most important objective of the Communists today is to discredit the Adenauer government in the eyes of the world. The anti-Semitic demonstrations already have brought results by way of increasing criticism of the West German Government for

an alleged lack of vigilance in cracking down on former Nazis. But the truth is the West German Government finds it difficult to take effective action against the Communists who travel back and forth across the frontier from East Germany every day carrying verbal instructions to Communist agents in the press, in the universities, in the churches, and even in the local governments in West Germany. Part of the strategy is to arouse many so-called liberals to pooh-pooh the Communist menace, and this gives the Communist apparatus even more leeway than ever before in carrying on their diabolical plots.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Jan. 5, 1960]

DISGRACEFUL TACTICS

(By William Loeb)

Decent people everywhere are profoundly shocked at the sudden desecration of Jewish synagogues and the painting of anti-Jewish signs on buildings in West Germany, England, New York City and in other parts of the world.

This newspaper joins all decent people everywhere in condemning these outrageous actions.

We further urge that the culprit be immediately brought to justice. The culprit, in our estimation, is the Communist International operating from Moscow.

No coordinated outbreak of anti-Semitism in so many different parts of the world could possibly occur unless it were in response to orders from some central headquarters. There is, unfortunately, no organization in the world that can produce such spontaneous reaction in various parts of the world except the Communist International. The Communists appear to be responsible for these anti-Jewish symbols appearing in various parts of the world, and especially in Western Germany.

And why do we believe the Reds responsible for these outrages? Because elsewhere—in this country and in other lands—never in the memory of this writer has there been more good will toward different religions, including the Jewish religion. Religious prejudice is at an alltime low in the United States, and that is so elsewhere, from what we have been able to observe.

There is no reason for this outbreak. It had to be planned by someone who had something to gain from it.

The nation to gain most by these outrages is Communist Russia.

The Communists are attempting first to seize Berlin and then to take over all of Germany and then to turn its immense technology to the benefit of the Communist world conquest.

In order to seize Berlin and West Germany they must discredit Adenauer and the German people. What better way to do it than to tell the whole world, "Well, those Germans are still nothing but a bunch of Nazi anti-Semites." Men and women of good will all over the country must remember one thing and never forget it—the Communists conquer more by psychological warfare and more by dividing peoples, than they do by military arms.

The police in every nation where the fake anti-Semitic outrages have occurred should apprehend the perpetrators of the deeds and carefully and rapidly check back their Communist connections. When the data is assembled, then the heads of the Governments of the United States, Germany, England, and the rest of the world should send a note to Khrushchev, telling him that there will be no summit meeting or any other negotiations until this latest Communist skulduggery ceases. But, to our Jewish friends we say—do not be alarmed; do not be upset—these are not genuine outbreaks of anti-Semitism. These are deliberate attempts to disturb you and to arouse suspicions of brother against brother.

There has never been a better era of good feeling between Christians and Jews than the present and it will continue as it is and will grow better as the years go by.

DR. MARTIN F. PALMER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last evening there was portrayed on one of the national networks the life of a very dedicated Kansan, who has built one of our important institutions concerned with children handicapped in communicative capabilities.

Approximately 25 years ago Dr. Martin F. Palmer came to Kansas and, in a very small and very humble way, started to work with the problem of handicapped children, particularly those who were handicapped in speech. He began his work at Kansas Wesleyan College, at Salina, Kans. Later he moved to Wichita, Kans., where he built a very outstanding institution.

The institute, under the direction of Dr. Palmer, has done much to help children and adults in Kansas affected with severe communicative problems. During the past 10 years alone, 11,500 children from Kansas have been helped by the institute.

The work of the institute is known throughout the world, and the people of Kansas are very proud to have this organization located in their State.

Approximately 8 percent of the population of our Nation have communicative disorders needing professional attention. A great deal more research is needed to find the answer to the many complex problems of man's highest level of function. I know the Institute of Logopedics is the best place for such research to be carried on. Nowhere in the country does one find such extensive research material, as the institute is the largest residential speech and hearing clinic in the world.

The work of this outstanding institution will be greatly enhanced now that there has been set up the Johnny Belinda Fund, the proceeds of which will be used in the interest of thousands of boys and girls. Generous contributions have already been made to the fund in support of the program.

As a member of the national board of trustees of this institution, and as a personal friend of Dr. Palmer, and one who is familiar with his work, I can only say we in Kansas are proud, and our Nation is proud of the splendid service he is rendering our handicapped children.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PASSAGE OF FIRST FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE LAW

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Saturday, January 16, will mark the 77th anniversary of the passage of the first Federal civil service law.

The occasion provides me with a long-sought opportunity to express the appreciation of one servant of the people for the loyalty, industry, and genuine devotion to their work of the great majority of those in Federal civil service.

The occasion also permits me to call attention at this time to the contributions to the civil service law of the first Vermonter to become President of the United States, Chester Alan Arthur.

Like his predecessor, President Garfield, Chester Arthur was himself a victim of the spoils system prevalent in the political life of his day. As President, however, he became one of the prime supporters of the Pendleton proposal for reform of the Federal civil service, and signed the bill which made it law.

While the civil service law today may be far from perfect, the original Pendleton Act and its various amendments have served to give to the career men and women in the merit civil service system a degree of stature, dignity, and security unknown to Government workers when Chester Arthur, of Fairfield, Vt., became the 21st President of the United States.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have had distributed this morning copies of an amendment which I propose to offer, probably this afternoon, to S. 2436, the Federal Elections Act of 1959. I think the amendment will strengthen the bill considerably, and I hope Senators who are interested will take time to read the amendment and will be prepared to ask any questions they desire at the proper time.

PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 5421.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain favorable economic status, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SCOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON INTEREST RATES NEEDED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in furtherance of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], I wish to invite attention to

the fact that in his first state of the Union message last week and in his special message to Congress on Tuesday of this week, President Eisenhower renewed his request for action to remove the arbitrary and unnecessary interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

Mr. President, today I believe it to be of the highest importance that the President's request on interest rates be granted. I stated my views on this matter on the floor of the Senate several times during the last session.

Let me briefly restate this position:

The United States is fortunately in the midst of an impressive economic boom. The demand for investment capital is great, and as a result interest rates have increased. Why not? Ours is a free competitive economy and that is the way it works.

The Government meanwhile has a debt, and it must sell bonds. Like everyone else, the Government must sell its obligations at the current asking price for the real savings of our economy—whatever that price may be.

Following this thinking through to the logical conclusion, it is apparent that if, in a free economy, the asking price for investment capital—that is, for the real savings in our economy is above 4¼ percent, the Government rate on long-term securities must also be above 4¼ percent.

Opponents of the removal of the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term bonds contend that raising the interest rate is inflationary. This simply is not true. In fact, the opposite is the case.

As is well known, the interest rate ceiling currently prevents the Treasury from selling any long-term bonds. Full reliance must be placed on short-term notes on which there is no interest rate ceiling. Government notes now sell for rates of 5 percent or more. These notes represent what is called "near money," which means that savings used to buy Government notes are much more liquid. They can be quickly and easily converted into cash, and as a result, there is more money in use or immediately available for use in our economy. This situation is clearly inflationary.

On the other hand, if the Treasury could sell long-term bonds at the market price, the savings in our economy would not be so fluid and for this reason inflationary pressures would be more easily held in check.

Mr. President, I want to invite attention this morning to a New York Times editorial which was published while Congress was in recess. I have been saving this editorial because I think it states the President's case for removal of the interest rate limit in very strong and very clear terms.

The Times refers to the blocking of the President's request as "obstructionism." The editorial goes on to point out that developments in our economy over the past year clearly demonstrate the wisdom of the President's request for the removal of the interest rate ceiling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1960]

RETURN TO REASON?

Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, speaking before a joint annual meeting of two of the Nation's leading economic associations in Washington, returned to the prevailing arbitrary interest rate ceiling of 4¼ percent on Treasury bonds. The administration, he said, will press Congress "with all the vigor that we can command" for prompt action on the issue.

Feeling has mounted against this piece of obstructionism since the adjournment of the last session of Congress as an increasing number of people have come to understand the significance of the action by the congressional opposition. The consensus now seems to be that the next session will see the opponents of the President's request bow to changed public opinion and retreat from their earlier, misguided position.

This view would seem to be confirmed by the staff report to the joint congressional committee, which says:

"While the interest rate ceiling should be repealed, modification of the policies that led to this situation is a matter of much more pressing importance. Whether the Congress will want to repeal it without basic reforms in fiscal, monetary, and debt management policy is a matter for it to decide."

This was not written in a spirit of "let the chips fall where they may" and without reference to the position in which the Democratic caucus made its important decision a few months earlier, and it is not written in a spirit of contrition. It is written, one is compelled to conclude, with the idea of saving the faces of the group of Senators that was largely responsible for putting the party out on a long and insecure limb and would very much like to climb back with a minimum loss of dignity.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, few men who have served the United States in this Chamber have achieved so remarkable a record as Edwin C. Johnson. Ed Johnson continues to lend his efforts to the betterment of the Nation and of his native State even though he is now enjoying retirement.

New recognition of his great efforts was recently accorded him by the Department of Colorado, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at their 39th annual department convention last June when they issued him a citation.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation be printed in full in the RECORD so that his friends may read anew of the accomplishments of Ed Johnson, a constant friend of the servicemen and the veterans.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

In recognition of his lifetime service to his Nation, his State and to his fellow man and his outstanding accomplishments in legislation for the veteran, his widow and dependents: His untiring efforts on behalf of the individual veteran and his sympathetic interest and understanding of the problems of the defenders of our country.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands and the official seal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Colorado; this 20th day of June 1959.

NEIL BLACK,
Department Commander.
AMOS B. CLARK,
Department Adjutant.

Whereas it is the policy of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to recognize the service of an individual to our Nation, our State, our disabled veteran and our great organization, and

Whereas in Colorado we have such a man, who, down through the years, has been an outstanding legislator and fellow citizen who has always been ready, willing, and eager to help the veteran, his widow and dependents, and

Whereas we believe the service he has rendered to the veteran, and veteran organizations and his many acts in helping individuals, many of them members of our organization, goes far beyond the call of duty, and

Whereas he is retired from active service as a U.S. Senator and Governor of our great State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ray Jr. Brannaman Post No. 3971, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting assembled in Denver, Colo., this 26th day of May 1959, hereby recognize the outstanding service of this great American, the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, to his Nation, State, the individual veteran, and veteran organizations, and hereby awards a special citation expresive of the appreciation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the department of Colorado, Veterans of Foreign Wars 39th Convention, to be held in Walsenburg, Colo., June 17–20, 1959, for approval and that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Colorado issue the citation to be presented to this great American at a meeting suitable for the occasion.

ECONOMIC STRATEGY IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two items on the ticker this morning which deserve careful reading by every Member of the Senate. The first deals with Chairman Khrushchev's speech in Moscow, in which he promises to reduce the conventional armed forces of Russia, and at the same time makes some very big statements about new atomic and hydrogen weapons which are available to the U.S.S.R.

It seems to me that this emphasizes the policy debate and the strategy debate which is now going on in the free world on how we can deal with the continuing East-West struggle. Many people, including myself, are convinced that this struggle is phasing out of its previous basis of strictly military competition, subversion, and various types of aggression, and is now phasing into a new and historic economic struggle, especially beamed to the less developed areas of the world.

What Mr. Khrushchev is in effect reiterating is that the new weapons have become so terrible from the standpoint of the devastation which they would wreak upon the countries of the world and have become so devastating that it is most unlikely that these weapons would be used. The result is that in my view the rulers of the Soviet Union, as the free world should, believe that the way to win the world is through the economic struggle.

It is especially significant, therefore, when a great American, like Douglas Dillon, the Under Secretary of State, who is in Paris now, can bring about a

marked development toward a more effective integration of the free world and toward making a beginning of a posture for doing the job which needs to be done within itself.

I believe it will mean a very decisive victory over communism that the free world can protect itself effectively in the economic field and bring itself to the highest standards mankind has ever known, and bring along on that road the less developed areas of the world.

It is with great gratification that I announce this news, that the 18 European nations and the United States and Canada, the most powerful industrial complex in the world, have approved our plan, the American plan, of linking both sides of the Atlantic in an organization for economic cooperation, aid, and trade. Also, this new organization to deal with the problems of Europe, which is at odds—not in an invidious sense, but in terms of peaceful trade—through the two blocs of countries, and further to deal with the problem of getting more aid to the less developed areas from the whole group of 20 nations and other industrial nations.

I close by expressing considerable gratification that the Congress participates in the work of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, which met here in Washington last November, and of which I have the honor to be chairman of its economic committee; and that this idea of integrating further economically the free world and doing the job that ought to be done by the industrial countries of the world, including the United States and Canada, had its origin in the work of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, and, I say with pardonable pride, in the resolutions of its economic committee.

It is proof of the fact that parliamentary representatives can have a responsibility for work which results in constructive international statecraft.

THE RUSSIAN MISSILE TEST IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at his press conference yesterday the President made clear that he has no intention of protesting the Russian missile tests in the Pacific. His statement was tempered and reasoned and the position he has taken now becomes the official position of the United States. Nevertheless, I must respectfully suggest that in my opinion the Russian action, coming as it does, in the interim before the first summit conference is provocative.

To say that we have used the Pacific for the same purpose in the past begs the question. Times change and, presumably, people are capable of learning from experience. Right now, the world is trying to get a summit meeting to ease tensions. This Russian action, coming at this time and in this place and in the manner in which it was announced serves only to heighten the tensions.

To say further that the Russians' test in the Pacific is legal under international law is only to underscore the inadequacy of international law and to point up the need for action to remedy this defect.

The use of the high seas, no less than outer space, for dangerous scientific tests is bound to increase drastically from now on. Not only Russia, the United States and Britain will be involved. So will other nations. As regards outer space we are trying to get an agreement, not to stop tests, but to regulate them in the best interests of all mankind. As regards the high seas, we are not doing a thing. Yet the high seas are of more immediate importance to all nations than is outer space.

The rights of all nations are involved in the use of the high seas for a test such as the Russians are about to conduct as well as the ones we ourselves are conducting, even though they take place under every possible precaution. Fishing areas which are presumably open to all nations are closed and may be permanently damaged. Surface and air transport which is open to all nations is impeded. The lives and property of persons may be imperiled.

An agreement is essential if we are to protect the rights of peoples, including our own, to the peaceful and equal use, not only of the Pacific but of all the oceans. Unless we get an agreement of this kind, the free seas will become increasingly the scene of "no trespassing" or "pass at your own risk" signs placed there against all other nations by whatever nation chooses to do so at any given moment. All this will be justified in the name of science.

I respectfully suggest to the administration that the place to work toward such an agreement is in the United Nations.

I respectfully suggest to the administration that it not allow this problem to fester by inaction.

This Nation ought to take the question to the United Nations now as a matter of urgency and as an initiative for peace.

CUBAN THREAT TO NICKEL PRODUCTION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, at Port Nickel, La., the $45 million installation is capable of turning out 50 million pounds of nickel and 4.4 million pounds of cobalt a year from the raw commodity which comes from Cuba. Although this installation was completed last September, there has been virtually no production because of the turmoil which has occurred in Cuba during the past year. The Government of Cuba has adopted punitive tax measures and has caused the expropriation of American property, so that there is little, if any, cooperation between the Government of Cuba and firms in the United States and our own Government in the observance of contracts which have been negotiated in the past.

This development shows the uncertainties of the policy of depending upon foreign sources for our minerals, and likewise emphasizes the essential need of stabilizing our own minerals industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Cuban 'Reform' Spells Cobwebs for a Nickel Refinery in Louisiana," written by James C. Tanner, and published in the Wall Street Journal of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN "REFORM" SPELLS COBWEBS FOR A NICKEL REFINERY IN LOUISIANA—EXPORT TAX, SEIZURE THREAT BAR FLOW OF ISLAND'S ORE TO FREEPORT SULFUR PLANT

(By James C. Tanner)

PORT NICKEL, LA.—Hard by the Gulf of Mexico and just off the east bank of the meandering Mississippi here, a big refinery made up of towers, tanks, spheres, and intricate machinery sprawls over much of a 220-acre tract.

The $45 million installation is capable of turning out 50 million pounds of nickel and 4.4 million pounds of cobalt a year—in tiny and shiny chunks similar in size and shape to charcoal briquettes. It's part of a grandiose plan to dent the nickel markets of International Nickel Co., a Canadian concern. The plant's owner, Freeport Nickel Co., a subsidiary of Freeport Sulfur Co., has billed it as "the new nickel-cobalt capital of the United States."

But, since it opened in early September, the "capital" has turned out only a trickle of nickel—and that in test runs—because of confusion in Castro's Cuba.

The plant here is designed to process only a specific type of nickel-cobalt ore from deposits in Cuba, where Freeport, through another subsidiary, Moa Bay Mining Co., has invested another $75 million. So far, Port Nickel still awaits the Cuban shipments.

CONSTRUCTION DELAYS

Construction delays at the Moa Bay end have been partly responsible for the lack of raw material here. But a number of other factors make Freeport hesitant to step up its Cuban operations and start shipping big quantities of ore from Cuba to Port Nickel. For one thing, there's Cuba's hefty new 25 percent tax on all minerals exported. There's also the threat of Cuban Government expropriation of the Moa Bay facility. Or Cuba may insist on buying Mao Bay's output for pesos—and reselling it to Freeport for U.S. dollars.

The upshot: Even though the Port Nickel project initially was scheduled to get into operation last summer as this country's leading producer of both metals, the refinery stands idle. A skeleton crew maintains the machinery here. Cobwebs can be seen on some of the costly and silent devices. A stone's throw away, a Liberty ship converted to bring in the raw material in slurry form is docked, empty, on the Mississippi.

Several other U.S. concerns, of course, also have felt the backlash of Fidel Castro's reforms. Some, such as Texas' King Ranch, have lost lands in Cuba. Others, such as International Telephone & Telegraph Co., have seen their Cuban subsidiaries taken over by the state. Still others, such as Gulf Oil Corp., are pulling out of Cuba despite sizable investments there. Gulf just this week announced it was ending petroleum exploration on the island.

All told, U.S. companies have more than $800 million invested in Cuba, and many of them fear that their properties are in jeopardy.

NICKEL CLOSER TO HOME

Freeport's frustration, though, is worth a close look. For one thing, it involves one of the biggest single U.S. investments in Cuba—partly financed, incidentally, by four

U.S. steel companies and two automobile concerns who had hoped to get a nickel source closer to home.

Both cobalt and nickel have wide defense uses. Nickel, for example, is a prime ingredient of electronics components, jetplanes and missiles.

Nickel is combined with steel to produce stainless steel. Nickel also adds extra strength to steel. It's used in auto bumpers, and in telephones, television sets and toasters.

A leading consumer of the metal, the United States at times has faced acute shortages of nickel. Free world production totals around 450 million pounds a year, most of it from Canada.

Other lands boasting nickel deposits include New Caledonia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Brazil, Venezuela, and the Union of South Africa. Freeport's nickel authorities aver the most important reserves are in Cuba, and some studies have calculated reserves there as six times as large as Canada's.

When Christopher Columbus sailed into Moa Bay in Oriente Province on the northeast coast of Cuba on his first voyage to the New World in 1492, he noted the red-tinted coastal hills and jotted in his journal that he detected signs of valuable minerals.

Some 400 years later, Cuban and U.S. engineers roaming the same Oriente hills, some 450 miles east of Havana, turned up iron ore in vast quantities. U.S. steel companies sought to mine the ore but found that it was contaminated with nickel and chrome and that it made brittle steel.

A quarter of a century ago, Freeport, today one of the Nation's big sulfur producers, had manganese operations in Cuba and became interested in the iron ore as a source of nickel and cobalt. It developed processes to break the ore down to produce the contained metals as separate products.

THE B–70 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during December, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the B–70 program be so stepped down that I feel the entire program will be seriously endangered. I wish I had been on the floor the other day when this matter was discussed, because it has been of great concern to me.

It is very rarely that I disagree with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or with the President himself so far as matters of economy are concerned, but I cannot agree that the elimination or the cutting down of the B–70 program will be advantageous to this country.

The B–70 is a brand new idea in aerodynamics. It is an airplane which, in my opinion, must be built. I do not agree with those who say that the piloted airplane is on the way out. There will be men in the cockpits of planes so long as men fly. The B–70 airplane has the capability of Mach–3. It has the capability of flying three times faster than sound, and can fly at an altitude of 80,000 feet. For those reasons alone, if for no other reasons, and whether this plane ever carries the H-bomb or not, the United States should proceed with research on the B–70.

From the military standpoint, the B–70 would make obsolete the present fighter force of Soviet Russia. The altitude capabilities of the Russian planes do not exceed 60,000 feet. I seriously doubt that they exceed 50,000 feet. Thus, possession of the B–70 would make it impossible for an interceptor to reach the altitude at which this bomber would fly.

According to the information I have, the B–70 would make obsolete almost all the surface-to-air missiles which Soviet Russia has, because none of them has an altitude capability of 60,000 feet. Here, again, with a target flying at 80,000 feet, it would be impossible for an interceptor to hit it.

We should develop not only the airplane, because the air frame and its power system are only a part of the whole program, but we should develop new concepts of navigational systems for a plane flying at the speed of which the B–70 is capable, a plane which will reduce the travel time from the United States to Russian targets from 6½ hours to less than 3 hours. The B–70 is a plane which will make it possible, if used in commercial transport, for one to have breakfast in New York and to arrive in Los Angeles an hour before breakfast is served there. Or, it could take off from New York and fly west, with the moon already having set in New York, and land in Los Angeles with the moon still shining.

Along with that, it will be necessary to develop electronic counter measures, because the present ones cannot work in an aircraft of this speed. It will be necessary also to develop new bombing systems for aircraft of this speed.

I disagree with the Budget Bureau on the position it has taken in this respect, and I have written to the President, urging him to reconsider the action which has been taken, in the hope that we can proceed with the development of the B–70 program.

Mr. President, in this connection, an excellent article entitled "The Gutting of the Valkyrie," written by Ed Mack Miller, was published in Air Force magazine for January 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GUTTING OF THE VALKYRIE

(By Ed Mack Miller)

Congress and the American people now stand as the last hope for continued American supremacy in the skies of the world. Their prompt response and action can yet save a vital weapon system, essential to U.S. survival. Early last month the Department of Defense announced that the B–70 bomber program had been "reoriented."

A better word might have been "gutted."

The Air Force reluctantly and with grave apprehension bowed to what was essentially a political decision in a budget-balancing atmosphere.

From the time the intercontinental ballistic missile entered the military picture, our military strategists have talked and planned in terms of the "weapon mix," a combination of missiles and manned weapon systems which would function together for years to come. This has been considered the best approach to the keeping of the peace through deterrence.

In addition, it has been generally agreed that the complexity and high cost of military weapons required us to take the longest possible look forward in their planning and then schedule concurrency of systems development so that at a given date the pieces could be jigged together to form the finest and most advanced product obtainable. No more of World War II's mating of a new flight platform with whatever bombing, navigation, and armament hardware was on hand at a given time.

But implicit in the deep-cutting B–70 decision was the negation of both the plane-missile "mix" philosophy and the hard-come-by weapon-system concept. As matters now stand, with many B–70 subsystems canceled outright, ECM, bombing, and navigation black boxes for the B–70, if needed, would have to be adapted from the B–52. None of them is truly adequate for a Mach 3 airplane.

The B–70, if the decision stands, will not be a bomber, only a "barebone" airplane. Only two reoriented B–70's are planned; perhaps no others will ever be built. Under current conditions, it will have none of the subsystems to make it work effectively as a bomber. And in a year or so it will be easy to kill the B–70 completely, on the grounds that it is not a useful vehicle without these subsystems.

One fact above all stands out in the wake of the fiscally dictated B–70 decision. The Washington Post stated it well in a front-page story on December 3:

"The Pentagon decision to delay and reorient the B–70 bomber is far more than a mere defense stretchout. It means the end of the 2,000-mile-an-hour plane as a bomber, and apparently the end of the line for manned strategic bombers. * * * It is important to recognize the Defense Department's B–70 announcement for what it is—not the postponement of a new bomber, but its demise."

Can the free world afford to be without a manned bomber in its future? Can we truly afford to eliminate the highly trained human being, with his established mastery of the sky, from our national defense equation? These questions were left unanswered in the dollar-haunted atmosphere hanging heavy over Washington.

The North American B–70 Valkyrie strategic bomber is perhaps the most imaginative and sophisticated airplane ever designed.

The B–70's designed dimensions are not far from those of the B–52. It fits into a B–52 hangar. But in other ways the Valkyrie would be a radical departure. Authentic artists' conceptions endow it with a spaceship quality.

Its long gooseneck, peacock tail, canard control "ears," and tapered body give it the appearance of being, in the words of one observer, "supersonic just sitting still."

Some of the most daring features ever proposed have gone into its design, which is now firm. One primary (and secret) element of its aerodynamic configuration is described as "more important" even than the area-rule ("coke bottle") design that made the Convair F–102 Delta Dagger supersonic.

Because of this design breakthrough, the B–70 was the first plane scheduled to cruise at top speed for its entire mission instead of cruising to the vicinity of the target subsonically and then going supersonic in a brief dash (at high fuel penalties) like the Convair B–58 Hustler bomber.

Powered by six General Electric J–93 engines with a total of more than 150,000 pounds of thrust, the B–70 was designed to cruise at up to 80,000 feet, with a range of more than 6,000 miles without refueling in flight. A crew of four could man the roughly 170-foot-long and 115-foot wide plane, which would have a maximum takeoff weight of about 250 tons.

The B–70 has been designed to operate with ordinary jet fuel, although for a time it appeared that exotic fuels, such as boron types, would give even better performance. A USAF-Navy program for such "zip" fuel was canceled in August on the verge of completion, then reinstated on a much-diminished scale last month in line with high-energy rocket programing.

Living-room comfort has been designed into the B–70. There would be no need for air crewmen to wear pressure suits, oxygen masks, parachutes, or the like. The plane, able to fly at some 15 miles above the earth at about 2,000 miles an hour, with a 10-megaton hydrogen bomb, would provide its four-man crew with optimum cabin conditions in terms of temperature, pressure, and elbow room.

The B–70 would "encapsulate" the individual. In an emergency, the capsule would eject, its chute opening at a preset altitude. The capsule would be equipped with a boat for water landings, and clothing and food suitable for such extremes as arctic or desert survival.

The name "Valkyrie" was selected for the B–70 in a Strategic Air Command naming contest. More than 20,000 names were submitted. In Norse mythology, the Valkyrie were maidens of extreme beauty who ranged the heavens on their steeds, choosing those who were to die in battle and bearing the fallen heroes back to Valhalla.

Originally known as Weapon System 110-A, the Valkyrie represented one of the greatest breakthroughs in the history of aircraft development.

The breakthrough was explained by Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, then Director of the now-defunct National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, before the House Appropriations Committee in February of 1958.

Said Dr. Dryden: "About a year ago, a strange and wonderful thing happened. It was as if the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle began falling into place. Almost simultaneously, research programs that had been under way at the NACA labs in Virginia, California, and Ohio began to pay off. The result—this is an oversimplification, but it is not an overstatement—was that the companies and the Air Force suddenly realized it would not be much harder to design a long-range bomber that could fly its whole mission supersonic than to design one that would fly subsonic most of the way, and only a small fraction of the flight supersonic. Not only that, but the top speed of the prospective bomber was raised to Mach 3—about 2,000 miles per hour."

Constructed of titanium stainless steel, and nickel-base alloy, the B–70 has been designed to hit the heart of Russia in less than 3 hours after takeoff. It could use existing airbases in the SAC system, or even civilian fields like Idlewild in New York, Friendship between Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, or San Francisco International.

The B–70's 250-ton gross weight for takeoff would be about the same as that of a B–52, its landing speed actually slower than that of the North American F–100 Super Sabre fighter, its range and speed such as to take it around the world (with inflight refueling) in less than half a day. At higher speeds, the B–70's wingtips were designed to turn down 50° to provide better stability.

How fast is Mach 3? This fast. At such a speed, you could eat breakfast in New York at 8 o'clock, then take off and arrive in Los Angeles an hour and a half before you ate.

In fact, flying west in the B–70 you could make the sun set in the east or bring the moon back up once it had set in the west.

Actually, the B–70 would have so much speed that it would take a tremendous defensive system to cope with it. The plane would move more than 30 miles per minute. At that rate, any errors in quick calculation the enemy might make would compound immediately. A 10-minute warning or computation delay would find the B–70 some 300 miles further along its route—streaking close to the earth's skin, below effective radar coverage, or so high no ground-based weapon could hit it.

The B–70 at this writing is not a mere dream. Far from it. The plane and its components were in detailed design stage and tooling design when the gutting was announced. A mockup of the plane is in existence at North American's plant at Inglewood, Calif.

But USAF's trisonic "packaged offensive" will probably never be capable of functioning as the superb machine it was designed to be, even when the "barebone" plane is flying. Contracts for the following subsystems were effectively cut away, although in some cases the contractors will proceed with the projects involved on their own hook:

Radar, to have been produced by General Electric with the ability to discriminate between two closely spaced objects at a great distance and possessed of powerful antijamming characteristics.

A sophisticated new bombing-navigation system by International Business Machines, incorporating modular design and allowing for inflight maintenance.

A new central air-data system to have been produced by the Garrett Corp.'s AiResearch Division.

An extremely advanced electronic countermeasures system to be developed by Westinghouse.

Motorola's new mission and traffic-control system.

Beech Aircraft's special power pod.

All major subcontracts for airframe were returned to North American, the plane's prime contractor, in last month's move. Wing production had been in the hands of Boeing Aircraft, stabilizer production assigned to Chance Vought, and upper fuselage development to Lockheed Aircraft.

Under examination, with a possibility of being reduced, are those held by United Aircraft's Hamilton Standard Division (air-induction control and environmental systems); Sperry (gyro platform); Sundstrand Aviation (secondary power system); Cleveland Pneumatic Industries, Inc. (landing gear); and John Oster Manufacturing Co. (powerplant instrumentation).

Fighting a rear-guard action against the budgeteers, the Air Force is investigating alternative uses for the aircraft itself. Even for purposes other than as a bomb platform, the Valkyrie shapes up as a potent piece of flying hardware.

The B–70 could be a—

Supersonic transport.

Moneysaving recoverable booster for space projects, including the Dynasoar test vehicle.

Space interceptor to query and investigate foreign satellites in orbit.

Ballistic missile launcher.

Supersonic nuclear-powered aircraft.

The B–70 could be a first-rate military transport. It could deliver war materials to any point on earth in only a few hours. In a limited war, this would provide an immediate show of strength, with great potential as a diplomatic tool in backing up foreign policy. If the United Nations ever gains a police force, someone suggested the B–70 could be an ideally effective global police cruiser, the "cop on the beat" worldwide.

The Valkyrie was designed to deliver anything—the biggest hydrogen bomb, air-launched ballistic missiles (ALBM's), a train-load of standard bombs, a series of hydrogen bombs for primary, secondary, and tertiary targets, or a combination of bombs and missiles for sequence attacks. The B–70 could become a tremendous launching platform, taking orbital or space-probe vehicles to the edge of the atmosphere before launching.

From a practical, commercial point of view the B–70 represents almost a quantum jump in the state of the aeronautical art. The world has merely scratched the surface of the potential of air transport. Someone, somewhere, eventually is going to build a Mach 3 transport. And, like most of the technical developments that have brought commercial aviation to where it is today, the money invested in the B–70 would have considerable commercial fallout.

A Mach 3 transport could whisk passengers from coast to coast in little more than an hour, from Honolulu to Denver in less than 3 hours, and from New York to Paris in the same time.

But perhaps the greatest danger in eliminating the B–70 from our future weapons inventory is the negation of the principle of the mixed force, thereby eliminating versatility and flexibility from our future deterrent strength.

A meaningful SAC motto says, "We must strive for the greatest technical advance—consistent with continuous capability." In other words, reach, but not so far that you trip.

Intercontinental ballistic missiles and manned intercontinental bombing systems are not competing but complementary. Each has inherent disadvantages which cancel out each other in a mixed force whereas they are compounded in a force wedded to one or the other on an "either-or" basis. Missiles can do things a bomber cannot do and vice versa.

Put together in a mixed force they mean that the prospective enemy cannot rest easy until he has effected a counter to any and all combinations of weapons. Narrow the field of your own choices in delivery systems and you make the enemy's defensive job commensurately easier and immeasurably cheaper.

The manned bomber is selective. It can, in effect, turn its head and peek out of the corners of its eyes. The ICBM cannot. The bomber weapon system can also radar-map the destruction a raid has caused and return with information to plan a subsequent mission. There is little guesswork in the assessment of the damage it does.

One of the big drawbacks of an all-missile force is the question of quick dispatch without recall. For instance, if the DEW line radar warning net were to pick up blips heading over the pole from Russia, the question would be this: Should we launch our ICBM's? Remember, the blips could be meteor showers, northern lights, migratory birds, or ice-packed clouds. Would we want to start a war by mistake? But they could be attackers. We'd probably wait. * * *

For once the missile goes, it can't be recalled—only destroyed, an expensive undertaking. A few planned spoofs by Red strategists actually could cause depletion of our stockpile of missiles.

The bomber force can go even to the point of preparation for bombdrop and still be recalled, with the only expenditure being fuel.

Under national policy, missiles will be launched only with the permission of the President. Bombers can be dispatched without his OK—because they can always be recalled.

With the gutting of the B–70, many knowledgeable persons have stated in recent weeks, we have allowed ourselves to be stampeded by incessant Soviet propaganda which says that all manned weapons are obsolescent. From the size and technical improvement of Red aircraft, it would appear that the Communist world itself is far from giving up on manned airplanes. There is a good chance, in fact, that Russia is today developing her own Mach 3 bomber.

It can easily be seen how we could play into Communist hands by concentrating exclusively on missile hardware. Their defensive strategy and logistics problems would be immeasurably simplified by such a decision on our part.

It has been suggested that one of the neatest tricks the Reds could pull would be to let us put all our nuclear eggs in one missile basket—and then proclaim to the world that they would use only conventional weapons if war came. The propaganda coup would be hard to offset. We

would be effectively handcuffed until we could get back into production of nonnuclear weapons—and extremely vulnerable in the interim.

Farfetched? Perhaps, but it illustrates the position we are getting ourselves into by the apparent trend of administration defense thinking.

If the Soviet hordes broke across the NATO countries, we would face another terrible decision, if missiles were our only weapon. Should we fire our nuclear "big birds," possibly even into friendly countries, to combat this Soviet aggression? This would be a fateful step. A versatile manned aircraft striking force with pinpoint bombing capabilities—especially with the capability of switching to nonnuclear warheads —could strike the enemy effectively. Again the advantage of the mixed force.

In this regard, Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, recently said, "Manned aircraft will continue to be a military requirement in the foreseeable future. Ballistic missiles and other manned vehicles are not as yet, and may never be, the solution to all military problems."

The B–70, of course, would not be immune to enemy counterattack, but our past experience has shown us that "a weapon developed and produced at the limit of the nation's technological capability will be a competitive weapon in the planned time period." There is no reason to suppose that our B–70 would not be able to more than hold its own against any defense the enemy could throw up against it for quite a few years to come. Even if the enemy's defense "caught up" (at immense cost to him, it might be added), the Valkyrie would remain an immensely potent fighting machine with a great likelihood of outfighting or outthinking an opponent to perform its mission.

By way of analogy, the Nazi fighter planes of World War II were a highly effective countermeasure for our Flying Fortresses, but the U.S. airman and his machine, competing against these defenses, won out.

It would seem, too, that the B–70 could make our investment in ICBM's pay off with dividends. The bomber force could reach enemy territory, in the event of hostilities, shortly after our first barrage of ICBM's. The B–70's would be able to assess the damage and clean up targets before the enemy could recover from the first shock of the missile attack.

It is an axiom of military history that the only thing you know for sure about the next war is that it won't be fought the way you plan it now.

Many top strategists believe that it would be utter folly for us to base our force requirements on a sudden and conclusive exchange of nuclear missiles. Especially when we have officially created a missile gap. An insufficient missile force could leave us fearfully unprepared. Versatility may not assume victory, but rigidity will almost certainly assure defeat.

An effective use of the B–70 would be against mobile targets, including truck or train-transported missiles. Another type of target would be that for which we do not have accurate geographical coordinates. In other words, it could do what we suddenly found it had to do without massive advance planning.

An extremely important advantage of the B–70, in addition, is this: Merely the building of the B–70 in sufficient numbers would force the Soviets to enlarge their commitment for home defense. It would cost them more to defend against the B–70 than it would cost us to build the plane. And because the Reds also have budget problems, it would penalize their strategic offensive force, aiding our own security. In fact, the B–70 fiasco may well prove an economic bonanza for the Kremlin, preventing the obsolescence of thousands of their fighters and other elements of their air defense system. It is Russia, not the United States, that can't afford the B–70.

"To prevail," said the great military philosopher Von Clausewitz, "apply force in the right amount, at the right place, at the right time."

The B–70 can do just that—with maximum efficiency.

For this reason it will behoove the Senators and the Representatives of the United States to reevaluate the B–70 program when Congress reconvenes.

It could be their last chance to rectify a grave error.

As one civilian expert said, "In Government today, we are so organized that military decisions made by the best military experience are subject to veto by well meaning businessmen who frequently are on a part-time basis with the Government."

In the opinion of the majority of the men who work daily with the defense problems of the country, defensive missiles are not yet ready to assume full responsibility for defense of the Nation. Yet the North American F–108 Rapier, a Mach 3 interceptor, was canceled outright in September. A few weeks earlier, Lt. Gen. Joseph D. Atkinson, commander, Air Defense Command, declared in a speech at AFA's 1959 convention that a Mach 3 fighter was a "must."

Now comes the B–70 gutting. The Air Force still hopes to revive development of the B–70 as an essential strategic weapon, not a bare test bed with possible eventual uses as a supersonic transport, nuclear-powered aircraft, recoverable booster, or satellite interceptor. Reinstated in the next few months, the B–70 program could still yield operational weapon systems in line with earlier scheduling.

As a bomber, the B–70 is vital to the defense of this country because, to quote one design expert, "It has uninhibited response, it can be tailored to force application, it is dispersable, it has utility, it has convertibility, and it has recallability."

If it dies, one top Air Force officer said bluntly after the DOD announcement, the concept of true national preparedness may die with it.

In sum, what are we, as a nation, on the verge of throwing away if we permit the B–70 program to go down the fiscal drainpipe?

1. We are committing SAC to a subsonic manned retaliatory force for the indeterminate future.

2. We are committing our military planners to a rigid, inflexible force structure which inevitably will make a mockery of our deterrent posture.

3. We are contenting ourselves with second place in the advancement of the state of the aeronautical art. It is quite certain that the Soviet Union will have a supersonic jet transport in service before we do. Now, we are handing them preeminence in the Mach 3 range as well, in the same manner that we are playing second fiddle (or perhaps piccolo) in space. One Air Force planner phrased it bitterly:

"One day," he said, "your kids and mine will be flying in a Mach 3 airplane, but chances are it will have the hammer and sickle on the rudder."

4. We will save $85 million in fiscal year 1961—about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of our defense spending.

Fortunately there is yet time to correct this tragic blunder. The Congress has yet to meet, and it will have a duty to turn its searching spotlight on the reasoning behind the B–70 decision. Public opinion is still the final arbiter in this democracy of ours, even though it must grope through the obfuscating fog of fiscal scaremongers to reach the facts.

It is an open secret in Washington that the B–70 program has long been the target of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Stans. He claims we cannot afford it. Whether the taxpayer would agree, if he knew the facts, is another story.

We almost lost the B–17 many years ago on the grounds of economy. Atlas, key of our missile force and currently of our space program, fell under the budgeteers' broad ax and was kept alive with the contractor's money. Word is that some B–70 contractors are willing to exhibit similar faith in their mission.

It is not too late for decisive action, but the time grows perilously short.

STEEL: HOW INFLATIONARY?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a truly excellent editorial appears in the current issue of Life magazine—that for January 18, 1960. It is entitled "Steel: How Inflationary?"

The editorial contains words of praise for the excellent public service rendered by the Vice President and by others in the steel controversy. It comments that, in the opinion of participants to the settlement of the dispute, the Vice President proved himself to be a true mediator. The article contains the comforting assurance that the settlement "is the least inflationary steel settlement since the war." It states:

The cost increase is about 3½ percent per year, as against a previously habitual 8 percent.

The editorial contains, however, a stern warning to the men of steel—management and labor, alike. It relates how, after the settlement or the accord was reached, an American manufacturing establishment—the Joy Manufacturing Co., producing heavy mining and industrial machinery—decided to go ahead, in Australia, with a new plant which makes the cheapest steel in the world. "If the American steel industry does not keep its costs competitive," says Life, "there will be a lot of unemployed steelworkers before long." I agree. And the hazard of foreign competition, along with our own public opinion, ought to supply all the incentive necessary for American steel to produce more, and more efficiently, and to keep the price down.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL: HOW INFLATIONARY?

The steel strike was settled by the President, the Vice President, and Secretary Mitchell; theirs the credit or the blame. According to steel men, NIXON proved "a true mediator" and a very well-informed one. With Mitchell's help, he even worked out the actual terms of the agreement. It provides for two wage increases in the next 2½ years, plus other benefits that bring the cumulative cost to around 40 cents an hour, or $1 billion in all. It is generally felt that labor won this costly argument.

As Life has stated repeatedly during this longest of nationwide steel strikes, the chief public interest has been that the outcome be noninflationary. United States Steel's Roger Blough promised that if the White House kept its nose out of the negotiations, he would reach a noninflationary settlement. But the administration did intervene and the terms, according to Blough, "could hardly be regarded as noninflationary." By

this reasoning the public interest (and the steel companies) have taken a licking.

But that is not the whole story. The collective bargaining process had broken down. Had there been no Government intervention, the strike would probably have resumed on January 26, with its mounting costs in lost wages and production (already over $6 billion) becoming the paramount aspect of the whole nasty mess. Hence Government intervention, far from subverting the public interest, saved it from a worse disaster. The NIXON settlement was almost certainly the best that could be secured under the circumstances.

How then did the circumstances get so unfavorable to the public interest? It is easy enough to blame Blough & Co. for bad generalship, for they were guilty of it. They omitted the chance to take the initiative from the union with a price cut (Life, May 18). The way they introduced their own demand for revision of the work rules won them minimum public sympathy and maximum union opposition (which they consistently underestimated). But when all that is said, the question remains whether the best generalship in the world could have defeated the union in this or any other steel strike, under present laws.

The union enjoys a legal monopoly of bargaining power for wages; and its strike weapon is more powerful than anything in management's arsenal. When labor wants a raise, the chief practical check on its demands is the moderation of its leaders. This is not the same thing as the public interest. If the public interest lies in little or no wage increase, as was the case in this strike, it can only win its point by curbing the monopolistic power of the unions.

No such legislative curbs are to be expected from Congress in an election year. This political fact of life was one of NIXON'S strongest arguments in getting Blough & Co. to agree to his settlement. In his state of the Union message the President put protracted strikes first among the nagging disorders that still afflict us. Yet instead of new legislation, he proposes to rely on the good commonsense of labor and management. A Pollyanna solution. But we had better make the best of it during this election year.

The settlement gives us nearly 3 years of peace in steel in which to bring its inflationary consequences under control. Moreover, it is the least inflationary steel settlement since the war. The cost increase is about 3½ percent per year, as against a previously habitual 8 percent; but also as against a 2½ percent annual increase in steel productivity. Thus its inflationary ingredient is about 1 percent. There lies the source of the wage-cost push which has forced prices up in so many industries, and in which steel has been the chief villain. Steel is no longer the chief villain. In fact the 1 percent can doubtless be absorbed without a price increase by the highly profitable rate of production in prospect for steel in 1960. But it will mean higher prices later unless labor and management now collaborate in increasing steel productivity still further. The work rules (on which a committee will report next November) are one means to do this.

Let's hope this collaborative effort gets results because it will have to. A new drillmaster of American costs has now entered the steel picture to stay: foreign competition. Right after the steel settlement, Joy Manufacturing Co. (heavy mining and industrial machinery) decided to go ahead with a new plant in Australia, which makes the cheapest steel in the world. Scores of other U.S. manufacturers are importing European steel, or building plants abroad, to avoid rising costs at home. If the American steel industry does not keep its costs competitive, there will be a lot of unemployed American steelworkers before long, and this is one thing the union cannot prevent. In this respect its interests are the same as management's. If good commonsense can't find this common interest, misfortune will teach it.

CHARLES A. CONNAUGHTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the many people in California who know Charles A. Connaughton, the regional forester of the California region of the U.S. Forest Service, were delighted to learn, a few weeks ago, that he has been elected the president of the Society of American Foresters, a professional organization of foresters devoted to the cause of strengthening, on a nationwide basis, the work of forestry. Its membership of 13,000 includes persons from private industry, as well as persons from various governmental or public agencies.

Mr. Connaughton has been with the U.S. Forest Service, and a member of the society, for 30 years. He will serve as president of the society for the next 2-year term—1960 and 1961.

As a Californian, I am glad to salute a graduate of the University of Idaho, who thereafter obtained his master's degree in forestry at Yale University.

Mr. Connaughton has served in numerous posts with the U.S. Forest Service, including the directorship of two forest and range experiment stations.

He was regional forester for the southern region of the Forest Service, at Atlanta, Ga., before coming to my State of California as regional forester in 1955. There he has done, and continues to do, a splendid public service in a professional field; and I can only reiterate the pride of those who know him and have worked with him, on the recognition that is his due.

COAL-TO-GAS EVENTUALITY DRAMATIZES NEED FOR COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise to speak bluntly but, I believe, factually.

Five days after the 1st session of the 86th Congress closed its deliberations, the President of the United States saw fit to veto the Coal Research and Development Commission Act, which had passed both the Senate and House of Representatives by very substantial majorities. In this body, Members on both sides of the aisle, including the illustrious minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], had joined in sponsoring this meritorious legislation.

Mr. President, it seems important to a State such as West Virginia and to contiguous States in which bituminous coal also is produced, and to other States which contain substantial deposits of bituminous coal, to have enacted again the basic legislation which was vetoed by the President. I am sure that during this session we shall have an opportunity again to pass a measure essentially of the type the President vetoed.

My particular attention is called today by a news story to the uses of coal. Of course, we are cognizant of the fact that during World War II, coal was the base for the high octane gasoline which fueled the aircraft of the Nazis. Now, we are face to face with a further development in the conversion of coal; I refer not to its conversion into gasoline, but also to its conversion into gas, itself.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a news article entitled "Coal-for-Gas Use Predicted," from the Charleston Daily Mail of yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the article states that Fred A. Otto, the manager of the Belle works of the Du Pont Co., has explained in a challenging manner the opportunities for the gasification of coal. Mr. Otto made a rather startling statement which, of course, may not please Texans. He said the day will come when West Virginians will be piping gas back to Texas. In other words, he envisions the coming of a time when gas as a natural resource may be depleted; but in the same article we find that he indicated there are virtually inexhaustible supplies of coal under the mountains of West Virginia. He deplored the lack of detailed research in regard to the various fields of uses for bituminous coal, and he urged the need for concentration of effort immediately along such lines. He pointed out—and correctly so, I believe—the possibility of the conversion of coal into gas.

The President of the United States, in my judgment, acted upon bad advice when he pocket-vetoed the legislation to which I have directed your attention. The position he took had been tested in the form of the Allott amendment, which was defeated 56 to 27 in the Senate; yet the President vetoed the measure after Congress had adjourned and could not sustain or override that veto.

It is my belief that Senators of both parties will join with vigor in again presenting to the President a bill covering this vital area. I hope that after the facts have been made known to the President, he will realize that this is an obligation in which he can join with the Congress in fulfilling a challenge of creative action in developing a strengthened economy.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Jan. 13, 1960]

COAL-FOR-GAS USE PREDICTED

The day will come when West Virginia will be piping gas back to Texas.

Fred A. Otto, manager of the Belle plant of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., made the prediction Tuesday at a meeting with representatives of news media at the plant.

But it will not be natural gas as Otto foresees it. That resource ultimately will be exhausted he said, and gas then will be made from coal taken from the virtually inexhaustible supply in the mountains of this State.

Otto said that by the gasification of coal and its mixture with oxygen, a much cleaner and more volatile product could be made than the natural fuel now consumed.

RESEARCH LACKING

The method of production remains to be perfected, but Otto believes it is readily

feasible. This led him to criticize the lack of detailed research being done in the field of coal. He said that with the proper concentration of scientific effort, the process of conversion would probably be a present reality.

Otto believes that the undertaking should be made by the industry and that research has been lax because of the great demand for coal both as a fuel and the base product of hundreds of chemicals.

At present, much of the gas consumed in West Virginia comes over long transmission lines that lead here and to the eastern seaboard. But this State remains a major gas producer in the East. Much of the production goes out of the State.

The occasion of newsmen visiting the Belle plant was for an inspection of the modernized works.

The company last summer completed a multi-million-dollar conversion from coal use to natural gas as a basic raw material in the manufacture of chemicals.

COAL STILL USED

But E. L. (Gene) Pleninger, assistant to the manager, pointed out that Du Pont has far from completely abandoned coal at Belle. Thirty carloads are used daily in the generation of steam.

Pleninger pointed out that modernization at staggering cost became a necessity if the plant was to remain in the competitive market. Old production techniques designed more than three decades ago could not match those less cumbersome and costly in modern day plants, he said.

The plant employs 3,000 persons. Four hundred others were cut from the payroll when modernization was completed. Pleninger said this step had to be taken but was deeply regretted. Many were placed in other chemical plants through a company employment bureau.

The first nylon manufactured came from the Belle plant. The base product made there is ammonia. From it many other wonders of the chemical world are extracted.

Pleninger told newsmen that the competitive position of the Belle plant now is excellent.

WIRETAPPING, EAVESDROPPING, AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on December 15 and 16, 1959, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights held hearings on wiretappining, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights.

Those hearings evoked some very thought-provoking comment because of the high caliber of the three lawyers who testified, and a demonstration of electronic eavesdropping devices by another witness, Harold Lipset, a San Francisco private investigator. The complex legal questions that have been raised by use of these devices were ably discussed by Edward Bennett Williams, of Washington, D.C., prominent defense counsel; Paul Williams, of New York City, former U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York; and Harris Steinberg, prominent defense counsel in New York City.

As chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a series of newspaper editorials, columns, and comments on the subject of our continuing study.

Among these materials are an editorial, "The 'Secret' Recorders," appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on December 30, 1959, and the text of a telegram from me about that editorial.

Incidentally, this is another occasion when I regret that printing rules do not provide a means of reproducing political cartoons in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I make this observation because there have been a number of cartoons in different newspapers recently bearing on wiretapping, eavesdropping, the right of privacy, and the Bill of Rights.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 16, 1959]

THE RIGHT TO SNOOP

Since he is in the private-eye business which leans heavily on tapping telephone lines and planting secret microphones, it was natural enough for a San Franciscan named Harold Lipset to tell the Hennings committee that anybody who uses a telephone does so at his own risk and, in effect, that anyone who engages in conversation surrenders his right of privacy to anyone else who may manage to overhear what he says.

This probably is sound legal doctrine in any police state where big brother makes it his business to know everything lest anything endanger his boss rule. But neither the United States nor any of the sovereign States have yet gone totalitarian. They still are devoted to the notion of the Founding Fathers that a man's house is his castle and that his affairs are his own business—at least so long as no court has issued a writ for their investigation.

No private eye rings a man's doorbell and claims the right to tap his phone or to plant a recording machine. So even Mr. Lipset may have doubts about what he says. He should know that eavesdropping is a furtive, dirty business against which honorable men instinctively revolt. No doubt there is money in stealing other people's secrets—and listening to perhaps thousands of personal conversations to do so—but it is not nice money, nor is it legal money.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 22, 1959]

A NATION OF WHISPERERS?

The display of a pocket-sized recording gadget before the Hennings committee—brazenly used by a witness without the knowledge of the Senators—will be regarded favorably by those who believe that anything is fair in the catching of a crook. But it fills with consternation those who believe that a man's right to privacy extends to the words he speaks.

The unconsidered approval of wiretaps and other electronic devices of detection lies behind the bland admission of the Attorney General and J. Edgar Hoover that the FBI makes wide use of them. The officials contend this is proper so long as the evidence obtained is not introduced in court. In this they rely on a Supreme Court decision which rejected wiretap evidence.

Yet, as another committee witness pointed out, the Federal Communications Act broadly forbids the use of wiretaps by anyone "for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto." The only persons who seem to have any claim to wiretap information are the police in States which have sanctioned the dangerous practice. Other States protect telephone communications, and, at least by implication, they protect their citizens against all forms of electronic snooping.

If only the apprehension of criminals were involved, a Federal statute might be drafted which sanctioned the limited use of these devices in specific cases and for specific reasons. Perhaps an attempt should be made to draft such a law. But their use always will be repugnant because of the devices—unlike legal search and seizure—are a constant temptation to total eavesdropping on innocent and guilty alike, and for many a purpose other than law enforcement.

It is disturbing that the police and the FBI put so much reliance on electronics. How did they ever catch a criminal before this method was available to them? Must they, and every "private eye" and anybody else who has a few hundred dollars for one of these gadgets be free to listen where and when they will? Surely the manufacture and sale of electronic snooping devices should be strictly regulated. Or are we to become a Nation of furtive whisperers?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 26, 1959]

IN THE HOLDOVER

Solon, the great lawgiver of Athens, said a good 2,500 years ago that justice would not prevail unless "those who are not injured feel as indignant as those who are." That principle underlies the Bill of Rights and all other safeguards of our liberties. Those who made these rights a matter of law did "feel as indignant as those" who were injured. But do very many Americans today share this feeling? If they did, would civil rights be violated as often as they are?

The Hennings subcommittee has thrown further light on the widespread use of wiretaps and electronic snooping devices even by the Department of Justice itself. Would this be the case if indignation were as widespread as is such eavesdropping? An even more aggravated abuse is the arrest and illegal detention by the police of suspects. A Chicago judge is mentioned as a victim of this practice. Persons less well known are in greater peril. And even lawbreakers have a right to prompt arraignment and speedy trial.

A study of arrests and detentions made in Chicago by the American Civil Liberties Union conservatively suggests that in 1956 more than 20,000 arrests were made which involved detentions of more than 17 hours before those arrested were "booked." And the record of other cities is believed to be no better. Such cases have occurred in St. Louis. Being held so long by the police without even being allowed to use a telephone, for all practical purposes, may be as bad as being subjected to the third degree.

It is easy to imagine how the average citizen, especially if innocent, would feel if locked up for a day or longer without being able to call his family or a lawyer. Yet many suspects are treated this way, and then released with virtually no redress. Even the condemnation of the Supreme Court is of no avail except to those brought to trial.

Yet this limited rule of the Court has aroused the protest that it makes it too difficult for the police to capture criminals. That overlooks the importance to the innocent of speedy arraignment on a specific charge. And the speedy arraignment of lawbreakers should not be a handicap to efficient police and prosecutors. Holding a man behind bars until he confesses in sheer desperation is not a reassuring way of clearing up unsolved crimes. It is a threat to those who may be arrested through misadventure, a threat which should be intolerable to public opinion.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 30, 1959]

THE "SECRET" RECORDERS

While sympathetic with the Hennings subcommittee's efforts to find out why so many miniature recording devices are being bought in the Government, we think it important to keep in perspective the fact that neither possession nor use of such a device is necessarily sinister or even improper, even

though the person involved should not be engaged in investigative work. Portable and battery-powered recorders are legitimately used for making observations and notes and even dictating letters on inspection or field trips and perhaps in many other situations. The reprehensible use of these devices is for recording the conversation of another without his knowledge. If innocent persons are not to be hurt, mere possession of a miniature recorder bought by the Government should not be allowed to become a "smear by association."

TEXT OF A TELEGRAM DATED JANUARY 5, 1960, FROM SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., TO THE EDITOR OF THE EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH WITH REFERENCE TO THE ABOVE EDITORIAL

Copies of late December issues of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch were not received in my office until late yesterday so this is the first opportunity I have had to comment on the editorial entitled "The 'Secret' Recorders," published on your editorial page Wednesday, December 30, 1959.

I appreciate the sympathy expressed with the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee's efforts to find out why so many miniature recording devices are being bought in the Government and I note that the Post-Dispatch believes that use of these devices for recording the conversation of other persons without their knowledge is reprehensible.

So that there will not be any misunderstanding, perhaps I should point out that I have not—and neither has any other member of the subcommittee—drawn any conclusion to date that the mere possession of a miniature recording device is necessarily sinister or even improper. It is true that the subcommittee asked witnesses appearing in current hearings on the subject of wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights for their views on a number of aspects of wiretapping and secret recording of sounds and conversations. In this connection, it has been only natural to ask questions about the possibility of outlawing the possession of specified equipment with the intent to use it for prohibited purposes. New York State presently has such a law. Whether such a proposal is constitutional, feasible, desirable, or otherwise expressive of sound public policy presents questions appropriately to be examined by the subcommittee. But I repeat that no conclusion has been reached nor implied by the subcommittee that mere possession of a small wire or tape recorder is improper or should be made illegal.

When informed, during the course of a hearing last month by the subcommittee, that the General Services Administration of the Federal Government lists a specific item on its price list for sale to Federal agencies and offices, I directed that an inquiry be made to ascertain how many of these devices had been purchased by Federal offices in recent years, by whom, and for what purposes. The specific device being discussed at that moment was the Minifon, a small concealable wire recorder manufactured in Germany, weighing only 28 ounces, capable of recording for 4 hours; it was demonstrated to the subcommittee by an investigator wearing it in an under-the-arm, under-the-coat, holster with the microphone attached to a necktie clip, or disguised as a wristwatch. My initial inquiry therefore was specifically directed to purchase and use of the Minifon although it is obvious we should ask the same questions about similar lightweight concealable, portable tape- or wire-recording equipment, and that we are doing.

Our preliminary inquiry discloses that total sales to Federal offices for the Minifon devices and accessories were as follows for the fiscal years indicated: $48,622 for fiscal year 1957; $55,244 for fiscal year 1958; and $37,270 for fiscal year 1959.

The Government price for the 4-hour recorder is listed at $269.50 and for the 2-hour recorder at $249.50. Quantity discounts apply of 2½ percent for 1 to 5, 5 percent for 6 to 10, and 10 percent on 11 or more recorders.

A preliminary report on Government agencies and offices which have purchased Minifon wire recorders in the second half of 1959 furnishes the names of the following:

Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C., 1; U.S. Naval Security Station, Washington, D.C., 1; National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md., 2; Fort Holabird, Baltimore, Md., 7; District Director, Internal Revenue Service, Cleveland, Ohio, 1; Signal Supply Officer, Decatur, Ill., 3; Veterans' Administration Hospital, Phoenix, Ariz., 1; Diamond Ordnance Fuse Laboratories, Washington, D.C., 1.

To date, we do not have an indication of the stated purposes for which these devices were purchased.

I trust that this information will be helpful to you.

Your thoughtful editorial of December 22, 1959, entitled "A Nation of Whisperers?" indicates our common concern about the use of these electronic devices. It is indeed a disturbing subject that requires all the facts and all the thought that we can muster in our respective roles as Members of Congress, law enforcement officials, commentators, and plain citizens.

The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is interested in reaching a better understanding of the present-day use of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping devices, by whom and for what purposes. As our study progresses, we expect to be in a much better position to determine whether we should recommend further restrictive legislation, permissive laws, or that no further statutes be enacted concerning either wiretapping or electronic listening devices and secret recording equipment.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1958]

PRIVATE LINE

In Coxsackie, N.Y., there is a small, independent telephone company with a general manager named James Warren who believes that a subscriber who pays for a private telephone is entitled to privacy in the use of it. This old-fashioned fastidiousness got Mr. Warren into serious trouble recently. State police investigating gambling came to him with a court wiretap order authorizing them to tap the telephone of one of Mr. Warren's subscribers. In the presence of the police, Mr. Warren notified the subscriber that his telephone was about to be tapped. So the police arrested Mr. Warren on the charge of disclosing the contents of the court order—an indictable misdemeanor, for which there is a maximum penalty of a year in jail and a $500 fine.

Without knowing whether Mr. Warren's subscriber was actually engaged in gambling and without knowing the precise terms of the law respecting wiretapping in New York (a State which permits interception of telephone conversations despite an act of Congress forbidding such interception), we offer a silent cheer for Mr. Warren. He told reporters that he considers wiretapping an unwarranted invasion of an individual's privacy and added that it is high time somebody had the courage to stand up against such an invasion of privacy. We think so, too. Mr. Warren's attitude, peculiarly appropriate to an official of a public utility engaged in the business of facilitating communication between individuals, is a thoroughly becoming one to any freeborn American.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1959]

FORCES MOBILIZE FOR INVASION OF OUR PRIVACY

(By George Dixon)

Without a formal declaration of war, we are preparing for one of the most devastating invasions in history—the invasion of privacy. We are mobilizing forces to invade our lives and put to rout our innermost secrets.

On Capitol Hill the Senators are studying eavesdropping equipment that is well-nigh undetectable. In a building in downtown Washington the International Association of Chiefs of Police is plotting a campaign to spy secretly upon motorists. And at Forbes Air Force Base, in Topeka, Kans., they have started, and then hastily dropped, an around-the-clock check on the airmen, including what they do off duty and with whom.

When I dropped in on the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee the solons were watching a demonstration of eavesdropping gadgets by a San Francisco private eye named Harold K. Lipset. Looking as nervous as if he expected the coppers from San Francisco Beat to muscle in on him any minute, Shamus Lipset first showed pocket-sized devices that can be hidden in anybody's living room, bedroom, or bath, and which start working automatically at the sound of a voice.

One of these instruments would have to work long hours if planted in the Dixons' love nest. The private dick said it would operate 24 hours a day for 5 days without running down, which isn't any more than I can do. Moreover, I, too, start working automatically at the sound of a voice—and you can guess whose.

Subcommittee Chairman THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, didn't exactly tell Private Eye Lipset: "I'm from Missouri. You've got to show me," but he inquired if the pocket recorder operated noiselessly. The "eye" replied that it was operating right under Senator HENNINGS' nose, picking up everything he said, and recording it.

The private investigator then pulled off his coat and revealed a recorder strapped under his armpit, the way his TV counterparts pack a rod. Lipset explained it was handy for taking down open air conversations.

A recorder like that could be more deadly than a gun. A gun-toter is not apt to shoot you on the chance that you will talk out of turn but a spy with one of those things aimed at you could make you wish for the mercy of a bullet.

The secret spying on motorists by the chiefs of police was disclosed by the association's field service director, Ray Ashworth, who said the U.S. Public Health Service granted $209,515 for the snooping. He said concealed devices and aerial photos will be employed to study the driving habits of autoists who won't know they are under observation.

Ashworth explained that drivers will behave more naturally if they don't know they're being watched, and it'll be easier to detect the vagaries that go to make accidents. As well as being unconscionable invasion of privacy this could be almost murderously dangerous. I shudder to think of one lovely lady with whom I am closely associated behaving any more naturally at the wheel of a car than she does when she thinks the cops are looking.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 20, 1959]

DIRTY BUSINESS

The witnesses who appeared last week before Senator HENNINGS' Constitutional Rights Subcommittee were virtually unanimous in the view that wiretapping is, as Mr. Justice Holmes said long ago, dirty business. Not

all of them agreed, however, with an assertion by the same Justice in the same opinion that "it is a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part." For example, Paul Williams, a former U.S. attorney in New York, told the subcommittee that, although wiretapping is dirty business, crime is even dirtier; and he went on to declare: "Wiretapping is so important that New York wouldn't be a livable place without it."

Mr. Williams invites the question whether New York is a livable place with wiretapping. The State permits its police to tap telephones with a court order. According to a study just published under the sponsorship of the Pennsylvania Bar Association Endowment, "most of the private wiretapping done in the world is done in the city of New York," and the New York City police make approximately 20,000 wire taps a year, all but a small number of which are illegal in the sense that they are set up by plainclothes policemen without any prior court authorization. This hardly makes for an atmosphere of free and comfortable communication.

Wiretapping is not only dirty; it is also unlawful. This was made abundantly clear by another Mr. Williams who appeared before the subcommittee—Edward Bennett Williams, an eminent attorney. Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act says very explicitly:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person * * * or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

Successive Attorneys General have argued that this section makes wiretapping a crime only if its fruits are published or divulged; and this, of course, is one reason why evidence obtained by wiretapping is not admissible in any Federal court. But the section also forbids any use of information obtained by a wiretapper for his own benefit or for the benefit of another. To tape wires without making any use whatever of what the wiretap discloses would be altogether senseless.

It is unmistakably plain from this that whenever any information is used as the product of a wiretap, in New York or anywhere else in the United States whether with a court order or without, an act of Congress is violated. It is no less plain that this act of Congress is violated even when the tapping is done by the FBI, whose director candidly acknowledges that it taps telephones in cases involving national security. The law prohibits any use for any purpose.

Wiretapping, as Edward Bennett Williams put it, is rampant in this country today. And the reason it is rampant, he pointed out, is that law enforcement agencies cannot effectively enforce a law which they themselves violate. The Department of Justice has repeatedly asked Congress to change the law; Congress has repeatedly failed to do so. Another subcommittee witness, Harris Steinberg, said forcefully that the use of "lawless methods degrades the Government which uses them." Law observance is the first obligation of those who enforce the law.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 18, 1959]

NOT SO "DIRTY" AS IT SEEMS

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights heard witnesses repeat the late Justice Holmes' comment that wiretapping is a "dirty business." But one of the witnesses, former U.S. Attorney Paul Williams, properly pointed out that "crime is even dirtier." Some crimes against the Federal or State government are so dirty, he said, that eavesdropping by law enforcement authorities is fully justified. We agree.

Is listening in on a suspected spy's telephone line so unethical that the FBI should allow itself to hear no evil unless the plotters are warned first that their line has been tapped?

Is wiretapping such an underhanded way of trapping a kidnaper that he should be permitted free use of his telephone to make his ransom demands on the parents of an abducted—and possibly slain—child?

How much courtesy and consideration should law enforcement officers be required to display toward a vicious criminal?

We strongly endorse Mr. Williams' recommendation that wiretapping be legalized by specific Federal legislation and that use of wiretap evidence in kidnaping and national security cases be permitted by law in Federal courts. The whole not-so-dirty business should be surrounded with careful safeguards against abuses, however, with the authority for specific taps vested in responsible officials—such as the Attorney General or the judges of Federal or State courts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Labor, Jan. 31, 1959]

CONGRESS SHOULD END THIS "DIRTY BUSINESS"

Labor often has reported on the growth of two kinds of modern scientific snooping—wiretapping and eavesdropping—which a great Supreme Court Justice, Louis Brandeis, once called a dirty business. Now a particularly noteworthy article on that subject has been written by Bem Price, Washington correspondent of the Associated Press, and carried in various papers across the country.

"Here (in Washington) you have the uneasy feeling that half the people in town are listening to the other half. The feeling is justified, in large part.

"Washington, headquarters for more than 25,000 Government-paid investigators, has become a city infested with snoopers, wiretappers, and eavesdroppers."

The article explains that, in wiretapping, an actual connection is made with a telephone wire, so that a snooper can listen in, and this is supposed to be illegal. On the other hand, there is no law against eavesdropping, which is listening in on conversations by means of modern electronic devices, without any connection with telephone wires.

"Loyalty probes, security checks, and assorted congressional and department investigations," the article says, "apparently have shredded what most citizens regard as their right to privacy. Private detectives are in the act, too. Wiretapping is not confined to Washington, but few cities offer so lush a field for the electronic snooper—and so many rewards."

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, headed by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, will soon resume its hearings on this subject, Price points out. Then he says:

"Meanwhile, the wise man here in Washington, especially if he is of some importance in public life, keeps in mind the possibility that even the walls have ears. He knows there are radio transmitters and tape recorders which can be carried in innocent-looking briefcases, mounted behind pictures, installed in lamps or in desks, or carried in shoulder holsters. Above all, he is careful when he discusses business on the telephone.

"A lot of business firms are using private detectives skilled in bugging for industrial espionage. A police captain advised: 'If you want a private conversation with a guy, take him to a turkish bath—and don't go there too often.'

"Who taps wires? Who eavesdrops?" the article asks, and answers: "More than 40 public investigative agencies in Washington and its environs.

"In addition to the regular police forces, there are investigators for Congress, the FBI, the Secret Service, the Civil Service, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Post Office, all three armed services, and each major branch of the Government. There are 31 private detective agencies."

After telling much more about this modern snooping, the article adds: "All this poses a fundamental question for Americans: At what point does wiretapping and eavesdropping begin to approximate police intimidation and political thought control?"

Similarly, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, has warned that the rising wave of snooping may be a sign that this country is in danger of becoming a police state. Senator HENNINGS feels much the same way about it, and some further light on the subject will be provided by his committee's hearings.

As Labor has pointed out before, such an inquiry is vitally needed—and so is action to curb this dirty business.

[From the Providence Journal, Dec. 17, 1959]

EAVESDROPPING ISSUE DRAWS LITTLE INTEREST

(By Frederic W. Collins)

WASHINGTON.—About the only change that seems to have occurred in the eavesdropping business in 20 years has been in the field of technical improvement.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, has been holding hearings this week on wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights.

Constitutional rights apparently rank somewhere below cranberries, payola, broadcast programs, and the high prices for drugs as a subject of public concern. Senator HENNINGS, one colleague, one staff attorney, and a handful of spectators and reporters are rattling around in the huge Senate caucus room.

The chummy discussions between Senator HENNINGS and his witnesses could as easily, by all signs, be carried on across a luncheon table. But several linear feet of distance and several square yards of mahogany committee table destroy the intimacy of their communication and reduce it to lonely echoes in the almost empty marble chamber.

It was just about 20 years ago that a wiretap case steeped in politics had Rhode Island by the ear. It is just about 19½ years since another Senate subcommittee looked into that case and the general subject of eavesdropping.

The operation at issue then involved climbing a pole with a roll of wire and connecting the right "pairs" to a listening device. Now, as Senator HENNINGS was told, listening in can be done without any direct connection.

Paul W. Williams, a former U.S. district attorney in New York, explained listening by "the induction method—you just lay a wire down beside the telephone line and you can hear the conversation.

"Or," he said, "You don't even have to be in the same room. You can hang a device on a wall in the next room. Or," he said, "the old-fashioned direct connection can be used."

Earlier witnesses showed pocket-sized devices, easy to conceal in a room, which would start recording at the sound of a voice. One transmitter would run for 5 days, 24 hours a day, before its batteries run down. A recording device worn unnoticeably in a holster under a suit coat was displayed.

Against these modern marvels, the issues stood unchanged. There were still the frequent references to the characterization of wiretapping as "a dirty business" by the late Justice Holmes. There are the arguments by prosecutors, like Mr. Williams, that law enforcement requires wiretapping—under appropriate safeguards, of course. And there

are counterarguments in favor of defending individuals against invasion of their privacy, by denying officials any more leeway than they have now.

Senator HENNINGS is regarded as being just about as sincere in his dedication to the protection of individual rights as any Member of the Senate. A former prosecutor, greatly respected as a constitutional lawyer, he remarked rather wearily to Mr. Williams yesterday:

"Government officials are violating the law now. We have evidence. You'd like to have them do it legally."

But he is conscientiously steering clear of conclusions. He recognizes three schools of thought: Those who think wiretapping and eavesdropping should be banned completely as destructive of private freedom; those who would authorize law enforcement officers to use the latest devices in coping with crime, and use the results in prosecution; and those who favor strictly private use of such devices, totally unrelated to crime.

He sees little ground for compromise among those views. Perhaps his own was disclosed when he remarked at the opening session on Tuesday that the day marked the 168th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

[From the Baltimore Morning Sun, Dec. 23, 1959]

CONFIDENTIAL

The vexed question of wiretapping and other electronic spying has been getting another going over, this time by Senator HENNINGS's subcommittee. All agree that wiretapping is, in the late Justice Holmes's words, "a dirty business." From that follows the argument about whether ends justify the means, proper legal control of their use, and so forth.

One question that gets little attention, however, is whether the best laws and regulations imaginable can really control wiretapping and the use of the results so obtained. Laws and regulations are far from foolproof, in spite of the widely held belief in this country that all you have to do to correct or prevent an evil is to pass a law.

We cite an example—namely, the unauthorized use of wiretapping information in that kangaroo court set up last spring by members of the city delegation at Annapolis to get Police Commissioner Hepbron.

General Order No. 8533 of the police department, governing the use of wiretap information, runs to four pages and reads like a model document. It includes the following:

"3(b) All requests or suggestions for interception of communications, all applications to a court, all court orders, all tapes and recordings, all reports, and all other records, writings, or information concerning interception of communications shall be considered strictly confidential by every member of this Department and all knowledge or information relating thereto shall be restricted to those persons authorized by law and this order on a 'need-to-know' basis. All matters relating to interception of communications shall be conducted in such a manner and with such precautions as to insure this confidential treatment."

Yet most of the testimony in that hearing was based on wiretap information which former Chief Inspector Ford (who retired so abruptly in December 1957) had taken from police department files before retiring. There is no evidence that he had formal authorization to do this. Even if he had, there was no authority to divulge this information in an informal, open hearing of this kind.

Maryland wiretap law reads well. General Order No. 8533 reads well. Their power to restrain proved in this case to be precisely nil. Nor have we seen any disposition anywhere to follow up this disregard of law and regulation.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Dec. 21, 1959]

ASSIGNMENT: WASHINGTON

(By Ed Koterba)

WASHINGTON, December 20.—It was with sagging relief that I walked into the old stomping grounds of our Senate caucus room, the place where everybody practices the art of free expression.

Reason for this sense of utter mental relaxation was that now, at last, I had freedom to talk without the overbearing fear of being bugged by hidden microphones.

In Czechoslovakia, I had good reason to suspect that the Commies went so far as to slip a miniature wire recorder into the lining of my overcoat while I slept at night, to record my next day's activities.

But, now, this was America. This was the Senate caucus room. And the first thing I discovered was that the place was bugged.

A wire recorder was spinning away secretly even while a Senator was wondering out loud how those gadgets work. Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, had called together his constitutional rights subcommittee to look into the constitutionality of mechanical snooping.

One witness was Harold Lipset, a private investigator from San Francisco. When he started to explain to the subcommittee how simple it was to tap public and private sound waves, the man from Missouri wanted to be shown. So the investigator showed him.

He peeled off his coal and right there under his armpit, like a .45 in a holster, was a miniature recorder that no one knew was there. Another recorder, placed discretely 40 feet away, was taking down the dialogue without the use of wires or hands, and without a peep.

I recall last year, at a New York convention, a sound salesman tried to sell me a $500 outfit that could pick up whispers on the run from 100 feet away.

Now, some of those sensitive little snakes in the grass cost around $300, but with heavy production the price could drop to a fraction of that.

The caucus room demonstration left me almost speechless. And that's why I'm going to stay if Congress doesn't outlaw those miniature monsters.

Can you imagine what would happen to this country if those recorders got as popular as TV sets and everybody owned one? For one thing, it would destroy the exciting pastime of gossip. We'd have a million noiseless spies in our midst.

You can see what would happen to Gussie the Gossip. In the middle of the night, her phone would ring. The voice on the other end would say: "Gussie, I have just played back my recorder, and I resent what you said about me at the party last night when I left the bridge table to go to the powder room."

And Gussie would retort: "Well, I don't recall what I said because I had my recorder beamed at the next table, and from the playback I just learned what the girls picked up from you when you were saying those nasty things about me in the powder room."

Unless Congress passes some laws, our only escape to privacy will be to the cellar.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Dec. 12, 1959]

DANGEROUS HABITS—BETTER STOP 'EM

In case you are going to stop eating, why not stop talking, too? As you know from recent news reports, both practices are dangerous.

If you eat you might get a chemical poison (cancer possibilities), as the pronouncements have shown. If you talk you might get blackmailed, as a Senate Constitutional Rights Committee disclosure has indicated.

It probably will be consoling to some people to know that some slight precautions can be taken against having private conversations recorded and used for blackmail or other purposes. But even this uncertain safety is reserved for alert people who look into the old cigarette cases around the desk for midget voice recorders, and keep an eye on that thing on the other fellow's wrist that passes as a watch.

A private detective demonstrated one of the midget electronic devices to Senator TOM HENNINGS in committee. The Senator caught the significance of it instanter, and hurried investigators out to find "if those worthies down Constitution Avenue" (bureaucrats) were using them to eavesdrop on unsuspecting people.

The Senator could be optimistic about the chances of finding a culprit because the things cost about $300 now, and the Government records would show if any were bought. But the solon's good luck, if he has any, won't mean a thing to Smith or Jones who thinks he can have a little head-to-head talk with a fellow he has seen around a good deal. Prices will come down—for the used kinds, anyhow—and the time may come when no good eavesdropper would be caught without a gadget.

So you see, if you want to play it really safe (100 percent social security), you'll have to quit doing the things that are dangerous to you. Don't eat; don't speak.

WIRETAPPING IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the question of wiretapping of private telephone lines has lately become a subject of considerable interest in the United Kingdom. Sharp debate in the House of Commons has led to the appointment of a Committee of Privy Councillors to study what to do about evidence collected by police wiretaps. I feel that it would be enlightening to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two news reports on the controversy; an excerpt from an editorial appearing in the London Times of December 7, 1959, and, finally, a portion of the debate in the House of Commons on December 16, 1959, which states the problem and which became so intense that one Member of Parliament arose and observed: "Really. This debate is becoming like a beer garden."

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have various items printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 17, 1959]

LABORITES LOSE WIRETAP DEBATE

LONDON, December 17.—The government last night defeated a censure motion in the House of Commons after a sharp debate on police tapping of private phone lines. The vote was 336–238.

Home Secretary Richard A. Butler declared there is no widespread wiretapping. At the same time he said he is setting up a committee to consider whether evidence collected by this means should be handed over to professional disciplinary bodies.

Wiretapping became a national controversy recently after disclosure that a police tap led to the barring of a physician from practicing his profession. The General Medical Council struck him off its register for infamous conduct after police were directed

to produce a record of a phone call between the doctor and a woman patient. The police had tapped the phone at the woman's request.

The censure motion, filed by Laborite Patrick Gordon Walker, regretted Mr. Butler's failure to insure that no telephone conversation would be intercepted without his express permission.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 17, 1959]

BRITAIN TO INVESTIGATE PHONE TAPPING

(By Peter Lyne)

LONDON.—Following a rumpus in Westminster over phone tapping by the police, the Macmillan government will set up a committee of inquiry to investigate telephone interception by the police and the use made of information thus obtained.

Home Secretary Richard A. Butler gave this news to the Commons on the night of December 16 after the Labor opposition had moved a motion of censure on the Government arising out of the case of Dr. Kenneth Fox. Dr. Fox was disqualified from practicing by the General Medical Council largely on evidence obtained by police phone tapping.

The police had acted on a deputy coroner's request because the suicide of a woman was involved in the case.

Mr. Butler's case has been that with the subscriber's consent the police listened on a private telephone extension in the course of criminal investigation.

Mr. Butler explained that the solicitor to the General Medical Council learned from the subscriber that a record of the conversation had been made and subpenaed the police to produce it.

According to the Home Secretary, when the subpena was received he was consulted on whether the subpena should be complied with. He accepted the advice given to him that it should.

In other words, Mr. Butler refused to intervene. And this was largely the basis of the Labor charge against him.

OPPOSITION STATED

In the Commons debate on the night of December 16, Labor spokesman, Patrick Gordon Walker, protested that it was not just a case of the police listening in.

Mr. Gordon Walker told the Commons, "The police first of all instigate a conversation, then they deliberately and secretly listen to it and record it.

"They record the words of a man who knew nothing about it in order to incriminate him.

"Unless we stoutly announce and confirm that every citizen must have an assurance that this sort of thing does not happen without the Home Secretary's warrant, then our liberty is threatened."

Mr. Gordon Walker continued: "Every citizen who uses any means of communication provided by the state should have an absolute assurance that his communications, his talk, or letters should not be intercepted by the agents of the state without a warrant."

WARRANT NOT NEEDED?

According to Mr. Gordon Walker it had been generally assumed that the Home Secretary's warrant was necessary for every phone interception. But now it appeared that any policeman could intercept any conversation at his own discretion and without a warrant.

Mr. Gordon Walker said he thought the Home Secretary was wrong in not applying for Crown privilege to prevent the police from handing over the transcript of the phone conversation to the General Medical Council.

MOTION DEFEATED

Mr. Butler sharply protested against what Mr. Gordon Walker was implying. He said this method of investigation was very sparingly used. But he announced the setting up of the committee of inquiry.

The Commons defeated the opposition's censure motion by 336 votes to 238.

Earlier, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan announced another and must wider inquiry. A royal commission will review the constitutional position of the police, and in particular their relationship with the public.

The chairman is to be Sir Henry Willink, eminent lawyer and master of Magdalene College, Cambridge.

There is welcome from all sides of the Commons for this move, because in many respects relations between police and public seem to have deteriorated lately in Britain.

Police pay will also be reviewed. An inadequate wage standard is considered one of the reasons London's police force is undermanned at the moment.

EXCERPT FROM THE TIMES, LONDON, DECEMBER 7, 1959

Eavesdropping is distasteful and more is needed than emerged on Wednesday to satisfy people that this commonplace device of police states will be used in our free society only for compelling reasons affecting the course of justice at its gravest and, then, with the prior consent of high authority.

When so used its results should be firmly put out of reach of even so responsible and essential a body as the General Medical Council. The council performs, of course, disciplinary functions of the highest social value. But it does not constitute a court of law, and to supply it with evidence furtively collected for the purposes of justice and, in that context, available only under the known safeguards of our legal system is surely indefensible. There is something peculiarly repugnant about words taken down, unknown to their speaker, by a police recording instrument, being used for a quite different purpose, where no breach of the law is involved.

EXCERPTS FROM PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, HOUSE OF COMMONS, DECEMBER 16, 1959

TELEPHONE TAPPING

Mr. GORDON WALKER (Smethwick). I beg to move that this House regrets the failure of the Secretary of State for the Home Department to insure that no telephone conversations should be intercepted without his express warrant and that material obtained by interception should in no circumstances be made available to any body or person whatever outside the public service; and calls upon Her Majesty's government to carry into effect their acceptance of the recommendations in the report of the Committee on Privy Councillors appointed to inquire into the interception of communications, presented to Parliament on November 28, 1957, Command Paper No. 283.

This motion raises two distinct but related issues. The first concerns the interception of a telephone conversation without the warrant of the Secretary of State, and the second issue goes to the disclosure of material obtained by interception outside the public service to a domestic tribunal. Both of these are of the highest importance for the liberty of the subject. Both are attended by some difficulties. But, in both these aspects of the problem, as it seems to us, the Secretary of State has acted in breach of the acceptance by the Prime Minister on October 3, 1957, of the Birkett Committee Report.

I should like to take the two issues, related as they are, separately and in turn and to start with the question of interception. The right honorable gentleman argued—this argument has been taken up by a number of newspapers—that, in this case the listening in was done with the consent of one party, and was done on an extension, it really is nothing more than a case of eavesdropping, no different in essence from a policeman hiding behind a curtain to catch a blackmailer. Therefore, it is argued that the police must have this sort of power in order to make effective criminal inquiries.

I wish to make one thing clear straight away. The argument between us here is not about whether or not the police should have the sort of power they used in this case. We are saying they should not use the power off their own bat, that they should have applied for a warrant to the Secretary of State. The right honorable gentleman then would have had to decide whether this was a proper case for the application for a warrant, whether it fell within the sphere of crimes and types of offenses for which interception is permissible. To say that a warrant is necessary in this case is no more to deprive the police of the power to intercept than saying that a search warrant is necessary deprives the police of the power to search.

Those who argue—this has been argued in many quarters, including some liberal-minded newspapers—that this is only a case of legitimate eavesdropping seem to me to be on a rather dangerous and slippery slope. The line running from eavesdropping all the way to telephone tapping is a line made up of a series of gradations, and it is not at all easy to draw a logical line of distinction. After all, telephone tapping itself is only a form of eavesdropping, and one must be very careful how far one carries this eavesdropping argument. One can only distinguish between eavesdropping on the one hand and telephone tapping on the other because one draws an arbitrary line—not one which can be wholly defended in logic—which is absolutely necessary to the securing of our liberties. Just because it is not easy to draw a clear and logical line, it is absolutely essential to draw a clear and firm line in these matters and to draw it decisively on the side of liberty.

I have given a great deal of thought to these difficult questions, both as a member of the Birkett committee and in this matter, as soon as the facts which we are now discussing first became known to us. It seems to me that the point at which we must draw a clear line, even though it be a little arbitrary, if our liberties are not to slip and slide from us, is, first, at the point where the police come in, and second, where a telephone is concerned. It seems to me that one must cling to those two points or one is in grave danger of being led into very perilous paths, as I think the facts of this case show.

It was not—as the right honorable gentleman kept on implying when answering questions on December 3—just somebody listening in on an extension. It was the police listening in. Now let us consider what the police did without a warrant authorizing them to do it. They first of all instigated a conversation and then they deliberately and secretly listened to that conversation and recorded it. They recorded the words of a man, who knew nothing about what was happening, with the aim of incriminating him. And all that was done without a warrant. I say that our liberties are really in danger unless we stoutly announce and affirm that every citizen in this country must have the absolute assurance that this sort of thing does not happen, that this sort of action is not done to him by the police without the warrant of the Secretary of State. I think that equally we get into danger unless we draw a line, and a firm line, between eavesdropping at large and eavesdropping on the telephone.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

REVISION OF CONNALLY AMENDMENT: A DUTY THE SENATE MUST NOT SHIRK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, comments on the cold-war struggle are most frequently expressed in terms of comparisons between military capability, economic development, and propaganda effectiveness. These are, indeed, the vital weapons of the cold war, and they deserve critical analysis. They are not, however, the objectives of this unprecedented conflict.

The world situation does require that we maintain a defense force second to none, that we preserve a healthy and vigorous economy, and that we refute the lies and distortions of the international Communist conspiracy. But these are only the methods of struggle, not its goals. I believe that there has been too little discussion of the American mission in the cold war and too much confusion between means and ends.

One reason for this confusion is that it is much easier to debate tactics than it is to define strategy. The armchair generals have had a field day on such subjects as the missile gap, the merits of one rocket over another, the need for more nuclear submarines or more aircraft carriers. The economists can supply us with daily tomes on gross national products, production techniques, and standards of living. I do not want to undermine the importance of these subjects, but I do want to emphasize my belief that in America the discussion of principles should get at least as much attention as the discussion of statistics.

I want to discuss today one of these much-neglected principles in the hope that my remarks will center attention on an important goal of America's cold-war efforts; namely, advancement of the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes.

This goal is uniquely related to our American heritage. Our land was settled by people escaping tyranny. Our Government was established and nurtured by men dedicated to freedom and justice. While we have not yet achieved equal justice for all our citizens, we have made constant progress. In our Nation there is a passion for justice and a feeling almost of reverence toward the law.

Communism, on the other hand, is a materialistic and expedient system. Its theology is the philosophy of Marx and Engels. Its god, whatever dictator holds sway. Communists regard our laws as a bourgeois invention and their own as simply another means of consolidating the power of the ruling clique. Justice in the Communist block is what the dictator decrees. Theirs is a government by force, not of law.

We Americans are proud of our heritage. But pride is not enough. I believe we have a duty to future generations of the world to preserve and foster the rule of law. This is a sacred mission stemming from our inheritance of the blessings of freedom and justice. Let it be recorded in the history of freedom that America met its duty.

This, then, is one of the reasons why we have engaged Russia in a cold war. This ideal of a rule of law gives an almost spiritual purpose to our struggle. For the law, after all, protects our religious worship, as one of our inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If Russia and its ally, Red China, were ever victorious in the cold war, one of their first measures would be to destroy the rule of law. Is any sacrifice too great to prevent such a calamity?

The Senate of the United States can demonstrate its faith in the rule of law by strengthening the International Court of Justice. This tribunal was created by the United Nations especially to apply the rule of law to the settlement of international disputes. In keeping with our traditions, the United States should be one of its stanchest supporters.

The fact is that the United States has done less than many other nations to encourage the use of the International Court of Justice. One of the major failings of our policy in this regard has been the assertion of a unilateral right to divest the Court of jurisdiction. Under the United Nation's Charter, the International Court of Justice may not assert jurisdiction over matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Faith in the Court would require us to assume that this limitation would be respected. But every judicial body should have the authority to determine its own jurisdiction when its power is challenged. What the United States has done with respect to the International Court of Justice is to assert the right in cases in which it may be a litigant to determine the Court's jurisdiction for itself. This shows a lack of confidence in the judicial process which is wholly inconsistent with our dedication to a rule of law. As was said in an editorial in the New York Times:

> A court whose jurisdiction depends on the whim of the defendant cannot add much to the law.

This U.S. reservation is contained in the Declaration of Adherence filed under article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice. This reservation, the last eight words of which are referred to as the Connally amendment, provides that the Declaration of Adherence shall not apply to—

> disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America.

In effect, this gives the United States a veto power with respect to the jurisdiction of the Court.

This veto power can operate to our disadvantage in a number of ways.

First of all, under article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, any nation has the right to invoke against the United States the veto power we have reserved. This is because the statute provides that the obligations assumed by any nation thereunder shall exist only in "relation to any other state accepting the same obligation." The United States' assertion of the right to be judge in its own case, therefore, has given other member states a reciprocal right in any case to which the United States is a party.

This reciprocity actually may hurt our intersts more than the reservation can help them. The report of the American Bar Association's Section of International and Comparative Law points out that:

> This [reservation] cripples the United States more than others because its foreign interests are the largest. From a strictly selfish, economic point of view, the United States should be doing all it can to strengthen international law and to advance, not discourage, means of enforcing international obligations.

In short, since we can reasonably expect to be plaintiff more often than defendant in cases before the International Court of Justice, we will be victim more often than beneficiary of the veto power.

This is well illustrated by an actual case cited in one of Roscoe Drummond's columns last year. In that case, the United States attempted to hale the Soviet Union before the International Court of Justice for damages caused by shooting down an unarmed American plane over the Sea of Japan. As Drummond explains, "Moscow blandly denied the Court's jurisdiction on the ground that it was a 'domestic matter.' The Court had to agree on the premise that so long as the United States reserved to itself the right to decide when an issue was 'domestic,' the right must be conceded to all other countries."

The U.S. reservation has been expressly followed by seven other member nations: France and Mexico in 1957, Liberia in 1952, Union of South Africa in 1955, India in 1956, Pakistan in 1957, and the Sudan in 1957. However, France withdrew its reservation after the Norwegian loans case in which Norway, which had no such reservation, was allowed to invoke the French reservation on the grounds of reciprocity and thereby defeat the French claim.

In addition, a number of other countries have adopted variants of the self-judging reservation. For example, in 1957, the United Kingdom filed a declaration which excluded from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes relating to any question which, in the opinion of the Government of the United Kingdom, affects the national security of the United Kingdom or any of its dependent territories." This reservation was amended in 1958 so that it is now applicable only to disputes based on events occurring prior to 1958.

It is easy to see that the precedent setting U.S. action has seriously impaired the work of the International Court. The result is that in its 14 years of existence, the 15 judges of the Court, each of whom receives a salary of $20,000 a year, have rendered decisions in only 17 contentious cases and rendered only 10 advisory opinions. This is an average of only two opinions a year, despite the obvious superabundance of international disputes during this period.

More important than this waste of manpower, however, is the demoralizing impact on the Court of these reservations. This is reason enough for a drastic modification of the present U.S. attitude toward the Court. We will never be able to convince other nations of our faith in the rule of law if we do not fully support the principal legal organ of the United Nations.

Those who continue to favor the retention of a veto power by the United States argue that this is the only way to keep the Court out of our domestic affairs. I do not advocate any cession of domestic jurisdiction to the World Court. I feel as strongly about this subject as anyone who expresses such concern. But I suspect that many misgivings on this issue are based on a failure to appreciate the numerous other limitations on the Court's intrusion into domestic affairs, all of which would remain even if the veto power were removed.

The most important of these is the provision in the United Nations Charter declaring that nothing therein:

> shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter.

Another unmistakable limitation is the language in the remainder of the U.S. declaration stating that the declaration shall not apply to "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America.

Beyond these broad provisions are the additional limitations spelled out in article 36 of the World Court's statute.. These specify that the Court's jurisdiction shall apply only to "legal disputes" concerning "treaties," "any question of international law," "a breach of an international obligation" and "the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation." The American Bar Association report to which I have already referred, explains, that:

> Since the Court's "compulsory" jurisdiction is limited to international "legal" disputes, no reservation is necessary to avoid consideration by the Court of political or sociological disputes. The Declaration of Human Rights, for example, is only a "declaration" of aspirations, not a treaty. Since it created no obligations, and made no law, it could not be a proper basis for a claim before the Court. Nor could the U.S. Constitution or its laws be the basis for such a claim because they create no international law or obligations.

There can be added to these safety factors against interference in domestic matters, the right of the United States to terminate or amend any revised Declaration on 6 months' notice, and the right as a permanent member of the Security Council to veto any attempts to enforce an unwarranted judgment against the United States.

This margin of safety against misguided decisions by the World Court is more than adequate to reasonably protect our interests.

Actually, in order to secure the necessary two-thirds support for a resolution removing our veto power, it may be necessary to include in any revised declaration filed by the United States a specification of matters which we consider to be within our domestic jurisdiction. The three particular matters which immediately come to mind are immigration, tariffs, and the Panama Canal. There may well be others as to which it will be prudent to state that they are deemed by the United States to be within our domestic jurisdiction and therefore not subject to the jurisdiction of the Court. It should be made clear, of course, that the three matters I have mentioned are not the only subjects of domestic jurisdiction, and if necessary, the list could be supplemented from time to time.

Such a revised declaration would remove the most obnoxious feature of our present declaration—its self-judging language. While it would not go as far as some have proposed, it would be an unmistakable forward step in our efforts to promote an international rule of law.

I would expect that such a precedent would be followed by the other nations of the world who have also pledged their support to the International Court of Justice.

As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, I believe that it is of supreme importance that we define our objectives in the cold war struggle. I hope that in the rush to get through the session we will not overlook this vitually significant matter. It has been urged by the President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General. Let us do our part in President Eisenhower's crusade for peace with freedom by expressing our full faith in the instruments of international justice.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME-TAX CREDIT FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO A NATIONAL OR STATE POLITICAL PARTY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on Wednesday the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I announced our intention to introduce an amendment to S. 2436 to permit an individual over 18 years of age to receive a credit against his personal income tax of an amount, up to a maximum of $10, equal to any contributions of money made by the individual to a National or State political party.

In view of the fact that an amendment providing for a tax credit was placed before the Senate late Wednesday afternoon by the capable Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], rather than submit to the Senate a second and similar amendment, we have decided to withhold introduction of our proposal.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Tennessee intends to call up his amendment today, or tomorrow, if debate should continue that long. I welcome the fact that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the issue of Government encouragement of small campaign contributions through the machinery of a tax credit against Federal personal income-tax liability, a suggestion which I advanced in 1956, and which I believe would be a significant aid in eliminating the necessity for large campaign contributions, with their accompanying danger to true democracy, and in stimulating public participation in the political process.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday, January 11, in discussing the recent political settlement of the steel strike, I referred to "the $1 billion estimated cost of the settlement" which I said surely would be paid by the general public in the form of increased prices throughout the economy, with something extra added for the steel companies.

I should have made it clear that the $1 billion increase was the estimate of Mr. Roger M. Blough of United States Steel as to the cost of the increase to the steel companies only and was confined to the 30-month period of the contract.

If I left the impression that this $1 billion was in any sense a total price tag on the political settlement of the strike, I wish to apologize to any reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who may have been misled thereby.

The total bill which this political settlement will involve is incalculable. As an example of what the political settlement is already entailing, I wish to refer to the Wall Street Journal of January 11 containing a page 1 article headed "Steel Pact Triggers Factory Price Boosts; Retailers Set To Follow."

I read only the first sentence:

> CHICAGO.—"Two weeks ago, I was considering raising prices a little in March or April, but since the steel settlement I've decided to increase them at least 3 percent and do it as soon as possible." Speaking is Morris Futorian, president of Futorian-Stratford Furniture Co.

This article gives a number of examples of what is already occurring throughout the economy in increased prices resulting, directly and indirectly, from the steel strike, even before the political strike settlement is effective in increased costs to the steel companies.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, paralleling this article is an interpretive news article entitled, "The Outlook," an appraisal of current trends in business and finance.

I also ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the article in general points out that inventories at the end of the last year were probably rather low for the amount of business being done and that the reaccumulation of inventories will be a powerful factor booming business in the first half of this year. I wish to read two paragraphs from this article:

> Nor is the prospective accumulation of inventories—mainly in steel itself and in goods made of steel—likely to be the sole force for good business in the months immediately ahead. Consumers also probably have relatively low or overaged inventories in their hands. For instance, there will surely be some buying of autos in the current 6 months, which, but for the steel strike and consequent car shortages, would have taken place in the second half of 1959.
>
> Similarly, spending on new plants and new equipment undoubtedly was held down in the past 6 months by the steel strike and resulting shortages, and there is even some evidence that new ordering of such equipment was restricted by uncertainties created by the strike. Probably in both respects some catch-up purchasing will be done in the current half year.

The article also points out that accumulation or reduction of inventories were powerful factors in the business cycles of the past dozen years. The recessions of 1949, 1954, and 1958 were all marked by purposeful reductions in inventories, while the periods of prosperity—one might say inflation—in between, were accompanied by increases in inventories.

The political settlement of the steel strike came at a very opportune moment. It enabled the President to say in his state of the Union message:

> Today our surging (economic) strength is apparent to everyone; 1960 promises to be the most prosperous year in our history.

The political settlement of the steel strike may well have such a result because, as the Wall Street Journal points out in the article from which I have read, reaccumulation of inventories is a substantial factor in recent business upturns, and inventories at present, particularly in items manufactured from steel, are relatively low. But, as the Wall Street Journal says, the gyration of inventory accumulation and reductions have played important parts in recent inflation and recession. These prospective accumulations will be at higher and higher prices.

The President made another remark in his state of the Union message which I think is applicable here. He referred to a reduction in the national debt saying:

> I prefer to think of such an item as a reduction in our children's inherited mortgage. [Applause].

It is interesting to speculate on how much the political settlement of the steel strike has added to our children's inherited mortgage. My opinion is that it is far greater than the $4.6 billion predicted as surplus in the 1961 budget.

The President, in his state of the Union message, pointed out that inflation's ravages do not end at the water's edge. He said:

> Increases in prices of the goods we sell abroad threaten to drive us out of markets that once were securely ours.

The President had referred to our balance-of-payments problem, saying that our surplus from foreign business transactions has in recent years fallen substantially short of our expenditures abroad. He said:

> We must meet this situation by promoting a rising volume of exports and world trade.

As I stated Monday, the President's own Department of Commerce, in November 1959, published an analysis of changes in U.S. shares of export markets for manufacturers for the years 1954–58. The study determined that the overall U.S. share of these world markets had indeed been reduced, but that the general decline was explained by serious losses centered in a few items—most notably motor vehicles and steel. In the same period—1954–58—steel imports doubled and automobile imports increased several times over.

The issue of U.S. News & World Report dated January 18, at page 41, includes a roundup of foreign reaction to the political settlement of the steel strike. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of this article be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This roundup shows unanimous opinion that the political settlement of the steel strike means additional inflation in the United States and weakening in the strength of the U.S. dollar abroad.

These opinions are not to be casually dismissed in their domestic implications any more than in their forebodings in international trade. I recall that last year the principal argument in favor of an increase in the statutory limit on long-term Government obligations was the international implications of a statutory maximum below the market. Both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve officials pointed out that gold and dollar outflow reflected a lessening in confidence abroad about our ability to control inflation within the United States. Disquieting rumors about devaluation of the dollar were going to be put at rest by our determination to preserve the value of the dollar. And this determination was to be illustrated by our willingness to pay the price of dampening inflation by increasing interest rates on Government obligations.

The President, in his state of the Union message, reiterated this determination to seek the removal of what he called artificial barriers in the management of the huge public debt. He said:

> Removal of this roadblock has high priority in my legislative recommendations. [Applause.]

The financial newspapers and commentaries are now about as full of speculation about when the next increase in the Federal Reserve rediscount rate will take place as they are about when steel prices will be increased and how much. There seems to be little doubt that it will take place.

I have been generally sympathetic with the efforts of the Federal Reserve Board to dampen inflationary fires through monetary policy. I have not had any great confidence in the efficacy of monetary policy but have considered its exercise as a distasteful but necessary tool in the absence of wise fiscal measures and proper restraints on big business and big labor. However, my patience is about at its end. Even in a political settlement of disputes between these colossal powers, the public ought to receive some consideration. They must pay the price of monetary restraint in the form of higher interest rates on the national debt, housing, consumer financing, small business loans, community facilities, schools, and everything else. In short, they are being taxed in the form of tight money to compensate for the cupidity of big business and big labor. In addition, they are soon to be taxed in the form of higher prices for steel in all of its many forms.

The New York Times on Tuesday, January 12, contains a story referring to a statement by Malcolm P. McNair, Lincoln Filene professor of retailing at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, in a speech he made at the convention of the National Retail Merchants Association. I quote from this article.

He said that his recent optimism on an end to inflationary pressures was now beginning to look like "wishful thinking." He continued:

> It now seems clear that the Government has maneuvered a settlement of the steel strike that is inflationary in its implications. Within a few months there will be higher steel prices, and there is now an increased likelihood that the process of inventory rebuilding in the coming months will generate renewed inflationary pressures. In the meantime, the speculative boom in the stock market and in real estate.
>
> How much farther can all this go? We have seen, and shall continue to see, grave Government financing problems. We had tight money throughout most of 1959, and if we add up the credit necessary to sustain all the forecasts we have made for 1960—the increased buildup, the higher consumer credit for the purchase of automobiles, the increased borrowing of State and local governments and the needs of business for expansion of plant and equipment—we can readily apprehend that money will get even tighter, and historically we know that sooner or later a prolonged period of tight money has always led to substantial business readjustments.

Professor McNair referred also to the increasing imbalance of international trade, bringing about a reduction of this country's gold reserves, and the cost inflation that is not only pricing U.S. goods out of world markets but is subjecting domestic industry to rising foreign competition.

He remarked that "some astute foreign observers believe that ultimately the United States will be faced with the dilemma of either deflating costs and prices or of devaluing the currency," and added:

So far there is little indication of willingness to accept the cost deflation alternative.

On Monday I referred to the fact that there were many ways to increase steel prices and predicted adjustments and definitions and classifications of the multitudinous steel products.

In the January 9 issue of Business Week there is an article entitled "Steel Now—Bill Still To Come." The editors of this authoritative business publication say:

But it's perfectly clear that steel prices will go up.

The speculation is about how much and how soon. I quote from this article as follows:

How much more is a mystery. Estimates of from $2 to $3 a ton increase are being bandied about this week, but these estimates are meaningless. There's informed speculation that when the increases come they will not follow the traditional pattern of across-the-board boosts in base prices. It's far more likely they will come bit by bit, imposed first on one mill product then another, and set first by one company and next time by another.

For scores of other industries, the settlement in steel has had an effect like the dropping of that other shoe. Businessmen who saw only two alternatives—fresh steel shortages or inflation—guess they know what to expect now.

They will probably start building their own steel inventories faster now, to beat as much as they can the eventual steel price increase. There's almost as good a chance that many other industries will try to push through their own price increases ahead of time.

There will be some dampers on the upward pressures. Federal monetary and fiscal policies will hold back some of the pressure. Rising productivity will help. And politics may well affect the issue again.

Autos: The auto industry provides a picture of what may happen in dozens of other industries. Last year, the auto makers set 1960 model prices with so fine a margin that there's no room in them even for a small steel-price increase. Since steel prices will go up, auto prices will go up, too.

But how they'll go up is another matter. The increases could well be hidden in extra dealer charges. The dealers would recoup by shaving their trade-in offers. And the net result would be that the retail customer would hardly be aware of the increase.

Whether it will happen this way depends on the extent of steel-price rises. But if piecemeal increases do not spread far before October, the auto makers may get through the 1960 model year without a formal increase of their own. Detroit obviously expects the settlement in steel will boost 1960 auto sales.

The auto industry, like scores of others, is banking on a record sales year now that its steel supplies are assured.

The Washington Evening Star of Monday, January 11, contains an article based upon another article from Steel magazine which predicts that across-the-board price increases by steel companies are not likely before December 1, when the first wage increase goes into effect. The article goes on to say, however: "but selective raises will come before then. Extra charges also may be increased. Specialty items requiring a lot of production man-hours are prime candidates for early action," and further stated:

Because the contract settlement with the United Steelworkers Union assures labor peace, steel companies will go on a production bender during the first half of the year and pour out a record 70 million tons of steel, the magazine forecast.

The mills got off to a good start, producing 2,707,000 tons last week, operating at 95 percent of the industry's 1960 rated capacity. The 1960 annual capacity of 148,570,970 tons is up by 1.9 million tons from the 1959 figure.

Of 50 executives interviewed by Steel, 45 agreed steel prices will be raised eventually. The magazine said if and when the price raise comes, it won't affect all steel products.

"Competition from aluminum may discourage increases in stainless steel. Prices of barbed wire, nails and fence can't be hiked because foreign producers are underselling American makers now.

Mr. President, I know that last fall there were in my own State large supplies of barbed wire, nails, and similar items imported from abroad, and ready to be sold at retail in my State.

Mr. President, many other points could be raised about the political settlement of the steel strike. For example, did not the settlement circumvent the Taft-Hartley Act, by undermining and making a mockery of the factfinding procedures and the provisions of the act which call for such disputes to be referred to the Congress when the factfinding and injunctive procedures of the act fail?

Does not the political settlement make a mockery of the conciliation and mediation service? Why would either big labor or big management in the future pay any attention to the factfinding or conciliation or mediation efforts, when they must now know that these procedures are liable to be corrupted by clandestine deals by ambitious candidates for the highest office in the land.

There have been many serious suggestions about what ought to be done to improve the existing procedures, but I know of none, seriously advanced, which calls for their settlement in the manner in which the steel strike was fixed.

Most of the proposals I have heard call for some factfinding procedures. For instance, the Clark-Reuss bill would bring the interests of the consumer into the picture in some form, by means of public procedures designed to acquaint the public with its interests in possible solutions. I am not overly impressed with this or any other procedure, but it does have the virtue of minimizing the dangers of privately arranged agreements with political overtones.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

COSTLIER FURNITURE—STEEL PACT TRIGGERS FACTORY PRICE BOOSTS; RETAILERS SET TO FOLLOW—PRODUCERS EXPECT INFLATION ATMOSPHERE TO EASE RISE, SEE LABOR COST PRESSURE—PATTERN FOR OTHER PRODUCTS?

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

CHICAGO.—"Two weeks ago, I was considering raising prices a little in March or April, but since the steel settlement I've decided to increase them at least 3 percent and do it as soon as possible."

Speaking is Morris Futorian, president of Futorian-Stratford Furniture Co., a big Chicago-based producer of upholstered furniture. His comments are typical of those of furniture men interviewed at the winter furniture market, which is expected to draw over 50,000 retailers, manufacturers, materials suppliers and others during its 2-week stand. The market, which spreads over 96 acres of showroom space in the American Furniture Mart and the Merchandise Mart, will continue through this week.

It may seem strange that last week's steel settlement is triggering furniture price increases. The furniture industry is not a major steel user and, in any event, the larger steel firms promised that the contract settlement would not bring an immediate steel price rise. Steel wage increases, however, are sure to bring pressure for similar pay boosts in a wide range of industries, putting upward pressure on manufacturing costs generally. And the steel settlement, furniture men claim, creates an atmosphere in which price increases—which they say are overdue because of earlier cost boosts—will be easier to put into effect. This is a phenomenon that could help spark price increases in a number of other industries, too.

EASIER TO PASS ON BOOSTS

"This type of settlement makes it easier to pass on the price boosts of furniture producers and to bring my markup back up," says Albert Silverburg, owner of Allen Furniture Co., a retail store in Midland, Pa. "Most of my customers work at Crucible Steel Co., and they know that the more they make the more they will have to pay for most products, including furniture. I started buying more furniture here as soon as I heard about the steel settlement."

Even retailers whose customers won't benefit directly from the steel settlement argue that the contract will lead buyers to expect higher prices. "After all," says a New York City retailer, "everyone has been pointing out that the contract is inflationary."

"We don't use any steel to speak of but the steel settlement is likely to affect our costs," says J. Hardin Hill, executive vice president of Johnson-Carper Furniture Co., Roanoke, Va., producer of wood bedroom and dining room furniture. "Our veneer supplier is likely to have to raise his wages as a result of the increase the steel workers received. They'll pass that on to us."

Furniture makers and retailers, like most businessmen, expect the steel settlement to aid business generally: A sizable element of economic uncertainty has been removed. "All buyers will make bigger commitments now that the steel dispute is settled and that apprehension is behind us," says Elias Jones, merchandise manager of Jones Furniture Co., an Indiana, Pa., retailer.

MAKING THE BOOSTS STICK

Americans spent $4.3 billion for furniture in 1959, up 12 percent from the previous year. Continued brisk business, which the furniture men expect, would help to make the price increases stick. "The steel settlement won't make any difference in the price advance of 3 percent we have been planning

to make in March, but the increase will be easier to get," says Lawrence Schnadig, president of Schnadig Corp., a Chicago furniture maker. "It's always easier to get more for your money when the general economy is secure and active."

Although some furniture makers, like Mr. Schnadig, came to the Chicago market with firm plans for raising prices, the steel settlement nailed down the decision in other cases. Fourteen of the 18 manufacturers interviewed here either are increasing prices at the market or plan to boost them by spring. Of two score retailers interviewed, four of every five plan to pass along any wholesale price advances to their customers.

"We edged up prices 2 percent in October. While we aren't raising prices at this market, all indications are that costs will force us into a general 3 percent increase in the spring," comments Clyne Crawford, president of Crawford Furniture Manufacturing Corp., a dining room and bedroom furniture producer based in Jamestown, N.Y. "Our cherry wood sources have boosted prices 5 percent or 6 percent since June, our labor costs us 4 percent more than a year ago and we know we are paying more for hardware in new lines."

SIX-PERCENT OR SEVEN-PERCENT WAGE INCREASE

Another big producer, United Furniture Corp., of Lexington, N.C., also a manufacturer of bedroom and dining room pieces, raised part of its line at this market. "About a quarter to a third of our furniture is new at this market and it's about 5 percent higher than comparable pieces in June," comments J. A. Philpott, sales vice president. "We had a 6 percent or 7 percent wage increase in the summer and we have to pay a premium for good lumber now because everybody's production is up." United had a general price increase of about 5 percent in the early part of 1959, Mr. Philpott notes.

A provincial cherry wood cocktail table produced by Brandt Cabinet Works, Inc., Hagerstown, Md., wholesales at this market at $34.75, up from $33.75 in June and from $32.75 last January. "Even though the wholesale increase was only $2 in a year, most retailers are moving the retail price from $59.95 a year ago to $65 now in order to maintain percentage profit margins," comments H. B. Hoopes, president.

Brandt's cherry wood supplier boosted prices 20 percent in September and the company recently signed a labor contract adding another paid holiday and raising company payments on insurance, Mr. Hoopes notes. The new contract raised labor costs about 2½ percent, he estimates.

Today we're paying $275 per thousand board feet for mahogany; in June it was $250," says Harry B. Hungerford, president of S. R. Hungerford Co., a Memphis firm specializing in popularly priced bedroom furniture of solid maple, cherry, mahogany, and walnut. The firm is introducing at this market two new furniture groups, representing about 20 percent of its volume, at prices about 4 percent higher than those on comparable merchandise last June.

OTHER PRICE BOOSTS

Other producers announcing boosts include White Furniture Co., Mebane, N.C., which raised prices 4 percent at this market, and Tomlinson of High Point (N.C.), also boosting prices about 4 percent. Moving counter to the general price uptrend is Kroehler Manufacturing Co., of Naperville, Ill., a big producer of upholstered furniture. At this market, Kroehler announced general price reductions on its "Sterling" line of furniture, a popularly priced "heavy modern" furniture in which the firm does the majority of its business. The reductions, ranging from roughly 5 percent to 15 percent, stem from "new production techniques and more efficient automatic equipment," R. E. Burow, merchandising manager, says. A trend bucker in the retail field is Sears, Roebuck & Co., which says furniture prices in its spring catalog are down 1.5 percent from a year ago.

With few exceptions, however, retailers are raising prices or expect to soon. "Wherever a manufacturer raises a chair or table at this market, my customers will be paying more this spring," states Will J. Delaney, owner of four furniture stores in Michigan and Indiana. "With property taxes, wages and everything else going up, I have to pass them on to stay in business."

"We've tried again and again to absorb wholesale price increases but they are at the point now that we can't," says Kenneth O. Race, vice president of Bass Furniture Co., with stores in Atlanta, Ga. "Freight, for instance, is killing us. I just walked out of a showroom where I found exactly the furniture I was looking for. But I didn't buy it. The producer is in Indiana and I have to find someone closer to home to hold down freight costs."

Memphis retailer Charles Schaffler, coowner of a store bearing his name, complains, "Our electric rate went up 18½ percent recently, along with gas and tax assessments. Clerks' wages are being boosted about 10 percent. Our profits are squeezed to the point we couldn't possibly absorb any more increases."

BOOSTING MARGINS

In some cases, retailers will mark up wholesale prices a bit more than in recent years to increase profit margins. "We usually try for a markup equal to 90 percent of the wholesale price," says Frank Connelly, partner in Nellett Carpet & Furniture Co., of Saginaw, Mich. "The year 1958 was so rough we were forced down to about 70 percent and 1959 wasn't much better. We think we'll hit 90 percent again this year."

"We boosted our markup slightly in 1959 and got no customer reaction whatsoever," says Robert Holloway, buyer for Ed Marling, Inc., a three-store, $4 million a year Topeka retailing firm which bills itself as "Kansas' largest home furnishings store." "We plan to raise it some more in 1960 to keep profits where they should be."

Furniture producers generally expect business to continue strong through the first half of 1960. "Our 1959 volume was up about 10 percent from 1958 and our backlog runs about 50 percent higher than a year ago," comments William Tomlinson, president of Tomlinson, of High Point, N.C. "The furniture business has shown remarkable vitality during the past 6 months. It would seem that with all the millions of dollars taken out of the economy by the steel strike and its side effects that it would have been very noticeable but it hasn't been."

Crawford Furniture Manufacturing had its biggest year in history last year, with sales up 40 percent over 1958, the company says. "We came into this market with our biggest backlog in history—production is sold out through mid-March," comments Mr. Crawford.

Other firms reporting substantial year-to-year increases for 1959 include the International and Karpen Furniture divisions of Schnadig Corp., which were up an average of 18 percent; and Kling Factories, Mayville, N.Y., up 20.8 percent.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

With nationwide inventories at the end of last year probably rather low for the amount of business being done, there is little doubt—as little as there can be about anything in the future—that business in the first half of this year is going to be close to or at record levels. The question in everyone's mind is what will happen in the second half.

That inventories are somewhat on the low side is strongly suggested by available statistics. True, at the end of November the total for the Nation was $89.7 billion, or almost $4 billion more than a year earlier. But this supply of all kinds of goods, from raw materials to finished products, was smaller than 2 years earlier. On a seasonally adjusted basis of comparison, it was a full $3 billion smaller than at its peak in the summer of 1957, just before the first rumblings of the 1958 recession began to be felt.

Furthermore, the fact that the accumulation, or reduction, of inventories is a powerful factor in business trends is easily demonstrated by a look at the cycles of the last dozen years. The recessions of 1949, 1954, and 1958 were all marked by purposeful reductions in inventories, while the periods of prosperity in between were accompanied by increases in standing supplies of goods.

These shifts were very large in terms of dollars. For instance, the increase in inventories in 1956, the middle year of the last upward leg of the business cycle, totaled $9 billion, while the reduction in 1958 amounted to $5 billion. Thus there was a total difference of $14 billion annually in the pace of production of the two years just as a result of inventory changes. That's three-quarters as much as the Nation's total exports in the record year 1951.

Nor is the prospective accumulation of inventories—mainly in steel itself and in goods made of steel—likely to be the sole force for good business in the months immediately ahead. Consumers also probably have relatively low or overaged inventories in their hands. For instance, there will surely be some buying of autos in the current 6 months which, but for the steel strike and consequent car shortages, would have taken place in the second half of 1959.

Similarly, spending on new plants and new equipment undoubtedly was held down in the past 6 months by the steel strike and resulting shortages, and there is even some evidence that new ordering of such equipment was restricted by uncertainties created by the strike. Probably in both respects some catchup purchasing will be done in the current half year.

This fact, furthermore, may well push some of the increased activity following the strike into the third quarter of this year. Great as is our industrial capacity today, it may be strained by the triple combination of current demand, demand postponed from last year, and demand for inventory building. If so, the post-strike boom could last more than 6 months. An additional factor pointing in that direction is that recent surveys, including one by this newspaper, show consumers to be in an optimistic frame of mind, willing and even anxious to do some spending for big-ticket items, such as refrigerators, furniture, or cars.

But what comes after that? There are several factors which suggest the possibility of a setback, while those which point to any further gains in overall activity are fewer and vaguer.

One downward factor is the reduced estimate of Federal spending that President Eisenhower has just announced. Just under $80 billion for fiscal 1961, the figure is $1 billion less than estimated earlier and also a bit less than was spent in fiscal 1959. These reductions don't amount to much, of course, but they contrast with the uptrend of recent years. And even if Congress takes a bit in its teeth and increases the total, the net result may well be a lesser outlay than if the

Executive's effort to cut had not been made. Any substantial budget surplus also would tend to take more money out of circulation through taxes than is put into circulation through spending.

Another restrictive influence around or after midyear will be a less speedy accumulation of inventories than in the next few months. While some expansion of inventories may continue, as new and growing companies stock up and the older ones seek to push their wares by means of a plentiful choice for customers, the additions will surely not be as rapid as while present real shortages are being met.

A third depressing influence is that industrial managers may hesitate to increase their spending plans for new capacity until they see how much of early 1960's good business is of lasting character and how much represents mere catching up. Some increase in such spending is foreshadowed for the early months of 1960 over the reduced rates of 1958 and 1959, but the projected gain is not very big so far, and also may reflect just the catching-up mentioned some paragraphs above.

Finally, high and rising interest rates, and short supplies of funds for lending, may put a damper on business. Unless Congress takes the counteraction proposed by some legislators, these factors may pull down homebuilding, which already has turned down from last spring's high. They may hold down inventory building, which often is done with borrowed money. And they may restrict borrowing for expansions of industrial and other capacity.

Bullish factors include the natural growth of our economic system in per capita output, the continuing growth of the population, the probable approach of a new big wave of marriages as the millions of youngsters born in the 1940's approach adult years, and the hope of larger exports this year. But the latter hope is at best for an increase of $2 billion, which in a $480 billion economic system is small. And the other three factors, though powerful in the long run, have not historically prevented business setbacks.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 18, 1960]

LONDON.—British authorities agree on these points: (1) Steel prices will rise and more inflation lies ahead for the United States; (2) U.S. money authorities will be forced to take action to try to restrain inflation; (3) as time goes on, Government may be forced to take more direct action to regulate wages and prices. The London Financial Times refers to the "fiasco of the steel dispute."

Zurich. Creeping inflation in the United States will continue. The steel settlement is viewed among Swiss bankers as an unconditional surrender to the wage demands of trade unions. The settlement also is viewed as a failure in efforts often talked about in the United States to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar. Swiss bankers regard eventual devaluation of the dollar as almost inevitable.

Stockholm. The steel settlement may further weaken European belief in the strength of the U.S. dollar.

Ottawa. Informed opinion in Canada is that the steel settlement in the United States is a "disquieting victory for labor." While welcoming peace in steel, Canadian leaders foresee wage rises in the United States boosting prices to new highs. Since Canadian and U.S. economies are so tightly linked, inflation in the United States encourages more inflation here.

Bonn. West German steel companies expect American steel prices to increase in the future, despite calming statements by some U.S. officials. The prevailing impression is that the rising price trend in the United States will be encouraged by the steel settlement inasmuch as the industry lost its decisive battle againt inflationary wage demands.

Paris. A $4-to-$5-per-ton rise in U.S. steel prices is predicted for later this year. The settlement, therefore, is judged to be inflationary and likely to contribute further to deficits in the U.S. balance of payments. That means further weakening of the U.S. dollar.

Tokyo. The Japanese are convinced that additional creeping inflation lies ahead in the United States, hindering the attempt to narrow the gap between U.S. exports and U.S. imports. The settlement will tend further to weaken the dollar.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRUNSDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, at this time I should like to speak very briefly on the amendments which were offered yesterday at the close of the session; and I might say, by way of additional explanation, that the amendment, together with certain technical changes—which I referred to as amendments—relate to the reporting and disclosure of expenses in primary elections.

Let me say, by way of preface, that before the bill was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration these amendments were defeated by a vote of 5 to 4 of the members of the committee. I offered the amendments in the committee, and I offer them again, as of yesterday, to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. President, the first amendment would revise the definition of the term "election" in the bill to include primary elections. Of course, this would include the so-called presidential preferential primaries as well as caucuses, and conventions where candidates for Federal office are nominated.

The remaining amendments would make the necessary technical word changes throughout the bill to bring its provisions into agreement with the changed definition of the word "election."

The word "election" is very important, in my judgment, because our understanding of what constitutes an election is the very gravamen, the very basis upon which the amendments are offered and sought to be adopted.

As we all know, Mr. President, the present Corrupt Practices Act, the Act of 1925, and the bill before the Senate, are based upon two principal foundations: First, there should be certain limitations on the amount of money spent or contributed in election campaigns. Second, such expenditures and all contributions within the limitations should be reported.

What is the reason for reporting them? The reason, of course, is obvious. It is so that the people of this country may know, as they have a right to know, from what source or sources every candidate for Federal office derives his financial support.

As I said yesterday, there is nothing inherently evil or wicked in the use of money in modern election campaigning, but again I say, the people have a right to know and to understand exactly who are the persons who are willing to support with money their convictions and their beliefs as to the election of a candidate or certain candidates. The people have a right to know exactly who those persons are and to what extent they are willing to expend presumably their own funds to this end.

Therefore, it is honest, it is forthright, and it is in keeping with the American tradition, to disclose the sources of monetary contributions to candidates, since the legislative bodies and public officers supposedly obtain their power as a result of the free expression of the will of the people at the ballot box.

These things are so elementary, it would seem to me, Mr. President, that they do not require great elaboration.

In undertaking to report the bill we bore these basic principles clearly in mind. There was a division as to primary elections and conventions and caucuses.

It is my very strong conviction that there should be certain limitations on the amount of money spent or contributed in election campaigns, and certainly such expenditures and contributions should be reported. Those reports, as we further provided in the bill, should be readily available to the public. It is not that they should be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House alone, though that is good, but they should be filed in the district courts, or they should be filed with the officers of the States who are empowered and authorized and indeed required to keep such records, so that information may be obtained speedily in the area or region where the election is being held.

That, again, is all for the benefit of public information, all for the benefit of full disclosure, by the elimination of secrecy and the circumvention of what I think all of us agree is now an obsolete enactment of law, the 1925 Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I see the distinguished Senator from South Dakota would like to address to me a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will yield I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, whose interest in this subject has been manifest for a considerable length of time. I am sure that throughout the course of his distinguished legislative

career the Senator has had many occasions to give it much thought. One instance which we all recall was especially emphasized in the Senator's own legislative career in this body. It came to the attention of the entire Senate and of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, anyone who runs for Federal office is concerned with this subject, of course.

I have noted with considerable interest the work of the distinguished Senator from Missouri in this regard. I am glad the pending bill is before the Senate today. I hope that when action on it is completed it will make a substantial contribution to the election standards and requirements throughout the Nation.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the filing of reports, I think it is highly desirable that whatever reports may be required by law should be filed at a point where they will be readily available to the constituency which is concerned with the candidate making the report, or his committee.

The Senator referred to filing such reports in the district courts.

Mr. HENNINGS. With the clerk of the district court, I will say further.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would be the requirement, in the case of an election, where there is more than one Federal court district in the State?

Mr. HENNINGS. It is stipulated that the candidate may file a report in the district court for the district within which he resides.

I may say to the Senator that if in a given State there are State officials who are required by law to keep the records of elections, filing will be with them.

For example, in a State which includes several districts, it would not be necessary for the campaign manager or the campaign treasurer to travel across the State, as might be the case in some of our more populated areas, to file the information. He would file it at his own county seat, or in his own town or community, with the officer who is empowered to receive reports of elections under State law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my State of South Dakota the report would be made to the county officials if a county candidacy were involved; but if the candidacy involved more than one county, and was concerned with a State office, the report would be filed with the secretary of state.

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume—if I may in turn ask the Senator a question—that there is State authorization for the filing of such reports.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. There being a State authorization, that would suffice. We have tried to make this process less burdensome, and not more burdensome, to the candidates, their treasurers, the chairmen of their respective committees, and other adjuncts to the campaign for public office. We have required, instead of six reports annually, four reports annually during election years. Bearing in mind the possibility of having to go great distances or having to mail a report which might not reach its destination within the period of grace provided for under the bill, we have provided—and the committee unanimously agreed to this provision, after considerable thought and many, many hearings—that a candidate may file with the properly authorized official, authorized under State law. He may file a report in his own Federal district courthouse, or such other place State law may require.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the bill specifically provide that the report, when filed, shall be made available to the public?

Mr. HENNINGS. Indeed so. Not only would it be made available to the public, but it could be copied or photostated. Modern means of reproduction might be used, at the expense of the person copying or making a facsimile of the report so filed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The provisions of the bill with regard to the filing of the report and making it available to the public are not limited to the amendment which is pending, and to which the Senator was earlier addressing his remarks, are they?

Mr. HENNINGS. No, indeed. I am glad that the Senator asked further questions on the subject upon which I undertook to touch yesterday in my overall summation of the purposes and some of the provisions of the bill. This provision does not bear upon the so-called primary amendment, except that, should the primary elections amendment be adopted, it would then, of course, apply, as it would apply in all other particulars, to the report required to be made relating to primary elections, conventions, and party caucuses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Several details of the bill are worthy of comment, and, for the most part, commendation. But no part of the bill is more important than that providing for the report. I am one of those who believe that if there is adequate light and publicity about what is going on, the people can be trusted to apply their own remedies at the ballot box, if they do not like the source of the funds, the nature of the funds, or the amount of the funds involved.

Mr. HENNINGS. My friend has well stated the basic philosophy of that portion of the bill—full reporting, based upon the premise that some of us think the candidates should not be ashamed of their support. They should not conceal the source of their financial support. Those are things with respect to which the public is entitled to information before going to the polls, in order to judge, along with other qualifications of a given candidate, what sort of public officer he might make—and, to use an extreme example, which I think is happily not frequent, what pressures he may be subject to, and to what groups or individuals he may be beholden.

That is the purpose of the reporting requirement. To me it is a straightforward declaration of purposes as embodied in the bill, which was reported unanimously, I am glad to say, by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was not, however, agreed upon in that committee that the provision relating to primaries should be incorporated in the bill as reported. That I regretted; but I still feel that we have made substantial progress in reporting a modern bill, a bill which moves toward more complete disclosure, and a bill which establishes a limitation upon campaign expenditures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield further.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have noticed with interest the several amendments which have been printed and are proposed to be presented. There is one of the amendments with respect to which I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, chairman of the committee reporting the bill, although that amendment is not immediately before us.

I refer to the amendment proposed to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], which would establish a basis of tax income credit for 50 percent of the contribution made to a political committee, or some such provision. I am not attempting to give the details of the amendment, other than to point out that it relates to a tax credit in the form of a deduction from taxable income of some portion of the political contribution made.

The amendment would amend the Internal Revenue Code. In view of that fact, I am wondering if the Senator and the staff working on the bill have considered the possible effect of that amendment, if it were adopted and attached to a bill originating in the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I happen to have been more or less engrossed in this task for the past 5 years, having served for about 6 years on the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, and having been involved in several of the election contests and inquiries during that period of time.

The inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota is timely, even though the amendment to which he refers is not before us at this time. We desire to develop every phase of this discussion, of course.

The amendment referred to was rejected by me, for one, this year. I drafted the original bill and several subsequent bills, and had much to do with drafting the bill which was ultimately reported, although it did not contain all that I wanted it to contain. We considered this proposal, and it seemed to me at this time that such a provision should, perhaps, originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was the point to which I was addressing my inquiry.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think that disposes of it. There have been several suggestions emanating from respectable sources as a result of consideration of this phase of election financing, but we did not feel that the proposed amendment had any part in the present bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At this time it was not my intention to go into the merits of the proposal but merely to suggest that if there were any likelihood

that the amendment would be considered by the Senate, it would seem to me that the committee handling the bill might wish to consider offering an additional amendment containing a separability clause, so as to protect the bill as a whole from any possibility of its being held unconstitutional by reason of their being incorporated in it an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the thoughtful Senator's suggestions as to that point. I may say that that amendment was never considered this year. The full committee took the bill up in executive session at the first session of this Congress, as it had in 1957 and 1955. This amendment was never discussed. The provision to which the Senator is referring was never offered as an amendment in committee; nor was it discussed in committee as a possible amendment to the proposed legislation. I think the Senator's point and observation are very well taken indeed. I thank him for them.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I should like to ask the Senator for an explanation of the proposed deduction. As I understand, the deduction is a $10 credit on the tax. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. To which amendment is the Senator referring?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I am referring to the Kefauver amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Virginia is referring to the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as I understand.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes. As I understand the amendment, it would permit a deduction of $10, as a credit.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is not a part of the bill before the Senate at this time. It was never presented to the committee, as I have undertaken to indicate in response to the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thought perhaps the Senator could explain the second part of the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is nothing in the purview of the pending bill which contemplates such a provision at this time.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I suppose the amendment will be offered.

Mr. HENNINGS. It will not be offered by me, I assure the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I gather from that statement that the Senator is not enthusiastic about the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will have to play it by ear so far as that is concerned, because the amendment came to my attention only today. I do not know whether it has been printed as yet.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes; it has been printed.

Mr. HENNINGS. It was probably printed last night.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I should like to know if the provision means that a credit would be given. First $10 is taken off as a deduction from the tax, as a credit. That is taken from the tax after it has been estimated. Then there is another section which permits other credit. As I understand the amendment, it would be possible to deduct political expenses from the income tax. That could not be correct, could it?

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume the Senator from Virginia is aware that tax credits and tax deductions are normally mutually exclusive, in terms of tax legislation. However, I would rather have the Senator from Tennessee undertake to explain his own amendment, because it was not presented to the committee.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It was not acted on by the committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was not acted on one way or the other, I may say to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I appreciate his interest and his inquiry. It was not presented to the committee. It was not voted up or down. It is not a part of the bill. It is not one of the amendments proposed to be offered by any member of the committee, so far as I know.

To continue with a brief résumé of the primary elections provision embodied in the amendment offered yesterday, Mr. President, the present Corrupt Practices Act and the bill before the Senate both provide for disclosure in general elections for Federal offices. We know that both—that is, the 1925 act and the 1959 bill—fail to include primaries or caucuses or conventions. In my judgment, this is indeed a very serious omission. After nominations are made, the voting public is confronted with a choice as between two or more candidates. For that reason it has always seemed to me, since I have been able to give consideration to the matter, that primaries can be just as important as general elections and, in many instances, more important. Therefore, when we in the United States think about elections we think about a primary, a convention or caucus, and a general election, the latter, of course, being predicated upon the former. I cannot for the life of me see why there should be any reluctance on the part of candidates to disclose the names of the persons who have contributed, or how much they have contributed. Why should not the people know about such things?

We talk about secrecy in Government. We talk about secrecy of Senate payrolls. We talk about secrecy of salaries of committee staffs. Here we get into another realm of obscurity and obfuscation and meandering doubt, where the people never really know who are the persons behind the men they are voting for, financially, generally, and in other respects.

I am not suggesting that for the most part the people who contribute are not good citizens. We do know of instances, however, where certain special interest representatives, certain groups, and even some elements of the underworld have been known to contribute, albeit sometimes deviously—under the counter or under the table, as we call it—money to political campaigns. To eliminate this practice, criminal penalties have been provided, not only for failure of disclosure of such matters by the candidates within the realm of their knowledge, but also for failure of certain contributors, in the amount of over $50, to disclose that they have contributed.

I believe it is time, in this fateful test of our form of government, to make our elective process one of candor and honesty, and to let the full light of information and public opinion be brought to bear upon what is really happening in a campaign for election. Most of these things are great mysteries to a number of our citizens and, I might even say, to a vast majority of our people. Sometimes a man makes a contribution of $10 or $5, and thinks he has made a very large contribution. Ofttimes a candidate is so hard pressed in a primary that he is outdone and outmatched incalculably.

I know, Mr. President, in my own case, that in my first primary for the Senate, I had in opposition to me the President of the United States, the Governor of my State, the mayor of St. Louis, the chairman of the national committee, the national committeeman, and the chairman of the State committee. They were all ranged on the other side. I had this matter rather forcefully brought home to me when I found that I was sending $25 into some county to take voters to the polls, while the other side was sending $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000. But under our present law, such contributions never had to be reported. So no one ever knew the source of this great largesse. I daresay many of us have been in similar circumstances.

That is why, among other reasons, I think those who have a financial interest in campaigns should be held up to the light. They should not be ashamed of it. They should not be ashamed of their candidates. They should not be ashamed of their full and lawful participation in political campaigns. It is a badge of good citizenship if a man contributes to a candidate in whom he believes or to the party in which he believes. Why should not that be a matter of record and a matter for public inspection?

Of course, if the people are to have full knowledge, it is not enough that the reports show the money spent in a campaign for a general election. They are entitled to know the whole story, because we all know that half a story can be quite misleading.

If Federal elections are to be accompanied by public disclosure, it certainly should be full disclosure, and this means complete financial disclosure throughout the entire process of the election. Anything less, it is my very deep conviction, is not sufficient to meet the requirements of 1960, in this year of great crisis when many important decisions affecting the world and our country are to be made. Why do we not start by being honest, forthright, and candid about these matters ourselves? By many of our statutory enactments and laws, we require of others the disclosure of many things relating to their transactions. But here we sit in the U.S. Senate, and some of

us seem willing to have a primary election process—which in many States means election; the only contest there is—carried on in secrecy and in darkness, without any public understanding of what is really being done behind the scenes by many of the persons who would undertake to control our destinies. For this reason, I have constantly urged, as I did in the first bill in 1955, the inclusion in our election laws of primaries, caucuses, and conventions.

I may also say that if we are to have full disclosure in Federal elections, it will also be necessary to bring within the purview of the reporting provisions of Federal law, committees which operate within a State, but in the Federal elections. In some of the largest States, literally scores of committees are organized for the sole purpose of raising funds to support a candidate. I intend at the appropriate time, after action on the pending amendment, to offer another amendment which, as was stated yesterday, would prevent the proliferation or growth of innumerable committees in a State, for the purpose of living within the letter, but not within the spirit, of the law, so that every time a candidate finds his expenses are running high it will not be advantageous to set up another committee for the sole and exclusive purpose, or indeed, for collateral purpose, either, of raising more money.

I believe I presided throughout the investigation of an Ohio campaign some years ago. We found that committee after committee throughout the length and breadth of that great State was being set up, not for the violation of any law, but for the purpose of collecting enormous sums of money for a late and great Senator. But there was not any limit. I believe that that campaign involved something like $3 million, insofar as we could ascertain, within that one State to elect a Senator. We know that in some of the more populous States this kind of thing is done, and done openly, without concealment. It is done within the law. There is no law violation involved at all.

So if there is to be the maximum disclosure, to which the American people are entitled, I believe that both of the provisions proposed must be adopted, unless we want to fool ourselves, which is never a good thing, even though it is human nature to want to do it, or unless we want to fool the American public, which is not good public morals.

Over the course of many years, a number of arguments have been raised in opposition to the inclusion in our Federal election laws of primaries and committees within a State. One of the objections has been a constitutional objection. It has been argued, and argued with much force and conviction, that committees operating in only one State are activities and organizations which fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States. That argument will be made today, I assume. I would make it if I were an advocate for the other side of this case. It is argued that a primary election is the State's business, even though it involves a Federal official, and that the Federal Government has no business interfering in any sovereign State, by inquiring into a primary. However, fortunately, the Congress itself has answered that argument, and the answer has demolished the argument, because today there are on the statute books several laws which regulate primaries. I shall mention one which may be of great interest to Senators: The Taft-Hartley Act provision which prohibits the making of contributions or expenditures by corporations or by labor unions applies to primaries as well as to general elections. The prohibition of individual campaign contributions in excess of $5,000 to a candidate or a political committee during 1 calendar year covers not only elections, but also nominations. That has been settled by the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hatch Act; and, so far as I can determine, no Member of this body has spoken in opposition to those provisions, although doubtless some will oppose the pending amendment on the ground that it is unconstitutional and constitutes an invasion of the rights of sovereign States. However, such a provision seems to be satisfactory when it applies to labor unions and to corporations.

Furthermore, the general language of the Hatch Act which prohibits Members of Congress from soliciting or accepting money from Federal Government employees, carries the implication that primaries are within the purview of the prohibition. This broad interpretation was adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *U.S.* v. *Wurzback* (280 U.S. 396 (1929)).

The Supreme Court has also answered this argument by upholding the power of Congress to regulate primaries insofar as they are an integral part of the Federal election process—*U.S.* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299, 1941).

Another argument presented is that even without Federal regulation, State laws provide sufficient requirements as to disclosure of facts pertaining to campaign financing.

It is true that many States have very thorough disclosure laws, however, we are dealing with election to Federal office; and the people of the Nation as a whole have an interest in every Federal office, and are entitled to reporting on the national level.

It has also been suggested that the inclusion of primaries in the Federal statute is directed against certain regions of our Nation where primaries are tantamount to election. This, however, is not the case. I should like to point out that the State of Illinois, which does not have a reporting statute, would be among the States primarily affected by this amendment.

The question before us is quite simple: Do we want the full disclosure which the people of our Nation have a right to expect; or do we want large areas of campaign financing to remain secret and forever foreclosed from public inquiry and public scrutiny?

Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment; and I shall now ask that the question be put, if no other Senator desires to speak at this time on the pending amendment.

After the vote on the pending amendment is taken, I shall offer the other amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I must object to that. Anyone can look around the Chamber and see that obviously there are not 50 Senators present. There are no more than six.

I will withdraw my objection because I note that my wonderful friend from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is in the Chamber. He seems prepared to make a speech. While I believe there should be at least 50 Senators to hear him, if he is willing to speak to a lesser number I am willing to sit here and listen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT IN DU PONT-GENERAL MOTORS CASE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I am sure that only the Presiding Officer and Senators who are present can really appreciate the significance of the statement of the Senator from Louisiana. I am deeply grateful to him, and also to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The message which I have to deliver is extremely important. It will require only a few minutes. I am hopeful that Senators who are not present will take advantage of the opportunity to read the RECORD tomorrow morning and be fully and legally informed.

Mr. President, a few hours ago the Department of Justice appealed to the Supreme Court the decision of Federal District Judge Walter J. La Buy in the Du Pont-General Motors case.

This case, in which the Government seeks to force the Du Pont Co. to divest itself of 63 million shares of General Motors stock, most of it acquired more than 40 years ago, has already been dragging through our courts for 11 long years.

I have no idea, Mr. President, what this litigation has cost the Government and the taxpayers, as well as the defendants, over this long period, but the figures must be staggering.

The appeal filed by the Department of Justice will prolong this litigation, and continue to engage the time and talent of the Government's attorneys for at least another year. I submit that a better course is available, and the Department of Justice knows it.

On a previous appeal, decided 3 years ago, a minority of the Supreme Court—four of the six Justices who took part—decided that because the Du Pont Co. owned 23 percent of the stock of the General Motors Co., there was created a

"reasonable probability" that Du Pont would have a preferred position in supplying General Motors with finishes and fabrics. While the four Justices, in a new interpretation, held that this was in violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act, they also found that during the preceding 40 years "all concerned in high executive posts in both companies acted honorably and fairly, each in the honest conviction that his actions were in the best interest of his own company and without any design to overreach anyone, including Du Pont's competitors."

The case was remanded to Judge La Buy who conducted lengthy hearings on an appropriate remedy. His decision last fall directed the Du Pont Co. to transfer to its stockholders the right to vote its General Motors stock, established regulations for trade relations between the two companies, prohibited Du Pont from acquiring any more General Motors stock, and prohibited anyone from serving as an officer, director, or employee of both companies. Furthermore, the General Motors stock allocable to Christiana Securities Corp. and Delaware Realty & Investment Co., in which members of the Du Pont family have substantial interests, has been sterilized; that is, it may not be voted at all. Neither can any General Motors stock be voted that is owned by or allocated to officers or directors of Du Pont, Christiana, and Delaware, and members of their families residing in the same household with them. The companies accepted this decision. The directors of the Du Pont Co. who were on the General Motors board resigned from that board, and the one General Motors director resigned from the Du Pont board. A distinguished former Member of this body, Hon. Scott W. Lucas, has been designated by Judge La Buy as the monitor to oversee the pass through of the voting rights of the General Motors stock owned by Du Pont.

The La Buy decision was hailed by scores of newspapers, large and small, throughout the United States, as fair and equitable. The Department of Justice has appealed it primarily because the court did not order a distribution of Du Pont's General Motors stock to the Du Pont stockholders. The fact is, of course, that Judge La Buy found it unnecessary to order divestiture to carry out the Supreme Court's mandate. Weeks of testimony also convinced him that an order for divestiture under present tax law would be "unnecessarily harsh and punitive" upon the 1 million stockholders of both companies. In an editorial, the Wall Street Journal on October 5, 1959, had this to say:

> Well, the Government can appeal the plan to the Supreme Court if it wishes to do so. But it appears to us the better course would be to accept the decision gracefully. For an appeal would no longer be another skirmish against Du Pont and General Motors. It would be an outright attack against a decision that protects thousands of innocent people from injustice by their own Government.

It is hard for me to believe, Mr. President, that the agency of the Government dedicated to justice can be indifferent to the tax penalties and destruction of stock values which its plan would inflict upon citizens and charitable and educational institutions which hold stock in these two companies. The facts are on record, and if the Attorney General of this administration sincerely believes divestiture is the only proper and effective remedy, there is, as I have said, another course open to him.

Let him, and let others in this administration, join me in supporting the bill which I introduced nearly 2 years ago to facilitate antitrust enforcement by eliminating the tax penalties upon forced divestiture.

My bill would not affect the two large corporations, Du Pont and General Motors. It would not save either of them one penny. It would not relieve Du Pont stockholders of their liability for taxes on any capital gain realized on the distributed General Motors shares. It would relieve them of the present law's penalty which would require them to pay income tax on the full market value of the shares received at the time of a forced distribution resulting from antitrust proceedings.

As the New York Times editorial of October 12, 1959, stated:

> In the light of the present tax law it is easy to understand Judge La Buy's reluctance to make Du Pont give up its GM stock. A Du Pont stockholder who received GM stock from Du Pont would have to pay straight income tax on the current market value of the stock he received. His liability, depending on his particular tax bracket, would run from 20 to 91 percent.
>
> The tax committees of the House and Senate approved differing measures to reduce this obstacle in the final weeks of this year's session. The Treasury accepts the concept of tax relief and the Justice Department actively advocates it as a means to more effective antitrust enforcement.
>
> There should be an early effort to enact such legislation.

In 1956, Mr. President, when the present administration was confronted with a similar problem, it readily agreed to a provision of the Bank Holding Act to postpone the imposition of taxes on stockholders who received stock in a forced distribution under that act until they sold the stock.

At the insistence of Mr. Justice Douglas, who in 1938 was chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a similar provision was written into the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

It is curious, Mr. President, that the administration which embraced the Bank Holding Company Act has not proposed similar legislation in the antitrust field. However, I have seen no mention of this problem in the messages which come to us from time to time suggesting the need for congressional action.

So, today, I call on the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury to join me in encouraging prompt action to enact legislation such as proposed in S. 200, which I introduced on January 12, 1959. If they want divestiture, this is the way to obtain it without inflicting serious and unrealistic penalties upon one million persons of all ranks of life whose only crime is that they have invested in either Du Pont or General Motors stock. This is the way to end 11 long years of litigation which now promises to stretch indefinitely into the dreary future. It is the way also to protect the interests of innocent stockholders in other corporations who may be subjected to similar divestiture proceedings in the days ahead.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I should like to notify the attachés of the Senate that this will be a live quorum, and I hope Senators will be notified in turn to that effect.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bartlett	Goldwater	Morse
Beall	Gore	Morton
Bennett	Green	Moss
Bible	Gruening	Mundt
Bridges	Hartke	Murray
Brunsdale	Hayden	Muskie
Bush	Hennings	Neuberger
Butler	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Cannon	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Carroll	Javits	Russell
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jordan	Scott
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wiley
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGee	Williams, Del.
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Ervin	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Mansfield	Young, Ohio

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business in Latin America as a member of the Latin American Trade Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of the illness of his wife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). A quorum is present.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal

election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, to the pending amendment, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the Hennings' amendment, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

STATE PRIMARIES

SEC. 213. No person's name shall appear on a ballot or voting machine in any general election for a seat in the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives unless that person has been nominated in a primary election in which all registered or otherwise properly qualified members of his party shall have had an opportunity to vote: *Provided, however,* That such conditions shall not apply to names written by the hand of the voter: *And provided further,* That the regular nomination by primary election shall not be necessary for a candidate for Senator or Congressman whose party did not receive more than ten percentum of the votes cast in the previous senatorial or congressional election for the office to which he aspires.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the pending amendment to which I have offered this amendment would seek to regulate State primaries and to tell us how we should conduct them.

I did not have any particular interest in this matter until the pending amendment was joined in by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], although in New York State there is no primary. The Senator from New York testified on the floor, on yesterday, that his name came on the ballot and he became a candidate for the prevailing party because the Governor of New York State simply called him into his office—and it was not a smoke-filled room, because the junior Senator from New York does not smoke, and neither does Nelson Rockefeller—and—whack—the name of the Senator from New York went on the ballot. Only one man, the Governor of New York, picked him; and immediately the name of the junior Senator from New York went on the ballot.

Mr. President, I think that if a man has the courage to run for office, he should be willing to run in a primary; and so it is that I want my friend, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], to have that great opportunity. As a result, after he has had the experience of running in a primary, he then will know better how to go about the business of regulating a primary.

In other words, Mr. President, this is an amendment to let the would-be regulator know something about what he would regulate. [Laughter.]

The experience which is had by those who run in many of the primaries is most interesting, indeed. In some of the primaries there are as many as 10 candidates, each one running against all the others. In the course of the primary campaigns, each candidate "knocks" all the others; often no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast in the first primary, and thus it is necessary to hold a runoff election. Sometimes 5 or 6 of the original 10 candidates proceed to endorse one or another of the remaining candidates who are to participate in the runoff election. Finally, one candidate wins in the runoff, and he becomes the Democratic candidate. Then, in the general election, he has to run against the Republican candidate, who has been sitting back, safe and comfortable, without having any trouble at all, just waiting for the Democratic candidate to emerge.

In the ensuing general election, the Republican candidate endorses all the critical things the other nine aspirants to the Democratic candidacy have had to say about the one who finally has become the Democratic candidate. So, in the general election, the Democratic candidate has to proceed to run for election all over again, but this time he has to try to win in competition against the Republican candidate, who up to that point has not been subjected to any trouble or difficulty whatever.

Mr. President, just think how comfortable it is to be a Republican candidate in a Southern State. In such circumstances, the Republican candidate has no trouble at all, up until the general election, for all the Republicans are for him. Furthermore, the Republican candidate then has very little difficulty deciding how to campaign, for in making his campaign speeches he simply endorses all the critical things the other Democratic candidates in the primary said against the Democratic candidate who finally won the Democratic nomination.

Would you not like to be a Republican, under the circumstances in New York, and have the Governor of your State say to you, "Won't you run?"

You would reply, "Well, I don't mind if I do."

Then the Governor would say, "Do you object to getting in by riding on my coattails?"

And you would reply, "Well, I don't mind if I do."

Mr. President, under those circumstances, the Republican candidate would have no expenses to pay; and if you were asked to run in the general election—if, for instance, the Governor of New York asked you to run in the general election, and if you did not smoke, and, of course, neither does the Governor of New York—what would be your expense? Just the expense of the shoe leather you would have to use in order to walk into his office.

Would it not be nice to ride along on the coattails of a popular Governor, with no expense and no trouble whatever? In that event, you are in; the Governor would ask you to run, and immediately you would be running for election to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I am willing to go along with the pending amendment, and to let the junior Senator from New York have the power to determine the terms and conditions under which a Senator runs for office. I simply want him to be regulated in the same way.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The amendment which I have offered, and which will be voted on following the vote on the amendment the Senator from Louisiana has offered to my amendment, provides, does it not, that caucuses and primaries shall be subject to this regulation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; but what would that mean? All one would have to do would be to walk into Nelson Rockefeller's office, when asked by him to do so, and immediately—at his request—be "in," be picked as the candidate; Governor Rockefeller would have picked him.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, Mr. President, I may not describe the matter nearly so well or nearly so graphically as it was described by the Senator from Louisiana when he referred to such a conclave with the Senator from New York. But I suppose that procedure might come within the general definition of a party caucus. Of course, we do not know how much it cost the Senator to get there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure it did not cost the junior Senator from New York one penny. Rockefeller is a millionaire already. [Laughter.]

But the junior Senator from New York likes that system. The Senator from New York said Nelson Rockefeller sent for him, and that that is why he is now a U.S. Senator.

There was no smoke-filled room; the Senator from New York does not smoke. Neither does the Governor of New York. But the Senator from New York, who does not have to run for the nomination, wants to tell us, "If you fellows are going to run against each other, I am going to regulate the primaries."

I know of no more democratic process than for the Senator to run in a primary election and then to have your name placed on the ballot. I want to accord that privilege to my friend from New York. I know he will prove that he will be elected by an overwhelming majority when he becomes a candidate. He has done a marvelous job in the Congress. I am sure the people of New York approve of what he has done. I want to accord to him the privilege of reporting every 5 cents in contributions. At this time his primary campaign contributions amount to nothing. But let me tell the Senator, when he gets ready to run against a good Republican, it is going to cost him something. I can tell him that from my own experience. I would like the Senator from New York to have the privilege of reporting every 5 cents received by him in contributions, and who contributed it, because it will be a very illuminating experience. I will promise the Senator his Republican opposition will tan his hide. They have done it to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I offer this amendment, and hope it will be adopted. There are only three States, so far as I know, which do not follow the democratic procedure of letting their citizens vote for those who will be the nominees of the major parties. These States are New York, Connecticut, and Indiana.

The late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., was a great Senator. If anyone does not believe it, I invite him to go out to the reception room and see the picture of that Senator, who was picked

by all Senators as one of the five greatest Senators of all time. This is what he said about State caucuses:

> Away in some retired room behind locked doors the masters of the machine sit in quiet conference. They have issued their orders to those in nominal control. The program of the convention is all prepared. The temporary and permanent chairmen have been elected in advance. * * * [Laughter.] These men have been selected by masters of the machine with considerate judgment. There will be no mistakes made. Men designated in advance will be recognized by the chairman for all important motions at the "right time." All troublesome points of order will be decided in the "right way." [Laughter.]

There is a man who knows something about it. Do Senators know why? Because he, who was the author of this quotation, is the same one who abolished the conference system of nominating candidates in the great State of Wisconsin. His picture is in the Senate reception room for all to see. He was selected as one of the five greatest Senators. That is what he thought about the conference system, which is the system which still exists in New York.

If we are to regulate the primaries, there should be no constitutional objection to our making it uniform by requiring that every State have primaries. A candidate's name should be placed on the ballot after election in primary elections. We wish to accord the Senator from New York the privilege of getting his name on the ballot, as is done in Louisiana, through the primary system, unless a candidate comes from a party having a small minority of votes of less than 10 percent. Then we accord him the right to have his name put on the ballot without a primary election. But if a Senator's selection is controlled by a powerful fraction, which has the power to put a man in the Senate, my amendment provides that he will have to offer himself for selection by the people.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. If I construe the Senator's amendment correctly, it proposes democratic processes in the selection of candidates. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. It is designed to give the power or the right, insofar as the selection of candidates is concerned, to the people themselves. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is completely correct. Think what a great outrage it is. According to the testimony of the distinguished Senator from New York, himself, the Governor calls him in office. He then becomes the nominee of the party in the largest State of the Union, just because the Governor wants him to be. He did not even smoke a cigarette. He just called him in and said, "You're it. You're it." So he is. He is a great Senator, representing in part a great State. I have no doubt the people would approve of him. Let him prove it. The Senator would like to regulate primaries, so he should be willing to run in one, and I should like to accord him that opportunity.

I hope my amendment will be adopted. There are only three States that do not have primary elections. A Senator from the State of New York is denied the right to prove he is the choice of his party. I would like to accord that opportunity to my genial friend from New York. I think he would prove himself, and I think he should have the opportunity to run in such a primary election.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am afraid my friend from Louisiana has me slightly bewildered. I thought he was going to speak with emphasis on the question of States rights when it comes to electioneering, but now he has spoken about the power to determine whether a State shall do the Governor's bidding and on the question whether a State shall select its candidates by means of primaries or conventions, or abolish conventions.

I think I am like the bureaucrat downtown whom a constituent of mine went to see. When he got through talking, he looked at the button the bureaucrat had on his coat, and the constituent asked him, "What do those letters BAIK mean?" The bureaucrat said, "They stand for, 'Boy, am I confused.'" The constituent said, "You do not spell 'confusion' with a 'k.'" The bureaucrat said, "You don't know how confused we are." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I am hopelessly confused by this rather strange philosophic approach. I hope, therefore, that the Long amendment will be defeated. I hope the Hennings-Keating amendment will be likewise defeated. I have some different ideas about the matter, and I am not very much inclined to let the sovereign power of the Federal Government determine for the people of Illinois, in a contest for the selection of a party's nominee, whether the procedure is all going to come within the purview of a Federal statute. A primary is, after all, not an election, but a selection process.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but I would rather complete my statement.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the State of Illinois have any reporting requirements whatsoever relating to primaries?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Absolutely no reports whatsoever are required.

Mr. HENNINGS. Or relating to any election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, none whatsoever.

Mr. HENNINGS. Illinois has no regulation whatsoever?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No regulation whatsoever. We have lived with it and have done pretty well, and I am content to continue under that system. Here are the election laws. They constitute about 350 pages. About half of those are devoted, in meticulous detail, to how one can become a nominee of a party. First of all is described who shall vote, whether a citizen is properly registered. There is nothing in the Federal statute with respect to that. Then it describes how a candidate gets on the ballot. If one wants to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate, he goes forth and gets for himself between 5,000 and 10,000 signatures, but if no party affiliation is indicated with the signatures, the petition can be invalidated by a canvassing board. There is nothing in this proposal to stop it that I know of. If there is, I have not encountered it.

The State of Illinois determines who shall vote in a primary election. It determines how many signatures there shall be. It determines the qualifications which one must have. Everything in connection therewith comes under the State law. Nothing in the bill which is pending before the Senate would modify that in the slightest degree.

But our law goes further. Under the State law we set up our party machinery. It provides how one may become a precinct committeeman. It provides how one may become a country chairman. It provides how one shall be elected chairman of the State central committee or a member of the State central committee. All the qualifications are set forth. Under a provision of State law one is required to carry a voter's registration card in his pocket. When the voter appears in a primary election, the judge or the clerk may challenge him, if he thinks there is cause for challenge. He may say, "We do not think you are entitled to vote."

All of that is done, not under the laws of the United States, but under the laws of the State of Illinois. When a voter shows up at a precinct the judge takes out the poll book. Is the voter's name inscribed in the poll book? The Federal law does not ask that, the State law asks it.

So nothing in the bill in the slightest degree touches all the requirements prescribed in the State statute before one can even have a petition validated and get his name on the ballot.

Then if the canvassing board or the secretary of state has any doubt about the matter, there will be an examination, name by name, to determine whether the addresses are proper, whether the signatures are correct, and whether the petitions in whole or in part ought to be thrown out. All that remains within the domain of the States.

If one is aggrieved and wants to take an appeal, the appeal is not under a Federal statute, but the appeal comes under the State law. There is not in the bill before the Senate a jot or a tittle, there is not a comma or an adjective, which would modify that in the slightest particular.

Now what a paradox there would be if it were necessary to operate under the State law and under the Federal law. The State can prescribe who may vote. I remind Senators that in our primaries only party affiliates can vote for Republican or Democratic candidates, as the case may be. They have to be qualified as members of the party. Yet under the Federal law as proposed to be amended, the United States enters the picture and says to the candidate, "If you are a candidate in the primary, we are going to determine how much you shall receive and how much you shall spend. We shall determine, here in the Nation's Capital, by the fiat of the law of the land, whether you have spent too much or spent too little."

It is proposed to go even further. Look at section 203(d)(1). That section is

going to make the Federal Government a policeman, because it says—and this will apply to the primary—"You as a candidate will have to make every reasonable effort to ascertain what committee has been supporting you with radio, printed material, television, publications, newspapers, and so on."

The State of Illinois is 400 miles long, from the State of my friend ALEX WILEY at the north down to Cairo at the confluence of the Ohio River and the Mississippi River. How shall I know, 300 miles away, if a dozen people in Alexander County, where these rivers come together, meet at somebody's house some night and say, "Let us give DIRKSEN a lift. Let us all throw $100 into the hat. Let us buy some radio time. Let us go on TV"—if they have a TV station. "Let us buy some advertising in the newspaper."

The chairman of the committee, if there be such, might write to my office in Chicago, in Peoria, or in Pekin. The letter might come to the attention of a stenographer, of a secretary, or an administrative assistant. I may never see it. But under the language proposed I would have to make every reasonable effort to ascertain who supported me. And Senators should not forget that this will be a criminal statute. In the intensity of the political arena, I do not want somebody to come up on my blind side and say, "I think there is a letter in DIRKSEN'S file." That would not mean I had seen the letter, but there might be a letter in my file. It might say, "Dear DIRKSEN: We organized a little group. We got together a little money. We are going to help you. You do not even have to answer this letter and say 'Thanks.'"

Where does a reasonable effort to find out end? This will be a criminal statute. I have stated what information candidates are asked to provide.

We are going to let the State say who shall vote, who is qualified in the primaries, how many names are required on a petition, and all the rest that goes with it; but the sleuthing operation, as to the amount to be expended and the amount to be received, is to be determined by the Federal law.

The interesting thing about this bill is—and I am going to vote for it, if it gets the necessary modification—there is no limit placed on the county committee or on the State committee. There are limits on the congressional committee. There are limits on the senatorial committee. There are limits on the national committee. But there is no limit on the State committee or on the county committee, because those are not political committees under the definition carried in the bill. If I am incorrect, then let the proponents stand up and say I am, but as I read the language, with my feeble talent, that is what is provided.

If one wants to "rig" an election, all one has to do is to bail his money into the county committee, and do the business there. That is what will happen, if proposals of this kind are made effective.

In the earlier drafts of the bill it went so far as to provide that the treasurer of every county committee had to be bonded. Can Senators imagine the reaction of a very humble fellow in the township where I live, if a lawyer should walk up to him and say, "Joe, if I were you I would not serve as treasurer of the county committee." He would say, "Why?" The lawyer would say, "Well, you have to give a bond. This is an operation under a criminal statute. You have to make a report. One of these fine days they are going to have you in the 'can.'"

It will be difficult to get anybody to serve with such a provision in the law, and it was originally in the bill, when I went before the Committee on Rules and Administration and testified 2 or 3 years ago.

The bill has been very, very materially improved, but I shall not stand here and let the bill pass without lifting my voice against the further intrusion of the Federal Government and against having the long arm of Uncle Sam reach out to tamper with the rights of the States.

I praise the President of the United States, for in his state of the Union message he adverted to the fact that it is necessary to preserve and keep fresh the Federal-State system, for therein lies the very vitality of this country, with its diversity of interests.

If we go as far as is now proposed, then of course it will mean a deeper intrusion of the Federal Government into the picture. It must be obvious that I shall never give my voice and I shall never give my vote to that sort of thing.

There is a question in regard to this bill which somewhat disturbs me. I am not going to make a point of it, except to make the legislative history.

With respect to the amount of money which a candidate may spend, we are asked to lift the limitation very materially; to $50,000, or to 20 cents for the first 1 million votes cast in the last general election and 10 cents for those over 1 million, or to 20 cents for the first 1 million registered voters and 10 cents for those in excess of 1 million.

A big State such as Illinois has 4½ million voters. Twenty cents for the first million would mean $200,000. Ten cents each for the next 3.5 million would be $350,000. That would be $550,000 one could spend in the primary or one could spend in the general election.

I am for it. I believe in raising the limits. They have been all too low in times past.

This is the age of space and radio. Who knows when we shall have a campaign in outer space? Perhaps "Front Porch" HARMON will have a porch up on the moon the first thing we know. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] should not laugh at that.

Who knows what the limits are? The cost for television time is $150 a minute, if a candidate can get it. It is time to be a little realistic about expenditures. Politics requires money, and we shudder at the idea; but the more we project our country under the merit system and civil service and take away all the other incentives there may be for party workers, what is left? Either one of two things—either a great cohesive, energizing force that brings men out to do work at the polls, or the necessity of paying them. And, of course, we must energize the electorate. A candidate does not get newspaper space for nothing today, or time on the television or radio, or any other facility.

So I am for lifting the limit, and I subscribe to that proposal, but I point out that there is one little difficulty which I have tried to check. I am saying this today only to make the legislative history. Somewhere along the line this proposed law will be interpreted by the courts. With respect to section 207, which deals with expenditures by candidates, the laws of the State which may be involved are supervened and annulled.

It could conceivably be that under State law the limit of expenditures by a candidate for Senator might be $50,000, but under this provision he might spend $200,000. Suppose he should spend $100,000. He would be in complete conformity with the Federal law, but he would have violated the State law.

Suppose he becomes the successful nominee, and the Secretary of State telephones him and says, "Joe, I am sorry, but I cannot certify your name, because you violated the State law with respect to expenditure, and it is a criminal statute."

How are we going to make him certify the candidate? Of course, there is the cumbersome proceeding of mandamus. Then one must determine whether to go into the State courts or into the Federal court. In connection with fine questions of law like that, I should have to refer to distinguished lawyers like Judge ERVIN and Judge LAUSCHE.

Such a situation could happen. If there were intense political feeling, and a successful Republican who was strong in the State, running against a Democratic nominee with a general understanding that the Republican could lick him, if there were a Democratic Secretary of State, would it not be convenient for him to say, "I will not certify that Republican?" That could happen.

I raised the question in our policy meeting the other day. I have talked with the legislative counsel. I thought perhaps we should write into the bill the statement that it is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government shall preempt the field so far as limitations on expenditures and receipts by candidates are concerned. I defer to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has done so much work in this field of preemption.

Perhaps I see a ghost under the bed; but I have seen so many ghosts which became live ghosts—and this is my 25th year of legislative service—that I do not like to see these questions left up in the air, without having some words uttered on the floor of the Senate so that a learned judge in a robe can say, "What was the intent of Congress? What was said? What happened on the floor of the Senate when this question was before it?" At least there will be some feeble thoughts to guide him. The problem definitely exists.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wonder if the Senator realizes that the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What difference does that make?

Mr. HENNINGS. This difference: The section to which the Senator seems to direct a great deal of his attention, that is, the section relating to the candidates making every reasonable effort to ascertain what political interests supported them, was inserted over the objection of some of us, in order to reach an agreement and report a bill, at the suggestion and upon the insistence of the ranking minority member, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. I would be very glad to have that provision stricken. I hope the Senator will so move.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall so move.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to see that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, has espoused the doctrine of States rights. He comes from the State of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator. The Senator from Illinois is disturbed about procedures which bear no relationship whatsoever to anything contained in the bill. This provision has nothing to do with registration clerks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How does the Senator think I got on the ballot in the State of Illinois?

Mr. HENNINGS. Apparently there are very few regulations in that State. The Senate had to unseat one man from Illinois because he spent too much money. There was one case which related to excessive expenditures in the State of Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will not mention the name of the candidate. The Senator spoke of that case after his study of the precedents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, he was here long before my time.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator and I serve on the Judiciary Committee together. He knows that some of these questions are a little complex, and he seeks to make the procedures appear ridiculous, onerous, burdensome, and cumbersome.

I invite the attention of my friend the Senator from Illinois to the fact that the 1925 Corrupt Practices Act, by which the Senator seems to lay so much store, an act of 35 years ago, contained criminal penalties.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. There were sanctions provided by law. Does the Senator suggest that we should have more reporting than we had in 1925? We propose to reduce the reporting to four times a year. The Corrupt Practices Act required reporting six times a year.

I do not believe the Senator practices law, but it is an old trick before juries, of course, to try to befuddle and obfuscate the issue so as to make it seem that the question involved is vast, complex, and difficult.

The question involved here is as simple as this: Does the Senator from Illinois want the people of his State to know who contributed to his primary, and in what sums, and who contributed to his general election, and in what sums, or does he not? Does he want the matter of the primary contributions to be shrouded in secrecy, to be withheld from public knowledge, to remain only in the bosom of the distinguished Senator and his advisers and colleagues and others associated with him, or does he think the public is entitled to know, as a part of the general election process, who contributed the money to nominate a candidate? Does the Senator wish to have the public enabled, by that measure, together with other facts and considerations, to determine the qualifications of a candidate for office?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend has made his speech——

Mr. HENNINGS. This bill has been called the clean elections bill. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in indulging me to make a few remarks. I believe that the Senator's remarks were not pertinent or apposite to anything contained in the bill, when he talked about registrars, and about a letter coming to his office, telling about a group of people who had decided to support him.

If the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] would consent to remove that provision, I think we could get along very well, so far as the "policeman" aspect is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, let me take a little of my own time.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has all the time in the world. There is no limitation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At the first crack out of the box, the distinguished Senator from Missouri brings forth a bill and says he will join the minority leader in striking from it a provision which would make the Federal Government a policeman. It seems to me there is a confession right there that there is a little weakness in his bill to begin with.

Second, I point out to the Senator from Missouri that we have a legislature in the State of Illinois which meets regularly. As I remember, there are 51 members of the State senate and 153 members of the house of representatives, or perhaps more. Whenever they wish to place on the statute books an act dealing with contributions and receipts, they can do so, and we abide by their action, just as is the case in other States of the Union. That is what I mean when I say that this matter can be controlled at that level, because a primary is a selecting process. A person is not even a candidate for Federal office at that point; he is merely a candidate for nomination; and up to that point I will not vitiate and destroy the powers of my own State in that field. Whenever the General Assembly of the State of Illinois wishes to legislate in that field, it is free and uninhibited in so doing. That is the reason I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the weakness were not there, obviously, my friend from Missouri would not join with me in supporting an amendment to strike out that particularly offensive section.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois point out the language on which he relies for his statement that the regulations contained in the proposed act covering expenditures will not apply to local and State committees?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator will find it on page 3, beginning at line 3, which reads:

> (3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures.

And so forth. Then in parentheses it reads:

> (Other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party.)

That is the clear exception in the bill. In all other respects its limitations apply.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has referred to the language appearing in the bill beginning at line 14, page 9, and running through line 9 on page 10.

I should like to clarify the record by making this statement. The pending bill was before the Committee on Rules and Administration for 2 or 3 years. An attempt was made to require intrastate committees to make reports, to which I was unalterably opposed. There were also attempts made to make the candidate responsible for all committees which operated in his behalf, and to provide that their expenditures were to come under the limitation provided for the candidate. In my opinion that would be entirely unworkable, and could not be carried out.

In order to resolve the controversy, the language I have referred to was offered. It would require a candidate to list and to make a reasonable effort—and by reasonable we mean he would not be required to make an unreasonable effort—to ascertain what the committees are doing publicly, such as publishing newspaper advertisements and the like, and to list them; and it further provides that the listing itself shall not constitute an endorsement.

If an effort is made to strike out that section I shall not oppose it, because I do not believe it would be workable to go to the extreme measure of making a candidate responsible for all committees that spring up and having the committees' expenditures count in his limitation. Furthermore, because I was unalterably opposed to requiring a local committee to file Federal reports, that provision was stricken out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the clarification made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the acting majority leader to

make an announcement. I am sure the Members of the Senate will be interested in it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has come to the attention of the leadership that 15 or 16 Senators have speaking engagements for tomorrow, Friday. After discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, the leadership would like to announce that there will be no yea-and-nay votes on any amendments today, and that it is the intention to ask the Senate to be allowed to go over, on the conclusion of its business this afternoon, to Monday at noon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is certainly no objection on my part to such a request. I may only add that I have finished my discussion of the subject. I presume other Senators will wish to elaborate on these proposals. Then in due time I shall submit the amendment we have discussed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight, it adjourn until noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I was very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said about the proposed law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was very much interested in the Senator's observation that the bill, if enacted into law, could very well be construed by the Court as preempting the whole field with which it deals. If that be true—and I think his apprehension is well founded, based upon decisions of the Court in the past—if we enter the field of primary elections and enact any law with regard to the regulation of them and the expense involved, the Court could very well hold that the State laws were obliterated and no longer had any force and effect, but had been nullified because the Federal Government had entered that field. I think there is real warrant for concern about what we are doing if we go into the primary field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may, I should like to say there is also the confusion which develops as a result of traveling on two tracks, with the States traveling on one, and the Federal Government on the other.

If we wish to make short shrift of it, the easy way to do it would be to lift out that section and make it an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. In that way we would bring it within the dimensions of realism. I do not know that it has occasioned any difficulty.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would point out one thing further. I have not concluded my study of it, but in reading subsection (c) on page 13 of the bill, in section 207, dealing with the exemptions with respect to expenditures by a candidate in a given State, according to my interpretation of that section, there are only about five things for which expenditures could be made within the basic limitation of $50,000. There would be the rent for headquarters. That is not included.

Also excluded are newspaper ads and billboards. I do not know why it is provided that one can print posters and tack them to telephone poles, but not put them on billboards. I do not know the reasoning for that.

Then radio and television. Those are five things. It appears to me that they are expenses which might be incurred, and which are limited to the amount stated for a given State, $50,000, or whatever the total limit is. Within the exemptions, a candidate can do just about everything else, with no limitation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. I am simply wondering, after all, if we pass the bill as it is, even including primaries, just what we will have done. I do not think we will really have accomplished anything toward cleaning up elections or doing anything else. I think there is a gap there through which a team of horses and a wagon could be driven.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To circumvent the limitations contained in the bill on the amount of money which may be spent, it then would be possible to spend money under State and local committees; and except for the limitation imposed by the State statute, the local committees could proceed to spend at their will.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Any amount, in my judgment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then I am correct in believing that if I wanted to avoid the prohibitions contained in the bill, I could have contributions made to local and State committees.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They could proceed to spend without limitation, except when they reached the amount which the State law prohibited.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. There is only one refinement in that connection. There is a provision concerning expenditures which inure to the benefit of a candidate. But as the Senator so well knows, the expenditures spread across a broad field. They include local, county, and State candidates. So how can the expenditures be separated or allocations be made so that it could be said that so much was spent for a Representative and so much for a Senator? It becomes a very bewildering task, to say the least.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suppose I have as much pride as any other person in being permitted to serve as a Senator of the United States. I have an inordinate pride in the Senate as a legislative body, but that does not blind me to the fact that all the patriotism, all the wisdom, and all the integrity of the country is not confined within the limitations of this Chamber.

I think we ought to leave the legislatures of the several States just a little something to do to occupy their time. Many of our brethren are interested in bringing everything within the scope of Federal law and having everything regulated from Washington, in order that it may bear the stamp of their genius and the impress of their efforts.

The Georgia Legislature is in session at the present time. I served in that body for 10 years. I think that that legislature is wholly capable of regulating the primaries of the political parties within the State of Georgia. They have done so up to now, and we have never had any great scandal in our State as a result of any primary or any general election.

It seems to me we are going very far afield when we try to boil the matter down to minute detail, as some of these provisions do, and to subject to Federal law primaries which heretofore have been regulated altogether by the States. There is not a Member of this body who would have even a vague idea of how many State statutes, which are the result of years of experience and effort on the part of the State legislatures, this amendment would repeal if it were adopted. It would require, perhaps, untold litigation ever to establish just what State laws were stricken down and which ones were not stricken down.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has so well stated, the present Supreme Court, if we even indicate that we are going to take a look in any field, will say that we have assumed entire control in that area, to the exclusion of the States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I particularly raised that question with the legislative counsel this morning. I said that perhaps we ought to include language to determine whether it is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government shall completely preempt or partially preempt this field, so as to make it abundantly clear what we have in mind and how far we intend to go.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have not been able to pass a bill, H.R. 3, which would provide some guidelines or standards in that direction. The Supreme Court, at least until the last two or three judges were added—I think the Supreme Court has been improved over what it was a few years ago—was undertaking to use every possible excuse it could to strike down State laws and to bring everything under Federal control and Federal jurisdiction.

We ought to call a halt somewhere along the line. I believe that if we destroy our dual system of government, this Republic will not too long endure.

I was interested, in listening to the radio this morning, to hear that in Russia Premier Khrushchev proposes, as a result of his visit to the United States,

to give at least a little police power to the 16 components—the 16 separate states—of the Soviet Union. He has learned very fast. He came here to get some ideas which would be helpful to him. I am sure that he has not gone far enough; but I commend him for recognizing, even to this extent, the wisdom of having some little activity carried on under local control.

For my part, I am willing to trust the General Assembly of Georgia to control the primaries. They have legislated in that field in the past. I shall not cast a vote here which will say to them that they are incapable of dealing with this subject in the future. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I commend the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois and the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia for their illuminating remarks on this subject. I wish to associate myself with them. There is no question that if this amendment is adopted, it will result in a further usurpation by the Federal Government of power which belongs to the States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can conclude my observations, before the distinguished Senator from Georgia leaves the Chamber, by bringing to the attention of the Senate this one thought: In the office of the Sergeant at Arms, just off the Chamber, hangs a very beautiful portrait. It is a portrait of a distinguished former Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois. He was a great citizen, a great Senator, and a great Democrat. His name was J. Hamilton Lewis.

Mr. RUSSELL. He was born in the State of Georgia, I may say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct, and he was at one time a Representative from the State of Washington.

We lived at the same hotel in Washington for years. I remember, after about my second term in Congress, that we used to meet in the lobby at night. He came one evening, put his arm around my shoulder, and asked, "How is my distinguished leader in the House?" I certainly was not a leader. But we had a good visit about many matters, and the question of Federal-State relationships came into the discussion.

He said, "My boy, I will never live to see it, but you may live to see the day, unless there is great vigilance, when State boundaries will have no significance except to be put on road maps for the convenience and the guidance of tourists."

That statement came from a great Democrat and Senator from my State.

As I watch the unfoldment of Federal power and its deeper thrust into the economic, political, and social life of the country, I shall not vote for the pending amendment, which carries that power only so much further.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the expenditures in primaries are controlled, will it not establish the principle that the Federal Government may go a step further and determine how primaries shall be conducted, as has been proposed by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HENNINGS. The bill has as its basic foundation points or tenets the matters of full disclosure and full reporting, as well as an increased limitation beyond that contained in the present Corrupt Practices Act, as I have said several times before, relating to expenditures.

It has been held in the case of United States against Classic, and in other cases, that the Federal Government does have the authority over primaries with respect to these matters. Certainly in the so-called Taft-Hartley Act this principle has obtained, and has been passed upon by the Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would be the Senator's answer to the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that since this measure would deal with the matter of how primaries shall be conducted and how money shall be spent in that connection, the measure would establish the principle that the Federal Government may completely determine how primaries shall basically be conducted, whether by convention or by direct vote.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator from Ohio understands that the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 has already established a precedent relating to the conduct of elections in the States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that the answer of the Senator from Missouri to my question?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is the best answer I can give, if I have correctly understood the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall appreciate it if the attachés of the Senate will advise the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that I am about to answer his remarks. I previously told him that I would, and he said he would be available. He has been necessarily detained in the outer chamber. So I shall appreciate it if he is notified, because he has rather misunderstood the situation in New York State.

The Senator from Louisiana does not like primaries, and apparently there are many other members of his party who do not like primaries. I, myself, do not particularly like primaries. I have never been in a primary contest. Apparently the Senator from Louisiana is inviting me to engage in a primary contest in Louisiana. That I have no desire to do; neither do I think he should be called to New York to engage in a primary contest there. As a matter of fact, we do not have primaries in New York; that is to say, we do not have them in connection with elections to the office of U.S. Senator.

In New York, the way in which we operate—and it is the way in which I was nominated or in which any other candidates for election to the U.S. Senate are nominated—is by a statewide convention of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party, as the case may be. The delegates to that convention are chosen by the Republicans or the Democrats, respectively, throughout the State, to represent them.

The amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], on behalf of himself and myself, would cover the activities of a nominating convention, just as it would cover matters connected with the primaries in the States in which candidates are chosen through the primary method. Apparently it is that part of the amendment that the Senator from Louisiana has lost sight of, because, in addition to primaries, it covers a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates.

The important point is to insure that all methods of selecting such nominees are covered; and of course this is particularly important in the case of States in which victory in the primary or in the party caucus or in the party convention is tantamount to election. I assure my friend from Louisiana that that is not true in New York, because, there, nomination definitely is not tantamount to election.

The method of the selection of the junior Senator from New York was the same as it has been for the selection of any other candidate from New York for election to the Senate. It was the same as that for the selection of the candidate on the Democratic ticket, who opposed the junior Senator from New York—although with the important difference that, apparently, in the case of the junior Senator from New York very fortunately there was a rapport, we might say, a community of interest, and enthusiasm, between the candidate for Governor and the candidate for Senator, which apparently did not exist, or did not exist to so great an extent, on the Democratic side. It is possible that that may have had an effect on the result of the election.

But I point this out for the purpose of emphasizing what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said—namely, that the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana has offered of course proposes a much more radical interference with States' rights than anything proposed in this bill or in the Hennings amendment to which the Senator from Louisiana has proposed his amendment. It is one thing to regulate that which in its judgment a sovereign State has made a part of its own electoral machinery; it is quite another thing to dictate to the States and to the political parties that a certain procedure must be followed in selecting the candidates for office.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to our amendment.

But I differ with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] in his position on the amendment in chief. Apparently, Illinois has no laws at all regulating elections. Of course, that is the privilege of the people of Illinois, if they do not wish to have such laws; and, therefore, I can understand the reluctance of the Senator from Illinois to

have any such rules or regulations whatever established. It is the natural result of his political experience in a State which does not see fit in any way to regulate such procedures.

But, Mr. President, in this case we are dealing with candidates for election to Federal office. The pending bill is called, in the very bill itself, the Federal Elections Act of 1959, although the press very generally has spoken of it as the clean elections bill. Well, Mr. President, that is a fine name. I have no objection to it, except that it may place too much emphasis on the point that there may be dirt which has to be cleaned up; and I think that is an undue amount of emphasis, because the bill deals with provisions of the election laws and the reporting of the amounts of money spent, even when there is no allegation that anything improper had occurred. It is perfectly proper to contribute to the campaigns of candidates for election to public office, and indeed, we should encourage more active participation by more people in politics.

But if the bill is to be called a clean elections bill, since we are familiar with the expression that cleanliness is next to godliness, the use of such a title for the bill would seem to be incorrect unless we take steps to provide for the elimination of all the dirt which may exist in connection with the elective process. It may be clean and shiny, like a little boy's face; but if we look closely, we may find a little dirt behind the ears or a little telltale gray on the white collar. So, Mr. President, if the pending bill is to be construed as a bill to clean up elections and a clean-elections bill, let us make it clean all the way through. It will not be enough to remove the surface dirt from the shirt or from the political practice. If there is any dirt about it, all the dirt—including the hidden dirt—must be scrubbed out.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], on behalf of himself and myself, is the cleansing agent that is needed if we are to have a full, complete, clean elections bill.

Finally, I call attention to this fact: It has been argued here that primaries are nothing with which we should concern ourselves. This all happened before my time in the Congress, but it is my understanding that it was the primary contest between our former colleague, Senator Alben Barkley, and former Gov. Happy Chandler, of Kentucky, that gave rise to the writing of the Hatch Act. The allegations on the part of the Chandler forces were that the Barkley forces were using all the Federal employees, and the charges made by the Barkley forces were that the Chandler forces were using all the State employees. I have no knowledge or position about the merit of those charges, but my understanding is that it was those allegations which gave rise, more than any other single factor, to the writing of the Hatch Act, dealing with all Federal elections, along with primaries. Today a Federal employee cannot engage in political activity in a general election or in a primary.

So there is a complete and clear legislative precedent for doing a thorough job here, and not a halfway job.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be adopted.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments which I propose to offer to the pending bill, S. 2436, on Monday, and have them printed and printed in the RECORD so that they will be at the clerk's desk on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the table.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. GORE are as follows:

On page 14, after line 7, insert the following:

"LIMITATION UPON AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES BY CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—NATIONAL POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 208. Candidates for election as President and Vice President, who are the nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding presidential elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this section, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates and there shall be included in the total of expenditures made by such candidates, the expenditures made on their behalf by all national political committees authorized by them to support their candidacy, pursuant to section 212.

"The limitations prescribed in this section shall not include expenditures made by political committees authorized by such candidates to support their candidacy within a State, which shall in each case be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 209.

"LIMITATION UPON AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—STATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 209. Whenever candidates for President and Vice President have authorized a political committee, within a State, to accept contributions and make expenditures in support of their candidacy, pursuant to section 212, such political committee, together with other political committees within the State, authorized by the candidates and by chairmen of the committees so authorized, shall not make aggregate expenditures in support of such candidates in an amount exceeding the limitation for expenditures that would apply to a candidate for election as a Senator from that State.

"LIMITATION UPON AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES BY CANDIDATES FOR NOMINATION FOR THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT—NATIONAL POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 210. A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the limitation prescribed in section 208.

"For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this section, there shall be included in the total of expenditures made by a candidate for such nomination the expenditures made on his behalf by all national political committees authorized by him to support his candidacy. No more than 10 per centum of such amount shall be expended from the personal funds of the candidate and/or from the personal funds of the spouse of such candidate.

"The limitations prescribed in this section shall not include expenditures made by political committees authorized by such candidates to support their candidacy within a State, which shall in each case be subject to the limitations prescribed in section 211.

"LIMITATION UPON AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURES ON BEHALF OF CANDIDATES FOR NOMINATION FOR THE OFFICE OF PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT—STATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 211. Whenever a candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President has authorized a political committee within a State to support his candidacy for such nomination, pursuant to section 212, such political committee, together with other political committees within said State authorized by the chairmen thereof, shall not make expenditures on behalf of such candidates in excess of the limitation that would apply to a candidate for the office of Senator from such State.

"AUTHORIZATION OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 212. (a) Candidates for election as President and Vice President seeking election as nominees of a political party may jointly authorize in writing one or more national political committees to support their candidacy. Such authorization shall be addressed to the chairman of the authorized political committee and a copy of such authorization shall be filed by the candidate with the Comptroller General. Such candidates for election as President and Vice President may also jointly authorize in writing not more than two political committees within each State to support their candidacy, and may further authorize the chairmen of such political committees, as their political agents, to authorize other political committees within that State to support their candidacy. Copies of all such authorizations shall be filed with the Comptroller General as above provided.

"(b) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President may authorize one or more national political committees to support his candidacy in the same manner as provided in subsection (a). Such a candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President may also authorize in writing not more than two political committees within each State to support his candidacy, and may further authorize the chairmen of such political committees, as his political agents, to authorize other political committees within that State to support his candidacy. Copies of all authorizations shall be filed with the Comptroller General as above provided.

"(c) Whenever a candidate authorizes a political committee to support his candidacy for nomination or election, he shall specify the maximum amount of expenditures such committee may make in his behalf. Any such authorization may be modified from time to time by filing an amended authorization, to be filed in the same manner as prescribed for original authorizations: *Provided*, That the amount specified in any amended authorization shall not be less than the expenditures made on behalf of such candidate by such committee prior to the time at which the amended authorization is effective.

"(d) No political committee shall make expenditures for or on behalf of a candidate in excess of the amount specified in the written authorization to such committee last filed by such candidate.

"REPORTS BY CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION AS PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

"SEC. 213. (a) Candidates for election as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party shall jointly file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Comptroller General, on forms to be prescribed by him. Such reports shall be complete as of the thirtieth and tenth days next preceding the date on which an election for the offices for which they are candidates is to be held, and as of the twentieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the fourth day following the reporting date. Such reports shall contain—

"(1) a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by or for them in aid or support of their candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 202, including amounts expended from their own funds and total amounts received and expended by committees authorized by them pursuant to section 212 to support his candidacy;

"(2) a list of the names and addresses of each political committee they have authorized to support their candidacy; and

"(3) a statement of every promise or pledge made by them or by any person for them with their consent, prior to the closing of the polls on the day of election, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any public or private position or employment for the purpose of procuring support of their candidacy, and the name, address and occupation of every person to whom any such promise or pledge has been made, together with the description of any such position. If no such promise or pledge has been made, that fact shall be specifically stated.

"(b) The reports required to be filed by subdivision (a) (1) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

"(c) Candidates shall enclose with their first report a statement, based upon the records of the proper officials, giving the total number of votes cast for all candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, at the prior election used as a basis for the computation made under subsection 207(b).

"(d) Candidates for nomination for the office of President or Vice President shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Comptroller General, on forms to be prescribed by him. Such reports shall be complete as of the corresponding dates, shall be filed within the same time limitations, and shall contain the same information as that prescribed in subsection (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

"Renumber section 208 through section 212 to read section 214 through section 218, respectively."

Strike out all after line 3, page 17, through line 18, page 18, and substitute the following:

"LIMITATIONS ON FINANCIAL AID

"SEC. 302. Section 608 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) It is unlawful for any person, other than a political committee, to make, directly or indirectly, contributions to or on behalf of, or expenditures on behalf of, candidates and/or political committees, in a total aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year;

"'(b) It is unlawful for any person other than a political committee to make contributions or expenditures in excess of a total aggregate amount of $250 in any calendar year to or on behalf of any candidate or candidates for the Senate or the House of Representatives seeking election in any State or States other than the State in which such contributor has his legal residence;

"'(c) It is unlawful for any political committee, other than a national political committee, to make, directly or indirectly, contributions to or on behalf of, or expenditures on behalf of, candidates and/or political committees in any State or States other than the State wherein said political committee maintains its office, and it is unlawful for any candidate or political committee to accept or receive any contribution or to authorize or permit an expenditure prohibited by this section: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this title or in the Federal Elections Act of 1959 shall be construed to prohibit any political committee from transferring funds in any amount to a national political committee, up to the maximum limitations placed upon such national political committee;

"'(d) It is unlawful for a national political committee to make contributions to or on behalf of, and/or expenditures on behalf of, candidates, and/or their authorized committees, for the Senate or the House of Representatives, in excess of the following sums in any calendar year:

"'(1) $10,000 in the case of a candidate for Senator, and

"'(2) $3,000 in the case of a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner:

"'(e) It is unlawful for a candidate for Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, to receive contributions from and/or authorize expenditures by national political committees aggregating in excess of the following:

"'(1) $10,000 in the case of a candidate for Senator, or

"'(2) $3,000 in the case of a candidate for Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner.

For the purpose of the limitations prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included in the aggregate contributions received by a candidate all contributions on behalf of such candidate made by national political committees to all political committees authorized by such candidate to support his candidacy;

"'(f) It is unlawful for any person to purchase or buy any goods, commodities, advertising or articles of any kind or description, the proceeds of which, or any portion thereof, directly or indirectly inures to the benefit of or for any candidate or any political committee: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not apply to the purchase and sale by candidates and committees of campaign pins, buttons, and similar materials for prices not exceeding $5 per article.

"'This subsection shall not interfere with the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any candidate.

"'(g) In all cases of violations of this section by any person other than an individual, any officer, director, or managing head thereof who consents to such violation, shall be punished as herein provided.

"'(h) Whoever violates any provision of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.'"

Strike all after line 14, page 5, through line 6, page 8, and substitute the following:

"REPORTS BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 202. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Comptroller General, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the thirtieth and tenth days next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as of the twentieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the fourth day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

"(1) amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

"(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $500 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution, with the names of the contributors arranged alphabetically;

"(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

"(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

"(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

"(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

"(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

"(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

"(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

"(b)(1) Each item of expenditure shall be described in sufficient detail to identify it accurately, including, in the case of printed cards, pamphlets, circulars, posters, dodgers, booklets, or other such advertisements, writings or other statements (such as reprints from periodicals, books, newspapers, or other publications), the title and number of each; in the case of newspaper advertisements, the names of the newspapers; and in the case of radio and television items, the names of the stations.

"(2) Each expenditure shall also be described by general category, including (i) personal services and reimbursed expenses (salaries, commissions, fees, traveling, and subsistence); (ii) printing, purchase, and distribution of literature; (iii) newspaper, periodical, and billboard advertising; (iv) radio; (v) television; (vi) office overhead; (vii) election day expenses; (viii) transfer to other political committees and contributions to candidates; and (ix) miscellaneous; and the total expenditure for such category shall be listed.

"(c) The reports required to be filed by subdivision (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

"(d) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

"(e) The reports required to be filed by subdivision (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made, listing separately those candidates who have authorized the committee to support their candidacy. In the case of committees supporting more than one candidate (including State and local

candidates) the amount of expenditures allocable to each candidate as computed under subsection 203(c) shall be stated."

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator AIKEN, Senator MURRAY, Senator EASTLAND, Senator JORDAN, Senator GRUENING, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator MORSE, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Senator MCNAMARA, Senator CLARK, Senator JACKSON, Senator KENNEDY, Senator KEFAUVER, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator FULBRIGHT, Senator HART, Senator LONG of Louisiana, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator SYMINGTON, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator GREEN, Senator HENNINGS, Senator CHAVEZ, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, Senator CARROLL, Senator ENGLE, Senator CANNON, Senator COOPER, Senator LONG of Hawaii, Senator MAGNUSON, Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Senator MONRONEY, Senator JAVITS, Senator PROUTY, Senator YOUNG of Ohio, Senator BUSH, Senator MUNDT, Senator BIBLE, Senator MCGEE, Senator MOSS, Senator BARTLETT, Senator BENNETT, Senator PASTORE, Senator DODD, Senator KUCHEL, and Senator CHURCH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes.

The Library Services Act, which I introduced in the 84th Congress and which became law on June 19, 1956, has for its purpose the development of public library services in rural areas by providing funds for a grant-in-aid program to stimulate the States to develop methods of providing library services to residents of small towns, villages, and farming communities which now totally lack them, or where they are inadequately supplied.

The act authorizes an appropriation of $7,500,000 annually for 5 years for grants to the States for the extension and improvement of rural public library service.

Rural area is defined as any place of 10,000 population or less, according to latest U.S. census. However, funds may be utilized by urban libraries to extend service to rural areas.

The State library extension agency in each State prepares and submits to the U.S. Commissioner of Education a plan, which will, in its judgment, assure the use of the funds to maximum advantage.

Funds under a State plan may be used for salaries, books, and other library materials, library equipment, and other operating expenses, but not for the erection of buildings or purchase of land.

Funds are allotted to the States on the basis of their rural population and are matched by the States on the basis of their per capita income.

To remain eligible for a Federal grant, a State must maintain its expenditures for all public library service at least at the same level as in fiscal 1956; and State and local expenditures for rural public library service must not fall below the 1956 level.

The program provided for in this legislation has accomplished much to assist our people in small towns and rural areas.

Thirty million rural people now have new or improved public library services available to them as a result of this cooperative State-local-Federal program.

County and regional library developments have brought public library service for the first time to over 1 million rural children and adults, and substantially improved service to 7.6 million more.

Over 280 separate project activities to extend and develop rural public library service were included in the 50 State plans for 1959.

State appropriations for public library service to rural areas have increased 54 percent since 1956.

Local appropriations for public libraries in rural areas under State plans have increased 45 percent since State and Federal funds were available for stimulation and development.

Approximately 200 new bookmobiles are traveling rural roads, bringing books and information to people in remote areas.

More than 5 million books and other informational and educational materials have been added to the cultural resources of rural communities.

State library extension agencies have been able to strengthen their staffs and resources to assist rural communities in improving their library services or establish new services. Some 90 field consultants were added to State agency staffs, an increase of 80 percent over total field staff in 1956.

Increases in library usage as a result of library development projects are impressive. Many county and regional library projects report increases in book circulation of 40 percent and up, following the availability of more good books, more staff, bookmobiles, and added library branches and stations.

In spite of the tremendous gains made in the extension of library services where they did not exist in the past, there is a great need for the extension of this legislation.

By the end of fiscal 1961, when this program will expire, there will still be millions of rural children and adults who have not had the opportunity to benefit from library demonstration or development programs under the Library Services Act. It is estimated that only half of the job will be done, that at least 40 million rural residents will still have no public library service, or inadequate service, and that 150 rural counties will still have no public library service within their borders.

Among other reasons for extending the program for an additional 5 years is the fact that the program has not, due to a number of factors, been completely operative for all of the years authorized by the legislation.

Much preparatory time was needed in getting the program under way. For example, regulations were not completed until December of 1956. State library extension agencies found it difficult to staff the library development program because of a serious shortage of trained librarians. In many States time was needed for necessary State legislation and for appropriation of matching funds. In some cases States have not been able until recently to use all of the money which has been made available, so that the program has not been carried on at the level anticipated when the act was passed. Other States could, of course, have used the full appropriation, had the money been made available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the following table, which shows the action of the Congress in consistently granting more money than has been requested by the Bureau of the Budget for this program. Even with the increased appropriations, however, the full amount has never been appropriated.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Appropriation
1957	$7,500,000	(1)	$7,500,000	$2,050,000
1958	3,000,000	$5,000,000	[2] 5,000,000	5,000,000
1959	3,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
1960	5,150,000	6,000,000	7,500,000	[3] 6,000,000
1961	[4] 7,300,000			

[1] House did not consider request; late supplemental submitted to Senate.
[2] Senate added for first time reallotment provision; accepted by House conferees.
[3] While Senate increase was not accepted, we won an allotment based on authorization—just as good—a supplemental of $130,000 is proposed for later submission.
[4] Estimate proposes continuation of allotment of full authorization.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks excerpts from an article appearing in the January 1960 issue of the "American Library Association Bulletin." This material was prepared by Mr. John G. Lorenz, Director, Library Services Branch, U.S. Office of Education, and indicates in summary form the extent to which the various States and territories have benefited during the first 3 years of this program.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: Four new regional libraries were developed: Wheeler Basin, Choctawhatchee, Coosa Valley, and Carl Elliot regions. Cross Trails region was formed by merger of Covington-Crenshaw and Coffee-Geneva regional libraries; and the Horseshoe Bend Regional Library, by adding two counties to the former Lee-Tallapoosa region. The State staff was strengthened by the addition of 2 field workers and 10 other professional librarians, some of whom are in project libraries. Two regions held in-service training programs. State funds for rural library service increased approximately 50 percent between 1956 and 1959.

Alaska: A major reason for the organization of the first Territorial Department of Library Service in 1955 was to provide Alaska with an agency which could administer the Library Services Act. The Federal program assisted the new agency to add to its small staff and build its book collection. Field trips were made by the agency head to remote areas to develop small community libraries and establish book stations to which books could be mailed from Juneau. Financial grants were made to assist local public libraries. Ten new community libraries were

established. In 1959, under statehood, the territorial department became a division of the State education department.

Arizona: As a result of the Federal program, the Department of Library and Archives received its first State appropriation to establish a new library extension division. Most of the State and Federal funds have been assigned to building a book collection for statewide loan and reference service. Direct bookmobile and consultant service is also being given, statewide, to the limit of equipment and staff available. A cooperative library development project between Yuma city and county has been organized.

Arkansas: Five new regional libraries were developed: Arkansas Valley, Garland-Montgomery, Mississippi-Crittenden, White-Woodruff, and Hempstead-Nevada. Three regions were enlarged and the Southwest Regional Library developed its first bookmobile service. By 1959, the State agency and State grant budgets had both increased by approximately 30 percent over 1956. State funds are now totally supporting four new positions added to the State library agency to carry out the Library Services Act program.

California: The State library strengthened extension services by adding two field consultants and other staff and by purchasing an exhibit bookmobile. A processing center was established at the State library to serve 16 member libraries. Three demonstrations of improved library service were successful. Butte County voted to support bookmobile service. Amador County voted to continue cooperation with San Joaquin County for processing and improved reference and loan services. Lassen and Plumas-Sierra County libraries are coordinating their services under one head librarian. Santa Barbara County, however, did not vote funds for added reference and advisory services.

Colorado: Four field libraries have been added by the State library to work with four regions of the State. A seven-county demonstration in the lower Arkansas Valley was organized with bookmobile service. A similar five-county demonstration has been started in northeastern Colorado, and a single one-county deposit demonstration was established in a mountain county. The State library appropriation increased 17 percent in 1959 over the previous year and local funds in the areas of the State plan increased 10 percent.

Connecticut: A central processing unit and a central book collection were organized in newly rented quarters. Two added field consultants were employed to provide an expanded consultant service in the eastern and western areas of the State. Workshops have been held on public relations, storytelling, and cataloging; and assistance has been given to the State library association in planning a workshop for trustees.

Florida: The State library's extension services have been strengthened by the addition of two public library consultants and by added clerical staff. Increased book purchases have resulted in a 32 percent increase in interlibrary loans. The State library has sponsored two workshops with Florida State University, and one workshop with the State library association. The first regional libraries in Florida were established—Suwannee and St. Lucie-Okeechobee. Two new county libraries were established—Collier and Alachua (by contract with the Gainesville Public Library). Rural library service in Orange, Leon, and Martin Counties was improved.

Georgia: Two new regional libraries were established and eight single county libraries joined other regional systems. Six regional libraries expanded or improved rural service, and 31 improved their reference collections and service through special grants. Seventeen professional staff members were added throughout the regional systems. A study course for library trustees was developed and is being offered through the university's center for continuing education. State and local funds each show an increase of approximately $300,000 between 1956 and 1959.

Guam: The territorial library has been strengthened with the addition of two staff members and an enlargement of the book collection. One staff member has secured professional training. Station collections have been improved and enlarged and a station wagon purchased for deliveries. Arrangements are under way to move the headquarters library in the fall of 1959 to larger quarters.

Hawaii: All rural residents have benefited by strengthening of services from the county libraries of Hawaii, Kauai, and Maui, and from the Library of Hawaii. A bookmobile for adult services has been added, two professional librarians and other staff hired. Science, juvenile and young people's book collections have been strengthened. Arrangements for a professional survey of Hawaii libraries, both public and school, have been completed.

Idaho: Services of the State library have been strengthened by hiring the first trained administrator and by the addition of three more professional librarians. Twice as many books were purchased in the 1957–59 biennium as in the previous 14 years. Six new library districts, five being countywide, were organized as the result of elections. Grants were made to seven district libraries to extend and improve services. The 1957 legislature tripled the biennial appropriation for the State library and increased it further in 1959.

Illinois: Warren County assisted neighboring Henderson County, which had no library, to establish countywide service. Result, a successful vote in Henderson and continuing cooperation between the two counties. The southern Illinois regional library service was made a permanent State regional branch serving 34 counties. Other regional library systems, demonstrated with aid of LSA funds, are Illinois Valley, Prairie Trails, Savanna, and Kaskaskia. Institutes, workshops, and other in-service training meetings were held in area of cataloging, children's work, reference, and cooperative practices. Two annual statewide trustee workshops have been held. State library appropriation has been substantially increased.

Iowa: Major projects were improving book collection and physical facilities of traveling library commission. Contracts were entered into by the State agency with Cherokee, Mason City, Cedar Falls, and Jefferson City to do fieldwork in specific geographical areas of the State. Grants of reference books and special advisory services were made to 87 libraries meeting State standards. Other State agency level highlights are: Increase in travel funds for consultant staff; improvement of book, recording, and library films collection for interlibrary loan service. Leadership training workshops and district meetings were held on improved library planning, public relations, and cooperative projects. Assistance was given to 70 public libraries in improving collections and services.

Kansas: In 1956 the traveling libraries commission had one trained librarian on its staff. Two field librarians and two clerks have been added and larger quarters provided and equipped. Two exhibit bookmobiles have been purchased and a western Kansas extension office was opened in the college library at Hays. Countywide studies were started and the Stevens County report was completed. Regional workshops were held for trustees and others were sponsored for librarians.

Kentucky: Six regional libraries, Kentucky's first, are being developed and include 34 counties. The State staff has been strengthened by addition of three fieldworkers and six other professional librarians working either in the State agency or in the regional systems. The State agency employed a library consultant for a limited period to work with the State legislative reference commission in its survey of the State agency and public library service, including the library laws. The biennial appropriation for the State agency has been increased by $50,000.

Louisiana: The State has accelerated its demonstration program. Five were undertaken in the period 1956–59; Allen, St. Bernard, and Vernon have been successfully completed and two are still under way. A bookmobile service demonstration was successfully completed in Caddo parish with an appropriation of $56,000 before the end of the demonstration period. Ten professional librarians have been added in the demonstrations. A film describing the Louisiana demonstration program and showing the value of library service to Louisiana citizens is in production. It is designed for use on television as well as for group meetings.

Maine: Interstate cooperation was initiated on a film circuit project with New Hampshire and Vermont, as well as cooperation with all other New England States on a film about library development in the New England region. Professional consultants and a specialist in children's work were added to staff; State book collection was expanded and improved; a statewide newsletter and other professional materials were distributed to libraries; and State agency headquarters were improved. Three bookmobiles are giving direct service in designated geographical areas of the State.

Maryland: Two new county libraries, Calvert and Carroll, were established and 13 county libraries improved service. In these counties, 39 percent of the special grants were spent for books; 34 percent for additional staff; 21 percent for bookmobiles, and 6 percent for other equipment. Three counties contracted for technical processing service. Informal cooperative agreements have been developed in several other counties, including exchanges of materials and extension of reciprocal borrowing privileges.

Massachusetts: A fourth State regional library center, in the northeast, was established with personnel, books, bookmobile, and quarters. Services of the other three centers were expanded. A statewide newsletter has been started and an intensive in-service training program conducted in library administration, as well as in cooperative practices. Forty-two surveys of public libraries were made, and an audio-visual center was set up in one of the regions.

Michigan: State agency consultant staff increased, and collection of books for public library development programs was enlarged. Stimulation programs and bookmobile demonstrations in several areas of the State were used to develop new or better library services. First phase of the statewide study by State library staff was completed. Oakland County study was completed and cooperative programs in north Oakland begun. Twelve community libraries in six northwestern counties are receiving books and technical assistance.

Minnesota: The Library Services Act stimulated the enactment of the first State grant program for public libraries. The State agency has been strengthened by the addition of a field worker, clerical staff, and two demonstration bookmobiles film service, and publication and inservice training programs have been expanded. Five new regional libraries serving five counties and two new county libraries have been established. Library service is available for first time to 68,000 rural residents and improved service to 269,000.

Mississippi: Two new regional libraries were established; one county library extended service to an adjoining county by

contract; one established regional library added another county, another increased its tax millage, and a third doubled its book budget. One new county system was established. The State agency has been strengthened by addition of six professional staff members (including four field librarians), and by increased book and essential equipment purchases. A statewide conference on book selection resulted in improved book resources in local libraries. Forty-two counties strengthened services through larger book collections, improvement of physical facilities, and addition of bookmobiles and branches.

Missouri: Three regional libraries of three counties each have been established. Four independent town libraries have merged with their respective county libraries, resulting in strengthened services for all. Two years of a three-year series of inservice training institutes have been completed. The addition of two field librarians and one other professional librarian has resulted in closer relationship between the State and local libraries. New teletype service from the State library has increased interlibrary loan transactions by 4,000 in 1 year. The State agency produced a kinescope for TV and local library usage and a sound and color filmstrip entitled "Building Your Regional Library." Ten scholarships of $2,000 each have been awarded. Two recipients have completed their courses and are at work in rural Missouri libraries.

Montana: Two federations of libraries were organized—the northwest federation serving 2 counties with 4 libraries, and the Five Valley federation serving 7 counties with 7 libraries and 13 branches. Bookmobile service and centralized ordering, cataloging, and processing are provided. A statewide film circuit has been established with the Great Falls Public Library as the center. The State Library Extension Commission has been strengthened with the addition of two professional librarians and clerical staff. The agency has moved to larger quarters.

Nebraska: The south central regional library was established to serve Harlan, Phelps, Franklin, and part of Kearney Counties. Bookmobile service has been extended and film services started. Bookmobile service has also been established by the Rock County Library, and the service is extended to Loup and Keya Paha Counties. The public library commission has employed a consultant to supervise projects under the program. The first statewide meeting of trustees was held as a Governor's conference.

Nevada: A survey of public service in the State was made by a special consultant; the report recommended centralized cataloging, the use of bookmobiles, and the formation of three regional centers to be supported through cooperative financing. Two bookmobiles were demonstrated statewide as part of a library promotion project, directed by a special consultant. Centralized cataloging has been started at the State library for six county libraries. Grants have been made to eight county libraries for improving services such as lengthening hours of service and adding to the book collection. The State library has opened a branch office in Las Vegas.

New Hampshire: A new branch of the State library has been established and other branches strengthened. Four new bookmobiles have been assigned to State branches, 2 field consultants added to the State staff, and 80 workshops held. At the State library, a 15-percent increase in book stock increased interlibrary loans 47 percent. A unique statewide public relations program by a professional firm has increased library awareness and local library support substantially.

New Jersey: A State agency tricounty library service center has been set up in southern New Jersey with a staff of six and a bookmobile to serve Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties. Book loans exceeded 113,000 in less than 1½ years. Staff was added at the State agency for more extensive field work; new automotive and office equipment was purchased to handle demands from the field; lists of new books purchased by the State agency were distributed to all libraries; and regional institutes, clinics, and workshops, and a statewide 2-day trustee workshop were held.

New Mexico: Four regional branches of the State library have been established, serving 21 of the State's 32 counties. Each region has a bookmobile, station wagon, and professional and clerical staff. Centralized cataloging for the regions has been started. Personnel have been added at the State library commission to handle special requests and reference questions. A workshop for trustees has been held.

New York: Seven field advisory positions were added, including specialists in young adult, reference, and children's services. A demonstration bookmobile was used in development of library systems. Other significant developments: a communication network by telephone and teletypewriter among local and regional libraries and State library; a substantial scholarship program; 51 regional workshops particularly in reference and children's library work; six film circuits, and a central collection of recordings developed.

North Carolina: A regional library, Northwestern, was formed by Allegheny, Stokes, and Surry counties; and a county library, Brunswick, was established. Rural library service improved in 82 of the State's 100 counties under plans submitted by 64 counties and 8 regional library systems. Fifty of the plans called for additional book and staff resources, and 32 called for extended bookmobile service. One field librarian and three other professional librarians, including a specialist in adult services, have been added to the State staff. Reference and interlibrary loan services of the State library were strengthened and teletype connection set up with the interlibrary center at the university.

North Dakota: Three regional libraries have been organized, and four bookmobiles serve six counties. Another bookmobile, purchased with federated women's club funds, is used on exhibit. A 1957 law enabled establishment of county libraries if 51 percent of the voters sign petitions. A county tax levy is made when the library is voted and State funds are granted until local tax collections are made.

Ohio: Annual book purchases for State agency were tripled. The State library provides bookmobile service to two bicounty systems. Demonstrations of improved service to Wood and Hardin Counties were successfully completed. Bookmobile grants were made to five counties; centralized processing center for 12 libraries in eastern Ohio was established; and a series of workshops on selection and reference work were held.

Oklahoma: One of the first two regional library demonstrations was successfully completed with establishment of the Cleveland-Garvin-McClain Multi-County Library. Although the Osage-Pawnee multicounty demonstration failed to secure continuing local appropriations, the existing local libraries were strengthened and received larger local appropriations. The State's library extension division program has been greatly strengthened through addition of two field librarians and four other professional librarians, including an adult services specialist. Additional books and equipment, and an exhibit bookmobile have also contributed to the library development program.

Oregon: The first State grant program for public libraries was established in 1957 to match Federal funds, and grants have been made to nine counties. Three multicounty demonstrations have been started, five bookmobiles purchased and three field consultants employed. Centralized cataloging has been started in Clackamas County and in the north coastal region. Trustees and Jaycees have helped to carry on an active library promotion program.

Pennsylvania: State agency increased its professional staff, improved its book collection, and reorganized its administrative structure. An extensive workshop and field visit program was carried out and a statewide conference for library trustees held. A survey of present and potential library service was made, which led to the creation of a Governor's commission on public library development, to implement the recommendations of the survey.

Puerto Rico: The Commonwealth's established program for extension of service through community libraries, bookmobile service, libraries in rural housing projects, and traveling libraries for rural barrios has been greatly strengthened with added materials and clerical staff to help in processing these materials. With the arrival of the eighth bookmobile in the Commonwealth, 65 new community stops have been added. Seventy-seven traveling library collections and nine housing project libraries have also been added to the service. Information about the public library program has been widely distributed through TV and radio programs, newspapers, educational publications, and library exhibits.

Rhode Island: A special unit of the secretary of state's office, public library services in rural areas, was organized to administer the LSA program. A director, assistant director, clerical staff, and a bookmobile were added and new quarters were obtained. A book grant to rural libraries program, stressing reference materials was initiated. Books are ordered and processed by the State agency. A series of workshops have been held at headquarters. State consultant and bookmobile service has steadily increased.

South Carolina: A new regional library has been legally established by Aiken, Barnwell, and Edgefield Counties. The independent libraries of Anderson County merged to establish a county system. As special projects, 10 county library systems received grants of $2,500 each for improved reference materials and services, and 6 library systems participated in the personnel project grants for the employment of intern trainees under a work-study program. Improved reference materials at the State library resulted in a 1,000-percent increase in interlibrary loan requests filled. Expansion and strengthening of the State agency services have been aided by the addition of a field librarian and two other professional librarians, including a reference services specialist.

South Dakota: Two regional libraries have been organized and preliminary work has been started for the third. In the northwest regional library, Butte and Harding Counties have voted support, and in the northeastern part of the State, Brown County has also voted county library support. Centralized cataloging and processing is provided by the State library for the regional libraries, and bookmobiles have been placed in service. The State agency moved to larger quarters.

Tennessee: A new regional library service center was established. A 2-year demonstration of service to seven counties successfully ended when each county formally affiliated with the regional center conducting the demonstration. Improvement of rural library service was undertaken by three metropolitan library systems through contract with the State library. Ten professional librarians have been added in the statewide program. An added State fieldworker has enabled the State library to organize its first statewide trustee institute and the first statewide meeting of all regional service

center personnel. The State library's appropriation for public library service was increased by $50,000 a year. The legislature passed an act providing for a study by the State legislative council of the State's public library program.

Texas: A special staff of 10 (including a director, 2 regional supervisors, and project and bookmobile librarians) was added for rural library service, to work in close cooperation with the extension division. The program of 1-year multicounty bookmobile demonstrations is moving ahead and bringing the first public library service to many areas, as well as encouraging greater cooperation among existing public libraries. The first regional library demonstration is now underway in the coastal bend area centering around Corpus Christi. Nine workshops on better library practices have been held in regional locations and the first statewide trustees institute was held in 1959.

Utah: The legislature established its State library in 1957 and organization of the agency was the primary activity in the first year. Four bookmobiles have been purchased. Demonstrations are being provided to nine counties in two regions with the use of two bookmobiles. The State library appropriation for 1960–61 was increased from $100,000 to $125,000, and the support for local libraries has also shown a marked increase.

Vermont: Five new bookmobiles, nine added staff members, and more books and library equipment have materially strengthened the State's program and its regional centers. More field visits and workshop programs have been accomplished and cooperative programs between libraries have increased. Vermont is cooperating with New Hampshire on a joint publication, "North Country Libraries."

Virginia: The regional demonstration program in the State has been strengthened with books, equipment, and personnel. The Eastern Shore regional demonstration has been successfully completed and a demonstration is now underway in Wise County (a city-county region). Already established county and regional libraries have received funds to strengthen their programs through books, personnel, and equipment, including new bookmobiles and extended bookmobile schedules. The State library extension division has been strengthened by the addition of staff, and materials and equipment to improve their consultant work with the local libraries. Under the scholarship program, six scholarships have been awarded.

Virgin Islands: The islands' centralized library service has been strengthened through a great increase in materials and by staff to process them. Many new library service outlets have been opened. St. Johns Island has its first permanent library branch, and traveling library service to other points of the island. St. Croix Island has the first bookmobile in the islands as well as materials and equipment to improve the libraries in towns of Christiansted and Fredericksted. The central library of St. Thomas is now open more hours, and has improved its book collection. The legislature has appropriated $12,500 in added funds for rural library extension in the past 2 years.

Washington: The Columbia River Regional Library was established to serve Chelan, Douglas, Ferry, Grant, and Okanagan Counties, which cover an area of 15,000 square miles. A bookmobile operates from the headquarters at Wenatchee, and another from each of the subcenters at Omak and Moses Lake. Staff specialists have been employed for the major services and 56,000 books have been added to the region. Recordings and films are also available. Book catalogs for all libraries in the region have been provided. A color film, "Yours for the Asking," on regional library service was prepared by the State library.

West Virginia: The State commission initiated centralized book ordering and processing for its regional program, and expanded its staff and public relations activities. New quarters for agency were acquired; three bookmobiles were purchased; and a film on library use and development was produced. One demonstration, in Harrison-Upshur Counties, was successful; and another was started in Marshall County. Reference collections of 16 libraries were strengthened, and training in use of reference materials was given.

Wisconsin: Eight staff members were added to increase services; and book collection was increased to improve reference and loan work, in response to local library requests. A more intensive workshop program was undertaken, and a statewide trustee conference was called by the Governor. Demonstration bookmobiles have been used in several counties and regions. The Milwaukee Public Library received a grant for extension of its services to rural areas around Milwaukee via bookmobile. A library processing center was set up for 18 libraries in a 5-county area. Scholarship funds for library training have been made available and a grant was made to the University of Wisconsin for a statewide library study.

Two more States in the fourth year—Delaware and Wyoming—submitted State plans for fiscal 1960 which were approved and are now in effect, bringing the total number of States and territories participating to 52. Allotments for the fourth year are on the basis of the maximum authorized appropriation, $7.5 million.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in my own State of Alabama the Library Services Act has been of great benefit.

It has resulted in a local, State, and Federal effort which has provided new or improved library services for 707,705 people; increased State appropriations for library services from $108,100 to $179,695; increased local support for library services from $1,097,813 to more than $1,595,156; increased statewide support for library service from 36 cents per capita to 52 cents per capita.

Mr. President, it has also resulted in the establishment or expansion of the following regional libraries: Coosa Valley Regional Library; Horseshoe Bend Regional Library; Wheeler Basin Regional Library; Choctawhatchee Regional Library; Cross Trails Regional Library, and Carl Elliott Regional Library. New bookmobiles have been provided for Coosa Valley Regional Library; Coffee-Geneva Regional Library; Wheeler Basin Regional Library; Choctawhatchee Regional Library; Walker County Library; Horseshoe Bend Regional Library.

In spite of all this progress for Alabama, there is still a great need for assistance in this area.

Alabama still has 6 counties without free public library service; 33 counties without effective means of serving entire population; at least 20 counties with significant plans for improved library service, such as, further regional library development and expansion; and 3 counties giving bookmobile service without a trained librarian.

Mr. President, I am sure that if the Congress will approve the extension of this program, Alabama and all other States will use library service funds to good advantage to promote and crystallize local incentive, and to develop and strengthen library services throughout the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the Federal payment to States under the Library Services Act for each of the 4 years in which the program has been in operation. This table was prepared by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal payments to States under the Library Services Act (Public Law 597, 84th Cong., 2d sess.)

States	1957	1958	1959	[1] 1960
Alabama	$40,000	$139,644	$161,369	$207,576
Alaska		40,000	40,000	44,647
Arizona	40,000	58,514	63,528	72,485
Arkansas	40,000	114,812	130,203	164,544
California	40,000	158,520	184,362	239,322
Colorado	40,000	68,592	74,826	88,084
Connecticut	40,000	65,812	68,413	86,919
Delaware				48,301
Florida		95,308	116,083	146,259
Georgia	40,000	149,159	172,959	223,578
Hawaii	40,000	48,971	50,927	55,087
Idaho		62,412	83,293	88,416
Illinois	40,000	142,780	177,739	230,178
Indiana				
Iowa	40,000	102,604	105,849	213,719
Kansas		71,649	64,543	76,860
Kentucky	40,000	147,746	171,239	221,203
Louisiana	40,000	110,170	125,470	158,010
Maine		103,250	71,159	83,021
Maryland		66,000	51,336	71,550
Massachusetts	40,000	78,487	78,000	80,000
Michigan	40,000	146,547	171,799	221,976
Minnesota	40,000	130,565	135,750	172,203
Mississippi	40,000	131,012	150,856	193,061
Missouri	40,000	119,936	133,847	200,736
Montana	40,000	59,282	63,486	72,427
Nebraska	40,000	77,030	89,626	108,519
Nevada		43,757	56,272	70,141
New Hampshire	40,000	53,112	55,971	62,051
New Jersey	40,000	74,163	85,783	97,403
New Mexico	40,000	59,647	63,931	73,042
New York	40,000	164,365	191,482	249,152
North Carolina	40,000	195,986	229,997	302,331
North Dakota	40,000	66,337	72,079	84,291
Ohio	40,000	177,140	207,041	270,635
Oklahoma	40,000	97,570	100,063	134,239
Oregon	40,000	80,651	89,514	89,514
Pennsylvania		187,882	85,472	237,257
Rhode Island		40,000	45,587	54,197
South Carolina	40,000	117,541	69,270	141,241
South Dakota	40,000	65,248	70,753	82,462
Tennessee	40,000	146,494	169,714	219,097
Texas	40,000	138,494	205,606	313,582
Utah		67,868	70,185	74,658
Vermont	40,000	66,609	56,937	63,385
Virginia	40,000	141,830	164,032	211,253
Washington		130,714	101,770	125,287
West Virginia	40,000	115,917	132,470	130,627
Wisconsin	40,000	118,606	132,450	190,468
Wyoming				50,291
Puerto Rico		50,000	110,000	220,000
Virgin Islands		20,641	10,782	11,079
Guam		12,970	13,980	15,495
Total	1,440,000	4,922,344	5,327,803	7,314,467

[1] Estimated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ENCOURAGING EDUCATION AND STRENGTHENING THE STATES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, debate about Federal aid for education has swirled over the land for more than a decade.

Presidential message after Presidential message on the subject has been dispatched to the Congress and the country. Bills of every size and shape have clogged the hopper. Legislative proposals on the subject have paraded up and down committee calendars, and back and forth between the Houses of Congress.

All to no avail. No new national policy has evolved, no major legislation has been placed on the statute books.

As a practical matter, the impasse on the question of racial segregation, as well as the threat of inflation, greatly reduces the likelihood of enacting any bill allocating Federal money for public education.

Instead of continuing the fight on the same old battlegrounds, firing the same old arguments and the same rebuttals, I believe the time has come to look for agreement and for action in new directions. And make no mistake about it, we urgently need to agree. The educational needs of our youth pose one of the severest challenges of our day.

A great Nation which can agree on devoting funds and resources to its pines and its pigs can surely find an acceptable way to aid its pupils.

In 1957 the Federal Government spent three times as much money on pigs as it spent in support of the Nation's system of 68 land-grant colleges and universities. It spent almost as much supporting the price of peanuts as it did in boosting education in the high schools of the country. Federal spending for trees exceeds the direct spending on public school pupils.

Our programs for fish and ducks in 1958 exceeded our spending on general, nationwide public education.

Surely our childlife deserves as much as our wildlife. Our pupils deserve as much as our pigs, pines, or peanuts.

It is with the hope of pointing out a new direction which might lead to agreement and action that I offer my first suggestions in this field.

I believe the best way to aid education is to strengthen the States—strengthen their responsibility for education, and their ability to discharge that responsibility.

Most Federal grant-in-aid programs emphasize the Federal leadership. They are hedged with careful and complete restrictions. They are enacted with a full set of criteria; and the States must conform if they are to get their share. In such an aid program, the State has about as much responsibility and authority as a puppet.

A Federal aid for education program which followed this model would be a disaster for education, for the States, and for the Nation.

A successful program for aid to education must enhance the State's authority as well as its ability.

Both the proposals I am offering meet these tests.

One of the two bills I am offering would return to the States, for educational purposes only, 2 cents of the Federal tax imposed on each package of cigarettes consumed in the State. In addition, it would repeal certain Federal educational programs and thus leave the States free to carry them on without Federal restraints or redtape.

The other bill I am proposing would simply return to the States, for educational use, the equivalent of 1 cent per package of cigarettes consumed in the State, without any reduction in Federal programs.

I offer them as alternative approaches to the problem.

The Federal tax on cigarettes is 8 cents a package, and it produces annual revenues in excess of $1.5 billion. Return of 1 cent of this tax would restore about $180 million a year to the States; 2 cents would return about $360 million.

The functions which would be turned wholly over to the States by the one bill would cost the Federal Government about $148 million a year under present authorizations. These functions are: Vocational education programs, and provisions of the National Defense Education Act making grants to the States for purchase of teaching equipment—title III; for programs of testing and guidance and counseling—title V, part A; area vocational education programs—title VIII; and grants for State education statistics—section 1009.

First. These bills would not extend Federal aid as such. They simply would restore to the States some of their own money, tax revenues collected within the State from its own citizens. Congress need not concern itself with the question of the use of these funds by the States for maintaining segregated schools, for transportation to private or religious schools, or any other similar vexatious issue because every cent furnished each State would come from the pockets of the taxpayers of that State and simply be returned. No Federal funds, in a strict meaning of the term, would be involved. Furthermore, because of the direct correlation between the source and the distribution of the funds, these proposals do not run afoul of the usual arguments of budget officials against earmarking. Unlike the earmarking of gasoline taxes for the highway program, my proposals would return to each State the exact amount collected within the State and only that exact amount.

Second. The bills would not shatter the Federal budget. Furthermore, one of them compensates for a part of the revenue shift by turning over specific functions to the States.

Third. They will not require a great Federal bureaucracy to administer and operate. The task of computing the amount to be returned to each State will be relatively simple. At least 42 States now tax cigarettes. So, each State's share of the Federal collections can be determined from the State tax receipts, or from per capita cigarette consumption figures where there is no State tax.

Fourth. The bills will strengthen the States. The funds will be directly available to them for improving their programs of public education. While the funds returned to the States would be earmarked for education, the Federal restrictions would end right there. The money could be used for construction, for equipment, for salaries, for vocational education, or in any other way the State might decide. The Federal controversies about the use of funds, the control of education, and the question of integration would all be avoided. States could put the money to work meeting the most pressing educational needs within their own borders with greater flexibility and efficiency than they can now.

Fifth. Furthermore, this approach lends itself to a complete withdrawal of the Federal Government. Once the shift of revenues and functions is completed, it will be an easy matter for the States to increase and the Federal Government to reduce the cigarette tax so that even the collection functions will be entirely within the control of the States.

Sixth. The Federal programs relinquished to the States will concentrate the responsibility in a constructive, effective way. They are programs which the States are well qualified to assume in full because they already bear a large share of the responsibility for them.

Mr. President, I digress to state that this proposal is completely in line with the efforts of the conference of Governors of the States, which for many years, and more intensely of late, has sought to have the Federal Government, so far as it can afford to do so, relinquish certain taxes or certain fields of taxation to the States, in order that the States may not be drained of their resources and may raise their own money for their own necessary functions and purposes.

Mr. President, I would be the last to contend that either of these bills represents the perfect solution to the vexing educational problems of today. But they avoid the blind alleys and dead ends which have halted progress of every other proposal for aid to education in the past decade. I believe they deserve careful consideration from every person who is interested in the welfare of public education in America.

I further believe that proposals of this type—perhaps not exactly as I have prepared them, but proposals of this type—constitute the only real chance of getting some aid for education from this or any of the immediately succeeding sessions of Congress.

Mr. President, I introduce these bills at this time so that Members may have a chance to look them over before debate opens on Federal aid to education. I introduce and send these two bills to the desk for appropriate reference. It is my present plan to offer one or both of these alternatives as a substitute for or as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the measure now on the calendar, which will be considered shortly by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. COTTON, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2831. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 2832. A bill to strengthen State governments to provide financial assistance to

States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 18, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14 (legislative day, January 13), 1960:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class one, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen, vice Raymond A. Hare.

Tyler Thompson, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland, vice John J. Muccio.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clifford O'Sullivan, of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit, vice Charles C. Simons, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska; new position.

C. Nils Tavares, of Hawaii, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Hawaii; new position.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Kenneth G. Bergquist, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho for a term of 4 years, vice Ben Peterson, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

Gilbert B. Scheller, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois for a term of 4 years, vice William J. Littell, resigned.

Dudley G. Skinker, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years, vice Carlton G. Beall, resigned.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by laws and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

J. Richard Crout
Hilde S. Schlezinger

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Michael Ogden	Isao Hoshiwara
Richard L. Brent	Charles R. Cain
Richard A. Cain	George N. Cavros
David J. Bender	Harry H. Marsh, III
Julian A. Waller	Milton B. Moore, Jr.
Jacob R. Fishman	Winsor V. Morrison
John S. Fletcher	

To be assistant surgeon

Arthur Maron

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Robert G. Hansen

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Alice E. Duncan

To be assistant pharmacist

Hyam N. Eglash

To be senior assistant health services officers

John F. Roatch	Robert M. Beauregard
Robert J. Mahon	Karst J. Besteman
Paul E. Jones	

III. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

George L. Harlow

To be senior assistant pharmacists

George R. Hall
John H. Herath

ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Frank E. Barr, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Eugene J. Lyons.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Line of the Air Force

Abbott, William H., 36628A.
Abernathy, George E., 36851A.
Adair, Donald A., 36635A.
Adair, Luther E., Jr., 17299A.
Adams, Donald D., 17253A.
Adams, Harry J., 17539A.
Adams, Kenneth D., 35900A.
Adams, Ranald T., Jr., 17336A.
Adams, William D., 36775A.
Adcock, Walter M., 36890A.
Adden, William L., 36333A.
Ahlborn, Robert H., 36379A.
Aldrich, Allen R., 36314A.
Alexander, James H., 52251A.
Alexander, Robert C., 36434A.
Alexander, Thomas D., 36050A.
Allard, Lionel C., Jr., 24331A.
Allen, Lew, Jr., 17342A.
Allen, Ralph G., Jr., 17911A.
Allery, Kenneth E., 36093A.
Allison, John S., 21479A.
Allison, Robert M., 52312A.
Alloway, Hillard C., 36167A.
Alloway, William G., 36102A.
Almes, Guy C., 36012A.
Altiere, Fred J., 36079A.
Alverson, Henry A., 37065A.
Alverson, Richard C., 36482A.
Ambrose, Earle H., 36335A.
Ames, James R., 35945A.
Amos, Clarence A., 36671A.
Amos, Leon W., 26830A.
Andersen, Chris E., 36873A.
Anderson, Carroll R., 36479A.
Anderson, Charles T., 52094A.
Anderson, Daniel, Jr., 52158A.
Anderson, Donald L., 36065A.
Anderson, Franklin L., 36141A.
Anderson, Hunter W., 17737A.
Anderson, John B., 36552A.
Anderson, John L., 35968A.
Anderson, Ted E., 36574A.
Andonian, Harry, 52039A.
Andrew, John H., 36296A.
Andrew, Sam H., Jr., 37012A.
Andrews, Robert J., 52200A.
Anenson, Lester N., 52077A.
Appel, Kenneth J., 35970A.
Arasmith, Lester L., 35941A.
Arentson, Robert M., 52197A.
Armer, Willis L., 36774A.
Armstrong, Lloyd R., 36069A.
Arndt, Paul C., 22726A.
Arnold, George P., 52068A.
Arnold, Hendrick J., 36874A.
Arnold, Tommy R., Jr., 36993A.
Asher, Clifford L., 52301A.
Ashley, William G., 36571A.
Atchley, Robert M., 36011A.
Atkinson, Anderson W., 17339A.
Augustyn, Frank J., 17308A.
Ausfahl, Carl B., 36154A.
Austin, David A., 26422A.
Austin, Harold R., 37040A.
Austin, Louis C., Jr., 36354A.
Avery, Richard H., 36170A.
Bachtell, Linford B., 17989A.
Bacon, George W., 36758A.
Bagby, Donald W., 37002A.
Bailey, Carl E., Jr., 36152A.
Bailey, Joseph D., 21508A.
Bain, James, 36368A.
Baisden, Orville R., 24336A.
Baisley, William D., 17386A.
Baker, Herman W., 21475A.
Baker, Richard D., 36241A.
Baker, Samuel E., 36153A.
Baldridge, William J., 35996A.
Ball, Robert O., Jr., 36655A.
Ballard, James F., 36609A.
Bally, William J., Jr., 36589A.
Barker, Harrison H., Jr., 36976A.
Barker, Herbert R., 36047A.
Barker, James L., 52243A.
Barker, Paul W., 36196A.
Barksdale, Thomas H., Jr., 48797A.
Barnard, Ralph P., 52028A.
Barnwell, James S., Jr., 36228A.
Barr, Thomas J., 17307A.
Barre, Louis A., 3d, 20753A.
Barrentine, Emmett S., Jr., 27679A.
Barricklow, John A., 17370A.
Barron, Thomas P., 36554A.
Barrow, Ruffin C., 37008A.
Bartholf, John C., 17502A.
Bartlett, James B., 52148A.
Bartlett, Paul V., 35919A.
Bartlett, Thayer E., 36158A.
Barton, Bernard H., 36844A.
Bash, Darrell S., 52102A.
Bass, Bernie S., 36743A.
Bassett, John K., 17562A.
Bates, Edgar A., Jr., 36886A.
Baumann, Kenneth W., 23737A.
Baumann, Lee S., 36615A.
Baxter, William D., 17530A.
Beam, John B., 36695A.
Bean, Tarleton S., Jr., 37124A.
Beane, Walter O., Jr., 36021A.
Beasley, Carlos O., 52080A.
Beaumont, Charles R., Jr., 36226A.
Beavers, Luther M., Jr., 52091A.
Bechtold, Louis A., 17259A.
Beck, William J., 36918A.
Becker, William R., 36373A.
Beckley, Samuel R., 36018A.
Beebe, Donald E., 22755A.
Beecham, Charles N., 36626A.
Behr, Robert M., 21515A.
Beinkemper, Elmer H., 36513A.
Bell, Ben, 36673A.
Bell, Donald F., 37069A.
Bell, Paul E., 26466A.
Bell, Woodrow M., 36316A.
Bellis, Benjamin N., 17330A.
Benedict, James E., 3d, 36171A.
Benit, Henry J., 35982A.
Benner, James W., 36275A.
Bennett, Charles F., 26686A.
Bennett, Hugh C., 52204A.
Bennett, Samuel L., 37016A.
Bennington, Lewis R., 36850A.
Benschine, Edward, Jr., 36932A.
Bensey, Clyde S., 36579A.
Benton, Ernest L., 36608A.
Berge, Truman K., 17376A.
Bergeson, Charles M., 52213A.
Berneburg, Laverne L., 36342A.
Berry, Waldron, 17480A.
Beville, Ulmont U., Jr., 36985A.
Bieber, Robert W., 17739A.
Billman, Joe T., 36334A.
Bilyeu, Hiram P., 36204A.
Birdsall, Alan H., 17429A.
Birkland, Robert K., 35971A.
Birtwistle, Owen G., 52295A.
Bishop, Robert M., 35940A.
Bjorgen, Leonard L., 17270A.
Black, Vincent A., 36973A.

Blades, Leo L., 17250A.
Blake, Thomas A., 23698A.
Blanton, Clarence F., 36336A.
Blanton, Dwight W., 36070A.
Blanton, Eugene T., 36826A.
Blanton, William J., 17553A.
Bleakley, Ernest E., 36727A.
Bleau, Raymond R., 25807A.
Bledsoe, Carroll H., 22682A.
Blodgett, Warren S., 52029A.
Bloom, John P., 36713A.
Blos, Richard G., 52224A.
Bobo, Robert K., 52287A.
Boehm, Paul F., 17546A.
Bogan, Robert J., 52247A.
Boland, Thompson S., 36595A.
Boll, Raymond M., 36474A.
Bollinger, Walter L., 36396A.
Bolton, Wayne F., 52171A.
Bombyk, Stanley, 52238A.
Bond, Oscar L., Jr., 36803A.
Bonseigneur, Paul J., Jr., 28216A.
Bordeaux, Lyle B., 52268A.
Boswell, Marion L., 17719A.
Bouchard, Edmund M., 52072A.
Bowe, Donovan K., 36509A.
Bowman, Robert L., 37096A.
Boyce, Harris S., 37022A.
Boyce, Robert E., 36157A.
Boyd, Charles W., 36505A.
Boyd, Harwell L., Jr., 37047A.
Boyd, Lawrence A., 52129A.
Boyles, Howard H., Jr., 36724A.
Bozman, Dale A., 36286A.
Bradburn, David D., 17335A.
Bradford, Joseph E., 36580A.
Bradley, Richard W., 37053A.
Bradshaw, Cecil C., 35998A.
Brady, Aubrey L., 36110A.
Branch, Robert, Sr., 36598A.
Brandon, Jack J., 36974A.
Brant, Edward L., 36023A.
Brasseux, Emmett L., 37072A.
Brechwald, Edward J., 17363A.
Bresett, Charles K., 51687A.
Brewer, Harry E., 36808A.
Brewer, Martin M., 36929A.
Brewster, Ernest J., 36351A.
Briarton, Henry R., 52321A.
Brice, Kenneth B., 52142A.
Bridge, Charles F., 36804A.
Bridgers, Sam, Jr., 17296A.
Briggs, John A., 35959A.
Bright, William M., 35960A.
Brink, James N., 36362A.
Brock, George W., 36950A.
Brock, James E., 35997A.
Broderick, William P., 36709A.
Brookbank, William C., 36523A.
Brooks, Glenn L., 36428A.
Brooks, John P., 36975A.
Brothers, William W., Jr., 17359A.
Brown, Byron K., 37076A.
Brown, Charles L., 21512A.
Brown, Cortez C., 36654A.
Brown, Earle P., 36309A.
Brown, Elton D., 36701A.
Brown, Elzie C., Jr., 36008A.
Brown, Frank B., 35933A.
Brown, Gordon S., 36799A.
Brown, John C., 36915A.
Brown, Lawrence E., 36623A.
Brown, Russell J., 36897A.
Brownlee, Francis L., 36967A.
Brunelle, Albert F., 52168A.
Bryan, Donald W., 17302A.
Byrant, James A., 52178A.
Buchanan, Allen E., 36516A.
Buchanan, Frank A., Jr., 52180A.
Buck, Wendell R., 37033A.
Buckingham, Charles E., 17483A.
Buckley, Robert C., 17352A.
Buckner, James C., 26763A.
Bugal, Richard L., 36328A.
Buie, John H., 36099A.
Buihner, Norman E., 36597A.
Bullock, Frederick E., 52288A.
Bullock, William G., 52121A.
Bunge, Howard T., 17567A.
Bunn, Dewitt R., 17557A.
Burak, Carl, 36642A.
Burcham, Lee A., 17305A.
Burda, Theodore A., 36605A.
Burger, Robert J., 36914A.
Burgess, Leon M., 37019A.
Burgess, Richard B., 17383A.
Burke, Arthur R., 36324A.
Burke, Robert O., 17453A.
Burkett, Daniel L., 17571A.
Burkhart, Morris C., 36536A.
Burkle, Henry, 36999A.
Burnes, Arthur G., 36290A.
Burnett, Maurice G., 52047A.
Burnham, Robert E., 37034A.
Burnham, Welbon D., 22640A.
Burns, John J., 28203A.
Burrell, Harry R., 36384A.
Burriss, Richard C., 22641A.
Burson, George S., 36365A.
Burtenshaw, Edward C., 36164A.
Burton, Edward C., 52241A.
Burton, James A., 16485A.
Butler, Eugene R., 52114A.
Butler, Thurman B., 36951A.
Byram, Wallace G., 36838A.
Caldwell, John W., III, 36131A.
Calfee, Fred H., 36969A.
Call, Clair R., 36198A.
Callahan, Charles, 36762A.
Calmes, William P., 25519A.
Camara, John L., 37015A.
Cameron, Carl C., 36832A.
Cameron, William, III, 39758A.
Campbell, Ernest E., 35958A.
Campbell, Harvey H., 37105A.
Campbell, James M., 36195A.
Campbell, Milton A., 36624A.
Cap, George W., 52048A.
Capps, Lloyd L., 52036A.
Caram, John C., 52079A.
Caramia, Dominick J., 36527A.
Carbine, James T., Jr., 17445A.
Card, Billie E., 36261A.
Carey, Robert L., 36736A.
Carlisle, Jason J., 37086A.
Carlsen, Carl R., 36630A.
Carney, Gilbert J., 36121A.
Carnright, Richard G., 17455A.
Carpenter, William W., Jr., 26458A.
Carper, Morris E., 36210A.
Carrington, William H., 36049A.
Carroll, Bill J., 17292A.
Carroll, Sterling P., 36961A.
Carroll, Thomas L., 17313A.
Carson, Frederick B., 35962A.
Carson, James S., 52255A.
Carter, Duffey A., 36270A.
Carter, Jack E., 36242A.
Carter, Morris A., Jr., 36364A.
Carter, Ray I., 36263A.
Caruthers, Marion F., 36145A.
Casey, Maurice F., 36992A.
Casteel, Carleton N., 52065A.
Castle, Johnny R., 17446A.
Casto, Dayton C., Jr., 36990A.
Catching, Robert M., 36525A.
Cathcart, Charles E., 17300A.
Caton, James O., 36534A.
Cavanaugh, Thomas J., 52149A.
Cayton, Cecil B., 36426A.
Cerny, Louis C., 36062A.
Chambless, William F., Jr., 36114A.
Champion, William H., 36057A.
Chandler, Van E., 26427A.
Chandler, Vernon L., 36449A.
Chapman, Kenneth R., 17362A.
Chappell, William R., 52056A.
Charpilloz, Kenneth L., 36346A.
Chastain, John W., 35907A.
Chatfield, James D. L., 17515A.
Cheever, Charles T., 36034A.
Chenault, Millard W., 36185A.
Childers, Raymond R., 48794A.
Chille, Peter J., 17231A.
Chrisco, Sam D., 36439A.
Christensen, Keith L., 22639A.
Christian, Harrison G., 36907A.
Christian, Paul R., 36585A.
Christian, William E., 36436A.
Chronis, George H., 36645A.
Clancy, Orville W., 36620A.
Clapper, Robert E., 36910A.
Clark, Carlton H., 36122A.
Clark, Charles R., 36088A.
Clark, Eubert W., 26775A.
Clark, Philip S., 52264A.
Clary, Barney H., 36325A.
Clayton, Gerald H., 52089A.
Clem, James H., 36487A.
Clemenson, Robert C., 17385A.
Clement, Lewis S., Jr., 25820A.
Clift, William H., 36235A.
Clifton, David S., 52151A.
Cocks, Samuel W., 36903A.
Cofield, William B., 52225A.
Cogburn, Charles S., Jr., 28190A.
Coghlan, Jack V., Jr., 36163A.
Cohlmia, George V., 36393A.
Coke, Paul E., 25500A.
Cole, Frank E., 17338A.
Cole, James R., 52256A.
Coleman, James A., 36617A.
Coleman, William R., 52049A.
Colladay, Martin G., 17344A.
Collins, Billy C., 36877A.
Collins, John J., 36380A.
Colman, Seymour I., 37027A.
Commins, Robert E., 26672A.
Conelly, Arthur B., 36549A.
Cones, Ernest R., 36440A.
Conners, Ralph W., 52130A.
Connor, Roy J., 25824A.
Cook, Harold L., 35952A.
Cook, Henry E., 35981A.
Cook, William R., 36350A.
Coombs, Robert P., 36849A.
Cooper, Bob E., 52037A.
Cooper, Edwin H., 36215A.
Cooper, Howard M., 36553A.
Corrao, Nicholas A., 37109A.
Corroppoli, Vincent E., 35918A.
Cothern, Billie R., 36861A.
Cothran, Harold R., 35913A.
Cottrill, Ronald M., 36255A.
Counts, Dave, 24718A.
Courtney, Richard D., 36558A.
Covington, James C., 37093A.
Cox, Dyson W., 36162A.
Cox, Joe C., 35906A.
Cragg, William J., 52156A.
Cramer, Darrell S., 22758A.
Cramer, Thomas L., 36377A.
Crawford, Tom H., 36445A.
Creveling, Louis G., 17318A.
Crisp, Harold N., Jr., 17310A.
Crook, Eugene M., 52319A.
Crook, Jack A., 52217A.
Cross, Floyd E., 36545A.
Crosswell, Horace A., 36539A.
Crowder, Lucien G., Jr., 36518A.
Crutchfield, Silas M., Jr., 35899A.
Crysler, Richard D., 36044A.
Cummins, Clinton O., 36591A.
Cunningham, Carl E., 36181A.
Cunningham, Donald W., 36712A.
Curnow, Robert L., 37079A.
Curry, Ralph J., 18245A.
Curtis, Andrew R., Jr., 28218A.
Curtis, Philip E., 36107A.
Dahlem, Walter E., Jr., 36115A.
Dailey, Cole M., 36543A.
Dalferes, George L. J., 48786A.
Dallura, Joseph A., 20694A.
Daniel, William T., 36066A.
Daniels, Charles L., Jr., 52107A.
Daniels, Robert W., 22860A.
Darmstandler, Harry M., 36641A.
Davis, Austin O., 52229A.
Davis, Lawrence L., 36786A.
Davis, Milton C., 52145A.
Davis, William J., 17274A.
Day, Richard D., 36257A.
Daye, Thomas M., 17518A.
Dayton, Richard F., 52193A.
Dean, Louis J., 17285A.
Dean, Orien G., Jr., 36892A.
Dear, John R., 36218A.
Deatrick, Eugene P., Jr., 17371A.
Deen, Grover C., 36301A.
Degenaro, Guido J., 36311A.
Delaney, Charles E., 52285A.
Delano, Willard A., 52303A.
Delise, Dominic V., 36966A.

Dellinger, Chester M., Jr., 52026A.
Demoody, Harold C., 36042A.
Deniston, Dale R., 36901A.
Denniston, Clyde R., Jr., 17437A.
Denny, Donald A., 36870A.
Denton, Edward P., 369594A.
Depaolis, Thomas A., 36035A.
Derby, Royse C., 36025A.
Derderian, John J., 52223A.
Desloge, John M., 36126A.
Devine, Frank G., 52236A.
Dewolf, James G., 36390A.
Deyhle, Roger E., 36413A.
Dibbell, Robert A., 52147A.
Dickens, John W., 36059A.
Dickey, Philip A., Jr., 36876A.
Dillard, George E., 17542A.
Dillon, Leonard T., 36715A.
Dingeldein, Robert, 17568A.
Dipiero, Phil M., 36733A.
Disalvatore, William J., 36696A.
Disharoon, Jerry B., 17230A.
Dismuke, Jerry W., 36692A.
Dively, George E., 52309A.
Dixon, Christopher P., 52252A.
Dobbs, Charles E., 20708A.
Doherty, Albert M., 36614A.
Dolen, Warren G., 37123A.
Doll, George A. J., 28321A.
Dollar, James W., 35912A.
Donegan, Charles E., 18283A.
Doolittle, John P., 17402A.
Dorman, George S., 17411A.
Dosh, Robert N., Jr., 17382A.
Doswell, John P., 25822A.
Dotterer, Richard T., 36735A.
Doty, Erceal V., 36752A.
Dougherty, Richard G., 36045A.
Downer, Charles P., 36080A.
Doyle, Donald R., 36220A.
Dragnich, Stanley W., 36948A.
Drake, Clarence H., 36017A.
Drake, Francis R., 36687A.
Draper, Russell C., 17245A.
Dreger, Edwin K., 36435A.
Dreiseszun, Abraham J., 36902A.
Drenguis, John W., 36885A.
Dresser, Richard L., 17373A.
Drew, Adrian E., 37125A.
Dries, Howard T., 36040A.
Driver, Loren F., 52046A.
Drumm, Robert H., 52081A.
Dukes, James L., 52325A.
Dulion, William E., 37037A.
Dunlap, John V., 20723A.
Dunlap, Lloyd L., Jr., 17380A.
Dunn, Frederick L., 36083A.
Dupont, Forrest R., 36273A.
Durham, Ernest J., 36587A.
Durham, Nathan B., Jr., 22770A.
Durkee, Frank W., 52125A.
Duys, Dirk, 36232A.
Dwyer, George T., 25512A.
Dye, Rufus, Jr., 36943A.
Dyer, Kenneth L., Jr., 20717A.
Dykman, Carl J., 36470A.
Earhart, Charles A., 36046A.
Earle, Guy C., 37025A.
Easley, Frank, 36317A.
Eastham, David B., 36488A.
Eckhardt, Malcolm M., 37045A.
Edge, Robert L., 17565A.
Edmondson, Chad B., 36537A.
Edwards, David P., 36745A.
Edwards, William N., 52227A.
Eger, Charles H., Jr., 17255A.
Ehart, Howard L., 37101A.
Ehart, William G., 36568A.
Eichelberger, William R., 17244A.
Eisen, Charles K., 36202A.
Eisenhart, William E., 36971A.
Eklund, Robert G., 27700A.
Elbert, Edward A., Jr., 52123A.
Eldridge, Malcolm W., 52209A.
Elefterin, John, 36443A.
Elliot, James S., 37095A.
Elliott, Michael B., 23796A.
Elliott, Robert F., 36098A.
Ellis, Patrick M., 52231A.
Ellis, Richard H., 36867A.
Ellis, Wood, 36694A.
Ellison, Paul R., 35989A.
Ellison, Thomas W., 36452A.
Elstun, Maurice, 36278A.
Eltzroth, Merlin S., 36092A.
Emrich, Frederick S., 37073A.
Ensberg, Stanford A., 35992A.
Erickson, Leroy, 52062A.
Eskridge, James W., 36936A.
Ettenson, Bernhard M., 35876A.
Eudy, Troy J., Jr., 37081A.
Evans, Charles M., 21500A.
Evans, James R., 52166A.
Evans, William J., 17355A.
Evans, William L., 36453A.
Evely, Clyde P., 23738A.
Everette, John B., 17559A.
Farmer, Francis A., Jr., 36776A.
Farmer, Glenn M., 36748A.
Farnsworth, Robert A., Jr., 37058A.
Farrell, Robert M., 36648A.
Fedele, Frank, 48799A.
Feeney, Dean R., 36681A.
Feibelman, Max M., 17478A.
Felger, Ralph W., 36964A.
Felices, Salvador E., 17377A.
Fels, Leslie R., 25801A.
Ferrato, Theodore P., 22713A.
Fiene, Walter W., 36450A.
Fink, John B., 36156A.
Finnie, William L., 36182A.
Fisher, Paul H., 36862A.
Fisher, Robert O., 36159A.
Fitzgerald, Leo A., Jr., 36857A.
Flannery, Darrell N., 52067A.
Flansaas, Glenn A., 17261A.
Fleek, Thomas A., 36200A.
Fleming, George B., 36816A.
Flint, Cecil R., 36330A.
Flowers, Dale L., 36638A.
Flowers, Idus R., 36253A.
Flowers, Leo H., 36370A.
Foote, Marshall G., 52054A.
Foote, Robert C., 52202A.
Forbes, Thomas R., 36058A.
Fordham, Joseph T., 35951A.
Forester, Zachary T., Jr., 52219A.
Forsythe, Thomas H., 36815A.
Fortier, Norman J., 36244A.
Fortin, Edmond L., 35927A.
Foster, Everett E., 37000A.
Foster, Leo J., Jr., 35145A.
Foster, Thomas G., 36880A.
Fouche, Marvin E., 37011A.
Fouquette, Richard H., 35983A.
Foust, William L., 23690A.
Fowler, Lawrence A., 36386A.
Fowler, Russell M., 34982A.
Fox, Bruce F., 52253A.
Fox, George A., 17563A.
Francis, Charles E., 36140A.
Francis, Edward B., 52108A.
Franklin, R. C., Jr., 36845A.
Freeman, Richard E., 52137A.
French, James R., 17528A.
French, Lafayette, 37075A.
French, Willis M., 36575A.
Freshwater, Robert E., 17522A.
Freudenthal, Charles H., 36399A.
Frey, George A., 36091A.
Froebe, Leonard R., 36888A.
Fry, Joe, 52165A.
Fry, Wesley L., Jr., 36588A.
Fucich, Frank W., 52195A.
Fulgham, Edwin C., 36563A.
Fuller, Henry C., Jr., 37062A.
Fulton, Fitzhugh L., Jr., 36417A.
Fulwider, Richard B., 36577A.
Fuqua, Robert P., 37092A.
Furlow, Leo T., 35969A.
Furlow, Luther C., Jr., 52143A.
Gabbert, John H., 36471A.
Gahn, John W., 23744A.
Gaines, Edmund P., Jr., 17558A.
Gall, Herbert J., 52316A.
Gallagher, Walter J., 36427A.
Gallarda, William J., 36920A.
Gallavan, Robert H., 52163A.
Gallier, Neil E., 35901A.
Galvin, Donald W., 23886A.
Garces, John R., Jr., 36349A.
Garlington, Arthur R., Jr., 17545A.
Garlock, Frederic R., 36785A.
Garner, Donald E., 36176A.
Garoni, Aldo E., 36322A.
Garrett, Clifford E., 36813A.
Garrett, John S., 36704A.
Garrett, Warren H., 36269A.
Gaskins, Aubrey S., 52093.
Gates, Albert E., Jr., 36919A.
Gates, Paul N., 37050A.
Gauch, Eugene W., Jr., 35961A.
Gaudsmith, Richard A., 35893A.
Gauthier, Adelbert G., 36457A.
Geller, Walter N., 37074A.
George, Jack L., 36485A.
George, Richard S., 36177A.
Gering, George W., Jr., 36801A.
German, Joseph, 36674A.
Ghormley, William G., 26442A.
Gibson, John S., 36792A.
Gibson, Ralph D., 17284A.
Gibson, William A., 52110A.
Gibson, Winfield S., 36407A.
Gilbert, Raymond H., Jr., 18092A.
Gilbert, William W., 20738A.
Gilbreth, Bruce G., 52041A.
Gill, Gerald B., 25797A.
Gillespie, Stuart E., 36835A.
Gilpatrick, Arlo E., 36906A.
Gimmi, Richard F. B., Jr., 21517A.
Gippert, Winfield S., 35931A.
Giraudo, Joseph L., Jr., 36639A.
Giuli, John F., 36933A.
Gledhill, John W., Jr., 36685A.
Glen, Robert E., 37094A.
Glessner, James L., Jr., 36778A.
Glover, Kenneth B., 36285A.
Godbee, Horace C., Jr., 52035A.
Goeden, Ervin H., 52244A.
Goldman, Sam, 37057A.
Gonzalez, Santiago, 36289A.
Goodman, Joseph N., 36356A.
Goodnight, Elmer K., 21495A.
Gordon, Lawrence N., 17467A.
Gorman, Robert T., 17361A.
Goss, James L., 36661A.
Graalfs, Edward H., 36465A.
Gramprie, William J., 36788A.
Grant, Harold E., 36288A.
Grantham, Jasper E., 36958A.
Graybill, Harold L., 28222A.
Green, Jesse E., 17447A.
Green, Paul L., 36168A.
Greene, Charles R., 52194A.
Greene, Howard R., Jr., 36236A.
Greene, James D., 36293A.
Greenwade, Paul V., Jr., 37102A.
Greenwood, Gulher G., 37099A.
Greget, Tony M., 35946A.
Grenard, Harold E., 36858A.
Grieder, Orville E., 36722A.
Griffard, Robert M., 18264A.
Griffin, Henry C., Jr., 52126A.
Griffin, Robert J., 52304A.
Griffith, James A., 37090A.
Griffith, Paul A., 36636A.
Griffith, Rolla E., 36800A.
Griffith, Weston F., 37100A.
Griffiths, Charles E., Jr., 37001A.
Grimes, Daniel D., 36432A.
Grissom, Thomas R., 36192A.
Groesbeck, Bruce R., 52085A.
Grooms, Ray M., 36944A.
Gross, Kenneth E., 18289A.
Grossman, Frank H., 52279A.
Grossman, Ralph F., 36348A.
Grossmiller, William J., 17311A.
Grosso, Gerard M., 36717A.
Grow, John W., Jr., 36887A.
Gulledge, Tom W., 36749A.
Gundry, Hugh C., 36593A.
Gunn, William F., 36323A.
Gunvordahl, John W., 36418A.
Gustin, George, 36865A.
Guthrie, Bobbie G., 27683A.
Guthrie, Harold E., 36444A.
Guthrie, Keith R., 49301A.
Guynes, Joseph B., 20743A.
Gwiazdon, Joseph M., 37043A.
Gwynn, Robert W., 37051A.
Hackney, Donald I., 17374A.
Hafer, Frederick L., 17341A.
Haggerty, Walter E., 36292A.

Hairston, Guy E., Jr., 17432A.
Hairston, Robert, 3d, 36186A.
Hale, Carl F., Jr., 26787A.
Hall, Clarence, Jr., 35934A.
Hall, George F., 48784A.
Halstead, Howard L., 36586A.
Hamel, Robert E., 20728A.
Hamilton, James W., 36578A.
Hamilton, Percival B., 48791A.
Hamilton, Robert S., 36381A.
Hammer, Edson G., 36490A.
Hamner, Albert P., 36209A.
Hampton, John B., Jr., 35903A.
Hampton, Luther L., Jr., 36691A.
Hanna, Keith C., 22642A.
Hannah, Maurice M., 35572A.
Hanniball, August, 3d, 36741A.
Hannum, Robert R., 36937A.
Hardcastle, Frank L., 23693A.
Hardie, Robert L., 36852A.
Hardin, Thomas H., Jr., 52159A.
Harding, Warren W., 22685A.
Hardy, Alan H., 36738A.
Hargarten, Richard A., 36345A.
Haring, Frederick C., 36956A.
Harkins, George F., 36789A.
Harley, Dwight L., 36389A.
Harmon, Carlos B., 36313A.
Harmon, Russell A., Jr., 37130A.
Harn, Gene L., 36572A.
Harper, Gilbert S., Jr., 17324A.
Harre, Eugene H., 52096A.
Harris, Claude E., Jr., 36806A.
Harris, Edgar S., Jr., 17505A.
Harris, Robert M., Jr., 36199A.
Harris, Roy L., Jr., 17560A.
Hart, William K., 36514A.
Hart, William M., 37084A.
Hartenberger, Edmund K., Jr., 36089A.
Hartman, Roy E., 52118A.
Hartzell, Richard A., 17547A.
Hassig, Lee E., 36946A.
Hauenstein, Charles J., 17358A.
Haven, Robert E., 36414A.
Hawkins, Edward D., 36271A.
Hawley, Jack, 52132A.
Haworth, Gordon C., 36938A.
Hayden, Robert W., 52257A.
Hayes, David J., 36581A.
Hayes, Louis W., 36367A.
Hayes, Thomas G., 36916A.
Haynes, Glen M., 52293A.
Haynes, Joseph V., 36446A.
Hays, Ralph M., 36669A.
Hazel, John H., 36856A.
Hazzard, Robert F., 36305A.
Head, Vernon L., 36425A.
Hebert, Kenneth G., 36029A.
Hedges, David A., 52083A.
Hedvall, Alerd M., 52100A.
Heffernan, Frank J., 26790A.
Heiberg, Harrison H. D., Jr., 17368A.
Heiberg, Lloyd C., 52300A.
Helser, Loren E., 52250A.
Henck, Noel J., 17236A.
Henderson, Fred H., Jr., 36262A.
Henderson, Joseph C., 37114A.
Hendricks, Wayne J., 36895A.
Hendrix, Alfred F., 52226A.
Henry, Harold F., Jr., 37063A.
Herbst, Joseph W., 35924A.
Hewitt, Ray R., 52050A.
Heyboer, Gerald T., 36398A.
Hicks, Arlie H., Jr., 17531A.
Hicks, Joseph W., Jr., 36986A.
Hicks, Richard A., 52076A.
Hicks, Robert D., 36663A.
Higbee, William W., 36297A.
Hildebrandt, James E., 17351A.
Hiley, James H., 36438A.
Hill, James E., 20741A.
Hill, Lloyd C., 52239A.
Hill, Robert L., 37115A.
Hill, Steven E., 17441A.
Hindsley, John A., 36135A.
Hines, Donald M., 52283A.
Hinshaw, Milton L., 35976A.
Hinson, Pat N., 21494A.
Hinton, John R., Jr., 20691A.
Hissem, Alan H., 36939A.
Hitchcock, James W., 36566A.
Hixson, John E., 37078A.
Hock, Robert C., 20761A.
Hoerter, George J., 35942A.
Hoffman, Paul E., 52191A.
Hoffman, Robert G., 36031A.
Hoffs, Henry, 36071A.
Hogan, Robert J., 35966A.
Hogan, William H., 36032A.
Hoh, John E., 36415A.
Holladay, Jean D., 52082A.
Holland, Ernest C., Jr., 52138A.
Holmes, Robert E., 36060A.
Holt, Emmett L., 52059A.
Holton, William J., 52274A.
Holtorf, Arthur M., 17279A.
Holtz, Lorenz P., 36500A.
Homich, George E., 36320A.
Homza, George J., 22720A.
Honchul, Delbert, 36698A.
Hood, James D., 37121A.
Hopkins, James R., 37029A.
Hopkins, Philip B., Jr., 17504A.
Hopkins, Theodore L., 36136A.
Hopman, William F., 26841A.
Hopson, Tassanilla, 36464A.
Horne, John R., 35200A.
Horne, Raymond E., Jr., 20735A.
Horton, Clarence F., Jr., 17486A.
Hoskins, James E., 52043A.
House, Charles D., 36326A.
Howard, Roy W., 52188A.
Howell, Homer H., Jr., 25783A.
Howell, Morris S., 36144A.
Howell, Philip V., Jr., 17534A.
Howland, Jack W., 36924A.
Hoyer, Richard G., 35915A.
Hoyt, Thurber L., 17233A.
Hubbard, Charles H., 36904A.
Hubbard, Van D., 36773A.
Hubbes, Robert E., 36302A.
Hudgens, Helton G., 52103A.
Hudiburgh, Sydney C., 36478A.
Hudlow, Richard J., 17550A.
Hudson, James D., 24370A.
Hudspeth, Edwin G., 28223A.
Hudspeth, Roy R., 17472A.
Huffer, Frank M., Jr., 36054A.
Huffman, Wallace E., 36358A.
Huggs, Edward C., 36828A.
Hughes, Jack L., 36921A.
Hughes, James D., 17468A.
Hulett, Charles E., 36843A.
Hunsberger, Harold U., 36026A.
Hunt, John H., 36928A.
Hunt, Merwyn A., 36930A.
Hunt, Ralph M., 36538A.
Hunt, Samuel R., 36592A.
Hunt, Senour, 17405A.
Hunter, Cedric V., 17290A.
Hunter, Gordon M., 36622A.
Hunter, Guy N., 37127A.
Hunter, William J., Jr., 36095A.
Hurlburt, Daniel A., Jr., 52214A.
Hurn, James L., 17294A.
Hutchins, Lavern C., 24363A.
Hutchinson, Raymond P., 36376A.
Hutchinson, Wilbur T., 52249A.
Hutchison, Thomas J., 22801A.
Hutchison, William C., 36197A.
Hutto, Merl G., 17433A.
Hyde, James R., 17260A.
Icenhour, James O., 36240A.
Immig, Richard G., 17309A.
Inman, Benjamin F., 37005A.
Innis, John J., 52153A.
Israelsen, Orson A., 36469A.
Jackson, Bush M., Jr., 36061A.
Jackson, Calvin W., 49300A.
Jackson, John W., 17517A.
Jackson, Lawrence, Jr., 36291A.
Jackson, Robert D., 52090A.
Jacobs, Albert, 36281A.
Jacobs, Lloyd E., 52234A.
Jacobson, Bertram, 48798A.
Jacobson, Hilding L., Jr., 36683A.
Jacolick, Harvey T., 36889A.
Jaffray, Robert M., 36627A.
James, Arthur H., 52306A.
James, Charles M., 36401A.
James, Claude, Jr., 36882A.
Janson, Alfred P., 36604A.
Janssen, William L., 52092A.
Jarmek, Edmund J., 36481A.
Jaudon, Robert H., 36266A.
Jeanes, Bill F., 36239A.
Jeffers, Ulie H., Jr., 52208A.
Jeffries, Jess E., 36909A.
Jenkins, Forrest S., 36264A.
Jensen, Sherwood G., 36007A.
Jewell, Harold R., 17297A.
Johnson, Carter W., 52230A.
Johnson, Dale A., 37021A.
Johnson, George A., 24341A.
Johnson, Gunnar, 36056A.
Johnson, Ivan D., 36010A.
Johnson, Kenneth O., 52066A.
Johnson, Lester L., 52053A.
Johnson, Mark R., 37087A.
Johnson, Ralph W., 36366A.
Jones, Arthur M., 17286A.
Jones, Dale N., 22781A.
Jones, David M., 36019A.
Jones, Henry I., Jr., 24368A.
Jones, John P., Jr., 37070A.
Jones, Muller L., Jr., 37044A.
Jones, Murray O., 36472A.
Jones, Roy L., Jr.,52027A.
Jones, William M., 36151A.
Jorgensen, Richard I., 52181A
Joseph, Adolph D., Jr., 17301A.
Kaempfer, Robert E., 36112A.
Kaidy, Erwin J., 36822A.
Kaiser, Henry A., 35938A.
Kalb, Robert D., 36879A.
Kalessa, Russel R., 36519A.
Kamaras, Henry J., 35990A.
Kaminski, Edward J., 35972A.
Kammerer, John E., 52032A.
Kane, Robert F., 52075A.
Karbin, Joseph J., 35954A.
Karol, Joseph, 36231A.
Kasten, Nelson, 22714A.
Kasun, Nicholas J., Jr., 36015A.
Kaufman, Leo J., 52025A.
Kaynor, Donald D., 36451A.
Keefer, Russell A., 52254A.
Keeler, Hyrum G., 52134A.
Keeter, Tom E., 36300A.
Keith, Jack L., 36073A.
Keller, Floyd E., 23712A.
Kellerman, William C., Jr., 36978A.
Kelley, Gordon L., 36343A.
Kellogg, Richard A., 17431A.
Kelly, John K., Jr., 35944A.
Kelly, Thomas G., Jr., 36723A.
Kelsey, Joseph P., 36602A.
Kemp, Eugene A., 36085A.
Kendziora, Franklin C., 37061A.
Kennington, Joe T., 36718A.
Keogh, Curtis R., 36424A.
Kepner, William C., 36719A.
Keriakou, Paris N., 25511A.
Keutman, Charles H., 24699A.
Kienlen, Rodney T., 36063A.
Kilian, William F., 52266A.
Killpack, Harry W., 36100A.
Kimball, Jack Q., 17426A.
Kimball, Wesley D., 52302A.
Kimble, Robert C., 26784A.
King, Joe R., 52071A.
King, Neil E., 52064A.
Kinney, Robert W., 36129A.
Kirby, Elwin G., 23714A.
Kirkland, Henry O., Jr., 36132A.
Kirpatrick, Herman L., 23853A.
Kissinger, Richard B., 37129A.
Kleber, Raymond B., 52265A.
Klein, Robert, 35950A.
Klein, Walter J., 36783A.
Klingler, Ralph R., Jr., 17247A.
Knapik, Delores M., 21359W.
Knight, Bernard R., 36357A.
Knight, Harry R., 17347A.
Knowlton, Harold B., 36369A.
Kohn, Norman R., 36327A.
Kolb, James R., Jr., 35974A.
Koltz, Roger H., 52315A.
Komons, Nick, 36596A.
Korinek, Warren J., 36118A.
Korpanty, Leo S., 24354A.
Kosmatka, Raymond, 36090A.
Kozelka, Paul, 36795A.
Kraft, Gustav A., 37117A.
Krajnik, Arlington C., 36284A.

Kraker, Eddie C., 36875A.
Kramer, John C., 36458A.
Krauska, Thomas J., 23186A.
Kreft, Ivan J., 36742A.
Kresge, Cletus C., 36965A.
Krieger, Thomas B., 17538A.
Kugel, Arthur, 52030A.
Kuhn, Coleman D., 37031A.
Kullin, Arthur C., 36028A.
Kuntz, Scott A., 16948A.
Kutarnia, Robert P., 36790A.
Kutsch, Hubert A., 36064A.
Ladd, Herbert W., Jr., 36884A.
Laidlaw, Robert C., 52173A.
Lake, William J., 36397A.
Lake, Willis M., 36125A.
Laliberte, Robert C., 36750A.
Lamar, John F., 52031A.
Lamb, Charles M., Jr., 17273A.
Lamb, Thomas E., 25498A.
Lamp, Richard E., 17416A.
Lantz, John A., 36190A.
Lapp, James W., 36562A.
Lapping, Sherwood F., 35914A.
Larkin, Harold J., 17078A.
Larsen, Packard, 36682A.
Larson, Gail W., 36917A.
Larson, Vern L., 52292A.
LaSalle, Louis W., 36412A.
Laseter, William H., 36180A.
Latham, Raymond C., 52115A.
Lavender, Emory C., Jr., 17240A.
Law, Jot B., 48783A.
Lawrence, Keith L., 36248A.
Lebell, Jonah, 19786A.
Lecce, Albert J., 36814A.
Lee, Gareth G., 52177A.
Legg, Clinton C., 37112A.
Leibel, Louis L., 36968A.
Leighty, Claude C., 35988A.
Leishman, Jack C., 36650A.
Lembeck, Edward A., 2d, 17451A.
Lengnick, Roger H., 17326A.
Lentz, J. Warren, 36853A.
Leonard, John H., 28161A.
Lester, Frank G., 17367A.
Leuchtmann, Robert L., 17564A.
Lewis, C. J., 28022A.
Lewis, James M., 52164A.
Lien, Maurice L., 36039A.
Ligon, William C., 36649A.
Like, Delbert O., 17548A.
Lillie, William H., Jr., 36812A.
Lindeman, Jack R., 17314A.
Lindow, Kenneth R., 24371A.
Lindsey, Paul N., 36637A.
Linn, John S., 36802A.
Linn, Julius, Jr., 17243A.
Little, Samuel J., Jr., 37077A.
Little, Theodore D., 52179A.
Littlejohn, Don W., 36217A.
Loar, Matthew E., 36583A.
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., 17360A.
Lock, Philip A., 36847A.
Lockee, Archie S., 36104A.
Lockhart, Charles L., 35932A.
Lockridge, Clarence R., 18298A.
Loeffler, Robert M., 36504A.
Loftus, Marshall J., 36353A.
Logan, Lewis B. C., 17345A.
Loggins, James C., 35975A.
Lomax, Everit B., 37113A.
Long, Billy J., 52038A.
Longmoor, Hugh W., 36584A.
Lonsdale, John K., 36411A.
Loos, Albert G., 52242A.
Loos, Raymond E., 35963A.
Lord, Alden F., 36507A.
Loveless, William C., 36078A.
Lovett, John M., 36489A.
Lowry, Robert M., Jr., 17420A.
Lowry, Thomas J., Jr., 36881A.
Loyd, Robert N., 35926A.
Luby, Edward W., 36855A.
Lucas, Charles W., 36221A.
Ludeman, Roger B., 36081A.
Luebbert, Herman E., 37013A.
Lund, Howard L., 36524A.
Lund, Roger N., 52207A.
Lundholm, Donald A., 17388A.
Luther, Joseph G., 36989A.
Luxton, Joseph G., 52160A.
Lykins, James O., 52073A.
Lyles, Luther W., 36097A.
Lyman, Walter A., 17346A.
Lynn, Raymond H., 36864A.
Macia, James H., Jr., 36621A.
Mackie, Francis M., 36570A.
MacKinnon, Robert L., 17303A.
MacLellan, Donald J., 36006A.
MacQuesten, Frederic G., Jr., 36510A.
MacWilliams, Malcolm M., 17396A.
Madison, John E., 24725A.
Magers, Norman P., Jr., 36805A.
Magnan, Mark W., 28204A.
Magness, Gayland W., 36672A.
Maher, John L., 35948A.
Mahon, William J., 25537A.
Maloney, Clement M., 36419A.
Maloney, Raymond A., 37032A.
Mancus, John R., 36893A.
Mand, Robert, 36433A.
Mankin, Alfred P., 36830A.
Mann, Frank W., Jr., 36067A.
Manning, William R., 52116A.
Mansfield, John, 36361A.
Marall, Fred C., 52128A.
Marcum, Winfred K., 52042A.
Marinkovich, Obrad, 36555A.
Mark, Sherwood A., 36076A.
Marker, Stanley N., 28329A.
Markey, James R., 52296A.
Markowitz, Israel B., 36751A.
Markussen, Orlin H., 36866A.
Maronde, Lawrence F., 52324A.
Marquardt, Elden G., 24262A.
Marquette, Donald E., 36763A.
Marrkand, Paul J., 36460A.
Marsh, Wesley C., Jr., 23007A.
Martin, James C., 36726A.
Martin, John A., 17507A.
Martinez, Cesar J., 36127A.
Marx, Albert B., 37006A.
Mason, Wendell L., 24708A.
Mason, William H., 17508A.
Masters, Allen A., 52310A.
Masyn, William, 37055A.
Matheson, Milton N., 36161A.
Mathews, Hughie E., 36934A.
Mathewson, Tracy B. 3d., 36690A.
Matthew, Harry L., 36702A.
Matthews, William P., 36268A.
Mauck, John F., 36629A.
Maurer, Lyle E., 17554A.
Maxwell, Joseph B., 36526A.
May, Edward S., 18301A.
Maykut, Edward S., 36084A.
McBrain, Gordon D., Jr., 36714A.
McBride, Benjamin R., 17424A.
McBurney, Raplee Y., 36700A.
McCain, William M., 36600A.
McCann, John G., 36205A.
McCary, Benjamin C., Jr., 36747A.
McClellan, Dewey S., 36280A.
McClelland, Clifton A., 36708A.
McClinton, James L., 36147A.
McCloskey, Dean F., 36332A.
McCormick, Howard E., 20744A.
McCormick, Thomas W., 36495A.
McCoy, Arlie E., 36522A.
McCracken, Robert L., 36344A.
McCrea, Gearald D., 36707A.
McCreary, Harry A., 36416A.
McCullough, William N., 52323A.
McCully, Robert H., 18274A.
McCurdy, Norman R., 17556A.
McDaniel, Ralph E., 37068A.
McDannel, William W., 36660A.
McDonald, Robert J., 36260A.
McDowell, Gildas D., 36511A.
McElroy, Edward F., 36548A.
McEwen, Dale R., 36705A.
McFadden, Samuel E., 52291A.
McGee, Morris W., 36872A.
McGovern, Francis J., 36935A.
McGuire, Harold J. A., 36043A.
McGuire, Ivan L., 26776A.
McIntosh, Billy B., 23224A.
McKamy, James H., 36150A.
McKinney, Joseph T., 17323A.
McLain, Herbert W., 37030A.
McMahon, Thomas H., 36312A.
McMann, Ira H. S., 36447A.
McManus, Leonard M., 36146A.
McMichael, Julian A., Jr., 37064A.
McMillan, Cornelius, Jr., 17492A.
McMillan, Edward H., Jr., 35904A.
McMullin, Joseph B., 32405A.
McNown, John R., 36640A.
McPhee, Harry J., Jr., 17448A.
McPherson, Daniel E., Jr., 17907A.
McRobbie, William A. D., 36502A.
Mead, Bobby J., 52135A.
Mead, John C., Jr., 52131A.
Means, Harwood F., 36561A.
Meehan, Thomas F., 36030A.
Meier, George E., Jr., 36483A.
Mejaski, Joseph W., 36454A.
Melendez, Michael J., 17252A.
Melton, Robert E., 36926A.
Melville, Robert L., 36891A.
Memminger, Charles G., 17499A.
Mendenhall, Keith S., 36820A.
Merlo, Anthony L., 36004A.
Merritt, Norman F., Jr., 22822A.
Merz, Charles F., 35956A.
Meserow, Joseph T., 36720A.
Messer, James T., 36565A.
Messmer, Eugene J., 17289A.
Metcalf, James D., Jr., 36048A.
Meyers, Roy L., 17264A.
Michaelis, Donald R., 35984A.
Michaels, Douglas D., 36306A.
Michell, Irving E., 36619A.
Mikkelsen, Jack A., 36051A.
Millard, Howard W., 36911A.
Miller, Charles E., 36408A.
Miller, Clement K., 36267A.
Miller, Donald D., 36086A.
Miller, Edward W., 36409A.
Miller, George K., 52308A.
Miller, James R., 37052A.
Miller, Jerome L., 36837A.
Miller, William F., 17910A.
Mims, John W., 37046A.
Minnich, E. Scott, 17462A.
Minor, John M., 17415A.
Mitchell, John O., 36550A.
Mitchell, Robert V., Sr., 36603A.
Mock, Theodore E., 22724A.
Moebius, Homer N., 36942A.
Moffatt, John S., 36499A.
Molchan, John E., 17391A.
Mold, David T., 36878A.
Molesworth, Frank, 35897A.
Molnar, George, 36149A.
Moody, George W., 48795A.
Moon, Howard E., 36461A.
Moore, Arthur R., Jr., 17475A.
Moore, Elbert L., Jr., 36448A.
Moore, Harry Z., 52263A.
Moore, James A., 36477A.
Moore, Marvin F., 36769A.
Moore, Maury K., 36983A.
Moreau, Victor A., 52259A.
Morgan, John P., Jr., 36188A.
Morin, Ernest N., 37020A.
Morris, Dryden E., 36556A.
Morris, Edward D., 36279A.
Morris, George H., 25776A.
Morris, Jack B., 24326A.
Morris, Thomas W., 36900A.
Morrison, Charles M., 36148A.
Morrow, James H., 36113A.
Morss, Marvin N., 52051A.
Mortensen, Eldon D., 52289A.
Morton, Oakley K., 2d, 36143A.
Moser, Willie R., 36277A.
Mosier, Perley L., 36972A.
Moss, George R., 52203A.
Moulton, Ralph R., 36601A.
Moye, Russell D., 36540A.
Moyer, Richard A., 35979A.
Mueller, Delbert L., 36842A.
Mulcahy, William J., 22798A.
Muldoon, Dennis, 36303A.
Mull, Glen D., 52269A.
Mullen, Evrette J., Jr., 36355A.
Mumma, Lemoyne B., 52157A.
Munroe, Herman E., 52044A.
Munson, William S., 52189A.
Murdoch, William A., Jr., 52218A.
Murphy, Arthur B., 37010A.
Murphy, Jack A., 36359A.

Murphy, James S., 37080A.
Murphy, James T., 21498A.
Murphy, Robert B., 36456A.
Murphy, Robert D., 17526A.
Murphy, Walter S., 36611A.
Murphy, Warren G., 36191A.
Murphy, William J., 36949A.
Murphy, William J., Jr., 22681A.
Murray, Alva V., 52235A.
Musella, Anthony E., 36913A.
Mutch, Alex Y., 17295A.
Myers, Earl M., 36352A.
Myers, William B., Jr., 36768A.
Nadon, Norman C., 28207A.
Nakis, George M., 36810A.
Naleid, Jerome F., 17334A.
Naler, James D., 37038A.
Nash, Harry M., 35980A.
Nave, William P., 17272A.
Neal, Perry W., 36679A.
Neal, Windell W., 36656A.
Nealon, John F., 35995A.
Nedbal, Charles F., 36382A.
Neff, Benjamin G., 17280A.
Nelligan, William J., 36818A.
Nelsen, Raymond Z., Jr., 36506A.
Nelson, Alfred J., 35947A.
Nelson, George J., 17491A.
Nelson, Michael S., 36730A.
Nelson, Milton E., 26782A.
Nelson, Omer C., 35935A.
Nelson, Thomas O., 17242A.
Nemetz, Albert M., 17414A.
Newby, Warner E., 37082A.
Newell, Richard G., 17484A.
Newell, Wallace B., 36249A.
Newfield, Lou K., Jr., 36462A.
Newhouse, Morris H., 36124A.
Newmark, Bert, 36894A.
Newsom, Thomas L., 23882A.
Nichols, Dixon E., 52061A.
Nichols, Joseph C., Jr., 20699A.
Nicholson, Alvie H., 36055A.
Nicholson, Gilbert O., 28205A.
Nickelson, Marvin F., 52260A.
Nickerson, Robert K., 37071A.
Nicol, Thomas E., 37122A.
Nixon, Alva E., 36194A.
Nolan, James C., 3d, 36224A.
Nolan, Michael J., 36962A.
Norris, Carol D., 35936A.
Norris, Paul M., 17510A.
Norwood, Billie J., 17525A.
Nostdal, James O., 36988A.
Novy, James S., 35965A.
Nuessle, Harry C., 37004A.
Nunes, Arthur R., 35894A.
Nunez, Raul, 23751A.
Nyhous, Gordon B., 36896A.
Obarski, Stanley J., 36371A.
O'Connell, William F., 48782A.
O'Connor, John T., 36761A.
O'Connor, Theodore J., 36165A.
O'Connor, Thomas F. X., 36372A.
Odenthal, Warren M., 26764A.
Odom, Phillip S., Jr., 36737A.
Oechsler, Robert H., 26438A.
O'Hara, Vincent M., 36659A.
Ohmann, Duane F., 36824A.
Olds, Roger H., 52326A.
O'Leary, James P., 36405A.
Oliver, Jeptha D., Jr., 36243A.
Opfer, David H. E., 36869A.
Osterhus, Peter C., 35909A.
Osver, Sam L., 37003A.
Oswald, Louis A., 36970A.
Ottem, Gerald A., 36868A.
Otto, Charles F., 36834A.
Ouder, Melvin L., 23010A.
Overton, Thomas L., 36955A.
Owens, Calvin C., 36610A.
Owens, Merlin R., 35896A.
Ownbey, Elbert H., 36686A.
Pace, John D., 36613A.
Pace, Robert E., 22710A.
Palenscar, Alexander J., Jr., 48787A.
Palmer, William R., 36632A.
Pappas, Antonio S., 36455A.
Paradise, Alfred A., 36174A.
Park, Paris D., Jr., 36250A.
Parker, John M., 36475A.
Parker, Levin W., Jr., 26460A.
Parr, Ralph S., Jr., 28206A.
Parrott, William H., 36732A.
Parry, Thomas B., 36791A.
Parsons, Charles H., 2d, 17514A.
Paschall, James E., 17427A.
Pasco, Robert C., 36998A.
Pasenhofer, Arlo H., 20696A.
Pasqualicchio, Robert P., 36766A.
Pate, Ernest W., 35898A.
Patrick, Harold L., 36725A.
Patrick, James T., 36827A.
Patterson, Charles L., 52275A.
Pattison, John D., 36406A.
Payton, Harold J., 37014A.
Pear, Charles E., 36251A.
Pearson, James M., 36184A.
Peck, Waldo W., 36395A.
Pendergraft, Wesley L., 18242A.
Penn, William H., 36400A.
Pennington, Charles E., 36531A.
Perkinson, Julian E., 36223A.
Perks, William R., 36984A.
Perris, Walter H., 36987A.
Perry, George E., Jr., 36053A.
Perry, Jack R., 36787A.
Perry, Norman F., 36503A.
Perry, Robert E., 36082A.
Peters, Herman, 36116A.
Peters, John D., 52139A.
Peters, Warren E., 18276A.
Peterson, Charles H., 37120A.
Peterson, Harry W., 18275A.
Peterson, Robert C., 36721A.
Peterson, Robert D., 36212A.
Petty, Reginald, 36492A.
Pfantz, Vayne L., 52155A.
Pfeffer, Frank A., 36819A.
Phelan, James, 36496A.
Phillips, William C., 22689A.
Picarelli, Rudolph R., 36420A.
Picken, James L., 36173A.
Pigg, Leroy D., 24724A.
Pine, Forrest S., 24323A.
Piotter, Vernon V., 52245A.
Pittaway, James W., 36846A.
Pitts, John E., Jr., 17406A.
Planinac, John W., 28318A.
Plank, David H., 17417A.
Planta, Edward A., 36560A.
Plowden, William M., 36676A.
Podwolsky, George R., 36931A.
Poe, Bryce 2d, 17393A.
Pohl, Nelson O., 23709A.
Poladian, Robert, 23695A.
Polk, Lewis B., Jr., 36423A.
Pollard, Thomas B., Jr., 36480A.
Pool, Sam J., 36247A.
Popp, Russell A., 36771A.
Porreco, Andrew R., 36283A.
Portaluppi, Charles J., 36387A.
Portt, Glen A., 52311A.
Posselt, Gale V., 36533A.
Post, Gerald J., 24707A.
Posvar, Wesley W., 17316A.
Potter, Davis B., 36003A.
Potts, Stanley R., 36429A.
Poutre, Rex L., 36535A.
Powell, Adrian E., 37023A.
Powell, Wade N., 35910A.
Pratt, George J., 52330A.
Preston, Charles F., 36272A.
Prevost, Herbert L., 36760A.
Price, Henry M., 52162A.
Prieve, Donald G., 23743A.
Prince, Tony, Jr., 35925A.
Proctor, William H., 36463A.
Prong, John K., Jr., 36036A.
Provencio, Juan J., 36547A.
Pruett, Murphy A., 37083A.
Pryor, Theodore R., 36996A.
Pugmire, Glen L., 36119A.
Purdy, Edward W., 36665A.
Purdy, Robert F., 36532A.
Putman, Earl E., 52305A.
Pytel, Stanley J., 52284A.
Raaz, Quentin W., 35923A.
Ramsey, Charles E., Jr., 37111A.
Rand, Alexander, 36295A.
Randall, Edward W., 52206A.
Randolph, Robert C., 52211A.
Rankin, Allan P., 36068A.
Ransel, Alfred S., 36871A.
Ransom, Jerald J., 36421A.
Rapley, Herbert J., 36520A.
Rapp, John W., 25726A.
Rase, Louis W., 36117A.
Readout, Clifford H., 36329A.
Reber, Thomas R., 36542A.
Reding, John A., 36899A.
Reeb, Richard L., 36512A.
Reed, George M., 36977A.
Reed, Hovey G., 37066A.
Reed, Junior B., 36109A.
Reed, Marvin C., 17496A.
Reed, William P., 17454A.
Reeter, William E., 36991A.
Reeve, William S., 52154A.
Reeves, Alton P., 37132A.
Reeves, Merritt A., 36360A.
Reilly, Brendan J., 52262A.
Reinhard, Charles W., 36033A.
Reinhart, Arthur S., 36319A.
Reisinger, William J., 36782A.
Remaklus, Theobold G., 35993A.
Remington, Walter B., 52063A.
Rentschler, Victor R. T., 36779A.
Revel, Russel J., 36582A.
Reynolds, Ralph C., 52199A.
Reynolds, Robert R., 36925A.
Rhoades, Emmett E., 36299A.
Rhoades, Maynard R., 36094A.
Rhodes, Dowe S., 36005A.
Riach, John B., 36169A.
Rice, Franklin C., 36403A.
Rice, Harry F., 36994A.
Rice, John G., 36394A.
Rice, Thomas J., Jr., 35937A.
Rice, Warren H., 36139A.
Richards, Marion R., 17430A.
Richards, Paul M., 36908A.
Richardson, Vernon E., 36265A.
Ricketts, James E., Jr., 17543A.
Ridgway, Clifton S., 36959A.
Ridler, George E., 36002A.
Ridley, James F., Jr., 36041A.
Riebman, Philip, 52124A.
Riess, Donald A., 28333A.
Riggs, Charles E., Jr., 36941A.
Rijnovan, Lawrence, 36441A.
Riley, Thomas W., 52099A.
Rippey, Robert S., Jr., 20726A.
Ritchason, Alfred C., 36770A.
Ritchie, Nelson C., 36467A.
Ritter, Elvador E., 36528A.
Ritter, William E., Jr., 52045A.
Rivenbark, Thomas H., 35953A.
Robb, Francis J., 36607A.
Roberson, John F., 36706A.
Roberts, Robert S., Jr., 52183A.
Robertson, Nubron L., 52084A.
Robertson, Owen R., 36823A.
Robinson, Noel K., 36310A.
Robinson, Ray A., Jr., 23828A.
Rochelle, Joseph B., Jr., 37106A.
Rockwood, Charles L., 36863A.
Rockwood, William P., 36716A.
Rodriguez, Reynaldo A., 52176A.
Roeder, Victor H., 36544A.
Roffinoli, Louis J., 36072A.
Rogers, Walter W., 25527A.
Rogers, William J., 36138A.
Rohlfs, Robert D., 52267A.
Rollman, Robert O., 22823A.
Romero, James E., Jr., 36213A.
Romine, Charles G., 25494A.
Rose, Alvin S., 36014A.
Rose, Jesse L., 36077A.
Rose, John M., Jr., 24398A.
Rosenow, John J., 35994A.
Ross, Herbert E., 36339A.
Rossing, Arthur T., 26436A.
Rothwell, Ian D., 36728A.
Rottmann, Carl W., Jr., 36486A.
Rouse, James L., 36193A.
Rowdon, Earle J.,36668A.
Roy, A. J., 36731A.
Roy, Carl W., 17572A.
Ruark, Thomas W., 36796A.
Rubino, Frank J., 36957A.
Ruddy, Warren N., 35929A.
Ruenheck, Wilbert H., 36459A.
Ruge, Frederick C., 36037A.

Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., 17487A.
Ruley, Charles H., 36757A.
Runyan, Jack E., 35921A.
Ruoff, Edwin E., 21492A.
Rushton, Robert V., 52246A.
Ruth, Cecil, 36442A.
Sachanen, Felix, 36809A.
Sacks, Max, 36979A.
Sadek, Louis C., 37042A.
Sadler, Robert E., 17561A.
Safford, Philip R., 17439A.
Salmon, Donald K., 52281A.
Salyer, Truman D., 35920A.
Sanders, Henry G., 37026A.
Sanders, Ray H., 36377A.
Sanderson, Robert W., 36541A.
Sandin, Edward E., 36106A.
Sandstrom, Robert G., 52187A.
Sandusky, William E., 52033A.
Sanny, Max J., 37119A.
Santmyer, Howard E., 52109A.
Sargen, Charles M., 52297A.
Saunders, William F., 36739A.
Saurer, Richard H., 36905A.
Sauvage, Russell E., 36404A.
Saxton, John P., 36103A.
Sayers, Bill K., 36331A.
Saylor, Warren D., 20637A.
Schaefer, Raymond P., 36363A.
Schafer, Seymour M., 36658A.
Schankel, Richard M., 34710A.
Schauberger, Clarence A., 36517A.
Scherler, Arnold E., Jr., 23697A.
Schickling, Edward A., 36287A.
Schiess, Francis C., 36606A.
Schilling, Frank K., 36016A.
Schmidt, Arthur J., 36276A.
Schmidt, Earl M., 21513A.
Schmitt, John J., Jr., 17470A.
Schneiderhan, William J., 36612A.
Scholz, Nicholas J., 36501A.
Schoonover, Orville G., 17238A.
Schreck, James O., 36923A.
Schreiner, Joseph B., 37056A.
Schroeder, Neil C., 52282A.
Schrom, Robert C., 36476A.
Schueler, Robert J., 35978A.
Schuh, Robert C., 36402A.
Schulz, Richard G., 36689A.
Schumacker, Robert L., 52074A.
Schutte, June V., 36225A.
Schwab, Samuel G., 36557A.
Schwab, Warren H., 36128A.
Schweickert, Jerome G., 52220A.
Scott, Elgin W., Jr., 36836A.
Scott, James E., 36206A.
Scott, James P., 52258A.
Scroggin, Orville O., 3d, 17738A.
Searle, Joseph W., 36546A.
Sears, Phillip F., 36238A.
Seay, Richard W., 36038A.
Seccomb, Milo L., Jr., 36833A.
Sedore, Carl R., 35902A.
Sedvert, Theodore W., 36947A.
Seeman, Ralph T., 36234A.
Sellis, Roland W., 35928A.
Senkbeil, Edwin A., 37133A.
Senter, Lee R., 36825A.
Serage, Harold N., 36142A.
Serowski, Richard, 52233A.
Sestokas, Victor G., 52141A.
Seward, Edward D., Jr., 52167A.
Sexton, Roy D., 26677A.
Seyvertsen, Harold L., 36133A.
Shackelford, Dave S., Jr., 17312A.
Shackley, George G., 36982A.
Shadeck, Jack C., 52106A.
Shamblin, Austin L., 36840A.
Shanahan, Roger T., 36599A.
Shannon, William E., 21802A.
Sharkey, Howard C., 36201A.
Sharp, Paul E., 37091A.
Sharp, Paul H., 36233A.
Sharp, Savell L., 36559A.
Shattuck, Jack B., 37009A.
Shawe, Hamilton B., Jr., 17395A.
Shay, Francis S., 36764A.
Shearer, William D., 52248A.
Shepherd, Thomas J., 36130A.
Sheppard, Harry A., 36101A.
Sheppard, Walter L., Jr., 36777A.
Sherman, Charles C., 37024A
Sherrell, Walter J., 36422A.
Sherrill, Alvan C., Jr., 35917A
Shimmin, Elden Z., 36175A.
Shinn, Homer R., 37110A.
Shisler, Harry E., 52127A.
Shockley, Gene W., 36230A.
Shrawder, Gerald R., 36729A.
Shriner, Frederick F., 36781A.
Shuler, Lucien B., 20768A.
Shupe, Bennie A., 17241A.
Sielbeck, Lloyd W., 35977A.
Sigman, Isiah, 36657A.
Silcher, Bruce E., 52150A.
Silverman, Fred, 52271A.
Simmons, Don E., 36590A.
Simmons, James A., 17282A.
Simon, Ted E., 20730A.
Simonson, Clifford W., 52328A.
Sinsabaugh, Robert M., 35987A.
Siravo, Pasco F., 51240A.
Skaggs, Alvin D., 23931A.
Skibbe, Harold W., 52237A.
Skladzien, Thaddeus S., 17460A.
Slaughter, James M., 36120A.
Sleeper, John, Jr., 36678A.
Smith, Albert E., 52112A.
Smith, Arnold, 52055A.
Smith, Cecil L., 36551A.
Smith, Charles A., 17276A.
Smith, Clarence R., 36684A.
Smith, Forrest L., 36753A.
Smith, Frederick L., 35939A.
Smith, Gilbert A., Jr., 36794A.
Smith, Harry B., Jr., 20727A.
Smith, James S., 37035A.
Smith, John B., 52087A.
Smith, Larry R., 20757A.
Smith, Mart G., Jr., 17976A.
Smith, Paul A., 36997A.
Smith, Paul E., 35922A.
Smith, Robert C., 36530A.
Smith, Robert D., 52212A.
Smith, Stanley C., 36664A.
Smith, Walter A., Jr., 17574A.
Smithson, Daryl P., 17267A.
Snead, William E., 35895A.
Snelling, Rollins C., 36009A.
Snow, Daniel W., 36466A.
Snyder, John W., 36027A.
Snyder, Robert W., Jr., 36256A.
Soler, John M., 37060A.
Sonderman, Clarence H., Jr., 35908A.
Soucie, George E., 35949A.
Soucy, Ralph J., 36651A.
Sowell, Jesse D., 36207A.
Sowers, Robert L., 52273A.
Spain, Dewitt S., 36000A.
Spalding, John R., Jr., 36711A.
Spangler, Lloyd R., 36652A.
Spencer, William R., 36392A.
Spicer, Garland H., Jr., 25789A.
Staley, Ray C., 20742A.
Starker, William A., 36697A.
Steele, Leonard H., 20740A.
Stees, Hubert S., Jr., 17513A.
Stein, Eldred N., 36074A.
Stein, Milton, 36829A.
Steiner, Floyd D., 36219A.
Steiner, Philip, 22844A.
Stepanian, Stephen, 36831A.
Stephenson, Orlando W., Jr., 36821A.
Sterling, Raymond N., 36699A.
Stern, Nathan, 36912A.
Stevens, Jack D., 20679A.
Stevens, Robert M., 23724A.
Stevenson, Charles L., 52184A.
Steward, Maurice G., 52192A.
Stewart, Emmett F., 36282A.
Stewart, Robert B., 17322A.
Stillwell, Howard A., 52294A.
Stinchcomb, Roger W., Jr., 36898A.
Stippich, Robert C., 37041A.
Stocks, Harold J., 52122A.
Stockton, David E., 52210A.
Stockton, Lyle E., 17275A.
Stoddard, Loren A., 36616A.
Stoesser, Robert E., 52088A.
Stokes, Clyde B., 36631A.
Stotts, James C., 36497A.
Stout, Byford H., 36105A.
Stover, Glenn A., 52299A.
Stowers, Frederick P., 52172A.
Strain, Bailey T., 17320A.
Strand, Sherman R., 52186A.
Strate, Sterling J., 36307A.
Strating, Robert E., 52261A.
Strickland, Bunyan D., Jr., 36848A.
Strickland, Joseph M., 36573A.
Stringer, Elbert M., 17423A.
Strom, Edwin W., 36569A.
Strouhal, Rudolph C., 20758A.
Studak, Joseph W., Jr., 36274A.
Studer, William F., 17332A.
Stukas, Robert R., 17169A.
Stultz, Harry T., Jr., 35999A.
Styger, Joseph C., 36391A.
Sugerman, Leonard R., 36666A.
Sullivan, Joseph M., 52196A.
Sullivan, Mervin R., 36096A.
Sullivan, Michael W., 36963A.
Summers, Thomas L., 37054A.
Susskind, Harold A., 52298A.
Sutherland, Edward A., 36954A.
Swain, James N., Jr., 36137A.
Swan, Harry C., 36383A.
Swank, Ellery E., 20733A.
Swanson, Arthur K., 37131A.
Swearengin, Milton G., 22813A.
Sweeney, Francis J., Jr., 36784A.
Sweet, Robert V., 36134A.
Sweetnam, Richard W., 36052A.
Swift, John J., 52277A.
Swift, Mayland D., 36667A.
Swinney, Harold E., 36798A.
Sworn, Douglas L., 36746A.
Syester, Robert R., 36388A.
Tallman, Kenneth L., 17337A.
Tarr, George P., Jr., 37036A.
Tarrant, Edward W., 17237A.
Task, Harry J., 36927A.
Tauer, Otto S., 36001A.
Taylor, Howard C., 35916A.
Taylor, John H., 52280A.
Taylor, Joseph D., 35964A.
Taylor, Odis F., 36022A.
Taylor, Robert L., 20736A.
Taylor, Robert W., 26838A.
Taylor, Thomas E., 52040A.
Temple, Robert J., 17248A.
Temple, William A., 17319A.
Terry, Hal M., Jr., 22780A.
Terry, Willard R., Jr., 48790A.
Tesla, William M., 36111A.
Thacker, Allie A., 52216A.
Thacker, Charles E., Jr., 43294A.
Theus, Lucius, 18270A.
Thomas, Archie C., 52098A.
Thomas, Charles P., 36529A.
Thomas, James M., 37118A.
Thomas, John E., 52318A.
Thomas, Onial A., 23758A.
Thompson, Clay E., Jr., 36214A.
Thompson, John A., 17257A.
Thompson, John D., 26770A.
Thompson, Leslie S., Jr., 36494A.
Thompson, Robert J., 36772A.
Thompson, Webb, 52307A.
Thompson, William D., 20711A.
Thornton, Ellison E., 36767A.
Thornton, Jack R., 52205A.
Thorson, James M., 36859A.
Thurman, George D., 36625A.
Tieman, August, 36633A.
Timmins, Edward A., 52221A.
Tinney, Jack R., 36677A.
Toburen, Robert D., 37097A.
Todd, Robert F., 52078A.
Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.
Toolan, Frank J., 36807A.
Toon, Thomas A., Jr., 36211A.
Torvestad, Robert J., 24268A.
Tracey, John C., Jr., 36304A.
Trammell, James C., 36237A.
Trexler, David H., 17527A.
Trexler, Ernest J., 36087A.
Tribolet, Robert W., 17404A.
Trigg, William B., 36378A.
Trigg, William J., 36178A.
Trimble, Robert J., Jr., 36410A.
Trout, Max D., 52058A.
Troutman, George G., 17249A.

Tullos, John B., Jr., 36508A.
Turbyfill, Carl M., Jr., 25518A.
Turner, Arthur R., 36252A.
Turner, Gordon L., 35905A.
Turner, Joseph H., 17537A.
Turner, Richard H., 18060A.
Twitchell, Alvin, 26841A.
Twyford, Thomas L., 36755A.
Tyndall, Joseph M., 22803A.
Uhalt, Joseph H., 52317A.
Uhrich, Raymond J., 36515A.
Ulrich, Paul T., 36108A.
Umlauf, John L., 17419A.
Umphress, Robert C., 36298A.
Upland, Theodore R., Jr., 17375A.
Upright, George P., 25819A.
Upton, Troy H., 52097A.
Vanberkum, Jacob J., 36564A.
Vanbuskirk, George L., 36953A.
Vancura, Arthur T., 36780A.
Vanhouten, Philip J., 36693A.
Vanmatre, David F., 36024A.
Vannest, John H., 52060A.
Vanpelt, Warren W., 26429A.
Vansickle, Earl R., 17516A.
Vantrease, William T., 52144A.
Vargo, John M., 36688A.
Varney, Thomas S., 35943A.
Vega, John W., 18280A.
Velde, Theodore M., 36385A.
Veneable, Samuel W., 36075A.
Ventres, Robert L., 17234A.
Vernon, Sheldon I., 36703A.
Via, Ernest A., 52201A.
Vice, Carl R., 36338A.
Vidmer, Richards, Jr., 17544A.
Vik, Leonard F., 36468A.
Villone, Victor J., 36203A.
Vincent, John H., 37017A.
Vodicka, Robert D., 37085A.
Volker, Frederick W., 52232A.
Voll, John J., 22754A.
Volz, John C., 36567A.
Voss, John B., 36811A.
Voyce, Charles J., 52185A.
Vrablick, Frank S., 35007A.
Waechler, Harold H., 37108A.
Walcott, Oliver M., 36473A.
Walding, William H., 22611A.
Waldon, Edward L., 36995A.
Wale, Elmer G., 36883A.
Walker, Arthur I., Jr., 52169A.
Walker, Eldon C., 36315A.
Walker, Howard E., 36123A.
Walker, John E., 37007A.
Walker, Robert L., 17511A.
Walker, William L., 37126A.
Wallace, Ingvar A., 37107A.
Walsh, James H., Jr., 52272A.
Walsh, Robert A., 17459A.
Walters, Clarence D., Jr., 28024A.
Waple, Charles G., Jr., 52290A.
Ward, Dale B., 36216A.
Ware, Reuben M., 37028A.
Warndorf, James P., 36981A.
Warner, Paul A., 52313A.
Warren, Foster G., Jr., 17566A.
Washington, Fielding L., 25603A.
Wassner, William R., 36340A.
Wasson, John C., 32404A.
Watkins, Charles T., Jr., 36013A.
Watkins, James R., 36734A.
Watkins, Marvin M., 17742A.
Watson, Allan R., 17258A.
Watt, James G., 52069A.
Watts, William G., Jr., 23857A.
Wayne, Allen T., 52111A.
Wayne, Robert E., 17397A.
Wear, James H., Jr., 52190A.
Weatherford, Ross H., Jr., 17288A.
Weaver, Arthur D., 36155A.
Weaver, Earl G., 52152A.
Weber, George F., 36245A.
Weber, Marvin O., Jr., 17461A.
Wedlan, Paul A., 52174A.
Wehrle, Joseph H., 52329A.
Weigelt, Winfred H., 17278A.
Weinbrenner, George R., 36374A.
Weingand, Paul G., 36839A.
Weinstein, Melvin, 36431A.
Weisman, Gerald P., 36227A.
Weitner, Walter L., 36765A.
Weldon, Andrew J., Jr., 52105A.
Weldon, James J., 48788A.
Wenrick, Stanley T., 52322A.
Werbeck, Donald L., 18290A.
Werlich, John D., 36662A.
Werner, Milton H., 52095A.
Wesighan, Arthur E., 35911A.
Weston, Robert L., 36759A.
Weyhrich, Melvin P., 23700A.
Wheaton, Harry P., Jr., 36187A.
Wheeler, James I., 23717A.
White, Charles R., 17533A.
White, Jack E., 36945A.
White, Richard T., 17418A.
Whitehead, John L., Jr., 37088A.
Whitenack, Charles L., Jr., 36258A.
Widdicombe, Robert K., Jr., 35955A.
Wienecke, Edward R., 23002A.
Wilcox, George O., 52240A.
Wilcox, Max A., 52117A.
Wilkie, Charles W., 26828A.
Wilkinson, John L., Jr., 52228A.
Wilkinson, Stanley, Jr., 36675A.
Williams, David O., Jr., 36634A.
Williams, Durwood B., 23750A.
Williams, Harold, Jr., 17364A.
Williams, Leo M., 48793A.
Williamson, Henry W., 52222A.
Willis, Richard G., 36756A.
Willis, William T., Jr., 52286A.
Willoughby, David J., 36521A.
Wilson, Scott E., 36491A.
Wilson, Clarence D., 52104A.
Wilson, Claude J., 52101A.
Wilson, Donald, Jr., 17408A.
Wilson, Frank E., 37067A.
Wilson, Robert M., 36308A.
Wininger, Thomas G., 35973A.
Winn, David W., 36646A.
Winslow, Robert C., 36653A.
Winsor, William J., 37103A.
Witt, James R., 36437A.
Witzel, Robert B., 36744A.
Wolf, Daniel W., 17239A.
Wolf, Horace G., 36680A.
Wolf, Ray D., 35930A.
Wood, George D., 37104A.
Wood, Robert S., 36644A.
Woodrum, William C., 36618A.
Woody, Walter W., 52034A.
Woolbright, James G., 52215A.
Wortman, John J., 17281A.
Wright, Jerome D., 37059A.
Wright, Robert K., 17348A.
Wright, Robert W., 36254A.
Wrinkle, Jack H., 36318A.
Wygocki, William M., 52276A.
Wyseman, Thomas K., 48785A.
Yancey, William B., Jr., 17476A.
Yaw, Robert H., 36754A.
Yawn, Henry C., 3d, 22735A.
Yeoman, Wayne A., 17328A.
Yep, George, 48789A.
York, Charles J., 37039A.
Young, Frank J., 36670A.
Young, Harry C., Jr., 52182A.
Young, John K., 52278A.
Young, Kendall S., 36493A.
Youngblood, Winton S., 36172A.
Younger, Clyde W., Jr., 22719A.
Younk, William E., 36160A.
Zaniewski, Felix J., 26685A.
Zeh, Theodore G., Jr., 17421A.
Zeine, Donald A., 25725A.
Zellers, Robert A., 55897A.
Zemitis, John M., 35957A.
Zengel, John F. P., 36952A.
Zettl, Bernie E., 36222A.
Zierden, Eugene H., 52052A.
Zuppan, Lawrence L., Jr., 17523A.

Medical Corps

Bosley, Robert J., 25653A.
Bralliar, Max B., 25468A.
Burba, William H., 24212A.
Cerha, Harry T., 26693A.
Chesney, Murphy A., 29808A.
Dierdorf, Fred W., 29475A.
Digiovanni, Anthony J., 25477A.
Gipson, Edgar N., 25646A.
John, Joseph J., 27975A.
Kruse, Francis, Jr., 22558A.
Minyard, A. E., 25659A.
Moffatt, Keith, 24210A.
Peniston, William H., 25636A.
Shum, Lyle M., 24663A.
Smith, Daniel L., 51324A.
Snedden, Hal E., 23123A.
Spada, Frank J., 23067A.
Staples, Pelham P., Jr., 23064A.
Steele, Jack E., 55210A.
Vaden, Otis L., 24138A.
Webster, John G., 25658A.
Wells, John C., Jr., 26732A.

Dental Corps

Buchholz, Robert E., 27982A.
Calomeni, Alexander A., 23179A.
Chappell, Robert P., 26635A.
Cornyn, John, 27632A.
Crouse, Vance L., 26735A.
Dirlam, James H., 21765A.
Freeborn, Carl H., 32354A.
Hooker, Southern P., 32353A.
Lord, Hunting J., Jr., 55772A.
Mahan, Charles J., 24678A.
Martin, Edward R., 28128A.
Metts, Dewey M., Jr., 26695A.
Morris, Charles R., 21852A.
Prejean, Edward J., Jr., 29277A.
Riley, William D., Jr., 26358A.
Roy, Edward W., 24676A.
Sachsel, Arthur J., 29278A.
Salentine, Russell J., 22407A.
Schwatka, Charles T., Jr., 21768A.
Shuttee, Thomas S., 23594A.
Smolen, George, 32570A.
Snider, J. Martin, 29651A.
Stern, Roger O., 29652A.
Varrin, Rene D., 25481A.
Walker, Raymond C., Jr., 27593A.
Woodward, Hubert W., 22977A.

Veterinary Corps

Grau, William H., Jr., 23073A.
Griffin, Thomas P., 23217A.
Lang, Charles V., 27530A.

Medical Service Corps

Baker, Wesley H., 48953A.
Cahill, Daniel P., 48944A.
Cox, Sidney D., Jr., 21875A.
Crabb, Kirkham V., 48948A.
Dibona, Philip, 21641A.
Dunn, Charles C., 21628A.
Dykes, Leroy C., 48942A.
Haigler, Steven V., Jr., 21638A.
Heitlinger, Robert V., 48932A.
Herold, Paul A., 48945A.
Hilty, Eugene A., 48956A.
Jones, Harold M., 55329A.
Leahy, Joseph H., 55326A.
Liberson, Samuel, 48946A.
McChesney, Lambert W., Sr., 48955A.
McLellan, Walter J., Jr., 55327A.
McMahan, Philip E., 48954A.
Moss, Robert J., 55328A.
Park, Arthur W., 23077A.
Payne, Carl N., 48947A.
Peterson, Robert L., 48950A.
Plock, William L., 21639A.
Shaw, John R., 48941A.
Smith, Francis S., 36854A.
Snyder, Edward E., 48943A.
Yearty, James E., 26652A.

Nurse Corps

Anderson, Carol L., 56171W.
Kennedy, Rita M., 51585W.
Wickstrom, Mary K., 51586W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Bodycomb, Joyce, 20897W.
Ellis, Mary C., 49737W.

Chaplain

Ahern, Patrick J., 21860A.
Alt, Eugene R., 23202A.
Bonner, Harold W., 21865A.
Brian, Sam E., 48605A.
Christensen, Morley W., 55116A.
Clemens, Eugene M., 48606A.
Dubose, Wilds S., Jr., 48603A.
Durkin, John R., 48599A.

Finneran, Michael J., 20859A.
Gaffney, Conrad J., 48604A.
Gilchrist, Frank J., 48602A.
Hoop, George E., 21861A.
Jellico, Thomas M., 24681A.
Levitan, Kalman L., 23204A.
Mulligan, Edward B., 20860A.
Prokopovitsh, John E., 48601A.
Puseman, Edmund A., 21864A.
Rutan, Robert M., 55112A.
Saul, Laurence E., 21862A.
Shelton, David K., 21863A.
Shinn, Benjamin J., 24680A.
Shoemaker, William L., 55114A.
Spiewak, Stanley W., 48600A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Allington, Maynard F., 50071A.
Andrews, John F., 54723A.
Baker, Robert L., 32295A.
Barnhouse, Verdo R., Jr., 54722A.
Cain, Thomas G., 32296A.
Calvert, Donald R., 32516A.
Cannon, Daniel P., 54720A.
Carlson, Jack W., 48551A.
Chance, Victor P., 54712A.
Colyer, James A., 48556A.
Cooley, Anthon E., 54713A.
Crum, Fred B., 54705A.
Davis, Albert M., 32292A.
Dekeyser, Bernard R., 32300A.
Denison, Harold G., 32515A.
Dickensheets, Richard E., 54691A.
Dillman, Laurie E., 54721A.
Dondero, David S., 32550A.
Epps, Ernest, 54709A.
Ferrell, Raymond L., 54703A.
Fiscus, John E., 32289A.
Gatza, James T., 48554A.
Green, Bruce, 32290A.
Greene, Wiley E., 32294A.
Gutchess, Robert, 32297A.
Hand, Norbert R., Jr., 54738A.
Hansen, Ernest L., 54730A.
Harris, James, 54726A.
Harrison, Harrold G., 32547A.
Harvey, Thomas E., 29904A.
Heilala, Gary A., 48540A.
Hill, Thomas D., 48555A.
Jamieson, James R., 54690A.
Jones, James G., 56227A.
Koenig, Donald F., 54740A.
Korzun, Edwin A., 29908A.
Landers, Bobbie J., 32303A.
Ley, Roger P., 32298A.
Lundy, Charley E., 54698A.
McCormick, Donald K., 54739A.
McMillian, James C., 3d, 54714A.
McNeill, Frederick W., 32293A.
Mestemacher, James L., 54692A.
Miles, Victor J., Jr., 48547A.
Miller, William R., 54695A.
Montgomery, Jack T., 32556A.
Morelle, Fredric T., 32299A.
Morris, Don L., 32302A.
Morrissey, Robert D., 32557A.
Nelson, Eric B., 48541A.
Nowotny, Albert J., 48557A.
O'Connor, John H., Jr., 29903A.
Patch, Donald C., 32301A.
Petty, Gerald L., 48544A.
Price, Richard B., 3d, 48553A.
Probst, Frederick N., Jr., 54689A.
Render, William E., 54734A.
Roberts, Joseph W., 54715A.
Robertson, Bill J., 54706A.
Robinson, James M., 50072A.
Schurr, Roger D., 48537A.
Seigal, John W., 54731A.
Sickenberger, William L., 54693A.
Spiegel, Donald R., 50073A.
Stemler, Rodger L., 32549A.
Stevens, John R., Jr., 32291A.
Stoob, John C., 54711A.
Stowell, Dibrell C., 48535A.
Swofford, Donald D., 32223A.
Tanner, John B., 32527A.
Tarvin, Albert L., 54744A.
Thomas, David H., 2d, 48558A.
Tolley, Charles P., 54737A.
Tonge, James M., 48467A.
Usher, Robert L., 29902A.
Vanduyn, Alfred V., Jr., 54707A.
Watson, Florence G., 54735W.
Webster, George L., 54704A.
Westmoreland, Barney, Jr., 54727A.
Wheat, Anthony J., Jr., 54688A.
White, Warren G., 54694A.
Wiggins, Frank S., 32226A.
Wilson, Robert C., 54745A.
Wine, James C., 48548A.
Winn, Ray J., 54729A.
Wright, William E., 54719A.
Yde, Robert E., 48549A.
Zielke, Eugene C., 54708A.

Medical Service Corps

Cavanaugh, Patrick D., 49128A.
Clemons, Keith, 49130A.
Kennedy, Charles L., 55369A.
Voorhees, John D., 49129A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 25: 40: *Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our prayer, at this noon hour, be one for the forgiveness of all our sins in the realm of human relations and for that peace which comes from pardon.

We acknowledge with humility and shame that we have so frequently taken a supercilious attitude toward our fellow men whom we do not regard and count our equal.

Wilt Thou forgive the blindness of our pride and prejudice which fails to see the worth of the least of Thy children and those in our social order who are unlike ourselves.

Grant that we may be purged of all our selfishness and petty self-concern and our indifference toward the untold numbers of needy and helpless members of the human family who are finding the struggle of life so difficult.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of that lowly Man of Galilee who came to proclaim the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

RE-REFERRAL OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 42

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 42, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, be re-referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS—THE PRESIDENT CONTRADICTS HIMSELF

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, may I remind my colleagues who heard the President deliver his state of the Union message in this Chamber that he made reference to civil rights legislation, and I quote a portion of his remarks:

> Early in your last session, I recommended legislation which would help eliminate several practices discriminating against the basic rights of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has developed additional constructive recommendations. I hope that these will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session. I trust that Congress will thus signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people.

Now the important point to me, and evidently it was important enough for the President to include it in his official message, is the specific reference to the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, which the President described as "additional constructive" recommendations, and that he hoped that "these will be among the matters to be seriously considered."

I heartily agree with these Presidential remarks made before the United States Congress on January 7 of this year. And indeed, I was happy to hear our Chief Executive make reference to the fact that, and I quote, "the right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society" and that "our first duty is to protect this right against all encroachment."

Certainly the Civil Rights Commission recommendations in the area of voting, as well as in other areas, is based on well-founded facts and documentation. So when the President made specific reference to protecting the right to vote, and then subsequently gave emphasis to the Commission recommendations, I thought surely he meant he was anxious to see this Congress act positively in guaranteeing the right to vote when we finally get the chance to act on civil rights legislation.

Mr. Speaker, evidently I was mistaken in my first burst of enthusiasm engendered by these Presidential statements, because only this morning I read the President's comments on civil rights legislation at his news conference of yesterday, January 13.

I would like to read the questions posed to the President and his answers:

QUESTION. Mr. President, you asked the Congress to study the recommendations of

the Commission on Civil Rights in your state of the Union message.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

QUESTION. Do you agree with the majority of the Commissioners that a law is needed to provide Federal registrars when Negroes are denied the right to register or vote?

The PRESIDENT. I don't know—as a matter of fact, I don't even know whether it is constitutional. What I am saying is, or what the Commissioners said, this was one plan that they thought might have some measure of validity, and, therefore, they wanted to study it. Now, the way I feel about this civil rights, we have one bill that was put in last year in which extensive hearings have been heard—had; and I should like to see the Congress act decisively on this particular proposal, and such other proposals made as—that now become almost controversial from the moment that they are presented—would not enter into the proposal or to the process of examining and passing the bill that was already put before the Congress.

QUESTION. You mean——

The PRESIDENT. You see, I don't have any—what I am trying to get at is, I have no objection to the study of the others. As a matter of fact, I want to study them because I would like to see what everybody thinks about it. My big problem is, though, let's get this bill already proposed on which they have had hearings, let's get that acted on.

Now, if I can translate this, I would say the President did not take a positive position in his press conference to parallel what I felt was a clearly stated position in his state of the Union message. It appears to me he was for the recommendations of the Commission in his state of the Union message, delivered on January 7, but is now backtracking or vacillating on January 13. What will be his stand, say, tomorrow?

I respectfully ask my colleagues across the aisle, particularly the minority leadership, what does the President really mean? What will the administration finally support when we do meet the civil rights issue on this floor?

On further consideration, perhaps the proper person to make this matter clear is the Republican Presidential designate, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON. We shall eagerly await his answer.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been most interested in the remarks of my colleague from California in which he points out, with typical incisiveness, the striking disparity in the President's attitude on civil rights legislation as set forth in his state of the Union message and the hesitant, retrogressive, and disappointing statement on the rights issue which he made at his press conference yesterday.

Unfortunately, this inconsistency on the part of our national leadership is not confined to civil rights.

In his state of the Union message, the President spent considerable time discussing the dangers of inflation and our balance of payments deficit. In the next breath, however, he lauded a settlement of the steel strike which can only trigger price increases throughout our entire economy and add to our balance of payments problem.

The only way that the President can make sense out of this situation is to proclaim steadfastly that there is nothing inflationary about the steel settlement. He goes even further, of course, and maintains that any suggestion that Vice President NIXON or the administration forced a steel settlement is just plain silly.

The President explains that Mr. NIXON's role in the matter "was a very simple affair." He goes on to say that negotiations had been deadlocked for a long time and there was no prospect of a settlement before the injunction obtained by the administration was scheduled to expire. Under the circumstances, says the President, he asked Mr. NIXON and Secretary Mitchell to act as mediators, and he goes on to relate that they made a proposal, after going to each side and working very hard, that was a solution between the positions taken by the management and the union.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know the President as a sincere and truthful man, but we also know that he is sometimes badly advised and ill informed.

Certainly this must be the situation as far as the steel settlement is concerned. After all, the President was out of the country for nearly 3 weeks prior to management's sudden capitulation. For those who followed in detail the day-to-day efforts at compromise and solution of the strike, it strains credibility to suppose that the solution proposed by the likely Republican ticket of NIXON and Mitchell was one which had never before been discussed.

I say this strains the credulity of the average person because the average person knows full well that the negotiating teams of both labor and management numbered not in the dozens but in the hundreds, and that a score of experienced professional mediators were on the scene as well. Yet we are asked to believe that it took NIXON and Mitchell to find an acceptable solution and that this solution was gratefully accepted by both sides without the slightest bit of political pressure.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is only one more example of this administration's habit of dealing with the American public on a basis of fancy rather than fact.

But the real shocker in yesterday's Presidential news conference, Mr. Speaker, was the denial that the politically contrived strike settlement would result in inflationary increases in the price of steel.

I do not know who gave Mr. Eisenhower this piece of advice, but I doubt if there is anyone in the country who has gone beyond the sixth grade that agrees with it. Certainly the steel producers do not—and they are the ones who decide when prices go up and how much. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., is widely quoted as saying that the strike terms "could hardly be regarded as noninflationary." The magazine Steel has stated that higher steel prices can hardly be avoided. It calculates that over the 30-month life of the new contract steelmaking costs will rise about $16 a ton.

In foreign capitals throughout the world it is an accepted fact that U.S. steel prices will rise and that inflation lies ahead for the United States. Failure to stabilize the purchasing price of the dollar is seen to pose a further danger to the U.S. balance-of-payments position and specifically it is seen as a formidable roadblock to our attempt to narrow the gap between U.S. exports and imports.

Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of the consequences can hardly be overstated when we allow political influence to be applied by high administration officials in our already sensitive field of labor-management relations. It is for this reason that I will urge appropriate committees of the House and Senate to scrutinize carefully the record of the recent strike settlement. Meanwhile, I am sure I share the hope of many that the summit meetings between industry and union leaders which have been initiated by Mr. NIXON will henceforth include a taxpaying consumer to represent the American public.

DESECRATION OF PLACES OF WORSHIP

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as you all know from reading the papers during the past few weeks, the hatemongers are back at work.

All right-thinking people view with considerable alarm the recent deplorable series of desecrations of churches, temples, and synagogues in both Europe and right here in the United States. Such outrages against places of worship and religious instruction, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or other denominations merit not only our severest condemnations, but also call for full recognition of their true source. That such evidences of bigotry are un-American, un-Christian, and foreign to our ideals, no one can deny, since it bears all the earmarks of our former enemy and alien foe; namely, the Nazis.

It is bad enough when the hated and despised swastika—that dread emblem of brutality, coldblooded murder, and utter disregard of basic human rights—is raised in foreign countries, it is unpardonable when this alien and awful symbol makes its unwanted appearance in America, a nation dedicated to liberty, freedom, and justice for all. It is equally as bad as the red flag of atheistic communism and both must be forever removed from our midst.

Some say that these recent paint smears and anti-Semitic words that have defaced the walls of some of our places of worship are but the work of so-called pranksters and crackpots. Others say that it is clear evidence of a well-organized underground movement. But, no matter what it may be, we should have learned the lesson of history, for that is exactly the way Hitler and other dictators started and then came to power. We cannot, we must not, and we will not permit such intolerable acts of hate, bigotry, and un-Americanism to raise their ugly heads in the United States and ultimately destroy our way of life. To this end, I have introduced a resolution in the Congress denouncing such depredations and calling upon every freedom-loving American to help stop this campaign of hate and prejudice before it gets started.

Unfortunately, it seems that few, if any, of those responsible for such vandalism were arrested or punished. If this means that new legislation is required to combat this evil, then let us consider appropriate measures. But, whatever is needed, the time for action is now. America must remain free from religious persecution and prejudice, and it is the obligation of the Congress of the United States to safeguard our freedoms.

Under the Constitution, people are guaranteed the free exercise of their chosen form of worship. And we must never brook any interference with this basic right, no matter what the source, for it is an important part of the foundation of our democracy.

The defiling of our houses of worship with the despicable symbol of nazism should serve to remind us all that the price of freedom is truly eternal vigilance.

THE RULES COMMITTEE AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday while I was absent from the floor my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, made this statement:

> The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], my very dear friend, stated that I have not as yet requested hearings before the Rules Committee on the civil rights bill.

I advised the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], my dear friend, a little later in the afternoon that his statement was incorrect, that I had not made such a statement, but that in reply to an inquiry I had stated that as far as I knew he had not requested a hearing, and certainly he had not appeared before our committee to testify.

The gentleman from New York is very fine, a very well educated and a very distinguished gentleman. As I said a moment ago, he is my dear friend, my good friend, but he does have one weakness that seemingly applies to a great many people: He knows so much that is not so. This statement that he made about me is not so. I hope he will correct the RECORD.

Then I want to go a little further, if I may. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I have consistently voted for civil rights legislation, both in the committee and on the floor, but I do not control the Rules Committee, which is made up of eight Democrats and four Republicans. The agenda of the committee is not made up by the Republican members. Neither can we set the time for holding hearings on an application for a rule.

Further, may I point out that our Democratic friends control the Judiciary Committee, of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is the distinguished chairman, 21 to 11.

Now, in these days of wild statements and politically inspired charges relative to civil rights legislation, it may be well to get some facts, or to look at the record. Here is what has actually happened:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILLS

January 22, 1959, H.R. 3147 introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] 2 weeks after Congress convened. Seventeen days of hearings were not held until March and April 1959.

June 17, 1959, subcommittee ordered H.R. 3147 reported to full Judiciary Committee.

August 5, 1959, H.R. 3147 ordered reported by the full committee with amendments.

August 11, 1959, a clean bill—H.R. 8601—ordered reported by the full committee.

August 20, 1959, H.R. 8601 reported.

August 21, 1959, Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee a routine letter requesting a hearing for a rule. No further written request for a hearing by the Rules Committee had been made up to January 13, 1960.

Congress adjourned on September 15, 1959.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JANUARY 18

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no program to announce for next week. If anything develops I will give the membership as much advance notice as possible. Two bills have been reported out of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. The full committee meets on Tuesday. Whether the bills can be brought up this coming week I am unable to state now, but I will give as much advance notice as possible.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I probably will not, the House has been in session all this week in order to get signatures to a couple of discharge petitions. Is that correct? We have been meeting each day this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are discharge petitions on the desk, and the gentleman's statement is correct. If he particularized on the civil rights petition for emphasis that would be more correct.

Mr. GROSS. Have the petitions been signed?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, under the rules of the House, one cannot disclose who signs petitions.

Mr. GROSS. I was not asking who signed. But have the sessions of this week each day brought about the necessary number of signatures?

Mr. McCORMACK. From the information I have, there have been a number of Members who have signed the civil rights discharge petition.

Mr. GROSS. Would it not be well to have the House in session tomorrow and Saturday as well?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not put the gentleman to the burden of objecting to my request. If the gentleman will slightly intimate he would prefer that I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, I will do it.

Mr. GROSS. I was not suggesting that the gentleman withdraw it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will be glad to do that because I am sure a number of us are debating the advisability of signing that petition.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would like to have me withdraw my request?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would the gentleman do that at my request? If that could be done, I will make it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman wants me to do it, I would, because if I thought the gentleman would object I would not put the request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would not do that. I would not object. If the gentleman wants to withdraw it, I would be glad to help out by making the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a reasonable thing to go over from Thursday to Monday.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say that the House will be in session next week without any business for the purpose of obtaining signatures to the discharge petition?

Mr. McCORMACK. Until Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Until Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Until Thursday; yes.

Mr. GROSS. But not on Friday or Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not predict for next week what I would want to do then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I know his reputation for truthfulness, and I certainly accept his statement. I had read in the public print, a statement attributed to him in turn, that I had not asked for a hearing before the Rules Committee. I took it for granted, and probably should not have done so, that the statement was actually made by him. It probably was a statement made by the reporter who wrote the article in the Evening Star.

However, I again reiterate that the petition is on the Speaker's desk, and I fervently hope we will be able to get enough signatures so that we may be able, shall I say, to circumvent the reluctance of the Rules Committee to give us a rule in order that the House may work its will on this very important legislation, the civil rights bill. The intransigence of the Rules Committee is quite manifest. I applied for a rule and asked the chairman, Judge SMITH, for an opportunity to be heard. Both requests were treated with indifference and inaction.

ESTABLISHING A FREE GUIDE SERVICE FOR THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute's time to say a word about my bill, H.R. 9487, to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol.

Actually, I had the bill drafted last year and threw it into the hopper Tuesday with no thought that it would be particularly newsworthy.

But apparently from the press yesterday, I am viewed as a fellow who would like to curb the free speech of the Capitol guides. I am an autocrat who would place a censorship on what is said about Will Rogers and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Davey Crockett, and those three marble ladies who sit in a tublike arrangement in one of the lower corridors of the Capitol.

Let me assure the members of this body that I am no witchhunter of Capitol guides. The provision forbidding the guide from speaking in praise or censure of any person was to protect both political parties from prejudicial opinions on the part of the guides. I am certainly not in favor of curbing the imagination of these men and women who are the Capitol's hosts and hostesses, but merely trying to insure that, regardless of which party controls the Congress, the information given and the impression made is not slanted.

Actually, my real objective in introducing the legislation was to eliminate the necessity for visitors paying for their tour of the Capitol. It is painful for me to witness American citizens, many of them students and members of our armed services, having to pay to take a conducted tour of their own U.S. Capitol. American tourists come from all over the United States. Many of them must make a considerable effort to get to the Capitol, and I feel that the Government should provide these Americans with a guided tour of the building. After all, is it not kind of silly to give billions of taxpayers' money in foreign aid and then ask another two bits of those who come to see the building where we shovel out those billions. And we have free bulletins about the love life of bullfrogs and care of expectant mothers—which is fine for the bullfrog and baby population. Let us use a little largesse with the American who pays the taxes to support the Capitol and the washing of the statues and the putting up of that new east front.

Then, too, it certainly does smack a little of mendicancy for these men and women—doing one of the really important jobs of introducing the Capitol of the United States to the American people—to hold out a tin cup for 25 cents instead of being paid adequate salaries for what they are doing. Let us get these people into a professional category where they belong.

Now let me give you a quick summary of the situation at the present time with regard to the Capitol guides.

There are 24 Capitol guides, who are appointed by and serve under the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police Board. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate appoints 12 guides, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives appoints 12.

According to my proposed bill, there would be 1 chief guide who would be paid $7,500, and 19 who would be paid $6,000 a year—a total expenditure of $114,000.

Today visitors to the Capitol who desire the services of the guides pay 25 cents each for adults and 15 cents for children. Persons who enter the Capitol as passengers on sightseeing buses also pay the required fee, which is included in their fee for sightseeing service.

The total fees received by the Capitol guides are divided equally among the 24 guides, under rules governing leave privileges and absence from duty.

In order to qualify for a position as guide, the applicant must take at least a week of training and pass an examination covering the information to be given to the tourists. The captain of guides is elected each year by the guide group.

Although exact information is not available, approximately 15,000 persons enter the Capitol each day. On peak days—during Easter week, for example—the guides serve from 10,000 to 12,000 people daily, while in inclement weather they may conduct only a few tours of small numbers of people, and their income is based upon the number of visitors each day. A very rough estimate—no exact figures are available—is that each guide makes about $6,000 a year at the present time.

It is my hope that the House Administration Committee will give this suggestion their careful consideration.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 296)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress enact certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to clarify management responsibilities and to streamline organizational arrangements concerning the national program of space exploration.

Prior to establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense had been responsible for all of the Nation's space activities, including those of a nonmilitary nature such as the Vanguard satellite project designed for U.S. participation in the scientific activities of the International Geophysical Year. When the new agency came into existence, with the duty of carrying out a program of space exploration, it became necessary to transfer the nonmilitary projects, with their supporting facilities and personnel, to the new agency from the Department of Defense. The act empowered the President to make such transfers. I exercised this authority on October 1, 1958, when I transferred to NASA responsibility for Project Vanguard and certain other space-related projects previously under the direction of the Department of Defense. I exercised it for the second time on December 3, 1958, when I directed the transfer to NASA of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena, Calif. And today I am transmitting a report advising the Congress of my intention to transfer to NASA the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency. The authority granted to the President has thus been used to center in NASA direction of all of the Nation's nonmilitary space activities, and to provide NASA with the facilities and personnel needed to carry out this task.

The act, however, contains a number of provisions which tend to obscure the

responsibility of NASA for planning and directing a national program of space exploration and peaceful space activity. For example, there is inherent in the concept—which I believe to be incorrect—of a single comprehensive program of space activities embracing both civilian and military activities, and it implies that a multiplicity of unnamed agencies might have responsibility for portions of such a program.

In an effort to deal with these problems, the act established a scheme of organization of considerable complexity: First, section 201(e) of the act imposes upon the President an unusual degree of personal responsibility for developing this comprehensive space program and of surveying its operations in detail; second, the act established the National Aeronautics and Space Council and gave it the sole function of advising the President with respect to the performance of his statutory duties; third, it made provision for a civilian-military liaison committee, which was given no other duty than providing a channel of advice and consultation between NASA and the Department of Defense.

I have become convinced by the experience of the 15 months since NASA was established that the act needs to be amended so as to place responsibility directly and unequivocally in one agency, NASA, for planning and managing a national program of nonmilitary space activities. This requires, first of all, elimination of those provisions which reflect the concept of a single program embracing military as well as nonmilitary space activities. In actual practice a single civil-military program does not exist and is in fact unattainable; and the statutory concept of such a program has caused confusion. The military utilization of space, and the research and development effort directed toward that end, are integral parts of the total defense program of the United States. Space projects in the Department of Defense are undertaken only to meet military requirements. The Department of Defense has ample authority outside the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to conduct research and development work on space-related weapons systems and to utilize space for defense purposes; and nothing in the act should derogate from that authority.

I am also convinced that it is no longer desirable to retain in the act those provisions which impose duties of planning and detailed surveying upon the President. We have come to the end of a transitional period during which responsibilities for a broad range of activities were being shifted to NASA from the Department of Defense and NASA's capabilities for discharging those responsibilities were being developed. From now on it should be made clear that NASA, like the Department of Defense in the military field, is responsible in the first instance for the formulation and execution of its own program, subject, of course, to the authority and direction of the President.

With the repeal of the statutory enumeration of Presidential duties, the National Aeronautics and Space Council should be abolished, since its only function is to advise the President in the performance of those duties. The repeal would not, however, affect another provision of the act which provides that the Administrator of NASA and the Secretary of Defense may refer to the President for decision those matters concerning their respective areas of responsibility on which they are unable to reach agreement. This provision should be retained in the law.

The Civilian-Military Liaison Committee should also be eliminated. The statute should go no further than requiring that NASA and the Department of Defense advise, consult, and keep each other fully informed with respect to space activities within their respective jurisdictions; it should not prescribe the specific means of doing so.

Finally, the act should contain safeguards against undesirable duplication by NASA and the Department of Defense in developing the major tools of space exploration. Although a civilian space exploration program is clearly distinguishable from the military utilization of space for defense purposes, both NASA and the Department of Defense may have similar or identical requirements for launch vehicles used to propel and guide spacecraft into orbit about the earth or toward other celestial bodies. I propose that the act be amended to provide that the President shall assign responsibility for the development of each new launch vehicle, regardless of its intended use, to either NASA or the Department of Defense. Responsibility for development of the new vehicle should in no way determine responsibility for its use in space activities.

Amended as I have recommended, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 would become the organic act of an independent civilian agency having a well-defined statutory responsibility for which it is answerable to both the President and to Congress.

I have requested the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to transmit to the Congress draft legislation incorporating the foregoing recommendations, and I urge that they be enacted by the Congress at the earliest possible date.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

CERTAIN TRANSFERS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO NASA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 297)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In pursuance of the provisions of section 302 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 I transmit herewith a transfer plan headed "Making Certain Transfers From the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration." This message, together with the transfer plan, constitutes the report to the Congress, relative to the transfers, as required by the provisions of section 302.

Under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has primary responsibility for the Nation's program of space exploration. The Department of Defense has responsibility for the Nation's defense program, including the development and operation of space vehicles for defense purposes.

I have recently reviewed the needs and requirements of the two agencies in their respective fields. It is clear that NASA, in order to carry on a vigorous and effective program for the exploration of space, both manned and unmanned, requires boosters for space vehicles greatly exceeding the thrust of any boosters now available. Furthermore, there is at present no clear Department of Defense requirement for such very large boosters. For this reason I assigned sole responsibility for development of space vehicle boosters of very high thrust to NASA last November. In carrying out this responsibility NASA will be fully responsive to specific requirements of the Department of Defense for the development of very large boosters for future military missions. At the same time the Department of Defense and NASA will continue with a coordinated program for the development of boosters based on the current intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and the intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) and growth versions of those missiles.

On the basis of this assignment of responsibility the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has assumed technical direction of the Saturn booster project which was previously under the direction of the Department of Defense. This booster which promises to increase greatly the Nation's ability to explore space is being developed by the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and will soon constitute the major workload of the Development Operations Division of that Agency.

The foregoing reflects the pertinent arrangements as they now exist. I have concluded that it is in the best interest of the Nation to take another step at this time—to provide NASA with an organization capable of and equipped for developing and operating large space vehicle boosters and conducting related research. This can be done by transferring to NASA the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and certain supporting personnel. At the same time it is recognized that the Army must continue to be able to discharge its responsibilities for development of missile systems. The transfer plan forwarded herewith is designed to accomplish these purposes.

In carrying out the transfer plan every effort will be made to prevent the dislocation or disruption of ongoing missile or space vehicle projects. The development of military weapons systems and

related programs, currently being worked on by the Development Operations Division, will be continued by the Army, utilizing the skills of the transferred personnel as requested by the Army, on a reimbursable basis.

The transfer of personnel, property, and funds, under the plan, will be accomplished in such manner as to serve the objectives I have outlined.

I urge the Congress to allow the transfer plan transmitted herewith to take effect.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 299)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the 16th semiannual report on the operation of the mutual security program for the period ending June 30, 1959. The report was prepared under the direction of the Coordinator for the mutual security program by the Department of State, including the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

The information set forth in the report demonstrates once again that today our national security is directly involved with nations and happenings throughout the world.

The mutual security program is flexibly designed to meet military threats where they occur and to make an effective contribution toward the cooperative effort of the nations of the free world to promote economic development.

The economic problems of the newly developing nations of the world pose a challenge to our wisdom and energy, and to our steadfastness of purpose, that is as demanding in its own way as the blunt threat of an armed attack. Our economic development and economic aid programs are designed to meet this challenge and its ever-changing problems by selective and prudent use of the talents and resources available under the mutual security program.

The military, economic, and technical assistance provided by the mutual security program is essential to the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. A strong program, vigorously and intelligently implemented, will see the challenge that confronts us surmounted. But a weakening of the program can only invite the destruction of our free-world society.

This report affords the Congress a means of measuring what has been done by the United States and its friends to preserve a world where men and nations can live in freedom, without fear.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 298)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress the Sixth Annual Report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1954, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Twelfth Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency covering housing activities for the calendar year 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 14, 1960.*

THOMAS KENNEDY, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Thomas Kennedy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House the fact that Thomas Kennedy, a former Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, a distinguished son of that State, from the city of Hazleton, which numbers among its other attributes the fact that I was born there, is the new president of the great United Mine Workers of America.

We have known him in Washington for many, many years, not only as an officer of that great labor organization but as a public servant of four Presidents upon great missions of domestic and international importance.

Mr. Kennedy is a very gracious, a very calm, and a very fine, sympathetic, understanding gentleman. I know that he will do great good for the men who follow his brilliant leadership, and that that leadership will redound to the benefit of the United States of America as well.

My statement on this occasion follows:

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS J. KENNEDY

This is Congressman DAN FLOOD. I am making this statement in Washington as part of the wonderful tribute that you are paying to my dear friend, Tom Kennedy. We know him back home as a friend and neighbor and, of course, as a leader of the United Mine Workers, a great segment of organized labor; but here in Washington I am proud to report to you that we know him as a statesman. He has served four Presidents of these United States ably and well, not only on commissions dealing with the welfare of the United States but also representing this Nation upon important international commissions all over the world.

We know him in our council chambers here in Washington; we know him in the meetings of the Senate committees; we know him in the meetings of the House committees, where he testifies every year in support of matters affecting the mine workers, not only with reference to matters dealing with domestic affairs alone but in all great and in important things, for his experience, his ability, his great repute for integrity is recognized by everybody in Washington of both great political parties.

And so I come to you as an old friend of Tom Kennedy's, and I am proud to say to Washington as I say repeatedly that he comes from my hometown of Hazleton. But it is pleasant, indeed, it is encouraging, indeed, to know that Tom Kennedy is now the president of the great United Mine Workers of America.

Here is the typical American story if there ever was one—working in the mines as a little child, as you might say, to now gracing the president's chair of a great organization in the Nation's Capital. He is a man from our hometown streets who comes to us in the Nation's Capitol, who sits with kings and presidents and leaders of great nations, bringing to them from his knowledge and from his heart, and from the warmth of his spirit and the understanding of people those things which makes America great.

And so in Washington we are just as proud of Thomas Kennedy as you are back in Hazleton.

The statement by Mr. Thomas Kennedy in accepting the presidency of the United Mines Workers of America is as follows:

I think it should be obvious that I accept the presidency of the United Mine Workers of America with a deep sense of humility, because no one can literally replace a man of the immense stature of John L. Lewis.

I think that history will without a doubt record him as the greatest leader the American labor movement has ever had, and I further think that history will also record him as one of the two or three outstanding Americans of our century.

A change of names has taken place today. No change in union policy need necessarily follow. The policies enunciated and explained throughout the land and to our members by Mr. Lewis down through the years will be the policies of this organization for many years to come. The impress of his 40 years as president of the United Mine Workers of America will not soon be eradicated and our entire membership can rest assured that I will do the best I can to carry out the principles and policies to the *n*th degree.

My faith in the future of the coal industry and its union is deep. The United Mine Workers of America has a fine body of capable men who have already displayed outstanding talent for leadership. They will continue

our longstanding policy of battling vigorously on all fronts for better wages and working conditions for the men who mine the fuel that powers America. They will also fight to better the lot of the more than a quarter of a million American men and women who are members of district 50, including our Canadian membership in that district.

We also will continue to cooperate and give every assistance to our Canadian membership in districts 18 and 26. The problems of these districts are difficult and complicated, but I believe eventually these matters will be resolved on a basis that will guarantee stability and employment in the coal-mining industry of Canada.

Furthermore, we will continue our cooperative work with the mining industry in Latin America through the Inter-American Regional Organization Workers (ORIT), as well as render assistance to the Miners International Federation and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. All of these organizations are working toward a goal of organizing all workers in underdeveloped countries to fight the infiltration of communism and seek to bring about free organization of labor, free collective bargaining, and raise the standard of wages and living conditions for people throughout the world.

During the coming year the United Mine Workers of America and the coal industry face a host of problems, many of which can and should be solved legislatively by the Congress. I need not here be specific about our legislative program because I believe that right-minded legislators are fully aware of the needs of the coal industry and the legislation that must be passed to keep it vigorous. Among the many things which are of utmost necessity, I would say that we definitely need a national fuels policy.

In time of national stress it has always been coal—not the luxury fuels—that bear the burden of providing energy for American industry and national defense. Congress and the administration must be made to realize that an ailing coal industry is not only detrimental to the American economy but it is dangerous to our continued existence. The United Mine Workers of America will now as always continue to battle against politicians of both parties who are willing to allow the coal industry to sink into obsolescence through neglect or attachment to a special interest. Furthermore, the United Mine Workers of America will continue its vigorous opposition to atheistic communism and exert every possible influence at our command, within this country and elsewhere, to prevent the spread of this evil which threatens our freedom.

MR. THOMAS KENNEDY

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to note the great loss to the American mining industry, the United Mine Workers of America, and, in fact, the American people by the retirement from the presidency of this great union by its longtime leader, John L. Lewis.

Maybe it is because of my early youth spent in the coalfields of Pennsylvania, or maybe it is because I have spent so many years in the field of legislative action, but I personally feel that the loss of his great counsel in public affairs pertaining to the touchy subject of labor-management relations will be sorely missed by the whole Nation.

In this connection, I believe it appropriate that the following statements by these distinguished men in the industrial life of our Nation ought to be recorded in the RECORD of the Congress:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, Jan. 1, 1960]

WHAT OTHERS SAY—THE NATION COMMENTS ON LEWIS' RETIREMENT

(By J. McC.)

To each of us in the United Mine Workers of America, President John L. Lewis' decision to retire shortly after the new year is a deeply personal thing.

For 12 years now your editor has worked closely with "the Boss." There are many things that might be said in praise of this man. Almost all of them seem inadequate at this time. Perhaps the best thing that comes to mind was a simple statement made to us some years ago by our predecessor, the late editor of the Journal, Cecil Owen.

"We are working with a great man," Mr. Owen said.

Because we all know in our hearts how we feel about President Lewis, it was with some considerable hesitancy that the Journal considered the question of what to write about President Lewis in this issue.

Then an easy but appropriate answer occurred. The members of the United Mine Workers of America, to whom President Lewis addressed his letter of resignation, obviously know how they feel.

So, let the public speak. Let the editors of the daily newspapers, of the news magazines, the radio and television commentators, the columnists, the labor writers and editors and the reporters who covered Lewis down through the years—let them speak.

Across our desk since December 15 have come thousands of clippings concerning the retirement of President Lewis. We present, herewith, some of them:

"It is possible that the American Newspaper Guild would not be in existence today if it had not been for John Llewellyn Lewis, and it is dead certain that a good many men and women who today are reasonably well paid, reasonably secure in their job opportunities, and reasonably capable of self-respecting labor owe a great deal to that giant of a man. * * *

"He was an indispensable figure in the building of the mass-production unions. There are very few men of his time who contributed so greatly to bringing equity, security, and a sense of strength to humble people who can literally be numbered in the millions. * * *

"He * * * will be remembered when everyone has forgotten the corporate managements with whom—to use his phrase—labor 'was locked in deadly embrace.'" (Willard Shelton in the Guild Reporter.)

"All the citizens of this country * * * are better off because John L. Lewis, a valiant fighter for humanity, has 'passed by here.'" (Charlie Houston, veteran union printer, in the Journal of Labor, Atlanta, Ga.)

"The crowning contradiction of his life came * * * when—after announcing he would retire * * * the coal operators expressed their deep, sincere regret.

"No group ever has a more wretched record of mistreatment of labor than the coal barons. But in the end Lewis made them see the light with a result unbelievable 20 years ago.

"His miners are on the top rung of labor, in wages and benefits, and relations between Lewis and the operators are now so well adjusted there hasn't been a big strike in years." (James Marlow, Associated Press news analyst.)

"In the latest report on Pennsylvania employment and earnings * * * the hourly wage for soft coal miners is given at $3.29 * * * the top of any wage classification in the report, far above the figure for all manufacturing which was $2.16.

"That statistic can stand as representative of what John L. Lewis did for the members of the union to which he devoted his long and memorable career." (The Pittsburgh Press.)

"It was typical that he announced his retirement directly to his membership through the medium of the UMW Journal instead of at a press conference. Equally typical was his refusal to expand to interviewers on his announcement, his preference being to say to no one anything he hadn't told his solidly loyal fellow unionists. * * *"

"Lewis truly has been a volcano of a man, who spewed molten prose, who roared, who glowered, who threatened, seemed born to be caricatured, to be described or quoted, to be hated or followed unquestionably.

"In an increasing timid age, he has been one of the giants." (The Fairmont (W. Va.) Times.)

"There is only one John L. Lewis and the chances are there never will be another comparable figure in the U.S. labor movement. He was not a John Mitchell, William Green, Philip Murray, or Sam Gompers. He was strictly himself—able, resourceful, courageous. * * *

"John Lewis had an unusual capacity for leadership. He was as exacting with his subordinates and the rank and file as he was with the coal industry, the Government, or rival unions. He did not hesitate to pioneer or to take an unpopular stand when he believed his cause was right. His integrity, like his ability, was beyond question." (Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader; the Evening News.)

"He is either ardently admired or intensely disliked. People who know him best are in the former category and those who know him least are possibly in the latter.

"Mr. Lewis' unswerving devotion to the cause of the men whom he represented is unquestioned. He has given most of his life to advancing their welfare—and with a degree unmatched in the history of American labor. * * *

"His strongest adversaries in the coal industry privately admire and respect him. Many of them concede he is the most forword-looking figure in the industry." (The Scranton Times.)

"The finest tribute to his career is to be found in the miners' wages and working conditions today as compared with 40 years ago. Today, the miner is at the top of the industrial heap, as he should be. More than that, he has gained a sense of dignity and security compatible with his risks and efforts." (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.)

"He has remained first in the hearts of his miners * * *. People who shake their heads at such devotion perhaps never saw the bleak streets of a company town and the crippled ex-miners who sat uselessly on their little porches in the old fighting days. * * *

"The miners' hospitals of Kentucky and West Virginia will be lasting monuments to the man who fought for the per-ton assessment that made them possible. They have brought modern medical care to people who for generations knew only the uneven mercies of the company doctor." (The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.)

"To the Nation's reporters and columnists, to cartoonists everywhere, this is a black day in journalism.

"John L. Lewis is quitting and where shall we find another? * * *

"Ah, spring will never be the same in Washington again.

"Once spring meant magnolias, cherry blossoms, tourists—and the end of the miners' contract.

"Then up rose John L. Lewis and great was his wrath.

"Even his silence seemed cosmic. When Lewis decided on the silent treatment, he could stalk majestically through a crowd of reporters like—as one columnist put it—a frigate sailing through a school of minnows.

"Then the contract would be signed." (Arthur Edson, Associated Press writer.)

"Whatever one may have thought about Mr. Lewis in the past, there was never any question of his honesty and integrity. Strong-willed and brave, he fought for his ends with astonishing endurance. He was a formidable opponent, and powerful was the man who could successfully withstand the stripes of his rage.

"A man of Mr. Lewis' strength and purpose would be unusual anywhere. His is a type which is vanishing from the labor movement, giving place to the managers and the administrators and the experts. Labor for its own sake must hope that it can again produce someone of his stature." (New York Herald Tribune.)

"For several years it has become increasingly clear that in public estimation Mr. Lewis ranked head and shoulders above all other labor leaders in the United States. Now that he has announced he will resign early in 1960, more open expression of this esteem will naturally follow." (Morgantown (W. Va.) Post.)

"From the immense reaches of a shadowed room * * * a man looks out on a busy Washington park. His eyes are a little amused, a little proud, and very tolerant of the passing scene. No man yet alive has so molded the times in which he lives.

"Mark him well—the massive head with its great mane of white hair and stirring chunks of eyebrows, the deep sagacious eyes, the brawny shoulders. This is John L. Lewis, the Welsh coal miner who founded the modern labor movement.

"There would be no unions today in most production industries if John Lewis, ever scornful of the timid, had not moved his organizers from the coalfields to the steel mills * * * and set up the Committee for Industrial Organization.

"And he has made the American coal miner one of the best paid, best cared for workers in the world. John Lewis, too, brought to the soot-strewn mine towns of America something very special and very important. He gave the miner a sense of dignity and identity. Before the days of John L. Lewis, back in those towns crouched among the mountains, there were people and miners. In fighting for the miner, he gave them pride and self-respect and human dignity. This, perhaps was his greatest gift to his fellow men.

"Personally, John L. Lewis is a man of great modesty and charm. He can pull from the pockets of his mind, and rumble out in his deep, echoing voice—with its fine shades of emotion—lines from the ancient poets, philosophers, and dramatists." (Tris Coffin, Washington radio commenator.)

"Majesty is the mark of John L. Lewis.

"In his 40 years of labor leadership he has commanded more idolatry and more hatred than any other union chief in the country's history. But even those who damned him most were quick to concede that he was a man of towering personal gifts and that he used them extravagantly. He made his loyal army of coaldiggers the highest paid and most adequately insured group of industrial workers in the world; he stormed the bastions of the open shop in the mass-production industries and led millions of workers in steel, automobiles, and other fields into union ranks; he built a pioneer welfare and pension fund that became a model of industry-financed social security.

"And in the process he conducted epic battles with Presidents, Members of Congress, industrialists, and virtually every other union leader who came to power in his lifetime. He was not a man who believed in speaking softly and he was congenitally unable to accept second place to anyone—even if the 'anyone' held a 4-year lease on the White House." (The New York Times.)

"Away from the public view he is affable, kind, and surprisingly gentle. A smile-wreathed face replaces his well-known stern visage when he sits down and relaxes in the privacy of his office or a hotel room." (Personal and Pertinent in the Scranton Times.)

"We are not so naive as to think that with his resignation * * * the voice of John L. Lewis will be stilled. Can you dam the thunder of Niagara Falls? Can you silence the crushing surf? As much ask an eagle not to fly as to expect John L. to keep quiet. Good luck to him." (The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph.)

"More than any other man * * * it is to John L. Lewis that the first 75 years of U.S. labor history belong. Described by ex-President Herbert Hoover as "the most able man in the labor world and of very superior intelligence," John L. Lewis lived up to that billing, whether jousting with a President of the United States or trying to get a mine-owner to knuckle under * * *. He never took on a molehill when there was a mountain around." (The Birmingham News.)

"He took his stand on automation without a quibble: he is for it as far as it can be made to go. Latter-day labor leaders, the younger generations, have been less clear-eyed about this than old John L. Lewis." (Baltimore Sun.)

"Much will be written of his jousting with powerful men. But the real story of John Lewis is the story of how he leaves the coal industry. He saved it * * * it took courage to do this just as it took courage to tell U.S. Presidents not to bother him or to try to mine coal with bayonets. And so, it took courage to step aside when the work of an era was done. It took the courage of a giant. John L. Lewis is that giant." (Labor Columnist Victor Riesel.)

"The American labor movement will seem like a house without a father." (Evening Star, Washington, D.C.)

"Once at a press conference * * * Mr. Lewis became impatient with the laughing and talking. He called for order but the noise continued.

"For a moment he forgot his platform manners. 'Cheese it' he barked * * *. Then he caught himself. Turning to reporters, he said soberly: 'That's off the record.'" (Retired Scripps-Howard Labor Writer Fred Perkins.)

"He is a man of strong convictions who has never compromised his principles and who has never hesitated to speak out forcefully whenever he felt it his duty to do so. That is very probably the reason he will be missed most. Let us hope in retirement, he still on occasion gives us his opinions on matters he deems important." (The Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette.)

"Always the battler in public and in behalf of the miners he called the mighty host, John L. Lewis is also renowned for his courtly attitude around ladies and his loyalty to those he served. His message tonight, stepping down, credited the miners themselves for the great gains in pay and welfare and community respect that they have won, and as one man, the miners erased their own pronoun to write in for the record and tribute: 'John L. Lewis.'" (NBC Commentator Merrill Mueller.)

"In newsrooms through the Nation, this will become known as black Tuesday, for this is the day the reporter lost his best and most colorful source of news. You know, even John L. Lewis' silence was majestic." (NBC–TV Commentator Bryson Rash.)

"There's never been a breath of scandal about John L. Lewis. He never took any kickbacks or payola. In this time when the Nation's morals are on a toboggan, he stood like a Rock of Gibraltar, solid and oblivious to all attacks." (The Bryan (Ohio) Times.)

"Through the late Truman and the Eisenhower years, Lewis showed labor statesmanship of the highest order." (Time, the weekly news magazine.)

"Lewis was a tough fighter, but he was exceptionally intelligent, too. He fought his way to the top of his union, secured a loyalty that made opposition useless, and then used his personal power to improve the miner's lot. Whatever the United Mine Workers are today, they were made that way by John L. Lewis." (The Detroit News.)

"Not only his miners but also the members of the mass-production unions of the old CIO in auto, steel, and rubber industries still regard Lewis as the man who battled for and built the U.S. labor movement. * * *

"Once the ogre of the mineowners, he and the mineowners now work in close cooperation. * * * At one time, the operators never could have conceived the concern, the sorrow, they felt this week." (Business Week.)

"The historic Lewis will emerge clearly as a leader devoted to the welfare of his rank and file. His constant objective has been not a maximum number of dues paying union members, but optimum conditions for the decreasing numbers who mine coal. * * *

"Lewis is a miner and the son of a miner, but a miner who has dreamed that miners' sons might work at other trades and professions above ground. He has done much to make this dream come true. In doing so he has deserved well not only of his union but of his industry and his country also." (Chicago Tribune.)

"May the rest of your voyage be smooth, John." (West Coast Sailors.)

"We recognize with gratitude the inspiration and leadership you provided for all of us." (Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union.)

"John L. Lewis made labor history." (Flint (Mich.) Weekly Review.)

"Lewis is the real sire of America's industrial unions and was founder and financial backer of the old CIO. Certainly all such workers, especially his own coal miners, owe a lot to this dynamic, realistic, completely fearless man." (St. Louis Labor Tribune.)

"Nobody could agree at all times with John L. Lewis. Possibly he made some mistakes. Any man as dynamic as he is cannot stop at every twist and turn to make sure that he has made no little mistake along the road. But in the larger sense he was always right because he always made the fight that had to be made. What a monument that is to any man." (The Eye Opener, Local 45, UAW.)

"What a record he has made of service to the rank and file of the miners and all organized labor and to the cause of rock-founded democracy, democracy founded on the right of workers to organize and improve their conditions and their standards, their hopes and their economic security." (R. D. Cramer, editor, Minneapolis Labor Review.)

"The greatest of them all * * *. There'll never be another one like him." (New Jersey Labor Herald.)

"Mankind is the better because of John L. Lewis." (The New Era, United Labor Council of Reading and Berks County, Pa., AFL–CIO.)

"John L. Lewis has been an irritant to Presidents, employers, politicians, other labor leaders, editors (including the writers for labor publications who could never match his marvelous gift with words), the courts, and at times he has annoyed the American people. Nevertheless, we hope he emerges from his 'retirement' often enough to give us a view of his nonconforming personality and the sound of his stirring voice. And

knowing John L. Lewis, we're assured that he'll choose to be heard and seen." (Federation News, Chicago Federation of Labor.)

"Let him retire. He has been one of the great labor leaders of the century and he has earned some rest. But let him keep on talking. * * * In the use of the mother tongue there is no one anywhere near his grandeur." (Times, Bayonne, N.J.)

"One of the last of the great individualists, he battled for the economic advancement of workers with skill, courage, and endurance, and he has left an imprint on this country which will last for a long time to come." (Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del.)

"Certainly, but for him and his kind, communism might well have absorbed the United States in years gone by. There is no question but that his role in our free enterprise system prevented American working men and women from turning to godless communism for solution to their plight, and provided hope to labor the world over for a brighter future. * * * The world is richer, democracy is stronger for his having passed our way." (Fred W. Luigart, Jr., in the Hazard (Ky.) Herald.)

"John L. Lewis made a major contribution to organized labor. * * * He is a man of courage and tenacity. And even his enemies have never accused him of corruption." (Houston (Tex.) Post.)

"If it is too early to count the old champ out, it is also too soon to try to assess fully the force of a personal militancy unsurpassed at the tipple, the bargaining table, and amid the tiers of tycoons." (Tennessean, Nashville, Tenn.)

"Whether one agrees with what he has done or not, one must agree that what he did, he did well." (Banner, Nashville, Tenn.)

"Lewis says he will ask the UMW to give him an honorable discharge. He certainly has earned one. For no matter what faults he may have, the labor movement might never have done so well without his leadership." (Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

"What Mr. Lewis has done in recent years is to make a smaller number of mines and miners more efficient and thus keep the industry on the best possible footing. The price of coal has actually been reduced while the miners have been getting their increased benefits." (Transcript, North Adams, Mass.)

"He kept his word. Once he pledged himself and his men to a contract or an agreement, he honored the pledge and saw to it that his men did also. * * * More often than not there was sound reason for his candor." (Press, Middletown, Conn.)

"John L. Lewis * * * who for years had struck terror at the bargaining table * * * had become the chief architect of survival of an industry * * *.

"One wonders what Lewis would have done, knowing how he championed mechanization and efficiency in the coal mines about the same issue that now divides the steel industry. (Item, Clinton, Mass.)

"We are losing what can ill be afforded—one of the last of the oldtime, hell-raising individualists to survive into an era of uniformism and goody-goodism.

"He has told off the whole Republican Party, the whole Democratic Party, several Presidents of the United States, hundreds of coal mine managers, and a dozen other labor leaders including Samuel Gompers, William Green, William Hutcheson, and Phillip Murray.

"He never hesitated to denounce anything or anybody, including the courts. But—and this is the whole point—he never did it out of littleness or spite. And he never acted at all except in behalf of what used to be the most tragically depressed men in the world, the coal miners.

"In every waking moment for 40 years he looked after his people. He never, never let them down.

"There never was a better coal salesman than old John L.

"John L. was one self-made man who, in the big things, did an excellent job of it.

"He never wrote solemn manifestoes about the real meaning of Indian neutralism. But he sure did try to decide what should be done about pay and working conditions in the coalpits.

"He became one of the only true aristocracy—those who don't for any reason hit people who are smaller than they are * * *.

"John L. was a kind of minor and rough-diamond Churchill * * * grand of manner, purple, sometimes, of language, but devoted always to those who trusted him." (Washington columnist William S. White.)

"The verdict must be that Lewis was a man who did his work well and maintained the militancy essential to improve the lot of an underprivileged group of Americans and become a legend in the process." (Fresno (Calif.) Bee.)

"None exactly can take his place. He's the only one of his kind.

"Regardless of title, whenever miners gather, it must be said of John L., as it was of Rob Roy MacGregor: 'Where he sits there is the head of the table.'" (News-Call Bulletin, San Francisco.)

"Men who once called Lewis a saboteur of the coal industry and 'the best salesman for oil and gas,' today admit with some reluctance that he has been far ahead of most other labor leaders in his philosophy and his accomplishments." (The Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va.)

"Once * * * somebody suggested that John L. would make a wonderful Secretary of State. He would have, too. Imagine him banging that big fist on a desk, and telling those furriners where to head in. Too bad they never gave him the job—isn't it?" (Sentinel, Waterville, Maine.)

"When 'Mr. Eyebrows' * * * walks off the stage * * * he will leave with head unbowed, one of labor's great." (Independent, Southbridge, Mass.)

"His own miners worship him, as well they should. Once they were among the poorest paid and most dangerously employed of American workmen. Now they walk with the aristocrats of labor." (Journal, Meriden, Conn.)

"History will inevitably record that he played a major part in the shaping of America as we know it today." (Herald, New Britain, Conn.)

"The honesty and the dedication always shone through. It shines even brighter today, when too many labor leaders have replaced the crusading slogans of a generation ago with a plaintive, 'What's in it for me?'" (Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, Mass.)

"An era of labor is passing. Winner or loser, angel or sinner, John L. Lewis was no hollow man. Like him or not, he stood for vigor, which is a commodity with which we shall never be oversupplied." (Press-Herald, Portland, Maine.)

"He spoke like a combination of Job and Jeremiah. * * * This was no act. Mr. Lewis was a sincere, zealous, ardent, champion of labor. He was a genius at persuasion. It was no easy job to build the CIO from the discordant labor groups that were its first members. He had an immense reservoir of moral courage." (Times, Hartford, Conn.)

"He has never been the kind of labor leader who would fall back on the fifth amendment when called upon to testify. On the contrary, his expositions carried a thunder and an honesty that became a conspicuous force in the field where he labored. * * * One had to respect him." (Telegram, Worcester, Mass.)

"To the generations which knew the thunder of his gravelly voice and the power of his name, he ranks as one of the most remarkable figures of our times." (Bulletin, Providence, R.I.)

"I have not always had the warmest feelings for John L. Lewis * * * but * * * one * * * realizes that * * * he did a magnificent job." (Eleanor Roosevelt.)

"There were times when Lewis' tactics frightened the Nation. But, despite strikes and shutdowns during the war, production was never allowed to stop. Mr. Lewis was annoying and aggravating, but he was an American and a patriot." (Advocate, Stamford, Conn.)

"Labor's practical man, John L. Lewis, is about to step down." (Times, Pawtucket-Central Falls, R.I.)

"He talked about the miners the way Hercules might have talked about the club he carried on his shoulder." (Murray Kempton in the New York Post.)

"He told a rank-and-file UMW meeting during a contract crisis:

" 'I have never faltered or failed to present the cause or plead the case of the mineworkers of this country. I have pleaded your case from the pulpit and the public platform; in joint conference with the operators of this country; before the bar of State legislatures; in the councils of the President's Cabinet; and in the public press of this Nation—not in quavering tones of a feeble mendicant asking alms, but in the thundering voice of the captain of a mighty host, demanding the rights to which freemen are entitled.'

"He liked to speak that way." (Edward Kosner in the New York Post.)

Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in drawing attention to the fact that Thomas Kennedy takes over the leadership of the United Mine Workers of America today. I served as a member of the State senate in Pennsylvania when Tom Kennedy was the Lieutenant Governor of that great State. He has always been a man who understood the problems not alone of labor and of industry but of all the people of this great Nation. I predict for him a great and successful career as president of the United Mine Workers.

INTERNATIONAL IMMORALITY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I allude again to the state of the Union message of our President. He said, among other things, after talking about "a storm of semantic disorders," that "we must live by what we say." I say amen to that.

I ask, When will we start?

Our Nation can be looked upon as a moral nation as long as we not only talk morals but act morally. One of the most immoral things that has been done by our Department of State in many a day is its approval of the World Bank loan for the improvement of the Suez Canal. That is no different than saying we condemn the theft but that we will receive the stolen goods.

Here is a nation under a dictator that has no respect for its obligations—a nation that is constantly violating its treaty and convention obligations, and yet we condone it.

What is worse, we say, "We will lend you money with which to carry on your violations."

No loan should be made to a morally irresponsible borrower. Moral irresponsibility is irrefutably established when a nation unilaterally disregards its treaty or convention obligations or otherwise violates such treaty or convention obligations.

This rule should apply with equal force to acts of confiscation, expropriation, and the like.

The seizure of the Suez Canal was as vicious and violent a violation of treaty obligations as is imaginable.

The subsequent unilateral misinterpretation by Egypt and the United Arab Republic of the clear language requiring free international transit of the canal is inexcusable. The continued seizure of ships and cargoes and the detention and harassment of crew members by the United Arab Republic cannot be too strongly condemned. The granting of a loan by the World Bank to the United Arab Republic for use on the Suez Canal and the approval of the granting of such loan by the U.S. Government is an immoral condonation of these illegal and immoral acts.

All of this adds up to legal precedent to sustain the illegal demands of the Panamanians with reference to the Panama Canal.

MILITARY PERSONNEL ABROAD SHOULD BE PROTECTED BY AMERICAN JUSTICE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Capt. John W. McEnery, of Cheyenne, Wyo., has been relieved of duty by the U.S. Army, apparently at the insistence of the Department of State. The penalty was imposed because the captain ordered two sergeants to shave the heads of Korean prostitutes who broke and entered a military reservation in South Korea.

I would like to direct some questions to the Army and State Department.

First. Is it true that for some time prior to this incident there had been a history of prostitutes cutting the wire fences and otherwise unlawfully invading the military compound?

Second. Is it true that these prostitutes had been repeatedly warned to stay off the reservation?

Third. Is it true that there has been a high incidence of venereal disease on the post?

Fourth. Is it true that no physical injury was inflicted upon the prostitutes?

Fifth. Is it true that American servicemen involuntarily stationed abroad and their mothers, sisters, wives, and sweethearts at home still have the right to expect basic protection from their Government against the depredations of diseased harlots, narcotics pushers, and other criminal predators?

Sixth. Is it true today that, to appease the wounded vanity of a foreign nation which American blood helped to liberate, America will forsake American justice and penalize an American officer who has done his duty to his country and those entrusted to his command and protection?

PROTECTION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the gentleman who just left the well of the House said, let me say, I read the account of the incident to which reference was made. I have one grandson, an officer in the Navy. I have a son who was in the Navy. Last Saturday, another grandson, as fine a young man as ever lived, who was just married, took ship to serve as a private in Germany. What I want to know is: Do you mean to tell us that, under the policy of the Army and the Department of State, prostitutes can go into the quarters of these young men we send overseas—can go into the quarters of our men—crawl in bed with them and, if the prostitutes are caught and punished, the Army demotes the officer who inflicted the punishment? Is that it?

Mr. POFF. If the gentleman will yield, I cannot say that that is the policy generally but that is what happened on this occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The wives, the mothers—yes and every decent individual—would like to know the overall policy.

Is the young man, into whose bunk the prostitute crawls, to get out of it, or crawl under it? Is that policy an essential part of our program to keep free nations, the free people of the world? If it is, we better "go home Yanks."

WATER SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a bill is being introduced today by me and a number of gentlemen in this House to which I would like to draw attention. It is a bill to permit cities and towns in all sections of the country where needed to supplement their dwindling supplies of natural fresh water with water converted to fresh from sea or brackish sources.

For many years we have known that fresh-water supplies are limited for communities in the East and Midwest as well as the West. Many have been, and are, facing critical shortages. Supplies are already inadequate to meet the demands of our growing municipal, industrial, and agricultural requirements. With an expanding population we are faced with serious shortages unless the conversion of brackish and sea water can be speeded up and made economically feasible.

Last year a small California community, Coalinga, made U.S. history by becoming the first city in the Nation to obtain its municipal water supplies by converting salt-contaminated underground water to fresh. This converted brackish water is relatively expensive. It costs the citizens of Coalinga $1.45 per thousand gallons, but it eliminated the necessity of hauling in water at a cost of $9.35 per thousand gallons.

Coalinga is not an isolated example of the problem many of our cities now face. Clear evidence of the growing shortages that confront us is supplied by the number of applications received by the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior from cities and communities seeking to have one of the five authorized saline water conversion demonstration plants located in their area.

Over 200 site applications were received from 32 cities and communities in the 50 States of the Union. Most of these cities are seeking one of the demonstration plants because they are almost desperate for additional supplies of fresh water, and for many, converted sea or brackish water will be the most reliable and economical new source of supply.

The bill which I am introducing is designed to assist cities and communities to solve their water supply problems by providing for a Government loan to finance the design and construction of a sea or brackish water conversion plant.

The only course of action now open to most cities and communities that now plan to purchase the necessary conversion equipment to provide this new source of water is to raise the necessary funds through a general obligation or revenue bond issue. These bonds will undoubtedly bear a high interest rate which would increase substantially the cost of the product water. The citizens of the cities and communities that have no other choice but to turn to converted sea or brackish water as their source of supply are certainly entitled to obtain that water at the lowest possible cost. By providing a Government loan to finance these necessary projects, we will assure a reasonable interest rate, which in turn, will lower the rate the city must charge its customers for this necessary commodity.

The bill permits any State, territory, possession, political subdivision thereof, or publicly owned public utility organization to apply to the Secretary of the Interior for a loan to finance the design and construction of a sea water or brackish water conversion plant. The loan may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of design and construction—excluding land and water costs—or $1 million, whichever is smaller.

If the Secretary finds that the construction is feasible and that the loan would be a reasonable risk, he may approve the application and transmit it to Congress. If Congress approves the application by resolution within 60 days, an appropriation may be requested and if the appropriation is made the loan may be completed.

Congress would thus have ample opportunity to pass on the operation of the program. This bill offers no blank check arrangement by which tax money could be channeled into useless or unfeasible projects. It would make possible the use of the national credit by States and communities to get started on doing something about their water problems before we are faced with real emergencies.

I would much rather use the Federal credit this way than wait until we are faced with emergencies calling for crash programs and large outlays of Federal money.

The loan must be repaid in 40 years, with interest at a rate that is fixed by estimating the average annual yield on Government obligations with a 15 year or longer maturity date.

The bill also permits the Secretary to contract with the borrower for the use of the borrower's plant facilities for further research and demonstration, and reasonable compensation for such use may be made by a credit on the borrower's loan.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I would like to say that my colleague has performed a distinct service in drafting this legislation and I am happy to join with him as cosponsor.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman, who is one of the Members of the House who has introduced this bill.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker—

Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small.

To me that sentence carries both a warning and a promise.

A warning and a promise that justice and punishment will overtake the wrongdoer.

An implied promise that he who perseveres when his cause is just, will ultimately succeed.

I note the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is listening, and I hope he will take courage, for he certainly has been doing his best to bring about some economy in our Federal Government, but has often been discouraged. However, in the end I know he will come out all right for he is on the right track. It may be he will not see his victory until after we are broke, but he will get there in the end.

Last year we passed a so-called remedial labor bill. That bill was helpful to the union man, but it did not cure the basic evil.

There is no question but that our people will become aware of what has happened and what is now going on. There is no question about what they want. They want some of the existing evils abolished. The bill we passed last year did not do the job, because we either did not have the courage or the inclination—whichever it was—to do what we knew we should do.

This reference is to the failure of the Congress to insist that the Department of Justice enforce legislation which will protect the rights guaranteed by the 5th and the 14th amendments.

I am talking now about that provision in those two amendments; one which applies to the Federal Government, and the other to the State governments, which guarantees that the individual shall have the right to enjoy his own property; that it shall not be taken from him without due process of law—just compensation. And to substantiate the claim that the basic evils which existed then, that is, when we wrote the Landrum-Griffin bill, exist now.

I refer to the strike not so long ago in Wisconsin.

I talked with some of the representatives from Wisconsin. They say this statement is correct, and it is worthwhile thinking about at least. Permit me to summarize the press story.

TWO HUNDRED STRIKERS FIGHT POLICE, RIP UNIFORMS

NEENAH, WIS., January 8, 1960.—Two policemen were injured and several others were knocked down and their uniforms ripped Friday in a melee with 200 to 300 strikers.

* * * * *

Further clashes were foreshadowed when nine strikers' wives marched on the city hall to protest police aid to the nonstrikers and asserted they would have their families in the picket line tomorrow.

* * * * *

PIN POLICEMEN TO GROUND

As the nonstrikers marched between the two thin lines of policemen, the mob closed in on them from both sides. Groups of policemen were isolated from the others.

POLICE CHIEF STILP USED TEAR GAS TO RESCUE POLICEMEN, DEPUTY SHERIFF HOSPITALIZED

Chief Stilp fired a tear gas cylinder to disperse the crowd, he said, and to prevent injury to the beleagured policemen. "It was something I had to do because the crowd was getting out of control," he said.

* * * * *

TEAR GAS ROUTS MEN

Deputy Sheriff Wilbur Fuller, 35, of Oshkosh, also was hospitalized. He suffered burns and other effects from the tear gas. A striker, Russell Tollard, was taken to the hospital in the belief a rib had been broken but he was released when no injury was found.

Firing of the tear gas broke up the melee and the nonstrikers then entered the plant.

POLICEMAN BREAKER—CHEST INJURIES—TAKEN TO HOSPITAL

Policemen Durward Breaker, 35, of Neenah, incurred chest injuries when the strikers piled on him. He was taken to Theda Clark hospital where it was said his condition may be serious and that he may have suffered a heart attack.

* * * * *

OFFICIALS DO THEIR DUTY

"The right to strike doesn't include the right to gather in masses," Mayor Chester S. Bell told the delegation. "If the strikers had confined themselves to picketing, there would have been no violence. They have the right to strike but not the right to prevent others from entering the plant."

"It is the job of police to protect nonstrikers as well as others," Chief Stilp said. "The law says we must."

"We will protect everyone's right to strike," said City Attorney Charles Schaller. "If there was a congregation of men led by the management, we would have to do the same thing."

Permit me now to refer to the strike at High Point, N.C., and to quote excerpts from the press. This is the caption, "Police Alert as Violence Flares":

HIGH POINT, N.C., December 31, 1959.—Shotgun ambushes, dynamitings, rock throwing, firebombs, and old-fashioned assault are features of the Teamsters' strike at the local terminal of Bottoms-Fiske Trucking Co., and at terminals in Charlotte, N.C., and Danville, Va.

* * * * *

The latest in a chain of violence occurred the night of December 22 when someone hurled a stick of dynamite from a passing automobile.

* * * * *

The dynamiting was the first act of violence at the firm since December 10 when the home of a nonstriking driver was peppered with buckshot and a picture window blasted in. At the same time a driver was slightly injured in a shotgun roadside ambush while driving a Bottoms-Fiske truck between Siler City and Randleman.

THE JUDGE RELEASED 12 TEAMSTERS LOCALS, INCLUDING 391

Local 391 has been under a trusteeship for 9 years. A segment of the local, which charges abuse of members, waste of moneys, and conspiracy to prevent an election, is seeking to oust present officers and the secretary, Lloyd Huggins. D. S. Willard, local 391 president, estimates the local will be self-governing by March. It has about 3,600 members, according to the local, scattered from North Wilkesboro to the North Carolina coast.

Those two references show that, not withstanding the new legislation, union goons keep on destroying property and beating up individuals.

Then, to bring it directly to your attention, permit me to quote an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of January 12, last:

WHAT'S NEW WITH THE GOONS

We think it meritorious that the mayor, police chief, city attorney, the small police forces of two Wisconsin towns, and the Winnebago County sheriff's police did their best to maintain law and order the other day when a couple of hundred strikers put on a pitched battle at the gates of the Neenah Foundry Co., at Neenah, Wis.

The outnumbered police sustained rough handling, but they held their ground and wound up in command, while nonstrikers whose entry into the plant the goons sought to prohibit were able to go to work.

Even more commendable than the courage of the law enforcement agencies were the declarations officials made of the principles on which they acted. When a delegation of strikers' wives informed Mayor Chester S. Bell that it was the purpose of the massed pickets to prevent anybody from working, the mayor calmly replied:

"The right to strike doesn't include the right to gather in masses. If the strikers had confined themselves to picketing, there would have been no violence. They have the right to strike, but not the right to prevent others from entering the plant."

Chief of Police James Stilp added, "It is the job of police to protect nonstrikers as well as others. The law says we must."

City Attorney Charles Schaller also emphasized that the law enforces equality of treatment. He promised to obtain an injunction if there is a continuation of mass picketing and disorder.

These attitudes are in refreshing contrast to the craven behavior of authorities at such other sites of industrial disorder as Albert Lea, Minn., where the police and sheriff's men have done virtually nothing to halt a reign of strike terrorism against nonstrikers at the Wilson & Co. packing plant. The Democratic Governor, Orville Freeman, first tried to load the decision in favor of the union by calling out the national guard and closing the plant on the pretext that such action was necessary to save life.

When he was thrown for a loss by the courts, he sat back and allowed the goons to take over, with little hindrance from local authority. One nonstriker has compared the results to Communist terrorism in Hungary.

Appropriately enough, Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer of the United Auto Workers, whose goon auxiliaries were sent from Michigan into Wisconsin at the height of the Kohler strike a few years ago, turned up in Albert Lea to express solidarity with the packinghouse union. He promised not to let them down.

Mazey's valiant statement was made as a third of the goons sent to Kohler, Wis., in 1954 was being arraigned on a fugitive warrant at Mount Clemens, Mich. Two other of Mazey's sluggers have already been sentenced to prison for an assault which was followed by the death of William Bersch, Sr., a Kohler nonstriker. So when Mazey promises help at Albert Lea, the effect is more than a little sinister.

As you note, in this article they refer to Emil Mazey, who is secretary-treasurer of the UAW–CIO and who is Reuther's right-hand man.

Mazey is the man who 10 years or so ago under oath at Clinton, Mich., said that he had brought 400 "educators"—he named them that, I call them goons—into a town of less than 1,600 people to educate the people. He said there that the purpose was to lend encouragement to the strikers; and that he proposed, by violence if necessary, to solidify the lines and keep the workers out.

FROM CLINTON HEARINGS

After Mazey testified that he took 400 people from Detroit and vicinity to Clinton, a distance of 70 miles, the following occurred. The page references are to hearings held October 21, 1947—hearings before the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 80th Congress, 1st session, "Labor-Management Disputes in Michigan, Indiana, Ohio."

Page 326:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. And did that intending that they should do what, when they got there?

"Mr. MAZEY. I said we were going down there to protect our people; stop them from being pushed around.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you mean—what do you mean by protection?

"Mr. MAZEY. Well, if any scabs attempted to push our pickets around as they had done on the occasion on which the back-to-work movement was organized, we wouldn't stand idly by and see them pushed around.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. You were going to use force and prevent that?

"Mr. MAZEY. If our people were pushed around; yes.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean that you were going to use—you mean that if the employees of the Thomas Co., of the Clinton Machine Co., attempted to go through the picket line you were going to assist your pickets in keeping them out?"

Page 327:

"Mr. MAZEY. I did not say that."

* * * * *

"Mr. MAZEY. What I said was that if any of our people on the picket line were to be pushed around as they had been in the previous—Mr. Thomas incidentally beat up on the president of our local union physically, a man of about 220 pounds. If that had occurred we would have given our people protection.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, I think we have had that three times on the record.

"Mr. MAZEY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. And we accept it as your statement. Now, my question is this, Was it your purpose if when you got to Clinton you found a picket line down at the plant and that the employees or some of the employees of the company attempted to go through that picket line and if it became necessary in order to get through for them to push or shove your pickets aside that you were going to call for action from so many of your 400 supporters as might be necessary to prevent that?

"Mr. MAZEY. That was our purpose and our record there speaks for itself. We did not prohibit anybody physically from going into the plant.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. I say, did you intend to use as many of your 400 from Detroit as might be necessary to strengthen that picket line?

"Mr. MAZEY. Our people walked the picket line that morning.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Your people from Detroit?

"Mr. MAZEY. That is right.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, you say, you contend that the picket line there in Clinton had not been keeping the workers who wanted to return, from going into the plant?

"Mr. MAZEY. I did not say that.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, do you say that—wait, put it this way——

"Mr. MAZEY. I did not say that."

Page 328:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. * * * This statement that I read: 'We are going to demonstrate to employers in small towns that they are not going to push our workers around.' Now, as to these other employers in other towns what were your 400 going to do?

"Mr. MAZEY. We just wouldn't tolerate the smashing of our picket lines, that is what I said.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. What would you do in Clinton that would tell somebody, for instance, in Dowagiac, some employer, that you—that he couldn't push your folks around?

"Mr. MAZEY. I think if the average employer saw where he was dealing with a small union that this union had the support of a larger organization both physically and financially and morally that they probably would treat our people a lot better.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. He might be induced to make concessions and agreements that the union wanted?

"Mr. MAZEY. Unions operate on that basis; we believe that an injury to one of our members is an injury to all our members.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. Just stick to the questions. How many pickets were there at Clinton on this day when you went there, approximately?

"Mr. MAZEY. I brought 400 from Detroit.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Give us—yes; I know, give us an estimate of about how many were there.

"Mr. MAZEY. Probably 550, I didn't count them so I don't——

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, I continue to read from the paper: 'This demonstration by the Detroit and Toledo locals is just a sample of what is going to happen if this strike continues.' What did you mean by that?

"Mr. MAZEY. I meant that if the strike was to continue we would bring additional people, thousands if we had to.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Thousands, if you had to?"

Page 329:

"Mr. MAZEY. That is right.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Clinton is a town of some 1,600 people?

"Mr. MAZEY. That is correct.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. What were you going to do if the strike continued, what were you going to do with a thousand people down there?

"Mr. MAZEY. Convince the community and the people who wanted to scab that it wasn't the way to settle this matter.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. How were you going to convince them, by just having your people present?

"Mr. MAZEY. Just being present."

Page 330:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. I say, are you familiar with the fact that in Michigan we have a statute which makes it unlawful for more than 50 people to gather together, 30 people to gather together riotously, tumultuously?

"Mr. MAZEY. No; I am not familiar with that and I would like to know what the date of this act is.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Off the record.

"(Discussion off the record.)

"Mr. MAZEY. We have been conducting strikes for several years and there have been no limitations on our pickets. There isn't any limitation on the number of pickets that we can have.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no limitation on the number of pickets that you can have, but are you aware that you cannot block entrances to any plant?

"Mr. MAZEY. I understand that is unlawful; that is one law that I do not believe in."

Page 331:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Weren't you the high-ranking union official in command?

"Mr. MAZEY. No; Mr. McAuley was the ranking official in command. I was a visiting fireman that day.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. I see. With 400 assistants. Well, frankly, now, the purpose was to convince Mr. Thomas that the picket line was going to remain around the plant and that any back-to-work movement wasn't going to be successful, wasn't it?"

Page 332:

"Mr. MAZEY. I think we convinced him, we settled the strike that afternoon.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. I say, that was the purpose?

"Mr. MAZEY. Yes.

"Getting back to the observation I was about to make, I want to state that for a number of years we have been assisting sister local unions when they are in difficulty. What took place in Clinton, Mich., has taken place in a number of other communities for the last 10 years. I have been in Flint, I have been in Pontiac, I have been in every section of the State assisting our local unions to settle their problems with management and this is the only time that people seem to have gotten excited in this particular hysterical era that we are living in today with the Taft-Hartley Act and so on; this thing has been made quite an event, quite an affair."

Page 333:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Quite what?

"Mr. MAZEY. It has been made quite an event, quite an affair, but we have for years, we have been able to build our organization and maintain it on the basis of assisting our local unions when they are in difficulty; we have been doing it for 10 years and we intend to continue doing it.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, let us analyze that just a moment. You intend to continue for example sending in to say Berrien County and Benton Harbor hundreds of thousands of men from other unions in order to assist local unions?

"Mr. MAZEY. If our services are needed; yes.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. And when they come in do you intend to assist them on the picket line?

"Mr. MAZEY. Yes.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. And that is becoming members of the picket line?

"Mr. MAZEY. Absolutely.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Do I understand that you intend that those picket lines are going to prevent workers from returning to work?

"Mr. MAZEY. No, no; I didn't say that.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. You are going to run right into the local officers when you try that.

"Mr. MAZEY. We have run into a lot of them."

Mr. Mazey was the boss of Jess Ferrazza.

Jess Ferrazza and Communists engaged in violence in the sitdown strikes in 1937, in the Ford strike in Detroit in 1941, and pictures on the wall at the entrance to my office—1424 New House Office Building—show the type of violence.

Also in the office are photographs of the same Jess Ferrazza—taken 13 years later—showing Jess, under Mazey's direction, engaged in similar brutal beatings in the Kohler strike. You will also find photographs of Gunaca participating in violence in the Kohler strike. He went to jail for one offense.

William R. Vinson, to whom the Tribune editorial refers, is another of Reuther's goons. Under Mazey's direction, he beat up a Kohler worker during that strike, served one term, and recently was resisting extradition from Michigan to answer another charge of violence in the Kohler strike.

Here is what the AP recently carried:

HE'LL RESIST EXTRADITION

MOUNT CLEMENS, January 9.—William P. Vinson, a former organizer for the United Auto Workers Union, says he will resist attempts to extradite him to Wisconsin for prosecution on a charge of beating up two Kohler Co. employees at Sheboygan Falls in 1954.

Vinson, 32, who is now a painter in the Chrysler Corp. Vernor plant in Detroit, was arraigned Friday on a fugitive warrant. He was freed on $500 bond pending a formal request for extradition.

Apparently, Mazey is again backing Vinson.

It may be helpful and perhaps interesting to take a look at the propaganda of Reuther. Permit me once again to quote from the Chicago Tribune. A news story written by Chesly Manly on July 18, 1954, not only carries the views of the UAW international representative Burkart, but gives us a little more information about the Reuther and Mazey goon, Vinson, or, as Mazey put it, "educator":

When Robert Burkart, UAW international representative in charge of negotiations, was interviewed, he used such phrases as "standard contract provisions" and "standard practices throughout the country."

"We want to establish the principle of an annual wage increase based upon the improvement in production methods," Burkart said. "Everything at the Kohler plant is on the incentive system. The Kohler company gets more for its production dollar than its competitors do."

WANTS POLICY VOICE

This was a frank assertion that the union wants a voice in management policies. It opposes any improvement of a company's competitive position as a result of increased efficiency and lower production costs. It insists that such savings should go into annual wage increases.

The company has been able to pay high wages and still maintain a competitive position to the advantage of the consumer because of improvements in production methods. Unique machines and procedures, designed in the Kohler plant, eliminate back-breaking toil, increase output per worker, improve the quality of products, and remove safety hazards. The company makes not only plumbing fixtures but electric generator units, gasoline engines, and a hundred varieties of precision control devices for jet aircraft engines. It recently completed an Army contract for 105 mm. shells. Some of the intricate valves for jet engines were designed by Kohler engineers.

The company believes in a free-competitive market and is known for the independence of its sales policies. Shortly after World War II, when a Federal judge in Cleveland dismissed a Government antitrust case against 102 defendants, he commended the company particularly for its avoidance of collusive practices.

FEARS END TO COMPETITION

Kohler believes the union's policies would tend to eliminate competition and force American industry into European-type cartels. Then when industry could no longer meet union demands for higher wages, because of decreased efficiency and higher production costs, there would be powerful inducements for the Government to take over the system.

Burkart, one of Reuther's proconsuls, is not to be confused with the imported goods on the picket line. Redheaded, blue eyed, and fair, he's handsome and is as bland as baby oil. Yet he can snarl as scornfully as any revolutionist. Addressing 1,200 strikers in Sheboygan's armory, he reviled Kohler and E. I. Biever, the plant manager, as psychopaths and ogres who were out to destroy the union and impose a second class substandard contract on the workers.

He read an anonymous letter charging that Allan Graskamp, president of local 833, was "in league with the Communists and the Jews to take over the country."

READS WIFE'S LETTER

"That's the same as Hitler's propaganda before World War II," Burkart said. "The Kohler Co. officials have slyly whispered that this strike has something to do with communism."

Burkart read another unsigned letter purportedly written by the wife of a striker. She complained that she would not be able this year to take her children to the summer camp where they had always gone. She blamed this misfortune on Kohler.

Burkart said Kohler had a colossal nerve to complain about violence, considering that he had compelled so many children "to go without shoes." He jeered at Harold Curtis, a nonstriking Kohler employee, who was hailed as "Harold Curtis, American," in the Kohler Co. magazine after a shotgun was fired through a window of his home on June 28.

"I have called him to his teeth; 'Harold Curtis, scab,'" said Burkart.

BERATES THE PRESS

He berated the newspapers as "scandal sheets" for publicizing the assault on Willard Van Ouwerkerk, 50, a nonstriking employee, in a Sheboygan Falls tavern on June 20. William R. Vinson, 27, of Detroit, has been accused of the assault. Burkart said the papers printed only tiny items when "Brother Vinson" and George Allman, a companion were acquitted earlier in the strike after their arrest for blocking an entrance to the Kohler plant with a station wagon.

Vinson, who was defended by Reuther's man, Burkart, is 6 feet 3 inches tall and weighs about 240 pounds. Van Ouwerkerk stands 5 feet 4 inches and weighs 125 pounds. According to District Attorney John Buchen, the tavern was full of customers who saw Vinson assault Van Ouwerkerk. They have stated that Vinson first hit his victim in the back of the head, knocking him to the floor, and then kicked and stomped upon him with heavy boots until another Kohler employee, a union man on strike, pulled him off.

Here is the nub of the present situation: Just how long will the Department of Justice—what shall I say—fail to do the job which ought to be done, which must be done, in connection with the enforcement of the Hobbs Act?

The Democrats had control of the House when the amendment was adopted, and there is not a man here now who was here then who does not recall how earnestly and persistently Judge Hobbs went about getting an effective act—the judge was an able legislator and, if the legislation he wrote is enforced, much of our trouble will vanish.

At least, in my mind there is no reason at all—unless it be lack of funds and personnel—why the Department of Justice cannot prosecute and convict many of those who are engaged in violence at this time—violence to force others to yield something of value.

When the Department answers, as it does, that it cannot establish motives, I will say they are lacking in—well, they are just lacking in knowledge of how the average juror thinks and reaches conclusions.

I recall that not very long ago the U.S. Supreme Court said that no one was so dumb—they did not use the word "dumb"—that he did not know the purpose of a strike. The purpose is, of course, to secure financial advantage of some kind. In one of the strikes to which earlier reference was made the issue was wages. In the other, it was a closed shop.

There would seem to be no reason why last year we did not write, and insist upon the enforcement of, legislation which would protect the personal right of a citizen, his right to own and use property.

The people were then fully aware of the abuses which were carried on by gangsters and professional criminals under the cover of union leadership. Union men, to the same degree as the average citizen, were resentful of the abuse of the power we had given.

We skirted around the edges but we did not write effective legislation which would protect either the citizen or his property.

I have bills pending before the Committee on Labor and they have been over there for a long, long time, but I have never been able to get a hearing on them. The Democratic majority controls that committee at this time 20 to 10. Permit me to state that partisan politics is not involved. It was not so very long ago that the Republicans controlled the committee, and at no time then did either the chairman of that committee, neither the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McConnell, nor the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr.

BARDEN, give consideration to this very much needed, basic legislation which will make effective the provisions of the 5th and the 14th amendment.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Rules Committee H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill, one of the most important measures for congressional consideration this session. Reported from the Judiciary Committee on August 20, the bill has been languishing, awaiting a break in the procedural storm which has been raging around it.

Implementation of our constitutional guarantees is a responsibility of the entire Nation, the need for which was dramatically pointed up by the report of the Civil Rights Commission late last summer. Our job now is to see to it that the bill comes to the floor for debate and consideration by all the representatives of the American people and that Congress carries out its duties under the 14th and 15th amendments.

The vital nature of the subject matter and the procedural tangle in which the bill is enmeshed are powerful reasons for the use of extraordinary measures to assure consideration of the bill. Normally we all would prefer to follow regular practice but in this instance bold action within the rules is not only desirous, it is necessitated by the situation.

The discharge petition can bring the bill to the floor. Those of us who have signed the petition call on Members on both sides of the aisle to add their signatures to the growing roster in the great American tradition of furthering human rights.

I urgently appeal to my colleagues on the Republican side, consistent with one of the basic principles of our party, to meet the issue squarely and to sign the petition. I further appeal to our colleagues of the Democratic majority to stand up to be counted with those intent on effectuating this legislation which is so eagerly awaited by so many Americans. We owe the American people a broadened affirmation of the basic principle of equality of rights, the fundamental tenet of our free society.

Enriching and deepening the meaning of democracy is one of the foremost challenges we face. Opening doors of equal opportunity is the answer we can and must provide. We have the means to begin this effort in H.R. 8601. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members to sign the petition so that the bill may be brought to the floor for reasonable debate and consideration.

SMALL BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. MULTER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am quoting below a public statement of our most able colleague, Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Small Business Committee. The situation therein described is a heartening example of what Members of Congress can do to correct an administrative injustice. Many Members of both houses of Congress made their feelings known to the Department of Defense and the result is gratifying. But most important it rights a wrong and lays the foundation for a directive fair to all and providing efficient service to military personnel and their families.

Mr. MULTER's statement and enclosures follow:

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 ON SMALL BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT OF THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York, chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Small Business Committee, announced that the Defense Department has suspended until July 1, 1960, the directive issued on December 8, 1959, in connection with the transportation of military household goods.

This action by the Department was confirmed by its letter of January 12, 1960, to Mr. MULTER. In this letter the Department stated that agreement had been reached with industry representatives to cooperate in the preparation of the directive and regulation which would serve the best interest of the Government and industry having in mind that all concerned were interested in obtaining top quality service at minimum costs for military personnel and their families and that the directive and implementing regulations would be designed to achieve that goal.

In August 1959, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Small Business Committee, received a complaint from a small business member of the moving van industry, reporting that the Department of Defense was considering abandoning a rotation system whereby contracts covering such services were awarded in an equitable fashion to all qualified movers. This complaint was brought to the attention of Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2, which promptly initiated the investigation that has led to the suspension of the proposed directive by the Department of Defense.

Mr. MULTER stated: "This harmonious cooperation by the officials of the Department of Defense, of the Small Business Administration, of congressional committees and of representatives of industry, will surely achieve the desired result. The participation by the Small Business Administration and the Small Business Committees of the Congress, in this effort, in advance of the issuance of a directive and regulations gives further assurance that the interest of small business not only will not be overlooked but will be protected."

Mr. MULTER accordingly announced that he is postponing hearings of his subcommittee on this subject in order to avoid duplication of effort and in order to give the Department every opportunity to work out a fair directive with proper implementary regulations.

This is believed to be a happy solution to a troublesome problem that has been giving much concern to the Members of Congress for a long period of time.

In addition to Mr. MULTER as chairman, Subcommittee No. 2 is composed of the following Members: Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, Illinois; Hon. TOM STEED, Democrat, Oklahoma; Hon. H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, California; and Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, New York. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN is chairman and the Honorable WILLIAM MCCULLOCH is ranking minority member of the full committee.

Attached are copies of the letters between the Department of Defense and Congressman MULTER, dated January 12, 1960.

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1960.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in further response to your letter of December 30 requesting that DOD directive No. 4500.26 be suspended. The directive has been suspended until July 1, 1960.

At a meeting this morning, industry representatives and DOD staff agreed that: (1) Military personnel and their families were entitled to top quality service; (2) a directive and implementing regulations to achieve this goal were appropriate.

Spokesmen representing all segments of the moving van industry agreed to cooperate with the Department of Defense in developing an appropriate directive and implementing regulations to achieve this goal. It is hoped that this work can be accomplished to the satisfaction of all concerned prior to the adjournment of Congress, or July 1.

We are looking forward to the continued assistance of your committee and staff in resolving this important matter.

Sincerely,

PHILIP LEBOUTILLIER, JR.,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 12, 1960.

DEAR MR. LEBOUTILLIER: Thank you for your letter of January 12, 1960. I am pleased to be advised that you have suspended your directive 4500.26 pertaining to the movement of household goods of military and civilian personnel until July 1, 1960.

Inasmuch as you will conduct hearings prior to the issuance date to which all interested parties in the above directive will be invited, I am postponing any hearings by my subcommittee so that we can cooperate together in the promulgation of a new directive.

I am positive that this procedure will result in new regulations which will be in the best interests of both the Government and industry.

As you have requested, I am directing Mr. Irving Maness, counsel to the subcommittee, to aid and assist you to that end.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 2.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S TOP PRIORITY LEGISLATION: INDIVIDUAL SPECULATORS AND INVESTORS PURCHASE ONLY ABOUT 4 PERCENT OF TREASURY SECURITY ISSUE—PROFESSIONAL OPERATORS KNOW IN ADVANCE HOW MUCH ALL OTHER PROFESSIONALS WILL OFFER TO BUY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and the day before I spoke about several aspects of the legislation which the President has assigned top priority. This is

the legislation to repeal the interest rate ceiling at which the Treasury can issue long-term bonds.

SOMETHING TO LEAVE THE BANKERS' GRANDCHILDREN

As we know, the forces pushing for this legislation are most powerful and most determined. This administration has only about 11 months more in office, and it is understandable that some people in the financial community are rather in a hurry to have a great deal more of the national debt put on a long-term basis—say 20, 30, 40 years or more—at the present high interest rates, before this administration goes out of office. They want to make sure that President Eisenhower, to use his phrase, leaves something for our grandchildren—and theirs.

But they cannot be sure what events lie ahead even in the few months that this Congress will be in session, and can act on the legislation. The predicted surplus in the Federal budget makes it rather difficult, as a public relations matter, for the Federal Reserve to continue its part in maintaining interest rates in their present orbit—which orbit reaches well beyond the moon.

Furthermore, despite all the predictions that this will be a boom year, it is entirely possible that the recovery trends may not continue as strong as they now seem. Almost anything could happen. So this may be a sort of a last chance for the promoters of the drive to put the Government under contract to pay astronomical interest rates over the next several decades, on a sizable portion of the $180 billion Federal debt.

Today I wish to call attention to an aspect of the so-called Government securities market, where the Treasury must go, hat in hand, to borrow money.

THE TREASURY'S MARKET IS A SMALL GROUP OF WALL STREET PROFESSIONALS

According to reports from the financial community, the 1-year bills which the Treasury auctioned day before yesterday attracted an unusual amount of interest on the part of individual investors. The alltime bargain rate which was predicted for these bills—which prediction came true—caused an unusually large number of individuals to submit bids for these bills. The bills were sold at a discount which yields an interest rate, by normal methods of computation, of 5.36 percent. This was indeed a bonanza which individuals who have the sort of money it takes to invest in these bills should want to get in on. The Wall Street Journal of yesterday described individual interest in the Tuesday auction as follows:

> Although New York sources told the Treasury a rush by individuals was on, the application figures released by the Treasury don't show that it was overwhelming.

Now the important question is, just how much of the securities issued by the Treasury are purchased by individuals?

Altogether, the bids submitted for the $1.5 billion of bills amounted to $2.3 billion. In other words, the issue was oversubscribed by less than 2 to 1.

Of this $2.3 billion of offers to purchase the Treasury bills, the Wall Street Journal reported that specialists in the so-called market estimated that about $100 million was submitted by individuals—although there were a "whacking" number of bids by such investors. The point is that although there is a "whacking" number of people around Wall Street and the Waldorf-Astoria Towers who bid or subscribe to Treasury issues, the amount of their purchases is, relatively speaking, very, very small. In fact, if these estimates are correct that individuals accounted for $100 million of the bids, out of a total of $2.3 billion, then individuals accounted for only 4 percent of the total.

Not only are subscriptions from individuals small, but they have even less influence in determining the price of Treasury issues sold at auction. Individuals are permitted to make "at the market" bids—open bids—and generally do bid in this manner. In other words, they bid to accept the average of the prices at which the securities are sold to others. So the prices named by the professionals determine the price.

The so-called market for the Treasury's marketable securities is in reality, a small group of professionals. My estimate would be that 90 percent of any given Treasury issue is purchased by between 100 and 200 big banks, professional bond dealers, and insurance companies. Most of these are centered around Wall Street.

It could be wished that we had more exact information on this subject. As a matter of fact, when the Joint Economic Committee was making its study of the Government Securities Market last summer, I asked Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for information on this subject of how sales of Government securities are concentrated in a relatively few banks, securities dealers, and so on, and he promised to cooperate; but so far, I have seen no report on this subject.

EACH PROFESSIONAL KNOWS HOW MUCH ALL PROFESSIONALS ARE GOING TO BID

The Members will find, I think, that one of the most interesting aspects of the Treasury's "market" for securities, is that each time the Treasury puts a security up for auction, or puts one up for subscription at a fixed price, the professionals all know before the bids or the subscriptions are made what the total amount of all the bids or subscriptions is going to be, within a very small margin of error. Sometimes a Treasury issue is oversubscribed four times, five times, six times, or more. For example, the 4-year and 10-month issue of last September was oversubscribed 12 times.

But according to testimony given before the Joint Economic Committee last summer by the Secretary of the Treasury and by several of these professionals themselves, oversubscription does not mean what it would first appear to mean. It does not mean that these professionals wish to buy 4 times, 5 times, or 12 times the amount of the securities which they actually do buy.

When there is an oversubscription, the Treasury allocates the amount it issues among the various bidders on the basis of the oversubscription. In other words, if an issue is oversubscribed 4 to 1, the Treasury allocates to each bidder one-fourth the amount he has offered to buy.

What oversubscription means, then, according to testimony, is that each of these professionals knows what the total subscription is going to be and bids accordingly. In other words, a professional who wishes to buy $1 billion worth of a Treasury issue, knowing that the oversubscription will be 4 to 1 puts in an offer to buy $4 billion worth. And he makes a cash deposit to cover his offer for that amount. As matters turn out, he will then receive the $1 billion which he intended to buy in the first place.

As far as these professional investors are concerned, the matter of oversubscription is no game to be taken lightly. Their testimany makes it clear that if they should be wrong—if by some chance they misjudged the amount of the subscription, and the Treasury ended up accepting their offer as submitted—they would lose their shirts. In other words, they do not wish to buy and do not have the money to buy anything like the amounts they offer to buy. So the remarkable thing is that the professionals not only have an estimate of what the total subscriptions will be, but they have an estimate in which they must, as a matter of practice, be able to place very high confidence. In other words, each of the professional operators in this market has an estimate for all which is necessarily based upon an intimate knowledge of the firm plans of each and every professional operator in the market.

So, when we hear the statement that the Treasury "ought to be allowed to pay the market rate," it would be well to keep in mind what kind of market it is that makes this rate.

A POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS—TO ENABLE MORE YOUNG AMERICANS TO PARTICIPATE IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the decade of the 1960's, we recognize certain characteristics of the new age.

While we must seek always for progressive disarmament on the part of East and West, and while we must present continuing constructive proposals to resolve the differences between East and West, the main theater for the drama of the 1960's will be the developing countries of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. The way we play our role in that theater will help to determine whether our civilization will survive.

Many Americans are haunted by the image we now cast into these areas. Our aid has been generous. Yet we have the gnawing fear that we are not succeeding. Too often our emphasis, rightly or wrongly, seems to concentrate on military alliances with corrupt or reactionary leaders; on furnishing military hardware which all too frequently is turned on the people of the country we are pre-

sumably helping; on grandiose and massive projects, such as superhighways that please the monarch but do little to please his people; on hordes of American officials living aloof in enclaves in the country's capital.

POSITIVE STEPS NEEDED

The picture painted by "The Ugly American" is no doubt exaggerated. But rather than spend all our time denying the validity of the picture, why not take some positive steps to prove that the picture is untrue?

With this in mind, I have today introduced H.R. 9638, an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, to provide for a study looking toward a possible Point 4 Youth Corps of young Americans willing to serve their country in public and private technical assistance missions in far off countries, and at a soldier's pay.

TEXT OF BILL

The text of H.R. 9638 explains its purpose:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 307. Advances and Grants; Contracts.—", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b)(1) The President shall provide for the conduct by a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation of a study with a view to ascertaining the advisability and practicability of the establishment by the United States of a program, known as the 'Point Four Youth Corps', under which young citizens will be trained and serve in programs of technical cooperation. The objectives of the Point Four Youth Corps will be—

"(A) to make additional technical manpower available to United States agencies and to private agencies carrying out economic, medical, educational, and community development programs in underdeveloped friendly foreign countries;

"(B) to assist in broadening the understanding by the peoples of other nations of the ideals and aspirations of Americans, through close contact with young Americans participating in the Point Four Youth Corps; and

"(C) to offer our young people an opportunity to serve their country in a stimulating way, while broadening their understanding of the problems facing other peoples and nations, and thereby helping them better to understand American policies and purposes abroad.

The President shall endeavor to have such study conducted as a public service without Federal contribution toward the expenses thereof; and any Federal contribution which may be required for such study shall not exceed $10,000, to be paid out of sums appropriated pursuant to section 304 of this act.

"(2) Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the group, university, or foundation which conducts such study shall report to the President and to the Congress its recommendations with respect to the establishment by the United States of the Point Four Youth Corps, and if the establishment of such Corps is recommended, such report shall be accompanied by draft legislation proposed for the implementation thereof. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the consideration of the following factors—

"(A) The types of projects in which members of the Point Four Youth Corps might be used, based upon investigation of existing and proposed private and governmentally sponsored projects, and how such projects should be carried out;

"(B) The manner in which interested private American foundations, and groups such as service clubs, religious groups, farm organizations, labor unions, business groups, youth groups, and similar organizations, might cooperate in the operation of Point Four Youth Corps projects;

"(C) Whether or not it would be desirable to provide that service in the Point Four Youth Corps shall be considered as satisfying the obligation of individuals to perform training and service in the Armed Forces;

"(D) The optimum size of the Point Four Youth Corps, the period of service which might be required and the pay scales and conditions of employment which would be most desirable in the public interest;

"(E) The pattern and manner of orientation and training in the United States and abroad that would be required to make young American adults effective workers in programs of technical cooperation conducted under this title or otherwise;

"(F) Whether it would be practicable and advisable to recruit young American adults who have completed less than four years of college;

"(G) Whether the Point Four Youth Corps should be placed under the administration of a Federal agency or a private group on a contract basis, or both; and

"(H) The manner in which the Point Four Youth Corps could most usefully supplement current governmental and private programs of technical cooperation.

"(3) The group, university, or foundation which conducts such study is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, and statistics for the purpose of this subsection; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to such group, university, or foundation upon its request."

SUITED FOR PRIVATE STUDY

The study of the practicability and advisability of a Point 4 Youth Corps is peculiarly one for a private university foundation or similar group. Since much of the utility of a Point 4 Youth Corps would be for private rather than public technical assistance missions, the study should not be governmentally conducted. As H.R. 9638 indicates, it should not be difficult for the President to find a private group willing to make such a study at no cost to the taxpayers.

H.R. 9638 sets forth the principal issues which such a study would need to resolve—the types of projects suited for a Point 4 Youth Corps, how they are to be carried out, the mix between public and private projects, the pay and administration of the corps, its relationship to selective service, preliminary training here and abroad, age of the participants, and many others.

The study group is directed to confer with all appropriate governmental agencies, and if it recommends the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps, to recommend draft legislation.

ANALYSIS BY THE LIBRARY

I am indebted to Mr. Arthur H. Darken, analyst in U.S. Foreign Affairs, Library of Congress Foreign Affairs Division, Legislative Reference Service, for an admirable analysis of the nature of the study:

ANALYSIS OF A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS

(By Arthur H. Darken, analyst in U.S. foreign affairs, Foreign Affairs Division, Dec. 17, 1959)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Initial study.
II. Recruitment for the Point 4 Youth Corps as an alternative to military service.
III. Administration of Youth Corps.
IV. Public and private cooperation on Youth Corps program.
V. Types of oversea projects where the Youth Corps might be useful.

After preliminary inquiry, we find there are some who believe that a Point 4 Youth Corps could be useful in economic and community development enterprises abroad and that the establishment of such a corps would not necessarily meet with insuperable difficulties.

Given the purposes you have advanced we suggest the following in answer to your questionnaire for the establishment, administration, and operation of the corps:

I. INITIAL STUDY

The initial study of the advisability and feasibility of establishing a Point 4 Youth Corps should be commissioned by a relevant executive branch agency, probably the International Cooperation Administration, but should not be conducted by that agency itself. An outside research group, university, or foundation would probably have greater freedom in making its recommendations than would a Federal agency. It must also be reported that many persons concerned with the technical assistance program feel the administration is generally opposed to the initiation of new programs in this field. It seems therefore that more positive recommendations for a Youth Corps might come from a private group than from a Federal agency.

It may be advisable, however, to urge that the private group conducting the study consult with the International Cooperation Administration, other relevant Federal agencies, and nongovernmental organizations active in the field of providing economic and technical aid to the less developed areas. Consultation with interested persons and organizations, while the study is in preparation, could do much to eliminate the administrative impracticalities that sometimes accompany otherwise extremely logical and worthwhile development programs.

The study when completed should be submitted to the commissioning agency and to the Congress.

Past experience with federally commissioned studies as outlined by various executive agencies suggests that this one probably could be prepared for about $10,000 and should not require more than 6 months.

II. RECRUITMENT FOR THE POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO MILITARY SERVICE

It is difficult to decide whether service in the Youth Corps should be planned and advertised as an elective alternative to regular draft military service. The benefits of doing it are clear. It could give much favorable publicity to the technical assistance program and stir up enthusiasm among many young adults here; it could help improve the quality of the American reception in some less developed countries abroad because their people might be impressed by the increased American effort in their behalf; it would make a large pool of young adults available for technical assistance programs so that there would not possibly be any lack of manpower for these programs that can use college students or fresh graduates.

But there are several important factors that cast doubt on the value of this device for recruiting Youth Corps members. The most obvious problem is that only men are draftable while the Youth Corps should include both men and women. It would therefore seem necessary to make some exceptions that would at least provide for accepting young women into the corps with the same remuneration and allowances provided to the young men.

More serious problems involve the possible reaction of the Armed Forces, the Selective Service System, and the veterans' groups to the Youth Corps idea. The most important objection would probably come on the issue of veterans' benefits. For instance, it appears that many would object to giving Youth Corps veterans the same educational, pension, and medical benefits as those received by military veterans. Probably it would take a lot of persuading to convince the armed services and veterans' groups, or even the American people in general, that Youth Corps veterans should receive the benefits that go with actual military service.

Another line of objection to making Youth Corps service an alternative to the draft might be the possible diversion of some of the best young men away from military officer training. Presumably college graduates would be involved in both cases and the number of college graduates available to the draft is always much smaller than the number of noncollege men. But for the present this does not appear to be a serious problem due to the small percentage of men classified 1A that are actually being drafted today.

Another element worthy of careful consideration is the draft itself. If we judge by the discussion last year when the Selective Service Act was renewed, the value of the draft system is questioned by many Members of Congress. This proposal might be opposed on the same grounds, for to some it could imply that the draft is not needed for military service recruitment today and that the proposal is part of a plan to keep the system alive. The Youth Corps as an alternative to military service would also seem to add one more to the already long list of devices whereby young men can escape the draft. This may also create opposition to the Youth Corps idea.

After all of these factors are considered it would seem that service in the Youth Corps would have the greatest possibility of being accepted as an alternative to military service if it were made clear that Youth Corps veterans would not receive any of the medical, educational, pension, or other benefits accruing to military veterans because of their service. This tends to reduce the general appeal of the Youth Corps somewhat, but it might also serve to avoid serious opposition from the armed services and veterans groups and make it easier for young women to participate in the corps. It would also help to weed out those who might otherwise join the Youth Corps as an easy means of securing veterans benefits.

It seems clear that young people recruited into the Youth Corps should have completed at least 2 years of college and preferably have a 4-year bachelor's degree. The experience of both Federal and private technical assistance programs has been that young adults who lack this minimum of education usually do not have sufficient maturity and understanding to be a net value to the program. It appears, therefore, that any attempt to recruit Youth Corps members who are only 18 years old, or who are only high school graduates would meet opposition from almost all interested public and private agencies.

Students might wish to apply for the Youth Corps when they register and are classified for the draft upon reaching their 18th birthday. They could be deferred for the period of their college education as is now done in most cases. At the end of their 4-year course of study students who elected to volunteer for the Youth Corps would have their names placed on a list, given appropriate examinations and interviews and a number selected equal to the projected needs of the Youth Corps for the following year. Those students not selected would revert to their regular Selective Service System classification and be available for military service should they be needed.

The ideal period of service in the Youth Corps seems to be 2 years. Less than that would be uneconomical for everyone concerned. If the service lasted much more than 2 years it might prove unattractive by requiring too long a commitment, especially in terms of the alternatives available.

If the Youth Corps is viewed as an alternative to military service it would seem appropriate to set the salary and allowances to correspond as closely as possible with those for draftees in the Armed Forces. This would be likely to include transportation, medical care, subsistence, and about $60 to $70 a month in cash salary. The International Voluntary Services, which operates more young adult technical assistance groups than any other private agency, uses this scale of salary and services with considerable success. It has approximately 10 applicants for every available opening on a technical assistance team.

How large should the Youth Corps be? This cannot be determined until experience provides some measure of the usefulness of corps members in the economically less developed areas. Some have suggested that a figure of about 10,000 would not be unreasonable for current discussion purposes. The initiating legislation might set this as the initial membership limit, but make it subject to later revision. The actual number of recruits, within the prescribed limit, could be determined each year by the availability of overseas positions for corps members.

Finally, it would seem important to include the provision that recruitment and service in the Youth Corps would be on a nonsectarian basis. This would serve to eliminate unnecessary disputes between the various church groups that will undoubtedly be intensely interested in the Youth Corps.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF THE YOUTH CORPS

There are many possible ways of administering the Youth Corps and there is no obviously best way. In general, however, it seems that the operation of the corps should rest primarily with an agency that has substantial responsibility in the technical assistance field. This will avoid further splintering the responsibility for foreign assistance programs and also help to assure that those in charge of the corps are familiar with the problems and possibilities of assistance programs in the less developed areas.

Second. It seems that this would have to be a Federal agency if persons are to be recruited to the Youth Corps in large numbers as an alternative to U.S. military service. There have been instances in the past, however, when nongovernmental bodies administered alternative service programs.

Third. Given the problems of administering new programs in an existing agency it might be advisable to set up a new division, or bureau, to handle the Youth Corps within whatever Federal agency was given this responsibility.

Fourth. It might be possible to include the interested nongovernmental organizations on a significant advisory committee established especially for the Youth Corps.

There would have to be about a 3-month period of orientation and training in the United States followed by a similar one in the receiving country. The initial period here would permit a final screening of Youth Corps members to help eliminate the misfits and those who are seeking only a vacation in exotic lands. Instruction would be necessary in the particular skills or operations that corps members would be expected to perform in the receiving country. Likewise they would have to be taught the key economic, political, social, and cultural facts about the particular country in which they will be serving and a few basic words and phrases in the local tongue. Nor should the training period overlook some discussion of the highlights of American history, race relations, foreign policy, and contemporary thought. Young Americans abroad are often asked about these matters and many are unable to speak intelligently.

Further training in skills, local conditions, and basic language could be provided in the receiving country. It has been the experience of the International Volunteer Services that students are able to pick up a basic speaking knowledge of the local language with only a month or two of actual life there.

The training and orientation period is crucial to the success of the entire Youth Corps program. Sending immature young men and women abroad as technical assistance workers who are not dedicated to the broad purposes of the corps could have disastrous results. The existing problems of interpreting America to the peoples of Asia and Africa would be compounded and the experience might call into question other American technical assistance programs. The necessity of guarding against the wrong kind of persons as Youth Corps members is particularly important because of the intended method of recruitment. The corps may well attract many young men who regard it as a lark and an easy guarantee against having to perform military service.

IV. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COOPERATION ON YOUTH CORPS PROJECTS

How would Youth Corps members be assigned by the operating agency and how would private agencies participate in its projects? It is clear that Youth Corps teams could be sent abroad only upon the request of a foreign government. Presumably the request would be made through the U.S. Embassy or aid mission in the receiving country. If the Youth Corps administrator felt this was an appropriate project he could assign Youth Corps recruits to the proper orientation and training here and then send them overseas. The Federal agency could do this under its own auspices. But alternatively it might be possible to place a particular project in the hands of a U.S. private foundation or group recognized by the Youth Corps as responsible and active in the field. This would be similar to the usual contract arrangement whereby many universities and private groups now take part in the U.S. technical assistance programs overseas. Such public and private cooperation would not eliminate the separate programs maintained by these private agencies. Rather it might be regarded by many groups as a highly desirable supplement to their present programs.

It should be recalled that a number of interested private groups would be serving on the Youth Corps Advisory Committee where they should be intimately involved in setting standards for the Youth Corps selection, orientation, and training program. The committee might also advise on preparing a list of private agencies and foundations that would contract to administer Youth Corps projects from time to time.

These are offered as only a few tentative suggestions for Federal and private cooperation in the operation of the Youth Corps. They are not intended to explore all the problems involved, and it has not been possible to check even these few ideas with the

interested groups. But the interviews so far conducted do suggest that some private groups would welcome the presence of the Youth Corps and that they would cooperate in particular projects.

V. TYPES OF OVERSEAS PROJECTS WHERE THE YOUTH CORPS MIGHT BE USEFUL

One of the major responsibilities of those studying the advisability and feasibility of establishing the Youth Corps will be to evaluate the types of jobs these young men and women can usefully fill. But the nature of the Youth Corps recruits and of the less-developed areas in which they will be working do suggest several guides to the most likely types of projects.

(A) The members of the Youth Corps will have a substantial amount of college training which sets them apart as already highly skilled workers by comparison with all but the few highly trained people in any less-developed country. But they will have something less than the knowledge and experience of those who are usually sent from the United States as technical-assistance workers. Also, some Youth Corps members will be more useful than others. Those who have majored in agricultural, scientific, and mechanical subjects, and those who have a rural background, may find themselves in high demand, while humanities majors may have to learn alternate skills. It should be noted in this regard that one agency, the International Voluntary Services, restricts its recruitment almost entirely to graduates of agricultural, mechanical, and home economics courses.

(B) It would be inadvisable for Youth Corps teams to do jobs that could be undertaken just as well by unskilled native labor. This is an important consideration, because most less-developed countries have a serious surplus-labor problem. For these reasons, it might be worth while, for instance, to have Youth Corps members show villagers how to dig an improved type of well, but it would not be advisable for a Youth Corps team to dig a whole set of improved wells for a particular village.

(C) Many feel that projects combining both Youth Corps members and trained local people in physical labor are desirable because this may help to break down the stigma that often attaches to physical labor in Asia and Africa. In many of these areas it is not considered proper for a man with even an elementary education to engage in physical labor. This is left to the illiterates. But American groups can help to break down this feeling by encouraging local educated persons to join in work projects that require some amount of skill. This might be a joint American-local school construction, drainage or water supply project.

(D) The spirit in which the Youth Corps projects are conducted is of the utmost importance. The key to effectiveness here is the attitude of fellowship with the local people rather than an attitude of superior-inferior paternalism. The attempt to learn basic words in the local language will help to establish the feeling of fellowship, but there must also be a genuine desire to work with the local people for a common purpose. Mature and sensitive young adults often do this effectively because they are enthusiastic and optimistic about what can be done to build a better future.

(E) The great need for Youth Corps workers probably will be in the village and rural areas where their semiskilled labor will be more useful than in the cities. Most of the few technical assistance workers now available are in the cities performing highly skilled operations as advisers to higher level public servants or technicians.

(F) There is a great demand for English teachers throughout Asia and Africa so that many Youth Corps members would find work in the school systems.

(G) Perhaps more useful than teaching English would be the help Youth Corps members could provide in training native teachers in a variety of subjects such as biology, simple sanitary procedures, mechanics, arithmetic, etc.

(H) A few examples of other types of projects that have been conducted by voluntary agencies using young adults in technical assistance groups include: planting and testing new types of crops for productivity, inoculating, and teaching local farmers how to inoculate farm stock against diseases, helping to clear away underbrush and dense forests to increase the land available for cultivation, and physical assistance in the resettlement of refugees from flood and famine, or from communism.

A SENSE OF PURPOSE

The establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps would assure an adequate supply of young Americans to man public and private technical assistance missions in the years to come. But there are two even more important things to be said for a Point 4 Youth Corps.

Young Americans in their late teens and early twenties need a sense of purpose—the excitement and stimulus of taking part in real events. The philosopher, William James, pointed this out a half century ago when he suggested in his essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War," that a season on a fishing schooner or on a cattle ranch could well provide the sense of excitement and purpose which war—at least old-fashioned war—was supposed to provide. If the evolution of the have-not nations is at once the greatest challenge and adventure of the age, young Americans are going to want to become involved in it.

SPREAD AMERICAN IDEALS

From the standpoint of a successful American foreign policy, a Point 4 Youth Corps could be equally beneficial. The peoples of the developing countries need economic assistance, but even more they can profit from exposure to the ideas of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Young Americans who are willing to help with an irrigation project, with digging a village well, with setting up a rural school, could be one of our best ways for creating such a picture of America.

It is said that Napoleon once confessed his failure in these words:

Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and I myself have founded empires; but upon what do these creations of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love; and to this very day, millions will die for Him.

Power has revealed its limitations. Why not try a little love?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave of absence on official business in connection with subcommittee hearings from the 19th to the 28th of this month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for 1 hour, today.

At the request of Mr. ALBERT the special order granted to Mr. ULLMAN for today was transferred to Wednesday next.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 18.

Mr. WILSON (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 19.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 20.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 21.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 22.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 25.

Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 1 hour, on January 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of California.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. PORTER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 18, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1661. A letter from the Special Assistant for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve Forces, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Secretary of the Air Force on the progress of the flight training program, pursuant to Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1662. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government as of the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1960 (Dec. 31, 1959), pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1663. A letter from the president, the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.,

pursuant to the act of Congress approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1664. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of family housing construction activities at the Granite City Engineer Depot, Granite City, Ill.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1665. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make permanent the temporary increases in rates of basic salary provided for employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1666. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1667. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the need for the extension of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways within the States of Alaska and Hawaii, pursuant to section 105 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959; to the Committee on Public Works.

1668. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of March 31, 1959 for the Reserve Officers Association, pursuant to Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1669. A letter from the president, Conference of State Societies, transmitting the Annual Report of the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D.C., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 293, 82d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9385. A bill to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 540. An act for the relief of Maybell King; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 981. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1862. An act for the relief of Harve M. Duggins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5301. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Nelson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Don L. Herring; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7636. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Viola H. Rooks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8988. A bill for the relief of Warren S. Boggess; with amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2312. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna D. Myers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain technical revisions in the income, excise, and administrative provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make certain technical revisions in the income, excise, and administration provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9628. A bill to provide for a highway bridge across the Fort Randall Reservoir in South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9629. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9630. A bill to amend section 11(e) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9631. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to extend to substitute postal employees the provisions of such act relating to overtime and holiday pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 9632. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Court of Veterans' Appeals to review decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 9633. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 9634. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9635. A bill to limit the amount of price support which may be made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation to $35,000 per person per year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 9636. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a spouse's annuity be reduced if the spouse is eligible to receive certain social security benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9637. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9638. A bill to amend section 307 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for a study to be conducted of the advisability and practicability of the establishment of a Point Four Youth Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9639. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 758) entitled "An act to integrate the Judge Advocate's promotion list with that of the Army to restore lost seniority and grade, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9640. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9641. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9642. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9643. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9644. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 9645. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 9646. A bill to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.J. Res. 551. Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Secretary of the Navy of a highway in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 552. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Children's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 454. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain Federal responsibilities for care of Indians who leave their reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 419. Resolution authorizing additional expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9647. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain members of the Mississippi National Guard who suffered accidental death while in preparation for active Federal military service in the Korean conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Fowler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H.R. 9649. A bill for the relief of Nguyen Van Thoai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 9650. A bill for the relief of Fred H. Hagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9651. A bill for the relief of Col. William R. Bradford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9652. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Alonzo C. Tenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9653. A bill for the relief of Claude A. Bang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9654. A bill for the relief of Remedios C. Montalban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9655. A bill for relief of Felix S. Montalban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 9656. A bill for the relief of Mayram Kelesoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 9657. A bill for the relief of Lucia Lena Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9658. A bill for the relief of Yu Shu Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 9659. A bill for the relief of Clyde E. Harwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

312. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislative Director, United States Savings & Loan League, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing appreciation for the savings and loan legislation enacted by the 86th Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Special Senate Showing of "On the Beach"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my pleasure on Monday to sponsor a special Capitol Hill showing of the film "On the Beach." I want to thank all my colleagues and the many other Hill people who were in attendance. The response to my invitation was so overwhelming that two showings were required to accommodate all those who wanted to see this film. I hope that this did not inconvenience anyone.

I recognize that this film is somewhat controversial, and I therefore appreciate the statement which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] made on the Senate floor at about the time the first showing of the film started. I have written a letter to the Senator from Utah expressing my sentiments on the subject, and since this letter may be of interest to other Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 12, 1960.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALLACE: I have read your letter and statement on the Senate floor with regard to "On the Beach" with great interest and agree with many of your comments.

Of course, any work of art is subject to varying interpretation, and this film is no exception. To me, it conveys a simple message—the importance of avoiding nuclear war and mistakes in the handling of nuclear weapons. I do not regard it as a plea for peace at any price. I do not regard it as a scientific demonstration of the effects of fallout. Art forms frequently have to be overdrawn in order to create the desired impression, and some dramatic license certainly must be allowed those responsible for this film. But I believe it was important for someone like yourself to call attention to its limitations.

I am glad that you agree that the film was worthy of presentation in the Senate Auditorium, and I appreciate the sincerity of your comments.

With kind personal regards,

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Questionnaire Submitted by Senator Milton R. Young to People of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a questionnaire I am sending out to approximately 27,000 North Dakota people.

There being no objection, the questionnaire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This questionnaire is being mailed to approximately 27,000 North Dakota people. Included in the list are all North Dakota newspapers, Republican and Democratic, precinct committeemen, 1,000 public officials, every 10th name in the Grand Forks city telephone directory, and many thousands of others representing all occupations.

1. Do you think that foreign aid should be: Abolished? ——. Continued with present amount of funds? ——. Continued with greatly decreased funds? ——.

2. Do you favor legislation to provide Federal aid to education? Yes, ——; No, ——; no opinion, ——.

3. If you plan to vote Republican this year, which of the following would be your choice for President? NIXON, ——; Rockefeller, ——.

4. If you plan to vote Democratic, which of the following would be your choice for President? Humphrey? ——; Kennedy; Stevenson ——, Symington ——.

5. If the following were nominated for President, which one in each group would be your choice? (All candidates listed alphabetically.) Humphrey ——; Nixon, ——. Kennedy, ——; Nixon, ——. Nixon, ——; Stevenson, ——. Rockefeller, ——; Stevenson, ——.

6. Many proposals have been advanced to solve the farm problem. Your views concerning some of the more prominently mentioned programs, as stated in this questionnaire, will be very helpful to me. Space does not permit a more detailed explanation of each program. Would you approve or disapprove the following?

(a) Abolish all price support programs and controls? Yes, ——; no, ——; no opinion, ——.

(b) Provide high price supports and marketing quotas for every commodity a farmer produces, with stiff penalties for violation of marketing quotas? Under this proposal price supports would be based on direct production payments for each commodity. Approve, ——; disapprove, ——; no opinion, ——.

(c) Abolish present mandatory 75 percent of parity price supports for wheat and dairy commodities; elimination of the 15-acre provision; elimination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas; price supports for wheat based on the support level for corn (which is primarily based on a 3-year market price average) with adjustments for differences in quality, etc.? According to testimony of proponents, this would result in price supports of approximately $1.10 to $1.20 a bushel. Approve, ——; disapprove, ——; no opinion, ——.

(d) Provide price supports for wheat at 100 percent of parity (presently $2.36 a bushel) for that portion of the farmers' production which is consumed within the United States. (This would be about half of his production.) For the other half, the producer would receive the market price or whatever minimum price support the Congress might provide. Proponents claim that under this program acreage allotments or quotas soon could be eliminated. Approve, ——; disapprove, ——; no opinion, ——.

7. If it would appear impossible for Congress to agree on any new farm legislation, would you approve modifying the present program to make it more workable until a new one could be enacted? This would envision some further cut in production, reducing the present 15-acre exemption to 12

acres or less, and stiffer penalties for violation of quotas. Approve, ——; disapprove, ——; no opinion, ——.

8. Do you approve of the soil bank program? Yes, ——; no, ——; no opinion, ——.

Name ——————; Occupation ——————

Address ——————

Because of the personal nature of some of the questions, you may prefer not to sign your name. Your vote will be tabulated whether you sign it or not. Results will be mailed to you when completed.

Please return to: Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, 3121 Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dedication of the Pfc. Melvin L. Brown, U.S. Army Reserve Center, Clearfield, Pa., November 1, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of the U.S. Army Reserve Center, Clearfield, Pa., November 1, 1959, at which time I delivered the dedication address.

The new U.S. Army Reserve Training Center has been named after Pfc. Melvin L. Brown of Mahaffey, Pa., who was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously in 1951 for his heroism while serving with Company D, 8th Engineer Combat Battalion in Korea.

The 20-year-old soldier, the first Pennsylvanian to receive the Medal of Honor, was the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Edward D. Brown, Mahaffey, Pa. He was first listed as missing in action and later as killed in action. He is buried in the Mahaffey cemetery.

Participants in the interesting program included county and borough officials, while the Clearfield Area Senior High School Band under the direction of Mr. Harold E. Kuhns rendered musical selections.

The dedication address follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW U.S. ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER AT CLEARFIELD, PA., NOVEMBER 1, 1959

As a veteran of both World Wars, as a member of the Naval Reserve, and as a Member of Congress who has always supported a strong Defense Establishment, I am especially grateful to be able to return again to Clearfield to participate in the dedication of this training center for those patriotic Americans in our Army Reserve.

It is a particular significance that this new U.S. Army Reserve Center is named in memory of the late Pfc. Melvin L. Brown of Mahaffey, Pa., one of Clearfield County's Medal of Honor winners.

He was killed in action September 5, 1950, while serving with Company D, 8th Engineer Combat Battalion.

Private Brown's outstanding war record is well known.

His valor was recognized by various decorations and awards in addition to the Medal of Honor which was awarded posthumously in 1951 for heroism beyond the call of duty.

This U.S. Army Reserve Center is a dignified memorial serving both a practical and a patriotic purpose—a purpose suited to the character and career of Pvt. Melvin L. Brown.

As a memorial it should prove gratifying to all who knew and loved him—and most of all to his living relatives.

It is regretted that Private Brown's mother died 2 years ago and his father in July 1958.

It is good to think that the surviving loved ones of Private Brown, who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of his country, will have ever before their eyes this substantial evidence of the honor in which his name is held by his grateful country.

On this occasion I should like to salute the officers and enlisted men of the Army Reserve units which will use the new center, namely:

1. Headquarters and Headquarters Battery, 4th Howitzer Battalion, 92d Artillery Regiment.

2. Company D, 336th Military Police Battalion.

3. 353d Ordnance Company (ammunition).

In this time of continuing crisis, the vital importance of this Reserve training center here at Clearfield—and of others like it throughout the land—is clearly apparent.

The United States is confronted by a diabolical enemy who is relentlessly seeking to destroy our way of life.

This enemy is armed with weapons of a destructive power hitherto unknown to mankind, including long-range ballistic missiles which can deliver hydrogen warheads.

With these weapons, the enemy can strike in a matter of hours or even minutes.

Soviet missiles can now be shot at the major centers of population and industry of our West European allies.

Many of the most vital military bases and installations of the free world are within the range of Communist missiles, including some of our oversea airbases, which are an important part of our deterrent force and retaliatory power.

The time is soon coming—indeed, it may have already arrived—when Soviet missiles can be aimed at targets here in the United States.

Never in our history has it been as important for the United States to have powerful and vigilant Armed Forces at its command.

A strong program of national preparedness offers the best chance for deterring an all-out nuclear war.

Strength is the only language which the Communists will listen to with respect.

Only through strength can the free world convince the Communist dictators that aggression will not pay.

To deter war, and to win a war if we should be forced to fight, the United States must have a strong retaliatory force of strategic bombers and ballistic missiles that will strike fear in the hearts of those tyrants who would plot aggression against the free world.

Not only must the striking power of this retaliatory bomber and missile force be very formidable, it must also be made as invulnerable to enemy attack as possible.

At the same time, the United States must strive to develop a more effective defense against attack from Soviet bombers and missiles.

If the United States is capable of deflecting a significant portion of the attacking forces, the enemy will be less likely to launch all-out aggression against the free world.

The security and survival of the United States will be placed in grave jeopardy if we fall behind in the race for military supremacy.

If the Soviet Union should succeed in its attempt to gain a decisive military advantage, the United States is likely to be confronted with the disastrous choice between appeasement or all-out war on terms favorable to the Communist bloc.

The recent achievements of the Soviet Union in missile development—especially during the past 2 years—has increased the urgent necessity for strengthening our ability to deter and, if need be, to win a general nuclear war.

However, the military threat from international communism is by no means confined to long-range missiles and hydrogen bombs.

The ground forces in the Communist bloc outnumber those in the free world by about 2 million men.

The Soviet Army, alone, is over 2½ million strong, whereas there are less than 900,000 in our Army.

The Red Army is the only major ground force in the world today that has a completely new postwar arsenal of weapons.

It is capable of fighting either a big war or a small war, with nuclear or conventional weapons, in any kind of climate or terrain.

At present, strong Communist forces are deployed adjacent to the Middle East, Western Europe, North Korea, Southeast Asia, and Formosa.

The threat of these Communist forces represents piecemeal aggression and is part of a plan to conquer the free world in installments, thus posing an even greater danger than all-out war.

As you well know, during the cold war there have been many diplomatic crises which have been provoked by the blackmailing tactics of international communism.

The dispute over the West's rights in Berlin is a current example.

There have also been several limited-war situations in which maximum firepower was not employed.

The engagements of armed forces in Korea, Indochina, the Formosa Straits, and elsewhere illustrate the dangers of limited war which challenge the free world.

The United States and its allies must have the armed forces which can deter and cope with the threats of limited aggression.

Otherwise, small conflicts may spread into global wars fought with weapons of mutual destruction or the free world may be gradually nibbled to death.

The power needed to deter and repel limited aggression and subversion against the free world is vastly different from hydrogen bombs and long-range missiles.

The forces required for dealing effectively with this kind of situation must be mobile, flexible, and discriminating.

It must be able to engage the enemy without destroying major centers of population and without arousing the moral antagonism of world opinion against the mass slaughter of nuclear warfare.

It should fit the punishment to the crime.

It must be adaptable to a variety of geographic and military situations.

It must not cause the conflict to spread into all-out war.

A strong reserve and national guard is important to our national defense posture.

In past wars—most recently in Korea—the Reserves have been a vital component of our military strength.

In case of either all-out or limited war, the Reserves can put added steel into our Armed Forces.

Our reservists have written a glorious account of themselves on the pages of our Nation's history.

Our first reservists were the colonial militiamen who organized to protect their farms and families against hostile Indians.

The United States has always depended heavily on its reserves of citizen soldiers.

Like the patriotic men who will train at this center, they were peace-loving men who preferred work at their civilian jobs and enjoyed life with their families and friends, free from the disruptions and separations of active military duty.

But in the face of danger to their country these men, with courage and patriotism, always rallied to defend the American way of life.

The progress which our Reserves and National Guard have made during recent years is very commendable.

Our Reserve units have made marked improvements in their organization, training, and general readiness.

They are now more positively oriented toward their primary mission of supporting the active forces.

Better training and recruitment programs have been inaugurated and are now under way.

A larger percentage of Reserve personnel is now participating in the training program.

Better equipment is now being made available.

And maintenance and operations activities have been improved.

In addition, the Reserves and National Guard are now carrying out certain essential air defense functions which were previously performed by the regular services.

In recent years, the reorganization of the U.S. Army has been an almost continuous process.

But the greatest change in the past 25 years has been the conversion to "pentomic" organization.

The "pentomic" organization is now considered the best form of Army structure for adapting nuclear weapons to the battlefield and for deterring and fighting effectively in both limited and all-out wars.

It has now been put into operation in all active Army divisions and nondivisional support units.

If Army Reserve units are to replace, reinforce, or relieve Active Army units in wartime, the organization of the Active and Reserve Army must be identical.

The Army Reserves must be capable of performing according to the most up-to-date principles of strategic and tactical mobility.

The organization, training, and deployment of our Reserve combat and support units must conform to the requirements of modern warfare.

As missions, weapons, and tactics change, the members of the Army Reserve must be prepared to assume new assignments and to become proficient in new military occupational specialties.

As a result of new developments, three important changes in our Army Reserve Forces are now occurring.

First, our Army Reserve units are being reorganized into a "pentomic" structure, so that in case of mobilization they can be more quickly integrated into the Regular Army Forces.

Second, the mission of the Army Reserve is more oriented in the direction of rounding out and balancing an Active Army that in peacetime is unbalanced because of limited manpower and financial resources.

Third, the principle has been accepted that the Army Reserves must be prepared to respond on very short notice in event of a national emergency.

Due to the potential enemy's capability of launching an attack with little or no warning time, the Reserves must be prepared to reinforce quickly our Active contingents, both at home and overseas.

The new Reserve policy is to give priority to the men and material which are most essential in aiding our Active Forces to carry out the objectives of our war plans.

For this reason, the Army Reserve must be organized, trained, and equipped to perform its assigned mission of rounding out and balancing the forces of the Active Army almost immediately after an order for mobilization.

However, our war plans do not require that all Reserve units be immediately mobilized in case of emergency.

Those Reserve units which can be organized and trained after the outbreak of hostilities in accordance with our war plans will receive secondary priority in the allocation of manpower, training, and equipment.

Top priority will go to those Reserve contingents that are assigned the mission of immediately reinforcing our Active Forces at the beginning of mobilization.

Men, equipment, and money are limited.

If these resources are spread too thin, the overall effectiveness of our Reserve Forces will be weakened.

Defense plans have been changed in order to meet the threat of the Communist bloc's increasingly strong capabilities in new weapons and techniques of warfare.

The Reserves must be modified to conform to these plans.

Few will dispute the necessity of this requirement.

An important Reserve policy is the assignment of Army and Air Force National Guard units to Continental Air Defense.

This is a form of combat which properly trained and equipped Reserve units should be able to perform effectively.

Continental Air Defense calls for a number of fixed installations which must be manned at all times and prepared for instantaneous action.

The sites of these installations are very often in or near communities which have National Guard or Reserve units.

By assuming these air defense functions, reservists and National Guard men free active servicemen for other combat duties.

Because of the increasing complexity of modern weapons, training is very important to our Reserve program.

The modern reservist is no longer like the self-sufficient frontiersman who at a moment's notice could simply lay down his plow, pick up his rifle, and march off to war.

The modern reservist must be a specialist and a technician.

He must be skilled in the operation and maintenance of complicated weapons and other elaborate pieces of military equipment.

As new weapons and equipment are introduced, he must adapt his skills to the operation of the most up-to-date tools of defense.

Because the Reserves have an important role to play in our national defense, this country has an obligation to treat the members of the Reserves fair and square.

Reservists serve at considerable sacrifice.

They must not be allowed to become the victims of neglect and discrimination.

Their rights and benefits must be protected.

Reservists have spent considerable time and energy developing assets which strengthen our national security.

These assets to our country's defense should not be wasted.

The best training programs and facilities must be provided to see that they are not wasted.

At present, there are about 1 million members in all of our Reserve and National Guard units.

This is an increase of about 50,000 over 1958.

The support of the Army Reserves and the Reserve Officers Training Corps requires only 2 percent of the Army budget and only 1 percent of the total Department of Defense budget.

In view of the relatively small size of our Active Army compared to that of our potential enemies, the role of the U.S. Army Reserve assumes increased importance.

Since the end of the Korean war, the United States has reduced the strength of its Active Forces.

But there is a limit to how few men we can have under arms or available for rapid mobilization.

If we don't have these men in our Active Forces, then we must have them in our Reserves.

A strong and well-trained Reserve organization is essential to our defense posture.

The Reserves are an effective and economical alternative to the maintenance of a larger standing Army.

America cannot afford to relax its vigilance when confronted by the menace of aggressive dictatorship.

The relentless and unscrupulous forces of international communism are watching intently and waiting hopefully for the free world to drop its guard.

Therefore, a strong program of national preparedness offers the best hope of preventing war.

In this time of continuing world crisis, strength is indispensable to the preservation of liberty, justice, and the American way of life.

Ladies and gentlemen, this U.S. Army Reserve training center which we are dedicating here today in the memory of Private Melvin L. Brown is a symbol of America's strength and determination to defend its freedom.

Ninety-third Birthday of Dr. Francis E. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 93d anniversary of the birth of Dr. Francis E. Townsend, famed as the founder and president of the organization which bears his name. It has been my privilege to have known the doctor for most of the years since the early 1930's, when he launched his movement to bring security and decency to the retired and disabled citizens of our country. In fact, the headquarters of the Townsend organization is located a few short blocks from the Chamber in which we sit today.

Dr. Townsend, I believe, merits far more recognition than has been accorded him. He was, in truth, the vital force which persuaded the Congress to enact a social security program in the first place. Through the years, when amendments have been under consideration, the doctor has appeared on Capitol Hill to urge the adoption of changes which would bring social security closer to his ideal, and to help direct the social security program into even more liberal channels.

The results of his efforts have been substantial. Today we near his goal of universal coverage. We are liberalizing in the direction of benefits made available at age 60. We realize now that disability benefits should be provided at the time the disability occurs, and not at an arbitrary age. And I believe, too, that we are inexorably moving toward

his principle that retirement benefits should be geared to actual living costs, thus providing insurance in the finest meaning of the word "insurance."

And so I salute Dr. Townsend on this, the occasion of his 93d birthday. Here is a fortunate man indeed—one who has been given the years necessary to see his dream on the very verge of fulfillment.

The Consumer Interest in the Continuation of Federal Grading of Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has been conducting hearings this week on the proposal of the Department of Agriculture to suspend for a period of 1 year the voluntary program in effect for Federal grading for quality of lamb and mutton. Because of the widespread interest in this matter, particularly among the Nation's housewives, I include under unanimous consent the statement which I prepared for the committee's hearings giving the reasons why I think the lamb grading program should be continued. In the last session, on several occasions, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of statements, letters and comments on this matter and there has been *such broad* response throughout the country to that material that I am sure the statement I have prepared on the current status of the issue will be similarly of interest to many people.

The testimony referred to is as follows:

THE CONSUMER INTEREST IN THE CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL GRADING OF LAMB AND MUTTON CARCASSES

(Testimony by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before the House Committee on Agriculture, January 13, 1960)

Chairman COOLEY and members of the Committee on Agriculture, I congratulate the chairman for his prompt action last month in interceding with the Department of Agriculture to continue the lamb grading program of the Federal Government at least until this committee of the Congress can examine the Department's reasons for wanting to suspend the program. If Chairman COOLEY had not acted when he did, lamb grading would have ended on January 4 without Congress having had the opportunity to look into the issues until after the death sentence had already been executed. Now, with this short reprieve—the second in a period of less than a year—I am hopeful the program can be rescued from the death sentence Mr. Benson has imposed.

In the period since the lamb grading program came under attack last summer until now, I have written or wired the Department on a number of occasions urging consideration for the consumer's stake in this important governmental program. Usually, a month or so later, I receive a polite reply telling me what has been decided in the interim, and I therefore cannot help but have the feeling that expressions from individual Members of Congress carry very little weight in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. For that reason, I feel that it is most important that this committee, after hearing all of the facts in the controversy, follow up on its hearings by reporting out a resolution calling for the continuation of lamb grading. Otherwise, I am afraid the hearings will have been futile, and the Department under present leadership will continue to pay no attention to any views expressed here except those it may happen to agree with at the moment. This, unfortunately, has been the history of the Department's attitudes under the present Secretary.

CONSUMERS WANT GRADING CONTINUED

Since first intervening in this matter last summer, Mr. Chairman, I have heard from many consumers—not only from St. Louis but from widely separated parts of the Nation—supporting my view that the Federal meat grading program—including lamb grading—should be maintained and its integrity defended. Consumers first learned through the wartime price control programs to look for Federal grades in buying meat, and they still find the grades essential in obtaining fair value for their meat dollar. I will grant that tastes in meat are changing over the years and that many housewives no longer prefer to buy and pay for the high-fat-content prime grades of beef and lamb, but at least they want to have a basis for knowing and measuring the quality of the cuts they do select so that they are certain they are paying only for the quality of cut they are receiving.

The recent revelations of cheating in so many areas of our economy and society—mass, organized cheating often engaged in by respected, if not wholly respectable, business firms, and even by some industries on a broad basis—have emphasized to consumers the absolute necessity for keeping whatever reliable quality guides are available to them. Meat grading is a reliable guide of quality to the consumer. Consumers do not want to see it abandoned.

SMALL PACKERS NEED GRADING TO SURVIVE

And neither do the small packing firms which depend upon Federal grading as their means to compete with the big packers. You are all familiar with the way almost any product can be glamorized by packaging and advertising magic—and that is all right—but Federal grading of meat is the only sure guide the consumer can use to be sure of quality among a host of competing brand names and unbranded cuts. Having graded cuts is therefore the only way the small packer can market his meat in competition with the giants in the industry. This committee has gone to bat too often for the small packer and the small businessman to want to step aside now and allow the small packer to be denied the most important selling tool he has in order to compete with the big packers. As you know, grading does not cost the Federal Government or the Federal taxpayer a cent—it is paid for by the packer who chooses to utilize this service. And I think you have had testimony showing that on lamb, for instance, the prices to the consumer of comparable graded and ungraded cuts in the stores are often, if not usually, identical, indicating that the customer is not paying extra for this helpful service.

Certainly somebody is paying for it, and that somebody is the small packer, out of his profits. But at least he has profits—he is able to compete—because of the existence of this program. One might wonder why the big packers which are not using grading do not reflect the saving in their prices. But that is another story—another issue. Obviously, if grading were eliminated, the packers which do not at present use the service are not going to charge any less for their meat; on the contrary, if they can force out the small packers as competitors, you can be sure the price of lamb will go up.

MANY GROUPS HAVE PROTESTED DEPARTMENT ACTION

Last July, when the Department originally proposed abandoning the lamb grading program, about 1,000 firms, organizations and individuals wrote to the Department of Agriculture on this matter, and apparently the overwhelming majority supported the idea of continuing the program. At least, the Department so indicated in a press release at that time—reassuring those of us interested in the issue that the battle for the continuation of lamb grading had been won. The outpouring of consumer protests and of protests from small business firms directly involved in this matter was the more remarkable in that, up to then, practically nothing had appeared in the newspapers or on television about the Department's intention to end lamb grading. The newspapers in St. Louis had carried information on this, but very few others did.

Since then, the newspapers have become much more interested in this matter, so that today the consumer is alerted to the issue now facing this Committee. I can assure you therefore that if you take action to insist on a continuation of lamb grading it will be broadly supported in the country.

POST-DISPATCH EDITORIAL

Let me list a few of the comments I have received or seen on this:

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented editorially that—

"Chairman COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee deserves the gratitude of consumers for intervening in the suspension of lamb and mutton grading."

Then, after giving the background of the issue, and citing Secretary Benson's decision to suspend grading because representatives of the various segments of the industry could not agree on changes proposed by the Department in the grading regulations, the Post-Dispatch editorial added:

"We imagine Representative COOLEY will want to know, as many consumers certainly do, why the Secretary did not perform the obvious administrative functions of enforcing a decision of his own until the industry could agree on a better. Such a course might still provide a healthy incentive to agreement."

ST. LOUIS CONSUMER FEDERATION PROTESTS

Consumer groups throughout the country have urged continuation of lamb grading. The St. Louis Consumer Federation, which is one of the outstanding organizations of its kind in the country—an alert and well-informed group of outstanding St. Louis residents—advised the Secretary of Agriculture as follows last month, in a letter from Mrs. J. M. Klamon, president:

"Our organization has learned that an order has been issued by your Department suspending lamb and mutton grading service for one year, effective January 4, 1960. The reason given in the press for this suspension is that the industry could not agree on standards. Industry interests, apparently, were the only ones considered; no mention is made of consumer interests.

"Our organization has fought for years to have grades placed on meats and other foods so consumers can buy intelligently. As you know, Federal standards for poultry were made effective only a few years ago.

"For the benefit of the consumers we urge that you reconsider the suspension of lamb and mutton grading. We find ourselves in agreement with those consumers who have already stated that they fear the suspension

of lamb and mutton grading is only the first step toward removal of grading from beef.

"We feel that the solution of the problems now present in connection with lamb and mutton standards can be found while the grading program is in effect, and strongly protest the removal of grading from these products.

"We sincerely trust you will reconsider this entire matter for the protection of the consumer.

"Sincerely,

"MRS. J. M. KLAMON,
"President, St. Louis Consumer Federation."

MEAT DEALERS SUPPORT GRADING

Mr. Chairman, I received an equally emphatic letter on this same subject from the president of the Metropolitan St. Louis Meat Dealers' Association, Mr. Morrison McFarland, who points out the difficulty which would confront the small meat dealer if he personally had to grade and evaluate every piece of meat he buys—if he did not have reliable Federal grades to guide him—particularly on top quality meats destined for the hotel, restaurant, and institutional trade.

Even if each meat dealer had the time or the experienced personnel to grade in his own establishment each piece of meat he sold, so as to reassure the customer on quality, please keep in mind the fact that meat merchandising today is done largely through prepackaged meats put out for display in a refrigerated case. As Dorothy Diamond, the columnist on the woman's viewpoint for the magazine Printer's Ink put it in her column directed at people in the advertising and communications fields, "Now that the old-fashioned butcher who used to advise the housewife has become almost as elusive as the maid-of-all-work, and now that meat is sold increasingly in antiseptic prepackaged form, we housewives need and deserve all the help that we have been accustomed to getting from the Government." She makes a good point.

PROTEST TO SECRETARY BENSON

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to include in the record of your hearing the admittedly angry telegram I sent to Secretary Benson on this matter on December 9, immediately after hearing in a most roundabout fashion of the decision to suspend lamb grading. If you will recall, I had been very much interested in this matter when it first came to a head last July and had writen to him then and had placed a lot of material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this issue and so, in the normal course of things, I would expect to be notified when a decision of last July is suddenly changed in December. But I received no notification of the change in plans and when I did hear about it—in a roundabout manner—I reacted quite angrily, and sent the wire which I shall attach at the end of my statement. The wire was sent December 9. I received a polite answer to it from an Assistant Secretary on January 8. I shall not include the reply because I am sure you have received the identical information from the Department in these hearings.

But I would like my wire to be included, as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1959.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

I have just learned in a fantastically roundabout manner that you have ordered suspension for 1 year, effective January 4, of U.S. Department of Agriculture lamb grading program which provides quality guidance to consumers. I bitterly protest not only the sudden about-face in the Department's position on this controversial matter but the quiet, unobtrusive, almost surreptitious manner in which the order has been promulgated within the Department without alerting consumers or even notifying those of us in Congress interested in this issue. In contrast, your decision last July 23 to continue the lamb grading program despite wishes of some industry groups was announced with great fanfare via a press conference and widespread news coverage. Consumers believed then the battle was won; apparently all they won was a short reprieve if your latest order stands.

As one who believes sincerely in the important role of meat grading by USDA in protecting consumers on the quality of the meat they buy, I protest what is obviously a surrender by your Department to a few powerful special interest groups which prefer to see the consumer flounder amid conflicting quality claims on meat rather than have clearly marked, federally certified grade standards which the consumer can follow in selecting meat purchases. Suspension of lamb grading appears to be the first step toward eliminating beef and other meat grading programs—programs which are completely self-supporting and operated at no cost to the taxpayer.

May I urge, in view of the long consideration given this matter prior to your decision of last July to continue lamb grading, that the suspension order for January 4 be rescinded. If lamb growers and some big packers believe changes should be made in grading criteria, let them come forward with intelligent, constructive suggestions, rather than be permitted to kill the program by their failure or refusal to agree on proposed changes. In giving in to their demands, I am sorry to say you have sold out the consumer completely.

Your action on this matter convinces me that programs established by Congress primarily to protect consumers rather than merely to aid sellers should be placed within departments which have at least a semblance of interest in the consumer's welfare. This action on lamb grading, coming on top of your ridicule of danger of using a prohibited, cancer-inducing weedkiller on cranberries, indicates the Department of Agriculture under present leadership is concerned only with the tinkling of the cash register on food sales with little or no interest in the quality, purity or value of the food the consumer buys. Is there any way I can state more strongly my dismay over the lamb-grading action, or my conviction that many consumer-important functions of the Department of Agriculture should be transferred to other agencies of Government?

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the statement given to the committee. To complete the background, I now include as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this matter the reply I received from the Department of Agriculture to the above wire, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1960.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your telegram dated December 9, 1959, to Secretary Benson, protesting the suspension of Federal grading of lamb and mutton for 1 year effective January 4, 1960, as announced by the Department in a press release December 2, 1959.

In evaluating the decision to suspend Federal lamb grading for 1 year, it is necessary to consider the history and sequence of events that prompted this action. The proposal was brought to the Department's attention by the National Wool Growers Association which adopted a resolution on January 29, 1959, stating the Federal grading was detrimental to the efficient merchandising of lamb and urging that the Department suspend Federal lamb grading immediately. The National Lamb Feeders Association had adopted a similar resolution on January 10, 1959.

In view of the widespread interest in this subject, the Department called a meeting on April 17, 1959, of individuals representing various organizations, from producers to retailers, who were directly concerned with the merchandising of lamb. Based upon the statements presented at that meeting, it appeared that the entire industry should have an opportunity to comment on this situation prior to the Department taking any action to discontinue lamb grading. Consequently, notice was published in the Federal Register on May 28, 1959, announcing that the Department of Agriculture was considering the suspension of lamb grading on August 1, 1959, and inviting all interested parties to submit comments by June 22, 1959. At the request of certain segments of the industry, the time for submitting comments was extended until July 6, 1959, and was again extended until July 20, 1959, as requested by Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman, Subcommittee No. 5, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives.

During this period for filing comments there was ample opportunity for the entire industry to express its views on this subject. After considering comments of more than 1,000 organizations and individuals, and weighing the matter carefully, the Department issued a press release on July 23, 1959, announcing that Federal lamb grading would be continued and stating that the Department would proceed promptly to consider revised grade standards for lamb and mutton to eliminate any deficiencies in the present standards. At that time it was stated that "If improved grade standards for lamb and mutton are not developed to meet more adequately the needs of the industry the Department will give further consideration to suspension of Federal grading of lamb and mutton carcasses." Following that announcement, Department officials met with an industry group at Kansas City on August 26, 1959. Representatives from all segments of the industry from producers to consumers attended this meeting and advised the Department concerning the objectives to be accomplished in revising the standards. General agreement was reached on the principle of the revision which was to lower the requirements for the two highest grades, Prime and Choice, with the objective of sufficient volume within each of these grades for effective merchandising.

Following the meeting of the general group, the Department met with a technical committee of eight members selected to advise on the techniques of effectuating the changes which were to be proposed. This group met again on September 16 to review the tentative proposals which the Department had developed. At this meeting the technical committee indicated its general agreement with the objectives of the grade standards and final grades placed on demonstration lambs in accordance with the new standards. However, six of the eight members of the committee strongly objected to the use of interior carcass indications of quality in determining grade. The Department maintained the position that the standards should contain all indicators of quality necessary to accomplish a precise evaluation of grade. It was pointed out that without the consideration of internal indications of quality in determining gradelines the Department graders would not be able to maintain a satisfactory degree of uniformity in grading. In view of this, the Department proposed these standards on October 21, 1959. Comments concerning these

proposals were received through November 21, 1959, and clearly indicated a substantial lack of agreement within the lamb industry. Consequently, on December 2, 1959, it was announced that Federal lamb grading would be suspended for 1 year and hope was expressed that representative groups in the industry would make every effort to resolve their differences in order to propose a generally acceptable plan for the Department's consideration.

Since issuing this statement, the Department has received numerous comments and we have met with a large number of representatives of producers, consumers, and industry interested in this subject to hear their position regarding this action. In addition, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, requested that the suspension of Federal grading of lamb and mutton be delayed so as to permit his committee an opportunity to become more fully acquainted with the problem. In respecting his request, the Department announced on December 30, 1959, that the decision on this matter is being withheld for a period up to 1 month (not later than February 8, 1960). A copy of the press release explaining this action is enclosed.

Thank you for forwarding comments for consideration. Your views and suggestions are always welcome and your interest in the Federal meat grading program is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE L. MILLER,
Assistant Secretary.

Almost Respectable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are coming to realize that practicality and reason, if not survival itself, require resumption of communication with the governing entity of the 600 million Chinese people who live on the mainland of China. While at one time a suggestion of this kind would have elicited tacit, if not outspoken, accusations of near treason, some of our most respected leaders are now advocating it without incurring any thought that they are disloyal. One of those who is speaking out on the subject is the distinguished Senator from Ohio, STEPHEN M. YOUNG.

Under a previous consent, I am including excerpts from his newsletter, "Straight From Washington," of November and December 1959:

RED CHINA

Thought should be given and, very likely, action taken early in the year to bring about increased communications with Red China and opening trade between that nation and ours. Then the question of recognizing the government of Red China may be given consideration. Of course, recognition of any de facto government does not at all mean that this Nation approves of that form of government. Practical considerations are persuasive in connection with doing business with Red China. For one thing, how can we definitely stop testing of nuclear weapons under a plan for international inspection unless the government of Red China agrees to allow control stations within her borders? We are not advocating appeasement, softness or concessions to Red China, but why not start this troubled world on the road to disarmament with adequate safeguards to compel real disarmaments?

PENETRATE THE CURTAIN

We, in this Nation, have had no definite foreign policy since the good neighbor policy of Cordell Hull 25 years ago. It is important that we find some way to establish friendlier relations with Red China. We should penetrate that bamboo curtain and permit American newsmen, businessmen, tourists and students to visit that country and permit Red Chinese nationals to visit this country, under severe restrictions, of course. Were we to engage in some trade with Red China, we in this Nation would gain from that. Furthermore, we cannot ignore that nation of 600 million people. We have no intention of abandoning Taiwan (Formosa), as our frontier there and the maintenance of bases are important to us and to the free world. Nevertheless, Chiang Kai-shek is merely a symbol. He knows that the Communist regime is well entrenched in the Chinese mainland. Furthermore, 35 percent of 640,000 Nationalist soldiers are Formosans. The youngest and best soldiers of the Nationalist Army have never seen the Chinese mainland. As Formosans, they desire freedom for their country. They have no patricular liking for Chiang Kai-shek. The force is entirely too small anyway for a successful invasion of the Chinese mainland, unless American air, sea and military might spearheads the drive. Chiang Kai-shek himself knows that he is talking as a politician and boasting as a warlord when he speaks of invading the Chinese mainland. This has been going on for 10 years, and the prospects of his meeting with success are nil. No revolt in Red China could possibly succeed unless elements of the Red Army revolted. The peasants have no arms or munitions. Were any section of the Red Army to revolt, and of course there is no indication of that, then that Commander would be the new No. 1 boy, and General Chiang would be definitely out even as a symbol.

Veterans Day Program, Altoona, Pa., November 11, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, veterans' organizations in Altoona, Pa., under General Chairman Lt. Col. Harold J. Pegg, joined in the annual Veterans Day observance held November 11, 1959.

A parade through the business district preceded the memorial service to all veterans. The program was held in front of the Altoona City Hall, at which time I had the privilege of delivering the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE VETERANS DAY PROGRAM, ALTOONA, PA., NOVEMBER 11, 1959

Once again it is my privilege to join with my fellow veterans and the citizens of my hometown in observing Veterans Day, a day of tribute to those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

In preparing my remarks for this occasion, I could not help but recall the great contribution made by thousands of men and women from this area who have worn the uniform of their country in all of America's wars, from the Revolutionary War to the end of the Korean conflict.

It is not difficult to understand the deep love of country that has been characteristic of the manhood and womanhood of this area, because its history reveals that early settlers were deeply religious, with the result that love of God and country were their outstanding characteristics.

Today the many beautiful churches in our midst are eloquent testimonials of the faith and devotion of God-fearing and liberty-loving Americans that inhabit this area.

The sponsors of this Veterans Day program are the veterans organizations of Altoona, all of which serve a common purpose, namely, to promote love of God and country and to provide a means for war veterans to foster and preserve the ideals for which they served in the Nation's wars.

As we observe Veterans Day this year we are reminded that 41 years have passed since this Nation paused at 11 o'clock on the morning of November 11, 1918.

This hour and date marked the end of World War I and for years was observed as Armistice Day.

November 11 has been designated by Congress in recent years as Veterans Day.

Today we commemorate the services of those from this area who fought in all the wars in which our country has been engaged.

Our few minutes today are dedicated to this noble purpose—the commemoration of the patriotic service of all veterans.

The presence of our respected veterans on this occasion, and the entire purpose of this part of the program makes it very necessary that we seriously consider how the average citizen can assist in our efforts to keep the cold war from turning into a conflict which would destroy the very foundations of our civilization.

Missiles and nuclear bombs are in themselves no menace to mankind, nor are the "conventional" weapons which can inflict widespread destruction.

The menace is the man who, in disregard of the wishes of his people, can order the trigger pulled.

The one big danger in the world, therefore, as David Lawrence recently stated, is one-man rule—autocratic government.

Our opponents are strong—this we must admit.

To avoid facing such a fact is nothing less than cowardly.

The square mile area of the Soviet Union is greater than that of the United States by over 5 million square miles.

The population of the Soviet Union exceeds that of the United States by 33 million persons.

The military manpower picture of the Soviet Union is greater than ours by over 1 million men.

It is significant that between 1954 and 1955 trade between the Communist countries and the rest of the world rose from $3.6 billion to $4.46 billion—an increase of 24 percent.

Afghanistan, Egypt, Finland, Hong Kong, Iceland, Iran, Turkey, and Yugoslavia all increased their trade with the Communist world by 10 percent or more.

It is recalled that in 1956 the Communist bloc extended $600 million in credits to Yugoslavia, Egypt, Afghanistan, and India.

In addition, Russian trade with Communist China increased $200 million between 1954 and 1955.

Then too, Russia is building a million-ton steel mill in central India on "generous credit and repayment terms."

We used to think that the economy of a slave state could never be as productive as a free one.

We must now revise this belief.

Within a recent 12-month period, the leaders of the Kremlin made trade agreements with 11 countries.

During that same period the United States did not sign a single agreement.

Mr. Khrushchev has been—for some months now—calling for the end of the cold war.

This is no recent request.

In February of this year he boasted that "economic competition was now enough to win the world to communism."

During his recent visit to the United States, he repeated his views on the Russian economy in no uncertain terms.

We have been warned from several sources that we must choose now between teamwork and dictation or the freedom of choice may be taken away from us.

Leaders in Government, in business, in labor, must stop fighting small battles among themselves and present a united front—a truly United States of America against our known adversary—world communism.

The director of our Central Intelligence Agency in Washington, D.C., Allen W. Dulles, tells us that in addition to its worldwide penetration through Communist Party organizations, the Communists in Moscow and Peiping have set up a whole series of front organizations to penetrate all segments of life in the free countries of the world.

Mr. Dulles says these include the world federation of trade unions, which claim some 90 million members throughout the world.

International organizations of youth and students stage great festivals at frequent intervals.

Last summer they met in Vienna, and it was the first time they dared to meet outside of the Iron Curtain.

They have the Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Teachers Unions, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers; Communist journalists and medical organizations.

Then cutting across professional and social lines, the Communists have created the world peace council which is designed to appeal to intellectuals and which maintains so-called peace committees in 47 countries, gaining adherents by trading on the magic world of peace.

Mr. Dulles gives us additional pertinent facts, which I quote as follows:

"To back up this massive apparatus, the Soviet has the largest number of trained agents for espionage and secret political action that any country has ever assembled.

"In Moscow, Prague, and Peiping and other Communist centers, they are training agents recruited from scores of other countries to go out as missionaries of communism into the troubled areas of the world."

Continuing, CIA Director Dulles said:

"Much of the Middle East and southeast Asia, and particularly black Africa, are high on their target list.

"They do not neglect this hemisphere as recent disclosures of Communist plotting in Mexico show us."

Concluding, he said, "Their basic purpose is to destroy all existing systems of free and democratic government and disrupt the economic and political organizations on which these are based.

"Behind their Iron Curtain they ruthlessly suppress all attempts to achieve more freedom—witness Hungary and now Tibet."

Ladies and gentlemen, under the heading of subversion we must not overlook the fact that the Communist leaders have sought to advance their cause through local wars by proxy.

In this connection, Korea, Vietnam, Malaya are typical examples.

One of the important aspects of the cold war is the way in which it shortens the time one can take to learn about the world into which we are moving.

Throughout the history of our country—and until the past 25 years—it was possible to allow time for the development of understanding of the inherent process of our society.

Now no such allowance of time can be made because of the hot war threat which would bring death itself.

In simple language—the business at hand is survival itself—there is no time to find out the why and wherefore.

Perhaps the answer to our vexing problem is a more positive stand on the issues—or delving even deeper, perhaps we need a firm reappraisal of the issues themselves.

Dean C. Ken Weidner of the American University of Beirut has pointed out that many thoughtful Europeans feel that in the United States we still do not understand that the Russians have devised a new kind of war.

He points out that instead of seeking out the enemy's forces and destroying them, the Russian approach is to maneuver and encourage the enemy to destroy himself by exhausting his natural resources and dissipating his wealth and power in countering widely scattered military threats.

Meanwhile, he says all the time the Russian ideology is being sold to the people of the United States from within our own borders.

Eminent philosophers and statesmen of our Nation have in the past warned that our kind of system cannot be destroyed from without, but can be destroyed from within our own Nation.

Mark you, there is no prescription for a quick and easy peace.

We must expect periods during which world tensions will flare up, quiet down, and then break out again.

Therefore, we must strive constantly to narrow the gap between the differences in our world.

We must earnestly seek an answer to the questions: What can I do to help solve the issues?

What can I do to help the problems from becoming worse and worse?

It was in this spirit of earnestly seeking peace that Premier Khrushchev was invited to visit the United States.

On this Veterans Day as we attempt to briefly evaluate the cold-war picture, we may safely conclude that much of our defense lies in understanding and firmness, in a strong and ready deterrent military power, in the marshaling of our economic assets with those of other free countries.

This was the picture we sought to convey to Premier Khrushchev in the hope he would not continue to underestimate our desire or our ability to continue to strive for a just and lasting peace.

As liberty-loving Americans, if we are to fulfill our obligations to the veterans of past wars—if we are to keep that faith we talk about on every Veterans Day—we must widen the streams of freedom that flow through our world.

"Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," that is the way one great American historic document spelled out the needs of the time.

Self-government and respect for the rights of man are ideals deeply cherished by the peoples of America since their earliest days.

Drawing upon their common belief in the dignity of man—based on their Christian heritage—our Founding Fathers were inspired to lay the foundations of a new nation.

Although from time to time the achievement of our goals has encountered obstacles and setbacks, we have never wavered in our determination to press forward.

We have maintained our political system which is designed to uphold American principles and to guarantee human dignity.

Ladies and gentlemen, we should not lose sight of our purpose in opening our doors to the leaders of the Soviet Union, any more than we should lose sight of the purpose of our Founding Fathers when they drafted the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

It is important in our personal and national conduct during the cold war that we not become so embroiled in the conflicting ideologies of the present, that we forget to draw upon the past for our inspiration.

We must not forget to remind ourselves our purpose is upholding the dignity of the individual.

It is not a fly-by-night ideal—but one basic to a continuation of free society.

If we wish to maintain faith in ourselves and in the values our free society embodies, we must understand what this faith is and how it came to earlier generations.

Every civilization is cradled in some religion.

The culture of China is unthinkable without the philosophy of Confucius.

Indian society is the expression of Hinduism.

Islam is composed of followers of Mohammed.

In like fashion, our Western culture stems from the Judeo-Christian tradition.

We are a branch of Christendom.

Our Declaration of Independence sets forth the conviction that political liberty is part of the covenant between a man and his Maker.

The American dream was built upon a religious foundation.

If liberty and freedom are our commitments, then we have no choice except to stand for those principles.

We cannot sacrifice those principles and expect to lessen the gap that is caused by the cold war.

Only when peoples are able, in free elections, to choose their leaders and to remove them at will can there be an assurance of peace in the world.

People do not make wars—but dictators do.

November 11, 1918, was a day of rejoicing in the United States.

The meaning of that day seemed so simple.

Right had triumphed; aggression had been put down; men could and would again live together in peace.

Armies could be disbanded; ships converted to the uses of peaceful commerce.

Indeed, there were not enough swords to make all the needed plowshares.

In 1918 there was little boastful triumph in our mood.

It was not the celebration of a military victory—it was a spontaneous hymn of joy to the fortunes of peace.

Today it is not the victory of that war that we remember.

Because since the first Armistice Day we have learned that there can be no enduring victory.

Meanwhile, we ask ourselves, "what of those who have sacrificed their all."

"What of those we especially honor on this Veterans Day program."

Perhaps those of us who wore the uniform of our country and breathed the essence of comradeship-in-arms as we saw the naked spirit face the peril of wars can give the words for the tribute we are groping for today.

It is said that men who live for freedom will die for freedom.

We are told to contemplate such sacrifice in true perspective.

And we are told that it is better to have even a brief vision of the stars from the vantage point of free men than to have a spirit dulled by the futile routine of communistic oppression until the eyes can no longer be lifted upward.

May God grant that the memory of those brave men and women whose patriotic service has enshrined them in the hearts of all Americans—and whom we honor here today—will serve as an inspiration to us in the great task before us of preserving our priceless heritage of liberty and freedom.

Fidel Castro: America's Achilles Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 14, 1960

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, not since the days of Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders has Cuba been more on the minds of Americans. With the suddenness of a black thunderhead rolling up in the summer sky, a young revolutionary, Fidel Castro, swept to power last January in this lovely Caribbean island. Since then, like a tempestuous volcano, Castro has been strewing revolutionary lava far and wide. Most alarmingly, some of his deeds and words sound suspiciously like the tactics of communism. More and more, as Americans learn about the Cuban revolution, they are shocked by the increasing Communist infiltration and, in some areas, Communist guidance. These facts must give America great care lest Cuba become a Soviet stronghold on our very doorstep.

To most Americans, Fidel Castro must appear as a fascinating character. Young, gay and handsome, his bearded face brings memories of a young Daniel Boone. An intelligent, jolly fellow, he always seems ready for a good time. Perhaps most appealing, he gives the impression of an allegiance to an ideal—the 26th of July Movement, the name of his revolutionary party. Always we admire a man supposedly dedicated to an ideal—especially a man who has the vigor, enthusiasm and determination to carry forward its principles. Admittedly, Fidel Castro possesses leadership qualities which have made him a towering figure in his homeland.

The question before America today is simply this: Which way does Fidel Castro tower? Does he lean toward democratic ideals—the ideals which gave his country freedom, the ideals which brought Americans as liberators to his shores in 1898, the ideals which made America and Cuba friendly neighbors? Or does he lean toward totalitarian precepts—the precepts which destroy liberty and justice and would make his country a captive of international communism? That is America's chief interest in Castro.

We are all familiar with the background of Fidel Castro—how, as a young student, he led a revolt on July 26, 1953, against the Batista government, how he was arrested, sent to prison, later released. That was just the beginning for this young man. He went to Mexico, organized a band of revolutionaries and vowed to overthrow the Havana government. The very term "26th of July Movement" comes from the historic date in 1953 when Castro made his fateful attack against Moncada Barracks in Santiago.

Then one December day in 1956, Castro with only some 80 men actually invaded Cuba. This act in itself shows the daring fearlessness of this man—who with a mere handful of followers would attempt a military invasion of a sovereign American Republic. Castro's expedition met with resistance at the shore and only some dozen members, including Castro, escaped inland. The stage was now set for one of the most ingenious, swift, and amazingly successful coups in the whole history of the Western Hemisphere. In just a few months these dozen men, through terror, cajolery, and blind devotion to a revolutionary program, mushroomed into a tremendous military force. From a shadowy silhouette figure hurriedly slithering ashore from a small boat to a grand Cuban conquistador cheered by thousands as he parades down the streets of Cuba's capital city—that was the transformation of Fidel Castro in roughly 2 years.

There is a lesson here to be learned. Castro's success shows the tremendous power which can be generated by a fanatic minority determined to overthrow a legitimate government. Lenin and his henchmen did the same in 1917. A mere handful of Bolsheviks, trained in deceit and revolutionary techniques, overthrew the mighty, centuries-old governmental structure of the czar. They then went on—after brutally murdering the czar and his family—to erect a revolutionary Communist government. The world is still reaping the bitter fruits of that fateful event.

To the victor belong the spoils—such has been the motto of dictators for countless centuries. Castro heaped upon himself the honors and rewards which came from victory. He promised reforms. He promised new laws. He promised to do away with injustices. Many Americans were highly sympathetic as it must be admitted there was much room for improvement in Cuba.

But when victory is achieved by a revolutionary minority through military means, there inevitably come the abuses of power. We remember the infamous treason trials, held in a virtual circus atmosphere. Human beings were sent to death—almost like cattle in a slaughterhouse. The name "La Cabana"—the hated fortress where prisoners were jailed—leaped into the headlines. Many hundreds fled Cuba as political exiles. These are the familiar trappings of the dictator state: "treason" trials, prisons, political exiles.

Yet, there was much good will still left for Fidel Castro. Last April, as you will remember, he toured the United States. Virtually everywhere he was received with enthusiasm. He spoke before many audiences of political leaders, newspapermen, civic officials, students. He told what he was trying to do in Cuba. He tried to explain away the excesses of the revolution. He denied his movement was Communist. "We have said very clearly we are not Communists, very clearly." He espoused friendship for our country. He said he was bringing a new life to millions of his fellow countrymen.

Now, some 9 months later, the time has come to take a serious inventory of Fidel Castro. I know some people are downright weary trying to figure out just what is occurring in this historic isle—where Christopher Columbus traveled on his first expedition to America. One day Castro resigns as Prime Minister—then upon the appeal of the people, returns. Invasions of Cuba occur while Cuba invades the Dominican Republic. The President of the state resigns under fire and another is appointed—both mere puppets of Castro. Special tricks are used to lure airplanes to the island—there to be captured. A high-ranking Cuban official, Maj. Pedro Luis Lanz, chief of the air force, suddenly disappears—is denounced by Castro—and then testifies before an American congressional committee. These 9 months have been marked by a kaleidoscope array of confusing incidents, bewildering to anybody who does not take the time to study the pattern of developments in this country.

And what we see is not encouraging. Castro's Cuba, from all indications, is rapidly falling under Communist influence. Whether Fidel Castro himself is a Communist is not known. Major Lanz was asked during his appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as to who was the "strongest Communist in the Castro government." He replied, "I think it is Fidel himself. I am completely sure he is a Communist."

Major Lanz added, "While fighting in the hills we talked about bringing democracy back to Cuba, about free election, about the constitution. What have we got now? He has let the Communists have control, and few Cubans are Communists."

Evidence continues to mount of Communist infiltration and control in Cuba. Intelligent observers have pointed out that there are Communists in the Army, labor unions and public communications. Likewise, Cuban education is being penetrated by the Communists, even to the extent of rewriting history books. Reports continue to circulate of contacts by Cubans with Communists from other countries.

Most important are the close advisers of Fidel Castro. His brother, Raul, is one of the most prominent. Raul reportedly was in attendance at a Communist-directed youth rally in Vienna in 1953, later traveling behind the Iron Curtain As commander of the Cuban armed forces, Raul is in a most strategic position. His friendliness to Marxist-Leninist propaganda is obviously giving the Communists an entree into new fields of Cuban life.

Then there is Ernesto "Che" Guevara, the so-called No. 3 man of the Castro regime. Argentine born, an international adventurer, always ready to fight at the drop of a hat, he has become Fidel Castro's right-hand man. He led part of Castro's army in its bloody struggle for power, later served as commander of the infamous La Cabana fortress. He, too, reportedly has intense Communist leanings and has long been regarded

as one of the key party figures in the Caribbean area. A man like Guevara—bold, dashing and ruthless—is not one who would be expected to fight for democratic liberties. He is a promoter of dictatorship.

The handwriting is clear for all who are willing to observe—Cuba is well on the road toward Communist domination. Perhaps Castro himself is not to become Cuba's Lenin—the man who actually sets up the Communist dictatorship. We do not know; perhaps Castro will be a Kerensky, the man who was to briefly head the Russian Government after the czar's forced abdication in March 1917, only in turn to be replaced by Lenin the following November. The important thing is this: anti-American, anti-democratic, anti-liberty forces are on the rampage in Cuba at this very minute. Communism is growing there. Our fear is that the Kremlin will gain either overt or covert control, swinging this lovely tropical island into the Kremlin's control. This, I say, America can never permit.

There are some people who say give Castro time to straighten out affairs. That advice would be excellent, if only the possibility existed that democratic processes might gain the ascendancy. But the whole flavor of the July 26 movement and Fidel Castro personally militate against this prospect.

First of all, there is the fact that Castro gained power through bloody military revolt, not democratic elections. He thinks in terms of ruthless military force—witness his handling of the "treason" trials and those who criticize his regime. "From now on the symbol of our revolution," he told a cheering throng on resuming the Premiership, "will be the machete," the razor-sharp ax used by Cubans. Seldom has history recorded that a military dictator has become a believer in democracy.

Then, in 9 months, the trends are all running contrary to free government: there have been no free elections; establishment of responsible local self-government; no operation of an independent judiciary. Attempts have been made to interfere with the free press. Property has been expropriated without due process of law. Then there is the continual atmosphere of emotion, Castro-sponsored rallies and parades designed to whip the people into frenized acclaim—the familiar trappings of the dictator.

Castro, moreover, is attempting to churn discontent and revolt among his Caribbean neighbors. He has become a firebrand threatening to inflame the peace of Latin America. He talks and acts like a bully, forgetting that nations must learn to live peacefully. If disputes arise, they should be settled amicably—not by name calling, guerrilla invasions, and subversive infiltration. Castro is running contrary to the principles of Western Hemisphere unity.

When the Cuban jig-saw puzzle is put together, piece by piece, we find a man—Fidel Castro—and a group—26th of July Movement—which are basically anti-democratic. This young man, trained to think in terms of violent revolution and dictatorship, represents a severe danger to the United States. As Communist influence grows, as the Kremlin increases in power in Cuba, we must be alert to protect our national security. Let's make no mistake: Fidel Castro is the Achilles heel of our national security. We cannot allow Moscow to gain a foothold too close to our shoreline.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our merciful Father, whose faithfulness abides in spite of all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions, take from our darkened minds, we pray, the delusions which so often color our judgments and control our verdicts.

May we know that in all the confusions and perplexities of these days, which so sorely test our powers of discernment, at best we but see as through a glass darkly. Keep us from mistaking one ray of light for the total sun.

We dare to ask for light upon only one step ahead, faith to take 1 day at a time, endurance in the darkness to wait in patience and confidence for the dawn.

May we be loyal to all the truth we know and seek, and, with scorn of all expediency, may we discharge faithfully the duties which lay their commission upon our conscience.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 255)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the budget for the year 1961, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 300)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Ninth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1960.*

DIRECTOR OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of 68 Stat. 265, the Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] a Director of Gallaudet College to fill the vacancy created by the retirement from the Senate of Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the presentation of memorials, the introduction of bills, and the submission of other related matters, be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during

the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed. This is the customary request which is made on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations early in each session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that we plan a Democratic caucus for Wednesday, at 10:30 a.m., in the room in which we have previously held our caucuses, for the purpose of discussing the education bill which appears on the calendar, and is Order No. 1049, Senate bill 8, introduced by the Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART]. It is a bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

I announce that we expect to follow the unfinished business—which is Calendar No. 571, Senate bill 2436, to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes—with Calendar No. 559, Senate Joint Resolution 39, to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives. That joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I am informed that amendments will be offered to that measure—including an amendment known as the so-called poll tax amendment, and perhaps others.

When the Senate completes its action on the unfinished business, Senate bill 2436, I expect the Senate also to take action on Calendar No. 819, Senate bill 694, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. That is a bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

Furthermore, a number of other bills have been cleared by the policy committee; and announcement about them has previously been made to the public. These bills will be called up at appropriate times. I do not mean to indicate that they will be called up in order in which I have announced them.

I should like to have all Members know that the proposed constitutional amendment measure, the juvenile delinquency bill, and the Democratic caucus on the State aid to education bill, have been scheduled, and that we plan to follow the disposition of the unfinished business with some of those measures.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C. transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Special Assistant for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve Forces, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Air Force, on the progress of the flight-training program, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1959, there was an aggregate of 2,463 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting three drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans.

A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program; and

A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN SERVICES BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—PAKISTAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on review of the military assistance program, Pakistan, dated August 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED REGIONAL OFFICE ACTIVITIES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected regional office activities, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO ANTHRACITE EXPERIMENT STATION, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Anthracite Experiment Station, Bureau of Mines, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE OF LAND AND INTERESTS ON BLUE RIDGE AND NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAYS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY MUCKLESHOOT INDIANS, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION ON TALENT DIVISION, ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of contract relating to proposed construction work exceeding a total cost of $200,000, on the Talent Division of the Rogue River Basin project, Oregon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial report of that order, for the fiscal year, August 1, 1958 to July 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISSOLUTION OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Daytona Beach, Fla., confirming the final dissolution and liquidation of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., formerly incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant

to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949 in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Mary Braun of Chicago, Ill., relating to the resurgence of nazism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the annual convention of the United States Savings and Loan League, held in Dallas, Tex., last November, the league adopted a resolution on the subject of "Preserving a Sound American Dollar."

In this resolution the league recognizes that the management of the public debt is closely related to the battle for a stable dollar and expresses concern over the fact that the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term marketable Treasury obligations is adding an ever-increasing burden to the cost of financing our Government obligations.

The United States Savings and Loan League is entitled to much credit for its statesmanlike stand on this important issue.

Congress has a very definite responsibility in this field and I sincerely hope we can get legislative action that will permit our Government to finance its obligations on a long-term basis and eliminate the 4¼-percent limit on interest rates that may be charged on long-term bonds.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING A SOUND AMERICAN DOLLAR

During the past year the present administration and many Members of the Congress have intensified their efforts to preserve the integrity of the American dollar. Their insistence on fiscal responsibility on the part of the Federal Government was a primary factor in making a balanced Federal budget for the fiscal year 1960 a confident expectation. The United States Savings and Loan League commends the President and these Members of Congress for their unwavering efforts to improve the status of the American dollar abroad and to preserve its buying power at home.

The league recognizes that the management of the public debt is closely related to the battle for a stable dollar; it also recognizes that such management is a particularly serious problem to the Treasury in a period of rising demand for credit from all sectors of the economy. The league urges upon its member savings and loan institutions continued active assistance to the U.S. Treasury by participation in the sale of savings bonds, through which many thousands of persons are started on the path to thrift.

It is obvious that the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term marketable Treasury obligations should be eliminated. This limitation has not prevented interest rates from rising, nor has it prevented the Treasury from paying more than 4¼ percent for money. On the contrary, the ceiling has the unfortunate effect at the present time of forcing the Treasury to concentrate its bond offerings in maturities under 5 years, has imposed an abnormal pressure on the short-term securities market, and has forced the Treasury into an unprecedented competition with thrift institutions which seems likely to result in a decrease in funds available for home mortgage loans next year.

The league recognizes that earlier in the decade of the 1950's—before the 4¼-percent ceiling became a barrier—the Treasury did not move frequently and decisively toward placing more of the debt on a long-term basis. Its policy of continually refunding on a short-term basis contributed to the present difficult situation the Treasury now faces. Fortunately, the Treasury now gives every indication of being wise and courageous enough to pursue a policy of long-term financing.

The U.S. Savings and Loan League urges that the 86th Congress, when it reconvenes in January, promptly enact legislation raising the present ceiling on long-term Treasury obligations.

DISASTER RELIEF BY A "GREAT WHITE FLEET"—COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the whole free world was delighted with the enthusiastic reception which the President received on his visit to other countries last month. Nothing has done more than has this visit to promote good will and friendship among the nations. The reception accorded President Eisenhower on his trip proved dramatically that a just and lasting peace is uppermost in the minds of the people everywhere.

While the results of the President's trip abroad were indeed momentous, other ways to implement our efforts for world peace can be effective, and can be carried out with comparatively little cost.

One project which would have very great value is the sending of a fleet, without guns, to carry medical supplies, food, clothing, and other emergency assistance to the victims of disaster in near and far parts of the world.

On July 21 of last year, I joined with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, urging the President to provide for the establishment of a Great White Fleet to carry emergency assistance to people stricken by famine, disease, earthquakes, floods, or other disasters.

Subsequently, 31 other Members of the Senate became cosponsors of the resolution. The same resolution was offered in the House by Representative BATES, of Massachusetts, and Representative EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

The effect of the submission of the resolution was not only gratifying, but also rather startling. I received thousands of letters from people in every State, as well as many mailed on shipboard and from foreign countries, urging the establishment of this mercy fleet, and offering moral and material support for this purpose. In fact, I have had to return to the writers nearly $1,000 which they wanted to contribute to the cause.

Much of the credit for this outstanding response was due to an article and endorsement by Life magazine.

I had hoped that the administration would take the lead in pushing this project, without further urging by the Congress.

The very fact that our Nation would be prepared to cope with disaster wherever it might occur would give hope and encouragement to people everywhere.

We already have the necessary ships, lying idle; and it is my firm belief that the expenditure of $5 million in establishing such a Great White Fleet would make a greater contribution to understanding among nations and the establishment of a lasting peace than an additional $5 billion spent for instruments of destruction.

Since several months have gone by, and since there appears to be no move on the part of the executive branch to take any further steps toward the establishment of the Great White Fleet, I am turning over today to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee the several thousand communications which I have received in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66; and I urge that the Senate go on record as favoring this proposal.

I submit the communications, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would it be possible and also very practical to take the $5 million from perhaps the foreign-aid funds which have not already been specifically committed? I think the idea of such disaster relief is a very worthy one, as a positive contribution to worldwide understanding and good will.

Mr. AIKEN. I would be delighted to select a part of the foreign-aid funds from which the $5 million could be deleted.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that could be done.

Mr. AIKEN. At the time when the concurrent resolution was submitted, I believe the White House was supporting the idea. However, I have heard nothing further from it lately, and I do not know what has happened.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought I should bring it to the attention of the Senator. It is a worthy objective, and I think it is a very practical approach. Certainly, it would be wise to consider that approach once a year to see what would happen. We have certainly spent money on less worthy projects, and we have sometimes obtained rather small results.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New Hampshire knows, of course, he will have an opportunity to review these reports, because these communications are being referred to the Committee on Armed Services, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a high ranking member.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution authorizing a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, and I submit a report (No. 1027) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the conduct of United States foreign policy, with special reference to Latin America, and the problems of world disarmament.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (4) to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) to take such testimony; and (6) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $185,000 for the period ending January 31, 1961, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTERIM REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY" (S. REPT. NO. 1026)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 115, 86th Congress, I submit an interim report entitled "Organizing for National Security," which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1960, through January 31, 1961, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees; and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various Governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided,* That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government; (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided further,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $275,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 248) providing additional funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1960 to January 31, 1961, inclusive, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government with particular reference to—

(1) the effectiveness of the present organizational structures and operational methods of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government at all levels in the formulation, coordination, and execution of an integrated national policy for the solution of the problems of survival with which the free world is confronted in the contest with world communism;

(2) the capacity of such structures and methods to utilize with maximum effectiveness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation in the solution of those problems; and

(3) development of whatever legislative and other proposals or means may be required whereby such structures and methods can be reorganized or otherwise improved to be more effective in formulating, coordinating, and executing an integrated national policy, and to make more effective use of the sustained, creative thinking of our ablest citizens for the solution of the full range of problems facing the free world in the contest with world communism.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one such person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and shall receive compensation at an annual gross rate not less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred to examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2833. A bill for the relief of Sadako Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar S. Auad, Beatriz Auad, and Manuel Auad; and

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Dominador B. Cunanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Florante M. Dulay;

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Dr. Avelino Raquiza Lazo and Dr. Segundina del Carmen Lazo; and

S. 2838. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyun Mo Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2839. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2840. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2841. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the Civil War, both Union and Confederate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2842. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2843. A bill further modifying the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2844. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Kanopolis Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 2845. A bill to stabilize the price support of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JORDAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Chyn Duog Shiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2847. A bill to amend the Act relating to the importation of adult honeybees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 2848. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL FUNDS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 248) providing additional funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD TO FILE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the time for filing a final report by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, established by S. Res. 74, Eighty-fifth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1957, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended to March 31, 1960.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of enabling the Select Committee to complete its work and prepare such final report, it is hereby authorized to exercise, until such date, all of the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon it by S. Res. 74, Eighty-fifth Congress, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $48,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Republican committee on committees has concluded its committee assignments. The recommendations were approved by the conference held this morning.

I therefore submit a resolution which embodies the recommendations, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 251) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, is excused from further service on the Committee on Government Operations; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, is excused from further service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. COTTON, is excused from further service on the Committee on Finance; the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, is excused from further service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MORTON, is excused from further service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Be it further resolved, That the Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. COTTON, be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary; the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, be assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MORTON, be assigned

to the Committee on Finance; the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, be assigned to the Committee on Government Operations; the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. FONG, be assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. BRUNSDALE, be assigned to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 251) was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 252), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Unemployment Problems established and authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 196, adopted September 22, 1959, is hereby continued through June 30, 1960.

SEC. 2. Expenses of the committee under this resolution for the period February 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, which shall not exceed $24,682.61, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION TO MICROFILM BOTH UNION AND CONFEDERATE MILITARY AND NAVAL RECORDS OF CIVIL WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the microfilming of the original official records of the Union and Confederate Armies and Navies and other records now in the National Archives and other places. This measure would enable many scholars across the country to have access to these priceless historical records, thus increasing the public knowledge of our great heritage.

A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives last year by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, and is of importance to the Civil War Centennial Commission, and many libraries across the country, including the Texas State library. The State archivist of Texas, Mr. Dorman H. Winfrey, has called this matter to my attention, and I hope that this bill may be enacted to allow him to so render even greater services to the people of Texas, just as it would enable other librarians to render similar services to their States and thus to all the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter addressed to me by the State Archivist of Texas be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2841) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the Civil War, both Union and Confederate, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in connection with the centennial of the Civil War, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized and directed to microfilm for publication or to procure the microfilming for publication of the original official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Navies, War and Navy Departments and such other official Confederate records as are not now included in the War Department collection of Confederate records in the National Archives: *Provided*, That there shall be excluded from the records microfilmed such series of records as the Archivist of the United States may deem to be of insufficient historical value to warrant the the cost of microfilm publication: *Provided further*, That when any of the records to be microfilmed are not now in the custody of the Administrator, the consent of the present holders thereof shall be obtained.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall cause a printed descriptive catalog of the microfilm publication prepared in accordance with this Act to be issued from time to time to reflect the current stage of progress in the work of publication until such time as the whole project shall be completed.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of General Services such sum, not exceeding $50,000 per year for ten fiscal years, as may be required to cover the costs of preparing the records for microfilm publication and making a negative and security copies thereof.

The letter presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

TEXAS STATE LIBRARY,
ARCHIVES DIVISION, CAMP HUBBARD,
Austin, Tex., January 4, 1960.

The Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Thank you so much for your letter of December 28, 1959, concerning the Civil War service records of Texans now in the National Archives.

In 1955 the National Archives microfilmed its carded index file of Texas Confederate soldiers and made it available on 41 rolls of microfilm as the National Archives Index to Compiled Service Records of Confederate Soldiers from Texas. We do have this in the State archives.

I feel certain that more recent legislation has been passed concerning the microfilming of Confederate and Union records, and that I just do not know about it. In the American Archivist (January 1959), there was the following item:

An assembly of interested organizations, called by the Civil War Centennial Commission a year ago, endorsed the idea of microfilming the important Civil War records in the National Archives and elsewhere. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, chairman of the Commission's Legislative Committee, has introduced a bill in Congress that would authorize the appropriation of $50,000 per year for this purpose. "For the first time," commented the Commission's Executive Director, "it will be possible, if this bill is passed, to study, without coming to Washington, the day-to-day and hour-to-hour business transacted by war officials on both sides."

And in the American Archivist, July 1959, the following item appeared:

"Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, stated that bills had been introduced in Congress calling for an appropriation of $500,000 to microfilm Union and Confederate records in the National Archives."

I would be interested in any information you may have about the above legislation. I hope the charge for microfilm will not be large. It took our State archives 4 years to secure the 41 rolls of the National Archives Index to Compiled Service Records of Confederate Service Records, and then the money to purchase the microfilm had to come through private sources. Any assistance you can render in this matter will be deeply appreciated by the customers of the Texas State archives and Texans throughout the State. I am sure you agree that the next few years will see much research done on the subject of the Civil War. I want to make everything possible on the subject available here.

Respectfully yours,

DORMAN H. WINFREY,
State Archivist.

NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from Massachusetts [Messrs. SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY], the Senators from New Hampshire [Messrs. BRIDGES and COTTON], the Senators from Rhode Island [Messrs. GREEN and PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact.

Mr. President, the compact proposes a unique experiment in Federal-State relations which may set a nationwide pattern for regional conservation and development of water and related land resources. For the first time in our history, the many Federal agencies concerned with these problems would be brought into a continuing cooperative relationship with the States.

The hurricanes and floods which have taken a disastrous toll of lives and property in New England in recent years have emphasized the need for an effective, coordinated protective program. Much progress has been made since the tragic flood disasters of 1955, but much more remains to be accomplished. The proposed compact offers a method of expediting this vital work, and other related programs, such as the development of water resources for recreational, domestic and industrial use, the improvement of harbors, and the prevention of erosion of the beaches on the Atlantic coast and Long Island Sound.

The compact already has been approved by the legislative bodies of four States; Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. By its terms, it will become effective when approved by the Congress. I trust that approval will be given promptly.

Mr. President, an excellent summary of the history of cooperative efforts to develop New England's water and related land resources, of problems encountered in Federal-State relations in this area, and of the need for the proposed compact was given in testimony by William S. Wise, director of the Connecticut Wa-

ter Resources Commission and vice chairman of the Northeastern Resources Committee, before the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources at Boston, Mass., on December 8, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wise's statement, which was presented in behalf of the Governors of the New England States, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks, together with the bill itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2842) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is given to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, as hereinafter set out. Such compact reads as follows:

"NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

"ARTICLE I

"Findings

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resouces, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region. The work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee demonstrated that a continuation and furtherance of activities such as those undertaken by it would be of great value. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of a joint agency for the Northeast.

"ARTICLE II

"Purpose

"It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the northeastern region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of the United States, the several states, and private persons or entities, in the field of water and related land resources, and to study, investigate, and plan the development and use of the same and conservation of such water and related land resources; to provide means by which conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the field of water and related land resources; and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination on both the federal and state levels of government.

"ARTICLE III

"Creation of Commission

"There is hereby created the Northeastern Resources Commission, hereinafter called the Commission.

"ARTICLE IV

"Membership

"The Commission shall consist of one member from each party state to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the state which he represents, and seven members representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development to be appointed and to serve in such manner as may be provided by the laws of the United States.

"ARTICLE V

"Functions

"It shall be the responsibility of the Commission to recommend to the states and the United States, or any intergovernmental agency, changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources. The efforts of the Commission in coordination of work and resolution of conflicts may be directed towards all state and federal activities involved in water and related land resources development responsibilities and shall include coordination of the following:

"(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

"(2) Investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects.

"(3) Programming (including scheduling) of water and related land resources construction and development.

"(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for resources projects to the Commission.

"The Commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research in the field of water and related land resources, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make its own investigations and conduct its own research. The Commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations, or original research within its purview.

"ARTICLE VI

"Voting

"No action of the Commission respecting the internal management thereof shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the members are present and vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the Commission membership. No action of the Commission respecting a matter other than its internal management shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the state members and a majority of the members representing the United States are present and a majority of said state members together with a majority of said members representing the United States vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the state members and the concurrence in writing of a majority of the members representing the United States.

"ARTICLE VII

"Finances

"A. The Commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party state a request for funds to cover estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof. Any such request shall indicate the sum or sums which the Commission has requested or intends to request be appropriated by the United States for the use or support of the Commission during the period covered thereby.

"B. With due regard for such monies and other assistance as may be made available to it, the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several states participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"With due allowance for monies otherwise available, each budget of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the party states, to be apportioned among them on a weighted formula based 50% on population and 50% on gross land area, such population and gross land area to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. Census of Population, but provided that the total contributions of all of the states shall not be required to exceed $50,000 annually and provided further that regardless of the number of states party to the compact at any time the maximum annual contribution required of any state shall not exceed its share of the $50,000 as determined above. Any state may contribute such funds in excess of its share, as determined above, as it may desire.

"C. The Commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article VIII (E) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

"D. The members of the Commission shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the Commission.

"E. The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its by-laws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"F. The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the Commission.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Administration and management

"A. The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"B. The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice chairman and treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"C. The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The Commission shall establish and maintain, independently, by contract or agreement with the United States or an agency thereof, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"D. The Commission may borrow, accept or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

"F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may accept, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind by-laws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party state, and to the President and Congress of the United States, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"ARTICLE IX

"Other compacts and activities

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect, the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party state participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party states may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact. Nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party states for the management of natural resources, or the coordination of activities with respect to a specific natural resource or any aspect of natural resource management, or for the establishment of intergovernmental planning agencies in subareas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

"ARTICLE X

"Enactment

"A. This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and when the United States has provided by law for the designation of its representation on the Commission. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other aforementioned state upon its enacting this compact into law.

"B. Upon consent of the Congress of the United States of America, any other State in the northeastern area may become a party to this compact, by entering into and enacting this compact into law.

"ARTICLE XI

"Withdrawal

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending three years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the governor of each of the other states party hereto and to such officers or agencies of the United States as may be designated by federal law.

"ARTICLE XII

"Construction and severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any state, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed.

"SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is given to any of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become a party to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact in accordance with its terms.

"SEC. 3. (a) The President is authorized to appoint seven members, representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development, to the Commission created by the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

"(b) Each such representative shall receive compensation and travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the manner provided for experts and consultants in sections 5 and 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, except that (1) the time limitation with respect to the length of services authorized in such section 15 shall not apply, (2) the per diem rate of compensation for such representative shall be such amount, not in excess of $100, as is established by the President, and (3) the total compensation paid in any calendar year to such representative shall not exceed $15,000. A retired military officer of the United States or a retired civilian employee of the United States may be appointed to serve as such representative without prejudice to his retired status, and shall receive compensation as authorized in this subsection except that his retired pay or annuity under Federal law and compensation under this subsection shall not exceed $15,000 in any calendar year. If an employee of the United States is appointed to serve as such representative in addition to his regular duties as such employee, he shall serve without additional compensation.

"SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

A statement concerning the water resources of New England presented in behalf of the Governors of the New England States to the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, U.S. Senate, by William S. Wise, director, Connecticut Water Resources Commission, Boston, Mass., December 8, 1959

The individual New England States and many of the State agencies will present more detailed information at this hearing covering varying phases of water resources conservation and development. Consequently, this presentation will cover only general statements and conclusions for the region.

The opening sentence of the findings of the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact states:

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of the geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region."

The Governors of the New England States heartily concur in this statement and unanimously support any sound and equitable program which promotes the growth, prosperity, and welfare of this great region. What benefits this region also benefits the Nation.

This statement will present briefly a review of the water resources under three main headings:

1. Water resources of the area.
2. Accomplishments in water resource development.
3. Policy and program needs for the future.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE AREA

History supports the contention that New England comprises one of the great industrial and recreational regions of the country. One of the most important factors contributing to this fact is the nature and extent of its water resources—ample in quantity and generally suitable in quality. They are also unusually well distributed and reasonably accessible to the centers of demand. New England occupies an enviable position in this respect.

The water resources, in this 65,000 square mile area, are contained in thousands of lakes, ponds, and reservoirs with a total water surface area estimated at 3,500 square miles and in over 75,000 miles of rivers and streams with drainage areas ranging in size from over 10,000 square miles to only a fraction of a square mile. An undetermined, but obviously large, volume is hidden under the ground surface. New England is also fortunate in having a beautiful shoreline approximately 4,600 miles long. This constitutes a tremendously valuable recreational asset, a source for industrial supplies where saline water is useful, and also as an unlimited potential source of fresh water when salt water conversion becomes feasible and economical. Because of the large number of undeveloped potential fresh water supplies it does not seem likely that there will be a heavy demand for such water in the foreseeable future, except for special requirements.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The development of water resources in New England has reached its present stage largely through the efforts and initiative of private interests and by a people who traditionally have been doing things for themselves. Currently consideration is being given to providing storage in flood control reservoirs for future supplemental water supplies. This has great merit in those areas where the future conditions may become critical, provided the beneficiaries bear an equitable share of the costs for this service.

The people of the New England States have generally adjusted themselves to the principles of State sovereignty in those matters affecting their economy. In those problems of regional scope they have endeavored to find the solutions through interstate compacts and interstate agreements. This practice has proven to be very effective in the attack on broad scale complex problems and in uniting the people in a common interest for their common good.

In 1947 the States joined in a compact setting up the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission for the purpose of controlling pollution in interstate rivers and waterways, a fundamental step in the conservation of the region's water resources. The Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission was created in 1955 by the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut to coordinate and program the construction of flood control works on the Connecticut River watershed. In 1957 the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts created the Thames River Valley Flood Control Commission to coordinate efforts in reducing the ravages of floods in that valley. Less formal associations have served this region well in the numerous interstate problems.

This region was the locale of the most outstanding experiment in Federal-State relations ever undertaken in this country. Through a Presidential directive in 1950 the New England-New York Interagency Committee was created to make a thorough study of the natural resources in this area. Representatives from each of the 7 States involved and from seven Federal agencies worked, struggled, and compromised for 4 years to complete a factual report contained in 43 volumes and at a cost of over $5 million. This was the most comprehensive study of its type ever undertaken in the field of water and related natural resources.

Following the discharge of this committee the New England Governors, in 1956 through a charter created the Northeastern Resources Committee with a similar membership of States (except New York) and Federal agencies to implement this report and its recommendations. In 1958 after 2 years of organizational endeavors the Governors again indicated their interest in the continuation of the work of this committee in a memorandum of understanding between the States involved. The results of these efforts and the growing concern over resource problems have aroused public opinion strongly supporting a permanent and more effective status for this committee. Consequently legislation in the form of a compact, between the New England States and the Federal Government, was introduced into the States' general assemblies in 1959. Four States, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, already have approved this document and the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact will be presented for action in the next session of Congress. If enacted this could become the most useful agency for coordinating the conservation and development of natural resources in this region.

With few exceptions the public water supplies of this region are obtained from unpolluted sources and therefore the States have always diligently followed a strong policy seeking to protect the quality of the waters for future expansion and development. New England has pioneered in stream pollution control and some of the early treatment works were constructed here. The different States, individually and collectively, are engaged in other programs involving certain phases of water resource management, such as flood control, shore and beach erosion control, stream encroachment control, dredging and construction in tidal and navigable waters, supervision of dams and drainage. Cooperative programs have long been carried out with Federal agencies—Army Engineers and Geological Survey—on flood control, beach erosion control, stream gaging, ground water investigations, quality of water studies, and geological mapping.

In the realm of law of water rights and water use the New England States have generally followed the common law of riparian rights. The general adoption of this principle by the States in the eastern and midwestern portions of the country has caused this to be referred to frequently as the eastern law in contrast to the western law followed by those States in the western part of the country. The doctrine of riparian rights has adequately served the growth and prosperity of this region and while some of the States are examining their laws in this field to determine if they are outmoded, it is questionable, if changes are found to be necessary, that they will be based extensively on the western doctrine.

POLICY AND PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

The fields of water resource investigation and management are becoming overcrowded with activities of multifarious agencies—both governmental and private—which if uncontrolled might cause a confused condition approaching chaos. Initiative and competence should not be suppressed but proper channels should be established for directing the activities toward their maximum productivity.

A partial cause of this perplexing situation is the reluctance of Federal and State Governments in setting forth policies and indicating possible guidelines for action. Then, too, it has frequently been claimed that the only method of attack on this problem is from the top level of government down rather than from the lower levels of government and activity up. It is obvious that all levels of government and activity must participate but each in its own special sphere of influence and responsibility.

In line with this premise the most important and fundamental first step is the establishment of a sound national water policy. This policy should set forth six areas of principles and cooperative intent:

1. Recognize the differences in water problems, water rights, and water law existing between regions—especially the contrasting doctrines followed in the eastern and western sections of the country.

2. Encourage and facilitate participation by private interests or agencies to attract the wealth of competence and ability available in this sphere of action.

3. Encourage establishment of regional agencies and authorize binding agreements or compacts between the Federal Government and such agencies for positive, cooperative action.

4. Assure participation by State or local governments consistent with the impact upon the economy of the respective areas.

5. Delineate the functions and responsibilities of the various Federal agencies involved in water-resources problems to avoid duplication and confusion in administration.

6. Set forth procedures for coordinating and channeling the activities of all agencies involved.

Conflicts now exist between Federal and State Governments and with the increasing attention being given to water resource matters by both governments it is likely that the conflicts will become more acute. A clean cut national water policy could prove to be a great boon to sound resource development and should stimulate establishment of State water policies without risk of conflict with Federal piecemeal policies and procedures.

Congress has set a pattern for Federal assistance to the States and local communities in the construction of stream pollution control facilities through Public Law 660. This has greatly stimulated the construction of necessary treatment facilities to the extent that in some areas there are substantial backlogs of plans awaiting availability of Federal funds. The pollution control programs in New England would be greatly advanced if Congress provided increased funds for both construction and programing until the backlog of construction is reduced. It then should determine what policies would best maintain this program in a fluid and active state, recognizing that the State and local communities should bear their fair share of responsibility and support.

There is a great need for overall comprehensive planning to care for the many problems confronting the economy of local communities. These programs have been advanced by interest-free loans through the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. This service should be continued until the urgency has abated.

A well developed navigation system is as important to the Nation as it is to New England. The harbors of this region have not been as intensively developed for use by modern deepwater transportation craft as has been done in other areas. The needs for deeper harbors in New England must be recognized and positive steps taken to insure their construction in the near future.

In the fields of flood control, tidal flooding and hurricane protection, shore erosion, geologic mapping, surface and ground water studies the appropriate Federal agencies have provided invaluable assistance and support in carrying out these programs cooperatively with the respective States. From time to time the needs for temporarily accelerating these programs in certain areas becomes critical and provisions should be made for meeting these demands with the requirement of a fair share of support and participation by the States involved.

The water problems of New England are not as critical as they are in other sections of the Nation. Time is in our favor, but there is a common belief that this situation will not continue indefinitely. There is also a very real determination to prevent a lackadaisical approach to advance planning for meeting the future needs on both the State and Federal levels. Public sentiment strongly favors coordination and programing on a regional basis such as is contemplated under the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. This would provide a sound and most effective procedure for a real Federal-State-local cooperative action. To demonstrate the productiveness of this plan and to assure an abundant future New England needs the helpful assistance of a sympathetic Congress, which could partially be supplied by favorable consideration of the previously suggested policies and procedures.

MODIFICATION OF LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Mississippi River is without a doubt one of America's greatest assets and one of the principal sources of its wealth and well-being. The long, wide, deep river drains 42 percent of the entire United States into the Gulf of Mexico. On its way to the sea it picks up much sediment and meanders at will if it is not controlled by bank protection works.

During the course of its meanderings over a long period of time, the Mississippi River has changed its course on numerous occasions. Recently the Federal Government has found it necessary to take steps to prevent the river from changing its course in any particularly critical area where the change would have been so drastic that it would have affected the economy of the entire southern part of the country.

On several occasions the Mississippi River, in its process of building and cutting, has seen fit to build a mudbank in front of some of the harbors along the river. It has done this at New Madrid, Mo., Helena, Ark., and Lake Providence, La. As a result of this action of the river, the harbors at these three places have been cut off from access to the river. As the result of this action, the Federal Government, through the Corps of Engineers, cannot legally maintain the 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River that it guarantees for navigation on a year-round basis.

On behalf of myself, the Senators ELLENDER, FULBRIGHT, HENNINGS, and SYMINGTON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will make it legal for the Corps of Engineers to maintain

navigating depths in these chutes that have resulted from the action of the Mississippi River. This bill will make it possible for the engineers to construct and maintain low-water acce: navigation channels from the existing channel of the Mississippi River to established harbor areas along the river between Cairo, Ill., and Baton Rouge, La. This bill will limit this work in any particular locality for any single year to $150,000.

It is my feeling that, had we had corrective works years ago, we would never have permitted these harbors to be blocked off. It is only proper that we should now restore the harbors and make this important artery of our commerce available to those localities that have been cut off as the result of this unusual action of the river. The bill I am introducing will accomplish this purpose and will do so at a cost that is very negligible when the amount of good that it will accomplish is considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2843) further modifying the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STABILIZATION OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to stabilize the price supports for tobacco.

This measure, Mr. President, would accomplish the same objectives as the Jordan-Cooper bill which was passed by the Congress last year and was vetoed by the President.

The new bill differs very little in its approach from the original Jordan-Cooper bill. It would allow prices of tobacco to fluctuate in direct relation to the prices farmers pay for the things necessary to the production of tobacco, including wages, taxes, interest, and the other costs involved in production. Under the bill, the 1960 price supports would be identical with those for the 1959 crop. Beginning with the 1961 crop, tobacco price supports would be computed on the basis of the average index of prices paid by farmers for the 3 calendar years immediately preceding each crop year. In this way, tobacco prices would move up or down in relation to the average cost of production for the 3 preceding calendar years.

I should like to emphasize that this measure represents another effort on the part of growers, warehousemen, dealers, and exporters of tobacco to stabilize prices in a manner that will help tobacco produced in the United States to regain its position in world markets.

For several years we have been losing at a dangerously rapid rate foreign markets for our tobacco. If action were not taken, we would lose still more, and farmers would be forced to take another acreage reduction, which would spell disaster for thousands of farm families. If this measure is enacted into law, it will bring hope of an increase in acreage allotments, because of the new foreign sales it will promote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2845) to stabilize the price support of tobacco, introduced by Mr. JORDAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], as I did last year, in introducing this bill to stabilize the support levels for tobacco. I enjoyed working last year with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, and I look forward to working with him again this year in the interest of the enactment of this legislation. He is an able advocate of the interests of tobacco farmers, and has great knowledge of our tobacco program.

This bill is very similar in its practical effect to Senate bill 1901, which Senator JORDAN and I sponsored last year and which was passed by the Senate and by the House of Representatives.

This bill has the complete support of all the tobacco-grower organizations and the tobacco-State farm groups, and in fact of the entire tobacco industry.

I am particularly glad that the bill has the support of the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, the Burley Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association, the Burley Auction Warehousemen's Association, the Western Dark-Fired Tobacco Growers' Association, and the Stemming District Tobacco Association, all of Kentucky.

In addition, this bill has the full support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which opposed Senate bill 1901. And in view of the conferences which have been held with responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture in coordinating the presentation of this proposal, I trust that this bill will have the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the bill, which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and I are joining in introducing today, is to stabilize the price-support levels for tobacco, basing them on the 1959 support levels, which were the best in history. This would assure continuation of the present fair level of price support, which has resulted in good prices for tobacco growers, with adjustments reflecting any future changes in farmers' costs.

As an example of the improvement in farmers' prices under the tobacco program, I give the average price per pound of burley tobacco in recent years:

	Cents
Prewar, 1934–38	22.2
1941–45	40.0
1946–50	45.7
1951–55	52.5
1956–59	62.6

In addition to protecting farmers' prices—and this is of great importance—the bill will encourage the expansion of markets for tobacco in this country and abroad. Stabilizing the price-support levels for tobacco will permit manufacturers of tobacco products in this country and other countries to make their plans for a period of years, and will stimulate larger purchases.

I am sure this proposal will have the support of all Members of Congress from the tobacco-producing areas. I can see no reason why the bill should be opposed by any group, and I do not anticipate any objection. A preliminary hearing on the proposal was held by the House Committee on Agriculture on Thursday, January 14.

I trust that the Department of Agriculture will promptly approve this bill. I hope the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will quickly report the bill; and, Mr. President, as a new member of that committee, I will urge, together with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], that the bill be passed.

I believe this measure certainly should be passed by the Congress without delay, and I see no reason why it should not be signed into law.

IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2847) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a proposed bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The proposed legislation would amend the Honey Bee Act (42 Stat. 833; 7 U.S.C. 281) to prohibit or regulate the importation into the United States of adult honey bees of all species and subspecies. The present law is now specifically limited in its application to only one species of honey bees.

Apis mellifera, the present species' name for the honey bee designated as Apis mellifica

in the act, is only one of four species of honey bees, the others being A. indica, A. florea, and A. dorsata. These latter three species may now be imported without restriction since the present act is specifically limited in its application to A. mellifera. Recently an infestation of Acarapis woodi, a mite that causes a serious disease of A. mellifera, was discovered at the Beltsville Bee Culture Laboratory of the Department of Agriculture in specimens of A. Indica imported from India. This illustrates the potential danger in importing species of Apis other than A. mellifera.

Acarine disease, caused by the mite Acarapis woodi Rennie, is one of the most serious diseases affecting the honey bee. This disease is considered more serious than any other disease of bees, adult or brood, by apiculturists in the countries where it exists. In areas abroad it has been so destructive that it has virtually wiped out the apiculture industry in heavily infested localities.

The acarine mite is known to be present in 22 countries which represent most of Europe plus South Africa, India, and two countries in South America—Argentina and Uruguay. It is possible the disease may also occur in other countries where its presence has not been noted. The probability of this is suggested by the recent receipt of a sample of abnormal bees by the bee culture laboratory at Beltsville from Punjab, India. The sample was Apis indica and was found infested with Acarapis woodi. This was the first record of the mite being present in India and first for the indica species.

At the present time, to our knowledge, we do not have the disease in the United States. We have had quarantines against importation of bees since 1922, imposed solely to exclude this disease. Should the disease be introduced into the United States, it could have a devastating effect not only upon beekeeping but upon agriculture in general through the more than 50 crops that now rely heavily on the honeybee for pollination. There are approximately 450,000 beekeepers in the United States operating a total number of colonies in excess of 5 million. The value of the honeybee in pollination is often quoted as at least 10 times that of the honey and beeswax crop of $50 million annually.

Amendment of the act as recommended would not involve the expenditure of any additional funds for its enforcement, since its effect would be to prohibit the importation of additional species of adult honeybees, except that the Department could bring in such bees under adequate safeguards if necessary for experimental purposes.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HENNINGS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXPANSION OF SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2797) to increase and extend the special school milk program, introduced by me on January 13, 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1960, the name of Mr. YARBOROUGH was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2827) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Senators MORSE, CHAVEZ, ENGLE, GRUENING, GOLDWATER, MANSFIELD, and DIRKSEN), on January 14, 1960.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION—EDITORIAL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on January 13, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, which would authorize that a gold medal be struck for Dr. Thomas Dooley for his extraordinary services to mankind, both in the U.S. Navy and subsequently. I am glad to report this resolution is now sponsored by some 35 Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the Senators' names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 148 (medal for Mr. Dooley) sponsored by Mr. BUSH and Senators HENNINGS, JAVITS, SYMINGTON, MANSFIELD, BIBLE, BEALL, PROUTY, FONG, SCOTT, CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, ROBERTSON, HRUSKA, PROXMIRE, MURRAY, DODD, SPARKMAN, SCHOEPPEL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, GRUENING, JACKSON, MCGEE, ALLOTT, BYRD of Virginia, KUCHEL, THURMOND, YOUNG of North Dakota, MOSS, NEUBERGER, CURTIS, BENNETT, COOPER, CASE of New Jersey, and SALTONSTALL.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial which was published January 16, in the Hartford Courant, entitled "A Medal for Dr. Dooley," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEDAL FOR DR. DOOLEY

There should be unanimity in Congress in supporting the resolution of Senator PRESCOTT BUSH calling for a medal honoring Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. Few contemporaries deserve it more than this young physician. Originally assigned to Laos and the surrounding area by the U.S. Navy, Dr. Dooley became so impressed by the need of these poor, gentle, and grateful people that after his discharge he raised money and went back with severeal colleagues as volunteer medical workers.

What he and his companions have done to help those unfortunate people, and the good will for the United States it has engendered, will never be fully appraised. There is an epic quality to it, enhanced immeasurably by the news that Dr. Dooley himself has been suffering from a cancer and that his own useful days may be numbered.

This country is dotted from end to end with metallic men on horseback who, to be sure, served what appeared to be useful ends. But the ends of society can be said to be improving when recognition is given to men like Dr. Dooley. Hartford has a statue to the discoverer of anesthesia, but this is a rarity. A medal to Dr. Dooley, as Senator BUSH suggests, would be America honoring one of her best-loved and most useful citizens.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I observe, for the benefit of the Senate, that sponsorship of this joint resolution remains open until the close of business tomorrow.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94 BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations announcing the scheduling of public hearings on Senate Resolution 94 on January 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on Senate Resolution 94 on January 27, 1960, at 10 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, announced today. This resolution, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on March 24, 1959, would serve to repeal the so-called Connally amendment to the 1946 resolution which authorized the President to deposit with the United Nations a declaration accepting on behalf of the United States the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under certain conditions. The Connally amendment has the effect of reserving to the United States the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a dispute was essentially within its own domestic jurisdiction. Senate Resolution 94, which is a resolution of advice and consent, will require a two-thirds Senate vote for approval.

On January 27, the committee expects to hear administration witnesses, as well as witnesses who have asked to testify.

In connection with the forthcoming hearings, Senator FULBRIGHT released the attached reports on Senate Resolution 94 which the committee has received from the Departments of State and Justice:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE REPORT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 30, 1959.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 25, enclosing a copy of Senate Resolution 94, relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising, and requesting the views of the Department of State.

The Department notes that the resolution in question would amend Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session, by omitting the automatic reservation under which the United States reserved the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a dispute was essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. The Department of State favors omission of this automatic reservation from the U.S. declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The following considerations are believed to be relevant.

The reservation of a unilateral right to determine whether a particular matter lies essentially within domestic jurisdiction is regarded by some as inconsistent with the provision in the statute of the International Court of Justice (art. 36, par. 6) whereby the Court is to decide a dispute whether it has jurisdiction in a particular case. Under that view, such a reservation could be regarded as rendering the U.S. declaration illusory and as evidencing a distrust of the Court, contrary to our policy of support for referral to the Court of international legal disputes which cannot be settled otherwise.

This policy is in aid of the broad U.S. objective of fostering development of the rule of law in world affairs. With an automatic reservation in our own declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction, the United States is hindered in urging upon all states the judicial settlement of international legal disputes and greater use of the World Court. The U.S. automatic reservation has served as a model for reservations in a number of other declarations accepting compulsory jurisdiction. It would be desirable for the United States to be in a strong position for advocating the elimination of automatic reservations.

Under the statute of the International Court of Justice (art. 36, par. 2), declarations accepting the Court's jurisdiction are made on a reciprocal basis. Thus any state against which the United States might bring suit is enabled today to invoke against us reciprocally the automatic reservation, and could determine unilaterally that the subject matter of our suit was essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the defendant state. This is precisely what happened in the case of certain Norwegian loans (*France* v. *Norway*), decided by the International Court of Justice in 1958. There the defendant Norway successfully invoked the automatic reservation of France, and the French application was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Elimination of the U.S. automatic reservation would not result in conferring jurisdiction on the World Court with respect to disputes over matters essentially within domestic jurisdiction. Disputes of this character would still be subject to exclusion from the Court's jurisdiction under the standard reservation on domestic jurisdiction. The Court would decide in particular cases whether this reservation was applicable.

As a practical matter, retention of the automatic reservation would not afford a defense having significant value. It was the understanding of the Senate when the automatic proviso was adopted that this reservation would never be improperly invoked and that the United States would be bound in good faith to accept the Court's jurisdiction in every case involving matters not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. Thus, the United States as a matter of policy would expect to invoke the reservation only in those cases in which the Court itself would probably uphold a plea of domestic jurisdiction if interposed by the United States on the basis of the domestic jurisdiction reservation without the automatic proviso.

The Department of State notes that Senate Resolution 94 would retain in the resolving clause of Senate Resolution 196, 79th Congress, the words "hereafter arising" as a limitation on disputes to be submitted to the International Court of Justice. In their original context these words referred to the date of Senate Resolution 196, namely, August 2, 1946. In order to avoid any possible doubt as to the import of Senate Resolution 94, it would seem desirable to replace the words "hereafter arising" with an expression such as "arising after August 2, 1946" if it is intended to carry forward the limitation contained in Senate Resolution 196.

With warmest personal regards,

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1959.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning Senate Resolution 94 relating to the "recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising."

The purpose of Senate Resolution 94 is to amend Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session, agreed to August 2, 1946, by which the Senate consented to the U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to international legal disputes upon the express terms provided therein. One of these terms reserved from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." This amendment would delete the words "as determined by the United States" from this reservation.

The legal effect of the proposed amendment would be to affirm unequivocally that the Court is the judge of its own jurisdiction as provided in article 36(6) of the statute of the Court to which the United States is a party. The proposed amendment would not otherwise change or alter any of the U.S. reservations including the reservation of disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

This Department recommends the adoption of this amendatory resolution by the U.S. Senate.

The proposed amendment would tend better to effectuate our settled national policy to encourage and develop the rule of law in the affairs of nations. The existing reservation of a unilateral right to determine what disputes are domestic has had the opposite tendency. First, it has served as an example for other nations to adopt similar limitations on the Court's jurisdiction. Second, it permits other nations on the basis of reciprocity to exercise the same right after a dispute has arisen. The inevitable effect, contrary to our objectives, is to frustrate the purpose of the advance acceptance by nations of the Court's jurisdiction and to weaken the Court as the principal organ of the United Nations for the judicial settlement of international legal disputes.

The proposed amendment would be fully consistent with article 36(6) of the statute of the International Court of Justice which provides "in the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

The amendment would be consistent with the comparable reservation with respect to domestic matters in article 2(7) of the Charter of the United Nations.

Experience over a period of 13 years has demonstrated that the Court has not sought in any way to enlarge its limited jurisdiction. On the contrary, the Court in its judgments has meticulously applied relevant principles of international law on a case-by-case basis after affording to the parties before its full procedural safeguards.

For the foregoing reasons, it is the Department's conclusion that the national interest would be best served by the adoption of Senate Resolution 94.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Deputy Attorney General.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Address by Senator KENNEDY delivered at National Press Club, Washington, D.C., on January 14, 1960.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Opinion poll taken from small businessmen throughout the country and in New York State, submitted to him by the National Small Business Men's Association.

NEEDED: IMMEDIATE ACTION TO PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate bill 2797, to provide supplemental funds for the current year for the special school milk program, as well as to extend and expand the program for the years ahead.

During the period in which this program has been in effect, it has been extremely useful in terms of providing an outlet for surplus milk, as well as improving the health of our school children.

To carry out the milk distribution program, school officials and community leaders have made a constructive effort to provide services and facilities, and have done an outstanding job.

As I stated upon the introduction of my bill, additional funds are needed immediately, if the program is not to suffer curtailment. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has already sent out directives that Federal participation is to be cut back on March 1, if the necessary money is not provided.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committees in both the House and the Senate have recognized the need for expeditious action to avert curtailment of this program. As I understand, hearings to consider supplemental appropriations have been scheduled in the House committee for Wednesday, and in the Senate committe for Thursday of this week.

Today, I received a number of communications from school officials in Wisconsin, who point out the adverse impact which lack of funds would have on the milk program. These letters reflect the need for expeditious action; and I request unanimous consent to

have a number of these printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF OCONTO, WIS.,
January 15, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Early in November of 1958 the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment to his regulations governing the operation of the special milk program in which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960. This reduction would mean that schools serving type A school lunches, of which our school is one, the reimbursement rate would be dropped to 3½ cents per half pint of milk.

To the casual observer this may seem like a very insignificant amount and hardly worthy of consideration. This is not the case, however, as most school lunch programs are operated on a nonprofit basis to enable all students who so desire to take part in the program and receive a well balanced meal without a prohibitive cost to their parents.

In a low income area such as we have in our school district, this lack of revenue would have a profound effect upon our lunch program. It is very possible that a higher student assessment would be necessary, and this might discourage the very student who stands to gain the most from a program of this type.

As I understand it, the only way the Secretary's action can be rescinded would be through legislation on the part of the Congress to appropriate additional funds to make possible the continuation of existing rates and to issue a mandate to the Secretary of Agriculture requiring that the amendment to the regulations be withdrawn or adjusted.

We are all looking for ways to hold down the rising costs of taxes, and perhaps our community is selfish in its motives for perpetuating the school milk program as it now exists, but we are sure that this type of aid is providing positive help to many millions of school children who might be without nourishing food each day were it not for the school lunch program. Few Federal programs benefit so many.

We hope that you see fit to support any legislation which would make it possible to continue the milk support program at its present level.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

GERALD A. EYLER,
Superintendent.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1,
Glidden, Wis., January, 15, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received a communication from the Wisconsin School Food Service Association indicating that the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an amendment to his regulation governing the operation of the special milk program to the effect that the rates of the reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk.

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to vote for legislation that would appropriate additional funds and also legislation requiring the amendment to the special lunch program to be rescinded. Any action you may take in this regard will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. CORRIGAN,
Supervising Principal.

WILTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Wilton, Wis., January 15, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is a protestation of the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture reducing the Government reinbursement rate for milk provided schools in the special milk program.

This amendment to his regulation governing the operation of the special milk program will undoubtedly terminate the program, at least as far as providing free milk to the students is concerned in our school.

A reduction of Government reimbursement to 3½ cents per one-half pint will add an additional ½ cent to the 1 cent per one-half pint already expended by district funds for this program. This adds up to a 1½ cents per one-half pint cut which the school district must pay to have students enjoy the special milk program here at Wilton.

As the administrator of the Wilton Public Schools I wish to voice my objections to this Department of Agriculture action and I urge you, as one of our Congressmen, to use your influence to secure legislation in this present session to prevent the forthcoming reduction from becoming a reality.

Respectfully,

ALLEN E. SCHRAUFNAGEL,
Supervising Principal.

GALE-ETTRICK SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Galesville, Wis., January 15, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is urgent that you exert all effort available to support a renewal of sufficient funds for the special milk program. It is imperative, since our budget has been established for the ensuing year, that the full value is received for all school milk.

Very sincerely yours,

VERMONT JOHNSON,
District Superintendent.

ONALASKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Onalaska, Wis., January 15, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am disturbed by a recent directive from the Secretary of Agriculture ordering a cut in subsidy of one-half cent per half pint of milk used in the schools' special milk programs. This is a cut in this subsidy of 12½ percent and many school districts, including our own, are subsidizing lunch programs as much as they can. Our plans are made for this school year so that a cut going into effect March 1, 1960, fills us with consternation.

* * * * *

I appeal to you to use your resources to get this directive changed or to support legislation designed to maintain the present rate of Federal support.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT G. PETERSON,
Superintendent.

U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION IN NEW YORK LAST DECEMBER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday, January 17, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, issued a statement alerting America to the results of the U.S. Communist Party convention in New York last December.

In my opinion, Mr. Hoover's significant statement is "must" reading for every Senator.

Noting that the 200 Communist delegates to the convention adjourned in a state of jubilance, Mr. Hoover said:

And well they might feel in high spirits, because Communist Party, U.S.A., emerged from this convention more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic.

Mr. Hoover further stated:

Without question, the most signal achievement was the welding of the Communist Party, U.S.A., into a solidly unified, aggressive force behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, exconvict and avowed archenemy of the American way of life.

Mr. Hoover then asked:

Why is the party so optimistic for the future? Why were Gus Hall and other Communists almost gleeful in speaking of Communist possibilities in the days ahead?

"The answer," Mr. Hoover declared, "comes from the convention proceedings, an answer which, like a thread, runs through all the remarks, actions, and hopes of the leadership."

The answer, Mr. Hoover stated very emphatically, is:

That the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans.

Mr. President, this is exactly what I warned against last August before Mr. Khrushchev came to this country. Last summer I said I was opposed to the Khrushchev visit. I said I was very doubtful that any good would issue from it.

More than that, I said I feared it would have a softening effect on a certain element of our population and cause a lowering of our guard. Now, just a few months later, we find Mr. Hoover substantiating my fears.

Mr. Hoover reported:

In one convention discussion, for example, it was stated that as a result of the Khrushchev visit the American people have open minds toward socialism. Hence, the party must learn how to get socialism across to the people and break down misconceptions about the Soviet Union.

Mr. Hoover asserted:

To party leaders, Khrushchev's presence in this country has eased the way for party activities.

Mr. President, what is happening is exactly what I warned against last summer. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statements be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that it will receive the attention and widespread distribution it deserves.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, CONCERNING THE 17TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A., DECEMBER 10–13, 1959

Profaning the very meaning and spirit of the "Star-Spangled Banner" by opening its sinister conclave with our national anthem, the Communist Party, U.S.A., convened its 17th national convention on December 10, 1959, in a hotel in New York City's Harlem section. Four days later, the same 200 delegates, representing other Communists

throughout our Nation, adjourned in a state of jubilance.

And well they might feel in high spirits—because Communist Party, U.S.A., emerged from this convention more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic.

Without question, the most signal achievement was the welding of the Communist Party, U.S.A., into a solidly unified, aggressive force behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, exconvict and avowed archenemy of the American way of life.

Hall was elected general secretary of the party at the convention, and there is virtual unanimous agreement among party powers and rank and file that he is the No. 1 man in the party. As such, he now spearheads as powerful a group of dissidents and fanatic democracy haters as America has seldom seen within its shores during peacetime.

The Communist conspiracy in America today is led by a man who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of government. Hall was convicted in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1934 in connection with a riot there when he was a member of the Young Communist League. During his trial he testified as follows:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?

"Answer. I prefer American with a Soviet government.

"Question. And you are willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.'"

As a hot-blooded young Communist in the late 1930's, Hall was arrested in Ohio and charged with the possession and use of explosives. He subsequently pleaded guilty to a lesser charge of malicious destruction of property and was fined $500.

The election of the fiery Hall to lead a strongly knit Communist Party which has and always will have as its chief objective the communizing of America should certainly shake even the most apathetic American from his lethargy, especially when viewed in the light of this hardened Communist's own statements. During radio and television interviews at the convention, Hall gladly stated that the American public "definitely" has underestimated the size and influence of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He added that the Communists in this country should make even greater strides toward increasing its already growing number of members. He boasted that the party "is growing in industry and youth" due mainly to the change in political climate.

Assuredly, there is a significant lesson for every American in this display of machinations, propaganda, and opportunism which is communism itself at work within our borders. The 17th national convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a revealing 4-day miniature prevue of what our Nation would become if those who aspire to become commissars of a Soviet America should ever fulfill their evil ambitions. It is apparent that, more than ever before, each American must maintain vigilant watchfulness toward this Trojan horse in our midst.

The 17th national convention is being hailed by the Communists themselves as a great milestone in the party's history in the United States.

These gains, recognized as formidable ones, are regarded by the party faithful as their chief accomplishments:

1. Promotion of Gus Hall, strongly pro-Russian and an energetic, aggressive leader, to the No. 1 position in the party;

2. Uniting the membership solidly behind the newly elected leadership, making the party a hard-hitting, mobile weapon against the free American Government;

3. Exploiting the current international political climate in an effort to make Russian policies more acceptable to American public opinion. This involves an attempt to exploit Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's visit to the United States as a means of furthering its own schemes for bringing about a Soviet America;

4. Implemented a number of concrete programs aimed at increasing party membership and party influence in America. Such programs include increased emphasis on party recruiting, training of leaders, collection of funds, stepping up of party propaganda, and infiltration efforts into non-Communist organizations such as labor unions, Negro groups, national minorities, etc.

The newly elected "boss" of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Gus Hall, vaulted to the top post of the party through a combination of fortuitous circumstances and artful plotting. He has long been disgruntled at what he believed to be soft, ineffectual leadership in the party; but his ambitions have been hidden by the shadow of Eugene Dennis, national chairman and previously acknowledged leader of the party. As the date of the convention approached, Dennis still was top man in the party, although there was indication that Hall had nurtured a "dump Dennis" campaign to the point where Dennis' position was indeed a tenuous one. Then came the news that Dennis would be unable to attend the convention, that he had suffered a slight stroke, and that someone else would have to give the keynote address.

The scheming, opportunistic Hall rose to the occasion and delivered the address. He saw his ambition start to crystallize. Today he is communism's champion in the United States—a powerful, deceitful, dangerous foe of Americanism.

What sort of a man is Gus Hall? We in the FBI know him as a fanatical practitioner of Karl Marx' tenet that "the end justifies the means"; a coldly calculating Communist conniver who changes tactics as easily as he changed his name many years ago. He was born Arvo Halberg in 1910 at Virginia, Minn., the son of Matt and Susanna Halberg, both of whom later became charter members of the Communist Party. As a result of his early background of having been born into communism, many of his followers regard him as literally a man of destiny who can breathe new life into the party.

Hall joined the party in 1927 and went to Russia in 1931 to attend the Lenin School where students were taught, among other things, sabotage and guerrilla warfare techniques. After returning to this country in 1933, he became active in the Young Communist League as an organizer and in 1938 entered into full-time party work as a section organizer. As a Russian-taught disciple of Leninistic communism, Hall worked hard and rose swiftly into positions of increasing power. He was elected to the party's national committee in 1945 and became a national board member in 1947. In 1950, he was appointed national secretary, a move necessitated by the imprisonment of Eugene Dennis, who was then general secretary and who was found guilty of conspiring to violate the Smith Act of 1940.

Then, faced with confinement himself after being convicted for violation of the same act, Hall jumped $20,000 bond and became a fugitive. He dyed his blond hair, eyebrows, and eyelashes dark brown, shaved off his mustache, and shed 40 pounds in an unsuccessful effort to evade apprehension. Arrested by the FBI in 1951, Hall was sentenced to 3 years for contempt of court, making a total of 8 years when added to the 5-year sentence imposed for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act.

Conditionally released from prison in March 1957, Hall, after his probationary period ended on April 5, 1959, immediately resumed his nefarious aim of infecting America with communism.

This, then, is the man—exconvict, propagandist, unabashed emissary of evil, and rabid advocate of a Soviet United States.

Behind this Moscow-trained, utterly ruthless Communist leader, the 17th national convention formulated an organizational apparatus designed to make the Communist Party a hard-striking power against American society. A 60-member national committee was established with such veteran and hardened party leaders as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, James Jackson, Hyman Lumer, Arnold Samuel Johnson, and Irving Potash. This national committee is theoretically the governing body of the party between conventions, but actual policy is made by the small ruling clique.

This small clique consists of the party's national officers (though a national executive committee is later to be established) who were elected after the convention by the national committee. The national officers are: William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus; Eugene Dennis, national chairman; Claude Lightfoot, vice chairman; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, vice chairman; Benjamin J. Davis, national secretary; Gus Hall, general secretary; Hyman Lumer, national education secretary; James Jackson, national secretary for the South.

A five-man secretariat, consisting of Dennis, Hall, Davis, Lumer, and Jackson, will be the day-to-day operating authority of the party.

Although the positions of national chairman, national secretary, and general secretary theoretically are of equal importance, Hall is indisputably the new party chief. It will be remembered that Joseph Stalin once bore the title of general secretary of the Russian Communist Party—a position from which he became dictator of all communism.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the national convention's leadership decisions:

(1) The party will remain in the future—as it has been in the past—an obedient slave of Moscow: No new personalities were brought into the party's top leadership. Rather, leadership is today exercised by the same corps of hardened, disciplined, veteran Communists who feel that Moscow represents the final goal of all of mankind's hopes. So-called rightwing Communists are not represented. They have either voluntarily resigned in complete disillusionment or been coldbloodedly purged. These rightwingers believed that the party in America should have some choice in its tactics of operation, not be completely bound by Moscow. This slight deviation cost them dearly. Communists should know there is only one road—that defined exclusively by Moscow.

Proof of the growing monolithic unity of the party is further shown in the changes made in the party's constitution by the convention. These changes eliminated features stemming from the previous convention which allowed greater freedom to local party units. The 1959 changes eliminated these rights and centralized control in national headquarters. They are in full accord with the historic Communist principle of democratic centralism which asserts that once a decision has been made in the party it must be carried out without dissent.

(2) The elimination of factionalism, making the party a more unified and more compact organization: Especially since the death of Stalin, the party has experienced factional disputes. These "factionalists" have now been liquidated or driven to cover. This was the theme of Gus Hall's summary remarks just before the end of the convention. Speaking with gusto, this new Communist commissar declared that "we" now

have one policy, one line, and one direction. Interpreting the convention, Hall stated it gave a mandate to the leadership to completely destroy and burn out all elements of factionalism and that the leadership must carry out the mandate. Hence, in his words, the party cannot permit factionalism.

So, in the days ahead, we can expect an ever-increasing emphasis on party discipline, with all dissidents being eliminated. This is truly in the tradition of international communism which has no place for free speech and free thought.

Every action of the convention was designed to make the party a hard-hitting, versatile, and mobile weapon of attack against our form of government.

Why is the party so optimistic for the future? Why were Gus Hall and other Communists almost gleeful in speaking of Communist possibilities in the days ahead?

The answer comes from the convention proceedings—an answer which, like a thread, runs through all the remarks, actions, and hopes of the leadership. It is: that the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans. In one convention discussion, for example, it was stated that as the result of the Khrushchev visit the American people have open minds toward socialism. Hence, the party must learn how to get socialism across to the people and break down misconceptions about the Soviet Union.

To party leaders, Khrushchev's presence in this country has eased the way for party activities. The Communists see the possibility of gaining still more influence in American society. Gus Hall, in his keynote speech on the convention's first day, was most sensitive to this point. He stated:

"The central question of this convention is: What is the role of the party in this entirely new situation? How can it now move out into the broad stream of the people's movement? How can it break the bonds of its isolation and become more and more effectively a factor in the life of our Nation?"

He then went on:

"We want to participate in, organize, and lead the broadest of united front movements—on every level—in a thousand ways, in 10,000 places, on 100,000 issues—if possible, with 180 million people."

Note the scope of Communist hopes—180 million people or the entire United States. The buoyant optimism of the party is geared to plans to take advantage of an international climate which, in their eyes, is aiding their work. Americans can look forward to a period of renewed party agitation in all fields—always hoping to increase party strength and influence. The Communists will endeavor to gain allies wherever they can be found, creating fronts, launching infiltration programs, participating in all phases of American life.

This new hope program of communism in the United States is geared to concrete programs both (1) building up the party apparatus itself, and (2) increasing party influence in the Nation as a whole.

Party leaders realize that a strong party organization is absolutely necessary to a successful agitation program. The convention adopted a number of programs to strengthen the internal operational structure of the party.

A resolution was adopted calling for the immediate launching of an intensive membership drive to run to May 1, 1960, aimed at increasing membership by 10 percent. This resolution outlined a program which calls for each party district to advise the national office by the end of January 1960, as to its specific plans for recruitment. To show the urgency of this task, the resolution asserted that each national committee member must adopt a personal quota of new recruits. In addition, each Communist Party club must adopt a quota. Moreover, each national officer will be designated to a specific district to aid in this nationwide recruitment program.

The training of party members also must be stepped up. This will mean more party schools. In the Communist Party, education (really meaning indoctrination) is of vital importance. Every member must be deeply imbued with the principles of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

The convention also adopted reports about the status of the Worker, the party's weekly publication. It was pointed out that the Worker was the lifeblood of the party and that strengthening this paper must be one of the party's chief aims. The Worker does much to guide members, giving them the latest twists of the party line. Circulation of the Worker is now approximately 14,000, and the party wants it to be increased to 25,000 in 1960. The convention also accepted a resolution to the effect that the Daily Worker, which was discontinued in 1958, be reinstituted in the shortest possible time but preferably prior to the 1960 national elections in the United States. To the party, the Communist press represents one of its most effective methods of propaganda. In addition, it was recommended that the new national committee should set a date for the next fund drive, probably from January 13. 1960, to May 1, 1960. (The date of January 13 was selected as on this date in 1958 the Daily Worker was discontinued.)

Hence, the convention has given new guidance and enthusiasm to the party's recruiting, indoctrination, and propaganda campaigns. As one of the speakers stated, this was a convention to build the Communist Party, U.S.A.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., FOLLOWS LENIN

Virtually every move taken at the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., has its roots in the teachings of the early gods of communism. In 1902, Lenin wrote:

"We must go among all classes of the people as theoreticians, as propagandists, as agitators, and as organizers. The principal thing, of course, is propaganda and agitation among all strata of the people."

In 1920, Lenin was even more explicit regarding the manner in which the seed of communism was to be planted in fertile areas of unrest, dissension, and strife:

"Every sacrifice must be made, the greatest obstacles must be overcome, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, perseveringly, persistently, and patiently, precisely in those institutions, societies, and associations—even the most reactionary—to which proletarian or semiproletarian masses belong."

Naive, indeed, is the minority, class, or dissatisfied group which lets its banner pass into the hands of the Communists, for this banner will be held aloft by the Reds only so long as it serves the purpose of expediting the Communist objective of domination over all classes.

YOUTH

If for a moment any American considers the Communists to be blind to opportunity, let him consider this vile tactic which came out of the 17th national convention:

It is obvious to the Communists that, if its party is to survive, it must attract the youth of this Nation. As newspapers and other media reveal almost daily, many of America's juveniles are in a state of upheaval—adult authority and morality have been spurned to the point where juvenile arrests in this country in 1958 increased 8 percent over the preceding year.

During the convention, an Illinois Communist took note of the juvenile delinquency situation and proposed that if we provide them with a place to go and with activities they will not be so delinquent; we can move them in a positive direction.

What can be more despicable or dangerous to our democracy than this sort of Red Pied Piper trickery?

NEGROES

Another of the major aims of the 17th national convention was to reemphasize the recruitment of Negroes into the Communist Party by reembellishing the same old hackneyed phrases alleging that the Communist Party is the savior of the Negro. It is no secret that one of the bitterest disappointments of communistic efforts in this Nation has been their failure to lure our Negro citizens into the party. Despite every type of propaganda boomed at our Nation's Negro citizens, they have never succumbed to the party's saccharine promises of a Communist utopia. This generation and generations to come for many years owe a tremendous debt to our Negro citizens who have consistently refused to surrender their freedoms for the tyranny of communism.

Behind the Communists' scheme of recruiting Negroes is deceit as there is in every one of their designs. The Reds are not so interested in the Negro as they are in using him to further Communist goals. This is clearly shown by instructions issued by the Communist Party, U.S.A., to its members as early as 1925:

"The aim of our party in our work among the Negro masses is to create a powerful proletarian movement which will fight and lead the struggle of the Negro race against exploitation and oppression in every form and which will be a militant part of the revolutionary movement of the whole American working class, to strengthen the American revolutionary movement by bringing into it the * * * Negro workers and farmers in the United States to broaden the struggles of the American Negro workers and farmers, connect them with the struggles of the national minorities and colonial peoples of all the world and thereby further the cause of the world revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Negro resolution adopted by the convention discarded the party's historic position advocating self-determination, meaning that Negroes should be given the right to form a separate nation in the Southern States. Stalin had defined "self-determination" in these words:

"The right of the oppressed peoples of the dependent countries and colonies to complete secession, as the right of nations to independent existence as states."

The 1959 convention resolution hence represents a party admission that its position concerning Negroes is bankrupt. Time itself has shown that the party is not interested in the welfare of the Negro, but only in using him as a tool to advance party interests.

OTHER MINORITIES

During the 17th national convention, much was made of the party's responsibility of championing the causes of such groups in the United States as the Mexicans, Japanese-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and a relatively new target, the American Indian. Again, such pseudo concern by the party is readily made apparent by its history of exploiting any area of unrest.

As early as 1921, the Communist International laid down the following rule to be followed by foreign Communist Parties affiliated with the Comintern:

"In countries whose population contains national minorities, it is the duty of the party to devote the necessary attention to propaganda and agitation among the proletarian strata of these minorities."

The choice of the words "propaganda" and "agitation" belies any "noble" motive which those who are easily beguiled might ascribe to the international Communist conspiracy.

LABOR UNIONS

The 17th national convention reaffirmed the party's constant aim of attempting to

infiltrate and dominate labor unions to turn them into a tool for communism—to make them recruiting areas for additional members in the Communist movement.

The 17th national convention's 10-page draft resolution on trade union problems contains the pious statement that—"that fact that Communists have no interests apart from those of the entire working class must be brought home to the American workers again and again."

Actually, the party's burning desire to grab control of labor unions is nothing more than an attempt to carry out one of Lenin's most necessary rules to achieve communism:

"It is necessary to be able to withstand all of this, to agree to any, and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion, and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs."

Certainly, the Communists' glittering generalities of "freeing the workingman" and securing "better working conditions" for him can never take the place of the free bargaining system under our democracy. No semantic windowdressing will ever disguise the true objective of communism—to make slaves of workingmen.

The man masterminding the party's unscrupulous attempts at infiltrating labor unions is Irving Potash, national labor secretary. His sordid background indeed makes a farce of the party's claim that it has no interests apart from those of the entire working class. Born in Russia in 1902, he has an arrest record dating back to 1919 for criminal anarchy, conspiracy to influence and intimidate witnesses, conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, and illegal reentry into this country.

Potash has been dedicated to the Communist movement since his early youth and has been described by a party comrade as "a guy who has never betrayed the party line." In 1931, he placed his own picture on a passport issued to another person and utilized this passport to travel to Russia to attend the Lenin School. Although Potash has stated that he considers America his home, there is no indication he has made any efforts to obtain U.S. citizenship in the 46 years he has called America his homeland. He has, however, frequently and consistently invoked the constitutional privileges of an American citizen when questioned by various congressional committees regarding his Communist Party membership and activities.

FARMERS

In considering what position the Communist Party, U.S.A., will take during the 1960 political campaign, those in attendance at the 17th national convention were provided with a document containing a 10-point program, which the party would support. One of these concerning farmers is ridiculous per se when examined in the light of the ultimate aim of communism. Despite the slaves in the communes of Communist China and the state-owned collective farms and farm machinery in Soviet Russia, the Communists in America have the effrontery to intone sanctimoniously that the Communist Party, U.S.A., will support a program which will "protect the rights of the small farmers to their land and their implements."

What else could such a program be but one small, but expedient, step toward the sovietization of American farmers? Who can conceive of farmers being allowed to own their farms and machinery in the type of society advocated by Communists whose very name connotes a social order in which all goods are held in common by a single authoritarian party?

POLITICAL ELECTIONS

Communists know that apathy among American citizens is the chink in democracy's armor. One of the speakers at the 17th national convention revealed the basic Communist tactic of taking advantage of every weakness when he urged members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to move in the primaries since 90 percent of the Congressmen are elected at the primaries.

The convention heard a report of a five-man committee which had made a study of what the party could do in the 1960 elections. It advocated, among other things, influencing both major political parties. Also, it recommended that the party attempt to exploit labor and Negro groups to wield independent political influence. This report was adopted by the convention.

EDUCATION

The Communist Party remains deeply interested in the American college student. At a press conference, Gus Hall was asked if the party had made any inroads among college students. He replied that the party had made gains in this field, adding that there has been a change in the thinking of college students toward nonconformity. Hall added that he based this comment on the fact that a number of requests have been received from colleges for speakers.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

As evidence of the fact that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a part of the international Communist conspiracy, the convention received greetings from 50 Communist Parties in foreign countries. Most prominent, of course, were the messages received from the Communist Parties in Russia and China.

A motion adopted by the convention reflects another area of growing Communist concern. This motion instructed the new national committee to create a subcommittee on Latin American affairs. Another motion called for an appeal to the conscience of the American people to give support to the "revolutionary" movement developing in Latin America.

In the days ahead, the party can be expected to give increasing emphasis to Latin American matters. Joseph North, foreign affairs editor of the Worker, gave a report to the convention on Castro and the Cuban situation. He praised the progress that has been made by the Cuban Government and said that the agrarian land reform has made the farmers more prosperous than they were before the revolution.

Juan Santos Rivera, president of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, addressed the convention. He extended his best wishes for success to the Communist Party, U.S.A. The party was most enthusiastic over Rivera's appearance.

COMMUNISM AND THE PRESS

One of the paradoxes at the convention was the fact the convention was closed to the press, this in spite of the party's old, old theme that the Communist Party fights for freedom. When queried by a reporter as to why the convention was not open to the press, Hall blithely stated that the party has received unfavorable treatment from the press in the past and also because there were delegates in attendance who might lose their jobs if their identities became known. Of course, the real reason the press was not admitted was because the party does not dare let its illegal aims against the United States become public. The exclusion of the press is a tacit admission that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a clandestine, far from legitimate organization, and that if the free press cannot praise communism, then there is no room at Communist conventions for the press. His feelings regarding the purpose of the press are revealing, too, as to what place the fourth estate would have in a society dominated by the Communist Party.

However, veteran newspapermen are not easily fooled, and some of Hall's answers to questions posed by the reporters quickly exposed him. For instance, Hall was asked if the Communist Party, U.S.A., advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. Hall, convicted in Federal court for conspiring to do just that—Hall, who once openly testified that he was willing to take up arms to bring about a Soviet America, blandly said without hesitation, "No, we have never advocated this."

THE SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the assistant majority leader, last week had a colloquy with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. In the course of that colloquy some very important information was elicited from the Senator from Montana. I should like to follow that up, since the Senator from Montana is now present on the floor.

I refer to a speech that was made last year, March 9, in which a colloquy took place between the Senator from Montana and myself. The Senator from Montana at one point said this:

> The Senator knows that under the law there are only seven members on the policy committee. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to have that committee expanded, I suggest he introduce a measure to that effect. I assure him it will be given the most earnest and serious consideration. At the present time the committee is stymied as to the number of its members. So far as I am concerned, I am merely a file closer. I am an ex officio member.

It is my understanding and I hope the Senator from Montana will correct me if the situation is now different.

While other members of the committee may be ex officio members, who are not among the seven referred to by the Senator from Montana, they have a vote, and they have the same powers as the regular members of the policy committee; there is no difference except that they were appointed at a later date. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. Under the law there are only seven members of the policy committee, and that includes the leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. However, beginning with Senator Barkley, the secretary of the majority at the present time, the position being held by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the whip or assistant leader, the position held by me, were added as ex officio members, and that has been the situation down to the present time.

The majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], instead of looking upon us as ex officio members who merely participate, has allowed us every leeway he possibly could in discussions and voting. Last year he extended the membership still further by bringing into the policy committee the three members of the calendar commit-

tee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and he has given them the same privileges a regular member on the committee has. So what we have in effect at the present time is a 12-man committee, although under the law only 7 are supposed to be members.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the fact is that the senior Senator from Texas, the majority leader, has extended the power of voting on the policy committee to five additional members, who, according to the law as it was passed, are not designated as members of the policy committee. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true. In the case of two, he was carrying out a policy inaugurated by the former majority leader, Mr. Barkley, at the time the so-called policy committee was set up in 1947; and, on his own initiative, to give a wider representation, I suppose, he brought into the policy committee the three members of the calendar committee, who sit with us regularly, and have for over a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wanted to reinforce that impression, as to whether the members of the calendar committee had power to vote on all occasions. I think the statement of the Senator from Montana has made the situation perfectly clear. I called the Library of Congress on that question. They checked with the Democratic National Committee. I do not know why the Library should have checked with the Democratic National Committee——

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the advisory committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Library received word that the ex officio members of the policy committee do not vote. The Senator from Montana has clarified that aspect. I am glad that fact has been made a matter of public information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted the Senator from Wisconsin has brought this matter up, but I thought it was a matter of public information. I assure the Senator that, so far as the members of the calendar committee are concerned, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], they have a vote and they know they have a vote. Their views are asked, and they participate in matters affecting proposed legislation reported by the standing committees of the Senate.

THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times has a massive sense of history which is brilliantly condensed in a 3-minute thumbnail summary of the news every morning in the Times' daily news summary and index. Yesterday morning the first two news events summarized under the caption "National" bear an interesting relationship. I will read them without comment:

NATIONAL

His finger poised in the air for emphasis, Vice President NIXON opened his 1960 campaign against the Democrats by challenging Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's concept of the Presidency. In Florida for his first speaking appearance since announcing his own candidacy, Mr. NIXON said the Senator, also a declared candidate, seemed to confuse presidential table pounding with strong leadership. The Vice President defended the Eisenhower record and set forth his own list of qualities the next President should have.

President Eisenhower spent the entire day out in the fields in Georgia hunting elusive quail. Shotgun blasts and the yelping of bird dogs set up a commotion, the like of which had scarcely been known since a hurricane all but leveled the nearby town of Albany in 1940. When it was all over, the President had bagged his legal limit of 12 birds.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], discussing the Presidency, and his remarks about the President, particularly calling attention to the weekend vacation he has taken, I wish to comment briefly.

The President of the United States needs no defense from me. Criticism of or debate about the concept of the Presidency or the President's policies is a matter within the competence of this body and of the American people. But from time to time some Members rise in this body and comment on the fact that the President has taken a weekend vacation, that he may play golf, that he may shoot, or that he may hunt. I do not derogate the character or the qualities of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I must say that in my view such remarks are in bad taste and wholly uncalled for.

Even for a man who has had no sickness at any time, one serving as President of the United States, one who bears the tremendous burdens of that Office, deserves to have a rest now and then, even often, and it is good for the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. The President, who has had a heart attack and another serious illness, and who has come back from those illnesses to serve this country with devotion to duty, deserves and has the approbation of the people of this country.

Whatever may be said, it is a fact that the President is at a peak of public approval in this country and throughout the world. It is doubtful if any President of the United States ever before enjoyed the confidence of the people of this country and of the people of the world that President Eisenhower enjoys.

I hesitated to give any notice to such comments, but I must say that in the last 2 or 3 years I have heard these statements, and at times they affront me, not simply because I happen to be a member of the President's party, but it affronts my sense of taste. I believe the people of this country are affronted also.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I should like to finish.

The President of the United States serves 12 months a year, every day of the month. We in the Congress have our vacations, and we take them pretty often. We have recesses, and Members travel all over the world, at Government expense. I am sure these Members work hard, but they are traveling much of the time on vacations.

The President of the United States has no such vacation. He is working constantly. The decisions which he has to make—which we talk about but do not have to make—weigh upon him heavily and affect the Nation and the world.

I wish to say to my friend from Wisconsin and to other members on the other side of the aisle, for 3 years, some of you have talked about finance and what ought to be done, defense and foreign policy and what ought to be done, but the chief result of all their talk has been declarations employing such adjectives as "imaginative, bold, new programs." Neither from their side of the aisle in the Senate nor from their party on the outside have they yet been able to come up with any program—other than criticism and critical remarks—and you have had neither the support of your own party in the Congress or the support of the people of the United States.

Again I say, I am in favor of debate upon all public issues. We have a perfect right to debate these questions—not only the right, but the responsibility. But these little personal remarks are tiring.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since the Senator commented on an insertion I made in the RECORD, I should appreciate the opportunity of replying briefly.

The remarks of the Senator from Kentucky seem to me simply incredible. I have never engaged in any personal attack on the President. What I did was to read into the RECORD a summary from the New York Times, which is certainly a fair, dispassionate, objective, and competent newspaper.

Republicans have become so inordinately sensitive about the President that they cry out in protest against any recitation of the facts. And, Mr. President, how could any Senator be more precisely factual than I have been. I have simply taken a factual summary from a newspaper that is internationally known for its absolute fidelity to the facts, and I have asked that it be printed—that is all.

I read one item, and then I read the item immediately following, and I sat down. I made no comment on it whatsoever.

The New York Times pointed out that the Vice President of the United States said the Eisenhower record was a strong record, and printed right below the fact that the President was quail shooting. I did not draw any conclusion from that. This was in the New York Times, and was considered to be extremely newsworthy and pertinent. I simply leave it to the American people and to all Senators to draw whatever conclusions they wish to draw from it.

TENDENCY OF STAND OF CHANCELLOR ADENAUER TO ENCOURAGE MOB VIOLENCE IN GERMANY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not my usual custom to speak about

events in other countries, but I feel I must speak out on the issue of anti-Semitism in Germany

We all recall too vividly how Adolf Hitler rose to power using anti-Semitism as a lever and then plunged Germany and the entire world into the grim holocaust of senseless war. It is not my purpose today to detail the horrows that Hitler cast upon this planet.

I do desire to register my concern about the advice Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is reported to have given his people on the recent outbreak of anti-Semitism. He is reported by the Washington Post and Times Herald for Sunday, January 17, 1960, to have said in a nationwide TV-radio speech:

> To my German fellow citizens as a whole I say: If you catch a hooligan anywhere, carry out the punishment on the spot and beat him up. That is the punishment he deserves.

I hope that, upon quiet deliberation, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer will rescind this advice. I am confident the German government has the legal means and the lawful capabilities to suppress hooligans of any sort without inviting mob action. Government should not encourage violence.

For a leader of government to urge his people to take on the role of policemen, prosecutors, juries and judges, is to invite anarchy—the complete breakdown of justice, with harm to innocent people. This is what the ruthless Nazis did in the 1930's.

How well can a mob—or a few emotional citizens—provide justice on the spot? The answer is that they cannot and they should not try to.

I express the earnest hope that the good people of Germany will show the world that they respect the rights of their fellow man. This will require that any and all violations of human decency be handled in a manner which gives the accused a fair trial, presided over by officials of the German Government and its subsidiaries.

I particularly hope that those German citizens who are of the Jewish faith will carefully abstain from taking the law into their own hands. Violators of the law should be promptly handed over to the proper authorities—not manhandled. There must be government by law.

Only by faith in lawful procedures will Germans escape a return to the pain road that Hitler led them down. His faulty creed was well set forth in "Mein Kampf," when he said:

> The very first essential for success is a perpetually constant and regular employment of violence.

The bombed ruins that still exist in Germany challenge that advice.

Germans must show that law and order prevail and that violence will be met by the rule of law. But beyond this the German people must show that they will not turn their eyes away and pretend not to see what their eyes see well or pretend not to hear what their ears hear plainly. To ignore vicious and debasing evils are to condone and—yes—to support them.

The German nation must actively demonstrate a national purpose based upon genuine respect for the rights of all people. No other route will save them from the anarchy that breeds a Hitler and the destruction that follows a Hitler. The well-being of Germany lies in showing unity to protect human rights by lawful means. The danger is discord caused by disregard for man's inherent rights. I know that the intentions of Chancellor Adenauer are of the best. His motives are high and pure; and yet I fear it is a basic mistake for a great national leader like Mr. Adenauer to condone mob violence in the slightest degree. Upon reflection, he himself—wise man that he is—may reach a similar conclusion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 17, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST GERMANS TOLD TO BEAT "HOOLIGANS"—ADENAUER PLEDGES STATE BACKING TO JEWS IN TV TALK

BONN, JANUARY 16. — Chancellor Konrad Adenauer advised West German citizens tonight to beat up any anti-Jewish holligans they find smearing walls with Nazi symbols.

Such punishment on the spot is what the hooligans deserve for disgracing Germany and causing a wave of hatred for Germans abroad, Adenauer said in a nationwide radio-TV address. He told German Jews they have nothing to fear, that he personally guaranteed that the power of the German state stands behind them.

Nazism has no roots in West Germany and its incorrigible followers are few, Adenauer said. He pledged that the movement never will make a comeback.

The anti-Semitic incidents have been strongly condemned by the whole German people, Adenauer said.

There was a marked lapse across Germany in the rash of vandalism that, breaking out at a Cologne synagogue Christmas eve, has spread to far corners of the world. None has been reported on German soil for 48 hours. Authorities speculated that bitterly cold weather is keeping swastika-smearers indoors.

Adenauer told the German people that most of the incidents, in Germany and elsewhere, seem due to hooliganism without any political background, but the Cologne outrage appears to be of a political nature.

"To my German fellow citizens as a whole I say: If you catch a hooligan anywhere, carry out the punishment on the spot and beat him up. That is the punishment he deserves."

In Saarbruecken, meantime, a torchlight procession of 500 people marched to the site of a former Nazi concentration camp to protest the recent neo-Nazi outbursts. Earlier, at a rally there, speakers urged that German schoolchildren be told more of Nazi crimes. A French movie on concentration camp atrocities was shown.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the President's estimate of a budget surplus in excess of $4 billion on June 30, 1961, cannot be accepted or regarded as an accomplished fact. From experience I know accurate budget estimates 18 months in advance are extremely rare.

A surplus was also estimated originally for last fiscal year—ended June 30; and the Government closed the year with a deficit of $12.5 billion—the biggest peacetime deficit in history. During the 18-month period involved the Federal debt limit was raised three times.

Following the recent state of the Union message, there are already some who are planning to reduce taxes, increase spending, and do both in anticipation of surplus which is by no means certain. The Nation should be warned that this would be fiscal irresponsibility.

From the President's statement it was obvious that he was relying on increased revenue—not expenditure reduction—to produce the surplus he forecast.

Revenue totaling $84 billion in the coming year would be an increase of $15.7 billion over collections last year, or an increase of 23 percent in 2 years. Such an increase would be difficult without heavy inflation. Inflation of such proportions is certain to increase Government costs.

If a surplus develops, I agree with the President that it should be applied to the Federal debt, which this month reached its all time peak.

Preliminary examination of the Federal Budget for fiscal year 1961, beginning next July 1, submitted by the President to Congress today, shows the following:

1. Budget in general

[In billions]

	1959	1960	1961
Receipts	$68.3	$78.6	$84.0
Expenditures	80.7	78.4	79.8
Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−12.4	+.2	+4.2
Appropriations and other new spending authority	81.4	79.7	79.4

These estimates contemplate $554 million from increased postal rates (1 cent in first-class and airmail rates, etc.) and $140 million in other charges, fees, transfers, etc., requiring legislation. If these changes are not enacted, expenditures and appropriations would be increased by $694 million, and the surplus would be reduced by the same amount.

One-half cent increase in highway gas tax is proposed, but this is without effect on the general fund. The Byrd amendment (pay as we go) would control.

2. Receipts breakdown

[In billions]

	1959	1960	1961
Individual income	$36.7	$40.3	$43.7
Corporate income	17.3	22.2	23.5
Excise	8.5	9.1	9.5
Other	5.8	7.0	7.3
Total	68.3	78.6	84.0

Total collections would be up 23 percent over 1959 and 7 percent over this year. Individual income tax collections would be 19 percent over 1959 and 8 percent over this year. Corporate income tax collections would be 35 percent over 1959 and 6 percent over this year. Excise taxes would be 12 percent over 1959 and 4 percent over this year.

The revenue estimate, of course, contemplates continuation of present excise and corporate income taxe rates.

3. Expenditure breakdown

[In billions]

	1959	1960	1961
National security	$44.1	$43.9	$43.8
Foreign aid, etc.	6.1	3.9	4.0
Domestic-civilian	33.3	34.8	35.7

Domestic-civilian figures include roads and FNMA; they are up more than 86 percent over the expenditures at the end of the Korean war.

4. Interest: 1959—$7.7 billion; 1960—$9.4 billion; 1961—$9.6 billion. Another temporary increase in the Federal debt ceiling will be requested for seasonal excesses.

5. Unexpended balances at the start of fiscal year 1961 will total $71.8 billion; $38.5 billion obligated and $33.3 billion unobligated. 1961 expenditures out of prior year authorizations are estimated at $26.3 billion.

6. Notes: Revenue proposals include continuation of existing corporate and excise rates; equitable co-op taxes; prevention of excessive depletion allowances; revision of taxes on gains from sale of depreciable personal property; increase in aviation fuel tax and transfer to general fund; repeal of interest rate ceiling; deferral of taxes on income derived from less-developed areas abroad; postponement of cuts in transportation and telephone tax rates. The item veto is proposed. Effort is made to bring foreign currencies under control. Backdoor spending is reduced and sharply criticized. Extension of Corporation Control Act is recommended. Transfer of forest and public land highways to trust fund is proposed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, an increase of nearly $1 billion in domestic-civilian expenditures is estimated in the Federal budget submitted to Congress today.

Including highways and FNMA, domestic-civilian expenditures in fiscal year 1961 are estimated at $35.7 billion, as compared with the estimate of $34.8 billion in the current year.

The 1961 estimate represents an 86-percent increase in Federal spending, outside of defense, atomic energy, and foreign-aid categories, since the end of the Korean war.

If there is to be a surplus, it will not result from expenditure reduction.

A breakdown showing the increase in domestic-civilian expenditures follows:

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1954–61, broken categorically to show national security, foreign aid, etc., and domestic-civilian

[In millions]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
National security:								
Military functions	$40,336	$35,532	$35,791	$38,439	$39,062	$41,233	$40,945	$40,995
Stockpile and defense production	1,045	944	588	490	625	312	230	134
Atomic energy	1,895	1,857	1,651	1,990	2,268	2,541	2,675	2,689
Subtotal, national security	43,275	38,334	38,030	40,918	41,955	44,086	43,850	43,818
Foreign aid:								
Military assistance	3,629	2,292	2,611	2,352	2,187	2,340	1,800	1,750
Economic and other	1,511	1,960	1,613	1,683	1,910	3,403	1,714	1,824
Subtotal, foreign aid	5,140	4,252	4,224	4,035	4,097	5,743	3,514	3,574
International affairs	221	221	231	290	322	376	351	419
Total, other than domestic-civilian	48,636	42,807	42,484	45,243	46,373	50,206	47,716	47,810
Domestic-civilian:								
Veterans services and benefits	4,256	4,457	4,756	4,793	5,026	5,174	5,157	5,471
Labor and welfare	2,485	2,575	2,821	3,022	3,447	4,421	4,441	4,569
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,557	4,388	4,867	4,525	4,389	6,529	5,113	5,623
Natural resources	1,316	1,202	1,105	1,297	1,544	1,669	1,785	1,938
Commerce and housing [1]	817	1,420	2,142	3,392	3,816	6,264	7,125	6,363
General government	1,235	1,199	1,630	1,790	1,359	1,606	1,711	1,911
Interest	6,470	6,438	6,846	7,308	7,689	7,671	9,385	9,585
Allowance for contingencies							75	200
Total, domestic-civilian [1]	19,136	21,679	24,168	26,127	27,270	33,334	34,790	35,660
Grand total [1]	67,772	64,486	66,652	71,370	73,643	83,540	82,506	83,470

[1] Since 1954 expenditures for Federal National Mortgage Association and highways have been dropped from the general budget and converted into so-called trust funds—FNMA in 1955 and highways in 1957. Commerce and housing figures and affected totals above are adjusted to include these figures throughout for complete and accurate comparison over the period. For this reason the President's budget shows total expenditures estimated at $79.8 billion for fiscal year 1961 and the above table shows $83.5 billion. The $3,654 million difference is entirely in FNMA and highway expenditures—$800 million for FNMA and $2,854 million for highways.

ANNOUNCED RETIREMENT OF SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the week since my beloved colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, announced his decision not to be a candidate for reelection, the flood of praise for this statesman's contribution to our times has been a refreshing chapter in the usually competitive existence that is the American political scene.

To this volume may I add the editorial judgment of numerous outstanding newspapers and ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and articles be printed in the RECORD:

The Woonsocket Call for Wednesday, January 13, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Has Had Distinguished Career."

The Providence Visitor for Friday, January 15, 1960, entitled "Moral Courage and Public Life."

New York Times for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN calls It a Day."

Louisville Courier-Journal for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Plans a Suitable Exit."

Providence Journal for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "In Praise of Senator GREEN."

Pawtucket Times for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Steps Down."

Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Calls It Quits."

Newport Daily News for Tuesday, January 12, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN To Retire."

Kansas City Star for Wednesday, January 13, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Misses a Goal by 7 Years."

Bristol (R.I.) Phoenix for Friday, January 15, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Woonsocket Call, Jan. 13, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN HAS HAD DISTINGUISHED CAREER

It comes to few men in the field of politics to enjoy as full a life as THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has packed into his 92 years. Now the oldest man ever to sit in the U.S. Senate has decided, for reasons of health, to forgo the political arena and leave it to others to succeed him as one of Rhode Island's two representatives to the upper Chamber. As he leaves public office he will take with him the affection and good wishes of the citizens he has represented so faithfully.

To say that Senator GREEN has been a statesman of the first rank is not to use words carelessly. He brought with him to both the governorship of Rhode Island and the Senate, where he has served since 1937, a background steeped in the best New England tradition. He is a man of erudition as well as political acumen.

His abilities were properly recognized when he finally became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, possibly the most important Senate assignment in recent years. He served in that capacity until impaired health forced him to step down.

But as he represented the United States in broad fields he never lost touch with his constituency; the people whom he has represented in Rhode Island. It might be fair to say that Rhode Island has been his first love only after the Senate and more than likely it has not been easy for him to decide to leave that distinguished group which likes to be known as the world's most exclusive club.

While Senator GREEN has announced his intention not to seek reelection, he will, of course, continue to serve during this final session of the 86th Congress.

The healthy vote always accorded Mr. GREEN here in Woonsocket is indicative of the esteem in which he is held by this community. Our people, therefore, will wish him well and join with his colleague, Senator PASTORE, in expressing the hope that "the Lord will grant THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN many more years of happiness and health."

[From the Providence Visitor, Jan. 15, 1960]

MORAL COURAGE AND PUBLIC LIFE

Rhode Island has had many reasons to be proud of its senior Senator, a man whose long life has been marked by notable attainments in law, scholarship, business, finance, and public service. His studies at the Universities of Bonn and Berlin and his teaching of Roman law at Brown gave early evidence of the objectivity and breadth of his outlook.

His labors on behalf of the public good during his two terms as Governor, his efforts to promote the further development of the Library of Congress, and his very able handling of his duties in connection with

the Committee on Foreign Relations have all won him deserved acclaim. But his act of relinquishing his cherished hope to continue his career in the Senate stands out not only as an evidence of his understanding of the limitations that come with the years but also of his unfailing sense of civic responsibility and his desire to serve the people of Rhode Island, as he will continue to do in his capacity as a private citizen and a senior statesman.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN CALLS IT A DAY

In politics, distinction does not automatically come with age, as it seems to do in some other fields. And it has not come automatically to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN—it has been earned. Senator GREEN's announcement that he would not seek reelection draws to a close a tenure characterized by wisdom.

That Senator GREEN, at 92, has become the oldest Senator in our history is remarkable, but more remarkable still is the fact that his entire senatorial career, marked most outstandingly by his tour as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has been carved out after the age of 70. Senator GREEN was born in Providence in 1867. After his graduation from Brown University he taught Roman law there during the nineties. He assumed a number of diversified business interests in Rhode Island and began working in State politics in 1907.

The striking aspect of Senator GREEN's career is its continuity. He maintains old business associations. A graduate of and teacher at Brown, he is now connected as trustee. Born in Providence, he has a home there still. Obviously this is a man who sinks roots—and not to lie dormant but to grow. His decision to retire was made, he says, "after considerable thought." It was a mental tussle, obviously for a man who hates to cut ties. The Senate—and the country—will miss his services.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN PLANS A SUITABLE EXIT

One of the hardest things about a career in politics is knowing when to quit. That fine art has been demonstrated by THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN of Rhode Island, who has let it be known that he will retire from the U.S. Senate when his term ends next January.

Senator GREEN is 92 years old. He is the oldest man who has ever served in the Senate, but he is one of those rare individuals whose mental and physical vigor remained with him into his ninth decade. The sight of his spare figure darting around a tennis court is a matter of only recent memory in Washington.

But time moves on, even when its progress has seemed almost magically delayed. The Senator has had to have an operation on his eyes, and his hearing has begun to fail. A year ago he voluntarily surrendered the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee to the man next in line, the amply qualified Senator FULBRIGHT. Now he announces that his fourth full term in the Senate will be his last. Rhode Island will find it hard to replace so genial and influential a spokesman, but any State would be proud of a Senator who prepares to leave public office in the same way he occupied it—with dignity.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Jan. 14, 1960]

IN PRAISE OF SENATOR GREEN

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The old, old man is going at last from the Senate.

In the 93d year of his life, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, has announced he will not seek reelection to his fifth term because he does not feel well enough.

He is not, of course, indispensable. And a man can work only so long as strength remains. Too, his State will have no trouble in finding a replacement.

All the same, when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN leaves, the Senate will be the poorer, in the strictly human sense anyhow, for his departure. For oddly, in this correspondent's time, it has been mainly the very old men there who have given a special quality to the place.

There, more often than not, it is the very old who will take the greatest risks, who are the least influenced by today's universal urge for personal security, who are the most ready to run forward to meet the possibly menacing tomorrow. They are, again more often than not, the best of the individual men, the free and fighting spirits who make the youngsters look rather like conscientious objectors.

To be sure, "the problems of the aged"—which is a nice-Nelly phrase admitting that society tends to throw the aged upon the ash heap—exists in the Senate, too. Even there, men can grow too old to go on any more—but happily it takes an awfully long time to grow that old in the Senate.

Senator GREEN at a mere 70 carried not simply a full load but a great load, as a personally aristocratic and privileged man who went all the way with the Roosevelt New Deal.

Senator GREEN at a ripe 80 was tough enough and strong enough to take on one of the hardest and most thankless jobs the Senate had handed out in this century.

This was to serve on the first committee that investigated Senator Joseph McCarthy's charges of communism in the State Department. Nobody could hope to win in that mare's nest—nobody but, in the short run, Senator McCarthy himself. Fear and suspicion were loose in a country that had suffered great and undeniable setbacks from imperialist communism. The Nation was ready for a devil hunt; it was all there to be exploited.

But Senator GREEN, unlike some of his committee colleagues, faced the unalterable facts with that special candor and realism of the Senate's aged men. He knew Senator McCarthy and his associates were making a bitter brew that at length would spill over on the Republicans—as well it did when the Eisenhower administration came to power. But he knew that, first of all, Senator McCarthy was reaching for the throat not simply of President Truman and Dean Acheson but of the Democratic Party which Senator GREEN loved.

So, full of the self-honesty of the old Senate types, Senator T. F. GREEN, from the first moment, made no pretense to an objectivity that could not exist there. From the first moment he hit Senator McCarthy with everything to which he could lay hand.

He was a true liberal, as distinguished from a knee-jerk liberal, and he was a loyal liberal, instead of a cut-and-run liberal.

He stayed with President Truman in the good times, and also in the bad times. In the times, indeed, when some of the knee-jerk liberals were rushing self-righteously into print (to coin a sparkling phrase) to run out on a liberal President who had represented the views which they always had said were also their own. But this was a President who also now had the bad luck to get into trouble. So though they were just terribly, terribly liberal they also managed to be terribly, terribly safe.

It was only the true liberals like Senator GREEN, plus some nonliberals who believed in most but not all of what he was doing, who stood with President Truman when the heavy firing about corruption and cronyism broke out.

Mr. Truman never has hated, or even much disliked, all those who had fought him from conviction, the Republicans and the ultra-conservative Democrats. But he has an unforgettable contempt for those who really agreed with his policies but prudently left the firing line when it became evident that his troops were going to be overborne.

Aging Senator GREEN may have been intellectually wrong in staying in the line to the end. But he was a combat soldier, and not a talking soldier. He had guts. You knew where he stood; not just some of the time but all of the time.

[From the Pawtucket Times, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN STEPS DOWN

Now that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN prepares to leave the political stage there are those who wonder if there will ever be another public figure just like the venerable Senator. Most unlikely, seems to be the answer to those who wonder. Senator GREEN is a unique figure, an unusual and delightful person, as many will attest.

Of Senator GREEN's political contemporaries not one was more steadfast to the ideals of the Democratic Party in the face of political foemen who could not hold a candle to the integrity of the Senator, who made an open profession of his politics.

There was a time when the Democratic Party "was" THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. Only he and a comparative handful of followers persevered to keep intact the framework of the party. After a long series of campaign disappointments lightning struck in 1932 and THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was swept into the State capitol as Governor while the New Deal was inundating Washington. From the vantage point of the executive offices the Governor made the Democrats dominant in Rhode Island by engineering the political coup which swept Republicans from power. Elected to the U.S. Senate the former Governor continued to exercise an influence in Rhode Island as well as in the foreign affairs of the United States for he was a member of powerful Senate committees. So great was his prestige and so acceptable his leadership there were no Rhode Island Democrats willing to challenge his right to return to the Senate, even though nature was taking its toll of the oldest man ever to sit in the U.S. Senate.

So long has Senator GREEN been a Democrat and so long has he had the last word in party affairs that comparative newcomers to the party should not discount the Senator, even in retirement. Nor should anyone question his right to dictate because he bore the heat of the battle in the days when Democrats were very much in the minority. One of the most puzzling things about THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is that as a man born to high estate, he chose to throw his lot with those of humble birth, with those who lacked the cultural background which set Senator GREEN apart.

The man who might have been a Cabinet member, or an Ambassador, chose, for reasons best known to himself, the rough and tumble of partisan politics, perhaps in the belief that he too could make a contribution to the State to which his forebears had contributed so much.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN CALLS IT QUITS

Time catches up with all men sooner or later. It has caught up at last with Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, who says that he will not run for the Senate next November after all.

At 92, Senator GREEN is the oldest man ever to serve in Congress. His sight and his

hearing are not as good as they used to be. But the Senator still astounds his colleagues with his vigor and perception of what is going on.

No one will begrudge Senator GREEN his retirement. He deserves to take it easy. But his leaving the Capitol scene will be something like the departure of the Washington Monument. He is a fixture, and an honorable one. He has served long and ably in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations until just a few months ago, he consistently showed good judgment, a serene temperament, and the wisdom that comes from vast experience.

As he goes into somewhat unwelcome retirement, he has the warm regards of well-wishers all over the Nation. The Senate will not be quite the same without THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. He has served in it with distinction and style.

[From the Newport Daily News, Jan. 12, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN TO RETIRE

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN'S announcement that he will not stand for reelection, removes from Congress next January the oldest man ever to serve there and from active politics in Rhode Island one who has been a tower of strength in the Democratic Party for many years.

Senator GREEN, in his 92 years, has had a remarkable career. We generally think first of him in a political role. But it must not be forgotten that over the years he has been prominent in the State's business, civic, and social life. He is a patron of the arts and a world traveler. Professionally a lawyer, at one time he was on the faculty of Brown University, his alma mater.

When he attained the position of oldest Member ever to serve in Congress, he remarked he'd like to serve until he was 100. For several months, however, the feeling has been growing that an announcement he would not seek renomination for a fifth term was imminent. Failing eyesight and hearing led to his decision to retire.

The Senator's declaration, read to the Democratic State committee last night, ordinarily would have left the nomination open to the field. But with former Gov. Dennis J. Roberts practically nominating Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY of the Second District for the place, what might have been spirited competition was cut off, until Mr. FOGARTY speaks out.

How Congressman FOGARTY will consider this opportunity for promotion to the upper Chamber remains to be seen. In his 19 years in the House, he has attained considerable seniority in the House Appropriations Committee. He has sponsored and is developing important national programs in the fields of health, education, welfare, and labor. The Senate offers greater prestige, but Mr. FOGARTY would face difficulties in continuing programs so close to his heart.

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 13, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN MISSES A GOAL BY 7 YEARS

In Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN'S decision to retire from the Senate at the close of his present term there is the human tragedy of frustrated ambition. GREEN long has expressed his desire to be serving in the Senate at 100. Now he will not seek reelection this fall. On his last official day as a U.S. Senator, the Rhode Island Democrat will be only 93.

But GREEN'S four terms have already made him the oldest man ever to serve in the upper Chamber. Also, they have made him a living legend. In appearance the Senator resembles the late Roland Young in the role of Topper in the movies. In personal activities GREEN has been the talk of Washington, the spritely oldster addicted to 2-mile walks to the office, a patron of the cocktail party circuit and tennis player until 2 years ago. He refused, however, to take up golf because:

"It's an old man's game."

Politically, GREEN is one of the rich men who adopted the New Deal philosophy. Forty-eight years ago Theodore Roosevelt wanted him to manage the Bull Moose campaign, but GREEN stuck to his party. The GREEN skill at political infighting was apparent by then.

Twinkling blue eyes mirrored an enthusiasm for both the naked battle of the political arena and for legislative problems.

After this session, the familiar little figure will be gone from Capitol Hill. Even those who have disagreed with GREEN on matters of policy will miss their colleague. THEODORE GREEN'S zest for life made each day in the Senate—indeed, each day anywhere—a great new experience.

[From the Bristol (R.I.) Phoenix, Jan. 15, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN

U.S. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has earned the right to retire from public life. He has been and still is an excellent example of the kind of man who should hold public office. From the standpoint of training, education, experience, and personal character, his qualifications are all that are to be desired in a man elected to represent others in government. And beyond all these he has that saving sense of wit and humor that have always made him a delight in public life.

In stating now that he will not run in the November elections, he once again displays the good judgment which has marked his career. His many friends, Democrats and Republicans alike, wish him years of good health so that he might continue to enjoy life without the cares and responsibilities that accompany public office.

AIR TRANSPORTATION OF ALL MAIL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 2402, which provides air transportation for mail that has not paid the airmail postage. This bill was reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the Senate late in the session last year by a committee vote of five to four. Joining me in voting against the proposal was the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and such able members of our committee as the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

S. 2402 would, first, authorize the Postmaster General to transport all classes of mail, other than air mail and air parcel post, by air carrier if he finds it would be in the public interest, because of the nature of the terrain, or the impracticability or inadequacy of surface transportation, and when the cost thereof is reasonably compatible with the service to be provided; second, require air carriers to provide such transportation under rates and conditions prescribed by the CAB; and, third, authorize the Postmaster General and any air carrier to contract for such transportation at other than CAB prescribed rates.

The Postmaster General is now transporting some first-class mail by air on an experimental basis, but this bill would go far beyond that, and would, in addition, authorize air transportation for second, third, and fourth classes of mail regardless of the postage paid.

Mr. President, the bill does not limit the additional expense that will be incurred over and above that now being incurred in the movement of this mail by surface means. The provision that the cost of the air transportation must be reasonably compatible with the service to be provided is no limitation, since we must assume that the CAB will fix rates which are reasonably compatible with the service to be provided. Transportation rates by air have been suggested at an average of 19 cents per ton-mile, which is at least 3 times greater than the transportation rates by surface carriers, and even this rate has been objected to by the airlines as being too low.

S. 2402 MEANS HIGHER POSTAL RATES

It is inconceivable that the service sought under S. 2402 can be effectuated without greatly increasing the cost of operation of the Post Office Department, and these costs must be recovered either through increased postage rates or appropriations from the general funds.

I understand that the Postmaster General, following release of Senate Report No. 805, has taken steps to provide air transportation for classes of mail here under consideration between major cities of the United States, and has indicated that there will be a reduction in the railway post office service between the same points. When railway post office service is reduced or eliminated it not only affects the terminal cities, but it also has the effect of greatly impairing the service to the many smaller towns and villages lying along the routes of the RPO cars between the terminals.

S. 2402 MEANS POORER MAIL SERVICE TO MOST COMMUNITIES

The shift from surface transportation to air transportation between major cities could improve the service between those cities only and even then there is no assurance of an improvement since time in transit is not the only factor affecting the delivery of mail. Enroute distribution by railway post office cars or highway post offices can offset the greater speed by air, and at the same time provide an excellent service to the smaller cities. There are only about 800 air stops in this country, whereas the railroads, which carry the greater part of the mails, serve directly some 12,000 post offices.

Mr. President, since the proposal to fly all classes of mail is based on a "voluntary space-available basis," which means that the airlines will transport the mail if they wish to and have the space to accommodate it, there is no assurance that mail taken to airports will move promptly between points where the service is expected to be provided. There have been many instances where mail has been taken to airports and then, because of the inability of the airlines to move the mail promptly, has been returned to the post office for movement by surface transportation. The result could very well be complete

chaos so far as a dependable regular service is concerned. In addition, it would be quite reasonable to assume that, with the disclosure of this service, there would be a tendency on the part of many citizens to cease using airmail postage and thus reduce the revenues of the Post Office Department. The citizens of this country are entitled to an airmail service unencumbered and unhindered by the transportation of surface mail by air. That the dual system, that is, an airmail and a first-class mail, is satisfactory is evidenced by the fact that millions of people use airmail at the higher cost when speed is of sufficient importance.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE FULLY ADEQUATE

The Postmaster General has always been able to obtain all of the transportation by surface means that he needs. The railroads have some of their finest service betwen the points where he has announced that he intends to fly the mail. In addition, the railroads have expressed a willingness to establish exclusive mail and express trains wherever the volume of business warrants such a service. Indeed, many such trains are now operated.

S. 2402 must be carefully reviewed and considered by the Congress since it inevitably means higher postage rates and poorer mail service to most communities in our Nation, as well as endangering the financial security of the railroad industry which is so vital to our national defense. It is my earnest hope that this legislation will not be enacted into law.

PASSENGER TRAINS IN OREGON WOULD SUFFER PARTICULARLY

Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like to point out one additional factor which has helped to persuade me to oppose this bill. Evidence submitted by the Post Office Department has indicated that the principal loss of railway post-office cars, should S. 2402 be enacted, would occur in the long-haul railroad operations. These are the long-distance rail routes, predominantly the transcontinental trains.

Such trains are the principal common-carrier surface transportation linking communities like Seattle, Portland, Tacoma, and Spokane with Middle Western and Eastern States. They also afford service for the smaller cities in my own State of Oregon like Pendleton, La Grande, Baker, Ontario and others. I am informed that the loss of railway post-office cars could jeopardize the continuance of these trains. Already, transcontinental train service between the Pacific Northwest and Chicago has suffered heavily from elimination of many once-popular passenger trains. Not very many more of these trains can be abandoned without the total loss of passenger train service between our State and the rest of the Nation.

These references may seem merely regional in character, Mr. President, but I fear that passage of S. 2402 would place in great danger the jobs of hundreds of railroad workers in my State, as well as reducing the transportation facilities available to Oregon and its neighbors. S. 2402, while containing some worthy features, would disrupt existing transportation facilities with possibly disastrous consequences.

Only recently, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, speaking before the Exchange Club of Chicago, cited the transportation crisis in his community due to the abandonment of many passenger trains. He noted that subsidy of these trains might cost far less than the construction of many new super highways and off street parking facilities to take care of travelers forced off the rails and onto public thoroughfares.

The current January 18, 1960, issue of Time magazine likewise features an article on this general problem. The article points out that a double-track railroad can transport five times as many people per hour as a four-lane superhighway. Adds Time:

> To build enough highways for the 30,000 commuters who travel into Philadelphia on the Pennsylvania Railroad would cost $611 million. If everyone who now rides the trains into New York decided to drive, a third of Manhattan (Island) would be needed just for parking space.

In view of all these situations, Mr. President, I regard it as unwise for the Federal Government to adopt a post office policy which will merely accelerate and hasten the abandonment of so many passenger train facilities throughout America, at present so disturbing.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are all pleased that we are not once more in the throes of a steel strike. But I believe the words of the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, sum up the situation in the truest and best form.

The respected Mr. Lippmann wrote:

> So, we have come to a crude and embarrassing ending to an inglorious and mismanaged policy. * * * I think it is arguable from the record that a settlement on the Nixon-Mitchell terms could have been had at any time.

The settlement was clearly an act of political expediency.

Federal negotiators did not enter the dispute until after the strike was called, even though companies everywhere were stockpiling steel for the strike they knew would come. No one looked after the welfare of the people, something which cannot be stockpiled.

By mid-June of last year I think anyone who read the papers or listened to the radio or watched TV knew a steel strike was coming. But the official policy of the administration was "hands off."

A number of us in the Senate, Mr. President, met with representatives of both sides of the dispute to see what we could do to head off the impending strike. Those of us from steel-producing States begged the President to meet with us and Governors to see what could be done toward a settlement.

There was a refusal by the administration at every turn to demonstrate leadership—to try and help find a solution. The strike dragged on. Fact finders reported. The Secretary of Labor said he had a legislative solution, but he refused to tell us, who legislate, what it was—if anything.

The President declined to use the power and prestige of his Office in the national welfare.

Finally, the strike ended with the hand of leadership absent and the hand of politics present.

The cost of the strike to all concerned was fearful, at a time when our economy was sagging anyway with pockets of unemployment, contracting foreign markets, and increasing Soviet competition. Estimates are that the cost of the strike was $1.16 billion in wages and $5 billion in production.

In my State of Indiana we normally produce a fifth of the Nation's steel. We lost more than $200 million in wages and $1 billion in production. Our State government lost an estimated $1 million in tax revenue alone. Dollars lost cannot compare to the unnecessary human suffering the people of Indiana were compelled to undergo.

Only time will tell if the terms of the settlement were good for the country. Only time will tell us if prices of steel will rise—and then, if the time comes when they do, will it be after the election. Only time will tell us if the companies will settle for something less than record profits.

But we do not have to wait on time to tell us that we have already paid a heavy price. The price might have been far less had the administration acted with true leadership instead of neglecting the public welfare.

HELP FOR THE HELPLESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill, S. 1403, which would authorize the extension of aid for dependent children to cover those children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents. At present, as Members of this body know, a child is not eligible for Federal aid unless he is in need because of the death, desertion, or disability of his father. This results in the anomalous circumstance whereby fathers who cannot find work are frequently able to provide for their families only by deserting them and thus making them eligible for public assistance.

The Advisory Council on Public Assistance, which recently made its report to Secretary Flemming, has recommended that children who are in need for any reason be eligible for aid to dependent children. This goes further even than my bill.

In an editorial which appeared on January 7, 1960, the Washington Post has endorsed this recommendation of the Advisory Council. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR THE HELPLESS

Some of the conditions attached to public assistance for dependent children, the aged, unemployed and others in desperate need seem designed to thwart the very aims for which the assistance is provided. The

Advisory Council on Public Assistance, after a year of careful study, has recommended that these conditions be modified in important ways. Congressional action and State action alike will be required to put the desired changes into effect.

The two changes recommended by the Council which seem most significant were urged here not long ago by District Welfare Director Gerard M. Shea. Residence requirements for public assistance ought to be abandoned entirely; misery knows no geographical limitations. To bring about this change, the Council sensibly proposes that Federal grants be denied to States which impose a waiting period before granting assistance.

Similarly, there is obvious need to alter the prevailing present condition that Federal aid may be given to children only if they are deprived of support or care because of absence, death or incapacity of one parent. As the report of the Council remarks, "a hungry, ill-clothed child is as hungry or ill-clothed if he lives in an unbroken home" as an orphan or illegitimate child without a father. Besides, the present limitation pushes indigent fathers into deserting their families so they can qualify for relief.

In general, the Council proposes that the Social Security Act be amended to provide Federal aid to needy persons "regardless of the cause of need." Common sense as well as common humanity supports this view.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the best commentaries on President Eisenhower's state of the Union message that I have seen is the one which appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot of January 9, 1960.

This newspaper supported President Eisenhower in both his election campaigns, but this support does not prevent its taking a balanced and objective view of the President's policies in its editorial page—which, incidentally, is one of the best editorial pages in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, indeed, in the Nation.

While the Patriot praises many aspects of the state of the Union message, it is critical of the President's failure to "give persuasive answers to the widening missile gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R." and of his failure to mention Federal aid to depressed areas in the United States. The newspaper is also dissatisfied with his comments on inflation and by his lack of fire on the issue of civil rights.

I ask uanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF THE WORLD—A LOOK BACK, A LOOK AHEAD

According to some Republicans, President Eisenhower's state of the Union message is one of the greatest documents of all time.

According to some Democrats, it is a compilation of sweet nothings.

One must suspect that it is neither. It is, on the whole, an outline of our position within and beyond our borders whose worth will become clearly discernible only in the light of the future.

Of necessity, the President concentrated on assessing America's posture and purpose against a worldwide backdrop.

He restated our desire to live in peace with all nations but reiterated that it must be a peace with freedom. In fact, he said, "in our scale of values we place freedom first."

Reassuringly, he made clear that America isn't going to be duped into lowering its guard by the Kremlin's recent pleasantries. In short, we would negotiate from strength.

The President was sanguine about our defenses as an adequate deterrent to Communist aggression. But he failed to give persuasive answers to the widening missile gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R. He promised to work toward improving our space program to the extent of doubling its funds. But there have been growing doubts whether money alone can bring us up to par in the absence of new ideas and a central, efficient setup to put them into practice. Certainly, this problem needs the closest scrutiny in the months to come.

Mr. Eisenhower had the good news that our next budget will probably show a $4.2 billion surplus. This surplus, he said, will be used to pay off part of the huge national debt. There can be no quarrel with this, provided the saving isn't achieved at the expense of vital projects, such as defense. Certainly it makes sense to try to reduce the Nation's debt during the Nation's greatest prosperity.

The President reiterated the close relationship between the economic progress of the underdeveloped nations and the security of the free world. And he gave a timely nudge to the well-to-do countries in Europe and the Far East to assume a greater burden.

Our gold reserves have been depleted to the danger point. Our foreign payment balance shows a $4 billion deficit. This trend can't go on without imperiling our economy and, consequently, the stability of the entire West.

Unfortunately, the President held out no hope for an assistance program much closer to home. He said nothing of Federal aid to depressed areas in which Pennsylvania in particular abounds. These are underdeveloped areas which Mr. Eisenhower apparently doesn't see. But they are there and won't go away just because they're ignored.

The President made an eloquent and urgent point when he characterized inflation as our prime domestic problem. "We must fight it," he said, "as we would fight a fire that imperils our home."

It is doubtful, however, whether the galloping prices and costs can be arrested merely by what Mr. Eisenhower termed "stern self-discipline by every citizen."

The steel strike is painful evidence that labor and management cannot be depended upon to place the Nation's interest ahead of their own because it's the patriotic thing to do. And the dilemma isn't going to be solved simply by appealing to the common sense of protagonists engaged in a fight for profits on one hand and bigger wages on the other.

Somehow, and soon, the inflation spiral must be blocked. And it well may take some laws to help patriotism along in this field.

One would wish, too, that the President had displayed more fire on the civil rights issue with its vast moral, social, economic, and international implications. We have a long way to go here before our performance begins to match our words.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE BY THE EDITORS OF WISDOM MAGAZINE TO FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the current issue of Wisdom magazine pays tribute to one of the most thoughtful men ever to serve in the U.S. Senate, William Benton, of the State of Connecticut.

This honor is attributable not only to Senator Benton's distinguished career in business and in public life, but also because of his position as publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which is one of the great compendiums of knowledge and facts available to mankind.

I am particularly pleased to call attention in the Senate to this tribute to ex-Senator Benton, because I regard William Benton as an American of genuine courage and valor. Ahead of his time, he warned of ominous forces of hysteria and intolerance which threatened our heritage of liberty and brotherhood. His lonely stand in this regard may have contributed to his defeat for reelection in 1952, but it may also be a factor in the almost universal respect and esteem in which William Benton is held today in our country and in the free world. Despite his retirement from public office, he is a citizen of influence and eminence. His words carry weight and profundity.

Political opportunism, alas, is a more prevalent commodity than political sacrifice and bravery. Relatively few Senators challenge majority opinions in their own States, much as they may risk unpopularity in another State where they do not run for office. As a Member of the Senate, William Benton defied what probably was prevailing sentiment in his home State of Connecticut. This may have cost him his Senate seat. Yet it also heightened his stature, and stature is a priceless ingredient in both public and private life. Thus I am happy today to cite the issue of Wisdom magazine which heralds the outstanding career of former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut. The tribute is a deserved one, as many will agree.

Mr. President, the leadership of William Benton in our Nation continues to demonstrate itself in many good works. Under his direction, the education subcommittee of the Democratic Party's advisory council has recently brought forth a most comprehensive and necessary proposed program to extend educational opportunities in this country. The keystone of the program is a plan for Federal aid to schools similar to the famed Murray-Metcalf bill, which could do much to equalize school facilities in our Nation and to make certain that our greatest resource—namely, the brains of young Americans—is not wasted and frittered away.

An excellent summary of the educational program prepared under ex-Senator William Benton's wise guidance was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 18, 1960, under the byline of Mr. Raymond Lahr, of United Press International. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the

article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL ASKS U.S. AID-TO-EDUCATION BILL

(By Raymond Lahr)

The Democratic Advisory Council proposed yesterday that the Federal Government undertake a program of aid for education starting at $1 billion a year and rising eventually to $3 or $4 billion.

It said many States and communities had done much in the past 10 years to expand and improve schools but that they must do more and that they are entitled to more help from the National Government.

The council said the Eisenhower administration "has been characteristically strong on words and weak on deeds" in promoting better education.

SERIES OF PAMPHLETS

The council, an arm of the Democratic National Committee, is composed of former President Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson and other party leaders, most of them from outside Congress. It gave its sizeup of "education and freedom's future" in a report, one of a series of pamphlets it is publishing on foreign and domestic problems.

"Even in a world at peace it would be priority business for our free society to help every young person develop his full potentialities through education," the council said.

"In a world threatened by the aggressive challenge of the Soviet Union, education becomes a means for national survival as well."

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

It recommended this program:

Passage of an Education Act of 1960 to provide greater coordination of Federal education programs with machinery modeled after the 1946 Employment Act. That act created the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a joint House-Senate Economic Committee. An education council would help the President prepare a report, which would be reviewed by a joint congressional committee on education.

Congress should grant the limit on funds for the National Defense Education Act program of fellowships, loans and grants, and should review the authorized limit to see if it is high enough.

While leaving control of schools to State and local governments, the Federal Government should give financial aid to the States.

Federal grants—with States perhaps required to match Federal funds—would equal $25 for each school-age child the first year, $50 the second, $75 the third, and $100 the fourth and subsequent years. Additional help would be given the poorest States.

Set up a cooperative program with the Federal Government matching State funds to provide college scholarships, starting at $25,000 a year and increasing the number eventually to 100,000.

Scholarships would be adjusted to individual need but would not exceed $1,000 a year.

Expanding the college housing loan program to include all buildings and set up a new program of matching grants to improve and build facilities.

The pamphlet was originally drafted by an education subcommittee headed by former Senator William Benton of Connecticut. It was reviewed and revised by the council's economic policy committee and the council itself.

NARCOTICS USE AMONG JUVENILES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has been studying the problem of narcotics use among juveniles for the past several months. During this investigation, we have been concerned with the source of supply for illicit narcotics and marijuana as well as the high rate of use among boys and girls.

Last fall, committee staff members made an intensive investigation of the illicit narcotics traffic along the United States-Mexican border. In November, public hearings were held in three California cities, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco, where we heard much valuable testimony from experts in the field of narcotics control and enforcement.

This Friday, we will resume our study of the juvenile narcotics problem with hearings here in Washington.

Mr. President, several very excellent editorials have appeared in newspapers around the country relating to this problem. I ask unanimous consent that two of these from the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times—"Shouting in the Proper Ears," November 15, 1959, and "Dust on the 'Mexican Desk,'" November 19, 1959—be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 15, 1959]

SHOUTING IN THE PROPER EARS

The grim recital of facts concerning the illicit narcotics traffic from Mexico to southern California has been heard many times before. But it has never had a more important audience than the Senate subcommittee which held hearings in Los Angeles last week.

DIPLOMACY REQUIRED

Bureaucracy and diplomacy require that such facts, no matter how flagrant and well documented, be transmitted to Washington only by proper official procedures. No matter how loud we may shout, it must be into the proper ears.

The Times started the shouting this summer by assigning Gene Sherman to investigate the border dope problem and the evil and sorrow it brings. The resulting public awareness prompted the California congressional delegation to seek official action in Washington, which in turn caused the Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency to probe further into the local narcotics smuggling situation.

Senator HENNINGS, the subcommittee chairman, said at the end of the week that "while much of the testimony and evidence produced at this hearing has been known to various people previously, it must be pointed out that, as Members of Congress charged with the responsibility of engendering activities of the Federal Government, we have had to take into consideration all information so that we could build a record as a sound basis for action upon our return to Washington."

SHOCKING RECORD

The record that was built in the Los Angeles hearings was as clear and unmistakable as it was shocking. Expert witness after expert witness reaffirmed the two basic facts of the local dope situation: that marihuana and heroin are in abundant supply and are easily obtainable in southern California, and that by far the biggest source is from across the border of our good neighbor, Mexico.

Subcommittee members reached the inevitable conclusion that "the only realistic method of alleviating the dope smuggling problem is by cooperative agreement with the Mexican Government."

"Upon our return to Washington," said Senator HENNINGS, "we will contact the State Department and with their advice seek ways to solve this problem."

And there is little doubt that on their way to the State Department headquarters, the Senators will stop off at the Treasury Building to discuss the dangerous conflict of jurisdiction between U.S. Customs officials and Federal narcotics officers.

Testimony last week indicated that Federal narcotics officers are working to combat international dope traffic with one hand tied behind them because of the strange division of authority between the two agencies.

CUSTOMS FAILURE

George White, regional Federal narcotics agent on the west coast, testified that the practice of assigning Federal Bureau of Narcotics agents in European and Middle East countries had succeeded in controlling the flow of illicit drugs to the United States. However, by some bureaucratic quirk, Mexico and the Orient were assigned to the Customs Service, which obviously has been unable to stem the smuggling tide.

When the subcommittee asked White what control steps had been set up in Mexico, he replied:

"Nothing. And I am afraid that our Government is to blame."

The subcommittee is scheduled to hear a rebuttal from customs officials this week in San Diego but U.S. Attorney General Rogers has already been advised of the charges and the importance of working out a consolidated effort.

The pattern that emerges from the hearings is the usual one of frustration. The ineffectiveness of local control efforts was again shown to be reinforced by what amounts to level indifference toward this most vicious of all corrupting crimes.

There is a difference today, however. An end to the frustration may soon be in sight, for we have begun to shout into the proper ears.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 19, 1959]

DUST ON THE "MEXICAN DESK"

The U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating the frightening flow of illicit narcotics from Mexico traveled southward from Los Angeles this week for a closer look at the border situation.

FIXING THE BLAME

What they found was even more confirmation that the ultimate responsibility—and much of the blame—lies in Washington and Mexico City.

Testimony at the subcommittee hearings Monday and Tuesday in San Diego made previous criticism of Federal narcotics control efforts seem almost complimentary by comparison.

District Attorney Don Keller of San Diego County bitterly told the investigating Senators that complaints about border vice conditions receive a pigeonhole instead of a priority in Washington. Efforts to close the border to juveniles, for instance, were initiated by the San Diego grand jury in 1951 and then taken up by the State legislature, which each year since 1953 has formally requested action in Washington.

"I was informed," said Keller, "that the Mexican desk (of the State Department) had a handy way of pigeonholing this sort of complaint."

PROBE PROMISED

This led Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., subcommittee chairman, to declare his determination "to find out about these things gathering dust. * * * We want to find out why matters like these are not considered properly."

"Maybe some of those people back there need a fire built under them," he said.

More fuel for the Senators' fire was provided by O. J. Hawkins, chief of the San Diego office of the State bureau of narcotics.

"The fault lies with the attitude of the State Department, as expressed in bulletins issued from time to time," Hawkins testified.

"The Department says repeatedly that Mexico does not create a narcotics problem and that she is making tremendous strides to control dope."

Such bureaucratic blindness also resulted in the Treasury Department's decision not to assign Federal narcotics agents to work inside Mexico, the subcommittee learned last week in Los Angeles.

INSTANCES OF FAILURE

District Attorney Keller enumerated two other instances in his own county: Abolition of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics office in San Diego and elimination of customs control.

Although the city is only 17 miles from the border all appeals to Washington to reopen the San Diego offices were unavailing, Keller said.

Other witnesses familiar with the shocking border situation reiterated the basic facts disclosed by law enforcement officials at the Los Angeles hearings and by Gene Sherman in the Times narcotics series last summer: Not only does the great majority of marihuana and heroin in southern California come from Mexico but the amount of smuggling is increasing.

This terrible traffic will not be halted until the dust is swept off bureaucratic and diplomatic desks. The Times pledges that it will not rest until that dust—and with it the border dope traffic—is swept away.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MOHAWK VALLEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week, I spoke briefly on the floor of the Senate to report on the Schenectady, N.Y., hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Unemployment Problems. At that time I inserted in the RECORD a summary of the fine work being done by the GUTS (Gear Up For Tomorrow in Schenectady) program.

Mr. President, today I call attention to two statements, made at the hearings, which relate further to economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley region of my State. The first is by Mr. William Pollock, general president of the Textile Workers of America. The second is by Mr. Fred Krokenberger, business manager of the Amsterdam Joint Board, of the same union. Both of these statements are excellent presentations of the views of the leaders of the Textile Workers Union, and they add greatly to our knowledge of employment and economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley area.

At their request, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of these leaders of the Textile Workers Union be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM POLLOCK, GENERAL PRESIDENT, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, JANUARY 8, 1960

The time and place of this hearing add poignancy to the subject of the committee's investigations. The problem of unemployment is one which demands serious attention whenever and wherever it may be raised. But in January 1960 it is particularly fitting that we stop and take stock of our position in the age-old struggle against the human suffering that results from unemployment. We are entering a new decade. Will it be a new era? Can we fashion the tools for achieving a state of human progress in which the hopelessness of people who cannot find work will finally be abolished? This is the challenge of the sixties.

I believe we can meet this challenge. The means are at hand. It remains for us to grasp and to use them. I am confident that the investigation of this committee will reveal the shortcomings in our present approaches and uncover the tremendous potentialities of a systematic, integrated program for utilizing our human and physical resources to rid our society of joblessness and poverty. We can no longer afford the waste involved in mass unemployment and idle capital. The economics of the Soviet and Chinese Communist empire are growing too fast to permit us to accept the unemployment of 4 million Americans with complacency. By putting them to work, we can outdistance the Iron Curtain countries, increase our ability to aid the free world, and improve our own national self-confidence.

The city of Schenectady is an especially appropriate focal point for the study of unemployment problems. Here is an old center of heavy manufacturing industry which is suffering from the effects of industry's moves to newer areas. Neighboring towns in the Mohawk Valley are experiencing similar dislocations. Amsterdam, a major center of carpet and rug production, has lost one of its two large carpet mills and employs less than half the number of carpet workers employed 10 years ago. Gloversville, once the major supplier of the Nation's leather gloves, has been depressed by a decline in demand and the influx of imports which has captured the bulk of the domestic market for fine gloves.

How do we cope with the human problems created by the changes flowing from our dynamic economy? This is a question this Nation has been asking ever since the industrial revolution transformed the United States from an agricultural economy to an industrial power. In the 19th century a start was made in providing an answer. Limits were placed on the extent to which private industrial actions were permitted to cause public injury. State laws were adopted regulating factory conditions relating to the health and safety of workers. But it was not until the 1930's that the Federal Government recognized the national character of the human problems engendered by our industrial processes.

The social security and labor legislation developed in the great depression was a creative response to the need for bolstering the efforts of the individual in coping with the vicissitudes of life in a modern industrial society. The Federal programs that resulted from the innovations of the thirties provided a measure of security against the hazards of unemployment and old age. A floor was placed under wages to prevent extreme exploitation and the right to organize was established by law to enable workers to improve their economic and industrial position through collective bargaining.

These measures provided the underpinning for an economy that had lost its moorings. They sought to ameliorate the ill effects of a system that had gone wrong. But they did not seek to correct the operations of the system itself. It remained for the experience of the Second World War to teach us that the Federal Government has a significant positive role to play in promoting the full employment of our resources. The result was the Employment Act of 1946, which declared it the national policy for the Federal Government to "use all practical means * * * to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

THE PROMISE OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 marked a milestone in the development of a positive approach to the solution of the human and economic problems created by our industrial civilization. A new dimension was added to the function of the Federal Government in the economic sphere. A pledge was given to the American people that the National Government would do what was needed to achieve and maintain a full employment economy.

Has this pledge been kept? Have all Americans been afforded useful employment opportunities? Have maximum employment, production and purchasing power been achieved? To ask these questions is to answer them. With full-time unemployment averaging 3¼ million during the past 7 years, the Nation has lost $175–$200 billion in production owing to underemployment of our labor force. Surely the average rate of full-time unemployment during this period (4.8 percent) has been greatly in excess of what can be considered frictional. Even in the period from 1955 through 1957, when full-time unemployment averaged 4.3 percent, the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that only half of the unemployment was accounted for by short-term frictional factors (entry of new workers into the labor force; voluntary job shifting; and seasonal fluctuations). ("The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment," Study Paper No. 6, prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.)

The truth is that the Employment Act has not yet been adequately implemented. While the administration has given lip service to its principles, its actions have been directly contrary to the purposes of the act. Full employment has been subordinated to the balanced budget. An obsessive fear of inflation has displaced economic growth as our primary goal. The administration's tight money policy has cramped our recovery from the 1957–58 recession, leaving 4 million Americans out of work a year and a half after the start of the recovery. It has failed to adopt the correct policies to prevent rising prices and followed programs which have throttled the economy.

A major part of the problem of persistent unemployment—surely one of its most urgent aspects—is that of structural unemployment. The displacement of workers from their jobs as a result of changes in basic economic conditions attending economic growth is particularly serious because it is most likely to lead to long-term unemployment. The overall dimensions of this problem are indicated by the fact that in November 1959 some 823,000 of the 3.7 million

unemployed in the United States were located in 171 labor market areas which were suffering from chronic economic distress. In comparison to a national rate of unemployment of 5.3 percent, the rate in the distressed areas was 8.8 percent.

STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN SCHENECTADY

Structural unemployment is at the heart of the problems facing the people of Schenectady and the entire Mohawk Valley. It is the type of unemployment about which the individual workers can do least. His main alternatives are to move or to await the appearance of new enterprise which would employ his skills. The major challenge therefore is to understand the nature of the developments which have made for the chronic condition of unemployment and for the Federal Government to provide the help necessary to inaugurate a new era of economic growth in these areas. In all of these instances, the communities have tried but, with the resources at their command, have been unable to overcome the decline in economic activity.

The central community in this area is Schenectady. Not only is it important because it is the largest but also because it has been the source of employment for people living in the city proper and also for people in the surrounding areas, including Amsterdam and Fulton County. As the distress developed in the latter two communities, men sought employment in the Schenectady shops. When the latter shrank their job opportunities and laid off the newly hired people, the residents of these outlying areas were first displaced as they were likely to have the least seniority. This aggravated the already difficult employment problems of these smaller communities.

The central issue in Schenectady is the determined and conscious policy of decentralization of operations pursued by the General Electric Co. It is deliberately moving out of Schenectady many of its important units and retaining only a few basic operations. This program has left a great economic void. Alco Products, Inc., which has been the second largest source of employment, has contracted its diesel manufacturing activities in this area and closed down its tank manufacturing facilities. As a result its employment has been cut to well below one-fourth its former peak. The contraction of both of these large centers of employment has also meant the loss of many auxiliary and feeder industries. The men and women employed in these industries, both on manual and nonmanual jobs, include people with the widest range of skills used in the modern metal manufacturing industry and constitute a reservoir of unsurpassable quality, highly necessary in this era of electronics and complex machine manufacture. Despite this invaluable resource, the community has not displayed the resilience necessary for adjustment to its economic setbacks. For the greater part of the last 2 years, its rate of unemployment was in excess of 6 percent and its current improved record is attributable in part to the fact that the displaced workers living in the surrounding communities are excluded from the count of the unemployed within the Schenectady area itself.

The citizens' program for diversification in the Schenectady area is interesting but the great question is whether it is adequate to the task of modernizing this community and making it better able to attract new industries. Has its long history of adjustment to the policies and needs of the General Electric Co. and Alco Products, Inc., handicapped this community in its ability to provide a home for other industries and companies? It is paradoxical that the hometown of the General Electric Co. should be suffering from its current difficulties in view of the company's proclaimed program of fostering a favorable industrial climate as a prerequisite for local economic growth.

With its impressive human and capital resources, this community should be the cradle for many new modern industries, but there is need to modernize the civic facilities and utilities to make it better able to absorb these enterprises. Through study these needs can be more quickly identified, corrections instituted, and the process of adjustment shortened. This is the crying need of the community of Schenectady upon which the future of much of the Mohawk Valley is dependent. It can fit into the pattern of American economic growth. What is necessary is to shorten this process deliberately so that human suffering and economic waste be reduced to a minimum.

The community cannot do this job itself. When it is left to its own resources, it will turn primarily if not exclusively upon promotional techniques which, however useful, will not be sufficient. Economic planning and modernization of the community's facilities to fit the needs of the newer industries must be pushed concurrently with the promotional work. These two developments will be inaugurated if the Federal Government helps underwrite these activities.

The two neighboring areas in the Mohawk Valley are confronted with different structural problems. Amsterdam is beset by the fact that it has depended upon the carpet industry for its basic economic foundation. Unfortunately, more than 5,000 carpet millworkers have lost their jobs in recent years as a result of a combination of factors, including the geographical relocation of the industry to the south, shifts in consumers' tastes, a rising volume of imports and technological changes. The Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., one of the two major operations in the city, has closed down all of its local activities and the Mohasco Co. has contracted considerably. These industries had for decades been the base of the economic organization of this community and its surrounding areas. They employed both men and women at comparatively high wage and benefits. This community had shaped its existence around the economies of these companies. The direct skills which they fostered were primarily useful to this industry.

The removal of these jobs has left thousands of men and women without other resources. There have been few alternative jobs available. Even though the community has made heroic efforts through Industries for Amsterdam, Inc., to find occupants for the abandoned carpet factory buildings and has itself constructed one new building, these additions have not been sufficient to correct the downward trend. Since the beginning of 1955, Amsterdam has been uninterruptedly classified as a surplus labor market.

The problems of redevelopment of this community are more difficult than those faced by Schenectady. There are obvious problems of physical rehabilitation in the community including the leveling of some of the older industrial sites along the railroads and the clearance of other outmoded facilities in order to open up sites for the construction of new buildings with better access to transportation and other utilities. Many necessary local public facilities must be advanced in order to make the community more attractive. These programs should be preceded by a careful economic analysis which will help to define precisely the way in which this community will fit into the major new American industrial and economic trends. Following such studies and projections, the human and physical resources must be updated and adapted to these trends. The crying need is to shorten the process of adjustment to our changing industrial complex. This community has done much to help itself but it is not sufficient to ameliorate the plight of the people or to provide the base for economic rehabilitation. It needs the help of the Federal Government to address itself vigorously and determinedly to this problem.

The third area, Gloversville-Johnstown, should be more properly labeled Fulton County. The distinctive feature of this area has been the preponderance of leather, fabric, and knit glove manufacture. The region has been dependent upon these industries for its growth. More particularly these communities have specialized in the manufacture of fine gloves. They have been beset by the fact that there has been a drop in the total consumption of women's leather gloves and a growing proportion of this domestic market has been taken up by imports. While cut and sewn fabric gloves made of warp knit fabric have gained in popularity, this industry has been a marginal operation in this area, with less than 5 percent of domestic production being located here. This branch has also suffered from low-cost competition from Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and other foreign producers. Seamless knit gloves have not fared better as foreign competition has also hit this branch. Moreover, the cutbacks in employment in Schenectady and Amsterdam adversely affected workers living in Fulton County for they were among the earliest to be laid off. As a result, the chronic unemployment has been of longer standing in this community than in the other areas of the Mohawk Valley. The problems of economic redevelopment are therefore of more serious nature. The experience of this area points up the discouragement which sets in after continuing high unemployment has become truly chronic.

The continuing depression has narrowed the tax base and has also resulted in a restruction of local services, both of which have inhibited new industries from coming into the area. The long standing economic difficulties have engendered a fatalism which has robbed the community of the daring and enterprise necessary to redevelop for new growth. A conservatism has set in which has deterred new growth. The funds have not been available locally for developing the base for new industries or economic activities. Here is a community which needs stimulation from a friendly Federal agency which will help it better to understand its problems and to define long term solutions. It cannot on its own find the answers to its difficulties; it must be helped to define its future pattern and the course to follow for its redevelopment. (For a thorough analysis of the Fulton County problem, see Betti Goldwasser, "Report on the Gloversville Project, Local Impact of Foreign Trade Project," National Planning Association, Washington, D.C., May 1957, mimeographed.)

HEAVY IMPACT ON TEXTILE WORKERS

Textile workers have borne a heavy share of the burden of structural unemployment in these areas. From a total of 15,600 in 1951, textile employment has fallen to 8,600, a decrease of 45 percent. The largest portion of this decline is accounted for by the demise of the carpet and rug industry in Amsterdam, where total textile employment dropped from 8,600 to 4,200 or 51 percent. The Albany-Schenectady-Troy area contributed a loss of 2,200 jobs in this period as textile employment declined from 5,500 to 3,300, a 40-percent reduction. In Gloversville textile employment fell from 1,500 to 1,100 in the past 8 years, a reduction of 27 percent.

The figures cannot tell the full story of the personal tragedies involved: the desperation of workers who see the mill shut down after a lifetime of service, without so much as a severance payment; the search for jobs where there are no jobs; the exhaustion of unemployment benefits; the exhaustion of personal savings; the dependence on private and public charity; and above all, the sense of

hopelessness that overcomes the individual after many months of enforced idleness.

The plight of these people cries out for a solution. The promise of the Employment Act must be fulfilled. It is time to put into practice the words of the law: those who are "able, willing and seeking to work" must be afforded "useful employment opportunities." It will take imagination and the courage to innovate. But it must be done.

The Senate has taken the first step. The adoption of the Area Redevelopment Act by the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress points the way to a massive attack on the problem of structural unemployment. This legislation would set in motion a coordinated program for redeveloping the distressed industrial and rural areas of this country so that they could throw off the yoke of hopelessness imposed by chronic unemployment. With technical assistance from the Federal Government, these communities could take a fresh look at themselves. They could determine what they have to offer and what it will take to put the area on its feet again. They could plan to take advantage of their resources—potential as well as actual. They could renew their public facilities. These are the essential prerequisites for an effective rehabilitation program.

Now it is up to the House of Representatives. The Committee on Banking and Currency has approved the bill. It remains for the House to act on it. Surely this should be the first order of business in the new session of Congress. The suffering of the people in economically distressed areas will brook no further delay. It is time we put the principles of the point 4 program to work at home. Can we hope to show the peoples of the underdeveloped areas in the world how to eradicate poverty if we cannot wipe out the pockets of economic distress in our own country?

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT A NEW MILESTONE

The Area Redevelopment Act will be a new milestone in the forward march of America. It will translate into concrete accomplishments the promise of full employment offered by the Employment Act of 1946. It will provide living proof for all the world to see that a free society can harness the resources of an economy for the benefit of all the people.

As we plan for the achievement of this great goal we must not neglect the immediate needs of the people in distressed areas. Emergency measures are needed to tide these people over until community rehabilitation is achieved. Government contracts should be channeled into these areas to provide immediate employment opportunities. Surplus food should be allocated. Persons in distressed communities who exhaust their unemployment benefits should receive extended benefits. The entire unemployment compensation system needs to be modernized, with Federal standards to assure adequacy of benefits and duration.

The free world looks to us for leadership in this critical time. As we enter the decade of the sixties unemployment is no longer merely a domestic problem. Our response to it may well prove crucial in determining the struggle between Communist tyranny and the free peoples of the world. Our success in solving the problem of unemployment will add strength to our purpose and set an example for all the world to emulate.

STATEMENT BY FRED KROKENBERGER, BUSINESS MANAGER, AMSTERDAM JOINT BOARD, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, ON THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT IN AMSTERDAM, N.Y., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE U.S. SENATE

The city of Amsterdam, N.Y., is economically distressed. It has been suffering from heavy unemployment continuously for the past 6 years. One of the largest plants in the area was closed in 1955 and further curtailments have since taken place. In spite of strenuous local efforts to attract new industries, employment has continued to decline. Unemployment in the latest available month (July) numbered 1,900, comprising 8.1 percent of the civilian labor force. The people of this distressed community look to the Federal Government for aid in redeveloping the area so that it can once again be placed on a healthy self-sustaining basis.

EVIDENCE OF DISTRESS

Employment in the Amsterdam area has fallen steadily in recent years. In 1951, nonagricultural industries covered by the unemployment insurance law employed 17,182 workers. Of this total, 13,167 were employed in manufacturing industries. By far the largest group (8,649) was employed in the textile industry, with the bulk of these workers accounted for by two large wool carpet and rug plants, Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., Inc., and Mohawk Carpet Co. Employment in these plants declined gradually until 1955, reflecting the drop in consumer demand for wool carpets and rugs and the substitution of tufted carpeting for woven carpets.

CARPET MILL LIQUIDATIONS

In the spring of 1955, the community suffered a severe blow when the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. announced the liquidation of its Amsterdam plant, except for a small axminster carpet weaving unit. More than 2,000 workers were displaced, comprising about 20 percent of the total factory employment in the area. By the end of 1955 textile employment was down to 5,847, a decline of 32 percent from the 1951 average. Total covered employment declined from 17,182 to 14,262, or 17 percent, during this period.

While there was a modest pickup in employment in 1956 and 1957, the latter year witnessed new reverses in the community's fortunes as Bigelow-Sanford closed its remaining axminster weaving unit, displacing 400 workers, and the Mohawk company also shut down its axminster weaving unit, resulting in the loss of 700 additional jobs. Mohawk had merged with Alexander Smith, Inc., at the end of 1955, becoming Mohasco Industries, Inc., and making it possible to shift its axminster production to the Greenville, Miss., plant which the city of Greenville had built for Alexander Smith. The subsidy which Greenville had supplied (amounting to $4,750,000) thus was instrumental in wiping out 700 jobs in Amsterdam.

Further declines in textile employment brought total employment to a low of 13,458 for the year 1958, with textiles accounting for 3,825 jobs. In spite of the improvement in 1959, employment in covered industries during the latest available period (first quarter) was only 13,640, still lower than in any comparable period during the past decade, except for the recession low of 1958. Textile employment (4,181) had dropped by 4,468 since 1951. Less than one-quarter of this loss had been offset by gains in apparel (which increased from 1,548 in 1951 to 2,045 in 1959), food (which rose from 1,507 to 1,710) and durable goods plants (which increased from 218 to 607). Consequently, there was a net loss of 3,542 jobs in covered employment from 1951 to the first quarter of 1959. The area's largest employer (the Mohawk carpet mill) currently employs 2,500 compared to the previous peak of 5,400.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The impact of the decline of the textile industry on the economy of Amsterdam is evident in the physical structure of the community and the suffering of its people. High rates of unemployment have become chronic, persisting in prosperous periods and reaching catastrophic proportions during general recessions. Thus in 1954, when the national average rate of unemployment rose to 5.6 percent, the Amsterdam rate fluctuated between 11.6 and 17 percent. In the 1955–57 recovery, when the national average varied between 4.2 and 4.4 percent, the annual average for Amsterdam stayed up between 8.9 and 9.8 percent more than twice as high as the national rates. The 1958 recession raised the national average to 6.8 percent while the Amsterdam unemployment ratio jumped to 14.1 percent, with a high of 18 percent in July. By July of 1959, the national unemployment rate had fallen to 5.2 percent while 8.1 percent of Amsterdam's labor force was still unemployed.

As high as the Amsterdam figures are, they are still an understatement of the seriousness of the unemployment problem in this area. Thousands of workers who have sought employment unsuccessfully for long periods have either left the labor force entirely or have departed to look for work elsewhere. In July 1957, there were 26,850 persons in the Amsterdam labor force (employed and unemployed). By July 1959 this number had dwindled to 23,450, a decline of 3,400 in 2 years. This marked decrease indicates that many residents of the Amsterdam area have withdrawn from the labor force out of despair. While the Government estimates of unemployment do not include these people, they are an integral part of the problem faced by the community.

RISING WELFARE COSTS

The high cost of meeting the immediate consequences of this problem is evident from the figures on welfare expenditures in the area. The cost of home relief has mounted steadily. In 1951, when the average number of persons receiving home relief was 197, the cost amounted to $62,000. In 1958, the average number of recipients had jumped to 350 and the cost to $106,000. In the first 11 months of 1959 the average number of recipients rose to 368 and the cost ($119,000) exceeded the amount for the entire year 1958. Expenditures for home relief in the first 11 months of 1959 were 26 percent greater than in the corresponding period last year and 111 percent greater than in the corresponding period in 1951.

These steep increases in relief costs result from the inadequacy of the current unemployment insurance system in dealing with the problems of chronic unemployment. While payments under the unemployment compensation programs have cushioned the economic distress of those affected by short-term unemployment, they do not meet the needs of the people in an area suffering from persistent distress. Payments under the permanent State and Federal programs in the Amsterdam area amounted to $1,255,000 in 1951 and rose to $2,541,000 in 1954. After falling to $1,591,000 in 1957, unemployment compensation benefits jumped to $2,706,000 in 1958. In addition, payments under the Federal Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, effective June 23d, amounted to $419,000 in 1958. Regular benefits in the first 9 months of 1959 amounted to $1,269,000, with an additional $168,000 paid under the Federal and State temporary programs, which expired in July.

EXHAUSTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The inadequacy of present unemployment insurance provisions is highlighted by the fact that 1,442 claimants exhausted their benefits in 1958; these workers comprised 66 percent of the average number of claimants during the year. As a result of the high rate of benefit exhaustions, the proportion of all unemployed workers who received compensation fell from 70 percent in January 1958 to 61 percent in November 1958 and to a low of 52 percent in June 1959.

Older workers have been hit particularly hard by the distressed condition of the Amsterdam economy. These workers have much more difficulty in finding a new job when they are laid off than do younger workers. In January 1959, when unemployment insurance claimants in Amsterdam numbered 1,859, the proportion of claimants who were 65 or over was 9.4 percent. In October, when the total number of claimants had declined to 836, the proportion 65 and over jumped to 19.6 percent. Significant increases in the proportions in the 55–64 and 45–54 age groups also took place during this period, with the former rising from 15.7 to 16.7 percent and the latter from 24 to 29.3 percent.

DECLINE IN POPULATION

The lack of adequate employment opportunities has resulted in a gradual decline in the population of Amsterdam. From 33,329 in 1940, the population fell to 32,240 in 1950, a decline of 3 percent in a decade which saw an increase of 10 percent in the population of the State. In 1959 the population of Amsterdam is estimated at 31,745, a further decline of 2 percent since 1950, compared to an increase of 13 percent for New York State.

The demise of the textile industry in Amsterdam has left the city with considerable excess factory space. Approximately half a million square feet of vacant space still exists in the old buildings vacated by Bigelow-Sanford in 1955. An additional 100,000 square feet of space is vacant in other industrial buildings, much of which is obsolete. In addition, many thousands of square feet of space is to be found in vacant stores and other commercial structures.

LOCAL EFFORTS AT REHABILITATION

The efforts of the people of Amsterdam to solve the problems resulting from the decline in the textile industry have been organized by Industries for Amsterdam, a membership corporation established in 1954. This group is designed to promote the location of new industrial enterprises in the city. It collected $260,000 in contributions and built a factory shell which is currently occupied by the Ward Products Co., a manufacturer of antenna employing 125 workers. It has also obtained credit of $80,000 for the acquisition and development of real estate suitable for industrial development. The only plant which has availed itself of this opportunity so far is the Southwest Manufacturing Co., a boat building firm employing 60 workers. In addition to these activities, Industries for Amsterdam has sought to attract new industries by disseminating information. Altogether, as a result of its efforts to date the development corporation claims the location of 15 new industrial plants in the area, including the two above-mentioned plants, with a total employment of between 1,000 and 1,150.

Another organization which has been active in the industrial promotion field has been L. Grossman Sons Inc., which acquired the former Bigelow-Sanford real estate in December 1955. This firm has leased or sold space in the old carpet plant to 13 firms, which currently employ a total of approximately 900 employees. Five of these firms, employing 800 workers, received assistance from "Industries for Amsterdam," and are included in the above-cited figures for the development corporation. The peak employment by Bigelow-Sanford in these buildings had been in excess of 3,200. All but 4 of the current tenants employ fewer than 40 workers apiece, and 7 of them have fewer than 20 employees. Only 1 employs more than 200. Approximately one-fourth of the 2 million square feet of floor space in these buildings is still vacant.

It is clear from the gap which still exists between the community's needs and the achievements of local promotion groups over the past 6 years that Federal assistance is urgently needed. Local resources are inadequate to the tremendous task of revitalizing the area. It will take more than the erection of a few factory shells and the sale or leasing of existing plants to very small businesses to solve Amsterdam's basic problems. What is needed is a fundamental study of the community's economic, physical, and human resources and a plan which would take advantage of the area's actual and potential advantages. With appropriate planning and adequate financing, the Amsterdam area can be redeveloped into a highly attractive location for modern, progressive industries.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF A FEDERAL REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Only the Federal Government is in a position to provide the integrated program necessary to revitalize the Amsterdam area. We heartily endorse the Douglas area redevelopment bill (S. 722) as encompassing the flexible and comprehensive approach which is imperative for the solution of our problems.

First, it would provide technical assistance to our local development group in conducting a survey of the current and potential resources of the community. This information is indispensable to the intelligent planning of a constructive development program. It will point to the kinds of industries we should seek to attract to our community. Moreover, it will enable our development group to discuss local advantages with prospective employers on a specific and factual basis.

Second, the bill would integrate the redevelopment program with the existing Federal urban renewal program. At present, the latter is largely confined to residential renewal. Extension of the urban renewal program to areas which are not primarily residential will make available Federal grants to defray a portion of the cost of removing obsolete industrial and commercial structures as part of the economic development of the area. This would be an important contribution to the improvement of Amsterdam's layout, making it possible to build modern plants in locations which are convenient for transportation facilities.

Third, the Douglas bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine the needs of our community for vocational training to meet the new skills required by new and expanding industries in the area. In order to enable unemployed persons to get the benefits of this training the bill also provides for subsistence payments to such persons while they are being trained.

Finally, the area redevelopment bill would provide financial assistance for projects which would fit in with the overall program for redevelopment, as drawn up by the local development group. Such assistance would contribute to the revitalization of the community through the improvement of public facilities and the construction of industrial and commercial facilities necessary for balanced economic growth.

NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The experience of the people of Amsterdam is clear proof that present unemployment compensation provision are inadequate. We endorse the Karsten-Machrowicz-Kennedy-McCarthy bill, which would establish Federal standards guaranteeing each eligible worker unemployment benefits for up to 39 weeks, and increasing the benefits to the levels originally intended for unemployment compensation.

With decent Federal standards for unemployment insurance and a Federal program for area redevelopment, we are confident that the people of Amsterdam can overcome the difficulties that have made our community a distressed area during the past 6 years. We shall rebuild our economy on a sounder base to assure a healthy future for ourselves and our children.

WASHINGTON POST SUPPORTS REMOVAL OF INTEREST-RATE CEILING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, when I spoke briefly on the floor, I stated my position in favor of the President's request for the removal of the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

As I said at that time, I intend to follow up on this matter; and it is my hope that in the near future it will be possible to bring about congressional action to carry out the President's request.

Mr. President, today I want to call attention to an excellent editorial, published in the Washington Post, supporting the removal of the interest-rate ceiling. The Post is squarely in favor of immediate congressional action to remove this unrealistic and arbitrary limit. The Post's analysis of and comment on this matter deserve careful consideration.

Mr. President, I commend the Post for its fine editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1960]

MIXED OBJECTIVES

The argument about the efficacy of the Federal Reserve Board's monetary controls and the wisdom with which they have been used in the past will no doubt continue for a long time. There is much room for improvement both in techniques and in timing. Most of all, monetary policy should be fitted to a larger framework in which the long-term requirements of growth would more fully influence day-by-day decisions. But, given the present state of affairs, the President's renewed request for elimination of the archaic ceiling on the interest rates of Government bonds is supported by the most urgent considerations. Congressional attempts to evade this present need in a search for monetary-policy reforms are an unrealistic mixing of objectives.

If Congress wishes to attempt to define a monetary policy for the avoidance of high interest rates, let it recognize that the task involves a quite sweeping reappraisal of budget, tax, and credit programs and then lift its sights to the challenge. But, in the meantime, it cannot ignore the consequences of past failure to develop institutions and policies within which severely restrictive monetary controls and high interest rates might not be necessary.

The unavoidable fact is that the short-term money market is exceedingly tight and the Government's necessary reliance on short-term borrowing has contributed to the trouble, although it is by no means the only cause. Unless the Treasury is freed to enter the long-term market at realistic interest rates, short-term rates may be driven even higher.

Let Congress acknowledge these facts in sorrow, if it wishes, but let them be faced. Then the larger task of freeing up the country's full productive potential can be undertaken. If this broader goal could be achieved, the Government's debt-management problems would be eased in more fundamental and lasting ways.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESS, AS WELL AS THE PRESS, SHOULD BE GIVEN COPIES OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in behalf of all Americans, I desire to enter a strong protest against the one-sided, and thereby deliberately distorted, manner in which the Bureau of the Budget and the current administration is using Madison Avenue propaganda techniques to try to foist off the proposed budget on the American people.

Since last Saturday, gentlemen of the press have been calling my office to get me to comment on this or that item in the President's budget. Copies of the budget were handed the press last Saturday, yet they were marked for release today at noon, and copies were expected to be delivered at my office and the offices of most other Senators around 1 p.m. today.

Mr. President, I do not object to this information being given to the press, because I am a firm believer in keeping the press informed so that it in turn can contribute mightily to keeping the people informed. But I do object most strenuously to the press being informed before Members of the Congress as to proposed expenditures, for I believe that we who are elected to represent the people and vote the money and the taxes to run this Government have an even greater responsibility than any private business in letting the people know about proposed projects and expenditures. In line with this responsibilty, it seems to me just as important that we of the Senate, and even key members of our staffs, should receive information on proposed budgetary actions, as it is for private individuals to have such information.

Mr. President, I think it is time for the executive branch of the Government to treat the legislative branch as equal partners in the Government, and stop treating the Congress as a bunch of schoolboys to whom information is doled out at the will of the teacher.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

WILL OF MRS. W. L. CLAYTON, GREAT DEMOCRATIC WOMAN LEADER, INCLUDES LARGE BEQUEST FOR HER "BELOVED COUNTRY" THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday January 11, it was my painful duty to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one of our most honored and distinguished philanthropists and Democratic leaders of Texas, Mrs. W. L. Clayton, had passed away.

As the wife of Will Clayton, brilliant former Under Secretary of State, Mrs. Clayton would have naturally enjoyed wide social acceptance and prominence. Therefore, I think it particularly adds to her enduring fame and credit that on her own she did such outstanding work, made such exceptional contributions of service and money to helping thousands who could not help themselves, and that she earned widespread personal recognition.

Perhaps one of her most remarkable attributes was that although she was blessed with substantial wealth, she assiduously avoided joining with the so-frequent cry of the money class against taxes, against spending on programs of human decency. On the contrary, as an ardent supporter of President Franklin Roosevelt, she worked many hours to forward his basic programs of economic justice—his fights to "return America to the American people." She believed in liberty and equality and individual dignity, and she recognized that our Nation virtually was the only spot on earth where all men have even a chance of enjoying such priceless treasures.

This was not only true at the national level, but also at the local level, as evidenced by the fact that she fought for slum clearance in her home city of Houston.

It was, I think, entirely fitting, then, that she should not forget her country in her last will, although probably no one else thought of it until her will was made public. In a handwritten codicil dated August 3, 1957, she had made a very substantial contribution to "my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt." The contribution to this country was of one-half of the Susan V. Clayton Trust No. 2, the other one-half going to Johns Hopkins University for medical research.

Score of millions of Americans dearly love their country; most would die for it, but few voluntarily make gifts of money to it. Mrs. Clayton was one of those rare persons who so loved this country that in her will she divided her accumulated wealth with it, and said, "To you my beloved country, goes this part of my estate."

Higher patriotism has not been shown by any American in time of peace.

Her surviving husband, Will Clayton, her children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren, have a proud heritage that few can equal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story by Marshall Verniaud in the January 14, 1960, issue of the Houston Post, entitled, "Will of Mrs. Clayton Includes Her 'Beloved Country' for Retirement of U.S. Debt."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR RETIREMENT OF U.S. DEBT—WILL OF MRS. CLAYTON INCLUDES HER BELOVED COUNTRY

(By Marshall Verniaud)

A bequest to the United States of America "to be used for the retirement of the national debt" was made by Mrs. William L. Clayton in a will and codicil filed for probate Wednesday.

Mrs. Clayton, wife of the cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co. and former Under-Secretary of State, also directed bequests to the Texas Children's Hospital, the Clayton Fund, and Johns Hopkins University.

Specific bequests totaling $3,686,000 to her husband, 56 other relatives and 3 servants were included in the handwritten will executed April 18, 1953.

No estimate of the estate's value was available. The petition for probate listed it as having a value "in excess of $100,000."

In a handwritten codicil dated August 3, 1957, Mrs. Clayton directed that one-half of her interest in the Susan V. Clayton Trust No. 2 shall be given "to my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt."

The remaining half of her interest in this trust will go to Johns Hopkins University for the support of medical research to be designated by a son-in-law, Dr. Benjamin M. Baker, of Baltimore, Md.

The will written on both sides of a single sheet of paper, bequeathed two-thirds of her corporate stock in Anderson, Clayton & Co. to the Texas Children's Hospital, with a proviso that it will be retained by that institution and only the income used.

The remaining one-third of the stock was given to the Clayton Fund, founded by Mr. and Mrs. Clayton.

Any balance of the estate after distribution of designated bequests shall go to the Texas Children's Hospital, Mrs. Clayton directed.

In addition to a bequest of $100,000 to her husband, Mrs. Clayton ordered payment of $100,000 each to four daughters, their husbands, four granddaughters, and five grandsons.

Additional bequests of $50,000 each were made to 5 nieces, 3 nephews, 5 great-nieces, 10 great-nephews, 9 great-great-nieces and 5 great-great nephews.

The will also directed bequests of $25,000 to a sister in-law, $5,000 to a brother, $2,500 each to two servants, and $1,000 to a third servant.

Daughters named in the will were Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, of Austin; Mrs. S. M. McAshan, Jr.; Mrs. John W. Johnson, of Houston; and Mrs. Benjamin M. Baker, of Baltimore.

Granddaughters named to receive bequests were Mrs. Lucy J. Hadac, of Seattle, Wash.; Miss Burdine C. Johnson, of Houston; Mrs. Susan V. Baker and Miss Julia May Baker, of Baltimore.

The five grandsons who will share in the estate are St. John Garwood and William T. Johnson, of Houston; William L. Garwood, of Austin; Benjamin M. Baker, Jr. and William C. Baker, of Baltimore.

Mrs. Clayton died January 7 at the age of 78.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the 1st session of this 86th Congress two bills were introduced which proposed a U.S. Department of Science. One of these bills was S. 586, which I introduced. A second bill, S. 646, was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Since then, it has become increasingly evident that lack of coordination, bickering, duplication, and absence of leadership among various bureaus, agencies, and branches, are major stumbling blocks in our Nation's efforts to match if not outdistance the Soviets in space and missile developments.

When I appeared before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations last April 17, I stated:

The outstanding attribute of science is its exactness. If we are to deal with science in our Government, we must also be exact.

It is my serious contention that the quickest course of exactitude in our scientific research and development programs will be found in this bill which I have offered—S. 586.

We need action and we need it fast. Duplication of effort is wasting our resources and money and retarding our country in this very fast and dangerous race. In the Pentagon alone, the maze of committees and departments is enough to confound progress itself.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues on this committee, science in our Nation today is all over the lot.

In spite of the improvements that have been made to correct this situation, we have no overall boss, no Cabinet member to make the ultimate decisions.

For our immediate needs—and they are most immediate—I feel my bill for a Department of Science holds the answer.

To have effective direction of our scientific efforts, we need somebody to call the signals.

Perhaps our ultimate goal is to be found in Senator HUMPHREY's proposal, which would transfer all the functions of science to such a department.

But for the immediate, crying needs of here and now, I feel it is better that we make a start. We can transfer the other functions later as we go along.

I urge that you report out my bill for a Department of Science as quickly as possible.

I was pleased to read in the newspapers of December 29, 1959, that Dr. Wallace R. Brode, the retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, called for creation of a Cabinet-rank Science Department when he spoke before the group meeting in convention in Chicago.

Dr. Brode expressed the opinion held by many scientists and laymen that the Nation cannot hope to get the most from its scientists unless their genius and energies are better coordinated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two newspaper accounts of Dr. Brode's address, as well as an editorial on the subject from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 29, 1959]

CABINET-RANK SCIENCE OFFICE URGED FOR UNITED STATES

CHICAGO, December 29.—A ranking Government scientist has called for creation of a Cabinet-rank science department to take over all basic scientific work for all branches of the Federal Government.

Only by establishing such an operating agency, Dr. Wallace R. Brode said last night, will the Nation be able to meet the demands of technology with the scientific assets available.

Dr. Brode, who is serving as science adviser to the Secretary of State and who is on leave as Associate Director of the National Bureau of Standards, outlined his proposal in a speech before the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The talk, entitled "Development of a Science Policy," was Dr. Brode's traditional "swan song" address as retiring president of AAAS.

The scientist, a noted chemist as well as Government administrator, rejected arguments that resulted early this year in the shelving of a proposal to create such an agency. He said the matter should be reopened at once.

WANTS REAL SETUP

"We should be certain that it is in fact as well as in name an operating department," Dr. Brode said. "It should not be a superstructure imposed on existing organizations, but * * * an honest and real effort to mesh the scientific interests and objectives of our Government in the fullest utilization of resources.

"Thus a department of science, while not removing from agencies such as Defense and Agriculture applied research programs specific to their mission, should, however, include all major segments of science not specifically pertinent to an applied mission.

"It should have separate bureaus or institutes with suitable directors of distinction to deal with space, atomic energy, medicine, weather, patent information, physical science, geology, and other recognized areas of importance.

"To provide the * * * administrative head with broad and helpful advice it would seem reasonable to create an advisory council * * * [this] might be helpful in arriving at decisions on extent and character of support which the Government should provide."

SLAPS AT DEFENSE

Dr. Brode noted with alarm the domination of the national research scene by defense agencies, in which he lumped the military services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This domination, which he said adds up to about 85 percent of the total basic research bill of the whole American economy, creates a situation of artificial priorities which often works against scientific projects.

A department of science, Dr. Brode said, should be run by scientists and career civil servants. He criticized the procedure to try to find someone to come in from the outside to run a major agency.

"Seldom does one seriously consider the appointment of a career civil servant even though there are in the Government career civil servants who may be recognized in other nations as world authorities * * *."

Speaking generally against this outside recruitment trend, Dr. Brode added:

"The Government should develop within its own establishment sufficient capability to operate its agencies; and our policy decisions, whether they be in science, taxation, or welfare, should not be made without guidance from governmentally experienced personnel."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 29, 1959]

SCIENCE BUREAU URGED FOR UNITED STATES—BRODE, STATE DEPARTMENT'S ADVISER, OFFERS PLAN TO END WHAT HE CALLS CHAOS

(By Walter Sullivan)

CHICAGO, December 28.—A program designed to end the alleged chaos of this country's scientific effort, stimulate basic research and loosen Government control over universities was proposed today.

Dr. Wallace E. Brode, scientific adviser to the State Department, made the proposal at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Brode, who is the association's outgoing president, emphasized that he was speaking for himself, not the association, or the Government.

The root of his plan is to create a Federal Science Department. He testified for such a step during a congressional hearing on the plan earlier this year.

He proposed that a commission or study group be formed to examine the question of administering American science.

Among his criticisms of the organization of Government research were the following:

"It is dominated by military and quasi-military agencies. Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy Agencies spend $500 million a year, about 85 percent of the total research outlay.

"Universities, having been bailed out of financial difficulties after World War I by defense contracts, are now under excessive control. Each agency feels it should be able to select and direct both recipient and subject of research. Such contracts cover half the total basic research.

"The role of the military has made foreign scientists reluctant to take part in American-sponsored projects.

"With the explosive growth of research in recent years, there has been increasing proliferation of Government agencies concerned with research.

"A function of the National Science Foundation, in Dr. Brode's view, was to take over the Government's role in basic research except where such work was closely linked to the tasks of other Government departments. Instead, the various agencies have been contracting for research in all areas of science, with a consequent lack of coordination and planning."

SAYS PROGRAMS STAND STILL

Dr. Brode said Government agencies were farming out research to industry and universities, whereas programs in Government laboratories were standing still.

Thus, he said, there has been no substantial change since the 1930's in the number of scientists working for the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines and Forest Products.

In addition, he noted, civil service status limits their advancement and makes it hard to attract talent.

Dr. Brode also called for a National Science Council, whose membership would bridge the gap between the Government, the academic world, and industry. Centralization of planning, he said, would help free policy-making from the whims of public fancy and political expediency.

He said the Government would be less inclined to go all out for space research one year, and perhaps weather control or new energy sources a year later.

Instead, he argued, there could be long-range planning for a balanced program with enough leeway to preserve the independence of researchers.

Britain and France have taken such a step, he said. He admitted there was opposition to it, even within the association's board. The President's Science Advisory Committee also opposed it early this year, but on synthetic grounds, he added.

While there is a crisis, he warned, it is mild compared with what will exist a decade later, when expenditures for research are expected to double present levels.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1960]

A SECRETARY OF SCIENCE?

Among other proposals likely to be made again in Congress for the strengthening of the Nation's scientific efforts will be that to create a Department of Science with a Secretary of Cabinet rank. Many scientists and others in the administration are opposed to this idea, but the science adviser to the State Department and immediate past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Wallace R. Brode, said in a speech the other day that he thought such a department might be

useful. We hope that congressional sponsors of the plan will focus on the objectives. Otherwise the creation of another Federal agency could become an end in itself and could result merely in the imposition of a new layer of administrative supervision, more redtape, and more interagency committees to try to cut it away.

As Dr. Brode sees the objectives, one is to provide a better allocation of Federal funds among the competing scientific programs which the Government either conducts or supports and which, he calculates, account for some 80 percent of the Nation's basic research. This might be accomplished, we suppose, by better scientific staffing of the Budget Bureau, or by fuller use of the recently created Federal Council of Science and Technology, or even by a stronger voice for the science adviser in the White House. Or it might take a new Cabinet office to provide the sustained effort obviously required.

Another objective, Dr. Brode believes, is to upgrade Government scientists so that less scientific work will have to be farmed out and to establish more Government owned and operated laboratories. Again, a Department of Science might be the only way to bring the virtual revolution in pay scales and organization which this would entail—or there might be easier ways. The point is that there is much more at the root of the American scientific lag, already pronounced in some fields and merely imminent in others, than the mere lack of a Department of Science. The coming debate in this field ought to concern itself with the fundamentals, not just the superstructure.

DIVESTITURE OF DU PONT INTEREST IN GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, late last week I found it desirable to again call to the attention of the Senate the necessity for enacting appropriate legislation to prevent shareholders of the Du Pont Co. from the serious and unjustified tax penalties threatened as a result of the pending antitrust case brought by the Government against this corporation.

My statement was issued following an announcement by the Department of Justice that it had appealed the findings of the district court in Chicago which had ruled that divestiture by Du Pont of its General Motors stock was not necessary to effect appropriate relief which the Supreme Court by a 4-to-2 decision had earlier decided would be required.

In my remarks, I invited and urged both the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Treasury to join in supporting legislation to facilitate antitrust enforcement by lowering tax hurdles to the achievement of this goal.

This proposal is embraced in Senate bill 200 and in H.R. 8126 approved during the last session of Congress by the Ways and Means Committee.

Today, I am happy to advise the Senate that the Attorney General has written me a personal letter in which he reiterates the Department of Justice's support for enactment of tax legislation at this session of Congress which would assist the Government in pursuing appropriate enforcement under our antitrust laws.

I now trust, Mr. President, that the statement of the Attorney General will be followed by a similar expression of cooperation by the Secretary of the Treasury to the end that we may have approval of one of these pending bills on this subject before Congress adjourns. Mr. President, I ask that the letter of the Attorney General be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1960.

Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have noted your statement in the Senate yesterday on this Department's decision to appeal to the Supreme Court the district court's decision permitting Du Pont to retain its interest of over $3 billion in General Motors. First, in regard to the U.S. appeal, our position is that the district court's decree fails to remedy that violation the Supreme Court found. Until the Supreme Court determines this issue, the merits of our position, we feel, should be argued before the Supreme Court, and in no other context.

Beyond the question of appeal, you called upon this office and "others" to "join * * * in supporting * * * [legislation] to facilitate antitrust enforcement in eliminating the tax penalties upon forced divestiture" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 538).

This Department did just that last session of Congress. We expressed the belief that appropriate legislation lowering present tax hurdles to divestiture in antitrust cases could spur effective relief. Such legislation, in addition, would speed enforcement results by obviating the necessity for extending the period of divestiture over a number of years. It was with the goal in mind of prompt and effective antitrust enforcement that the Department recommended enactment of tax legislation to accompany the duty Congress placed on this Department to enforce the antitrust laws.

This continues to be our view. And our hope is that, this session, the Congress will see fit to act favorably on appropriate legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO RETIRED OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like at this time to say a word about some bills which I have introduced, which relate to the responsibility of retired officers of the armed services.

I have served on the Committee on Rules and Administration for 2 years, at the feet of our very distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. I hope, after my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has concluded his address, to which I look forward with great interest, to speak upon the pending legislation for a little while this afternoon.

In the meantime, I wish to advert to certain bills which I have introduced in cooperation with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with respect to the responsibility of retired officers of the military services.

It is very gratifying to me that the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee, before which I testified last July 8, in support of a bill which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I had introduced, Senate bill 2228, the Retired Military Officers Defense Procurement Activities Act of 1959, has issued a report and proposed legislation which in many respects follows closely the recommendations of Senate bill 2228.

The 2-year "cooling off" period after retirement, during which officers may not participate in "selling" activities to the Department of Defense; the extension of the definition of "selling" to include negotiations, and the permanent exclusion of officers from selling activities directly related to their particular assignments in the services, should offer valuable guidelines to former personnel in their choice of future business connections.

It also becomes our duty to do affirmative acts which will offer a better opportunity for retired officers, as well as to do negative things which will prevent any abuse of what we consider to be a public trust.

Accordingly, I hope that, at the same time we consider the restrictive legislation which I have discussed, we shall also consider one other bill which I introduced on September 12, 1959, which would offer retired officers working for the Federal Government in positions classified as having a shortage of personnel, according to the Civil Service Commission, the opportunity to receive an increased share of their retirement pay, notwithstanding the salaries which they receive in civil service jobs. In this way we can provide retired officers with a career beneficial both to them and their country.

With reference to Senate bill 2703, which I introduced on September 12, 1959, the bill would also require the Civil Service Commission to make a report within 3 years, to help Congress with further legislation along this line.

It is important to bring to the notice of retired military officers that real efforts should be made to keep their fine and honorable status in our country, and that in the complexity inherent in the public concern over their trying to sell defense items to the Defense Department, or to negotiate with their former colleagues, we should also make every effort to utilize their services, which are often so precious, in jobs where we do have a shortage of personnel, and to encourage them to render that kind of service by minimizing the cost to them in terms of their retirement compensation. I hope very much that Congress will, therefore, consider both sides of this coin.

I end by saying what I have maintained time and time again, namely, that I hope that our retired officers will realize our gratitude to them for their services, and that all we are trying to do is to make very clear the ground rules, and that we know from their patriotic service, which they have always rendered to their country, they would be the first to desire the ground rules to be clear, and that, as we may restrict their activities, we also indicate the lines along which they can be extended, which will be beneficial both to the country and to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 571, S. 2436, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to add a new section to the pending amendment, which is the Hennings-Keating amendment lettered "C."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Hennings-Keating amendment the amendment which would make the bill applicable to primary elections?

If that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry, perhaps I could direct the question to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will answer the question in the affirmative. That will be the pending question, following action on the so-called LONG amendment relating to caucuses and conventions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On which amendment will the vote first come? Will it be on the Long amendment to the Hennings-Keating amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the first vote will occur on the Long amendment to the Hennings-Keating amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at this time I wish to state how I expect to vote on the Hennings-Keating amendment, and to give a few reasons therefor.

I expect to vote for the Hennings-Keating amendment to include primary elections within the scope of the bill. The reason I shall do so is that I think the primary election is an essential part of being elected to the Senate; or, if the primary election is not used, then the nominating convention which may be provided by State law is an essential part of being elected.

The selection of a party candidate, the nomination of a party candidate, is one of the steps in election.

When I was considering this matter it occurred to me that the notable cases in which there have been election contests before the Senate of the United States—the most outstanding examples of something going wrong, to which the Senate had addressed itself in the past—have been in regard to primary elections. I have in mind the Newberry case in Michigan, the Vare case in Pennsylvania, and the Smith case in Illinois.

In the report on these various contests, in the book compiled by Frank Hays, of the Senate Library, on "Senate Election Cases from 1913 to 1940," these several contests are all dealt with.

In review of the case of Ford against Newberry, the opinion of Chief Justice White is cited. In that citation, this review states:

> The Chief Justice pointed out that the contention of the majority that elections did not include nominating primaries was illogical, for the same clause (of the Constitution: art. I, sec. 4, clause 1) which delegated to the States control over elections and, inferentially, control over primaries, also placed the power of regulation in Congress; that the argument that the powers of election and of nomination were separable and without relation was untenable; that the general powers conferred upon Congress under the necessary and proper clause were also left out of account in the majority opinion; and that the 17th amendment tended to confirm his view as after much debate it was adopted by a resolution of promulgation which reserved to the Congress its power under article I, section 4.

In the report of a committee in the Newberry case, one of the headings is "Primary Election." Under that heading I read this paragraph:

> Your committee condemns the use of such a large sum of money in any primary campaign, but in the instant case there is not the slightest foundation upon which to connect Truman H. Newberry with its solicitation, its acquisition, or its use, nor to condemn him because of the amount. * * * It is but fair to state that the evidence discloses a situation in regard to this primary which perhaps has no parallel in American history.

That was the opinion of the majority. But even in that opinion it is clear that the whole matter with which the committee was charged was that which dealt with what happened in a primary election. It is my feeling that if the cases to which the Senate has addressed itself from time to time have dealt with primary elections, then consistently the bill which we pass at this time should deal with primary elections.

In the report of a committee in this same review of Senate election cases I find that there was quoted a letter which Mr. Arthur H. Vandenberg, editor of the Grand Rapids Herald, wrote to Mr. Newberry on August 8, 1918. He quoted in his letter from the Escanaba Journal of August 2, in an editorial entitled "An Offense to Political Decency."

It—

> Referring to the Newberry campaign—

is being made a money campaign which outclasses the "money barrel" campaigns of 20 and 30 years ago, and if the campaign is to continue unchallenged it will create a condition which must inevitably mean the debauchery of Michigan politics.

I am sure that if the late great Arthur Vandenberg were here today, he would recognize that the dollars necessary to carry on a general campaign, or a primary campaign, back in 1918, would be quite inadequate to carry on a campaign at this time. But if he felt, as he apparently did when he wrote this letter to Mr. Newberry, that the conduct of the primary was an offense to political decency, he would feel that primaries should be embodied in the proposed legislation.

The review further quotes Mr. Vandenberg as saying:

> I direct your attention to these specific charges which have appeared in responsible newspapers. They are charges, furthermore, which find kinship in the very general rumor and report. I fully realize that gossip is a deadly and a ruthless assassin, but gossip, in this instance, is too widespread to be longer ignored. It charges you and your associates with the expenditure of money running into six figures in the erection of your senatorial organization. Such a situation must be as intolerable to you, if these reports are false, as it is intolerable for the State, if the reports are true.

In the summary of the report on the Ford against Newberry case, submitted by the minority, Atlee Pomerene, William H. King, and Henry F. Ashurst, the opening sentence is:

> The exorbitant expenditures in this primary campaign shocked the conscience of the country.

They were dealing not with a general election, but with a primary.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend yield for an observation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to see that the Senator from South Dakota is, as always, careful, comprehensive, and scholarly in the statements he makes either here or in committee, where he and I have served together in the past.

I take it the Senator is reading from "Senate Election Cases," in part.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. By Hays.

Mr. HENNINGS. From 1913 to 1940?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am quite sure that the Senator has also read the landmark case of the United States against Classic.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have not read it recently.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is another very illuminating case which bears upon the question of the constitutionality of Federal election laws and regulations as applied to primary elections. The Senator has noticed, I am sure, that in the "Senate Election Cases" from 1913 to 1940, as we go back, the last case which was considered was the case of Willis against Van Nuys. Preceding that was the case of Hatfield against Holt. Preceding that was the case of Chavez against Cutting; and preceding that were the cases of Long against Overton and Hefflin against Bankhead.

Without further interrupting the Senator, let me say that many of these cases in which the Senate took jurisdiction were primary election cases. Is not that true?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They dealt with the nomination of a candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Indeed. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the conclusion of the report submitted by the minority in the Ford against Newberry case, Senators Pomerene, King, and Ashurst gave this as their conclusion from the facts disclosed by the record:

As conclusions from the facts disclosed by the record and the findings herein set forth, we are of the opinion—

First. That the irregularities complained of do not relate to the general election but to the primary. Henry Ford did not receive a plurality of the votes cast at the general election. We, therefore, find that the petitioner, Henry Ford, was not elected and is not entitled to a seat in the Senate of the United States.

Second. We find that under the facts and circumstances of this case corrupt and illegal methods and practices were employed at the primary election and that Truman H. Newberry violated the Corrupt Practices Act and the Primary Act of the State of Michigan, and that by reason thereof he ought not to have or hold a seat in the Senate of of the United States, and that he is not the duly elected Senator from the State of Michigan for the term of 6 years commencing on the 4th day of March 1919, and we recommend, therefore, that his seat be declared vacant.

So again I take note of the fact that Members of the Senate in dealing with this case, which was referred to them, and which was their responsibility as members of the committee to investigate, dealt with a primary, and goings on in the primary, rather than with the general election, and dealt with the disbursement of funds in the primary on which the case turned.

Then, similarly in this collection by Mr. Hays of "Senate Election Cases," in the report of Mr. Reed of Missouri from the Special Investigating Committee To Investigate Expenditure in Senatorial Primary and General Elections, I find a paragraph which I believe to be significant. Again there I would point out that the committee, which the able former Senator from Missouri headed, and who was the predecessor of the able Senator who now in part represents the State of Missouri, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], was entitled "Special Committee Investigating Expenditures in Senatorial Primary and General Elections." In the partial report which Chairman Reed submitted in 1927, there appears this paragraph:

For all practical purposes it may be said that no candidate for the Senate at the last election in the State of Illinois could have any reasonable hope of election unless nominated in the primary by one of the regular party organizations. The intimate relation of the primary and the general election, and the interdependency of the latter upon the former, cannot be subject to any serious dispute.

I should like to reread that paragraph from the report of Chairman Reed of the special committee back in 1927, and invite the comment of the present Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. On what page does that appear?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At page 305.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The paragraph to which I direct attention reads as follows:

For all practical purposes it may be said that no candidate for the Senate at the last election in the State of Illinois could have any reasonable hope of election unless nominated in the primary by one of the regular party organizations. The intimate relation of the primary and general election, and the interdependency of the latter upon the former cannot be subject to any serious dispute.

Does the Senator from Missouri agree with the conclusion of his illustrious predecessor, that there is an interdependency, and that the intimate relation between the two cannot be subject to any serious dispute?

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, I would say to the learned Senator from South Dakota that it is quite obvious that we cannot have a general election without having nominees, and that a part of the election process, as I undertook to say, I believe on Wednesday or Thursday, when discussing the amendment at the outset, is the primary, which is a predicate to the nomination and subsequent election of any candidate for the office of U.S. Senator. Of course I do agree with the late Senator James A. Reed in that statement, as do the courts and the Senate precedents, and the cases relating to them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at page 318 I read a part of the Senate report to the 69th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

On May 19, 1926, the Senate adopted a resolution creating a special committee and directed it to investigate the expenditures in the senatorial primaries and general elections for the 6-year term in the U.S. Senate beginning March 4, 1927. The Nation's press had charged the employment of corrupt practices and large expenditures in the Pennsylvania primaries of May 18, 1926.

So again, Mr. President, the Senate, as on many other occasions, and as in this case of William S. Vare, took cognizance of what happened in a primary election.

There is one other feature in connection with the Pennsylvania case which is of interest, and that is, as the report points out—

There was no law in Pennsylvania limiting primary expenditures.

Notwithstanding the fact that there was no law in Pennsylvania limiting primary expenditures, the Senate took cognizance of the reports of excessive expenditures and corrupt practices, and went into the matter.

The letter from the Governor of Pennsylvania which transmitted the certification of the returns of the election is of interest in this connection. It appears at page 351 of "Senate Election Cases." The letter was dated at the Governor's office at Harrisburg, Pa., January 8, 1927. Gov. Gifford Pinchot wrote as follows:

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the returns of the election of U.S. Senator, held on November 2, 1926, as the law of this Commonwealth directs.

I have the honor also to inform you that I have today signed and by registered mail delivered to Hon. William S. Vare, a certificate which is as follows:

"To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the face of the returns filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth of the election held on the 2d day of November 1926, William S. Vare appears to have been chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 4th day of March 1927."

The form of words customarily used for such certificates by the Governors of this Commonwealth and the form recommended by the Senate of the United States both include certification that the candidate in question has been "duly chosen by the qualified electors" of the Commonwealth.

I cannot so certify, because I do not believe that Mr. Vare has been duly chosen. On the contrary, I am convinced, and have repeatedly declared, that his nomination was partly bought and partly stolen, and that frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election. But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated cannot be honestly elected to a seat.

That statement by the Governor of Pennsylvania is pertinent and germane to the debate today. The Governor refused to use the ordinary certification of election. He did say that it appeared on the face of the returns that Mr. Vare had been chosen, but the Governor took pains in his letter to the President of the Senate to say that he could not so certify, because he did not believe that Mr. Vare had been duly chosen. He said that "frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election," and continued: "But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated cannot be honestly entitled to a seat."

If that is true, and if the Senate of the United States in this previous case, as in the other cases, took cognizance of the fact that a taint rested upon the selection of a party nominee, then, it seems to me, the pending bill, if it is to be a clean elections bill, should embrace primary as well as general elections.

The Pinchot letter concludes:

The stealing of votes for Mr. Vare and the amount and the sources of the money spent in his behalf make it clear to me that the election returns do not in fact correctly represent the will of the sovereign voters of Pennsylvania. Therefore I have so worded the certificate required by law that I can sign it without distorting the truth.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Very respectfully yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT,
Governor.

I may say, in conclusion, that the vote of the junior Senator from South Dakota will have to be cast for the Hennings-Keating amendment, which would make primary elections, as well as general elections, come within the scope of this law.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota upon his diligence and

scholarship, and for taking the trouble to read the cases, to analyze them, and to present them to the Senate in his customarily effective and forceful fashion.

I may say to the able Senator that it has been a source of profound doubt in my mind as to the specific reasons, aside from various oblique and offside attacks which have been made upon the primary election reporting provision, why any Senator would not want the people of his State to know who the contributors to his campaign in the primary election were, and in what amounts those contributions were made. Why should there be reluctance on the part of the Senate to take moral leadership in this matter?

In this blessed year of 1960, when we are confronted with challenges and difficulties and crises of all manner, I do not understand why we in the U.S. Senate should seriously question the desirability, forthrightness, and honesty of reporting publicly the source of contributions to candidates' nominations, as well as their elections. I cannot understand, for the life of me, the reluctance on the part of some of our colleagues to make such information a matter of public record and understanding. The people have a right to know who support candidates, and to what extent such support may be manifested by contributions of money.

If the Senator from South Dakota could enlighten me as to what he believes a substantial argument contrariwise might be, I should be very happy to try to meet it.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] said last Thursday that the State of Illinois had no such regulations whatsoever, either as to the primary elections or the general elections.

The Senator from South Dakota is well aware that the Senate had a very unhappy circumstance resulting from that, and perhaps other known defects of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which is now sought to be amended, in the case of Frank L. Smith, which is one of the cases which I had intended to discuss, and shall discuss later, relating to the right of the Senate to inquire about corrupt practices employed to secure nominations to the Senate. Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, one of my illustrious predecessors, offered the motion to investigate. As the Senator well knows, the inquiry was had, and it was found that Mr. Smith had received contributions in enormous amounts from, among others, the former utilities magnate, Samuel Insull; that Mr. Smith was nominated; and, on the face of the returns, apparently elected, although he was not seated in the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was about to conclude my remarks, but I think the points and the statements which the Senator from Missouri has made are very pertinent.

As to the reasons for Senators opposing the amendment, I am not advised. In general, I had understood there was a theory that State sovereignty might be involved; that the State had the right to establish its own method of choosing its nominees for the Senate. But that theory, of course, could be equally applicable to the election of Senators.

I think any position to the effect that the Senate does not have the right—either the moral right or the legal right—to go into the primary, overlooks the record of the fact that the Senate has, in the cases I have cited, the Vare case, the Smith case, and the Newberry case, made an examination into what happened in the primaries, and that it was on the basis of what happened in the primaries principally that the Senate created special committees, or took whatever action it did take.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is, of course, true that in some States nomination means election, so if we imposed the so-called Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as has been done in fiction, if not in fact, upon all States of the Union, is there any reason why in certain States, which have no reporting provisions—Illinois, for example, it not being a Southern State—candidates for the U.S. Senate should not divulge information to the public, so that the contributions to their campaigns may be subject to public knowledge and scrutiny? Thus it will be possible to determine the fitness of candidates for public office, and to determine the extent and nature of the support which candidates for office are getting. Such information may then be weighed as one factor—not necessarily the determining factor, but a factor—to enable the voters to make up their minds whom they want to have represent them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I see no reason why the law should not apply to both elections. In my State of South Dakota, there is a requirement for the disclosure of contributions and disbursements in primary elections, just as there is in the case of general elections.

I conclude by reiterating what Chief Justice White pointed out, that the argument that the powers of election and of nomination were separable and without relation was untenable; and with the conclusion of Governor Pinchot that even if there had been no fraud in an election, a man who is not honestly nominated cannot be honestly entitled to a seat.

Since the Senate has recognized that doctrine in the past by instituting tests and by coming to judgment upon evidence developed in connection with primary elections, it seems to me it would be most inconsistent and untenable for the Senate now to pass a so-called clean elections bill and not encompass primaries as well as general elections.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his very cogent and comprehensive presentation, which I think is invulnerable and, indeed, unassailable.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read, for the RECORD from an editorial which was published last week—on January 15—in the New York Times:

FIRST BUSINESS

The first major legislative business of the Senate in the present session is the bill to revise the antiquated campaign expenditures law, which in its essence has been on the books since 1925.

For years the hyprocrisy of the existing statute in the light of actual conditions has been apparent. Regularly, after each presidential election, the American public is duly shocked to learn that millions upon millions of scarcely controlled dollars have been spent by and on behalf of both parties—no one knows how much—and regularly there is a great fever to do something about it, a fever that lasts a few weeks or months before subsiding again into complacent normalcy. If the national figures who talk about morality and crusades would spend a little less time moralizing and a little more in giving hard political support to specific measures for reform of concrete political evils, our democratic institutions would be on firmer ground than they are.

One of these evils is the inadequacy of the laws governing campaign expenditures, now theoretically limited to a maximum of $25,000 for Senators, $5,000 for Representatives, and $3 million for interstate political committees. There is nothing inherently good in the fact that the actual amounts spent in many campaigns are much higher; but there is something inherently bad in a law that sets limitations so unrealistic that they are constantly evaded. Therefore the proposal to raise materially these limitations, and to provide for fuller publicity as to the sources of contributions, is sound.

The present bill is, however, inadequate on two main counts. One is that it does not apply to primaries, which in at least a fourth of the States are the equivalent of elections.

I may say that to remedy that condition is the purpose of the pending amendment.

I read further from the editorial:

The other is that it sets no limit on total contributions of one individual, providing for merely a $5,000 top to any single candidate or to any single committee.

Again I may say, Mr. President, that I propose to offer an amendment to cure that inadequacy. I offered such an amendment in the Committee on Rules and Administration, where I also offered the amendment which deals with primaries. The latter amendment was rejected by the committee, by a vote of five to four; and the bill was reported to the Senate without that amendment.

I read further from the editorial:

These deficiencies are serious; but a bill that included primaries would probably fail through the usual combination of conservative Republican and southern Democratic votes.

I say if this occurred, it would be a great tragedy. The Senate of the United States is not likely to have an opportunity to pass on legislation on this kind, character, and objective for a very long time. We have been trying to do so since I first introduced an elections bill in 1955. We had an elections bill on the calendar in the years 1955, 1957, and 1959, reported out of the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, we have not had an opportunity to pass on any bills relating to Federal elections since the enactment of the so-called Corrupt Practices Act in 1925.

For that reason I think the Senate has a clear, well-defined duty that is unmistakable, and not subject to a respectable difference of opinion, to see to it that the people have a right to know who

finances campaigns, whether they be primary campaigns or in general elections.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. In just 1 minute I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

For example, in the 1926 election in the State of Illinois, the late Samuel Insull, the largest manager and owner of public utility corporations in Illinois, contributed $125,000 to the campaign of Mr. Frank L. Smith for the U.S. Senate. Of course, those were 1926 dollars, not 1960 dollars. To say that Mr. Insull's interest was entirely that of good government in the broad sense I think would strain the imagination and credulity of any reasonable or experienced man, and of particularly the Members of this body, who have themselves been through primaries and general elections, and who know something of what is done behind the scenes, what is done under the table, what is done without benefit of light of day, who know about cash contributions which are offered by some persons who do not want their names published, for various reasons, and, indeed, some members of the underworld. It would be very embarrassing, indeed, for some candidates for office to have to list the names of some of their less respectable contributors; and it would be even more embarrassing to have to say that certain interests or certain individuals had contributed so substantially to the primary process, in order to enable the candidate to present himself in the general election for election to this body, it would be a matter of deep and grave concern, not only to that candidate, were he to accept such contributions, but it would be a matter of deep and grave concern to some of the donors who expect something in return, who are not, by and large, so public spirited in many instances—and I speak of the disproportionate contributions such as that of Mr. Insull in 1926, of the equivalent of something like $300,000 today, to nominate one man in the State of Illinois for the U.S. Senate.

Why in heaven's name, Mr. President, this question should have to be a matter of protracted consideration and debate, as it has been for many years, is beyond my simple understanding, unless, for reasons best known to ourselves, some Senators think that primaries are none of the people's business; that what happens in the primaries should not be known to the people of this country; that a man has a right by some magic or other, by the investiture of certain talents, powers, and gifts, to appear as a nominee on the ticket.

Now, Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my friend, the very able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my colleague from Missouri. When the Senator from Missouri was mentioning the fact that it may be a long time hence before, once again, the question of campaign financing comes before the U.S. Senate, I was moved to say to him that I think many of us realize this paramount question would not be here today if it were not for the persistent and tireless and indefatigable efforts of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my friend from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I salute him for his great contribution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I could not, however, quite associate myself with the suggestion that I have been tireless. This has been a long and unrewarding labor, with very few persons indicating any great interest or burning desire to help us reform ourselves and face up to the honest reality of political campaigning. I thank the Senator from Oregon, who has made many contributions along these lines, and who has, indeed, himself offered a bill which has very much merit. I should like to hear a further exposition of the Senator's bill as a part of the debate upon the pending amendment and subsequent amendments which some of us shall offer.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I assure the Senator from Missouri of my support for his dual effort, first to have primary elections brought within the scope of his bill, and, second, to establish an overall limitation on what any one individual can contribute to candidates or political groups in this country. I feel that the "dark continent" of American politics is the whole question of political campaign spending.

I have noted that a well-known author, William S. White, has declared that in a relatively small State it takes $100,000 to elect a U.S. Senator, and that in some of the great industrial States it takes a minimum of $1 million to elect a U.S. Senator.

In my own campaign in the State of Oregon in 1954, approximately $103,000 was spent on my campaign, and about $176,000 was spent on the campaign of my Republican opponent. In my opinion, both sums probably were somewhat too large.

It is my hope that eventually the time will come in the United States when no candidates for office will be dependent upon any benefactions from private sources, be they from persons engaged in industry and management or be they from trade unions.

I am sponsoring a bill, to which the Senator from Missouri very kindly referred, which is based on a special message to Congress by one of our greatest Presidents, a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, a half century ago. Even in that distant time, before the age of television and radio, Theodore Roosevelt was disturbed by the huge campaign benefactions of the type which the Senator from Missouri discussed, namely, the Insull contributions in Illinois. So Theodore Roosevelt proposed that the U.S. Government should finance political campaigns, to free all candidates from the potential servitude occasioned by being indebted to private sources.

I have introduced a bill in that respect. I shall not offer it as an amendment to the bill of the able Senator from Missouri, because I realize that an innovation of this sort, as to which no committee hearings have been held, would not receive the number of votes to which its serious purpose would entitle it, unless extensive committee hearings were able to be held.

I think the Senator from Missouri is probing at the very root of our political processes. There is a sort of double standard in American public life which I do not understand. Many people say that if the assistant to the President of the United States, for example, should receive a coat of vicuna cloth, the assistant to the President of the United States is perforce obligated to do some special interest mission for the person who gave the coat; or, if an assistant to another President of the United States should receive a Deepfreeze, let us say, that he is inescapably obligated to the giver of the Deepfreeze. However, nothing is said about the fact that a President of the United States himself may be obligated to oil companies or utility companies not for a coat or for a Deepfreeze, but for hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions. Evidently, no obligation runs from that.

I again want to compliment the Senator from Missouri. I assure the Senator of such support and influence as I can offer in his effort to tighten up the provisions of the law, to make them apply to primaries, to put an overall limit on what one person can give, and to otherwise contribute to the effectiveness of the legislation which the Senator is so ably sponsoring.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my good friend, the able and erudite Senator from Oregon, for his generous remarks.

I wonder if the Senator can tell me why there is such a reluctance on the part of the Members of the Senate to tell the people where they get the money to finance their campaigns. Is it that we hold ourselves above some of the other functions, agencies, and departments of the Federal Government? Is it because we think we are invested with some sacred immunity—some sacrosanct, above-the-law, above-the-common-experience, above-the-common-observation, cloak? Or is it simply a general idea that things have been going along pretty well as they are, that every one here has somehow been elected under the antiquated 1925 act, so why disturb things?

Why should we let a wave of apathy and indifference and opposition overwhelm any efforts whatsoever to do anything about this matter? We try to hold ourselves up to the world, and indeed as a body in the Senate we hold ourselves up to the American people, as being above the taint of corruption and influence and suggestion improperly conveyed and made, yet we are faced with an opportunity to do something about the situation and there is all this scrambling around in an effort to evade, to avoid, and to duck.

There is talk about invading the sovereignty of States and of State election officials and State commissioners. In regard to Illinois, the minority leader has told us there is no requirement whatsoever in that State, that one can do

exactly as he pleases in both the primary election and in the general election, without reporting to anybody at any time. Now there must be a report under the obsolete, antiquated, and shamefully ineffective, abused and violated, Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

There are many, indeed, who would be satisfied to go along with this hypocrisy and this nonsense, this making a pretext of filing reports under that act, knowing full well the act does not reach anybody at any time in any consequential or meaningful way.

So there has been no effort to do much about this, until rather recently.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To answer the question of the Senator from Missouri, I am afraid there is a slight tendency here to hold up higher standards for others than we have for ourselves. We often undertake to investigate various Federal officials, bureaus, and others to determine, for example, if they have accepted favors in the form of trips or entertainment or other benefactions. Yet at the same time there is a corresponding effort to conceal not the relatively small things, like some excursion, but the enormous campaign contributions which are often required to elect somebody to the U.S. Senate.

As John Selden said:

Preachers say, "Do as I say, not as I do."

Mr. HENNINGS. "Do as I say."

Mr. NEUBERGER. We have that practice in the Senate.

I feel that the bill presented by the Senator from Missouri offers all Members of the Senate an opportunity to end this hypocrisy.

Mr. HENNINGS. If we get down to it, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, it really resolves itself into an exceedingly simple ultimate question, does it not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It certainly does.

Mr. HENNINGS. The question is, Do we want the people to know what we are doing in order to be nominated and elected, or do we not want them to know?

By voting against this proposed amendment we shall in effect be saying, "This is none of the people's business." As Commodore Vanderbilt was once quoted as saying, although he said it in a different context, "The public be damned."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think—and I know the Senator from Missouri, as his action demonstrates, also thinks—that the American public has a right to know about funds which are invested in electing the officials who are elected to govern them. That is the key of the issue before us today.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator mentioned another thing, Mr. President, which I believe is very important; that is, the undertaking of a candidate to raise funds for his nomination and for his election should he be nominated.

I individually have always felt considerable embarrassment in that process. I have been nominated six times and have been elected six times to office, five of those times being election to the House and to the Senate. It has always seemed to me that when a man gives a very substantial amount, unless he is a man who is of considerable means and is highly public spirited, or a man who is a great believer in his party and who wishes to augment and increase his party's representation in the Congress, his action should be carefully scrutinized. There are many contributions offered. Some are refused, I am sure, by many Senators. I refer especially to the instance regarding the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] known to all of us, when a campaign contribution was offered to him and refused by him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We all recall that episode.

Mr HENNINGS. We recall that. We recall the Senator's embarrassment. We recall his forthright honesty in presenting the matter to the Senate at the time of consideration of some proposed legislation of vital importance to many Members, and indeed to the whole country.

The process of trying to raise money for campaigns I think does lead us to a conclusion, ultimately, that while the country at this time may not be quite ready for what the learned Senator from Oregon has suggested, sooner or later that may be the point at which we will arrive. It may be necessary to do so, so that men will enter this and other legislative bodies free from any suggestion of taint or corruption or influence, as these factors may affect their decisions on matters relating to the welfare of the country at large.

I may say to the Senator that my own thinking on the matter, as we have been trying to set the figures, has been that we should attempt to set the amount as realistically as possible, to try to keep the funds allowed somewhat in relation to the demands of modern campaigning, with modern media, involving increased costs since 1925, and such cognate things.

However, we are still confronted with the very deep—and I think distressing—moral problem of the extent to which a candidate for office, a nominee for office, or an officeholder is under obligation to some of his contributors if that obligation to his contributors or the interests of some of his contributors is in conflict with what his conscience tells him to be the public interest and the public welfare.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it is signficant, in connection with the very point raised by the Senator from Missouri, that more than half a century ago Theodore Roosevelt faced this problem. The reason I emphasize the long hiatus since then is the fact that, in 1907, a political campaign cost only a fraction of what it costs today. An entire campaign could be financed for what one major network television broadcast costs a political committee today; yet even in that bygone era, Theodore Roosevelt was highly alarmed and disturbed over the huge campaign contributions on which candidates for the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, and both Houses of Congress were then relying. In his opinion, the only ultimate solution was Federal financing of the campaigns, to free candidates from all dependence on campaign contributions. Unless we enact legislation of the sort advocated by the Senator from Missouri, with the tightening amendments proposed by him and some of his colleagues, we shall hasten the time when Theodore Roosevelt's proposal will become effective, when no private campaign contributions will be permitted.

Again I compliment the Senator from Missouri for the great and persistent leadership he has shown in this important effort in the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my good friend from Oregon very much for his generosity. No one ever does anything alone. I have received a great deal of help from the staff and from other Senators on various phases of this problem over the years. I hope that some of this work may be reflected when we come to vote upon some of the amendments which would tend to make elections more honest and to make it easier for office holders to be more forthright and considerate, in the objective sense, of the public interest.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to express a brief concluding thought with respect to Theodore Roosevelt's proposal, which is embodied in the proposed legislation which I have introduced.

Some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle express great alarm and abhorrence over contributions made to Democrats from the political-action funds of trade unions. Conversely, many Democrats voice anxiety over contributions made to Republican officeholders by those who are leaders in management and big business. If the proposal of Theodore Roosevelt were law, there would be no such big contributions, either from labor unions or from big business. Both such reliances would be wiped out, and all officeholders would enter upon their offices on equal footing, with no obligations either to labor or to management, which might possibly conflict with their public responsibility.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator very much for his able and illuminating contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that I have offered an amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I understand that the Senator's amendment is the pending amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was hopeful that the Senator would be able to agree to that amendment, requiring that primaries actually shall be held by both major parties.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would say that I do not know that I would have the authority to agree to any amendment. I do not run the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator could accept my amendment as a modification of his amendment. I was hopeful that the Senator would see fit to accept my amendment to his amendment, which would require that primaries shall be held in all States.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask this question of the Senator? If the Senator's

amendment were accepted, would the Senator vote for the amendment I have offered relating to primaries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be strongly inclined to vote for it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator from Louisiana vote for it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be constrained to vote for it.

Mr. HENNINGS. "Constrained" is a very fancy word. Would the Senator vote for it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would expect to vote for it; yes. It is for that reason that I inquire the Senator's attitude toward my amendment. If it is to be resisted, I may not insist on it at this time, and let the Senator's amendment come to a vote first. However, it did seem to me that if we wished to regulate primaries we should require that all States hold them. I would therefore inquire of the Senator if he would accept my amendment to his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. That presents an entirely new question, of course, because the Senator did not suggest his amendment to the committee at the time the bill was reported. I am a little surprised that the Senator from Louisiana should offer his amendment, because the Senator is well known for his position relating to so-called States' rights and primary elections. Would the Senator go a step further and say that the Federal Government should prescribe the manner and means by which the State elections should be held? As I understood the Senator's amendment——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I have made my position clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was here when the Senator stated his position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be constrained to go along with the amendment the Senator has offered if my amendment were accepted, to require that all States hold primary elections—that is, by the major parties—as my amendment would provide. I was hopeful that the Senator from Missouri would be able to accept the amendment to the amendment which he has offered. I did not know that his amendment was a committee amendment. Is it a committee amendment?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; it is not a committee amendment. It reflects the thinking of four members of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that the Senator could accept my amendment to his amendment. If he could not accept it, I would be reluctant to insist upon it at this time. I would rather wait to see what happens to his amendment. However, I thought it might be clear that it would be fair that some of those who would like to regulate primary elections would be willing also to submit to primary elections. That might be a fair premise, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Louisiana is well aware that the amendment contains a provision relating to caucuses and conventions, as well as referring to primaries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; a person named by a caucus or convention has hardly any expense, and in many instances the expense is only negligible. In most instances there is very little expense involved to a person nominated in that fashion, particularly if he has the support of the choice of the convention for the governorship. If the nominee for Governor supports a person for the nomination for Senator in a caucus or convention, there may be no expense at all to the person nominated for the Senate.

If we are to have the Federal Government regulate primary elections, it might be well to require that there be primaries. In that way the democratic process would be followed. I would hope that the Senator would accept the amendment which I have offered to his amendment. If he cannot accept it, I may not insist upon it at this time. I would rather withdraw it to see what the result of the vote on his amendment may be.

Mr. HENNINGS. To borrow the Senator's phrase, I am constrained to say that I cannot accept the amendment as such, because the amendment would seem to me to limit the States with respect to their internal systems of the nominating processes. At this time I would think it unwise to say that a State which holds a convention or a caucus for the nomination of candidates must necessarily be driven to hold primaries, as well, although there are very few States that do not have primaries.

Mr. LONG. The Senator cannot agree to accept my amendment at this time. Therefore, I will ask to withdraw my amendment to the Senator's amendment, and reserve the right to offer the amendment as an amendment to the bill in the event the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has that right. I do not feel that I have a right to accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment to the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. HENNINGS. At this time I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the action of the Senator from Louisiana in withdrawing his proposed amendment to the amendment makes unnecessary some of the observations which I wished to make in opposition to his amendment. However, he has raised an argument which I believe should be met in part in the general outline and context of his remarks.

The argument has been raised that the amendment in chief, of which the Senator from Missouri and I are the authors, would apply unfairly to certain States, because they do have primaries, while other States do not. I apprehend that the Senator from Louisiana would still be opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I missed some of what the learned Senator said.

I assume the Senator has made the point, or intends to make the point further, of our learned friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, that the essence of the bill, in its primary ingredients, is in terms of the importance of reporting moneys received, moneys used, and the source of those moneys. I am not deeply concerned whether a State has a primary election or a convention. We have tried to keep the bill within certain boundaries and limitations, so as not to make it the subject of all manner of oblique and irrelevant attacks upon it.

I think it is very important that we bear in mind that truth telling concerning sources and amounts contributed is what we are really seeking to accomplish. I would even be willing, were it not for the fact that I do not think the public mind might be quite conditioned to it at this time, to raise the ceilings even more than we have, assuming that everything is reported. That is the basis of the proposed legislation and the philosophy behind it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that sooner or later the Federal Government must and will approach adoption of the type of suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I believe if that is done, it will have to be done on the basis of reimbursing candidates for their actual expenditures in campaigns, and with some relation to the vote which a candidate receives in an election.

It is my attitude, based on what I have seen in politics over a period of years, that whether or not such reporting is required, it will not be possible to eliminate the effect resulting from campaign contributions. It is the attitude of some of us—certainly it is my attitude—that the way to get away from the influence which follows contributions to political campaigns is to work out, eventually, a system whereby the Government will pay the necessary expenditures of those who offer themselves for office.

I have not had a chance to study the Neuberger bill. I have some ideas about how the same purpose might be accomplished from a different approach. It seems to me, however, that if we begin to regulate primary elections, it will be well to require such regulation in all States; but I do not care to insist upon it at this time, in view of the fact that there is strong sentiment in the Senate that we should not undertake to regulate primaries at all.

Frankly, I find the problem to be not so much the reporting of money, but more a question of how to get it so as to run for office. It has been my experience that money has been extremely hard to get in order to enable one to run in a Democratic primary. I cannot

speak of Republican primaries, because I have had no experience with them.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Louisiana knows that his own distinguished father was involved in a contest with the late Senator Overton.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He was involved in a contest as counsel for the late Senator Overton, whose election was investigated.

Mr. HENNINGS. The only point I wished to make relating to that incident was that the Senate took recognition of the fact that it had jurisdiction over a primary election. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To investigate it, yes. Of course, as the Senator from Missouri knows, the Senate can investigate anything. We have committees which have investigated baseball, football, juvenile delinquency, and everything else under the sun.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the Reorganization Act was passed, the Senate had a standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was composed of some 18 members. That committee was confined to and had as its purpose the investigation of contested elections, expulsions, and matters relating to Federal elections. The Senator is well aware of the fact that among the precedents there are many, such as the case of Heflin against Bankhead, and the case of the able Senator's distinguished father versus Senator John H. Overton, relating to matters occurring in the Louisiana primary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe the Senator from Missouri will find that that happened to be an election in which my father was a candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The election to which the Senator from Missouri refers was one in which John Overton was a candidate. If I might be permitted to relate an incident in that connection, without trespassing unduly on the time of the Senator from New York, I should like to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Any incident which the Senator from Louisiana relates will be of interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to note, in connection with that election, that Senator Overton had previously been a candidate for election to the Senate, prior to the time when Huey Long was Governor of Louisiana.

There is a story told about it. Although I was not of an age at the time to know much about it, I have heard the story.

It seems that when Senator Overton ran the first time, he received a pitiful number of votes in New Orleans. That accounted for his defeat. To show his gratitude for the few voters who voted for him in New Orleans, the late Senator Overton went to New Orleans and inserted an advertisement in the newspapers inviting as his guests the relatively few persons who had voted for him. Unfortunately, there was some misunderstanding, because thousands of people showed up. The hotel simply did not have the accommodations to make it possible to handle so large a number of persons.

A subsequent election, the one to which the Senator from Missouri makes reference, was, I believe, one of the few times that the Old Regular organization in New Orleans supported the same candidate supported by my father. They did not support Huey Long for office, but they did support Senator Overton in that election. So on that occasion it was the time for the other side to complain about what happened in the city of New Orleans. I do not believe there was ever a moment's question that Senator Overton had received a very substantial majority, and that if there had been any irregularities in the election, they were more than overshadowed by the very large majority that he achieved in the particular election.

However, the junior Senator from Louisiana has always had the feeling that those who criticized events that happened in his father's time in Louisiana, should also direct attention to what the other fellow was doing at the same time. For example, when Huey Long ran for Governor for the first time, in the great city of New Orleans he received, I believe, only about 12,000 votes out of the large number cast. Fantastically, he was greeted by large and enthusiastic crowds; yet in the returns he had very few votes in New Orleans, although elsewhere he received a large majority. I have seen that type of thing happen.

I have always thought that one of the largest contributing factors to the death of my father was the elimination of the poll tax which he fought to achieve. It doubled the number of electors. This, I believe, contributed to his assassination in that a large number of people felt that he would be in office as long as he cared to run, once the number of electors in the State of Lousiana had been doubled.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has noticed, although he does not consider himself to be equal in ability to his late father, that his own majorities have exceeded the total vote which his father received in elections, whenever his father stood for office. If Huey Long had lived to run for office after the poll tax was eliminated, his majorities would have been far greater than mine.

Mr. HENNINGS. The junior Senator from Louisiana is a worthy successor to any Senator Louisiana has ever had, in my opinion. As the Senator well knows, I do not mention this except to indicate that even in the Southern States contestants have submitted themselves to the Senate in matters relating to primaries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt whatever that Congress has the right to regulate primary elections. There is no doubt in my mind that Congress has the power to regulate primary elections for Senator or Congressman in the greatest detail, if Congress wishes to do so. In appropriate cases I favor it. As a matter of fact, I am a cosponsor of a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax——

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure he is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For primary elections, as well as in the general election, for the election of Members of Congress.

Mr. HENNINGS. Being the able lawyer that he is, the Senator from Louisiana does not take the position that any requirement of the reporting of the financing of primary elections is unconstitutional, does he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. It is only my position that if that is to be done——

Mr. HENNINGS. If that is to be done, the Senator from Louisiana would have it established as a matter of policy, not a matter of constitutionality; is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. It is my point of view that if we are to do that—if we are to regulate primaries—it might be well actually to require that there be primary elections. That was the basis on which I offered my amendment to the pending amendment.

In Louisiana, one who wishes to run for election to be Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives pays a $500 qualifying fee, which assures that his name will be placed on the ballot, even though there is no assurance that he will receive any votes.

It seemed to me, and it still does, that usually the candidates of one of the major parties are almost certain to be elected, in most States. I cannot speak of all the States; but I know that in most States the candidates of the major parties are the ones who are most likely to be elected.

So it seemed to me that there should be an opportunity for the people and for the members of the parties to vote as to whom the candidates should be. I am not insisting on the adoption of that amendment; and the Senator from Missouri and I may not agree about it; however if his amendment is adopted, I would like to have my amendment to it adopted, as a part of the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Louisiana is aware that this is a reporting amendment, and it would relate to primaries, conventions, and caucuses. So they have been contemplated and taken into consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the point I had in mind, in connection with the reporting part of the process, is that if we take first things first, then we should first require that there be an election, if we are to require that someone report his costs in an election.

In the case of party caucuses, in many instances there is no expense whatever for the candidates. In many instances, in States where the caucus and convention system prevails, a strong candidate for election to be Governor in a position to determine who will go on the party's ticket with him.

But on the other hand, there may be other persons who, if they had an opportunity to submit themselves in a primary election, might be successful.

Mr. HENNINGS. And the Senator from Louisiana thinks, does he, that the Empire State of the Union has not quite enough democracy at this point—in other words, not enough public participation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not quite say that. I imagine New York State probably has too much Republicanism at the present time. [Laughter.]

But, if we are going to regulate primaries, I feel that it would be desirable to require that primaries be held.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In connection with their colloquy, I merely wish to join in sharing the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] about the great merit of our friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who differs with me in regard to the desirability of adoption of the pending amendment and also his amendment to the pending amendment. However, all the Members of this body hold in the highest regard the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, who certainly is the peer of any Senator who in the past has represented the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Louisiana, in advancing his contention, overlooks the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, on behalf of himself and myself, covers not only primaries but also "a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates."

In my case, I was not only the selection of the great Governor of the great State of New York. In addition, the only avowed candidate for election to the U.S. Senate who at that time had announced his candidacy was apparently convinced that the junior Senator from New York was a deserving young man, and was so kind as to nominate the junior Senator from New York in the convention. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana has laid great stress upon the views of the Governor of one of the States that does not have a primary for the selection of a candidate for election to membership in the U.S. Senate; but I assure him that more than that is required in order for one to be nominated to run for election to the U.S. Senate. The delegates to the convention which is held in the State of New York—and a few other States have this system—were chosen by the Republicans, in primary elections throughout the State, to represent them at that convention.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and myself would cover the activities of that convention, just as it would cover matters connected with primaries in other States, wherever primaries are held, and where that method of choosing such candidates is used.

The important point is to assure that all methods of selecting nominees are covered; and this seems to me to be of particular importance in the case of the States in which victory in the primary or in the party caucus or in the party convention—whatever method is used—is tantamount to election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from New York for the very fine compliment he paid me. Let me state that I have the greatest admiration for the Senator from New York and for his service in this body.

I wish to ask him whether, as a practical matter, the situation in his State is somewhat the way the situation is in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, in that when a candidate for Governor is selected, and when one person is to be chosen as a candidate for his ticket, from that point forward the candidate for Governor can fairly well determine whom he wants to go on the ticket with him.

Mr. KEATING. I must respond in that connection, because, apparently, my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, did not follow very closely the campaign in New York in the fall of 1958. What he has just referred to was one of the issues in that campaign. The candidate for reelection as Governor, who was chosen by the party of the Senator from Louisiana, selected as his choice for his running mate someone other than the man who eventually was nominated. The convention did not agree with the Democratic candidate for Governor and picked another man.

It so happened that, happily, in my case the convention agreed with the candidate for Governor; and throughout the election, a beautiful, tranquil relationship existed between the junior Senator from New York and the Governor of New York, whereas on the other side, unhappily for them, that did not occur. So it does not always take place.

So in New York the candidate for election to the U.S. Senate is separately selected by the convention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been the experience of the junior Senator from Louisiana, at the only convention he ever attended, where a candidate was to be picked—and it was a convention to select a candidate for election as President—that once the Democratic candidate is nominated, he can usually determine who will go on the ticket, for election as Vice President.

It seems to me that in most instances when a Governor is being selected for a party ticket, it would be the rule, rather than the exception, that the candidate for Governor could, if he wished to do so, determine who would go on the ticket with him.

Mr. KEATING. Let me put it in this way: If I were seeking the office of U.S. Senator, I would like to have the support of the Governor, and I would like to be on the ticket with him. In most instances it would be desirable to have action taken in accordance with the Governor's desires, I would think.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under the convention system there would not be the opportunity for the public to participate that there would be under the primary system.

I concede that many people who qualify for election to office have no business qualifying to begin with.

Mr. KEATING. Yes, under any system; it is impossible to devise a system to protect against that situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it seems to me that it would be desirable for a candidate to offer himself for selection under the primary system.

Mr. KEATING. I think it is open to anyone in the State of New York, just as it is in the State of Louisiana, which has primaries. It is open to anyone to offer himself for office, for the Senate or any other office. Such candidates are not even required to put up any money. They can just say, "I am a candidate." If they can get a majority of the delegates to support them, they are in the clear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could the Senator inform me as to whether in many instances there is any great cost incident to being selected under a convention system? Do candidates spend a lot of money for the selection, or is the cost nominal?

Mr. KEATING. I would say the cost is normally less than that in a primary. If a person is an avowed candidate for the nomination of his party for the U.S. Senate, let us say—and parenthetically I should say I am not speaking of candidates for Members of the House of Representatives; I am speaking now of only candidates in New York for the Senate who are selected by convention—and if a number are seeking that nomination, they must spend substantial amounts of money in seeking support. I would say, in all fairness, that, generally speaking, the amount spent would be less than what would be spent in a primary.

I personally think that the decision as to whether nominees should be selected by primary or convention or caucus, or whatever other manner, is something which the State legislatures should decide, rather than Congress. I feel that the bill which is before the Senate, Mr. President, would be sadly deficient if each procedure for picking candidates were not covered by what we are calling here, or what has been called, a clean elections bill.

I should like to point out also that this amendment is pertinent and important for those States where nomination does not mean automatic victory on election day. Congress has just as firm an obligation to fix the guidelines and prescribe the limitations on the manner in which nominees for Federal office are picked in those States as in those jurisdictions where nomination means election.

In other words, if we are going to set forth limitations on the process of selecting candidates for President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, or Representative, we should not do a halfway job. The law must apply to the whole electoral process, and it must apply to the so-called one-party and the so-called two-party States.

Whether nomination of a Federal candidate means he is a "shoo-in" on election day or means he must then face a

campaign against the opponent of another political party—such as described by my friend from Louisiana, with, I am afraid, a certain exaggerated degree of hyperbole—we have an obligation to set up certain rules and regulations about the manner in which each is selected. Abuse of power or misuse of funds in primary, caucus, or convention of either party weakens the whole structure of the electoral process.

If we are going to call this a clean elections bill—and that is the phrase having such wide circulation—we should make it worthy of the name. A half-hearted job will not do. Only by including within its purview primaries, caucuses, and conventions can we achieve a goal of fairness and equity in choosing federally elected officers.

I would remind the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other Senators who oppose this amendment that the concept of States rights is a many-splendored thing. However, he would seem to wish to make it a many-splintered thing, particularly in the case of the State of New York. It happens that New York is a politically spacious State, where we have ample room for differences of opinion. The primary, we feel, is not the sole and sacred way of forming or recording that difference of opinion, and I think New York, just as should Louisiana, should have the decision in the matter.

In New York, nominating conventions are the avenues of selection, and they are broad thoroughfares open to those with conflicting opinions. They are not one-way streets that lead unfailingly to victory.

I can testify to that most persuasively, Mr. President. In New York, to be nominated for Congress means only that one gets to play in the big November game. In Louisiana, if one is nominated on the ticket of the Senator from Louisiana, it means that he has already won the game and he can already start wearing his varsity letter. So there is that difference between the two States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know the Senator really believes that; otherwise, he would not say it. But let me tell the Senator that whenever a popular Republican candidate for President heads the ticket which carries the Senator's State, if one is running for the House or the Senate in my State, he would be unwise to take his election as a foregone conclusion. The junior Senator from Louisiana recalls that in a presidential election some years back, the Republican opponent got 25 or 26 percent of the votes.

Mr. KEATING. That is amazing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. His Democratic opponent in the following election got 29 percent, which was not a lot more than the Republican opponent had received. That being the case, it would seem that one should be cautious. In fact, I would caution against a person's believing that the citizens of Southern States are above voting for Republican candidates.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator means below, does he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana had assured his little daughter in the last presidential election, that although President Eisenhower would carry the Nation, he would not carry Louisiana. She could not understand, the next day, how her father could have been wrong. I had to tell her there was no doubt that was what happened. I was satisfied President Eisenhower had carried Louisiana, and by about 40,000 votes.

Mr. KEATING. But no Republican candidate for the Senate or the House was elected from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There were few running on the ballot that same day. Every now and then a good Republican candidate comes along and gets a very respectable vote.

Mr. KEATING. I do not want to embarrass my friend by asking who a good Republican candidate would be in Louisiana. I am very glad President Eisenhower carried Louisiana. I hope the next candidate from my party will be strong enough to carry Louisiana.

I think the junior Senator from Louisiana will not be a candidate in 1960. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Well, then, I would hope that some of the candidates for Congress from Louisiana will be elected from the Republican ticket. It would be a very healthy thing, in my judgment. Undoubtedly my friend will differ with me, but, in general parlance, I think Louisiana is generally considered a one-party State, and all of the Representatives in Congress now are Members of the Senator's party. We hope that may be changed in the future.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to recommend that there be no change in the present Louisiana delegation. I think the State is very well represented at this time. But some of the Members of Congress from that State can point out to the Senator that they have had very serious opposition from Republican candidates in recent years; I would say in the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the illumination from the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, but I must impress upon him, in the light of some of the statements which he made about the procedures in the State of New York, that the candidates for the Senate in that State may come from smoke-filled rooms or non-smoke-filled rooms, but that is only a point of departure. Those candidates must then be nominated actually in convention. They must after that stalk like hopeful gladiators into the area of popular selection. Their victory or defeat is at the whim—in New York, of course, the educated and informed whim—of the convention delegates. These delegates who select the candidates did not wander in accidentally, nor were they culled like flowers all of one party shade and one party aroma. They are literally the voices of the constituents.

I can assure the Senator that whether it be a Democratic or Republican convention, the unanimity of delegates, or close to unanimity, is music to the ears of the man who has to fight his way into an election, rather than shadow box his way there.

To the argument that primaries are outside the scope of our legitimate interest, I draw attention to the genesis of the Hatch Act, a most significant and far-reaching piece of legislation which, according to its history, seems to have been born out of a primary contest between two of our former colleagues, Alben Barkley and Gov. A. B. "Happy" Chandler of Kentucky.

According to the allegations, we had the situation of a massed battle in the great heroic tradition, with Federal employees on the Barkley firing line, according to Mr. Chandler, and the Chandler minutemen of State employees, striking and sparring for their Governor, by the claim of Mr. Barkley.

I do not seek to pass upon the merits of those claims, but I am informed that this was the great confrontation which gave rise to the writing of the Hatch Act, so that we are on firm historical ground, buttressed by a sound precedent, in this attempt to create legislation which is responsive to actual conditions rather than to traditional emotions.

It seems that during June of 1938 a series of articles dealing extensively with conditions in the Kentucky primary, written by one of the staff writers for a prominent press association, was published. In these articles the writer alleged that undue political activities in the WPA in Kentucky had taken place on behalf of Senator Barkley, the candidate in that primary for the Democratic nomination to the U.S. Senate.

A press release containing a résumé of all these charges—22 of them in all—prepared in the form of individual paragraphs and a reply to each, by Mr. Harry Hopkins, was issued by the WPA in Washington, June 30, 1938.

The dates of all of these events in 1938 are significant in the light of what I shall come to in a moment. Mr. Hopkins denied all but two of these charges, admitting the correctness of these two.

In July of 1938 the committee decided to send a representative to Kentucky in connection with these charges and the replies by Mr. Hopkins. The committee's representative and the staff assisting him, after investigation, made a report sustaining the staff writer in a majority of the charges, and concurring with Mr. Hopkins in four instances. The findings of the committee's investigator in reference to these charges indicated solicitation of WPA employees and officials for contributions to the campaign funds of candidate Barkley and a systematic canvassing of WPA employees as to preference in the race for the Democratic senatorial nomination. These activities, so far as solicitations were concerned, were carried on mainly by private parties not connected with the WPA but in some instances by WPA officials.

While the committee's investigator was in Kentucky, charges came to his attention regarding the solicitation and receipt by the campaign committee of Governor Chandler, candidate for the Democratic senatorial nomination, of contributions in behalf of his campaign from State employees whose salaries were

derived partly or wholly from Federal funds. Certain other charges were presented to the committee's investigator while in Kentucky relative to the solicitation by private citizens of Federal employees in behalf of the campaign committees for candidate Barkley.

The committee sustained many of these charges. The committee sustained the charge that the campaign committee of candidate Chandler received contributions as the result of solicitations for contributions from State employees who were receiving salaries from funds derived wholly or in part from the Treasury of the United States. The findings of the committee, based on the evidence before it, showed that the amount received for Governor Chandler's campaign, from State employees whose salaries had been partly or wholly derived from funds paid by the Federal Government, was roughly $70,000.

The findings of the committee, based on the evidence before it, also showed that subscriptions intended for candidate Barkley's campaign committees were made not only by employees of the WPA in Kentucky, but also by employees in this State of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Accounts of the Treasury Department, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, and the Federal Housing Administration, amounting to about $24,000 in all. In other words, the committee sustained in part the charges of both of these candidates.

I wish to emphasize at this point that in a later part of the report about the matter the committee did have more to say, lest there be any misunderstanding. Again I reiterate that the merits of this controversy are not so important as the precedent which it created.

In response to questionnaires of the Sheppard committee, Senator Barkley stated that he had not used any public funds or political patronage in behalf of his campaign for nomination or election to the Senate, and that no public funds or political patronage had been used to his knowledge by others in behalf of his nomination or election to the Senate. In fact, the committee found nothing to show that Senator Barkley had any knowledge of any activity by persons soliciting contributions from Federal employees in his behalf, or of political activity within the ranks of the WPA personnel in his interests. The committee found, therefore, no basis upon which to recommend any challenge to the right of Senator Barkley to take the seat to which he had been elected.

In January 1939 the Sheppard Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures and Use of Governmental Funds reported that sufficient misuse of Federal relief funds had been shown to prompt them to make certain recommendations. On the next day after the Sheppard committee had reported, Senator Hatch introduced two bills, which he later incorporated into a single bill, introduced on March 20, 1939. This bill subsequently was enacted and became known as the Hatch Act. In other words, the entire history of that transaction shows that the genesis of the Hatch Act, which bars political activity by Federal employees, arose out of a primary contest. Certainly there is legislative precedent for the contention that the Congress is and should be as much concerned with primary elections of Federal officials as with general elections.

I served in the House of Representatives for several sessions on the committee appointed every 2 years, known as the Committee on Campaign Expenditures, which is a slight misnomer. Actually we usually did not investigate expenditures so much as various irregularities charged by one side or the other in a campaign. A number of our hearings and the evidence we took all over the country in various years as the result of allegations of irregularities had to do with primaries.

I remember very well an investigation which we made in North Carolina, with respect to which I shall not go into detail now; but there was no question that our jurisdiction over primaries was accepted by everyone, and there is a clear basis for the action.

Mr. President, power of Congress to regulate elections has been compared, in some of the precedents, to the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. There are some incidents of interstate commerce over which, of course, the Congress has plenary control—for example, when the subject matter is one of national interest, requiring a uniform rule. This means, for example, that Congress could require that all interstate trains comply with certain safety regulations, but it does not mean that Congress could compel a trucking company to go into the railroad business. That is the basic distinction between the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to the Hennings-Keating amendment, and the Hennings-Keating amendment itself.

If the States wish to stay out of the primary field, that is their right, and no act of Congress can properly alter that situation. But if the Congress decides that candidates in a primary for election to the Senate or the House shall disclose where their campaign contributions come from, and the amount of them, and that they shall not exceed a certain amount, certainly Congress has the power to do so.

Despite the concession by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that in his opinion Congress does have a constitutional power to legislate in this field, his feeling being that Congress should not do so, there is a body of opinion—judging from some discussions in the cloakrooms and elsewhere—which raises the question as to whether or not Congress can constitutionally act in this field. I wish to address myself briefly to that argument.

The argument that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act cannot constitutionally be made applicable to primary elections is contrary to reason and precedent. Whatever doubt there may have once been on this issue has been laid to rest by a line of Supreme Court decisions starting in 1941 recognizing that the selection of candidates for Federal office is an integral part of the elections process and is subject to Federal limitations. I must say that any other rule would make a mockery of regulation in the large number of States in which the primary determines the outcome of the election, and in all States in which candidates are chosen by vote would ignore a vital part of the election process. Can anyone doubt that corruption in a primary contest can impair the integrity of the election itself and undermine the free choice of the electorate?

The power of Congress to legislate on this subject derives primarily from the provisions of article 1, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4, of the Constitution provides:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof.

These sections have been described as an arsenal of power ample to protect congressional elections from any and all forms of pollution. If they are not broad enough to deal with integral steps in the election process, then the Constitution itself is inadequate to the task. Happily, the courts have not found such a defect in our fundamental law.

The leading case in point is *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299 (1941). In that case, the Supreme Court upheld an indictment against the commissioners of elections in the great State of Louisiana which charged that they willfully altered and falsely counted the ballots cast in a primary election to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for Representative in Congress. I might add that in 1941 our distinguished friend from Louisiana was virtually in knickers. I am just stating a historical precedent. It happened to be in Louisiana. We have had violations of law in the State of New York, also. The Court pointed out that in Louisiana interference with the right to vote in the Democratic primary is an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance. Such interference, the Court held, could be constitutionally proscribed by the Congress.

The majority opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in the Classic case answers virtually every argument that has been raised. I highly commend it to any of my colleagues who have even the slightest doubt on the legal merits of the amendment proposed. Let me quote just

a few short passages from the opinion to demonstrate how directly and eloquently it covers the subject:

That the free choice by the people of representatives in Congress was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted. We cannot regard it as any the less the constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privileges in the absence of congressional action, changes the mode of choice from a single step, a general election, to two, of which the first is the choice at a primary of those candidates from whom, as a second step, the representative in Congress is to be chosen at the election.

Or let us consider this passage:

Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representative by the people has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of elections, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4 includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Or finally:

It is hardly the performance of the judicial function to construe a statute, which in terms protects a right secured by the Constitution, here the right to choose a representative in Congress, as applying to an election whose only function is to ratify a choice already made at the primary, but as having no application to the primary which is the only effective means of choice.

To these decisions and to these quotations I say "amen." Let us not be so foolish as to make the mistake the judges avoided. We have got to come to grips with the facts and not be misled by fanciful theories and unreal distinctions. This bill does not deserve to be called "a clean elections bill" as long as it leaves the primaries unscrubbed.

Back in 1957 the committee of which my distinguished friend from Missouri is now chairman and was chairman then, reported a bill to the Senate which included primaries. That bill was never scheduled for action, but in the report accompanying the bill the committee pointed out that under some of the other precedents which at present to a significant degree regulate primaries, the law prohibits national banks, corporations, and labor organizations making contributions or making expenditures in connection with the election of any Federal candidate. The committee said:

The language of this statute explicitly includes primary elections and political conventions and caucuses. Again, the prohibition of individual campaign contributions in excess of $5,000 for a candidate or political committee during 1 calendar year comprises not only elections but also nominations. Finally, the general language of these statutes which prohibits a Member of Congress from soliciting or accepting money from Federal employees carries the strong implication at least that primaries are within the purview of this prohibition, and this broad interpretation was adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States in *U.S.* v. *Wurzbach*, in 280 U.S.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a direct legislative precedent for regulating political expenditures "in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus."

Certainly those who have laid down this provision in the Taft-Hartley Act for one segment of our economy cannot be heard to say that the Congress of the United States is not interested in the conduct of primary elections, or that some different rule shall apply where some other situation is presented.

The committees of Congress charged with the function have never hesitated to inquire into irregularities in primaries, as I mentioned a moment ago, as well as in the general election, in judging the qualifications of Members under challenge.

As I indicated earlier, the Classic case has been consistently followed in a host of cases involving discrimination or inequality in primary elections; cases such as *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649 (1944); *Chapman* v. *King*, 154 F. 2d 460 (5th Cir. 1946), cert. denied, 327 U.S. 800 (1946); and *Terry* v. *Adams*, 345 U.S. 461 (1953).

The law on this subject is well settled. It is plain to see for anyone who does not view the matter through a clouded looking glass. Law and reason combine in this situation to make an overwhelming case for approval of this amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that the pending bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation which is likely to come before us at this session. I am really dismayed at the apparent public apathy concerning the bill. We know that everyone wants clean elections. However, many people apparently are indifferent to the great opportunity which this measure represents to help achieve that goal.

Of course, there is not anything we do here in a legislative way which is going to be perfect or going to take care of every situation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator made the observation that this will not be perfect legislation, if it is adopted, even if it is amended to the ultimate extent that some of us would like to see it amended.

I would say to my distinguished colleague that it cannot be emphasized too strongly that this is probably the last time for many years that a bill will be available to this body which will attempt to do anything about the election process and the regulation and the reporting of contributions.

I am especially pleased that the Senator has made a scholarly approach to this matter in a lawyerlike fashion in referring to the Classic case, which utterly demolishes any contention that legislation relating to primary contributions in reporting is unconstitutional or that primaries are not a part of the election process.

We know that things do happen in primaries, as they happen in general elections, of which the public has the right to possess full knowledge. I think the Senator from New York will agree that it will be a shameful thing if the U.S. Senate goes on record by telling the American people that we do not think they should know anything about contributions and their sources and amounts in primary elections.

We like to go about the world setting ourselves up and holding ourselves up before others as having a standard of government and a form of government under a free electorate; as being governed by the people in democratic elections, under a republican form of government; and still we ourselves, right here, in what so many people think of and describe as the greatest deliberative body in the world, do nothing about this matter, and let it go by default, either through indifference or through failure to face up to the facts of life.

Contributions are something to which the public has every right to know about. The courts have so held and, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, there are innumerable precedents in the Senate itself, when the Senate has taken jurisdiction of primary election contests. Those precedents would seem to demolish effectively any argument on that point, unless there are matters of policy involved, which is an entirely different thing. Certainly on the legal and constitutional basis, there is no other side.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate those remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I do not see how anyone who votes against this amendment can explain his action. Of course, it is not up to me to try to explain someone else's vote; I am answerable only to my own conscience, as is the Senator from Missouri to his. But I agree with him that the people of the United States want to have the bill apply just as much to primaries as it does to general elections. Of that I am sure. I am sure that is true of the people in every State of the Union, not only in the State which I have the honor to represent, in part. If there is to be an election law, the people want it to apply across the board; they want to have it apply to any part of the election process where funds are used.

But I am rather concerned that there has been relatively little public response. My mail has been very light on this subject. I do not speak for other Senators, but I feel that if the people of the country understood this issue, they would back this amendment. A number of newspapers have backed the general effort to modernize our outdated election laws. The Senator from Missouri referred in his remarks today to a very splendid editorial published in the New York Times, a newspaper which has spoken out vigorously in support of the bill and in support of the amendment to include primaries. Those are sound words. They come also from other great newspapers of the Nation. I know of no newspaper which has campaigned against the bill or, indeed, against the inclusion of primary elections in the bill. There may have been some, but I have not learned of them; they have not come to my attention. I hope that such support of the general principles of the bill will be heeded when this measure and the amendment come to a vote.

Some of the provisions of the bill can be improved upon; but, by and large, the bill represents a very fine attempt to make this statute more realistic and in tune with the costs and practices of modern political campaigns. It is a giant stride in the right direction and, therefore, deserves the support of all those who believe in sound and practical legislation to improve the Federal electoral processes.

The Senator from Missouri is dead right when he says that now is the time to act. The hour has struck. If this amendment is not adopted and the bill is not passed at this time, there will not be another opportunity for a good many years. The Senator from Missouri reported a bill on this subject 2 years ago. It included primaries, as he pointed out a few minutes ago. But it was never acted upon. It was never scheduled for action. If we do not act now, we will not have another chance for a long time to come.

Mr. President, the issue is so clear and, it seems to me, so fundamental, that I do not see how there can be any opposition. Usually I can see the merit of the other side of an argument. I have sometimes bent over backward to do so. Perhaps an error or a fault of mine is seeing too much merit on the other side. But in this case I cannot understand how one can be in favor of the general principle of improving the Federal electoral machinery by enacting the bill, and then say that he will vote to leave out of it one of the most fundamental steps in the process of choosing a candidate for the Senate or House. The people, I am satisfied, want to know who spends the money to elect their candidates in a primary or a general election. They are entitled to know. We should respond to them by adopting the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the amendment. I think it goes to the very heart of the political process. It is vital that the electorate have the fullest possible knowledge of the money which is spent in campaigns, not only in general election campaigns, but in primary election campaigns, as well.

On the basis of the individual views expressed in the committee report, both the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and also by the Republican Members of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that the constitutional issue has been made crystal clear. I have not heard it challenged. I have been looking for enlightenment from the other side, so as to meet such a challenge. But I have been looking in vain for a substantial argument.

It has been emphasized that the case of United States against Classic, in 1941, touches very directly on this point. There is no question about it. The Supreme Court has spoken out. Perhaps even more persuasive with Congress is the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which prohibits unions, corporations, or banks from expending money in a primary election, a convention, or a caucus. If that is not Federal regulation of primary elections, I do not know what it is. It seems to me that the precedent is clear, just as the constitutional issue is absolutely clear.

The issue is simply a matter of disclosure. I do not think anyone in the Senate has done a more consistent, a more effective, a more commendable job of championing the public's right to know than has the great chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. His position on this amendment is certainly in keeping with the fight he has made over the years for the right of the newspapers to print the facts and the public to know the facts.

The only argument which can be made in opposition to disclosure is that this information is not any of the public's business. How can such an argument be made? It seems to me that if there is anything which is the public's business, it is to have a full and complete knowledge of the money which is being spent in elections. Every American citizen knows that a primary contest is as much an election, in every sense, as is a general election.

There has been a great deal of talk and there have been many changes to the effect that a great deal af labor money has been used in elections. Some have charged that oil money has been used heavily in elections, or that the executives of large banks have tried to get their friends elected to office by heavy contributions.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HENNINGS. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend, the able and diligent junior Senator from Wisconsin, for his very kind words of commendation of the efforts of some of us in connection with bringing this proposed legislation before the Senate, and also for his recognition of the many years of work and effort to adjust and accommodate disparate views and views lacking in harmony, in order to report to the Senate some bill on this subject.

As I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the bill was reported to the Senater after I had offered, in the committee, amendments which I have proposed to offer here in the Chamber. One of those amendments has already been offered thus far during the consideration of the bill in the Senate.

I think the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin in regard to the Taft-Hartley Act is especially important. I undertook to mention that point several days ago, and I am very glad the Senator from Wisconsin has emphasized it.

We have not heard any hue or cry about Federal intervention in States by the Taft-Hartley Act, which relates to contributions made by labor unions and corporations. Yet we find, for some reason or other, a disposition to set ourselves up in the guise of being the judges of what the public has a right to know about what we do in order to be elected to membership in this body, to represent them.

Not only is it hypocrisy, Mr. President, but it also seems to me that it is an evasion of direct public duty and responsibility, if we say that these things are not in the public domain and do not become, by their very nature, essential parts of the public business.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his references and for his contributions thus far.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Missouri said, in the course of his remarks, that the public has a right to know about what we Senators do, I believe he put his finger on what is the natural, human, understandable objection to this proposed legislation. It is too bad that that has to be the situation; but, after all, legislators are human, and the Senate and the House of Representatives are human institutions.

It is always difficult for any group of people to act in such ways that they circumscribe their own conduct. However, it seems to me that this is exactly what should be done. I believe that anyone who is able to stand to one side and take an objective view of this situation must be persuaded that what we now propose is the right thing to do, and that the public has every bit as much right to know about the amounts of money spent in primary elections of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives as the public has a right to know how the executive agencies function, or as the public has a right to know about any other matter of public business.

It seems to me that the only consistently defensible position which can be taken against the public's right to know is in connection with military or diplomatic action by the Government. However, I do not believe anyone can properly argue that a general election or a primary election has anything to do with the military or diplomatic activity of the Federal Government. No sound case can possibly be made for a contention that the interests of the American people, the interests of the Nation, the interests of the Government, or the interests of any person, can be seriously damaged by letting the public know the facts of these situations.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell briefly on the nature of the vote. We take pride in the fact that we leave it up to the people of the country to decide who shall be the nominees of the respective parties. But do we really leave it up to the people to decide, if they do not have sufficient information when they are voting?

When either a Senator or any other citizen goes to vote in a regular election, it seems to me that the quality of his vote is extremely important. If people vote in ignorance, if they do not have

the facts, if they are not informed, we cannot correctly say that democracy has had a chance to speak or that the people have had a real opportunity to make a proper determination.

I believe it perfectly obvious that the amount of money contributed in connection with primary elections preceding the general congressional elections is of most vital importance in connection with the determination of whether certain candidates merit support. Certainly the people have a right to know whether persons with an ax to grind or with legislation to support or oppose are contributing very heavily to the campaigns of various candidates. The people have a right to examine those facts and the record of the candidates.

For instance, I have received campaign contributions from both business groups and labor groups, and I am very proud that I have. In fact, if I had not received those contributions, undoubtedly I would not have been elected; and I believe the same is true of all other Members of the Senate.

Certainly, the people also have a right to know what my record has been, on the basis of who my financial supporters are and who they have been. If the people do not have that information, their votes will not be informed ones; and then we shall be depriving them of the right to cast informed votes. It seems to me that then the whole process of democracy is directly and seriously weakened.

That is why I believe the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], which he has submitted on behalf of himself and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], goes to the very heart of the political process.

Mr. President, basically we are dealing with a most delicate subject which is difficult to discuss, not only because it directly affects the election of U.S. Senators, who themselves have to make the decision in this instance, but also because it affects the very delicate issue of political power. I believe that all of us recognize that the expenditure of money is necessary in order to conduct a modern campaign. All of us recognize, I believe, that democracy has been greatly aided by the participation of those who can have their campaigns financed in ways which enable them to have their messages reach the people. The television, the radio, and the newspapers perform a very vital, important, necessary, and desirable political function when they carry to the people of the country political speeches and messages.

There is nothing wrong with it. But it is clear that the public has a right to know where the money is coming from, evaluate the record of candidates who run for office, consider the amount of money that is being spent, put it in some proportion, and, on the basis of information the public has, come to a conclusion and cast a vote that is informed, and informed on the realities of political life.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New York have both pointed out that this bill makes a real effort to diminish the burden of reporting in elections. This is not a bill that provides that candidates for Congress and their committees should do more work. This is a bill which, on the contrary, provides, as I understand it, a situation in which Senators and their committees and Representatives and their committees and their staffs would do less work. The reporting work is substantially lessened. It would not be significantly increased if primary campaigns also were subject to reporting.

Mr. President, I suppose it is not always wise to discuss all aspects of these issues, but I do not see how I can make a meaningful presentation of what I think of the issues without discussing the fact that we have in a large part of the country—and it directly affects my own party—a one-party system. We have a political system in the South in which the general election is meaningless. For many, many years—for generations—only one party has determined who is going to sit in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives, and, indeed, generally, who is going to receive the electoral votes for the Presidency of the United States.

Under those circumstances it is just incredible that the Congress of the United States should permit one-fourth of our Nation, in effect, to have no requirement whatsoever for disclosure of campaign contributions, no opportunity for the public in the South to know who is contributing to an election and who is not.

It is true that some of those States have adequate reporting laws. But the States have no responsibility. One might even say they have no business determining the qualifications of the candidates for Federal office.

The Constitution is very explicit and clear on that point, and the cases are abundant on it. It is up to the Senate of the United States to judge the qualifications of its Members. We had a celebrated case in my own State, in which the supreme court of my State set forth that, although a candidate seemed to have disqualified himself on the basis of his conduct, the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin had no right to pass on it, because the Constitution provided that the U.S. Senate alone shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Under those circumstances, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States are going to take the position that they have no right to inquire into and regulate the primary election process and require reports to be made to the public. What we are doing it depriving the public of an opportunity to know who is making contributions in an election—the only election in which the people in one-fourth of the Nation have a real opportunity to determine who is going to represent them in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in his very excellent speech, asked that those who were voting against this amendment attempt to explain their vote. He pointed out that there had been very little publicity on this amendment, very little public outcry, and very little mail. I suppose that is because those who oppose the amendment have made no attempt to answer the arguments, because, from the standpoint of the public, there is only one answer, that is a vote of ringing support for the Hennings amendment.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying that I feel we indeed should have a clean elections bill. I think it is a very happy title for the bill. But it ought to be a really clean elections bill for the United States of America, for all 50 States, for all sections of our country, and for all elections. I feel we ought to have a clean primary elections bill, just as we have a clean national elections bill.

Mr. President, I think the case for this amendment is simply overwhelming. I am very proud and happy to support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad to be recognized immediately following the very fine speech of my colleague from Wisconsin, because I should like to take up where he left off. I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration and helped to draft the bill, which got nowhere in the Senate. I congratulate the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Missouri, for getting this bill called up so early in the session.

I should like to state the issue, taking up from where my friend from Wisconsin left off, as I see it. The issue, as I see it, is, Shall we have a clean elections bill or shall we have a partial clean elections bill? This is what the question really comes down to. Shall we have a bill that relates to some of the States and not to other States, or shall we have a bill that relates to all the States, where the people who decide who is going to be their Senator or Representative or President or Vice President in the primary or general elections? Because, as my friend from Wisconsin has truly said, in a very large number of States the primary decides the election. Indeed, an analysis of the individual number of citizens who vote shows that in a majority of the cases a much larger number of votes is cast in primary elections than in the general elections. In those very Southern States, a minor percentage of the vote cast in the primary—in some cases a ridiculously small portion of the vote cast in the primary—is cast in the general election. Hence, it would be a mockery for the election process to pass a clean election bill without including the primaries.

We would not be reaching what is substantially the election in many of our States.

Mr. President, the interesting thing is how we sometimes debate in a vacuum, because they have just had a hot primary election for Governor in Louisiana between Mayor deLesseps Morrison of New Orleans, and a man named Jim Davis. This primary took place in one of the largest and most important States of the Union, and the primary election was decided in favor of Mr. Davis after not only the originally primary election, but after a runoff primary election. Does anyone in this Chamber or in the United States doubt that Mr. Davis will be elected Governor of Louisiana? Will

many citizens of Louisiana trouble to go to the polls and vote in the general election? Probably not, if history continues in the future as it has in the past, as it undoubtedly will. Who is going to put up money for a candidate in opposition? Everyone knows the election has already been decided. So it would be a mockery to pass this bill to control contributions to campaigns in the general elections which is absolutely meaningless to the people of the State of Louisana and to other States of the Union. Indeed, I think if my colleague from Missouri did not proposed this amendment, he would be derelict in his duty, he would be misleading, he would be advocating a clean elections bill which was applicable to only certain sections of the country. I know him too well and love him too much to believe anything like that from him.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am most grateful to my friend from New York. He is an able lawyer. He is a former attorney general of the State of New York He had been a diligent member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I happen to be chairman.

The Senator is one to whom we listen when matters relating to constitutional law, or indeed all law, are involved in the processes of the Senate.

May I ask my friend from New York, whose remarks I very much appreciate and whose support we indeed welcome, how he would view any suggestion that an attempt to regulate primaries is unconstitutional, or that an attempt to regulate contributions in primaries is unconstitutional, in view of the Classic case, with which the Senator is doubtless familiar, and in view of the precedents of the Senate, taking further into consideration the Taft-Hartley Act and the contributions by labor unions in primaries and general elections?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think there is any question, Mr. President, about the fact that legislation made applicable to primaries is absolutely constitutional.

I should like to go further and point out that unless we do what we should do in this regard we hardly shall be honest with ourselves, because we passed in 1957 a so-called civil rights bill to deal with elections in far greater particularity than even the primaries.

Mr. President, one of the things which also makes me feel we live in a dream world here so very often is that nobody has talked about the fact that this is really the opening round, the challenge round to the whole question of whether we will or will not effectively protect the right to vote in this country. Mr. Presiden, if we find ourselves inhibited on legal grounds from passing legislation to determine whether there shall be public attention drawn to whoever contributes to a primary campaign, how are we going to deal with the elementary question of what to do in a State where the State officials absolutely defy the mandate of the Constitution that every citizen is entitled to vote by refusing or by failing to register the citizen or by effectively barring him from registering as a voter?

Of course, Mr. President, everybody understands that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the distinguished Senator, we are holding hearings, which commenced this morning, with regard to the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission relating to temporary Federal registrars. This morning we heard a former president of the American Bar Association, a former dean of the Southern Methodist University, now a practitioner of law in Dallas, Tex., who strongly supported and advocated the appointment of Federal registrars, even though he is a southerner born and bred. He advocated the appointment of registrars in certain States where the right to vote is denied to citizens otherwise qualified.

Because I know of the Senator's broad interest in this question—our mutual interest in it—I thought he would be glad to know of that testimony. I believe we shall hear from the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. I shall testify tomorrow.

Mr. HENNINGS. We look forward to hearing the Senator's testimony.

Mr. JAVITS. I have just completed preparing my testimony.

The important thing, Mr. President, is that again we live in a dream world, because nobody talks about the facts that what we do in regard to this bill is directly connected with what we shall do in regard to the other and very basic proposed legislation which we are assured will come before us in the middle of February, as to which the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is now engaged in what I consider to be a great exercise of responsibility, the holding of hearings.

Mr. President, only a few days ago the Attorney General of the United States argued in the Supreme Court a case which relates to this very critical question which is before us now, for a lower court had held the Civil Rights Act of 1957 unconstitutional, stating that the act was beyond the power of the Congress. The Attorney General was in the Supreme Court arguing it was well within the power of Congress and was very constitutional, because of the very arguments which we are making here, that the Congress has the right to deal with Federal elections in order to be sure that every citizen may vote.

Mr. President, only a few days ago a judge in the Federal court in Louisiana, acting under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, ordered restored to the voting rolls 1,377 Negroes in a Louisiana parish.

Mr. President, what we are told by those who propose that we should defeat this amendment to include primaries in the bill is, in practical effect, that we have no right to know by what processes people are financed in order to get voters either on or off the voting rolls. This is a question of a primary election, not a question of a general election.

It seems to me that to implement the law which we passed by a heavy majority in 1957 it is absolutely essential to include primary elections under the coverage of the bill.

Mr. President, I emphasize the aspects of this matter which relate to the whole struggle to give American citizens the opportunity to vote, because I think this is very much a part of that struggle. An opportunity to vote effectively may be denied by the conditions which surround primary elections, by the amounts of money poured into them, by the sources from which the money comes, or by other conditions which relate to the election.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about money, and money is a very important thing, but the bill by no means confines itself only to the question of who shall contribute money. If we pass the amendment, we shall make the whole bill—not simply that part of it relating to the reporting of contributions—applicable to primary elections.

In the first place, we shall make applicable that part of the law which, for the first time, makes realistic provision in regard to what it costs to run a primary election in one of these States where the primary election winner takes all, instead of the "mumbo-jumbo" we have been going through for years and years and years because of an archaic law, with the proliferation of many committees in order to be able to run a campaign at all, as we all know.

Mr. President, it seems to me we ought to be as honest about primary elections in that regard as we are about general elections.

Even a simple provision like that contained in the bill which would prevent anybody from making a contribution except in his own proper name, so that the people may know exactly who is contributing, ought to be applied in the primary elections.

Finally, there are regulations with relation to the so-called equal-time rule as to political broadcasts. That is certainly as applicable to primary elections as it is to general elections, and the rules on that subject should be uniform.

The same is true with respect to other phases of the law.

Mr. President, it seems to me the very key to the issue posed before us is this: Shall we pass a clean elections bill which discriminates against some States of the Union in favor of the States of the Union which decide their elections, for all practical purposes, in the primaries, or shall we not?

Shall we pass a clean elections bill which, whatever may be the approach of a particular State as to deciding who shall be the highest officials, will apply exactly the same standards to all States?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the mere framing of the question dictates the answer.

Those of us who will go out to tell our constituents that we voted for a clean elections bill, to reform the elections procedures of the country, in one and the same breath will have to tell our constituents that we were honest enough to make it applicable to all elections in which the question of who will be the Representative in Congress or the Senator, in national elections, is finally decided. In a very large number of States in the United States the question is finally decided in the primary.

Mr. President, I deeply believe there is no alternative other than to adopt the

amendment recommended by our colleague from Missouri and by my own junior colleague from New York.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I should like to say a few words about the bill itself. As I have said, when I was a member of the committee I had some hand in drafting the predecesor bill, which, incidentally, when it came to the Senate, also covered the primary elections. This bill marks a departure from a situation which I hope very much we shall correct.

Lest anyone think this bill is going too far too fast, I point out that this is an extremely modest bill, doing nothing, really, but bringing up to date, in realistic terms of today, the amounts which are spent in elections, and the ways in which the present law is made to function, notwithstanding the fact that it is archaic, and legalizing, in the sense of a Federal election, those practices, and also requiring those elements of disclosure with which we are so familiar as to accept them as almost axioms of government—as for example, in the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, the new labor law which we passed only last year, and a dozen other statutes.

In short, there is now thoroughly built into our legislative philosophy the idea that people are not wards of the legislators or anyone else. They are adults. If we give them information, we have the right to assume that they will use it wisely. If they do not, no government of our character will try to drag them or lead them around by the hand. But if we keep them in the dark, which would be the result of not passing the bill, we can hardly expect them to act as mature and educated citizens.

One final word. Something has been said about the fact that people ought to know who supports whom, as though that were a point of virtue. I know it was not thought of in that way, but I think it should be noted that it has been said to be a virtue to be supported by labor unions and not by banks; or, on the other hand, that it was a vice, in that if one were supported by labor unions he must be a wild-eyed radical, whereas if he were supported by bankers he would be a sound and very conservative fellow.

That situation is attributable to the fact that we do not have an effective law. I think the people of the United States can evaluate, in their own way, what all these things mean, and give them their proper weight when it comes to voting. But if we leave them in the dark, we only encourage all the mysteries which occur in dark places. How many people have we all heard who have said:

> You do not really know how much money is being poured into this campaign by the great bankers.

Then we meet with the great bankers, as we all do, and they tell us darkly:

> You cannot imagine how much money is being poured into the campaign by the loaded treasuries of the labor leaders and the labor unions.

Neither of these ideas should be given any substance unless it is supported by the facts. It seems to me that by common consent those of us who suffer under either set of mysteries, which are spread abroad and expected to be taken seriously by intelligent people, should favor a measure of this kind, which will at last be realistic. The realistic aspect of it, I will say to my friend from Missouri, is that it tries to gather up the totality of the contributions, instead of committing all the circumlocutions which have been piled upon those who run for office, and upon the very distinguished people who support them, because the law is simply out of date. The law should be brought up to date. It should be made inclusive, and it should be nondiscriminatory.

In order to accomplish all these things, we must pass the bill plus the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that if the public had a full, complete, and accurate understanding of the amount contributed by officials of labor unions, banks, and utilities, and if the reports were made in full by the various competing parties and candidates in primary elections, very likely the public would come to have a far clearer, better, and more approving attitude toward candidates than it has?

The Senator has referred to the dark rumor that labor is pouring hundreds of thousands of dollars into a campaign, or that banks or big oil companies are pouring enormous funds into a campaign. The Senator has said so well that it is the innuendo, rumor, or half-truth kind of situation which develops so unfortunately in a campaign which smears candidates, merely because the facts are not known. It seems to me that this kind of legislation, requiring disclosure, could eliminate that very unfortunate situation, which unfortunately colors the character of too many persons who are public officials or would be public officials, and lends a very sad aspect of evil and improper conduct, which too many people associate with political activity.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with my colleague. We ourselves often fall into the same error. Even in this discussion, for example, I have spoken of utilities, labor unions, and banks. So have others of our colleagues. As a matter of law, they are not permitted to contribute. They do not contribute. The contributions are made by individuals—directors or heavy investors in the companies. Yet the discussion becomes loaded with generalities, because we do not have an adequate accurate reporting system, and everything is left to the general observation of the people, because the specific facts are not clearly delineated and set forth, as would be required by this bill.

We are really doing something which is long overdue, and which seems so elementary that it is a little sad that we must spend so much time on the problem.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does not the Senator from New York know that there were days in the Senate during the past century and early part of the present century when virtually every interest or business—manufacturing, banking, shipping, agriculture, and other interests—had its own Senators here?

Mr. JAVITS. That was popularly reputed to be the case.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will not mention the name of a great former Senator from the Senator's State, but a certain Senator was known as a New York Central Senator. He was a great after dinner raconteur. He was in the Senate for a long time.

There were others, whose names it would serve no useful purpose to remember. All one has to do is to read "The Robber Barons," or "The Age of the Moguls," together with a considerable amount of the history of the Senate. During that period no doubt there were Senators who were owned, body and soul, who were bought and paid for to look after certain interests. They performed their work well.

Mr. JAVITS. To make the discussion completely bipartisan, I know that the Senator will recall that certain Senators in those days were considered to be Southern Pacific Senators.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. The supreme court of my State was formerly referred to in terms of two divisions, namely, the division which represented the Frisco, and the division which represented the Missouri Pacific. That was many years ago, happily.

But there is no use in our being completely unsophisticated and naive about the fact that many people want someone here who will do their bidding.

If all the information is disclosed and becomes a matter of public information, the public may decide:

> Well, and good. We are happy to have that Senator in the Senate, because he is doing the bidding of a group of interests which are contributing to the welfare of the State. We believe he is a man who could control matters, and do such things as are best for the interests of the country.

We are not quarreling with the fact that there are contributions. We are trying to resolve the simple proposition, as the Senator has well said, that these facts should be made public. They should be a matter of public record, subject to public scrutiny, public observation, and understanding by the people who do the voting. The reason why there is no substantial debate on these points, and no substantial arguments against the provision relating to primaries, seems readily apparent.

I doubt not that if there were constitutional questions really involved, many of our Members would raise those questions; that if there were matters of Senate precedents, such as the election cases involved, those questions would be raised by our Members.

Therefore, the reluctance on the part of Senators to support the amendment regulating contributing and reporting of contributions can be fairly interpreted as meaning, as I have undertaken to say before—I believe the Senator from New York was not present—that it is none of the public's business.

Some of us believe it is, indeed, in very large part, the public's business, and that the public has a right to know, and wants to know, and has demanded for these many years to know. We believe that the proposed legislation is in the public interest and for the public benefit.

I thank the senior Senator from New York for his very able and thoughtful contribution to the discussion.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New York—because of his acute and long experience and because of his fine legal mind, as a former attorney general of the great State of New York, and a man whose brilliant legal career is well known—with respect to one argument which I have heard some of my colleagues make against the bill, namely, that it involves a matter of States rights; that while it is right for the Federal Government to regulate general elections, primary elections should be left up to the States, because the States have a peculiar interest in primary elections.

For the life of me I cannot grasp what principle is involved. A primary election for Federal office is a Federal election, not a State election. It is an election for Federal office in which, the Constitution states—in the case of the Senate—that the Senate shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Can the Senator from New York enlighten me as to what is the legal nature, at least, of the States rights argument which is being made against the proposed legislation?

Mr. JAVITS. The States rights argument is based on the premise that Senators are ambassadors of their States. That is completely contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why would not this argument apply also to general elections?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right. However, the concept is that although we have gotten away from the idea that a Senator is elected by the State legislature—and it took a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct election of Senators—there still persists the argument that when a Senator comes from his State he is an ambassador of his State; therefore the process of his coming to the final point of his appointment as ambassador is none of our business.

That is a completely artificial premise. The answer is overwhelmingly stated in the Classic case, to which my colleague has referred, and to which there have been so many references during the debate; namely, that there is an organic process of electing Senators and Representatives, part of which is their nomination in a primary, and the other part of that organic process is the result, to wit, their coming to the Senate; and that, therefore, the primary, just as the general election, is properly susceptible to the action of Congress.

Therefore we are dealing with a question of option, or a question of judgment. If we do include primaries by adopting the amendment, then these particular requirements would be applied to them. We are not obliged to pass every statute that is constitutional.

So the argument is answered on two grounds: First, the bill is without question constitutional; second, it is absolutely essential that the bill, if passed, be nondiscriminatory and do what it states to the public it will do, namely, include all elections.

Not only is the primary an organic element of the process, but it is also in some States the final selection process itself. Therefore it seems crystal clear to those of us who support that argument that the amendment must be adopted if the proposed legislation is to be meaningful at all. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment reported by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

I should like to make an observation or two about the procedures in the Senate. It has been said that legislative committees make policy in the Senate and that, accordingly, my party, at least, if not the opposite party, should press forward as the majority party in the Senate to enact legislation which is reported by a legislative committee.

Yet I would suggest that the proposed legislation now before the Senate has almost as good a case history as any could have to enable anyone to sustain the position that legislative committees cannot, will not, and do not make policy, in many instances.

A committee of nine very able Senators, after intense deliberations, have presented a bill which it reported unanimously, but which satisfies no one. It is a bill which I believe my good friend, the chairman of the committee, who has worked so hard in this matter, would be the first to admit is an inadequate bill, because he himself, the chairman of the committee, has brought to the floor three amendments, of which the pending amendment is one, intended drastically to rewrite on the floor a bill which I think he quite obviously considers inadequate in the form in which it comes from the committee.

He is joined by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island in his effort to amend the bill on the floor, against a 5-to-4 vote of the committee of which he is the chairman.

An earlier bill presented by the distinguished chairman of the committee, also sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, carried in it—and I ask if this is not the case—the three provisions which the Senator from Missouri now seeks to insert by floor amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply to the able Senator from Pennsylvania, the 1957 bill did contain provisions relating to primaries. That bill was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, as I have said before in the debate. The bill before the Senate was reported after a number of amendments had been offered. It was reported in the hope that legislation would, as it has now, reach the floor for the purpose of debate and improvement by the process of amendment. Although the vote was very close on the amendment—5 to 4 in committee—the committee did reject the primary provision. I feel that the bill would be inadequate without such an amendment. I have felt that way since the beginning of my consideration of these matters back in about 1953, and during all of the time since then.

I hope that that, in some measure, at least, answers the question put to me by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his excellent clarification of this subject.

Now we find a situation in which two Democratic members of the committee and two Republican members of the committee join in submitting an important floor amendment. Their five colleagues—four Democrats and one Republican—do not join them in this request.

We are told that legislative committees make policy and that we in the majority party should support the legislative committees. Whom are we to support—the chairman and the Republicans who join him, or those Republicans and Democrats who do not join them? So I suggest that there still is a problem as to how my party can determine what policy it should follow on specific pieces of proposed legislation.

For that purpose, we scheduled a Democratic conference the other day. Unfortunately, other matters took so much time that when this bill was called before the conference for discussion, and although the chairman of the committee made a very able and a very short statement of what the bill was about, there was no opportunity to discuss it before the conference recessed. So now we are trying to make policy on the floor.

We have been told that we have no policy committee in the Democratic Party. I agree that that is the fact. We have what has been called a traffic committee or a listing committee, or, unhappy analogy, a rules committee in the sense of that in the other body, which schedules proposed legislation for floor action. But we have no policy committee, and it is said that we do not need one. I suggest that the pending bill is about as good evidence as we can get that we need a real policy committee; that we should have an opportunity to determine what the party policy on an important piece of proposed legislation of this sort should be. But we do not. Unfortunately, we were never able to get to the matter in conference.

In the absence of any definitive party policy on this matter, I, for one, turn to a pamphlet published on December 7, 1958, by the Democratic Advisory Council.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he comes to the last point?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me, in an attempt to pursue this very interesting suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that there are several things which Senators could do. They could say that the committee as a whole—a majority of the committee—should be viewed as a policy-recommending body—at least, to the Senate—and therefore if a majority of the committee decides on a certain course of action, that is a recommendation for the Democratic Senators, inasmuch as we have a substantial majority.

Mr. CLARK. I assume the Senator by his statement meant that if a majority of the Democrats on the committee voted a certain way, that would be our party policy. He could not have meant a majority of the Democratic Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am wondering. This is a question which has never been answered by our friends who say we do not need a conference to arrive at a party policy; they say we do not need a policy committee to help us to arrive at party policy. We should not have to be that responsible or that unified. This is something we should not have to arrive at.

What puzzles me is that if we exclude the Republicans who are on that committee, and if we take the recommendation of the Democrats, we might conceivably arrive at some kind of recommendation. But I have never—and this is the third year in which I have served in the Senate—heard any Member of the Senate refer to the vote of a standing committee and say, "I feel that because it is the recommendation of the Democrats, because the Democrats on this committee voted 4 to 2 to follow a certain course, we should be constrained to pay attention to that action and to follow it."

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Wisconsin agree that the proposal is untenable that legislative committees, in the present Senate at least, make party policy for our party?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is, indeed, because there is in committee deliberations no opportunity to refer to any party position which the Democratic Party may have arrived at. There is no reference to any party platform; there is no consideration of any position taken by our great national leaders, our former President, or our nominee for President in the past. There is no reference to what the position of the leadership of the Senate, powerful, and able as it is, may be. There is no reference to anything of this kind.

The result is that a policy may be set by any kind of majority which can be put together. It may be a majority of unanimous Republicans and a small minority of Democrats. It may be almost any kind of a majority which comes forth with a conclusion or recommendation, whether it be yes or no.

I enthusiastically support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think it carries great weight with all Senators. But I have no illusions about this. If a standing committee does not come forth with a majority recommendation, the chances of its passing in this body are enormously reduced. Whether we like it or not, it means that our policy is being made, in an effective way, by whatever majority can be put together on the bipartisan committee, which has no responsibility of any kind to party position. It has no reference, in discussions, or anything else, to actions or principles which have been arrived at by the Democratic Party.

Mr. CLARK. I find myself in complete accord with the Senator from Wisconsin. Having received no policy guidance from the committee itself, having had no opportunity to obtain policy guidance in the Democratic conference, and having received no expression of opinion from the leadership as to what it thinks the policy should be, I am constrained to turn to the only authority in the Democratic Party which has expressed, as a matter of policy, its views on this subject, namely, the Democratic Advisory Council, which, on December 7, 1958, published a pamphlet entitled "Democratic Task During the Next 2 Years."

I am constrained to give this policy statement of the advisory council a great deal of weight, indeed, because of two facts: First, that the advisory council is an official arm of the Democratic National Committee, created by it to advise on matters of policy during the 4 years between presidential elections. That, I believe, entitles the council to receive careful attention by all Democratic legislators in both bodies of Congress.

My second reason for paying careful attention to the recommendations of this group is the distinguished nature of its composition. I shall read for the RECORD only a few of the names of the members of the council who have given their approval to this statement by having their names printed on the flyleaf: W. Averell Harriman; Hubert H. Humphrey, the senior Senator from Minnesota; Estes Kefauver, the senior Senator from Tennessee; David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, whose views on this matter are particularly pertinent and important to me, as a Senator from that Commonwealth; Herbert H. Lehman, who served with great distinction for so long in this body; Adlai E. Stevenson, twice the Democratic standard bearer in the presidential contests of 1952 and 1956; the grand old man of the Democratic Party, one of the greatest Americans now alive, Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States; G. Mennen Williams, the distinguished Governor of Michigan; and as consultant, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The collective wisdom of this group and their many other colleagues on the committee does, I submit, Mr. President, carry great weight with me and, I believe, should carry great weight with my colleagues on this side of the aisle. What do they say——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. May I complete my sentence? What do they say about the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri?

Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me it is most significant that the Senator from Pennsylvania is doing what he is doing this afternoon. This is the first time, to my knowledge, it has been done. I think it is highly important. Many of us in the Senate have been asking for a long time for some opportunity to take part in determining policy for our party—a responsible policy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out very well that we do not really have that opportunity. He has also pointed out that there is an eminent body of well-qualified, thoughtful, responsible, and very, very distinguished Americans who have assumed that responsibility. I welcome the way in which the Senator from Pennsylvania has called the attention of the Senate to the recommendations of these distinguished Democrats, who are an official body, and who do have a responsibility which they are willing to recognize, and who have met and have thoughtfully considered the matter, and, I may add, have tapped the best brains in the country—some of the outstanding leaders in our universities and elsewhere—in regard to issue after issue after issue, and now have come before the American people to make their recommendations in regard to the policies the Democratic Party should follow.

The fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out that there is such a well-qualified body of Democrats who have taken a strong position on this proposed legislation is most important; and I believe that January 18, 1960, will go down—at least in my book—as a most important day, because of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania has called on Democrats in this body to recognize that the only group of nationally recognized Democrats who attempt to arrive at a thoughtful and responsible Democratic Party position is the advisory committee of the Democratic National Committee. This is party responsibility day, 1960.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his comments, and I hope he has not overemphasized the importance of the comments I have made. Time alone will tell as to that.

Mr. President, I return to the question of what did the Democratic advisory committee say about the pending amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]; what did the Democratic advisory committee say about it on December 7, 1958, when they published to the world the pamphlet entitled "The Democratic Task Force During the Next 2 Years?" They said:

> Clean elections law: The Federal election laws should be modernized along the lines proposed by the Hennings-Green bill, in order to assure more meaningful reporting of campaign expenditures and tightening of the corrupt practices laws and an exten-

sion of Federal regulation of elections for Federal office, to include primary elections for any Federal office.

Mr. President, that is so plain that there can be no doubt that the Democratic advisory committee, composed of many distinguished members of our party, and including an ex-President of the United States and our party's candidate for that high office in two separate elections, is 100 percent behind the effort of the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections to overrule a majority of his own committee and to call up, here on the floor of the Senate, an amendment which will comply with that suggestion by the Democratic advisory committee.

Mr. President, I intend to support the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, and I intend to go down the line with the Democratic advisory committee.

I urge every Democratic Senator to follow the lead of that committee; and I hope and believe that the Senate leadership of the Democratic Party will also follow that lead. I hope they will make their position abundantly clear before we come to vote on this matter. If they have any reasons for not following that lead, I wonder whether they will be kind enough to state those reasons on the floor of the Senate, before this matter comes to a vote, so that we who wish, when possible, to bend over backwards in endeavoring to follow our duly elected leadership may have an opportunity to consider any views they may have which may happen to be in opposition to the views of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HENNINGS], who himself is a member of the Democratic leadership, since he serves as secretary of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended. I shall not longer detain the Senate, except to say that the cogent reasons stated by the chairman of the committee [Mr. HENNINGS] and, indeed, also stated by the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who comes from the other side of the aisle, in support of this amendment are, to my mind, so persuasive that it is difficult to understand why the Senate does not unanimously accept the amendment as being clearly in the public interest.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I desire to express my thanks, and also those of the rest of us who are associated in this endeavor, for the brilliant and apposite statement made by the most able Senator from Pennsylvania. He has raised some very challenging and some very thought-provoking questions.

I am glad to have him revive the 1958 statement of support by the Democratic advisory committee.

Some of us have been "in the trenches" for a good many years, in regard to this one bill and these amendments to it; and by "a good many years" I mean 7 or 8 years.

But now, here on the floor, we find virtually no opposition expressed from any source or quarter. Sometimes I feel that we are speaking out in the woods, and that perhaps we are hearing only the echo of our own voices.

If there are substantial reasons for opposition to this amendment, I think many of us believe we are equipped to debate the matter on the issues.

But if the reason for opposition is simply "Well, we do not want it; we do not like it; we do not want to regulate ourselves; we do not want anyone to tell us what to do, because we are the Senate; we may represent the people, but we do not want them to know about what we do to get here"—if such an attitude of cynicism is the general attitude on the part of those who are opposed to our proposals, not only would I say it is exceedingly disappointing, but I would also say that those who take that position are recreant in the performance of their duty to the people of the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I had the privilege of being on the floor last week when the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] engaged in a colloquy with the able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I do not believe that ever during my service in the Senate I have heard any Member go more quickly or better to the heart of any matter than did my friend, the Senator from Missouri, when, in one sentence, he said to the able minority leader that the issue is simply whether we want the people to know who contribute to our primary campaigns, or whether we want to keep that information secret. Certainly, that is clearly the issue.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that those of us who advocate the adoption of this amendment have not been engaging in legalistic expressions; neither have we been engaged in stating, here in this Chamber, sententious platitudes or in answering ourselves—already completely in agreement—by engaging in a process of repetition and redundancy.

No substantial argument against this proposed legislation has been offered in this Chamber. Yet, there seems to be going around word that there is a coalition between some Members on the other side of the aisle and some Members on this side of the aisle, and that that coalition will be able to defeat this amendment.

I may say that, to the best of my knowledge, no such group of Senators appeared before the committee prior to the time when it reported to the Senate a skeleton bill susceptible of amendment, and now in the course of being amended. It seems to me that here in the Senate Chamber there has not been any semblance of respectable opposition to the amendment on the basis of any claim that it lacks constitutionality.

We have had no persuasive argument on the basis of violation of States rights, or indeed of policy, except what seems to be a very durable core of stubborn opposition to telling the people the truth about what happens in primary elections. I do not think many would dare go so far as to say that we should not have to make any reports in general elections, although I cannot help but question whether some would not like to have all regulation of all elections relegated to limbo, because there are some people who just do not like any regulation whatsoever, be it traffic regulation, be it a criminal statute, be it a matter of public information given to the people of this country by public officers, or those seeking to be public officers, after or before their nominations at primaries or at conventions.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I had not intended to speak further on the amendment. The other day there was a smokescreen attempted by some Senators for the sole purpose of confusing and concealing the issues. I believe it necessary, in very brief fashion, to reply to it as a matter of record, not because of the stature of the arguments made or because of their persuasiveness or their cogency.

This floor today is singularly deserted by those who, I am sure, are prepared to come in when a vote is taken on this amendment and to vote in opposition to it. However, the names will be recorded, and the people of this country will know who, of the Senators representing them, wish to continue to operate in the dark and to attain nomination in a political party by means not requiring full and public disclosure.

We have heard arguments about this being selection and not an election, and about preemption and election areas not being covered by the bill or the amendment.

The argument that it is selection, not election, is, indeed, a nice distinction. However, in a good many State elections we know selection means election, as has been said many times. In many States where this situation exists, I would not like to tell the victorious nominee that he had not been through an election, but only a selection. I believe the comments of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are more than enough to prove that a nominee in his State has been elected.

The sole question before us is, Do we believe the people should be informed as to campaign financing in primary elections, caucuses, and conventions? As has been said repeatedly on this floor during the course of this discussion, primaries are an integral part of the election process, for no candidate, of course, can be elected to a congressional seat unless he is placed on the ticket by victory in the primary process, be it election, caucus, or convention.

In the general election, the people must choose between the candidates on the ballot. Therefore, it is impossible to separate the general election and the primary process. We have again the authority of the leading case in 1941, United States against Classic, from which I had intended to read further, but that has already been done by my able colleague from New York. I have read parts of it, and may again advert to it tomorrow. The Congress has taken this attitude in election contests, and

the courts have taken this attitude in cases before them—that the primary is a part of the election process.

It has also been argued that it would be a paradox if primaries had to be conducted under both State law and Federal law. If such is a paradox, that paradox exists today, because under existing law, the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and other Federal statutes control phases of general elections. However, each State also has laws controlling who can vote and where. Even in primary elections today we have dual control. Certainly, the Taft-Hartley Act, relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations, is the law pervasive throughout all States of the Union.

I now ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD title 18 of the United States Code, section 610, being that portion of the United States Code relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations under the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice-presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

For the purposes of this section "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 723; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 10, 63 Stat. 90; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, sec. 20(c), 65 Stat. 718.)

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as has been said before, the Hatch Act limits contributions to $5,000 to any candidate or political committee in a calendar year. Therefore, if dual control is a paradox, it has existed, indeed, for many years.

Another one of the arguments presented, in some fashion or other, to prevent the extension of reporting and disclosure to primaries is that the bill, even with this extension, does not go far enough, in that it does not require reports from State and local committees. This is the strangest argument I have heard against extending the bill to cover primaries. In preceding days, although not today, we have had some weird or singular arguments raised in opposition to this amendment.

I would agree that failure to require reports from such committees may be a weakness, but the solution to a weakness in another section of the bill is not to oppose the amendment on primaries, but to support it and also support an amendment to include such committees.

As I said in my opening remarks on Wednesday, I advised the Senate that at the appropriate time, after consideration of the pending amendment, I proposed to offer an amendment to extend the bill to cover State and local committees. The adoption of this amendment I believe would be a solution to the weakness which some have pointed out.

Another argument raised is that where the new expenditure limitations disagree with expenditure limitations under State law, doubt may arise as to which one controls, and a State secretary of state might refuse to certify an election because the victorious candidate had expended more than the State limitation.

I am unable to determine exactly what this argument has to do with this amendment on primaries because it goes to the certification of the winner of a general election, but, nevertheless, the answer is simple, if we are going to undertake to answer it, and I think we should, because the minority leader himself raised the question the other day.

Section 210 of the bill is titled "Effect on State Laws," and in this section, the bill specifically states:

That the limitations on expenditures prescribed in section 207 shall supersede any such limitations prescribed in State laws which differ therefrom.

This provision is simple and direct. There can be no question as to the intent of Congress. In the area of expenditure limitations, the Federal law controls, and supersedes State law.

Mr President, as I said earlier, the question of preemption has been brought up, again by the able minority leader, who said that it did not make any difference whether the committee reported the bill unanimously or not. We sometimes think in the Judiciary Committee, where we serve together, that reporting a bill unanimously is a rather important and most unusual achievement. It has been suggested that because the amendment would bring primaries within the purview of the law and would regulate expenditures and require reporting respecting primaries, the courts might hold that the Federal Government had preempted the whole field of regulation of primaries. The answer to this is manyfold.

First, Congress regulated the same activities with respect to general elections by the passage of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1925 and the courts have not so ruled during the 35 years this creaking, archaic 1925 act has been in effect.

Second, as I mentioned before, the bill contains a specific provision as to preemption. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has long worked diligently for the passage of a bill which would govern preemption on a general basis. I, conversely, have long opposed passage of such a bill, because it would cut across the whole area of Federal law with one swoop without regard to the past inteent of Congress.

This matter was debated in the closing days of the Congress preceding this, when it was defeated by a margin of one vote. I refer to S. 3, and the so-called McClellan-Bridges amendment.

Mr. President, I have always believed that Congress must determine specifically in every area of the law if it has the power to preempt, and, if it desires to preempt, then Congress should spell it out in clear, unmistakable, and unequivocal language, so that in interpreting the law the courts will know the legislative history and the intent of Congress.

However, we cannot today pass a bill in broad terms covering all past legislation. The result would be chaos. The bill of the Senator from Arkansas on preemption in its first provision sets out that—

No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of any State laws on the same subject matter unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

Section 210 of the bill before the Senate provides:

This act shall not be construed to annul or to exempt any candidate from complying with the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the limitations on expenditures prescribed in section 207 shall supersede any such limitations prescribed in State laws which differ therefrom.

I do not think there can be any question as to the intent of the Congress, following that language and its interpretation, with respect to the so-called doctrine of preemption.

Question has been raised because certain expenditures of a candidate, such as assessments, fees, or charges levied upon a candidate by a State; necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses and cost of stationery, postage, writing, or printing—other than billboards or newspapers—distributing letters, circulars, posters, and telegraph or telephone service, are not to be included in determining whether the candidate's expenditures have exceeded the limitation. The present law—the Corrupt Practices Act, so called—also excludes these expenditures from this computation, and

the committee agreed to keep these exclusions. However, under both the present law and the bill of 1959, these expenditures must be reported by the candidate.

Again we get back to the essence, to the gravamen of the bill, which is the reporting, which is indispensable, so that the people will know the amount of such expenditures. This certainly is the heart and soul of the proposed legislation.

The question of precedents has also been raised. The Congress has already enacted legislation controlling activities in primaries. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, corporations, national banks, and labor unions cannot contribute or expend money to influence primaries or general elections. Under the Hatch Act, a person cannot contribute over $5,000 to any candidate or committee in a calendar year to influence the nomination or election of a candidate. Therefore, the precedent is there. This amendment would extend Federal control in this area, but some of us believe it is very significant to recognize the extent of Therefore, the control provided by this bill if the amendment is adopted. Primarily, the bill calls for disclosure. It requires that the people be informed. Therefore, the control provided by this bill will not come from the Federal Government, but from the people, when they are informed as to the amount of money spent and from where it came.

I have said before, and I believe it worth repeating, the sole question before the Senate is, Are we to inform the people respecting campaign financing or are we to operate in the dark, in secrecy, in a subterranean manner? I ask, What do Members of the Senate have to fear from informing the people as to campaign financing in primaries?

That question has been asked many times in the course of this debate, and to this time, Mr. President, the silence of this Chamber has remained unbroken by any answer to that very direct, very simple question, which relates only to common sense and, to human experience; which is not legalistic; which does not transcend, interfere with, or in any wise impinge upon State law, the decisions of the Supreme Court, or the precedents of the Senate in determining the qualifications of its own Members.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1960:

Federal Reserve System

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1960. (Reappointment)

Department of the Air Force

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Dudley C. Sharp.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Glennon, James B., Jr.
*Carneal Wyatt B., Jr.
*Walsh, Walter R.
*O'Connor, Thomas J.
*Johnson, Richard S.
*Welch, Claude H.
*Spritzen, Roland J.
*Lattimer, Hubert C.
*Wilkinson, Andrews M.
*Dalton, Honore G.
*Aldridge, Frederick S.
*Glickert, Robert W.
*Russell, Gerald F.
*Currin, Ralph H.
*West, Fraser E.
*Popper, Harry S., Jr.
*Doyle, Edward J.
*Helmer, Wilbur R.
*Sawyer, Webb D.
*Jewson, Winston E.
*Kisgen, James T.
*Moore, George E.
*Oliver, William P., Jr.
*Williams, Maxie R.
*Pratt, Harry D.
*Dobson, Charles E., Jr.
*Harris, Arnold W.
*Reid, Leonard D.
*Cokin, Milton G.
*Wertman, Howard E.
*Altman, Sidney J.
*Buzhardt, Harry O.
*Feeley, James A., Jr.
*McDaniel, James T.
*Keller, Robert P.
*Stapp, Donald H.
*Armstrong, Alan J.
*Lahue, Foster C.
*Padley, John J.
*Porter, Frank R., Jr.
*Campbell, Albert W.
*Mee, Fenton J.
*Pratt, Spencer H.
*Arsenault, Albert
*Farrelly, Robert B.
*Vogel, Frank H., Jr.
*Clark, James H.
*West, Robley E.
*Gorman, John E.
*King, John H., Jr.
*Bangert, Douglas A.
*Bronleewe, Thomas G., Jr.
*Ireland, Julius W.
*Howatt, William J.
*Burnett, John R.
*Randall, David S.
*Winstead, Edwin G.
*Esterline, William C.
*Marsh, William H.
*Blackwell, James R.
*Dulacki, Leo J.
*Daughtry, George W. E.
*Hammond, Bruce B.
*Nelson, Stanley J.
*Brickley, John H.
*Griffin, David R.
*Ryffel, George G.
*Hammond, Robert C., Jr.
*Coss, Francis K.
*Vick, Kirby B.
*Schlesinger, Francis R.
*Ingle, Shelton C.
*Sherman, Donald W.
Olson, Merlin R.
Smith, Robert E., Jr.
Miller, Roy D.
Bonner, William R.
Clarke, Harry D.
Elliott, Benton H.
Norton, William R.
Kurdziel, Edward G.
Blackwell, John O.
Myers, Reginald R.
Leffers, James
Martin, Glen E.
Trompeter, Joseph D.
Atkin, Ernest G., Jr.
Miller, Norman A., Jr.
Andre, Paul L., Jr.
Smith, Sherman A.
McGlothlin, Joe H., Jr.
Baker, Robert R.
Yunck, Michael R.
Quilty, Joseph F., Jr.
McElhany, Boyd C., Jr.
Moran, Arthur M.
Moore, Jack R.
Morrison, Jack W.
Flaherty, Robert F.
Scott, Jack C.
Shuman, Perry L.
Abblitt, William E.
Eisele, Harold A.
Long, Herbert H.
Whitten, Robert T.
McMahon, John P.
White, Robert O.
Love, James W.
Holdzkom, Lincoln N.
Widdecke, Charles F.
Andruska, Bruno J.
Early, Cleland E.
Burgoyne, William R., Jr.
Wilson, Louis H., Jr.
Flake, William L.
Gottschalk, Vincent J.
Gililland, George A.
Mitchell, Bryan B.
Wojcik, Thaddeus P.
McLaughlin, John N.
Holmes, Fenwicke W.
Haltom, Winfield S., Jr.
Treleaven, Lewis F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Brandenburg, Paul F.
*Anderson, Eugene
*Kruszewski, Matthew J.
*Burrill, Ray M.
*Seaton, James B.
*Landis, Walter P.
*Tomlinson, John H.
*Leslie, Lornie
Tant, St. Clair
Utz, Joseph W.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Moriarty, Paul M.
*Pickerell, Walter D.
*O'Neal, William T.
*Humphrey, Howard M.
*Jordan, James D.
*Cox, David M.
*Reed, Edwin O.
*Sloan, Jack R.
*Boortz, Neal A.
*Strandtman, Lesley V.
*Miller, Thomas H., Jr.
*Mickelson, Laurel M.
*Dair, William G., Jr.
*McClane, George E.
*Martin, Benjamin G.
*Lehnert, Robert C.
*Barbour, Robert J.
*Finlayson, Edwin H.
*Hopkins, Warren G.
*Peebles, Vernon J.
*Wilson, Rex.
*Jennings, Francis C.
*Idler, Basil T.
*Kelly, George E.
*Dominick, Robert L.
*Brandon, William E.
*Lomac, John M.
*Cowper, William H.
*Patton, Harvey M.
*Hansen, John E.
*Allen, Victor E.
*Cleeland, David
*Pietz, Reuel H.
*Carver, Nathaniel H.
*Danowitz, Edward F.
*MacAskill, Ross M., Sr.
*Hubka, Frank J.
*Wagner, John H.
*Anderson, Elmer A., Jr.
*Lupton, Edward I.
*Porter, Mervin B.
*Bardon, Thomas J.
*Buford, Ernest A., Jr.
*Reed, Roy L.
*McGough, James D.
*Blatt, Wallace D.
*Schmidt, Carl E.
*Lodge, Orlan R.
*Schultz, Leonard L.
*Ebel, Ardell.
*Butcher, Warren A.
*Howe, Odia E., Jr.
*Lewis, Woodrow B.
*Thorne, Nicholas G. W.
*Woods, Ray.
*Finn, John, Jr.
*Mitchell, Joseph A.
*Bohannon, Thomas J.
*Wilson, James E., Jr.
Carter, David V.
*Terry, Wilson C.
*Shoden, John C.
*Smith, Richard B.
*Lawrence, George E.
*Barrow, Robert H.
*Lobell, William R.
*Donnell, James W.
*Duncan, William R.
*Beckington, Herbert L.
*Sullivan, John B.
*Casey, Thomas P.
*Gibson, Baylor P., Jr.
*Fribourg, Leonard E.
*Hollenbeck, Marvin K.
*Rainforth, Richard H.
Wailes, Eugene A.
*Krumm, George A.
*Graves, James B.
*Wray, Robert P.
*Morrison, Robert J.
*Pope, Eugene J.
*Boldman, James D.
*Knapp, George C.
*Henley, Paul B.
*Warren, Stephen G.
*Wilson, Frank E.
*Jones, States R., Jr.
*Truesdale, Marion G.
*Atkins, Wade W.
*Sollom, Almond H.
*Frankovic, Boris J.
*Dressin, Sam A.
*Rushlow, Bruce A.
*Stanford, Norman R.
*Beckett, John W., Jr.
*Challacombe, Arthur D., Jr.
*Wilkinson, John H.
*Anderson, Roy L.
*Johnson, Wayne
*Tulipane, Thomas T.
*Driftmier, John F.
*Corman, Otis W.
*Brown, Charles S.
*Simmons, Robert L.
*Farish, George B.
Gray, Roy C., Jr.
*Daniels, Elmer R., Jr.
*Miller, Edward J.
*Bruce, Henry K.
*Dyer, Phillip G.
*Dewees, Raymond, Jr.
*Hamm, Norman L.
*Magill, James H.
*Merchant, Clark E.
*House, Charles A.
*Melin, Ernest I.
*Greenfield, Gaylord C.
*McDaniel, James
*Harmon, Lester G.
*Morrison, Gene W.
*Clapp, Archie J.
*Rushlow, Ray D.
*McBarron, Alden
*Witt, William T., Jr.
*McManus, John
*Wilker, Dean
*Mawyer, Ralph P.
*Johnston, John C.
*Vance, Johnnie C., Jr.
*MacQuarrie, Warren L.
Dellamano, Albert F.
Hepler, Frank M.
Guss, William F.
Johnson, James K.
Ross, John D.
Feliton, James A.
Barber, William E.
Hemstad, Robert S.
Barnhill, Claude O., Jr.
Austen, Philip N.
Sevier, Charles B.
Leogue, John J.
Keller, Karl T.
Millenbine, Otis E.
Reed, Herbert C.
Sigler, William M., Jr.

Cass, Bevan G.
McGraw, Thomas F., Jr.
St. John, Roscoe R.
Swinford, David G.
Ewers, Norman G.
Kern, Richard H.
McGraw, William C., Jr.
Ezell, Dee E.
Rutledge, Rockwell M.
Flinn, Norman W., Jr.
LeFaivre, Edward N.
Adams, Harold W.
Pond, Darwin B., Jr.
McCaleb, Alfred F., Jr.
Payne, Ernest W.
Gould, William R.
Schmagel, Arthur O.
Ward, Richard A.
Quillian, Stone W.
Ray, Grady W.
Francke, Donald E.
Conroy, Donald
Jackson, Owen G., Jr.
Andres, Russell A.
Gribbin, Thomas A.
Collins, George J.
Panska, Donald A.
Matthews, Merlin T.
Warren, Robert F.
Painter, Harry F.
McLaurin, John M., Jr.
Lees, Urban A.
Bolts, Lewis E.
Mileson, Donald F.
Robinson, Robert B.
McRay, Harold G.
Newport, Richard B.
Graham, Robert J.
McMahon, John F., Jr.
Heilman, Roland B.
Atwater, William L., Jr.
Simlik, Wilbur F.
Derryberry, Don G.
Holland, Dan C.
Hughes, Thomas H.
Durnford, Dewey F., Jr.
Beck, Noble L.
Corbett, Leroy V.
Bruce, James P.
Caswell, Dean
Mulvey, William H.
Panchision, Walter
Pritchett, Clarence H.
Petty, Douglas D., Jr.
Berge, James H., Jr.
Kew, George D.
Cronin, James T.
Pedersen, Poul F.
Jillisky, Leo R.
Jones, James R.
Estey, Ralph F.
Eubanks, Fred F., Jr.
Daigle, Adlin P.
Smith, James W.
Joslyn, William G.
Harp, Dene T.
Price, Elbert F.
Murphy, John J.
Parnell, Robert L., Jr.
Jensen, Harvey L.
Nichols, Thomas H., Jr.
Miner, Ross R.
Wosser, Joseph L., Jr.
Higgins, William B.
Doswell, James T., II
Harris, Donald R., Jr.
Hovatter, Eugenous M.
Bohn, Robert D.
Stawicki, Theodore A.
Airheart, William C.
Dodenhoff, George H.
Hughes, Orlin A. P.
Crossman, Ralph B.
Brooks, Donald H.
Mize, Charles D.
Doehler, William F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Olszewski, George M.
*Carter, Johnny L.
*Martin, Gene C.
*Rapp, John A.
*Zielinski, Edward L.
*Pyles, Howard E.
*Livingston Charles R.
*Blass, Lytton F.
*Roberts, Henry G.
*Bradshaw, Frank L.
*Varley, William J.
*Bailey, Jack F.
*Grow, Hubert C.
*Anderson, Eugene D.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Rall, Raymond R., Jr.
Grimes, George H.
Clark, C. P., Jr.
Haden, Frederick M.
Ferguson, Gilbert W.
Markus, Howard M.
Alexander, Richard D.
Talbott, Richard B.
Gaughf, Orvis O., Jr.
Phillips, George R.
Webster, Charles A.
Levert, Harris J., Jr.
Lamb, George R.
Burger, Donald J.
Ohanesian, Victor
Keith, William C., Jr.
Alsop, William F., Jr.
Cunningham, Ralph L., Jr.
Grubaugh, William R.
Foley, Kenneth S.
Beyerle, Garland T.
Stevens, Marvin H.
Mathis, Jerry F.
Deering, Claude E., Jr.
Cross, William E., Jr.
Hart, Elwin B.
Stine, Harold E.
Mehargue, David G.
Bronars, Edward J.
Marsh, James W.
Cowing, Harry O., Jr.
Tubley, George F.
Bendell, Lee R.
Rosenfeld, Charles A.
Petersen, Arthur R.
Pross, Vincent J., Jr.
Greenwood, John E.
Vest, Wendell N.
Hare, Andrew E.
Twomey, David M.
Dinabo, James J., Jr.
Walker, Paul D., Jr.
McNair, Audrey P.
Palmer, Thomas A.
Brennan, Robert B.
Morgan, Ira L., Jr.
McMillan, Alexander P.
Svenson, Otto L., Jr.
Green, Fredric A.
Sargent, George T., Jr.
Gary, Harry L.
Gruenler, Robert E.
Walsh, Walter V.
Herman, Stanley A.
Randall, Harry B., III
Ryan, Raymond M.
Hall, Lawrence A.
Megarr, Edward J.
McClintock, Bain
Good, Robert N.
Miller, Donald C.
Buchanan, Richard K.
Ridderhof, David M.
Talbert, Aubrey W., Jr.
DeWitt, Birchard B.
Wightman, David J.
Chapman, Winston D.
Swigart, Oral R., Jr.
Woeller, Frederick M.
Jones, Richard E.
Savage, Cornelius F., Jr.
Trevino, Rodolfo L.
Zlogar, Albert J.
Nastasi, Joseph
Buss, Kenneth M.
Wadzita, Cyril
Dorsey, Joshua W., III
Lesser, William
McMahon, Paul G.
Brown, Robert G.
Wold, Henry E.
Keller, Don L.
Hytrek, David J.
Corson, William R.
Robinson, Kenneth L., Jr.
Oliver, Robert W.
Paraskos, Peter G.
Burckell, Thomas J.
Foxworth, Eugene D., Jr.
Rigby, Edward J.
Wood, James W.
Stanton, Donald C.
Smith, Erin D.
Bowman, James L.
Aichele, James R.
Dorsa, Lawrence R.
Fleming, William B.
Johnson, Warren R.
McLernan, Joseph V.
Harter, Robert H.
Cizek, Gregory J.
Horn, William K.
Abbott, Charles W.
Gambardella, Joseph J. N.
Bulger, Thomas E.
McCurdy, William B.
Watson, Edward R.
Smith, Richard J.
Roth, Earl F., Jr.
Preis, Reagan L.
Wyatt, Richard B.
Staley, Newell D., Jr.
Herrin, William M., Jr.
Gibney, Jesse L., Jr.
Bacauskas, Withhold J.
Monti, Anthony A.
Wehrle, Robert E.
Corvi, Joseph A.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Maas, Patricia A.
*Caley, Virginia
*Mock, Mary S.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*McAlexander, Donald E.
*Carlisle, Robert L.
*Gerber, Donald R.
*Bischoff, Joseph J.
*Grey, Clearence B.
Cates, Leroy R.
*Candea, George A.
*Bicknel, William V.
*Newell, James F.
*Marushok, Andrew G.
*Fifield, John G.
Whitley, Billy L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Nichols, Bobby J.
*Portner, Jack
*Hartmeier, Wiliam J.
*Bittner, Barry N.
*Moore, Jacob W.
*Ingraham, John D.
*Peacock, Marvin E.
*Carr, John R., Jr.
*Melcher, Paul F.
*Bosbonis, Stephen
*Lamb, Allan W.
*Grayum, Walter E.
*Batt, Karlton L.
Baker, Terrance P.
*Czubai, Stanley J.
*Kramer, Russell I.
Ward, Charles
*McCoury, Melvin W., Jr.
*Maxwell, Jack L.
*Folks, Tommy L.
Borlan, Albert G.
*Christensen, Keith L.
*Loughry, Arthur S.
*Morgan, William I., Jr.
Brown, Walter R.
*Kussmann, John E., Jr.
*Hamber, John W.
*Greer, Jesse R.
*Hanneman, Richard W.
*Hurley, John E., Jr.
*Lowe, Willie L., Jr.
Oestricher, Philip F.
Terwilliger, John W.
*Flint, Robert D.
Widick, Lester D., Jr.
*Crumback, Willard I.
*Driefer, John L.
*Sweeney, Robert M.
*Hickle, Arthur R.
*Cacace, Pasquale L.
*Golden, Joseph F.
*Graves, Arthur L.
*Taylor, Jack R.
*Thomas, Donald J.
*Magaldi, Joseph M., Jr.
*Colburn, George W.
*Turner, David C.
*Hasler, Frederick R.
*Hepp, Gerald J.
*Jones, Harry P.
*Norman, Van A.
*Mann, Horace L.
*Kueker, William R.
*Bearden, Max
*Loraine, Jacques B., Jr.
*Stevens, Jerome E.
*Shetzer, William J.
*Reid, Herbert J. L.
*Dilley, Donald E.
*Heise, Edward J.
Brewer, Augustus E.
*Parsons, James R.
*Hedges, Manuel H. L.
Preston, Leonard T., Jr.
*Larsen, Erik
Moody, James D.
*Dotson, Thomas E.
*Griggs, Charles E.
*Popok, Charles S.
*Jacobs, Phillip M.
*Worden, Peter R.
*Barry, Lloyd W.
*Smith, William R.
*Miller, James E.
*Cooney, Thomas D.
*Janz, Edward P.
*Spreier, Richard P.
*Conway, Richard C.
*Skinner, Wilbur E.
*Derickson, Neal L.
*Webb, Donald E.
*Robinson, Charles D.
*Pratt, George E.
*Robertson, Thomas E.
Nelson, Herbert E.
Pafford, Billy E.
Plant, Robert
*Daniels, Charles E., Jr.
*Yanochik, Walter N.
Hull, Robert R.
*Schofield, Harold
Evans, George G., Jr.
*Manzione, John A., Jr.
*Habgood, Charles R.
*Coogan, Richard J.
Hadden, Don H.
*Weiss, Robert J.
*Stauch, Victor D., Jr.
*Bainbridge, Robert L.
*Piantadosi, Louis J.
*Sesslar, Donald T.
*Wilson, Paul A., Jr.
*Holmes, Lyell H.
Miller, Henry G., Jr.
*Gash, William J.
*Nalle, Thomas A., Jr.
*French, Russell W.
*Sprott, David N.
*Reap, Thomas S.
Sells, Jimmy D.
*Nelbach, Arthur A., Jr.
*Nieland, Paul F.
*Graham, Frank E.
*Curry, Kenneth D., Jr.
*Cassidy, Gerald W.
*Sanders, Albert L.
*Koch, John R.
*Holstead, George N.
*Emery, Gordon P.
Baughman, Robert C.
Elliott, Philip L.
*Boddy, Howard E.
*Klinglesmith, Ronald W.
*Simerly, Calvin F.
Hutchinson, Franklin G., Jr.
Sardo, Americo A.
*Williams, Charles P.
*Courson, Eugene S.
*Kettering, Alvah J.
Emberton, Bruce W.
Henson, Edwin B., Jr.
*Zimmerman, Karl A., II
*McNelis, James F.
Woeckener, Robert J.
*Pentecost, Thomas J.
*Oliver, John P.
*Dale, Denver T., III
*Gregorcyk, Joe L.
McDonald, Charles J., Jr.
*Parker, Charles E.
*Shubert, James D.
*Shoemaker, Franklin R.
*Reid, Robert J.
*Lafser, Raymond C.
Bair, Harry H.
*Jamison, Russell E.
*Wood, Richard F.
*Nulty, William H.
*Cady, Michael P.
*Overcash, Bobbie G.
*Heister, Theodore A.
*Boone, William
Johnson, Richard J.
*Bustamante, Miguel E., Jr.
*Dodds, William E.
Waters, Robert T.
*Anderson, Donald C.
*Black, Carl E. R.
*MacFarlan, Cornelius W.
*Leighty, Merle R., Jr.
Petroff, Richard
*Leavitt, James E. C., Jr.
*Cardwell, Ronald E.
*Andrew, Thomas C., Jr.
*Bailey, George N., Jr.
Jones, Homer P.
*Ondrako, Stephen Jr.
*Robson, Jon R.
Scarborough, Kenneth L.
*Moore, Robert H.
*Berry, Fred H., Jr.
*Brubaker, Ralph E.
*Gahagan, James S.
Throgmorton, James R.
Samaras, Peter N.
Schilhab, Eugene E.
*Monteau, Hubert A.
*Jupp, Walter A.
*Birzer, Edward A.
Tye, Charles
*Mills, Harry L.
*Symm, Bernace M.
*Crittenden, Jerry J. S.
*Nichols, John T.
*Brandenhorst, John D.
*Isbell, Will D.
*McMahon, George F., Jr.
Holcomb, Charles E.
*Guttormson, Darold L.
*Anderson, James E.
*Bieger, Donald C.
Chapman, Ralph L.
*Cole, Jack L.
*Cassidy, Brendan J.
Brown, Earl E.
*Page, James E.
*Ramsey, Lonnie E.
*Johnston, Carl B.
*Harrell, James T., III
*Roberts, John W.
*Pitman, Charles H.
Boemerman, George F.
*Hintz, Gary W.
Bergman, Arthur A.
Henry, Charles A.
*Phifer, David W.
Beers, Thomas G.
*Green, James R.
Webb, Bruce D.
Huss, Marvin A., Jr.
*Frandsen, Jerald L.
*Nelson, Jack P.
*Stewart, Arthur L., Jr.
*Horn, Denis R.
*Barry, John A.
Yeckel, Donald G.
*Kraxberger, Billy D.
Coleman, George F.
*Sheehan, James F.
*Gaboury, Laurence R.
*Gonzalez, John C.
*Bloomer, William A.

*Foreman, Clarence D.
*Cox, James M.
Cranford, James O.
*Eggers, Robert F.
Steffey, Richard G.
*Leach, George H.
*Ivy, Henry C., Jr.
*King, Robert D.
Foley, William M.
*Abel, Gerald G.
*Shunkey, William P., Jr.
*Mack, Jack A.
*Crampton, Ervin J.
*Browne, Desmond F.
Young, David L.
*Cooper, James L.
Wieler, Eric H.
*Macha, Benjamin E.
Vanous, Fredric J.
Blalock, Ira, Jr.
Kandra, Michael D.
*Whitman, Fred T.
*Arman, Phillip T.
*Weir, Robert K.
Valentini, Mario S.
*Lockie, John E.
*Crawford, John D.
*Stevenson, Craig H.
Widener, William W.
Lewis, Ernest P., Jr.
Scolforo, Leo J., Jr.
*Edwards, Myrddyn E.
*VanHemert, Willem
*Solazzo, Vito M.
*Liedel, Arthur J.
*Bollard, George J.
*LeBrun, Robert A.
*Fahrni, Leonard W.
Scott, Roger F. Jr.
*Rust, Barry P.
*Oaks, Charles W.
*White, Francis V., Jr.
*Roberts, Stanton H., Jr.
*Bailey, Richard A.
*Greene, Wallace M., III
Newton, Haril W.
*Lee, Arthur E.
*Carr, Richard W.
*Way, John D.
Townsend, David C.
*Doran, Edwin J.
*Noble, Joe B.
*Clauretie, David M.
Hawthorne, Richard W.
*McElroy, Howard M.
Buxton, John S. W.
Slack, Paul D.
Kerr, Hugh T.
Franklin, Donald H.
Stewart, James T., Jr.
Smith, Rodgers T.
Bradley, Robert L.
Jacks, Glenn G.
Lapham, Thomas J.
Knuebel, Kenneth P.
Robertson, Richard S.
Christy, Howard A.
Masters, James E.
Pauley, Donald C.
Carli, Randall C.
Biel, Richard K.
Odom, David L.
Frucci, Allen L.
Jones, George E.
Murty, James B.
Mason, Robert B.
Clark, Arthur B.
Hyatt, Richard C.
Peterson, George E.
Clarkson, Edward J.
Swift, James N.
Morris, McLendon G.
Martino, Frank W.
Murray, John D.
Caldwell, Robert C.
Avera, B. Lewis, Jr.
Caputo, Joseph J.
Mason, Donald G.
Miller, Donald R.
Perryman, James M., Jr.
Sparks, Donald R.
Burton, John J.
Marks, Roy M.
Ridgely, Reginald H., III
Clute, Morrel G.
Onslow, Robert C.
Brown, Allen W., Jr.
Votaw, Edward F.
Trehy, Jerome P.
Read, William T.
Eller, Franklin P., Jr.
Obuhanych, David E.
Edson, Herbert R.
Rogers, Marcus B.
Ross, Richard D.
Kelly, Francis J.
Berwald, Herbert T., Jr.
Cuthbert, Edward W.
Knotts, Joseph B.
Bennett, David R.
Grissom, Esta D.
VonHarten, William R.
Perron, Edward R.
Ball, William R.
Weaver, Calvin G.
Armstrong, Joseph E.
Tolleson, Frederic L.
Curnutt, John R.
McGarvey, James M.
DeWitt, John W.
Eldred, Loran C.
Fischer, Robert L.
Gary, John H., III
Owlett, Fred
MacNulty, William K., Jr.
Terhorst, Bernard R.
McAfee, Carlos K.
Pifel, Bruce A.
Cassin, Brendan J.
Trueblood, Cecil R., Jr.
Chmelik, James J.
Cisewski, Richard J.
Milone, Donald E.
Maitland, Peter R.
Gannon, Dominick R.
Camper, Richard M.
Edwards, Cecil A., Jr.
Bickel, Donald C.
Shea, William S.
Hallden, Richard C.
Albert, Karl V.
Schulken, James E.
Arney, Harold E., Jr.
Hayes, Charles H.
Blanchard, Ronald E.
Esterline, Charles S.
Forehand, Lorraine L., Jr.
Hoag, John A.
Wiedemann, Robert J.
Poland, James A.
Coffin, John C.
McFarland, Thomas G., Jr.
Sasko, George M., Jr.
Acey, John B.
Beery, Richard L.
Morra, John A.
Colassard, Barry S.
Sudduth, Donald E.
Arnold, William P.
Gray, John T.
Stuckey, Robert D.
Stoy, Charles H.
Goins, Robert F.
Valentine, Harry C., Jr.
Slattery, William P.
Cowart, James G., Jr.
Locke, Frederick A.
Sime, Colben K., Jr.
Tyler, John T.
Vail, Alfred L.
Adkins, Mars M.
Freeman, Bobby H.
McManaway, James L.
Janis, Robert V.
Bowers, Donald V.
Fisher, Wilfred S.
Geraghty, Gerald W., Jr.
Celli, John G.
Fisher, Albert T.
Monahan, John P.
Shelton, Jerry L.
Holdridge, George L.
Marks, James W.
Taylor, Charles H., Jr.
Seeley, Devon C.
Helms, Samuel H.
Adams, John A.
Lowrey, Bill G.
Sheridan, John J.
Miller, Robert C.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cox, Martha A.
Land, Florence E.
Wallis, Jane L.
Pruett, Margaret R.
Olds, Dorothy A.
Colmer, Patricia A.
Gifford, Shirley J.
Pinney, Claire A.
Twilley, Patsy A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Richard J.
Ades, Robert E., III
Airola, John B.
Allen, Earl R.
Allworth, Norman D.
Altman, James L.
Amidon, Alton L.
Andrews, Burk
Andrews, Robert H.
Angus, Thomas P.
Arnold, Roy F.
Augustine, Charles A.
Babbin, Robert R.
Baer, John H.
Bailey, David B.
Baker, Daryl E.
Baker, Owen C.
Bancroft, Robert E.
Barney, Kline P., Jr.
Barutio, William H.
Bateman, Kent C.
Bates, William S.
Batson, Herman D.
Baulch, Ernest F.
Beans, James D.
Beaty, William D.
Beck, Jerome L.
Bell, Francis W.
Benjamin, William D.
Benton, Bert D., Jr.
Berry, Eugene A.
Binns, Donald R.
Black, Frank R.
Black, Robert M.
Blaul, Daniel J.
Bloodworth, John M.
Bond, William H., Jr.
Borland, Joseph P.
Boulton, Jerry D.
Brennan, Gene E.
Bridges, Larry W.
Brooks, Robert P.
Brown, Donald G.
Brown, Gordon R.
Browne, Randolph M., III
Brownlee, Gordon D.
Bruce, Robert C.
Buckley, Edward A.
Buckley, John C., Jr.
Bugbee, James F.
Bullard, Donald E.
Burch, Gene P.
Burchard, Jerome C.
Burnes, Alan J.
Burns, Mervyn J.
Busby, Marion G.
Butler, John W.
Byrnes, Joseph B.
Caccivio, James C.
Canova, James H.
Carboni, Joseph L.
Carew, Frederick R., Jr.
Carpenter, Charles L., Jr.
Cassity, James E.
Cate, Bradley F.
Cockell, Robert C.
Cerasoli, James R.
Cerreta, Michael D., Jr.
Champlin, Jimmy C.
Chandler, James R. F.
Chelius, Carl R.
Chenault, Richard F.
Chwatek, Walter T.
Cisewski, Fred L.
Clapp, Wiley M., Jr.
Clark, Gordon M.
Clark, John W.
Clark, Richard W.
Coakley, Paul F.
Cobb, Jere B.
Cole, Paul M.
Conaty, Donald B.
Condon, Edward A., Jr.
Cooper, John C., Jr.
Corr, Edwin G.
Corr, Ethelbert L., Jr.
Corrigan, Francis M.
Crabtree, Robert A.
Craig, Eric W. S.
Crouch, Logan A.
Currey, Stanley R.
Dahlquist, Martin J.
Dasch, Robert D.
Davidson, James U.
Davis, Robert D.
Davison, Hollis E.
Day, Marilyn F.
Dayton, Valerie M.
Dearth, Wayne R.
Dobrowolski, William D.
Dodd, Edward L.
Doman, Tom R.
Doyle, Cyril W.
Drake, Clancy G.
Drost, Ronald S.
Duggan, Donovan F.
Dunn, John L.
Duval, Robert C.
Easley, Jon T.
Eastin, Ray F.
Eddins, James C.
Edwards, Charles S.
Ellis, Gerald L.
Ellison, George V.
English, John P.
Ernst, Edward H.
Esau, Richard H., Jr.
Evans, Emory S.
Fairbanks, Edward J.
Farber, James F.
Fassler, Gerald D.
Faust, Frank B., Jr.
Firnstahl, Vernon E.
Fitts, William D., III
Fitzgerald, Dennis C.
Fitzgerald, Stanley G.
Flattery, Paul C.
Flynn, John F.
Ford, Hadley C., Jr.
Fowler, John W.
Frank, George R., Jr.
Fredricksen, Ronald A.
Fuller, Irving L., Jr.
Futrell, John W., Jr.
Gale, George A.
Garcia, Robert E.
Gardner, George L.
Gast, Harry H., Jr.
Gatliff, James I.
Gentry, William R.
Gerber, Frederic H.
Germagian, Barker P.
German, Richard T.
Gillette, Robert W.
Gilson, Ronald H.
Goddard, Charles D.
Golletz, Victor H.
Goodwin, William L.
Gore, Gordon D.
Gore, Orrin R.
Gorham, Bradford
Gould, Walter D.
Graham, Otis L., Jr.
Graves, Dean W.
Grosch, Glenn R.
Gullett, Charles H.
Gurtner, James F.
Gustafson, Richard A.
Hahn, Paul A.
Haldi, Donald A.
Hall, Donald D.
Hamel, William S.
Hammack, Tommy R.
Hammond, George L.
Hanklin, Ronald M.
Hanly, Alfred S.
Harrison, Kenneth P.
Hart, John G., III
Hart, Richard T.
Hart, Robert W., Jr.
Hatcher, William J., Jr.
Haupt, Hans S.
Haven, Thomas W.
Haverkamp, Robert E.
Hayden, Louis H., Jr.
Heiden, Charles H.
Henry, Norman E.
Hicks, Donald L.
Hines, David R.
Hoar, Joseph P.
Hoff, Robert M.
Hoffman, Marvin E.
Hollabaugh, Jon D.
Hooper, Robert C., Jr.
Hornback, Bert G.
Houchin, Gerald R.
House, David W.
Howard, Medford W., Jr.
Huff, Emmett S., Jr.
Hunt, Richard V.
Ingels, Larry T.
Inglisa, Angelo M.
Irwin, William R.
James, Gerald D.
James, Robert L.
Jensen, Redmond R.
Jensen, Robert G.
Jessup, William B.
Johansen, Peter J.
Johnson, Edward T., Jr.
Johnson, Mary Ann
Johnson, Richard R.
Johnson, Theodore C., Jr.
Johnston, Gordon R.
Jones, Allan E.
Jones, Duncan H.
Jones, Richard O.
Jones, Stanley E.
Joy, Jim R.
Junger, Frank
Jurecka, James R.
Kahn, Paul F.
Kauffman, Francis M.
Keeney, Robert
Kellett, Morris C.
Kelly, Michael J.
Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr.
Kerce, Herbert M.
Kiene, Christian F.
Kindig, Jerry L.
Kirchner, John A.
Kitchens, Kenneth E.
Kline, Franklin J.
Knapp, James V.
Knight, Howard E. Jr.
Kohnen, Hubert
Kozischek, Donald A.
Kreppein, Donald U.
Kristoff, Basil L.
Kruthers, James M.
Landis, John P.
Lawrence, Robert L.
Lawson, Charles S.
Layer, Robert W.
Lecky, Timothy B.
Lee, Barbara J.
Lee, Peter B.
Lefevre, Pierre L.
Leighton, David J.
Lessard, Paul F.
Liati, John J.
Lilla, John M.
Linford, Claude M.
Linnemann, John A.
Lipper, A. Michael
Lively, Charles M.
Lloyd, Charles F.
Loe, Gerald E.
Long, Basil M.
Lopresti, Phillip A.
Lougheed, Thomas P.
Lovejoy, Hugh M.
Lowe, Thomas F.
Lucas, Robert G.
Lutes, William R.
Mabry, David R.
Machenberg, Donald E.
Mackie, Carter G.
Maguire, James F., Jr.
Manwarring, Charles L.
Manzo, Joseph V.
Marada, Joseph P.
Mardick, Max L.
Marsden, Richard W.
Marsh, John O.
Martin, David R.
Martin, Donald D.
Mason, Benjamin J.
Maxwell, John A.
May, Jacob T.
McAlexander, Donald E.
McCoart, James J., Jr.
McCraner, James N.
McCrindle, Ronald B.
McDorman, Leroy D., Jr.
McGee, David O.
McGinn, James A.
McIlhenny, John B.
McIntyre, David S.
McLennan, Charles C.
McMahon, Bernard
McManus, John F.
McMillan, Colin R.
McSweeney, Harold R.
McTighe, Michael J.
McWilliams, James P., Jr.
Meador, James G.
Merritt, Richard O.
Mikulecky, Donald C.
Miller, John G.
Miller, Justus K.
Miller, Ralph D.
Mixson, Joseph G.
Monteith, Joseph W., Jr.
Moore, Brian D.
Moore, Wilbur N., Jr.
Morgan, Louis L.
Morris, Donald L.
Mount, Fred H.
Mullally, Daniel E., Jr.
Mundy, Carl E., Jr.

Murphy, Gerald P.
Murphy, Irene M.
Murray, Ronald L.
Murray, William R.
Napheys, Benjamin F., III
Neal, Robert G., Jr.
Nelson, Harold M.
Neumann, Peter F.
Newton, John S.
Norton, James C.
Nowak, Andrew N.
Oates, Richard H.
O'Brien, Paul M., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Ohman, James H.
Olf, Nelson M.
O'Rourke, John F.
Orr, James W.
Orth, Allan J.
Ossenfort, Richard C.
Osterman, Joseph V., Jr.
Pare, David F.
Parrish, Lionel J.
Patterson, Roy A., Jr.
Peavey, John T.
Peterson, Jerry D.
Peterson, William P.
Phillips, John E.
Philon, Robert H.
Pikel, John J., Jr.
Piper, Earl S., Jr.
Pitt, Albert
Pollock, John C.
Prescott, George S.
Price, Allen I., Jr.
Putnam, Samuel G., Jr.
Pyne, Richard S.
Raiselis, Donald R.
Ram, Cornelius H.
Ramzel, David R.
Reams, Radford M., III
Redding, William P. Jr.
Revell, Joseph E.
Ridge, Paul E.
Rilling, David S.
Ritchie, Robert D.
Robertson, Olin J.
Robertson, James Y.
Robillard, George N., Jr.
Robinson, Frederick J.
Robinson, Lucien C.
Rodenbach, William J.
Rodriquez, Evelyn J.
Rogers, Jack J.
Rogers, Robert P.
Roush, Paul E.
Royer, James E., Jr.
Ruck, Thomas L.
Rule, Julius M., III
Rushin, Robert K.
Rutherford, Robert E.
Samsonoff, Ivan K. T.
Samuelsen, Conrad J.
Sanderford, James H.
Sargent, Richard H.
Sattolo, Arthur J.
Saye, Dicky A.
Shroeder, Clifford
Schultz, Joseph P.
Schuppe, Robert H.
Schwaninger, Marvin E.
Searby, Frederick W.
Sellers, Wiley J.
Senik, John P.
Seymour, Kenneth F.
Shaw, Philip G.
Shaw, Robert W.
Shearer, William L.
Shepard, Robert B., Jr.
Sheppard, Thomas F.
Sheridan, Michael K.
Silhanek, David K.
Simmons, Roger E.
Sindelar, Robert L.
Sistrunk, Francis
Smalley, David P.
Smart, Robert H.
Smeltzer, Gareth W.
Smiley, James B.
Smith, Staley L.
Smith, Vea J.
Smith, William W.
Snyder, Brock R.
Soomre, Raoul
Sorenson, Dwight T.
Spaulding, Dorsey L.
Spivey, Lloyd G., Jr.
Squillace, Gaetano F.
Stephens, Carl M.
Stevens, Robert C.
Stonum, Burl V.
Stowe, Edward L.
Strausser, Warren J.
Streitman, Henry W., III
Strickland, William C.
Stringer, Anthony R.
Stubin, Charles S.
Suhre, Walter A., Jr.
Sullivan, William L.
Sullivan, John C.
Swartwood, Robert E., Jr.
Sweeney, James R.
Swift, Richard F.
Teague, Marjorie L.
Tebbe, Carl G., Jr.
Thelen, John F.
Thomas, Carl R.
Thompson, Wayne D.
Thorp, Joseph C.
Tiernan, William H. J.
Tirschfield, William J.
Tivnan, John M.
Townsend, Bruce E.
Toxie, Paul G.
Treadwell, Russell P.
Tricca, Chester J.
Trippe, Samuel M.
Trower, William P.
Trowsdale, Annie M.
Turchinsky, Andrew
Vazquez, Pedro R.
Vogt, John S.
Waggener, Ronald W.
Waibel, Leonard C.
Walker, James E.
Wall, Caleb N.
Warren, George F.
Waterbury, Mark H. III
Webb, Richard J.
Wehrell, William K., Jr.
Wells, Harry E.
Wells, Richard C.
Wells, Samuel F., Jr.
Wescott, William J.
Westmoreland, James H.
White, Edward A.
White, Francis V., Jr.
Wilde, Hugh L.
Williams, Larry R.
Williams, Benjamin D. III
Williams, Morris M.
Williamson, Charles P.
Wilson, Douglas N.
Winglass, Robert J.
Wittmann, Phillip A., Jr.
Wright, David H.
Wuerch, George P.
Wulff, Fred A. III
Wuthrich, John R.
Young, William D., Jr.
Anderson, Hugh H.
Andreas, Ronald C.
Bacik, Vladimir H.
Black, Harry P.
Brown, Charles W.
Brutcher, Samuel P.
Cantrell, Robert L.
Carrigan, David H.
Clayes, Alfred I., Jr.
Connolly, Richard P.
Cooper, John G.
Cronkrite, Charles L.
Davis, Gary A.
Dawson, James P.
Deitrick, Roger E.
Dolan, John J.
Ekholm, Wallace H. Jr.
Giligoria, Thomas J.
Goodman, Robert B.
Griffay, Donnie M.
Grimshaw, James E.
Harnden, Milton D.
Haych, Everard E.
Hinkel, John B.
Hoffman, Richard C.
Howe, Edward L., Jr.
Keathley, Jesse N.
Kemp, Gerald G.
Krueger, Stanley P.
Layman, Phillip B.
Lewis, Dale E.
Mason, John L. H., Jr.
Millhouse, Timothy J.
Morgan, John E.
O'Mahoney, Terrence P.
Oren, Ralph B.
Psaros, George C.
Pulcheon, Jack H.
Radich, John T.
Ridings, William H.
Root, Roland W.
Downing, Glenn H.
Rinehart, Benny D.
Sahaydak, Edwin
Simon, Clyde C.
Skinner, Barry F.
Skinner, James L.
Sparks, Kenneth R.
Spauldings, Jerry L.
Stofer, John M.
Stroman, Herbert F.
Uhlenhake, Dale J.
Watson, John L.
Wehrell, William K., Jr.
Whipple, Lawrence A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abington, Richard C.
Adams, Joe C.
Allen, John S., Jr.
Ammon, Ray D.
Amsler, John H.
*Anthis, Bobby G.
Archambault, Arthur E., Jr.
Armstrong, Reginald E.
Babbs, Kenneth J.
Baggett, Charles A.
Baker, Donald S.
Banks, Charles G., Jr.
Bean, Gary W.
Bearce, Larned V.
Behymer, Lynn A.
Bernotas, Alphonse A.
Bickley, Leroy A.
Bienvenu, Charles T., Jr.
Bienvenu, Wayne J.
Bizzano, Joseph D., Jr.
Black, Samuel E.
Bledsoe, Leard B., Jr.
Bock, Philip H.
Boltz, Harry W.
*Booth, Francis D.
Bottom, Earle D., Jr.
*Bown, Rodney L.
Boyce, Edward H., Jr.
Braman, George H., Jr.
Branner, William H., Jr.
Breth, Frank J.
Brinkley, Edward C., Jr.
Brown, Bruce G.
Brown, Dwight E.
Brown, James H.
Brown, Jimmy L.
*Bucknam, Howard V.
Burnett, Leslie D.
Burns, Edmund B. R.
Burt, Robert N.
Bush, Charles A.
Calhoun, David H.
Calteaux, John A.
Capin, Frank L.
Carnes, Robert A.
Carr, Donald R.
Carroll, Herman G., Jr.
Carter, Robert S.
Cashwell, Richard G.
Cassidy, Lawrence M.
Chambers, Francis X., Jr.
Chapla, Daniel B.
Christensen, Gary E.
Clarence, Donald L.
Clark, Arthur L.
Clements, John E., Jr.
Coleman, David C.
*Collins, Patrick G.
Cone, Daniel B.
Cooper, Richard S.
Coplan, Ronald F.
Crompton, Thomas R.
Cupples, Gordon J.
Cushing, Philbrook S.
Damore, Louis J.
Dauer, Arthur F.
Davis, David N.
Davis, Leonard N.
Deal, Frank E.
Dean, Anthony B.
De Diminicantanio, Joseph J.
Deiuliis, William E.
De Ornellas, Clifton L.
Dickie, Louis
Dickinson, John
Dincher, Thomas A.
Dixon, Albert K., II
Dougherty, John W.
Dove, William G., Jr.
Ducote, James A., Jr.
Dwan, John F.
Edward, William H.
Elliott, Keith E.
*Elofson, Rodger H.
Epstein, Jerome R.
Eshelman, William P.
Estes, Henry D.
Etcho, Leonard L.
Fairchild, Chauncey R.
Farrar, Ross W.
Farrier, James A.
Faulkner, Joe E.
Fernandez, Angelo
Fischer, Max C.
Fitts, Walter M.
Fleming, Charles A.
Floyd, David A.
Flynn, Joseph F.
*Foster, Edward B.
Fox, Jon I.
Frie, David J.
Furtado, Robert A.
Gapenski, Louis C.
Garbacz, Gerald G.
Gardner, Joseph E.
Gardner, Robert B.
Gibbons, Edward W.
Gibson, Wallace C.
Gillespie, Bernard M.
Gilmore, Vincent K.
Gipson, Carl L.
Gould, Fred C.
Green, Marshall M.
Griggs, George R.
Grinalds, John S.
Halbert, Robert O.
Hanle, Ray L., Jr.
Hawkins, Ronald H.
Heffley, Henry S., Jr.
Heginbotham, Stanley J.
Henderson, David H.
Hicks, Harold D.
Hokom, Robert A.
Horsfall, Richard S.
*House, Edward L., Jr.
Hoynes, Edward J.
Huber, Thomas P.
Huddy, Norman W., Jr.
*Huffcut, William H., II
Hunnicutt, John E.
Hyatt, Wayne R.
Iversen, Kenneth M.
Jenkins, Hulen F.
Jenkins, Raymond S., Jr.
Jennings, James W.
Johnson, Charles M.
Johnson, David C.
Johnson, Richard A.
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnston, Clyde J.
Kappelman, Charles W.
*Keating, Daniel J., Jr.
Keiser, Gordon W.
Kemper, David L.
Kempf, Donald G., Jr.
Kiely, Denis J., Jr.
Kilday, John J.
Knief, John H.
Koester, Alfred K.
Koury, Victor A.
Kruger, Alfred L.
Kurtz, Patrick T.
Lain, Bobby D.
Lamar, Lewis W.
Lannes, William J., III
Larowe, William C.
Laumbach, Dallas D.
Lavan, Ray E., Jr.
Lee, Thomas A., Jr.
Legro, Stanley W.
Lemmel, Kenneth G.
Lennartz, Francis J., IV
Lewandowski, James H.
Lewis, John W.
Liittschwager, Robert C.
Ling, Harry A., II
Losee, Ronald M.
Lovett, William D.
Lowe, Robert E.
Lyons, Perry D., Jr.
MacEachin, Douglas J.
Madden, Richard J.
*Magee, James T., Jr.
Maney, David A.
Marks, Anthony M.
Marr, David G.
Maxwell, John A.
McCarthy, John M.
McFarlane, Robert C.
*McGuire, James S.
McLelland, Donald R.
McMinn, Wilbur C., Jr.
McRoberts, James C.
Meehan, John L.
Meharg, Ben A.
Menning, Frederick H., Jr.
Messerschmidt, Donald B.
Metry, Robert A.
Mikkelson, Philip C.
Miskow, Kenneth P.
Molineaux, Joseph F., Jr.
Monaghan, Thomas C.
Monroe, Jerry W.
Moore, William S., Jr.
Moran, John B.
Morgan, Harcourt A., III
Morris, Maynard R.
Morris, Robert S., Jr.
Murphy, John T.
Nash, William A.
Naviaux, Jacques C.
Neville, William H.
Nevins, Gary R.
Norton, Gary D.
Noteboom, Kenneth W.
*Oravits, Joseph J.
Osgood, Jonathan K.
Ostermann, George A.
Parker, Larry E.
*Patrick, Jimmy L.
Paulson, Raymond C.
Phelan, Leo H., III
Philips, Jack W.
Pittman, Raiford L.
Platt, John C., III
*Powell, Donald A.
Proctor, James M., III
*Prewitt, Robert C.
*Ramsay, Charles J.
Rector, Edwin B.
Reed, Amos R.
Reed, Gerald D.
Richards, Tommy J.
Rider, James W.
Rietman, Jan D.
Rindfleisch, Jon A.
Roberts, Albert J., III
Rolstad, Lawrence A.
Roof, Douglas P.
Rucksdashel, Rex N.
Saenz, Ramiro
Sallstrom, Duane M.
Sapp, John W., IV
Sarvi, Alfred R.
Schon, Peter C.
Schrader, Daniel W.
Searle, Robert E.
Sedutto, William H.
Selby, Mack D.
Severs, Hugh B., II
Shimota, John E.
Shirreffs, John J., Jr.
Shropshire, Jack C.
Shuter, David V. A.
Simmons, Gary
Sisson, Winfield W.
Skellenger, James R.
Smith, Lynn A.
Southard, Frank L.
*Spence, Jack R.
*Sperry, Charles B.
Stamand, Norman
Stanford, George R.
Stanton, James E.
*Steffen, Allan J.
*Stevenson, Samuel H.
Sockwell, John R.
St. Pierre, Glen S.
Swingen, Ronald K.
Taggart, Thomas M.
Tammaro, Richard J.
Taylor, Zelma L., Jr.
Thomas, Dudley E., Jr.
Thomas, Henry E., IV
Thompson, Thomas W.
Thompson, William S., III
Tibbetts, Otis P.
Tinsley, James H.
Topham, James T.
Torinus, John B., Jr.
Towers, Thomas B.
Town, Kenneth R.
Tupper, Jan C.
Turner, Robert A.
Updyke, James M.
Vann, Fredric M.
Vecchio, Ralph J.
Vogt, Robert L.
*Vorreyer, Richard W.
Walker, Robert F.
*Wall, Melvin N.

Ward, Michael J.
Warman, Kenneth E., Jr.
Warren, David D.
Weber, Edward M.
Weida, George A. F.
Whelan, James E.
*Whipple, Oliver M.
Wilke, Martin R. P.
Williams, John R., Jr.
Williams, Wayne S.
Wilmore, Winfield S., II
Windolf, John A.
*Wogan, Christopher M.
Wolk, Charles J., Jr.
Wollard, David A.
Wolpert, Richard J.
Wood, Mack E., Jr.
Woods, Richard M.
Wright, Grant D.
Wright, Wilton

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bormann, William P.
Floyd, Wayne R.
Giovingo, Salvador
Thyrring, Arthur J.
Oliver, William M.
Aldridge, Jack B.
Cole, Philip J.
Horstmann, Theodore
Kuchler, Lester W.
Christensen, Jack R.
Chapin, Charles H., Jr.
Edmunds, Merritt S.
Farris, William D.
Gryder, Kenneth W.
Hajtun, Paul
Baxter, Monta G.
Lemoine, Levy P.
Bialack, Robert L.
Vickery, Wallace E.
Mervish, Nathan
Light, Paul L.
Davis, Harold R.
Calcagno, Martin J.
Frey, Eugene C.
Allen, John H., Jr.
Amend, Robert G.
Head, Samuel
Jensen, Donald L.
Sedinger, James P.
Lockaby, Prince L.
Ryan, James E.
Degener, Walter E.
Young, Henry H.
Madore, Norman C.
Cumiskey, Francis P.
Millar, Stanley G.
Cole, James E.
Slagle, John W.
Wilkinson, Henry E.
Burt, Floyd R.
Dryden, Weldon J.
Forgash, Edward M.
Gustafson, Oscar D.
Kunkle, Frank P., Jr.
Candler, Orville G., Jr.
Miller, George H.
Montgomery, Benton R., Jr.
Moog, Carl W.
Oldenburg, Forrest A.
Bourbeau, Richard T.
Berling, Raymond R.
Sieger, Joseph, Jr.
Locke, Orville C.
Gerard, Louis E., Jr.
Pullen, George D., Jr.
Armstrong, Leonard O.
Post, Robert L.
Jablonski, Raymond C.
Edmondson, Phillip A.
Niekowal, Michael J.
Pike, Earl A.
Kouba, Joseph
Garvey, James M.
Johnson, Roy M.
Stewart, Robert F.
Green, Harold A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Johnson, Brooks, Jr.
Glenka, John M.
Clydesdale, Robert, Jr.
Morrison, George E.
Rasmussen, John H.
Sudduth, Joseph F.
Hall, John C.
Reese, Charles L.
Park, Herbert E.
Jenkins, Clarence E.
Vickerman, Joseph R.
Zimmerman, Edward L.
Owens, Norman S.
Davis, Kenneth L.
Shelton, Deward E.
Zarkos, Tom A., Jr.
Seaman, George W.
Kelly, Edwin F.
Good, Hubert M.
Block, Robert E.
Walton, Theodore C.
Joyce, Danna
Jordan, Thomas E.
Strickland, George E.
Yeam, Arden W.
Emerson, Sheldon M.
Nutter, Edward L., Jr.
Doyel, Grant R.
McLeod, Sandy L.
Antoine, George E.
Larkin, Harold E.
Waugh, Clinton C.
Peters, Benjamin F.
Beattie, Clarence R.
Mihalak, Stephen J.
Huffaker, Lionel
Taylor, James R.
Hamlet, Dean L.
Donavan, Samuel H.
McLaughlin, Patrick H.
Costlow, Walter E.
Shultz, James S.
Smith, Albert J.
Nickell, Chester T.
Haisley, Robert E.
Johnson, Robert W.
Black, Robert M.
Perry, George A.
Foster, George E.
Healey, Philip N., Jr.
Boyd, Ossie A.
Owens, William C.
Fields, John, Jr.
Watson, James O.
Sturgis, Richard C.
Duer, Arthur M., Jr.
Nestor, George R.
Adams, John A.
Exley, Harley H.
Bryks, Leon J.
Clark, Talmadge
Hull, Donald L.
Duerr, Edward J.
Covert, Newton C.
Wood, Edward N.
Myorski, Stephen M.
Harris, Roy K.
Winship, Larry E.

Parretti, Lawrence
Clay, Robert L.
Wells, Marcus D.
Hill, William J. D.
Magrath, Eric
Parker, George R., Jr.
Durham, George D., Jr.
Swearengen, Thomas F.
Fleming, Raymond R.
Noonkester, Henry E.
Jones, Samuel J.
Angil, Thomas
Parsons, Franklin R.
Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
Powell, Richard T., Jr.
Ponstingel, August J.
Gleim, Earl C.
Smith, Arnold H.
Johnson, Harold E., Jr.
Zimmerman, Norbert A.
McIntyre, Alice

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, John P.
*Allen, Hartsel D.
Alley, Charles J.
Anderson, Elmer D.
Anderson, Roy G.
Anderson, William R.
Andrews, Clyde C.
Andrews, Thomas L., Jr.
Auman, Forrester C.
Bacon, Schuyler W.
Baker, Carl S.
Balaban, Stephen F.
Ball, Thomas J.
Bangs, Louis L.
Barackman, Bruce M.
Barnhart, Robert E.
Bassett, Henry B.
Bauser, Edward J.
Baxter, Robert J.
Beauchamp, Ernest M.
Bellis, Charles A.
Benton, Burgin "L"
Bikle, Burton L.
Bjornson, Gordon B.
Blandin, Victor A.
Borden, Paul F.
Bowell, John H.
Bowen, John S.
Boyle, John E., Jr.
Bradway, William S., Jr.
Brandt, George E., Jr.
Brines, George R.
Brinn, Rufus T.
Brittin, Burdick H.
Brooks, Sidney
Brown, Gordon J.
*Bryan, William C.
Byrant, James S.
Bunn, Giles F., Jr.
Burley, Thomas G., Jr.
Byrnside, Benjamin C., Jr.
Calland, Robert W.
Calvert, James F.
Campbell, Donald C.
Cappello, Henry J.
Carmichael, Carl
Carney, Gerald F.
*Carpenter, William M.
Carr, Charles H.
Carter, William D.
Chalmers, Norman E.
Chandler, Ralph S.
Christiansen, Arnold R.
*Clark, Robert B.
Clinton, Jack W.
Coats, Robert C.
Cocowitch, Harry M.
Collingwood, John F.
Combs, Paul C.
Compton, Oliver D.
Compton, Raymond F.
*Cone, Davis
Connolly, John M., Jr.
Cook, Ralph E.
Corcoran, William J.
Cornelifussen, Steve T.
Costagliola, Francesco
Cowart, Andrew H.
Cox, Harry C.
*Coyle, James J.
Cramp, Kenneth W.
Crawford, Joseph W., Jr.
Crockett, David S.
Cross, William H.
Crowe, John W.
Cunnare, Francis H.
Daly, George W.
Damon, Arthur H., Jr.
Daniels, Lowell P.
Darby, Lowel E.
Darrah, Charles A.
Davidson, James J.
Davis, Bernard W.
Davis, Maxey B.
Davol, Charles D., Jr.
Denegre, Thomas B., Jr.
Dertien, Donald A.
Deventer, Willard W.
Dinneen, John H.
Dolan, John H.
Donahue, John C., II
Donahue, Philip M.
Douglass, George M.
Drain, Dan T.
Drake, James P.
Dresser, Kenneth R.
Drum, Henry W.
Dupzyk, Robert R.
Earnest, Albert K.
Eason, Van V., Jr.
Easterling, Henry M.
Edelstein, Sam E., Jr.
*Eder, Willard E.
Edwards, Frederick L., Jr.
Eggen, Arnold W.
Elliott, James B., Jr.
Englander, Felix L.
Engle, Aubrey D.
*Ereckson, Henry J., Jr.
Evers, Adelbert R.
Fairchild, Dale E.
Field, Henry C., Jr.
Fleet, John P.
Floyd, Joe H.
*Flynn, David R.
Foltz, Gayle C.
Ford, James A.
Foster, Edward L.
Foster, William M.
Erdmann, Robert F.
Freitag, Robert F.
French, Dana P.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
Garrett, Ned
Garvey, Richard S.
Gee, Roy P.
Gerry, Duane J.
Gibbs, Harry B.
Glassman, David E.
Gooch, Floyd W., Jr.
Gooding, Robert C.
Gordon, Archer R.
Gorman, Frederick E.
Grabowsky, Leon
Grieber, Peter A. M.
Griffing, Charles W.
*Gruber, Richard D.
Guillory, Troy T.
Gundlach, William
Gustaferro, Joseph F.
Guy, Robert S.
Hackett, James E., Jr.
Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
Hailey, Robert
Haller, Morris E.
Harding, William T.
Hardy, Lewis R., Jr.
Harrell, Robert B.
Harrison, Edward W.
Harrold, Clay
Hatch, William N.
*Hawes, George M.
Hickman, Howard H., Jr.
Hildreth James B.
*Hill, Raymond E.
Hirst, William B., Jr.
Hitchcock, John H.
Hodson, Norman D.
Hoffberg, Howard J.
Holm, Stanley R.
Holmes, John L., Jr.
Holmes, Paul L.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Holmquist, Carl O.
Hopkins, Lewis A.
Horner, Thomas L.
Houser, William D.
Howard, Seth T.
Hunt, Edward R.
Iarrobino, John H.
Ireland, James M.
Issitt, Donald K.
Ivison, Sterling H., Jr.
Jackson, Clifton E.
Jackson, Harry A.
Jackson, Wyman N.
James, Daniel V.
*Jeffrey, Robert E.
Johns, Ruben L.
Johnson, Edward B., Jr.
Jones, Joseph M.
Kalin, Morris I.
Keegan, John P.
*Keehn, Robert H.
Kelly, Charles B.
Kennedy, John E.
Kern, Donald H.
Kiefer, Edwin H.
Kilner, John S., Jr.
King, Jerome H., Jr.
*Kittler, Fred W.
Kittrell, James R.
Knoche, Ernest J.
Knowlton, Negus W.
Kobey, Albert L., Jr.
Koenigsberger, Charles, Jr.
Kooy, Herman P.
Kosciusko, Henry M.
Kotsch, William J.
Kroger, Bruce G.
Laforest, Thomas J.
Lane, Stanley H.
Lange, Robert V.
Lanterman, William S., Jr.
LaRocque, Gene R.
LaRoe, Edward T.
Lauff, Bernard J.
Leidel, John S.
*Lee, Norman I., Jr.
Lewis, Allen L.
Lewiston, William A.
Lienhard, Bernard A.
Lloyd, Frederic M., III
Lockett, Lawrence S.
Long, Andrew W., Jr.
Lowe, Grady H.
Luce, William T.
Luehman, Earl A.
Lundgren, Arthur E.
Lyon, Hugh P.
*MacGregor, Stephen H., Jr.
Macklin, Robert D.
Marquardt, Richard C.
Marshall, James M.
Mason, Frank V.
Mayer, Lucas B.
Mayher, John R.
McCormick, Thomas E., Jr.
McDonald, Maxwell "D"
*McEntire, Paul W.
McIntosh, David M.
McKee, John R.
McLaughlin, Bernard
McNulty, Willard J.
McQuown, Wymard B., Jr.
Medley, Russell C.
Melson, Lewis B.
Menge, Robert F.
Merrill, David A.
Micheel, Vernon L.
Mildahn, Elwood C.
Miller, Jack A.
*Miller, Robert N.
Milota, Robert F.
Minor, Gerald E.
Minton, Robert B.
Mishan, John E.
Mohl, Edgar V.
Moriarty, Thomas J.
Morrissey, Jack L.
Morton, Albert O.
Muckenthaler, Charles P., Jr.
Myers, Fredrick R.
*Neese, William G.
Nelms, Kenneth S.
*Nelson, John B.
Neman, Sol
Nichols, Keith G.
Norrington, William E., Jr.
*Norton, Marvin D., Jr.
Norvell, Forres H., Jr.
Oliver, Ray E.
Oliver, William B.
Olson, Donald K.
O'Neill, Harold J.
Orme, Samuel T.
*Osborne, Manley C.
Osterhoudt, Raymond S.
Ousey, Walter M.
Parisian, Richard W.
Parris, Arthur
*Paulin, William B.
Pease, Forrest A.
Peet, Raymond E.
Pendergrass, James T.
Penfold, Jack R.
Pennoyer, Frederick W., III
Pittman, William R.
Plate, Douglas C.
Plemons, Arnold G.
Pollard, Eric W.
Porter, Ebenezer F.
*Potter, James A., III
Poulsen, Harold N.
Pugh, Harry M.
Quinn, Charles S., Jr.
Rahill, Gerald W.
Raht, Adolphus G.
Rau, Robert E.
Rawlings, Grover L.
Rayburn, Joseph H., Jr.
Redmayne, Richard B.
Reidy, John J., Jr.
Reitz, Spencer
Rex, Daniel F.
Ricks, Robert B.
Rifenburgh, Edward G.
Riley, George B.
Ring, Eli D.
Roberts, Francis R.
Rodin, Harry C.

Rood, George H.
Ruefle, William J.
Russell, Allard G.
Sallenger, Asbury H.
Salyer, Herbert L., Jr.
Salzer, Robert S.
Sanborn, Francis R.
Sandor, Edward A.
Santry, Jere J., Jr.
Satterfield, Loys M.
Saveker, David R.
Scapa, Jacob
Schaible, Theodore C.
Scherrer, Carl L.
Schley, John B.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Schweer, William W.
Seith, William
Sessums, Walter M.
Shallenberg, Lowell W.
Shawcorthorn, George
Shear, Harold E.
Shelton, Samuel M.
Shockey, William H.
Showers, Donald M.
Shropshire, Paul H., Jr.
Shults, Roy G.
*Siefert, Jerry R.
Silberstein, Howard J.
*Simmons, Kenneth G.
Sims, John H.
*Smalzel, Charles W.
Smith, Carl M.
Smith, Coleman H.
Smits, Cornelius J., Jr.
Sorensen, Robert E.
Sotos, George P.
Southard, Pemberton
*Spencer, John C.
Stanziano, Arthur J.
Staring, Merlin H.
Steen, Kenneth
Stetson, Thomas H.
*Steuckert, Julius F.
Stevens, Paul F., Jr.
Stevens, Wynne A., Jr.
Stone, Frank B.
Stonecipher, Elmer T.
Strum, Charles G.
*Swacker, Stewart W.
Swain, Dean H.
Swayne, Charles B.
Sweatt, Robert A.
Sweeny, James B., Jr.
*Swenson, Winford A.
Talbot, Wallace L., Jr.
Tappan, Benjamin
Tenanty, Joseph R.
Terrill, Ralph B.
Terry, John H.
Thomas, Willis L.
Thompson, Joseph E., Jr.
*Todd, Forrest A.
Towle, Barnaby L.
*Trauger, Robert J.
Traynor, Laurence G.
Tripp, Jack H.
Turner, Thomas A.
Tvedt, Joseph A.
Vanderburg, Elden R.
Venne, Antoine W., Jr.
Wallace, John G.
Warns, James T.
Wayne, John B.
Weary, Neil S.
*Weatherwax, John C.
Welch, David F.
Westervelt, John D.
Whatton, James E.
Whitman, William A.
*Wier, John P.
Williams, Clyde A.
Williams, Robert E.
Witten, Charles H.
Wittmann, Narvin O.
Wolfe, Malcolm E.
Wood, Albert H.
Worcester, Benjamin F., II.

MEDICAL CORPS

Anthony, Lynn E.
*Ash, Henry T.
Baisch, Bruce F.
Baker, Howard A.
Benson, Victor G.
Brown, Carleton J.
Brown, Robert H.
Burkle, Joseph S.
Connor, Richard B.
Deas, Thomas C.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Dineen, James R.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Draper, Arthur J.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Egan, John T., Jr.
Esswein, John G.
Fisichella, Rosario A.
*Fleck, Robert L.
Fraser, William E.
Geib, Philip O.
Helgerson, Arthur A.
Hering, Alexander C.
Holmes, Alden V.
Honsik, Cyril J.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.
Howard, John W.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
Kelley, Kenneth J.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Lewis, Garner L.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Loeffler, Robert A.
Mackie, Robert W.
Martin, Richard J.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Meyer, Fredrick W., Jr.
Nauman, Richard D.
Nordstrom, Harry C.
Ricketson, George M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Charles E.
Rush, Anthony P.
Schlang, Henry A.
Semmens, James P.
Spicher, Robert W.
Stevenson, Roger
Valusek, Fred A.
VanPetten, George T.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, John P.
Arrighi, Norman L.
Arst, Norton J.
Balch, Richard S.
Beyer, Kenneth M.
Bonnell, Graham C.
Bradley, Rex A.
Brogan, James M.
Campbell, Robert R.
Cartee, James W.
Christensen, Don C.
Cooley, Hollis W.
Custer, John D.
Clark, Grover V.
Daray, Jack L., Jr.
Edwards, Robert B.
Evans, Philip W.
Everett, Robert J.
Foster, George S., Jr.
Gay, William W., Jr.
Graham, John W.
Gregg, William B.
Harrison, Frederick D.
Harvey, James E., Jr.
Heisel, Rolland A.
Henry, George, Jr.
Hobgood, William W.
Howard, Joseph L.
Hughes, William V.
Jepson, Francis E.
Jones, Richard M.
Kahao, Martin J. B.
Knight, Charles L.
Labarre, Carl A.
Lindsay, Peter M.
Linscott, Henry D., Jr.
Lyles, Arromanus C., Jr.
Lynch, James J.
Lyness, Douglas H.
Lyon, Frederick A.
Malloy, John M.
Mann, Arthur W., Jr.
McCarten, George C., Jr.
McCreery, Bernard L.
Peterson, George W., Jr.
Purvis, Theodore B., Jr.
Quinn, Joseph P.
Rainey, Benajah L.
*Rieseberg, Robert W.
Roberts, Leo W.
Sharp, Evert R.
Shea, Leonard E.
Smith, Bert
Smith, Stuart H.
*Spore, James S.
Stern, Theodore S.
Tobias, Robert H.
Vandermaaten, Robert R.
Voegeli, George L.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Williams, Richard A.

Chaplain Corps

Albrecht, Herber C. W.
McComas, Robert F.
Michaels, Emmett T.
Moorman, Julian P., Jr.
Reaves, James E.
Ricker, Richard W.
Salyer, Oswald B.
Schnurr, Herman J.
Stephenson, Marion O.
*Weise, John W.
Wright, George A.

Civil Engineer Corps

Allegrone, Charles
Clampet, William T.
Cooke, Thomas P.
Culp, Dennis K.
Gill, Samuel C., Jr.
Johnson, Henry J.
Maley, William T., Jr.
McFarland, Wilburn J.
Neumann, Arthur C.
*Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.
Raymond, John M., Jr.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Smith, Spencer R.
Sparks, Robert E.
Stevens, Harry, Jr.

Dental Corps

Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
Enke, Loren F.
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Hillis, Walter G.
Lyon, Harvey W.
Mueller, Ray B.
Rhobotham, Frank B.
Sheppard, John R.
Steinauer, Jerome J.
Stowell, Ralph H.

Medical Service Corps

Holway, Richard T.
Timberlake, Claude V., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Erickson, Ruth A.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, Paul A.
Adams, Robert E.
Adams, Will M., Jr.
Adrianse, Homer R.
Agles, James H.
Alexander, Richard G.
Allen, Charles C.
Allison, John K.
Ambler, Joseph B.
Anania, Vincent J.
Anderson, Charles O.
Anderson, Paul A.
Anderson, Vernon F.
Anson, Henry O., Jr.
Armour, Robert H.
Armstrong, Sam "T", Jr.
Arthur, Russel L.
Atkins, Waldo A.
Atkinson, Aubrey E.
Atkinson, Wilton L.
Aulich, Julian
Austin, Kenneth B.
Bagby, Henry L.
Bain, Edwin C., Jr.
Baker, John T.
*Ball, James L.
Barkley, Paul H.
Barnes, John W.
Barnett, Gordon R.
Barnhart, Robert C., Jr.
Barrett, Ernest R.
Barry, Searle J.
Bascom, Wade R.
Bean, George F.
Beardsley, William J.
Becker, Merlin D.
Behm, Edward W.
Beierl, Peter G.
Bell, Lloyd F.
Bennett, Edgar T.
*Berg, Royal D.
Berry, Robert M.
Berude, John B.
Bess, James O.
Bessac, Norman B.
Birdt, George
Blair, Carvel H.
Blair, Marvin S.
Blakely, Robert G.
Blaylock, Mabry, Jr.
Blum, Howard E.
*Bodnaruk, Andrew
Boldt, Charles H., Jr.
Bolger, Joseph F., Jr.
Bollenbacher, Robert M.
Bonds, Joseph E.
Boney, Bobby E.
Bordelon, Guy P., Jr.
Boriotti, Joseph
Boston, Leadore G.
Bowcock, Charles S., Jr.
Bowes, William A.
Bowler, Roland T. E., Jr.
Boyd, Edward A.
Bradley, James F., Jr.
Brandenburg, John H.
Bratten, Toria J., Jr.
Brauer, Walter J.
Braun, James F.
Brekke, Trond G.
Brent, Sherman E.
*Brimmer, Frank L.
Britt, Harvey R.
Brocato, Samuel J.
Brogoitti, Bobby C.
Brooks, Laurence G.
Brown, Fred W., Jr.
Brown, John E., Jr.
Brown, LaVerne W., Jr.
Brown, Willis I.
Bryan, Clarence R.
Bryan, Leonard G.
Bryant, Olney J.
Buchanan, Charles S.
Buck, Clarence C., Jr.
Bucknell, Howard, III
Buerger, Robert P.
Bush, Thomas A., Jr.
Bussey, Samuel T.
Butler, William S.
*Butz, Frederick S.
Cadenas, Ernest M. M.
Callahan, Robert J.
Callaway, Steven W., Jr.
Callaway, William F.
*Campbell, Donald L.
Caple, Edward S., Jr.
Carlenzoli, Henry
Carpenter, Donald B.
Carpenter, Charles R.
Carrier, Francis A.
Carrier, William, Jr.
Carson, James D.
*Carter, Lester D.
*Catanzarito, Joseph
Chaires, William F.
Chambers, Kenneth W.
Chambliss, Joe "E"
Chapman, Arthur S.
Chapman, John W.
Chappell, John R.
Chesler, Daniel E., III
*Chester, Raymond M.
Chester, William R.
Childress, Howard W.
Christofferson, Edward A., Jr.
*Churchill, Jack G.
Clancey, Robert J.
*Clark, Eugene F.
Clarke, Robert L.
Clary, Warren "L"
Clements, Daniel C.
Cleveland, Hugh A.
*Cleveland, Jesse S.
Clifford, Frank F., Jr.
Close, Robert A.
Cobb, Jesse B.
Cochrane, Edward L., Jr.
Cockrill, James T.
Coffey, Claude C., Jr.
Cogswell, George W.
Cole, George
Colegrove, Warren R.
Coleman, Edward P.
Collins, John D.
*Collins, Ralph W.
Colton, Joseph
Colvin, Ted H.
Condor, Bernard
Converse, Paul V.
Cook, Charles D.
Cookie, Richard J.
Cooley, Samuel M., Jr.
Cooper, Lloyd F.
Corner, Sheldon L.
*Cornwell, Roy S.
Correia, Frank B.
Coset, Albert W.
Cosgrove, Thomas A.
Coulthard, Robert O.
Cox, John W.
Cox, Lyle A.
Cranney, "W" Loron, Jr.
Crayton, Louis B., Jr.
*Crosby, Edward O.
Cross, Richard E.
Cullen, John P.
Cummins, David E., III
Cunningham, Patrick F.
Curran, Donald C.
Custer, Robert E.
Dalland, Carl A.
Dame, Allen M.
Daniel, Royal T., Jr.
Daubin, Scott C.
Dauer, Frank H.
Davidson, Hubbell Y.
Davis, Charles R.
Davis, Jack E.
Dean, Benjamin H.
Deasy, Charles J.
Dedrick, Walter
DeGroote, Douglas F.
Delaney, Charles E.
Delany, Walter S., Jr.
Delaware, Joseph L.
Delgado, Robert
*Delly, Daniel B.
Demmler, Charles F.
Derr, Phaon B., Jr.
Dietzen, Walter N., Jr.
Dinwiddie, John M.
Doak, Joseph J., Jr.
Dobbs, Charles E. W.
Donaghy, Charles F.
Donavan, Robert D.
Doolin, Edward H., Jr.
*Drag, Theodore F.
Driscoll, John R.
*Duckett, Edmund D., Jr.
Dunning, Bruce B.
Dunton, Donald D.
*Dutton, John P.
Dzikowski, Richard J.
Eaton, John D.
Eaton, William G., Jr.
Edge, Donald B.
Edmonds, Leroy S.
Edmunds, Francis E.
Ellis, George F., Jr.
Eppes, George P.
Ericksen, George A.
Ernesti, John H.
Esmiol, Morris A., Jr.
Evans, Kenneth J.
*Evans, Simpson, Jr.
Ewald, Frank W.
Ewing, Robert H.
Faddis, James M.
Fahey, John A.
Fannin, William E.
Farnsworth, William D.
Farrell, Charles S.
Farrell, Crumpton
Farrell, Rollo L., Jr.
Fay, Richard C.
Felchner, William E. H.
Ferrin, Robert W.
Fick, Theodore R.
Fielding, Teddy R.
Findly, Lee B.
Fisher, Dale W.
Fisher, Lowell E.
Fisher, Robert D.
Fisher, Willis M.
Fitch, Lowell F.
Flynn, William J.
*Fogg, Reginald S.
Forbes, Bernard B., Jr.
Ford, John E.
Fortson, Robert M., Jr.
Fowler, William E.
Franck, Herbert A.
Freeman, DeWitt L.
Froyd, George R.
Furtek, Adolph J.

Gale, Philroy C., Jr.
Gallemore, James G.
Gambrill, Nelson J.
Garofalo, Paul C.
*Gary, Vaughn H.
Gates, James L.
*Gatlin, William A.
Geiger, Anson D.
Gensert, John R.
Gilbert, John R.
Gilcrist, John A.
Gillooly, John F.
Gilmore, Allen J.
Godfrey, Earl F.
Godshall, Walter H.
Gohr, Robert B.
Gore, Frederick S.
Goulet, Lionel J.
Graham, Frank W.
Graham, Ralph E.
*Greenwood, Thomas E.
Grey, Valentine
Griffin, Thomas H.
Grill, Robert W.
Gronemann, Carl W., Jr.
Gumb, Irving T., Jr.
Hadaway, Donald L.
Hale, Robert R.
Halwachs, Alois W.
Hamilton, Billie C.
Hamilton, George T.
Hannifin, Patrick "J"
Hansen, Jens B.
*Hanson, Donald M.
Harper, Wyatt E., Jr.
Harris, Jack
Harris, Willie W.
Harrison, Leo W.
Hartzel, Harvey C.
Harvey, James H., Jr.
Harward, Phillip S.
Hastings, Edward E., II
Haugh, Edward M.
Hayes, Robert S.
Hayes, Robert V.
Hayler, William B.
Heagerty, Harold R.
Heath, Leroy A.
Hecker, George M.
Hefferman, William J. J.
Heid, Robert S.
Heinze, Arthur D.
Henley, Nathaniel T.
Henson, Josiah
Herman, John S.
Hermann, Edward P.
Herrick, Robert W.
Hertzig, Richard D.
Hicks, Richard J.
Hill, John F.
Hill, Robert D.
Hilson, Ralph A.
Hinkelman, John W., Jr.
Hinman, Charles R.
Hoblitzell, Charles M.
Hogsed, Robert A.
Holmes, Francis M.
Holmes, Robert A., III
*Holmgaard, Evald
Holschuh, Howard W.
Hooper, James A., Jr.
Hoover, William H.
Hopwood, Gordon R.
Hosler, Ray S., Jr.
Houck, Richard
Houghton, Alexander J.
*Houston, Trumond E.
Hubbeling, Johan D. W., Jr.
Hubert, William E.
Huddleston, Woodrow
Hudson, William H., Jr.
Huff, Ralph E.
Hunter, Clifford E.
*Hurd, Ernest L., Jr.
Jobe, James K.
Johnson, Clayton F.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Theodore L.
Johnston, Harry D.
Johnston, Philip D., Jr.
Jones, Edward D.
Jones, Roy K., II
Jortberg, Richard E.
*Juarez, Robert
Julian, Alexander, Jr.
Kalina, John F.
Karnes, Austin G.
Kasten, Robert I.
Kauth, John L., Jr.
Kays, Robert L.
Kearns, William E.
Keating, James H.
Keeler, William E.
Keevil, Arthur K.
Keith, Omar F.
Kelley, Frederick J.
Kelly, Merrill E., Jr.
Kempf, Lawrence A.
Kennedy, Donald W.
Kerr, Alex A.
Kerstein, George E.
Kidd, John D.
King, Ernest J., Jr.
King, Evans P. K.
King, Nathan H.
King, Patrick J.
Kirk, Robert
Kirkemo, Leland E.
Kistler, William C.
Klaessy, Dale S.
Klaus, Edward L.
Kleber, Francis T.
Klein, Harry J.
Klemawesch, James
Klindworth, Carl H.
Klockenkemper, Joseph B. G.
Knudsen, John T.
Knudson, Irving H., Jr.
Koch, Robert A.
Kole, Carl B.
Konzen, Joseph J.
Kopps, Richard L.
Kribs, David A., Jr.
Krolczyk, Stanley P.
*Kube, George F.
*Kulig, Raymond A.
Kurfess, John F.
*Kushman, Howard B.
Lake, Kenneth "B"
LaMar, Burris D.
Lamartin, Frederick H., Jr.
Lamb, Harold M.
Lang, Ralph R.
Laubach, Luther W. S.
Laughton, Robert J.
*Lawrence, Edward J.
Lea, Malcomb A.
Leavitt, Eben, Jr.
Lee, Richard H.
LeFevre, Adolphe C.
Legare, Rupert W., Jr.
Leib, Frederick L.
Leland, Harley G.
Lemert, Russell C.
Leonard, Warren E.
Leslie, Jene L.
LeTourneau, Joseph R. E.
Lewis, David D.
Lewis, William C.
Licko, Richard J.
*Lindler, Charles R., Jr.
Lipfert, Ralph G.
Loftin, Edward H., Jr.
Longfield, John N.
Longton, David M.
Longwill, Albert E.
Lorenz, Samuel, Jr.
Loveday, John C.
Lowery, Hugh H.
Luka, Earl
Lulu, Michael T.
Lyons, Thomas W.
Mackay, Douglas S.
*Maddock, Edmund J.
Madson, Rae P.
Mallon, Richard J.
Manger, Arthur J.
Manger, Martin M., Jr.
Manhart, Raymond J.
Manherz, Jack M.
Mansfield, Samuel K.
Marr, Robert I.
Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
Masica, Eugene M.
Mason, Hugh C.
Massey, Joseph P.
Masters, James C., Jr.
Matheson, James C.
Mathwich, Leon E. L.
Matthes, Harold K.
May, Robert E.
McAdams, John K.
McCaskill, James M.
McCool, Richard M., Jr.
McCord, Stanley R.
McCullough, William F.
*McDade, Nolan H.
McDaniel, Hector S.
McGarry, William J., Jr.
*McHugh, Richard P.
McKee, John C.
McLaughlin, William H., Jr.
McLean, William O.
Mercer, Ellsworth O.
Meredith, Carl E.
Merrick, John L.
Merrick, Robert H., Jr.
Merrill, Clayton W.
Middleton, Charles H.
Midgett, Joe L.
Milhan, Harry L.
*Miller, David L.
Miller, John W.
Miller, Orville H.
Miller, Robertson L.
Miller, William W. K., Jr.
Mills, Terry
Mitchell, Cleo N., Jr.
Montgomery, James W.
Moore, Albert L.
Moore, Charles K.
Moore, Jack L.
Moore, Joseph E., III
Moore, Robert L.
Moorer, Joe P.
Moul, Cornelius F.
Mulligan, Champ C.
*Mundt, Clinton H.
Murphey, Samuel B.
Murphree, Hugh D.
Nance, James W.
Nearman, Leonard M.
Neilson, Thomas L.
Nelson, Robert R.
Nelson, Wayne S.
Nicholls, Benjamin F.
*Nichols, John E.
Nichols, Ramon B., Jr.
Nickerson, Norval E.
North, John R.
Norton, Hassell L.
Novak, Jerome C.
Nugent, Floyd C.
Nuschke, Paul L.
O'Day, Henry J.
Oder, Lyle D.
Olsen, Alfred R., Jr.
Olson, Fredrick G.
O'Neil, Warren H.
O'Neill, John L.
O'Rourke, Gerald G.
O'Shea, George A., Jr.
*Osterholm, Robert E.
Overman, Dana C., Jr.
*Padburg, Harry R.
Padgett, John B., Jr.
Page, William P.
Parke, Everett A.
Pate, Jack A.
Peed, George P.
Perkins, Peter R.
Peters, John V.
Petersen, Forrest S.
Peyton, Henry A. R.
Phillips, Donald M.
Pitts, Charles R.
*Plante, Richard J.
*Plowden, James E., Jr.
Poe, Donald T.
Poenicke, Charles F., Jr.
Polk, Mavis X.
Polk, Thomas H.
Poorman, Herbert "R"
Potter, John R.
Priest, Charles, Jr.
Prothro, Randell H.
Prouhet, Clement R.
Purinton, David F.
Purkrabek, Paul V.
Quanstrom, Carl R., Jr.
*Quiel, Norwald R.
Quinn, George D., Jr.
Quinn, Harry T., Jr.
Racette, Henry J., Jr.
Radcliffe, Robert J.
Ragon, George T.
Rankowski, Charles A.
Raposa, William C.
*Rasmussen, Ralph R.
Rawlings, Frank T., Jr.
Ray, Glenn E.
Rayburn, Lawrence M.
Reeve, Robert W.
Reid, James A.
Renaldi, Richard R.
Rentschler, Alexander K.
Richards, Donald R.
Richards, Harold O.
*Richardson, Kenneth
Richardson, Guy D.
Ricinak, Michael D.
*Rider, Russell D.
Riley, Horace, Jr.
Riley, John F.
Riley, Ralph R.
Risch, Harry, Jr.
*Robb, Earl J.
Roberts, Gerald M.
Robinson, Rembrandt C.
Rockoff, Herbert R.
Rogers, Benjamin C., Jr.
Roll, Walter D.
Rooney, George M.
Rorex, Sam, Jr.
Roth, Edward F.
Rumble, Richard E.
Rush, Max R.
Rymal, George R.
Saroch, Emil, Jr.
Saunders, David M.
Scambos, Thomas T.
Scherrer, Robert A.
Schulz, Quinley R.
Schwager, Joseph E.
Schwartz, Matthew J.
Schwartz, Walter W., Jr.
Sciiris, Louis G.
Scott, Julian F.
Scott, Kenneth W.
Searles, Philip N.
Seay, Samuel D.
Selfridge, Samuel W., Jr.
Sepper, Frank
Sette, Lyle H.
Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Shelton, Doniphan B. Jr.
Shepard, Alan B., Jr.
Sheppard, Cedric W.
Sheppard, William L.
Sherman, Robert O.
*Sherwood, Charles
Shuman, William P., Jr.
Shurtleff, Kenneth L.
Silliman, Henderson G.
Simpson, William H., Jr.
Sims, Wilbur N.
Skipper, James C., Jr.
Slaff, Allan P.
Sledge, Jack B.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, George H.
Smith, John E.
Smith, Lawrence N.
Smith, Lewis O.
Smyer, Theodore M.
Snyder, Joseph E., Jr.
Snyder, Joseph M., Jr.
Soltys, Leo S., Jr.
Sommer, Charles A.
Spargo, James
Sperberg, Franklynn R.
Squire, Wade R.
Stalmaker, Will L.
Stansell, Herman J., Jr.
Stanton, Robert F.
Stauffer, Howard C.
Steele, George P., II
Steele, Robert D.
Steere, Lucius E., III
Stell, Ralph W., Jr.
Stepanian, George
Stephens, William E., Jr.
Stewart, Clifford L.
Stewart, Hal B.
Stewart, William S., III
Stirnweiss, Andrew P., Jr.
Stout, Graydon T.
Strong, William W.
*Stull, John O.
Sulick, Tom E.
Sullivan, Robert C.
*Sutton, Ralph N.
Swallow, Chandler E., Jr.
Swank, John A.
Swensen, Robert A.
Tarbox, William
Tartre, Robert J.
Tate, James D.
Taylor, Arnett B.
Taylor, Harold A.
Taylor, Thaddeus M.
Taylor, Warren
*Teevan, Charles L.
Temple, Walter N.
Thomas, Homer B., Jr.
Thomas, Warren J.
Thompson, Arthur E.
Tierney, Glenn A.
Tollefson, Leif
Trautman, Wilbur C., Jr.
Traynor, William J.
Tremaine, Mark G.
Trueblood, Harold J.
Uncles, John F.
Ursettie, Howard J.
Utegaard, Thomas F.
VanOrden, Merton D.
VanOss, Willis B.
*Vaughan, Elwood
*Vaughan, Vie J.
Vierregger, William T.
Vining, Pierre H.
Vint, Vinton, C.
Viscardi, Peter W.
Vissering, Victor M., Jr.
Voller, Sherman L.
Volk, Ralph L., Jr.
Wade, Kenneth W.
Wadleigh, George C.
*Wagner, Adrian D.
Wagner, Theodore A., Jr.
Walery, Kenneth F.
Walker, William F.
Wallace, Luther B.
Warner, Robert L.
Waters, David E.
Waters, Robert M.
Waters, Willard H.
Watson, Fred C.
Watson, Robert H., Jr.
Wear, LaVern C.
Webb, Howard "T," Jr.
Weidig, Donald H.
*Weinbeck, Eugene J.
Wells, Lionel E.
Werdelman, Egon H.
West, Raymond W.
Westcott, Malvern P., Jr.
Whilden, Adolphus D., Jr.
White, Edward C.
White, Garrett "A," Jr.
Wiesendanger, Carl F.
Wikenheiser, Frank J.
*Wilder, George, Jr.
Wilder, Lawrence A.
Wilder, Tracy H., Jr.
*Williams, Henry J.
Williams, Harlan D.
Willis, Avery L.
Wilson, Dick G.
Wilson, Jennings B., Jr.
Winter, Homer A.
Wise, John P.
Wollar, Edward S.
Wondergem, John M.
Wood, Robert C.
Wootton, William T.
*Working, John D.
Worley, Carson R.
Worrall, Alton H., Jr.
Worrall, David J.
Yeagle, Carl H.
*Young, Thomas C.
Zech, Lando W., Jr.
Zeigler, William T.
Zelibor, Joseph L.
Zenner, Harold J.
Zseltvay, Robert R.

MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, William C., Jr.
Austin, Frank H., Jr.
Bernard, Donald P.
Blakey, Ernest A.
Bowers, Jesse A.
*Browne, Howard S., Jr.
Cales, Robert J.
Chandler, Deck E.
Christiansen, David V.
Cummings, Ronald A.
Delaney, Thomas B.
Dempsey, John J.
Dinsmore, Harry H.
Downey, John J.
Dykhuizen, Robert F.
Ebersole, John H.
Fox, Lay M.
Guida, Anthony J.
Hastedt, Robert C.
Hines, Larry J.
Humes, James J.
Ireland, Roger G.
Jones, Kenneth P., III
Klein, Chester L., Jr.
Klein, Martin H.
Kramer, Scott G.
Laning, Robert C.

Lehman, Ross M., Jr.
Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
Lonergan, Walter M.
Pascoe, Delmer J.
Paul, Jed
Sigel, Carter B.
Snyder, William A.
Sparks, Henry A.
Speaker, Richard B.
Sweeney, Francis J.
Trummer, Max J.
Watten, Raymond H.
Webb, Martin G., Jr.
White, Neil V.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Clayton L.
Aull, Herbert H.
Austin, Charles B.
Balcon, Vaughn O.
*Barton, Alton W.
Bates, Raymond H.
Batterson, Robert E.
Baumann, Wesley O.
Bennett, Keith
Benson, David W.
Bland, Herbert L.
Blandin, Sherman W., Jr.
Blank, Arthur E.
Boylan, Walter J.
Bryson, William L.
Burns, Hugh F. J.
Caldwell, William F.
Cohn, Murry
Creel, Clarence A.
Crosby, Philip
Curtis, James R.
Dale, Oscar N.
Duncan, Henry C.
Dunn, George G.
Ericson, James B.
Gardner, Charles A., Jr.
Geneste, Elmon A., Jr.
Greene, Eugene G.
*Griffin, Cecil L., Jr.
Grinstead, Eugene A., Jr.
Hackenson, Bernard J.
Haddock, William N.
Hart, Samuel S.
Henn, Carl L., Jr.
Herb, James W.
Hightower, James I., Jr.
Hoffman, George P.
Howell, Jesse E.
Jones, Russell A.
*Kost, George J.
Larson, Phillip D.
Lewis, William L.
Lipscomb, John W., Jr.
Longnecker, Kenneth W.
Leubbe, Harry R.
Mattila, Martti O.
Maxwell, Lester G.
McClaren, Wesley J.
McCormick, Robert J.
McDonough, Edward M.
McPike, Howard D.
*Miller, Edward J.
Mills, Herbert F., Jr.
Noga, Edward Leon S.
*O'Keefe, Paul "D"
O'Loughlin, Richard C.
Paolantonio, John F.
Patton, Gerald J.
Rawls, Elbert S., Jr.
Rivers, Vernon G.
Robinson, William J.
Ruete, Edward S.
Schauffler, Robert A.
Sigman, William E.
Simpson, Samuel R., Jr.
Smith, James A.
Spillman, Frank L., Jr.
Stringer, Carl J., Jr.
Swart, Phillip
Walter, Frederick W.
Wheless, William A.
Whiteside, Charles E.
Williams, William C.
Woodfin, Kenneth L.
Zielinski, William E.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Capers, Keen H.
*Metzger, Ernest W.
Schutz, Adam J., Jr.
Snelbaker, James K.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bannister, John M., Jr.
Graff, Charles W.
Grahl, Ralph B., Jr.
Jones, Richard O.
Krickenberger, Custer F., Jr.
Lalor, Foster M., Jr.
Marschall, Albert R.
Rogers, William R.
Stephens, Henry E.
Stephenson, William B
Waters, Allen S.
Williams, John P.
Wilson, Joe R.
Wynne, Sydney J., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

*Black, Edwin "R"
Chap, Bernard
DeLautentis, Carlo A.
Didion, Robert W.
*Evans, Joseph R.
Green, George H.
Lynch, James P.
*Outlaw, Billie F.
Silberstein, Victor H.
Sobieski, Edward F.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Abernathy, Odell S.
Baker, David H.
Ball, Gilbert R.
Bennett, Paul B.
Bing, John H.
*Bodenlos, Leonard J.
Bonnell, Theodore V.
Curtis, Ned B.
Donovan, Harold G.
Edge, Cary O.
Goldenrath, Walter L.
Hoche, Herman E.
Johnson, Woodbury
Keener, Mary F.
Mibeck, Albert E.
*Morgan, Guy H.
Pflag, Solomon C.
Phillippi, Fred E.
*Richardson, Richard C.
Teller, Leslie W., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Carlson, Eloise M.
Daughtry, Edna M.
Duwe, Elizabeth M.
Flanagan, Rose A.
Jacobs, Grace E.
Mentzer, Romaine M.
Smith, Hattie B.
Williams, Kathryn E.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abdon, Albert L.
Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Ahles, Raymond W.
Albright, Donald S., Jr.
Allen, Richard P.
Allison, Paul
Allman, Richard R.
Ambrose, John E.
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Armstrong, Robert P.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, Julian M.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Axe, John R.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Babb, James R.
Babcock, Robert E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, William C.
Banke, Elmer A.
Barck, Dale E.
Bardecki, Frank J.
Bare, Keith R.
Barker, Frankin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnes, Dale E.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnhart, Robert W.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Basso, Robert J.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Baty, Norman R., Jr.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Beavers, Robert A.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Bell, James R.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Benson, Harry L.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Berglund, Rex R.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, John H.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William Brown
Blaha, Albert J.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Bloomfield, Rollin W.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bogart, Tudor M.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Bond, John R.
Bonekamp, Fred H.
Borst, Francis W., Jr.
Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
Bourne, William D.
Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
Boyd, David S.
Bradberry, Richard F.
Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Brandenburg, Robert C.
Brandorff, Paul A.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brecka, Joseph, Jr.
Brewer, Thomas J.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, James W.
Brown, Robert S.
Brubaker, Walter Y.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Brzenski, Benjamin J., Jr.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
Burks, Ernest, Jr.
Burnett, James C.
Burson, Roger T.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Cameron, Clifford R.
Campbell, Donald H.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Norman R.
Campbell, Richard B.
Campbell, William D.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Capers, Ellison
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carlton, George A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, Robert L.
Carr, William K.
Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Childs, William J.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christiansen, Charles C.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Cleveland, Arthur W.
Clifford, John G.
Cochran, James A.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
Conroy, Thomas P.
Coogan, Joseph E.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Jack E.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cordray, Richard P.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblett, Frank
Crosby, Howard S.
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cullivan, Daniel W.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dahlman, Donald A.
Daley, Bradley L.
Dalla Betta, Aldo
Daly, Norman F.
Darfus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, Jack W.
Day, Lawrence C.
Deibler, Daniel T.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
Dennis, James M.
Dickins, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Doyle, Richard B.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dukes, Warren C.
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunnan, Neville D.
Dunning, Freder S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
East, George W.
Eaton, Nelson W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Ellena, Eugene D.
Elliott, James D.
Ellison, Leroy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Enright, George E.
Erikson, Warren W.
Esau, Robert L.
Estes, Windom L.
Everett, Elmer C.
Everson, Carl
Eyler, Emil M.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph
Farrell, John B.
Fassula, Richard F.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Frank H.
*Feeney, Harold
Fendorf, James E.
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferguson, George D., III
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fleming, Joseph P.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Donald J.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foscato, Sydney E., Jr.
Foster, James R.
Foster, John B.
Foster, Raymond H.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Richard T.
Fraasa, Donald G.
Frazee, Joyce M.
French, Robert D.
Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle "A"
Gaddis, George E.
Gaddy, James K.
Garland, John C.
Gates, David E.
Gates, Herbert K., Jr.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Giles, Claude F.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gilyard, John G.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F., Jr.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Greene, Leonard B.
Gregory, George T.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grote, Joseph C.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Guggenbiller, James A.
Gully, Robert L.

Gureck, William A.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hahn, William S.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Hall, Donald P.
Halladay, Norman L.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamilton, Donald C.
Hamilton, Robert C.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanson, Richard W.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardin, David L.
Hardy, Martin E., Jr.
Harlan, Edgar W.
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harrison, James R.
Hartshorn, David L.
Harty, Thomas G.
Hartzell, Robert H.
Harvey, John W.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hatcher, Hugh P.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hayes, Stanley M.
Hays, Ronald J.
Hecker, Stanley
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henderson, Burton
Henning, John C., III
Henning, Robert F.
Henry, Martin H.
Hiatt, Henry G., Jr.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Jackson D.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hohn, Henry E.
Hollack, Michael
Holloman, George H.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Holt, Donald P.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Horan, John E., Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hoseman, Leland J.
Howard, Joseph B.
Hubbard, Donald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunsley, Lindell A., II
Hunt, Donald B., Jr.
Hunter, Paul I.
Huntsman, Gary S.
Hussmann, Harry "L", III
Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jackson, John G. "W"
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jacobson, Robert C.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, John E.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Edwin F.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jessen, George E.
Jewell, Downing L.
Johns, Ronald L.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Kenneth W.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, Huby A., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kallgren, Bruce M.
Kampe, John H.
Kangas, Robert T.
Karns, Dane L.
Kaufman, Norman L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kays, Jack C.
Kearney, John R.
Keays, Keatinge
Keeler, Donald J.
Keller, Robert G.
Kelley, Bruce E.
Kellogg, Edward P., Jr.
Kelly, Roger W.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William, Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kernan, William H.
Kersch, Roger N.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiernan, Warren R.
Kiker, Herbert W. ,Jr.
Kimball, Edwin D.
King, Robert A.
King, Thomas R.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knecht, Harry B.
Knighten, Charles E.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Krag, Robert L.
Kramer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Krause, Stephen R.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kropf, John F.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Lally, William K., Jr.
Lamb, Arthur D., Jr.
Lane, Henry
Laque, Harold A.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawler, William G., Jr.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Leach, Donald B.
Leary, Ramon W.
LeDew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lefler, Luther
Lehman, Donald A.
Leibowitz, Martin M.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leser, John R.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Lewis, William W., Jr.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Littell, Raymond W.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Lombard, Richard L.
Long, Charles R.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lord, Warren W.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Losely, Willis M.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Lund, John D.
Luzader, Robert B.
Lyman, Jack N.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lynch, Robert M.
Lyne, George C.
Lyon, Howard E.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
Mackell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Magnuson, Roy W.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maier, William J., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Mann, Charles L., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Markham, Walter G.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Marona, "G" "L"
Marriner, Richard E.
Martin, Gene A.
Martin, Richard W.
Mason, Robert C.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathews, Ross A., Jr.
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A.
Mauney, Thomas C.
Mauro, John
May, Donald S.
May, Harry Lee
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayo, William H.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McBride, Jeremiah R.
McCarthy, James P., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McConnell, Joseph E.
McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
McDaniel, Willard H.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGinnis, Ted R.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McIntyre, Andrew
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNally, John J., Jr.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Meetze, James C.
Melville, Charles W., Jr.
Merkley, Carlyle "C", Jr.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miesner, John A., Jr.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Milani, Albert V.
Miles, Frank A.
Miller, Alfred E.
Miller, Byron K.
Miller, Gerlous G., Jr.
Miller, Marvin J.
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William A.
Millpointer, Edward D.
Mills Joseph E.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Misakian, Harry H.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Modeen, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molnar, Joseph J.
Molzan, Edward W.
Monroe, Robert R.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Howard B.
Moore, John F., Jr.
Moore, Lundi A.
Moore, Thomas L.
Moore William F.
Moors, Donald E.
Morgan, Robert E.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Moss, Lewis M.
Moss, Robert
Moy, Frank "E"
Muck, Floyd R.
Mudrock, John
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Mumford, Homer E.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Murphy Garrison E.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Myers, Charles B.
Myers, Raymond W.
Nall, Delbert L.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, William R.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Nichol, Monte B.
Nicholson, Jerome E.
Nix, Henry J.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nulton, Frank I.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
Oberholtzer, James P.
Oberle, Ronald R.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donel, James H.
O'Donnell George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
O'Reilly, James P., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Osborne, Dwight G.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Owen, Charles K.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parent, Gerald "J"
Parker, James W.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Donald W.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
*Pennington, Otis G.
Perry, Frank M., Jr.
Perryman, Donald B.
Pester, Benjamin H.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pierce, Robert E.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Pleasants, John B.
Pond, Richard E.
Porter, Thomas
Portnoy, Howard R.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powel, Samuel F., III
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Allen B.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profilet, Leo T.
Proper, Worthy "F"
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Racy, Louis P.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Rakes, Calvin E.
Ramella, Albert J.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Ratliff, William M.
Rau, William F.
Raymond, Marshall P.
Reddick, James P., Jr.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Sherman C.
*Reichel, Alfred J., Jr.
Reichl, Charles J.
Reid, Eugene L.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reyn, William P.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Ricci, William J.
Rice, Minor T.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Risser, James B.
Robertson, John W.
Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rochester, Carl W.
Rockwell, Frank A.
Rodgers, James F.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rosenberg, Donald D.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Roulstone, Lawrence M.
Rowe, John D.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Russell, George G.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Sacarob, Merwin
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sands, James W.
Sandsberry Jack C.
Satre, Robert S.
Sattler, Donald C.
Schader, James A.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schettino, Joseph N.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Seipp, Russell M.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Sharpe, William K.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shea, Paul W.
Sheehan, Charles A.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherin, Joseph E.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shick, George B., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Singer, Arnold N.
Sirrine, Jack D.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Skorheim, Robert D.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Sliwinski, Daniel J.
Smith, Allan R.
Smith, Chandler G.
Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Leon W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Melbourne L.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smoot, William N.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stalzer, Charles E.
Stanley, Donald E.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stein, Earl M.
Sterrett, Bailey D., Jr.
Stimler, Richard P.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.

Stollenwerck, William M.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
Strand, John A., Jr.
Streich, Paul R.
Stroupe, Keith K.
Stull, Donald
St. Ville, Edward L.
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Summitt, Clyde W.
Sutherland, Donald G.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
Switzer, James R.
Swope, Homer J., Jr.
Tarbox, Ronald L., Jr.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Temple, Charles H.
Templeton, Stuart N.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thom, Norman R.
Thomas, Bernard K., Jr.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Thyberg, Robert C.
Tobias, David L.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, William E.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Touch, Ralph J.
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trommlitz, James R.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Upton, William O., Jr.
Valentine, Robert F.
Vanderbeck, Eugene A.
Van Kirk, Robert W., Jr.
Van Kleeck, Justin L.
Varner, Byron D.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Veasie, Robert H.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vining, Adrian D.
Vinsel, John E.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Walchko, Daniel P.
Walker, George D.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Donald E.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Wamsley, John A.
Ward, Donald S.
Warner, Marvin H.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Watson, Richard K.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Weeks, Grady A.
Werner, Robert V.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
White, Arthur C.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, John E.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whittlessey, Eugene H.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilhite, Alan S.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Willard, Daniel D. M.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, Leland S.
Williams, William A. III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Carl B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wiram, Gordan H.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wood, John W.
Wood, Peter W.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Wooley, Robert T.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, William B.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wylie, Henry K.
Young, Casanave H., Jr.
Young, Robert M.
Ziarnik, Walter P.
Ziegler, Frank G.
Zilch, Charles H.
Zimm, Alfonz
Zimmerly, Arthur, III
Zink, Stewart T.
Zoske, Frank H.
Zwolinski, Frank J.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abele, Andre
Adams, Ben L.
Adams, Billy J.
Adams, Frederick G.
Adams, Jerome B.
Adams, Thomas C.
Ahrens, Michael C.
Akers, John F.
Albin, Harold C., Jr.
Albright, William E., Jr.
Alexander, Sherman G.
Allard, Frank A.
Allemang, John D.
Allen, Corbett U., Jr.
Allen, Curtis R.
Allen, Edward P.
Allen, George M., Jr.
Allen, John E.
Allen, Richard O., Jr.
Allen, Robert L., Jr.
Almand, Willie G.
Althouse, Arnold S.
Alton, Homer W.
Ambrosini, Leo A.
Ames, David E.
Ames, Laverne W.
Amon, Ronald L.
Amos, Robert H.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, Charles L.
Anderson, George B.
Anderson, Howard R.
Anderson, Joseph J.
Anderson, Jerry P.
Anderson, James B.
Anderson, John A.
Andrade, Allan L.
Androski, Frank N.
Angell, Richard C.
Anthony, Joseph D., Jr.
Anthony, Phillip D.
Anton, Leonard G.
Apple, John D., Jr.
Aquilino, Salvatore P.
Armstrong, Leo F.
Arnold, James G.
Arnold, Thomas F.
Arrighi, George J., Jr.
Arvay, John F.
Ashbacher, Raymond W.
Ashworth, Thomas, III
Atkins, Allan L.
Audilet, Garland O.
Avery, Paul R.
Ayers, Harry P., Jr.
Baals, John R.
Bachman, Robert A.
Bailey, George M.
Bailey, Robert B.
Bair, Lavon H.
Baker, Earl R.
Baker, Evan S.
Baker, Floyd O.
Baker, Robert E.
Baldwin, Max M.
Ball, George B., Jr.
Ball, Glenn F.
Ball, John W.
Ballou, James E.
Balsley, Francis W.
Bandy, Clifford W.
Banks, Peter A.
Barbour, William J., Jr.
Baril, Robert F.
Barnes, Harold E.
Barnett, Charles E.
Barnett, Stephen B.
Barney, Charles R.
Barnhart, Harold D.
Barr, John F.
Barret, Lee E., Jr.
Barrigar, Donald B.
Barrish, Paul D.
Bartley, Robert H.
Barton, Harold C.
Bassett, Charles G.
Bassett, James S.
Baszak, Joseph F.
Bate, Ronald D.
Battersby, John J.
Baudouin, Morris R.
Bauer, Donald R.
Bauman, John M.
Baumann, Gerard R.
Baumgartner, James A.
Beach, Milton D.
Beach, Robert R.
Beall, Thomas J.
Bean, Lynn B.
Beaton, John M.
Beck, Richard J.
Beck, Richard E.
Beecher, Ronald R.
Beegle, Earl A.
Belisle, Philip M.
Bell, Brewer
Bellinger, John R.
Benediktsson, Philip W.
Benjamin, Charles L.
Bennett, Edward I. H., Jr.
Bennett, John E., Jr.
Bennett, Peter C.
Bennington, Thomas P.
Benoit, Richard S.
Benser, Earl H.
Benson, Thomas C.
Bentley, Arthur L.
Berg, Milfred C.
Berger, Raymond E.
Bergman, Walter R.
Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
Berry, Roy A.
Bess, George D.
Best, Albert H., III
Bethel, Robert G.
Betts, Roger S.
Beverly, Louis M.
Beversdorf, Donald W.
Beving, Duane U.
Biehl, George F.
Bigler, William W.
Biles, George E.
Billings, Alfred J.
Bird, Ralph G.
Bitner, Gregory J.
Black, James L.
Blake, Gordon N.
Blackwood, David E.
Blanchard, James W., Jr.
Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
Blankenship, James M., II
Blaser, John W.
Bledsoe, Paul I.
Blevins, Deward C.
Bloom, Donald D.
Blumie, John A.
Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
Boensch, Arthur C.
Bolte, William S.
Bonadies, Louis
Booth, Peter B.
Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
Borden, Clifford A.
Borden, Robert C., Jr.
Borgardt, Elmer G.
Bossert, John L.
Bovey, Paul E.
Box, Roger E.
Boyd, Jack W.
Boyd, Richard M.
Boyer, Jesse V., Jr.
Boyle, James T.
Brannigan, James W., Jr.
Brasseur, Edmond L.
Breeding, Leslie E.
Breland, Edgar A.
Brennan, Richard J.
Brenneman, Harold R.
Brennen, William L.
Briegel, Charles V.
Briggs, Braden R.
Bright, Richard A.
Bright, Thomas B.
Brink, Robert E.
Brisbois, Marshall B.
Brockway, Charles J., Jr.
Brogan, Thomas E.
Brooks, Bernard A.
Brooks, James W.
Broton, Chester F.
Brown, Bruce F.
Brown, Claude C.
Brown, Daniell M.
Brown, Donald L.
Brown, Harold W.
Brown, James E.
Brown, James J.
Brown, Nicholas
Brown, Ora D., III
Brown, Robert H., III
Brown, William M.
Browning, Elmer L.
Brunner, James W.
Bruso, James W.
Bruyere, Thomas E.
Bryan, John E., Jr.
Bryant, Leroy
Buchanan, Charles A., Jr.
Buchsieb, Louis D.
Buckwalter, Gary L.
Buehler, William S.
Buggy, Joseph S., Jr.
Builder, Gustav F.
Bullock, Robert F.
Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
Burdsall, Milton E.
Burghardt, Louis, Jr.
Burke, Edmund, III
Burke, Francis J.
Burke, Joseph S.
Burkel, John F.
Burris, William L., Jr.
Burt, Mattison A., Jr.
Burt, Russell H.
Bush, Ronald J.
Bush, Vernon R.
Button, Ralph L.
Butts, Richard F.
Bylund, Howard E.
Byng, Weston H.
Cahill, Walter A.
Calamaras, Nicholas
Caldwell, John M.
Callahan, David F., Jr.
Callaway, Jack M.
Camacho, Richard G.
Camp, Robert W.
Campbell, Carl E.
Campbell, Donald G.
Campbell, George E.
Campbell, John E.
Campbell, Ronald K.
Canada, Donald E.
Cannon, James R.
Carlson, Walter G.
Carpenter, Lemmon F.
Carpenter, Jack R.
Carre, David M., Jr.
Carrigan, Richard C.
Carroll, John T.
Carroll, Robert J.
Carswell, Michael S.
Casey, Ronald C.
Cates, Gus V.
Catoe, Ralph D.
Catola, Stanley G.
Cecelski, Arthur R.
Cedercrans, Phillip N.
Cellar, Charles J., Jr.
Cernan, Eugene A.
Champlin, Donald G.
Chancellor, Dean H.
Chaney, Marvin L.
Chang, Ming E.
Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
Chase, Henri B., III
Chase, Warren T., Jr.
Chatham, Walter L.
Chemacki, Stanley
Chester, Scott A.
Chisholm, Charles G., III
Chrans, Ronald L.
Christensen, Charles C.
Christensen, Cyrus R.
Christopher, Richard V.
Christopher, Allyn C.
Chumley, Sylvester G.
Cicchetto, Mario J.
Cichowitz, Edward J., Jr.
Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
Clark, Bruce A.
Clark, Elmer S., Jr.
Clark, George G.
Clark, George E.
Clark, James M.
Clark, Joseph E.
Clark, William E., Jr.
Clausen, Bernard F.
Clay, Jack D.
Clayton, George H., Jr.
Clement, Leroy A.
Click, Duane L.
Clock, Richard V.
Cloud, Bruce L.
Clower, Claude D.
Clynes, Charles E.
Cobb, Roy L.
Coffee, Ernest E.
Cohen, Milton N.
Coleman, Cornelius E., Jr.
Coll, William A.
Collier, Merrill F.
Collins, Charles R.
Collins, Erwin A.
Collins, Jay R.
Collins, Leroy, Jr.
Collom, Frederick W., Jr.
Colville, Robert E.
Condron, Thomas E.
Conklin, Peter A.
Conley, James H.
Connell, Earl W.
Connell, Laurence M.
Connell, Philip J.
Connelly, James H., Jr.
Connolly, Leo J.
Conroy, John W.
Conti, Francis A.
Cook, Richard D.
Cook, Ross E.
Cook, Wilmer P.
Coolidge, Julian L., II
Coons, Henry A.
Cooper, James L.
Cooper, Ross E.
Cooper, Scott E.
Corica, Kenneth J.
Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
Corkrum, Richard C.
Cosgrove, Robert R.
Costello, Donald H.
Costilow, Kenneth L.
Cothran, George E.
Cotsonas, John P.
Cotton, Francis X.
Counsell, Duane J.
Coupe, Walter E.
Courtney, Hugh J.
Covey, Edward J.
Cox, George E.
Cox, Henry
Coyle, Charles A.
Cozine, Kenneth J.
Craddock, Gerald G.
Craig, John E., Jr.
Craig, Stephnos D.
Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
Cramer, Dean E.
Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
Crandall, Douglas R.
Craven, Robert P.
Crawford, Paul G.
Credland, Earl D.
Cremo, John, Jr.
Cress, Robert B.
Crickey, James E., Jr.
Crim, Billy R.
Crissman, Daniel M.
Crosby, Elwood A.
Crowder, Billy
Crowe, George W.
Crowe, Guy T.
Cruse, Reese E.
Crutchfield, Claud C.
Cumming, Richard S., III
Cunningham, Donald E.
Curry, Keith Royal W.
Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
Cust, Harlan R.

Cutter, Alan "B"
Cyr, Byron A.
Czar, Raymond J.
Dage, Jerry D.
Daley, Joseph M., Jr.
Daniels, Hal B.
Daniels, Nelson M.
Danin, Victor
Dankel, Kenneth M.
Daulton, James T.
Daus, Rudolph H.
David, Thomas P.
Davidson, Jack R.
Davidson, Paul J.
Davies, Eugene L.
Davis, George E.
Davis, Howard C.
Davis, Milton W.
Davis, Norman E.
Davis, Robert G.
Davis, Sidney F., III
Dawe, Robert V.
Day, John T., Jr.
Dean, Robert V.
Dean, Ronald I.
Dement, Ira B.
Denison, William F.
Dennis, Don J.
Dennis, Paul L.
Denunzio, Nicholas J.
Deutermann, David W.
DeVane, Richard W., Jr.
DeWeese, Everett D.
DiBona, Charles J.
Dickerson, Kenneth A.
Diedrich, Robert E.
Diloreto, Lucio
Dockery, Olan L.
Doebler, Harold J., II
Doerr, Peter J.
Doherty, Richard S.
Dolan, Edward H., Jr.
Dolan, John H.
Domville, Compton N., Jr.
Donahue, John F.
Donlan, William J.
Donley, James M.
Donohue, Douglas J.
Donovan, Neil
Doolittle, Wallace F., Jr.
Doran, Samuel W.
Dorow, William R.
Dorsey, James F., Jr.
Dougherty, Charles E.
Dove, William F.
Dowd, Gregory P.
Drake, Donald L.
Drake, Leon L.
Drayton, Frank J., Jr.
Drennan, Donald C.
Dresser, Roderick A.
Driskell, Robert E.
Drucquer, Cedric W.
Dudrow, Donald L.
Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.
Dugan, William D., Jr.
Dunbar, Fredric A.
Dunn, Robert R.
Durckel, Ronald E.
Durham, Jack D.
Duval, Thomas J.
Dwyer, James L.
Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.
Dyro, Stanislaus G.
Eagye, Vernon A.
Earman, Harry L.
Earnest, Charles "M"
Eason, Thomas E.
Eason, William G.
Eaton, Robert H.
Edmunds, Donald C.
Edwards, James C.
Edwards, Joshua V.
Edwards, Joe D.
Edwards, Leslie R.
Edwards, William F.
Egerton, James W.
Elfsten, Robert N.
Elinski, Michael, Jr.
Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.
Elliott, Bernard C.
Elliott, John H.
Ellis, Frank K.
Ellis, Hal R., III
Elpers, William W.
Emmerson, Milo E.
Emsley, Albert P., Jr.
England, Robert N.
Englund, David L.
Erie, Carl R.
Erner, Eugene J.
Errickson, John J.
Ervin, Charles F.
Eskew, Perry R., Jr.
Estes, Edward D.
Evans, Alton R.
Evans, Frederic H.
Evans, Gene O.
Evans, James A.
Evans, Ronald E.
Everett, William A.
*Eversole, Fredrick L.
Eylar, Frederick P.
Eyler, Armand T., Jr.
Fairbanks, Wayne K.
Faircloth, Gerald F.
Fallin, Jerry W.
Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.
Faris, William E.
Farnsworth, John F.
Farr, Sterling J.
Farrar, Charles E.
Farrell, Edward J.
Farren, Thomas J.
Fauth, Donald P.
Featherstone, Rex W.
Feeney, Edward J.
Fehrle, Fred R.
Fehrs, Walter H.
Felkins, Charles G.
Fellowes, John H.
Fenton, Clayton J., Jr.
Ferrarini, Richard L.
Ferry, James M.
Fesler, Robert J.
Festag, Albert P.
Findley, Anderson H., Jr.
Finley, Dean M.
Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.
Fisher, Walter L., Jr.
Fitch, Edward S.
Fitzgerald, Maurice D.
Fitsimmons, Eugene W.
Fitzwilliam, Peter K.
Flanary, Thomas N., II
Flannery, Gerald J., Jr.
Flather, Charles R.
Flatley, James H., III
Fleming, William J.
Flight, John W., Jr.
Floyd, Edward R.
Folds, Arthur T.
Foote, Everett W.
Ford, Homer L., Jr.
Ford, John W.
Forgy, James P.
Forster, Robert M.
Fortenberry, Thomas N.
Foster, Charles R.
Foster, John A.
Fournier, Paul R.
Fowler, Neville D.
Foxworth, David H.
Franchini, Wallace L.
Francis, Paul R.
Frank, Thomas P.
Fredrick, Russell E.
Freely, John J.
Freeman, Thomas L.
Frey, Charles W.
Friedrich, Thomas E.
Fries, Charles L.
Friichtenicht, Richard D.
Frokjer, Elmer H.
Fromm, George R.
Fuld, Charles L.
Fulk, Gerald A.
Fuller, Fred R.
Furlong, George M., Jr.
Gable, Edwin P.
Gaffrey, Leo J.,
Gaines, Milton J.
Gaines, Richard S.
Galinsky, Jerome J.
*Gallagher, Vincent E.
Gambarani, Paul R., Jr.
Garber, Cecil E.
Gardoza, Henry
Garretson, Arthur S.
Garrison, Charles H., Jr.
Garsoe, Norman D.
Garvin, John K.
Gates, Richard L.
Gay, Donald M.
Gaylor, Elvin L.
Geer, Gilbert H.
George, Irl J.
Gero, Richard L.
Gerrald, Benjamin W.
Gesling, Marion L.
Ghering, Walter L.
Gibson, Clifford W.
Gibson, Donald
Giffin, John L.
Gifford, Robert M.
Gilbert, Donald B.
Gilbert James C.
Gilbert, Robert L.
Gilchrist, Edwin B., Jr.
Gile, Robert H.
Gillette, Nelson M.
Gillman, James W.
Gilpin, George W.
Gilreath, James E.
Giuliani, Leonard E.
Glaeser, Frederick W.
Glenn, Eugene R.
Gluse, Michael R.
Goetz, Charles R.
Goeway, Lee E.
Golden, Edward E.
Gomez, Louis G.
Good, Glenn E.
Goodale, Charles N.
Goodman, Robert B.
Gore, Lawrence C.
Gormley, Kenneth L.
Goss, Richard M.
Gougar, Jack M.
Graham, Frank M.
Gralow, Richard T.
Grandjean, Charles A.
Grant, Claude A.
Grant, Freeman A., Jr.
Grant, John C.
Grant, Richard L.
Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
Gray, Lewis S.
Green, Gerald E.
Green, William E.
Green, William H.
Greene, Richard O.
Greer, Albert E.
Gregory, Kenneth A.
Grewe, Webster
Grier, Thomas C., Jr.
Griffin, John R.
Griffin, William H.
Grimes, Donald L.
Grimes, William H.
Grimmell, Robert L.
Grisham, Albert M.
Groepler, Neil F.
Groff, Peter J.
Grossoehme, Clyde
Gulli, Carmano J.
Guthrie, Wesley E.
Gyder, Charles E.
Haberman, Robert
Hahne, Dayton R.
Hale, Frederick W.
Haley, George K.
Hall, Don L.
Hall, Robert A.
Hall, Thomas J.
Halloran, Richard J.
Hamilton, Donald E.
Hamilton, Verlie M.
Hammon, Colin P.
Haning, James L.
Hannaford, William H.
Hansen, Lawrence W.
Hanson, David F.
Hanson, Deroy L.
Hanson, Donald C.
Hanson, Edwin E.
Hanson, Morton H.
Harmon, Jack E.
Harmon, Oliver E.
Harney, George S.
Harriott, Robert K.
Harris, Homer D.
Harris, Robert H.
Harris, William R.
Harrison, Joseph W.
Harscheid, David G.
Hartley, Donald H.
Hartshorn, Owen P.
Hasch, Ralph H.
Haskell, Hugh B.
Hastad, Cleighton J.
Hastings, Irvin W., Jr.
Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.
Hatch, Ross R.
Hatfield, Willis G.
Havran, Philip S.
Hayes, Newton G.
Hayman, Douglas S. F., Jr.,
Hefferon, Thomas W.
Hegar, Edwin J.
Heggood, Frank E.
Heiland, Charles E.
Heinz, Paul R.
Heisinger, Duane L.
Heitman, Milton H.
Hejhall, Roy C.
Helm, Ralph M.
Helmick, John P., Jr.
Henry, Albert L., Jr.
Henry, John A., Jr.
Henry, William F.
Hepburn, Richard F.
Herring, Hubert B.
Herring, John J., Jr.
Herring, Paul E.
Hess, Ronald K.
Hickerson, James M.
Hickey, John F., III
Hickman, Jimmie E.
Hicks, Harry E.
Hicks, John R.
Hierholzer, Joseph A.
Higgins, Lloyd A.
Hill, Kenneth E.
Hill, Raymond W.
Hill, Richard L.
Hill, Rollin L.
Hindorff, Donald M.
Hines, Walter P.
Hipp, William J.
Hoak, James F.
Hobbs, Fermor W., III
Hodgate, Charles, Jr.
Hodge, William R.
Hoerner, Fredrick C.
Hoffman, Chauncey F.
Hoffman, Herbert F., Jr.
Hogeboom, Edward L., Jr.
Hogg, James R.
Hogue, Robert L.
Hohenstein, Clyde G.
Holland, Clyde W.
Holland, John O.
Holliday, James R.
Holm, John P.
Holmes, Harry M.
Honea, Milton D.
Honsinger, Vernon C.
Hootman, John J.
Horne, Roger B., Jr.
Horvath, Donald L.
Hovater, Arthur K.
Howard, Charles B.
Howard, Edgbert F.
Howard, Richard P.
Howell, Richard F.
Howell, William J.
Hubbard, John H.
Hubbell, Milford M.
Huckaby, James H.
Hueber, Fred P.
Huff, Walter C., Jr.
Hughes, Howard W.
Hughes, William D.
Huhn, Samuel P.
Hull, William S.
Hullander, Robert A.
Hunter, Wallace R.
Huntington, Donald E., Jr.
Hurd, Devon "H"
Hurst, Wilmer M.
Hussey, Harold W.
Husted, Murl E., Jr.
Husted, Richard C.
Hutchinson, Alden M.
Hutto, Charles H.
Hyatt, Robert G.
Ingalls, Frederick G.
Ingram, Frank L.
Ingram, William A.
Ion, Dalton L.
Irons, Robert P., Jr.
Isaac, Philip D.
Isaacs, Charles R.
Isenberg, Albert D.
Ishol, Lyle M.
Ivy, Travis R.
Jackson, Carle L.
Jacobs, Arthur G.
Jaeger, Robert H.
James, Edgar L.
James, Ernest W.
Janetatos, Jack P.
Jarratt, Guy C., III
Jarwin, Raymond J.
Jebb, Robert D.
Jellison, Harry E.
Jenkins, Jerry V.
Jennings, Mark J.
Jennings, Walter E.
Jensen, Richard S.
Jenson, Gunnar S.
Jernee, Andre L.
Johe, Richard E.
Johns, Alan D.
Johnson, Bobbie D.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, David R.
Johnson, Harrison A.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Jerome L.
Johnson, Myron S.
Johnson, Norman C.
Johnston, Donald H., Jr.
Johnston, Donald W.
Jones, Jerry E.
Jones, Wilbur D., Jr.
Jordan, Henry W.
Jordan, Henry M.
Judge, Michael J.
Jumper, Vernon L.
Karas, Robert E.
Karn, Alvin R., Jr.
Kasnicki, Edward J.
Kavanaugh, Michael W.
Kawalkowski, Leonard P.
Kearl, Grant W.
Keegan, Arthur E.
Keeley, Edward C.
Keene, Charles R.
Keith, William J.
Keller, Robert M.
Keller, William E., Jr.
Kelly, Francis P.
Kelso, Frank B., II
Kemper, Robert D.
Kenaston, George W.
Kennedy, Dennis E.
Kennedy, William F.
Kenney, Richard A.
Keough, Robert J.
Kersting, William H.
Kilgore, William H.
Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.
Kilpatrick, Louis A.
Kincade, Clarence R.
Kinert, John H.
King, Charles C.
King, Ural W.
King, William W.
Kinney, Ben J.
Kinney, Charles H.
Kinsel, Herman L.
Kirkpatrick, John H.
Kirkwood, Robert L.
Kitzelman, Glenn E.
Klein, Melvin A.
Kloman, John H.
Knef, Andrew L.
Knight, Burton L.
Knight, John R., Jr.
Knott, Howard E., Jr.
Knowlton, Ronald S.
Koll, William P.
Komisarcik, Adam
Kordek, Walter A.
Kouns, Archie R.
Kraemer, Kenton K.
Kralik, Simon C.
Kramer, James B., Jr.
Kramer, Rex W., Jr.
Kreutzberger, Donald J.
Krieger, John W.
Krieger, Thomas R.
Kristof, John J.
Krogh, David E.
Kronnagel, Julius
Kruger, Allen L.
Kurz, Walter C.
Kuykendall, Herbert B.
Kvederis, James P.
LaBarge, William A.
Lacey, Trammell C., Jr.
Lacy, William A.
Lackey, Earl L.
Ladas, Nick J.
LaFave, Maurice G.
Laird, John V.
Lakey, Jimmie D.
Lakin, Bill
Lambert, Billy C.
Lamm, George E.
LaMotte, Francis J.
Landroche, William J., Jr.
Langenheim, John P.
Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
Lanham, Gene
Lanning, Richard J.
Larison, John D., Jr.
Larsen, James L.
Larsen, Victor D.
Larson, Lawrence H.
Lassetter, Keith M.
Laub, Burton R., Jr.
Laux, Arno H.
Lavelle, Thomas J.
Law, Mervin H.
Lawrence, Donald W.
Lawson, Henry T.
Lawson, Ramsay
Leach, Richard L.
Leahy, Philip G.
Leblanc, James B.
Lee, Dennis B.
Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
Lefevre, Robert J.
Leird, William A.
Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
Levendoski, Richard J.
Levy, Norman S.
Lewey, Ira D.
Lewin, Theodore E.
Lewinski, Roman R.
Lewis, Harold S.

Lewis, John L.
Lewis, Norman H.
Linch, Donald T.
Lind, Frederick J.
Lindquist, Donald E.
Linehan, Timothy J., Jr.
Lippert, Frederick G., III
Lloyd, David B.
Locke, Jerry L.
Loechelt, Cecil P.
Logan, David E.
Lohr, Harold C.
Longley, William N.
Loos, Donald G.
Loscavio, John M.
Loudermilk, Henry E.
Lovdal, Rodney H.
Lowden, Lawrence A.
Lown, Paul C.
Lowry, Donald G.
Loynes, Louis A.
Lumbert, Albert W.
Lundquist, Donald R.
Lyle, Calvin H.
Lynch, Robert B., Jr.
Lyons, James E.
Macan, John J.
MacAskill, Everett, Jr.
MacDiarmid, Allen B.
MacDiarmid, Ronald B.
MacIntyre, Daniel G.
MacLaren, John H.
MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Mademann, Paul F.
Magarity, Roy L.
Maines, Henry L.
Mainland, Edward A.
Majors, William T.
Maliczowski, William
Malloy, Malcolm A.
Malone, Donald W.
Maloney, John J.
Manes, William C.
Mansell, Richard T.
Marcoux, Eugene A.
Marks, Everett D.
Marrion, Reginald T.
Martensen, Vincent F.
Martin, Charles G.
Martin, Frank P.
Masterson, Leo S.
Maston, Joseph H., III
Mateer, Edward R., Jr.
Matson, Bruce W.
Matt, George E., Jr.
Matthews, John B.
May, Harding W.
Mayer, Robert V.
Mayer, Robert R.
Mayfield, Albert L.
Mayfield, Douglas S.
Mays, Samuel E., Jr.
Maytham, Peter
McAlister, Rex F., Jr.
McAllister, Richard C.
McBride, Francis E.
McBride, Michael A.
McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCaffery, Robert A.
McCain, James R.
McCarter, Kenneth W.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McCarthy, John D.
McCauley, George A.
McClenahan, Tom P.
McCleskey, Jerry
McClure, Dale R.
McConkey, Edward C.
McConnell, Edward W., II.
McCoy, Harry E.
McCoy, James C., Jr.
McCoy, Thomas H.
McCravy, John R., Jr.
McCullough, "J" "P"
McCune, Terrance O.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
McDonald, Ray M.
McDonell, Walter I., Jr.
McDonough, William J.
McEachen, Angus D., III
McFadden, John H., Jr.
McGarry, John G.
McGee, Claude A.
McGhinnis, Richard O.
McGlamery, James L.
McGrath, James J.
McGuire, Marvin "E"
McHugh, Philip R.
McIlwaine, John C.
McIntire, Stanley H.
McIntire, William G., Jr.
McIntire, Wilton H.
McKee, Frank R.
McKenna, Charles E.
McKinney, Charles P.
McKinney, Gale A.
McKinney, Mercer L., Jr.
McKinnon, John D.
McKinstry, Thomas W.
McKinzie, William E.
McKissock, Donald J.
McLaughlin, John R.
McLean, Charles R.
McLellan, Charles A.
McMillan, Edward W.
McMillan, Lee Q.
McNeil, Charles H.
McNeil, Dale A.
McNeill, Richard J.
McPherson, Edward W.
McPherson, Albert A.
McQueen, George B.
Medwedeff, Channing W.
Meier, Leonard M.
Meintzer, William C., Jr.
Mellette, William W.
Melvin, Edmund W.
Melvin, Virgil B.
Merrill, Grant C.
Metzler, Charles D.
Michaels, Danny J.
Mikeal, William S.
Mikitarian, Samson
Miller, David K.
Miller, Donald R.
Miller, Gordon J.
Miller, Herbert A.
Miller, Hoyle H.
Miller, James R.
Miller, John A.
Miller, John M., Jr.
Miller, Kenneth L.
Miller, Merle E.
Miller, Robert L., Jr.
Miller, Wayne W.
Miller, Wendell E.
Miller, William H.
Minton, David C., III
Mirise, Kerry W.
Misar, Kenneth H.
Milligan, Wayne L.
Millon, Donald H.
Milne, James L.
Minkler, Eugene D.
Mitchell, Kenneth
Mizerak, John
Moffitt, Vernon D.
Molloy, Arthur E.
Molloy, Ronald J.
Monahan, Edward P.
Moore, Harold A., Jr.
Moore, Nelson E.
Moore, Paul M.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, Robert W.
Moran, Thomas J.
Morgan, William N.
Morris, Charles S.
Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
Morris, John D.
Morrison, Jon K.
Mortimer, Edmund C.
Morton, Richard E.
Mossop, Wallace L., Jr.
Motika, Ralph
Mount, Eugene A.
Moyers, Gilbert E.
Mozier, Richard A.
Mulholland, Howard E.
Mullen, John T.
Mulloy, Charles S.
Mulvihill, James H.
Munn, Robert J., Jr.
Munsey, William D.
Murphy, James J., Jr.
Murphy, Robert E.
Murray, Darrell
Murray, Frank S.
Murrell, Charles J.
Musgrove, William M.
Musick, Wayne O.
Myers, Ashley A.
Naddy, Llewellyn L.
Nagel, "L" "D"
Neale, George L.
Nelson, Carl A.
Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, Sven D.
Neuhard, Henry H.
Newbury, Alfred C.
Newcomb, James W., Jr.
Newsom, Joe R.
Nicholas, David W.
Nicholson, Murray M. J., Jr.
Nicholson, Odis A.
Nielsen, Irving C.
Nielsen, Robert P.
Niles, Wilmer J.
Normand, Paul R.
Norris, Richard J.
Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
Noss, Charles H.
Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
Novarra, Francis J.
Novratil, Robert V.
Nowak, Arthur A.
Nowak, Edward M.
Nuanes, Charles
Oberle, Ronald J.
Ochs, Dorance L.
O'Connell, Jerome A.
O'Connor, Edwin A.
O'Connor, Harold B.
O'Connor, William J. M.
O'Donnell, Daniel T.
O'Donnell, Robert G.
O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
Ogden, John H.
O'Halloran, William J.
Ohmen, Douglass J.
O'Keefe, William J.
O'Kelly, James R.
Oliverio, Theodore E.
Olson, Albert W.
Olson, Carroll A.
Olson, Darryl D.
Omundson, Jerrold W.
Onstott, Donald D.
Orchard, Wayne J.
Ord, Donald C.
O'Rear, Gilbert A.
Orton, Cloyd G.
Orzech, Bernard P.
Osgood, Wayne R.
Overstreet, George H.
Owen, James L.
Owings, Dwight C.
Oyler, Jimmie D.
Paine, Francis S., Jr.
Palmer, Howard L.
Palmer, Jerry J.
Pardue, James I., Jr.
Parrick, Carl R.
Parsons, Charles E.
Pasquinelli, Francis C.
Pate, Homer W.
Patterson, James W., Jr.
Patterson, Ray A.
Patterson, Robert G.
Pattin, Stephen M.
Patton, James M.
Pearson, John E.
Pedersen, Odd B.
Peek, Robert F.
Peeples, John M., Jr.
Peetz, Robert E.
Penders, Joseph W.
Pennock, Murray F.
Perez, Edward A.
Perry, Albert J.
Perry, Henry B.
Person, Herbert F.
Peters, Vernon W.
Petersen, Richard D.
Peterson, Bob L.
Peterson, James F.
Peterson, John R.
Peterson, Karl L.
Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
Petree, Noel H., Jr.
Petrich, Horst A.
Pfister, William J.
Philipp, Frederick C.
Phillips, Charles R., Jr.
*Phillips, George L., Jr.
Phillips, Ronald M.
Phillips, Richard W.
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
Pinion, David E.
Poe, Benjamin L., Jr.
Polfer, Clarence R.
Poole, Thomas E.
Poore, Thomas W.
Porter, Robert W.
Potter, Clare E.
Poulsen, Wells P., Jr.
Powell, Falvey C., Jr.
Powell, Francis L.
Powell, Leonard F.
Powell, Stewart G.
Powell, Wendell W.
Powell, William C.
Poyet, Elmer F.
Presley, Jack C.
Previ, Wallace M.
Price, William H., II
Proctor, Robert C.
Proper, Vance D.
Propper, Ronald M.
Pugh, Robert W.
Putnam, John C.
Pyle, Roger G.
Quinn, James E., Jr.
Quisenberry, Jesse W.
Raab, Charles F.
Raab, George E.
Rabuck, Leo V.
Randall, Harold N., Jr.
Randrup, Peter N.
Ranieri, Richard A. J.
Ransom, James P., II
Rashley, George E.
Rathbun, Philip W.
Rayome, Francis L.
Read, Benton M.
Redhage, James L.
Redington, Jerome J.
Reed, Allen E., Jr.
Reed, Dale H.
Reese, Russell R.
Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
Reifschneider, Jack L.
Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
Rennaker, Charles L.
Renner, Lorraine E.
Repta, Robert S.
Rettig, Godfrey A.
Revak, Paul A.
Reynolds, Rodney R.
Rice, Robert P.
Rich, Willis S.
Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
Richardson, Ronald W.
Richmond, Bruce R.
Richter, John H.
Riefler, George B.
Rigler, Douglas V.
Riley, Edward E., Jr.
Rinkel, Richard A.
Rinn, John R.
Roach, John C.
Roberts, Charles R.
Roberts, Ned C.
Roberts, Richard D.
Roberts, Tommie W.
Robertson, Hollis E.
Robertson, Robert J.
Robinson, David W.
Robinson, Eugene I.
Robinson, Robert E.
Rodgers, Robert D.
Rodrigue, Gerard J.
Roegge, Charles E.
Roehren, Robert R.
Roemer, Charles P.
Rogers, Joseph A.
Roper, Vincent W.
Roscoe, Simon A., Jr.
Rosendale, George W., Jr.
Ross, Scott K.
Rothe, Jack F.
Rowell, George W.
Rowsey, James M., Jr.
Ruhle, Robert C.
Rush, Claude E.
Russ, William M., Jr.
Russell, Kay
Rutherford, Harry M.
Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
Ryan, Thomas M.
Rypel, Ronald J.
Saavedra, Robert
Sabin, James F.
Sabine, Frederick R.
Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
Salatine, Richard
Saleh, Richard E.
Salo, Elmer E.
Sampson, Robert J.
Sams, Hugh P.
Sandler, Charles A.
Sandman, Richard S.
Sandoval, Albert, Jr.
Sargent, Stephen E.
Saunders, Richard E.
Savage, Jimmy R.
Saville, Terry D.
Sayers, Samuel L.
Scarborough, John R. L.
Scarlett, Frank B.
Schade, Eric H., Jr.
Schaffert, Richard W.
Schaible, David L.
Schatz, Robert G.
Scherer, Francis H.
Scheyder, Ernst J.
Schick, Herbert A.
Schilling, George F.
Schleicher, Carl
Schmidt, Peter R.
Schmidt, Robert H.
Schmidt, Robert P.
Schmitt, Robert W.
Schneider, Frederick F., Jr.
Schneider, Walter L., III
Schoen, Victor A.
Schoessel, William M., Jr.
Schreadley, Richard L.
Schreck, Milton W.
Schreiner, Raymond J.
Schulze, John M., Jr.
Schuster, Eugene J.
Schutte, John J.
Schwartz, Ralph C.
Schwatka, August O., Jr.
Schweiger, Melvin B.
Scott, Philip J.
Scott, Thomas P.
Scott, William W.
Scovel, Frank D.
Scranton, Herbert "H"
Seaward, Hobart E.
Sechrest, Edward A.
Seesholtz, John R.
Seiler, Melvin E.
Seip, Asher P., Jr.
Sesma, Ramon A.
Sexton, Delbert A.
Shafer, Richard W.
Shanley, Robert J.
Shannon, Philip M.
Shannon, Richard A.
Sheehan, John P.
Shelso, David A.
Shelton, Donald D.
Shelton, Woodrow W.
Sheppy, Clayton L.
Shinn, Robert A.
Shipley, Carl N.
Short, Benjamin F.
Short, Leroy A., Jr.
Shultz, Theodore B.
Shumaker, Robert H.
Sibley, David N.
Sigmond, Arie C. A.
Sikes, James H.
Siletto, Ronald J.
Simonic, Robert J.
Simpson, George T. K.
Simpson, William H.
Sirch, Richard W. F.
Skelly, Arthur R.
Slack, Stephen R.
Slaughter, William T.
Slawson, Bryce D.
Slawson, Bruce L.
Sleeman, Charles F.
Slingerland, Raymond D.
Sloan, John H.
Sloan, William D.
Slough, John H.
Smetheram, Herbert E.
Smiley, Robert R., III
Smith, Augustine J., Jr.
Smith, Bobby E.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
Smith, Gene A.
Smith, George O.
Smith, Harold L., Jr.
Smith, James W.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
*Smith, Richard H.
Smith, Norman M.
Smith, Phillip J.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Thomas F.
Smith, Vernon C.
Smith, Warren R.
Smith, Wayne H.
Snively, Arthur W.
Snyder, Richard C.
Sones, William C.
Sorenson, Fred, Jr.
Spann, Homer R.
Spees, Adrian D.
Spellman, Fred G.
Spencer, Barry W.
Spencer, Charles H.
Spindler, Raymond S.
Spink, Peter J.
Spivey, Franklin L.
Spotts, James L.
Squires, Howard J.
Staats, Michael C.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur C., Jr.
Stammer, Walter H. Jr.
Stanford, Robert M.
Stanley, John N.

Stanwick, Stanley W.
Starbuck, Virgil K.
Stark, Walter W.
Statham, Raymond B.
Steece, Robert B.
Stefanou, Christopher M.
Stephens, William J.
Stephenson, Paul D.
Sterling, John C.
Stevenson, Connelly D.
Stevenson, Barr S.
Stewart, Charles C.
Stewart, Edwin M., Jr.
Stocking, Sigurd I.
Stone, Elmer M.
Stone, Lowell P.
*Strahan, Wendell L.
Stratford, Robert H.
Stratton, Richard A.
Straughan, William N.
Streull, Joseph W.
Strong, Henry H., Jr.
Stroup, Wayne B.
Stuart, Charles J., Jr.
Stutz, James D.
Sullivan, Gene F.
Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr.
Sumner, Donald M.
Sumrall, William H.
Swagart, Allan M.
Swan, William R.
Swanson, Harlan D., Jr.
Sweeney, Leo H.
Taff, Clarence O., Jr.
Tager, Bruce A.
Talbert, Joseph T., Jr.
Talbott, Merrill L.
Tapp, John B.
Tarbuck, Richard R.
Tatom, Frank B.
Taylor, Dan L.
Taylor, Hugh R.
Taylor, James M.
Taylor, John D.
Taylor, Larry J.
Taylor, Robert C., Jr.
Teachout, David S.
Thearle, William J.
Theodorelos, Pete "J"
Thoma, John C.
Thomas, James G.
Thomas, Richard L.
Thompson, Benton G.
Thompson, James M.
Thompson, Jack D.
Thompson, Tommy L.
Thomte, William J.
Thorin, Duane W.
Thurber, John D.
Thurneysen, Jon S.
Tibbitts, Barrick F.
Tibbs, John C.
Tierney, James S.
Tietgen, Charles A., Jr.
Toohey, Edward L., Jr.
Townsend, James B.
Tralla, Wade A.
Trent, Richard W.
Truax, Hugh G.
Trupp, Adam R.
Tubbs, Kenneth A.
Tucker, Edwin B.
Tucker, James E.
Tucker, Roy E.
Tugwell, Richard L.
Tullis, James V.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Vernon K.
Turner, Wilson C.
Tuttle, Jerry O.
Tyers, Robert D.
Tyler, Eugene M.
Tyler, Maurice F., Jr.
Ulrich, Thomas R.
Underhill, Edward B.
Ussher, John P.
Vail, William C.
Vallera, Rocco D.
Vance, Walter N., III
Vanderwagen, Edward A.
VanHorne, Alfred L.
VanMetre, James M.
VanNice, James R.
Vanoy, William E.
VanPool, Logan E.
Varney, Gale N.
Ventimiglia, Edward M.
Vickers, Wrencie
Villalobos, Julian
Villenave, Robert A.
Vincent, Robert F.
Vispo, Peter P.
Vohden, Arthur F., Jr.
VonGlahn, Ralph H., Jr.
Voorhees, Walter M.
Vowell, Joe L.
Waddell, Jack W.
Wagner, John A.
Walder, Edward F., Jr.
Waldron, Charles H.
Waldron, Michael J.
Waldrop, Glynn A.
Wales, George E.
Walker, Brian F.
Walker, William E.
Wallace, Richard J.
Wallace, Turner P., Jr.
Walleen, Maurice L.
Wallis, Wayne H.
Walter, Dale J.
Walters, James E.
Waltzer, Jacob
Ward, Compton E.
Wardell, William L., Jr.
Warren, James W.
Watkins, Robert L.
Watson, Lloyd C.
Watts, Henry A.
Watts, James W.
Way, Edward R.
Weaks, William G.
Weatherby, Theodore R.
Weber, Gustave A., Jr.
Webster, John A., Jr.
Wehner, George D.
Weidknecht, Frank A.
Weidman, Russell H.
Weinfield, Richard M.
Welch, Ralph W.
Welch, Richard D.
Wells, Walton E.
Welsh, George T.
Werner, Marshall D.
West, Arch T.
West, Charles T.
West, Norman P.
Westall, Kenneth W.
Westendorf, Donald R., Jr.
Westphal, Harold S., Jr.
Wharton, Edwin K.
Wheeler, James R.
Whitbeck, Charles J.
White, Clarence A.
White, Laurence A., Jr.
White, Richard F.
Whitehorn, Floyd H.
Whiteside, James D.
Whitten, Jimmie
Whittington, James W.
Whittle, Henry W.
Wichmann, William H.
Wicke, James O.
Widen, Max W.
Widen, Richard D.
Wier, Ronald L.
Wiggins, Larry C.
Wilbern, Jack M.
Wilde, John H., Jr.
Wilke, William L.
Wilkins, George H.
Wilkinson, Thomas A. R.
Will, Robert A.
Williams, Forrest R.
Williams, Frank E.
Willis, Clayton B.
Wilson, Charles R.
Wilson, Charles N.
Wilson, Donald C.
Wilson, Eric J.
Wilson, Jackson A., Jr.
Wilson, John S.
Wilson, William E.
Windsor, Nelson E.
Winslow, Myron S., Jr.
Winter, Richard A.
Wise, Stephen A.
Witherspoon, Beverly W.
Witherspoon, Charles R.
Witt, Robert F.
Wolfe, Robert E.
Wolfe, William F.
Wollam, John E.
Womack, David R., Jr.
Wood, Clarence W.
Wood, Forrest H.
Wood, Joseph V.
Wood, Rex S.
Wood, Walter S.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., III
Woodruff, Gene L.
Woods, Herbert P.
Woodside, Harold R.
Wootten, Carl B.
Word, Millard L.
Worrock, Bryce K.
Wright, Frederick E.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Joseph M. P., Jr.
Wright, Marsh E.
Wright, Orville, Jr.
Wuthrich, Richard E.
Wyly, James R., Jr.
Yarber, James
Yarbrough, William P., Jr.
Yarnell, James L.
Young, Kenneth G.
Zagortz, Leonard "A," Jr.
Zaner, Aubrey B.
Zarcaro, John G.
Zdolsek, Martin F.
Zechlin, Frank F.
Zerwas, Richard L.
Ziemer, Howard
Zimmerman, John C.
Zimmerman, Robert W.
Zinn, Chester A., Jr.
Zipse, Robert L.
Zirbel, William D.
Ziskovsky, Joseph W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bosco, Clement, Jr.
Shaughnessy, John M.
Sorenson, Jackie R.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Vernon, Clarence A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Smith, Ralph A., III

William W. Scott, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Baker, Mary T.
Ducey, Anne L.
Ziegler, Kathleen

SUPPLY CORPS

Brown, Betty J.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Casanova, Jean O.
Cronin, Catherine V.
Lloyd, Sara J.
Zook, Joan E.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Carol Y.
Andersen, Jeanette L.
Bashe, Kathleen A.
Bingham, Rosina E.
Burnside, Mary D.
Denby, Sara P.
Dilorenzo, Julia J.
Forbes, Shirley J.
Frost, Beverly W.
Goodwin, Anne V.
Hollis, Zid V.
Larsen, Dorothy A.
Pierce, Velma A.
Staub, Shirley A.
Steenburgen, Anna L.
Thomas, Wyline S.
Young, Johanna L. H.
Zierdt, Lucy E.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Angell, Richard C.
Aucoin, James B.
Bailes, Ralph T.
Bailey, William W.
Baumstark, Richard B.
Beagle, Clyde A., Jr.
Bingham, Rosina E.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Burton, James L., Jr.
Campbell, Carl E.
Coffman, William R., Jr.
Cust, Harlan R.
Daum, Richard A.
Davis, Donald V.
Dean, Robert V.
Dyro, Stanislaus G.
Forbes, Shirley J.
Gardella, John K.
Gilbert, Robert L.
Goodwin, James B.
Graham, Neil H.
Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
Gray, Lewis S.
Greer, Robert E.
Hanson, Deroy L.
Herd, Robert V.
Higginson, John J.
Jines, Milton L.
Kaseote, George
Kloman, John H.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Lomheim, Louis G.
MacAskill, Everett, Jr.
MacKenzie, Bruce E.
Maloney, John J.
Mann, John P.
McCauley, George A.
Moran, Charles K., Jr.
Mozley, Edwin A.
Newsom, Joe R.
Perkins, Richard L.
Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
Persons, George R.
Pollard, Ronald T.
Proper, Vance D.
Rayome, Francis L.
Ream, Ronald L.
Reich, Merrill D.
Rhoads, John D.
Salatine, Richard
Schmidt, John A.
Schumacher, Duane O.
Scott, William W.
Self, Norman T.
Smith, Lee O.
Swartz, Theodore R.
Thomas, James W.
Thorpe, Gordon L.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
Wages, Clarence J.
Wales, George E.
Walter, Harold B.
Weichman, Denis R.
Wood, Walter S.
Word, Millard L.
Yelle, A. Courtney

SUPPLY CORPS

Corbitt, James R.
Cunningham, John H.
Daddona, John M.
Dewey, Edward P.
Greenfield, Milton
Gumpert, Leroy C.
Hawkey, William C.
Hopkins, Richard B.
Kalafut, George W.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
Petras, George A.
Pliska, Robert F.
Sechler, John L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Chin, William
Crisp, Hugh A.
Godsey, Jack L.
Klein, Dale M.
Lonegan, Thomas L.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Abbot, James L., Jr.
Abercrombie, Theo J.
Ady, Howard P., Jr.
Akers, Charles O'N.
Alford, Lodwick H.
Allen, Charles "L" "D"
Alley, Murlin W.
Alm, Carlton F.
Almgren, Neal
Anderson, Fernald P.
Arbes, James D.
Arrington, John L., II
Aymond, John P.
Bacon, Noel R.
Bagby, Oliver W.
Balch, John B.
Baldwin, Charles A.
Ballantyne, Robert D., Jr.
Bampton, Frank W.
Banvard, Theodore J.
Bardshar, Frederic A.
Barnes, Jess W.
Barnes, Robert C.
Barr, Capers G., Jr.
Barry, Richard F., Jr.
Bell, Clarence E., Jr.
Bemis, Wendell W.
Berg, Alvin C.
Berg, Winfred E.
Bergstrom, Edward W.
Bernard, William B.
Berns, Max A., Jr.
Bettinger, Joe L., Jr.
Beveridge, Richard A.
Bill, David S., Jr.
Blackburn, John R.
Blonts, Edward C., Jr.
Bobczynski, Sigmund A.
Bogart, Frank L.
Bonner, Emmett P.
Bonvillian, William D.
Bowdey, George W.
Bower, Carl R.
Brandenburg, Howard H.
Brassfield, Arthur J.
Breen, Roy E., Jr.
Brehm, William W.
Brent, Robert
Brough, James A.
Brown, Frederick W., Jr.
Brown, Gaylord B.
Brown, Ira W., Jr.
Brownlie, Robert M.
Broyles, Ned L.
Bruning, Robert MacK., Jr.
Bryce, David G.
Buchan, Robert B.
Burgess, Andrew L.
Burke, Edmund, Jr.
Butler, Glen "B"
Byrnes, Robert B.
Caldwell, Sam J., Jr.
Calhoun, Charles R.
Callahan, Cornelius P., Jr.
Cameron, Gerald L.
Campbell, Duncan A.
Caracciolo, Felix
Carmichael, David C.
Carrison, Daniel J.
Cassel, Charles M., Jr.
Cassidy, Herbert A., Jr.
Cattermole, George B.
Centner, Richard L.
Chalmers, George E.
Chandler, Charles R.
Childers, Kenan C., Jr.
Christie, William F.
Clark, Alto B.

Clark, Charles R., Jr.
Clark, Robert W.
Clarke, Fredric "B"
Clarke, Samuel R.
Clarke, Walter E.
Clausner, Marlin D.
Coleman, James P.
Collins, Thomas W., Jr.
Compton, Emmett M.
Conatser, Charlie N.
Conrad, Homer E.
Conroy, Thomas L.
Cooper, Francis T., Jr.
Corcoran, Daniel J.
Cox, Robert D., Jr.
Crabill, Charles H., Jr.
Crenshaw, Russell S., Jr.
Crews, Howard W.
Crouch, Partee W., Jr.
Crowley, Roger J., Jr.
Cunha, George D. M.
Curran, James H.
Dancy, Charles A., Jr.
Daniels, James G., III
Daniels, Jerry F., Jr.
Dare, James A.
Dashiell, Edward L., Jr.
Davey, Harry E., Jr.
Davis, Lewis F.
Davis, Richard J.
Davis, Will "J", Jr.
Davison, William H.
Dawson, George E.
Dawson, William S.
Deacon, Edward T.
DeLaureal, Henry H.
DeLoach, William R., Jr.
Denton, William, Jr.
De Vico, Anthony J.
Dewey, Irving D.
Diekhoff, Arold H.
Dimpfel, Emerson H.
Dinsmore, John R.
Dobie, Ernest W., Jr.
Doughty, Morris R.
Downing, Arthur L.
Duchin, Morris G.
Dudley, John B.
Duffy, Gerald H.
Duncan, George C.
Duncan, Richard L.
Dunlap, Ernest H., Jr.
Eddy, Thomas R.
Egbert, Gordon R.
Eisenhart, George N.
Elder, Robert M.
Ellison, Thomas B.
Elsom, James H.
Evans, Frank W., Jr.
Fagan, Robert H.
Fairfax, Eugene G.
Fargo, William B.
Farmer, Claude S.
Farwell, Arthur F., Jr.
Ferriter, John B.
Fidel, John A.
Finn, William S.
Fischer, Arthur F., Jr.
Fisher, Ellis J.
Fisher, Guin M.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J.
Forrest, Blake S.
Foster, Thomas M.
Frazee, Murray B., Jr.
Fryer, Norman E., Jr.
Funk, Harold N.
Furlong, Donald
Gantz, Saxe P.
Gavitt, Severance W.
Gehman, Harold W.
Geis, Lawrence R.
Gentry, William W.
Gerdon, Harold P.
Ghesquiere, George D.
Gibson, Edward I.
Gill, Paul W.
Gillette, Robert C.
Goolsby, Lee D.
Gould, Richard K.
Green, Robert R.
Greene, Howard J.
Grell, Theodore A.
Griffin, Donald
Guerry, John B., Jr.
Gugliotta, Guy F.
Guinan, Timothy J.
Guinn, Dick H.
Gulick, Robert A., Jr.
Haines, John L.
Hance, Kenneth P.
Harbert, Charles W.
Hardaker, William T.
Harding, Edwin T.
Hardy, Leonard R.
Hare, Robert H.
Hargreaves, James C.
Harkleroad, Neil E.
Harper, Robert M.
Harrington, Daniel J., III
Harris, David L.
Harris, Leroy E.
Harris, Thomas D.
Hart, Charles S.
Hart, Joseph E.
Hartigan, Charles C., Jr.
Harty, Harry L., Jr.
Hayes, Richard M.
Healy, Charles E.
Helfrich, Harry D., Jr.
Hendrix, Charles N. G.
Henry, Eugene B., Jr.
Hermanson, Joseph M.
Heyer, Frank D.
Higgins, Elmore F., Jr.
Higgs, Alfred H.
Hilgedick, Winfred C.
Hingson, James M.
Hizer, DeVon McC.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Holmberg, Paul A.
Holt, Alexander C., Jr.
Holzapfel, Valentine G.
Honan, John B.
Hoolhorst, Robert A.
Hooper, Frederic A.
Hooper, Posey A.
Hough, Jack W.
Howell, Willard Y.
Howland, John B.
Hubbell, Lester E.
Hughes, Jack J.
Hughes, John G.
Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
Hushing, William C.
Huston, Charles D.
Hutchins, Robert B.
Iarrobino, Charles A.
Isaman, Roy M.
Jackson, Andrew D., Jr.
Jarvis, Benjamin C.
Jennings, Verne A.
Johnson, Cecil V.
Johnson, Charles H., Jr.
Johnson, Stephen L.
Johnston, James F. B.
Johnston, Means, Jr.
Kaye, John B.
Keegan, Thomas D.
Keim, William J.
Kellogg, Frederic D.
Kenny, Edward T.
Kiem, Edwin L.
Kinney, Sheldon H.
Kinsella, Charles W.
Kline, Raymond P.
Knapp, Elton L.
Knapp, Paul J.
Kroeger, Edwin J.
Kuntz, William E.
Lafferty, Kenneth F.
Lambing, Charles LeR.
Lancaster, Norman G.
Laning, Richard B.
Lawler, Joseph T.
Lawrence, John C.
Lefever, Robert C.
Leon, Strauss S.
Lindon, Elbert C.
Lindsey, Robin M.
Linehan, Joseph D.
Lloyd, Henry F.
Locke, Ralph F.
Lockwood, Ralph H.
Loustaunau, Paul E.
Lowe, Marcus L., Jr.
Lyngby, Alfred R.
Mackroth, John R.
MacNair, Martin P.
Magennis, Edward G.
Mandel, Herbert I.
Manning, William J.
Manser, Burton R.
Marinke, Charles A.
Mather, Lee W.
McAllister, James A.
McCall, Charles D.
McCarthy, John C.
McConnaughhay, James W.
McCrocklin, James W.
McCurtain, James H.
McCuskey, Elbert S.
McDaniel, George T., Jr.
McDowell, Joseph M.
McElroy, Richard S., Jr.
McElwain, Harry W.
McGuinness, Walter A.
McManus, John W.
McQuiston, Lionel T.
Merritt, Robert G.
Meyer, Otto F., Jr.
Michael, Willard deL.
Millard, Robert C.
Miller, Charles K.
Miller, Harold C.
Miller, Hugh B., Jr.
Miller, Jim D.
Miller, Walter B.
Minner, Delbert M.
Moffett, Charles S.
Moore, Frederick T., Jr.
Moore, Waller C.
Mott, Charles D.
Munson, John J.
Munson, William H.
Murphy, Thomas W.
Nace, Charles D.
Norton, Gerald S.
Oldfield, James C.
Olson, Clarence E.
O'Malley, George F.
O'Meara, Donald J.
Ost, Herbert E.
Parker, James F.
Parker, Oscar B.
Parks, John E.
Parmelee, Clyde H.
Pawka, Edward J.
Pear, John F.
Pennell, Jesse L.
Peters, Maurice A.
Peterson, Dale K.
Pew, Leslie A.
Pfeifer, Carl F.
Phillips, Douglas G.
Pond, Charles E.
Powell, Lucien C., Jr.
Powell, Ward F.
Powell, William O., Jr.
Pressler, Louis P.
Price, Frank H., Jr.
Prickett, Samuel L., Jr.
Pugsley, Edmond B.
Radel, Frederick M.
Ramage, James D.
Ratliff, William "K"
Rawie, Wilmer E.
Read, Samuel H. P., Jr.
Reaves, Henry G., Jr.
Refo, Miles P., III
Register, Allen B.
Reigart, John M.
Reilly, James D.
Renfro, John N.
Rhodemyre, John L.
Rice, Richard H.
Rigg, James F.
Ringness, William M.
Ritch, John B., Jr.
Roberts, Richard S.
Robertson, Charles M.
Robertson, James McI.
Robinson, Leslie S.
Robinson, Thomas
Roemer, Charles E.
Rogers, Leon W.
Rogozienski, Frank E.
Romberger, William M.
Rommel, Herbert F., Jr.
Rooney, Paul C.
Roth, Eli B.
Rudden, Thomas J., Jr.
Ruhe, William J.
Rumsey, Dexter C., II
Russell, Frederick N.
Rynd, Robert W.
Salvia, Onofrio F.
Satterford, Robert B.
Saunders, Thomas F., Jr.
Savage, Arthur M.
Savidge, William L.
Sawyer, William T.
Schlegel, Rowland F.
Schmidt, Herbert T.
Schratz, Paul R.
Schreiter, Ernest F.
Schroeder, Fred J.
Schumann, Roland W., Jr.
Schuyler, Irving J.
Schwab, Ernest L., Jr.
Schwab, Erwin G.
Schwartz, John R.
Scott, Albert P.
Scott, George W., Jr.
Scurria, Norman V.
Semmes, Raphael, Jr.
Seymour, Harry A.
Shamer, Preston N.
Sharp, George F.
Sheridan, John G.
Shifflette, William M.
Shirley, Gene T.
Short, Norman S.
Siegmund, Theodore C.
Silk, Francis W.
Simmons, George S., III
Simpson, Eugene H.
Sinnott, Robert E.
Skuzinski, Charles F.
Slagle, Robert J.
Sloatman, John K., Jr.
Smith, Ellsworth N.
Smith, Emory C.
Smith, Eugene C.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Gordon W.
Smith, James H., Jr.
Smith, Joseph G.
Smith, Leonard "B"
Smith, Robert H.
Snipes, Beecher
Spear, Louis P.
Standish, Edwin O.
Stanley, Onia B., Jr.
Stay, Charles A.
Steigelman, Edward T.
Stow, Walter K., Jr.
Stultz, Ronald F.
Suddath, Thomas H.
Sullivan, Eugene T. B.
Superfine, Irving J.
Sutherland, William T.
Swanson, Chandler W.
Swanson, Leroy V.
Syverson, Douglas N.
Taeusch, Frederick L.
Taylor, Edward J.
Teich, Richard J.
Thompson, Howard A.
Toulon, Alfred J., Jr.
Tucker, Frederick B.
Tunnell, Richard McC.
Utgoff, Vadym V.
Vandergrift, Jacob J., Jr.
Vannoy, Frank W.
Van Wolkenten, Raymond V.
Vasey, Lloyd R.
Verbrycke, "J" Russell, III
Vinock, Eli
Waldron, Alton L. C.
Wallace, James B.
Wallace, William E.
Walley, Marion C.
Waring, Elmar S., Jr.
Warner, Rex W.
Washington, Thomas, Jr.
Watson, Joseph T., Jr.
Wedell, Edward V.
Wehmeyer, Wilbur J.
Weinel, John P.
Weisner, Maurice F.
Weitzenfeld, Daniel K.
Welden, Frederick
Wells, Harold A.
Wells, Wade C.
West, John N.
West, Joseph M.
Wheat, Dick M.
Whitby, Frank R., Jr.
White, Thomas S.
Whiteman, Armand D.
Whitney, Laurens A.
Whittier, Mark T.
Williams, Gordon B.
Williams, John B., Jr.
Williamson, Thomas C.
Wood, Robert H.
Wood, Robert B.
Woollen, William S.
Wootton, James C.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Spencer D.
Wright, Whitney
Young, Jack C.
Young, Lloyd V.
Zimanski, Frank A.
Zimny, Stanley M.
Zoeller, Raphael A.
Zullinger, John R.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, Jesse F.
Banks, Lawrence E.
Beckman, Edward L.
Black, Paul E.
Bond, Sidney D., Jr.
Brooks, Ralph K.
Callagan, Dwight "A"
Canfield, Earle G.
Cheffey, John H.
Childs, Donald R.
Clare, Frank B.
Clark, Gale G.
Courtney, Marvin D.
Cronemiller, Philip D. D.
Cunningham, James K.
deWilton, Edward L.
Dominey, Joseph B., Jr.
Doolittle, Robert C.
Faaland, Halvdan G. K.
Faucett, Ralph E.
Goebel, John E.
Goodman, Edward G.
Hall, Clifford R.
Hill, Howard W.
Holloway, Charles K., Jr.
Holmes, Francis H.
Kaufman, James A.
Leach, Edwin M.
Mahin, Harry P.
McArtor, James R.
McCabe, John F.
Nadbath, Rudolph P.
Neikirk, William I.
Newton, Charles B.
Osborne, David P.
Palmer, John R., Jr.
Pino, Daniel M.
Price, John J., Jr.
Pruett, Carl E.
Rusher, Merrill W.
Sarkisian, Sarkis S.
Smith, Bruce H., Jr.
Smith, William L.
Stalter, Robert A.
Stoecklein, Herbert G.
Stover, John H., Jr.
Stryker, William S.
Sweeney, Edwin C.
Tarr, George H., Jr.
True, DeWitt S.
Vaupel, George E.
Walker, Granville I., Jr.
Watkins, Dale B.
Weiss, Harry A.
Zuska, Albert J.

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Adams, Henry P.
Allis, Frederick A.
Atkinson, Wallace L., Jr.
Bell, Thomas H.
Brandow, Henry W.
Brighton, Edward E.
Carson, John D.
Cherry, Jerome
Christensen, Charles M.
Claypoole, Jess S., Jr.
Cobb, Richard
Cope, Raymond W.
Corle, Frederic W.
Cosgrove, Paul F., Jr.
Coutu, Louis A.
Davis, James J., Jr.
Dexter, Robert C., Jr.
Dobbyn, Edward T., Jr.
Durant, William B., Jr.
Durham, Henry O., Jr.
Fisher, Allan J.
Frampton, Woodley E.
Glocheski, Virgil R.
Gore, John M.
Grahn, Karl A., Jr.
Grassino, Ceasar M.
Greenhalgh, William T.
Grubb, Francis B.
Haggard, James W.
Heck, Charles B.
Hoard, Douglas H.
Hunt, Harold H.
Jackson, Alfred C.
James, Nathaniel W., III
Jeffrey, Richard P.
Joshua, Edward R., Jr.
Lally, Paul R.
Lee, Curtis J.
Letterman, Lincoln L.
Logan, Daniel F.
Lovig, Lawrence, Jr.
Madden, John E.
Major, Samuel J.
Millson, Wallace F.
Moore, George E., II
Moore, Glen C.
Muller, William F.
Norton, David C.

Osborne, Charles S., Jr.
Peckham, Charles W.
Rice, Gilbert McK.
Robertson, John B.
Stafford, Otis W.
Standish, Eben M.
Stewart, Fred B.
Stokes, Maynard G.
Tolbert, Harmon S.
Tonner, William G., Jr.
Twitchell, William A.
Van Donge, Charles J.
Waite, George T.
Walsh, James G.
Watson, Robert L.
Webster, James K.
Wheeler, Kenneth R.
Willis, Enos H.
Yockey, Roy O.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barnes, Ernest R.
Coe, Robert W., Jr.
Kleckner, John M.
McGann, Francis L.
Shilling, John H.

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Boyer, William R.
Burke, Jasper R.
Byrnes, William J.
Chilton, Arthur B., Jr.
Morris, Albert C.
Pratt, Richard T.
Reynolds, Luther S.
Seufer, Paul E.
Simmons, Paul J.
Wilson, John W.

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Aldridge, William A.
Cathcart, John H.
Cermak, George L.
Conant, Julian R.
Cooper, Richard G.
Edwards, Irwin G.
Eubank, Dillard P., Jr.
Gray, Gus W.
Hamilton, Martin R.
Hamilton, Traver R.
Hass, Albert P.
Hedman, Warren J., Jr.
Joseph, Robert L.
Kaires, Anthony K.
Larson, Gilbert H., II
Manke, Wilbert C.
Marking, William M.
Mosson, Lester H.
Oesterle, Albert R.
Pennington, James F.
Pruitt, Charles C., Jr.
Reilly, John V.
Richardson, Glenn D.
Rudolph, Charles E., Jr.
Rupp, Nelson W.
Salandi, Robert T.
Spann, Sylvester E. W., Jr.
Stanford, Walter O.
Susewind, Simon W.
Swearingen, John C.
Tande, Syrus E.
Van Damm, Vincent W.
White, Dan B.
Williams, Robert M.

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Knight, Kenneth L.

CAPTAIN, NURSE CORPS

Houghton, Ruth A.

COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, Thomas H.
Adams, Alton P.
Adams, Loraine S.
Adams, Robert S.
Adams, William L.
Adrian, Robert N.
Ady, Joseph W.
Airheart, James H.
Alber, La Vier C.
Alexander, John S.
Alexatos, Michael S.
Allen, Joseph W., Jr.
Allison, Donald
Alt, Earl J.
Amme, Robert G.
Andersen, Wayne G.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, Donald A.
Anderson, George D., Jr.
Anderson, Paul H.
Anderson, Robert W.
Anderson, William R.
Andrews, Milner L.
Aroner, Richard
Arthur, Robert L.
Aubrey, Norbert E., Jr.
Ault, Frank W.
Babcock, Courtland T.
Bacak, Joseph J.
Bailey, Bernard J.
Bailey, William F.
Baird, Lawrence I.
Baker, Howard J.
Baker, Robert W.
Baker, Robert H.
Baker, William P.
Baldridge, Jewett A.
Ball, Robert
Ballou, Justin G.
Banks, William R.
Barbor, Robert T.
Barco, Leslie T., Jr.
Barker, Laughlin
Barrett, Alcus E.
Barrett, Boynton
Barrett, John M.
Barron, Carl F.
Bartol, John W.
Bass, Thomas E., III
Bath, Edwin J.
Bauman, John F.
Baumeister, Charles, Jr.
Bayne, Marmaduke G.
Bays, Frederic L.
Beaver, Robert H.
Becker, Jack L.
Behl, John H.
Behner, Herbert C., Jr.
Beling, John K.
Belk, George H.
Belt, Richard W., Jr.
Bemis, Lawrence R.
Bennett, Milton D.
Benoit, Horace G.
Bentall, Howard G.
Berg, Frank M.
Berger, Eugene B.
Berkeley, Kenneth H.
Berquist, Carl R.
Bertoglio, Lloyd W.
Bertoglio, Floyd J.
Beyer, Clarence R.
Bisbee, Roger A.
Bishop, Ralph F.
Blackburn, Emmit W.
Blakeney, Hulon R.
Blattmann, Walter C.
Bloom, Paul J.
Bloomer, Francis W.
Bolt, William H., Jr.
Bookhamer, Robert H.
Borysiewicz, Anthony F.
Botten, Ralph D.
Boyle, John A.
Braddock, Robert L.
Brady, Francis X.
Brady, Francis L., Jr.
Brady, Gordon G.
Brady, James G.
Braley, Gerald N.
Branscome, James R.
Bratten, John L.
Braun, John E.
Brchan, Edwin D.
Brega, Richard E.
Bress, Henry
Brissette, Kenneth F.
Britt, Edgar R.
Brock, John R.
Brookes, Charles S.
Brown, Billy F.
Brown, Clifford L.
Brown, Donald N.
Bryan, George R., Jr.
Bryant, Franklin D.
Buchanan, Donald J.
Bucklew, Oscar T.
Buckowski, George A.
Buckwalter, Earl E.
Buergey, Herman P.
Burgess, Emery L.
Burgo, Daniel F.
Burley, Albert C.
Burnett, Robert C.
Burnette, Oliver S.
Burns, Warren "H"
Bursik, Vlada D.
Burton, John H.
Burum, Roger L.
Busik, William S.
Butcher, Harold K.
Butler, Francis A.
Byrd, Newton P., Jr.
Cable, Jesse F.
Cafferata, William F.
Callahan, James E.
Callan, Allie W., Jr.
Campbell, James M.
Campbell, William A. Jr.
Caney, Lawrence D.
Cantwell, Richard A., Jr.
Carlson, Paul G. A.
Carlson, Robert C.
Carmichael, William P.
Carpenter, Melvin J.
Carter, Arthur McD., Jr.
Carter, Harold A.
Carton, Wilbur A.
Casey, Thomas H., Jr.
Cates, Clifton B., Jr.
Center, George
Chalkley, John W., Jr.
Charles, John F.
Cheal, Wayne R.
Cheney, Harlan L.
Cherbak, Alfred A.
Choate, Robert B.
Clark, Harry L., Jr.
Clark, Jackson W.
Cleveland, Blair
Clingan, Forest M.
Coad, Richard J.
Coates, Joseph K.
Cobb, William W.
Cochran, Elvin P., Jr.
Cockroft, Irving G.
Coil, John A., Jr.
Coleman, Thaddeus T., Jr.
Collins, Cecil B., Jr.
Collins, Samuel L.
Conn, Alton H.
Connolly, Bartholomew J., III
Cook, Marshall M.
Cooke, Henry J. H.
Cooper, Walter
Coppola, Eduguardo M.
Cormack, John G.
Cornelius, George
Cornell, Leland B.
Coulter, William G.
Cowles, Jack R.
Cox, Channing H.
Cox, James L.
Craw, Nelson W.
Cruser, Handford T., III
Culley, William F.
Cummings, Edward J., Jr.
Cure, Harold R.
Curley, Clyde W.
Dalzell, Samuel, Jr.
Dampier, Robert M.
Daniel, Charles L.
Daniels, John
Dankert, Herbert W. H.
Dankworth, Edwin G., Jr.
Danner, Howard E., Jr.
Danz, Lawrence F.
Darchuck, Matthew E.
Darnold, Marshall P.
Dauphin, Oyd L.
Davidson, William A., Jr.
Davis, Edwin T.
Davis, George S., Jr.
Davis, George J.
Davis, George W. V.
Davis, James H.
Davis, John K., Jr.
Davis, Judson C., Jr.
Davis, Raymond E.
Davison, Jaquelin C.
Deatherage, Benjamin C.
De Bord, Robert K.
Decker, Daniel D., Jr.
Demoss, Charles W.
Dennehy, Roderick C.
Detweiler, Austin L.
Dewey, William H.
Dibble, Edgar J.
Dick, John
Dick, John H.
Dimmitt, Robert E.
Dingle, John A.
Ditch, William E.
Dodson, Boykin R.
Donald, Herbert L., Jr.
Donnelly, John A.
Dootson, William W.
Doran, Homer M., Jr.
Dorsey, Patrick C.
Dougall, Alan
Dougherty, Robert M.
Douglas, Benjamin T.
Douglas, Daniel E.
Douthit, James H.
Dower, William D.
Downs, Arnold E.
Doyel, Wilbur T.
Doyle, William T.
Drachnik, Joseph B.
Dress, George K.
Dudley, John A.
Duncan, Charles L.
Dunkum, Hugh H., Jr.
Dunn, Stanley M.
Durham, Ardis H., Jr.
Durham, Harold D.
Durio, Jack N.
Durna, Gordon A.
Durocher, Charles O.
Durup, Paul C.
Earl, Raymond L.
Easton, William R.
Eaton, Max A.
Ebel, August A.
Edgerton, Stuart T., Jr.
Edlun, William O.
Edmisten, William H.
Edwards, Arthur T. McB.
Edwards, Eldon L.
Edwards, Emory H., Jr.
Efird, Terril A.
Elder, Arthur G.
Elefter, Theodore
Elens, James N.
Ellerbe, Gail J.
Ellis, James W., Jr.
Ellis, Walter J.
Ellison, Harold H.
Ellzey, Jack E.
Emerson, Arthur T., Jr.
Emerson, William D., Jr.
Engdahl, William A.
Engelman, Ralph
Eslinger, Robert "H", Jr.
Essling, Mark T.
Etheridge, Melvin R.
Everett, William J.
Fallon, James V.
Fatkin, Thomas J.
Favreau, Floyd F.
Fearnow, Fredrick R.
Fechtelkotter, Harlo E. D.
Fehr, Harrison R., III
Ferris, James
Feuerbach, Theodore
Field, Leonard E.
Finley, Miles R., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Paul D.
Fitzhugh, Mayo McG., Jr.
Fleming, William W.
Flessner, Conrad J.
Flynn, Edward P., Jr.
Foley, Peter J.
Foltz, Frank E.
Forcier, Alfred A.
Forde, Lambert V.
Fortner, Herschell
Fosha, Charles E.
Foster, John I.
Fox, Elmer L.
Fox, John C.
Francis, Frederick E.
Franz, Leonard A.
Frawley, Larry W.
Freeman, Daniel H.
Freeman, Leon H.
Freeman, Rowland G., III
Frellsen, Max E.
Frese, Bernard W., Jr.
Frohme, Charles T., Jr.
Gadberry, William F.
Gage, Rex A.
Gallemore, Roy H.
Gano, John H.
Garbow, Bernard L.
Gardemal, Robert C.
Garrett, William L., Jr
Garrison, Lloyd W.
Garvey, Hugh M.
Gastrock, Martin D.
Gendron, Edward W.
Gerdes, Henry A.
Gersuk, Ipser J.
Getschell, Douglass D., Jr.
Gibson, Aubrey L.
Gibson, James C.
Gibson, Moses McA., III
Gieszl, Carl R.
Gillespie, Donald R.
Gillin, James McK., Jr.
Gillock, Robert H.
Gills, James W.
Girard, George W.
Gleeson, Richard G.
Godek, Mieczyslaw
Gonzalez, Rene E.
Good, Dale S.
Goode, William M.
Goodwin, Glendon
Gordon, Grant B.
Gordon, Harold L.
Gorman, John P.
Gould, Joseph E.
Graham, Mac A.
Gray, "O" "B"
Gray, Rollin E., Jr.
Gray, William J.
Grazda, Melvin G.
Greenwell, Martin D.
Greenwood, Robert B.
Gregory, Hayden A.
Grieve, John R.
Griggs, John B., III
Grkovic, George
Groesbeck, James D.
Grossetta, Warren A., Jr.
Guidry, Joseph W.
Hadley, Stephen V.
Hagood, Douglas R.
Haithcock, June D., Jr.
Hall, Alvin W., Jr.
Hall, Jack S.
Hall, Perry
Halsey, Edward K.
Hamblin, Robert L.
Hamby, Edward P.
Hammerstone, James
Hamrick, Laurence L.
Hanks, Eugene R.
Hannon, Edward J., Jr.
Hansen, Frederic T., Jr.
Hansen, John B.
Hansen, John L.
Hansen, Robert L.
Hanson, George W.
Hanson, Ralph M.
Hanson, Sammy H.
Hardcastle, William H., Jr.
Harrelson, George D.
Harrington, Charles B.
Harris, Daniel R.
Harrison, Curg W., Jr.
Hart, Gordon McA.
Hart, "J" Vincent
Hart, John R.
Hartman, Raymond G.
Hartzell, James W.
Hassell, Victor G.
Hathaway, George C., Jr.
Hatheway, Valentine J., Jr.
Hattaway, Cleland S.
Hawkins, Arthur R.
Hawley, Edward R.
Hawthorne, Robert E.
Haynie, John C., Jr.
Hazapis, Thomas
Healey, Thomas L.
Heflin, Edward A.
Hein, Ralph, Jr.
Heller, Samuel R., Jr.
Hellickson, Aaron J.
Hendler, Pennard
Henry, Alfred J., Jr.
Hersey, Kirk
Heyworth, Lawrence, Jr.
Hickman, Berton H.
Hill, Charles A., Jr.
Hill, Fred C.
Hill, Paul E.
Hill, William O.
Hines, William M.
Hitchcock, Edwin N., Jr.
Hitchins, William S.
Hitz, Frederick W., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert J.
Hoggard, Preston
Hogue, "J" "C"
Hogue, Robert F.
Holder, Billy D.
Holloway, James L. III
Hollowell, Frank W., Jr.
Holly, David C.
Holmes, David C.
Holt, Harry S.

Holzrichter, Max A.
Homer, William N. P.
Hook, John C.
Hooper, Kenneth C.
Hoppe, William E.
Horrell, Ernest R.
Horswell, Vance E.
Houck, Dean W.
Hough, John B.
Hrabosky, Joseph
Hubbard, Raymond A.
Huber, Harvard C.
Hudson, Jack G.
Hudspeth, William L.
Huestis, Gerald S.
Huff, Alvin D.
Hughes, John E., Jr.
Humphrey, William S., Jr.
Hunt, Daniel, Jr.
Hunt, Robert F.
Hurley, William G.
Hurst, Thomas C. III
Hutchison, Earle G., Jr.
Hyde, Harold G.
Idle, Charles T., Jr.
Iiams, Meryl A.
Ingham, John W.
Irons, Robert E.
Irwin, Kay S.
Ischinger, Eric, Jr.
Jackson, Erwin S.
Jackson, James R., Jr.
Jahn, Waldemar P.
James, Richard C.
Jansen, John F.
Jennings, Douglas H.
Jennings, "E" "F" Kahle
Jerbert, Arthur H.
Jester, Walter H.
Jogan, George J.
Johnson, Earl B.
Johnson, Harold T.
Johnson, James B., Jr.
Johnson, Melvin O.
Johnson, Silas R.
Johnson, Waldo P.
Jones, Donald R.
Jones, Jack B.
Joy, Bernard F., Jr.
Kane, John P.
Kanze, Robert F.
Karcher, Daniel M.
Karl, Paul J., Jr.
Karl, Robert D.
Karr, Delbert G.
Karter, Wilbur K.
Kauffman, Hal A.
Keifert, Robert N.
Keil, Robert A.
Keller, Edgar T.
Keller, Harry B.
Kellerman, Lewis F.
Kelley, George A., Jr.
Kelley, Vincent F.
Kelsey, John W., Jr.
Kemp, Joseph C., Jr.
Kenney, Edward F.
Kent, Donald G.
Kenton, Howard B.
Kenyon, Jack S.
Kerr, Edward E.
Kest, Harold W.
Kevan, Samuel McK., Jr.
Keyes, Thomas E.
Kier, Kenneth J.
Kimener, Robert A.
King, David A., Jr.
Kirk, Leone E., Jr.
Kirkendall, Melvin S., Jr.
Kirkland, William B., Jr.
Klahn, Dale C.
Knickelbine, Harry, Jr.
Knight, Charles A.
Knight, Gilbert L.
Knopke, William R.
Koenig, Fillmore G., Jr.
Kostrzewsky, Alexander J.
Kouns, Maynard W., Jr.
Krapf, Harry J., Jr.
Kruzick, George F.
Kuencer, William O.
Kuhl, Charles A.
Kuhn, Melvin M., Jr.
Kunhardt, Robert M.
Kunkle, Robert D.
Kuntz, Robert E.
Kurtz, Lawrence A.
Kuzell, Charles E.
Labrum, Willard D.
Laessle, Frank W.
Laird, Dean S.
Laird, Don E.
Laird, Ian M.
Landreth, William L.
Langfur, Joshua A.
LaPierre, Douglas B.
Largess, Clifton R., Jr.
Larkin, Edward J.
Larkins, Bowen S.
Larson, Rueben D.
Lasater, Allen N.
Lassell, Donald L.
Laurinat, Henry S., Jr.
Lavrakas, Lefteris
Law, Richard R.
Lawson, Dunbar
Lazenby, Richard D.
Leach, Alvin D.
Lee, Clyde J.
Lee, Howard "C"
Leggett, Ernest H.
Lemly, Frederick H., Jr.
Lennon, Bernard C.
Leonard, Edward F.
LeValley, James B.
Lewis, Lawrence E., II
Lindstrom, Kenith V.
Linville, Cloyd A.
Linwick, Robert, Jr.
Livingston, William H.
Lloyd, Marshall O.
Logan, John W.
Logan, Thomas B.
Longino, Walter B.
Loomis, William R.
Lovegrove, Howard C., Jr.
Luberda, William S.
Lynn, Robert T.
Mabey, Alfred
MacFarlane, Arthur S.
Mackie, John R.
MacMurray, James W.
Maher, David B.
Mann, David O.
Mann, William G., Jr.
Manson, Frank A.
Marrow, Jack S.
Martin, Neal, Jr.
Martin, Richard H.
Marx, Theodore F.
Mason, James M.
Mason, Robert C.
Masie, Malcolm R.
Matthews, Joseph A.
May, Allan E.
Mayes, Damon C.
Mayo, James O.
McCain, Audley H.
McCants, Thomas R.
McCaughey, William H.
McCauley, Brian
McConnell, Robert McC., Jr.
McCord, Walter D., Jr.
McCue, Hartsel F.
McCulley, William M., Jr.
McCurdy, John D.
McDaniel, Jerry F.
McElwee, Robert E.
McEnery, Edwin B.
McGaha, Curtis "D"
McGann, Patrick H.
McGinty, William G.
McGowan, Edward C.
McGrath, William F.
McGuire, Clair A.
McInnis, Norman K.
McIntyre, William R.
McKee, Robert W.
McKee, Robert L. J.
McKinley, Charles E.
McLinden, Hugh F., Jr.
McManus, Philip S.
McMullen, Cornelius E.
McNair, William D.
McQuary, John E.
McQuilkin, William R.
McTighe, John A.
Medick, Glenn A.
Meldrum, George B.
Mercer, James W.
Merryman, Charles A., Jr.
Merwin, Jesse A.
Metze, George M.
Metzger, Lewis W., III
Meyer, Francis A.
Meyer, George R.
Michael, Bernard E.
Michie, Donald
Miller, Anthony J.
Miller, Clark W.
Miller, Harry Z.
Miller, Jesse E.
Milner, Frank D.
Mink, Robert O.
Minnear, Clyde W.
Minnick, Harvey E.
Mitchell, William C.
Monahan, John J.
Montgomery, John A.
Montunnas, Stanley
Mooney, James D.
Moore, James H., Jr.
Moore, James S., Jr.
Moore, Michael U.
Moore, Robert H., Jr.
Moore, Thomas H.
Morey, William R.
Morrison, Hubert
Morse, Lloyd C.
Morton, Henry S., Jr.
Moss, Richard N.
Mott, Howard
Muir, James S.
Mukhalian, Zaven
Mulligan, Charles E.
Munroe, William R., Jr.
Murphy, James E., Jr.
Murtha, Vincent L.
Naegely, Laurence R.
Naylor, Jesse A.
Nelson, Arthur A.
Nelson, Leo W.
Nelson, Robert J.
Nelson, William M.
Newell, Arthur F., Jr.
Newland, John W., Jr.
Newman, Raymond C.
Nolan, John J.
Noon, Henry S., Jr.
Norton, Leroy G.
Now, John G.
Oakley, Robert D., Jr.
O'Brien, Clement E.
O'Brien, James M.
O'Brien, William B.
Ogden, Myron L.
Oliver, Joseph J.
Oller, John S., Jr.
Olson, Lester D.
Omohundro, Frank P.
O'Neil, Raymond C.
Orndorff, Winfield S., Jr.
Pace, Glyndol W.
Padget, Paul E.
Pahl, Herschel A.
Palm, Edgar P.
Palmer, Charles A., Jr.
Papas, Louis J.
Payne, Alton W.
Payne, Lloyd A.
Peale, William T.
Pearson, James W.
Peck, Edward M.
Pendleton, Charles A., Jr.
Perez, Romeo
Perkins, James W.
Perkins, Tom A.
Peterson, Robert M.
Phillips, John J.
Phillips, Rockford L.
Phipps, Richard W.
Pickler, David A.
Pimentel, Antonio T., Jr.
Pond, Robert McH.
Porter, Austin McC.
Porter, Charles S.
Porter, Phillip W., Jr.
Powers, George P.
Prada, Gerald W.
Prichard, Melvin M.
Provost, William B., Jr.
Pryor, Samuel W.
Quillen, Vincent G.
Quillin, James C., Jr.
Quinn, Frank N.
Quinn, William J.
Racette, William A.
Raddatz, Robert W.
Randle, Jack
Randolph, John B.
Rapp, William T.
Rasmussen, Albert L.
Reed, George P.
Reeve, Delos B.
Regester, Richard P.
Reilly, Thomas E.
Rice, Russell C.
Ridgway, Richard H.
Ries, Herbert H.
Ries, Robert E., Jr.
Riley, William P., Jr.
Ringenberg, George W.
Ritchie, James
Roark, Lonnie H.
Robbins, Spencer E.
Roberts, Carlton B.
Roberts, Charles C., Jr.
Robertson, William P., Jr.
Robertson, Chester L.
Robertson, Gordon H.
Robie, Edgar A.
Robinson, Roy H., Jr.
Robinson, Samuel J., Jr.
Robison, Charles D., Jr.
Rock, James C.
Rogers, Robert A., III
Rosengrant, Warren M.
Rossell, Robert H.
Rothamel, William P.
Rowell, Kenneth F.
Ruiz, Charles K.
Rusk, Alfred D.
Russell, Patrick E.
Rust, Charles C.
Ryan, Robert R.
Ryles, John W., Jr.
Ryner, Evan H.
Sammons, Robert J.
Sams, William R.
Sands, Jack H.
Sattler, James A.
Savacool, James McA.
Sawyer, Clifford R.
Sayre, Frank A., Jr.
Scantlebury, Edwin W.
Schall, Rodney F.
Schatz, Delmer A.
Schermerhorn, Dale V.
Schirmer, Adolf C.
Schoulda, George C.
Schroeder, William A., Jr.
Schwartze, George McN.
Schwass, Earl R.
Scott, William J.
Seaman, Laurence F.
Seaver, Clifford N.
Sebring, Clair W., Jr.
Sedaker, Thomas S.
Sedell, Thomas R.
Sedwick, John W.
Selmer, Robert J.
Serrill, Julian "D," Jr.
Sevilla, Bernard
Shaver, Robert G.
Shea, John "D", Jr.
Shear, Dale M.
Sheehan, Joseph E.
Shelton, William T.
Shepard, Tazewell T., Jr.
Sherwin, Robert W.
Shinneman, John R.
Shonerd, David A.
Short, James W.
Sigurdson, Orville S.
Sillers, Colin B.
Silvani, George F.
Silverthorne, Frederick W.
Simmons, Andrew K.
Simmons, Charles T., Jr.
Simon, William H., Jr.
Singletary, William C.
Singleton, Royce A.
Sipe, Harry C., Jr.
Sisk, Francis J.
Skidmore, Howard H.
Sloan, Stanley E.
Slocum, Winfield S., III
Smiley, Walter P.
Smith, Alwyn, Jr.
Smith, Burton E.
Smith, Clayton W.
Smith, Fenton F., Jr.
Smith, Floyd E.
Smith, Hovey D.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Leonard G., Jr.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Rodney N.
Smith, Thomas B.
Smyers, Charles W., Jr.
Smyle, Ralph S.
Snodgrass, Joseph C., Jr.
Snyder, Charles E.
Snyder Gordon A.
Sollenberger, Harold D.
Soule, Robert M.
Sparks, Ben, Jr.
Sparks, Robert M.
Spears, Paul H. A.
Spenser, Ray A.
Spreen, Roger E.
Spuhler, Ralph W.
Stacy, James M.
Staffel, Clayton F.
Stanley, David S.
Stanley, Donald C.
Stastny, Charles E.
Stear, David S.
Stearns, Theodore H.
Stearns, William G., Jr.
Stegg, Robert J.
Stegner, DeWayne H.
Stephens, Russel T.
Stephens, Sidney B., Jr.
Stewart, Jack H.
Stinson, John F. J.
Stockebrand, Archie P.
Stowe, Jack L.
Straub, Robert L.
Streeper, Harold P.
Streig, Frederick J.
Strelow, Reuben E.
Strohl, Mitchell P.
Strong, Hope, Jr.
Stronski, Edmund J.
Stroud, George W.
Struthers, Frederick E.
Stuart, Robert M.
Sullivan, Joseph B.
Sullivan, John R., Jr.
Sullivan, Philip H.
Sundquist, Gustave "A", Jr.
Sutton, Sheldon L.
Swanson, Ray J.
Switzer, George D.
Taddeo, Alfred S.
Taliaferro, Philip B.
Tate, Benjamin C.
Taylor, Charles A., Jr.
Taylor, Halton H.
Taylor, Theron J.
Tazewell, John P.
Telfair, Robert M.
Temme, Robert L.
Teufer, William E.
Thelen, Robert H.
Thielges, Bernard A.
Thomas, Fred L.
Thomas, Gardner "J", Jr.
Thomas, Lloyd H.
Thompson, Bert A.
Thompson, John R.
Thompson, John L.
Thorpe, Milton W.
Tichenor, William B.
Timm, Henry O., Jr.
Todd, James F.
Tolerton, Raymond C. Jr.
Toline, Francis R.
Toulon, Ygnacio T., III
Tower, Robert G.
Tracy, Weimer B., Jr.
Traylor, James T., Jr.
Treadwell, Thurman K., Jr.
Tuft, Robert McR.
Turner, William H., Jr.
Umbarger, Bernard S.
Underwood, William E.
Vaatveit, Allan R.
Vallandigham, William W.
Vanderford, Gordon J.
van Lier Ribbink, Edvard F.
Vann, Isaiah McP., Jr.
Van Ness, Harper E., Jr.
Vansant, Victor W.
Vaughen, William L.
Vicars, Earl C.
Vineyard, Merriwell W.
Vitucci, Vito L.
Vopatek, Matthias J., Jr.
Vraciu, Alexander
Waddell, Stanton W.
Wagner, Arnold A.
Waldman, Albert C., Jr.
Walker, Gordon D.
Walker, Lewis W., Jr.
Wall, Charles G.
Wall, Maurice E.
Wallace, Duncan P.
Wallace, Kenneth C.
Wannamaker, John J.
Ward, Charles W.
Ward, Felix E., Jr.
Ward, Herbert H., III
Ward, James R.
Wardall, William K.
Warner, John D.
Watson, Raymond S.

Watson, Samuel E.
Watters, Harry J.
Webster, John A.
Weeks, John M.
Weible, Robert C.
Weimer, James O.
Weiss, La Verne L.
Welch, Glenn E.
Welles, William T.
Wessel, Robert L.
West, Frank R.
West, Ira "B"
West, Robert G.
Westby, Donald E. S.
Westerfield, Billy G.
Westray, William H.
Whisler, George H., Jr.
Whitcomb, Roy S.
White, James T.
White, John F.
White, Norman E.
Whitehurst, Robert E., Jr.
Whitmore, Quentin R.
Wideberg, Samuel R.
Williams, Charles M.
Williams, William G.
Williamson, Cecil O.
Willis, Richard W.
Willis, Warrington R.
Wilson, Carter L., Jr.
Wilson, Robert G., Jr.
Wilson, Walter K.
Wimpey, George A.
Winner, Hal "M"
Wolff, Leonard C.
Wolff, Paul M.
Woodall, Reuben F.
Woodside, Robert C.
Woodward, Horace J.
Woodward, Lynn F.
Woodward, Nelson C.
Woodward, William B.
Wooley, Millard J.
Worthing, Lewis K.
Wright, Graydon D.
Wroblewski, Sigmund V.
Wyatt, James R.
Wyman, Herbert B.
Wynkoop, David P.
Wyrick, James W.
Yerger, Maury F., Jr.
Yonkers, George P.
Young, Richard O.
Young, William C.
Zane, Curtis J.
Zeigler, Joseph S.
Ziegler, William F.
Ziemba, Anthony M.
Zimermann, Richard G.
Zimmerman, Chester A.
Zinn, Charles S.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Country, John C.
Cunningham, Lowell K.
Dobbie, Robert P., Jr.
Holmes, James H.
Jenkins, Judson H.
McGinley, Joseph M.
Ulshafer, Thomas R.
Waite, Charles L.
Whiteside, James E.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Andrews, Joseph P.
Arthur, Harry B.
Baker, Emile W., Jr.
Baldwin, Frank A.
Banks, Richard A.
Barham, John T.
Beckmeyer, Harold E.
Beumer, Alvin F.
Bevil, Lester F.
Blankinship, Grover F., Jr.
Blanton, Oscar R.
Bofenkamp, James E.
Brademan, Royce A.
Brehm, Frederic C.
Brooks, Marvin L.
Brosseau, Oswald J.
Burkhead, Franklin
Burnett, Howard W., Jr.
Busby, John C., Jr.
Caporaso, John J.
Carr, Daniel M., Jr.
Cassidy, John V.
Clifford, George M., Jr.
Connelly, Max "R"
Cook, Glover H.
Cornell, Alexander H.
Coulter, Preston H.
Cummings, William J.
Dalbey, Earl G.
Daley, Clement E.
D'Amico, Joseph
Davis, Roger L.
Dawson, Thomas H., III
DeLany, Johnie L.
Detwiler, Fred M.
Diggle, Raymond H.
Donohue, Philip V.
Dowd, Wallace R., Jr.
Earle, John B., Jr.
Eckfield, Kenyon C.
Ernst, Clayton W.
Fallon, William J.
Fischer, Carl A.
Flamand, Paul J.
Fortenberry, Earl T.
French, Ferris L., Jr.
Fulton, Clyde E.
Geisman, Gunter
Gibbons, Frank J.
Goodwin, Eric C.
Gould, Gene F.
Gray, William J.
Hackett, John J.
Hamblen, Eunice A.
Hammond, Richard C.
Hayden, Ralph H., Jr.
Hazen, Ralph E.
Hempson, Donald A.
Henkel, Harold L.
Herrick, Daniel K.
Herron, John C.
Hopwood, Alonzo L.
Hough, Homer H.
Huebner, Dale C.
Humphreys, Harvey F.
Huntington, John S.
Hurley, Robert E.
Iber, George H.
Jeffrey, Paul W.
Jeppson, Robert B., Jr.
Jones, Cecil P.
Kerr, Algernon H., Jr.
Kesselring, Waverly D.
Kirk, Charles A.
Klofkorn, Kenneth R.
Kriz, Frank J.
Kriz, Joseph A.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Law, Kenneth S.
Leedy, Ralph G.
Leighton, Richard W.
Lenox, Wilbert W.
Lewis, Wellington H.
Lightner, Thomas A. L.
Lohse, William M.
Lotterhos, Augustus, Jr.
MacQuarrie, Harry A.
Maggard, Talmadge P.
Maiman, Elmer J.
May, William R.
McDairmant, Robert J.
McKay, Frank W.
McKnight, Maurice P.
McLanahan, Clarence E.
Meyer, John P.
Miller, John D.
Mills, Hubert P.
Minor, George E.
Morrissey, John E.
Murphy, Robert W.
Nalley, Thomas L.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neely, Joe B.
Neilsson, Birger N.
Norcott, William C.
O'Connell, Arthur W., Jr.
Oldfield, Edward C., Jr.
O'Neill, Joseph S.
O'Rourke, Edward P.
Owen, Charles S.
Parrish, Donald E.
Perkins, Charles F.
Race, William W.
Rand, Arthur G., Jr.
Reardon, David N.
Reid, Donald P.
Reilly, Louis J.
Reiner, Raymond C. J.
Robison, Dale M.
Rosapepe, James V.
Russell, Albert J.
Sanders, Allen B.
Scheela, Jerome J.
Schmeder, Charles E.
Schmitt, Earl J.
Scott, John A.
Scott, Walter E., Jr.
Sharp, Melvin E.
Sheehan, William J.
Simpson, Harold W.
Slettvet, Richard M.
Smiley, Creath B.
Smith, Lewis R.
Stonum, Robert H.
Suslick, Alphonse D.
Swan, Alfred W.
Thomson, Harvey W.
Turner, Ray M.
Van Teslaar, Everett A.
Vanzant, Joseph C.
Vaughan, James M.
VonChristierson, Robert
Walker, Woodrow T.
Walton, Clarence H.
Weart, Elliott M.
Weiss, Arnold
White, Ernest C.
Wiedman, Charles, Jr.
Williams, Sidney W., Jr.
Windham, Albert C.
York, Edward S.
Young, Gilbert S.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Anderson, Arthur R.
Austin, Henry E.
Bradley, Paul F.
Brink, Frederick W.
Brosius, George R.
Burns, John J.
Cahill, Richard A.
Caughey, Donald R.
Elliott, Robert E.
Ernstmeyer, Milton S.
Felder, George, Jr.
Ferris, James S.
Gallagher, Joseph P. F.
Garrett, Francis L.
Hemphill, Edward J., Jr.
Jones, Oliver W.
Jones, Robert "Q"
Kapalczynski, Eugene J.
Lloyd, Paul A.
Lonergan, Vincent J.
Lyons, Earle V., Jr.
McGrath, James R.
Meier, Kermit I.
Menges, Harold F.
Morton, Frank R.
Oliver, Algernon M.
Peterson, Karl G.
Pipho, Edmund W.
Richter, Thomas J.
Ruleman, Robert N.
Sargent, Gerald H.
Schneck, Robert J.
Sneary, Earl D.
Sullivan, James A.
Swinson, Jesse L.
Thomas, George E.
Tuxbury, Vernon W.
Wilson, Robert K.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Nelson R.
Barlett, James V.
Beck, Tom W.
Busbee, Greer A., Jr.
Callahan, John F.
Cornwell, George G., Jr.
Cunney, Edward G.
Dillon, John "G"
Dougherty, John A.
Engram, Robert C.
Flaherty, Paul V.
Hansche, Frank C., Jr.
Hardin, Fred M.
Herbert, Edgar, Jr.
Johnson, Edwin E.
Kwasny, Harry P.
Nelson, Martin R.
Ralston, William S.
Richey, John
Terry, Alfred G.
Turner, Charles W.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Armstrong, Lloyd M.
Brauer, Frank J.
Colby, Gage
D'Vincent, Richard "C"
Ellis, Frank N.
Firestone, Dale L.
Gunther, Lewis L.
Haymes, Benjamin F.
Hutton, Edward G.
Mazzarella, Maurice A.
Nystul, Oliver G.
Peterson, William A.
Rinck, Theodore J. H.
Rives, Robert G.
Troxell, Richard R.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Feyh, Clarence W.
Gade, Robert L.
Heison, Walter J.
Jacobs, Joseph J.
Kuntz, Robert E.
Leopold, Robert S.
Sennott, Ralph A.
Swanson, Robert W.
Weise, George W.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Bogdon, "D" Dorothy
Moesser, Maxine M.
Monahan, Dorothy P.
O'Neill, Rita V.
Richards, Margaret
Thompson, Ida K.
Williams, Nell R.
Wilson, Judy N.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, Edwin W., III
Abel, Samuel J.
Absher, George W., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, Lynn W.
Addy, Alfred M.
Ahearn, Joseph F.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
Albright, John J., Jr.
Alexander, Aaron G.
Alleman, Lee E.
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
Allen, Harry, III
Allen, Philip H.
Allison, Cecil G.
Allred, Jimmie "B"
Alotis, John
Alsover, James E.
Althoff, William B.
Amos, James W.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Leo J.
Anderson, Paul E.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
Andreason, Raymond R.
Archer, Martin D.
Arthur, Malcolm B., II
Ashley, Courtland L.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Atkinson, Edward C.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Aulick, Donald M.
Averett, Rufus M.
Babbitt, Franklin G.
Bacchus, Robert E.
Bachert, John O.
Bailey, John D.
Bailey, John B.
Baker, Granville M.
Bakle, George F.
Baldwin, Lawrence C.
Ball, Edwin L.
Bard, Rudolph T., Jr.
Barfield, Norwood R.
Barksdale, David A.
Barlow, John F.
Barnes, Jerald D.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnum, Ralph L.
Bartholomew, Barton W.
Barton, Charles A.
Baskin, Donald
Bates, George M.
Baughman, Robert F.
Bauman, Kenneth E.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
Beals, Granville A., Jr.
Beck, Charles E.
Becker, Arvade L.
Becker, Karl E.
Beeland, Cecil H.
Behre, Herbert A., Jr.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bennett, William O.
Benson, William D.
Bent, Jack
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Bergner, Robert B.
Bergs, Robert A.
Bettis, Alfred McC.
Beumer, Everett H.
Beutler, Albert G.
Beyer, Stuart E.
Bigham, Harry
Biltz, Sylvain F., Jr.
Bird, George W.
Bischof, William W.
Bivins, William "F"
Blackwelder, Buren L.
Blades, Jehu L.
Blair, Donald D.
Blair, John A.
Blake, Gordon
Blake, John S.
Blanks, Alva L.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Blondin, John L.
Bly, Theodore S.
Boland, Joseph P.
Boland, Paul
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Boller, Jack W.
Bolles, Robert R.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boniface, John G.
Booker, Thomas F.
Borgerding, Howard A.
Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Bouveron, Ernest A.
Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Carl J.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Bradberry, Gordon D.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branton, Richard C.
Branum, Rudolph
Breen, Charles E., Jr.
Brett, Robert P.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
Brouillette, Robert R.
Broun, Leroy R.
Brown, Francis T.
Brown, Ian F.
Brown, Irwin M., Jr.
Brown, Jack, Jr.
Brown, Keith F.
Brown, Lewis C.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Russell D.
Browne, Herschel McK.
Brozo, John G.
Brubaker, Donald E.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryan, George S., Jr.
Bryant, Bobby D.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Bucolo, Mariano J.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgin, Wilbur J.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, Lester H.
Butler, Frank J., Jr.
Byron, Herbert I.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Camp, Herbert E.
Campbell, Joseph W.
Cannon, Herbert "B"
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Carlson, Robert L.
Carneghi, Albert J.
Carper, John E.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Carroll, Thomas F.
Carter, Jack L.

Cartmell, James P.
Cartwright, Harold J.
Casey, Robert M.
Casseday, Jack N.
Casson, Robert M.
Castillo, Edmund L.
Cerstvik, Milan S.
Chamberlain, Charles H.
Chambers, Lloyd S., Jr.
Chaney, Robert S.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Chaudoin, Harry D.
Chokas, Nicholis P.
Christensen, Morris A.
Chute, Charles L.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James H.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clarke, John L., Jr.
Clausen, Paul K.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Cleland, William H.
Clemmons, Robert H.
Clifton, Autry W.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M.
Coleman, Yale
Colley, Edward L.
Collins, John T.
Collins, Wayne D.
Comet, Robert E.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Cone, Warren M.
Constantine, James R.
Cooke, Edward W.
Coope, Peter MacD.
Corbett, Kenneth G., Jr.
Cordell, Curtis C.
Cottingham, Donald R.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Cowan, Paul G.
Cox, Harry W.
Crandall, Jack C.
Crangle, Eugene V.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Francis G.
Crawford, Joseph E., Jr.
Crawford, Robert E.
Critchley, John P.
Cronander, James H.
Cronemiller, Carl F., Jr.
Crooks, Thomas L.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crowe, Thomas H.
Crozier, Francis J.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cuccias, Robert F.
Culwell, Jackson P.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
Curless, James P.
Curry, James G.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Daly, Richard H.
Davis, Harry O.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Davis, William R.
Davis, William R.
Davison, Morgan L.
Davison, Richard R.
Deacon, William, III
DeBold, Joseph F.
DeCamp, Edgar A.
Decker, Edward A.
Decker, Walter C.
Dehart, Turner
Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
Deitz, Charles J.
De Lorenzi, Robert M.
Demas, George K.
DeMayo, John J., Jr.
Demmler, Charles F.
Deney, Leonard J., Jr.
Dente, Eugene
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dickson, George A., Jr.
Dickson, John E.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
Di Matteo, Dominic J.
Dise, Robert L.
Doell, Robert E.
Doles, Thomas K.
Don, John D.
Dorman, Alvin E.
Doss, Robert F.
Doty, William K.
Dougherty, John J.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis J. J.
Doyle, Luther W.
Dozier, James H.
Drinkwater, Eugene E.
Duberg, Carl N.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dudley, Sherman F.
Dugger, John A.
Duncan, Marvin H.
Duncan, Robert C.
Dunning, Richard A.
Durbin, Stephen F.
Dutra, John E.
Duval, Robert E.
Eagan, Bryan R.
Eckert, George J.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
Edwards, John A., Jr.
Eells, John P.
Eger, Frank A., Jr.
Egert, Marlin V.
Elgee, James F.
Elliott, Homan O.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
Ellis, William H.
Emerson, Allan L.
Endacott, Jack A.
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
Engelmann, Henry A.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Enyart, John W.
Erickson, John W.
Erwin, Willard L.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, Jack R.
Evans, James G.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr.
Everett, Elmer C.
Exum, John D.
Fader, Kenneth B.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Fagan, Philip J.
Fahrney, Robert H.
Farmer, Harry C.
Farrell, John E.
Farrington, Richard S.
Faucett, William "A"
Faughman, Franklin P.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
Faull, Joe D.
Fay, Robert J.
Feisman, Jack L.
Ferguson, James C.
Ferrante, John M.
Ferree, Richard J.
Field, Francis E.
Finkel, Herman C., Jr.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Finley, Robert N.
Finnigan, Robert J.
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fisher, Lee W.
Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Carl S.
Fitzgerald, Thomas R.
Fitzgerel, John H.
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Fluhart, James H.
Folop, Albert A.
Ford, Frank W.
Forrester, John J.
Forson, Roy E., Jr.
Forsyth, William D.
Foust, James W.
Fox, Francis M., Jr.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Francis, Samuel
Fridge, Herbert E.
Fries, William D.
Fromknecht, George W.
Fuller, Robert C.
Furland, Frederick W.
Gaehler, Alfred H.
Gainer, Richard D.
Gallup, Frederick S., Jr.
Galt, Robert W.
Gammill, James L.
Gard, John G.
Garland, Earl E.
Garodz, Leo J.
Garrison, Robert G.
Gately, Donald E.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gaul, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
Geary, Mervin O.
Gee, Harry C.
Gee, Robert D.
Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
Gernert, Harold F.
Geroy, Francis O.
Gibbons, James G.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Gibbs, Thomas E.
Giedt, John G.
Gilles, Donald A.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Gilyard, John G.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
Ginn, John O.
Glaser, William R.
Glauser, Clarence J.
Glennon, Allan N.
Gless, Richard D.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glover, George W.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Gobble, George F.
Gordon, Jack G.
Gorman, John V.
Gorski, Joseph J.
Gortney, William M.
Gorton, Robert J.
Graham, Martin C., Jr.
Grantham, Robert D.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Greene, Joseph M.
Griest, Hadley C.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Grojean, Charles D.
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullette, John G.
Gunter, Monchie M., Jr.
Gunther, Ernest H.
Guthrie, Charles A.
Haak, Frank S., Jr.
Hagler, Billy E.
Hahs, Orrie A.
Hall, Ray E.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
Hamaker, William R.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hamblin, Robert N.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hannah, Glyde B.
Hansen, John E.
Hardenbergh, Terry
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harmer, Frank D., Jr.
Harp, Orland C.
Harper, George A.
Harris, Eli P., Jr.
Harris, William C.
Harrison, Glenn C.
Harshman, Glenn W.
Hart, John E.
Hart, Robert R.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Haselton, Frederick R., Jr.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hauser, William F.
Hayek, Paul A.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Hayes, Kent W.
Hayward, John L.
Hazen, Alan M.
Heberling, Donald A.
Hebert, Ernest P.
Heesacker, Bernard A.
Heffernan, James M.
Heidorn, Lawrence H.
Henderson, Jerome E.
Henningsen, William J.
Henriques, David N., Jr.
Herbert, Edward D.
Herweg, John B.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heuer, Edward H.
Higgins, Robert T.
Highsmith, William N.
Higley, Warren A.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
Hinchcliff, Lester G., Jr.
Hoffman, Raymond L.
Hogg, Frank W.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holden, John J.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Hopkins, Francis D.
Hopp, Frederick H.
Horn, Francis R.
Horn, Maurice A.
Horner, Walter R.
Hoskins, Thomas H.
Howard, Carl L.
Howard, George D.
Howard, Walter F.
Howard, William D.
Howe, Raymond E.
Howser, Howard M.
Hoy, Hugh A.
Hubbard, Edward R.
Huddleston, William E.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hughes, Arthur J.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hugus, James E.
Hume, David M.
Hurst, Howard B.
Hutches, Robert S.
Hutchinson, Thomas H., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold R.
Huval, Williard R.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Iacobelli, Rocco F.
Ideker, Donald E.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jack, Earl
Jackson, Joseph A.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jacobsen, John H.
Jarina, Michael
Jeffes, Edward W. B., Jr.
Jenkins, Glen E.
Jensen, Duane L., Jr.
Johnson, Allen R.
Johnson, Charles McC., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R.
Johnson, Donald W.
Johnson, Frank E., Jr.
Johnson, Harold E.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Keith V.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnson, Walter P.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, Donald P.
Jones, Francis F., Jr.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Theodore R.
Jones, William F.
Jordan, Edward V.
Jordan, James, Jr.
Jorgensen, George D.
Joy, Harmon R.
Junod, Louis L.
Kahre, Edward L.
Kallies, Richard H.
Karr, Walter G., Jr.
Kasner, Edmund B.
Kaufman, John
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Keene, Warren E.
Keiser, George R.
Keller, Thomas D.
Kelley, Albert J.
Kelly, George R.
Kelly, James J.
Kelly, Leslie D., Jr.
Kenefick, James P.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kennedy, James R.
Kent, John "L"
Kent, Robert B.
Kenworthy, Arthur R.
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kerfoot, Dale L.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kessing, Oliver O., Jr.
Kibler, Robert L.
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimmons, George W.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
King, Herbert T.
King, John E.
King, William D.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kinney, Grayson C.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirklighter, James F., Jr.
Klein, George R.
Klibbe, Orville O.
Kline, Edward C.
Klug, George J.
Knapton, Richard P.
Knox, Gordon L.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Koepcke, William W.
Komorowski, Raymon A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Lambert, Carl R.
Lampe, James S.
Landtroop, Joe M.
Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
Languedoc, Arthur J.
Larson, Ray I.
Lassiter, "A" "C", Jr.
Lavelle, Francis M.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Lee, John W.
Lefler, Luther
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leib, James M.
Leighton, David T.
Leist, Frederick, Jr.
Lemeshewsky, Andrew A.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levine, Saul
Lewis, George H.
Lichtenberg, Robert S.
Light, Robert G.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lindberg, Charles H.
Lindsay, John R.
Linville, James C.
Little, John B.
Lococo, Salvadore
Long, David A.
Longton, William F.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Loritsch, Richard H.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
Lumsden, David, Jr.
Lund, Howard R.
Lynch, James
Lynch, Richard J.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, Howard E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
MacKay, Robert T.
Macon, Glen G.
Madill, William G., Jr.
Maginnis, Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Maier, Frederick L., III
Malone, Walter J.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Manring, Alvin B.
Maple, Charles J.
Marsh, John C.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
Martin, Joseph R.
Martin, Lealyn E.
Martz, David J.
Mason, George E.
Matejceck, John F.
Matthews, Walter L., III
Matthews, William R.
Maupin, Elwin C.
May, Robert C.
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
McAdams, Lee T.
McCall, Robert E.
McCallum, John F., Jr.
McCandless, Arlin R.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McClelland, Robert A., III
McClintock, William W., Jr.
McDonnel, James L.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
McGaw, Donald A.
McGee, Dan, Jr.
McGovern, William
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
McGrath, Charles T.
McGraw, Donald L.

McKee, David A.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McKenzie, Robert P.
McMahon, Joseph D.
McManaman, Raymond J., Jr.
McMillan, Leo D., Jr.
McNeil, Richard S.
McNeil, Robert K.
McNeill, Howard G.
McRostie, Richard J.
Mealy, John K., Jr.
Meek, Orville M., Jr.
Meenen, Henry R.
Melick, Roger E.
Merrell, Chadler V.
Metschel, John J.
Metzger, Daniel T.
Metzger, Robert L.
Meyer, John J., Jr.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miles, Kenneth N.
Miller, Donald G.
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Miller, John W.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Jack O.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Mills, William P.
Millsaps, Lewis M.
Minton, Don R.
Miskill, Donald K.
Moll, Kenneth E.
Monthan, George R.
Mooney, Francis E., Jr.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, James A.
Moore, James I.
Moore, Oswald M.
Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Moran, Thomas L.
Morey, William C., Jr.
Morgan, Horace H.
Morgan, Robert L.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Moro, Albert J.
Morris, James W.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morrison, John "L", Jr.
Morrison, James W.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Mulholland, William P.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murphy, Francis J.
Murphy, Thomas J. Jr.
Myers, Robert W.
Naffah, Ned
Nagler, Gordon R.
Nasipak, Valentin
Nelson, Albert N., Jr.
Nelson, Gerard L.
Nemoff, Alfred J.
Nesbitt, James O.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
Newbern, Robert O.
Newman, Dale E.
Newsome, William R.
Newton, Daniel D.
Ney, Kenneth C.
Nichols, Robert L.
Nickerson, Jerome W.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Nilson, Clifford E.
Noble, Guy E.
Noble, Lee V.
Nolta, Cornelius V., Jr.
Norman, James H.
Norris, Crackett J.
Norton, James C.
Norville, Robert W.
Nott, Hugh G.
Nugent, Corliss R.
Odell, John D., Jr.
Offtermatt, Wilbur F.
Ogle, Robert J.
Ohsiek, Robert R.
Oliver, Daniel A., Jr.
Oliver, Stephen
Olson, Edward C.
Olson, Edwin G.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
O'Neill, Thomas H. R.
Ortland, Henry, III
Orton, Robert D.
Otten, Vincent B.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Overn, John A.
Owens, Haydn, Jr.
Oyer, John L.
Packer, Samuel H., II
Page, Robert A.
Paige, Robert W.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Palmer, John G.
Parish, John J.
Parker, Edwin J.
Parks, Larry G.
Parr, Charles W.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Parry, Loren C.
Parsons, Robert C.
Paterson, Donald P.
Patterson, William C., Jr.
Pavis, George P.
Paxson, Roy H., Jr.
Pearson, Douglas C.
Pearson, Francis E., III
Pefley, John W.
Pennington, Otis G.
Pennington, Philip B.
Penny, Harmon C.
Perez, Raul B.
Perkins, Jack B.
Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.
Peters, Bernard
Petersen, Richard L.
Peterson, Frank
Petre, Gabriel L.
Petricka, Robert P.
Pfefferkorn, William R.
Phares, John V.
Phelps, Henry E.
Phillips, Chester G.
Phillips, Harvey R.
Phillips, Robert G.
Piatek, John A.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Picton, Richard E.
Pierce, Robert E.
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Pilmer, Edwin H., Jr.
Pittman, Shelly B.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plaut, Arthur, Jr.
Plummer, Philip F.
Podhradsky, Henry B.
Pohrman, David C.
Pole, Thomas M.
Polgar, Paul S.
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Potter, Horace S.
Powell, Edwin H.
Powers, Horace S.
Pringle, Robert C.
Probyn, Robert W.
Putman, Orlin N.
Putnam, Earl B.
Quisenberry, William R.
Rabe, Richard D.
Radloff, Fred H.
Ragland, Roy J.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Rambur, William M.
Randle, David D.
Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Charles E.
Ray, Troy G.
Rayner, Donald E.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Redgrave, DeWitt C., III
Reese, John W., Jr.
Reich, Charles A.
Reiff, Glenn A.
Renn, John E.
Reynolds, Allan J.
Reynolds, George R.
Rice, Minor T.
Richelieu, Charles F.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Rieke, Norbert A.
Riggs, Wallace M.
Riley, Jack
Rives, James D., Jr.
Roberts, John
Robertson, Chaytor L., Jr.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, Gordon E.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Rock, Clifford "T"
Rockett, Charles W.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roe, Philip A.
Rogers, David A.
Rogers, Frank W.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
Rothwell, James G.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
Rushin, Thomas E.
Rusling, John A., III
Russel, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
Sabota, Leo M.
Samota, Frank
Sandeford, William H.
Sanders, Rodney D.
Sanderson, James R.
Sands, James W.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, John E.
Savage, Richard A.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Saylor, Beverly
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schaefer, John E., Jr.
Schaffer, Donald R.
Schetky, Malcolm O.
Scheuhing, Robert E.
Schindler, Clyde H.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schmieder, Arthur H.
Schneider, Frank J.
Schoultz, Robert F.
Schulenberg, Duane E.
Schultz, Henry
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Clyde L.
Scott, Norvell O., Jr.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Scripp, John L., III
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seargeant, John A.
Searl, Floyd C.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seay, George W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
Shane, Elbert B.
Sharer, Keith W.
Shea, Stephen J.
Sheehy, Edward J.
Sheil, James E.
Shepard, Everett G., Jr.
Sheppard, Walter P., Jr.
Sherfy, John B., Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Shipman, James L.
Shonk, William H., Jr.
Short, Merton D.
Shrake, Francis B.
Shreve, Andrew K.
Sickel, John A.
Sidenberg, George M., III
Sigafoos, John J.
Sigler, Edward E., Jr.
Simmons, Robert L.
Simon, Harold W.
Simons, Minton, II
Simpson, William E.
Sims, Clifford L., Jr.
Sindell, Leroy J. E.
Singer, Arnold N.
Sipe, Richard G.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Skoog, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Bruce K., Jr.
Smith, Donald L.
Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
Smith, Emory P.
Smith, Floyd L.
Smith, Frederic N.
Smith, Henry L.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
Smith, Lowell H.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Rush S.
Smith, Wallace E.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, John W.
Snowden, Macon S.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Sproul, William C.
Stadter, George B.
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stanley, Donald E.
Stanley, Earl W.
Starr, Mark R.
Staveley, Ernest
Steedle, George D., Jr.
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
Stephens, Alvis H.
Stephenson, Marion G.
Stevens, Mortimer, Jr.
Stiegelmar, Loren R.
Still, Raymond G.
Stilwell, Louis "C"
St. John, Alvin P.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.
Stose, John F.
Stout, Cecil C.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Stroux, Peter M.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sturdevant, Harvey W.
Sullivan, Joseph J.
Sullivan, Russell H., Jr.
Sullivan, Robert M.
Sullivan, William P.
Sumney, Frank F.
Sutton, Thomas L.
Swanson, Karl T.
Sweeney, James R.
Swope, John R.
Taft, Jesse W.
Taylor, James D.
Taylor, John L.
Taylor, Perry R., Jr.
Taylor, Waymon
Teneyck, Hubert A., Jr.
Tesh, Charles P.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Robert H.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thompson, Lewayne
Thompson, Robert D.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thompson, William
Thorndyke, John R.
Thurman, Russell, Jr.
Tice, John J., III
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tiderman, Otto D.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tilghman, Walter W., Jr.
Tippie, Bruce E.
Tipping, William L.
Tisdale, Robert S.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Trahan, Paul K.
Trapp, Bill C.
Travers, Edward P.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Treadwell, Archie B.
Tribble, Gordon B.
Tribble, Robert J.
Trip, Rudolph E.
Trott, Robert J.
Tucker, William W.
Tull, John "L" D.
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turley, Miles D. J.
Turner, William R.
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Vail, Ronald A.
Valentine, Andrew J.
Vallely, James R.
Van Train, William A., Jr.
Vardy, Richard S.
Vaughn, Donald E.
Vaught, Thomas B.
Veling, George M.
Vereen, Jackson E.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Viele, John W.
Voorheese, Jack R.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Wade, Felix W.
Wagner, Paul R.
Wahl, Clyde F.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
Wallace, Donald E.
Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Walsh, John A.
Warmath, Martin C.
Warren, Burtis "W"
Wasdin, James R.
Wash, John L.
Watt, Jesse R.
Wattle, Thomas F.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter C.
Webb, Babe W.
Weber, William J., Jr.
Webster, Daniel A.
Wedding, Edwin G.
Weidner, Robert E.
Weigel, John J.
Weirich, James E.
Welander, Robert O.
Welch, Harry E.
Welty, Wayne J.
Wencker, Donald P.
Werner, Robert V.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wesper, Willis H.
Wessinger, William D.
West, Earle L.
West, Jack
West, Richard E.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheat, Elwood C.
Wheatley, Chester H.
Wheeler, William L.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur C.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ira R.
White, Ray B.
White, Rue W.
Whitehead, Andrew D.
Whitlock, Eldred L.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whitney, William J.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
Wible, Lester C.
Wieland, Daniel T.
Wilcox, Burr C.
Wilder, James H.
Wilkinson, Roland F.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, Dwight L.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, Joseph N., Jr.
Williams, James E.
Williams, John H. D.
Williams, William H.
Williamson, Robert H
Willis, Charles H.
Willis, Thomas J.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Phillip A.
Wilson, Richard H.
Wineman, Glenn W.
Wingfield, Elmer A.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
Wise, Maurice H., Jr.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, George M.
Wolfe, John M.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
Woolums, Charles R.
Worsley, Earl A.
Wyand, Donald McK.
Wyman, Charles L.
Yerbury, Robert H.
Yerly, Harold J.
York, George H.
Young, William B.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zavoy, Andrew J.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zimm, Alfonz
Zimmerman, George G.
Zimmerman, Wayne L.
Zook, Lester E.
Zowarka, James G.
Zwolinski, Frank J.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Baker, Robert L.
Boswell, "J" Thornton
Buechel, Donald R.
Conner, Robert A.
Craighead, John T.
Drips, Robert C.
Dunn, Seldon C.
Durden, Charles S., Jr.
Egan, John F.

Garrett, Robert I.
Gaylor, Donald H.
Gill, John E.
Herlihy, Charles E.
Hodges, Thomas L., Jr.
Kaufman, Paul
Lagerquist, Howard W.
Long, James A.
Maher, Robert W.
Martin, Stuart H.
McDonald, John J.
McGreevy, John J.
Meekings, Walter J., Jr.
Neptune, Edgar McC., Jr.
Olson, Marshall W.
Palmer, Robert H., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Risi, George F.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Sanderlin, Joseph M.
Smitley, Roger P.
Valdivieso Del Toro, Jorge R.
Welch, Elbert S.
Wiebenga, Ned H.
Wilber, Martin C.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Adrian, Rodger J.
Ainlay, Henry L., Jr.
Albea, John P.
Allen, Paul M.
Applegate, Richard C.
Avellone, Francis P.
Bailey, Edward F.
Bain, Louis E.
Baird, Richard S.
Baker, William R.
Barron, Willard D.
Benson, John A.
Bond, Calvin C.
Bower, Edward R.
Britt, Ernest R.
Buchanan, Richard W.
Buck, Walter J.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chance, Carl
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Clifton, Emory V.
Collins, James H.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Conard, Melvin L.
Conover, Donald T.
Corley, James O.
Crain, Harold
Creekman, Charles T.
Criner, Eugene F.
Crook, Lewis J.
Crowder, Norman M.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Dester, John M.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Duncan, Bryan L.
Dura, Leon J.
Effner, James E.
Elkins, Robert H.
Ewing, Paul C.
Fay, John F., Jr.
Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Forrest, James E.
Gallup, Mearl
Gillis, Charles L.
Gobel, Carl F.
Gralla, Eugene
Haberlin, William E.
Hair, Maurice E.
Haley, Robert S.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Harris, Robert B.
Hart, Carten M.
Harvey, Hobart D.
Haslett, Robert H.
Hay, Patrick M.
Henker, Donald E.
Hill, Roger E.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Hughes, Thomas W., Jr.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Jones, Joe L.
Jones, Joseph B.
Jones, Thomas W.
Keidel, Charles J.
Kephart, Norman R.
Knight, Richard H.
Knobel, Roland J., Jr.
Larson, Albert G.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
LeClert, Arthur C.
Leish, Calvin R.
Lewis, Raymond O.
Locke, Frank E.
Lucand, Dale C.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
MacEwan, Clarence L., Jr.
Maragides, Harry N.
McGill, Willis L.
McGlaun, Albert L., Jr.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
McKenzie, Harry F., Jr.
McLean, James P.
Meng, Edwin "L", Jr.
Meyer, Milton, Jr.
Miller, John C.
Moore, Alvin
Moore, Vincent P., Jr.
Mulholland, Donald E.
Neighbors, Milton L.
Nickson, Roy E.
Nuernberger, Gale W.
Nugent, Francis F.
Olson, Robert S.
Patterson, Frank H., Jr.
Peffley, John F.
Pilgrim, Orville "L"
Pollitt, Ernest A.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rigg, Donald C.
Rinetti, Edward J.
Robinson, James A.
Schanze, Fred, Jr.
Schar, Kenneth A.
Sloan, Dale F.
Small, Joseph T.
Spargo, Robert A.
Stabe, Robert W.
Steele, James H.
Sueur, Charles A.
Surran, Charles R.
Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Tinney, Richard T.
Tongren, Hale N.
Toomey, John F.
Travers, Sumter L.
Valentine, Gordon K.
Weir, Robert A.
Wingo, Rodney K.
Woolard, Kenneth A.
Worden, Frank N.
Zenk, Lawrence P.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Abucewicz, John A.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Dennis, Arthur W.
Fay, John P.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J. N.
Forney, Fredric J.
Hayes, Henry H.
Hayes, Jack W.
Herrmann, Theodore C.
Hopkins, Ralph W.
Howland, Barker C.
Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
Keaney, Kevin J.
Lavin, Henry T.
Maguire, Connell J.
Mahoney, Vincent J.
Mershon, Carroll McB.
Morgan, Raymond
Nerthling, Edwin J.
Nunn, Jack E.
Power, Joseph G.
Rademacher, Glen A.
Rossbach, George F.
Sullivan, Mark
Szczesny, Charles A.
Vincer, John D.
Webb, Charles E.
Widman, John A., Jr.
Zoller, John E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Max H.
Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Boyd, Earl I.
Brantner, William B.
Burton, George W.
Daub, Leland A.
Dearth, Keith H.
Devlin, John G.
Diehl, Charles E.
Doyle, Paul J., Jr.
Draves, Albert W., Jr.
Farley, Robert J.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Heglund, Robert Q.
Heuston, Robert H.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jasper, Paul R.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Kirk, Randolph
Klingenmeier, Russell J., Jr.
LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Mabbitt, Robert C.
Merritt, Harold W.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
More, David C.
Morgan, Joseph E.
Mueller, William A.
O'Neill, Lawrence F.
Patrick, Donald A.
Peacock, Francis B.
Petersen, John H.
Reeve, John J., Jr.
Roy, Vershall A.
Saunders, Edward M.
Seitz, Carl R.
Snow, Arthur W.
Scuder, Charles L.
Spangler, William S.
Stiffler, Lloyd E., Jr.
Sturman, William H.
Van Leer, Blake W.
Vaughan, James H., Jr.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Yount, George R.
Zirzow, Charles F.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Bartlett, Stephen O.
Beall, Frank P., Jr.
Counsell, Lee A.
Dunn, John J.
Echols, Archie P., Jr.
Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Holmes, Corey H.
Jasper, William J.
Lehmann, William G.
Mahoney, Jack D.
Nelson, Jack D.
O'Malley, John E.
Samuels, Homer S.
Stephenson, Thomas D.
Swanson, Carl J.
Taber, Donald S.
Timberlake, Robert W.
Woodworth, George K.
Wortham, Maury E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Cleo R.
Allen, Robert V.
Anderson, William S.
Armitage, Horace G.
Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
Bohannan, Ray
Broulik, Frank
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
Carter, Charles H.
Cartier, William L. G., Jr.
Chapman, William H.
Civiello, Harold J.
Clauss, Edward L.
Coburn, Kenneth R.
Colman, Frederick R.
Combs, Harrison T.
Cox, Walter R.
Deriso, Dominic J.
Dyches, Kenelm "O"
Ervin, Francis A.
Ethridge, John W.
Garrett, John L.
Henry, Girton H.
Hunter, Russell E.
Joslin, Leslie H.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Klostermann, Wolfgang E.
Lasco, John, Jr.
Lee, Ulyses O.
Long, Thomas H., Jr.
Mason, Anderson T.
Mason, Edwin R.
McDonald, John P.
McMillin, Charles R.
Meade, Charles D.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moore, Daniel D.
Nooney, Thomas W., Jr.
Parker, James H.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
Ricker, Robert E.
Smith, Forbes H.
Smith, Orville E.
Sorger, Frank J.
Stutler, David R.
Taliaferro, Richard B., Jr.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
Tompkins, Franklin H.
Von Radesky, Horace
Young, John L.
Zellmann, Earl G.

LIEUTENANT, LINE

Abele, Henry F.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.
Abrahams, Thomas P.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Addams, John F.
Adler, Ronald E.
Adorney, Frank
Ahlquist, Stanley W.
Aiau, Harvey C. K.
Albers, William P.
Albertson, William H.
Albright, Richard K.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, William H.
Alexander, Marvin W.
Alldredge, Donald L.
Allen, John B.
Allen, William D.
Allen, Winfred P.
Allison, Arnold W.
Altee, Thomas M.
Altmeyer, John M.
Amick, Benjamin C., Jr.
Anaston, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Curtis O.
Anderson, Duane E.
Anderson, David W.
Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Robert P.
Anderson, Robert C.
Anderson, Robert N.
Apted, George L.
Archambault, Jackson L.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Arison, Rae E.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Philip McC., Jr.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, John E.
Arrott, Reed T.
Asbacher, Martin A., Jr.
Ashley, Bruce H.
Atkinson, Robert J.
Aucoin, Leonard L.
Avary, James C., Jr.
Avrit, Richard C.
Ayers, David W.
Babcock, Donald E.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Backes, Ronald J.
Bacon, John L.
Bademan, Harold W.
Bagby, Hallam O.
Bailey, George T.
Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
Ball, Courtland D., III
Bandemer, Otto H.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, Bruce R.
Banks, William E., IV
Banta, Robert
Barke, Arthur R.
Barnes, Donald K.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, John B.
Baron, Charles R.
Barringer, Malcolm L.
Barry, Thomas M.
Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bates, David H., Jr.
Bates, John A., Jr.
Bath, Alan H.
Bathurst, Robert B.
Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.
Baum, Joseph H.
Bayer, David A.
Beard, Donald W.
Beat, Robert O.
Beaulieu, Reo A.
Beaumont, Eugene A. G.
Becker, Glynn R.
Beers, Robert C.
Beeton, Harvey J.
Bekkedahl, Clifford L.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gershom R.
Bell, William R.
Benero, Manuel A., Jr.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
Bennett, Richard W.
Bennie, Donald B.
Bentley, William C.
Benton, Jerry S.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Norman K.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berkley, Lawrence N.
Berry, Joel H., Jr.
Berry, William H.
Best, Eddie F.
Bird, Charles F.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bishop, Richard D.
Bivens, Arthur C.
Blackington, Richard N.
Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blackwood, Jack D.
Blanchard, Robert C.
Blandine, Robert E.
Block, Stanley H.
Blum, Frederick J., III
Blundell, Peverll
Boggs, Steve V.
Bohannan, William L.
Bolst, Albert L.
Bolster, Harry E.
Boncer, Lawrence
Booth, Roger G.
Booth, Theodore W.
Borthwick, Robert B.
Botula, Bernard C.
Bowen, John H., Jr.
Bowen, William S.
Bowers, Henry H.
Bowling, David H.
Bowman, Lawrence F.
Boyd, John H., Jr.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyett, Stephen G.
Boyle, Darrell D.
Bozeman, Henry G.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Brady, Francis T.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Breaux, Fred J., Jr.
Bridge, James A., Jr.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
Bristol, Robert B.
Britton, William L.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brouillard, Donald C.
Brown, Cloyde I.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, Harold
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Kenneth R.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Robert M.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.
Browning, Siras D.
Brownley, John H.
Bruce, George W., Jr.
Brummage, Richard L.
Bruning, Richard A.
Brunson, Wright "A", Jr.
Bucher, Lloyd M.
Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bull, Joseph L., III
Bullard, John R.
Bunnell, William P.
Burdon, Eugene R.
Burgess, James A.
Burke, William C.
Burley, John R.
Burriss, John R.
Burt, Thomas E.
Bush, James T.
Bushong, Brent
Butcher, Nathan T.
Butcher, Paul D.
Butler, Archie P., Jr.

Butler, Charles T.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Buys, Jay R.
Byrd, Sam R.
Byrnes, Robert E.
Cahill, Charles A.
Callicott, Jack D.
Cameron, Kenneth R.
Cameron, Norman A.
Campanella, Anton M.
Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, John A.
Campbell, James B.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, William N.
Canfield, Gerald I.
Cann, Tedford J.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, David E.
Cannon, Leo J.
Canon, George A., III
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Carelli, Francis L.
Carey, William R.
Carl, William T.
Carlin, Robert J.
Carlson, Olof M., Jr.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Carnevale, Angelo M.
Caron, Robert R.
Carosia, Joseph J.
Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevin P
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ernest H.
Carson, Ralph
Carter, James D.
Carter, Robert D.
Carterette, Robert T.
Cash, Eugene J.
Cashman, Michael, II
Cassell, Dean G.
Cassen, John S., Jr.
Cassidy, Thomas J., Jr.
Causey, Donald F.
Cave, Thomas H.
Chadwick, John K.
Champlin, Gerald B.
Chapman, Frederick L.
Charest, Philip G.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Warren A.
Chesley, James F.
Chewning, Robert W.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Christon, Paul W.
Clark, Charles R.
Clark, David P.
Clark, Donald E.
Clark, Richard G.
Clark, Stanley D.
Clarkin, James J.
Clements, Billy R.
Clew, William M.
Clingenpeel, William A.
Cloughley, William D.
Coe, David C., Jr.
Cole, Edgar E.
Cole, William S., Jr.
Coleman, James O.
Collier, Larry D.
Colligan, Thomas R.
Collins, Philip K.
Combs, Martin F.
Comey, Robert W.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
Conolly, Robert D.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conrad, Peter C.
Converse, Douglas
Coogan, Richard D.
Cook, Charles L.
Cook, William H.
Cooke, Donald L.
Cooley, Arthur W.
Cooper, Robert G.
Cooper, Tommy G.
Corbett, Eugene A.
Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
Cormier, Conrad R.
Cornell, Arthur F.
Coscina, Michael A., Jr.
Coskey, Kenneth L.
Coston, Stanford W., Jr.
Cottrell, Walter N.
Cotugno, Paul J.
Coughlin, Eugene F.
Coughlin, Paul G.
Cour, Edward E.
Crader, Clifford L.
Craig, Earl C.
Crain, James D.
Crater, Ray F.
Craven, Robert C. E.
Crawford, Nace B., Jr.
Crepeau, George A.
Cricchi, John V.
Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Cronin, Francis W.
Crosby, Charles A.
Cross, Charles H.
Cruden, David S.
Cuccias, Leo P.
Cunningham, Edward F.
Curl, Kent W.
Curran, Robert W.
Curry, Thomas E.
Dally, David F.
Dalton, Charles W.
Dalton, Richard V.
Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Daly, Richard G.
Damian, John L.
Daniels, James M.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
D'Arville, Edmond J.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davidson, David D.
Davis, Bill N.
Davis, Frank E.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, John B.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Davison, John W., Jr.
Day, Arthur R.
Deal, Walter C., Jr.
De Hart, William
Delaney, William E.
DeMaris, Darryl A.
De Martini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Denton, David N.
Derr, John P.
DeTonnancourt, Arthur E.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dick, Joseph L.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Diesel, Charles N.
Dietz, Richard J.
Di Giacomo, Joseph G.
Dillingham, Paul W., Jr.
Dillon, Harlan K.
Dimon, Charles G., Jr.
Di Nola, Michael J.
Divelbiss, Dallas R.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dobyns, John E.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, William R.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donnelly, Raymond D., Jr.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donovan, James F.
Doroshuk, John, Jr.
Dotson, Gene E.
Douglas, Jack R.
Douglas, James G., Jr.
Dowe, Robert M., Jr.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Dowse, Herbert B., Jr.
Doyle, William J.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Drew, Russell C.
Drummond, Scott E., Jr.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dubois, Roland H.
Duckering, Donald W.
Duckett, Philip VanH. L.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Joseph A., Jr.
Duhrkoph, Don J.
Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Duncan, Dale W.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunlop, Thomas E.
Durbin, Peter
Eberhart, Robert S.
Eckhouse, Morton A.
Eddleman, Gilbert H.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, William P., III
Edwards, Forrest L.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Edwards, William R., Jr.
Eibert, Don C.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, George D., Jr.
Ellison, John C.
Elster, James M.
Emerson, Jesse R., III
Engel, Francis J., III
Engelbrecht, Richard H.
English, Francis W., Jr.
Erwin, Donald E.
Evans, David W.
Evans, George J.
Evans, Thomas B.
Everist, Philip W.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Fall, David R., Jr.
Farber, Karl H.
Farnham, Charles G.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis McP.
Feeks, Edmond M.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Feller, Donald L.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Felt, Donald L.
Felt, Joseph A.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Fenn, Dan E.
Ferguson, Andrew C.
Ferguson, William W.
Fergusson, Ernest W.
Fernandes, James E.
Ferrell, Dewitt T., Jr.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Filkins, William C.
Finneran, William J.
Finney, Jack L.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fischer, Edward J.
Fisher, John C.
Fisher, Russell H.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W., Jr.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fleischmann, William H., Jr.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Fletcher, Richard M.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Fong, Chong S.
Font, Carlos G.
Fonville, Henry P.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Fox, Richard V.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert "E"
Frederick, Donald R. A.
Freeman, Linus W., Jr.
Freeman, Robert W.
French, Fred H.
French, William L.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friese, George A.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F., III
Fudge, David A.
Furey, Laurence T.
Furgerson, John A.
Furmanski, John A.
Gall, Daune M.
Gallagher, Hugh L.
Gallagher, Robert S.
Gallipeau, Richard W.
Gallup, Shelley P.
Galvin, Bernard J.
Gantt, Richard G.
Garcia, William V.
Gardner, Kenneth R.
Gardner, Louis J.
Garner, Pat M.
Garnett, Walter W.
Garrett, Bernard D.
Garrett, John E.
Gatewood, Tommy L.
Gavazzi, Robert R.
Gennette, Robert L.
George, Charles A., Jr.
Gibbs, Charles E., Jr.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Giles, Thomas N.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gilmore, Arthur H.
Giovanetti, William C.
Glaves, Robert H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
Gleim, Ernest H.
Godek, John
Golde, Morton
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goldstein, Jonas L.
Good, Ronald P.
Gooden, Richard O.
Goodfellow, John
Goodman, Kelsey B.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, Frank O., Jr.
Goodwin, William D.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Graffam, Earl H.
Graveson, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Harry J.
Green, Thomas B.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Gress, Donald H.
Grier, Robert W., Jr.
Griffith, Philip G.
Griffith, Webster
Griggs, Norman E.
Groder, Robert E.
Groff, Peter F.
Grogan, Lee R.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gross, Ralph, Jr.
Gunn, William J.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Benjamin F., III
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Haig, Robert B.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, John P.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamel, James K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamilton, LeRoy A.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Hammock, John W.
Hamrick, Thomas D.
Handford, Richard C.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hannula, Brian K.
Hansard, Stonewall
Hansell, Emerson L., Jr.
Hansen, Norman T.
Hansen, Robert F.
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Hare, Charles W.
Harney, Russell F.
Harns, John H.
Harper, William W.
Harris, James W.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harrop, Robert D.
Hart, John R.
Harter, Raymond B.
Hartley, John D.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatcher, William K.
Havens, Stanley L.
Haverty, Alvin D.
Havird, Lloyd B.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hawkins, Richard McK.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Headley, Allen B.
Headrick, Billy J.
Heasley, Waldo L.
Heath, Frederick T.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helgemoe, Raymond A.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Henderson, Charles G.
Henderson, Nathan S., Jr.
Hendrick, David R.
Hennessey, Aloysius G., Jr.
Henry, Lee L.
Henson, John M.
Herkner, Richard T.
Hertwig, William G.
Hetu, Herbert E.
Hickman, William J.
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgins, Raymond F.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Charles D.
Hill, Frank W.
Hill, Lucio W.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hilz, Harold J.
Hiniker, Peter J., Jr.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
Hoare, Haydn F.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Hoge, James H.
Holbert, William H., Jr.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Holland, James N.
Hollenbach, William T.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holway, Nathan C.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Horton, Edward R.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houser, Richard M.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howey, Robert E.
Hoye, James M., II
Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbard, Samuel W., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter B.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Hull-Ryde, Donald
Humber, Marcel B.
Humphreys, Felton "M", Jr.
Hunter, Herbert P.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hyde, Robert A.
Ingraham, Talcott L., Jr.
Inman, Wayne D.
Isaacks, Marion H.
Jacobs, Edward J.
Jacobs, Edward J., Jr.
James, Joe M.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferies, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Jeter, Norman L., Jr.
John, Robert P.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Clifford D.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Emil L.
Johnson, George M.
Johnson, Oren D.
Johnson, Theodore F.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, George T.
Johnston, John M.
Johnston, James I.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Donald S.
Jones, Henry R.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jordan, James S.
Joy, Bernard I.
Kaai, Samuel W.
Kallaus, Richard L.

Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Karpaitis, Anthony J.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keenan, Richard L.
Kehoe, Thomas R.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kelly, James F.
Kelly, John S.
Kelt, William N.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William B.
Kennedy, William E.
Ketzner, Harry T.
Kidd, Vernon G.
Kiewel, Frank W., Jr.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Killian, Donald J.
Kimzey, Walter F.
King, Everett D.
King, John E., Jr.
King, Wilbert A.
Kinsley, Harry W., Jr.
Kirksey, Robert E.
Klee, Robert E.
Kleeman, Leonard
Kling, William T.
Knight, Charles H.
Knight, Robert H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.
Koch, Donald F.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kohler, Walter, Jr.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretzschmann, Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles T., Jr.
Krusi, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
Kuffel, Robert W.
Kugler, Kenneth D.
Kunstmann, Clarence M.
Kutzleb, Robert E.
Labeau, Thomas J.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
Lamb, Marion G.
Lamm, William A.
Landersman, Stuart D.
Lane, Archie G.
Lane, Terry L.
Lang, James M.
Langford, John McC.
Langstron, John L.
Lardis, Christopher S.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood E.
Latham, William B.
Latta, Robert L.
Laube, Clarence E.
Lauber, Ronald M.
Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavender, Robert E.
Lavin, Charles V.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
LeBlanc, Georges E., Jr.
Lenahan, Robert P.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Leonard, Robert W.
Levenson, Lee E.
Levey, Sanford N.
Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
Lewis, Robert
Limerick, Christopher J., Jr.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Lodge, Billups E.
Loftus, Robert McN.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Longman, Richard D.
Lorden, Lawrence R.
Lorge, Eugene P.
Low, Frederick M.
Ludwig, George E.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lykes, William F. G.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lynn, Robert E.
Lyon, Peter W.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
MacGregor, John
Mack, Chester M.
MacKenzie, William W., Jr.
MacKinnon, James C., III
Mahony, Wilbur J.
Malaney, Robert E.
Malone, John S.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Maloney, Peter M.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Manduca, Theodore W.
Mangin, Joseph N., III
Mann, Horace D., Jr.
Mann, James D.
Markham, Lewis M., III
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, John C.
Martin, Alan F.
Martin, Charles W., Jr.
Martin, Donald E.
Martin, James K.
Martin, Robert C.
Mason, Wesley R.
Masse, Donald M.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Mathews, Donald W.
Mathews, Thomas H.
Matthews, William B., Jr.
Mattson, Donald J.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAlevy, John H.
McBrayer, John E., Jr.
McCafferty, William E.
McCall, John M.
McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
McCardell, James E., Jr.
McCarthy, Eugene W.
McCarty, Charles M.
McCarty, Richard W.
McCausland, Robert G.
McClain, Joseph E.
McComb, Robert B.
McConnell, Donald L.
McConnell, Giley R., Jr.
McCormack, William E.
McCormick, Daniel G. III
McCoy, Roy E.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Raymond T.
McDowell, Russell N.
McGathy, Charles L., Jr.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGrath, William D.
McGreevy, Walter J., Jr.
McHugh, James J.
McKay, John H.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McKeown, William G., Jr.
McLaird, Preston, Jr.
McLaughlin, Bernard R.
McLuckie, James D.
McMurtray, Robert A., Jr.
McNaughton, James M.
McNett, William T.
McPadden, Donald F. X.
McQuesten, John T., Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
McWaters, William A., Jr.
McWilliam, John R.
Mead, George R.
Melchers, Arthur C.
Melton, Edward C., Jr.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Merwin, Paul L.
Metzler, Donald M.
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Miale, Robert E.
Middleton, Charles O. III
Milano, Vito R.
Miller, Blount R., Jr.
Miller, Clarence W.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Evan K.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, James H., Jr.
Miller, John R.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, Richard J.
Miller, Robert L.
Mills, James R.
Miner, Jack B.
Mircheff, Robert A.
Mitchell, Allan R.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, Grant L.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mitchell, Robert C.
Mock, Roy L.
Moncure, Edwin C., Jr.
Monroe, Edward H., Jr.
Monroe, William D., III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Joseph O.
Moore, Raphael B.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Clifford D.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morford, Dean R.
Morgan, Houston M.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Morgan, Leroy W., Jr.
Morin, Ronald D.
Morris, Robert E.
Morse, Edward A.
Morton, Charles B., III
Moss, Daniel J.
Moury, Roger F.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mulcahy, William J., Jr.
Mulloy, Paul J.
Mumford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murnane, Frederick C.
Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
Musorrafiti, Francesco A.
Myers, Coleman E.
Mylander, Stig J.
Naschek, Marvin J.
Nason, Charles F., Jr.
Neill, Louis D., Jr.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Herbert F.
Nelson, James McC.
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Leroy C.
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevarez, Antonio
Newcomb, James A.
Newman, Robert L.
Nichols, John F.
Nichols, Richard L.
Nicholson, John L., Jr.
Nielsen, Donald E.
Nielsen, Richard
Nokes, Neil M.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nordmeyer, Philip J.
Nordtvedt, Ernest R.
North, Dean B.
Numbers, Earl W.
Nunnally, Edward H., Jr.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Brien, Terrence P.
O'Bryan, Michael E.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Connor, Joseph E.
O'Der, John T.
Ogle, William J.
O'Hara, John T.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
Olson, Conrad B.
Olson, John R.
Olson, Richard S.
O'Neil, Louis C.
O'Reilly, Charles W.
Orell, Quinlan R.
O'Rourke, Bernard J.
Ortega, Joseph J.
Osborne, Arthur M.
Oster, John S.
Owens, Robert M.
Padgett, Harry E.
Painter, George V.
Pajak, Michael M.
Palmieri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Paris, Thomas A.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parks, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Passantino, Sebastian P.
Pattee, Arthur W.
Pattridge, Roger H.
Paul, David L.
Paul, John E.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Peckworth, Dana
Pedersen, Alton A.
Perkins, Joseph "A", Jr.
Perkins, Richard L.
Perrault, Mark E.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, Lowell E.
Perry, Robert P.
Person, Ross H.
Personette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Peters, William J.
Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Fred D.
Peterson, George E., Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Peterson, Richard N.
Petry, William A.
Pfromer, Robert A.
Phillips, Charles A.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Lawrence, Jr.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Pitkin, Ronald E.
Pitts, Paul D.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Grafton S.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Podaras, Nicholas C.
Pohli, Richard R.
Poland, James B.
Poling, William E.
Pollum, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K., IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porter, Robert D.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, George W.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, Edgar H.
Price, Oliver L.
Price, Walter P.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priddy, Clarence L., Jr.
Pritscher, Robert L.
Profilet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Jack M.
Purdum, William H.
Purvis, Ronald S.
Quartararo, Michael A.
Quick, Jaye E.
Quirk, William J.
Radeff, Lewis J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ralph, Steve, Jr.
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Howard W.
Randall, Howard F., Jr.
Rasmussen, Robert L.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Ray, Glen P.
Rayder, Daniel F.
Read, Carlyle D., Jr.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reed, Robert G.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Reffitt, Raymond E.
Reger, William L.
Reilly, William F.
Reischauer, Robert E.
Reith, George, Jr.
Renz, Donald J.
Reynolds, James H.
Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
Rhodes, John P.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Stanley G.
Rich, Richard
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richardson, Harold M.
Riley, Raymond T.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Robertson, Coll E.
Robinson, Kirby L.
Robinson, Percy E., Jr.
Robinson, William A.
Rodgers, Dean T.
Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Rodgers, Thomas A.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr.
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rorie, "C" "J"
Rose, Hardy N.
Ross, Orrin B.
Rosson, James W.
Rowan, Thomas C.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Ruhsenberger, Roger H.
Rumplik, Rudolph H.
Rusch, John M.
Russ, William A.
Russell, John J., Jr.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sacks, Harold H.
Sanden, Oscar E., Jr.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanford, Stephen J.
Sanks, David R., III
Sapp, John, Jr.
Sargent, Richard E.
Saucier, Gerald
Saunders, Thomas J.
Sawyer, George A., Jr.
Sayer, William D.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schaefer, Gene R.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schimansky, John A.
Schroeder, Robert E.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schutz, Albert C., Jr.
Schwartz, Wallace J.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Frank P.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scully, John J.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seitz, Richard L.
Self, David L.
Semple, William C., III
Sesow, Anthony D.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shafer, William J. E.
Shakespeare, Franklin B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shaw, Warren L.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheehy, Eugene E.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Sheets, Roger E.
Shelley, Leon R.
Shepherd, David C.
Sherman, John W.
Shilling, John D.
Shine, Maurice J.
Shirley, William B.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.

Shuler, Olin J.
Signor, Philip W., Jr.
Sillars, Donald G.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simms, James T.
Simon, Douglas M.
Simpkins, George C.
Simpson, Bryan L., Jr.
Siska, Edward
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Skubinna, Myron A.
Slater, Donald L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Small, Joseph F.
Smevog, Herbert W.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, James H.
Smith, Jason J.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Paul J., Jr.
Smith, Robert M.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smith, William L.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Fred D.
Snyder, Ned "C"
Solan, Thomas V.
Sothan, Norman L.
Southerland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spanagel, Herman A., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Spaulding, Robert E.
Spear, Willard W., Jr.
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
Spradley, Van E.
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Stanard, John D., Jr.
Stanley, Edward E.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Thomas A.
Stark, Arthur R., Jr.
Stark, Gerry L.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Stevens, Jack D.
Stewart, Douglas A.
Stocking, William B.
Stolle, Edward St. C., Jr.
Stone, James M.
Storm, Richard E.
Story, Warren L.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stromme, Donald J.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Sturgeon, William J., III
Sudduth, Roger M.
Sullivan, Joseph E., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick G.
Sullivan, Thomas J.
Sullivan, Walter F.
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Swarztrauber, Sayre A.
Sweeney, John F.
Sweet, William J.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tally, Billy F.
Tappan, Jeremy R.
Tarlton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Richard F.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Tennyson, Richard B.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, Donald P.
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Douglas N.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, George I.
Thompson, Jack C., Jr.
Thonneson, Earling R.
Throop, James R.
Todd, Alexander M.
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweek, Billy B.
Treber, Gerald R.
Trebor-MacConnell, Barrie K.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Trowbridge, Vern H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Turk, Herman L.
Tuttle, John R.
Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Usilton, William B.
Vaden, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Van Hoof, Eugene R.
Van Horssen, David A.
Van Houton, Laurence P.
Van Valkenburg, George B.
Van Westendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Varney, Jack E.
Vaughan, Edgar, III
Velazquez-Suarez, Francisco A.
Vernon, Everett L.
Volatile, Thomas M.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wade, Thomas R.
Wagner, David F.
Waite, Charles E.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, Henry McD.
Walker, Peter R.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wallace, Thomas McC.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wallner, Michael P.
Walls, Richard B.
Walters, James B.
Wanamaker, John F.
Ward, Conley R.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, Thomas C.
Warthen, Donald
Wasson, John E.
Watson, Max H.
Watson, Wyatt P.
Weaver, James J.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James McA.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
Weedon, Robert E.
Weeks, Alan L.
Weeks, George H.
Weeks, Wayne F.
Wehrman, Philip W.
Weissman, Marvin M.
Wellings, John F.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Wenker, William A.
West, Gordon R.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetz, James E.
Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
Wheeler, James B.
Wheeler, John R.
Whiddon, Elmer C., Jr.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, John E.
White, Richard E.
Whittaker, Don J.
Whittier, James F.
Wilder, William E.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Willhauck, Aarion
Williams, Clyde V., Jr.
Williams, David W.
Williams, James G., III
Williams, Kenneth A.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Randall L.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Williams, Wallace E.
Williamson, Paul W.
Williamson, Robert L.
Willis, Jack R.
Wills, Doyne R., Jr.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Robert W., Jr.
Wilson, Samuel B.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Winfield, Gordon T., Jr.
Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
Wise, Peyton R., II
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Wolf, James D.
Wolff, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
Woodberry, Earle B.
Woodburn, Craig E.
Woods, Paul G.
Woods, Robert C.
Woodyard, Jon C.
Worth, Edward R.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William W.
Wunsch, John R.
Wyatt, Charles M.
Wynn, Carl E., Jr.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Yoder, Dwane F.
Young, Alfred A., III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zeithaml, Donald P.
Zemaitis, Robert J.
Zirkle, Forrest E.
Zirps, Christos

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS

Alleman, Howard
Anctil, Arthur O., Jr.
Anderson, Robert F.
Anderson, Daniel G.
Applegate, William V.
Arness, John A.
Baird, Robert M.
Baker, John H.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, William J.
Balas, George I.
Balster, Vernon H.
Barker, Dell J.
Bason, William M.
Beach, Thomas B.
Beaumier, John H.
Beddo, Byron L.
Beeby, James L.
Benoit, Fred L., III
Bergee, Harold E.
Betts, Gordon D.
Biemer, James J.
Biser, Christopher H.
Borin, Robert S.
Boucher, Wesley W.
Bouterie, Ronald L.
Boylan, Charles E.
Brighton, Carl T.
Brooks, Herbert E.
Bryan, Frank S.
Burr, John B.
Cagle, Donald R.
Cameron, Ronald R.
Cassidy, Walter J., Jr.
Chappelka, Alfred R., Jr.
Christian, Maynard S.
Coil, Edmonston F.
Colgrove, Robert C.
Collentine, Marvin E.
Collier, Terry M.
Corbett, John R.
Cosgrove, Theodore J.
Cremona, Frederick J.
Cureton, Richard K.
Daum, Jere J.
Davis, John W.
DeCaprio, Vincent H.
Defiebre, Bruce K., Jr.
DeFries, Hugh O.
Dewey, Albert W., Jr.
Doland, Kenneth D.
Dolan, Michael F.
Douglass, William C.
Elliott, Robert C.
Evans, Eldon L.
Evans, Fred S.
Ferre, George A.
Finch, John R.
Finney, Louis A.
Fisher, Elbert L., Jr.
Fithian, William W., Jr.
Folkner, Albert L.
Fortenberry, Ralph M.
Gallent, James H.
Garcia, Nicolas A. III
Giard, Henry L.
Gilbert, Allyn E.
Gillespie, James T., Sr.
Glover, James B.
Gramlich, Edwin P.
Greaves, Edward D.
Greene, Donald H.
Hamilton, Thomas P.
Hansen, James E.
Hargrave, Robert L.
Harmon, Stanley D.
Harper, Charles R.
Hayes, Jude R.
Hebert, James E.
Hillis, Jon K.
Huseby, Helmer W. S.
Irons, Howard S.
Jacobs, Edmund P.
James, Stephen H.
Kendra, Stephen J.
Kent, Tommy S.
Kinkel, Donald M.
Klingle, Francis L.
Knapp, Robert W.
Knox, Henry D.
Kohl, David H.
Koller, Elmer C., Jr.
Krepps, Arthur C., II
Kuehn, John L.
Langevin, Jack A.
Lansinger, Donald T.
Larocque, Normand P.
Larson, Willard A. E.
Lee, Joseph D.
Livingston, William O.
Loew, Albert G., Jr.
Lukash, William M.
MacCarthy, Denton E.
Madison, Gilbert I., Jr.
McHale, James J., Jr.
McMahon, George J.
Meehan, William L.
Menzel, Richard E.
Meredith, Robert C.
Merrill, Raymond E.
Metz, George E.
Miles, Donald R.
Millington, Richard A.
Milner, Johnny E.
Mitts, Murray G.
Modell, Jerome H.
Moquin, Ross B.
Morgan, Jacob R.
Mortensen, Norval
Mukomela, Arthur E.
Nelson, George A., Jr.
Nickel, Alvin L.
Norton, Robert K.
Norwood, Otar T.
Oldershaw, John B.
Olesijuk, Andrew
O'Neal, David M.
Pardue, Andrew M.
Payne, Stanley R.
Pearson, John M.
Pine, Harry L.
Posatko, Robert J.
Quinlan, Edward J.
Rack, William A.
Rehme, Arthur L.
Rogers, Richard L.
Ryskamp, James J., Jr.
Sacks, Ellsworth J., Jr.
Sand, Richard E.
Schaefer, David F.
Seeley, Richard J.
Segaul, Arthur I.
Sengstack, George F.
Settipane, Guy A.
Shackner, Alvin A.
Sheldon, Edward J.
Sierchio, Gerald P.
Sirois, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Bradley E.
Smith, Ronald W.
Southworth, Alvin J.
Spence, Kenneth F., Jr.
Steyn, Rolf W.
Strange, Robert E.
Svendsen, Fred J.
Sweeney, Lawrence
Talmadge, Bruce A.
Thillet, Ives C.
Thorp, James H. M.
Tolchin, Sidney
Torsney, Philip J., Jr.
Toussaint, Harold E., Jr.
Townsend, Guy B.
Trout, Monroe E.
Trump, Richard C.
VanPeenen, Peter F. D.
Voiss, Daniel V.
Wade, James B.
Wagner, Kenneth E.
Weiss, Edward B.
Weitzman, Gerald
Wentworth, Alan F.
Wood, George H., III
Woody, Ronald H., Jr.

LIEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Joseph P.
Alderman, Charles B.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Almen, Richard E.
Ashton, Merton E., Jr.
Ayling, Charles W.
Baker, Ernest L.
Bates, Robert L.
Bell, John L., Jr.
Blue, Frank H., Jr.
Bogorowski, Robert J.
Bolander, Jack "C"
Boyer, Charles L.
Brainard, John W.
Briggs, Irving G.
Brown, Boyd F., Jr.
Brown, Russell M.
Brunson, Robert L.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Bunker, Donald J.
Burlingham, Nathan N.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Carberry, Raymund G., Jr.
Carpenter, Charles F.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Christopher, Robert N.
Clancy, John F.
Clark, Roger S.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Connelly, Charles T.
Conner, Walter E.
Corn, James R.
Curtin, Pat
Curtis, Richard E.
Davis, William W.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Derby, Francis A.
Donzell, Richard J.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Earl, Bobby J.
Eastwood, William O., Jr.
Ebert, Scott W.
Ethridge, James D.
Felthousen, Charles E.
Fishback, Burney L., Jr.
Fiske, Leon S., Jr.
Flolid, Robert E.
Flores, Joseph L.
Freese, Ralph F.
French, Robert T.
French, Robert C.
Frost, Shirley D.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Giagni, Vincent J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Gilrod, Roy O.
Gray, Jack E.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Greer, Merwyn C.
Gunther, Roy W.
Haggard, Howard F.
Hamilton, Thomas, Jr.
Hemmert, George V.
Hendrickson, Richard
Hennessy, William J.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hill, Jesse R., Jr.
Hill, Robert E.
Hodges, William J.
Hohenstein, Charles R.

Hopgood, Roy E.
Howe, Donald K., Jr.
Hubbard, Charles C.
Jackson, Reuben J.
Jacobs, Frank S.
Jernigan, Joseph W.
Johnson, Jerry D.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kling, Fred A.
Knox, Arthur F., Jr.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kreutzinger, Donald R.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Lane, Anthony D.
Lang, Charles, Jr.
Larson, Nelson S.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lazarus, Steven
Lemly, William D.
Lenz, Allen J.
Lewis, John C.
Lindsay, William E.
Livermore, Robert E.
Long, Charles W.
Lovell, Donald E.
Lukens, Robert F.
Maldonado, Teodosio
Marek, Gardiner
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCoy, Thomas E., Jr.
McGee, James E.
McGillivary, Duncan P.
McMahan, Paul T.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Miller, Richard K.
Morehouse, Charles W.
Moyer, William R.
Mullen, James V.
Neelley, Charles G.
Newman, John F.
Normand, Robert L.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
O'Neil, Raymond L.
Osborn, Robert H.
Palmer, Donald R.
Paul, John W.
Pavlisin, Frank
Pokorny, Frank J., Jr.
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Pyper, Arthur G.
Quinn, Carl S.
Recher, Bernard L.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Russell, Frederick R.
Sabec, Edwin J.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sammons, Joseph E.
Sankey, Harry W.
Schanz, Thomas L.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert McB.
Schwenz, Richard W.
Scolpino, Frank J., Jr.
Sebes, Edward A.
Shipley, Robert W.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, George W., III
Strange, Hubert E., Jr.
Stumbaugh, David C.
Sumner, William M.
Taylor, James M.
Teaford, Sidney J.
Temte, Knute P.
Trimble, Philip
Van Scoyoc, James S.
Vogel, Ralph H.
Vollmer, Merle J.
Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
Waid, Stanley B.
Waldvogel, Henry J.
Walker, John A.
Ware, Arthur T.
Watt, Robert C.
Webb, Robert F.
Weber, Robert J.
Weisend, John G.
White, Frank L.
Wiener, Lawrence "S"
Wilczynski, Jeremiah
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wolfe, William D.
Wong, Ronald M.
Woodward, Ralph C.
Woolley, Herbert T.

LIEUTENANT, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Andress, Gene B.
Auel, Carl A.
Baker, Marvin D.
Beck, John T.
Bigler, Robert L.
Boreczky, John V.
Carpenter, Elbert N.
Clardy, William J.
Clifford, William "J"
Dietrich, Raymond J.
Dillard, Donald H.
Dodson, Leonard W., Jr.
Feagins, Walter B., Jr.
Fogarty, Daniel F.
Ford, Thaine E.
Gillis, Edward F.
Hershberger, John R., Jr.
Howard, Marvin W.
Ingebretson, Ervin D.
Janeway, James A.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Johns, Harry D.
Keen, Homer E., Jr.
Keenon, John C.
Kinlaw, Dennis C.
League, William C.
Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.
McAlister, Fred R., Jr.
Ota, Peter I.
Perry, Johnie L.
Plank, David P. W.
Ramsey, Vernon J.
Reagan, Ernest McD., Jr.
Richards, Sherman B.
Rittenhouse, James C.
Robertson, Donald L.
Samuel, William R.
Schmidt, Calvin F.
Schneider, Otto
Scott, Knox O.
Seim, James E.
Stevenson, Neil M.
Swenson, William R.
Thornberry, Roy V., Jr.
VanBeck, Alfred F.
Vanlaningham, Maurice R., Jr.
Veltman, Dean K.
Wuebbens, Everett P.
Zemites, Joseph F.

LIEUTENANT, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Agee, Aaron B.
Allen, Roy L.
Barber, Horace M.
Belton, Edward H.
Bigelow, David S.
Bischof, Ernest J.
Borberg, James R.
Bowers, Richard A.
Carioti, Bruno M.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
D'Emidio, Joseph A.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Erickson, James A.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gates, Charles W.
Gates, Paul R.
Hartell, William K.
Hines, John C.
Hoffner, Carleton C., Jr.
Houghton, Robert J.
Hrnjez, Nicholas C.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Johnson, Clarence B.
Johnson, Durrell A.
Jones, Horace B., Jr.
Jones, Thomas K.
Keegan, Robert D.
Koblos, Michael C.
Lapolla, Joseph
Lawson, LeRoy D.
Leavitt, Fred O.
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Mangan, Thomas J., Jr.
Mathews, Charles J.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
O'Leary, John F.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Reese, Joseph L., Jr.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Rickels, Jack C.
Robinson, Charles F.
Schellhardt, Richard H.
Scherer, Clark H., Jr.
Schoenagel, Fred C., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Smith, Matthias J.
Stultz, Bobby E.
Taylor, James T.
Thoman, Charles L.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Uhe, James L.
VanBelkum, Kenneth D.
Wear, John R.
White, Robert K.
Wilson, Dean G.
Woodring, John W.
Wright, John A.
Yoshihara, Takeshi

LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS

Allen, Robert W.
Argue, William F.
Baker, Ronald D.
Barlow, Doil E.
Bodner, Joseph A., Jr.
Bottomley, William K.
Bradford, Paul L. J.
Brewster, Jerry G.
Brown, Kenneth E.
Butler, George R., Jr.
Carrothers, Richard L.
Comcowich, William L.
Coombs, Paul S.
Cross, George B.
Cummings, Matthew R.
Cunningham, Charles J.
Dattilo, Bruno F.
DelGrande, Patrick A.
Diem, Charles R.
Dodds, Donald N.
Donofrio, Albert M.
Driscoll, John M.
Edwards, Richard C.
Eichel, Frederick P.
Fenster, Robert K.
Ferguson, David A.
Forte, John T.
Gensior, Arthur M.
Gherardi, Roy F.
Gholson, Dan C.
Giles, Norman B.
Good, Richard J.
Gordon, Jim D.
Grady, Charles J., Jr.
Grimsley, William A., Jr.
Grove, David M.
Hands, Dale F.
Harland, Robert J.
Heckel, Robert D.
Hill, Robert L.
Jacobson, Rudolph
Jayne, John H.
Kennedy, Larry H.
Kieny, Richard J.
Kimbrough, Harris McD., Jr.
King, Gordon E.
Landes, Robert P.
Lattner, Richard A.
Lolla, Richard V.
Mainous, Elgene G.
Marino, Louis J.
Mark, Leonard E.
Martin, William R.
Mayberry, Richard M.
McAndrew, James R.
McCann, Thomas F.
McDonald, Edwin E., Jr.
McDonnel, William J.
McGary, Charles W.
McLeod, Carlton J.
Messer, Eugene J.
Mielke, Dean T.
Miller, James E.
Moffitt, William C.
Molacek, Marvin J.
Moore, Robert E.
Muldrow, Lewis M.
Newell, William J.
Olson, Fred A.
Page, Roy C.
Peck, Robert B.
Perlitsh, Max J.
Petruccelli, Francis
Porter, William J.
Rusell, David T.
Ryan, Joseph P.
Schaeffer, Peter K.
Scharpf, Herbert O.
Sipe, Kenneth D.
Smith, Jerome A.
Strange, Charles G., Jr.
Stump, Thomas E.
Tibbetts, Van R.
Tietzer, Herbert O., Jr.
Tramontana, Joseph S.
Trusz, Edward J.
Valasek, Arden D.
Westerhoff, Warren R.
Whited, Don H.
Williams, Frederick B.
Wirthlin, Milton R., Jr.
Witte, Ernest T.
Wright, Henry G., Jr.

LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Ambrose, Edward A.
Arns, William E.
Ash, Lloyd M.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Becker, David E.
Buckley, Emanuel N.
Campbell, Howard B.
Cole, James R.
Cook, Paul E.
Dean, Jerdon J.
DeGrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diener, Richard V.
Dobbs, George I.
Elliott, Gordon E.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Havice, Andrew J.
Howard, John E.
Howard, Vaughn
Jones, Philip E.
Jordan, Ray D.
Kelley, Donald R.
Knight, Jerry B.
Longest, Clifford "B"
May, Carl R.
McDuffie, Wilbur B.
Nyman, George A.
O'Neill, Joseph M.
Peake, Stanley C.
Pribnow, James F.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Bill J.
Smith, Robert L.
Steward, Edgar T.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Voas, Robert B.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
White, Leland E.
Wimberly, Clyde O.
Wolf, John W.

LIEUTENANT, NURSE CORPS

Alexiou, Grace E.
Barry, Dorothy M.
Belair, Danya A. B.
Beveridge, Robina W.
Brogan, Mary A. M.
Burke, Lois E.
Burns, Patricia J.
Callahan, Dorothy H.
Davis, Rosemary
Durkin, Veronica A.
Fate, Phyllis B.
Fitzpatrick, Mary E. A.
Green, Dorothy J.
Gurgul, Stephanie D.
Hessel, Jane C.
Hockenberger, Charlotte E.
Job, Lucy A.
Lane, Grace A.
Martin, Zuleime L.
Mooney, Geraldine T.
Motomatsu, Toshiko
Peterson, Eleanor V.
Redgate, Janet M.
Roberts, Catherine V.
Shelton, Mildred L.
Smith, Margaret A.
Stack, Patricia J.
Walsh, Elizabeth A.
Warren, Ellen G.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert E. Anderson
David E. Atkinson
Edward W. Bailey
William C. Ballamy
William P. Bancroft
William A. Barclay
William W. Bartlett
Lawrence A. Bennigson
Dennis P. Bowen
Ralph B. Brown
Lawrence T. Browne
Robert LeR. Brower
Robert D. Burke
Gary LaV. Carlson
Paul A. Casey
Charles W. B. Connors
James H. Cunningham
John B. Dalton, Jr.
Duane L. DeWerff
Lawrence H. Dietrich
Robert F. Estes
Homer D. Evans
Phineas D. Evans
Eugene J. Flath
Earle S. Florance
George H. Foster, Jr.
Thomas G. Freeman, Jr.
Thomas H. Gabbard
Paul R. Gage
Will H. Gassett
Ronald E. Gast
Richard A. Geudtner
Richard A. Harris
Daniel R. Hegg
Boyd A. Henderson
John K. Hewitt
James R. Hutchins
Henry C. Jeffries, Jr.
Larry D. Johnson
Gordon S. Jones
Deane D. Judd
Ronald H. Julian
Jackie L. Keltner
George N. Keyser
Phillip K. Knouse
Ronald S. Koener
Tom B. Larsen
Emil H. Levine
Robert C. McConnell
William B. McCormick
Lawrence J. McDonnell
Thomas N. McDowell
LeRoy E. McLaurin, Jr.
Andrew J. Macaulay
Harry P. Mann
William B. Martin
Tatsuo Matsushita
Melvin D. Miller
Richard B. Mills
Joseph R. Musolino
Philip A. Nelson
Alan R. Newhouse
Theodore N. Pateas
Willis B. Perkins III
Paul E. Penn
Peter P. Philhower
John W. Pieper
James S. Poor
Thomas J. Powers
William A. Press
Norman A. Proffitt, Jr.
William W. Rhoades
Wendell C. Ridder
Harold P. Riley
Rex G. Roberts
Jack "W" Ross III
James H. Russell
John V. Russo
Loren L. Sanders
John E. Simkins, Jr.
Gerald M. Simmons
Thomas D. Smith
William J. Stewart
Thomas M. Tait
Frederick R. Taylor
Jonathan A. Topham
David A. Trebour
David W. Twigg
Paul D. Varady
Kenneth E. Vought, Jr.
Daniel D. Weber
Richard D. Wentzel
James R. Wiegley
Raymond G. Zeller

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the

Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Barber
Forrest R. England
Dan W. Sargent
Arthur D. Bert
William P. Hickey

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald R. Bradford
William H. Dittman
George H. Ginn
Stephen Staley Groves, II
John C. Kiefer
Richard Albert Schaeffer

Robert R. Gillespy, Jr., Naval Reserve officer to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Charles H. Miller (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Herbert L. Pope, Naval Reserve officer to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Warren C. Boop, Jr.
*Walter J. Cassidy, Jr.
*Jerry Cassuto
*Nicholas A. D'Amato
*Charles H. Dockhorn
*Vernon L. Goller
*Francis M. Highly, Jr.
*Elmer C. Koller, Jr.
*Louis E. Potvin
*William C. Prescott
*James J. Ryskamp, Jr.
*Howard A. Levin
*Robert C. Meredith
*Richard A. Millington
*Norval Mortensen
*Donald W. Sobel
*Alan C. Stormo

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Claude A. Barnhill
*Arthur A. Beaudry
*James K. Cooke, Jr.
*Tommy E. Hall
*Francis T. Kostohryz
*Robert H. Saxton
*John T. Vincent

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Tor Richter
*Frank G. Steen

*Robert M. Jennings (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Philip R. Falcone
*Joseph J. Lawrence, Jr.
*Robert R. Thomason
*James McC. Wilson

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Joseph A. Bodner, Jr.
*Joseph H. Burke
*Richard L. Carrothers
*Sam Castronovo
*Bruno F. Dattilo
*John S. Eppolito
*Robert E. Howe
*Robert P. Kuentzel
*Robert P. Landes
*James H. McLeran
*Leonard E. Mark
*Robert J. Pinkerton
*George W. Rice, Jr.
*Ronald M. Romaniello
*Harry E. Semler, Jr.
*Kenji Seo

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William R. Brown
*Thomas J. Charles, Jr.
*Robert V. Peterson

The following-named graduates from naval enlisted scientific educational program to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Lexie B. Boswell
*Richard F. Dehler
Robert F. Noland

*John P. Dobson, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Henry T. Koonce, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the line of the Navy for engineering duty, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Richard F. Johnston, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Clyde L. Ido, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Chester A. Adams
*William R. Andrews
*Dale E. Alexander
*Leon Austin
*Samuel S. Bable
*James E. Bagley
*Willie H. Ball, Jr.
*George J. Bauer, Jr.
*Willis D. Bender
*Frederick C. Bowley
*Anthony Ciotti
*William J. Clemente
*Willis D. Conner
*Anthony C. Coulapides
*Charles E. Craig
*Richard W. Culbertson
*Edward M. Deloury
*Merrill L. Dennis
*Victor C. Evans, Jr.
*Cornelius W. Fisher
*William F. Flannery
*John E. Flinn
*Wayne E. Fryman
*Norman H. Gelinas
*James E. Goforth, Jr.
*Cecil M. Greene
*Raymond E. Haney
*Edward M. Hart
*William C. Hatton
*Clifton W. Jenkins
*William T. Jennings
*Robert H. Keepin
*Alexander H. Kerns
*John N. Kull
*George E. Labor
*"J" "D" Lane
*Robert C. Lee
*Gordon E. Lindstrom
*Richard J. Logue
*Robin C. MacFadden
*James R. McCall
*George C. Meiers, Jr.
*Raymond R. Mulhearn
*Stanley E. Mumford
*Ernest E. Olds
*Walter H. Otte
*Stanley D. Peckham
*Charles R. Pilcher
*William F. Polzin
*Fred H. Qualls
*Arthur O. Richartz
*Lloyd T. Ritchie
*Laurentino Rodrigues
*Henry F. Rooney
*Earl W. H. Schultz
*Robert E. Shuford
*Gordon H. Simms
*Robert W. Smiley
*Billie J. Smith
*Fairon J. Smith
*Henry B. Stenson
*Thomas N. Thompson
*Video V. Tonelli
*Morris E. Upham
*Downey M. Ware
*Robert R. Warren
*Donald C. Wheeler
*Loran A. Wilcox
*Raymond M. Will
*Dallas K. Williams
*Arthur D. Wombold
*Jere W. Woodall
*Gene Yarber

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

*James W. Ahern
*Theodore L. Baron
*Francis X. Beaudin
*Felix Benoit
*Kenneth R. Benson
*James C. Buchans
*John F. Carr
*Alon E. Cawthon
*Lloyd C. Davis
*John F. Dodge
*Richard R. Dovalgo
*Alan R. Dvorak
*William T. Farrell
*Ernest G. Felcuth
*Leo Garcia
*Bernard S. Gath
*Clyde W. Hartsell
*Joe P. Harrison
*Robert J. Hawkey
*Donald G. Jerrell
*Stanley D. Jones
*James F. Kearns
*"J" "E" Lowry
*Glynn Martin
*William H. Maulin
*James T. McConnell
*Robert M. McFarling, Jr.
*Charles A. McLoon
*John N. Milliken, Jr.
*Michael L. Murphy
*Liborio W. Nobile
*Patrick H. Pearce
*Thomas M. Perkins
*John A. Petrilla
*Laroyce F. Rivers
*Kenneth L. Smith
*Lyal M. Stryker
*Richard D. Tuchscherer
*Alfred H. Wagner, Jr.
*Calvin R. Warner

ADMINISTRATION

*Berton E. Bresch
*Richard C. Cullen
*Leonard G. Davis
*Lawrence D. Duncan
*Allan L. Eaton
*Thomas Hamby, Jr.
*Leslie R. Kelsay
*Robert H. Morrison
*Estelito N. Potente
*William D. Riggs
*Lyle D. Rochholz
*Albert V. Schenfisch
*Charles F. Simons, Jr.

ENGINEERING

*Dewey E. Babb
*Willard D. Baker
*Robert D. Bell
*Dale St. John Betz
*Robert L. Borkert
*Francis L. Carroll
*Walter E. Copeland
*Ralph R. Devine
*Gilliam S. Dunn
*Oliver K. Evans
*William E. Evans
*Charles J. Fritz
*Richard E. Gehrlich
*Harry W. Harbin
*Cecil E. Jones, Jr.
*Robert B. Klausegger
*George S. Law
*Harry R. Long
*James G. McMichael
*Herbert D. Morisset
*Arthur P. Murray
*Joseph P. Neary
*John P. O'Malley
*John C. Recktenwald
*Robert E. Rowe
*Daniel M. Shovlin
*Wayne E. Staley
*Raphael T. Supersano
*Phillip S. Thompson
*John M. Watt, Jr.
*Charles A. Whitworth
*Richard A. Wigen
*Robert A. Wilson
*Avery G. Wood, Jr.
Raymond A. Hunter

ELECTRONICS

*Douglas W. Belsheim
*Clyde E. Brown
*Halbert G. Clark
*Richard R. Cornett
*Dick A. Danals
*Thomas A. Dzurko
*James H. Ecoff
*Raymond B. Ferris
*David L. Garner
*Donald R. Graham
*Robert B. Gross, Jr.
*Donald E. Haney
*Charles R. Hendon
*Leroy L. Hill
*Walter J. Hyde
*Allan F. Jamsgard
*Stephen Johnson
*Richard E. Lambert
*Donald W. Lampert
*Robert A. Litten
*Fred H. Lowery, Jr.
*John F. Lusby
*James B. Mason
*William A. Mitchell
*James R. Morrissey, Jr.
*William S. Neill
*James E. Olsen
*William A. Ottino
*Charles A. Pellegrini
*Harold E. Polaski, Jr.
*William M. Putnam
*Philip J. Rager, Jr.
*William C. Ryan, Jr.
*Robert M. Sajdera
*Billy K. Schisler
*Arthur J. Smith, Jr.
*"J" "B" Smith
*Robert L. Smith
*John H. Straub
*James R. Taylor
*Fred E. Thompson
*Paul E. Wall
*Patrick A. Walsh
*James K. Wolfgram

HULL

*James P. Cowell
*Charles R. Cornett
*Ronald Edwards
*William J. Flynn
*George W. Gould
*James M. Hagins
*Ronald D. Hanson
*John L. Heath
*Garth W. Johnson
*Calvin L. Jones
*Raymond A. Kraft
*Leon Mansi
*Walter E. O'Shell
*Harry Ray, Jr.
*Clarence H. Regner, Jr.
*Jack M. Ridens
*John A. Russick
*Omar M. Selland
*Ralph D. Sisk
*John N. Smith
*Alton B. Spann
*Clarence R. Taylor
*Garland W. Toomer
*James M. Vincent
*James Watkins
*Gerald F. Williams

SUPPLY CORPS

*Robert R. Austin
*Martin L. Beck
*Carleton W. Boutwell, Jr.
*Howard L. Fry
*William R. Kenly
*Albert J. Kennedy
*Raymond P. Lasher
*Fred O. McWhorter
*Matthew A. Stofanak
*Raymond J. Wynne
*Robert S. Yelle

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Arthur L. Newman

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Charles W. Bollinger

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Varro D. Anderson
*David G. Carruthers
*Charles E. Cater
*Paul W. Elkins

*Donald C. Johnsen	*Albert H. Robbins
*Thomas D. Martin	*James A. Sheler
*Samuel A. Miles II	*Richard H. Short

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Royce L. Cutler	*Gerald E. MacDonald
*George P. Edgell	*Dan G. Miller
*Robert G. Flynn	*Michael I. Opean
*Mark T. Fulmer	*Milton C. Otto
*Donald W. Johnson	*Olen D. Presley
*Gregory W. Jordan	*James D. Scrivner
*Robert W. LaFon	

The following named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kenneth A. Sadler

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Edward L. Abner	*Bobby N. Jackson
*John M. Barberi	*Charles T. Knight
*Earl C. Cleim	*John Koyiades
*Frank J. Cox, Jr.	*Richard White
*Daniel C. Georgia	*Lauritz W. Young
*Robert W. Greene	

The following named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William D. Bethea	Delmar D. Long
James S. Bowers	James W. Lowe, Jr.
Donald N. Broadwell	Robert D. Marshall
Michael C. Canaday	Miles C. Mays
Thomas J. Carroll	Bruce F. McMillan
Edward L. Chambless	Harry R. Metzler
Michael T. Crawford	Robert O. Meyer
David (n) Connell	Frank H. Miner, Jr.
Lynn A. Daubenspeck	Maurice C. O'Connell
MacGregor Flanders, Jr.	Scott C. Puckett
	James T. Sehulster
Charles G. A. Harmon, Jr.	Craig E. Shuler
	Jerry I. Simpson
Thomas C. Hendrix	Alexander R. Spellman
Richard C. Hippner	David R. Stefansson
Walton F. Hudson, Jr.	Kenneth J. Steiner
Frank A. Huey	Allan (n) Thompson
Alvin W. Jennings	Michael E. Tipton
Burrell H. Landes, Jr.	Gary E. Todd
Garland M. Lasater, Jr.	James H. Tumlinson III
David A. Lefeve	Arthur L. Wallace, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 5: 9: *Wherefore we labor that we may be accepted of Him.*

O Thou who art great in might and in mercy, in this moment of prayer, we are praising Thee for Thy goodness and seeking those needed blessings which Thou alone canst give.

We penitently confess that so frequently we betray and break faith with our better self and lapse from loyalty to Thee and allow the baser impulses to have their way with us.

Wilt Thou quicken and gird us with Thy spirit that in all the various circumstances of life we may do Thy will with humility and sincerity.

Inspire us to carry on with faith and hope when the burdens of life become heavy and fears threaten to enslave us.

Show us how we may meet the hardships and weather the storms which we encounter in our journey toward the desired haven.

Hear us as we cry out, "Jesus Saviour, pilot me." Amen.

* Indicates ad interim appointment.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SCOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 15, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Administration Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely,

WILLARD S. CURTIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives. It has been a privilege and pleasure to work with the members of this committee, and I regret I must discontinue this association.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. LAFORE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 15, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: It is with regret that I submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It has been a privilege and honor to work with the many fine members of this committee during the 85th and 86th Congresses, during which time it formulated historic statehood legislation.

My association with this committee will remain a pleasant and enlightening experience.

Respectfully,

HAROLD R. COLLIER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 420) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York.

Committee on House Administration: JOHN KYL, Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: JOHN KYL, Iowa.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: WILLARD S. CURTIN, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Ways and Means: JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CONSENT CALENDAR, PRIVATE CALENDAR, AND CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar today, the Private Calendar tomorrow, and the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LET US GET RID OF THE PEEPHOLES IN THE POST OFFICES

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, you remember that terrifying book by George Orwell entitled "Nineteen Eighty-Four."

Last week I was shocked to discover that in the post offices of this country, 1984 is already here. When I went through our new post office building at Ravenswood, W. Va., I saw that at great expense there has been constructed a corridor along one side and through the middle of the mailing room. Along this corridor are peepholes, hidden in panels and equipped with one-way glass, through which snooping postal inspectors enter secretly to spy on postal workers to try to find them loafing or see that they do not steal anything.

Mr. Speaker, this is going on in post offices all over the country. Inspectors can sneak into town and set up their gestapo watch through private doors and special keys, unknown to the postal employees. I say this is an insult to thousands of hard-working postal clerks.

These peephole facilities actually cost millions of dollars in special construction, and they do not accomplish anything that tight supervision could not cure. But worst of all, this peephole policy is like a gestapo, and it has been misused to spy on union meetings, and embarrass postal employees in matters which should remain personal.

The peepholes cover nearly all of the post offices. They have peepholes to cover where the employees have their lunch. They have peepholes so they can look and listen in on union meetings if held in the post office. The peepholes even look into the men's room. Apparently the only place the Post Office Department has drawn the line is at the women's restroom.

The editor of the Ravenswood News, Phil Fourney, in denouncing this practice, reported that a postal inspector at Ravenswood boasted "they often spend 18 hours or more in their peephole area observing activities of postal employees."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Postmaster General Summerfield may want to place signs so all post office employees can see them, and the signs might read: "Big Brother Arthur is watching you."

I intend to find out how much of the taxpayers' money goes into constructing these vicious, un-American, and insulting peephole spy systems.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of freedom and Americanism, let us treat our postal employees as human beings and get rid of the peepholes in the post offices.

U.S. MARINES MARCH FROM MOUNTAINS TO SEA IN FIGHT AGAINST DISEASE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Marines represent the American military at its best. Every child in America has heard the expression "The Marines have landed—the situation is well in hand." The Marines ask for the hard jobs, the difficult jobs, the unusual jobs. The Marines accomplish the impossible.

Some time ago a young marine, a gunnery sergeant by the name of Willie Fleming, of Pacolet, S.C., along with Cpl. Philip Lassiter, of Corinth, Miss., and S. Sgt. Dave Corbitt, of Axson, Ga., obtained permission from their commanding officer at the Beaufort Air Station, Beaufort, S.C., to participate in the March of Dimes. As everyone knows, the March of Dimes is that magnificent program begun many years ago, whereby the whole Nation contributes to the conquest of poliomyelitis. These marines asked permission to march the length of South Carolina with full battle dress, including helmet. They also proposed, and got permission, to take the time from their annual leave to complete the 17-day ordeal. For each step during this 375-mile march, they would ask a dime be given in every city, town, and hamlet through which they passed.

On Wednesday, January 20, the march will terminate back at their home base in Beaufort, S.C. at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Representatives of the Marine Corps and of the U.S. Marine Reserves in South Carolina will be there to greet them along with dignitaries from all walks of life. I plan to be among the group to welcome these fine young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this march will not be an easy one; it has not been easy. Through wind, sleet, and snow they have made their journey in an effort to eradicate some of the most insidious diseases ever to attack the human body. Mr. Speaker, I know of no undertaking so unique or so worth while. I know of no undertaking that has so captivated the imagination of all people in my part of the United States. All marines, regular and reserve, have backed this project. Col. Ted Watson—a distinguished Marine Reserve colonel from Greenville, S.C.—has actively encouraged these young men. He has constantly brought their march to the attention of every area through which they have passed. All people have contributed as they have trod from the mountains to the sea.

Mr. Speaker, I want the whole Nation to know of this great and unique march by these distinguished young Americans. They have the appreciation of all of us and they have the admiration, respect, and affection of Americans strong and weak. They have performed a great service in the common fight against disease.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therewith some newspaper clippings on the march:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 5, 1960]

MARINES START LONG MARCH FOR DIMES

SPARTANBURG.—Three tough young leathernecks stepped off Monday on a heel-blistering 375-mile march to the coast for the March of Dimes.

They hope to collect donations of 10 cents for every step of the way from Pacolet to Beaufort. Based on the 792,000 steps they figure it will take, that will be $79,200 to fight polio.

Sgt. Willie Fleming, 34, of Pacolet; Sgt. Dave Corbitt, 30, of Axson, Ga.; and Cpl. Philip Lassiter, 19, of Corinth, Miss., form the trio. They are based at the Marine Beaufort Air Station.

Each carries a 28-pound pack, mostly clothing. In case of bad weather, they will use shelter halves. Otherwise they will sleep under the stars.

They collected $56 on the 10-mile trek into Spartanburg from Pacolet, where they started. An additional $144 was sent by donors into the March of Dimes headquarters here.

They were to camp out on the dual lane highway between Spartanburg and Greenville Monday night and head for Greenville Tuesday morning.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 16, 1960]

MARCHING MARINES REACH SUMMERVILLE IN POLIO FUND DRIVE

Three Marines, marching from the mountains to the sea in a drive to raise funds for the National Foundation's New March of Dimes received a warm welcome yesterday at Summerville. The tired trio reached the Flower Town in the Pines about 5 p.m. after an all day trek from St. George, 27 miles further inland. They were welcomed by a group of Summerville citizens including Mayor L. Hayden Doty, Mrs. Frank Rehak, Jr., Capt. John M. Moore, South Carolina National Guard, A. M. Barshay, representing the town's merchants, DaCosta Muckenfuss, and others. The three Parris Island Marines are Gunnery Sgt. Willie Fleming, of Pacolet; Cpl. Philip Lassiter, of Corinth, Miss.; and S. Sgt. Dave Corbitt, of Axson, Ga. After witnessing fund collecting in the Summerville Town Square, the trio were fed. They bedded down for the night on the grounds of the Summerville Presbyterian Church. The Marines will break camp early today and head for Charleston. They are scheduled to enter the city sometime this afternoon and will camp at White Point Gardens on the Battery tonight. The 53d Rifle Company, U.S. Marine Reserves, of Charleston is cooperating with the local March of Dimes program and will act as hosts to the three Marines here. The trio is on special furlough. Their aim is to raise 10 cents for each step they take in their march from Pacolet to Beaufort. They will leave Charleston at 6 p.m. tomorrow and head southward toward their goal. They have visited Spartanburg, Greenville, Columbia, Orangeburg, St. George, and Summerville in addition to other towns along their route.

NONVOTING DELEGATE FROM GUAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 86th Congress convened on January 6, 1960, the Congress of the United States, for the first time in 163 years, was without territorial representation. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, of course, is not a territory.

When the 1st session of the 86th Congress convened Hawaii was a territory, and its nonvoting territorial delegate was our former beloved colleague, the Honorable John A. Burns. It was not until late in the first session, that Hawaii having attained statehood, the Honorable DANIEL KEN INOUYE, the popular, able, and dedicated Representative from the State of Hawaii, came to replace Delegate Burns, of the Territory of Hawaii.

The present 86th Congress is the first Congress since 1797 that includes in its composition no delegate from any territory. I have seen no newspaper comment on this phase, at least none stressing its historic significance. In fact in our entire history only four Congresses have had no territorial representation—the 1st Congress, the 2d Congress, the 5th Congress, and the 86th Congress.

In the First Congress—1789–91—only the Thirteen Original States were represented. In the Second Congress—1791–93—there were 15 States, Vermont and Kentucky having been added without serving territorial apprenticeship in the Congress.

After that each Congress—with the exception of the 5th—until the 86th Congress had in addition to its State delegations delegates from territories later destined for statehood. The reason there was no territorial representation in the Fifth Congress was by that time what had been in the Third and Fourth Congresses the territory south of the River Ohio had become the State of Tennessee and it was not until the Sixth Congress—1799–1801—that the territory northwest of the River Ohio entered the Halls of Congress.

The territory northwest of the River Ohio served out its apprenticeship in the Sixth and Seventh Congresses, entered the Eighth Congress as the State of Ohio. Meanwhile Mississippi Territory had come to Congress, later joined by Indiana Territory, the Territory of Orleans, and in the 12th Congress—1811–13—Illinois Territory.

So it went on and on in the long period of our cementing of a sisterhood of 50 States, with territorial apprenticeship in the Congress awaiting new territories as old territories became new States. On and on for 163 years until this January 1960.

Representation in the Congress by a nonvoting Delegate has given to our fellow Americans, residing in territorial domains, a recognition and a dignity that for 163 years has brought rich results in the development of our representative democratic government. I hope that in the 87th Congress we will return to the old pattern.

Guam is our most farflung territory. Under the organic act it has made marvelous progress. Its legislative body, presided over by the distinguished and able Speaker Won Pat, well known to us in Washington, is modeled on the Congress of the United States, as are our State legislatures, and its influence in that faraway area in the Pacific is large and important.

I am not a member of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction in this field and the members of which are of course much better informed, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I do not hesitate to say that the seating in the Congress of a nonvoting Delegate from Guam would have most wholesome repercussions.

I shall support a bill giving nonvoting representation to Guam if one is introduced by a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and favorably reported by that committee. Its passage would mean a return to the old and honored pattern.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY CONTRACTORS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last June in the debate on the Defense Appropriation Act of 1960, the House was promised that an inquiry on the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors would be made by the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of which I have the honor to be chairman.

On June 23, 1959, promptly after Mr. VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, directed the inquiry, I addressed a letter to all Members of the House and to the Senate, requesting any information they might have bearing upon this subject.

There has been put in every Member's office today, the printed text of our hearings together with the report of my subcommittee, unanimously adopted and approved by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

I have dropped in the hopper, today, a bill containing the subcommittee's recommendations. This, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, directed me to do. It is their bill as well as my own even though under House Rules it bears my name alone.

To summarize:

We would extend the coverage of the criminal statutes contained in title 18, United States Code, relating to the activities of retired commissioned officers and separated civilian personnel, within 2 years next after their separation.

To accomplish this: Section 1 of our bill introduces a new section 292. We have broadened section 283 and extended the coverage of section 284 of title 18, United States Code.

The purpose of these amendments is to stop selling. We propose to bar selling information acquired while in Federal commissioned service or otherwise, for a period of 2 years. These sections contain criminal penalties.

It is our hope that they clearly express the intent of the Congress; and that they are enforceable, and will be enforced.

Next, we have struck out what we feel is an unnecessary and discriminatory penalty upon naval and marine regular officers selling of war material and supplies to that department, while Army and Air Force officers were not under the same limitations. This Navy statute is partial and punitive, beyond the point of usefulness.

We propose a law which across the boards at all times for 2 years after retirement forbids retired pay to any commissioned officer engaged in selling, directly or indirectly, to the Department of Defense.

After 2 years, we feel that the hold of old associations will have been diluted by time. This is the cooling period of 2 years as to which there has been no noticeable dissent.

Finally, we have equalized certain opportunities. We have amended the dual compensation statute to provide, that without interrupting the career of civil service system, if the Secretary of Defense shall find the indispensable man to give the unique service which none other can supply, then he may without the restrictions of that act appoint a retired military officer and certify the action he has taken to the Congress.

The requirement that the Secretary must be personally responsible for such an appointment will, we feel, keep the exception from being abused. Likewise, we amend the dual office statute to lift the ban on officers retired for age or length of service, who, alone of all commissioned officers are now restricted by this act.

There are ethical considerations, applicable as well to all persons, as to those in retired military status. These should be made clear in a code of conduct. It should be unnecessary for the Congress to set up by legislation the details of moral and personal obligations which men of honor ought to observe. There are bounds of propriety which can be spelled out in the military profession just as in other professions. The judgment of ostracism which follows upon the violation of these codes, the scorn of upright and self-respecting professional men, should be sufficient punishment throughout the years for those who abuse the confidences obtained while in the armed services.

Now, to sum up: The subcommittee proposes to stop selling of any kind under any pretext for 2 years after departure from the Pentagon, and we think selling has a well understood meaning; and we think it embraces every form of engagement which results in the extraction of money from the public purse by reason of knowledge and associations obtained through Government service.

The subcommittee did not engage in a punitive expedition. But many instances disclosed in the testimony and the cold statistical record leave some important questions unanswered.

First. Salaries when measured against the statement of duties performed left me at least not quite satisfied that all of the salaries were associated with pious hard work.

Second. The coincidence of increased company business and the employment of retired officers may have been accidential but it left me skeptical.

Therefore, we have determined to outlaw the "salesmen" for 2 years. I have no pride of language but, as clearly as it can be expressed, I hope this bill gives effect to that objective.

We want to prevent the exploitation of Government knowledge. We want to obtain for the hundreds and hundreds of officers in all grades, especially the lower grades, the opportunity to usefully employ their skills after they are no longer needed in the military service. All anyone must do now is stay away from selling.

The salaries encountered most frequently were about $700 per month. This is far below the grade of corresponding technical civilian competence.

It is a rather sad commentary upon the distinction made by many defense department contractors who have eyes only for the stars in technical liaison. A $40 billion budget bears watching.

THE SITUATION IN THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Canal Zone is an area where the United States, through treaties with Panama, exercises in perpetuity all those rights which we would possess and exercise if we were the actual sovereign of the territory.

The Department of State is currently giving consideration to a request by the Republic of Panama that the Panamanian flag be flown in the Canal Zone. On the surface, this may appear to be a small request. There are implications involved, however, which might have extremely serious and far-reaching effects.

There seems to be some sharp division of opinion within the executive branch concerning the advisability of granting such permission, and many Members of Congress have also voiced their deep sense of personal concern and misgiving.

The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs is currently holding hearings on this matter. These hearings have not yet been finished and we will continue to receive views and recommendations from official and private sources.

As our subcommittee hearings have progressed it has become increasingly apparent that flying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone would be a major deviation from our previously established policy. We have come to no decision concerning its advisability, but I am convinced that it would be an action which should not be undertaken by the executive branch alone.

I have, therefore, today introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress "that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty, shall only be made pursuant to treaty."

This resolution simply expresses the sense of the Congress that a matter of such potential and far-reaching importance be undertaken only after full consideration by both the Executive and that body of the Congress which is charged under the Constitution with the exercise of such responsibility.

We wish to maintain the best and most friendly relations with the people of Panama and we wish also to fulfill the great responsibility which we undertook with the construction of the canal. I am firmly convinced that the procedure called for in my resolution will eventually do more to help avoid misunderstandings with Panama than unilateral acts of grace by the executive branch alone.

CLARENCE S. WIBEL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tonight in Boston a testimonial dinner is being given for a very able and distinguished employee of the U.S. Government. On January 31, 1960, Mr. Clarence S. Wibel will retire from the Inspection Service of the U.S. Post Office by virtue of having reached the mandatory age limit of 70.

In his long and noteworthy career of over 50 years, Mr. Wibel has made many friends. These friends are honoring him tonight on his 70th birthday with this testimonial banquet. I wish so much that I could be in Boston tonight and join in the honoring of Mr. Wibel. However, due to a previous engagement here in the Capital which I have had for some time, I shall be unable to fly to Boston for this occasion. I would want to pay tribute to Mr. Wibel's lovely wife, who has been an inspiration.

During his career as chief inspector of the U.S. postal service in the Boston regional area, Mr. Wibel always has been extremely courteous and cooperative, not only with me but with everyone requiring his services. He has made a great contribution to the efficient operation of the U.S. post office in the Boston area.

Mr. Wibel's career in the postal service extends over a period of 51 years. He entered the service at the age of 18 as a substitute clerk in the Denver, Colo., post office at 30 cents an hour. Progressing through the ranks, Mr. Wibel attained the position of foreman in this office and in July of 1923 was appointed to the Inspection Service. He served as an inspector in St. Louis, Denver, and Washington, D.C., before coming to Boston in June 1937. On October 1, 1953, he became postal inspector in charge at the Boston office, which position he is now leaving by reason of reaching the mandatory age of 70 for retirement. His service in the Inspection Service has covered all fields encompassed by that branch of the Department.

It is interesting to note that following his first 6 months' assignment at Pine Bluff, Ark., his inspector in charge elatedly reported that Inspector Wibel had expressed no discontent with his territory, which had theretofore been a problem to man because of the high incidence of malaria. Subsequently Inspector Wibel was commended for his extraordinary industry in general and specifically for his tenaciousness in obtaining a confession from a postmaster who had faked a $1,000 holdup and claimed its proceeds.

In keeping with the pattern of industry and conduct he had demonstrated in the post office, Mr. Wibel progressed through the ranks of the service willingly accepting assignments regarded as undesirable by many and tackling the most difficult problems with vigor.

During his career he served in the St. Louis, Denver, Washington, and Boston divisions. In the mid-1930's his persistence and attention to detail brought about the recovery of $10,000 taken in a mailtruck holdup in Charlotte, N.C., and permitted the successful prosecution of a New Jersey doctor who had received the stolen money.

During the war years his initiative and insight into operating problems was of particular value in the Boston area in assisting in the establishment of facilities for mail for the Armed Forces in the face of trying manpower and equipment shortages.

It was in 1953 in recognition of his experience, leadership abilities, tact, and diplomacy he was appointed inspector in charge of the Boston Division, where he has continued to display untiring and loyal devotion to the principles of the service and deicated competence in the direction of its affairs in his area.

On January 31, 1960, Mr. Wibel will have completed 51 years in the employment of the U.S. Post Office. Over a half of a century is a long time. As an anecdote of interest, when he was first sworn into the postal service in 1908 by the assistant postmaster at Denver, the then young Wibel was told, "Young man, don't think this is a permanent appointment." After a half century, Mr. Wibel states this appointment was not permanent, it lasted only 51 years.

I believe the Congress would like to send congratulations to a great public servant, a great American—Inspector Clarence S. Wibel—and to his real helpmate and splendid son.

THE LATE A. B. GRAHAM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I announce to the House the death the day before yesterday, in Columbus, Ohio, of A. B. Graham, the father and the founder of the 4–H Clubs of America. He was 92 years old. He founded the first 4–H Club in a country school in Champaign County, of which he was a native in my district 58 years ago.

Just a few years ago the Government of the United States honored the 4–H Clubs and Mr. Graham by the issuance of a special postage stamp. He also headed up the first agricultural extension department of any university in this country, at Ohio State University.

Mr. Graham lived a long and honorable life, and was revered by all who knew him. Of course, his living monument will be the 4–H Clubs, which have done so much for the rural youngsters of this Nation.

The following article concerning Mr. Graham appeared in the Washington Post of January 16, 1960:

ORGANIZER OF 4–H CLUBS

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 15.—A. B. Graham, 92, died in a suburban rest home last night, 58 years after he organized what became the world's first 4–H Club.

The movement, which began in Springfield, Ohio, on January 15, 1902, has since spread over the world.

Born on a farm near St. Paris, Champaign County, in 1868, Mr. Graham rose from the post of teacher of a one-room country school to become the first director of the agriculture extension at Ohio State University in 1905. He was the first full-time extension director in the Nation.

His club, organized in Springfield as a boys' and girls' agriculture club, was grouped under the name 4–H in 1930 with similar clubs.

Mr. Graham retired in 1938 after 23 years of developing methods of extension teaching for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has called upon Congress to reduce expenditures and balance the budget. I call upon the administration to collect the millions of dollars which aircraft companies owe to the people of the United States which the Federal Renegotiation Board has determined they have made as excess profits. On August 26, 1959, I brought to the attention of the House that certain aircraft companies were resisting the refund to our Government of the amount of excessive profits from payments made by the Federal Government. The law requires that these excessive profits be returned to the United States after the Federal Renegotiation Board has determined that the companies have overcharged the Federal Government.

Since Congress adjourned in September, determinations have been made by the Federal Renegotiation Board, and once again, we find aircraft companies which are the recipients of defense contracts by negotiation without competitive bidding, refusing to refund to the Government the taxes on excessive profits which they have earned.

I want to bring to the attention of this House the failure to cooperate on the part of the Boeing Airplane Co., the Martin Co., and Lockheed Aircraft Co. I also wish to bring to the attention of the House the fine cooperation of the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., which apparently has listened to the demands of the people and the Congressmen, and since my last speech made payment to the Government on taxes of $8,500,000 excessive profits which it owed for the years 1951 and 1953.

I wish to report that the Boeing Airplane Co., which received defense contracts from our Government in fiscal year 1958 to the extent of $2,131 million and for the fiscal year 1959, received in contracts $1,166,511,000, however, once again resisted payment to the Government of the taxes on $6,784,165 which it made in excessive profits in the year 1955. As I reported to you before, the Boeing Airplane Co. in the year 1954 made in excessive profits $10 million and refuses to make payment thereon.

The Martin Co., in fiscal year 1958, received $400,200,000 of defense contracts and in fiscal year 1959 received in defense contracts by negotiation and without competitive bidding $524,063,000. It was determined by the Federal Renegotiation Board that the Martin Co. earned in excess profits the sum of $3,500,000 in 1955. The Martin Co. has refused to pay to the people of the United States the taxes on the excessive profits of $6,250,000 earned in 1954, and now once again $3,500,000 on the excessive profits for the year 1955.

This is the same company which entertained many of the Pentagon officials and retired officers in the Bahamas, and saw nothing improper or untoward in the fact that a defense contractor entertained important Pentagon officials with whom it discussed the weapons procurement and contracts relative thereto.

In 1955 it was determined by the Federal Renegotiation Board that for the year 1955 Lockheed Aircraft Corp. earned $3,500,000 as excessive profits and owed the Government the taxes thereon. Lockheed Aircraft owes taxes on its $6 million excessive profits which it made in 1953 and the taxes on its $6 million excessive profits which it made in 1954. The total amount that it refuses to pay taxes on is $15,500,000.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. is another one of the favorite companies of the defense contractors. For fiscal year 1958 it received $755,100,000 and for fiscal year 1959 it received $886,462,000 of defense contracts not given on a competitive basis.

The President should call upon these companies which are making tremendous profits from defense contracts to make refunds so that we need not borrow funds to pay them on their defense contracts to the extent of their indebtedness. Perhaps the retired military officers employed by these companies will use their influence to have them pay.

I commend the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., which I criticized in my speeech of August 26, 1959, because they have withdrawn their suits against the Government and have permitted the Government to collect on the bonds which guarantees the payment of taxes on the $8,500,000 of excessive profits which it made during 1951 and 1953.

I urge that the Attorney General act diligently in the collection of these claims for refunds against companies like Boeing Airplane Co., Lockheed Aircraft, and the Martin Co., and I once again urge the Defense Department not to favor those defense contractors who refuse to refund their excessive profits and cause this Government to borrow more money than necessary.

FREE ACCESS TO FEDERAL INFORMATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of every Member of Congress an excellent article by Dr. Clark Mollenhoff, who has long been in the forefront of the fight for free access to Federal information.

The article was published in the January 1960 issue of Nieman Reports and is based on the eighth annual Lovejoy lecture given at Colby College by Dr. Mollenhoff when the college awarded him an honorary doctorate of laws. It is one more in the series of magazine articles, newspaper stories, speeches, and other public pronouncements by Dr. Mollenhoff which are part of his aggressive attempts as a working reporter to find out the facts of Federal Government.

Last year, in the July 1959 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, an article by Dr. Mollenhoff outlined the dangers to a democratic society posed by the growing restrictions on information from the executive branch of the Federal Government. The effect of the Atlantic Monthly article has been noticeable. It contributed, I believe, to some of the developments in Congress which helped reassert the people's right to know about their Government. I hope Dr. Mollenhoff's most recent article will have a comparable effect.

The article follows:

SHIELD OF SECRECY—THE CLAIM OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

On the surface it would appear there are few threats to the free press today. Those who are critical of governmental officials or of the great institutions of our Nation do not have their presses smashed, nor are they likely to be subjected to the continuous personal harassment that resulted in the death of Elijah Parish Lovejoy.

Today there is the tendency in America to take our freedoms for granted. We assume that freedom of the press is so well established that it will always be with us. Our daily newspapers are filled with columns of print exposing wrongdoing, and criticizing the mistakes of judgment by our public officials, our labor leaders, our television performers and television executives. Many newspapers pride themselves on finding room for all points of view, and have demonstrated it by carrying columnists who are as far apart as the conservative David Lawrence and such a liberal as Marquis Childs.

Members of the public and many newspapermen are inclined to accept the idea that the American people are so steeped in the traditions of a free press and its part in a democracy that no public official would dare to attack our idealistic concept of an uncensored and independent press. There is the view that Americans, born and reared in this tradition, would rise in fury to strike down the Government officials who would seek to control or suppress the Nation's newspapers. We often hear it said that Americans, reared in an atmosphere of freedom, would not put up with the encroachments on liberty that have been forced on people behind the Iron Curtain. We are told that they would not put up with the kind of conditions that have stifled many freedoms in our own hemisphere.

It seems to me that this philosophy of the indomitable American presupposes that Americans are somehow braver, stronger, wiser, and more valiant than people living in other parts of the world. I would think that the present stage in the space race would teach us that Americans have no monopoly on wisdom, enterprise, strength, or know-how. For years we kidded ourselves into thinking, simply because we are Americans, with many advantages over the Russians, that we were guaranteed a long lead in the fields of nuclear weapons, aircraft, and space exploration. In recent years we have seen our lead dwindle and vanish while many of our leading scientists have complained that nonsensical security on many matters interfered with our scientific progress.

Now, many realists are willing to admit that we Americans have no guaranteed superiority in scientific areas. We have been forced to learn the hard way that the rate of accomplishment in scientific areas is tied pretty closely to our willingness to work, to study and make sacrifices.

There is little in our lazy, well-fed, luxury-loving attitudes of the present to make me believe that any great number of Americans have awakened to the recognition that we are not a super race. There is little to indicate that any large segment of the American people recognize that we must work and study to recognize when there are encroachments on our freedoms, or risk seeing these freedoms go down the drain as has our lead in the scientific field.

My concern today is over the apathy that exists toward serious encroachments on the right of access to information. It is an apathy that covers not only the general public but a good many representatives of the press. This lack of concern is either the result of a lack of knowledge of what a free press means to a democracy, lack of enough interest to dig in and learn where some arbitrary governmental secrecy policies can take us, or lack of guts to speak out.

It is time that more Americans recognize that we are no brighter, stronger, or more courageous than many people who have been crushed by totalitarian governments. We are only luckier—luckier because we are fortunate enough to be living in a free nation.

We are fortunate that the slogans of a free press are deeply enough rooted in our history that few American political figures would take the risk of any direct attack on the institution of the free press. I have no doubt that a direct attack on the free press would result in a loud outcry from the press itself, and from a few citizens. There is a recognition of the possibility of political repercussions from a direct assault on the press, and public officials are almost unanimous in giving at least lipservice to the concept of an uncensored press. But, many of these same public officials find indirect ways to control the information available to the press.

They also find subtle ways to influence or coerce reporters or columnists who are too aggressive and too critical.

What are the subtle methods used to influence the press?

There are the smooth public relations operators who are helpful to the point where some newsmen lean on them too much, and forget how to do their own digging and thinking.

There is the misuse of security classifications—top secret, secret, and confidential—to withhold information that should not be classified. This is a particularly effective means for officials in the Pentagon to cover up mistakes as well as improprieties. This overclassification is expensive from a standpoint of the extra cost to the Government where there is misuse of Government property or the rigging of Government contracts.

There are efforts to give the impression that material is being withheld for security reasons, when it is actually being withheld for political purposes.

There is the practice of officials being unavailable or slow in responding to calls from reporters who are regarded as critical of the administration in power.

There is the practice of granting special interviews or other privileges (such as invitations to the White House dinners) to reporters who are regarded as basically friendly.

Most important, there are the efforts to hide arbitrarily the records of executive agencies on grounds that some vague national interest unconnected with security is involved in refusing to divulge confidential executive communications.

We of the press must accept the fact that an aggressive press will always be faced with some obstructions or harassment. Regardless of which political party is in power, there will always be some men in the administration who will adopt the attitude that public business is not the public's business.

I would like to emphasize at this point that I do not believe the press is entitled to any special access to information. We should be entitled to the same access that every citizen should have in a democracy if the citizen is to inform himself on how officials are handling his Government.

I would also like to warn that the freedom of the press and the rights of citizens in a democracy are not an issue when a woman columnist refuses to tell a court the source of her hearsay information on the temperament or excessive weight of a movie and television actress. Gossip columns, comics, and a good many other features in our newspapers are mainly froth to attract readers, and have little connection with the real purpose of a free press—the informing of the public on the conduct of Government and on other matters that are vital to the general welfare.

Labor organizations operate under the privileges of special laws. The steel industry is a basic industry, tied to our national defense and to the public welfare. Television channels operate on Government licenses, and represent a powerful force in molding public opinion. These are areas in which the press and the public have an interest second only to the conduct of public affairs by Government officials.

Government secrecy represents our major reason for concern today.

A few of these secrecy-minded officials are malicious and tyrannical despots with no real concept of the responsibility to the public that is inherent in the operation of a true democracy. Such figures can grow even in a democracy.

But, I would say that a majority of those who erect secrecy barriers are well-meaning, but misguided and shortsighted.

These secrecy fanatics include men who believe a near totalitarian type of censorship is needed to protect U.S. secrets from the Kremlin. Read the testimony before the congressional committees and you will see who they are.

There are other secrecy fiends who rationalize the hiding of matters that have no connection with military secrecy on grounds that information released by the Government will be slanted or twisted by political enemies. They rationalize their own slanting of Government press releases on grounds it is really in the national interest.

There is also the secrecy group that argues that secret discussions of governmental problems result in greater efficiency, and more frank discussions of different viewpoints.

Each of these groups overlooks the long documented record of how secrecy has been used to cover up corruption in Government. They disregard the basic right of the public to know the arguments involved in a decision to award contracts or dispense other rights, unless some real military security problem is involved.

There are some reporters and editors who will tell you that there is no real problem in obtaining information in Washington.

It may be true that some reporters and editors have run into no secrecy barriers. There is no problem of obtaining information that is favorable to an administration that is in power. There is usually no problem of obtaining access even to the busiest individuals if they are reasonably sure they are to be the subject of articles puffing their importance.

The problem of access to information arises when officials know (or suspect) that the inquiring reporter may unearth facts that are not wholly complimentary to the administration, or when the reporter is known to have been critical of the administration.

Point out the newsman who says he has no trouble obtaining information, and it is likely the subject will fit one of these patterns:

1. A reporter or editor who has been largely a patsy for the administration.

2. A reporter or editor who lacks either the imagination or the energy to go behind the self-serving declarations of agency press releases.

Reporters who are considered friends of the administration in power may have a few exclusive stories dropped in their laps in return for understanding and uncritical treatment.

By contrast, there are often efforts at retaliation against those who are critical of the administration in power. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt went so far as to summon Lyle Wilson, United Press Bureau chief, to the White House in a direct effort to kill a story. Roosevelt also threatened reprisal against the United Press if Wilson did not give in to his demands, but Wilson refused. Occasionally, Presidents since then have been equally blunt.

But, it is seldom that a President will take such direct action as to summon a reporter or editor to the White House. More common are the subtle efforts of lesser officials to interfere with the reporter, to ridicule or undermine his work, to erect barriers that interfere with him on even routine assignments.

The New York Times occupies a unique position that makes its reporters less susceptible to the pressures of Federal officials than other newspapers. It is a paper read

in Washington and in the embassies all over the world. It has a voice that is loud as well as respected and feared by official Washington.

Yet, some reporters for this mighty newspaper find themselves subjected to subtle pressures when they are critical of the administration. Bureau Chief James Reston has been highly critical of the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy, and its conduct of other matters. Although Reston was highly critical of the foreign policy of the late John Foster Dulles, the New York Times Bureau chief praises Dulles for "never taking any step to cut off my sources of information."

However, there were others in the administration who were not so understanding of the role of a critical press in a democracy. Reston's critical comments were met with hostility in some quarters, and with subtle harassment by officials who were unavailable for interviews and dilatory or unavailable on telephone calls.

Columnist Walter Lippmann, speaking from the experience of his 70 years, commented before the National Press Club this fall on the tendency of Government "insiders" to ridicule criticism from outside Government as coming from ignoramuses—persons who don't have access to the conferences and secret files of the Government.

Lippmann declares that formidable as this criticism is, he has no trouble getting the better of it:

"I tell the critic, you be careful. You will be denouncing the principle of democracy itself, which asserts that the outsiders shall be sovereign over the insiders. For you will be showing that the people themselves, since they are ignoramuses because they are outsiders, are therefore incapable of governing themselves."

Furthermore, Lippmann declared that as far as the affairs of the world are concerned, those who regard themselves as insiders are actually outsiders since none of them read all of the U.S. papers and they have no access to the records of foreign governments that are equally important if one is to have the total wisdom the insiders indicate they have.

Columnists Drew Pearson and Joseph Alsop report that when they were critical of Government policies and personalities, they found themselves subjected to investigations by agents of the FBI and other Government bureaus. They contended that no breach of security was involved but that they were subjected to probes to dry up their sources of information.

On the local level, the Arkansas Gazette found itself the target of the barbs of Gov. Orval Faubus for aggressive opposition to Faubus on the explosive issue of the Little Rock schools. Despite the fact that the paper found its circulation cut and its advertising revenue off sharply, the publisher and editor stuck with their position to win an expensive victory.

Executive editor Harry Ashmore left the Gazette this fall. He had won his battle, but he was aware that the bitterness of the integration fight had left scars that would remain as long as he directed the editorial policy of the newspaper.

Wallace Turner and William Lambert, reporters for the Portland Oregonian, tackled the corruption in local politics and the mighty Teamsters Union. They found themselves and their newspaper subject to immediate attacks and a series of libel actions that might have terrorized a less courageous editorial department.

Vance Trimble, reporter for the Scripps-Howard syndicate, had no more than started his series on the nepotism on congressional payrolls when he was subjected to vicious attacks from Congress. Fortunately, many newspaper groups rallied behind Trimble's effort, and an atmosphere was created that forced many Members of Congress to drop relatives from the payroll or to cut their salaries. The impact of public opinion also forced the Senate to adopt new rules opening Senate office payrolls for public inspection.

As head of Sigma Delta Chi Freedom of Information Committee, V. M. (Red) Newton, managing editor of the Tampa Tribune, lashed out at the secrecy that covered spending of counterpart funds. He was immediately subjected to a personal attack by members of the House Administration Committee. That crusade to open these spending records has been unsuccessful so far, but Newton and others are still pushing for open records on this congressional spending.

The term "managing the news" was used by James B. Reston in explaining to the Moss subcommittee his complaint about Government information practices. Reston, whose work has been largely in the foreign affairs field, was objecting to the practice of releasing selective facts to present the favorable picture the administration wanted to get across to the public. He complained that barriers were erected to block those who sought further facts that were inconsistent with the picture presented in the "managed news."

In the foreign affairs field and in some other areas, the "managing of the news" can be accomplished by misusing security classifications to cover part of the facts.

In fields where national security cannot be used to hide the facts, a new device has come into wide use for managing the news. It is the claim by the executive branch of Government that it has some inherent right to refuse arbitrarily to produce any records or give any testimony that includes advice or recommendations in the executive agencies.

The Eisenhower administration has pressed this broad secrecy doctrine with the argument that all communications containing advice or recommendations are confidential executive business. The administration claims some inherent extensive privilege to hide such communications from the press, the public, committees of Congress and even from auditors of the General Accounting Office.

Leonard J. Saccio, acting International Cooperation Administration Director, testified before the Hennings Subcommittee that he believed this so-called executive privilege gave the ICA the authority to withhold practically every document in the agency from the Government Accounting Office auditors.

"If ICA wanted to apply the executive privilege, GAO would not see one thing because practically every document in our agency has an opinion or a piece of advice," Saccio testified.

No agency in the executive branch has carried this arbitrary executive secrecy to the extreme point Saccio says it could be carried. However, the testimony by Saccio was an admission from within the executive department of the danger inherent in a doctrine that any executive department official can withhold any document that includes advice or recommendations.

It may be that some have such faith in the present administration that they feel quite content to have that administration exercise an arbitrary power to refuse to produce records for the Congress, the GAO, the press and the public. However, it would be well to question whether they want such unchecked power to conceal records lodged in the hands of some other administration.

If you are a Republican, ask yourself if you would feel comfortable in letting the administration of a Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Jack Kennedy, or Hubert Humphrey put up such a barrier to congressional investigators or the GAO.

If you are a Democrat, ask yourself if you want the administration of a RICHARD NIXON to have such a total arbitrary power to withhold records of Government actions.

It is only by viewing the power of arbitrary executive secrecy in the hands of the other political party that many can test their true reaction to such a broad claim of a right to refuse to produce records.

Apply the doctrine of arbitrary executive secrecy to the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration. Then you will see how the claim of arbitrary executive secrecy could have been used to conceal these notorious scandals.

The oil scandals of the Harding administration involved communications between Secretary of Navy Denby and Secretary of Interior Fall. Had a claim of arbitrary secrecy been invoked, it would have been impossible for Senator Thomas Walsh, the Montana Democrat, to establish the fact that eventually sent Secretary of Interior Fall to prison.

Assume that the Truman administration officials had claimed a precedent of executive privilege and refused to give testimony or produce records on the tax scandals. The communications between top officials in the White House, Justice Department and Treasury would have remained buried, along with the crimes involving some of the highest officials of the huge tax-collecting agency.

In 1948 there were some restricted efforts by the Truman administration to bar congressional investigations from some executive department records. The personnel records of William Remington were withheld under a general executive order placing loyalty files outside of the reach of congressional committees. William P. Rogers, now the Attorney General, was then the chief counsel for the Senate committee investigating Remington. Rogers presided over the preparation of a report that was highly critical of this executive secrecy.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, then a young Congresman from California, had some sharp comments to make about this limited withholding of records by the Truman administration. NIXON said:

"The point has been made that the President of the United States has issued an order that none of this information (on Remington) can be released and therefore the Congress has no right to question the judgment of the President.

I say that that proposition cannot stand from a constitutional standpoint or on the basis of the merit for this very good reason. That would mean that the President could have arbitrarily issued an executive order in the Meyers case, the Teapot Dome case, or in any other case denying the Congress information it needed to conduct an investigation of the executive department and the Congress would have no right to question his decision.

NIXON was only one of many prominent Republicans who attacked this executive secrecy at the time. By contrast, a good many high ranking Democrats—including House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas—were defending the secrecy of the Truman administration. Many Democrats who were inclined to defend the secrecy in the Truman administration are now highly critical of the Eisenhower administration for merely extending the same basic principle. It demonstrates that political expediency has a tendency to encroach on the views of our elected representatives and to color their thinking. The press and the public cannot depend on either political party to be the beacon of right where their freedoms are involved.

After the Truman administration was so severely criticized by Republicans for imposing unjustified secrecy, it was amazing to see a Republican administration lay down a claim to a right of arbitrary executive sec-

recy that is broader than any similar claim in our history.

The new secrecy doctrine was made public in connection with the Army-McCarthy hearings on May 17, 1954—the same day the U.S. Supreme Court pronounced its historic ruling against racial segregation in public schools. The fact that the Supreme Court ruled on segregation on that day did not bury the colorful Army-McCarthy hearings or the fact that officials of the executive branch were refusing to give testimony before a committee of Congress.

President Eisenhower, in a letter to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, authorized Army Counsel John Adams to refuse to relate conversations with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and William P. Rogers, then the Deputy Attorney General. The President wrote that in his view members of the executive branch should not be required to testify on conversations and communications with other members of the executive branch where recommendations and advice were involved.

Many large newspapers—still hysterical with the fear of the McCarthy era—saw this letter only as a blow at Senator Joseph McCarthy. If McCarthy wanted the testimony, then these newspapers were opposed to it. Unthinking editorial writers praised the Eisenhower letter as some new and brilliant statement of the separation of powers doctrine. Only a few looked behind the minor inconvenience it presented to McCarthy in his television battle with the Army and saw the full claim of arbitrary executive secrecy it embodied. Since then, many have changed their views.

The full threat inherent in Eisenhower's May 17, 1954, letter did not become apparent immediately. It took months and even years before it became clear that the administration would use that letter as a precedent for refusing a wide variety of information to the press, to a dozen congressional committees, and to the General Accounting Office.

Sherman Adams refused to testify in a congressional hearing on the Dixon-Yates case on grounds that his activities were all confidential executive business. His action was to set the pattern for officials of more than a dozen agencies of Government to inform Congress and the GAO that important records and testimony would not be produced. A half dozen committees of Congress prepared reports castigating this arbitrary withholding of testimony and documents.

The refusal of the executive branch to make certain evaluation reports and inspectors general reports available to the GAO and committees of Congress has become a major barrier to investigations of the Defense Department and foreign aid spending.

Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, an appointee of the Eisenhower administration, has declared that the withholding of documents was hindering the GAO in the performance of its statutory duties and could be almost fatal to the GAO's effectiveness.

The Moss Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information has lashed out at the withholding from GAO as being a violation of the law since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provides that all agencies must turn over all records requested by the GAO auditors.

In recent months, liberals as well as conservatives in Congress have become concerned over evidence indicating that the executive secrecy has covered up fraud and mismanagement in the foreign aid program. Even a rider tied to the foreign aid appropriations bill has not changed the administration's position.

The President has continued to provide a blanket secrecy shield to evaluation reports and inspectors general reports with a vague comment that the withholding is "in the national interest."

Some Members of Congress are so concerned that they are proposing to tighten the law and withhold all funds from those agencies that do not make full reports to the GAO on their spending and activities. This is a serious step, but many Members of Congress feel that this matter has reached a serious stage.

The concern of Congress is not so much over what has been withheld as it is worry over where this broad claim of a right to withhold records may lead at some future time. Members of Congress recognize that in the wrong hands the precedent could become a major tool in forming an executive dictatorship.

They know that it has been necessary to keep a constant surveillance over military spending—now 60 percent of our budget—to expose corruption and force action against officials involved in the corruption.

As we have greater expenditures and more complex operations of our Government, we need more congressional investigations to burrow constantly into the activities of our public officials. The press needs the skill and the power of congressional committees to spotlight the big problem areas in our society.

Congress and the GAO need the power to obtain records and testimony from those public officials in the executive departments who are responsible for administration and enforcement of laws.

This is a great issue of freedom in our time. It goes to the question of the right of Congress to serve as a check on the executive department's activities. It goes to the question of whether a free people are entitled to information on the activities of Government when no question of national security is involved.

This year, in this administration, it may represent only an inconvenience to the press, an irritant to congressional investigators and an impediment to efficient work by the GAO auditors.

But, what could such a precedent of arbitrary executive secrecy do under some later administration that may be less kindly in its basic outlook?

FLOOD CONTROL PROBLEMS AT CANTON, OHIO, AND NEIGHBORING AREAS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted to the Committee on Public Works a suggested resolution to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers of the very serious flood problems at Canton, Ohio, and neighboring areas.

It was just a year ago that a rainfall of 3.23 inches during a 24-hour period, at a time when the ground was frozen and unable to absorb additional moisture, caused the most damaging flood in over 40 years. More than 800 people were evacuated from their homes in Canton, Louisville, Waynesburg, Minerva, and Malvern, and property damage was estimated in the millions of dollars.

I immediately requested the advice of the Corps of Engineers, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and the Muskingum Conservancy District to investigate possibilities of flood control in Stark County, and have been in correspondence with these officials from time to time since.

Some months ago I called upon local officials to take action in the matter, and I am glad to report that a general meeting was called by Mayor Charles Babcock at which representatives of all interested groups, State and Federal agencies, and the mayor's flood committee discussed the problem. Considerable credit is due Carl F. Schoenbaum, chairman of the committee, and his associates for their carefully prepared report.

We hope that the Public Works Committee will act quickly to authorize the review report, and that the Corps of Engineers will be able to rcommend a sound and feasible project to control flooding in Stark County.

Meanwhile, I have urged the mayor and other officials to continue to explore all other possibilities, including a watershed project in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Marion DeHoff, chairman of the Stark County Soil Conservation District, has stated his willingness to cooperate with officials of the urban areas in this work.

Many other areas of Ohio have demonstrated that floods can be controlled and that many benefits accrue from proper soil and water management. I am confident we can be equally successful in meeting and solving this serious problem in Canton.

JANUARY 16, 1960.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am submitting herewith a suggested resolution to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers of the very serious flood problems in the city of Canton, Ohio, and nearby areas including the towns of Louisville, Minerva, Waynesburg, and Malvern.

Just a year ago, January 17, 1959, after a rainfall of 3.23 inches in a 24-hour period, severe flooding in this area forced the evacuation of about 800 people in the communities concerned and property damage of several million dollars. The situation was repeated in February, and certain areas are flooded whenever there is a heavy rainfall.

Following my suggestion, the mayor of Canton called a meeting of all local officials concerned, representatives of industry, and of the State of Ohio, the Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Corps of Engineers. There was full discussion of all possible methods of providing flood control and it was determined that we should seek the assistance of the Corps of Engineers. Mayor Charles Babcock of Canton called on me last week and assured me the city stands ready to provide rights of way and any other local contributions that might be required should a regular flood control project be developed.

Accordingly, I am most hopeful that your committee can approve a resolution authorizing a review report at an early date. I will be glad to furnish any factual information the committee may desire.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors be, and is hereby,

requested to review the reports on the Ohio River, submitted in House Document No. 306, 74th Congress, 1st session, with a view to determining the advisability at this time of improvements for flood control and allied purposes on Nimishillen Creek and its tributaries at and in the vicinity of Canton, Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDER FOR OBSERVANCE OF RESTORATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 16, on the occasion of the 42d observance of the independence of Lithuania, that after the reading and approval of the Journal, and prior to any legislative business for that day, I may have permission to address the House for 1 hour and to yield time to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill called the quality stabilization bill. The quality stabilization bill should not be confused with fair trade legislation in any of its forms.

Surely it can be seen clearly by all that everybody, including business, labor, and the public, is certain to benefit by the proposed establishment of a simple, direct, and inexpensive method of protecting against the destructive results of predatory discounter pricing.

It is vastly different from fair trade legislation previously considered by Congress. The quality stabilization bill is not price fixing in any sense of the word. Under the proposed legislation the consumer will have complete freedom of choice. This bill will enable the consumer to choose between products varying widely as to price and as to quality, while giving the manufacturer the means, if he so chooses, to stabilize the quality of his product by stabilizing its price.

Discounter raids upon public respect for manufacturers' trademarks harm not only big manufacturers. They destroy, sometimes almost overnight, the business of smaller manufacturers who are unable to adopt the costly substitutes for price stabilizing available always to wealthy manufacturers. Discounters also are destroying the business and livelihood of those hundreds of thousands of smaller wholesalers and retailers who constitute the very backbone of the American system of distribution.

The quality stabilization bill, provides only for an honest, specific retail price, to be established by the manufacturer and to be available uniformly to all citizens, whether rich or poor.

The quality stabilization bill provides that a manufacturer may protect his property rights in his trademark simply by revoking—by mail, if desired—the right of an offending reseller to make any further use of, or reference to, the trademark. However, the manufacturer may take such action only if the reseller sells either up or down from the specific price made known by the manufacturer as representing an honest value he desires to maintain competitively through the stabilization of the quality of his product, or if the reseller resorts to certain misrepresentations expressly condemned in the bill.

Extensive surveys have proved that when discounters select a widely known and respected product for price bait they force the manufacturer to strive constantly to reduce the cost and quality of that product, as a means of reducing its price to meet competitive prices forced constantly lower by the discounter.

This quality squeeze forced by discounter pricing inevitably injures factory labor employed in the industry affected. Surveys show frightened manufacturers laying off employees to make 15 men do the work of 20. Naturally, a manufacturer under the vicious squeeze of discounter prices has constantly less and less opportunity to improve wages or working conditions. Labor finds the dollar harder to get, and finds it gets less in real value per dollar in the products labor must buy.

To avoid further misleading confusion of quality stabilization with so-called fair trade a separate hearing will be requested for the quality stabilization bill. I am advised by the best of counsel that, with the quality stabilization bill enacted, neither manufacturer, reseller, nor the public would have any reason to rely upon any State fair trade act or upon any proposed Federal fair trade law.

And let me repeat that the bill permits the manufacturer to revoke the right of any reseller to make any further reference to, or use of, the manufacturer's distinguishing brand, name, or trademark, if the reseller sells either above or below the manufacturer's specified price, or commits other abuses, of public confidence or of the manufacturer's trademark rights, condemned in the bill.

Growing appreciation of the true meaning of the above facts is bringing increased support for quality stabilization, by manufacturers, and by reseller organizations, as well as by Members of Congress being urged to act for the protection of the public.

For the protection of all those rightfully concerned, and of the integrity of the traditional American business system, the bill should be enacted with a minimum of delay.

STABILIZING SUPPORT LEVELS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which, in my opinion, will be of great help and advantage to the entire tobacco industry. The purpose of the bill is to stabilize the support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and the upward spiral in recent years due to the operation of modernized parity formula. The bill provides for adjustments for changes in farm costs so that the level of support will rise or fall in direct proportion to changes in prices paid by farmers for commodities purchased, using the previous 3-year moving average as a base.

Briefly, the bill provides that the tobacco support level in 1960 be the same as in 1959 and that in subsequent years the support price be adjusted from the 1959 level. This bill if enacted into law should be a great factor in the retention of the foreign markets for our tobacco. It will let the exporters, the dealers, and the foreign manufacturers know that for the foreseeable future they will be able to obtain ample quantities of choice Virginia-type tobacco at a fair price and a price that will compete with foreign-grown tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced carries out fully the recommendations of the Tobacco Industry Committee which appeared before the Tobacco Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee last Thursday, January 14. It is my understanding that the entire tobacco industry favors this legislation. I hope very much that we can get an early report from the Department of Agriculture as to its position on this legislation so that the Tobacco Subcommittee will be in a position to act on this legislation in the next week or two.

PROVIDING FOR EXCLUSION OR DEPORTATION OF ALIENS FOR VIOLATION OF LAWS RELATING TO ILLICIT POSSESSION OF MARIHUANA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 184; 70 Stat. 575; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(23)), is further amended by changing the language "narcotic drugs," to read "narcotic drugs or marihuana,".

SEC. 2. Section 241(a)(11) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 206, 70 Stat. 575; 8 U.S.C. 1251(a)(11)), is further amended by changing the language "narcotic drugs," to read "narcotic drugs or marihuana,".

SEC. 3. Section 245(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat.

217, 72 Stat. 699, 8 U.S.C. 1255(a)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The status of an alien, other than an alien crewman, who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if (1) the alien makes an application for such adjustment, (2) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence, and (3) an immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is approved."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 16, insert:

SEC. 4. Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) The first 50 per centum of the quota of each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (2) and (3), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified quota immigrants whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability of such immigrants and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Immigrants who are the spouse or children of any immigrant described in this paragraph shall be held to be nonquota immigrants if accompanying or following to join him."

SEC. 5. The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding thereto sections 208, 209, and 210, to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. The alien fiance or fiancee of a citizen of the United States may be issued a visa and admitted into the United States as a temporary visitor under section 101(a)(15)(B) for a period of three months (unless in exceptional circumstances this period is extended by the Attorney General): *Provided*, That (a) the alien is not otherwise ineligible to receive a visa or excludable from admission into the United States;

"(b) the Attorney General finds that the alien is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to a citizen of the United States; and

"(c) the Attorney General finds that the parties to the proposed marriage are able and intend to contract a valid marriage within the period for which the alien is admitted.

"SEC. 209. In the event the marriage does not occur within the period for which the alien is admitted, the alien shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported at any time after entry in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 210. (a) In prescribing regulations for the administration of the provisions of section 208 of this act the Secretary of State shall include a requirement that the parties to a proposed marriage shall furnish satisfactory evidence to the American consular officer concerned, including sworn statements corroborated by other appropriate evidence showing that the parties have entered into a valid agreement to marry and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of three months after the alien's arrival, or within such period as may be extended by the Attorney General.

"(b) In prescribing regulations for the administration of sections 208 and 209 of this act in connection with the arrival of the aliens concerned, at ports of entry in the United States the Attorney General shall include a requirement that the prospective American citizen spouse of an alien covered by the provisions of section 208 shall furnish to the Attorney General a suitable bond, which shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the deportation of the alien concerned, and which shall be forfeited to the United States if and when the alien becomes deportable, or shall be canceled by the Attorney General upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that a valid marriage has been concluded, or that the alien has left the United States without expense to the said United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 300)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Ninth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1960.*

BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 255)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

With this message, transmitting the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1961, I invite the Congress to join with me in a determined effort to achieve a substantial surplus. This will make possible a reduction in the national debt. The proposals in this budget demonstrate that this objective can be attained while at the same time maintaining required military strength and enhancing the national welfare.

This budget attests to the strength of America's economy. At the same time, the budget is a test of our resolve, as a nation, to allocate our resources prudently, to maintain the Nation's security, and to extend economic growth into the future without inflation.

In highlight, this budget proposes:

1. Revenues of $84 billion and expenditures of $79.8 billion, leaving a surplus of $4.2 billion. This surplus should be applied to debt reduction, which I believe to be a prime element in sound fiscal policy for the Nation at this time.

2. New appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense amounting to $40.6 billion, and expenditures of $41 billion. These expenditures, which will be slightly higher than the 1960 level, will provide the strong and versatile defense which we require under prevailing world conditions.

3. Increased appropriations (including substantial restoration of congressional reductions in the 1960 budget), and a virtual doubling of expenditures, for nonmilitary space projects under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This furthers our plans to keep moving ahead vigorously and systematically with our intensive program of scientific exploration and with the development of the large boosters essential to the conquest of outer space.

4. Nearly $4.2 billion in new appropriations for mutual security programs, an increase of about $950 million above appropriations for the current year, with an increase of $100 million in expenditures. This increase in program is needed to accelerate economic and technical assistance, chiefly through the Development Loan Fund, and to strengthen free world forces, in particular the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with advanced weapons and equipment.

5. A record total of expenditures $1.2 billion, for water resources projects under the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition to funds for going work, this amount provides for the initiation of 42 new high-priority projects, which will require $38 million in new appropriations for 1961, and will cost a total of $496 million over a period of years.

6. Substantially higher expenditures in a number of categories which under present laws are relatively uncontrollable, particularly $9.6 billion for interest; $3.9 billion to help support farm prices and income; $3.8 billion for veterans compensation and pensions; and $2.4 billion in aid to State and local governments for public assistance and employment security activities. The aggregate increase in these relatively uncontrollable expenditures is more than $1 billion over 1960.

7. Research and development expenditures of $8.4 billion—well over one-half of the entire Nation's expenditures, public and private, for these purposes—in order to assure a continuing strong and modern defense and to stimulate basic research and technological progress.

8. Recommendations for prompt legislative action to increase taxes on highway and aviation fuels, and to raise postal rates. These measures are needed to place on the users a proper share of the rising costs of the Federal airways and postal service, and to support the highway program at an increased level.

9. Recommendations to extend for another year present corporation income and excise tax rates.

10. A constructive legislative program to achieve improvements in existing laws

relating to governmental activities and to initiate needed actions to improve and safeguard the interests of our people.

In short, this budget and the proposals it makes for legislative action provide for significant advances in many aspects of national security and welfare. The budget presents a balanced program which recognizes the priorities appropriate within an aggregate of Federal expenditures that we can soundly support.

I believe that the American people have made their wishes clear: The Federal Government should conduct its financial affairs with a high sense of responsibility, vigorously meeting the Nation's needs and opportunities within its proper sphere while at the same time exercising a prudent discipline in matters of borrowing and spending, and in incurring liabilities for the future.

BUDGET TOTALS

During the present fiscal year we have made encouraging progress in achieving sound fiscal policy objectives. The deficit of $12.4 billion in fiscal 1959, which was largely caused by the recession, is expected to be followed by a surplus of $217 million in the current year. To safeguard this small surplus, I am directing all Government departments and agencies to exercise strict controls over the expenditure of Federal funds. Even so, the slender margin of surplus can be attained only if economic growth is not interrupted.

For the fiscal year 1961, I am proposing a budget surplus of $4.2 billion to be applied to debt retirement. In my judgment this is the only sound course. Unless some amounts are applied to the reduction of debt in prosperous periods, we can expect an ever larger public debt if future emergencies or recessions again produce deficits.

In times of prosperity, such as we anticipate in the coming year, sound fiscal and economic policy requires a budget surplus to help counteract inflationary pressures, to ease conditions in capital and credit markets, and to increase the supply of savings available for the productive investment so essential to continued economic growth.

The budget recommendations for 1961 lay the groundwork for a sound and flexible fiscal policy in the years ahead. A continuance of economic prosperity in 1962 and later years can be expected to bring with it further increases in Federal revenues. If expenditures are held to the levels I am proposing for 1961 and reasonable restraint is exercised in the future, higher revenues in later years will give the next administration and the next Congress the choice they should rightly have in deciding between reductions in the public debt and lightening of the tax burden, or both. Soundly conceived tax revision can then be approached on a comprehensive and orderly basis, rather than by haphazard piecemeal changes, and can be accomplished within a setting of economic and fiscal stability.

Budget expenditures in 1961 are estimated at $79.8 billion, which is $1.4 billion more than the 1960 level. The total increase is attributable to (1) an increase of more than $1 billion in relatively uncontrollable expenditures for farm price supports fixed by law, interest on the public debt, veterans compensation and pensions, and public assistance grants, and (2) an increase of about $500 million in expenditures because of commitments made in prior years for Federal housing programs, for civil public works projects and other construction, for loans under the mutual security program, and for other programs.

New activities and expansion of certain other programs have been included on a selective basis of need. These increases are offset by reductions in other existing programs, including the proposed elimination of the postal deficit.

New obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1961 totals $79.4 billion. This is $306 million less than the amounts already enacted and recommended for 1960, and $401 million less than estimated expenditures in 1961.

Budget receipts under existing and proposed legislation are expected to rise substantially to $84 billion in 1961. This compares with the revised estimate of $78.6 billion for 1960 and actual receipts of $68.3 billion in 1959.

MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Achievement of the proposed budget surplus will provide an opportunity to offset part of the deficits incurred in the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 largely because of the recession. The corresponding reduction of the public debt will reduce Government competition with private industry, individuals, and State and local governments for investment funds and will help ease the pressure on interest rates. Along with the recommended removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Federal debt, this will help hold down budget expenditures for interest, which now amount to almost one-eighth of the whole budget.

Statutory debt limit: It is estimated that the public debt, which stood at $284.7 billion on June 30, 1959, will be $284.5 billion on June 30, 1960, and will decline to $280 billion at the end of fiscal 1961. Thus, the budget surplus estimated for fiscal 1961 will permit the Government to end the year with desirable operating leeway within the permanent debt limit of $285 billion. However, the fluctuating seasonal pattern in receipts will again require a temporary increase in the debt limit during the fiscal year 1961, since the present temporary limit of $295 billion expires on June 30, 1960. It is expected that the request for a new temporary limit will be for less than the present $295 billion if the Congress accepts my budgetary proposals.

Interest ceiling: Effective management of a debt of this size requires a reasonable distribution among securities maturing at different times. Three-fourths of all marketable Treasury securities outstanding today come due in less than five years, of which $80 billion will mature in less than a year. As long as the rate that would have to be paid on newly issued bonds exceeds the present statutory ceiling of 4¼%, it is impossible to issue and sell any marketable securities of over five years' maturity.

Exclusive reliance on borrowing in a limited sector of the market is an expensive and inefficient way to manage the debt. Inflationary pressures increase as the volume of short-term and, hence, highly liquid securities mounts, especially if these securities are acquired by commercial banks. Further, effective monetary policy becomes more difficult when the Treasury has to refinance often. To make possible prudent and flexible management of the public debt, to permit sale of a modest amount of intermediate and longer term bonds when market conditions warrant such action, and to keep the average maturity of the debt from constantly shortening, it is imperative that the Congress immediately act to remove the 42-year-old 4¼-percent limitation on interest rates on Government securities maturing after 5 years.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Estimated budget receipts of $84 billion in the fiscal year 1961 assume a high and rising level of economic activity in calendar year 1960. Specifically, this revenue estimate is consistent with an increase in the gross national product from about $480 billion for calendar 1959 to about $510 billion for calendar 1960. Personal incomes and corporate profits are expected to rise considerably beyond last year's levels, which were depressed somewhat by the long duration of the steel strike. The accompanying table shows the sources of Government receipts for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961.

Budget receipts

(See special analysis B in pt. IV of this document)

[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Individual income taxes	$36.7	$40.3	$43.7
Corporation income taxes	17.3	22.2	23.5
Excise taxes	8.5	9.1	9.5
All other receipts	5.8	7.0	7.3
Total	68.3	78.6	84.0

The estimates for 1961 assume (1) extension of present tax rates and (2) the adoption of modifications recommended last year for certain tax laws. These are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Extension of present tax rates: In order to maintain Federal revenues, it is necessary that the present tax rates on corporation profits and certain excises be extended for another year beyond their scheduled expiration date of June 30, 1960. The scheduled reductions in the excise tax rates on transportation of persons and the scheduled repeal of the tax on local telephone service, which were enacted in the last session of the Congress, should be similarly postponed.

Improvement of the tax system: The recent tax revision hearings of the Ways and Means Committee have provided valuable information bearing on changes in the tax laws. The Treasury will continue to work in cooperation with the committees of the Congress in developing sound and attainable proposals for long-range improvement of the tax laws.

As the development of a comprehensive tax revision program will take time, the Congress should consider this year certain changes in the tax laws to correct inequities. These include amendments of the laws on taxation of cooperatives, now before the Congress, and a number of technical changes on which the Treasury Department has been working with committees of Congress. There is also before the Congress an amendment to prevent unintended and excessive depletion deductions resulting from the computation of percentage depletion allowances on the selling price of finished clay, cement products, and mineral products generally; unless the problem is satisfactorily resolved in a case now pending before the Supreme Court, the need for corrective legislation in this area will continue.

Under existing law, administration of the depreciation provisions is being hampered by the attempts of some taxpayers to claim excessive depreciation before disposing of their property. If gain from the sale of depreciable personal property were treated as ordinary income, the advantage gained in claiming excessive depreciation deductions would be materially reduced and the taxpayer's judgment as to the useful life of his property could more readily be accepted. Accordingly, I recommend that consideration be given to a change in the law which would treat such gain as ordinary income to the extent of the depreciation deduction previously taken on the property.

Aviation fuel taxes: To help defray the cost of the Federal airways system, the effective excise tax rate on aviation gasoline should be promptly increased from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and an equivalent excise tax should be imposed on jet fuels, which now are untaxed. The conversion from piston engines to jets is resulting in serious revenue losses to the Government. These losses will increase unless the tax on jet fuels is promptly enacted. The revenues from all taxes on aviation fuels should be credited to general budget receipts, as a partial offset to the budgetary costs of the airways system, and clearly should not be deposited in the highway trust fund.

Changes in fees and charges: The cost of other Federal programs which provide measurable special benefits to identifiable groups or individuals should be recovered through charges paid by beneficiaries rather than by taxes on the general public. Whenever feasible, fees or charges should be established so that the beneficiaries will pay the full cost of the special services they receive. To help accomplish this purpose, I have directed that further work be done by the departments and agencies on a carefully defined inventory of Federal services which convey such special benefits. In the meantime, the Congress is requested to act favorably on the postal rate proposals described in this message and on a number of other specific proposals now pending before it or planned to be submitted this year for increased fees or charges for special services.

Estimated savings to the general taxpayers from more adequate fees and charges

[In millions]

Proposal	Fiscal year 1961	Full annual effect
Increase postal rates	$554.0	$554.0
Support highway expenditures by highway-user taxes:		
Replace future diversion of general excise taxes to trust fund with increased motor fuel tax or other user charges	----------	850.0
Transfer financing of forest and public land highways to trust fund	39.0	36.0
Charge users for share of cost of Federal airways:		
Increase taxes on aviation fuels	72.0	88.0
Transfer aviation fuel taxes from highway trust fund to general fund	17.0	20.0
Revise fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases	----------	14.0
Recover administrative costs of Federal crop insurance	----------	6.4
Increase patent fees	3.7	3.7
Increase miscellaneous fees now below costs	8.0	8.9
Total savings	693.7	1,581.0

RECEIPTS FROM AND PAYMENTS TO THE PUBLIC

The program of responsible fiscal policy represented by a balanced budget with a substantial surplus is reinforced by an even greater surplus of total cash receipts from the public over cash payments to the public. In this more comprehensive measure of Federal financial activity, obtained by consolidating budget, trust fund, and certain other Federal transactions, receipts from the public are estimated at $102.2 billion in 1961 and payments to the public at $96.3 billion, resulting in an excess of $5.9 billion of receipts.

This excess of receipts will be used to repay cash the Government has previously borrowed from the public. Repayment of such debt owed to the public will be greater than the amount of public debt retired, because the Government trust funds are expected to add to their holdings of public debt securities to the extent that trust fund receipts exceed trust fund expenditures. This will reduce the debt held by the public in like amount by shifting ownership to the trust funds.

For the fiscal year 1960, on the other hand, an excess of payments to the public of $542 million is estimated, despite the anticipated budget surplus of $217 million. This situation reflects the fact that total disbursements of trust funds will exceed their receipts in 1960, notably in the old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment, and highway trust funds.

Federal Government receipts from and payments to the public

(See special analysis A in pt. IV of this document)

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Receipts from the public	$81.7	$94.8	$102.2
Payments to the public	94.8	95.3	96.3
Excess of payments over receipts	−13.1	−.5	----------
Excess of receipts over payments	----------	----------	+5.9

REVIEW OF MAJOR FUNCTIONS

The following sections of this message discuss the legislative and budget recommendations for 1961 in terms of the major purposes which they fulfill. The following table compares the estimated expenditures for each of the nine major functional categories with the actual figures for 1959 and the latest estimate for 1960.

The expenditure totals for 1960 and 1961 include expenditures under both existing and proposed legislation. The allowance for contingencies is intended to provide for unforeseen increases in existing programs, and for proposed new programs not separately itemized.

Budget expenditures

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961	
			Estimate	Percent of total
Major national security	$46,426	$45,650	$45,568	57.1
International affairs and finance	3,780	2,066	2,242	2.8
Commerce and housing	3,421	3,002	2,709	3.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources	6,529	5,113	5,623	7.0
Natural resources	1,669	1,785	1,938	2.4
Labor and welfare	4,421	4,441	4,569	5.7
Veterans services and benefits	5,174	5,157	5,471	6.9
Interest	7,671	9,335	9,585	12.0
General government	1,606	1,711	1,911	2.4
Allowance for contingencies	----------	75	200	.3
Total	80,697	78,383	79,816	100.0

The figures for 1961 allocate to the separate programs for the first time the dollar equivalent of expenditures for U.S. Government programs of foreign currencies received from the sale abroad of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Our national objective remains as before—peace with justice for all peoples. Our hope is that the heavy burden of armaments on the world may be lightened.

But we should not delude ourselves. In this era of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles, disarmament must be safeguarded and verifiable. The problems involved in achieving reductions of armaments with safety and justice to all nations are tremendous. Yet we must face up to these problems, for the only alternative is a world living on the edge of disaster.

While seeking the true road to peace and disarmament we must remain strong Our aim at this time is a level of military strength which, together with that of our allies, is sufficient to deter wars, large or small, while we strive to find a way to reduce the threat of war. This budget, in my judgment, does that.

Expenditures of the Department of Defense in 1961 will continue to emphasize the modernization of our Armed Forces. Military assistance for our allies under the mutual security program will also reflect the growing importance of modern weapons and missiles in the continued strengthening of the free world

defense forces. The Atomic Energy Commission is continuing its weapons programs on a high level and will move forward with research and development on the peaceful applications of atomic energy. Expenditures for stockpiling and for expansion of defense production will decline further, since most of the stockpile objectives have been met.

Major national security

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Department of Defense—Military:				
Military functions:				
Military personnel:				
Present programs	$11,801	$11,959	$12,124	[1] $11,813
Proposed legislation, retirement pay	-------	-------	22	24
Operation and maintenance	10,384	10,137	10,321	10,527
Procurement	14,410	13,943	13,602	13,085
Research, development, test, and evaluation	2,859	3,680	3,917	3,910
Construction	1,948	1,670	1,359	1,188
Revolving funds	−169	−444	−350	30
Subtotal	41,233	40,945	40,995	40,577
Military assistance	2,340	1,800	1,750	2,000
Atomic energy	2,541	2,675	2,689	2,666
Stockpiling and expansion of defense production	312	230	134	39
Total	46,426	45,650	45,568	[2] 45,282

[1] Additional obligational authority available by transfer: $350 million.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $45,517 million enacted for 1959 and $44,749 million (including $25 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Department of Defense—Military: New appropriations of $40,577 million are recommended for the military functions of the Department of Defense for 1961. Expenditures in 1961 are estimated at $40,995 million. These amounts exclude funds for the development of the Saturn space project which I have proposed be transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Strategy and tactics of the U.S. military forces are now undergoing one of the greatest transitions in history. The change of emphasis from conventional-type to missile-type warfare must be made with care, mindful that the one type of warfare cannot be safely neglected in favor of the other. Our military forces must be capable of contending successfully with any contingency which may be forced upon us, from limited emergencies to all-out nuclear general war.

Forces and military personnel strength: This budget will provide in the fiscal year 1961 for the continued support of our forces at approximately the present level—a year-end strength of 2,489,000 men and women in the active forces. The forces to be supported include an Army of 14 divisions and 870,000 men; a Navy of 817 active ships and 619,000 men; a Marine Corps of 3 divisions and 3 air wings with 175,000 men; and an Air Force of 91 combat wings and 825,000 men.

If the reserve components are to serve effectively in time of war, their basic organization and objectives must conform to the changing character and missions of the active forces. Quality and combat readiness must take precedence over mere numbers. Under modern conditions, this is especially true of the ready reserve. I have requested the Secretary of Defense to reexamine the roles and missions of the reserve components in relation to those of the active forces and in the light of the changing requirements of modern warfare.

Last year the Congress discontinued its previously imposed minimum personnel strength limitations on the Army Reserve. Similar restrictions on the strength of the Army National Guard contained in the 1960 Department of Defense Appropriation Act should likewise be dropped. I strongly recommend to the Congress the avoidance of mandatory floors on the size of the reserve components so that we may have the flexibility to make adjustments in keeping with military necessity.

I again propose a reduction in the Army National Guard and Army Reserve—from their present strengths of 400,000 and 300,000, respectively, to 360,000 and 270,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1961. These strengths are considered adequate to meet the essential roles and missions of the reserves in support of our national security objectives.

Military personnel costs.—About 30 percent of the expenditures for the Department of Defense in 1961 are for military personnel costs, including pay for active, reserve, and retired military personnel. These expenditures are estimated to be $12.1 billion, an increase of $187 million over 1960, reflecting additional longevity pay of career personnel, more dependents, an increased number of men drawing proficiency pay, and social security tax increases (effective for the full year in 1961 compared with only 6 months in 1960). Retired pay costs are increased by $94 million in 1961 over 1960, partly because of a substantial increase in the number of retired personnel. These increased costs are partially offset by a decrease of $56 million in expenditures for the reserve forces, largely because of the planned reduction in strength of the Army Reserve components during 1961.

Traditionally, rates of pay for retired military personnel have been proportionate to current rates of pay for active personnel. The 1958 military pay act departed from this established formula by providing for a 6 percent increase rather than a proportionate increase for everyone retired prior to its effective date of June 1, 1958. I endorse pending legislation that will restore the traditional relationship between retired and active duty pay rates.

Operation and maintenance: Expenditures for operating and maintaining the stations and equipment of the Armed Forces are estimated to be $10.3 billion in 1961, which is $184 million more than in 1960. The increase stems largely from the growing complexity of and higher degree of maintenance required for newer weapons and equipment.

A substantial increase is estimated in the cost of operating additional communications systems in the air defense program, as well as in all programs where speed and security of communications are essential. Also, the program for fleet modernization will be stepped up in 1961 causing an increase in expenditures. Further increases arise from the civilian employee health program enacted by the Congress last year.

Other factors increasing operating costs include the higher unit cost of each flying hour, up 11 percent in 2 years, and of each steaming hour, up 15 percent. In total, these increases in operating costs outweigh the savings that result from declining programs and from economy measures, such as reduced numbers of units and installations, smaller inventories of major equipment, and improvements in the supply and distribution systems of the Armed Forces.

In the budget message for 1959, and again for 1960, I recommended immediate repeal of section 601 of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365). This section prevents the military departments and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization from carrying out certain transactions involving real property unless they come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. As I have stated previously, the Attorney General has advised me that this section violates fundamental constitutional principles. Accordingly, if it is not repealed by the Congress at its present session, I shall have no alternative thereafter but to direct the Secretary of Defense to disregard the section unless a court of competent jurisdiction determines otherwise.

Basic long-line communications in Alaska are now provided through Federal facilities operated by the Army, Air Force, and Federal Aviation Agency. The growing communications needs of this new State can best be met, as they have in other States, through the operation and development of such facilities by private enterprise. Legislation has already been proposed to authorize the sale of these Government-owned systems in Alaska, and its early enactment is desirable.

Procurement, research, and construction: Approximately 45 percent of the expenditures for the Department of Defense are for procurement, research, development and construction programs. In 1961, these expenditures are estimated at $18.9 billion, compared to $19.3 billion in 1960. The decreases, which are largely in construction and in aircraft procurement, are offset in part by increases for research and development and for procurement of other military equipment such as tanks, vehicles, guns, and electronic devices. Expenditures for shipbuilding are estimated at about the same level as in 1960.

New obligational authority for 1961 recommended in this budget for aircraft procurement (excluding amounts for related research and construction) totals $4,753 million, which is $1,390 million below that enacted for 1960. On the other hand, the new authority of $3,825 mil-

lion proposed for missile procurement (excluding research and construction) in 1961 is $581 million higher than for 1960. These contrasting trends in procurement reflect the anticipated changes in the composition and missions of our Armed Forces in the years ahead.

The Department of Defense appropriation acts for the past several years have contained a rider which limits competitive bidding by firms in other countries on certain military supply items. As I have repeatedly stated, this provision is much more restrictive than the general law, popularly known as the Buy American Act. I urge once again that the Congress not reenact this rider.

The task of providing a reasonable level of military strength, without endangering other vital aspects of our security, is greatly complicated by the swift pace of scientific progress. The last few years have witnessed what have been perhaps the most rapid advances in military technology in history. Some weapons systems have become obsolescent while still in production, and some while still under development.

Furthermore, unexpectedly rapid progress or a technological breakthrough on any one weapon system, in itself, often diminishes the relative importance of other competitive systems. This has necessitated a continuous review and reevaluation of the defense program in order to redirect resources to the newer and more important weapons systems and to eliminate or reduce effort on weapons systems which have been overtaken by events. Thus, in the last few years, a number of programs which looked very promising at the time their development was commenced have since been completely eliminated. For example, the importance of the Regulus II, a very promising aerodynamic ship-to-surface missile designed to be launched by surfaced submarines, was greatly diminished by the successful acceleration of the much more advanced Polaris ballistic missile launched by submerged submarines.

Another example is the recent cancellation of the F–108, a long-range interceptor with a speed three times as great as the speed of sound, which was designed for use against manned bombers in the period of the mid-1960's. The substantial progress being made in ballistic missile technology is rapidly shifting the main threat from manned bombers to missiles. Considering the high cost of the F–108 system—over $4 billion for the force that had been planned—and the time period in which it would become operational, it was decided to stop further work on the project. Meanwhile, other air defense forces are being made effective, as described later in this message.

The size and scope of other important programs have been reduced from earlier plans. Notable in this category are the Jupiter and Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles, which have been successfully developed, produced, and deployed, but the relative importance of which has diminished with the increasing availability of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile.

The impact of technological factors is also illustrated by the history of the high-energy fuel program. This project was started at a time when there was a critical need for a high-energy fuel to provide an extra margin of range for high performance aircraft, particularly our heavy bombers. Continuing technical problems involved in the use of this fuel, coupled with significant improvements in aircraft range through other means, have now raised serious questions about the value of the high-energy fuel program. As a result, the scope of this project has been sharply curtailed.

These examples underscore the importance of even more searching evaluations of new major development programs and even more penetrating and far-ranging analyses of the potentialities of future technology. The cost of developing a major weapon system is now so enormous that the greatest care must be exercised in selecting new systems for development, in determining the most satisfactory rate of development, and in deciding the proper time at which either to place a system into production or to abandon it.

Strategic forces: The deterrent power of our Armed Forces comes from both their nuclear retaliatory capability and their capability to conduct other essential operations in any form of war. The first capability is represented by a combination of manned bombers, carrier-based aircraft, and intercontinental and intermediate range missiles. The second capability is represented by our deployed ground, naval, and air forces in essential forward areas, together with ready reserves capable of effecting early emergency reinforcement.

The Strategic Air Command is the principal element of our long-range nuclear capability. One of the important and difficult decisions which had to be made in this budget concerned the role of the B–70, a long-range supersonic bomber. This aircraft, which was planned for initial operational use about 1965, would be complementary to but likewise competitive with the four strategic ballistic missile systems, all of which are scheduled to become available earlier. The first Atlas ICBM's are now operational, the first two Polaris submarines are expected to be operational this calendar year, and the first Titan ICBM's next year. The Minuteman solid-fueled ICBM is planned to be operational about mid-1963. By 1965, several or all of these systems will have been fully tested and their reliability established.

Thus, the need for the B–70 as a strategic weapon system is doubtful. However, I am recommending that development work on the B–70 airframe and engines be continued. It is expected that in 1963 two prototype aircraft will be available for flight testing. By that time we should be in a much better position to determine the value of that aircraft as a weapon system.

I am recommending additional acquisitions of the improved version of the B–52 (the B–52H with the new turbofan engine) and procurement of the B–58 supersonic medium bomber, together with the supporting refueling tankers in each case. These additional modern bombers will replace some of the older B–47 medium bombers; one B–52 can do the work of several B–47's which it will replace. Funds are also included in this budget to continue the equipping of the B–52 wings with the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile.

In the coming fiscal year additional quantities of Atlas, Titan, and Polaris missiles also will be procured. I am recommending funds for 3 additional Polaris submarines to be started in the coming fiscal year and for the advance procurement of long leadtime components on 3 more—making a total of 15 Polaris submarines and the appropriate number of missiles. Funds to continue the development and to initiate production of the first operational quantities of the Minuteman are also included in this budget.

Thus, four strategic ballistic missile systems will be in development and production during the coming fiscal year. These, together with the manned bomber force, the carrier-based aircraft, the intermediate range ballistic missiles, and the tactical aircraft deployed abroad, ensure our continued capability to retaliate effectively in the event of an attack upon ourselves or our allies.

In order to ensure, insofar as practicable, the safety and readiness of these forces, we have substantially completed the dispersal of Strategic Air Command aircraft and the construction of alert facilities. These measures will permit a large portion of all our manned bombers and supporting tankers to get off the ground within 15 minutes after receiving warning of an attack.

I have also authorized the Department of Defense to begin to acquire a stand-by airborne alert capability for the heavy bombers. This will entail the procurement of extra engines and spare parts, and the training of the heavy bomber wings with the ability to conduct an airborne alert. It is neither necessary nor practical to fly a continuous airborne alert at this time. Such a procedure would, over a relatively short period of time, seriously degrade our overall capability to respond to attack. What I am recommending is a capability to fly such an alert if the need should arise and to maintain that alert for a reasonable period of time until the situation which necessitated it becomes clarified.

Attention is also being given to the safety and readiness of our land-based strategic missile forces. Except for the first several squadrons, strategic missiles will be dispersed in hardened underground sites. Measures are also being taken to shorten the reaction time of liquid-fueled missiles. The Minuteman, because it will be solid fueled, will have a quick reaction time and will lend itself to mobile use. The solid-fueled Polaris to be carried in submarines at sea is by its very nature highly invulnerable.

Air defense forces: Much progress has been made in increasing the effectiveness of the North American Air Defense Command organized in 1957 as an integrated command of the U.S. and Canadian forces. The U.S. military elements—consisting of parts of all of our armed services—are integrated with Canada's Air Defence Command for maintaining an air defense capability for the entire North American Continent.

While we pay increasing attention to the growing threat of a potential enemy's ballistic missiles we should not lose sight of the fact that for the time being the manned bomber is the major threat. Although some $17 billion has already been invested in defense systems against manned bombers, excluding the cost of personnel and operation and maintenance, certain segments have yet to be completed. These were described in the Department of Defense air defense plan presented to the Congress last year. The funds recommended in this budget will substantially complete the programs outlined in that plan. Specifically, the last major elements of the Nike-Hercules surface-to-air missile program will be financed in 1961 and the Bomarc interceptor missile program will approach completion. The related radar warning, electronic control, and communication systems will also be further equipped and modernized.

In response to the increasing missile threat, we are pressing to completion a new system for the detection of ballistic missile attack—the ballistic missile early warning system. Construction has been under way for the last 2 years and the first segment is expected to be in operation in about a year.

To provide for an active defense against ballistic missile attack, I am recommending the continued development of the Nike-Zeus system, but it will not be placed in production during the coming fiscal year during which further testing will be carried out.

The Nike-Zeus system is one of the most difficult undertakings ever attempted by this country. The technical problems involved in detecting, tracking, and computing the course of the incoming ballistic missile and in guiding the intercepting Zeus missile to its target—all within a few minutes—are indeed enormous.

Much thought and study have been given to all of these factors and it is the consensus of my technical and military advisers that the system should be carefully tested before production is begun and facilities are constructed for its deployment. Accordingly, I am recommending sufficient funds in this budget to provide for the essential phases of such testing. Pending the results of such testing, the $137 million appropriated last year by the Congress for initial production steps for the Nike-Zeus system will not be used.

Sea control forces: Control of sea and ocean areas and sea lanes of communication is an integral element in the maintenance of our national security. The naval forces which carry the primary responsibility for this mission will consist of 817 combatant and support ships, 16 attack carrier air groups, 11 antisubmarine air groups, and 41 patrol and warning air squadrons.

From new construction and conversion programs started in prior years, the Navy will receive during fiscal year 1961 an unusually large number of modern ships. These will include the fifth and sixth *Forrestal*-class attack carriers, the first nuclear-powered cruiser, nine guided missile destroyers, seven guided missile frigates, and six nuclear-powered submarines. Three more Polaris ballistic missile submarines and a converted guided missile cruiser will also be commissioned.

For the coming fiscal year I am recommending the construction of 20 new ships and conversions or modernizations of 15 others. Included among the new ships is an attack carrier. It is planned to construct this carrier with a conventional rather than a nuclear powerplant.

While it is generally agreed that a nuclear-powered attack carrier has certain military advantages, such as extended range and endurance at high sustained speeds, these advantages are not overriding as in the case of a submarine. In a submarine, nuclear power provides the critical advantage of almost unlimited operation, submerged at high speeds. This enables nuclear-powered submarines to carry out missions which no conventionally powered submarine, no matter how modern, could accomplish.

The advantages of nuclear power with respect to the carrier, however, are not comparable. The primary requirement in a carrier is up-to-date facilities to operate, safely and effectively, the most modern naval aircraft. Use of a conventional powerplant will in no way prevent a carrier from functioning as a completely modern and mobile base for fleet aircraft for its foreseeable life. The additional $130 million which a nuclear-powered carrier would cost can be used to much greater advantage for other purposes. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to support this request for a conventionally powered aircraft carrier.

Tactical forces: Elements of the ground, naval, and air forces comprise the tactical forces which are available to deal with cold-war emergencies and limited-war situations, in addition to performing essential tasks in the event of general war. Recommendations made in this budget provide funds for modernization and improvement in the effectiveness of our tactical forces.

Increased emphasis has been given in this budget to improving the mobility and firepower of the 14 Army divisions and other active combat elements of the Army and the 3 Marine Corps divisions. Additional quantities of new rifles and machineguns employing the standard NATO ammunition will be procured, as will combat and tactical vehicles of all kinds, including the new M60 tank, the M113 armored personnel carrier, self-propelled howitzers, trucks and jeeps. In recognition of the value of artillery in both nuclear and nonnuclear warfare, an entire new family of self-propelled artillery is introduced with this budget. This new artillery is lighter, more mobile, and, utilizing new ammunition, will have greater range than that of types currently available.

The Army and Marine Corps will also buy a wide variety of guided missiles and rockets, such as Sergeant, Honest John, Little John, and Lacrosse for medium- and close-range ground-fire support; Davy Crockett for an integral infantry-unit close-range atomic support weapon; and Hawk and Redeye for defense of field forces against air attack. Army aircraft procurement proposed for 1961 is more than 35 percent higher than for the current year and includes funds for surveillance aircraft and for utility and medium cargo helicopters.

The tactical forces of the Army are supported by the tactical air wings of the Air Force which will also be provided with an increased capability under these budget recommendations. Funds are provided for increased procurement of F–105 supersonic all-weather fighter bombers. These aircraft, with their low-altitude handling characteristics and large carrying capacities for both nuclear and nonnuclear weapons, will strengthen significantly the air support available to the Army ground units.

The three Marine divisions are tactically supported by three Marine aircraft wings, which will also receive quantities of new aircraft.

Military assistance: The ability of the free world to deter aggression depends on the combined strength and determination of many countries. The total forces of the countries receiving aid under the military assistance program include about 5 million Army troops, 2,200 combatant ships, and over 25,000 aircraft, about half of which are jet. These forces make a vital contribution to the security of the free world, including the United States.

A committee of distinguished private citizens, the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program, conducted an extensive and comprehensive analysis of the mutual security program during the last year. I have previously transmitted the reports of the Committee to the Congress. Many of the significant findings and recommendations of this group have been put into effect by the executive agencies; others are in the process of implementation. The military assistance program has been budgeted in 1961 with other activities and programs of the Department of Defense, and major changes are being made in the management, organization, and programing of military assistance.

Last spring I mentioned the possibility of requesting a supplemental appropriation as suggested by the Committee largely to expedite modernization of NATO forces. However, in view of the time factor involved in securing a separate authorization and appropriation for 1960, a supplemental request this year is not practical.

The new obligational authority of $2 billion recommended for fiscal year 1961 for the military assistance program will provide the training and quantities of materiel required to support the forces in the countries receiving aid. Because of the long leadtime required for many items, procurement must be started in 1961 in order to provide the necessary deliveries in future years. During recent years, deliveries have been maintained only by drawing down the backlog of undelivered items by an amount ranging from $500 to $800 million per year. The backlog has now been reduced to the point where adequate deliveries in the future must depend on new appropriations.

The defense of Western Europe in this era of modern weapons is costly and

must be accomplished through the combined efforts of all NATO countries. Many of these countries have now assumed the financial responsibility for producing or purchasing conventional arms and equipment which the United States previously supplied. At the same time, the 1961 military assistance program squarely faces the pressing need for new and costly weapons for which the free world still looks for help from the United States. In addition, it provides for an intensified training effort to assure effective use and maintenance of the new equipment by allied forces.

This budget also provides for military assistance to countries which are building defenses against aggression and subversion in other parts of the world. These countries border on aggressive regimes, or are confronted with strong internal subversive elements. Many of them have joined in mutual defense organizations such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), or with the United States in bilateral defense agreements. Assistance to these countries, most of which are in the Near East and the Far East, emphasizes primarily the strengthening of conventional forces in keeping with the nature of the threat in each area.

Atomic energy activities: In 1961 the expenditures for the Atomic Energy Commission are expected to remain at the 1960 level of about $2.7 billion. Substantial increases for research and development activities will be offset by reductions in procurement of uranium ore concentrates from United States and Canadian producers. These reductions will bring ore supplies into better balance with production requirements.

Development and production of nuclear weapons in 1961 will remain at the high levels of previous years. The vigorous development of military reactors for a variety of propulsion and power uses will continue. When the land-based prototype reactor for a destroyer is placed into operation in 1961 along with four other naval prototype reactors now operating, nuclear powerplants will be available for major types of naval combatant ships. Emphasis in naval reactor development in 1961 will be placed primarily on development of improved and longer lived reactor fuel. The development of nuclear ramjet engines for missiles, of nuclear aircraft engines, and of nuclear electric powerplants for use at remote military bases will be carried forward.

Peaceful uses of atomic energy: Expenditures in 1961 for development of civilian electric power from atomic energy are estimated at $250 million. Of this amount, $185 million is for research and development and $65 million is for construction of civilian power reactors and related development facilities. The estimated expenditures include amounts from proposed new appropriations of $40 million for assistance to private and public power groups in developing and building demonstration nuclear powerplants, and alternatively for such direct Government construction as may be considered necessary. The number, type, and size of reactors built and the nature of the assistance provided will be determined by the Commission after considering the state of technology and the cooperation proposed by industry.

Expenditures by the Commission for research in the physical and life sciences in 1961 will again increase substantially to over $210 million. This level of research will help the United States to continue its leadership in the study of the behavior of the basic matter of the universe and the effects of radiation on man and his environment. The largest part of the increase will be used to place in operation in the next 18 months three new particle accelerators in the multi-billion electron-volt energy range, including the alternating gradient synchrotron at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

In support of the civilian space program, the Atomic Energy Commission will continue development of nuclear-powered rockets and small, long-lived nuclear power sources for space vehicles. Development work on thermonuclear power and on applications of nuclear explosives to a variety of civilian uses will continue in 1961.

Stockpiling and defense production expansion: Most of the objectives for the stockpile of strategic and critical materials have been met. Receipts of materials under contracts to promote expansion of defense production are continuing at a reduced rate, as the number of such contracts still in effect declines. Hence, expenditures for stockpiling and expansion of defense production are estimated to decline from $230 million in 1960 to $134 million in 1961.

Amendments to outstanding contracts are now being negotiated where practicable, so as to minimize the delivery of materials no longer required for stockpiling. Arrangements are also under way to dispose of materials excess to stockpile objectives whenever disposal will not seriously disrupt markets or adversely affect our international relations.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

The United States is continuing to support programs to maintain world peace and to improve economic conditions throughout the free world. In helping to improve economic conditions, we are being joined in larger measure by our friends in the free world who have now reached a high level of prosperity after recovering from the ravages of war. Accordingly, multilateral programs are being expanded. At the same time, the pressing need for economic development requires the continuation of substantial economic assistance under the mutual security program.

Expenditures for international affairs and finance are estimated to be $2.2 billion in the fiscal year 1961. This amount is $177 million higher than estimated expenditures for 1960, mainly because of larger disbursements by the Development Loan Fund under prior commitments.

Mutual security program: Through the mutual security program as a whole the United States helps promote stability and economic growth in less-developed countries and helps strengthen the defenses of the free world. For these purposes new obligational authority of $4,175 million is recommended in fiscal year 1961, an increase of $949 million over the amount enacted for 1960 (of which $700 million is for military assistance). Expenditures are estimated to be $3,450 million, an increase of $100 million over 1960.

The military assistance portion of this program is carried in the Department of Defense chapter and has been discussed in the major national security section of this message. Economic assistance is discussed in the following paragraphs in this section.

Development Loan Fund: The Development Loan Fund was established in 1957 in order to provide capital to less-developed countries, when capital is not available from other sources. The capital is provided on favorable terms, often including the option to repay in the borrower's own currency. By the end of the fiscal year 1960, the Fund will have made commitments for an estimated 148 loans totaling some $1,400 million. More than three-fourths of the projects it is financing are for roads, railroads, electric power generation, and industry, including industrial development banks. Because many of these projects require several years for construction, expenditures have thus far been relatively small. However, in the fiscal year 1961 they are estimated to be $300 million, an increase of $125 million over 1960. New obligational authority of $700 million is requested for 1961, an increase of $150 million over the amount enacted for 1960. This will provide the loan funds essential to our foreign policy objective of assisting in the economic growth of the less-developed countries of the free world.

Technical cooperation: Technical and administrative skills are no less important for the newly developing countries than capital. Through the technical cooperation program, American experts are sent abroad to transmit the skills required in a modern economy and foreign technicians are brought to the United States for training.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Economic and technical development:				
Mutual security—economic:				
Development Loan Fund	$66	$175	$300	$700
Technical cooperation	169	170	175	206
Defense support	881	740	730	724
Special assistance	257	250	255	268
Other	120	105	110	101
Contingencies	30	110	130	175
Subtotal, mutual security—economic	1,524	1,550	1,700	2,175
International Monetary Fund subscription	1,375	------	------	--------
Inter-American Development Bank	------	80	------	--------
Export-Import Bank	390	−56	−7	--------
Emergency relief abroad and other	113	140	131	116

International affairs and finance—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Conduct of foreign affairs:				
Administration of foreign affairs	$211	$205	$197	$205
Philippine claims:				
Present program	24			
Proposed legislation			49	49
Other	2	5	3	2
Foreign information and exchange activities:				
United States Information Agency	109	110	124	124
Department of State, exchange of persons	22	24	36	36
President's special international program	8	7	8	9
Total	3,780	2,066	2,242	[1] 2,715

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $6,982 million enacted for 1959 and $2,697 million (including $49 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960. The 1959 authorization included $3,175 million for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and $1,375 million for the International Monetary Fund.

For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of $206 million is requested, which is $25 million over the amount enacted for 1960, in order to permit an increase in the bilateral programs. It will also permit a higher contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program and the related special fund; as other governments increase their contributions for the United Nations programs, the U.S. contribution, which is two-fifths of the total, also increases.

Defense support: Many of the less-developed countries participating in the common defense maintain large military forces whose cost imposes a severe strain upon their limited economic resources. In order to help maintain political and economic stability and to prevent the cost of necessary defensive forces from unduly hindering economic development, the United States provides economic aid principally by supplying commodities for consumption and raw materials and machinery for industrial production. For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of $724 million is requested, an increase of $29 million over the amount enacted for 1960.

Special assistance: New obligational authority of $268 million is requested for economic assistance to promote economic and political stability in various countries of the free world where the United States is not supporting military forces, and for certain other special programs. In several instances, this assistance indirectly relates to military bases maintained by the United States.

The appropriation recommended for special assistance in 1961 is $23 million above the amount enacted for 1960. Additional programs are proposed to help improve conditions in Africa, largely for education, public health, and administration.

Increased funds will also be devoted to certain worldwide health programs in conjunction with the World Health Organization of the United Nations. The largest of these is the malaria eradication program, now in its fourth year. In addition numerous public health projects are supported through technical cooperation.

Mutual security program

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Military assistance	$2,340	$1,800	$1,750	$2,000
Economic (including technical) assistance	1,524	1,550	1,700	2,175
Total, mutual security	3,864	3,350	3,450	[1] 4,175

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $3,448 million enacted for 1959 ($1,515 million military, $1,933 million economic) and $3,226 million enacted for 1960 ($1,300 million military, $1,926 million economic).

Other mutual security programs: Other programs include assistance to refugees and escapees; grants of atomic research equipment, including reactors, to the less-developed countries for training and research in nuclear physics; support of the NATO science program; and the United States contribution to the United Nations Children's Fund. For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of $101 million is requested, an increase of $1 million above the amounts enacted for 1960.

Contingencies: Experience has shown that economic and military assistance is also required in some international situations which cannot be foreseen or for which it is not possible to estimate in advance the specific amount needed. To cover situations of this type, new obligational authority of $175 million is requested.

Other economic and technical development: More resources from countries of the free world are being channeled into economic development by increasing the capital funds of international organizations. In the past year the capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was doubled and that of the International Monetary Fund increased by half.

The Inter-American Development Bank, with planned total resources of $1 billion, including $450 million from the United States, is expected to begin operations before the close of this fiscal year. Expenditures of $80 million are estimated in the fiscal year 1960 as the first installment of the U.S. cash investment in the Bank. In addition, guarantee authority of $200 million will be made available, on the basis of which the Bank can sell its bonds to private investors.

Last October the Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development unanimously approved in principle a U.S. proposal for an International Development Association, which will be closely affiliated with the Bank. Under this proposal, the Association will make loans on more flexible terms than the Bank is able to offer under its charter, such as loans repayable in the currency of the borrowing country. In addition, it is expected that the charter of the Association will contain provisions under which a member could provide to the Association, for use in lending operations, other member country currencies which it holds. The draft charter of the Association is being prepared and will probably be submitted to the member governments early this year. Legislation authorizing U.S. participation and making financial provision for membership will be transmitted to the Congress at the appropriate time.

Private investment: The United States is trying to encourage more reliance on private enterprise in foreign economic development. During the past year, the Department of State and the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce have both completed special studies on ways to increase the role of private investment and management abroad. Tax treaties, with investment incentive clauses, are now being negotiated with many countries. More trade missions are being sent abroad. Several of the less-developed countries are opening business information offices in this country. As a result of these various activities, more private investment in the less-developed areas should be forthcoming. To provide an additional incentive, U.S. taxation of income earned in the less-developed areas only should be deferred until repatriated.

Export-Import Bank: The oldest Federal agency specializing in foreign lending and the largest in terms of foreign loan volume is the Export-Import Bank. In the fiscal year 1961 the Bank plans to devote an increasing share of its program to transactions which support economic development abroad. At the same time the Bank plans to finance its operations without requiring net budgetary expenditures by encouraging more participation by private lenders in its loan program and by using funds obtained from repayments on its large outstanding portfolio.

Eligibility for assistance: Amendments to the Battle Act to revise the eligibility requirements for assistance to certain countries are pending before the Congress. It is highly desirable that they be enacted.

Conduct of foreign affairs: The Department of State is making plans to strengthen further the administration of foreign affairs in the fiscal year 1961. The disarmament staff is being expanded in preparation for discussions on disarmament soon to begin in Geneva and for the continuation of the negotiations on the suspension of nuclear tests. Language training programs will also be expanded. New diplomatic and consular posts will be opened in Africa, Latin America, south Asia, and Eastern Europe. For these and other activities, new obligational authority of $205 million is requested for the fiscal year 1961.

Legislation is recommended to remove certain reservations on acceptance by the United States of jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (the World Court).

Legislation will be requested for payment in the fiscal year 1961 of certain war damage claims of the Philippine Government against the United States in the amount of $73 million. These claims

will be partially offset by an amount, now estimated at approximately $24 million, owed to the United States by the Philippine Government. Pending legislation should be enacted in fiscal year 1960 to authorize compensation of $6 million to displaced residents of the Bonin Islands.

Foreign information and exchange activities: New obligational authority totaling $168 million is requested for foreign information and exchange activities in the fiscal year 1961. The United States Information Agency plans to expand its programs in Africa and Latin America, including construction of a new Voice of America transmitter in Africa. The Agency will make greater use of the growing number of television facilities overseas. The expansion of domestic radio transmitting facilities, begun last year in order to improve oversea reception, will continue. Exchanges of key persons with about 80 other countries will be increased, with special emphasis on leaders and teachers.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING

The improvements made in recent years in Federal programs for outer space exploration, aviation, highways, in postal service, housing, urban renewal, and small business will be further extended by this budget.

Expenditures for all commerce and housing programs in the fiscal year 1961 are estimated at $2.7 billion, which is $293 million less than the estimated expenditures for 1960. Proposed legislation to provide adequate postal rates will reduce sharply the net budget expenditures of the Post Office Department. Expenditures for other programs, however, especially space exploration and the promotion of aviation, will increase substantially.

Space exploration and flight technology: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is carrying forward the nonmilitary space projects started by the Department of Defense and has initiated additional programs that will lay the foundations for future exploration and use of outer space. Estimated expenditures of $600 million during the fiscal year 1961, nearly double the expenditures in 1960, will carry forward the programs now under way and those becoming the agency's responsibility in 1961 Appropriations of $802 million for 1961, together with anticipated supplemental appropriations for 1960 of $23 million to restore substantially the congressional reduction in the space program last year, are recommended to finance these programs. Legislation is being submitted to authorize the appropriations required for 1961 and to provide permanent authorization for later years.

I am assigning to this new agency sole responsibility for the development of space booster vehicles of very high thrust, including Project Saturn. This assignment includes the transfer of certain facilities and personnel of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency. With the imminent completion of the Jupiter missile project this outstanding group can concentrate on developing the large space vehicle systems essential to the exploration of space. Certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 will be proposed to clarify the organization and streamline the management of the space programs.

At the present time Soviet scientists have the advantage in the weight of the payloads that they can hurl into space. This weight advantage stems from the earlier start of the Soviet development of very large rocket boosters that they considered necessary for their intercontinental ballistic missile program. Because of the relatively advanced state of our nuclear warheads, however, we were able, after a much later start, to develop an effective ICBM using a smaller rocket booster.

Commerce and housing

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Space exploration and flight technology	$145	$325	$600	$802
Promotion of aviation:				
Federal Aviation Agency	441	567	681	717
Civil Aeronautics Board	53	60	69	72
Promotion of water transportation:				
Department of Commerce	200	257	263	299
Coast Guard	229	276	281	285
Panama Canal Company	7	4	14	------
Provision of highways	30	45	[1] 3	(1)
Postal service:				
Public service costs	------	37	49	49
Postal deficit	774	567	554	554
Proposed rate revisions	------	------	−554	−554
Community development and facilities:				
Urban Renewal Administration	77	197	172	305
Other	31	39	31	27
Public housing programs	97	130	148	159
Other aids to housing:				
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:				
Under present legislation	−41	−50	−57	------
Proposed premium increase	------	------	−28	------
Federal Housing Administration	−51	−76	−120	------
Federal National Mortgage Association	842	56	111	150
College housing loans	180	186	148	------
Veterans housing loans	113	230	−12	------
Farm housing loans and other	43	−122	36	11
Other aids to business:				
Small Business Administration	107	102	120	66
Proposed area assistance legislation	------	------	10	57
Other	32	48	48	64
Regulation of commerce and finance	58	58	64	66
Civil and defense mobilization	46	56	68	76
Disaster loans and relief	8	8	8	------
Total	3,421	3,002	2,709	[2] 3,204

[1] Reflects proposed financing of Federal-aid highways in national forests and public lands from highway trust fund.

[2] Compares with new obligational authority of $2,929 million enacted for 1959 and $3,789 million (including $71 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Our space programs are based on a systematic and technically sound approach to the complicated scientific and engineering problems involved. This approach will assure continued demonstrable achievements. Project Mercury has a high priority and we should be ready to attempt actual manned space flights within the next 2 years. Progress on the development of very high thrust engines and the vehicles to use them will make it possible, in the not too distant future, to launch much larger space vehicles and thus extend the conquest of space.

For the near future satellites and space probes will continue to depend primarily on Thor and Atlas missiles as boosters, with the Delta and Agena upper stages providing improved performance and reliability. These vehicles will make possible a wide variety of highly useful scientific experiments which will provide essential information for future exploration of outer space by manned and unmanned vehicles. Somewhat later the Centaur project will provide an Atlas-boosted space vehicle with further improved capabilities and establish the technology of very high energy propulsion for space vehicles. In all of these projects, the success of the space vehicle launchings depends on a strong continuing program of supporting research and ground testing.

Transportation and communication: The detailed review of transportation problems and policies which I requested last year is now nearing completion in the Department of Commerce. This study should provide a sound basis for administrative actions and for legislation that may be needed to assure adequate and balanced growth of all branches of the Nation's transportation system.

Aviation: Primarily because of the airways modernization program now under way, expenditures of the Federal Aviation Agency will increase by $114 million to an estimated $681 million in fiscal year 1961. New obligational authority of $717 million is requested mainly for procurement and operation of radar equipment, airport landing aids, communications, and other facilities needed to handle the rapidly growing volume of air traffic safely and efficiently and for establishment and enforcement of air safety standards. Research and development activities are being accelerated to insure the future improvements in equipment and techniques required to meet future aviation needs.

The Federal Aviation Agency is already making increasing use of military facilities, and steps are under way to achieve a closer integration of air defense and civil air traffic control networks. Over the next few years the Agency will also assume traffic control functions now performed by military personnel at airbases throughout the world, with significant savings in cost.

Expenditures for subsidy payments to the airlines by the Civil Aeronautics Board are estimated at $69 million in 1961, an increase of $31 million, or 80 percent, over the $38 million actually spent in 1958. Almost all of the subsidy will go to local service airlines, including helicopter operations in three major metropolitan areas and intra-Alaska service. This rise and the prospect of even higher subsidies in the future make necessary the consideration of proposals to reduce the dependence of these airlines on the Government.

Airway user charges: Consistent with the principle that special beneficiaries of Government programs should pay the

cost of those benefits, the users of the Federal airways should ultimately be expected to pay their full share of rising capital and operating costs. Accordingly, the effective tax on aviation gasoline should be raised from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and the same tax should also be levied on jet fuels, which are now tax-free. Receipts from all aviation fuel taxes should be retained in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund as at present. These actions will increase revenues to the general fund by an estimated $89 million in fiscal year 1961.

Promotion of water transportation: Expenditures of the Department of Commerce to aid water transportation will be sharply higher in both 1960 and 1961 than in 1959, primarily because of higher levels of payments required under past commitments for ship operating and construction subsidies. A supplemental appropriation of $32 million will be requested for the current year to meet increased operating subsidy obligations caused by lower earnings of the shipping industry and to permit prompt payment of subsidies accrued.

Efforts to maintain a U.S. merchant fleet adequate, along with the ships of our allies, to meet national defense requirements are seriously hampered by high operating costs. To preserve the capability of our merchant fleet without placing an undue burden on the taxpayer will require willingness by ship operators, maritime labor, and the Government to explore and adopt new solutions.

This budget provides for expanded work on advanced ship designs that could bring sharply reduced operating costs. By extending the operation of war-built vessels, which comprise more than 70 percent of the subsidized fleet, over a somewhat longer period, the results of this research can be more fully exploited in replacement plans. The Secretary of Commerce is also undertaking a special study of sailing requirements and competitive conditions of maritime trade routes and services, in the hope of discovering opportunities to increase the benefits flowing from the public investment in this area.

I repeat the request made last year that the 3½-percent interest rate ceiling on ship mortgage loans made by the Maritime Administration be replaced by authority to charge the Government's full cost for such loans.

Work will continue on widening sections of the Panama Canal from 300 to 500 feet to facilitate the movement of increased ship traffic. Largely as a result of this program and the increased disbursements for the $20 million Balboa Bridge, which is being built to fulfill a treaty commitment with the Republic of Panama, expenditures of the Panama Canal Company in 1961 will be $10 million higher than in 1960.

Highways: Federal payments of $2,728 million from the highway trust fund in 1961 will enable the States to proceed with construction of the Interstate System at a level consistent with the pay-as-you-build principle established by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 and reaffirmed by the Congress in 1959. Last year I recommended that highway fuel taxes be increased by 1½ cents per gallon for a period of 5 years to meet estimated expenditure requirements. The Congress after months of delay enacted an increase of only 1 cent for less than 2 years.

As a result of both the delay and the failure to provide the full amount of revenue requested, the roadbuilding program has been slowed below a desirable rate of progress. The apportionments to the States for future construction had to be reduced and a plan had to be established to time reimbursements to the States so that the trust fund could be kept in balance. By timely action and planning, however, potential failures to reimburse States promptly for want of funds in the trust fund have been avoided, and equitable and proportionate programs in every State have been established.

I urge the Congress again to increase the highway fuel tax by another one-half cent per gallon and to continue the tax at 4½ cents until June 30, 1964. This will permit the construction program for the Interstate System to proceed at a higher and more desirable level. I request repeal of the diversion of excise taxes enacted last year for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1964. New reports giving estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System and recommendations on the allocation of costs among future highway beneficiaries will become available in 1961. At the appropriate time, further recommendations will be made to the Congress for the ensuing conduct and financing of the program.

A temporary advance of $359 million from the Treasury to the trust fund was necessary in fiscal 1960 to balance out the monthly flow of revenues and expenditures within the fiscal year, but this will be repaid by June 30, 1960. A similar temporary advance of $200 million will be required in the fiscal year 1961, repayable before the end of that year.

During this session of the Congress, funds should be authorized for 1962 and 1963 for regular Federal-aid highway programs and for forest and public lands highways. In view of the limited resources available to the trust fund and the priority requirements of the Interstate System, it is recommended that authorizations for the regular programs for each of these years be reduced to $900 million from $925 million provided for 1961. Annual authorizations of $33 million for forest highways and $3 million for public lands highways are also recommended.

Finally, I again request that the financing of forest and public lands highways be transferred from the general fund to the highway trust fund. Most of these highways are integral parts of the Federal-aid systems, and they should be financed in the same way.

Postal service: The Post Office Department is intensifying its efforts to improve service and to hold down the persistent postal deficit while handling a growing volume of mail. Initial steps have been taken to mechanize mail processing and to reduce serious congestion at major distribution centers. Ultimately, modern mail processing plants will be established in all principal urban areas to assure prompt and efficient deliveries.

The Postal Policy Act of 1958 established the policy that postal rates should be adjusted whenever necessary to recover postal expenses, excluding the costs of certain public services as fixed by appropriation acts. Over the past 13 fiscal years, 1947–59, the Federal budget has had to finance postal deficits totaling $6.8 billion, which is almost half of the increase in the national debt during that time. At the average rate of interest on the outstanding debt the taxpayers are paying well over $200 million annually in interest for the unwillingness of the Congress to take timely action to increase postal rates.

For fiscal 1961, a postal service deficit of $554 million is estimated with postage rates now in effect or scheduled, after designating $49 million as attributable to public services. Rate increases enacted in 1958 were substantially less than needed to meet the deficit at that time and made no allowance for the pay increase for postal employees then enacted. Since then, increased railroad rates (up $55 million), costs of modernization (up $80 million), and the new employee health insurance program ($39 million) have widened the gap between revenues and expenditures.

Accordingly, legislation is again proposed to increase first-class and airmail rates by 1 cent and to raise other rates and fees by enough to cover the postal deficit. I urge the Congress to act promptly on these proposals, which will be submitted in the near future.

Housing and community development: I have presented to each of the past two sessions of the Congress a comprehensive program of legislation for the Government's housing and community development programs. Some of these recommendations were enacted in the Housing Act of 1959. This year, legislation will be requested only for the authority necessary to continue important existing programs and provide necessary flexibility in interest rates. The authorization of additional funds for these programs should be subject to appropriation action.

Urban renewal: In the decade since Federal grants were first authorized, urban redevelopment has become recognized as essential to the future vitality of our cities, and planning has been initiated on 647 projects in 385 communities. However, only 26 projects have been completed. An additional 355 projects for which Federal funds have been obligated are now under way, but progress on many of these has been slow.

The budget, accordingly, places major emphasis on accelerating program progress. Sixty-five projects are scheduled for completion in 1960 and 1961. At the same time, the number of projects under way is expected to increase from 355 at the end of 1959 to 510 at the end of 1961. The acquisition of land for these projects in 1961 is estimated at more than double, and the sale of land to redevelopers at nearly triple, the 1959 amounts. As a result of the increased rate of activity, a supplemental appropriation of $50 million will be necessary in the current year

to pay capital grants for projects nearing completion under prior contracts. Since the Housing Act of 1959 provided new contract authority for capital grants of $350 million for 1960 and $300 million for 1961, no additional obligational authority will be necessary for this program for 1961.

Public facility loans: The authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to borrow $100 million from the Treasury for loans to small communities for needed public facilities will be exhausted early in 1961. An additional $20 million will be required to meet loan applications through the end of the fiscal year 1961. Legislation is recommended to authorize the provision in annual appropriation acts of this amount and such future increases as may be necessary.

Public housing programs: By the end of fiscal year 1961, about 500,000 federally aided public housing units will be occupied and an additional 125,000 units will be under contract for Federal contributions. In the allocation of new contracts authorized in the Housing Act of 1959 emphasis is being given to projects which will be constructed in the near future. The 1959 act authorized 37,000 added units of public housing, to be available until allocated. Accordingly, no additional authorization is requested. Increases of $18 million in 1961 expenditures result primarily from rising Federal contributions to local authorities under past contracts.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: The share accounts of savings and loan associations insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation have increased fivefold over the past 10 years. With a continuation of this rate of growth, the insurance reserve of the Corporation cannot reach levels commensurate with the mounting insurance liability without an increase in the present premium rate. I am, accordingly, recommending legislation to restore the higher premium rate in effect prior to 1949, to remain in force until the reserve exceeds 1 percent of the share accounts and borrowings of insured institutions. At the same time, the statutory goal of a reserve equal to 5 percent of such accounts and borrowings exceeds potential needs and should be reduced to 2 percent. In addition, the Corporation should be given authority to borrow from private sources, both to increase the available sources of funds to levels adequate to meet any temporary borrowing needs and to reduce its potential dependence upon the Federal Government.

Insurance of private mortgages: The mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration will continue in 1961 to underwrite a substantial share of the mortgages on residential housing. While it is difficult to forecast mortgage insurance requirements, the general mortgage insurance authorization of the Federal Housing Administration now appears to be adequate to meet demands for mortgage insurance until the next Congress is in session.

Sharp fluctuations in the demand for mortgage insurance during recent years have caused the funds available for personnel under appropriation act limitations to be inadequate in periods of heavy demand to provide the staff required by the Federal Housing Administration for prompt service on applications. Supplemental funds are usually not made available in time to meet this problem. To correct this situation, appropriation language is being requested to permit use of additional income for such expenses when actual demand exceeds the budget estimate.

Legislation should also be enacted to extend the authority for insurance of loans on home improvements. This program, which makes a major contribution to modernization of existing homes, would otherwise expire on October 1, 1960.

Last year legislation was recommended to provide some flexibility in maximum interest rates on mortgages originated under the housing loan and guarantee programs of the Veterans' Administration and under certain mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration. The action taken by the Congress was inadequate and some of these programs are now seriously hampered by their inability at present maximum interest rates to attract adequate private capital. The Veterans' Administration should be given the same flexibility to adjust its interest rates to market conditions which is now possessed by the Federal Housing Administration in its basic mortgage insurance programs. In addition, the maximum interest rate of 4½ percent on insured mortgages on armed services family housing should be removed.

Veterans housing loans: The direct housing loan program of the Veterans' Administration, which has been extended several times, terminates July 25, 1960, and I am asking for no further authorization. At that time, over $1 billion of loans will be outstanding, and the program will have provided over 150,000 loans to veterans. There is no longer justification for continuing this readjustment program.

Mortgage purchases: The authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow from the Treasury to purchase mortgages under its special assistance program will be exhausted during 1961. I am recommending legislation which would permit future increases in authorization to be subject to appropriation review. An additional $150 million is requested for 1961 for this program. The additional funds will be used chiefly to buy mortgages on housing in urban renewal areas, on housing for the relocation of displaced families, and on housing for the elderly.

Special assistance for these mortgages is intended to be transitional, and an increasing proportion of total financing should in the future be obtained from private sources. With annual financing requirements in excess of $1 billion already in sight for these programs, the need can be met only with the full and active support of local communities and private financial institutions.

At the same time, mortgage purchases by the Association's secondary market operations trust fund will continue at high levels. Expenditures for such purchases are estimated at $1,047 million in 1960 and $975 million in 1961. These purchases will be almost wholly financed through the sale of debentures to the public and the purchase of common stock by mortgage sellers. Budget expenditures of $50 million, however, will be necessary for the additional Treasury purchases of the preferred stock of the Association required to support the mortgage purchase program.

College housing: No additional authorizations are proposed for the existing college housing direct loan program. The housing needs of our colleges and universities represent only a part of the need for new university facilities of all types. These needs should be considered as a whole and within the framework of the general problems of education. I have, accordingly, recommended the termination of the college housing program and the enactment of legislation authorizing a new program of grants and loan guarantees for college facilities, to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (discussed under labor and welfare programs).

Small business: The increase in financial assistance to small businesses under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 will continue in 1961. I recommend the enactment of legislation previously proposed to the Congress to encourage the formation of additional investment companies by liberalizing the authority of these companies, thus expanding the supply of private capital available to small businesses. Other loans by the Small Business Administration will continue at a high level, but less new obligational authority is recommended because repayments on outstanding loans will increase. Efforts to assist small businesses in obtaining a fair share of Federal Government procurement and surplus property will also continue. In order to facilitate small business financing, the Securities Act of 1933 should be amended to extend the privilege of simplified filings to a wider range of security issues.

Area assistance: Despite the rapid economic recovery in the Nation as a whole, unemployment remains high in a relatively small number of local areas. The chronic problems in these communities reflect primarily basic changes in consumer buying habits, production methods, and industry location patterns. Some localities and States have properly taken the initiative in measures designed to meet these problems. In addition, the Department of Commerce, with the cooperation of 13 other Federal agencies, is intensifying existing Federal programs to encourage and support this local initiative. More help is required. Therefore, for the past 4 years I have requested expanded legislative authority, primarily for loans and grants, to supplement existing Federal, State, and local programs. Prompt enactment of this legislation is important. The budget includes an estimated $57 million in appropriations as the initial amount necessary to provide the proposed additional Federal aid.

Regulation of commerce and finance: The general growth of the economy,

newly legislated responsibilities, and the increased complexity of the problems which confront the regulatory agencies require increases in funds for most of them. The largest single increase in this category will permit the Federal Communications Commission to make a thorough study of ultra-high-frequency television to determine whether channels in this range can be used to meet the needs of the expanding television industry.

I again recommend legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws, including extending Federal regulation to bank mergers accomplished through the acquisition of assets, requiring businesses of significant size to notify the antitrust agencies of proposed mergers, empowering the Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases when civil procedures are contemplated, and authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek preliminary injunctions in merger cases where a violation of law is likely.

Civil and defense mobilization: Preparations for nonmilitary defense have been seriously hindered by the unwillingness of Congress to provide appropriations to carry out programs authorized by the 1958 amendments to the Federal Civil Defense Act. Funds are again being requested for 1961, as well as in a supplemental appropriation for 1960, to help States and localities strengthen their full-time civil defense organizations. Increased funds are also required to finance greater purchases of radiological instruments for donation to the States; for expansion of the emergency preparedness activities of other Federal agencies; and to carry on the national fallout shelter policy.

In accordance with the national fallout shelter policy, the Federal departments and agencies have been directed to include fallout shelters when appropriate in the design of new buildings for civilian use, and funds for such shelters are included in the budget requests of the various agencies. In addition, the budget of the General Services Administration includes $6 million for a new fallout shelter program at certain Federal relocation sites and in some existing Federal buildings.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In the fiscal year 1961, Federal programs for agriculture will again have a heavy impact on the budget, primarily because of continued high agricultural production and the past unwillingness of the Congress to make appropriate modifications in the long-established price support laws. The longer unrealistic price supports are retained, the more difficult it will be to make the adjustments in production needed to permit relaxation of Government controls over farm operations.

Last year I proposed to the Congress urgently needed legislation relating to price supports. Very little of that program was enacted. I recommend that the Congress give this important matter early consideration.

Particularly urgent now is legislation to put wheat price supports on a more realistic basis. Stocks of wheat are continuing to rise in spite of our efforts to move wheat abroad through the International Wheat Agreement, sales for foreign currencies, and grants to disaster victims and needy people. The carryover of wheat stocks is expected to rise to almost 1.4 billion bushels by July 1, 1960, an amount that would provide for more than 2 years of domestic consumption without any additional production.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:				
Commodity Credit Corporation—price support, supply, and purchase programs	$2,775	$1,828	$2,279	$1,250
Commodity Credit Corporation—special activities (other than acreage reserve of the soil bank):				
Public Law 480	1,022	1,055	1,172	881
International Wheat Agreement	48	49	68	49
National Wool Act	20	94	70	51
Other	347	243	124	423
Soil bank—acreage reserve:				
Program total	673	6	------	--------
Under CCC special activities	(64)	(5)	------	--------
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	141	110	110	271
Sugar Act	67	74	78	74
Other	34	41	48	47
Subtotal	5,126	3,499	3,950	3,046
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones	315	334	355	200
Financing farm ownership and operation:				
Farm Credit Administration	5	6	8	2
Farmers Home Administration	246	236	221	216
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:				
Conservation reserve:				
Existing program total	175	365	362	362
Under CCC special activities	(4)	(30)	------	--------
Proposed legislation	------	------	32	32
Agricultural Conservation Program Service:				
Program total	246	244	233	243
Under CCC special activities	(7)	(1)	(−12)	--------
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program)	125	130	137	136
Research and other agricultural services	291	298	325	333
Total, agriculture and agricultural resources	6,529	5,113	5,623	[1] 4,570

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $5,421 million enacted for 1959 and $5,099 million (including $704 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

The wheat surplus problem has been a long time in the making and cannot be solved overnight. In fact, wheat legislation enacted in this session cannot be made applicable before the 1961 crop. The fact that any significant effect on the budget would be delayed until the fiscal year 1962 underlines the need for prompt action at this session of the Congress.

Authority to bring additional land into the conservation reserve expires after the 1960 crop year. Legislation is proposed to extend this authority through the 1963 crop year and to expand the program by increasing the basic limitation on the amount of payments that may be made in any calendar year from $450 million to $600 million. Specific authority will be requested for the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration, in allocating conservation reserve funds, to those States and regions where curtailment of production of wheat or other surplus commodities is consistent with long-range conservation and production-adjustment goals. The rental rates needed to induce farmers to withdraw cropland from production under the conservation reserve depend on the income prospects from farming, which in turn are a reflection of the levels of price supports. Therefore, the future authorization for the conservation reserve program should not be increased above the 1960 level unless needed price support legislation is enacted for wheat.

Estimated expenditures for agricultural programs in fiscal 1961 are $5.6 billion, which is $510 million more than the estimate for the current year but $907 million less than was spent in 1959. Total new authority to incur obligations requested for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1961 is $4.6 billion. This amount includes $1.3 billion to restore, to the extent necessary, the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from previous price support losses and $1.4 billion to reimburse the Corporation for estimated costs and losses through the fiscal year 1960 of other programs financed through that agency.

Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: Most of the recent year-to-year variations in expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources reflect changes in expenditures for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and farm income. During the five fiscal years, 1955–59, Federal spending for these programs has accouted for 70 percent to 80 percent of the total for all agricultural programs. In the fiscal year 1961, these programs are estimated to cost $3.9 billion, an increase of $450 million over 1960, but a decrease of $1.2 billion from 1959.

Under present laws, price support expenditures for agricultural commodities cannot be controlled through regular budgetary processes. They are the result, mainly, of the loans and commodity purchases that the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make, and the other price- and income-supporting programs that the Corporation is required to finance, under existing laws. These expenditures reflect the volume of production, consumption, and exports of price-supported commodities, which, in turn, are influenced by such uncertain factors as the weather and domestic and foreign economic conditions.

The budget estimate for 1961 reflects the residual effect of the large 1958 and 1959 crops and assumes that yields on price-supported crops for the 1960 crop year will be in line with recent averages; also exports of farm commodities in the fiscal year 1961 may be down somewhat from the high level expected in 1960.

The Sugar Act expires on December 31, 1960. To give sugar producers maximum time for production planning, action should be taken early in the present session of the Congress to continue this program.

We are continuing to use our surplus agricultural production in many ways for constructive purposes overseas through the "food for peace" program. Under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), surplus wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and other commodities are being sold abroad for foreign currencies. These currencies are used principally as loans or grants for the economic development and common defense in foreign countries, and to a lesser extent to finance various U.S. programs abroad. Surplus commodities are also being given to foreign governments for emergency relief needs and to private relief organizations in support of their programs abroad; over 60 million needy people benefited this past year from these donation programs. Last year the executive branch proposed certain amendments which, if enacted, would have made this surplus disposal program more effective. It is recommended that the Congress again consider these amendments.

Rural electrification and telephones: About 96 percent of our farms now have central station electric service, as compared with 11 percent in 1935. The expanding use of power in the areas served by electric cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration continues to require substantial amounts of new capital every year to provide additional generating capacity and heavier transmission and distribution facilities. More than one-half of the total power sales by the REA system are made to rural industrial, recreational, and other nonfarm customers. The nonfarm users now comprise over 80 percent of the new customers being added.

The Rural Electrification Administration currently finances the capital needs of the cooperatives by borrowing from the Treasury at the statutory interest rate of 2 percent and relending at the same rate. Legislation is proposed under which REA would (a) borrow from the Treasury at not to exceed the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on recently issued long-term marketable obligations, and (b) make future electric and telephone loans at the same rate plus one-fifth of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and estimated losses. Legislation now before the Congress to place the operations of this agency on a revolving fund basis should also be enacted.

It is vital, looking ahead, that legislation be developed to enable telephone as well as electric borrowers to obtain funds from a mutually owned financing institution to meet the needs for the future growth of these borrowers. Under this longer range plan, loans would also be available from the Rural Electrification Administration to meet special circumstances. The Secretary of Agriculture will work with REA cooperatives and other interested parties in developing such a proposal.

Farm ownership and operation: In 1961, new direct loans and administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration are proposed in an amount equal to estimated collections on outstanding loans. Loans are made to borrowers who are unable to obtain credit from other sources at interest rates currently prevailing in their communities in order to finance farm ownership and enlargement, farm operations, and soil and water conservation. Direct loans for farm ownership and soil and water conservation are supplemented with private loans insured by the Federal Government.

The present authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and ranchers is the cumulative result of the enactment of many separate laws over a long period of years. The legislation now before the Congress to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make these types of loans should be enacted. Also, the pending legislation to require the States to share a greater part of the costs of farm disaster relief assistance should be enacted.

Conservation of agricultural resources: Expenditures under the conservation reserve program are expected to be $394 million in the fiscal year 1961. Of this amount $362 million will be needed to fulfill commitments incurred in the crop years 1956 through 1960 under existing authority, and $32 million will be used for conservation practice payments and additional operating expenses under proposed legislation to extend this program for 3 years. Under the proposed legislation it is planned to add about 9 million additional acres to the program during the 1961 crop year, bringing the total at the end of that crop year to about 37 million acres. Increases in expenditures required for the 1961 crop year program will occur mainly in 1962 and later fiscal years.

In both the 1959 and 1960 appropriation acts, the Congress maintained the agricultural conservation program at levels which far exceeded my recommendations. As a result, expenditures of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service are estimated to be $244 million in 1960 and $233 million in 1961. The advance authorization for the 1961 agricultural conservation program, which will affect primarily fiscal year 1962 expenditures, should be limited to $100 million. The lower program recommended, together with other public aids for soil and water conservation, will meet the Nation's high-priority conservation needs.

Federal policy on cost-sharing assistance in the future should be concentrated on conservation measures which will foster needed shifts to less intensive uses of cropland, and assistance should be eliminated for practices which increase capacity to produce agricultural commodities already in surplus supply. Continuation of cost sharing for output-increasing practices would directly conflict with the recommended expansion of the conservation reserve program under which cropland is removed from production.

New obligational authority of $43 million is recommended for the upstream watershed programs, including $28 million for projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Of this amount, $5 million is provided to initiate construction on projects involving an estimated total Federal cost of $29 million.

New obligational authority of $10 million is requested for the Great Plains conservation program, the same as for 1960. Under this program conducted in designated counties of the 10 Great Plains States, the Federal Government provides cost-sharing and technical assistance to farmers who enter into long-term contracts to make needed adjustments of land use on their farms.

Research and other agricultural services: Expenditures for research, education, and other agricultural services, exclusive of programs financed with foreign currencies, will be about $8 million higher in the fiscal year 1961 than in 1960. This amount will provide increased support for the research programs on pesticide residues and on industrial uses of farm commodities. It will also provide increased support for the rural development program which is making an important contribution to the solution of the economic problems of rural areas arising out of technological changes in agriculture and inadequate employment opportunities.

In addition, it is estimated that $19 million will be spent in 1961 for the purchase of foreign currencies, obtained from the sale of surplus farm commodities, to be used for research and market development work abroad. This compares with approximately $12 million in foreign currencies to be used for this purpose in 1960.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The recommendations in this budget for Federal natural resource programs take into account their great importance to the Nation's economic growth and security.

The estimated total of $1.9 billion to be spent in the fiscal year 1961 for natural resources is more than has been spent for this purpose in any previous year. The increase of $152 million over 1960 is predominantly for water resources programs.

Water resources: The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation will spend an estimated $1.2 billion in the fiscal year 1961 to construct, maintain, and operate flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and related projects. This record total includes, in addition to operating costs, $965 million to continue construction on projects started in 1960 or prior years, $12 million for advance planning, and $18 million for the first-year expenditures on 42 proposed new starts. These new projects, as well as three new construction starts by the Tennessee Valley Authority and one by the International Boundary and Water Commission, are recommended in this budget in the interest of balanced development of water resources.

For the Corps of Engineers, appropriations (as distinct from the expenditures previously discussed) of $21 million are

required for starting 31 new projects and for an additional number of smaller projects costing less than $400,000 each. The estimated commitments for these new projects total $301 million. Appropriations of $6 million for 1961 are recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin construction on six projects with total estimated commitments of $184 million, and $11 million for loans which will be used by local groups to start work on five small reclamation projects.

I again recommend that the Congress authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers	$779	$860	$910	$936
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Reclamation	246	234	300	314
Power marketing agencies	33	40	40	40
Indian lands resources	57	62	57	41
Public domain and other	33	36	40	38
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	15	7	4	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	7	35	73	21
Federal Power Commission	7	7	8	8
Department of State and other	5	6	9	9
Mineral resources	71	66	64	63
Forest resources	201	223	222	191
Recreational resources	86	87	87	54
Fish and wildlife resources	68	70	71	68
General resource surveys and other	60	53	53	53
Total	1,669	1,785	1,938	[1] 1,836

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,742 million enacted for 1959 and $2,538 million (including $32 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

To carry forward the joint development of the waters of the Rio Grande, construction should be started on the Amistad (Diablo) Dam, in accordance with the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico. I urge the Congress to enact promptly the legislation now needed to authorize negotiation of an agreement for this construction. Funds will be requested for the U.S. share of the first-year cost of this project following enactment of the legislation. Provision is made in this budget to begin modification of the lower Rio Grande levee system.

Under legislation enacted during the past session, the Tennessee Valley Authority plans to issue an estimated $115 million of revenue bonds in 1961. These funds will be used to help finance construction of a second unit in the Paradise steam powerplant and of other units under way, including new generating capacity in the eastern part of the TVA area. The Authority will start construction of the Melton Hill project for navigation and power. In accordance with this administration's policy, and as authorized under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended by the recently enacted revenue bond legislation, the power facilities portion of this project will be financed from net power proceeds and revenue bonds, and the remaining portion will be financed from appropriations. With the completion of the Wilson lock, the present lock at Wheeler Dam will be a bottleneck for shipping on the Tennessee River. Appropriations are therefore recommended for 1961 to begin construction of a new lock at Wheeler Dam.

Research for converting sea water and brackish water into fresh water, carried on cooperatively by the Department of the Interior and non-Federal groups has progressed to the point where some processes are in the development stage. Construction will begin in 1960 at Freeport, Tex., on a demonstration plant for conversion of sea water, and $1.5 million is recommended in the 1961 budget for the Federal cost of building the first brackish water plant as well as a second sea water plant. Advance planning will be completed in 1961 on two additional demonstration plants.

Cost sharing on flood protection projects: It is essential that legislation be promptly enacted to establish a consistent basis for cost sharing on projects which provide flood protection benefits. At the present time, the various Federal agencies responsible for flood protection operate under different and confusing cost-sharing standards. The non-Federal contributions vary from zero to over 60 percent. This intolerable situation should be corrected. Legislation now before the Congress would require generally that identifiable non-Federal interests receiving flood protection benefits bear at least 30 percent of the costs of flood protection. The value of lands, easements, and rights-of-way contributed locally would be included as part of this non-Federal share. The cost of operation and maintenance would also be a State or local responsibility.

Mineral resources: Amendments to the Helium Act were recommended last year to carry out a long-range plan for conserving helium. This lightweight nonflammable gas is important to the Nation's atomic energy and missile programs, and known deposits of it are extremely limited. Under the legislation proposed, private industry would be encouraged to finance, build, and operate plants which would make helium available for conservation by the Department of the Interior. Prompt enactment is needed to check the waste of this essential gas.

The Bureau of Mines will continue its research on improved methods of production and utilization of coal and other minerals. Legislation is again recommended to grant authority to the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research, thus allowing the Secretary to use outside scientific resources to assist the coal industry.

Other resource programs: In the fiscal year 1961, programs for conserving and developing the resources of the public domain and Indian lands will be carried on at about the 1960 levels. Although total expenditures for forest resources are estimated at about the same level in 1961 as in 1960, some increases are provided in 1961 to carry forward the long-range program of the Forest Service for conservation and development, including added facilities and services to accommodate campers and picnickers. It is expected that these increased expenditures will be offset by a decrease in the unusually large 1960 outlays for fighting forest fires.

Receipts from the timber, grazing, and mineral resources on these public lands are estimated to increase to a total of over $400 million in 1961, including revenues from mineral leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. To obtain a more adequate return for use of federally owned resources, legislation is again recommended to revise the fee schedule for noncompetitive oil and gas leases on public domain lands.

In the interest of improving efficiency and providing convenience for the non-Federal parties concerned, certain functions with respect to land and timber exchanges should be transfered from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture by legislation embodying the basic provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, which was disapproved by the Congress. In these exchanges, the Government obtains non-Federal lands in exchange for national forest lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture or for timber on such lands. This legislation is need to simplify the work relating to these land exchanges.

Each year more of our citizens use and enjoy the national parks. Expenditures of $86 million estimated for the National Park Service in 1961 for recreational resources will provide for additional urgently needed facilities and services for visitors, for maintenance and operation of the present facilities, and for selective acquisition of lands to add to existing park areas.

Before it is too late we should take steps to preserve, for public benefit, part of the remaining undeveloped shore areas. I hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact during this session the legislation proposed in the last session to permit the Secretary of the Interior to select and acquire for the national park system three areas which would be of national significance because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational advantages, and other public values.

Contract authority is available to finance planned construction of parkways, roads, and trails in the national parks and forests and on Indian lands during 1961. Beginning in 1962, this construction should be financed by direct appropriations, and the budget so contemplates.

Recent legislation increased the fee charged to hunters of migratory birds and earmarked these revenues for acquisition of lands for refuges and nesting areas. In 1961 land acquisitions from these revenues will be four times those of the current year. Other proposed increases in expenditures for fish and wildlife resources are mainly for fishery research.

LABOR AND WELFARE

Budget expenditures for labor and welfare programs in the fiscal year 1961

are estimated to reach an all-time high of $4.6 billion, of which three-fourths will take the form of grants to States and localities. The total expenditures are estimated to be $128 million more than for the current year. The largest increase is for promotion of public health, mainly for research and hospital construction, as a result of much larger appropriations by the Congress in previous years. Significant increases are also estimated for the support of basic research provided by the National Science Foundation and for the defense education and public assistance programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Budget expenditures for labor and welfare programs will be more than double the amount a decade ago. During the same period, trust funds expenditures for these programs, including social security and unemployment compensation, will have quintupled to an estimated $16.2 billion in 1961.

Labor and welfare

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Promotion of education:				
National Science Foundation, science education	$51	$54	$59	$70
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:				
Defense education program	78	134	170	171
Assistance to schools in federally affected areas	216	234	207	171
Vocational education and other	63	67	67	69
Other, primarily Bureau of Indian Affairs	60	60	62	65
Promotion of science, research, libraries and museums:				
National Science Foundation, basic research	55	71	101	122
Department of Commerce:				
Bureau of the Census	23	91	36	29
National Bureau of Standards and other	12	22	33	50
Other	27	37	50	45
Labor and manpower:				
Temporary extended unemployment compensation	447	−7	------	--------
Grants for administration of employment service and unemployment compensation	306	323	311	326
Other	91	99	124	126
Promotion of public health:				
National Institutes of Health, research grants and activities	265	364	390	400
Grants for construction of health research facilities	23	26	29	25
Hospital construction grants	136	144	161	126
Grants for construction of waste treatment facilities	36	45	45	20
Other	243	271	279	276
Public assistance	1,969	2,056	2,087	2,087
Correctional and penal institutions	39	46	48	57
Other welfare services:				
School lunch and special milk programs	218	234	234	225
Other	61	71	76	79
Total	4,421	4,441	4,569	[1] 4,538

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $4,182 million enacted for 1959 and $4,543 million (including $22 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

New obligational authority recommended for 1961 totals $4.5 billion, about the same as for 1960 but $356 million more than for 1959. Reductions from 1960 are recommended in the grant-in-aid programs for assistance to schools in federally affected areas for hospital construction, and for waste treatment works construction. Larger appropriations are proposed for other presently authorized activities in the fields of science, vocational rehabilitation, education, welfare, and health. In addition, a number of new programs are recommended to meet important national needs, particularly in the education and labor fields.

In the last several years great strides forward have been made in the social security, welfare, and health fields. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is continually reviewing the various programs in these fields for the purpose of determining where improvement should be made. As needs for improvement are found, appropriate recommendations will be made.

Education and research: Our Nation seeks to foster a climate of freedom and creativity in which education, the arts, and fundamental science can flourish. The Federal Government helps in the attainment of these objectives through programs for support of basic research, aid to educational institutions, and training assistance to individuals in various fields important to the national interest. In this budget, I recommend increased appropriations for high-priority education and research programs and enactment of new legislation to authorize additional aids to education.

I am recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that prohibits payments or loans from being made to any individual unless he executes an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels that it is being singled out for this requirement.

Education: Expenditures for the education-aid programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will increase sharply in 1961. During the current school year more than 100,000 students from 1,368 colleges, about four times the number of students last year, are expected to borrow from college loan funds to which the Government makes repayable advances. A supplemental appropriation of nearly $10 million is proposed to enlarge this loan program for 1960. A small increase in appropriations is recommended for 1961 pending further experience on the rate at which loans will be made to students. Increases are also proposed for fellowships for prospective college teachers; for grants to States for science, mathematics, and foreign language teaching equipment; for research in the educational use of television and other media; for contracts with universities for training of counselors and for foreign language training; and for grants to States for vocational training in occupations requiring scientific skills.

Appropriations of $70 million are requested for aids to science education programs administered by the National Science Foundation, an increase of $3 million over the amount provided in 1960.

The budget includes the same aggregate amount for vocational education programs as was appropriated this year, but with shift in emphasis. The need for Federal assistance in the vocational education programs begun in 1917 for the purpose of stimulating training in agriculture, home economics, industrial trades, and distributive occupations is not as great as for promotion of training in new science-age skills. Thus as increased funds for training needs in new skills are provided under the National Defense Education Act, Federal assistance for the older programs is being reduced by a corresponding amount.

Appropriations recommended for 1961 to assist school districts whose enrollment comes partially from children whose parents work or reside on Federal property are $54 million below those enacted for 1960 and are in line with requirements under legislation proposed by the administration last year. The appropriation recommended for these programs is the maximum which I believe should be provided. The substantial increase in Federal employment during World War II, which led to the enactment of this legislation in 1950, has been superseded by a relatively stable Federal Establishment. In many cases, the presence of Federal installations in the communities adds to rather than detracts from the revenue base for the support of schools. This is particularly true where parents employed by the Government live on private property which is subject to State and local taxation even though they earn their income on nontaxable Federal property. The proposed legislation would discharge more equitably the Federal responsibility in these districts, and its prompt enactment by the Congress is recommended.

The pressing need now is not for aid to federally affected districts on the basis initiated in 1950 but for general aid to help localities with limited resources to build public schools. Despite encouraging progress in the rate of school construction, many school districts are still finding it difficult to avoid overcrowding and double sessions as enrollments continue to mount. Moreover, increasing secondary school enrollments require facilities which are much more costly than elementary school classrooms. Last year the administration recommended legislation authorizing annual Federal advances to local school districts to pay up to half the debt service (principal and interest) on $3 billion of bonds to be issued in the next 5 years for school construction. This legislation is designed to stimulate, not supplant, additional State and local effort. Affirmative action should be taken this year on that proposal.

Congressional approval of the administration's proposals for aid to higher educational institutions is also essential. The enrollment growth facing colleges and universities from 1960 to 1975 brings

a need for additional academic, housing, and related educational facilities. To help colleges finance the construction required, the administration's proposal would authorize Federal guarantees of $1 billion in bonds with interest subject to Federal taxation, and would provide Federal grants, payable over 20 years, equal to 25 percent of the principal of $2 billion of bonds. This program would provide aid on a much broader basis, and result in the construction of much larger total amounts of college facilities per dollar of Federal expenditures, than the present more limited college housing loan program which should be allowed to expire.

Basic research: To provide a strong foundation of fundamental scientific knowledge for the Nation's future advancement, this budget provides, in various functional categories including major national security, expenditures totaling more than $600 million for support of basic research in 1961.

Appropriations of $122 million are recommended for support of basic research by the National Science Foundation, an increase of $34 million over 1960. The total includes $79 million for basic research projects and $15 million for grants to universities for modernization of graduate level laboratories under a program initiated in 1960. Increased support is also provided for scientific work of the Bureau of Standards, including funds for two new laboratories, as a first step in the construction of completely new facilities for the agency.

Oceanography: Federal support of oceanography and related marine sciences is being substantially augmented by several agencies under a long-range program developed by the Federal Council on Science and Technology to strengthen the Nation's effort in this field. This program stems from a study undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of several agencies. The expansion of oceanographic research will be undertaken by the Navy, the Departments of Commerce and the Interior, and the National Science Foundation. Funds are provided for the construction of new vessels and the replacement of obsolete vessels, and for increased support for research by private institutions.

Government statistical services: Adequate and timely national statistical information is essential for recording and appraising the performance of the Nation's economy, and for formulating public and private policies. Activities planned in various agencies for the fiscal year 1961 will help close significant gaps in our statistical information and make improvements in current data. Obligations for these purposes in the various functional categories of the budget are estimated at $62 million, including $20 million for the decennial census and other periodic statistical programs.

This budget includes funds for tabulating and processing basic economic and demographic data collected through the Eighteenth Decennial Census, and for the final publication of the results of the 1958 censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries. Other recommendations include the initiation of a new series on the service trades and the improvement of data on retail trade, on consumer prices, on health, on crop and livestock production, and on State and local government finances.

Labor and manpower: Last year the administration recommended and the Congress enacted much-needed legislation designed to protect workers and the public from racketeering, corruption, and abuse of democratic processes which had been disclosed in the affairs of a few labor unions. To assure effective and efficient administration of this new law, the budget recommends supplemental appropriations in 1960 for the National Labor Relations Board and the newly established Bureau of Labor-Management Reports in the Department of Labor. Increased appropriations are proposed for both agencies for 1961. Additional funds needed by the Department of Justice will be requested later when requirements can be better determined.

Appropriations of $326 million are requested in the fiscal year 1961 for grants to the States to administer the Federal-State employment security system with its network of 1,800 offices throughout the country. These grants are now financed from an earmarked Federal tax and the transactions involved increase both budget receipts and expenditures, even though these funds cannot be used for general Government purposes. Legislation proposed by the administration last year for financing this program through the unemployment trust fund should be enacted. Amounts equal to the proceeds from this tax could then be placed directly in the trust fund from which the necessary grants could be appropriated and an adequate balance could be maintained as a reserve for employment security purposes. The administration of the program would then be financed in essentially the same way as other major social insurance programs.

The job placement services and unemployment compensation payments provided through the State employment security offices are important for a smoothly operating free labor market in a growing economy. These services and payments provide also for security against economic hardship for the work force covered by the system. I again urge the enactment of legislation to extend unemployment compensation to some 3 million workers, primarily those employed in small enterprises. Some States have recently made encouraging progress in increasing the duration and level of benefits, but more needs to be done and additional States should take these steps.

Action is needed to strengthen the financial position of the unemployment compensation system. Although the reserves of most States proved adequate in the past recession, a few were and still are in a precarious condition. Moreover, reserve funds in most States have fallen behind the growth in payrolls during the last decade, and in certain States could be inadequate in the event of future economic distress. I have asked the Secretary of Labor to make a study of this problem and to report to me his conclusions.

Previously proposed amendments to strengthen the basic authority in the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act should be enacted, and the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to several million additional workers in accordance with previous recommendations. Legislation is likewise again proposed to assure equal pay for equal work, and to strengthen and improve laws governing hours of work and overtime pay on direct Federal and certain federally aided construction projects.

Public health: Advances in medical technology and the spread of private health insurance have played important roles in raising the level of health services for our rapidly growing population. At the same time, the growing demand for better health care has contributed to shortages of facilities, medical and scientific manpower, and supporting health workers, as well as to the rising cost of medical and hospital services.

In order to deal effectively with these developments, the Federal Government has expanded its public health programs and is actively seeking solutions to the Nation's health problems. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1961 are estimated to total $904 million, which is $53 million more than in 1960 and nearly three times the level 5 years earlier. The largest part of the increase is for medical research and training of research workers through programs of the National Institutes of Health, for which the estimated expenditures of $390 million in 1961 will be four times as great as 5 years ago. Expenditures for hospital construction grants are estimated at $161 million in 1961, a threefold increase during the same period.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will insist on maintaining high standards in determining the acceptability of medical research projects for Federal support. As I indicated last August in approving the 1960 appropriations for the Department, it is essential that Federal grants for these projects be so administered that medical manpower is not unduly diverted from other pressing needs and that Federal funds are not substituted for funds from private sources. The 1960 appropriation of $400 million for the National Institutes of Health will not be entirely committed this year even with advanced funding of certain training programs. I am recommending that 1961 appropriations to the National Institutes of Health continue at the high level of 1960.

The recommended appropriation for the Hill-Burton hospital construction program for 1961 is consistent with the levels achieved by this program before the 1958 recession. It will assure that sufficient new general hospitals can be financed to keep pace with population growth, cover current obsolescence rates, and provide for 6,000 new beds to reduce the backlog of needs. The remainder of this program, covering diagnostic and other special facilities, would approximate the 1959 and 1960 levels.

The 1961 appropriation proposed for construction of waste treatment facilities is the same as that requested for 1960. It represents the maximum amount which I believe is warranted for a construction program which is and should remain primarily a State and local responsibility.

Larger appropriations are proposed for other health programs where present or impending needs create urgent priorities. Emerging health problems of increasing seriousness to our population arise from the complexities of the environment in which we live. To cope with the far-reaching problems of environmental health on a more systematic and intensive basis, this budget provides substantial increases to the Public Health Service for air pollution, water pollution, and radiological health control activities. These increases for radiological health, together with the stepped-up activity by the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies, will permit a greatly intensified effort by the Federal Government in this field. In order to provide for more effective Federal air and water pollution control activities, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will make legislative recommendations to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act and to authorize greater Federal leadership in combating air pollution.

Rapid technological developments in the production, processing, and marketing of foods, drugs, and other products likewise underline the necessity for more research and action for the protection of the consumer. To meet this need, the budget continues to emphasize an orderly expansion of the Food and Drug Administration, expenditures for which will be more than double those 5 years ago.

Social insurance and other welfare: The social security insurance system now provides basic protection against loss of income from death, disability, and retirement to about 85 percent of our labor force. Another 8 percent are covered under the railroad retirement system and other public retirement systems.

Social security and public assistance: At the present time 10 million of the 16 million people aged 65 and over are receiving monthly old-age or survivors insurance benefits. This vast insurance system, which will pay $11.7 billion in old-age, survivors, and disability benefits to 14.6 million people of all ages in 1961, is administered at a cost of about 2 percent of the social security taxes.

Our social insurance and public retirement systems provide basic protection to the worker and his family. For those who have no such protection and whose incomes are insufficient to meet basic needs, the Federal Government shares, through grants to the States, in providing four categories of public assistance payments. These are (1) old-age assistance, (2) aid to the blind, (3) aid to dependent children, and (4) aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In 1961, the Federal share for payments, made to an estimated monthly average of 5.9 million beneficiaries, will total an estimated $2.1 billion, or about 58 percent of the total Federal-State-local public assistance expenditures. This contrasts with Federal expenditures of $1.1 billion, representing a Federal share of 52 percent, for payments to 4.9 million individuals in 1950.

Public assistance has long been recognized as primarily a responsibility of the State and local governments, because need for these payments in individual cases can best be determined at the local level. I am particularly concerned about the growing Federal share, especially because it tends to weaken this sense of State and local responsibility.

While we are spending hundreds of millions for aid to the needy, there are large gaps in our knowledge of the causes of dependency and of the best ways to alleviate or prevent it. I believe that appropriations to initiate a program of research and demonstration projects designed to identify and alleviate these causes are highly necessary and I have so recommended in this budget.

Military service credits: It has long been recognized that military service should be counted toward the rights of employees under the various public retirement programs. Likewise, where employees are not required to make payroll contributions during military service, the trust funds from which benefits based on such service are paid should be reimbursed by the Government. However, the Federal Government should not, as required under the Railroad Retirement Act, pay more than the true cost of such benefits or pay to both the railroad retirement account and to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds for the same military service benefits.

Accordingly, I repeat my earlier recommendation that the Federal Government should reimburse the railroad retirement account only for the actual added cost of benefits resulting from military service. Pending action on legislation dealing with substantial overpayments found by the Comptroller General, no provision is made in this budget for further Federal military service payments to either the railroad retirement account or the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds.

Other welfare services: This budget includes recommended appropriations for vocational rehabilitation totaling $72 million for the fiscal year 1961, primarily for grants to help the State agencies rehabilitate an estimated 93,000 individuals, about 6 percent more than in 1960.

Grants to all school systems in the States through the school lunch and special milk programs of the Department of Agriculture are estimated at $234 million in 1961, approximately the same as in 1960. These programs will provide improved diets for 11.8 million children, on the average, in 1961. The 1961 amount is in addition to the commodities which are distributed to the schools through the disposal programs classified in this budget under agriculture and agricultural resources.

The health, employment, income, and other needs of the increasing number of elderly people in our population can be met only through the combined efforts and cooperation of private, local, State, and Federal organizations and agencies. The White House Conference on Aging, to be held in January 1961, and the State conferences which precede it should help point the way toward more productive and satisfying living for our aged citizens.

The realization of our aspirations for a better society in the years to come will in large measure depend upon the way in which our children and youth are prepared to realize their maximum potential. This will be the vital concern of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, which will be held in March 1960 and through which private and public organizations will endeavor to bring their wisest and most expert counsel together on this vitally important matter.

VETERANS SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Expenditures for veterans programs are estimated to rise by $314 million to $5.5 billion in 1961, chiefly because of additional pension cases and higher pension rates, both authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959. The increase for pensions, amounting to $438 million, will be partly offset by a decrease of $128 million in readjustment benefit expenditures.

Programs of the Veterans' Administration, providing compensation and pension, medical, and readjustment benefits for the Nation's veterans, rank fourth in size among all Government functions in this budget. Total expenditures for these programs, as presently authorized, will continue to increase in future years as our veterans advance in age. The 23 million living veterans, together with the dependents and survivors of veterans, comprise a total of 81 million people, a considerable proportion of whom are potential recipients of one or more types of benefits.

This country has provided a wide range of benefits and services for war veterans and their families to meet needs resulting from military service. Disability and death compensation benefits have been provided for veterans who were injured in the service or for their survivors. The Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act of 1956 improved the death benefit structure both for wartime and peacetime servicemen. In 1957, general disability compensation rates were increased by 10 percent, and a still larger increase was enacted in the basic rate for the totally disabled.

A first-rate hospital and medical care program is also being provided. During the past year a long-range policy for stabilizing the Veterans' Administration's hospital program at 125,000 beds has been established, and beginning with the 1961 budget a 12-year hospital modernization program is being initiated that will ultimately cost $900 million.

The 21 million veterans who served during World War II or the Korean conflict were eligible for benefits from the highly successful readjustment programs. For the 16 million World War II veterans the GI bill provided unemployment and self-employment compensation

payments to 9.7 million veterans; education and training benefits to 8.4 million veterans; and loan assistance to 5 million veterans for the acquisition or improvement of homes, farms, and businesses. Except for the loan guarantee and direct loan programs, which will terminate on July 25, 1960, the World War II readjustment benefits have essentially expired. Similar readjustment programs, which will continue into 1965 for veterans of the Korean conflict, have already provided 2.3 million veterans with education and training benefits and 700,000 with loans. The special unemployment compensation program for Korean conflict veterans which ends in 1961 has aided 1.3 million veterans. No further extension or liberalization of these benefits is needed.

The longstanding veterans pension program also provides special assistance to war veterans for needs not arising from military service. The Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 was an important step in the modernization of the program. It eliminated the disparity in eligibility for pensions between the widows of World War I veterans and those of later wars, and provided higher benefits for all persons who could demonstrate need under a new sliding scale income test. No further liberalization of the laws concerning pensions for nonservice-connected disability is proposed.

In addition to the special veterans programs, a great majority of veterans participate in the general social security, health, and welfare programs which are financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government. In the future these general programs will provide with increasing adequacy for the economic security needs of our elderly population, of which veterans and their widows will constitute a large and increasing proportion for several decades.

Veterans services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training	$574	$445	$316	$286
Loan guarantee and other benefits	133	115	124	124
Unemployment compensation	44	8	------	------
Compensation and pensions:				
Service-connected compensation	2,070	2,071	2,066	2,066
Non-service-connected pensions	1,153	1,278	1,716	1,716
Burial and other allowances	52	58	58	58
Hospitals and medical care	875	906	928	933
Hospital construction	45	60	63	75
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities	35	36	31	49
Other services and administration	193	180	169	168
Total	5,174	5,157	5,471	[1] 5,476

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $5,125 million enacted for 1959 and $5,176 million (including $114 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Readjustment benefits: Readjustment assistance is expected to decline significantly from 1960 to 1961, primarily because of the reduction in the number of veterans of the Korean conflict participating in educational or vocational training programs. An average of 225,000 veterans will receive training in 1961, compared to 325,000 in 1960 and 425,000 in 1959. Educational benefits for war orphans, which were enacted in 1956, are expected to total over $17 million in 1961.

Peacetime ex-servicemen are recognized as being in a different category from wartime veterans because of the different conditions under which they serve. Those who serve in peacetime undergo fewer rigors and hazards than their combat comrades. The disruption of their educational plans and careers is minimized under peacetime selective service procedures. While on active service they now receive substantial pay and benefits, and they return to civilian life under more favorable conditions after receiving valuable training while in service.

To discharge its responsibility to peacetime ex-servicemen, the Federal Government has provided unemployment compensation, employment service and reemployment rights, and service-connected disability or death compensation. One additional benefit should be added to these in accord with my earlier recommendations: a program of vocational rehabilitation for those with substantial service-connected disabilities. On the other hand, I oppose the establishment of special educational and loan guarantee programs for peacetime ex-servicemen. Such benefits are not justified because they are not supported by the conditions of military service. Moreover, they would be directly contrary to the incentives which have been provided to encourage capable individuals to make military service a career.

Compensation and pensions: Expenditures for compensation for service-connected disabilities and deaths will show only a minor change in 1961. A reduction in the number of World War I and II veterans on the rolls will be offset somewhat by the addition of veterans of the Korean conflict and peacetime ex-servicemen. Compensation will be paid for an estimated 2.4 million cases during 1961.

The net impact of the 1959 law governing non-service-connected pensions is to add several hundred thousand new cases to the rolls at an estimated additional cost of $284 million in 1961 and an estimated cumulative cost of $9 billion during the next 40 years. Expenditures are also increasing because of the growing number of World War I veterans reaching age 65. Approximately 40 percent of all World War I veterans over 65 are now receiving pensions. An average of 1.9 million veterans and families of deceased veterans are expected to receive pensions in 1961; this is 26 percent more than in 1960 and 38 percent more than in 1959.

Hospital and medical services: The budget includes $928 million of expenditures in 1961 for hospital and medical care for veterans. The increase of $22 million from 1960 is to continue improvements in the staffing and quality of service in the hospitals and to meet the higher costs of hospital and medical care generally. Hospital and domiciliary care will be provided during the year for an average of 141,250 beneficiaries per day, and a total of 2,300,000 veterans will receive medical or dental care for service-connected disabilities in outpatient clinics.

Hospital construction: As a first step toward an orderly 12-year program for modernization of existing veterans' hospital facilities, an appropriation of $75 million is proposed for 1961. Of this total, $53 million is for construction of replacement hospitals at Cleveland, Ohio (800 beds); Washington, D.C. (700 beds); and Martinez, Calif. (500 beds). The remainder is for a large number of modernization projects.

Administration: The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration are expected to decline approximately 7 percent in 1961, reflecting decreased workloads in loan and educational programs, improved administrative procedures particularly in insurance operations, and the application of modern electronic equipment to recording and paying veterans' benefits.

INTEREST

Interest payments are estimated to rise $200 million to $9.6 billion in the fiscal year 1961. These payments, almost entirely for interest on the public debt, represent 12 percent of budget expenditures.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Interest on public debt	$7,593	$9,300	$9,500	$9,500
Interest on refunds of receipts	70	75	75	75
Interest on uninvested funds	9	9	10	10
Total	7,671	9,385	9,585	9,585

For a year and a half now, market rates of interest have been increasing, reflecting inflationary pressures, the high level of investment demands in our economy and heavy Federal borrowing required by the 1958 and 1959 budget deficits. The rise in market rates requires the Treasury to pay higher interest on securities issued to refinance the heavy volume of maturing obligations, which were issued when interest rates were lower.

It is imperative that the Congress lift the present legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on interest rates on all Government obligations having maturities of more than 5 years. Otherwise, interest payments could rise even more sharply. The current interest rate on shorter term securities is now higher than on long-term bonds, and the continued need to limit financing to the short-term market tends to raise interest rates more than if the financing could be spread over both the short- and long-term markets.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Expenditures for General Government activities are estimated to rise by $200

million to $1.9 billion in the fiscal year 1961, primarily because of increased construction of Government buildings and a new appropriation to the civil service retirement fund required by law.

Federal financial management: There is growing evidence that a considerable amount of revenue is lost annually to the Government because of the failure of some individuals and businesses to report fully the income which they have received. The existence of such a condition seriously weakens the integrity of our tax system, and places an unfair share of the total tax burden upon the vast majority of citizens who conscientiously report all of their taxable income. This budget includes an increase of $29 million for the Internal Revenue Service, primarily to strengthen its enforcement programs, including initiation of an electronic computer system. I urge its approval as the first step in a long-range plan to prevent this revenue loss. The additional costs should be recovered many times through increased tax collections in later years.

General Government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Legislative functions	$102	$121	$146	$95
Judicial functions	47	50	53	53
Executive direction and management	12	13	14	14
Federal financial management	566	560	591	595
General property and records management	291	384	432	469
Central personnel management and employment costs	205	198	251	251
Civilian weather services	46	52	58	63
Protective services and alien control	216	218	229	230
Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia	89	96	126	124
Other general government	30	20	12	15
Total	1,606	1,711	1,911	[1] 1,910

[1] Compares with new obligational authority of $1,795 million enacted for 1959 and $1,645 million (including $7 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

General property and records management: The efficient and economical operation of many Federal agencies is hindered by inadequate office space, much of which is rented. Accordingly, new obligational authority of $185 million is recommended for fiscal year 1961 for the planning and construction of additional general office space. Although no funds for such construction were appropriated for 1960, expenditures will rise in 1961 as outlays for new construction are added to those for construction initiated in prior years. In addition, the estimate for the legislative functions includes increased expenditures for a new office building for the House of Representatives.

The General Services Administration, in collaboration with other agencies, has developed a new program for improved use of excess personal property by Federal agencies, and faster, more efficient disposal of surplus property. This involves more effective screening of such property and simplifying the procedures under which agencies are advised of its availability for other uses.

Central personnel management: The Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have recently recommended a long-range policy on financing the civil service retirement system. I hope the Congress will speedily enact these recommendations, which would assure continued availability in the fund of the full amount of the net accumulations from employee contributions and establish a definite basis for meeeting the Government's share of the costs consistent with the principle that its full faith and credit support the authorized benefits.

A new appropriation of $46 million for payments to the civil service retirement fund is requested for 1961 to finance the costs of new or increased benefits enacted in 1958 for certain widows or widowers of former Federal employees and for certain retired employees. The law provides that these particular benefits cannot be continued after July 1, 1960, unless such an appropriation is made. Recipients of these benefits should enjoy the same assurance of uninterrupted payment as do other annuitants of the civil service retirement system, and the Federal liability in their case is not different from that for other benefits under this program. Accordingly, I recommend that the Congress consider, in connection with the legislation referred to in the preceding paragraph, authorizing the civil service retirement and disability fund to bear the future cost of these particular benefits without a specific appropriation.

The budget provides approximately $120 million to pay the Government's share of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which becomes effective in the fiscal year 1961, and which will provide opportunity for approximately 2 million employees and 2.4 million dependents to have reasonable protection against the cost of both basic and major health care. This program will add substantially to employee fringe benefits, which in the aggregate now compare very favorably with those provided to employees in private industry.

In 1958 immediately following enactment of a 10 percent general salary increase for Federal civilian employees, I propose to the Congress a review of all compensation systems in the three branches of the Federal Government, directed toward adoption of an equitable employee compensation policy. This recommendation was renewed in my budget message for the 1960 fiscal year.

It has been more than 30 years since a thoroughgoing review has been made of the manner in which the Federal Government compensates its employees. There are now dozens of pay plans in the executive branch alone. Review and coordination of the excessive number of pay plans now in existence are the most effective means of removing inequities which adversely affect the Government's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel in some fields. Continued patching of individual Federal salary systems is not satisfactory as a substitute for a comprehensive Federal pay policy, which should be developed either by authorizing a Joint Commission such as I proposed or by some other equally effective means. Pending development and adoption of such a comprehensive policy, a general pay raise would be unwarranted, unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, and inequitable as among employees compensated under different and unrelated pay systems.

The budget estimates for the Post Office Department assume legislative action to continue that part of the 1958 salary increase for postal field service employees which expires on January 20, 1961.

Civilian weather services: Appropriations totaling $63 million are recommended for the fiscal year 1961 for the Weather Bureau. The $12 million increase over the amounts enacted for 1960 will permit expanded research, weather observation, and forecasting services. These improvements are necessary primarily to keep pace with advances in air traffic controls. Research projects include intensive investigation of hurricanes and tornadoes, and the development of a semiautomatic system for the collection and analysis of weather data.

Hawaii: Our Union was greatly strengthened in 1959 by the admission of the States of Alaska and Hawaii. As in the case of Alaska, comprehensive legislation will be necessary to enable Hawaii to take its place as the equal of the other 49 States. Recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress concerning those changes needed in Federal laws in order to bring Hawaii under the same general laws, rules, and policies as are applicable to the other States.

Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia: Completion of action on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii makes it all the more urgent that legislation to provide home rule for the District of Columbia be enacted without delay. Both equity and efficiency require that the people of the Nation's Capital be given a voice in their own local government and that the role of the Federal Government be limited to matters of Federal concern.

Legislation will shortly be proposed to the Congress to establish a Government corporation to develop an improved mass transportation system in the National Capital metropolitan area, pending creation of an interstate agency to assume this responsibility.

To foster further development of democratic institutions and in keeping with the growth of local self-government, action should be taken to authorize the Virgin Islands and Guam to be represented in the Congress through nonvoting resident commissioners.

Intergovernmental relations: There are many problems requiring attention of the recently established Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Foremost among these are the problems of allocation of tax sources among various levels of government and rapid growth of metropolitan areas.

An aspect of intergovernmental relations requiring attention in both the legislative and executive branches involves

a series of court decisions permitting local taxation of federally owned property in the hands of contractors and leaseholders. This matter should be resolved in the context of the broader subject of Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

Other recommendations: Legislation enacted in the last session of Congress to amend the immigration and nationality laws failed to cover several significant proposals, including modification of the quota system. Prompt action is needed on these remaining items.

To strengthen the Government's hand in restraining inflationary forces, I urge that the Employment Act of 1946 be amended to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power now specified in that act.

I urge the Congress to enact the remaining six points of the civil rights program that I recommended last year. The Civil Rights Commission, extended for an additional 2 years by the last session of Congress, continues its important work and has developed additional constructive recommendations, particularly for protecting the right of every citizen to vote. I hope these recommendations will also be earnestly considered by the Congress.

I also recommend that the Congress create additional Federal judgeships, as proposed by the Judicial Conference, and strengthen Federal laws against organized crime.

Legislation will be submitted to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure in order that it may complete its work successfully.

It is important that legislation now before the Congress be enacted to provide reimbursement to Americans for certain property damage in Europe and the Far East during World War II for which compensation has not previously been authorized.

I again recommend that a system be devised for suitable recognition in the United States for distinguished achievement in various fields of endeavor.

IMPROVEMENTS IN BUDGETING, ORGANIZATION, AND MANAGEMENT

The decisions made by government are vital to so many aspects of our national life that improvements of the procedures through which these decisions are made should be a continuing major goal. A substantial number of important specific steps can and should be taken to improve these practices.

Revisions in authorization and appropriation procedure: Contract authority and authorizations to spend from debt receipts in basic legislation outside the appropriation process are generally inconsistent with sound standards of budget practice. The recommendations being placed before the Congress in this budget are based upon the principle that authority to make budget obligations and expenditures, whether financed from receipts or borrowing, should be granted by the Congress only in appropriation acts.

The Congress has shown a growing tendency to require the annual enactment of authorizing legislation before appropriations may be made. Space programs, some mutual security programs, military and atomic energy construction in this budget, and much of defense procurement beginning in fiscal 1962, will require separate authorizations before appropriations can be considered. Under this procedure these programs receive a duplicating review each year. At the same time the value of legislative consideration and expression of long-range program objectives and amounts is largely lost, and agency personnel devote an inordinate amount of time to the congressional process at the expense of effective administration of the continuing program. I hope the Congress will find it possible generally to make authorizing legislation cover program requirements for longer periods of time.

In the interest of good government, methods to expedite the authorization and appropriation processes should be found. In order to facilitate early consideration, and also to show the Government program more fully, this budget includes specific proposed appropriations for a number of programs for which authorizing legislation must also be renewed. In most of thse cases, proposals for such legislation will be submitted in a very short time. This procedure should be an improvement over the past practice of delaying submission of detailed estimates until the renewing legislation has been enacted.

Before the executive budget is presented to Congress annually, the most careful consideration is given to the relationships of spending to receipts and borrowing, and to relative priorities of various programs. When the budget reaches the Congress, however, its consideration is usually fragmented because of the distribution of responsibilities among the various committees and subcommittees. I believe that the Congress should find means by which it can more effectively examine the budget as a whole and base its actions on the overall fiscal situation.

Provision for item veto: In passing the Alaska and Hawaii statehood acts, the Congress again recognized the value of an item veto by a chief executive by approving provision for its use in their State constitutions. Forty-one State Governors now have item veto authority. Many Presidents have recommended it, but the Congress has not yet granted the President of the United States that power. I again recommend it.

Control of foreign currencies: The Government receives from its operations considerable quantities of foreign currencies each year. Much of this currency is earmarked for grants to and loans in the country concerned, and some is available for programs of the U.S. Government. In many countries the currencies available to us are needed for conducting normal U.S. operations, yet such use is prevented in some cases by statutes or by the international agreements under which the currencies are received.

As a result of a detailed study, this budget includes provisions to bring under budget and appropriation controls all foreign currencies available for U.S. agency operations which are received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. This change will not alter total appropriations or expenditures, but will increase those of the agencies using the currencies and decrease those of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Accordingly, I intend that no more allocations be made for uncontrolled use after the current fiscal year except for country grants and loans committed in international agreements, and I recommend that at an appropriate time the Congress remove from the laws the provisions which permit uncontrolled use for other purposes. I am also instructing that in future negotiations of international agreements we endeavor to avoid restrictions which would limit our ability to apply normal budget and appropriation controls to the use of those currencies which are earmarked for U.S. agency operations.

Improved funding for public enterprises: Major business-type activities of the Government should, with few exceptions, operate on a self-sustaining basis. Their budgets and accounts should permit ready comparison of their expenses and revenues. They should have simplicity in their financing structure and the flexibility in expenditures necessary to meet unforeseen business conditions, but should be expected to keep their obligations and expenditures within the resources provided by Congress for that purpose, and should be subject to annual review and control by the Congress. Accordingly, I recommend that the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the loan guarantee programs of the Veterans' Administration be financed through revolving funds. Similar recommendations may be made in due time for other business-type activities.

Legislation is again being recommended to bring under budget review the activities of those few Government corporations which are now exempt from such review, but possess authority to draw money from the Treasury or to commit the Treasury for future expenditures. This can best be done by including them under the budget provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

Revision of budget presentation: In this budget more than half of the 626 appropriation accounts of the executive branch have been presented on a cost basis. The remaining appropriations, including those for the Department of Defense, will be converted to this basis as soon as possible. This budget also provides for accrued expenditure limitations for 12 appropriations, in accordance with legislation enacted in 1958. Such limitations are recommended to permit closer congressional control over annual expenditures.

The customary totals of budget receipts and budget expenditures are dis-

torted by the inclusion in both of interest and other payments by public enterprise funds to the general fund of the Treasury. Such interfund payments amounted to $355 million in the fiscal year 1959, and are estimated at $737 million for 1960, and $779 million for 1961. While this duplication does not affect the amount of the budget surplus or deficit, it does overstate the size of the budget receipts and expenditures. To correct this it is planned that such amounts, while still shown within the figures for the affected agencies, will be eliminated from budget totals in financial statements on Government operations beginning with the fiscal year 1961. I also plan to present the 1962 budget so as to remove this duplication. However, in order to preserve full comparability with previous budgets, no such adjustments are shown in the amounts in this document. If adjustments had been made, the net totals would appear as follows:

Adjusted budget totals, excluding interfund payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Budget receipts	$67.9	$77.9	$83.2
Budget expenditures	80.3	77.7	79.0
Budget deficit	12.4		
Budget surplus		.2	4.2

Strengthening of organization and management: From the beginning of this administration I have placed emphasis on obtaining the best possible executive ability in the administration of the widespread and diverse activities of the Federal Government and on providing the best organizational structure in which officials can carry out their responsibilities. This continued emphasis is essential not only to operate the complex machinery of government effectively, but also to meet the constant flow of new problems of organization and management.

In recent years several major organizational improvements have been made, including the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as new organizational structures for defense programs and for civilian and defense mobilization activities. The many actions taken on recommendations of the two Hoover Commissions have also resulted in more efficient administration.

The Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, under which numerous executive agencies and functions have been reorganized, contains a limitation of June 1, 1959, for the transmittal of reorganization plans by the President to the Congress. Accordingly, this authority is not now available. I urgently recommend that this cutoff date be removed in order to permit continued use of that act by me and by my successor in improving the management and organization of the executive branch.

The search for better management and operations is a never-ending process. Like all large organizations, the Federal Government continues to have management problems. For example, property management offers an enormous challenge, and in the past year greater attention has been focused on it. Application of new data-processing techniques to Government operations is under constant study. The Post Office Department is improving its operations by installing modern methods of mail handling and transportation. The Treasury Department is using up-to-date data-processing equipment to achieve more effective administration of disbursements and revenue collection. These are but a few of many examples, and this budget provides for further improvements.

At my request, the heads of all Government agencies will give renewed emphasis to the review of management procedures and operating activities to make sure that the most modern methods, techniques, and equipment are in use. All agency heads have been encouraged to continue to search for the best practices in other Government agencies, in business, or in industry, to apply them in their own agencies to the extent possible during the term of this administration, and to leave to their successors a legacy of plans for further improvement.

The plans presented in this budget meet the Nation's immediate needs and will support continuing sound economic growth in the future. The achievement of these plans, however, will in the last analysis depend on the people themselves.

I believe our people have the determination to hold expenditures in check, to pay their own way without borrowing from their children, to choose wisely among priorities, and to match sound public policy with private initiative. It is that determination which is the key to continued progress and sound growth with security. It is that determination which reinforces the recommendations I have made.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 18, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, never before has the United States faced such odds as it faces today—both at home and abroad. Abroad we are menaced by an implacable totalitarian power with superior armament, and the imperative necessity of demonstrating conclusively in the near future its control of international affairs. At home we are carrying the greatest debt ever contracted by any nation in the world's history, with rapidly deteriorating credit and the imminent necessity of reversing that trend not later than this Congress.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to one of the most optimistic budget recommendations ever transmitted to the House within my recollection.

The outstanding feature of this budget is the most satisfying assurance that could be given—the promise not only of a balanced budget but the prospect of a surplus of $4.2 billion at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, to be applied to a reduction of the public debt.

The most disappointing feature of the budget is that it promises to accumulate this surplus through tentative increases in the national revenues and not through reduction of national expenditures. Throughout the lengthy document there is no mention of the word "retrenchment." In fact, the Bureau of the Budget recommends the largest recurring expenditures since the administration of George Washington. It is proposed to exceed current year expenditures by $1.4 billion. It also includes the largest amount ever spent for interest on our staggering national debt. But it offers not one scintilla of hope of reduced taxation. As a matter of fact, it proposes another extension of wartime taxes in time of peace and in addition the imposition of new taxes not heretofore levied.

At the close of every other war the Government has promptly repealed war taxes. The Korean war ended 7 years ago but this budget still asks the continuation of wartime taxes and new taxes not heretofore imposed, including the irksome nuisance taxes which have so clogged the channels of trade for the past 10 years.

In short, this budget proposes to take from the people $84 billion, the highest take in any year, peace or war, since the foundation of the Republic.

CONTINGENCIES SURROUNDING $4.2 BILLION SURPLUS

Even with this unprecedented tax draft upon the taxpayers of the country, there is serious reason to doubt the fulfillment of the promise of any surplus whatsoever, much less a surplus of $4,200 million. We have learned by sad experience that no prediction of a budget surplus can be taken at face value, and certainly that is true of this budget.

You will recall that in the annual budget submitted to Congress for 1959 we were promised a balanced budget and a small surplus, and we wound up at the close of that year, ending last June 30, with a backbreaking deficit of more than $12 billion.

The estimates both of revenues of $84 billion and expenditures of $79.8 billion rest on a number of assumptions and highly doubtful contingencies. Revenues totaling $84 billion in the coming year 1961 would involve an increase of $15.7 billion over collections in fiscal 1959, or an increase of 23 percent between these 2 years. The recordbreaking $84 billion tax take expected in this budget rests on a rosy outlook predicated on great national prosperity and large profits—with inflated dollars. It assumes the enactment of legislation raising postal income by some $554 million, a proposal emphatically rejected by this Congress in the last session. It assumes the extension of Korean wartime taxes. It proposes new taxes. In all, of the six budgets previously submitted by the Bureau of the Budget during this administration,

the original spending estimates were exceeded, as shown by the following tabulation:

Variations in Spending

[In billions]

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result	Over (+) or under (−), original estimate
1960 budget (latest estimate)	$77.0	[1] $78.4	+$1.4
1959 budget	73.9	80.7	+6.8
1958 budget	71.8	71.9	+.1
1957 budget	65.9	69.4	+3.5
1956 budget	62.4	66.5	+4.1
1955 budget	65.6	64.6	−1.0

[1] Revised estimate, as shown in 1961 budget.

NOTE.—Figures represent "net budget expenditures" as used in the budget.

Similarly, there have been wide variations in revenue results contrasted to original budget estimates. The following table of official figures shows that situation:

Variations in Revenues

[In billions]

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result	Over (+) or under (−), original estimate
1960 budget (latest estimate)	$77.1	[1] $78.6	+$1.5
1959 budget	74.4	68.3	−6.1
1958 budget	73.6	69.1	−4.5
1957 budget	66.3	71.0	+4.7
1956 budget	60.0	68.1	+8.1
1955 budget	62.6	60.4	−2.2

[1] Revised estimate, as shown in 1961 budget.

NOTE.—Figures represent "net budget receipts" as used in the budget.

And in addition, original budget estimates of deficits and surpluses matched against actual results affords comparisons much in point to the $4.2 billion surplus figure. The following table shows how far and how often the mark has been missed in the last 6 years:

Variations in deficit and surplus estimates under the present administration

[In billions]

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result
1954 budget	(1)	−$3.1
1955 budget	−$2.9	−4.2
1956 budget	−2.4	+1.6
1957 budget	+.4	+1.6
1958 budget	+1.8	−2.8
1959 budget	+.5	−12.4
1960 budget	+.1	[2] +.2
Total for last 6 years	−2.5	−16.0
1961 budget estimate	+4.2	

[1] Submitted by previous administration but revised and administered by present administration.
[2] Latest official estimate (in 1961 budget).

NOTE.—Highway trust fund which began with fiscal 1957, not included.

There is no arresting assurance that we can realize these highly desirable predictions this year with any more accuracy than we did last year. Inevitably, the collector, the tax gatherer, working diligently around the clock, bringing in larger and larger amounts, collecting from the taxpayers of the country larger national revenues than were ever enjoyed by any nation since the beginning of time—the busy tax collector has not been able to keep up with the spenders in the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As a result, today we are saddled with the largest national debt that ever kindled the fires of inflation; that ever increased the cost of living; that ever debased the currency; that ever limited business expansion; that ever curtailed employment; that ever imperiled national defense in this or any other country.

WHO PREPARES RECORDBREAKING BUDGETS?

All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget. The President makes it. It includes only what he recommends. He is directed by law to make such tax, spending, and appropriation recommendations as in his judgment are necessary. The President is in complete command. He is not required to submit his recommendations to anyone before including them in the budget. He is by law completely free to recommend cuts in appropriations of any magnitude and revisions of basic legislation to correspond.

They do not have to recommend more and more spending—as in this budget and as in past budgets.

They do not have to urge extension of war tax rates in time of peace—as in this budget and in every budget.

They do not have to recommend new taxes and new revenues—as in this budget and in past budgets.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the administration talks economy, hope of tax relief, the practice of self-restraint in expenditure, and holding the line on the cost of living—when they talk this but submit record budgets, that is the executive branch of the Government and not the legislative branch of the Government.

Some features of this budget do not comport with the goals announced in this and past messages. And this final effective budget from the President discloses beyond all challenge that this administration, after 8 years in office, has not accomplished a single one of the laudable objectives promised in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns.

The message calls for restraint in expenditure but the budget proposes to spend $1.4 billion more than this year. It was only a little over a year ago that the President declared war on excessive spending. He was quoted this way:

I think every place we are spending too much money * * * We must start right from the biggest and go right down to the smallest.

He decried what he termed "loose handling of our fiscal affairs." But the budget submitted shortly thereafter proposed to spend more. And it also proposed increased appropriations, both large and small.

You remember the bristling vetoes of last year's public works appropriations and the castigation of the number of new project starts especially because of their long-range expenditure effect. But we find this budget advocating new project starts that will call for even more spending in the future. In fact, it proposes 42 new starts requiring $38 million in 1961 and a total commitment of $500 million over a period of years. This budget was being formulated at the time Congress was being advised in a veto message concerning new starts that

This tremendous expansion in Government expenditures in just this one area in so short a period of time brings into sharp focus how Congress by action in one year builds increases into the Federal budget in future years. * * * This illustrates how easily effective control of Federal spending can be lost.

Overspending in respect to water resources is hurtful to the United States and to the proper development of these resources themselves. The American people are opposed to overspending no matter where it is attempted.

It is almost inconceivable that the sins of the Congress in the last session can be made virtues of the executive branch in just 5 months.

I include a summary of budget receipts, expenditures, and surpluses or deficits for the 8 fiscal years 1954–61.

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), 8 fiscal years, 1954–61

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net receipts	Net expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	$64.7	$67.8	−$3.1
2. Fiscal 1955	60.4	64.6	−4.2
3. Fiscal 1956	68.1	66.5	+1.6
4. Fiscal 1957:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	72.5	70.3	+2.2
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	71.0	69.4	+1.6
5. Fiscal 1958:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	71.2	73.5	−2.3
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	69.1	71.9	−2.8
6. Fiscal 1959:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.4	83.4	−13.0
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	68.3	80.7	−12.4
7. Fiscal 1960 (revised estimates in 1961 budget):			
(a) Including highway trust fund	81.2	[1] 81.5	−.3
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	78.6	[1] 78.4	+.2
8. Fiscal 1961 (budget estimates):			
(a) Including highway trust fund	[2] 86.9	[3] 82.7	+4.2
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	[2] 84.0	[3] 79.8	+4.2
Total, all 8 years:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	575.4	590.3	−14.9
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget	564.2	579.1	−14.9

[1] Includes $378,000,000 from supplementals proposed to be submitted.
[2] Including revenues from proposed legislation (continuation of certain excise taxes; certain new fuel taxes, etc.)
[3] Among other things, assumes enactment of additional $554,000,000 in postal revenue.

THE PUBLIC DEBT AND INTEREST COSTS

As shown by the pending budget, the national debt this coming June the 30th is estimated at $284,500 million. Granting that it will be no more than that—and that is an unknown—even that figure represents an increase of $18,400 million during the first 7 fiscal years

under this administration. The debt stood at $266,100 million when this administration assumed full control and responsibility in June of 1953.

This is the record.

Our debt today is far above the highest of the World War II debts. It is $29 billion above the postwar low-water mark. On the first day of this month, the national debt stood at $290,924,917,717.63. That represents a mortgage of $1,623.04 against every man, woman, and child in America today.

The President has transmitted to the Congress six straight requests to raise the old statutory $275 billion debt ceiling. In consequence, the temporary ceiling is today, $295 billion. The permanent ceiling is $285 billion.

Now the administration, in this budget, has asked for another extension for next year. Failure to control spending while collecting the highest revenues of all time has forced step by step, piece by piece, and year by year the conversion of the so-called temporary ceilings of earlier years to a permanent status. Even the once restraining influence of the debt ceiling has now gone by the board.

But, Mr. Speaker, the greatest evil attending the flowering and fruition of this astronomical debt is the high jacking of the rate of interest, the carrying charge on the debt, and the influence it has had on American business, individual, and corporate. Formerly, and for years, especially in time of peace, the Government was able to borrow money at less than 2 percent—perhaps a fraction above or a fraction below—and the bond issues of the Government were always oversubscribed.

The public debt—8 fiscal years

[In billions]

1. Actual increase, 6 fiscal years (1954–59):	
July 1953	$266.1
July 1959	284.7
Increase in the 6 years	+18.6
2. Current budget estimate of change during current fiscal year 1960 (July 1959 to July 1960—from $284.7 to $284.5)	−0.2
3. Estimated increase in the 7 years	+18.4
4. Budget estimate of change during fiscal year 1961 (July 1960 to July 1961—from $284.5 to $280)	−4.5
5. Total budget estimate of increase for the 8 years, July 1953 to July 1961	+13.9

NOTE.—Old statutory limit of $275 billion raised as follows:

For fiscal 1955 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1956 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1957 by $3 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1958 by $5 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1959 by $8 billion (permanently to $283 billion); $5 billion (temporarily to $288 billion).

For fiscal 1960 by $10 billion (permanently to $285 billion); $10 billion (temporarily to $295 billion).

NOTE.—Budget message for 1961 indicates request will be made later in session for a temporary increase for 1961 beyond the permanent ceiling of $285 billion (amount unspecified, but something less than $10 billion in force during fiscal 1960).

Interest on the public debt

1. The debt:	*Billion*
June 30, 1959	$284.7
June 30, 1960 (estimated)	284.5
June 30, 1961 (estimated)	280.0
2. Interest on the debt:	*Million*
Fiscal 1959	$7,592
Fiscal 1960 (current estimate)	9,300
(Increase of $1,700 million, fiscal 1960 over fiscal 1959.)	
Fiscal 1961 (current estimate)	9,500

(Increase of $200 million, fiscal 1961 over fiscal 1960, although debt is estimated to drop by some $4.5 billions.)

3. In the current fiscal year 1960, interest on the debt averages $25,479,400 every day, $1,061,000 every hour, $17,690 every minute.

4. In the current fiscal 1960, interest on the debt exceeds interest cost for fiscal 1959 by $4,657,000 every day, $194,000 every hour, $3,230 every minute.

5. In fiscal year 1961, interest on the debt is estimated to average $26,027,300 every day, $1,084,400 every hour, $18,000 every minute.

Now, due to the fact that we have spent and spent and overspent our income, it has been necessary to raise the interest on Government bonds, in order to make them sufficiently attractive to the buyer. Today we are paying in excess of 5 percent for short-term loans. Treasury notes of 6 months or a year, for money which we formerly borrowed for less than 1 percent. It has never happened before in time of peace.

This situation could have been avoided if even in the last fiscal year the administration had recommended and Congress in response to that recommendation, had spent $12 billion less than the revenues instead of $12 billion more than the revenues

With the $12 billion cash in hand we would have paid it on the national debt, the cost of living would have dropped, the dollar would have been stabilized, business would have continued to expand, inflation would have faded and our bonds would have again been marketable at far less than present high rates.

But the sky was the limit and the budget recommended and Congress obligingly spent $12 billion more than we took in. We were living high on the hog and we spent $12 billion more than our income. We whistled for the grizzly and the grizzly came. Every month, in an effort to sell that $12½ billion we spent above revenue, every month more savings bonds were cashed than were sold. The public did not want them. Our credit was slipping. Exports were dropping. Imports were increasing. The balance of trade was heavily against us. Investors abroad were alerted. Foreign creditors, alarmed at our improvidence, began to demand gold. Assurances by Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, have checked only temporarily the demand of foreign creditors for gold. Unless the administration and the Congress can, in the few remaining months of this fiscal year, restore the confidence of the world in the ability of the United States to manage its financial affairs in keeping with accepted business principles, our gold reserves will shortly drop below our bank requirements. Unheard of. Undreamed of. Incredible.

But if the Government were the only one to suffer from the effects of this spending debauch that would be bad enough. But the Government is the least of the victims. When you raise the cost of money above 5 percent to the Government, you raise the cost of money—the rate of interest—to every borrower in the United States. And you particularly raise the interest, the cost of borrowing and the opportunity to borrow to those who are least able to pay exorbitant interest. The Government has been lending money for many activities at reasonable rates of interest. But if the Government must pay 5½ percent for short time loans, it cannot lend money for housing, for contractors or builders or workmen or for people who need homes, at a rate they can afford to pay.

Banks and loan associations cannot lend money at 4 or 4½ percent when the Government itself must pay 5½ percent.

One of the greatest beneficiaries of President Roosevelt's wise provisions for credit is the farmer—the farmers in my State and the farmers in your State.

He authorized the now familiar production credit associations to whom he lent money at 3½ percent permitting them to lend it to the farmer for 4½ percent, retaining the extra cent for amortization of their debt to the Government. Farmers who must have capital for crop production but who cannot borrow a cent from any bank, can come to the Production Credit Association and get the money they need at a low rate of interest. These associations are managed by the farmers themselves and have proven remarkably successful. They are operating in every county in my district and in the last 10 years have not lost a dollar. Every loan has been repaid with interest. Bankers who formerly opposed them now approve them because farmers to whom they could not lend have now prospered to the point where they carry substantial bank accounts.

But the Production Credit Associations have received notice that beginning the first of the month interest will be advanced to 7 percent, due to the fact that the Government must pay 5½ percent itself and can no longer lend the money at 3½ percent.

So the farmer's interest goes up to 7 percent. And the farmer, the man who works longest and hardest and receives the lowest pay for his labor and the lowest return on his investment, whose wife and children work with him, who is today receiving the lowest price for his product, and who must pay all of these increased costs of operation, machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, and every other cost of production—the farmer who is getting less all the time and paying more all the time—who is least able to pay—must pay 7 percent for his money. Why? Because this administration and this Congress spent $12,500 million more than we took in.

In the same category we have the GI loans under which the veteran is to receive money at 5½ percent. But when the Government must itself pay 5½ percent the money sources are dried up and

no one will lend the veteran money which was available to all as long as a prudent operation of Government finances kept governments down to 2 percent.

Likewise the FHA, created to lend money at 5¾ percent and under which loans were freely made at that rate, a rate profitable to the Government and the borrower alike, is now wholly unworkable because the Government required to pay 5½ percent interest in the money market cannot relend it at the statutory rate of 5¾ percent.

Numerous other instances indicate faintly the widespread disaster resulting from high rates of interest which the mismanagement of Government finances has brought about.

There seems to be a general impression that money does not cost the Government anything. But the interest alone on the national debt for fiscal 1960, as represented in this budget, is $9,300 million. Every year the Federal Government must pay $9,300 million merely for interest, and with nothing to show for it at the end of the year. Only 20 years ago we operated the entire Government on a good deal less than that. Not only does this budget call for $9,300 million in interest for 1960, but the President tells us that next year—fiscal 1961—it will be $9,500 million. That is 12 cents out of every dollar of budget spending.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman would approve of a request for an extension of time. The gentleman's time is approaching at the end of his speech, and I note there are Members here who wish to comment on his speech. If I should propound a request for a 15-minute extension of time for the gentleman, would he approve?

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad to have the time to yield to other Members.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 15 minutes, in order that some points of his speech might be commented upon and questioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from California that there are other special orders pending immediately at the conclusion of the time allotted to the gentleman from Missouri. However, if the gentlemen who have the special orders have no objection, I can entertain a unanimous-consent request. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] here?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 10 minutes immediately following the speech by the gentleman from Missouri. Would the gentleman from California be willing to incorporate that in his request?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I revise my request that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], be allowed to follow the gentleman from Missouri for 10 minutes, immediately thereafter, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his request? I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], is here. There has been a request for an extension of time. Does the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Wisconsin have any objection?

Mr. COLLIER. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted, 15 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri and 10 minutes for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the 15 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri come after the gentleman from New York uses his 10 minutes?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then, my original request stands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will be recognized for an additional 15 minutes, and immediately after that the gentleman from New York will be recognized for 10 minutes.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, heavy defense outlays in recent years has tended to obscure the genesis of these inflationary deficit budgets. The impression persists that they have come primarily from the necessity of heavy defense spending. That is not so. It is the nondefense items that have unbalanced recent budgets, as the following official data unerringly discloses:

Net budget expenditures—Defense and nondefense (8 fiscal years 1954–61)

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense-military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.9	$23.9	$74.3	$74.3
* * * * *	*	*	*	*	*	*
Fiscal 1954	40.3	46.9	20.9	20.9	67.8	67.8
Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	24.0	24.0	64.6	64.6
Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.9	25.9	66.5	66.5
Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	26.1	27.0	69.4	70.3
Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.8	29.4	71.9	73.5
Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	34.3	37.0	80.7	83.4
Fiscal 1960 (latest estimates from 1961 budget document)	40.9	45.6	32.8	35.9	[1] 78.4	81.5
Fiscal 1961 (budget estimates)	41.0	45.6	34.2	37.1	79.8	82.7
Comparisons:						
a. 1961 budget compared with last war year (1953)	−2.6	−4.8	+10.3	+13.2	+5.5	[2] +8.4
b. 1961 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954)	+.7	−1.3	[3] +13.3	[4] +16.2	+12.0	+14.9
c. 1961 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956)	+5.2	+5.0	+8.3	+11.2	+13.3	+16.2
d. 1961 compared with last completed year (1959)	−.2	−.8	−.1	+.1	−.9	−.7
e. 1961 compared with current 1960 estimate	+.1		+1.4	+1.2	+1.4	+1.2

[1] Includes $378,000,000 estimated to be expended from anticipated 1960 fiscal supplementals, also estimated at $1,125,000,000 (all but $23,000,000 of the $378,000,000 is for nondefense).
[2] Represents increase of 11 percent over war year of 1953.
[3] Represents increase of 63 percent over 1st year of 1954.
[4] Represents increase of 77 percent over 1st year of 1954.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

As will be noted, the entire increase of $1.4 billion in spending in this 1961 budget compared to the year 1960 is allotted to nondefense items. The national security total remains unchanged.

For nondefense, this budget for 1961 proposes spending $13.3 billion, or 63 percent more than fiscal 1954, the first year of the present administration. Including the highway item, it is up $16.2 billion, an increase of 77 percent.

On the other hand, defense spending for 1961 in this budget is $1.3 billion below the 1954 total. And it is unchanged from the current year.

The record is plain. Nondefense spending has far outstripped defense spending. And it has come at the urging of the administration in a succession of record-breaking budgets.

Before it is too late—if it is not already too late, before the value of the dollar plummets still further, we must reverse this relentless trend to ever-increasing expenditure.

This budget is too high. It is inflationary. We must cut it. Nothing within the power of men to alter should logically be regarded as beyond reach of the knife. We should probe deeply into every item. We must dispense with every nonessential. And that includes the defense budgets. It is not so much a question of what we spend for defense as it is what we spend it for. We must dispense with outmoded, obsolete, obsolescent weapons and systems. We are long past the point where we can afford the luxury of adherence to business as usual.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE THE GOVERNMENT

The amount of authority to obligate the Government, either enacted or requested, is the most consistently accurate yardstick by which to measure future spending. That comes first. Spending follows. The President recom-

mends $79.4 billion of new obligating authority in this budget for 1961. With the highway fund, the requests total $82.6 billion.

I include a table for the 8 years 1954–61:

Appropriations and other forms of authority to obligate the Government ("New obligational authority")

[A rearrangement of budget table 7 with certain additions]

[In billions of dollars]

Type of authority	Enacted, 1954	Enacted, 1955	Enacted, 1956	Enacted, 1957	Enacted, 1958	Enacted, 1959	1960		1961 (total proposed)	1961 compared with—	
							Already enacted	Total proposed		1960 enacted	1960 total proposed
1. Appropriations:											
(a) Annual	51.8	45.8	50.8	58.9	61.9	67.7	66.5	67.6	68.6	+2.1	+1.0
(b) Permanent (annual action not required)	6.8	6.8	7.4	7.8	8.1	8.1	9.9	9.9	10.2	+.3	+.3
Total, appropriations	58.6	52.6	58.2	66.7	70.0	75.8	76.4	77.5	78.8	+2.4	+1.3
2. Public debt receipt authority	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.2	5.7	5.4	1.7	1.7	.5	−1.2	−1.2
3. Contract authority	.9	1.0	2.4	.3	.5	.4	.6	.6	.4	−.2	−.2
4. Reappropriation of prior funds	.4	1.2	.4	.1	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	−.1	−.1
Total, all forms of authority	63.5	57.8	64.1	70.3	76.4	81.7	78.9	80.0	79.8	+.9	−.2
5. Deduct appropriations to liquidate contract authority previously granted	−.7	−.7	−.9	−.1	−.1	−.3	−.3	−.3	−.4	+.1	+.1
Net new obligating authority per budget	62.8	57.1	63.2	70.2	[1] 76.3	[1] 81.4	78.6	79.7	79.4	+.8	−.3
6. Add highway trust fund for proper comparison with years prior to 1957:											
(a) New contract authority	----------	----------	----------	2.6	3.6	3.4	2.9	2.9	[2] 3.1	+.2	+.2
(b) Tax refunds and interest on genera fund advances	*	----------	----------	----------	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	----------	----------
Grand total	62.8	57.1	63.2	72.8	[1] 80.0	[1] 84.9	81.6	82.7	82.6	+1.0	−.1

[1] The budgets for 1959 and 1960 recommended several large supplementals for the respective immediately preceding fiscal years (1958 and 1959) which normally should have been carried in the regular bills for the ensuing year or were otherwise unusual or special items which tend to distort comparisons between years.

[2] Includes $900,000,000 under proposed legislation.

HAVE LIVING COSTS BEEN REDUCED?

Mr. Speaker, the inevitable result of these recordbreaking budgets and deficits has been a steady upward march in the cost of living. This was also among the things they promised to halt. But they have failed in that also. The cost of living keeps skyrocketing as the dollar plunges in value. The official index hit a new high water mark last November—and that was merely topping record highs reached in five of the preceding 6 months. The dollar is now worth only 47.3 cents.

Life savings have been eroded; money accumulated for old age is being dissipated; pensions and allowances won't do what they were intended to do; wages buy less and less; every morning it costs more to set the breakfast table.

And it is all because we have spent for non-defense purposes money we did not have—money we had to borrow—for things we could get along without. And it has been done at the urging of the administration in these budgets. As conclusively shown, they asked for more and more.

Here is the official data in support:

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
YEARS			
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
[2] New record high.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar—Continued

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
SELECTED MONTHS			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1953—January	113.9	113.1	52.2
1954—January	115.2	113.1	51.6
1955—January	114.3	110.6	52.0
1956—January	114.6	109.2	51.8
1957—January	118.2	112.8	50.3
1958—January	[2] 122.3	118.2	48.6
April	[2] 123.5	121.6	48.1
July	[2] 123.9	121.7	47.9
August	123.7	120.7	48.0
September	123.7	120.3	48.0
October	123.7	119.7	48.0
November	123.9	119.4	47.9
December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—January	123.8	119.0	48.0
February	123.7	118.2	48.0
March	123.7	117.7	48.0
April	123.9	117.6	47.9
May	[2] 124.0	117.7	47.9
June	[2] 124.5	118.9	47.7
July	[2] 124.9	119.4	47.6
August	124.8	118.3	47.6
September	[2] 125.2	118.7	47.4
October	[2] 125.5	118.4	47.3
November	[2] 125.6	117.9	47.3

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, debt analysis staff, Dec. 22, 1959.

SEVEN-YEAR COMPARATIVE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, it is timely to submit a comparative accounting of the condition of Treasury finances administered during the 7 years thus far under the present administration, fiscal year 1954 through the present fiscal year 1960—with the immediately preceding 7 years of fiscals 1947 through 1953 under the previous administration. The figures for the current fiscal year 1960 are still tentative since there are 5 more months to go, but they are probably close enough to the mark to suffice for such comparison. In 3 of the 7 years under the previous administration we were at war in Korea.

Budget revenues during the present administration exceed the previous administration by $150.9 billion. They have taken more taxes from the people.

Budget expenditures under the present administration exceed expenditures under the previous administration by $164.3 billion. They have spent more, and as documented, mostly for nondefense purposes.

The cumulative net deficit under the present administration is $19.1 billion. They have not lived within income. Under the previous adminstration, it was only $5.7 billion, including the 3 war years in Korea. Eliminating the war years, there was a surplus, not a deficit.

As to the public debt, up to this coming June 30, the debt under the present administration has increased by $18.4 billion, whereas under the previous administration in 7 years it was reduced by $3.3 billion. In the 4 peacetime years, 1947–50, it was reduced by $12 billion, But even with the Korean war years, the previous administration reduced it. In the last 7 years bigger and bigger debts have been saddled on generations yet unborn.

The following 7-year comparisons are submitted in substantiation:

7-year comparative figures on income spending, deficits or surpluses, and debt changes

[In billions of dollars]

7-year tax take, net budget receipts:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60)	480.2
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53)	329.3
Present administration over previous	+150.9
7-year outgo, net budget expenditures:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60)	499.3
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53)	335.0
Present administration over previous	+164.3
7-year deficits:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954–60, all peacetime years)	−19.1
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947–53, of which 1951–53 were war years in Korea)	[1] −5.7
Present administration over previous	+13.4
7-year changes in Federal public debt:	
Under present administration (July 1953 to July 1960—from $266.1 billion to $284.5 billion)	+18.4
Under previous administration (July 1946 to July 1953—from $269.4 billion to $266.1 billion)	−3.3
Present administration over previous	+21.7

[1] The net deficit during the Korean war years, fiscals 1951–53, was $9.9 billion. Thus the 4 peacetime years, fiscals 1947–50, showed a net surplus of $4.2 billions.

NOTES: For simplicity here and so as to tie directly to official "budget" figures, amounts applicable to the Highway Trust Fund for fiscals 1957–60 have been omitted.

Amounts included for fiscal 1960, ending June 30, 1960, are estimated as shown in 1961 budget.

THE RUSSIAN DANGER

Mr. Speaker, the situation is even more desperate than this.

We have witnessed in the last decade one of the most remarkable developments in history; a nation just emerging from barbarism, a nation which had never won a war in all its history has, in the last decade become the greatest military power in the world today. They have greater manpower, more modern weapons; have attained greater scientific accomplishments; have extended control over a majority of the peoples of two continents. And they have indicated that they cannot live in the same world with our form of government and our system of finance.

They make no secret of the fact that they expect to control the world.

Ten years ago they were not only a backward people, a people without previous cultural training or scientific attainments, their entire land was devastated and impoverished by the ravages of war. The German Army, perhaps the greatest army ever mobilized, had ravaged their country to the very gates of their capital. They did not leave a bridge, a railroad, a building. They stripped the country clean of food, factories, supplies, and foundation herds. On this side at the close of the war not a single bridge was out of place, not a brick upon any chimney top had been disturbed, not a single railroad rail had been moved. We continued business as usual. We were the greatest scientific nation in the world. And still, incredible as it may seem, they have completely outclassed us, completely outdistanced us in scientific achievements.

Down at the Pentagon they waved away any apprehensions about the future. "Oh," they said, "we can destroy any nation that attacks us." They said the Russians have nothing; do not have to be taken into consideration. They have no mechanical genius. It was not until the Russians presented indisputable evidence, until they put into orbit the first artificial satellite in the history of science that we realized our danger.

Today it is universally conceded that we are 4 years behind them in vital military weapons. It will take 3 or 4 years for us to overtake them, but of course the Russians will not play fair, they will not stand still while we are catching up with them. They will keep going. Perhaps by the end of the 4 years they will then be 8 years ahead of us; at least we have no convincing reason to believe otherwise.

The great need of our Defense Department, the great need for national defense, is money. This $12 billions we spent above our revenue last year was not spent for war purposes, it was not spent to arm our defense forces, it was not spent to develop missiles or nuclear submarines, it was spent for nondefense purposes. But if the Russians come over it will not avail us much when instant annihilation strikes our centers of population, mobilization, communication, and production.

So, Mr. Speaker, because I want to leave some time for the distinguished gentleman from California, let me earnestly recommend that in this session of Congress, not for the sake of victory, but for the sake of bare survival we keep this budget within the national income.

There is no second place in a world in which Russia is first.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and accepting additional time because, in my opinion, he has made the most important speech on the budget and the rapidly accelerating interest rate problem that has been made in this Congress for many years. The gentleman is eminently qualified from his long years of experience as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to do this particular job which he has done today. I am sure his words will be read far and wide, and probably be reprinted in some of the financial journals of our Nation.

The gentleman has stressed two points, the budget and the interest rate. I want to point out that in the 7 years immediately following the war the average annual budget had an interest rate of 2.38 percent. During the war, when we averaged a $52 billion deficit every year for 4 years, we increased from 1940 to 1945 from a $43 billion national debt to a $258 billion national debt. Yet, the debt management under the Roosevelt-Truman administration kept the interest rate at 2.38 percent or an average of 2.38 percent notwithstanding this tremendous deficit. In the 7 past years, under the Eisenhower administration, our debt has gone up. The gentleman gave the figure of around $18 billion. The figures show that in 1953 the debt was $266 billion and the estimated debt this year is $284 billion, which would give the $18 billion debt increase for those 7 years. This is a little less than $3 billion a year deficit. Yet, the interest rate in that period of time has gone up 60 percent. It is costing 60 percent more on the debt cost. The cost of money, that is, the interest rates, rose under the Eisenhower administration's 7 years from 2.20 percent average in 1953 to 4.25 percent in 1960 on long-term Government bonds or an increase of almost 100 percent and we paid to 5.36 percent in 1960 on short-term notes and bills or an increase of 150 percent. So I believe the gentleman will probably concur in this remark that debt management has a great deal to do with interest rates. Is that not true?

Mr. CANNON. Unquestionably.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hold in my hand a document known as Document No. 67, which is entitled "Congressional Action on the Presidential Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority," put out by a committee in the other body in which it shows that in the last session, the Congress appropriated $1,881,410,093 less than requested in the budget estimates of the President. Is the gentleman aware of those figures?

Mr. CANNON. The figures are a matter of record.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And in new obligational authority, we have heard a great deal about the backdoor financing method in new obligational authority, the so-called backdoor financing, there has been asked a total of $81,227,609,151 and the Congress has granted $79,428,598,352 or $2,580,410,093 less than the administration has asked in the so-called "backdoor financing." I think the gentleman will agree that the charge against the Democratic Party that has been in control of the Congress, is unfounded in the light of these figures. If these figures are not right, I would like to have the gentleman or someone at the proper time prove that they are not correct.

Mr. CANNON. The figures speak for themselves.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House, if the gentleman will allow me just 1 more moment to do so, to present January 17 issue of the U.S. News. He will find on pages 50 and 51 an item on this interest proposition which would be of great value to read. It takes different booms and depressions and it points out in every instance prior to a depression there was a series of interest rate raises

as a result of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department actions. This holds true in the depression of 1919–20, 1928–29, 1936–37, 1948, 1952–53, 1955, and in 1957, and it also says that, during the boom of 1958–60, the discount rate already has been raised five times and that another hike is likely. Interest rates are the highest they have been in a generation.

In view of the record which is portrayed of depression which occurred immediately after a series of tight money methods on the part of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department, are we not justified in expecting another depression such as followed the other, unless this is corrected?

Mr. CANNON. As far as I am aware, there is not a national magazine, or a metropolitan newspaper which does not disapprove of Government deficits, which does not urge upon the President and upon the Congress a retrenchment of expenditures, down to the point where we will live within our income.

I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to go into a few things that I think ought to be called to the attention of the House.

Just before I came to the floor I looked at the current Treasury statement issued on the 12th day of January, and it showed, making adjustment for the 12 days, that the expenditures of the Government during the period from July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959, increased just about $1 billion. The receipts of the Government in that same period increased a little over $6 billion.

In view of the fact that the trend is that way and we have a prospect of better revenues in the last half of the fiscal year, I can see no question but what the receipts of the Government will be at least $8 billion more in the last half of this current fiscal year. This is going to result in a balanced budget, provided some of these taxes relating to excises are restored and kept going from this point on for another period. That makes practically a balanced budget for this year. I am satisfied, with the trend of the economic situation, that we can count on an increase in the fiscal year 1961 of receipts and that we should not have a terrific increase in expenditures. That is if this Congress and the Members of it will go along with what is needed right straight down the line rather than for all the frills and gewgaws that a lot of people think they would like to have.

Those things can upset the applecart completely, but if we are going to approach anything like a balanced budget and keep it balanced we must hold expenditures down and not authorize all sorts of projects we cannot afford to have. You know and I know that everywhere we look we see governmental expenditures, both Federal, State, and local, getting way out of hand. We must remember, however, that the responsibility lies with us to keep from contributing to that tendency which is so dangerous at this time.

I believe, and I have been watching it pretty closely, that the present operations of the Defense Department have given us an armed force sufficient to take care of our needs. There is no question but what we would be able to repel what the Russians might do in the case of emergency. We have got to keep it that way. At the same time we have got to cull out of the Military Establishment as well as everything else the things that are not needed.

I hope the membership of the Congress will go along with the idea of trying to help those of us on the Appropriations Committee who are trying to keep these expenditures down so that we will be able to make the Congress proper contribution to a balanced budget.

One of the worst things that those of us who desire to see appropriations properly justified and the unnecessary items cut out has for many years been the back-door approach picture. That resulted in over $5 billion of appropriations that the committee had nothing to do with last year. It is about time that we stop that approach to the Treasury of the United States. I hope that the Budget will not send up any more such things and that the President will not approve any more projects passed on the back-door approach to the Treasury.

DISASTER OR PROGRESS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we stand at the dawn of a new decade—one horizoned with both rich promise and awesome peril. Are our political parties, Republican and Democrat, constituted, organized, and prepared to meet the challenges of the 1960's? In a nation which governs through a two-party system, this is an all important question. In quest of an answer, a series of speeches will be delivered by a group of Republicans in the House. This is the first in that series.

We shall outline three major challenges. We shall seek to analyze the differences in the ways the two parties respond to these challenges.

Why should we attempt this? In the hands of the voter at the polls resides the power to point this country toward the greatest disasters or the most profound progress in our entire history. The decision will be reached cumulatively by a storekeeper in New York City, a dairy farmer in Wisconsin, an autoworker in Michigan, an executive in Los Angeles, a housewife in Tennessee—and by millions of others. Public political debate over the real issues is an absolute necessity if the American people are to be alerted to the grave choice they cannot escape.

We propose, therefore, to examine the decade ahead.

In the space age, ironically, the exploration of new horizons in human relations and government on earth will be even more important than the exploration of outer space.

Both in human relations and in outer space, we voyage now into an epoch very much like the first great age of discovery and exploration which uncovered the New World. On Columbus' famous voyage, the crew at one point panicked and wanted to turn back because the waters into which their leader was taking them did not appear on Old World charts and maps. They lacked the vision of the Great Navigator. Indispensable to Columbus' genius was the knowledge that if a new world was to be discovered, courage and pioneer faith were required.

There are those today who would timidly turn to socialism, centralized control and the planned state in human relations and government in order to escape the uncharted waters into which our civilization now ventures. Many would go back to the Old World of the New Deal, to the hackneyed solution of a decade of depression. They would substitute statism for freedom and enterprise. Like Columbus, we must understand that new shores can never be reached by those who shrink from exercising the freedom and initiative required to go forward. Those who want to use the old charts and centrally control every social, economic, cultural, educational, and research problem are placing security above freedom, dictation above individual creativity and materialism above the God-given spirit of man.

As we look to the decade of the 1960's, one course of action would be to meet the challenges of promise and peril by turning back, diluting the pioneer spirit, meeting Russian statism by greater statism at home, spending extravagantly today and letting our children pay the awful debts tomorrow.

The other course is to meet the challenges by advancing toward them with courage, free creativity, meeting Russian centralization and regimentation with greater incentives and leadership at home, putting our financial house in order, providing an inheritance of freedom and prosperity for our children, and granting our Nation the economic health to flourish and grow over the centuries.

Can 179 million Americans pick and choose knowingly and properly between these two routes if the two political parties do not clarify the differences in the routes? Political parties become thieves and robbers in the market place of public opinion when they try to confuse rather than clarify how they plan to respond to the perils and promises ahead. We Republicans who undertake this speech series believe that candor is essential. Our purpose is to clarify the differences in party responses to the challenges of the 1960's.

To face successfully the challenges of this decade, what are the qualities a political party needs?

Our survival and our growth depend upon a much greater sense of purpose and unity than the Nation has evidenced in the last few decades. Indeed, Russia's astonishing accomplishments in a few select fields of endeavor have resulted from her driving sense of unified purpose. The fast moving technological,

industrial, managerial and social advances of today involve such a maze of continuing change that purpose is needed if we are to prevent a totality of confusion, division and frustration.

In the time-space age, our country will constantly cry out for unity and purpose. A party seriously divided against itself will never be able to give the Nation the unity and purpose it so urgently needs. To furnish leadership toward these qualities, a party must have within itself a basic degree of unity. By that, I do not mean that everyone within the party must agree on every issue. But I do mean that disagreement and dissension must not reach the dimensions which exist in the Democrat Party today. Each day we see that party expending its energies on party civil war, and in the end obtaining intraparty peace only by compromising and camouflaging vital issues before they reach the public. Theirs is a strategy of negatism with the public paying the price for party schizophrenia. In the time-space age ahead, political parties must have within themselves basic unity to be effective.

The country today is suffering from the current intraparty disunity which is monopolizing the energies of the Democrat Party.

We cannot as a Nation afford a party in control of the Congress whose Members' time and energies are consumed in intraparty wrangling rather than legislating to meet the needs of the Nation.

Second. If a political party is to be more than just a conspiracy to gain power, it must be a party of principle. A party which is concerned with only day-to-day demands of its lust for power becomes a gathering of officeseekers and their friends. Its concern for self-preservation takes precedence over its concern for national preservation. On the other hand, the party of principle will hold to certain unchanging beliefs about freedom, so precious that they will not be sacrificed for any political victory. And these unchanging principles must flourish into a forward-looking philosophy that seeks out the issues and abhors escapism. To a major degree, the legislative actions of that party must support this philosophy lest its principles and philosophy become a sham.

Third. A political party must have democracy within its ranks. Whether in State committees, the national committee, or in the congressional organization, it must represent the viewpoints within the party. It must shun party dictatorships and organize itself to express rank-and-file views

Fourth. A political party must have a sense of responsibility toward the future. Open to any political party is the tempting opportunity to buy votes by squandering the public money. For that type of timeserving, selfish politics, the next generation will have to foot the bill. What is more, it is a myopic political party which can see only ever increasing outlays of dollars as the solution to a host of continuing problems. It is an enlightened and farsighted party which chooses, if needed, the difficult way in order to avoid expedient solutions that will harm and impede this Nation a decade or so hence.

The greatest temptation of expediency is to solve a dilemma by placing overriding authority in the hands of the Federal Government. Wielded by a benevolent executive or administrator, such power might be used wisely. But a government of law, not of men who preempt the power of law, was the design of our Republic. Sooner or later, such power in the hands of man is abused and the liberties of the people reduced.

It is much easier for a monopoly or for a large pressure group, or for a small group of unscrupulous politicians to control one national legislature as against control of 50 State legislatures.

The problems of Florida are not the problems of Oregon. The industrial complexion of Detroit is not the industrial complexion of Hollywood. The academic approach at Harvard University is not necessarily the academic approach at North Texas State Teachers College. Overfederalization ignores this and cultivates two massive evils. First is the habit of superficial generalizations—the attempt to standardize the governmental response to every local and specific need.

Second, overfederalization takes the government away from the people. The decisionmaking process becomes remote from the storekeeper in New York City, the dairy farmer in Wisconsin, the housewife in Tennessee. The people find that all aspects of their way of life—their education, their housing, their culture, are being controlled from afar. This is the way for the United States, like ancient Rome, to slip from a Republic to an authoritarian state.

I repeat, four qualities are needed for a political party to meet the challenges of this decade: First, a basic degree of unity and purpose; second, a coherent, forward-looking philosophy based on principle; third, democracy and genuine representation within the party organization; and fourth, a responsibility toward future generations of Americans. Only with these qualities can a party help preserve a free and dynamic America in the years ahead.

Permit me to apply these tests to the Republican Party.

Does it have the unity and purpose to give unity and purpose to the Nation?

The Republican Party is more united today than perhaps ever before in its history. While there will always be room for disagreement between its members, and those disagreements are freely expressed in party councils, there is no cleavage on basic party principles or philosophy.

The Republican Party is not torn apart by regional differences, nor is it in constant battle with itself over fundamental beliefs. There is no strife between its National and State elements. Its leader can speak for the whole party, not for just fragments of it. It is prepared to offer the Nation continuity of executive and legislative leadership because its philosophy and principles, rather than its urge for power, are its motivating force.

Our unity in Congress was dramatized during the consideration of labor reform legislation last year. This was perhaps the most important issue of the session, for labor reform has become a major concern of our times, just as business reform was a major concern of the 1890's and the subsequent era of Theodore Roosevelt Republicanism. On this crucial issue, almost 90 percent of the Republican Members of this body voted to substitute the Landrum-Griffin bill for the weak committee bill, thus insuring that the Nation would meet the issue head-on with effective legislation. Republican unity contrasted with the remarkable schism in the majority party on this all-important vote.

Does the Republican Party possess a coherent, forward-looking philosophy based on principle?

I believe that ours is the party of principle; the party that would rather be right if it means sacrificing a political victory; the party which believes in a government of laws to prevent seizure of dominant powers by any arm or faction; the party which believes that individual freedom is man's most valuable possession.

We believe, as the preface of the report of the committe on program and progress of the Republican National Committee put it, that:

> The Nation's greatness comes from the tremendous, God-given strength in each of us that is unlocked when a man is his own master reaching for his own destiny, with the opportunity to move constantly toward a better life.
>
> This principle underlies our determination to guard against the heedless growth of the Central Government in Washington—and to keep the basic control of Government in the hands of the people, as against those who wish to give more and more authority to the Central Government—away from the people.
>
> It prompts the Republican policy of due care in public spending to avoid eating away the right of the people to save or to invest their own money in their own way, as against those who show no such faith in the ability of the people to handle their own money. * * *
>
> Government paternalism carries a price tag, the surrender of the individual's right to order his own life, to plan his own future. * * *
>
> The unregimented mind has a better chance to reach out for new ideas than the mind that operates as the prisoner of a political dogma; in a space age of limitless horizons, the race will go to the side with the freest, farthest-ranging minds in search of truth.

The third question, Does the Republican Party have real democracy and representation within its ranks?

Political bossism is the exception rather than the rule in the Republican Party organization. The party's strength comes from the grassroots. Its leaders gain office in democratic elections. It is remarkably free from the political machines which plague the other major party.

Nor has the Republican Party allowed itself to be taken over by power-hungry pressure groups. It has refused, for example, to sell its soul for the votes promised by union bosses. The sources of the Republican Party's power are its members. It has not become the appendage of any self-serving economic group.

True democracy in the Republican Party carries over into its party organization in the Congress. Its congressional leaders neither seek nor are given the

dictatorial powers over party strategy and policy which characterize the majority party. We operate through frequent party conferences. Policy advice comes from elected policy committees.

It would not be amiss at this point, I believe, to point out that Republicans in Congress are not feuding about whether to have policy committees or whether or not party policy is democratically determined. Republican policy committees are operating in both Houses now.

They are committees which have been democratically selected and designed to represent all shades of opinion within the party membership. In the House, for example, I can personally testify that the Republican policy committee is a functioning, representative body, assisting in the formulation of Republican legislative policy in the House and providing close liaison between the executive and legislative branches. Its members are elected by fellow members under a system which insures that each geographical area and each newly elected group has representation. The committee meets regularly every Tuesday with special meetings called whenever required.

The effective operation of both Republican policy committees contrast with the situation in the majority party, where in one House, its policy committee is threatened with downgrading into a scheduling committee, and in the other, no policy-formulating committee has ever existed. This denial of democratic procedure within one of our parties is responsible for the constant wrangling in one House over policy matters and the undercurrent of protest in this body against the junta-type organization of the majority party. The substitution of intraparty wrangling in the Democrat Party for effective legislative procedures gives Republicans no comfort. Regardless of party, we know that the Nation suffers when the majority party in Congress dissipates its energies in civil war.

We Republicans place great emphasis upon democratic procedure within our party primarily, of course, because we feel that party practice must coincide with our party's basic belief in the democratic practices of free government. Just as strongly, however, we feel that any party which refuses to provide the channels, within itself, for the free expression of new ideas is doomed to stagnation and becomes ill-equipped to make the decisions necessary for the survival of freedom in the decades ahead.

I would hope that the time will come when both parties, in both Houses, will function through formalized policy committees, similar to those recommended by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in the 79th Congress.

The fourth question: Is the Republican Party forward looking and concerned with the welfare of future generations?

No other principle of the Republican Party is as deep and instinctive as our belief that no generation can live solely for itself but instead has the heaviest of obligations to preserve the Nation and its institutions, strengthened and improved, for those who follow. What we have now we know was won for us only by the efforts and sacrifices of those who went before us. We have the high moral duty to labor and sacrifice, if need be, to preserve and protect our heritage for the generations to come.

It is this principle which leads us to oppose programs which can solve temporary difficulties only at the price of the irretrievable loss of national strength or individual freedom. It is this principle which urges us to advance solutions which require effort and sacrifice now but will pay dividends in the future in the form of a sound political and economic structure for us and our children.

As an example, we Republicans are the leaders in the fight against inflation: a battle fought on many fronts—against excessive spending, for sound taxing policies, in support of rational debt management. For our efforts, we often hear Republicans accused of being preoccupied with balanced budgets, as negative, as stand-patters. What could be less negative and more far-seeing than this battle to insure that the next generations inherit freedom instead of economic tyranny? What is more negative, destructive and immoral than to squander money and engage in other acts of irresponsibility today and lose our children their freedom tomorrow?

Daily on the floor of this House, Republicans have battled for the long-range welfare of the Nation and its people; against those who would choose the easy but wrong way; against those who would divide the people into groups, stir selfish passions, appeal to special interests and promise what cannot be delivered.

Republicans in this body have stood for principle in foreign and domestic policy, against those whose addiction to expediency places them in an endless sea of confusion.

The Republican program is geared for the protection of interests of the American family—the interest of that family in preserving peace with justice so that no son of theirs will be sacrificed because of blundering diplomacy; the interest of that family in maintaining a sound dollar, so that their savings for their children's education will not be eroded, so that the power of free decision will not be lost by prices and debts which make us all slaves to an economic monster.

We will articulate these beliefs, this program, our actions to the American people. But, we will go beyond, and that is the principal reason for this series of speeches by Republican Members. We will discuss, in frankness and fullness, the challenges of the age ahead.

Three of these challenges will be examined in detail. First is the challenge of preserving peace with justice. This deeply involves the Communist peril and our response to it. Second is the challenge of maturing labor-management relations into constructive avenues which will protect the public, as well as the parties involved, and help foster economic growth. Third is the challenge of controlling inflation and high prices in a way which will preserve the economic freedom of the average American family. We will examine the way our party and the other party responds to these challenges.

Already, in the decade of the 1960's, we in this body are making history. Just as surely, we make history when we fail to act as when we do act. Our every move carries us one step closer to the dreadful perils or one step closer to the boundless promises. The clock ticks off the time, and each striking hour, our political parties face, irrevocably, a judgment. At the final sounding, either the peril or the promise will have won.

It is the declaration and firm belief of the Republican Party that we can defeat the peril and bring the promise into being if this Nation will harness and put to work the God-given strength of free men and women. To this end, we propose to dedicate ourselves and our party in the decade ahead.

ROLLCALL VOTE ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, while most of us have not had an opportunity to fully digest the 1961 Federal budget which was presented this afternoon, it is certainly not too early to view and review the fiscal situation of the Nation with deep concern as we approach our deliberations on a score of appropriation bills.

The full and final responsibility for balancing the new budget and opening the door to applying any surplus to the national debt lies squarely upon the Members of this body.

Recording of yea and nay votes on all appropriation bills brought before us is, in my opinion, the first step in curtailing excessive Government spending and prudent refinancing of the national debt.

Within the next few weeks Congress will be grappling with a variety of legislation, including a score of appropriation bills for both committed and new Federal programs.

This being a presidential campaign year and politics being what they are on the American scene today, we can expect the usual pressures both internally and externally for programs which will move outside the realm of good fiscal judgment.

With the advent of the end of the steel strike and an era of great prosperity at hand, it may be easier to yield to these pressures.

It is not necessary to remind any Member of this House of the great public consternation which arose less than a year ago over deficit spending and inflation.

While messages of this nature have not flooded congressional offices as yet this year, it is my hope and my prediction that the same sentiment still prevails and these sentiments may well be transmitted to us before this session of Congress is another 6 or 7 weeks old.

It has been easy for Members of this Body to claim economy voting records and it has been just as easy through newsletters and news releases for Members of this body to convey to the folks back home a deep and undying interest in fiscal responsibility.

It is politically popular to take credit for assisting in a balanced budget, particularly when it is also possible to do so in the face of supporting every expanded Federal spending program offered for public or private consumption.

We need only go back to January of 1958 when a boom year was predicted and Congress went its merry way in spending generously of the anticipated tax income, only to encounter a temporary recession which left a deficit of 12 billion 400 million dollars.

Although we should not have to be so warned, one of the outstanding weekly news publications in the Nation has just pointed to this situation with the warning that it could happen again.

But back to the matter of pinning individual responsibility squarely upon the Members of this body from which all spending bills must originate.

Last July, sensing the inability of the average citizen to score his Representative on his record of fiscal responsibility, I introduced a bill providing for amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the Senate and the House of Representatives on appropriation bills.

I am pleased to say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, Representative SMITH of Virginia, has advised me that he will bring the matter of this legislation to the attention of the Rules Committee at its first meeting.

I sincerely believe the time has arrived when each of us should be agreeable, if not anxious, to accept our individual responsibility in the matter of our stand for or against such appropriation bills as are presented.

Let me further state that I see no reason why any Member of Congress should, when voting in the good conscience of his convictions on the expenditure of Federal funds, object to the adoption of a rule such as this which simply puts him on record in pursuing such convictions.

Looking to the core of our present fiscal situation, and projecting the cost of our national debt, legislation of some nature in this area has never been of greater demand than it is today.

I believe the average citizen should have an opportunity to itemize, if you please, the appropriation approvals of his Representatives in Congress.

All things being equal, and the high level of prosperity in the country continuing throughout the next fiscal year, any deficit in the new budget would be a shame.

It would certainly be an admission to the American public that this Congress lacks an understanding of the seriousness of our present fiscal problem, which is the hangover of many years of deficit spending sprees.

It has become vitally essential that any surplus that might be accumulated be applied against the astronomical national debt, as recommended by President Eisenhower.

And let me say the day we find ourselves in a position to reduce even a small portion of this costly obligation would be just cause for a national holiday.

As I have said before, I repeat that it is most unfortunate that the youth of this generation do not have a lobby here in Washington to protect their interest in the dollars they have yet to earn, for most of them will find, with their great American heritage, an obligation which this generation is bequeathing to them.

This problem of fiscal responsibility is certainly no longer one that can be construed as entirely of a domestic nature.

Unless we choose to blind ourselves to what is happening in the world money market, we must realize that our dollar troubles here have a very serious international implication.

Not only are dollars piling up faster abroad than ever before in history, but we are actually losing gold because U.S. payments to other nations are now exceeding our receipts.

Our labor costs in this country, now at an all-time high, are making it more and more difficult to hold foreign markets, although foreign manufactured goods continue to come into this country at an increased pace.

This is naturally going to expedite the growing tendency of industry to move abroad where labor costs are lower, taxes are lower, and potential profits accordingly higher.

This, coupled with the necessity of having to refinance $25 billion of our national debt by the midsixties, and roughly $2 billion of this within a matter of 5 to 6 months, while interest rates are the highest in the history of this Nation, should have a sobering effect upon any enthusiastic programs of deficit spending in the months ahead.

We continue to spend billions for national defense, yet it frequently appears that we forget that a strong internal economy and a sound fiscal policy are as vital to our national security as any ingredient of its foundation.

Further devaluation of the dollar, increased indebtedness and its eroding effect upon the stability of our economy at home can only be construed abroad as a decay in the general strength of this Nation.

Election year or no election year, the seriousness of the situation faces us as squarely as any national problem before us today.

It can be made either a challenge of statesmanship or bypassed for political expediency.

The choice is before each Member of this House as we move into the legislative task before us.

THE NORTHERN DEMOCRAT-SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have entitled these remarks "The Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat Coalition."

Mr. Speaker I drafted a letter to my constituents to inform them of the status of the civil rights legislation. After drafting this letter I thought I would prefer to deliver this on the floor of the House so that anyone who wants to take exception to what I say will have an opportunity.

Dear constituents, the 2d session of the 86th Congress has started on a very curious note. The House has been meeting every day for just a short time, but transacting very little business.

The reason for the meetings, as stated by Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader, is "to give the Members of the House an opportunity to sign the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill onto the floor of the House for debate."

The majority leader, along with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman CELLER, and a few other spokesmen for the northern city wing of the Democratic Party, have been making speeches chastising the Republicans in the House who compose about one-third of the membership for not signing this discharge petition.

Certain members of the working press, TV, and radio commentators have echoed the statements of these congressional leaders. Some have gone a step farther by raising the question whether the Republicans had a deal with the Southern Democrats to get through the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill and now the Republicans are "paying off to the Southern Democrats." Once again a Southern Democrat-Republican coalition is suggested as being the reason the Democratic Party cannot function as a party.

WHAT ABOUT THE NORTHERN DEMOCRAT-SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT COALITION?

Now what is the truth of the situation? The truth is easily obtainable by any observer of the Washington scene. The truth has been known for years. Why is not the truth reported to the people so that they can evaluate the situation themselves?

I regret to state that rigged quiz shows and payola rackets are only a symptom of a much more serious disease which has afflicted our Nation. Indeed, some of the loudest cries condemning the decline of morals evidenced by rigged quiz shows and payola come from people who are engaged and have been engaged for many years in a much more serious distortion of the truth to fool the people. They are engaged in no parlor games or selling a particular product to the public, they are engaged in hoodwinking the people on the issues involved in the national security and well-being of our society.

In many instances these people are motivated by good intentions. They believe that the people do not know what is the best for themselves, therefore they must be led into doing what is best for themselves. If it is necessary to deceive them so that they will do what is for their own good, then deceive them.

I am convinced that good intentions can never in the long run compensate for the damage which results from the use of willful deception. I am convinced that the people of this country properly supplied with the facts and arguments sur-

rounding the issues of the day will come to intelligent conclusions and support the policies proposed by the persons they have selected to lead the Nation. The people do not have to be fooled for their own best interests. Representative government can work if we will work at it.

I want to make it quite clear that in my judgment neither political party has a monopoly on this business of trying to fool the people. Likewise, in both political parties, there are persons who are fighting against this debilitating philosophy of fooling the people for their own best interests. On the other hand, those who have been most active and successful in their efforts to fool the people in recent years are in my judgment as wrong in their goals of what is good for the people, as they are in their methods. The members of the group I refer to have styled themselves as liberals. Actually they are not liberal by any dictionary definition of the word inasmuch as their programs invariably call for more government, not less government, and therefore less individual freedom. Their programs call for more Federal Government at the expense of local and State governments. Their programs call for more control by the executive department of the Federal Government at the expense of the Federal legislative and Federal judicial branches of the Government. In essence, this group of liberals are the modern day Federalists who believe that in modern times our society must have more of a centralized planned economy if we are to continue to advance and to compete with the other societies in the world.

Now back to the question about the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition that has been described in the public over a period of years. This proposition is one of the themes advanced by these so-called liberals. What is the truth? The truth is that the real coalition is between them and the Southern Democrats. Congressman CELLER and Congressman MCCORMACK and Congressman ROOSEVELT, for example, voted for and influenced their liberal congressional following to vote for Congressman SMITH of Virginia to be chairman of the Rules Committee, and Congressman BARDEN to be chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. In return for this support Congressman SMITH and Congressman BARDEN voted and threw their support to elect JOHN MCCORMACK majority leader of this coalition and voted for Congressman CELLER to be chairman of the Judiciary Committee. In the other body a similar situation prevails, the details of which I shall not set out in order to conform to the statement I made in response to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman made reference to Senators in his speech here?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I was referring to them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is that in conformity with the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think in context, it is, because I am not discussing any particular issue or casting any aspersions on them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The point of order is made to the Chair. As I understand it, the rules of the House prohibit Members of the House from referring to action of the Senators or anything in that relationship. The gentleman has, on a number of occasions, made reference to Senators EASTLAND, HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, and several others. Now, that is contrary to the rules of the House and should be stricken.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will say this, if the gentleman wants to insist on his point of order, I will delete the actual names in order to comply with the rules and in order to discuss the issue I was trying to bring out. But, I will be happy to agree to strike those names and proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, then, if the gentleman from Colorado has no objection, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will withdraw the reference to the Senators. That is what I suggest I do, and I agree with the gentleman's point that it is a proper point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As long as you are willing to admit that you are violating the rules of the House, that is all right with me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now, wait a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Colorado insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado withdraws his point of order. The Chair requests that the gentleman from Missouri proceed in order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the Speaker.

In speaking about the rules of the House, the rule is a very good one, and one I do try to observe carefully, and I think all Members should. The purpose of the rule, though, is to preserve amity between this House and the Senate. Frequently it becomes a very awkward rule, however, in order to discuss some of the pertinent public issues. I think my reference to the Senators was courteous and in no sense a degradation of them or in any way taking issue with them on any specific issue. I was commenting on party organization.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you think that it is fair to the Senators to make a comparison of what is taking place here in the House by naming them specifically in a letter that you now propose to send to your constituents?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Sure. What I say to my constituents is my own business. And, the rules of the House are not involved in that, I might say. Certainly, in order to discuss the basic issues that affect the country, it is pretty difficult not to refer to the other body at times, because they do have some influence on both your party organization and mine.

In other words, the obviousness and bigness of the Southern Democrat-Northern Democrat coalition and its long-standing operation has been such that it is completely overlooked in viewing the national scene. Hitler realized that the big lie carried greater weight because human nature tends to overlook the obvious. We tend to dismiss basic truths by referring to them with the conceit of the half educated as platitudes. So this self-styled liberal group establishing their basic coalition with the Southern Democrats has sought to distract the people from this true and obvious picture by calling the splits that occur from time to time in the coalition as the Southern Democrats go a different direction, a Republican-Southern Democrat coalition.

Are there occasions when the split is different and the liberal Democrats go their way and vote with the Republicans? Certainly; and these splits are almost as frequent as are the Southern Democratic lapses from the basic coalition. It happens every time civil rights legislation is before the House. It has been happening with more frequency in the past couple of years, I am happy to state, on farm legislation. But does the self-styled "liberal" group talk about the Northern-Republican coalition when this occurs? It does not. But in the South in order to keep the southerners voting for Representatives who will support the coalition there is plenty of talk about it.

BACK TO THE DISCHARGE PETITION

The liberal groups who make such great protestations about being for civil rights need to be called to task for ignoring and indeed undermining the most basic civil rights which our society possesses. The most basic right is the right to vote and have the vote counted honestly. Both the Southern Democrats as a group and a majority of the Northern city Democrats are guilty to a considerable degree of constant violation of this basic civil right—the southerners in their denial of the vote to the Negro and the Northern city Democrats in their boss-ridden city machines where fraudulent voting is almost a byword. This is not to give the Republican Party a clean bill of health in this regard. But I think the people of the country might well contemplate the contrast of the two parties in this respect.

An independent Congress, acting according to rules, not by personal whim, is a second foundation stone in any code of civil liberties. Why are the self-styled liberals always ready to discredit the rules of the House whenever they have trouble getting through some specific measure they claim to favor? This group was behind the idea of packing the Supreme Court when in the thirties they did not like what the Court was doing. Now they defend the Court

against similar attacks of the southerners, not because they seek to preserve the integrity of the Court—as proven by their previous behavior—but because what the Court is now saying meets with their approval.

This is not to say that the rules of the House are sacrosanct and beyond improvement. Indeed, the rules need constant looking into and improving, but this calls for specific criticism and specific recommendations for reform. For example, 3 years ago I helped to write and to get through new rules for committee procedure in the House. Yet, these rules had scarcely been on the books when one of the committee—the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—was guilty of gross violation of it, in my opinion. Almost alone I took the floor of the House to try to preserve the integrity of these rules. Not one of the self-styled liberals had the interest to defend rules that they had stated were necessary reforms.

When I first was assigned to the Joint Economic Committee in 1954 I found the committee had no rules of procedure. It took 6 months of complaint and pressure on the then chairman, Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, to get rules written.

Now are the rules of the House adequate to get the civil rights bill on the floor of the House without the discharge petition process? The answer is unequivocally, "Yes." The discharge petition itself is a proper procedure and a part of the rules but it is in the nature of a last resort measure and should only be used if all machinery in the Congress has proved ineffective against arbitrary and unjustifiable action or lack of action on the part of a group of Congressmen. Under the House rules, no one or two Congressmen, no matter what their position is—even if they be Speaker and majority leader—can stop proper measures from coming to the floor of the House against the will of the majority.

The question is, Have all reasonable measures under the House rules to bring the civil rights bill on the floor of the House been exhausted? The answer is, Even the basic procedure of bringing the matter before the Rules Committee has not been undertaken with any real force by Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which voted out the bill as the result I might state of a Northern Democrat-Republican coalition. The bill was reported out last August in the closing days of the first session. Chairman CELLER wrote a letter to Congressman SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, asking for a hearing on a rule. By Congressman CELLER's own statement on the floor he has done nothing since then to try to get a hearing for a rule before the Rules Committee.

Even if the Rules Committee controlled, as it is by the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition, 8 to 4, were unable to get a rule because the coalition would not hold together on this issue, there are other ways of getting the job done. Incidentally, the Rules Committee would vote out a rule if the Northern Democrats will supply three votes to the Republicans on the Rules Committee and just bring the necessary pressure on the chairman of the Rules Committee to call the committee together for this purpose. The Northern Democrats have not taken this route because, I presume, they are trying to keep the people of the country from realizing the true story of Northern Democratic-Southern Democratic coalition. That it is not a political party in the proper sense of the word that is an organization of people joining together on the basis of a common belief in certain fundamental principles of government. It is a coalition for power—"You vote for our man, we will vote for yours even though our views are completely discordant on all major issues."

The silence of the Republican Members of the House on this issue stems from their natural reluctance to help the opposition, and specifically their reluctance to help in hiding the truth from the people. The Republican members of the Rules Committee will not state how they will vote on the rule before the matter is presented to them. This is in accordance with good procedure and good precedence. The self-styled liberals know full well these four Republicans will vote for a rule based both on their past actions and votes and on the tradition of the Republican Party. So do the self-styled liberal newsmen who are yakking about a Southern Democrat-Republican coalition know this to be the reasonable prognostication. Furthermore, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind based upon past voting records that probably all of the 153 Republicans in the House, save a handful of less than 10, will vote for the civil rights bill. The Republicans, I hope, are not going to help keep the leadership of the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition from exposing this coalition to the people for just what it is, I regret, a coalition for power and not for principle.

There is an easy procedure to call up the civil rights bill without any reference to the Rules Committee. When the reform was made back in the early 1900's to expand the Rules Committee from a 3-man committee completely dominated by the Speaker—a Republican in those days—to a 12-man committee which would be more responsive to the will of the House membership and so to the people, the reformers wisely realized that even with a 12-man committee and one that was set to have 8 men from the majority party and 4 from the minority, the Speaker might still work with this group of 8 to thwart the will of the majority of the House. Accordingly, they created a procedure entitled "Calendar Wednesday." This procedure guarantees through very careful drafting that any committee which has voted out a bill by majority vote can bring the bill out to the floor for debate and amendment with ample time for debate whether the Speaker likes it or not and with reasonable expedition.

The present Speaker—like, I believe, his Republican and Democratic predecessors—does not like to call attention to the procedures of Calendar Wednesday. Certainly nothing would call it to the attention of the country more than a proper use of it. The Speakers have not liked and do not like this rule because it is a real diminution on their power as they well know it to be and it was intended to be.

The self-styled liberals almost destroyed any possible effectiveness of Calendar Wednesday back in 1949 by pushing through the 21-day rule. This gave back to the Speaker some of the powers over the Rules Committee which the enlargement from 3 to 12 members had taken from him. The 21-day rule provided that after the Rules Committee had failed to act on a bill for 21 days the Speaker could recognize the chairman of the committee to bring the bill up on the floor of the House for debate. The significance of the rule is that it gave this power which Calendar Wednesday gives to the majority of a legislative committee to call up a bill for debate also to the Speaker. This takes some of the steam, whatever steam there may be, out of the drive to use Calendar Wednesday and gives to the Speaker just one more device to bend the will of the majority to his own will.

Fortunately the next Congress in 1951 repealed the 21-day rule. So this device to keep the Calendar Wednesday procedure from being used does not stand as an excuse for Chairman CELLER not using Calendar Wednesday to bring up the civil rights bill.

The clincher about the deceptiveness of the Southern Democrat-Northern Democrat tactics in resorting to a discharge petition procedure is brought out by the fact that neither the Speaker—a Texan Democrat—nor the majority leader—a Massachusetts Democrat—will sign the discharge petition. Of course they will not. Signing a discharge petition in essence means that the signer has lost complete faith in the ability of the political party in control of the House to live up to its responsibilities as a political party. It also means a complete collapse of the leadership of the House to implement its decisions.

I have never signed a discharge petition since I have been in the Congress. There are many Members who take the same position, based upon the belief in the essential soundness of the House procedures and the importance of preserving these procedures and the procedures of orderly leadership.

That is not to say that the time would never come when I would sign a discharge petition. The time might come but it would only be when there was such a collapse of leadership of a political party that a willful minority segment of that party was thwarting the will of the majority and the issues were of serious nature to our people.

I believe we are approaching such a situation. Civil rights are serious to our Nation. This bill which relates to the basic civil right that of voting should be on the floor for debate and passage. However, I know that the leadership of the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition has not yet collapsed to the point where it cannot work its will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Frankly, I wish it would reach this point because I have long felt that it is an unholy alliance which is hurting the cause both of good and of representative government in the United States. Certainly I will not play this coalition game to try to deceive the public about its demise when I know it is still very much alive and kicking. This is not payola or a quiz game we are playing. This is life and it is in earnest. The future of our country is wrapped up in the outcome. If this coalition through its elected leader, the Speaker, SAM RAYBURN of Texas, wishes to state that the coalition has been abolished and that it is no longer capable of providing leadership to this Congress, then I will sign this discharge petition. Otherwise, let us face it, a Congress which is controlled almost 2 to 1 by the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition, as a coalition has decided it does not want a civil rights bill. This means the northern wing of the coalition has agreed to pay this price to the southern wing in order to keep the coalition going. I hope the Republican Party will stand firm on refusing to aid and abet them. I further hope the truth of what is going on will get through the silken curtain of the liberal newsmen to the public.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this is a letter he is sending out to his constituents?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This was a letter that I wrote. I regularly send a newsletter to my constituents. This was a letter I was going to send to them. Then, after writing it, as I said at the beginning, I thought I would prefer to deliver it on the floor of the House so that those who might want to take exception to it would have an opportunity to do so. So it will be in the RECORD and those who want to take exception, I hope will do so and I will be very glad to listen to what they have to say.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What was the gentleman's statement about Members of the House voting for the chairman of a committee, like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me, if I were to add the phrase "in effect were voting" that would make it absolutely accurate. I know the gentleman is familiar with the procedure. So when, in effect, you do organize the House through a coalition, and I think that is a fair term, of Northern Democrats and Southern Democratic votes, that perforce means that those men will become chairmen of these committees, as the gentleman well knows. So, in effect, that is voting for those gentlemen in both senses to be chairmen of these committees. I am trying to bring out the point which I know is true, and I think the gentleman knows it is true, that the coalition is between Northern and Southern Democrats and only incidentally do we Republicans ever get together with the Northern Democrats at times on civil rights, and with the Southern Democrats at times on fiscal policy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman mean when the rules of the House were adopted that the membership or the chairmanship and so forth of the committees was then and there determined?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would say, as a practical effect, yes; and the gentleman knows it. Your party has control and if you do not want to choose chairmen of the committees another way, you could decide that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. One other question. Did you vote against the adoption of the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I voted against SAM RAYBURN for Speaker, yes, and that is the issue. That is the key vote in the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That does not answer the question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I believe it does.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did you vote against the adoption of the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I submit I answered the real question which is that I voted to organize the House through the Republican Party. The gentleman voted to organize the House through the Democratic Party. The result of that has been just as I have described. The gentleman voted for Judge SMITH to be head of the Committee on Rules; did he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In reality was not the House already organized?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no. The organization, the first day, as the gentleman knows, is to elect the Speaker.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman would agree with me that to attempt to bring the civil rights measure up under the Calendar Wednesday procedure would be a very ineffective way to do it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Why would the gentleman think that would be a good way to do it?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Because it can be done without the Speaker or anyone else stopping it. As the gentleman knows, Calendar Wednesday occurs every Wednesday. All the Committee on the Judiciary has to do is to wait until its turn. No other committee has any bill ready, as I understand it, and the committee could probably get an early Wednesday.

Mr. PRICE. In the first place, any Member of the House can object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right, and I am going to object it, I may say.

Mr. PRICE. That is, if you really favor civil rights, you would not be doing the cause any good, because what you would be doing under the rules under which the bill is considered under Calendar Wednesday, the bill would still be with us at the end of the session. The gentleman is familiar with the rule which limits the time on Calendar Wednesday to the committee which succeeds in calling up the bill to 2 hours.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, the gentleman is not correct.

Mr. PRICE. So the committee would take the full 2 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Under the Calendar Wednesday rule the committee on call that handles the bill has 2 hours for debate; 1 hour for the proponents and 1 for the other side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me point this out. The gentleman must realize that then the committee proceeds under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. PRICE. The committee is limited to 2 hours of general debate on Calendar Wednesday. If that time expires and the committee rises they cannot proceed with the reading of the bill, and then the committee may have to wait until its next turn on the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think this debate should go on further.

Mr. PRICE. I would be willing for the gentleman to check my parliamentary opinion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have checked the Calendar Wednesday rule. I regret it is not used.

Mr. PRICE. It is not used, for this reason——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. It is used on less controversial bills.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The last time it was used was on a civil-rights bill.

Mr. PRICE. Because they know it would have no effect. It would never finish the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is incorrect. I will be glad to have debate with the gentleman on this sometime in the very near future.

Mr. PRICE. I do not think it is a question of debate. It can be checked as a parliamentary question.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASEM. I wish to commend the gentleman for refraining from the use of the childish words "Democrat Party" that has been indulged in so frequently by Members on the Republican side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BICENTENNIAL OF RICHARD ALLEN, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1960, February 14 to be precise, is the 200th anniversary of the birth of a great American, Bishop Richard Allen, a former slave who after purchase of his own freedom founded the African Methodist Episcopal Church

As a civic leader and a citizen dedicated to the principle of brotherhood and equality for all mankind, Richard Allen exemplified the best tradition of his time. It is noteworthy that he was eminently respected by his contemporaries and fellow Philadelphians, Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Benjamin Rush, and others whose names were affixed to the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

To mark the anniversary of Allen's birth, the African Methodist Episcopal Church will hold a year-long observance commencing February 14, 15, and 16 in the city of Philadelphia. A committee of distinguished Philadelphians has been formed to launch this bicentennial with appropriate dignity and ceremony.

The name of Richard Allen is revered not only by the members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in America, but throughout the world wherever the message of brotherhood as a Christian principle has been carried.

It is most fitting that the entire populace of the United States join with the African Methodist Episcopal Church in paying tribute to Richard Allen, and I deem it a signal honor as a clergyman to make this tribute to his life a matter of official record.

The life and philosophy of Richard Allen becomes increasingly meaningful in the year of 1960. Indeed, the struggle for civil rights in which we are now engaged has its roots deep in the fruits of his life and works.

It was Richard Allen's objections to racial segregation in the Methodist Church of Philadelphia that led to the founding of the present African Methodist Episcopal Church as a Christian body foresworn to the right to worship without humiliation and dedicated to the principle: God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother.

Most of the early fighters for the freedom of Negroes were members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Hundreds of the first Negro teachers received their early training under its auspices, and Wilberforce University, Xenia, Ohio, the first institution of higher learning for Negroes in the United States, was founded by African Methodists.

Bishop Sherman Lawrence Greene, of Atlanta, Ga., is chairman of the Bicentennial Observance Commission. As senior bishop of his church, Bishop Greene is also the closest link to the tradition and philosophy of Richard Allen. It is pertinent, therefore, to note the following exhortation made by Bishop Greene in a pastoral letter to his colleagues on January 2 of this year:

The 1950's saw many far-reaching changes in our status. Paced by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, we have won victory after victory in the courts of the land. The most singular victory, however, is the raising of the banner of unity and oneness in the goals toward which we are struggling.

We must keep it crystal clear as well as firmly declared the Negro leadership is dedicated to make liberty and justice for all a living reality.

Our preachments of democracy will continue to have a hollow ring so long as we are complacent about the existence of segregation on account of race or religion, or so long as any of God's children are denied their due.

To implement this policy of massive insistence, the A.M.E. Church, both clergy and laymen, must maintain constant vigilance. They must be more concerned with the proper exercise of the right of franchise, and they must vote into office only those who unequivocably share our hope for a bias-free America by 1963.

This statement, calling for massive insistence on first-class Americanism, was warmly endorsed by the national board of directors of the NAACP at its annual meeting—New York, N.Y., January 4, 1960. It exemplifies a spirit and social gospel that is patriotism in its purest sense. It is dedicated to the realization of the principles on which this, our Nation, is founded.

One of the denomination's ranking general officers, Dr. George Arnett Singleton, of Philadelphia, widely regarded as a man of letters and a keen student of history, is editor of the oldest of Negro magazines, the A.M.E. Church Review. Dr. Singleton has compiled the following highlights of the life of Richard Allen:

RICHARD ALLEN

He was born in Philadelphia, a slave of a Quaker lawyer, Hon. Benjamin Chew, chief justice of the Commonwealth, February 14, 1760. Because of financial problems he was sold with his family to a Mr. Stokley, near Dover, Del. At the age of 17 he was converted under the preaching of Freeborn Garretson, and became a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church. He purchased his freedom. During the Revolutionary War he was a noncombatant and hauled salt for George Washington from Rehoboth, Del. When the Christmas conference met at Lovely Lane, Baltimore, Md., in 1784, and organized the Methodist Church as a connection, Richard Allen was present. He traveled as a preacher, returned to Philadelphia in 1786, joined Old St. George Church, Fourth and Vine Streets; organized a prayer band of 42 members. Because of segregation, and an attempt to pull his friends from their knees while in the act of prayer, one Sunday morning in 1787 he led them out by faith.

He purchased an old abandoned blacksmith shop for $35 at Sixth and Walnut Streets, hauled it with his own team of horses to Sixth and Lombard, and founded Mother Bethel, which stands upon the sacred spot.

During the yellow fever epidemic of 1793, under the direction of Dr. Rush he nursed and treated the patients. The sick he carried to the hospital managed by Stephen Girard, and buried the dead.

January 23, 1794, he was given a letter of commendation by the mayor of Philadelphia, Hon. Matthew Clarkson:

"Having, during the prevalence of the late malignant disorder, had almost daily opportunities of seeing the conduct of Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, and the people employed by them to bury the dead: I with cheerfulness give this testimony of my approbation of their proceedings, so far as they came under my notice, their diligence, attention, and decency of deportment, afforded me, at the time much satisfaction.

"MATTHEW CLARKSON,
"*Mayor.*

"PHILADELPHIA, *January 23, 1794.*"

Allen organized a Sunday school, a day school, and a mutual aid society. For the War of 1812 he organized a regiment of Black Legion to defend the Nation.

Allen was the first ordained preacher of color in America, in 1799. In 1816, with 15 ministers and laymen, he organized the African Methodist Episcopal Church as a connection, because of segregation. Today the denomination has over a million members in the United States, Canada, the West Indies Islands, Bermuda, South America, West and South Africa; 7,000 churches, and 6,800 preachers. He was the first bishop elected and ordained April 11, 1816.

In 1817 he published the first book of discipline, and in 1818, the first hymnal.

The A.M.E. Church now owns and operates the oldest college by people of color in America, Wilberforce University, Ohio; Allen University, Columbia, S.C.; Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga.; Kittrell College, North Carolina; Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Fla.; Payne College, Birmingham, Ala.; Campbell College, Jackson, Miss.; Paul Quinn College, Waco, Tex.; Shorter College, Little Rock, Ark.; and Payne Theological Seminary, Wilberforce, Ohio. And there are schools in South America and Africa. The Douglas Hospital, Kansas City, Kans.; Camp Baber, Mich.; and the Reid Community Center, Charleston, S.C.

The church publishes the oldest religious journal, the Christian Recorder, and the oldest magazine, the African Methodist Episcopal Church Review.

Richard Allen took the leadership in organizing a Masonic lodge in Philadelphia, March 26, 1797, and was the treasurer of the first African lodge.

The bicentennial celebration is in honor of the pioneer champion of religious liberty in America. Upon the foundation which he laid a stride is now being made toward first-class citizenship for all. The motto of the church is: "God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother."

THE EFFECT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON HOME BUYING

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the home buyer is once again one of the first victims of the administration's high interest rate, hard money policy. Once again we are witnessing the paradox of a slump in residential construction at a time when most other sectors of the economy are rising.

The typical American family who wants to buy its own home, like the farmer and the small businessman, is simply unable to compete with the giant corporations for the limited supply of money. Even if home buyers were able to pay ever higher interest rates, this would not solve the problem. Last year, the Congress reluctantly authorized an increase in the interest rate on VA-guaranteed home loans. In spite of this, the discount charged by the Federal National Mortgage Association when it purchases these loans is even higher now than it was at the lower rate.

More direct action is necessary if American families are to realize their deep-rooted hopes of homeownership.

Moreover, we must act and act promptly to halt the decline in home building which has already resulted in the loss of some half a million jobs. We must not forget that the dropoff in housing was a major contributing factor to the recession of 1958.

To meet this serious and growing problem I have introduced the emergency homeownership bill, H.R. 9371, and I have scheduled hearings on the bill before the Housing Subcommittee beginning next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to place into the RECORD a section-by-section summary of the emergency homeownership bill, as follows:

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

In general, it is the purpose of the bill to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people.

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the Emergency Homeownership Act).

Section 2 amends section 203(b) of the National Housing Act (the regular residential housing mortgage insurance program) to make it clear that FHA may insure mortgage loans made by individuals as well as those made by corporate and other commercial lenders in order to make the program more effective in smaller towns and communities.

Section 3 amends section 203(c) of the National Housing Act so as to fix the premium charge for mortgage insurance granted under the regular residential housing program during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment at one-fourth of 1 percent. Under existing law the FHA Commissioner has discretion to fix this charge at any point between one-half of 1 percent and 1 percent.

Section 4 amends title III of the National Housing Act to provide that it shall be one of the purposes of the Federal National Mortgage Association, in its secondary market operations, to aid in the stabilization of the mortgage market.

Section 5 amends section 302(b) of the National Housing Act to require FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, to purchase any mortgage which is offered to it regardless of the type of housing covered, so long as title to the property is good and the mortgage is otherwise eligible and not in default. FNMA's authority to limit the age of eligible mortgages would not be changed. (Under current regulations, eligible mortgages cannot be more than 4 months old.)

Section 6 amends section 302(b) of the National Housing Act to prohibit FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, from selling or otherwise disposing of any mortgage which it may hold.

Section 7 amends section 303(b) of the National Housing Act to fix the amount of FNMA stock which a person is required to purchase when selling a mortgage to FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, at 1 percent of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage. Under existing law FNMA has discretion to fix this requirement at any point between 2 percent and 1 percent of such unpaid principal amount.

Section 8 amends section 305(b) of the National Housing Act to require that FNMA, in the performance of its special assistance functions, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, shall not pay less than par for any mortgage.

Section 9 amends section 305(b) of the National Housing Act to provide that the maximum charges or fees which FNMA may impose for its commitment and purchase of a mortgage under the special assistance program, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, shall be 1 percent of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage, with one-fourth being collected at the time of commitment and the remainder at the time of purchase. Under existing law, FNMA has full discretion to fix these charges and fees. (Under current regulations, these fees total 1½ percent with one-half of this amount collected at the time of commitment.)

Section 10 amends section 305(g) of the National Housing Act to make it clear that mortgages on cooperative housing insured by FHA under section 213 are eligible for purchase by FNMA under its program 10 special assistance operations. (See sec. 11.)

Section 11 amends section 305(g) of the National Housing Act to provide an additional $1 billion for FNMA's program 10 operations. This program was established by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 under FNMA's special assistance function for the purchase of mortgages on new construction. This bill retains the present ceiling of $13,500 per mortgage (or per dwelling unit in the case of sec. 213 mortgages) but adds the further provision that the association may by regulation increase the amount by not more than $1,000 in high-cost areas.

Section 12 amends section 305 of the National Housing Act to create a $50 million special assistance fund for the purchase by FNMA of mortgages which are insured under section 203(i) (and which cover new construction). No such mortgage could be purchased from the new fund if any service charges other than the usual origination fee had been imposed. (Under current regulations, FHA permits a special service charge of one-half of 1 percent on the outstanding balance of the mortgage to be added to the monthly carrying cost on loans of $8,000 or less.)

Section 13 requires the originating mortgagee under an FHA-insured mortgage or a VA-insured or guaranteed loan to report to the agency involved the amount of any fees, charges, or discounts paid in connection with such mortgage or loan.

DANGER IN YOUR DRINKING WATER

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 169 articles in a series called "Poison in Your Water." This series chronicled the horrifying scandalous waste found in America's use of its water resources for open sewers. They told of the danger to human life from germs and bacteria of typhoid, dysentery, infectious hepatitis, toxic materials like cyanides, zinc, salts, and phenol which are being dumped in hundreds of ton lots into our rivers and streams throughout this country.

An article appeared in the January 1960 issue of Good Housekeeping, entitled "Danger in Your Drinking Water," chronicling more danger to our American people in the poisons, wastes, filth, and germs we find in the water that we drink every day. I hope all will read this splendid article by a distinguished author, Mr. Alvin B. Toffler, together with the remarks of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, who says:

Our water resources must be vigilantly safeguarded. Our Department is providing extensive assistance to States and communities in the control of pollution under the strengthened Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. The enforcement authority written into this act at the insistence of the Department provides for the first time an effective mechanism of encouraging and if necessary, requiring the construction of waste-treatment plants to control pollution of interstate streams. But the battle must be waged on a broad front—in intrastate as well as in interstate waters. If it is not, we may be confronted with a crisis of such gravity as to jeopardize the further growth and development of many areas of the country and even the health of millions of people.

This article, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1960, by my colleague, the Honorable BYRON L. JOHNSON, of Colorado, puts forth strong arguments why H.R. 3610 should be enacted by Congress at the earliest possible moment and signed into law by the President. It also shows sound reasons why the Congress must appropriate the full $50 million authorized for grants to the States for water pollution control under the provisions of Public Law 660. It is a compelling argument in favor of my bill (H.R. 8494) to strengthen the enforcement authority of the Federal Government in the field of water pollution control.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY IS PREDICTED AS A BOOM YEAR FOR BIG BUSINESS AND A BUST YEAR FOR SMALL BUSINESS—TIGHT MONEY AGAIN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sylvia Porter points out in her column today that small business failures are rising. She predicts the greatest wave of

small business bankruptcies in 1960 since the depression thirties.

Last year was a near-record year for small business bankruptcies. The total topped 14,000, or more than 300 a week.

The reason for the rise in small business failures in periods when big business is booming is the Federal Reserve's tight-money policy.

The Federal Reserve authorities still like to say that "the interest rate allocates credit"; but nothing could be further from the fact.

Credit is extended on a kind of priority system. Big industry and big finance have all kinds of interlocking relationships and reciprocal back-scratching arrangements. These are paralleled by the vast interlocking directorates of the big banks, insurance companies, mutual savings banks, investment banks, and, of course, the big industrial and utility corporations.

The big industrial and utility corporations have first priority. When there is adequate credit, small business gets what is left over. When credit is not adequate to meet both big business demands and small business needs, small business gets left out.

To find the deadly shadow of what will happen in the year ahead, we need only to look back to what happened during the last tight-money squeeze. For a 2-year period, beginning late in 1955 and ending late in 1957, credit was made progressively tighter. Many thousands of efficient, deserving small businesses were squeezed into bankruptcy.

At my suggestion the Federal Reserve finally made a survey of its member banks to find out how business credit had been divided up among firms of various sizes at the beginning and at the end of the big squeeze. Despite a large increase in business in this period, the smallest size firms—those with assets of $50,000 or less—had 3 percent less bank credit in October 1957 than they had in October 1955.

The giant firms—those with more than $100 million of assets—had 66 percent more bank credit at the end of 1957 than they had had at the end of 1955.

In between these two extremes the various size classes had shared in the available credit in a manner graduated in accordance with their size. In other words, the big corporations got most, the middle-size corporations got less, and the small firms got still less.

For the Members' attention, I will insert Miss Porter's column from the Washington Evening Star of today. No doubt those Members who have small businesses in their districts will be interested in reading this, as will other Members who are concerned about what is happening to the competitive structure of American business and to the public welfare generally.

The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

WAVE OF SMALL FAILURES DUE

A wave of bankruptcies among small businessmen is due this year.

The number of small business failures is heading for the highest level since the depression thirties. It's almost certain that 1959's total of 14,000 bankruptcies will be topped. It's almost certain that businesses will be dying at a rate of more than 300 a week as the year rolls on.

The ironic explanation lies in the very fact of prosperity. The economic boom is bringing on the most severe money squeeze in over a generation, and this credit pinch will spell disaster for smaller concerns.

A second explanation lies in the upsurge in competition, older firms without the know-how to compete successfully in a rough period and tender infants without adequate credit lines will die.

I am not guessing about this trend. The background of prosperity and tight money is unmistakable now.

Against this background, all I am doing is making a simple—and conservative—projection of Dun & Bradstreet's authoritative compilations of the total and type of failures which occurred in 1959.

CREDIT IS PROBLEM

As always in a boom cycle, thousands of enthusiastic but inexperienced individuals try to realize the American dream of going into business for themselves.

But the significant fact is that in this boom, credit is becoming tougher and increasingly expensive to get.

A big, established corporation can get credit. Even if it can't get all it wants, it will have the financial connections to raise what it must have to compete and grow.

But the smaller businessman? The Nation's banks aren't organized to supply him with risk capital, and in this era of tight money they understandably favor their long-standing, "safe" customers.

The capital markets aren't set up to provide him at tolerable cost with the long-term funds he needs to grow.

The revolutionary system of small business investment companies created by law in 1958 to help finance small business has so far been an appalling flop.

And even if a small firm can get a loan, the cost in many instances may be just too steep. With the bluest of blue-chip companies paying close to 6 percent for loans, the charges—plus extras—to a little, marginal concern may be unbearable.

COMPETITION GAINING

Nor is there any denying the intensifying competition in this era as domestic and foreign producers scramble for a share of our dollar. In this sort of era, a high-cost, low-efficiency firm is fighting a losing battle on prices, services, research.

The statistics don't show the trend yet. Actually, Dun & Bradstreet's failure statistics were leveling off as 1959 closed. But the lull won't last as the money pinch really starts to pinch.

Most vulnerable will be merchandising and food stores, high-cost service shops, businesses in the $5,000 to $25,000 range. Killing them will be not only their experience, but also their inability to get the cash imperative if they are to compete and grow.

Surely we are not so complacent that we will smugly view this trend during a period of record prosperity?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARR (at the request of Mr. DENTON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. WITHROW (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), on account of illness.

Mr. GARY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for 1 week, on account of illness.

Mr. SCHERER, on account of official business participating in discussions on road legislation at American Road Builders Association annual meeting.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CANNON, for 40 minutes, following the reading of the President's budget message today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, January 20.

Mr. MURPHY, for 1 hour, on February 16, on independence of Lithuania.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on Tuesday, January 19, for 1 hour.

(At the request of Mr. SISK, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted:)

Mr. ADDONIZIO, for 10 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday and for 30 minutes on Wednesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. BRADEMAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. MCGINLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON, to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include with his remarks a statement by Mrs. PFOST, of Idaho.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, to extend his remarks in the RECORD together with extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(At the request of Mr. SISK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. GALLAGHER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1670. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $23 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1671. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1672. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1673. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc No. 304); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1674. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1675. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1676. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1677. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) for the fiscal year 1959 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1678. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected phases of low-rent housing and liquidating activities of the regional offices of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1679. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1680. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1681. A letter from the Inspector General and Comptroller, Mutual Security, Department of State, transmitting the quarterly report on utilization of foreign currencies as provided by section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1959 (Public Law 85-853), for the period October 1 through December 31, 1959; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1682. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report required pursuant to the provisions of section 412(a) of Public Law 86-149, approved August 19, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1683. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting the required report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major receiving monthly flight pay for the period July 1 through December 31, 1959, pursuant to 60 Stat. 20; 37 U.S.C. 118a-1; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1684. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation entitled (1) "A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans"; (2) "A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program"; and (3) "A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1685. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 47th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of February 14, 1903 (5 U.S.C. 604); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1686. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Anthracite Experiment Station of the Bureau of Mines, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of contract relating to proposed construction work dealing with the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1689. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1690. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to suspend the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, during periods of war or national emergency, to vessels operated by or for the account of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, located respectively at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, pursuant to Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1692. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 in the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report of all settlements made under the authority of section 2732 entitled "Property loss: incident to service; members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and civilian employees," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to title 10 United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1694. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting the financial report of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., for the fiscal year August 1, 1958, to July 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 761, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., relative to and confirming the final dissolution and liquidation of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., formerly incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, pursuant to Public Law 761, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1697. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1203. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6027. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9661. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9662. A bill to make technical revisions in the income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9663. A bill to make technical revisions in the income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 9664. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 9665. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 9666. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9667. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9668. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm costs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9669. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm costs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 9670. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9671. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9672. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 in order to reduce from 10 hours to 9 hours the length of the period in which 8 hours of work per day shall be performed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 9673. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical, educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9674. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9675. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9676. A bill to amend section 4248 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the termination of custody of mentally incompetent prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9677. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 9678. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9679. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9680. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9681. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 9682. A bill relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERLONG (by request):

H.R. 9683. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9684. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9685. A bill to amend section 309(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 9686. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9687. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9688. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 9689. A bill to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9690. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9691. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9692. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm and define the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9693. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders with respect to certain processed fruits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9694. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9695. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9696. A bill to extend the conservation reserve program for 5 years, to limit annual payments under it to $5,000 for any one producer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9697. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9698. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" and for disability insurance benefits, in certain cases, with 10 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 9699. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 9700. A bill to provide that the coverage of religious science practitioners under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on an elective basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 9701. A bill to provide for the installation of the 5-inch guns from the U.S.S. *Colorado* on board the former U.S.S. *Olympia;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 9702. A bill to amend section 2771 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 9703. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 9704. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9705. A bill to provide for investment of the civil service retirement and disability fund, for appropriations to such fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9706. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9707. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to eliminate the existing requirement that a determination of need be made by the community involved before any hotel or other transient housing can be constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area with assistance under such title; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 9708. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 455. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 456. Concurrent resolution expressing the concern and disapproval of Congress at the recent desecration of places of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H. Con. Res. 457. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 458. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 459. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 421. Resolution to amend House Resolution 107, 86th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 422. Resolution extending greetings and sincere felicitations to the members and clergy of the African Methodist Episcopal Church on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Bishop Richard Allen, the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 423. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 81; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 424. Resolution extending cordial good wishes and sincere felicitations on the occasion of the unveiling of a bust of Noble Sissle, a great American showman and musician; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 9709. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Paulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9710. A bill for the relief of the surviving widow of Randolph Weum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9712. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Joseph Andrew Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Isabel Perez-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Otis Drinkard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Maria (Antonina) Kulisic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Masako Ishiguro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9718. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 9719. A bill for the relief of Calogera Virone Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9720. A bill for the relief of John J. Russell and Emma J. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Small Business Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of opinion among small businessmen throughout the country and in New York State, submitted to me by the National Small Business Men's Association. This survey, conducted last summer, deals with five questions of great interest to the small businessman and to the Nation as a whole. It is of interest to note that percentagewise the small business community of New York State—numerically the largest in the United States—is in agreement on all five issues with the U.S. small business community. Each of us—whatever may be our views on each issue—can certainly be helped by this information.

I wish to compliment not only the National Small Business Men's Association for the splendid service they perform in keeeping the Congress informed of the currents of small business opinion—information vital to the effective execution of our legislative duties—but I would like to extend a special word of commendation to the small businessman himself, whose sense of responsible citizenship prompts him to take time out of a busy day to fill out his opinion ballot so that his views may be recorded and made known to us. The motto engraved on the front of each ballot reads: "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty." I believe that the small businessman of this country is giving proof of his understanding of these words by his display of civic responsibility in recording his opinion.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	National percentage			New York State percentage		
	For	Against	No vote	For	Against	No vote
1. Faster tax writeoff for equipment and machinery	83	14	3	87	9	4
2. Ending farm subsidies	87	11	2	90	7	3
3. Fair trade laws	43	52	5	39	55	6
4. Government insurance to provide old folks' medical care	21	76	3	16	79	5
5. Tax-exempt pension plans for self-employed	67	30	3	61	32	7

Gas and Germ Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased last week that when the President of the United States was asked in his press conference what he thought of the use of gas or germ warfare, he replied that his own instincts would be against United States use of these agents unless they had first been employed against us.

The President also said that no official proposal had reached him to change the long-standing American policy, which is that only if they are used first by an enemy will the United States employ these agents. But it is clear, as a story in the New York Times of November 10, 1959, said and as a letter to me from the President indicates, that a reevaluation of the policy is taking place. The President's letter to me said that "the Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter," that is, the use of chemical and biological weapons.

It seems to me that, despite the President's laudable personal view, it is necessary to have a formal national position on record, to stand beyond Mr. Eisenhower's term and to restrain the efforts of certain elements in the Defense Department to free gas and germ warfare to be used "like any other weapon." Last September, I therefore introduced House Concurrent Resolution 433, now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to reaffirm the statement of President Roosevelt in 1943 that "the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or obnoxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies."

I hope that the President's expression of his personal views will serve to stimulate the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 433, and I am pleased to say that there has been increasing public concern on this matter. For the information of the Congress, as to the President's view, I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD my correspondence with him and his statement at the press conference:

DECEMBER 21, 1959.
The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write in the wake of your journey for peace to ask you to restrain unpeaceful demands of the Army.

During the last several months, a public relations campaign has been waged in the press by present and retired armed service officers to change our basic policy of not using chemical and biological weapons.

From various newspaper accounts, it now appears that the Army and other groups within the Department of Defense have recommended, both officially and unofficially, that we change our policy concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons.

Many citizens and Members of Congress, including myself, are very disturbed about these recommendations. They negate our position as enunciated by President Roosevelt on June 8, 1943, when he stated that the United States under no circumstances would use poisonous or obnoxious gases unless first used by our enemies. The abhorrence of chemical and biological weapons stems from our basic belief that even in war we must preserve the essence of humanity and humane principles.

It strikes me as utter folly that we should accede to the judgment of certain members of the Defense Department, when it is now more important than ever that the United States continue to express itself as repudiating the use of chemical and biological weapons as a preventive or preemptive means of attack.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union has recently been taking the propaganda initiative regarding the use of CBR during wartime. At the end of August of this year, Premier Khrushchev stated in a message to a conference of leading scientists who met in Canada:

"We share the concern of scientists, who justly point out that the use of these weapons may have no less horrible a consequence than the use of atomic or hydrogen weapons. Not by chance were chemical and bacteriological weapons condemned by mankind, and their military use prohibited by international agreement through the Geneva protocol of 1925. As is well known the Soviet Union strongly supports the prohibition of all types of weapons of mass annihilation, including nuclear as well as chemical and biological weapons. We hold that their use runs counter to humane principles, the rules of international law, and the conscience of all peoples."

Conversely, it disturbs me that our Nation, which repudiates naked power politics, should consider sacrificing its unassailable position regarding chemical and biological weapons when the people of the world are hoping for a settlement on the armaments question.

While we may be constrained to develop these weapons qualitatively and quantitatively if international negotiation in the CBR area fails and if the realities of the situation demand that we continue to produce these weapons, we should not change our long-standing policy of not using these weapons first in any eventuality. We must reaffirm our resolve never to initiate the use of these weapons.

Because of this, and because of the urgency of the problem, I earnestly suggest international negotiations in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Although this question is one which will be very difficult to negotiate, this should not deter us from seeking both solution and negotiation in this area of armaments activity.

Because of the urgency of the problem, I have introduced in the Congress a concurrent resolution which will reaffirm our policy of nonuse of biological and chemical weapons unless they are first introduced into warfare against us. I sincerely hope that the American position will not be changed. Knowing of your interest in and admiring your efforts on behalf of world peace, I am sure that our policies will not be changed in this area.

Sincerely,
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1959.
The Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KASTENMEIER: I appreciate the concern which prompted your December 21 letter concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons. The Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter with particular reference to some of the new features mentioned in your letter. You will of course have a further reply as promptly as possible.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCE, JANUARY 13, 1960

Ronald W. May, Capital Times, Madison, Wis.: "Mr. President, Representative KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, has suggested that there might be a change in our traditional policy of not using chemical, germ, or poison gas warfare first. He said that Army people have tried to—indicated that they believed that maybe we should change our policy and use these first either in a large or even in a small war. Is this true?"

Answer: "I will say this: No such official suggestion has been made to me and so far as my own instinct is concerned is to not start such a thing as that first."

Address by Hon. John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a great speech by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. This speech is highly significant because it sets forth the views of one of the leading candidates for the Presidency on his conception of the kind of President the Nation and the times demand.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that immediately following the Kennedy speech, there be printed in the RECORD a perceptive analysis of the significance of this speech by the chief of the New York Times Washington bureau, Mr. James Reston.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATOR KENNEDY'S SPEECH

The modern presidential campaign covers every issue in and out of the platform from cranberries to creation. But the public is rarely alerted to a candidate's views about the central issue on which all the rest turn. That central issue—and the point of my comments this noon—is not the farm problem or defense or India. It is the Presidency itself.

Of course a candidate's views on specific policies are important, but Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft shared policy views with entirely different results in the White House. Of course it is important to elect a good man with good intentions, but Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding were both good men of good intentions; so were Lincoln and Buchanan; but there is a Lincoln Room in the White House and no Buchanan Room.

The history of this Nation—its brightest and its bleakest pages—has been written largely in terms of the different views our Presidents have had of the Presidency itself. This history ought to tell us that the American people in 1960 have an imperative right to know what any man bidding for the Presidency thinks about the place he is bidding for, whether he is aware of and willing to

use the powerful resources of that Office; whether his model will be Taft or Roosevelt, Wilson or Harding.

Not since the days of Woodrow Wilson has any candidate spoken on the Presidency itself before the votes have been irrevocably cast. Let us hope that the 1960 campaign, in addition to discussing the familiar issues where our positions too often blur, will also talk about the Presidency itself, as an instrument for dealing with those issues, as an Office with varying roles, powers, and limitations.

CRITICIZES EISENHOWER

During the past 8 years, we have seen one concept of the Presidency at work. Our needs and hopes have been eloquently stated—but the initiative and follow-through have too often been left to others. And too often his own objectives have been lost by the President's failure to override objections from within his own party, in the Congress or even in his Cabinet.

The American people in 1952 and 1956 may have preferred this detached, limited concept of the Presidency after 20 years of fast-moving, creative Presidential rule. Perhaps historians will regard this as necessarily one of those frequent periods of consolidation, a time to draw breath, to recoup our national energy. To quote the state of the Union message: "No Congress * * * on surveying the state of the Nation, has met with a more pleasing prospect than that which appears at the present time."

Unfortunately this is not Mr. Eisenhower's last message to the Congress, but Calvin Coolidge's. He followed to the White House Mr. Harding, whose sponsor declared very frankly that the times did not demand a first-rate President. If true, the times and the man met.

But the question is what do the times—and the people—demand for the next 4 years in the White House?

RULES OUT CASUAL BYSTANDER

They demand a vigorous proponent of the national interest—not a passive broker for conflicting private interests. They demand a man capable of acting as the commander in chief of the Grand Alliance, not merely a bookkeeper who feels that his work is done when the numbers on the balance sheet come out even. They demand that he be the head of a responsible party, not rise so far above politics as to be invisible—a man who will formulate and fight for legislative policies, not be a casual bystander to the legislative process.

Today a restricted concept of the Presidency is not enough. For beneath today's surface gloss of peace and prosperity are increasingly dangerous, unsolved, long-postponed problems—problems that will inevitably explode to the surface during the next 4 years of the next administration—the growing missile gap, the rise of Communist China, the despair of the underdeveloped nations, the explosive situations in Berlin and in the Formosa Straits, the deterioration of NATO, the lack of an arms control agreement, and all the domestic problems of our farms, cities, and schools.

This administration has not faced up to these and other problems. Much has been said—but I am reminded of the old Chinese proverb: "There is a great deal of noise on the stairs but nobody comes into the room."

The President's state of the Union message reminded me of the exhortation from "King Lear" but goes: "I will do such things—what they are I know not * * * but they shall be the wonders of the earth."

In the decade that lies ahead—in the challenging revolutionary sixties—the American Presidency will demand more than ringing manifestoes issued from the rear of the battle. It will demand that the President place himself in the very thick of the fight, that he care passionately about the fate of the people he leads, that he be willing to serve them at the risk of incurring their momentary displeasure.

AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Whatever the political affiliation of our next President, whatever his views may be on all the issues and problems that rush in upon us, he must above all be the Chief Executive in every sense of the word. He must be prepared to exercise the fullest powers of his Office—all that are specified and some that are not. He must master complex problems as well as receive one-page memorandums. He must originate action as well as study groups. He must reopen the channels of communication between the world of thought and the seat of power.

Ulysses Grant considered the President "a purely administrative officer." If he administered the Government departments efficiently, delegated his functions smoothly, and performed his ceremonies of state with decorum and grace, no more was to be expected of him. But that is not the place the Presidency was meant to have in American life. The President is alone, at the top—the loneliest job there is, as Harry Truman has said.

If there is destructive dissension among the services, he alone can step in and straighten it out—instead of waiting for unanimity. If administrative agencies are not carrying out their mandate—if a brushfire threatens some part of the globe—he alone can act, without waiting for the Congress. If his farm program fails, he alone deserves the blame, not his Secretary of Agriculture.

"The President is at liberty, both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can." So wrote Prof. Woodrow Wilson. But President Woodrow Wilson discovered that to be a big man in the White House inevitably brings cries of dictatorship.

So did Lincoln and Jackson and the two Roosevelts. And so may the next occupant of that office, if he is the man the times demand. But how much better it would be, in the turbulent sixties, to have a Roosevelt or a Wilson than to have another James Buchanan, cringing in the White House, afraid to move.

Nor can we afford a Chief Executive who is praised primarily for what he did not do, the disasters he prevented, the bills he vetoed—a President wishing his subordinates would produce more missiles or build more schools. We will need instead what the Constitution envisioned: a Chief Executive who is the vital center of action in our whole scheme of Government.

AS LEGISLATIVE LEADER

This includes the legislative process as well. The President cannot afford—for the sake of the Office as well as the Nation—to be another Warren G. Harding, described by one backer as a man who "would, when elected, sign whatever bill the Senate sent him—and not send bills for the Senate to pass." Rather he must know when to lead the Congress, when to consult it and when he should act alone.

Having served 14 years in the legislative branch, I would not look with favor upon its domination by the Executive. Under our government of "power as the rival of power," to use Hamilton's phrase, Congress must not surrender its responsibilities. But neither should it dominate. However large its share in the formulation of domestic programs, it is the President alone who must make the major decisions of our foreign policy.

That is what the Constitution wisely commands. And, even domestically, the President must initiate policies and devise laws to meet the needs of the Nation. And he must be prepared to use all the resources of his office to insure the enactment of that legislation—even when conflict is the result.

By the end of his term Theodore Roosevelt was not popular in the Congress—particularly when he criticized an amendment to the Treasury appropriation which forbade the use of Secret Service men to investigate Congressmen.

And the feeling was mutual, Roosevelt saying: "I do not much admire the Senate, because it is such a helpless body when efficient work is to be done."

QUOTES WILSON ON SENATE

And Woodrow Wilson was even more bitter after his frustrating quarrels. Asked if he might run for the Senate in 1920, he replied: "Outside of the United States, the Senate does not amount to a damn. And inside the United States the Senate is mostly despised. They haven't had a thought down there is 50 years."

But, however bitter their farewells, the facts of the matter are that Roosevelt and Wilson did get things done—not only through their Executive powers but through the Congress as well. Calvin Coolidge, on the other hand, departed from Washington with cheers of Congress still ringing in his ears. But when his World Court bill was under fire on Capitol Hill he sent no messages, gave no encouragement to the bill's leaders, and paid little or no attention to the whole proceeding—and the cause of world justice was set back.

To be sure, Coolidge had held the usual White House breakfasts with congressional leaders—but they were aimed, as he himself said, at "good fellowship," not a discussion of "public business." And at his press conferences, according to press historians, where he preferred to talk about the local flower show and its exhibits, reporters who finally extracted from him a single sentence—"I'm against that bill"—would rush to file tongue-in-cheek dispatches, proclaiming that: "President Coolidge, in a fighting mood, today served notice on Congress that he intended to combat, with all the resources at his command, the pending bill * * *"

But in the coming years we will need a real fighting mood in the White House—a man who will not retreat in the face of pressure from his congressional leaders—who will not let down those supporting his views on the floor. Divided Government over the past 6 years has only been further confused by this lack of legislative leadership. To restore it next year will help restore purpose to both the Presidency and the Congress.

AS PARTY LEADER

The facts of the matter are that legislative leadership is not possible without party leadership, in the most political sense—and Mr. Eisenhower prefers to stay above politics (although a weekly news magazine last fall reported the startling news, and I quote, that "President Eisenhower is emerging as a major political figure"). When asked, early in his first term, how he liked the "game of politics," he replied with a frown that his questioner was using a derogatory phrase. "Being President," he said, "is a very great experience * * * but the word 'politics' * * * I have no great liking for that."

But no President, it seems to me, can escape politics. He has not only been chosen by the Nation—he has been chosen by his party. And if he insists that he is "President of all the people" and should, therefore, offend none of them—if he blurs the issues and differences between the parties—if he neglects the party machinery and avoids his party's leadership—then he has not only weakened the political party as an instrument of the democratic process—he has dealt a blow to the democratic process itself.

I prefer the example of Abe Lincoln, who loved politics with the passion of a born practitioner. For example, he waited up all night in 1863 to get the crucial returns on the Ohio governorship. When the Unionist can-

didate was elected, Lincoln wired: "Glory God in the highest. Ohio has saved the Nation."

AS A MORAL LEADER

But the White House is not only the center of political leadership. It must be the center of moral leadership—a "bully pulpit," as Theodore Roosevelt described it. For only the President represents the national interest. And upon him alone converge all the needs and aspirations of all parts of the country, all departments of the Government, all nations of the world.

It is not enough merely to represent prevailing sentiment—to follow McKinley's practice, as described by Joe Cannon, of "keeping his ear so close to the ground he got it full of grasshoppers." We will need in the sixties a President who is willing and able to summon his national constituency to its finest hour—to alert the people to our dangers and our opportunities—to demand of them the sacrifices that will be necessary. Despite the increasing evidence of a lost national purpose and a soft national will, F.D.R.'s words in his first inaugural still ring true: "In every dark hour of our national life, a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory."

Roosevelt fulfilled the role of moral leadership. So did Wilson and Lincoln, Truman and Jackson and Teddy Roosevelt. They led the people as well as the Government—they fought for great ideals as well as bills. And the time has come to demand that kind of leadership again.

And so, as this vital campaign begins, let us discuss the issues the next President will face—but let us also discuss the powers and tools with which we must face them.

For we must endow that office with extraordinary strength and vision. We must act in the image of Abraham Lincoln summoning his wartime Cabinet to a meeting on the Emancipation Proclamation. That Cabinet has been carefully chosen to please and reflect many elements in the country. But "I have gathered you together," Lincoln said, "to hear what I have written down. I do not wish your advice about the main matter—that I have determined for myself."

And later, when he went to sign after several hours of exhausting handshaking that had left his arm weak, he said to those present: "If my name goes down in history, it will be for this act. My whole soul is in it. If my hand trembles when I sign this proclamation, all who examine the document hereafter will say: 'He hesitated.'"

But Lincoln's hand did not tremble. He did not hesitate. He did not equivocate. For he was the President of the United States.

It is in this spirit that we must go forth in the coming months and years.

SENATOR'S DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENCY OPENS A PRIVATE DEBATE TO THE PUBLIC

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—There are really two quite different presidential debates going on in this country: a private debate and a public debate.

The public debate has dealt primarily with secondary issues. It has dealt with the past. It has centered on personalities. It has discussed Vice President NIXON's record in the forties. It has centered on Adlai E. Stevenson's two defeats, Senator John F. Kennedy's religion, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson's Texas heritage, President Eisenhower's popularity, Governor Rockefeller's wealth, and a variety of technicalities on the tactics and strategy of how to win.

The private debate has been much more limited but much more serious. It has looked to the future. It has inquired into the qualities necessary in a President of the sixties. It has dealt a great deal on the difference between what the public thinks is true about the present and what is actually true.

Fortunately, Senator KENNEDY made a genuine attempt today to bring these two debates together. In his performance at the National Press Club this noon, he made the first really serious political speech of the formal campaign.

For he dealt with the primary issue. He dealt with the future. He analyzed the Presidency as it is now being interpreted by President Eisenhower, and how he believes it must be interpreted in the future.

SCORNS SURFACE GLOSS

This was no attempt to ride the current popular waves of illusion. He was highly critical of the President in the full knowledge that the President is at the height of his personal popularity. He scorned today's surface gloss of peace and prosperity and insisted on emphasizing the increasingly dangerous, unsolved and long-postponed problems of the missile gap, the rise of Communist China, the despair of the underdeveloped nations, the explosive situations in Berlin and the Formosa Straits, the deterioration of NATO, the lack of arms control, and all the domestic problems of our farms, cities, and schools.

Honest men and women will differ and differ violently about the Senator's characterization of the President as a man who does not follow through on his own goals, as a bookkeeper who feels that his work is done when the numbers on the balance sheet come out even.

In the present mood of wishful thinking in the country, the Senator has taken a chance. But right or wrong, he has at least started to discuss serious issues in a major arena where they cannot be ignored or brushed off.

The President's news conference yesterday illustrates what the Senator is talking about. In that conference, the President made these statements:

On Vice President NIXON's intervention to settle the steel strike: "Any idea that there was threat or pressure brought to bear upon the companies is silly."

On the assertion of Sir Anthony Eden, former British Prime Minister, that he had stopped a U.S. plan to intervene in the Indochina war: "I do know this: that there was never any plan developed to be put into execution in that particular instance."

On the charges that the defenses of the United States are inadequate: "I want to tell you this: I've spent my life in this, and I know more about it than almost anybody, I think, that is in this country. * * * I believe that the matter of defense has been handled well and efficiently * * *."

CONVINCING TO MANY

Now, these statements dominated the news today. They were widely published, and no doubt they were convincing to most people who read them.

Yet it is a fact that there are a great many well-informed people in the Capital today who still believe that pressure was applied to the steel companies to settle, who know that there was a National Security Council debate, provoked by Adm. Arthur W. Radford's proposal to intervene with air power in the delta of Indochina in 1954, and who are still dissatisfied with the President's personal defense of the Nation's arms program.

For months the President's popularity has smothered the debate on defense. He has not satisfied many people even in his own administration by assertions of greater personal knowledge of modern defense requirements.

In short, the President has defeated his critics but has not convinced them. They have continued the private debate, but have been increasingly frustrated in the belief that the President was telling the public what it wanted to hear.

What Senator KENNEDY is at least attempting to do is to force these issues into the open. He is saying quite bluntly that the way to begin a presidential campaign is with a definition of what the Presidency should be in the coming years. And he is saying frankly that if the people want the kind of leadership President Eisenhower has given them, they better not choose the Senator from Massachusetts because he does not think this is what the country needs.

Maybe the people will take him up on this. That remains to be seen. But anyway he is bringing the private debate into the public domain, and that at least gives people a chance to make up their own minds.

Congressman Brock Lauds Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Midwest provides the Nation with the finest meat to be found in the world, and it does it in great volume. This is no accident and is not the single accomplishment of any one group. It is a huge and efficient industry the effects of which are felt throughout the entire economy of the area.

One of the component parts of the livestock empire is a business that has in itself grown to be a strong and valuable industry. This is the livestock trucking industry.

I think the importance of this industry, made up of many big lines and small, independent truckers, is very well outlined in a speech made by my colleague from the Third District of Nebraska, LARRY BROCK, who spoke to the farm-to-market truckers at their 17th annual get-together of truckers and businessmen in Sioux City, Iowa, last month.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address given by my good friend and colleague, LARRY BROCK:

The trucking industry has often been called the mainspring of the Nation's economy in recent years. Throughout the country the motor truck is the important link in the transportation of virtually all commodities, an estimated 75 percent of all tonnage moving daily in the Nation's commerce moving by this method. Although other means of transportation play an important role, their scope of operations is limited by peculiar facilities requirements. All of these methods of transport must be supplemented by the use of trucks for cargo to reach its ultimate destination. The motor truck is the only form of transportation available to more than 25,000 communities in the United States.

In absolute terms, no single transportation service has advanced so rapidly over the past 20 years. But it is significant that the greatest advances in truck transportation have been accomplished without the impetus of major technological breakthroughs which have so drastically changed the airline and water carriers, and even the railroad industries. Though vastly greater in size, trucking seems not to have changed much in character, being still a highly volatile, competitive industry.

The trucking industry has grown from a few thousand one-man one-vehicle operations to include 18,000 common carrier companies subject to ICC regulation; yet these comprise only one-quarter of the trucking industry, the other 75 percent consisting of private and contract carriers. Common carriers operate about 1.5 million of the approximately 11 million trucks on the highways. Some 800 class I carriers (those whose annual revenues exceed $1 million) were responsible for more than half the industry's earnings in 1957. An estimated 260,856 million ton-miles of intercity freight traffic moved by truck in 1957.

Freight hauled by trucks during the second quarter of 1959 rose 20.5 percent over the similar 1958 period with all geographic regions showing gains. The growth in trucking was particularly great in the central regions of the country where tonnages of truck-hauled freight increased 33.4 percent over a year ago.

The trucking industry is both young and dynamic and will continue to grow with the expanding national economy.

Gifts for National Debt Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the January 15 issue of the Washington Evening Star it was reported that a patriotic American, the late Mrs. W. L. (Will) Clayton, has bequeathed a sizable sum "to my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt." It does not detract from the splendid patriotism shown by Mrs. Clayton to point out that other Americans also feel deeply about the necessity of reducing our national debt and, from time to time, spontaneously come forward with gifts and bequests to reduce the national debt. On September 3, 1957, it was reported that the late Arthur E. Lamper bequeathed U.S. bonds valued at between $5,000 and $10,000 for this purpose. On May 8, 1957, the press carried the story of Miss Sheila M. Martin who gave $120 to Treasury Secretary Humphrey for national debt reduction. On March 5, 1959, it was reported that an 11-year-old Miami, Fla., girl, Kathy Hewitt, had offered her life savings of $61 to help pay off the national debt.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Treasury tells me that under present law it cannot give absolute assurance that a gift or bequest for reducing the national debt will be devoted exclusively to that purpose. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6292, which would make it possible to give such assurance. Once this legislation is enacted, it will be possible for a private organization to make concerted efforts to obtain debt reducing contributions from American citizens who feel that they would like to make special contributions to show their love for their country. If Mrs. Clayton and the others mentioned above will make such contributions spontaneously and without assurance that their gifts will be used to reduce the national debt, how many others will come forward with contributions if given that assurance?

The Need To Redefine Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our social security program is now on the eve of its 25th anniversary. During the almost a quarter of a century that the program has been in operation we have come a long way in securing the future of our workers and their families. But any program needs to be revised from time to time in order to strengthen the areas in which it is weak.

I feel that one of the parts of the social security program which needs to be reexamined and revised is the portion dealing with disability benefits. During the first session of the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill to eliminate the 50-year age requirement for the payment of disability benefits under social security. Today I am introducing a measure which would provide a more realistic definition of the term disability.

Under the rigid requirements of the present law, many thousands of men and women who are considered to be totally disabled by employers and by competent medical authorities still cannot secure disability benefits or qualify for the disability freeze of their incomes. For if such a person can perform any kind of work at all, no matter what it is or how far removed it may be from the type of work for which he is trained, then he is not disabled so far as social security is concerned.

Take, for instance, an accountant who has spent 40 years in that profession and who now is not physically able to continue in this field. If he still is able to sell apples in the street he does not qualify for disability benefits under social security.

This narrow definition of disability works a very real hardship on our senior citizens who no longer work on their regular jobs. Many of these people have no other skills. Employers are reluctant to train older people for new jobs that they would be able to perform. Unskilled jobs usually involve physical labor which is beyond the strength of the aging. As a result, these people suffer financial hardship and the humiliation of having to ask local welfare agencies for assistance.

As a woman from my home district in Wisconsin so ably put it:

> You have to be ready for the coffin before you can draw social security disability benefits.

The bill I have introduced would change the definition of disability in the present social security law to provide that an individual shall be considered unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity if he is unable, by reason of his physical or mental impairment, to engage in the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before he became disabled.

In other words, when a person is disabled to the point where he no longer can do the job for which he has been trained and in which he has been working for years, then he will be eligible for social security disability benefits or the disability freeze.

We cannot turn our backs on our responsibility to this country's senior citizens. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the original Social Security Act, he called it "a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete." It is up to us to see that the resulting structure is worthy of its fine foundation.

Senator Green To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, it was with mixed emotions that I received the announcement that Senator GREEN would not seek reelection.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, now in his 93d year, is the senior Senator from Rhode Island, and has been in the Senate since January 1937. He has the distinction of being the oldest man ever to serve in Congress.

I am saddened at the thought that such a great statesman and so excellent a representative of our State will not be with us in the Halls of Congress after this session.

I am happy, however, at the thought that after so many years of arduous service as Governor of our State and as one of our U.S. Senators he will have an opportunity to relax and take life easy.

We will miss his sage counsel and advice in the Halls of Congress but I am confident that while he will withdraw from active service he will continue his keen interest in politics and will be available to us whenever we call on him.

His leaving active political life will leave a void that will be hard to fill. His long experience in public affairs, both foreign and domestic, has been invaluable to our State and country, both under Republican as well as Democratic administrations.

About a year ago Senator GREEN gave us an example of his greatness, of his patriotism, and of his love for America. He did what few, if any, Members of Congress have ever done—step down voluntarily from the chairmanship of a great committee.

He relinquished the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee because he felt that his impaired sight and hearing made it impossible for him to discharge the duties of that high office as he felt it should be done.

He now informs us that medical attention has remedied the condition although it has not done so to a degree sufficient to permit him to discharge his congressional duties as he feels should be done and, therefore, has decided not to seek reelection.

I have known Senator GREEN intimately for more than a quarter century. I served under him while he was Governor of our State and we were both elected to Congress for the first time, on the same ticket, in 1936, he to the Senate and I to the House. I cherish the fact that he has been my friend, and I am thankful for his wide counsel.

He is a man of wealth with a heart of gold. Although endowed with this world's goods he has always taken a keen interest in those less fortunate than himself.

He was one of the first to sponsor cafeterias for workers in plants, and one of the originators of a banking system that made loans to needy people.

He always has taken a great interest in education and made possible the education of a number of youngsters who, without him, never would have been able to attend college.

He has devoted himself to the care of the unfortunates and during his service as Governor of our State he rehabilitated and expanded the facilities at our State institutions. The new and up-to-date buildings that he sponsored there is a monument to his humanitarianism.

This is only a minor part of what could be said of this great man.

Is it any wonder, then, that the leaders and Members of the Senate, and, particularly the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, should have tried to prevail on Senator GREEN to continue as chairman, and paid such high tribute to him when he announced that he would retire? They know of his devotion to duty and his unrelenting efforts in the interest of our country.

In his retirement I wish him health and happiness. He can well rejoice at his many accomplishments for the benefit of humanity and I am sure he will take with him many fine memories that will help him in his retirement.

We of Rhode Island salute Senator GREEN. We love him.

Gordon Canfield Retires and the District Loses a "Champ"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I share in the regrets which have been echoed by Members of Congress upon learning that the dean of New Jersey's delegation, GORDON CANFIELD, is to retire after a long and dedicated service to the people of New Jersey and to the country. I would like to include as part of my remarks the following editorial from the Paterson News of December 16, 1959, and the following letter which I have written to the editor of the Paterson News:

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES A "CHAMP"

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his "boss," the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus for well nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years, he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans, the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD'S beneficences and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the Canfield juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD'S dedicated service, and in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again in spite of the void he will leave and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD'S unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago, an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it, touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The "little man" was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped aboard a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor, which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him "Nay"?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service we were his stanch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth: "Well done thou true and faithful servant."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1960.

Mr. HARRY B. HAINES,
Editor, the Paterson News,
Paterson, N.J.

DEAR MR. HAINES: I wish to applaud your fine editorial on the retirement of GORDON CANFIELD. He is a man for whom it is really difficult to find words adequate for the praise he deserves. You touched the core of the man when you said it was dedicated service. But there is more—for he possessed a sincerity which transcended everything else he did. He extended this sincere desire to help to all men regardless of politics. He believed that the Congress of the United States was deserving of the best effort of the men elected to serve in that body and that this best effort should not be dependent on any political label.

I am sure that some people feel that politics preclude praising men of the opposite party, but as a newly elected Democrat to the Congress, I can say without hesitation that no one was more inspirational to me than the dean of our delegation—GORDON CANFIELD.

He made a great contribution to the United States for no man in Congress was more dedicated, more conscientious or more aware of his responsibility.

I, as well as my colleagues I am sure, will miss him greatly. I join with all of his many friends and admirers in heartily endorsing the wonderful words you expressed in your paper. I hope that in the years to come he will enjoy the good health and happy life he so richly deserves.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

Dumping of Atomic Waste Into the Waters of the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN YOUNG
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a most serious and hazardous proposal now under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission which may have far-reaching and injurious effects on every American citizen now alive and on generations to come.

On January 13, 1958, a private industrial company, the Industrial Waste Disposal Corp., of Houston, Tex., filed application with the Atomic Energy Commission for a license authorizing this company to receive, package and

dispose of certain radioactive waste materials by placing this radioactive material in cement containers and dumping them in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. On December 5, 1958, the Atomic Energy Commission published in the Federal Register a "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Byproduct Material License to the Industrial Waste Disposal Corp.," which would authorize the disposal of this radioactive waste in this manner. The notice stated that the license would be issued unless formal hearing was requested.

Immediate public interest was expressed in this matter and various municipalities and groups demanded a hearing. The State of Texas also requested a hearing. Hearings were held in Houston on January 22, 1959. After these hearings, the AEC issued an intermediate decision the effect of which was to approve the dumping license of the disposal company. An appeal to the full Commission was taken by interested parties, and final hearings are set here in Washington on January 20, 1960.

I most firmly believe, and I think a majority of the Members of this body will feel as I do, that the dumping of atomic waste into waters of the oceans touching our shores poses a possibility of a serious hazard to the health and well-being of our citizens. At best, the evidence introduced by the AEC at previous hearings was speculative and conjectural. I believe the U.S. Congress would be derelict in its duty to the people of this country if we stand idly by and allow without protest a branch of the Federal Government to engage in a practice which may have far-reaching ill effects upon the health of the citizens. I most seriously object to the approval of this disposal license by the Atomic Energy Commission until such time as it has been established beyond any doubt that the dumping of this atomic material in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico will not be harmful to human life or marine life in the disposal area.

I feel, likewise, that it should be definitely determined at this time to what extent this disposal program will be accelerated or expanded in future operations for the disposal of atomic waste. I understand it has been the experience of other waste disposal areas, both in Europe and off the shores of this country, where dumping and disposal operations have been inaugurated, that these dumping operations tend to expand and increase to the point where the number of curies contained in the original operation may be infinitesimal as compared to the vastly increased number of curies contained in the cumulated subsequent dumping operations.

This is not an isolated matter, pertaining to the citizens of the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico alone. I have in my files a list of proposed dumping grounds running the full length of the Atlantic seaboard, around the Florida coast, and the entire Gulf of Mexico. Thus, today we are concerned with one dumping operation in the Gulf of Mexico, tomorrow and in future years, if we open the door for this proposed plan, we may be faced with radioactive waters lapping our shores from Maine to Texas, and from Oregon to California. This would indeed be a Frankenstein monster which we might not be able to control or rectify.

This problem not only has national significance, but has now become a matter touching on our relations with our neighbor to the South. About a month ago the Government of the Republic of Mexico, acting through channels, protested to our Department of State the dumping of this atomic waste in Gulf of Mexico waters. In a letter dated November 18, 1959, to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State, advised the AEC that the Mexican Government is making formal protest to this proposed action by a branch of the U.S. Government. In his letter of protest to the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Rubottom states:

> From the note of the Mexican Embassy it may be inferred that the Mexican Government believes disposal of radioactive wastes so close to its shores would be interpreted in Mexico as a unilateral and arbitrary act on the part of the United States, adverse results from which would present virtually identical hazards to the residents of the two countries. Our Embassy at Mexico City concurs in the Department's view that Mexico's reaction to the granting of the license would be uniformly adverse and would cause harm to our relations with Mexico, regardless of any explanations that might be given. Furthermore, it would be difficult to explain why the United States unilaterally and without the concurrence of Mexico selected a site for disposal of radioactive wastes in an area approximately 180 miles from the shores of both countries, particularly as so little can be known with certainty in Mexico regarding the possible adverse effects oceanic waste disposal might have over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the Government of Mexico for the future health and well-being of its citizens, and it appears to me that the U.S. Congress might do well to follow the example set us by the Republic of Mexico and express a similar concern for the people of our own country whose lives and health are endangered by this proposed action on the part of one of our Federal agencies.

Lead and Zinc Miners Still Seek Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the lead and zinc miners of the United States are still looking to Washington for justice.

Last week, the Tariff Commission began its third series of hearings in 7 years into the unquestionable distress and injury of our domestic lead and zinc producers.

Another strong showing was made that hundreds of American mines are still shut down, and thousands of American miners are still unemployed, as a result of recordbreaking foreign imports of lead and zinc.

There can be no serious question of the fact that quotas imposed by the administration in October of 1958 are not doing the job of reopening our shutdown mines and restoring the vitality and prosperity of our domestic lead and zinc producers.

From coast to coast, the evidence points in the other direction: the quotas have failed in their purpose, and must be strengthened or supplemented by other measures.

One of the splendid statements made on this point before the Tariff Commission was made by my distinguished colleague from Idaho, the Honorable GRACIE PFOST, who testified on January 12, 1960.

Mrs. PFOST, who has been one of the finest champions of the domestic miner in this body throughout her period of service, called for prompt and fair conclusions by the Tariff Commission.

The complete text of Mrs. PFOST's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN GRACIE PFOST BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON INVESTIGATION OF THE DOMESTIC LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY, JANUARY 12, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today.

As a Representative of a congressional district in Idaho which is a heavy producer of lead and zinc, and as a member of the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, I am especially interested in this investigation by the Tariff Commission.

I understand Mr. Charles E. Schwab, of Kellogg, Idaho, who was until recently executive secretary of the Emergency Lead and Zinc Producers Committee in Washington, D.C., will appear later during these hearings and will give a very comprehensive picture as the situation exists in the lead-zinc field.

He did a tremendous job in coordinating the presentations made in behalf of industry before this Commission and the Congress. Mr. Schwab has recently been appointed superintendent of operations of the Bunker Hill Co. in north Idaho, and while he will be missed here, we are glad to have him home again where he will continue working toward a solution to our problem.

First, I want to express my appreciation to the Commission which has been tremendously helpful in making an objective analysis and the unanimous findings of serious injury in 1954 and 1958. These findings have laid the foundation for this hearing, and for your report to the Congress which I hope will be coming shortly.

This investigation, pursuant to Senate Resolution 162, and passed by the 86th Congress, deals with the full range of lead and zinc products, whether manufactured or unmanufactured. The investigation is timely in view of the clearly adverse effect imported ores and products have upon the depressed lead and zinc mining industry in Idaho and other mining States.

In my judgment, even with quotas operating throughout the entire year, no lead-zinc producer operated at a profit in 1959. In Idaho, the lead-zinc picture has progressively deteriorated since January 1, 1952, the date selected as the base point by the Tariff Commission for its first unanimous finding of injury (May 1954).

In the great Coeur d'Alene mining district in my State, one complete section known as the Pine Creek area, has only one mine working today, where seven mines previously operated.

Underground employment has declined 40 percent in the Coeur d'Alenes during this period and practically all of the moderate and small-size producers have been forced out of business. An estimated 2,000 workers have lost their jobs.

You have only to examine the annual financial reports of those mines still operating

to see that the steady and excessive influx of metal imports continues its devastating and fatal impact upon this area.

It has been conservatively estimated that committees, school districts, counties, and State tax revenues during these 7 years have declined about $5 million a year in the Coeur d'Alenes, as the mines have closed down. Let me point out too, that the shutdowns do not eliminate the cost of maintaining the mines to prevent serious damage and to protect investments. Large expenditures are needed for pumping, retimbering, and other upkeep to forestall mine flooding and cave-ins.

The citizens of the mining areas in Idaho have had faith that the mining problem will be corrected. They have gone forward with building a new hospital, a new school, and other community projects. The Commission has the opportunity now, because of prior decisions to recommend an answer which will again provide a healthy economic climate in ours and other domestic mining areas.

The need for relief to the domestic mining industry in general has been abundantly established by hearings held last year before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on House Concurrent Resolution 177. I commend to the attention of the members of this Commission the record of these hearings and the committee's report, House Report No. 708.

The hearings contain statements by 21 Members of the House, 2 State Governors, and 67 other persons. All that these people ask is that the domestic mining industry be allowed to maintain itself in a sound and healthy condition. Such a condition is essential to the wise use of natural resources and the long-range growth and defense of the country.

The domestic industry is entitled to a fair share of the domestic market where economically feasible. The economic feasibility of domestic lead and zinc mining to supply a substantial share of the domestic market has long been established.

The mineral output of the United States in 1959 did not follow the upturn in economic activity. The total value of all minerals, including fuels, was less in 1959 than in 1957. Low metal prices and other factors dropped domestic mine output of lead to 251,000 short tons, the smallest since 1900. Mine output of zinc in 1959 was no higher than in 1958, despite the quota established in October of 1958. The combined price of lead and zinc metals is at present not materially higher than immediately after the imposition of the quotas, and is substantially below the level indicated by domestic mining interests as essential for restoration of production.

Perhaps the most disturbing element in this situation is the severe decline in employment for mining workers. Our so-called magnanimous foreign policy has backfired on U.S. workers.

American know-how has gone abroad. Now cheap foreign labor and the newest machinery installed in foreign lands is causing an invasion of our own shores.

It would be one thing if this invasion had come about gradually through the free enterprise of individuals and firms. Then our domestic firms and workers could have made normal readjustments. But the Government itself has directly stimulated the situation through loans, grants, barter, technical assistance and otherwise in foreign lands.

National policy requires that domestic production at least be reasonably protected from undue hardships arising from the Government's own actions in the economic sphere.

The folly of counting unduly on foreign sources of essential raw materials has been demonstrated once again in the new export taxes on minerals and related measures taken by the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro. The policy of the Congress, expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 177 and numerous earlier measures, is to avoid critical dependence upon foreign sources. It is essential to maintain a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

The law as it now stands delegates control over tariffs to the executive branch acting on the basis of investigations of the Tariff Commission. It has been urged that Congress should reestablish and exercise direct control over tariffs. In the meanwhile, the existing process should be effectively employed.

Time is of the essence in the Commission's current lead and zinc study. Undue delay in making the report would compound the current injury and might impede the consideration of related measures by Congress.

I urge that the Commission give its close and speedy attention to the testimony presented in this hearing, so that prompt and fair conclusions and recommendations may be made.

Some Suggestions for a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I was in the district this fall, I talked to as many farmers as I could in order to bring back a cross section of ideas which might improve some of the inequities in the farm program.

In many instances, I asked the farmers to whom I talked, to set their ideas down on paper so that I could make them known to Congress.

Mr. Emery Hemingway, Rural Route No. 5, Iowa City, Iowa, a long-time friend and a successful Johnson County farmer, is one of the first to outline the basic ideas which he feels will improve the farm program.

In presenting these suggestions to the Members, I do not make a wholesale endorsement of all of the ideas, but offer them for consideration with the hope that there may be some proposals here which can be incorporated into farm legislation and improve conditions, not only for Midwest farmers, but for the entire farm economy.

Mr. Hemingway's proposal follows:

Any farm program must have at least three goals:

First. Full parity for agriculture.

Second. Be fair and equitable between producers, and protect the smaller family farm from being taken over by the larger farms.

Third. Promote good soil conservation.

Historic bases are erroneous and unfair between producers and we must have a sound base to start from such as the crop acres in the farm.

Some suggestions for a long-time farm program are, first, applying flexible price supports to soil conservation; or second, the higher the soil-depleting crops to the crop acres in the farm the lower the price supports; and third, let the farmer decide at what percent of parity he wants his crops supported, or not at all.

In the old AAA farm program the number of crop acres in every farm were recorded.

Now, let us have this sound, fair, base to work from and apply flexible price supports to a soil-conservation program in about these percents:

First. The farmer who keeps his intertilled crops-soil depleting crops under 30 percent of his crop acres the Government gives him a price support of full parity.

Second. The farmer who plants between 30 and 35 percent of his crop acres in soil-depleting crops the Government gives him a price support of 90 percent of parity.

Third. Between 35 and 40 percent—80 percent of parity.

Fourth. Between 40 and 45 percent—70 percent of parity.

Then if you want to go further than that, classify the farms according to their capabilities and let the higher capability farms have a higher soil-depleting base, or crop base, than the lower capability farms.

No producer should be able to turn all of his crop over to the Government to market in any one year.

The Government should only handle surpluses and not become the marketing agency for a producer's whole crop.

A better way would be to use the sound base we started with—crop acres in the farm—and let the farmer deliver up to 10 bushels to the acre times the crop acres in the farm as a limit.

What we need are longer crop rotations on a lot of farms that have been causing the surplus trouble.

By longer crop rotations some of us have held down our feed grain crops and built a soil fertility bank at our own expense, but the farmer who has been over-producing feed grain crops has destroyed the price and we are penalized for practicing soil conservation.

The soil-bank program has some good features, but in most cases only rewards the producer who has been causing the most trouble by over-cropping his land, and puts all his poor land in the soil bank and lets the Government pay him to build it up again.

If we do not apply flexible price supports to a soil conservation program then we must set a crop base using the crop acres in the farms to start from, and have this base include cotton as well as the feed grains—corn, sorghums, and beans—and the farmer keep the production of all these crops under this base or no supports.

This would bring about cross-compliance on these crops.

Wheat has its own program and there should be some regulation so the wheat producer, if he keeps under his acreage for price supports, he cannot put in other crops that will help defeat the other programs.

Rice, peanuts and tobacco have more or less a program of their own. We should have found out before this that no program will work without some cross-compliance.

A farm program of price supports and acreage controls, two price systems or commodity by commodity approach, will work if you put regulations and controls

on the right producers in the right way at the right time, but none of them will work without these controls.

Not enough farmers will self-discipline themselves to make any voluntary program work.

This is the legislation that needs to be enacted right now.

Now, that Congress and the Department of Agriculture apparently have done nothing to keep production in line with market demand without building up huge abnormal surpluses of feed grains, and are creating an over production of live stock, the farmer is producing at an average of around 78 percent of parity. He is not getting his rightful share of the national income and the livestock producer is entitled to some consideration.

The sheep men have their subsidy program.

The hog producer should have a program in which the Government pays a subsidy between the market price and $21 for No. 1 hogs, market price; $20 for No. 2 hogs, market price; and $19 for No. 3 hogs and only on hogs weighing between 190 pounds and 240 pounds. This is to be based on 400 pounds to the crop acres in the farm up to 75 crop acres or 30,000 pounds as a limit to any one regular farmer producer.

Do the same for the cattle feeder. Pay him a subsidy between the market price and $32 for prime cattle market price; $30 for choice, market price; and $28 for good grade. The same to be paid on 400 pounds to the acre times the crop acres in the farm up to 75 acres and 30,000 pounds limit. No subsidy paid on cattle weighing over 1,250 pounds.

Education—Investment in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the text of an address I was privileged to deliver at the seventh annual National Conference on Federal Legislation of the National Education Association in Washington, D.C., on December 11, 1959.

The text of the address follows:

EDUCATION—INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

I am delighted to have the opportunity to take part in the seventh annual National Conference on Federal Legislation of the National Education Association.

ROBERT WYATT OF INDIANA STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION PRAISED

It is a particular pleasure for me to be introduced by Robert Wyatt, executive secretary of the Indiana State Teachers Association. I think it is fair to say that Bob Wyatt has done more than any other man in recent years to win greater public support for education in Indiana.

I am glad, too, to be able to talk with leaders of the NEA. I come from a family of teachers, and my mother, who started teaching in a one-room country schoolhouse in Indiana and is still teaching school today, is a life member of the NEA as was my late grandfather, who was a teacher for many years in central Indiana.

During my first year in Congress, I have been deeply impressed by the splendid leadership which the NEA as a national organization and your representatives here in Washington have given to the cause of education. This conference is a first-class example of the continuing dedication of the NEA to lifting the level of education in America.

One of the reasons I have so much enjoyed my first year in Congress was my good fortune in being named to the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee and thereby having the high privilege of serving with men like CLEVELAND BAILEY, FRANK THOMPSON, and STEWART UDALL and coming to know a person like LEE METCALF—all men who are deeply devoted to education and all unquestionably among the ablest Members of Congress.

My brief experience on the committee has only reaffirmed my conviction that, as Adlai Stevenson once said, "Our children's needs—the needs of education—have first priority over all other civilian needs."

Today we have more discussion of education, its purposes, its methods, and its facilities than we have seen for many years in this country.

SOVIET GAINS SPARK NEW LOOK AT U.S. EDUCATION

It is unfortunately true that the American people have been jarred into this reassessment not by any apocalyptic vision but by the sudden impact of the technological achievements of the Soviet Union.

We had until recent months been living under what Prof. Denis Brogan of Cambridge University describes as "the illusion of American omnipotence." Our reaction to the symbol of sputnik is represented by the fact that in order to pass an education bill, we had to call it the National Defense Education Act.

Yet Soviet competition should not be the only, nor indeed, the most important cause for our taking a new look at American education. It was Chet Huntley who said last year, "If tomorrow Russia became a pro-Western, two-party democracy, and international communism disappeared from the face of the earth, we should still need more engineers than we have, and many more poets."

STUDENTS MUST LEARN IMPORTANCE OF HARD WORK

Let me suggest that there are two major areas in education today to which we should give our concern.

First is the problem of quality. What are we turning out in our schools and universities?

A late president of Princeton once remarked, "Madame, we guarantee results or we return the boy."

For those of you whose chief responsibility is public education, there is no such simple solution to the problem of the student from whom no results can be guaranteed.

With respect to this first problem in education, I should like to say only this: in our pursuit of equality of opportunity for education, we must give far more attention to the element of quality of education. We must insist in the education of our young people on the central importance of hard work, on the futility of the search for shortcuts.

Let me give you the answer that Soren Kierkegaard, the 19th century Danish theologian, gave to the question, "What is education?"

He said, "I should suppose that education was the curriculum one had to run through in order to catch up with oneself, and he who will not pass through this curriculum is helped very little by the fact that he was born in the most enlightened age."

AMERICA HAS SHORTAGE OF CLASSROOMS AND TEACHERS

My chief concern this evening, however, is not with the problem of quality but rather with a problem with which Members of Congress can deal more directly—the resources education has for doing its job.

The simple facts are these:

We have in America a continuing shortage of buildings.

We have in America a continuing shortage of qualified teachers.

The result of these shortages is a serious crisis in meeting the Nation's needs in education. And if the crisis is with us today, consider the fact that within the next 20 years the present school-age population of this country will have increased by 60 percent.

Last August, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming declared that "the number of pupils whose education is being impaired by the classroom shortage is about 10 million."

On October 14 of this year, the Secretary spoke of a shortage of between 130,000 and 140,000 classrooms. Yet he warned that the latest figures on school-bond sales—which showed a drop of fully 20 percent during the most recent 12-month period from the preceding 12 months—indicated that "marked declines in school construction are to be expected."

The State superintendent of public instruction in Indiana said this year that my State was short 3,000 classrooms.

There is widespread agreement then, that we need more school buildings in this country.

There is, however, another serious deficiency in our resources for education. We do not have enough qualified teachers. At the beginning of the 1958 fall term, our school systems were employing 92,300 full-time teachers with substandard qualifications.

INADEQUATE SALARIES A MAJOR CAUSE OF TEACHER SHORTAGE

Study after study has provided evidence of this shortfall, and study after study has pointed to inadequate teachers' salaries as a major cause of the trouble.

President Eisenhower himself, in speaking of "the importance of raising the standing of our teachers in their communities," said, "Higher salaries are a first requirement."

The president of the National Science Teachers Association blames low pay as a key reason for the lack of qualified science teachers.

The Rockefeller Bros. Fund Report on U.S. Educational Needs declares, "the root problem of the teaching profession remains financial. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially."

And I am sure you are all familiar with Secretary Flemming's contention that doubling teachers' salaries in the next decade is a reasonable national goal.

It is clear then that we are not investing enough money in education, either in my home State of Indiana or in the Nation, either in classrooms or in teachers' salaries.

I use the phrase "investing in education" advisedly. In the American language, to "spend" suggests using up scarce resources—a wasteful and profligate notion. To "invest" however, suggests that dividends will be forthcoming—a wise and prudent course to follow.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION PAYS DIVIDENDS

Of perhaps no other area in our national life can the concept of "investment" more accurately be used than education. Some 10 years ago, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce published a book entitled, "Education, an Investment in People." The study showed

dramatically that those States and communities in America which had the best educational systems had the highest levels of real income as well. The chamber of commerce survey showed that it paid, in dollars and cents, to invest in education. It was good business to put money into schoolrooms and teachers' salaries.

Again, let's look at my State of Indiana. Are we investing enough money in education there? The apostles of States rights piously tell us that there is no need for Federal support for education, because, they blandly assure us, the States can do the job.

The State of Indiana ranks 15th in the Nation in per capita income. If the States-righters were doing their job, Indiana would logically be 15th in the Nation in per pupil expenditures for public education. But we are 31st.

Indiana provides from State sources some 30 percent of public school expenditures as against a national average of 40 percent—so that we rank 32d in the Nation in this respect.

HOOSIER GOP POLITICIANS SHORTCHANGE EDUCATION

These facts are telling evidence of the intellectual dishonesty of those who argue that the States are meeting their responsibilities, and I remind you that there are few politicians in America who preach the States rights doctrine more but practice it less than Gov. Harold Handley and his political godfather, ex-Senator William E. Jenner.

At a recent subcommittee hearing, I asked the legislative representativee of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which opposed the Murray-Metcalf bill on grounds that education was a job for the States and local communities, to provide me with a summary showing how State chambers of commerce across the Nation were leading the fight in their respective States for more money for education.

I am still waiting for that summary, not, I may say, breathlessly.

In Indiana, moreover, our State constitution limits the bonding power of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation, a limitation which has forced schools to turn from general obligation bonds, ranging from 1½ to 2½ percent interest, to the transparent device of setting up holding corporations and issuing revenue bonds at 4 to 5 percent interest. How do you like that for sound, businesslike fiscal responsibility? How's that as an example of deep concern for the taxpayer's dollar?

PROPERTY TAX INCREASE NOT THE ANSWER

There may still be a few persons who contend that the way to raise more money for education is to raise the property tax. To understate the case, this is not an exceedingly popular approach in my part of the country, and any Republican who wants to run against me on a "let's raise the property tax" platform will be a more than welcome opponent.

We simply cannot get much more blood out of the property tax turnip.

The several considerations I have suggested with respect to financing education in Indiana and the Nation were among those which led the House Education and Labor Committee this year to report favorably H.R. 22, the Murray-Metcalf bill, a bill which now languishes in the House Rules Committee, another victim of the continuing Republican-Dixiecrat effort to starve America of vital resources at a time of great peril to our country.

MURRAY-METCALF BILL DESCRIBED

Because the NEA played a most significant role in the shaping of the Murray-Metcalf bill, most of you already know that this legislation would provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating Federal funds to the States to be used for constructing classrooms and/or improving teachers' salaries.

The bill provides a program of $1.1 billion a year for 4 years. Each State would receive $25 per school-age child.

Each State would be free to divide its allotment between classrooms and salaries, as it saw fit. Any portion of the funds expended for salaries would be distributed within the following guidelines: one-half to school districts on a per teacher basis and one-half on an equalization basis.

BRADEMAS STRONGLY OPPOSES FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

We are all aware that one of the chief obstacles to the passage of the Murray-Metcalf bill is the issue of Federal control. As a former teacher, I certainly want no Federal control of what is taught in our schools. I am, therefore, very glad to say that this bill contains very effective safeguards against such control.

First, the procedures for the administration of the program by the U.S. Office of Education are so simple that the Office will have no opportunity to coerce the States.

Second, the bill provides that once Federal funds reach the State, they are thereafter deemed to be State funds.

Third, the bill explicitly provides that in the administration of the law, the Federal Government shall exercise no direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration of any school or school system—which is about as clear a declaration of purpose as the English language can supply.

Fourth, each State education agency is required only to certify that funds granted under the act have been expended in accordance with the provisions of the act, the same procedure for Federal fiscal control which has been followed historically under the land-grant college program.

FEDERAL FUNDS NOW USED FOR EDUCATION WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL

I think finally that the best evidence that Federal funds can be used for classroom construction and teachers' salaries without Federal control is the fact that we have been using them for both these purposes for some years now.

It has been a source of constant surprise to me to learn that very few citizens in my district—indeed, very few schoolteachers—know that under Public Laws 815 and 874, the impacted area programs for school districts near defense plants or military bases, for example, Federal funds are now being used not only to build classrooms but to pay teachers' salaries and even to buy textbooks.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee, I asked several witnesses, including Members of Congress and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the following question this year during hearings on the administration's ill-advised proposal to cut funds for education under the impacted area programs: Have you any evidence that the use of Federal funds for classrooms and teachers' salaries has led to any Federal control of education in these districts?

Here is a typical answer:

One Republican Congressman whose views are normally very conservative but whose conservatism was apparently greatly tempered by the fact that his district receives substantial amounts of such Federal aid to education replied, "I have not, sir. I think that has been one of the outstanding virtues of Public Laws 815 and 874. There has been no Federal control curriculumwise."

EISENHOWER EDUCATION COMMISSIONER ADMITS NO EVIDENCE OF CONTROL

Here is Commissioner Derthick's reply: "I am glad to say, Mr. BRADEMAS, that the question has not come up. On the contrary, there was a doctorate study done up at Teachers College, Columbia University, investigating to determine whether there had been any semblance of Federal control in the administration of these laws throughout the United States; and the conclusion was impressive and complete, that there has not been any indication in any of these approximately 4,000 school districts."

And the Commissioner went on to assure the committee that his statement applied to the use of Federal funds both for school construction and for teachers' salaries.

For those persons, therefore, who are sincerely troubled about the issue of Federal control but who base their conclusions on facts, I urge a look not only at the safeguards built into H.R. 22, but at the actual record of the administration of Federal funds under present law.

I have tried to suggest why we must invest more in education. I have tried to suggest why it is imperative that we make use of Federal funds for building more classrooms and raising teachers' salaries.

I have tried to suggest why the Murray-Metcalf bill is the most effective avenue for achieving these goals.

And finally, I have tried to suggest that Federal funds can be used to support State and local efforts in education without infringing on their control of school systems.

INCREASED U.S. INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL OF FREEDOM

Let me now attempt, briefly, to put the problem of increasing our national investment in education in a somewhat different perspective.

No one who watched television or heard the radio or read the newspapers during the time that Mr. Khrushchev moved across the face of this land can fail now to understand that in him we are confronted with an alert, intelligent, aggressive, and articulate leader and by a people in the Soviet Union who can be described in similar adjectives.

In the decade of the 1960's to begin in just a few days now, the American people will be faced with the most powerful challenge to our survival as a free society that we have known in all the history of this Republic.

It may well prove to be true that in the struggle between ourselves and the Communist world—a struggle both economic and moral as well as political and military—that side will prove triumphant which more effectively marshals its brainpower.

Whether we are able to maintain a free and vigorous and civilized society here at home and to encourage such societies abroad will, in large measure, depend on the quality and resources of our education.

OUR MOST VALUABLE NATURAL RESOURCE: EDUCATED MEN AND WOMEN

It seems to me, therefore, that we in America must invest far more of our national resources in the most valuable natural resource we have: educated young men and women.

I salute you of the National Education Association for your dedication to the purposes of education. We share a common conviction that, as Adlai Stevenson has said, "The goal of education is to teach Western man not just to survive but to triumph, not just to defend himself, but to make man and the world what God intended them to be."

Washington Report by Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include my newsletter of January 16, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JANUARY 16, 1960

The machinery of congressional legislation is picking up speed. Committees are meeting to evaluate their pending bills, Members are preparing speeches, political motivations of candidates and parties are becoming more evident.

The ingredients of this legislative year are these: (1) An election year for Representatives (2 years), the President (4 years), and some Senators (6 years); (2) split government—the legislative body, Congress, under Democrat leadership, and the administration, Republican; only Congress makes the law; (3) various problems or trouble areas, highly controversial, which are, (a) the military and economic cold war with Russia; (b) the monopoly power of unions and dictatorial power of labor leaders; (c) the fiscal situation—a national debt of $290 billion; plus already incurred c.o.d. bills of $440 billion or more ($90 billion now owing and $350 billion committed as future obligations); plus a $2 billion built-in budget increase; plus hundreds of billions of legislative proposals for additional spending now pending; (d) a financing problem—Congress expects the Treasury Department to borrow money without a flexible interest ceiling, thus forcing the Government to borrow in the short-term market competing with individuals and businesses; (e) a heavy tax burden with progressive rates that kill incentive; (f) civil rights, welfare programs, and other controversial bills, all politically explosive, are pending.

What will Congress do? The answer will result from the people's demands, of course. (1) The election year issues and solutions can be politically expedient or statesmanlike as to motivation and outcome. (2) There could be a rash of new spending proposals adopted or a balanced budget with debt repayment and an aim toward tax adjustment and reduction. (3) There will be blaming of the administration for congressional shortcomings or responsible acceptance of the legislative role by Congress. (4) There can be more regimented planned economy or an emphasis on free competitive enterprise. (5) There will be more labor domination by law or placement of unions under antitrust law. My recommendation is the acceptance of the second of each of these alternatives.

The citizens of this great Nation and the Congressmen have reached the place, as I see it, where we must either restate and practice our belief in free competitive enterprise or abandon it, as we continue to legislate ourselves into the planned, regimented society. We don't need more law; we need to examine, evaluate and eliminate stifling, antiquated policies. Balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and lessening the tax burden are what this Nation needs most, not more welfare spending. The basic choice is between siphoning off money into Federal programs or leaving the money in the hands of the people to reinvest as they see fit. The latter course is the only one possible for sound economic growth and prosperity for all. Only in producing more can we all have more.

The purge of 56 Congressmen threatened by Jimmy Hoffa, head of the Teamsters (including myself) will be met by a counter-offensive by those Members who are now uniting for this effort.

The Ways and Means Committee (of which I'm a member) will: (1) Hold hearings February 1 on the taxation of cooperatives; (2) Bring out a social security revision, possibly including the Forand, allegedly "socialized medicine", provision, as an amendment; (3) Possibly permit a revision of the interest rate ceiling. Some of the language used in the Ways and Means Committee illustrates the special world of taxation (not all are self-explanatory, either)—multiple trust, retroactive correction, conduit, throwback rule, partial distribution, corpus, aggregating, spin-off, collapsible corporation, traps, loopholes, pitfalls, blind alleys, distribution in kind, election of choice, etc.

The weekly newsletter is available to anyone in Dallas by request.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960

Dr. James T. Cleland, dean of the chapel, Duke University, Durham, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy art Thou, O Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Glory be to Thee, O God most high.

Almighty God, through whose will we live, under whose judgment we stand, in whose mercy we are redeemed, we commend unto Thee those whom we have entrusted to make just laws for our good land. Grant unto them insight to know the truth, courage to face the truth, and consideration to speak the truth in love. Among angry voices that deafen and deaden the ear, before problems that beset and vex the mind, amid rumors of war that frighten the heart, in the multitude of choices that puzzle the will to act, give them peace and poise and the assurance that all things can work together for good, under Thee; to the end that these Thy children may live with integrity and charity, worthy to hear Thy "Well done, good and faithful servants."

And unto Thee, and to Thee only, we shall ascribe, as is most due, honor and majesty and dominion and power, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 18, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, together with reports covering the operations during the same period of Foreign-Trade Zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, located at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATION OF USE OF THE RED CROSS AND OTHER EMBLEMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Convention for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal home loan banks supervised by Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, an audit report on the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, 17, AND 18

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering a Civil Service Commission position in grade GS–18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering supergrade positions under the control of that Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF WYOMING RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by a convention of the Wyoming Rural Electric Cooperatives, relating to water and power resources in the State of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the future growth and development of the State of Wyoming is inseparable from the full development of its natural resources; and

Whereas such resource development hinges on multipurpose water projects which will effectuate the maximum utilization of Wyoming water resources including the power potential; and

Whereas the 15 Rural Electric Cooperatives of Wyoming have been and are now projecting plans to serve now underdeveloped but potentially productive areas of Wyoming with electric power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Rural Electric Cooperatives in convention assembled do go on record as supporting the full multipurpose river development of Wyoming, and to this end dedicate themselves severally and individually to the promotion of multipurpose programs which will provide water and power to open the storehouse of natural resources which is Wyoming; and be it further

Resolved, That the Wyoming Rural Electric Cooperatives urge upon the Federal Government a soundly conceived long-range resource program which will insure the orderly and progressive development of the natural resources not only of Wyoming but throughout the Nation, and to this end urges an increase in planning funds for such resource agencies as the Bureau of Reclamation and a resource budget predicated upon a growing economy and a resource base equal to the full potential of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wyoming congressional delegation and to the President of the United States, the Department of Interior, and other applicable resources agencies, both State and National.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the long struggle for the development of the Upper Basin of the Colorado River system came to fruition in the enactment of the Upper Colorado River Storage and Development Act (Public Law 485); and

Whereas the construction of the main features of the upper Colorado project is now under way; and

Whereas the construction of the participating water-use projects of this act are dependent upon the power revenue of the holdover and power units now under way; and

Whereas Public Law 485 specifically authorized such transmission lines as are necessary to effectuate interconnection of the project powerplants and other existing and potential Federal and private power systems of the area; and

Whereas the rural electric cooperatives and municipal power users of the upper basins States have organized the upper basin preference users committee to coordinate and spearhead the interests of preference users and the activities of existing preference user organizations of the basin; and

Whereas this committee has compiled and presented to the Department of Interior and to the Congress data showing a preference demand in the upper basin capable of absorbing the capacity of the project powerplants within a reasonable period of time; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Rural Electric Cooperatives of Wyoming go on record in support of an extra-high voltage transmission system which can make power available to all States of the upper basin as contemplated in Public Law 485; and be it further

Resolved, That the cooperatives go on record in support of the Upper Colorado Preference Users Committee and hereby authorized and directs the Wyoming State Rural Electric Association to give its full support to such committee and to other interested groups active in the field; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wyoming congressional delegation, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, the Wyoming Resources Board, the Secretary of the Department of Interior and such other State, interstate, Federal, or other agencies having jurisdiction in this matter.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 135. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries; (Rept. No. 1028).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 210. Resolution providing additional funds for the Select Committee on National Water Resources (S. Rept. No. 1029); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 230. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Robert Bernerd Anderson, of New York, to be a governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State;

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Philippines.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Korea.

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Finland.

William P. Snow, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Burma.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Guatemala.

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bulgaria.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2849. A bill to prescribe a Federal Code of Administrative Practice to govern administrative proceedings of departments and

agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2850. A bill to provide for the appointment of one circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2851. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2852. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying and to preserve copyright protection for creators of artistic works in which copyright subsists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2853. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on the number of days of service for which members of county and local Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees may be compensated; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2854. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property of the Public Health Service to the New Town Health Center Corp., New Town, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2855. A bill for the relief of Brenda Nicholson Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2856. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to grant Members of Congress and employees eligibility for benefits under the act after the performance of 5 years of any combination of creditable civilian service; and

S. 2857. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2858. A bill to secure the United States from losing essential mineral reserves and to preserve an adequate mineral reserve stabilization base for emergencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2859. A bill to impose certain requirements upon persons engaging in certain activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2860. A bill to provide for a highway bridge over the Missouri River west or southwest of Platte, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. KEATING submitted a resolution (S. Res. 253) creating a select committee to study the question of jurisdiction of U.S. courts over employees of the Armed Forces outside the territorial limits of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEATING, which appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 254) establishing a select committee to investigate the impact of labor-management disputes and of collective bargaining on the national economy and their effect on the American public, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. GOLDWATER, which appears under a separate heading.)

CODE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a great deal of work has gone into the development of a code of administrative practice. It stems in part from the hearings held by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, which subcommittee was created for the first time in the first session of the present Congress. The subcommittee is under the very able leadership of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

I should pay special testimony, I believe, to the minority staff member, Mr. Cornelius Kennedy, a very able lawyer, who has had much to do with the drafting of this code. It serves the same purpose in administrative law as do the rules of civil procedure which today are applicable to our Federal courts.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement on this matter. I prefer not to burden the Senate by reading the statement during the morning hour; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in its entirety in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks; and I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and request that it remain at the desk today and tomorrow, in case other Members may wish to join in sponsoring it.

I am introducing the bill on behalf of myself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], all members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2849) to prescribe a Federal Code of Administrative Practice to govern administrative proceedings of departments and agencies of the United States and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HRUSKA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN—CODE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

On behalf of myself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HRUSKA, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to prescribe a Federal Code of Administrative Practice to govern the administrative proceedings of all the departments and agencies of the United States.

At present, there are more than 100 such agencies of the Federal Government which conduct administrative proceedings. They include the principal regulatory agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. They also include the National Labor Relations Board, the departments such as Agriculture and Interior, the Food and Drug Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the myriad of other agencies, boards, and commissions of this Federal Government.

By their very numbers, these departments and agencies constitute an administrative maze. When it is also considered that each of these departments and agencies conducts its administrative proceedings by its own set of rules, the maze becomes a bewildering labyrinth governed by many conflicting procedures.

The need for a better guide to govern industry, practitioners, and the agencies themselves has long been recognized, and on February 2, 1959, the Senate authorized the establishment of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which I have the honor to be a member, to study the problems of administrative proceedings.

The code of practice prescribed by this bill for administrative proceedings will make it no longer necessary for those dealing with departments and agencies to learn a special set of rules for the conduct of administrative proceedings by each department or agency. This code will establish one set of rules for administrative proceedings before all departments and agencies.

However, I want to make clear at the outset that though this code of practice applies across the board to departments and agencies of this Federal Government, it deals only with the mechanics of administrative proceedings. Except as it governs the practice by which such proceedings are conducted, this code does not affect the basic statutes creating the departments and agencies, defining their duties and giving them their power and authority.

It does not apply to any of the steps in an administrative matter prior to the filing of a petition for relief. In other words, it does not apply to agency investigations or to agency decisions as to whether or not to take action as a result of a complaint or an investigation. To make this crystal clear, let me give two specific examples. This code would not apply to complaints such as are made to the FTC about unfair competitive practices or complaints to the NLRB about unfair labor practices until the agency has decided to file formal proceedings against the person about whom the complaint was made. The reason for this is that Congress, in the basic statutes relating to those agencies, gave the power to prosecute to the agency and not to the complainant. No attempt has been made in this code to change this basic agency power. If the Congress desires to give the power to prosecute a complaint to the person making the complaint rather than to the agency, it should change the basic statute pertaining to the agency. If that is done, this code would then automatically apply to the proceeding. This code also does not apply to what is often called general rulemaking by departments or agencies. The time when this code begins to apply to an agency matter is when an agency or department, based upon its investigation or upon a complaint made to it, starts a proceeding seeking to direct someone to do or not to do something. The function of this code is to establish the rules for the conduct of such a proceeding.

It also governs any situation in which a private citizen seeks relief from an order, determination, or rule of general applicability

issued by a department or agency. This would include an individual who asks the FCC for an additional TV station, or one who asks the CAB for a new air route. It also includes anyone who may protest the refusal of the Veterans' Administration to grant a pension, or a contractor who has a case pending before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, as well as the farmer who wishes to protest an order by the Department of Agriculture. This code will apply regardless of the department or agency before which such a proceeding is pending. It will make the practice before all of them fair and uniform.

This code is a counterpart of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure used in the Federal courts, and it has a similar purpose. Just as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure brought certainty and uniformity to the different types of proceedings in the various Federal courts, this code will bring certainty and uniformity to the proceedings before the various departments and agencies of the United States.

There was substantial opposition to the adoption of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the ground that cases are law and cases in equity could not be tried under the same rules, and that the great variety of civil cases including breach of contract, personal injury, and antitrust actions, as well as specific performance and injunctions, could not be governed by one set of rules. Time and experience have shown that they can be.

Even prior to the time that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were adopted—in fact for over 30 years—there have been efforts to bring the same type of unity and uniformity to agency procedures. Many of the departments and agencies, particularly the larger and older ones, have adopted their own rules of practice, often modeled on the same precedents which were used in formulating the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

However, there has been resistance to attempts to formulate uniform rules for all departments and agencies on the ground that the particular problems with which each deals are different from the problems dealt with by the others. Some have maintained that a special set of rules is necessary to govern the proceedings before different agencies. These proceedings cover a wide range including the granting of air routes or the licensing of aircraft, assigning radio wavelengths or licenses to operate radios, veterans' benefits, agricultural acreage allotments, marketing quotas, grazing permits, unfair competitive practices, granting of research and development contracts, applications for patents, as well as charges of unfair labor practices, violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act.

Let us look at the argument which has been and no doubt will be made again that the practice in such proceedings cannot be governed by a single code. There is no mystery to the conduct of such a proceeding. A claim and the relief sought must be stated. The claim must be answered to determine which points are admitted and which points are actually in dispute. There must be provisions for the other steps which can be taken in the proceeding and a time schedule for the steps. There must be provisions relating to the form of the decision and for an appeal.

These are the basic matters covered by this code of practice. This code is meant to supplement the Administrative Procedure Act in those areas touched only lightly by that act and not to replace it.

Much of the language of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been incorporated into this proposed Code of Administrative Practice. This has a great advantage. In the more than 20 years during which the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have been in use, the language of the rules has been interpreted by the courts where it has been necessary. By using the same language in this code, many questions of interpretation should be eliminated.

This Code of Administrative Practice is flexible too. Time has shown that much of the success and versatility of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been due to the fact that in drafting the rules, considerable freedom was left to the individual courts and to the parties to adopt the general procedures set forth in the rules to the requirements of a particular proceeding. That concept has been adopted in the drafting of this code.

In another and extremely important aspect, this code is the counterpart of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The rules are the tools which a judge uses to conduct the court's proceedings. No matter how well qualified in the law a judge may be, he cannot effectively dispense justice without such tools. The same reasoning applies to agencies and departments.

The Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure has been concerned with criticisms leveled at the conduct of proceedings by departments and agencies, which have received widespread notice. However, these matters represent a minute portion of the countless cases which have been disposed of to the satisfaction of everyone concerned with due regard to the public interest. These agencies during the past 50 years have played a vital role, as administrative law has become more important in our complex economy.

It appears that many of the difficulties which have surrounded the administrative agencies may be remedied by insuring a uniformity in their proceedings which will develop better rules of practice, not only by the agencies concerned, but by those who are subject to regulatory proceedings.

Our difficulties arise from a lack of uniform rules to govern everyone concerned, rather than from a lack of character or integrity by the individuals who serve as public officials in these important posts. Many times blame has been directed at the members of commissions when a matter before them was not handled satisfactorily. Yet, these men are selected by the same process as applies to the appointment of Federal judges. Their nominations are subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Before confirmation, they are subject to the scrutiny of the Senate and its appropriate committees. As a matter of fact, Cabinet officers and their principal assistants normally serve only during the tenure of a President, which under the 22d amendment is now limited to 8 years.

The regulatory agencies have been established by statute so that their membership shall always be bipartisan. In many instances, an individual accepts an appointment with the belief that if a satisfactory record is made, reappointment may be expected. Such service then becomes a professional career in a true sense. However, this implies a maintenance of an outstanding record of public service.

Hence, the members of agencies and commissions, as well as Cabinet members heading departments appointed by the President, are subject to even closer Senate scrutiny than are judges because their qualifications must be reviewed by this body whenever they are nominated for a new term.

This requires that each nominee demonstrate the capacity for exceptional public service and an unassailable integrity. The Senate has no such opportunity with respect to Federal judges who have a lifetime tenure. There is, then, every reason for us to expect that the men directing agencies and departments are outstanding citizens as are Federal judges. Unfortunately, up to now these officials have been charged by the Congress with exercising great power and authority, but they have not had the proper tools with which to work. By adopting this code, the Congress can give the departments and agencies a set of uniform ground rules for their conduct of all administrative proceedings.

The benefits which can be obtained from this uniformity of practice are so great, and the application of this code so widespread, that I invite the most careful consideration, analysis, and discussion of this bill by all interested persons. I hope it will serve to crystallize the ideas of informed people which will enable the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure to offer sound legislation acceptable to both the agencies concerned and those members of the public who must deal with them. It should simplify the problems of the agencies concerned and insure more expeditious disposition of cases which should always be decided in the public interest. I have no pride of authorship and I believe that this original draft can be improved by the combined experience of many.

I am introducing this bill at this time because I am convinced that its enactment would be the most important single action which this Congress could undertake to assist the various departments, agencies, boards, and commissions which it has created to discharge the responsibilities we have delegated to them. It is essential that we eliminate the bewildering labyrinth of unnecessary variations which have grown up in the practice before the departments and agencies.

I have asked unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 2 days, so that any of my colleagues who may wish to join with me as cosponsors may have an opportunity to do so. The enactment of this proposed legislation will affect the practices of these agencies in future generations long after our terms of service have expired.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think Members may have taken account of the fact that Judge Parkinson, a circuit judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, disappeared a good many months ago. There have been no clues as to his whereabouts; and that situation presents somewhat of a problem, because of the fact that he enjoyed a lifetime appointment and, under the law of Illinois and under the law of Indiana, actual death cannot be established until, in one case, 5 years have elapsed or, under the law of the other State, until 7 years have elapsed.

The administrative officers of the Supreme Court have taken account of these facts; and they believe that, in view of the overburdened docket, an additional judge should be appointed.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to meet that situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2850) to provide for the appointment of one circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit, introduced by

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION FOR CREATORS OF ARTISTIC WORKS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying and to preserve copyright protection for creators of artistic works in which copyright subsists. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2852) to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying and to preserve copyright protection for creators of artistic works in which copyright subsists, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DESIGNS PROTECTED

SECTION 1. (a) The author of an original design, or his legal representatives or assigns, may secure the protection provided by this Act upon complying with and subject to the provisions hereof.

(b) (1) For the purposes of this Act, an original "design" consists of those original elements of a useful article that are intended to give the article an ornamental appearance. Such elements may be two-dimensional or three-dimensional.

(2) A useful article, hereinafter referred to as an "article", is an article normally having an intrinsic function other than merely to portray its own appearance or to convey information. An article which is normally a part of a useful article shall be deemed to be a useful article.

DESIGNS NOT SUBJECT TO PROTECTION

SEC. 2. Protection under this Act shall not be available for—

(a) a design that is staple or commonly known, including standard geometric figures, familiar symbols, emblems, and motifs, and other shapes, patterns, configurations, or ornamentation which by general use over long periods of time have become common, prevalent, or ordinary; or

(b) any other design that is in the public domain: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall affect the availability of protection under this Act for any design, notwithstanding its similarity to subject matter in the public domain, if the design was created without actual knowledge of the subject matter in the public domain; or

(c) a design that is dictated solely by the function or purpose of the article embodying the design.

REVISIONS, ADAPTATIONS, AND REARRANGEMENTS

SEC. 3. Protection for a design under this Act shall be available notwithstanding the employment of subject matter in the public domain, or subject matter protected under this Act or under titles 17 or 35 of the United States Code, if the design is a substantial and lawful revision, adaptation, or rearrangement of said subject matter. Such protection shall be independent of any subsisting protection in subject matter employed in the design, and shall not be construed as securing any right to subject matter in the public domain or as extending any subsisting protection.

COMMENCEMENT OF PROTECTION

SEC. 4. (a) The protection provided for a design under this Act shall commence upon the date when the design is first made known.

(b) A design is made known when, by the proprietor of the design or with his consent, an article embodying the design is anywhere publicly exhibited, publicly distributed, or offered for sale, or sold.

TERM OF PROTECTION

SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the protection herein provided for a design shall continue for a term of five years from the date of the commencement of protection as provided in section 4(a).

(b) If the design notice actually applied shows a date earlier than the date of the commencement of protection as provided in section 4(a), protection shall terminate as though the term had commenced at the earlier date.

(c) The term of protection provided by subsections (a) or (b) above shall be extended for a second period of five years from the expiration of the original period and for a third period of five years from the expiration of the second period if an application for extension of the term of protection for the second or third period is made in the form prescribed in accordance with rules established pursuant to section 16 of this Act before the expiration of the original period or the second period, as the case may be, and if the prescribed application is accompanied by the prescribed fee.

(d) A design utilized in substantially identical form in a number of different articles shall be protected as to all such articles when protected as to one of them, but no more than one registration shall be required. Upon expiration or termination of protection in a particular design as provided in this Act all rights under this Act in said design shall terminate, regardless of the number of different articles in which the design may have been utilized during the term of its protection.

THE DESIGN NOTICE

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any design for which protection is sought under this act is made known as provided in section 4(b), the proprietor shall, subject to the provisions of section 7, mark it or have it marked legibly with a design notice consisting of the following three elements:

(1) The words "Protected Design", the abbreviation "Prot'd Des." or the letter "D" within a circle, thus (D);

(2) The year of the date on which the design was first known; and

(3) The name of the proprietor, an abbreviation by which the name can be recognized, or a generally accepted alternative designation of the proprietor; any distinctive identification of the proprietor may be used if it has been approved and recorded by the Administrator before the design marked with such identification is made known.

After registration the registration number may be used instead of the elements specified in (2) and (3) hereof.

(b) The notice shall be so located and applied as to give reasonable notice of design protection while the article is passing through its normal channels of commerce. This requirement may be fulfilled, in the case of sheetlike or strip materials bearing repetitive or continuous designs, by application of the notice to each repetition, or to the margin, selvage, or reverse side of the material at regular intervals, or to tags or labels affixed to the material at regular intervals.

(c) When the proprietor of a design has complied with the provisions of this section, protection under this Act shall not be affected by the removal, destruction, or obliteration of the design notice on an article by others.

EFFECT OF OMISSION OF NOTICE AFTER REGISTRATION

SEC. 7. The omission of the notice as provided in section 6 shall not cause loss of the protection or prevent recovery for infringement against any person who, after written notice of the design protection, begins an undertaking leading to infringement; *Provided*, That such omission shall prevent any recovery under section 22 against a person who began an undertaking leading to infringement before receiving written notice of the design protection, and no injunction shall be had unless the proprietor of the design shall reimburse said person for any reasonable expenditure or contractual obligation in connection with such undertaking incurred before written notice of design protection, as the court in its discretion shall direct. The burden of proving written notice shall be on the proprietor.

INFRINGEMENT

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be infringement of a design protected under this Act for any person, without the consent of the proprietor of the design, within the United States or its territories or possessions and during the term of such protection, to—

(1) make, have made, or import, for sale or for use in trade, any infringing article as defined in subsection (d) hereof; or

(2) sell any such infringing article: *Provided, however*, That a seller or distributor of any such article who did not make or import the same shall be deemed to be an infringer only if,

(i) he induced or acted in collusion with a manufacturer to make, or an importer to import such article (merely purchasing or giving an order to purchase in the ordinary course of business shall not of itself constitute such inducement or collusion), or

(ii) he refuses or fails upon the request of the proprietor of the design to make a prompt and full disclosure of his source of such article, and he orders or reorders such article after having received a personal written notice of the protection subsisting in the design.

(b) It shall not be infringement to make, have made, sell, or import any article embodying a design created without actual knowledge of the protected design.

(c) A manufacturer who incorporates into his own product an infringing article acquired from others in the ordinary course of business shall not be deemed an infringer except under the conditions of clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (a) (2) of this section.

(d) An "infringing article" as used herein is any article, the design of which has been copied from the protected design, without the consent of the proprietor. An article embodying only a feature of the protected design which is solely dictated by the function or purpose of the article, or which is in the public domain is not an infringing article. The presence of an illustration or picture of a protected design in a book, periodical, newspaper, photograph, broadcast, or motion picture does not make it an infringing article.

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION

SEC. 9. (a) Protection under this Act shall be lost if application for registration of the design is not made within 6 months after the date on which the design was first made known as provided in section 4(b).

(b) Application for registration may be made by the author of the design, the legal representative of a deceased author or of one under legal incapacity, or the proprietor of the design in the event the rights thereto have been acquired by such proprietor.

(c) The application for registration shall be made to the Administrator and shall state: (1) the name and address of the author of the design; (2) the name and address of the proprietor if different from the author; (3) the specific name of the article, indicating its utility; (4) the date when the design was first made known as provided in section 4(b); and (5) such other information as may be required by the Administrator.

(d) The application shall be accompanied by a statement under oath by the applicant or his duly authorized agent or representative, setting forth that, to the best of his knowledge and belief: (1) the design was created by the author named in the application; (2) the design is original, and has not previously been registered on behalf of the applicant or his predecessor in title; (3) the design has been made known as provided in section 4(b); and (4) the applicant is the person entitled to protection and to registration under this Act. If the design has been made known with the design notice provided in section 6, the statement shall also describe the exact form and position of the design notice.

(e) Error in any statement or assertion as to the utility of the article named in the application, the design of which is sought to be registered, shall not affect the protection secured under this Act.

(f) Errors in omitting a joint author or in naming an alleged joint author shall not affect the validity of the registration, or the actual ownership or the protection of the design: *Provided*, That the name of one individual who was in fact an author is stated in the application. Where the design was made for hire and individual authorship of the design is difficult or impossible to ascribe and the application so states, the name and address of the employer for whom the design was made may be stated instead of that of the individual author.

(g) The application shall be accompanied by two copies of a drawing or other pictorial representation of the article having one or more views adequate to show the design, in a prescribed form and style and suitable for reproduction, which shall be deemed a part of the application.

(h) Related articles having common design features may be included in the same application under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

BENEFIT OF EARLIER FILING DATE IN FOREIGN COUNTRY

SEC. 10. An application for registration of a design filed in this country by any person who has, or whose legal representative or predecessor or successor in title has previously regularly filed an application for registration of the same design in a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States shall have the same effect as if filed in this country on the date on which the application was first filed in any such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within six months from the earliest date on which any such foreign application was filed.

OATHS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SEC. 11. Oaths and acknowledgments required by this Act may be made before any person in the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States authorized to administer oaths, or before any official authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country concerned whose authority shall be proved by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and shall be valid if they comply with the laws of the state or country where made.

EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION AND ISSUE OR REFUSAL OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 12. (a) Upon the filing of an application in proper form as provided in section 9, and upon payment of the fee provided in section 15, the Administrator shall determine whether, on its face, the application relates to a design subject to protection under this Act.

(b) If, in his judgment, the application on its face relates to a design not subject to protection under this Act, the Administrator shall send the applicant a notice of his refusal to register and the grounds therefor. Within three months from the date the notice of refusal is sent, the applicant may request, in writing, reconsideration of his application. Upon receipt of such a request the Administrator shall either proceed as provided in subsection (c) of this section, or shall send the applicant a notice of his final refusal to register.

(c) If, in his judgment, the design appears on its face to be subject to protection under this Act, the Administrator shall publish an announcement of his intention to register the design, together with a pictorial representation of the design. Within thirty days after publication of the announcement any person may file with the Administrator a verified objection to registration, on the ground that the design is staple or commonly known. At the end of the period for filing objections, the Administrator shall determine whether, in his judgment, the design is subject to protection under this Act, and shall either register the design or send the applicant a notice of his refusal to register and the grounds therefor. Within three months from the date the notice of refusal is sent, the applicant may request, in writing, reconsideration of his application. Upon receipt of such a request, the Administrator shall either register the design or send the applicant a notice of his final refusal to register. Registration or refusal to register under this subsection shall be announced by publication.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 13. Certificates of registration shall be issued in the name of the United States under the seal of the Office of the Administrator and shall be recorded in the official records of that Office. The certificate shall state the name of the article, the date on which the design was first made known as provided in section 4(b), the date of filing of the application, and shall contain a reproduction of the drawing or other pictorial representation showing the design. A certificate shall be admitted in any court as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein.

PUBLICATION OF ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INDEXES

SEC. 14. (a) The Administrator shall periodically publish announcement of his intention or refusal to register designs as provided in section 12(c), and lists and indexes of registered designs. He may also publish the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs for sale or other distribution.

(b) The Administrator shall establish and maintain a file of the drawings or other pictorial representations of registered designs, which file shall be available for use by the public under such conditions as the Administrator may prescribe.

FEES

SEC. 15. (a) There shall be paid to the Administrator the following fees:

(1) On filing each application for registration of a design, $——;

(2) For each additional related article included in one application, $——;

(3) For recording assignments, $——;

(4) For a certificate of correction of an error not the fault of the Office, $——;

(5) For certification of copies of records, $——;

(6) For each application for extending term of protection, $——.

(b) The Administrator may establish charges for materials or services furnished by the Office, not specified above, reasonably related to the cost thereof.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 16. The Administrator may establish regulations not inconsistent with the law for the administration of this Act.

COPIES OF RECORDS

SEC. 17. Upon payment of the prescribed fee, any person may obtain a certified copy of any official record of the Office of the Administrator, which copy shall be admissible in evidence with the same effect as the original.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN CERTIFICATES

SEC. 18. The Administrator may correct any error in a registration incurred through the fault of the Office, or, upon payment of the required fee, any error of a clerical or typographical nature not the fault of the Office occuring in good faith, by a certificate of correction under seal. Such registration, together with the certificate, shall thereafter have the same effect as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form.

TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP

SEC. 19. (a) The property right in a registered design, or a design for which an application for registration has been or may be filed, may be assigned, granted, or mortgaged by an instrument in writing, signed by the proprietor, or may be bequeathed by will.

(b) An acknowledgment as provided in section 11 shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment, grant, or conveyance.

(c) An assignment, grant, or conveyance shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee for a valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded in the Office of the Administrator within three months from its date of execution or prior to the date of such subsequent purchase or mortgage.

REMEDY FOR INFRINGEMENT

SEC. 20. The proprietor of a protected design shall have remedy for infringement by civil action instituted after the issuance of a certificate of registration of the design.

INJUNCTION

SEC. 21. The several courts having jurisdiction of actions under this Act may grant injunctions in accordance with the principles of equity to prevent infringement, including in their discretion, prompt relief by temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunction.

RECOVERY FOR INFRINGEMENT, AND SO FORTH

SEC. 22. (a) Upon finding for the claimant the court shall award him damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than the reasonable value of the use made of the design by the infringer, and the costs of the action. When the damages are not found by a jury, the court shall assess them. In either event the court may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed. Such sum in any of the above circumstances shall constitute compensation and not a penalty. The court may receive expert testimony as an aid to the determination of damages.

(b) No recovery under paragraph (a) shall be had for any infringement committed more than three years prior to the filing of the complaint.

(c) In exceptional cases the court may award reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party.

(d) The court may order that all infringing articles, and any plates, molds, patterns, models, or other means specifically adapted for making the same be delivered up for destruction or other disposition as the court may direct.

POWER OF COURT OVER REGISTRATION

SEC. 23. In any action involving a registered design the court when appropriate may order the cancellation of the registration. Any such order shall be certified by the court to the Administrator, who shall make appropriate entry upon the records of his Office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTION ON REGISTRATION FRAUDULENTLY OBTAINED

SEC. 24. Any person who shall bring an action for infringement knowing that registration of the design was obtained by a false or fraudulent representation materially affecting the rights under this Act, shall be liable in the sum of $1,000, or such part thereof as the court may determine, as compensation to the defendant, to be charged against the plaintiff and paid to the defendant, in addition to such costs and attorney fees of the defendant as may be assessed by the court.

PENALTY FOR FALSE MARKING

SEC. 25. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of deceiving the public, marks upon, or applies to, or uses in advertising in connection with any article made, used, distributed, or sold by him, the design of which is not protected under this Act, a design notice as specified in section 6 or any other words or symbols importing that the design is protected under this Act, knowing that the design is not so protected, shall be fined not more than $500 for every such offense.

(b) Any person may sue for the penalty, in which event one-half shall go to the person suing and the other to the use of the United States.

PENALTY FOR FALSE REPRESENTATION

SEC. 26. Whoever knowingly makes a false representation materially affecting the rights obtainable under this Act for the purpose of obtaining or preventing registration of a design under this Act shall be fined not less than $500 and not more than $1,000, and any rights or privileges he may have in the design under this Act shall be forfeited.

RELATION TO COPYRIGHT LAW

SEC. 27. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, nothing in this Act shall affect any right or remedy now or hereafter held by any person under title 17 of the United States Code.

(b) If the proprietor of the copyright in a pictorial, graphic, or sculptural work in which copyright subsists under title 17 of the United States Code utilizes such work in the design of a useful article and either—

(i) marks the design or article embodying such design with the notice provided for in section 6 of this Act, or

(ii) makes application for registration of such design pursuant to section 9 of this Act

for the purpose of securing the protection afforded by this Act, the design resulting from such utilization shall be, from the date such notice referred to in (i) above is placed on the design or article or from the date such application referred to in (ii) above is made, regarded as an original ornamental design of a useful article, which shall be subject to, and the protection of which shall depend upon compliance with, the provisions of this Act.

RELATION TO PATENT LAW

SEC. 28. (a) Nothing in this Act shall affect any right or remedy available to or held by any person under title 35 of the United States Code.

(b) The issuance of a design patent for an ornamental design under said title 35 shall terminate any protection of the design under this Act.

COMMON LAW AND OTHER RIGHTS UNAFFECTED

SEC. 29. Nothing in this Act shall annul or limit (1) common law or other rights or remedies, if any, available to or held by any person with respect to a design which has not been made known as provided in section 4(b), or (2) any trademark right or right to be protected against unfair competition.

ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 30. The Administrator and Office of the Administrator referred to in this Act shall be such officer and office as the President may designate.

SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 31. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act or the application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT OF COPYRIGHT LAW

SEC. 32. Chapter I of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding the following:

"§ 33. Effect of utilization of copyrighted work in design of useful article.

"(a) When a pictorial graphic or sculptural work in which copyright subsists under this title is utilized in the design of a useful article and the proprietor of such copyright has either—

"(i) marked such design or article embodying such design with the notice provided for in section 6 of the Design Protection and Copyright Preservation Act, or

"(ii) made application to register such design in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of that Act

for the purpose of obtaining the protection of the Design Protection and Copyright Preservation Act, the resulting ornamental design of a useful article shall be, from the date of marking the design or article as referred to in (i) above or from making the application referred to in (ii) above subject to the provisions of that Act and protection of the work as embodied in useful articles shall be governed by the provisions of that Act and not by this title. Nothing in this subsection shall affect any right or remedy held by any person under this title in a work in which copyright was subsisting on the effective date of the Design Protection and Copyright Preservation Act, or in a copyrighted work which has not been utilized in the design or a useful article by the copyright proprietor, or in a work in which copyright now subsists or hereafter is obtained which has been, or which may thereafter be, utilized in the design of a useful article by the copyright proprietor but which has not had the notice referred to in (i) above marked thereon or for which no application as referred to in (ii) above has been made for the purpose of securing the protection afforded by the Design Protection and Copyright Preservation Act or with respect to any utilization of a copyrighted work in the design of an article other than a useful article.

"(b) A 'useful article' as used in this section is an article normally having an intrinsic function other than merely to portray its own appearance or to convey information. An article which is normally a part of a useful article shall be deemed to be a useful article."

AMENDMENT OF OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 33. (a) Subdivision a (2) of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898 (11 U.S.C. 110(a)) is amended by inserting "designs," after "patents," and "design registration," after "application for patent,".

(b) Title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by inserting "designs," after "patents," in the first sentence of section 1338(a);

(2) by inserting ", design," after "patent" in the second sentence of section 1338(a);

(3) by inserting "design," after "copyright," in section 1338(b);

(4) by inserting "and registered designs" after "copyrights" in section 1400; and

(5) by adding at the end of section 1498 a new paragraph as follows:

"This section shall also apply to the case of designs registered under the laws of the United States."

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 34. This Act shall take effect one year after its enactment.

NO RETROACTIVE EFFECT

SEC. 35. Protection under this Act shall not be available for any design that has been made known as provided in section 4(b) prior to the effective date of this Act.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 36. This Act may be cited as "The Design Protection and Copyright Preservation Act of 1960."

The statement presented by Mr. TALMADGE is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Under the present law of the United States, copyright in newspaper features, pictures, strip cartoons, drawings, television and motion picture films, and other works is fully protected for a term of 28 years plus a renewable term of 28 years for a total of 56 years.

At the present time if a copyright owner uses his protected work industrially, commercially, or on useful articles (whether two- or three-dimensional), his copyright is not lost, diminished, or adversely affected (*Mazer* v. *Stein* (1954), 347 U.S. 201, 98 L. Ed. 630, 74 S. Ct. 460). The copyright owner has full and complete copyright protection irrespective of the use to which he puts his copyright work. Under the provisions of legislation pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee (S. 2075), if a copyright owner uses his work industrially, commercially, or on useful articles, he would lose his protection in that field unless he obtained design registration under the proposed act. If he obtained design registration under that act, he would be afforded only a 5-year period of protection on the registered design and his totality of basic copyright protection would be seriously impaired.

If Congress should determine to enact legislation providing for the protection of ornamental and commercial designs, legitimate copyright interests should not be unfairly penalized. The protection now afforded under present copyright law ought not to be lost, impaired, restricted, or diminished.

The measure which I am introducing in the Senate has for its primary purpose the continued protecton of copyright to the full extent now provided under the law of the United States in event registered commercial design legislation should be enacted.

My proposal provides for (1) a 5-year term of protection plus the right to two renewable terms of 5 years each for registered designs and (2) further provides that a copyright owner has the right to choose to come under the proposed Registered Designs Act if he wishes; but his full copyright protection remains intact and inviolate unless he should elect to diminish the protection and term afforded by it by voluntarily registering under the provisions of the Registered Designs Act.

Under design registration laws of some other countries, protection is afforded for a 5-year term plus two renewable terms of 5 years each. I do not think that American nationals should be placed in a less advantageous position than foreign nationals if Congress enacts registered design legislation.

In other words, my proposal undertakes to provide protection for commercial interests concerned only in short-term and limited protection for ornamental designs without unfairly or unjustly injuring or adversely affecting copyright interests which are satisfied with the full protection and term now afforded copyrights under the existing law of our country.

I do not believe that Congress should upset or diminish the present protection afforded by our copyright laws to legitimate copyright interests. Provision can be made for registered commercial designs without prejudice, injury, or hurt to copyright owners. The bill I am introducing makes provision for that just and fair result.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JURISDICTION OVER AMERICANS EMPLOYED BY, OR ACCOMPANYING, OUR ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in four cases yesterday, the Supreme Court freed Americans convicted of baby murder in Germany, wife murder in France, larceny in Morocco, and sodomy in Berlin. Earlier, the Supreme Court ordered the release of two ladies, if they deserve that appellation, who killed their husbands while the latter were serving with the U.S. military forces abroad.

The basis for the Court's ruling in every case was that civilians accompanying the Armed Forces overseas are not subject to trial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This means that unless such defendants are turned over to the French, the Germans, and the Moroccans, as Private Girard was turned over to the Japanese, they will go completely unpunished for their crimes.

There is no law in the books now which gives the U.S. Federal courts jurisdiction over Americans who commit such offenses overseas. With the ruling that these people cannot be tried by court martial, our Government is powerless to act against them unless we turn them over to local authorities, even where no foreign nationals are involved, which would obviously be distasteful to all concerned.

This decision directly affects the safety of almost half a million Americans accompanying our Armed Forces overseas and could lead to many potentially very serious international incidents. In addition, it offends our whole concept of justice to permit such offenders to go scot free.

Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution creating a select committee of the Senate empowered to explore the desirability of amending laws and treaties relating to the jurisdiction of Federal courts over Americans employed by or accompanying our Armed Forces overseas.

The select committee I am proposing would consist of seven members, at least two of whom would be selected from each of the following Senate Committees: Judiciary, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs. The select committee would be directed to make a final report to the Senate no later than June 1 of this session, which should still leave time for final action on any new legislation required prior to adjournment.

Mr. President, I hope that this matter can be acted upon by the Senate before any more of these offenses occur.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government now maintains, and can be expected to continue to maintain, military and civilian installations throughout the world, at which United States personnel must serve as members of the Armed Forces and at which civilians, both United States and foreign, must be employed by the United States, and to which installations and outposts such persons will be accompanied by dependents; and

Whereas the presence of such personnel at such installations has raised questions as to the jurisdiction of military and civilian courts of the United States, and of courts of foreign nations, over such personnel, which affect the constitutional rights of such personnel and the security of the United States; and

Whereas Congress has enacted legislation, and the United States has entered into treaties, defining the jurisdiction of courts over such personnel; and

Whereas recent events have revealed such inadequacies in these statutes and treaties that the rights of individuals, the public interest and the security of the United States have been seriously threatened; and

Whereas existing statutes and treaties affect the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Judiciary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a select committee of the Senate be appointed by the President of the Senate, which is authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry, to take evidence, to review existing statutes and treaties, to make findings and recommendations, legislative or otherwise, and to report to the Senate not later than June 1, 1960, with reference to the desirability of amending existing statutes and treaties and of enacting new legislation relating to the jurisdiction of courts of the United States over persons employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces of the United States outside the territorial limits of the United States, with particular reference to (1) the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and (2) existing statutes relating to crimes committed outside the territorial limits of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That such select committee shall be composed of seven members, at least two of whom shall be selected from the membership of each of the following Senate committees: Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Foreign Relations, and Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF IMPACT ON NATIONAL ECONOMY OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT DISPUTES AND OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING GENERALLY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which would create a bipartisan select committee composed of eight members chosen in equal number from the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Labor and Public Welfare, who would be charged with the duty of conducting an investigation and study of the impact of labor-management disputes and of collective bargaining generally on the national economy, the effects thereof on the well-being of the American public as a whole, and to determine whether any changes are required in our Federal laws in order to protect the national economy and to safeguard the interests of the public.

In 1935, with the adoption of the Wagner Act, it became the national policy to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining. In establishing this policy, it was the primary concern of the Congress, by granting specific benefits to labor unions, to equalize the strength of employees in their economic relations with their employers. In 1947, believing that the scales had tilted too far in the opposite direction, Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley law to provide certain protections for employers against the enormously increased strength of the unions. And finally, in 1959, Congress, in adopting the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, commonly known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, established certain specific safeguards for rank-and-file union members against abuses by their unions and union leaders.

In enacting this legislation over the last quarter of a century, the basic policy of encouraging collective bargaining was always left intact, and the Congress assumed that the reforms provided in the law for the benefit of specific categories of the American public were necessarily in the interest of the public as a whole.

But the recent steel strike has caused considerable uneasiness among large numbers of the citizenry. In the face of the unending inflation which has persisted since the end of World War II, many are asking whether our public policy and legislation dealing with labor-management relations are really adequate to safeguard the public interest. Some are wondering, whether in its zeal to encourage collective bargaining, Congress has not created a condition in which the public interest is forgotten and only the interests of the parties to the negotiations receive any legislative protection, or even attention.

I myself have experienced these doubts. So in an effort to learn more about this problem, I requested several Government agencies for information and data concerning the impact of work stoppages and labor-management contract settlements on the national economy and their effect on the public interest. I was shocked to discover that not a single Government agency is engaged in conducting studies along these lines. A significant aspect of one of the most important domestic problems facing our country is being completely ignored. I therefore came to the inescapable conclusion, that unless the Congress itself engages in such an investigation and study, none will be made.

In my opinion, the basic question is this: How is the public interest to be effectively protected, not only in those labor-management controversies which result in interruptions of production, but in the settlements and agreements which result from the normal and peaceful procedures of collective bargaining?

Mr. President, if we do not presently devote some thought and study to finding a solution to this problem, we may, in the next national emergency resulting from a labor dispute, find ourselves confronted with an overwhelming and uninformed demand for extensive and permanent intervention and participation by the Federal Government in the settling of labor disputes and the writing of collective bargaining agreements. That would mean the end of our free enterprise system. But I am confident that an answer can be found which will be consistent with our political and economic tradition. It is for that reason I propose that the Congress investigate and study the situation.

The problem is fundamentally an economic one. That is why I ask that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce participate. But it also involves the relations between labor and management, and hence requires the attention of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as well. It affects all of us beyond all partisan considerations, and therefore, as I have provided, it should be approached on a bipartisan basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 254) submitted by Mr. GOLDWATER was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation and study of the impact of labor-management disputes and of collective bargaining generally on the national economy, and the effects thereof on the well-being of the American public as a whole, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the national economy and to safeguard the interests of the public.

SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall consist of eight members to be appointed by the Vice President, selected in equal numbers from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and two members from each committee shall be Members of the majority and two of the minority of the Senate. At its first meeting, to be called by the Vice President, the select committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman, and adopt rules of procedures not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 3. (a) The select committee shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1961, inclusive, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

(b) Upon the filing of its final report the select committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) take such testimony; (5) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (6) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it may deem necessary and appropriate; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees, work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $———, and shall be paid upon vouchers by the chairman of the select committee.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BEALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. THURMOND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSERVATION OF ANADROMOUS FISH SPAWNING AREAS IN SALMON RIVER, IDAHO—AMENDMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I submit an amendment to be proposed to Senate bill 2586, which I call the Salmon River preservation bill.

This bill is now pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. When I introduced it last year, it was drafted by its terms to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from licensing any dam on the Salmon River in Idaho which would have a more restrictive effect upon the passage of anadromous fish than any existing dam already constructed on the Columbia River downstream from the mouth of the Salmon River. It also provided protection for the reproduction of the salmon in the upper reaches of the Salmon River and its tributaries, by prohibiting the construction, under FPC license, of any dam, regardless of its height, which would flood the established spawning grounds of these fish. The bill also required the Secretary of the Interior to report to the Congress any developments in fish passage facilities or techniques, which, in his judgment, would justify changing or lifting the restrictions contained in the proposed law.

The amendment I am submitting today is intended to further strengthen the original bill. The language is changed to prohibit the licensing of any dam on the Salmon River, whether high or low, and whether or not such dam would prove more or less restrictive to the passage of salmon than existing downstream structures. As amended, the bill would keep this famed wilderness river open and unobstructed until such time as the fish passage problem has been satisfactorily solved.

The nursery areas for Chinook salmon in Idaho are found in the high mountain valleys of the central part of the State. The Middle Fork of the Salmon, widely known as "the river of no return," runs almost entirely through primitive areas from its headwaters in Bear Valley, including its tributaries, Sulphur Creek, Marsh Creek, Loon Creek, and Big Creek. The main Salmon, which rises in the uplands of the Sawtooth Mountains, and its tributaries like Yankee Fork Creek, the Pahsimeroi, and the Lemhi, also have retained their natural character.

This vast nursery area is of immense significance to the great anadromous fish resource of the Northwest. No other river system contributes so greatly to the Chinook runs. No other river system has so long escaped the works of man.

No amount of protection in the spawning areas avails us if the fish cannot get to them. The people of the region appreciate this fact. They want the Salmon River preserved. The support for the basic objective of my bill expressed at the hearing which the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], held at Lewiston, Idaho, last November, was overwhelming. More than 50 witnesses testified, and their testimony was eloquent. But a number of these witnesses expressed concern that the original bill did not go far enough to accomplish its objective.

While the low dams now in existence downstream from the mouth of the Salmon do not prevent the passage of the parent fish or of the fingerlings, the evidence was that they do exact a toll. In its cumulative effect, this toll may become very damaging. The attrition of a series of low dams, were they to be built on the Salmon River, would, in this same cumulative effect, seriously endanger the anadromous fish runs, the experts said.

This amendment would meet the objection by prohibiting the construction of any dam on the Salmon River, whether high or low, until such time as the fish problem has been solved.

Solutions to the fish problem are being sought vigorously, for it is now widely appreciated that the anadromous fishery resource in the Columbia River Basin is a major natural resource. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers, gives as his opinion that 15 years may be required to find solutions. If this bill is enacted, the Congress will express its will that the solution to the fish problem be in hand before any structures are built on the Salmon River, whether for power, flood control, or otherwise.

Fortunately, such a prohibition against dam construction on the Salmon River will have no detrimental effect on the

economy or the growth of Idaho or the Northwest. For many years to come, we have sufficient damsites available on our other major rivers to provide all of the water storage, the power, the flood control, and the navigational benefits that the growing needs of the Northwest may require. By the time that these damsites, located mainly on rivers that have already been obstructed by dams, are fully developed, it is to be hoped that the fish passage problem will have been satisfactorily solved. In the meantime, if this bill is enacted into law, the Salmon River will have been kept open and its salmon run will have been saved.

The Clearwater River in Idaho was once a major Chinook stream, but in 1923, a small dam without facilities for the passage of the migrating fish was built at Lewiston. The Chinook no longer use the Clearwater in significant numbers, notwithstanding that a fish ladder has since been installed.

The lesson is obvious. When nature's inexplicable cycle in these fish is interrupted, it may well be beyond the power of man to undo the damage.

Mr. President, I shall exert every effort to secure favorable action on the Salmon River preservation bill—to save the river in its pristine state, while there is still time, and to keep the spawning beds in the vast wild areas of central Idaho unspoiled, until man's ingenuity learns the way to move the adult salmon upstream and the fingerlings downstream, through and around the barriers which he may install in the future.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill as it will read with the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The bill (S. 2586) to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, as proposed to be amended, is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the fact that the Salmon River and its tributaries constitute one of the principal spawning areas of anadromous fish from the Pacific Ocean, it is the purpose of this Act to prohibit, unless or until future developments justify a change in this policy, the authorization of dams and reservoirs or structures on the Salmon River that would restrict the passage of such fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission shall not issue any permit, license, lease, or other authorization under the provisions of the Federal Power Act for any dam, reservoir, conduit, powerhouse, or other works for the storage or collection of water or the development of power on the Salmon River in Idaho in any case in which any such proposed works would restrict the passage of anadromous fish, or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress any developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams and reservoirs that in his opinion justify amending the provisions of this Act.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES ACT OF 1960—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2810) amending the National Labor Relations Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by me for myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on January 14, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2830) to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 14, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2840) to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center, introduced by me on January 18, 1960.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 13, 1960, the names of Senators HENNINGS, SYMINGTON, MANSFIELD, BIBLE, BEALL, PROUTY, FONG, SCOTT, CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, ROBERTSON, HRUSKA, PROXMIRE, MURRAY, DODD, SPARKMAN, SCHOEPPEL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, GRUENING, JACKSON, MCGEE, ALLOTT, BYRD of Virginia, KUCHEL, THURMOND, YOUNG of North Dakota, MOSS, NEUBERGER, CURTIS, BENNETT, COOPER, CASE of New Jersey, SALTONSTALL, RANDOLPH, CANNON, CLARK, KEATING, LONG of Hawaii, KEFAUVER, and YARBOROUGH were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 148) to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) on January 13, 1960.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JORDAN:

Address on the subject "The Challenge of Citizenship," by Senator RANDOLPH, delivered before the 14th National Conference on Citizenship, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 19, 1959.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Address entitled "State, School, and Child in Today's World," delivered by him at South Dakota Educational Association Convention, Aberdeen, S. Dak., November 4, 1959, and Spearfish, S. Dak., November 5, 1959.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Telegram dated January 14, 1960, from the Soviet news agency Tass, addressed to Senator FULBRIGHT; and his reply to the aforementioned telegram, dated January 18, 1960, relating to Premier Khrushchev's address to Supreme Soviet.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "The Real Cost of Milk," published in the Dairy Record of January 13, 1960.

IS THE UNITED STATES TO BE SECOND BEST?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries an article, written by the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, which is a thoughtful and provocative analysis of this administration's national policies.

Mr. Lippmann observes, under a general heading of "The Second Best," that while our country is still much richer than the Soviet Union "we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the lifegiving principle of national power."

I commend this article to each Member of Congress, but even more do I commend it to the careful attention of each responsible member of this administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1960]

THE SECOND BEST

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has been true to the principle he laid down in his first budget, which was submitted on January 21, 1954. "We will reduce" he said 6 years ago, "the share of the national income which is spent by the Government."

He has done that. Although the Federal Government is spending on the purchase of goods and services more than it did 6 years ago, this is a smaller share of the much in-

creased national income. Even when we add the very considerable increased amount spent by local and State governments, the total is still a smaller share than it was in 1953, when the President was preparing his first budget.

So the President is entitled to say that he has been faithful to the principle he laid down when he began. During his term of office, the American people have been enjoying a larger share of a greatly enlarged national income. Never before in all history have so many people in any country had so much money to spend privately and as they saw fit.

This would be an unalloyed delight were it not for the disturbing fact that during these years of private prosperity the President has been presiding over the loss of American primacy among the great powers of the world.

There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union. But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the lifegiving principle of national power.

Why has this happened? Why are we challenged in this way when, in fact, the Soviet Union has a gross national product which is less than half of ours and a standard of living about a third as high as our own? Why is this richer country being pressed by a poorer country?

The reason, at bottom, is that in this period of cold war the President has adhered to a principle which would probably no longer be suitable even in a time of total peace. He has adhered to a principle which puts private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. The challenge of the Soviet Union has been demanding an increase, not a reduction, of the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run.

The Soviet economy is growing at a rate which, estimated conservatively, is 6 percent per annum. Our economy has been growing at a rate of less than 3 percent. The Soviet economy is half as big as ours but it is growing twice as fast. This means that this year's increment of increase is about $12 billion in the U.S.S.R. and about $15 billion in the United States.

But, and this is the crux of the matter, the U.S.S.R. will use most, not all, of the $12 billion increase for national purposes, for armaments, for productive investments, for foreign aid, and for national education. We on the other hand, are acting on the Eisenhower principle, and are spending a greater share of our $15 billion increase for private purposes, for the making of consumer goods and of the factories and facilities connected with the making and use of consumer goods.

That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States.

I have taken this analysis of the figures from several sources but chiefly from the brilliant and notable testimony before the joint committee of Congress given last autumn by Prof. W. W. Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The analysis is confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Allen W. Dulles based on the findings of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. Dulles' statement is one that we must all ponder and take to heart. It says "the major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized industrial, military, and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of the consumer type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our respective gross national products nor of our respective industrial productions is a true yardstick of our relative national power positions.

"The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

I have quoted the last sentence of Mr. Dulles' statement because it states, so it seems to me, the fundamental issue which the country must meet. The President's controlling principle—that the Government should spend a smaller share of a growing national income—has as its consequence, in this age of cold war and national rivalry, that the country will have a smaller position of influence and power in the world. While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what must not be allowed to come to an end is our parity with the greatest powers. For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

Nobody can say as yet when the Nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency.

The voices that will serve this country, and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things. They may not as yet do well in the Gallup polls. They will be listened to sooner or later. For they will shatter the belief, now so prevalent among us, that affluence is greatness. It is not. In the history of human societies it has not seldom been the case that when riches were devoted to luxury it was the mark of their decline.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield briefly for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, although I also wish to request the printing at this point in the RECORD of an editorial which appears in today's press.

Mr. GRUENING. I wonder whether it is the editorial which was published this morning in the Washington Post, and which constitutes a very thoughtful analysis of the inadequacies of the President's budget. I hope the Senator from Texas will also request that that editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am about to do so.

Mr. President, the principal editorial of today's Washington Post deals similarly with this subject matter, in the context of the 1961 fiscal year budget. It, too, observes that there are objectives that may be more important to our national survival, growth, and welfare than budget surpluses.

I request unanimous consent that this editorial also be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1960]

THE CALL THAT NEVER CAME

The President said it all in his first sentence. "With this message, transmitting the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1961, I invite the Congress to join with me in a determined effort to achieve a substantial surplus." From beginning to end it is as if nothing else mattered nearly so much. The administration's final energies apparently are to be consecrated to the attainment of a budget surplus. Seldom has its narrow view of Federal economic responsibilities and of the Nation's priority needs been more unabashedly acknowledged. A surplus would indeed be appropriate and helpful in fiscal 1961—but it ought not to be the focus of the Government's planning, as Mr. Eisenhower thus has made it.

It is difficult to see how or why the President thinks his budget attests to the strength of America's economy. The Treasury estimates of gross national product and of corporate earnings on which the $84 billion revenue forecast is founded are plainly ultraconservative. If there is any expectation—as there ought to be—that the Nation can or will experience relatively full employment in the next 18 months, receipts should be measurably higher. (Despite the steel strike, revenues this year are now expected to run $1.5 billion higher than foreseen a year ago, and it is likely that the Treasury again is playing it safe.)

As for spending the President's expenditure estimates hardly constitute an affirmation of faith in the Nation's capacities. The figures are the lowest of all the Eisenhower years in terms of national income—even if the conservative official forecasts are accepted. The $79.8 billion spending program would amount to just 18 percent of the national income, compared with 19 percent for the current fiscal year and an average of 20 percent for the years since 1954. Spending in the coming year could be increased by as much as $9 billion and not exceed the Eisenhower average, in these terms.

Thus a budget more in keeping with national needs in defense, education, research, public health and welfare, and foreign economic assistance would seem easily within reach on the only terms that count: the Nation's ability to pay for it. At truly full employment and with a minimum program of tax reform—including the postal rate and gasoline tax increases which the President properly insists upon—such a budget could be balanced and might well include a surplus for debt retirement.

Spending this year was depressed in so many areas of Federal activity that it is not surprising to find instances in which outlays for 1961 show slight increases. Given last year's policy of no new starts on water resources projects, for example, the 42 projects for which initial funds are proposed in the new budget look like progress. Measured against national needs, this is a faltering half step. The increased outlays for basic research of various kinds are extremely modest.

The aid-to-education programs contain little that is more realistic or workable than the proposals of a year ago. Here among all the challenges to national enterprise is where a substantial increase in Federal spending is not only desperately needed, but also would pay enormous dividends. And so on through the dreary recital: still no significant acceleration of nuclear power development, of urban renewal projects, of stream pollution control, of public housing, and of many other programs in which the national shortfalls are evident and growing.

The defense budget calls for reductions in overall weapons procurement, extensive cutbacks in the Strategic Air Command's bomber strength, and a 47-ship reduction in authorized naval strength. The snail's paced modernization of the Army is to be slightly accelerated, it appears, but nothing is projected for more adequate airlift or for the other requirements of an ample limited war capability. The increased procurement of intercontinental ballistic missiles is heartening but regrettably the major emphasis in the next 2 or 3 years must be on missiles relatively vulnerable to a surprise attack.

The reductions in bomber strength may simply be an accommodation to the realities of improved Russian defenses. But it ought not to be imagined that missiles are yet ready to take over the bomber's role. The budget begins to reflect the imminence—perhaps indeed the presence—of the much-advertised gap in American strategic power. A 50-percent increase in authorizations for the civilian space agency's programs may ultimately help to shorten the long Russian lead in this field, but this is by no means a "crash program" to achieve American parity in space exploration.

The proposed foreign economic aid programs add to impressive totals, but far too small a sum is yet being committed to the basic development programs which the have-not nations so desperately require to achieve the breakthrough to self-sustained growth. This makes all the more desirable the plan to focus economic aid in a few areas. Military aid appropriation requests are somewhat higher, but a decline in actual spending next year is forecast. The recommendations of the Draper committee for more expeditious modernization of NATO forces seem finally to be receiving recognition, however.

Few of the President's legislative recommendations are new. We have previously supported many of them, such as the proposal to equalize military retirement pay, to repeal the American reservation on the jurisdiction of the World Court and to remove the interest ceiling on Government bonds. These and several others deserve the close attention of Congress.

As for the budget itself, Congress has already greeted it on the familiar pattern. Representatives TABER and CANNON, of course, promise that it will be further reduced. A disappointing number of Democrats have contended themselves with observing that the postal rate and gasoline tax increases cannot be approved and that therefore the budget surplus may prove illusory. A few have suggested that urgent programs may get more funds, but last year's reduction in the funds for space exploration is not an encouraging omen. Until the vast sum of unmet national needs is faced, limited goals like the achievement of a surplus or the reduction of an indicated deficit will probably continue to shape Federal budgets.

The call to a peacetime greatness of national purpose comes hard. In President Eisenhower's 7 years it has not come at all. Now, with the outlines of the final chapter written there is little to do but frame the great issues anew for national reappraisal and, hopefully, a fresh start next January. In this budget message, the Republicans presumably have taken their ground. The appeal is narrow—and in these times, exceedingly dangerous.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the budget message sent to the Congress yesterday is inadequate in its provisions for education, for public health, for research and development, and for national defense; and it is also inadequate in its plans with respect to our position in, and our relationship with, the rest of the world.

A year ago this month the present administration admitted that it was actually planning to let the Soviet Union attain a long lead in the new weapons.

Today, so as to further our unprecedented life of luxury and consumer comforts, this administration further admits, through the proposed budget in question, that we are planning to pass over to the Soviets, leadership in such additional fields as education, technological progress, and production incident to the development of our natural resources.

In summary, therefore, this administration is now, in effect, planning that this Nation become a second-rate power; and all of the various reports by qualified individuals—the Gaither report and the Johns Hopkins, Stanford, and Rockefeller reports, and so forth, plus many statements by Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency—prove that to be true.

I have just returned from a trip to Africa, the Middle East, and Europe. Anyone who makes such a trip can see at first hand the decline in our prestige. What is nevertheless surprising, however, is the speed and degree of that decline.

If these conditions continue, it will not be long before the future of the United States will depend a great deal upon the concepts of justice and mercy as expressed by the rulers in Moscow and Peiping.

Today the United States is no longer the No. 1 military power.

If present policies and programs continue, tomorrow we shall be second also in economic and technological strength: and that unfortunate development can only grow as we plan to fall further behind in educational effort.

These compose the psychological forces which will be present at the peace table.

Recently a great author, formerly close to this administration, wrote that: "Power plus principles equal policy."

As we continue this sad relative decline in at least part of that formula, for all the world to see, it will be interesting to watch what concrete results are attained at the summit conference next May.

In an effort to justify this budget, there has been much talk about the danger of planning to place our future generations in debt. Is not that preferable to planning to place them in bondage?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his excellent statement. Evidence of what the Senator has said about putting the United States in second place and Russia's gaining over us is being demonstrated in several aspects. We find in the type of budget sent to Congress yesterday very striking evidence of that kind.

Last year there was nothing in the budget for any power development on the Yukon River in Alaska. We managed to introduce an item of $100,000 to begin surveys of the greatest damsite left on the North American Continent, the Rampart Canyon, northwest of Fairbanks. The Corps of Engineers stated last year it could usefully utilize $100,000. When the item of $50,000 to which amount the corps' estimate had been reduced by the Congress, was placed in the public works bill and sent to the White House, it was vetoed. It was vetoed a second time when that item had been further reduced to $48,750.

Fortunately, Congress, with wisdom and vision, provided that amount so that a study of Rampart could be made. The study was begun. The geologists were on the job last fall. For fiscal 1961 the corps found it could use $350,000. This is not a great deal of money to request for a project of such importance and potential benefit—benefit not merely to Alaska but to our entire Nation. The budget, however, contains a pitiful item for that purpose, having reduced the amount to about one-fifth of that required.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who has always been interested in the physical, scientific, and technological development of the United States.

I think one way to further industrial development is by the development of hydroelectric power, in view of the fact that one of our great needs in the future will be fresh water. The Soviet Union continues to develop its water resources at an increasing rate. In addition, they have given the Arab Republic substantial assistance toward building the Aswan Dam.

I congratulate the Senator for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I desire to add a word to the colloquy I have had with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, to point out the great contrast exhibited in the President's paltry recommendation that we appropriate only $75,000 for the development of the most important hydro site remaining in the Western Hemisphere under the American flag, whereas the Army Engineers have said they could usefully use nearly five times that amount, or some $350,000.

Mr. President, I was a member of a special Senate committee, representing both the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, which last fall visited Russia and Siberia. We were deeply impressed and at the same time appalled by the tremendous progress which the Soviet Government is making in harnessing its hydroelectric power. They are determined to overtake and outrun us in the economic race.

We saw on the Volga a dam, completed 2 years ago, which was larger in its power production than Grand Coulee, which, at the time of its completion, under the sponsorship of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the largest dam in the world, with an installed capacity of 1.9 million kilowatts. The dam we saw at Kuibyshev, on the Volga, had an installed capacity of 2.4 million kilowatts. It was completed 2 years ago.

Farther down on the river we saw already in operation, although not fully completed, a still larger dam at Stalingrad, with an installed capacity of 2½ million kilowatts.

When we went to Siberia, at Bratsk we saw nearing completion on the Angara River a dam almost twice as large, with an installed capacity of 4.5 million kilowatts.

Farther down on the river, at Novosibirsk, a dam is under construction which will have an installed capacity of 5 million kilowatts. These are only a few examples, and I am not going to take the time of the Senate now to go into details as to what the Kremlin is doing to develop its natural hydro resources. The details will be found in the very excellent report issued by the special subcommittee which made the trip to which I have referred. However, it is striking and shocking that while we ought to be worried about Soviet Russian progress, we are doing next to nothing about it. At the very same time, I repeat, we are denying proper progress and proper development to our own hydroelectric resources. At the rate of progress which may be anticipated from the budget's $75,000 item it will take 15 years to complete the rampart study. The Corps of Engineers, given the funds it needs, could complete it in 3 years.

The administration, which is asking for an increase in foreign aid spending in this same budget, an increase of nearly $1 million is authorizing surveys and studies, and construction of hydro dams in countries all over the world. This is indeed a shocking contrast. The Eisenhower administration takes the position that whatever is needed for development in foreign countries is desirable and sacrosanct. Congress has repeatedly been told by the White House not to cut a nickel from foreign aid, but that whatever is needed at home of a similar nature is wasteful, extravagant, and would unbalance the budget.

I think it is high time, Mr President, that we erect a standard which would make clear that the people of the United States are entitled at least to equal treatment with those in foreign countries. That is not a policy of which this administration approves, but it is one which the American people should insist upon, and I for one will do all within my limited powers to work toward that goal.

LINCOLN DAY WEEK—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and in order that Senators may be put on notice, I wish to announce that the leadership has an agreement concerning Lincoln Day absences.

I am pleased to announce that we shall expect no rollcalls during Lincoln Day week, following Wednesday, February 10. In other words, we will have a session Wednesday, February 10; and if we have a session on Thursday or Friday, we will not expect any rollcalls before the following Monday, the 15th. We may have sessions those days, but Members may arrange speaking engagements out of town after Wednesday, if they desire.

To repeat, Senators may feel free Thursday and Friday of that week. We will try to protect Members of the Senate from rollcalls on those days. We will expect rollcalls, if possible, not before February 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to express my own personal appreciation and that of Members on this side of the aisle for this courtesy. Lincoln Day dinners have now become traditional everywhere in the country, and the time and period over which they run have been expanded in recent years. This opportunity to attend them without missing any important record votes we deeply appreciate. I thank the majority leader for the courtesy. I appreciate he has a schedule in the Senate to maintain, that there is a heavy workload, that there are some impediments which make that schedule a little difficult to follow. That fact only sharpens my appreciation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

I should like the Senate to be on notice that after consideration of the pending bill, we shall probably consider Order No. 819, Senate bill 694, the authors of which are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. That bill is to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

I wish the appropriate secretaries of the Senate would notify any interested Senators.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the sixth annual report to President Eisenhower from the Committee on Government Contracts was recently made public. This report is somewhat different from the usual Government report in that it not only chronicles the Committee's activities and accomplishments of the past year, but also offers some assessments of the future in terms of the Committee's program and objectives.

The Government Contracts Committee, which is headed by Vice President NIXON, was established by President Eisenhower in 1953 and is charged with responsibility for monitoring the standard clause in all Government contracts which forbids discrimination in employment on Government projects on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin.

The Committee report demonstrates that commendable progress is being made in the removal of discrimination in Federal contract work. It also establishes a challenge to employers, educators, vocational counselors, and parents to assist the nonwhite segment of our labor force in acquiring the skills and training which will be needed in the promotion of the Nation's whole economy during the 1960's.

The theme of this report is set in the opening paragraph of its introduction, which reads:

> It is of paramount importance that all of our Nation's manpower should be effectively used. We cannot afford to neglect any part of the potential contribution of our nonwhite population. It comprises over 18 million people, or more than the total population of Canada.

The report places particular stress on the economic importance of the utmost utilization of the Nation's basic resource, manpower, which means that there is a great deal more involved than the moral righteousness of nondiscrimination in employment. It means that the Nation's economy cannot stand any waste of the skills and talents which are offered by the nonwhite segment of America's labor force.

Mr. President, I know that this report will be of interest to many Members. However, since copies of the full report are available at the Committee's office, I request that only the introduction to the report and an article in the New York Times summarizing its contents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

INTRODUCTION

The situation today and tomorrow

It is of paramount importance that all of our Nation's manpower should be effectively used. We cannot afford to neglect any part of the potential contribution of our nonwhite population. It comprises over 18 million people, or more than the total population of Canada.

The President's Committee on Government Contracts helps qualified minority group members to obtain equal job opportunities in work provided by Government contract funds. Thus, it aids our national economy today, and in the measure of its success it can help our Nation still more tomorrow.

To develop the Committee's program effectively we must relate it, of course, to the overall growth of our economy. We must also take note of emerging trends within the labor force to determine whether we are concentrating on the long-term problems as well as those which call for immediate corrective action. Occupational shifts within the labor force, resulting from our changing technology and growing population, make it essential that the Committee redouble its efforts to insure that the Nation's basic resource—manpower—is effectively used.

The labor force in the sixties

There will be an appreciable growth in the Nation's labor force through the next decade, with fairly rapid changes in its internal composition. According to recent studies by the U.S. Department of Labor, our labor force will probably expand from 73.6 to 86.1 million in the next decade. Further, in this net addition of 13.5 million workers, the major proportion will consist either of young workers, under 25 years, or older workers over 45. A small component of this increase, actually fewer than a million, will fall into what statisticians call the prime working group, those between the ages 25 to 44. This primary working group is the one which has had the most training and possesses most of the skills we need.

Since we will have to depend upon very young as well as older workers, the problems of vocational guidance, of training and retraining are of paramount importance.

Our nonwhite population increased more rapidly between 1940 and 1950 than our white population. The former increased 22 percent; the latter 14 percent. Census estimates of the composition of our labor force in 1958 show a very high proportion of Negro men under 20 and over 45. Further, Negro women of all ages have a higher rate of participation in the labor force. If these trends continue, there will clearly be a substantial increase in our nonwhite labor force. This increase will be concentrated in the younger and older male Negro worker and female Negro worker groups.

Employers who will still be looking for male, white, under age 45 workers will be in trouble in the next decade. These sought-for types of workers simply will not be available in the numbers required.

A further complication will arise from changes in the composition of the labor force. The Labor Department's projections for the 1960's show that the most significant increase in employment will be in occupations requiring more training and education. The American economy will require an increasee of nearly 50 percent in professional and technical occupations, 20 percent in the numbers of proprietors and managers, 25 percent in the clerical and sales force, 23 percent in the numbers of skilled craftsmen, and 25 percent more service workers. The increase projected for semiskilled workers is only 15 percent, however, and no increase is foreseen for laborers.

Importance of education

Workers entering the labor force tomorrow will face more demanding entrance requirements. It will become increasingly difficult for young workers without a high school education to obtain their first or entrance job, and when they are successful in obtaining it, to achieve promotion to better jobs. Yet 7½ out of the 26 million new workers who will be in the labor force in the 1960's will be without a high-school education, according to the Labor Department's projections—and a high proportion of these 7½ million workers will be Negroes.

While the differences in educational attainment between Negroes and whites have diminished, they have not been eliminated. Recent Census Bureau data indicate that 80 percent of white children between ages 14–17 are attending high school, while only 65 percent of Negro children in the same age group are enrolled.

The disparity in education which continues to handicap Negroes will become a more serious drawback as occupational needs develop in the next 10 years. Our national leaders, be they colored or white, will have to make added efforts to convince Negro parents to keep their children in school so that they can compete for employment more effectively.

Educational conferences

The Committee's educational activities have been aimed at this problem. The Youth Training-Incentives Conference of 1957 and the Minority Community Resources Conference of 1958 sought to inform Negro leaders throughout the Nation of the changing economic climate. We have been seeking their assistance to marshal the resources of the home, the church, the school and the community to impress Negro youth with the necessity for better educational preparation. The Committee also has conferred with school officials representing some 25 metropolitan areas with substantial Negro populations on the inadequacy of the vocational guidance provided for minority youth, in an effort to meet the demands of the present, and more important, the immediate future.

The Committee is seeking to stimulate the use of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with its provision for special vocational guidance to help Negro youth to meet the demands of the changing labor market.

Employment trends

The greatest increases in employment will be in the professional, technical, managerial, clerical, sales, and service jobs. All these require preparatory training. The trend is unmistakable. In 1956, for the first time in the history of this country, white-collar jobs exceeded the number of blue-collar jobs in the American economy. The increase in white-collar jobs continues.

Even within the blue-collar job group new forces are operating which will create grave problems for the Negro worker unless he can adapt himself to these changes. Many factory jobs are being automated. To continue to hold even semiskilled positions, workers in the future will have to have a higher degree of literacy. These automated jobs require that the worker be able to read complex measuring instruments, maintain clearly detailed records, and in general operate machines which will be more demanding than today's production equipment.

White-collar jobs have never been readily available to Negroes. In 1958 approximately 12 percent of male Negroes were employed in professional, managerial, clerical, and other white-collar occupations as compared to 6 percent in 1940. However, in the same year almost 40 percent of male white workers were employed in these occupations.

The proportion of Negro women in white-collar positions presents an equally sharp contrast. In 1959 only 23,000 or nine-tenths of 1 percent were in sales positions as compared to 8 percent, or more than 1,500,000 white women. In clerical positions there were 7½ percent, or fewer than 200,000 Negro women as contrasted to 31.8 percent or nearly 6 million white women.

Most of the Government contractors within its jurisdiction are in the manufacturing industries. But labor force statistics show that job opportunities in manufacturing are decreasing. However, job opportunities in service, finance, and Government are increasing and will continue to do so through the next decade. The Committee will therefore emphasize the integration of minority groups into white-collar positions.

Direct consultations

A nondiscriminatory employment policy in itself does not lead to the achievement of an integrated work force. The employer must act to break through the cake of custom by making initial placements in positions traditionally denied to Negroes. Such deliberate breakthroughs are necessary because minority group workers are normally reluctant to risk the possibility of yet another turndown in applying for such jobs. The responsibility of a contractor in carrying on a merit employment policy cannot rest upon his simple declaration. The procedures involved in making such an initial breakthrough are often difficult, and the Committee has found that its assistance at this point is appreciated.

Emphasis is being placed on the program of direct negotiation with major contractors in order to facilitate this highly important first action in implementing a merit policy.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1959]

JOBS FOR NEGROES EXPECTED TO RISE—BUT LACK OF TRAINING MAY HURT THEM IN NEXT DECADE, ANTIBIAS GROUP REPORTS

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, December 26.—Negro workers will be needed for an expanding labor force in the next decade, but may suffer from lack of adequate education and training.

This was forecast today by the President's Committee on Government Contracts, which strives to end racial discrimination by companies doing work for the Government. It filed its sixth annual report with the President.

The report cited Labor Department statistics to show that the economy would need more and more white-collar and technical employees, and relatively fewer laborers and semiskilled production workers.

Negroes have always had trouble getting the more important jobs, the report noted. In 1958, almost 40 percent of male white workers had white-collar jobs, against only 12 percent of Negro men.

A SHARPER CONTRAST

The contrast was even sharper for women workers. About 40 percent of whites were in clerical or sales jobs, against 8 percent of Negro women.

The Committee indicated that racial prejudice was a major factor in keeping Negroes out of clerical, technical, and managerial work. For that reason, it said, it would emphasize integration into white-collar positions from now on.

Committee activities in opening white-collar jobs to Negroes have been disclosed recently. It has won what it terms "significant breakthroughs" by persuading several large southern employers to hire their first Negroes as secretaries, chemists, and for similar posts.

The report went beyond the question of racial barriers imposed by employers. It emphasized that Negroes must have the background and skill to deserve better jobs.

"While the differences in educational attainment between Negroes and whites have diminished," it said, "they have not been eliminated.

"Recent Census Bureau data indicate that 80 percent of white children between ages 14 and 17 are attending high school, while only 65 percent of Negro children in the same age group are enrolled.

"The disparity in education, which continues to handicap Negroes, will become a more serious drawback as occupational needs develop in the next 10 years."

CALLED VICIOUS CIRCLE

The problem is something of a vicious circle, the Committee indicated. Negroes will not be encouraged to finish high school and get further specialized training unless they have confidence that better jobs will be open to them, it implied.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who is chairman of the Committee, issued a statement terming the report a challenge to the country.

"Pessimistic estimates with respect to the availability of trained Negro workers during the next decade can be reduced through education and training," he said.

"These estimates constitute a challenge to the Nation's educators, vocational guidance counselors, and employers, as well as to Negro students and parents.

"Added efforts must be made to help Negro parents to keep their children in school so that they can compete for employment more effectively."

The growing need for Negro workers was explained by the Committee in terms of population changes.

The nonwhite population of the country has been growing more rapidly than the white, the report said, and there will not be enough white employees, especially young men, for the estimated rise in the labor force from 73 million to 86 million in the next decade.

"Employers who will still be looking for male, white, under-age-45 workers will be in trouble in the next decade," the report said. "These sought-for types of workers simply will not be available in the numbers required."

But the real need, it emphasized, will be for more highly trained employees.

The Committee noted that in 1956, for the first time, white-collar jobs exceeded manual or blue-collar jobs. Even production workers will need a higher degree of literacy as factories become automated, the report added.

The Committee was set up to enforce a provision in Government contracts requiring a contractor to hire without regard to race. It has no real enforcement powers except publicity and persuasion.

Until recently it focused efforts on getting companies to agree in principle on nondiscrimination. Signs were posted and agreements made, but the Committee found that Negroes often were not hired except for menial work.

A new program, adopted since the appointment of Irving Ferman as Executive Vice Chairman last summer, has Committee officials persuading companies to take on their first Negro clerical and professional help.

The report lists several plants that have done so in the last year. Among them are the Martin Co. in Orlanda, Fla.; Southern California Edison Co. in Los Angeles; Kaiser Aluminum Co. in Baton Rouge, La.; and the Convair Division of the General Dynamics Corp. in Fort Worth, Tex.

A WELL-MERITED TRIBUTE TO DR. DOOLEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased today to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and others in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 148. This joint resolution would authorize the President to present to the incomparable Dr. Thomas A. Dooley a special gold medal in recognition of his heroic services to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and other newly emerging nations.

The presentation of this medal provides a concrete means for the American people to express their admiration and high esteem for the dedicated humanitarian crusade of this man. Dr. Dooley's selfless efforts to wipe out disease and want among peoples least well equipped for such a fight is a shining example of the splendid American in action. His work has done much to raise America's standing in the world community and all of us should be grateful for his supreme work.

Because Dr. Dooley symbolizes the best that is in America, because he is working unceasingly to fight disease and ignorance in the less well developed nations of the world, and because the American people yearn for the opportunity to express their gratitude to him, this medal is a well-merited and fitting idea. I am delighted to join in sponsoring this joint resolution and hope it will receive the early and favorable consideration it deserves.

LYNDON JOHNSON "VICTORY" DEPLORED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend to the careful and thoughtful reading of my colleagues an editorial carried in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 16, 1960. This editorial throws the editorial support of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch squarely behind those of us who are fighting for a strong and responsible Democratic Party program in the Senate.

Mr. President, no man can question the dedication to principle of this newspaper that has so brilliantly lived up to the legacy of Joseph Pulitzer who, on April 10, 1907, willed to the Post-Dispatch this great platform, and said:

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles, that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the January 16, 1960, editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TOO MUCH POWER

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S victory over the hardy handful of liberal Democratic Senators who are trying to cut the majority leader's powers down to size is as unfortunate for the country as it is for the U.S. Senate and the Democratic Party. For what is fundamentally at stake here is whether the majority shall present a strong legislative program and fight for it vigorously, or whether it shall continue presenting only disjointed proposals which have been timorously watered down to avoid a Presidential veto.

The reforms which had been proposed were both fair and moderate. Senator GORE, of Tennessee, proposed that the Democratic policy committee, which decides when legislation shall be considered, should be enlarged from 9 to 15 Members by election, and should be so chosen thereafter, rather than appointed by the majority leader as it is now.

Senator CARROL, of Colorado, proposed that the steering committee, which assigns Democrats to other Senate committees, should be elected rather than, as now, appointed by the majority leader. Senators CLARK, of Pennsylvania, MCNAMARA, of Michigan, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois, proposed regular and frequent party caucuses, the best means by which every Senator can make his influence felt in majority action and become fully informed about what is going on.

The majority leader pulverized the proposals respecting committees with votes of 51 to a dozen or less. He turned aside the caucus proposal with his standard formula reply that he would call a caucus whenever a Senator asked for one and he thought it would be useful. All of which leaves the liberal Democratic Senators back where they were to start with, blocked by JOHNSON in fighting for what they believe to be the mandate of their electorates.

But the ranks of emboldened insurgents have grown remarkably in a short time. Last year Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, raised what was at first a lonely voice, though he was soon supported by Senators DOUGLAS, of Illinois, CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and MORSE, of Oregon. Now are heard also HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, a leading student of parliamentary processes and coauthor of the Congressional Reform Act of 1946; and YARBOROUGH, of JOHNSON'S own State, Texas.

What they are up against is the necessity to regain for themselves and other Senators authority rightfully belonging to them which has become overconcentrated in the majority leader. It is such a struggle as the House of Representatives faced when it broke, in 1910, the stranglehold of "Czar" Cannon, of Illinois, its Speaker.

The fact that Senator JOHNSON can muster a crushing vote against the rebels does not necessarily mean that all who voted on his side are particularly happy to have him dictate. Many others may be disturbed by this excess of power, but restrained by the knowledge that success in the Senate is not promoted by locking horns with the man who runs it. All this only emphasizes the courage of those who have spoken out. The making of majority decisions by the majority, instead of by Senator JOHNSON, is an objective worthy of some risk; it is also one which must be attained.

INCREASE IN ALASKAN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the interesting phenomena of our time is the striking disparity between the pronouncements and the actions of this administration, and the contrast between its words and its deeds.

A few days ago we heard, in the state of the Union message of President Eisenhower, an injunction to the American people to fight inflation, as he said, as they would fight a fire imperiling their home. That was a very fine sentiment. Almost before the echoes of his urgent injunction to fight inflation died away, one of his executive agencies, the Federal Maritime Board, took one of the most inflationary actions imaginable.

Without granting a prior hearing, which was requested by the people of Alaska, by the Governor of Alaska, and by the Alaskan delegation, it granted a 10-percent increase in freight rates to the Alaska Steamship Co. and other carriers, which provide the only means of transportation of freight to Alaska, this increase coming on top of a 15-percent increase granted less than 2 years ago, thereby making a total increase of 26½ percent in these rates.

It is true that a hearing has been granted after the event, with the understanding that until the Commission makes its finding, the amounts of the increase will be held in escrow, and if the increase is found unwarranted, the amount thus retained will be returned to the shippers. But that is a striking example of putting the cart before the horse, or, let us say, of imprisoning people before trial with the understanding that if they are found innocent, they will then be let out of jail. It will do no good to the consumers of Alaska, to whom these increases are passed on, to have refunds made to the shippers. That was pointed out most specifically to the Federal Maritime Board before its members made their decision. They were particularly reminded of President Eisenhower's fervent injunction to fight inflation. Our delegation's plea fell on deaf ears. Already the cost of transported articles has gone up in Alaska and the inflationary spiral launched. It is no more possible to stop it, no matter whether the ultimate decision calls for

reduction, than it is possible to get the genie back into the bottle.

Two days later another such increase was projected by the Government in a case in which no private shipper is involved. It involves the Alaska Railroad, which is a wholly owned Government enterprise. In other words, the Government itself is raising the rates on one of its own activities, without immediate inflationary consequences.

The Alaska delegation in Congress has received no official announcement of this action. We learned of it through the Alaska newspapers. When reading of it a week ago I sent a telegram of protest to Secretary Seaton, asking why this was to be done, and why no hearing had been held or scheduled.

Yesterday I was visited in my office by two Alaskans who both happen to be outstanding Republicans. They live along the rail belt, and are adversely affected by the increase as will all Alaskans who live in the central part of Alaska. They pointed out that the result would be to increase the cost of living, and they expressed their view that hearings should be held. So, having received no reply to my previous wire, I sent to the Secretary of the Interior another telegram, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

HON. FRED SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D.C.:

On Wednesday, January 13, I sent you a telegram protesting against the information received only through newspapers that the Alaska Railroad was announcing a rate increase and protesting this as a direct violation to the view expressed a few days earlier by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message when he said, "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

I have just talked to two Alaska businessmen who are directly affected not merely by the 10-percent water transportation increase which was granted without a hearing by the Federal Maritime Board on Sunday but by the railroad increase. One is Mr. John B. Coghill, a general store merchant of Nenana, who is also a member of the State Senate in which body he happens to be the minority leader. He feels that this is an increase which is totally unwarranted and will add to the further high cost of living in Nenana. He expressed surprise that this proposal had been made without a hearing. The other visitor was Mr. John H. Clawson, who has a steel fabricating plant in Anchorage. He happens also to be an appointee of this administration on the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission. He points out that his steel products will have to go up in price because of the increased water rate from Seattle to Seward and again because of the increased rail rates over the railroad between Seward and Anchorage and beyond as his products are distributed by railroad to the interior.

What justification is there for this increase in rates without a full hearing to which the merchants, shippers, and consumers along the Alaska rail belt can be heard?

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

PREDICTION OF BUSINESS FAILURES DURING 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the popular commentator on economic affairs, Sylvia Porter, whose column appears in the Evening Star, has written another thoughtful article which appeared in yesterday's evening edition of the Star.

Miss Porter very correctly, in my judgment, outlined the situation faced by the typical small or new business in these days of tight money and high-interest rates.

Miss Porter predicts business failures at a rate of more than 300 per week as 1960 unfolds as a year of prosperity for some and extreme difficulty for others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Evening Star for January 18, 1960, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAVE OF SMALL FAILURES DUE

A wave of bankruptcies among small businessmen is due this year.

The number of small business failures is heading for the highest level since the depression thirties. It's almost certain that 1959's total of 14,000 bankruptcies will be topped. It's almost certain that businesses will be dying at a rate of more than 300 a week as the year rolls on.

The ironic explanation lies in the very fact of prosperity. The economic boom is bringing on the most severe money squeeze in over a generation, and this credit pinch will spell disaster for smaller concerns.

A second explanation lies in the upsurge in competition, older firms without the know-how to compete successfully in a rough period and tender infants without adequate credit lines will die.

I am not guessing about this trend. The background of prosperity and tight money is unmistakable now.

Against this background, all I am doing is making a simple—and conservative—projection of Dun & Bradstreet's authoritative compilations of the total and type of failures which occurred in 1959.

As always in a boom cycle, thousands of enthusiastic but inexperienced individuals try to realize the American dream of going into business for themselves.

But the significant fact is that in this boom, credit is becoming tougher and increasingly expensive to get.

A big, established corporation can get credit. Even if it can't get all it wants, it will have the financial connections to raise what it must have to compete and grow.

But the smaller businessman? The Nation's banks aren't organized to supply him with risk capital, and in this era of tight money they understandably favor their long-standing, safe customers.

The capital markets aren't set up to provide him at tolerable cost with the long-term funds he needs to grow.

The revolutionary system of small business investment companies created by law in 1958 to help finance small business has so far been an appalling flop.

And even if a small firm can get a loan, the cost in many instances may be just too steep. With the bluest of blue-chip companies paying close to 6 percent for loans, the charges—plus extras—to a little, marginal concern may be unbearable.

Most vulnerable will be merchandising and food stores, high-cost service shops, businesses in the $5,000 to $25,000 range. Killing them will be not only their experience, but also their inability to get the cash imperative if they are to compete and grow.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if some way is not found by this Democratic Congress to reverse the tight money, high interest rate policy of the Eisenhower administration and the Federal Reserve System, I am apprehensive that the happy predictions of many other writers on economic affairs will prove to have been without sufficient justification.

CIVILIANS AND COURTS-MARTIAL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe the Supreme Court decisions handed down yesterday are sound constitutional law and do not create a frightening legal no man's land for the criminal prosecutions of Americans with our Armed Forces overseas.

I believe it is possible to maintain necessary discipline and support for American defense operations outside the United States at the same time we are preserving basic constitutional rights of Americans.

Since the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been studying the subject of "Civilians and Courts-Martial" for over 2 years, I am asking the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General of the United States to present their views on dealing with the situation as a result of the Supreme Court decisions.

I ask unanimous consent to have included as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD, the texts of the Supreme Court decisions, including concurring and dissenting opinions; copies of my letters to the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General; and a brief public statement I issued today.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 21 AND 37, OCTOBER TERM, 1959—MCELROY, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL., PETITIONERS, *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. DOMINIC GUAGLIARDO; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT—BRUCE WILSON, PETITIONER *v.* MAJ. GEN. JOHN F. BOHLENDER, COMMANDER, FITZSIMONS ARMY HOSPITAL; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

(January 18, 1960)

(Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the Court.)

These are companion cases to No. 22, *Kinsella* v. *Singleton*, and No. 58, *Grisham* v. *Hagan*, both decided today. All of the cases involve the application of article 2(11)[1] of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Here

[1] Article 2. The following persons are subject to this chapter:

"(11) Subject to any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States and outside the following: that part of Alaska east of longitude 172° west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

its application to noncapital offenses committed by civilian employees of the Armed Forces while stationed overseas is tested.

In No. 21 the respondent, a civilian employee of the Air Force performing the duties of an electrical lineman, was convicted by court-martial at the Nouasseur Air Depot near Casablanca, Morocco, of larceny and conspiracy to commit larceny from the supply house at the depot. Before being transferred to the U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, New Cumberland, Pa., respondent filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the military authorities had no jurisdiction to try him by court-martial. This petition was dismissed (158 F. Supp. 171). The court of appeals reversed and ordered respondent discharged. It held that *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957), was binding as to all classes of persons included within the section and that each class was nonseverable (259 F. 2d 927). We granted certiorari, 359 U.S. 904, in view of the conflict with *Grisham* v. *Hagan*, 261 F. 2d 204.

In No. 37, petitioner, a civilian auditor employed by the U.S. Army and stationed in Berlin, was convicted by a general court-martial on a plea of guilty to three acts of sodomy. While serving his 5-year sentence, petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the U.S. District Court for Colorado. The petition was dismissed and appeal was perfected to the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. Prior to argument we granted certiorari[2] (359 U.S. 906).

We first turn to respondent Guagliardo's contention that article 2(11) is nonseverable. As desirable as it is to avoid constitutional issues, we cannot do so on this ground. The act provides for severability of the remaining sections if "a part of this act is invalid in one or more of its applications" (70A Stat. 640). The intention of Congress in providing for severability is clear, and legal effect can be given to each category standing alone. See *Dorchy* v. *Kansas*, 264 U.S. 286, 290 (1924).

We believe that these cases involving the applicability of article 2(11) to employees of the armed services while serving outside the United States are controlled by our opinion in No. 22, *Kinsella* v. *Singleton*, and No. 58, *Grisham* v. *Hagan*, announced today. In Singleton we refused, in the light of *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957), to apply the provisions of the article to noncapital offenses committed by dependents of soldiers in the armed services while overseas; in Grisham we held that there was no constitutional distinction for purposes of court-martial jurisdiction between dependents and employees insofar as application of the death penalty is concerned. The rationale of those cases applies here.

Although it is true that there are materials supporting prosecution of sutlers and other civilians by courts-martial, these materials are "too episodic, too meager, to form a solid basis in history, preceding and contemporaneous with the framing of the Constitution, for constitutional adjudication." Concurring opinion, *Covert*, 354 U.S. at 64. Furthermore, those during the Revolutionary period, on which it is claimed that court-martial jurisdiction rests, were all during a period of war, and hence inapplicable here. Moreover, the materials are not by any means one-sided. The recognized authority on courts-martial jurisdiction, after a careful consideration of all of the historical background, concluded: "That a civilian, entitled as he is, by article VI of the amendments to the Constitution, to trial by jury, cannot legally be made liable to the military law and jurisdiction, in time of peace, is a fundamental principle of our public law."[3] But it is contended that *Ex parte Reed*, 100 U.S. 13 (1879), is controlling because the forces covered by article 2(11) are overseas and therefore in the field. Examination of that case, as well as *Johnson* v. *Sayre*, 158 U.S. 109 (1895), however, shows them to be entirely inapposite. Those cases permitted trial by courts-martial of paymasters' clerks in the Navy. The Court found that such a position was "an important one in the machinery of the Navy," the appointment being made only upon approval of the commander of the ship and for a permanent tenure "until discharged." Also the paymaster's clerk was required to agree in writing "to submit to the laws and regulations for the government and discipline of the Navy." Moreover, from time immemorial the law of the sea has placed the power of disciplinary action in the commander of the ship when at sea or in a foreign port. None of these considerations are present here. As we shall point out subsequently, a procedure along the lines of that used by the Navy as to paymasters' clerk might offer a practical alternative to the use of civilian employees by the armed services. As was stated in the second *Covert* case, supra, at 23, "there might be circumstances where a person could be 'in' the armed services for the purposes of clause 14 even though he had not formally been inducted into the military."

The only other authority cited in support of court-martial jurisdiction appears to be opinions by the Attorney General and the Judge Advocate General of the Army. However, the 1866 opinion of the Judge Advocate General (cited in support of the Government's position) was repudiated by subsequent Judge Advocate Generals.[4] To be sure, the 1872 opinion of the Attorney General, dealing with civilians serving with troops in the building of defensive earthworks to protect against threatened Indian uprisings, is entitled to some weight. However, like the other examples of frontier activities based on the legal concept of the troops' being "in the field," they are inapposite here. They were in time of "hostilities" with Indian tribes or were in "territories" covered by entirely different considerations. See second Covert, at 12–13. Such opinions, however, do not have the force of judicial decisions and, where so "episodic," have little weight in the reviewing of administrative practice. Moreover, in the performance of such functions as were involved there, the military service would today use engineering corps subject to its jurisdiction. This being entirely practical, as we hereafter point out, as to all civilians serving with the Armed Forces today, we believe the Toth doctrine, that we must limit the coverage of clause 14 to "the least possible power adequate to the end proposed," 350 U.S., at 23, to be controlling.

In the consideration of the constitutional question here we believe it should be pointed out that, in addition to the alternative types of procedure available to the Government in the prosecution of civilian dependents and mentioned in *Kinsella* v. *Singleton, supra*, additional practical alternatives have been suggested in the case of employees of the armed services. One solution might possibly be to follow a procedure along the line of that provided for paymasters' clerks as approved in *Ex parte Reed; supra*. Another would incorporate those civilian employees who are to be stationed outside of the United States directly into the armed services, either by compulsory induction or by voluntary enlistment. If a doctor or dentist may be drafted into the armed services (50 U.S.C. App. sec. 454(i), extended, 73 Stat. 13); *Orlioff* v. *Willoughby*, 345 U.S. 84 (1953), there should be no legal objection to the organization and recruitment of other civilian specialists needed by the armed services.

Moreover, the armed servics presently have sufficient authority to set up a system for the voluntary enlistment of specialists. This was done with much success during the Second World War. "The Navy's Construction Battalions, popularly known as the Seabees, were established to meet the wartime need for uniformed men to perform construction work in combat areas" 1 Building the Navy's Bases in World War II (1947) 133. Just as electricians, clerks, draftsmen, and surveyors were enlisted as "specialists" in the Seabees, id., at 136, provisions can be made for the voluntary enlistment of an electrician (Guagliardo), an auditor (Wilson), or an accountant (Grisham). It likewise appears entirely possible that the present "specialist" program conducted by the Department of the Army[5] could be utilized to replace civilian employees if disciplinary problems required military control. Although some workers might hesitate to give up their civilian status for Government employment overseas, it is unlikely that the Armed Forces would be unable to obtain a sufficient number of volunteers to meet their requirements. The increased cost to maintain these employees in a military status is the price the Government must pay to comply with constitutional requirements.

The judgement in No. 21 is affirmed and the judgment in No. 37 is reversed.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 21, 37, 22 AND 58, OCTOBER TERM, 1959—MCELROY, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL., PETITIONERS *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. DOMINIE GUAGLIARDO; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT—BRUCE WILSON, PETITIONER, *v.* MAJ. GEN. JOHN F. BOHLENDER, COMMANDER, FITZSIMONS ARMY HOSPITAL; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT—KINSELLA, WARDEN, APPELLANT, *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. SINGLETON; ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA—ALBERT H. GRISHAM, PETITIONER, *v.* CHARLES R. HAGAN, WARDEN; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

(January 18, 1960)

(Mr. Justice Whittaker, with whom Mr. Justice Stewart joins, concurring in part and dissenting in part.)

---

[2] Since the offense occurred within the U.S. area of control of West Berlin, the Government now contends that petitioner Wilson is amenable to the military government jurisdiction of an occupied territory. However the charges were drawn in terms of art. 2(11) power, and jurisdiction was sustained on that basis. Moreover the Court of Military Appeals refused to consider that issue when raised by the Government and the trial court did not rest its decision sustaining military jurisdiction over petitioner on that ground. This contention is consequently denied.

[3] Winthrop, "Military Law and Precedents" (2d ed. 1896), 143. See also *Ex parte Milligan*, 4 Wall. 2, 121, 123 (1866); Maltby, "Courts Martial and Military Law," 37; Rawle, "Constitution" (2d ed. 1829), 220; 3 Ops. Atty. Gen. 690; 5 id., at 736; 13 id., at 63.

[4] See 16 Ops. Atty. Gen. 13; id., at 48 Dig. Ops. JAG (1901), 563, Par. 2033; id. (1895), at 599–600, Par. 4; id. (1830), at 384, sec. 4.

[5] See Army Regulations 600–201, 20 June 1956, as changed 15 March 1957, and Army Regulations 624–200, 19 May 1958, as changed 1 July 1959.

In No. 22, one Joanna Dial (whose cause is prosecuted here by respondent Singleton), an American civilian wife accompanying her husband, an American soldier serving in Germany, was there tried and convicted in 1957 by a general court-martial for manslaughter in violation of Article 119 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice,[1] (10 U.S.C., sec. 919), and was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 3 years. In No. 21, respondent Guagliardo, an American civilian employed as an electrical lineman by the United States Air Force at Nouasseur Air Base in Morocco, was there tried and convicted in 1957 by a general court-martial for conspiring to commit larceny from the stores of the Air Force in violation of Article 81 of the Code (10 U.S.C., sec. 881), and was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 3 years. In No. 37, petitioner Wilson, an American civilian employed as an auditor by the United States Army in Berlin, Germany, was there tried and convicted in 1956 by a general court-martial for three acts of sodomy committed upon military personnel in violation of article 134 of the Code (50 U.S.C., sec 728), and was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 5 years. In No. 58, petitioner Grisham, an American civilian employed as a cost accountant by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in Orleans, France, was there tried by a general court-martial for the capital offense of premeditated murder and convicted of the lesser included offense of unpremeditated murder in violation of article 118 of the Code (50 U.S.C., sec. 712), and was sentenced, as affected by clemency action of the Secretary of the Army, in 1957, to imprisonment for a term of 35 years.

Each of the accused persons objected to trial by the court-martial upon the ground that it had no jurisdiction to try him. After their convictions, sentences, and return to the United States, each sought release by habeas corpus in a Federal district court. Two were successful—*Singleton* (164 F. Supp. 707, D.C.S.D., W. Va.) and *Guagliardo* (259 F. 2d 927, C.A.D.C. Cir.)—but the other two were not—*Wilson* (167 F. Supp. 791, D.C. Colo.) and *Grisham* (261 F. 2d 204, C.A. 3d Cir.)—and the four cases were brought here for review.

These cases fall into three categories. No. 22, the Singleton case, involves a civilian dependent tried for a noncapital offense; Nos. 21 and 37, the Guagliardo and Wilson cases, involve civilian employees of the military tried for noncapital offenses, and No. 58, the Grisham case, involves a civilian employee of the military tried for a capital offense. Each claims that, being a civilian, he was not constitutionally subject to trial by court-martial but, instead, could constitutionally be tried by the United States only in an article III court, upon an indictment of a grand jury under the fifth amendment, by an impartial petit jury under the sixth amendment of the Constitution.

The cases present grave questions and, for me at least, ones of great difficulty. Our recent decision in *Reid* v. *Covert* (354 U.S. 1) makes clear that the U.S. Constitution extends beyond our Territorial boundaries and reaches to and applies within all foreign areas where jurisdiction is or may be exercised by the United States over its citizens—that when the United States proceeds against its citizens abroad "[i]t can only act in accordance with all the limitations imposed by the Constitution" (354 U.S., at 6).

The broad question presented, then, is whether our Constitution authorizes trials and punishments by courts-martial in foreign lands in time of peace of civilian dependents "accompanying" members of the Armed Forces and of civilians "employed by" the Armed Forces, for conduct made an offense by the Uniform Code of Military Justice, whether capital or noncapital in character.

The source of the power, if it exists, is article I, section 8, clause 14 of the Constitution.[2] It provides:

"The Congress shall have power. * * *

"To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

Pursuant to that grant of power, Congress by the act of August 10, 1956, c. 1041, 70A Stat. 36 et seq.—revising the preexisting Articles of War—enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Article 2(11) of that code provides, in pertinent part:

"The following persons are subject to this chapter:

* * * * *

"(11) Subject to any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States."

It is not disputed that existing treaties with each of the foreign sovereignties, within whose territory the alleged offenses occurred, permitted the Armed Forces of the United States to punish offenses against the laws of the United States committed by persons embraced by section 2(11) of the code. Arguments challenging the reasonableness of section 2(11) are presently put aside, for if clause 14 does not grant to Congress the power to provide for the court-martial trial and punishment of the persons embraced in article 2(11) of the code it may not do so, however reasonable. *Reid* v. *Covert, supra,* 354 U.S., at 74 (concurring opinion).

Did clause 14 empower Congress to enact article 2(11) of the Code? Certain aspects of that broad question have recently been determined in *Reid* v. *Covert,* supra, and though not a Court opinion. I consider that decision to be binding upon me.[3] In that case four members of the Court held that article 2(11) of the Code cannot constitutionally be applied to civilian dependents "accompanying" members of the Armed Forces outside the United States in time of peace, because, in their view, to do so would violate article III, section 2, and the fifth and sixth amendments of the Constitution; and two members of the Court, in separate concurring opinions, agreed with that result, but only with respect to capital offenses.

Like my Brother Clark who writes for the Court today, I am unable to find any basis in the Constitution to support the view that Congress may not constitutionally provide for the court-martial trial and punishment of civilian dependents for capital offenses but may do so for noncapital ones. Certainly there is nothing in clause 14 that creates any such distinction or limitation. Legalistically and logically, it would seem that the question is one of status of the accused person, and that courts-martial either do or do not have jurisdiction and, hence, power to try the accused for all offenses against the military law or for none at all. Sympathetic as one may be to curtailment of the awesome power of courts-martial to impose maximum sentences in capital cases, the question, for me at least, is the perhaps cold but purely legal one of constitutional power. There would seem to be no doubt that Congress may constitutionally prescribe gradations of offenses and punishments in military cases. The question is solely whether clause 14 has granted to Congress any power to provide for the court-martial trial and punishment of civilian dependents "accompanying," and civilians "employed by," the Armed Forces at military posts in foreign lands in time of peace. If it has, then Congress has acted within its powers in enacting section 2(11) of the code—otherwise not. Inasmuch as six members of the Court have held in Covert that Congress may not constitutionally provide for the court-martial trial and punishment of civilian dependents "accompanying the Armed Forces" overseas in peacetime in capital cases, and because I can see no constitutional distinction between Congress' power to provide for the court-martial punishment of capital offenses, on the one hand, and noncapital offenses, on the other hand, I conclude that the holding in Covert means that civilian dependents accompanying the Armed Forces in peacetime are not subject to military power, and that it requires affirmance of No. 22, the Singleton case.

But each of the three opinions supporting the conclusion reached in Covert was at points to limit the decision to civilian dependents. "[T]he wives, children and other dependents of servicemen cannot be placed in that category [of being 'in' the armed services for purposes of clause 14], even though they may be accompanying a serviceman abroad at Government expense and receiving other benefits from the Government" (354 U.S., at 23). "The mere fact that these women had gone overseas with their husbands should not reduce the protection the Constitution gives them" (354 U.S., at 33). See also 354 U.S., at 45 (concurring opinion of Frankfurter, J.), and 354 U.S., at 75–76 (concurring opinion of Harlan, J.). The main opinion carefully pointed out that "Mrs. Covert and Mrs. Smith * * * had never been employed by the Army, had never served in the Army in any capacity" (354 U.S., at 32).

There is a marked and clear difference between civilian dependents "accompanying the armed forces" and civilian persons "serving with [or] employed by" the armed forces at military posts in foreign lands. The latter, numbering more than 25,000 employed at United States military bases located in 63 countries throughout the world—mainly highly trained specialists and technicians possessing skills not readily available to the armed forces—are engaged in purely military work—as in the case of Guagliardo, employed as an electrical lineman by the Air Force to construct and maintain lines of communication and air field lighting apparatus and equipment, as also in the case of Wilson, an auditor employed to audit the accounts of the U.S. Army in Berlin, and as in the case of Grisham, employed as a cost accountant by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to assist in setting up a cost accounting system for the building of a line of communications from Pardeau, France, to Kossalater in the American-occupied section of Germany.

These civilian employees thus perform essential services for the military and, in doing so, are subject to the orders, direction, and control of the same military command

[1] The Uniform Code of Military Justice, 70A Stat. 36 et seq., will hereafter, for brevity, be called the "Code."

[2] This does not overlook the "necessary and proper" clause, art. I, sec. 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, but, in my view, that clause, though applicable, adds nothing to clause 14, because the latter clause, empowering Congress "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces," plainly means all necessary and proper rules for those purposes.

Mr. Justice Stewart is of the view that clause 14 must be read in connection with the "necessary and proper" clause, and agrees with the views expressed in Mr. Justice Harlan's separate opinion as to the applicability and effect of that clause.

[3] Although a member of the Court when the opinions in the Covert case were handed down, I was ineligible to and did not participate in the decision of that case because it had been argued, submitted and decided prior to my coming to the Court.

as the members of those forces; and, not infrequently, members of those forces who are assigned to work with and assist those employees are subject to their direction and control. They have the same contact with, and information concerning, the military operation as members of those forces and present the same security risks and disciplinary problems. They are paid upon the same payroll, and have the same commissary, housing, medical, dental, mailing, transportation, banking, tax exemption, customs benefits, border-crossing privileges, and other privileges as members of the Armed Forces. They are so intertwined with those forces and military communities as to be in every practical sense an integral part of them. On the other hand, civilian dependents accompanying the Armed Forces perform no services for those forces, present dissimilar security and disciplinary problems, have only a few of the military privileges, and generally stand in a very different relationship to those forces than the civilian employees. Nor should there be any confusion about the fact that the materials found in Covert to be "too episodic, too meager, to form a solid basis in history, preceding and contemporaneous with the framing of the Constitution, for constitutional adjudication" (354 U.S., at 64, concurring opinion), related, as did the whole case, to civilian dependents in particular, id., not to persons employed at foreign military bases to do essential military work. And I readily agree with the Court today that under the severability clause in the Code, 70A Stat. 640, "legal effect can be given to each category standing alone" (*McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, ante, p. 638).

Determination of the scope of the powers intended by the framers of the Constitution to be given to Congress by clause 14 requires an examination into the customs, practices, and general political climate known to the framers and existing at that time. The first Articles of War in this country were those adopted by the Provisional Congress of Massachusetts Bay on April 5, 1775.[4] Those articles, initially governing the civilian army of farmers and tradesmen—the Minute Men—who were first involved in the War of the Revolution, were made applicable to "all officers, soldiers, and others concerned" (Winthrop 950). Article 31 provided:

"All sellers and retailers to a camp, and all persons whatsoever serving with the Massachusetts Army in the field, though not enlisted soldiers, are to be subject to the articles, rules, and regulations of the Massachusetts Army." Ibid.

The American Revolutionary Army initially was governed by Articles of War adopted by the Continental Congress on June 30, 1775.[5] Nine of the original 69 articles provided for the trial by court-martial of persons serving with the Army but who were not soldiers. Those articles were revised by the Continental Congress on September 20, 1776,[6] and, save for minor revisions not here pertinent, governed the Revolutionary Army during the remainder of the war.[7] Thirteen of those articles provided for the trial by court-martial of civilians serving with the Army such as "commissaries,"[8] "sutlers,"[9] "store-keepers,"[10] persons "belonging to the forces employed in the service of the United States,"[11] and persons "belonging to the forces of the United States, employed in foreign parts."[12] In 1778, a relevant addition was made. It provided, in pertinent part: "That every person employed either as commissary, quartermaster, forage master, or in any other Civilian Department of the Army shall be subject to trial by court-martial for neglect of duty, or other offense committed in the execution of their office." (Journals of the Continental Congress, vol. X, p. 72.) Wagon drivers "receiving pay or hire" in the service of the artillery were made subject to court-martial jurisdiction under the American Articles of 1775[13] and 1776.[14] Throughout the Revolutionary period, "drivers" and "artillery gunners" were civilian experts. "Horses or oxen, with hired civilian drivers formed the transport" for the cannon. Manucy, Artillery Through the Ages (G.P.O. 1949), p. 10. Their civilian status in Washington's Army is concretely shown by his writings.[15]

There was a protracted controversy in the Constitutional Convention over whether there should be a standing army or whether the militia of the various States should be the source of military power.[16] There was, on the one hand, fear that a standing army might be detrimental to liberty; on the other was the necessity of an army for the preservation of peace and defense of the country.[17] The problem of providing for essential forces and also of assuring enforcement of the unanimous determination to keep them in subjection to the civil power was resolved by inserting the provision that no appropriation for the support of the army could be made for a longer period than 2 years (art. I, sec. 8, clause 12), and by the continuance of the militia "according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." (Art. I, sec. 8, clauses 15 and 16, and amendment II.)[18]

It was in the light of this background and upon these considerations that the framers gave to the representatives of the people—the Congress—the power "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" (clause 14). That language was taken straight from the Articles of Confederation.[19] In respect thereto, Hamilton said in the Federalist, No. 23:

"These powers ought to exist without limitation; because it is impossible to foresee or define the extent and variety of national exigencies, and the corresponding extent and variety of the means which may be necessary to satisfy them."[20]

Soon after the formation of the Government under the Constitution, Congress, by the act of September 29, 1789 (c. 25, § 4, 1 Stat. 96), adopted the Articles of War which were essentially the articles of 1776. By that act, Congress—it is almost necessary to assume—approved the consistent practice of exercising military jurisdiction over civilians serving with the Armed Forces, although not actually soldiers. The first complete enactment of the Articles of War subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution was the act of April 10, 1806. Article 60 of that act (2 Stat. 366) reenacted the provisions for jurisdiction over sutlers, retainers, and "all persons whomsoever, serving with the armies of the United States in the field, though not enlisted soldiers." Provisions similar to article 60 have been made in all subsequent reenactments of the Military Code: In the revision of 1874 (Rev. Stat. (2d ed. 1878), p. 236 (art. 63)); in 1916 (39 Stat. 651); in 1920 (41 Stat. 787); and in the adoption of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (64 Stat. 109, codified in 70A Stat. 37, 10 U. S. C., sec. 802(11)).

In the 1916 general revision of the Articles of War, Congress used language which is substantially equivalent to that of article 2(11),[21] and it appears it did not consider

---

[4] Winthrop, "Military Law and Precedents," 947.

[5] Journals of the Continental Congress, vol. II, p. 111. Those articles, with additional articles enacted Nov. 7, 1775, are reprinted in Winthrop 953 et seq.

[6] Those articles are reprinted in Winthrop 961–971.

[7] The articles were prepared principally by John Adams. See John Adams, Works, vol. 3, pp. 83–84; Winthrop 22.

[8] Articles of War, Sept. 20, 1776, § IV, art. 6.

[9] Id., § VIII, art. 1.

[10] Id., § XII, art. 1.

[11] Id., § XIII, art. 9.

[12] Id., § XIII, art. 17.

[13] Articles of War, June 30, 1775, art. XLVIII; Winthrop 957, n. 19.

[14] Articles of War, Sept. 30, 1776, § XVI, art. I; Winthrop 970, n. 22.

[15] The civilian status of such persons is concretely shown by the report which Washington made to the Committee of Congress With the Army, on January 29, 1778; "As it does not require military men, to discharge the duties of Commissaries, Forage Masters, and Wagon Masters, who are also looked upon as the moneymaking part of the Army, no rank should be allowed to any of them, nor indeed to any in the departments merely of a civil nature. Neither is it, in my opinion proper, though it may seem a trivial and inconsequential circumstance, that they should wear the established uniforms of the Army, which ought to be considered as a badge of military distinction." Writings of Washington, vol. 10, at 379. (Emphasis added.)

Numerous instances of the exercise of military jurisdiction over civilians serving with the Army are detailed in Washington's Writings. A "Wagon Master" was so tried and acquitted on January 22, 1778. (Vol. 10, p. 359.) A "waggoner" was so tried and sentenced on May 25, 1778 (vol. 11, p. 487), and another on September 2, 1780. At the same time, an "express rider" was so tried and convicted. (Vol. 20, pp. 24–25.) On October 1, 1779, a "Commissary of Issues" and a "Commissary of Hides" were tried by court-martial. (Vol. 16, pp. 385–386.) On September 27, 1780, another "waggoner" was so tried and convicted. (Vol. 20, p. 96.) On December 16, 1780, another "commissary" and also a "barrack master" were so tried. (Vol. 21, p. 10, and pp. 22–23.) Numerous other court-martial trials of civilians serving with the Army are recited in vol. 10, p. 507; vol. 12, p. 242; vol. 13, pp. 54, 314; vol. 21, p. 190.

[16] Prescott, "Drafting the Federal Constitution" (1941), pp. 515–525; 5 Elliott's Debates 443–445.

[17] Glenn and Schiller, "The Army and the Law," pp. 14, 18–20.

[18] The basis of this conclusion was summarized by James Madison in the Federalist, No. 41:

"Next to the effectual establishment of the Union, the best possible precaution against danger from standing armies, is a limitation of the term for which revenue may be appropriated to their support. This precaution the Constitution has prudently added."

[19] Prescott, "Drafting the Federal Constitution" (1941), p. 526; 5 Elliott's Debates 443.

[20] Hamilton, aide-de-camp to Washington and a distinguished army officer, undoubtedly knew that civilians serving with the army were commonly subjected to court-martial judisdiction. The same must be presumed to have been known by most, if not all, of the members of the Constitutional Convention, for so many of them had been a part of the Revolutionary Army wherein that practice was commonplace.

[21] Article 2(d) of the 1916 articles provided that the following persons should be subject to the Articles of War:

"(d) All retainers to the camp and all persons accompanying or serving with the armies of the United States without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and in time of war all such retainers and persons accompanying or serving with the armies of the United States in the field, both within and without the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, though not otherwise subject to these articles." This section was reenacted in 1920, 41 Stat. 767.

that any new concept was being adopted.[22] After full consideration by an eminent committee of experts, Congress, in 1956—recognizing that, although we are not at war, turbulent world conditions require large military commitments throughout the world—reenacted, in article 2(11), the provision that civilians "serving with" the armies of the United States "outside the United States" are subject to military jurisdiction, and it redefined that concept by adding the "employed by" classification.

Clause 14 does not limit Congress to the making of rules for the government and regulation of members of the Armed Forces. Rather, it empowers Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. The term "land and naval forces" does not appear to be, nor ever to have been treated as synonymous with members of the armed services.[23]

Viewed in the light of its birth and history, is it not reasonably clear that the grant of clause 14, to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces, empowers Congress to govern and regulate all persons so closely related to and intertwined with those forces as to make their government essential to the government of those forces? Do not civilians employed by the Armed Forces at bases in foreign lands to do essential work for the military establishment, such as was being done by respondent Guagliardo and petitioners Wilson and Grisham, occupy that status and stand in that relationship to the Armed Forces for which they worked?

This Court has consistently held, in various contexts, that clause 14 does not limit the power of Congress to the government and regulation of only those persons who are members of the armed services. In Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall. 2, 123, it was said, relative to the discipline necessary to the efficient operation of the Army and Navy, that "Everyone connected with these branches of the public service is amenable to the jurisdiction which Congress has created for their government, and, while thus serving, surrenders his right to be tried by the civil courts." In *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku*, 327 U.S. 304, 313, this Court recognized the well-established power of the military to exercise jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces [and] those directly connected with such forces." In *Toth* v. *Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11, 15, this Court said that clause 14 "would seem to restrict court-martial jurisdiction to persons who are actually members or part of the Armed Forces." Of even greater relevance, the main opinion in Covert although expressing the view that clause 14 authorized military trials only of persons in the Armed Forces, recognized that there might be circumstances where a person could be in the armed services for purposes of clause 14 even though he had not formally been inducted into the military or did not wear a uniform (354 U.S., at 23). To repeat the query of this Court, made under very similar circumstances, in Ex parte Reed, 100 U.S. 13, 22, "If these [civilian employees] are not in the [armed] service, it may well be asked who are. That case held that a civilian, employed to serve aboard ship as the clerk of a paymaster of the United States Navy and who was dismissable at the will of the commander of the ship, occupied such an important [place] in the machinery of the Navy • • • [that] [t]he good order and efficiency of the service depend[ed] largely upon the faithful performance of [his] duties and brought him in the naval service, so that he was subject to trial and punishment by court-martial for an offense committed in a Brazilian port (100 U.S., at 21–22), *Johnson* v. *Sayre*, 158 U.S. 109, reaffirmed the principle on practically identical facts.

The provisions of article III, section 2, and the fifth and sixth amendments of the Constitution requiring the trial of capital or otherwise infamous crimes in an article III court, upon an indictment of a grand jury, by an impartial petit jury, are not applicable to "cases arising in the land or naval forces." The fifth amendment expressly excepts those cases. It cannot be said that the "words in the fifth amendment, relating to the mode of accusation, restrict the jurisdiction of courts-martial in the regular land and naval forces." *Johnson* v. *Sayre, supra*, 158 U.S., at 115. The exception in the fifth amendment "was undoubtedly designed to correlate with the power granted to Congress to provide for the 'government and regulation' of the armed services" (*Reid* v. *Covert, supra*, at 22), and so was the jury trial provision of the sixth amendment, for "the framers of the Constitution, doubtless, meant to limit the right of trial by jury, in the sixth amendment, to those persons who were subject to indictment or presentment in the fifth." *Ex parte Milligan, supra*, 4 Wall., at 123. See also *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U.S. 1, 40. The power conferred upon Congress by clause 14 to provide for court-martial trials of offenses arising in the land and naval forces is independent of and not restricted by article III or the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution.

Counsel for the convicted employees argue, with the citation and force of much history, that even if civilians "serving with [or] employed by" the Armed Forces are subject to the military power of courts-martial, such could be so only in respect of offenses committed while those forces are "in the field." Some of the early Articles of War limited military jurisdiction over certain civilian employees to the perod when the army was "in the field."[24] What is really meant by the term "in the field"? Seemingly, it does not mean "in actual war" or even "in time of war." "The essential element was thought to be, not so much that there be war, in the technical sense, but rather that the forces and their retainers be 'in the field.'" *Reid* v. *Covert, supra*, 354 U.S., at 71, note 8 (concerning opinion). Historically, the term has been thought to include armed forces located at points where the civil power of the Government did not extend or where its civil courts did not exist. Prior to the Civil War, a number of civilians employed by the Armed Forces were tried and punished by courts-martial in time of peace.[25] In 1814, the Attorney General expressed the opinion that civilian employees of the Navy were subject to punishment by court-martial for offenses committed on board vessels beyond the territorial jurisdiction of our civil courts (1 Op. Atty. Gen. 177). The term "in the field" was thought to apply to organized camps stationed in remote places where civil courts did not exist or were not functioning. In 1860 the Judge Advocate General of the Army so declared.[26] But thereafter, Winthrop expressed the view that the term "in the field" is to be "confined both to the period and pendency of war and to acts committed on the theater of the war."[27] This would seem to ignore the fact that the constitutional authority involved in clause 14, not the war power, and that the clause 14 powers apply both to times of peace and war.

Moreover, even at the time when Winthrop wrote, there was no consensus of interpretation supporting his view. In 1872, the Attorney General issued an opinion which concluded that civilians serving with troops in Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and the Indian Territory (where civil courts did not exist or were not functioning) in the building of defensive earthworks to protect against threatening Indians were "in the field" (14 Op. Atty. Gen. 22).[28] As earlier observed, this Court held, in 1879, in Ex parte Reed, supra, and again in 1895, in *Johnson* v. *Sayre*, supra, that the civilian clerk of a paymaster of the Navy might be tried and punished by a court-martial for a military offense committed in peacetime aboardship in a foreign port.

Doubtless, with the passing of the frontier and the extension of civil courts throughout the territorial boundaries of the United States, detachments of troops stationed within our borders may not in time of peace be regarded as "in the field." But, it

---

[22] Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, then Judge Advocate General of the Army, stated before the House Committee on Military Affairs: "There is nothing new in the article in subjecting these several classes to the provisions of article 65. It is a jurisdiction which has always been exercised. When any person joins an army in the field and subjects himself by that act to the discipline of the camp he acquires the capacity to imperil the safety of the command to the same degree as a man under the obligation of an enlistment contract or of a commission." (62d Cong., 2d sess., H.R. 23628, p. 61).

[23] See Congressional Globe, 37th Cong., 3d sess., 995 et seq.

[24] Article 32 of American Articles of War of 1775, 2 J. Cont. Cong. 111, provided that "All sutlers and retailers to a camp, and all persons whatsoever, serving with the Continental Army in the field" were subject to court-martial jurisdiction.

Article 60 of the American Articles of War of 1806, 2 Stat. 359, provided that "All sutlers and retainers to the camp, and all persons whatsoever, serving with the armies of the United States in the field" were subject to court-martial jurisdiction.

Article 63 of American Articles of War of 1874, R. S., sec. 1342, provided that "All retainers to the camp, and all persons serving with the armies of the United States in the field" were within the jurisdiction of courts-martial.

[25] At Fort Monroe, Va., in 1825; Fort Washington, Md., in 1825; Fort Gibson, in what is now Oklahoma, in 1833; Fort Brooke, Fla., in 1838; Camp Scott, Utah Territory, in 1858; Fort Bridger, Utah Territory, in 1858.

[26] On November 15, 1866, the Judge Advocate General of the Army formulated the following opinion and direction:

"It is held by this Bureau and has been the general usage of the service in times of peace, that a detachment of troops is an army 'in the field' when on the march, or at a post remote from civil jurisdiction.

"It has been the custom and is held to be advisable, that civil employees, sutlers and camp followers when guilty of crimes known to the civil law, to turn the parties over to the courts of the vicinity in which the crimes were committed. For minor offenses against good orders and discipline, it has been customary to expel the parties from the Army: If, however, it is sought to punish civil employees in New Mexico, for crimes committed at a post where there are no civil courts before which they can be tried, it is held that they can be brought to trial before a General Court Martial, as they must be considered as serving with 'an army in the field' and, therefore, within the provision of the 60th Article of War." Op. J. A. G. of the Army, No. 15, 1866, 23 Letters sent, 331 (National Archives).

[27] Winthrop, "Military Law and Precedents," 101.

[28] The opinion rested primarily on the ground that the term "in the field" implies military operations with a view to an enemy, and that an army was "in the field" when "engaged in offensive or defensive operations." It also noted, p. 24, that:

"Possibly the fact that troops are found in a region of country chiefly inhabited by Indians and remote from the exercise of civil authority may enter into the description of 'an army in the field.'"

seems to me that armed forces of the United States stationed at bases in foreign lands—where jurisdiction of our civil courts does not extend—must, under turbulent world conditions, be otherwise regarded. Because of long-existing world tensions and with the fervent hope of preventing worse, the U.S. Government has stationed armed forces at military bases in 63 foreign lands throughout the world. We are told that they must be kept constantly alert and ready to prevent or, if and when they arise, to put down "brush fires" which if allowed to spread might ignite a worldwide holocaust of atomic war. Because of physical necessities, such a war, like the frequently recurring "brush fires," could be suppressed, if at all, mainly from those bases. The forces at those bases are as much "in the field" in the one case as in the other. Though there be no war in the technical sense, those forces while so engaged in foreign lands—where our civil courts do not exist—are in every practical sense "in the field." They are as clearly "in the field" as were American soldiers while building fortifications to protect against threatening Indians in New Mexico and the Indian Territory, where our civil courts did not exist, in the days of the frontier. Op. J.A.G. of the Army, November 15, 1866, 23 Letters sent, 331 (National Archives) and see note 26; 14 Op. Atty. Gen. 22, and see note 28.

Clause 14 empowers Congress to "make rules"—all necessary and proper rules—"for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"—not just for members of those forces, but the forces, and not only in time of war but in times of both peace and war. In the exercise of that granted power, Congress has promulgated rules, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, for the government of the Armed Forces and, to that end, has deemed it necessary, as witness article 2(11), to include persons employed by those forces when outside the United States—where our civil courts have no jurisdiction and do not exist—in times of both peace and war. In the light of all the facts, it would seem clear enough that Congress could rationally find that those persons are in those forces and, though there be no shooting war, that those forces, in turn, are in the field; and hence Congress could and did constitutionally make those employees subject to the military power. Both the practical necessities and the lack of alternatives, so clearly demonstrated by Mr. Justice Clark in the *Covert* case, 354 U.S., at 78 (dissenting opinion), strongly buttress this conclusion, if, indeed, it could otherwise be doubted.

For these reasons, I would affirm No. 22, the Singleton case; reverse No. 21, the Guagliardo case; and affirm Nos. 37 and 58, the Wilson and Grisham cases.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 21, 37, 22, AND 58, OCTOBER TERM, 1959—McELROY, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ET AL., PETITIONERS, *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. DOMINIC GUAGLIARDO; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT—BRUCE WILSON, PETITIONER, *v.* MAJ. GEN. JOHN F. BOHLENDER, COMMANDER, FITZSIMONS ARMY HOSPITAL; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 10TH CIRCUIT—KINSELLA, WARDEN, APPELLANT, *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. SINGLETON; ON APPEAL FROM THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA—ALBERT H. GRISHAM, PETITIONER, *v.* CHARLES R. HAGAN, WARDEN; ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

(January 18, 1960)

(Mr. Justice Harlan, whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter joins, dissenting in Nos. 22, 21, and 37, and concurring in No. 58.)

Within the compass of "any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party" and "any accepted rule of international law," article 2(11) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice makes subject to the code, and therefore prosecutable by court-martial for offenses committed abroad, all "persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces" outside the United States and certain other areas.[1]

These four cases, involving persons and crimes concededly covered by the Military Code, bring before us the constitutionality of article 2(11) as applied to (1) civilian service dependents charged with noncapital offenses (No. 22); (2) civilian service employees, also charged with noncapital offenses (Nos. 21 and 37);[2] and (3) civilian service employees charged with capital offenses (No. 58). In each instance the Court holds the act unconstitutional. While I agree with the judgment in No. 58, which involves a capital offense, I cannot agree with the judgments in Nos. 22, 21, and 37, in each of which the conviction was for a noncapital offense.

The effect of these decisions is to deny to Congress the power to give the military services, when the United States is not actually at war, criminal jurisdiction over noncapital offenses committed by nonmilitary personnel while accompanying or serving with our Armed Forces abroad. I consider this a much too narrow conception of the constitutional power of Congress and the result particularly unfortunate in the setting of the present-day international scene. To put what the Court has decided in proper context, some review of the past fate of article 2(11) in this Court is desirable.

At the 1955 term there came before the Court in *Kinsella* v. *Krueger*, 351 U.S. 470, and *Reid* v. *Covert*, 351 U.S. 487, the question whether two army wives could be constitutionally convicted, under article 2(11), of the capital offense of first degree murder, committed while stationed with their husbands at military bases abroad. Initially a divided Court, in two opinions which I joined, upheld the convictions.[3] In so holding the Court relied not upon constitutional power of Congress "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces," (art. I, sec. 8, cl. 14), but upon *In re Ross*, 140 U.S. 453, the so-called *Insular Cases, e.g., Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 and article IV, section 3, of the Constitution, respecting congressional power over territories. These factors, in combination, led the Court to conclude that the constitutional guarantees of article III and the fifth and sixth amendments did not apply to criminal trials of Americans abroad before legislatively established tribunals; that it was permissible for Congress to conclude that persons circumstanced as those women were should be tried before a court-martial, rather than a civil tribunal; and that such trials did not offend the fundamentals of due process.

The decisions in these cases were reached under the pressures of the closing days of the term. (See 351 U.S., at 483–486.) Having become convinced over the summer that the grounds on which they rested were untenable, I moved at the opening of the 1956 Term that the cases be reheard, being joined by the four Justices who had been in the minority. See 352 U.S. 901, 354 U.S. 1, 65–67.[4]

Upon a consolidated rehearing of the cases, the Court's original opinions and the judgments of conviction were set aside, a majority of the Court then holding that whether the convictions should stand or fall depended solely on the article I, section 8, clause 14 power, and that such power should not be constitutionally applied in those cases. *Reid* v. *Covert* (354 U.S. 1). There was, however, no opinion for the Court. Four Justices joined in an opinion broadly holding that "civilians" can never be criminally tried by military courts in times of peace, id., at 3–41.[5] Two Justices concurred specially in the result, on the narrow ground that article 2(11) could not be so applied to civilian service dependents charged with capital offenses, explicitly reserving judgment, however, as to whether nonmilitary personnel charged with other than capital offenses could be subjected to such trials,[6] id., at 41–64, 65–78. Two Justices dissented, adhering to the grounds expressed in the earlier majority opinions,[7] id., at 78. And one Justice did not participate in the cases.[8]

Thus the only issue that second Covert actually decided was that article 2(11) could not be constitutionally applied to civilian service dependents charged with capital offenses. Nevertheless, despite the wide differences of views by which this particular result was reached—none of which commanded the assent of a majority of the Court—Covert is now regarded as establishing that nonmilitary personnel are never within the reach of the article I power in times of peace. On this faulty view of the case, it is considered that Covert controls the issues presently before us. Apart from that view I think it fair to say different results might well have been reached in the three noncapital cases now under consideration. Without needlessly traversing ground already covered in my separate opinion in Covert, id., at 67–78, I shall give my reasons for believing that while the result reached by the Court in the capital case is right, its decisions in the noncapital cases are wrong.

First. The Court's view of the effect of Covert in these noncapital cases stems from the basic premise that only persons occupying a military "status" are within the scope of the article I, section 8, clause 14 power. The judgment in Covert having decided that civilian service dependents were not within the reach of that power in capital cases, it is said to follow that such dependents, and presumably all other "civilians," may also not be tried by courts-martial in noncapital cases; this because neither the statute nor article I makes exercise of the power turn upon the nature of the offense involved.

I think the "status" premise on which the Court has proceeded is unsound. Article I, section 8, clause 14, speaks not in narrow terms of soldiers and sailors, but broadly gives Congress power to prescribe "rules for the government and regulation of the

---

[1] To wit: "that part of Alaska east of longitude 172° west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

[2] In No. 37 the Government, alternatively, relies on the "War Power," the offense having been committed in the American Occupied Zone of West Berlin. Cf. *Madsen* v. *Kinsella*, 343 U.S. 341. Apart from whether or not the contention is available in light of the course of the proceedings below, I do not reach that issue.

[3] In addition to myself, the majority opinions, written by Mr. Justice Clark, were joined by Justices Reed, Burton and Minton. 351 U.S. 470 and 487. The Chief Justice and Justices Black and Douglas dissented. Id., at 485. Mr. Justice Frankfurter filed a reservation. Id., at 481.

[4] The three remaining members of the original majority were in dissent, 352 U.S., at 902, Mr. Justice Minton having meanwhile retired. Mr. Justice Brennan, his successor, did not participate on the motion.

[5] The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Black (the writer of the opinion), and Justices Douglas and Brennan.

[6] Mr. Justice Frankfurter and myself.

[7] Justices Clark and Burton.

[8] Mr. Justice Whittaker, succeeding Mr. Justice Reed who had meanwhile retired.

land and naval forces."[9] This power must be read in connection with clause 18 of the same article, authorizing Congress—

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Thus read, the power respecting the land and naval forces encompasses, in my opinion, all that Congress may appropriately deem "necessary" for their good order. It does not automatically exclude the regulation of nonmilitary personnel.

I think it impermissible to conclude, as some of my brethren have indicated on an earlier occasion (see second Covert, supra, at 20–22), and as the Court now holds, ante, —, that the Necessary and Proper Clause may not be resorted to in judging constitutionality in cases of this type. The clause, itself a part of article I, section 8, in which the power to regulate the armed forces is also found, applies no less to that power than it does to the other section 8 congressional powers, and indeed is to be read "as an integral part of each" such power. Second Covert, supra, at 43 (concurring opinion of Frankfurter, J.). As Mr. Justice Brandeis put it in *Ruppert* v. *Caffey*, 251 U.S. 264, at 300–301:

"Whether it be for purposes of national defense, or for the purpose of establishing post offices and post roads or for the purpose of regulating commerce among the several States Congress has the power 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution' the duty so reposed in the Federal Government. While this is a Government of enumerated powers it has full attributes of sovereignty within the limits of those powers. In re Debs, 158 U.S. 564. Some confusion of thought might perhaps have been avoided, if, instead of distinguishing between powers by the terms express and implied, the terms specific and general had been used. For the power conferred by clause 18 of section 8 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution' powers specifically enumerated is also an express power."

Of course, the Necessary and Proper Clause cannot be used to "expand" powers which are otherwise constitutionally limited, but that is only to say that when an asserted power is not appropriate to the exercise of an express power, to which all "necessary and proper" powers must relate, the asserted power is not a "proper" one. But to say, as the Court does now, that the necessary and proper clause "is not a grant of power" is to disregard clause 18 as one of the enumerated powers of section 8 of article I.

Viewing Congress power to provide for the governing of the Armed Forces in connection with the necessary and proper clause, it becomes apparent, I believe, that a person's status with reference to the Military Establishment is but one, and not alone the determinative, factor in judging the constitutionality of a particular exercise of that power. By the same token, the major premise on which the Court ascribes to Covert a controlling effect in these noncapital cases disappears.

Second. It is further suggsted that the difference between capital and noncapital offenses is not constitutionally significant, and that if article 2(11) of the Military Code, as applied to nonmilitary persons, is unconstitutional in one case, it equally is so in the other. I think this passes over too lightly the awesome finality of a capital case, a factor which in other instances has been reflected both in the constitutional adjudications of this Court and in the special procedural safeguards which have been thrown around those charged with such crimes.

Thus, this Court has held that the 14th amendment requires a State to appoint counsel for an indigent defendant in a capital case, *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45, whereas in noncapital cases a defendant has no such absolute right to counsel, *Betts* v. *Brady*, 316 U.S. 455. Again, the Congress in first-degree murder cases has in effect put infliction of the death penalty in the hands of the jury, rather than the judge, 18 U.S.C., sec. 1111(b); see also 60 Stat. 766, as amended, 42 U.S.C., sec. 2274(a), and various States have similar statutes.[10] Further illustrations of the same concern about capital cases are the prohibition on acceptance of pleas of guilty in such cases,[11] and, in the appellate field, provisions for mandatory or automatic appeals from such convictions.[12]

In my *Covert* opinion I pointed out that the Government itself had in effect acknowledged that because of the gravity of the offense, a treason case against a nonsoldier in time of peace could not constitutionally be held to be within the otherwise unlimited scope of article 2(11); and I expressed the view that the same constitutional limitation should obtain whenever the death penalty is involved (354 U.S., at 77). I see no reason for retreating from that conclusion. The view that we must hold that nonmilitary personnel abroad are either subject to peacetime court-martial jurisdiction for all offenses, or for none at all, represents an inexorable approach to constitutional adjudication to which I cannot subscribe.

It is one thing to hold that nonmilitary personnel situated at our foreign bases may be tried abroad by courts-martial in times of peace for noncapital offenses, but quite another to say that they may be so tried where life is at stake. In the latter situation, I do not believe that the necessary and proper clause, which alone in cases like this brings the exceptional article I jurisdiction into play, can properly be taken as justifying the trial of nonmilitary personnel without the full protections of an article III court. (See 354 U.S., at 77.) Before the constitutional existence of such a power can be found, for me a much more persuasive showing would be required that Congress had good reason for concluding that such a course is necessary to the proper maintenance of our Military Establishment abroad than has been made in any of the cases of this kind which have thus far come before the Court.

Third. I revert to the Court's status approach to the power of Congress to make rules for governing the Armed Forces. How little of substance that view holds appears when it is pointed out that had those involved in these cases been inducted into the Army, though otherwise maintaining their same capacities, it would presumably have been held that they were all fully subject to article 2(11). Yet except for this formality their real status would have remained the same.

Although it was recognized in the second *Covert* case that a person might be subject to article 2(11) "even though he had not formally been inducted into the military or did not wear a uniform," (354 U.S., at 23), I think that drawing a line of demarcation between those who are constitutionally subject to the article I, section 8, clause 14 power, and those who are not, defies definition in terms of military status. I believe that the true issue on this aspect of all such cases concerns the closeness or remoteness of the relationship between the person affected and the Military Establishment. Is that relationship close enough so that Congress may, in light of all the factors involved, appropriately deem it necessary that the military should be given jurisdiction to deal with offenses committed by such persons?

I think that such relationship here was close enough, and in this respect can draw no constitutional distinction between the Army wife in No. 22 and the civilian service employees in the other cases. Though their presence at these Army oversea bases was for different reasons and purposes, the relationship of both to the military community was such as to render them constitutionally amenable to the article 2(11) jurisdiction. By the same token, being of the view that the constitutional existence of such jurisdiction has not been shown as to civilian service dependents charged with capital offenses, I am equally of the opinion that it cannot be found with respect to civilian service employees similarly charged. For these reasons I concur in the judgment of the Court in No. 58.

Fourth. The other factors which must be weighed in judging the constitutionality of article 2(11) as applied to noncapital cases have, in my opinion, been adequately satisfied. I need not add to what was said in my concurring opinion in *Covert*, 354 U.S., at 70–73, 76–77, with reference to the matters which originally were adumbrated by my Brother Clark in his dissent in the same case (id., at 83–88). Nothing in the supplemental historical data respecting courts-martial which has been presented in these cases persuades me that we would be justified in holding that Congress' exercise of its constitutional powers in this area was without a rational and appropriate basis, so far as noncapital cases are concerned. Although it is now suggested that the problem with which Congress sought to deal in article 2(11) may be met in other ways, I submit that once it is shown that Congress' choice was not excluded by a rational judgment concerned with the problem it is beyond our competence to find constitutional command for other procedures.

I think it unfortunate that this Court should have found the Constitution lacking in enabling Congress to cope effectively with matters which are so intertwined with broader problems that have been engendered by present disturbed world conditions. Those problems are fraught with many factors that this Court is ill equipped to assess, and involve important national concerns into which we should be reluctant to enter except under the clearest sort of constitutional compulsion. That such compulsion is lacking here has been amply demonstrated by the checkered history of the past cases of this kind in the Court. Today's decisions are the more regrettable because they are bound to disturb delicate arrangements with many foreign countries, and may result in our having to relinquish to other nations where U.S. forces are stationed a substantial part of the jurisdiction now retained over American personnel under the Status of Forces Agreements.

I would reverse in Nos. 22, 21, and 58, and affirm in No. 37.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 22, OCTOBER TERM, 1959—KINSELLA, WARDEN, APPELLANT, *v.* UNITED STATES EX REL. SINGLETON; ON APPEAL FROM THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

(January 18, 1960)

(Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the Court.)

This direct appeal tests the constitutional validity of peacetime court-martial trials of civilian persons "accompanying the Armed Forces without the continental limits of the

---

[9] The fifth amendment excepts from its protection "cases arising," not persons, "in the land or naval forces."

[10] E.g., Mass. Gen. Laws Ann., c. 265, sec. 2; Miss. Code Ann., sec. 2536; N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann., c. 585, sec. 4.

[11] E.g., N.Y. Code Crim. Proc., sec. 332.

[12] E.g., Cal. Penal Code, sec. 1239(b); Oreg. Rev. Stat., sec. 138.810.

United States,"[1] and charged with noncapital offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 50 U.S.C., sec. 551, 64 Stat. 108. Appellee contends that the dependent wife of a soldier can be tried only in a court that affords her the safeguards of article III and of the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution. The trial court held article 2(11) of the code unconstitutional as applied to civilian dependents accompanying the Armed Forces overseas and charged with noncapital offenses, 164 F. Supp. 707, and the Government appealed. We noted probable jurisdiction and permitted appellee to proceed in forma pauperis. 359 U.S. 903.

The appellee is the mother of Mrs. Joanna S. Dial, the wife of a soldier who was assigned to a tank battalion of the U.S. Army. The Dials and their three children lived in Government housing quarters at Baumholder, Germany. In consequence of the death of one of their children, both of the Dials were charged with unpremeditated murder under article 118(2) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Upon the Dials' offer to plead guilty to involuntary manslaughter under article 119 of the code, both charges were withdrawn and new ones charging them separately with the lesser offense were returned. They were then tried together before a general court-martial at Baumholder. Mrs. Dial challenged the jurisdiction of the court-martial over her but, upon denial of her motion, pled guilty, as did her husband. Each was sentenced to the maximum penalty permitted under the code. Their convictions were upheld by the Court of Military Appeals and Mrs. Dial was returned to the United States and placed in the Federal Reformatory for Women at Alderson, W. Va. Thereafter the appellee filed this petition for habeas corpus and obtained Mrs. Dial's discharge from custody. From this judgment the warden has appealed.

As has been noted, the jurisdiction of the court-martial was based upon the provisions of article 2(11) of the Code. The Congress enacted that article in an effort to extend, for disciplinary reasons, the coverage of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to the classes of persons therein enumerated. The jurisdiction of the code only attached, however, when and if its applicability in a given foreign territory was sanctioned under "any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party" with the foreign sovereignty, or under "any accepted rule of international law." The existence of such an agreement here is admitted. The constitutionality of article 2(11) as it applies in time of peace to civilian dependents charged with noncapital offenses under the code is the sole issue to be decided.

The question is not one of first impression, as we had before us in 1956 the constitutionality of the article as applied to civilian dependents charged with capital offenses, in the companion cases of *Kinsella* v. *Krueger*, 351 U.S. 470, and *Reid* v. *Covert*, 351 U.S. 487. At the original submission of those cases, we decided by a bare majority that the article was a valid exercise of the power of the Congress, under article IV, section 3, to "make all needful rules and regulations" for the "territories" of the United States. We held further that the "procedure in such tribunals need not comply with the standards prescribed by the Constitution for article III courts," 351 U.S., at 475, and specifically upheld court-martial jurisdiction in such cases against the contention that its procedures did not provide for indictment by grand jury or trial by petit jury. In short, we said that the failure to provide such protections raised "no constitutional defect," citing *In re Ress*, 140 U.S. 453 (1891), and the *Insular Cases*, such as *Belzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1922). On rehearing at the following term, these opinions were withdrawn and judgments were entered declaring the article unconstitutional when applied to civilian dependents charged with capital offenses. *Reid* v. *Covert*, consolidated with *Kinsella* v. *Krueger*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957). The Court held[2] that the power over "territories," as applied by the *In re Ross* doctrine, was neither applicable nor controlling. It found that trial by court-martial was the exercise of an exceptional jurisdiction springing from the power granted the Congress in article I, section 8, clause 14, "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces," as supplemented by the necessary and proper clause of article I, section 8, clause 18.[3] But as applied to the civilian dependents there involved it must be considered, the Court said, in relation to article III and the fifth and sixth amendments. The majority concluded that, in those capital cases, trial by court-martial as provided could not constitutionally be justified.

The appellee contends that this result, declaring civilian dependents charged with capital offenses not to be subject to the provisions of the code, bears directly on its applicability to the same class charged with noncapital crimes. She says that the test of whether civilian dependents come within the power of Congress as granted in clause 14's limitation to the "land and naval forces" is the status of the person involved. Her conclusion is that if civilian dependents charged with capital offenses are not within that language, a fortiori persons in the same class charged with noncapital offenses could not be included, since the clause draws no distinctions as to offenses. The Government fully accepts the holding in the second Covert case, supra. It contends that the case is controlling only where civilian dependents are charged with capital offenses, and that in fact the concurrences indicate that considerations of a compelling necessity for prosecution by courts-martial of civilian dependents charged with noncapital offenses might permit with reason the inclusion of that limited category within court-martial jurisdiction. It submits that such necessities are controlling in the case of civilian dependents charged with noncapital crimes. It points out that such dependents affect the military community as a whole; that they have, in fact, been permitted to enjoy their residence in such communities on the representation that they are subject to military control; and that realistically they are a part of the Military Establishment. It argues that, from a morale standpoint, the present need for dependents to accompany American forces maintained abroad is a pressing one; that their special status as integral parts of the military community requires disciplinary control over them by the military commander; that the effectiveness of this control depends upon a readily available machinery affording a prompt sanction and resulting deterrent present only in court-martial jurisdiction; and that not only is court-martial procedure inherently fair but there are no alternatives to it. The Government further contends that it has entered into international agreements with a large number of foreign governments permitting the exercise of military jurisdiction in the territory of the signatories, and pursuant to the same it has been utilizing court-martial procedures at various American installations abroad. Its legal theory is based on historical materials which it asserts indicate a well-established practice of court-martial jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces, during colonial days as well as the formative period of our Constitution. From this it concludes that civilian dependents may be included as a necessary and proper incident to the congressional power "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces," as granted in clause 14.

In this field, *Toth* v. *Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11 (1955), cited with approval by a majority in the second Covert case, supra, is a landmark. Likewise, of course, we must consider the effect of the latter case on our problem.[4] We therefore turn to their teachings. The Toth case involved a discharged soldier who was tried by court-martial after his discharge from the Army, for an offense committed before his discharge. It was said there that the clause 14 "provision itself does not empower Congress to deprive people of trials under Bill of Rights safeguards," 350 U.S., at 21–22, and that military tribunals must be restricted "to the narrowest jurisdiction deemed absolutely essential to maintaining discipline among troops in active service" (id., at 22). We brushed aside the thought that "considerations of discipline" could provide an excuse for "new expansion of court-martial jurisdiction at the expense of normal and constitutionally preferable systems of trial by jury" (id., at 22–33). We were therefore "not willing to hold that power to circumvent these safeguards should be inferred through the necessary and proper clause" (id., at 22).

The holding of the case may be summed up in its own words; namely, that "the power granted Congress 'to makes rules' to regulate 'the land and naval forces' would seem to restrict court-martial jurisdiction to persons who are actually members or part of the Armed Forces." Id., at 15. It was with this gloss on clause 14 that the Court reached the second Covert case, supra. There, as we have noted, the person involved was the civilian dependent of a soldier, who was accompanying him outside the United States when the capital offense complained of was committed. The majority concluded that "trial by court-martial is constitutionally permissible only for persons who can, on a fair appraisal, be regarded as falling within the authority given to Congress under article I to regulate the 'land and naval forces.'" Concurring opinion, 354 U.S. at 42.[5] The test for jurisdiction, it follows, is one of status; namely, whether the accused in the court-martial proceeding is a person who can be regarded as

---

[1] "Art. 2. The following persons are subject to this chapter:

"(11) Subject to any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States and outside the following: that part of Alaska east of longitude 172 degrees west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

[2] Four Justices joined in an opinion announcing the judgment, two concurred in the result, and two dissented. Mr. Justice Whittaker, having come to the Court subsequent to the time of argument and decision in this case, took no part.

[3] Clause 18. "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution, the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

[4] See also *Dynes* v. *Hoover*, 20 How. 65 (1857); Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall. 2 (1866); *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku*, 327 U.S. 304 (1946); and Winthrop, Military Law and Precedents (2d ed. 1896), 144 et seq. and Reprint (1920) 105–107.

[5] The second concurring opinion expressed the view that art. I was an unlimited grant of power to Congress "to make such laws in the regulation of the land and naval forces as are necessary to the proper functioning of those forces" and indicated that the necessary and proper clause "modified" clause 14 "expanding" its power "under changing circumstances" (354 U.S., at 68).

falling within the term "land and naval forces." The Court concluded that civilian dependents charged with capital offenses were not included within such authority, the concurring Justices expressing the view that they did not think "that the proximity, physical and social, of these women to the 'land and naval forces' is, with due regard to all that has been put before us, so clearly demanded by the effective 'government and regulation' of those forces as reasonably to demonstrate a justification for court-martial jurisdiction over capital offenses." Concurring opinion, 354 U.S., at 46–47.

In the second Covert case, each opinion supporting the judgment struck down the article as it was applied to civilian dependents charged with capital crimes. The separate concurrences supported the judgment on the theory that the crime being "in fact punishable by death," id., at 45, the question to be decided is "analogous, ultimately, to issues of due process," id., at 75. The Justices joining in the opinion announcing the judgment, however, did not join in this view, but held that the constitutional safeguards claimed applied in "all criminal trials" in article III courts and applied "outside of the States," pointing out that both the fifth and sixth amendments "were all inclusive with their sweeping references to 'no person' and to 'all criminal prosecutions.'" Id., at 7–8. The two dissenters [6] found "no distinction in the Constitution between capital and other cases," id., at 89, but said that the constitutional safeguards claimed were not required under the power granted Congress in Art. IV, § 3, and the cases heretofore mentioned. The briefs and argument in Covert reveal that it was argued and submitted by the parties on the theory that no constitutional distinction could be drawn between capital and noncapital offenses for the purposes of clause 14. Supplemental Brief for Government on Rehearing, Nos. 701 and 713, at pp. 16–20, 82–95.

We have given careful study to the contentions of the Government. They add up to a reverse of form from the broad presentation in Covert, where it asserted that no distinction could be drawn as between capital and noncapital offenses. But the same fittings are used here with only adaptation to noncapital crimes. It asserts that the second Covert case, rather than foreclosing the issue here, indicates that military tribunals would have jurisdiction over civilian dependents charged with offenses less than capital. It says that the trial of such a person for a noncapital crime is "significantly different" from his trial for a capital one, that the maintaining of different standards or considerations in capital cases is not a new concept, and that, therefore, there must be a fresh evaluation of the necessities for court-martial jurisdiction and a new balancing of the rights involved. As we have indicated, these necessities add up to about the same as those asserted in capital cases and which the concurrence in second Covert held as not of sufficient "proximity, physical and social * * * to the 'land and naval forces' * * * as reasonably to demonstrate a justification" for court-martial prosecution. Likewise in the Government's historical material—dealing with court-martial jurisdiction during peace—which was found in Covert "too episodic, too meager * * * for constitutional adjudication," concurring opinion, 354 U.S., at 64, it has been unable to point out one court-martial which drew any distinction, insofar as the grant of power to the Congress under clause 14 was concerned, between capital and noncapital crimes.[7] The Government makes no claim that historically there was ever any distinction made as to the jurisdiction of courts-martial to try civilian dependents on the basis of capital as against noncapital offenses. Without contradiction, the materials furnished show that military jurisdiction has always been based on the "status" of the accused, rather than the nature of the offense. To say that military jurisdiction "defies definition in terms of military 'status'" is to defy unambiguous language of art. I, sec. 8, clause 14, as well as the historical background thereof and the precedents with reference thereto.[8]

Furthermore, we are not convinced that a critical impact upon discipline will result, as claimed by the Government (even if anyone deemed this a relevant consideration), if noncapital offenses are given the same treatment as capital ones by virtue of the second Covert case. The same necessities claimed here were found present in the second Covert case, see the dissent there, and were rejected by the Court. Even if the necessity for court-martial jurisdiction be relevant in cases involving deprivation of the constitutional rights of civilian dependents, which we seriously doubt, we doubt that the existence of the small number of noncapital cases now admitted by the Government in its brief here,[9] when spread over the worldwide coverage of military installations, would of itself bring on such a crisis. Moreover, in the critical areas of occupation other legal grounds may exist for court-martial jurisdiction as claimed by the Government in No. 37, *Wilson* v. *Bohlender*, decided today. See *Madsen* v. *Kinsella*, 343 U.S. 341 (1952). Another serious obstacle to permitting prosecution of noncapital offenses, while rejecting capital ones, is that it would place in the hands of the military an unreviewable discretion to exercise jurisdiction over civilian dependents simply by downgrading the offense, thus stripping the accused of his constitutional rights and protections. By allowing this assumption of "the garb of mercy," [10] we would be depriving a capital offender of his constitutional means of defense and in effect would nullify the second Covert case, supra. This situation will be aggravated by the want of legislation providing for trials in capital cases in article III courts sitting in the United States. At argument, the Government indicated that there had been no effort in the Congress to make any provision for the prosecution of such cases either in continental United States or in foreign lands. Still we heard no claim that the total failure to prosecute capital cases against civilian dependents since the second Covert decision in 1957 had affected in the least the discipline at armed services installations. We do know that in one case (*Wilson* v. *Girard*, 354 U.S. 524 (1957)), the Government insisted and we agreed that it had the power to turn over the case of an American soldier to Japanese civil authorities for trial on an offense committed while on duty. We have no information as to the impact of that trial on civilian dependents. Strangely, this itself might prove to be quite an effective deterrent.

Moreover the immediate return to the United States permanently of such civilian dependents, or their subsequent prosecution for the more serious offenses in the United States when authorized by the Congress, might well be the answer to the disciplinary problem. Certainly such trials would not involve as much expense nor be as difficult of successful prosecution as capital offenses.

We now reach the Government's suggestion that, in the light of the noncapital nature of the offense here, as opposed to the capital one in the Covert case, we should make a "fresh evaluation and a new balancing." But the power to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" bears no limitation as to offenses. The power there granted includes not only the creation of offenses but the fixing of the punishment therefor. If civilian dependents are included in the term "land and naval forces" at all, they are subject to the full power granted the Congress therein to create capital as well as noncapital offenses. This Court cannot diminish and expand that power, either on a case-by-case

---

[6] The writer of this opinion wrote the dissent.

[7] Even at argument here Government counsel admitted he had found no such distinction other than that asserted by the concurrences in second Covert:

"Mr. Justice Black. What is the historical difference as to the 'Members of the land and naval forces' and the constitutional power of Congress dependent upon whether they are capital crimes or noncapital crimes? When did that distinction first come into existence?

"Mr. Davis. Well, I think that distinction was first articulated in the concurring opinions in the Covert case."

* * * * *

"Mr. Justice Black. I really asked you about the history because I was curious to know [whether], in your reading and so forth, you found any reference to that distinction in this field before the Covert case.

"Mr. Davis. No. No explicit reference Mr. Justice Black."

[8] It was for this reason that the majority in the first Covert case, supra, based its decision on art. IV, sec. 3, rather than the congressional power under clause 14.

[9] Aside from traffic violations, there were only 273 cases (both capital and noncapital) involving dependents subject to foreign jurisdiction during the period between December 1, 1954, and November 30, 1958. This number includes 54 "offenses against economic control laws" and 88 offenses denominated "other." Government's brief on the merits in *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, No. 21, at p. 75.

[10] "He was glad, he said, that the penalty under this bill was not to be greater than that to which persons were subjected who were convicted of counterfeiting the great seal; but, on the other hand, he feared that this seeming lenity was not what it appeared to be, the child of mercy; he apprehended that its object was to facilitate the conviction of the accused, by taking from him the means of defense, which he might claim as his right, if the bill left the enumerated acts within the statute of the 25th of Edward III. These acts might be considered as proofs of an adherence to the King's enemies, and consequently came within the species of treason on which corruption of blood attached; but, by classing them under the head of treasons which did not operate a corruption of blood, the framers of the bill had contrived to take from the accused the means of defense, under the appearance of lenity. Of all the characters of cruelty, he considered that as the most odious which assumed the garb of mercy: such was the case here; under the pretence of mercy to the accused, in not charging him with corruption of blood, he was to be deprived of the means of making his defense. That he might not stand a chance in the contest, his shield was to be taken from him. The list of the jury, to give him the benefit of the challenge—the list of witnesses, to enable him to detect conspiracies and to prevent perjury—the copy of the charge 10 days before the trial, to enable him to prepare himself for the awful day—the assistance of a learned gentleman to speak for an unlearned man—all the arms and means of protection with which the humanity of the law of England had fortified an individual, when accused by the crown, were to be taken away. Harshness and severity were to be substituted for tenderness and compassion; and then he was to be insulted by being told he was spared the corruption of blood." 5 The Speeches of the Right Honorable Charles James Fox in the House of Commons (London 1815) 78.

basis or on a balancing of the power there granted Congress against the safeguards of article III and the fifth and sixth amendments. Due process cannot create or enlarge power. See *Toth* v. *Quarles*, supra. It has to do, as taught by the Government's own cases [11] with the denial of that "fundamental fairness, shocking to the universal sense of justice." *Betts* v. *Brady*, 316 U.S. 455, 462 (1942). It deals neither with power nor with jurisdiction, but with their exercise.

Obviously 14th amendment cases dealing with State action have no application here, but if they did, we believe that to deprive civilian dependents of the safeguards of a jury trial here, an infamous case by constitutional standards, would be as invalid under those cases as it would be in cases of a capital nature. Nor do we believe that due process considerations bring about an expansion of clause 14 through the operation of the necessary and proper clause. If the exercise of the power is valid it is because it is granted in clause 14, not because of the necessary and proper clause. That clause is not itself a grant of power, but a caveat that the Congress possesses all of the means necessary to carry out the specifically granted "foregoing" powers of section 8 "and all other powers vested by this Constitution." As James Madison explained, the necessary and proper clause is "but merely a declaration, for the removal of all uncertainty, that the means of carrying into execution those [powers] otherwise granted are included in the grant." VI Writings of James Madison, edited by Gaillard Hunt, 383. There can be no question but that clause 14 grants the Congress power to adopt the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Our initial inquiry is whether Congress can include civilian dependents within the term "land and naval forces" as a proper incident to this power and necessary to its execution. If answered in the affirmative then civilian dependents are amenable to the code. In the second Covert case, supra, it was held they were not so amenable as to capital offenses. Our final inquiry, therefore, is narrowed to whether clause 14, which under the second Covert case has been held not to include civilian dependents charged with capital offenses, may now be expanded to include the same civilian dependents but who are charged with noncapital offenses. We again refer to James Madison:

"When the Constitution was under the discussions which preceded its ratification, it is well known that great apprehensions were expressed by many, lest the omission of some positive exception, from the powers delegated, of certain rights * * * might expose them to the danger of being drawn, by construction, within some of the powers vested in Congress, more especially of the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying their other powers into execution. In reply to this objection, it was invariably urged to be a fundamental and characteristic principle of the Constitution, that all powers not given by it were reserved; that no powers were given beyond those enumerated in the Constitution, and such as were fairly incident to them." Writings, supra, at 390.

We are therefore constrained to say that since this Court has said that the necessary and proper clause cannot expand clause 14 so as to include prosecution of civilian dependents for capital crimes, it cannot expand clause 14 to include prosecution of them for noncapital offenses.

Neither our history nor our decisions furnish a foothold for the application of such due process concepts as the Government projects. Its application today in light of the irreversibility of the death penalty would free from military prosecution a civilian accompanying or employed by the armed services who committed a capital offense, while the same civilian could be prosecuted by the military for a noncapital crime. It is illogical to say that the power respecting the land and naval forces encompasses * * * all that Congress may appropriately deem necessary for their good order and still deny to Congress the means to exercise such power through the infliction of the death penalty. But that is proposed here. In our view this would militate against our whole concept of power and jurisdiction. It would likewise be contrary to the entire history of the Articles of War. Even prior to the Constitutional Convention, the Articles of War included 17 capital offenses applicable to all persons whose status brought them within the term "land and naval forces." There were not then and never have been any exceptions as to persons in the applicability of these capital offenses. In 1806 when the Articles of War were first revised, Congress retained therein 16 offenses that carried the death penalty, although there was complaint that "almost every article in the bill was stained with blood." (15 Annals of Cong. 326.)

Nor do we believe that the exclusion of noncapital offenses along with capital ones will cause any additional disturbance in our "delicate arrangements with many foreign countries." The Government has pointed to no disruption in such relations by reason of the second Covert decision. Certainly this case involves no more "important national concerns into which we should be reluctant to enter" than did Covert. In truth the problems are identical and are so intertwined that equal treatment of capital and noncapital cases would be a palliative to a troubled world.

We therefore hold that Mrs. Dial is protected by the specific provisions of article III and the fifth and sixth amendments and that her prosecution and conviction by courtmartial is not constitutionally permissible. The judgment must therefore be

---

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—No. 58—OCTOBER TERM, 1959—ALBERT H. GRISHAM, PETITIONER, *v.* CHARLES R. HAGAN, WARDEN—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

(January 18, 1960)

(Mr. Justice Clark delivered the opinion of the Court.)

This case tests by habeas corpus the validity of Article 2(11) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C., section 802,[1] as applied to a civilian convicted by courtmartial of a capital offense while employed overseas by the U.S. Army. It is a companion case to No. 22, *Kinsella* v. *Singleton*, which involves the application of the same article to noncapital offenses committed by dependents accompanying soldiers stationed outside the United States, and to No. 21, *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, and No. 37, *Wilson* v. *Bohlender*, involving noncapital offenses committed by armed services employees while stationed overseas—all of which cases are decided today.

Petitioner, a civilian employee of the U.S. Army attached to an Army installation in France, was tried by a general court-martial for the capital offense of premeditated murder as defined in article 118(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. He was found guilty of the lesser and included offense of unpremeditated murder, and sentenced to confinement at hard labor for the term of his natural life. The sentence was subsequently reduced to 35 years. While serving this sentence at the U.S. Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., he filed this petition for a writ of habeas corpus, claiming that article 2(11) was unconstitutional as applied to him, for the reason that Congress lacked the power to deprive him of a civil trial affording all of the protections of article III and the fifth and sixth amendments to the Constitution. The writ was dismissed, 161 F. Supp. 112, and the Court of Appeals affirmed, 261 F. 2d 204. In the light of the opinion of this Court on the rehearing in *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957), as well as that of the Court of Appeals on the issue of the severability of article 2(11) in *Guagliardo* v. *McElroy*, 259 F. 2d 927,[2] we granted certiorari. 359 U.S. 978 (1959).

We are of the opinion that this case is controlled by *Reid* v. *Covert*, *supra*. It decided that the application of the article to civilian dependents charged with capital offenses while accompanying servicemen outside the United States was unconstitutional as violative of article III and the fifth and sixth amendments. We have carefully considered the Government's position as to the distinctions between civilian dependents and civilian employees, especially its voluminous historical materials relating to court-martial jurisdiction. However, the considerations pointed out in Covert have equal applicability here. Those who controlled the majority there held that the death penalty is so irreversible that a dependent charged with a capital crime must have the benefit of a jury. The awesomeness of the death penalty has no less impact when applied to civilian employees. Continued adherence to Covert requires civilian employees to be afforded the same right of trial by jury. Furthermore, the number of civilian employees is much smaller than the number of dependents, and the alternative procedures available for controlling discipline as to the former more effective. See *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*. For the purposes of this decision, we cannot say that there are any valid distinctions between the two classes of persons. The judgment is therefore reversed.

It is so ordered.

JANUARY 19, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, for the past 2 years, has been studying the rights of persons under American military jurisdiction, particularly civilians, whether dependents, employees of the armed services, or defense contractors and their employees.

Accordingly, the subcommittee is very much interested in the Supreme Court decisions handed down yesterday in four cases involving persons in these categories.

This is to ask that you inform the subcommittee as soon as possible of the plans or plan proposed by the Department of Defense to handle criminal jurisdiction of civilians with American military overseas. I would like to know your thinking on this matter immediately and receive your detailed proposal as soon as it is prepared. It is presumed that you have been making such plans in the eventuality that the court would

---

[1] "Art. 2. The following persons are subject to this chapter:

* * * * * *

"(11) Subject to any treaty or agreement to which the United States is or may be a party or to any accepted rule of international law, persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States and outside the following: That part of Alaska east of longitude 172 degrees west, the Canal Zone, the main group of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

[2] In the light of our opinion in No. 21, *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, handed down today, we deny the contention that the article is nonseverable.

[11] *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), and *Betts* v. *Brady*, 316 U.S. 455 (1942), both 14th amendment cases which would, of course, have no application here.

decide as it did. When we have had an opportunity to examine your suggestions, we will be in a better position to decide ourselves what public hearings or further study are indicated.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

JANUARY 19, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, for the past 2 years, has been studying the rights of persons under American military jurisdiction, particularly civilians, whether dependents, employees of the armed services, or defense contractors and their employees.

Accordingly, the subcommittee is very much interested in the Supreme Court decisions handed down yesterday in four cases involving persons in these categories.

This is to ask that you inform the subcommittee as soon as possible of the plans or plan proposed by the Department of Justice to handle criminal jurisdiction of civilians with American military overseas. I would like to know your thinking on this matter immediately and receive your detailed proposal as soon as it is prepared. It is presumed that you have been making such plans in the eventuality that the Court would decide as it did. When we have had an opportunity to examine your suggestions, we will be in a better positoin to decide ourselves what public hearings or further study are indicated.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

HENNINGS CALLS FOR JUSTICE AND DEFENSE DEPARTMENT VIEWS ON CRIMINAL PROSECUTION OF CIVILIANS WITH AMERICAN MILITARY OVERSEAS

U.S. Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, Missouri, chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, commenting on the Supreme Court decisions holding that the Constitution prohibits courts-martial of civilians with American military overseas in peacetime, pointed out today that the subcommittee has been continuing a study for the past 2 years on the subject, and called for Justice and Defense Department plans concerning criminal prosecution of such Americans who commit offenses overseas.

"I think the Court decisions are sound constitutional law and, further, I believe it would be quite incorrect to assume that there is now a legal 'no man's land' as a result of the holdings," Senator HENNINGS stated.

"However," the Senator went on, "the Government of the United States should decide what legal forum is most desirable in which to prosecute civilian offenders overseas.

"The nearly half-million civilians under discussion fall in three categories: (1) dependents of American military personnel, (2) Defense Department employees, and (3) defense contractors and their employees, working overseas with American Armed Forces," Senator HENNINGS explained.

"Of course," he said, "the hundreds of thousands of American civilians who travel abroad yearly, outside the above categories, are always subject to the criminal laws of the countries that they visit. This is equally true for civilians with the American military unless they are completely exempted from local laws by treaty provisions.

"The United States has several alternatives: (1) Let foreign countries try these American civilians the way they would try any other American civilians under their local laws in their own courts; (2) bring the civilians back for trial in courts in the United States; (3) enact legislation placing such civilians in a military status so that they could be covered by courts-martial under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

"The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is anxious to receive the views of the Departments of Defense and Justice. I feel that necessary discipline and support for American defense operations outside the continental limits of the United States can be maintained at the same time we are guaranteeing basic constitutional rights of Americans," Senator HENNINGS concluded.

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPMENTS IN CHINA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Communist regime on the mainland of China has now been implanted for a full decade. During that time there has been evidence of many rumblings within Communist China, and quite forcefully brought to world attention was the ruthlessness with which the Chinese Communists dealt with the 1959 Tibetan rebellion.

In assessing both the past and future of the Communist regime, it seemed to me that it would be helpful to Members of the Senate and the general public to have an analysis of the frictions which have developed on the mainland since the Communist takeover. Accordingly, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a study of tensions in Communist China, along the lines of a series of studies relating to tensions in the Soviet Union and the satellites which was prepared at my request several years ago. The earlier studies proved to be most useful documents.

The report indicates that some of the factual assumptions on which our China policy is based are not static, but are constantly in a state of change. Opposition to the present regime in Communist China is poorly and ineffectively organized, according to the report. In attempting to gain support, the Chinese Communists appeal to the nationalism of the people and seek to create resentment against the West.

Complacent westerners should not forget, however, that for many centuries before modern times—long before the advent of communism—this giant nation excelled all countries in cultural attainments, political stability, military prowess, and economic wealth. Today China is the second greatest national land mass on the globe and its people make up one-quarter of the world's population.

Reportedly, there have been extensive economic improvements in China in recent years. For example, it is reported that China mines four to five times more coal than during the best pre-Communist years. Operating railway and highway mileage has been tripled since 1949. While many of these accomplishments may be Communist exaggerations, there is no doubt that much has been changed in China since the Communists came to power.

In the light of these facts, the United States and the free world will need to design a strong, effective policy to deal with the impact which this mighty Nation will have upon not only its surrounding neighbors, but the world itself, in the years ahead.

In proposing a new, hard look at our China policy, this does not mean that we should go soft on communism. Nor does it mean—now or in the foreseeable future—that we should recognize Red China or admit it into the United Nations.

To the contrary, the purpose is to provide our policymakers with a more realistic evaluation of the changes and motivating forces in China.

An effective China policy must take into account the following factors:

First. The increasing military power of Red China, particularly when this massive nation obtains missile-nuclear weapons.

Second. The impact of the Chinese population explosion on both southeast Asia and the world community.

Third. The growing Chinese economic might, and its impact of world trade.

Fourth. The interrelationships in the Communist league, particularly between Peiping and Moscow.

For an effective policy, we must better understand what goes on in China, what motivates the Chinese Government, and what we can expect from the Chinese Government in the future. It is imperative that we take measures to keep developments in China under constant review, that we keep alert, adequate, and ready to meet changing conditions.

It has been the policy of the Chinese Communists to carry most of their campaigns—for industrialization, for farm communes, and for political control—to an excess, and such excesses may very well increase tensions within China. In the hurry to obtain national goals, the individual rights of the citizens are being ignored. Ten years after its establishment, the Communist regime still has no definite code of laws and no regard for civil liberties.

This study on "Tensions in Communist China" points to some of the major areas of tensions which have occurred on the mainland of China since the Communist takeover.

What do these findings mean? Fundamentally, this:

First. The Communist leadership now has a strong grasp on China—but only the future can tell how long this hold on the 650 million people of China will last.

Second. There is no doubt that large groups of the Chinese people, traditionally beset by hunger and poverty, are experiencing some economic benefits under the Communist system.

Third. If internal unity is accomplished and the rate of Chinese economic expansion continues, China may in a few years rank as one of the great powers. This, we must recognize, and prepare for.

Consequently, our China policy cannot be based on an attitude of turning our heads. We must remain alert and adequate.

I recommend this study of "Tensions in Communist China" as a highly informative and interesting one. I am informed that it will be ready for distribu-

tion today, and that it is Senate Document No. 66 of the 86th Congress, 1st session.

VOTING RECORDS IN DALLAS AND WILCOX COUNTIES, ALA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a well-documented series of incidents which point most directly to the need for responsible Federal officials who will respect the right of qualified U.S. citizens to vote and who, when called upon to do so by properly constituted authorities, will furnish proof that they have upheld these citizens' rights.

The Director of the Federal Civil Rights Commission has submitted to me a chronological account, recording a history of frustrations engaged in by officials in one of the States of this Union—a history which has now lasted for 14 months and has not yet ended—hampering work of the Federal Civil Rights Commission in determining whether or not the practice of democracy is truly being followed in every part of this Nation. This frustration persists in two counties, one of which, Dallas, has a nonwhite population over the age of 21 of 18,000 with only a maximum 5 percent of nonwhite voter registration, and the other of which, Wilcox, with a nonwhite population of more than 8,200 over the age of 21, has no perceivable nonwhite registration whatsoever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a letter I have received this morning from the Honorable Gordon Tiffany, Staff Director of the Federal Civil Rights Commission, and a series of newspaper articles from the local Alabama press, describing the record to which I refer.

There being no objection, the letter and newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1960.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: A member of your staff has been discussing the voting situation in Alabama with various members of my staff, in particular the difficulties we have encountered in attempting to carry out our duties with respect to the investigation of voting complaints in Alabama. As recently as the past week we made a further attempt to examine the voting records in Dallas and Wilcox Counties, two of the counties involved in our original hearing in Alabama in December of 1958, and were again prevented from seeing such records.

During the hearing, in the afternoon of December 8, 1958, one of the witnesses who had been subpenaed to appear before the Commission with the records was the probate judge of Dallas County, Hon. Bernard Reynolds. His testimony appears at page 188 of the record of the hearing which has now been printed. Judge Reynolds did not produce the records, stating that they had been subpenaed by the grand jury of Dallas County, dated the 5th day of December 1958 but served on him on the 4th day of December 1958. The same records had been subpenaed by the Commission on Civil Rights prior to the 4th day of December 1958, which Judge Reynolds admitted (p. 189 of the record).

During the spring of 1959 in order to complete our investigation, and subsequent to the examination of the records of Macon, Barbour, and Bullock Counties, we again requested an examination of the records of Dallas and Wilcox Counties and were advised through a statement by the grand juries that we could see only those records of the complaining witnesses whose names we would divulge to the grand jury. This was contrary to the examination of the records in Macon, Barbour, and Bullock Counties, wherein all of the records were open for inspection.

Negotiations were made for the inspection of the records of Dallas and Wilcox Counties in the spring of 1959 between this office and Mr. Joseph F. Johnston, president of the Alabama State Bar Association, who appeared in the hearings in the Federal court in Montgomery, Ala., in January of 1959 at the time of the legal arguments involved in our examination of the records of Macon, Barbour, and Bullock Counties.

At the special direction of the Commission to attempt to wind up all unfinished investigations, negotiations were again established with Mr. Johnston the latter part of December 1959 and on January 6, 1960, for the purpose of making a final attempt to see these records. As a result of conversations with Mr. Johnston, representatives appeared at the office of the judge of the circuit court embracing Dallas and Wilcox Counties on Tuesday, January 12, and Wednesday, January 13, 1960. The representatives were again informed that the voting records of those counties were still under subpena to the grand jury and that all additional voting records since that time were under subpena to the grand jury, and, therefore, were not available for inspection by our representatives except in those cases where we would disclose the names of the complaining witnesses, after which we might examine the records of those witnesses.

In order to present a picture of the attitude of the authorities in Alabama at the present time, I have enclosed herewith photographic copies of the newspaper publicity taken from the local Alabama papers last week during and following the visit of our representatives.

If there is any further information you desire with respect to our attempt to see the records, will you be good enough to communicate with me.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON M. TIFFANY,
Staff Director.

[From the Birmingham News, Jan. 14, 1960]

FORTY-FIVE COMPLAINTS MADE—PROBERS CHECK MONTGOMERY VOTING CASES

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has checked on 45 recent voting rights complaints from Montgomery County, a spokesman said here today.

It has made a third vain attempt to see voting records in Dallas, Wilcox, and Lowndes Counties, he added.

He said the investigations in Montgomery County began several weeks ago and has just been completed. Fieldmen from the Commission tried without success to look at records in Dallas and Wilcox Counties earlier this week.

A planned visit to Lowndes County today was called off as useless.

Col. A. H. Rosenfeld, head of the field division, said the Commission sought to inspect records in these three counties on the basis of an oral agreement worked out with Alabama authorities in Federal Judge Frank M. Johnson's office in Montgomery early last year. Gov. John Patterson, then attorney general, was a party to the agreement, Rosenfeld said.

"These Alabama counties had everything to gain and nothing to lose by letting us see their records," said Rosenfeld. "After all, we already have reported on the general registration situation in these counties. We probably could have added little more except for detail and documentation. And—more important—we would have wound up our unfinished business there. As it is, the continued challenge cannot be ignored."

Next step of the Commission probably will be to report to Congress on the Alabama situation. The continued refusal of Alabama authorities to make these voting records available to the Commission could stir liberals in Congress to more demands for new civil rights legislation.

Efforts are now being made in the House to bypass the Rules Committee and get a civil rights bill to the floor by a discharge petition. At last reports, the petition lacked 40 to 50 of the required 219 signatures.

A Birmingham news survey last year gave the following voter registration figures in the four counties:

Wilcox—3,040 registered, no Negroes.

Montgomery—29,000 registered, including 3,480 Negroes.

Lowndes—2,306 registered, no Negroes.

Dallas—8,000 registered, including 520 Negroes.

At Selma, Circuit Judge James A. Hare said the investigators conferred with us about grand jury meetings in Dallas and Wilcox Counties and the possibility of their inspecting board of registrar records now in the hands of those grand juries.

Hare said they also asked about the location of grand jury records in Lowndes County.

"I told them that Lowndes County is not in my circuit and I don't know what those folks over there do with their records," Hare told a reporter.

Dallas and Wilcox Counties are in the fourth judicial circuit which Hare represents. Lowndes is in the second judicial circuit.

Judge Hare said he informed the investigators of the next regular meeting dates of the grand juries—in Dallas County January 24, and in Wilcox County during February.

He said he reminded them of past action of these grand juries concerning Commission requests to inspect voting records in their hands.

These grand juries have agreed to permit Commission investigators to examine records held by them under certain conditions.

These conditions call for an agreement that the records would be examined only upon the presentation of a specific complaint brought against the board of registrars.

Any inspection would be made in the presence of a special grand jury committee and the circuit solicitor.

Hare said the investigators declined to disclose any specific complaint.

Voter registration records in Dallas and Wilcox Counties have been in the hands of grand juries since November 1958, when Hare ordered them to investigate alleged malpractice of voter registration.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Jan. 15, 1960]

PATTERSON "DELIGHTED" IF HE INTERFERED IN RIGHTS VOTE PROBE

(By Donald F. Martin)

MONTGOMERY, January 14.—Gov. John Patterson said today he was "delighted" if he interfered with a Civil Rights Commission investigation in Alabama because "it is the most unconstitutional body there is."

The Governor's statement followed an accusation by a Civil Rights spokesman in Washington that Dallas and Wilcox Counties officials had broken an agreement to give Commission agents access to the voting records of the two counties. The spokesman said three Commission field representatives

met with a circuit judge and other officials at Selma Wednesday in an effort to examine voting records.

DENIES AGREEMENT

Patterson hotly denied any agreement, but added "if there was an agreement (Col. A. H.) Rosenfeld, chief investigator for the Commission, and his so-called civil righters broke it."

While denying any deal, the chief executive said "there was an agreement that the Federal investigators could see the records in Macon County and then get out. They were given a certain length of time.

"But what did they do? They went ahead and sued us anyway."

Patterson implied that permission had been given on the basis the Federal Government would not sue the State as such.

Showing his anger, Patterson said, "If I've caused these so-called civil righters any difficulty, I'm delighted."

The Governor said the Federal Commission "got beat in court and now they're mad as hell about it. The trouble with Rosenfeld," he said, "is that his word ain't good." There was no agreement.

"If he made an agreement, it was not to sue the State and he repudiated his own agreement. This Commission has used lies, intimidation, and harrassment against our public officials.

"They are trying to destroy our schools and stir up race conflict. If the President wanted to help the country he would kick that bunch.

"Let them go to New York City where you can't even walk down the street safely."

RECORDS IMPOUNDED

The civil rights spokesman said when the investigators arrived there the judge said that the records were still impounded by the grand jury.

"They've been saying that for 14 months and they've had an election since then," he added. "I wonder how they held that election. They can keep saying that the records are impounded for the next 3 years."

The spokesman said the latest defiance on the part of Alabama officials would be mentioned "when Commission members testify before House and Senate committees considering proposals that Federal registrars be sent into the area where certain persons cannot get registered by local officials."

Patterson, in a press conference a few weeks ago, requested all State, county, and local officials to refuse aid to the Federal agents. While attorney general in 1958, Patterson also advised all boards of registrars to close their records to the Federal agents.

Grand juries in Barbour, Bullock, Lowndes, Wilcox, and Dallas Counties went into emergency sessions and impounded all voter registration records just before a Civil Rights Commission hearing here December 8, 1958. The jury action blocked Rosenfeld's attempts to compile alleged evidence from the records.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Journal, Jan. 14, 1960]

RIGHTS MEN BLOCKED—GRAND JURIES HOLD RECORDS IN TWO COUNTIES

WASHINGTON.—Field representatives of the Federal Civil Rights Commission failed yesterday in a renewed effort to gain access to voting records of Dallas and Wilcox Counties in Alabama.

A spokesman of the Federal Civil Rights Commission said today that two field representatives were in Selma, Ala., yesterday by appointment to meet with the State circuit court judge and other officials.

The spokesman said it was understood in advance that the representatives were to be given access to records the Commission has sought since late 1958.

JURY HOLDS RECORDS

"The representatives were told that the records are still impounded by the grand jury," the spokesman said. "They were told that the grand jury would let them see the records pertaining to any complaining witness, if they would divulge the names of the witnesses."

The grand jury impounded the records after the Civil Rights Commission sought to subpena them for a hearing in December 1958.

The spokesman said the field representatives arranged to leave Selma yesterday after reporting by telephone on what had taken place.

Circuit Judge James A. Hare today revealed at Selma that inquiries were made there concerning voter registration in Dallas, Wilcox, and Lowndes Counties by Civil Rights Commission agents.

Hare said two men who showed credentials associating them with the Commission had spent 2 days questioning him, Circuit Solicitor Blanchard L. McLeod, and Dallas Sheriff James G. Clark.

Hare issued a brief statement after the sessions ended Wednesday. He said:

"They conferred with us about grand-jury meetings in Dallas and Wilcox Counties and the possibility of their inspecting board of registrars' records now in the hands of those grand juries."

Hare said they also asked about the location of grand-jury records in Lowndes County.

"I told them that Lowndes County is not in my circuit and I don't know what those folks over there do with their records," Hare told a reporter.

Dallas and Wilcox Counties are in the fourth judicial circuit, which Hare represents. Lowndes is in the second judicial circuit.

Hare said he could only identify the two men as Bounds and Miller.

Judge Hare said he informed the two men of the next regular meeting dates of the grand juries—in Dallas County January 24 and in Wilcox during February.

He said he reminded them of the past action of these grand juries concerning commission requests to inspect voting records in their hands.

These grand juries have agreed to permit Commission investigators to examine records held by them under certain conditions.

These conditions call for an agreement that the records would be examined only upon the presentation of a specific complaint brought against the board of registrars.

Any inspection would be made in the presence of a special grand-jury committee and the circuit solicitor.

Hare said the two men declined to disclose any specific complaint.

Voter registration records in Dallas and Wilcox Counties have been in the hands of grand juries since November 1958, when Hare ordered them to investigate "alleged malpractice of voter registration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there further morning business?

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, time and again the junior Senator from Tennessee has lifted his voice in apprehension over the drift and complacency, in this crucial period in world history, of U.S. policy and program, and the weakness of its leadership.

I am prompted once again to cry out a word of warning, and I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a very pungent and beautifully written article by the eminent commentator, Mr. Walter Lippmann, published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. Lippmann says:

The President has been true to the principle he laid down in his budget, which was submitted on January 21, 1954. "We will reduce" he said 6 years ago, "the share of the national income which is spent by the Government."

He has done that.

Later on in the article Mr. Lippmann says:

So the President is entitled to say that he has been faithful to the principle he laid down when he began. During his term of office the American people have been enjoying a larger share of a greatly enlarged national income.

Then Mr. Lippmann says:

This would be an unalloyed delight were it not for the disturbing fact that during these years of private prosperity, the President has been presiding over the loss of American primacy among the great powers of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Lippmann be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND BEST

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has been true to the principle he laid down in his first budget, which was submitted on January 21, 1954. "We will reduce," he said 6 years ago, "the share of the national income which is spent by the Government."

He has done that. Although the Federal Government is spending on the purchase of goods and services more than it did 6 years ago, this is a smaller share of the much increased national income. Even when we add the very considerable increased amount spent by local and State governments, the total is still a smaller share than it was in 1953, when the President was preparing his first budget.

So the President is entitled to say that he has been faithful to the principle he laid down when he began. During his term of office the American people have been enjoying a larger share of a greatly enlarged national income. Never before in all history have so many people in any country had so much money to spend privately and as they saw fit.

This would be an unalloyed delight were it not for the disturbing fact that during these years of private prosperity, the President has been presiding over the loss of American primacy among the great powers of the world.

There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union. But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the lifegiving principle of national power.

Why has this happened? Why are we challenged in this way when, in fact, the Soviet Union has a gross national product which is less than half of ours and a standard of living about a third as high as our own? Why is this richer country being pressed by a poorer country?

The reason, at bottom, is that in this period of cold war, the President has adhered to a principle which would probably no longer be suitable even in a time of total peace. He has adhered to a principle which puts private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. The challenge of the Soviet Union has been demanding an increase, not a reduction, of the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run.

The Soviet economy is growing at a rate which, estimated conservatively, is 6 percent per annum. Our economy has been growing at a rate of less than 3 percent. The Soviet economy is half as big as ours but it is growing twice as fast. This means that this year's increment of increase is about $12 billion in the U.S.S.R. and about $15 billion in the United States of America.

But, and this is the crux of the matter, the U.S.S.R. will use most, not all, of the $12 billion increase for national purposes, for armaments, for productive investment, for foreign aid, and for national education. We, on the other hand, are acting on the Eisenhower principle, and are spending a greater share of our $15 billion increase for private purposes, for the making of consumer goods and of the factories and facilities connected with the making and use of consumer goods.

That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States.

I have taken this analysis of the figures from several sources but chiefly from the brilliant and notable testimony before the Joint Committee of Congress given last autumn by Prof. W. W. Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The analysis is confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Allen W. Dulles, based on the findings of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. Dulles' statement is one that we must all ponder and take to heart. It says "the major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized industrial, military, and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of the consumer type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our respective gross national products nor of our respective industrial productions is a true yardstick of our relative national power positions.

"The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

I have quoted the last sentence of Mr. Dulles' statement because it states, so it seems to me, the fundamental issue which the country must meet. The President's controlling principle—that the Government should spend a smaller share of a growing national income—has as its consequence, in this age of cold war and national rivalry, that the country will have a smaller position of influence and power in the world. While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what must not be allowed to come to an end is our parity with the greatest powers. For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

Nobody can say as yet when the Nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency

The voices that will serve this country, and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things. They may not as yet do well in the Gallup polls. They will be listened to sooner or later. For they will shatter the belief, now so prevalent among us, that affluence is greatness. It is not. In the history of human societies it has not seldom been the case that when riches were devoted to luxury it was the mark of their decline.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: FACT OR FICTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the December 1959 issue of the Western Political Quarterly there appeared an excellent article by Howard N. Mantel, of Columbia University, entitled "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Fact or Fiction of the Legislative Process."

In a most illuminating discussion, Mr. Mantel explores the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the courts in interpreting statutes passed by Congress.

Mr. Mantel reviews present practices by which a Member of Congress may revise or extend his remarks so as to appear to have delivered remarks during debate which, in fact, he did not, or may insert material in a fashion which leaves the impression that he spoke on the floor when, actually, he did not.

RECORD ACCURACY QUESTIONED

He cites the use by the courts of statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in attempting to clarify the intent of Congress for the purpose of determining the meaning of statutory language, and questions the weight which can be given to such evidence in light of procedures followed in recording of the statements of Members of Congress.

Mr. Mantel notes court acceptance of the accuracy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and examines the legal difficulties involved in raising this question in the courts. He concludes that—

A strong argument can be made for the gradual lessening of weight assigned in appellate cases to the floor debates as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless and until the revision and extension practices are radically revamped. There is need for a rule against substantive changes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, in the case of the House of Representatives, against extensions which appear as speeches. Changes for the sake of grammar and, perhaps, rhetoric should be allowed, with prudence the keyword to apprehensive Congressmen, worried about the possible effects their unexpurgated remarks may have in home districts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OFFERED

Several suggestions are made by Mr. Mantel for improvement of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a device for reporting of congressional debates, including use of maps, diagrams, and illustrations to help explain debates—a suggestion which I advanced in an article in the New York Times in 1958; a limit on the number of items which a Member of Congress may insert in the Appendix during a single session; a table of contents to each day's Appendix items; a status table of major substantive legislation; and a weekly digest of debates reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. Mantel's article points up a significant problem upon which the Congress should act. In the 85th Congress, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I introduced Senate Resolution 193 to amend the standing rules of the Senate to prohibit substantive changes in the recording of remarks made on the Senate floor. The resolution provided that changes would be permissible only to correct grammar and syntax and to eliminate errors made in the transcribing of remarks. We reintroduced this proposal in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. It is embodied in Senate Resolution 168.

CONGRESS HAS RESPONSIBILITY

In view of the fact that Congress has in general retained to itself the privilege of deciding whether or not a Member may voluntarily, or in answer to a subpena, testify in ordinary courts of justice as to any matter pertaining to his official capacity, a special responsibility is placed upon Congress to insure that justice is not denied through its practices in the recording of its official proceedings. If the actions of Congress are to be analyzed in courts of law on the basis of statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, then the RECORD must actually be a record—an honest reporting of the remarks of individual Members. Rigging the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represents not merely a distortion of debate, but a real interference with the carrying out of justice in the courts.

As Mr. Mantel states:

A certain fiber of moral courage is needed so that Members of Congress will not hesitate to speak their minds on issues of the day. Perpetual doctoring of the primary source of legislative activity is no solution to hasty thoughts and hot tempers.

I commend this article to my colleagues. I urge that they read it. I hope that they will act on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mantel's comments be printed in their entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: FACT OR FICTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

(By Howard N. Mantel)

Unlike its staid British cousin the Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is at times a lively, and is always a many-faceted, publication.[1] It records the debates of the House and Senate; it summarizes activities of congressional committees; it is replete with editorial opinion gleaned from the great and the not-so-great newspapers of America; and it is dotted with such sundry items as poetry, both professional and homespun, high school essays on "what democracy means to me," the results of a particular Congressman's public opinion poll, letters to the editor and other miscellany, ad infinitum. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD serves also as a local tabloid of events on Capitol Hill, recording, for example, the menu and agenda for the serving of the second Senate salad, an epicurean concoction combining the finest in back-home specialties, to be offered in "the world's largest salad bowl—3 feet wide and 14 inches deep. Heaped, it will serve 320 main course salads. Hand turned, it is made of solid walnut."[2]

This paper explores problems implicit in reporting the proceedings and debates of Congress, the value of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an instrument of immediate political control and as a source of information, and its historic value as documentation of the legislative process, both to the scholar and (as illustrative of the problem generally) to the courts where the RECORD serves as evidence of legislative intent of statutes enacted by Congress. That the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under present rules of publication is not altogether accepted by those who write it is evidenced by a speech on the floor of the House by Representative THOMAS CURTIS of Missouri[3] and an article by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER in the New York Times.[4]

I

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not the official record of the proceedings of the House and Senate, that function being fulfilled by the Journal of each House in accordance with the constitutional requirement that "each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgments require secrecy. * * *"[5] The RECORD is, by law, "substantially a verbatim report of proceedings," to be printed under control of the Joint Committee on Printing.[6]

The daily edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a formidable document, printed on newsprint and containing stapled pages measuring 8½ by 11 inches. A single issue may have upward of 200 pages. Each day's proceedings follow a set pattern, the Senate debates preceding those of the House,[7] which, in turn, are followed by a voluminous Appendix and the well-prepared and informative Daily Digest. A semimonthly printing of the daily RECORD is issued in limited edition, together with an index for that period. Thereafter, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is "revised, printed, and bound promptly, as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, in permanent form, for distribution during and after the close of each session of Congress."[8]

The significant thing about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that, by statute, it is not intended to be an exact reproduction of the remarks uttered on the floor. The language, "substantially a verbatim report on proceedings," reflects accurately what the RECORD is, the less-than-verbatim status being derived from custom and practice of the two Houses: a Member may revise his own remarks and, in the House of Representatives, may insert into the RECORD as a speech material never uttered on the floor of the House. The Official Reporters work in relays; one reporter takes down the debates for several minutes and immediately transcribes them, so that before the printing deadline a Member has full opportunity, timewise, to revise his own remarks.

In the Senate, revision is done as a matter of course. Senator NEUBERGER in his Times article described one aspect of the process as follows:

"After a major debate in the Senate over an issue which stirs profound emotions * * * I have seen many Senators * * * virtually rewriting the speeches and retorts just delivered on the floor of the Senate. Some will totally expunge comments made in the heat of debate that may seem indiscreet or unwise in the cold, gray light of the next dawn and in the inflexible type of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Others will be adding afterthoughts, which may furnish an extra fillip to a reply that was flat or ineffective when uttered under the duress of argument in the Senate Chamber."[9]

In a recent volume on Senate procedure and precedents, it is stated, "A Senator in making a revision of his remarks is not supposed to make any substantial changes therein. (He has no rule of the Senate for guidance.)"[10]

In the House of Representatives it is customary and universal for a Member to ask and to obtain unanimous consent to revise remarks made, usually with leave to extend. Revision, but not the right to extend, may be done without such express permission of the House although the precedents speak of a necessary consent of the Speaker. The Joint Committee rules do not, in terms, authorize revision, but speak of revision as accepted fact. Section 3 states, "When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision, * * *"; section 5 states, "Proofs of 'leave to print' and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received * * *"; and section 6 refers to manuscripts returned too late for printing in the day's RECORD. House practice prohibits a Member from changing the remarks of another Member, nor can he alter his own remarks "in such a way as to affect the remarks of an opponent in controversy without bringing the correction to the attention of that Member."[11] Representative CURTIS of Missouri has pointed out that under present practice some far-reaching results are obtained: "This privilege has been abused to the extent that even in a colloquy which has occurred in debate the remarks of one of the debaters has been so changed as to render meaningless the printed remarks of his opponent which remain unrevised."[12] Under permission of the House to extend remarks, a Member may add to his own spoken remarks or have inserted as a speech statements never made on the floor.[13] Some curious results follow: A Member may ask and obtain leave for another Member to extend even though such Member is absent from the floor; where an authorized extension is submitted too late in the day to appear in the body of the RECORD, it will usually appear in the Appendix, but as a speech, not as an extension of remarks.

Senate procedure is more circumscribed. Speeches not actually delivered may be printed in the body of the RECORD or in the Appendix, but they must appear in "such manner as to indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate."[14] The difference between the two Houses as to extension in the body of the RECORD stems directly from the size of each body. Time considerations are so precious on the House side that speeches made just after the House convenes, and before the business of the day—that is, while there is a sizable audi-

---

[1] The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dates from Mar. 4, 1873, 43d Cong. Earlier volumes covering the proceedings and debates of Congress consisted of the Debates and Proceedings (generally known by its binder's title, Annals of Congress), 1st–18th Congs., 1789–1824 (42 volumes, 1834–56); Register of Debates, 18th Cong., 2d sess.–25th Cong., 1st sess., 1824–37 (14 volumes in 29, 1825–37); Congressional Globe, 23d–42d Cong., 1833–73 (46 volumes in 108, 1834–73). See Constance M. Winchell, Guide to Reference Books (7th ed.; Chicago: American Library Association, 1951), p. 108.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 9, pp. 11421–11422, 11505–11506. Among other ingredients, the salad was to contain 2 quarts of Michigan vinegar blended with 30 envelopes of a garlic-type salad dressing mix and 5½ quarts of salad oil; frozen Florida grapefruit sections; Alabama watercress from Huntsville, "watercress capital of the world"; California ripe olives and 32 heads of California iceberg lettuce; lemon-flavored gelatin from Le Roy, N.Y.; New Jersey tomatoes; Texas gulf shrimp, escarole, and green onions.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, pp. 6594–6597.

[4] "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Is Not a Record," New York Times, April 20, 1958, sec. 6, 14, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, pp. 6816–6818. NEUBERGER reasserted his position on this subject in a recent Senate speech. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 12, pp. 16454–16455. He has also introduced a resolution (S. Res. 168, 86th Cong.) to curb certain practices in the Senate. The text of the resolution follows: "*Resolved*, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule: 'Rule XLI. Reporting of Proceedings in the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Except as provided herein, the remarks of Senators in proceedings of the Senate shall be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as actually made. Changes in the recording of such remarks shall be permissible only to correct grammar and syntax, and to correct actual errors made in the reporting of such remarks. No changes of a substantive nature or changes concerning remarks of another Senator made in the proceedings shall be permitted.' "

[5] U.S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 5, clause 3. On the proposition that the Journal, not the RECORD, is the official record of the proceedings, see Hinds' "Precedents of the House of Representatives," vol. IV, sec. 2727.

[6] Title 44, U.S.C., sec. 181. Sec. 182a of that title provides, "The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD." See also U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Printing, Rules for Publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 2, 1956.

[7] Joint Committee Rules, sec. 1. The rule contains a proviso authorizing the House debates to be printed first, when the Senate debates are not received in time.

[8] Title 44, U.S.C., sec. 182a.

[9] NEUBERGER, op. cit.

[10] Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick, Senate Procedure, S. Doc. No. 93, 85th Cong., 2d sess. 204 (1958).

[11] Manual and Rules, U.S. House of Representatives, 1957, sec. 928. See also Hinds, op. cit., vol. V, sec. 6972 and vol. VIII, sec. 3462.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, p. 6594.

[13] See Clarence Cannon, Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives (Washington: GPO, 1953, 82d Cong., 2d Sess., H. Doc. No. 562), p. 318.

[14] Rules and Manual, U.S. Senate, 1957, p. 132 (standing order of the Senate of July 23, 1947, S. Res. 127, Senate Journal, 80th Cong., 1st sess., p. 510).

ence—are normally limited to 1 minute. Even during general debate either in the House qua House or when sitting as Committee of the Whole, time is scarce, and tempers have been known to rise to the height of fisticuffs over the question of allotment of time.[15]

There are reasons for "fixing up" the RECORD, some of which, at least, deserve more than cursory attention. There is a real question of how best to facilitate the placing on record of the views of a Member both as to current national issues and to more local ones.[16] Questions of grammar and rhetoric involved in transcribing oral remarks, often delivered impromptu, to printed literature worthy of perpetual scrutiny, require that some minimum flexibility be allowed. Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, offers still another reason for favoring a broad revision policy:

Sometimes in running debate, extemporaneous debate in the House and heated argument, I say things sharply that upon reflection I would not have said and did not mean. * * * But I have always gone to the Member and said, "I just did not mean that; do you mind if I delete it?" I do not want to have anything sharp in the RECORD unless someone is nasty with me, trying to smear me, but I find upon reading my remarks that unintentionally I had a sharper quality that I do not want to possess, but that in running debate I find occasionally I do possess.[17]

The daily edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not always completely accurate, hence the customary unanimous consent grants in both Houses to correct the previous day's RECORD. The House has, on occasion, ordered the omission from the permanent RECORD of remarks made but not caught at the time of utterance.[18] On rare occasions, remarks made during debate are excluded from the daily RECORD as being in violation of the rules of House or Senate. A Member of the House, for example, may be called to order for words spoken in debate and, under rule XIV, section 5, "the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing * * * and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened."[19]

It is almost impossible to ascertain the accuracy of a Senate speech once printed since there does not appear in the RECORD any request for authority to revise, but it is possible at times to gain some slight insight into the revision and extension practices in the House. In the case of extensions in the body of the RECORD, a careful reading may disclose an individual request to extend, so, while the extension appears as a speech, it is obviously not a speech actually delivered. There are, however, many instances of leave to extend being granted across the board for all Members of the House. It is the practice of the House for such permission to be granted immediately after passage of a bill and, in fact, this permission is given to extend remarks for five legislative days thereafter. There is no way of determining whether such remarks are uttered or inserted. In the case of an individual request to extend, if the extension is part of an actual, delivered speech, there is no sure way of determining which portion was delivered and which inserted under the leave-to-extend privilege.

II

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not an inexpensive document to publish. In 1956 the total printing cost of the daily edition (43,000 copies), the semimonthly reprint, the index, and the bound edition cost $1,733,861.06. The cost of the daily edition alone for that period was $1,311,763.06, at an estimated page cost of $60.47. The total cost of the Appendix for 1956 was estimated at $480,000 and, as an indication that the cost for publishing the RECORD is rising, an estimate for page cost of the daily for 1959 is given as $81.[20]

The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD serves the principal distinction of keeping out of the body of the RECORD the mass of extraneous material which would, otherwise, hopelessly clog the reported debates. In the Appendix, too, appears those items intended for the body of the RECORD but which are returned too late in the day. Some of the Appendix items relate directly to pending issues; many do not. There are limitations on what may be included, and it would appear that nothing which may not be uttered on the floor may be inserted in the Appendix.[21] No insertion which will run more than two pages may be printed unless an estimate of the cost, obtained from the Public Printer, is recited in the unanimous consent request.[22] This limitation is somewhat illusory in that consent may be obtained to extend in three, four, or a score of instances. The Joint Committee rules provide that an article printed in two or more parts "shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply."[23] Further, section 10 of the rules provides for elimination of duplication of articles, with the caveat that it does not "apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks." The rule prohibits insertions of speeches, addresses, or articles delivered or released after the session of Congress. Notwithstanding these limitations the Appendix is enormous and the variety of material which finds its way into the Appendix is truly amazing. Beginning with the 83d Congress, 2d session, the Appendix is no longer bound permanently as separate volumes, although some extension of remarks in the House are included following each day's session.[24]

The Daily Digest is a summary index of congressional activity prepared by a staff of employees under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and is authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.[25] Periodically, the Daily Digest contains a statistical summary of legislative activity for the session to date, as well as a status table of the annual appropriation bills. It would be helpful if a similar table of major legislative resolutions, bills, and treaties were published. The Daily Digest does not attempt to summarize the speeches delivered. While the Digest is designed to make meaningful the great mass of material in the body of the RECORD and to furnish helpful information on other action of Congress, to the political scientist and to the historian it offers a unique opportunity to study the day-by-day activities of the committees, whose journals and minutes are not always available. The Daily Digest for each session is bound and indexed in separate volumes from the debates, and I recommend it as one of the more important documents for the study of congressional activity.[26]

III

Much of what has already been discussed is academic unless one considers the "how" and the "why" of the RECORD's publication in light of its use. The value of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is twofold: first, as a source of information and political control, and second, as an historical record of congressional activity and intent. The RECORD under the practice of revision and extension described, can be viewed as a good approximation of what transpires on the floor of each House; but it is not, obviously, a spontaneous transcript. Major changes in text present an inaccurate and misleading picture of congressional debate and intent. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, notes, "I myself have participated in numerous debates on the floor, and sometimes when I read the RECORD the following morning, I have found it very difficult to recognize the debate which occurred."[27] We may illustrate some of the difficulties which ensue from this situation by examining the extent to which the courts use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other legislative documents in determining questions of statutory interpretation. In an era of

---

[15] Letter to editor, New York Times, June 30, 1940, "Speeding Up Legislation," reprinted, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 15, p. A4326.

[16] See, in this connection, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 17, p. A5837, reprinted, U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Hearings on Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted To Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, p. 304 (hereinafter cited as Hearings).

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, p. 6597.

[18] Cannon, op. cit., sec. 926, p. 315; Hinds, op. cit., vol. V, secs. 6978–81. Letter from Charles H. Hallam, Associate Librarian, U.S. Supreme Court Library (July 15, 1958), reveals that the Supreme Court Library has a file of the semimonthly cumulative edition of the daily RECORD from 1940 to date. It is interesting to note that the library has "a nearly complete run of dailies from 1885 to 1891, which were bound for the convenience and use of a then member of the Court."

[19] Discussed, House Manual, op. cit., secs. 671, 924, 925. For the Senate rule, see rule XIX and Jefferson's Manual, sec. XVII.

[20] Letter from Raymond Blattenberger, Public Printer; U.S. Government Printing Office (July 15, 1958). Dates given are for fiscal years.

[21] Cannon, op. cit., p. 319, and Hinds, op. cit., vol. V, secs. 7004, 7005, and 7008. The Senate, on motion or by unanimous consent, may reverse a previous unanimous consent grant to place matters in the RECORD and order the matter stricken. Watkins and Riddick, op. cit., p. 200.

[22] Joint Committee rules, sec. 11. The rule does not apply "to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses, or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress."

[23] Ibid.

[24] The Index includes reference to all Appendix items but with the notation that page references preceded by "A" indicate Appendix material deleted from the permanent RECORD. Thus, in order to have a complete file of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it is now necessary either to bind the daily or semimonthly Appendixes or to obtain microfilm files thereof. Note that an analysis of the growth of the Appendix, including statistics showing the number of items inserted therein by Members, is included in remarks of Representative JONES of Missouri in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 8, pp. 9545–9547. The text of the resolution by the Joint Committee on Printing setting forth its policy on the Appendix (revised to Feb. 6, 1956) is contained in JONES' remarks.

[25] Sec. 221; title 44, U.S.C., sec. 182c.

[26] A poll of 67 Senators and 263 Representatives, conducted in December 1950, determined that the Daily Digest, of all innovations resulting from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, was the most successful. Only 4 percent of the Senators and 7 percent of the Representatives polled felt that it was unsuccessful. Hearings, op. cit., p. 7.

[27] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 5, p. 6016.

increasing Federal activity, the answer to the question, "What did Congress mean?" becomes of vital significance, and the documentation reflecting congressional intent becomes a part of the living literature of our statutes.

The American rule on construction of statutes differs from the rule followed in Great Britain: "The sense and meaning of an act of Parliament must be collected from what it says when passed into a law; and not from the history of changes it underwent in the house where it took its rise. That history is not known to the other house or to the sovereign." [28] While it is not our purpose to comment on the wisdom of this approach, which should be viewed in the context of the whole juridical picture of the United Kingdom, yet the comment of Mr. Justice Frankfurter is revealing:

"These current English rules of construction are simple. They are too simple. If the purpose of construction is the ascertainment of meaning, nothing that is logically relevant should be excluded. The rigidity of English courts in interpreting language merely by reading it disregards the fact that enactments are, as it were, organisms which exist in their environment. One wonders whether English judges are confined psychologically as they purport to be legally. The judges deem themselves limited to reading the words of a statute. But can they really escape placing the words in the context of their minds, which after all are not automata applying legal logic but repositories of all sorts of assumptions and impressions? Such a modest if not mechanical view of the task of construction disregards legal history." [29] In the United States the courts have generally moved beyond the English rule. A court will look at the language of the act and in doing so may apply one or more of a number of canons or maxims of construction, e.g., that a penal statute is to be strictly construed; general language following particularly described acts, classes of persons, or other enumerated objects are to be viewed as applicable to the general kind described by the enumerated items or persons and not as a complete generality (ejusdem generis rule); [30] what was the mischief sought to be remedied by the statute; or that statutes in pari materia, that is, relating to the same subject, should be construed together. The court may also seek to determine the meaning of the language of the statute by inquiring into the legislative intent as set forth in the history of the act. It is here that persists the essential difference between English and American methods of construction of statutes, the function of our courts being aptly described by Mr. Justice Reed: "It is to construe the language so as to give effect to the intent of Congress. There is no invariable rule for the discovery of that intention." [31]

The examination of legislative history is followed by both Federal and State courts, but it is the former, and more particularly, the Supreme Court, which chiefly interests us.[32] Two questions are raised regarding legislative history: Is there evidence of the intent of the legislative body which can be used in the understanding of statutory language, and if so, what weight should be assigned to that evidence? The question is never quantitative, for as Frankfurter has remarked:

"Spurious use of legislative history must not swallow the legislation so as to give point to the quip that only when legislative history is doubtful do you go to the statute. While courts are no longer confined to the language they are still confined by it. * * * In the end, language and external aids, each accorded the authority deserved in the circumstances, must be weighed in the balance of judicial judgment." [33]

In a 1916 decision, Mr. Justice Day ruled that where the language of the act is plain and constitutionally authorized, the use of extrinsic aids is not justified.[34] The dissenting opinion argued that the majority rule was too simple:

"The words of a statute may be uncertain in their significations or in their application. If the words be ambiguous, the problem they present is to be resolved by their definition; the subject matter and the lexicons become our guides. For here, even, we are not exempt from putting ourselves in the place of the legislators. If the words be clear in meaning but the objects to which they are addressed be uncertain, the problem then is to determine the uncertainty. And for this a realization of conditions that provoked the statute must inform our judgment." [35]

It is the dissent which has been largely followed in recent years, rather than the "plain meaning rule" announced by Mr. Justice Day.

What is sought for in the examination of legislative history is a nonstatutory expression of congressional intent. To be valid this evidence must reflect the intent of the majority of both branches of the Congress at the time of passage of the amendment, bill, resolution, or treaty in question. Certain types of legislative history have more validity than others. The statement of a witness before a House committee holding hearings on the bill in question will have some passing weight, more so if the witness is a member of the President's Cabinet and the bill—as finally enacted—is the administration proposal. The committee report, as a formal document submitted to the parent House or Senate, has considerable weight since it represents the considered judgment of the legislative committee assigned to consider the proposed bill. But committee reports do not always represent the intent of the full membership of the House or Senate, and in at least one case a committee report was shown to have been hastily prepared and, in fact, not to have been read by all Members who signed it.[36] Statements made on the floor of the House or Senate—as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—are often cited, particularly explanatory statements of the chairman of the committee reporting the bill or other committee spokesman or sponsor of the bill.[37] Here the very keenest reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is called for, since the crucial point to be determined, reasonably, is whether the statements made orally, or the formally submitted report of legislative committee or conference committee, or any other legislative documentation, was accepted by the majority of the parent body at time of voting. Where the chairman or floor leader of the bill makes a statement that particular language is designed to accomplish a stated objective, and it appears subsequently that that language was amended in either House, the statement loses weight. So, too, a statement made by the chairman or floor leader which is challenged by other members of the committee as inaccurate or as not being indicative of committee intent. Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in a 1951 opinion, stated that the use of legislative history must be exercised with caution. He commented:

"Resort to legislative history is only justified where the face of the act is inescapably ambiguous, and then I think we should not go beyond committee reports, which presumably are well considered and carefully prepared. I cannot deny that I have sometimes offended against that rule. But to select casual statements from floor debates, not always distinguished for candor or accuracy, as a basis for making up our minds what law Congress intended to enact is to substitute ourselves for the Congress in one of its important functions. It is not to be supposed that, in signing a bill, the President endorses the whole CONGRESSIONAL RECORD." [38]

Compare, too, the remarks of Justice Frankfurter in *United States* v. *Public Utilities Commission of California:*

"It is one thing to construe a section of a comprehensive statute in the context of its general scheme, as that scheme is indicated by its terms and by the gloss of those authorized to speak for Congress, either through reports or statements on the floor. It is a very different thing to extrapolate meaning from surmises and speculation and free-wheeling utterances, especially to do so in disregard of the terms in which Congress has chosen to express its purpose." [39]

There is little doubt that those preparing committee reports do so with full knowledge

---

[28] From a 1769 opinion, *Millar* v. *Taylor,* quoted by Lord Haldane in *Viscountess Rhondda's Claim,* 2 A.C. 339, 383 (House of Lords 1922). The opinion of Lord Wrenbury, concurring in the (latter) case, gives the rule as follows: "Neither the debate nor the outcome of the debate is admissible to explain the words which are found in the Act as passed."

[29] Felix Frankfurter, "Some Reflections on the Reading of Statutes," 47 Col. L. Rev. 527–546 (May 1947).

[30] In the hypothetical statute, "No shipper, truck operator, barge conductor, freight forwarder 'or other person' shall operate without a license," the quoted phrase would not, under the ejusdem generis maxim, include every man, woman, and child in the United States, but at most only those persons within the general class comprising shippers, truck operators, and the others enumerated or reasonably to be included in such class.

[31] *United States* v. *American Trucking Associations,* 310 U.S. 534 at 542 (1940).

[32] For a general analysis of this subject, see 70 American Law Reports 5–46, annotation: "Resort to constitutional or legislative debates, committee reports, journals, etc., as aid in construction of constitution or statute." For a good anthology the textbook by H. E. Read, J. W. MacDonald, and J. B. Fordham, "Cases and Other Materials on Legislation" (Brooklyn: Foundation Press 1959), pp. 964–1277, is recommended. I was rather surprised to find that the examination of legislative history extends to local ordinances; in a recent New York lower court case, *People* v. *Greenberg,* 174 N.Y., Supp. 2d, 803 (Magistrates' Court, New York City, 1958), a provision of the city administrative code was under scrutiny. The court quoted at length from a committee report on the legislation of the 1926 municipal assembly of the city of New York, aldermanic branch.

[33] Frankfurter, op, cit., pp. 543–544.

[34] *Caminetti* v. *United States,* 242 U.S. 470 (1916).

[35] Ibid., p. 496. See also Harry W. Jones, "The Plain Meaning Rule and Extrinsic Aids in the Interpretations of Statutes," 25 Wash. U.L.Q., 2–26 (December 1939).

[36] *Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific RR Co.* v. *Acme Fast Freight, Inc.,* 336 U.S. 465 (1949). The Court, p. 473, quotes Representative Wolverton in his floor statement on the bill in question: "Due to limitations of time the report was not submitted to the members of the committee or subcommittee. * * *"

[37] Statements issued by the President when approving a bill or a veto message are also used as legislative history.

[38] *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.,* 341 U.S. 348, at 395–396 (1951). Jackson agreed with the judgment of the Court "insofar as it rests upon the language of the Miller-Tydings Act. But it does not appear that there is either necessity or propriety in going back of it into legislative history." Cf. Jackson's opinion in *United States* v. *Five Gambling Devices,* 346 U.S. 441 (1953), wherein he cites floor statements of a number of Congressmen as well as the House committee report.

[39] 345 U.S. 295 at 321 (1953).

of their subsequent use in the courts: so too, statements made on the floor, Senator NEUBERGER noting that a Senator sponsoring a bill may read into the RECORD a detailed "record of legislative history" as a guide to those administering the legislation when finally enacted.[40] A CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is subject to extensive revision of uttered remarks lessens the efficacy of the legislative history offered to the judiciary. How sure can one be that a committee report is accepted by the membership at large or that a statement of the floor manager of a bill in the House was actually uttered on the floor? Yet the printed RECORD is often the only clue to congressional intent. Despite these fundamental queries, the current sessions of the Supreme Court, as recorded in the recent opinions thereof, show continued usage of legislative history including the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A summary of some of these opinions follows.

In *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Co.*,[41] legislative history was used in support of opposite sides of an argument, lending emphasis to the point that such history must be used with caution. Mr. Justice Harlan, for the majority, decided that the legislative history of the Robinson-Patman Act was that "although price discriminations are both criminally punishable (under section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act) and subject to civil redress (under section 2 of the Clayton Act), selling 'at unreasonably low prices' is subject only to the criminal penalties provided in section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act." In support of this he cites the conference report of the bill, a statement on the House floor of the senior House manager of the committee of conference, a statement of another member of that committee, and a later statement—not on the pending bill—by Representative PATMAN before a congressional committee. Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting, stated: "The Court holds that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act is not a part of 'the antitrust laws' as used in the Clayton Act. We disagree. The legislative history in our opinion shows that Congress intended to permit private actions to be brought for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act." Douglas cites some of the very same legislative history used by the majority and, in addition, the debates in the Senate on the bill and the additional fact that the House Judiciary Committee, in its work of preparing and publishing the United States Code, included section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act as part of the antitrust laws.

In *United States* v. *McNinch*,[42] the Supreme Court held, "From the language of that act, read as a whole in the light of normal usage, and the available legislative history we are led to the conclusion that an application for credit insurance does not fairly come within the scope that Congress intended the act to have." A footnote to the opinion cited a statement of the Senate floor manager of the bill and noted, "Apparently there were no committee reports nor any record of the proceedings in the House."

In *Perez* v. *Brownell*,[43] the opinion of the Supreme Court quotes committee reports, hearings, and other history of the act in question including a statement by the chairman of the committee of the House responsible for the bill during the course of House debate; in the same case, the Chief Justice, Mr. Warren, cites floor debates in the dissent.[44] In none of these opinions is there raised any question regarding the accuracy of the reported debates.

IV

How long this trend of accepting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as evidence of the debates in Congress will continue, is not too easily predictable, but certainly the fact that Members of Congress themselves have become concerned about the practice of revision and extension is an indication that the situation is far from static.[45] Attorneys have a knack of finding loopholes, and the practice of revision and extension may give one or more of them an opportunity to try and negate the use of legislative history by opposing counsel. The questions posed are whether such negating evidence can be presented to the courts, and if so, what use will the courts make of it? At the outset one must distinguish between questions of fact and of law. A question of law concerning the meaning of a statute may be raised in the trial court, but not as a factual issue triable by a jury. More likely, it is not raised until the trial has concluded. Procedurally, an attorney would be faced with the difficult problem of how to impeach the printed CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If he makes the assertion in his brief, it would be nothing more than a self-serving statement and would, no doubt, be rejected by the court. He might, however, show as a general principle that the printed RECORD may not always record with accuracy remarks made on the floor, citing appropriate documentation. But such an argument, while having the possible effect of causing the court to refuse to accept any legislative history from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would not prove whether the quoted statement of the Congressman was or was not his actual oral remarks and, as such, accepted by the majority of the House or Senate. Testimony would be required from either the official reporter of debates or some officer of the House or Senate or, perhaps, the Congressman himself or one of his colleagues. Thus counsel would be faced with task of arguing a legal point by the presentation of factual evidence—all of which would be subject to cross-examination. This is not an easy thing to do on the court level—less so on the level of the court of appeals or the U.S Supreme Court.[46]

The settled practice of the House is that no Member nor officer of that body may voluntarily or in answer to a subpena testify in the ordinary courts of justice as to any matter pertaining to his official capacity. In practice, where the Clerk of the House is served with a subpena duces tecum, he formally notifies the Speaker who lays such communication and the subpena before the House. If there is no objection to his appearing, a resolution will be adopted which states: (1) That the privileges of the House preclude its documentation from being subject to the "process of the ordinary courts of justice * * * but by its permission"; (2) that where it appears that such documentation is needed for use in any court of justice, "this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House"; (3) that the Clerk may appear at the court but without the asked for papers; and, (4) that where the court "determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for," the court officers and parties may proceed to the House and make copies of the documents "except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions. * * *"[47] This question has never been resolved in the Senate, but on one occasion during the 85th Congress, Senator EASTLAND was subpenaed to appear as a witness in a criminal case in a U.S. District Court. The case arose out of a contempt citation voted by the Senate in respect of conduct of the defendant when he was a witness before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which EASTLAND chairs. A vigorous debate ensued on the proprieties of allowing the Senator to respond to the subpena, Senator RUSSELL arguing that "the privileges of the Senate are involved. The Senate might be completely disorganized, so that it could not proceed as a legislative body, by reason of the abuse of the power of subpena. It could not function. It could be denuded of Senators by reason of irresponsible subpenaing." The entire matter and two proposed authorizing resolutions were dropped when EASTLAND announced that he would appear voluntarily as witness for the Government.[48] There is little practicable chance of testimony questioning the accuracy of the debates reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD being presented to the courts.

Then, too, there is the question of whether the courts will even sanction the raising of such an issue. In *Meyers* v. *United States*,[49] the U.S. Court of Appeals, in affirming a district court conviction for violation of a provision of the District of Columbia Code (title 22, sec. 2501) on perjury and subornation of perjury, held that it was not error to allow the counsel of a congressional committee investigating the national defense program to testify as to what was said in the committee, the indictment arising from certain statements therein alleged to have been made. The court ruled that the "best evidence rule" in Federal courts is limited

[40] NEUBERGER, op cit.

[41] 355 U.S. 373 (1958).

[42] 356 U.S. 595 (1958). See also *Automobile Workers* v. *Russell*, 356 U.S. 634 at 647–59 (1958), dissent of Mr. Chief Justice Warren, on legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act.

[43] 356 U.S. 44 (1956).

[44] Ibid., p. 72 (see footnote 25 of the opinion).

[45] See, e.g., the remarks of Representative JONES of Missouri, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 5, p. 6136, and H. Res. 176, 86th Cong., 1st sess., introduced by Representative CURTIS of Missouri, which would prohibit the printing of remarks in the RECORD as oral remarks unless actually delivered.

[46] The question is somewhat analogous to the problem involved in trying to prove that a printed statute, i.e., the bill signed by the executive (or the slip law, the session law, or the codification of the law) does not represent the act passed by the legislative body. The question comes down to this: Do we (the court) accept the statute as set forth on the paper ultimately signed by the Executive or do we look beyond this paper to see what the enacting body actually passed.

[47] See, e.g., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 6, pp. 7262–7263 and 7636–7637. In the latter instance, the subpena duces tecum involved a grand jury investigation of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR. Among the information called for were "Records reflecting attendance of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., during each session in the years 1951 through 1955."

[48] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 3, pp. 4135–4136, 4140–4147, and 4202–4212. Senator JOHNSON, the majority leader, offered one resolution (S. Res. 116) and commented. "The Parliamentarian suggested that in view of the lack of precedents in the Senate on this very point, there should be a formal resolution similar to the resolutions passed in the House and this resolution was modeled after the resolution adopted there." S. Res. 117 was offered by Senator WAYNE MORSE and differed from the JOHNSON resolution in that it recited that the Senate rules prohibit the absence of a Senator but by leave of the Senate; JOHNSON's resolution recited that "by the privileges of the Senate no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the Senate." MORSE did not feel that there was any precedent for the JOHNSON recital.

[49] 171 F. 2d 800 (D.C. Cir., 1948), certiorari denied, 336 U.S. 912 (1949).

"to cases where the contents of a writing are to be proved. Here there was no attempt to prove the contents of a writing; the issue was that Lamarre had said, not what the transcript contained."[50] In the Meyers case the conviction arose out of testimony in a committee, whereas in the situation we are discussing, impeachment of the RECORD is not to determine whether perjury or the subornation thereof, or contemptuous language was used, but whether a Congressman did or did not make a statement on a given bill. I think the courts would refuse to inquire into the correctness of the RECORD, save in the very rare instance where the House or Senate itself adjudges a person in contempt.[51] But while the courts may not allow impeachment of the reported debates, they may well come to a realization that the RECORD is not always a record, to paraphrase the title of the Neuberger article, and think twice before using any such legislative history. One recent U.S. Court of Appeals case offers some final clue as to judicial thinking in the area of Congress-court relationships:

The right of an accused by appropriate means to obtain evidence material to his defense is essential to the administration of the criminal law. A subpena duces tecum to one who has custody of the evidences is an appropriate means. If such evidence is under the control of a department of Government charged with the administration of those laws for whose violation the accused has been indicted, and its production is refused, or it is excluded, the courts, having responsibility under the Constitution for the trial of criminal cases, have held a conviction will not be permitted without the evidence. * * * Like principles should apply with regard to evidence in the custody of the House of Representatives. While the privilege of the House must be respected it might give rise to occasions when it would be necessary to forego conviction of crime because evidence is withheld. There is no doubt some discretion, to be carefully exercised so as not to invade the constitutional rights of an accused to compulsory process.[52]

But here, as in *Myers* v. *United States*, the situation is to be distinguished from the question of interpretation of statutes and evidence impeaching certain types of legislative history. A strong argument can be made for the gradual lessening of weight assigned in appellate cases to the floor debates as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless and until the revision and extension practices are radically revamped.

V

There is need for a rule against substantive changes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, in the case of the House of Representatives, against extensions which appear as speeches. Changes for the sake of grammar and, perhaps rhetoric should be allowed, with prudence the keyword to apprehensive Congressmen, worried about the possible effects their unexpurgated remarks may have in home districts.

As suggested in the Neuberger article, the RECORD should contain maps and diagrams—and on occasion illustrations—when needed to explain debates. Under the law[53] the Joint Committee on Printing has authority to allow this, and a moderate exercise of that authority appears warranted.

To make the Appendix more meaningful, some thought ought to be given to placing a ceiling on the number of items a Member may insert during any one session; this should cut down the great bulk of extraneous material. There ought also to be a short table of contents to each day's Appendix items.

As noted, it would be helpful to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD's Daily Digest a status table of major substantive legislation worked out by the respective party leaders in each House, since it might prove embarrassing for employees of the Digest to have to make such determination

A weekly digest of the debates reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be of value to those who seek more than the usual newspaper reports of congressional activity but have neither time nor energy to plow through the RECORD itself. This could be handled as a private publication, although it might be practicable to have it undertaken by the Government Printing Office which has the plates used for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, a certain fiber of moral courage is needed so that Members of Congress will not hesitate to speak their minds on issues of the day. Perpetual doctoring of the primary source of legislative activity is no solution to hasty thoughts and hot tempers.

WE MUST HAVE A MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM—NOW

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message delivered to a joint session of Congress on January 7, the President of the United States spoke in part on the status of our missile and space satellite programs.

The President said that the Atlas missile had "entered the operational inventory" during the past year.

The President said that our military missile program "does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration."

The President said that we were nevertheless "pressing forward" to develop such larger engines.

The President recited what sounded like an impressive list of satellites under development for research, for navigation, for weather forecasting, for communication. He said that the new budget would call for "practically doubled" space program expenditures.

And the President said that our space exploration program was "Often mistakenly supposed to be an integral part of defense research and development."

Last Sunday night, on a television program, the minority leader in the Senate for the Republican Party, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made even clearer the basic philosophy of this administration with regard to our space program

Senator DIRKSEN said, commenting on the President's speech:

I think he has put the emphasis where it belongs * * * he (meaning President Eisenhower) divorces the space program from the military program, something he should have done long ago, so that there won't be any confusion as to the accent and emphasis of the space program with respect to our military.

Mr. President, I rise to challenge this philosophy. It is wrong. It misleads the American people, and it misleads them dangerously. It is my purpose today to show why this is wrong, why our military and scientific space programs cannot be and should not be separated. And I rise to do what I can to call the attention of the Senate to the very real, the very great urgency of our developing a military space program just as soon as we can do it.

Mr. President, I have said that our need for a military space program is real and urgent. It is real because we live in the same world, we compete in the same world, with the Soviet Union. It is urgent because we have allowed ourselves to fall behind. We are falling further behind every day. We have not yet started to catch up, not because it is beyond our capability to do so, but because we have not yet made up our minds that it is important to do so.

In his state of the Union message, as I have pointed out, the President has said that in the budget just presented to Congress, expenditures for our space program were going to be "practically doubled." The facts do not support this promise. In the last budget, our combined expenditures for space programs were on the order of $500 million. The new budget calls for expenditures on the order of $825 million, but this includes $150 million appropriated last year for the Army Ballistic Missiles Division, which has now been transferred to NASA, the civilian space agency. The correct comparison is between $650 million last year and $850 million this year. That is a 29 percent increase—almost 30 percent. Not "practically double."

There is only one inference to be drawn from all of the President's statements on our missile and space programs, from the statement I quoted from the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and from the budget.

This is the inference that our missile programs and space exploration programs are in good shape and that we have no legitimate cause for concern.

Mr. President, this is far from a true picture.

For example, it may be true that the "Atlas entered the operational inventory during the past year," but as I speak today, we have exactly one operational Atlas base. The number of operational missiles on our one operational base gives rise to a few nightmares at the Pentagon.

The administration itself admitted—without ever saying so—that the President's rosy picture of our missile program was incorrect only a few days after he made it. The administration now asks Congress for enough more money to expand our ICBM inventory by one-third. That is, one-third more for the Atlas and one-third more for the Polaris. These are substantial increases.

And we do have a number of space satellites under development. But let me quote from a recent speech by Dr.

---

[50] Ibid., p. 812; see, too, the dissent of Judge Prettyman, pp. 814 et seq.

[51] On the right to punish for contempt, see Jefferson's Manual, sec. III, and the annotations thereto in House Manual, op. cit., sec. 293 et seq. The more normal procedure is set forth in title 18, U.S.C., sec. 192 and sec. 194, without which the House and Senate would be spending a great amount of time debating whether the course of conduct of a witness should be punished and the method of punishment. The law provides for certification of a statement of facts concerning the contempt to the appropriate U.S. attorney for grand jury attention; punishment is authorized up to 12 months or a $1,000 fine, or both.

[52] *Christoffel* v. *United States*, 200 F. 2d 734 at 738–739 (D.C. Cir. 1952).

[53] Title 44, U.S.C., sec. 182b.

Eberhardt Reichten, chief of the guidance and research division of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of California Institute of Technology:

> The other day * * * we were attempting to plan the missions for a set of space vehicles in 1961 and 1962 * * * only to be shocked at the end of our efforts to find that the first half of our fine program had already been done by the Russians.

In other words, in the field of space exploration, we are plodding along slowly behind the Russians. We are losing more ground with every day that passes.

Let me remind you, Mr. President, that only last Thanksgiving Day we attempted a moon shot. We failed. That was bad enough, but understandable. What was far worse, and not understandable, is that we cannot even attempt to repeat that experiment for an entire year. The reason given is that we do not have any more Atlas rockets available for this purpose. Think of what such an admission does to world regard for the technological leadership of the United States of America.

How can we have the Atlas in our operational inventory and still not be able to spare even one to repeat a vital experiment on which so much worldwide prestige depends?

And what is the reason that many people suppose—"mistakenly," according to the President—that our space exploration program is an integral part of defense research and development?

The reason is that this is what it should be. The mistake lies with this administration, which blindly insists there is little, if any connection, between our space program and our national security.

One of the consequences—or perhaps it is one of the causes—of current administration policy is its refusal to admit that we are in competition with the Russians in this field.

The Soviets maintain—and the whole world believes—that there is such a race, and that we are running a poor second. But the administration insists that we are just out for the exercise

I do not wish to labor something I know all of us in this body appreciate—the immense damage to our world prestige resulting from Soviet achievements in space and our failure to equal or surpass them.

Nor will I dwell at any length upon the fact that Soviet successes in space have exploded what used to be one of our better arguments against communism. I refer, of course, to the argument that scientists would not, or could not, produce first-class results under a Communist dictatorship. Some of us still cling to this comforting assumption. But the facts prove it to be wrong.

Perhaps we do not all fully realize how Soviet space achievements have already returned cash dividends far in excess of the program costs. The increase in Soviet technological prestige all over the world resulting from their space achievements was very great. Almost overnight, they became a truly formidable competitor with us in the field of supplying the foreign market with complex technological and engineering installations.

It has been reliably estimated that for a cost on the order of $500 million to launch the first several sputniks, the Soviets got a return on the world market of at least $5 billion, or 10 times the investment—and a good deal of it at our expense.

So there is a race. There are prizes for winning it. There are penalties for losing it. We are in that race. Already we have forfeited some of the prizes and paid some of the penalties. Perhaps we can afford them. There are, however, some penalties we cannot afford to pay, if we choose to remain a major force for freedom in the world, or if we choose to remain a free and unconquered Nation.

We cannot afford to continue to ignore, or even to soft pedal, the military significance of satellites. If we allow the Russians to win the prizes in this race simply because we refuse to admit it exists, or because we refuse to admit past mistakes, or because budget balancing precludes us from allocating sufficient resources to the task soon enough to give us a chance, then, Mr. President, we shall be in very serious trouble, indeed.

Let us examine for a moment some of the reasons why we so urgently need a military space program.

One of the major reasons for our need arises from the difference between the nature of our commitment and that of Soviets.

The United States of America stands for world peace, not world revolution. Our leaders of both parties stand for peace. Our people stand for peace. We covet no new territories. We do not feel any compulsion to force our system of government, our system of economics, or our way of life upon any other nation in the world.

We stand for freedom.

If we were convinced that the Soviet Union shared our aspirations for world peace and for freedom, then we should have no cause to fear the great progress the Soviet Union is making in industry, in science, and in technology.

But we are not so convinced, as our multibillion dollar defense budget proves.

In a military sense, we are committed to a policy of deterrence, as opposed to a policy of aggression. We will not strike the first blow. We will retaliate—if we can—only after the first blow has been struck at us.

This posture—although it is morally the right one—places us at a grave disadvantage against an aggressor nation armed with three ICBM's to our one, nuclear war heads, and superior military intelligence.

Clearly, the most we can hope for from our present deterrent forces, and those planned by this administration, is a stalemate—the stalemate of mutual terror.

If we are ever again to know any real measure of security in this world, we must have a deterrent force which is superior—not just equal, but superior—to the forces of potential aggression which oppose us. If we possessed such a force today, we would be in a really effective position to negotiate steps toward a permanent peace.

Can we create such a superior deterrent force? Yes, we can. The answer lies in space and the uses we can make of it. We can do it, I repeat, provided we abandon the policy fiction that our space program is primarily a civilian scientific undertaking with minor military applications; provided we admit we are in a race, with the Russians, that we cannot afford to lose; and provided we unshackle ourselves, and tackle the job with the urgency it deserves.

I spoke a moment ago, Mr. President, of the superior military intelligence possessed by the Soviet Union. Let me make clear what I mean.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my able colleague yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to his colleague?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield for a question to the distinguished acting minority leader, my able colleague from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. My able colleague has propounded a thesis which I believe worthy of grave consideration by the Congress. In that connection I wish to ask a question. What does the present law in regard to NASA authorize? Does it authorize research and development or the probing generally of the problems of outer space in connection with the military? What is the present statutory limitation under which NASA may conduct its operations?

Mr. ENGLE. So far as I am aware, there is no statutory limitation, except that as a matter of practice NASA has been devoted to the civilian technology in space; and the President made it very clear—and this is the matter about which I am complaining—that he intended to keep separate the military applications and the civilian applications of outer space.

My point is—and later I shall develop the point further—that they cannot be separated, that they should not be separated, and that this administration is asking two or more agencies to do the same thing, thereby creating the duplication, the overlapping, and the wasting of the taxpayer's funds which slow up the doing of the vital things which must be done in this field.

Second, I am saying that military requirements in connection with outer space are being ignored and are being made subservient to civilian applications in outer space, although they should not be.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I say to my colleague that it is my understanding that the outer space legislation which was initiated in the Congress 2 years ago, and in the passage of which the able majority leader played a very prominent part, was designed to provide for the civilian activities in outer space, as distinguished from the military activities. It is my hazy recollection that not only was that legislation so designed, but that there was in the outer space legislation which we passed language which indicated that in the opinion of the Congress there should be that distinction.

Mr. ENGLE. That is the program the administration requested. The idea was—and I mentioned that last August, in connection with the speech I made on the floor of the Senate, in connection with our defense reorganization—that we should have a civilian agency operating in the outer space field, because it would be bad for us psychologically, throughout the world, if that program appeared to be a military one.

But the Russians are not as thin-skinned about the matter; the Russians have their space program operated, as I understand, by the artillery section of their army.

So we set up a civilian operation in the space field; and we also set up a military operation—but very much muted—in the space field.

My complaint is, first, that they should not be divorced; and, second, that higher priority should be given to the military applications of space technology.

I am about to refer to one of those points, and I believe my colleague will find this matter of very great interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate what my colleague says. I shall follow with interest his comments.

The only point I wished to inject was that, in relying on my memory, it seems to me that the majority in the Congress and most particularly the distinguished majority leader together were responsible for the outer space legislation—for which I voted, and for which, as I recall, all other Members of this body voted.

It may well be that my colleague is pointing out some ways in which that legislation could be amended, or, at any rate, that consideration should be given to amending it.

Mr. ENGLE. This is the first time I have said this.

As I have already stated, the bill which came through was the one the administration requested.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair.) Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from California, whether we have been operating for a number of years under the type of program to which he now advocates that we return. In other words, we have had the military engaged in the space business, and we have had the civilians engaged in the space business. Is that not true?

Mr. ENGLE. Since the creation of NASA, we have had a civilian-operated space agency. The military has gotten into that field through the side door, so to speak; and it has been the purpose of the administration to disconnect the civilian applications and the military applications of outer space.

I am saying that both of them should go together. Last August I recommended—because this Space Agency had gotten so far down the road—that we could not very well retreat and change; that we put a military application section inside the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. That has not been done, and I am going to advocate it again. I think it should be done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator recall the confusion that existed in our space work and in our missile work when we had each service in the act, developing, in many cases, one missile, and the civilian agency at the same time, working with the military, was working by itself? I think one of the reasons why our missile solar and lunar work—not our military work—has lagged has been because of the confusion created basically from our setup in the Joint Chiefs, which I have been strongly against. That setup has created confusion and duplication.

I am afraid if the Senator's suggestions are followed, without centralizing authority in one branch of the military or in one committee of the military, we shall see an identical confusion come about again. I hope the Senator will go along with what the President has suggested, because I think the program has improved in the short number of months since he suggested a division.

Mr. ENGLE. The President has made some suggestions with reference to what we call the missile mess. Last August I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that there were 101 separate agencies in the Federal Government which, one way or another, had their hands in this missile business. I suggested at that time that the President clean up that organizational structure. He made a couple of moves to clean it up. For instance, he got rid of ARPA, which was a fifth wheel if there ever was one. Recently he made some more suggestions. I intend to comment on those in a few minutes.

What I am saying here is that we ought to get this military space program off the ground and give it great emphasis, and that we ought to have both the civilian and military space programs together.

In just a few minutes, I intend, in my speech, to go into this matter of having a space vehicle, a civilian space vehicle or satellite, or a military space vehicle or satellite. I am sure the Senator will agree with me it is not intelligent to have two organizations doing the same job, duplicating and overlapping each other.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the point I am trying to make. I am afraid the Senator's suggestion will only add to the number of agencies in the field. If his suggestion is to the point that there should be created a central agency, there may be some merit to it.

Mr. ENGLE. That is what I am talking about, putting them together, instead of further fractionalizing them. I want to put them together under one operation, under one man who has the job of directing the whole program, both civilian and military.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Might I point out to the Senator that until we can eliminate the different services from participation in this field, I think the Senator's suggestion is not going to produce the result he would like to have produced. I can say the result which he wants produced is a result which every Senator and everybody else in the country would like to see produced. I think the President has taken a right step. I think we have gotten too confused when we have had failures in the solar or lunar probes and have felt that failure has reflected on the entire missile program and effort. In my mind, that has done the American public a disservice, because our missiles should be classified as weapons or as probes. In the weapons field, our accomplishments have been nothing short of miraculous, to my mind. I have never heard of the Russian equivalent of the CEP, the circle of error probability, but I doubt seriously that they approach our accomplishments. I think we do the American people a disservice if we allow further failures in solar or lunar probes to be associated with our capabilities in the weapons field, our nuclear missiles, or the ICBM. I rise only to raise the point that I am afraid what the Senator is suggesting will put us back in the mess we were in a year ago.

Mr. ENGLE. We were not only in a mess a year ago; we are still in a mess, and anyone who knows those people who are presently either in the field of satellites or missiles will say that what we need most is a better organization in this field.

Mr. President, when I yielded to my distinguished friend from Arizona, I was talking about the military, instead of the satellite, program. I was saying that our democratic system is one in which we maintain a really tight security only about our most vital secrets, and even then not always successfully. It is not a difficult task for a first-rate—or even a fifth-rate—espionage network to gather precise information about the state of our defenses, the location of our missile bases, the number of missiles we have or have under construction, the number of manned bombers, their locations, and whether or not we are on airborne alert, and so on.

Let me stop to emphasize this in the light of what the distinguished Senator from Arizona has said. It is correct to say that we have reached phenomenal accuracy with the Atlas missile. We can shoot it 5,000 miles and hit a bull's eye. But we have got to assume that the Russians can do the same thing. If that is true—and we must proceed upon that assumption—they will be able to knock Vandenberg flatter than a pancake on the first volley, and they will also be able to knock down our other Atlas bases, and we will not have the Atlases to shoot that the President is talking about. On the other hand, we do not know where Russia's bases are.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. If the Senator will let me complete this thought I will then yield to him, because I shall make the point I wish to submit.

In fact, to get information about the bases, one does not need to be a spy at

all; he only has to be able to read. If he can read the Appropriations Committee hearings, he can do pretty well.

On the other hand—and I say this without meaning any reflection on our CIA—we simply do not have, and cannot get, anything amounting to a comparable body of precise intelligence about the offensive and defensive strengths and dispositions of the Soviet Union. They do not have a government based on separation of powers. They do not believe in arriving at great policy decisions through public debate. They do not have a free press. With them, secrecy and security are a fetish.

Therefore, plainly one of our great needs is to redress the intelligence balance. We can do this with reconnaissance satellites.

From space, we can view at close range all the territories of any potential aggressor. The extent of the information thus available will be limited in the near future only by our ability to place large satellites in orbit about the earth.

Let me emphasize this: A reconnaissance satellite equipped with the Midas infrared sensing detectors would enable us to detect missile launchings almost instantaneously, and with a greater degree of reliability than radar. A reconnaissance satellite equipped with the light-gathering and photographic equipment presently in prospect might—as early as 1962—enable us to photograph objects as small as 7 feet in diameter from 300 miles up. I repeat that: It might enable us to photograph objects as small as 7 feet in diameter from 300 miles up.

And it has been reliably predicted that by the latter half of this decade, such devices will be improved to the point where we may be able to photograph, at night, objects as small as 2 feet in diameter from 300 miles up.

Now I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, because I have made the point I was driving at; that is, the place where we have the biggest and worst gap is in the field of intelligence. We have a big enough gap in the field of missiles and retaliatory strike power, but we do not know what is going on inside the Soviet Union, whereas all the Russians have to do is to read the newspapers or talk to the construction workers, in order to be able to draw a bead on our Atlas missiles wherever they are perched, sitting up like pine trees on the horizon.

I am delighted to yield, if my friend from Arizona desires to make comment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator got so far past his point, it would be useless for me to reply at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, let me point out, however, that even if we had such a satellite now, all set to go, we would have to borrow the powerplant from the Russians to get it off the launching pad.

In other words, what chiefly limits us in this field is the lack of a powerplant with a thrust on the order of a million to a million and a half pounds.

The President told us that we are pressing forward to develop such engines.

Now, I do not claim to know more about the problem of defending America than almost anybody else in the country. But I do know that one does not press forward on the basis of a low priority, a limited budget, and a 40-hour week. And that is exactly what we are doing on the Saturn cluster and the Nova motor.

I am glad to note that someone in the administration seems to have called this glaring inconsistency to the attention of the President. And I approve of the latest move of the administration which foreshadows a higher priority, more funds, and overtime work for this project.

Surveillance and warning are by no means the only functions which satellites would serve. Space satellites, even at our present level of technology, offer tremendous possibilities for rapid and reliable communication between any two or more points in the world or over it. From a military standpoint, this means that adequate and reliable communication between globally dispersed land, sea, and air forces is possible through space satellites. So great would be the improvement over our present system in terms of our capability, that it would place us in literally another world, according to General Schreiver.

Reconnaissance, warning and communications are primarily peaceful in the purpose they serve. They offer no active threat to any nation. They need be feared only by the nation secretly planning acts of unprovoked aggression. All of them have tremendous scientific and commercial possibilities.

For example, one of these possibilities is worldwide television—live coverage of any event anywhere in the world made instantaneously available to every other point in the world.

Some of us, of course, might consider this to be more a disaster than something to be desired. Nevertheless, it is coming, and the only real question is whether the announcer will speak English or Russian.

But it is not the tremendous commercial and, possibly, cultural dividends of communication satellites with which I am concerned today, it is their military application.

We may be able to endure the next few years without "Maverick in Leningrad," or "Riverboat on the Volga" or "Have Sputnik, Will Travel," but I seriously doubt that the Russians would be willing to make their worldwide satellite communications system available for the use of our Armed Forces.

This is one case where we have to use the "do it yourself" kit.

Space satellites offer us additional possibilities for increasing the effectiveness of our deterrent forces. Chief among these is the possibility of a really effective means for active defense against missiles launched from any place on land or sea. It may even be possible to thwart an attack in such a manner that the harmful effects would be borne only by the aggressor. It appears now that this could be accomplished only from space.

Incidentally, I emphasize this is a field where there is no question about the technical capability of our people to accomplish the result.

Further, we may well be able to establish a strategic force in space, remote from the earth, widely dispersed, constantly alert, and capable of striking an aggressor's targets—following early warning—with such speed and force as to eliminate a large portion of the enemy's force before launch.

Of one thing we may be certain. The Soviets are alert to every one of these potentialities. They have a demonstrated capability in the field. We are years behind them, but not yet so far behind that we cannot catch up. Our beginnings are on a broad front, our resources and our capability are extensive.

The concepts I have described today are the sound concepts and designs of many of the Nation's best scientists and engineers. They are concepts based on the established laws of science, and on a relatively conservative extrapolation of established technological achievements.

Now, Mr. President, the subject I am discussing today is far too important to our national security to be discussed solely as a political issue, or to assess the blame for the mess we are in solely in terms of which political party occupies the White House.

But the fact is that the major impediment we face today in this field is the stubborn refusal of the Eisenhower administration to admit that they have made a whole series of tragic mistakes and to set about correcting them.

On the 28th of last August, I spoke to the Senate on the necessity of reorganizing our Armed Forces in terms of functions and missions. In the course of that address I had occasion to point out the tremendous duplication and complexity which exists in our missile and space program agencies. One effect of this has been to stretch out the time required merely to make decisions to the point where our leadtime in developing air and space projects is twice that of the Russians.

I pointed out then that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was set up as a separate civilian agency because the administration wanted to negate the idea of our space program being military in character.

I will say to my distinguished friend that this is the matter to which I referred a few minutes ago.

It desired to place the emphasis, as far as the development of our program in outer space is concerned, on the civilian and peacetime use of space and space activities.

I pointed out then that there appeared to be no logical basis for completely separating the missile and space programs.

It seemed clear to a number of us last August, exactly as it is clear today, that all space vehicles—and the ICBM is a space vehicle—have four problems: propulsion, guidance, reentry and payload. Three of these—propulsion, guidance, and reentry—are identical whether the space vehicle is civilian or military; only the payload—that is, what the vehicle carries—is different.

I said also that because of commendable desire to emphasize the peacefulness of our intentions, we were ignoring the fact that the head of the Department of Defense and all his top assistants are civilian, not military. And we were—and still are—by this purely arbitrary distinction, impairing our ability to concentrate sufficient resources on programs in which the requirements of both the military and the scientific programs were very largely identical.

Conceding that NASA was by then too far down the road to stop, I called, among other things, for the establishment within NASA of a military applications division, to operate in similar fashion to the military applications division in the Atomic Energy Commission. I call for it again.

In the interim, some small progress has been made. The operational functions of ARPA—a fifth wheel if there ever was one—have been abolished and transferred to NASA. One single service—the Air Force—has been given the main responsibility for operating the missile and space vehicles.

In the message sent to Congress this January 14, the President proposes to make certain changes in NASA structure. It is not my purpose today to comment extensively on this proposed legislation, pending study and analysis of the proposed amendments by the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, chaired by our distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

But even one reading of the message and the bill is enough to make a few important things about this proposed legislation obvious.

The President proposes to abolish the National Aeronautics and Space Advisory Council, and the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee. Insofar as these actions tend to simplify the administrative structure—to eliminate two of the echelons concerned with the decisionmaking processes, I am for them 100 percent.

However, the President's measure, and proposed bill, are replete with evidence that he is still unwilling to admit that our civilian and military space programs simply cannot be separated.

The President tells us that a single military-civilian space program does not exist and is unattainable. Without ever telling us how to go about it, he assures us that the military and civilian programs are clearly distinguishable. And then, in the very same sentence, he admits that both NASA and the Department of Defense may have similar or identical requirements for launched vehicles.

In fact, about half the message seems to be proposing to get the Department of Defense entirely out of NASA's hair on the grounds that their missions are entirely different, and that the Department of Defense has ample authority to proceed on its own. Then, as I have pointed out, he admits that at the heart of the problem—and the launched vehicles are the heart of the problem—their missions are not different at all, but practically identical. Clearly, this is an open invitation for duplication of effort, authority, and responsibility. This he proposes to avoid by himself assigning development of new launched vehicles to one or the other, regardless of whose program requirements brought about its conception, or to what eventual use it will be put.

It seems to me that what has really happened here is that some of the many voices which have been raised throughout the country about the unsatisfactory status of our missile and space programs have finally been heard. In an attempt to meet this criticism, rather than grapple with the real problem, the President has proposed one more reshuffling of responsibilities, a reshuffling that will not advance us by so much as one single day, and may in fact, retard us still further.

Mr. President, we have had about all of this we can stand. I say, let us freely admit the mistakes of the past Let us candidly admit that we are in a race with the Russians and that we are seriously behind Let us face up to the fact that we have an urgent need of a military space program as rapidly as we can devise, develop, and produce it. Let us hammer together an effective combination of governmental, scientific, military, and industrial resources to do the job—and supply that team with the funds it needs, the direction it needs, and above all, the sense of urgency it needs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. My colleague has made some excellent points, and I believe the Congress might well consider the advisability or feasibility of a better integrated activity, both military and civilian, in the field of space exploration.

I am not a member of the committee. I certainly can add nothing in the way of expert advice, pro or con, but I think the point has been well made, and we should study it.

I wish to say, with complete respect, however, that the present space law is and was a product of the Congress. With understandable pride, the Democratic leader of the Senate laid that legislation before us. We passed it unanimously. In the declaration by the Congress as to the outlines of the program it is clearly indicated that the responsibility of the new space agency over control of aeronautical and space activities shall be complete, except for that part which has to do with weapons systems, which shall be the responsibility of the Department of Defense. I say that because I believe we should set about reexamining what we did, to see whether we can make progress in this field.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me comment to my colleague and friend from California that the Space Act did not put anyone in a straitjacket. In the case of a space vehicle, a satellite, we have the problem of propulsion. We must get it up. We have the problem of guidance. We must guide it in the direction it should go, so that it will go into orbit. We have the problem of reentry, bringing the satellite down into the atmosphere and getting it back safely to the ground. Those three problems are the problems of space and space technology. They are identical, whether the vehicle is a military vehicle carrying radar to detect missiles coming from Soviet territory, or photographic equipment for reconnaissance purposes, or a communications system, which would be purely civilian in character. The difference lies only in what we put into the satellite.

What I am saying is that a program does not make sense which says that the military should develop their own propulsion system, their own guidance system, and their own reentry technology, while NASA, working on the civilian side to develop a space vehicle or satellite, does precisely the same thing. That is the kind of duplication which has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, and slowed up the program.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I remember sitting here and listening to the distinguished Democratic leader when the bill was before us. Let me read from his statement to the Senate on June 16, 1958, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 9, page 11293:

> Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee bill states clearly that it is the fundamental policy of our country that aeronautical and space activities should be dedicated to peaceful purposes and the benefit of all mankind. We can today see only a short distance into the future, and we can only speculate upon a few of the ultimate benefits which the space age can bring to the people of the world.
>
> We know that there will be tremendous gains in the economic and physical well-being of people brought about by discoveries in the areas of weather prediction and control, communications, medical science, and transportation.
>
> At the same time we are not unmindful that technological advancement in the space age will have military applications which, if our own capacity to defend ourselves is not maintained, can result in our subjugation and decline.
>
> In order to insure that the progress man makes in the space age produces peaceful benefits rather than military destruction, it is essential that we carry on our scientific exploration and development in aeronautics and space with vigor, and determination, and without injury to our national defense requirements. Without strength to defend ourselves, there can be no peace.
>
> There is no dispute here as to whether we shall have civilian or military control over our aeronautical and space activities. That control will clearly, in the traditions of our country, and in accord with the fundamental principles upon which our form of government flourishes, be civilian.
>
> The committee bill recognizes, however, that such control does not, and should not, involve any change in the traditional power of the Department of Defense over its responsibilities in the defense of the Nation. Aeronautical and space activities which are primarily associated with the development of weapons systems and with military operations will remain under the direction and responsibility of the Defense Department.
>
> The Senate bill establishes a new civilian Space Agency with a civilian Director and Deputy Director, and grants it complete operational authority and responsibility in the field of nonmilitary aeronautical and space

activities. Since operating authority and responsibility for military aeronautical and space activities are placed in the Department of Defense, a new overall Space Policy Board is established in the Executive Office of the President.

This Space Policy Board will be composed of seven Presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate. Four members will be the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Director of the new Space Agency, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The three other members will be selected by the President, one each from other interested agencies of the Government, with the provision that one of these but no more may come from the Defense Department.

The Board is charged with the duty of surveying our overall space objectives and capabilities, recommending comprehensive programs, designating responsibility for major projects and resolving disputes which may arise between governmental agencies in this field.

It is to carry out the direction of the President as well as apply the jurisdictional standards created in the act. The Secretary of Defense is specifically empowered to appeal to the President whenever any action or inaction of the Board in his judgment adversely affects our national security. A similar right of appeal is implicitly given to every other member of the Board.

The Space Policy Board has no administrative or operational functions. While it is authorized to employ a staff it is intended and expected that such staff will be of modest size, composed of only those experts and clerical assistants necessary to permit the Board efficiently to carry out its limited policy planning, and decisionmaking functions.

Operational authority and responsibility are placed in the civilian space agency and the Department of Defense. It is obvious that many of the projects carried on under the primary responsibility of one agency may also involve the active cooperation and effort of the other. Provision for flexible coordination and cooperation is made in the bill and the bill directs that there be no undue duplication of facilities, personnel and effort.

Also it is anticipated that under the primary direction and responsibility of either the Department of Defense or the civilian Space Agency, other agencies of the Government will be called upon to perform much essential scientific and technical work. At this early stage in our venture into space, the area of our knowledge is so small and the potentialities for progress so great that we will do well to organize our effort so as to utilize as much of our trained manpower and facilities for aeronautical and space activities as other national requirements will permit.

There is a provision in the bill directing the civilian Space Agency to make publicly available all technical information which the security interests of the country will permit. We also recommend the enactment of patent provisions like those contained in the House bill. These provisions are intended to provide protection to the interests of the Government and at the same time permit ample rewards and inducements to inventors to insure their maximum effort. The patent provisions are similar to those in the Atomic Energy Act, and to the regulations used now by the Department of Defense and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The committee reported in accordance with the statement I have just made; but in view of the desire of several able members of the committee to give further study to the House section and because unanimous consent would be required to write any new language into the bill if the Senate adopted the identical language of the House bill, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read. The amendment strikes the patent section from the Senate bill in order that the House patent section will be in conference. Then whatever the conferees may agree upon can be done.

I say to my friend that I think we have the responsibility of inquiring into the subject again, to see whether the law which we in the Congress passed with great enthusiasm 2 years ago might now be susceptible to constructive amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. That is precisely what I am saying. The program which was enacted into law was the program of this administration. In his message the President said that our space exploration program was "often mistakenly supposed to be an integral part of defense research and development."

That is precisely what I say it should be. He says it is mistakenly supposed to be that.

Then, to really button the case down further, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], in commenting on the President's speech, said:

> I think he has put the emphasis where it belongs. * * * He (meaning President Eisenhower) divorces the space program from the military program, something he should have done long ago, so that there won't be any confusion as to the accent and emphasis of the space program with respect to our military.

That was said Sunday night on a television program. What I am saying today is that that is exactly the wrong direction in which to go. We ought to put the two together.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Congress has now received the President's budget, which, in my judgment, is another "head in the sand" budget which refuses to face up to our national needs and international responsibilities.

I can think of no more pertinent comment than that contained in a recent article entitled "A Dissenting View on National Audit," reprinted yesterday on the editorial page of the Washington Post from the New Republic, in which it originally appeared.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DISSENTING VIEW ON NATIONAL AUDIT

Welcome to the Age of Damocles. Sorry that thing is hung up there by a hair, but you know what rope costs these days.

The President has given an account of his stewardship, but the greatest, overriding shortage in the national accounts was not mentioned. It arises, we think, from the President's conviction that it isn't the principle, it's the money of the thing. He fails to see that there is more than one kind of mortgage on the future; there is more to a national audit than a counting of blessings and cash.

What is the President's message as the new decade begins? Save now, be strong later. Save now, educate later. Save now, cure unemployment later. Save now, reclaim our towns and cities later. Save now, research later the cause and remedy for mortal disease. Save now, build housing later. Save now, clear the air later. Save now, purge our streams later. Save now, nourish later the people—and the hopes—of new nations.

Along with its fixation on money debits, the President's state of the Union message encourages further default of national responsibility, glossed over by recourse to the doctrine of divided powers and the icy morality of self-help: "The traditional framework of our Federal system * * * has worked effectively for nearly 200 years." The system has evolved for nearly 200 years, to a point where Federal help for States and local communities now invigorates rather than threatens the Republic, politically as well as financially.

To favor dedicating the energies of the National Government to the fostering of economic growth is not necessarily to favor deficit financing on the one hand, or reliance on a theoretical high volume of revenue to the Government from such growth on the other. There is room in a balanced budget for the encouragement of growth if there is a willingness to make necessary revisions in our tax structure and monetary policies; and if there is the courage and intelligence to make sense of the defense budget. Here the soldier President is the most disappointing. He, if anyone, we were told in 1952, could slice away the fat and end the waste of service rivalry, duplication, and a clinging to the old while embracing the ever-more-costly new. But instead of expert reconstruction of the anatomy of the defense budget, we have had only the arbitrary imposition of an upper limit of size prescribed not by the President or any other constitutional officer, but by the Director of the Budget.

But we are less anxious about the possibility of war (although we do not rule it out entirely) than by the effect of this military imbalance upon United States diplomacy. We want our statesmen to be armed by more than the short end of the big stick. Neither our military posture nor our diplomacy is well served by a design of defense which scamps the requirements for conventional war and comes perilously close to committing us to automatic recourse to nuclear weapons if war, any kind of war, should come.

Nor is it healthy for the world to believe, with all too much evidence, that we stand on the verge of shortening our shadow in Europe, for budgetary reasons.

In his message a year ago, Mr. Eisenhower made much of a plan for defining national goals. It sounded good, although it was hard to see why he could not sit down and do the job with a pencil and pad. This year, there was no talk of national goals. Yet this is a subject for deepest concern: Not just the omission by the President, but the evident fact that we are finding no such goals, with or without his help.

In examining the state of the Union, we cannot help remembering George Kennan's savagely expressed doubt whether a society with the empty preoccupations of this society can survive. We recall the forecast of Henry James 73 years ago in "The Bostonians," where he anticipated "a reign of mediocrity of the feeblest and flattest and most pretentious that has ever been seen."

There is something a President could do about this, and it is not in outer space, or on the far side of the moon, but right here on earth. It is to mobilize the resources, the thought, the idealism of this country, and of the world for the task of helping toward a decent existence the people now denied it by accidents of history and environment. If the public response to the mobilization were to be what we are sure it would be, there would be no reason for doubt as to the state of this Union.

Mr. CLARK. The key statement in the article is:

What is the President's message as the new decade begins? Save now, be strong later. Save now, educate later. Save now, cure unemployment later. Save now, reclaim our towns and cities later. Save now, research later the cause and remedy for mortal disease. Save now, build housing later. Save now, clear the air later. Save now, purge our streams later. Save now, nourish later the people—and the hopes—of new nations.

Mr. President, the history of how the President placed himself in his current fiscal predicament, and how he is perpetuating that predicament, is well outlined in a column which appeared this morning in the New York Times under the byline of that outstanding reporter, James Reston, under the title, "More Money, More Woe." It is this predicament, rather than a realistic facing up to national challenges which has moved the President to present a budget which in a year of prosperity proposes the cutting back of our military procurement and total military expenditures in the face of the growing power of the Russian and Chinese Communists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE MONEY, MORE WOE—PRESIDENT'S BUDGET TROUBLES ARE CALLED SIMILAR TO THOSE OF MOST AMERICANS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—Like most Americans who look over their financial accounts these days, President Eisenhower is confronted by a familiar dilemma. That is to say, he took in more money than he ever expected to get, but had more financial worries than ever before.

Even if he gets the $4,200 million surplus predicted in today's Federal budget, his financial accounts for the 8 years of his administration will show a deficit of at least $15 billion.

Again like most Americans, the President didn't plan it that way, but he is, to a large extent, the victim of events beyond his control.

"Our goal," said the Republican platform of 1952, "is a balanced budget."

Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, was more explicit in the famous statement he issued from Morningside Heights in September of that year just before the election. He said:

"General Eisenhower emphatically agrees with me in the proposal to reduce drastically overall expenses. Our goal is about $70 billion in fiscal year 1954 and $60 billion in fiscal year 1955. Today we are up against the guns. Government is taking one-third of the people's income and thereby one-third of its freedom."

PLEDGE REPEATED

In the campaign itself, General Eisenhower repeated the pledge, "My goal, assuming that the cold war gets no worse, is to cut Federal spending to something like $60 billion within 4 years," he said.

Starting with the budget of fiscal year 1954, here is the financial summary in billions of dollars, of his 8 years in office:

	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus or deficit	Public debt
1954	64.7	67.8	−3.1	271.3
1955	60.4	64.6	−4.2	274.4
1956	68.2	66.5	+1.6	272.8
1957	71.0	69.4	+1.6	270.5
1958	69.1	71.9	−2.8	276.3
1959	68.3	80.7	−12.4	284.7
1960 (estimate)	78.6	78.4	+0.2	284.5
1961 (estimate)	84.0	79.8	+4.2	280.0

An incident took place in the presentation of that first Eisenhower budget that explains a great deal about the figures above. On April 30, 1953, the President called Senator Taft and other Republican congressional leaders to the White House to hear an explanation of the budget.

As related by Robert J. Donovan, Washington correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, who was later given access to the minutes of the President's Cabinet and other White House meetings for an official history of the first Eisenhower administration, the President explained that he had cut the Truman budget but that heavy military spending would continue, that more deficits lay ahead and that the first Republican budget would be out of balance.

Senator Taft denounced the budget as a violation of their private agreements and public statements.

"The one primary thing we promised the American people," he said, "was reduction of expenditures. Now you're taking us right down the same road Truman traveled. It's a repudiation of everything we promised in the campaign."

From that day to this, the President has been caught between those members of his own party who wanted expenditures cut even at the expense of the military budget, and those Democrats who are now blaming him for spending too little and allowing the defenses of the Nation to fall behind the offensive power of the Soviet Union.

In this battle the President has defended the concept of collective security overseas and of social security at home. His deficits are largely the result of the military, political, and social revolutions in the world and of the requirements of a population that rose from 155 million in 1952 to just under 180 million today.

It is interesting in this connection that associates of the President who look sadly on this overall deficit now mention three things in explanation of the record.

First, the Soviet sputniks, which boosted the budget.

Second, the recession of 1958–59, which led to additional expenditures.

And, third, the President's three illnesses of 1955 and 1956.

ECONOMY NOT PUSHED

On this last point, it is now conceded here that after the President took ill in September of 1955, the administration's careful plan to cut about $3 billion of expenditures was never followed through.

Looking back on that period now, officials concede that the absence of the President produced a kind of administrative untidiness. The President himself was not able to enforce economy on the departments as he might have done if he had been active. The direction of the Bureau of the Budget was not forceful, and even those in the Government who saw the deficits mounting hesitated to bother the President with the problem.

In addition to this administrative untidiness, some officials here believe that there was also intellectual untidiness in dealing with the recession. The recession, they note, could have been dealt with by cutting taxes or increasing expenditures.

Some officials argued for a tax cut, on the ground that once expenditures go up in the Federal budget, they tend to remain on the new higher plateau. This course, however, was rejected, and while there was no actual decision to increase expenditures they were allowed to go up piecemeal, adding once more to the size of the budget.

OTHER CAUSES, TOO

It was this difference of opinion on expenditures that led to the extraordinary spectacle of former Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey condemning his own administration's budget just before he retired.

In the last analysis, however, the deficits were not caused primarily by these differences within the administration, the farm program, which the administration inherited and did not solve, the rising interest on the debt and inflation all contributed to the administration's disappointments.

They could have cut the cost of defense and put solvency ahead of security, or rejected new programs for highways and airports, but if they had taken this course, the outcries of protest would have been louder than those being voiced here today.

Mr. CLARK. The article gives, year by year, national receipts and expenditures. It shows that deficits have occurred in 4 of the first 6 years of the Eisenhower administration, the last deficit of $12,400 million being the largest deficit in a peacetime year in our history, and shows how the public debt has increased from $271 billion to more than $280 billion.

It shows rather optimistically, to my way of thinking, the small estimated surplus for fiscal 1960 and a somewhat unrealistic surplus of $4,200 million for fiscal 1961, which appears in the President's budget message.

I am appalled that the President proposes to terminate the college housing program, to cut back on aid for hospital construction, to rock along with the present minimum level of urban renewal, and to propose only $10 million in expenditures to create jobs in all of the many areas of longtime, heavy unemployment, a subject with respect to which a subcommittee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota will soon make a report. The President proposes no expenditures at all for aid to education. I hope very much that the Senate will see fit to disagree with the President during the next few days and pass a substantial aid to education bill.

As the Washington Post notes in this morning's lead editorial:

The President said it all in his first sentence. "With this message, transmitting the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1961, I invite the Congress to join with me in a determined effort to achieve a substantial surplus."

Mr. President, the editorial continues—and I am paraphrasing—that from the beginning to the end of the budget message it looks as if nothing else matters in our national economy and our national posture at home and abroad except to achieve this substantial sur-

plus; and to this end the final energies of the administration are apparently to be devoted.

I suggest that it has been very seldom in our history that so narrow a view of the economic responsibilities and of the Nation's real priority needs has been more unabashedly acknowledged.

I concur in the President's view that a surplus would be both appropriate and helpful in 1961; but it should not be the focus of the Government's planning, as Mr. Eisenhower has made it.

This budget, as the Washington Post points out, calls for reductions in the overall weapons procurement, extensive cutbacks in the Strategic Air Command, and a 47-ship reduction in authorized naval strength. It calls for only a snail's pace of modernization of the Army—and our boys in Berlin are still equipped with World War I type machine guns.

The President's aid-to-education program is no more realistic and workable than it was a year ago. Yet this is where a substantial increase in Federal spending is not only desperately needed but would also pay enormous dividends in many other fields.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this leading editorial published in today's Washington Post may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1960]

THE CALL THAT NEVER CAME

The President said it all in the first sentence. "With this message, transmitting the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1961, I invite the Congress to join with me in a determined effort to achieve a substantial surplus." From beginning to end it is as if nothing else mattered nearly so much. The administration's final energies apparently are to be consecrated to the attainment of a budget surplus. Seldom has its narrow view of Federal economic responsibilities and of the Nation's priority needs been more unabashedly acknowledged. A surplus would indeed be appropriate and helpful in fiscal 1961—but it ought not to be the focus of the Government's planning, as Mr. Eisenhower thus has made it.

It is difficult to see how or why the President thinks his budget attests to the strength of America's economy. The Treasury estimates of gross national product and of corporate earnings on which the $84 billion revenue forecast is founded are plainly ultraconservative. If there is any expectation—as there ought to be—that the Nation can or will experience relatively full employment in the next 18 months, receipts should be measurably higher. (Despite the steel strike, revenues this year are now expected to run $1.5 billion higher than foreseen a year ago, and it is likely that the Treasury again is playing it safe.)

As for spending, the President's expenditure estimates hardly constitute an affirmation of faith in the Nation's capacities. The figures are the lowest of all the Eisenhower years in terms of national income—even if the conservative official forecasts are accepted. The $79.8 billion spending program would amount to just 18 percent of the national income, compared with 19 percent for the current fiscal year and an average of 20 percent for the years since 1954. Spending in the coming year could be increased by as much as $9 billion and not exceed the Eisenhower average, in these terms.

Thus a budget more in keeping with national needs in defense, education, research, public health and welfare, and foreign economic assistance would seem easily within reach on the only terms that count: the Nation's ability to pay for it. At truly full employment and with a minimum program of tax reform—including the postal rate and gasoline tax increases which the President properly insists upon—such a budget could be balanced and might well include a surplus for debt retirement.

Spending this year was depressed in so many areas of Federal activity that it is not surprising to find instances in which outlays for 1961 show slight increases. Given last year's policy of "no new starts" on water resources projects, for example, the 42 projects for which initial funds are proposed in the new budget look like progress. Measured against national needs, this is a faltering half step. The increased outlays for basic research of various kinds are extremely modest.

The aid-to-education programs contain little that is more realistic or workable than the proposals of a year ago. Here among all the challenges to national enterprise is where a substantial increase in Federal spending is not only desperately needed but also would pay enormous dividends. And so on through the dreary recital: still no significant acceleration of nuclear power development, of urban renewal projects, of stream pollution control, of public housing and of many other programs in which the national shortfalls are evident and growing.

The defense budget calls for reductions in overall weapons procurement, extensive cutbacks in the Strategic Air Command's bomber strength, and a 47-ship reduction in authorized naval strength. The snail's-paced modernization of the Army is to be slightly accelerated, it appears, but nothing is projected for more adequate airlift or for the other requirements of an ample limited war capability. The increased procurement of intercontinental ballistic missiles is heartening, but regrettably the major emphasis in the next 2 or 3 years must be on missiles relatively vulnerable to a surprise attack.

The reductions in bomber strength may simply be an accommodation to the realities of improved Russian defenses. But it ought not to be imagined that missiles are yet ready to take over the bomber's role. The budget begins to reflect the imminence—perhaps indeed the presence—of the much-advertised gap in American strategic power. A 50-percent increase in authorizations for the civilian space agency's programs may ultimately help to shorten the long Russian lead in this field, but this is by no means a "crash program" to achieve American parity in space exploration.

The proposed foreign economic aid programs add to impressive totals, but far too small a sum is yet being committed to the basic development programs which the have-not nations so desperately require to achieve the breakthrough to self-sustained growth. This makes all the more desirable the plan to focus economic aid in a few areas. Military aid appropriation requests are somewhat higher, but a decline in actual spending next year is forecast. The recommendations of the Draper Committee for more expeditious modernization of NATO forces seem finally to be receiving recognition, however.

Few of the President's legislative recommendations are new. We have previously supported many of them, such as the proposal to equalize military retirement pay, to repeal the American reservation on the jurisdiction of the World Court and to remove the interest ceiling on Government bonds. These and several others deserve the close attention of Congress.

As for the budget itself, Congress has already greeted it on the familiar pattern. Representatives TABER and CANNON, of course, promise that it will be further reduced. A disappointing number of Democrats have contented themselves with observing that the postal rate and gasoline tax increases cannot be approved and that therefore the budget surplus may prove illusory. A few have suggested that urgent programs may get more funds, but last year's reduction in the funds for space exploration is not an encouraging omen. Until the vast sum of unmet national needs is faced, limited goals like the achievement of a surplus or the reduction of an indicated deficit will probably continue to shape Federal budgets.

The call to a peacetime greatness of national purpose comes hard. In President Eisenhower's 7 years it has not come at all. Now, with the outlines of the final chapter written there is little to do but frame the great issues anew for national reappraisal and, hopefully, a fresh start next January. In this budget message, the Republicans presumably have taken their ground. The appeal is narrow—and in these times, exceedingly dangerous.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder why the President of the United States, who tells us that he is more knowledgeable about defense than anyone else in the country, is so niggardly with the military phase of the budget. In this regard, the Washington Post this morning has published what is, to my mind, one of the greatest of the many great columns which that distinguished commentator, Walter Lippmann, has written over the course of the years. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column, entitled "The Second Best," may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND BEST

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has been true to the principle he laid down in his first budget, which was submitted on January 21, 1954. "We will reduce," he said 6 years ago, "the share of the national income which is spent by the Government."

He has done that. Although the Federal Government is spending on the purchase of goods and services more than it did 6 years ago, this is a smaller share of the much increased national income. Even when we add the very considerable increased amount spent by local and State governments, the total is still a smaller share than it was in 1953, when the President was preparing his first budget.

So the President is entitled to say that he has been faithful to the principle he laid down when he began. During his term of office, the American people have been enjoying a larger share of a greatly enlarged national income. Never before in all history have so many people in any country had so much money to spend privately and as they saw fit.

This would be an unalloyed delight were it not for the disturbing fact that during these years of private prosperity the President has been presiding over the loss of American primacy among the great powers of the world.

There is no doubt that this country is still much richer than the Soviet Union. It may be, although no one knows, not any weaker than the Soviet Union. But we have fallen behind and are not holding our own in terms of national power, in overall military capacity, in the competition to pioneer in outer

space, in the comparative rate of economic growth, and in education, which is the life-giving principle of national power.

Why has this happened? Why are we challenged in this way when, in fact, the Soviet Union has a gross national product which is less than half of ours and a standard of living about a third as high as our own? Why is this richer country being pressed by a poorer country?

The reason, at bottom, is that in this period of cold war, the President has adhered to a principle which would probably no longer be suitable even in a time of total peace. He has adhered to a principle which puts private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. The challenge of the Soviet Union has been demanding an increase, not a reduction, of the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run.

The Soviet economy is growing at a rate which, estimated conservatively, is 6 percent per annum. Our economy has been growing at a rate of less than 3 percent. The Soviet economy is half as big as ours but it is growing twice as fast. This means that this year's increment of increase is about $12 billion in the U.S.S.R. and about $15 billion in the U.S.A.

But, and this is the crux of the matter, the U.S.S.R. will use most, not all, of the $12 billion increase for national purposes, for armaments, for productive investment, for foreign aid, and for national education. We, on the other hand, are acting on the Eisenhower principle, and are spending a greater share of our $15 billion increase for private purposes, for the making of consumer goods and of the factories and facilities connected with the making and use of consumer goods.

That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States.

I have taken this analysis of the figures from several sources but chiefly from the brilliant and notable testimony before the joint committee of Congress given last autumn by Prof. W. W. Rostow of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The analysis is confirmed by the testimony of Mr. Allen W. Dulles based on the findings of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. Dulles' statement is one that we must all ponder and take to heart. It says "the major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized industrial, military and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of the consumer-type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our respective gross national products nor of our respective industrial productions is a true yardstick of our relative national power positions.

"The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power."

I emphasize the last sentence of Mr. Dulles' statement because it states, so it seems to me, the fundamental issue which the country must meet. The President's controlling principle—that the Government should spend a smaller share of a growing national income—has as its consequence, in this age of cold war and national rivalry, that the country will have a smaller position of influence and power in the world. While it may be that the days of our primacy, which were brief, are ending, what must not be allowed to come to an end is our parity with the greatest powers. For on it depend many of the dearest hopes of mankind.

Nobody can say as yet when the Nation will become aroused to the realization that national duty must take precedence over private indulgence, that it is not possible to preserve our society by private affluence and public complacency.

The voices that will serve this country, and indeed save it, will be those of stern men demanding hard things. They may not as yet do well in the Gallup Polls. They will be listened to sooner or later. For they will shatter the belief, now so prevalent among us, that affluence is greatness. It is not. In the history of human societies it has not seldom been the case that when riches were devoted to luxury it was the mark of their decline.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Mr. Lippmann points out that never before in our history have so many people in so many different countries had so much money to spend privately as they saw fit. This would be fine if we were not using this unexampled period of prosperity to sit back on our national and collective haunches and watch the President preside over the loss of American primacy among the great nations of the world. In short, as Mr. Lippmann says, the President of the United States is putting private comfort and private consumption ahead of national need. Mr. Lippmann says:

> The President has spent his 7 years in office reducing the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. The challenge of the Soviet Union has been demanding an increase, not a reduction, of the share of the national income devoted to public purposes. We are falling behind in the race because we are not allowed to run.

Mr. Lippmann says that most of the $12 billion increase which is anticipated in our national economy will not be used in the public sector of the economy, to rehabilitate obsolescence in that section of our economy at home, to shore up our defenses and increase our foreign aid, or to rehabilitate our national educational system, which is badly in need of help. All this increase is to be used for private purposes, for the making of more consumer goods, such as whisky and cigarettes, for advertising, and a host of activities included in the computation of our gross national product which are either downright harmful to the moral and spiritual well-being of Americans, or which, at the very best, are useless.

As Mr. Lippmann says:

> That is why the national power of the Soviet Union is forging ahead of the national power of the United States.

Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, has put it as well as anyone else, if not better. He has concluded, as Mr. Lippmann relates and as others know, that—

> The major thrust of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized military and national power goals.

Whereas the major thrust in our economy is directed merely into the production of more consumer goods and services which add little, if anything, to our national strength. Indeed, it was less than a year ago that the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers had the effrontery to tell the public that the aim of our economy was the production of more consumer goods. When he was criticized on the floor of the Senate for that comment, he defended it. He said the aim of our economy is the production of more consumer goods.

I suggest that the aim of our economy is to eliminate misery at home, to strengthen our national resources, to play our part in the world of today and tomorrow in international affairs, and to assure to every American man, woman, and child the opportunity to live in freedom, with appropriate civil liberties, in order to pursue his or her opportunity to advance by some little bit the Western Civilization and its spiritual growth, of which we are a part.

Mr. Lippmann italicizes, in his column, a sentence of Mr. Allen Dulles' which sums up the matter in a nutshell:

> The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power.

I suggest that they largely determine also the measure of national strength—not merely material strength, but spiritual strength, as well. It is in this regard that one must, unhappily, be critical of the President's philosophy and his method of stating it.

In all the President's emphasis of his notion of fiscal responsibility, we still see the administration practicing fiscal sleight-of-hand. Interest charges on the national debt will be $2 billion higher next year than last; and an additional $500 million is proposed to be spent on the farm program.

I am no expert on agriculture although we have many fine family farms in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But I have talked at some length with the experts, in and out of this body, on a farm program. I do not hesitate to say that we could have a better farm program than we have today, at a minimum of $2 billion less cost to the taxpayer. Yet no such program has been suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the administration has done everything possible to discourage those who would evolve such a program within this body from pursuing their objectives.

The President says nothing about stronger tax law enforcement and closing the tax loopholes although I am happy to note that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, apparently speaking for himself, proposes to make a greater effort than heretofore to crack down on tax dodgers, an area in which billions of dollars are going down the drain through phony claims for business expense and other like improper expenditures charged off as tax deductions.

The President says nothing about closing tax loopholes through which additional billions of dollars are slipping away. The President is right in saying that we must live within our means, but during his administration our means have been decreased by improper tax cuts, and our potential revenues have never been adequately explored.

Mr. President, if there is one thing that the country needs above all others, in order to put its economy on a strong basis, it is a drastic and complete overhauling of its outmoded, obsolete, unfair, and inadequate tax system. The country certainly needs such a drastic and complete overhauling of the tax system, so as to yield substantially greater tax revenue without having tax rates raised by as much as 1 percent.

I applaud the effort of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the other body to bring this to pass. It is unfortunate that it is not likely to be done during the present session of Congress.

But in order to assure the surplus of which the President speaks, and yet enable us to pass the measures necessary for the national well-being and the national security and strength, I hope that, at the very least, we shall close some of the flagrant and inequitable tax loopholes of which I have spoken.

Mr. President, let me close my remarks by referring briefly to an excellent article written by the able British political scientist, Dennis W. Brogan. The article, which is entitled, "Many U.S. Voters Cling to the Past," was published last Sunday in the Washington Post. Perhaps the public attitudes which Mr. Brogan has so well outlined in the article explain why it is that our First Citizen clings so tenaciously to his outmoded thinking.

However, Mr. President, regardless of whatever may be the attitude in the White House, the American people can no longer afford such complacency. It is time for America to wake up and take a look at the world as it is, not as we would like it to be. It is time for all of us to pull in our belts and prepare to do whatever is necessary to be done in order to put our house in order at home and be able to play our proper part abroad.

But, Mr. President, we shall never do that if we follow the philosophy and the recommendations of the state of the Union message and the President's budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Mr. Brogan be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY U.S. VOTERS CLING TO PAST

(By D. W. Brogan)

When I first went to the United States in 1925, there were tens of millions of American citizens who, Post Office apart, had do dealings with and no interest in the Federal Government. Not only was the income tax low but, given the income level of those times, many didn't pay it. There was no pay-as-you-earn system, and unless for the rich, the direct taxes levied by the Federal Government, which had been quite high during and just after World War I, were minimal.

If you smoked, you helped to pay for Uncle Sam's little luxuries, but if you merely drank, you didn't, thanks to the 18th amendment. Nor did the Federal Government do much for you even if it did little to you. There were national parks, and pork barrel projects, and there was a Navy and an Army that only a minority of the population ever set eyes on.

Washington itself reflected the remoteness of the Union from the affairs of the Nation. The Plaza in front of the station was full of rusty war shacks. That masterpiece of the Grant era, the old State Department, housed not only State but War and Navy. Government offices in that pre-Hoover era were often hidden in shabby office buildings.

Pennsylvania Avenue was lined with shacks that Hollywood would hardly dare to show as background to a sophisticated western. Washington was still a village and, according to repute, many of the diplomatic missions of the minor nations (a third or so of those represented today) were useful to their occupants and their customers as high-class and legally immune bootlegging joints. It was an idyllic time—and it is over.

But, and it is important but, many, many millions of Americans still live, emotionally, in that idyllic world that died in the New Deal and whose grave was bulldozed flat in World War II. Government is all around them; it affects every aspect of their lives. They know this; the tax bite makes that unavoidable, but old and not so old men still dream of a country in which politics will be art for art's sake and government will be confined to keeping the Indians on the reservation.

And a consequence is that the American's attitude to government is ambivalent. He is proud of the Constitution, of the Monroe Doctrine; he is all for Lincoln (deeply misrepresented as being first and last a kindly and ethical type, a sublimated Sunday school teacher). But he is unwilling to accept the fact that for good or ill, mostly for ill, big government and mostly big National Government has come to stay.

"The business of the United States is business," said Cool Cal Coolidge in those days when cool had no musical or artistic meaning. Today the United States is the business of the United States (including business). United States Steel is big but U.S. Government is bigger. There are many reasons for this, but the impact, scale, cost of World War II and the cold war are enough to explain most of the phenomena.

It was all very well for President Eisenhower's first Collector of Internal Revenue to dream of working himself out of a job by abolishing the income tax. But it was a dream, and yet so many millions of Americans live in the dream world of T. Coleman Andrews.

Government is a nuisance that we could get rid of if all good men got together. A strong tendency to anarchy, finding expression in some of the dreams (not in the practices) of Thomas Jefferson, is part of the American way of life. It shouldn't be taken too seriously, but it can be a nuisance.

For example, it bedevils sensible discussion among citizens about the role of the States, cities, counties. A great deal of the current talk about giving power back to the States is nonsense, since it ignores the financial limitations of the States. Sometimes the difficulty could in great part be dealt with by legislation or amending the State constitution, as in Michigan and New Jersey. Sometimes even cities could be solvent and competent if State legislatures extended their boundaries and relaxed too jealous controls. But there are lots of States and still more lots of cities which can't make ends meet, which never will be able to make ends meet out of local resources.

Yet the tradition that I have talked of, as far as it does accept the necessity for governmental activity, wants to pass the buck to the State, the city, the New England town. Let Sam not do it. That way lies fiscal sanity. Maybe, but that way lies a government that denies its responsibilities in the public sector from sputniks to schools.

The tenacity of the idea can be illustrated from an issue of the most serious journal in the United States, a copy of which has recently come my way. (I mean the Harvard Alumni Bulletin, of course.) A member of the class of 1937 takes Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to task for advocating Federal aid to education, asking with crushing scorn "an economically literate explanation of how a dollar raised by Federal taxes differs from a dollar raised by State taxes."

Senator CLARK does not need my help, but the author of the letter might reflect that in his State, which is also Senator CLARK'S, the taxable revenue per head is far greater than in, say, Mississippi. Left to itself, that State and many others can't provide, no matter how willing they are, the minimum social services that not only they want but that they need—and that it is desirable from the point of view of the Nation that they have.

No doubt this means raising money in one State to spend in another, but it is a long time since Lee surrendered and States rights, hostility to internal improvements, etc., have never been the same since.

Of course, the average citizen knows that he needs schools, roads, bridges, and he expects the Federal Government to help pay for them. Schools? Not yet, but soon. I have been struck in my recent peregrinations in areas like upstate New York with the resistance to the rising school taxes, not because they are proof of extravagance, though sometimes they well may be (it depends on how important you think basketball is), but simply to the often unjust effects of the local tax system. Federal aid will come, and it is needed.

Then it is hardly necessary to contrast the theoretical hostility of the embattled farmer to all Government interference, with the sad reality of his no doubt shamefaced and resentful, but still steady, acceptance of those horrid parity payments. Nor, indeed, is business, so much of it dependent on the Pentagon, or the stiff-necked bourgeoisie, who don't necessarily despise the resources of the social security system, really hostile to the Government. And the sturdy, independent striker, member of a big union, does not always remember how much that union owes to Federal patronage.

Back to Jefferson, back to Calhoun, if you like, but only in dreams.

Two souls, as Goethe put it, dwell in American breasts. What are the consequences for politics, for the role of the citizen? As I have said, politics 35 years ago, when I first began to study the system at firsthand, was a game. It was not in Harvard, when I arrived there from Oxford in the golden age of Cal, a popular game. My habit of slinking off to political meetings, listening to former Mayor Curley or former Mayor Fitzgerald, even to Congressmen and Senators, was frowned on by all my friends. Why was I wasting my time like this when I could be in the library or in a speakeasy?

I did get to the library from time to time, but I also got out and about among the politicians, and I should say that today the average American, in his sense of duty as a voter, is not impressive, does take more interest and a more intelligent interest in politics than he used to do. By British standards, he is idle and indifferent, but by the standards of 1925 he is Cato or John Quincy Adams.

But what kind of an interest? In his interesting panegyric of the U.S. Senate, "Advise and Consent," Allen Drury makes the valid point that many Americans, perhaps most active politicians, get their initiation into the political way of life by running

for office in high school or college or in some organization. "Heeling," as I believe it is called at Yale, is a political education. But it is a political education of a special type.

It is about people, not projects, about men, not measures. The doctrinal content is nil or fictitious, like near beer in the 1920's. In the spring of last year I ran across one or two college elections, with parties, primaries, pamphlets, campaigns. They provided political education of a kind, but not of the best kind. For the parties were artificial divisions like the Blues and the Greens in Constantinople or like scratch sides of softball got up among more or less willing parents and children.

There may be campuses where there are genuine college issues debated and settled that way, but I haven't been on them. What was decided was the pecking order of the campus elite. What is often decided in local, State, and national politics is the pecking order of the political elite. There are other issues in politics; they are neglected, on the campus and on Capitol Hill.

I rush in to say that I am not demanding and would be horrified to get that panacea of so many political scientists, a rational political system. Parties based on defined and deeply dividing doctrines are what the United States, luckily, hasn't got. When she did get such a system in 1860, she got a civil war thrown in. But it seems to me that one reason for the comparative idiocy (in the Greek sense of the word) of the average American is his frustration when confronted with his duties as a voter.

He votes the straight ticket and what does he get? He doesn't know even what to expect, what to hope for. What has the big Democratic majority of 1958 got from this Congress? In State politics, the outrageous gerrymandering at the expense of the cities, at its worst in Georgia but bad in Iowa and existent everywhere, depresses the good or even the sporting citizen. After all, at the racetrack, your horse starts. In politics it often doesn't. The division of powers into three branches accounts for a lot of this frustration; so does the necessary ambiguity of party platforms.

But whatever the cause, boredom, frustration, apathy are not unnatural results.

The American citizen is asked to do more than any other citizen since the great days of Periclean Athens. (And the Athenian had often little else to do and was paid for a lot of his political duties.) There are too many elections, for too many offices. From President through Governor to dogcatcher. From U.S. Senator to selectman. No one has the time, energy, or knowledge to do all that he is asked to do—well.

It is a surprise that so much intelligent cross voting takes place, that primaries and final elections so often make the right choices. Happy citizens of the District of Columbia, who have no rights, duties, or worries.

Nor is this all. In too many States they have direct democracy. They elect practically every public official; they have initiatives and recalls. I remember in the election of 1952 looking at the ballot paper and the accompanying literature issued to the inhabitants of San Francisco County (Calif.). There were propositions for the county and the State and endless officeholders were to be chosen. There were explanatory pamphlets. Altogether, the documentation issued to the voter weighed 14 ounces on this, bad paper and small type. It would have taken an expert a week's exclusive study to begin to know how to vote.

No wonder the American dreams of simpler days, no wonder he forgets to vote or to register, no wonder he doesn't know the name of his Congressman. Yet things have improved.

Everybody knows the name of the Vice President, which wasn't true in 1925 (who was he now? Dawes? Curtis? Marshall?). The presidential is a sporting event that eclipses the world series or the preakness. And that justifies all the ballyhoo that the heirs of Washington and Jefferson are going to go through this year.

Even if millions of Americans won't vote, all will know who is running. In that lies the safety of the Republic.

PRIVATE ELECTRIC UTILITY PROPAGANDA MILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I very much enjoy reading the Washington Grange News because I find that in almost capsule form it does, in the public interest, a job which needs to be done. I have reference especially to an editorial signed by Ted F. Berry, which appeared in the January 8, 1960, issue of the Grange News.

In the editorial, which is entitled "Doubling in Brass," Mr. Berry quotes extensively from a report which was issued by the Northwest Public Power Association.

I realize that it might be asked why, as an Oregon Senator, I make reference to this Washington State publication. In this instance I would need no further justification than that the editorial quotes extensively from a report issued by the Northwest Public Power Association, a fine organization which in the past has done much to counteract the skillful propoganda emanating from private utility sources.

Mr. President, in addition to that justification, which stands by itself, the material quoted refers to the private utility spokesman E. Hofer & Sons, of Portland, Oreg., whose office supplies free canned editorials to rural and community papers throughout the United States.

Because of the importance to the Nation of setting straight the record with respect to misleading and biased editorial opinion, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grange News, Jan. 8, 1960]

DOUBLING IN BRASS

(By Ted F. Berry)

You've probably read, in your local weekly newspaper, certain editorials which surprised you because they were so bitterly warped against public power and virtually all forms of Government activity. It's a good bet that many such grassroots gems did not originate with your local editor—that many of them came from the same propaganda mill, namely, E. Hofer & Sons, of Portland, Oreg.

Largely subsidized by private utilities whose interests it constantly promotes, the Hofer organization regularly circulates its free canned editorials to more than 11,000 rural and community papers throughout the United States. They are designed to save work for busy editors who are told frankly that they do not need to give any credit to the source, Hofer's mimeographed Industrial News Review.

Last November the Northwest Public Power Association published a documented report on the Hofer agency, by Gus Norwood, executive secretary, pointing out that the Industrial News Review has been the subject of investigations since the late 1920's. "The Hofer editorials are skillfully and professionally written," Mr. Norwood said. "They never lose track of the points that they and their subscribers want made. They employ guilt by association, glittering generalities, name calling, half truths, distortion, and sometimes guilt by omission of pertinent facts."

Further, Norwood commented, the Industrial News Review gives no hint as to who's paying for its gratuitous service to overworked editors.

"But readers also have rights," he concluded. "They have a right to know who plants the seeds for this grassroots field of opinion. Who pays for the fertilizer? And who, then, will gather the harvest?"

Private utilities customarily charge their customers with the costs of supporting the perennial Hofer output. But there's a serious question now in the mind of the Internal Revenue Service as to whether they should be allowed to deduct such propaganda expenditures from their Federal income taxes. The utilities have cried "foul" on the ground that IRS is interfering with the processes of free expression. Somehow, in their thinking, the ratepaying public is benefited by being brainwashed.—B.

PRIVATE ELECTRIC UTILITY RAPID TAX WRITEOFF WINDFALLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that many Members of the Senate have noted in the mass media of publications, advertisements, sponsored by private utilities, deploring the Federal investment in the great multipurpose dams erected to provide power, flood control, and agricultural benefits, at reasonable cost to the citizens of our Nation.

What many who read the skillfully worded advertisements may not realize is that the private power companies themselves receive substantial tax benefits.

The Oregon Grange Bulletin in its January 5, 1960, issue helps to set the record straight, and comments upon the rapid tax writeoff windfalls of the private utilities. The editorial is entitled "Private Power and Taxes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Oregon Grange Bulletin item of January 5 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Grange Bulletin, Jan. 5, 1960]

PRIVATE POWER AND TAXES

(By Elmer McClure)

If we don't watch out we are going to drown in the crocodile tears the private power companies are shedding for the poor victims whose heard-earned tax dollars are being used to build hydroelectric dams for the benefit of public power customers. We can hardly pick up a magazine or newspaper any more that isn't soggy from the power companies' crybaby ads about the poor victimized taxpayers in non-Federal power areas.

If we may be permitted to emit one last squeak as we go down for the third time, we should like to point out to these bereaved private power companies that the customers of the Federal hydroelectric projects are not being subsidized by the rest of the Nation's

poor deprived taxpayers. They are, in fact, subsidizing these same taxpayers most handsomely. The customers of the Bonneville grid system have paid into the general fund of the United States in interest alone on the Federal money invested in the Bonneville grid system, $219,599,782 as of June 30, 1959.

Speaking of something to cry about. How about a few tears for the poor Federal taxpayers who are going to have to pay additional taxes in the amount of $36¼ million to make up for the windfall the stockholders of just eight private power companies got when they were issued some $72,548,754 in tax-free dividends in 1958 as a result of accelerated amortization.

The December 21, 1959, issue of "News for Electric Consumers" gives this account of the windfall received by the wealthy investors of just eight private utilities:

"The December 3 issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly advises investors to consider 'the available returns from tax-free dividends on stocks of some private companies. Last year three companies paid dividends which were entirely tax free—California Oregon Power Co., Detroit Edison Co., and Pacific Power & Light.

" 'It appears likely that the dividends on California Oregon Power will remain fully tax free in 1959 and 1960, but after 1960 the percentage may decline and it is uncertain whether any part of the dividend will be free of income tax after 1963, when accelerated amortization will run out,' says the magazine."

Emphasis added, for this points up what consumer groups have been saying: that private power companies have been reaping a windfall through rapid writeoff gimmicks in the tax laws. They charge consumers regular taxes—paid for in electric bills—but then pay only part of the tax take to the Government.

They retain the remainder, listing it as deferred taxes, and apparently do with it as they see fit—including paying out some of it as tax-free dividends to their stockholders.

The PUF piece continues: "Pacific Power & Light preferred and common dividends * * * will probably remain fully tax free for about 5 years, due to accelerated amortization in connection with the company's large hydro projects."

Lest wealthy investors run out of private power firms in which to invest, the magazine notes that other firms paid dividends last year which were "substantially tax free." They were: California Electric Power, 79 percent tax free; Hartford Electric Light, 78 percent; Niagara Mohawk Power, 77 percent; Portland General Electric, 78 percent; and Washington Water Power, 89 percent.

What these percentage figures mean in terms of dollars is readily seen in this table:

Company	Dividends declared, 1958	Percent tax free	Amount tax free
California Oregon Power	$3,663,202	100	$3,663,202
Detroit Edison	25,543,546	100	25,543,546
Pacific Power & Light	8,403,585	100	8,403,585
California Electric Power	3,600,971	79	2,844,767
Hartford Electric Light	5,035,046	78	3,927,336
Niagara Mohawk Power	26,650,562	77	20,409,283
Portland General Electric	4,230,000	78	3,299,400
Washington Water Power	5,008,579	89	4,457,635
Total	82,135,491		72,548,754

OREGON'S ACHIEVEMENT IN BRUCELLOSIS CONTROL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association has strongly urged me to do all I can to have adequate funds for the brucellosis eradication program appropriated in this session of the Congress.

I take great pride in the fact that Oregon has achieved a standard which permits the U.S. Department of Agriculture to certify the State as having less than 1 percent of its cattle infected and less than 5 percent of its herds affected.

However, the goal toward which we should point is one which in the interest of public health we should attempt to achieve. It is my hope, and also that of the dairy industry of my State, that Oregon can become brucellosis free. To do this, money will be needed. The curtailment of Federal funds for this program in 1959 hampered the program. If there is an additional curtailment of funds in the remainder of this year, it will be a most discouraging thing.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am not simply making a plea for the appropriation of funds to be used to eradicate disease from cattle; I am making a plea for the appropriation of funds to be used so that, by means of the eradication of disease from cattle, hundreds of little boys and girls in this country can be saved from suffering from undulant fever. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who presently is presiding over the Senate, has been one of the victims of undulant fever in this country.

There is no question about the medical data in regard to this subject. Much of undulant fever can be traced directly to cattle infected with Bang's disease. I think I speak as somewhat of a competent witness on this matter, for I happen to be president of the Devon Cattle Breeders Association, and for many years I have raised cattle.

I say we have to do everything we can in the interest of protecting the health of the people of the country; and by eradicating this serious disease in cattle, we can take a long step in that direction.

However, Mr. President, this problem is a national one. The funds which I shall urge to be appropriated are not needed in the selfish interest of the cattle breeders or the cattle industry; but they are needed from the standpoint of taking action in the best interests of the health of the American people. As all of us know how important it is that dairy products be available for food, and we must make certain that the milk that is served to the young people and the adults in this country is free from brucellosis infection.

I have urged that the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations give thoughtful and favorable consideration to this matter in connection with the fiscal year 1961 budget, and that a supplemental appropriation of $3½ million be provided in this fiscal year for this most worthwhile and important disease-prevention program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated December 29, 1959, from Dr. O. H. Muth, and the accompanying resolution of the association, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Corvallis, Oreg., December 29, 1959.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In Oregon, the reservoir of brucellosis is in the cattle population where it takes its economic toll. As long as this reservoir remains, brucellosis presents a public health problem in the human population where it occurs largely as an occupational disease.

Oregon has gone a long way toward eradication of brucellosis. Twenty years ago, the disease was widespread and common. Up to 15 percent of the cattle in the more densely cattle areas were infected. On September 11, 1959, there was a Brucellosis Day celebration in Salem because on July 1 of this year, Oregon became officially recognized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and by the U.S. Livestock Sanitary Association as a modified certified area, signifying that less than 1 percent of the cattle and less than 5 percent of the herds remained infected.

It would be a shame to waste this investment in disease control. Yet, disease knows no compromise. As soon as eradication and control measures relax, disease spreads.

Oregon, like a number of other States, may find it difficult to finish this job. It may not even be able to hold its present hard-gained position without Federal assistance; assistance such as it has received in the past.

You are urged to give this problem your interest and your support.

Sincerely,

O. H. MUTH,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR FEDERAL-STATE BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION PROGRAM

Whereas much progress has been made in the eradication of brucellosis and the brucellosis eradication program was encouraged and expedited by Federal disease control authorities and by congressional allocation of $20 million for the program in 1954, followed by the allocation of comparable moneys in the succeeding years with the aim of completion by mid-1960's; and

Whereas many States in a spirit of cooperation with the Federal program accelerated their effort resulting in the certification of 21 entire States, although some States, through no fault of their own, have been unable to complete the objective to date; and

Whereas the unexpected curtailment of Federal funds in the fiscal year 1959 has hampered completion of the program, and further discouragement because of another 25 percent curtailment in funds for 1960 is obvious, although the urgency of the problem remains unchanged; and

Whereas the already planned and initiated brucellosis eradication program with a goal of early completion will now be delayed in many counties in several States; and

Whereas curtailment of Federal support will result not only in loss of planned progress in eradication, but further actual extension of the disease, resulting in eventual greater economic loss to the cattle owners, especially those who move their animals interstate, and to the general public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association, That the 2d session of the 86th Congress, convening January 1960, be requested to take immediate and positive action to effect the passage of supplemental legislation appropriating approximately $3½ million for continuation of the brucellosis eradication program on an aggressive and progressive basis in keeping with intent and assurances of Federal cooperation implied

when the prgram was offered originally; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this recommendation be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman representing the State of Oregon with a letter explaining the effects of reduction of the current appropriation on the program in the State of Oregon.

IMPORTATION OF LAMB AND MUTTON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called by a number of Oregon sheep breeders to the difficulty they foresee facing their important industry, should there continue to be a heavy and increasing importation of lamb and mutton into the United States.

Mr. S. A. Jackson, secretary of the Oregon Purebred Sheep Breeders Association, of Corvallis, Oreg., has informed me, for example, that—

the importations make it difficult and a financial hardship for sheep producers and those serving the sheep industry to compete with foreign lamb and mutton imports. The two mentioned imported items have increased about 10 times in the last 3 years to a present annual volume of about 40 million pounds.

It is my sincere hope that those interested in presenting their viewpoint to the Tariff Commission during public hearings on March 22 will be able to marshal their evidence in a persuasive manner, so that such relief as is justified by the facts can be given.

Mr. President, because it is my feeling that Senators from other areas of the country also have a deep interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent that certain of the correspondence and supporting data addressed to me on this topic by Oregonians be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence and the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON PUREBRED SHEEP
BREEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Corvallis, Oreg., January 6, 1960.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After giving importation of lamb and mutton considerable study, the Oregon Purebred Sheep Breeders Association opposes the heavy importation of lamb and mutton into the United States. The importations make it difficult and a financial hardship for sheep producers and those serving the sheep industry to compete with foreign lamb and mutton imports. The two mentioned imported items have increased about 10 times in the last 3 years to a present annual volume of about 40 million pounds.

We shall appreciate your help in protecting the American sheep industry. A public hearing will be held March 22, in Washington, D.C., by the Tariff Commission on the subject. You may wish to write or appear at the hearing.

Yours truly,

S. A. JACKSON,
Secretary.

ROSEBURG, OREG.,

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

If the opportunity should arise when you would be able to use your influence toward stopping or reducing the importing of sheep or carcasses from countries outside the United States it would be appreciated very much.

With conditions as they exist now it is hard to "make it" with a flock of sheep.

With kindest regards I am,

Respectfully.

ARTHUR BOYER.

ROSEBURG, OREG.,
January 3, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In regards lamb and mutton imports: This enclosed statement is an opinion from the Douglas County Farm Bureau Federation and the Douglas County Livestock Association.

If some point needs clarifying, or some local condition is not clear to you, please feel free to write and some of us will try to let you know what we think.

One point was not included because there was a difference of opinion among us. I think this point is important. It is: That since there is a surplus of field crops, of corn, wheat, etc., since there is a shortage of wool and also according to the importers of lamb and mutton a seasonal shortage of that kind of meat, it would seem foolish not to protect and encourage sheep farming, because sheep farming is an actual income-producing way of taking cropland out of competition. It would seem better to protect domestic sheep farming than add to the tax-supported soil bank.

We hope this will receive your careful consideration. Thank you.

Very truly,

DON OLLIVANT.

IN REGARD TO LAMB AND MUTTON IMPORTS

Imports affect livestock raising in general. However, lamb is our main crop and we are very close to the ports of entry for New Zealand and Australian lamb and mutton.

We believe certain premises must be assumed as true and argued later to readily reach an understanding.

First. The U.S. farmer, generally, unless supported by an artificial economy in the form of Government programs, is unable to keep a balance with labor and capital.

1. Farmers' living costs and necessary services climb steadily.

2. Returns to the farmer drop consistently.

Price rises caused by added services are not shared by the farmer.

Price declines are not absorbed by labor or the processor, or seldom so, but are assessed against the farmer. In the case of our local improved pasture sheep economy, technical advances bid fair to keep us almost even with the cost-price squeeze if our prices are not too suddenly depressed. We still must have time to adapt to these improved methods.

Second. Likely these extra and higher service charges in packaging and manufacturing will discount the advantages of skill and volume supposedly always found in American enterprise. This will surely happen in that part of agriculture supported by Government guaranteed prices. However, it seems an injustice for the part of agriculture that has always wanted to and largely has avoided Government support, to be the one to suffer first from a system that is not realistic.

Third. U.S. farm products cannot be expected to compete with a foreign import produced with cheap labor.

Fourth. In competing with the imports of lamb and mutton from New Zealand and Australia, the U.S. farmer is at a technical disadvantage.

1. Sheepraising is the basic economy of Australia and New Zealand. The New Zealand and Australian sheep farmer receives government aid of an enlightened and energetic nature in the form of large research and marketing programs. Therefore, it has been developed faster than in the United States. Incidentally the U.S. sheepman borrows methods and techniques from Australia and New Zealand.

2. Land leases used in the Australian grazing system makes the owned-land system of the average American farmer a decided disadvantage in a meat price competition.

Fifth. It seems unlikely any of us would want to launch another Government subsidized agricultural commodity (meat in this case). Our only protection seems to be some form of tariff or quota system administered as a protection to our own farmers and not just as an aid to other sections of the national or international economy.

Parenthetically, we the small grazing farmers of Douglas County believe we are about to be sacrificed to further free trade in subsidized manufactured goods and crop surpluses. (Our farmers cannot and do not want to participate in the subsidized programs.)

The only argument so far advanced in favor of New Zealand and Australian lamb and mutton imports is that a sesonal period of low domestic supply is remedied. (We question the validity of this reasoning and are prepared to argue this point.)

We do know that a source of income to those of us having a method of operation that allows us to winter over and fatten late feeder lambs has been lost. This will be reflected in a lower price for feeder lambs to the growers who cannot fatten their own.

Our local early lamb prices have in the past been strongly affected by, if not controlled completely by, supply and quality of the California crop of lambs. With the steadily increasing imports depressing the price of California lamb, we will soon be fighting for our last margin of profit on our early and best paying lambs.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK
IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF OREGON,
Roseburg, Oreg., September 25, 1959.

WAYNE MOSHER,
County Agent,
Roseburg, Oreg.

DEAR WAYNE: As per your telephonic request September 21, attached are data on lamb and mutton imports for the year 1958 through July 1959.

Also enclosed are data on lamb and mutton imports as a percentage of domestic production during the same period, and midmonth slaughter lamb prices for 1958–59 on all weights Choice grade at Portland and Denver.

These data are pretty much self-explanatory. However, I want to emphasize the price data in relation to imports and domestic production. As you can see in table III prices on Choice grade live slaughter lambs at Portland and Denver this year lagged behind a year earlier most of the time. The higher level of prices at Portland in May and at Denver in April, May, and June, reflect the domestic spring lamb supply situation. California had an exceptionally poor pasture season last spring and more than the usual number of spring lambs failed to develop into slaughter grade at that time. Notice how U.S. lamb and mutton production and prices in April and May this year compare with a year earlier (table II). That is when imports were the heaviest, especially in April.

As slaughter volume increased in July, prices on live lambs dropped below a year

earlier. During August and so far this month lamb and mutton production (data available on federally inspected only) also was substantially heavier than a year earlier.

So the price differential between the two periods in comparison in large measure reflects domestic production trends, not only of lamb and mutton but also poultry, beef, and pork, especially the latter two, which are in larger supply this year.

It is difficult to weigh the true impact of this year's heavier imports on the domestic lamb market. There is some evidence that they have had some measure of downward influence. Certainly domestic lamb prices would have been some higher last spring if we did not have the imports adding to total supply of lamb and mutton for fresh market and processing and the seasonal decline may not have been as great. I would evaluate the effect of live imports in about the same way.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN C. MARKS,
Extension Agricultural Economist.

TABLE I.—*Monthly U.S. lamb and mutton imports by country of origin, 1958–59*

[Thousand pounds]

Year and month	Australia	New Zealand	Canada	Others	Total		Year and month	Australia	New Zealand	Canada	Others	Total	
					Month	Cumulative						Month	Cumulative
1958—January	421	68	33	17	539	539	1959—January	4,135	419	44	1	4,599	4,599
February	620	455	28	----------	1,103	1,642	February	1,413	238	43	36	1,730	6,329
March	189	184	4	114	491	2,133	March	1,625	674	9	----------	2,308	8,637
April	733	904	5	220	1,882	4,015	April	8,346	3,259	3	578	12,186	20,823
May	2,525	701	----------	----------	3,226	7,241	May	3,552	1,066	1	17	4,636	25,459
June	2,454	829	----------	370	3,653	10,894	June	5,226	1,186	4	519	6,935	32,394
July	284	383	3	143	813	11,707	July	3,731	928	2	----------	4,661	37,055
August	1,949	1,781	4	----------	3,734	15,441							
September	1,863	176	372	----------	2,411	17,852							
October	1,405	140	405	155	2,105	19,957							
November	1,184	169	238	131	1,722	21,679							
December	1,088	173	73	41	1,375	23,054							

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information, Sept. 24, 1959.

TABLE II.—*Lamb and mutton imports as a percentage of domestic production* [1]

Year and month	U.S. production (million pounds)		Imports (thousand pounds)		Imports as a percent of U.S. production		Year and month	U.S. production (million pounds)		Imports (thousand pounds)		Imports as a percent of U.S. production	
	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative		Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative
1958—January	59	59	539	539	0.9	0.9	1959—January	75	75	4,599	4,599	6.2	6.2
February	53	112	1,103	1,642	2.0	1.5	February	62	137	1,730	6,329	2.8	4.6
March	56	168	491	2,133	.9	1.2	March	65	202	2,308	8,637	3.5	4.3
April	65	233	1,882	4,015	2.9	1.7	April	62	264	12,186	20,823	19.6	7.9
May	62	295	3,226	7,241	5.2	2.4	May	55	319	4,636	25,459	8.4	8.0
June	55	350	3,653	10,894	6.6	3.1	June	55	374	6,935	32,394	12.6	8.7
July	53	403	813	11,707	1.5	2.9	July	58	432	4,661	37,055	8.0	8.6
August	50	453	3,734	15,441	7.4	3.4							
September	55	508	2,411	17,852	4.3	3.5							
October	60	568	2,105	19,957	3.5	3.5							
November	48	616	1,722	21,679	3.5	3.5							
December	59	675	1,375	23,054	2.3	3.4							

[1] Domestic production includes federally inspected and other wholesale and retail but excludes farm slaughter.

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information, Sept. 25, 1959.

TABLE III.—*Midmonth slaughter lamb prices at Portland and Denver, 1958–59*

[Dollars per hundredweight, Choice grade [1]]

Month	Portland			Denver			Month	Portland			Denver		
	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58		1959	1958	Difference 1959–58	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58
January	[2] 19.22	23.62	−4.40	19.15	23.90	−4.75	July	20.00	21.47	−1.47	22.52	23.72	−1.20
February	[2] 17.75	23.25	−5.50	18.88	23.32	−4.44	August	20.25	20.88	−.58	22.85	23.50	−.65
March	19.00	23.38	−4.30	20.40	22.70	−2.30	September	19.83	20.44	−.61	21.25	23.10	−1.85
April	[3] 23.25	[3] 23.34	−.09	[3] 23.02	21.08	+1.94	October	----------	----------	----------	----------	23.50	----------
May	23.16	21.84	+1.32	25.20	23.20	+2.00	November	----------	20.33	----------	----------	22.31	----------
June	22.38	22.38	(4)	24.38	23.62	+.76	December	----------	[2] 19.03	----------	----------	20.48	----------

[1] All weights.
[2] Shorn.
[3] Spring lambs.
[4] No change.

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information, Sept. 25, 1959.

[From the Oregon Farm and Market Outlook, Sept. 3, 1959]

SHEEP STEADY TO LOWER

Price prospects are mixed for sheep and lambs in the year ahead. Slaughter price patterns probably will be moderately higher this winter but the same or lower next spring and summer. A May-to-July price drop on spring lambs is almost certain. Feeder lamb prices probably will stay under the past year through 1960.

Slight rise in domestic lamb and mutton supply seems likely. The Nation's 1959 lamb crop was 2 percent larger than last year. The 1960 crop will increase again if the gradual increase in ewe numbers continues and if the number of lambs per ewe resumes an upward trend. It slipped slightly in 1959.

Imports may be less of an unstabilizing factor than in the past season. The market apparently has made most of its adjustment to the shock of changed policies in Australia and New Zealand. Foreign suppliers will continue testing U.S. lamb and mutton market. They have found it rather thin and easily depressed; but shipment to United States continue much heavier than in the past year, although still small compared to domestic production.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1959.

P.S.—Wayne: I might add that imports are not entirely against the best interest of U.S. sheepmen. More abundant supplies have tended to benefit the producer in terms of maintaining ample supplies before the consumer. So, in this way, the lamb market has been less likely to lose favor to other red meats in greater abundance.

MARKS.

TABLE 1.—*Monthly U.S. lamb and mutton imports by country of origin, 1958–59* [1]

[Thousand pounds]

Year and month	Australia	New Zealand	Canada	Others	Total		Year and month	Australia	New Zealand	Canada	Others	Total	
					Month	Cumulative						Month	Cumulative
1958—January	421	68	33	17	539	539	1959—January	4,135	419	44	1	4,599	4,599
February	620	455	28	----------	1,103	1,642	February	1,413	238	43	36	1,730	6,329
March	189	184	4	114	491	2,133	March	1,625	674	9	----------	2,308	8,637
April	753	904	5	220	1,882	4,015	April	8,346	3,259	3	578	12,186	20,823
May	2,525	701	----------	----------	3,226	7,241	May	3,552	1,066	1	17	4,636	25,459
June	2,454	829	----------	370	3,653	10,894	June	5,226	1,186	4	519	6,935	32,394
July	284	383	3	143	813	11,707	July	3,731	928	2	----------	4,661	37,055
August	1,949	1,781	4	----------	3,734	15,441	August	1,259	1,209	74	----------	2,647	39,702
September	1,863	176	372	----------	2,411	17,852	September	1,933	1,096	234	----------	3,263	42,965
October	1,405	140	405	155	2,105	19,957	October	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
November	1,184	169	238	131	1,722	21,679	November	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
December	1,088	173	73	41	1,375	23,054	December	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] In addition to the figures shown, about 25,000 head of live lambs were imported in July and another 25,000 in November.

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information.

TABLE 2.—*Lamb and mutton imports as a percentage of domestic production* [1]

Year and month	U.S. production (million pounds)		Imports [2] (thousand pounds)		Imports as a percent of U.S. production		Year and month	U.S. production (million pounds)		Imports [2] (thousand pounds)		Imports as a percent of U.S. production	
	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative		Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative	Month	Cumulative
1958—January	59	59	539	539	0.9	0.9	1959—January	75	75	4,599	4,599	6.2	6.2
February	53	112	1,103	1,642	2.0	1.5	February	62	137	1,730	6,329	2.8	4.6
March	56	168	491	2,133	.9	1.2	March	65	202	2,308	8,637	3.5	4.3
April	65	233	1,882	4,015	2.9	1.7	April	62	264	12,186	20,823	19.6	7.9
May	62	295	3,226	7,241	5.2	2.4	May	55	319	4,636	25,459	8.4	8.0
June	55	350	3,653	10,894	6.6	3.1	June	55	374	6,935	32,394	12.6	8.7
July	53	403	813	11,707	1.5	2.9	July	58	432	4,661	37,055	8.0	8.6
August	50	453	3,734	15,441	7.4	3.4	August	53	485	2,647	39,702	5.0	8.2
September	55	508	2,411	17,852	4.3	3.5	September	62	547	3,263	42,695	5.3	7.8
October	60	568	2,105	19,957	3.5	3.5	October	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
November	48	616	1,722	21,679	3.5	3.5	November	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
December	59	675	1,375	23,054	2.3	3.4	December	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Domestic production includes federally inspected and other wholesale and retail but excludes farm slaughter.
[2] In addition to the figures shown, about 25,000 head of live lambs were imported in July and another 25,000 in November.

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information.

TABLE 3.—*Midmonth slaughter lamb prices at Portland and Denver, 1958–59*

[Dollars per hundredweight, Choice grade [1]]

Month	Portland			Denver			Month	Portland			Denver		
	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58		1959	1958	Difference 1959–58	1959	1958	Difference 1959–58
January	[2] 19.22	23.62	−4.40	19.15	23.90	−4.75	July	20.00	21.47	−1.47	22.52	23.72	−1.20
February	[2] 17.75	23.25	−5.50	18.88	23.32	−4.44	August	20.25	20.88	−.58	22.85	23.50	−.65
March	19.00	23.38	−4.30	20.40	22.70	−2.30	September	19.83	20.44	−.61	21.25	23.10	−1.85
April	[3] 23.25	[3] 23.34	−.09	[3] 23.02	21.08	+1.94	October	----------	----------	----------	----------	23.50	----------
May	23.16	21.84	+1.32	25.20	23.20	+2.00	November	----------	20.33	----------	----------	22.31	----------
June	22.38	22.38	[4]	24.38	23.62	+.76	December	----------	[2] 19.03	----------	----------	20.48	----------

[1] All weights.
[2] Shorn.
[3] Spring lambs.
[4] No change.

Source: Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA. Prepared by OSC extension specialists in agricultural economic information.

TABLE 4.—*Comparative production, availability, and prices for lamb and mutton, 1958 and 1959*

[In percent]

	Difference in U.S. production 1959 versus 1958	Difference in total lamb and mutton available 1959 versus 1958 [1]	Theoretical price change		Actual price change [2]		Difference in U.S. production 1959 versus 1958	Difference in total lamb and mutton available 1959 versus 1958 [1]	Theoretical price change		Actual price change [2]
			Based on U.S. production change	Based on total change					Based on U.S. production change	Based on total change	
January	+27.0	+33.0	−13.5	−16.5	−19.2	August	+6.0	+3.5	−3.0	−1.8	−2.8
February	+16.9	+17.7	−8.4	−8.9	−21.3	September	+12.7	+13.8	−6.3	−6.9	−5.5
March	+16.1	+21.3	−8.0	−10.6	−17.2	October	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
April	−4.6	+10.9	+2.3	−5.4	+4.1	November	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
May	−11.2	−10.1	+5.6	+5.1	+7.3	December	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
June	[3]	+5.6	[3]	−2.8	+1.6						
July	+9.1	+16.5	−4.5	−8.5	−5.9	Total	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] U.S. production plus imports.
[2] Simple average of Portland and Denver.
[3] No change.

THE DECLINE IN FAMILY SIZED FARM INCOME

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the master of the Washington State Grange, Mr. A. Lars Nelson, in an editorial entitled "Agriculture's Need: Bargaining Power," published December 11, 1959, in the Washington State Grange News, has stated with clarity a position upon the solution of the problems facing our farmer-citizens which deserves careful attention and, in my judgment, favorable acceptance.

Not only does Mr. Nelson put forth the legitimate claims of farmers persuasively; he bolsters his arguments by quotations from responsible labor union spokesmen, who have the best interests of agriculture at heart. He is, by implication, stressing a most important point. It is one that I have frequently made here upon the floor of the Senate. It is this: If we are to have a healthy and prosperous economy, it is necessary for us to provide an adequate economic reward to the family-size farm operators. The small farmer ought to have a parity of income with men and women engaged in other economic sectors of our population.

It is, I believe, undeniable that in recent years our farm families have subsidized, through low food costs, the expansion of the remainder of our economy. This cannot continue indefinitely, and it ought not to be tolerated further. I have said before, and I repeat it today, parity of income for the farmer at the farm gate rings the cash registers in the main streets of America. It would contribute to a high level of national income prosperity, which would enable labor to continue to have high wages while permitting investors a security of dividends.

We each are dependent upon the other. In the end we can either increase the level of goods and services available to each and every segment of our economy or we can expect to stand in grave danger of falling together into an era of unemployment and poverty. A static economy, like the floodtide, will surely ebb. Our economy must expand, and one of the best methods by which we can see to it that it does expand is to give to agricultural workers and the owners of family-sized farms returns on their work and their capital investments far better than those they now receive.

Mr. President, because of the importance of the subject matter, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Grange Master A. Lars Nelson, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Grange News, Dec. 11, 1959]

AGRICULTURE'S NEED: BARGAINING POWER

Agriculture in our State and the Nation still produces in excess of need. Surpluses continue to pile up, prices in many instances are declining and the cost-price squeeze tightens as inflation continues to roll unabated.

So-called checks on inflation, such as increased discount rates and the hard money policy, have only intensified agriculture's woes. Now belatedly, businessmen and consumers are increasingly feeling the pinch. Surplus investors, Wall Street and commercial banks have never had it so good.

The farm parity rate which is opposed by some of the leaders and farm organization contemporaries is now at 75 percent compared with 82 percent in June 1959 and 85 percent in July 1958. How would agriculture compare its position economically with business and labor if it weren't for the parity yardstick? None of its opponents has suggested either a better device or a substitute for it, possibly because they would like to leave us in an indeterminate position.

Index of prices received by farmers was 242 percent of the 1909–14 base period in July 1959. On September 15, 1959 it stood at 239 percent. This same index was 250 percent a year ago. Net farm income is down from 9 to 17 percent, depending on who is making the estimate. Net realized farm income for the last three quarters of 1959 was running at the rate of $11.5 billion. A further decline in purchasing power, with continuing and increased inflation, are almost inevitable.

Despite these facts, agriculture has been tarred with a vicious brush. Those who have painted with tar or other clinging substances know how difficult it is to remove the substance and the stains. False impressions, half truths about agriculture, farm programs, subsidies, surplus bogies are equally difficult to correct once they have been enumerated by editorial writers, certain agricultural leaders and high placed officials.

The top spokesmen of the USDA recently said agriculture had never had it so good, with the highest per capita income in history of $1,027. Contrast this with a $2,040 average per capita income for nonfarm people. Realized net farm income per farm averaged $2,767; for Washington, $3,027.

Some months ago the editor of Successful Farming came to agriculture's defense. This editorial said that of the total Federal subsidies paid to all comers, farmers drew a measly 10 percent. If Public Law 480 were arbitrarily included it would reach 19 percent. Where did the remaining 90 or 81 percent go? I have no alternative but to assume that it went to industry, labor and commerce.

Could it be that an attack on agriculture was being used to bring drastic changes in agriculture—and perhaps also to direct attention away from what someone else was receiving willingly?

It might be appropriately asked, "How long or why should the American farmer continue to subsidize American consumers with continually lowering raw food prices at the farm gate when returns to industry and labor continue to spiral upward?"

Agriculture is determined that there must be an end to confusion induced in agriculture itself and about agriculture to its friends. The National Grange says, "We emphasize parity of income, not parity prices. Parity income should provide farmers a return for their labor, management, risk and investment in reasonable relation to that returned for other segments of the economy."

In a recent convention the AFL–CIO said, "We seek an American standard of living for farm proprietors who by their skill, labor and investment produce our food and fiber. In particular, we wish to aid the family operated farm through measures to increase its efficiency and its income, so that the independent farmer may efficiently compete with corporation farming and remain the predominant producer in American agriculture."

May industry and business soon be constrained to join in such an objective. To gain it, I believe every legitimate tool used by any other segment of the economy should be made available to agriculture. This means that we will need to employ marketing agreements and orders on a State, regional, and National basis. It means that enabling laws, not on the books, will have to be enacted to permit agricultural industries to control quality, quantity and negotiate for a price which provides cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

The National Grange at Long Beach said, "We believe that farmers are entitled to bargaining power comparable to that enjoyed by labor and business. Farmers are both. Through legislation, Government has helped develop the bargaining power of organized labor. Other Federal laws often enable business to regulate and control production and marketing of products and services. Government should provide the framework for producer-managed commodity marketing programs where necessary to enhance producer bargaining power and to deter accumulation of price depressing stocks in the hands of Government or other nonfarm groups."

I would remind all of us that the line between surplus and scarcity is a thin one. Our present surplus of all commodities taken together ranges between 4 and 6 percent of all production. Ray Reiman says the big problem 15 years from now may be scarcity instead of food surplus in 1975. According to Carroll Downey, USDA economist, farmers at that time, with a population estimated at 230 million, will need to produce 58 percent more beef and veal, 41 percent more pork, 40 percent more milk, 35 percent more eggs, 18 percent more poultry.

We must be aware of other trends, including expanded vertical integration. We should weigh carefully the Packing House Workers' warning: "Freeing the farmers from Government controls means that giant food processors and other corporations take over completely the job of control." Farmers have experienced less and less competition among buyers for their products. The price of eggs in New York City is determined by one man.

We in the Grange will continue to stress the commodity by commodity approach to self-help programs. We must and will continue to foster and defend the family type farms in order to provide for a stable rural America for the benefit of both urban and rural people.

FAITH AND SCIENCE—ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR CARL W. STROM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that there also be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an able address delivered by Ambassador Carl W. Strom, Ambassador of the United States of America to Bolivia, at the University of San Francisco in Bolivia.

Speaking as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to say a word about Ambassador Strom. I spent some time in Bolivia last November, and I take pleasure in saying, in behalf of Ambassador Strom and the personnel of our Embassy at La Paz, that here is a great Foreign Service officer, one who is performing a remarkable and dedicated job for the people of the United States.

Bolivia has been one of the trouble spots of Latin America so far as U.S. relationships are concerned. I found when I was there in November a great change of attitude, not only on the part

of the people within the Bolivian Government, but I found it among the rank and file people of the country with whom I communicated. I think no little credit is due to Ambassador Strom and the work of our Embassy personnel.

As one reads the speech Ambassador Strom delivered in Bolivia, he sees ample evidence to justify the high commendation I have made of the Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH AND SCIENCE

(Address delivered by Ambassador Carl W. Strom, Ambassador of the United States of America to Bolivia, at the Major Royal Pontifical University of San Francisco Xavier of Chuquisaca at Sucre, Bolivia, August 18, 1959)

It is a signal privilege to occupy the podium of this illustrious university, an institution consecrated to the pursuit of knowledge and the center from which radiated the vital ideas of the South American war of independence, ideas whose splendor illuminated and gave lustre to an entire epoch of the history of the continent.

The historic and outstanding role that the Major Royal and Pontifical University of San Francisco Xavier of Chuquisaca has played in the life of this Republic is not unknown to me. During the period of the viceroys, this cloister of science and thought was the center where the most important resolutions, of vast and profound influence in the political development of South America, were conceived, discussed and formulated. The ideas which, in the fire of debate, were born in these halls, kindling spirits and developing movements of public opinion, extended their sway beyond the lecture hall and the faculty to penetrate deeply into the consciousness of the people and to set the course for many generations of Americans. The most notable successes of that epoch whose influence transformed the structure of the society of the South American Continent has as their place of origin this most notable house of learning. The illustrious men who nourished their wisdom in these venerable halls and who achieved the highest positions in legal, literary, and social arenas went forth from this center to ennoble with their inspiration and erudition the thought of all America.

Graced by its learning and its doctrine throughout the colonial period, Chuquisaca continued to exercise its primacy in the Republic as the nation's capital. The fame of its university went beyond the frontiers of Bolivia to extend throughout the entire continent and to stamp it with culture and refinement.

As a citizen of the United States, I am proud to think that the democratic principles which the men of the University of Chuquisaca spread throughout the continent were inspired in part by the ideals of the leaders in the achievement of the Independence of the United States: George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, champions of our democracy. The inspiration, which in times past shaped for our people identical ideals of freedom and equality, today continues to find its expression in the solidarity and friendship which unite our two nations, because the ties between us had their origin in the similarity of our ideals and of our aspirations to achieve the material and spiritual greatness of our peoples.

If I were appearing before this distinguished assembly this evening primarily in my capacity as a diplomatic officer, representing my country and my President in your country, I should feel obliged to speak on some feature of international affairs. Such a political subject of general interest would be eminently appropriate since our two countries share the same objectives in international policy, especially in questions touching relations within the Western Hemisphere where we stand side by side in the effort to promote the solidarity of our Americas. This latter theme would be particularly fitting at a time like the present when the Ministers of Foreign Relations of our 21 sister Republics are assembled in the fair capital of one of them to discuss matters relating to our common, glorious destiny.

However, I should this evening like to explore with you other interests which I am sure we have in common, namely, the relation of faith and science. If you will pardon a personal reference, I may be permitted to explain my personal involvement in this problem. My father introduced me at an early age to the Bible and the classics with all their spiritual, moral, and esthetic values. When I started a career as a university teacher, I continued this early interest in classical studies by teaching classes in Greek grammar and literature, including the Greek New Testament. However, mathematics displaced the classics as my main field of interest as I progressed in my university career and I specialized in pure and applied mathematics, with special emphasis on algebra, geometry, and theoretical mechanics. I started my work as a university teacher with the idea that it should be my life work but after 16 years I entered the Foreign Service of the United States and now for 24 years I have served my country as a consular and diplomatic officer in 12 foreign countries and in Washington.

However, during these 24 years I have retained a lively interest in the spiritual and esthetic values that are inherent in religion and in the classics as well as a firm conviction concerning the integrity of the sciences with respect to the things they teach us about the nature of the physical universe around us. It is with this background of 40 years of interest in two fields of major importance to the intellectual community that I venture to address you this evening. I do not flatter myself that I shall be bringing new information to this learned audience. Everything I shall have to say will certainly be unknown to some among you and some will probably be familiar with all the facts I shall present. At most, I shall hope to be able to demonstrate a relationship among these facts, that may be new to some of you and may lead you to new conclusions or at least stimulate you to further thought. It is with this modest objective that I ask as the basis of my discussion the question, "Is there room for faith in the modern world of science?"

The dictionary defines faith as "Unquestioned acknowledgment of the existence of a Supreme Being and the reality of a divine order." The definition given in the Bible in the Epistle to the Hebrews is "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Faith is therefore a concept that belongs entirely to the world of the spirit. My question is whether or not there is room for such a concept as faith in a civilization characterized by scientific concepts whose nature is primarily materialistic.

The background of my question is twofold. It is first of all the tremendous expansion of scientific knowledge that has taken place during the era that was ushered in by the researches of Galileo in the 17th century. It is secondly the emergence during the latter part of this era of a new force that claims the allegiance of millions and which asserts with religious fervor that life contains no spiritual values; that all of life can be explained in terms of matter and motion; and that faith is a delusion of weak minds that do not have the courage to face boldly the force of the material universe.

Among the early achievements of the new age whose precursor was Galileo were Newton's announcements of his laws of motion and gravitation. These are so familiar to us now that it is difficult in looking back to realize what fundamental changes they caused in science and, later, in philosophy. Together with the simultaneous discovery of the differential and integral calculus, they gave men of science hitherto unknown tools for observing and studying physical phenomena. Before the time of Newton, knowledge of a physical phenomenon was limited to what could be learned from actual observation. The methods of analysis provided by the calculus made it possible to extend the results of observation beyond the interval in which data were collected. For the first time in history, scientists were enabled to predict the course of a phenomenon beyond the period during which its period was actually observed. In effect, Newton's discoveries gave scientists the gift of prophecy.

This gift of prophecy had most important consequences for the philosophers. In every age philosophic thought has had to accommodate itself to the observed facts of science as they were known at the time. The results that were obtainable by the use of Newton's discoveries gripped the imagination of the philosophers. To cite a simple example, it was very easy to observe and describe the flight of a lead ball, which was dropped from an altitude of 150 feet. But Newton's laws enabled the scientist to describe with a high degree of accuracy how the ball would fall if dropped from 10,000 feet or from any other altitude. Spectacular results were achieved by the application of Newton's laws, among the most notable of which was the discovery of the planet Neptune in 1846. For years it had been possible to predict the position of the inner planets with precision. However, Uranus, the outermost one that was known at that time behaved in an eccentric fashion. Sometimes it arrived at a given position in its orbit at the time predicted but at other times it was either early or late. It was reasoned that there must be some unknown planet in the solar system beyond Uranus which was affecting its movements. Unknown to each other, an English mathematician, Adams, and a Frenchman, Leverrier, attacked this problem as an exercise in pure mathematics. Neither one knew that the other was working on it but they arrived at the same result at about the same time. Leverrier wrote to an astronomer friend of his in Berlin saying that he would find a new planet if he would direct his telescope at a certain point in the sky at a stated time. The planet was found at almost exactly the point predicted by Leverrier. Subsequent observations have shown that Leverrier and Adams both not only predicted where this unknown planet would be found, but, before anyone had ever seen it, they described its size, its mass, its orbit, and its velocity in its orbit, all with a very high degree of accuracy.

Newton stated his laws of motion and of gravitation for particles of matter and Leverrier and Adams treated Neptune as a particle in making their calculations. They demonstrated in a sensational manner the ability of the scientist to predict the future course of a particle under certain conditions. It was an easy assumption that an equation is associated with every particle in nature and that the future behavior of the particle could be predicted if its equation was known.

The next step in the reasoning was that man's body is made up of particles, each of which has its equation. It was reasoned further that a given man's future could be predicted, given a master mathematician capable of writing down the equations of all the particles that make up his body and solving these equations simultaneously. It was freely admitted that there were obstacles in the way of writing down the large

number of equations that would be required and of solving them, but it was held that the obstacles were all of a practical kind. Theoretically, the equations could be written and solved and their solutions would reveal what was going to happen to the man in question in the future. This reasoning led to the conclusion that a man's future is determined entirely by his present State. It left no room for such a thing as free will and it ruled out completely such a thing as faith or the directing hand of God. It led to a deterministic philosophy and a materialistic conception of the universe. In spite of the practical difficulties involved in applying the reasoning to a specific person, the reasoning itself was considered unassailable and determinism held sway in many circles throughout the 19th century and the first quarter of this one. Materialism was not a new concept, but the results achieved from the application of Newton's discoveries to an ever-increasing variety of physical phenomena gave the doctrine vastly increased authority.

We now come to the second part of the background of my theme question, namely, the emergence of a new, materialistic force in our world. When Karl Marx was composing the dogma on which modern communism rests, he found this deterministic and materialistic view of the universe ideally suited to his purpose. Stalin was for many years the spokesman for international communism. In his "Problems of Leninism," which was published in Moscow in 1953, he wrote:

"Dialectical materialism is the world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist Party. It is called dialectical materialism because its approach to the phenomena of nature, its methods of studying and apprehending them, is dialectical, while its interpretation of the phenomena of nature, its conception of these phenomena, its theory, is materialistic."

The main elements of this materialistic view of nature are succinctly set forth in a recent glossary of terms associated with communism, as follows: (1) Matter is the basic reality and God does not exist; (2) the universe and all life in it can be explained in terms of motion and matter; (3) human values should center around material considerations, sensations, and pleasures; and (4) the interpretation of human history must rest on material elements.

The incorporation of the materialistic, deterministic view of the world into communistic dogma makes it of the greatest importance to examine how the philosophy of determinism has fared in the light of most recent scientific knowledge. Since the lives of nearly 1 billion inhabitants of the earth are governed by Communist dogma, it is a vital matter for every thinking human being to decide in his own mind whether or not the theoretical basis of communism is tenable in this modern world of science.

Discoveries made during the last 30 years have given us a most profound insight into this problem.

A little over 30 years ago the German mathematical physicist, Werner Heisenberg, published his "Principle of Uncertainty." Heisenberg showed that the application of Newton's laws of motion to the elementary particles with which modern mathematical physics deals involves entirely different problems from their application to particles of discrete magnitude with which the calculations of classical physics had were concerned. Heisenberg's theory does not question our ability to write the equations that describe the course of many physical phenomena. However, when the particles involved in a phenomenon have the magnitude of electrons, protons, neutrons, etc., a situation arises that was not encountered in classical physics.

A complete discussion of this problem would be long and difficult. However, the crux of the situation is the fact that no prediction can be made about the future course of any particle unless its position and velocity are both known at some specific time. This is strictly in accordance with what has long been known about classical mechanics. It is easy to do this when the particle is, for example, a rifle bullet. Numerous methods of making observations of the flight of the bullet are available and its position and velocity at a starting time and starting place are determined without much difficulty. The apparatus for making the required observations may employ light or it may depend on an electrical mechanism. Electricity is, of course, a form of energy and light is known now to be a form of energy also. The important thing is that no matter how the apparatus is constructed, it works by impinging some form of energy on the particle. The mass of the bullet is so great in comparison with the amount of energy that is required to determine the starting position and velocity that the observations do not affect the flight of the bullet within the limits of our ability to observe it.

However, an entirely different situation arises when the particle involved is an electron or one of the other ultimate particles of matter and this is the point that was overlooked in formulating the philosophy of materialism. The smallest amount of energy that can be made to impinge on an electron is a photon of light and its energy is comparable in magnitude to the energy of an electron. Hence, it is impossible to observe the position and velocity of an electron at a given time without changing one or the other. In an article published in the Saturday Review of Literature on January 3, 1959, the distinguished American mathematician, Warren Weaver, makes a very graphic exposition of the situation. He says that the scientist is able to ask the electron, "Where are you?" The electron can reply, "Here I am" but the energy expended in making the reply changes the electron's position. Dr. Weaver adds that it would not be misleading to say that what happens is a little like asking questions of an exceedingly delicate and sick person through a crack in the door to his room in the hospital. You call in, "How are you?" He answers, "OK." But, if he is very weak, indeed the effort of making that answer may result in his death, so that the reply completely and automatically invalidates its own meaning. Dr. Weaver continues by saying that when a physicist asks an electron, "Where are you?", the electron replies but the effort of replying always moves the electron—and unpredictably—into a new location so that the answer is automatically invalidated.

The practical difficulty of solving simultaneously a very large number of equations, each one describing the motion of a particle in a man's body, which we noted in the basis of deterministic or materialistic philosophy, is, therefore, not only a practical difficulty but a theoretical one as well. It is not even theoretically possible to carry out the calculations on which determinism as a philosophy is based and from which resulted a materialistic view of life. A man's future course cannot be determined from his past. Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty has completely destroyed the scientific basis on which determinism rested. It has, moreover, provided room for free will and for spiritual elements.

More recent discoveries in mathematics have supported this conclusion. All of you have been accustomed to hearing all your lives that, whatever weaknesses other scientific theory may have, mathematics is one field in which everything is certainly either true or not true. Three or four years ago the Hungarian mathematician, Kurt Gödel, shattered even this citadel of certainty by the publication of certain results that have become known as Gödel's theorem.

An understanding of the proof of Gödel's theorem requires a very considerable degree of mathematical sophistication. However, it is not very difficult to explain his results. To do this let me take you back to your school days when you first approached the study of Euclid's Elements of Geometry.

Geometry brought many new concepts into the range of the knowledge of all of us, the most novel of which was probably the concept of the axiom. We were next introduced to Aristotle's method of reasoning with the use of the syllogisms, which incidentally played such an important role in the philosophical speculations of the authors of independence at the University of Chuquisaca. This method of reasoning, known as the deductive method, enabled us to derive new results, called theorems, from our axioms. We learned to define geometry as the collection of theorems that could be derived from our axioms by means of Aristotle's rules of logic.

Euclid was one of the great intellectual giants of the ages and for centuries his system of geometry was regarded as a unique creation. However, in more recent years it was discovered that Euclid's set of axioms was not the only one on which a mathematical system could be based. In fact very many sets of axioms were presented by mathematicians from which theorems could be derived by the use of Aristotle's rules of logic. Each new set of axioms together with its theorems was a new mathematical system.

As mathematical systems proliferated, axioms themselves became the object of intensive study and certain conditions were laid down to which a set of axioms would have to conform if it was to form the basis for a mathematical system. This intensive study of the axiomatic method, originally invented by Euclid, fortified the conviction of mathematicians that a set af axioms that satisfied the conditions that had been established furnished a sure and secure foundation for the development of a mathematical system. the result was to strengthen the conviction, so long held not open to question, that mathematics is the one science in which everything is either true or false; that is, in which there is no element of uncertainty. However, Gödel's Theorem has changed all this.

One of the conditions to which a set of mathematical axioms must obviously conform is that the axioms must be consistent; that is, one axiom may not contradict another one of the same set. The necessity of this condition is clear. Obviously, a set of axioms that contains a contradiction within itself cannot be useful in a mathematical sense. It has been assumed for over 2,500 years that Euclid's axioms were consistent, the one with the other, and the same has been assumed about many other sets of axioms.

However, quoting Dr. Weaver again, Gödel obtained two results, each of which is of the most massive importance. He proved first of all that it is impossible—theoretically impossible and not just unreasonably difficult—to prove the consistency of any set of axioms which is, so to speak, rich enough in content to be interesting. The question, "Is there an inner flaw in the system," is a question which is simply unanswerable.

All our lives we have made use of an infinity of results derived from Euclid's axioms. They have been useful and are still useful. They have not been vitiated by this first portion of Gödel's Theorem. Euclid's axioms may be consistent. The point is that there is an element in the proof of their consistency (or lack of consistency as the case may be) that is beyond man's intellectual powers. Hence far from being able to explain the universe in terms of matter and motion, as the dialectical materialism of

communism asserts, we are not even able to establish the consistency of the theoretical foundation on which all our studies of matter and motion rest.

Gödel's second result is even more startling than the first one. To quote Dr. Weaver once more, Gödel proved that any deductive logical system has a great limitation. Such a system is essentially incomplete. Within the system it is always possible to ask questions that are undecidable, again, not just unreasonably difficult to decide but actually and definitely impossible to decide.

This portion of Gödel's Theorem puts an entirely new light on the science which has always been considered not to admit of any uncertainty. There are many questions in mathematics that have been unreasonably difficult to decide and which have, in the course of time, been decided. The question of how to construct a square equal in area to a given circle was such a one as well as the question of how to trisect an angle using only ruler and compass. These questions are familiar to every schoolboy. For centuries it proved impossible to answer either one of them but as mathematical knowledge expanded and new methods were invented, both were answered in the negative.

In a certain sense, the answers were unsatisfactory. When we ask a question concerning a construction in mathematics we like to obtain an answer in the form, "Yes, you do the construction as follows." In the two examples I have just given, the answers were, "The construction is impossible" but the answers were found. However, many similar questions remain unanswered and, until Gödell published his theorem, it was assumed that they all had answers also; that the problems represented by the questions could all be solved or that they could be proved impossible to solve. We now know that among these unanswered questions there are some that will never be answered since they belong to the area of mathematical uncertainty where answers do not exist. You ask me to give you an example of such a question. I can only speculate on this point, since it is obviously difficult to distinguish between questions that are unanswerable and those that have merely not yet been answered. However, I can cite the following problem as one which probably belongs to the category of unsolvable ones.

You are all familiar with the definition of a prime number, namely a number which has no divisors except itself and one. In one of the most brilliant pieces of mathematical reasoning on record Euclid proved over two and a half thousand years ago that the number of prime numbers is infinite.

It was noticed at a very early age in the history of mathematics that some prime numbers are separated by a single even number, for example, 1 and 3, 3 and 5, 11 and 13, 17 and 19, 29 and 31, and so forth. These primes have been given the name, "prime pairs." After Euclid proved that the number of primes was infinite, the question naturally arose as to whether or not the number of prime pairs was also infinite. An enormous amount of the time and energy of countless mathematicians has gone into this question for over 2,000 years and so far no one has even discovered any promising method of taking hold of the problem. The problem is, of course, of no practical importance whatsoever. It has been to the mathematicians what Mount Everest was to the mountain climbers. Everest represented a challenge until it had been climbed. In the same way this question concerning prime pairs represented a challenge to mathematicians. Until Gödel published his theorem, it was assumed that the question must have an answer, either yes or no. It is now realized that it probably belongs to the category of questions whose existence was proved by Gödel and which simply do not have answers.

The result of Gödel's theorem is, therefore, the same as that of Heisenberg's principle of uncertainty. Both of them tell us that there is a definite limit to what we can learn about the physical universe. There is a paradox here and possibly the most extraordinary paradox of all history. The paradox is that useful results can be obtained from the study of the average behavior of very large numbers of very small particles without any knowledge of how any single particle will behave. Using the theory of probability, the scientist can assure himself that enough neutrons to support a chain reaction will impinge on a given body of uranium whose mass exceeds the critical size. However, he has no way of determining whether a given neutron will collide with any atom of uranium. In fact far from being able to predict that a given neutron will have a collision, he has no way of determining even where it is at any time. We can go even further and say that it really does not make any sense to speak of a given neutron, since it surely makes no sense to speak of a given object if one will forever be unable to present it for inspection.

Dialectical materialism asserts that the whole universe can be explained in terms of motion and matter whereas modern science states that we can make no assertions at all concerning the motion of individual particles of matter. In fact, modern science shows us that in a period in which we have been expanding our knowledge of the behavior of physical phenomena almost infinitely, we have been forced to the startling conclusion that we have no hope of eventually acquiring an understanding of objective reality. Communism has made a god of science but science has now betrayed those who have committed indolatry in its name. Dialectical materialism is therefore not only bankrupt; it is obsolete. Scientifically, it has been lost behind the advancing front of knowledge and its intellectual foundation has been destroyed beyond all hope of reconstruction.

I might pursue the consequences of this conclusion at great length but I fear I would try your patience unduly if I spoke much longer. However, you may well ask what communism has become now that it has been robbed of its philosophical basis. The answer is given in eloquent terms by one who once rode the crest of the Communist wave but who has seen its fallacy and incurred the mortal danger of testifying against it. I refer to the former Vice President of Yugoslavia, Milovan Djilas, who gave his witness in his notable book, "The New Class." Djilas points out that communism has lost whatever idealistic motivation it may once have had. Karl Marx's doctrine of dialectical materialism is used at present merely to conceal the opportunism of a new ruling class which, endowed with unlimited and autocratic authority, is more imperialistic in its designs than any system has ever been in the history of the world.

To conclude these reflections on the theme of "Faith and Science," I return to my original question, "Is there room for faith in the modern world of science." We have seen that the answer to this question is a resounding "Yes."

As the light was dawning over Ancient Greece, Homer wrote in the Odyssey, "All men have need of the gods." Throughout the history of mankind, men have believed intuitively that there are two factors in life, the material which we can see and the spiritual which we cannot grasp with our physical senses. Man's conscience testifies that man is responsible to a higher power outside himself. In these latter days, science has added its testimony that "man does not live by bread alone."

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to the subject matter before the Senate, and would like to have the attention of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] for just a very few moments, because I want to put certain questions to him.

First, Mr. President, I wish to say that I support the Hennings-Keating amendment. I have taken this position for years here in the Senate. It will be found in the so-called clean elections bill Senate bill 466, which I cosponsored last year with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. It, too, included jurisdiction over primary elections.

In speeches which I have made on several occasions in the Senate in the past, Mr. President, I have expressed the view that we will never get anywhere, in my judgment, in cleaning up elections in the United States—and they sorely need it—until the Federal Government takes jurisdiction over primary elections involving the election of Federal officials.

In the past, as today, I have based much of my argument on this tenet, Mr. President, which I repeat, that in a democracy there is no substitute for full public disclosure of the people's business. Now, one can make that a cliche. One can make that a politician's glittering generality, or one can breathe meaning into it. It is a principle of Government, and, in my judgment, the Congress of the United States should both protect and implement it.

I repeat, Mr. President: There is no substitute in a democracy for public disclosure of the people's business. And the election of Federal elected officers is the people's business. Their election does not take place only in a general election. We have to face a reality. The reality is that the condition precedent which determines, in the last analysis, who is going to be elected, is in the primary elections in many States. And, so far as I am concerned, I wish every State had a primary.

NO CONFLICT WITH STATE JURISDICTION

Mr. President, I come from a State which I suppose is considered to be among those with the purest of primary election laws, in the sense that it has wide open election laws. But those laws still have their shortcomings.

As one who comes from a primary election State, may I say to the Senator from Missouri and to my colleagues in the Senate, I see no interference at all with States' rights in connection with the Hennings-Keating amendment. To the contrary, I think the Federal Government has a clear duty to exercise jurisdiction over every step of the election process which finally results in sending a Federal official to the Congress of the United States or the White House.

I also enunciate, or repeat, another tenet I have been heard to express before, probably to the point of boredom.

Nevertheless I think it is important to repeat these immutable principles of democratic government from time to time as one makes a plea for their protection and their implementation. I have been heard to say many times that no man sits in the Senate of the United States from his State for his State. I know many do not share my point of view in regard to this tenet.

Mr. President, my study of the history of our Government, my teaching of the constitutional debates, my analysis of what the constitutional fathers definitely had in mind, and I think said so very definitely when they set up the Senate of the United States, establish that a man is elected from his State to the Senate of the United States for the Nation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say most respectfully, that, in my judgment, placing the Nation first, recognizing that which is best for the Nation, must necessarily be best for each individual State.

The Federal Government has an obligation to see to it that the procedures adopted for the election of Senators and other elected Federal officials are procedures that can withstand public scrutiny; and the only way we can give assurance of that is to adopt a principle of full public disclosure.

I turn now to the fourth general principle. I want to repeat it, although Senators have heard me say it before, to the point of boredom, I am sure. It is directly applicable in this case.

In the matter of the election of officials, the substantive results will be dependent upon the procedures we adopt which lead to the substantive results. The kind of men elected, the final result of the election, cannot escape that irrefutable logic line of reasoning. We will get no better men than the procedures by which we elect them, by and large.

With those four general principles as sort of an introduction to the remarks I desire to make, I now proceed to apply the principles in terms of certain questions which I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri. First, however, I think the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] wants me to yield for a moment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon. I embrace this opportunity to state that I shall vote for the Hennings amendment.

I think it is important for us to realize that the Senate and the House of Representatives, with the concurrence of the President, placed upon the statute books in the last session the reporting and disclosure law affecting the labor unions of this country. It seems to me, in line with the purpose of the Congress of the United States in that legislation calling for reporting at the local level that Members of this body should vote for this meritorious proposal. We should be willing to do that which we have required of other citizens and their organizations, The primary is an integral process in the election of a Senator in all but a few States.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has raised that point. That was to be covered in one of the questions I was going to ask. It was not to be my first question, but I will make it my first question, so that there will be a continuity of discussion and argument on the floor of the Senate, in view of the point the Senator from West Virginia has made.

My first question to the Senator from Missouri is this: It is true, is it not, that the Federal Government, in the Taft-Hartley law, has proceded to exercise some jurisdiction over elections in the several States by including a prohibition against the expenditure of any union funds in any Federal election in any State?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to have the assurance of my old friend, with whom I served in the House of Representatives in the 1930's, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, that he will vote to support the amendment.

I am equally glad that the able Senator from Oregon, who is one of the best lawyers and students of the Constitution in this body, has undertaken to address himself to this problem and is also supporting the amendment. Some of us have been working in terms of reforming elections procedures for something like 7 years. In my case it has been 6 years of hard work and experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, and during part of that time I have been chairman of the subcommittee and have conducted and been a part of inquiries relating to senatorial elections.

Anyone who has had that experience, anyone who has studied the problem, anyone who understands the basic elements, which are, indeed, very simple, can come to but one honest conclusion, in my own judgment, which is that the present law, the so-called Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, is absurd, ridiculous, without meaning, and utterly impotent as it affects modern-day elections and campaign practices.

To turn to the interrogation of the distinguished Senator, yesterday, as shown at page 636 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made this statement:

> It has also been argued that it would be a paradox if primaries had to be conducted under both State law and Federal law. If such is a paradox, that paradox exists today, because under existing law, the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and other Federal statutes control phases of general elections. However, each State also has laws controlling who can vote and where. Even in primary elections today we have dual control. Certainly, the Taft-Hartley Act, relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations, is the law pervasive throughout all States of the Union.

I then asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD section 610, title 18, of the United States Code, relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations. The Senator will find that set out fully at page 636 of the RECORD.

So, in answer to the Senator's question, of course, it is palpably true, beyond cavil, that we do undertake to regulate primaries in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much. I did not hear his discussion yesterday afternoon because I spent the entire afternoon in an executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations, where we listened to Mr. Allen Dulles give us a very valuable report.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have long appreciated the Senator's interest in the type of legislation represented by the pending bill, and his ideas and suggestions with respect to it. The Senator, with others, has been in the forefront and has been one of the foremost advocates of truth telling, not only about general elections, but also about primary elections.

The Senator knows full well there is no good reason why the people should not know about the sources of moneys and the amounts contributed in primary elections. Why should the Senate not take some moral leadership in this matter? We are very pious about a great many things. We are, indeed, very self-righteous about a great many things. I have heard many, in sonorous voice, intone that this is the greatest deliberative body in the world. Why cannot we be more honest in matters as simple as this? There is nothing complicated about it. The constitutional provision is clear and unequivocal.

The Landmark case, United States against Classic, in 1941, is clear and unequivocal.

I feel that I am repeating myself constantly in this debate, since this is now the third day we have been discussing one amendment.

As the Senator and others who are legal scholars and who have directed their attention to matters relating to elections cases know, there are innumerable cases contained in the books which I have heretofore mentioned a good many times and from which I have read time and again. There are presented various cases which have occurred throughout the country. I refer to the Senate elections cases, 1913 to 1940, which is an official document of the Senate.

I do not like to single out any one section of the country, but we know that there is great resistance to the primary provision in the South, where nomination means election. We need not elaborate upon that point. It is very evident and obvious, so it does not require any statistical data.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the floor, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from South Dakota if he will permit me a moment to reply to the Senator from Missouri. I want to assure my friend from South Dakota that as soon as I get through with a brief commentary I shall yield to him.

I will say to the Senator from Missouri that he has saved me a great deal

of time, because the very points he has made, without exception, with one or two others which I shall now make, are points which I had prepared to make.

My position can be summarized by saying that in my judgment there is no question whatever about the legal authority of the Federal Government to lay down rules, regulations, and procedures for the conduct of primaries in respect to the election of Federal officials.

The cases which have been set forth in this debate make it very clear that the Supreme Court has ruled that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government goes to the grass roots, so to speak, in connection with any phase of a Federal election. A primary election for a Federal office is, in that sense, a Federal election.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an interruption, another way of putting it is that it is a part of the electoral process.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. The primary and the general election are both parts of the electoral process.

Mr. MORSE. The next point I was prepared to make, and which the Senator has made even better than I could, is the point in regard to the degree to which we have laid down, in both the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hatch Act, rules and regulations in connection with elections held within the State. There is no question about their legality. There is no question about the fact that the courts have sustained those provisions, which, again, is reinforcement of the proposition so ably made by the Senator from Missouri, that the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

SENATE CONSIDERS PRIMARIES IN JUDGING CONTESTED SEATS

The third point I was prepared to make has been alluded to by the Senator from Missouri without reference to specific cases. He has made use of the same reference work which I used in the preparation of my remarks, namely, the book which is on the Senator's desk, which gives us an analysis of the contested election cases upon which the Senate has acted in connection with candidates who sought to be seated. The Senate itself had no hesitancy in passing judgment on whether or not they should be seated, or in going into great detail regarding what happened in their primary campaigns.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will yield for a further observation, it is exceedingly interesting, I think, to note that the first two cases in this compilation, extending from 1913 to 1940, are cases from Alabama.

Among the last cases in the same volume are Heflin against Bankhead, another case from Alabama, in connection with which it was said by some that there should be no regulation of primaries—I do not refer to present Senators, because I do not know how they intend to vote on this amendment—and the case of Pritchard against Bailey, in North Carolina. Another case related to Senators from Louisiana.

Next, from the State of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, comes the case of Hatfield against Holt, which I am sure he remembers, although he is from a border State, as it is commonly described.

The point I seek to make is that representatives of the Southern States who have sought election to this body have brought contests before the then Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was a standing committee of the Senate before the Reorganization Act, and have submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of a standing committee of the Senate. How can they now be heard to say that, after all, the Senate has no jurisdiction over primaries, when the Taft-Hartley Act was not challenged upon that basis; when the case of United States against Classic defines a primary as an inherent and integral part of the electoral process, and when we have a large body of precedents embraced in the book to which the learned Senator from South Dakota referred yesterday, cases in which the Senate was asked to pass upon matters relating to primaries? It seems to me that we cannot have it both ways. There is some virtue in consistency, even among lawyers and Members of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, I wish to summarize my position on the point which the Senator from Missouri has developed at greater length than I had intended to develop it.

On various occasions the Senate recognized its responsibilities in regard to doing what it could to protect the voters from corrupt practices in elections which involved primary races, because we have taken jurisdiction in the Senate over contested cases which involved corruption in primary elections as well as in general elections—and in some instances in both.

Mr. HENNINGS. The able Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senate is to do that—and it should—we have the further duty of adopting procedures which will afford a greater inducement to honesty in the conduct of elections. After all, one of the reasons we enact laws is to help to make it easier for people to be more honest. We have a tendency to take the attitude that we are passing laws to catch crooks, but there is a therapeutic purpose for laws, too. That purpose is to provide legal procedures which make it easier for people, with all the human frailties which tempt us all, to be more honest. I do not believe that we should wait to sit in judgment until some wayward brother goes wrong. Our purpose should be to keep politicians honest.

Mr. HENNINGS. We do not necessarily sit in judgment only whenever, as the Senator has put it, a wayward brother goes wrong. We are compelled to sit in judgment when his opponent, or others in a given State, ask the Senate to take jurisdiction. The Senate must then determine, through its committee, which makes recommendations to the Senate, what the facts and circumstances are in a given primary election or general election.

Mr. MORSE. We do sit in judgment as to what the candidate did.

Mr. HENNINGS. We do, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that, in all fairness, we should provide election procedures which will be preventive of the kind of conduct we all deplore when it is brought to light in some of the contested cases.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the questions which I had in mind to ask have largely been answered, so far as the attitude expressed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Missouri is concerned. However, for purposes of emphasis, I shall ask some of the questions I had in mind.

First, is it not true that the contested cases which have offended the Senate the most, and in which it has made some of its sharpest pronouncements, have been those in which the offenses to decency occurred in the primary rather than in the general election?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am thinking of cases which have embarrassed the Republican Party—for example, the Newberry case in Michigan, the Vare case in Pennsylvania, and the Smith case in Illinois. Those were all rather celebrated cases in their day.

Mr. HENNINGS. They are three of the most celebrated cases in the volume we have been discussing.

Mr. MORSE. I have that point in my manuscript, and it deals with the three cases which involved corruption in primary elections.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other day when I was making some remarks on the floor on this subject I had the book, "Election Cases," by Hays, before me. That is the document to which the Senator from Missouri is alluding. I read some of the excerpts relative to those cases. That is the point I was seeking to make. I was doing it from the standpoint of my being a Republican.

I believe the Republican Party, as well as the country, would have been the beneficiary had we had on the statute books a law such as is being proposed now, which would have made contributions in those cases subject to being reported and subject to being made public. Had we had such a law in existence at that time, and had the committees which were set up—not necessarily the individuals involved—been warned about the requirement to make public all contributions received by them, and had they been under the limitations which are proposed in the pending bill, is it not possible that the country and the Republican Party would have been spared the embarrassment in those cases which later had to be experienced?

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe there is any doubt that such a law would have been a preventive measure, and probably would have prevented the kind of conduct that was brought out in those cases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In some of those cases the point was not that the law had been violated, but that the sense of what was proper was violated. One of the cases from which I read the

other day had to do with an editorial written by Arthur Vandenberg. He was then the editor of a newspaper in Michigan. He was disturbed, and wrote a letter to the then candidate for the Senate, Commander Newberry, and said that he found it difficult to accept some of the things that were going on. That was in August, before the election. It had to do with some expenses in the primary contest between Henry Ford and Newberry. No one today would challenge my belief that Arthur Vandenberg was truly one of the great Senators of the United States. If in August of the year of the Newberry-Ford election he felt that the sense of what was proper was being violated, although not necessarily that anything illegal was being done, it would have been fortunate for the Republican Party in Michigan, and fortunate for the whole country, had we been spared the embarrassment that came with the disclosure of some of the actions of committees supporting Mr. Newberry with respect to exorbitant expenditures.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution to the debate. It has been constructive and in my opinion is unanswerable. I am not only going to vote for the Hennings amendment, but I also intend to vote for the Hennings bill. I should like to see a better bill enacted. I should like to have a bill which would do more than the pending bill, and I know the Senator from Missouri would also like to see that kind of bill enacted.

Mr. HENNINGS. There are three additional amendments I intend to propose.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand those amendments, I will support them. I believe the present bill is a constructive first step down the road of cleaning up modern elections that must be walked by those in positions of responsibility in Congress and in the White House, and we ought to take that journey just as fast as we can.

However, I am convinced from my discussion with my colleagues that the bill is probably as far as we have a good chance of going at this time. This involves no compromise of principle at all, because everything we are proposing is something that ought to be adopted. The fact that other things I would like to see adopted are not included in the bill offers no reason why I should not vote for the bill in the form in which it is proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL FINANCES ALSO NEEDED

The record should show that I believe all expenditures by all groups in connection with Federal elections ought to be public knowledge, and ought to be public knowledge before election day. As the Senate knows, I think the finances of politicians even after they are in office should be a matter of public knowledge. That is why there is pending before the Senate, and has been year after year since 1947, I believe, my proposal for a full public disclosure of sources and amounts of income of Members of Congress and of people holding high Federal office.

However, we cannot cover that point in the pending bill. I do wish the record to show that I believe we must proceed as rapidly as we can to a full public disclosure of all sources of political contributions to a candidate's campaign, both in the primary and in the general election, and require that the information be published at least 10 days before the election.

ALL COLLECTIONS SHOULD BE REPORTED

We do have a gimmick—I believe that is a correct description of it—in the present Corrupt Practices Act. I call it a gimmick because it really is a matter of form without very much substance. It is the requirement that a candidate for the Senate must file with the Secretary of the Senate 10 days before the election a list of the contributions which he has personally received and the expenditures which he has personally made.

Mr. President, that is practically a worthless provision. In fact, I wish to say that there are many sections of the Corrupt Practices Law—and this is one of them—which really in practice function as an inducement for various types of—to use a polite term—evasion, although I think a more ugly and accurate and proper term would be "practices of deception."

However, let us consider the little gimmick I have mentioned. A candidate files with the Secretary of the Senate 10 days before a general election the amounts of contributions he has received as a candidate, and his expenditures. We know that in practice they do not include any money the candidate has spent for travel and meals and hotels and personal contributions. Then, too, it includes only the amount of money that was handed to him personally, and that he accepted personally.

What happens as a matter of practice?

The public ought to be told that candidates just do not take the money. That is the general practice of candidates for the Senate. I will limit myself to the Senate, but that is true of the whole Congress. The general practice is that a candidate running for the Senate does not take the money. It is received by one or more of the finance committees.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. We may find a finance committee set up in each county, in each city, and sometimes in each ward. There can be a whole host of finance committees. The money they receive and the money they spend need not be reported under this section of the Corrupt Practices Act. I ask the question: "Really, now, is that not a form of deception?" I ask, "Is that not a device to keep undisclosed from the public the public's business?"

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The next amendment, following the pending one, would undertake to make provision for the money received by committees, the fund collecting committees, set up within a State for the purpose of accepting contributions and evading and avoiding and dodging the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, that provision was in his bill of last year, which I was proud to cosponsor.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct; it was indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Let us see the way in which the present Corrupt Practices Act really operates. I have a good sense of humor about it. I wish to tell very briefly the embarrassing position I found myself in in 1950 as a candidate for the Senate. Like all my campaigns, it was not an easy one. I was speaking many times each day, campaigning as hard as I could, and leaving the matter of campaign details to the administration of my central campaign office. One day one of my assistants called me on the phone when I was campaigning on the coast of Oregon and said, "We are already behind in this matter of filing the report with the Senate, unless we can get the report into the mail by midnight and send it by airmail, and get a ruling that if we get it in the mail by midnight it will be considered by the Secretary of the Senate as complying with the law."

A long-distance call was made to the Secretary of the Senate, and my plight was described to him. It was agreed that if I could get the affidavit in the mail by midnight, it would be all right, and that I would at least have met the spirit of the law, although I was in some doubt as to whether it was meeting the letter of the law.

So my assistant, with a notary public, arrived at my speech meeting that night. I thought that would be a good opportunity to do a little political educating of that audience. So in the presence of the audience, I signed and swore to the affidavit and to the accounting which had been prepared for me from the books of the campaign. I went on to use that as an opportunity to discuss the need for an improvement of the Corrupt Practices Act. I thought it was a good joke on myself, because under those circumstances I did not read in great detail the full account that had been prepared for me.

It was sent to Washington. Two days later the headlines in my State were that I led the Nation in campaign contributions and expenditures. Immediately the opposition took up the hue and cry: "You are going to let MORSE buy his seat." What had happened was that my assistant thought that what was called for was a full statement of all money which we knew had been contributed to my campaign through any committee, and all the money that I knew the campaign, up until that time, had spent. So the report which came here to the Senate showed that I was reporting some $50,000 in contributions and a little more in deficits, and was already running a deficit. I shall comment on the deficit point later.

There was a candidate for the U.S. Senate that year in Ohio, and his report showed that he had received and spent a little more than $6,000. There was a candidate for the U.S. Senate in the great Empire State of New York, and

his report, filed with the U.S. Senate in 1950, showed that he had received and spent a little more than $7,000. But here was MORSE in Oregon reporting more than $50,000. What we had done was to include in our report money which we had received and spent in the primary and in the general election campaign up to that point—contributions received and expenditures made by all the finance committees in my campaign, of which I knew. At least, as I said laughingly, my opposition and the people got the facts about what I actually received and spent. Do you know how much, really, my opponent received and spent through other sources?

I always thought of that experience as a pretty good illustration of the need for giving the public the full story about what is actually received and what is actually spent by all groups working for the candidate, of which he has knowledge.

That is why I am so glad the Senator from Missouri has announced that he has an amendment to follow this one which will deal somewhat, at least, with that point. With that principle, I am in complete accord.

But I come now to the matter of the deficit provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act. In my judgment, those provisions tend to induce corruption, rather than to end it. I think the whole procedure in regard to deficits ought to be exactly the same as the procedure in regard to reporting contributions, in the first place.

When I ended one year with a substantial deficit, I was visited by a committee of members of my party at that time in Oregon, who said to me, in effect "You know, you have been elected for 6 years. We are going to do the best we can to defeat you in 1956, but we do not think you ought to hold your seat from 1950 to 1956 with a heavy campaign deficit hanging over you. We are going out, if you give us permission to do so, to raise that deficit."

I said, "I welcome it. Fine. I appoint you. But you will have to raise it on the basis of the same terms that contributions had to be made during the campaign." There were three conditions which I made. First, no money would come to me; second, no commitments were to be made; third, there was to be a public record made of the contributions.

They ask, "Could you not dispense with that last condition, because there are those who will be perfectly willing, from a party standpoint, to help to wipe out the deficit, but they would not want the record to show that they ever gave you a dollar by way of a political contribution?"

I said, "Then I do not want their money."

Why should it not be a matter of public record? Why should the public not know how deficits are raised, just as they know how campaign contributions, in the first place, are raised? Yet under the Corrupt Practices Act, when deficits are raised, it is not necessary to make any report.

It is a pretty good rule that if any particular procedure invites wrongdoing, invites corruption, invites injustice, that procedure had better be corrected.

The provision in regard to deficits invites, in my judgment, a lot of chicanery. I think the present procedure in regard to deficits is not an inducement to clean elections. It invites a running up of deficits. It encourages deficits.

The effort is to get the campaign going and get it won. The idea is to wait until the election is over and then go out and get money under the table. I think that practice ought to be cleaned up and cleaned out of the Corrupt Practices Act.

The last point I make is that I think we have a responsibility and ought to be happy to do something about the whole matter of raising funds for the election of free men to a free parliamentary body representing free people. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has pleaded time and again on the floor of the Senate for the adoption of the principle that there ought to be some assumption of governmental responsibility in connection with the raising of the contributions necessary for election. I have always supported that principle and shall support it again.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], is the author of, and I am a consponsor of it, a proposal which, if passed—and I shall be a cosponsor again—will provide for a portion of the cost of the election to be borne by the Federal Government. Such a procedure follows the English system. It is not a total answer to the question, but it is a part of the answer to the question.

I say to the American people: You have a great stake in the procedure of electing your Governors, your representatives in Congress, and the occupant of the White House.

When the taxpayers come to an understanding of the pertinent objectives of the Douglas proposal and of the fine objectives of the Neuberger proposal, which I have supported in the past and shall support in the future, we will get their approval of such a procedure.

If we continue the present procedure of campaigning for Federal elections in the United States, we greatly endanger the freedom of the persons elected. Those who are elected to office must be men and women free of debt, who can act on the merits of the issues, on the basis of the evidence, and in accordance with the facts presented. They should never be placed in a position where they may be tempted to look the other way in regard to some issue or even go further and vote for some issue against their better judgment.

We should look for means of freeing a candidate from the necessity of raising funds for his campaign.

It is a delicate thing, and it involves a rather ugly thought. Nevertheless, it is one of the cold realities of American politics. If and when I get out of politics and begin to write my book, the chapter on the subject of political financing will cover one of the greatest causes of corruption in American politics today.

Mr. President, by means of this bill we have an opportunity to bring about some improvements by emphasizing public knowledge of campaign contributions. Let this bill be the first step in the march of Congress down the road toward the goal of a clean election procedure.

GREATER PUBLIC SERVICE SHOULD BE EXPECTED FROM RADIO AND TELEVISION

Mr. President, my last point involves the entire matter of the use of television and radio. Consider the use of the public's airways which television and the radio companies receive from the American people, and yet the very little that those companies return to the people, by way of public service. When one takes into account the fact that, after all, the air waves belong, not to the television or the radio companies, but to the American people, I wonder why we are so hesitant to pass a law which some of us have been proposing for some time—a law which will require, as part of the right to operate under the licenses of those companies, the setting aside of reasonable amounts of good time to be used as a public service, without charge, for the benefit of the American people, in the election campaigns.

There are many problems to be worked out in connection with the implementing of such a principle, Mr. President; but I say this job lies ahead of us, because the American people are entitled to have an opportunity to hear from the candidates for major posts in their government, and are also entitled to hear them under circumstances which do not destroy the freedom of the candidates before the elections even occur.

It is true that, today, if a man does not have substantial funds or if those who support his candidacy cannot raise substantial funds, the cost of the use of television, alone, makes it impossible for him to run for election to the U.S. Senate. I speak on this point from knowledge, because in 1950 television was not in use in the State of Oregon, but by 1956 television was in use there; and the television costs of my 1956 campaign were more than double the costs of my entire campaign in 1950.

Even so, Mr. President, I come from a small State; and I hate to think of the amounts of money that a candidate for election to the U.S. Senate who comes from one of the heavily populated States has to spend for television costs alone.

Mr. President, is it in the interest of good government to let this condition continue unabated? Is it in the interest of good government to pull our cloaks over our eyes and try to hide ourselves from the reality of American political campaign problems? Today, do we who serve in the U.S. Senate not have the responsibility of speaking against the very bad practices which are developing in the American campaign system; and do we not have the duty of striking some blows in favor of the adoption of some procedures which will clean up American elections and protect the public from the growing danger of corruption in American politics?

Mr. President, I leave that challenge with the Senate. We now have an opportunity to come to the aid of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], who is urging the passage of this bill. He does not claim that it is a perfect

bill; but certainly the bill, if enacted, will produce some improvements. I believe we should proceed to work on the bill, and should try to improve it as we go along, even at this time. We should make perfectly clear that we shall not end our action on this subject matter by whatever final action we take on the bill introduced by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have undertaken to discuss this bill in particularity; and I have been available here on the floor of the Senate for the better part of 3 days, to answer all questions which may be asked in regard to the constitutionality of the bill or in regard to the court decisions relating to the authority of the Federal sovereign over primary elections as well as general elections, as evidenced by the decisions of U.S. courts and by the other authorities in this field, including the precedents established by the Senate itself.

I believe that the distinguished present occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and also the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who only a moment ago made so able and moving a plea on this subject, and I am thinking along the same lines when we consider what we shall do in the future.

Sometimes, perhaps with some chauvinism, but nevertheless with great pride, we like to describe our Nation as the most powerful on earth. Mr. President, power does not reside merely in military might; neither is it derived solely from economic and productive capacity.

In that connection, there are certain things which we place in the general classification of public morals and public decency. And, Mr. President, I believe that one of those things is enactment of the pending bill, which would include primaries, in order that the people of the country may have the full and unadulterated truth, not only as to whom are the contributors, but also as to what amounts of money they contribute, in both primaries and general elections.

I have stated to my brethren from the South that a majority of the cases to which the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has had recourse between the years 1913 and 1941, have arisen in southern primaries.

Now we have an opportunity to demonstrate that we are not going to cower behind an unrestricted license, as is presently the case if we live within the terms of the 1925 Corrupt Practices Act. This matter involves the self-respect of the Senate, and it also involves our respect for the people of the country.

The next amendment which I propose to offer will relate to intrastate committees—that is to say, committees within a State. The amendment would prevent what the Senator from Oregon has just described as a proliferation of committees set up with the sole purpose of evading or, to use a euphemistic expression, avoiding the terms of election legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. We know there are no limits upon the number of committees which may be set up in a given State for the purpose of collecting money, and we know that these committees, under present law, do not have to report to the Secretary of the Senate, and we know that they do not.

Does anybody believe when Samuel Insull gave $125,000 to the late Frank L. Smith for his primary in the State of Illinois, that he, Samuel Insull, was interested simply in good government? And so we could go on down the line, and we could go up the line, in terms of dollars.

Do we believe that some of these contributions, disproportionate to the interest of an individual in a candidate or in a party or in his government, should not be restricted and restrained, not only as to amounts, but that the full glare of publicity be put upon what is done, so that the people may know?

We prate in this body about our righteousness and our greatness. I have great respect for my colleagues. I think the Senate is a great body of men. I just hope that in this instance we can grow up in terms of our own problems, and come to grips with what is a very basic issue in this country today, How are people nominated, by what interests are they supported, and how are they elected?

Mr. COOPER and Mr. LONG of Louisiana addressed the Chair.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, is it a shameful thing that people should know? What are the substantial arguments against this proposed legislation? The silence of this room has been broken very seldom by any constitutional question, any question relating to precedents. The general attitude of the Senate seems to be, as evidenced by the debate, "Well, there is nothing really wrong with it, except some of us do not want to have to tell. We do not want to have to tell what happens in primaries."

I may say to my colleagues, the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Kentucky, that I shall be glad to yield just as soon as I have completed this thought.

There is nobody in this body who is so immured in the fastness of an Alice-in-Wonderland sort of world as not to know what happens in primary and general election campaigns when it comes to contributions. As the Senator from Oregon has said, it takes a strong and rugged man, of inflexible will and character indeed, to overlook the pleas and the urgings and the petitions and the visitations of a $5,000 contributor, when the one who may not have contributed at all, or who may have been in opposition to the elected Senator, has a matter also to present, adversely to the matter presented by the large and substantial contributor.

In a sense, Mr. President, this body is composed of judges. True enough, we are not a part of the judicial system, but it comes within the purview of our duties, day in and day out, to exercise our best judgment and the best conscience that is available to us upon matters affecting the States we represent, the Nation, and the entire world.

To me it has always been a source of deep embarrassment to ask my friends to form committees and organizations and go out and solicit money for my campaigns. I have been through 12 of them. In one I had the opposition of the then President of the United States, the then Governor of my State, the then chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the then national committeeman, the then mayor of St. Louis, the then chairman of the State committee. I refer to the campaign in the year 1950. These gentlemen actively campaigned against my nomination. My opponent may have been a better man. Far be it for me to say he was not. The fact is that I was outgunned in the primary by $1,000 to $1, and I knew money was coming in from Washington, from New York, from the foreign ambassadors, and others. I later learned a great deal about what had been done in that campaign.

Still, Mr. President, I had no basis upon which to challenge any one of three opponents on the ground that money was being sent into my State for the purpose of supporting my opponent, and, as everybody had a right to do, to work for my defeat.

So I say, Mr. President, it is a little more than an academic matter with me. The great President of the United States campaigned actively in the State for another nominee, as he had every right to do. The Governor and the State employees were all on the other side.

I sent $25 into a county to help some of my friends. Lord only knows why they were for me in that county, because when I went there I found some had business in Washington, some had business in the State capital, others had business in an adjoining town. I encountered great difficulty in finding anyone on whom to call, because they seemed to be exceedingly busy with other business. When I sent $25 into a county, which was about all a few friends of mine and I could afford—I spent virtually all I had readily available to spend in the campaign—I found the other side had sent $3,000 into the county. I refer to a county in northwest Missouri where the pony express originated. I do not know how I happened to carry that county. I did not know anything about that money. Nobody told me anything about it until much later, when they expressed regret at having done what they did and were honest enough to say so.

So I say, Mr. President, some of these things come right down to us. We are talking about what happens to us.

I have thought of going out, if I should seek reelection 3 years hence, to say to my friends, "Get me some contributions, but get only $5 from each person. I do not want to be under an obligation to anybody for a contribution of $1,000. If a man should contribute $5,000, he might influence my judgment, so I should not take that contribution."

I might say to my friends, "Do not take contributions from an officer, be it an officer of a labor organization, of a manufacturing concern, or of a bank or other business organization. Do not take that money, because something may come before the Committee on the Judiciary in which that man will be interested. He may have an interest in the Alien Property Custodian matter, now before the committee."

It seems that many lawyers and lobbyists of my acquaintance have expressed an avid interest in that matter in the last 4 or 5 years. I refer to the Trading With the Enemy Act, which we have had under consideration.

Are we going to say, Mr. President, that I am not going to consider, at least with some human degree of mental hospitality, what a man who has contributed $10,000 to my campaign might have to say about what his client wants in regard to dipping into the fund, since there are millions and millions of dollars involved? I hope I would be strong enough to withstand the pressure, but, as the Senator from Oregon well said, why can we not make it a little easier for ourselves to not have to be quite so strong in all matters? Why can we not begin by telling the people what it is we really are doing, rather than engaging in this shadowboxing, by saying, "Oh, well, the primary is a State matter. We have State primary laws."

The State of Illinois does not have State primary laws or laws relating to reporting in the general elections. That State is wide open. That is why the late lamented Frank Smith, who was elected to the Senate on the face of the returns, but who was not seated, was able to take $125,000 from the late utilities magnate, the then powerful and mighty Samuel Insull.

It happens that Mr. Smith was at that time also the Commissioner of Public Utilities for the State of Illinois.

The minority leader made quite a speech the other day about States' rights, stating he did not think he should be subjected to any legislation because the legislature in his State had not seen fit to enact any regulations relating to primaries or general elections. I do not find the distinguished minority leader always quite so subservient or quite so amenable to what State legislation provides, whether it be his own State or other States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD a number of editorials. I refer to an editorial entitled "Clean Elections," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 19, 1960, an excellent summation of the matter presently before us, and other cognate and related matters; an editorial entitled "Dangerous Campaign Costs," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 18, 1960; an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 15, 1959, entitled "Inadequate Campaign Bill;" an editorial from the Salt Lake City Tribune of July 18, 1959, at the time the bill was reported, entitled "Push 'Clean Elections' "; an editorial from the Beaumont, (Tex.) Enterprise of July 12, 1959, entitled "In the Name of Realism"; an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 13, 1959, entitled "Clean Elections Again"; and an editorial from the Wilmington Morning News of July 15, 1959, entitled "For Cleaner Elections."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to my colleague the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to obtain the Senator's reaction to the problem which may be faced by a candidate, which is somewhat different from the situation the Senator has described. I refer to the candidate who is faced with the unanimous opposition of the daily press.

That is an experience some of us have had on occasion. I recall that the first time the junior Senator from Louisiana offered himself for office he did not have a daily newspaper for him. There might have been one which was neutral, but certainly there were none for him. Certainly the largest daily newspapers were very active against him.

I am sure the Senator realizes that the problem is not simply one of regulating contributions, but there is a problem of trying to find money to make it possible to be heard, when one has practically every newspaper in the State against him.

Without meaning to criticize anyone, much as I admire newspaper publishers they have a way of being human themselves. Sometimes their newspapers' editorials tend to be consistent with the publishers' own financial positions.

For example, the junior Senator from Louisiana cannot recall that he has ever been urged by a daily newspaper in his State to vote for increased public welfare payments, for old-age pensions, for aid to dependent children, or for aid to the needy blind.

How would the Senator propose that we find a solution to this problem, where a person is simply trying to find the opportunity to reply to what is being said against him? Does the Senator have some idea as to how we could ease that problem?

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish I had found the philosopher's stone or were the repository of all wisdom as to such matters.

Fortunately, in my last campaign I had the support of the Republican paper in St. Louis, the Globe-Democrat, as well as many Republican papers in the State. Of course, the Senator does not have that problem in the general elections in Louisiana, does he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The problem of being supported by a daily newspaper?

Mr. HENNINGS. In general elections.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My reaction would be——

Mr. HENNINGS. Is the Senator suggesting that we try to control the press, as to what they say for or against a candidate? Or is the Senator saying that we should give a candidate a means whereby he may meet this so-called scurrilous or unfair or invidious attack? I know of no way to do that except to resort to the ingenuity of which I am sure the Senator from Louisiana is capable and competent, which is to get out and cover the territory.

How many parishes are there in Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Sixty-four.

Mr. HENNINGS. We have 114, counties in Missouri, and we have a city of 1½ million or 2 million in the metropolitan area. One has to get out to the people, if the newspapers happen to be in opposition.

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt—as was also true with respect to Mr. Truman, I am sure—found no great handicap in that fact. In fact, I have heard them say repeatedly that the people who worked for the newspapers were generally for them and the publishers and sometimes the editors were against them, but they somehow or other survived, and were elected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator is familiar with the fact that if a candidate does not have a single daily newspaper for him, and very few weekly newspapers for him, if any, he is confronted with a very serious problem of getting his views across to the electorate. That costs him money.

The point I had in mind is that it is difficult enough to raise money as conditions are now.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, it is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wonder if the Senator can assure me that it will be any easier to raise money once we start publishing in the newspapers who contributed $5, $10, $100, or more than $100 for the campaign. If the Senator could indicate it might be easier to raise some money, I would be more inclined to support his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very sorry, I cannot give any such assurance.

I know the Senator is not going to support the amendment. I wish I could give the Senator good counsel on the matter. I find myself totally incapable of so doing.

The Senator has a strong instinct for self-preservation, and his presence here during this long period of time is eloquent testimony to it. He is a good Senator, an able Senator, and a diligent Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator this question: Has the Senator not stated that the present law——

Mr. HENNINGS. It is always difficult to raise money. We can always use money for a variety of things in campaigns. I do not believe anyone has ever decided exactly how much money should be spent for the various media, respectively, or for one as against the others. I do not believe anyone has ever decided whether campaign buttons, campaign posters, placards, advertisements in newspapers, and other things, do any good or not. I believe that most of us react, or our opponents react, because one candidate or the other does something. The other side does it because the oppo-

nent does it. Those things have never been nicely analyzed or weighed. We do not know.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It surely helps to be heard over the radio or television, as a general rule. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Has not the Senator stated that the present Corrupt Practices Law, so-called, has been a delusion, and that it has been honored more by its evasion and by the failure to accomplish the desired purposes than by compliance with it?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I have so stated, and so have all other Senators who have spoken in favor of the amendment, I believe. They have so stated either directly or by implication.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Recognizing the fact that this is a law which has not worked, which has been consistently evaded, and which has resulted in a great deal of hypocrisy, deceit, and misrepresentation in Government, how can we be sure that if we apply the proposed legislation to primary elections the result will be more honesty in elections than has resulted in the past? Why not try it in general elections and see how it works before trying to apply it to primaries?

Mr. HENNINGS. I cannot give the Senator any affidavits or any assurance that human nature will measurably improve within our limited lifetime. I can say to the Senator that there are penal provisions in the proposed legislation which we hope will be enforced and will be effective. I believe that taking big campaign money out of the dark will make for better legislation, better government, and more faith by the people in their elected representatives and representative bodies.

The Senator has many times heard it said that all politicians are crooked, and that everyone knows that politics is corrupt. I have heard it hundreds of times. I never had any intention of becoming involved with politics. It all happened rather accidentally to me, for better or for worse. But that is the common currency of talk about so-called government politics, is it not? Perhaps the Senator associates with and knows better people than I know, but I am talking about the generality of people. They say, "Well, you may be honest, and doubtless are, but there are some fellows who do this, that, and the other thing. We know that such and such a company or corporation owns such and such a Senator. We know that the Senator accepted enormous contributions from this, that, or the other group or interest. We know that this, that, or the other Senator has been influenced by someone who was once his law partner, and perhaps still is."

I have heard that kind of talk all my life. I think we might do something to try to remedy the situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The general problem which occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana is that many people feel—and perhaps sometimes correctly—that as among certain opposing candidates, none of them are completely honest, but that, on the other hand, one type of candidate has the habit of being for the little fellow, and the other does not. The people would like to have the choice of candidates. They may not get it if a candidate finds no way of financing his campaign.

It has been my experience that the average politician is probably more honest than the average businessman. Some businessmen would not like to agree with that statement. A politician does not have the privilege of criticizing businessmen. It is very poor politics. However, it is not necessarily bad for business for a businessman to criticize a politician.

Mr. HENNINGS. As a lawyer, I might observe to the Senator that I have encountered some prospective clients from the business community who did not seem especially concerned about preserving the integrity of the criminal statutes if they could find a way to get around them. We know that many people believe that they are buying influence when they support a political candidate by large contributions, just as we in the legal community know that in spite of repeated assertions to the contrary, many people think they may be buying influence when they retain counsel in connection with a legal matter. That is human nature.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me state the point which the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind, and then the Senator can react to it.

The point the junior Senator from Louisiana had in mind was this: Most newspaper publishers tend to be conservative. Some tend to be very reactionary. While their support is not regarded as a part of the financing of a campaign, or a campaign contribution, it is of great value in a campaign, particularly if it is on a day-to-day basis, when they hammer away from day to day against one candidate and for another.

In a State where the press tends to be extremely conservative, or even reactionary in point of view, reflecting not the view of the men who work on the newspaper, but the man who owns it, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is a mistake to make it too difficult to raise campaign funds to fight for a different viewpoint. We cannot regulate the influence of the newspapers, and neither the Senator nor I seek to destroy or undermine the freedom of the press. But when we make it difficult for a candidate to raise funds to make himself heard in opposition to the press, I fear we have scored a tremendous victory for conservatism and reactionism in government.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator has read the proposed legislation, he knows that the ceilings in the case of candidates for both the Senate and the House have been increased five times over the ceilings under the present law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator knows, and as he has testified——

Mr. HENNINGS. The ceilings in the proposed legislation certainly exceed most of the State limitations, within which the Senator would have his domain, if I correctly understand his line of reasoning.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Many people are reluctant to contribute to a campaign because they are shy. They would not want their names to be published in the newspaper. The Senator is perhaps familiar with the situation in which a contributor may approach a candidate and make a cash contribution, saying, "Please do not say anything about this. I do not want your opponent to know that I contributed to your campaign. He would expect me to contribute to his campaign, too, or he might hold it against me."

Mr. HENNINGS. I think we have a rather blunt word for that. When I was growing up as a boy in St. Louis that was called under-the-counter or under-the-table money. I think it is lamentable that some people are so bashful and shy about having their contributions recorded. But that is another matter which rests with the individual conscience under the given circumstances. The fact remains that the present Corrupt Practices Act requires that money received in a general campaign by a candidate be recorded. For the most part the very shy people belong to the gentry who come to the candidate himself. They want him to know that they are contributing. They do not go to the candidate's treasurer.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is not my impression. My impression is that the candidate usually has to look up the contributors. From what I have seen of campaign fund raising, I should say that it is often as necessary for the candidate to look up the contributor as it is for the contributor to look up the candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. That may be.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1960]

CLEAN ELECTIONS

After 5 years of discussion the Senate is expected to begin voting today on a badly needed clean elections bill. The measure reported out by the Rules Committee is in many respects a disappointment, for it stops far short of what the term "clean elections" implies. Control over the amount of money spent on behalf of candidates has been eliminated, apparently by oversight. The bill would modernize the limitations upon campaign expenditures and tighten up the reporting requirements, but it would apply only to general elections and thereby leave primaries untouched. Even so, it would mark some advance toward bringing the rules abreast of actual practices.

No realist would contend that the chances are bright for passing the Hennings amendment to extend the coverage to primaries. Despite the broad efforts by Senators HENNINGS and KEATING to remedy this obvious injustice, the amendment has been met by vigorous opposition from a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans. A bill that did not apply to primaries would of course create a gross disparity by in effect exempting most of the Southern States from its requirements.

The fact that Congress has dallied inexcusably on the matter, and the fact that the eve of a presidential campaign is not the ideal time to make changes in the rules, ought not, however, to influence the basic decision. There is little hope that a law could be made effective this year in any event because of the absence of preparatory work in the House. But the vote will be an

important moral test—a test of whether Senators are really concerned about making the electoral process fairer, or reserve their piety to be expressed only when scandals are uncovered. Passage of the bill with the Hennings amendment would be significant evidence of genuine Senate concern with the problem and a strong encouragement to effective action by the House.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 18, 1960]

DANGEROUS CAMPAIGN COSTS

Every red-blooded American boy, so the story goes, may aspire to the White House. Rich or poor, makes no difference. To the man born or reared in a humble log cabin, every American youth may nurse the ambition to win political office, even the highest in the land.

This belief is part of the American folklore. And it may have been true once, when the Nation was smaller, society simpler, and elections a much less costly matter. Now it takes a huge and excessive pot of money to get elected.

At one time, a candidate for Congress could visit every constituent in the district and solicit his vote.

Today, the average congressional district takes in more than 400,000 men, women, and children. It's too big an audience to reach, traveling from door to door in a horse and buggy.

When George Washington was elected President, the population of the entire United States was less than 4 million people—or about half that of New York City alone today. Any American who wants to sit in the White House has to reach an audience of 180 million Americans—or at least those over 21 who have the right to vote.

Reaching the voters has become a bigger and bigger job, more and more expensive.

It is estimated the cost of national elections is running as high as $140 million. This is a result not only of the growth of population, but of the appearance of new and expensive ways to woo the Americans for their vote—notably radio and TV.

Representative HALE BOGGS, New Orleans Democrat, and a member of a congressional committee probing the sky-high costs of running for office, once commented:

"The staggering cost of the recent campaign in which these newer media of communications were used has generated considerable public interest in this problem."

In theory, the Republican Party and Democrat Party can spend only $3 million in any one calendar year to elect their members to office. There is a Federal law that puts this ceiling on the national committees of both political parties.

It also limits a candidate for U.S. Senate to $25,000 for his campaign spending, and a candidate for the House to $5,000. But the law is a joke.

In effect, this limit applies to each group that backs a candidate. As a result, the limit is easily evaded. Candidates are backed by a number of independent committees which get together to raise separate funds for a campaign. Each group or committee can spend up to the legal limit.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., has introduced a bill that would put a higher, more realistic ceiling on campaign spending, but make it cover all groups working for the same candidate. His proposal would also apply to primary elections which are now completely exempt from the Federal law.

Southern Democrats have raised the roof over this point. Since the Democratic primary is the important election in Dixie, the lid has been off completely for the Democratic Party down South. That's how they want to keep it.

The Hennings bill addresses itself to a major weakness in our political system. When a party must spend $140 million in a national election, it places itself under too much obligation to contributors who hold the purse strings. Such an election reform should get warm support of Congressmen in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 15, 1959]

INADEQUATE CAMPAIGN BILL

A clean elections bill should have been adopted long ago. Yet the measure approved by the Senate Rules Committee last month as a complete substitute for the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 would be an imposition on the intelligence of voters.

It does not go as far as measures introduced in 1955 and 1957 and, as Senator HENNINGS and a number of others complain, it fails to bring primaries—still more important than elections in some States—under regulation. Also it sets no ceiling on individual contributions to the campaign funds of one or more candidates.

Worst of all, it eliminates the reporting requirement for persons who spend $50 or more in any year to influence the election of congressional candidates in two States or more. It also reduces the number of reports on expenditures by the national committees, and it would allow one of these to be made 30 days after an election, instead of before. Thus it actually weakens the reporting provisions of the present law. Information about "slush funds" cannot help the voters after an election has been held.

The least to be expected of new legislation is greater publicity. Voters at least should know who is interested in supporting candidates all over the country, if not why. The many secondary campaign committees, which at present need not report expenditures, also should be made to operate in the open. Higher ceilings on campaign expenditures are reasonable in view of the increased cost of campaigning, but it is important for the voters to know who is putting up the money.

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune, July 18, 1959]

PUSH CLEAN ELECTIONS

A clean elections bill recently approved by the Senate Rules Committee falls far short of the needs but, in the words of Chairman HENNINGS, it is an improvement over the obsolete 1925 Corrupt Practices Act.

A chief weakness in the measure is that it excludes primary election expenses. Primaries are often hotly contested and more crucial than general elections in some States, particularly in the South where they are for all practical purposes the only elections. Another weakness is that reports are required only from the candidate himself and not from the campaign committees that help him in his State. Many campaigns are financed through committees. For example, 7 Senate and 121 House candidates reported no personal expenditures in their 1958 campaigns.

The bill does establish more realistic rules for political spending. It would increase from $4 million to about $12 million the yearly spending limit for national political committees and raise the legal maximums Senate and House candidates may expend. It would also require more strict accounting of contributions and expenditures.

Senator HENNINGS tried to have primaries included in the bill but the committee voted five to four to reject the proposal. He will seek to amend it on the floor to make it conform to his original strong measure.

There is no assurance at present that even the mild bill will be voted on this session. Similar measures have died in two preceding sessions. Congress has an opportunity to assume moral leadership by adopting a real clean elections bill.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, July 12, 1959]

IN THE NAME OF REALISM

One cannot justify the existence of a law that is completely unrealistic and ignores wholesale the facts of life.

That's why we are pleased with a bill that has been approved by the U.S. Senate Rules Committee.

The measure requires fuller reporting on political campaign funds, but raises spending limits to what was called—and rightfully so—more realistic levels.

It includes a formula for campaign funds based on votes in the last previous election. For a State like New York the limit for a Senate candidate would be about $300,000. The present limit is $10,000, a ridiculous figure.

Chairman THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, is right when he says the measure is a vast improvement over the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Certainly excessive use of money in a political campaign can be a corrupt practice. However, with such costs as expensive television time and use of other communications media to be contended with, a great deal of it has to be spent if a candidate for major office is to be able to fully acquaint the voters with his program.

If he is limited by law to an unreasonable degree there is tremendous temptation to simply lie about expenditures, or at least to find devious and dishonorable ways of getting around the statutes.

Take, for instance, a statewide campaign in Texas. Just to visit half the counties takes a mint of money.

Times have changed a great deal since 1925.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, July 13, 1959]

CLEAN ELECTIONS AGAIN

Every Member of Congress ought to have a special interest in the clean-elections bill which has been approved by the Senate Rules Committee. This measure would enable them and their rivals and/or successors to run for office in 1960 without the chagrin of having to flout the intent of the Corrupt Practices Act. It would raise the legal limits on campaign expenditures to reasonable sums that candidates for office could abide by. The present limits are so out of line with the current costs of campaigning that they compel candidates to be evasive if they wish to be elected. Certainly that is an unhealthy situation for every legislator who has to live with it.

The amended Hennings bill, which the committee reported out, would enable candidates for Senator or Representative at large to spend up to $50,000 in the small States and up to $300,000 in the large States. The present ceiling is $10,000. Congressmen would be allowed to spend $12,500 (or more in some instances if they should invoke the 20-cents-a-vote formula) as compared with $2,500 at present. The formula applied to the national committees would enable them to spend about $12 million instead of $3 million. That figure still falls short of covering the cost of a national campaign in these days of television, but it is a substantial improvement.

Other important provisions of the bill would tighten up committee organization and the reporting of both contributions and expenditures. The Rules Committee did not offer any formula for requiring all groups working in behalf of a single candidate to combine their financial reports, but its bill would require every candidate to list the committees and organizations known to be working in his behalf, even though he may have repudiated some of them. Perhaps that is as far as it is feasible to go toward the consolidation of political financing.

Reports would have to be made 10 days before election (in addition to later complete reports), and they would be open to public inspection in Federal courthouses as well as at the Capitol. In other words, the bill relies heavily upon publicity to discourage excessive political spending and reliance on funds from special interests.

There are some glaring weaknesses in the bill, as Senator HENNINGS has pointed out. It would not cover primaries despite the fact that these intraparty contests are equivalent to elections in many States. It does not cover political committees operating in only one State unless they are subsidiary to a national group. Opportunity will arise, however, to improve the bill as it moves through the legislative process. The important task now is to push it to prompt passage through the Senate. The House should also get into action so that the bill will not get caught in the adjournment rush or the political tangle that would likely beset any measure of this sort held over until the campaign year of 1960.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, July 15, 1959]

FOR CLEANER ELECTIONS

The clean elections bill approved by the Senate Rules Committee is a sensible attempt at realism. The existing Corrupt Practices Act sets spending limits so low that if there weren't loopholes in the act almost the only candidates who won elections would be those who flagrantly violated it.

The present ceiling on spending by candidates for U.S. Senator is $10,000. It is a safe bet that no Senator has been elected from a large State in the television age who hasn't spent (or had spent for him) several times that amount. Even in a small State, $10,000 is hardly enough to produce a senatorial victory.

This is a problem to which no practical solution has been found. The aim is to keep the limit low enough so that bona fide candidates have a chance, while leaving it high enough so that candidates will have a reasonable opportunity to reach all classes of voters. It is undesirable, of course, for candidates to take office pledged to repay obligations to private interests at the expense of the general public, and yet the alternative—financing political campaigns out of taxes—has never attracted much support.

The present Hennings bill is another stab at the problem. It operates on the same principle as traffic speed limits, which are set at the speed 85 percent of drivers actually adopt on a given stretch of road. And actual campaign spending "speed," as almost everybody realizes, is a good deal higher than the "speed limits" set by the Corrupt Practices Act.

So the Hennings bill would set a senatorial campaign spending limit ranging from a maximum of $50,000 in small States to a maximum of $300,000 in large States. The present limit is $10,000. For Members of the House, who run three times as often, the limit is raised from $2,500 to $12,500. For national committees it goes up from $3 to $12 million.

Raising the limits would not necessarily mean that actual expenditures would be raised. The Hennings bill, indeed, contains provisions designed to make its limits practically enforcible. Candidates would be required to list all committees and organizations working for them, including any whose support they had repudiated. They would have to file reports 10 days after election, with complete reports later. And these reports would be open to public inspection in Federal courthouses, in the hope that the public would know just what financial support each man had received.

This is just the latest attempt to solve a problem which may be insoluble. It won't be the last. It would not cover primaries, though primaries are the real elections in the South, and it leaves other loopholes open. There is room for improvement before passage. But the important thing is that we are trying to get more honest national elections, and that there has been marked progress over the years.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question before he yields the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York was recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Before the Senator from Missouri yields the floor I wonder if he will yield for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Texas to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall try to answer any question put to me by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The inquiry I wish to make of the distinguished Senator from Missouri is this: If his amendment should be adopted, would he be willing to accept an amendment reading as follows:

On page 10, after line 9, insert the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act reports complying with other requirements of this Act filed with State officials under valid State laws shall be deemed in compliance with the requirements of this section if copies thereof are filed with the officials above named at the time of filing with the appropriate State officials, so long as one report is filed before, and one after, the primary, convention, caucus, or election in question."

In explanation of the amendment I should say that in my State we have very strict primary election reporting laws. There is no limit on the amount which may be contributed by any one person, but it is a penitentiary offense not to report each contribution, and that reporting must be made under oath. It takes page after page of reports. We must report contributions of $5, $10, $12½, and $1. It takes a very large amount of meticulous bookkeeping and a large amount of accurate accounting in reporting these contributions. If we were to have a Federal law on top of that law, it would complicate the situation tremendously. The purpose of my amendment would be to amend the Senator's amendment, in the event his amendment is adopted, to require only one set of those onerous election reports under the State and Federal laws.

In my State we have two primaries. First the primary and then the runoff. In my State a sworn report of all receipts and expenditures, including gifts and loans of property, is required. That means that if someone lends us an automobile, it must be reported. If someone lends us a typewriter, that must be reported as a loan. That report must be made under oath. Such a report is required from 7 to 10 days before each primary, special, or general election, and within 10 days after each primary, special, or general election. Unfortunately, the dates on which these reports are required are different from those proposed in the Federal Elections Act. Therefore a candidate running in my State would end up after a year in a primary, runoff primary, and general election filing six State and six Federal reports.

Since all these reports must be filed under oath, it is naturally very important that the candidate insures their accuracy.

In a large campaign, these reports require many hours of bookkeeping and typing.

I therefore propose the amendment, which would allow reports filed under a valid State law, which complies substantially with the Federal requirement, to be accepted under the bill when filed with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, even though the dates may differ from those listed under the proposed act. This at least would reduce the 12 reports to 6 reports, and impose no more onerous a burden than that already imposed by the State of Texas.

I might say to the Senator that we cannot merely say we spent $20,000 for printing. We must give the name of the printer. We must say, for example, "We paid $571.20 to XYZ printer, and $59.30 to this, that, or the other printer."

If we incur debts, we must list every debt we incur, and who the debtor is and how much is owed. All of this requires meticulous accounting and bookkeeping. Formerly, we in Texas had a limit of $10,000 on expenses. No one ever paid any attention to it. So now we make a realistic approach to the whole problem. Under the reform law there is now no limit placed on the amount of contributions, but it is a penitentiary offense if the contributions and expenses are not reported. Under the pending bill, it would require a whole headquarters full of accountants and bookkeepers and typists. The requirements under our State law are already more strict than are proposed under the proposed Federal Elections Act.

Mr. President, I can see nothing to be gained from supporting the proposed amendment, so far as Texas is concerned—I refer to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]—except more burdensome bookkeeping and typing on the part of the candidates. If the distinguished Senators will accept my amendment as a proviso on their amendment requiring financial reports in primaries, I will be glad to join in support of their amendment. The amendment proposed by the distinguished Senators would not add one iota of information to the people of Texas to that which is now required under present law. It would add a terrible expense, and would require the filing of 12 reports instead of 6 reports. The people of Texas already get full information.

Mr. HENNINGS. In trying to answer the rather lengthy question of the Senator from Texas, I should like to inquire first whether the Senator presented his amendment to the committee at any time for consideration.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; I have not.

Mr. HENNINGS. The first time, I believe, that those of us who are members of the committee and are supporting the proposed legislation have heard of it is now. I would say that I sympathize with the Senator's position. However, the proposed law requires four reportings each election year by political committees and reporting before and after each election by candidates. Bankers and brokers and investment bankers complain about the great many reports they have to file with the SEC. They do not talk about driving bucketshops out of business. They always talk about the number of reports they have to make. I do not say that in derogation of my friend's suggestion. I only say that under the proposed law in election years only four reports would be required from political committees. Under the 1925 act six reports are required. Therefore, we are cutting down on the reporting process.

As to words "substantial compliance" there we get into very deep water. I do not know just how we could say that a State law is in substantial compliance both as to time and amount, as well as with respect to other factors embodied in the Federal statute, without getting ourselves enmeshed deeply in great controversy in the courts.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am only trying to answer the question of the Senator. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I will take out the word "substantial." The reporting would be in compliance with everything that the Federal law requires except as to the dates.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does my friend from Texas understand that the present law provides that these filings may be made with the clerks of the district courts or with any State officer authorized by the State to receive these reports for the purpose of filing and preservation of them? When we get to the point of substantial compliance——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw that word "substantial."

Mr. HENNINGS. Our bill provides that a report may be filed in the county with any officer authorized by State law to receive these reports. Therefore it would simply mean the filing of one report with the State officer and a duplicate for Federal purposes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My amendment provides that where the Federal law is slightly different with respect to the date from the State law, the filing would comply with Federal law and would be treated as compliance, where all the information is furnished that is required under the Federal act, although the date is slightly different under State law.

Mr. HENNINGS. My first impression is that I believe we must have uniformity. The Senator says that so many reports are being made, or would be made. There are only two reports that candidates would make. I do not know where we part company.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Perhaps this will clarify the situation. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri this question. In a State having a first primary and then a runoff, or second primary, does the proposed act require filing both before and after each primary, or only one report before the first primary and one after the second primary?

Mr. HENNINGS. There would be the requirement for filing reports before the primary election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If there were two primaries, first a primary and then a runoff primary, would the proposed amendment of the Senator require four reports or two reports for the primaries? Does it require two reports for each primary or only two reports for both primaries combined?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think there is no question that it requires, as is stated, reporting before and after a primary.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Each primary?

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume it would mean any and every primary. Of course, the Senator has not very much trouble in the general election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That would require, then, six reports, if there are two primaries.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not understand why the Senator says six reports. One report would be required before and one after the primary, and one report before and one after the general election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There are two primaries. As I understood the distinguished Senator from Missouri, if there were two primaries, there would be two reports for each primary; one before and one after the first primary, and one before and one after the second primary; and then one report before and one after the general election, making a total of six reports.

Mr. HENNINGS. One report would be required before each primary and one after each primary, and one before the general election and one after the general election, if the Senator is referring to the general election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Under the very strict laws in Texas, requiring full disclosure, I do not know of any additional information which could be given to the people of Texas or to any interested person anywhere in the Nation on campaign finances.

Mr. HENNINGS. Why cannot the Senator file the same statement with the State that he files with the Federal Government?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Our State laws are stricter than those of the Federal Government.

Mr. HENNINGS. If they are stricter, the candidate is then well within the law—well within both the State and the Federal enactments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the number of reports from 12 to 6. Will the Senator accept the amendment?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have never seen or heard this objection before. As I read the amendment of the Senator from Texas, the candidate would only have to make duplicate reports.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My proposal would accept very full reports. The only difference is in the dates. Our dates, under the State law, differ. But this amendment, a report filed with the secretary of state, under State law, would be accepted as the filing, even though the dates might vary by a few days.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator mind repeating his question? I was engaged in a discussion.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who has a question to ask in connection with the proposed amendment.

Mr. GORE. I have a copy of the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Texas. As I understand the amendment, from a careful reading of it, it provides that the filing of reports with a State government, which reports comply with the provisions of the bill now before the Senate, would be deemed to be a compliance with the bill, if duplicate copies were submitted. Is that not correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what I have been driving at. We are all in agreement, then. The bill provides, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Texas, that the filings may be made with the clerk of the Federal district court or with any State official authorized under State laws to receive reports on contributions and expenditures.

I believe we are talking about the same thing. I can accept the amendment with the understanding that the legislative history will provide that the reports shall be filed at the same time as the reports are required by the Federal Act. I understand the amendment so provides.

Provision has been made in the bill for filing with a State official; it is not necessary to file with a Federal official. It will be lawful to file with a State official authorized by State laws to receive these statements.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In response to the statement by the Senator from Missouri, I call attention to the fact that the bill provides:

> Such reports shall be complete as of the tenth day next preceding the day on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date.

The State requirement in Texas is that they be filed not less than 7 nor more than 10 days prior to the primaries, and that following the primary they be filed in not less than 10 days—I believe it is 10 days.

Mr. HENNINGS. That brings the requirement well within the proposed Federal provisions for the date of filing; does it not?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. "As of the 40th day following such election."

The reporting date in the bill is 40 days after an election. The reporting date under State law is 10 days after an

election. In the State of Texas, that is complicated because the primaries are not 40 days apart.

The purpose of the amendment is simply to provide that where a candidate furnishes information required by Federal law, and the report is filed at a time which is in compliance with State law, that date will be sufficient to comply with the Federal law, too.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would it be satisfactory if we superseded that with the dates required under the Federal law?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Provided it meets the State date and gives all the information provided in the Federal law, that will be sufficient under Federal law.

Mr. HENNINGS. If 10 days is provided under State law and 40 under the Federal law, which has been extended to receive a great deal of information which might come in by way of payment of bills, late contributions, and such other things, I do not see how the two can be harmonized. We are talking about 40 days as against 10 days after the election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In Texas, as in many other States, the primaries are not held 40 days apart. Generally, they are run within 3 weeks of each other. In my State, it is either 4 weeks or 5 weeks apart, depending on whether the second primary shall be held on the last Saturday of the month. Some States fix the time at 5 weeks, some 3 weeks, some a month.

When provision is made for 40 days, and there is another requirement for the next primary, the situation becomes confused.

Mr. HENNINGS. In that case they would overlap, and reports would be made on both occasions.

I am sure it is obvious to the Senator from Texas that when we deal with the time when the reporting is required, we cannot understake to enact Federal legislation which will meet certain circumstances in all 50 of the States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The purpose of the amendment is to avoid a hiatus in the law in the case of a primary. The bill would require that a report on the primary be filed within 40 days, and we also would have the requirement that the report on the second primary be filed 10 days before the report on the first one. That hitatus would make the law unworkable in that respect, unless the purpose in connection with the amendment is to require that the first report be filed before the final one.

As the wording now stands, the second report would have to be filed before the first one, and thus there would be inextricable confusion as between the first and the second reports.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I inject myself into the debate on this matter only because I wish to be helpful, if possible.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I fully understand that.

Mr. PASTORE. Although there may be a little disagreement in regard to the details, yet it seems to me that the requirements of the Texas law are much firmer and much stricter than the requirements of the pending bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is true.

Mr. PASTORE. In such a situation, the second primary might be held before the 40 days had elapsed, and thus before having the full amount of publicity intended to be had by means of this provision.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE. It seems to me that it will only be necessary for the Senator from Texas to add to the language he proposes a provision that when the time for the filing of the report on the second primary comes before the time for the filing of the report on the first primary, the filing of the report on the date required in the case of the general primary will serve to satisfy the provision.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is the purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator's amendment does not contain such a provision, although I believe it should. I believe the Senator should add a provision to the effect that the 40-day period shall not be required to be observed if the State requirement is for a shorter period of time.

In other words I think the Senator from Missouri is trying to put the spotlight of publicity on the amounts of money that are being spent for candidates in general elections, after they have been selected in primaries.

Mr. HENNINGS. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE. If there are sufficient State law provisions, I believe that objective will be attained.

So I believe the Senator from Texas should include in his amendment a provision that when the State requirement as to time is stricter—in other words, when the period of time thus required is shorter—the meeting of that requirement will serve to meet the time requirement under the so-called Hennings amendment.

I think that will be simple to provide, for I believe that both Senators are in agreement.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the contribution the able Senator from Rhode Island has made.

Since this proposal has just now been dropped out of the sky, so to speak, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will put in writing the amendment he proposes.

We know that the 40-day period following the election is for the purpose of coming to an understanding and reporting on all promises and agreements; and we assume that compliance with that provision would be effected in 40 days following the election. That is the reason for the 40-day provision.

Our proposed legislation contains such a provision, and that procedure is contemplated by the act.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The purpose of the amendment is to accomplish that result. The amendment was drawn up with that point in mind—in other words, to avoid the hiatus of requiring that the final report on the first primary be filed some days after the filing of the report on the second primary, inasmuch as in Texas we have the requirement that the initial report shall be filed 10 days before the second primary.

It is believed that this amendment would obviate that difficulty.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Texas had mentioned this matter to me before now. I feel considerable responsibility in connection with this matter, along with other Senators who have joined me in support of the pending measure; and if I were to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas, even though not fully understanding what the amendment would do as regards the entire act, I believe I would be undertaking more responsibility than I should undertake here on the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I appreciate the conscientious attitude of the Senator from Missouri in that regard.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to do all I can for all the States, as regards these provisions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the time and work and effort he has devoted to this subject. I regret the inconvenience I have caused him.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not mind inconvenience. I have devoted 7 or 8 years of work to this measure, and I am not at all disturbed by any proposal in connection with it. Certainly, I very much appreciate the interest of the Senator from Texas.

After all, so far as I am concerned, convenience is the least of the considerations involved. We want to pass a good bill which will be fair and just to the American people.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. And I am sure that the Senator from Texas is in agreement with these purposes, for I know his high-mindedness.

On the other hand, we have a serious problem if we try to adjust to the dates of primary runoffs in two-party States in which such primary elections are held. The 40-day provision is for the express purpose of making it possible for a candidate to report on the fulfillment of promises made and agreements entered into and similar matters. I point out that that subject was very carefully considered by the committee, and is covered by the bill as reported unanimously by the committee, insofar as the bill relates to general elections.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was not attempting to cause delay; my sole interest was in finding a way to avoid the hiatus in regard to the 40-day provision, which causes great difficulty in my State, since the two primaries are never more than 35 days apart.

I certainly thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the efforts of the Senator from Texas to be of help to us and to render help in the circumstances, as he sees them. But I am sure he well realizes that there must be at least some degree of uniformity.

As I have stated, we have provided that the reports may be filed with any State officer who is authorized by law to receive reports. That means any authorized State officer of the county in which the candidate resides.

We have eliminated the requirement for six reports a year, as contained in existing law; and we now propose that only four reports, instead of six, be required each election year from political committees.

I have tried my best to simplify the arrangement.

At this time, and without seeing a further modification of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, if he proposes to make one, I would not wish to undertake the responsibility of accepting his amendment solely as a result of the colloquy we have had here on the floor, for I have not seen his amendment in final form, and I would have to compare it with other provisions of the bill.

This is a very complex matter—not in principle, but certainly in draftsmanship; and I do not know how his amendment would impinge on the other provisions of the bill.

I know that the 40-day provision was included with a definite purpose in mind; and I have undertaken to outline that purpose.

But when we come to deal with a 10-day provision, we deal with an entirely different matter; and I do not know how we can serve the purpose of the pending bill by adopting the suggestion that the bill be amended so as to provide for a period of 10 days—if that be the suggestion.

Certainly I have done my best to understand the good purpose the Senator from Texas has in mind.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The laws of our State require that they be filed 10 days after the primaries and that they be filed under oath. This amendment was proposed to comply with that requirement of State law.

Mr. HENNINGS. Would the Senator object to having the reports filed 40 days after election?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not if we could get the State legislature to amend the State laws; otherwise we would end up with 12 very extensive reports.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is the Senator basing his objection on the necessity for having to make carbon copies and having to make 12 reports, because of there being runoff elections in the Southern States?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was not an objection; it was an inquiry.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do hope the Senator can support the amendment, because it is a truth-telling amendment. The Senator from Texas is one of the most candid and forthright Members of this body. I hope he does not object to the amendment simply upon the basis of having to make a few more reports, which I realize can be burdensome, but, goodness knows, we all make them. I hope the Senator will not depart from the general philosophy and objective of this proposed legislation merely because it may require the copying of a few additional reports.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. May I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the amendment which is proposed by me would furnish all the information that the Senator's bill would furnish, but would provide for simplification of reports——

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will present an amendment that will comply with the time requirement and provisions of the present bill, we shall accept it. Anything that is simpler is generally better. I do not know how the Senator's amendment would affect legislation as relating to all 50 States of the Union.

I do wish I had had an opportunity to see the amendment before the hour of a quarter after 4 this afternoon. Perhaps the Senator from Texas and I can work out something better. I offer my services for that purpose, and will stay here until midnight or after to do it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator. I would not ask the Senator to remain until midnight.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand the Senator's problem. I am sure he understands a part of ours.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I can thoroughly give sympathy to the objective of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Three bills have been reported in 7 years, and we have done the very best we can. After three bills were reported, we tried to perfect them by some amendments. Some of us have been interested in this subject for 10 years, ever since we have been on the committee and have become interested in such legislation, which happens to be true in my own case.

This amendment is presented to me. I would like to accept it, but I cannot accept it until I take a look at it, compare it with the rest of the bill, and have some of my able aides of the committee do the same thing.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I shall present it later, so the Senator will have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I deeply appreciate it. I thank the Senator from Texas for his spirit of helpfulness and for attempting to assist us in the formulation of forthright legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for his offer to work with us on it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that my able colleague, who is very much interested in this legislation, and who has been most helpful in making various suggestions with relation to it, and indeed offering legislation of his own and amendments of his own with respect to it, wishes to speak, I am very glad now to yield the floor.

I should like to pay tribute to the Senator from Tennessee, who also served in what some of us have called the rather unrewarding and thankless job of chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections when, in 1956, I resigned the chairmanship because I was a candidate that year. I tried to resign several years before, but I was not permitted to resign, because certain contests were coming up, and I suppose I had worked myself into that job because I was in so many of these contests, and some Senators were deluded into thinking that I knew more about those laws than other Senators did, which I now disclaim. Like so many other things, we find the drafting of legislation is exceedingly complex, but the basic principles upon which the legislation is based are very simple.

With that thought and my thanks to the junior Senator from Tennessee, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am indeed grateful for the generous remarks of the able senior Senator from Missouri. It is with the greatest of appreciation that I say to you, Mr. President, that the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has labored long and diligently to bring to enactment a bill which would throw proper safeguards around our elective process. This is important, because the quest for democracy must never cease. The battle continues from day to day, year to year, from generation to generation, from issue to issue. Today the Senate is considering means of safeguarding, protecting, and making more meaningful the elective process.

The essence of democracy is that each individual citizen have a voice in his government, in its policies, in its administration, and in the selection of parties and persons to see to its day-to-day operation. In the ballot box each voice is equal.

But, Mr. President, there is more to the meaningful exercise of the franchise than the mere right to cast a ballot, important as this is. Not only must the ballot itself be free; it must offer choices and be protected against the undue influence of money in our elections.

In the early days of our Nation, even the right of suffrage was hedged about by many qualifications. Some of these qualifications had to do with the economic status of the individual voter or prospective officeholder.

Perhaps we forget that under our early State constitutions possession of a freehold estate was a common suffrage qualification. The power of the purse was even more in evidence in the qualifications for holding office. In Massachusetts the Governor had to possess property worth at least £1,000, a considerable sum in that day. In Maryland he had to own no less than £5,000 worth of property. It has been estimated that, in the 1780's in Massachusetts, only about 16 percent of the population enjoyed the right to vote. An even smaller percentage was eligible to hold office.

Property qualifications were gradually reduced and removed in one State after another. The direct power of the purse was broken. Such pronouncements as the one by Justice Samuel Chase, of the U.S. Supreme Court, in 1802, sound strange to us now. In referring to proposals to change the constitution of Maryland to provide for universal male suffrage, he stated.

The change in the State constitution by allowing universal suffrage will in my opinion, certainly and rapidly destroy all protection to property and all security to personal liberty; and our republican constitution will sink into a mobocracy, the worst of all possible governments. The modern doctrines of our late reformers that all men in a state of society are entitled to enjoy equal liberty and equal rights have brought this mighty mischief upon us; and I fear it will rapidly progress until peace and order, freedom, and property, shall be destroyed.

That sounds a bit like some dire predictions we hear now ever so often.

There is no point in detailing further developments in the broadening of the suffrage. We are familiar with the 15th amendment and the 19th amendment.

Yes, Mr. President, we have now progressed to the point where most of us are willing to admit that any citizen, not disqualified by reason of insufficient age, lack of sufficient mental capacity, or the like, is qualified to vote without reference to property qualifications, and that all should be permitted and encouraged to qualify to vote and to vote.

But a new menace has arisen. Again the power of the purse threatens the meaningful participation of the individual in the democratic process.

Today, advances in the social sciences, in advertising and merchandising, and the ready access of all individuals to mass media of communications such as newspapers, radio, and television, have combined to present us with a new threat to the proper selection of candidates and the proper decisions on issues through the elective process.

Means of thwarting the public will, means of warping the public will, means of manufacturing public opinion, are readily at hand for those who have the price to pay.

Today the candidate for public office who has access to unlimited funds has many advantages over the candidate who can purchase no forum from which to present his views. Today money can buy Madison Avenue promotional techniques and facilities. Money can give the candidate radio and television time. Money can give the candidate newspaper advertising. A staff of researchers and writers can have quality speeches suitable for all occasions ready at hand and available at a moment's notice.

These things, and others that money will buy, can be helpful to our electorate if used in moderation in reasonably equal amounts by both contestants. But if the big money is on one side a great advantage may be gained.

Now, these ideas are not original with me, although I have had them for a long time. As long ago as 1952, a great Republican statesman, the late Robert A. Taft, understood this.

Perhaps Senators have read the memorandum which was written by the late Senator Taft shortly after his defeat for the Republican nomination in 1952. Mr. Taft gave much of the credit, or attached much of the blame, for his defeat for the presidential nomination by General Eisenhower to the power of New York financial interests.

Here is Senator Taft's own assessment from his memorandum as quoted in U.S. News & World Report:

First, it was the power of the New York financial interests and a large number of businessmen subject to New York influence, who had selected General Eisenhower as their candidate at least a year ago. There was a strong and substantial minority of Taft supporters among business leaders, but they were a minority, particularly in the East.

Mr. President, I think Senator Taft was correct in his assessment of the power of the purse in our political activities today.

In 1956 I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and in that capacity conducted an investigation of political contributions and expenditures during the 1956 general election campaigns. My committee cataloged direct expenditures of campaign committees in excess of $33 million.

I repeat—this applied only to the general elections. We made no investigation as to the expenditures in the primaries or in the conventions of the two political parties.

Mr. President, I am convinced that $33 million can influence a lot of votes. I am also convinced that my subcommittee was not able to catalog anywhere near the total amount of money spent to influence voters during the 1956 general election campaigns. But even if this were all the money thus spent, it is entirely too much. And particularly so when it goes preponderantly to one side.

Much of the expenditures we cataloged in 1956 were made in the mass media field. We were able to trace almost $4.5 million in newspaper political advertising. We were able to trace almost $10 million in political advertising by radio and television.

I think it is not surprising to find that those who have fortuitously inherited wealth, or who have, by one means or another, accumulated wealth, are the heavy contributors to political campaign funds. A man who does not have big money cannot contribute big money.

Neither is it surprising to find these people contributing preponderantly to that political party with policies most favorable to large vested interests.

My subcommittee attempted to trace and catalog campaign contributions by various categories. Of course we could not follow all contributions. We attempted to determine who contributed amounts of $500 or more and we tried to find out where the money went.

In running down these contributions some interesting patterns developed. For example, we found that an overwhelming proportion of the contributions from organized labor, though smaller than other mass amounts, went to candidates of the Democratic Party.

We found that officials of the 47 leading underwriters of investment bonds contributed, in individual amounts of $500 or more, a total of $237,800 to Republicans against only $2,000 to Democrats. This, of course, is not surprising. It is, nonetheless, in my opinion, deplorable.

We found $51,600 contributed to Republicans by officials of 37 leading advertising agencies. We were unable to find any $500 contributions from these officials to Democrats.

Checking among officials of the 29 largest oil companies, we found $344,997 for Republicans and $14,650 for Democrats.

Officials of the 100 largest military prime contractors gave, according to our records, $1,133,882 to Republicans and $40,975 to Democrats.

We found, among officers, regional and honorary vice presidents, and directors of the National Association of Manufacturers, 21 individuals who contributed $81,475 to Republicans. According to the information received by the subcommittee, Democrats received nothing whatsoever from this notable group.

The Democrats registered zero with officers and directors of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, too.

It was a matter of concern to me to discover that, among contributions of $500 or more made by individuals, our committee received reports showing that individuals in the State of New York gave almost as much money to the Republican Party as the Democratic Party received from all States, including New York. In fact, individuals listing a Manhattan Island address contributed more to the Republican Party than the Democratic Party got from all such contributions throughout the entire United States, exclusive of Manhattan Island.

I was equally concerned to note the high percentage of Democratic Party contributions which came from New York. As reported to our committee, among contributions of $500 or more from individuals to the Democratic Party, 37 percent came from the State of New York.

This is not to speak in derogation of that State. It is to state a fact—that both political parties lean heavily upon the financial center of New York City for campaign contributions. One party received by far the greater amount, of course, but I wish to give the facts regarding both parties. As reported to our committee, among contributions of $500 or more from individuals to the Democratic Party, 37 percent came from the State of New York. I think it is dangerous and unwise for either party to be thus indebted to, or forced to seek contributions from—or, if that term is not satisfactory, to accept contributions from this tight little group of titans who manipulate our Nation's financial strings from the canyons of Wall Street.

At this point I wish to invite attention to the policies of the Federal Government presently in effect, which operate so greatly to the benefit of this group.

The investigation and report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections provided a dramatic illustration of the complete inadequacy of existing law regulating the contribution and expenditure of funds for the purpose of influencing elections. The Congress not

only has the power, but it has a clear responsibility and duty, to enact meaningful legislation to protect our democratic processes in the public interest. I am gratified that after long delay the Senate is proceeding to consider a bill on this subject. For 3 years I have undertaken to bring such legislation to the floor of the Senate. Now that the Senate is considering a bill, I hope it will enact an effective measure.

In my view, meaningful and effective legislation governing the use of money in elections must contain certain fundamental provisions.

First, there must be some reasonable limit on the amount which any one individual may contribute for use in political campaigns during a calendar year. The present law is utterly meaningless in this regard. Individuals can and do contribute money to candidates and parties of their choice in amounts which are limited only by the size of their pocketbook and their willingness to contribute. One who contributes upward of $100,000 during the course of a campaign is obviously exercising a degree of influence on the outcome which is far out of proportion to the one vote he is permitted to cast.

One who, over a year or a period of years, spends uncounted thousands, and perhaps uncounted hundreds of thousands of dollars, to influence the election of a presidential nominee of either political party, is exercising an influence over the Democratic or Republican Party to which, in my view, no citizen should be entitled.

Contributions in such large amounts are inimical to the process of representative government, which envisages the election of public officials by the free choice of the entire electorate. Just as I have spoken of the freedom of an individual to contribute whatever amounts he may be willing to contribute, the same is true of certain interests represented by a group of individuals fortuitously situated. This situation constitutes a threat to government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I feel strongly that there should not only be an overall limitation on the aggregate amount which may be contributed by one individual, but that there should be further and more restrictive limitations upon the amount which an individual of one State may contribute to influence the election of a candidate for the U.S. Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives in some State other than his own.

By what right does a wealthy individual in one State exercise influence in the choice of a representative for the people of another State far and away greater than that which a voter in that State can bring about through the casting of his ballot?

A representative of the people in either the House or the Senate should be selected on the basis of the free choice of the people whom he represents directly, without undue influence from those outside the State who have special interests which they may wish to protect or preserve.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question, if I may.

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the able Senator from Tennessee ever gone into another State and made a speech for or against a candidate for the Senate running for election in that State?

Mr. GORE. I have spoken in many States in the course of our national campaigns, in support of candidates of my party.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator think that that is a violation of the principle he is laying down today?

Mr. GORE. I do not so construe it, because what I can contribute in the way of a speech is information, ideas, perhaps encouragement, and is perhaps to encourage enthusiasm of the workers and supporters of a particular candidate. It is something that does not cost a great deal of money. My party speeches are always free, I assure the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say this to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. If a had my choice between receiving a $1,000 contribution from a resident of Tennessee and having come into Oregon the eloquent, persuasive, and influential voice of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], raised in my behalf, I would much prefer that the latter would be done for me.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the compliment. I have never had such a value placed upon my feeble efforts. I volunteer now to speak at Klamath Falls, at Eugene, and in as many cities as the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon wishes me to speak in Oregon in his behalf.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I appreciate immensely the very generous offer of the junior Senator from Tennessee, and his kind offer is taken up herewith by me. I know that we sometimes speak rhetorically in the Senate, but I hope he did not so speak just now.

I do wish to say in all seriousness that I feel we should not compartmentalize ourselves too much. We are 50 States, but we are also 1 Nation. I have the feeling that I have much more interest, for example, in who the two Senators from Tennessee are than in who is the Governor of Tennessee. It makes very little difference to me who is the Governor of Tennessee. He can only pass upon laws which prevail in Tennessee.

However, the two Senators from Tennessee can have a voice in making laws which apply equally in Oregon as they do in Tennessee.

I wonder if we should say we will adopt a provision which proclaims that a resident of the Tennessee Valley has no interest whatever in the presence in the Senate of a man who believes the Tennessee Valley Authority should be dismembered. In other words, the TVA is a part of the very lifeblood of the area which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee represents so well. Let us assume that a certain other Senator says the Tennessee Valley Authority should be abolished. He would certainly have the right to advocate such a step. Would the Senator from Tennessee say that a person who lives in the Tennessee Valley, who obtains cheap power from TVA, benefits from flood control, benefits through the improvement of his farm, and obtains recreation, navigation, and all the other things which are a part of TVA, cannot make a contribution in a campaign in opposition to the Senator from another State who would abolish TVA?

I just wonder if that is a wise principle to put into law? I again emphasize that although we are 50 States, those who are sent to the Senate from the 50 States enact legislation for the whole country.

Mr. GORE. I believe the able Senator has displayed remarkable ability in raising the question of national interest in the makeup of the National Congress. Undoubtedly all have an interest. However, under our system it is the prerogative of the people of Tennessee to send to Washington representatives of their own choosing.

I would not prevent any individual in Tennessee from making a contribution to the campaign of a candidate for the House of Representatives or for the Senate from another State. However, I do say that there should be a limit. When one candidate receives substantial sums from without the State, his opponent may find it necessary to seek similar assistance. When I am a candidate for the Senate I undertake to encourage enough contributions to keep a headquarters open. I am aware of the fact that it is general knowledge that I am not one who has ever had a great deal of money with which to conduct a political campaign.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Tennessee is so able and attractive that he does not need a great deal of money.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oregon is overly generous. Money comes in very handy, I will say, particularly when television time is so expensive that 1 or 2 minutes cost a great deal of money.

I realize that the people in Tennessee have an interest in the Senator from Oregon. We have a very vital interest in the election of men who will take a national viewpoint, who will regard the development of natural resources in the Tennessee Valley as the development of natural resources of the United States of America.

The people of Tennessee have sent to the Senate for several years now Senators who take a similar view with respect to the development of natural resources in Oregon. It does not necessarily follow, though, that because of our interest in the election of broadminded Senators from Oregon that we should have the right, if we had the funds, to send unlimited slush funds into Oregon to thwart the will of the people of Oregon.

In modest amount, I would permit it. But I should like to point out to the Senator a rather classic example of the type

of abuse permitted by present law. I will not use names, because I prefer not to identify the persons. But a very prominent American, who has long been interested in public affairs, and who has displayed a marked interest in America's welfare, told me he went to a very wealthy citizen of Pennsylvania and solicited a sizable campaign contribution for a candidate for the U.S. Senate in Pennsylvania. The reply of the wealthy individual was that the amount requested would be but a drop in the bucket in the campaign of a candidate in Pennsylvania; that we can take that much and buy the election of a Senator in a small mountain State.

I say we need to take these things into consideration. Let an individual in New York, or Texas, or Tennessee, or Maine, or any other State, make a reasonable contribution to the campaign of the junior Senator from Tennessee or the junior Senator from Oregon, or others; but the sky should not remain the limit; there should be some reasonable limitation upon the amount of such contributions, I submit to the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that there should be reasonable limitations, not only on contributions made across State lines, but on all political campaign contributions.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the Senator from Tennessee is aware of the fact that I have been the sponsor of a bill which would eliminate all private benefactions and would have the U.S. Government finance all campaigns, as was first advocated by President Theodore Roosevelt more than half a century ago. So the Senator from Tennessee and I are not very far apart in our views.

I call attention to the fact that there is a certain danger to our national cohesiveness in proposing any compartmentalization of campaign contributions. For example—and I know the Senator from Tennessee would not propose this—one could say, with certainly collateral logic, that a resident of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee should be forbidden to contribute to a campingn for the House of Representatives in the First Congressional District of Tennessee, because it is obvious that no one in the Second District of Tennessee can vote in the First Congressional District. I know the Senator from Tennessee would not want to go that far in compartmentalizing this proposal.

We have had the situation where certain exponents of so-called big business have made large campaign contributions across State boundaries to races for the Senate in Oregon on behalf of Republican candidates. On the other hand, to be fair, we also have had situations in which certain trade-union political education funds have made substantial contributions across State lines in Oregon to the campaigns of Democratic candidates for the Senate. This has become a practice.

If I am not mistaken, the last senatorial campaign of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, which was in 1950, benefited by tens of thousands of dollars of contributions from conservatives all over the United States, not simply those in Ohio. They admired Senator Taft.

I know that when a liberal candidate of national reputation runs for office, he receives contributions from liberal-minded citizens all over the United States, to whom he has become a symbol.

I would not want to destroy the national interest which there is in a seat in the U.S. Senate, where so much influence is cast on laws for the whole country.

I think the Senator from Tennessee has done a public service, as he so often contributes in this Chamber, by raising the issue and bringing before us a question which I feel ultimately has to be settled. I simply wanted to be careful that we do not do anything which will jeopardize the status of the Senate as a national body, and cause it to be something which will be divided into many separate compartments.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oregon has contributed greatly to this debate. I concede that there is great merit to his view, and in that light I wish to call his attention to the fact that if we had a limit of, say, $500 which a person from one State could contribute to a campaign within another State, that $500 might be duplicated by his wife, by his son, by his daughter, and by his daughter-in-law. Some of his friends might be encouraged to make similar contributions.

I do not seek in any way, nor do I desire, to prevent reasonable contributions and the movement of campaign money in reasonable amounts across State lines; but in this day of monopoly, in this period when small business is being pushed to the wall, when the big get bigger and the rich get richer and more powerful, in this day when the tax policy of the U.S. Government is so vital to certain vested interests, there is a temptation, as well as an opportunity, for a few with vested interests to combine their wealth, particularly in the small States, and bring to bear an influence in this Chamber which is inimical to the public welfare.

I may say to the junior Senator from Oregon that I shall now refer to one other provision which is omitted from the bill before the Senate. That is a limitation on campaign expenditures in presidential campaigns. When the able junior Senator from Oregon seeks reelection next fall, he will be on the Democratic ticket headed by the Democratic candidate for President. It is ineffective, it seems to me, to place ceilings and restrictions upon campaign expenditures of candidates for the office of Senator and Representative who are running on the same ticket with candidates for President and Vice President, without imposing limitations on campaign expenditures made on behalf of candidates for President and Vice President. If we want to do this job effectively, we cannot do it piecemeal. We must apply restrictions not only upon the amounts which an individual can contribute, not only upon the amounts which one campaign committee can expend, but we must also impose a ceiling upon the total expenditures which can go into the effort to influence public opinion and bring about the election of a Representative, a Senator, and a President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Inasmuch as the able Senator from Tennessee has spoken of presidential contests, what about presidential primaries, which have become so important and so symbolic in creating public sentiment for or against certain candidates for President? We all know that the primaries have become so decisive that, in relatively recent years, the fate of national figures like Thomas E. Dewey, Wendell L. Willkie, and Harold Stassen, in their presidential aspirations, has been decided in the presidential primaries in certain States. Yet there is no public record at all of the financing of their campaigns in the presidential primaries.

Mr. GORE. I agree completely with the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon that such a provision is omitted from the bill. I agree that it should be included in the bill. But I am happy to say that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], has offered an amendment, which is now pending and which I support, which will bring within the terms of the bill not only the primary elections for the nomination of Senators and Representatives, but also the nominating conventions and primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President and Vice President. Is that not correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is entirely correct; that is one of the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I join the Senator from Tennessee in supporting this very worthy amendment, as I stated yesterday, which has been joined in by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New York.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee, and I desire to congratulate him on them. Unfortunately, I was called out of the Chamber during part of his address.

Will he discuss the desirability of prohibiting contributions by minors who themselves are not entitled to vote? As the Senator from Tennessee knows, contributions of that type have been subjected to great abuse by a number of the wealthier families of the country.

Mr. GORE. I have not yet referred to that point. One would naturally wonder what legitimate political interest an infant would have in the nomination or election of a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives from a State far removed from the playground

of the infant, and what moral right there exists for the exercise of such an influence.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, state whether he gave any consideration to the desirability of prohibiting contributions by persons who themselves are too young to vote?

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I do so through the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee—that this point was considered. Of course we know that as regards tracing the source of a contribution, a minor has no right, as a general rule, to make such a contribution if he is the beneficiary of a trust fund or if his income is in some way or other subject to the influence or control of others.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Missouri not agree that the record shows that a number of the wealthier families in the country—for instance, I recall that the Du Pont family was one, although I would not wish to single out only that one family—have made, in the names of their children, contributions to the Republican Party?

Mr. HENNINGS. We noticed that as long as 8 or 10 years ago; and in that connection I might also refer to a very prominent family in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct; and let us name the family—the Pew family.

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, that is not far from it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Could it be that their offsprings are precocious?

Mr. CLARK. That is a possibility, but I would not think it a probability in that case.

Mr. HENNINGS. This point was covered by the bill as reported in 1957.

Mr. CLARK. I would not pursue the subject further, except to say that in my judgment such a limitation would be a wise one; and that the principle supported by the Senator from Tennessee, although questioned to some extent by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], probably is, on the whole, desirable—namely, that one who is not entitled to vote for a candidate for nomination or election should not be entitled to contribute to the campaign of that candidate.

I realize that such a prohibition might cause difficulties in some of the States in which a preponderance of the wealthy persons in the State are in one political party. But I believe that matter could be handled by strictly limiting the amount of the contributions by any individual or group of individuals, while at the same time providing a tax credit for small contributions, as suggested by the junior Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Oregon, and myself.

Mr. HENNINGS. We certainly gave that point a great deal of thought—as we have tried to do to every possible development in connection with a primary campaign or a general election campaign, and as we did in connection with Senate bill 2150, introduced on July 3, 1957, and reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration

Mr. CLARK. Is that bill the one known as the Hennings-Green bill?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. It was reported by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] on July 3, 1957, and was Calendar No. 585.

The particular provisions were that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election of candidates in any name other than his own; or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited under this section.
>
> It shall be unlawful for any individual under the age of 18 years to make a contribution or expenditure in an amount exceeding $100, and for any person knowingly to authorize, ratify, or receive any such contribution.

I may say that we have tried in many ways to have the bill reach this floor, and we have offered many alternatives, many of which have been rejected by the committee, and others have been rejected by me.

Mr. CLARK. As a matter of legislative history, does the Senator from Missouri believe that the provisions of his amendment which restrict contributions, directly or indirectly, in excess of a particular amount would prohibit this method of making gifts by minors, from funds given to them, for contribution purposes, by their parents or their grandparents?

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe the phrase "indirectly" would substantially cover the matter, and that is really the amendment.

However, this situation reminds me of the one in regard to the gift tax imposed on any sums in excess of $3,000. Seven or eight years ago we found, to our amazement, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue was not doing anything about undertaking to collect gift taxes on contributions in excess of $3,000. We had officials of the Bureau appear before us and testify in regard to that matter, and that was the substance of their testimony.

So there are many, many ways in which it would be possible to make the proposed legislation better than it now stands, or even better than it would be if all these amendments were to be adopted.

We have tried to present a relatively simple series of amendments in conjunction with the bill as reported so as to make some progress this year in dealing with election legislation.

Mr. GORE. I should like to point out to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania that Senate bill 440, which I introduced last year, contains on page 24 a provision which would prohibit contributions by persons under the age of 18, and, likewise, it contains a provision which would prevent one person from making a contribution in the name of another person.

Mr. CLARK. Do those amendments contain these prohibitions?

Mr. GORE. No; they do not.

Frankly, I think the action which the Senate takes on the pending amendment which has been offered by the senior Senator from Missouri will determine whether the Senate wants to have effective legislation in this field enacted.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with my friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me say that I agree with both my friend the Senator from Tennessee and my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania, especially on that particular issue.

Mr. GORE. I have some amendments at the desk, and I have discussed them with the distinguished and able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the chairman of the committee.

If his amendment shall be agreed to, then further amendments will be offered and a serious effort will be made to secure their adoption. But unless the Senate shall agree to include primary elections and conventions and nomination campaigns, then perhaps all other proceedings will be pro forma.

Would the Senator from Missouri agree with that candid observation?

Mr. HENNINGS. I would say that, unhappily, is a doleful fact. Should the Senate fail to face up to its responsibility in this matter and fail to come to the realization that it has a duty to the American people, both in reporting and in compliance, to see that the full light of publicity be allowed to shine on all things that happen in primary as well as general elections, then a great deal of the useful purpose of this bill, as these amendments would, I think, tend to improve it, would be defeated. It would be an occasion of deep regret to me, and I think an occasion of disappointment and dismay to the American people, if the Senate failed to live up to its own moral standards with respect to conduct in our own primaries and our own general elections.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. This discussion illustrates one other thing. The pending bill, though it makes some improvements on existing law with respect to reporting, is in fact little more than a shell. Provisions offered in the committee which would place effective limits and safeguards upon the aggregate amount which could lawfully be contributed by an individual, the amount which could lawfully be expended in a campaign for election to the House of Representatives or the Senate, or in a campaign for nomination or election to the offices of President and Vice President, were rejected.

Mr. HENNINGS. I might say to the Senator that I offered many amendments which were rejected, one of them by a vote of 5 to 4, in committee. I am now offering these same strengthening amendments on the floor. I wanted to make that fact clear.

Mr. GORE. I hope the Senator understands I implied no criticism of him.

Mr. HENNINGS. I know the Senator did not. I wanted other Senators, who may have come to the floor and not heard all the discussion, to understand that even though the committee voted to report a bill to the Senate, many of us were not satisfied that it was a complete bill, or, I may say, a completely honest

bill, in terms of serving the purposes in which some of us believe so deeply.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I am glad the bill was reported. I would have much preferred the reporting of a more effective bill, but I am glad that finally the Senate is considering the matter, and that we shall have an opportunity to vote on it.

I wish that more Senators and Representatives were concerned. I wish more of the American people were aroused to the danger of having public opinion molded, bent in certain directions and for certain purposes, by the unlimited use of financial resources.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for one question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. During the 3 days of debate on this one amendment, is the Senator aware that there have been no more than three or four Senators who have taken this floor and expressed opposition to the pending amendment relating to primaries? I set forth that statement as a fact, if the Senator is not aware of it, because I have been here most of the time, if not all the time.

Mr. GORE. Then perhaps the amendment can be adopted.

Mr. HENNINGS. The fact that there seems to be no interest, as the Senator has indicated, may or may not be indicative of the disposition of the Members of the Senate to vote one way or the other; but there have been no substantial arguments offered as to constitutionality or as to precedents or as to jurisdiction of the Senate over this subject matter relating to primaries.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think many of us are aware that the very presence of this bill is a tribute not only to the Senator from Missouri, who has been a leader in the committee, but also to the monumental study of campaign spending in 1956 which was carried out under the guidance of the Senator from Tennessee.

To demonstrate the truth of what the Senator from Tennessee has said about the potential dominance of large campaign contributions, we need only recall that a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, warned us about this matter in 1907, which was decades before the era of television and radio.

Today one single network presentation on TV costs nearly as much as an entire national campaign did half a century ago. Imagine what the views of Teddy Roosevelt would be had he lived until today and could see campaign funds 200, 300, 400, and 500 times the size of what they were back in 1907, when he warned against huge campaign contributions that could be used to shape and control the course of government in the United States.

Mr. GORE. Can the Senator think of a more glaring example than the fact that one political party, in the last presidential campaign, received more campaign money from one small island in the United States than the other party received from all the remainder of the United States and its insular possessions combined? That fact illustrates the dangerous situation to which we have already come. And the memorandum of the late Senator Taft illustrates how these same influences can operate in the selection of our nominees for President who, let me remind my colleagues, is a part of the legislative process, as well as being the Chief Executive.

Effective legislation should contain realistic and effective limitations on the amount which may be spent either by or on behalf of any candidate for Federal office. Here existing law is farcical. The ostensible limits contained in the present law are set unrealistically low and are completely ignored by resort to the presently legal process of having funds spent by committees—one committee after another—of which the candidate is presumed to be legally unaware. Unless the entire sum spent in behalf of a candidate is chargeable against the ceiling which may be established, there is no point in specifying a ceiling at all.

In the third place, legislation should provide for full and timely disclosure to the public of the source and the use made of campaign funds. Present law requires the reporting of only a small fraction of the total sums involved. And such reports as are required are made at times and in a manner which, as a practical matter, preclude timely disclosure to the general public.

The bill reported by the committee makes a start in correcting the conditions which make possible present abuses. I am frank to say, however, that it makes only a start.

The pending bill does contain provisions which would provide a greater degree of public disclosure of the information required by the bill to be reported. This is a step in the right direction. I do not think the bill goes far enough in this regard in that it provides for only one report prior to the election. Furthermore, no provision is made for the automatic publication of the information contained in the reports.

The committee bill contains no effective overall limitation whatever on the amount which may be contributed by any one individual. It would continue the present practice under which an individual may contribute the specified limit to as many different candidates or campaign committees as he may choose, limited only by the amount of money he has available to contribute.

The limitations on expenditures by candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives as contained in the bill are ineffective because they can and will be evaded and ignored by the same procedure which is employed under existing law.

I have referred to the lack of any provision to regulate expenditures in campaigns for the Presidency. The Presidency of the United States is by far the most important elective office for which citizens have the responsibility and the privilege of casting a vote. Indeed, it is the most important temporal office in the world.

I see no valid reason why the presidential campaign should be exempt from reasonable restrictions as to the expenditure of funds and reasonable requirements for the reporting of such expenditures in such a manner as to make possible timely disclosure to the public.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, the bill reported by the committee should be strengthened in the areas to which I have referred, and can be improved in other details. Amendments are at the desk or in the process of being prepared which, if adopted, will accomplish this result.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Missouri upon the strengthening amendments which he has offered.

I say in all candor, however, Mr. President, that no bill on this vital subject can adequately protect the public interest unless the entire elective process is covered.

The amendment of the Senator from Missouri, which is now pending, would extend application of the bill to primary elections for Federal offices.

Unless this amendment is agreed to, in my view, which is shared by the senior Senator from Missouri, even though the bill is otherwise amended along the lines I have indicated, the use of money in Federal elections will in large measure remain subject to no effective Federal regulation.

Selection of nominees of the major political parties is just as important as is the election of one of them. This is true in any State. In many States, as is commonly known, selection of the nominee of one of the major political parties is decisive. And not all of these States are in the South as some appear to assume.

I see no valid justification whatever for leaving completely unregulated by Federal law the use of money in so important an aspect of Federal elections.

I regard the vote on the pending amendment as crucial. By its action on this amendment the Senate will demonstrate whether it is seriously interested in safeguarding Federal elections. I urge the Senate to face the issue squarely and realistically.

Finally, after years of effort, a clean elections bill is before the Senate. Let us not be satisfied with voting merely for a title. Let us make the bill effective. I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and that the Senate will then proceed to the task of perfecting the bill in a manner which will provide adequate protection for the right of citizens to exercise a free choice in the selection of those by whom they are to be governed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, several days ago, during the debate on the amendment which has just been adopted, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] attempted to obtain the floor to make a short statement, but he was unable to do so. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed before the vote on the amendment just adopted.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

I want to register as strongly as I can my support of the pending amendment to include primaries within the scope of the reporting requirements of the Federal election laws.

As a member of the Rules Committee when it earlier considered revision of the laws, I am well aware of the difficulties attendant upon revision. The members of the committee in the 85th Congress labored long and hard over a revision designed to bring the laws into line with modern conditions and political realities and also to provide more effective protection to the public interest in clean elections.

The members of the committee recognized that the bill as finally reported was not perfect, but we could say with confidence that it represented a real step forward, primarily because it did include primaries within the scope of regulation.

The inclusion of primaries is a key provision to any meaningful revision of our election laws. From a constitutional point of view, there is no obstacle to making them subject to Federal regulation. The Supreme Court has clearly ruled that Congress has such authority with regard to the nomination of candidates for election to Congress.

From a political point of view, in approximately one-third of the States, the primary is the election. Not to include them is to deny information rightfully in the public domain.

Exemption of the primary makes impossible a fair and comprehensive accounting of campaign practices. The whole purpose of the bill is to make available to the American people the facts as to campaign expenditures and practices on the basis of which they can make their own judgment. This principle of public disclosure as the most effective protection against improper use of money to influence election results has been the basic philosophy of the regulation of Federal elections. The principle is a sound one, but we are not applying it if we provide for only partial disclosure. The American people are entitled to the full story, and only the inclusion of primaries in the bill will assure that.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the many contributions which have been made, including the able address by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], designated "1–13–60–0." On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is this the amendment which would include primaries in the instant bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting he would vote nay. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote yea. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASTORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is confined to his bed with the flu. If he were present and voting he would vote in the negative. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote in the affirmative. I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is necessarily absent. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business for the Latin American Trade Study Mission as Chairman of the Latin American Trade Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hennings	Moss
Bartlett	Jackson	Mundt
Bush	Javits	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Neuberger
Carroll	Kefauver	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Kennedy	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Randolph
Church	Lausche	Scott
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Cooper	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Wiley
Engle	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Green	Martin	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NAYS—39

Allott	Dirksen	Johnston, S.C.
Beall	Ellender	Jordan
Bennett	Ervin	Kerr
Bible	Fong	Long, La.
Bridges	Frear	McClellan
Brunsdale	Fulbright	Robertson
Butler	Goldwater	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Saltonstall
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hill	Stennis
Carlson	Holland	Talmadge
Cotton	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Johnson, Tex.	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Chavez	Humphrey	Pastore
Dodd	Mansfield	Smathers
Dworshak	Murray	Sparkman
Eastland	O'Mahoney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] without losing the floor in order that he may offer an amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, first I wish to thank all Members of the Senate for the patient consideration they have given to the amendment and, indeed, to our efforts, extending over some 7 years, to improve the present Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

I express especial gratification and gratitude, indeed, to those who have supported this all-important and basic amendment, which has given the Senate an opportunity to be honest with itself, to be honest with the people of the country, and to further maintain the self respect of this body and to make this body free from taint and, insofar as can be, free from any suggestion of undue and improper influence because of the use of money unreported in primary elections, and for the further realization by this great body that primary elections are, indeed, an integral part of the electoral process, as the courts and the precedents have abundantly held.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate by speaking at length, having done so for the past 3 or 4 days. I should like now, because of the gracious consideration of the Senator from Vermont, who has yielded to me, to have my amendment designated 1–13–60–D stated and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $1,000 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;.

On page 16, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $1,000 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence

in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader, while most of the Senators are present, what is proposed by way of business for the remainder of the day?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Illinois publicly what I said privately: We have had the bill under consideration for several days, trying to make some progress. I believe more Senators are now on the floor than has been the case during the duration of the debate. I hope that while they are here, we may proceed to dispose of some of the amendments. So long as we are able to accomplish anything, I should like to have the Senate remain in session and do so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Vermont to yield. At this time, when there is a substantial representation of the Senate present, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which I have just called up and which is now the pending business.

I may say, briefly, that it is the amendment relating to committees within a State, to the Federal regulation of a proliferation of committees receiving contributions and making expenditures within the boundaries of a State, and to reporting requirements of those committees. The amendment has the same philosophy or the same rationale as the amendment relating to primary elections, which the Senate in its wisdom has just adopted.

Because of the great importance of the amendment, I think Senators should have the opportunity to be recorded upon it. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I shall proceed to discuss the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. What amendment is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Which one?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is designated as "1–13–60–D."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who presently has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. The floor was yielded to him by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. HENNINGS. I was not aware that the floor had been yielded to me until I was recognized by the Chair. I do not wish to be discourteous, certainly, to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who was kind enough to yield to me a while ago, by agreement.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it was my understanding when I yielded the floor before that I would not lose it; that the distinguished Senator from Missouri intended to offer an amendment, and that the activities of the Senate on the bill for this afternoon would then be concluded, and I would have the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not insist upon anything which might result in any disadvantage to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. If that was the Senator's understanding, I shall most readily comply with it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to ascertain to whom to direct several questions in regard to the pending amendment. I cannot do so unless I discover who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The parliamentary situation is that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] had the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], with the understanding that the Senator from Vermont would not lose the floor.

The Senator from Missouri has offered his second amendment, and thus far he has not yielded the floor back to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then at this moment my queries can very properly be addressed to the Senator from Missouri, can they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In fact, I wish to ask two or three questions.

First, the bill as reported by the Senator from Missouri defined a political committee as one which operates in two or more States. However, the bill as reported excluded local and State committees, did it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. That was the original bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And such a provision was also contained in the bill as it was reported to the floor, did it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Second, the amendment now pending would change that section of the bill, as reported, and would make every committee—whether a local committee, a county committee, a State committee, a local congressional committe, or any other kind of committee—a political committee if it receives and disburses as much as $1,000 in any 1 calendar year. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is substantially correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask a third question: That simply means that every local committee and every county committee which receives in contributions as much as $1,000 and spends that much in an election in which presidential electors or Senators or Members of the House of Representatives are involved will have to make all the reports which are required by this bill to a clerk of a Federal court or to the Secretary of the Senate or to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. The amendment is explicit in its terms. The 1959 act defines a political committee as one that operates in two or more States to influence the election of candidates for Federal office; and the definition includes State and local committees which are branches or subsidiaries of national committees excluding duly organized State or local committees of a political party, as the Senator from Illinois has said.

All other intrastate or local committees or organizations which function only within a single State are excluded by that definition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for an observation?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The pending amendment reads in part as follows:

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $1,000 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors.

There is not any county committee in any 1 of the 3,109 counties in the Nation that does not come within the purview of this amendment and that will not have to make all the required reports to the district court or to the Secretary of the Senate or to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. That is what this amendment provides.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me add that, in compliance with the amendment agreed to only a few minutes ago by the Senate, they will also have to make reports to the people, who I think have some concern about the nature and manner and means by which candidates are nominated and elected to public office.

I believe that the Senator from Illinois, in speaking in opposition to the preceding amendment, made much of the fact that reports would be required and that, somehow or other, the State law might be subverted.

Of course, in the State of Illinois there are no election laws; so there is nothing to worry about, as regards Illinois, because in Illinois there are no legal requirements in regard to primary or general elections.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is proposed is a criminal statute.

Mr. HENNINGS. So is the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know that; but that act does not touch a political committee.

Under this amendment, a county committee or a local committee will have to report; and then the lawyer of the treasurer of each one of those committees will say to him, "Joe, you will have to look out, because unless you keep a pretty good set of books, you may wind up in jail."

So every political organization in the country will be disrupted, before this process ends.

Two years ago, I testified for 2 hours before the committee. I said then that whoever drew up the bill in the first instance must have had in mind the destruction of all the local political organizations; and this amendment is a part of that destruction.

If the amendment is adopted, I should like to see the Senator from Missouri find any man, way out in Podunk or in Bingville who, when in his right mind, ever would accept the job of serving as treasurer of a local committee, when he would know that he would have to make all these reports and when he would know about all the other things he would have to do under the requirements of such a criminal statute.

Mr. President, that is the long and short of the matter; and I am ready to vote on the amendment right now.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. First, Mr. President, let me say that the distinguished minority leader, with his great gift for oversimplification, and sometimes his lawyer's gift for misdirection of the issue, has failed to state that one of the great evils in American campaigning has always been the setting up of a number *of committees*—as the distinguished senior Senator from Maine will attest we found when we investigated the election in the State of Ohio. We found that literally a myriad of committees was set up in that State, for both parties; that neither the treasurer for the one candidate nor the treasurer for the other candidate knew how much had been expended by the various local committees for the candidacy of one or the other of the candidates; and that no means whatsoever exists for regulating or determining how much money is spent in a campaign in any given State, because if limits are exceeded, all one has to do is set up another Committee of the Friends of Jo Schmaltz or another Committee of the Friends of any other candidate; and thus there would again be developed the intolerable situation which has been existing in the country for years. All of us and all other persons in the country who are familiar with these matters know that that is the case; and in such circumstances, that procedure would continue to be followed through the use of such committees.

As a result, when the required report is presented, it is a complete fraud upon the people of the country.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois very glibly said, in his remarks in opposition to the amendment which the Senate adopted a few minutes ago, and with his customary facility in the use of words and phrases, that since the Illinois State Legislature in its wisdom had not seen fit to enact any law relating either to primaries or to general elections, he saw no reason why any such law whatsoever should be enacted. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Missouri not only is incorrect, but he is also wide of the mark.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did not the Senator from Illinois say——

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Illinois did not say anything of the kind.

In the course of the debate, the Senator from Illinois said that if the General Assembly of Illinois wanted to legislate with respect to the primary, that was its business. However, we have all the election laws we need. In addition, we come under the Corrupt Practices Act.

But I should say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. President, that it is not necessary for him to speak of the minority leader as being "glib"; he does not have to speak about the "adroitness" of the minority leader; he does not have to speak about "the customary way in which the minority leader goes about it."

The minority leader relies upon the language the Senator from Missouri has included in the amendment he has sent to the desk; and a proper understanding of the amendment requires neither "adroitness" nor "legal skill" nor "glibness" nor anything else of the sort.

Mr. President, I resent the making of any such statements for the RECORD. I do not say such things about any other Senator, and I think the Senator from Missouri has spoken in violation of the rule.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then, Mr. President, may I say that the distinguished minority leader is not glib, and he is not adroit. I will withdraw all the comments I made, although I thought they were customary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri does not need to treat me in that way. He can treat me as a gentleman, here on the floor of the Senate; that is all I request.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I see no reason to resort to personalities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the Senator from Missouri began that procedure. Why did he have to say "with his customary glibness"? Certainly that is no way to refer to any Senator; and in my judgment it is in violation of the rule.

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, Mr. President, I will not say "with his customary eloquence"; but I will say that with his unfailing and transcendant eloquence the Senator from Illinois has said that thus and so is the long and short of a highly complex and controversial amendment which goes to the very heart of this proposed legislation; and if the Senator from Illinois objects to use of the phrase "fobbed off," then I say the amendment cannot be dismissed by a short statement to the effect that "That is all that can be said on the subject," and that the Senator from Illinois is ready to vote on the amendment here and now, because, I suggest to the Senator from Illinois, much more can be said about the amendment, whether with customary eloquence or glibness or adroitness or what not, and with or without appropriate embellishments, all of which the Senator from Illinois—and I admire him for it—is capable of giving us the benefit of hearing on the floor of the Senate. I think it is a highly admirable trait, and I think the Senator takes justifiable pride in his ability as an orator, but I do not see that it has anything to do with what we are talking about now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield for half a minute? I can only say, in my feeble way, I must interpret the English language, and when it comes to putting it in proper form, I can only repeat what was written on parchment many years ago:

> But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the Senator from Missouri if the intent of his amendment was to place in the bill a requirement that a committee should either receive or expend more than $1,000 in order to come under the purview of the act?

Mr. HENNINGS. May I say to my good friend from South Dakota that a committee is not required, under the terms of this amendment, to report unless it makes an expenditure of or accepts contributions in excess of $1,000 in any calendar year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator intend to eliminate the additional requirement that it be a committee which operated in two or more States? Did he intend to eliminate that requirement?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. That was in the bill as reported, may I say to the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator intend to eliminate the requirement that either the committee must operate in two or more States or must be a subsidiary of a national committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is right. The purpose of this amendment is to stop the unholy, outrageous proliferation of committee after committee in all the States of the Union, for the purpose of collecting contributions and making disbursements without reporting Let these committees exist, and let there be as many of these committees as any candidate can assemble for his own benefit, but why in heaven's name should not a committee which expends $1,000 or more be required to so report? That has been one of the things that has been plaguing the whole system of elections in this country since the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that I am sympathetic with the broad objectives of the bill, but I would not want a provision included in the

bill which would destroy the effectiveness of it. I think the language in the bill could very well have the $1,000 requirement added to it.

I wonder if we ought not to require that a committee be in one of two categories, either one which is an interstate committee operating in two States or more, or that it be a subsidiary of a national committee? It would be very difficult, onerous, and forbidding for local political workers to feel that they came under a Federal law if they merely expended $1,000 and if it were truly a local committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I say to the Senator that, the Senate has adopted an amendment relating to primaries, we know that committees formed within a State for a candidate are, by and large, committees within the borders of a given State, existing solely for the purpose of nominating a candidate. For that reason I feel that the Senator's suggestion at this point in the consideration of this proposed legislation is not perhaps accurately directed to any defects which may appear in the bill later, because, having dealt with the primary requirement, we are now undertaking to deal with the superabundance of committees within a State or within its boundaries, and seeking to require that those committees, if they collect or disburse over $1,000, also must make a report of that fact.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I call attention to the language in the amendment which reads, "for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors."

The amendment is limited to the presidential and vice presidential campaigns, is it not?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator has overlooked something. The language reads "the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a final question, if I may ask it. Would the Senator consider changing his amendment to make a change in the bill to bring into it the $1,000 requirement? That is, on line 5, page 3, if the Senator's amendment were changed so that after the word "expenditures" these words would be added, "in an aggregate amount exceeding $1,000 in any calendar year," would he not accomplish both objectives, and obviate the difficulty which has been suggested?

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator may know, under the present proposed legislation any interstate committee must report. We are now dealing with intrastate committees, committees within the State, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I will make my observations very brief. I believe that this amendment should be defeated. It invades States rights. It will destroy the right of a State to govern local intrastate committees. It will tend to drive political financing underground. It will place a burden upon our citizens who take part in politics to file Federal reports or face a penalty. As a result, they will withdraw from political activity.

If the amendment were enacted and the bill as reported adopted with it, it would mean more reports in Washington, doing no good.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri how many reports a year these local intrastate committees will have to make to the Federal Government if his amendment prevails.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would require four reports.

Mr. CURTIS. Four reports, filed in how many places?

Mr. HENNINGS. They would be filed in one place, with the U.S. district court, or with any State officer who under the law of the State is entitled to receive and preserve elections records.

Mr. CURTIS. And the reports will have to be filed in Washington.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, they are always filed with the Secretary of the State.

Mr. CURTIS. That is eight reports. That would be true, would it not, even though it were a temporary committee which got together and collected money to publish one advertisement, if it spent over $1,000?

Mr. HENNINGS. If it is more than one individual, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish the Senator would withdraw his amendment. The objective which we seek is to have a wide participation in politics, in this business of government, and in the financing of campaigns. This proposal would drive the financing of political campaigns underground. It would compel conscientious but very busy citizens to withdraw from politics for fear they could not comply with filing more and more and more Federal reports.

Mr. HENNINGS. Since the Senator has asked me to yield, I should like to ask the Senator a question. The Senator remembers that during the time of the consideration and passage of the Securities and Exchange Commission Act one of the main objections of the investment bankers and brokers was that they would have to file an inordinate number of reports, and that reporting would become burdensome. I can recall hearing many complaints during those days, in the 1930's, about the great burden placed upon those who had to file reports. Now the banking and investment securities community would not be without the Securities and Exchange Commission, because they know it has driven from the markets and from the exchanges the "bucketshop" operators and salesmen of stocks who have no business upon the stock exchange and stocks which have no business being marketed to the public.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not regard the situations as comparable at all.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has said that this will drive campaign financing underground. May I most respectfully ask my colleague on the Committee on Rules and Administration, who has been most helpful in the formulation of this proposed legislation, if he thinks that the financing of campaigns is now underground, by and large?

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator referring to Missouri, or to Nebraska?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am referring to both States and to every State about which I know anything.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I know that when a committee is set up and it does not have to report to anybody anything about the money it collects or the money it spends, I would call that underground. It is subterranean. The actions are not subject to public disclosure. The committee is not subject to the scrutiny of the public, and it is not subject to any regulation whatsoever.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to answer the Senator's question. In the State of Nebraska there is a very rigid statute requiring political committees to report and to continue to report up to election time.

There is not a State in the Union which cannot have honest elections and complete reporting if a majority of the people want it.

I do not subscribe to the doctrine that we have to bring everything to Washington, destroy the States, and add and add to the Federal Government all the time.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I think it is certainly a good general premise that we should not have to bring everything to Washington all the time. I certainly subscribe most heartily to the doctrine that the sovereignty of the States is a sovereignty which should be preserved. But the Constitution, the courts, and the precedents have held that primary elections are part of the electoral process. We are undertaking to regulate only by holding up to the light of day, to let the people know, how many committees there are operating in a State in a given election, how much those committees collect and from whom, how much those committees disburse and to whom, and for what purpose.

This again enters upon the general and I think broad proposition of the right of the people of this country to know from where the money is coming and how it is being spent, so that they may understand the situation. I do not say that money in campaigns is necessarily an evil thing. Money is a necessary thing.

I am sure no Member of this body would be present today were not some of his friends sufficiently generous to give of their substance to enable him to make a campaign. However, I say that the people are entitled to weigh the factor of a candidate's support and the nature of that support. I repeat, the people of the country should know how many committees there are in a given State collecting money in behalf of a given candidate, from what sources they collect the money, and so on, for it is all a part of the information to which the public is entitled, in my judgment. We may not agree as to that.

I think these factors may be weighed and taken into consideration, together with other factors and the qualifications of the candidates, in order that the people may determine their choice, as they see fit, under our democratic processes.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe that the conduct of elections and the regulation of financing can be handled by the States. The people have shown that over and over again. All we need to do is bring outsiders into a State to interfere, and the people assert their jealousy.

The American people are capable of governing themselves. The sovereign States of the Union are capable of governing their own elections and of requiring sufficient reporting by the committees which are solely within their borders.

I concede that a committee operating in two or more States should file a Federal report.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. HENNINGS. No one can disagree, certainly, with the eternal verity as stated by the Senator, that the people are capable of governing themselves. That we have been trying to prove for a good many generations, since the founding of this Republic. But we think that the people will be better capable of governing themselves if they know a little bit more about the candidates—who is supporting the candidates and in what amount—and if publicity is given to these facts in every State of the Union.

Again, this is to make sure that the people know, so that they may better govern themselves.

I find myself, of course, in complete agreement with the proposition that the people are capable of governing themselves, but I think it is the duty of this body to enable the people to understand a little bit more about the subterranean processes which are used in the formation of committees in primaries in the several States, for the purpose of collecting and disbursing funds for a candidate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my friend the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I refer to the definition on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, and to the substitute definition which is now in the pending amendment. The definition of a "candidate" is given as one "whose name is presented at an election for election as President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative."

The definition of a political committee, under the Senator's pending amendment, deals only with committees that are attempting to influence in any manner the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors. What about a Jones-for-Senator committee, or a Jones-for-Congress committee? How would that be covered?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator raised that point. I refer the Senator to page 3 of the pending bill, the Elections Act of 1959, now pending, beginning in line 3:

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors (1) in two or more States, or (2) whether or not in more than one State if such committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization;

Mr. BUSH. Let me say to the Senator that, in the first place, his amendment is a substitute for the language he has just read, as I understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. BUSH. I am asking only for information, without criticizing the amendment. This amendment excludes entirely, as I read it, any mention of a "Bush-for-Senator committee" or a "Hennings committee," or a "Jones-for-Congress committee." Is not that true?

Mr. HENNINGS. In the first place, I want the Senator to know that I am very glad he voted as he did on the primary amendment. It indicated a recognition on the part of the Senator of the right of the public to know about these matters in primaries.

This amendment relates to what the Senator has just very aptly and appropriately suggested. It relates to a "Bush-for-Senator committee," a "Labor-for-Bush committee," a "First-Voters-for-Bush committee," or whatever the terminology may be, organized in the State of Connecticut for the purpose of supporting the Senator's candidacy, but only if that committee receives or disburses an amount in excess of $1,000.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I believe I understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator understands that a multitude of committees exists in every State of the Union. If we run beyond legal limitations we organize another committee, which undertakes to operate still within so-called legal limitations. So there is no limit whatsoever on the number of committees which may be formed. However, we do provide that there shall be reporting and publicity, so that the people may be fairly advised as to who is supporting the candidates, the number of committees, who comprises the committees, and so forth.

I thank the Senator for his inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A number of Senators wish to attend an official American Bar Association dinner this evening, and they would like to leave the Chamber by 7 o'clock. As I understand, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is agreeable to having his amendment go over until tomorrow, provided he is recognized tomorrow for the purpose of offering it.

The Senator from Missouri states that he has no further statements to make on the pending amendment, but he is desirous of answering any question which may be asked regarding the amendment.

I wonder if I can have an indication as to how many questions Senators may have in mind, and the length of time which may be required. Does the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] plan to consume much time in connection with the pending amendment? If not, we could vote on it by 7 o'clock.

Mr. KEATING. As the distinguished Senator knows, the Senator from New York will be very brief. I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I should like to make one modification of what the distinguished majority leader stated as his understanding of my statement. I have no extensive speech to make on the pending amendment. In answering questions on in undertaking to elaborate what I think needs to be said on the subject, I may have a few words to say. But I have no lengthy speech to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is now 25 minutes to 7. If the Senator from New York wishes to take only 2 or 3 minutes, perhaps we can reach a vote before 7 o'clock.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I approach this amendment, as the Senator from Missouri knows, in a rather friendly fashion. I was the coauthor of the preceding amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has given substantial and yeoman service to the entire bill, and certainly to the previous amendment. Again I pay tribute to him and compliment him upon his very able presentation of various phases of what is a very simple matter in philosophy, but an intricate matter legislatively, speaking from the standpoint of draftsmanship.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate any spirit in which the Senator approaches this legislation, because I know that anything he would undertake to say or do with relation to it would be for the improvement of it, according to his understanding of it.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those remarks very much. I do share the philosophy which I believe the distinguished Senator from Missouri has, that if we are to pass a bill we should do as thorough a job as we can.

I am a little concerned about the present wording of the first page of the amendment, because of the difficulty in determining how much of the expenditures made by a local committee may have been for the purpose of electing a candidate for the Senate or House of Representatives, or a presidential or vice presidential elector.

For example, if the local candidate for the State assembly were featured on a television program with a candidate for the House or a candidate for the Senate, or an elector, would that come within the purview of this section? And if it is not intended to—and I do not believe it should, unless we are to raise the $1,000 limit somewhat—I wonder what the Senator from Missouri would think of in-

serting in the sixth line of his amendment, on page 1, the word "sole" before the word "purpose," in order to have it limited only to those activities which are directed solely to the election of a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or the presidential or vice presidential elector.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the colloquy in which Senators desire to engage, I announce that I do not believe a vote could be reached before 7 o'clock this evening, so that all Senators may know that we will have no rollcall this evening.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. A parliamentary inquiry has been addressed to the Chair. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Missouri has yielded to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I have directed a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee, which perhaps he would like to think over in the light of the fact that we are going over anyway on the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. It might be advantageous to do that, since this matter has been freshly presented by the Senator from New York. Therefore it might be advantageous if the Senator from New York and I had a discussion about it without attempting to rewrite or modify legislation on the floor of the Senate, since that specific point was not considered in committee. I would appreciate the Senator's indulgence. I believe I understand exactly what he is getting at. I am a little afraid that it may impinge upon the purposes of the amendment, but I certainly am most amenable to any reasoning or suggestion, and may see the light as the Senator is undertaking to express himself on it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator. I believe we can confer on it before tomorrow morning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does not the Senator from Vermont have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri still has the floor, yielded to him by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether we ever straightened out that question. However, I wish it to be straightened out to the satisfaction of the Senator from Vermont, because he was so courteous in letting me have the floor for the purpose of my offering the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I was very glad to cooperate with the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish the Senator from Vermont to be the victim of any misunderstanding to which I have been any party whatever.

Mr. PROUTY. Some of my friends have said that I have made the best speech of my life.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator wishes to speak now I shall subside and yield the floor, and the Senator from Vermont can yield as he wishes to other Senators.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a question. Does the Senator assume that every committee which is created acts with the approval and consent of the candidate for Senator or Representative who is running in an election?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Ohio does not give me much credit for my sense of reality if he thinks that I entertain any such fallacious notion. Of course there may be committees operating without the consent or approval of a candidate. I have done everything I could to avoid endorsement or approval by certain committees or groups. I told them I did not want their support or endorsement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Missouri undoubtedly has had the experience when individuals have proceeded to collect money under the pretense of acting in support of a candidate, and some of the money was expended in supporting the candidate, but much of it was used for purposes completely dissociated from the candidate. The Senator has heard of such instances, I am sure.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not only heard of them; I have experienced them time and again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have experienced them. According to the argument which has been made by the Senator from Missouri, every committee would be required to report, and the public would judge from whom the candidate was getting financial support and other support. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; in the bill there reposes a section which the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, objected to the other day, which states that a candidate should make a reasonable investigation of the committees supporting him in order to give him an opportunity to repudiate those committees. I will read that section.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am familiar with it. However, does that not place an undue burden upon the candidate? Would it not be better to provide that the committees which have the approval and consent of the candidate shall report?

Mr. HENNINGS. The provision on page 10 of the bill, may I say to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is a fine lawyer and who sees these things very clearly, states:

> (3) The listing of committees, associations, and other organizations and their officers provided for in paragraph (2) shall not be construed as a ratification by the candidate of any action by them and the candidate may at his option note in any such report a repudiation of the support of any such committee, association, or other organization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would cover the situation?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not have to tell the Senator, who has been Governor of his State and has been elected and reelected, and has been elected to the Senate, and to other public offices, that there will always be such committees. I believe it was my predecessor, Senator James Reed, who said, "I can take care of my enemies, but only the Lord can protect me from my friends." We run into that proposition as one of the occupational hazards of seeking public office. However, we also have available the means of repudiating certain support. I hope I have undertaken to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have one final question. Under the proposal of the Senator from Missouri, every committee expending a thousand dollars or more would be required to report to Congress. That is, if in my neighborhood of St. Clair Avenue a group got together and assembled a thousand dollars, they would have to report that fact?

Mr. HENNINGS. They would have to report the fact that the St. Clair Avenue Frank Lausche for President or Vice President or Senator Club had collected a thousand dollars, so that it would be generally known.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If they did not, they would be told that they would be subject to criminal prosecution?

Mr. HENNINGS. They would be told that they would be subject to prosecution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But we would not want to get into a situation whereby a committee friendly to a candidate would be required to report and an unfriendly committee would not be required to report, would we?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. All committees would have to report, but the candidate could repudiate a committee if he did not want its support. Many of the committees are friendly to the candidate, but some of them are like the albatross; we do not want them hung around our necks. I have had that experience. I dare say that the Senator, in his very honorable and considerable public life, has had the same experience.

We do not always want the vocal, blatant, and at times embarrassing support of all people and all elements and all groups who may want to support us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the effect of the Senator's amendment be to wipe out the requirement with respect to the interstate character and affiliation of a national committee, and would he make the reporting requirements purely a matter of receipt and expenditure of $1,000?

Mr. HENNINGS. Do I understand the Senator to inquire whether interstate committees will be required to report under the terms of the act?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The amendment, as I read it, starts by striking out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, on page 3, which would strike out the interstate requirement or the affiliation with the national committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct. At that point it does. But interstate committees are covered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I hope I am answering the Senator's question in a responsive manner. I wanted to make very clear that it does not in anywise abrogate the requirement relating to interstate committees, but it does make the additional requirement that committees operating within the State, or intrastate committees, beyond the $1,000 limitation, shall report.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. In the definition of the word "candidate" in the bill before us, starting on page 2, I read:

> The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for election as President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected.

Is it the intention of that language to define "candidate," for the purposes of the proposed legislation, as only a person running for President or Vice President, for either House of Congress, or for Resident Commissioner to the Congress?

Mr. HENNINGS. Or, to use the other term in the bill, "whose name is presented at an election."

Mr. KUCHEL. Very good. In other words, when I refer to them as running, it means those whose names are presented for those offices.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should say they are interchangeable within the meaning of the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. KUCHEL. If a political committee is formed in the city of X, and Representative Jones is a candidate for reelection, let us assume that the city of X political committee receives, from contributions, $1,100. Suppose it purchases $600 worth of newspaper advertising for Representative Jones, and it purchases $500 of advertising for the candidate for Governor.

My question is: Would the language of the Senator's amendment (a) require that the committee report, and (b) would it require the reporting of the moneys expended for the candidate for Governor?

Mr. HENNINGS. Again, we get into the apportionment problem, as the Senator well realizes. That was included in the 1957 bill. We dropped it from this bill because of the great difficulty in determining, where a committee supports a number of candidates, a proper allocation as between the candidate for President, the candidate for Governor, the candidate for the Senate, and so on down the line. In the 1957 bill we tried in every possible way we could, in this very difficult field, to achieve some degree of apportionment and allocation. But none ever met with my complete approval, because I simply do not see how we can separate candidates running as a group, in a primary, when one is a candidate for district attorney, another is a candidate for the Senate, another for the House, and another for Governor. One committee may work for all of them. So we get into a very difficult field.

The original bill of 1955, which I introduced, that was 5 years ago, provided that in the case of expenditures made on behalf of more than one candidate, for printing, advertising, radio time, television time, the statement shall indicate the candidates in whose behalf the expenditure was made and the amount to be allocated to each, such amount to be determined by dividing the total expenditure by the number of candidates in whose behalf it is made.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the Senator from Missouri would say that under his amendment, once the $1,000 figure were reached, either in receipts or expenditures, the amendment would take effect and the requirement to report would be in order.

Mr. HENNINGS. According to my understanding of it, it would. That is the provision relating to the expenditure of in excess of $1,000 for one candidate.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator has just said something which I did not understand before. One candidate?

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator from California will bear with me, I will try to locate that language. We have had so many papers, authorities, and amendments before us all day, that we have misplaced the amendment we were just talking about.

> The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in the aggregate amount of $1,000 in a calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates for Presidential or Vice-Presidential election.

So if a committee which was collecting funds for a number of candidates were to collect $1,000 or more in 1 calendar year, then—as I interpret the meaning of the amendment—the committee would have to report that it had collected "for the following candidates" that sum of money, amounting to $1,000 or more.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is to say, the intention of the amendment is that no matter how many candidates are involved, if one such group of candidates comes within the meaning of "candidate" in the committee bill, then when the receipts or expenditures reach the $1,000 level, the requirement to report is in order?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my understanding of the provision. I think the Senator is exactly correct, going back to the definition of "candidate" in the bill before us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Once the requirement of reporting were reached, would it be required to report on the expenditures of those moneys which affected candidates other than as described in the Senator's bill—the local candidates, for example?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; it would not be my understanding that it would.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the requirement would be to report those moneys received or expended in support of, in the language of the bill, "an individual whose name is presented at an election for election as President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected."

Mr. HENNINGS. Is that the question of the Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from California has been reading from the bill, has he not?

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me restate the question; I shall begin it again:

Is it the intention of the Senator from Missouri that when the $1,000 level is reached, such a committee will be required to report the receipts or expenditures of the moneys used for a candidate—as the bill describes the meaning of the words "a candidate"—but not for those who are aspiring to election to local or State office?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; so far as the Federal legislation is concerned.

Mr. KUCHEL. The answer to my question is "Yes," is it?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; according to the way I interpret the question.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. But in answer to the question of the Senator from California, did not I correctly understand the Senator from Missouri to say that, under the wording of the amendment as it now exists, only if a political committee which were formed spent less than $1,000 solely for any one such candidate, would the committee be relieved from the necessity of complying with the requirement to report?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think that is correct.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, under the wording of this amendment, if a candidate for election to the House of Representatives were running with a number of local candidates—perhaps 20 local candidates—and if a committee spent more than $1,000, under the requirements of this provision the committee would have to report; is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who has worked so hard and so faithfully over the bill, will consider, during the evening, reinstatement of

language something like that contained in his original bill of 1955, so as to permit an apportionment, because I really believe that would greatly strengthen the support for his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly any suggestion the Senator from New York makes will be carefully considered, and I should like to discuss the matter further with him.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Who now has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following disposition of the pending amendment, I may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, at this time I yield the floor for today.

DEATH OF PETER HENDERSON, FIRST HEAD OF HOUSE GYMNASIUM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning of the passing of a great friend of the U.S. Congress and a good friend of many Members of this body who have served a number of terms in the House of Representatives. I refer to the death of Pete Henderson, the first head of the House gymnasium, who ministered to the physical needs of many Senators at the time they were Representatives. He was a great friend, I am sure, of everyone who ever participated in the activities of the House gymnasium. Above all, he was a great American.

I believe Pete Henderson was as proud as any human being could be of his connection with the U.S. Congress. He served for 15 years as the head of the gymnasium in the House of Representatives and retired in about 1948 because of ill health.

It was distressing to learn that he has passed away. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to this fine associate of the Members of Congress and to extend to his family my commiserations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as an attachment to these remarks there be printed at this point in the RECORD the article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald concerning Mr. Henderson's passing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETER HENDERSON, FIRST HEAD OF HOUSE GYM, DIES

Peter Henderson, a man whose job it was to keep Congressmen healthy and relaxed, died Saturday in West Palm Beach, Fla., it was learned here yesterday.

Mr. Henderson was the first gym director for the House of Representatives when the new office building opened in 1933. He retired 15 years later.

In early years he found himself as much a gym promoter as director. First, he won additional space from House planners to add a half-court gym floor to the original steam bath layout. This made space for handball and volleyball and solo exercise.

Then, to get Members to limber up, he called on their offices and sent them flysheets promoting his therapy. "It was not easy," says his successor. "The average age here is about 40 and they just don't figure on starting something like that."

But, sport lovers or not, they turned out, more each year. Such spare time athletes as former Vice President Henry A. Wallace and Representative RICHARD NIXON joined in the nonpolitical workouts.

Mr. Henderson came here from the West during the depression. His first job on Capitol Hill was on the construction of the Supreme Court.

Soccer was the gym director's favorite game, a preference going back to his youth in Scotland.

Later he served in the U.S. Army in World War I. His age was unavailable.

Since retirement, Mr. Henderson and his wife, Ellen, spent winters in Florida and summers in Washington.

Services will be held at the James T. Ryan funeral home.

U.S. POLICY AS SEEN IN HONG KONG

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, among the outstanding representatives of the United States in oversea posts whom I had the privilege to visit during my recent trip overseas, none occupies a position of greater responsibility at this particular time than the American consul general at Hong Kong, the Honorable Julius C. Holmes.

I had the distinct privilege of hearing Mr. Holmes speak at the meeting of the Rotary Club of Hong Kong on December 29, 1959.

His remarks were received with great attention and appreciation. I believe they will be of interest to the Members of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who are interested in, and realize the importance of, what is happening in the Far East and how international events look to an experienced observer there.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that Mr. Holmes' remarks may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE YEAR'S EVENTS

(Remarks of the Honorable J. C. Holmes, American Consul General, to the Rotary Club of Hong Kong, December 29, 1959)

I have been asked to cap your luncheon fare today with a few thoughts on the developments of the year in the world as a whole. This is the traditional time for stocktaking, both in a personal sense and in our view of the world around us, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss this subject with you.

It seems pointless to attempt a catalog of events and pretentious to venture predictions. I believe it appropriate, and I hope useful, however, to try to sort out the major themes of this year's sympathy, since they may help us to understand next year's program.

WARMING OF INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE

Perhaps the most striking, and potentially the most promising, aspect of this year's events was the warming of the international climate, symbolized by the interchange of visits between leading officials of the East and West.

I refer in particular, of course, to the visits of Prime Minister Macmillan and Vice President NIXON to Moscow; the visits of Premier Khrushchev and Deputy Premier Mikoyan to the United States; and to President Eisenhower's prospective tour of the U.S.S.R.

To be sure, these visits were preceded by, and to some degree probably resulted from, the sudden initiation of a crisis over Berlin by a Soviet ultimatum. Nevertheless, we should be prepared to take hope wherever we find evidence.

The main point is that these interchanges have been without precedent in the history of the cold war; they took place against a background of East-West cultural, scientific and educational exchanges that would have been surprising to contemplate only a few years ago; and they laid the basis for summit meetings that are to take place next year.

These are possible symbols of change, not the change itself; they may presage a thaw, but alone provide no assurance of the settlement we all seek. Nevertheless, they are important and have great promise largely because they may indicate that the leaders of the U.S.S.R. at last share our conviction that no side can win the gamble of a nuclear war.

Such a change in the Soviet viewpoint might be influenced by other forces; notably, by the fact that the Soviet society, after 40 years of painful austerity, is only now beginning to produce partly for welfare rather than exclusively for power. And material satisfaction once tasted is not easily contained.

In any event, these possibilities are the measure of our hope, and to this extent the climate and the prospects for peace have brightened.

NEED TO BE IMAGINATIVE YET HARDHEADED

I emphasize that as yet we deal with symbols, not reality, because we are all participants in a vital game. Certainly the West must be flexible and imaginative; but in view of the high stakes we must above all be hardheaded as well.

In this connection I need hardly point out the highly disturbing fact that the thaw in climate has strict geographical limits; it is a fact that unfortunately is only too clear in this area of the world. It means among other things that the road to a settlement will be difficult and probably long, and we may dare to travel on it only if we maintain our position of strength.

We can, in short, hope and work for peace only if we maintain our capability to deter aggression, nuclear or otherwise. This expensive fact is not of our choosing, but it is a fact nonetheless.

On the related and probably more critical subject of disarmament, the year's events produced mixed results.

I realize that this is a field in which even the most studious and conscientious observer experiences a sense of ignorance and frustration. In the long history of disarmament talks the negotiations during any one year periodically have been the source of headlines, and—here it is safe to predict—this is likely to be the case again in the year ahead. But the same issues always seem to be repeated, and this fact, combined with the surrounding maze of highly technical considerations, creates the impression in some minds that the whole affair is talk and no movement, and little more than the "rice bowl" of diplomats.

I believe, however, that the principles underlying this subject are basically simple

and straightforward, and we can lose sight of them only at our peril.

In the interest of preventing a world holocaust, the West can afford to discard its most powerful weapons only if we can be certain that our potential opponent is not concealing his own. The West is more than prepared and willing to enter the era of peaceful competition, but we may do so only on the assurance that the competition can be only peaceful.

Thus talk alone provides no certainty of what is in the minds of the Soviet leaders. They may in fact share the desire of the Russian people to enjoy the prospect of a better material future; but alternatively, they may calculate that if they can disarm us first, while concealing some of their own military capabilities, they can work their will and accomplish the objectives of communism in a world unprepared to contest force.

DIFFICULT COURSE TO STEER

The Free Nations must, therefore, steer a difficult course, for it would be tragic to assume that Soviet intentions are secretly hostile when in fact they were genuinely, although selfishly, peaceful, and therefore lose the chance of building a secure peace. Similarly, it would be suicide to act on the premise that their intentions are peaceful when de do not have real proof of their lack of capability for militarily hostile acts. In short, we must act in such a way that whichever assumption is correct we have taken the path that is both prudent and morally correct.

For this reason, the Western Powers have insisted throughout the long history of disarmament talks on a foolproof system of inspection; but in 13 years of trying to negotiate an agreement on the reduction and control of conventional and nuclear weapons, a system for minimizing the danger of surprise attack, and an end to nuclear weapons tests, agreement on inspection and control procedures has been a consistent obstacle to a meeting of minds.

TWO STEPS FORWARD

This year, however, has seen a moderate, but nevertheless significant, turn for the better. There have been two concrete steps forward: First, no nuclear weapons were tested by either side during the year; Second, we have reached an understanding with the Soviet Union on some of the mechanics of inspection that would be involved in a testing ban, and even on the wording of 17 articles of a test ban treaty.

This is the first time since the United Nations was established that agreemnt was reached on definite treaty provisions in the field of weapons control, and for this reason it represents progress, even though agreement on these provisions has no validity until a complete treaty is concluded.

In this field, however, the year ended on a disappointing note. The meeting of technicians for detecting underground nuclear explosions—who are dealing with a critical element in the nuclear inspection procedures—ended in a deadlock and the conference on a nuclear testing ban has been recessed until January 12.

Once again the Russians, on the flimsiest of objections, seemed bent on refusing to satisfy the West on this most crucial point. Is it because they think we will abuse the privilege of inspection to carry on espionage within their borders? Or is it because their real goal is to have us disarm while they do not?

It is these questions that require us, despite the best of intentions, to proceed with the utmost caution.

On a more positive note, the year also provided dramatic and continuing testimony that an increasing area of the world is on the verge of entering what one economist recently termed the age of high consumption. As a representative of my Government, and in all humility, I believe that I can take some pride in the part that the United States has played in fostering this happy trend. As you know, in the first 5 years after World War II the United States concentrated its assistance on Western Europe in what proved to be an effective effort to make good the ravages of war and set in motion the strong forces in being that ultimately led to the attainment of record productivity in the area. Subsequently much of our assistance, as well as that provided by other countries, including the U.S.S.R., has been channeled to Asia for the more difficult and perhaps more crucial task of promoting the development of this region.

WORLD PEACE AND WORLD PROSPERITY

I believe it is safe to generalize that the issue of world peace eventually may be reduced to the question of world prosperity.

In this connection, I was struck by the recent statement made by Sir Oliver Franks to the effect that events will bring the world to the position where the division between East and West may prove to be less important than the division between North and South. By this he meant that the issues of our age increasingly may stem less from ideological differences between East and West and more from the responsibility that the industrialized countries as a whole must accept to assist in fostering economic progress in the poorer countries of the world, which for the most part are situated in the southern portion of the globe.

Toward this end, competitive assistance between East and West need not be out of character; in fact, it should be welcomed.

It is a type of competition that is not only based on peace, but can build peace. Nor is this problem any less critical than some of the others I mentioned earlier.

Economic progress by no means has been confined to the industrialized nations, but the harsh and unfortunate fact is that the gap between the industrialized countries and the developing countries has increased, not lessened, during the last decade.

Most of the countries of Asia are working hard, and have been successful, in raising total production, but in per capita terms the advance has been painfully small. In terms of essential consumption, we must recognize that production of food is barely keeping pace with the minimum consumption need of Asia's growing population.

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR FUTURE

This trend indicates all the more clearly that the task of promoting economic progress in Asia and other similar areas must be pushed forward on an enlarged scale. It will require resources that cannot come from one or from a few of the industrialized nations, but represents a project in which all who can afford it must share. This is no small design and it may well represent the challenge of our future.

If there is to be progress, and what is equally important, the prospect of progress, all the major industrial nations of the world must join in the competition to raise living standards elsewhere to the level where peace is secure. Of course this is not the only condition for a secure peace. Wars have been started by prosperous nations. I submit, however, that it is one of the conditions, and possibly one that is essential to the equation.

Having been obliged at the request of your program director to talk with you on a global plane, I believe I can take the liberty and the pleasure of ending with a note of comment on the microcosm that is Hong Kong. I am a newcomer to your community, but it does not take long to savour its unique and engaging characteristics. I find in it, to the fullest measure, the conditions that enable people to devote their energies to creative tasks. As such, Hong Kong is dramatic witness to what the human being can do, against all odds, when he can work in freedom and gain the rewards of his effort.

The citizens of Hong Kong seem to be dedicated to the advice of Voltaire; that everyone should cultivate his own garden. But it is an unusual garden that we have here. Flowers of considerably more than a hundred kinds are blooming; few wither; none is chopped off. This display of horticultural strength and variety is worthy of a model farm, and indeed Hong Kong seems to be so regarded, and preferred to other models, by an embarrassingly large influx of people. It is an embarrassment of which Hong Kong should be proud.

I know that many visitors to your city pay tribute to it as a lighthouse of free enterprise, of resourcefulness in overcoming every kind of difficulty, and of the democratic spirit at work. The fact that so many people have paid you this tribute does not mean that it is not worth offering again. I should like to join those others in saluting Hong Kong, and the many people in this room who have helped to make Hong Kong what it is.

I wish you all a very happy new year.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Has an order for adjournment until tomorrow previously been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; an order that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow has previously been entered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, is such a motion in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn, until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 12: 20: *Turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve Him with all your heart.*

Almighty God, Thou knowest how greatly we need Thy divine wisdom to understand and Thy divine strength for the responsibilities which daily press so heavily upon us.

May our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of this legislative body never falter or fear to make right decisions.

Grant unto them that courage of heart and peace of mind which only integrity and fidelity can give.

Deliver us from anxiety and make us strong of faith to dare and of hope to

endure when we are in danger of being buffeted from our course by the winds of adversity.

Help us to go forward courageously with a clear vision of Thy guiding presence and with the assurance of Thy sustaining power.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE REDS ARE AFTER OUR PANAMA CANAL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an extension of remarks that appeared in the RECORD last week. The Government Printing Office made a mistake, and the only way the mistake can be corrected is by including it in the RECORD today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Evangelist Billy James Hargis, president, and Julian E. Williams, research director, of the Christian Crusade:

THE REDS ARE AFTER OUR PANAMA CANAL

(By Evangelist Billy James Hargis, president, and Julian E. Williams, research director, of the Christian Crusade)

During recent months there have been increasing rumblings of serious trouble for the American people in the strategic Panama Canal Zone. There have been demonstrations by highly organized student groups, and increasing demands by the Panama Government which is under strong pressure from the agitating forces. The Panama Government has demanded one-half of the revenue from the Canal, and has declared an extension of Panama's territorial waters from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit.

Let us remember that the Panama Canal belongs to the United States. Our Nation dug it, paid for it, and by terms of a treaty with the Government of Panama in 1903 has all rights in the area. Article 24 of the Panama Canal Convention of 1903 states "no change either in the Government or in the laws and treaties of the Republic of Panama shall, without the consent of the United States, affect any right of the United States under the present convention, or under any treaty, stipulation between the two countries that now exists or may hereafter exist touching the subject matter of this convention." Our Government pays the Government of Panama an annual rental of $1,930,000 for the Canal Zone. The original rent established in the 1903 treaty was $250,000 but it has been raised twice since that time by new treaties.

The Panama Canal has been of great assistance to the Republic of Panama. The Encyclopedia Britannica describes it as "the greatest single economic asset of Panama." The Panama Canal brings to Panama the largest tonnage of shipping of any country in Latin America, and its ports rival the great ports of the world. In other words, the Panama Canal has practically made this little country what it is today.

Our Government recognized the importance of building the Panama Canal, and the Soviet leaders of international communism recognize the importance of it now. They are determined to get it, and some years ago their man, Alger Hiss, was operating toward that end in the U.S. State Department.

While he was Director of the State Department's Office of Special Political Affairs he got hold of the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, and decided that it should be turned over to the United Nations. He argued that the United States was required to turn this Canal Zone report over to the U.N., and cited article 73(e) of the United Nations Charter as his authority. Article 73(e) provides that member nations having responsibilities for the administration of territories that have not attained a full measure of self-government shall transmit to the U.N., "statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories." Through this move, Hiss implied that the Canal Zone was a territory of the United States and that the people of the zone were on their way to self-government. If accepted by the Governments of the United States and Panama this would place us in a perilous spot as far as the canal is concerned.

Actually, the Panama Canal Zone is not a territory in the traditional sense of the word and the people of the zone are not supposed to have self-government according to the terms of the treaty. The only persons who may live in the Canal Zone are officials, employees, military personnel on duty and their families. No one can live in the zone unless they are occupied in work relating directly to the canal.

At this time Spruille Braden was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. Two of his assistants learned about the Hiss plan. They complained. Mr. Braden complained to Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, but Acheson did not even give him a chance to state his case, according to Braden. During the controversy, Spruille Braden checked with the Pentagon to find out just how important our military bases in Panama really were. He was told that the bases were vitally necessary for the security of the Panama Canal—therefore, of the United States. Regardless of this, Alger Hiss won out just as he always did with Dean Acheson and the report was submitted to the U.N. Braden later found out that Hiss identified the Canal Zone as an occupied territory.

As long as he was Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Spruille Braden managed for America to keep the vitally important military bases in Panama. However, in the fall of 1947 he read that our Nation had to give up those important bases—134 of them. Alger Hiss marched on. No less important than the surrender of our military bases was the dangerous diplomatic precedent which Acheson and Hiss had established. The submission of the Canal Zone's report, and classification of the zone as a territory opened the doors to some dangerous future meddling by the United Nations.

Moscow has had its evil eye upon the Panama Canal for a long time, as the activities of Alger Hiss showed, but during the Suez crisis in 1956 the Kremlin conspirators came out in the open and suggested that the Panama Canal should be internationalized. Top Polish Communist leaders were told by the Soviet commander of the Polish armed forces, "Although the Panama Canal route is longer by some 1,000 miles than the southern sea route through Suez, it has considerable advantages for the Soviet Union—which have been studied in detail by numerous Soviet vessels. Moreover, the Panama Canal has an outstanding position in communications with South American States and is one of the hubs of the imperialistic policy of the United States in the Pacific and the Far East." The Soviet speaker was Marshal Rokossovsky.

That energetic little product of the Pendergast political machine, Harry Truman, was not going to let the Kremlin get ahead of him. After the Soviets announced their plot to internationalize the Panama Canal, Mr. Truman grabbed the nearest newspaperman and informed him that this was not a Soviet idea at all because he (Truman) had proposed it at the Potsdam Conference in 1945. That is one of the many astonishing examples of America's current political climate in which it is not smart to consider the interests of the American people. This foolish internationalist outlook has been predominant in American leadership for years. Meanwhile, the American people are kept in a deep sleep by welfare state handouts, and the promise of the beautiful welfare state utopia which is impossible. The welfare state can lead only to the enslavement of the American people.

During a spy trial in Paris in March of 1935, a young American couple from East Orange, N.J., testified. The man, Robert G. Switz, remarked to the court that his missions for the Communist conspiracy network included work in the Panama Canal Zone. Edward Hunter covered this trial for International News Service. Paris had informed the U.S. Embassy, and so Hunter went to the Embassy to find out what was being done about the matter. They informed him that the tip had been cabled to Washington. But Hunter said in National Review magazine of March 14, 1959, that he never found out what interest our Government had shown in the tip. He said that another astonishing thing was the way this important news was slurred over in the American press. Time magazine gave it a couple of paragraphs and made it sound like a joke.

This is a typical example of how vitally important matters have been handled and are being handled by supposedly reputable Government officials, newspapers, and magazines. Important facts—facts which are vital to America's defense—are slurred over, ignored, or ridiculed, but never answered straightforward, and seldom is effective action taken. How grossly misinformed our people are. Good has been made to look evil and evil to look good in the eyes and minds of millions of deceived American citizens.

Back in 1948, the Communist People's Party had a candidate in Panama's presidential race. Panama has had its share of the usual student revolts which break out when Communist agents do their jobs behind the scenes. In 1947, the U.S. Ambassador and a Panama Foreign Minister signed an agreement to renew the World War II agreement by which the United States operated 13 airbases outside the Canal Zone. The next day a student riot erupted in the streets, and there were more than 30 casualties. There were cries of "Down with Yankee imperialism." As a result not one deputy in the Panama Parliament dared to vote for the agreement. This weakened U.S. military strength in Central America and deprived Panama of badly needed employment and money that U.S. expenditures on the airbases would have provided.

Panama student groups have demonstrated for a 50–50 split on the Panama Canal tolls, ignoring U.S. expenditures in operating the canal and building it originally. They have agitated for a monopoly of canal jobs by Spanish-speaking peoples, and for the return of the canal through nationalization. Last May the streets of the Panamanian capital bristled with troops as rebellious students and the Government remained deadlocked for days. Panama was under a stage of siege and appeared to be on a war footing, according to news accounts of the struggle. A Government spokesman charged that Communists were involved in the rioting that took 11 lives, and said that the well-known Communist leader Bolivar Davalos was with the students barricaded in the university.

A self-avowed Marxist, Diogenes de la Rosa, is the Panamanian President's economic adviser. He is director of the National Economic Council. He said that Panamanians are so unsympathetic to Americans that they might help the enemy in case of war. This means the enemy of Panama also, as the only enemy on the scene is international communism. This dangerous attitude has been created in a small country which we built and put on the map in turn for rights to the canal which we also built and financed. It took almost miraculous measures of sanitation to make the land habitable.

During 1958 the Panama Government found a number of arms deposits in and near the capital city, and announced discovery of a plot to plunge the country into revolution. During 1959, a small landing force of revolutionists tried to establish a foothold in Panama. Even though only a few men landed, the mission was to build up gradually an insurrection army out of Panamanians. A lecturer at the Moscow Political Academy described the recent events in Panama as a "continuation of the general struggle for the liberation of the peoples of Central America from the U.S. colonialist yoke." The invasion of Panama by a small revolutionary force was the same pattern as the Cuban pro-Communist revolution showed at the start.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, tried to alert the U.S. House of Representatives to the perilous situation in Panama after the Panama Government declared an extension of the Republic's 3-mile water limit to a 12-mile limit. In his speech exposing the peril, he said, "Also, I desire to emphasize that, as regards the Republic of Panama and its people, I hold both in the highest esteem and count many Panamanian citizens as valued friends of many years' standing." For his efforts in behalf of the security of Panama and the United States, Representative DANIEL FLOOD was voted "public enemy No. 1" by the Panama Assembly.

Let us remember the strategic importance to America of the Panama Canal. Will American Government officials follow the same policy in relation to the Communist threat to this lifeline of America as they have to the Communist operations in Cuba and other important Latin American nations? Will the answer be to ignore obvious Communist subversion and propaganda on this continent while lulling the American people deeper and deeper into a sleep of national death through increased foreign aid as the only way to oppose communism? What a hoax. The foreign-aid war against communism is as phony as a $7 bill. The strongest proof that it is a hoax is the fact that a large portion of the aid goes to Communist and Communist sympathizing governments—governments that will turn on the American people with a vengeance in the final showdown; governments that are already open in their opposition to America.

Include in your prayers those innocent people in Panama who are being deceived by the clever agents of international communism. Demand of the Congress, the President, and the State Department that we do not allow Communist subversion to continue in the vital Panama Canal Zone area. Demand a realistic approach to the Communist peril every area of its operation.

ANTI-SEMITIC ACTIVITIES

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the lassitude on the part of this Government in connection with the anti-Semitic acts that have been and are taking place throughout Germany and even the rest of the world.

Although expressions of disgust of these deplorable acts have been heard from the other governments, this Congress has not been singularly vocal in its protests.

Acts of desecration and vandalism have occurred and are occurring throughout the world violating the interests of minorities. A world war was fought, among other things, to denazifying Germany; yet we still find former Nazis in high places in the German Government. Who knows but what the peoples of Germany, in view of the presence of so many former Nazis in their government, interpret the attitude of their government to be one of tolerance despite the protests and expressions of horror by their leaders.

Let this be but a small voice rising in protest.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, after an uncertain start, following World War I, Congress went all out to provide a comprehensive program of benefits for veterans and their dependents before World War II had ended.

In legislation embracing tens of millions of people, it is impossible to foresee all the situations that are entitled to our consideration. There are bound to be omissions which only time can reveal.

I find that a growing number of Gold Star Mothers are seeking my assistance in securing their admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals for medical treatment. They assume in view of their sacrifices, that they are eligible for such benefits. It is always distressing to witness the shock of their disbelief when I explain that the law makes no provision for their medical care as dependents of veterans.

But my son not only served his country, he gave his life in its defense. I cannot understand why the Government, in return, will not help the Gold Star Mothers who are in need of hospital care.

In some cases, the son who died in service was the sole support of his mother. The pension she receives is barely enough for her ordinary needs. Now that the infirmities of age require the hospitalization which she cannot afford, she looks to a grateful Government to help her.

Even where there are other sons or daughters living away from home, they find it difficult to pay the soaring costs of private medical care for their mother in addition to their immediate responsibilities of supporting their own homes and children.

The respect and honor that we accord to Gold Star Mothers is cheapened if we apply the yardstick of a means test, or try to shift our obligation to others.

There is no need to debate the right of Gold Star Mothers to these benefits. We simply did not anticipate the predicament in which many of these brave and generous women now find themselves.

To balance this moral budget I ask early consideration of the bill I have introduced to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers.

And to amend by adding to that section the following words:

(c) To the extent that the furnishing of such care will not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans, the Administrator is authorized to furnish hospital care which he determines is needed to the mother of any member of the Armed Forces, if she was eligible to be furnished a gold star lapel button under Public Law 306, 80th Congress, on account of the death of such member.

THE BIRTHDAY OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, 153 years ago today—on January 19, 1807—Robert E. Lee was born. He was a great soldier, a loyal southerner, a noble American. Above all, he was a Christian gentleman.

Millions of words have been written about him in thousands of books, plays, and poems. He means innumerable things to vast numbers of my fellow citizens.

This is what he means to me. He means the eternal symbol of that holy spark which causes the possessor to follow his belief to his manifest destiny. He did not question whether what he believed was popular or unpopular. He did not ask himself, "What is there in it for me?" What he did do was to set his course by the bright spark of his dedicated convictions. What he did do was to follow his star, whether it led him into sunlight or into shadow.

My friends, on his birthday, I salute a man of the South, a man of America, a man of God.

I hail, with all my heart, Robert E. Lee, of Virginia.

NATIONAL LOTTERY STILL ONLY HOPE FOR TAX CUT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement that his proposed budget will provide for a $4.2 billion surplus and that it would be applied toward reduction of our national debt is most commendable and should be applauded.

I am in complete agreement with Mr. Eisenhower when he insists that "this debt growth must stop," especially when the interest charges alone now cost the taxpayers about $9½ billion each year.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with our President when he suggests that we withhold tax relief from our American taxpayers until payments on this gigantic debt have been established as normal practice. At the rate we are going and with costs of Government operation on the rise, it might be years and years before we can make an appreciable reduction on our children's inherited mortgage. This can very well mean a long, long wait for our hard-pressed wage earners who are looking to us for relief from what our President describes, "the heavy burdens of taxation."

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has it within its power to help the President in his desire to reduce our national debt and the American people who deserve and need relief from the extreme pressures of taxation. All we have to do is wipe out hypocrisy and display some good American horsesense by passing a national lottery bill.

Mr. Speaker, the time is more than ripe for this Congress to gather up enough courage and face the fiscal facts of life. A national lottery should be accepted by this Congress as a good practical and sound fiscal substitute for taxation. My bill will painlessly and voluntarily pump into the U.S. Treasury $10 billion a year in new additional revenue. A national lottery would bring into the coffers of our Government enough money to help ease our present financial pains and bring long-awaited relief to our overburdened wage earners.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will have the intestinal fortitude to tap this new source of revenue which can be ours just for the asking. Let us make Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer's dreams for a tax cut a reality with a national lottery.

RELIEF OF VETERANS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, here is a bill that will be dropped in the hopper today.

The purpose is to relieve veterans who have been overpaid through no mistake of their own and who are now having to repay with interest whatever they have received. We all know about what some times happens. The Government pays the veteran something to which he is not entitled. He does not know about any error. Then, perhaps after he is married and has a couple of kids, buys a home and added obligation and expenses then the Government which made the mistake comes along and not only wants back what they have overpaid him which, of course, in all equity, he should repay if he can, but they want interest on it.

I cannot see the fairness in that.

One other matter. We want to relieve the disbursing officer, who is in no way at fault and will offer an amendment to that effect.

THE CHALLENGE OF PRESERVING PEACE: PART I, THE SINO-SOVIET PERIL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, filled with promises and perils, the 10-year period we now enter truly defies the imagination of all of us. Will our two political parties be able to meet the fast-moving demands of the sixties? What are the differences in the responses of the two political parties to this challenge? A search for answers is the purpose of our Republican speech series.

This is the second speech of the series. Along with the third speech, it will explore the challenge of preserving peace with justice during the 10 years ahead. First, I will endeavor to define the Sino-Soviet peril to peace and freedom. Then I will contrast the two distinct approaches of Republicans and Democrats to this peril.

I pause to make an advance apology to some of my good friends in the other party. Often I shall characterize the attitude of that party by citing attitudes of the Democratic advisory council. Actually, many of the Members on the other side of the aisle are as disillusioned as I by that advisory council.

Tragic as it may be, these gentlemen are inescapably hog-tied to their council. Its members include those who formulated the foreign policies of the last administration. Those same members would formulate the policies of any Democratic administration which might be elected in 1960. The inability of party rank and file to control that council's irresponsible foreign policy statements is one unfortunate penalty of belonging to their disunified party.

Now this points again to the question raised in the first speech of the series by the chairman of our policy committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. This is the question: Can a political party, crippled with serious geographical and ideological splits, meet the dynamic challenges of the future age?

Basic Republican unit, I believe, is one reason why the report of the Republican committee on program and progress, commonly called the Percy report, was able to avoid the destructive approaches of the Democratic advisory council and produce a constructive goal for a foreign policy designed to preserve peace with justice. The report said:

> Freedom is our highest aim. Peace, coveted by all our people, is worth every sacrifice except that of freedom.

THE AIM OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

If this is acceptable as our aim, what is the fundamental aim of a Communist foreign policy? Obviously that aim has been to destroy the free world. Conceivably, that aim could change. But the Communist strategy employs and combines military, political, economic, psychological, and ideological means. The way Russia zigzags between those means must not be interpreted to be a change of overall aim.

The Scriptures say: "By their fruits, you shall know them." We await the Soviet Union and Red China to bring forth good fruit, not just good talk, to promote peace and self-determination for all nations. By their deeds we shall judge them.

Until then, we Republicans, like the President of the United States, wait watchfully, looking for new approaches, but never forgetting the basis of the Russian strategy. True, that strategy is in part a carryover of imperialistic Russia's designs at expansion. But it is far more fearsome than the aggression of an Ivan the Terrible or Peter the Great. At heart, it is an ideological belief that history ordains the inevitable victory of communism over free enterprise.

Communists believe their sole mission in life is to contribute to this inevitable victory—or, to put it another way, the irresistible course of history. These are not gamblers, as many past conquerors have been. They do not risk everything on one stroke. They do not feel that their success is dependent upon a gamble.

THE STRATEGY OF LIMITED METHODS FOR UNLIMITED ENDS

Because of this conviction of inevitability, the Soviet Union has relied upon a series of limited means to accomplish her unlimited ends. Russia has avoided chances of all-out war. In Finland and in eastern Poland in 1939, and in Manchuria in 1945, Soviet leadership showed how closely and carefully it appraised the cost of military adventures. It would limit or alter its aims rather than risk expanding the war.

Studies now reveal that in the 1948 Berlin crisis, Moscow accepted many affronts to its prestige rather than risk the crisis cracking into war. As former Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor testified:

> We yielded to a challenge which may well have been a bluff.

The patterns of limited risk was definitely evident in the Korean war. In fact, this was a war the U.S.S.R. fought through pawns. And this was a war which the Far East Communists estimated there was no danger of expanding, because of statements by Secretary of State Dean Acheson which I shall review later.

Continually, the Communists run the gamut from the military to the economic. As long as we will permit any particular method of theirs to be successful, they will employ it.

But what happens when the United States seizes the initiative, when the United States no longer allows the Communists to select the weapons and the places for aggression? The Communists switch to another approach, often nonmilitary. After Korea, for example, they increased their economic and subversive efforts in uncommitted areas of the world. They also renewed their psychological attack and, more specifically, tried to play on the nerves of Western leaders.

The psychological part of their strategy seeks to divide and conquer.

This nerve warfare attempts to produce division within our own country. From past experience Russia has learned that international pressures inevitably lead some faint-hearted Americans to advocate appeasement. By such pressures the Soviets know there is a chance of splitting us apart and undermining our national will. Such is the aim of their nuclear blackmail. This amounts to a strategy of pressures just short of all-out war or a final showdown.

In all cases of blackmail, unfortunately, the more the victim gives in, the more the blackmailer demands.

Russia attempted this blackmail during the Lebanon crisis in 1958, and more specifically during the Berlin crisis of last year. The Eisenhower administration would not be blackmailed. As a result, Soviet strategy again had to shift its method.

But if the United States has a change of national leadership which would change our foreign policy Russia would be tempted again to try Korean-type wars or nuclear blackmail. Let us not foolishly assume that their pattern of zigzags has necessarily ended.

HOW EACH SOVIET METHOD FITS INTO A PROTRACTED STRATEGY

Consider how each step in these limited Communist challenges fits into the overall ladder of the total Communist strategy. Each challenge to the free world, whether military, economic, psychological, or political, is one rung in a protracted conflict that Communists believe will last until the free world is exhausted.

Guided by this protracted conflict strategy, the Russians have achieved an amazing integration of a variety of their efforts. While they are concentrating and coordinating their own efforts, they seek to keep our own efforts splintered and conflicting. They do not want us to relate our space effort to our economic effort, or our political effort to our military effort. They try to induce this splintering of our effort by a series of alternating challenges — for example, hitting the moon, lowering a deadline on Berlin, or underselling us in a trade war.

In every case certain groups in America panic into the Soviet trap and demand a crash, rash program with some short-range, narrow goal. In almost every case this crash program would be merely copying or duplicating one particular temporary instrument in the pattern of Soviet challenges.

You get the total picture of the Soviet pattern only after you consider the influence of Russia's internal conditions on her external policy. The Communists often make threats ostensibly aimed at America or England. Very often, however, their purpose has been to create a crisis climate within Russia which would enable a consolidation of power.

For example, Khrushchev wanted to build up heavy industry. That demanded sacrificing the well-being of millions of Russians. To induce the masses to accept sacrifices, Khrushchev and his spokesmen made bombastic statements about the imminence of nuclear war. So he successfully manufactured his own crisis climate at home.

During the Hungarian crisis, Khrushchev's leadership at home was threatened by the plenum of the party central committee. He reacted with sufficient war talk to scare and consolidate his own people behind his personal leadership.

In Red China, Mao apparently precipitated the crisis with India because of the serious difficulties in his tyrannical domestic program.

Studies indicate that often when Russian threats have been the most warlike, Russia has been most determined to avoid war, and is actually quite concerned about certain domestic difficulties. We should remember this in regard to Premier Khrushchev's speech last week where he talked about a fantastic new weapon.

But the spokesmen of the Democratic advisory council seem never able to analyze the various purposes behind Russian threats or behind their zigzag strategy of limited means. A review of Mr. Stevenson's statements during the Suez crisis and again during the Formosa crisis bears this out. The council members have often advocated retreats before such threats, even when the Sino-Soviet powers did not really expect us to retreat, and merely expected to distract from their domestic problems.

The advisory council approach is a bit naive.

THREE CONDITIONS FOR WAR

Even though the Soviets employ limited means to accomplish their unlimited objectives, three terrifying sets of conditions could force them to reach out for unlimited means, that is, make an all-out, one-blow effort at our destruction.

The first of these would be a condition whereby they miscalculate.

The second would be a condition whereby they feel they possess the power of one type or another to defeat us in one blow, whereby they believe the outcome of such an attempt on their part would be a certainty and not a gamble. Then the Communist strategists would say that their long-expected hour to consummate the Marxian course of history had arrived, and the consummation would be through a holocaust of worldwide aggression.

The third would be a condition whereby internal stresses would so threaten the power or prestige of the Russian leaders that they would seek nuclear war as an insane alternative to loss of personal power. Even if one or two top Soviet leaders elected this course, it seems improbable that other powerful party men would allow the execution of the wild scheme. What is more such a condition would be predicated upon all other avenues of relief being cut off, all constructive flow of world diplomacy having ceased, until only the rash way of a madman remained.

Soviet strategy seeks to avoid and not to advance conditions which could lead to a self-destructive nuclear war. We, too, seek to avoid those conditions. How the Republican foreign policy is equipped to prohibit these conditions from coming about in the 1960's will be discussed in the next speech of the series by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

I turn now to the economic side of the Soviet strategy of limited and varied pressures aimed ultimately to exhaust us.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee reveals what rapid strides the Soviet economy is making in certain areas of production and technology. Russia is now experiencing an annual growth of about 6 percent in gross national product, as compared to an annual growth of about 3 percent in America. It is true and encouraging, however, that our factories, mines, and utilities stepped up their production 6 percent in December; this is the greatest monthly gain in more than 7 years.

Of course, when the free world bloc is compared to the Sino-Soviet bloc, Soviet growth is not merely as striking. Parts of Western Europe, Germany for example, have a growth percentage comparable to Russia's.

Nevertheless, the peril is especially great, because part of the Soviet plan is to induce us to forfeit the inherent advantage we have as a free society. At the very time that Russia is adding more incentives and decentralizing certain fields of science and production, groups like the Democratic advisory council advocate greater centralization, regimentation, and statism in the United States. The massive spending program that the council proposed at its December 1959 meeting in New York City could only be implemented through greater centralization, regimentation, and statism.

The greatest danger in the Soviet peril—whether it be military, scientific, economic, political, or psychological—is not that our free society lacks the advantages. It is that we may tragically fail to mobilize the decisive advantages we do possess in an amazing abundance.

Now that I have outlined the nature of the Soviet challenge, I turn to the ways our two political parties have responded to the challenge.

RESPONSES TO SINO-SOVIET STRATEGY DURING TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION

Let us consider how the former Democratic administration, whose members now fill the Democratic advisory council, reacted to this Sino-Soviet strategy—the strategy of employing limited means to accomplish our unlimited destruction.

In 1949, Mao Tse-tung consolidated his hold over China. This was 2 years af-

ter General Wedemeyer had been sent there to investigate. General Wedemeyer urgently had advised the White House to give Nationalist China moral and material support, and to send advisers to promote needed reforms in the Chinese Army. General Wedemeyer strongly recommended the only way of saving Manchuria from the Communists: To place it under a guardianship in accord with the United Nations Charter. The recommendation was shelved.

Curiously enough, while the White House was rejecting competent advice and misinterpreting the nature of the Communist peril in the Far East, the White House was advocating the policy establishing NATO in Europe. This the Republican 80th Congress avidly supported. But the Republican 80th Congress never lost sight of the Far East peril.

The entire foreign policy of the previous administration, however, was characterized by this one-sided view. It constantly fell into the Communist-designed trap of seeing the Communist peril with splintered vision, and never as a whole. NATO was important, but Asia was not. Red Russia was a menace, but Red China was not.

Today, as yesterday, the big difference between the approach of the Republicans and the approach of the Democratic advisory council is this: The Republicans see the Communist strategy globally; the advisory council spokesmen see it piecemeal. Thus, they respond with dangerous inconsistency.

For example, Dean Acheson of the advisory council, on the eve of President Eisenhower's departure on his recent good-will tour, afforded Pravda much propaganda material by criticizing any meeting or negotiation over Berlin. Yet, less than a year and a half ago, he called for the United States to abandon protection of the offshore island defenses of Formosa. Thus, he wanted total inflexibility in Europe, but total flexibility—flexibility amounting to retreat—in the Far East.

Let us further examine the dangers of this inconsistent approach, and further beware that such inconsistency does not create one of the terrifying conditions which could destroy the peace.

A few months before the outbreak of the Korean war, the American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, had publicly declared the limits which the United States would defend in the Far East. Korea was excluded. This was the green light for Communist aggression. Naturally, the subsequent commitment of U.S. troops to the defense of South Korea came as a surprise to the North Koreans.

Nevertheless, the Communists pursued the war, including even direct intervention by the Red Chinese. Had their pattern, which we discussed earlier, changed? Certainly not. But the United States played into the Communists' hands. They granted them a privileged sanctuary—that is, a war-making base in Manchuria which we would not attack.

After President Truman fired one of our great experts on the Far East, General MacArthur, an angry debate took place over the wisdom of allowing the Red Chinese this privileged sanctuary. President Truman's position in the debate announced to Soviet Russia that the doctrine of the privileged sanctuary would still shape the thinking of the White House, despite General MacArthur's warnings of its fallacies. The Communists seemingly could wage aggression indefinitely in Korea without the United States ever changing its defensive response. Our only hope appeared to be in electing a new administration. It is interesting to note that Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., today a Democratic advisory council panelist, has written a book, entitled "The General and the President," which, in effect, supports the privileged sanctuary concept.

This defensive response in Korea merely was one facet of a similar policy followed at that time by the United States throughout the world. This was known as the policy of containment. Its author was George Kennan; its proponents were President Truman and Dean Acheson, presently of the Democratic advisory council. Simply, it amounted to the concept that if you could draw and hold a defensive line around the Communist areas of the world the menace of communism would gradually liquidate itself.

That Maginot-line type of thinking played directly into Sino-Soviet hands. In the 7 years of Truman-Acheson policy, 600 million people were taken over by the Communists, without a single Russian soldier going to combat. Before the new administration took over in Washington, 125,000 Americans had become casualties in Korea, again without a single Russian soldier going to combat. And most of these enormous Communist advances were at a time when we virtually had an atomic monopoly.

Even more tragic, the reliance purely on containment spread to the moral and psychological realm—much to the Communists' delight. This explains why some Americans captured in the Korean war had difficulty in understanding what they were fighting for. The idea of a containment war, where we abdicate to the aggressor all advantages, was without parallel in American history.

THE REPUBLICAN RESPONSES TO THE SINO-SOVIET PERIL

Not until the election of Dwight Eisenhower was our defensive strategy changed. The armistice of July 1953 was produced by notifying the aggressor that the new administration would not tolerate a privileged sanctuary in Manchuria, and, to use Mr. Dulles' own words, that "the fighting might, to the aggressor's peril, soon spread beyond the limits and methods which he had selected."

And how has the peace been maintained since that armistice? Again, I quote Mr. Dulles: By putting the Communists on public notice that if they "violate the armistice and renew the aggression, the response of the United Nations command would not necessarily be confined to Korea."

The Red Chinese have continually tested this policy by threatening Quemoy and Matsu. Even though the President had inaugurated the policy, perhaps America could be divided, once the pressure was really applied. Fortunately, the administration saw that the only way to preserve the Far Eastern peace was to convince Red China that America was willing to defend Quemoy and Matsu if such an attack threatened the security of Formosa. Unfortunately, Democrat political candidates in the fall campaign tried to make voters jittery by destructive statements about the administration's policy of firmness on Quemoy and Matsu. On September 30, 1958, Mr. Stevenson, in a speech supporting a California senatorial candidate, advocated that the United States "get out and stay out" of those islands. He also pressed for Nationalist Chinese evacuation. In short, he wanted a Far East Munich.

It is entirely possible that such political irresponsibility could have convinced Red China that America would return to the doctrine of privileged sanctuary. And thus, Quemoy might be attacked with the same immunity that Korea supposedly could have been attacked in 1950.

Plainly, there is a sharp difference in the approach of the Democratic advisory council spokesmen and the approach of the Republicans to the problem of preserving peace. No wonder the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES] has commented that the 1958 Quemoy developments "persuaded many Democrats that the safest issues were the homespun ones such as highways, housing, and social security. Here, at least, they felt themselves to be on safe and familiar political ground."

My task in this speech of our series has been twofold: First, to outline the nature of the Sino-Soviet peril, and secondly, to review and contrast the responses of the two parties to that peril. In the introductory speech, the chairman of the Republican policy committee noted four qualities necessary for a political party to face the challenges of our age. They were party unity; party philosophy based on principle; party democracy; and party concern for future generations of Americans.

As to the degree of unity and coherent philosophy the other party possesses with regard to foreign policy, I again quote the gentleman from Connecticut:

> I sense a deep public uneasiness over the absence of an identifiable, predictable, realistic Democratic Party approach to the major issues of foreign affairs.

As to the representation within party organizations, I cannot believe that the expressions of members of the Democratic advisory council really meet the approval of responsible Democrats. Yet that council seems to determine the foreign policy thinking of that party.

Previous administration and the advisory council, more than often, and notably in their Far East diplomacy, responded to the Sino-Soviet peril with short-range, splintered vision.

In the next speech of the series, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will present seven dynamic spearheads to protect and advance our free society. During this decade Republicans propose

to use these spearheads of foreign policy and national security to meet the Communist challenge, to preserve the peace with justice, and to expand freedom throughout the world.

THE LATE ALBERT J. ENGEL, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I call to the attention of the House the recent death of former Congressman Albert J. Engel, Sr., who served with great distinction in this body from 1935 to 1950.

Albert Engel died on December 3, 1959, several weeks after he was seriously injured in an unfortunate automobile accident which occurred not far from his Christmas tree farm near Lake City, Mich.

Mr. Engel's death ended a varied and distinguished career. He was born January 1, 1888, in New Washington, Ohio, and attended public schools there until he was 12, when he left his studies to work as a lumberjack.

At 16, he ran a logging locomotive on a lumber woods railway in Grand Traverse County, Mich., until the company learned about his age and released him.

He completed that summer earning $75 with a threshing crew, took the money to Chicago, lodged at the YMCA and enrolled in high school. Working at a succession of jobs, he graduated from high school, entered Northwestern University, and received his bachelor of laws degree there in 1910.

He returned to Michigan and to Lake City, setting up a law practice. He entered politics with his election as Missaukee County prosecutor in 1916, but interrupted his first and only term by going to war. During World War I, he served on the staff of Gen. John J. Pershing in France, and left the service with the rank of captain.

Mr. Engel retained his interest in politics and was elected to the Michigan State Senate in 1921.

His election to the Michigan Senate opened a political career that was to continue virtually without interruption for 29 years. He compiled an outstanding record in the senate, to which he was elected and served in 1921, 1922, and 1927–32.

In 1934, he was elected to Congress from the Ninth Michigan District, and served in that office for 16 years. Mr. Engel retired from Congress in 1950.

Albert Engel was a man of color, courage, vision, and conviction. He earned national acclaim and universal respect as the result of his one-man crusade against boondoggling and irresponsible spending during World War II. Although he stepped hard on military toes here and in farflung parts parts of the world, the walls of his Lake City home are covered with photographs bearing the tributes of great generals and admirals—including President Eisenhower, General Bradley, Admiral Nimitz, General Arnold, and many others.

A vigoroous foe of waste in military expenditures and a dedicated "watchdog" as member—and one-time chairman—of the House Armed Forces Appropriations Subcommittee, he saved the U.S. Treasury—and the taxpayers—many, many millions of dollars.

After he retired from politics, Mr. Engel was content to shun the public spotlight, but he continued working with the same zeal and energy at managing the Engelwood Plantation, which he soon developed into one of Michigan's largest tree farms, on 1,500 acres of once-abandoned Missaukee County land.

His retirement hobby soon became a big and successful business. What it lacked in political color, it made up in real values. The farm has tree plantings now numbering 1,100,000—a significant contribution to the effort to restore Michigan to its once-proud position as a timber empire.

Albert Engel was one of the most dynamic figures in public office for a quarter of a century. To him, public service was a challenge every hour of every day.

He held the same basic beliefs when he retired from Congress that he took with him when he entered the House in January 1935. It has been appropriately said that during his eight terms he changed Washington much more than Washington ever changed him.

Mr. Speaker, Albert Engel was a great American who left an indelible mark on the pages of history. Michigan and the Nation have lost a distinguished statesman.

At the time of his death, Albert Engel left behind him his wife; a son, Albert J. Engel, Jr., who was a law school classmate and a close friend of mine; and two daughters, Mrs. Robert L. Cavanaugh, of Dayton, Ohio, and Mrs. James H. Strahle, of South Bend, Ind.; a sister, Mrs. Harold Taylor, of Bay Village, Ohio; and eight grandchildren. To Mrs. Engel and the family, I wish to extend my deep sympathy in the great loss which has been theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members of the House have permission for 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, all Michiganites and all older Members of this House were saddened recently by the death of an old and dear friend, former Representative Albert J. Engel, of Michigan. I enjoyed a long and warm friendship with Al Engel. All who knew him were somehow better for knowing such a fine person.

Al Engel and I always ran life's race along parallel paths. We were born little more than a year apart. We both completed school and were admitted to the bar within 2 years of each other. We were both elected to our first Congress at the same time. That was the 74th Congress, and, if memory serves correctly, we arrived in Washington on the same day in January 1935. That day began a long and fruitful congressional career during which Representative Engel served his district, his State, and his Nation with dignity and distinction. As a legislator, he was a man of high ability, boundless energy, and deep sense of duty. I shall never forget how he traveled thousands of miles, to all parts of this country, driving his own car at great personal expense and inconvenience and minimum cost to the Government, to inspect Army posts in connection with his committee post. This was his type of devotion.

I have also had the privilege on many occasions to work closely with Al Engel on various projects. It was Al Engel and I, working together, who were successful in getting the first veterans' facility built in the State of Michigan. This was the Veterans' Hospital in Dearborn; and to all who know of it or who have used it, this hospital should stand as a lasting monument to the untiring efforts Albert Engel always put forth for the people of his home State.

In the passing of Albert Engel the State of Michigan, and the Nation as well, have lost a good friend, a devoted public servant, and an eminent citizen. I know that all the Members of the House will join with me in extending to his family the deepest sympathy. They may be forever proud of the name they carry forward.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the senior member of the Republican delegation, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigin. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to Congress in January of 1935, with Republicans Albert Engel, Fred Crawford, Henry Kimball, William Blackney, and Earl Michener, who had been defeated in the previous election but returned in 1935, who represented the district now represented by GEORGE MEADER.

Michigan Republican Representatives already here at that time were Carl Mapes, of the 5th District; George Dondero, of the 17th; Jesse Wolcott, of the 7th; and Roy Woodruff, of the 10th. They were all at or near the top on the important standing committees on which they served.

The delegation was a close-knit one, working together.

From the day he came to Washington until he retired, Albert Engel was a personal friend, never missing an opportunity to be helpful.

Our colleague had long served in our State senate, where, because of his ability and his energy, his attention to his official duties, he was one of our leaders. Because of the qualifications he had demonstrated in the Michigan Senate, he immediately was accepted by the older Members in Congress, not only as an able colleague, but as one who could and would—as he subsequently did—render exceptional service to the party as well as to the country.

Because Albert Engel had had wide experience in the Michigan Legislature, because he was an able and aggressive lawyer, because of his self-sacrificing services as a Member of the House, and because of his character, Albert was exceptionally helpful to those who served here with him.

Engel was a wizard with figures. He was a productive worker.

The lack of fear which he had exhibited as a combat soldier in World War I remained with him as a Congressman. He was not only fearless in investigations, but, with his experience as a trial lawyer, his personal knowledge of how a dollar was earned, and his native vigor, he carried on independent, effective investigations on his own, and at a cost to the Government so low that some others, not only in the executive, but in the legislative, branch of the Government, were envious and, sometimes, because he had set a pattern of efficiency and economy, somewhat resentful.

His investigations were effective, in part, because he was on his own. In part, because he was unhampered by others who were dragging their feet.

He had no personal interests of his own to serve.

It followed as a matter of course that he was fair and effective.

He pursued a policy of getting out in the morning, getting into his own automobile, doing his own driving, going into a production plant with and when the workmen went in. To a very large extent, he was one of the workers. Seldom, if ever, was he suspected of being an investigator or a Congressman. He would go through a plant; he knew what he had seen; and he recognized either inefficiency or waste for what it was.

His information came to him firsthand from those who were doing the work, not from the swivel chair boys whom he often embarrassed by his accurate knowledge of what was transpiring, but unrecognized in their own department.

His personal experience gave him an insight which many other Members did not possess. He knew the value of a dollar, and he knew just how many a task in a production plant should be performed. He knew where to find and how to lessen waste and inefficiency, and his report on either was understood by his colleagues.

He not only called attention to practices which were wasteful or inefficient, but he came up with many suggestions as to how a saving could be made, an operation more effectively performed.

He never, in his investigations, prejudged the situation. He weighed the evidence. But when he reached a conclusion, there never was any doubt as to his views.

Whether he voluntarily retired, or in part because he found it impossible to get greater results toward economy and efficiency, or in part because he was urged to become a candidate for Governor of his State or because he wished to retire to private life, I have no way of knowing.

Recently, talking with his son, Albert, Jr., I was told that his father had become somewhat discouraged because he could not see immediate fulfillment of the objectives for which he was striving. This was difficult for Albert Engel, Sr., but he was never a quitter. If he was discouraged with what was happening here, he but foresaw much of the future, for the inefficiency and the ruinous waste, the excessive waste, against which he fought, is still with us—and, unfortunately, in a greater degree than when he was here.

When a candidate, Albert received the wholehearted support of the AFL and of many other labor organizations. I have a distinct and regretful recollection of the fact that some Members of the House were critical because of his vote on some measures. They forgot that Albert represented the views of his constituency on any and all occasions when those views did not, in his opinion, interfere with the welfare of the Republic. During the time he served his Nation so ably and so effectively, he represented and gave effective support to the overwhelming sentiment of his district.

When he voluntarily retired, I am certain that the Members of the House felt a personal loss, as did your humble servant. When recently he passed away, we lost a personal friend; his district lost a vigorous, determined, and able American. His family lost an ideal husband and father.

If reward beyond the grave is based on unselfish service rendered here below, Albert Engel's place has already been made secure.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of Hon. Albert J. Engel who represented the Ninth District of Michigan from 1934 to 1950 with distinction.

It was my pleasure to serve with Albert Engel the entire time he was in Congress. He was dedicated to his work, eager to render every assistance possible, and always fair in his dealings with others. He was a man of courage, true to his convictions, and was highly respected by everyone who knew him. He was a tried and true friend, a splendid citizen, and outstanding Congressman and great American.

I mourn his passing and I wish to extend to his family my profound sympathy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of Albert J. Engel at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and others in paying tribute to the memory of Albert H. Engel. Mr. Engel and I were first elected to Congress at the same time back in 1934. For many years Mr. Engel and I, and we always called him Al, worked together on military appropriations. At one time when the Republicans were in control of the House, Mr. Engel was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. Regardless of the party in power, at the time, Al Engel was always a dominant and influential force in defense activity in Congress. He was a strong man, a fearless man, and indefatigable worker. He was not partisan in his outlook. He had great influence on military appropriations during his service in Congress and his influence was always directed toward economy, efficiency, and military preparedness. One of the interesting chapters in the life of Al Engel has to do with the development of the atomic bomb through the Manhattan project in World War II. Al Engel went along with funds for the project but not until he became satisfied in his own mind that the gamble was worth taking. When the Secretary of War, Henry Stimson, came to the Capitol one day in May 1945 to report on the progress on the Manhatton project he asked five members of the Appropriations Committee to accompany General Groves on a trip to Oak Ridge, Tenn., for a firsthand observation of accomplishments and a report on the Manhattan project. Mr. Engel was one of the five. This was one of the rich and significant experiences of our departed friend.

It seems hard to believe that this rugged man has passed away. When he left Congress about 10 years ago, he left with the respect and good will of the Members who had served with him. I mourn the passing of Al Engel. He wrought well for his country during his lifetime and he left a heritage which his family can always treasure. I pay tribute to the memory of a departed friend, and I express deep sympathy to the fine family which he has left behind.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Albert Engel, of Michigan, was elected to Congress in 1934 and he served practically 20 years. He was a member of the Appropriations Committee almost all of that time. He was about the best hand at figures that I have ever known. He went out into the field himself and investigated the operations of the Army and brought back his reports in the most complete manner of anybody that I have ever known. Because he found out just what was needed, he was able to cut out a lot of unnecessary items from the bills and reduce the appropriations that were presented to him for action. Few if any Members of the House worked harder and more effectively than he did. He had the absolute confidence of the House of Representatives.

I am extremely sorry to see him pass away, but we all can be thankful that we had such a fine colleague.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Albert Engel. Albert Engel was an outstanding Member of this body for many years. I recall before I came to Congress of reading an article in one of our leading news magazines about Albert, the one-man investigating committee. He served on the Appropriations Committee and few have been better watchdogs of expenditures than Albert Engel. This Nation has lost a constructive American and, with my colleagues, I wish to extend my sympathies to the family.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], in expressing regret over the death of our former colleague and friend, the late Albert J. Engel, who so ably represented the Ninth District of Michigan for many years.

It was my privilege to have been associated with Al Engel during the first years of my service here and I remember

his helpful and friendly advice to me as a new Member of Congress. Al Engel was a sincere and dedicated Member of Congress and worked early and late for the benefit of his district and his country. I recall in particular the outstanding service he rendered as a one-man investigating committee looking into waste and extravagance in the Department of Defense during World War II. Through his efforts, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, millions of dollars in needless expenditures were saved. I would like to join with others in paying tribute to his memory and expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened when I learned of the passing of Albert Engel. I wish to join my colleagues from Michigan in paying tribute to his memory.

I had great respect and admiration for Albert Engel. When I came to the House he was one of our most active and diligent Members. He worked untiringly as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, and was looked upon as a one-man investigating committee. I have never seen any Member of this House work harder than Albert Engel did in his effort to eliminate waste and extravagance, and to protect the taxpayers of this country.

One of my first contacts with Albert was on Inauguration Day in 1941. I stood on the Capitol steps and watched the inaugural parade with him. I was deeply impressed with his familiarity with every piece of military equipment and every type of weapon in the parade. In many instances he knew the cost of the same.

I considered it a great privilege to serve wtih Albert Engel in this House. His passing is a great loss to this Nation. We need more men like Albert Engel in public life today.

I extend my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there are many of our colleagues whom we remember long after they have left this House.

Albert J. Engel served in the House of Representatives from the Ninth Michigan District from 1934 to 1950. From 1942 on, it was my privilege to know Al, and my esteem for him grew with the years.

When he rose to speak, I listened attentively, for he was always thoroughly prepared on his subject. His arguments for or against a certain measure were most dependable, and were of great help to us in the formulation of our own opinions.

It was my belief that overwork in behalf of his constituents and the Nation was responsible in part for the loss of his eyesight. For Representative Engel was not one to rely on the research of others. He had to see for himself.

When blindness closed the curtains on the world around him, he did not despair. With the dauntless spirit that was so concerned with helping others, he traveled the country in behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars when his congressional career was over.

Though he has been gone from this House since 1950, the news of his death has saddened those of us who recall the best years of his life that he gave with such conscientious devotion to the welfare of his country.

We are grateful to his memory for the high standard of public service that he set before us.

We send our condolences to his relatives, and to the larger family of constituents and veterans, for whom he made so many personal sacrifices because he believed in them.

Former Representative Albert J. Engel was a good and faithful public servant who surely earned the reward of eternal happiness.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the death last December of Albert Engel, a former colleague and close friend. We served together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years, and his dedicated and untiring service as a member of the committee during the crises of World War II was an inspiration to all of us. His personal contribution to the defense of our country began with his service in the Army during World War I. Thereafter he dedicated his life's work to public service in the Michigan State Senate, and subsequently in the Congress of the United States.

It is a privilege to join in paying this tribute to the memory of a distinguished Member of the House. My heartfelt sympathy is extended to Mrs. Engel and their children.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the death of Hon. Albert J. Engel, who ably represented the Ninth District of Michigan for a period of 16 years, from 1934 to 1950. Those of us who had the privilege of serving with him remember him as an aggressive, conscientious, hard-working Member. He was devoted to the work of the Committee on Appropriations, on which he served with great distinction. He traveled thousands of miles and made many investigations in the hope he could be responsible for savings.

His first public service was as a prosecuting attorney of his home county in Michigan. He had a fine record of service to his country in time of war, having served overseas in France and Germany for 23 months in the First World War.

Michigan and the Nation have lost a dedicated patriot. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their great bereavement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Albert Engel was one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives when he served here from 1934 to 1950 as the Congressman from the Ninth District of Michigan.

The invaluable service which he performed as a member of the Committee on Appropriations is well known, and the recognition he has received in this respect is well deserved.

I specifically want to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend and able colleague, BOB GRIFFIN, who now represents the Ninth District of Michigan. Al Engel's devotion to duty, his respect for the truth, and his effectiveness in obtaining results made him a leader in the House of Representatives.

Personally, I have always been appreciative of Al Engel's assistance to me in the early years of my membership in the House. I was grateful for his competent advice and counsel, and most appreciative of his efforts in securing for me an appointment to the Committee on Appropriations. When he decided to retire from the House of Representatives, Al resigned from that committee when it had completed its work on the budget for that year, and urged my appointment as his successor. This assignment eventually was made and it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations since Mr. Engel left the House. This specific kindness and personal consideration of Al Engel for me will never be forgotten.

I want to compliment Representative BOB GRIFFIN on his eulogy of Albert Engel. We know that "the past is prolog," and that on the solid foundations a more stately structure is erected. Albert Engel built well, so that his successors could stand and work on a firm foundation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I learn with deepest regret of the death of former Congressman Engel, of Michigan. He was one of the historic men of the House and served with distinction on the Committee on Appropriations in the Second War Congresses.

He was one of the most indefatigable men I have ever known and during the war years examined every bill pertaining to appropriations for the armed service with meticulous care. He accepted nothing proposed by the departments at face value until he had examined and explored every detail and could discuss it from a matter of personal knowledge.

He was a member of the committee of five, consisting of Engel, of Michigan; Snider, of Pennsylvania; Taber, of New York; Mahon, of Texas; and myself. It was he who first questioned an item of $800 million sequestered in one of the larger appropriations and for which no explanation was included in the justifications.

When the representatives of the Department declined to explain specifically the purpose for which the money was to be spent the committee refused to approve the appropriation. It was then that the general in charge finally said we were in a race with German scientists on a secret project and if they first solved the problem Germany would win the war in spite of anything we could do and if we solved the problem first we would win regardless of anything Germany could do.

On that basis the subcommittee of five included in the bill, and subsequent bills, large amounts until 2 years later we had appropriated over $2 billion without knowing the purpose for which it was being spent. Eventually the A-bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and the war was ended and the unorthodox procedure of the subcommittee was belatedly justified.

Mr. Engel probably contributed more time and study to the war appropriations than any other member of the subcommittee and his services to the committee and the country were invaluable.

He was great in life and is great in death and the Nation can never fully repay the debt of appreciation we owe him. Peace to his honored ashes.

INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the President has renewed his request that we permit the ceiling on interest rates on long-term Government bonds—that is, bonds having a maturity date of 5 years or longer—to be removed. To put it another way, he asks that we permit rates higher than 4¼ percent to be paid. This question was discussed at substantial length in these Chambers last year between June and August and a vote was had on the measure. At the conclusion of that debate, the Congress did not accede to the request.

During the course of that debate, many suggestions as to other, and I believe better, alternatives were made. Notwithstanding that discussion and those proposals, we are again given the same recommendation. We are given that recommendation without any review or analysis of the alternatives that might be employed to accomplish the administration's purposes. I think it proper, therefore, that at the outset of this session of Congress there again be a review of these alternatives.

I rise this afternoon to open that public debate and to request that the administration favor not only the Congress but the country with a complete review of these alternatives, in order that we might make our judgments with knowledge of all the alternatives.

But before discussing these alternatives, I think we might do well to line out the areas of basic agreement.

First. We are all opposed to inflation. We recognize that the health of the American economy depends upon the willingness of savers and investors to use long-term debt. Our housing industry, our corporate growth, our utility expansion depend in significant part upon the willingness of business and individuals to undertake long-term contracts. Such contracts are endangered if there is a loss of confidence in the value of the dollar.

We also oppose inflation because it has its heaviest effects upon the weakest part of our society. The aged living on fixed incomes, the unorganized workers, the civil servants, the holders of savings and insurance policies—these are the persons most hurt by inflation.

Finally, we all oppose inflation because we recognize that the dollar is an international currency, that trade contracts around the world would be greatly damaged if there were to be any doubt as to the security and safety of the dollar. So we are agreed that we oppose inflation.

Second. We are agreed that we must express our concern to fight inflation in a tangible fashion. We should make it clear to all of our citizens, both labor and business, and to foreigners, that we are determined to avoid inflation, to protect the dollar, and to preserve confidence in it. We may differ as to the form of this action but we are agreed on the principle.

Third. We are agreed that we want an expanding economy. We want economic growth which is commensurate both with our population increase and our technological advance. We may disagree as to the adequacy of the rate of growth which has taken place in the recent past, but we certainly agree it is necessary for a prosperous nation to have growth.

May I note parenthetically that the administration has a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, the so-called Nixon Committee, whereas the Democratic position calls for economic growth for price stabilization. Economic growth should have a prior claim; it is not the end of a stabilization policy but rather its beginning.

The question is not whether the Government can pay more than 4¼ percent. They can pay anything they need to on bonds which have a maturity of less than 5 years, and they are now paying 5 percent. The question is whether we should permit the Treasury to undertake long-term contracts at the peak of our interest rate cycle or whether we should say to them, "Until the interest rate falls to some more realistic and reasonable long-term level, we suggest you get along with short-term contracts."

Certainly a prudent businessman would not undertake long-term debt commitments at the highest rate in history. He would try to get along if he could with short-term credit and make his long-term commitments when he had a more favorable market facing him. Why the Government should now offer to be imprudent is, I confess, hard for me to understand.

The administration says they want to be able to compete in the long-term market instead of in the short-term market because somehow, in their opinion, it is more inflationary to sell short-term bonds than long-term bonds. I think for the sake of the record it is well to make it clear that the fundamental distinction in economic logic and experience is not short- versus long-term but rather to whom does the Government sell bonds. If the bonds are sold to individuals and nonbank corporations, in other words to those who have in fact saved the money, the loans are noninflationary.

If the bonds, whether short or long, are placed in the hands of the banks they are not necessarily inflationary, but they create the potential of inflation because the banks can then use the bonds, by sale to the Federal Reserve, to build up their own reserves against which they might make larger loans. But the Federal Reserve, as we shall see, has adequate means to deal with that.

Before we permit the Federal Government to enter the long-term bond market at this time, the administration ought to speak up forcefully and tell us that what they will be doing is to shrink still further the long-term funds now available for housing. They should tell us that the United States will still further compete in the long-term market with State and local governments, whose own needs for long-term loans are aggravated by administration policies recommended in the recent budget message which neglect the needs for aid to education. They should tell us that they intend to compete with public utilities which must also borrow for their growth in the long-term market.

Now what the administration, in the name of attacking price increases, is asking us is this: "We are asking you, the Congress, to confirm a price increase for money not for a short period of years but for a long period of years so that we may burden down the next generation with the costs of the heavy interest now prevailing." For this doubtful benefit, we are asked to mortgage the future for 20, 30, or 40 years. And the administration assures me it has no intention of protecting the taxpayer by making such high-interest bonds callable.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to discover that my estimate of last year as to the cost of interest on the public debt was too low. You will recall that last year the budget message estimated the interest payments at $8.1 billion.

You will further recall the June message when the President requested a larger appropriation for interest. In effect he said, "Oh, by the way, I will need an extra $500 million because the interest burden will be $8.6 billion, not $8.1 billion." I then took the floor to estimate that the interest expense for the fiscal year 1960 was more likely to be $9 billion. And I find in the budget message yesterday that it is now estimated at $9,385 million. This is an increase of $1.2 billion burden on the taxpayers simply to meet the interest payments which the administration has encouraged by the policies it has been using.

So, Mr. Speaker, before we come to the conclusion that we need to engage in cooperating with the Treasury's proposals for long-term high interest bonds, let us examine the alternatives. Let us invite the administration to examine the alternatives not just privately but publicly. Let us know by what logic they come to their conclusions, so that before we join with them in that conclusion, we know how they arrived at it. I suspect that if we review the alternatives, we may reach the same conclusion we reached last year, namely, that there are better alternatives.

Certainly, the increase in interest rates over the past several years has not successfully fought inflation. The consumer price index continues to rise. Moreover, the basic problem is not just inflation, it is that we need a rapidly

growing economy because of our population increase and our new technology. A rapidly growing economy demands a large amount of capital. At the moment, the demand for capital exceeds the supply, both from savings and from the increased money supply that the Federal Reserve System provides. We may wish to quarrel with the Federal Reserve as to whether they have made adequate provision to increase the money supply, but that is not the central issue.

Basically, we need an adequate supply of capital and we need a system of making judgments as to what are the priorities among the claimants or among the would-be borrowers. We must recognize that high interest rates are simply a form of rationing money. Lenders give it to those who will pay the highest price. But this kind of rationing has an effect which is frequently offensive to the country and to the Congress. As a result, we have many special provisions of law to exempt the veterans, the aged, the colleges, REA's and other groups from some of the adverse effects of high interest.

I regret to note that the President's budget message for 1961 asks us to repeal, one by one, what slight protection we have given to these weaker sections of the community. Evidently the administration prefers to expose such groups to all of the rigors of an impersonal high-interest market. Such action will, unhappily, have consequences that Congress did not intend. Many will have no real chance to borrow at all. The administration cannot escape responsibility for these consequences of their action by saying they did not intend these consequences because, if they did not intend harm, we might ask what choices they could have made which would have gotten the consequences desired.

If we want an adequate supply of housing, if we want an adequate number of colleges and of elementary and secondary classrooms, how can we best get these consequences? This is the question, it seems to me, that both the administration and we must face. We call upon them to give us a renewed statement of the alternatives. But let me now briefly summarize in broad outline some of the alternatives.

BUDGET POLICY

First, let us look at the budget policy. We welcome the present budget surplus. The receipt of taxes in excess of expenditures promises a reduction of the public debt. The moneys thus returned can be used to meet other heavy demands by other borrowers, and this should have a helpful effect in increasing the supply of funds to meet demands upon the money market.

It would be sound budget policy, though not proposed by the administration, to pay for more of our public capital outlays out of taxes rather than out of borrowings. This is particularly a problem for State and local governments, because they face a growing burden in the years ahead. Their tax systems are not equal to the demands and do not provide revenues equal to needed outlays.

I regret to find that the President has recommended that we encourage State and local governments to indulge in additional borrowings to supply schools, as though in the years thereafter we would not again have to build even more schools. I remind him that the children entering schools today are the children of the young persons born during the depression years when children born to families formed out of the war year classes start to school, there will be a tremendous further increase in the demand for public schools. This period is only a few years away. We should not be mortgaged to the hilt when we enter it. Yet the administration would have us mortgage the future for another 20 years to build schools needed now. I am unable to see how this is a wise budget policy, or consistent with sound practice. I would rather pay for more of the schools needed today out of current taxes, including a suitable share out of the Federal tax structure, because it has greater strength than the State and local tax structures have.

Congress tried last year, and by veto was denied an opportunity even to make loans to build additional college classrooms, even though the Nation must double its college classrooms in 12 years to take care of the visible need. That demand can be estimated accurately.

On the tax side of the budget, we ought to close tax loopholes. In this regard, I am hopeful the Ways and Means Committee will go beyond the budget message. I welcome the budget suggestion of an increased amount of money for tax-collection purposes, because the money spent on improved tax collections will pay for itself many times in additional revenue. It will pay off in public acceptance. A citizen does not mind paying his taxes if everybody pays equally, but he resents paying taxes if he feels many are permitted to escape taxes because of careless tax enforcement.

Let us turn to the expenditure side of the budget. It may be that we could reduce unproductive outlays. We have heard about unification of the Armed Forces. If this were effectively pressed, great savings could be made.

If we could get the administration to adopt budget, monetary, and credit policies which would reduce interest rates, there are at least $3 billion in this year's budget for interest expense that could be used for more constructive purposes.

Or if we could get the administration to go along with the Congress on a modification of the farm program which would move from the acreage allotment to the marketing quota system, and let the farmers hold their own surplus crops in storage, we might get the Government out of the storage business which it is now in, without hurting the farmers. That is the system being used in Canada with great success. I recommend that it be examined.

CREDIT POLICY

What might be done to improve credit policy? First of all, we should seek to increase savings. Most of our savings are made by contracts. When a man buys a house and assumes a mortgage, each payment against that mortgage is a savings payment. The repayment of that debt is in fact savings. Let us accelerate the repayment of debt by using shorter periods of amortization. This could be done without burdening the homebuyer if he could get lower rates of interest in the money market. The same amount of monthly payment would then permit a larger amount to be treated as savings and a smaller amount as interest.

A more generous depreciation or obsolescence writeoff policy in our tax laws would permit the kind of savings that is useful in expanding our capital outlays. It would permit a quicker capital recovery by business firms, and these sums promote expansion. But if we do this we should also revise our capital gains tax treatment so that it does not become favoritism for a few, and a new tax loophole.

Let us turn from the supply side of the credit market to the demand side. We could pay for more of our public capital out of taxes, as we are doing with Federal aid for State highways, or by using part of our budget surplus in this manner. This would reduce demand, as would the more generous tax policies suggested. But let us look especially at the consumer credit policy. The administration certainly ought to undertake a more complete statement on the question of consumer credit controls than they have given us up to this point. Consumer credit has been the biggest single inflationary force in our Nation in the past 10 months. There has been, last year, a $6 billion increase in consumer credit. Remember that the terms of the credit are not merely interest, but they are also downpayment, amortization period, and eligibility of the borrower. If we were to tighten up on the amortization period we could achieve a better effect than we could by merely raising the interest rate, because the consumer does not ask what the interest rate is. Instead, he asks, "What is the monthly payment?" This can best be effected by changing the allowable amortization periods.

To be unresponsive to the inflationary impact of consumer credit is throwing away one of the best antirecession weapons we have.

We know there are business cycles on fluctuations, and when we look at the situation in terms of consumer credit we know that generous consumer credit is the quickest working antirecession measure we have. But if during a period of expansion the consumers are given he most generous credit possible, then there is no further relief that can be given in a recession.

The administration is ignoring the inflationary effect of much of the present expansion of consumer credit. Consumers are really borrowing tomorrow's income for today's consumption. This is certainly not sound credit policy; it is very dubious economics; we are simply putting off paying the piper until tomorrow. It is something else again to

encourage the expansion of credit for the accumulation of capital goods.

Summarizing, we might help alleviate the present situation by reducing the demands for money by making it possible for State and local governments to meet more of their needs through grants-in-aid rather than by encouraging more borrowing, and by greater attention to the terms of consumer credit.

MONETARY POLICY

I invite the Federal Reserve to take another look at its kit of tools. Consider first its use of the open market policy. Currently they will only buy and sell securities having a maturity of less than 1 year. They appear to ignore their obligation to provide an orderly market for Government securities. Their policies may well have caused many would-be buyers of Government securities to be hesitant before buying long-term Government securities. In face of the long upward drift of interest rates, one cannot be certain of many buyers at 5 percent, for what assurance have they that rates would not go to 6 or 7 percent? Thus the administration's policy which is also the Federal Reserve Board's policy, is in fact weakening the market for long-term Government bonds. This matter deserves far greater concern than it is getting currently. With an orderly market for Government bonds there should be a relatively stable interest rate. The Government should not give up its concern for the security which the buyer has when he buys a long-term Government bond.

The open market policy must be a part of the whole program for adequate economic expansion without inflation. Moreover, we should use the open market policy to expand the supply of money rather than using the technique the Federal Reserve does of lowering reserve requirements. But the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] will talk more about that in a little bit. Suffice it to say here that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have shown disregard of the burden on the taxpayers in the policy they have been following.

The Congress has provided them with other legal alternatives, and we invite them to reexamine their use.

The Federal Reserve has almost ignored the use of "reserve policy" as a device for encouraging bankers to use good credit judgment without the necessity for controls.

The administration has largely ignored the possibility of integrating the monetary and credit policies of the Government lending agencies in an effort to help keep the supply and demand for money within reasonable bounds of each other.

Direct Government loans, many of which we are being asked to abandon by the President, represent an attempt to protect certain sectors in the market from the adverse effects of the policies new being pursued. Either we have a set of priorities for the use of capital or we have not. Either we have a purpose for the nature of our society or we have not. These laws represent a concern for priorities that the administration apparently does not share.

It seems to me that both the administration and the Congress are responsible for the consequences, both of their action and of their inaction. To recommend inaction because you are unwilling to face the hard decisions that action requires is not a way to be relieved of responsibility for the consequences. I trust that Congress will not abandon the aged, the veterans, the small businessmen, or the REA's in response to the administration's recommendations, for these tend to drive them out of the market altogether, and to cut them completely off from the supply of capital.

PRICE POLICY

I have not yet discussed price policies. Certainly, the fact is that most of our inflation is not a demand inflation. It is largely an administered price inflation. The administration should be discussing with us the necessity for more widespread growth as a means to lower prices. A higher volume of output creates lower unit costs, so that even lower prices will still permit the same or greater profits.

The administration ought to be recommending more vigorous antitrust programs. The administration ought to be recommending a further reduction in the tariffs to increase competition in the American market and to encourage increases in productivity. The administration ought to be consulting with both labor and management on the necessity to increase productivity and to lower the unit costs and thus lower prices. The administration ought to be examining the market behavior of steel companies, and manufacturers, and other areas where the price behavior in recent years would suggest some of the real pressures for inflation.

Let us review all of these alternatives and see whether we cannot agree on a set of policies which would provide, at lower interest rates, a better base for an expanding economy without inflation.

I have great confidence in the American business and enterprise system. I am convinced that the American businessman and the American worker, and all American citizens, can take the hard truth. The citizen is willing to face tough decisions, but he needs straightforward discussion of the alternatives and not an intellectual pabulum of predigested economic mush which feeds him the simple conclusion that all we can do, or need to do, is to raise interest rates, that there are no better alternatives.

But, we must make it clear, Mr. Speaker, in whatever we do, that the public policy adopted by the Congress in the Employment Act of 1946 remains the policy of the Congress and the administration. That policy, you will recall, was to assure that we will promote and maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Certainly, if we are to expect significant improvements in productivity on the part of labor, significant expansion on the part of management in greater investment, then both sides must have the assurance that we really mean to maintain full employment. We are all opposed to inflation. We all favor expansion. We all want a program that will give us adequate expansion without inflation.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must object to the oversimplification which we have been given, especially during the past 8 months. We insist that the whole community must understand the full dimensions of our problem. We call upon the administration to review with us the full panoply of policies which might provide us with the kind of economy that we all say we want, a rapidly expanding economy, one which extends and gives us a higher standard of living, which makes it easier for us to meet all our obligations, both domestic and foreign, without inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for his very discerning plea to the administration to reexamine some of its economic policies to see whether it is not possible to evolve a set of policies which, while being adequately anti-inflationary, will bring about a lower interest rate structure, and thus speed us on our way to national growth.

Last summer the President, in the name of fighting inflation, requested Congress to repeal the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on U.S. bonds which has been in effect since 1918.

This House refused to do so. The vote on the question came as close to being a straight party vote as any during the session. The Democrats, the traditional party of low interest rates and economic growth, almost to a man stood fast against this attempt to saddle the administration's high interest rates on the next generation. The Republicans, the traditional party of high interest rates, though it means economic stagnation, voted almost to a man in favor of raising the interest rate ceiling.

Happily for the country, the Democrats prevailed, and the President's request was turned down. Equally fortunately, the full debate on the subject of the interest ceiling gave both parties a chance to state their views extensively.

The Republican position was that the 4¼ percent ceiling was somehow inflationary. When asked for a bill of particulars why it was inflationary, about all the administration could come up with was this: The ceiling prevents the sale of long-term bonds at present, and the higher the percentage of long-term bonds outstanding, the better. It is perfectly true that long-terms do not come due so frequently—possibly just at the time when interest rates are high.

But this is surely no reason to issue long terms at a time, like now, when interest rates have been forced to a 30-year high. During the years after 1953, no serious effort was made to lengthen the term of the national debt when interest rates were low. In fact, the average length of the debt has declined from 5 years and 8 months in 1952, to less than 4 years and 7 months today. Having missed one opportunity of the low-interest years, it is ironic to be hell-bent on issuing long-terms when interest rates are high.

The Democratic position, by and large, came down to this: We had no objection to lifting the 4¼ percent interest ceiling, provided the administration was willing at least to make a good faith effort to put its economic house in order. Unless this was done, we Democrats felt, the administration would be able to market vast amounts of long-term U.S. bonds, bearing interest coupons of 5 percent, 6 percent, 7 percent, 8 percent, or whatever percentage they could put on them, and thus place a 30-year mortgage on an entire new generation of taxpayers.

It is bad enough for the Treasury to be paying 5 percent interest, as it now is, on its short-term obligations. These at least come due shortly, and if and when a Democratic administration takes over in January 1961, and the present high interest-rate policy is thus abandoned, new securities can be issued at reasonable interest rates. But to allow the present administration, with its misguided fiscal, monetary, and economic policies, to exceed the 4¼ percent ceiling, would be to allow it to project the consequences of these misguided policies for a generation in the future.

The administration, as the debate showed, failed to keep its economic house in order in five main ways, so far as the 4¼ percent interest ceiling was concerned:

First. By its sloppy fiscal practices—making a sieve out of our tax system with special interest loopholes, and thus running deficit after deficit.

Second. By its irresponsible inaction in the face of administered price increases in the concentrated industries.

Third. By its continued adherence to the doctrinaire bills only policy, with disastrous effects upon sound debt management.

Fourth. By its stubborn refusal to give the taxpayers a break—through reductions in the cost of carrying the national debt—through use of open market purchases as the means of expanding the money supply.

Fifth. By its opposition to standby controls over consumer credit.

Each of these five shortcomings has tended to raise unnecessarily the interest rate in general, and on the national debt in particular. Let us look at them:

First. Fiscal sloppiness: For some years the administration has been fighting inflation almost entirely by monetary policy—raising interest rates—and not at all by fiscal policy—running a genuine budgetary surplus in prosperous times, then using this surplus to retire portions of the national debt and thus bring down interest rates.

For fiscal 1958, the administration estimated a budget surplus of $1.8 billion. In fact, the year showed a deficit of $2.8 billion. For fiscal 1959, the administration estimated a budget surplus of $500 million. What actually occurred was a deficit of $12.5 billion.

It is very easy for the administration to talk big, when it presents its budget, about the nice surplus that it is going to have. As long as it persists in continuing loopholes in the tax structure, and special-interest giveaways on the expenditure side, these estimates of budgetary surpluses tend to be mirages.

Some years ago back in Milwaukee, we had an old reprobate who solved the problem of giving to the Community Chest in a unique way. Each year, when a solicitor came around, this gentleman would ask what he had pledged last year. "This year I'll double it," he would promise. The solicitor was overjoyed. The only hitch was: the old gentleman never made good on his pledges.

This has been about what the administration has done with its budget estimates. Always in January there is a starry eyed prediction of a budget surplus, to much applause. But the budgets show no real attempt to achieve a balance, much less yield a surplus.

The large corporate farmers who are the special darlings of Secretary Benson come in for the usual tremendous handouts. The newspaper and magazine publishers are protected in their continued Federal mail subsidy.

And on the revenue side, the receivers of dividends bask under the special tax treatment they got under the 1954 act. The oil and gas companies, soothed by the Tidelands oil giveaways, continue to enjoy their 27½ percent depletion allowance. Businessmen continue to luxuriate in the scandalously lax allowance for entertainment deductions. Receivers of interest and dividend income continue to evade the income tax by the billion, through the failure to apply collection at the source for such income.

The failure to produce budget surpluses in prosperous times is an important reason why interest rates are as high as they are.

Second. Administered prices: As the hearings during the last year before the Joint Economic Committee have made abundantly clear, the leading cause of inflation in the economy is not an excess of overall demand, but administered price, and associated wage, increases in highly concentrated pace-setting industries such as steel, automobiles, and petroleum. Seven-eighths of the increase in wholesale prices since 1953, for example, have occurred in steel and steel-using industries. And this despite recessions in 1954 and again in 1958.

The administration's solution to this new problem in American economic life has been to do nothing. The administration opposed H.R. 6263, the so-called Clark-Reuss bill. Under this bill the public would be given the facts on proposed increases that threaten national economic stability, accompanied where necessary by recommendations of the factfinding board on the limits of price and wage increases; even though the recommendations were in no way compulsory, an enlightened public opinion could be brought into play.

H.R. 6263 was favorably reported out of the House Committee on Government Operations on June 9, 1959—with all Democrats favoring it and all Republicans opposing it—and is now before the House Committee on Rules.

Had H.R. 6263 been law a year ago, when the steel strike was brewing, and had a responsible factfinding board been appointed, it is quite possible that such a board would have recommended a very modest wage increase, and a price decrease, and that a strike and a possibly inflationary settlement could have been avoided. Due to administration opposition, the bill is still not a law. The Nation is the loser.

Third. The doctrinaire bills-only policy: Since 1953, the Federal Reserve Board has encased itself in a quite unnecessary "iron maiden"—the bills-only policy, whereby the Board restricts its purchases to only the shortest term securities, as opposed to a policy which would allow it to buy whatever was best for the country. Much of the demoralization of the market for Government securities is due to the doctrinaire refusal by the Federal Reserve to buy U.S. notes, certificates, and bonds—the longer term securities.

Fourth. Disregard of the taxpayers' interests: When the Federal Reserve, in its wisdom, wishes to expand the money supply, it can do so by either of two methods—by lowering bank reserve requirements, or by purchasing U.S. securities on the open market. Both have precisely the same monetary effect. But the second method—open market purchases—has the decided advantage for the taxpayer in that the interest received on such purchases is returned to the Federal Treasury.

Despite this, the Federal Reserve since 1953 has consistently used the method of lowering bank reserve requirements. Had the Federal Reserve instead used the taxpayer-oriented method of open market purchases to create exactly the same amount of money, the net saving to the taxpayers to date would have been at least $500 million, and would continue from here on out at the rate of more than $110 million a year. For the future, if the Federal Reserve augments the money supply at the rate which it has indicated it will, more than $1⅓ billion can be saved for the taxpayers in the next 10 years if the Federal Reserve can somehow be induced to abandon its savagely antitaxpayer policies and use the open market method rather than the reserve-lowering method of creating money.

Yet the administration went into a tantrum last summer when the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and myself suggested that it give the taxpayers this kind of a break.

Fifth. Consumer credit controls: The cumulative experience of the postwar period has shown that one of the most potent sources of inflationary pressure, as well as of economic instability, has been expenditures for consumer durable goods, financed by an ever-expanding volume of installment credit, ever lower downpayments, and ever longer maturities.

It is instructive to refer briefly to the year 1955, when cars were being produced at the rate of 8 million, and over half of the record increase in installment credit was supplied directly and indirectly by the commercial banks. Although in the spring of that year students of business conditions warned of the inflationary influence of the rising volume of consumer credit, the admin-

istration did nothing to check this unhealthy condition. Only after it became unmistakably clear that the automobile industry had been overextending itself, not only to its own detriment but also to that of the economy as a whole, did the administration begin to move. And what was the nature of its action? The President, early in 1956, after the damage had already been done, requested his Council of Economic Advisers to request the Federal Reserve Board to undertake a study of consumer installment credit. Not only had the subject been investigated at length here and abroad; the Federal Reserve Board had already taken the position 4 years earlier that consumer credit was unresponsive to general credit controls, and for this reason selective regulation of credit would be helpful. Controls with consumer credit worked well during World War II and during much of 1947–52.

In the spring of 1957, the Board published a six-volume study and arrived at the conclusion—despite the abundance of evidence included in the report that indicated a contrary conclusion—that authority for regulating consumer installment credit was inadvisable, and that the use of general controls was adequate to deal with it.

If credit has to be curtailed, as the administration contends, should not the first place for it to be in the market for consumer goods, ranging from uplift-tailfin motorcars to fly-now-pay-later vacations? Limits on the smallness of the downpayments and the length of the period of repayment can remove a large part of the demand for credit from the market, and thus make available lower interest rates for the really essential growth-producing needs of the economy—new plants and new schools, for example. Such controls, by lowering general interest rates, can ease the interest burden of the national debt. Finally, they can space out demand and provide a ready spigot to be turned on if there is an insufficiency of demand later on—instead of satisfying consumer demand for far, far into the future, and inviting a depression in a year or two.

Now, the President is again asking Congress to remove the 4¼ percent interest ceiling. He requested it in his state of the Union message on January 7, and again in a special message on January 11.

Some fair questions to ask the President are: Have you put your economic house in order? Have you invigorated fiscal policy by plugging tax loopholes? Have you come to grips with administered prices? Have you ended the bills-only policy, and the fetish of lowering reserve requirements to expand the money supply? Have you faced up to the problem of consumer credit?

And the answer is that the house is more disorderly than ever.

First. Fiscal sloppiness: There has been no fiscal reform. The President's budget once again points to the mirage of a surplus, but once again it fails to plug any of the tax loopholes without which a substantial surplus is impossible—not to mention a decent margin for the great varieties of national need, domestic and international.

The oil depletion allowance is still a sacred cow. Instead of collecting interest and dividends at the source, and thus adding $2 billion to $3 billion to our receipts out of the hides of the tax evaders, the administration contents itself by urging taxpayers to be honest. Here is the Eisenhower tax reform, sent out at the yearend:

TO ALL TAXPAYERS

Interest and dividends, whether paid to you or credited to your account, must be included in your U.S. income tax return. Accuracy in reporting such amounts, even if small, will benefit both the recipient and the Government, and will avoid expensive enforcement action that might otherwise be necessary.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

(U.S. Treasury Department—Internal Revenue Service. Doc. No. 5219.)

Instead of recommending a legislative tightening of the entertainment deduction, there are similar year-end threats directed at the tired businessman.

Second. Administered prices: Instead of setting up a factfinding board to give the public the facts on wages, prices, profits, and productivity in the steel industry, and thus provide the basis for a fair and noninflationary settlement, Vice President NIXON has been allowed to perpetrate what Mr. Walter Lippmann rightfully calls a "political fix." The steel industry's statement in announcing the NIXON settlement was that there would be "no general price increase, at this time." In other words, there can be a series of special price increases in various terms and discounts and other concealed ways at once; and we may look forward to a general across-the-board price increase a few days after the hoped-for inauguration of President NIXON. Indeed, Big Steel warned of this outcome yesterday when it asserted that Mr. NIXON had not even asked the companies to hold the line on prices.

The Milwaukee Journal, in an editorial of January 11, 1960, has well exposed the NIXON hocus-pocus:

STEEL SETTLEMENT NOT BY FREE BARGAINING BUT BY POLITICAL FIX

The dimensions of the steel settlement which Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell engineered have now become apparent—and also the extent of management's licking.

In return for a 30-month contract, the steel companies gave up a wage-benefit package worth 40 cents an hour, or 16 cents an hour per year. The settlement was reached after a 116-day strike and Presidential use of a Taft-Hartley back-to-work injunction.

In 1956, after a 34-day strike, the steel industry settled for 45.6 cents an hour in return for a 3-year contract. On an annual basis, that is fractionally less than this year's settlement. Yet it was to avoid an inflationary settlement of the 1956 kind that the steel companies held out as long as they did. They were tired of being "pushed around" by the union, they said, and were determined to put an end to "something for nothing" wage increases. Yet when Government, as personified by Nixon and Mitchell, teamed up with David McDonald, of the steelworkers' union, the companies caved in.

The irony of the situation is that the steel industry could undoubtedly have settled at any time for the Nixon-Mitchell terms, and during the early stages of the dispute for considerably less. Well-informed A. H. Raskin, labor reporter for the New York Times, says: "Most observers are convinced that they [the steel producers] could have bought a strike-free settlement for less than 10 cents an hour last June."

In late October, when Kaiser Steel Corp. broke the united company front, the steel firms might still have obtained approximately the same terms. Edgar Kaiser, chairman of Kaiser Steel, estimated the increase at 22½ cents an hour for the 2 years, or 11¼ cents an hour per year.

In the showdown the companies also gave in on the work rules issue. They had fought for the right to adjust these rules in order to increase efficiency as an offset for higher production costs. In the end they settled for a committee study.

No immediate increase in steel prices is promised—which is intended to reassure the public. But consider what happened subsequent to the 1956 settlement. Steel prices were hiked $8.50 a ton in 1956, $6 a ton in 1957 and $4.50 a ton in 1958—a total of $19.

Under the new settlement, the first of two wage boosts does not take effect until next December 1. This timing suggests the neat political touch of NIXON—no wage increase before the election, and therefore no price boost to scare the voters and raise legitimate complaints that while this administration talks against inflation it does mighty little about it when the chips are down.

Viewed from all angles, it is hard to avoid reaching the same conclusion as commentator Walter Lippmann.

"The strike was not settled by free bargaining," said Lippmann. "It was settled by political fix."

So has the Milwaukee Labor Press in its January 16 issue:

THE STEEL STRIKE DEAL

There is increasing evidence that the recent steel strike settlement was timed by the administration in an effort to boost the presidential stock of Vice President NIXON. As pointed out in a story by A. H. Raskin, veteran labor reporter for the New York Times, the steel industry could undoubtedly have settled at any time for the terms which were accepted when NIXON entered the picture.

Raskin has even predicted that the steel firms could have had a strike-free settlement for less than 10 cents an hour last June.

Last October when Kaiser steel settled with the union, the other firms could probably still have obtained approximately the same terms.

However, it was not until the entry of NIXON that the steel companies decided to sign.

If this was not a prearranged deal to have NIXON, the knight in shining armor astride a white charger dash in and save the heroine (in this case the country's economy), what was it?

A Milwaukee Journal editorial last week quotes nationally known commentator Walter Lippmann as saying, "The strike was not settled by free bargaining; it was settled by a political fix."

If this is true, and every evidence points that way, it was one of the sorriest and most shameful political deals in history.

Scapegoats, of course, were the steelworkers themselves, who were kept out on strike and suffered the hardships of the strike until the time that NIXON could make his heroic entry.

This then, is how little both the steel firms and the Republican administration, consider the welfare of the workingman and his family.

Third. Bills only: The bills only policy continues to be gospel with the Federal

Reserve. Partly because of this policy, U.S. Government bonds are selling below 80, the lowest price in a generation.

Fourth. Open market purchases: On December 1, 1959, the Federal Reserve allowed the banking system to increase its reserves by some $230 million, by permitting them to count vault cash. Once again, the method of increasing the money supply was the antitaxpayer method of increasing bank reserves, rather than by open market purchases of U.S. securities.

Not only does the administration thus keep right on thumbing its nose at the taxpayer; in its December 1 action, it thumbed its nose at the Congress as well.

When Congress passed the vault cash bill—S. 1120—last summer, it made it crystal clear that the permission thus granted was not to be used to create additions to the money supply by the antitaxpayer method. In the debate on the House floor on July 1, 1959, for example, I said this:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 9, pp. 12487–12448]

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill permits the counting of vault cash as part of a member bank's reserve requirements. It requires that within 3 years the existing Central Reserve city bank classification be amalgamated into the Reserve city bank classification.

I want to make it very clear that Congress, in enacting this bill, has no intention whatever of giving the Federal Reserve a mandate to lower member bank reserve requirements, in the overall. As for the vault cash proposal, the bill simply empowers, but does not direct, the Federal Reserve to permit the counting of vault cash. If, when, and to the extent that the Fed does permit the counting of vault cash, there is no reason under the sun why it cannot at the same time raise the general percentage of reserve requirements for the banks affected, so that the credit-creating powers caused by permitting the counting of vault cash are neutralized by an increase in overall reserve requirements.

As for the provision that New York and Chicago Central Reserve city banks be thrown into the same pot as Reserve city banks within 3 years, this likewise does not mean that any overall decrease in bank reserve requirements is necessary. The present reserve requirements on demand deposits for Central Reserve city banks is 18, for Reserve city banks, 16½. It is just as easy for the Fed to raise the 16½-percent requirement for Reserve city banks to 18, as it is to lower the 18 percent requirement for Central Reserve city banks to 16½. In fact, raising it to 17⅛ percent for both keeps the present level of required reserves.

I make this point because more and more Members are coming to the conclusion that the crisis in the management of the national debt requires that additional bank reserves—the basis of our credit system—be created through purchase by the Federal Reserve of U.S. securities, of varying maturities, rather than by decreasing overall bank reserve requirements.

The debt management crisis has resulted in the current request of the administration for Congress to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on U.S. bonds, a ceiling in effect since 1918.

The crisis has been brought about in large measure by the administration's policy of depriving the U.S. securities market of all help from the Federal Reserve. In the last 5 years, the Federal Reserve has created $4.3 billion worth of new bank reserves by lowering reserve requirements of member banks. For the future, the Fed's announced policy is to further lower reserve requirements at the rate of around $1 billion a year. These methods help the banks but not the National debt.

The administration, through the Federal Reserve, has thus made a deliberate decision that necessary increases in the money supply—which includes bank credit—should be made by lowering reserve requirements, rather than by the purchase by the Federal Reserve, for its portfolio of U.S. securities of varying maturities. The sole reason given by the Federal Reserve for its practice, past, present, and future of creating needed reserves by lowering reserve requirements rather than by buying U.S. securities, is that the method it has chosen will help member banks make even larger profits, though their earnings after taxes have doubled in the last 8 years.

If the Federal Reserve would create needed additions to the money supply by purchasing U.S. securities rather than by its present method of decreasing bank reserve requirements, it would help out in the national debt crisis in at least two major ways:

First. Purchases by the Fed would tend to keep the prices of Government securities from sagging as low as they do now. When investors see governments that sold for 100 selling in the eighties a few months later, they are frightened off. As the market prices of U.S. securities rise, the going interest rate is lowered, both on U.S. securities, and on all other debt. High interest charges discriminate particularly against homebuilding, schools, highways, and other local government activities, farmers, small businessmen, and all others who need long-term capital.

Second. To the extent that the Fed purchases U.S. securities, the interest charge comes back to the Treasury instead of having to be paid out to banks or other holders of the national debt. The savings to the taxpayer can run into the billions. For example, if necessary, increases in the money supply had been created by the Fed's purchasing $4.3 billion of U.S. securities in the last 5 years, instead of achieving this increase by lowering reserve requirements, $160 million could be saved annually for U.S. taxpayers at current interest rates. For the future, the Fed's net purchases of U.S. securities at $1 billion a year would amount to $10 billion in 10 years, thus saving $400 million a year additional for the taxpayers.

The Federal Reserve and the administration have been putting forth the myth recently that any attempt by the Federal Reserve to help manage the national debt is inflationary. The short answer to this is that as long as the money supply is not increased beyond the ability of the economy to respond, neither the administration method of increasing the money supply—by constantly lowering bank reserve requirements—or the sensible method—by the Federal Reserve's purchasing an equal amount of U.S. securities—is inflationary. The only difference is that the Fed's method helps only the banks; the sensible method cuts the taxpayers of the United States in for at least a small part of the benefits.

Therefore, a proper use of its powers by the Federal Reserve would be to furnish needed additions to the money supply by purchasing U.S. securities, rather than by an overall lowering of reserve requirements. The passing of S. 1120 is no warrant whatever for the Fed to do the latter.

And the conference report on the vault cash bill—S. 1120—of July 13, 1959, contained the following clear statement by the managers on the part of the House:

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

During the debate on this bill in the House, questions were raised as to whether the purpose of this bill was to transfer Government securities held by the Federal Reserve banks to privately owned commercial banks. To avoid any possible misunderstanding on this point, the managers on the part of the House wish to emphasize that it is not the intent of this legislation to encourage or cause the Federal Open Market Committee to reduce the Federal Reserve System's holdings of Government securities. As was made clear in the House debate, the purpose of this bill is simply to make needed reforms in the structure of reserve requirements.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM MULTER,
GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
E. W. HIESTAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Obviously, since the Federal Reserve is by its own admission now forbidding increases in the money supply, it must offset the $230 million increase in reserves by the sale of an equivalent amount of U.S. securities. Indeed, this is precisely what the Fed is now doing.

Thus is the clear intent of Congress flouted. Somebody ought to tell the Federal Reserve that it is supposed to be the servant of Congress.

Fifth. Consumer credit: On July 30, 1959, at a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee, I had an opportunity to discuss the subject of consumer credit with Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board. The following ensued:

Representative REUSS. When did you come up with your report saying that no controls were needed over consumer credit? Was that about 2 years ago?

Mr. MARTIN. It was the spring of 1957, but I don't think we said "no controls." We came up with an exhaustive report on consumer credit, and we have some inquiries continuing in that field.

We did not come up specifically and request controls. We had those controls taken away from us in 1952, as you remember.

Representative REUSS. Let me ask you to do this and submit it in time for the completion of this record here.

It does seem to me, from all I have heard from you, Secretary Anderson, and others, that we may well be getting into a period of real inflationary excess of demand. I would not think I was doing my duty as a Congressman, and particularly as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, if I did not have the benefit of the judgment of the Federal Reserve System as to whether controls over the amount of downpayment and length of maturity of consumer installment credit may not now be necessary.

I say this in recognition of what has been said about excess demand for goods, and in recognition also of what has been said about excess demand for savings.

Certainly, if you could cut down on the demand for credit by installment sales somewhat, you would make a little happier the market for short-term Government securities.

Would you, therefore, file, at your convenience, but as soon as you can, a report on this with the Joint Economic Committee, so it will be included in our record?

Mr. MARTIN. I will be very glad to. (Hearings, Joint Economic Committee, July 30, 1959, p. 1490.)

Toward the end of 1959, the Federal Reserve submitted its answer to my question whether it was for or against standby consumer credit controls. Here is the Federal Reserve's answer:

An important factor in the heavy demand for credit which has generally characterized the postwar period has been the use of credit by consumers. This has included, on the one hand, short- and intermediate-term credit, such as charge accounts and installment credit and, on the other, long-term credit in connection with home mortgages. Since 1946 short- and intermediate-term credit has increased $38 billion to a total of $47 billion on June 30, 1959, and long-term mortgage loans to consumers, associated almost entirely with the purchase of homes for their own use, have risen by almost $100 to $117 billion as of June 30.

Whether the growth of this credit should be subjected to some form of selective restraint is a complex question involving judgments as to equity and administrative feasibility, as well as monetary policy. However, there is little question but that restrictive regulation of the terms offered to installment and mortgage borrowers would effectively reduce the total demand for credit and thus relax somewhat the upward pressure on interest rates. Conversely, it is also certainly true that the liberalization of terms, both as to downpayments and maturities, which has taken place since 1952, has contributed to the demand for credit and the upward pressure on rates in the recent period. This liberalization and expansion has been the result of the competition among private consumer lenders and installment vendors, in the case of short and intermediate credit, while in the case of long-term credit the Federal Government itself has taken the lead in promoting progressively lower and lower downpayments and longer and longer maturities on real-estate loans.

As indicated above, the selective regulation of the use of credit by consumers raises many problems beyond those implied in the general restraint of credit-financed demands. Such regulation has been vigorously opposed by interested groups whenever it has been proposed. After weighing the many conflicting arguments enumerated in the study submitted by the Board in 1957 (see pt. I, vol. I, ch. 16), the Congress may determine that the balance favors establishment of permanent authority to regulate consumer credit. To be fully effective, such authority would have to cover long- as well as short- and intermediate-term credit and should be permanent, broad, and flexible in character. Application of the regulations should be limited to periods when the need is sufficient to justify the considerable burden such regulation imposes on the businesses directly affected and toleration of the discriminatory aspects which are unavoidable.

The Board does not feel justified, at this time, in taking the initiative in a recommendation to Congress in this matter. The effectiveness and workability of this kind of selective regulation depends heavily on broadly based acceptance and support. Whether such support exists can best be determined in the forums of the Congress itself. (Hearings, Joint Economic Committee, July 30, 1959, pp. 1490–1491.)

Here, I submit, is a case of pussyfooting over and beyond the call of duty. When the Fed has in mind a project that will raise interest rates—the "bills only" policy, raising the rediscount rate, selling from its portfolio of U.S. securities, for example—it displays no sensitivity about the desires of Congress. It just goes ahead and raises interest rates. But where the question is one of possible standby consumer credit controls—which would lower overall interest rates—the Fed believes in leaving it to George.

So, in the five areas of economic policy in which major reforms are needed, the situation has not improved since a year ago. It has grown worse. The administration has done its best to raise interest rates throughout the economy.

Let the administration put its economic house in order. Let it make a good-faith effort at the reforms that have been indicated. If it does, we will be ready and eager to remove the ceiling, which would then be an unnecessary clog on a responsible economic policy. Until it does, let our motto on the 4¼-percent ceiling be "They shall not pass."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman made this statement: He mentioned that he was in favor of a more moderate increase in the steel settlement. I assume then that you were opposed to the wage increase which the workers received. Is that true?

Mr. REUSS. I am opposed to government by secrecy and to the failure of Vice President NIXON and of the administration to let the public interest into the steel settlement. I would like to have seen a recommendation made which gave to the American public the facts on this crucial matter. This is not just a matter for the wage earner and for management, but for the entire American public.

Whatever the economic facts showed, I would be willing to let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But you did make the statement that a more modest settlement would be desirable, which caused me to conclude you were not in favor of the increase they received.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I am glad you raised that point. I think in the interest of the Nation's economy a decrease in the price of steel was, is, and will be essential. If that means that the wage increase had to be only a modest one, so be it. I think that the Nixon formula is not in the public interest.

If a steel price decrease would have meant that labor would have received a lesser wage increase than it got, then let me say here very candidly that I would have supported such lesser increase, if that is what the economic facts showed. My point is that we are all alike grappling in the dark here. The public needs the facts, and it is a crying shame that Mr. NIXON did not see fit to give the public the facts.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was under the impression that Mr. Kennedy, father of the aspiring presidential candidate was also not above secrecy in what he did. Do you decry that too?

Mr. REUSS. I do not think the same strictures about secrecy in Government apply to a retired businessman who holds no public office as apply to members of the administration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to ask just one further question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am not as great an authority by any means on this subject as are the two gentlemen now in the well of the House, and I certainly respect their viewpoints. I was under the impression that there was considerable criticism here by the gentleman from Wisconsin. In his closing remarks he made quite a few critical statements about the Federal Reserve Board and their policy, and so on. If I am wrong I would like to be straightened out.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman is quite right; I did make critical remarks.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was under the impression that the Federal Reserve Board was a creature of the Congress. Is not that true?

Mr. REUSS. The Federal Reserve Board is, indeed, like all administrative agencies of the Government, a creature of the Congress. However, the administration is responsible for its actions; and far from criticizing the actions of the Federal Reserve, far from trying to make the Fed walk correctly where it has walked incorrectly, the administration has cheered to the echo of each misguided act of the Federal Reserve, and has nuzzled the Fed's whole set of misguided policies to its bosom. I think that is a legitimate subject of criticism.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is a fact though that the Federal Reserve Board and system are not like other Government agencies but are an independent agency as compared with those which are directly under the thumb of the executive branch. Is not that true?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman is correct. That, however, in no way absolves the administration from its duty as guardian of the Nation's economy of speaking out on what it regards as sound monetary policies. If the Federal Reserve wishes to differ from the administration, that is, of course, its privilege. The point, however, is that the administration, far from saying that it disagrees with the Federal Reserve, applauds the Fed and urges it to go further in its misguided course.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I for one, and maybe one or two others, disagree entirely with the gentleman's presentation. I do not suppose we could solve this here today, but I do believe that the Federal Reserve Board is an independent agency, and the gentleman is a member of a very powerful committee of the Congress. If they thought all of these accusations were factual and that something ought to be done about them it would be a simple and expedient way to meet these problems by proposing legislation to make the necessary corrections. Many of the things about which the gentleman has been critical could, if there were a desire on the part of the majority, be corrected by the introduction of legislation for Congress to consider. I am sure that would be the proper way.

It is easy to be critical of those who have the responsibility. I would suggest only that if the Federal Reserve Board is not living up to the expectations of the gentleman, that through his powerful committee influence the necessary legislation could be introduced and recommended to the Congress.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman; and I have done exactly that, following down the list of items I have suggested.

Under the so-called Metcalf amendment of last summer, of which the great majority of Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee were in favor, and to which the great majority of the Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee were opposed, both the bills only policy, and the doctrinaire reliance on lowering reserve requirements for expanding the money supply, would be changed. I hope the gentleman will perhaps be willing to vote with us on a similar amendment at this session.

On the question of administered prices and the administration's do-nothing attitude, I am particularly proud that H.R. 6263, the Clark-Reuss bill, was reported out of the House Government Operations Committee by the unanimous vote of all Democratic members, and was voted against by the unanimous vote of all Republican members. I hope that a similar nice, clear-cut party line will be evidenced when that bill reaches the floor of this House, as I hope it will shortly, so that these great national economic issues may be argued out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes after all special orders for today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

CHANGES IN OUR SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, in the social security amendments of 1958, the Congress increased the amount of social security benefits, and strengthened Federal assistance in the programs for needy aged, the blind, the disabled, and children. I was glad to support these much needed changes. But there are other changes in our social security plan which were not written into the law, but call just as urgently for action. Among the next very vital improvements which must be made, in my opinion, are, first, the eligibility age must be reduced to age 60 for both men and women in recognition of the shortening working life of an automating economy; second, disability benefits must be made available to workers at any age, rather than holding to the arbitrary limitation of paying them only to workers aged 50 or over and other corrections made in the disability program; and third, the provision which limits the earnings of social security beneficiaries to $1,200 a year must be removed.

First of all I believe now, as I have long believed, that the retirement age of 65, set over two decades ago in the midst of a depression, is about as unrealistic for our times as is a 1935 airplane or automobile. It is true that, finally in the 1956 amendments, we cracked the age barrier which had held for so long, but it was a very slight crack. As you know, Congress lowered the eligibility age for full benefits for only two groups of beneficiaries—widows and dependent mothers—and moved it down only 3 years from 65 to 62. Wives and women workers received a slight concession, in that they were permitted by these amendments to apply for actuarially reduced benefits at age 62. A reduction of the retirement age which chops off 20 percent of the amount of benefit a woman worker would otherwise receive and 25 percent of the amount a wife would receive can hardly be called a liberalization.

The stark fact of our times is that many of our workingmen and heads of families are now being forcibly retired by age 62 either by illness or by the edict of their employer or the company's retirement plan. They may be able to qualify for short-term unemployment insurance benefits but this is the only Federal program which covers this situation. But we must, I believe, face up to the fact that unemployment insurance is no answer for this situation because it is predicated on the concept that the worker will return to a job. Most of these people will not because they cannot. And each new streamlining of plant or procedure, designed to increase productivity, merely compounds the problem of older men and women trying to stay on the job until they reach social security's retirement age. It seems not only a matter of individual equity but wise social policy, to allow these people to receive their social security benefits at least at age 60 when they have thus been retired by circumstances beyond their control.

We must always keep in mind the fact that lowering the eligibility age to 60 does not mean that everyone will automatically retire at that age. Even under the existing social security plan, with its eligibility age of 65 for men, the average age of those men who first apply for benefits is around 69 years. Can there be better evidence that a lower eligibility age would not lead to a wholesale walkout on the job of everyone reaching age 60 as some people have predicted they would. Rather the age 60 provision would recognize that the time of retirement varies with each individual and is not an event which occurs invariably and automatically on the morning of a 65th birthday.

Secondly, I am convinced that justice dictates that we make all workers eligible for benefits who have been, in effect, retired from their jobs by a total and a permanent disability. Under existing law—and after a hard fight—we did in 1956 introduce this disability benefit concept into our social security system but the payments were limited to workers age 50 and over. Because it was a new program, calling for new administrative procedures, it seemed wise at that time to adopt this approach. We now know that the disability program works. It is time, therefore, to recognize that this is a problem not exclusively for people 50 and over.

The Ways and Means Committee report stated in 1956:

> Certainly there is as great a need to protect the resources, the self-reliance, the dignity, and the self-respect of disabled workers as of any other group. As the advisory council to the Senate Committee on Finance pointed out: "The protection of the material and spiritual resources of the disabled worker is an important part of preserving his will to work and plays a positive role in his rehabilitation."

This philosophy, I submit, applies equally as well to the man severely disabled before age 50 as it does to those who can now receive benefits because they have attained that age. Indeed, the young father who undergoes the tragedy of such a completely crippling accident or disease may have the best right to claim benefits not only for himself but for his wife and children.

One of the bitter truths about the way our present system operates is that if the young father is killed or dies under such circumstances, his wife and children are entitled to such benefits, but if he manages to survive but is still so crippled that he cannot work, they are not. This distinction, is, to my mind, totally indefensible especially in view of the fact that our present disability system has built-in provisions to encourage rehabilitation services.

The program should also be extended to wives and widows who are permanently and totally disabled. Experience has also demonstrated the advisability of removing the requirement of a 6-months' waiting period before benefits can be paid again to disabled persons who unsuccessfully tried to return to work, and of extending the 12-month trial work period for persons drawing disability insurance benefits to include all types of rehabilitation programs.

I commend the Ways and Means Committee for holding hearings on the disability program during adjournment, and I am confident that these will result in substantial improvements in the law itself and also in the administrative procedures which have proved so cumbersome.

This brings me to my third point—the quixotic earnings limitation for people receiving benefits, entitled the "retirement test," which begins to cut off benefits when people receiving them earn over $1,200 a year. If there is any one provision of the Social Security Act which brings about more misunderstanding—and more hardship—than this one, I have yet to discover it. First of all, I believe it is wrong in principle because it actually discourages those older people who can find jobs from working because, if they do, they may actually receive less money during the course of a year than

they would have if they had sat idly at home. This is true because of the "block unit penalty" which deducts 1 month's benefit for each $80, or fraction thereof, of earnings in excess of $1,200 per year. As a result, one man may earn $1,200 a year and receive all of his social security benefits, while his neighbor, who happens to go just a few cents over the $1,200 limit—say he earns $1,200.20—can lose a total benefit, including a wife's benefit, of $174. Thus because his total annual pay happened to exceed $1,200 by as little as 20 cents, his total annual income is reduced by $173.80.

Furthermore, I submit that this provision is so excessively complicated in its operation that it takes the wisdom of a prophet and the training and skill of a topflight lawyer—or a topflight bureaucrat—to understand its machinations. Listen to this little section from the booklet, "Your Social Security," which is written to try to inform the American people of their rights in this matter. With regard to people working for wages it reads:

> If your earnings are over $1,200 in a year or if you reported that you expected them to be more than $1,200, you must make a written report at the end of the year. You can get a special blank for this report at your social security office.

The man or woman who takes a job while receiving benefits thus obligates himself not only to report to his nearest social security office and make a guess as to the amount of money he may earn during the year, but also he must report again to the social security office at the end of the year. Moreover, the net result of all this effort is, as I have said, that he may actually lose money for taking the job.

The case of a self-employed individual is even more confusing, for here we are dealing with a concept not as clearly identifiable. He will be permitted to keep his benefit for any month in which he does not perform substantial services regardless of his annual earnings. Again the explanation in the little booklet, "Your Social Security," suggests the complications which may result to the self-employed man who likes to keep busy in his little store, in his office, or on his farm even though he may not be able to work on a full-time basis. As to what constitutes those substantial services the little booklet reads:

> There is no single rule for determining whether a person is performing substantial services in self-employment. There are many factors to be considered for different kinds of self-employment. The Social Security Administration will make decisions based on the facts in each case.

Clear? How, without hours of consultation at the social security office, it is possible to conform to this law is more than I can see. Moreover, the fact that conformity with the law calls for hairline administrative distinctions in a variety of work situations, smacks of the kind of bureaucratic control of individual rights and equities which we have always—and proudly—opposed in this country.

Finally, I am opposed to this provision because it applies only to earned income but has no effect whatsoever on unearned income, such as money flowing in from rents, stocks, and dividends.

The Congress has always recognized the problems arising from the retirement test and we have on four different occasions, tried to ease its effect. But we have done so, I am afraid, at the expense of making it so complicated and so capricious in its results that we have only succeeded in adding bewilderment to indignation.

I am gratified at the ever increasing recognition of the health problems confronting the great majority of social security beneficiaries. I trust the committee will give further consideration early in this session to the plans for protecting our retired citizens against the costs of medical and hospital care.

I also urge sympathetic consideration to the need for increasing monthly benefit payments and widows' benefits. They are not able to rely upon their earning capacity to maintain the decent American standards of living on which this Nation prides itself. The steady erosion of purchasing power of our retired persons' fixed income robs them of any enjoyment of their hard-won leisure years. To be effective the system must be kept current with economic facts.

I believe I speak for the American people—and toward the goal of attaining the kind of a social security system which they can understand and which provides real security—when I recommend the enactment of these improvements in the law. At a time when our country is challenged as never before we must demonstrate to the world that we are not only capable of conquering space and controlling the atom, but also that we can take care of our own people.

ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the discussion that has just taken place. It was not my good fortune to be here all of the time. I have been tied up with my committee assignment on the Appropriations Committee.

I was particularly intrigued by some of the items to which the gentleman from Wisconsin and his associate in these remarks referred. He particularly mentioned the oil depletion allowance as a tax loophole which to me seems to indicate a great lack of understanding of the purpose of the oil depletion allowance and what it is intended to accomplish, for the good of the country, and has accomplished to a good degree.

I realize that the State of Wisconsin is not blessed with large oil reserves; however, in the district and in the State represented by the gentleman from Colorado, it is of increasing importance to the economy of that State. I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado if he joins in pointing the finger and saying that the oil depletion allowance is a tax loophole?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not sure I would use that frame of words. I would say that the purpose of a special tax provision for the recovery of capital has its place. In my own remarks, which the gentleman may have missed, I made the observation that I favored those tax laws which were necessary to encourage the recovery of capital. I suggested that once capital had been recovered by tax favors, however drawn, whether they be by depreciation, obsolescence or in this case by depletion allowance features, I would then try to prevent an unfair gain to those favored persons or industries by modifying the capital gains features accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my comment is with respect, therefore, not only to oil depletion, but with respect to a rapid amortization or depreciation schedule with respect to any corporation. You will recall that up until a few months ago we had many such schedules for many so-called defense industries.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Now, if the gentleman would not mind, with respect to oil depletion allowance—that is rather a simple proposition—do you favor or do you not favor the 27½ percent allowance that has been in effect for several years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to suggest to the gentleman, unless we are trying to rewrite the tax laws here this afternoon, that there are fundamental principles out of which tax revision should come. I am suggesting that there are two basic principles here which are involved. One is the need of the tax system to provide a structure which will encourage investment by assuring rapid recovery of capital to the investor, however that is being done. Depletion allowance happens to be a method. It may not be the best method, but I am in sympathy with the fundamental purpose. But, I would add that once one has been granted, by whatever tax rate, the right to a rapid recovery of capital, then a subsequent sale of the same asset at a much higher price is a double recovery of capital, or means that depreciation did not occur, this becomes something more than true capital gain; it is a tax favor which is unfair as between taxpayers. And, therefore, there is a second basic principle, namely, equity as between taxpayers, which also would govern any sound tax revision structure that I would propose. My answer as a legislator to the Committee on Ways and Means would be in terms of those two basic principles.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If I understand the gentleman correctly, then, his position is that he would favor some depletion allowance, not necessarily 27½ percent, until the producer had on a given well, recovered his cost of exploration on that particular well, his development cost and his operation costs, and thereafter no depletion; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I did not say that. The gentleman presumes to press my comment far beyond its purpose. I was saying "recovery of capital." Obviously, capital spent in the oil business is spent whether it produces a dry

hole or a producing hole. If one wants to attract and hold sufficient capital into any industry, into our industrial life, one needs tax laws with respect to accounting which will help attract and hold capital. I favor tax laws that will attract and hold capital. They need not go beyond that basic point, and I think it is incumbent upon the Committee on Ways and Means to examine and adjust all of the tax laws, not merely this one, to see whether in any given area we are not being unduly generous or, shall I say, playing favorites as among Uncle Sam's children.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Now, may I just say to the gentleman that some of the policy thinking evidenced by the factions apparently in control of his Democrat Party very closely approaches the proposition he presents; that is, that the tax laws should go only so far as to allow a man to recover his capital. That is a dangerous proposition in this country when you say there is no reward for free enterprise, no profit allowed to the man who risks his capital in order to create new wealth, new jobs, and new economic resources for this country so that he can go forward, as we have over the years, under the free enterprise system. The idea of recovery of capital alone is not getting to the problem of the depletion allowance. Depletion allowance is also based upon the high risk incident to investment of capital in the oil industry and the attraction of the new capital necessary to maintain our production and our reserves. It is different than any other natural resource that I know of in this respect. We must encourage the exploration for, and discovery of, new oil, which is essential to the security and well-being of this country. To further the economic prosperity of our area and the whole surrounding Rocky Mountain area, as well as other great producing areas of this country, it is incumbent upon us to find oil. And may I say that in the Rocky Mountain area from which we both came that the facts will show, the incontrovertible facts, as far as I know, that in the last few years the cost of discovering a new barrel of oil has exceeded the price which that barrel of oil brings when it is brought to the surface and marketed, after deducting production costs and marketing costs.

Further, I say that not only are you toying with the economy of a great part of our country, when we make such statements about the oil depletion allowance, but, over and beyond that, the Cabinet committee, the Office of Defense Mobilization, all those who have looked into this proposition, have come up with the hard cold facts, which were brought to our attention particularly by the Suez crisis, that we must have for the security of this country a firm, producible supply of liquid petroleum products, which was fixed, I believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of 7 to 8 million barrels a day. It was put in percentage figures in order to limit the percentage of daily imports of oil.

Mr. Speaker, I say if we are going to point the finger, merely to try to embarrass the administration, to such things as this and say that they are tax loopholes, when in fact they represent good, sound tax legislation that is absolutely essential to the economic well-being of this country and the security of this country and, therefore, is tied into the peace of the free world, then we are doing a distinct disservice, in my humble opinion. I think that is enough on that particular point.

Am I to understand, furthermore, that the gentleman is of the opinion that tariffs and restrictions upon imports are no solution to some of these economic problems? If I understood the gentleman's statement correctly—I came in a little late and did not hear all of it—he said in the latter part of his remarks that he would be opposed to that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The purpose of my remarks in the field of price policy was to note that a certain portion of our economy faces growing competition from oversea trade. I was advised, for example, that steel can be delivered to western Nebraska from foreign countries at lower prices than it can be purchased from Pueblo, Colo., nearby. We cannot hope to maintain a healthy economy by providing special shelters for those who will not undertake effectively to compete. We in America have demonstrated our capacity to compete and to compete freely. I, therefore, recommend that we continue that policy.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Taking into consideration the problems that the American producers and American workingmen face in terms of taxes which they must pay, and considering the money that some pay to build a plant abroad for their competitor to produce, which means to produce at a lower labor cost, do they not invite communism or at least offer a foothold to communism? The gentleman and I are both interested, for example, in sugar and the extension of the Sugar Act. I have just had the Library of Congress and others doing a little work on that question and I find that in the beet sugar area where we come from, the labor cost in the year 1958 was 94.8 cents an hour which did not include fringe benefits, bringing the total to over $1. In Cuba I find that the unskilled agricultural worker there in the sugar industry gets 36.4 cents an hour. I find that for cutting and loading cane they get 40.1 cents an hour. Does the gentleman think that the agricultural workers in Colorado, Wyoming, Minnesota, and in over 20 of our States throughout this Nation that produce beets and beet sugar, can compete with that kind of labor scale without some kind of protection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The gentleman knows full well that the Sugar Act has been a remarkable success. I wish that the administration had paid more attention to the methods of the Sugar Act in other agricultural areas. We have used an allotment quota system effectively in order to provide an orderly and stable market.

Sugar is almost the only basic commodity whose price has not increased during the past 10 years. If the gentleman's research into Caribbean sugar had gone further, he would have found that the rains come there but the winters do not. You can harvest three crops a year. So in addition to whatever labor economy is present you have also economy in land use there. We cannot fully compare the two.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Will the gentleman just answer my question? Does he think that our agricultural workers in the beet sugar areas should try to compete, that our American producers, farmers, and refiners out there should try to compete with this 40-cents-an-hour wage paid in Cuba, and does he believe they can do it successfully?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. The district I represent produces approximately 15 percent of the sugar beet crop in the United States. Let me say that the American sugar beet industry has shown remarkable imagination. They have mechanized. They are using far less stoop labor today than they did 10 years ago. Great progress has been made in mechanization in the sugar beet industry.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. As one who has done some of that stoop labor I agree that what the gentleman has said with respect to elimination of much of it is absolutely true and I for one am happy for it. The Sugar Act is worth while because it affords protection to the American worker and the American producer. I think they should have it. But why turn around then and say that in steel, as compared with Japan, where the industrial wages are 60 to 90 cents a day, while ours are $3 an hour, our steel producers ought to be able to compete with that sort of thing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The error is frequently committed of confusing hourly wages with per-unit labor costs. As you increase automation, for example, and provide for greater use of laborsaving machinery, a comparison of the actual cost of labor time per unit of output bears very little relationship to the hourly wage.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman think our people should be able to compete?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. We have been doing it all our lives.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The gentleman may have had the same experience I had when home. I found the only barbed wire you can buy in Wyoming is that produced offshore. Almost all of the generators going into our dams are produced offshore. Even the pipe for oil pipelines and other types of pipe, metal pipe, is coming from offshore. Does the gentleman think that is a healthy situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course it is a healthy situation to have competition. I am surprised that a Member of the opposition party would be suggesting that American enterprise cannot compete. We have competed successfully throughout our history and we will go on competing. I recently had the opportunity to sit at the feet of Charles Taft and heard him make an excellent speech, to the effect that when American enterprise had been forced to compete it has done so, and it can do so now.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I wish I had been there, because I would have

been on my feet instead of sitting at his feet. I am for competition. I believe the American worker and the American businessman can compete with the best in the world, and they have proven it when they operate under fair rules of competition. But the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Foreign Aid, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], brought out as we were considering the 1958 appropriation that when you tax the American people to produce the foreign aid to build a factory some place else, when our State Department in a particular instance says, "Yes; we will make it possible for you to go into the textile business in the Far East, in this case, we will arrange through foreign aid for you to go in business and build a factory for you, and we will give you the cost back if the Communists take over, and we will guarantee a certain rate of return, and then we will help you get the American markets away from the American businessmen and workingmen so you will have better than a fair proposition," then that is not operating under fair circumstances; but that was an actual case and that is what has been going on. The American farmer, the American worker, the American producer, the American businessman, can compete under fair circumstances but he cannot be expected to compete when he is asked to pay higher taxes to finance the rest of the world, and he cannot compete when he is faced with a labor cost such as we have been talking about here. Yet these higher labor costs are synonymous with our higher standard of living and we are all for that.

When the Sugar Act was up for extension in 1955 and 1956, during my first term here, I pointed out that the real danger was that the real people involved were the Wall Street interests who control the American-Cuban sugar production over there.

At that time I predicted what would happen, and that is what now has happened. These people looking for this favored labor position and looking for this favored tax position, own about 24 percent or 25 percent, as I recall, of the plant but produce over 40 percent of the sugar. But they keep these people, in order to maintain that unfair advantage, in a straitjacket as far as low wages are concerned. Then, as I believe Grover Cleveland for whom I think most of you gentlemen over there would agree was a pretty good President said, I believe in his fourth state of the Union message, this type of condition creates a hot bed for communism. Now look at what has happened. In this type of situation where people cannot afford to put clothes on their children and shoes on their feet, naturally, they are dissatisfied with the system. Then, under those conditions, in come some Communist agents and they find fertile ground for disrupting the political stability of the country. Now look what we have.

I suggest to you that the Sugar Act however has operated very well. It is, I think, a good standard for us to follow in our tariff policy and in our foreign policy and in our trade policy except for one thing, and that is the difference between the Sugar Act and the bills that have been introduced first by our good friend and late colleague, Henderson Lanham, from Georgia, and I see one of his colleagues here on the floor, and now known after the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] as the Davis bill. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor since 1955. In those bills we provide that when the domestic industry is being hurt and they can prove it, and it is proven to the Tariff Commission, then you fix a percentage of the market to allow that level for foreign imports so there it is identical to the Sugar Act. They cannot come in and take it all away from you by an unfair advantage. The one place it differs from the Sugar Act and where the Sugar Act, in my opinion, needs to be seriously looked into, is that it does not create a czar by giving someone power to put controls on the production of the American producers and American working men, and it leaves that up to the law of supply and demand. That is the only basic difference between that pending legislation and the Sugar Act, which I agree with you has worked very well except for the czar that is created and the bureaucracy that has held the price of beet sugar, which was $13.76 a ton in 1946 and only $13.26 in 1956.

Now, with inflation, the farmers cannot live under that, even when they raise the yield from 7 tons to around 13 tons. It just cannot be done. In addition, out in my area right now sugar beets are around $14 a ton. That man down there is a little czar and he looks upon himself that way. I am for "unhorsing" him, as we say out West. I am also for protecting, as the Sugar Act does, the American working man in his right to have a higher standard of living as we have enjoyed in this country, and the American farmer in his right to produce. I have statistics here to show that if we stop the importation of agricultural products, we would have no surplus problem whether it be in barley, oats, rye, livestock, wheat, cotton, or what have you. I am in favor of protecting the American farmer and giving him a fair shake in competition instead of a loaded set of dice that he is put up against. I am in favor of protecting the American working man, the American businessman, and the American manufacturer. I am in favor of protecting the American industrial society. I am satisfied that with some reasonable treatment to protect us from unfair competition, America is just as good as it has ever been and we can compete. In that way we can go forward on a fair basis throughout the world at the same time. By having these people with their new industrial capacity sell at home, we are going to accomplish what we hear so much talk about, namely, raising the level and standard of living of underdeveloped countries. It does not help them to produce a lot of automobiles and send them here to be sold to Americans. It does not help them any to produce these fine wool suits and things like they are grinding out in cotton and other materials in Japan and sell those products over here in this country. Let them put those clothes on the backs and feet of their own children. Then that is going to raise the level of their society and raise their standard of living. That is something so far that has been proved cannot be done by just taking these things away from the American taxpayers under the foreign aid program.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. KASEM. I notice in all the people the gentleman wants to protect, the American businessman and the American business and so on, the gentleman omitted to mention the American consumer. If these tariff protections were invoked, can the gentleman tell me who else besides the American consumer is going to pick up the tab for it?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I have not found this fellow called "American Consumer," because we do not have any people out in my part of the country who get a living without working for it. The American consumer is your laboring man, he is your farmer, he is your businessman—and their families. Where else does he come from?

Mr. KASEM. I think it is very nice to walk into a store and purchase something made by the Japanese for $1.50 when you have to pay $2.50 for the same thing made in this country.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am sorry but I do not know what the gentleman's district is. What is your principal item of production?

Mr. KASEM. We produce in my district babies, mostly. We are suburbia of Los Angeles.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. That produces consumers but somehow you must support them.

Mr. KASEM. We have a suburban district in Los Angeles County, and most of our people are concerned very much about what they have to pay and they have been extremely thankful for competition from foreign producers, for goods which Americans have declined to put on the market.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does that happen to be the district where they make movies?

Mr. KASEM. No. That is the other end of the county. We have a couple of defense plants.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. They are living off the taxpayers. The taxpayers will not be able to pay taxes unless they have a job or something that is going to make some money to pay taxes with. I was out there and I saw your defense installations. Where do you think that $41 billion a year is coming from if it is not from the rest of the people throughout this land? Those taxes have to come from profits, whether from profits from the sweat of a man's brow to create something in this country or profits that come from the income to a man for investing his capital in this country. Do we get any of those profits from Japan?

Mr. KASEM. We certainly did.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. How many? Do you know? How many taxes are being put into the Treasury that come from Japan to keep your people employed?

Mr. KASEM. Indirectly a great deal, because we handle mountains of things to Japan.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. We sold them the plants, yes. In fact, we gave most of them to them, so that they could put it up to sell for less. But I thank the Lord that we have men in this Government who can see that we have been in a continually deteriorating position and that we are facing a serious result. I believe in a free world, but when the United States goes under economically, the free world goes down with it. Then we lose the things we are trying to maintain in the shape of opportunity, in the shape of personal and individual liberties. I think we can well go to Japan and every other nation throughout the world and say, "We did not mind taking our money to help you to get back on your feet after this shooting-up in World War II, but you must agree that if the United States goes under economically so does the free world. We do not want to pull ourselves down to your standards. We want to lift you up to our standards." So we say to you that whenever we hit the point, as it is now in this country, like wool is in my district, where it dropped 50 percent from 1944 to 1954 because Australia and New Zealand were not in the war, when we get down to the point where the United States is actually going under, I think we can say to those countries, and they will understand, "We are not going to take anything away from you now."

We say to them that we are not just going to limit you in exporting to the United States percentagewise what you have built up to, but we are going to give an increase on a percentage basis that corresponds with your historic share of total consumption of the increased consumption in the United States due to increased population and other causes. But we are just simply not going to let you put American workers out of business or drive American businessmen to the wall by taking it all. I am for high wages and for the high standard of living the gentleman mentioned, but I do not want to raise labor costs to the point of impossibility.

Mr. KASEM. The gentleman has very acutely observed that the United States is the key to the free world and if it falls so does the free world fall. Does the gentleman believe for a moment that if the United States should isolate itself from the free world that our American businessmen and industry would prosper in foreign markets? How then could we maintain this freedom and this high standard of living?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I do not know whether the gentleman has looked into this as much as I have or not. We have not isolated ourselves through this Reciprocal Trade Act. That is a misnomer, for we have thrown our doors wide open to the admission absolutely free of duty of many, many items. It is the other countries who have isolated themselves through quotas, currency restrictions, and other things which are prohibiting the export of our articles to those countries. I have not suggested isolation in one thing I have said; I do not believe in that, yet I do think that when they have got from 40 to 50 percent of our domestic market the time has come to call a halt.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I just wanted to take a moment as a neighbor of the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming, to commend him, for one of the most forceful pro-American speeches I have heard in the 3 years I have been here. It is the type of thinking all of us should give more attention to, and I hope the Congress and the entire Nation will take his remarks to heart.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not intend to leave the impression, in the remarks I made earlier with respect to the oil industry, that we did not want anything more than recovery of capital, or that we were not concerned about an industry's ability to make profits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The suggestion may have been left that I was opposed to having adequate profits in any business, including the oil business. May I say to the gentleman and my distinguished neighbor from Wyoming that my father was in the oil business for some 20 years. I have been fairly close to the wildcatters and the oil developers, and I know what oil fever is, because it afflicts our family; I know about the desire to find oil and to make the profit which comes from satisfactory discovery. Certainly nothing I said was intended to leave any such inference, and I trust the gentleman understands my desire.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I appreciate that clarification. With his background in the oil industry, I find it hard to understand why the gentleman just cannot flatly say whether he is for the 27½-percent depletion allowance or whether he is against it. I have no interest in the oil industry whatsoever, stocks, bonds, or anything else; I think I have about two shares in one of the pipeline companies someplace, but, nevertheless, no substantial interest or any that has paid dividends in the last 5 years.

What I am concerned about is the development of our area; and our problem in Wyoming and in the Rocky Mountain area has been to attract capital to do some of the wildcatting, exploration, and developing that must be done to find oil, if it is there; and I have been wondering if the present depletion allowance is enough to attract the necessary capital to seek new oil and increase the Nation's production of this vital fuel. I certainly thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this subject up, and I would certainly like to see something done in the managing of our economy to increase the prosperity of the free world, but not entirely at the expense of ours and our standard of living.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment before the gentleman from Wyoming leaves the Chamber, that I respect the energy with which he defends the oil industry of Wyoming. It is characteristic of my good friend, the gentleman from Wyoming, and I understand perfectly how gentlemen on both sides of the aisle will, of course, defend the oil-depletion allowance when they come from oil-producing States. The point I wish to make is in the national sense. Both of the Democratic predecessors of President Eisenhower sent message after message to the Congress asking for reforms in the oil-depletion allowance. This is the first national administration in a quarter of a century which apparently is willing to accept the present oil-depletion allowance as it is. I think the RECORD should show that.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, this administration has requested such reforms, in fact, it has requested such to Secretary of the Treasury Anderson. I am for anything that will lead to clarification in this respect. I may say that later on I shall make a request for a special order in which I will attempt to show where the oil-depletion allowance and the oil industry in this country have been good for the consumer.

Mr. REUSS. I will say that the requests of this administration all related to the oil-depletion allowance, and it has to go to the subsequent basis of the extracted product.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I would not ordinarily take the floor on such matters as this because I find there are other avenues in which to express my opinion in the matter of our relationship with other nations. But I state on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States at a time when the United States is involved in a gigantic ideological struggle, when it is more important than ever, that we not close off our economic ties with all of the free world, that we open the markets, because this is the only avenue that we have to reach other people. Yet when I find

in modern times there are still those as the previous speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming, who seriously advocate a policy of protectionism, which is seriously detrimental to the competitive system within the United States, I must speak up.

To the south of us is the South American Continent and all of the Latin American world. There is the great continent of Africa and southeast Asia, all desperately trying to lift their standard of living and in desperate need of capital, equipment, goods, and machinery, for which there are only three major sources—the Soviet Union, Europe, and the United States. They will get these supplies where they can get them.

It is proposed that we make it impossible for them to sell in the American market or make it increasingly difficult for them to do so. They must sell to survive. They will take whatever markets are available to them and whatever market they sell in must be the market that they buy in.

The United States is uniquely well qualified to supply the underdeveloped or the aspiring nations, or whatever is the fashionable term in referring to them now, with the capital and the equipment that they need, with the agricultural and the technological know-how that they must have. In the absence of our providing it, there is the alternative that should make us shudder, the Soviet Union will be chosen.

We hear a great deal of talk on the Republican side about helping others to help themselves. A great deal of talk we have heard about trade, not aid. Yet consistently they have pursued a policy which is adverse to that. In every instance, I think, almost without exception, when the President has exercised his discretionary powers, instead of diminishing tariff barriers, as the act was designed to do, he has refused to act or, in a few instances, actually increased them.

Japan is an excellent example for us to discuss. It is an island kingdom or an island empire, if you choose; an extremely productive country, considering the limitations of its resources and so on. They make cameras and tools and all sorts of things that are sold in the American market. They can make excellent quality merchandise, as we have come to realize of late. The consumers in my district can go down to Thrifty Drug Stores, Woolworth's 5-and-10-cent store and look on the shelf and there they will see two wrenches of equal quality, one selling for 78 cents marked "Made in Japan" and another selling for $2.50 marked "Made in the United States." Naturally he is going to buy the 78-cent item. There will be very few who will choose the more expensive item for patriotic reasons. Then he has left in his pocket $1.72. A good portion of his money is still in his pocket to buy other things. What happens to the other 78 cents? Perhaps 50 percent, or a substantial percentage, is kept in the United States in the form of employees' wages in the store, importers' profits, or retailer's profits, and some goes to the bank for interest on his loan and so on. The remainder will then go to Japan. It is an American credit, and eventually it must be spent in the United States. It will be spent in the United States for the iron necessary to make the wrench or whatever the commodity is, or the copper and so on. It will be spent in the United States, most assuredly, in due course of commerce, because it cannot be spent, in the absolute sense, anywhere but in the United States. The money or credit is nothing but a claim on the American economy. They can transfer that credit to West Germany or to Turkey or to some other country, but eventually it must rest here and create production and employment here. It is time that we be done with this myth of protectionism, that American jobs are jeopardized by dealing with other countries. On the contrary, we expand opportunities for American industry limitlessly.

We must do it not only for commercial reasons but for ideological reasons, so that we may preserve our influence and help the spread of freedom everywhere. I know that we will in the future hear the phrase "pro-American" used in this connection, as my friend from Nebraska uses it. The patriotic theme has very frequently been used to procure privilege for special sections of our economy when they are not motivated by patriotism or love of country at all, but are motivated by love of the buck. But we who are legislators owe our responsibility to all the people. Every American is a buyer as well as a producer.

A point that I particularly wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we have no other instrument, no other tool, to reach the rest of the world.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENT BETWEEN RICHMOND AND WILLIAMSBURG

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been deeply alarmed and concerned over the recent rash of tragic aircraft accidents. The one that occurred last night touched me very deeply just as I am sure each of us is touched when a tragedy of this kind hits close to home.

The Capital Viscount that crashed between Richmond and Williamsburg last night was scheduled to land at Norfolk in my district. I have not yet been able to learn what the facts are surrounding that accident but have been furnished a list of most of the passengers who were on the flight. From the names which have been announced, I know that some of my good friends were on that ill-fated plane. In all, 50 persons, many of them my neighbors, met an untimely death.

This terrible tragedy touches me deeply and I would like to express a word of sympathy for the grief-stricken survivors of those who lost their lives in last night's catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, we must determine the causes of these accidents, and take prompt action, legislatively or otherwise, to prevent recurrences and to make air travel safer.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in concluding the discussion we have had for the past hour and a half on the House floor, let me say that the questions raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself were intended to touch off a full-blown discussion of all of the policies in connection with budgetary policy, both income and outgo, as well as monetary, credit, and price policies.

The subsequent remarks opened up some very interesting and new areas for discussion, which now prompt me to extend my invitation for further discussion. Let the administration, and its spokesmen here, not merely answer the questions we have asked with respect to how to secure adequate economic growth without inflation, but let them also give us a full-blown discussion of the question of our foreign trade and the balance of payments question.

The area of ideas opened up by my distinguished colleague from Wyoming is indeed a good area worthy of full-blown House discussion by spokesmen on both sides with respect to all of its ramifications.

But I would still like to see some Member address himself to the other issues we have raised today, so that the House may make its judgment with respect to interest rates and other matters, after having had a full, public discussion of the alternative courses of action that are in fact open to any administration at any time.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S PROPOSAL FOR STATE PREEMPTION OF TELEPHONE SERVICE EXCISE TAXES TO HELP MEET OUR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us who are concerned over the problem of financing our schools were interested yesterday to read of Governor Rockefeller's proposal. As I understand, he has urged that the 10 percent Federal excise tax on telephone service be allowed to expire in order that

New York and other States that desire to do so could utilize this source of revenue to meet educational needs.

Having recommended the reimposition of this tax, President Eisenhower may well frown on this program, but I must say that any such step in the way of aiding our schools without any possibility of Federal control appeals to me. Indeed, I have long favored the policy of the Federal Government transferring sources of income so that States could better solve their own problems without having to seek help at the Federal level.

Governor Rockefeller's proposal will not solve entirely the problem of financing our schools, but I favor it especially on one account which would be its freedom from Federal control. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that all too few educational and political leaders see the danger of losing community responsibility for education if the Federal Government becomes a partner in meeting our educational needs.

In order to indicate the potential revenue involved by regions and States, I have obtained these figures from the annual report of the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue which shows collections in fiscal year 1958 of this excise tax.

This table of revenue follows:

Internal revenue collections by sources and by internal revenue regions, districts, States, and territories

[In thousands of dollars]

Internal revenue regions and districts; States and territories (States represented by single districts indicated in parentheses; totals for other States shown at bottom of table)	Long-distance telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, etc. (52)	Leased wires, wire and equipment service (53)	Local telephone service (54)
United States, total	256,143	23,233	370,810
Atlanta region	29,630	899	38,270
Atlanta (Ga.)	24,145	758	33,073
Birmingham (Ala.)	373	16	307
Columbia (S.C.)	315	1	324
Greensboro (N.C.)	2,024	20	2,002
Jackson (Miss.)	61	7	42
Jacksonville (Fla.)	2,203	71	1,888
Nashville (Tenn.)	509	25	635
Boston region	14,868	1,160	24,256
Augusta (Maine)	92	5	89
Boston (Mass.)	10,424	403	18,439
Burlington (Vt.)	55	15	49
Hartford (Conn.)	4,263	693	5,648
Portsmouth (N.H.)	33	11	29
Providence (R.I.)	(*)	34	2
Chicago region	28,789	2,016	51,449
Chicago (see (c) below)	14,108	1,245	25,602
Detroit (Mich.)	9,272	549	16,830
Milwaukee (Wis.)	3,855	197	6,990
Springfield (see (c) below)	1,554	25	2,027
Cincinnati region	22,866	1,026	36,348
Cincinnati (see (g) below)	1,565	117	2,741
Cleveland (see (g) below)	8,582	482	14,103
Columbus (see (g) below)	743	10	1,374
Indianapolis (Ind.)	4,946	169	7,766
Louisville (Ky.)	703	30	1,025
Parkersburg (W. Va.)	1,664	121	2,579
Richmond (Va.)	3,620	86	5,413
Toledo (see (g) below)	1,042	12	1,345
Dallas region	3,435	298	3,024
Albuquerque (N. Mex.)	92	12	61
Austin (see (i) below)	363	70	298
Dallas (see (i) below)	2,481	153	2,189
Little Rock (Ark.)	197	5	227
New Orleans (La.)	149	13	102
Oklahoma City (Okla.)	154	44	147
New York City region	49,027	12,550	56,616
Albany (see (f) below)	498	23	523
Brooklyn (see (f) below)	27	90	3
Buffalo (see (f) below)	952	54	1,883
Lower Manhattan (see (f) below)	47,224	12,235	53,858
Syracuse (see (f) below)	300	8	347
Upper Manhattan (see (f) below)	26	138	2
Omaha region	43,024	1,680	60,252
Aberdeen (S. Dak.)	90	5	174
Cheyenne (Wyo.)	20	8	14
Denver (Colo.)	8,216	304	11,215
Des Moines (Iowa)	811	13	1,175
Fargo (N. Dak.)	85	3	122
Kansas City (see (d) below)	201	20	257
Omaha (Neb.)	9,047	243	13,244
St. Louis (see (d) below)	23,182	1,046	32,266
St. Paul (Minn.)	617	27	889
Wichita (Kans.)	756	10	896
Philadelphia region	29,665	1,671	47,262
Baltimore (Maryland and District of Columbia)	4,858	203	9,081
Camden (see (e) below)	8	5	10
Newark (see (e) below)	10,570	512	13,721
Philadelphia (see (h) below)	12,958	631	22,595
Pittsburgh (see (h) below)	961	240	1,493
Scranton (see (h) below)	307	78	361
Wilmington (Del.)	2	(*)	
San Francisco region	34,839	1,934	53,33
Boise (Idaho)	54	12	47
Helena (Mont.)	79	18	62
Honolulu (Hawaii)	328	31	1,096
Los Angeles (see (b) below)	5,668	204	5,473
Phoenix (Ariz.)	74	21	29
Portland (Oreg.)	389	31	339
Reno (Nev.)	315	4	222
Salt Lake City (Utah)	62	5	45
San Francisco (see (b) below)	26,437	1,525	44,314
Seattle (see (a) and (j) below)	1,433	85	1,705
International Operations Division			
Puerto Rico			
Other			
Totals for States and territories not shown above:			
(a) Alaska	245	38	159
(b) California	32,105	1,728	49,788
(c) Illinois	15,662	1,270	27,629
(d) Missouri	23,383	1,066	32,523
(e) New Jersey	10,578	517	13,732
(f) New York	49,027	12,550	56,616
(g) Ohio	11,933	621	19,564
(h) Pennsylvania	14,227	950	24,449
(i) Texas	2,844	223	2,487
(j) Washington	1,188	47	1,546

GAS AND GERM WARFARE

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include correspondence with the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased last week that when the President of the United States was asked in his press conference what he thought of the use of gas or germ warfare he replied that his own instincts would be against United States use of these agents unless they had first been employed against us.

The President also said that no official proposal had reached him to change the longstanding American policy, which is that only if they are used first by an enemy will the United States employ these agents. But it is clear, as a story in the New York Times of November 10, 1959, said and as a letter to me from the President indicates, that a reevaluation of the policy is taking place. The President's letter to me said that "the Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter"; that is, the use of chemical and biological weapons.

It seems to me that, despite the President's laudable personal view, it is necessary to have a formal national position on record, to stand beyond Mr. Eisenhower's term and to restrain the efforts of certain elements in the Defense Department to free gas and germ warfare to be used "like any other weapon." Last September, I therefore introduced House Concurrent Resolution 433, now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to reaffirm the statement of President Roosevelt in 1943 that "the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or noxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies."

I hope that the President's expression of his personal views will serve to stimulate the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 433, and I am pleased to say

that there has been increasing public concern on this matter. For the information of the Congress, as to the President's view, I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD my correspondence with him and his statement at the press conference:

DECEMBER 21, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write in the wake of your journey for peace to ask you to restrain unpeaceful demands of the Army.

During the last several months, a public relations campaign has been waged in the press by present and retired armed service officers to change our basic policy of not using chemical and biological weapons.

From various newspaper accounts, it now appears that the Army and other groups within the Department of Defense have recommended, both officially and unofficially, that we change our policy concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons.

Many citizens and Members of Congress, including myself, are very disturbed about these recommendations. They negate our position as enunciated by President Roosevelt on June 8, 1943, when he stated that the United States under no circumstances would use poisonous or obnoxious gases unless first used by our enemies. The abhorrence of chemical and biological weapons stems from our basic belief that even in war we must preserve the essence of humanity and humane principles.

It strikes me as utter folly that we should accede to the judgment of certain members of the Defense Department, when it is now more important than ever that the United States continue to express itself as repudiating the use of chemical and biological weapons as a preventive or preemptive means of attack.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union has recently been taking the propaganda initiative regarding the use of CBR during wartime. At the end of August of this year, Premier Khrushchev stated in a message to a conference of leading scientists who met in Canada:

"We share the concern of scientists, who justly point out that the use of these weapons may have no less horrible a consequence than the use of atomic or hydrogen weapons. Not by chance were chemical and bacteriological weapons condemned by mankind, and their military use prohibited by international agreement through the Geneva protocol of 1925. As is well known the Soviet Union strongly supports the prohibition of all types of weapons of mass annihilation, including nuclear as well as chemical and biological weapons. We hold that their use runs counter to humane principles, the rules of international law, and the conscience of all peoples."

Conversely, it disturbs me that our Nation, which repudiates naked power politics, should consider sacrificing its unassailable position regarding chemical and biological weapons when the people of the world are hoping for a settlement on the armaments question.

While we may be constrained to develop these weapons qualitatively and quantitatively if international negotiation in the CBR area fails and if the realities of the situation demand that we continue to produce these weapons, we should not change our longstanding policy of not using these weapons first in any eventuality. We must reaffirm our resolve never to initiate the use of these weapons.

Because of this, and because of the urgency of the problem, I earnestly suggest international negotiations in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Although this question is one which will be very difficult to negotiate, this should not deter us from seeking both solution and negotiation in this area of armaments activity.

Because of the urgency of the problem, I have introduced in the Congress a concurrent resolution which will reaffirm our policy of nonuse of biological and chemical weapons unless they are first introduced into warfare against us. I sincerely hope that the American position will not be changed. Knowing of your interest in and admiring your efforts on behalf of world peace, I am sure that our policies will not be changed in this area.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1959.

The Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KASTENMEIER: I appreciate the concern which prompted your December 21 letter concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons. The Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter with particular reference to some of the new features mentioned in your letter. You will of course have a further reply as promptly as possible.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCE,
JANUARY 13, 1960

Ronald W. May, Capital Times, Madison, Wis.: "Mr. President, Representative KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, has suggested that there might be a change in our traditional policy of not using chemical, germ, or poison gas warfare first. He said that Army people have tried to—indicated that they believed that maybe we should change our policy and use these first either in a large or even in a small war. Is this true?"

Answer: "I will say this: No such official suggestion has been made to me and so far as my own instinct is concerned is to not start such a thing as that first."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON, for 14 days, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, January 27, 1960, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BAILEY, for 1 hour and 30 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, January 27.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, January 27.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, January 21.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee), for 60 minutes, on Thursday next instead of on Friday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. OLIVER and to include a speech made by himself yesterday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee) and to include an address made by him today.

(At the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 20, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1698. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the convention of the 61st National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in Miami, Fla., September 20–24, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1699. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report showing officers in the Navy receiving flight pay for the 6-month period preceding January 1, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1700. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1701. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1702. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a report covering supergrade positions authorized by Public Laws 85–469 and 85–726, pursuant to Public Law 84–854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1703. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to the number of positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 existing in calendar year 1959 in the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1704. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and

equipment, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1705. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the reassignment of officers designated for aeronautical engineering duty, other than aerologists, to the unrestricted line of the Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1706. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the closing of Indian hospitals; with amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5789. A bill to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame; with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9465. A bill to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9464. A bill to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 9721. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va.-N.C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9722. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9723. A bill to impose certain requirements upon persons engaging in certain activities with respect to the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9724. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9725. A bill to amend section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to eliminate the ceilings in the use of foreign currencies for informational and educational activities carried on with funds provided under authority of that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9727. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9728. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to reduce in certain cases the age which an individual must attain to qualify for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to reduce the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 9729. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Tullahoma, Tenn.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9730. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the prompt notification to members of the Armed Forces of any indebtedness they may have to the United States arising out of overpayments of pay and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9732. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in the State of California to the county of Trinity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 9733. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit the inclusion of military pay in the computation of average salary for annuity purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9734. A bill to amend title III of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to prohibit the improper utilization of the services of enlisted men in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9735. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9736. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by trustees the majority of whom are citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 9738. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 9739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that income derived by an Indian from tribal lands or allotted and restricted Indian lands shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9740. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9741. A bill to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9742. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9743. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 9744. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to increase acreage allotments for burley tobacco and to distribute the major part of the increase in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9746. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 9747. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9748. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 9749. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Pony Express; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9750. A bill to supplement the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, to permit any State to acquire certain public lands for recreational use; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to establish the third Thursday in August of every year as Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the year 1960 as "Pony Express Year"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to authorize the conveyance of lands to States for recreational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution granting the consent of the United States to the jurisdic-

tion of the International Court of Justice to determine whether or not disputes before that Court involve matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution authorizing the establishment of National Zoo Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Con. Res. 460. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecration of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 461. Concurrent resolution expressing the intent of Congress that naval and Marine Corps officers captured by the enemy during World War II who were authorized for promotion during captivity and subsequently promoted after release be entitled under the authority of section 2 of the act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, ch. 166), to pay, allowances, and precedence from the date of rank stipulated in the later appointing orders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Icile Helen Hinman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 9752. A bill for the relief of K. J. McIver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 9753. A bill for the relief of Peter Larr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9754. A bill for the relief of Teresa Piantedosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9755. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Chu Shu Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 9757. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9758. A bill for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston (also known as Kiyoshi Terata); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 9759. A bill for the relief of Demitrios P. Georgantas and Maria Aslanidis Georgantas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Sam Doolittle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 462. Concurrent resolution expressing gratitude and appreciation to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur for his unsurpassed service to this Nation and the world; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

313. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor of Scranton, Pa., relative to requesting early adoption of the Federal area redevelopment program legislation pending before the Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

314. Also petition of Robert Zelis, president of Student Senate, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., relative to the National Defense Education Act, and expressing approval of the bill pending before the Congress of the United States which would repeal a certain requirement of a disclaimer affidavit being required of aid applicants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, the National Conference on Citizenship held an inspirational 14th annual meeting at the Shoreham Hotel September 16–19, 1959. Those who initiated the conference in 1946 sought to preserve the spirit of unity that had reached such a high point during World War II. They believe that the ideals upon which this Nation was founded and built should be stressed in peacetime as in wartime. The U.S. Department of Justice and the National Education Association cosponsored the annual meetings until 1953, when the late Willis Smith, U.S. Senator from my home State, introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to charter the National Conference on Citizenship. Although Senator Smith died of a heart attack before the bill passed the House, both Houses of Congress passed the bill unanimously.

The 14th annual meeting of the conference again mobilized a mighty force for the cause of good citizenship. Delegates from several hundred organizations represented all levels of government; religious faiths, professional, veterans, farm, civic, and youth organizations; labor, business, industry, and finance, and other groups.

The theme for this year's conference was "U.S. Citizenship—Know It—Cherish It—Live It." The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, delivered an address on the "Challenge of Citizenship" at the closing session of the conference. I ask that this challenging speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, West Virginia, before the 14th National Conference on Citizenship, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 19, 1959)

Judge Walter Bastian, delegates to the National Conference on Citizenship, and ladies and gentlemen, the deliberations and proceedings of your sessions these past few days have revealed again the capacity of American culture to generate honest inquiry and self-criticism.

As long as such meetings as this can prevail in our land, and continue to draw participants from varied areas and activities in life, there is hope that American citizenship will take on a continually broadening and deepening significance.

I am sure that some of you must have been impressed, as I have been, with the accidental, but peculiarly appropriate, conjunction of this conference with the presence in Washington of our notable foreign visitor. On the one hand, your gathering is the embodiment of the democratic process—a voluntary association of men and women and boys and girls assembling for a free exchange of ideas on the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. On the other, Premier Khrushchev—for all his air of comradeship—is the living expression of the autocratic state which defines for its subjects, rather than citizens, their rights and responsibilities—without reference to individual desire.

Within our system of allowing the individual the freedom to determine and express his own sense of loyalties, we must sometimes suffer the ignorance, the apathy and the irresponsibility of a significant number of our people. In one's more pessimistic moments, he is tempted to feel that these people are a majority. But this feeling passes, and from a more balanced and dispassionate view, I believe it is fair to say that the sense of citizenship responsibility

continues to enjoy a healthy development in the United States. If this growth is not registered in the voting statistics—as it seems not to be—then that is a problem which deserves our attention.

But citizenship does not mean only the use of the ballot. It is not a role which is to be asserted merely every 2 or 4 years. The duties of the citizen imply the responsibility to engage in the vital dialog of democracy in the continuous day-to-day activities of our community. For one person it may mean participation in the Parent-Teachers Association and contributing special efforts to the development of our schools. For another it may mean engagement in the affairs of the League of Women Voters, analyzing and promoting understanding of public issues. For still others, citizen obligations may call for added contributions of time and energy to the building of a community park, to slum clearance, or to urban renewal programs.

In each instance, however, there is involved an active expression of one's loyalties to the welfare of the community. The genius of democracy is that it allows the individual to choose his own avenue of such expression. The challenge of democracy—and the challenge of citizenship—is to provide the framework and the inspiration to impel each of us to explore his own avenue of creativity to its fullest. For, as William James truly remarked, "When we touch our own upper limit, and live in our own highest center of energy, we may call ourselves saved."

Democracy still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. And in the history of man's affairs, the failures of democracy outnumber by far its successes. It is not a form of society decreed for man by a beneficent cosmos—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and will maintain only with continued courage and imagination. And it is a way of life which men who are less than men have always sought to avoid—as the psychiatrist, Erich Fromm, noted some years ago in his book, "Escape From Freedom."

But the naturalization proceedings before the Washington Monument on Thursday of this week indicated that American democracy still remains the pole star of aspirations for men and women who will accept the hazards of freedom. Those people who stood upon the green under the late summer sun will add their transfusion to the continuing lifestream of American culture—a stream which has been borne along by the dissatisfaction of men and women with the old ways of penury and oppression.

Justice Learned Hand once referred to a comment by the historian, James Harvey Robinson, to the effect that mankind arose from the ape because, like the ape, he was always monkeying around. But man, unlike the ape, was able to remember the results of his meddling curiosity, to record them, and to pass them on to subsequent generations.

America is the rightful heir to this legacy of mankind. For this, I believe, is the nugget of liberty—the right to be meddlesome—to be dissatisfied with established forms and customs and to search, according to one's own predisposition, for ways of creating a better world. This is essentially the story of every naturalization ceremony—as it was the story of earlier settlers of this land.

For all Americans are either nonconformists or the descendants of nonconformists—the meddlesome, maverick, and malcontented people who in some way—religious, political, or economic—opposed the established forms of their society and believed in the ability of men to improve on these forms. They believed in the ability of men to create a new image of man, and they believed in the power of man to fashion society in the light of that image. This is the permanent revolution of America, and this is the revolution feared by autocracy everywhere. By referring to this as a permanent revolution I intend to imply that it is not and will never be finally won.

The rights and responsibilities of democracy are by their very nature, impermanent possessions. Each generation must nurture their growth during its own time, as this conference has been doing by searching out the methods for our time.

In the addresses which have been delivered here, and in the workshops, you have considered the varied activities and forms of citizenship. I would like now to consider the common denominator underlying these activities and ask your reflection on the challenge it poses to us today. I offer no original formula—only the observations of experience.

When we speak of the obligations of citizenship in daily life, I believe we mean something like this: the duty to engage in informed, intelligent, and active participation in the decisions of community life based upon one's capacity voluntarily to submerge his own private interests in the welfare of the community. All of these qualities are requisite, but particularly the latter—for if the capacity for voluntary submission of the individual will does not exist then there is no community—there is no society—but only an aggregate of individuals already deteriorating toward anarchy. For every social act presumes a sense of the community—an awareness of the ties that bind us to our fellow man. Herein lie both the greatest threat to and the greatest hope of the meaning of citizenship in our time.

The established and traditional meanings of the citizen are threatened—and indeed, have been radically altered—by the centralization of power in our society and by the atomization of the individual. To elaborate a bit further on this point—I believe we can agree that the role of the American citizen was first most clearly expressed in the writings of Thomas Jefferson. Here was developed the view of the American citizen as the independent freeholder, jealous of his own integrity and independence, informed on matters of public concern, and capable of exercising reasoned judgment in the light of this information. The underlying assumption of this view was that man acts of his own free will, is guided by the light of innate reason, and that all men are potentially capable of exercising reason.

During the 18th century and for the first half of the 19th century, this typical American citizen found himself in a society which was predominantly rural and agrarian. And with the continual advancement of the frontier there existed in general a harmony between the public interest and the interests of the individual citizen. We need not cavil at the literal truth of this picture in every instance. This, I believe, is in general a fair sketch of the surrounding conditions and the basic assumptions of the historic image of the American citizen. This is still the image that governs much of the political thought and rhetoric of today. But what of the change from the conditions that gave birth to this image?

And I speak not only of the fact of change, but the scope and depth—the quality—of change itself. No longer are a man's years measured in terms of gradual accretions and modifications of what he learned as a child and youth, but complete reversals and reconstructions of his view of the universe. Indeed, the world alters as we walk in it.

One of the most profound alterations, in terms of our concern here, has attended the process of centralization of power. The economic power of the modern corporation, the political power of the state, the power to control the flow of information through the mass media of communication—all have been subject to the force of centralization. I am not here concerned with passing judgment on this process as to whether it bodes ill or well for our Republic. I refer to it only as one of the facts of our existence, and a fact which is not acknowledged in the Jeffersonian concept of the individual and society.

Nor is this the only modern contradiction of our traditional assumptions. As part and parcel of the trend toward centralization, we have witnessed also what I have termed the atomization of the individual. I refer now to the segmentation of life and the alienation and isolation of the individual from the forces which shape his own existence. Here we look upon the source of the terrible loneliness and barrenness which fill the lives of so many who have become lost in the complexity and gigantism of the modern industrial society.

These are the people whose lives stand in contradiction to the traditional symbols and attitudes with which we have surrounded our concept of the citizen—a concept born of another time, even another world. This was a world of yeoman citizenry, of economically independent individuals and decentralized power. Now, I am not mourning the loss of that world; it is futile to assail the forces and facts of change. But it is foolhardy to ignore them.

And ignore them we have—at least with reference to our public attitudes and the ideas we use to fashion our understanding of public problems. Allow me to illustrate what I mean by this statement with reference to the field of economics. Our official views—what Professor Galbraith has called the conventional wisdom—were formed on the basis of an economy of individual entrepreneurship, an economy in which the offices of ownership and management of the means of production were joined, and an economy in which it was never quite possible to produce the necessities of life for all. These were the conditions on which our still existing traditional attitudes were based.

Yet, what are the facts of contemporary economic life? The modern giant corporations are not private enterprise in the hallowed terms of Adam Smith and Ricardo; they are public institutions in the most meaningful sense of the word, inasmuch as the decisions they make, the actions they take, affect the public welfare and the life of each of us. And they are institutions in which the functions of ownership and control are not always complete, the average corporate shareholder, owning often a part in a concern in which he is inactive in directing its action. These are basic alterations in the dominant economic institution of our society, alterations which are seldom reflected in the official rhetoric of today.

But more important than these changes—as it bears upon the citizen's responsibility in the decision-making process—is the fact that we have an economy of abundance, while our public policies are based too often upon the theory of an economy of scarcity. For the first time in man's history, we have achieved a form of social and economic organization in which we can produce enough for all. And yet we are embarrassed by our riches. We talk of a farm problem—because one working farmer cannot raise enough food for 24 people. Our tax policies, our national budget, our philosophy of private consumption against public service—all are based not on the facts of today, but on the fictions of yesterday.

Now, let me be quite explicit in stating that I offer these observations in no partisan sense. I am presently concerned only with pointing out the need for reexamining our traditional attitudes in the light of present political and economic realities. For this is the first duty of the citizen—to be informed and to think clearly. And in spite of all our modern communications devices, perhaps

even to some extent because of them, the problem of achieving adequate information, and the difficulties of screening misinformation and mechanized information have probably never been as acute since we achieved universal national literacy.

The way we deal with this problem will, in all seriousness, determine the future destiny of the United States and the meaning of citizenship. It has become almost axiomatic in any public discussion to refer our national destiny to the conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. But in this sense the reference is valid, and in this sense the burden of the future rests with each of us.

The conflict of our era is not only between capitalism and communism. The basic antagonism that creates the gulf between our two worlds is between our divergent concepts of the nature of man and the nature of history. It is in essence the conflict between our view that man is free to create history, and the dialectical view that history creates man.

Whether man will be bound to the iron chains of circumstance and the inexorable laws of a malignant fate—or whether we will have the freedom to choose a world of our own and create that world in the image we choose—that is the option offered humanity today.

We in the United States have already cast our own ballot—in the name of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But let us be quite clear that Mr. Jefferson and our Founding Fathers did not mean by "happiness" the pursuit of hedonistic pleasures in the semi-narcotized state too prevalent today. They meant—and it is our duty thus to reaffirm—the opportunity for fulfillment of the distinctively civilized and human virtues—love, esthetic enjoyment, a decent regard for one's fellow man, and respect for the truth.

These are the values at hazard in the contest before us. Their loss under the dominance of the Communist autocracy will mean the fixation of human morality at a level less than human. These are the stakes for which we are playing—stakes which are surely high enough to call from each of us the utmost in intelligence, self-sacrifice and determination that he has to give.

In closing, I refer once again to some words of Justice Hand, spoken at a time when the United States was just moving out of a time of peril. However, they are equally appropriate to our own time as we face a new peril.

"If our Nation could not itself exist half slave and half free, are we sure that it can exist in a world half slave and half free? Is the same conflict less irrepressible when worldwide than it was 80 years ago when it was only nationwide? Right knows no boundaries and justice no frontier; the brotherhood of man is not a domestic institution.

"We may not stop until we have done our part to fashion a world in which there shall be some share of fellowship, which shall be better than a den of thieves. Let us not disguise the difficulties; and, above all, let us not content ourselves with noble aspirations, counsels of perfection, and self-righteous advice to others. * * * We shall need the wisdom of the serpent; we shall have to be content with short steps; we shall be obliged to give and take; we shall face the strongest passions of mankind—our own, not the least; and in the end we shall have fabricated an imperfect instrument. But the history of man has just begun; in the eons which lie before him lie limitless hope or limitless despair. The choice is his; the present choice is ours. It is worth the trial."

The frontiers of freedom are always forward. The challenge to a finer citizenship lies ahead.

American Indian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution proposing to set aside 1 day each year to be known as American Indian Day.

The resolution proposes that the third Thursday in August each year be designated as a day to be set aside by the President to observe with appropriate ceremonies and activities the first American—the original American—the American Indian.

I have done this at the suggestion of the Governors' Interstate Indian Council which has done such an excellent job of helping to bring about recognition of the Indian problem. It was their suggestion that this be done as a means of making it possible to give special recognition and honor to the original citizens of this country. We have had several days for the recognition of other groups, we have had special weeks for the recognition of various industries, but never, Mr. Speaker, have we officially designated a time for the recognition of the American Indian.

I am confident the effect that this would have is significant and important for America's first citizens. One important thing that I see in this is making the people of America aware of the contributions that Indians collectively have made in this country and possibly to influence the Congress to take a more serious, dedicated, and active interest in Indian affairs.

It was the thought of the Governor's Interstate Indian Council that if a day were set aside by Congress as American Indian Day it would help to create many of the finer aspects of Indian culture and heritage and bring the knowledge to Americans everywhere that Indians still exist, forming a definite and constructive part of American society instead of in a fictional and romantic state. It would help to make the American people generally aware of the fact that the Indian people are no different than non-Indians, that they want jobs, employment, income, and to provide for their families, not only the necessities, but the luxuries of life, and the opportunities for education that are available in non-Indian communities.

It could be pointed out that the Indian people were segregated into communities first for the protection of the non-Indian and then later, in an agricultural adventure in rehabilitation. It should be pointed out that simply because the Indian people resided on the land that they are not necessarily farmers and ranchers but have a high degree of manual skill and that if given an opportunity could and would raise the level of their own economic status.

It could be pointed out on these special days that industry has been reluctant to locate on these reservation areas without some special inducement such as a tax inducement, or something of that nature, but with such an inducement industry could and would locate on these Indian reservations, opening up a whole new vista of opportunity for the Indian people and give them an opportunity to lift themselves up by their own bootstraps.

These are some of the things that should be brought to the attention of the American people, should be brought to the attention of the Congress and could be brought out on the occasion of this special date to be established as American Indian Day.

The date of Thursday on the 3d week in August has been chosen because this is an era of time during the summer when the Indians of most areas are holding special events. The Indians of Oklahoma celebrate their Anadarko Exposition during this week. The Indians of the Northern Plains are holding their fall expositions and councils at about this time. Consequently, I have named the Thursday of the third week in August as a suggested date for recognizing the first American on American Indian Day.

Recent Developments Affecting the U.S. Atomic Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AFFECTING THE U.S. ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

(Remarks by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, at workshop meeting of the Electric Consumer Information Committee, Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960)

It is always a pleasure to talk with a group interested in atomic energy, particularly from the consumers' point of view.

As we enter each new decade it is always wise—or it at least is always done—to take stock on the last year and have a look at the next 10 years.

GOALS AND PREDICTIONS

I regret to say, that from the consumers' viewpoint, we have not achieved economic atomic power in the United States by 1960. You will recall the rosy predictions by AEC and others on this subject some years ago. But economic atomic power still remains a will-o'-the-wisp—off somewhere yonder.

You will also recall the prediction of how many plants and kilowatts the United States would have in operation by 1960 or the end of this year. In 1955 the then AEC Director of Reactor Development foresaw about 2 million kilowatts of nuclear power capacity in service by the end of 1960. It now appears that less than 40,000 kilowatts will be in operation by the end of this year.

Predictions were also made as to the U.S. foreign atomic power program, which in large part was to be carried out in cooperation with Euratom. Former AEC Chairman Strauss adopted the goal established by the

so-called "three wise men" of 15 million kilowatts of atomic power in Euratom countries by 1967, and 3 million kilowatts by the end of 1969.

The objective of the AEC-Euratom Cooperative program was scaled down to be 1 million kilowatts by the end of 1963. The Joint Committee extended it to 1965 for two plants. However, when proposals were received last fall, only one project was submitted. This was the Italian Senn project which was planned prior to Euratom and could be carried on independently of it.

So we see the chickens let out in the Atomic Energy Amendment of 1954 are beginning to come home to roost, or to change the metaphor, somebody laid an egg.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECTS

Now what are the reasons for our difficulties? In addition to the problems of the Madison Avenue approach, it should be understood that many people underestimated the difficulty of the technical problems which had to be solved. These in turn raised costs, delayed schedules, and presented financial problems.

Perhaps a brief rundown of the current status of various projects would help make this point clear. I hesitate to go into any detail, since the newsletters of your various organizations do this very well. I especially find Jim Grahl's APPA newsletter interesting and informative.

As of this date not one watt of civilian power is being generated in the United States by atomic reactors, except possibly the small Oak Ridge HRE experiment. The Shippingport reactor, our first and largest central station plant, has been shut down since October for planned replacement of fuel elements and will not be in operation until the spring of this year. The Atomic Energy Commission's experimental boiling water reactor at Argonne is under modification and will not be in operation until late this year. The Atomic Energy Commission sodium reactor experiment at Santa Susana has been shut down since October of last year to rectify a fuel element failure and will not be in operation until sometime this spring.

These shutdowns do not mean lack of progress. They illustrate the developmental problems we encounter.

Reactor plants under construction are also having their troubles—schedule and cost-wise. The first and largest privately financed commercial plant, the Dresden station, has recently run into trouble due to technical problems—fuel element cladding and control rod failures. The next largest commercially financed plant is the Consolidated Edison, Indian Point plant, which has already experienced an increase in the estimated cost from $55 million to $100 million—nearly 100 percent, and this may be only the beginning. Detroit Edison's cost estimate has gone up and it still hasn't been proved safe.

The public and cooperative atomic energy plants also have their troubles, as you know.

The first cooperative public atomic power proposal was submitted to the Commission in 1955 in response to the Atomic Energy Commission's first request for proposals. This plant is still not complete. The completion date has slipped from the original estimate of 1959 to 1962 and the original cost estimate has gone up from approximately $25 million to $50 million.

Of the seven public and cooperative atomic power proposals submitted to the Commission in 1955 and 1956 in response to the Commission's second invitation for cooperative atomic powerplants, only two are presently being pursued. These are the Piqua and the Elk River projects, neither of which is complete. The estimated cost of both projects has approximately doubled and the original estimated completion dates have been extended considerably.

The only bright spot in our power reactor program is our naval reactor program where reactors at this moment are performing a job which cannot be equaled by any other energy source.

DEVELOPMENT OF REVISED ATOMIC POWER PROGRAMS

The difficulties in which the atomic power industry found itself in 1956–58 led, of course, to demands for revised or accelerated programs.

Whether we are building enough atomic power projects can be debated, but no one can charge that not enough studies have been made of the atomic power program. There was the McKinney report to the Joint Committee in January 1956; the atomic energy acceleration report made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in July 1956; the American Assembly and National Planning Association reports in 1957; the Joint Committee and AEC seminars with leading reactor and industry experts in 1957; the Edison Electric Institute reports in 1958; the Joint Committee staff report on a proposed expanded civilian nuclear power program in August 1958; the AEC ad hoc committee report in 1959; and now AEC is preparing its report on a proposed 10-year program; and Mr. Robert McKinney is reviewing the foreign situation for the Joint Committee.

All of these reports have agreed that it is important to develop economic atomic power, to meet sharply rising domestic needs for power in future decades and to establish and maintain clear international leadership in an important technology.

Several of the reports also agreed upon a goal of economic atomic power in the United States in 10 years. The Edison Electric Institute report in 1958 suggested that economic nuclear power might be attained by 1968; the AEC ad hoc committee report in 1959 chose 1969 as the target year.

This tendency to hope perennially that we will reach our goal in 10 years is not new. Back in 1955, the then-Director of AEC reactor development foresaw a 10-year induction phase and then a rapid expansion of commercial nuclear power capacity. Five years later, we may be still foreseeing success 10 years hence. Unless we take more vigorous action to make our predictions come true, I fear that we may be forever predicting that economic atomic power will be here in 10 years.

I would make the personal suggestion that we stick with the goal we established. In 1958, the Edison Electric Institute—surely a conservative institution—suggested that economically competitive nuclear power might be possible by 1968. That this is still feasible is indicated by the testimony of Dr. Walter Zinn to the Joint Economic Committee in October 1959. He said that the next generation of large-size plants will be competitive in some areas of the United States. Such plants could be built and in operation by 1965 or 1966, according to Zinn. But under present AEC policies this is not likely to be done before 1970.

Instead of making more studies, why do we not consider doing what Dr. Zinn says is possible, particularly since a recent preview of AEC's forthcoming report on its 10-year program confirms this view. In a speech in November, the Director of Reactor Development for AEC—Frank Pittman—said that the studies recently made for AEC show that with some further research and development a 300,000-kilowatt pressurized water plant could be built to produce power at costs competitive in some areas of the United States, and that this project could be started "in the near future."

The Pittman report on the AEC studies also concluded that, assuming success in further research and development, it would be possible to start construction by 1965 on 300,000 kilowatt boiling water and organic plants which should produce power at costs competitive in relatively high fuel cost areas of the United States. Presumably these could be in operation by the end of 1968.

POLICY ISSUES IN ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

Consideration of the AEC 10-year program (as forecast by the Pittman report) raises again policy issues which have been with us for a number of years.

NARROWING DOWN ON REACTOR CONCEPTS

One is the Commission's alleged recent policy of emphasizing three basic reactor concepts—the pressurized water, boiling and organic cooled and moderated—and possibly cutting back the effort on other types.

I question whether we know enough yet to put most of our eggs in only two or three baskets. I suspect that AEC's deemphasis on the other concepts—some of which may in the long run prove superior—may be dictated more by budget considerations than by informed technical judgments. We have only one large power reactor in operation and are only in the early phases of this new technology.

If we confine our major bets now to only two or three basic concepts we may save money in the short run. But if we should find in the future that we had guessed wrong, the cutbacks being made by the Commission will prove to be extremely costly. I do not endorse, consequently, the present Commission tendency to abandon our previous program of developing six to eight different types of nuclear plants.

SIZE OF PROTOTYPES

Nontechnical factors also seem to have influenced Commission views of the sizes of the developmental plants which should be built. I have believed that construction of a certain number of large demonstration prototypes will be required in order to develop any given reactor type to the point that it is commercially attractive. This view was confirmed unanimously in 1957 by a group of outstanding reactor development experts convened by the Joint Committee.

To my knowledge, nothing has developed since 1957 which would alter their conclusions. I consequently believe that AEC's ad hoc committee was mistaken in recommending a year ago that, in general, only plants of small and moderate size should be constructed. I believe that AEC was mistaken in accepting that recommendation. There is some suspicion that the so-called "prototype" plants may have been especially appealing to AEC for reasons having nothing to do with the technical requirements of the program. The smaller plants would cost less money, obviously, than large plants and this would please the budgeteers. Since their energy output could be more readily absorbed by AEC installations or else wasted, the disposition of any Government atomic power, which so frightens the AEC, could be avoided.

More recently, the Commission seems to be shifting back to the view that full-scale demonstration plants will have to be built. I understand that AEC is now shopping around for a utility or utility combine to undertake the 200- to 300-megawatt pressurized water project which I mentioned earlier.

LEVEL OF EXPENDITURES FOR ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

The dominant policy issue in the past several years has been one of budgets and expenditures. We who have long urged a vigorous and effective atomic power development program find that the key program decisions in this administration are being made more and more by the bookkeepers and budgeteers rather than by technical authorities.

The bookkeepers seem unable to peer beyond the ends of their noses in determining

what this country can afford in the way of public investments. In the atomic power field, a vigorous attack on the remaining technical problems in order to attain economic atomic power at the earliest feasible date could bring the consumers of this country very large savings. Such a development inevitably would restrain the steady upward trend in the costs of the fossil fuels. As you know, gas prices have been climbing at a startling rate and even the cost of coal, despite our huge reserves, has been increasing at an average rate of about 1.5 percent per year.

If the development of low-cost nuclear power were to achieve a saving in fuel costs of no more than one-tenth of a cent per electrical kilowatt-hour, this would mean savings to the American consumers by 1975 of more than $2 billion per year. We can well afford to invest another $100 to $150 million per year now in accelerating atomic power development. When the potential economic gains are considered, we cannot afford not to.

This annual incremental investment is about what was estimated as necessary by the Joint Committee Staff Report of 1958. Relative to the total AEC budget of $2.6 billion in fiscal 1959, or to the massive expenditures for missile development, for example, this is hardly an astronomical sum.

(Indeed the total AEC expenditures for fiscal year 1959 are but a fraction of 1 percent of the total gross national product; are only 3.3 percent of total Federal expenditures, and 5.6 percent of total expenditures for national defense.)

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND SUBSIDIES

A related policy issue which I assume will be reopened this year is the question of whether additional subsidies, in the form of capital grants, should be offered to utilities to enable them to build the additional plants which are deemed necessary.

In considering this question, we should take a look at how far we have come in subsidizing these so-called private plants. In 1954, when the Eisenhower administration and the Republican majority in Congress insisted upon rewriting the Atomic Energy Act, private industry spokesmen assured the Joint Committee that if the act were amended, private industry would develop economic atomic power with its own resources. Mr. Walker Cisler of Detroit Edison even declared that his utility would require no guaranteed buy back of byproduct plutonium as far back as 1953.

The fact is, of course, that private industry has not been able to proceed unaided with the development of atomic power, but has had to come back to Congress with repeated requests for additional Federal assistance.

The fundamental Government aid, is AEC's reactor development program. Without the public research program, there is not one of the privately sponsored atomic power projects which could even have been proposed. Instead of diminishing after revision of the Act in 1954 and the entry of private industry, AEC power reactor development expenditures have increased every year and now are at a level of $105 million per year—five times the 1954 level.

A second significant subsidy is the Government-guaranteed price for the power reactor byproduct, plutonium. The present base price of $30 per gram reflects a subsidy of about $18 per gram to a power reactor operator. Despite Walker Cisler's protestations in 1953, the subsequent financial plan for the fast-breeder reactor sponsored by Detroit Edison and others assumes Government plutonium payments of more than $33 million, about $20 million of which would be clear Government subsidy.

For the more usual nonbreeder reactors, the present plutonium base price represents a subsidy of about 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. For a 100,000-kilowatt plant, this will amount to about $1 million per year.

A third important public subsidy for the so-called "private" projects is the Government fuel loan program. The Government finances the production of all enriched uranium fuel and loans it to the utilities at 4 percent per year. As long as the utility generates power with enriched uranium, it will receive a perpetual series of loans and never repay the outstanding balance. A private industrial reactor expert (Menke) told the Joint Committee last year that the fuel loan program is "a very heavy subsidy" worth about seven-tenths of 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. This is because it would cost the private utilities up to 10 percent per year to finance their own fuel inventories. For a 100,000-kilowatt nuclear plant, the fuel loan subsidy alone will be worth almost a half million dollars per year to a private utility.

In view of its great affection for high interest rates, I am surprised that the administration has not proposed to raise the fuel loan charge above 4 percent. The latest short-term Treasury bonds were sold at an interest rate of 5 percent.

A fourth form of Government aid is the cheap enriched uranium fuel provided by the Government. The major element in the price of enriched uranium is the cost of power, and all enriched uranium in the United States is produced either with low-cost TVA power or with power from private plants which is also low cost because of the TVA "yardstick" and Government underwriting. Thus, with the advent of an atomic power industry, and the widespread use of enriched uranium fuel, the benefits of low-cost TVA power will be exported to all parts of the United States. Since about three-fourths of the benefits will go to the privately owned utilities, one would think they would be stanch friends of the TVA. However, they seem instead to want the cheap uranium fuel but to eradicate the power agency which makes its low cost possible.

The low cost of U.S. enriched uranium probably should not be called a subsidy, since the TVA and private utility power charges to AEC cover all costs, but it is a benefit to the nuclear power industry made possible by huge Government investments and underwriting.

Federal fuel reprocessing is another public subsidy provided for all power reactor projects. It has been estimated that if private facilities were available, the cost would be two to three times the charge made by AEC. For the privately financed plant of Commonwealth Edison, for example, at Dresden, Ill., the savings represented by the Government fuel-processing service will approximate more than $2 million during the first 5 years of plant operation, and for Detroit Edison's fast breeder, more than $8.5 million, and, of course, subsidies are also extended to cooperatives and public power associations under the AEC second round demonstration program.

In addition to these general forms of aid, the Government is providing specific grants of research and development funds and fuel subsidies amounting to millions of dollars per project for many of the privately sponsored developmental power reactors.

Thus, the picture today is quite different from that promised by the spokesmen for private enterprise when they declared in 1954 that rewriting of the Atomic Energy Act to facilitate private activity was about all that would be required, other than a continuation of a modest national research and development program.

Yet, as I pointed out earlier, the accomplishments of the publicly subsidized, privately sponsored program have fallen short of what was promised. For example, the original estimated completion date for the Yankee atomic energy plant, was 1957, and for the Detroit Edison plant, 1958. Both are now scheduled for full operation next year. Similar slippages have occurred with other projects and some have been canceled entirely.

Thus despite valiant efforts and a substantial program of Government subsidies and services, the private organizations have not been able to move forward with projects as rapidly as was promised by them and by the Commission.

Last year, to stimulate the proposals for additional projects, AEC Chairman McCone recommended a new subsidy program under which AEC would finance up to half the cost of a nuclear powerplant but allow title to remain in the sponsoring utility. This was to have been the first of a series of projects financed with such capital grants. This idea of capital subsidies finds favor with some members of the Joint Committee also. I respect their reasons, but I continue to have questions about it. We already have built into the atomic power industry a considerable subsidy system, and the results have fallen short of the promises.

In view of this experience, I wonder if still another and more substantial subsidy program is clearly the best answer. I also feel concerned that initiating a capital subsidy program may open a "Pandora's box." Once started, Federal subsidy programs have proved difficult to shut off.

This question of how to finance additional projects is a complicated one, as long as AEC continues to oppose a sizable Federal developmental power reactor program. As you know, I joined with Senator GORE in 1956 to authorize such a program. Although recommended by the Joint Committee and passed by the Senate, the Gore-Holifield bill was defeated in the House due largely to strong administration opposition.

If the bill had passed and AEC had proceeded with such a program, the atomic power program would be well ahead of where it is now and we would have a series of developmental plants either in being or well under way, in addition to the projects sponsored by the utilities. We would not need now to be considering capital subsidies.

The great amount of invaluable technical information produced through the development, construction and operation of the Government's PWR demonstrates the value of this type of plant. Under the Gore-Holifield bill, a number of such heavily instrumented atomic power laboratories could have been undertaken. The relatively small amounts of power they produced surely would have done no conceivable harm to the private utilities, and the technological benefits to the entire utility industry would have been very substantial. In opposing the Gore-Holifield bill and, subsequently, every effort we have made to initiate a Federal developmental project, the private utilities have done themselves and the general public a grave disservice.

The private utility projects are not substitutes for the PWR-type facility. They are not being designed or equipped primarily for research and development nor will they be operated primarily to produce technical information. The privately sponsored plants will be operated primarily to produce power. They certainly will contribute to the technology, but to a much lesser extent than a truly developmental facility.

It has almost been forgotten that AEC proposed in 1957–58 that these private plants serve in part as test reactors for trying out improved types of fuel elements. This was a counter to our proposed governmental experimental-prototype type of plant. However, as in so many things, this program was dropped when the utilities apparently could not cooperate as their primary purpose was continuous power production.

GAPS IN PROGRAM

As in past years, I assume that the Joint Committee during this session will give attention to the gaps in our atomic power development program. One of the continuing lacks is a program for heavy water reactors using natural uranium as fuel. In putting this concept near the bottom of its priority list, AEC seems to overlook its important advantages. A successful natural uranium reactor would mean saving the power and therefore the coal consumed in making enriched uranium fuel. From a conservation standpoint, this makes sense. This reactor type also would allow development of a normal commercial fuel industry, free of Government loans and fuel ownership. For similar reasons, it would be more attractive to foreign countries, which hesitate to develop a nuclear power industry dependent upon enriched uranium from the United States. I am gratified that the present AEC has proposed a full-scale cooperative program with Canada in this field. This cooperation should not replace our own prototype development.

Another concept which seems well worth pursuing is the steam-cooled reactor, a variant on the nuclear superheat concept which may involve fewer technical difficulties.

I believe that the Joint Committee should also consider the project suggested last year of a 20,000-kilowatt plant on Guam if it is designed to contribute to the technology, and to another process steam reactor.

I feel certain that we also will take up the question of authorizing conversion of the new Hanford plutonium production reactor to a dual-purpose plant. This will enable the plant to produce at least 700,000 kilowatts of power—more capacity than in Bonneville Dam—rather than just warm up the Columbia River. General Electric Co. studies showed that such a dual-purpose plant will produce plutonium at less cost to the Government, with the power priced at going Bonneville rates. Almost half the power would be consumed by Hanford and *the remainder* sold to Bonneville for further marketing to the utilities of the region. Conversion needs to be authorized this year or next year if it is to be done on the most economical and efficient basis.

On all or most of these projects, I am afraid we will encounter the usual opposition by the budgeteers.

I am gratified to note, however, that the Commission has gone ahead with the projects which the Joint Committee added to the program last year, including the 50-megawatt boiling water reactor for municipal and cooperative systems, the organic moderated 50-megawatt prototype under third round terms, and the small nuclear superheat plant in Puerto Rico.

Unfortunately, however, there still has been a good deal of foot-dragging on projects like these which the Joint Committee adds over commission opposition. These projects were authorized last June and funds were appropriated in early August but AEC waited until the end of December to request proposals on the two 50-megawatt prototypes and has only now concluded negotiation of an agreement with the Puerto Rico water resources authority.

I understand all these projects were held up while Consumers Power of Michigan was haggling about the account of financial assistance it would receive in the unsolicited proposal program.

THE NEED FOR BETTER ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM

In view of AEC Chairman McCone's remarks upon returning last fall from a visit to the Soviet Union, it is hard to understand why the Commission delayed about 6 months before getting started on these important projects. Mr. McCone, as you know, stated in November that he had been impressed "by the speed with which the Soviets appear able to reach a specific objective once they decide that it is of overriding importance." He declared that the United States "must be prepared to seize upon the undertakings which are of importance and advance them on an urgent basis. If we do less, our position of leadership soon will fade away."

I have been expressing the same sentiments for a good many years. I only wish that this administration would match its words with action.

It seems to me that the Commission's reluctance to back a really vigorous atomic power development program despite continuous pressures from the Joint Committee springs from budget and power policy considerations which are at best of only secondary importance.

The achievement of economic nuclear power is a technical problem and should be attacked as such. The technical problems which must be solved should be defined and systematic programs to solve them should be planned and carried out in a systematic way.

Instead, the Commission initially pursued a relatively planless approach to the construction of large, developmental power reactors. The PWR and the Oak Ridge gas-cooled reactor are exceptions but these were forced through over Commission resistance.

In 1954, the Commission initiated the first of a series of rounds under which utilities were encouraged to propose projects with Federal aid, not so much because this approach was considered the best way to get technical problems solved as that it avoided Federal expenditures for reactors and the possibility of Federal atomic power production. Some of the resulting projects were started more for political or public relations purposes than to solve specific technical problems and others bear only an accidental relationship to a coordinated program to achieve economic atomic power.

When the so-called partnership approach failed to produce an adequate program, the administration came forward in mid-1958 with the Euratom assistance proposal. This plan had several purposes but one obviously was to reduce the need for U.S. developmental plants by subsidizing their construction abroad, hopefully at less cost and of course with no power marketing responsibilities. Again, this was an attempted political solution to a technical problem and I criticized it severely for this reason. As of this date, the Euratom program has not resulted in one new atomic power project. As a substitute for U.S. developmental plants, it seems to be a fiasco.

What we need is a planned and coordinated program aimed at specific technical objectives and tied to a time schedule which puts the pressure on AEC, the national laboratories, and the reactor industry. I believe that unless we soon adopt such an approach we are not going to achieve truly economic atomic power. We suddenly will wake up some day to find that we are in second or third place in the world. Then, as in the missile field, there will be understandable demands for a costly crash program to try to catch up.

Now I think some progress has been made in this regard. In the spring of 1958, I recommended that AEC assume the positive direction of its experimental and prototype reactor program. This approach was outlined more completely in the joint committee staff report in August 1958. I am happy to say that AEC Chairman McCone adopted this policy in 1959, except for the unsolicited proposal proviso.

However, much more remains to be done in organizing and implementing AEC's positive direction of the program. AEC is still in need of a larger technical staff to provide technical direction. Too much time is spent in Washington haggling over contracts, and not enough is spent on seeing to it that adequate scientific and technical programs are planned and carried out in the use of experimental and prototype reactors. Here again the Shippingport project seems to be an exception.

I am also concerned that in recent months there seems to be a growing attitude by AEC and administration officials that the Soviets are cutting back on their atomic power program, and that we therefore can relax. The Russian atomic representative, Mr. Emelyanov, has even suggested that the U.S.S.R. and the United States should agree on which types of reactor prototype each country would emphasize, and thereby save development money. As you know, the United States and the U.S.S.R. already have signed a memorandum of agreement covering exchange of visits and technical documents and also provides for developing joint projects in certain research fields.

Although I am most strongly in favor of reducing the tensions between the United States and Russia, we would be foolhardy to relax our efforts in atomic power development for any such reasons. We do not know for a fact that the Russians are cutting back their atomic power effort. This is only what they have told some U.S. visitors. On the other hand, I do know that if I were hoping to win a competition I would certainly try to lull my competitors into feeling that they could afford to relax.

I need not remind you that this country has been lulled before, only to wake up with the Russians running away with the ball. We received no prior notice when the big Soviet jet bombers first flew over Moscow, nor did we have any notice prior to sputnik and their other outer space accomplishments. We may be faced with another important surprise just before the summit meeting this spring.

Indeed, in atomic energy, AEC was quite surprised at Geneva in 1955 when the Russians announced the operation of their 5,000-kilowatt atomic powerplant. Again in 1958 at Geneva, although the joint committee was assured by AEC that there would be no surprises, the Soviets unveiled their 100,000-kilowatt dual-purpose powerplant amid great publicity.

I know also, that in 1953, the United States held undisputed leadership in atomic power technology, that we retained it as late as 1955 but that by October 1, 1958, Dr. Walter Zinn reported to the joint committee that Russia not only had closed the gap but in some areas had moved ahead of us.

Therefore I do not favor any cartel or other arrangements to parcel out reactor types with the Russians, or any so-called cooperative endeavor which would relax our pressing forward to maintain our slim lead.

Admiral Rickover has not paced his nuclear submarine program in accordance with what he thought the Russians might be doing in nuclear submarine development. He has pressed ahead as rapidly as possible, and as a result the security of the United States today is greatly bolstered by the possession of this unique and powerful weapon.

The same policy should apply in the field of atomic power development. Our own power needs, as this group knows well, will mushroom immensely in coming decades, and the sooner we have an additional source of low-cost power the better for the long-term well-being of the American people.

Abroad, two-thirds of the world's peoples are energy-starved. Electric power is essential if they are to improve their miserable living standards. As a means of meeting their potentially huge needs, atomic power is of great interest and will assume ever-increasing importance.

The battle has been joined with the Soviet Union and the Red Chinese for the friend-

ship of the uncommitted and underdeveloped countries—most of the world's population. In this competition, American leadership in the new and vital technology of atomic energy and power can be a factor of great value.

To speed the realization of economic benefits by the American consumer, then, and to regain the decisive international leadership we once enjoyed, I will continue to urge a strong, coordinated, and purposeful Federal program for the development of nuclear power.

Statement by Hon. J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas, Commenting on Address by Premier Khrushchev to Supreme Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a request which I received from the Soviet news agency Tass and the text of my reply.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New York, N.Y., 14 NFT,
January 14, 1960.

Senator JAMES FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are asking group of prominent Americans for statements of about 400 words commenting on Khrushchev's address to Supreme Soviet. We would greatly appreciate statement from you. As you undoubtedly know our agency serves entire Soviet press and radio. Please wire reply collect to Tass Agency Associates, Press Building, Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

TASS AGENCY.

JANUARY 18, 1960.

TASS AGENCY ASSOCIATES,
Press Building,
Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N.Y.

In response to your telegram of January 14 requesting my comment on Chairman Khrushchev's address to Supreme Soviet, I submit the following with the understanding that the statement must be used in its entirety and the use of excerpts from it is not authorized:

"It is difficult to understand precisely what thoughts Premier Khrushchev desired to communicate in his speech on January 14. On the one hand he apparently wished to convey the idea that he intended to reduce the military might of his country by a reduction in the number of men under arms, and that this should be construed by us as a slowing down of the pace of the arms race. On the other hand, he clearly states that this reduction does not lessen the power of the armed forces and that his army possesses fighting means such as have never been possessed by any army before.

"The Chairman of the Council of Ministers cannot have it both ways. He cannot by the same action reduce his armed might and increase it. The only conclusion that can reasonably be drawn from this statement is that he is reorganizing his armed forces in such a way as to enhance their firepower and fighting means. This cannot be interpreted as a serious contribution to the reduction of armaments or to the lessening of the tensions in the world which derive from the arms race.

"It should be remembered that even when the reduction he announced takes place, he will still have as many men under arms as the United States. Presently, the Soviet Union has 3,623,000 men under arms, compared to 2,504,000 in the United States.

"Today, the effectiveness of armaments is measured not in numbers of men under arms, but in the possession of new and modern weapons and the means of delivering them. It is particularly disappointing, therefore, that Mr. Khrushchev displayed no willingness in his speech to consider real and verifiable measures of disarmament. Instead of discussing this problem realistically, in terms of the application of control and inspection without which no safeguarded disarmament measures can be undertaken, he brushed it off with generalities. Talk of Soviet rocket prowess and fantastic new weapons leaves the impression that the Soviet Union is more interested in threatening the rest of the world than in joining other nations to reduce existing world tensions.

"It is unfortunate that the Premier again repeats the insulting falsehood that we maintain armed forces equal to his own only because of the desire for profits by the manufacturers of armaments. This is the most flagrant kind of misrepresentation and increases the difficulty we have in taking his offer to negotiate arms reduction seriously. All the world should know that the United States would prefer to devote the wealth now expended on the arms race to the improvement of the economic conditions in the underdeveloped countries and the building of schools at home, and would do so if Premier Khrushchev would accept an arms limitation agreement upon which reasonable men could rely."

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Remarks Before Business and Professional Women's Club of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my speech before the Business and Professional Women's Club of Greater Lynn, Mass., on October 6, 1959, on the subject of "Social Security."

I was pleased to attend, together with head-table guests consisting of Miss Mary S. King, of the Lynn Telegram-News; Katherine Donahue, State chairman of health and safety; Mildred Caram, State president; Despena Zervas, local president; Grace B. Michaud, chairman; Rena A. Decatur, president of district No. 1; Margaret O. Hill, State treasurer; Mrs. Anna M. Korsun, quota president; and Hazel Anderson, of the Lynn Item.

Greetings. Social security is a very general description that includes such programs as old age and survivors insurance, old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and unemployment compensation.

Old age insurance is earned through special taxes paid by the worker and his employer. Unemployment compensation is financed through taxes levied on the employer alone. The remaining programs come under the heading of public welfare—or charity—and are supported through Federal and State appropriations out of general revenues.

In order to avoid confusion, I shall confine my remarks to the subject of old age and survivors insurance, which might be loosely termed old age pensions, or earned monthly benefits to provide for persons during their retirement.

To understand social security we must look into the background of this revolutionary type of legislation.

Many older nations had modest social security programs in operation long before we even considered the subject.

Our young and growing Nation, isolated from the rest of the world while it busily tended to its own confident development, emphasized the values of hard work, private initiative, and saving for "a rainy day."

In earlier days when each family was a self-contained economic and social unit, raising its own food, building its own shelter, and providing for its other needs through handicraft industries in the home, the sick, the disabled, and the older people were taken care of within this family circle.

With the coming of the industrial revolution, and the employment of large numbers of people in the factories, with the consequent shift of population from the farms to the towns and cities, the old-style way of supporting the aged and the dependent members of society, was no longer effective.

We had to fill the vacuum by new social and economic programs.

But, as people cling to old and familiar routines, even when they no longer suffice, the dominant conservatism of the United States delayed action on these imperative changes until the serious depression of the 1930's forced our hand.

It is to the great credit of the United States and its people that they engineered the "peaceful revolution" of that time and, by a combination of realism and humanism, adapted our social and economic systems to solve these problems in order to continue the progress of our Nation.

Everyone wants and needs economic security.

As a free and independent people, we want to be dependent on no one.

In the vicissitudes of life, even the best of people are apt to find themselves in a position where it is difficult, if not impossible, "to make both ends meet."

Programs must be devised, not only to eliminate these financial hardships, but to maintain the human dignity that is essential to the lives of self-respecting free men and free women.

Security for the mass of our people can be achieved only when most of us have jobs. But in the farflung, complex, and impersonal organization of our industrial society, there are millions who become destitute even in times of general prosperity. People who are eager and willing to work cannot find jobs. In some industries, an able and experienced worker runs into an invisible barrier as soon as he reveals that he is 40 years of age or older. Unlike the old days, he and his wife cannot develop a homestead out of the wilderness to provide for themselves and their children by their own efforts. We live in a collective and interdependent society, where our jobs and our incomes often depend upon decisions made by those we never see.

The Social Security Act was born during the depths of a paralyzing depression. At a time when 10 million workers were without employment other than work relief, and when some 18 million people were dependent for subsistence on direct relief or welfare, the President set up a Committee on Economic Security To Study the Problem of Destitution and to Make Recommendations. That was in 1934.

After searching study, the Committee found that the heart of the problem is loss of earnings. It discovered that, in most cases, whenever earnings are cut off, destitution is not far away. The question, then, was how to spread earnings over a lifetime, over periods when the breadwinner is working and periods when he is not, how to provide an income throughout the whole cycle of life—in childhood, youth, middle and old age.

It found that this could not be done on an individual basis: relatively few people can save enough out of their income to take care of emergency periods.

The Committee came to the wise conclusion that the problem could be met to a large extent through savings on a social basis. The family circle concept of long ago, where the young and the strong helped the weak, and were helped in turn as they became dependent, was broadened to include our whole society.

This could be done on the principle of sharing the cost and spreading the risk.

By 1959 the people themselves, on a voluntary basis, had accelerated this development. Through group medical and hospital insurance plans, they are now able to protect their health in a way that they could not afford as individuals.

Disaster can happen to any of us, suddenly and with no chance to prepare for it. Actually, however, it strikes relatively few at any one time. If a small amount could be collected from the many who are subject to the risk, a fund could be built for payment of benefits to the few whom disaster or misfortune has struck. As a substantial part of its answer to insecurity and destitution, the committee, back there in the midthirties, recommended social insurance.

After studying the findings and considering the advice of the Committee on Economic Security, the Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935.

The Social Security Act is a Federal law, but the Federal Government operates only one of the programs—old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. The other eight programs are operated by the States, with Federal cooperation.

It is common knowledge that most of us, because of living costs, social standards, and economic misfortunes, do not set aside enough money or other assets during our working years to provide adequately for ourselves or our families when earned income is cut off by disability, old age, or death.

The OASI, as it is known, is a Federal program operated by the Social Security Administration.

Because of many amendments through the years the law now covers, with few exceptions, all people who are gainfully employed. The program provides regular monthly benefits for insured workers and their families when the wage earner reaches retirement age (65 for men, 62 for women), for eligible survivors when the worker dies at any age, and for disabled workers aged 50 to 65 and their eligible dependents.

A person whose annual net income from covered self-employment is $400 or more, reports his earnings and pays the social security tax when he files his Federal income tax return. (Only the first $4,200 of earnings are taxed through 1958. Beginning with 1959, net earnings up to $4,800 are taxed. The contribution rate for self-employed income is 3¾ percent for 1959. It is scheduled to increase to 4½ percent for 1960 through 1962; 5¼ percent for 1963 through 1965; 6 percent for 1966 through 1968; and 6¾ percent for 1969.)

These earnings are also recorded by the Social Security Administration under the self-employed person's social security account number.

Although self-employment was not covered by the original Social Security Act, most persons who work for themselves have been brought under its protection by amendments to the law.

To qualify for monthly payments when you reach retirement age, or to make payments possible for your survivors in case of your death, you must have been in work covered by the social security law for a certain number of "quarters of coverage."

You get 4 quarters of coverage for a year in which you have $400 or more in net earnings from self-employment.

If you have self-employment net earnings from more than one occupation covered by the law, your income from all of them (up to the applicable maximum) is counted toward old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. A net loss in one business is deducted from net earnings in the others.

If you operate a business but close it during a year and open another, or if you operate more than one business, you still should make only one report of self-employment net earnings for the year.

There is no provision in the law which permits refund of social security taxes properly paid, in the event that you do not have enough work under the law to be insured.

In case of your death at any age, payments may be made to certain members of your family if you had social security credit for 6 quarters of coverage out of the 13 calendar quarters before your death.

When you reach retirement age, you and certain members of your family can get monthly payments if you have had 1½ to 10 years of work (6 to 40 quarters of coverage), depending on how soon you reach retirement age. (No one will need as much as 10 years of work to qualify for retirement benefits until after 1970.)

The minimum payment to an insured retired person is $26.40 monthly. The maximum retirement payment is at present $116. The maximum family payment depends upon the worker's benefit amount If his amount is $109 a month or more, the family maximum is $254.

My colleague, Congresswoman KATHARINE ST. GEORGE of New York State, introduced a bill on January 7, 1959 * * * numbered H.R. 944, "to amend title I of the Social Security Act, so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder."

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, incidentally, is a member of the Spring Valley Chapter of Business and Professional Women, which explains her interest in the proposed amendment.

Although her bill did not pass in the last session of the Congress, I am confident that it, or a similar bill, will be enacted in the near future.

Under the present law, if a person earns more than $1,200 a year after he or she has retired, the number of monthly benefit checks due you (while you are under the age of 72) will be reduced correspondingly. In general, you lose your right to 1 month's benefit check for each $80 (or fraction of $80) of earnings over $1,200 in the year.

Beginning with 1959, no matter how much your total earnings are in a year, those earnings will not cause you to lose the monthly payment for any month in which you neither work as an employee for more than $100 ($80 per month for 1958 and previous years) nor render substantial services in self-employment.

Generally you perform "substantial services" when you actively engage in the operation of your trade or business.

There is no single rule for determining when a person is performing substantial services in self-employment. Some of the factors considered are: the amount of time devoted to your business both before and after your retirement; the nature of your service; the presence or absence of a paid manager or member of your family who manages the business, and whether your activity is seasonal, etc.

After your 72d year, benefits may be paid to you no matter how much you earn.

This $1,200 ceiling on outside earnings is a holdover from depression days.

In 1935, the Congress had to keep in mind the millions of unemployed.

The purpose, in establishing this ceiling of $1,200 was to discourage retired persons from continuing in the jobs, or income-producing self-employment activities, and thereby make them available to younger and unemployed persons.

That reasoning is now obsolete, and the ceiling itself has no meaning because of the rise in the cost of living.

In the last session of the Congress, the income limitations for single veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions was raised from $1,400 to $1,800 and for married veterans from $2,700 to $3,000.

This precedent is certain to strengthen the case for a substantial increase in the amount that may be earned by a person retired under social security without jeopardizing his monthly benefit checks.

This is of particular interest to business and professional women who want to continue earning additional income after retirement.

It is appropriate that this issue should be stressed during the observance of National Business and Professional Women's Week.

I intend to introduce a companion bill identical with that already submitted by Congresswoman KATHARINE ST. GEORGE.

It is a proposal of such overriding merit that I expect it to be enacted into law during the year 1960.

The Real Cost of Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we in Wisconsin, who produce so much milk, have at times discussions between the city folks and the farmers, because the city folks feel that the farmers are getting a great deal for their milk, and the farmers try to tell them they are mistaken. For instance, the farmer gets about 7 cents a quart for milk, or perhaps $3.25 a hundredweight. The same day, if he is a consumer, he pays anywhere from 20 to 25 cents a quart for milk.

The point I am making is that the farmer who sells the milk is not getting a big profit from the milk because in between the producer and consumer there is the cost of getting the milk to the factory. To get it there, high wages have to be paid. Then the milk probably goes to the distributing station. Again wages have to be paid. The result is that

no one is getting a great perecntage of profit out of the milk.

But the point is that the farmer does the milking, he owns the cows, he has to feed them, he has to have a farm on which to raise feed for the cows to consume, he has all the work to do, and practically none of the pay. The point is he is not getting his equitable share of the price the milk sells for. That point should be stressed and restressed, because there are those who want to create dissension between the farmers and the city folks.

Mr. President, today the Nation is striving for a solution of the problems in agriculture.

Over the years, the Nation has experienced a strange anomaly in the pricing of agricultural commodities. The prices for products have risen in dollars and cents value.

However, by the yardstick of how many hours of work are required to pay for a quart of milk, for example, the costs have actually shown a steady decline since 1890.

According to a study by the Milk Industry Foundation, the purchase of a quart of milk required 25.5 minutes of labor in 1890. In 1959, the wage earner needed to work 6.8 minutes for a quart of milk.

In the days when the farmer—because of the high cost of the farm program—is increasingly becoming the target of criticism, I believe it is important to point out such factors. The decline in real costs of such commodities—for the most part, at the expense of the farmer—has contributed greatly to holding down the costs of living.

I wish to stress, also, that the farmer often receives too little of the dollars and cents value of his product.

Currently, for example, a dairy farmer in Wisconsin may sell his milk for 6 cents a quart. Within 24 hours, the same milk may be sold at a retail price of about 24 cents a quart. Now, is the farmer getting a fair share of the retail price? Definitely not.

The 6 or 7 cents a quart received for milk is not only too small a share of the retail price, but it is also inadequate in terms of meeting the costs of equipment, labor, taxes, and other skyrocketing expenses of farm operations.

Now, who is getting the money? From time to time investigations have been made into this problem, including hearings by congressional committees. Unfortunately, the big price spread between what the farmer receives for a product and what it sells for retail continues to account for an increasingly large portion of the higher price to the consumer.

Recently, the Dairy Record, an authoritative voice in dairying, published an editorial entitled "The Real Cost of Milk." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL COST OF MILK

It would require a very aggressive job of public relations to convince the consumer that the real price of a quart of milk has shown a steady decline since 1890, but such actually has been the case.

The Milk Industry Foundation points out that the real price of milk is represented not by the number of cents required to pay for it but by the amount of work that the consumer has to do to earn enough money to buy it.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has collected data for 70 years on milk prices and the number of minutes of factory work required to earn the price of a home-delivered quart, using the factory worker's average hourly earnings as a basis.

In 1890 the average price for quart of home-delivered milk was 6.8 cents and it required 25.5 minutes for a wage earner to earn enough to buy the quart for in those halcyon days of low wages the average hourly factory wage was 16 cents.

In 1914 the average price of milk was 8.9 cents; it required 22.9 minutes to earn the price of a quart of milk and the average hourly factory wage was 23.3 cents per hour. In the booming year of 1929 the price of milk had advanced to 14.4 cents per quart; the average hourly wage was 56.6 cents and it required 15.3 minutes to earn enough to buy the quart of milk.

In the postwar days of 1947 the average price per quart was 19.6 cents; the average hourly factory wage was $1.237 and it only required 9.5 minutes to earn that quart bottle of milk. In 1959 the January-October average price of milk was 25.2 cents; the average hourly factory wage was $2.216 and it required only 6.8 minutes to earn the price of the quart.

Consumers seldom, if ever, give any thought to the relative stability of milk prices or that it takes less out of the family budget in relation to income than is the case with most other products which they buy.

Milk distributors continue to operate on a margin of slightly more than 2 cents of each sales dollar for a net profit of about one-half cent a quart. There may be many individual companies which are operating on a 2 percent margin, but we doubt very much that there are any great number of industries which in the overall are operating on such a slim percentage margin.

And this is the industry that political demagogs from time to time raise their quavering voices to demand that the fluid milk industry be made a public utility.

The Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was no surprise that the President, in his budget message yesterday, included as part of his anticipated surplus some $554 million, which he proposes be raised by increasing first-class and airmail rates by 1 cent to liquidate the postal deficit.

Over the years the administration has complained about the size of the postal deficit and has periodically proposed legislation to increase rates. Yet, for some strange reason it carefully avoids proposals which would increase the rates on the types of mail which really cause the tremendous postal deficit.

I refer, of course, to the preferential second-class rates granted newspapers and magazines—outright subsidies totaling more than $200 million a year for profitmaking second-class publications. A few large magazines, such as Life, Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, Look, and others, are carried at taxpayers' expense to the tune of $4 million, $7 million, and up to $10 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, last July 28 I introduced H.R. 8433 to place an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies, based on a 5-year sliding scale—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, pages 14543–14547.

The bill would provide that during the first year, Post Office Department costs of receipt, handling, processing, transporting, and delivering of second-class publications to its subscribers by mail may not exceed by more than $5 million the annual postage paid by the publication. During the second year this subsidy could be a maximum of $3 million per publication; the third year a maximum subsidy of $1 million; the fourth year a maximum subsidy of $500,000; and during the fifth year and each year thereafter, a maximum subsidy of $100,000 for each publication. Once the subsidy limit were reached for any publication during any year, the full postal rate necessary to cover the Department's costs for that publication would go into effect.

This bill is similar to, but meets specific criticisms offered by the magazine publishing industry to a previous version of my bill, adopted by the House as an amendment to the postal rate bill in the last Congress, but subsequently dropped from conference.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would bring in new revenue to the Post Office Department from the types of mail now incurring the deficit. First-class mail is more than paying its own way. The administration proposes to impose the burden on the average mail user to cover up the huge deficits being incurred by profit-making magazines. There is no doubt of this fact. During the last year's hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Department, Mr. Hyde Gillette, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Finance said, in anwer to a question about magazine losses to the Department:

Mr. Chairman, it is true that magazines probably pay more than a hundred million dollars less than the cost of handling them, but part of that is offset by the extra amount that the first-class mail pays over and above its fully allocated cost, so that the net effect is not carried through directly to the deficit.

If the Post Office Department were really interested in eliminating the postal deficit, it would support my bill and urge that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee schedule hearings. Yet both the Department and the Bureau of the Budget has reported adversely on H.R. 8433 and its companion bill, H.R. 8603, introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming support I have received for my bill from persons all over the country has convinced me that Americans are becoming increasingly resentful of having their tax

dollars used to subsidize profitable publishing companies. As evidence of this fact, I call attention to Bulletin No. 252 "The Mandate," published by the National Federation of Independent Business. Members are familiar with these ballots on national issues, conducted by this organization for many years.

Question No. 3 of Bulletin No. 252, circulated last fall reads:

Reduce postal rate subsidies: Are you for or against Congress requiring all large national magazines to pay their full share of Post Office mailing costs, the same as users of first-class mail are required to do?

As is the usual practice, a pro and con statement on the issue was presented:

Argument for reducing subsidies: $200 million yearly, that's what it is costing the U.S. Post Office to handle the weekly and monthly mailings of the Nation's giant magazines. That is the difference between its costs, and what they pay for postal services. This subsidy has amounted to $2.5 billion during the past 12 years, and it has been paid for out of the pockets of people who more than pay their way when they use first-class mail. Meanwhile the firms publishing these magazines have been running up record profits, and indulging in all sorts of cut-rate offers to take bread and butter out of the mouths of small businessmen in the magazine distribution field.

Argument against reducing subsidies: These national magazines are paying their way. Through countrywide advertising programs they make possible, they help to keep the wheels of industry turning, employment high, and earnings ever mounting, which means purchasing power available for business, large and small. More than this, they are educating our people about important national issues and events, and furnishing them top-flight entertainment. In our postal scheme, they are never supposed to "pay their way," in any way other than these. Despite this, their mail handling *cost is low*, and they are charged for part of the services they receive.

Mr. Speaker, the result of this nationwide poll among small businessmen were published in bulletin No. 253 as follows:

Reduce postal-rate subsidies: For, 84 percent; against, 13 percent; no vote, 3 percent.

So long as the administration opposes efforts to curb the exorbitant second-class publishers' subsidies, we must continue to vigorously resist pressures to raise the rates on first class and air mail.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence provides an opportunity for all Americans and free people everywhere to do honor to the continued struggle of a courageous people for freedom.

It is worth reminding ourselves that wherever or whenever freedom is denied, then the idea of freedom itself is in danger. Free people can never relax in the presence of tyranny.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the World Congress of Ukrainian Women, sponsored in New York by the Ukrainian National Women's League of America. It was an impressive demonstration to me of the undying determination of people of Ukrainian descent, wherever they may live, to keep alive the hope of freedom for their brethren still in Soviet Ukraine.

Under previous leave, I include my remarks on that occasion in the RECORD as a testimonial of my own admiration for their courage:

UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN WOMEN AND FREEDOM

I want first of all to greet the delegates to this World Congress of Ukrainian Women and to welcome those of you from other countries to our own, and of course I want also to congratulate the Ukrainian National Women's League of America for sponsoring this Congress.

Woman's role in our civilization has always been considered important, though that importance has not been adequately emphasized and properly understood. Certainly such has been the case in the distant past, in ancient times, in the Middle Ages, and in some countries and communities even in our own day.

From time immemorial woman's status and her role was more or less clearly defined and widely recognized: the home was her special place, and to attend to all the details within and around the house was her rigidly prescribed duty. She brought warmth and encouragement to her growing children and helped her husband as indispensable partner in all phases of the family. But with the coming of industrialization, the rise of modern metropolitan centers, urbanization, and all the complexity of today's civilization, this seemingly happy equilibrium was upset. A different relationship developed. Men went off to their work and women remained at home. A separateness and sharp division—a distance—grew up between man and woman. But today we are learning that man alone cannot cope with all his pressing and perplexing problems without the encouragement and inspiration, without the aid and counsel and assistance of woman. Thus, in a sense we have traversed a long distance, through the ages, in enlarging the area in which woman works, in enhancing her standing in our civic and social lives, and in appreciating more properly her indispensable role in modern society as her role was also understood—taken for granted—in earlier societies.

These general remarks apply equally to the women of the Ukraine as they apply to the women of America and to those of other countries, particularly to the women of the free and democratic West. It is difficult for one not brought up in the Ukrainian tradition in the historic Ukraine, for one not well acquainted with the traditional Ukrainian family and communal customs, and the Ukrainian way of life, to speak of women in the Ukraine, and describe adequately their important role, to the World Congress of Ukrainian Women. But this challenge may be attempted if one has had a keen interest in Ukrainian affairs, has followed recent tragic history of the Ukrainian people in their homeland, has learned of their struggle for freedom against their heartless oppressors, has known Ukrainian-Americans at work here, and has been aided with information by the Ukrainian National Women's League of America. I have these interests and have enjoyed the favors of the Women's League, and therefore gladly accepted the invitation to address you today.

Now let me say a few words about the general status of women in the U.S.S.R.

It is extremely interesting and revealing to consider the role Soviet women play in Soviet society today. Soviet society presents us all with the distressing and disturbing dilemma of seeing the mixture of good and evil. This is so in a review of Soviet accomplishments in education and science. In the case of the Soviet woman, this dilemma is even more sharply delineated.

The Soviet woman holds some of the most important positions in Soviet economic life and some of the most degrading and humiliating. If any of you ladies present were to be admitted to a hospital in Moscow, Kiev, or Tiflis, undoubtedly you would be attended by a woman doctor. Women dominate the medical profession in the U.S.S.R. It is estimated that in both the medical profession and in education more than 70 percent are women.

Women in the Soviet Union are also technicians and engineers and hold responsible positions in the Soviet Government and the Communist Party organizations. A woman, Madame Furtseva, is actually a member of the highest organ of Soviet political power, the party Presidium.

Yet, this is only one side of the picture. To be sure many hundreds of thousands of women are engaged in the familiar roles of housewife, mother, teacher, doctor, and researcher. But the Soviet woman is also doing a man's job—often of the most back-breaking kind. For every Soviet woman who is a doctor there are many more who wield picks and shovels in construction work, drive rivets in steel structures, run massive agricultural machines, haul mortar and brick, repair sewers, and sweep the city streets day and night. None of these is a pleasant task. All are degrading and humiliating in the extreme.

Why do we see such striking contrasts in the treatment of women? One part of the answer lies in the fact that Soviet Russia suffers from an acute labor shortage. Thus, to achieve the extraordinary goals laid down by the successive 5-year plans, the Soviet Government has not hesitated to exploit the Soviet woman. The Soviet labor force needs them. It is estimated that a third of all heavy manual labor in the U.S.S.R. is being done by women and that nearly one-half of all industrial and factory jobs are held by them. Recent statistics on Soviet population indicate that in 1939, before the war, 52 percent of the total population were women and 48 percent men; the 1959 census revealed that owing to war losses of manpower, the current percentage of the total population of 208,800,000 is 55 percent women to 45 percent men.

The fundamental explanation for women's position in the Soviet Union, however, can be found in the nature of the Soviet system and the Communist ideology. Here, the state is the all-important consideration. In theory, of course, the state consists of all the people and exists to serve their best interests. But in Communist practice, the state is directed by the Communist Party which alone knows what is best for the people. And, the Communist Party, in turn, is dominated by a handful of top officials, and led by a dictator, whose every decision and desire is law.

In a free society, all the people participate not only in the work of the state but in making the decisions. The goals and purposes of a free democracy are the goals and purposes freely determined by its people. Even minorities, even those who may disagree, are protected in their freedom because a truly free society in the Western tradition insists upon limits to the power of government. The essential dignity and freedom of the individual is guaranteed against the demands of the state—no matter how large a majority may feel otherwise.

This, of course, is not so in Soviet society—and this explains the basic difference in the role of women as between the free world and the Communist world. The people of Soviet Russia—regardless of differences in nationality, religion, or personal desires—must devote their services and efforts to the Communist state in whatever way its Communist masters order. There is little or no free choice. If one woman is assigned a profession that gives her unusual opportunity, it is not because she chose it freely or earned it fairly; it is exclusively due to the decision of the Government that she could best serve the state in that capacity. Likewise, the degrading work to which other women are assigned results from the same impersonal, dictatorial decision of the Government. There is no free choice, no consideration of individual rights, no opportunity for freely developing one's God-given talents and tastes.

I have no doubt, however, that before all and above all Ukrainian women in their native homeland and in their personal lives are proud mothers, faithful wives, efficient homemakers, and vigilant guardians of family and community conscience insofar as the state permits. But it is difficult for Ukrainian women in the Ukraine, under the stern and unrelenting Communist totalitarian dictatorship, to retain these virtues and carry on their difficult and onerous tasks. There, under the most oppressive of tyrannies, in the very midst of abject misery. Ukrainian women cannot hope to be their true selves. They are not allowed to be true to themselves, to their families and communities. The monolithic Communist regime, with its purely materialistic beliefs has been forcibly trying to imbue the women of Ukraine with Marx's preposterous and ungodly beliefs. For nearly 40 years the fanatical and brutal Communists have been doing their worst to rob the women, as also the men, of Ukraine of their time-honored and venerated traditions and virtues. Fortunately, Communist attempts have not succeeded, and I am glad to be assured that today the courageous and stout-hearted women of Communist-dominated Ukraine still steadfastly and tenaciously cling to their womanly, motherly, and family virtues. There, against heavy and often forbidding odds, they are carrying on the fight with all the means they possess for the preservation of these virtues, and also for their personal and national freedom. These dauntless and daring souls deserve our unstinted praise and wholehearted sympathy for their willingness and readiness to sacrifice their all in defense of their cultural and spiritual values.

The virtues of family love, of motherly affection and of concern for the local community are the basic necessities in all free societies. They are much the same in every country and among all peoples, but only those who enjoy the blessings of freedom and democracy may freely practice them. That explains the close relationship and the spiritual kinship prevailing among women of the free world, and also between the women of the free world and the freedom-loving women of the unfree, Communist-dominated world. Of course even closer is the spiritual and cultural relationship between the Ukrainian-American women, the women of Ukrainian descent in other free countries, and the women of the Ukraine itself. That is only natural and desirable. There should be unbreakable ties between the women in the Ukraine and those in the free world. These ties need strengthening, cementing and forging through constantly sustained efforts on the part of women of Ukrainian descent, and particularly by American women of Ukrainian descent.

Those in this country, as well as all of you here representing Ukrainian women in the free world, have the special mission of acquainting the women of your particular country with the lot and fate, with the gifts and talents, with the accomplishments and attainments, with the hopes and aspirations of the women of Ukraine. And since the women of unfree Ukraine are not in position—are not allowed—to speak for themselves, it is incumbent upon all of you in the free world to speak for them, to espouse their cause in all the forums of the free world. I consider this task, in fact, the task of speaking for the women of Ukraine, as one of your solemn duties. It is a primary and basic obligation of women of Ukrainian descent in the free world.

The Ukrainian National Women's League of America, in the course of its existence during the last 34 years, has been doing splendid work both in the propagation of the cause of Ukraine, and also in welfare and educational fields in a large number of communities. Operating in 16 States with 63 branches in many parts of this country, its activities reach out to all communities having large numbers of Ukrainian-Americans. As a civic, cultural, educational and welfare organizations, the league has been helpful to all those needing aid and guidance. Besides giving financial and material aid to the needy, it has been rendering signal service in guidance and educational work, particularly among immigrant Ukrainians. In this respect, the league has become a first-rate educational agency, an enterprising American institution, in teaching and educating Ukrainian immigrants in the American way of life. If the league has done nothing else, this delicate and difficult work alone would command our admiration and high praise. I am indeed glad to express my personal and profound admiration for such fine work.

Since its founding in 1925, the object of the league has been, and remains, that of uniting and organizing women of Ukrainian birth and descent in this country for the purpose of mutual benefit, and for the promotion of their common interest, as well as giving assistance to Ukrainians in Europe.

As I said before, in all of its varied and worthwhile activities, in the performance of many humanitarian and educational tasks, the league has been eminently successful. Let me state that it will be even more successful in its future endeavors after this congress, for I am sure that upon your return to your respective countries, you will carry your fine work with increased vigor, energy, and zeal. And the league, knowing that its work has been properly and fully appreciated, will continue the policies which have been endorsed and acclaimed by its members and followers.

I have admired the work of the league in all fields and in all communities, in domestic and international affairs. And I like particularly the slogan adopted by the league for this congress: "Ukrainian women in the non-Communist world in defense of the four freedoms, and of the human rights." In these precarious days, we in the free world should never relax our vigilance in behalf of our most cherished values, our birthrights, our freedoms, the Bill of Rights, and the human rights that belong to all people for all of which freedom-seeking humanity has struggled throughout its known history.

It is of course natural that those who suffer most under tyranny should become its most uncompromising enemies, vowing to fight for its destruction. For that reason I can well understand, and everyone should know, why Ukrainian women everywhere in the free world are so bitterly and justly opposed to all forms of totalitarianism and dictatorship, particularly to Communist totalitarian dictatorship. It is the natural but courageous response of good people to become involved in this world struggle for freedom and independence against the forces of darkness and destruction, against Soviet Communist dictatorship. You have grasped the full significance of that struggle, encompassing not only man's material possessions but also his very soul. By your willingness and readiness to take such a strong and honorable stand against Communist tyranny, you are assuring to yourselves a high place among those who have fought and died for the higher and nobler ideals of humanity. The women of Ukraine, the women of Ukrainian birth and descent, the delegates of the World Congress of Ukrainian Women, and the members of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America—you all deserve well of the free world, for you are fighting in defense of the four freedoms wherever they are denied in the world.

State, School, and Child in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address I was privileged to give when I was invited to appear on the program for the South Dakota Educational Association Convention at Aberdeen, S. Dak., on November 4, 1959, and at Spearfish, S. Dak., on November 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE, SCHOOL, AND CHILD IN TODAY'S WORLD

(Excerpts from the remarks of FRANCIS H. CASE, U.S. Senator for South Dakota, Education Association at Aberdeen, Nov. 4, 1959 and Spearfish, Nov. 5, 1959)

"The primary function of any legislative body is the education and training of its youth." In those words, Aristotle, some 300 years B.C., stated the partnership responsibility of the educator and the legislator.

Figures released by the Census Bureau show over 4,300,000 births in the United States last year, a net increase of more than 2,600,000 over deaths. At 30 to a class, that calls for 90,000 additional classrooms when the babies of 1959 enter school.

We also have the new space age and all the requirements of foreign language study, higher mathematics, physics and electronics that have come with it.

Here is the price tag on the public school crisis in our own State of South Dakota that was recently put forth by the Citizens' Tax Study Committee:

Total spent in 1946, $15 million; total spent in 1950, $23 million; total spent in 1958, $42 million. Projecting, that will be $46 million in 1960; a 100 percent increase in 10 years.

To you who measure school costs in terms of mill levy, here was the committee's figure on that: 17.2 mills in 1950; 21.7 mills last year in 1958; but 38.3 mills in 1970 on the State's total assessed valuation to raise the estimated requirement at that time.

BIDDING FOR TEACHERS

To be sure, our State's increasing population now should provide a greater annual income and our assessable values should increase—and in my opinion will greatly increase during the next decade, but any way you look at it, the need for larger revenues for schools is very real and very large.

I can remember one year when a western school district advertised to let the job of teacher to the lowest bidder—and got one

for less than $40 per month. But, the kind of education that is needed today is not to be found on any bargain counter of low standards and low salaries.

Some teachers may supplement their income by outside employment, but free-lance writing, baby-sitting, and even seasonal refereeing of athletic contests cannot be counted upon to recruit and retain the number and the quality of teachers that the needs of our country require today.

By whatever means is necessary, local government, State government, and Federal Government—mark you, I include Federal Government—must join in a common endeavor to provide the dollars necessary to offer the kind of education that will meet the challenge of the day in which we live.

AID NEED NOT MEAN CONTROL

Federal aid does not need to mean control. We have had Federal aid to education ever since Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant Act into law in 1862, almost 100 years ago.

Here are some of the possibilities to explore: Dedication of revenues from natural resource development is one way. Profits of the State cement plant over and above the $2 million now earmarked for highways is an example—and might provide a dividend on classrooms built with cement. A penny sales tax to be distributed to school districts on a per capita basis would not mean controls and would let South Dakota's growing number of visitors share in the cost of the communities they here enjoy.

In all taxation, it is well to remember the epigram of old Bob Doughton: "You can shear a sheep many times but you can skin him only once."

If government meets its responsibility in financing, then what?

Take the child. If government provides his education, does it have the right to possess the child? My answer is: "No."

However important it may be to have scientists and engineers, doctors and nurses, or whatever calling you name, the free world will lose the very faith that makes it free if government dictates the product of education. It can offer incentives for courses to pursue; it can provide facilities essential to certain training; but when the state seeks to possess the mind of the student, education fails.

COMPETITION IN LEARNING

Russian children, we are told, are required to complete 7 years of schooling and they are moving toward 10 years. The 7-year students have had 7½ Carnegie units in mathematics, 1½ in history, 1½ in geography, 1½ in biology, 1⅓ in physics and chemistry, 2 in a foreign language. The 10-year exams are estimated by the College Entrance Examination Board in this country to be roughly equivalent to the advanced mathematics examination which is taken by only about 10 percent of the 12th grade students in the United States. The 10-year graduates must pass an examination in 7 academic subjects—Russian language and literature, one foreign language, algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry and biology.

Here is a sample question in history: "Set forth the universal-historical significance of the formation of the U.S.S.R.—the first multi-national socialist state in the world." Another: "The great advance of the Soviet Army in 1944 and its liberation of European countries abroad from Hitlerite invaders."

Here is one in physics: "An automobile which weighs 5 tons with its load proceeds along an arched bridge at a speed of 21.6 kilometers per hour. What is its pressure upon the middle of the bridge, if the radius of the bridge's curvature is 50 meters?" Or this: "A container weighing 250 kilograms falls from 800 meters. At a point 100 meters above the earth, what is its potential and kinetic energy equal to?"

But in our anxiety to improve our educational policies and methods, we must not abandon the regard for the individual child which is a basic corollary of our belief in the rights of the individual and the limits to which government can go in possessing the child.

HOW MEASURE PURPOSE OR DRIVE?

When the Committee of Five was created to plan the new Academy of the U.S. Air Force, Dr. Virgil Hancher, president of the University of Iowa, told us there has never yet been devised a satisfactory method to measure the drive in a young man's personality.

Who could have predicted that a small town high school such as Canton, S. Dak., in one school generation could have produced two of the world's greatest scientists of our generation, Dr. Merle Tuve, president of the Carnegie Institution in Washington, and the late Dr. Ernest Orlando Lawrence, inventor of the cyclotron which smashed the atom and ushered us into the age of nuclear power?

Badger Clark reminded us:

"That is the small town's latent power,
Some name upon its schoolroom page,
The future hero of the hour,
The future glory of an age.
'Twas always so; 'twill always be—
Small town, the great folks' starting place
A small-town boy in Galilee
Rerouted all the human race."

Close to this is our belief that in America, good citizenship requires minds capable of exercising the powers and responsibilities of self-government. There are values, to be sure, in taking public opinion polls—but woe to America if we ever permit our laws to be made solely upon the basis of the latest percentages. As someone has said, it's a good thing for us that the signers of the Declaration of Independence did not wait for a Gallup poll.

LET THE MIND BE FREE

If our schools are to perform the function the State needs, we will not demand conformity. We will let teachers maintain a certain amount of objectivity, independence, "academic freedom" if you will. We will expect even legislators to think for themselves once in a while.

Our own State of South Dakota is entering into a new day. Our preconstruction forecasts of the effect of the great dams on the Missouri River may be modified—greater interest in recreational opportunities than expected; slow progress in utilization of water for irrigation; insistent growth demands for hydroelectric power; but withal, a faster rate of population growth. More and more of our young people should find opportunities in their home State.

If we provide them with true educational opportunities, we shall expect not servile minds, trained to parrot self-serving doctrines of an all-powerful government, but persons with all the rights and strengths of human dignity.

Ann Mundelein, of Sioux Falls, in Pasque Petals, put it so plainly in these lines:

"Oh, Chinese mother sitting by the roadside beside your child,
What does the future hold for him?
Will he be taught the wisdom of Laotze or of Confucius?
And the proverbs of the Sages?
Will he learn great poetry—'The Lure of Jade' and 'The Gray Bird Flying'?
Will he take his place as head of the family
To become a Venerable Ancestor?
Or—will he be only a tool in the fist of the State?"

The third goal of education—this education for which we are to provide adequate funds—should be to provide society at large with leadership in the constructive use of the knowledge which the educational system develops.

A simple example would be to say that we should produce men and women who will show the world an increasing number of ways to use nuclear power for peace rather than for war. President Eisenhower has well said that "Peace is the paramount goal of our times."

WORLD'S PEOPLE WANT PEACE

It has been my privilege to attend meetings of the Interparliamentary Union as a delegate from the U.S. Senate. There, wistfully, almost despairingly, the smaller nations of the world appeal to those from the great powers to assure them that there will be no nuclear war. They know that radiation unloosed in such a conflict would engulf them.

On the 1st day of September last, I spoke to the general assembly of the Union meeting in the chambers of the Sejm, the name of Poland's parliamentary body. That was in Warsaw, destroyed over 80 percent in the last war but now remarkably rebuilt. That was the 20th anniversary of the day that Hitler invaded Poland and sent bombers over Warsaw.

I joined other speakers in praising the valor of the Poles and their efforts in reconstruction. I reminded them that people in other countries, in the large countries, also wanted peace. I assured them that people in my country did not relish the high taxes from every dollar of which over 60 cents go into maintaining the weapons of security.

Our President, with other international leaders, has called for reduction of armaments, but the arms race is the result of aggression from without and subversion from within. Tension comes from threats to freedom; mere promises of arms reduction are not sufficient; there must be agreement upon controls respecting nuclear tests, placement of weapons and deployment of troops; and finally, there must be the machinery to carry out the agreements.

Educators along with legislators and leaders of thought in all walks of life have a responsibility to help produce the climate of opinion and to turn out the mechanics by which the people on this planet can live in peace.

What would be your attitude, if you were an Asiatic and you had seen a great power unleash an atomic blast over Hiroshima that had burned and buried thousands of people who were noncombatants and of all ages, men, women, and children? And what would have been your reaction as an Asiatic if we had saturated the eastern provinces of China with the modern-day counterpart of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs in an effort to immobilize Red China's effort to recover Quemoy by force?

We have stated we would not start a war, that someone else would have to be the aggressor, but a great many strategists argue we should not wait if the opposition seems poised to strike. That is not the position of General Norstad, commander of the NATO forces, but some others hold it.

WE CAN DO MORE

By the student and teacher exchanges with which you are familiar a great deal has been done; more needs to be done. By cultural and spiritual exchanges more can be done.

I have seen devout worshippers in the churches of Poland, the most Catholic country in Europe. I have seen people standing in the rain out on to the sidewalk for half a block away to get into one of three two-hour services in a Baptist church in Moscow; I saw two Catholic churches filled there, one crowded for standing room where a Polish priest administered sacraments.

People, people, human beings, deep in their hearts have a spiritual longing in every

country. The barriers of race and language can be overcome if the desire is great enough and if the task of understanding is undertaken as a mutual problem and recognition is ready when mutual effort is given.

So, as partners in these matters, let us provide the means whereby education may do its task in our day.

Let us provide the child with the fundamentals of knowledge and a mind that knows how to work for the good of mankind.

Let us understand that the object of education is not to produce slaves of the state, but citizens with free, creative minds, able, and alert for self-government.

Let us provide a society with the leadership it rightly expects in solving the great problem of our day—finding the way in which peoples and nations can live on this planet in peace and moving to new heights of mental, moral, and cultural development.

When Alfred Tennyson dipped his pen into the future for his immortal Locksley Hall, he saw "men the workers, ever reaping something new; that which they have done but earnest of the things they shall do."

New Starts, U.S.A

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 19, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement which I was privileged to make before the Electric Consumers Information Committee on January 18, 1960, at the Willard Hotel in Washington:

NEW STARTS, U.S.A.

(Remarks by Hon. JAMES C. OLIVER, of Maine, at the ECIC Legislative Workshop in Washington, D.C., on January 18, 1960)

Ladies and gentlemen, we meet here today to discuss one of the most vital problems which confront the American people and, in effect, that could mean, as well, the people of the entire free world, because of the international leadership which has been thrust upon us since the end of World War II.

I refer, of course, to the issue of so-called new starts in the progressive and aggressive developments of the natural resources of America. At least, in my opinion, the effect of availing ourselves or not availing ourselves, both as people of America, and as people of the world, of the maximum benefits which can, and will flow from such development of our real wealth, namely, the natural resources of our earth and its usable environment can mean the difference whether we survive, both physically and economically. Therefore, to me, the issue of new starts goes far beyond the immediate scope of the specific projects which may be in our minds for fiscal years, 1961, or thereafter.

Naturally, every one of us is concerned as to the fate of specific projects which have great importance for our States and our regional areas. This, of course, is as it should be. But, when I think of the dedication of such great Americans as Senator George W. Norris, and his vision of multipurpose development of the great major river basins of this Nation, together, with the unselfish and never-deviating determination which he applied over the years; then, it is, that I am forced to lift my thinking from the trees of individual projects to the forest of the basic significance of full exploitation of the great unharnessed potential of the natural resources of America and of the world.

Mr. Chairman, unless we get bold, courageous, and creative imaginative leadership in our Government in the elections of this year, the new starts, so vital to America and the world are doomed. We can no longer gamble that time is running in our favor as we realize the potency of the drive and the determination of the Soviet-Sino bloc. My distinguished colleagues, here today, have a far better understanding than I, in this regard. My friend and leader from Maine, our former Governor and now Senator, able ED MUSKIE, for whom Maine people have a most abiding and sincere affection and the utmost respect, has already given our folks his impressions of the dedicated drive and purpose of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people to unceasing efforts to develop all of their natural resources.

The Soviets and the Chinese know nothing and want to know nothing of the issue of new starts. They never stop. Our policy of stop and go, of the turning off and on of the spigot of needed public projects is a luxury that we might conceivably have afforded in the past, but, not today as we face up in this last half of the 20th century to the life and death challenge of those who would bury us.

However, I appreciate that this gathering of leaders and members of organizations, who have been devoted for years to the philosophy and crusading spirit of statesmen of the stature of George Norris, does not need any words from me to renew their faith or to stimulate their already aggressive attitudes to get this job done.

As I see it, the job which must be done is to persuade the American people that we can no longer rest upon our gains of the past. This means that we must move forward with progressive action. In science, and technology, we do not hesitate. We know that we must have basic research, and from the ideas gleaned from such research we have no hesitancy in applying these ideas to our industrial operations. Without this sort of pioneering, we would soon be bankrupt. Conservatism, to the point of ignoring our needs, and of sweeping under the rug, our obvious problems is nothing but radicalism of the most dangerous type. It means ruin. These next 40 years of the 20th century will continue to find us in such competition as we have never known before. Being afraid or reluctant to reach for unorthodox answers to unorthodox problems is not Americanism or the American way. Call it smugness, complacency, or what you will. It adds up to defeatism—defeatism which must result in bankruptcy and ruin.

But, my friends, this has been the policy of this administration. It has called itself progressive; but, it has failed to meet the needs of the people; and, consequently, it has been regressive. It has failed to measure up to the challenge. It has placed dollars above needs. It has subordinated the dignity of people to an idolatry of dollars. It has paid obeisance to stability, and, in some areas, even stagnation when we should have been surging ahead with new life, growth and expansion.

Under these condition, it is only natural that we should have the policy of no new starts. It is only natural that we should be handicapped with the tight-money policy and the unconscionable increase in the interest rate structure which is strangling us with accumulative usurious results. This has been done in the name of anti-inflationism. We are told that there is scarcity of credit and money. Money should only be thought of, in my opinion, as a reflection of our economic activity. When the administration decides to get off its knees where it has been paying tribute to the golden calf of dollars, and decides to expand the credit supply of this Nation; then, and then only, will we get the new starts which are so essential to our survival.

The money supply today is less in terms of the gross national product than it was 7 years ago. For example, per $1,000 of gross national product in 1953 there was $345 of money supply. In 1959, per $1,000 of gross national product, there was $295 of money supply. Expansion and growth through new starts just cannot survive in this contracting environment. We are told that there is not enough money to meet the demands. Yet, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, which control the money supply, refuse to take those measures which would expand the money supply. Again, we are told that this would be inflationary. Yet, the scarcity of money, we are told, increases the rental rate of dollars, namely, the interest rates. This, in turn, is one of the most inflationary factors that is feeding the fire of inflation. If the interest rate of 5 percent is increased by one-half of 1 percent, this represents, in my arithmetic, to a 10 percent administered price increase, which is felt in the homes and business activities of every nook and cranny of this great Nation. Such increases strangle new starts on the public projects which are the lifeblood of this Nation.

Tight money, increasing interest rates, and unwillingness of the administration leaders to face the facts of the needs of a growing Nation and the threat of the Soviet-Sino challenge are the basic factors which will cause this administration to be recorded in history as the leadership which did not lead and which threatened to cause America to lose its opportunity to remain as the world's leader for centuries to come.

But, this can be changed. It can be changed if this session of the 86th Congress refuses to lift the 4½ percent ceiling on interest rate of long term bonds. At least, this must not be done until fiscal and monetary reforms are realized. To lift this ceiling, otherwise, will mean that a green light will be given to that school of thought which believes that money is a commodity rather than a medium of exchange; which believes that we can be prosperous and healthy without a restricted cost of money; that 7 percent money is not inconceivable in a healthy economy; that our taxpayers can meet an ever-increasing debt service charge on our public debt; that we can afford the continued strangulation of new starts in our program of public projects; that, in short, we can continue a policy of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

It is my feeling that we can do something about these dangerous policies. This session of Congress can refuse to lift the interest ceiling. It can direct the Fed to support all types of Government securities. It can direct the Fed to use its power to increase reserve requirements of member banks whenever necessary. In short, it can establish the same policy that was used to finance the war.

In other words, it can expand the money supply in terms of the needs of the people of this country. But, to be practical, it will probably do none of these things and America will be forced to wait until the next administration takes over to face up to the urgent needs of an economy which is all ready to go but which is being held in check by those who prefer to sit on the powder keg of conservative and orthodox policies which are not meeting, and will not meet, the unorthodox conditions which confront us.

Meanwhile, those of us in Maine who are first and always for a policy of action, rather

than inaction and reaction; those of us who have supported and will always support "new starts"; those of us who know that America must process into use those natural resources which are its real wealth; and those of us who believe that dollars and credit are only mechanisms to make the economy grow rather than being a cushion upon which to sit call your attention to our "new start"; namely, the Passamaquoddy-St. John Power project, located in the international waters of Canada and the United States. We urgently solicit your wholehearted and active support of our efforts to realize this start and the completion of this project which can be the beginning of the great northeastern power grid, envisioned by that devoted crusader in power development, Leland Olds, who has already contributed in a substantial way to our cause.

In closing, let me say that it was been a real pleasure to have been invited to be with you in your deliberations. I assure you that the programs of your organizations, devoted to the best interests of the electric power consumers of America, always have had and always will have my enthusiastic and complete support. You are doing a great job and you deserve all possible support for the great battles which so obviously lie ahead.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, in the silence of whose presence the clamor of the outer world dies away, help us to come to this new day, not with hearts clouded by past failures and regrets, but with freshness of mind and with the light of undimmed wonder and of great expectations in our eyes.

All about us are the hard and harsh sounds of discordant voices. Forgive us if we seem to listen too much to those that speak the loudest.

Give us to know that it is the still, small voice that speaks of destiny and of eternal values, not seen or sensed by those who falsely assume that man can live by bread alone. In all our striving, keep our eyes on the verdict of history—that a world built on purely secular levels would be a world that would fester and spoil and corrupt.

Fit us to lead our common humanity, which so largely has lost its way, back to the springs of life and refreshment which alone can restore the souls and bodies of our despairing race. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 19, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 258)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Economic Committee.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1960.

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters it discusses. It summarizes the economic developments of the year and the steps taken in major areas of economic policy to promote the sound expansion of employment, production, and income. It also puts forward a program for the year 1960 which, in the context of present and prospective economic conditions, would effectively implement the purposes of the Employment Act.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

By the first quarter of 1959, the recovery that started early in 1958 had already carried production and income to levels higher than ever before attained in the American economy. A considerable further advance was scored during the remainder of 1959, despite the deep effect of the 116-day strike in the steel industry.

The Nation's output of goods and services in the fourth quarter of 1959 was at an annual rate of $482 billion. When adjusted for price changes, this rate of output was 3½ percent higher than the rate attained in the corresponding period in 1958. By December 1959, total employment had reached a record level, 66.2 million, on a seasonally adjusted basis. And personal income payments in December were at an annual rate of $391 billion, $24 billion greater than a year earlier. After adjustment for increases in prices, the rise in total personal income in 1959 represented a gain of nearly 5 percent in the real buying power of our Nation.

As we look ahead, there are good grounds for confidence that this economic advance can be extended through 1960. Furthermore, with appropriate private actions and public policies, it can carry well beyond the present year.

However, as always in periods of rapid economic expansion, we must avoid speculative excesses and actions that would compress gains into so short a period that the rate of growth could not be sustained. We must seek, through both private actions and public policies, to minimize and contain inflationary pressures that could undermine the basis for a high, continuing rate of growth.

Three elements stand out in the Government's program for realizing the objectives of high production, employment, and income set forth in the Employment Act: first, favorable action by the Congress on the recommendations for appropriations and for measures affecting Federal revenues presented in the budget for the fiscal year 1961; second, use of the resulting surplus, now estimated at $4.2 billion, to retire Federal debt; third, action by the Congress to remove the interest rate limitation that currently inhibits the noninflationary management of the Federal debt. Numerous additional proposals, many of which are described in chapter 4 of the Economic Report, will be made to supplement the Federal Government's existing economic and financial programs.

Following the budget balance now in prospect for the fiscal year 1960, these three elements of the 1960 program will strengthen and be strengthened by the essential contributions to sustainable economic growth made through the policies of the independent Federal Reserve System. Fiscal and monetary policies, which are powerful instruments for preventing the development of inflationary pressures, can effectively reinforce one another.

But these Government policies must be supplemented by appropriate private actions, especially with respect to profits and wages. In our system of free competitive enterprise and shared responsibility, we do not rely on Government alone for the achievement of inflation-free economic growth. On the contrary, that achievement requires a blending of suitable private actions and public policies. Our success in realizing the opportunities that lie ahead will therefore depend in large part upon the ways in which business management, labor leaders, and consumers perform their own economic functions.

A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic growth. Such public opinion can be an effective safeguard against attempts arbitrarily to establish prices or wages at levels that are inconsistent with the general welfare. Informed public opinion is also necessary to support the laws and regulations that provide the framework for the conduct of our economic affairs.

Further progress is needed in establishing a broad public understanding of the relationships of productivity and rewards to costs and prices. It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law, and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth.

Our system of free institutions and shared responsibility has served us well in achieving economic growth and im-

provement. From our past experience, we are confident that our changing and increasing needs in the future can be met within this flexible system, which gains strength from the incentive it provides for individuals, from the scope it affords for individual initiative and action, and from the assurance it gives that Government remains responsive to the will of the people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FALLON, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. MACK of Washington, and Mr. CRAMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that the statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND VICE PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today marks the seventh anniversary of the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States, and also marks the seventh anniversary of the induction of the distinguished Vice President as the Presiding Officer of this body.

Mr. President, that was a great day in American destiny. I have often said that, in my judgment, there is a quiet, brooding destiny that looks after the affairs of men and nations. I have puzzled hundreds of times about how one could account for the fact that Abraham Lincoln came on the American scene when he did and made his exit when he did, if it were not the unfolding of a divine pattern of history.

I feel that way, too, Mr. President, about the distinguished occupant of the White House, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. First of all, he came at a time when I think a sort of spurious liberalism existed in the country; and when I describe it as "spurious," I mean a degradation of the word "liberal" and its meaning, because, as any student knows, the very word "liberal" is derived from the Latin word "liber," meaning free. So the word "liberalism" pertains to freedom. But the amazing kind of liberalism that was growing in the country at that time was interpreted in terms of deeper intrusion of government and government control.

So, Mr. President, at that period, our distinguished President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and you, sir, came into the national picture and reversed the course, and, I believe, set America on better ground.

Second, I would say that what the country needed at that time was the impress of warm and wholesome personalities. Those came like a tonic to our country 7 years ago today. I feel that thereby the country was deeply enriched and deeply inspired.

Mr. President, our distinguished President, and you, sir, came at a time when solvency was becoming little more than a word in the dictionary; somehow it had lost its meaning and had lost its vitality. But we gave it meaning, because of its importance to the perpetuity of free institutions and the assurance that in solvency America will not go down the disastrous road which, within our generation, has caused the foundering of so many countries.

I think the same can be said about our peace and security. President Eisenhower came at a time when young men of our country were still yielding their blood in the valleys and on the slopes of Korea. But all that has been stopped; and I can think of no greater boast, Mr. President, than that in this 7-year period no young men of America have left their lifeblood on some foreign battlefield. Mr. President, if we had nothing else of which to boast, that fact in itself would be justification for the victory we won, and further justification for the victories I envision ahead.

I believe that President Eisenhower, and you, sir, came at a time when a peculiar and clammy cynicism was beginning to fasten its tentacles upon the thinking and the feeling of America.

I know there are liberals who find rare amusement when one talks about history as being the unfolding of some kind of divine pattern with the dignity of man at its very core. Perhaps they find amusement in it; and if they can, that will be all right with me.

But President Eisenhower, with his big heart, his big soul, and his warm personality, has, in my judgment, driven back the frostline of cynicism in this country, and has developed an entirely wholesome temper.

Mr. President, I must also say that I think you, sir, and the President of the United States came at a time when individual freedom was being impaired. Once it is impaired—whether in the economic field or in the political field—everything else remains nothing more than a hollow shell.

All these are the wholesome things that have come to America in the 7 years since we have assumed the authority and the responsibility of government.

Mr. President, I congratulate you, sir; and I congratulate the President of the United States. I am sure that on this day there will be a feeling of gratitude and thanksgiving in the hearts and minds of the American people for what has been wrought.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very much pleased this morning to hear the lovely remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois not only in relation to you, but also in relation to the President of the United States. Some of us who were privileged to be present at the time of the inauguration have not been unmindful of what has happened in the intervening years, as we have seen you meet every experience and every challenge in a wonderful way. We have seen you grow in the confidence of the American people, as is evidenced by the polls, so that there cannot be any question, first, as to your nomination, and, next, as to your election. We are very happy to join with the Senator from Illinois in wishing you Godspeed and happy years for you and your wife ahead.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on construction at military installations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components, during the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), reporting, pursuant to law, on the flight pay for that Department, for the 6-month period preceding January 1, 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the reassignment of officers designated for aeronautical engineering duty, other than aerologists, to the unrestricted line of the Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that Agency under the Federal Airport Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON FINAL VALUATIONS OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the civil service retirement system, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of the Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., signed by Thomas Hugh Latimer, executive vice president, relating to the assassination of Paul Bang-Jensen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 37th annual convention of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America and the 5th annual conference of the Young Outdoor Oregonians were held recently in Eugene, Oreg.

The convention adopted a number of resolutions which pertain directly to Federal legislation. These resolutions include recommendations dealing with access to public lands, deer loss in irrigation canals, river development, fish research, and water pollution. All the subjects of the resolutions are of vital concern to citizens of the Northwest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those convention resolutions relating to Federal legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 1950 CONVENTION, OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, EUGENE, OREG., NOVEMBER 28, 1959

RESOLUTION 1. DEER TRAP ON IRRIGATION CANAL

Whereas in the Talent division irrigation project in Oregon, of the Reclamation Bureau, there is a delivery canal consisting of about 17½ miles of trapezoid type and vertical walls, which runs across the area used by the Green Springs black-tailed deer herd; and

Whereas said herd is one of the largest migratory black-tailed deer herds in the West, and said canal cuts straight across the migration route of said deer herd; and

Whereas ramps and slab crossings have been provided at certain places along said canal, but the same generally are ineffective to provide a means of escape for the deer that get into said canal, and such would be true regardless of the number of said ramps and slab crossings provided; and

Whereas a known minimum of 75 deer have been trapped in a 19-mile section of open concrete ditch between Howard Prairie Reservoir and Keene Creek Reservoir during the first month of operation of the project; and

Whereas it is impossible for any fawn to escape from said canal after getting into it; and

Whereas the deer losses caused by said canal will decimate said herd if corrective measures are not taken; and

Whereas a slab covering of said canal or a deer-proof fence with bridges at proper places would eliminate said losses and also any loss of human life and domestic animals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November 1959, That the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation immediately construct improvements that will prevent the loss of human and animal life in Talent project ditches, and until such time as these structures are completed, to drain the ditches or operate the same at levels which will allow animals to escape.

RESOLUTION 2. ROGUE RIVER BASIN STUDY

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is in favor of a dam on the main stem of the Rogue River at the Lost Creek site or above, provided it is constructed and operated so as to be beneficial to anadromous fish resources, wildlife, and recreation as well as flood control; and

Whereas the most important flood control project is a dam at Lost Creek site and the same is unacceptable to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under the proposed operating plan, because of possible damaging effects to the fishery that might result in total loss of the fish runs which have a substantial value to the State of Oregon; and

Whereas an Army Engineers' representative states that they have "substantially completed studies for a plan of development" of the basin but have no funds available for an expanded study to include provisions for possibe fishery benefits on Rogue River; and

Whereas a representative of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service states that water temperratures of the lower Rogue River already are critical and that it is possible that the present plan for Lost Creek Dam would further aggravate the problem and that their service is now making a complete temperature study of Rogue River to determine optimum flow and temperature necessary to enhance anadromous fish life in the Rogue; and

Whereas the present study of the Rogue River is incomplete in that it does not take the needs of anadromous fish resources into full account; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in convention at Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November 1959, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide more time and funds for further study of the Rogue River and tributaries by the Army Engineers, so as to secure an acceptable project on the main stem of the Rogue River at Lost Creek or above that would benefit the anadromous fish resources, wildlife, and recreation; and be it further

Resolved, That until positive assurance can be provided that these benefits will be an integral part of such project the Oregon division stands unalterably opposed to any structure as located and outlined above; and be it further

Resolved, That the congressional delegation from Oregon be urged to work toward this end.

RESOLUTION 5. PUBLIC LAND ACCESS

Whereas the increasing public demand for outdoor recreation is resulting in crowding of available recreational areas and straining the tolerance of some private landowners; and

Whereas the recreational potentials of the 32 million acres of Federal land in Oregon are not being fully utilized for want of an adequate public access to those lands; and

Whereas rights-of-way and access roads are necessary for the proper management and utilization of Federal lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League urges the U.S. Congress to appropriate funds for the development of an adequate public road system to serve all major blocks of Federal land in Oregon.

RESOLUTION 6. PUBLIC LAND ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the public lands and resources administered by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management require greater protection and more intensive development than that Bureau has been equipped to provide; and

Whereas support of the Izaak Walton League for a more aggressive land management program has produced some constructive results during 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League continues to urge the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Congress to strengthen the regulatory authority of the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and provide the appropriations necessary for multiple-use development and management of lands and resources administered by that agency.

The Oregon division further renews confidence in the principles set forth in the public lands resolution adopted in March 1959 and subsequently adopted by the National Izaak Walton League of America.

RESOLUTION 7. FISH RESEARCH

Whereas the anadromous salmon and steelhead trout of the Columbia River are of great economic and esthetic value as sport and commercial fish; and

Whereas the continued production of these fish, particularly the long-run races, is dependent upon the maintenance of natural spawning grounds in the watershed and of migration routes to them; and

Whereas Columbia basin development plans contain proposals for high dams across these migration routes below the few remaining spawning grounds; and

Whereas acquisition of knowledge and skills necessary to provide and maintain

adequate passages past such structures has not kept pace with the planning and design of the dams; and

Whereas research is necessary to obtain this knowledge, vital to maintenance of this renewable natural resource; and

Whereas this Columbia River salmon and steelhead resource is of national significance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Izaak Walton League of America, That the the U.S. Government make $1 million per year available for research into ways and means of maintaining anadromous fish in the face of the major structures proposed for construction below their spawning grounds.

RESOLUTION 8. PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR WATERSHED MANAGEMENT RESEARCH IN OREGON

Whereas our national progress and economic security are vitally dependent upon adequate supplies of usable water; and

Whereas wise use of water-source areas is dependent upon principles of water shed management involving integration of water production with recreational uses, growing and harvesting of timber, and grazing of domestic stock and game animals; and

Whereas deteriorating watershed conditions in the State of Oregon have led to many forms of damage to economic and esthetic values, including flooding, sedimentation of stream channels, and destruction of fish habitat; and

Whereas techniques of sound watershed management have not been developed because of insufficient research, particularly in the Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League—

(a) Promote an expanded program of research on forest and range watershed lands.

(b) Advise members of Oregon's congressional delegation of the need for these investigations and encourage support of increased funds for upstream watershed research by the Forest Service in Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the House Committee on Appropriations, and to Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 10. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESCHUTES RIVER

Whereas the Deschutes River now is one of the outstanding fishing streams of the United States and is noted for its recreational offerings; and

Whereas the stream provides water for irrigation and hydro power; and

Whereas there is an increased demand on its water for all uses; and

Whereas in the past its development has been on a fragmentary, bit by bit, often single use, basis without any plan that gives consideration to all beneficial uses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, assembled in Eugene, Oreg., this 28th day of November, 1959:

(a) Requests the Forest Service to make a study and adopt a program of use of its lands contiguous to the Deschutes River and its tributaries, giving consideration to the multiple use concept, taking into consideration the needs of the people of Oregon and of the United States for outdoor recreation.

(b) Requests the Bureau of Land Management to make a like study.

(c) Requests the committee on natural resources to develop a plan of recreation use and development for the entire Deschutes River Basin, which will coordinate the plans of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, the State lands including State parks, and private lands, and hydroelectric developments.

(d) Requests the Portland General Electric Co., which public utility now operates a hydro project on the Deschutes River known as Pelton, which company desires to build another dam immediately upstream from Pelton, where it has indicated that it will provide substantial recreational opportunities as well as replace the Cove State Park, which Round Butte would inundate, to contribute the sum of $25,000 or more if necessary to the State of Oregon to be used under the direction of the committee on natural resources to hire a recognized, trained, experienced recreationist to act as director for the committee in developing a coordinated recreational plan for the Deschutes River Basin.

(e) Requests the Oregon Water Resources Board to accelerate their announced intention of making a study of the Deschutes River and to adopt a program for the use and control of the Deschutes River Basin, which will give consideration to all beneficial uses including the use of the water for recreation, fish, and wildlife as well as for irrigation, hydro power, pollution abatement, domestic, municipal, and industrial uses.

(f) Request the Fish and Game Commission to develop a plan that would provide the least possible damage to anadromous fish runs and to other game fish in the event the Federal Power Commission should license the construction of Round Butte or any other dam on the Deschutes River and that such plan be presented to Federal Power Commission to be made a part of the license.

(g) Request the State of Oregon to intervene in the application of Portland General Electric Co. to the Federal Power Commission to urge that body to conform to the program for use and control of the Deschutes River as may be adopted by the Oregon Water Resources Board and in the event that the program permits the use of the water in the Round Butte section, that the license, should one be issued by the Federal Power Commission, adopt the plan for fish adopted by Oregon Fish and Game Commissions, and include a recognition of the recreation plan for the use of the river basin to be developed by the State of Oregon through its committee on natural resources and the recreational and land use plans to be developed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

(h) The Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America reiterates its historic stand against the licensing of any single purpose dams or obstructions of any kind in the Deschutes River until the conditions outlined herein are met. It is the firm conviction of this organization that the best use of this river is for fishing and recreation and uses compatible therewith and that this river should not have been and should not be further committed to hydropower uses.

RESOLUTION 11. PUBLIC LANDS EXCHANGE

Whereas problems of access to public lands are in many instances aggravated by the existence of isolated public land parcels that are entirely or largely surrounded by private lands; and

Whereas comprehensive study has been given to this problem by organizations and agencies concerned; and

Whereas several solutions have been proposed to ease the problems created by the so-called isolated public land parcels, said solutions including, reblocking, through the system of land exchange, condemnations and purchase of easements, and exchange of use; and

Whereas the system of exchange of use, providing the tenancy be on a stable basis comparable to 10-year Bureau of Land Management leases, appears to be the most feasible and expeditious: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America go on record in favor of the concept, under proper controls, when applicable to the exchange of use idea.

RESOLUTION 13. AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, THE BLATNIK BILL, H.R. 3610

Whereas the Izaak Walton League of America has already gone on record in support of this bill; and

Whereas action on this bill was not completed at the last session of Congress; and

Whereas Congressman BLATNIK, of Minnesota, is to be highly commended for his inspired leadership and zeal in support of this legislation; and

Whereas Governor Hatfield has gone on record in support of this bill based on the excellent record of the program of Federal grants to municipalities for sewage works in Oregon, particularly, and for the critical need to continue this activity: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to support the Blatnik bill, H.R. 3610, which calls for amendment to the Federal Pollution Control Act, the primary purpose of which is to increase the amount of grants to municipalities to further encourage them to construct sewage treatment works.

RESOLUTION 14. FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT, PUBLIC LAW 660, EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5, GRANTS TO STATE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCIES

Whereas this provision authorizes $3 million each year as grants on a matching basis to the State water pollution control agencies to support their technical investigations, enforcement, education, and other activities; and

Whereas these funds have proved to be an incentive to the development and improvement of water pollution control activities in the States; and

Whereas the provisions of this section of the act are due to expire June 30, 1961; and

Whereas cessation of these grants would result in serious impairment of State water pollution control programs and of Federal-State cooperative activities in water pollution control enforcement actions: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national in support of the Federal Pollution Control Act, Public Law 660, section 5, providing for extending the authorization of $3 million each year as grants on a matching basis to State water pollution control agencies so as to enable these States to continue at an accelerated rate, their technical investigations. enforcement, actions, education, and other activities in the control of water pollution.

RESOLUTION 15. NEED FOR EXPANDED RESEARCH PROGRAM IN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Whereas major technical breakthroughs to provide better methods of treating industrial and municipal waste are urgently needed if the quality of our water resources is to be maintained for legitimate uses including public health and fish and aquatic life; and

Whereas the speed and accuracy with which we solve these problems depend solely upon new knowledge from research; and

Whereas Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, provides under section 4 for the Public Health Service to conduct research through the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, through grants-in-aid to public and private agencies, through contract research, and through consulting service of experts, and research fellowships; and

Whereas despite these various research efforts the need for new knowledge is still noticeably outstripping the acquisition of such knowledge: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to call for increased appropriations for the Public Health Service to implement section 4 of Public Law 660. This will provide for expansion of research not only by that service directly through the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, but will also make possible expansion of research facilities at educational institutions and other organizations. Rapid expansion of research in this critical field of water pollution control is urgently needed to keep abreast of our rapidly growing population and industry and changing patterns of water use.

RESOLUTION 16. PROVISION OF LOW FLOW AUGMENTATION IN FEDERAL WATER RESOURCE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Whereas important advances have been made in water resources policy in recent years as a result of congressional action; and

Whereas an important addition, which would supplement and make more valuable these advances as well as give support to the water resource development programs of the States and the Federal Government, would be the ability to use Federal water development projects to increase the flow in streams, particularly during periods of low flow; and

Whereas adding this as an authorized function in Federal projects would make it possible to develop the full potential of reservoir sites, and bring about a general improvement in the quality of waters under regulation; and

Whereas this addition is particularly important to fish and wildlife and other aquatic life, to municipal and industrial water supplies, the protection of public health, and the recreational use of waters; and

Whereas the benefits from low flow augmentation are general, widespread, and nonspecific; and

Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination Act of 1946, amended in 1958, authorizes the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake similar responsibilities with respect to fish and wildlife; and

Whereas the resolution suggested herein should supplement the Fish and Wildlife Service program by considering all other aspects benefited by flow augmentation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., November 28, 1959, That action be taken by the Oregon division and by the national to support legislation:

(a) Granting general authority to the Federal water resource construction agencies to include the provision of low flow augmentation as an authorized function in planning future water development projects, in modification of existing projects, or in adjustment of operations of existing projects in order to achieve the described benefits.

(b) Granting authority noted in (a) above as a nonreimbursable item in Federal water resource development projects;

(c) Granting the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Public Health Service authorization to cooperate with the Federal water resource construction agencies in the development of low flow augmentation programs since the net effect of these programs is to control and improve water quality; and further that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be required to submit reports to the Congress to accompany Federal construction agency reports insofar as low flow augmentation programs are concerned;

(d) With the proviso that the above provisions be recommended only with the understanding that flow augmentation is not to be used for the abatement of water pollution in lieu of full and complete sewage and waste treatment facilities by city, industry, or others concerned.

RESOLUTION OF LODGE 459, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution in support of the Forand bill (H.R. 4700) as adopted by Lodge 459 of the International Association of Machinists in St. Paul, Minn., be inserted at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the members of Lodge No. 459, International Association of Machinists, representing 2,600 members, wholeheartedly support H.R. 4700, as sponsored by Representative FORAND; be it further

Resolved, That the elected Congressmen do all in the scope of their office in supporting this enabling legislation, whereby the retired Americans may have a burden lifted from their shoulders.

RESOLUTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America in support of the proposal for a White Fleet of mercy ships (S. Con. Res. 66) be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 4. MERCY FLEET

In July of 1959, Congressmen EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, and BATES, of Massachusetts, introduced into the House of Representatives, and Senators HUMPHREY and AIKEN introduced into the Senate, a concurrent resolution calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus food, medical aid and supplies, to disaster and distressed areas throughout the world.

This particular resolution was in response to suggestion by Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson.

Since the time of the introduction of the concurrent resolution, Life magazine, in its July 27 issue, threw its full support behind the idea of a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace." Massive mail was received by the Congress urging establishment of this Fleet by every sponsor of the concurrent resolution from every State in the Union including Hawaii and Alaska. Less than 1 percent of the mail received was unfavorable to the proposal.

Over 20 percent of the House of Representatives and over one-third of the Senate are cosponsoring the resolution.

This bright concept for peace, it is true, will not bring peace to the world in a single sweeping movement. However, it can prevent the people of the world from losing hope. A Great White Fleet would come from our reserve fleet, crews would come from the Navy and the merchant marine, and the supplies from America's great abundant surplus.

It should be remembered that in 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt sent a similar Great White Fleet around the world, which had the mission of impressing American naval power upon the world. The present Great White Fleet would carry hope and health to areas of the world struck with poverty, disease, or starvation. They would carry supplies and equipment necessary to bring relief to people of all nations in times of emergency or disaster.

We are known as a people and as a nation for the fact that the helping hand of America is always extended to disaster areas. This Great White Fleet can quickly become an international symbol of American concern for the destitute everywhere.

Commander Manson's idea of using our reserve fleet for the purpose of waging an aggressive peace program; of bringing relief to disaster victims; of carrying emergency supplies and medical facilities into famine-stricken areas; and in general, of bringing the arts of healing into underdeveloped regions wherever emergency needs exist, is one of the most meritorious proposals for people-to-people effort of putting our ideals into action.

There can be no question of our ability to do this. We have the ships, we have the doctors, the money, and the commodities. The cost of putting the first six-unit fleet into operation and maintaining it for 18 months has been estimated at $30 million. This is but a small fraction of the amount we now spend for any one of a dozen luxuries. Certainly it represents only an infinitesimal amount when compared with the annual expenditure of the Nation's military armaments.

We now have over $6 billion worth of dairy products, cotton, and various staples and items of food piled up in our surplus-commodity warehouses.

The President already has the authority under existing law to divert shiploads of these commodities to areas where emergency relief is needed, regardless of the friendliness of the governments involved. Here, in the idea of the new White Fleet, is a magnificent opportunity to implement the American dream which was also the dream of the ancient prophets—of turning our swords into plowshares. What an immense appeal this program would have in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples around the world.

Certainly the world needs our help. Just as certainly, we need to give that help. Selfishness impoverishes those who practice it. Undisciplined self-indulgence degrades us as individuals and as people. Even if there were an impenetrable curtain drawn around us so that the rest of the world could not witness our prosperity, we would be poorer in not sharing. In holding on to our valuable commodities, we are just guarding these commodities from being used by other people. We are at the same time excluding ourselves from the valuable and necessary fellowship of the rest of the world. The world cannot indefinitely survive with the preponderant majority in poverty and the fortunate few enjoying prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the sixth national policy conference of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO, go on record as supporting the institution of the mercy mission of the Great White Fleet, by reactivation of part of the mothball fleet to wage an aggressive peace program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent the Senators and Congressmen who introduced the concurrent resolution on the Great White Fleet.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings on an inquiry into the satellite and missile programs;

S. Res. 207. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Official Reporters of the Senate;

S. Res. 211. Resolution to pay certain funeral expenses of the late Senator Langer, of North Dakota;

S. Res. 227. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to development in military technology and foreign policy in Africa;

S. Res. 228. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy on Asia and Western Europe; and

S. Res. 229. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations copies of certain committee prints relating to foreign policy.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution, which was approved by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, January 18, 1960. The resolution is for the purpose of authorizing funds for a study of interagency coordination, including completion of a study previously authorized by the Senate.

The committee proposes a review of problems of budgeting and accounting, efficiency and economy in certain significant activities shared by several Federal agencies in related fields. This type of review is, of course, especially appropriate to the standing jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations as designated under the Legislative Reorganization Law and the Rules of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas pursuant to Senate Resolution 347, Eighty-fifth Congress and Senate Resolution 42, Eighty-sixth Congress, the Committee on Government Operations has been conducting a "complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the international activities of Federal executive branch departments and agencies relative to worldwide health matters"; and

Whereas the study indicates significant problems of coordination between (a) numerous agencies of the United States Government engaged in health activities, (b) agencies of the United States Government and international organizations of which the United States is a member, (c) official programs of the United States Government and related nonofficial programs of private voluntary organizations, in addition to problems of Federal budgeting and accounting; and

Whereas the study confirms the continued existence of certain problems of the interagency organization of common Federal activities such as documentation and other problem areas of management of the general type revealed in past studies by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of Government; and

Whereas pursuant to rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations has the duty of studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency, and the further duty of studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to—

(a) complete its study of worldwide health research, assistance, and rehabilitation matters;

(b) to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters in scientific and other fields where there may be indications of a need for (a) improved budgeting, accounting, and other managerial practices on the part of agencies of the United States Government, (b) strengthened cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies;

(c) effectiveness of international organizations of which the United States is a member; and

(d) avoidance of Federal duplication of private responsibilities and activities.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from date of approval to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $85,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF U.S. FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS IN BOLIVIA" (S. REPT. NO. 1030)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, 86th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report of its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations regarding the administration of the U.S. foreign aid program in Bolivia, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, in connection with this report, a press release which I have issued.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS,
U.S. SENATE.

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, stated:

"Executive hearings were held by the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations to evaluate the administration by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) and its predecessors, of U.S. foreign aid programs in Bolivia since 1953, totaling an expenditure of $137 million.

"These hearings disclosed that, as a result of loose administration, an inadequate U.S. mission staff, difficulties in recruitment of personnel, and a dearth of administrative ability among Bolivian officials, heavy losses, in the neighborhood of several million dollars, were sustained in connection with the U.S. aid programs in Bolivia. For example, almost $2 million in food and fiber items were lost in the ports and in transit from 1954 to 1957. Many claims for such losses against insurance companies are statute barred, as they were not initiated within the prescribed period of time.

"Many projects were undertaken in that country without benefit of sufficient prior review by qualified technical personnel and, as a result, several projects were discontinued, some of which were beyond the absorptive capacity of Bolivia. The Villamontes irrigation project, which has been permanently halted, is unoperational and cost us over a million dollars. The Muyurina project, for vocational agricultural training, which cost us over $100,000, did not achieve its purpose and attempts are being made to use it for other purposes. The Cochabamba milk processing plant, which cost us $100,000, will never operate efficiently. Two yucca flour mills, financed by the U.S. Government at a cost of $225,000, will never be used.

"The agriculture servicio (a joint United States and Bolivian administrative and cooperative mechanism) failed to maintain adequate records until 1957 and, as a result, over a million dollars' worth of equipment cannot be accounted for. In addition, it imported machinery that was not needed and machinery that was not adaptable for use in that country. As a result, over a million dollars' worth of this excess machinery has already been sold at a loss. Attempts are now being made to dispose of $500,000 more and it is anticipated there will be losses on this amount.

"From 1954 to 1957, despite existing regulations, the Government failed to collect counterpart money from the Bolivian Government. There are still nearly $2 million owed, and some 18 distributors have become enriched while projects which needed this financing were impaired. It was quite apparent during the hearings that the former mission director in Bolivia from 1952 to March 1956 was unaware of the various shortcomings which were brought to light, although he should have been.

"Although one of the ICA mechanisms for ascertaining whether various aspects of a program are being operated efficiently is the end-use audit system, it was not until April of 1957 that end-use reports began in Bolivia. Since that time approximately 150 reports have been submitted, revealing many inadequacies which existed since 1953. Fortunately, during the past year, there has been

a capable director in Bolivia who is taking positive action to correct many of the irregularities which formerly existed."

REPORT ENTITLED "CASE PROBLEMS IN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT" (S. REPT. NO. 1031)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Case Problems in Government Procurement." I ask that the report, which includes a statement by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 2861. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of the sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2862. A bill to provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; to provide for greater conservation of natural resources; to provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; to provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; to provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2863. A bill for the relief of Kyong-Ok Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2864. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 2865. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2867. A bill to give effect to the Convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Habana, August 15, 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2868. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2869. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Alfred O. Domeier, and Frances I. Domeier; and

S. 2871. A bill for the relief of Dr. Daryoush K. Shahrokh; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2872. A bill for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 255) authorizing funds for a study of interagency coordination, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

NATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER UTILIZATION POLICY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a farm bill to: First, provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; second, provide for greater conservation of natural resources; third, provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; fourth, provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; and fifth, provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes.

Since Congress adjourned last September, the economic conditions in agriculture have deteriorated to a point where immediate positive action is essential.

Farm prices, already at very low levels last summer, have dropped even further. In December, the farm parity ratio was 77—lowest for any December since the depression year of 1933. In 1959, farm income declined 15 percent.

According to the Department of Agriculture's own estimates, this year it is expected to drop another 7 to 8 percent.

In 1959, production of all farm commodities set a new record. That production was 5 to 10 percent above the total we as a nation use at home, and export for sale or assistance abroad.

Today the Government inventory of surplus farm commodities is over $9 billion—and during this year, that figure will increase.

These facts demonstrate the degree of the failure of the present farm program. Overproduction has built up huge surpluses. But these surpluses have not been used to any real advantage, either at home or abroad. In addition, there have been reduced farm prices, and reduced farm income.

Nevertheless, the expenditure on the agriculture program over the last 5 years has exceeded $30 billion.

Despite these conditions, has there been any change of policy on the part of this administration? There has not. Therefore, it is essential that the Congress act—and act now.

To this end, in the hope of getting action in time to affect the 1960 crops, I am introducing a bill designed to deal with this problem; and I would respectfully request that this bill become the basis for corrective legislation early in this session of the Congress.

The bill would:

First. Establish a "food use policy," whereby existing surpluses and future production will provide more of our citizens with an adequate and nutritious diet; and will promote world peace by helping to alleviate hunger and poverty in undeveloped nations.

Second. Place the administration of such domestic and foreign food use programs in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the State Department, where the responsibility, the personnel, and the administrative machinery exist.

Third. Establish a national reserve stockpile of food items to be used in event of enemy attack, or other national disaster. This reserve stockpile would be administered by the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization.

Fourth. Halt the costly and uneconomical buildup of surplus commodities by bringing farm production into balance with our national food and fiber needs.

Fifth. Establish farmer advisory and administration committees composed of bona fide farmers, so as to have more practical farm programs.

Sixth. Provide the authority and the flexibility to the end that the Secretary of Agriculture may tailor individual commodity programs to the particular conditions or requirements affecting that commodity.

Seventh. Provide that a two-thirds majority of producers voting in a national referendum must approve any supply adjustment program before it becomes effective. Prior to voting in a referendum, all producers are to be provided with a thorough explanation of the provisions and effects of any program.

Eighth. Require the preparation of a true parity price formula, a formula which would afford fair returns to the family farmer for his labor, investment, and managerial ability. Prior to adoption of such formula, price goals are established at 90 percent of the present parity formula.

Ninth. Place a limit on any benefits which might be received by producers who are not bona fide farmers.

Tenth. Provide for a natural resource conservation program, whereby a producer, to be eligible for benefits, must contribute a portion of his crop land to sound conservation practices. The Department of Agriculture may rent additional acres for conservation or reforestation purposes.

Eleventh. Continue the program whereby the farmer and the Department of Agriculture share the cost of establishing needed conservation practices.

Twelfth. Establish an agency—the Agriculture Development Service—in the Department of Agriculture whose sole function would be to develop and coordinate programs to deal with low income problems in rural areas.

The provisions of this bill will enable our farm population to obtain a more reasonable share of our Nation's prosperity and insure an adequate supply of food for our total national needs, and these objectives would be accomplished at a greatly reduced cost to the American taxpayer.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2862) to provide a national food and fiber utilization policy; to provide for greater conservation of natural resources; to provide farmers a greater voice in the formulation and administration of farm programs; to provide for supply adjustment programs so as to return to farmers a fair share of the national income; to provide greater opportunity for economic development in rural agricultural areas; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I. FARMER COMMITTEES

SEC. 101. In order to insure a more practical and workable domestic farm program and to insure more direct participation by family farm operators in the formulation and administration of agricultural policy, the Secretary shall, in carrying out the provisions of this Act, utilize the services of local and county farmer committees and State Farmer Administrative Committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and also the State Farmer Advisory Committees and the National Farmer Advisory Committee established pursuant to the provisions of this title.

SEC. 102. (a) In each State there shall be a State Farmer Advisory Committee for the State composed of twelve members. Such members shall be elected by the County Farmer Committees of the State concerned from nominees made by such committees. Members of the State Advisory Committees shall be elected for two years, except that with respect to the membership of each committee first elected pursuant to this subsection one-half of such membership shall be elected to serve for a period of only one year. Each State Farmer Advisory Committee shall be utilized by the Secretary to study and consider the agricultural problems and policies of the State it represents and shall cooperate with and advise the Secretary, the National Farmer Advisory Committee, and the County Farmer Committees of the State it represents regarding such problems and policies.

(b) There is hereby established a committee to be known as the National Farmer Advisory Committee. The membership of such committee shall be appointed by the President. Insofar as practicable, members shall be appointed to insure fair representation of all agricultural commodities and geographical areas of the United States. Not less than one-half of the membership of such committee shall be from the membership of the several State Farmer Advisory Committees. The membership of such committee shall also include representatives of National, State, or commodity organizations of agricultural producers; farm cooperatives; agricultural education or research institutions; and industries engaged in the processing, transporting, and marketing of agricultural commodities. Such committee shall be utilized by the Secretary to advise and make recommendations to him with respect to all matters pertaining to agriculture.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (b), only persons who are agricultural producers and who obtain the major portion of their income from farming shall be eligible for selection and service on committees established under this title.

(d) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as he deems proper with respect to the nomination and election of the State Farmer Advisory Committees.

(e) Members of the State Farmer Advisory Committees and the National Farmer Advisory Committee shall receive compensation, at a rate to be determined by the Secretary, for the performance of the duties of the committees, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the committees.

SEC. 103. The fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth sentences of section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act are amended to read as follows: "The local and county committees provided for in this subsection shall be known as Local Farmer Committees and County Farmer Committee, respectively. In each State there shall be a State Farmer Administrative Committee composed of three members. Such members shall be appointed by the Secretary from nominees designated by County Farmer Committees of the State. Such members shall be appointed for a period not to exceed three years. Only persons who are agricultural producers and who obtain the major portion of their income from farming shall be eligible for selection and service on committees provided for under this subsection."

TITLE II. NATIONAL FOOD USE PROGRAM

SEC. 201. It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national security and the maintenance of the health and morale of the American people that the means for obtaining an adequate and nutritious diet be placed so far as practicable within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared to be in the interest of national security that there be maintained a national reserve stockpile of essential food, fiber, and biological oils for use by the civilian population in the event of enemy attack or other disaster. It is further declared to be in the interest of national security that the abundant supplies of food, fiber, and biological oils available in the United States be used so as to alleviate hunger throughout the world, to promote world peace by assisting more rapid economic development of undeveloped nations, and to further the interests of the United States abroad and to fulfill commitments under international agreements.

SEC. 202. (a) In order to carry out the policy expressed in the first sentence of section 201 of this title, the administration of (1) the National School Lunch Act, (2) the Act of July 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 276), providing for the continuation of the special milk program for children, and (3) section 306 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, providing for the establishment of a food stamp plan, is hereby transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and all functions and activities carried out thereunder shall be carried out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and all references in such provisions to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make a determination each year of the total quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required in the next succeeding year in the operation of the programs named in subsection (a) of this section and any other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction. Such total quantity for any commodity shall consist of (1) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be required from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, and (2) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be removed from the open market.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantities of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsections (b) (1) and (2) to be required for such year to carry out the programs described in subsection (a) and other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction.

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the quantity of commodities determined pursuant to subsection (b)(1) to be required in carrying out the programs described in subsection (a) of this section and other similar programs carried out under his jurisdiction.

(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be responsible for ascertaining prior to certification that sufficient funds are available to remove from the open market the quantity of each commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (b) (2) of this section.

SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") is authorized and directed to establish and maintain a national reserve stockpile of essential food, fiber, and biological oils for use by the civilian population of the United States, its possessions, and the District of Columbia in the event of enemy attack or other disaster.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Director shall make a determination each year of the quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required for maintaining the stockpile provided for in subsection (a).

(c) The Director shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantity of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (b) to be required for such year for maintaining the stockpile provided for in subsection (a).

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Director, the quantity of commodities certified under subsection (c) for carrying out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary of State shall make a determination each year of the total quantity of each agricultural commodity that will be required in carrying out authorized programs (including programs under titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) furthering the interests of the United States abroad and for fulfilling commitments under international agreements. Such total quantity for any commodity shall consist of (1) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be required from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, and (2) the quantity of such commodity he determines will be removed from the open market.

(b) The Secretary of State shall certify each year to the Secretary of Agriculture the total quantities of each agricultural commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (a) to be required for such year to carry out the programs specified in such subsection.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall be responsible for the delivery, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation or from acquisitions made by the Department of Agriculture, at the location and time and in the form specified by the Secretary of State, the quantity of commodities determined by him pursuant to subsection (a)(1) of this section to be required in carrying out the programs specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The Secretary of State shall be responsible for ascertaining prior to certification that sufficient funds are available to remove from the open market the quantity of each commodity determined by him pursuant to subsection (a)(2) of this section.

SEC. 205. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Secretary of State shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture for commodities delivered pursuant to sections 202(d), 203(d), and 204(c).

TITLE III. FARM PARITY

SEC. 301. The Secretary shall determine the parity price of any agricultural commodity in accordance with section 301(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 302. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall maintain the average price during the marketing year for any commodity at not less than 90 per centum of the parity price for such commodity, if producers have not disapproved a market supply adjustment program for such marketing year in a referendum conducted in accordance with the provisions of title IV.

SEC. 303. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall undertake research and studies necessary to determine a true parity price formula for each agricultural commodity which will enable the efficient family farm operator producing such commodity to earn and receive a return on his labor and investment reasonably comparable to that received by similar productive resources in other segments of the economy.

(b) The Secretary shall report the results of such research and studies to the Congress not later than December 31, 1960.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures as he deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this section.

TITLE IV. MARKET SUPPLY ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 401. If at any time for any commodity or group of closely related commodities (such as feed grains), the Secretary determines that in the absence of a market supply adjustment program for such commodity or group of commodities, such prices would, for the next succeeding marketing year, average less than the price specified in section 302, he shall, after utilizing the advice and recommendations of the National Farmer Advisory Committee, formulate and announce a market supply adjustment program to be effective for such marketing year, which will be adapted to the special circumstances and conditions of such commodity or group of commodities, and which will maintain returns to producers at the levels sepcified in section 302 at a cost to the United States no greater than the limitation specified in section 409.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the formulation and announcement of any market supply adjustment program made pursuant to section 401, conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers engaged in the production for commercial use of the commodity concerned to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to the announced program.

(b) If more than one-third of the farmers voting in such referendum oppose such market supply adjustment program, it shall not become effective. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder as soon as possible.

SEC. 403. In formulating and carrying out a market supply adjustment program for any commodity or group of commodities, the Secretary shall, with the advice and recommendations of the National Farmer Advisory Committee, use such means as he deems the most efficient and economical to insure that producers will receive not less than the price specified in section 302 for their commodity during the operation of such program. Such means may include, but shall not be limited to: commodity loans, marketing agreements and orders, acreage allotments, marketing quotas, market shipment scheduling, commodity purchase and diversion programs, stabilization pools, incentive payments, compensatory payments, market stratification, and export equalization payments. Whenever payments of any type are utilized in the program for any commodity, the Secretary shall give producers and exporters the option of receiving payments in kind or cash.

SEC. 404. The Secretary shall, at least one month prior to the date of any referendum conducted pursuant to section 402, provide each producer who is eligible to vote with a thorough explanation of the provisions of the program submitted to referendum. Such explanation shall include, but not be limited to, information and estimates of the effect on prices, income, acreage, or marketing restrictions, penalties for violation, and other relevant factors which would result if the referendum is approved, and an equally comprehensive explanation of probable effects if the referendum is disapproved.

SEC. 405. (a) In formulating a market supply adjustment program for any commodity or group of commodities, the Secretary shall determine a national requirement for such commodity or group of commodities.

(b) The national requirement for any commodity for any year shall consist of (1) quantities of such commodity which the Secretary estimates will move through commercial market channels for domestic consumption at not less than the price specified in section 302 for such commodity; (2) the quantity of such commodity certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 202(c) for use in programs specified in such section; (3) the quantity of such commodity required for maintenance of the national food, fiber, and biological oil reserve as certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization pursuant to section 203(c); (4) the quantity of such commodity which the Secretary estimates will be exported for dollars at competitive world prices; and (5) the quantity of such commodity certified by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 204(b) for use in programs furthering the interests of the United States abroad and in fulfilling commitments under international agreements.

SEC. 406. (a) The national requirement for any commodity for any year as provided in section 405 shall be reduced by an amount equal to the quantity of such commodity, if any, which is in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture at the time the national requirement for such commodity is determined, and which will be delivered pursuant to the provisions of sections 202(d), 203(d), and 204(c). The national requirement, after reduction as provided in the foregoing sentence, shall be allocated to States, counties, and individual farms on the basis of production history during the first 9 of the 10 years preceding the year in which the allocation is made, adjusted for abnormal production conditions and trends in yields and land use.

(b) In allocating the national requirement for any commodity, the Secretary, with the advice and assistance of the County Farmer Committees, the State Farmer Advisory Committees, and/or the National Farmer Advisory Committee shall make necessary adjustments so as to provide for fair and equitable treatment for all farm operators, taking into consideration: (1) trends in production, (2) effects of previous acreage diversion or other programs, (3) availability of alternative production opportunities, (4) abnormal weather conditions, (5) sound conservation and land use practices, and (6) requirements for the attainment and maintenance of efficient family farm units.

(c) The national requirement of any commodity shall be expressed in units of production, such as bushels, pounds, or bales, but the national requirement may be expressed in terms of acres in the case of feed grains or other commodities which are used to a substantial extent on the farm where produced.

SEC. 407. The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish necessary incentives, penalties, or compliance deposits to facilitate enforcement of any market supply adjustment program.

SEC. 408. No person who customarily derives more than 50 per centum of his total personal income from sources other than the production of agricultural commodities shall be entitled to any benefits under this Act in excess of $5,000 for any year.

SEC. 409. (a) The Secretary shall utilize the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for carrying out the purposes of titles II, III, and IV of this Act.

TITLE V. CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

SEC. 501. In order to protect the national interest in the conservation and development of soil, water, timber, and other natural resources and to prevent the wasteful and uneconomical use and exploitation of these resources, the Secretary shall establish a resource conservation base which shall consist of contributed acreage, as provided in section 502, and rented acreage, as provided in sections 503 and 504.

SEC. 502. (a) To facilitate the effective administration of this Act, the Secretary shall determine annually the percentage of total cropland in the United States on which no resource depleting commodity shall be produced. Such total acreage shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total crop acreage of the United States.

(b) To be eligible for benefits under this Act, each producer shall designate a portion of the total cropland under his control as producer contributed conservation acreage, and such portion shall be devoted to such soil conservation practices as the Secretary may prescribe. Such portion shall be equal to the percentage determined by the Secretary under subsection (a), after allowing a twenty-acre exemption for each farm.

(c) The Secretary shall share the cost of establishing and maintaining soil conservation practices required under this title in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and the National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary shall determine annually the amount of acreage that will be needed to be taken out of production, in addition to the amount determined under section 502(a), in order to bring agricultural production in balance with the food, fiber, and biological oil requirements determined pursuant to section 405 of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall enter into annual rental agreements with producers to divert from resource depleting uses to soil conservation practices an amount of acreage equal to the amount determined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, less an amount equal to the amount contracted for under section 504.

(c) The Secretary shall not enter into such agreement with any producer for more than 50 per centum of the total crop land controlled by such producer.

(d) The Secretary shall share with the producer the cost of establishing and maintaining soil conservation practices on lands contracted for under the provisions of this section in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and the National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 504. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into long-term rental contracts whereby land unsuited or unneeded for the production of agricultural commodities is returned to its original cover or reforested.

(b) The Secretary shall share with the producer the cost of establishing soil conservation practices on lands contracted for under the provisions of this section in accordance with programs approved under section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The Secretary shall determine, after consultation with the appropriate State Farmer Advisory Committee and The National Farmer Advisory Committee, the particular program to be effective in any State or area.

SEC. 505. The Secretary is authorized to renegotiate any contract entered into under the provisions of subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act in order to provide fair and equitable treatment to all producers under the provisions of this Act.

TITLE VI. AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish in the Department of Agriculture an agency to be known as the Agriculture Development Service for the purpose of providing a coordinated program of assistance to low income farm families, and to develop rural areas of low productivity and under employment so as to increase the rate of economic growth and the efficiency of resource utilization.

(b) The Secretary shall appoint an administrator who shall be known as Administrator of the Agriculture Development Service and who shall, under the general supervision and direction of the Secretary, administer the provisions of this title.

(c) To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by this title, there is authorized to be created an advisory board, composed of representatives of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and representatives of farm organizations, church groups, labor unions, private businesses, and State welfare and industrial development agencies. The members of such advisory board shall be appointed by the President.

SEC. 602. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "agricultural development areas" those rural counties or parts thereof, parishes, reservations, or areas, where there has existed persistent substandard family farm income which has resulted in depressed economic conditions for the rural area.

(b) Among the factors to be considered by the Administrator in making the designations under subsection (a) are (1) the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, (2) the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, (3) the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, (4) the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and (5) the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

(c) Any area designated as an agricultural development area pursuant to the provisions of this section shall continue to be so designated as long as the conditions upon which the designation was based persist.

SEC. 603. It shall be the function of the Administrator—

(a) to submit to Congress, in the case of each area designated as an agricultural development area, a program to carry out the purposes of this title with respect to such area;

(b) to cooperate with all departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to programs of assistance being made available to persons of low income in rural areas; and

(c) To submit to Congress as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, but not later than December 31, 1960, specific recommendations for legislation required to establish a national program—

(1) provide supervised credit to low income farm families to assist such families in developing an efficient farm unit;

(2) provide the necessary technical advice to low-income farm families to help such families broaden their economic opportunities;

(3) provide opportunities to members of low income farm families in obtaining nonagricultural vocational training; and

(4) assist local and State authorities in developing available and potential resources to provide greater rural industrialization and additional economic opportunities in agricultural development areas designated pursuant to section 602.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. (a) As used in this Act the term "Secretary" means Secretary of Agriculture, unless indicated otherwise;

(b) As used in section 408, the term "person" means any individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or agency of a State. Such term shall not include a cooperative marketing organization for the purposes of the limitation on benefits prescribed in such section, but the amount of benefits made available to any person through such cooperative organization shall be included in determining the amount of benefits received by such person for purposes of such limitation.

SEC. 702. The reference in section 306(g) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 703. Any provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other Act, providing for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price supports for any agricultural commodity, shall be ineffective with respect to the 1960 and subsequent crops of such commodity; but if the Secretary determines that the provisions of this Act cannot be carried out with respect to any commodity for the 1960 crop year, all existing provisions of law relating to such commodity shall continue in effect for such crop year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Could my distinguished friend from Missouri give us any idea as to what this farm program would cost?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator asking for a detailed analysis of the cost of the program?

Mr. SCOTT. I was asking for an estimate as to what the Senator's program, in his opinion, would cost if it became law.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Even if this program is adopted, there are still some laws on the books, which would be carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture; but I am confident that one of the problems of the Department of Agriculture in recent years has been the failure to properly enforce controls. Also, unfortunately, many people who are not really farmers have been participating heavily in the programs which were designed primarily to help the efficient family-sized farmers. Both of these matters would be handled in this bill. I would say that if this bill were adopted, the savings to the American taxpayer would be several billion dollars a year.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator not agree that the Secretary of Agriculture is enforcing only those programs which the Congress sends to him?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I do not. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture told the Agriculture Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is chairman, that he would send us a bill, recommending what he thought should be

done about agriculture. The record will show that he did not send that bill to Congress, and also the stenographic copies of the record were changed, so that when the record was printed it did not say the Secretary of Agriculture had agreed to give us a bill.

This year I would hope we make it clear to the Secretary, as we did last year, that if he will recommend an omnibus bill—which he has never done since I have been on the committee—providing that the bill would reduce inventories and help the family-sized farmer earn a fair share of the national income, we would do our best to see that his proposed legislation was adopted.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course, the Senator does not mean to imply, I am sure, that the Secretary of Agriculture was monkeying with an official transcript of the Senate or of a Senate committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do state, regardless of who did it, that somebody in the Department of Agriculture monkeyed with the official transcript; and that monkeying changed the meaning. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that when this matter was called to my attention by an able Senator on his side of the aisle, I gave the Senator the facts; and he assured me, after studying the facts, that I was correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY WORKERS AND THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to alleviate the serious educational problems that have come to light as a result of the investigations of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Special Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

The legislation provides for a modest program of Federal assistance to help overcome the unique problems and added burdens connected with the education of the children of our migratory workers and to help improve the fundamental education of the migratory workers themselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the two bills, together with a brief summary of the bills and a table of State participation, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bills lie at the desk until Friday evening of this week so that other Senators who wish to become cosponsors may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and statement will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie at the desk until Friday evening of this week.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

S. 2864. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 2865. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Since August last year the subcommittee has been conducting a full study of the problems besetting the more than 1 million men, women, and children who perform an indispensable service in providing every one of us with the agricultural necessities of life by traveling from State to State to meet the uniquely heavy seasonal demands of the agricultural industry.

The migratory agricultural workers have often been called our most displaced and forgotten people. Although considerable progress has been made in recent decades through the determined efforts of State and local governments, private organizations and the farmers themselves, the migrant workers still suffer many privations in the area of income, housing, health, and community acceptance.

But perhaps the greatest privation lies in the field of education, particularly for the thousands of children who follow their parents from crop to crop and who, in many cases, rarely see the inside of a school building.

Even in the best of circumstances the constant movement of these migrant children is enough to insure a serious lag in their educational lives. When you add to that the problem of their special environment and upbringing, the fact that they often are needed to work in the fields to help supplement the meager family income, the fact that some parents are unaware of the importance of education, the language barrier frequently present, and the financial difficulty confronting many communities which are suddenly overwhelmed for brief periods by an influx of large numbers of migrant children, it is not hard to appreciate the scope and depth of the problem.

The first bill I have introduced attempts to meet this obvious and vital need for providing the children of our migratory workers with better educational opportunities. The other bill is a small program to help provide the workers themselves with a start in practical education.

I have been gratified to note, Mr. President, the number of farmers who have begun to recognize the benefits to them of having educational opportunities available in their area for migrant children.

During the field hearings held last fall through Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota in the Midwest, and in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, I had occasion to talk to many growers who cited, time after time, the major "headache" and expense resulting from a high and rapid turnover in their migrant working force. Not only did many growers suffer from the problem of having to "break in" a whole new migrant population from year to year, but they often had to suffer the cost and loss of efficiency caused by a steady stream of departures during the course of a single season.

They were also faced with the danger of serious accidents to small children left to their own designs in the field and with the problem of providing care for the children or losing the full efforts of their parents.

Against this backdrop, many farmers who were fortunate enough to be located in an area that provided good educational facilities for migrant children told me how many migrant families returned year after year to the same farms because "here our children can get an education."

Personal experience has taught these farmers what a stabilizing influence an educational program can have in their community. It decreases the turnover, and consequently the expense of finding replacements. It provides a happier and more willing work force. And perhaps not least important, it helps give the farmers themselves a peace of mind they might not otherwise enjoy.

Unfortunately, however, despite the manifest value to the migrant, the farmer and the community of providing good educational opportunities, it is often impossible to do so under existing conditions.

States like Texas with approximately 95,000 domestic migrants at the peak season, or California with around 59,000, or Florida with more than 25,000, simply do not have the funds, instructional capacity or classroom space to cope with the educational needs presented by such an influx. The number of children accompanying these workers can be calculated on the basis of estimates by the Department of Labor that there is approximately one child for every five workers.

It is too much to expect States and local communities to be able to absorb large numbers of migrant children into their existing educational systems for relatively brief periods of the year. Most schools are overcrowded and understaffed as it is, and it is hardly surprising that even the most dedicated community can do very little to shoulder this added and heavy burden.

This is true in our hard-pressed urban areas; the problem is even more acute in the rural sections of the country. It is also understandable that many communities find it hard to rouse sufficient concern over what is, to them, a transitory problem.

But it can be emphatically said that this is far from a transitory problem for the migrant children. It is an everyday problem—every day of their lives.

Mr. President, I intend to make these bills the subject of public hearings by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor during the early part of this session. I am sure that many valuable suggestions will be received from interested witnesses and agency officials for improving this legislation. It is my hope, Mr. President, on the basis of the considerable information already received on the subject and the comments we will receive in the

coming hearings, that legislation dealing with the improvement of educational opportunities for the migrant workers and their children will be perfected and reported favorably during the course of this session.

Passage of this legislation would be a small token of recognition for the many years of silent toil by our migratory workers.

EXHIBIT I

S. 2864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Children Educational Assistance Act of 1960".

Findings and purpose of Act

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The Congress recognizes, however, that the interstate movement of migrant agricultural employees imposes severe burdens on local educational agencies in discharging their responsibilities with respect to the education of the children of such employees who temporarily reside within their school districts. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide assistance to local educational agencies in providing education to the children of migrant agricultural employees, and to provide for certain planning grants to the States to improve such education.

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(2) the term "child" means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable local educational agency provides free public education;

(3) the term "parent" includes a legal guardian or other person in loco parentis;

(4) the term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual employed in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(f)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis in a State where such individual does not maintain a permanent residence, and for the purposes of this Act maintaining a permanent residence shall include the ownership of real property by either such individual or the spouse of such individual;

(5) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(6) the term "average daily current expenditures per public school child" means the total current expenditures for a State's public elementary and secondary schools during a particular year divided by the product of the average daily attendance in such schools during such year times the number of schooldays in such year; the term "current expenditures" means expenditures for free public education in such schools to the extent that such expenditures are made from current revenues, except that such term does not include any such expenditure for the acquisition of land, the erection of facilities, interest, or debt service; and for the purposes of payments under title I for attendance during any academic year the Commissioner shall determine and use the average daily current expenditures per public school child for the year preceding such academic year;

(7) the term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(8) the term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has—

(A) at least five counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county;

(B) at least two counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county and one county with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees;

(C) at least two counties with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees in each such county; or

(D) at least one county with three thousand or more such employees;

and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources.

Administration

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act, and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

TITLE I—PAYMENTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EDUCATING CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 101. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for the four succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Payments

SEC. 102. (a) Upon application in accordance with the provisions of this section for the school year beginning in 1960, or for any of the four succeeding school years, by a local educational agency in any State, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency an amount equal to 75 percent with respect to the school years beginning in 1960 and 1961 and 50 percent with respect to the school years beginning in 1962, 1963, and 1964, of the average daily current expenditures per public school child, for the State in which such agency is located, for each day's attendance in excess of 10 during such school year in the free public elementary or secondary schools of such agency, by a child of a parent who is a migrant agricultural employee.

(b) Payments under this section shall be made for attendance during the regular school year beginning in 1960, and the four succeeding school years, and may be made at such intervals as the Commissioner deems appropriate. Such payments shall me made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(c) An application under the provisions of this section shall be in such form and contain such information as may be required by the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner may require such additional information and reports at such intervals during the school year as he deems necessary.

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR SUMMER SCHOOLS FOR CHILDREN OF PARENTS WHO ARE MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

Appropriations

SEC. 201. There is authorized to be appropriated $300,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 202. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made and the succeeding fiscal year for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title for the operating costs of conducting necessary summer school sessions for children of migrant agricultural employees. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 203. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) is from a local educational agency or an institution of higher education within a State;

(2) sets out the summer school program, and the necessity therefor, the operating costs of such summer school, and the amount needed under the provisions of this title to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such agency or institution will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency or institution, out of the allotment to the State in which such agency or institution is located, the amount requested, or in the event requests from agencies and institutions in any State are in excess of such State's allotment, such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

TITLE III—PLANNING GRANTS

Appropriations

SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years for grants under the provisions of this title.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 302. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year shall be

populations of migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this title (1) to survey the need for summer school sessions for children of parents who are migrant agricultural employees; (2) to develop plans for such sessions where needed; (3) to develop and carry out programs to encourage such children to attend school during the regular academic year and such summer sessions, and to improve the quality of education offered such children; and (4) to coordinate programs provided for in this Act with similar programs in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children. Grants under the provisions of this title shall not be available for the cost of acquisition of any facilities.

Application and payments

SEC. 303. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this title if such application—

(1) designates the State agency which will carry out the program for which the funds are to be used;

(2) sets out such program in sufficient detail to satisfy the Commissioner that it carries out the purposes of this title; and

(3) provides that such agency will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency out of its State allotment the amount requested. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

S. 2865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Migrant Agricultural Employee Adult Education Act of 1960".

Federal control of education prohibited

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Definitions

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State, and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education;

(2) the term "migrant agricultural employee" means an individual employed in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(f)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis in a State where such individual does not maintain a permanent residence, and for the purposes of this Act maintaining a permanent residence shall include the ownership of real property by either such individual or the spouse of such individual;

(3) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(4) the term "institution of higher education" means any such institution which is accredited as such by a nationally recognized accrediting agency; and

(5) the term "migrant agricultural employee State" means any State which has—

(A) at least five counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county;

(B) at least two counties with one hundred or more but less than five hundred such employees in each such county and one county with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees;

(C) at least two counties with five hundred or more but less than three thousand such employees in each such county; or

(D) at least one county with three thousand or more such employees;

and determinations for the purpose of this definition shall be made for the most recent year that satisfactory population figures are available from reliable sources.

Administration

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioner shall administer this Act, and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this Act, including a detailed statement of disbursements.

Appropriations

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for grants under the provisions of this Act.

Allotments and grants

SEC. 6. Amounts appropriated pursuant to section 5 for any fiscal year shall be allotted among the migrant agricultural employee States on the basis of their relative populations of migrant agricultural employees for the most recent year that such populations are available from reliable sources. A State's allotment under this section shall be available during the year for which made for payments in accordance with the provisions of this Act for the operating costs of conducting adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses. As used in this section the term "operating costs" includes all ordinary costs of operation other than any costs for the acquisition of facilities or costs related to any such acquisition.

Application and payments

SEC. 7. The Commissioner shall approve any application for funds provided under this Act if such application—

(1) is from a local educational agency or an institution of higher education within a State;

(2) sets out a program of adult education classes for migrant agricultural employees and their spouses which provides fundamental education and training for healthful modern living, the operating costs of such classes, and the amount needed under the provisions of this Act to defray such costs; and

(3) provides that such agency or institution will make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner upon request, access to the records upon which the information is based.

Upon approval of any such application the Commissioner shall pay, in such installments as he may deem appropriate, to such agency or institution, out of the allotment to the State in which such agency or institution is located, the amount requested, or in the event requests from agencies and institutions in any State are in excess of such State's allotment, such lesser amount as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

First. The first bill I have introduced would provide a 5-year program of Federal assistance for the education of our migrant children. It is a sound, workable program of modest sum which, I believe, will provide great improvement in this vital area. The proposals are based upon information drawn from the hearings held by the subcommittee and upon the considered judgment of people who have spent many years dealing with the problem.

Briefly, the bill would provide matching funds to help defray the added expense of educating the children of migratory workers for whom there is no direct local school tax during the regular school session, a program of grants totaling $300,000 for the establishment of summer schools, and a program of planning grants totaling $250,000 to promote interstate cooperation, the development of educational programs, materials and demonstrations, and the transmission of school records for migrant children.

To help bear the additional cost of educating these children during the regular school session, the Federal Government would for the first 2 years pay 75 percent of the State's cost of educating the child for each day of attendance. Thereafter, the Federal Government would share 50 percent of the cost.

On the basis of estimates prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this program would cost slightly more than $2 million.

The grants for the establishment of summer schools for migrant children is, to me, perhaps potentially the most rewarding part of the program, for a well-run summer school averaging from 6 to 8 weeks in duration could well be the longest uninterrupted educational experience that the migrant child will have in a given year. For that reason, a relatively small amount of money spent wisely in the right areas might yield benefits far beyond what normally might be expected.

It is estimated on the basis of pilot projects conducted in Colorado, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey that the average cost of a 6-week summer school is approximately $5,000. The sum authorized in this bill would therefore provide money for the establishment of 60 such schools which could pattern their activities on the projects that have proved so successful thus far.

It is anticipated that the States and local communities will provide the school buildings and maintenance costs, with the Federal Government paying for the administrative, instructional, food, transportation, and other operating costs.

The planning grants, as I indicated earlier, would serve a number of valuable purposes. The grants would provide funds to help stimulate interest and leadership at the State level. They would assist in the preparation of plans and methods for the operation of summer schools. They would encourage in-

terstate cooperation so that the educational pattern of the child will be interrupted as little as possible. And they will help facilitate the transfer of the child's school records so that a teacher will not have to spend so many precious days trying to find out what ground the child's last teacher has covered.

These three programs, when added together and put into operation over a period of years, will, I am certain, achieve tremendous results at a minimal cost.

Second. The second bill I have introduced has been inspired directly by the information arising from the hearings and talks with the farmers. Perhaps the strongest and most justifiable complaint raised by the growers time and time again might be paraphrased something like this:

"Well, I've done a lot of things to improve the living conditions of the migrants who work on my farm. I've built them new housing, put in toilet facilities, new showers, cooking facilities, nice new bedding, plenty of garbage cans—and what happens? They mark up the walls, kick holes in the window screens, stop up the toilets, pull the knobs off the showers and stoves, tear the blankets, and tip over the garbage cans."

Unfortunately many of these things have happened on many farms and one can hardly be anything but extremely sympathetic to the farmer who provides good facilities only to have them abused, damaged, and sometimes wrecked. Sometimes this kind of damage is done by workers who lack the self-respect to care. Sometimes it is the result of a simple lack of knowledge of what the facilities are for.

In both cases the root problem is a lack of fundamental education and knowledge of modern living. It is to this problem that the second bill is directed. A sum of $250,000 is authorized for a program of practical education for the migratory workers themselves.

Based on the experimental programs so far conducted, particularly those held in two counties in Wisconsin in 1957 and 1958, I believe this is an area that could and should be explored more fully as a means for improving the living conditions of the migrants and increasing their self-respect, as well as providing a basis for protecting the interests and expenses of the farmers themselves.

Essentially this program follows along the path so successfully blazed by the Cooperative Extension Service, which now combines the efforts of some 11,000 county extension workers and 1.2 million voluntary local leaders to provide information about home economics and agricultural methods to more than 12 million people.

This bill would provide grants to States with serious migratory worker problems to help organize instructional programs and stimulate local activity and interest. There are, of course, a multitude of ways in which such a program could be of help. It could provide for meetings, demonstrations, and films on such subjects as the relationship between sanitary facilities and personal health, the preparation of family budgets and methods of handling family finances, instruction in clothes care and nutritious and economical preparation of food, and so forth.

The advantages of this program, I am sure, will far outweigh the very modest expense involved.

The following is a table, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of estimates of State participation under the Migrant Children Education Assistance Act, provided the minimum standards regarding the eligibility for participation contained in section 4(8) of the act are met:

Estimated cost of ADA payments to States based on 1959 data

	Total migrants	Number of migrant children	Amount paid per pupil	Estimated daily attendance	Amount paid for migrant children
1. Alabama	3,400	680	$1.00	15	$10,200.00
2. Arizona	7,998	1,600	1.25	20	40,000.00
3. Arkansas	4,875	975	1.00	15	14,625.00
4. California	59,680	11,935	1.25	20	288,375.00
5. Colorado	10,056	2,010	1.25	15	37,687.50
6. Connecticut	4,540	905	1.25	20	22,625.00
7. Delaware	4,747	945	1.50	15	21,162.50
8. District of Columbia.[1]					
9. Florida	25,347	5,065	1.00	20	101,300.00
10. Georgia	5,300	1,060	1.00	15	15,300.00
11. Idaho	8,875	1,775	1.00	15	26,625.00
12. Illinois	7,499	1,495	1.25	15	28,131.25
13. Indiana	6,989	1,195	1.00	15	17,925.00
14. Iowa	773	155	1.25	15	2,906.25
15. Kansas	20,850	4,170	1.00	15	62,550.00
16. Kentucky	3,450	690	1.00	15	10,350.00
17. Louisiana	5,075	1,015	1.25	15	10,031.25
18. Maine	404	80	1.00	15	1,200.00
19. Maryland	13,038	2,605	1.25	15	48,843.75
20. Massachusetts	1,614	325	1.25	15	6,093.75
21. Michigan	46,543	9,305	1.25	20	232,625.00
22. Minnesota	5,399	1,075	1.00	15	16,125.00
23. Mississippi	1,274	255	1.00	15	3,825.00
24. Missouri	13,155	2,630	1.00	15	39,450.00
25. Montana	7,172	1,035	1.25	15	19,406.25
26. Nebraska	4,052	810	1.00	15	12,150.00
27. Nevada	614	105	$1.25	15	$1,968.75
28. New Hampshire	308	60	1.00	15	900.00
29. New Jersey	13,055	2,610	1.50	20	78,300.00
30. New Mexico	1,506	300	2.00	20	12,000.00
31. New York	27,934	5,585	2.00	15	167,550.00
32. North Carolina	13,707	2,540	1.00	15	38,100.00
33. North Dakota	7,213	1,440	1.00	15	21,600.00
34. Ohio	9,987	1,995	1.00	15	29,925.00
35. Oklahoma	11,050	2,210	1.00	15	33,150.00
36. Oregon	20,176	4,035	1.25	15	75,656.25
37. Pennsylvania	7,355	1,470	1.25	15	27,562.50
38. Rhode Island [1]					
39. South Carolina	3,650	730	1.00	15	10,950.00
40. South Dakota	2,000	400	1.00	15	6,000.00
41. Tennessee	477	95	1.00	15	1,425.00
42. Texas	95,610	19,120	1.00	20	282,400.00
43. Utah	1,622	325	1.00	15	4,875.00
44. Vermont	220	45	1.00	15	675.00
45. Virginia	10,595	2,115	1.00	15	31,725.00
46. Washington	18,109	3,620	1.25	15	67,875.00
47. West Virginia	130	25	1.25	15	375.00
48. Wisconsin	11,752	2,350	1.25	15	44,062.50
49. Wyoming	2,241	445	1.25	15	8,343.75
Total					2,044,025.00

[1] No data available.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION OF EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 26 of last year, I introduced a bill—S. 1168—for the removal of the existing limit on the earnings of persons receiving social security benefits. I hope that within the coming weeks action will be taken by Congress to implement this proposal into law.

It is my impression that considerable public opinion now favors liberalization of our social security system. It is widely recognized that America's senior citizens deserve far better treatment than they have been getting. A full examination of the level and structure of our social security system is definitely needed.

An articulate constituent of mine, in writing to support certain important changes in our social security system cited the following literary reference which I think is extremely appropriate in this connection:

When all the world is young, lad,
And all the grass is green,
And every goose a swan, lad,
And every lass a queen,
Then ho: for boot and horse, lad,
Across the world away—
Young blood will have its course, lad,
And every dog his day.
When all the world is old, lad,
And all the grass is brown,
When every sport is stale, lad,
And all the wheels run down,
Creep home and find your place there,
The spent and maimed among;
God grant you find one face there,
You loved when all was young.

Mr. President, my bill—S. 1168—to remove the earnings limit is, in my mind, of the highest priority in the way of revising and improving the social security system. There is a very important and basically human reason for removing this limit. Many older persons are far more contented if they are are able to continue to work after they have reached retirement age. Under present law, many such persons are deterred from doing so because they feel that they have paid for social security and should not surrender these benefits as a result of the existing limitation on earnings. This most certainly should not be the case. The dignity and self-satisfaction derived from work are of the highest importance and should be permitted to all Americans, young and old alike.

In a recent Gallup survey it was found that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor removing the social security earnings limit. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gallup's column on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNING LIMIT HIT

(By George Gallup)

The American public favors the idea of letting its senior citizens work to the full limit of their earning power without losing

any of the social security benefits which have accrued to them.

Current limitations, as the public sees it, just do not provide the average retired person with adequate income in today's high-cost-of-living conditions.

Under present law, any person between the ages of 65 and 72 who earns more than $1,200 a year loses at least some of his social security payments. If his earnings are in excess of $2,080 a year, he may get no monthly benefits at all.

The question as to whether existing laws should be changed has raised much controversy and undoubtedly will be injected into the political campaign in 1960.

A nationwide survey by the Gallup poll on retirement benefits finds these are the highlights of the public's thinking on the issue:

A substantial majority of the public (two out of three) believes that the present restrictions on earning should be changed. Chiefly, people believe that the current limits are not realistic in today's economy.

A slightly smaller majority, in fact, would permit persons on social security to earn as much as they wish at a job and still be eligible for all payments.

This is the first question put to a representative cross section of American adults of all ages by Gallup poll reporters:

"A person over 65 who works full time and earns more than $1,200 a year cannot receive social security payments. Do you think this law should or should not be changed?"

Here is the vote:

	Percent
Should be	67
Should not	23
No opinion	10

The next question:

"Do you think persons over 65 should be permitted to earn as much as they can and still get their full social security payments, or not?"

	Percent
Should be able	62
Should not	31
No opinion	7

(Under a law, effective this year, a retired person may actually earn more than $2,080 a year and still get some benefits if the work is not of a full-time nature. For any month in which a person between 65 and 72 does not earn $100, he may qualify for a social security check.

(Theoretically, therefore, a retired person could earn the full $2,080 or even more in any one month and nothing the remaining months of the year and still get 11 social security payments.)

The American public has supported the general principal of old-age benefits from the very beginning of the plan nearly a quarter of a century ago.

In January 1936, for example, as the program was just getting started, 9 out of 10 Americans in a Gallup poll favored the idea of a Government old-age pension. At the end of that year, 7 out of 10 favored the plan as it now works—that is, a joint tax on employers and employees for old-age pensions.

During World War II, when, in 1943, the question of expanding social security benefits to include sickness, disability, doctors and hospital bills arose, a substantial majority of the public backed such a move.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am well aware that there are many who feel that the proposal to completely remove the earnings limitation goes somewhat too far. A constituent of mine, Mr. D. S. Sargent, personnel director of Consolidated Edison, Inc., has called my attention to a similar although more moderate proposal regarding the earnings limitation. I should like to give this Congress the benefit of Mr. Sargent's wide experience and great ability in this field. For this reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill encompassing Mr. Sargent's proposal on the social security earnings limit.

This bill would raise what I call the chargeback figure from $80 in present law to $254. This amount, $254, is the maximum family monthly social security payment permitted at the present time.

Under existing social security statutes, an individual can earn $1,200 per year—that is, $100 per month—without losing any social security benefits. If his income is over $1,200, he now loses 1 month's benefits for every $80 or fraction thereof in additional earnings. Should his monthly social security check be greater than $80, he may well lose more than a dollar in benefits for each dollar earned above the $1,200 limit. It is well to note here that most social security monthly benefits are higher than the current $80 chargeback figure.

By making the maximum monthly benefit allowed the same as the chargeback figure, as in the proposed bill, we establish in law the principle that for each dollar earned over $1,200 per year, an individual covered under social security cannot lose more than $1 in benefits. Under this bill, the social security earnings limitation would no longer prevent an individual from continuing to work beyond retirement age.

I believe that this proposal is logical and straightforward. If one understands the mechanics of the social security program, the proposal is not complicated or especially technical.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following figures and brief statement, which further illustrate the impact and intent of this bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Explanation of social security earnings limit proposal

	Annual income, man age 65, wife and children receiving maximum benefit [1]	
	Present	Proposed
Social security payments (12×$254=$3,048)	$3,048	$3,048
Can earn without penalty	1,200	1,200
Total possible income (including $1,200 in salary)	4,248	4,248
If he earns $1,454 in a year; that is, $1,200 plus the equivalent of 1 social security check ($254):		
Social security eligibility	[2] 2,032	[3] 2,794
Earnings from employment	1,454	1,454
Total income	3,486	4,248
Decrease in total income resulting from additional work	[4] 762	0

[1] Maximum benefit is $254 per month.
[2] Four monthly benefits lost (4 times $80, or a fraction thereof, in additional income).
[3] One monthly benefit lost under proposed bill.
[4] Represents 3 payments net loss (3×$254=$762). 1 lost benefit of $254 compensated by the extra $254 in income.

The proposed amendment consists of enlarging the charge-back figure of $80 to one of $254. As the sum of $254 has the individual significance of being the maximum monthly benefit check any individual may receive under the present social security legislation (and that for a beneficiary who has a qualifying spouse and one or more qualifying children), the net result of this substitution of figures is to enable all social security beneficiaries who lose all or a portion of such benefits by accumulating earnings in excess of $1,200 per taxable year to forfeit no greater sum of such benefits than that which they have earned in excess of $1,200 per year. In illustration of this fact consider the individual beneficiary whose monthly benefit is $116, or the beneficiary with qualifying spouse whose monthly check might be $174—both of these beneficiaries are able to earn a greater amount in excess of $1,200 per year than the sum of the social security checks for such year that they lose by such excess earnings.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to conclude my remarks on this proposal by reiterating what I said in the beginning of my statement. I strongly and enthusiastically favor the complete removal of the existing limitation on earnings for persons receiving social security benefits. The bill which I have introduced today in my opinion does not go far enough. But if the proposal contained in this bill more clearly reflects the tenor of Congress, then I certainly want to see to it that it is brought to our attention. It most certainly represents a step in the right direction and I urge that it be given full and careful consideration by the Congress in the months ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I introduce today be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill—S. 2866—to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 203(e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "$80" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$254".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I came to the floor while my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was speaking. I am glad to associate myself with him in the effort to remove the existing limit on the earnings of social security beneficiaries. I have taken up the torch which divine providence caused Senator Langer to lay down. I am delighted that my colleague from New York feels as Senator Langer did about this matter.

CONVENTION WITH CUBA FOR CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2867) to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
September 12, 1959.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate.

SIR: There is submitted herewith for consideration of the Congress a draft bill entitled "A bill to give effect to the Convention Between the United States of America and Cuba for the Conservation of Shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958." The convention entered into force September 4, 1959.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed the Department that it has no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Acting Secretary.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX AS VOTING REQUIREMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, for the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as the principal cosponsor, and 22 other Senators, whose names I shall read into the RECORD, a bill to eliminate by statute the poll tax and other taxes or property qualifications as a bar to voting in national elections.

I introduce the bill as an original measure and also as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 126, a proposed constitutional amendment to do away with the poll tax, which was introduced in the last session of Congress. Seventeen Senators who previously supported Senate Joint Resolution 126 have now joined as cosponsors of the measure I am introducing today, which would substitute for that constitutional amendment a statutory means to achieve the same objective.

The Senators who have joined with the Senator from Illinois and myself are the following: The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who is the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2868) to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the enactment of the bill would eliminate the poll tax requirements in five States where it still stands as a prerequisite for voting: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. Also, it would remove any other economic disqualifications for voting, other than a poll tax which are at present on the books in Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and South Carolina.

The bill to eliminate the poll tax by statute is also being introduced, as I have said, as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 126. It is my intention to substitute it for that constitutional amendment as the parliamentary situation will allow. It is my understanding that floor consideration of both these approaches to the poll tax repeal—that is, the constitutional amendment route or the statutory route—may be imminent, for I understand that Senate Joint Resolution 126 may be offered in the very near future as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 39, a constitutional amendment dealing with the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives in a time of national disaster.

Certainly the objective of constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax or to eliminate the poll tax is an extremely vital one in regard to the national effort to further secure the voting rights of all qualified citizens. But I cannot support it, for two important reasons, and favor instead the enactment of a statutory means capable of achieving the same result with equal, if not added, effectiveness.

First, as a lawyer, I believe it is most inadvisable to use a constitutional amendment to do what I am convinced Congress is fully capable of doing by statute. It is particularly unwise, moreover, to invoke such practice when dealing with a question, like the poll tax, which has major ramifications in the civil rights field, where it seems inevitable that on many major bills to secure these rights, charges of unconstitutionality are constantly raised with respect to rights which are already, in fact, guaranteed by the Constitution.

Such questions are being raised already, for example, with respect to Federal voting registrars. If once we adopt the idea that we have to proceed in this field by constitutional amendment, it seems to me we handicap ourselves in the normal current of civil rights legislation. Therefore, if we do not need a constitutional amendment—and I think I can demonstrate that irrefutably in the legal discussion which will take place—then we who believe in eliminating the poll tax as a requirement for voting should certainly not seek to do it ourselves.

Then, too, Mr. President, as everyone knows, the constitutional amendment method is a very difficult and cumbersome one; for example, between 1927 and 1959, 1,819 constitutional amendments were proposed, but only 3 of that enormous number were ratified by the States as amendments to the U.S. Constitution. So it seems to me that is another reason why we should not take the constitutional amendment route.

Mr. President, I was extremely heartened to review again the remarks made by the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 126, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the very distinguished sponsor of the constitutional amendment idea, and also the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and other Members of the Senate at the time when the constitutional amendment joint resolution was introduced on August 6, 1959. They expressed with great sincerity their personal convictions that the poll tax should be removed, so that every citizen—regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin—who can qualify under State law to vote should be able to do so. However, their assurances that they believed this constitutional amendment would speedily be ratified were made before the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission was issued in September of last year. In light of the Commissioners' blanket indictment of the methods used to prevent—because of their race—otherwise qualified citizens from registering to vote in primaries and other Federal elections, I find it impossible to share a sense of optimism over the prospects of fast approval by the legislatures of the several States on such a constitutional amendment.

As the national income and per capita earnings have risen fairly steadily in recent years, there has been a tendency to downgrade the importance of the poll tax as a real financial barrier to qualified citizens who wish to vote; rather, it is decried as an archaic impediment and annoyance. While this may be true in some areas, I have obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau some rather interesting statistics which indicate that in certain States, such as Mississippi, the

poll tax requirement could easily absorb at least half the weekly paycheck of a Negro voter who might otherwise be qualified to vote.

In 1957, the most recent year for which statistics are available, the average nonwhite wage earner in the South had an income of about $23 a week. In Mississippi, where the average income of nonwhites is still lower, the State has a cumulative 3-year poll tax requirement which can necessitate the payment by a voter of a total of $9, including $3 to cover each preceding election year during which no poll tax was paid. Thus, if a husband and wife, for example who live in Mississippi wished to vote, and could meet all the other State qualifications, they would have to pay a minimum total of $6, and they might have to pay a maximum of $18.

However, while it probably is true that the poll tax is not necessarily a prohibitive factor in regards to voting in most other States, it is one more well-known technique which is used in many areas of the South to further discourage Negroes from registering and voting at all. Therefore, through the introduction of this proposed legislation today, we are seeking to remedy this situation, through enactment by the Congress of a statute eliminating the use of poll tax and similar devices.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that if one thing has stood out in the civil rights debates it is the fact that all of us agree that the first and primary thing for anyone to ask, even on a minimal basis, is that the Negro be given the right to vote; and that is what we are seeking by means of this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments, in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from New York, on behalf of himself and other Senators, to Senate Joint Resolution 126, will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESTORATION OF SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to restore the size and weight limitations on parcel post packages mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii, as those limits existed prior to statehood.

As territories, residents of these two new States could send packages through first-class post offices up to 100 inches in length and girth, and weighing up to 70 pounds. However, statehood brought both Hawaii and Alaska under the tighter limitations which apply to the States of the mainland. These are 72 inches and 40 pounds for first-class post offices, as in Honolulu.

There is pending before this body Senate bill 1306, introduced by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], which would make these larger limits generally applicable throughout our Nation. I am strongly in favor of S. 1306, because it seems obvious to me that the limits now imposed on parcel post shipments are inadequate and inconvenient for users of the U.S. mails. However, to emphasize the special need for continuing in Hawaii and Alaska the larger limitation which we enjoyed as Territories, limitations geared to our geographical position and completely unrelated to our territorial status, I am introducing this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2869) to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. FONG, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—AMENDMENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GORE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2436, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill—S. 1362—to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes, introduced by me on March 10, 1959, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DIRKSEN, MURRAY, RANDOLPH, BYRD of West Virginia, SCOTT, COOPER, MORTON, BEALL, and BUTLER may be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] be added as a cosponsor to the bill—S. 2755—to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION LOANS FOR BRACKISH WATER CONVERSION PLANTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1960, the names of Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. FONG were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2816) to authorize loans for the design and construction of sea and brackish water conversion plants, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators) on January 14, 1960.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, which would authorize the striking of a medal for Dr. Thomas Dooley for his remarkable services to humanity. I am happy to report there are some 41 Senators who have already joined in sponsorship of this resolution. The authority to join the resolution as a sponsor expired last night, but since that time the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], have indicated they wish to cosponsor the resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these Senators may be added as cosponsors, and that when the joint resolution is reprinted they be shown among the sponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR DURUM WHEAT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion for the reconsideration of Senate bill 1282, which was passed on August 21, 1959, and concerns production of Durum wheat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion will be entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate bill 1282.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 5 and 6 years ago type 15b rust virtually wiped out our domestic production of Durum wheat from which macaroni, spaghetti, and similar doughy products are produced. Production fell from more than 30 million bushels to less than 5 million.

With the aid of new irradiation techniques, we developed rust-resistant strains, meantime permitting farmers to plant extra acres to Durum for each acre of allotted wheat acreage they would put in the crop. In Montana, South Dakota, Minnesota, and California, farmers who had once produced Durum were induced

to plant the crop again to maintain the semolina products industry, and this market for a farm product.

The bonus for planting allotted wheat acreage to Durum has been reduced with the development of rust-resistant strains. Now we find that we are not keeping up with demand, and that it is advisable to offer a small, 25-percent bonus to wheat producers to shift from types of wheat in surplus to this needed type.

Our carryover, or beginning stocks of Durum in the 1958–59 marketing season were 26 million bushels. This carryover has dropped to 20 million bushels, although we had an unusually high yield of 23.8 bushels per harvested acre in 1958. We had nearly a third increase in acreage in 1959, but our stocks of Durum are going to decline another 6 million bushels this year.

The Department of Agriculture now estimates our crop of 21 million bushels will be 6 million bushels short of disappearance and we will be down to 14 million bushels of stocks on July 1. There will have been a nearly 50-percent decline in stocks—from 27 million to 14 million bushels—in just 2 years.

When the Senate passed S. 1282 last August, we limited the 25 percent extra acreage allowed for planting Durum to growers who planted their entire wheat acreage allotment to Durum varieties. There are some farmers in my own State of Montana, in Minnesota, South Dakota, and California who would help meet our Durum requirements with such an inducement, but they do not want to gamble their entire income by planting their whole acreage allotment to this type of wheat. In the areas outside North Dakota, Durum is not so certain a crop as other wheats.

We believe that we have now worked out some agreement among growing areas on a proper bill and it is desired to recall S. 1282, amend and reenact it so it will be satisfactory to all concerned and more effectively meet our Durum requirements.

To the extent that farmers can be encouraged to produce a variety of wheat in demand, and not plagued by surpluses, we will reduce the production of varieties which are in surplus. Although limited geographic areas produce Durum, its production, instead of surplus varieties, is in the interest of all wheat producers and the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some figures on the Durum wheat situation be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USDA figures on the Durum wheat situation

[000 omitted]

	1958–59	1959–60 [1]	1960–61
Beginning stocks bushels	26,000	20,000	14,000
Production do	21,679	21,018	
Imports do	174	175	
Total supply do	47,853	41,193	

[1] Calculations based on December Crop Report.

USDA figures on the Durum wheat situation—Continued

DISAPPEARANCE

[000 ommitted]

	1958–59	1959–60]	1960–61
Food	23,000	22,850	
Feed and losses	2,442	1,968	
Seed	1,767	1,775	
Total domestic disappearance	27,209	26,593	
Exports:			
Grain	0	0	
Semolina and flour	498	425	
Macaroni and products	146	175	
Total export disappearance	644	600	
Total disappearance	27,853	27,193	
Carryout	20,000	14,000	

PRODUCTION STATISTICS

[Actual figures]

Acres planted	932,000	1,283,000	
Yield bushels	22.9	16.1	
Acres harvested	900,000	1,220,000	
Yield bushels	23.8	17.0	

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT ENTITLED "FARM PRICE AND INCOME PROJECTIONS, 1960–65" (S. DOC. NO. 77)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report, entitled "Farm Price and Income Projections, 1960–65," which report is based upon conditions approximating unlimited production and marketing of agricultural products and which was prepared by the technical staff of the Department of Agriculture and an advisory committee of land-grant college economists be printed as a Senate document. At a session of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on this day I was authorized to make such a request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the findings. It is an objective, unbiased report. The basic data and conclusions were gathered and prepared by a group of the most competent technicians in the Department of Agriculture, at my request. The conclusions and evaluation were prepared by a committee of experts from several of the leading land-grant colleges. These conclusions, based upon conditions approximating free production and marketing of agricultural products in 1960–65, show that farmers' net income would fall to about $7 billion, which would mean less than 1½ percent of the gross national product at this time. This would be a drop of 46 percent from 1958, or less than half the net income farmers received in 1952, the year before this administration took office.

While it is true that the assumptions underlying these projections do not correspond exactly to the administration's present farm program, the report shows what would result under a program without any acreage controls or similar limitations, such as is apparently advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Specialized wheat producers under a wide-open program would find their net incomes reduced by one-half to three-fourths.

Even the largest and most efficient irrigated cotton producers would find their net incomes sharply reduced. Smaller dry land cotton producers would have to give up growing cotton.

Corn Belt feed grain and hog producers, in spite of sharply increased production, would find their net cash incomes almost one-half smaller than in recent years.

Mr. President, I need not go further to demonstrate that the so-called open throttle farm program of this administration is really a program which would throttle the farmer. It is worse than that. It is a program which would force most of agriculture into financial bankruptcy.

For several years now I have asked Mr. Benson to furnish the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with estimates of price and income effects of his recommendations. Now I see why he has been so unwilling to comply with my requests.

This objective report, the basic data for which were gathered by the most competent people in the Department of Agriculture, concludes that production will continue to increase at the rate of about 2 percent a year in spite of a sharp drop in farm prices. This is what many members of the Senate committee have contended by time after time it has been denied by Secretary Benson. Mr. President, is it surprising that farmers have lost confidence in the administration?

This report shows that under the wide-open program such as that advocated by Secretary Benson, wheat prices would drop to 90 cents a bushel, corn to 80 cents a bushel, rice to $3 per 100 pounds, cotton to 25 cents a pound, hogs to $11.20 per 100 pounds, and beef cattle to $15 per 100 pounds. These are the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. The advisory committee in reviewing them concluded that the average level of farm prices in the Department report is somewhat higher than is consistent with the estimated volume of marketings.

In other words these price and income estimates which I have been quoting probably would prove to be on the high side if the Secretary were to put his most recent programs into operation.

I hope that all the people of the United States will read this report carefully.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I have before me an article from the U.S. News & World Report, dated December 14, 1959, which shows, as does the report the Senator has just presented, the effect on farm prices by 1962 and 1963, if there was no farm program. As the Senator has just stated, according to this study prices would drop even further—wheat to 74 cents a bushel, beef cattle to 11.51 cents a pound, and so forth.

This U.S. News & World Report article entitled "If the Government Gets Out of Farming"—refers to the work and studies of farm economists at Iowa State University.

I congratulate the authority on agricultural matters in the Senate, the distinguished chairman of our committee, for his very fine presentation today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the report contained in the December 14, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF GOVERNMENT GETS OUT OF FARMING

(In spite of billions spent supporting farm prices, farmers' purchasing power now is the lowest in 19 years. Would farmers do better without Government help? Look at this study from the heart of the corn belt.)

AMES, IOWA—This idea keeps popping up: Why not get the Government out of farming and let farm prices find their own level in a free market?

What would happen then? A study just completed by farm economists at Iowa State University attempts to answer that question.

The answer this study comes up with: There would be further, drastic declines in prices of farm products.

The table on this page shows you, commodity by commodity, the level of prices that the Iowa State economists would look for within 3 years if Government price supports and crop controls were removed.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its latest price report, showed the level of prices for farm products at this time to be lower in relation to the prices that farmers pay for things they buy than at any previous time in 19 years. In others words, the purchasing power of a unit of farm products is less than at any time since 1940. That is the case in spite of Government price supports now in effect.

If price supports and crop controls are taken off, the study carried out at Iowa State University indicates that the following things would happen, assuming that surpluses now on hand are frozen and held off the market:

Grains: The bottom would drop out of the markets for wheat and corn. The price of corn, assuming normal weather in 1960, would drop down to 79 cents a bushel during the 1960–61 marketing year. The following year it would drop to 77 cents a bushel, and, in the 1962–63 marketing year, corn price would be down to 66 cents a bushel—lowest since 1940. Estimated average corn price for the current marketing year is $1.06 a bushel.

The study assumes that the 1960 wheat crop, much of which already is planted, would be sold with the market propped by price supports. So the first big drop in wheat prices would come with the 1961 crop. That year, the average price would drop to 90 cents a bushel, compared to the $1.71 a bushel estimated for the current year. Average price for the 1962 crop would sink to 74 cents a bushel, lowest since 1940.

Livestock: Price declines in these grains would result in great increases in the production of livestock. Wheat would join corn as a grain widely used to feed livestock and poultry. It is axiomatic among farmers that cheap feed means lower prices for livestock.

The market for beef cattle would hold up fairly well in 1960. By 1961, however, cattle prices would be dropping sharply. The average for the 1961–62 marketing year, without supports, is projected at $14.99 a hundredweight. In 1962–63, cattle prices would drop on down to $11.51 a hundredweight, just about half the average of $21.60 estimated for this year.

A reason given for the steep slide in cattle prices is that farmers now have a record number of cattle and calves on hand, and, with cheap feed, would put large supplies of beef on the market.

Hog prices would improve slightly in the 1960–61 marketing year. Then they would start dropping, reaching an average of $10.80 a hundredweight for 1962–63. That is 25 to 30 percent under present prices.

Milk, poultry, and eggs: Starting at the estimated average of $3.91 a hundredweight for the current year, milk prices would drop to $3.65 in 1960–61, to $3.42 in 1961–62, and to $2.66 in 1962–63. As shown in the table, prices for chickens, for turkeys and for eggs also would move downward over the 3-year period.

The Iowa State University economists emphasize that their study is not to be taken as a prediction of production and prices. Their projections, they state, "are the result of working through the implications of utilizing all grain that probably would be produced with no crop controls and average weather during the 1960 to 1963 period."

It was assumed that U.S. population would increase at the rate of 2.7 to 2.8 million a year during the period of the study and that per capita income would continue to rise.

Farm prices without supports: 74-cent wheat, 66-cent corn?

A forecast of how farm prices would drop if Federal price supports and crop controls were ended is given in an Iowa State University study, as follows:

	Prices now [1]	Estimated prices by 1962–63
Wheat, per bushel	$1.71	$0.74
Corn, per bushel	1.06	.66
Cotton, per pound	.315	.21
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds	21.60	11.51
Hogs, per 100 pounds	13.42	10.80
Milk, per 100 pounds	3.91	2.66
Eggs, per dozen	.327	.272
Broiler chickens, per pound	.167	.130
Turkeys, per pound	.221	.165
Lambs, per 100 pounds	18.62	15.13

[1] Averages, estimated for the 1959–60 marketing year.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON EXECUTIVE I, 86–1, AGREEMENT ON THE IMPORTATION OF EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL MATERIALS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 26 at 10:30 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, will hold a public hearing on Executive I, 86th Congress, 1st session, the agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. This agreement, often referred to as the Florence Convention, was signed in behalf of the United States on June 24, 1959, and was transmitted to the Senate by the President on August 25, 1959. While designed to promote education, science, and cultural interchange, the proposed agreement essentially has the form of a tariff and trade measure.

All those wishing to present testimony regarding this agreement should contact the chief clerk of the committee without delay.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address on the subject "Let's Help the Small Tobacco Farmer," by Representative KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 14, 1960.

Also correspondence between Joe R. Williams, Director of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Senator RANDOLPH.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

Correspondence with William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, in regard to hiring policies of the Arabian American Oil Co., in New York State.

COMMISSIONER DOMINY DISCUSSES WATER AND PEOPLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while we carry out our day-to-day duties in Congress in representing our constituents, we are in contact with the many different agencies, bureaus, and departments of the Federal Government. Despite the fact the executive is controlled by the opposition, I have received excellent cooperation from many, especially the Bureau of Reclamation. This Agency is of vital importance to Montana, because of its many activities in the State.

Commissioner Floyd Dominy has done a fine job in administering this bureau. Both he and the Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, have been most helpful in developing the resources of our State; and they are to be commended. Much of this development has centered around the State's water resources, and water is the key to much of Montana's future.

It was the subject of water and people to which Commissioner Dominy directed the attention of the Great Falls (Mont.) Chamber of Commerce, several days ago. On January 11, when he spoke to this civic group, he outlined the important role that reclamation plays in the growth of Montana, and he placed particular emphasis on water and people as our two important resources. This is a thesis with which I am in complete agreement.

Mr. Dominy is well known in Montana as a friend. He is a resident of our neighboring State of Wyoming. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his speech of January 11, and also an editorial from the January 13 issue of the Great Falls Tribune, printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Also, I ask that a letter on this matter, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator

from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION FLOYD E. DOMINY, BEFORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT GREAT FALLS, MONT., JANUARY 11, 1960

I am honored indeed in addressing the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce here tonight. It is always a pleasure and privilege to come to Montana, but under the circumstances of several previous visits in recent months, it is a distinct and signal honor to be invited back. I only hope I am not wearing out my welcome.

I enjoy these meetings with you folks, I consider them part of my job—a very important part—and I assure you that the business of reclamation is so broad and complex that even in four tries we are not going to get everything said on the subject.

It is possible that some of you were present at Sidney last summer when we celebrated the golden anniversary of the lower Yellowstone project and reviewed the accomplishment and far-reaching influence of that oldtimer among reclamation developments.

Others among you were with me in August at Helena when we talked about the physical accomplishments of that growing teenager—the Missouri River Basin project.

The trilogy was completed at Butte in November when we talked about the impact of the entire water resource program on the people it is designed to serve.

Tonight I ask that we look at the basic ingredients of this program—water and people—and consider the future of Montana in the light of some implications which we can draw.

Montana sits astride the Continental Divide. As is the case with all the States along the backbone of the Rockies, Montana is a producer and exporter of water. She is an importer too, primarily from Wyoming on the south and Canada on the north.

Water leaves the State principally near the two northern corners, in the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers on the east, and the Clark Fork and Kootenai Rivers on the west. These are all very respectable streams.

It was a surprise to me, though it probably will not be to you, to learn that the Missouri, as it leaves Montana, is the smallest of the four. It discharges on the average about 6.4 million acre-feet annually. The Yellowstone contributes about 8.6 million acre-feet annually on the average. These two, combined into the Missouri River are just slightly smaller than the Clark Fork River, which has an average annual flow of 15.2 million acre-feet. The Kootenai River discharges an average of 9.9 million acre-feet annually, with much of the water originating in Canada. In total these four rivers carry about 40 million acre-feet of water away from Montana. By way of comparison that is roughly double the capacity of Fort Peck Reservoir.

It would appear to the casual observer that with this amount of water leaving the State, there should be plenty for all uses and there should be no serious competition for water within the State. As a matter of record this is not the case. Annual averages do not mean that the water will be available for any given year when and where needed and competition for water has been an integral part of Montana history. The first manifestation of this conflict was the outlaw ditch, by which water was put to use illegally in conflict with established rights.

The illegal competition was only a passing phase but soon more significant conflicts developed for which solutions were needed.

For example, in the middle thirties the Bureau of Reclamation was asked to investigate the possibility of developing a supplemental water supply for the Gallatin Valley, where serious water shortages developed. The studies were completed and showed that there was adequate water in the Gallatin River to supply the requirements, and that the water users could probably pay the cost of reservoir construction.

At this point, however, the potential development ran squarely into the established rights of the Montana Power Co. for its hydro powerplants on the Missouri. There was water enough, on an annual basis, for both uses, to be sure, but storing the spring runoff of the Gallatin for irrigation use would have made the powerplants short at certain seasons. Furthermore, this conflict was not restricted to the Gallatin Valley. It precluded any further water development on the Missouri River or its tributaries, above Fort Peck Reservoir.

As a result of the situation uncovered by this investigation, a study of the entire upper Missouri River area was commenced—particularly the area above the uppermost Missouri River plant of the Montana Power Co. The results of the investigation were incorporated into the plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, authorized in 1944 as the Missouri River Basin project.

The crux of the whole plan as far as Montana is concerned, was Canyon Ferry Dam and reservoir, which is now a reality. To many people Canyon Ferry Reservoir is a place to boat or fish; to some, the rising waters in the spring endanger the nesting geese; to others the drawdown period in the fall creates ugly mud flats; some see the power potential created, and the flood damage abated; others, the existing agriculture changed and production insured through irrigation.

Each of these observations and attitudes has some foundation in fact. No reservoir construction can have only a single effect, good or bad; all serve multiple functions with different emphasis. Canyon Ferry Reservoir provides flood control, power, some direct irrigation and municipal water supply, fish and wildlife conservation and recreation—just about everything in the book.

But having said all this we have still missed the real point of Canyon Ferry. Its principal benefit to Montana is that it permits development of the resources of the Missouri Basin both upstream and downstream in Montana, including a potential 170,000 acres of irrigated land, and the use of water for various purposes without interfering with prior rights. It is one of the most valuable river control structures in the State, a fact which is often overlooked. The development of the east bench unit near Dillon—now an integral part of our construction program—would not be possible without Canyon Ferry.

But lest you get the impression that Canyon Ferry is a panacea for all Montana's water ills, let me assure you that it is not. In the first place it affects only the Missouri; in the second place, when one conflict is resolved another usually crops up. This is natural in a dynamic society.

Let me continue the illustration with which I started—the Gallatin Valley. The overall plan of development approved by the Congress in 1944, under which Canyon Ferry Reservoir was built, also included a proposal for providing supplemental water for the Gallatin Valley and expanding irrigation there by diverting water from the Madison River. It was a carefully thought out plan, believed to best resolve the then evident conflicting demands on the river system.

However, when we began more detailed planning, real conflict became apparent in the Madison Basin. The Madison River is a blue ribbon fishing stream. Any suggestion of manipulating or controlling its waters met with vigorous protest. We do not object to such protests. They are one of the privileges of our democracy and one of the ways in which these conflicts are made known. We did, in this case, become concerned over some of the intemperate remarks based on inaccuracies which came into the picture. I am a fisherman myself, and last summer I managed to play hookey for a day of fishing on the Madison. Several nice trout and a grayling were in the creel at the close of the day. I left the stream only a day before it was dammed by nature without consulting anyone.

As a result of the high priority given to the fishery value of the Madison River, our suggested plan for developing the Three Forks area was modified. There will be only local use of the Madison, should conditions ever warrant, and greater use of the Jefferson and Gallatin Rivers in their respective basins. So here we are back at the Gallatin Valley again.

When we made plans for storage at the Spanish Creek site in the 1930's, no question was raised about fish and wildlife conservation. When we studied the same proposition in the 1950's, these conservation values had become of such consequence as to be a major factor in the decision to place storage in a deferred category and not include it in the proposed plan of development.

The implications of this situation are serious. Where conflicts of this magnitude exist some way must be found to reconcile the conflict through compromise, or a choice must be made. Sometimes both processes are used. In the Jefferson River Basin we have been able to reach a compromise at Clark Canyon Reservoir on the Beaver Head River near Dillon, which is soon to go into construction, as a part of the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project and a similar course seems practicable at Reichle Reservoir, on the Big Hole River, now in the detailed investigation stage.

Not everyone is satisfied with compromise, of course, because it always involves a retreat from a preferred and established position. Nevertheless, a compromise represents an important step in the democratic process of government and we bend our efforts to seeking the best compromise in the interests of the Government and the people it represents. In all cases, of course, the final arbitrator is the Congress, the direct representative of the people.

I have used an illustration involving a fishery problem because it is pertinent and carries through a full cycle. I don't want anyone to leave this gathering and report that the Commissioner of Reclamation is sniping at the conservation interests, because that is not the case. Conflict is represented in most of the potential purposes and benefits of multipurpose reclamation development, and it is one of our jobs to reach the most equitable solution.

Recreation in Montana is big business, and it is to a considerable extent dependent on wise use of water to maintain it. Similar groups such as yours constantly working to bring new industry to the State, and adequate supplies of water at reasonable cost will be one criterion of site selection. Your cities and towns are growing, and water supplies must keep pace. There are still hydroelectric power sites in the State, which can be developed economically. You have thousands of acres of land which will respond to irrigation.

The fact that 40 million acre-feet of water leave the State annually will not prevent conflicts among these uses within the States. That there will be conflicting demands beyond the borders of Montana is also a foregone conclusion. So far development of the Columbia and Missouri basins is not far

enough along to create a pinch, but the next few years may see some real problems developing.

These conflicts and problems will be affected by the decisions you make in Montana as to future development. There is a potential additional consumptive use of 2 million acre-feet of water annually for irrigation in the eastern part of Montana where most of the arable land lies. To the extent that this development takes place and the water is thus used, it will reduce the 15 million acre-feet leaving the State on the east and available for downstream use, and competition will be increased.

On the other hand, the regulation required in Montana to effect use of this water will be advantageous to all users, within and without the State, because the resulting flow will be more uniform. Similarly as other uses are developed which will not reduce the total flow leaving the State, they will serve to regulate the flows and make them more useful.

This situation also exists in the western part of the State but because opportunities for consumptive use of water are less and the total volume of water is much greater the net effect will be less pronounced.

I mentioned at the outset of these remarks that I planned to talk about two of Montana's most important resources, water and people. Thus far I have dealt only with water and the problems you face in future development. Now, what about people.

I have before me, unofficial population estimates for the last decade. They show that the West as a whole is the fastest growing area in the country and that only the Pacific States, Washington, Oregon, and California, exceed the Rocky Mountain States in population gains.

The Rocky Mountain States show a gain of 32 percent, up 1.6 million from 1950. Montana participated in this increase to the extent of 96,000 people, a gain of 16 percent over 1950. With such a steady increase, *should not* Montana be concerned with further development of its natural resources, particularly water, for water is the key which unlocks the treasure chest for further economic development and growth?

I say you should and must tie in the planning of water resources development with your planning for population and economic growth. Just because you have experienced some solid growth in the last decade is no reason to rest on your oars.

The new census will probably show a total national population of 180 million people. Within the next 20 years, this total is expected to go to 250 million and by 2010, we can expect it to double, probably ranging around 370 million.

The wide open spaces will feel the impact of this population growth and your State will be under constant pressure to find new economic opportunities for coming generations. You can take advantage of this future growth, indeed live up to the challenge and responsibility it offers only if you maintain a steady pace in development and utilization of your natural resources.

Thus as these pressures grow, as the competition for water becomes keener, there will be new conflicts both within and beyond the State boundaries. Because of them you have an obligation to the State and the Nation to insure that maximum effective use is made of the water you have. I emphasize that word maximum.

No longer can the status quo or personal preference or loud voices of special interest groups be the criterion of priority of development. No longer should a single purpose be permitted to block development which can be clearly demonstrated to provide greater multiple benefits. The stakes are too high in terms of Montana's total best interests.

Neither can the Bureau of Reclamation or any other Federal agency make the decision—nor do we want to. It is your problem—one to be resolved in the light of all available information—in an atmosphere of cool considered judgment—by the best talent you have.

I urge you to create a climate of open-minded public opinion and adequate machinery in your State government to study the facts, and weigh the consequences of the several alternatives. You will then be able to present a united front in support of the wisest use of the natural resources which have been entrusted to your care. No one can do more.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of Jan. 13, 1960]

MONTANA CANNOT AFFORD TO LAG IN WATER USE DEVELOPMENT

No stranger to the West is Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy. Reared on a Nebraska farm, a graduate of the University of Wyoming, and a former Wyoming county agent, his grass-roots acquaintance with life and growth problems in Montana and other Rocky Mountain States was clearly evident to the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce audience Monday evening.

"Water and People" was the subject of Dominy's talk—a combination which if properly brought to bear on Montana's great variety of natural resources will open up a vast wealth of new economic opportunities for today's and future generations in this "Land of the Shining Mountains."

Sitting astride the Continental Divide, Montana is a producer and exporter of water aplenty to supply all possible needs of agriculture, industry, recreation and resident use—current and future. Montana is also an importer of water, primarily from Wyoming on the south and Canada on the north.

As Dominy remarked, it would appear to the casual observer that, with the amount of water that leaves Montana and the amount that flows into the State, there should be no serious competition for water within the State. It is a matter of record, however, that competition for water has been an integral part of Montana history. We have become increasingly aware of that competition in recent years—competition not only between regions but also among the various uses. And as we grow in population and industry that competition will grow inside and beyond Montana.

Two things we must keep in mind with regard to this competition for water in and outside of Montana. We cannot afford to allow our use competition for water within the State to prevent its development in the best interests of all the people. And we cannot afford to lag in our statewide development program, or we will lose in the race with outside competitors while they gain prior rights to the water which arises in and flows unused from Montana.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want you to know that I was particularly pleased to read the speech made by your Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd Dominy before the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce on January 11. He stated the value of Canyon Ferry Dam and Reservoir to the Missouri Basin as succinctly as it has ever been put. I am sending copies of his speech to some interested newsmen in the area so that more Montanans may have an opportunity to read the Commissioner's statement about Canyon Ferry.

I was also pleased that your Commissioner emphasized that Montanans "have an obligation to the State and the Nation to insure that maximum effective use is made of the water you have." I hope this full development concept is reflected in the Department's report on S. 1226 which would authorize construction of a dam in the Clark Fork-Flathead Basin of western Montana.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have heard a discussion this morning about a remedy in the agricultural situation. The remedy which has been spoken of may be a remedy or it may not be. I doubt very much whether there is any remedy, unless we can, first, curtail production and, second, get distribution.

I happen to have before me a statement about the program of the Grange. As Senators know, I am a member of the Grange, and I have been for a good many years. This program is taken from the National Grange Monthly, and it has no relation to a miracle. It contains a number of suggestions. It bears in mind, which I think is the important feature, the fact that practically every depression we have had has started in the farm areas.

If we start monkeying with farm receipts we shall be in trouble. The farmer is the only fellow in America who does not receive his equitable share of the consumer's dollar for what he produces. That is definite. I could cite a number of instances to prove it.

The real problem we face is how to get distribution.

It was my privilege yesterday to be at the White House, and was my privilege also to have a few words with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. We are happy that he has recovered. He told me of a very interesting incident. He said, "Senator, you have been talking about adequate distribution. I want to tell you something. You know, we are educating the Japanese people to eat wheat and to drink milk, which they never did before. We have programs in that regard."

I was in that country myself, and saw that program in action. It seems to me that is the beginning of a solution to the farm problem, which is in the right direction.

Mr. President, as the Congress searches for a solution to our complex farm problems, we turn, as always, to the farmers, themselves, and farm organizations for constructive thinking on ways and means of assuring a healthy agriculture.

Unfortunately, it is not always possible to get agreement, even among those in agriculture, as to what is best for the farm economy. Nevertheless, we must continue to carefully examine the proposals emanating from farmers and their organizations in striving to find ways and means of preventing a further downtrend in farm income. According to USDA reports, purchasing power of the Wisconsin farmer's dollar has dropped almost to depression levels of a quarter century ago.

At its 93d annual convention, the National Grange—one of our great farm

organizations—outlined a farm program for 1960. The Grange said that it seeks:

(1) Parity of income for producers; (2) income from the sale of farm products—not from taxpayers; (3) a continued program of abundance; (4) increased producer bargaining power; (5) producer-managed marketing programs; and (6) an expanded expert program that would permit farmers to compete in world markets on the basis of quality and efficiency.

As a strong voice in agriculture, I believe the 1960 platform of the Grange merits the consideration of Congress.

Recently this platform, entitled "On This We Stand," was published in the National Grange Monthly, including programs which the Grange favors and opposes. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THIS WE STAND—A SUMMARY OF THE GRANGE PLATFORM FOR 1960 AS ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION

The Grange favors—

Programs to provide increased producer bargaining power.

Orders and agreements to provide farmer control over the marketing of agricultural commodities.

Adequate appropriations for extension and research.

Priority for research relating to utilization and marketing of farm products.

More strict quality control over export wheat.

Increased duty on imported sheep and dressed lamb.

Meat grading program modifications necessary to eliminate undue hardships on producers, handlers, or consumers of meat.

A continuation of the conservation reserve program.

Adequate appropriations for Farmers Home Administration with special emphasis on tenant purchase program.

A continuation of the present tobacco program.

The school lunch and milk program.

Making surplus commodities available to county or State tax-supported institutions as well as to schools.

A continuation of present peanut program.

A continued use of the parity income formula philosophy.

Continuation of the sugar program.

A self-help dairy stabilization program.

Legislation protecting State and individual water rights from Federal preemption.

The continuing development of soil districts.

Increased emphasis on programs for upstream watershed protection.

Tax-exempted farmer contributions to a retirement program.

Official designation of ample supplies of foods as a security reserve.

Legislation permitting farmers to use a 5-year average in figuring income for tax purposes.

Appropriations from general U.S. fund—for completing authorized Federal highway program.

A uniform system of road signs, signals, and markers adopted by all States.

Farmer representation on Interstate Commerce Commission.

Coordinated piggy-back rail-truck service.

Continued private ownership of railroads.

Decisive immediate action to implement a sound and adequate rural civil defense program.

Classroom grouping according to potential ability of students.

Equalization of school support burden.

Establishment of additional junior colleges to meet needs of rural areas.

More adequate rural health facilities, including additional qualified personnel.

Accelerated research to develop pesticides less toxic to humans.

A continuation and fuller use of Public Law 480.

Where possible, the use of farm commodities in place of foreign aid dollars.

EXTENDING AND EXPANDING THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that a few days ago, on January 13, I introduced a bill, S. 2797, to extend and expand the special milk program.

As Senators know, the program has provided a great service in the direction of making healthful milk available to children in schools and in other nonprofit institutions, including summer camps, child-care centers, settlement houses, and similar institutions. During its lifetime the program, operated on a cost-sharing basis, has met with real enthusiasm.

Annually, the service has expanded from a modest beginning until in 1959 more than 81,000 institutions were participating in the program distributing about 2.2 billion half pints of milk to the children of the Nation.

Unfortunately, funds have again run short; consequently, the USDA has put out a directive that, as of March 1, the Federal contribution will be somewhat curtailed.

The action has resulted in a great deal of deep concern on the part of school and other officials of institutions operating such programs. Overall, these school and community leaders have made an outstanding effort to provide such service for the children of the community. A cutback in Federal participation now is expected to create real hardship—since, in many instances, milk is provided for children from low income or otherwise less fortunate groups. The action by congressional agricultural committees in scheduling early hearings for consideration of supplemental funds is most commendable.

To illustrate the deep concern with which cutbacks in the special milk program are viewed by our school officials and other leaders concerned with the program, I request unanimous consent to have additional messages relating to the need for supplemental funds to avoid cutbacks of the milk-distribution service printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Whereas the special milk program in Wisconsin has demonstrated its value in providing essential nutritional benefits to schoolchildren of the State; and

Whereas such program has provided a substantial and ready market for the abundant milk production of Wisconsin's dairy farms; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has announced by amendment to regulations the reduction in reimbursement rates for milk served under the terms of the special milk program effective March 1, 1960; and

Whereas such reduction of one-half cent per half pint would tend to work a hardship on school districts and children participating in such program; and

Whereas school budgets and finances for the current year have been established and cannot be readily amended to provide for the additional funds which this action would require; and

Whereas this action would in itself tend to discourage the expansion of the special milk program in Wisconsin and deny the nutritional benefits of this worthy program to the many needy children of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin School Food Service Association do hereby resolve that the association go on record as opposing such action by the Secretary of Agriculture and requesting that the Representatives and Senators in Congress from Wisconsin initiate and support such legislation as would rescind the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture and reinstate the prevailing rates of reimbursement for special milk, and that copies of this resolution be provided to Representatives and Senators from Wisconsin.

WISCONSIN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
R. W. FENSKE, *President*.

TWO RIVERS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Two Rivers, Wis., January 18, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On November 11, 1959, the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment to his regulations governing the operation of the special milk program in which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960.

The objective of reimbursements for school lunch programs and milk programs is to aid in making it possible for all of our children to have at least one-half pint of milk per day. The present rate of reimbursement is pretty much guaranteed that even where there are several children in one family it has been possible for families to provide this cost.

It is our feeling that additional reimbursement funds should be forthcoming to provide milk for schoolchildren rather than to decrease the amount of reimbursement which could result in many of our children not being able to participate in the milk program.

Yours very truly,

H. G. KNUDTSON,
Superintendent.

GRANVILLE HIGH SCHOOL,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 18, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We who are involved in the school lunch program are very much disturbed by the recent amendment of November 11, 1959, by the Secretary of Agriculture concerning regulations governing the operation of the special milk program for which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960.

The school lunch program in our school district is probably as valuable as any of our curricular programs. We feel that without Government support at even a higher level than previously, the program will suffer.

I am, therefore, urging you to defeat or repeal this amendment made by the Secretary of Agriculture. We need your support desperately in what we feel is a very vital issue in the school lunch program.

Thank you very much for your support in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

D. J. MCDONELL,
Business Manager.

WAUKESHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Waukesha, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has just come to my attention that the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment on November 11, 1959, which states that our allowance on milk will be reduced one-half cent per one-half pint beginning March 1, 1960.

This poses a very serious problem for us, because at the present time we can sell our milk with the hot lunch program at 1 cent and milk without the lunch program at 2 cents. If the subsidy is reduced one-half cent, you can see that we will have to charge the children 1 cent more in each instance than we do now, since most children buy only half pints at a time.

If this is going to be a legal policy, that is one thing; however, if the subsidy is reduced for a temporary period and then is increased to normal again, it causes greater confusion and inconvenience at the local level.

I hope you will use your influence to bring about action that will leave the subsidy the same so that we are not forced into an embarrassing situation in local schools.

Cordially yours,

R. G. HEIN,
Superintendent.

PLYMOUTH JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 8,
Plymouth, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has come to our attention that according to proposed regulations of the Department of Agriculture the reimbursement on the school milk program will be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint beginning March 1, 1960.

I suppose it is the usual thing for people to raise a hue and cry whenever a Government subsidy of any kind is about to be discontinued or reduced. It does seem, however, that the reduction of the reimbursement on the school milk program involves more than the ordinary philosophy underlying a Government support program. We have in this consideration, it seems to me, the matter of health of our Nation's children as well as the program of reducing milk surpluses.

As I have discussed the school milk program with parents in our community, I have observed wholehearted endorsement of this particular Federal support program by people in both the city and county. Although the proposed reduction is small, it cannot help but result in a corresponding increase of cost for milk to the pupil, as the milk and lunch programs operate on as close to a just-break-even basis as possible. With an increase in price, it is rather evident that the consumption of milk by schoolchildren will decrease.

At a time when Congress is seriously considering additional school aids, it seems inconsistent to reduce an aid program which appears to be operating effectively and well accepted by the public.

In the interest of a working support program for agriculture, as well as an investment in the physical well-being of the children in this country, I urge that you exercise the influence of your membership in the Congress to restore the proposed cut in school milk subsidy to its present level.

Thanking you for your kind consideration of this matter, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ELDEN M. AMUNDSON,
Superintendent.

PLAINFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Plainfield, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Funds for the school lunch milk program are running out and the State informs us that there will be a cutback if Congress doesn't act at once. The health of our young people is our frontline of defense. I know how you stand on this vital issue but we again need your leadership to get something done at once.

There are bills up to construct classrooms with Federal funds. What we need is a place where we can borrow money at 3 percent interest to build our own classrooms. There is enough Federal money wasted to take care of both these programs.

Regarding your letter of December 10, 1958, "When the 86th Congress convenes, I shall introduce legislation aimed at increasing the allowable extra earnings from $1,200 to $1,800 a year" (social security). Social security was not set up to provide a living; $1,200 annually is unrealistic and should be changed at once. Best regards and a Happy New Year.

Sincerely,

C. S. PICKERING.

PLATTEVILLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Platteville, Wis., January 18, 1960.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that, as of March 1, reimbursement for the special milk program in the school lunch program is going to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint.

The school lunch and school milk programs have been of very definite benefit to the schools, not only in this community, but throughout the State and Nation. Children are getting milk and lunches where previously they were unable to get them due to the economic conditions of the family at home. In order that we may distribute milk and lunches to all who need them, it has been necessary to keep costs to an absolute minimum and, in some cases, provide free lunches or free milk where the child was unable to pay for the same.

With this anticipated reduction in Federal reimbursement, it will be necessary for us to do one of two things. We must either increase the price that we charge the individual child, or the additional cost will have to be absorbed by the school district and become an increased burden on the local property tax.

I would like to take this opportunity to request you and your office to do what you can to try to get the reimbursement reinstated, or take whatever other measures are necessary to avoid shifting this additional cost to the local taxpayer. We are very much afraid, in fact, in some cases we are positive that if we raise the price, the number of children participating will definitely be reduced.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. DIMICK,
Superintendent.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
OCONTO FALLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Oconto Falls, Wis., January 18, 1960.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We, the board of education of Oconto Falls, request your support in taking action to continue the existing rates of reimbursement for the special school milk program.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY WOLF,
JOSEPH PORTER,
WINONA DOBRATZ,
HOWARD LEHNER,
STERLING BAUMAN,
AARON RUDOLPH,
HERB BRAUN,
Board of Education.

UPLIFTING TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, of all mass media of communications television is the most popular and most powerful. It is the easiest to turn on, it is the most difficult to turn off. It has special appeal to our children and youth because it is dramatic, and combines pictures with words. I believe that some of the sociologists undertaking all kinds of remote and exotic studies would do well to examine a problem in our midst—the impact of television and television philosophies and morals on American youth.

Television presents a tremendous power, which can be either properly used—or else misused. All reasonable efforts must, therefore, be made to maintain it on a level which produces public benefit rather than waste and harm. This, however, is most difficult to accomplish due to the fact that advertisers desire large television audiences and will sponsor programs that appeal to the largest mass of people, without regard to their cultural, moral, or social value.

The public interest in radio and television is demonstrated by the fact that these instruments of mass media are public controlled and government owned in many countries—including Britain, where the BBC is a government-controlled system.

Naturally, we believe in freedom of speech and expression in this country, and have thought it advisable to leave radio and television to the management and competition of free enterprise. Yet, this does not relieve those responsible for American radio and television from discharging their public duty. This they have not always done well—much too often they have imposed on the public programs which appeal to the lowest common denominator of the viewing audience.

How to achieve a higher standard of radio and television without the necessity of Government control is a question not easily answered. Recently, however, Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission, has suggested one way in which television can be upgraded without any control by the FCC over programing. He would have each network and its affiliated stations devote a preferred hour, for 1 week each, to cultural and educational programs. The next week another network would take its turn at presenting upgraded programs. These cultural programs, that the audience will see on the local station, would be divided between network originated programs and locally produced informational or cultural programs.

I believe that Chairman Doerfer should be highly commended for this excellent proposal. He appears to me to provide a solution in the American way—in which Government control is kept to a minimum, while the interested parties are required to show a higher degree of self-restraint and public responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Upgrading

Television." It is time the television industry recognized more fully its public duty, because, in the words of the Washington Post and Times Herald, "The possibilities for making television a more useful tool of communication remain enormous."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPGRADING TV

Chairman John C. Doerfer, of the Federal Communications Commission, has suggested one way in which television can be upgraded without any control by the FCC over programing. He would have one network and its affiliated stations carry cultural or educational programs each evening at a preferred hour for 1 week. Presumably the specified half hour would be given to network programs several evenings during the week and to locally produced informational or cultural programs on the other evenings. The next week another network would take its turn at presenting upgraded programs during the same half hour. The net result would be that educational programs would be available at a fixed time on one network or another every evening.

The plan has had a good reception among the broadcasters and it seems to have very promising possibilities. No doubt the individual stations will need a good deal of flexibility in substituting cultural programs of their own for what the networks may offer, but that would not neecssarily detract from the virtues of the plan. If the television industry takes the hint from the FCC Chairman and finds ready acceptance of a "cultural half hour," the next step might well be the development of a "public affairs half hour" worked out on a similar rotating basis. The possibilities for making television a more useful tool of communications remain enormous.

SECRETARY BENSON STANDS UP FOR JUSTICE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer contains a fine tribute to one of our truly dedicated public officials, Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson.

It is gratifying to me that Secretary Benson continues to fight to relieve the American taxpayer from the mounting costs of farm subsidies and overstuffed granaries—for the good of the farmer and our economy in general.

I request unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 16, 1959]

SECRETARY BENSON STANDS UP FOR JUSTICE

Regardless of the political storms that follow Secretary Benson's every move—and will continue to do so in the 1960 election year—he stands out as a man who never fails to rise above partisan attack and continues to advocate what he believes to be in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Governor Rockefeller of New York spoke forcefully in defense of Mr. Benson—and justifiably so, we believe—in denouncing those who would make the Secretary of Agriculture a scapegoat for the multitude of economic ills that plague the farmers of America.

Rockefeller outlined a possible solution to the farm problem—one of many such proposals that have and will be presented and should receive careful study by Congress next year.

The farmers' troubles started long before Benson arrived on the scene. He has done his best, against formidable opposition, to free the farmers from the yoke of Federal controls and free all taxpayers—rural and urban—from the oppressive cost of farm subsidies.

Philadelphians and other city dwellers have good reason to give thanks to Mr. Benson. They pay not only a large share of the subsidy costs but higher food prices that result from the Federal farm program.

With the Government's stockpile of surplus crops now in excess of $9,200 million and expected to reach the $10 billion mark by early next year, it seems to us that Secretary Benson is absolutely right in demanding new legislation to reverse the present trend of ever-larger crop surpluses and constantly rising farm subsidies.

Mr. Benson's stand for what is right and just—regardless of political considerations—deserves greater appreciation and applause from the public than has been heard thus far.

We liked his reply when asked about rumors that he might resign.

"Resign? I am resigned to one thing—to do my duty as I see it."

Secretary Benson should stick to his guns. It will not be easy. But standing up for what is right, instead of what is expedient, never is.

REVIEW OF RECORD OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 7 years ago, on a wintry day in January, a large assemblage of the American people gathered to hear the new President of the United States deliver a message, the essence of which was that he intended to be guided by a single precept, namely, what is good for all America.

He sent up a little prayer to heaven, for divine guidance in the pursuit of his dedication to his task. On that day, when he and his youthful and well-trained Vice President took the oath of office, I assume that the American people wanted, during the ensuing 7 years and thereafter, to believe that when we should arrive at this day in January 1960, they might be living in a nation which is at peace; that they might be living in a republic which has prospered, and which would have grown in those 7 years, in national wealth and savings, and in the personal welfare of individual Americans.

I believe that as they listened to the distinguished and beloved new President of the United States, they must have wished that the Government would accept and respect its responsibilities, and would accept and live up to the concept that the individual, the local community, and the State also have obligations which they must be prepared to assume in the interest of the only true liberalism, the freedom and dignity of the human individual; and that the Government and the people would effect a working partnership under the guidance of this administration to achieve that end.

It is a very happy day, in this happy land of ours, when, 7 years later, the dreams and aspirations of the American people are, in fact, realized; that indeed, as the people hoped that day, we are living in a land at peace; that indeed we are living in a land where progress goes hand in hand with the development of the individual's aspirations and the continuing recognition by the Government of the need for restraint, discipline, good housekeeping, thrift, and care in the handling of the revenues which it receives from our people.

After 7 years, it can certainly be said that that President and his administration have kept the faith. They have deserved well of the Republic. One evidence of that, among others, is the announcement in the press yesterday that 71 percent of the people approve of this President and of his course of conduct as the chief of the administration, and only 17 percent think otherwise.

We have heard also during these years that our rate of growth has put us behind the Soviet Union; that our rate of growth is only 3 percent, and that the rate of growth of the Soviet Union is 8 percent. Those same people have not bothered to tell their constituents or their listeners that 3 percent of the American prosperity is much greater, in dollars and in goods and good living, than 8 percent of the Soviet equivalent. But I am sure they will be either pleased or discomfited—according to their several natures—to know that when the budget was submitted by the President the other day, the rate of growth for the past year was shown to be not 3 percent, but 6 percent. While we were ahead of the Soviet Union then, in total results achieved, we have now doubled the rate of growth which we were accused of having in earlier years.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my good friend from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am grateful that the Senator has called attention to this date when President Eisenhower enters upon his final year as our Chief Executive. In his time of service the President has in the truest sense presided over the growth and greatness of our Nation.

We should be especially mindful, on the occasion of this milestone date, of the historic contribution the President has made to world understanding by his journeys to the hearts of men, by his unremitting efforts to project the true image and the true meaning of America to the peoples of foreign lands. Through his inspired efforts, he has torn away the false curtain of propaganda, he has made peace a living word of hope, he has held out the hand of friendship and felt its warm clasp in return.

As he enters his final year in office, the President stands as a global symbol of peace and friendship. We can be sure he will meet the great events and great challenges of the months to come with the same high spirit of dedication that has marked the past years of his office. May we join in wishing him Godspeed on this epochal day.

I am grateful to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for permitting me to join him in these remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I conclude by saying that the true test of effective leadership is to be found in the judgment of the people. The people of this country have unfailingly today in very great numbers indicated their respect and trust and confidence in that kind of leadership, and have shown that they want to have continued that leadership, which will engender trust, faith, and confidence. It is significant to note that the President has been judged the Man of the Decade from among all the world's leaders. The judgment of the world and the judgment of the people of this country is that we have a good, strong, devoted, faithful, and effective leader. He has been ably supported in his leadership by his administration, by you, sir, Mr. President, and by all those who have the responsibility and obligation of Government resting on them.

FEDERAL REGISTRARS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the decision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, announced this morning, to terminate its hearings on the proposed Federal registrar bills on or before February 5, is good news for all who wish to see real progress in the field of civil rights.

The timely ending of these hearings will insure orderly consideration of civil rights proposals at this session of the Senate. It is my intention as soon as the committee reports a Federal registrar bill to the Senate to offer a comprehensive amendment which will include all seven planks in the President's program plus a provision which will give the Attorney General the right to bring civil injunctive suits in all equal protection cases. This will permit the entire subject of civil rights to be placed before the Senate in a manner which should satisfy even the most sticklish parliamentarian. And it will make possible fulfillment of the promise of a Senate civil rights debate starting February 15 regardless of any action in the House of Representatives or inaction by the Committee on the Judiciary.

None of the bills dealing with Federal registrars which are presently before the committee is entirely satisfactory to me in every detail, although I support the general principle of these bills. I am confident that an effective registrars bill will be drafted in committee which will command the support of the majority of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, in my judgment the action of the committee this morning is an insurance policy against any possibility that consideration of civil rights legislation will be delayed because the other body may not have acted and may not have sent a bill to us before February 15.

THE MEANING OF THE DILLON PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the New York Times an article captioned "Foreign Affairs—the Meaning of the Dillon Plan." The article was written by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, and bears a London dateline.

Again I call the attention of the Senate to this plan; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, because I believe the Dillon plan is one of the most significant developments since World War II. By means of the Dillon plan, the United States now is seeking to obtain as partners, in connection with the giving of aid to less developed areas, the principal countries of the free world.

This matter is extremely important, for two reasons: First, we, alone, cannot do the job in an adequate way. That fact has been demonstrated in a practical manner, although we have done a great deal and have done a very fine job insofar as we have been able to proceed. Second, in the United Nations there are not sufficient funds to enable the doing of this job.

Therefore, Mr. President, the Dillon plan is the one to use in order to do the job—namely, use the NATO countries, and add to them Japan, Brazil, Australia, and other countries which can join in giving help.

Again I must report to the Senate that the initiative in this entire effort—commenced as far back as the fall of 1958, and continued in September, 1959—was taken by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, to which the Congress adheres, and was taken primarily through its Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be Chairman. I point out that development as one of the fruits of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference; and it is important that we do point out the very worthwhile fruits of that organization and similar organizations, inasmuch as we participate in the many activities of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, the Interparliamentary Union, the Council of Europe, and similar groups.

Mr. President, the initiative taken by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, to which we adhere, and which we help support, is worth manyfold, incalculably more, than all that we have spent in time and effort in supporting that organization, and even if we lump together our contributions to all the parliamentary organizations to which we adhere. I believe the Dillon plan is one development by means of which that work has borne extremely fine fruit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE MEANING OF THE DILLON PLAN

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

LONDON.—The United States has now accepted the Soviet challenge to an era of competitive coexistence during which there will be increasing emphasis on an economic contest to win the ideological allegiance of underdeveloped lands. This is the real meaning of the developing policy known unofficially in Europe as the Dillon plan.

The decade of the fifties, dominated by the growth of NATO and the anti-NATO Warsaw Pact, was marked by military rivalry between the Communists and the West. The decade of the sixties will almost surely be marked by a similar economic rivalry if the balance of armed strength can be maintained.

Under the Dillon plan, which is only beginning to take shape, the following new departures may be discerned in our policy. We seek to unite the two European trading blocs, North America and Japan in a single organization to coordinate overseas economic aid.

We are quashing an incipient trade war between the European blocs before it can damage Western unity or hurt U.S. commercial interests. And, for the first time, we hope to harness Japan's industry in tandem with that of the West to help backward nations.

This program is a logical successor to the Marshall plan, which put Europe back on its feet. The Marshall plan served as the bony structure upon which NATO was built and also aspired to provide the framework for West European unity. There it failed. Europe split into a continental bloc led by France and West Germany, known as the Inner Six, and a peripheral bloc, known as the Outer Seven and led by Britain, concerned with its Commonwealth interests.

Washington intends to prevent this division from maturing into a political schism that would weaken NATO. It also intends to insure that any arrangements between the Six and Seven are not prejudicial to us. Furthermore, it hopes to join both groups with all other free industrial nations in a program to assist poor lands.

Rich countries have been getting richer and poor countries poorer. Therefore, Africa and Asia need emergency help to avoid eventual chaos. The raw materials, potential markets, and strategic location of these lands make it essential for us to keep them from Communist control.

Inside our administration there has been discussion on the best way to meet the challenge. Some advocated a global aid program in which the free and Communist worlds would work together under the U.N. It has now been decided to reject that idea.

An era of frankly competitive coexistence is therefore accepted with our own and the Soviet coalition each determined to make political and propaganda capital out of eleemosynary efforts. The U.N.'s special programs will clearly be relegated to a subordinate role.

The Dillon plan was developed by the Under Secretary of State after his return from a GATT conference in Toyko last October. Simultaneously Sir Oliver Franks, British economist and former Ambassador to Washington, and Jean Monnet, French economist, were elaborating similar approaches.

Since last month's Western summit meeting the Six and the Seven, without really burying their dispute, have at least agreed to work together, where possible, to curb threats of discrimination against each other and against us, and to join in the overall aid program. Shortly they will accept Tokyo's partnership.

The new organization to be created will therefore be on a free world rather than an Atlantic basis. But the United States and other prospective members expect to name as delegates to it their present envoys to NATO, thus insuring good economic liaison with the latter.

The logic behind the Dillon plan is simple. The United States helped restore prosperity to Europe and Japan. Now it is time for them to join North America in a similar endeavor elsewhere. The war against pov-

erty and confusion is being fought on vast battlefields. Our goal is not only to hoist underprivileged peoples by the bootstraps but to insure them against communism.

This is an infinitely long-range task, likely to endure the rest of this century. Fortunately, and thanks no little bit to the prod of Russia's own increasingly effective aid program, the job has now begun. And fortunately, also, the United States has again begun to assert positive diplomatic leadership.

BETTER CITIZEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TRUE COST OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is unfortunately true that far too many of our people do not know the fiscal picture of our Government. There is one time during the year, however, when almost every one of us thinks about the situation; that is when we figure our income taxes.

There has come to my attention an excellent concise "Fiscal Report to Each Taxpayer in Maryland," prepared by Mr. Louis L. Goldstein, the comptroller of that State. It is published on inexpensive paper on a sheet, 8½ by 11 inches, folded three ways in order to fit in the envelope containing the State tax forms. Three sets of piegraphs are included; they are captioned "Where Your State's Money Came From"; "Where Your Money Went"; and "The State's Bonded Debt Account." I ask unanimous consent that the message on the front cover and the data in the piegraphs be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I believe that the Federal Government could well emulate the excellent job Maryland is doing in informing its citizens. While I have not had extensive research on the subject done, I imagine that other income tax States are doing this sort of thing, too.

I should like to suggest that Secretary of the Treasury Anderson look into the possibility that a brief report of this nature be prepared and sent to the taxpayers annually, when income tax forms are distributed. As of now, no fiscal report is made directly to our taxpaying citizens. I think one should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the pamphlet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FISCAL REPORT TO EACH TAXPAYER IN MARYLAND

We are pleased to submit to the people of Maryland this report on the money received and spent by the State during the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1959.

Few taxpayers have the time to familiarize themselves with the amount of money received by the State, nor do they realize how much is collected from each specific tax. Many people in Maryland may not be aware of the numerous services rendered by their State and the cost of such services.

It is our hope that the information contained in this folder will help you have a better understanding of the financial affairs of Maryland.

LOUIS L. GOLDSTEIN,
Comptroller.

Where your State's money came from, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959

INCLUDING BOND ISSUES, $452.5 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Income taxes:		
Individuals	$81.6	18.02
Corporations	18.1	4.00
Total	99.7	22.02
Retail sales and use taxes	55.8	12.33
Motor vehicle fuel tax	51.0	11.26
Motor vehicle licenses, fines, titling tax	37.3	8.25
Property and franchise taxes	36.0	7.98
Tobacco, liquor, and racing taxes	34.8	7.69
Fees, service charges	25.0	5.51
State revenue	339.6	75.04
Bond issues:		
State of Maryland	16.8	3.72
State roads commission	27.7	6.12
Total	44.5	9.84
Federal grants:		
Highways	37.8	8.35
Welfare, health, conservation	30.6	6.77
Total	68.4	15.12

EXCLUDING BOND ISSUES, $408.0 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Income taxes:		
Individuals	$81.6	20.00
Corporations	18.1	4.44
Total	99.7	24.44
Retail sales and use taxes	55.8	13.68
Motor vehicle fuel tax	51.0	12.50
Motor vehicle licenses, fines, and titling tax	37.3	9.14
Property and franchise taxes	36.0	8.82
Tobacco, liquor, and racing taxes	34.8	8.53
Fees, service charges	25.0	6.13
State revenue	339.6	83.24
Federal grants:		
Highways	37.8	9.26
Welfare, health, and conservation	30.6	7.50
Total	68.4	16.76

Where your money went, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959

INCLUDING DEBT RETIREMENT, $450.1 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Highways:		
State roads	$92.7	20.59
Highway tax distributions to political subdivisions	31.1	6.90
Total	123.8	27.49
Education:		
School aid to political subdivisions	81.5	18.11
State programs	39.7	8.82
Total	121.2	26.93
Health and welfare:		
Health, hospitals, mental hygiene	37.7	8.38
Public welfare	29.0	6.45
Total	66.7	14.83
Legislative, judicial, general government	33.8	7.51
Land, buildings, equipment	21.4	4.75
Correction, public safety	17.4	3.87
Operation and maintenance	384.3	85.38
Debt service:		
Debt retirement	23.0	5.11
Interest	7.3	1.63
Total	30.3	6.74
Sundry taxes distributed to political subdivisions	35.5	7.88

Where your money went, fiscal year ended June 30, 1959—Continued

EXCLUDING DEBT RETIREMENT, $427.1 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Highways:		
State roads	$92.7	21.70
Highway taxes distributed to political subdivisions	31.1	7.29
Total	123.8	28.99
Education:		
School aid to political subdivisions	81.5	19.08
State programs	39.7	9.30
Total	121.2	28.38
Health and welfare:		
Health hospitals, mental hygiene	37.7	8.83
Public welfare	29.0	6.79
Total	66.7	15.62
Legislative, judicial, general government	33.8	7.91
Lands, buildings, equipment	21.4	5.01
Correction, public safety	17.4	4.07
Operation and maintenance	384.3	89.98
Interest on public debt	7.3	1.71
Sundry taxes distributed to political subdivisions	35.5	8.31

The State's bonded debt account, including highway construction bonds, June 30, 1959

TOTAL OUTSTANDING, $395.8 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Public school construction advances to political subdivisions	$80.2	20.26
Highway improvement	189.2	47.80
Buildings and equipment	126.4	31.94

BONDS AUTHORIZED FOR FUTURE ISSUANCE, $292.4 MILLION

	Amount (millions)	Percent
Public school construction advances to political subdivisions	$45.3	15.49
Highway improvement	195.0	66.69
Buildings and equipment	52.1	17.82

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC STRIKERS' VOTING RIGHTS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS IN THE LABOR REFORM LAW

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate an address by James V. Constantine, Solicitor of the National Labor Relations Board, entitled "Economic Strikers' Voting Rights Under Taft-Hartley Amendments in the Labor Reform Law."

Mr. Constantine served the Labor Subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as a technical adviser during the difficult days when

both groups were considering labor reform legislation. Jim contributed a great deal to our understanding of the Taft-Hartley law and to our comprehension of what proposed changes in the law would mean in terms of developments within the labor-management field.

Although Jim would be the last to admit it, he is an acknowledged expert on the operations of the National Labor Relations Board and the law it is empowered to administer.

In his address dealing with economic strikers, Jim views with objectivity the problems which face the Board and labor and management in coming to an understanding of the provisions affecting strikers not entitled to reinstatement.

So that every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to read his statement, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC STRIKERS' VOTING RIGHTS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS IN THE LABOR REFORM LAW

(Address of James V. Constantine, Solicitor, National Labor Relations Board, at the Briefing Conference on Taft-Hartley Amendments in the Labor Reform Law, the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The question of whether economic strikers should be permitted to vote in an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board has confronted the Board since its inception. At present, the matter appears to be regulated by section 702 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. This section amends the second sentence of section 9(c)(3) of the National Labor Act, as amended, to read as follows:

"Employees engaged in an economic strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall be eligible to vote under such regulations as the Board shall find are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act in any election conducted within twelve months after the commencement of the strike."

The second sentence of 9(c)(3), prior to the 1959 amendment, read: "Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote."

Section 603 of S. 1555 and its predecessor, section 604 of S. 505, as introduced and as reported by the Senate Labor Committee (S. Rept. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 4, 31–33, 56) would have deleted the second sentence of 9(c)(3). Such deletion was intended to allow permanently replaced economic strikers to vote. Identical treatment was accorded to the matter by both the Elliott and Shelley bills in the House. (See H.R. 8342, sec. 703; H.R. 8490, sec. 703; H.R. Rept. No. 741, p. 51.)

President Eisenhower also has attacked the problem of disfranchising the economic striker. In his 1952 campaign he characterized it as a "union busting" tactic. He mentioned it in a special labor message in 1954, and he denounced it in his labor message of 1958 to Congress—(S. Rept. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 32). Finally, the administration's labor bill of 1959 provided for a repeal of the second sentence of section 9(c)(3). (See sec. 507, S. 743, 86th Cong., 1st sess; sec. 507, H.R. 3540, 86th Cong., 1st sess.)

Constitutional questions aside—see *Teamsters v. Leedom*, 37 LRRM 2791 (D.C.D.C.)—this one sentence amendment seems to be gravid with ambiguities. Resolution of such ambiguities with respect to the second sentence as it stood prior to the passage of the 1959 amendment was had by resorting to legislative history. *Union Mfg. Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 221 F. 2d 532, 35 LRRM 2348 (C.A. D.C.). In addition, it would seem that the Board's past interpretations of language almost identical in the prior 9(c)(3), i.e., identical as to the words "employees on * * * strike who are not entitled to reinstatement," may command "great weight." See *Union Mfg. Co. v. N.L.R.B., supra*, 35 LRRM at 2351. Accordingly, it is proposed to discuss some of the more important problems likely to arise under the new amendment in the light of legislative history and prior Board decisions.

In its early days, the Board declared that only economic strikers were eligible to vote and excluded their replacements. *A. Sartorius & Co.*, 10 NLRB 493, 494. In Sartorius, the Board reasoned that if both strikers and replacements voted "possibly twice as many as can be employed may participate in the election. This was not the intent of Congress. Yet the intent that the strikers should remain employees for the purposes of the act is clear. By preserving to employees who go on strike their status as employees and the rights guaranteed by the act, the act contemplates that during the currency of a strike, the employer and the striking employees may settle the strike, with the striking employees returning to their former jobs, displacing individuals hired to fill these jobs during the strike. Strikes are commonly settled in this manner. The hold of individuals who, during the currency of a strike, occupy positions vacated by striking employees is notably tenuous. To accord such individuals, while the strike is still current, a voice in the selection of the bargaining representative of the employees * * * would be contrary to the purposes of the act and the ends contemplated by it" (10 NLRB at 494–495).

But the Mackay case (*N.L.R.B. v. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co.*, 304 U.S. 333) caused the Board to revise its thinking on this subject. Since the Mackay case held that economic strikers who had been permanently replaced were not entitled to reinstatement, the Board concluded that the replacements should have a voice in the selection of a bargaining representative. Accordingly, both strikers and replacements were permitted to vote. *Rudolph Wurlitzer Co.*, 32 NLRB 163; *Columbia Pictures*, 64 NLRB 490. In 1947, the amendment to 9(c)(3) was enacted whereby the strikers could not vote if they were not entitled to reinstatement. The 1959 amendment controls the situation since November 13, 1959.

Several problems readily present themselves in administering the 1959 amendment.

1. Does section 702 require adoption of formal regulations pursuant to the rule-making process, or is the Board empowered to develop this branch of the law by adjudication, i.e., on a case-by-case basis? In this connection, Congressman Griffin's remarks do not seem helpful. His contribution in aid of the legislative intent consists of the observation that the Board may limit the right to vote "by regulations consistent with the purpose of the act." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 14, p. 18152.) Senator KENNEDY seems to think that the adjudication approach is proper. He concluded that the amended 9(c)(3) "would permit the NLRB to decide when and under what circumstances it would be desirable for economic strikers to vote" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 5, p. 6411). Senator CASE of South Dakota, who sponsored the amendment to 9(c)(3) as finally adopted, accepted Senator KENNEDY's remarks as stating the situation "well" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 5, p. 6533).

2. May employees who permanently replace economic strikers vote? On this the text of the new amendment is silent. If Sartorius is followed, the replacements cannot vote; if Wurlitzer is adopted, the replacements will be eligible to vote. Legislative history is uninformative. Board decisions since November 13, 1959, seem indecisive. These cases merely provide in stereotyped language that "employees engaged in an economic strike which began less than 12 months from the date of the election who have been permanently replaced and their replacements shall vote by challenged ballot," and "ineligible to vote are employees * * * engaged in an economic strike which commenced more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced" (*Great A. & P.*, 125 NLRB No. 36; *Porto Rico Refinery*, 125 NLRB No. 45; *Thompson Weinman Co.*, 125 NLRB No. 32; *Florida Enterprises*, 125 NLRB No. 40). They do not decide the question of whether both strikers and replacements shall be eligible to vote, nor the question of what stage of the proceeding evidence relating to eligibility will be received.

3. Whether strike misconduct will render a striker ineligible to vote although he has not been discharged, replaced, or denied reinstatement by the employer. A preliminary question arises as to whether the conduct alleged to disqualify consists of violence or other nonpeaceful acts on the one hand, or nonviolent activities, such as wildcat strikes or strikes in violation of nonstrike clauses. It is possible that the Board may differentiate between violent and nonviolent conduct, denying the franchise to those who have engaged in one or the other conduct.

Assuming, however, that the Board will treat both cases alike, the question is whether misconduct by strikers will disqualify them from voting. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board held that, absent a discharge or refusal to reinstate a striker for misconduct, he remained an employee whose right to vote had not been forfeited (*Union Mfg. Co.*, 101 NLRB 1028, at 1031). Expanding upon this generalization, the Board observed that "where no * * * discharge or denial (for conduct rendering strikers unsuitable for reemployment) of reinstatement takes place * * * or where it occurs after the date of the election has passed, the individual, as an employee whose status has not been altered or challenged as of the election date, is clearly entitled to vote" (101 NLRB at 1031. Union Mfg. Co., was approved by the District of Columbia Circuit, 221 F. 2d 572, 35 LRRM 2349).

4. Another problem which the Board will probably meet involves the question of whether the replacements are in fact permanent. It would seem that, absent other disqualifying conduct, an economic striker who has not been permanently replaced is entitled to reinstatement. At least this result flowed from the Board's reading of the Taft-Hartley Act. (See *Belmont Smelting & Refining Co.*, 115 NLRB 495.) But to ascertain whether a particular replacement is permanent involves criteria which Congress has failed to establish. It would seem that Board decisions under the Taft-Hartley Act, like Belmont Smelting, supra, and the *Pipe Machinery*, 79 NLRB 1322, 1326 and *Triangle Publications*, 80 NLRB 835, 836 (temporary replacements became permanent) should be relevant.

5. Another problem is to distinguish between economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers, for the latter do not seem to be affected by the amendment to 9(c)(3). Unfair labor practice strikers have always been eligible to vote. *Times Square Corp.*, 79 NLRB 361, 364. An economic striker is not defined by either the amended statute or the legislative history accompanying it.

Under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act an economic strike was described by the NLRB as "a strike not caused by unfair labor practices." *Columbia Pictures,* 64 NLRB 490, 491. It is probable that Congress intended to embrace this understanding of the term in the amendment to 9(c)(3), especially in view of the rule that reenactment of statutory language may indicate congressional agreement with the Board's practice thereunder. (See *N.L.R.B. v. Seven Up Bottling Co.,* 344 U.S. 344, 351.)

But the question is how to ascertain whether a strike has been caused by unfair labor practices or by economic considerations. Neither the new amendment nor its predecessor in the Taft-Hartley Act offers any suggestions or even a hint. Legislative history has neglected this aspect of the problem. Prior Board practices may be applicable. These practices follow:

The Board has stated that strikers are presumed to be economic unless they are found by the Board to be on strike over unfair labor practices of the employer (*Anchor Rome Mills,* 86 NLRB 1120, 1122). Prior to the 1947 amendments, the determination that a strike was caused by unfair labor practices was traditionally made by the Board in complaint cases. But since 1947, that is, under Taft-Hartley, the initial finding in a complaint case can be made only by the General Counsel. Hence a dismissal of a charge by the General Counsel will compel the Board to conclude, "without further examination of the facts," that the strike was economic (*Times Square Corp.,* 79 NLRB 361, 364–365). Accordingly, there has developed the doctrine that whether a strike is an unfair labor practice strike cannot be litigated, and that the determination of the General Counsel on a charge is dispositive (*Cooper Supply Co.,* 120 NLRB 1023).

6. Another problem which Congress has left unsolved relates to employees who strike in violation of section 8(d), i.e., those who strike "within the 60-day period specified" therein. If such persons are treated as are other strikers guilty of misconduct, then the rules relating to misconduct should have some hearing in this area. For a strike within the 60-day period may be assimilated to a wildcat strike or a strike in violation of a nonstrike clause. But section 8(d) enjoins the Board to find that an employee who "engages in a strike within the 60-day period specified * * * shall lose his status as an employee of the employer engaged in the particular labor dispute." Since such a striker has lost his status as an employee, will the Board allow him to vote?

7. Another phase of the problem apparently overlooked by Congress but which may haunt the Board concerns those strikers, even if not replaced, who do not have a reasonable expectancy of being recalled in the near future because of lack of business. Such strikers literally "are not entitled to reinstatement" within the meaning of the amended 9(c)(3). But will the Board permit them to vote? Under the Taft-Hartley Act, the Board denied such strikers the right to vote (*Plastic Molding,* 112 NLRB 179, 182; *Cuttingham Buick,* 112 NLRB 386). Whether such strikers will become eligible to vote under the 1959 amendment may depend upon whether the Board will apply the Plastic Molding principle to them.

Closely allied to this problem is the question of whether a position exists because of its permanent discontinuance for economic reasons. (See *Pipe Machinery,* 76 NLRB 297, 250.) This need not detain us at this point, for it presents no more than a question of fact. But the legal question centers around the problem of deciding whether such discontinuance causes a striker to lose his franchise. Congress has set no guidelines. The Board must decide, in the light of past practices and other relevant materials, whether a striker may vote after his job has been abolished for economic reasons. And if the Board determines that a job eliminated for economic reasons disfranchises a striker, the further question will arise as to what constitutes economic reasons. It would seem that not only loss of business is economic, but also changes in operating methods may be economic. In *Meridian Plastics,* 108 NLRB 203, 205, for example, subcontracting the work of the strikers was held to have constituted an economic elimination of jobs which rendered the strikers affected ineligible to vote.

8. A few minor problems may be grouped together for summary discussion. If a striker obtains permanent employment elsewhere, may he vote in an election of employees of his former employer while the strike still persists? Under Taft-Hartley such strikers could not vote (*Belmont Smelting & Refining,* 115 NLRB 495; *Union Mfg. Co.,* 102 NLRB 1626, 1627). Will a replacement be permitted to vote if he was hired after the refusal of an unconditional application by a striker to return? In the past, the Board has not permitted such replacements to vote (*Columbia Pictures,* 64 NLRB 490, 491). And is a strike considered economic when prohibited by section 8(b)(4)(D), i.e., a strike in aid of a jurisdictional dispute? *Columbia Pictures, supra,* seems to think it is economic. Must a State-conducted election, which the Board sometimes recognizes (see *T–H Products,* 113 NLRB 1246), conform to the amended section 9(c)(3) to be accorded validity by the Board?

9. Finally, a serious procedural problem must be surmounted. How will questions of fact be decided—by evidence introduced at the representation hearing or at the time of disposing of challenges following the hearing. In the past, the Board has permitted all factual aspects concerning the voting eligibility of economic strikers and their replacements to be fully developed at the hearing of a representation case. In such cases, the Board made findings on eligibility upon the record made at the hearing and did not permit the strikers and replacements to vote under challenge (*Mastic Tile Co.,* 112 NLRB No. 178; *Belmont Smelting & Refining,* 115 NLRB 495). But if the facts have not been developed at the hearing, it has been customary to allow both strikers and replacements to vote subject to challenge, leaving resolution of eligibility questions to the investigation of challenged ballots after the election (*Pipe Machinery,* 76 NLRB 247, 249).

Whether the Board adopts one or the other of the above procedures, or leaves it to the parties to pursue either, cannot be predicted. But it would seem that both avenues may be open, in which case the parties will decide at what stage of the proceeding to introduce evidence on eligibility.

From the foregoing it seems reasonable to conclude that the new section 9(c)(3) is loaded with ambiguities, and that many of them may not be rendered certain until Board decisions in litigated cases have been issued.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION CONCERNING CIVILIANS AND COURTS-MARTIAL

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday in my remarks in the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 734–744, are included Monday's U.S. Supreme Court decisions holding that American military authorities lack constitutional power to try American civilians by courts-martial overseas in peacetime for noncapital offenses as well as for capital crimes.

Also included as a part of my remarks is a brief statement to the effect that there really is not a vast legal no man's land now as a result of the decisions, as some from time to time have said.

Mr. President, legal problems now exist. They are problems which I am sure we can solve.

I wish to say at this time, Mr. President, that I am engaged in drafting legislation, to be introduced in the near future, to try to clarify this portion of the law. I have asked both the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General of the United States for their views since they head the Departments directly affected. They are expected to consult with the Secretary of State

Surely, we must guarantee basic constitutional rights of Americans and we should be able to work out procedures—by international agreements and U.S. statutes, if necessary—to provide that Americans who are charged with and convicted of offenses shall be punished, no matter where in the world they commit their offenses; that discipline in connection with American military forces be maintained; and that support be effective for American defense operations outside continental limits of the United States.

The duty of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am honored to be chairman, in its continuing study of civilians and courts-martial, is to examine legislative proposals on the subject to see if constitutional rights are adequately protected. This we will continue to do to the best of our ability. We will give all suggestions our careful consideration. We welcome all suggestions from Senators who have an interest in this subject and feel disposed to make contributions to its solution.

Accordingly, I call attention to an editorial entitled "Curb on Military Trials," published this morning in the Washington (D.C.) Post. The editorial suggests methods of dealing with the problem which are worthy of our attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

CURB ON MILITARY TRIALS

The only puzzling thing about the Supreme Court's latest pronouncement on the constitutional rights of civilians who accompany the Armed Forces abroad is the fact that it split the Court three ways. Fortunately, the majority held fast to the principle that four Justices had previously laid down in the second Covert case and further projected that principle into new situations. The essence of the decision is that Congress may not deprive American civilians abroad of their right to a trial with constitutional safeguards because they are in some way attached to the Armed Forces.

In its 1957 decision the Court upset the court-martial conviction of Clarice Covert for the murder of her husband, but Justices

Harlan and Frankfurter joined in that decision only because a capital offense was involved. This newspaper took the view at the time that no logical distinction could be drawn between capital and noncapital offenses so far as the constitutional right to a jury trial in a civilian court is concerned. We also surmised that "time will sustain the main thread of their opinion"—the opinion against all military trials of civilian offenders abroad. This is precisely what a majority of the Court has now done. It is interesting to note that all four of the current opinions upholding this view were written by Justice Clark, who had dissented when the issue first went before the Court.

The distinction that Justice Harlan continues to draw between capital and noncapital cases seems to us illusory. If such a distinction were accepted, the military could, as Justice Clark noted, try all civilian cases abroad in military courts by merely reducing the charges. We do not think the Bill of Rights was intended to allow any such latitude. When the Founding Fathers gave Congress authority "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces," they meant those forces and not civilians who might follow them abroad.

It is equally difficult to follow the distinction drawn by Justices Whittaker and Stewart between civilian dependents "accompanying the Armed Forces" and civilian persons "serving with" or "employed by" the Armed Forces. To be sure, the employees are more essential to military operations than are dependents. But surely the controlling fact is that both are civilians. If Congress should deem it necessary for civilian employees to be under military discipline, it could put them in uniform.

Since the Court has invalidated the unconstitutional grant of authority to military courts to try civilians abroad, Congress will now have to act. In many instances crimes committed by American civilians in other countries can be dealt with by the courts of those countries. In other instances when the standards of justice are not comparable, perhaps diplomatic arrangements can be made to create American civilian tribunals for handling minor cases and to bring the more serious offenders to this country for trial. However difficult the problem may prove to be, we think the country will be glad to know that the rule against trial of civilians in military courts during peacetime is being rigidly applied.

COMMUNISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, evidence of Communist direction behind recent anti-Semitic acts in West Germany continues to roll in. Constantine Brown, the distinguished journalist, correctly analyzes the situation in his Washington Evening Star column of January 19.

Mr. Brown points out that the Communists have a vested interest in promoting atheism, and that in this particular instance "Mr. Khrushchev's tactics are not difficult to understand. He wants to create a strong sentiment against the German Republic in order to have a better chance to settle the Berlin question in keeping with his own plans and wishes."

Today's Chicago Tribune carries a news item entitled "Bonn Reports Proof Found of Reds' Plot." This report lends added weight to Mr. Brown's excellent column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1960]

KREMLIN IMAGE IN ANTI-SEMITISM—PRANKSTERS IN OUTBREAKS BELIEVED USED BY REDS TO PRESSURE WEST ON BERLIN

(By Constantine Brown)

As various pieces of news and information are put together, it becomes clear that the anti-Semitic outbreaks of the last few weeks in the Western World are largely the work of the skillful international Communist apparatus.

There has been no physical attack against persons of the Jewish race and creed. For the time being, at least, the perpetrators of the outbreaks have confined their activities to painting the Hitler swastikas on synagogues and breaking windows of some houses, which happened, however, to be occupied by gentiles.

The swastika painting was not limited to Hebrew houses of worship but also involved Protestant and Catholic churches. This was interpreted by those who are looking into the situation to mean that the so-called pranksters got out of hand and in their ardor to serve the Communist cause they included Christian houses of worship as well.

Atheism does not differentiate between religions. Whenever communism takes over a country the churches and their servants are among the first and principal targets. Churches and synagogues and temples, priests, rabbis, and bonzes all suffer alike.

New political philosophies which manifest themselves by violence as in major revolutions cannot tolerate religion which contradicts their "rational" doctrines. Thus the church suffered as much as the nobility during the French Revolution in 1789. Similarly, since the Communist revolution in 1917, the countries which were taken over destroyed or closed thousands of churches and murdered tens of thousands of pastors, regardless of their creed.

The present outbreaks have a definite political character and are palpably different from those which occur in the heat of a major turmoil. There is evidence that they were inspired by Kremlin agents and executed by crackpots who served as tools. It is strange, indeed, it is pointed out, that a wave of anti-Semitism—as it is falsely described—should take place almost simultaneously in West Germany, Italy, France, and the United States.

Mr. Khrushchev's tactics are not difficult to understand. He wants to create a strong sentiment against the German Republic in order to have a better chance to settle the Berlin question in keeping with his own plans and wishes. And what better platform can he devise to gain to his side the sentiment of the free world for a Kremlin solution of Berlin than to revive the hate and fear of nazism in the hearts of the people of Western Europe and America?

That the Red czar is determined to renew his demands for his own solution of the Berlin question became obvious last week when he entertained the heads of the Western diplomatic missions to the Soviet Union at the Russian New Year celebration. There, after the usual toasts for relaxation of tensions were drunk, Mr. Khrushchev told the American, British, and French Ambassadors separately that he will not tolerate further stalling on the Berlin question, which must be settled according to his lights at the forthcoming summit meeting. He was truculent and aggressive.

The clamor that nazism is not dead in Germany has been one of Mr. Khrushchev's stock accusations against the West German Republic ever since he assumed absolute power in the Soviet Union. He has used it in an effort to disassociate Germany from the NATO and is using it now in expectation of creating a strong anti-German sentiment in the free world which would serve his own purposes of establishing the Communist hegemony in that vital sector of free Europe.

The hooliganism of a handful of crackpots who became unwittingly or otherwise the tools of his agents caused an uproar which may have been fatal to the policies of the free countries. At the same time, in order not to disturb the prospects for a relaxation of tension, little is being said in the West about continuous systematic anti-Semitism which has been endemic in Russia since the days of the czars and has been worsened during the regimes of Stalin and Khrushchev.

Anti-Semitism and Communists work hand in hand. Only the Communists know how to use the anti-Semites in the free world for their own political purposes.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 20, 1960]

BONN REPORTS PROOF FOUND OF REDS' PLOT—EXPOSES ANTI-JEWISH CAMPAIGN PLAN

BONN, January 19.—The Government asserted Tuesday that it now has proof that "Communist influences were behind the worldwide anti-Semitic incidents of recent weeks."

A Government spokesman said the arrests Monday night of three anti-Jewish slogan scrawlers at Lehrte, near Hannover, confirmed intelligence reports that had been in Government hands for some time.

The spokesman said the information in the reports, part of which was published Monday, said the central committee of the East German Socialist Unity (Communist) Party met last January to lay plans for anti-Semitic incidents to bring West Germany into disrepute.

AN ARSON ATTEMPT

Authorities pressing an investigation into whether East Germany is behind the current outbreak of swastika daubing and hate slogans also announced the arrest of a suspected neo-Nazi student in West Berlin.

An arson attempt on a synagogue in Amberg, northern Bavaria, last Saturday was disclosed. An oil-soaked doormat was set on fire in a woodshed at the synagogue but firemen quenched the blaze quickly.

The three persons arrested at Lehrte were caught in the act of painting the words "Jews get out" on the walls of houses in black ink. Kurt Thomas, 33; Kurt Blank, 25; and Wolfgang Hulitschke, 28, were said to have been carrying a hand-painted poster with the same words on it as well as a swastika.

AT YOUTH FESTIVAL

Police said Blank had taken part in the 1951 East Berlin Communist world youth festival and Hulitschke was arrested in 1951 while illegally trying to travel to East Germany for the festival.

Police in West Berlin announced the arrest of Wolfgang Solondz, 21, a member of the banned neo-Nazi National Youth of Germany organization. He is suspected of having links with East German Communist officials.

MINISTER TO STAY

Theodor Oberlaender, West Germany's controversial minister for refugee affairs, said Tuesday he has no intention of resigning.

The 55-year-old ex-Nazi's minister issued an official statement after the Hamburg newspaper Die Welt appeared with a story that Oberlaender—accused of participating in mass killings in German-occupied Poland in 1941—had given to understand he would leave Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's cabinet. Oberlaender repeatedly has denied the mass death charges.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO DR. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can congratulate Dr. Francis E. Townsend on reaching his 93d birthday. Not only is this an achievement in itself, but Dr. Townsend has devoted more than the past quarter-century to forwarding the program he founded and he is still going strong. The Townsend Clubs of America urge us to utilize the talents and abilities of our senior citizens. This is an important segment of our population too often forgotten. It is a shame to neglect these people, and to ignore the fine work they can contribute toward our national goals.

Thanks to spectacular advances in nutrition, medicine and public health, today there are 14 million Americans over age 65. These are the retirement years, the golden years, when men and women who have worked hard can settle down in dignity and peace. But far too often, many of our people are finding the "golden years" tarnished with sorrow, pain and poverty.

The problem of our elder citizens is in two areas—ill health and low income. I am pleased that the special Subcommittee on the Problems of the Aged and the Aging, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] will continue its work on these problems.

Our most fitting tribute to Dr. Townsend on this occasion would be to give every attention to the urgency of this task. This has been his dedicated work in the past decades. I join in extending him my congratulations and best wishes on his 93d birthday. May he be blessed with continued good health, and happiness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], designated "1-13-60—D," proposing substitutes for certain subsections of the bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY SHOULD BE EXPANDED AND RETIREMENT PAYMENTS INCREASED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 25 years ago next August the Congress overwhelmingly enacted the most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history—the Social Security Act. This despite opposition of those who termed it "state socialism."

The man who proposed this legislation and whose signature placed it on the statute books is dead. This is one of the many imprints that Franklin D. Roosevelt has left upon the pages of history.

Today, under the beneficent provisions of this act, more than 72 million Americans, employed and self-employed, have assurance that in their old age they will enjoy a measure of security.

But, I regret to say, Mr. President, it is not enough.

America has never been a Nation content to stand still and rest on the laurels its great achievements have won. It has been our tradition and our history, rather, always to move forward. Always to take newer and ever greater steps in the interests of our Nation and its citizens.

This same tradition, I assert, must continue to be applied in the field of important social legislation.

Since passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, Congress has made changes in the act in keeping with fast-changing times. We have a duty to further expand and liberalize this program for the welfare of the Nation and its citizens.

It is my happy personal recollection that, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I helped draft the present liberalized and expanded social security program.

However, in the decade just passed, the need for broader, more sweeping changes has outstripped our efforts to meet that need.

Our social security program today does not give enough protection to enough people. It has not kept pace with the times, nor has it kept pace with expanding needs of our elderly citizens.

When the Social Security Act became law, there were fewer than 7 million Americans 65 years old or older.

Today, there are nearly 16 million; and by 1975, many experts believe, there will be more than 20 million.

Because today most of our over-65 population have inadequate incomes, most do not receive private pensions, most cannot afford proper medical care, and many are ill-housed, it is clear that expansion on a broad level in social security must be made now to avoid a catastrophe of sweeping proportions among our aged in the future.

CRASH PROGRAM

Indeed, Mr. President, in this 25th anniversary year and in the 1st year of a new decade of challenge, the time has come for a major breakthrough, a crash program in social security.

Piecemeal, patchwork, and after-the-fact legislation have proved inadequate to meet the needs of America's elderly population. We must learn to anticipate needs, not get tangled in the confusion of interpreting them long after they have swept onto the scene.

Mr. President, this Nation no longer can afford to handicap its elderly with inadequate benefits and inadequate health protection while, at the same time, confining them to an unrealistic, unfair, and unnecessary earnings limit of $1,200 annually.

This limit must be raised to $3,000 to enable many of our older people to enjoy a decent American standard of living without adding extra burdens to the taxpayers.

This present limitation is not realistic. It imposes cruel financial punishment on persons still able to work after 65 and denies them a right they have earned by their own contributions into the social security fund. Their work and money have built this fund.

As a trial lawyer in Cleveland, Ohio, for many, many years, going into court day after day, trying personal injury and other lawsuits, I have, since 1935, seen the life expectancy of American citizens increase by leaps and bounds. Those of us who have experienced tragedy in our own families, as I have, and who have lost dear ones, know that medical science is on the brink of finding a cure for cancer. It is generally known that science also may soon discover how to prevent heart attacks in many cases, which, as Senators know, cause so many untimely deaths to men in their forties and fifties.

UNREALISTIC LIMIT

When those two things have been accomplished by our medical research, then, indeed, life expectancy will go higher and higher, and men and women of 65, 70, and 75 will have the ability to participate in gainful employment after retirement. So it is very unfair and very unrealistic to impose, as the present social security law does, a limit of $1,200 a year. Otherwise, a retired person may not receive the social security retirement payment for which he paid premiums during his active lifetime.

If there is no substantial increase in the earnings limit, the so-called soaring sixties will never leave the launching pad for millions of our elderly citizens.

But more than this is needed if we are to bring our social security program truly up to date in keeping with the expanding needs of our people.

Retirement benefits, which now average only $72 a month, should be increased by at least 10 percent; and the minimum benefit payment, now $33 a month, should be increased substantially. Because of present surplus and premiums constantly coming in, the program will remain actuarially sound. After all, there is now $22 billion in the social security reserve fund. That is $22 billion, not $22 million. So, without impairing the fund in any manner, Congress can certainly increase the retirement payments by at least 10 percent.

It is a fact that we have dealt unrealistically and unimaginatively with the problems of disabled workers.

Crippling disability is no less tragic at 30 than at 50. No less final in destroying the ability to work and earn a decent living.

Once a doctor, or group of doctors, declares a worker to be disabled, it should be possible for him to begin receiving social security retirement payments immediately, no matter what his

age. Such payments should continue if periodic medical examinations show that he is totally and permanently disabled and unemployable. The needs for food, housing, and health care are inexorable. They do not wait until a man becomes 50.

I further assert that a disabled insured worker must receive all he is entitled to under the social security law without suffering deduction of funds granted under any other Federal or State administered program.

Mr. President, with these three basic improvements—increased earnings limit, increased benefit and elimination of the arbitrary age 50 before disabled workers can collect benefits—the 1960's could well be the decade the 1950's should have been in the field of social legislation.

TRAVEL BY MULE TRAIN

It seems tragic that a huge, important and deserving segment of our population has been, economically speaking, travelling by mule train while most of our society has traveled by jet.

I refer to our fast-growing population of persons over 65.

Today, three-fifths of all Americans over 65 have less than $1,000 money income annually. Four-fifths have less than $2,000.

Aged widows, most of whom are on social security, are the most impoverished group in America. They receive on the average only $56 a month social security.

Coinciding with these shocking statistics is the fact that life expectancy of Americans is constantly increasing. The consequences of longer life on less money hold out the prospect of an increasingly impoverished, rapidly expanding elderly population.

Only an ostrich would fail to see that care of the aged has become a major national problem. This has been made shockingly clear in hearings conducted by my able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Part of this deep-rooted problem can be met and solved through basic improvements in the Social Security Act. The wage base for coverage and collection of social security tax should be increased to $6,000 and then it would follow that retirement payments would also be higher.

Finally, Mr. President, our social security program should be universal, covering all employed and self-employed, whatever the occupation or profession.

For years, the ruling clique of the American Medical Association, and its powerful lobby in Washington, have stool in the way of inclusion of the medical profession under the beneficent provisions of the social security program.

They have even resisted the strong sentiment within the ranks of the AMA itself to give coverage to doctors.

Wherever doctors have been polled—in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York and other States—from 60 to 70 percent of them have expressed themselves in favor of compulsory social security coverage.

Notwithstanding this clear-cut evidence that medical men generally desire to be included within the provisions of our social security law, State medical associations and the American Medical Association continue to bar the door.

DENTISTS VOTED FOR COVERAGE

Men of the dental profession are protected by the Social Security Act. They were not dragooned into the program. They voted for coverage in referendums conducted by their various State dental associations.

Lawyers, too, are covered. Responding to the request of the vast majority of lawyers, Congress 3 years ago voted to include self-employed attorneys at law under social security.

Only the American Medical Association, through its leaders—that little group of willful men who rake in money from the medical profession and pay it out in salaries to themselves and in moneys to hire a lobby in Washington—has prevented the same coverage for physicians and surgeons, despite mounting evidence that most doctors themselves want it. The evidence shows that 70 percent of the physicians and surgeons in the United States desire to be included under the social security law.

Since 1935, and at the present time, the American Medical Association has vigorously opposed the inclusion of physicians and surgeons under social security coverage.

About 5 years ago, as president of the Cuyahoga County Bar Association, which is the second largest county bar association in the United States, I was privileged to appear as a witness before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate and urge that self-employed lawyers be included within the coverage of social security. I do not believe it was because I made a good witness—lawyers never make good witnesses—but it is a fact that shortly after that time Congress voted to include self-employed attorneys at law, responding to the request of the vast majority of lawyers of the United States to have this coverage.

But the attitudes and actions of the American Medical Association keep doctors as the only professional men who are still holdouts.

Physicians and surgeons who helped bring us into the world are not protected by social security by reason of the failure of the small reactionary group of rulers, or dictators, operating the American Medical Association to represent the views of the membership—of the thousands of physicians and surgeons who are the rank and file members of the American Medical Association.

Incidentally, those of the undertaking profession or occupation or business, who help take us out of the world, do have coverage under social security, but the fine medical men of our country, who help bring us into the world, are denied coverage through the action of their own leaders, who are misleading them.

Social security is an insurance system; and it must remain so. This is not a mere pension system. It is actuarially sound.

Our social security system does not compete with private pension plans, but is complementary and supplementary to them.

PAY AS YOU GO

Our social security program is a pay-as-you-go program. We must keep it sound in every respect.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more.

There was no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who had struggled all his life to gain a competence and who, at 65, was poverty stricken and dependent upon charity.

The dignity of every individual is involved. Something deep inside a person is offended if, after a lifetime of productive effort, all he or she gets is a handout.

An adequate old-age insurance program, reasonable aid to the unfortunate, and extension of retirement benefits is not statism, nor is it socialism.

If American industry—big business—can afford to pay huge pensions to retired officials who do not need them, is it state socialism when the people's representatives impose a tax on industry and on employees and self-employed to pay retirement and total disability pensions or social security payments to those who need them?

In expanding the system of safeguards against the hazards and cruelty of penniless old age or crippling disability, new concepts of security and human dignity are involved, as well as a new relationship between the individual and his Government.

Mr. President, I assert that the Federal Government can provide reasonable security for the aged and less fortunate among us without in any way sacrificing that liberty which we know as the American way of life.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the adoption of a modernized and expanded social security program such as I have outlined here today will mean a stronger, more vibrant America, a nation of expanded opportunity for all, where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and the aged have hope, and where the dignity of the individual is still looked upon as the highest goal of civilized society.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] designated "1–30–60–D."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Senators on this side of the aisle may come to the Chamber?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I yield to the assistant minority leader for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday I called up my amendment lettered "D"; and the pending question is on agreeing to that amendment, which would change the definition of the term "political committee," so it would cover intrastate committees.

At that time there was considerable discussion about the aggregate amount which would require a committee to report in any calendar year. The present distinguished occupant of the chair (Mr. CASE of South Dakota) and I have also discussed this matter. I have welcomed his support and consideration and very strong and sincere feelings about the pending proposed legislation.

After further considering the matter with the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota, I now modify the amendment by striking out on page 1 of the amendment, in line 6, and on page 2, in line 4, the figure "$1,000", as it relates to the aggregate amount; and I substitute therefor "$2,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has a right to modify his amendment; and the amendment, as modified, will be read.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, before the clerk reads the amendment, as modified, I wish to make a further modification, by means of language which was contained in my original bill, as introduced in 1955 and in 1957; and, indeed, it was also in the bill which was before the Committee on Rules and Administration during the last session. I make these modifications because I do not feel that they materially or in any substantial way affect the philosophy or the broad purposes of the bill; and especially is that true in the case of the amendment which requires that the committees in a State make a report.

After discussion with the learned junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and others, and after considerable reflection and further consideration, both last night and today, I believe that these modifications should be made in order that we may not find ourselves parting company upon matters which really are not essential, but relate only—as in the one instance—to the sum of money to be specified; and bearing in mind that, under the provisions of the modified amendment, all amounts of $2,500 or more—instead of the former provision for all amounts of $1,000 or more—must be reported by every committee; and also bearing in mind that the amendment does not contain a provision which would prevent the creation and establishment of any number of functioning committees, so long as they reported within the meaning of the act, so the public might know the number of committees formed and engaging in activity in behalf of any candidate for election to public office.

So, in addition to changing the amount "$1,000" to "$2,500," which modification will to some extent simplify the reporting by some committees—inasmuch as the committees within the States will not in any wise be limited numerically, but will be limited only as to the reporting requirement—I also modify the amendment by reinserting provisions similar to those contained in the bill which I introduced at the beginning of the last session. Therefore, I undertake to further modify the amendment as follows:

On page 7, following line 25, insert the following:

(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri have available a copy of his amendment, as modified?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, Mr. President; and I am about to send it to the desk.

I wanted to explain it briefly, as I went along.

Mr. President, the reason for this amendment is that a number of Senators last night asked a number of penetrating, and I think important, questions relating to the allocation of expenditures where a committee supports more than one candidate; and, in conformity with and in compliance with suggestions, on which my colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has been consulted as well, it seems to me that it might have an even more salutary effect—as I thought it would in 1955 and 1957 when I introduced bills—to try to allocate, as between candidates, the amount spent.

I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] desires to say something about this modification as well, and for that purpose I shall be very glad to yield to him, or to yield to him for any other purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel this proposed amendment, which is substantially, though not exactly, the same as the wording of the bill as reported to the floor previously, will greatly strengthen the provisions of the amendment. A possibility that worried many of us was that if a Member of Congress was running on the same ticket with a sheriff, clerk, county treasurer, or other official, under the wording of the amendment as submitted originally, if a political committee—let us say one of the party committees—supported all of those candidates together and spent over $1,000, it would be required to make a Federal report.

I concede some difficulties in the allocation problem, but it seems to me the effect of this proposal is, to put it in possibly oversimplified but approximately correct language, if a Member of Congress were running together with 11 other candidates and the committee supporting them spent the same amount for all, that committee would not have to report unless it actually spent, under the original wording, over $12,000.

I agree with the suggestion for raising this limit, because we certainly do not want to unduly burden the Federal system with reports, and there will be a good many more reports coming in under this amendment than came in today. I support raising the limitation to $2,500——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to observe, without interrupting the Senator's train of thought on the matter, there is, of course, no magic in numbers. The figure "$1,000" was selected and agreed upon as being a reasonable figure. Having received suggestions, including the principal suggestion emanating from the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. CASE of South Dakota], that the amount be raised to $2,500, I can see that it will not appreciably affect the result that is sought, because the reporting provisions are there and the people will know how many substantial committees exist and how much those committees have spent on behalf of the candidates of any candidate or group of candidates.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I feel this modification will greatly strengthen the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and that his amendment as modified should command our support.

However, Mr. President, I believe it is necessary, since this proposal amends a different section, to ask unanimous consent, as I now do, that this amendment be considered and voted on with the original amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk would like to have the Chair inquire of the Senator from Missouri if it was the intent of the Senator from Missouri to modify his amendment originally to change the figure "$1,000" to "$2,500" in both places where it occurs.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes. I neglected to mention the second portion, appearing on page 2 of the amendment at line 4, and I appreciate the Chair's calling that to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk now has the amendment.

The modified amendment as provided by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;".

On page 16, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;".

On page 7, following line 25, insert the following:

"(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

"(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

"(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;"

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

Page 8, line 1, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] as he has modified it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Has my colleague from New York completed his discussion?

Mr. KEATING. I am through.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, by way of a further brief explanation, and I shall try to make it as simple and understandable as I am able to do, I think the test of the existing law and of the new bill as to whether a political committee is an interstate committee would no longer apply, because, in calling up the amendment yesterday, it changed the definition of "political committee" so that it would cover intrastate committees or committees functioning or operating in a State. It requires, in accordance with the modification of today, any committee which spends in excess of $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing Federal elections to report.

By submitting the amendment on primaries, which the Senate adopted late yesterday, I undertook to indicate, Mr. President, that that amendment is closely related to the amendment on political committees.

I should like to say most emphatically that every argument for or against the inclusion of primaries applies to the amendment which would seek to broaden the definition of political committees. The issues involved have been thoroughly debated for 4 days by the Senate. The main question was, and the main question still is, whether we want to be candid and open and forthright in reporting to the American people the uses of money in Federal elections. I think this question has been settled partially by the Senate as a result of the vote yesterday, and I think further discussion on that point certainly would serve no useful purpose at this time.

I wanted to clarify one point, Mr. President.

The able junior Senator from New York and the distinguished senior Senator from California, the assistant minority leader, asked me last night whether the cutoff amount of $1,000, which is now $2,500 because of the modification, was limited to contributions and expenditures for Federal candidates where intrastate committees support local, State and Federal candidates.

I undertook to say last night, and I repeat today, that only contributions and expenditures for Federal candidates are included in the cutoff amount of $2,500. I do not believe there was any doubt about it then, and I think the language in the definition is clear on this point.

The junior Senator from New York further asked me how the Federal portion of expenditures and contributions could be determined in the case of committees supporting candidates on different levels. I should like to undertake to again say that beginning with the original bill which I introduced in 1955 and continuing with the subsequent bills of 1957 and 1959 there was contained in each bill the broad definition of the term "political committee" as it appears in the present amendment. In addition to that, and because of this definition, the bills of 1955 and 1957 included an apportionment provision, to further clarify the point raised by the Senator from New York yesterday.

I have always thought that such an apportionment provision was really a corollary to the broader definition of "political committee," and for this reason I have modified my amendment to include this provision, which would establish rules for separating expenditures made for Federal candidates from those made for other candidates.

The line of interrogation pursued last night further convinced me of the correctness of the original bill and of the position I had undertaken to assume upon it; that is to say, that we should try to have some apportionment provision relating to a committee, when it supports more than one candidate for local, State, and Federal offices. But this does not in any sense change the essential purpose of the proposal.

I think the formula is very simple. The formula would require political committees to report the names of candidates which they support, and would further require that in the case of committees supporting more than one Federal candidate, as well as candidates on a State and local level, the amount to be allocated to each candidate should be determined by a double formula. When the committee made expenditures for printing and advertising, radio and television time, the allocable amount should be determined by the ratio of such expenditures with respect to each candidate. Where no such expenditure was made, the allocable amount should be derived by the division of the total expenditures by the number of candidates supported by the committee.

Mr. President, that seems to me to be about as close as we can approach any fair, reasonable, and honest way of getting at the matter of a committee supporting more than one candidate. It would cover the case where an intrastate committee transferred to another committee a sum of money to influence Federal elections. Furthermore, expenditures specifically designated for an individual would be, under the formula, charged to that candidate and to no other.

Thus I believe, Mr. President, that the modification is logically interconnected with the amendment on the redefinition of the term "political committee."

The questions of the distinguished Senator from California and of the distinguished Senator from New York prove this, I think, beyond any reasonable doubt. I urge that the amendment, containing the modifications which have been made, be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona, or does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will yield to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, has the amendment to the amendment been agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has only been modified; it has not been voted on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The modification has not been voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Missouri was modifying his own amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Which requires no approval, of course.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the pending amendment is the amendment with the $2,500 amount rather than the $1,000 amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois permit the Chair to interrupt?

The Parliamentarian states that it is true ordinarily a modification to an

amendment does not have to be approved. In this instance it has already been agreed to that in respect to its multiple parts the amendment should be considered en bloc. The Parliamentarian tells the Chair it can be considered en bloc. Apparently we do have a little different situation from the ordinary situation, when a Senator simply asks to modify his own amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed changes by the Senator from Missouri be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from Montana. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not object. Even with the larger amount, Mr. President, I think the amendment is as offensive as it was before, because the modification of the amount does not affect the principle involved. I thought I uttered my own sentiments on the matter last night, and there is very little I have to offer on the subject beyond that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York reserves the right to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I point out that a modification of the amount is only one of the modifications which have been made to the amendment, the other modification being, in substance, to provide that a report will be required only when the $2,500 was spent for the particular candidate. So if there were a proliferation of candidates it would require an allocation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my request was that all modifications be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object, and is recognized for his reservation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New York, when he used the word "proliferation" he used the best word in the dictionary to indicate precisely what is going to happen.

Mr. KEATING. I learned that from my friend.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are going to proliferate all of the difficulties, because when it comes time for a county committee or any other committee to set up an allocations scheme on its books, to see how it can separate the money which will come into a common treasury, as to how much is spent for the congressional candidate, how much for the senatorial candidate, how much for the sheriff, how much for the Governor, and how much for the county coroner, that is when the difficulties and prolixities really will begin.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the minority leader has approved the word "proliferation." I have tried to avoid it in the course of the debate, because it is a word which is susceptible of many interpretations. But this amendment would certainly proliferate the opportunity and means whereby the people who vote, the American public, could scrutinize the situation to determine where the money being sent to candidates for the purpose of encouraging and supporting their candidacies is coming from. It would proliferate the opportunity for any candidate adverse to the candidate receiving the funds to discuss the question of the source of the funds, the number of committees, and all other things which may be of cognate or related interest.

So again I say to my friend the able minority leader that we may use the word "proliferate" in many senses. I believe this amendment would create a proliferation, so to speak, by increasingly making abundant the opportunity of the people of the country to know who is behind campaign financing, where the money is spent, who the people are who contribute it, and other facts as to which they are entitled to have knowledge in considering the qualifications of a candidate, together with his other qualifications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri yield in order that the Chair may submit the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as it seems that the debate on this amendment has run its course, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does he yield for that purpose?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I have introduced a bill (S. 2751) to maintain the special milk program at its current rate during 1960–61. To continue as at present, the program needs more funds to meet the steady rise in the number of schools and school children.

Mr. President, this situation is graphically pointed out in a resolution I have just received from the California State Board of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1959

Whereas the Congress of the United States authorized the use of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under; and

Whereas, in 1958, Congress authorized a basic annual expenditure of not to exceed $75 million, and in August of this year Congress increased the 1960 authorization to $81 million and established $84 million for 1961; and

Whereas the Director of the Food Distribution Division of the U.S. Department of Agricultural Marketing Service has advised the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction that effective March 1, 1960, the maximum subsidy per half pint would be reduced one-half cent; and

Whereas California schools entered into the program in good faith and have more than doubled milk consumption by school children since 1954. A reduction in the rate of reimbursement in the face of rising milk prices will force schools to increase charges to pupils, which will result in reduced participation. A decrease in the rates in March and a return to the original rates in July will cause confusion and create administrative difficulties at the State and local level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Board of Agriculture, meeting at Sacramento, Calif., on December 21, 1959, does hereby recommend that sufficient funds be made available to continue the special milk program through this current school year without change; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Governor of the State of California, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, and the California congressional delegation.

THE PATH OF WAR OR THE PATHS OF PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which I prepared for the New Year's edition of the Miami News, entitled "The Path of War or the Paths of Peace," which expresses some of my thoughts about the role of the United States in the coming decade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATH OF WAR OR THE PATHS OF PEACE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The sixties ahead could mean for mankind peace and security, or they could be the years in which man takes the final, irrevocable plunge into disaster. American leadership or lack of it may well be the determining factor.

Every new year gives each man and nation a chance to begin anew; the commencement of a new decade seems to offer the chance to think boldly ahead, to choose new directions, to reach more confidently toward a better and more just world. But mankind enters the sixties weighed down with the terrible burdens of his own creation, carrying into the new decade with him weapons of unimaginable power and sophistication. By comparison with these dark works of man, we have been able to fashion only the most primitive beginnings of new institutions designed for *living* and not for dying.

Like legendary Prometheus, man is dangerously close to becoming the permanent victim of his own thirst for knowledge and power. For the discovery of the awful secrets of the atom has not been accompanied by a breakthrough in the understanding of man's inner nature and of his social and political institutions.

Other world developments, not confined to the great leaps forward in technology, cast their shadows forward into the sixties. The ferment in Asia, Africa, and Latin America continues. The steady stream of revolts against European domination has been accompanied by an amazing record of successes in overthrowing corrupt and antiquated political and social structures. While the *Communists* have sought to capture the leadership of these revolutionary movements, they have more fundamental causes. In one sense they are the fruit of those rising expectations first kindled in North America in 1776, fed by a gradually rising literacy throughout the world, and blown into flame by the passionate dedication to freedom of men like Gandhi.

The economic and technological successes of the Communists must continue to be reckoned with through the next 10 years. And it is clearly not the Soviet Union alone that is our concern. Russian rockets, symbolizing the meteoric rise of Soviet power, have tended to obscure an even more massive (perhaps bloodier and more ruthless, to be sure) reorganization of an economically primitive society by the Communists in China. We of the free world must learn to recognize these successes in industrialization as a most fundamental challenge to our survival.

For the Soviet challenge is not confined to blunt, direct military threat and economic competition. The material achievements of communism inevitably make a strong appeal to the billions of people now straining to rise from the mud and filth of centuries of repression in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

At the same time, mankind finds at the end of the fifties immeasurably greater wealth and power at his hand—power and wealth which could transform life for half the world. The spectacular advances in nuclear energy, in communications and transportation, have overshadowed other long strides forward—in agricultural production, for example, in the automation of industry, and in gains in living standards for the working classes in America and Europe through the trade union movement. The creation of huge resources of disposable wealth in North America, and more lately in Western Europe and the Soviet Union, reflects a historic achievement; man in these areas is now capable of producing far more goods and services than he can possibly consume. Few have yet recognized, moreover, that American surplus food and fiber production is real wealth of a uniquely useful and noninflationary character.

In 1960, then, man's state is a paradox. Surrounded by real wealth in some areas, yet fearfully threatened by the weapons of his own creation, man has woefully lagged in organizing his economic and spiritual resources for the primary task of establishing a just peace in the world.

Huge masses of people throughout the world live on the edge of starvation; even in the United States there are large pockets of unemployment and genuine distress. As Aristotle commented, "Poverty is the parent of revolution and crime." And wherever poverty remains in the world—together with the new knowledge that there is no divine mandate for poverty—men may turn to violence. In American slums and in the African bush, in the coalfields of West Virginia and the dry lands of the Middle East, poverty breeds despair and often violence. The more desperate the poverty, the more violent the inevitable reaction. It may take the form of delinquency, or it may take shape in powerfully organized drives to overturn a whole society.

With the rising living standards in the Soviet Union, we have concurrently observed adjustments in the internal and external political policies of the Soviet leadership. The desperate economic straits of the Chinese people, on the other hand, are reflected in the violent and fanatical policies of the Communist Chinese leaders. There is reason to believe that the emerging differences between the two major Communist societies is in part due to the differences in economic well-being between their peoples.

In the coming decade, the one achievement which would contribute most to the freedom and security of America would be the successful launching of a worldwide cooperative attack on the common enemy of every society—poverty, with its evil companions of disease, hunger, ignorance, and fear. In this war on poverty all nations—free and Communist—can be allies. Preferably this cooperative effort should be undertaken through the United Nations and its related agencies. However, if methods could not be worked out rapidly, then we must find new means through other bilateral and multilateral efforts. Peace and security for America are not possible in a world of the hungry, the sick, and the illiterate.

Concurrently, no matter what the cost in energy and capital, we must keep our noses to the grindstone of disarmament. This means not only patient and tenacious negotiating, but also restoring our ability to negotiate effectively from a position of military strength. Paradoxically, in order to achieve disarmament in the next decade, we shall certainly have to increase our bargaining position with our Communist opponents by rebuilding our military capabilities to the point where the Communists are convinced they have nothing to gain by perpetuating the arms race. The very commencement of an intensive 3- to 5-year effort to restore our military position might alone be sufficient to convince the Communists—if the effort is obviously in dead earnest.

The drive toward an essentially disarmed world, and one in which poverty is not constantly churning the political waters is well within the Free World's capability. But it is necessary to decide to make the drive, to make the necessary plans, and to organize the necessary human and economic and spiritual resources. If the American people can be convinced that leadership in the works of peace is the only rational alternative to a world in arms and eventual destruction of all free institutions, they will contribute whatever is necessary to success.

Perhaps greater than the threat of Communist power in the decade ahead is the danger that we of the Free World will fail to see further than the immediate problem of communism, fail to see that mankind is struggling against more fundamental and formidable enemies. The challenge of the coming years is whether we more fortunate nations will choose to do in this world not simply what we are forced to do in order to survive from year to year, but what we ought to do because it is right and just. To follow the compassionate teachings of the great religious faiths of the world by their conscious and consistent application to national policy is the only way to peace, to security, to greatness.

Not fear of communism but faith in ourselves, not mere reaction to the threat from a competing society but bold initiative to seek out and defeat the older and greater enemies of all men—these must be the watchwords of free men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is entitled to the courteous attention of the Senate. Those Senators who wish to converse will please retire to the cloakrooms. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

POLITICAL LEVERAGE FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Council on Human Rights recently sponsored an address delivered by the Ambassador of the Republic of Panama to the United Nations, the Honorable George W. Westerman. Entitled "Political Leverage for Economic Security," the Ambassador's remarks touch on the importance of internal democracy to insure the full use of national resources in economic growth. The Ambassador explains, "The American political system of representative government with its constitutional guarantees of individual rights played a major role in social and economic growth."

Mr. President, I note that the American Council on Human Rights is a federation of national college sororities whose objective is to fight minority discriminations and to seek human rights through action and education.

To bring Dr. Westerman's text on "Political Liberties and Economic Growth" to the notice of the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL LEVERAGE FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY

Address delivered by His Excellency Ambassador Geo. W. Westerman, United Nations Delegation of Panama, under auspices of the American Council on Human Rights, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., on Saturday, October 17

It is my pleasure to bring you greetings from President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr., and the people of the Republic of Panama.

Genuine concern about the future of freedom and human rights is a healthy sign in a democracy, and it deserves appreciation. The American Council on Human Rights is to be warmly congratulated for its timely, forward-looking, vital programs of action in keeping the lamps of democracy trimmed and burning. I am indeed happy for this occasion to participate in your workshop and share your fine spirit of friendship and fellowship.

In an unforgettable movie Charlie Chaplin, as a glazier, employs Jackie Coogan to throw stones into shop windows, whereupon he providentially passes by and obtains the job of repairing the damage. The ingenious twist consists here in combining, under a single command, disequilibrating and equilibrating functions. Depending upon one's point of view, the act of window breaking may be regarded as destructive or constructive. I find in it an illustration of what I conceive as the principal roles of Federal, State, and local government, as well as the individual

citizen, in helping to provide political leverage for economic security for all of the Nation.

The Government in its executive, judicial, and legislative functions is in a commanding position to initiate democratic social and economic growth through forward thrusts that are meant to create incentives, guideposts, and pressures for further democratic action; and then it must stand ready to react to, and alleviate, these pressures in a variety of areas. The Government must take progressive measures to the end that in the social order human rights and fundamental freedoms are increasingly respected and fulfilled.

The realization of fundamental freedoms for all citizens depends upon the degree of democratic maturity and economic welfare in any given country. These again are dependent on the moral education on one hand, and a high standard of living on the other, are the two indispensable conditions for the achievement of the high ideals expressed in the concept of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The United States has not always been a capitalist democracy. At the time of the Declaration of Independence, the United States was a Nation of pioneer farmers and craftsmen with elements of feudalism in the South and some other areas, and with a class of slaves at the bottom of the social and economic scale. Only some 95 years ago did slavery disappear. With vast resources the American people gradually created for themselves an economic, political and spiritual environment which has been notable in the fact that it generated the birth of constructive ideas in every direction.

North America was the frontier of Europe. Over the centuries immigrants flocked to these shores in search of freedom. An urge toward progress has been part and parcel of American thinking, American social environment from the days of the earliest settlers. The American people tended quickly to throw off the old and seek the new. This questing spirit made itself increasingly evident in the continuous advances in technology, new inventions, new processes, new materials, and new machinery.

This country's representative democratic form of government was the principal factor in promoting fast growth in the early stages of its history. Obviously, the American political system of representative government with its constitutional guarantees of individual rights played a major role in social and economic growth. These are the rights which are found at the core of her growth.

The American economy has grown notably in many dimensions—in total population, total production, total employment and, most strikingly, in the variety of its products, services and occupations. The American standard of living has risen to be unquestionably the highest in the world and it has tremendous potential for providing a progressively increasing level of living for the American people. In order to obtain full advantage of this high potential it will be necessary to overcome certain existing but surmountable forces that place a drag on the dynamicity of growth.

In short, the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms is not a problem to be solved simply by a priori legal definitions and enactments; but by conditions of life, social and individual, which in turn demand the legal recognition and enforcement of certain relationships between the individual and society. Liberty and security for the individual in society are based on reciprocity. His personal, civil and political liberty are secure against the encroachment of the state on one hand and, on the other, the state guarantees his right to the attainment of social and economic security.

It is a fatal misconception to suppose that the progressive establishment of a social order, in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized, may be achieved merely by the pursuance of governmental policies. It should not be forgotten that the State does not and cannot and must not control all social and economic life.

Most of us interpret freedom today, not as a frozen, static achievement, but as a process of continuous fight against changing enemies and weapons. Many of us realize now that the very concept of freedom has of necessity been subjected to historical changes, both in its philosophical basis and in its practical implementation. The real question, therefore, concerns the extent to which traditional concepts of freedom are applicable to a world plagued by economic and emotional insecurity alike, and by the constant threat of depression and war.

In this country the U.S. Constitution is regarded as a basic foundation of human rights. As stated in the Preamble, the Fathers of the Constitution set out to "secure the blessings of liberty to" themselves and to their posterity. Consequently, human rights of the utmost importance are set forth in the original articles of the Constitution as well as in the famous first ten amendments known as the Bill of Rights. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, right of peaceable assembly and petition, due process of law, to mention only a few of those rights, are well known to us all.

The Civil War amendments, embracing articles 13 through 15, have lately been on the lips of most Americans. The 14th amendment especially has had the attention of the highest courts in the land. These amendments abolished slavery, defined citizenship and rights of Negroes, and provided for the enfranchisement of the Negro.

In this period of worldwide social and political change, it behooves every American to know the fundamentals of the Constitution, which, in times of stress as well as in peace, has provided the American people with as enduring and practical a form of government as has been seen on the face of the earth. Generations gave these human rights to you, and it is for you in turn to "secure the blessings of liberty" to yourselves and to your posterity, strengthened and enriched while in your hands.

There are some rights which are essential for the enjoyment of all other human rights and must, therefore, be thoroughly secured by law and moral force. Civil liberties are generally accepted as one objective criterion of freedom. Civil rights stand high on the list of basic human rights. The right to vote, to work where you are qualified, live where you want, the right to educate your children in the schools of your Nation without regard to color, religion or nationality—these are some of the civil rights for which you are now fighting. Many of your rights in these respects have been misused, abused and neglected. Although denied again and again by arbitrary power, the rights of man have been defended by good American citizens of both races and in the courts for many years. The fight for these rights must continue without interruption.

All too many people—black and white alike—take freedom and democracy for granted. Eternal vigilance is indeed the price of liberty. We must really believe in freedom, equality, and justice—keep a watchful eye on it and be willing to fight for it.

A great need of this Nation like in most democratic states, is more active participation in political life by informed, alert citizens of both races. My country of Panama being no exception. Here in the United States we are aware that not all American citizens have the freedom to function in political parties, become political candidates, or to vote. Legal and quasi-legal tactics, physical intimidation, and economic reprisals are the cudgels used to deprive colored Americans of their rights under the law. This is indeed a sad commentary on American democracy.

It is sadder still to recall the rights and privileges not denied to some segments of the American Negro populace which they apparently do not fully exercise. There are those Negroes who have the right to vote but fail to do so. The failure of Negroes in the Northern, Western, and border States to turn out to vote on election day is largely responsible, we have been told, for lack of representation in city councils, State legislatures and even in your Congress. This situation is most unfortunate as it deprives you of political power so much needed to attain better civil rights status.

All too frequently Negroes for one reason or another are reported to evade jury duty when called upon to serve in this vital capacity. All this at a time when important breakthroughs have been made in some States where Negroes are for the first time in history being allowed to serve on juries along with their white fellow Americans.

Equally important is the development of skills in civic participation and of attitudes of civic responsibility. These factors are of great significance to America's Negro citizens if they hope to close the gaps between the American creed and American practice. Can Negroes expect to win equal footing in civil rights by court action alone? Most assuredly not. They must work where they are needed and where they can as citizens in their communities. Adopting a "let George do it" attitude is a luxury Negroes cannot afford. Positive action is a must for every right thinking American Negro to make this country a better place for all its citizens through support of fine, public-spirited, dedicated organizations such as the NAACP, the National Urban League, the American Council on Human Rights, to name but a few.

Not long ago the name "Little Rock" exploded a racial atom bomb in these United States. The fallout of its publicity dust registered around the world. It was registered in Moscow and Peiping and taken as further evidence that American democracy does not mean what it says. It was registered throughout the 20 Latin American Republics where sentiments of common human decency were grossly outraged. It was registered through Africa and Asia and stirred the resentment of hundreds of millions who felt personally affected by the fortunes of their kin in Arkansas.

The waiting game currently being played in Prince Edward County, Va., has high stakes in a community's public schools and the education of its future citizens. It is a tragic situation. Those who feel that the issue at stake is more important than public education should beware lest one day they awake to find their children intellectually and morally crippled by their diehard defiance of the laws of this great land. The spirit of togetherness uniting the foes of democracy should be channelized into worthwhile pursuits—something more worthy than closing schools. The enemies of freedom are tampering with education—the very foundation of the democratic American way of life.

We have had many lessons that there is a direct and inescapable relation between the bread box and the ballot box. The free labor movement of this Nation should be encouraged to take a more active role in world affairs instead of leaving it up to politicians and diplomats. Labor's war against poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease must continue and vigorously so. It must purge itself of its detractors and work harder to secure effective legislation in the interest of human welfare. In the same area, labor must abandon discrimination in its ranks. Organized labor more than any other sector of the American scene, can ill afford the

specter of injustice, inequality, and discrimination. Full utilization of Negro labor is economically sound.

When any spot on the globe is within a few flying hours of your home airport and the welfare of the so-called heathen in the farthest land affects your community, there is actually harm in pretending you can live behind a Chinese wall. As citizens of this land you are also international citizens. A belief in the United Nations, international economic cooperation, and international understanding are as important to American Negroes as to any other American. Most people give too little emphasis to their duties to the world.

The importance of mutual aid for the economic welfare of the underdeveloped areas of the free world is everywhere recognized among free men. Many share the conviction that a really bold and purposeful program to underwrite economic development should be a main component of the foreign economic policy of the United States and of its Western Allies. A sound program of economic aid and technical assistance capable of giving momentum to economic advancement must be positive, farsighted, imaginative, adequate in size and scope, coordinated, and sustained.

Such a program would clearly be in the interest of the underdeveloped areas. But it would equally serve the vital interests of the United States and the Western members of the free world, because it affords a good prospect of transforming unstable and poor nations dangerously close to frustration into stable, progressive, and responsible states. The security of the West will be undermined if the aspirations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America for economic betterment, independence, and political equality are frustrated by lack of resources to build viable and productive economies.

The importance of the countries of the Western Hemisphere to the United States cannot be overemphasized whether the area concerned is political, economic or cultural. It is, therefore, encouraging to note that several agencies of international repute have, within recent days, all been unanimous in urging a more positive attitude toward Latin America. They advocate identification on a national scale with the aspirations of the Latin American peoples for social reforms, higher standards of living and increased educational opportunities. In effect, they are demanding an urgent and basic tenet of U.S. policy for this hemisphere.

Only today the National Academy of Sciences, meeting in this same city, took into account the rapid political evolution of African nations and advocated to the International Cooperation Administration adoption of a multimillion-dollar technical aid program to help Africa's social progress catch up with its political development. This observation of the NAS is being based on the fact that the new political entities are generally ill equipped to handle the technical and scientific responsibilities so fundamental to their sound future development.

Economic stability sets a goal which challenges the energies of all classes of a nation and provides outlets for the exercise of the talents of a people. The compensations to the United States for supplying aid are very real. They are the satisfaction from participating in a challenging and rewarding task, and the creation of political, economic, and social conditions in the less developed lands likely to make them stable, willing members of the free world.

You represent a substantial segment of this country's voting population. This being the case you can influence to a great extent the political leverage necessary to promote the economic security of which neighboring states of this hemisphere and new emerging countries in Africa and Asia are in dire need. Your duty then, should be very evident in giving political support to President Eisenhower's most recent call for greater technical, financial and material assistance to less fortunate peoples and countries.

The boughs of the Tree of Liberty may be swayed this way and that by recent political gales, but their strength to withstand the wind comes from the depth and toughness of their roots in the past. Our past sufferings are meant to teach us how to build a new future. The American people are faced with an unparalleled opportunity and a high responsibility. It lies within your power to lead the world into a racial utopia which in the past has been a mere dream. It may be a distant goal, but it is within the range of achievement as a practical matter.

The timetable for democracy must be stepped up. The eyes of the world are upon these United States—watching and waiting. North America must take a firm stand on human rights and fundamental freedoms in these trying times of racial tension.

Will anyone here deny that our era is overshadowed by the threat of the staggering destructive power given into human hands? In order, then, to eliminate this ominous shadow the world must unite not only against the horror of war but for the fulfillment of peaceful progress. I repeat, the strengthening of peace in the world requires the coordinated action of democracy, the respect for the principle of international morality and the fostering of economic security of the individual.

It must be a source of personal pleasure to you as it is to me that your country and mine are continuing actively in the United Nations Organization of which they were sponsoring members. As this organization approaches the 14th anniversary of its founding, the world in ferment would do well to reflect upon its growth and development. I am assured that both the United States and Panama will be single in the purpose of urging the entire world to reaffirm its faith in the U.N.'s charter. The aim of this charter, known to everyone, is in conformity with the concepts of social justice and a just application of the principles of settlement of international disputes, to establish peace, and to develop friendly relations among states, thereby ensuring the welfare of mankind.

Sir Winston Churchill in one of his notable postwar addresses cogently observed:

"Laws just or unjust may govern men's actions. Tyrannies may restrain or regulate their words. The machinery or propaganda may pack their minds with falsehoods and deny them truth for many generations of time. But the soul of man thus held in trance or frozen in a long night can be awakened by a spark coming from God knows where and in a moment the whole structure of lies and oppression is on trial for its life. Peoples in bondage need never despair."

Those words are of deep and lasting import. They are also the lesson of history, the promise of today and a beacon of hope for the future. The message is clear and unmistakable. Peoples in bondage do not need ever despair. Negroes need never despair. The knowledge of their right to freedom and justice, the elevation of American ideals and aspirations, the observance of the spirit of the U.N. Charter, and the turmoil which today is taking place in the thinking of all humanity guarantee the eventual triumph of justice and the disappearance of bigotry, tyranny and oppression.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] referred to a certain agricultural study which gave us pertinent economic information relating to the plight of the American farmer. Congress has been served notice that the administration will continue to recommend wheat legislation which can result only in an increased supply of wheat and an increased cost to the taxpayer, and still lower prices and income for wheat farmers.

The administration remains adamant in its adherence to theories which have been discredited by reputable agricultural economists. More is at stake than a perpetually depressed agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will suspend. If the Senate desires a recess, the Chair will see that one is provided. But the Senate will not proceed until there is order.

The Senator from Minnesota may now proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I said that more is at stake than a perpetually depressed agriculture. High-production low-price agriculture means diminished purchasing power for farmers. This in turn spells trouble for all who sell goods and services to farmers.

The report described earlier today by the Senator from Louisiana indicates that the projection of agricultural income by the Department of Agriculture is a further depressed income, with reduced net profits for farm producers, reduced farm prices, and a reduction in total farm income. It appears to me that this kind of prognostication on the part of the administration should alert Congress to what needs to be done to stop what will be a real depression in America's farm areas unless some steps are taken of a corrective nature.

Regrettably, the administration has no farm program. The administration's program is to do more of what it has already done; and to do more of what it has been doing will result in reduced farm income, a reduction in the number of farms and farmers, and a rise in farm indebtedness.

Mr. President, a very thoughtful discussion of what the administration's proposal would do for the average farmer appears in an editorial published in the January, 1960, issue of Capper's Farmer, an old and respected farm publication. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which is an analysis of the administration's wheat program, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Capper's Farmer, February 1960]

LET'S NOT ABANDON CONTROLS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has a warmed-over farm program to present to Congress when it convenes in January. The program has the blessing of President Eisenhower.

The Secretary's proposals should be recognized for what they are—a move to kill the wheat program, as he already has done for corn.

Besides the usual promises of increased research and stronger foreign sales effort, the proposals include more conservation reserve and a stepped-up rural development program.

The dynamite in the program is the proposal to remove controls on wheat and fix supports to a 3-year moving average mar-

ket price. That means abandonment of marketing quotas and the parity principle.

Capper's Farmer believes this move is inconsiderate, ill-timed, and unwise. It is neither to the best interests of farmers nor the American economy.

The Secretary makes his proposal at the time his own USDA economists estimate a $2 billion drop in net farm income for 1959. They predict a further $1 billion drop for 1960. Should the proposed wheat plan be adopted, economists foresee a further cut of $500 million to $1 billion by 1961.

Such a prospect is cause for grave public concern. Not only would the living standards of farm families suffer a disastrous blow, but the depleted purchasing power of rural America would be a serious threat to the Nation's economy.

What Mr. Benson is proposing would put wheat in direct competition with corn and the other feed grains in a few brief years. Hog raisers, already in trouble, would be hurt badly if millions of bushels of wheat were dumped into the national feedbin. Pressure of cheap feed makes more hogs and cheaper hogs.

In short, Mr. Benson wants to put wheat, along with corn, in a free market situation. Economists at Iowa State University recently have completed a study in which they estimate what farm prices might be under a free market with unrestricted production.

Assuming that all feed grains would be used, these men see average price of hogs down to $10.80 by 1962–63. Cattle would average $11.51. Corn would be 66 cents a bushel and wheat 74 cents.

As costly and cumbersome as the present program is, it is probable that the Benson-Eisenhower plan would be even more cumbersome—and costly. For example, C. R. Harris, University of California economist, estimates it would cost U.S. taxpayers some $400 million a year more than the present program costs.

Capper's Farmer does not believe the alternative to our present program is abandonment of production controls and price supports.

We believe there is a growing realization at the grassroots that some sort of a compulsory production control plan is necessary for a stabilized farm income. (See Today's Farming, Washington, p. 16.)

We urge that Congress summarily dismiss this attempt to abandon production controls and supports on wheat. We also urge the congressional agriculture committees to get to the job of writing a workable program that farmers and city people can live with.

A workable farm program must be in parts to fit the various commodities. We doubt that we can find one overall pattern. First, let us work on wheat. It is our biggest worry.

Last May, Capper's Farmer described the domestic parity plan for wheat and suggested that Congress give wheatgrowers a chance to vote on it. We think it is fair to both growers and consumers, and it would be self-financing.

Some acreage in a soil bank would be compulsory, and growers would take part payment in wheat until CCC holdings were reduced to a reasonable reserve.

We favor giving feed grain producers an opportunity to vote on a soil bank plan—one that would take enough land out of crops to reduce surpluses.

In any allotment or self-help legislation, the commodity group should be given a clean-cut, realistic choice to say whether it wants full rein to produce for a free market, or a program whereby it will accept production controls.

Some groups are asking for self-help programs. Let's be daring enough to give them a trial. Some of the supplemental programs are worthy of expansion. Surely we can find some way of getting more food into the stomachs of the hungry and undernourished here at home and overseas.

We have a "Food for Peace" program in Public Law 480. But let's get it out of the hand-to-mouth stage and make it fully effective in aiding developing nations.

As a consuming nation, we have everything to gain by the administration of a farm program that will help farmers obtain their fair share of the national income.

Our economy cannot exist half controlled and half free. Agriculture, too, must thrive if we Americans are to be assured of a continuing abundant food supply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many persons have said there appears to be no particular solution of the farm question. I submit that there is a solution. One is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a proposal which was discussed this morning, a proposal which I offered last year, known as the family farm development program.

A second possible solution is the use of our food and fiber abundance. I shall be looking forward to the recommendations of the administration relating to the use of our wheat.

I noticed that the President gave a remarkable address at New Delhi, India, and spoke about declaring war on hunger. I fully support that declaration. I await the details of the battle. I simply wonder what forces are to be deployed, what tools and weapons are to be used, and when the trumpet will be sounded, so that we can tell when the battle is under way and what troops will be placed in the field.

It appears to me that it is one thing to make a speech about war on hunger, and it is a second thing to present to Congress a program which will utilize the food and fiber we have as a constructive instrument of American farm policy.

I suggest to the President that he can find some good guide lines for a constructive policy by an examination of the reports of the food and agricultural organization of the United Nations, and an examination of a bill before Congress entitled "Food for Peace," and ultimately, possibly, long-term credits for the nations which need food to take care of their food deficits. I for one will pledge wholehearted cooperation to the working out of such a program, which is necessary if we are to solve our problems in agriculture.

Reducing the number of farmers, cutting down more and more on production, and reducing the number of farms will ultimately place America on the list of food deficit areas. If the present program is continued, that is exactly what will happen.

WILDERNESS BILL DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was very much heartened to read an article in the Albert Lea Tribune for January 3, 1960, entitled "Wilderness Bill Deserves Support of All of Us," by Maude M. Koevenig. Maude Koevenig is very much aware that the wilderness bill (S. 1123), which I was proud to introduce, with my distinguished cosponsors, has been the subject of hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and is pending measure of that committee. I thank the chairman of that committee [Mr. MURRAY], our very eminent colleague, for his interest in this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS BILL DESERVES SUPPORT OF ALL OF US

(By Maude M. Koevenig)

One of the most treasured gifts that Joe and I received for Christmas is a copy of the beautiful book, "America's Wonderlands, the National Parks," published by the National Geographic Society.

In view of the present delay in getting the wilderness bill passed by Congress, one can gain hope by remembering that the National Park Act was 5 years in Congress before being finally passed on August 25, 1916.

At the present time we take this priceless heritage of beauty and history pretty much for granted. However, the same type of opposition that is delaying passage of the wilderness bill, also keeps trying to invade, exploit, and thus destroy our national parks.

As support for the wilderness bill widens, traditional opposition of lumber, grazing, mining, and other commercial users of our public land stiffens.

A REASON

Please keep on reading, because at the end of today's column I'm going to ask a favor and give you a chance to do something important.

Such a magazine as Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, expresses hope that the wilderness bill will be passed at the next session of Congress.

The Minneapolis Tribune has urged passage of the bill, stating "few things facing the 86th Congress have as much permanent value as the wilderness bill."

Montana Wildlife, published by the Montana Fish and Game Department, expressed its agreement with "principles expressed in the proposed wilderness legislation." An editorial in the June 1959 issue said:

"We look, therefore, to a planned wilderness preservation system as insurance that we may continue to provide outstanding recreational opportunities, so important to Montana and the entire Nation.

"We believe that this program may be accomplished without jeopardizing other important uses of public lands. We sincerely hope that national wilderness preservation may soon become a definite policy of Congress."

"Congress should go ahead with the measure, this session, and see to it that our wildernesses are preserved," the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times wrote in an editorial entitled "Special Interests in the Wilds."

OTHER REASONS, TOO

The editorial pointed out that preservation of wildernesses is needed "not only for their esthetic and historic value, but for the practical purposes the bill envisions, such as watershed protection, the opportunity to study plant and animal life in primitive surroundings, and for recreation."

Let the members of both Senate and House Interior Committees know of your support of the wilderness bill. Ask them to vote out the bill promptly. Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, is chairman of the Senate committee.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, is chairman of the House committee, and one Minnesotan, ODIN LANGEN, is a member. What you can do is write our own Senators and Representative and ask them to speak to committee members and tell them of your interest.

Ask them to vote for the bill when it comes up for passage. Address your letters: Senator (or Representative): (Name), Senate or House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

I figure that anyone who doesn't know the names of his Senators and his Representative wouldn't write anyway. I'm sure that Mr. LANGEN would be glad to receive letters from Minnesota people to let him know they are interested in the wilderness bill.

Opposition to the wilderness bill comes from those who want to turn everything into money immediately. They remind me of the type Thoreau describes in Walden, "who would carry the landscape, who would carry his God to market if he could get anything for Him."

RACIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I read in the Washington Post on January 2, 1960, excerpts from a lecture given by Dr. John A. Hannah. Called Racial Problems Pose Acid Test, this speech is all the more compelling because Dr. Hannah is both the Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and the president of Michigan State University.

Dr. Hannah states:

In the few busy months of its existence, the Civil Rights Commission has learned that the basic problem is one of securing the full rights of American citizenship to those being denied in any degree "that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws." It has learned that, by and large, the problem is a racial problem.

At the time of the report of the Civil Rights Commission, I called the attention of this body to the suggestion that Federal registrars enroll the voters in cases of arbitrary denials of the right to vote. I have introduced legislation, the Federal Elections Registration Act, to assure that citizens of the United States will not be denied the right to vote in Federal elections because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

In the context of Dr. John Hannah's speech, Mr. President, I agree with his encouraging view on the extension of our voting franchise in this country. Historically, we have extended the franchise to nonproperty owners, to women, and gradually, to other segments of the population. As Dr. Hannah states:

Indeed, the lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which to be proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Hannah's remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 2, 1960]

RACIAL PROBLEMS POSE ACID TEST

(By John A. Hannah)

(These excerpts are taken from a recent lecture delivered before the annual meeting of the Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in New York. Dr. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, is Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.)

In the few busy months of its existence, the Civil Rights Commission has learned that the basic problem is one of securing the full rights of American citizenship to those being denied in any degree "that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws." It has learned that, by and large, the problem is a racial problem.

The children and grandchildren of the waves of immigrants from the nations of Europe, reared and educated as Americans, have dispersed and strengthened our communities everywhere. Discrimination, once widespread and victimizing Americans for reasons of race, religion, national origin, and economics, is now largely concentrated upon our 18 million Negro citizens.

In part this is the old problem of the vicious circle. Slavery, economic discrimination, and second-class citizenship have demoralized a considerable portion of those suffering these injustices, and the consequent demoralization has then been seen by others as an excuse for continuing some of the very conditions that cause the demoralization.

The fundamental interrelationships among the subjects of voting, education, and housing make it impossible for the problem to be solved by the improvement of any one factor alone. If the right to vote is secured, but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance.

If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums.

The Founding Fathers were not content with voicing lofty idealism. Being eminently practical men who had risked their lives in revolution against a powerful king and growing empire, they installed the basic elements of a political system by which these ideals might be achieved in time.

Both their idealism and their practicality were put to the test at the outset. Slavery was an established institution, and slavery was inconsistent with their ideals of human freedom and dignity. Being practical men, they arrived at a compromise, which was to forbid importation of slaves after a specific future date in the hope and belief that with the supply of human chattels cut off, the institution itself would eventually wither away in the heat and light of public discussion.

That they were wrong we know now; the political machine broke down when it was called upon to deal with this issue, and our country resorted to war to settle it, perhaps needlessly.

All this serves to emphasize the fact that the Negro problem has been with us from the beginning of our country, and that our success or failure in dealing with it has always been and continues to be the measure of our success or failure in the making practical reality fit our theoretical idealism.

All of our history, speaking generally, is a reflection of our constant concern that we have not as yet achieved the ideals to which we officially and traditionally aspire. This accounts, as Myrdal points out, for our propensity to self-criticism, which sometimes amazes and pains our friends and gives aid and comfort to our enemies.

But viewed in retrospect, our history is one of great overall progress toward the idealistic goals which we hold constantly before our eyes.

Take as one example the extension of the voting franchise. At the end of the Revolution we were a Nation of approximately 3,250,000. More than 1 million were not free—they were slaves or bondsmen. Of that 2 million free citizens, not more than 120,000 were allowed to vote. The others were disenfranchised because they were women, or did not own property of sufficient value, or for other reasons.

Today, the right to vote in most of America is almost universal. Property qualifications have been eliminated save for token poll taxes, and women have won the right to the ballot. Indeed, the lag in Negro voting in some sections of the South is almost the sole remaining disfiguring blot on a record of which to be proud. By this margin do we still fall short of our goal.

LOAN TO EGYPT BY WORLD BANK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was greatly shocked by the recent decision of the World Bank to extend a loan to Egypt for the improvement of the Suez Canal, despite the fact that that nation is violating its undertakings to maintain free transit in that canal by intercepting ships and cargoes bound for Israel.

I sought to warn the President of the Bank, the Honorable Eugene Black, against any such decision in advance, as did numerous other Members of Congress. The inappropriateness of our Government's supporting such a decision by the Bank in the face of the assurances by President Eisenhower in 1957, is just as obvious as the inappropriateness of the World Bank, as an agency of the United Nations, granting this assistance to a nation which is acting contrary to the basic principles for the administration of the Suez Canal laid down by the United Nations.

One new demonstration of popular opposition to this course in our country and an appeal to the President to take action to reverse such obstruction by Egypt is contained in a resolution adopted by the Pioneer Women of Chicago on January 6, 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of this resolution, which so succinctly and strongly states the position which I believe our Government should take.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas after Israel's withdrawal from Sinai in response to requests from the United States, President Eisenhower said on February 20, 1957, "We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws (from Sinai), Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aquaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the Society of Nations"; and

Whereas President Nasser of Egypt has flouted international law and has defied the United Nations Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, calling upon Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal, wherever bound"; and

Whereas Egypt has broken its pledge in 1956 to abide by the six principles governing the operation of the nationalized Suez Canal; and

Whereas President Nasser has violated the promise that he made to United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold in July 1959, to allow transit for ships and cargoes if they were not Israel-owned at the time of their passage through the canal, and has ordered the seizing on December 18, 1959,

of a Greek ship bound from Haifa, to Djibouti with a cargo of cement, and

Whereas, we note that our country continues to offer financial aid and political support to the United Arab Republic, thus whetting its appetite for fresh intrigues in the Middle East and Africa, threatening the lifeline and security of Israel, democracy's surest bulwark and ally in the Middle East, and posing new dangers to the peace of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pioneer Women of Chicago assembled this day of January 6, 1960, do call upon President Eisenhower to remember his sacred pledge of February 1957, that any further attempts of Egypt to block Israel's shipping in the Suez Canal "should be dealt with firmly by the Society of Nations" and to initiate such steps immediately in American policy and practice, as well as seek such measure in the United Nations as may be necessary to halt President Nasser's continued violation of his own pledged word and international law. We are persuaded that firm action by our own President will introduce a new note of international morality in the problems of the Middle East and that this will advance his quest and ours for peace and justice.

Mrs. Samuel Kaplan.
EVELYN P. KAPLAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I mention this issue as one of some urgency today because the press reports that U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is going to Cairo tomorrow, January 21, to renew his efforts to persuade President Nasser to lift the Suez Canal blockade against cargoes bound for Israel.

In this appeal I hope the Secretary General will have the warmest and most vigorous support of our Government and of the other member nations. I am confident that Members of the Senate from both parties believe such action essential.

The decision to grant the World Bank loan has been made. President Nasser has thus been granted the assistance of the U.N. in his plans for the Suez. Surely it is now timely to ask for some reciprocity from him and to urge him to abide by the U.N. decisions and his own promises of free transit in the canal.

The legal bargaining position of the United Nations is weakened by the World Bank's decision. But the moral bargaining position with the nation now assured of United Nations help is stronger than ever. I earnestly hope our Government will not lose this opportunity to advance the prospects for peace in the Middle East.

In addition, Mr. President, the interesting newsletter Near East Report, which comments upon American policy in the Near East, edited by Mr. I. L. Kenen, in its January 15, 1960, issue includes an editorial which raises a basic question all Members of Congress must face in connection with the mutual security program when it comes before the Congress this year. If a nation persistently flouts the decisions of the United Nations and uses boycotts, blockades, new arms from the Soviet Union and a proclaimed state of war against one of its neighbors to unsettle the peace and threaten the stability of nations in the Middle East, should our extension of assistance to such a nation be continued or accompanied by some conditions that seek to end these violations of United Nations obligations and policies which endanger the peace and security of the world?

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Near East Report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEUTRALISM OR COLLECTIVE SECURITY—WHICH?

President Eisenhower's state of the Union message stressed the need to help the underdeveloped countries whose poverty and stagnation provided a drab background for his epochal journey to Asia and Africa. But this responsibility may be shared. The administration is calling on prospering European nations whom we have helped in the past to join and lend a hand.

New questions are being raised on Capitol Hill. Should we proffer aid without conditions?

Within recent years, a shibboleth has gained credence. It has been argued that it is a mistake to put strings on our aid because new nations are suspicious, sensitive and easily offended. They want to be neutral. They will reject our good offerings if they suspect these impinge on their independence and sovereignty and convert them into satellites.

This natural aspiration of new governments to be free in the full sense of the word must be recognized. But freedom is never to be confused with license. While the free world must respect the wishes of these new countries to cast their votes in the United Nations as their own conscience and judgment dictate, this does not mean we must shut our eyes to neutralist and negative policies which are devoid of any sense of responsibility to the international community.

The concept of neutralism has no special virtue to recommend it. It is accepted all too easily by inexperienced nations which fail to grasp the full implications of collective security as the very condition of their survival. (But let their own borders be menaced and they are the first to deplore neutralism in others. One must draw a line between the policy of "nonidentification" which attempts to appraise international problems on their merits without a bloc precommitment, and the "neutralism" which measures issues by the egocentric criterion of self-interest and ignores duty to international law and to world cooperation and peace.

These questions are asked on Capitol Hill because the administration and Congress have been receiving many protests as a result of the $56.5 million loan to the UAR to improve the Suez Canal despite the misuse of that international waterway as an instrument of blockade and aggression. It has been argued that the World Bank is an economic instrument and could not reject the loan on political grounds—that political action is for governments, not banking institutions. Such an argument has naturally directed attention to our own Government, which is offering large assistance to the UAR for other projects without questioning its illegal policies.

More and more Congressmen are coming to believe that they must now write conditions into the mutual security program if it is to preserve the concepts of mutuality and security.

They ask:

Should we insist on freedom of the seas and respect for the prestige and authority of the United Nations?

Should we unconditionally grant aid to nations which: Carry on boycotts and blockades against neighbors? Acquire arms from the Soviet Union? Defy U.N. Security Council decisions? Proclaim themselves in a state of war in contravention of the U.N. Charter?

It may be old fashioned to suggest that moral considerations should motivate our foreign policy. But the first half of this century has taught us that material and security interests are jeopardized—and millions of lives are inevitably squandered—when nations affect neutralist isolationism and turn their backs on collective security.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCE CHARGES IN CONNECTION WITH EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the widespread and favorable response to the introduction of S. 2755, a bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit.

One of the most pointed and discerning comments on the bill was made by Mr. Edward P. Morgan on the American Broadcasting network, on January 11, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Morgan's comment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Never give a sucker an even break," that bumblingly belligerent and craftily calculating comedian W. C. Fields used to say. On the theory, presumably, that the term sucker and customer are synonymous, a number of merchants have religiously tried to follow Fields' advice in building their business practices. This category of sharpies has been thinned down gradually by the pressure and protests of ethical competitors, by legislation on various levels and perhaps even by some added discernment on the part of the buying public. But one area which has yielded less readily to treatment is that involving interest rates and purchases on the installment plan. One of the economic experts of Capitol Hill, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, thinks it is time to plunge into this labyrinth of deceptive double charges and straighten it out with some clear labeling.

Last Thursday, with active liberal encouragement in both Houses, Douglas introduced in the Senate a bill to require that consumers be given true and lucid figures about interest rates and finance charges when borrowing money or buying things on credit.

"In too many instances today," DOUGLAS said, "the consumer who signs a document that places him in debt would have to be a lawyer to understand the fine print that spells out his rights and liabilities; and he would have to be an accountant or an expert in higher mathematics to compute the cost of the credit in simple annual terms. Altogether too often he is deceived into paying a higher cost for credit than he has been led to expect by the huckstering and fast-talking salesmen."

As the Wall Street Journal pointed out in a report on the Douglas bill, a small loan company which now tells a borrower simply that the interest rate on his loan is three percent per month would, under such a labeling act, have to specify that the annual interest rate might amount to 36 percent. And, a mortgage company would have to explain to the man getting a 6 percent home loan that finance charges on a $20,000 house might exceed $10,000 over a 25-year period.

What all this amounts to, in effect, is disclosure, something the public is coming

more and more to expect. DOUGLAS himself was a prime force behind recently enacted laws requiring full accounting of employee welfare funds, whether union—or company run. One of the basic functions of the controversial new labor reform act is to bring to light the disposition of all union funds. It seems likely that when the full story of payola in broadcasting comes out remedial legislation will follow to prevent the practice of dispensing hidden payments for the plugging of certain products. The Illinois Senator reasons that there is a kind of payola in hidden interest rates and finance charges and he is hopeful that the current fashion for disclosure will provide an added impetus for his bill.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that a bill on basic auto price labeling sailed through Congress in the summer of 1958 and there is no indication that it has had any adverse effect on the sale of cars; indeed the New York Times says today the prospect is bright in Detroit for record sales in 1960.

There is some speculation that the Douglas measure may gain support as an alternative to outright Federal controls on consumer credit which has swollen to what some economists consider alarming proportions, and/or that it might provide a qualified counter to high interest rates. DOUGLAS calculates that what consumers owe now on installment purchases, car loans, personal loans, mortgages and the like totes up to a staggering $175 billion in personal debt. Consumer credit, he argues, has been transformed from a "financing mechanism to a merchandising tool, where loans are disguised as sales, to the detriment of our economy." One theory is that if the public were aware of how much these loans cost it would ease off on borrowing. This may or may not be true but if the buying public has been played for a sucker in the past I suspect it was largely because it wasn't getting an even break with clearly labeled facts.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the pending amendment, as modified. Perhaps the modified amendment is not quite as objectionable as was the amendment when it was first read. Nevertheless, it is based upon the premise that a political committee which operates in only one State must file a Federal report.

We should remember that if in any State a majority of the people want to regulate the elections, and if they insist upon a certain type of reporting of expenditures, they can do so and they will do so. If we resort to the device—and certainly it is not a remedy; it does not solve anything—of transferring every problem to Washington, we do a disservice to the public.

The reports which are filed under the existing law are seldom referred to, although it is true that they may receive some publicity that is helpful in nature.

However, today we are asked to embark upon the following course: If a group of citizens band themselves together, and if they operate in only one State, to exercise the great American privilege of taking part in self-government, the pending amendment, as modified, would require them to file reports in Washington, or else face the imposition of a criminal penalty.

Mr. President, the existing law provides that a political committee must operate in two or more States if it is to come under the required reporting provisions. We have no assurance that the mere filing of the reports will change anything. In fact, I do think it will make changes for the worse; it will cause citizens who should be interested in participating in elections to decline to do so.

The average citizen is very intelligent, but he is also busy. He might be induced to take part, in his precinct or his county, in political activity—for instance, in the raising of funds and in the holding of meetings. But if, in addition, he were required to make Federal reports in regard to those activities, or else take the chance of criminal prosecution, fewer and fewer of the people would take part in such activities.

Certainly the objective of the election laws should be to have more and more citizens participate in the elections and the campaigns; and I think that would be good for the country. I also believe it would be wonderful if more people were to contribute to political campaigns, so as to spread the base, and if more people were to give smaller amounts.

But whenever we add to the reporting requirement—and I may say that the amendment, as modified, relates to the reporting requirement—fewer and fewer people will participate in the elections and in the campaigns; and the tendency of such a provision will be to drive campaign financing underground, instead of placing it out in the open, so more people will take part, and so their neighbors will know what is going on, and so the States will have absolute power, if they wish to exert it, to regulate and to require the making of reports.

On the other hand, if we confuse the picture, we discourage citizens from taking part in campaigns and elections and in financing them; and the effects of such discouragement would be bad.

Mr. President, perhaps this bill will not become law. If we add too many provisions here, the bill will not meet all the objections which will be raised both in this body and in the other one, and it will not be approved in conference, and will not become law. Certainly it will not become law in time to affect very many, if any, of the primaries in the country.

Mr. President, the Senate should reject these amendments. The bill as it stands is a compromise; but it is fair to everyone. It raises the limit on the amounts which can lawfully be spent; and that should be done. After all, in view of the high cost, today, of all things, it is not possible, in conducting a campaign, to remain within the present limits. So that situation leads to the formation of many committees or to practices which are not the best.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will leave the bill as it is, and will pass this needed legislation.

On the other hand, to insist upon adding these extreme amendments, which are of doubtful value, will be to insist upon having no legislation of this sort.

Mr. President, I favor the enactment of legislation in this field. Therefore, I expect to oppose this confusing amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I know that sometimes legislation seems to be delayed because the Congress is persuaded to accept something less than the best or something less than what should be provided. I also recognize the validity of the argument that, under modern conditions, elections are expensive, and that in view of the great increase in the number of radio stations and television stations, considerable amounts of money must be expended in order to conduct a campaign for election to Federal office.

The raising of the limits on the amount of money a candidate may spend is a commendable objective of the bill. But, Mr. President, that, of itself, hardly would entitle the bill to be called a clean elections bill.

If this measure is to be a clean elections bill, it seems to me it should be fortified by means of provisions which would contribute to public knowledge of the sources of the funds employed for the election of candidates.

I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that he increase the amount which would be the dividing line between reporting and nonreporting; and I proposed that the amount be increased from $1,000 to $2,500, because I thought the latter figure probably was a little more realistic, and because its use would simplify the situation for a committee which might spend money for the campaigns of several candidates.

But if a committee is going to spend as much as $2,500 in advocacy of the election or nomination of one candidate to Congress—to either the Senate or the House of Representatives—or if a committee is going to attempt to influence the selection of electors for President and Vice President, certainly the people have a right to know who is providing the money for those expenditures. That is all this bill will do, so far as I know.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the comments my learned friend has made in regard to the bill.

Does not he agree that instead of driving people out of political activity, the regulation of a multitude of committees formed within a State would tend to bring more people to have an active interest in politics, because then they would know the sources of some of the contributions, and they could judge accordingly; and the people would not feel—as so many do now, as evidenced by the relatively small percentage of the people who vote in our great national elections—a sense of frustration—in other words, that, after all, the Government of the country is in other hands, that someone else is pulling the strings behind the scenes, that contributions are being made for the purpose of influ-

encing the elections, and that the people of the country never know the sources of the contributions, and never know how the committees which make the collections function, or, indeed, never know who the members of the committees are.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is my feeling and opinion about the matter. I believe the passage of the bill, with the provisions it contains and the amendments with which it has been modified, will increase the confidence of the public and more people will be willing to engage in politics. They will not have the feeling that perhaps things are being controlled from behind the scenes. The record will be open.

I certainly believe in public participation. I want the public generally, and on a broader scale, to take an active part in elections. If anyone hesitates to have his name included among the list of contributors for the promotion of the candidacy of some candidate for public office, the question must always arise, Why? Why? Why should anyone hesitate to let it be known that he is interested in the candidacy of somebody whom he wants to give some money for that campaign cause?

So I do not believe the objection that it may tend to discourage some contributions is of too much validity, Mr. President, for if someone does not want known his interest in a candidate and the support he is lending to him, then the question must come to mind, Why does he not want it known? What is there about his support that would make it a handicap to know that John Jones or Bill Smith was backing the candidate? If so, is not the public entitled to know about it? It seems to me the public is entitled to know the source of contributions by committees that spend $2,500 on behalf of a Federal candidate.

That is all this proposal does. For a minor or embryonic candidacy, a source might spend $500 or as much as $1,500 or $2,000, and the requirement would not apply to it, but when it gets to the point of spending as much as $2,500 to influence the election of a Federal candidate, then I believe the public is entitled to know the source of the contributions and the chairman or treasurer of the committee that is spending or distributing the funds.

Mr. MORSE. The question is on agreeing to the Hennings amendment, as modified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the Hennings amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The vote will be on the Hennings amendment, which is at the desk, identified as "1–13–60–D," as modified. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business in Latin America on behalf of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee studying economic conditions.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—53

Aiken	Hartke	Martin
Allott	Hennings	Monroney
Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Bartlett	Jackson	Moss
Bible	Javits	Mundt
Brunsdale	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Muskie
Cannon	Kefauver	Neuberger
Carroll	Kennedy	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Prouty
Clark	Lausche	Randolph
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Dodd	Long, La.	Symington
Douglas	McCarthy	Wiley
Gore	McGee	Williams, Del.
Green	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Hart	Mansfield	

NAYS—37

Beall	Fong	Robertson
Bennett	Frear	Russell
Bridges	Fulbright	Saltonstall
Bush	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Butler	Hayden	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Sparkman
Capehart	Hill	Stennis
Carlson	Holland	Talmadge
Cotton	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Yarborough
Dirksen	Jordan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McClellan	
Ervin	Morton	

NOT VOTING—10

Case, N.J.	Eastland	Proxmire
Chavez	Engle	Smathers
Church	Kerr	
Dworshak	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. HENNINGS' amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is designated "1–13–60—G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. PROUTY. In view of the fact that the amendment has been on the desks of Senators for some time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17, strike out lines 8 to 27, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 608. (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office with respect to which elections are conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides, including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice presidential electors, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States.

"(b) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes a contribution in any amount or of any value in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office with respect to which elections are not conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides, or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any such candidate, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States, if such national committee or State or local committee or other State or local organization is a regularly organized adjunct of a national political party.

"(c) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes a contribution out of funds made available to him for that purpose by another person in any amount or of any value in connection

with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and presidential and vice presidential electors), or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party shall, if he does not disclose at the time such contribution is made, the name of the person who made such funds so available to him, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions made by a National, State, or local committee, or other State or local organization or by similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in any possession of the United States, if such national committee or State or local committee or other State or local organization is a regularly organized adjunct of a national political party."

And on page 17, line 25, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)" and on page 18, line 15, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last night I was very glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] in order that he might offer the amendment which the Senate has just approved, because I knew that that amendment, if adopted, would operate well with the provisions contained in my amendment. In other words, my amendment is fully complementary to the one which the Senate has just approved.

The bill before the Senate is a good bill as far as it goes, but in no sense can it be considered a genuine election reform law.

The committee reported bill does alter obsolete limitations on spending; it tightens up reporting requirements and it improves publicity provisions. However, it does absolutely nothing to effectively curb certain unethical practices of some special interest groups seeking to circumvent regular party channels in their attempts to influence the choice and election of candidates in several States.

While not a cure-all, the amendment I have submitted does offer a realistic method for controlling some of the more flagrant of these unethical and unhealthy practices.

Four years ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill with similar objectives. At that time, Members will recall, Congress and the public were aroused over a shocking incident related on this floor.

The bill in its present form, as amended, is a much stronger bill than the bill which first came to the floor.

I think I can also say, without fear of contradiction, that if the amendment I am proposing is adopted we shall have completed a genuine electoral reform measure.

Four years ago a representative of a private interest went into a State not his own and attempted, in a roundabout way, to make a quiet contribution of $2,500 to the forthcoming campaign for reelection of a U.S. Senator from that State. It later developed that the individual attempting to make the donation was acting on behalf of parties financially interested in the outcome of a bill then before Congress.

It is to the everlasting honor and credit of this Senator that he brought this matter so openly to the attention of the American public.

Mr. President, let the integrity of our electoral process become tainted and subject to abuse and the very bedrock of our republican form of government is endangered.

Among our American people honesty of elections is taken for granted. When we learn of an occasional dishonest election we rightfully become incensed. We can attribute this to the probity of our people generally and to the integrity of most of our candidates. It decidedly is not due to Federal laws relating to campaign contributions and expenditures. These are so loosely drawn that if they do not encourage, at least they permit, deception and dishonesty.

It is no news to Members of this body, to representatives of information media, or to the public generally that a good deal of money is required to conduct a political campaign today, and that the cost is becoming increasingly higher. Newspapers, radio and television time, and travel have become campaign necessities and must be paid for.

Unless we are to say that only rich men should become candidates for public office we must recognize the need and make provision for campaign contributions. But the public possesses a genuine concern in the amount of, the source of, the character of, and the circumstances surrounding such contributions.

Most political contributions, I sincerely believe, are made with the honest and aboveboard intention of supporting one of contending philosophies of government, or because of respect and admiration for a particular candidate. We must recognize, however, that some political contributors may have selfish aims; they may expect quid for quo. It is this type of contribution that we must be concerned with and that my amendment seeks to control.

It was the intention of the founders of our Republic and of those who came after them that every Member of Congress should owe his election to the suffrage of his constituents and that he should be answerable only to them and to his conscience for his words and deeds.

Despite this intent, certain influences exist which tend to alter our traditional pattern. Not content with limiting their representation in Congress to Senators and Members of the House from their own State, as intended by the Constitution, some individuals have participated, directly or indirectly, in the nomination and election of candidates in States other than their own.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator's amendment reach the situation I shall picture to him, and, if so, how? Suppose a man simply mails his contribution or leaves it on someone's doorstep. Would the Senator's amendment cover that kind of situation?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that when I have concluded my prepared statement and have read a series of questions and answers, I will have answered the Senator's question to his satisfaction.

Some of these individuals to which I have referred may have been well intentioned and not motivated by selfish interest. Others, however, have had no such high-minded inspiration. Their financial contributions have been made with the hope, if not the understanding, that the candidate would cherish, protect and, if possible, advance their private, special interests.

It is my sincere conviction that citizens of one State should not meddle in the politics of another State. Certainly, they should not be permitted to influence, by contributions, the nomination or election of candidates in several States, for any reason whatsoever.

I am also firmly of the belief that no individual or group should have the right to make political contributions through a middleman. Not only does this conceal the identity of the real contributor, it also affords an opportunity for circumventing the statutory limitations relating to political contributions.

The amendment which I have offered to the bill (S. 2436), the Federal Elections Act of 1959, is not presented as a cure-all. It cannot change the minds and hearts of men with evil intent. It does, however, seek to control, in what I believe is a fair, realistic, and practical manner, the actions of their hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will suspend. Once more the Chair would state that the Senator from Vermont is entitled to attention, under the rules. He is deserving of being heard.

Mr. PROUTY. My proposal would prohibit any person from making a political contribution to, or on behalf of, any candidate seeking nomination or election outside the contributor's own State for the office of U.S. Senator or Representative in Congress.

There would be no prohibition, however, against contributing to presidential and vice-presidential candidates, since my proposal specifically permits contributions to, or on behalf of, candidates running in elections which are conducted within the State in which the person making the contribution resides.

Groups formed in one State, which are not affiliated with a national party, would be prohibited by my proposal from making contributions to influence the nomination or election of Senators and Representatives in other States. Of course, there would be no prohibition against activities of a local organized committee in a State making contributions so long as its activities were con-

fined to elections within the State and are in conformity with the provisions of existing law.

National, State, and local committees which are genuine adjuncts of a national political party would be exempt, under my proposal, from the prohibition against interstate political donations. There are several good reasons for this exemption:

In the first place, no national political party organization or any adjunct thereof contributes financially to candidates in State primaries or other State nomination systems. They only contribute toward the election of candidates in several States.

This exemption would result in a more extensive channeling of campaign funds through legitimate political committees; and, under the law, such committees are required to file reports of their contributions and expenditures. Other committees professing to be educational or nonpolitical in character sometimes do not consider themselves so obligated.

Another major feature of my amendment would make it a violation of law for any person to make a political contribution out of funds made available to him for that purpose without disclosing at the time the contribution is made the name of the person or persons who made such funds available.

This "who gave it" provision would be applicable to contributions made to national political parties and genuine adjuncts thereof, but would not apply to contributions made by them.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he leaves that paragraph?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I have been listening most attentively to the Senator's explanation of his amendment. I wish to make sure that I understand it. I recall that when Senator Bob Taft was running for reelection, which was before I was a Member of the Senate, as a citizen I was much interested in his campaign, and I remember, poor as I was, I sent him $5 toward his campaign in the State of Ohio, although I was a resident of the State of New Hampshire. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, would it preclude that being done?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator could make the contribution if he made it to an adjunct of a national political organization in Ohio.

Mr. COTTON. An adjunct of a national political party?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. This was an election campaign. It was sent, probably, to the treasurer of Senator Taft's own campaign. I had no special interest in any of the other candidates running in Ohio.

Would the Senator's amendment have precluded me if I had been wealthy enough to send Bob Taft $10,000? Could I have sent it to him under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. I shall come to that a little later through a series of questions and answers, which I believe will bring out those points very clearly. I would much prefer not to yield further at this point until I have had an opportunity to conclude my statement and to read the series of questions and answers.

Mr. COTTON. I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure I will clarify the point for the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to ask just one question on that point. Would the Senator's amendment preclude the possibility of a personal contribution to the Taft-for-Senator campaign in 1944 or 1950—just to use that as an illustration?

Mr. PROUTY. It would preclude the sending of money across State lines for use in a primary campaign. It would prohibit the interstate donation of funds in a primary campaign. Theoretically such a donation could be made if some political adjunct of a national political party or local State committee wished to receive the money and turn it over to the Taft-for-Senator campaign. It could be done on that basis. Obviously political organizations of national parties are not going to contribute financially to primary campaigns.

Mr. BUSH. However, whether it be a primary or an election campaign, after the primary the Senator's amendment would prohibit a gift from out of the State to the Taft-for-Senator campaign committee directly?

Mr. PROUTY. If the Senator will be patient, I will answer all those questions a little later on in some detail. Then the Senator will have a much better understanding of what my amendment proposes to do.

Mr. BUSH. I will not delay the Senator. The Senator had already covered that point, and I merely wished to be sure that I understood the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall bring out those points later.

In short, then, my amendment would accomplish two major objectives.

First, it would prohibit individuals and groups in one State from contributing to candidates who are running for the House or Senate in another State. That is a direct contribution. It would not, however, stop an individual or a group in one State from giving to a regular Republican or Democratic committee in another State.

Secondly, it would prohibit a middleman from making a contribution to a candidate for the House and Senate unless the middleman disclosed, at the time the contribution was made, who made the money available to him for the purpose of the donation.

Naturally, my amendment would not require a regular Republican or Democratic Party organization to reveal to a candidate where it got the money it is giving the candidate. Such an administrative task would be well nigh impossible to perform.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I am not a lawyer, and because I do not wish to ask the Senate to rely on my own interpretation of existing election laws, I submitted a series of hypothetical questions to the American Law Division of the Library of Congress. I might say that Mr. Samuel H. Still, who prepared the answers to these hypothetical questions concerning present statutes is a recognized authority in this field.

I shall now read the questions and answers:

Question 1: An individual in State A goes to a Republican town committee in State A and contributes $10,000 to the committee with the understanding that it will be used to further the campaign of Jones for the U.S. Senate in State B.

Question 1(a): Could he give $10,000?

Answer: Yes. By the very terms of section 608 the $5,000 limitation does "not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or any territory or possession of the United States." (18 U.S.C., sec. 608(a).) While Assistant Attorney General of the United States, Justice Tom C. Clark, wrote:

"Section 18 (18 U.S.C., sec. 608), though in term limiting to $5,000 the amount any individual may contribute to a candidate or political committee for his nomination and election, in fact restricts only the channels through which such contributions can be made since State and local committees are exempted from the application of the act. (6 Fed. Bar Journal 13 (1944).)"

Question 1(b): Would it be legal for Republican town committee in State A to give to the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B?

Answer: Yes. Section 608(a) does "not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee." (18 U.S.C., sec. 608(a).)

Question 1(c): Would it be legal for the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B to use the money thus received?

Answer. Yes. Section 608(a) only applies to contributions and not to expenditures or use of funds. There is no restriction under either the Corrupt Practices Act or the pertinent sections of the Hatch Act on a State or local committee unless the State or local committee is acting as an agent (bona fide) of the candidate. The phrase "indirectly" or "on one's behalf" in a criminal statute must be strictly construed. The Supreme Court of Wisconsin has held that the phrase "on his behalf" as employed in a statute limiting the amount which may be spent by or on behalf of a candidate for public office, and requiring an account of expenditures to be filed, means "by someone who acts for him [the candidate] in the sense that an agent acts for and on behalf of his principal" and if no authority, express or implied, exists, the disbursement is not made on behalf of the person sought to be charged. (State ex rel. *La Follette* v. *Kohler* ((1930) 200 Wis. 518, 228 N.W. 895), reported and annotated at 69 A.L.R. 348. The same view was taken by Senator Nye's Select Committee on Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1930–31 (72d Cong., S. Rept. No. 20; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, pp. 977–984).

Question 1(d): Would it be legal for the Jones-for-Senate committee in State B to give the $10,000 received from the Republican town committee in State A directly to Mr. Jones?

Answer. Yes. Under a strict interpretation of the law there would be no violation since State and local committees are exempt from the provisions of section 608(a) limiting contributions. However, since the courts have not construed this section, in order to be safe, most committees, including the political action committees of labor unions, have kept within the $5,000 limitation when making direct contributions to individual candidates for Congress.

Question 2: Would it be legal for an individual to (a) contribute to several different Jones-for-Senate committees and (b)

give more than $5,000 to any one or to a combined number of such committees?

Answer. Again it should be pointed out section 608(a) is a criminal statute carrying a penalty of $5,000 or not more than 5 years imprisonment, or both, for a violation. The section by its very terms does not apply to contributions made to or by "a State or local committee or local organization or to similar committees or organizations in the District of Columbia or in any Territory or possession of the United States." Although no lawyer would advise a client to trifle with a criminal statute, yet it is generally believed by most authorities that the prohibitions of section 608(a) are generally directed at personal contributions made directly to candidates or made to the national committees or their adjuncts such as the congressional and senatorial campaign committees and to committees operating in two or more States and do not apply to contributions made to local or State committees. (See hearings on H.R. 1167 and H.R. 433, Subcommittee on Elections, Committee on House Administration, July 19 and August 1, 1957, 85th Cong., p. 112.)

Question 3: Can an adjunct of a national party committee such as the senatorial campaign committee or House congressional campaign committee contribute more than $5,000 to a candidate for the House or Senate?

Answer: Conceivably yes. Section 608(a) is designed to limit to $5,000 individual contributions to such campaign committees but it fails to limit contributions or expenditures made by such committees. The only limitation placed on these committees are $3 million limitations placed on their total contributions received or total expenditures made by section 20 of the Hatch Act, now codified as section 609 of title 18, United States Code.

Question 3(a): Can such an adjunct of a national party contribute more than $5,000 to a Jones-for-Senate committee or Smith-for-House committee rather than to the candidate himself?

Aswer: There is no limitation on the congressional campaign committees except the $3 million calendar year overall limitation on contributions to or expenditures by such committees appearing in section 20 of the Hatch Act, codified as section 609 of title 18, United States Code. Furthermore, section 608(a) specifically exempts contributions to such committees as Jones for Senate committee.

Mr. President, I hope the questions I have just raised and answered will give you a clearer picture of the weaknesses and limitations of existing law.

I turn now to another series of prepared questions and answers which I think will bring sharply to focus the objectives of my amendment.

I read further:

Question. Under existing law, what can an individual do if he wants to influence a senatorial or congressional election outside his own State?

Answer. He can give unlimited amounts of money to further a Jones-for-Senator campaign as long as he makes his contributions to various Jones-for-Senator committees.

Question. Under the Prouty amendment, what can an individual do if he wants to influence the outcome of a congressional or senatorial election in a State other than the one in which he has a legal residence?

Answer. He cannot make contributions directly to Jones or to any Jones-for-Senator committees. He could, however, make contributions to recognized Republican or Democratic Party organizations. This would mean strengthening of major political parties and a channeling of campaign funds through regular committee channels.

Question. What effect does this proposal have on the rights of national, State, or local committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Answer. The amendment takes no rights away from these regular party committees. For example, the Republican National Committee can still make a contribution to the Jones-for-Senator campaign. In fact, the position of these regular party committees from a financial standpoint would be substantially improved because if an individual in State A wanted to promote the candidacy of an individual in State B he would have to make his contribution to a regular party organization and hope that it would go to help the candidate of his choice. Thus, the obligation, if any, of the successful candidate would be to a party and not to an individual or special interest group.

Question. Suppose an organization were formed called The National Group for a More Progressive Congress. Could this national group send money to its local branches which would be used to influence the outcome of a senatorial or congressional election?

Answer. No. Because the national group would be making a contribution to a candidate for an office within a State in which the national group does not reside.

Question. How about the local branch of this "National Group for a More Progressive Congress?"

Answer. It could make contributions to the senatorial campaign being conducted within its State, but not out of funds which came from the national headquarters.

Question. Does this proposal in any way limit the amount of money an individual can give?

Answer. No. It adds no limitation on the amount of money an individual can give. It places restrictions on the individual with respect to whom and where his political contributions are made.

Question. Since the Prouty proposal would allow out-of-State groups or individuals to contribute to senatorial or congressional campaigns only through official party channels, wouldn't this mean that any contributions made to a candidate during a primary election would have to come from the candidate's own State?

Answer. Yes. In the case of primaries, all money used in the primary would have to be contributed to the candidate or his committees from sources within that State. If, for example, Smith, from State A, contributes to the Jones-for-Senator campaign in State B, there would be a violation of the law, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Question. Could an individual in State A contribute to a presidential campaign under way in State B?

Answer. Yes. Since the office for the President is "an office with respect to which elections are conducted" within every State, a person could make contributions to presidential campaigns.

Question. In existing law is there any specific prohibition which would prevent A donating to a senatorial candidate without revealing at the time of the donation the fact that B provided the funds for the donation?

Answer. No.

Question. What change would the Prouty amendment make in this situation?

Answer. Under the Prouty proposal, if A did not reveal at the time he gave the money to the senatorial candidate the name of the person who made the funds available to him, he could be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact that in my State there are hundreds—perhaps thousands—of fine people who have their residence in Vermont or other States and live there in the summer, or live there more than half the year, but also have their winter homes in Florida. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator, by his amendment, to prevent persons in such a situation from showing an interest in Florida by making contributions in the regular, legal way, which must be shown in the way now required by State law as contributions, to the campaign funds of candidates for the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives?

Mr. PROUTY. In my judgment, that is a prerogative and right which belongs exclusively to the citizens of the Senator's great State. I do not believe that anyone outside the State of Florida or the State of Vermont has a right to go into a State not his own to try to influence the citizens or legal voters of that State in their choice of the candidates to represent them in Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the candor of the Senator, but I simply cannot agree with him, because I think a citizen in the situation I have described has a proper and understandable interest in the type of representation which Florida—my State—should have.

One more question: As the Senator from Vermont knows, I have relatives in Virginia and West Virginia. Some of them, for family reasons, have from time to time contributed to my campaign funds, always modestly, and the amounts have always been shown in my campaign contribution reports. Do I understand that such contributions would be precluded under the amendment of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. PROUTY. Such contributions could be made only if they were made through, for example, the Democratic State Committee in the State of Florida. They could not be made directly.

Mr. HOLLAND. These contributions are made for primary races. Of course, party contributions are not made in primary races, because in those races I will be a candidate, as I have always been in the past, against other members of my party. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator by his amendment would preclude the natural expression of interest, concern, and support by the relatives of a candidate in the primary for the Senate or House of Representatives. I do not believe such a provision should be engrafted into Federal law.

Mr. PROUTY. That is not the problem to which my amendment is directed; it is directed toward outside interests, who have no personal concern with what goes on within a State. Such interests may be trying to influence the election within that State of someone who may be susceptible to their wishes and interests after his election.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the frankness of the distinguished Senator. I am grateful for his allowing me to interrupt him. However, it seems to me that his amendment, cutting squarely across the lines of the natural interest of

relatives and the natural interest of people who have part-time homes in their adoptive State, such as is so often the case in my State, and in other States which I see represented in the Chamber, would be entirely unrealistic, so I shall regretfully have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Florida that a great many summer visitors come to Vermont, throughout the State; and we like to have them there. But unless they are permanent residents and legal voters, I do not believe it is their right to try to determine the choice of the people of Vermont with respect to their representatives in the House of Representatives or in the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to have the Senator from Vermont make clear for me, if he can—because it is not clear now—whether his amendment applies only to primaries, or whether it also applies to the general elections.

Mr. PROUTY. Under the provisions of the amendment, money can be sent to a State to be used in a general election; but the money must be contributed to an adjunct, State or local, of a national political organization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. So the amendment would apply to a general election, as well as to a primary, would it?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. Under the provisions of the amendment, a person outside of a particular State could not contribute directly to the campaign of a candidate in that State; but such a person could contribute to a State committee or to a local committee; and, in turn, that committee could turn over the money to the candidate, if that were wished.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to ask a practical question in regard to a matter about which I happen to know something, inasmuch as I am the chairman of a campaign committee: Suppose a prospective contributor did not wish to contribute money to a committee, but wished to give the money directly to a person who was running for office; and suppose the prospective contributor refused, in fact, to contribute the money to a committee. In that event, what would be the situation, under this amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe such a person could give the money to the committee, and could request that the money be turned over to the candidate of his choice.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the amendment of the Senator from Vermont make clear that that could be done?

Mr. PROUTY. I think it does make that clear.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I also wish to ask a question which goes to the constitutionality of this amendment; and I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont has considered this point: It has long been my understanding that a Senator does not represent a particular State, but, instead, represents the interests of the United States as a whole. If that be true—and according to my reading of the intent of the writers of the Constitution, and according to all I have been taught on that subject, it is true—it is perfectly natural for a resident of Vermont to have an interest in the election of a Senator from the State of Arizona, or vice versa, or to have an interest in the election of a Senator from any other State. I believe that candidates for election to the House of Representatives also would be made subject to the provisions of this measure, because they, too, under the constitutional intent, as I understand it, represent the entire Nation, as well as the people of their particular districts. But I am fearful that if we were to use the approach the Senator from Vermont proposes, we would be treading very dangerously upon the constitutional intent. Will the Senator from Vermont comment on that point?

Mr. PROUTY. Of course, as the Senator from Arizona well knows, I am not a lawyer. However, I anticipated that this question might be raised; so, if the Senator from Arizona will bear with me, I should like to quote the Constitution and a leading authority on this and related points.

First, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to article I, section 4, of the U.S. Constitution, reading as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof—

But there is also the following qualification—

> but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Those words in the Constitution make it perfectly clear that the manner in which elections are conducted is of concern to Congress and may be regulated by Congress.

A comprehensive Federal statute, enacted shortly after the Civil War, outlawed a number of types of fraudulent and corrupt practices. That statute was held invalid in part, as it applied to municipal elections; but it was otherwise considered to be a constitutional exercise of the authority conferred by the Constitution.

Edward Corwin, the constitutional expert, points out that the National Government has a right to regulate primary elections conducted under State law for nomination of Members of Congress, where such primary is made by State law "an integral part of the procedure of choice, or where, in fact, the primary effectively controls the choice."

His viewpoint relies, in part, on the Supreme Court decision in the case of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299, 318), to which reference has been made previously during the debate on this bill.

Edward S. Corwin, a noted constitutional authority, who edited for the Library of Congress the annotated version of the Constitution, to which all lawyers refer, indicates in that volume that a State may not add to the qualifications prescribed by the Constitution for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. He points out that both the House and the Senate have seated Members who were elected during their terms of office as State judges, despite the provision of State constitutions which purport to bar the election of judges to any office under the State or the United States during such term.

The right to vote for Representatives and U.S. Senators is derived from the Federal Constitution.

Furthermore, it can be said that a Representative or a Senator takes an oath of allegiance, not to his State, but to the United States.

As the Senator from Arizona knows, the opinion I have just read is not my personal opinion; it is the opinion of some noted constitutional authorities.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I believe my question has not been completely answered. I still cling to what I have long believed to be the intent of the framers of the Constitution—namely, that interest in the U.S. Senate is nationwide, and is not to be confined within the boundaries of any one State.

Because of that long-held belief on my part in regard to the intent of the framers of the Constitution, I have always felt, and I still do, that it is perfectly proper for me—if I wish to do so—to contribute money to the efforts of a candidate for election to the U.S. Senate from any State in the Union.

This point relates to one which previously was raised by my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, when he asked the Senator from Vermont whether, under this amendment, the efforts made for the reelection of the late Senator Bob Taft, in connection with which efforts funds were solicited throughout the Nation, would be permissible.

Mr. PROUTY. Only if the funds were contributed through recognized adjuncts of a national political party.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In that event, the "Bob Taft for Senator" campaign, which certainly had national interest which extended across all State lines, would be prohibited, under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, would it?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Once again I might remind the Senator from Vermont that—particularly in these days, when many people, in both parties, question whether they owe allegiance to any particular party, but, instead, look upon themselves as independents—we might, as actually is the case, and we find this situation existing in both parties, that

find individuals would object to contributing to any party; instead, they would wish to contribute to an individual candidate. Does the Senator from Vermont not feel that is a constitutional right of the people of the country?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not feel that I am the most qualified person to argue what is provided under the Constitution.

However, in reference to the reelection of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, I may point out that, in that connection, anyone outside of the State of Ohio could, under the provisions of this amendment, have contributed to a State committee or to a local committee, which could have used in behalf of the reelection of Senator Taft the money thus contributed.

In that case, money poured in from many groups all over the country, including labor organizations.

I believe it is the right of the people of Ohio, or any other State, to determine, particularly in the primary elections, whom they want to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. At this time I should like to refer to a point the Senator from Vermont raised a little while ago: For instance, if I wished to contribute to the Senator's campaign in Vermont, when the time for his reelection campaign came, could I do so by sending my check to the Vermont Republican organization, but with the specific provision that the money was to be used for the reelection of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe so, provided the Senator from Arizona specified that he wanted the money spent in that manner.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is a very dangerous one, although I do not wish to labor the point.

I completely understand the intentions of the Senator from Vermont, and I believe they are very honorable.

But I believe the amendment impinges on the Constitution; and, if I correctly understand the last remarks the Senator from Vermont made, I think that in many cases the amendment could result in depriving a candidate of funds which justly would be his.

Both of us know that State committees are not always completely friendly to candidates. Therefore, if we deprive a candidate of his normal means of obtaining funds with which to run for election we shall cause great danger, and in speaking on that point I speak from the practical point of view.

Mr. PROUTY. However, I feel certain that the Senator from Arizona will agree that in a general election a Republican State organization always will support the nominee of the Republican Party or the candidate of the Republican Party, regardless of whether the organization supported that candidate in the primary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Well, I cannot agree 100 percent with that, but I can assure the Senator that this business of raising money for candidates is not the easy thing it is portrayed to be. I have been in this activity for some time, and I must report it is difficult, particularly when we have to go through party channels to get money and both parties have trouble raising money. When certain candidates whose philosophies agree with those of the people, and who are able, are running, persons or groups should be able to give money in any amount to that particular candidate. I think the Senator will find in his own State there is as much money raised by a candidate as is raised by the party itself. I repeat, I think this is a dangerous step to take, although I do not by that statement condemn the Senator from Vermont, because I know his intentions are completely honorable. I wish I could agree with him, but in this case I must disagree.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not feel that if I wished to, and certainly I do not have that desire, I would have or should have the right to go into the State of Arizona, if the Senator from Arizona were engaged in a bitter primary fight, and contribute to his campaign or his opponent's campaign. I think that is a matter to be handled purely within the State, and the voters of Arizona should make that choice, without outside influence. We know that matter has been one of the great difficulties of the past. Outside interests have gone into a State and have tried to nominate candidates of either party not because they were interested in the least with respect to the State in question, but because they were or thought they were going to gain something if those particular candidates were elected. It has happened in the past only too frequently. I am sure no one approves of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. One more question comes to my mind, because the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], is presently sitting behind me. The Senator from Vermont will recall that the Senator from South Carolina was elected by a write-in vote. He had no party backing at all. Under the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from South Carolina could not have received contributions from the outside and he could not have received contributions from either party, because neither party was backing him. What would the Senator say about a case of that kind?

Mr. PROUTY. That is an intrastate affair. Money could be raised from the local committees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. From citizens in the State.

Mr. PROUTY. From citizens in the State or from local committees.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly, the Senator from South Carolina in this case was not running as a Republican, although I wish he were a Republican. He did not believe in the Democratic Party. He did not believe in the principles of the Democratic Party. He ran in his own right as a candidate. He could then not get money from normal sources. I had a great interest in the Senator's election. I supplied a little bit of money for his campaign. I do not think he ever knew it. I felt it to be in the best interests of the country to have in the Senate a man like the Senator from South Carolina, and I felt it within my constitutional rights to send a very nominal check for his campaign.

I would not want to feel, in any coming election, that as an American citizen, I would be precluded from helping candidates run for office from either party, or from outside of either party, with whose philosophy I agreed. I am afraid this amendment will destroy that right which I feel is mine under the Constitution.

Mr. PROUTY. It would not alter the right insofar as a general election is concerned. It would alter it, for all practical purposes, in a primary campaign.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Now, in a primary campaign, I can see some argument for the amendment, but the Senator from Vermont earlier said that this amendment would apply to general elections, also. I have been trying to get that point clear. Let us assume that a primary is over and Candidate Smith is the nominee of the party; he is in the general election. Does the Senator's amendment apply to the general election?

Mr. PROUTY. It would be possible for the Senator to contribute funds to a candidate in a State other than his own by contributing the funds through the Republican or Democratic political parties or committees. The Senator could not make a direct contribution to the candidate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I would have to indicate when I made that contribution that my check was for Candidate Smith?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, if the Senator wanted it used for that specific purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We have to recognize the fact that a party may not want to do that. Would the party be bound to use the check for that purpose?

Mr. PROUTY. No, I do not think the party or committee would have to accept that check for that purpose if it did not want to. I assume that in a general election the Democratic or Republican committees or parties would go all out to elect their candidates.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish I could agree that the Democratic or Republican Party wholeheartedly back candidates of their party. Unfortunately, they do not always do so.

Mr. PROUTY. They may not be happy with the selection, but, generally speaking, I think the parties are going to support their candidates, when the chips are down, in a general election.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a statement and perhaps questions?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I want to say that I appreciate very much the Senator's interest in bringing the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 up to date by making the ceiling as well as the publicity and reporting provisions more realistic. In the light of the Senator's conscientious desire to contribute to the bill, I have undertaken to analyze his proposal. If I make any misstatements in connection with my understanding of it, I would appreciate my friend from Vermont correcting me.

I would at the outset like to say that I regret the Senator's amendment was not presented a little earlier, so that we

might have given it some more study; but may I ask him this question: Suppose in the bill, the Elections Act of 1959—State committees, by which I mean legally constituted committees within the State, within the respective or several political parties, are not required to report—what would the Senator's answer be to the suggestion that, there being no reporting requirements as relating to official State committees for parties, it would open the door to the funneling off of funds not otherwise subject to reporting under amendments previously adopted and under other terms of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I will state to the Senator my understanding.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to misunderstand the Senator. I want to do everything I can to try to clarify my own understanding of the amendment the Senator has offered.

Mr. PROUTY. I assume that under the Senator's amendment which was agreed to this afternoon such committees would be required to report, generally speaking.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator would say, then, that there would be no real or present danger, under that interpretation, as to any money being channeled in other directions for the benefit of specific candidates, without it being reported?

Mr. PROUTY. I would think not.

Mr. HENNINGS. As I understand the able Senator from Vermont, the amendment would change 18 United States Code 608 as reported in the bill before us, in that it would modify subsection (a) and enact new subsections (b) and (c).

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would change subsections (b) and (c) to subsections (d) and (e), respectively. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. Therefore, subsection (a) would reenact the existing provision contained in the present Corrupt Practices Act, on the $5,000 limitation to individual candidates or political committees; is that true?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, that is correct, so far as intrastate contributions are made.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is aware that we will undertake to raise the limit to $10,000, but the Senator's amendment would contemplate that insofar as these contributions are concerned the amount would be $5,000 and not $10,000; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. In case the Senator's amendment is adopted, I would have no objection to changing the figure in my amendment to $10,000, so that it would be in accord with his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his clarification.

Now, in my attempt to understand the Senator's amendment and to analyze it, I believe the modification removes all limitations on out-of-State contributions. However, it must be read in conjunction with subsection (b), which makes it a criminal offense to make any direct or indirect contribution in the campaign for nomination or election outside the State of the contributor's residence.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is the intent of the Senator's amendment, as he contemplates it.

The able Senator from Vermont would also provide that only committees which are committees of the regularly organized national political parties are exempt?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct, so far as subsections (a) and (b) are concerned.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may detain the Senator a moment or two longer, I should like to understand a bit more about the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to correct my last answer. That is correct insofar as subsection (b) is concerned.

Mr. HENNINGS. Insofar as subsection (b) is concerned?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Vermont has made a very able presentation of his case. The Senator is, of course, well aware of the fact that the language makes it a criminal offense to make contributions in any campaign for nomination or election without disclosing the name of the principal, if the contributor acts as an agent, but party committees are exempt from this requirement.

Mr. PROUTY. Are they, under the Senator's amendment which was agreed to earlier?

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator agree on that point, that they are?

Mr. PROUTY. I will say to the Senator that contributions to national committees, for example, would have to be disclosed, but not the sources of contributions made by them.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

I will say that the Senator's amendment, in principle, has been the subject of much concern not only to me but also to others who are very much interested in the process in which we are now engaged, in the improving of the election machinery to provide fuller participation and greater publicity and to inhibit certain other excesses in the elective process.

I will say to the Senator from Vermont, as has been set forth, there is a prohibition against contributing across State lines. What would the Senator say as to that being possibly violative of the guarantees of the first amendment? I was absent from the floor for about 5 minutes, because I had to make a telephone call, and I do not know whether the Senator adverted to that or not.

Mr. PROUTY. Well, I think that all centers around the right of the Congress to regulate the election proceedings. I am not qualified to argue a constitutional point of law with the distinguished Senator, because I am not a lawyer.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe the Senator is very modest in his statement. I do not know exactly what is required to fulfill the capacity of a so-called constitutional lawyer, except that one may so proclaim himself and hope that some may believe he is, after he so advertises.

There is one thing which bothers me about this matter, which has been expressed to me by other Senators, and I think stated on the floor. That is the question of constitutionality, as the proposal relates to the first amendment, since national elections are a matter of principal interest to the citizens of every State, wherever the citizens may be domiciled or, indeed, wherever their places of residence may be. I am sure the Senator is competent enough as a lawyer to be well aware of the distinction between "residence" and "domicile."

Although a person resides in one State he may have exclusive business interests in another State or in several States. Even where there may be no direct economic interest, some relatives or close associates may have their residences in or carry their businesses in other States. As has been suggested, citizens may have residence in one State but also maintain permanent voting residence in another State.

Such citizens might wish to support candidates of their choice by making contributions to the candidates or to the political parties of that State. How would the Senator's amendment relate to that, in the Senator's belief?

Mr. PROUTY. Such persons would have to contribute to a regularly organized adjunct of one of the two national political parties.

Mr. HENNINGS. But they would not be allowed to contribute in any other State? I think that has been firmly and clearly established by the Senator from Vermont. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PROUTY. Well, they can contribute in any State, but only through the regular party channels.

Mr. HENNINGS. Only within the State of residence?

Mr. PROUTY. Oh, no.

Mr. HENNINGS. No?

Mr. PROUTY. No. They can contribute to a Republican or to a Democratic committee in another State. That money would be turned over to the candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure there is no question about that, and I spoke of it earlier. They may not contribute to an individual candidate?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. In any State except the State where they hold residence?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I assume the Senator defines "residence" as we generally understand it to be, which is the place to which a person intends to return?

Mr. PROUTY. I would be willing to say "domicile," if that is a more appropriate legal term.

Mr. HENNINGS. "Domicile" and "residence" are distinct.

Mr. PROUTY. Wherever the person lives, or wherever he votes.

Mr. HENNINGS. They are distinct, as the Senator knows.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that the place where he votes would be the controlling factor.

Mr. HENNINGS. We may reside in Washington as Senators, but our

domiciles are in the States whence we come. I am not attempting to draw too fine a distinction.

Mr. PROUTY. I think perhaps the criterion is the place where the person is a legal voter.

Mr. HENNINGS. Wherever the person has a legal residence.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. At the present time the practice of interstate contributions and expenditures is one of the most important ways of financing our elections. I do not know to what extent the Senator has studied the question, but I do him the credit of assuming that he has given it a great deal of serious consideration and thought, because he is of that character and nature.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. It seems to me that it is doubtful, so far as the design is concerned, whether we should exempt from the prohibition only national parties. Such a provision might tend to freeze the existing party organizations and make it difficult for other parties or other party groups or factions to arise within a State. Would that be within the Senator's contemplation?

Mr. PROUTY. In subsection (b) all elements of the party are exempt.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence and patience.

Without subsection (b), the modification of subsection (a) so as to limit to $5,000 contributions to individual candidates or political committees would seem to be without substance.

One thing that disturbs me is that it also runs contrary to a proposed amendment to the bill, which provides for a $10,000 overall limitation. The Senator has already indicated that he would be willing to raise his limitation from $5,000 to $10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that at first glance the spirit of the Senator's amendment is to bring into the open the real contributor of political funds. But the thing that bothers me is the handling of the situation by way of a simple amendment, without a thorough study of the problem and its scope, and the effect such a statute might have on the election process.

Unfortunately for all of us, this question was never discussed in the committee. It was never debated; and I fear that grave constitutional questions may be involved. I believe that the right of one to contribute to a campaign in any State of the Union, provided the contribution is reported and is within legal limitations, is a basic right. However, I would not say that I could not be wrong on that point. That is one question that disturbs me very deeply.

I thank the Senator very much for his enlightening statements.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I know the extremely high motives behind the offering of this amendment. I know the character of the Senator from Vermont, and that he offers this amendment in good faith and with a desire to make our election process clean all the way. I have watched with admiration his attitude with reference to the other amendments which we have considered.

I am a little concerned that the amendment the Senator now proposes goes too far. I have a sister in Pennsylvania. If I were in a primary contest or in an election contest in New York, I understand that under the terms of this amendment if she sent me a check for $10 she would be violating a penal provision. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Vermont feel that we should exclude all contributions from anyone outside the State or the congressional district where the candidate is running?

Mr. PROUTY. Generally speaking, yes. However, I would be willing to exempt members of one's family, if that is an important consideration.

Mr. KEATING. It might be that some of us might have a friend with $10, who might live in another State and be desirous of contributing to our campaign. Is it the feeling of the Senator from Vermont that there is something inherently wrong in a resident of one State contributing to a campaign in another State?

Mr. PROUTY. I think the definition of a friend could be extended ad infinitum. The expression is more or less meaningless. The Senator knows exactly what I am trying to prevent. Perhaps this amendment goes too far. Frankly, my chief purpose in offering the amendment was to get it on the record, primarily for future study and consideration. I believe we have a real problem when some interest—labor, business, or other interest or group—comes into a State and tries to dominate a primary election or a general election in that State. I think it is not their right, and I am very much opposed to it. Perhaps this amendment goes too far.

Mr. KEATING. I could not agree with the Senator from Vermont more completely about the abuse or possible abuse to which he is directing his amendment. Knowing the character and motives of the Senator from Vermont, it is just the type of thing I would expect from him.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. KEATING. I am concerned about the fact that, as this amendment is worded, it goes too far. I think, with great reluctance, I would have to oppose the Senator's amendment because of that feature, even though I think perhaps we should try to frame some amendment which will effectuate—as the bill does not—the objectives which the Senator from Vermont is so commendably seeking to achieve.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator very much for expressing that sentiment, and I reiterate that that was my chief purpose in offering the amendment at this time—not in anticipation that it would be approved.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expressed a fear which some of us have, that in some of the applications of this amendment it would make impossible contributions which in themselves would be perfectly innocent. For example, one Senator pointed out that he had a cousin in another State who might want to send him a little contribution in a primary campaign. It seems to me that that in itself would not be objectionable. I believe that the main objective of the Senator, to make it possible for a State to preserve its own voice and select its own candidates, is commendable.

There were some questions directed to the Senator which I thought really were questions with respect to the existing law. Is it not true that a large part of the Senator's amendment is merely reenactment of provisions of the existing law?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Many of the questions directed to the Senator earlier in the colloquy had to do actually with the application of present law, rather than with anything new which the Senator from Vermont was proposing.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that before the Senator concludes his remarks, it would be desirable if he were to summarize the particular changes which his amendment makes and to point out the parts of the amendment which are existing law.

Mr. PROUTY. I may say that the first subsection is almost all identical with existing law. It applies to intrastate contributions.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I recall that during the delivery of his very excellent explanation I addressed a few questions to him. He asked me to wait until the end of his prepared remarks. I am glad that he now has very kindly yielded to me, so that I may continue my interrogation very briefly.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator, my good friend from Vermont, that I endorse 100 percent every kind word and everything that has been said about the motives behind his amendment. We who know him know that when he offers an amendment it is, first, an amendment designed for high purposes and, second, that it is carefully prepared and carefully presented.

However, I cannot refrain from pursuing this matter, particularly in view of the fact that I started my inquiry of the Senator earlier and had to desist. I wish to be perfectly clear in my mind that as an individual, back in the days when Robert Taft was running for the U.S. Senate, and when the eyes of the country were concentrated on the campaign in Ohio, if I had wanted to send

$5 to Taft's campaign, the Senator's amendment, if in the law, would have forced me to send my contribution to the Republican State Committee of the State of Ohio.

Mr. PROUTY. Or to a local committee in the State of Ohio if it is an adjunct of a national political party.

Mr. COTTON. Even though I have not the slightest interest who might be running for Governor or who might be running for Representative from a district, or who might be running for a county office, or for mayor of a city—and I might be a Democrat interested in a great Republican, because of his superb citizenship, or a Republican interested in a great Democrat—under the Senator's amendment I would still have to send my money to the Republican or Democratic committee in any other State. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. However, if I happen to be a member of an organization which has a local chapter or a local group within the State of Ohio, for instance, all I would have to do to get my money to them and have them in turn relay it to Senator Taft's campaign committee. Is that correct? Is that what could happen if the Senator's amendment were adopted?

Mr. PROUTY. No.

Mr. COTTON. Why not?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator, I assume, is referring to a national group.

Mr. COTTON. What I am referring to—and let us be plain about it——

Mr. PROUTY. Assume a national group that does not have a headquarters in Ohio, for instance. If that is the question, under those circumstances the answer is "No."

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator mean that Local No. 567, AFL–CIO, in Akron, Ohio, could not make a contribution to Senator Taft's campaign if by a stretch of the imagination we could conceive of their wanting to do so?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly; it being an intrastate group.

Mr. COTTON. They are within the State.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Under the Senator's amendment no one would go in to find out where they got that money.

Mr. PROUTY. Well, that is perhaps a problem which ought to be met on another basis. However, a local organization, if it is a branch of a national organization, can contribute. On the other hand, the national organization could not send money into Ohio in this instance and give it to a local organization to distribute.

Mr. COTTON. In theory, no. But as a matter of fact, the adoption of the Senator's amendment—and I know what the purpose of the amendment is, and I am thoroughly in accord with its purpose, and I admire the Senator from Vermont greatly for his presentation of it—would mean—and his amendment could well be entitled "An amendment to stifle the American individual"—that John Q. Jones, as an individual, could not openly and frankly give money to help elect a Senator in another State.

Surely the Senator from Vermont is a very practical man and knows that any great national organization which is a composite of local organizations—and I am not trying to identify any particular group, because it could be a labor group, a group of farmers, or a group of manufacturers, or it could be individuals—could channel their contributions into the local chapter within a State and thus into the pockets of those who are waging a campaign for a Senator or other public official in that State. However, a bar would be raised which would make it impossible for an ordinary American individual, because he admires a great Senator in another State and admires his conduct on the floor of the Senate and his stand on certain principles, to write a check and send it to that individual's campaign committee.

If I wanted to help elect my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], whom I admire so greatly, I would have to contribute to the Democratic State Committee of Missouri. I am not in favor of the Democratic State Committee in Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Missouri could not imagine anything better than the Senator's doing that.

Mr. COTTON. Is my assumption not correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. I feel, perhaps because I am a States Righter that it is a prerogative which belongs to the people where the Senator is seeking nomination.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator believes that these elections are local elections. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. They are statewide elections. Much as I love and respect the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I do not feel that I would have a right to contribute to his primary campaign.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator could not engage in a more worthy activity than to contribute to the campaign of the Senator from New Hampshire. It seems to me to be a tragedy that such a serious bar should preclude his doing so. If it is purely a local election, why should we try to regulate it from Washington? If it is a Federal election, what consistency or constitutionality is there in trying to raise these State lines and trying to set up a barrier, so that simply because I live across the Connecticut River a few miles away from my dear friend from Vermont, whom I admire, I cannot send him a $5 contribution, or, more than that, anything of value?

I know what the Senator is going to say in explanation. I made a speech at the Republican State convention in Vermont during the last campaign, and as a result the Republicans nearly lost Vermont for the first time in history.

Mr. PROUTY. Perhaps if the Senator had not been there we would have lost.

Mr. COTTON. If the speech happened to be of any value, and if it helped—I do not expect the Senator to agree that it was of any help, and I do not know whether it was of any value—I do not know whether I could go into another State to make a speech.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure we all recognize that that is a little far fetched. The amendment relates solely to financial contributions.

Mr. COTTON. I am not so sure. If I paid my own expenses, which I did, because no Vermonter ever pays a visitor's expenses—or if the Republican National Committee paid my expenses, or if the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee paid my expenses, I am not sure that it would not be a thing of value, even though it were a poor speech. What I have said is not entirely facetious either, even though the last part may be.

Mr. PROUTY. "Anything of value" is included in many statutes, and it has always been held to be something concrete.

Mr. COTTON. I have just one more question. We all know what the Senator is getting at, and we all know that this deals with a matter of handing money under the table, and sending it into States to affect elections. However, is that not a matter of reporting? Most States have on their statute books corrupt practices acts which take care of such situations.

The unfortunate example, which the Senator cited when he began his speech, of the man who was going around the country attempting to hand Senators $2,500 for their campaigns, was an example of a person who was already probably in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act and of the laws of two-thirds of the States in the Union.

But rather than to raise a barrier between States, so that an American citizen cannot even help someone across a State line, would it not be the proper approach—and I am sure Senators would support this view very fully—to be certain that there must be reporting? Should not the Federal act about which we are speaking—the so-called clean elections law, which has been bruited about so much—be a reporting act?

Mr. PROUTY. I think I may suggest to the Senator that reporting requirements have been in the law for years, and there have been very few convictions, as I recall, for improper activities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I also address these remarks to the distinguished junior from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I think one of our difficulties is that we forget that a citizen who can well afford to contribute substantial sums of money will be interested in the cause rather than in the candidate. McKinley said, in 1896, before the students in Michigan, that it is not the party which makes the issue; it is the issue which makes the party. A person becomes interested in an issue. Then he sees in the press the names of persons who are candidates for Federal office, who become symbols or examplars of the issue and the cause. That is the thing for which a contribution is made.

Shall we draw arbitrary lines and say that because a person lives in Ohio, he cannot contribute in Indiana, when actually he might have a brother running in

Indiana, or a candidate is someone who is very much to his liking, and one who supports with vigor the cause of the free system of this country? I think the proposal is extremely arbitrary. We do not make this sort of provision to apply to any other situation.

I think the whole idea of cleanliness, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, is being carried to a point where it is actually damaging and does not go to the heart of the reason for which contributions are made.

Mr. COTTON. That was the point I was bringing up. I think the Senator from Vermont was very courteous in his response.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, if the Senator will indulge me before I ask him a question at the first part of my interruption—and I hope he will not be taken off the floor because of my comment—I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that I am certain that whatever the outcome of the election was when he went to the neighboring State and made a speech, the adverse result in the election was not due to his speech. I assure him that we will take a chance on his coming to South Dakota at any time he feels able and free to come out there, and will be confident in our own minds that any contribution he might make in the way of a speech will be helpful to the cause.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I may say that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was most kind to me on that visit. What I said about Vermonters paying our expenses over there was facetious, because I had to drive only a few miles across the line. I had a delightful time. The Senator from Vermont has never once reproached me for the apparent results of my visit.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his expression of confidence.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the amendment and one of the points which has arisen, it is my personal opinion that the Senator from Vermont has performed a most useful service in directing attention to the matter of interstate contributions.

There are certainly at least two classes of contributions: One class would be the contributions described by the Senator from Illinois as coming from someone who has a perfectly good motivation in wanting to support someone who has identified himself with a great cause, and wants to see him nominated and elected.

But there is, of course, the other type of contribution, the kind which is made, or is sought to be made, for the purpose of affecting the result in an election, only as a means to an end of affecting selfishly legislation which might be developed in Congress. The latter type certainly would be condemned by every Member of the Senate.

I am of the opinion that something of the objective which the Senator has sought to accomplish will be accomplished by a provision now written into the bill, making the bill applicable to the primary contests and nominating conventions, as well as to general elections.

Mr. PROUTY. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that that is very true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One thing which the bill does is to make those things which come within its purview subject to reporting. It also requires that the reports be made available, so far as possible, in advance of the election. That is the 10-day provision. It seems to me that the class of contributions which are objectionable, and which would be covered by the Senator's amendment, will to a certain extent be caught by the reporting of contributions, now that such reporting is applicable to the primaries.

As the Senator has said, that contribution could be made in a general election, and be made through the device of giving it to a committee affiliated with the national organization, and earmarked, so to speak, for the particular candidate or candidacy which the contributor wishes to espouse. There, of course, it would be subject to reporting under the provisions of the bill.

But also now, under the provisions of the bill, if it should become law, with the amendment relating to the primaries, the sinister type of contribution would also be subject to reporting in primaries and conventions. To that extent, the objective which the Senator from Vermont seeks will, I think, be accomplished by the amendments already adopted in the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I think real progress has been made in this direction yesterday and today as a result of the amendments which were added to the bill as it was reported. I think the bill is a reasonably strong one at present. It represents a step forward in our desire for really clean elections.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Contributions to a campaign per se are not objectionable. Everybody recognizes that if a person runs for public office—particularly for Federal office—some funds are required to do so. If we are not to put a bar against a person of limited means running, it must be possible for him to receive contributions. But if the public knows the source and the amount of the contributions, then the public is in a position to judge as to the validity of the motives behind the contributions, and can vote accordingly. That will help in their appraisal of the candidacy.

So I feel that the reporting features of the bill, as they apply to both the primaries or the nominating conventions and the general elections will be very salutary when the bill is enacted. I certainly hope it will be passed by the Senate and approved by the other body and by the President.

Mr. PROUTY. I fully agree with the comments made by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, my purpose having been achieved, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is withdrawn.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont yields the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I feel that our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, has performed a very useful service in focusing our attention on the abuses which he had in mind in drafting the amendment. I admire and agree with his attitude in withdrawing the amendment, but I think he is entitled to widespread commendation from us for the fine presentation he has made and for the very important and salutary points which he has brought out concerning some of the abuses.

Mr. PROUTY. I sincerely appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I express my appreciation and commendation to the Senator from Vermont for the spirit he has shown in uniting some of us in our common purpose to get a bill. I have the greatest respect for the Senator's philosophy on this subject. I think that at this stage of the proceedings the Senator from Vermont has shown that he can rise to reality, in terms of making possible the enactment of a bill on this subject, and that he can join us in working toward that goal.

I assure him that it will be my wish and my hope to collaborate with him in the future in undertaking to work out a provision similar to his amendment, or at least containing some of the provisions of his amendment, so we may have the benefit of his thought, advice, counsel, industry, and activity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much those remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I particularly appreciate also his untiring work on the measure to deal with this problem. Certainly he deserves the thanks of all Members of the Senate and of the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as "1–19–60—D." I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

SEC. 305. After the effective date of this Act, such Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, shall not be construed to prevent Federal employees whose legal residence is outside the District of Columbia from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns in the case of State and local offices.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to allow Federal employees to hold State and local offices and to participate in political activities connected with the election to such offices.

We have before us Senate bill 2436, the purpose of which is to revise the Federal election laws and to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections. This invites us to take another look at the Hatch Act, and to correct some of its now archaic provisions.

The Hatch Act was enacted in 1939—more than 20 years ago. It answered a definite need of the time. However, like some other laws passed in the 1930's, the Hatch Act has become outdated, and in some respects it has become harmful, rather than beneficial.

Twenty years ago, it was impossible to know that millions of people would leave the cities, and would migrate to the suburbs. It was also impossible to know that from this migration would arise hundreds of communities, many of which would achieve the status of municipalities in their own right.

Since it is the nature of the American people to seek self-government, there grew in these communities local civic committees or councils, by means of which the suburban residents sought to exercise self-government. Before long, these communities grew to the point where more formal governments were necessary.

Up to that point, a resident of one of these communities could, without regard to the Hatch Act, serve in the capacity of a local governing official, even though he was a Federal Government employee. However, once the formalities of modern local governments were imposed, the Hatch Act limitations applied. Federal Government employees thus were precluded from taking active parts in the fundamental practice of self-government.

When I propose that Federal Government employees be permitted to hold State or local offices, I have in mind offices which by their nature would not affect the ability of such a person to perform his full-time duties for the Federal Government. It goes without saying that no person can hold two full-time jobs at the same time. Certainly, no Federal Government employee could continue to hold his Federal position while he was serving in a major State or local capacity which would demand the major portion of his time.

The amendment I propose is not intended to scuttle the Hatch Act. Rather, the purpose of the amendment is to bring up to date that which has become outdated. Its purpose is to recognize and reestablish the right of an individual to use his free time to participate with his fellow citizens in the basic functions of government.

The Federal Government employs 2,364,000 civilians. Among them, there are many whose community consciousness and civic abilities and interests in their neighbors and their communities should not be discouraged.

Through the Hatch Act, as it now stands, we have been disfranchising this group completely. Not only is that unfair; it is also contrary to the best interests of good government.

Do we have such an abundance of qualified local officials that we can deny this field of interest to more than 2 million people? I think not, Mr. President.

As a matter of fact, we should do everything possible to encourage the Federal Government employees to accept the responsibilities of citizens of the local level.

It is in this spirit that I propose this amendment to the Hatch Act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator's amendment is excellent, but I should like to ask several questions about its meaning.

Would the Senator's amendment make it possible for school board members to take active parts in such political management or campaigns?

Mr. BEALL. Yes; because usually the school boards meet in the evenings, not during the day.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How about State auditors in small towns?

Mr. BEALL. A State auditor usually has a full-time job. I am thinking more of those who serve as city councilmen or in similar positions in small towns—members of groups which meet in the evenings, which meetings do not interfere with the regular daytime duties of those persons.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the amendment, would a town treasurer also be permitted to take such an active part?

Mr. BEALL. Yes; because generally his job as town treasurer is a part-time one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the Senator's amendment is not intended, is it, to open the door to active participation by Federal employees in additional full-time jobs?

Mr. BEALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me inquire about the members of State legislatures.

Mr. BEALL. Generally, they obtain leave of absence to attend the sessions of the legislatures; and most of the State legislatures have sessions which last for only 30, 60, or 90 days.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have in mind a bill which would enable residents of the District of Columbia to vote in connection with the selection of delegates to the national conventions. The first bill on that subject which we passed was vetoed, because of some fear that it would interfere with the operation of the Hatch Act. I would not want such action to occur in connection with this bill.

Mr. BEALL. Does the Senator from South Dakota mean to say that Federal Government employees should not have a right to be elected to serve in State conventions?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All I know is that the President vetoed the first bill we passed, when we endeavored to provide such an opportunity for the residents of the District of Columbia; and the veto was based on a fear by the President that the bill would interfere with the operation of the Hatch Act.

I would like the pending amendment much better if the Senator from Maryland would strike from it the word "State," in line 7. I think such a modification of the amendment would improve it.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion; and I modify my amendment accordingly. The modification will thus limit the application of the amendment to counties or municipalities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and also to school boards.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask a similar question. Do I correctly understand that the able author of the amendment has agreed to eliminate from it the word "State," in line 7?

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In that event, the amendment merely means that Federal employees can participate in campaigns such as those for election to a county court?

Mr. BEALL. To a county council or to be county commissioners.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what I meant by using the phrase "county court."

Mr. BEALL. Yes, provided—as I have stated plainly in the course of my remarks—such activity did not interfere with the performance of their regular duties in their regular Federal Government jobs. Of course, most of the county organizations—for instance, the county councils—meet in the evenings.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My question is quite similar to the one the Senator from South Dakota asked: Would not the inclusion of the word "State" legitimatize participation by Federal Government employees in campaigns for the election of State Governors, for example? If so, the amendment would break down the effectiveness of the Hatch Act.

Mr. BEALL. At this point let me say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] that a moment ago I agreed to eliminate from our amendment the word "State."

Mr. COTTON and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The amendment, as amended, will be restricted to local officers. What is the effect of it in a State in which delegates are elected to a convention to nominate candidates for Governor or U.S. Senator? Can Federal Civil Service employees in such a State be candidates for delegates and serve in a convention and cast their ballots to nominate a Senator of the United States or a Member of the House or some other State officer?

Mr. BEALL. I would not think so, under our understanding.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, he was courteous and kind enough to mention this matter to me yesterday and again today. Without

in any way wishing to discountenance or disparage the Senator's purposes, it would seem to me, Mr. President, may I say to the junior Senator from Maryland, I cannot see that this proposal is germane or has any place whatsoever in a so-called elections bill. I think it properly would come within the jurisdiction of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which, of course, does have jurisdiction of and which has engaged in a study of the so-called Hatch Act in relation to Federal employees or employees of States, or those whose salaries are derived from Federal contributions, as I recall the two provisions of the Hatch Act.

I think it would be unfortunate if we were to encumber a Federal elections bill with this provision to amend the Hatch Act. I do not know why citizens who live in other States cannot engage in political activities, unless they come within the Hatch Act. It seems to me what we had better set about doing is amend the entire Hatch Act, and not try to take an oblique approach by making this proposal a part of an elections bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. BEALL. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I am inclined to share the views of the Senator from Missouri about this not being the proper time or place to deal with this problem. However, I can well understand the motives actuating my distinguished friend from Maryland in offering this proposal, because I am aware of the great interest which he takes in the many Federal employees who reside in the State of Maryland and who might be desirous of participating, and probably are desirous of participating, in only local elections in towns and cities in the State.

Maryland and Virginia have rather peculiar problems that some of the rest of the States do not have, and I commend the Senator from Maryland for bringing this subject before us, because it shows his interest in the many, many thousands of Federal employees who live in his great State.

I desire to address a question to the Senator from Maryland with regard to the merits of the amendment, if it seems prudent to pass on it now. With the word "State" eliminated, the amendment is limited to participation with regard to local offices only. Let us assume a case where the Senator from Maryland was running on the same ticket with a local official in the State of Maryland. Would it not be pretty difficult to separate the activities of a Federal employee in advancing the cause of Mr. X, the local candidate, and the cause of Senator BEALL?

Mr. BEALL. I do not think so. As a matter of fact, he might be interested in it, but he would not himself be a candidate. In most cases in Maryland candidates for judgeship do not actively participate. They go out, but do not make campaign speeches. That practice is characteristic in our State.

Mr. KEATING. I have not framed this idea in any precise language, but I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would be willing to accept a further amendment which would seem to me to pin it down more to a particular contest for a local office, some proviso to the effect that it would apply only where the local office or offices were the only offices under contest in that particular election.

Mr. BEALL. In the territory the Senator is talking about, namely, the State of Maryland, we do not elect municipal officers on the same ballot with State and Federal officers. That is a separate ballot.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it never happens in Maryland?

Mr. BEALL. In the case of the county council it happens.

Mr. KEATING. What I was getting at is this. I know what the Senator is seeking to achieve, and I am quite sympathetic to letting a man who works in the Interior Department, for example, who wants to run for a school board in Maryland, or who wants to serve on the school board, to do so. It is a commendable objective. I personally think he should be entitled to do that; but I would not want him to be able to participate in a campaign in which a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives was running at the same time as the local official in whom he was interested was running. I would not want him to be on the ballot at the same time. If some language could be worked out to effectuate that objective, I wonder if it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Maryland. I suppose he would rather see it in writing.

Mr. BEALL. I would rather first see it in writing. I want to thank the Senator from New York for his suggestion, but first I would like to ask the Presiding Officer or Parliamentarian to rule on the question proposed by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HENNINGS], as to whether this amendment is germane or not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Maryland directed a question to me?

Mr. BEALL. I directed a question to the Chair. The Senator from Missouri said that, in his opinion, he did not think this amendment was germane.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would not want to undertake to make such a parliamentary ruling, I may say to my friend. It was not a subcommittee that reported the bill. It is the full Committee on Rules and Administration which undertook to report an elections bill. We have offered certain amendments to a bill which might be called a contributions and reporting bill.

I think, if my good friend would oblige, if the proposal could have some further consideration by an appropriate committee, this amendment never having been suggested heretofore, until the Senator was courteous enough to suggest the matter to me yesterday, we could then go into the matter of the Hatch Act and its application in regular order and to greater effect.

As I read the Senator's amendment—I appreciate the purposes of it and the Senator's interest in it—we are discussing only the District of Columbia. The Hatch Act applies nationwide, in all States of the Union. In my opinion, not as a parliamentary matter but as a matter of relevance, this proposal has no place in a bill relating to the machinery of elections.

Mr. BEALL. We just use the words "District of Columbia." Of course I mean any place in the country. The words "District of Columbia" are used, but the amendment refers to anybody domiciled or living outside the District of Columbia.

Unfortunately the citizens in the District of Columbia do not have the right of the franchise, which I think a great many of us favor giving to them.

Mr. HENNINGS. A great many of us are in favor of that.

I wish the Senator had given us an opportunity to discuss the matter with him before presenting it to the Senate without any committee consideration whatsoever, in the midst of consideration of certain requirements for spending and reporting, and limitations on amounts.

Mr. BEALL. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri remembers that this same provision passed the House of Representatives some 10 or 12 years ago. The then Representative Sasscer and myself sponsored it, and it passed the House but died in this body.

Mr. HENNINGS. It was not at that time a part of any election bill?

Mr. BEALL. No.

Mr. RANDOLPH and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the diligent Senator from Maryland is to be congratulated for seizing upon any opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of his colleagues. Certainly the prohibition against the people living within the District of Columbia, or those who work in the District of Columbia and live in nearby Maryland and Virginia, from participating in local elections is something which deserves the attention of this body.

In the State of West Virginia, in the counties of Morgan, Berkeley, and Jefferson, there are people who commute from those eastern panhandle areas and hold Federal positions in the District of Columbia. Those citizens also have the desire, as expressed by the Senator from Maryland, to be active in local elections, as well as the States mentioned specifically by the sponsors of the proposed legislation, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, also cosponsors this proposal.

I shall not labor this point, because I know the purpose which motivates my colleague of other days in the House, where we considered this matter, to again bring it to the attention of the Congress. I applaud him for seizing up-

on this opportunity. It may not be the most appropriate time to bring it to the attention of Senators for inclusion in the pending bill, but the principle is a good one.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, who is an old friend of mine. I know the Senator has had a very active interest in this matter for many, many years, at least for the 17 years in which I have been in Congress. The Senator has always been very active, both as a former Member and as a former chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, in looking after the interests of and the welfare of this community.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Is it necessary for the Chair to rule on the germaneness of the amendment in order for us to consider it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it is not. This is not an appropriation bill, and the Senate is not operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, the question of germaneness does not arise.

Mr. KEATING. So we are free to consider the amendment on its merits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I ask the Senator from Maryland to give consideration to this: In the amendment as it now reads, at the very end it states, "In the case of local offices." That is the way it now reads, since the words "State and" have been stricken.

I wonder if the Senator would favorably consider, in place of that language, using the words "solely involving municipal and county offices."

Mr. BEALL. That would be all right. We will accept that amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that. I think it clarifies the language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his amendment?

Mr. BEALL. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am not insensible to some of the problems which confront the distinguished Senator from Maryland and other Senators who are interested in the local communities near the District of Columbia. I sincerely hope that no action will be taken as to this particular amendment at this time, for the reason that the Civil Service Commission at the present time can exempt areas and can exempt certain employees from operations in this regard. The Civil Service Commission has already done so, in regard to the Hatch Act, in respect to local elections in municipalities and for such offices as membership on the school boards.

In order that there be no question as to what has been done and what can be done I should like to read from pamphlet No. 20, November 1959, U.S. Civil Service Commission, entitled "Political Activity of Federal Officers and Employees," on page 16, under the heading "Exceptions to Hatch Act Restrictions."

The Hatch Act specified two conditions under which political activity on the part of Federal officers and employees is permissible.

(1) Section 18 of the act sets forth an exception relating to elections not specifically identified with National or State issues or political parties.

(2) Section 16 of the act sets forth an exception relating to political campaigns in communities adjacent to the District of Columbia or in communities the majority of whose voters are employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this section of the pamphlet and the listing of the particular areas and the reports and orders of the Commission be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. EXCEPTIONS TO HATCH ACT RESTRICTIONS

The Hatch Act specified two conditions under which political activity on the part of Federal officers and employees is permissible.

(1) Section 18 of the act sets forth an exception relating to elections not specifically identified with National or State issues or political parties.

(2) Section 16 of the act sets forth an exception relating to political campaigns in communities adjacent to the District of Columbia, or in communities the majority of whose voters are employees of the Federal Government.

Both sections are quoted on page 4 of this pamphlet.

SECTION 18

To be permissible under section 18, the activity must be of a strictly local character—completely unrelated to issues and candidates that are identified with National and State political parties.

SECTION 16

For many years prior to enactment of the Hatch Act, Federal employees residing in certain municipalities near the District of Columbia were permitted to be candidates for, and to hold, local office in those municipalities.

The permission was granted either by an individual Executive order or by action of the Commission based on an Executive order, and it remained in full force and effect until the passage of the act of August 2, 1939, which prohibited active participation in political management or in political campaigns, without exception. When this act was amended by the act of July 19, 1940, a new section was added (sec. 16, 54 Stat. 767) whereby the Commission was authorized to promulgate regulations extending the privilege of active participation in local political management and local political campaigns to Federal employees residing in any municipalities or other political subdivisions of the States of Maryland and Virginia in the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia or in municipalities the majority of whose voters are employed by the Government of the United States.

The Commission has promulgated regulations governing the extension of the privileges set forth in the section quoted above and copies of these regulations are available upon request to the Commission's central office in Washington, D.C. Under these regulations it is necessary that a formal request be received from the representatives of the community involved and that the petitioners furnish certain specified information relative to their community and its elections. In all cases the final decision as to the extension of the privileges of section 16 of any individual municipality depends on the municipality's meeting certain prerequisites that are set forth in the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has extended the privileges allowed by section 16 of the Hatch Act to the following municipalities or political subdivisions by formal action recorded on the dates indicated:

In Maryland: Annapolis, May 16, 1941; Berwyn Heights, June 15, 1944; Bethesda, February 17, 1948; Bladensburg, April 20, 1942; Bowie, April 11, 1952; Brentwood, September 26, 1940; Capitol Heights, November 12, 1940; Cheverly, December 18, 1940; Chevy Chase, sections 1 and 2, March 4, 1941; Chevy Chase, section 3, October 8, 1940; Chevy Chase, section 4, October 2, 1940; Martin's Additions 1, 2, 3, and 4, to Chevy Chase, February 13, 1941; Chevy Chase View, February 26, 1941; College Park, June 13, 1945; Cottage City, January 15, 1941; District Heights, November 2, 1940; Edmonston, October 24, 1940; Fairmont Heights, October 24, 1940; Forest Heights, April 22, 1949; Garrett Park, October 2, 1940; Glenarden, May 21, 1941; Glen Echo, October 22, 1940; Greenbelt, October 4, 1940; Hyattsville, September 20, 1940; Kensington, November 8, 1940; Landover Hills, May 5, 1945; Morningside, May 19, 1949; Mount Rainier, November 22, 1940; North Beach, September 20, 1940; North Brentwood, May 6, 1941; North Chevy Chase, July 22, 1942; Northwest Park, February 17, 1943; Riverdale, September 26, 1940; Rockville, April 15, 1948; Seat Pleasant, August 31, 1942; Somerset, November 23, 1940; Takoma Park, October 22, 1940; University Park, January 18, 1941; Washington Grove, April 5, 1941.

In Virginia: Alexandria, April 15, 1941; Arlington County, September 9, 1940; Clifton, July 14, 1941; Fairfax County, November 10, 1949; town of Fairfax, February 9, 1954; Falls Church, June 6, 1941; Herndon, April 7, 1945; Vienna, March 18, 1946; Portsmouth, February 27, 1958.

Other municipalities: Bremerton, Wash., February 27, 1946; Port Orchard, Wash., February 27, 1946; Elmer City, Wash., October 28, 1947; Anchorage, Alaska, December 29, 1947; Benicia, Calif., February 20, 1948; Warner Robins, Ga., March 19, 1948; Sierra Vista, Ariz., October 5, 1955; New Johnsonville, Tenn., April 26, 1956; Huachuca City, Ariz., April 9, 1959.

The Commission's actions extending the privileges of active participation in local self-government of the above-listed communities to resident Federal officers and employees are subject to the following restrictions:

(1) Federal officers and employees in the exercise of these privileges must not neglect their official duties and must not engage in nonlocal partisan political activities.

(2) Federal officers and employees must not run for local office as candidates representing a political party or become involved in political management in connection with the campaign of a party candidate for office.

(3) Federal officers and employees who are candidates for local elective office must run as independent candidates.

(4) Federal officers and employees elected or appointed to local offices requiring full-time service must resign their positions with the Federal Government. If elected or appointed to offices requiring only part-time service they may accept and hold the same without relinquishing their Federal employment provided the holding of such part-time office does not conflict or interfere with their duties as officers or employees of the

Federal Government. The department or independent agency in which Federal officers or employees are employed is the sole judge of whether or not the holding of the local office conflicts or interferes with their official duties as officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(5) The permission granted by the Commission to any particular community may be suspended or withdrawn by the Commission when in its opinion the activities resulting therefrom are or may become detrimental to the public interest or inimical to the proper enforcement of the political-activity law and rules.

Mr. CARLSON. As I stated, Mr. President, I am not insensible to the problem. I sincerely hope that any action taken in this regard will consider the fact that the Civil Service Commission has great authority at the present time. I am sure the Commission will exercise the authority when it is felt it would be in the best interest of the Federal employees.

I urge that no action be taken which might in any way jeopardize our Federal employees. These Federal workers are, after all, an operating agency of our Federal Government when it comes to political activity. We should make sure that no pressure can be placed upon them to require them to get into political campaigns. I think that would be most unfortunate at this time.

I therefore urge the distinguished Senator from our adjoining State of Maryland to withdraw his amendment. I assure him I shall cooperate with him in trying to get additional relief in this field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator knows of the high regard I have for him in all matters, and particularly with respect to his interest in the District of Columbia.

Do I correctly understand that the amendment would permit every clerk in the post office in Philadelphia to get into Philadelphia municipal politics?

Mr. BEALL. That would not necessarily be true in the big metropolitan centers, where these officers have pretty high salaries. The office of city councilman may be a salaried and full-time position. The amendment would not cover that. The amendment only provides that the person may participate in local politics when it does not interfere with his official duties as an employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. CLARK. What concerns me, I will say frankly to the Senator, is that this would turn the Federal patronage wide open, to get these employees into municipal political affairs, and thus overturn a reform which took us years and years to accomplish. That concerns me very much.

I should be inclined to support an amendment which I think is what my friend has in mind, which would permit a man who works for the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and has a home in Arlington, Va., or in Maryland, and who wants to run for the office of member of a school board, to do so. If he wants to participate in that type of politics outside the District of Columbia, such participation would be all right, but I would not like to see a swarm of Federal employees, who are now properly forbidden by the Hatch Act to stay out of local politics, getting into deciding who was going to be the councilman or the mayor, in Philadelphia, or who was going to occupy any one of those offices. Thank goodness we got the Federal employees out of that years ago.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator from Pennsylvania was in the Chamber when the modification was made in the last two lines of the amendment. The amendment, as modified, now provides for insertion on page 19, between lines 7 and 8, of the following new section:

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

SEC. 305. After the effective date of this Act, the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended, shall not be construed to prevent Federal employees whose legal residence is outside the District of Columbia from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns solely involving county, municipal, or other local offices.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber of both the Senators from New York. I wonder if they would not agree with me that an amendment which would permit all the Federal employees in New York City to enter into the question of who was to be mayor or president of the Borough of Manhattan would be an unfortunate step backward, at a time when we have insulated workers under civil service from participation in local municipal affairs. I may be wrong about this, but I have lived with this problem for a long time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am not entirely sure, for example, that the postal workers should not have the privilege of serving on a school board in some town. I have always been quite of the opinion that the Hatch Act might be too rigid with regard to the possibility of Federal employees engaging in certain local political activities. For example, I know that many postal workers are having a hard time making ends meet, under present rates.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Some of them are taking second jobs. If one of them were qualified to serve on a school board, or to serve in some other local office, I am inclined to think that there is not much wrong with letting him do so.

Let me say to my friend from Maryland that I rather think this is a question which should have further study by the committee charged with responsibility in this area, namely, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I do not believe we should try to arrive at a solution of the problem here, because even though I have made a suggestion for what I feel would be an improvement in the amendment, I am not certain yet in my own mind just where I should land when it comes to the question of a vote.

I think there is merit in what my friend from Pennsylvania has said, but I think we should give some thought to the question of allowing Federal employees to have a little more participation than they have now in local activities. There is nothing wrong about politics. Politics is good, when it is conducted right. Federal employees are greatly restricted in anything they do, and many of them are afraid to say, "I like JOE CLARK," or "I like KEN KEATING," because someone may say, "You are engaging in political activities." I am sympathetic toward what the Senator from Maryland has said, but I think it would be helpful if he would withdraw his amendment so that we may confine our activities here to the piece of legislation which is before us.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Senators will note that I am listed as one of the cosponsors of this amendment. When it was brought to me by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and they talked with me concerning the situation which we face in the District, Virginia, and Maryland, I sympathized with them very much. So far as I was concerned, being chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I did not oppose the amendment, and I told them I would go along with it.

I believe that something should be done for the people of the District of Columbia. As Senators know, I have always opposed home rule in the District, but I think the people should have a right to vote if they live in Virginia or Maryland, and they should have the right to participate to a certain extent in local political activities. I believe we shall have to go very carefully into the situation when we consider amending the Hatch Act.

I also believe Federal employees ought to be given more latitude in exercising the rights of citizens of the United States in electing candidates to the Senate and the House, and to other poliical offices.

I believe the Senator from Maryland has agreed to withdraw his amendment, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had expressed to the distinguished Senator from Maryland the hope that he would withdraw his amendment, with the understanding, of course, in view of the evident interest, that he might offer it again tomorrow in order to afford Senators an opportunity to puzzle over the question overnight. Other considerations may arise. If that could be done, I certainly would concur that action on the part of my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I will accept the suggestion offered by the minority leader and withdraw my amendment for the time being, with the understanding that I may have the right to offer it tomorrow, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Senator has that right.

The Senator from Maryland has withdrawn his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for his consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of Senators, I wonder if it would be possible to conclude very shortly today's discussion on the pending legislation, in order that the Senate may go into executive session to consider nominations, and permit several Senators who have indicated a desire to speak, to do so, during the remainder of the day.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in reply to my friend, the assistant majority leader, let me say that, as a part of the pending bill, there are several amendments which do nothing more than bring the present Corrupt Practices Act up to date by increasing from $50 to $100 the direct-contribution reporting provision which appears in the existing law. I now ask that that increase be made, and I offer the amendments which I send to the desk. I have nothing further to say about them, except that they also bring the bill into harmony with existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish the amendments to be read?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents after "Sec. 202. Reports by political committees." insert the following:

"Sec. 203. Reports by others than political committees."

Page 2, in the table of contents, beginning with "Sec. 203" renumber the sections through "Sec. 212" to conform to above amendments.

Page 8, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"REPORTS BY OTHERS THAN POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 203. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 202) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 202, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 207(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 8, line 8, strike out "SEC. 203" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 204".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 9, line 13, strike out "207" and insert in lieu thereof "208".

Page 10, lines 13 and 14, strike out "candidate or by a treasurer of a political committee" and insert in lieu thereof "candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person,".

Page 10, line 17, strike out "206" and insert in lieu thereof "207".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "SEC. 205" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 206".

Page 11, line 22, strike out "SEC. 206" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 207".

Page 12, line 20, strike out "SEC. 207" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 208".

Page 14, line 9, strike out "SEC. 208" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 209".

Page 14, line 16, strike out "SEC. 209" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 210".

Page 14, line 20, strike out "SEC. 210" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 211".

Page 14, line 25, strike out "207" and insert in lieu thereof "208".

Page 15, line 4, strike out "SEC. 211" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 212".

Page 15, line 10, strike out "SEC. 212" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 213".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield the floor?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. I ask for the question.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the amendments which I have offered are very simple. The present Corrupt Practices Act provides that a $50 direct expenditure made by any person must be reported. We propose to increase the cutoff from $50 to $100, in order to bring the provision more nearly in line with present campaign costs.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, this provision is in the law today.

Mr. HENNINGS. This is in the present law, under which we are theoretically functioning. We propose to increase the amount, and to liberalize the provision so as to bring it into line with modern conditions. We propose to increase the amount from $50 to $100. I do not know why that should cause any debate or discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The amendments are identified as "1-18-60—A."

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is an explanation of the amendments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

Under the existing law, reports must be filed by (1) political committees, (2) candidates for Senator and Representative, and (3) persons other than political committees making expenditures "other than by contribution to a political committee" of $50 or more within a calendar year in order to influence elections of candidates in two or more States.

As we have been discussing the past few days, one of the foundations of the existing law is the principle of disclosure. Reporting is the means chosen to achieve this goal. At the present date, nobody doubts the importance of reports by candidates for congressional office and political committees in order to safeguard the integrity of Federal elections. But equally important is to require reporting from those who do not contribute to political committees but prefer to make expenditures directly in order to promote the cause of candidates of their choice.

This requirement of the existing law by the definition of the term "person" includes any organization or group of persons, as well as individuals. But the duty to report arises only if such persons try to influence Federal elections in two or more States. This provision is not limited to individuals, because the purpose of this legislation is full disclosure and, therefore, it is necessary to require maximum reporting of all direct expenditures. The requirement that persons who are not political committees shall report does not by implication widen the scope of the term "political committee." No State or local committees are involved. At the same time, the existing law considers it of importance to have this category of persons report their activities. Vast amounts of money may be spent by individuals and organizations which do not qualify as political committees to promote the chances of certain candidates. An army of canvassers may be hired to carry out door-to-door campaigns. Radio and television time may be bought, or other types of expenditures made. If this group of persons is not required to report, it would be difficult, probably impossible, to have an idea of the amount of such expenditures.

In this connection, it is my opinion that such activities would not be subject to the limitation of contributions to $5,000 for each candidate as it appears in section 608(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. This is a criminal statute and according to the well-known rule of law must be strictly interpreted. Under this statute, only excessive contributions are punishable whereas in our case, only expenditures are involved. It is for this reason, I believe the existing law has imposed the duty of reporting on persons making direct expenditures. Legally speaking, with respect to reporting, this category of persons is placed in the position of political committees.

The new elections bill while retaining reporting by political committees and candidates, does not require persons making direct expenditures to report. This omission in the new elections bill represents a weakening of disclosure requirements, as compared to those of the existing law. It withdraws from the public eye a wide field of campaign financing. As I have said, we all know that money is spent by individuals and groups of persons in order to promote the cause of candidates directly and not by contributing to political committees. Without the light of publicity upon them, people favoring certain candidates may be tempted to prefer anonymity and to substitute direct expenditures for contributions to political committees.

I believe it is important to retain the provisions of the existing law, requiring persons making direct expenditures to report.

In order to adjust this reporting requirement to the prevailing level of values my amendment raises the cutoff amount of reporting from $50 to $100 during a calendar year and also provides that the filing of reports follow the general scheme of the new

bill. Therefore, under this amendment a person making a direct expenditure of $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contributions to a political committee, in order to influence elections of candidates in two or more States, would have to report such expenditures.

I urge that this amendment be adopted and made part of the Federal Elections Act of 1959.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment. It is a technical amendment. It provides an overall limitation of $10,000. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in the table of contents, it is proposed to strike out the heading of section 302 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

OVERALL LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL AID TO CANDIDATES OR POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PURCHASES

On page 17, strike out lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

OVERALL LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL AID TO CANDIDATES OR POLITICAL COMMITTEES AND PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN PURCHASES

On page 17, strike out lines 8 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 608. (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or for election, for any or all of the following purposes—

(1) to or on behalf of any candidate or candidates for an elective Federal office or offices, including the offices of President and Vice President of the United States and presidential and vice-presidential electors, or

(2) to or on behalf of any committee or committees or other organizations engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates for any such office or offices or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to establish an overall limitation on financial aid to candidates and political committees. The existing law contains a limitation. I wish to make it very clear that the limitation provided by present law is $5,000, but such may be contributed to any number of candidates or political committees. The amendment would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask a question. The most serious trouble in the past with that limitation has been that a wealthy family could give $5,000 in the name of every member of the family. Is that not true?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator done anything to tighten up that matter?

Mr. HENNINGS. We have done everything we could do by adopting amendments relating to the intrastate committees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that we have been getting the reports, but that they are made after the elections, when everything is over?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under the present Corrupt Practices Act that has happened. I think that under the amendments which have been adopted and under the present bill there will be considerable improvement in that respect.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In the past, is it not true that a very wealthy man could give money to other individuals and they could give it to the committee and in that way put the money into the funds of the committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; that has been true.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How, then, are we going to stop this giving of money to campaigns?

Mr. HENNINGS. We are trying to bring before the people the facts as they relate to the giving and spending of these moneys. The reporting features of the bill, as I have tried to say repeatedly, are the heart and soul of the philosophy and rationale of it. I would suggest to the Senator that at the present time there is a limitation of $5,000. The present law provides that no person shall directly or indirectly make contributions in an amount exceeding $5,000 during any calendar year to or on behalf of any candidate for nomination or election to Federal office, or to or on behalf of any committee furthering or advocating the election of any candidate to Federal office.

The law under which we are presumably now operating provides a $5,000 limitation. We would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That just gives a wealthy man a chance to give twice as much in the future. That is about all it does.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The explanation which the Senator has made of the amendment is not exactly in accordance with my understanding of it. I could well have a misunderstanding of what it would do. Do I understand that the amendment raises the present limit from $5,000 to $10,000, and nothing more?

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what I have tried to say. The present $5,000 limitation is not an overall limitation.

Mr. KEATING. It is not an overall limitation?

Mr. HENNINGS. It is a limitation, but not an overall limitation. The $10,000 would be an overall limitation.

Mr. KEATING. An overall limitation. So that for the first time we would be enacting an overall limitation on what any one individual could give, and we would make that overall limitation $10,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that is correct. The Senator has substantially stated the purpose of the amendment, and that in part answers the questions of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KEATING. I personally support the amendment. I think it is a very important amendment, and it is important that in our deliberations we understand fully that this is quite a departure from anything now in the law. That was the purpose of my question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator asked the question. Perhaps I should have taken more time to go into detail and explanation of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. HENNINGS. Inasmuch as so many Senators have been asking me when we are going to adjourn, because so many of them have commitments for this evening, I must apologize to my colleagues for having perhaps made a rather cursory statement, whereas I had prepared and am prepared now to make a full and complete and detailed statement. I am glad to answer any questions that may be submitted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Missouri well knows that I voted for one of his amendments on the last yea and nay vote. I am not against all regulation of primary elections. But let me ask the Senator about this amendment. If it were adopted, would the bill not set a limitation of $10,000 on the amount a person could spend in support of his own candidacy?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would not be a limitation upon the candidate himself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not think it would be proper to place a $10,000 limitation upon what a candidate can spend in support of his own candidacy.

Mr. HENNINGS. The provision will not apply to the candidate himself.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Suppose one of us happened to be running against a very wealthy person, and that person was willing to go the limit in paying his expenses to get himself elected. Then suppose a candidate who does not have a large sum of money available has a mother who would be willing to match the amount being spent by the wealthy opponent, or suppose he has a friend who would be willing to act as such a contributor. Do I correctly understand that a person who does not have sufficient money to match his opponent's own contribution would be foreclosed from accepting the contributions of his own mother, and that his mother could be sent to jail for making such a contribution?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under the bill, such a person's mother could establish a number of committees. They could be called the mother-for-son committee or the grandmother's committee or the sewing circle committee. There could be various committees of that type. There would be no limitation upon the amounts they could contribute, except that they would be required to report, which is the heart and soul of this proposal, as I have endeavored to point out before.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator's amendment simply require that contributions above $10,000 shall

be reported, or does it provide that there is a $10,000 limit on the amount which any person can give to a campaign?

Mr. HENNINGS. There is a $10,000 limit which any one person may give in an election year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even if it happens to be the candidate's mother or father?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; the mother or father would be limited, of course, to that extent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even though that person himself might have no funds of any significance, but might be running against a very wealthy person?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I am afraid that is the case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the distinguished Senator not realize that it would be somewhat unfair to say that simply because one man has a large amount of money he is privileged to spend it; but the other man, by virtue of the fact that his mother is still living, and he has not had a chance to inherit some of her fortune, would not have a chance to match the expenditure of his opponent? I hope the Senator will answer that question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I cannot answer all questions. I have undertaken to say to the Senator that there are a good many factors involved. I appreciate the interest and support which the junior Senator from Louisiana has given to at least a part of the bill. But I cannot undertake to offer a solution for all the inequities in life, nor all the disparities, economic and otherwise, which exist in a free society.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But why create more? That is the point.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not think we are creating more. I think we are taking some of the enormous contributions out of political campaigns and are bringing them into line with what we think should be an emphasis upon the qualifications of the candidate, and not upon the number of interests, and their financial resources, which are supporting him.

We found, for example, in 1956, in the investigation conducted by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that members of 12 prominent families contributed an over-all total of $1,153,000 to candidates and political committees, and that one family alone gave $248,423. Those contributions were lawful and within the letter of the law as it presently exists. Nevertheless, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, it must be admitted that the possibility of influencing candidates or the results of elections is clear, in the light of such heavy contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From one's mother?

Mr. HENNINGS. I know that we often invoke mother and the flag, but I can scarcely see what mother had to do with this matter.

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield first to the Senator from California, who I believe was first on his feet.

Mr. KUCHEL. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri if he plans to push this amendment to a vote tonight.

Mr. HENNINGS. I had hoped that we might discuss the amendment this evening. However, I would not do so over the opposition of Members of the Senate. I do not view myself as a dictator of what the Senate should do with relation to proceeding or adjourning. I was trying to expedite action on the bill. There are some other amendments which will be offered. I had four amendments of my own, this being the last of them. I have had inquiries from many Senators as to when we might adjourn tonight. I am in no hurry. So far as I am concerned, I can stay until midnight or morning. However, I would not like to subject any Senator to such procedure. I understand the assistant majority leader has indicated that some Senators desire to depart.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think I can give the assurance of the leadership on both sides that it was our hope that the debate on this measure for today could be concluded soon, so as to enable other Senators who have speeches to make, such as the Senator from Oregon, to deliver them before it gets too late.

Mr. HENNINGS. Members of the Senate have been, indeed, very generous to me in my entire time here. I would not undertake to do anything which would not comport with what other Senators may wish to do this evening; nor would I insist upon the further consideration of any amendment tonight. If it seems to be contrary to the will of the Senate, and if there is an indication that not a sufficient number of Senators are available either to develop a quorum or to debate further this amendment, I have no desire to insist upon further debate on the bill this evening.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not my purpose to delay the Senate; but some Senators have already left with the understanding that there would be no further vote tonight. I apprehend that some Senators will oppose the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. As the acting minority leader, I simply wish to protect their rights to register objections. Under those circumstances, I hope the Senator from Missouri will not push the amendment to a vote tonight.

Mr. HENNINGS. Under those circumstances, I may say to the Senator from California, I would certainly not want to put any Senator, at any time, in a position of disadvantage or make him the victim of any misunderstanding with relation either to having a vote or further debate or discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a characteristically generous statement on the part of my friend, the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's bringing the matter to my attention. I wish to conform to the will and the spirit of the Senate on this occasion, as I have tried to do throughout my service in this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will listen to this colloquy, I believe he will understand that the pending proposal is merely for an addition to the law, not a raising of the amount. The Senator from Tennessee, I believe, can shed light on the matter, due to the investigations he undertook as chairman of the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Montana is eminently correct. I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. If I read the amendment aright, it would apply to the person making an expenditure out of his own pocket in support of his own campaign, as well as to the mother, so to speak, who might make an expenditure out of her own purse for the nomination or election of her son. Let me read:

> Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year * * *.

So it seems to me that it would apply, alike, to the son, to the mother, or to the mother-in-law.

Mr. KUCHEL. What about the wife or the sweetheart?

Mr. HENNINGS. Under present law—if I may answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana—insofar as a friend or other person is concerned, the limitation is $5,000 to the candidate, and no more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the fact that other Members wish to delve further into this particular amendment, I suggest—if it will meet with the agreement of the Senate—that we now end our debate of today on the elections bill, and that the Senate now proceed to consider other matters, and thereafter adjourn until tomorrow, when we shall continue the debate on the elections bill.

Mr. GORE. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to submit certain amendments, to be printed, lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD, if I may have unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is that course acceptable to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly. I may say that the Senator from Tennessee and I have discussed the offering of his amendments, and it was contemplated that they would be offered after the amendment now pending, which is the last of the amendments I had expected to offer, was acted on.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from California wish to ask questions at this time?

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I was merely asking about the procedure, not about the merits of the amendment. But I am sure other members will wish to ask some questions.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand.

Then, Mr. President, consonant with the understanding with both the majority leader and the minority leader, I now yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, I now submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 13, after line 21, insert the following:

"(c) Candidates for election as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates.

"(d) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination, shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount prescribed in subsection (c), above."

On page 13, line 22, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)".

On page 8, line 8, beginning with the comma, strike out down to and including the comma on line 9, page 8.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the request of the Senator from Tennessee been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will now be stated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read two nominations to the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate concludes its session tonight, it adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to submit some insertions for the RECORD relating to the current debate with respect to bills which are pending before us to increase the number of judges in the Federal courts. We are especially in need of such action in the southern district of New York.

I have before me a report on the need for six additional judges for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, submitted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; the New York County Lawyers Association; the Bronx County Bar Association; the Empire State Chapter of the Federal Bar Association; the Maritime Law Association of the United States; and the New York Patent Law Association. This report is very persuasive and forceful, and shows clearly what the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have been fighting for all these months. That is my reason for taking the time of the Senate at this time. I ask unanimous consent that this report may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with an editorial entitled, "Justice Versus Politics," published in the New York Times of January 20, 1960. The editorial approves the report, and shows that the southern district has 20 percent of the civil cases in all the Federal courts but only 7 percent of the total number of judges to hear them. We are far behind, and politics should not stand in the way of the administration of justice so urgently needed.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE NEED FOR SIX ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The bar associations submitting this report are deeply concerned over a threatened breakdown in the administration of justice in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York because of an insufficient number of judges in that court to handle its ever-growing business. Our members, whose practice constitutes the primary work of the court, firmly believe that unless Congress promptly enacts legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York, as recommended by the Judicial Conference of the United States, such a breakdown may occur.

While the need for additional judges is a problem which is not confined to the southern district of New York alone, the southern district is unique in terms of the volume and character of the matters that come before it, and should be treated as such. Not only does this court handle a greater volume of business than any other Federal district court, but, situated as it is at the hub of the Nation's largest economic, shipping, and financial center, this court is constantly being called upon to decide matters of vital and unusual importance to the country at large—matters involving more complex and difficult factual and legal problems than those found on the dockets of most other Federal district courts. Such matters, whether disposed of before or after trial, inevitably require more time than the relatively simpler cases that characterize most other Federal dockets.

As of July 1, 1959, out of the Nation's total Federal civil caseload of 56,430[1] cases this district alone had pending before it 10,937 civil cases. But, as indicated above, bare statistical data concerning the number of cases pending does not give the full measure of judicial output because in this caseload there is an unusually large percentage of highly complicated matters which will take far more time to dispose of than the ordinary cases. This load includes:

Thirty-three Government antitrust cases, or over one-third such cases pending in the country; 237 patent suits, constituting almost one-fifth of all such cases in the United States; 2,376 admiralty proceedings (exclusive of Jones Act personal injury cases), representing over two-fifths of all admiralty matters on file in the Federal courts; and 117 private antitrust suits, or about 20 percent of all such litigation in

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all figures are taken from the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., September 1959.

the Federal courts; and approximately 25 Robinson-Patman Act cases.[2]

Likewise high is the percentage of other cases that involve complex fields of industry, services, and enterprises, ranging from bottled baby foods and bananas to copyright music, watches, radio tubes, computers, television broadcasting, color photography, and prizefight promotion. These suits are of the type referred to colloquially by bench and bar as "the big case." Estimates of trial time required range from several weeks to almost a year per case, and the amounts of damages claimed run in many cases to over a million dollars each.

The implications of this unique type of caseload may be gathered by reference to some examples. In the admiralty field, for instance, the much publicized limitation of liability proceedings affecting the SS *Andrea Doria* and the MV *Stockholm* are recorded statistically as only two cases. However, they actually represent a vast number of separate suits, one for each claim, and in these two cases there were approximately 3,500 claims filed, many of which involved settlement of infants' and deceased persons' claims.

The recent Bethlehem-Youngstown steel merger case, a Government antitrust suit tried in the southern district before Judge Edward Weinfeld in 1958, is another typical example. There a motion for summary judgment (see *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 157 F. Supp. 877 for decision) required the court to consider affidavits, exhibits and briefs exceeding 400 pages. Despite complete cooperation on all sides to shorten the trial through pretrial conferences and stipulations (one of which was 600 pages long) the trial record ran to 12,000 pages and required the judge to spend a very substantial part of 6 months in chambers before handing down an 88-page decision (at 168 F. Supp. 576), plus 199 pages of findings of fact and conclusions of law.

The statistics in the Government suit against the investment bankers, *United States* v. *Henry S. Morgan et al.*, 118 F. Supp. 621 (SDNY 1953), tried before Judge Medina, reveal the true character of the "big case." That case involved 6,848 pages of pretrial depositions, interrogatories, and orders, 10,640 pretrial exhibits, consisting of 43,252 pages, 196 pretrial and interim motions, briefs and memorandums, plus 376 separate charts and tables prepared by the parties, totaling 3,846 pages; 309 courtroom days of trial, plus 25 days of off-the-record conferences between court and counsel; 23,962 printed pages of trial transcript; 4,469 trial exhibits totaling 20,474 pages plus 2,967 pages marked for identification; and 417 pages devoted to the court's opinion.

Yet the Morgan case would be counted as but one case in statistical records.

In his Field Study of the Operations of the U.S. courts—report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959, Mr. Paul J. Cotter, stated that "the problem of the complicated case exists to a high degree" in this district, and that it has the largest number of "long and complicated cases" in the country. Such litigation demands much more of a judge's time and intellect than the hours spent on the trial itself. Before trial the parties usually present difficult factual and legal questions by way of a series of motions accompanied by voluminous papers and briefs which must be studied for a considerable length of time in chambers before they can intelligently be decided. During trial many more hours must be spent analyzing minutes and exhibits and preparing jury charges; and in nonjury cases (which are customary in the complicated patent and admiralty proceedings, and in many antitrust suits) the judge must after the trial study the exhibits, transcript and briefs before drafting and filing his findings, conclusions, and opinion.

In addition to the many protracted cases on its civil docket, the southern district of New York has also been the venue for an unusually large number of so-called big criminal cases, such as the recently concluded Apalachin trial and the Genovese narcotics case which was tried in April 1959. It should be noted that the southern district handles approximately 1,100 criminal prosecutions annually, which cannot be deferred, since the Constitution guarantees the accused a prompt disposition; and that this consumes the full time of four judges, making them unavailable for civil cases.

To handle this enormous and complex case load, which in sheer numbers constitutes 20 percent of the civil cases pending in all the Federal district courts, Congress has allocated to the southern district of New York only 18 judges, or 7 percent of the total number of Federal district judges in the country. According to the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Warren Olney, III, "No district is as undermanned as the southern district of New York.

The 10,937 pending cases in the southern district breaks down to an average of 608 cases pending per judge. There are twelve Federal districts, including the southern district of New York, which have five or more judges. All of these districts are located in metropolitan areas and handle approximately 45 percent of all new civil cases filed in the 86 districts having purely Federal jurisdiction.[3] The average case load pending before each judge in these 12 districts was 321 cases as of June 30, 1959. In other words, each of the judges in the southern district of New York has on the average almost twice the number of cases pending before him as the judges of these other metropolitan districts. The situation as of June 30, 1958 was much the same: At that time, in the same twelve metropolitan districts, the average number of cases pending per judge was 336, while in the southern district of New York the average case load per judge was 578. And the average caseload of the judges in all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was 249 and 270 in those years.

Of course, if this unduly large number of cases pending per judge in the southern district of New York could be attributed to inefficiency or a lack of industriousness on the part of its judges, the creation of additional judgeships obviously would not be the solution to the problem. But the record establishes conclusively that this is not the case. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the judges in the southern district of New York on the average disposed of 334 cases per judge, as compared to an average of 253 cases per judge in the 12 metropolitan districts described above. A comparison for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, likewise reveals that the southern district disposed of a substantially greater number of cases per judge than the average of the other metropolitan districts. The average number of cases disposed of per judge for all 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction was even lower. In 1959 the figure was 236 cases disposed of per judge, and in 1958 the average number of cases disposed of per judge was 231.

Yet, despite the fact that through a prodigious effort the judges in the southern district of New York disposed of a much higher than average number of cases in both 1958 and 1959, their caseload continues to swell. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, 6,732[4] new cases were filed in the southern district and 4,896[4] cases were disposed of. Last year 6,549 new cases were filed and a total of 6,011 cases disposed of. Thus, from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the backlog of pending cases has increased by 2,374 cases in this district even though its judges are working harder than ever. Any further efforts to increase the output per judge pose the risk that judges will be forced unconsciously to sacrifice the quality of justice expected of them in an effort to keep up with the increasing workload. There is a limit to the burden that can be handled efficiently, even by the most conscientious judge. If he exceeds that limit his very attempt to keep up with the excessive burden is self-defeating since mental exhaustion will undoubtedly have an adverse effect upon all of his work, not just the excess.

The steady increase in this district's backlog does not completely reflect the seriousness of the situation. With an inadequate number of judges to handle the entire caseload before it, there is a natural tendency on the part of the court to dispose of the shorter cases first and defer the more complicated and protracted ones, since trial of these cases would consume months of the time of the judges involved and result in a sharp increase in the number of cases forming the backlog. This tendency to handle the shorter cases first, however, increases the hard core of the protracted and complicated cases, especially when one realizes that from 2 to 3 percent of the current filings, or approximately 150 new cases each year are of the complicated and protracted type. Recently Chief Judge Ryan has assigned four or five complicated and protracted cases, apiece, for all purposes, to each of the 18 judges and we may therefore expect that when trial of some of these cases is commenced in 1960 the delay in handling of regular run of the mill cases will be increased.

Nor have efforts on the part of Congress to stem the engulfing tide of new cases being brought in the Federal courts met with success in the southern district of New York. When Congress passed the Jurisdictional Act of July 25, 1958, which raised the minimum jurisdictional amount from $3,000 to $10,000 in diversity cases, it was anticipated that this would result in a sharp decrease in the number of such cases being brought in the Federal courts, because, of the 67,115 cases filed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, throughout the United States, 25,709 were diversity cases. From the standpoint of the country as a whole, the statute had its desired effect since there was an overall decline of 32.6 percent in the number of such cases filed in the fiscal year 1959. Unfortunately, this decline occurred in districts other than the southern district of New York. In this district, while the number of private civil cases filed in the fiscal year 1959 declined slightly from the previous year (5,388 filed in 1959 as compared to 5,764 filed in 1958), the total number of civil cases commenced in the southern district for 1959 remained substantially the same as it was in 1958, viz, 6,549 as compared with 6,727.[5] Furthermore, an examination of the docket in the southern district

[2] Estimated by Chief Judge Sylvester J. Ryan.

[3] These are Massachusetts, the eastern and southern districts of New York, New Jersey, the eastern and western districts of Pennsylvania, the southern district of Florida, the eastern district of Michigan, the northern district of Ohio, and the northern district of Illinois, and the northern and southern districts of California.

[4] Field Study of the Operations of U.S. Courts—Report to Senate Appropriations Committee, April 1959, prepared by Paul S. Cotter.

[5] 365 civil cases per judge were filed in the southern district in the fiscal year 1959 as compared with an average of 238 such cases per judge in the 12 largest Federal districts in the country (including the southern district of New York).

for the first 4 months of the current fiscal year (1959–60) reveals that 2,357 new civil cases have been filed, or an average of approximately 600 suits per month, which would mean that we may expect the total for the current year to exceed 7,100 new civil actions.

Thus, while the number of civil actions being commenced in most other districts is on the decline, the number in the southern district of New York is still increasing despite the new act. It should also be noted that the great majority of cases pending in the southern district consist principally of private civil suits rather than suits by or against the Government, a fact of considerable significance in assessing the court's workload, since it is generally accepted that "private civil cases * * * take much more time of the judges than Government cases." [6]

Other new Federal legislation enacted by Congress at its last session may also lead to additional litigation in the Southern District of New York. One example of this legislation is the Labor-Management Report and Disclosure Act of 1959 (the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill) enacted in September 1959 (Public Law 86–257) which establishes new controls affecting labor unions and their relationships with union members. Both labor and management representatives have predicted that this act will lead to a flood of litigation by individual union members and employees seeking to enforce rights accorded them under the law. The southern district of New York, which is the situs of the headquarters of many important unions will undoubtedly be invoked in such cases. We may further anticipate that future sessions of Congress will pass additional legislation in other fields that will likewise add to this important court's burden.

What has been the result thus far of this tremendous caseload in the southern district? The median interval between issue and trial in this district during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 was 19.1 months as distinguished from an average median interval of 10.3 months in the 86 districts having exclusive Federal jurisdiction. And the time between the filing of a complaint and trial was 26.7 months in the southern district as compared with 15.3 months in these same 86 districts during that same period.

The delay of over 26 months between filing and trial in the southern district causes hardships to litigants and brings the court into disrepute in the eyes of the public. In patent infringement cases, for example, this inordinate delay has serious consequences for it has encouraged willful and wanton infringement of important patents toward the end of their term. Infringers, secure in the knowledge that if suit is brought in the Southern District of New York no determination of the issues involved is probable until after the expiration date of the patent, have deliberately embarked on infringement activities toward the end of the term of many patents, thus foreshortening the effective term of such patents by several years.

In areas of industry engaged in highly competitive research, patented inventions frequently become obsolete in a matter of years; and in these areas the value of a patent is seriously reduced if speedy relief against infringers is not available, and absent value in the patent, the incentive for invention and development of new products disappears.

But the problem in the Southern District of New York is far more serious than one of delay alone. If the present rate of filings continues without abatement, or increases as the first four months of 1959–1960 indicate will be the case, and the court is given no relief in the form of new judges, we face a deterioration in the very quality of justice that this distinguished court will be able to dispense in the future. Because it is inevitable that when the caseload on the individual judges becomes too heavy, not only does court congestion occur, but the quality of the justice which is dispensed must ultimately be adversely affected.

We believe that this problem cannot be met by measures short of the enactment of legislation creating six additional judgeships. The court has welcomed any reasonable alternative suggestions including the use of visiting judges from other districts and the adoption of various procedural reforms calculated to increase the court's work product. But past experience has shown that the services of visiting judges, although welcomed with open arms, have limited utility since their help is of a temporary and transitory nature and they cannot therefore be assigned to deal with the court's No. 1 problem which is the extraordinary number of complicated and protracted cases pending on its calendar. These judges invariably return after a few weeks to their respective home districts which are often hundreds or thousands of miles from New York. To ask them to continue to handle a matter after they have returned to their home districts would not only be unfair to them and to the lawyers and litigants involved, but would also be impractical.

With respect to procedural reforms, efforts are continually being made toward improving the court's efficiency. These include studies presently under way, of measures designed to eliminate waste of time on the part of the court and counsel in the hearing and disposition of motions, and of possible revisions in the court's pretrial procedures. Even with such improvements, however, the court could never expect to increase its already prodigious work product to a point where it could keep abreast of the annual intake of new cases, much less to dispose of the huge backlog of pending litigation before it.

After reviewing the manner in which the present 18 judges are assigned, we are convinced that a minimum of 6 additional judgeships is required to enable the court to keep up with the current annual inflow of civil and criminal business. Any plan for assignments of the 24 judges would still necessitate continuation of the services of retired senior and visiting judges who would be utilized on shorter trials in order to enable a portion of the regularly assigned judges to handle the many complicated and protracted cases instituted in this district. Adequate space and facilities are available to accommodate the six additional judges recommended.

On behalf of our members we urge Congress as strongly as we can to enact promptly legislation creating six additional judgeships for the southern district of New York before the problem has grown to such gargantuan proportions that the damage will be irreparable.

DECEMBER 31, 1959.

[6] Quarterly Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts for the Third Quarter of the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1959, p. 8, table C–1; testimony of Warren Olney III, Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, Jan. 26, 1959, Hearings before the Subcommittee of the House of Appropriations, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 56.

JUSTICE VERSUS POLITICS

The city bar association's report on the need for six additional Federal judgeships in this southern district of New York raises a clearcut issue of justice versus politics. That it exists at all is a disgrace, made worse as the situation grows increasingly acute. The bar association has done a conspicuous service, to the public and to frustrated litigants, in its able presentation of the case for more judges—one which we hope will have a massive impact on Congress, where responsibility for the present situation squarely rests.

So remiss has Congress been in meeting the demands of swift justice in this district that the parties in civil actions now have to wait more than 2 years before their cases come to trial. As the report has pointed out, the delay causes hardships to litigants and brings the court into disrepute; in patent cases it has encouraged willful and wanton infringement. The outstanding cause for this deplorable situation is the failure of Congress to create enough judgeships, as the years have gone by, to keep up with the increase in cases that the court has had to handle.

The flood of cases has risen no less than 36 percent in the last 5 years, with the same number of judges to carry the load. And their burden is greater than that which judges in other districts have to bear. The southern district has 20 percent of the civil cases in all the Federal courts, but only 7 percent of the total number of judges to hear them. No wonder the New York court has failed by 2,374 to keep up in decisions with the new cases filed in the past 2 years.

While the situation is more acute here than elsewhere it is urgent everywhere. For the past 5 years the Judicial Conference of the United States has been urging Congress to create more judgeships—raising the number as conditions have grown steadily worse. But no action at all has been taken. Now a bill for 45 more places on the Federal bench is gathering dust in congressional committee rooms. Reason: the politics of possible appointments. And this in spite of the fact that President Eisenhower has pledged to appoint to new places an equal number of Democrats and Republicans qualified for the judgeships.

Could it be that leaders of the Democratic majority hope a Democratic President, bound by no such pledge, will be elected next year, or that some fear that President Eisenhower might not appoint the right kind of Democrats? Anyway, the delay is inexcusable.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy that my colleague has called our attention again to this crying need. A bill has been reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary which would at least help somewhat with the problem. I reiterate my hope that the leadership of the Senate will schedule the bill for early consideration. The need is very urgent.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] will remember that at our last meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary this matter was taken up and discussed. At that time it was brought out that I had reported the bill from the committee. I said it was not all that we would like to do, and that it was more or less a compromise bill. The whole committee understood at that time that we hoped to get the bill under consideration at an early date.

Mr. KEATING. I am well aware of the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with these matters, has been helpful in reporting

the bill which is now on the calendar. He recognizes, as well as the rest of us, that it does not fully solve the problem. I do hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is chairman of one of the important committees of the Senate, and whose relationship to the leadership is of the highest, and who has great persuasive powers in this body, will use his powers of persuasion with the majority leader and with the assistant majority leader and the policy committee of the Democratic Party in the Senate, to get the bill before us so that we can vote on it. I feel sure that it will receive widespread support, if only we can get it to the floor and let the Senate work its will.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to delay a vote on the pending amendment. My colleague from New York and I have made our case, and it is made very eloquently in the inserts that I have submitted for the RECORD. It is a matter of utmost statesmanship that this be done. It is one of the urgent needs of the country. The people feel it very keenly, whether they are litigants or prospective litigants. I join with my colleague in the expectation that we shall have action on the bill.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER STATE VOTING REGISTRATION MACHINERY AND CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is now under way a great deal of study in an effort to find ways and means for the Federal Government to intervene in the election powers of the various States. Those who promote such intervention also seek to force undesirable civil rights legislation upon the people of the various States.

At the present time the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is holding hearings on proposed legislation to enact a Federal registration program. For some days there has been on the floor of the Senate, debate on a so-called Federal clean elections bill. In the Judiciary Committee and elsewhere there are rumblings about civil rights legislation in nearly every field one could imagine.

All this talk about civil rights and Federal controls over elections and registration machinery is political vote baiting and, in actuality, has no place in the Congress of the United States. The control of elections or of the social habits of the people, or of the conduct of public schools has always been reserved, by the Constitution of the United States, to the local and the State governments.

The Senate has no more right to tell people in Alaska or California or Maine what to do in their elections than do those States have a right to tell the U.S. Senate how it shall conduct its business.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that we should stick to our business in the U.S. Senate, and should not delve into the business of the local or the State governments.

The Federal Government—whether the executive branch, the judicial branch, or either House of the legislative branch—has no business butting into State primary elections or State general elections. As I understand, there is no such thing as a Federal election; all elections are State elections. The Constitution of the United States provides that the people in every State shall have the right to elect. But the Constitution leaves to the States the right to control the elections.

When a President of the United States is elected, the people of each State vote to elect the delegates of their choice, who then decide upon who will be the President and the Vice President. This is done through State elections, not a national election.

The Constitution of the United States expressly reserves to the States the power and right to control elections. Within my lifetime, U.S. Senators from South Carolina and Senators from many other States, for example, were elected by the general assemblies of the various States, not by popular vote. The States have always decided election matters and registration matters; and any attempt by the U.S. Senate, or the House of Representatives, or any other Federal body or agency to change this rule would be an attempt to change the Constitution of the United States.

While on the subject of Federal Government intervention in State affairs and the general field of civil rights, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "Terror In New York," from the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., dated January 18, 1960. I commend this editorial for reading by all Senators; and with particular emphasis do I recommend a reading of a letter to the editor, published in the same issue of this newspaper, and upon which the editorial was based. The letter to the editor, written by a New York resident, is supported by a news item entitled "Women In Panic—Attack Victims Tell of Terror." The editorial, the letter to the editor, and the article from the New York Journal-American, as referred to in an editor's note, all emphasize that those who cry loudest for civil rights action have not yet learned to control the problems of their own communities.

The strongest proponents for Federal intervention in State registration and voting matters and for interfering in State matters, through civil-rights legislation, come from the large cities where the greatest racial problems exist and where there are more local civil-rights statutes on the books than anywhere else in the Nation.

I hope the Members of the Senate will think more than twice before they vote for legislation that attempts to interfere with the rights of States covering elections, registration programs, and other matters.

I, for one, stand ready, as a South Carolinian, to defend the civil rights of citizens in South Carolina as quickly as anyone else in this Nation. But I do not have a right to tell the people of New York what to do in this or in any other field; and the people of New York or any other State have no right to tell the people of South Carolina or any other State, what to do, regardless of the attempts that are made directly or indirectly through the Congress, the President of the United States, or elsewhere in the Federal Government.

I stand ready to defend the voting rights of every citizen in South Carolina; and I stand equally prepared to defend the rights of South Carolinians, New Yorkers, Californians, and the people of all other States to control their own voting machinery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the other two items to which I referred, from the News and Courier, be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 18, 1960]

TERROR IN NEW YORK

Not long ago a local reader accused us of exaggerating crime conditions in New York, where the list of attacks, especially on women, is constantly growing. Elsewhere on this page today appears a letter from a woman who says that nobody feels safe in the metropolis and that we have not misrepresented conditions.

Neither correspondent, of course, sets up to be an authority on these conditions. Both speak from personal observations.

Our comments are based on constant reading of newspapers, magazines, and official reports, and on conversations with informed persons in different parts of the country. Out of all this we have gathered an impression of virtual jungles in several cities of the North and West.

Much of this wave of violence is attributed to Negroes. For this reason we have related the outbreak of disorder to racial conditions.

Some observers believe that incoming migrants, both from the Southern States and from Puerto Rico, have set up new tensions that lead to crime. Our purpose in focusing attention on these disturbing conditions is to show that racial problems are more acute in the North than in the South, which is the target of hostile propaganda.

We are well aware that the South has too much crime, but in our judgment it is better controlled today than in northern cities where terror stalks citizens, principally women. Even the paper curtain press now is taking notice.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 19, 1960]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—WOMEN IN PANIC

BAY SHORE, N.Y.

To the News and Courier:

A letter, saying that the News and Courier exaggerates crime in New York, written by Chalmers S. Murray, has been forwarded to me and I can assure Mr. Murray that the conditions he mentions are not exaggerated but are even worse than is recorded in newspapers. No one is safe anywhere here and all are afraid.

I've lived in New York for many years, and know Charleston well and know of conditions there too, but at present things here are almost out of control, so please don't underestimate.

ADELE GARFIELD.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Enclosed with the foregoing letter was a news item from the New York Journal-American captioned "Women in Panic—Attack Victims Tell of Terror." The item says: "Fear is gripping the women of New York today. Their terror comes with the gray of dusk as muggers and rapists roam the streets. Only yesterday a subway change agent was added to the mounting list of assaults on women. What is happening in our town? To get at the facts, the New York Journal-American sent out a team of reporters to observe at first hand the march of fear. This is the first of a series revealing why the women of New York City are

now 'Women in Panic.'" The letter from Mr. Chalmers S. Murray of Edisto Island said that he had not been molested in numerous visits to New York, and that the News and Courier was exaggerating the dangers.)

NEWSPAPER STRIKE IN PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I entered into an understanding with the leadership of the Senate and with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that I would forgo making the speech I am about to make until after the debate for today on the clean elections bill was held, because again, as has always been my practice, I desired to cooperate with the leadership and the Senator in charge of any bill in expediting debate on that bill—particularly when the speech I make tonight is a speech not only for the RECORD, but one that needs to be read and studied by Members of the Senate, and needs to have adequate consideration given to its very serious import and the serious labor relations problem that it raises.

Mr. President, I propose to discuss for a few minutes the newspaper strike which has been raging in the city of Portland, Oreg., for the past 11 weeks. In all my years in the State of Oregon, through such labor strife as we have had from time to time, including some serious strikes on occasions on the waterfront, I have never witnessed such vicious antilabor employer conduct as I have witnessed on the part of the publishers and editors of the Portland Journal and the Oregonian in connection with this newspaper strike.

By way of an introduction to my speech, Mr. President, I think it is particularly appropriate that I read at this time a very short television speech I prepared for release in the State of Oregon on the strike. It reads as follows:

Fellow Oregonians, on this telecast, I am pleased to respond to the invitation of the Portland newspaper strike committee to give my views and suggestions on the union-busting controversy that is raging in Portland between the Newhouse newspaper chain dynasty and free workers in our city.

I have refrained from making a statement until I received this invitation from the Portland newspaper strike committee, because I am well aware of the very deep political hatred for me held by the publishers and the editors of both the Portland Journal and the Oregonian. However, this controversy has now reached the point where the public interest has become paramount. What I say on this telecast may not be acceptable in all details to either the newspapers or the strikers. But I want to point out that we have now reached the point where the public interest must be given first consideration.

Some weeks ago Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER made a very fine statement and proposal when they suggested that a factfinding board be appointed to find out what the facts are in regard to this controversy.

As some of our religious leaders in Portland, such as Dr. Steiner, have pointed out, the public is bound to get only biased and slanted news from one of the participants in this controversy, namely, the newspaper publishers themselves. It is about time that we have the facts presented to the public, and in view of the fact that the newspapers have turned down Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER's suggestion, I want to add a suggestion to what Hatfield and NEUBERGER have already proposed.

I would like to point out that the best labor law on the statute books today is undoubtedly the Railway Labor Act of 1926; it provides for the appointment when there is a deadlock reached of an emergency board, and that emergency board has the duty of finding the facts and making recommendations for the solution of the dispute.

Now the Railway Labor Act is not a compulsory arbitration act. It does not require either party to be bound by the recommendations of the emergency board.

But what has happened in practice? After the emergency board has made its recommendations for a fair solution of a dispute, then the general public becomes the final arbitrator. What we need in this case are recommendations from an impartial fact-finding board with power to recommend, that will give the public the facts and give the public proposals for a fair settlement of the dispute. As in most of the railway disputes, I am satisfied that if we followed this procedure, the public, as the final arbitrator, would bring great pressure to bear on both the publishers and the workers to accept such a fair settlement.

Now who should make this kind of a fact-finding recommendation proposal? Well, I would like to suggest that such a fact-finding recommending board be headed by the dean of the School of Journalism of the University of Oregon, and that perhaps seven other schools of journalism across this country be asked to name someone from their faculty to sit on such a board, put all their names in a hat and draw out three or five depending upon the number that would be most acceptable to the parties.

Now that certainly would give you an impartial board. That would give you a board that understands the newspaper industry, and that would give you a board of fair-minded men who would put the public interest into this dispute where it belongs.

Let us take a look at some of the issues involved in it. I think it is a sad thing that these newspapers have brought into our State, a State with high labor standards, a State that believes in good wages for our workers, known professional strikebreakers. There is no doubt about this antiunion busting activity on the part of the publishers of the Journal and the Oregonian. It is an old pattern and technique by the Newhouse newspaper chain dynasty. We need to keep in mind the fact that Samuel Newhouse is not really a newspaperman. He is basically a financier; he is not interested—it is demonstrated in his operations in other States—he is not interested in newspapers; he is interested in what newspapers can make for him by way of profit.

And I think it is a sad thing that the journalistic profession in our State has reached the low that Newhouse has brought to it in the State of Oregon. But those are facts that need to be brought out by an impartial board. Let Newhouse come on in and defend his practices in St. Louis and his practices in some eastern States.

Let us take a moment on this matter of strike insurance. It needs to be pointed out, of course, that publishers couldn't even get their insurance policies registered in the State of New York, because the officials of the State of New York found that this practice is against sound public policy. There is no doubt as to what it is; it is one of the union-busting techniques that combinations of newspaper employers think that they can develop in order to break the newspaper unions. So they had to go to Canada to get a foreign company to give them this kind of insurance.

But I want the people of Oregon to remember that these so-called strikers, who are just as locked out as they are striking, are your neighbors. They send their children to the same schools that your children go to. They go to the same churches. They are men and women who are deserving of the freedom that has been built up over the years in connection with the right of free men and women to collectively bargain for wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The people of Oregon are entitled to know what the facts are in regard to this dispute.

But there is one issue that I want to comment on very briefly, because I think it is very unfortunate that the publishers of the Journal and the Oregonian are guilty of such deception as they have been guilty of in the propaganda against the neewspapermen and women who are on strike in their plants.

They would have you believe that these newspaper workers of theirs are bound contractually to go through a picket line and scab on their fellow workers. It so happens that on March 2, 1939, when I was arbitrating maritime disputes on the west coast, I handed down the first decision in American labor arbitration law, that at least was known at that time, on a very important legal principle that I want to briefly discuss, because it gives the lie to the argument of the editors and publishers of the Oregonian and the Journal.

The case I decided was really based, as far as my decision was concerned, on some great language written by Justice Louis Brandeis back in 1910 before he went to the U.S. Supreme Court and while he was active in the field of labor relations. This case, March 2, 1939, that I decided involved a strike of the so-called clerks and checkers union at Encinal Terminal in the San Francisco Bay. As a result of the strike, not a ship was moving in San Francisco Bay. Why? Because the longshoremen refused to go through the checkers and clerks picket line; a picket line that was stretched in a good-faith labor dispute at Encinal Terminal. The ship owners took the position that under the contract with the Longshoremen they were bound to perform the work as ordered by the employer. After taking long, voluminous testimony on this matter, I handed down a decision on March 2, 1939, which has become a classic in American labor arbitration law, has been followed by many arbitrators since, and has never been upset by the courts. In that decision, and I read from it, I said:

"In the absence of an express agreement that the longshoremen would pass through the picket line of another union on strike, it is to be implied that both parties to the agreement of October 1, 1938, knew or should have known that the longshoremen would not pass through such a picket line. There are certain basic tenets of unionism, a knowledge of which can be reasonably charged to all employers. As pointed out by counsel for the union at the hearing, one of the cardinal principles of unionism is that a union will not permit itself to be used as the means of breaking the strength of another union which at the time is out on strike. The sanctity of picket lines is basic in the teaching and practice of American unionism.

"The arbitrator is compelled by the record in this case, and by a careful analysis of the agreement, to accept the view that the Waterfront Employers Association knew, or should have known, when they entered into the agreement of October 1, 1938, that if a strike situation involving such facts as existed at the Encinal Terminal on February 18, 1939, should arise, the longshoremen, under the agreement, would not be expected or required to go through the picket line."

I say most respectfully that the publishers and editors of the Portland Journal and the Oregonian knew, or should have known, when they entered into collective bargaining agreements with these newspaper unions that no self-respecting union man or woman is going

to scab on a sister union by walking through a good-faith picket line. There is no question about the fact that the stereotypers went out in a good-faith strike over wages, hours, and conditions of employment. No one can expect self-respecting union men or women to scab on the stereotypers union.

So we must face up to the fact that what really is involved basically in this controversy is another attempt on the Newhouse dynasty to set up an open shop in the newspapers of Portland; to subject workers in this great journalistic profession to all the harassment that goes along with an open shop; to the lowering of wages and hours and conditions of employment.

Now it does not follow, may I say, that they are not some merits on the employers side on some of these issues. I have never known a major labor dispute yet that was all one way, but what we need now is to get a relaxation of tension; to set up a tribunal where the rules of reason will prevail and where both sides can come in before an impartial board, present the facts, let that board present the facts and its report to the public with the recommendations as to how the dispute ought to be settled—recommendations not binding upon either side as it is not binding the railroad industry. But my prediction is that if a board really conducts an impartial judicial hearing on this matter, and makes recommendations documented to the evidence presented to the board, the public will back up the board. Both the publishers and the union will recognize that it is in the public interest to voluntarily accept the recommendations of the board.

The time has come for industrial statesmanship on the part of both sides in this controversy and it is the recommendation that I make to both sides.

Mr. President, I have read this brief telecast speech as an introduction to the comments which I shall now make, which will not in themselves take very long, either. I think that short telecast speech summarizes pretty well the operative fact situation which has the city of Portland, Oreg.—and, in fact, our whole State—very much concerned not only about what has happened to good labor relations in the newspaper industry, but also with respect to the effect of the strike on labor relations in other industries.

If the Newhouse dynasty succeeds in breaking these newspaper unions in Portland, it will be but encouragement and inducement for other antilabor employers in our State—and we have our fair share—to try to undercut and destroy unions in their plants, and, second, to set up an open-shop movement in the State of Oregon. So I wish to make some additional comments in regard to this very sad situation.

This labor dispute, as I have said, involves Portland's two daily newspapers, the Oregonian and the Journal. Pitted against each other in this long drawn-out controversy are two contrasting economic groups.

On the one hand we have the employees, who with their families are local residents. They are our neighbors. They attend our churches. They go to our schools. They are employees who possess special skills in the typographical field, many of them having devoted most of their lives to those jobs. They are in Oregon today, as they will be when the dispute is finally settled.

On the other hand we have the Oregonian and the Journal, a daily newspaper monopoly of Portland, whose editorial policies and practices are almost indistinguishable. These papers are in effect one side of the coin. There are no daily newspaper opponents in Portland. This monopoly is dominated by the Oregonian, a member of the financial empire of the Newhouse chain of eastern newspapers and television stations. This monopoly is aided and abetted by mercenaries, imported strikebreakers, hired from the far corners of the Nation, who perform the work of professional strikebreakers. These mercenaries are paid handsomely to take over the jobs of responsible local residents.

In fact, Mr. President, these mercenaries are being put up, for the most part in one or two hotels in Portland, where all their expenses are paid and where they live in concert, Mr. President, in this nefarious occupation of theirs, the occupation of professional strikebreakers.

It is interesting to note that almost immediately after the strike broke out early in November the publishers installed strikebreakers imported from other States, some from as far away as Florida, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Ohio, and Massachusetts. Many are known to be professional strikebreakers.

Toward the end of my speech I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD certain documentation with regard to these strikebreakers, and certain documentation in regard to a professional business organization, surprisingly enough, Mr. President, which exists in this country to supply newspapers with traveling strikebreakers.

There is much evidence and documentation, which I shall later point out, that many months ago some of the strikebreakers in other parts of the country, in conversation, said to people from Oregon who were visiting in the parts of the country where the strikebreakers were at that time, that they expected to be in Portland in a matter of a few months.

There is much evidence that here again, as Newhouse has done elsewhere, there has been a longtime, thorough preparation of the economic warfare that he is conducting against the free men and women who belong to the newspaper unions in Portland.

As I intended to say later—I might as well say it now—I think the Portland case gives us the pilot case which calls upon the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to proceed with an investigation of antiunion practices on the part of certain newspaper publishers. That involves the question of hiring professional strikebreakers, the question of transporting them, paying their expenses, and housing them in the area of the struck newspaper, and the question of strike insurance, about which I shall speak a little later in this speech tonight.

In my judgment these matters call for a thorough investigation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and in due course of time I shall submit a resolution calling for such an investigation. It is not intended to be an investigation limited to the Portland situation, but the Portland situation will be but an example of the need for a thorough nationwide investigation as to what certain antilabor newspaper publishers in this country are up to.

I believe that here, too, the public needs the facts. I am perfectly willing to rely on the final judgment of fairness on the part of the public as the final arbiter in regard to these newspaper publisher practices.

I wish to stress that this is a typical technique and strategy used by the Newhouse empire when it sets out to try to break a newspaper union.

In all good humor I should point out that the Oregonian and the Journal have not been friendly to me since 1952. They have been sticking their poisonous editorial pens into my blood for some years now, and writing uncomplimentary editorials and attacks upon me. Because I feel those newspapers would not welcome any suggestions, I have not publicly expressed an opinion on the newspaper strike until today. I did not want in any way to follow a course of action which anyone could interpret as one which might in the slightest degree make a bad situation worse for the free men and women in the newspaper industry who are out on strike.

However, when the strike committee of the strikers asked me to prepare a television speech on this subject, I agreed to break my silence; and although I have not been making any public statements in regard to the Portland newspaper strike situation, I have been keeping myself thoroughly informed, and in some instances have given my advice and judgment in respect to some of the issues involved.

I would have the people of Oregon and Members of the Senate keep in mind the account of the views I offer on the floor of the Senate tonight concerning the strike, and my suggestions concerning action which might lead to a fair settlement of the dispute.

By and large, the people of Oregon have been given a partisan report as to the merits of the positions taken by the opposing parties. That has been true because practically the only media of newspaper information available to the people of Oregon have been, of course, the newspapers of these publishers, whose employees are out on strike.

It is very interesting to know what has happened. When the strike started the Portland Journal and the Oregonian joined forces. The Journal moved its operations over to the Oregonian building, and they are publishing a joint newspaper.

There are many rumors with respect to which I do not know the facts, as to what the business strategy is in regard to this remarkable merger of the two antiunion newspapers. The Journal publishers continue to deny that they plan to sell out to the Newhouse empire. However, the rumor persists that that is the business strategy of the Newhouse empire in their disputes elsewhere in the Nation, as they have worked to the end of merging, gobbling up, and buying out newspapers which have found themselves in a weakened economic position.

It is interesting to note that it is the Oregonian, owned by the Newhouse empire, which has the strike insurance, which involves one of the very controversial issues which stirred up so much bitter resentment in my State, because more and more people are beginning to recognize the union "busting" purpose of the so-called strike insurance policy. I shall come to that subject later.

I point out that the people of my State have not had access to a full discussion of the pros and cons of this controversy, because they have no newspaper of general circulation to go to, other than the two struck newspapers. The publishers are putting out a joint newspaper. We can take judicial notice of the fact that we have only to read the issues of that newspaper to see that we obtain, from the accounts of the strike in the newspaper of the publishers of the struck plant, a biased and slanted account. Therefore, to a great extent, the people of my State have had to rely upon the views expressed on the pages of the struck newspaper.

An outstanding religious leader of Portland, Dr. Richard M. Steiner, of Portland's First Unitarian Church, stated it very well when he said that, in his opinion, to a large degree, the public has had to rely "upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information."

Later I shall ask consent to place in the RECORD some statements which have been published by other religious leaders in my State, who likewise have deplored the fact that the people of my State have not had access to the newspaper media of information which would guarantee to them unbiased accounts of the issues involved in the strike.

It should be stressed again and again that those who are on strike and those who are observing the picket lines at the Oregonian and the Journal are only asking that the traditional practices of collective bargaining be followed by the newspapers.

The empty words of the Oregonian and the Journal fail to fill the void caused by their unwillingness to cooperate with anyone in the interest of bringing this dispute to a conclusion. They have declined to meet with the Governor of Oregon. They have declined the offer of assistance by Oregon's clergy. In my judgment they have failed to use reasonable efforts at the bargaining table to bring about a fair settlement with their employees.

As I said in my brief telecast speech, which I have already read into the RECORD, Governor Hatfield, of my State, and Senator NEUBERGER, my colleague in the Senate, some weeks ago made the recommendation publicly that the parties to the dispute ought to agree to have a factfinding board appointed and have that board or the parties make a report of the facts to the people of Oregon.

It was a very fair and sensible proposal, but it was the newspapers who rejected it. The unions made clear that they would accept the Hatfield-Neuberger proposal. As Senators will see from the material that I shall insert in the RECORD later, it was the position of the newspapers that they saw no reason for accepting the proposal, because it would only bring the dispute into the arena of politics.

Mr. President, it should be brought into the arena of politics, in the high sense of the term of politics. It was in that sense that Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER made their suggestion. As I have said earlier tonight, the matter now is imbued and filled with the public interest. When the public interest becomes involved in any economic struggle, the officials of government representing a free people have a duty to step in and make proposals for a settlement of the dispute in a way which will protect the public interest and, by protecting the public interest, be fair to the disputants.

At the time they made their proposal, the proposal of Governor Hatfield and Senator NEUBERGER would have accomplished that purpose. Although I happened to be in South America at the time their proposal was made, had I been in the country I would not have hesitated, if asked, to endorse it.

Mr. President, in this case I believe we have gone beyond the stage at which factfinding alone will suffice. I believe we have reached the stage in this dispute where the public interest is so affected that the public is entitled to have the recommendations of fair, impartial, judicial, and competent men as to how they think the dispute on the merits ought to be settled, in fairness to all three parties to the dispute, namely, the newspaper management, the employees, and the public. It is such a proposal that I recommend today. In my judgment, the record of the case shows that the newspaper publishers have failed to use reasonable efforts at the bargaining table to bring about a fair settlement with their employees.

I have arbitrated many major labor cases in my professional career, over a good many years. Although it is important to make one's final judgment based entirely upon the record of evidence which is before him, it is perfectly obvious, as we read what has happened thus far procedurally on the part of the newspaper owners in this case, that they have not participated in good-faith bargaining. The evidence of the strategy that they have used from session to session convinces me that their desire has not been to bargain collectively with the employees but to put the employees in a position whereby they will be compelled to surrender to the employer's terms and demands. No wonder there has been stirred up among the newspaper workers in Portland the attitude "We will dig in for as long as necessary to protect the precious rights for which labor has sacrificed so much over the years to win for itself."

I wish to say that if the employers in this country decide to adopt the tactics being used by the Newhouse empire in the Portland newspaper strike, the country can get ready for militancy on the part of free men and women in the American labor movement the like of which we have not known for some decades. Free men and women in the American labor movement cannot sacrifice these precious rights which are so deeply imbedded now in the whole collective bargaining fabric of American industrial relations.

That is why I am making a plea for a relaxation of tensions, for a recognition on the part of those in the controversy that we have reached a point now where the rules of reason will have to be applied. If they are going to be applied, we will have to bring in a third party in the form of an impartial board to sit in judgment and recommend to the parties and to the public what would be a commonsense solution, issue-by-issue, of this very difficult controversy.

Of course the attitude and practices of the Newhouse empire in its antiunion drive in Portland is not only bad, but it has created a very sad situation. However, that is not surprising if one takes the time to study the tactics and practices of the Newhouse newspaper chain in other parts of the country prior to the strike in Portland.

After all, what can be expected of newspapers that resort to the unscrupulous 19th century practice of importing hired professional strikebreakers to resolve disputes? This conduct is generally shunned by most employers of our day. We can say with pride that that is the case. Therefore I am particularly disappointed that in the year 1960 we would have a newspaper publisher, the head of a great newspaper chain and a great economic empire, resorting to the tactic of importing strikebreakers, which is a tactic that most people, I believe, thought was rapidly disappearing from the whole scene of industrial disputes in our country.

But there it is, rearing its ugly head in the largest city of my State. I rise on the floor of the Senate to protest it. I rise on the floor of the Senate to plead through this speech with the people of the State of Oregon to make clear that there is no place in Oregon for a return to the strike-busting tactics adopted by antiunion employers in the 1880's, 1890's, and early 1900's, who took the stiff-necked position that they would kill the union rather than bargain with it in good faith and agree to reasonable terms of hours, wages, and conditions of employment.

That these newspapers have warped my words in the past and have presented half truths about me is not too surprising, because that is their political stock in trade. But now they are blasting their employees of many years and at the same time are wrapping a cloak of alleged goodness around hired strike breakers. Their regular employees on strike or observing the picket lines are fighting for what they believe is right and in the best interests of the working people and trade union members of Portland and Oregon in general.

The publishers are simply running true to form. They have fought liberal thought. Now they turn their wrath on their employees who want only the time-honored processes of collective bargaining observed so that their position may be considered by management and a settlement finally reached.

The Portland newspaper monopoly has recently been issuing sanctimonious edi-

torials alleging a breach of contracts by the various typographical unions. But these editorials fail to point out some significant facts.

The Stereotypers' Union contract had terminated before its members went out on strike; the Printers' Union contract had expired on September 15, the Photoengravers' Union members worked for 2 days until the contract expired on November 15, then they respected the picket line.

The Newspaper Guild contract does not have a no-strike clause and nothing in the contract requires the union to go through a picket line; some members of the Newspaper Guild returned to work, others have not.

The Pressmen's Union contract expired December 31, 1959, and prior to that time the international officers of the union ordered the members to fulfill the union's contract with the publishers, thereby demonstrating the international union's responsibility.

By secret ballot local members of the Pressmen's Union voted 108 to 1 to go out on strike and on January 1 took strike action; the Paper Handlers voted 22 to 0 to strike.

The International Typographical Union had no contract, but held 13 meetings with the publishers prior to the time of the strike, without making progress; the stereotypers met with the publishers 18 times prior to the strike without being able to resolve the dispute.

The Portland newspaper monopoly, like all backward-looking employers, relied heavily upon legalisms in dealing labor relations. Employers of this type refuse to recognize the facts of life in these relationships and proceed unrealistically to ignore the fact that no self-respecting member of a union wants to cross the picket line of a sister union when a labor dispute is in progress.

If the strike should succeed, the next logical step, of course, would be the operation of nonunion papers. That is really what the Newhouse newspaper chain is seeking. I am particularly concerned over the fact that the Federal law now on the books does not effectively prohibit the importation of strikebreakers as now practiced by the Oregonian and Journal. At my request the Library of Congress supplied a brief memorandum on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum and the text of the Byrnes Act be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum and act were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1959.

To: The Honorable WAYNE MORSE.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: The Byrnes Act.

The Byrnes Act prohibits not only the transportation of persons to obstruct or interfere with peaceful picketing but applies also to the transportation of persons with the intent to employ them to obstruct or interfere with the right of employees to organize collectively for bargaining purposes. Because this law has been invoked infrequently, there are no recorded court decisions which would show just how far the law goes in restricting management's right to replace strikers with new employees brought in from other States. (BNA Labor Policy and Practices. Labor Relations, 60: 482.)

TRANSPORTATION OF STRIKEBREAKERS (BYRNES ACT)

(Act of June 24, 1936, 49 Stat. 1899, Public Law 776, ch. 746, 74th Cong., 2d sess., as last amended by act of May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 30, 63 Stat. 94, 18 U.S.C., ch. 57, sec. 1231.)

An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whoever willfully transports in interstate or foreign commerce any person who is employed or is to be employed for the purpose of obstructing or interfering by force or threats with (1) peaceful picketing by employees during any labor controversy affecting wages, hours, or conditions of labor, or (2) the exercise by employees of any of the rights of self-organization or collective bargaining; or

Whoever is knowingly transported in or travels in interstate or foreign commerce for any of the purposes enumerated in this section—

Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

This section shall not apply to common carriers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is fair to charge employers with the knowledge of the fact that union men and women by the thousands will always insist upon acting in their individual capacity if there is an attempt made, even by the union itself, to force them across a legitimate picket line. This is a very deep-seated conviction on the part of a union member. It is something which is charged with great emotionalism and deep feeling. There is hardly anything which can raise the blood pressure of a good union man or woman quicker than the suggestion by a brother union member that he has become a scab by crossing a picket line.

My colleagues in the Senate have heard me plead over the years from the floor, as we have discussed labor legislation, about this matter. I have tried to point out that this happens to be one of the facts of life in connection with the union movement. The history of the American labor movement has too many crosses which are revered by union men and women; crosses symbolizing the lives of union men and women who have been willing to sacrifice their lives, in the earlier days of militant struggle, to gain the right to join a union and to insist upon the requirement of having an employer bargain collectively over wages, hours, and conditions of employment. The literature in this field is voluminous.

In 1960, the Newhouse empire is not going to turn back the clock, and the combination of antiunion employers in this country is not going to turn it back, because free men and women in a free society will not allow it.

It is a sad thing that the great State of Oregon, with its wonderful record over the years, of fair labor conditions, high wages, and a high standard of living for our workers, is confronted with this termite attempt on the part of the Newhouse empire to undermine the citadel and temple of freedom represented by free collective bargaining in the State of Oregon.

It will continue to be my plea and my prayer that reason will come to prevail in this economic crisis in my State. Both sides will recognize now that eventually this strike has to be settled; that eventually it will be settled; and that when it is settled, undoubtedly it will be settled, in part, because an aroused and enlightened public opinion makes clear to all concerned in the struggle, and to the officials of government, that a fair settlement must be provided and carried out. If eventually—can we not ask the question again?—why not now? Why let this waste, why let this suffering, why let this ill feeling which is building up and mounting day by day, continue?

To the end of trying to provide a common sense suggestion for a fair way out for all concerned, I offer the suggestion that the deans or members of the faculties of three or five or seven schools of journalism in this country be accepted by the parties to the dispute as a fact-finding board having the authority to make recommendations for the settlement of the strike, with the clear understanding, just as under the Railway Labor Act of 1926, that the recommendations are not to be binding upon the parties. If the suggestion of having this done by the deans of the schools of journalism is objectionable for some reason or is rejected by one or both of the parties for a good reason of which I am not aware, I am not married to that particular personnel arrangement.

What is wrong with asking some recognized, impartial agency or individual to appoint a fact-finding, recommending board? So far as I am concerned, when I was on the War Labor Board and had an opportunity to observe the policies followed by the U.S. Mediation and Conciliation Service in those rare instances in which they appointed arbitrators, they did a remarkably fair job in the selection of impartial men.

I call upon them to do it. I call upon the Governor of the State to do it.

I recognize that judges are rather hesitant to serve on boards of arbitration; they hesitate because they believe that if they were to serve on such boards, then some how or other, in some way or other, they might be looked upon as bringing the strict judicial approach into nonjudicial controversies. However, there are instances in which the parties to such disputes have agreed to have a judicial officer serve on a board to make findings of fact and recommendations; and that possibility should be considered in this instance.

Mr. President, there are available to the parties to this dispute, many sources for the selection of impartial persons to serve on a board to take testimony, study the case, and make findings of fact, recommendations, and a report. I suggest that consideration be given to including on such a board members of schools of journalism, because I believe that such persons know the newspaper industry and are thoroughly familiar with the problems which confront newspaper publishers and workers. It seems

to me that from the standpoint of experience, members of schools of journalism are very well qualified to serve on boards to make such findings of fact, recommendations, and reports.

But certainly there can be no excuse for rejection of my suggestion by either party to the dispute, on the ground that it would be difficult to obtain impartial members. In our free society we have not reached the point where it is impossible to find a procedure which any fair-minded person will regard as a reasonable one for the selection of other fair-minded persons to serve on a board to judge the facts in connection with such a dispute.

It is too bad that the newspaper industry, which is the beneficiary of the precious trust which accompanies the rights under the freedom-of-the-press clause of the Constitution—and they are constitutional rights, not privileges—should betray its trust in the way the Newhouse empire has been doing in connection with its union-breaking campaign in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. President, I believe all Members of the Senate know that if any proposal to infringe upon freedom of the press in the Nation were made, I would be in the forefront of those who would defend and insist upon protecting the right of the newspapers to have full enjoyment of freedom of the press.

But, Mr. President, other freedoms are precious, too. Among them is the right of union members to enjoy free collective bargaining. I need not tell the Senate or the people of Oregon that if there ever came a time when that freedom was infringed upon or was placed under destructive restrictions, we would then begin to lose a large part of our freedoms.

It has often been stated—but the statement still needs to be repeated—that when freedom in any country begins to wane, its wane usually begins with an attack on labor. In any country in which attempts to destroy freedom are made, the first ones are usually attempts to destroy the freedom of the workers.

Mr. President, I do not say there is any danger of a loss of freedom in our Nation as a whole. But I say we must be constantly vigilant and on guard against any attempt, at any time, in any segment of the body politic, to impair the full enjoyment of the rights of free men and women. In my judgment, those rights are being impaired in the Portland newspaper strike.

I believe we now need a procedure which will bring a return to reason in this situation; and for that purpose I have this evening offered my proposal.

Mr. President, I am about to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, various editorials and articles which bear upon the Portland newspaper strike. I have selected them from the voluminous material with regard to the strike which has come to my office. In selecting them, I have been motivated by a desire to present material on both sides of the controversy.

In this material will be found editorials, from the Oregonian-Journal, in which all sides of the controversy are set forth; also an article which sets forth in full the statements made by the members of a television panel, in the course of a broadcast in Portland, presenting the workers' side of the controversy. In the same article the editors of the Oregonian-Journal have set forth their rebuttal to the contentions made by the panelists on the program.

I believe it important that all Members of the Senate read this material, in order to ascertain the contentions of the parties to the controversy. After Senators complete their reading of this material, I am perfectly willing to rest my case on their judgment of it.

I urge that this material be read by all Senators, not because I shall ask the Senate to intervene in the Portland newspaper strike, but because this material discloses, in connection with the strike, a pattern of activity by some newspaper publishers which, in my judgment, calls for an investigation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of certain antilabor tactics, policies, and strategies by some newspaper editors.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a number of newspaper articles and editorials which I believe present a fair synopsis of the employer contentions in the Portland newspaper dispute.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Nov. 25, 1959]

SO OUR READERS MAY KNOW

Fifty-odd employees of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal represented by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 commenced a strike against the two newspaper companies at 5 a.m., November 10, 1959. Approximately 850 employees represented by other unions refused to cross the picket line of the Stereotypers' Union. The unions representing the 850 employees, with the sole exception of Multnomah Typographical Union No. 58, had valid existing contracts with the newspaper companies when the strike commenced. Not a single contract with the newspaper companies held by any union gave the union or the employees it represented the right to refuse to cross the stereotypers' picket line or the right to refuse to perform the work for which they had been employed. In every case the sanctity of contract was ignored. The employees and their unions flouted their contracts and violated their terms.

To avoid a strike the companies during the week preceding the strike in the presence of Federal Mediator Elmer Williams:

1. Offered to let an impartial arbitrator establish the number of men to be employed on new machinery during the life of the contract if the union raised a grievance over the number of men assigned to work on the machine by management. This offer was rejected by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 and by its international union.

2. Offered to submit all matters of difference over the terms of a new contract to final and binding impartial arbitration. This offer was rejected by Stereotypers' Union No. 48 and its international union.

3. Invited, in fact especially requested, the president of the international union to come to Portland and negotiate with the companies after he and his executive board had told the local union they could not agree to avoid a strike by arbitrating the terms of a new contract.

This request made upon the International Stereotyper Union President James Sampson through the local union was rejected and Stereotypers Union No. 48 continued to insist that (a) four men be employed on a one-man machine, (b) foremen must be union members, and (c) the companies recognize their right of substitution, even though it meant payment of time and one-half for a full shift to a replacement employee.

When the companies on November 9, 1959, received word that the stereotypers would commence a strike on November 10, 1959, at 5 a.m. they—

1. Through department heads and supervisors instructed all employees to report for work as usual at their regular starting times on November 10, 1959, even though they might have to cross a picket line.

2. Through proper union officials of each group of employees requested that the employees be told by their union they should honor their union's contract with the companies and report for work as usual even though they might have to cross a picket line.

When the pickets went on at 5 a.m. on November 10, 1959:

1. Employees represented by the Portland Newspaper Guild who ordinarily commence work at 5 a.m. at the Oregon Journal refused to cross the picket line.

2. As time went by employees of the Journal represented by the Typographical Union, Pressmen's Union, Mailers Union, Machinists Union, and Paper Handlers Union also refused to cross the picket line.

3. Employees represented by these same unions scheduled to report later in the morning at the Oregonian also refused to cross the picket line.

4. All entrances at the Journal were open to employees who wished to report for work until 12 noon on November 10, 1959. After that hour, only the main entrance remained open.

5. All regular entrances and employee entrances remained open at the Oregonian throughout the day November 10, 1959.

At mid-morning November 10, 1959, the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, recognizing that production necessity would permit operation in only one plant, agreed to produce a joint paper in the Oregonian plant using supervisory personnel and loyal employees of the advertising and circulation departments of both papers who agreed to help with the production effort. Approximately 750 loyal employees remain at work with the two newspapers.

At about 2 p.m. on November 10, 1959, the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal agreed to continue temporarily a joint publication in the Oregonian plant until such a time as production in their separate plants could be effectively resumed.

To carry out this agreement, immediate steps were taken to make individual offers of full-time permanent employment with the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal as separate newspapers to trained production personnel. This offer was made throughout the United States. The response to the offer has been and continues to be heavy.

Offers of permanent employment to perforator operator trainees and other mechanical trainees have been made and continue to be made in the help wanted classified columns of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal.

Joint production will be continued until separate production by the Journal can be effectively resumed in the Journal plant.

Our readers must know that—

1. The stereotypers struck despite means of peaceful settlement offered by the companies.

2. Employees represented by other unions refused to cross stereotypers' picket lines even though they were requested and instructed to report to work by the companies.

3. Union and employees alike flouted contracts and made mockery of contracts negotiated in good faith through collective bargaining.

4. The Journal has joined hands with the Oregonian as a production necessity. It is an independent home-owned corporation and intends to return to separate production in the Journal plant when the production problems for the opera'ion of the two plants have been solved.

SO OUR READERS MAY KNOW—No. 2

As the Portland newspaper strike enters its third week, union propagandists are redoubling their efforts to confuse the public and compound the difficulties of settlement. This fanatical campaign of self-justification is being conducted not only on behalf of the stereotypers who struck the papers in the face of the publishers' offer to arbitrate. It is being conducted also in defense of those other unions whose members rushed into the streets—and into the picket lines—most in flagrant violation of their contracts, all in complete disregard of the publishers' offer of continued work for those who would stay on the job and honor their contracts or would bargain for new contracts in the normal manner.

The stereotypers are represented in this campaign by the unions as having been pushed into the strike by a management demand to dictate the manning of a new machine. The truth is that management was willing to negotiate and even arbitrate the number of men to be employed on the MAN plate caster after the machine had been given a fair trial in production.

It was the Stereotypers Union that insisted that its antiquated make-work rules should govern the manning of the machine for an indefinite period. The manufacturer has stated that the new machine calls for only one man. The union's offer to "negotiate after the machine was installed" meant, simply, that the companies would be required to operate the machine with four men. This represented no savings at all over manning on present machines. Worse than mere featherbedding, this union position was tantamount to a demand that the publishers agree not to install the new machine, since its only value is as a labor-saving device. The local union's claim that the companies have rejected the traditional method for determining the number of men to be employed on stereotyping equipment, namely through negotiation between the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the International Stereotypers' Union is based on a false premise. George N. Dale, for 17 years head of the ANPA labor office in Chicago, categorically denies that any such negotiations have ever taken place or are now contemplated between the employers' national trade association and the international union.

But the manning of the MAN machine was only 1 issue, not 1 out of 3 but 1 out of 20 or more issues, which the union left unbargained or half bargained on the table when its members hurried out to call the strike.

The unlimited right of lay-off, virtually unknown outside the printing trades and not permitted in many printing trades contracts, had been discussed and an impasse had been reached because of the union's refusal to consider any practical solution to the companies' problem of resultant overtime. The union's promise of a straight-time substitute for a regular employee laying off for his own convenience was an empty gesture. It could only result, in most cases, in the companies incurring overtime at the end of the week when the companies needed extra help at straight-time rates.

The publishers and the union bargained and deadlocked over a contract requirement, believed by the companies to be illegal under recent decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, under which the foreman must become a member of the union and take an oath to enforce certain unlawful closed-shop rules laid down by the international. The companies did not say that foremen might not voluntarily join the union.

Hardly considered at the end of the 18 bargaining sessions were the usual union demands on wages, hours, and fringe benefits. The companies had made it clear, however, both to the stereotypers and to the typographical union, that they had no objection to, and in fact favored, a health and welfare program or other union elected fringes. For 4 years, the companies have proposed that the union take health and welfare contributions out of their negotiated wage-cost package, thereby giving themselves a tax advantage. Most unions rejected this. The stereotypers and typographers specifically demanded and obtained a cash settlement instead. The publishers renewed their proposal this year.

Why, then, did the strike occur November 10? The conclusion is inescapable that the stereotypers, who boasted across the bargaining table that they had obtained "100 percent support" from the other unions, contracts or no contracts, hoped, intended, and confidently expected to shut down the two Portland newspapers at the onset of the pre-Christmas advertising and shopping season so that they might force their demands upon a prostrate Oregonian and Oregon Journal—economic consequences to the community notwithstanding.

So the stereotypers did strike in accordance with their timetable, when it would hurt the newspapers the most, and the other unions went out with the stereotypers, most in cynic disregard for their contract commitments. But part of the plan failed. The Oregonian and the Oregon Journal did not capitulate or lie down and die as metropolitan newspapers are expected to do when confronted with a plantwide strike.

These two competing newspapers joined forces temporarily to publish jointly under a combined masthead and thus to maintain service as best they could to readers and advertisers in Portland and the Pacific Northwest. That service is improving and will continue to improve no matter how long the strike lasts. The Journal will resume publication in its own plant when the production problems for a two-plant operation are solved.

Meanwhile—back at the bargaining table—the negotiators will try to unscramble the omelet of old issues and new problems raised by the strike itself. With all the broken contracts lying around, the question will arise how any agreement can be signed with these unions and be worth the paper it is written on. In fact, this basic question of union integrity and the sanctity of contracts now becomes the major problem—a problem which goes to the very foundation of the collective bargaining relationship.

In the stereotypers' strike and the walkout of the unions, Humpty-Dumpty had a great fall. It remains to be seen whether Humpty-Dumpty can be put back together again.

INTERUNION'S BLUEPRINT FOR ACTION

The following is a complete text of a TV program broadcast over KGW–TV on Friday night, December 11:

"ANNOUNCER. Views expressed on the following program are not necessarily those of KGW–TV or the Pioneer Broadcasting Co. The Portland interunion strike committee presents 'A Blueprint for Action,' another report to the people bringing you the big story of the Portland newspaper strike. Here now is James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO.

"Mr. MARR. Tonight the talk on interunion newspaper strike committee presents 'A Blueprint for Action.' In our prior programs we have given a factual picture of the demands of management and the conciliatory attitude of the unions involved. We have presented a panel of responsible business, professional, and trade union representatives who have spoken in favor of the position taken by the unions. Last week we told the story of the strike directly from the mouths of those most closely involved in the strike-lockout—the strikers and their families—of those who are suffering not only economic hardship but also the anguish brought about by threatening telephone calls demanding that they give up their union activity or else. And we do not accuse the newspaper managements for being responsible for the threatening phone calls. We should not be fooled for 1 minute. The Portland public is being shortchanged by the struck newspapers. For the hybrid newspaper that is being published behind curtained windows is charging double rates for classified advertising for a reduced circulation. The same newspaper, representing itself to be a joint venture publication incorporating both the Oregonian and the Journal, is being written by only a small fraction of the number of the normal news staff. A hundred and forty newsmen and photographers, members of the Portland Newspaper Guild, are respecting the picket line. The working press is not working. Management is filling the news columns with wire-service reports and an occasional local story. The unions do not believe that newspaper management has bargained in good faith and feel that newspaper management has failed to keep faith with the reading public by endeavoring to publish some kind of a paper in order to try to maintain their display advertising accounts, while at the same time they are probably receiving substantial strike insurance. It is interesting to note that the largest local advertising in the struck newspaper is the largest non-union department store in Portland. A blueprint for action must be based on fact. To clearly determine the facts we have asked Keith Burns, deputy district attorney for Multnomah County, to examine representatives of the striking Stereotypers Union and members of the other unions involved in this dispute. Mr. Burns.

"KEITH BURNS. There are many questions—burning questions—in the minds of the public regarding the current newspaper strike. As we are not in any way connected with the strike or the unions involved, I hope that I will be able to ask of those present some of the very questions that you as members of the public may have in mind. Mr. Cotner, it is my understanding that you are a member of the scale or negotiating committee of Stereotypers' Local 48, and that you have been present during the meetings of your union with the management of Portland's daily newspaper. Tell me, Mr. Cotner, what in your judgment, is responsible for the failure of management and the union to get together on the matter of this new machine that has become such an issue in this strike?

"TED COTNER. Mr. Burns, throughout the more than 20 bargaining sessions that we've had with management, the question of the number of men required to operate this machine and the method of which their manning will be determined has been a continuing stumbling block. Our union has made many concessions to management in respect to our position in regarding this machine. Our present position, which seems reasonable to me and which I feel certain the public will feel is reasonable, is simply this: First of all, this MAN machine, which is manufactured in Germany, is not installed in the Oregonian. Actually, the management of the Oregonian has only stated that they intend to buy such a machine sometime in the future. Now, it is my understanding that if the company laid the cash

on the line tomorrow, it would be at least a year before this machine could be delivered. However, during the negotiations and in the interest of settling this strike, the union has offered to operate the machine with the X number of men—in other words, the number found to be necessary to operate the machine for the life of any contract arrived through these current negotiations without any work stoppage or strike at the time the new machine is introduced. We ask that the union, in conjunction with management, shall determine the number of men required to operate the machine safely and to the best interests of the company in terms of production. The company has said "No" to this and insists that the manning of this machine be left entirely up to its foreman as concerning the number of employees to operate it safely.

"KEITH BURNS. Briefly, then, you have said that the union will man the machine when and if it is installed with X number of men. You ask that management and the union jointly determine the number of stereotypers necessary to do the job safely and quickly.

"Mr. COTNER. Yes; that is our position.

"Mr. BURNS. And management has said "No" to this—that it wants the right to determine the number of men required to operate the machine.

"Also with us this evening is Perry Badgley, international representative of the Stereotypers Union. Mr. Badgley has also been present at some of the more recent negotiating sessions. Mr. Badgley, what are your impressions of negotiations to date?

"PERRY BADGLEY. Well, Mr. Burns, I can say, without any hesitation, that during the 15 years that I have been active in negotiations in behalf of our international union, I have never run into a situation of the nature to be found here in Portland. Time and time again during these negotiations sessions the union has been willing to make concessions to management. Each time concessions are made, which we feel should result in bringing the parties closer together, management still will not agree with our proposal which we feel to be reasonable. Never have we gotten down to the bedrock consideration of the union's proposals. It is obvious to me that the problems that have been presented by management are not the real problems at all. They serve only as a guide to hide the real intent and purpose of the strike. To me the most damning proposal to come out of the negotiations are the demand of management that they want us to take into our union the imported strikebreakers who are now operating the machines that our members, many of whom are long-time residents of Portland, operated before the strike Management now asks that these imported strikebreakers be given priority of employment over those regular employees who were forced out on strike by what we believe to be unreasonable demands of management. The MAN machine, the foreman clause, and that of the right of substitution have been used by management as a smokescreen issue behind which they can hide their intent to establish a nonunion operation for their publications. This position taken by the company that strikebreakers be given job priority over their other employees now on strike should serve as a cue to the minds of the public when they consider who is right and who is wrong in this current strike situation. For if its demand for the vicious undercutting of their own employees is indicative of the frame of mind of newspaper management, this serves only to show them in their true light.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Cotner, Mr. Badgley has mentioned the foreman clause issue. Can you tell us briefly what is involved in this disputed issue?

"Mr. COTNER. To make what has been a rather long story throughout these negotiations somewhat shorter, I will tell you of the exact position of the stereotype union on this issue and this position again has been arrived at on the part of the union as a matter of a concession to the demands of management in the interest of bringing this strike to a conclusion. We ask, simply, that the matter of whether or not a foreman be a member of the union be left entirely up to the individual foreman. This is all we are asking. To this management says "No." They have contended that it is illegal for foremen to belong to the union. We contend that it is legal. In recent weeks the Federal circuit court of appeals has upheld our convictions.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Cotner, why has this matter become an issue? Why do you feel that a foreman should have a right to belong to the union?

"Mr. COTNER. Well first of all, it is important to understand that a foreman in our trade is a working foreman. He works right along with the journeymen on the job. These foremen have come up through the ranks, first as an apprentice, then as a journeyman, later as an assistant foreman and then the foreman, all of which, incidentally, are covered by the contract. Union membership in a craft union is a valuable possession of the member. He has worked at the trade for years to become proficient in his job and become a recognized journeyman. We ask only that the right of self-determination be left up to the individual when he becomes a foreman. We ask only that he be given the right to continue his association and membership in an organization representing his trade if this be his choice.

"Mr. BURNS. Mr. Badgley, when you spoke before you mentioned another issue, the right of substitution. Can you explain briefly what is the area of disagreement in this matter?

"Mr. BADGLEY. Well, the matter of the right of substitution can be stated very simply. The union asks that, if it is necessary for a stereotyper to take time off from his job to attend to personal business, that the union be given the right to furnish in his place a fully qualified stereotyper who will work at the straight-time rate. Management states that such substitutions result in occasion where a time-and-a-half rate must be hired. They also demand that an employee must go to his foreman and his right to time off will be determined completely on the say-so of the foreman. We contend that if a man, for instance, wants to take time off because of a death in his family, and the union is willing to supply a qualified journeyman stereotyper in his place at the straight-time rate, that he should be entitled to do so without having to give an accounting to his foreman exactly why it is he needs the time to attend to his personal business. We feel that if a substitute can be supplied the company at no additional expense to the company, that the matter of the right of substitution fails to stand up as an issue to be opposed by management in this strike situation.

"Mr. BURNS. It seems to me that you have both answered the questions fairly regarding where the union stands on this issue. I know by your comment, and it is apparent from your tone of voice, that it is your feeling that the union has reached the end of the road in terms of concessions to newspaper management as regards the matters at issue. As a local union representative, Mr. Cotner, can you tell me how your membership now feels about this matter?

"Mr. COTNER. My union is 100 percent behind their negotiating committee and their officers. The apparent hope on the part of newspaper management that our members will pick up and drift away is totally unrealistic. We are prepared to wait out the time that it requires the Oregonian and Journal to learn that it is just too expensive to continue operations with hired outside strikebreakers, and all the costs connected with maintaining this type of struck operation. We appreciate the tremendous public support that has been given our cause in terms of newspaper cancellations on the part of the thousands of individuals. Our participation in this and the television programs that have preceded it, I feel, have been crystal clear evidence of our complete willingness to let the public know what has led to the strike, what the current strike developments are and, still more important, that we are going to stand our ground against imported strikebreakers, telephone threats—and, again we do not accuse management of these threats—and our belief that management has failed to bargain in good faith, and management's failure even to meet with the Governor of Oregon to discuss the settlement of this dispute. We are determined that when this strike is settled the Portland daily newspapers will continue to be manned by union employees paid a fair living wage and contributing their part to the social and civic betterment of our community. We ask only that the public be aware of the fact, and being aware of the fact, join us in our fight against those concepts of newspaper management that have resulted in the importation of strikebreakers and the continuance of management's attitude alien to the long-established practice of bargaining collectively with their employees.

"Mr. BURNS. It is my understanding that the reporters and photographers regularly employed by Portland's two daily newspapers are respecting the stereotypers' picket line. We have with us this evening Mr. Charles Dale, international representative of the Newspaper Guild who is in Portland representing the Newspaper Guild during the current stereotypers' strike. Mr. Dale, the guild members are the regular news gatherers for the Oregonian and the Journal and perhaps those who by virtue of their work are close to the pulse beat of our community. How do they feel about this strike?

"CHARLES DALE. Well, on the eve of the Portland stereotypers' strike, the Portland Newspaper Guild met and for over 2 hours debated all aspects of the crisis. Then in secret ballot they voted overwhelmingly to honor the stereotyper picket line. The decision came despite the fact that the guild has a contract in existence with both dailies, a contract that will not expire until next June. The guild's action was not taken lightly. Since the strike began, guild members have been honoring the picket line as a matter of survival, for this strike did not come as any great surprise. Evidence is shown that the Portland newspaper unions would have been facing a strike sooner or later. It was nearly the guild in October, stereotypers last month and this, it could have been the printers or the mailers or the pressmen or perhaps the guild next June. I do not believe this strike could have been avoided, even if the union had wanted to concede all of the conditions demanded by the publishers, even if the unions had been willing to give up all of the traditional contract clauses. I believe this.

"Mr. BURNS. This seem to me like a statement that could be enlarged upon. Exactly why do you feel that the strike could not have been avoided?

"Mr. DALE. Well it appears to me there has been a great deal of a high degree of planning for the strike by management prior to the time the strike actually began. Witness the influx of professional strikebreakers within hours after the stereotypers' picket line first went up in the early morning hours of November 10. That very afternoon a paper came out, a makeshift product to be sure, but a paper just the same. Next day and in the days that followed the quality of the paper improved as more and more

strikebreakers arrived from all over the country. By this time last week, guild members, reporters, and editors had uncovered upward of 70 strikebreakers. If any have left recently is unknown. But certainly more are arriving all the time. This, despite the resentment Portland residents feel against such tactics, despite the feeling that the clock in labor-management relations has been turned back decades by the actions of the two daily newspapers. Strikebreakers are new in the Northwest, but professional strikebreakers are not new to the American Newspaper Guild. They are even more familiar to the International Typographical Union, the pressmen, the stereotypers, and the mailers, for repeatedly in the East and in the South we have found ourselves faced with the same problem, professional strikebreakers brought in not only to run the paper after the strike begins but even before negotiations have deadlocked. They are brought in and kept as standbys in hotel rooms and serve as a constant threat to the negotiating union. They are a continual menace to collective bargaining in good faith. You know it is sometimes very difficult to convince people of this fact—strikebreakers are a menace to the living standards of the entire community. Let them break down the unions in the newspaper business. Let them make it possible for the two publishers to operate without union contracts and before long the temptation of low wage rates, of no contracts, will be too great for even some of the best employers, and in will come more strikebreakers and down will go the living standards. Here in Portland the guild has collected evidence of a parade of the hardest and most experienced strikebreakers. We have the McCoy leadership. Leo McCoy, of Oklahoma City or Galveston, Tex. He is a veteran of strikebreaking operations, Las Vegas, Kennewick, Oklahoma City, Galveston, and Ypsilanti, Mich., are among his shadowy assignments. Then there is L. B. Maxwell, born December 22, 1927, a veteran of the Monroe, La., strike, a member of the notorious strikebreaking crew of Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein. A lack of time prohibits me giving details of other strikebreakers known to be working on the two struck dailies. Of course, they are being ably assisted by local residents who have been attracted to the papers by promises of high hourly rates, incentive bonuses, and so forth. Hardened strikebreakers, schooled in the art of killing unions and stealing jobs, are no longer a source of surprise to international union employees. We have become accustomed to their faces. One thing that never fails to surprise us, however, is the reaction of the local people who, seeing the possibility of a fast buck by scabbing reach out and grab it. That newspapers, which in most communities stand as a symbol of freedom and justice, should stoop to the tactics now being practiced by the Oregonian and the Journal, is in my judgment, deplorable. Many members of the general public have made their feelings known by refusing to accept into their homes newspapers which are responsible for bringing into Portland such an undesirable element as professional strikebreakers.

"Mr. BURNS. Thank you, Mr. Dale. Now I would like to ask Mr. Chet Rookledge, a lifelong printer, who I understand has watched the growth and development of free collective bargaining over a period of 40 years how he feels the current strike situation compares with labor-management disputes in the newspaper field in past years. Mr. Rookledge, how do you feel about the position taken by management in the current strike?

"CHET ROOKLEDGE. Before I get into the direct question of the strike, Keith, I feel it is important to point out that through the years past, by means of good faith collective bargaining, certain rights have accrued to the union worker. I have been a union worker at my trade of printer since 1916. I am proud of my craft. It is an old and established one. Our international membership is over 100,000. We were one of the six founders of the American Federation of Labor. As for myself I will be 63 years of age this coming January. My race is nearly run. But for the younger members of my union, and all other organized working people in this community of ours the struggle now going on between newspaper management on one hand and the union employees on the other has an ugly, disturbing undertone in the avowed intent of management to publish by the use of imported strikebreakers. The pattern to this person seems clear. Break one link of solidarity and you break all. Nonunionize a major industry in an economic area and soon it spreads throughout the web of all industry, soon very soon, you have lowered living standards and a breakdown of the civic health of the community follows. Witness the nonunion Southern States. The city of Portland has had its labor disputes, some short, some long. In my industry, newspaper publishing, this is the first time locally that avowed imported strikebreakers have been used by the management to continue their operations when faced with a labor dispute. We ask the question. Why? Is this the Portland that you and I know? The responsibility for a condition like this must be laid at the door of a complete breakdown in bargaining by management. This is not the Portland way. We all know the effects of a malignant growth upon human body. By surgery we cut it out. In the case of the newspaper strike, there has been imposed by management a malignant growth of nonunionism on the economic body of this area. How do we rectify and correct this malignancy? We cut this growth out by the economic reprisal of permanently stopping our subscriptions to these struck newspapers and by asking our friends and business associates not to advertise in this combined attempt at a metropolitan newspaper that is being published at the Oregonian plant by nonunion personnel. There are other good newspapers in the immediate area to which you can subscribe. They are all published by union craftsmen, under union contracts, arrived at in good faith bargaining, and include the Vancouver Columbian, the Oregon City Enterprise, the Oregon Labor Press, and Monroe Sweetland's weekly Milwaukie Review. My friends, this is the blueprint. By firm positive action on the part of the citizens of this area as individuals and collectively, this malignancy on the economic body of the area can be removed. I wish to point out that this TV program has provided a means to the Portland interunion strike committee to bring to you the honest and confirmed facts concerning the threats to the wives and children, as well as the workers, on strike at Portland's two daily newspapers. It is important to note in this connection that were imported strikebreakers being used in any other labor dispute in this area, other than by the newspapers themselves, these acts of intimidation and violence would be front-page news.

"Mr. BURNS. It would appear to me that the union representatives here this evening have answered my questions concerning the basic issues involved in the current strike situation fully and completely. I can only wonder if the management of Portland's two daily newspapers would have submitted to the same examination. Here now to summarize this evening's program and to present the union's blueprint for action is James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO.

"Mr. MARR. You have heard representatives of the Stereotypers' Union now on strike tell of their many concessions to management during the course of their negotiations. You have heard them state their feelings of utter frustration when after over 20 meetings with management each forward step taken by the union is blocked by new and in the end unreasonable demands made on the part of the newspapers. The final insult by management is the demand that the imported strikebreakers be given priority over the employees now on strike. Charles Dale, the international representative of the Newspaper Guild, has presented detailed and factual information concerning the use of strikebreakers on the part of the struck publications. These professional strikebreakers are alien to Oregon, both in terms of their regular residence and their philosophy. That the owners and management of Portland's two daily newspapers should resort to such tactics is not to be condoned by the public. The public unquestionably feels that the newspapers have a moral public responsibility just as they have to their own employees. Newspapers traditionally pride themselves on complete and factual reporting and independent editorial policy. It is by these means that they are known to be one of the foremost architects of public opinion. Let us hope and pray that it is not their desire to mold a public in their own image today.

"Why, we ask, when news concerns the newspapers, does it cease to be news. Why do we have to depend upon television, radio, and our own labor press to bring the facts concerning the strike to the people of Portland?

"We know that it has not only been since the strike that the Oregonian has drawn a paper curtain over its pressroom windows to hide out what goes on inside from public view. Is it possible that they feel that, by drawing a news curtain over their bargaining methods and their importation of strikebreakers, those issues which could be damaging to the newspapers in the eyes of the public will simply disappear.

"Certainly, as far as their coverage of the strike is concerned, it is safe to say that the joint-venture newspaper being published by nonunion employees is presenting the public with only half of the news.

"Nor can it be said that they have done any better editorially. Time and time again on these telecasts, the question of strike insurance being held by one or both publications has been raised. At no time to date has the hybrid newspaper in either of its editorial columns denied this fact. Could it be that this is an instance where silence is literally golden? Contrary to the position taken by the struck newspapers, the unions involved have taken you behind the scenes in the Portland newspaper strike. They have purchased this television program and three others in order to present the facts concerning the current status of negotiations. They have presented a member of the clergy, a past president of the Portland League of Women Voters, and a businessman on one of their programs to assess the public's point of view toward the strike. The unions have hired neither a private police force nor the likes of strikebreakers to maintain their position. They have only suggested, if you believe the position of the newspapers to be wrong, that you cancel your subscriptions. A blueprint for action on behalf of the public in support of their friends and neighbors who are on strike at the Journal and the Oregonian can only be drawn in the area of economic reprisal. It must be remembered that to buy the paper is to also buy the principles currently being sponsored by the paper. The nickels, dimes, and dollars spent on subscriptions go into the pockets of imported strikebreakers. By the same token, to advertise in the struck publication also provides aid and comfort to an enterprise that has brought in not only alien employees but alien ideas into the country."

AND THE TRUTH

In adjacent columns is the complete text of a television program, "A Blueprint for Action," broadcast over KGW–TV Friday night under sponsorship of a Portland interunion strike committee. It is not normal procedure for Portland newspapers to publish complete texts of TV programs, not even when the broadcasts are by persons as important as the President of the United States.

However, in view of the wide interest in the Portland newspaper strike, in view of the seriousness and the falsity of many of the charges contained in the broadcast, and in view of the fact that, after three such programs, the Portland's interunion strike committee has finally touched upon some of the issues, the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal make this exception.

What are the false ideas the strike committee is seeking to sell the public? Here they are, and here are the facts:

HOW ABOUT THE STRIKEBREAKERS

The broadcast repeatedly referred to imported strikebreakers, implying the Journal and the Oregonian are being printed by outside people of inferior moral or social status.

The truth is that the vast majority of those engaged in publishing the joint newspaper are Oregon citizens of long standing. All are good people, most of them married, a large percentage owning their own homes and paying Oregon taxes.

In connection with so-called strikebreakers, Charles Dale, an international representative of the Newspaper Guild, charged a high degree of planning for the strike by management prior to the time the strike actually began.

The truth is there was no such planning. Pickets appeared before the doors of the struck plants at 5 a.m. on November 10. It was not until 2 p.m. that afternoon that the first telephone call for outside assistance was made.

Dale further charged that they are being ably assisted by local residents who have been attracted to the papers by promises of high hourly rates, incentive bonuses, and so forth.

The truth is that local residents have been attracted in large numbers by the very high pay rates of those who abandoned their jobs and by nothing more—no incentive bonuses and no "and so forth." In one department alone, 100 percent of the employees who walked off their jobs have been replaced—and 100 percent by local residents. Many others are being hired in other departments to meet production requirements, most of them Oregon citizens.

Dale expressed outrage that the Portland papers "should stoop to the tactics now being practiced by the Oregonian and The Journal." He said it is, in his judgment, "deplorable."

What are these deplorable tactics? Simply the continuance of operation, a decision on the part of management to preserve its business and to continue to serve its readers, its advertisers, and the community as a whole. The alternative: shut down the plants. Thus the newspapers had two choices—operate, or cut off from employment 750 loyal employees and 400 loyal independent contractors who were eager to continue work. Is it really "deplorable" not to throw 1,150 loyal people out of work merely to improve the bargaining position of a group of about 50 other workers?

Such a shutdown occurred when another local of this same Stereotypers Union struck the San Jose newspaper earlier this year. It was shut down for more than 100 days—and scores of employees were thrown out of work. The Portland papers chose to operate.

HOW ABOUT UNION CONCESSIONS?

Repeatedly throughout the program, union spokesmen talked about "concessions" the stereotypers made to management. But what were the concessions? They weren't spelled out. Why? Because the fact is there were no concessions. None. Here are some of the issues where concessions might have been made but were not:

Foreman: Ted Cotner of the stereotypers' negotiating committee said: "We ask simply that the matter of whether or not a foreman be a member of the union be left entirely up to the individual foreman"

This is a bald untruth. The publisher's original proposal provided—and still provides—that the matter of the foreman becoming or not becoming a member of the union be left to the decision of the foreman. The real issue is the union's insistence—illegally—that the foreman be compelled to join the union.

Substitution: The union considers it unholy that "an employee must go to his foreman and his right to time off will be determined completely on the say-so of the foreman."

The truth is there is no inherent right to take time off at will. Stereotypers talk about replacing themselves whenever they want time off by straight time workers, but what they fail to add is that this reduces the labor pool so that labor shifts must be filled by time and a half workers. During the deer season—a time of greatest need because of pre-Christmas work volume—men have laid of in droves, forcing the newspapers to pay for their hunting pleasures at time and a half.

The MAN machine: When the strike started, the stereotypers were saying it took four men to man this machine. In the broadcast, they said it takes X number of men, the X to be determined jointly.

Obviously, this would leave the union with the veto power still to insist upon four men when the time comes for the machine to be operated. Actually, the machine was designed to be operated by only one man. Management's choice: retain the power of determining the number of men or turn that power over to the union in the form of a veto.

WHAT'S THIS ABOUT A LOCKOUT?

There has been much talk on the part of the printers and mailers, both members of the International Typographical Union, of their having been locked out.

This is the most utter nonsense to evolve out of the whole strike situation. The truth is that both printers and the mailers, as well as all other unions (many of whom have violated their word and their contracts) were invited to continue working and, indeed, were directed by their supervisors to do so. The mailers had a valid, existing contract, but refused to honor it and continue to work. Is this a lockout?

Consider, too, this inconsistency. In Portland, the printers and mailers charge they have been locked out because they refuse, of their own volition, to cross a picket line. At the same time, in New York City, another local of this same mailers union has pressed to arbitration a demand that New York newspapers pay mailers wages during the strike prior to last Christmas. Why? Because the paper did not publish. The New York mailers' claim is that the newspapers failed to live up to their contract because they did not operate during the strike; although they—the mailers—were ready then to cross the picket line to work.

MUCH ADO ABOUT STRIKE INSURANCE

James T. Marr, executive secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO, again brought up "the question of strike insurance being held by one or both publication."

What is this evil thing called strike insurance? Well, the unions certainly should know. Their strike insurance, called defense funds, runs into millions of dollars. These millions, collected on a national basis from as many as 100,000 members or more—as in the case of the printers, for instance—can be focused with tremendous economic force upon the papers in a single community.

In the small city of Pasco, Wash., for example, the International Typographical Union poured in more than $1,178,000 to underwrite the losses of the Columbia Basin News, a paper born as a daily after the strike began, to enter into competition with the struck paper. This was in addition to untold thousands of dollars paid in strike benefits for 9 years, all in an economic war against the Tri-City Herald, which the union had struck.

SOME MISCELLANEOUS UNION LOOSE TALK

Perry Badgley: "To me the most damning proposal to come out of the negotiations are the demand of management was [sic] that they want us to take into our union the imported strikebreakers who are now operating the machines that our members, many of whom are longtime residents of Portland, operated before the strike. Management now asks that these imported strikebreakers be given priority of employment over those regular employees who were forced out on strike by what we believe to be unreasonable demands of management."

The facts: There has been no proposal by management that the union take into its membership anyone it has employed since the beginning of the strike. The people who have been employed have been employed permanently to replace the individuals on strike or individuals who abandoned their jobs. The truth is that management has insisted that no one employed since the strike began shall be forced to join any union.

AND SOME MORE MISCELLANY

James T. Marr referred in the TV program to a "paper curtain" drawn over the "Oregonian's pressroom windows to hide out what goes on inside from public view."

These are, in fact, not paper curtains, but sturdy plywood shields to protect the pressrooms from possible sabotage of the kind that has occurred elsewhere in newspaper strikes.

Charles Dale brazenly confessed that guild members walked off their jobs by official union vote, breaching a contract which would have been in effect until June of 1960. His exact words: "The decision came despite the fact that the guild has a contract in existence with both dailies, a contract that will not expire until next June."

James T. Marr again: "The unions have hired neither a private police force or the likes of strikebreakers to maintain their position."

The facts: The only instance of violence to occur since the beginning of the strike was a physical attack by three union members upon a loyal Journal worker. Two of these union members were found guilty in court and were subjected to fines. The third still is being sought under a John Doe warrant.

[From the Oregonian-Journal, Jan. 8, 1960]

PAPERS RAP ULTIMATUM OF STRIKERS

High officials of international newspaper unions Thursday, at conclusion of summit meetings in Portland, issued a statement in which they charged that "the publishers have chosen" to make the Portland newspaper strike "an all-out-fight" and said: "We must meet this challenge."

Publishers of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal replied that the union statement "is a fair sample of negotiation by ultimatum." They asserted that "until there

is a sincere desire by the union to negotiate—not dictate—a settlement" there will be no progress toward peace in the strike.

The complete text of the statements follows:

THE UNIONS

"We are united on a negotiating program with the publishers of Portland's strike-bound newspapers. The decision for common action by all newspaper unions was forced upon us by the blatant union-busting techniques employed by the publishers.

"The international unions cannot afford and do not intend to permit their local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite. The labor movement of Portland and the entire State of Oregon cannot afford to permit this return to labor's dark ages.

"Since the strike began on November 10, management has consistently raised its demands on the unions instead of seeking a peaceful and honorable solution at the bargaining table or through mediation efforts of Governor Hatfield or a factfinding committee. Chief of these new and outrageous demands is a management proposal that the stereotypers take a 12½-percent hourly pay cut despite the constantly increasing cost of living.

"The publishers have chosen to make this an all-out fight. We must meet their challenge. We pledge the utmost support of the international unions to assure that this union-busting venture by the publishers is not successful.

"Contracts of all of the mechanical craft unions have now expired. We reaffirm our decision that no union will return to work at the two newspapers until settlements are reached will all of the unions with expired contracts. Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants.

"The publishers are publicly tied in a common front against unions, and have consistently rejected all union offers to negotiate separate contracts with the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian. This stone wall of publisher opposition has today created the most significant and far-reaching team effort by international newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry."

THE PUBLISHERS

"New roadblocks to peaceful settlement of Portland's newspaper strike have been raised by the statement of the united union committee. It has reaffirmed and now made common cause of a series of demands presented by the Stereotypers Union at the first bargaining session that followed the strike.

"It is a fair sample of negotiation by ultimatum which has marked the sorry course of the union's procedures through 18 bargaining sessions that preceded the strike and the 7 that have followed it.

"The adamant attitude revealed by the unions places on the public record absolute proof of the conspiracy that existed among the unions and the Guild. This conspiracy impaired negotiations, brought rejection of the publishers' offer to arbitrate unresolved issues and now bars the solution of strike problems.

"Among the demands that carry the odor of conspiracy are:

"That settlements must be reached with all unions as a prior condition of the return to work by any union.

"That all contracts must have a common expiration date.

"That all contracts contain a clause allowing any union to respect the picket line of another union.

"Settlement with all 15 unions at once presents an almost unsurmountable barrier. That should be amply evident. Problems vary widely from craft to craft. The demand for a common expiration date is a tacit admission that the then existing contracts did not permit members of these crafts to walk out at will. It substantiates the publishers' position that this action was in violation of moral and legal obligations under those contracts.

"The demand for a clause to legalize the respecting of another union's picket line likewise demonstrates that no such authority existed under old contracts. It validates the publishers' claim that such action was in violation of moral and legal obligations under the contracts.

"The fact that they are now demanding these provisions demonstrates conclusively a belated recognition of the impropriety of their previous action.

"Inference that the publishers' had attempted to reduce the take-home pay of stereotypers by demands since the strike is deceitful. The companies had stated merely that the 40-hour week, common to all industry, would be appropriate in the post strike period. The weekly wage would remain exactly the same.

"Other accusations are the usual abusive attacks to which the public has become accustomed. They have no validity, even to the charge that the newspapers had refused to negotiate separately. Joint negotiation has been the historic procedure, approved for more than 50 years both by unions and newspapers. All negotiations have been handled by representatives of both the Oregonian and Oregon Journal—and will continue to be.

"Until there is a sincere desire by the unions to negotiate—not dictate—a settlement, no progress will be made in bringing peace to the newspaper strike front in this city."

RETURNING NEWSPAPER WORKERS REPLY TO CHARGES OF "DEFIANCE" BY GUILD

Eighteen members of the Portland Newspaper Guild who have returned to work on the Oregonian-Oregon Journal Thursday signed the letter answering charges made by the guild and demanding their expulsion.

Signers of the reply included Jessie B. Williams, Harold Hughes, Rolla J. Crick, Gerry Pratt, W. L. Hunter, Les T. Ordeman, David Falconer, Ruth Needoba, Arnold Marks, Lawrence Barber, Watford Reed, Beth Fagan, Max Wauchope, Phyllis Lauritz, Florence H. Harris, Herb Alden, Jack Ostergren, and Walter Hilbruner.

STATEMENT MADE

Their reply follows:

"PORTLAND NEWSPAPER GUILD
TRIAL BOARD.

"The undersigned wish to reply to charges raised by individuals of the Portland Newspaper Guild. Members of the group which received identical letters feel that a single reply is proper, even though their decisions to return to work were individual rather than a collective action. This reply does not mean that certain signers may not appear to present additional argument on the merits of their own cases, although this letter for a majority of the accused guildsmen will stand in lieu of any personal testimony before the trial board.

"This consensus was obtained from the undersigned:

"1. The Guild, in voting to observe the stereotypers' picket lines and by subsequent actions in supporting the strike when the Guild had no dispute with management, violated its contract and put in jeopardy gains made in that contract over the past 20 years. Guildsmen who returned to work felt they could not in good faith continue a dishonest action even though it was led by the Guild's officers and supported by a majority of the membership.

"The Guild's officers must recall that during negotiations in recent years the Guild has sought to have included in the contract a clause giving the Portland unit the right to refrain from crossing a picket line. Such a clause has been denied by management and does not now appear in the contract.

"The numerous and insistent demands by various Guild negotiating teams that such a clause be placed in the contract is proof that the negotiators of the contract did not feel the Guild had a right to observe picket lines during the life of the contract.

"2. The Federal law clearly states that union members have a right to assist or refrain from assisting any union: That it is an unfair labor practice for a union to coerce or restrain union members from these rights which are paramount to any phrases in the guild constitution or bylaws. Thus, coercing members with these charges is an unfair labor practice.

"We refer the Guild trial board to section 8(b)(1) of the amended (1959) version of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly called the Taft-Hartley law and the Landrum-Griffin Act. This section makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in section 7, which is entitled 'Rights of Employees.' This section which was in the old Taft-Hartley law and is repeated in the Landrum-Griffin Act says employees 'shall have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8(a)(3).'

"As you know, the Guild has a maintenance of membership dues agreement, it has no requirement forcing an employee to join a union, and it cannot, without engaging in unfair labor practices, cause discrimination against an employee except for failure to tender periodic dues.

"3. It is obvious the phrase 'working for or in a shop which is on strike' does not define 'strike,' and that the phrase is meaningless, since past practices of the Guild have found its members working inside scores of plants where one or more crafts are on strike. If this phrase has any legal standing at all (what about contracts with nonstrike clauses?) it must refer to actions in which the Guild itself is on strike.

"During the 1949 strike of Portland web pressmen, various Guildsmen worked inside picket lines, even when the papers were not publishing and virtually no jobs were available at the newspapers.

"In the Portland situation, we have one craft demanding its members take individual actions vis-a-vis the stereotyper strike and another craft (Guild) demanding its members take action as a unit. Both these demands are legalistic efforts to thwart contracts signed in good faith. These tactics are expedient devices to lend legal color to a shameful action against a management with which the Guild had no dispute. They are the methods of an international bent on finding a way, a loophole, to impose its will on the local unit which bargained in good faith. These methods resulted in the Guild losing its local autonomy when its membership was told by an international vice president that its charter would be lifted if the members voted to return to work.

"4. The charge of failing to follow the vote of a majority of the Guild is prima facie spurious in light of the previously cited Federal law which has been upheld in court tests. We need not lecture good Guildsmen about the rights of individuals in a democratic society, rights protected by the law and the courts.

"The Guild is not a court, nor is it a legislative body. It is ironical that in seeking to impose fines, penalties, public reprimands or admonishments upon members attempting to live up to a contract, the Guild is proposing actions it would consider disgraceful if proposed by an employer of either of the two newspapers."

The Guild's notification of action proposed to be taken against the members who returned to work follows:

"DECEMBER 29, 1959.

"We, the undersigned, hereby accuse (name of member) of failing to honor a majority decision of his fellow members of the Portland Newspaper Guild in having crossed a picket line established by Stereotypers Local 48, and further charge him with 'working for or in a shop which is on strike' in defiance of article XII, section I, subsection E of the constitution of the American Newspaper Guild. We seek relief from further association with this member and ask for his dishonorable expulsion from the American Newspaper Guild and all of its affiliates, including the Portland Newspaper Guild, as provided in the 'procedures and trials' section of the article XII of the constitution of the American Newspaper Guild.

"TED WAGONER.
"WAYNE A. SCOTT.

"Under the provisions of article XII, ANG constitution, you have 10 days in which to file an answer with two copies to the above charges with the secretary-treasurer. You will then be given 10 days notice of a hearing before the trial panel of the Portland Newspaper Guild conducted under provisions of the ANG constitution.

"J. LYNN WYKOFF,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

[From the Oregon Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

NEW TRY MADE TO DRAW GOVERNOR INTO WALKOUT

The president of the Stereotypers' Union renewed a suggestion Monday that the managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal accept mediation of factfinding of Gov. Mark O. Hatfield or Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in the strike which was called against the two papers November 10.

Publishers of the Oregonian and Journal said they found nothing new in the proposal and commented it appeared to be "an effort to project this dispute into the political arena."

Harley V. Flesvig, stereotyper president, made the suggestion following settlement of the steel strike with the aid of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and the Secretary of Labor.

Gov. Hatfield said:

"I have given no special consideration to it (the Portland newspaper strike) in the light of today's development. But I have been thinking about it right along. I am still hopeful we can get them together on a factfinding commission. That is the approach I would like to make and I am working toward that end."

The statements:

Harley V. Flesvig, stereoptyper president, said:

"The steel strike was settled today after both management and labor accepted voluntarily the terms of an agreement offered by Labor Secretary James Mitchell and Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

"In the 8-week-old newspaper strike, Governor Hatfield some time ago offered to help negotiate the dispute. Our union immediately accepted this proposal. The newspaper management rejected it.

"Shortly after that, Senator NEUBERGER suggested that Governor Hatfield appoint a factfinding committee to aid on clarifying the issues. Again our union readily agreed to this proposal. Management flatly turned it down.

"If the assistance of outside, impartial persons brought an end to the 8-month-old steel strike, why couldn't such help do the same in this situation?

"We sincerely hope that newspaper management will reconsider its earlier rejections of the proposals."

The publishers said:

"1. There is no reason to believe either the Governor, through mediation, or a factfinding committee could be any more effective in jarring the union loose from its untenable positions than has the Federal Mediation Service.

"2. The stereotypers have already elected to place factfinding in the hands of the National Labor Relations Board by filing unfair labor practice charges against the newspapers.

"3. The steel strike and the newspaper strike are vastly different. A steel shutdown affected virtually the entire national economy. By contrast, we are not shut down. We are publishing. Our readers, our advertisers and the interests of the Commonwealth are being served. Any adverse economic consequences have been largely obviated.

"4. The proposal appears, as before, an effort to project this dispute into the political arena. We do not believe that political intervention, at union behest, is indicated, nor do we believe it would be helpful."

THAT OUR READERS MAY KNOW—IS CONTRACT WITH UNION "WORTH DAMN"?—THE SANCTITY OF CONTRACTS—PART 2

The typographical unions built their strength, through the years, on the faithful observance of contracts. The unions would battle for wages and conditions but, once a contract was signed by a local and "underwritten" by the international, it was observed—and no monkey business.

Many a local has been ordered back to work by the international when it broke its contract. Sometimes the international sent in crews when outlaw locals refused to honor their word. And, historically, all crafts have crossed the picket lines of other crafts to carry out their contracts.

What has happened to the men of honor in these unions? In this dispute, by contrast with the past, we find international officers inciting locals to dishonor their contracts.

The other day a "summit" conference released an astonishing statement to the effect that union contracts had now ended, all but the Guild's. They were now free to take joint action as they desired. Further, they were going to demand a contract clause permitting them to observe picket lines of each other. This was an admission, on the face of it, that they had been violating their contracts for 7 weeks or so.

Is this just the position of "unenlightened employers?"

Suppose we quote from the "laws" of the International Typographical Union, largest of the craft unions. The laws are supposed to govern all members, including the mailers, a subordinate union which had a valid contract at the time of the strike. We quote from article VII, page 32:

"Subordinate unions of the International Typographical Union have a long and honorable history of compliance and fulfillment of all contract commitments. It is required that where contract commitments have been made such commitments are paramount and must be honored by the local unions parties thereto, as a matter of union policy only, subject to the limitations stated in the approval clause of such agreements without any assumption of liability thereunder by the International Typographical Union. This obligations cannot be considered to be mitigated or absolved because of picket lines established without authority provided in the local contract."

Leaders of other crafts have stood honorably, in the past, for observance of contracts. As late as September 1956, Frank R. Adams, first vice president of the International Stereotypers Union, told the union convention in Seattle:

No local had a right to disregard a contract in order to honor the picket line of another union.

Such action would be a contract violation and subject the union to suit.

No strike or "lockout" benefits would be paid by the international.

"A labor contract, which has been approved by the local and duly signed by its elected representatives and authorized representatives of a company, is just as sacred and binding as any other contract. It has been negotiated for the mutual protection of both parties."

This was no employer speaking. This was a labor leader, a vice president of the Stereotypers Union, the very same union that incited other locals to violate contracts with the Oregonian and Journal.

Recently a labor lawyer told a Portland businessman, who had contracts with a group of unions, that his agreements were worthless.

"Everyone knows," he said, cynically, "that contracts are binding on corporations. So far as the unions are concerned, they are not worth a damn."

It is the view of the publishers that a contract binding on management alone is no contract. Here is a central issue in this strike—the honorable observance of contracts. Let union apologists come down off their absurd propaganda fantasies and answer the simple question:

"Is the contract with a union worth a damn?"

Mr. MORSE. Next, Mr. President, in fairness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, representative newspaper articles and editorials which set forth the position of the employees who are involved in the Portland newspaper dispute.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Nov. 20, 1959]

STRIKEBREAKERS IMPORTED—OREGONIAN LION SAYS HE WON'T EAT THE LAMB

The strike of the Stereotypers' Union against Portland's two daily newspapers quickened in tempo this week with these major developments:

1. A charge by Edward J. Whelan, executive secretary of the Multnomah County Labor Council, that the strike was deliberately incited by the management of the Oregonian as part of a plot to give Samuel Newhouse, wealthy New York publisher, complete control of public communications in Portland.

2. A demand by Whelan for a congressional investigation of this potential newspaper monopoly.

3. An unprecedented importation into Portland of strikebreakers from the anti-union Deep South and other sections of the country to enable Newhouse and the Journal to publish a combined paper in the Oregonian building.

4. A stepping up of picket line activity with members of the Typographical and Mailers' Unions joining the Stereotypers in picketing the two newspaper plants.

5. A request by Whelan for an investigation of the strikebreaker situation by the State legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

6. The refusal of the Engravers' Union to cross the picket line, thus providing a solid front of all of Portland's newspaper unions in support of the Stereotypers.

Whelan's charges that the strike was deliberately incited by the Oregonian management were made in an address to the labor council Monday night.

Whelan's statement was called false and libelous by the publishers of the two newspapers, who attempted to stop the Oregon Labor Press from publishing the Whelan charges.

Whelan said:

"The Stereotypers and other newspaper unions were deliberately pushed into this strike to help the Oregonian carry out a plot to take over the Oregon Journal."

Whelan pointed out that Newhouse—who has a long record of anti-union activity—is the sole owner of the Oregonian, half-owner of KOIN-TV in Portland and head man of a nationwide empire of newspapers and TV stations.

"Newhouse would like to buy the Journal, print both newspapers in one building, and set up a complete newspaper monopoly in Oregon's largest city," Whelan continued.

"A newspaper monopoly in Portland would give the absentee owner Newhouse and his hand-picked local managers complete political domination of the State of Oregon—for the Oregonian and the Journal are the only two newspapers with statewide circulation."

Whelan said the matter of newspaper monopoly is "so serious that I am demanding a congressional investigation, and am sending copies of these remarks to the members of Oregon's delegation in Congress."

Whelan quoted a Journal executive as saying after the strike started:

"This strike situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

Whelan also said that the Oregonian carries strike insurance, but the Journal does not, and the Oregonian has been making "substantial profits, but the Journal has recently been in financial difficulties."

As far as the differences between the unions and the newspapers are concerned, they "could be settled in half an hour—just as they were peacefully settled in Seattle and Tacoma a few days ago," Whelan declared. "But the Oregonian doesn't want to settle—not until it gets its hands on the Journal and transforms Portland into a monopoly newspaper town.

"Oregonians had better wake up. The hours of honest competition among newspapers may be fast running out."

In an effort to stop the Oregon Labor Press from publishing Whelan's statement, the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal telephoned Labor Press Editor Jim Goodsell at 12:45 p.m., Tuesday.

Oregonian publisher M. J. Frey and Journal publisher William W. Knight said they were calling from Frey's office in the Oregonian Building. They warned that the Labor Press would face possible libel action if it published Whelan's charges.

Frey said: "Whelan's statement is libelous, malicious, and entirely false. We absolutely deny it. It is a false statement."

Knight said: "The statement is false, malicious, libelous, and without any basis of fact."

Goodsell commented: "The lion and the lamb have now denied that the lamb will be eaten."

Publisher Frey is an employee of the Oregonian's absentee owner, Samuel I. Newhouse, of New York.

Publisher Knight is one of three trustees of the Jackson estate, any two of whom could sell the Journal. The other trustees are David L. Davies, Portland attorney, and the U.S. National Bank.

Ted Cotner, chairman of the stereotypers' negotiating committee, also warned the labor council of the vicious situation that would result if Portland were to become a one-newspaper town.

"You would have one-sided news coverage and advertising rates would go up," Cotner said.

The Stereotyper spokesman said his union feels "this is a planned strike, formulated over a year ago to make this a one-newspaper town."

"Time and again," he said, "we offered to negotiate separately with the Journal because we feel the need for a hometown paper. But we were turned down flatly on that."

Speaking for the Typographical Union, Chet Rooklidge told the labor council of the frustrating, futile efforts his union had made since September 15 in trying to reach an agreement on terms of a new contract with the Journal and the Oregonian.

He said the management representatives at the bargaining table wanted to "talk about everything from pressmen, stereotypers, mailers, and Mrs. Fogarty's cat—but we couldn't pin a tail on the cat."

"It's hard to negotiate a contract when, by the admission of the people on the other side, their counterproposal is written 5 or 6 months before you ever sit down to negotiate."

The decision of the engravers to respect the stereotypers' picket line brings to 10 the number of unions whose members are supporting the strike. They are the Typographical, Web Pressmen, Mailers, Photoengravers, Newspaper Guild (reporters, photographers, some editors, artists, and some circulation office employees), Electrical Workers, Machinists, Teamsters, Building Service Employees, and Operating Engineers.

An estimated 750 union employees of both newspapers are out of work as a result of the strike, with their jobs being taken over by scabs, many of them from as far away as Florida.

Meanwhile, Federal Mediator Elmer Williams continued efforts to try to settle the strike. In a Tuesday session conducted by Williams, the publishers made a counterproposal which Cotner said indicated they "apparently are trying to widen the breach in this dispute rather than trying to bring us closer together and reach a peaceful settlement."

The counterproposal made by management would have required the Stereotypers to work 5 hours longer a week at no raise in wages. They also wanted a no-strike clause in the contract and an agreement by the union to pay for any financial damages to the companies if the union violated this clause.

The publishers also asked for elimination of union security, an issue which Cotner said was agreed to between the parties before the strike.

STRIKEBREAKERS

The use of imported professional strikebreakers—one of them armed with rifles and shotguns—spurred mounting indignation of Portlanders this week against the tactics of the Oregonian and the Journal in their efforts to break the strike of the Stereotypers' Union.

For the first time in Portland's newspaper history, the two dailies are bringing in nonunion workers from other States—some from as far away as Florida—to publish a combined scab paper in the Oregonian Building.

The situation brought a request from State Representative Edward J. Whelan, who is secretary of the Multnomah County Labor Council, for a special investigation by the legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

It also prompted a prediction by a Republican legislator that the next legislative session will consider seriously making such activity by employers illegal.

"This is the kind of thing you might expect in the Deep South, which is notoriously anti-union, but it's not what we expect to see happen here in Oregon," he said.

And the Stereotypers' Union, through its attorney, Don Richardson, has asked the U.S. district attorney to examine the possibility that a Federal law may have been violated by bringing in strikebreakers from other States.

Whelan, in his telegram to Senator Harry Boivin, chairman of the legislative interim committee on labor-management relations, asserted that the importation of strikebreakers is having a detrimental effect on efforts to obtain a speedy settlement of the strike.

"There is a gap in Oregon labor law with respect to the detrimental effect the importation of strikebreakers has on a labor dispute," said Whelan.

"Calling the committee into session to examine the role of strikebreakers in the Portland newspaper strike would give committee members a first-hand view of the situation. It would be of immeasurable help in implementing Oregon law at the next legislature to prohibit the importation of strikebreakers in future labor disputes in the State."

Whelan urged Senator Boivin to "call the committee into session in Portland as soon as possible."

The incident of the armed strikebreaker was reported by Portland police. The scab, imported to work at the Oregonian during the strike, was spotted by police checking into a downtown hotel with several rifles and shotguns.

The publishers of the combined Oregonian-Journal admitted in a published statement that the man's actions were "potentially provocative" in view of the strike and added that "he was no longer employed."

The stereotypers said that the imported scabs manning the presses and setting type for the Oregonian-Journal had been flown into Portland from Iowa, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and Nevada. They are paid a minimum of $200 a week plus expenses.

"This is the way Portland publishers seek to break a strike of local employees who have lived in the city for many years," said the stereotypers in a printed bulletin.

"The tactic is seen as a turn-back-the-clock move to the dark ages of labor-management history—a chapter foreign to Portland labor relations," the bulletin added.

"FEATHERBEDDING" IS NOT NEWSPAPER STRIKE ISSUE

Can the truth ever catch up with false propaganda?

That is the burning question in the Portland newspaper strike.

The public has been convinced that "featherbedding" is the key issue in the strike.

They have been told by the publishers that one small union—the Stereotypers—is fighting against labor-saving machinery and insisting on unreasonable "make work" rules.

This stubborn stand, the publishers claim, is the reason why the stereotypers have gone out on strike and why 750 other newspaper union men and women have left their jobs in sympathy.

Don't you believe it.

The fact is that this strike was deliberately provoked by the Oregonian—not by the union—and "featherbedding" is an issue trumped up by management.

Read these facts and judge for yourself:

1. In 18 negotiating sessions, the stereotypers offered one compromise after another. The newspapers flatly turned them down.

2. The publishers refused to discuss wages, hours or any other basic issue. First, they insisted the union must agree in advance on

all details of operating an unknown, unseen, unordered, untried, untested, German-made machine which the Oregonian said it plans to buy.

The German-made machine is new and completely unknown. It is not in use on any newspaper in North America.

It is dangerous because it operates with molten metal, under high pressure, at temperatures over 600 degrees.

The Oregonian has not ordered or bought the machine; the newspaper merely says it intends to buy one. The Journal has no interest in the machine at all.

More than a year will go by before the machine can possibly be delivered.

Yet the publishers refused to bargain on any other issue unless the Stereotypers Union would agree (sight unseen) to one-man operation of the machine—when and if it is delivered.

This was an ultimatum that no union could possibly accept—and the publishers knew it.

3. The stereotypers tried desperately to compromise, and to continue the process of collective bargaining. They did not want to strike.

They offered to reopen their contract when the German machine is delivered, and to decide then with the Oregonian how many men can safely operate the machine. The publishers refused.

The union offered two other compromises, both of them fair and reasonable. Again the publishers refused.

4. The Oregonian and Journal demanded that working foremen be removed from union membership. These foreman don't sit at a desk and give orders. They work side by side with the other stereotypers. They now belong to the union; they have always belonged to the union, and they want to belong to the union.

5. The publishers demanded that the stereotypers work 2½ hours longer each week for the same pay.

6. The publishers were just as stubborn and unreasonable in 13 negotiating sessions with another union, the Typographical Union, whose contract expired September 15.

"They were deliberately stalling and goading us with their demands," a Typographical delegate told the County Labor Council this week.

"We are sure that the Typographical Union would have been forced to strike if the stereotypers had not gone out first," he declared, "and nobody has claimed that the Typos were making any so-called featherbedding demands."

"Featherbedding" is a red herring in the newspaper strike. Three very significant facts will tell you the real reason for the strike:

The Oregonian carries strike insurance. The Journal does not.

The Oregonian raised the strike-provoking issue of the German machine. The Journal has no interest in the machine.

The Oregonian has been making big profits. The Journal has been in financial difficulties.

We believe that the Oregonian and its absentee owner, Samuel Newhouse of New York, have two purposes in this strike: To break the unions and to break the Journal.

That would give Newhouse and his imported strikebreakers a complete monopoly in the city of Portland, Oreg.

TO BREAK NEWSPAPER STRIKES: ARMED STRIKEBREAKERS IMPORTED

Men armed with rifles and shotguns walked into a downtown Portland hotel Sunday morning and registered as "guests."

Who are these men? They are professional strikebreakers. Others without arms have been flown to Portland in the past week from Iowa, Texas, Louisiana, Florida and Nevada.

The hybrid The Oregonian and Oregon Journal said Monday:

"Management, supervisory and other available personnel" are putting out the newspaper.

"Other available personnel" are professional strikebreakers. They are paid a minimum of $200 weekly plus all expenses.

This is the way Portland publishers seek to break a legitimate strike of local employees who have lived in the city for many years. These strikers for years have patronized local firms and contributed to United Good Neighbors and other community charities and activities.

Strikebreakers don't spend their money in Portland. They take it to Iowa, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, and Nevada.

Some Portland firms are canceling their advertising during the strike. They are using direct mail, radio, and television. They are doing this in protest to the tactics of the newspaper industry.

Monday 360 members of the locked-out Printers' and Mailers' Unions joined the stereotypers' picket line to demonstrate their faith in the stereotypers' cause and their indignation at the cold-blooded tactics of their former bosses and "friends."

The importing of strikebreakers who live in luxury hotels and receive in pay and expenses more than twice the income of union workers is being subsidized in part by doubled advertising rates and doubled paper prices. The tactic is seen as a turn-back-the-clock move to the dark ages of labor-management history—a chapter foreign to Portland labor relations. Peace has prevailed in the news industry of Portland—no strikes—for the past 10 years. And never before have professional strikebreakers been used in the City of Roses.

The strikebreakers in their hotel lobbies openly boast of year-round employment in the art of breaking strikes, an art in which all earnings are cream because all living expenses are paid and are also deducted as a business expense. This makes Uncle Sam an unwitting partner.

The Oregonian-Oregon Journal boasts of press runs of 500,000 copies. But this is not paid circulation. Many copies are being scattered away as thousands of union families in Oregon and southwest Washington cancel their subscriptions. This throwaway distribution in some cases is littering lawns and causing economic hardship to carrier boys.

The men from out of State who walked into a downtown hotel carried four guns—two .22 rifles, a Savage shotgun, and a home-remodeled 410 shotgun. They were sealed in the hotel safe and reported to the police. The men said they came to Portland to work for the Oregonian.

Meantime unions instructed their pickets to patrol peacefully in the American tradition of fair play.

Union investigators are convinced the callous tactics of the two newspapers are being directed personally by S. I. Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian. He is a man who has spent perhaps no more than a day or two in Portland since buying the newspaper on the telephone 9 years ago.

The use of strikebreakers has so shamed the local publishers that the sea-green windows designed by Pierto Belluschi in the Oregonian pressroom have been boarded up so that the public cannot see what is going on.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 1959]

ARMED SCAB CREW HITS COAST NEWSPAPER STRIKE

PORTLAND, OREG.—A stream of professional strikebreakers from other States, imported by the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, has helped swing public opinion behind striking stereotypers at the two papers.

The quick appearance of the scabs, some of them bearing arms, also backed up the union's contention that the strike was deliberately provoked by management as a union-busting effort.

Representatives of the two papers later told a Guild committee that henceforth they planned to operate as open shops in all departments.

The Stereotypers Union struck at 5 a.m., Tuesday, November 5, after 18 fruitless negotiating sessions. Guild members, printers, mailers, pressmen, and other crafts refused to cross the picket lines placed around the two newspaper plants. In the confusion of the first week, photoengravers continued to work, except for 1 day, until Saturday, when they joined officially in support of the strike.

Printers and mailers, members of the International Typographical Union, joined the picket line on the grounds that they were locked out when they found scabs had taken over their positions on the first morning of the strike.

They said they found the doors locked and guarded.

On the eve of the walkout, the Portland Guild voted 68 to 30 not to cross the stereotypers' picket lines. Only a few circulation clerks among the 165 members of the local failed to abide by the decision.

With the help of scabs, nonunion personnel, and supervisors, managements of the two papers have combined to issue a hybrid daily under the flags of both the Oregonian and the Journal, hitherto supposedly fierce competitors. The paper is being published from the plant of the Oregonian, owned by S. I. Newhouse.

The move led the Multnomah County (Portland) Central Labor Council to call for a congressional inquiry into report that Newhouse and his Oregonian are maneuvering to take over the Journal.

It was the Oregonian's bargaining tactics that brought on the strike. The Newhouse interests insisted that the stereotypers agree in advance that only one man would be required to operate a new platecasting machine of German origin. The Oregonian management said it intends to acquire one of the machines, not yet in use in this country.

Wages never were discussed in negotiations after management stalled bargaining and refused to budge on the manning issue. By the time Federal mediators entered the talks, the papers also were insisting, among other things, on the removal of foremen from contract coverage, an increase in the workweek from 35 hours to 40 hours, and a no-strike clause for the duration of any contract.

In their propaganda campaign among readers, the two papers have pictured the stereotypers as a featherbedding union which demands the use of four men to operate a one-man machine.

The union, however, has offered to bypass the manning issue and proceed to other questions, with the contract to be reopenable on manning when and if the German machine is ever purchased.

Another investigation, by a State legislative subcommittee on labor-management relations, has been demanded by Ed Whelan, executive secretary of the Central Labor Council. Whelan, a member of the legislature himself, has urged the subcommittee to gather material to strengthen Oregon laws pertaining to the importation of out-of-State strikebreakers.

The unions also have asked the U.S. district attorney here to investigate the interstate traffic of armed strikebreakers to determine if there have been violations of Federal regulations.

The arms of two of the scabs—two rifles, a shotgun, and a sawed-off shotgun—were confiscated by police, who were alerted by a

desk clerk when the men attempted to check into a hotel with the guns. They had come here from Reno.

The Oregonian management at first denied it had brought the men to Portland, but later changed the denial to a statement that the two men were "no longer employed." The pair hurriedly left town, but dozens of others have remained, drawing a minimum of $200 a week and expenses at Portland hotels. Some of them have been sleeping in the Oregonian building.

It was learned, too, that the papers had been training advertising and business office personnel in advance of the strike to operate mechanical equipment.

Strike strategy is in the hands of a steering committee representing all unions. ANG International Representative Charles Dale, who has been here to aid the local guild since the first morning of the strike, has been named chairman of the coordinating body. Staff representatives of all other affected unions also are on hand. ANG Executive Vice President William J. Farson flew here last weekend to confer with local Guild leaders and officials of other unions and to attend a membership meeting.

The Portland Guild, which represents 96 percent of reporters, desk editors, and photographers in the newsroom of both dailies, has set up headquarters for the duration of the strike in a vacant store on Broadway in downstown Portland. Committees have been organized to seek temporary employment for Guild members and their families, to administer strike benefits, to aid families with financial difficulties, and to help the strike steering committee.

Guild members have been particularly active in publicity work in behalf of the unions involved. They have kept radio, television and other media on top of strike developments and informed of the strikers' story. They have also prepared and distributed 75,000 copies of one handbill and 100,000 copies of another, with more in the works.

Most Guildsmen have been carying out committee assignments in addition to other employment they have found since the strike started. Some of the more able-bodied male members have been working on the Portland docks through the cooperation of the Longshoremen's Union. Others have found temporary jobs in offices and stores around the city. Some have landed with public relations firms, and a few are working for local radio and TV stations, which have stepped up their news coverage.

Also easing the financial burden is the steady flow of contributions from other Guild locals. Seattle, San Francisco-Oakland and Los Angeles sent $100 contributions on th basis of wire service reports of the strike before any appeal for aid was issued from Portland.

The hybrid Oregonian-Journal has been a source of both amusement and irritation.

One page of the strikebreaker contained a story which started in column five and broke back, Chinese-style, through columns four, three, two, and one. Television schedules were unchanged from the previous week. Classified advertising, pasted up and photographed from electric typewriter copy, was nearly illegible. A fullpage display ad for Portland's leading department store promoted a new lightweight, portable typewriter weighing only 86 pounds.

The executives and other amateurs producing the makeshift sheet also were having circulation problems, largely as a result of snowballing subscription cancellations. Thousands of residents who canceled subscriptions continued to receive the combined daily. Thousands of others who didn't cancel weren't getting the paper. Distribution appeared to be on a throwaway basis.

There has been no comment yet from advertisers on the plans of the papers, reported in Editor & Publisher, for double billing of space in the hybrid paper. Said the Editor & Publisher story:

"Advertisers in the current issues will be billed by both newspapers at each advertiser's contract rate. An advertiser with a contract at only one of the papers will be billed by both at that contract rate."

The first few days of the strike were bitterly cold for Portland, but the weather has since moderated and pickets now face only the usual Oregon rain. Guild members have been on duty on the lines daily, with stereotypers and printers, to observe the comings and goings of strikebreakers and keep the membership informed of general activity.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Dec. 4, 1959]

STRIKEBREAKERS ARE HERE—HIRED PROFESSIONALS PRINTING OREGOURNAL

Professional strikebreakers are working in Portland.

Names and hometowns of more than 70 of them are published on this page.

Most of them come from the Deep South and Southwest.

They are imported by the Oregonian and Oregon Journal to take the jobs of the striking members of the Stereotypers Union. They have also taken the jobs of printers, engravers, pressmen, mailers and paperhandlers who are honoring the stereotypers' picket lines.

Elimination of the unions from the mechanical departments of the Oregonian and Journal is the motive of the Portland publishers.

Strike insurance, which can pay the Portland publishers up to $500,000 over an 8-week period, provides the financial backing.

Provoke a strike, collect the strike insurance and call in a flying squad of professional strikebreakers. This is the pattern being followed by publishers all over the country. If the unions are divided and the general public misled, then the union-busting publisher is successful.

Who are the strikebreakers? Where did they come from? What is the role of the American Newspaper Publishers Association? Was this strike deliberately provoked by the publishers?

Here are some of the answers:

L. R. McCoy of Oklahoma City or Galveston, Tex., was sent here by the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association (an affiliate of the American Newspaper Publishers Association) to ride herd on the strikebreakers. He is staying at the Benson Hotel. He is a veteran strikebreaker. He has worked on similar strikebreaking jobs in Las Vegas, Nev.; Kennewick, Wash.; Oklahoma City, and Galveston. Members of his family, Hunter G. and Virginia McCoy, worked as strikebreakers in Ypsilanti, Mich., earlier this year.

McCoy was once a member of the International Typographical Union. He was suspended for nonpayment of dues in 1946.

McCoy's presence in Portland presumably relieves the Portland publishers of the distasteful chore of dealing directly with the strikebreakers.

McCoy in Portland is filling the same position, chief herder of the strikebreakers, that he filled in the Galveston strikebreaking attempt in 1957.

Also on hand at the Oregonian building are Bill and Justine Glover. These two were in Ypsilanti, Mich., in November of last year as key personnel in a Bloor Schleppey-Shirley Klein strikebreaking attempt. Justine's specialty is the training of teletypesetter operators.

Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein are the unholy alliance who operate a professional strikebreaking service for the American Newspaper Publishers Association. They were exposed to public view recently by an investigating committee of the New York State Legislature which probed their activities in Westchester County, N.Y.

There has been no definite proof that Schleppey-Klein is directly involved in Portland. But there are numerous Schleppey-Klein alumni among the Portland strikebreakers. This may not be a Schleppey-Klein operation, but the methods used here are certainly copied from the Schleppey-Klein strikebreaking handbook.

Bloor Schleppey of Zionsville, Ind., has been described by Time magazine as a man who has a role in American journalism as unusual as his name: he breaks strikes for pay.

Schleppey claims he gets his strikebreakers on a volunteer basis from the nonunion composing rooms of some of his newspaper clients.

The Typographical Union's dossier on Schleppey claims that his flying squads are mostly drunks, misfits, social cripples, and are generally incompetent in their work.

Time magazine reports that within days of the arrival of a Schleppey gang in Haverhill, Mass., for a strikebreaking job for the Haverhill Gazette, several of the recruits were arrested for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

Schleppey has often been scheduled as a convention speaker by the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Besides the McCoys and the Glovers, strikebreakers with Schleppey experience who have now shown up in Portland are Morris Smith, of Bastrop, La.; John T. Mott, West Monroe, La.; Warren Smith, Durant, Va.; Yancy Darbo, El Centro, Calif., and Bill Mills and wife Sally Mills, of Levittown, Pa.

Among the strikebreakers, some of whom arrived in Portland on the first and second days of the strike, were F. E. Early, of Reno, Nev.. and Kenneth G. Comstock, of Jacksonville, Fla.

Early and Comstock checked into the Hungerford Hotel with two rifles, a shotgun and a sawed-off shotgun. The publishers at first denied these men had been hired, then changed their story to admit that their actions might be considered provocative and said they were no longer employed.

Early has disappeared, but Comstock has reportedly been seen several times between the Hungerford Hotel and the Oregonian building.

Another armed member of the troupe is Max L. Rue, of Mahoae, N.Y. He is the paymaster, or swag man, for the strikebreakers.

Charles E. Richards, of Houston, Tex., is in town with his wife and daughter. His wife has reportedly stated that her husband has participated in strikebreaking operations in Kansas, Missouri, West Virginia, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Michigan.

Many strikebreakers are openly boastful of their line of work. They flaunt their ill-gotten gains, $200 and $300 per week plus overtime and expenses. They tell of this being my sixth (third, fourth, fifth) straight strike.

Some have qualms. One said, "I know this is a pretty dirty thing, but think of the money."

James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark., is working at the Oregonian. He was strikebreaking in Reno last spring and summer. He was encountered in a Reno casino with four other strikebreakers by two persons who are now in Portland on legitimate business. On hearing that the two would be in Portland later in the year, the strikebreakers said, "We'll see you in Portland."

These are the "other available personnel" the publishers talk about. These are the men and women the publishers say have been promised "permanent employment."

These are the people who feed on frustration and misfortune in labor negotiations. When the Portland strike is settled they will take off for the next strike. They don't participate in community affairs or support community charities. They accept community services without helping to pay for

them. They stay at luxury hotels mostly, but some are living in the security-guarded newspaper plant.

Importation of strikebreakers is something new for Portland. It is not new, however, in the newspaper industry in other parts of the country.

This has happened in Levittown and Bristol, Pa., in Westchester County, N.Y., in Haverhill, Mass., in Ypsilanti, Mich., in Oklahoma City, in Galveston, Tex., in Reno, Nev., and many other places.

Importation of strikebreakers was the cause of a legislative investigation in New York. Similar investigation has been planned in Pennsylvania. Congressional and State legislative investigation has been called for in the Portland situation.

One of the key findings of the New York investigation was that "availability of standby crews of strikebreakers tends to withdraw employer incentive to bargain collectively * * * the existence of a strikebreaker pool incites to irresponsible and negative behavior instead of good faith, interchange of proposals, and supporting argument."

That labor-management relations in Portland have come to such a pass is inconceivable to many citizens. They fail to reckon with the profit-fascinated ownership of the Oregonian.

S. I. Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian since 1950, is not the man who built the reputation of the Oregonian. That reputation was started and nurtured over a period of more than 100 years by Oregonians. S. I. Newhouse is not the man who won the Oregonian's Pulitzer prizes and Heywood Broun awards. These prizes were won for the Oregonian by reporters who are now supporting the stereotypers in their fight to retain legitimate contract provisions by collective bargaining.

S. I. Newhouse is the man who has brought armed strikebreakers to Portland.

STRIKEBREAKERS IDENTIFIED

Professional strikebreakers are in Portland.

Here are the names and hometowns of more than 70 of them.

They are producing the hybrid newspaper that used to be your hometown Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

Almost all of them come from the slave-wage Deep South and other far-off States.

They are hired professionals who make their living as strikebreakers, moving from city to city and from strike to strike to help publishers break the printing trades unions.

They live like kings in local hotels, and send their average $200 weekly earnings back home to good ol' Tuskahoochee. Their expenses in Portland are paid by the publishers, who pick up their tabs for hotel rooms, food and liquor.

They are working in the Oregonian Building as printers, stereotypers, pressmen, engravers, and mailers.

Here is the list of those who have been identified—and undoubtedly there are more:

From Oklahoma: L. R. McCoy, Oklahoma City; Leon A. Minnick, Oklahoma City; Abel (Arvel) Green, Oklahoma City; M. E. Hawkins, Oklahoma City; William D. Wilson, Oklahoma City; Wayne M. Clark, Oklahoma City; B. J. Guy, Blair; J. Brenan, Oklahoma City; Alvin L. Winn, Oklahoma City; B. J. Wood, Oklahoma City; B. H. Boles, Oklahoma City; Mrs. Sue Sherry, Oklahoma City; M. L. Gardner, Oklahoma City.

From Louisiana: J. T. Mott, West Monroe; Mrs. J. T. (Doris) Mott, West Monroe; Richard Munson, Baton Rouge; M. Smith, Bastrop; E. J. Willhite, Bastrop; Charles Chastant, Baton Rouge; L. Maxwell, Monroe; P. Moak, Winnsboro; P. Purvis, Monroe; J. P. McCarthy, Monroe; Grover Dunn, Monroe; Linton A. Kellum, Alexandria; Steve Moore (with two companions), Monroe.

From Texas: Bill Glover, Houston; Justine Glover, Houston; V. G. Vinson, Abilene; T. E. Smith, Wichita Falls; Lee Norton, Wichita Falls; B. E. Byrd, Henderson; Charles E. Richards (with two companions), Houston.

From Florida: J. Fikes, Miami; Kenneth G. Comstock, Jacksonville; E. Light, Miami; J. E. Nelson, Miami; G. Charles, Miami; Roy Chesser, Miami; B. A. (Betty) Coxe, Miami; G. K. Carastun, Jacksonville.

From Arkansas: R. Jennings, Eldorado; Howard G. Elliott, Hot Springs; James Younger, Fort Smith.

From Nevada: F. E. Early, Reno; E. G. Miner, Reno; Don Premer, Reno; D. B. Anderson, Reno; James Miller, Reno.

From Illinois: John Mitchum, East Moline; Bobby Smith, Rock Island; Mrs. E. Hansen, Galesburg.

From Pennsylvania: Donald Leeking, Liteh; Dick Brooks, Levittown; George Crothers, Bristol; Bill Mills, Levittown.

From Iowa: Bob Bushek, Davenport; Joanne Hodgkins, Davenport.

From Mississippi: William Goodfellow, Natchez.

From West Virginia: Virgil Lockhart, Huntington.

From Virginia: Warren Smith, Durant.

From New Jersey: Curt Scrum, Palisades.

From New York: Max L. Rue, Mahoae.

From Maine: L. W. Davis, Seymour.

From Ohio: Richard Axline, Zanesville.

From California: Yancy F. Darbro, El Centro.

From Washington: Sylvia Duran, Pasco; C. E. Benjamin, Kennewick.

From Oregon: Mrs. W. H. Allen, Cottage Grove.

WIVES OF TYPOS THREATENED

Threatening telephone calls were received this week by the wives of three members of the locked-out Multnomah Typographical Union.

Mrs. Leroy Blubaum, wife of the union's president, was called and told that her husband had better quit his union activities and resign from his position as president of the union or "watch out."

Mrs. Leta Rooklidge, wife of Chester Rooklidge who is a member of the union's negotiating committee, was called and told substantially the same thing. Included in the call to Mrs. Rooklidge was the threat that if Rooklidge did not stop his union "agitation" he would be in for great physical harm.

Mrs. Robert Burgess, wife of a member of the union, was the target of a slightly different type of call. She was told that the caller had pictures of both her and her husband. The caller said Mrs. Burgess was a "ring leader" in the "mob at the Oregonian Friday." (Mrs. Burgess participated in a peaceful demonstration by union wives at the Oregonian building). Mrs. Burgess was told: "You had better quit campaigning, you're no Carrie Nation and you had better watch out."

Mrs. Burgess was warned not to go out by herself on the streets, that it "might be dangerous." She was told to think twice before answering the telephone, that it "might be a window play."

The caller said, "After all the smart ones are weeded out and only the foolish remain, watch out."

The calls, received between 9 and 11 p.m. Monday, were believed to be the work of the same psychopathic personality. The calls were reported to the police.

The caller, a woman, spoke in a calm, clear, unhurried voice with no noticeable accent. She appeared to be quite well informed on the more spectacular aspects of the newspaper strike.

STEREOTYPER PRESIDENT REPORTS: DETROIT PAPERS SETTLE IN 7 HOURS ALL ISSUES OF PORTLAND'S STRIKE

Arrival in Portland of James H. Sampson, international president of the Stereotypers' Union, and the resumption of talks between publishers of the Oregonian-Journal and union negotiators were the only concrete developments this week in Portland's 24-day-old newspaper strike.

Sampson brought the report that all issues involved in the stereotypers' strike against the Portland papers were settled last Saturday in 1 day of negotiation with publishers of the Detroit Times, Free Press, and News.

Sampson said the issue of the German-made M.A.N. machine, a roadblock in the way of a Portland settlement, was settled in Detroit on substantially the same basis as proposed by the Portland stereotyper negotiators. That is that the manning of the machine be negotiated between union and management after the machine has been installed and both sides have had a chance to see it in operation.

Union membership of foremen was left up to each individual in Detroit. The substitution issue was also settled amicably in Detroit in the single negotiation session which lasted 7 hours.

The stereotyper president and the local union representatives met with Portland management all day Tuesday and again Wednesday through the efforts of Federal Mediator Elmer Williams.

After the Tuesday session, Sampson said, "We got nowhere today. Nothing was accomplished."

Management representatives, D. S. Haines and W. R. Morrish, at Tuesday's session refused to allow television cameramen to take pictures of them seated around the table with union representatives, including Sampson. Newsfilm on local TV stations showed the union men and Sampson at the table, but the only shots of management representatives showed them walking into the room.

THE JOURNAL FLIES INTO THE NEWHOUSE TRAP

Why does Portland have a newspaper strike?

President James H. Sampson, of the Stereotypers' International Union, said in Portland this week that the whole question of the new German stereotyping machine was recently settled by Detroit newspaper publishers and stereotypers in 7 hours of honest collective bargaining.

All of the other key issues of the Portland strike were settled in Detroit in the same 7-hour session.

They were settled peacefully, swiftly, and to the satisfaction of the newspapers and the union.

Three months ago the publishers of Seattle's two big daily newspapers signed a new 2-year contract with the printing trades unions. This contract granted the same improvements in wages and fringe benefits that Portland printers, stereotypers, and other unions have been trying patiently, for many months, to negotiate with the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

Then why does Portland have a newspaper strike?

Why all the bitterness? Why all the cost? Why the inconveniences? Why the broken friendships? Why the sickening sight of imported strikebreakers scuttling into the Oregonian building?

There is only one reason: This strike was deliberately planned and incited by the Oregonian and the Journal.

To be more accurate, it was planned by the Oregonian's absentee owner, Samuel Newhouse, of New York, who somehow holds the locally owned Journal as his captive partner.

The newspaper unions didn't want the strike. They tried desperately to avoid it. They offered one compromise after another in their efforts to reach a peaceful and honorable settlement.

What did they get in return from the publishers?

They got ultimatums. They got delays. They got legalistic maneuvers. They got evasions and runarounds. They got demands that the publishers knew no union could accept.

A spokesman for the Typographical Union reports: "They kept goading, prodding, needling, stalling, evading. If we dared to back down on one issue, we knew they would replace it with a new and more impossible demand. Finally we reached the only possible conclusion: They wanted us to strike."

If anyone still doubts that this strike was deliberately planned by the publishers, let him consider this evidence:

1. The lightning speed with which dozens of professional strikebreakers appeared in Portland from cities thousands of miles away.

2. In Reno last July, a group of professional strikebreakers told a Portland woman that they had "a date to break a strike in Portland next winter." These men were then working behind picket lines at the Reno Gazette and Journal.

3. The Oregonian (if not the Journal) carries strike insurance covering all losses for 50 days.

4. Gov. Mark Hatfield offered to mediate a settlement of the strike, and the unions promptly accepted. The Oregonian and Journal flatly rejected the Governor's offer.

Finally, consider this fact:

Samuel Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian, owns 13 other newspapers in the East and Midwest. Since last June, six of these newspapers have peacefully negotiated new long-term contracts with the printing trades unions.

None of the so-called "issues" of the Portland strike were raised by Newhouse's representatives in these negotiations.

We can draw only one conclusion: Newhouse deliberately chose Portland as his battleground. He ordered his local managers to force a strike. He decided to tear this town apart, if necessary, in a cold-blooded grab for more money and power.

Why did he choose Portland?

There is one obvious answer: Newhouse wants to buy the Oregonian's afternoon competitor, the Journal. A long strike will bleed the Journal white, while the Oregonian is propped up by its strike insurance and by the profits from 31 other Newhouse newspapers, magazines, and TV stations.

Why has the Journal fallen into the Newhouse trap?

The newspaper unions have repeatedly offered to negotiate independently with the Journal. But the Journal remains a captive in the Oregonian building. She no longer "flies with her own wings."

DR. STEINER'S SERMON—MINISTER ASKS NEWS STRIKE FACTS

The public's stake in the current strike-lockout at Portland's two daily newspapers was the subject of Dr. Richard M. Steiner's sermon last Sunday. Dr. Steiner is minister of the First Unitarian Church.

Dr. Steiner deplored the fact that the public is without adequate information upon which to render a judgment in dispute. "We are dependent upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information," he declared.

He called for the truth, and asked: "Can we trust the newspapers to give us the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?"

Half-truths, he noted, "can be as deceptive as outright lies."

Dr. Steiner said there are two reasons for the public's confusion over the newspaper strike. "In the first place," he said, "they cannot believe that the right is all on one side, and as far as the printed word is concerned, only one side has access to the newspapers and it quite obviously considers itself to be without fault in the present controversy."

He continued:

"When it comes to presenting their case to the public, the newspapers have all the advantage. We are, as a result, surfeited with rumors. Whether these rumors are deliberately incited or not, no one can say. Whether there is any truth in them or not, no one can say. We are told, for example, that the strike is a plot by the Oregonian to take over the Oregon Journal, which has been in financial difficulties. This has been denied, but anyone reading the denial must wonder if the publishers have not left themselves an out when they say 'at this time' they do not contemplate an absorption of the Oregon Journal into the Newhouse chain.

"We have heard that the issue is 'featherbedding,' that the union refuses to settle the issue as to how many men shall work on a machine for stereotyping that the Oregonian says it is going to purchase. I have heard it reported on one hand that the union is willing to arbitrate the number of men on the machine when, as, and if it is delivered. I have heard that the machine is not actually in existence, that one was made in Germany, imported to Montreal, Canada, and there it developed so many defects it had to be returned for redesign, that no one knows whether the new machine will prove effective or not.

"If this is the issue that is holding up the settlement of the strike, if the Journal is not interested in this machine, how does it happen that the Journal lends itself to this issue? This is a fair question, I think, and one which ought to be answered, but how are we to find the answer? How are we to get it?

"Featherbedding is a real problem and will become more acute as automation increases. Its solution does not lie in strikes or lockout, but in statesmanship.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian does not want to settle the strike until its insurance strike benefits run out, by which time it hopes to have brought the Journal and the unions to their knees. The benefits, by the way, make it possible, I am told, to pay strikers $200 a week. Is it true?

"The newspapers must be cognizant of these rumors, but they have not affirmed or denied them.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian and the Journal are out to 'bust the unions,' that they are insisting upon an 'open shop' from reporters to pressmen. If these rumors are true (and I do not say they are true because I do not know) they ought to be matters of public concern.

"With the consolidation of newspapers that is taking place all over the country—and the Newhouse interests are playing a major part in these consolidations—the labor market for those whose only skills are in newspaper work is being diminished. Thus in an open shop, the wage scale is apt to be depressed for there are an increasing number of applicants for every job, and the law of supply and demand when not protected by unionism, works just as well in the labor market as it does in the marts of trade.

"Indeed, one of the tragic consequences of the present controversy is the job uncertainty of the men and women who have dedicated their lives to the profession of journalism and who have given to the city of Portland high examples of professional competency as reporters, some of them winning national awards for their work.

"Indeed, the Pultizer Prize, which the Oregonian boasts of, was won for them by guild members who are now uncertain as to the future of their jobs."

Dr. Steiner noted the publishers' charge that by respecting the picket lines and staying off their jobs, members of the Newspaper Guild and the craft unions have broken their contracts. "This may be true," he said, "but, if it is true, the newspapers have recourse to the courts under the Taft-Hartley law for damages. So far, I have heard of no threat of such suit.

"Surely the newspaper publishers are not so naive as to believe that those who owe so much to their unions would cross a picket line. The union movement is based on solidarity. If unions don't hang together, they shall surely hang separately to quote a much honored and revered Revolutionary leader."

In conclusion Dr. Steiner declared that the responsibility both of the unions and of the publishers in the present controversy is of concern to the public "and we ought to make known our concern to those who have accepted the responsibility to keep us informed."

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Dec. 11, 1959]

PORTLAND PAPERS CUT OFF GUILD BLUE CROSS PROGRAM

PORTLAND, OREG.—The Oregonian and the Oregon Journal are squeezing guild members in a frantic attempt to force them back to work across the picket lines of striking stereotypers.

First step in the squeeze was an announcement by the papers Friday, December 4, that guild members and their families would be cut off from Blue Cross coverage under the plans at the two dailies.

Management rejected a proposal by the Portland Guild that the health and welfare trust be continued and coverage maintained, with premiums to be deducted from salaries when the strike is over.

The guild promptly reached agreement with Blue Cross to establish a new interim hospitalization and surgical plan for its members, identical in both benefits and costs with previous coverage at the Oregonian and the Journal.

The plan adds a $13 a month premium for each member to the financial burden during the strike. The cost to the local, with some 160 members out, will be more than $2,000 a month over and above routine operating costs and regular benefits for members and dependents.

If Blue Cross coverage had been allowed to lapse, however, maternity benefits would have been lost for the wives of several guildsmen because of interrupted membership.

The two papers followed up the welfare cutoff with a series of weekend telephone calls and letters seeking to induce guild members to return to work. The messages were made up of veiled threats, promises, and plain pleading. There were no defectors.

Guild units at both papers have been honoring the stereotypers' picket lines since the strike began, November 5. Printers, pressmen, mailers, engravers, and other crafts also have refused to work during the strike. ITU members joined the picket line when they found the plant doors locked and guarded against them and their positions filled by strikebreakers on the first day of the walkout.

With the help of the strikebreakers, plus supervisors and other nonunion personnel, the Oregonian and the Journal have managed to publish a combined daily edition under the flags of both papers. The plant and equipment of S. I. Newhouse's Oregonian are being used to produce the hybrid.

Despite a claimed press run of more than 500,000 and more than 5 weeks of operation, the combination paper still is little more than a throwaway. Circulation is haphazard. Carriers report mounting losses. Advertising space is rationed and a growing number of merchants have switched to spot television and radio commercials.

A telephone poll of Portland residents by guild members, using scientific polling

methods, revealed that some 15 percent of the papers' readers have canceled their subscriptions. Losses in the suburban and State areas, where circulation has been cut most sharply, may send the cancellation total to 20 percent, the pollsters estimate.

The cancellation campaign picked up momentum after the first of the month. Many residents had been reluctant to inflict losses on carrier boys by stopping delivery in mid-November.

Advertisers, too, are rejecting even rationed space in the face of the rate policy adopted by the Oregonian-Journal. For space in the combined paper, the advertiser pays twice—once to the Oregonian and once to the Journal.

Within the past 2 weeks, management's stand on two of the key issues in the strike appeared ludicrous in the light of developments elsewhere.

The Oregonian has insisted that the stereotypers agree only one man will be necessary to operate a new German plate-casting machine it has not even ordered yet and which is not yet in use anywhere in the country.

On November 27, the union reached agreement on the same question with all three Detroit newspapers under substantially the same terms it has offered the Oregonian: that the manning issue will be negotiated by the parties when and if the machine is installed and both sides have had a chance to see it in operation.

The Portland papers also insist they will sign no union contracts under which foremen remain members of the union, on the gounds that this creates a closed shop in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That question, too, was settled in Detroit by leaving the choice of membership to the individual.

And on November 25, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., ruled that a contract is not necessarily an illegal closed shop just because the foreman is a member of the union.

The unions also turned up new evidence that the strike was deliberately provoked by management in an attempt to turn the plants into open shops in all departments.

Two visitors to Portland reported they had met one of the strikebreakers now in the city—James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark.—in Reno, Nev., last spring and summer. They said that on hearing they would be in Portland later in the year, Younger replied: "We'll see you in Portland."

The names and origins of more than 70 of the strikebreakers were printed in the Oregon Labor Press, a weekly owned by 11 AFL–CIO unions and councils in the State. Several of the scabs were identified as recruits of Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein in other newspaper strikebreaking attempts around the country.

Part of the list was read to the public by Guild President Bob Shults on a half-hour TV program produced by the Inter-Strike Policy Committee, headed by Charles Dale, ANG international representative.

The program, which aroused a storm of comment in the community, featured a series of interviews with union officials, rank-and-file picketers, and strikers' wives. It was the third half-hour TV program sponsored by the committee since the start of the dispute. The policy committee also is sponsoring 10 5-minute news broadcasts a week, divided between two radio stations.

Preparation of the newscasts and other publicity and public relations material is being carried out by guild members. The local is continuing, too, the production and distribution of handbills and its work with the Inter-Union Speakers' Bureau. Local President Shults already has addressed student and faculty groups at three of Portland's four colleges.

One temporary setback—the loss of its interim headquarters—was met and overcome by the local. The guild was evicted from a vacant store it had rented on Southwest Broadway just before a wrecking crew demolished the building to make way for a new 23-story Hilton hotel. The local's new headquarters consists of a second-floor suite of offices formerly occupied by a firm of labor attorneys.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Dec. 25, 1959]

OREGON STRIKEBREAKER—PROBE SET—STATE GROUP ORDERS STUDY OF SCAB USE

PORTLAND, OREG.—The stereotypers' strike against Portland's two daily newspapers rolled into the sixth week with developments on every front except the bargaining table.

Management suffered two setbacks during the week.

The Oregon Legislative Interim Committee on Labor Management Relations ordered a special investigation January 9 on the use of imported strikebreakers and their effect on collective bargaining. The motion clearly aimed at the Portland newspaper strike was passed unanimously.

Unions were on hand for the committee's session in the State capital at Salem. They were prepared to introduce evidence on organized strikebreaking. The committee, however, preferred to call a special session to hear the explosive testimony.

The Oregon Wage and Hour Commission was advised at its regular meeting that women teletypesetter operators were being worked 72 hours per week in order to produce the combined Oregonian-Oregon Journal at the Oregonian plant.

The commission voted 2 to 1 to order the companies to obey State law in limiting the workweek to 44 hours for women employees. The commission also noted that under this law women may be worked a maximum of 60 hours under emergency conditions.

Both events received extensive radio and TV coverage. The strike newspaper, called the Orejournal by those on the picket lines, gave the stories the "kissed off" news treatment. But management trumpeted on the front page the return to work of eight guildsmen on December 14. Several others trickled back to work during the week, bringing to 14 the number of defectors from the guild's ranks.

The group included several leaders of a back-to-work movement launched the week before. This issue was met head-on at a membership meeting of the local. After 2 hours of debate, the back-to-work motion was resoundingly defeated 117 to 23 by secret written ballot. The night before the strike started the local voted 68 to 30, also by secret ballot, to respect the picket line.

Bob Shults, PNG president, said he and other guildsmen had the highest respect for others in the back-to-work movement who continue to observe the picket line. "We are proud that they are honoring the rights of others by obeying the mandate of the majority as recorded by a secret ballot," he said.

When the first seven defectors arrived at the Oregonian plant they found a mass picket line of 125 persons. Radio and TV were on the scene to cover the incident.

One radio station's news director handed a microphone to Shults on the sidewalk and asked what effect the defections would have on the morale of the guild. Shults replied:

"The guild is a thinking man's union, a few members just filtered through the picket line."

The remark was widely quoted and tape recordings of the live broadcast were repeated on subsequent news programs.

Publishers of the Oregonian and the Journal have flatly refused to accept mediation through Gov. Mark Hatfield or through an impartial factfinding panel as suggested by both the Governor and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

More than 3 weeks ago, the Portland newspaper unions accepted the Governor's offer of personal mediation, but the publishers would have no part of it.

This week, Senator NEUBERGER suggested that the Governor appoint "a citizen's factfinding panel of the utmost impartiality and integrity to help clarify the issues in the present Portland newspaper strike."

Again the unions agreed, but the publishers brushed aside the suggestion.

The Portland Guild represents the newsrooms of the two papers and inside circulation at the Journal.

For the first month of the strike management had let it be known that any guildsman would have to be rehired to get his job back. After the solid 5-to-1 vote to defeat the back-to-work movement management launched a whirlwind campaign at "weak sisters" with the offer that they could go back to work just as if they had never missed a day on the job.

Honey works where vinegar did not, management found out.

The defectors leaped from the frying pan to the fire as far as their hospital and life insurance plan is concerned. They can't work enough shifts in December to be covered in January under the joint guild-management trust fund and most certainly the hard-pressed guild treasury is not going to pay the $15.80 per person bill for them.

"Instead of declaring supplementary local benefits for members from the generous donations of other guilds we are paying the hospital and life insurance for all guildsmen respecting the picket line," Shults explained. This cost PNG almost $2,400 for December coverage. The local faces a $2,200 bill for January coverage for its 130 members still off their jobs.

The plan provides either Blue Cross or Kaiser Permanente hospital and surgical coverage and $4,000 life insurance.

Management apparently was stung by the latest in a series of TV shows sponsored by the newspaper unions. The newspapers reprinted the speeches of the four panel members and then denounced them in two columns of 12-point type. It took a full page of space.

The bitterest and longest blasts in the editorial were directed at Charles Dale, guild international representative assigned to Portland for the strike emergency. Dale had blistered management for the importation of 115 professional strike breakers into its mechanical departments. The TV shows have been hurting management as they urge the public to cancel their subscriptions.

One nonunion telephone operator said "The switchboard lights up like a Christmas tree the instant the program is over and continues that way for several hours as people cancel their papers."

Careful investigation shows the combined paper is down more than 100,000 in circulation. Advertisers, however, are charged the regular rates by both papers for rationed ads appearing in the combined edition.

The weekly Oregon Labor Press, in carrying the union story to Portland's citizenry, pushed up the press run of its December 18 issue to 100,000.

Planned for the year-end is an edition of 275,000, to be mailed to virtually every residence in the Portland metropolitan area. The eight-page issue will eliminate all advertising and regular features and will tell the Portland strike story from its beginning. Six striking editorial staff members, plus artists and photographers on assignment, will aid editor Jim Goodsell in production. Locked-out ITU mailers have volunteered to work over the Christmas weekend to get the paper into the mails.

The stereotypers are on strike at Portland. The ITU printers and mailers are on the picket lines carrying lockout banners. Pressmen, engravers, machinists, and members of other unions are respecting the picket lines. Teamsters employed by the Journal are also on the picket line.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Dec. 25, 1959]

THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE STORY: THERE IS ANOTHER SIDE—EMPLOYEES ASK ONLY THEIR DAY IN COURT

This is an appeal to your sense of fair play.

It is the story—spread across this special issue of the Oregon Labor Press—of a newspaper strike in Portland.

The publishers have described their version of the dispute as the facts. Their union employees believe that these facts are biased, slanted, and in some cases, outright untruths.

Here is the employees' side. Openly and honestly, they say it is their side. It is a side which has not, unfortunately, been told by the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

We ask only that you read—and then decide where the truth is to be found.

The present newspaper strike is not an ordinary labor dispute. It is not over wages. It is not over any clear-cut issue. There has not been good faith bargaining by the publishers to settle it.

In short, we believe this is an employer-forced strike.

We believe it was provoked, deliberately, by the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal to destroy unions—unions whose members are your friends and neighbors in every part of the Portland area.

We say this for several compelling reasons:

1. A Republican Governor, Mark Hatfield, offered to mediate a settlement of the strike. He was urged to do so by both the Portland and the Oregon Council of Churches.

The Governor agreed. The unions agreed. The publishers flatly refused.

A Democratic U.S. Senator, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, urged the appointment of a citizens' factfinding committee to clarify the strike issues for the public.

The unions welcomed the suggestion. The publishers flatly refused.

(Both newspapers, over the years, have praised Oregon Governors for mediating labor disputes. They have recommended factfinding as a method of settling strikes. But now the publishers reject these remedies in their own strike. We can only conclude that they don't want to settle this strike—and they don't want the public to know the facts.)

2. Every strike issue labeled as a "key issue" by the Portland publishers also was an issue in Detroit recently. In Detroit, each of these issues was settled without a strike, without months of negotiation, without bitterness.

In 7 hours of good faith bargaining, these issues were settled by Detroit's three major newspapers and the Stereotypers' Union—on terms to which Portland's striking stereotypers would agree this very minute.

Every issue settled—in 7 hours. They were not settled here, we believe, because the Portland publishers wanted this strike.

3. The Stereotypers' Union has offered many compromises and concessions, both before and after the strike began. But the Oregonian and Journal have met each compromise with a new and tougher demand.

We believe this proves that the publishers wanted the strike—and that now they want it to continue. How different from the 7-hour settlement of the same issues in Detroit. How different from the peaceful negotiation of new union contracts by both daily newspapers in our sister city of Seattle.

4. The Oregonian and Journal have continued to publish a joint newspaper by the wholesale importing of professional strikebreakers—most of them from the Deep South and other far-away States.

Many among the 116 identified strikebreakers have police records. Several of them came armed—at least one with an illegal sawed-off shotgun. All break strikes for salaries—premium salaries ranging to $300 a week plus expenses.

Several of these strikebreakers knew as long as 5 months ago that they were going to be needed in Portland this year. They were alerted long before the Stereotypers Union had even opened negotiations with the Oregonian and Journal publishers.

5. Strike insurance, a new device in labor relations, has enabled the Portland publishers to import their strikebreakers. Strike insurance is the reason why they defiantly refuse the proferred help of the Governor, why they defiantly refuse to bargain in good faith with the unions of their longtime employees.

Strike insurance means the Oregonian and Journal are collecting $1 million over a 50-day period—from a multi-million-dollar insurance account held in a Canadian bank.

This not only means that the publishers' losses are being covered.

What is far more important is that for the 8 weeks, while the employees try to scrimp along, there is absolutely no pressure on the publishers to negotiate for a settlement of the strike.

As in the old bloody days of raw capitalism, management can try—literally—to starve out its employees, while it loses not a cent. This is a strange situation for placid Portland and its once-venerated hometown newspapers.

6. This is a dispute which threatens to make Portland a one-newspaper city.

New York press lord Samuel I. Newhouse, who owns the Oregonian, wants the locally owned Journal.

If he gets it, he can save millions by merger.

If he gets it, we can expect the same kind of objectivity on all subjects that the hybrid Oregonian-Journal has provided on the news of this strike. Would we have newspapers or viewspapers?

HIGHER PRICES COULD RESULT

If Newhouse buys the Journal, watch prices climb; newspaper merger everywhere has meant higher advertising rates—and hence higher prices on the food and merchandise you buy.

Tragically, this strike never would have started if the publishers had shown good faith in bargaining or shown the slightest desire for honest negotiation of a labor contract.

But the Oregonian and Journal still profess to believe in collective bargaining. In rejecting Senator NEUBERGER'S factfinding proposal, they called collective bargaining the "proper procedure for settlement of such disputes."

In this dispute, the publishers have made a mockery of their own words. They have raised demands which no union in America could accept—wholesale elimination of union rights won in years of honest collective bargaining.

Check the progress on the issues:

Issue No. 1

Publishers originally demanded one-man operation of a German-made plate-casting machine which they haven't even ordered and which the stereotypers have never seen. They haven't seen it because there isn't a single one in operation in the United States.

Stereotypers offered to negotiate the number of men needed to run the machine when and if it was installed. As a further concession, they agreed to no work stoppage or strike during the progress of such negotiation.

The publishers refused the offer. Instead, they added a new demand—reexamination of the manning of other equipment—a question already settled by the collective bargaining procedure the publishers say they admire.

And, incidentally, the Journal has no interest in the machine. Why does the Journal support the Oregonian's adamant stand on an issue that means nothing to the Journal?

Issue No. 2

Publishers demanded the right to hire substitutes, which the union always has provided. Publishers said this system has forced hiring of men at overtime rates.

The stereotypers offered to settle this point by covering all regular shifts at straight-time rates and to guarantee no penalty shifts.

The publishers refused. Instead, they again added a new demand—that strikebreakers be given priority and seniority over regular employees of long standing.

Issue No. 3

Publishers demanded that foremen decide for themselves whether to belong to a union.

The stereotypers agreed.

Box score on the three issues:

The stereotypers: three issues, three concessions, no new demands.

The publishers: three issues, no concessions, five new demands.

In addition to the two mentioned, they insist on the following:

1. A 5-hour increase in the workweek, with no increase in pay.

2. An open shop, which would force union men to work side by side with strikebreakers.

3. A no strike clause in any new contract.

This is the type of collective bargaining that has caused the publishers to resist appointment of an impartial factfinding body.

This is the way management serves 850 employees, many of 20 and 30 years' service and whose loyalty would not permit them to walk out on mere whim or caprice.

ENTIRE COMMUNITY HURT

But this strike hurts not only the jobless employees.

It hurts merchants—because of restricted advertising sold at premium rates, because of the decreased spending power in the community. Strikebreakers take their money back to Dixie.

It hurts readers—because of an inferior product with scant local news, because they have grounds now to be distrustful of all objective news the papers may print.

It hurts the community—because if monopoly should result, Portland will be a city with one advertising rate and one voice—from which there would be virtually no appeal.

Documentation of the arguments we make here is detailed throughout this special issue of the Oregon Labor Press.

Read it and decide who merits your support—850 longtime citizens of our community who have made honest attempts and concessions in an effort to end the strike—or Newhouse and the professional strikebreakers he has imported from the South to destroy the unions to which your friends and neighbors belong.

THOSE NEW "OREGONIANS"—ROVING STRIKEBREAKERS SUPPLANT PORTLANDERS

"All are good people, most of them married, a large percent owning their own homes and paying Oregon taxes."

The words are those of the Oregonian-Journal, used to describe the personnel now putting out the combined paper.

They sound reassuring. Except for one thing.

They aren't true.

Already, the Labor Press has published documented rosters of 116 professional strikebreakers imported by the publishers.

Some were here within hours after the strike began—even though their homes are thousands of miles away. Others said, as long as 5 months ago, that they expected to be in Portland this year.

Take William Glover for example.

He is married—to Justine Glover, who has been associated with him in strikebreaking attempts across the country, including this one.

He may own a home—but it is not in Portland. And if he pays Oregon taxes, it is only because he has to through payroll deductions.

Glover, 34, known as "Bino" to his fellow strikebreakers, has worked for the Schleppey-Klein firm, an organization dedicated to breaking strikes—temporarily seizing, for exorbitant pay, the jobs of regular employees out on strike.

Before coming to Portland just after the present dispute began November 10, Glover was involved as a strikebreaker in Zanesville, Ohio; Houston; Ypsilanti, Mich.; Haverhill, Mass., and Westchester County, N.Y.

Compare him, for example, to Fred Breckon, one of the regular newspaper employees, whose jobs the strikebreakers have pirated.

Breckon is a soft-spoken printer who has worked at the Oregon Journal for 12 years.

He is proud of his home in Vermont Hills, a home into which he has welcomed this year a Mexican exchange student.

Fred Breckon votes and pays Oregon taxes, but he also does a host of things in the community which are not required of him:

He was one of the first volunteer workers at the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry. He is a member of the Men's Garden Club, a Mason, a radio ham, a member of the First Presbyterian Church.

His wife, Lillian, is a past president of the Portland PTA council and a State board member. She is on the YWCA board.

They managed to send their oldest son, Lyall, to Harvard, and now he works for the State Department. Their other son, Garry, is a Wilson High sophomore.

The Breckons now get the bare minimum strike benefits provided by the International Typographical Union. The Glovers, on the other hand, together make close to $700 a week, for their part in trying to break a legitimate strike.

This kind of activity has come under official scrutiny several times. In Westchester County, N.Y., for example, a New York State legislative committee denounced the existence of a strikebreaker pool.

A similar probe has been undertaken in Pennsylvania. Now, in Portland, the urgings of responsible public officials have resulted in the scheduling of an investigation by the legislative interim committee on labor-management relations.

The investigations come simply because these people are strikebreakers, who, by their existence, the New York committee concluded, incite labor strife by encouraging publishers to force regular employees, good people, out on strike.

Missing Bylines—Famous Reporters Honor Picket Line

Missing these days from Portland's two daily newspapers are the bylines of reporters whose years of dedicated service have won them a proud place in American newspaper history.

These are the bylines of members of the American Newspaper Guild, members who have voted overwhelmingly to support their fellow unions in the strike against the Oregonian and Oregon Journal.

They are bylines which have earned Portland a national reputation for honesty and impartiality in reporting.

The men and women supporting this strike have won, individually or for their papers, almost every major honor in American journalism—the Pulitzer Prize, the Heywood Broun Award, Nieman fellowships, national recognition for reporting in the fields of government, education, traffic safety, and aviation.

Nieman fellowships, incidentally, provide graduate study at Harvard University for America's outstanding newspapermen and newspaperwomen.

Supporting this strike are news reporters you know:

Wallace Turner, Oregonian, winner of two Heywood Broun Awards (for his exposure of scandal in sale of Indian lands and for investigation of vice), Nieman fellow, major contributor to the winning of a Pulitzer Prize.

Donald J. Sterling, Jr., Journal, Nieman fellow whose reporting of city government and of other stories have won him widespread respect for impartiality, for accuracy.

Wilma Morrison, Oregonian, one of America's top education reporters, twice winner of the National Education Writers Association's top award, only noneducator ever appointed to the educational policy committee of the NEA and former Oregon Education Citizen of the Year.

Stan Weber, Journal, whose down-the-middle coverage of labor disputes has earned him respect of both management and labor in a field as explosive as any covered by newspapers.

Mervin Shoemaker, Oregonian, veteran political writer, whose views are sought by national magazines.

Stan Durland, Journal, whose authoritative reporting of medical affairs has gained him the confidence of both the medical profession and the reading public.

Leverett Richards, Oregonian, national authority in the aviation field (he flies jets himself), public information officer for the Antarctic Operation Deep Freeze in 1956 and 1957, and 1957 winner of the Junior Chamber of Commerce Award for outstanding contribution to aviation in Portland.

J. Edward Reid, Journal, national award winner for his crime reporting, trusted associate of FBI agents and other top police investigators.

Paul Hauser, Oregonian, veteran of the political arena, even better known for his human interest stories which for years have drawn both tears and laughter from his readers.

John Finch, Journal, whose coverage of the waterfront has kept readers both entertained and informed on vital activities in a major shipping center.

These are but a few of the bylines missing from the hybrid newspaper now being printed by imported strikebreakers in our city.

And the reporters are not alone in the Newspaper Guild in their support of other unions.

With them are sports writers who have covered championship fights, Rose Bowl and East-West games, national basketball championships, national golf tournaments.

With them are the society editors and writers—at ease at Portland's most exclusive parties, in the most exclusive clubs—yet now supporting a newspaper strike and lockout, lending a hand in union activities.

With them are photographers, risking injury one minute at floods and fires, the next quietly photographing teenagers who win leads in senior class plays.

With them are women in the newspapers' home service departments, women who answer frantic young brides' requests for instructions on cooking elk steaks.

With them are garden experts who save your roses with proper pruning instructions.

With them are artists whose cartoons can infuriate or tickle, whose deft touches save faded photographs brought in for reproduction.

These are the men and women of the Portland Newspaper Guild.

They are homeowners, active in civic affairs, proud of their city.

They are proud of their role in American life.

They are also proud of their union.

Strikebreaking Probe Slated by Legislators

The importation of strikebreakers and its impact on labor-management relations in Oregon will be aired at a public hearing scheduled in Salem January 9 by the Legislative Interim Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

Although the decision to conduct such a hearing obviously grew out of the current newspaper strike, in which the combined Oregonian-Oregon Journal is being published by imported strikebreakers, the committee has announced that the matter will be considered in the light of the overall labor-management relations picture in the State.

Decision to call the hearing was reached unanimously by the committee at a meeting in Salem December 18 on the motion of Walter J. Pearson, senate president, who is a member of the group.

Initial request for just such a hearing was made by State Representative Edward J. Whelan, another committee member and executive-secretary of the Multnomah County Central Labor Council.

Representatives of the two struck newspapers and the unions involved in the strike-lockout will be invited to testify at the hearing, but no attempt will be made by the committee to consider the issues of the strike itself. It was emphasized that the hearing will be confined to the single matter of importation of strikebreakers.

George Brown, political education director for the Oregon AFL–CIO, also was in attendance at the December 18 meeting and urged the committee to confine its hearing to the one problem, without going into the strike issues.

Whelan originally proposed that the committee take up the matter of strikebreakers when it became apparent within the first week of the strike that the combined newspapers were importing strikebreakers from as far away as Florida.

Whelan viewed the practice of importing strikebreakers as having a "serious negative impact on the efforts of mediation."

Provocations Resisted—Attacks, Threats Harass Pickets

They have been attacked with cars, bottles, and baseball-size rocks.

They have been threatened with sawed-off shotguns, rifles, and late-night phone calls.

But, nonetheless, the pickets and other union members involved in the present newspaper strike have not let themselves be provoked.

A survey of the thick police bureau file on the strike disclosed that incidents of violence or near-violence concerning the strike, by and large, were not caused by the union side.

The first report in the police file, dated November 15, is probably also the most menacing.

Patrolmen Louis De Giovanni and Bernard Schuette stopped two men leaving a Florida-licensed car across Southwest Columbia Street from the Oregonian plant—where the struck managements are publishing jointly.

The men, Gordon Comstock, 27, and Franklin E. Early, 22, were carrying an armload of weapons. The men said they had been hired by the Oregonian.

The officers' report described the weapons as a .22 Winchester, a 12-gage Savage, a .22

Higgins—and a sawed-off shotgun, "homemade and without markings of any kind."

The gun, in clear violation of Federal law, was seized by the FBI, and the Federal Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit investigated.

The combined newspaper reported the incident without any mention of the sawed-off shotgun or the FBI's role.

Despite the notoriety this caused, a similar incident occurred 4 weeks later, when weapons were taken from three other imported strikebreakers—Curtis Gleason, Holden, Mass.; Richard C. Brewster, Oxford, Mass., and an unidentified third man.

On December 11, police arrested paper distributor Wilford P. Weller, 520 Northeast Laurelhurst Street, after he plowed his car into a group of women pickets.

Four women were struck, and Arleta Johnson, 27, 5423, Southeast Gladstone Street, was hospitalized.

Patrolman Bernard K. Smith said Weller was so belligerent that "I had to go over his hood to get to the driver's side and get the car stopped."

A more serious incident on November 19 sent printer Ira Connell, 55, 9570 Southwest 80th Avenue, to Emanuel Hospital with painful hip and ankle injuries.

Connell was not picketing but was talking to a friend on the picket line when he was struck by a newspaper-filled station wagon.

Connell's wife, a witness, said the vehicle didn't stop, but "just shot right out of the tunnel."

On December 14, picket Eugene K. Wootten, 14745 Southeast Rhone Street, walking in front of the empty Journal Building, just missed being struck by large rocks thrown from an upstairs window.

At least two union families have been threatened with violence, by a smooth-talking woman familiar with their jobs.

There have been a few incidents on the other side of the fence.

The most serious ended December 11 when two former Journal truckdrivers were convicted of assault and battery in Milwaukee justice court and fined $75 each.

Present Journal distributors George A. Fleming and Elmer Betts testified they had been struck several times with lengths of rubber hose after the former drivers, Mike Rovito and Claude Mayo, followed them to Oak Grove from the Oregonian.

On November 15, Henry D. Keith, 32, 910 Southeast 175th Avenue, identified as a pressman, was arrested for drunkenness and jaywalking in connection with an attempt to spill papers.

STRIKEBREAKER KNEW HE WAS COMING—FIVE MONTHS AGO IN RENO BAR: "WE'LL BREAK A PORTLAND STRIKE"

Five months ago, the publishers of the Oregonian and Oregon Journal already were planning to force a strike and to import professional strikebreakers.

That is the conclusion of two Portland telephone operators who were told by a newspaper strikebreaker in Reno last summer:

"We'll be coming up to Portland this year * * * we'll all be up there."

This week, the two women gave the first detailed public account of their encounter with newspaper strikebreakers, asking only that their names be withheld.

The scene: The cocktail bar of the Carlton Hotel in Reno, Nevada.

The time: The evening of July 11, 1959.

"I had been playing a machine," says one of the women, "when this man spoke to me. We got to talking and he said he was a strikebreaker.

"I didn't even want to talk to him then—a strikebreaker is the most despicable thing I can imagine, but my friend said she didn't even know what a strikebreaker was."

The man, now identified as James Younger, of Fort Smith, Ark., was then working behind the picket line at the Reno Gazette and Journal. He is now working behind the picket line at the Oregonian building.

In the Reno cocktail bar, Younger explained that he got $250 a week counting overtime, $6 a day for meals, and his hotel bills and transportation taken care of.

"I go wherever the money is," he said.

By this time, the husbands of the two women had returned "and we got to talking some more with this fellow—he was the only clean-cut looking one in the bunch—and four or five other people who worked with him.

"They said they were breaking the strike at the Reno paper and were bragging all about how much money they were making.

"We told them we were from Portland.

"'Say,' this one fellow said, 'we'll be coming up to Portland this year.'

"'Oh, don't be ridiculous,' I said," the woman recalls.

"'Well, we will be. We'll all be up there.'"

The other Portland woman's account of the incident is almost the same.

She recalls that a woman strikebreaker was creating a raucous scene at the bar. This woman, about 45, talked as though she were a leader of the strikebreakers.

"She said that by the end of the month, she would have earned $1,000," the young Portland woman relates.

"She told me where the next newspaper strike was expected, and said, 'I'm going to be there. I'm going to be in the middle of it.'

"I asked her how she knew.

"'Oh, our association always knows that,'" the woman replied.

After their return to Portland several days later, the women reported the incident to their union head, Wesley D. McDuffee, president of Local 9201, Communication Workers of America, who confirms their story.

"They were quite shocked about this strikebreaking situation in Reno," McDuffee said this week. "Very frankly, I didn't think much of it at the time. But I changed my mind when the strike started in Portland—and especially when Younger showed up here."

The women also asked an Oregonian reporter, long-time friend of one, about the likelihood of a strike.

"He laughed," the woman recalls. "He said there wasn't even talk of a strike."

And indeed there wasn't—by the unions. For all this took place 4 months before the strike began and 2 months before Stereotypers Local 48 even sat down to open negotiations with the Portland publishers.

But today, just as he said he would be, James Younger is 1 of the 116 identified strikebreakers working at the Oregonian plant.

PUBLISHERS IMPORT 116 STRIKEBREAKERS

A pool of professional strikebreakers is available on immediate call in the newspaper industry.

Each newspaper strikebreaking operation provides a training ground for new strikebreakers.

Now they are in Portland. They are working at the Oregonian building putting out the hybrid Oregonian-Oregon Journal, getting premium pay and all expenses.

They arrived from as far away as Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida, many on the first day of the strike.

Chief of the imported strikebreaking crew is L. R. McCoy, fresh from a similar assignment in Galveston, Tex. He was sent here by the Southwest Newspaper Publishers' Association, an affiliate of the national association.

Working here under him are a number of alumni of the Schleppey-Klein operation.

Organized by Bloor Schleppey of Zionsville, Ind., self-avowed paid strikebreaker for the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, the operation has trained printers, pressmen, and stereotypers to pirate the jobs of regular workers.

Schleppey has been a frequent speaker at ANPA conventions and his services have been used in dozens of strikebreaking attempts.

It cannot we determined if he or his associate, Shirley Klein, are involved here directly. But their students are here.

They are people like David B. Anderson, 23, whose home address is unknown, but who hasn't spent much time there lately in any case. He has worked as a Schleppey-Klein strikebreaker in Davenport, Iowa; Chicago, Miami, and Haverhill, Mass.

Or Betsy Coxe, a blonde teletypesetter instructor who is known to have worked as a strikebreaker in Miami and Oklahoma City.

Or Lee Norton, whose job-pirating history includes episodes in Galveston, Tex., Monroe, La., and Wichita Falls, Tex.

Their names have been detailed before. The Labor Press has listed the roster of 116 imported roving job stealers.

Whose jobs have they taken?

Harold Warner has spent 54 of his 68 years working for first the Journal and then the Oregonian.

"We helped build the Journal," he says with pride. "If the Jacksons or the Pittocks were around now, this kind of strike would never have happened."

His is a two-generation Oregonian family. Son George, 32, already has worked at the Oregonian for 9 years. Both Warners are substantial citizens. They own homes. They are active in youth work and other community activities. They pay taxes for and take pride in their neighborhoods and city.

In his 29 years as a pressman in Portland, John Bisch has been a leader in his union, a school district chairman, a civil defense official, and an active Mason.

Petite Freda Cowling, club editor of the Oregonian for more than 30 years, has spent countless hours working for the Red Cross, the United Fund, the Visiting Nurse Association, and the Air Defense Filter Center.

She has given blood 35 times at the Red Cross blood center.

Mrs. Cowling, who, like other members of the Newspaper Guild, decided not to cross the picket lines into the struck newspaper plant, is a church and precinct board member, buying a home and paying local taxes.

Who is more valuable to the community, Freda Cowling or Betsy Coxe?

The story can be repeated again and again—as many times as there are strikebreakers to compare with regular newspaper employees—solid citizens of Portland.

A few are detailed with pictures on this page. Compare the records—and then decide whose side you'd like to be on.

ONE-NEWSPAPER TOWN?—THREAT OF MERGER FACING PORTLAND

Repeated denials by Journal owners have failed to erase the threat posed by the newspaper strike-lockout that Portland will wind up in the ranks of one-newspaper cities.

Samuel I. Newhouse, the New York press lord who owns the Oregonian, wants to buy the Journal. Already the Journal has fallen to a "kept" status in the Oregonian building.

The Journal management's denial that the paper is for sale comes as no surprise. All newspaper consolidations are preceded routinely by similar firm denials.

Actions of Journal publishers, however, weaken their denials. The day the strike commenced, the Journal management closed its own plant and transferred operations to the plant of its competitor, the Oregonian.

Further, the Journal management admitted it had no interest in the German platecasting machine, operation of which the Oregonian posed as the primary issue which led to the strike-lockout.

One Journal official said privatey early in the strike:

"This situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

Missing is any denial on the part of the Oregonian management that Newhouse interests want to purchase the Journal. Elsewhere, Newhouse has been successful in buying out his competitors in the newspaper field.

Newspaper consolidation and monopoly control have been progressively increasing in recent years. The consequences of such mergers are manifold, and of growing concern to the public.

What might one newspaper mean to Portland?

It would mean increased subscription rates. It could mean increased advertising rates which would be passed on to the consumer through increased prices of merchandise.

Of more significance to the public generally might be the editorial implications of a monopoly operation. It could mean concentration of all editorial power in one newspaper and quite possibly in one man.

It could mean the establishment of a policy which could create a blackout of all but one side of any issue.

Louis M. Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University, views the newspaper consolidation trend in this way:

"As mergers increase and more and more cities are reduced to a single newspaper ownership, the danger that the newspaper will become chiefly a voice of the local power setup increases.

"As this concentration proceeds, what form of countervailing power is available to the elements in the community which do not feel their interests affiliated with the elements of local power?

"In short, what chance for those who do not feel represented by the board of trade?"

STRIKE INSURANCE: $1 MILLION ACE IN HOLE—PORTLAND PAPERS USE NEW WEAPON

Strike insurance.

This is the ace in the hole held by strikebreaking publishers of the Oregonian and Journal.

A strike insurance war chest of more than $17 million is held in a Montreal, Canada, bank. It is out of reach of U.S. courts and laws.

It can pay the Portland publishers up to $1 million in the present strike lockout.

Each of them can collect $10,000 per day, up to $500,000, over a 50-day period.

Premium payments are deductible as a business expense for tax purposes.

Strike insurance is the device that enabled the publishers to bring in a flying squad of strikebreakers. These strikebreakers, some of them armed and some with police records, are here to put down a legitimate effort of Portland newspaper unions to bargain collectively for fair and decent working conditions and wages.

NEWHOUSE LEADS DEVELOPMENT

Strike insurance is a potent new weapon for union busting. It has been pioneered by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Spearheading its development within the newspaper industry is Samuel Newhouse of New York, absentee owner of the Oregonian.

Two representatives of the Newhouse newspaper chain are on the Newspaper Publishing Premium Fund Committee of the strike insurance plan. They are Theodore Newhouse and M. J. Frey.

Theodore Newhouse is Sam Newhouse's brother. He is general manager of the Long Island Press and Star-Journal. Although he is a resident of New York, he is also vice-president of the Oregonian Publishing Co.

M. J. Frey is publisher of the Oregonian.

Presence of two Newhouse men on the strike insurance committee is all the proof needed that the Oregonian is covered. Statements that the Oregon Journal also participates in the union-busting insurance plan have brought no denials from Journal publishers.

One reason why the publishers' strike insurance is held in Canada is that in 1956 the filing of such policies in New York was rejected by that State's department of insurance as contrary to public policy.

PLAN MOVED TO CANADA

The New York State Department of Insurance investigated charges that strike insurance actually encouraged publishers to force their employees out on strike.

The investigation was handled by the office of Jacob K. Javits, then attorney general of New York and now a Republican U.S. Senator from New York.

"On July 26, 1956," Javits reported, "I was advised by the Department of Insurance that the filings of each insurance company involved were rejected on the ground that approval of such coverage would be contrary to public policy."

But that didn't stop the American Newspaper Publishers' Association. They merely transferred their strike insurance to other companies and moved it into Canada—beyond the reach of U.S. laws.

Premiums for this insurance are high. Cost of the 50-day policy for one newspaper is $12,262.50 per year.

But payment of $24,525 has given the Portland publishers $1 million and 50 days for their cold-blooded attempt to starve out their union employees.

Existence of newspaper strike insurance has been known for several years. But only last spring were the details of the plan made known. The American Newspaper Guild acquired copies of a memorandum of the Newspaper Publishers' Premium Fund Committee.

The plan was set up, according to the memorandum, by publishers to cover losses resulting from strikes. The memo says that responsible underwriters are willing to provide such insurance under a group plan. It predicts that total coverage issued by the underwriters will be not less than $17.5 million.

The underwriters are not named, but their representatives are Mendes and Mount, 27 William Street, New York, N.Y. Mendes and Mount are the New York attorneys of Lloyds' of London.

ANPA COUNSEL CALLS TURN

Montreal Trust Co. of Canada is the escrow agent to which all premiums are paid. This company issues strike insurance to newspapers on the advice of Elisha Hanson, general counsel for the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

Montreal Trust Co. pays strike insurance claims in U.S. dollars.

Payments are made starting with the eighth day of a strike.

If publication is totally suspended, publishers are paid the full amount of daily indemnity. If publication is partially suspended, the amount paid includes (1) fixed charges, (2) expenses that cannot be eliminated during partial suspension, and (3) profits the publisher is prevented from earning because of partial suspension.

Armed with their new strike insurance weapon, the publishers of the Oregonian and Journal deliberately took positions in negotiations that obviously could not be accepted by the Stereotypers' Union. They refused to bargain in good faith. Other newspaper unions ran into the same arrogant attitudes in their negotiations with the publishers.

That the publishers deliberately planned and provoked the strike seems clear also from the speed with which they brought to Portland an organized crew of professional strikebreakers.

STRIKEBREAKING VETS HERE

Strike insurance and a pool of strikebreakers are the coordinated one-two punch adopted by antiunion newspaper publishers all over the country. This is the strategy in Westchester County, New York, where the Macy chain of newspapers has embarked on a union-busting campaign.

It is in Westchester County that the activities of the Bloor Schleppey strikebreaking service to publishers has been bared by an investigating committee of the New York State Legislature. Key men in previous Bloor Schleppey strikebreaking operations are now in Portland working for the hybrid Oregonian-Journal.

Strike insurance for the Newhouse chain is just like finding money. Even if Sam Newhouse has to pay out the $12,262.50 premium each year for each of his 14 newspapers, he is money ahead if he provokes a strike at only one of his operations.

Payment for insurance protection against losses over which one has no control is a legitimate procedure. But to be covered against losses over which the publishers themselves do have control is another matter.

LABOR SPURNS SIMILAR PLAN

Can a publisher insure himself against strike losses and then deliberately provoke a strike in order to collect money to finance a union-busting operation? This is clearly not the basis on which insurance policies are normally written.

This is the same as taking out fire insurance on a building and then deliberately setting fire to it in order to collect the insurance.

No wonder the premiums are high. No wonder the money is kept in a bank outside the borders and jurisdiction of the United States of America.

A similar insurance plan was offered to the AFL–CIO to insure members against time lost during strikes. It was turned down flatly.

Nelson Cruikshank, director of the AFL–CIO Department of Social Insurance, termed the plan a violation of the principles of both insurance and unionism.

"You don't insure when the risk is increased by the insurance," Cruikshank said. "A group of workers might have a grievance and the insurance would encourage them to call for a walkout when the problem could be settled peacefully."

"These forms of insurance actually provoke strikes," Cruikshank said.

Portland's newspaper strike is a perfect illustration of the dangers foreseen by the AFL–CIO in refusing to become involved in strike insurance plans.

WHOLE COMMUNITY ENDANGERED

But Samuel Newhouse, owner of the Oregonian, has no such scruples against strike insurance. He is a leader in the group of publishers who have put strike insurance in to effect.

Newspaper unions are alert to the danger of strike insurance. It is a vicious and potent weapon in the effort to drive unions from newspaper plants. Combined with the equally potent professional strikebreaker weapon, it becomes doubly dangerous.

The danger is not only to union members, but to any community where free, collective bargaining for legitimate labor goals has been recognized as an American tradition.

Aroused public opinion against the insurance-financed strikebreaker tactics of the Oregonian and Journal has been the best answer in Portland.

You have one way in which to express your opinion: By canceling your subscription.

OREGONIAN'S ABSENTEE LANDLORD—NEWHOUSE SETS STRIFE PATTERN

To publish Samuel I. Newhouse, it's an old, old story—this strike and lockout at the Portland newspapers.

His record of constant clash with labor speaks for itself.

Examples:

The first strike in the history of the American Newspaper Guild was in 1933 against the Staten Island (N.Y.) Advance—a Newhouse newspaper.

The first strike in the 25-year history of the St. Louis Newspaper Guild was against the Globe-Democrat—a Newhouse newspaper.

And now it's Portland—where the Oregonian has been published since 1950 by the absentee landlord from New York City.

The pattern is clear.

And the pattern of his life is just as clear. Newhouse is a businessman with a sharp eye for the fast buck—bucks which have come fast enough that the value of his vast publishing empire is estimated at from $150 million to $200 million.

The secret of this business success can be spelled out with two words—purchase and consolidation. He buys papers. He consolidates them. And he winds up, when the plan works, with a one-newspaper city—his newspaper.

It happened in Syracuse, N.Y.

It happened in Harrisburg, Pa.

It could happen in Portland.

With his 14 newspapers, Newhouse is America's third largest chain publisher. (And how he hates that word chain.)

Yet in the cities from coast to coast in which he operates, Newhouse is almost unknown.

Only twice since he bought the Oregonian 9 years ago (for $5½ million in cash) has Newhouse visited Portland.

Newhouse is himself no newspaperman. He does no writing. He does not personally direct editorial policies of his vast holdings. He is interested only in making the money that enables him to collect an annual salary of $250,000.

Newhouse is a man of action—action which at times has proved downright amazing. He bought the Oregonian in a telephone conversation. He bought his Syracuse papers in the same way. (He'd never even been in the city, he said.)

He is said to know the financial condition of every major paper in the country. If true, this explains his success in moving so quickly.

Yet once a deal is completed he has shown an astounding lack of interest in his properties—except for the financial reports.

On his first visit to Portland he had to be persuaded even to take a look at the Oregonian plant. He was there 10 minutes, remarked that "it's three times too big," and left.

Newhouse is outspoken in his belief in mergers.

In Editor and Publisher, trade magazine of the newspaper publishing business, he was quoted as saying current tax problems make it advisable for local papers to gain strength by affiliation with other newspapers.

This, of course, spells merger.

And as another magazine, Printers' Ink, pointed out, Newhouse is "always on the prowl for available properties."

Newhouse, 64, was born in New York City, the oldest of eight children of immigrant Russian parents. He passed bar exams but junked a legal career to buy newspapers. When he was 25, he purchased his first one. And it was a classic transaction.

He bought a paper in Fitchburg, Mass., kept it a year and sold it at a 50 percent profit. And for the entire year hardly anyone in Fitchburg even knew what Newhouse looked like.

Newhouse is publicity shy. He gave the first speech of his life last year. It lasted 3 minutes, and he said he'll give no more.

He does not take part in community affairs, confines himself to business ventures.

As Joe Bailey, vice president of the International Typographical Union, put it:

"If he (Newhouse) has done anything constructive for humanity in this country, I have yet to learn of it."

Perhaps, the strangest statement ever made by Newhouse was uttered shortly after he purchased the Oregonian.

"A newspaper," he was quoted by Editor & Publisher, "is more than a press and rolls of print. It must have continuity of tradition and service. Such continuity is best achieved by retaining and aiding the men and women who give the newspaper its character."

This philosophy—"retaining and aiding the men and women who give the newspaper its character"—from an absentee publisher who has been an antagonist of labor in every city in which he has operated.

This philosophy from a publisher whose "men and women" have been supplanted by imported strikebreakers.

NEWHOUSE EMPIRE

These are the 14 newspapers, 9 radio and television stations, and 9 magazines owned or controlled by Samuel I. Newhouse:

The Oregonian, Newark Star-Ledger, St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Syracuse Herald-Journal, Syracuse Herald-American, Syracuse Post-Standard, Staten Island Advance, Long Island Press, Long Island Star-Journal, Harrisburg Patriot, Harrisburg Evening News, Jersey Journal, Birmingham News, and Huntsville (Ala.) Times.

KOIN–TV and KOIN–AM in Portland; WSYR–TV and WSYR–AM and FM in Syracuse; WTPA–TV in Harrisburg, and WAPI–TV, WAPI–AM and FM in Birmingham, Ala.

Vogue, Vogue Pattern Book, British Vogue, French Vogue, House & Garden, British House & Garden, French House & Garden, Glamour, and Bride's magazine.

"CAN WE TRUST THE PAPERS?"—DR. STEINER CALLS FOR FACTS IN THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE

A public without adequate information upon which to render a judgment has a vital stake in the current strike-lockout of Portland's two daily newspapers, Dr. Richard M. Steiner declared in a recent sermon. Dr. Steiner is minister of the First Unitarian Church.

"We are dependent upon rumors and upon the biased statements printed by the party that has control of the main avenue of information," he declared.

He called for the truth and asked: "Can we trust the newspapers to give us the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?"

Half truths, he noted, "can be as deceptive as outright lies."

Dr. Steiner is himself a former newspaperman, having served as reporter for the Chicago News Bureau and the Cleveland (Ohio) News. He has, in addition, been an instructor of journalism at Washington State College and Bradley College, of Peoria, Ill.

He is an active participant in Portland's civic life, serving as board member of the City Club, of which he is past president, and taking a leading role in such agencies as CARE, the USO council, Council of Social Agencies, the Child Guidance clinic and the Cerebral Palsy and Mental Health associations.

Dr. Steiner said there are two reasons for the public's confusion over the newspaper strike. "In the first place," he said, "they cannot believe that the right is all on one side, and as far as the printed word is concerned, only one side has access to the newspapers and it quite obviously considers itself to be without fault in the present controversy."

He continued:

"When it comes to presenting their case to the public, the newspapers have all the advantage. We are, as a result, surfeited with rumors. Whether these rumors are deliberately incited or not, no one can say. Whether there is any truth in them or not, no one can say. We are told, for example, that the strike is a plot by the Oregonian to take over the Oregon Journal, which has been in financial difficulties. This has been denied, but anyone reading the denial must wonder if the publishers have not left themselves an out when they say 'at this time' they do not contemplate an absorption of the Oregon Journal into the Newhouse chain.

"We have heard that the issue is 'featherbedding,' that the union refuses to settle the issue as to how many men shall work on a machine for stereotyping that the Oregonian says it is going to purchase. I have heard it reported on one hand that the union is willing to arbitrate the number of men on the machine when, as, and if it is delivered. I have heard that the machine is not actually in existence, that one was made in Germany, imported to Montreal, Canada, and there it developed so many defects it had to be returned for redesign, that no one knows whether the new machine will prove effective or not.

"If this is the issue that is holding up the settlement of the strike, if the Journal is not interested in this machine, how does it happen that the Journal lends itself to this issue? This is a fair question, I think, and one which ought to be answered, but how are we to find the answer? How are we to get it?

"Featherbedding is a real problem and will become more acute as automation increases. Its solution does not lie in strikes or lockouts, but in statesmanship.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian does not want to settle the strike until its insurance strike benefits run out, by which time it hopes to have brought the Journal and the unions to their knees. The benefits, by the way, make it possible, I am told, to pay strikebreakers $200 a week. Is it true?

"The newspapers must be cognizant of these rumors, but they have not affirmed or denied them.

"I have heard it rumored that the Oregonian and the Journal are out to 'bust the unions,' that they are insisting upon an 'open shop' from reporters to pressmen. If these rumors are true (and I do not say they are true because I do not know) they ought to be matters of public concern.

"With the consolidation of newspapers that is taking place all over the country—and the Newhouse interests are playing a major part in these consolidations—the labor market for those whose only skills are in newspaper work is being diminished. Thus in an open shop, the wage scale is apt to be depressed for there are an increasing number of applicants for every job, and the law of supply and demand, when not protected by unionism, works just as well in the labor market as it does in the marts of trade.

"Indeed, one of the tragic consequences of the present controversy is the job uncertainty of the men and women who have dedicated their lives to the profession of journalism and who have given to the city of Portland high examples of professional competency as reporters, some of them winning national awards for their work.

"Indeed, the Pulitzer prize, which the Oregonian boasts of, was won for them by Guild members who are now uncertain as to the future of their jobs."

Dr. Steiner noted the publishers' charge that by respecting the picket lines and staying off their jobs, members of the Newspaper Guild and the craft unions have broken their

contracts. "This may be true," he said, "but, if it is true, the newspapers have recourse to the courts under the Taft-Hartley law for damages. So far, I have heard of no threat of such suit.

"Surely the newspaper publishers are not so naive as to believe that those who owe so much to their unions would cross a picket line. The union movement is based on solidarity. If unions don't hang together, they shall surely hang separately—to quote a much honored and revered Revolutionary leader."

In conclusion Dr. Steiner declared that the responsibility both of the unions and of the publishers in the present controversy is of concern to the public "and we ought to make known our concern to those who have accepted the responsibility to keep us informed."

OREGON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
December 16, 1959.

GOV. MARK HATFIELD,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATFIELD: We were delighted to read of your offer to union and management to aid in settling the tragic dispute involving our two Portland newspapers, but regretted to learn of management's decision to reject your proffered help on the grounds that nothing could be accomplished. However, we fervently hope you will not let the matter rest with this initial failure.

Many ministers and laymen, not only in the greater Portland area but throughout the State, are tremendously concerned about this economic cold war which gives indication of erupting into violence. We have in our congregations families that are in economic distress at the Christmas season because of the strike, and others in the ranks of management who are greatly involved in the tension and strife.

More is involved in the strike than human need, economic issues, and strife. The fate of a community newspaper may very well be at stake. We do not feel that the press can rightly assume the strike is their private business. Newspapers are more than private enterprise; they are a public trust. Their policies and destinies are a community concern.

I am confident that the many ministers and church leaders with whom I have talked, and others whose attitude I can surmise, join with me in urging you to make continued efforts in urging management and labor to sit down with you and a factfinding group. I do not feel that public opinion will allow the newspapers to reject indefinitely your offer of assistance.

Just as the importunate widow was finally heard by the judge because of her persistence, so we are confident you will be heeded by the Portland newspapers if you continue to insist that there should be an honest attempt at settlement through your high office.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD GLEN BROWN,
President, Oregon Council of Churches,
Minister, First Christian Church of Portland.

[From the Guild Reporter, Washington, D.C., Jan. 8, 1960]

PORTLAND STRIKE

The Portland, Oreg., strike holds more significance than appears from casual inspection.

From all obtainable evidence, the Portland work stoppage serves as a pattern which, if it succeeds, could lead to its adoption elsewhere in the newspaper industry, to the complete destruction of union-won safeguards in pay and working conditions.

First, the Portland strike was planned and provoked by management, more specifically the management of the Oregonian, which dominates the Portland scene over its normal rival, the Journal.

There is no doubt of this fact. Last summer, before any Portland union had even planned an approach to collective bargaining in the fall, strikebreakers then at work in Reno were aware that they would be needed in Oregon later in the year.

And the negotiations, when they opened with the stereotypers' spokesmen, were farcical. Management introduced a trumped-up issue, increased its own demands as the union tried to make concessions.

Second, the massive retaliation familiar to guildsmen in Cleveland, Detroit, Boston, and New York takes shape in Portland, too. The Journal has made common cause with its business competitor, the Oregonian. Journal executives moved into the Oregonian plant to make it possible to get out a hybrid daily.

Third, the Oregonian carries strike insurance, beyond question, since its owners, the Newhouse interests, have strong representation in the insurance plan set up by the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

And lastly, the Newhouse management, absentee owners in Portland as in many other places across the country, is notoriously cash-register-oriented and oblivious to community interests, if they interfere with the moneymaking operation of its dailies.

There is increasing belief in Portland that the Journal, home-owned, has been taken captive by the larger, stronger and chain-newspaper-backed Oregonian. There have even been flat predictions that the Journal's days are numbered, and that the Newhouse plan is to emerge on top in Portland, making it a one-newspaper city.

Fortunately for the unions affected, there had been complete awareness from the time negotiations broke down, that this was no "ordinary" one-union strike. Other unions were quick to come to the aid of the stereotypers and presently there is a well-coordinated council of unions directing the overall strategy of the situation.

Fortunately, too, radio and television stations in Portland not under the censoring thumb of the struck dailies have been spreading the facts.

The year-end issue of Oregon Labor Press, edited by Portland Guildsman James W. Goodsell with the help of an augmented staff of strikers, ran off enough copies so that it could be distributed to almost every home in the Portland area where the dailies circulate.

Its message, "the other side of the strike story," has already brought encouraging support, and more importantly, a wider realization of the potentials in the ruthless, ominous drama being enacted behind the picketed entrances of the Oregonian plant.

The picture is a gruesome one. Given strike insurance and the willingness to import a loathsome crew of strikebreakers, there is also the possibility of the extinction of Portland's home-owned newspaper. In its place, readers would have a daily single-mindedly devoted to making money for its east-coast owner, who is a financial operator, not a publisher. It's an ugly situation, dangerous to the public welfare, to the industry and to its unions.

PORTLAND OPEN SHOP BID SPURS SUMMIT SESSION

PORTLAND, OREG.—Faced with a clear attempt by major unionized newspapers to establish plantwise open shops, international leaders of all unions involved in the Portland stereotypers' walkout converged here this week for a conference on strike strategy and coordination.

ANG President Arthur Rosenstock and Director of Organization J. William Blatz were here to represent the guild at the meeting, which began Wednesday, January 6. Also on hand were officials of the Stereotypers, the International Typographical Union, the Pressmen, the Photoengravers, and the Teamsters.

The meeting resulted from an invitation to the union leaders extended by Harold D. Bamberg, chairman of the Portland Newspaper Unions' Interim Committee, to "observe personally this fantastic union-busting operation."

Last weekend, ANG Secretary-Treasurer Charles A. Perlik, Jr., conferred with local guild officers and addressed a membership meeting Sunday night. International Representative Loel Schrader has been assigned to join International Representative Charles Dale in working with the local.

As the 10th week of the strike against the Oregon Journal and S. I. Newhouse's Oregonian drew to a close, there were these other developments:

The Legislative Interim Committee on Labor-Management Relations scheduled a public hearing at the State capital, Salem, January 9, on the impact of professional strikebreakers on free collective bargaining.

Public support swelled for a third, independent daily newspaper proposed as a community-owned enterprise.

Gov. Mark Hatfield for the second time declined to appoint a factfinding committee to intervene in the strike. As long as the managements of the two dailies refuse to cooperate with such a committee, he said, its appointment would be "fruitless."

Web pressmen, by a vote of 108 to 1, and paperhandlers, by a vote of 22 to 0, officially joined the stereotypers as strikers, January 2, and charged the companies before the National Labor Relations Board with bad faith in their refusal to bargain on a renewal of the unions' contracts, which expired December 31.

The stereotypers, who struck on November 10, also filed charges with the NLRB that the Oregonian and the Journal had refused to bargain in good faith.

A guild member became the object of telephoned and personal threats after four imported strikebreakers were beaten up in a barroom brawl with strangers.

The Oregournal—the hybrid daily being produced by scabs under the flags of both the Oregonian and the Journal—continued its throwaway circulation policy against a rising flood of cancellations.

The top-level conference of union officials this week underscored the seriousness with which they regard the Portland situation. The belief is growing among unionists that the Oregonian and Journal have launched their union-busting adventure as a pilot operation. Should the two papers succeed in ousting the unions with the use of strikebreakers, publishers in other large cities could be expected to try it, too, spreading industrial warfare throughout the industry.

Management tactics at the bargaining table before the walkout were enough to convince Portland union members that the strike was deliberately provoked.

The companies insisted that the stereotypers' workweek be increased from 35 hours to 37½ hours, at no increase in pay. In the first bargaining session after the strike started, the publishers called for a further increase in the workweek to 40 hours at no increase in pay. Since the strike the papers also have demanded elimination of the union-security clause from the stereos' contract. Management also has taken the position that long-standing policies on substitutions and union membership of foremen must be stricken from the pact.

One of the key issues in the dispute is the insistence of the Oregonian that the stereotypers agree in advance to one man operation of a new, untried German casting machine the paper says it plans to buy. The

union replies that this would be buying a "pig in a poke," that the machine is not in operation anywhere in the country and there is no way yet to determine how many men its operation will require. In its only installation so far on this continent—in Montreal—the machine developed serious "bugs" which raise questions of safety no matter how many men are operating it, the union points out.

These bargaining tactics of management and its reliance on strike insurance to recruit professional strikebreakers are the basis of the stereotypers' unfair practice charges filed with the NLRB.

The pressmen's charges against the two papers cite management's repeated refusal even to meet with the union to discuss renewal of its contract. On December 30, the day before the pressmen's contract expired, the papers notified the union that its members no longer were employees. At the same time, the publishers mailed checks to individual pressmen covering accrued vacation pay.

All unions at the Oregonian and the Journal plan to present evidence and witnesses at the Legislative Interim Committee's hearing on strikebreaking. Representatives of the two newspapers also have been invited to appear.

The committee will consider the importation of strikebreakers in relation to the overall labor-management scene in the State and will not delve into the issues which provoked the Portland strike. It was the current strike, however, which prompted the call for the hearing.

The call was by a unanimous vote of the committee's members, who represent both houses of the State legislature.

Petitions signed by hundreds of unionists idled in the strike were presented to Governor Hatfield Tuesday, January 5, calling for an inquiry by a fact-finding body. The petitions were presented by a group which included Mrs. Frances Blakely of the Guild. The Governor accepted the petitions but pointed out fact-finding was impossible without the cooperation of management as well as the unions. Earlier in the dispute, fact-finding proposals of the Governor and U.S. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER were spurned by the publishers. The unions had welcomed the offers.

The idea for another daily paper—tentatively designated the Portland Daily News—grew out of the fear that merger with or acquisition of the Journal is one of the goals of Newhouse's Oregonian.

When the strike bagn, a Journal executive remarked: "This strike situation means the windup of the Journal and the windup of me. The Oregonian is going to take us over when this strike is done."

At least one Journal circulation representative in central Oregon has urged subscribers who have canceled to take the paper again "because this strike is a secret plot by Newhouse and the unions to take over the Journal."

After repeated denials by Journal officials that it was for sale to anyone, a committee was formed to explore the possibility of another, independent daily.

A luncheon meeting of Portland union representatives unanimously voted to support "a profesionally managed and operated newspaper, independent in news coverage." They had heard from James T. Marr, executive secretary of the State AFL-CIO, that facilities already have been located for printing a new paper.

A coupon in the weekly Oregon Labor Press, intended to poll readers regarding their interest in another daily, brought such a response that four women were retained to handle the returns. Two television stations covered the scene in the Labor Press office as mail sacks were opened and thousands of coupons counted.

Although the poll did not solicit funds for the proposed Daily News, hundreds of $1 and $5 bills and numerous checks were enclosed with the coupon returns.

The outbreak of violence in the strike, and the subsequent threats against the person of a guild photographer, were attributed to the scabs themselves by Guild President Bob Shults.

Shults told the membership meeting Sunday night that local officers had spent 4 days running down information about the brawl in the bar of the Hungerford Hotel in which the four strikebreakers were beaten.

"We are convinced that the photographer had absolutely no connection with the incident," said Shults, "and further that no unionist was involved. We are deeply suspicious that the whole thing was staged by the scabs themselves to create an excuse either to leave town now that the strike insurance is running out or to move out of the hotel and across the street into the newspaper plant where their every whim would be satisfied by management."

The guild photographer, who formerly had lived in the Hungerford before it was taken over by the strikebreakers, had dropped in for a New Year's drink with the bartender, a personal friend. About 15 minutes after he left, a fight started between four of the scabs and four strangers. During the fracas, a chair was hurled through a huge plate glass window in the lobby of the hotel and the bar was nearly demolished. One of the scabs reportedly was hospitalized overnight.

The holiday season had at least one bright spot for guild members. Some 200 members and their spouses were entertained at a guild party, December 29, in the press club. Use of the club's facilities was donated, as were all drinks and food. Additional cash contributions actually gave the local a net of $21.20, Shults reported. Running the party were several ex-members of the local, headed by former president Bob Swan, who is now in public relations.

[From the AFL-CIO News, Washington, D.C., Jan. 9, 1960]

PORTLAND PAPERS OUT TO CRUSH UNIONS—STRIKEBREAKERS PAID UP TO $300 WEEKLY

PORTLAND, OREG.—The 2-month-old strike of the stereotypers against Portland's daily newspapers, focusing national attention in the newspaper industry on the showdown struggle here, is forcing unions in the field to consider major new tactics.

As the strike drags on, it has become more apparent that managements of the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal aim at nothing less than crushing all the newspaper unions involved in the dispute.

The stereotypers struck November 10 after failing to make any headway in negotiating a new contract. Their old agreement with the two papers expired September 15. The publishers refused to discuss wages or any other contract matters unless the union agreed first to three demands:

That a German-built automated metal plate-casting machine, which the Oregonian says it proposed to buy, be operated by one man. Present equipment is operated by four men. The German machine is untested in this country and has not even been seen by the stereotypers.

That foremen not be required to belong to the union. They have been in all past contracts. Foremen work alongside other men, perform the same duties.

That the union give up its right to provide substitutes.

All other unions in the two plants—printers, pressman, engravers, mailers, paperhandlers and Newspaper Guild of reporters, editors and photographers—observed the picket lines. But the publishers imported strikebreakers, chiefly from the South, and began immediately to publish a joint product in the Oregonian plant. Some of the imports have been identified as veterans of such strikebreaking operations as Lima, Ohio, Haverhill, Mass., Miami, Fla., Reno, Nev., and Oklahoma City.

The job pirates receive premium pay—up to more than $300 weekly—and are quartered at the publishers' expense in a nearby hotel. Management also picks up food and bar tabs.

Husband and wife teams are frequent among the strikebreakers. The women operate teletypesetter machines, on which news copy is translated into perforated tape, which in turn is fed through automated linotype machines. The publishers were caught early in the strike working some of the women 12 hours a day, 72 hours a week, in flagrant violation of State law which fixes a maximum 44-hour week for women.

A public hearing on importation of strikebreakers and its impact on labor-management relations in Oregon was scheduled for January 9 by an interim committee of the State legislature.

LAVISH OUTLAYS

Lavish outlays for recruiting and paying strikebreakers and setting up a training school for new ones at the Journal plant are made possible by payments from a publishers' strike insurance plan.

Each management can collect up to $10,000 daily over a 50-day period for a combined total of $1 million.

The stereotypers have offered compromises on each of the three management demands—compromises which formed the basis of peaceful settlement of the same issues at Detroit. But the publishers have refused to consider them and instead have come up with five new demands:

An open shop.

Re-examination of manning agreements on all other stereotyping equipment.

A 5-hour increase in the workweek at no increase in pay.

Priority and seniority for strikebreakers.

A no-strike clause.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, Republican, successful last year in mediating other labor disputes, offered his services but the publishers refused them. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, proposed a citizens' factfinding panel to study the strike and drew a similar curt rejection from the publishers. The unions had welcomed both proposals.

Unfair labor practice charges have been filed by the stereotypers on the basis of use of strike insurance funds to import and train strikebreakers, and by the web pressmen based on the publishers' refusal to bargain in good faith.

The pressmen's contract expired December 31. Four days earlier, management notified the local its members were no longer employees. With expiration of the contracts, the pressmen and the affiliated paper handlers voted to strike and joined other crafts on the picket line.

NEW PAPER POSSIBLE

To get their story before the public, the unions have turned to radio, TV, and handbills. A special edition of 300,000 copies of the Oregon Labor Press, devoted entirely to the strike, was mailed out to all residents in the Portland area. Now Portland's labor movement is taking steps to start a third daily newspaper in the city. Business agents and secretaries of unions in the area have voted support for such a paper, to be financed by sale of stock.

International officers of newspaper unions will hold a summit meeting in Portland this month to discuss financing for the venture.

A committee of newspaper union representatives is preparing cost estimates, locating publishing facilities, and determining staff requirements for the proposed new paper, tentatively named the Portland Daily News.

Union members have launched a house-to-house canvass to measure public interest in such a paper and to press, at the same time, a campaign to persuade those still taking the combined Oregonian-Journal to cancel their subscriptions. Cancellations already are estimated to have reached 100,000.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Jan. 15, 1960]

STRIKEBREAKER'S WITNESS IDENTIFIES PROFESSIONALS HERE

Professional strikebreakers now working at the Oregonian-Journal have swarmed into struck newspaper plants across the country—sent by a central strikebreaking agency.

So testified Gerald E. Gish, who as recently as 2 years ago worked shoulder to shoulder, breaking strikes, with many of the persons now employed behind picket lines at the Oregonian.

His testimony came before the State legislative interim committee on labor-management relations which met in Salem Saturday to explore possible legislation against the importing or use of professional strikebreakers.

Some 300 spectators, including four busloads of workers idled by the Portland newspaper strike, crowded the hearing room.

The implication of Gish's testimony was vehemently denied by the three Portland attorneys who appeared for the Oregonian and Oregon Journal. They argued to the committee that legislation against importing nonunion employees during a strike would discriminate against businesses requiring technically skilled employees.

Gish, now a union printer at the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, said he was affiliated with an organization known as the Schleppey-Klein strikebreaking agency from 1955 to 1957 and worked at a number of struck newspaper plants in various parts of the country.

He told of receiving premium pay, transportation and living expenses and even of being paid $110 a week for doing nothing while on standby duty for a month before a strike in Westchester County, N.Y.

"The highest I ever got was $627 for 1 week in the Zanesville, Ohio, strike," he told the committee.

A dramatic point in the hearing came when State Representative Edward J. Whelan, Portland, held up five snapshots of strikebreakers, taken on the Portland picket lines.

Gish identified the pictures and then picked out the names of 10 other strikebreakers—now at the Oregonian-Journal—with whom he had worked in other strikes.

The first of three attorneys appearing for management was William Lubersky, who said he represented the Oregonian and Associated Oregon Industries. He rejected the contention that the Portland papers had dealt with Schleppey-Klein or any other strikebreaking agency.

"I am emphatically denying," he said, "any collusion between the publishers. There were no employees on standby. Management did not want a strike."

Under questioning by committee members, Lubersky admitted that probably there had been advance planning. He said: "An employer who is threatened with a strike has every right to start laying plans to operate."

He said he guesses that the newspapers paid transportation and living expenses to the imported workers "who came in to help us out in an emergency."

At the end of the hearing, State Senator Harry Boivin of Klamath Falls, committee chairman, and State Senator Walter Pearson of Portland said several suggestions had been made and information collected which might lead to legislation.

Labor's presentation was led by George Brown, political education director of the Oregon AFL–CIO. He told the committee that the importation of professional strikebreakers is "a departure from normal, peaceful, intelligent collective bargaining and is not in the best interests of the citizens of this State."

Brown continued: "Acceptance of the use of professional strikebreakers will mean a return to the law of the jungle."

Appearing during labor's presentation was Dr. Richard Steiner, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Portland. He said he was not speaking for labor or management but as a member of the public.

Management, he argued, has a big advantage "because it can propagandize the public without hindrance. This is an advantage that is unfair. It is enhanced by the use of professional strikebreakers."

The committee can help overcome the unfair advantage by recommending legislation against strikebreakers, whose presence prolongs the strike, Dr. Steiner concluded.

In his testimony he told of a phone call from a woman who wanted advice. She had been asked, she told him, to get a strikebreaker into a compromising position—without doing anything actually immoral. Would he sanction this?

Dr. Steiner postulated several explanations for the call to the committee. In one he suggested the call might have been a "plant" from management of the newspapers or their sympathizers, designed to discredit or embarrass him.

The fourth union spokesman at the hearing was Rene Valentine, International representative of the Typographical Union, who traced the history of strikebreaking agencies and reviewed investigations into such activities in other States.

Gish detailed his own history as a strikebreaker, dating from a loan he received while still a student in Oklahoma.

His strikebreaking career started in Oklahoma City and then went to Zanesville, Ohio. Other strikes took him to Grand Junction, Colo.; Levittown, Pa., and Westchester County, N.Y.

LAWYERS OBJECT

Management's presentation, consisting largely of rebuttal, was begun by Lubersky who contended that labor's case was "both hypocritical and sanctimonious."

The sole purpose of labor's testimony, he said, "is to have another forum in the propaganda battle."

This point was later echoed by Portland attorney Verne Newcomb, who rapped labor for not bringing specific legislative proposals to the committee meeting. He was cut short, however by Senator Pearson, who pointed out that the committee's purpose was not to hear proposed laws but only to explore the need for legislation.

Both Lubersky and Newcomb argued that management had the right to continue to operate and that since technically skilled nonunion newspaper workers are not available in Oregon, it would be discriminatory to legislate against the importing of workers during a strike.

Replying to this, Richard Carney, Portland labor attorney, argued that the objectionable aspect of the strikebreakers was not their importation but their professionalism.

These workers, he said, do not have regular jobs or homes, but make their living touring the country from strike to strike. The existence of such a pool of strikebreaking workers is the evil, Carney said, since it is a deterrent to good-faith bargaining on management's part.

Management lawyers had claimed that only the Federal Government could properly enact legislation dealing with imported strikebreakers. Carney contended that a State law would be both practicable and proper

In addition to Chairman Boivin, Senator Pearson and Representaive Whelan, committee members attending the hearing were Senator Robert F. White of Salem, Representatives Robert Duncan, Medford, and William J. Gallagher, Portland; Dr. Richard H. Jones of Reed College, public member; Carl J. Gilson of Portland, labor member, and Hillman Lueddemann, Portland, management member.

MAYOR GETS UNION APPEAL—SCHRUNK IS ASKED TO SETTLE STRIKE

An earnest appeal for help, signed by about 80 union officers and members, was sent this week to Mayor Terry Schrunk.

The letter asked Schrunk to move with dispatch in an effort to settle the current strike against Portland's two daily newspapers.

Last month Schrunk invited both George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to hold a proposed top level labor-management conference in Portland. The major noted the need for "an improvement of attitudes being displayed at the collective bargaining table."

The union members' appeal to Schrunk said:

"In your recent letters to AFL–CIO President George Meany and Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, you called special attention to this area as being free from the frictions and pressures which might exist in other areas. These cancerous frictions are now rampant in this area. This is a condition that the city of Portland cannot afford."

The letter pointed out that the newspaper strike-lockout is farther from settlement now than it was when the strike began November 10.

"Offers of aid by the Governor have been brushed aside by the publishers. Federal mediation is ineffectual. The publishers seem adamant in their joint effort to disrupt the harmonious union-management relationship traditional in the City of Roses," it said.

"We ask you as chief executive of the city where this deplorable condition exists to move with dispatch in an effort to settle this dispute, which has become a conflict for the control of men's minds," the letter concluded.

LEADERS MEET IN PORTLAND—UNIONS PLEDGE FULL STRIKE AID

Publishers of Portland's struck newspapers have forced "the most significant and far-reaching team effort by national newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry."

So said a statement released this week following a two-day summit conference of leaders of international unions whose locals are involved in the present 10-week-old Portland strike.

The officials gathered here at the request of heads of the locals.

The nine visiting officials, after the first day of meeting, described Portland as a "national battleground," and said they were shocked by the "obstinacy and bad faith" of management's stand.

Among those who met with local officers were Arthur Rosenstock, president of the American Newspaper Guild; Walter J. Turner, national vice president of the Pressmen's Union, and Leo Feeney, national vice president of the Stereotypers.

The text of their final statement follows:

We are united on a negotiating program with the publishers of Portland's strike-bound newspapers. The decision for common action by all newspaper unions was forced upon us by the blatant union-busting techniques employed by the publishers.

The international unions cannot afford and do not intend to permit their local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite. The labor movement of Portland and the entire State of Oregon cannot afford to permit this return to labor's dark ages.

Since the strike began on November 10, management has consistently raised its demands on the unions instead of seeking a peaceful and honorable solution at the bargaining table or through mediation efforts of Governor Hatfield or a fact-finding committee.

Chief of these new and outrageous demands is a management proposal that the stereotypers take a 12½ percent hourly pay cut despite the constantly increasing cost of living.

The publishers have chosen to make this an all-out fight. We must meet their challenge. We pledge the utmost support of the international unions to assure that this union-busting venture by the publishers is not successful.

Contracts of all of the mechanical craft unions have now expired. We reaffirm our decision that no union will return to work at the two newspapers until settlements are reached with all of the unions with expired contracts. Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants.

The publishers are publicly tied in a common front against unions, and have consistently rejected all union offers to negotiate separate contracts with the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian. This stone wall of publisher opposition has today created the most significant and far-reaching team effort by international newspaper unions in the history of the American newspaper industry.

MRS. KEEVER CONFESSES FALSE STORY

Mrs. James Keever, who has made a number of police reports about threats and violence because her husband is working behind the Oregonian picket line, this week was arrested, jailed, and convicted for making a false police report.

She confessed to police that she made up the story she told them early Sunday morning about being kidnapped for 7 hours by two men who threatened her because her husband, an Oregonian advertising salesman normally, was working as a pressman in the struck plant.

The conviction came Wednesday in the municipal court of Judge J. J. Labadie, who fined her $25.

The Keevers won front-page banner-headline treatment in the Oregonian-Journal last week when a window in their home at 6607 Southeast Duke Street was broken by a rock.

Mrs. Keever, 26, told police she made up the kidnapping story in the hope her husband would not find out she had really been out with a male acquaintance.

The incident began when her husband filed a missing persons report with police Friday evening. At 12:15 a.m., Mrs. Keever called him from an eastside cocktail bar and told the kidnapping story.

She repeated it to police later but when they pointed out inconsistencies, she confessed the story was false and admitted having gone to a basketball game with the male friend.

PORTLAND DAILY NEWS—SUPPORT IS STRONG FOR THIRD NEWSPAPER

Prospects for a third Portland newspaper continued to brighten this week on two fronts.

Union business representatives, at their weekly luncheon meeting Tuesday, heard detailed legal reports on the incorporation of the third paper, tentatively named the Portland Daily News.

As projected, it would be launched with union support but would have an independent editorial staff and policy and would be financed through broad public stock sale and support.

A demonstration of that support, termed "amazing" by State AFL–CIO Secretary-Treasurer James Marr, came in response to a coupon printed in the Oregon Labor Press 2 weeks ago.

Officeworkers were still processing returned coupons this week, although the pace dropped off from the first week when four volunteer workers were called in to handle the flood of mail.

But by press time, 2,509 coupons, many of them containing unsolicited contributions, had been mailed in.

This response came from a press run of 32,500. In other words, 7½ percent of all Labor Press readers took the trouble to fill out and clip the coupon, address an envelope and mail it with 4 cents postage.

The original outline for the paper was to start with 100,000 24-page papers, but later information reported to the union representatives Tuesday indicated that either the press run or the maximum number of pages can now be doubled—100,000 48-page papers or 200,000 24-page papers.

OREGONIAN-JOURNAL KNOWS ITS ARGUMENT IS FALSE

The hybrid Oregonian-Journal has a crafty disregard for facts. Nowhere is this better shown than in its recent editorial complaint that the longtime Portlanders who belong to unions at the two newspapers refused to go through the stereotypers' picket line.

Of course they refused to go through. What else did the publishers expect when they forced the stereotypers out on the street?

Union men have been respecting picket lines for 100 years and more. Yet the hybrid newspaper pretends that this is a new and dastardly thing.

Further, the Oregonian-Journal cynically argued in a front-page editorial that the unions were violating their contracts in refusing to cross the picket line. As if a union contract were a slave labor agreement, binding a man to work no matter what changes may occur in the conditions of his employment.

The Oregonian-Journal singled out the Newspaper Guild, arguing that the Guild was morally and legally bound by contract to go to work across the picket line.

That is utter nonsense. And the Oregonian-Journal's highly paid battery of legal experts knows it. They are lying in their teeth when they say the Guild broke a contract or took any step that was not the legal and moral right of the Guild.

The labor laws of this land guarantee the reporters, photographers, artists, and editors of the Guild the right to refuse to cross a picket line at their employer's plant.

The cynical staff of the Oregournal is merely trying to confuse the public in arguing that it is illegal or immoral for a union to refuse to cross a picket line.

Just think back to 1949 when the Pressmen's Union went on strike. By the publishers' cynical theory of 1959–60, the other unions should have come to work. Well, in 1949 some tried to. And what happened? The publishers shut down their plants, locked out the employees and refused to pay their wages. All that, despite labor contracts with the same unions as today.

Were the publishers then guilty of violating the contracts? By their 1959–60 reasoning they were. But the fact is—and the publishers know it—that was not the case.

Only a few weeks ago the hybrid newspaper published on its front page a story from New York, reporting a court decision on this matter. It said publishers need not pay employees when the publishers decide to shut down their plants in a strike.

The conclusion is obvious. If a labor contract does not bind the employer to pay his employees during a labor dispute, then that contract does not bind employees to work during a labor dispute. The National Labor Relations Act clearly recognizes this fact.

So let's have an end to the Oregonian-Journal's preaching about the sanctity of contracts that do not apply.

It is a phony, dishonest argument.

ONLY ONE SIDE CAN PROFIT FROM ACTS OF VIOLENCE

Last Sunday the combined Oregonian-Journal published another in its series of front-page editorials on the newspaper strike. This one, titled "Fact for Today," accused the unions of fostering violence.

This calls for a reply.

We ask you to consider four facts:

1. No responsible union leader condones the use of violence as a strike tactic.

2. Every decent union member regrets any outbreak of violence, whether the act was incited by union members or by strikebreakers.

3. The Portland newspaper strike, throughout its 9 weeks' duration, has been remarkably free of violent acts. Yes, there have been a few—but remarkably few, considering the tensions of the strike and the provocation supplied by the publishers and their imported strikebreakers.

4. It is the publishers—not the unions—who profit from any incident of violence that can be blamed on unionmen or on "persons unknown." They can play it up on their front page and they can write front-page editorials about it afterward.

There have been many indications that the Oregonian-Journal publishers actually have been hoping for "rough stuff" as grist for their propaganda mill.

The unions' position on the question of strike violence is quite simple. We believe it is (a) wrong and (b) stupid.

[From the AFL–CIO News, Washington, D.C., Jan. 16, 1960]

UNITED FRONT FORMALIZED—NEWSPAPER UNIONS IN PORTLAND PLEDGE PACTS FOR ALL OR NONE

PORTLAND, OREG.—Representatives of international unions whose locals have been battling savage union-busting tactics of the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian have agreed that "no union will return to work until settlements are reached with all of the unions."

Officers and international representatives of the stereotypers, newspaper guild, pressmen, Typographical Union, photo engravers and the unaffiliated Teamsters declared they "do not intend to permit local unions to be destroyed by a giant newspaper chain and its Portland satellite."

The Oregonian is owned by Samuel I. Newhouse of New York, whose empire includes 14 newspapers, 9 magazines and 9 radio and TV stations. The Oregonian has been publishing a joint paper with the Oregon Journal, using imported strikebreakers.

Union members employed by the two papers have been respecting the picket lines of the stereotypers, who struck November 10 after rejecting management proposals to

seriously weaken their contract. Meanwhile contracts of the other mechanical unions have expired.

The statement by the union representatives declared:

"Striking employees will return to work without fear of reprisal or discrimination. The unions agree that all contracts must have a common expiration date. All contracts must contain a clause allowing all unions to respect picket lines at the newspaper plants."

The joint newspaper dismissed the unions' statement as "negotiation by ultimatum."

Meanwhile, the imported-strikebreakers issue was aired at a public hearing of the State legislature's interim committee on labor-management relations.

UNIONISTS AROUSED

More than 200 newspaper union members packed the committee hearing room in the State capitol at Salem, 50 icy miles away, to hear labor offer evidence and argue the need for remedial legislation.

George Brown, director of political education for the Oregon AFL–CIO warned that if "this precedent is allowed to continue and is accepted as common practice in labor-management relations, it can spread to every industry in the State."

"There seems to be evidence that strikebreakers were in Portland on a standby basis even before the strike was called," he said.

A witness was Gerald E. Gish, of Cleveland, a Typographical Union member employed on the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, who testified he had once been a professional strikebreaker, connected with the Bloor Schleppey and Shirley Klein newspaper strikebreaking organizations.

Gish outlined his career in 1955-57 from his recruitment by Oklahoma City publishers 2 months before a strike there until he broke with the Klein group and helped the ITU organize strikebreakers at Glen Cove, Long Island, N.Y.

STRIKES PROVOKED?

In an hour-long appearance before the committee, Gish testified:

Strikebreakers usually draw premium wages and extensive overtime, plus eating allowances and hotel bills. Transportation is usually paid as well. Gish's top weekly check was $675 at Zanesville, Ohio.

Strikebreakers know in advance where strikes will occur, and he was among strikebreakers brought into Westchester County, N.Y., and kept on a standby basis before an ITU strike against the Macy chain of papers there. When for a time it appeared the ITU would not strike there, Gish quoted Shirley Klein as saying, "We'll have to provoke it."

Strikebreaking organizations know in advance the plant layouts at the newspapers which will call on their services, and assignments of key strikebreakers are predetermined.

Gish identified names or pictures of at least 15 strikebreakers now on the Portland scene as people he had known in other similar operations. His experience as a strikebreaker included work in Oklahoma City, Zanesville, Ohio, Grand Junction, Colo., Levitttown, Pa., and Westchester County, N.Y.

The publishers were represented at the hearing by two attorneys, who contended State legislation on the subject would be unconstitutional because it would be discriminatory against certain industries and because the Federal Government had preempted the field.

Management also denied that strikebreakers had been brought in on a standby basis, that publishers had used the services of the Schleppey-Klein organization or any such group and that premium wages were paid the strikebreakers.

On another front, James T. Marr, executive-secretary of the Oregon AFL–CIO, reported articles of incorporation have been drawn up for a third daily newspaper for Portland. Preliminary work has been launched, he said, on details of a stock sale campaign by which the publication, tentatively named the Portland Daily News, will be financed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment on the matter of strike insurance. It may seem plausible and reasonable to suggest that a newspaper take out strike insurance to cover a certain period. However, we ought to consider the public policy involved. When we do so, then I think we shall have a better idea as to why the State of New York frowns upon that kind of a policy.

Mr. President, this kind of an insurance policy is designed to help stir up labor strife, or will have that result, because if an employer has strike insurance for 4 or 6 or 8 weeks, he thinks that by playing tough he can destroy the union in 4 or 6 or 8 weeks. And so a basic question of public policy is involved.

It does not follow that any insurance policy ought to be recognized as a policy that will have standing within the law if the purpose of that policy is to endanger free collective bargaining in our country. And so what the Newhouse empire has done is to go up to Canada and enter into an insurance policy arrangement which it thinks will insure it, or at least protect it or strengthen it, in case it gets into a "strike busting" controversy with the union, such as it has gotten into in Portland, Oreg.

So, Mr. President, I would have the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conduct a very thorough investigation with regard to the antilabor tactics being used by some newspaper publishers in this country, because, if I am correctly informed—and I am asking for an investigation to find out what the facts are—there has developed a combination of newspaper publishers in this country acting in concert in connection with this particular union-busting tactic.

Then I think there is a need for investigation on the part of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the practices, ascertaining to what extent the practices exist, of certain union-busting newspaper publishers who are working out a systematic arrangement with a business concern that contracts to assure and guarantee them that it will provide them with the necessary strikebreakers in case they get themselves involved in a strike with any of the newspaper unions in this country. That matter ought to be looked into.

Mr. President, there are other facets of antiunion activities on the part of newspaper publishers being raised in the Portland, Oreg., case which, in my judgment, call for investigation of the labor practices of newspapers in this country; and I shall offer a resolution within the next few days seeking to accomplish the end of having the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare take over a thorough investigation of this problem.

Mr. President, I think it is about time, may I say in conclusion, that the people of Oregon are relieved from the news monopoly of the Oregonian and the Journal, because, whether they are published in one plant under one management or under separate management, they do form a news monopoly in the city of Portland. They sorely need competition.

There are some indications that one good which may come out of this very costly strike may be the establishment of a Portland Daily News. Perhaps a new newspaper in our State may become a reality. We need it. And if it is established, it will certainly have my subscription, and I shall do what I can to encourage its establishment. I understand petitions are being circulated in my State seeking the signatures of those who are willing to back the establishment of such a newspaper.

All I wish to say in closing, Mr. President, because I think so many in my State have become weary of the unreasonable policy of the two-headed reactionary Oreganian-Journal, is that we need this proposed new newspaper in my State, and I hope the plans for its development meet with success.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20, 1960:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1963. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

I nominate the following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

Harry F. Colfer
Ralph W. McComas
Donald B. Tower

To be surgeons

David R. Kominz
Edward L. Kuff
Edward J. O'Rourke
Erwin S. Rabeau
Joseph F. Wilson

To be nurse officer

Margaret E. Benson

To be senior assistant surgeons

Thomas A. Waldmann
Stanford B. Friedman
Julian A. Koplen
John E. Venable, Jr.
Paul H. Black
Bertram S. Brown
Robert D. Bahr
William P. Reagan
John V. Petrucci
Robert C. Hoye
James I. Carr, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons

George W. Douglas, Jr.
Gerald R. Bassett
Jack D. Poland

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

John D. Weeks

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Donald P. Dubois — George R. Elmore
James K. Channell — Charles F. Walters
Richard I. Dick — John A. Eure

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Harold C. Ervine — Clayton L. Sullivan
Robert P. Hangebrauck — Howard P. Zweig
Harvey J. Hansen

To be senior assistant scientist

William H. Lyle, Jr.

To be assistant scientist

John R. Newbrough

To be senior assistant therapist

Martha M. Lasche

To be junior assistant therapist

James D. Ebner

SECTION 5232 APPOINTMENTS

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of such section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving:

*Joseph C. Burger — *John C. Munn
*Edward W. Snedeker — *Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
*Thomas A. Wornham

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea.

Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

William P. Snow, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala.

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1962, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Robert Bernerd Anderson, of New York, to be a governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 4: 10: *Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and He shall lift you up.*

Eternal God, as we turn to Thee in prayer and meditate upon Thy grace and goodness, wilt Thou inspire us with more of gratitude and devotion.

May we now, with one accord, beseech Thee for that needed wisdom which is far beyond our fallible and finite minds but never withheld from any who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We pray that Thy Holy Spirit may engender and kindle within us a sincere desire to do Thy bidding with a greater faithfulness and a more determined will.

Grant that neither despair from within nor enemies from without may ever becloud our vision of Thy divine presence with us and Thy beneficent purposes for us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—AMENDING FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3610) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment work, and for other purposes, disagree to Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BURKE]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLATNIK, FALLON, JONES of Alabama, MACK of Washington, and CRAMER.

ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 268)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Economic Committee and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I present herewith my Economic Report, as required by section 3(a) of the Employment Act of 1946.

The report was prepared with the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the heads of the executive departments and independent agencies directly concerned with the matters it discusses. It summarizes the economic developments of the year and the steps taken in major areas of economic policy to promote the sound expansion of employment, production, and income. It also puts forward a program for the year 1960 which, in the context of present and prospective economic conditions, would effectively implement the purposes of the Employment Act.

The major conclusions and recommendations of the report are set forth below, in part in the words of the report itself.

By the first quarter of 1959, the recovery that started early in 1958 had already carried production and income to levels higher than ever before attained in the American economy. A considerable further advance was scored during the remainder of 1959, despite the deep effect of the 116-day strike in the steel industry.

The Nation's output of goods and services in the fourth quarter of 1959 was at an annual rate of $482 billion. When adjusted for price changes, this rate of output was 3½ percent higher than the rate attained in the corresponding period of 1958. By December 1959, total employment had reached a record level, 66.2 million, on a seasonally adjusted basis. And personal income payments in December were at an annual rate of $391 billion, $24 billion greater than a year earlier. After adjustment for increases in prices, the rise in total personal income in 1959 represented a gain of nearly 5 percent in the real buying power of our Nation.

As we look ahead, there are good grounds for confidence that this economic advance can be extended through 1960. Furthermore, with appropriate private actions and public policies, it can carry well beyond the present year.

However, as always in periods of rapid economic expansion, we must avoid speculative excesses and actions that would compress gains into so short a period that the rate of growth could not be sustained. We must seek, through both private actions and public policies, to minimize and contain inflationary pressures that could undermine the basis for a high, continuing rate of growth.

Three elements stand out in the Government's program for realizing the objectives of high production, employment, and income set forth in the Employment Act: first, favorable action by the Congress on the recommendations for appropriations and for measures affecting Federal revenues presented in the budget for the fiscal year 1961; second, use of the resulting surplus, now estimated at $4.2 billion, to retire Federal debt; third, action by the Congress to remove the interest rate limitation that currently inhibits the noninflationary management of the Federal debt. Numerous additional proposals, many of which are described in chapter 4 of the Economic Report, will be made to supplement the

Federal Government's existing economic and financial programs.

Following the budget balance now in prospect for the fiscal year 1960, these three elements of the 1960 program will strengthen and be strengethened by the essential contributions to sustainable economic growth made through the policies of the independent Federal Reserve System. Fiscal and monetary policies, which are powerful instruments for preventing the development of inflationary pressures, can effectively reinforce one another.

But these Government policies must be supplemented by appropriate private actions, especially with respect to profits and wages. In our system of free competitive enterprise and shared responsibility, we do not rely on Government alone for the achievement of inflation-free economic growth. On the contrary, that achievement requires a blending of suitable private actions and public policies. Our success in realizing the opportunities that lie ahead will therefore depend in large part upon the ways in which business management, labor leaders, and consumers perform their own economic functions.

A well-informed and vigilant public opinion is essential in our free society for helping achieve the conditions necessary for price stability and vigorous economic growth. Such public opinion can be an effective safeguard against attempts arbitrarily to establish prices or wages at levels that are inconsistent with the general welfare. Informed public opinion is also necessary to support the laws and regulations that provide the framework for the conduct of our economic affairs.

Further progress is needed in establishing a broad public understanding of the relationships of productivity and rewards to costs and prices. It would be a grave mistake to believe that we can successfully substitute legislation or controls for such understanding. Indeed, the complex relationships involved cannot be fixed by law, and attempts to determine them by restrictive governmental action would jeopardize our freedoms and other conditions essential to sound economic growth.

Our system of free institutions and shared responsibility has served us well in achieving economic growth and improvement. From our past experience, we are confident that our changing and increasing needs in the future can be met within this flexible system, which gains strength from the incentive it provides for individuals, from the scope it affords for individual initiative and action, and from the assurance it gives that Government remains responsive to the will of the people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 1960.*

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS IN THE DOCUMENT ROOM, OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 340, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1960, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, compensation for the employment of two additional assistants in the document room, office of the Doorkeeper, at the basic salary rate of $2,000 per annum, each; such service to continue until the end of the month during which the Congress adjourns sine die, or recesses, or the fourteenth day after such adjournment or recess, whichever is the later date.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 136

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 410, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 136, Eighty-sixth Congress, as amended by House Resolution 181, Eighty-sixth Congress, is hereby amended by striking "$475,000" and inserting "$750,000".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 413, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1960, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $327,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1, following "1960," insert "the further."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM TO PROVIDE MINIMUM OF SECURITY FOR THE AGED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, any social security pensioner in the United States who is forbidden by law to earn over $1,200 a year—in addition to his old-age benefits—is barely existing.

Here is a strange contradiction.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the Congress made a cautious start on the construction of a social security program. In spite of a gradual extension in coverage, and a number of small increases in benefits, that program has not yet succeeded in providing a genuine minimum of security for the aged.

By writing into the original law a provision stating that a person receiving old-age insurance could earn up to $1,200 in wages each year without jeopardizing his monthly checks, we admitted that the benefits were woefully inadequate.

Depression thinking was also a factor in establishing this rigid ceiling. It was motivated by fears in the 1930's that retired persons would go on working and thus deprive younger people of job opportunities.

That ceiling is completely unrealistic in the light of today's high cost of living.

In a nation that prides itself on initiative, we are denying to older people the right to supplement their meager old-age insurance by continuing to work, even on a job paying less than the minimum wage.

Paradoxically, however, that antiquated provision of the law places no ceiling on other income, such as interest, dividends, and so forth, received by the few who are more fortunately situated than the rank and file of retirees.

I consider this as discrimination against those who are most in need of the opportunity to earn additional income. There should be no ceiling on income received from wages. As long as the Congress will not agree to this, I ask that the present ceiling be raised from $1,200 to $2,400, so that those who must continue to work after retirement will have a reasonable chance to lift themselves from the poverty of social security benefits. Because my bill, H.R. 9460, will not cost a dime, I think that it will be safe from a Presidential veto.

THE IMPENDING THREAT TO AMERICA'S HEALTH

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the mail flowing into my office in recent weeks shows that the American public wants, and expects, action in this session on a problem which threatens the well-being of nearly every American, from the newborn infant to the elderly adult.

That problem is the contamination and pollution of the food, water, and air which sustain the lives of our people.

I am pleased that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has announced that it will begin hearings January 26 on the color additives bill which passed the Senate last year. It is generally understood that the law on food, drug, and cosmetic color additives is outmoded and badly in need of a major overhaul. This legislation very probably will pass the House in this session.

The proposed amendment to the color additives law embodies some beneficial provisions. But I strongly feel the Congress has an obligation, in the face of growing public concern over this problem, to do more than simply to modernize the law on this subject. It must, I feel, begin in dead earnestness to seek a basic approach and solution to the general problem of contamination and pollution of our food, water, and air.

At least two developments have, since the adjournment of the 1959 session, given dramatic focus to this problem.

In November, the warning which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued on contaminated cranberries made front-page headlines in nearly every daily newspaper in the Nation.

Contaminated poultry made headlines in December, when the same Department asked the poultry producers—and the producers agreed—to stop the sales of dressed caponettes which, in being fattened for market, had been treated with pellet injections of an artificial hormone commonly called stilbestrol.

These developments, which sparked widespread public reaction, served to show that the contamination of our food is indeed a serious problem. There have been other manifestations of its seriousness; and still others seem certain to follow.

News Columnist Ed Koterba, in his column carried December 31, 1959, in the Salt Lake Tribune, said the cranberry scare will seem like "small peanuts" besides some of the other examples of chemical contamination which are likely to be exposed in the new year.

Mr. Koterba went on to observe, and I quote:

> Beginning March 7, under a new Federal law, all food chemicals that have not been proved safe by lab test up to then may be removed from grocery shelves. No such tests had been required in the past.
>
> Some food and drug people believe that right now there may be as many as 150 chemicals—possibly many more—which we are now eating that are dangerous to our health.
>
> In the light of this, cranberries, capons, and cosmetics are small fry.
>
> And this is just the beginning.
>
> Within a few months there will be additional revelations about strontium 90, and how this radioactive fallout, which has already been found in milk and wheat, is finding its way into other foods.
>
> In its "man versus environment" conference, the Public Health Service also brought out evidence that even the air we breathe is more dangerous than we have suspected. Research is now under way to determine relationship between air pollution and chronic diseases.
>
> Maybe the scariest handwriting on the food-bin wall comes from a study of drinking water.
>
> Public Health Service studies have so far barely made a bubble on the problem.
>
> One scientist gulped when he looked over the Food and Drug Administration's 10-page typewritten list of crude materials, all potentially dangerous, which could be found in water.
>
> Strangely enough, we can purify ordinary sewage these days, but no adequate methods have been found to make harmless the water that is polluted with these new chemicals.

The menace of air pollution made headlines just this week.

In a front-page story in the Washington Post of January 18, 1960, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, chief of the air pollution medical program in the U.S. Public Health Service, was quoted as saying that air pollution could produce a national disaster.

Dr. Prindle spoke in San Francisco at an air pollution conference sponsored by the University of California, and the Post report of his speech said, in part:

> Dr. Prindle advised his fellow physicians that such air-pollution episodes as that at Donora, Pa., in 1948—in which 20 persons died and 5,910 were made ill—are not the most difficult part of the problem they face. Instead, he said, it is "to understand and help correct the more subtle but nonetheless significant disaster of slow ruination of health and life."
>
> Dr. Prindle noted an increase in diseases "thought to be associated with or caused by air pollution." He listed among them lung cancer, chronic bronchitis, and emphysema.
>
> Even if the amount of air pollution could be held steady, he said, more people would become exposed to risk from lung cancer because more people are moving from the country into the cities. But, he added, air pollution is increasing because the expanding economy and rising need for energy cause more fuels to be burned. Combustion is never complete.
>
> Dr. Prindle presented data indicating that lung cancer kills 11 of 100,000 white male nonsmokers who live in the city, but only 1 of 100,000 living in the country. Among white male smokers he believes, the rate is 65.2 per 100,000 in rural areas and 79 in urban areas.
>
> He said that one can speculate that the higher rate in cities represents, in large part, the contribution of air pollution.
>
> In this connection, he said, that cigarettes and air pollutants may "interact to enhance each other's effect."

Dr. Prindle's remarks make it quite clear that the already distressing menace of degenerative diseases is being magnified by the problem of air pollution.

In my own mind, I have regarded for years the contamination and pollution of our food, water, and air as a serious problem. I strongly felt that it was one of the important problems confronting the Congress in 1959.

Last September, almost 2 months before the cranberry scare swept the country, I wrote and introduced a bill, H.R. 9150, which would establish a National Scientific Commission to make a thorough, independent investigation of food and water contamination and of the roles which additives play in this problem.

The time has arrived, I think, when the Congress ought to be striving consciously to project a national policy on health. The commission which I propose could give the Congress the independent, nonpartisan technical counsel which it needs to shape such policy and translate it into law.

To the American people, the voice of the Federal Government on health must sometimes seem to be that of an uncertain trumpet ringing tremulously in a wilderness of confusion. The absence or inadequacy of policy on health, at the national level, is reflected in the contradictions which characterize the pronouncements of Federal agencies on two topics, tobacco and fluorides.

On tobacco, the Public Health Service has issued public warnings about the association between smoking and lung cancer, while the Department of Agriculture continues to subsidize and encourage the production of tobacco. The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, a Member of the other body, who has repeatedly deplored this inconsistency in Federal policy, once observed:

> What would be the reaction here in America if we learned that the government of Red China was subsidizing the production of poppies, from which opium is distilled. Would we not raise our voices in righteous scorn and indignation? Then what must the rest of the world think of the fact that in the United States eggs and meat and vegetables are not supported as basic farm crops, but tobacco is?

After quoting the warning from Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney that independent studies "have confirmed beyond reasonable doubt a high degree of statistical association between lung cancer and prolonged cigarette smoking," the Senator went on to assert:

> Once the Surgeon General had issued such a statement, it seemed to me the height of irony for the Government to continue to regard tobacco as a basic crop. If tobacco is a causative element in spreading the grimmest malady which may plague large numbers of Americans, then the growing of tobacco should not be subsidized out of the taxes collected from the American people.

The contradiction in policies on fluorides has been described in the book, "The American Fluoridation Experiment," published in 1957. The Public Health Service has endorsed fluoridation; yet, as the book observes:

> Under the food and drug law, fluorine is classified as a poison, the use of which in processed foods in any quantity is prohibited.

I want to stress that I am neither an advocate nor an opponent of the practice of fluoridating public water supplies—I stand in complete and sincere neutrality on it. It is my earnest hope that the Scientific Commission which I have proposed would serve to resolve the national controversy which has developed over fluoridation. This, in fact, should be one of the high-priority assignments of such a Commission to make an authoritative, independent determination of whether this practice, now embraced by many American cities and endorsed by the Public Health Service, the American Dental Association, and the American Medical Association, but vigorously opposed by hundreds of distinguished members of the medical and dental professions and by other professional groups,

should or should not be embraced by all the people of this country for the enrichment of their health.

Some observers have suggested that the Commission which H.R. 9150 would establish would, in practice, duplicate the work which Food and Drug Administration is doing. This is not the case. This Commission could help the FDA in at least three ways in which this agency is not fully able to help itself, and do so without duplicating the agency's efforts.

In the first place, it would keep the FDA out of the sometimes awkward position of recommending policy changes and new legislation which the FDA itself would be responsible for enforcing. Second, it would offer a strong, authoritative voice to support some of the controversial moves which the FDA must necessarily make to protect the health and safety of the public. While it is true that the FDA has some excellent scientists directing its inspection and control work and carrying out its research, the Commission which I propose would also be comprised of distinguished scientists with national and international reputations. A controversial move, such as the warning on cranberry contamination, would be less controversial, and would seem less bureaucratic, if it were recommended by such a nonpartisan Commission. Third, this Commission would be in a better position than would the FDA to fight for a larger appropriation for the FDA, which it desperately needs, to enlarge the inadequacies in its current program. It is common knowledge that the FDA is underfinanced and understaffed.

There is a serious inadequacy, for example, in the inspection program on pesticides and insecticides. With its present facilities and manpower, the FDA can run only widely scattered spot inspections on agriculture crops. The vast majority of the raw foods which flow into the Nation's markets and kitchens now are never checked and may carry chemical residues which greatly exceed the tolerances which the FDA is attempting to enforce. Budget requests to enlarge the agency's inspection work have been repeatedly cut, and cut severely.

Moreover, the work of this Commission would actually benefit commercial interests. To illustrate, the crisis recently experienced in the cranberry market, which was a real blow to many a good and conscientious producer, would not have happened if the responsibilities of food producers had been made crystal clear long before these crises could ever have arisen. This proposed Commission would facilitate the realization of this objective.

It would also be my hope that this Commission, being completely unbiased and uninfluenced by commercial interests, might encourage public and private health agencies to extend their research further into fields which may promise very little personal profit, but which may promise much in improved national health. We must extend our horizons in every direction. There are many broad avenues to health. Let no one claim an exclusive monopoly for his particular approach. Diversification of effort must characterize our health program, with increased emphasis upon the importance of nutrition.

I do not suggest that H.R. 9150 is the only approach. My interest in health problems, and in the role which food and water contaminants play in that problem, is not motivated by any pride which I may have in the authorship of this bill. My interest is in seeing something constructive done about the problem. I would happily support any measure which serves that objective.

It well may be that the health problem will not receive the serious, sustained attention it deserves in the Congress until the House or the Senate, or both, establish standing committees on health This is a possibility which, I feel, the 86th Congress would do well to examine carefully. It seemed a step in the right direction when the Federal Government gave full departmental status to the functions combined in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is conceivable that in the future we will see those functions which are administered by this Department realined again, and perhaps separate departments of education, and of health, and of welfare, created.

Moreover, it is quite conceivable that the future will see the Congress establish separate standing committees to keep constant watch on the health of the American people. Meanwhile, I will continue to urge the enactment of H.R. 9150, as a necessary and acceptable immediate approach to the problem.

I am grateful for the support my proposal of a fact-finding Commission has received. Americans in nearly every State and many organizations have written me their support. Communications from the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Health Federation show they want a fact-finding Commission appointed on this problem.

We talk a lot about our competition with Russia, and the retention of our world leadership. It seems to me, however, that keeping up with, or ahead of, the Russians will be rather pointless, if in the meantime we dissipate our national virility and strength, and become a race of coddled and physically corrupted weaklings. Our real success will depend only in part, and a relatively small part, in building better missiles to shoot the moon or our enemies. Of far greater significance will be our ability to live in harmony with the laws of physical, mental, and spiritual health, in order that we might resist the ravages of disease, and achieve the fullness of our creative potential.

In conclusion, I find that I feel less concern over the serious problems which confront us than I feel over the attitudes of the American people toward these problems. The distinguished news analyst, Joseph Alsop, in his column carried last December 2 in the Washington Post, observed, and I quote:

> For surely the real source of America's self-pity and America's self-doubt is a dim but growing sense that we cannot compete in the modern world without somewhat greater efforts and sacrifices. Because of our rich heritage, we can get by with far less effort and far less sacrifice than any other nation. But we cannot grow as we ought to grow, and defend ourselves, and maintain our economic leadership and our political leadership, too, without rather more effort and more sacrifice than we are making now. And the sooner we pull up our socks in the indicated manner, the sooner the wails of self-pity will cease to be heard.

Mr. Alsop, I think, has bitten into the heart of the challenge before us. I hope we will not have to lose our priceless heritage to learn that it is truly priceless. If we are going to remain the foremost civilization of the world, we will have to be just as strong in our desire to hold that position as other dedicated, resourceful nations are in their desire to have it.

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE: IT'S THE LITTLE THINGS THAT COUNT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the state of the Union message this year was more than usually interesting. Not so much for its high sentiments of hope for peace, prosperity, and justice, but for its almost total silence on some fields of activity which are inextricably tied into our stature in the world.

In the past a Member could either read the message or listen to it and receive the same impressions. But not so this time.

On at least 18 occasions the President either added new material, deleted significant statements or expressions, or changed language. There is a saying that "It is the little things that count." And since this important annual speech was delivered over a week ago, I have carefully analyzed both the written and the delivered message in an effort to interpret some of the little things, express and implied, that seemed meaningful to me.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics ever since its formation, I was naturally very much interested and, in fact, pleased to note that the President recognizes the importance of stepping up our space program and that his 1961 budget will call for practically doubling expenditures for space research and development.

But I also have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and chairman of its Oceanography Subcommittee. Through work on that committee and from long prior service on the Armed Services Committee, I have become acutely aware of the importance of the oceans to the security and well-being of the world in general and to that of the United States

in particular. I am a strong believer in the concept of total seapower.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I know something of our needs in and on the oceans. As chairman of our Oceanography Subcommittee, I have been impressed with the fact that "we know more about the back side of the moon than we do about the bottom of the ocean." So I listened eagerly for the President's views on support and development of our posture on and in the oceans.

I was keenly disappointed at his almost complete failure to take any cognizance of this vital area of concern to this country, an area in which our military and our scientists have shown we are rapidly losing way in the competition for total seapower. Though plugging for step-up in space activity, no reference at all was made to the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences for a coordinated program of intensified oceanographic research. Nor was there any reference to strengthening our failing merchant marine or the growing problems in our increasingly important fisheries. And little reference was made to our Navy.

I said I was keenly disappointed at the omission of reference to some of these matters. But perhaps, in view of the very general nature of most state of the Union messages, it would be unreasonable to expect the President to make direct reference to every aspect of our national life and programs requiring support.

Upon listening to the delivered speech in comparison to the prepared text, I became frankly disturbed to note an apparently concerted effort to write off and to ignore the very existence of the oceans or anything suggestive thereof. Well, yes, there was enough reference to "oceans" left in the message to float our nuclear submarines—but not enough to ascertain the existence of undersea obstacles they might meet. For example, as delivered there were three very ominous, it seemed to me, and obviously deliberate emendations from the preprepared message—three of only four references, direct or indirect, substantive or rhetorical, to the water area that comprises more than 70 percent of the earth's surface.

I will cite these three instances:

First. On page 6 of the prepared text the President made the reassuring statement that "The deployment of a portion of these—our—forces beyond our shores, on land and sea, is pursuasive demonstration of our determination to stand shoulder to shoulder with our allies for collective security."

A good statement. But I wonder why the deliberate omission in the delivered speech of "on land and sea"?

Second. Then again, on page 9, after very rightly cautioning us against permitting the advance of inflation, he eliminated the sentence reading "inflation's ravages do not end at the water's edge."

Now I cannot help but wonder why this seemingly innocuous reference to water should be deleted.

Third. Then again, on page 12 of the prepared text, the President would have said:

> We live, moreover, in a sea of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe.

I believe I subscribe to the statement, to the extent that I can understand it. But am I paranoid to wonder why the word "storm" was substituted for the word "sea" in the delivered address? Am I sick to see something sinister or significant in such semantic antics as the sudden substitution of sibilants in a simple simile?

When the President speaks to the Congress on the state of the Union, it is surely proper to assume that he says nothing without a purpose. The same must apply to such unequivocal modifications of the distributed prepared text.

So I fear for the future of some of our naval, merchant marine, fishery and oceanographic programs. I predict that a study of the budget for 1961 will bear out these misgivings.

In any event, the President certainly squeezed all the water out of what was already a rather dry address.

INFLATION AND THE EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERSHIP BILL

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House this morning is to call to the Members' attention, with justifiable pride, the actions of the Home Builders Association of Chicago in properly understanding the inflationary abuses of the so-called emergency homeownership bill. Innocent-sounding titles such as this are too often used to cover legislative proposals which are, in the long run, detrimental to the interest of homeowners, taxpayers, and all Americans. Inflation is today the greatest danger our country faces. Fantastic spending proposals with their roots in the welfare-state philosophy of government are detrimental to the stability of the American economy, and I am gratified that the Chicago homebuilders, with their tremendous reputation for civic responsibility, have seen fit to boldly oppose this new proposal for massive Federal spending under the name of a nonexistent emergency.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 19, 1960]

BUILDERS WIN FIGHT AGAINST FEDERAL AID—CHICAGOANS HIT INFLATION BILL

Chicago area home builders were successful Monday in their initial efforts to prevent the National Association of Home Builders from endorsing a program to seek special financial aid from the Federal Government.

Kimball Hill, past president, and Ralph Finitzo, president of the Home Builders Association of Chicagoland, said that appropriation of $1 billion to the Federal National Mortgage Association as proposed in the Rains bill before Congress would be inflationary.

The measure has been urged by builders in the southern and western parts of the United States, where the supply of mortgage money has dwindled and interest rates have risen to 7 percent.

TABLED UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Monday the national association's directors voted to table the issue until Wednesday. The vote was close but the victors were confident the result would stand if another vote comes Wednesday.

The Rains bill was introduced by Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, who was a speaker at the national association's annual convention in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

A TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE GORDON CANFIELD WHO WILL RETIRE UNDEFEATED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of Paterson, N.J., will voluntarily retire from Congress at the end of this year to enjoy a well-earned rest.

He came to Congress in 1941 to represent the people of the Eighth New Jersey District. From his very first day in this House, he has compiled an admirable record of intelligence, integrity, and human understanding in behalf of his constituents and the Nation.

GORDON is an around-the-clock Congressman who never spared himself when others needed him. Always in close touch with the people and the problems of his district, he earned the respect and the affection of Republicans, Democrats and independents alike.

As a public servant he is invincible, because no man could do more for the people he represented.

As a colleague he won our esteem for his courage and devotion to the highest ideals of representative government.

His superhuman labors affected his health, and led to the reluctant decision to retire at the end of 1960. Our thanks and best wishes go with him at the conclusion of his brilliant career as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. We sincerely hope that he will enjoy many years of fulfillment in the less-strenuous program that opens up before him.

Our regard for him is best summed up in the December 16, 1959, editorial of the Paterson News, titled "GORDON CANFIELD Retires and the District Loses a Champ." Under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to insure permanent recognition of his outstanding service as a Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES A CHAMP

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his boss, the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus for well nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years, he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans, the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD'S beneficences and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the CANFIELD juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD'S dedicated service, and in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again in spite of the void he will leave and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD'S unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago, an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it, touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The little man was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped abroad a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him nay?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service, we were his stanch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth: "Well done thou true and faithful servant."

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1956 the Congress established a new program of disability benefits for persons aged 50 and over. It was described as a conservative plan designed to test the feasibility as to cost and administration of insuring against this type of risk in a public program. Because of this approach, the bill included a very strict definition of total and permanent disability, and the minimum age for benefits was set at age 50.

We have now had almost 4 years of experience with the plan. And we have learned from recent and extensive hearings conducted in November by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on the Administration of the Social Security Laws that the disability system has been a successful experiment and that it is financially sound.

The bill I introduce today would further strengthen this program by making benefits available to workers at any age, by giving some reality to the definition of disability as it applies to elderly disabled people and by providing insurance benefits to widows and widowers who are totally disabled. I would like to comment on each of these provisions in turn.

In a recent press release, the Honorable BURR HARRISON, chairman of this subcommittee, stated that he sees no reason to continue the exclusion of persons under 50, which he called an arbitrary and discriminating requirement. He added:

> A man, for example, aged 35 or 40, who is the sole support of a growing family and becomes disabled, faces as great a hardship as does the disabled person who at 50 years of age is more likely to have fewer dependents.

By removing the present limitation which pays benefits only to men and women 50 years of age and over, my bill would make eligible for benefits some 100,000 workers below that age, who have now qualified for the freeze. In addition, it is estimated that another 25,000 workers who have not applied for the freeze would apply for benefits together with around 100,000 dependents of the disabled workers. The rehabilitation features built into the present system would be far more important for this younger group of workers than they have been so far for older workers. Indeed, I believe that one of the most important features of this change would be the effect it would have of bringing these disabled younger workers into contact with rehabilitation facilities.

Of like importance, to my mind, is the strict definition of disability.

Since July 1957, when disability benefits first went into effect, it has become apparent that this strict definition has been administered even more strictly. I would venture to say that every Member here present has, at one time or another, had letters from constituents who, although clearly unable to work, have been held not to be disabled under the law. Such a strict definition works a particular hardship in the case of a man or woman approaching retirement age—a period when opportunities for employment for even the most ablebodied are very remote.

The bill I introduce today is a step in giving some reality to the definition of "disability" as it applies to these people. It would establish an occupational definition of "disability" which would be applicable to workers who have attained the age of 60. These older workers must now meet the admittedly tough requirement of the act by showing that they are unable to engage "in any substantial gainful activity"—which means, according to the Social Security Administration, that if a 60-year-old disabled lumberjack in my district could theoretically work as a pecan sheller in Georgia, he is thereby disqualified from benefits.

My bill would modify this definition by providing that a 60-year-old worker could qualify if he was unable to "engage in any substantial gainful activity which is the same or similar to that of his usual occupation or employment." I point out that this is not a new or untried concept from the standpoint of administration. Occupational definitions of disability appear in the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Act, as well as in State workmen's compensation, temporary disability, and staff retirement legislation.

Limiting the occupational definition to age 60 has the following advantages: First, it pinpoints the problem of the older disabled worker who has little chance or opportunity of becoming rehabilitated so that he can perform another job. Of those workers referred to State vocational rehabilitation agencies under the disability program of the Social Security Act, less than 5 percent accepted for rehabilitation have been aged 60 or over and only a small proportion of these are actually rehabilitated. To rehabilitate an individual aged 60 or over for employment requires expense, time, and effort which many consider not to be justified in view of the relatively short period before his retirement, and the fact that his reemployment often can be accomplished only under sheltered work conditions. However much we may engage in wishful thinking as to the potentialities of rehabilitation, the hard fact is that the limitation of trained staff for rehabilitation programs means they cannot be expected to concentrate their efforts on older men and women at the expense of younger people with families.

Moreover, my proposal faces up realistically to the fact that, although theoretically it might be possible for these people to, perhaps, do light work in another line of employment, their chances of getting such work are negligible. All evidence, and good commonsense, suggests that their chances of getting

any job at all are extremely remote. For most of us the time is past when, in an agricultural environment, our work life could be tapered off with light chores. A form of hard-core unemployment is developing even among our able-bodied older men and women who are unable to get jobs once they are laid off. This situation has been accentuated during the past few decades because more people are living longer. The call for handicraft skills is decreasing at a time when the expansion of machine technology is discarding many of the skills developed during a lifetime.

For these reasons, numerous bills have appeared to lower the retirement age for social security purposes to age 60. Such a proposal would help to relieve the hardships of the workers I have described but it would be very costly to social security plan. And a large part of that cost would go toward paying benefits to the most fortunate people of all—those who are financially able to retire early.

I believe, therefore, that the basic solution is not just an early retirement age but more flexibility in the retirement age concept by making benefits available to those men and women who, through factors beyond their control, have been retired by a disabling condition. We know that the onset and extent of crippling diseases rises rapidly after middle age. We know that a man 60 or more may be the victim of a slowly disabling ailment which, while it does not yet meet the strict definition in existing law, precludes the possibility of work. And, if able-bodied people at this age are unable to find jobs, how can our social security plan continue to deny benefits to disabled workers on the ground that they could work if someone would hire them?

The third provision of this bill is the extension of insurance benefits to widows and widowers who are totally disabled. Under the present law, such benefits are available only at age 62 for widows and at age 65 for widowers. It seems to me that the philosophy of the legislation as it now stands presumes that widows and widowers below this age, assuming that they do not have minor children to care for, are able to meet the loss of the family breadwinner by seeking employment themselves. This is undoubtedly true for most widows and widowers, but what of those who are physically unable to work? Under the present law they must wait for survivors benefits until they have reached age 62, or, in the case of widowers, age 65. This can be a long and heartbreaking wait and I feel sure that most, if not all, of the Members of this House have, like myself, received letters from constituents who find themselves in this situation. Since 1956 we have recognized the need for assistance of disabled workers. Can we, in good conscience, ignore the same need on the part of those who have lost the working member of the family but are unable to replace him themselves? I do not see how we can.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I present today builds on our past experience with the social security program. It does not propose any radical departures from current philosophy, but instead strengthens the program so that it better meets the needs of our people. Two of the proposals I am making relate to changes which Chairman MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee, has indicated as worthy of consideration, in his opinion. I believe that this bill presents a reasonable and equitable way of meeting the very real hardship which is now being experienced by older men and women who have been turned away from the door of the social security office because they were adjudged to be not quite sick enough or crippled enough to qualify under the law as it is now written; by younger workers whose disability is no less of a personal disaster because they don't happen to be 50 yet; and by younger widows and widowers who cannot now qualify for benefits because they have not established coverage under the law but who are unable to do so because of their physical disability. I hope that this proposal will receive the careful consideration which I believe it deserves.

THE CHALLENGE OF PRESERVING PEACE: THE SEVEN DYNAMIC SPEARHEADS OF PEACE POWER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, in the second speech of this series, outlined the Sino-Soviet peril to peace and freedom. Now I ask: In the decade of the 1960's, can we meet this dire peril?

Can we preserve a peace based on justice?

Can we move even one step beyond and enlarge freedom throughout the world?

We can. But, I firmly believe that we will, only if we remold seven dynamic spearheads of peace power, the very spearheads which the Republicans already have used to preserve peace since 1953. Because the peril has deepened, these spearheads must be continually sharpened.

First. The first of these spearheads is a consistent and firm American foreign policy designed to clarify our vital commitments in advance, in order that no opponent will be drawn into war through miscalculations.

Twice in this century the absence of such positive diplomacy has produced wars. In 1908, when conflict between Austro-Hungary and Serbia was imminent, Russia backed down on its obligations to come to the aid of Serbia. In 1914, when a similar crisis developed Austro-Hungary expected Russia to back down again. But Russia did not. Thus, the way to World War I was paved by the Austro-Hungary miscalculation of Russia's position.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] noted in the previous speech, the American Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in 1950 outlined the perimeter which America would defend in the Far East. Korea was excluded. Therefore, the Communists calculated that the United States would not intervene if they attacked South Korea.

Here, then, are examples of two prolonged wars, bred in an atmosphere of miscalculation. Had diplomats made clear, in advance, the positions of their countries, war could have been prevented.

Apparently, Russians today recognize all-out war as nuclear suicide. If so, the most likely possibility of nuclear war during the decade we have just entered would be through Russia miscalculating. That could occur if Soviet leaders believed that, when confronted with the brink of war, an administration in Washington would retreat.

Consequently, we must never introduce into our foreign policy ambiguities and appearances of softness and domestic divisions which might spark the Communists into a miscalculation that could fuse a war.

Today, Russia knows the United States cannot be bluffed or blackmailed. Throughout the decade ahead we must continue to have a President, Vice President, and Secretary of State, who understand the Soviet strategy and who will not employ defensive and ambiguous policies.

Is there a difference between the approaches of the Democratic Advisory Council and the Republicans to this area of foreign policy?

Unfortunately the same differences the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] noted in his speech exist today. The Democratic Advisory Council and its spokesmen, Adlai Stevenson and Dean Acheson, make statements which often give Red Russia and Red China the picture of a divided America with ambiguous will and zig-zagging diplomacy. Apparently they want to stand up to the Communists on one issue, but not on the next.

We Republicans shall always abhor this attitude. For we believe it breeds miscalculations.

Second. The second dynamic spearhead of peace power is an effective, flexible, military deterrent system. It must employ a secure retaliatory capacity to respond vigorously at places and with means of our own choosing.

There has developed an increasing tendency among critics of the administration to judge our deterrent capacity purely in arithmetical terms using only a part rather than the whole of our deterrent or retaliatory capability for comparative purposes. This defensive attitude of trying to match and copy everything Russia does would leave the initiative with Russia. In contrast, we must look to the total deterrent force in being and planned to determine our real military posture.

In order to reverse the pronounced Communist successes throughout the world, the Eisenhower administration inaugurated a new foreign policy which was the antithesis of the containment strategy of the previous administration.

As was noted in the previous speech, containment had resulted in the United

States trying to spread its ground strength around the world so thinly that it became ineffective. During this same period, we had a virtual atomic monopoly. Yet, so poorly was this source of potential strength integrated into our foreign policy that Communist aggression abounded.

Vice President NIXON explained the plight of the new administration when it took office in 1953:

> We found that economically their [the Russians] plan, apparently, was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth, to be prepared to fight anywhere—anywhere in the world—that they, the men of the Kremlin chose.

The solution of the new administration was expressed by Mr. Dulles:

> The way to deter aggression is for the free community to be willing and able to respond vigorously at places and with means of its own choosing.

This policy demanded a reshaping of our military forces in order to obtain a mobile retaliatory capacity. Many administration critics were slow, however, to grasp the true implications of this new strategy. They still do not understand it. They insist on saying that the term "massive mobile retaliatory capacity" envisions exclusively atomic retaliation aimed at cities like Moscow or Peiping.

They maintain that Mr. Dulles inaugurated a one-weapon strategy, an all-or-nothing-at-all approach. Ironically, his critics attack, for political reasons, a policy which they fabricated for attack, a strawman which exists only in their own thinking, a ghost of their imaginations which never existed in the thinking of the State Department and the White House.

Mr. Dulles often explained the fallacy of such an interpretation. For example, in a 1954 article published in Foreign Affairs, the late Secretary of State noted that the new policy, in relation to Korea, did not mean that renewed Communist aggression would result in the United Nations dropping atomic bombs on Peiping or Moscow. It did mean that we will respond, not defensively, but with initiative, at times and places of our own choosing.

Of course, we will never alert an opponent in advance to the particular weapon or the particular place we will respond. Keeping him guessing as to the means—whether we would use naval forces, conventional land forces, tactical atomic weapons, or what—is part of the psychology of our deterrence. But we will make crystal clear our aim to defend an area through an initiative which allowed no privileged sanctuaries. Manchuria in the Korean war was a privileged sanctuary.

If is unfortunate indeed if the constant literature produced about so-called massive retaliation beclouds the true strategy of the present administration. That strategy of the present administration ended the Korean war. It deterred war in the Formosa area. It foiled Communist designs on West Berlin. Throughout the decade ahead, this same strategy of initiative can preserve the peace.

It involves a system of deterrence where our entire arsenal—from conventional to the most unconventional weapons—is combined with just the right selectivity to apply force exactly calculated to check the specific case of aggression.

Throughout the 1960's, our responses must be affirmative—not just negative and defensive. Our vision must be forward-looking and sensitive to the constantly changing weapons of our military system. Our perspective must consider the intrarelationship of our deterrent system. The energy for our national security must not be wasted on duplication and overconcentration of what is no longer essential.

When it becomes necessary to increase the proportionate share of budget spending to maintain this type of security, the American people, through curtailment of subsidy and nondefense spending programs, must make personal sacrifices. We can afford the defense we need. But we Republicans believe that we must afford it through sacrifice, and not through deficit spending.

Democrats like those in their advisory council want to afford that defense through charging it to the next generation and bankrupting their freedom. With splintered vision, they want to build up our missile defenses by lowering our economic defenses.

Third. And this leads us to consider our next spearhead of peace power—a strong, free, and rapidly growing American economy.

On May 24, 1957, Khrushchev pronounced:

> We do not intend to blow up the capitalist world with bombs. If we catch up with the United States in per capita production of meat, butter and milk we will have hit the pillar of capitalism with the most powerful torpedo yet.

The gentleman from California—speech No. 2—described how the Eisenhower policy of using with initiative the total potentialities of our strength ended the Korean war and blocked major aggression by Communists since. As a result, the Communists have shifted their major hopes to an economic offensive.

Their success will depend to a large degree upon the fiscal policies and productive forces within America. For at the base of this Soviet-American economic conflict is the ruble versus the dollar. The fundamentals of the conflict are not new to the Communists. Lenin said:

> The best way to destroy the capitalist system is to debauch the currency.

Plainly, Communist theorists believe that eventually democratic nations will debauch their own currency. Thereseems to be a mounting danger of this Communist expectation turning into a reality within America.

Our impoverished oversea neighbors, however, have learned through bitter experience an economic lesson in survival. They have adopted balanced budgets and sound economic policies which have produced unprecedented prosperity. The austerity program in England has yielded budget surpluses and a 6 percent tax cut. Because of hard money policies in France, her economic stability has greatly increased. The Common Market has accelerated Europe's overall economic rise. Japan is enjoying swift recovery and booming industries. And the economic growth of West Germany equals that of Red Russia.

And how do these countries view the United States? I quote from some remarks of William McChesney Martin, Jr.

> To the foreigner, much more than to Americans, the dollar is a symbol of this country's strength. A decline in the value of the dollar would suggest to him a decline in the faith and credit of the United States; signaling in his mind a decline not only in American economic strength but also in moral force.

As we enter the 1960's the Democratic Advisory Council and liberal Democrats in Congress still scoff at the economic laws which are producing fiscal health overseas. They vigorously oppose efforts to balance the budget.

What makes their complacency over fiscal policies so perilous?

The industrial revolution, which reached its peak years ago in the United States, is just going into full swing in many areas abroad. Especially is this true in the Iron Curtain countries where the labor force has been reduced to slavery.

This cheap labor market becomes an acute factor in East-West trade competition, since in the United States wages often climb more rapidly than profits. Thus, the final cost of our products has priced us out of many foreign markets. This places us at a disadvantage in a trade war with Russia. Must we add to this the handicap of a decadent dollar?

Because of the importance of the dollar in our foreign policy, fiscal soundness at home has become essential in meeting the Communist peril abroad. This and the other economic essentials will be treated in more detail in a subsequent speech of this series.

Fourth. The fourth dynamic spearhead of peace power is collective security and solidarity throughout the free world. Mr. Herter said recently:

> Our greatest advantage in the world struggle is that we are not alone. Many countries are with us wholeheartedly and confidently. Many others are with us in spirit, even though they cannot say so.

To maintain this advantage, we must continue to foster our collective security system. In certain respects, this system is an economy measure, for it enables our allies to supplement our own military forces.

The numerous bases in those friendly countries not only provide needed facilities for our air and naval forces, but also afford us missile sites. This dispersion of bases throughout the world makes it impossible for Soviet aircraft and missiles to destroy our retaliatory capacity.

The other vital military contribution of our allies is in terms of manpower. The United States is able to devote primary emphasis to strategic striking forces, to missiles, and to space developments because of this supplementary manpower. So, our conventional war strength can be only partly appraised in terms of U.S. Army combat divisions. It can be fully evaluated in terms of the allied divisions our forces support and train. The technical, logistical, and mis-

sile capabilities perform a vital function for numerous military assistance groups and provide tactical support to many allies.

Paradoxically, many representatives of the opposition have shouted that our Army divisional strength is too small, and then have voted to cut mutual security funds and hence the Army divisional strength of our allies, which comes at less cost to us in dollars and American manpower.

At the same time, our entire foreign aid program must be subject to periodic reappraisal. A decade ago the economy of many of our major allies was in a depressed state, and this required us to bear the major burden of both military and general economic aid to the free world. We rejoice in the startling recovery that many of those allies have made, and we call upon them to accept their full share of responsibility in fostering both the defense and economic health of the free world.

As a result of economic transactions with other countries last year, the United States had a deficit in balance payments of about $3¾ billion. Why has this deficit resulted? We have an annual expenditure of about $3 billion to maintain our military forces overseas. Our loans, grants, and capital outflow that increase our exports amount to about $2 billion annually, and we have a private capital investment outflow of about $2 billion a year. Obviously, it is necessary to our economic health that the prosperous free nations bear more of the burden in maintaining efficient defenses, of encouraging private investment and in assisting the less developed areas.

Solidarity of the free world involves more than just the economic aspect. It has a psychological and diplomatic side, too.

It is indeed tragic that the leading foreign policy spokesman of the Democratic advisory council, Mr. Dean Acheson, seems to berate our efforts to promote moral solidarity throughout the world. On the eve of the President's departure for an unprecedentedly long and strenuous trip among our many allies and friends, Mr. Acheson publicly said that little good would come from the trip. While the President tries to promote unity, Acheson seems to promote disunity. Has he no awareness of the importance attached to statements of a former Secretary of State?

Will he never learn a lesson? About a year ago he was the principal author of an advisory council pamphlet which painted a picture of disunity within the free world and claimed that our position in the world and our alliances were dissolving "as just a hundred years ago men watched the Union dissolve under the weak and palsied hand of Buchanan." The release of this vindictive pamphlet was timed to coincide with the week that the NATO ministers were meeting in Washington to reaffirm unity and solidarity. The Berlin crisis had begun, and it was necessary to our diplomacy to present Khrushchev with the picture of a united NATO. And yet, the Democratic advisory council used its efforts to propagandize the line of disunity.

When supporting and promoting collective security and solidarity among our allies, both political parties should make a constructive contribution. During the 1960's, we call upon responsible Democrats to do something, somehow, to control these nonconstructive spokesmen of their advisory council. Indeed, we sympathize with those Members on the other side of the aisle who deplore this irresponsibility.

The dilemmas of their party disunity, however, in no way relieve them from the duty to curtail this council when its members jeopardize unity in our defenses against the Sino-Soviet peril. For, in the decade ahead, cooperation among our political parties to promote allied unity will be as important as cooperation among the allies themselves.

Fifth. Science and technology is the fifth spearhead of peace power which we must vastly sharpen.

The deepest peril we face is that the Russians will concentrate on a few given, but quite decisive, areas and develop superior technological skills. In the area of rocket technology, we have seen what they have accomplished in outer space. This did not happen by luck. They had enormous vision and great drive. By 1947, the rocket theories of the German scientist, Sanger, had created a tidal wave of excitement in the Kremlin.

So that a top priority could be set up for the rocket program, Stalin ordered an aerodynamics expert, Col. Gugori Tokaev, to his office. Tokaev, who later defected, said that the Kremlin leaders were in almost a hysterical clamor for greater details about a super rocket. Neither were the diplomatic implications of this technological adventure lost on Stalin. He told Tokaev that the rocket "would make it easier to talk to the gentleman shopkeeper, Truman."

As Dr. von Braun pointed out at the time Russia shot up her first sputnik:

> The United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. * * * These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost.

At the outset of the 1960's, we must launch into this field of technology with renewed determination to make up for the lost years. We must surpass Russia. Erratic programing and crash measures are not the answer. Clear lines of leadership, however, are essential. And I hail it as a great step forward that all space projects, including the brilliant team of Dr. von Braun, have now been placed under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The news that the Saturn project may cut 2 years from Russia's lead time is most heartening.

In the decade ahead, however, we must meet a much broader challenge yet in the fields of science and technology. Many spokesmen of the Democratic Advisory Council appear to advocate responses which exclusively involve greater appropriations of money and greater bureaucratic controls. Paradoxically, Russia has made profound progress in science and technology because in this area she abandoned Marxian centralism and control and inaugurated freedom and incentive. Did not Khrushchev, during his visit to America, boast to the President that Russia used incentives more extensively than did the United States?

In contrast to the approach of the Democratic Advisory Council, the Percy Committee Report emphasized that there are three essentials to the creation of a strong science and technology:

> The maintenance of an environment of freedom and public understanding in which creativity can flourish.
>
> The maintenance of a superior educational system which stresses the value of excellence for its own sake and which makes a special effort to search out the most gifted minds, wherever found, and to make available to them the most advanced training which they are capable of absorbing.
>
> The provision of scientists and engineers with the economic resources with which to pursue their search with the utmost aggressiveness.

This approach will indeed grant our Nation a new lease on its heritage, and a renewed faith in its capacity.

And this leads to a consideration of the next dynamic spearhead.

Sixth. The sixth dynamic spearhead of peace power is the increased use of the psychological, moral, and spiritual resources of a free society.

The Communists have made a god of Karl Marx and a religion of scientific materialism. Undoubtedly, the Marxian gospel exploits the weaknesses of human nature. Its breeding ground is in discontent and in frustrated hopes.

So, we are dealing with a dangerous peril, one involving far more deadly consequences than just missiles, military strategy, and geographical battlefields. The peril is not solely from without. It threatens from within as well. It will prey on our every lack of faith in ourselves.

During this age of conflict, the decisive battleground will be in the minds of men.

The static lie of Russian communism can be met only by the dynamic truth of American freedom. Unfortunately, many Americans have not awakened to the basis of the big lie even within their own country. The big lie is found in the materialistic interpretation of man and man's destiny. Of this, communism is merely a ruthless manifestation. This materialism is often called, simply, socialism. Our ideas and faith can never be victorious over Communistic ideas through a greater application of materialism, statism, and socialism.

I fear that the Democratic advisory council exerts an influence to convert our foreign policy into a materialistic program, to purge it of all principle. Is this not a repetition of the pattern of allowing the Soviet to control the initiative and to choose the framework for conflict?

A strong faith and ideology within America is essential. It is just as essential to carry it to the Russian people themselves. This leads to the next force.

Seventh. The seventh dynamic spearhead of peace power is a people-to-people approach. The Vice President's visit to Soviet Russia last summer was a creative, dynamic, and timely breakthrough of the Soviet Iron Curtain. I say it was creative because it challenged the Communists as never before into a contest of ideas. I say it was dynamic for it was a giant step forward toward a long-standing aim of the Eisenhower foreign policy of liberating minds and restoring freedom within the Sino-Soviet bloc.

The Percy report has splendidly summed up our policy of liberation:

> Our policy of nonviolent emancipation, with its longrun perspectives, would spell out the policy of peaceful liberation which some have either not understood or deliberately distorted out of all proportions. The emancipation policy promises to establish much-needed facilities for the peaceable creation of pressures for gradual expansion of freedom within the Communist empire.

During his visit to Russia, Vice President NIXON superbly dramatized American superiority in the production of consumer goods. Granted, much of what he said never got to the Russian masses. But some of what he said had a marked effect. A continued program of this nature, with increased cultural and scientific exchanges will bring to the Russian people and to the satellites the American story of the benefits from a free economy. In turn, this story will create upward pressures on the Soviet rulers. This could deter Soviet aggression and expand freedom within Russia and her satellites.

The follow-up to the initial people-to-people approach has been the personal diplomacy of President Eisenhower. For some time before his death, Secretary of State Dulles had pointed out to the President his tremendous prestige throughout the world. The time might come, insisted Dulles, for the President to use fully this prestige and influence through a series of tours. Obviously, it would have been a cardinal blunder to embark in this personal diplomacy at the wrong time. But was the time not ideal, before a summit meeting, toward the end of the President's term in office? This would further steal the initiative from Mr. Khrushchev. It would cast the setting for the conflict where we want it—in the arena of world opinion—that would make it a battle of ideas and not of missiles.

The casual observer will ask: Have not some of the members of the Democratic Advisory Council been calling for a summit meeting year after year? And is the Republican leadership not now taking us to a summit? So is there any difference in attitudes in this particular regard?

Most certainly, yes. The difference is in timing and in preparation. Yalta and Potsdam were failures. We tried a summit in 1955 and it became clearly evident that Khrushchev was not yet thoroughly convinced that the Eisenhower administration had irrevocably inaugurated a new foreign policy which would not bow to blackmail and to duplicity.

It took four more years to educate the Soviet leaders, during crisis after crisis, that the new administration would not compromise vital issues. And the final part of Khrushchev's education was during the Berlin crisis of 1959. He gave America a deadline. He was determined to humiliate us into a summit, when the entire world knew it was blackmail. America stood her ground, despite the fact that a former Truman advisor, George Kennan, declared we should withdraw from Europe altogether.

Khrushchev's education was complete. He realized that he was confronted with a new foreign policy, far different from that of the Truman administration. He had the alternative of plunging his country into an all-out war, or seeking a peaceful means of competition. At this decisive moment, the President took the initiative. He sought to avoid a condition mentioned in the speech of the gentleman from California—speech No. 2—where a Soviet leader might see no way out, feel that he was boxed in, and irrationally tumble toward war. Without retreating from the Berlin issue, Mr. Eisenhower invited Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. Thus the Soviet Chairman, at the decisive moment, was led toward the ways of peaceful competition. The timing of our President was brilliant.

Now we do hold the initiative.

The greatest single challenge of the 1960's is to bring the people-to-people approach closer and closer to every member of the Communist empire. This policy, however, can backfire if executed by unskilled men with limited ability and limited vision.

We must continue to have as President, Vice President and Secretary of State, leaders with judgment and knowledge of world affairs. The future of this country—indeed, the future of freedom throughout the world—cannot be risked, either to rank amateurs in international relations, or to those who produced the ambiguous and faltering diplomacy of the late 1940's.

As we enter the decade of the 1960's a profound difference emerges between the foreign-policy approaches of the Republicans and of the Democratic Advisory Council. Basically, it is this: While the Republicans are looking forward, members of the Democratic Advisory Council, the Stevensons and the Achesons, are looking backward. Against the Russian peril, they still do not understand the need for a consistent, clear policy of firmness. They have splintered vision, and see the Soviet peril only in parts. Their reactions are defensive.

The Republicans undertook the campaign of 1952 with two important foreign-policy aims—to end the war in Korea and to initiate a policy of liberation. Peace in Korea, the Republicans knew, could only come from reshaping a policy of the initiative which outlawed the privileged sanctuary. Liberation of those in Soviet slavedom could only come by maneuvering the Russian leaders into a climate of exchange of ideas, culture, and competition in consumer production.

This year the Republicans undertake another campaign. More than just political, it is a campaign to promulgate a philosophy for maintaining peace with justice and extending freedom here and throughout the world.

We have summed up this policy for the 1960's in terms of seven spearheads of peace power. Not just one, but all seven are needed to spearhead the progress of freedom throughout the world.

Why is the Republican Party capable of promoting this dynamic policy? Because as a party it possesses the four qualities which the chairman of the Republican policy committee mentioned in the initial speech: Party unity, party philosophy based on principle, party democracy, and party foresight toward the needs of future generations.

With these qualities, the Republicans uniquely are equipped to see the Sino-Soviet challenge as a whole and not in parts. Uniquely are the Republicans qualified to marshal all the forces and resources of our Nation and turn the age ahead from peril to promise.

THE NUMBERS RACKET IN NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ULLMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I exposed before this Congress and the Nation the numbers racket of New York City as pauperizing the poor and criminalizing the dwellers of the ghettos. The number of criminals is increasing rapidly according to the records of the courts. The amount of money now being played per year on numbers only, in New York City alone, is $150 million. This figure is arrived at on the basis of estimates made by members of the press in New York.

All of this is operating without a single banker or big controller being arrested. It is entirely in the hands, according to the police department's own admission and statistics, of the maffia syndicate and the combine, as the New York Times reported a week ago, in their Sunday edition, with every single Negro even in the Harlem community, driven out.

Last week I put before this Congress and this Nation the names and addresses of a few of those operating in my district, plus excerpts from my sermon calling on the people of my community to kick the habit of gambling. Police headquarters in New York City issued a bulletin after my speech of last Wednesday saying that the names that I gave them were "no new names" and that the list which I presented here in Congress, photostatic copies of which I hold in my hand, was 5 years old. These are the photostatic copies of the lists found on former Police Sergeant Luberda when he was arrested in March of last year by State troopers near Suffern, N.Y., for drunken driving.

Subsequently they found nineteen-thousand-four-hundred-odd dollars in his car. These lists have the names and addresses of a number of places and of

the numbers operators, with the amounts by each name of how much was paid off to the police.

Sergeant Luberda went to prison for 2 years for refusing to testify before the grand jury.

These lists, by the way, were identified in court by a member of District Attorney Frank Hogan's staff as "the pay off list" to the police department. Judge John Mullen in sentencing Luberda to 2 years in prison said, "You are the bag man for the police department."

The police department last Wednesday after my talk here said these lists were 5 years old, and also said I gave no new names. In the first place, there were new names, four, to be exact, and I will repeat them:

Nick Angelo and Louie B., bankers, 3543 Broadway.

Tony D'Amato, 509, 522, and 526 West 147th Street.

Tony Plait, at 529 and 531 West 151st Street.

These are new names.

The police department confessed later that one of them had been arrested, but he was "only a runner." This is an untruth. These four are all big, and the biggest is Tony Plait, at the two addresses I gave to the Congress last week.

Today in my remarks I will list more new names and more numbers headquarters, but in the meantime I am asking the police department to explain to the public why they have not arrested all of those who were named last week if for no other charge than the usual charge, that of vagrancy.

Let us take the word of police headquarters that the list I introduced last week was 5 years old. Mark you, these are the exact words of Deputy Police Commissioner Walter Arm as reported in the daily press in New York, that those lists are 5 years old.

Those lists I gave last week were part of the lists found on the person of former Sergeant Luberda in March of 1959. If these lists are 5 years old, then that means that Luberda, who was on the police force then, was the bag man for the Police Department while on the force. I would like the special committee of Congress which has been investigating payola on TV and radio to look into the $150 million numbers racket in New York and the payola to the police department of New York which, in other words, has been going on for 5 years. We know, of course, it has probably been going on much longer.

The damaging admission by police headquarters that they knew all of these lists for 5 years proves that they knew how much was being paid off by Luberda, because the amount is by each drop, with the weekly payoff, the amount by these names of weekly payoff to the lower echelon, the man on the beat.

I asked them publicly why they did nothing about this for 5 years. The public knows they did nothing.

Since the lists are 5 years old, then that means also the police headquarters knew who the bankers were—these names are here—where they were operating during that 5 years and yet let them operate freely without any arrests.

The very first name there, Louie the Gimp, was not arrested until I held a conference with the police commissioner and complained about Louie the Gimp, one of the biggest, operating a numbers bank in front of my church. Then and only then was he arrested. If they, the police department, say they knew about it for 5 years, since police headquarters knew that the list found on Luberda was 5 years old, why did they obstruct justice by not so informing the district attorney, Frank Hogan? The release from the police department, the list of 5 years ago, is also corroborating evidence, and this is important, that the gambling stamp tax which we passed here in 1951 is now due for at least 5 years on each one of the names mentioned.

I just received a letter a few minutes ago from Mr. H. Allan Long, who is director of the Intelligence Division of the Treasury Department. In response to my remarks of last Wednesday, he writes me, and the letter just came, that they are working on the gambling stamp tax of these named, and I quote from his letter, and it is already in the hands of the New York office.

The next point I want to bring out is—how can the police department and the district attorney's office find out who the overlords are in back of this $150 million racket?

Ninety percent of the bail bond business is handled by one man. How can we find out who pays off this one man? Because the bail bond fee and the forfeiture are not paid for by the man when he is arrested. They are paid for by someone else.

First. The application for the bail bond in New York City shows who pays the premium, and that is in the office of the company. The company is known to me and the company is known to the authorities in New York. So, therefore, it would be easy to find this information.

Second. The confession of judgment on the bail bond shows who pays the forfeiture. This must be signed in advance.

Third. And this is the important part, and this is a most important part, the affidavit filed with the court under the law of New York shows at whose request the bond is written when the bond is written. This affidavit is found in the court clerk's office attached to the bond.

I might point out that most of the time when the bond is written the defendant is in jail.

With all of the foregoing information, if 200 or 300 of these number runners who are repeaters, and mark you who were arrested before the Sergeant Luberda exposé of March 1959, if they are subpenaed and cross-examined, it would definitely show that they did not pay for their bail bond. They did not pay for their lawyer, even though at the beginning some might lie. After that evidence has been secured, then the bail bondsmen can be brought in and confronted with it and a demand made then as to who did pay for the bail bond.

I would like to say the district attorney for New York, Mr. Hogan, has been very cooperative. I have been working very cooperatively with him. I had an extensive conversation with him last Saturday. On Monday, I received a tip which undoubtedly is going to lead to the very top. I immediately called up Mr. Frank Hogan for whom I have the greatest admiration. He was overjoyed to get it and his office, with his own detective force, is working on this now. This, I think, is going to break within the next few days and I cannot say any more about it because it is too important.

These are new names and new addresses that I am going to give:

Candy store, 469 West 148th Street—under Nick Angelo. Also, the J. & P. Market, 3614 Broadway. The E. & J. TV appliance store at 3638 Broadway. Freddie's No. 2 Grocery Store at 3343 Broadway. Under another known hood named "Al," known to the police department, these are operated: The Big Four Coffee Shop, 3301 Broadway; Produce Market, 3491 Broadway; and again under Nick Angelo, the Piedmont Restaurant at 3301 Broadway. Finally, under two new bankers known only as Sol and Tom, the Amsterdam Market at 2016 Amsterdam Avenue.

I will continue to list these names, continue to turn them over to the district attorney, to the Intelligence Division of the Department of the Treasury, and to another authority that I cannot reveal at present that has been working with me—an authority in our area. I have received many threats, but they mean nothing to me. I will be back here, God willing, Wednesday with more of these names until that day comes when the police department of my town starts arresting these known people and starts closing up these known addresses which, in their own words, they have known for 5 years.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

ANTI-SEMITIC ACTS IN GERMANY AND THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my dear friend and distinguished associate on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], who addressed this body yesterday, in protest against the apparent inactivity of our Government in connection with anti-Semitic acts in Germany and elsewhere throughout the world. This is one time when our country must act with authoritative firmness. Outrageous attacks upon any people because of their religion or of their race are a challenge to all that our United States of America stands for. I am one of the House sponsors of a concurrent resolution that makes crystal clear the position of the Congress of the United States. I hope that there will be no delay in the adoption of this resolution, which the able chairman of the

Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MORGAN, promptly has scheduled for committee hearing and action.

From Rabbi Eric Friedland of the district that I have the honor to represent I have received a letter in which he states:

I am impressed with your concurrent resolution in connection with the recent wave of desecration of Jewish houses of worship. I dare say that none of us are in a position to speak authoritatively on the reason for the outrages. Whether they represent a planned attack on a very vulnerable target by neo-Nazis, whether this is a subtle communistic strategy to divide and confuse NATO, whether this is another demonstration of periodic international anti-Semitism, whether it is hoodlumism, or whether it is simply highjinks perpetrated by youth in a quest of "kicks" no one knows. Maybe it is a combination of a few of these factors. Maybe all are represented. At any event, it seems to me that the situation calls for vigorous action. First of all, an effort should be made to ascertain the source of the propaganda and the hostile acts. Secondly, some effort must be made to apprehend the dastardly perpetrators of these monstrous and inhuman acts. Finally, those in positions of authority and those who represent the conscience of the Western World must be heard.

To single out the Jew for humiliation and attack may seem innocent on the surface, but the Jew is a barometer of the moral state of the world. If the world is silent about the Jew, ultimately those who assail the world's morality will destroy all decent people and their institutions as well.

I am pleased that you saw fit to be among the first to take a bold position.

Mr. Speaker, I also am including in my remarks the statement of Rabbi Hayim Goren Perelmuter, another beloved spiritual leader in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

The Swastika rides again around the world, like *some satanic* satellite of somber warning. There are differences of opinion as to what it betokens.

Some would dismiss it as an outbreak of hoodlum rash, the new search for kicks on the part of delinquent degenerates. Some think it has a neo-Nazi origin. Some say it might emanate from the Communists; and some that an Arab League anti-Jewish factor is involved.

Perhaps there is an element of fact in all of these. But whatever it be, it betokens a serious danger sign as to the health of the body politic of the Western World. The sickness is compounded of a dangerous drift toward appeasement, and a flabby weakness fashioned out of an excess of prosperity.

And as always, the forces that would undermine democracy and decency strike, in whatever slimy manner, at the Jew.

To all of us this should sound an alert and a reaction. A reaction, not of panic, but of positive and courageous posture. If our synagogues are targets for these forces let us hallow them and sanctify them. Let us hallow them and sanctify them by strengthening them with our devoted participation.

We must educate our children better, deepen our own reservoirs of faith, and make the altar of our worship alive with our constant devotion.

We must throw ourselves with renewed vigor into every phase of Jewish activity at home and abroad. And we must alert all forces in the democratic world that they may know for whom this warning bell tolls.

It tolls for all, for Christian as well as Jew, for black as well as white. It tolls for all that is decent in humanity.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce at this time and send to the desk a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings. I request that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point:

TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT SO AS TO RELAX THE SEVERITY OF EXISTING PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO DEDUCTIONS FROM BENEFITS ON ACCOUNT OF EARNINGS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (2) of section 203(e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "$80" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$254".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective, in the case of any individual, with respect to taxable years of such individual ending after the month in which this Act is enacted.

This is an identical companion bill to that which Senator KEATING is today introducing in the other House. It is on a subject about which both Senator KEATING and I feel strongly, the welfare of our elderly citizens. The legislation would end the present injustice of the law whereby older people may actually have to pay for the privilege if they wish to work.

At present, as is common knowledge, a person receiving social security benefits can end up with less income by working than if he or she stayed home and lived on social security. If a person earns more than $1,200 per year he loses an entire month's benefits for every $80 or fraction thereof of additional earnings. Since social security payments may run up to $254 per month, a person earning $2,160 per year in wages might lose $3,048 in social security benefits. Such an older person would be in effect paying $888 per year for the privilege of working.

This is morally wrong and psychologically demoralizing for senior citizens who might wish to continue working after they have reached retirement age. Work is an essential ingredient for the happiness, self-respect, and dignity of many elder citizens. In a recent Gallup survey it was found that the overwhelming majority of Americans favor removing the social security earnings limit entirely. Such legislation, notably a bill by Senator KEATING—S. 1168—is at present before the Congress.

However, in default of the broader legislation, the bill I introduce today contains a proposal worked out by Mr. Dwight S. Sargent, an authority in this field, which, while it does not completely remove the earnings limitation, does provide both flexibility and incentive. The bill would raise the allowable monthly earnings increment in excess of $100 from $80 to $254. This latter amount is the maximum family monthly social security payment permitted at the present time. By making this maximum monthly benefit the same as the allowable monthly chargeback figure, we establish the principle that for each dollar earned over $1,200 per year a person drawing social security benefits cannot lose more than he would if he did not work.

Under the Keating-Barry bills the social security earnings limitation would no longer discourage an individual from continuing to work beyond retirement age. I cannot too strongly urge that the bill be given real consideration by the Ways and Means Committee.

I would conclude by inserting in the RECORD at this point a statistical explanation of the social security earnings limit proposal being introduced today by Senator KEATING and myself:

Explanation of social security earnings limit proposal

	Annual income, man age 65, wife and children receiving maximum benefit [1]	
	Present	Proposed
Social security payments (12×$254=$3,048)	$3,048	$3,048
Can earn without penalty	1,200	1,200
Total possible income (including $1,200 in salary)	4,248	4,248
If he earns $1,454 a year; that is, $1,200 plus the equivalent of 1 social security check ($254):		
Social security eligibility	[2] 2,032	[3] 2,794
Earnings from employment	1,454	1,454
Total income	3,486	4,248
Decrease in total income resulting from additional work	[4] 762	0

[1] Maximum benefit is $254 per month.
[2] 4 monthly benefits lost (4×$80, or a fraction thereof, in additional income).
[3] 1 monthly benefit lost under proposed bill.
[4] Represents 3 payments net loss (3×$254=$762). 1 lost benefit of $254 compensated by the extra $254 in income.

A GREAT PROFESSION MUST ACT RESPONSIBLY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1960, the Honorable J. Lee Rankin, Solicitor General of the United States, delivered an interesting and informative address at a meeting sponsored by the Wichita Bar Association.

There were about 800 lawyers in attendance of which many were court

judges in that area. The title of the address is "A Great Profession Must Act Responsibly."

I believe Members of the House will be interested in reading this statement, which follows:

A GREAT PROFESSION MUST ACT RESPONSIBLY

(Address by J. Lee Rankin)

Certain basic attributes are an essential part of a profession. First, it needs to have learning. Study and knowledge of the field involved are indispensable to a practice of a profession. Second, an organization is required to support proper standards of admission, disciplinary proceedings, and concerted action on behalf of the profession. Third, and this is a primary requirement and of at least equal standing, it has to serve the public interest.

The legal profession has all of these characteristics. It is a learned vocation. In this regard it has a background of culture and idealism which encourages the exercise of the art. It is nurtured by a rich tradition. The long roots of historical continuity helps its members to recognize and support the public interest. Its history is both old and honorable. Some of the most celebrated occasions of man's struggle for freedom are those in which members of the bar have championed the cause of justice at great personal sacrifice. Many of our venerated rights were declared and vigorously defended by lawyers. The teachings of these experiences stimulate the bar to revere and support the cause of justice.

In serving the public the bar probably gives more of its resources than any other group. A recital of those engaged in public life either on the local or national level reveals how the American public has grown to rely upon lawyers for the recruitment of its public servants. The contribution to public service does not end there. It is evidenced by innumerable hours, days, and even years devoted to work for the benefit of the public in bar associations as well as lay groups. Wherever it is sought to improve the administration of justice, the legal fraternity is present and generally eager to assist.

The bar's traditional organization is best developed by a brief glance at its history. Looking back, we note that the profession can be traced to Rome. While there are those who might suggest that lawyers were in evidence in Greece, this would be true only insofar as the Roman orator, who is the prototype of the present-day advocate, took the Greek speech writer as his model. Yet, despite the Greek inspiration, it was Rome that gave us the classic law of the legal order. It furnished an authoritative body of materials for the guidance of judicial action, which was different from ethical customs, religion, and public opinion. Even St. Yves, the patron saint of lawyers, was represented with the Twelve Tables drawn from Roman Law. Furthermore, the civil law is largely a refinement on the inheritance received from Rome.

Moving on to the development of Anglo-Saxon law, it is observed that there was a distinctly different growth. In England, the Inns of Court furnished an organization both to train and discipline lawyers. These Inns helped to furnish a fine professional tradition while they were flowering. As the division between barristers and solicitors grew and separate areas of responsibility were established, the barristers became well organized. The solicitors, on the other hand, had no early organization, and when it became necessary to regulate them, the task was undertaken by Parliament and the judges, who at the same time left the control of the barristers with the Inns of Court.

In this developing process the Inns gradually established an educational program, together with standards of conduct that became a strong disciplinary influence. They formulated the rules for proper relations with the courts. From the maintenance of these contacts, within the setting of the Inns, there flowed a judicial or common law, in contrast to the law of the universities, which were the educational centers for the Roman law.

In this process of evolution there developed three branches of professional legal activity. These divisions are not peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon tradition, as their counterparts under different names are found in the civil law. But in England, the agent for litigation became the attorney and later was called solicitor. The advocate or barrister presented cases to the courts. Last, the counselor or adviser was recognized, and gradually his function was taken over by the solicitor, along with the former responsibility of acting as agent for litigation.

During this unfoldment and assignment of work, the legal profession had developed and kept its characteristic fraternal spirit. The unusual ability lawyers have had to engage in fierce forensic arguments and then lay aside all antagonisms and treat their opponents as brethren was fostered by the Inns. This practice has become both legendary and habitual.

While the barristers had the Inns as their organizations, the solicitors did not remain indefinitely without their own association. In the 17th century the Society of Gentleman Practitioners in the Courts of Law and Equity was formed. This, unlike the Inns, was a voluntary group much like a bar association in the United States. Later the Incorporated Law Society was formed and became an effective institution. Then, there followed the law society which is the solicitors' present organization.

Despite the example of these early associations, this activity necessary to the best health of the legal profession gradually waned and almost disappeared, after its first beginnings, in the United States. Following Independence, there was a decided change in attitude toward all things English, and students stopped going from America to the Inns of Court. The Inns had lost much of their influence even in England and through lack of contract, developments in English law after Blackstone had little effect on the bar in the new country.

Bar associations did not flourish nor did lawyers, at least in reputation, in the period after the Revolutionary War. Learning was not considered necessary in a judge and, therefore, not in lawyers. The clergy were thought to have sufficient erudition in the States for all the professions. The disrepute of lawyers was aggravated by their being engrossed in collecting debts and enforcing property rights after the Revolution.

Organizations of the bar were also handicapped by the leveling spirit inspired by democratic ideas. As a result there was a general disbelief in professions after the Revolution. This was reflected in a trend of deprofessionalizing all callings, which set in and prevailed for many years. Along with this tendency, the geographical conditions had a similar effect by producing a decentralization of the administration of justice and the bar that served it.

In places where the members of the Inns of Court were admitted to practice, there was a further disintegration, because those lawyers felt no loyalty to a local bar and its activities. Wherever there remained any organization of the bar, it was fostered by the control over admission, training, and qualification for the profession and in part by social meetings.

Despite all of these difficulties and the general decadence of bar associations, the time from the Revolution to the Civil War was an interval of the greatest achievement in our legal history. The price for the deterioration of the bar's organizations was paid later. But, in the meantime, over a stretch of 75 years, the English materials were built into a common law for America. This result was the work of great judges, with the help of very gifted lawyers practicing before them. Those eminent lawyers handed down a magnificent tradition but were also a product of its inspiration.

During the period of organizational decadence, the legal profession and its group activities had sunk to such a low place in public esteem that legislation was passed which took the training and admission to the practice out of the hands of the bar. Voluntary selective associations kept up the traditions of the bar as they had come over from England, but gradually became dormant or decayed.

In the last third of the 19th century, a revival of legal associations occurred. The renaissance was materially stimulated by the organization of the American Bar Association in 1878. Thereafter, there grew up strong, active associations in each State and in many an integrated bar in the 1920's. In the redevelopment of the organizational movement, there was a ready acceptance of the obligation to the public. The American Bar Association recognized this responsibility by stating in its constitution:

"In the spirit of a service of furthering the administration of justice through and according to the law."

It is difficult to exaggerate the significance to the bar and Nation of the establishment of a legal organization for the entire country. The representative character of the national association with strong, well organized State and local associations behind it, conscious of the professional character, traditions, and responsibilities, was of major importance. It had an immeasurable effect on the strengthening of the profession and devoted itself to trying to lift the practice of law above the level of an individual business. As the organizations were revived, there resulted a considerable voice of the bar in the admission and discipline procedures along with training for admission. This was a resultant fruit of strong, concerted action by those who had high aspirations for their profession.

As one advances from history to the present day, the question arises as to how the bar now discharges its responsibilities to the public. For a long period, lawyers have labored diligently and at a considerable sacrifice to further the programs of the national and local associations. Magnificent contributions have been made, both in skill and dedication to the work in committees, sections, and the general organizational activities. There are those who have given a substantial part of their professional life to such assignments.

The bar has been benefited and enriched by such exertions and, in the process, the public has gained, both from the instruction of the profession and the improvement in the administration of justice that resulted. Law Day, World Peace Through Law, legal studies, and the Awards of Merit are just a few examples of the manifold programs to serve the public in which the bar has been engaged.

However, in examining the standing of the bar's organizations, it must be acknowledged that such pursuits do not always receive the principal public notice. Often, those efforts are buried in the mass of matters which are dealt with, and the slow, patient drive toward improvement in the administration of justice is lost under the cloud of some sensational claim or charge which does injury to both the bar and the public.

In addition to being noted for remarkable accomplishments, bar associations have also become famous for their attacks upon the Supreme Court. Although any reference to the Court is only a minute part of an association's action, such campaigns catch the headlines. As would be expected, there are those who have learned that such offensives are an easy avenue to publicity. And too often, the criticism gives those involved a notoriety that could be obtained in no other way. Usually such an assault is not supported by careful and thoughtful analysis of the opinions or a comparison with prior decisions. However, they have done substantial damage to the bar's repute.

Lest there be any misunderstanding and regardless of the extent to which such criticisms should be censured, it must be recognized that careful and scholarly examinations of the work of the Court are to be welcomed. They, of course, are a different matter. Such studies are of value, since they should be an important stimulant to reappraisal and self-examination by the Court. They can be a spur to greater skill and accomplishment in the discharge of the Court's work.

The question is, however, whether it is responsible for an association of lawyers not to do all within its power to prevent an assault against an institution as precious and valuable to our country as the Supreme Court. Because of the failure to devise sound methods of control, there is the unfortunate recent spectacle of a gifted president of the American Bar Association spending an important part of his term in trying to make it clear that the association had no intention or purpose of reflecting on the Court.

The price of such an experience in public respect is too large for the bar to look forward with complacency to a repetition. As to particularly important proposals, it is time that procedures were adopted, first, to postpone consideration until there is an ample period for careful study and review of all such proposals, both as to what they are and what they may appear to be; and, second, to require a vote of the entire association before any support is given to them. Such preventive measures should go far either to preclude such offensives from gaining the endorsement of the association or being understood to be an attack when none was intended. The suggested revision should not be limited to onslaughts against the Court, however, but should be applied in all cases where the proposal might injure fundamental institutions such as Congress, the executive, or the courts.

The referendum suggested is not without precedent. A referendum under its rules was taken by the American Bar Association on President Roosevelt's proposals with regard to the Federal courts in February and March 1937. A like poll was taken by the association as to all lawyers in the United States at that time. This the association said it was doing in the belief that the voice and opinion of lawyers "should be ascertained and made known in a thoroughly representative way, upon issues vitally affecting the courts of the United States."

While such a poll of lawyers generally might not be necessary or desirable, it could well be important in some instances. Certainly a referendum of the association's members would be a protection for the preservation of our liberties where insidious and indirect reflections might have as much effect as a direct assault on our cherished institutions.

While it is recognized that such procedures would not prevent one lawyer or a group from speaking out, they would avoid the involvement of the organization, except where it carefully chose to act by a means that would demonstrate its will, and only after full study and reflection. They should help to avoid any claim that the association had not acted responsibly. The practice suggested by providing a greater participation in the decision might prevent the harm that is to be anticipated both to the Court and the bar with present procedures.

There is a related area where the associations fall short of their announced goal of furthering the public interest. In committees, sections, and other special groups, those who take part are usually specialists in the field. Too often, some are there to forward special interests of industries and others engaged in the particular activity involved. Occasionally, there are also lawyers participating to further the objectives of their clients. There is frequently a divergence between such objectives and the public interest. In some instances, there is a direct conflict.

The legal profession can hardly defend with the claim of ignorance. From daily experience lawyers are well aware of the risks involved in ex parte hearings. The courts have surrounded such proceedings with numerous safeguards for the protection of the cause of justice. They display an acute awareness of the dangers in hearing only one side.

Admittedly developments such as those described are difficult to control. It is usual and to be expected that those who engage in the practice of a specialization will gravitate to the section or committee dealing with it. It is anticipated that they will furnish much of the skill and experience required for such special projects. However, if the profession is to act responsibly, it has to demonstrate an awareness of this problem and take steps to guard against accepting proposals that would further the special interests at public expense. At least there should be additional independent screening processes.

Precautions in this area of endeavor commend themselves, especially where recommendations are made covering such a comprehensive area, including legislation, rules and regulations, involving both substantive and procedural law. Such a wide range of proposals suggests how imperative it is that all sides be carefully examined, even if a more adequate independent staff is required for its views and suggestions. It would be difficult to claim that action was faithfully taken in the public interest without some such safeguard unless the decision-making group had both the time and the experience to arrive at an independent judgment as to the technical recommendations.

There is yet another area of the bar's concern that deserves careful reexamination in the exercise of its responsibility to the public—that is the proposals which involve positions on controversial political matters as distinguished from the regular legal issues. Associations should act to avoid taking such stands. They are generally divisive and splinter the membership into opposing camps with all the conflicts that that entails.

All who have worked with lawyers know that their philosophies range the full spectrum from conservative to liberal. Their beliefs are fundamental and are developed over a lifetime. Such views are not to be abandoned because of a resolution by any association. But, the group action which reflects on their concepts is embarrassing and tends to drive the lawyers to acts of disassociation by word or deed.

It seems obvious that a result of that kind, although to be expected, is damaging to common activity, mutual respect and regard. It does not conform to the basic tenets of the profession. Lawyers rejoice in independent thinking and are devoted to the belief that ideas should compete for acceptance in the minds of the thoughtful. If the price of membership in an organization is to be conformity, it is too high even for all the other benefits. Because of their nature and the teachings of their experience, the result with lawyers is certain to be either active opposition, open revolt, or a protest by separation.

In addition to these objections to such positions, there is the further fact that in most cases they need not be taken. There is ample for bar associations to do to improve the administration of justice without becoming engrossed in philosophies of political action. Furthermore, the complexion of a political issue appears to change its face so rapidly that a proud resolution of the moment may become quite a sad affair after the expiration of a short time. The high price to an association in its reputation with the public for responsible action and the injury to mutual respect and understanding between members, remains.

In conclusion, it would seem that the standing of the bar would be materially improved by the suggested safeguards. Public esteem, which is sought and believed to be deserved, demands that the profession deal justly with its brethren and the public interest and that it adequately recognize by its actions that its public positions can do harm as well as good. It requires that support of proposals be given only after the exercise of care commensurate with the risks involved. The public rightfully expects that both conduct and appearances demonstrate that the profession's purpose is to minister to justice and especially to scrupulously avoid any injustice resulting from its deliberations. The bar's response should be that the expectation is valid and will be satisfied in accordance with the high standards of a truly great profession. Such an answer would increase the esteem in which the association is held by the public. The organization would exert greater influence by its example in accordance with the bar's professions and the association's stated purposes. It would help to prove that the legal profession had a right to the claim of a great and learned profession that is determined to discharge fully its responsibilities to the public.

WITH OR WITHOUT PEEPHOLES, LET'S GIVE POSTAL EMPLOYEES PRIVACY IN THE MEN'S ROOM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of us has had occasion to complain to the Post Office Department about something.

On Monday of this week, for instance, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] objected strenuously to the use by postal inspectors of peepholes in post offices. While I cannot agree with everything the gentleman said about this kind of postal inspection, I surely agree that if there has been misuse of peepholes—such as to spy on union meetings—it must be halted.

However, the complaint against the Post Office Department which I wish to set forth today has less to do with peephole inspection tactics, and more to do with this question: Are not postal employees entitled to privacy when using some parts of the men's room in a post office?

Mr. Speaker, since September of 1958 I have been trying to get the Post Office Department to recognize this right of privacy in the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. Although it might be said that a victory of sorts was scored, the right of privacy was not really secured, and the case of the doorless water closets is not closed.

The story can best be told by a chronological presentation of key letters in my correspondence file:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1958.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: I write to call your attention to a situation in the new postal station at 12th and McKinley, which for all I know may be duplicated elsewhere. In the men's washroom the three toilets are without any front covering or other privacy device. The toilet room opens directly on the room used by postal employees for lunch, smoking, etc.

I can't imagine that this invasion of what seems an elementary right of privacy is necessary for the purposes of postal inspection against defalcation, particularly since many other areas in the building, such as the women's washroom and various closets, are not accessible to the inspector. Furthermore, I understand that there are many other postal installations without such lack of privacy.

I would be very hopeful that the matter can be cleared up, and proper doors installed locally, but if someone in Washington is responsible for this indignity, I will be obliged if you will tell me the man responsible. I shall appreciate your cooperation in this.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 1, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With reference to your letter of September 24, 1958, regarding toilet facilities at Hilltop station. The toilet room door opens directly from the swing room, however, there is a solid screen inside the toilet which eliminates any view of the toilet room and occupants from any person in the swing room.

The buildings leased for postal purposes are secured by the office of the regional real-estate manager. The details are, we believe, worked out by that office on standard specifications from the Post Office Department. We have no local control over contracts for, or construction detail of building for post office purposes. We are consulted as to location, space needed, etc. The matter of toilet stalls is probably one of nationwide policy and would not be changed at this level.

Your letter is being forwarded to the regional operations director, Minneapolis, Minn., for consideration.

Yours truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

OCTOBER 7, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Reference is made to your letter dated September 24, 1958, addressed to the Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis., wherein you raise a question as to the toilet enclosures not having doors at Hilltop station, Milwaukee, Wis.

The Post Office Department specifications require that open toilet enclosures be furnished for men and for that reason the existing facilities in Hilltop station are provided.

The purpose of this specification is to permit depredation inspectors to observe the activities of suspects in the case of pilfering of mail.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director.

OCTOBER 24, 1958.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of October 1, 1958, to mine of September 24, in which you say, with reference to the toilet facilities at Hilltop Station, that "there is a solid screen inside the toilet which eliminates any view of the toilet room and occupants from any person in the swing room." I have been up to inspect the Hilltop station twice within the last few weeks. Of the three water closets, two are in full view, whenever the door is open, of people in the swing room; only the third and easterly water closet is protected by the screen in front of the door. I really think that the numerous Federal employees who must lunch in the room deserve something better. For a few dollars, a screen could be erected a few inches north of the water heater. This solution would not in any way interfere with the operation of inspectors. There are probably other perfectly good solutions, though this one would cost only a few dollars.

I'll much appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 29, 1958.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Your letter of October 24, 1958, regarding the swing room toilet facilities has been referred to the regional operations director, 512 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis 2, Minn., for necessary attention.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 16, 1959.

Hon. HENRY REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago I approached you regarding the toilet facilities at the new Hilltop station post office. I was assured by you at that time that something would be done about it.

You made several visits to the new station and concurred that I had a just complaint.

To this date the situation remains the same, and the carriers at the station are asking when this condition is to be corrected.

As we all realize you were a very busy man during the campaign and the Post Office officials were also busy with the Christmas rush. I have not pursued the matter. Now that the rush is over, I hope something can be done about this situation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

JANUARY 19, 1959.

Mr. C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director,
Post Office Department,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. KNUDSON: On October 24, 1958, I wrote Col. Frederick C. T. John, Milwaukee postmaster, concerning the inadequate toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. I addressed a copy of this letter to you, and Mr. John by his October 29 letter indicated that my letter had "been referred to the regional operations director, 512 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis 2, Minn., for necessary attention."

Since more than 2 months have elapsed, and since the corrective measure I have suggested is such a simple one, I should appreciate a reply to my letter.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 21, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Referring to your letter of October 24, 1958, addressed to Col. Frederick C. T. John, concerning the toilet facilities at Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee:

Inasmuch as your letter was addressed to Colonel John, this office did not reply, but returned the letter to Colonel John for his reply to you.

After talking with Real Estate Officer Knapp, who supervised the building of Hilltop station and who is thoroughly familiar with it, a recommendation, as per attached letter, was sent to Colonel John, as a means of eliminating the view of any toilets which might be seen from the swing room if by chance the door is left open.

In your letter of October 24, 1958, you suggested a screen could be erected a few inches north of the water heater. The assistant postmaster and superintendent of mails in Milwaukee advise that this is not feasible as it would cause undue congestion in the morning just prior to the time the carriers are due to leave the office and, further, it would block the entry to the location of the washbowls.

Additional study is being given this matter, and if a further solution can be reached you will be so advised.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. KNUDSON,
Regional Operations Director.

NOVEMBER 5, 1958.

POSTMASTER,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Reference your letter of October 29, 1958, with enclosed letter from Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, concerning the need for a screen to provide privacy for the toilet facilities in the above postal station.

In view of the information you have furnished concerning the size and arrangement of the washroom in question, and after consultation with Real Estate Officer Knapp who is familiar with that building, it is suggested that lockers in the swing room outside of the washroom could be arranged in such a way as to form a screen in front of the washroom door. This would not take up any additional space in the swing room as the lockers have to be located there in any event.

I am returning the original copy of the Congressman's letter addressed to you.

JOHN K. STORR.

JANUARY 26, 1959.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: I have now heard from Mr. Knudson of the Minneapolis regional office concerning the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee. Mr. Knudson pointed out the recommendation made on November 5, 1958, after consultation with Real Estate Officer Knapp.

I am anxious that something satisfactory be done, whether in accord with the Knapp recommendation or otherwise. May I hear from you on this, please?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: With reference to your letter of January 26, 1959, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station. I have again gone over the situation at that point. Mr. F. E. Knapp, regional real estate officer, advised that a row of lockers could

be placed in front of the door. He apparently overlooked the fact that the swing room is only 12 feet 6 inches by 18 feet 6 inches and has barely enough room to care for the two tables and necessary chairs and food vending equipment. No lockers have been placed in the swing room and it is not possible to place any at that point without discontinuing use of the swing room for eating purposes.

We are in a quandary as to just what can be done with the present physical arrangement of the building. We can, of course, remove the tables, employees' vending machines, etc., from the swing room and place this equipment in the northwest corner of the workroom floor. As many lockers as will fit into the swing room can be removed from the workroom floor to accomplish this.

We are loath to take this action however, as a somewhat unsanitary and at times unsightly condition could possibly be viewed by the public using the lobby. There is always, of course, the possibility that some of the employees' sensibilities will be offended even more by moving the swing room to the workroom floor than under the present arrangement.

We are reluctant to make any changes, particularly as the clerical as well as the carrier force are affected. We have had no complaints made to us by the clerical personnel regarding the present arrangement. The expense to the Department of any physical change in a new building does not appear warranted in this instance.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.
By M. G. EBERLEIN,
Assistant Postmaster.

FEBRUARY 16, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I enclose herewith a copy of the letter of Regional Operations Director Knudson of January 21, 1959, and a copy of Mr. Eberlein's letter of February 12.

Needless to say, I am most unsatisfied with the present position. I would like to be in a position of recommending something definite, and feel that first it should be a recommendation that meets with the approval of the carrier force and clerical personnel at the Hilltop station.

Would you give this some thought, discuss it with various others, and then be good enough to make some sort of recommendation to me, that I may follow through on it?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 24, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of February 18 suggesting I consult with the carrier and clerical force in finding some solution as to what can be done about the toilet facilities at Hilltop station.

After careful discussion with the personnel we have come to the conclusion that the only remedy is doors.

If the toilets had been installed on the east or west walls, no doors would be necessary, but since the toilets are the first thing that faces you as you enter it is only fair and just that doors be installed. To install these doors would cost about $5 if plywood were used.

As all personnel do wash their hands before leaving the office I am sure you can understand what an awful sight it is to see three toilets in use staring you in the face in entering that washroom.

If the doors should take away the view from the walk above, I am sure that could be remedied by the lowering of the partitions between the toilets.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

FEBRUARY 26, 1959.

Col. FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR COLONEL JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of February 12, 1959, through Mr. Eberlein, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station.

From my discussions with both the carrier and clerical personnel at Hilltop station, I believe a reasonable and inexpensive remedy for the ignoble situation in the Hilltop swing room and washroom would be to install plywood doors in front of the three toilets. If these plywood doors should in any way obstruct the inspector's view from the walk above, that could be remedied by lowering the partitions between the toilets.

I am sure that these doors would not cost more than around $5 apiece, but if there is any difficulty about paying for them, I should be delighted to do so myself.

May I hear from you on this?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 16, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: With reference to your letter of February 26, 1958, regarding the toilet facilities at Hilltop station. A personal visit was made to the office by the regional space requirements officer, regional real estate officer, the assistant postmaster, and general superintendent of mails. It was the considered opinion of the group that the complaint was hardly justifiable because of the fact that it is almost impossible to look into the toilet room from the swing room.

I believe the regional operations director has previously explained to you the reason that doors are not placed on the toilet room stalls in post office buildings.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.
By M. G. EBERLEIN,
Assistant Postmaster.

MARCH 24, 1959.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I regret that it has become necessary to write to you about such a matter as the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis. However, since September 24, 1958, I have conducted a lengthy correspondence on this matter with the postal authorities in Milwaukee and the Minneapolis regional office of the Post Office Department. So far my efforts have resulted in nothing more than a fat file of no-action letters.

Let me say that I am fully aware of the need for postal inspectors to be able to see into toilet enclosures to observe the activities of suspects in the case of pilfering of mail.

However, I am sure you will agree that postal employees are entitled to reasonable privacy when using toilet facilities. You will agree, too, I believe, that other postal employees who are not using the toilet facilities should not have to look at those who are.

I have visited the Hilltop station in Milwaukee—a new station, by the way—and can assure you that there is no privacy in the men's toilet enclosures there. There are no doors on the three enclosures. Perhaps this would not be so bad, except that the men's toilet room opens directly on the so-called swing room where the postal employees eat their lunch, smoke, etc. The lunch eaters can hardly help but see the toilet users. This is a situation not calculated to improve digestion.

In my correspondence with the Milwaukee and Minneapolis postal authorities, mention has been made of a number of suggested remedies, but all have been discarded, on grounds of impracticability, expense, or what have you. Finally, in my letter of February 26, 1959, to Postmaster Frederick C. T. John, I offered to pay the cost of installing plywood doors on the three toilets. I quote from my letter to Postmaster John:

"From my discussions with both the carrier and clerical personnel at Hilltop station, I believe a reasonable and inexpensive remedy for the ignoble situation in the Hilltop swing room and washroom would be to install plywood doors in front of the three toilets. If these plywood doors should in any way obstruct the inspector's view from the walk above, that could be remedied by lowering the partitions between the toilets. I am sure that these doors would not cost more than around $5 apiece, but if there is any difficulty about paying for them, I should be delighted to do so myself."

The postmaster's reply of March 16, 1959, was another rejection of any suggestion for solving the situation.

I insist that there must be a satisfactory way to respect the privacy of postal employees without depriving postal inspectors of an adequate view of toilet enclosures. Something can, and in fact must be done about this situation. I urge you to see that something is done, promptly. May I hear from you?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 26, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 24 concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am requesting the Bureau of Facilities to look into this situation and write you direct as promptly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

APRIL 15, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: The Postmaster General has requested this office to reply further to your recent letter concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop station in Milwaukee, Wis.

Arrangements will be made to install an L-shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities.

Thank you very much for your interest.

For Assistant Postmaster General Barnard.

Cordially,

JACK E. GRANT,
Special Assistant to the
Assistant Postmaster General.

APRIL 29, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I am delighted to report that my last letter to the Postmaster General concerning proper toilet facilities at the Hilltop Station in Milwaukee is producing results.

I quote the following from a letter I have received from Jack E. Grant, special assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard (Bureau of Facilities):

"Arrangements will be made to install an 'L' shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities."

I trust that this improvement will be made soon, and that it will be satisfactory to all concerned. Please let me know if this is not the case.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 4, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am sure happy to hear that progress is being made to rectify the toilet facilities at Hilltop station post office.

I also wish to thank you for all your efforts. Without your help I am sure the cause would have been a loss.

The last action took place about a month ago when a representative of the Minneapolis regional office came down and took some pictures, but I am sure that something is being planned.

I shall inform you of the progress as soon as they start.

Again, my heartfelt thanks.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. OHM.

MAY 5, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: Thanks for your letter of May 4. It was a long fight, but we seem to have won.

Please do let me know when they install the partition they spoke of. I think we ought to have a celebration when it happens. And if there is more delay in installing it, I'd like to know that, too.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 11, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have been holding off writing to you in the hope that the toilet facilities at the Hilltop station would be corrected in a short time. It has now been a month since some worker came down and took measurements, but since that time nothing has been done.

May I again call on the assistance of your office in getting this job done. I am sure that a letter from your office would clear up this bottleneck which has been in our way for nearly a year and get the wheels of health and dignity going again at the Hilltop station.

After all the publicity in the papers I must answer the question I hear every day, "When is this situation going to be corrected?"

Hoping that your letter may again get us action, I remain,

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

June 12, 1959: Telephone call to Post Office Department by Reuss office protesting failure to install partition. Return call from Jack E. Grant, special assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, stating that the partition was about to be installed. Several days later, another call from Grant stating the partition had been installed.

JULY 7, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: Some days ago I was advised by Jack Grant, special assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, that the partition had been installed at the Hilltop station. This was after I had again contacted the Post Office Department, following your last letter to me.

Since I have received assurances before from the Post Office Department which were not quite accurate, I am writing you to make sure that the partition has been installed, and to ask whether the solution is satisfactory. I certainly hope that it is, and only regret that it could not have been accomplished in far less time.

Sincerely,

HENRY R. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 10, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of inquiry as to what has been done at the Hilltop station post office to rectify the still existing condition of our toilet facilities. I wish to inform you that nothing has been done as of this date.

Some weeks ago there was a man here representing the regional office and he suggested that our superintendent, Mr. Pautsch, consult with the personnel. Mr. Pautsch approached me and I suggested a partition be installed, and I also made a diagram of the kind of partition the boys would like installed, all to no avail as of this date.

Mr. Congressman, I realize your time is very valuable and the boys at the Hilltop station have a letter of thanks and appreciation ready to mail out as soon as they start on this great(?) small project.

Thanks again for your great interest in the welfare of the letter carrier.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

July 16, 1959: Mr. Grant of Post Office Department stated in a telephone conversation that the Hilltop station partition would be in today without fail.

JULY 16, 1959.

WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Post Office Department assures me that installation of Hilltop station partition will definitely be completed today. If it is not, please wire me collect. If it is, let us all say a prayer of thanks for eventual victory over bureaucracy.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 18, 1959, 5 p.m.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: As of this day and hour, no partition has been installed at the Hilltop station post office.

The owners of the building were in yesterday, July 16, and again took some measurements, but that was all that was done.

The partition they plan to install is not in the interest and welfare of the employees. The only remedy, as I suggested, is a partition in front of the lavatories or doors on the lavatories. As the toilet bowls were installed in front of the entrance I think the Department should go along and install a partition or doors in front of the toilets. As you know, there are 102 men using the washrooms and when they go in to wash their hands they still must set their eyes on these three toilets in use.

Mr. Congressman, we are still counting on you to see this through to a successful conclusion.

Sorry I could not answer by wire as my explanation would be too lengthy.

Enclosed find drawing of proposed partition.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: I have your letter of 5 p.m., July 18, 1959, reporting that, despite the promises of the Post Office Department to me, nothing has been done at the Hilltop station except the taking of measurements for a partition that won't solve the problem.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote today to the Postmaster General (a copy of which also went to Mr. Grant, the man who has been giving me all of the false assurances of action).

Thanks very much for sending me the diagram. It refreshes my memory of the whole situation and makes more clear than ever that the real solution is doors.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. JACK E. GRANT,
Special Assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Facilities, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: I enclose a copy of a letter written today to the Postmaster General, concerning the continuing failure to provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities at Hilltop station, Milwaukee.

I am sending you a copy in the hope that it may help to expedite the matter. I particularly call your attention to the fact that the partition which apparently is scheduled to be installed would not be a satisfactory answer to the problem.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 20, 1959.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: On March 24, 1959, I wrote to you, as a last resort, in an effort to get action on a matter that had even then been pending for 6 months—namely, the installation of doors or partitions to provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

Under date of April 15, 1959, Mr. Jack E. Grant, Special Assistant to Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, wrote me as follows: "Arrangements will be made to install an 'L' shaped partition to provide privacy when using toilet facilities."

This led me to believe that the situation would be remedied within a reasonable time. Imagine my shock, then, when I was told on June 12, 1959, by Hilltop station employees that nothing had been done. My office quickly contacted Mr. Grant. A day or two later he replied by telephone, stating that he had checked with Milwaukee and been advised that the partition had been installed.

Again I thought our troubles were over, Just to make sure, I wrote one of the Hilltop station employees on July 7, 1959, asking if everything was satisfactory. I could hardly believe it when I heard on July 13, 1959, that still nothing had been done. Again we called Mr. Grant. This time he replied, a couple of days later, that an absolute deadline had

been set for completion of the installation of the partition at Hilltop station. That deadline was July 16, 1959. It was not met.

This morning I received another letter from a Hilltop station employee. What happened on July 16 was that some people came into the Hilltop station and took some measurements. Furthermore, I am advised that the partition for which they measured would not—even if it were ever installed—provide privacy for persons using the toilet facilities.

As I stated in my previous letter to you, I have visited the Hilltop station myself. I have observed this situation at firsthand.

For the life of me, I cannot see why it is not possible to install on each of the three toilet enclosures an inexpensive door that is low enough for the postal inspectors to see over, yet high enough to provide some privacy to persons using the toilets. I point out that the postal inspectors' observation post is elevated, so that they can look down upon the proceedings. Low doors or partitions would not block the inspector's view. But they would make it possible for someone to walk into the men's room to wash his hands without seeing three toilets totally exposed and in use.

If we can't solve this small problem to the satisfaction of all concerned, I really fear that we are all doomed. May I hear from you promptly?

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 23, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Once again I must report to you on the toilet facilities at the Hilltop station.

The partition 30 inches wide was installed as per my diagram. When the boys look at that partition they get sick at heart and wonder just what kind of people can install such a monstrosity. I am sure that within a very short time someone will hurt his hand in opening and closing that door. When the washroom door is fully opened there is only 1⅜ inches between the door and the partition.

I hope that when Congress adjourns we may have the pleasure of once again having a visit from you to the new Hilltop station.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

JULY 23, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of July 20, with further reference to the Hilltop station in Milwaukee, Wis.

The installation of an L-shaped partition between the swingroom and the toilet room in the Hilltop station was completed on July 20. We regret the delay in completion of this partition from the time that Mr. Jack E. Grant in my office advised you that the action would be taken. However, as you know, this is a privately owned building and it was necessary for negotiations to be made with the owner of the property to install the partition and the owner's own arrangements to complete the work.

In your letter to the Postmaster General you have stated that you do not feel this type of partition provided adequate privacy. In this regard may I say that as a general policy in postal facilities throughout the country, completely private enclosures for toilets are not made. All facilities that have several toilets in the men's lavatory are provided with dividing partitions between the toilet locations, but doors are not installed in front of the toilet itself.

Your original correspondence pointed out the fact that men in the swingroom who were relaxing or eating their lunch could easily see into the toilet room and also see the occupants thereof. We certainly agree that this type of situation should be corrected.

The L-shaped partition which has been installed provides a baffle between the swingroom and the toilet room and provides the privacy which is found in similar facilities elsewhere.

Thank you for your continued interest.

Cordially,

ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General.

JULY 28, 1959.

Mr. ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Bureau of Facilities,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BARNARD: I have your letter of July 23, 1959, concerning the toilets at the Hilltop postal station in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am advised that a partition of sorts (it is not "L" shaped but "I" shaped) has been installed in the swingroom, in front of the door to the men's room. No doubt this partition does block the view into the men's toilet room of those in the swingroom, satisfying in principle one of my complaints about the Hilltop station situation. (I am told, however, that between this partition and the open door of the men's room there is only a clearance of 1⅜ inches. If a Hilltop station employee should hurt his hand opening the door with this slim clearance, I would not be a bit surprised. I suspect someone's measurements were made with a yardstick that was short on one end or the other.)

With reference to your letter, I am pleased that the Post Office Department agrees with me that men in the swingroom relaxing or eating their lunch should not be able to see easily into the toilet room and also see the occupants thereof. Having agreed on this, can we not strive for a meeting of the minds on even more basic men's toilet policy in postal facilities?

The question as I see it is this: Must everyone entering this men's lavatory, just to wash his hands for example, be confronted with a full and wholly unimpaired view of the toilets and the occupants thereof?

You state that "as a general policy in postal facilities throughout the country, completely private enclosures for toilets are not made." There are dividing partitions between toilets, "but doors are not installed in front of the toilet itself."

At no time have I requested completely private enclosures for toilets. I understand, and have agreed, that postal inspection requirements rule out completely private enclosures. I assume that these inspection requirements are the only thing which rule out completely private enclosures. If there are other reasons, I should like to know them.

I hope we can agree that, under normal conditions, persons using toilets are entitled to privacy whether in a post office or anywhere else; and also that other persons using the same room are entitled not to see the occupants of toilet enclosures.

If I assume correctly that the one abnormal condition in a men's lavoratory such as at the Hilltop station is the inspection requirement, the question then becomes: How can we provide some privacy to toilet occupants; and some restriction of the view of other washroom users, without interfering with the postal inspector's view?

I do not think this an impossible question. At the Hilltop station, for instance, it was my own observation that the postal inspector's lookout point is elevated, near the ceiling of the washroom. While a full-size door, its top at a height of perhaps 6 feet above the floor, would no doubt block the inspector's view, it is my distinct impression that a half-size door, its bottom perhaps 15 inches from the floor and its top perhaps 40 inches high, would not hinder inspection, but would provide reasonable privacy. If necessary, the dividing partitions between the toilets could also be lowered. I am sure there would be no objection to this. The problem is really one of establishing some barrier between the toilet enclosures and the other areas of the washroom. Aside from half-doors along the lines I have described, an alternative is a partition inside the washroom, not outside. It could be set a minimum distance in front of the toilet enclosures, allowing entry to them. It, too, could be considerably less than six feet high, yet provide reasonable privacy without preventing inspection.

The Hilltop station in Milwaukee is one place where I am certain that one or the other measure suggested above is workable. I urge your full and prompt consideration of this matter, and ask a reply as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 30, 1959.

The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: On August 10, 1959, between the hours of 7 p.m. and 9 p.m., a dedication ceremony and open house have been planned for the new Hilltop station of the post office, located at 1301 North 12th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

Because of your great interest in postal affairs, we feel sure that you would want to celebrate with us and the citizens of Milwaukee on this occasion.

You are cordially invited to attend.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Postmaster.

AUGUST 6, 1959.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: Thank you for your letter of July, with further reference to Hilltop station of the Milwaukee, Wis., post office.

We regret that the partition which has been installed in the swingroom pursuant to your original request does not meet with your complete approval.

Your further suggestions with regard to installation of doors or other material to provide more privacy have been carefully reviewed. We find, however, that it is not possible to give favorable consideration to these suggestions. As mentioned in previous correspondence, divided partitions between toilets are considered to be adequate privacy. Closures are not installed on the front of the toilet area. We do not find reason to alter this policy in the case of Hilltop station.

Cordially,

ROLLIN D. BARNARD,
Assistant Postmaster General.

AUGUST 10, 1959.

Postmaster FREDERICK C. T. JOHN,
Care of Hilltop Postal Station,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

Regret congressional business keeps me from joining in dedication of Hilltop station. I heartily approve of the new station, except for lack of privacy in men's washroom, and intend to continue my efforts to correct that situation.

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 10, 1959.

Mr. WALTER C. OHM,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. OHM: This is with further reference to the men's washroom situation at the Hilltop postal station.

First, I enclose a copy of a telegram I sent to Postmaster John today for the dedication. I am much interested in knowing if Mr. John read the telegram at the ceremonies.

Second, enclosed is the latest letter from Assistant Postmaster General Barnard, which appears to be a total rejection of any suggestions for providing even a minimum of privacy in the men's washroom.

I continue to feel that the Post Office Department is being unnecessarily rigid in this matter. I intend to compile a full record of this case, and place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the full story will be told. Whether this will produce better results I do not know, but I hope so. If you have any other suggestions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *August 13, 1959.*

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: With reference to your letter of August 10, our dedication ceremony at the Hilltop station was quite a success, but the full content of your telegram was not read, only the congratulations and your regrets at not being able to be there. It was read by Supervisor Doyne (master of ceremonies). The speakers were two county supervisors, the postmaster, president of the Vliet Street Advancement Association, and a member of the Minneapolis regional office. Some of the boys took the supervisors around and showed them the conditions we have to contend with in using the washroom facilities. The officials here say it is out of their hands, to "see the regional men."

Mr. Congressman, in my 35 years as a letter carrier, I have always found the Post Office Department very eager to carry out the wishes of a Congressman. I think there is some single person who is at fault and I hope you will be able to single out that man and never forget him.

I think our request is a fair and just one. After all, this is not the Army at war. In private industry they certainly would not tolerate any man who plans toilet facilities as we have at the Hilltop station. It is my genuine opinion that the regional men drew up the plans, and they have no alternative but to put up a partition or doors to hide their mistake and give the men back their dignity and self-respect. It may be a good idea to invite some high post office official down here to see for himself.

Thanks again for your time and effort to correct this situation.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. OHM.

Mr. Speaker, there rests the battle of the Hilltop station men's room. If other Members of Congress have suggestions as to where we go from here, I would be delighted to receive them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LINDSAY, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday of next week, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, vacating his special orders for today and tomorrow.

Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on January 25, 1960, for 1 hour.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on February 10, for 1 hour.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on January 21, for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 1 hour, on January 27, 1960.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts) and include extraneous matter.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter:

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. BREWSTER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1707. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1708. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1959, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1709. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report on the status of training of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the progress made in strengthening of the Reserve components during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 279 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1710. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to the disposal of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 404, 63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1711. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the financial assistance activities in five field offices of the Small Business Administration (SBA) made during the latter months of calendar year 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1712. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1713. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 14th annual report describing the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1714. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 under provisions of law other than section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1715. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1716. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report relating to the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, which have been settled by the Treasury, pursuant to section 646(b) of title 14, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1717. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing the payment of a claim to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. of Baltimore, Md., pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 646(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 340. Resolution providing two additional assistants for the document room, Office of the Doorkeeper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 410. Resolution to amend House Resolution 136, 86th Congress, as amended by House Resolution 181, 86th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 413. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain

funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1211). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 9761. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9762. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce to 30 the age at which an individual may become eligible for disability insurance benefits, and to provide that such benefits will be paid at a reduced rate to any individual who has not attained the present minimum age of 50; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9763. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9764. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of the sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9765. A bill to provide for liberalized benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act for certain emergency workers and their survivors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 9766. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9767. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the period within which veterans may pursue programs of education and training based upon Korean conflict service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 9769. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9770. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9771. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9772. A bill to provide that withdrawals and reservations of public lands for nondefense uses shall take effect only upon certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9773. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any Department or Agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefit amounts, liberalize the work clause, provide disability insurance benefits without regard to age, and improve the earnings of the social security trust funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9775. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1959 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9776. A bill for the relief of the city of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9777. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to permit persons injured by failure of an air carrier to so inspect to bring an action for damages against the air carrier; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require air carriers to maintain route maps in conjunction with certain weather information for the benefit of their passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9779. A bill authorizing the construction of certain improvements in the interest of flood control and allied purposes on the Gila and Salt Rivers, Ariz., from Gillespie Dam to Granite Reef Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 9780. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9781. A bill to repeal the laws imposing Federal control on agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9782. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a new program of mortgage insurance designed to assist the financing of residential housing located in older urban neighborhoods; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9783. A bill to determine the need for a canal across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., in the vicinity of Navarre to connect Santa Rosa Sound with the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend sections 706 and 744 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9785. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9787. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that an aid and attendance allowance of $150 per month shall be paid to certain paraplegic veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9788. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9789. A bill to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a double indemnity feature may be included in policies of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9790. A bill to extend to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion, eligibility for hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for any disability to the same extent as outpatient medical services are now furnished them; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9791. A bill to amend section 4108 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that persons rated as specialists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration shall not receive the 15-percent special allowance unless the specialty in which rated is usable in Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9792. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9793. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to broaden the definition of "disability" for individuals 60 years of age or over, to eliminate the requirement that an individual must attain age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to provide that disabled individuals may become entitled to widows' or widowers' insurance benefits without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday of September as Senior Citizens Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 463. Concurrent resolution favoring a general conference to review the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 425. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 426. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the need for rapid and complete atomic disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 427. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 101; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 9794. A bill for the relief of Chien-Min Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9795. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie Tilford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 9796. A bill for the relief of the National Aircraft Maintenance Corp. and Howard E. Cox and the estate of Archibald Watson, deceased, sole stockholders of the National Aircraft Maintenance Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9797. A bill for the relief of Tom Fook Tin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9798. A bill for the relief of Joanin P. Demas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 9799. A bill for the relief of Cynthia A. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9800. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

315. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of a group of employees of the Schenectady plant of General Electric urging the adoption of legislation providing for lowering of the age that a person may voluntarily retire and draw a full social security pension to 60 and exempting such pension from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

316. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State central committeeman, Young Democrats, Long Beach, Calif., supporting S. 1138, the peacetime GI bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Application of State Antidiscrimination Law—The Issue of Federal-State Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on several occasions in the 1st session of the 86th Congress I expressed concern that the Department of State was represented as having advised the New York State Commission Against Discrimination that a ruling by the commission applying the fair employment law of New York to the hiring policies of the Arabian American Oil Co. in New York State would adversely affect U.S. interests abroad. My concern was for the maintenance of appropriate Federal-State relationships and for the human rights aspects of the matter. Accordingly, I initiated correspondence with the Department of State. Thereafter, and expressly in the light of this correspondence, a New York judge decided that New York fair employment law should be applied, holding that the Department of State had taken no stand on the case. To complete the story, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three letters not previously published in the RECORD, which are an intrinsic part of the correspondence to which I have referred, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 3, 1959.

The Honorable E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have for reply your further letter of June 29 on the subject of the case of the *American Jewish Congress* v. *The Arabian American Oil Company* which has been under consideration before the New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

I appreciate the interest you have shown in discussing the Department's role in this matter during the course of our recent correspondence. As Mr. Josephson of your staff has undoubtedly informed you, he and representatives of the American Jewish Congress also examined the question in some detail in a meeting with Deputy Assistant Secretary Parker T. Hart on June 30.

It is my understanding that the matter will be heard before the Supreme Court of the State of New York on July 6. It is our feeling in the Department that it would not be appropriate for us to comment further on this case when a hearing of it before the New York courts is thus imminent. I am certain from your letter that you appreciate our position in this matter.

I assure you, however, that it is our desire to be appropriately helpful in resolving problems which arise out of actions by foreign governments which appear to discriminate against U.S. citizens. We shall, of course, be prepared to provide any further information on these problems which the commission or the court in New York may seek. I personally would also be prepared and pleased to discuss the Department's role in this case, as well as the general problem, directly with you at any time at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

JULY 20, 1959.

Mr. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: Thank you for your letter of July 3, to which I have withheld my response pending a decision in the New York litigation. Now that the court has held Aramco's questioning of job applicants in the city of New York about their religious beliefs to be a violation of the State law, it would seem that a personal conference between us on this subject would be unnecessary. Perhaps, indeed, the question of the Department's role has been rendered moot.

The opinion by the New York Supreme Court demonstrated the distinction between an order forbidding religious questioning and an order requiring the employment of Jews in Saudi Arabia. This distinction, which I sought to make in my correspondence with you, is essential. An order of the latter type was not sought in the New York litigation. The order of the former type, which was sought and granted, presented no conceivable damage to U.S. interests in the Middle East.

If the Department had not been involved deeply in the New York litigation, by reason of correspondence to the New York commissioner, your statement in your letter of July 3 that comment by the Department on the case "would not be appropriate" would have been unassailable. But because of the Department's involvement, I was seeking disengagement by the Department from the position in which it had been cast. Although I recognized the fact that the Department has never expressed itself on the precise issues involved in the New York litigation, I was aware that the Department had appeared to some to have assumed a policy position in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1959.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. BARTLETT: I thank you for your letter of July 20 discussing the findings of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in the case brought by the American Jewish Congress against the Arabian American Oil Co. and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination. The Department has throughout the hearing of this case been appreciative of your comments and concern, particularly since we share your conviction that the proper policy of our Government must be to work for the elimination of any procedures adopted by foreign states which tend to discriminate against our citizens in any way, including discrimination on the basis of race or religion.

As stated in our earlier correspondence, this Department has consistently maintained the position that it would not be proper for it to comment on a case being heard in a State court. We did not do so in this case. Nor did we assume a policy position in the matter, our only connection having been to reply in a general sense, as we consider ourselves properly obliged to do, to a request for information received from the authorities of the State of New York.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Revision of the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I think all my colleagues will agree with me when I say that one of the major, if not the major, issues facing the 2d session of the 86th Congress is revision of the social security law. Researches and on-the-scene surveys conducted throughout 1959 have demonstrated beyond question that

our elderly citizens have suffered a steady deterioration so far as their income positions are concerned, and that this trend is certain to continue unless this Congress takes remedial steps.

In this connection, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to an anniversary that is being remembered and celebrated this month by millions of elderly citizens throughout the vast reaches of this great land.

Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who pioneered the pension movement in America, and still heads the organization he founded, was 93 years of age on January 13. Still hale and hearty despite his advanced years, the doctor is even at this moment engaged in a vigorous speaking tour on the west coast, urging upon his audiences the acceptance of the plan he fathered.

That plan is before this Congress in the form of my bill, H.R. 4000. It calls for universal retirement benefits to persons age 60 and older, and to certain other groups including the disabled and widows with dependent children.

This program, to be financed from the proceeds of a modest 2 percent tax on gross incomes, would result in monthly benefits of about $140, and would be paid as a matter of right. H.R. 4000, unlike the social security program, calls for genuine pay-as-we-go financing.

The genius of Dr. Townsend lies in the appeal of a dream which captured the imagination of millions of his fellow citizens some 25 years ago and today commands increased respect, not only among the aged people of this country, but now, too, among the students of the social security problem, and among those of us in this Chamber who have been elected to serve the best interests of our constituents.

It is fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute to Dr. Townsend on the occasion of his 93d birthday. It is given to few men to live so long and accomplish so much and earn the devotion of so many fervent followers. May he live to celebrate many another birthday—and to realize at long last the fruits of his efforts on behalf of his fellow Americans.

Senator Symington's Views on U.S. Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the safety and survival of the United States and its friends and allies in the non-Communist world surely overrides all other issues facing the 2d session of this 86th Congress.

I share the concern of many of our colleagues over the adequacy and wisdom of our present defense policies. We are all concerned over the extent of the lag in missile production and space technology. Certainly we must continue to work for an enforceable disarmament agreement, but in the interim—the United States must remain strong.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, has dedicated much of his time to the study and evaluation of our defense posture. He is one of our country's outstanding experts in this field. Recently, on January 10, 1960, Senator SYMINGTON appeared on the "Meet the Press" program. Much of the program was devoted to exploration of the Senator's views on the state of U.S. preparedness. I am pleased to commend to our colleagues the transcript of that interview by a panel of veteran Washington correspondents.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I submit the transcript of the Sunday, January 10, 1960, "Meet the Press" television program. It is my hope that we will be able to approach this all-important issue without resort to partisan recrimination and with the emphasis on how best to keep America strong and free.

"MEET THE PRESS," SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1960

(Moderator, Ned Brooks; guest, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri; panel, Roscoe Drummond, New York Herald-Tribune; May Craig, Portland (Maine) Press Herald; Marquis Childs, St. Louis Post Dispatch; Lawrence E. Spivak, regular panel member.)

The ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, we invite you to "Meet the Press," the unrehearsed program which has won every major award in its field.

Our guest today is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, chairman of the Special Agriculture Investigating Subcommittee which begins hearings early this week.

In just a moment Senator SYMINGTON will Meet the Press.

Now "Meet the Press," produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Remember that the questions asked by the members of the panel do not necessarily reflect their point of view. It is their way of getting the story for you.

Now here is the moderator of "Meet the Press," Mr. Ned Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Welcome once again to "Meet the Press."

Our guest today is Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri. He is one of the five Democrats most frequently mentioned as possible nominees for President.

In the new session of Congress, Senator SYMINGTON will play an important role. He has earned a reputation as a critic of administration defense policies and he is now proposing a program for reorganizing the Defense Department.

He is the chairman of an investigating committee which on Tuesday will begin a far-reaching examination into the operations of the Government's farm program.

Senator SYMINGTON was appointed as the first Secretary of the Air Force when that position was created in 1947. He was first elected to the Senate in 1952. Senator SYMINGTON recently returned from an extensive trip which included Africa and the Middle East.

And now seated around the press table ready to interview Senator SYMINGTON are Marquis Childs of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May Craig of the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune, and Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Now, Senator, if you are ready, we will start the questions with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I would like to assume what everyone else in the political know takes for granted, and that is that you are being seriously advanced for the Democratic presidential nomination, and I would like to ask you some questions on some of the major issues that face us. First, the question of disarmament. While the rest of the world is talking about and hoping for disarmament, you keep hammering away on the question of armament.

Will you tell us where you stand on the question of disarmament?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Spivak, in 1955 I introduced a resolution which was passed unanimously by the Senate, and the resolution was one of universal disarmament. Nobody can be more for disarmament than I am. On the other hand, I believe it would be wrong and not in the best interests of my country to disarm unilaterally in the face of growing Communist strength.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, do you think we can make any kind of disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union today that would be safe for the free world?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I would hope that we could, and I think that it is important that we continue to try. But on the other hand, I think that we have to do two things: First, work for general disarmament, and secondly, be careful that in our desire to obtain a real disarmament agreement we don't sign one that might leave us in a position where it could be violated without our knowing it.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, specifically on nuclear weapons testing we have carried on negotiations now for over a year and the Russians seem to be getting exactly what they want and that is a test ban without inspection.

How long would you continue these negotiations if they continue in this present vein?

Senator SYMINGTON. For 14 months we haven't been testing and for 14 months the Russians have not been testing. It worries me a great deal because as the months go by our experts say continuously that we cannot tell increased size tests on their part if they want to cheat.

I am willing to leave this matter in the hands of the President who says that he has now abandoned the idea of just agreeing to an indefinite extension.

I would hope that we reach an agreement soon because the American people should realize that the longer it is that we have no agreement and yet do not test, the longer, provided the Russians are cheating, the longer we are giving up and therefore in effect disarming unilaterally.

Mr. SPIVAK. You think, then, if we don't get an agreement soon we ought to go back at least to underground testing?

Senator SYMINGTON. I do think we ought to go back to underground testing, yes; provided in the reasonably distant future we don't get an agreemeent that we consider the right agreement.

Mr. DRUMMOND. To touch on one more aspect of the test ban thing, in your judgment and in your knowledge, is there any method of verification that would be adequate to detecting underground testing?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Drummond, the amount of blast that could not be detected has increased to my certain knowledge in the minds of the experts, 20 times in the last year. Now we are talking "underground," in addition to which there is a great new field of testing in which there is a growing apprehension that we would not be able to detect and that is the field of space. For example, something that was tested halfway to the moon.

Therefore, again I say that all of us are looking toward peace and believe that the best way to get peace is through some form of agreement in this field and all the fields of armament. On the other hand I do think that based on the record we have to proceed with care.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Speaking of space, former President Truman and Senator MANSFIELD this afternoon said that they thought that the Soviet use of the Pacific for rocket testing was an act of arrogance.

Now I'd like to ask whether you think the Pacific is a proper area for rocket launching and what do you believe is the purpose of the proposed Soviet rocket test?

Senator SYMINGTON. Without getting too much into possibly classified territory, I think it shows that fairly soon, based on the orbit they get in the place that they now plan to test, fairly soon they plan to put a man in space. Where they plan to throw these missiles, now, is about 1,100 miles from Pearl Harbor. They are getting closer in their relationships in the space field to our newest State. They are not, however, nearly as close, perhaps, as they are in some other places in the world where the governments appear to be leaning their way.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator, the President gave us a rather optimistic picture of our defense in his state of the Union message. Does that agree with your knowledge of our own military position?

Senator SYMINGTON. No, Mrs. Craig. I think the President was misinformed in some of the things he told the American people with respect to our defenses.

Mrs. CRAIG. For instance he spoke of our Atlas situation. How much ready intercontinental missiles do we have, do you know?

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes; I do know, but I don't think I should say so on this program. I do think, however, that his statement as to what our position was was oversanguine.

Mrs. CRAIG. Could you give us some idea then perhaps in relation to what you know the Russians have?

Senator SYMINGTON. It has been acknowledged by this administration a year ago, after we corrected some of the statements that were made by some officials, it was acknowledged, admitted that the plan was to allow the Russians to get a lead of 3 to 1. That is what they said the lead would be. Personally I feel that the plans mean that their lead will be greater than 3 to 1. Inasmuch as we have not deviated from our announced plans by the Secretary of Defense at that time, it should be clear to all Americans that we are further behind than we were a year ago in the defense missile field.

Mrs. CRAIG. The President was rather optimistic about the Polaris nuclear subs. How many of them do we have ready?

Senator SYMINGTON. Again I wouldn't want to give the exact figures but I do agree with you that he was misinformed with respect to the statements he made about that weapon also.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, if he isn't informed, who misinformed him?

Senator SYMINGTON If I was in his position I would be interested in finding out.

Mrs. CRAIG. Well, Senator, that is an extraordinary statement to say the President the Commander in Chief, is misinformed and doesn't know what he is talking about.

Senator SYMINGTON. I didn't say the latter; you did. I did say that I was sure he had been misinformed in some of the statements that he had made in his talk.

Mrs. CRAIG. Does it not follow if he is misinformed, that he doesn't know what he is talking about?

Senator SYMINGTON. You made that statement, not I.

Mr. BROOKS. Senator, could you cite a specific example of where he was misinformed?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mrs. Craig brought up two. One was in what he said about the missiles and the other was what he said about the Polaris submarines

Mr. CHILDS. Well, just to push that a moment further, Senator, how long can the American public take this screen of security—I know you referred to classified information. Shouldn't the public know if the President is misinformed and isn't it your duty to tell us?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mr. Childs, in our form of government, one in a position like mine—a Senator from Missouri—has to be very careful about releasing classified information.

However, I want to say this: The American people now know from this administration that we are well behind in the missile field, even further behind in the space field, and that our plans are to remain that way and get worse.

Now I am amazed that the President in his statement points out that we are going to have the most prosperous year in our history next year, that we are going to have a $4½ billion surplus and at the same time these plans to let the Russians continue their relative growing strength against ours continue. And I'd like to just also say that I don't argue about the fact that under our form of government they have the right to consider the balancing of the budget more important than national security, but I do think that it is unfortunate that the people are not given the facts as to the nature of their actions to that end and the degree that we are falling behind.

Mr. CHILDS. I would like to ask you about that surplus, too, Senator. I gather you would not use that to reduce the national debt, that $4.2 billion, if such a surplus does materialize, is that right?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think there is anything more important in the world today than this country, the last great bastion against communism, keeping equal in strength with the Russians. Physically, economically, technologically, psychologically—of course spiritually where we already have a great advantage. Therefore unless they want to reorganize the Department of Defense, to wring out the waste over there that everybody knows is there, and get a new setup, which I am introducing a bill on as soon as I can get the floor, you might say, and unless they want to correct some of the other places in government where we are not having good administration and get the money that way, I most certainly would take that excess the President talks of, that surplus that he talks of, and put it into increasing our defenses.

Mr. CHILDS. Don't you then lay yourself open to the charge of being a spender and willing to unbalance the budget and contributing to our inflation?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think that whether we balance the budget, or many of our other plans, will mean much in this world unless we maintain our guard. Nobody wants peace in the world more than I do. Nobody wants peace more than any citizen with common sense. Your only problem is as we move to the summit next May, for example, with the great psychological, technological and physical accomplishments recently of the Soviet, do you have a better chance to negotiate that just and lasting peace we hope for at the summit for example, if you negotiate from a position of relative weakness or one of relative strength. To me that is the most important avenue to peace that we have in the world today.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you have said there is a great deal of waste in the Defense Department. Am I to understand, then, that if you were President of the United States you wouldn't spend more for defense, that you really would spend less for defense?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would spend more for defense right now. But on the other hand, I would have a single war plan. I'd try to eliminate the constant bickering and arguing and differences between the services by having a single Chief of Staff. I'd have a single war plan, I'd change the service Secretaries to Under Secretaries under the Secretary of Defense so as to build up the latter's authority and I would have a personnel transfer in grade. In other words, I would run the situation on the basis of good business practice instead of letting it drift the way it is today, in tradition.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, when you speak of waste in the Defense Department, is that just a generalized charge or do you know pretty specifically that there is sizable waste and that something could be done about it?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, Mr. Spivak, you know that. You could name item after item, that because of the disagreements, has been canceled or held back, started and stopped. Things like the Bomarc, things like the Seamaster, the Navaho—here we are today canceling hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of development and research items because each service is being allowed to try to fight the next war by itself.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, in fact isn't the whole Defense Department a wasteful Defense Department as long as it keeps this in peace—isn't there constant obsolescence? I mean don't you have to research and maybe waste money in research?

Senator SYMINGTON. That is true, that is true, of course. On the other hand, there is no reason why the organizational setup shouldn't be on a basis where the taxpayer gets the most return for his dollar. And in answer to the way you asked the question in the beginning, I would immediately start spending more, for example, in the space field. The degree that we are behind in thrust is almost incredible and yet last year we cut by tens of millions of dollars the one big thrust program we had, the Saturn. I would spend money quick there and I would accelerate these important programs and I'd modernize SAC.

On the other hand, I also would attempt to streamline that Department so that as soon as possible you are beginning to get true defense for your dollar.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you have spent a great many years studying defense. Do you have any idea how much you could save and how much you would spend if you were the President?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I think you could save—and I am on the record as having said I thought you could save 30 percent of the budget. That was when I was pretty close to the Department. If that was only half right today you would save $100 million a week.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Senator, on this program last Sunday, Senator KENNEDY said that if any Democratic leader was unwilling to submit his candidacy to the test of a representative primary, that that Democratic leader would not deserve well of the next national convention.

I'd like to ask whether you share that view.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Drummond, some time back when some of my friends in New Hampshire asked me if I would go into that primary, I had to make a decision: namely, would I go into primaries or would I not.

Now I know something about primaries. When I first ran for the Senate I was in a primary for 7 months, I believe, and I was in it 7 days a week. My State doesn't have presidential primaries. Only about a third of the States do have these presidential primaries, and less than 10 percent of the States have presidential primaries that are binding.

Anybody can have their own ideas as to the importance of primaries. I have decided not to go into any primaries, at least at this time. And as to whether they should be abolished or not, I wouldn't want to criticize anything that another State had set up. In my State we don't happen to have it and in two-thirds of the States they don't happen to have primaries.

Mrs. CRAIG. Senator, Cuba is only 90 miles from Florida. Do you think that the present Government of Cuba is under Communist influence, dangerous to us?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mrs. Craig, I have it on good authority that Communist influence in Cuba is growing steadily and I know that those people in our Government who should be worrying about it are very worried indeed. As you say it is 90 miles from the United States and that is getting pretty close. It also has one of the world's greatest naval bases at Guantanamo and of course anything that they are doing there could be supplied by submarines anyway.

Mrs. CRAIG. Yes. I wanted to ask you about that. Do you believe that there are submarines hiding on the Cuban coast now?

Senator SYMINGTON. I have heard that but I haven't heard it from such source that I could answer your question formally.

Mrs. CRAIG. Do you think there are missile bases there?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would rather not comment on that question, frankly.

Mr. CHILDS. Senator, getting back to this matter of politics, I checked up a few figures and found you traveled in the fall 32,000 miles and spoke in 22 States. I wonder if it would be fair to call you an active but unavowed candidate. Could that be?

Senator SYMINGTON. First let me answer this way, if I might. In 1958 I had another decision to make also and that was did I speak out of my State or did I not, and I decided not to go out of Missouri, and I didn't during the entire year.

Many of my colleagues and many other good Democrats came in to help me. Therefore when I am asked to go around and help the Democratic Party at fund raising dinners and others, why I do.

Now specifically answering your question, I am not actively seeking delegates at this time. I am interested in the general subject.

Mr. CHILDS. I would like to ask you about another unavowed candidate, if I may use that phrase. When we had Governor Brown on this program, he was asked about Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. He said he thought he would have a handicap in the North because of oil and gas and the integration issue.

I wonder if you would agree with that?

Senator SYMINGTON. I think that a man can only speak for his own State. In my State where Senator JOHNSON talked recently and met with the leaders, he had a great deal of support.

Mr. CHILDS. You believe he could carry Missouri?

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, he can certainly carry Missouri over any Republican.

Mr. CHILDS. Does this mean, Senator, that you don't think the North-South division in your party is important and you could nominate a southerner to run for President of the United States?

Senator SYMINGTON. I don't think there is a North-South division in my party. Only once has the South left the party since I have been reasonably active in politics. In that case President Truman still won the nomination and the election and I would hope that geography woudn't play too prominent a part or be a decisive matter in the choosing of a President. I would hope the way the world is today that the United States as a country will stay together and that we will pick the best man for the job regardless of where he lives. I think never more true was this statement of Benjamin Franklin's as we watch this situation, as I have noticed it over the world in recent weeks: "If we don't all hang together now we are going to hang separately."

Mr. CHILDS. Wasn't that Patrick Henry?

Senator SYMINGTON. I think it was Benjamin Franklin.

Mr. SPIVAK. You have said you are not a candidate for the presidential nomination. Would you tell us whether you would like to be President in 1960?

Senator SYMINGTON. I certainly would like to be President in 1960. I think anybody in politics would like to be President in 1960. It is going to be a rough job but the way things are going now I would hope we could put a brake and turn this country on the right keel from the standpoint of making us strong so that we can stay free.

Let me emphasize by strength I don't mean just physical strength, I mean all the other strengths.

I believe the one way that we can assure peace in the world is for the United States and its allies to get together and remain strong.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I would like to ask you another question, which I hope you won't consider a too personal question, but your critics are saying that you are all things to all men and are able therefore to get equally strong support in groups in sharp controversy with each other: the segregationists and the anti-segregationists; labor and capital; conservatives and liberals. How do you answer that charge that has been made against you, and it has been made as a charge against you?

Senator SYMINGTON. First, Mr. Spivak, they don't say it to me and secondly, I know of no issue that I haven't voted on and taken a position on and I think the charge is totally unwarranted. My voting record I believe proves it and I naturally am sorry that people say it. There is no justification, no proof of any kind for it. I regret that some people have said it.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, do you think that it is necessarily bad for you to be endorsed by the ADA and to be a favorite of the Chamber of Commerce, for example? This is for example from Harpers: "He is at home with the ADA and is far from unwelcome at the same table at the luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce."

Another one from the New York Post: "He can also apparently persuade liberals that he is a chip off the New Deal block and conservatives that he is as solid as a Hoover dollar."

Senator SYMINGTON. One of the last things my father-in-law said to me before he died, and he was a great American as well as a great Senator, was that politics was not a science, it was an art. It was the art of getting along with people. I do my best to get along with as many people as I can. Never once has that changed my convictions on an issue.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Senator, recently two political people, Governor Rockefeller and Senator Kennedy, have made it clear that they simply wouldn't consider, have anything to do with the vice presidential nomination. I am not going to ask whether you would accept the vice presidential nomination because I think nearly everybody could know the answer.

What I want to ask you is, do you think that either party ought to nominate a vice presidential candidate who is not qualified to be the presidential nominee?

Senator SYMINGTON. I do not.

Mr. DRUMMOND. Do you think that there is much prospect that either party will do that?

Senator SYMINGTON. I would not, Mr. Drummond. Naturally as you know, the vice presidential decision is one that is generally made, you might say "at the last minute."

On the other hand I would hope that the Vice President of the United States next time is a man who is fully capable, the way the world is, of being a good President.

Mr. BROOKS. I think with that future in mind, Senator, I will have to call a halt to the proceedings. I am sorry to interrupt but I see that our time is up.

Thank you very much, Senator Symington, for being with us. We will be back with Meet the Press in just a moment. First this message.

The ANNOUNCER. Meet the Press brings you leading world figures at a time when what they say or do is important in the news.

Next week only, Meet the Press will be seen over many of these stations at one p.m. eastern standard time because of the pro ball game. Consult your local TV listings for exact time in your area. Our guest will be the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, the most controversial member of the Eisenhower Cabinet.

If you have enjoyed today's program, you may wish to receive a printed copy of the questions and answers. In just one minute, we will tell you how you may get your transcript.

For a printed copy of today's discussion send ten cents in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Merkle Press, 801 Rhode Island Avenue, Northeast, Washington 18, D.C.

And now goodby for Senator STUART SYMINGTON and Meet the Press.

Meet the Press was produced by Lawrence E. Spivak; directed by Frank Slingland; associate producer, Betty Cole; technical director, Leon Chromak; production supervisor, Doris Corwith.

This is Lee Dayton speaking.

Need for Revision of Status of Forces Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill requesting the President to revise existing treaties to preclude foreign countries from taking jurisdiction over members of our Armed Forces stationed overseas.

This is hardly a new proposal in the Congress. I personally have been urging this resolution since 1955. Two years later the Girard case came to public attention and there was renewed support for a revision of our policy.

This is now 1960. Our boys are still subject to foreign jurisdiction under treaties which have remained the same despite congressional protest.

I feel very strongly that it is time we renewed that protest. The Girard case, which pointed up the problem so dramatically, was hardly an isolated incident. The list of less-publicized examples continues.

I am requesting the Department of Defense to supply me with data on the number of our servicemen who are currently serving jail terms in foreign countries, and I shall make that data available as soon as I receive it.

The reasons for my resolution have been too often described for me to discuss them in detail at this time. It remains basically unfair, regardless of constitutionality, to draft our young men into military service and then unceremoni-

ously abandon them to the vagaries of foreign jurisdictions, which may or may not adhere to our concepts of justice and fairplay.

I was personally familiar with a case of a young serviceman from my district who, several years ago, narrowly escaped British execution on evidence which turned out to be not only flimsy, but inaccurate. As I said in a statement at that time, the fact that this could happen in a judicial system so much like ours suggests strongly what coud happen, and does happen, under systems which are far more dissimilar.

Perhaps the greatest problem which the serviceman who is tried in a foreign court must face is the hostile sentiment which often makes conviction inevitable. Further, this conviction, which may be based as much on the hostile temper of the court as on available evidence, is frequently the basis for discharging that man from the service under less than honorable conditions.

I feel very strongly that we cannot, in all conscience, permit this situation to continue.

I do not believe that these treaties, as is frequently alleged, are necessary to the conduct of our foreign policy. To the contrary, I feel that the passions which are periodically aroused, whenever a foreign court tries a serviceman accused of a serious crime, do far more to strain our normal relations with our allies than would result were these cases turned over as a routine matter to our own military authorities.

Again, I want to emphasize that, although the Girard case is a thing of the past, this issue is as pressing today as it was in 1957. I therefore urge that this matter be given the serious and immediate attention it deserves.

Putting in Your "2 Cents Worth"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an article which appeared in the December 1959–January 1960 issue of Topics which was authored by our distinguished and beloved majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

It is a simple yet eloquent statement on a subject which is very close to all of us written by one of the most sincere and splendid Americans ever to sit in this Chamber. I am sure that you will find the following of great interest, and I am more than happy to be able to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Americans have a way of expressing their views in down-to-earth, simple terms, and one of these phrases is: "I put in my 2 cents worth."

Putting in our 2 cents worth, or expressing our individual opinions, can be vitally important to the future of our country.

Americans have a God-implanted love of free speech, but I have observed during my service in Congress that too few of our citizens take advantage of this privilege of speaking up on Government matters.

A reason may be that many people believe their Congressman does not welcome a letter or a telephone call from a citizen who has an opinion on some past, pending or future matter. May I correct this mistaken idea as simply and as clearly as possible? Every Congressman welcomes the opinion and counsel of our citizens because his primary job is to do just that: represent our people in the Government of our country. To do this well, the Congressman must know what his people are thinking, and the more opinions he gets the better will be his decisions. Public opinion is a very important factor in a democracy.

The very basis of our Government is built around people. What we call politics, elections, legislation—all are attuned to one great determinant, the voice of the people or public opinion.

The people created America, and the people—you and I—must continue to watch over and improve the country our forefathers built and our contemporaries are building. This is our duty and our greater obligation.

As a country, we decided long ago to place this responsibility upon our citizens. Freedom for all was the fruit of this decision, but freedom carries with it the cost of widespread citizen interest and participation in the affairs of Government.

One of the best ways to fulfill your duties of active citizenship, of course, is to help elect the man or women of your choice to public office. But do not stop there. Let me encourage you to take the next step. Keep the persons who represent you in Government informed of your views throughout the year. This is an equally important responsibility in our democratic form of government.

Sometimes I think it might be well if we erected a large sign over Congress which contained this thought: Here the opinions of all Americans are heard—and should be heard—with equality. As a result, the sense of their proposals becomes the law of the land.

Or perhaps we should put it in more typical American language: Here your 2 cents worth does make a difference.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Member of Congress.

National Safety Council and American Merchant Marine Institute Honors MSTS Crew of USNS "Pendleton"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I have sent to Admiral Gano, commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, commending his gallant crew on their great seamanship during the rescue of 24 Japanese fishermen who survived the sinking of their ship a year ago. I also include the names of the crewmen who reside in San Francisco and clippings detailing this great exploit in the annals of maritime history. I am now and always have been proud of our MSTS service and their brave officers and seamen. May I commend to your attention these items:

Vice Adm. ROY A. GANO,
U.S. Navy, Commander Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROY: With the presentation of the National Safety Council and American Merchant Marine Institute Special Award of Merit to the skipper and crew of the USNS *Pendleton*, national attention has once again been drawn to the magnificent seamanship of the men under your command.

The rescue of all 24 of the Japanese fishermen who survived the sinking of their sampan *Chiyo Maru* a year ago December has already become a legend of the sea. It is rightly fitting that the National Safety Council and the American Merchant Marine Institute should single out Capt. Hans C. von Weien and his brave and skillful crew for this honor.

I wish I had been back in my hometown of San Francisco when the award was presented and been able to have taken part in honoring the splendid seamen whose courage and devotion to duty exemplify the highest standards of seamanship which are characteristic of the Military Sea Transportation Service.

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

CREW MEMBERS ON BOARD USNS "PENDLETON" ON DECEMBER 18, 1958

PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

Name and address

Fred S. Crowley, Jr., radio officer, 49½ Caselli Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Modesto L. Lauriano, Carpenter, 639 Excelsior Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Enicirio A., Adam, able seaman, 5 Porter Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Archie F. Moromisato, ordinary seaman, 1990 Sutter Street, San Francisco; RIF January 1, 1960.

Chee T. Wong, ordinary seamen, 2248 Mason Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Hom B. Pon, ordinary seaman, 728 Montgomery Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Murray W. Jewett, first assistant engineer, 903 Pine Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Hugh I. Morrison, third assistant engineer, 121 Yukon Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Shee H. Yip, fourth assistant engineer, 1170 Powell Street, San Francisco; *Miller.*

Wayne F. Wagner, licensed junior engineer, 938 Geary Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Gasper F. Ferro, oiler, 576 Geary Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Carroll L. Main, oiler, 1955 Quesada Avenue, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Donald Chew, oiler, 1464 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Aurelio Ducosin, fireman-watertender, 654 Capp Street, San Francisco; receiving section.[1]

Damian A. Aguilar, fireman-watertender, 1351 Stockton Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Cornelio M. Manay, wiper, 1503 Scott Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Salvador P. Gancero, wiper, 281 Santos Street, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Water L. Reed, second cook-baker, 235 Prague Street, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Cornelio Villafuerte, assistant cook, 350 South Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco; retired May 31, 1959.

Rofino C. Forges, messman, 935 Kearny Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

Cleto J. Mercado, messman, Post Office Box 1028, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

[1] Awaiting reassignment.

Donato H. Visico, utility, 1478 Hudson Avenue, San Francisco; *Breton.*

Henry C. Verano, utilityman, Post Office Box 7073, San Francisco; *Patrick.*

Manuel G. Carreon, utilityman, 234 Linden Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

George, Cowans, utilityman, 1084 McAllister Street, San Francisco; *Pendleton.*

ADRIFT 29 HOURS—"PENDLETON" RESCUES 24 JAP FISHERMEN

In June 1944, the *Mandan Victory* slid down the ways to join the fleet of supply ships which helped win the war in the Pacific. Later, renamed the *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton,* she worked for the old Army Transportation Corps, and in January 1950, she joined MSTS. Little of excitement or special note happened to her from then until last December when she picked up this message from Pac:

"Fishing boat *Chiyoh Maru,* 148 tons, 25 crew, large hole in hull, flooding seriously. S O S received. Position 17–48 N., 161–25 E. Divert to position. Render assistance as necessary."

The U.S.N.S. *Pendleton* acknowledged the message and altered course while her crew made preparations for picking up survivors. Next word from the *Pendleton* came 28 hours later when her new skipper, Capt. Hans C. Von Weien, sent this message:

"* * * picked up entire crew *Chiyoh Maru.* Twenty-four members all aboard at 18130Z. No apparent injuries. Men taken from makeshift raft. * * *"

With the 24 fishermen safely aboard, the U.S.N.S. *Pendleton* set course for Guam. Their raft, which was left adrift, was described by Captain Von Weien. It consisted, he said, of four oil drums, various wooden boxes and fishing balls, held together by a fish net. It provided standing room only and rode the waves in sections. Once aboard the *Pendleton,* the Japanese, who had been adrift for 29 hours, luxuriated in fresh-water showers and were given cigarettes and $5 apiece by the crew.

At Guam the *Pendleton* and her crew received heroes' welcome, including a Navy band at dockside and a 25-foot banner hailing the rescue.

Captain Von Weien and his crew received official accolades from COMSTS, Admiral Will; from commander in chief, Pacific Fleet; and from commander, Hawaiian Sea Frontier—all of whom sent dispatches—while Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, commander, naval forces, Marianas, waited at the dock in Guam to greet them.

U.S. SHIP RESCUES JAPAN CREW ADRIFT

YOKOHAMA (KYODO).—All 24 crew members of a Japanese tuna boat, which sent out an S O S Wednesday southwest of Wake Island, were rescued Thursday by a U.S. military transport.

News of their rescue was contained in a report received yesterday by local maritime safety authorities from Wake Island.

The report said the 148-ton *Chiyo Maru* of Misaki, Kanagawa Prefecture, had been abandoned after it sprung a leak.

Skipper Kazuyoshi Taniguchi and the crewmen took to a raft and were picked up about 500 kilometers (300 miles) southwest of Wake at about 10:40 p.m., Thursday by the U.S. military transport *Jack Pendleton.*

The rescued fishermen were reported to be heading for Guam aboard the American transport, one of a number of U.S. and Japanese ships which rushed to the aid of the sinking boat. Planes also took part in the search for the craft.

MSTS SHIP RESCUES 24 FISHERMEN

YOKOSUKA, JAPAN.—The U.S. Navy said Friday a Military Sea Transportation Service cargo ship rescued 24 survivors from a stricken Japanese fishing boat at midnight Thursday about 1,800 miles southeast of Japan.

The MSTS ship *Sgt. Jack P. Pendleton,* a modified attack cargo ship, rushed to assist the fishing boat *Chiyoh-Maru* Wednesday after the Japanese vessel reported it had a hole in its hull and was flooding.

A Navy spokesman said word was received from the rescue ship that all members of the fishing boat's crew were rescued, including the Japanese skipper.

The Navy spokesman said the brief rescue message reported the Japanese vessel had sunk but did not elaborate on how the survivors managed to stay afloat.

The message quoted the Japanese captain as saying all persons aboard had been saved and that the boat was lost.

MSTS TO RESCUE—JAPANESE CREW SAVED

GUAM.—Twenty-four crewmen of an ill-fated Japanese fishing boat rescued Thursday by an American cargo vessel were transferred at sea Sunday off Guam to another fishing boat for return to Japan.

The Japanese fishermen had drifted 29 hours on an open raft with standing room only after sending an S O S Wednesday that their ship, the *Chiyoh Maru,* was sinking.

They were picked up by the U.S. Military Sea Transport Service cargo ship *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton.* The *Pendleton* rendezvoused with the *Sazamu Maru,* a sister ship of the *Chiyoh Maru,* 3 miles off Apra Harbor, Guam.

The Japanese were transferred by Navy crash boat.

Vice Adm. John M. Will, commander of the MSTS in Washington, described the rescue as upholding the finest traditions at sea.

Capt. Hans C. von Weien, the *Pendleton's* master, had high praise for the Japanese survivors.

He said they had been adrift on a makeshift 8-by-10-foot raft assembled from four oil drums, wooden boxes and fishing float balls held together by fishing net.

The survivors said the raft rode the waves in sections.

The Japanese fishermen took long and vigorous showers aboard the *Pendleton* and were treated to haircuts by the ship's barber. The crew furnished them with clothing and rubber sandals.

Just before their transfer the Japanese were given $5 and a carton of cigarettes each as a farewell gift.

The *Pendleton* received a hero's welcome when it returned to Guam after the transfer. Rear Adm. W. L. Erdmann, commander, Naval Forces Mariannas, and the Navy band were on hand to greet the rescuers.

[From the Japan Times, Dec. 22, 1958]

CREW RESCUED BY U.S. VESSEL BOARDS JAPAN SHIP OFF GUAM

YOKOSUKA.—Twenty-four Japanese fishermen rescued from a makeshift raft in mid-Pacific by an American naval craft, were transferred Sunday to a Japanese fishing boat off Guam, the U.S. Navy reported.

The survivors, who were aboard the *Chiyo Maru* which sank Wednesday night 350 miles west southwest of Wake Island, were transferred from the attack ship *Sgt. Jack J. Pendleton* to the *No. 7 Sasayama Maru* 3 miles off Apra Harbor at 8:30 a.m. Sunday, the Navy said.

The *Sasayama Maru* was one of two Japanese fishing boats directed by Japan's Maritime Safety Agency to pick up the survivors at a rendezvous point off Guam. The *No. 3 Azuma Maru* was also reported heading for the same place.

The *Pendleton,* a U.S. Navy attack cargo ship was en route to San Francisco from Guam when it received an S O S call Wednesday night. She diverted her course and picked up the fishermen some 1,000 miles northeast of Guam Thursday night.

The survivors were found adrift aboard a makeshift raft that consisted of four oil drums, various wooden boxes and fishing glass balls securely enclosed in a fishing net, the Navy said. They were adrift for 29 hours.

The *Chiyo Maru,* a 1,481-ton tuna fishing boat, flashed a distress signal at 5:50 p.m. Wednesday and sank 55 minutes later.

Anti-Semitic Vandalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the wave of anti-Semitism which has swept over Germany in recent weeks is most deplorable. Perhaps the most unfortunate thing is its spread to various lands in Europe, the Americas and elsewhere, where irresponsible young people and lunatic fringe followers are defacing synagogues, churches, institutions and private homes with swastikas and other symbols of hatred.

These anti-Jewish and antireligious demonstrations have occurred in various places and communities in this country and abroad where this form of social virulence has never before been a serious factor. I have no way of knowing whether these demonstrations have been organized by certain rightist or leftist elements for political or other purposes. I have no way of knowing whether they are being financed by certain elements in Communist or Arab countries, or by Nazi remnants still operating abroad, as is being suspected by many people.

One thing I do know, and that is: The free world, America included, has been dealt a heavy blow in the eyes of upright, liberty-loving and peace-loving people everywhere. In the midst of a great ideological struggle, when the nations of the free world are actually fighting for freedom and survival, our attention is diverted to acts of prejudice and intolerance which only tend to divide our forces and to sap our strength. The smearing of swastikas on houses of worship is not the path to survival in the struggle against communism, as some blind fanatics and cranks may believe, but is the road to ruin and destruction of our civilization, our common heritage and our very freedom.

Attacks on houses of worship are direct attacks upon freedom itself. Those who hate one religion, hate all religions. They also hate everyone whose beliefs may differ from theirs, whose national origin may be different, whose color of skin is different, whose political or social views are different. They prefer totalitarianism of one kind or another, based on hatred against all those who disagree with them. We fought World War II to eradicate this dangerous concept which brought so much misery upon humanity and resulted in the death of millions of innocent people.

Now, we are witnessing a resurgence of these evil forces. If left to pursue their

evil deeds, we shall sooner or later be faced with a new world tragedy. This is a warning which should not be ignored. There is no room in American life for these demented fanatics who let themselves become tools of others who seek to destroy us. Similarly, there should be no room for them in Germany if the German people and their leaders are earnestly interested in casting their lot with the free world.

We should make it clear to the German people that we expect them to adopt the strongest measures to eradicate these fanatics. We should also make it clear to them that if there is a revival or resurgence of nazism there, they should understand that the free world, America included, will be forced to renounce its alliance and support of a German state which tolerates or encourages neo-nazism in any form. At the same time, let us give the German people every assurance of support if they show a genuine desire and effort to uproot anti-Semitism and those preaching bigotry and intolerance.

Let's Help the Small Tobacco Farmer: Statements of Representative Ken Hechler and Senator Randolph Emphasize West Virginia Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are some 4,500 farmers in West Virginia who harvested tobacco in 1958. The growers in our State produce on a small scale.

My colleague from the Fourth District, Representative KEN HECHLER, has most of these farmers in the area he serves—and serves so well.

It is my privilege, Mr. President, to ask permission to have printed a recent statement by Representative HECHLER before the meeting within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Tobacco Division, to discuss the outlook for supply and demand of burley tobacco.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HELP THE SMALL TOBACCO FARMER

(Remarks of Hon. KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, before the Tobacco Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 14, 1960)

Gentlemen, when I appeared before you last year, I urged the Tobacco Division to resist attempts to reduce quotas in burley tobacco which would have reduced further the small incomes earned by many of the Nation's small tobacco farmers.

I was delighted that the Department of Agriculture did indeed resist this unwise and unwarranted pressure and retained tobacco allotments for the 1959 crop year at their 1958 levels.

The visible proof that your decision was a wise one is contained in the projected figures for the 1959–60 marketing year, which show that total supply—instead of increasing disastrously, as some feared—actually has declined in the past year from about 1,750 million pounds to an estimated 1,735 million pounds. I also understand that disappearance will show an increase this year which, based on a reasonable projection of existing market trends, may be in the neighborhood of 12 million pounds, or from 515 million pounds in 1958–59 to possibly 526 to 528 million in 1959–60.

This is ample evidence to me that tobacco, under the wise guidance of your Division and the cooperative spirit of the growers, remains our most intelligently marketed crop.

I believe both the farmers and the policymakers in the Tobacco Division deserve the commendation of all citizens.

Now I would like to speak for a moment on the 1960 crop year and the manner in which it relates to my district, which lies in the Ohio Valley and embraces the major tobacco-growing area of the State of West Virginia. In fact, 4,191 of the 4,565 tobacco allotments in West Virginia—or more than 91 percent, are in the Fourth District, which borders the Ohio River.

These 4,565 farmers in West Virginia harvested only 2,211 acres of tobacco in 1958. The small size of the average quota is obvious—it amounts to only forty-eight one hundredths of an acre. All West Virginia growers are raising tobacco on a very small scale.

I would like to bring you up to date on a few additional facts about the State of West Virginia.

The State's unemployment continues high, and the rate of unemployment is the highest in the Nation. Nearly one out of seven members of the work force is unemployed. And there is no relief in sight for the depressed condition of the State's economy.

Many of the quota-holders in West Virginia have, in the past, held part-time or full-time jobs, with the income from their farms supplementing these earnings. Today, many of these farmers have lost outside employment. There simply are no jobs to be had, and they are attempting to subsist entirely on the pitifully small income from tobacco farming.

For many of these farmers, the cash income from tobacco often provides the only dollars they see during an entire year. It is their only cash crop. Therefore, I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this crop to these small landholders. It frequently marks the difference between proud, self-sufficient living and the dependence upon public assistance funds to keep body and soul together.

The economic situation in West Virginia has improved only slightly since I reported to you in January 1959. Therefore, it is still just as urgent that the small farmer be given every reasonable protection under the law.

I would also like to suggest that some consideration be given to trying to increase quotas for small tobacco farmers in areas which the Department of Labor rules as "chronically depressed areas," with persistently high rates of unemployment.

Last year I was happy to support a tobacco bill which retained the principle of quotas and marketing supports but corrected a flaw which has developed in the modernized parity formula. This was a step to preserve and protect our export markets for tobacco, and I voted for it because I knew that tobacco farmers all over the Nation—in the spirit of cooperation and responsible citizenship which has characterized their statesmanlike attitude to the tobacco problem for many years—would be behind me in this fight.

Unfortunately, this bill, like many other good measures in 1959, met with a poorly explained and unjustified Presidential veto. Now I have been advised that a compromise measure has been evolved and again will be offered to the Congress. It is my hope that an effective and workable tobacco bill can be enacted into law this year.

Legislation is not the only item on the tobacco horizon at this time. I have been advised that there is a move under way to request a general raising of tobacco allotments for the 1960 growing season.

It seems to me that the matter of increasing tobacco quotas must be approached with greatest caution. This should not become a political football for profitable kicking around during an election year—with the tobacco farmer left to reap the horrible consequences after November 8.

The tobacco farmer does not want to sell his long-range, effective program down the river for a few short-range benefits, and I recommend that any decisions, to alter the allotment structure in any way be made with this thought firmly in mind.

But I believe that the time has come to raise quotas for those small tobacco farmers now growing less than six-tenths of an acre. There is ample authority for such preferred and just treatment under the law. The Secretary of Agriculture is specifically granted such authority, in fact.

May I cite section 313(c) of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provides:

"The Secretary shall provide * * * for the allotment not in excess of the national marketing quota * * * for further increase of allotments to small farmers."

I hope that under the terms of this section of the law which governs tobacco growing and marketing that the Division could provide some relief for the struggling small farmer. I further respectfully submit that such a formula could be instrumented without creating undue hardship upon the larger farmer and without exceeding the provisions of section 313(c).

May I propose for your consideration the following program:

For each farmer presently assigned an allotment of less than 0.2 of 1 acre, an increase of a flat 0.2 additional acreage shall be granted.

For farmers now growing from 0.21 to 0.3 of an acre, a sliding scale of increases not less than 0.15 acre but not in excess of 0.2 acre shall be granted.

For farmers with allotments from 0.31 to 0.4, an increase not less than 0.1 and not in excess of 15 shall be granted, again on a sliding scale dependent on previous acreage.

For farmers with allotments from 0.41 to 5 acres, an increase not less than 0.05 acre and not in excess of 0.1 shall be granted on the same sliding scale.

For all farmers with allotments of more than 0.5 acre, a flat increase of 10 percent of the 1959 allotment.

This would be a workable plan, within the framework of a 10 percent increase which I understand may be under active consideration within the Division.

This would be an altogether reasonable formula which would not deny deserved increases to the larger farmer, would not upset the marketing and support program, and would provide benefits where they are most needed.

In addition, it would not even require the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the full 5 percent benefit provision contained in section 313(c).

Under my formula, slightly less than 3.5 percent of the total national marketing quota would be set aside to benefit the small farmer.

If a 10 percent increase should be feasible, this would mean that the present marketing quota of about 310,000 would rise to about 341,000 acres.

Now, if the Secretary should choose to utilize only seven-tenths of the 5 percent "increase of allotments to small farms" provided under the law, this 3.5 percent increase would provide for the distribution of an additional 11,935 acres in increased allotments.

Sharing in this increase would be 25,000 farmers across the Nation who now hold allotments of 0.2 acre or less. A flat 0.2 increase would add 5,000 acres to their present production of only 3,095 acres.

The 13,700 farmers now raising from 0.21 to 0.3 acre could add 2,408 acres to their present production total of 3,425, under the formula I have outlined here. The 14,100 farmers now raising 4,935 acres would increase their production by 1,763 acres. This is the number of farmers with allotments ranging from 0.31 to 0.4 acre.

The 27,900 farmers with 0.41 to 0.5 acre would add 2,093 acres to the 12,555 acres they now grow.

And how much would this increase the national marketing quota?

I am happy to say that it would amount to a total increase of 11,264 acres—less than 600 acres of the 11,935 acres which would be provided for the small farmer if the Secretary will use the authorization of section 313(c) to increase allotments for small farmers not 5, but only 3.5 percent.

I firmly am convinced that in this way allotment increases could be apportioned among farmers who need them most. Every dollar added to their income would go toward providing a more stable way of life for them—and coincidentally would be pumped immediately back into the Nation's economy as the purchasing power of these deserving farmers increases.

This would be a humanitarian approach to the problem, and would render the maximum good for the largest number of people.

This, I believe, should be the underlying motive and governing factor if it is deemed possible to increase 1960 quotas.

The tobacco farmer wants these increases, if they can be granted without damaging the program which has proved the most successful and effective of an otherwise dismal farm administration.

They want to increase production and earn more dollars, but they do not want to return to the roller-coaster days of tobacco marketing, when a year of boom was followed by several of inevitable bust. The present program was an outgrowth of the problems raised by this damaging cycle, and the tobacco farmer is determined that it shall never return again.

The tobacco farmers of West Virginia have shown their patriotism by their record. They have stood with other farmers in defending and protecting their program even when it meant drastic reduction of their allotments in the face of falling markets a few years ago.

Consequently, the tobacco industry today is sound. Export markets apparently are weathering a serious storm and have risen about 30 percent over 1958. Disappearance is increasing and we all hope that its steady upward curve will continue.

It is most heartening that an increase appears to be justified this year or in the near future. For this I am truly thankful.

We must, at all costs, preserve the tobacco program which has been proven so effective.

If it does prove feasible to raise quotas for 1960, we should consider it only a matter of simple justice to distribute the major portion of this increase among the small allotment holders who depend so strongly upon tobacco to provide them with life's necessities.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask further consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD correspondence between Director Joe R. Williams and myself in reference to the subject of Representative HECHLER's address.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
TOBACCO DIVISION,
Washington, D.C. December 18, 1959.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: A meeting will be held at 9:15 a.m., e.s.t., on Thursday, January 14, 1960, in the Jefferson Auditorium, South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., to discuss the supply and demand outlook for burley tobacco and to obtain views and recommendations on the amount of the 1960 national marketing quota.

We shall be pleased to have any comments which you may wish to give us either by letter or telephone or to have you attend the meeting.

Sincerely yours,
JOE R. WILLIAMS, *Director.*

BURLEY TOBACCO SUPPLY AND DEMAND SITUATION

The carryover of burley tobacco on October 1, 1959, beginning of the current marketing year, totaled 1,236 million pounds, farm sales weight basis. This represented a decrease of about 50 million pounds, or about 4 percent, from a year earlier.

The 1959 crop of burley tobacco was estimated as of December 1, 1959, to be 500 million pounds, about 35 million pounds, or 7 percent, larger than the 1958 crop.

The total supply of burley tobacco (i.e., carryover plus estimated production) for the current marketing year is 1,736 million pounds, down 15 million pounds from a year ago. For the fifth successive year, the total supply has declined. The total reduction from the 1954–55 peak supply of 1,866 million pounds has been 130 million pounds, or 7 percent. At the current level of disappearance, the present supply is sufficient for a duration of about 3.4 years, while a supply of about 2.8 years' duration is considered normal under the formula contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Domestic consumption of burley tobacco during the marketing year ending September 30, 1959, was 480 million pounds, a gain of about 6 million pounds, or 1½ percent, over the previous year.

Exports of burley tobacco during the marketing year ending September 30, 1959, totaled about 35 million pounds, farm weight. This was a gain of about 7 million pounds from the level of the past 2 years, but about the same as during the 1955–56 marketing year. For the calendar year 1959, burley exports are running about 1 percent below the same period of last year.

It is estimated that cigarette production during the calendar year 1959 will reach an alltime high of about 488 billion, or 3.8 percent more than in 1958 and 12 percent more than the previous high of 1952. The quantity of domestic tobacco utilized in cigarettes has gained little in the last few years despite this substantial increase in the number of cigarettes manufactured.

It is estimated that the production of smoking tobacco during the calendar year 1959 will total about 73 million pounds, about 3 million pounds, or nearly 4 percent, less than in 1958. The production of chewing tobacco in 1959 is expected to be about 1½ million pounds, or 2 percent, less than in 1958.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TOBACCO DIVISION, CSS.
DECEMBER 1959.

JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mr. JOE R. WILLIAMS,
Director, Tobacco Division, Community Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks very much for your letter and the enclosed analysis of the tobacco supply and demand situation. The comprehensive statistics included are informative and helpful.

To my regret, previous commitments will prevent my attendance at your meeting but I appreciate the opportunity to express my views concerning the tobacco program for 1960.

I wish to commend the Tobacco Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service for maintaining stable growing and marketing conditions in the tobacco industry during the past year. I shall hope that this stability can be maintained throughout 1960. In allocating quotas for the present year, it is my opinion that special consideration should be given to the small tobacco farmer whose allotment is less than half an acre, and I respectfully urge your Division to take this action. There is ample authority for such action under section 313(c) of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended.

There are thousands of small tobacco farmers in our State of West Virginia whose average allotment is only 0.48 of an acre. Many of them depend on tobacco as their only cash crop and an acreage increase would be of genuine assistance to them. This adjustment would be particularly important because of the areas of unemployment in our State which significantly affect its economy.

I would not, however, advocate any increase which would impair the tobacco program administered by your Division. If it is feasible to grant increases for this year, I strongly recommend that they be distributed to the small farmer, including the constituents which I am privileged to represent.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

An Eastern Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 20, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 I had the privilege of speaking before the Electric Consumers Information Committee at the Hotel Willard in Washington, D.C. I am thankful to Jack Curran, a member of the ECIC executive committee, who extended to me an invitation to participate in a luncheon session of a legislative workshop with people from all over the United States who are interested in the problem of power and our natural resources. Mr. John Edelman, legislative representative of the Textile Workers, was the chairman.

The subject of my talk was "An Eastern Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development." In view of the erroneous impression that a conflict exists between the interests of the farm people and the city dwellers, I believe that my talk might eliminate some of the erroneous impressions held by many people.

I found the question and answer period after the speech very stimulating and the comments reaffirmed my deep-rooted feeling that whether we live on the farms or dwell in the cities that we are Americans all and that our natural resources have been granted to us for the benefit of all mankind, and not for the aggrandizement of power by a monolithic state or for the financial benefit of a select few.

The text of my speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO BEFORE ELECTRIC CONSUMERS INFORMATION COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ellis, Jack Curran, members of the Electric Consumers Information Committee, and ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked today to speak to you on the subject of how "An Eastern, Big City Congressman Looks at Resource Development." I am happy to participate in this workshop program.

When one talks about resource development, a person, whether he comes from the city, such as I, or from the farm belt, one immediately thinks of natural resources, farms, forests, fish and wildlife, minerals and sources of energy. Some city dwellers think of hunting, fishing, and swimming. The thought that comes to me, and which is sometimes overlooked, is the world's greatest natural resource—its population. This is so whether it be where population is exploding or where it is controlled by natural or artificial means. When I talked of natural resources, I mean both groups—the animate and the inanimate and the relationship between them.

As a human being and as a Catholic, I believe in the dignity of the individual and in his inherent worth. Just as I believe governments are created for the protection of the individual and the development of a spiritual, economic and political being, so do I believe that our natural resources have been placed on earth for the benefit of all peoples, all human beings, and not for the aggrandizement of power of a state or the financial benefit of a select few.

I am not a hedonist who believes that pleasure is the primary objective of life or summum bonum, but sometimes when we attend congressional parties, labor luncheons, or house parties, one can validly draw the inference that the guests believe in the mammalian philosophy—live for today for there is no tomorrow.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, I have been compelled to think about the soil, the trees, our streams, electric power, and their use, their development and their preservation. I have been extremely interested in these resources because I know that they affect my life, my constituency, and my Nation.

We all know that no nation is any stronger than its resources permit it to be. Because America has been fortunate in the blessings of nature bestowed upon it in the shape of all varieties of natural resources we have become strong. We have attained our preeminent position in the world today because we have had the energy, the ingenuity, and the purpose with which to convert natural resources in their many aspects to useful products. In the process, we have been shamefully prodigal as well as admirably efficient. Some nations have not been blessed with nature's bounty and consequently look to us with pitiful glances for help or with green eyes in envy.

Of all the natural resources needed to support even so complex an industrial structure and sophisticated a society as ours is today, there are only a very few which we do not possess in some quantity. Those few which we may need we have, of course, been able to secure elsewhere by exchange for others of which we have a surplus or for products made from them. And so we have our exports and imports and our trade agreements.

The first of the natural resources we come to is water. Certain elementary facts must be recognized. Water is vital to every form of life. We have a fixed or finite quantity of water in this world. Some have too much for their needs, such as Siam, Panama, and other countries in the Far East, which I have had the extreme pleasure of visiting within the past several months. Other areas have too little, such as Hong Kong, where running water is used only for several hours a day, or in parts of southern Italy, which suffers from the lack of water. Certain areas which have sufficient for their needs, do not have it at the time when they need it. So for them, it is a problem of storage and use in time of need. Then it becomes a matter of distribution. We have seen such conservation in the Tennessee Valley, in the far West at the Columbia River, or at the Wilson Dam.

I understand that Russia is developing the largest water dam in the world which will provide electric power and irrigation. This damsite is located at Bratsk north of Lake Baikal on the Angara River, and when completed will be more than 40 times as large as our largest reservoir at Hoover Dam. We almost had a war because the present administration withdrew its support to Egypt in the building of the Aswan Dam. I was pleased to see that Formosa with the help of our Government is building the first multipurpose water resources development undertaken by the Republic of China as part of an overall program to make Chiang Kai-shek's country self-sufficient. Its purposes are irrigation power, flood control, and public water supply.

Some areas have sufficient for their needs, but people in the use of it pollute, contaminate, or waste it, so that others cannot use it sufficiently or profitably. Riding across the 14th Street Bridge in Washington over the Potomac River, you will see this river being contaminated by industrial useage and those who live downstream are denied a proper use.

Water serves mankind in many ways. It helps provide food from the soil or from gravel as I saw in the hydroponic systems in Japan. It turns the turbines which furnish hydroelectric power and provides cheap electricity, as in the hills of Puerto Rico where the Rural Electrification Administration has brought light to darkness and bearable living conditions to the denizens of the hills.

When I first came to Congress I did not know what the words "Rural Electrification Administration" meant, and I had no conception of the kind of work it was accomplishing or the scope of its activities. The first real understanding I had of the REA's accomplishments was during my visit to Puerto Rico where I met Clyde Ellis and participated in a week's seminar conducted by the Puerto Rican Water Resources Authority. I traveled into the hills and inspected the powerplants and saw with my own eyes the wires leading to the shacks and hovels which some of the Puerto Ricans call their homes. In some instances the cost of the installation of the electricity was greater than the value of these homes. More than 50,000 families enjoyed for the first time the use of electricity and the darkness of the hills was illuminated. Refrigeration, preservation of food, electrical appliances, and modern conveniences were theirs for the asking by reason of the inspiration of a far-sighted Governor, Muñoz-Marín. Without the REA loans at 2-percent interest, these people would have remained in darkness, relegated to misery. Their health and their way of life were greatly improved.

Today we see an administration seeking to raise the interest rates to be paid by the REA from 2 percent to the going rate of interest paid by Government bonds. This means that the rate of interest would reach 5 percent and higher. This means that backward areas could not avail themselves of the great opportunities afforded by a program initiated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt which has brought electricity to 98 percent of the farm families throughout the United States and telephones to 90 percent of the people on the farms.

I, for one, will oppose a program which will grant 3½ percent additional interest to financial institutions to the detriment of the people and the destruction of one of the greatest programs our country has ever adopted.

Water serves as drink for man or beast, either in its pure state as H_2O or in its mixed state as in hooch. It also has less utilitarian purposes, such as perhaps for sartorial perfection as in washing and bathing or as a locus near the sands, attracting either a sunburn or the opposite sex.

As dependent as we are upon water then, we must learn to keep our demands within the available gallonage which is not infinite. As we approach the absolute limits we must learn to utilize it in the most efficient manner possible.

Wherever possible it must be used over and over. The same water that generates hydroelectric power can be used again. None is lost in the process. Wherever possible arid lands lying waste and unproductive should be given an opportunity to produce food and other products of the land. This will become more and more necessary as our population continues to grow.

Since the finite limits of water are known, at least in approximation, it is up to someone to take the lead in seeing that the available supply is most efficiently utilized. That someone could very well be the Federal Government. By that I do not necessarily mean that every drop should be nationalized and every bucketfull be doled out by a more or less benevolent Federal Government upon sufficient justification by potential consumers or users. I do mean that it would probably be a good thing that the utmost protection be given to the Nation's watersheds, that soil erosion be eliminated insofar as possible, that water pollution be prevented, or corrected when it occurs unavoidably.

I mean that potential hydroelectric power sites should be determined and the right to develop them be in the hands of those who can do so at the least cost, most efficiently and for the benefit of the most people. If these potential power sites are located where no one can or wants to undertake the job the Federal Government might undertake them. Not, however, unless there is at least a potential need for them.

As we well know, it would be a wasteful practice to build large power dams just for power. It is also possible to upset the natural regime of a stream and disorganize the economies of communities downstream dependent upon the water about to be impounded for domestic and industrial use, and possibly irrigation. The modern-day multiple-purpose planning for a coordinated development for all purposes is infinitely more desirable.

Yesterday our President forwarded to the Congress his budget message. In it he recommended $1,938,000 to be spent in fiscal year 1961 for natural resources, more than has been spent for this purpose in any previous year.

We have before Congress, apart from his recommendations, a measure which would establish a Council of Natural Resources and Conservation Advisers. The purpose of this council is to study the current status of

natural resource conservation and development and to develop, in terms of national policy for the President and the Congress, a program which will best meet the human, economic, and National defense requirements of the Nation and the enhancement of the National heritage for future generations.

A truly comprehensive program should encompass, each in its proper relationship to the other and to the whole program, all natural resources. These would include soil, water, timber, grazing land, fisheries, minerals, wildlife and, not to be neglected at all costs, recreational, scenic, and scientific values. The assistance and cooperation of all responsible parties should be enlisted. This I think should include industry, agriculture, government on all levels as well as individuals. Only thus could the interests of all citizens be given the proper consideration. That is the democratic way.

It would be well to have a central clearinghouse of information concerning the current status of our storehouse of nature's bounty. We should know of what plans there may be for its conservation, development, and utilization. If there are dangerous trends apparent, steps may be taken in time to arrest them. If there are forseen shortages developing, steps may be taken to head them off.

As a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration. I believe that some of my listeners may have some small interest in that program. That governmental undertaking is illustrative of the good that can be accomplished by the Government when others cannot or will not undertake the job.

Several other measures which protect our resources are such projects as the TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, marketing system, in the Pacific Northwest, other Federal power projects in various sections of the country and the rural electrification program. They have stimulated higher consumption of power at low wholesale rates. The results of this policy, which has its roots in the Reclamation Act amendments of 1906, have not only aided the ultimate power consumer in the regions affected, but have had an effect toward decreasing power rates in areas not in the watershed effected by the project even in large cities. (This is the F.D.R. yardstick of public power against which to measure rates of private utilities.) For example, the 1958 average annual domestic use of electricity in the TVA region was 7,800 kilowatt-hours, about double the national figure. The cost per kilowatt-hour of power among TVA distributors is about 60 percent of the average for the Nation. As a result the purchase of electrical appliances in the home and on the farm in the TVA is the highest in the Nation.

Since 1945 citizens of this region have purchased $2.5 billion worth of appliances and the same is true in the Pacific Northwest although adequate statistics are not available. Rural electric cooperatives, more than 900 in number throughout the country, form a $1 billion annual market for 20-odd household electrical appliances. These data were obtained from a study conducted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in 1959. It is obvious that low-cost power contributed to increasing usage which in turn contributed to purchase of more electrical appliances which help keep industries producing goods and workers employed.

From the standpoint of the national interest, I, as a big city Congressman, approve of the role that has been played during World War II, during the Korean crisis and by the TVA and Bonneville Power Administration in supplying power for defense during the present program of protecting the United States against aggression. Aluminum for the planes that helped to defeat the axis in World War II was produced by industries located in the TVA and on the Columbia. Only in those areas were there supplies of low-cost power available for the process of aluminum and other electro-process industries important to the war effort. As of now, more than half of TVA total power production goes to service the Atomic Energy Commission's facilities in that area. A substantial proportion of power generated by the Columbia River Basin dams is used to service the AEC facilities at Hanford, Wash.

The success of the programs that have been here described have stimulated areas elsewhere to look at their resources situation, particularly in the eastern part of the country where I live, in relation to meeting the problems of water pollution abatement, water supply navigation, and other uses of rivers.

The League of Women Voters, which enjoys respectability in the East, and perhaps is in disfavor in Louisiana, has set up as its goal the conservation of natural resources and the elimination of pollution. Whatever success they might achieve, of one thing you can be sure—that with such support, we will find this topic kept alive and legislators informed of its need and its importance.

I, for one, have supported the rural electrification program with vigor because I see its benefits and I recognize that all in our country, whether it be on the farm or in the city, have common interests. I have supported with pleasure the expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority's jurisdiction because I believe that the people of that area are entitled to cheap power and a right to receive the benefits which hydroelectric power provides for the residents in the area. If we in the city support programs which farmers feel are their private domain, we do so because we recognize their intimate relationship with us. We, on the other hand, have high hopes and confidence that the farmer be aware of and sympathetic to the problems which we cliffdwellers face in our urban centers. Newspaper reporters call this mutual assistance—"I scratch your back; you scratch my back theory of politics."

Our problems in the city are legion. We desperately need decent housing, and we would like to enjoy the fresh air which the farmers receive in their daily lives. We clamor for minimum wages because we feel that we should have the wherewithal to purchase the necessities of life and obtain those foods which we cannot abstract from the soil. If we recognize that we are our brothers' keepers and that there is no class warfare between the farmer and the city dweller, if we appreciate that education is the common concern of all, that decent housing, good health, are rights of mankind, then we have recognized the truth which has come down from all religions. When we recognize that truth, that Nature's bounty were planned for the benefit of mankind, then we can live as human beings and be proud of our way of life.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

The Very Reverend Omelan Mitzik, rector, St. Mary's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Chester, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, we heartily thank Thee for the precious heritage of the life we share and love in this land.

We humbly beseech Thee so to guide and bless the President of the United States, the Senate here assembled, and all others in authority, that justice and truth, peace and freedom, may be established among us and all people.

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the Presidential proclamation of the "Captive Nations Week," enacted by you the U.S. Congress, which ever reminds both the free and the enslaved that our Nation is ever the champion of the persecuted and oppressed.

We pray and humbly beseech Thee to grant unto the people of Ukraine that they may soon regain their liberties of old, and once again unfurl their flags, and fly them gloriously in freedom and liberation from the yoke of enslavement.

Let Thy spirit enter into our hearts and minds to inspire us to rededicate ourselves anew on this January day to the glorious cause of justice, freedom, and peace for all people. Cheer with hope all distressed peoples. Grant health and strength to our leaders. Help us to labor abundantly for freedom and peace. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 20, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1282) relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRASHES IN THE AIR—DEATH OF SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, stark tragedy again has hit the family of one of the Members of the Senate. Early

this morning, in a plane crash at Montego Bay, in Jamaica, Thomas Capehart and his wife, Nancy, the son and daughter-in-law of our dear friend and able colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], were killed.

Mr. President, the hearts of all Members of the Senate and their families go out now to Senator CAPEHART and Mrs. Capehart and their four grandchildren, as was also the case not long ago when the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] also suffered tragic loss.

Mr. President, I merely bespeak for all of us the deep feeling of sympathy which is shared by each one of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished acting minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], about the passing of the son of Senator CAPEHART. I know that it is a great blow to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, not only because it takes away from him a loved one, but also because this newest tragedy seems to fit into a pattern at the present time of airplane crashes which have taken the lives of so many good people in different parts of the world.

I wish to say that I, too, and all other Members of the Senate, I am sure, join in expressing our deep condolences and sympathy to the Senator from Indiana on his terrible loss.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to join the able Senator from California in expressing deep regret to the family of our colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], at his tragic loss.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart today. The news of airline crashes about which we have all read and heard so often in recent days has struck close to all of us.

Today Tom Capehart, son of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana, lost his life in the crash of an American-built airplane in the Caribbean area. Young Mrs. Capehart also was killed and so was one of Indiana's leading food processors, John H. Marhoefer. In addition the dead included my good friend and prominent civic leader, David L. Krupsaw, past chairman of the Arlington County, Va., Board of Commissioners.

To my colleague and to his family and to the Marhoefer family and the Krupsaw family, I extend my deepest and most sincere condolences. When Mrs. Hartke and I heard the tragic news of Tom Capehart's death in this new airline crash, our whole home was indeed saddened. More Americans had met unexpected and tragic death in the air.

At this moment, on the news wire comes news from Kansas City that another airliner is in trouble. This is a Trans World Airlines Constellation. The last report is:

Officers at the Olathe, Kansas, Naval Air Station, southwest of the city, were making preparations for an emergency landing.

It was at the naval station that a TWA plane made an emergency landing a year ago with 33 persons aboard. Its landing gear failed to lock down and the plane landed on its belly on a foam-covered runway. No one was injured.

TWA officials went to the naval station to assist in preparations for a possible emergency landing, tentatively set for 11 a.m. central standard time.

These and similar news items, Mr. President, have struck terror in the hearts of many Americans.

We have been accustomed since the advent of sputnik to second place in space exploration. We have become accustomed to second place in military power.

Must we also become accustomed to second rate airline safety? Will we take our new fear of airplanes and let it slowly build into a cynicism? Will we soon say "So, what? It is just another of those things?" Is terror in the air to be the accepted concept for America in the sixties?

I wonder, Mr. President, if we have become so accustomed to national defeat, so accustomed to cheating, so accustomed to rigging, so accustomed to moral decay that we simply accept relaxed airline safety as a matter of course. I wonder whether we are developing a national "ho hum" attitude?

It is true, Mr. President, that in terms of passenger miles our commercial safety record has been good and remains good. But it is in danger of becoming bad. Besides, we must strive for a record of no passenger deaths.

Last year in this country we counted 257 airline passenger deaths. We are off to a worse record in this new year.

We recognize that some of the deaths appear to have been caused by deliberate malice beyond the control of the airlines. We recognize that many Americans die on the highways. But on the highways most people feel they hold their own fate a bit more in their own hands. And, none of us wants the airways to become the death traps that our highways have become. We do not want the threat of death on the highways to become the threat of death on the airways.

There have been suggestions that airports are inadequate, that more rigid weather restrictions should be enforced, that safety inspections should be more frequent and more rigorous, that crews should have better training and more examinations.

All of these are being considered by our own aviation subcommittee, under the able and zealous leadership of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. For this we should, and do, commend them.

But where is the administration and the leadership that the people are crying for? Why does not the administration determine why it is that the Military Air Transport Service was able last year to operate what has been called the world's largest airline without a single fatality, while our national record was worsening? Will the administration check with the many airlines of this country who also have posted perfect safety records. Will the administration check into the activities of the Federal Aviation Agency and on safety regulations and their enforcement. Perhaps the administration should consider halting all air travel for a few days for an exhaustive check.

In this I am sure the carefully operated airlines will cooperate as will representatives of airline employees. I am sure the airplane manufacturers will cooperate.

The careful airlines suffer with the careless. The innocent suffer with the guilty. Americans die. Their families suffer the loss of loved ones. American pride suffers.

I feel certain, Mr. President, that my colleagues would join me in saying that bettering our air safety record now would be the greatest memorial we could provide for the loss of the son and daughter-in-law of our distinguished colleague. It would be a living memorial in which all Americans could share in saving loved ones, in peace of mind, and in restoration of our sagging national pride.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to compliment the Senator for his statement, to which I have listened with the greatest attention. I think it is a splendid, statesmanlike, and very honorable and characteristic statement for the Senator. There is no better memorial we could erect to Senator CAPEHART'S son, Tom, than to take precautions to see that other lives are not lost uselessly. Sometimes this is inevitable and there is nothing we can do about it, but I am confident, as the Senator is confident, that stricter measures will bring about the saving of lives.

It will require some money to tighten up the airports and provide better facilities. We must spend it. We Americans do not believe in putting money above lives.

I thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to join with him in the fine and high-minded expression he has just made, which has an appeal to the country's conscience, to which appeal I shall do my utmost to respond, as one Senator, and to which I feel all of us will endeavor to respond in the way the Senator has described.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from New York for the fine compliment he has paid me. I have worked with him in connection with many other matters, and I know that he speaks from the heart.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is a pleasure to be associated with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana, but it is with the deepest of sadness that we learn of the death of the son of our colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana. I wish to take this opportunity to extend to the senior Senator from Indiana, Mrs. Capehart, and other members of the family my deepest sympathy at their great loss.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I, too, wish to commend the junior Senator from Indiana for the remarks he has made on this occasion. We were all greatly shocked

when we heard the news about the crash of the plane and the death of the son and daughter-in-law of the senior Senator from Indiana.

I have had the privilege of working closely with the senior Senator from Indiana ever since I first came to the Senate. He and I have been members of the Housing Subcommittee. When the Republicans controlled the Senate, he was chairman of the subcommittee. When the Democrats controlled, I was the chairman. He is now the ranking minority member. We have had very close association.

I have often said that I have found the senior Senator from Indiana to be a man who is easy to work with, and one who is completely dependable. It is a terrific burden that has come to him and Mrs. Capehart at this time, and I certainly join in extending expressions of sympathy to both the Senator and Mrs. Capehart, as well as other members of their family.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I join in expressing deep sympathy to our colleague over this shocking incident. There is very little one can say at a time like this, but I know that HOMER CAPEHART and his wife and family will be in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Our colleague from Indiana brings to our attention the sad news in connection with the accident under discussion. Sometimes when these events come close to us and to our loved ones—in this case involving the son and daughter-in-law of one of our colleagues—we are perhaps conscious of an impact which we might not otherwise feel. Senator and Mrs. CAPEHART have been cherished friends for many years. Mrs. Randolph joins with me in sharing their sorrow.

I hope the Senator from Indiana will find it possible to include in his remarks, if he does not object, a statement made last night by Bryson Rash over the National Broadcasting System. He discussed, as he often does, an analytical subject in connection with a news item of current interest. I believe that Bryson Rash placed in perspective some of the problems to which the Senator from Indiana has so emphatically called our attention.

Mr. HARTKE. I shall certainly be glad to do as the Senator has requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who came into this body with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and as one who has had friendship with him over the years, I wish to add my brief word of sympathy and understanding in connection with the great loss which has come to him this morning, because of the death of a son and a daughter-in-law. The son was first known to me a number of years ago, when I was in Indiana.

The tragedy our beloved colleague has suffered is even greater, Mr. President, because of the fact that the Senator's four lovely grandchildren have now lost their parents.

Certainly Senator CAPEHART has the deep sympathy of each one of us, Mr. President; and particularly does our beloved colleague have my very deep sympathy, inasmuch as I, too, lost a son some years ago, and I have an intimate knowledge of how Senator CAPEHART feels at this time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions for the quarter ended December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled "An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of during the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of $4,566 to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Baltimore, Md., in full settlement of its claim for damage to bridge 8–A, Marley Neck branch, Baltimore, Md., sustained on March 13, 1959; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY VESSELS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage occasioned by vessels of the Coast Guard, during the period January 1 through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter, in the nature of a memorial, from Pedro J. Martinez, of Vega Baja, P.R., remonstrating against confirmation of the nomination of Juan Sanches de Jesus as Postmaster of Vega Baja, P.R.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF QUEENS COUNTY COMMITTEE, INC., THE AMERICAN LEGION, NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the Queens County Committee, Inc., of the American Legion, Department of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the U.S. Post Office has been hampered by restrictions to curb obscene matter sent through the mails; and

Whereas there is a strong need for legislation to stem the tide of filth to prevent delinquency and destruction of the moral, mental, and physical health of our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County committee of the American Legion, Department of New York, adopt this resolution, to approve and support H.R. 7379, an act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes; and H.R. 8496, a bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, both introduced by Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Member of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded through channels for adoption by the department of New York, and national body; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING, and to Congressman DELANEY, Congressman HOLTZMAN, Congressman BOSCH, and Congressman HALPERN, and Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations.

THOMAS STRAUSSNER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

Whereas the standards of decency and morality in the commercial field have been reduced to a new low; and

Whereas the character of our youth and the welfare of our country are of an important concern not only to parents but to all citizens as well; and

Whereas each State should have the right to decide, on the basis of its own public policy, questions of decency and morality, and to enact legislation with respect thereto, and not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County Committee of the American Legion, Department of New York, adopt this resolution to approve and support Senate Joint Resolution 116, which proposes to amend the Constitution, relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded through channels for adoption by department of New York and the national body; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; Senator KEATING, Senator JAVITS, Congressman DELANEY, Congressman HOLTZMAN, Congressman BOSCH, and Congressman HALPERN.

THOMAS STRAUSSNER,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 4586. An act to amend section 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 1033).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 6155. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951 (Rept. No. 1034).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution extending the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems (Rept. No. 1035); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 244. Resolution providing for a study of transportation policies in the United States; and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "CERTAIN ORGANIZED FRAUDULENT SCHEMES OPERATING IN THE UNITED STATES" (S. REPT. NO. 1032)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, 86th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report made by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, entitled "Certain Organized Fraudulent Schemes Operating in the United States," which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a press release, which I have issued today, in connection with this report, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, stated:

"Public hearings were held by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, under the acting chairmanship of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, in connection with Senate bill 550, which was introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, cosponsored by me. These hearings were held to determine whether existing Federal fraud statutes were adequate to cope with a vicious racket involving business opportunities by which some 70 firms in the United States had been fleecing small businessmen, who wished to sell their businesses, of an estimated $25 to $50 million annually.

"These hearings showed that in addition to this particular fraud, there were many types of schemes in operation throughout the United States, which were defrauding citizens of millions of dollars. One of the largest of these involved loans to small businessmen who need funds to continue operating.

"Unscrupulous salesmen, utilizing an elaborately prepared brochure, make numerous misrepresentations to the businessmen to the effect that their company will obtain from a lending institution the money required. The businessman fails to read the fine print in the contract and pays an advance fee to the salesman. Eventually, he learns he has been victimized. All the written contract calls for is the placing of a request for the loan with a lending institution. Loans do not result, and the operators of the particular fraud become enriched by $25 to $50 million per year.

"Other schemes highlighted include vanity publishers, who prey upon elderly and handicapped people; hair growers, who falsely claim that hair can be restored to baldheaded men; skip tracing, a deceptive means used in the location of delinquent debtors; common ailments, such as cancer, rheumatism, and arthritis, and the misrepresentations that permanent cures are available; scare tactics, utilized by many salesmen in the sale of their products; work-at-home schemes, where many housewives are defrauded; easy-to-win contests, where each winner receives credit on the purchase of items which are exorbitantly priced; and vending machines, which are sold to individuals based on fraudulent representations.

"The bill was not reported to the floor of the Senate, because, under presently existing penal legislation, the U.S. Post Office Department has hundreds of investigations pending in many of the categories mentioned above, and have been successful in obtaining many convictions."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 31 general officers in the Army and 3 general officers in the Air Force, as well as 101 flag and general officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The nominations placed on the calendar are as follows:

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense, vice Neil Hosler McElroy, resigned;

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., elevated;

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice W. J. McNeal, resigned;

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice James H. Douglas, elevated;

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenants general;

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. Manuel J. Asensio (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenants general;

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of admiral;

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list;

Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list;

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., and Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy, Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of vice admiral;

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel;

Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, in the grade of vice admiral;

Ephraim P. Holmes, and sundry other officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Alvan Fisher, and sundry other officers of the Naval Reserve, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Alan Shapley, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general;

Alpha L. Bowser, and sundry other officers fo the Marine Corps, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

James E. Howarth, Jr., for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve;

William W. Stickney, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, Marine Corps Reserve; and

George E. Tomlinson, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in addition I also report favorably 850 nominations in the Army and 145 nominations in the Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save

the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The nominations placed on the desk are as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers and persons, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Army of the United States and the Regular Army; and

John S. Flint, and sundry other officers and persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2873. A bill for the relief of William H. Brownlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2874. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2875. A bill to authorize the construction of certain improvements in the interest of flood control and allied purposes on the Gila and Salt Rivers, Ariz., from Gillespie Dam to Granite Reef Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2876. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyun Mo Kwak and his wife, Young Soo Ha Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2877. A bill to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2878. A bill to adjust Indian and non-Indian land use areas in the vicinity of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2879. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; and

S. 2880. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirements that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2881. A bill authorizing the improvement of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., in the interest of navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2882. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution designating the 20th day of April 1960 as National Urban League Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HART, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REIMBURSEMENT BY PRIVATE AIRCRAFT FOR COMPENSATION PAID CUSTOMS OFFICERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the junior Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees.

Our bill seeks to abolish a most unnecessary and annoying practice. Motorists entering the United States from Canada or Mexico are not required to pay the salary of the Bureau of Customs employees who make the border inspection. Private pilots entering from either country, however, sometimes have to pay 2 days' salary—as much as $50—to the customs official who clears them on a Sunday or holiday, even though the inspection takes only a few minutes.

Here is where the situation becomes complicated: If a second pilot comes through that station on the same day, he is charged one-half as much as the first one. If a third pilot clears, he is charged one-third; and so on. If five aircraft clear on this Sunday or holiday, only the last one across is charged the correct pro rata fee of $10. The preceding pilots have probably taken off in disgust by that time, so the Bureau of Customs, in accordance with the law and its regulations, makes out refunds and mails them to the overcharged pilots, providing they can be found.

In contrast, pilots entering Canada on Sundays or holidays simply pay the taxi or car fare—about $1—of the Canadian inspector who comes to the field.

Last year, I called a conference of interested agencies, pilot organizations, and Members of Congress. I was pleased that representatives of the Immigration and Naturalization Service arrived at that meeting, prepared to absorb similar charges sometimes levied against private pilots. I was particularly pleased at the interest of the able chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is cosponsoring my bill, and of two members of the committees which handle this legislation, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], of the Senate Finance Committee, the other cosponsor of this bill, and my Montana colleague, Representative LEE METCALF, who is introducing companion legislation.

The Government will lose no great sum of money by absorbing the overtime charges now levied against private pilots. The Bureau of Customs reports that the total cost of its overtime charges levied against private flyers in the period July 1–December 31, 1958, was $59,000. I suspect that the Bureau could save a substantial portion of this amount by the reduced clerical work and paper shuffling if our bill becomes law.

The bill introduced today has the support of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the Flying Farmers' Association, the National Association of State Aviation Officials, the International Northwest Aviation Council, and other aviation organizations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks an article from the January 1960 issue of AOPA Pilot, which details the injustice and inconvenience which our bill seeks to correct. The article, entitled "Customs Inequity: Problem For Congress," was written by Sue Timberlake.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2874) to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or oper-

ators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The article presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

CUSTOMS INEQUITY: PROBLEM FOR CONGRESS

(By Sue Timberlake)

There seems no hope now that Treasury administrators will end the strange inequity that last year cost general aviation some $80,000.

Working of this public injustice can be seen any weekday after 5 p.m., and any holiday or Sunday along this country's international borders where homecoming citizens in autos and private aircraft meet the U.S. Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs.

When automobiles are stopped for the usual inspection by American customs officials, the Government, day or night, picks up the check "in the public interest." Personal and executive aircraft undergo the same inspection, for the same reasons of national interest, but if their pilots are hep to the facts of border traffic, they watch the clock and the calendar. Unless willing to be hit with a sizable bill for clearing customs, they try to enter the United States during custom's regular working hours—ordinarily at international airports of entry, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., weekdays only. After the close of the "working day" or on Sundays and holidays, the pilot wishing clearance must pay the Government an amount theoretically equal to the inspector's overtime wage. Such a border bill may run to $40 or $50 for a 10-minute customs check.

True, the official's charge is prorated among the aircraft serviced, and, depending on the number of other aircraft sharing the cost of this same official's time, the pilot, may, or may not, get a refund. The system is, however, one of the strangest officialdom seems yet to have devised. It works like this:

If a customs official is called to inspect an aircraft on Sunday, he receives a 2 days' pay though he may be required on duty but a few minutes. First aircraft to be cleared by him that day puts up the whole amount of his wage, say, $50.24. If he is called to clear a second airplane during the day, this second plane is charged half the amount or $25.12, and should no more aircraft be cleared by this official, a like sum of $25.12 will be refunded to the first plane through. A third airplane would pay $16.75, a fourth $12.56, and so forth, with the proper refunds tallied at the end of the day for aircraft that have been overcharged. If, however, more than one official is employed to make the inspections, each one receives his full, 2 days' premium compensation.

For years pilots, and particularly those living near the borders, have protested this procedure. Since they can't ever be sure beforehand what their share of an overtime charge will be, pilots flying on business to Canada, for instance, will often feel constrained to close their own business day early, in order to slip in before overtime charges go into effect.

"It's not the money," one told the pilot, "but the feeling that I'm being penalized for flying that makes me so mad."

Tourists, flying for pleasure, must often cut short a holiday to avoid arriving at the border on a Sunday, unless they are willing to pay the Government a fee most consider excessive and discriminatory. Further embarrassment is caused by the fact that the Canadian Government pays its own inspectors, and the pilot at no time is charged more than the small transportation fee required to bring an off-duty officer to the airport.

AOPA has long opposed this customs policy, and this year is intensifying its campaign to obtain legislative relief.

The AOPA files bulge with protests, as, we suspect, do those of the Customs Bureau.

Here are some typical complaints from October correspondence:

"We felt like flying up to Toronto for lunch on Sunday. To get back into the United States that afternoon cost us $7.50."

"After a short fishing trip in Canada we had to get back before business on Monday. Customs bill Sunday afternoon: $15.20."

"I had purposely avoided returning to the United States on Sunday, but mechanical trouble tied me up until after hours on Monday. My arrival at customs was just after 7 p.m. and my bill was $24.56."

Last October one pilot wrote a letter to his Congressman that sums up the feelings of the majority of these pilots: "* * * I was returning from a trip to Canada, having just taken my boys to camp and in clearing customs at the Cleveland airport, I was informed that I would have to pay overtime fees to the customs officials inasmuch as it was Sunday. * * * Approximately a week later I again crossed the border on Sunday in my automobile, along with thousands of other motorists. Obviously I did not pay for the customs service in this instance.

Customs and immigration officials are, in effect, police officers, whose function is to protect the entire population of the United States. They are not performing any specific service to an individual when he enters or leaves the country, any more than any policeman or fireman is.

"It is difficult for me to see why I should be paying their salary and overtime on Sunday. When I am a private citizen driving an automobile I do not have to do so. This seems to be one of those hangovers of old customs which does not have any basis, and I think that overtime itself is probably an incorrect procedure. Why couldn't they schedule their days so that the men on duty on Sunday worked a regular shift, not receiving overtime pay? This is done in other 24-hour, 7-day-a-week operations in industry and, I presume, in Government."

Unfortunately the Customs Bureau itself is bound by the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to pay its inspection officers premium pay for nights, Sundays and holidays, and to pass this charge on to private persons clearing customs. Automobile traffic has been exempted by law from the requirement to reimburse the Government for overtime services of Customs personnel, but not so traffic by air.

As the Customs Bureau finds justification for its charges in the statutes so it appears that general aviation will obtain relief only from legislative action. One of those best informed on the problem is Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who said recently:

"The annual income from these overtime charges by the Bureau of Customs is relatively small and does not, in my opinion, compensate for the paperwork, irritation, and injustice caused by the present system which sometimes requires that a private pilot pay $48 for an inspection.

"Therefore, I intend to press during the next session of Congress for abolition of this charge against private pilots. They should receive the same treatment which our Government presently gives persons who cross the border by car or rail but refuses to give to pilots."

The basic law governing the payment of overtime wages to customs inspectors was written into section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267). This law requires the Secretary of the Treasury to fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for customs inspectors who remain on duty after 5 p.m. and before 8 a.m. or who are required to work on Sundays or national holidays. This compensation is to be one-half day's pay for each 2 hours or fraction of at least 1 hour's duration that the overtime work extends beyond 5 p.m. Only limitation is that no employee is to get more than 2½ days' pay between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m.

Here's what this means in practical terms. Suppose you are a customs officer in Detroit. Your half-day pay may amount to $12.56. If you work overtime from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. you make $12.56, though during this time you may have spent only 15 minutes inspecting an incoming aircraft. An aircraft arriving at 8 p.m. would be obliged to pay the Government $25.12 or the equivalent of your full day's pay.

Besides specifying this manner of calculating overtime, the law states that the extra compensation is to be paid by the "master, owner, agent, or consignee of * * * the vessel or other conveyancee" to be inspected.

According to Customs officials, when the Bureau feels it is necessary, tours of duty may be staggered, so that officers may be assigned to duty at some locations after 5 p.m. without working overtime. Prior to 1944, this was also done at some locations on Sunday.

Then January 3, 1944, the Supreme Court handed down an interpretation of the tariff law in the case of *U.S.* v. *Howard C. Myers*, making it illegal for the Customs Bureau to put inspection personnel on regular Sunday duty at their regular wage. The courts said extra compensation was mandatory and should be collected from those serviced.

That year, Congress amended the Tariff Act exempting certain groups from the requirement to reimburse the Government for overtime compensation of its inspectors. The amendment stated that the requirement "shall not apply to the owner, operator, or agent of a highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry between the United States and Canada or between the United States and Mexico, nor to the lading or unlading of merchandise, baggage, or persons arriving in or departing from the United States by motor vehicle, trolley, car, on foot, or by other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry. * * *"

From time to time since 1944, bills have been introduced in Congress to amend this section of the Tariff Act. Latest, H.R. 4543, was introduced last spring by Representative JACK WESTLAND, of Washington. This bill, referred to the Ways and Means Committee, would have exempted "persons arriving in the United States from Canada or departing from the United States to Canada by private aircraft." It was later broadened as H.R. 6534 and introduced by Representative ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota. Mr. NELSEN'S bill made the exemption apply at both the Canadian and the Mexican borders.

AOPA issued a memorandum on the bill drawing attention to the changed position of aviation since enactment of the Tariff Act:

"In 1930, there were about 9,000 civil aircraft in the United States and only about 15,000 certificated airplane pilots. Today civil aircraft in the United States number nearly 100,000 and there are about three-fourths of a million certificated airplane pilots. The great majority of today's civil aircraft are used in the field of general aviation and are the most practical means of transportation by those who engage in commerce and industry beyond our Nation's borders, an activity highly important to the national economy of the United States."

AOPA pointed out that "The President's Civil Air Policy Report of 1954 states that 'the public interest requires that the benefits of air transportation in all its forms be

widely available at low cost. The American people have accepted the airplane as a primary means of travel.'"

Following introduction of these bills, the chairman of the aviation subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee called a meeting for May 7, 1959, to be attended by various aviation spokesmen and representatives of Customs and Immigration. Included were AOPA, the International Northwest Aviation Council, Flying Farmers and others.

As Vic Reinemer, secretary to Senator MURRAY, put it in a newsletter at the time:

"Immigration and Naturalization Service got off the hook real fast, by saying it planned to put out new regulations this week so the Service would absorb the objectionable overtime payments. The Bureau of Customs promised to send up requested information on the money it would lose, and save, by adopting less cumbersome procedure. The general feeling at the meeting was that if the Bureau of Customs doesn't suggest a better procedure, Congress will."

If somewhat perfunctorily, Customs looked for another solution and considered the idea of making a flat charge for the inspection of private aircraft at night, Sundays or holidays by averaging out anticipated costs.

Overtime fees at all airports between July 1 and December 31, 1958, were compiled, and it was estimated that during the year the average charge to private pilots had been $10.42 and to commercial operators (excluding the airlines), $16.65. The Bureau calculated that on this basis a possible flat fee of $12 might cover costs.

According to David B. Strubinger, Assistant Commissioner of Customs, the Bureau was doubtful of the propriety or legality of the flat fee system. "We submitted the proposal to the formal decision of the Comptroller General," he said, "but we weren't surprised when it was turned down."

Strubinger insists that the Bureau could not take on itself responsibility for covering the expense of overtime compensation by the flat fee system without the approval of the General Accounting Office, for anticipated income might fall short of costs. "Then we'd be in trouble," he said.

The proposal was turned down by the Comptroller General on the grounds that under a flat fee system the charge to an individual would not be measured by the exact cost incurred by the Government on his account. At a busy airport where the customs fee is now small because it is shared by numerous aircraft, the flat charge would be higher than the average fee under the present system. At airports where traffic is infrequent, the Comptroller General argued, an aircraft being serviced would probably pay less than the actual cost of his inspection to the Government.

Whether this makes sense or not, the Comptroller General's decision was negative and no hope of amelioration is now to be held on this score.

Strubinger makes it clear that the Bureau would oppose any legislation exempting aircraft from customs payments in the near future, contending that it is felt the cost to the Bureau unjustified in the public interest.

"From a policy standpoint, we feel it would be an unreasonable expenditure," he said.

Favored instead is a standard overtime pay system for inspectors as proposed in Congress from time to time. AOPA supported such a Federal Employees Overtime Pay Act in 1952. The bill, which failed to get off the ground owing, to some extent to union opposition, would have cut excessive overtime costs—particularly the unreasonable 2-day pay for brief stints on Sundays and holidays.

In its reply to the Congressmen after the May 7 meeting on Capitol Hill, the Customs Bureau pointed out that Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, had introduced a bill (S. 1933) to provide a uniform premium pay system.

"The bill provides for payment of lower rates of overtime compensation to customs employees which, in turn, would reduce overtime charges to parties in interest," the memorandum said.

"For example," it continued, "the compensation for the services of a customs officer up to 3 hours on a Sunday or holiday would be about $17, as compared with about $46 under existing law if no other inspection service is rendered on that day.

"In addition, the bill provides, in section 2(c), for a standard rate to be charged per man-hour for special inspection service. Because of the lower overtime earnings of a customs employee, the flat rate charged for the inspection of private aircraft would be lower than the lowest flat rate shown above for private flyers ($11) [Under flat fee system.—Editor], and could be as low as $7.50."

But a discriminatory fee, no matter how low, would still harass aviation.

Customs officials make much of the fact that, if overtime customs service was provided free to general aviation, the total expenditure in overtime payments would soar.

The Customs Bureau has argued that free customs service to aircraft outside regular hours cannot be justified by public demand. Yet, they unashamedly turn the argument around, contending that a valid reason for opposing free service during overtime periods would be the rising cost to the Government as more aircraft took advantage of the opportunity to clear customs at hours convenient for them.

"Yes, we are convinced traffic would increase," Strubinger told the Pilot.

The repressive effect of excessive border charges on the movement of air commerce is cause for great concern. Hopeful that the Customs Bureau would correct the problem by fairer interpretation of the present law, AOPA said last spring:

"The Bureau of Customs was established to serve the United States by performing at public expense a number of essential services at the Nation's borders. As methods of transportation change and good international relations become increasingly important to this Nation, the Bureau of Customs is expected to modify its procedures or regulations to meet changing conditions. The service to aircraft users at our borders is not adequate and should be improved. Needed improvement could probably be made under a fair administrative interpretation of the present law. However, the Bureau of Customs and the Secretary of the Treasury have not initiated corrective action."

As they have not, and it now appears that they will not, the only remedy lies with Congress which alone can amend the Tariff Act. This is the year for general aviation pilots to speak out—to let their Congressmen know their views on a matter of equity.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to improve and remove inequities in the social security program. Companion legislation is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative CECIL KING, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

This legislation will:

First. Remove the present $1,200 limitation on earned income with respect to individuals receiving benefits.

Second. Provide earlier retirement at reduced benefits for men at age 62 and women at age 60.

Third. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits.

Fourth. Provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that this proposed legislation will improve our social security program by removing provisions and requirements which experience has shown us are both unwise and unfair.

Nation's Business, the monthly publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, speaks out on this vital issue. In an article entitled "Let's Take the Brakes Off Growth," in the November 1959 issue. the chamber of commerce publication says of our old-age and survivors insurance program:

> Permission for older people to work may often mean the difference between comfort and penury, self-confidence and despair, success, and failure.
>
> For both economic and psychological reasons, changes in our old age pension systems are sorely needed.
>
> REMOVE EARNINGS LIMITATION
>
> If an individual is qualified to draw benefits, under title II of the Social Security Act, he may not earn more than $1,200 a year in wages. There is, however, no such limitation on an individual who receives income from investments and annuities. Mr. Jones, who has retired and is receiving $100,000 a year in stock dividends, bonds, and so forth, in addition can receive his social security check each month while basking in the sun at some vacation resort. Mr. Smith, who has worked hard all his life but has had no opportunity to accumulate large investments cannot earn more than $1,200 a year in wages if he wishes to qualify for his monthly social security check.

Mr. President, this great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need this protection. The limitation is unjust, it is inequitable, it is unrealistic, and it is absurd. It penalizes our great American initiative. We cannot continue to penalize the health and vigorous members of our society who would like to continue working in jobs for which they are qualified and needed in order to supplement the bare subsistence income they receive under social security.

Mr. President, I believe that the earnings limitation should be completely removed. A comprehensive study by the proper committees will indicate the economic feasibility of doing this immediately. If for fiscal reasons it cannot be done immediately then a temporary adjustment should be made raising the present inadequate $1,200 ceiling to a figure which will be more reasonable, desirable and one which will take into account the high cost of living.

Recently, I conducted hearings of the special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems in Terre Haute, Ind. One of our witnesses, Dr. Waldo F.

Mitchell, emeritus professor of economics, Indiana State Teachers College, has some very interesting comments on retirement. He said:

> Retirement policies force workers to retire or become unemployed or downgraded. This reduces production more than consumption is decreased, thus tending to cause inflation.

Dr. Mitchell went on to say:

> We need the production of older persons who are still able to work and are desirous of doing so. They need to continue the good feeling that they are useful; and public interest is served by changing the procedure of retirement.

I think that this statement is excellent and is one of the most important reasons why we must stop the trend of allowing the elderly to become one of America's forgotten class of citizens.

LOWER AGE REQUIREMENTS

In addition, Mr. President, to removing this limitation, I feel our social security laws should be such that our elderly citizens should have something to look forward to—and at an age when they can enjoy its benefits. I, therefore, am providing in this legislation for optional retirement at age 60 for women and 62 for men, at reduced benefits. After a lifetime of work and after having contributed to a retirement fund in the form of social security, I feel that our older citizens are entitled to this additional consideration.

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Another provision in present law, Mr. President, which is inequitable is that provision which requires that a person be 50 years of age before he can qualify for disability benefits. An individual may be fully paid up under present law but be less than 50 and not qualify for disability benefits. We are trying to provide for some measure of security for those unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity. Why should we limit the application of this to those over 50? If an individual is fully paid up he should be eligible for disability benefits at any age—provided, of course, that he meets the other eligibility requirements. My bill would remove this inequity.

EMPLOYMENT FOR THE ELDERLY

The second bill which I am introducing, Mr. President, would provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age. This bill is the result of some studies I have made on the hiring of individuals over the age of 45. I find that by the time a worker has reached the age of 45, in all probability, he is well settled in his chosen occupation. Generally he does not want to leave his job, and he will not voluntarily. But once unemployment does strike an older worker it creates great problems. We have become a nation of wage and salary workers with 80 percent of the gainfully employed in the hire of others. The older worker is, therefore, becoming more dependent upon the attitudes, employment policies, and economic fortunes of others. Large organizations with maximum hiring ages because of seniority system and promotion-from-within policies make it difficult for an older individual to find employment. The Federal and State Governments have encouraged the hiring of elderly citizens through certain employment practices and publicity which has been shed on the problem. I feel that the Federal Government may encourage the hiring of workers over the age of 45 in another way. That is the purpose of legislation which I am introducing today.

Employers paying into the social security trust fund for employees over the age of 45 will receive a specific tax credit equal to one-half of 1 percent of the wages with respect to which the social security tax is imposed on such employees. In other words, at present tax rates, the employer will pay only a 2½-percent tax rate for employees over 45, rather than the 3-percent tax rate which he would be required to pay for employees under the age of 45.

I believe that this will encourage the hiring of those over 45. I feel it is at least worthy of consideration as a partial solution to this problem. I hope that it, together with legislation removing the earning limitation, reducing the retirement age, and removing the age requirement for disability benefits, will receive the early consideration of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 2879. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; and

S. 2880. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title.

THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT OF 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on September 8 of last year, I introduced a bill, S. 2663, providing relief through the Secretary of Labor for American industries which have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a result of foreign competition difficulties growing out of the differential in wage costs between American and foreign manufacturers.

I made it very clear at that time that S. 2663 constituted a tentative and preliminary recommendation and that considerable work remained to be done in the way of reviewing and tightening up the proposal put forth in this bill.

During the several months since this bill was introduced, I have had a tremendous volume of mail from American workmen and the owners and managers of manufacturing firms who feel that legislation along the lines of S. 2663 is very much needed. Many representatives of industries and labor unions generously offered their advice on ways in which the bill that I introduced last year could be expanded and improved. In light of this very encouraging and gratifying response, I have spent the past several weeks working with interested parties and authorities in the field of trade law to revise S. 2663, with the intention of bringing a more complete and technically sound bill on this subject before the Congress.

Mr. President, I send to the desk at this time a revised copy of S. 2663. I ask that it be introduced as a separate bill and that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 2882) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill is cosponsored by Senators BEALL, of Maryland; BRIDGES and COTTON, of New Hampshire; DODD, of Connecticut; PROUTY, of Vermont; and WILEY, of Wisconsin.

I ask that the bill may lie on the table until Thursday, January 28, so that any other Senators who may wish to join in cosponsoring it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the changes in S. 2663 are for the most part of a procedural and technical nature. S. 2663, as introduced last September and as revised for introduction at this time, establishes general procedures whereby injured American industries can appeal for relief to the Secretary of Labor who would then make an investigation and publish a finding in much the same fashion as does the Tariff Commission under the existing escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951.

The principle to which both S. 2663 and the new bill are keyed is in my mind clear cut and straightforward. American wages are well known to be considerably higher than wages abroad. In many cases, the basic reason for the wage differential between American and foreign producers is the fact that American minimum wages are set by law by the Federal Government and by the governments of the various States. This is a matter of public policy. We have decided, and rightly so, that no American worker should be paid a wage that is so low as to prevent him from enjoying what we consider to be minimal living standards. Congress is now about to consider raising the minimum wage, and in doing so we reassert the fundamental

public policy that all men should be assured of a share of the fruits of America's economic well-being.

If a manufacturer in a foreign country pays a wage equivalent in dollars to 10, 15, or 25 cents per hour, it is obvious that he is likely to have a significant competitive advantage over his American counterpart. This is especially true in industries in which wages constitute a considerable proportion of total production costs. It is generally these industries which are most seriously affected by increased foreign competition.

Let me name a few examples of American industries in which wages constitute a significant proportion of total costs and in which foreign competition has become increasingly more difficult to meet. They are: textiles, all types of apparel, kitchen utensils and various kinds of hand tools, small appliances, novelty items and toys, rugs, bicycles, umbrellas, light machinery, footwear, tile and ceramic products, athletic equipment, and plumbing fixtures.

Mr. President, I want to make it absolutely clear that I do not call for, nor do I want to see, a full-scale and sweeping reversal of America's trade policies. I am only interested in seeing that more equal justice is meted out to domestic industries which are clearly hurt by increased low-wage foreign competition. In all tariff legislation which has been passed in recent years, Congress has demanded that the needs of such industries be given every possible consideration. Many Americans, myself included, do not believe that existing procedures by which relief is obtained have effectively aided those American industries and their workers who deserve and badly need some sort of trade relief or assistance.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduced last September, and which I have introduced in a revised form today, is I believe a moderate and sensible approach to a serious problem which in recent years has not received the attention that it deserves. The trade agreements and treaties of all nations contain clauses or provisions permitting that adjustments be made to aid and relieve domestic industries in cases of clear and undeniable need. Every nation of the world watches over its own interests. So should we; although it is certainly assumed that in doing so we must not violate or abrogate existing agreements or understandings with our allies and trade partners throughout the world.

As a Member of Congress for the past 13 years, I have always supported the principle of reciprocal trade. I voted for and worked hard to initiate the Marshall plan. I know full well that it would be unwise to repudiate or reverse these policies and programs.

In this light, Mr. President, I believe that we are nearing or have now reached an important turning point. The United States is now faced with a new international economic and political situation. Many of the war-torn and hobbled nations of Europe are now riding the crest of a great and heartening recovery. Their economies are booming, their currency is sound, their people are prosperous as never before. The nations of the free world are stronger than at any time since the end of the war. The success of America's herculean postwar foreign-aid program was to a large extent responsible for this strength. Of this, the beleaguered taxpayers of a great nation can be justifiably proud.

It is clear to me that, as a consequence of these events, the United States is today faced with a considerably different situation from that of the early postwar period. We must be prepared to reexamine and readjust our trade and aid policies accordingly, and in doing so, we must seriously consider all proposals for action which, while consistent with our aspirations for world peace and freedom, are at the same time fair to those American industries and their workers who have been damaged or are seriously threatened by foreign competition. This is no easy goal. I am well aware of this fact. Nevertheless, I cannot accept the premise that the best way to understand our difficulties is to leave them alone and see if they get worse. It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I offered my original bill, S. 2663, and it is in the same spirit that I offer the revised form of this bill today.

Mr. President, Congress must consider measures intended to strike a better and fairer balance between our domestic industries—which have not gotten a "fair shake" under existing statutes—and our international interests, which all of us realize cannot and must not be ignored.

The new bill is not very different in scope and interest from its predecessor. As I said earlier, the changes which have been made are essentially of a technical and procedural nature. Let me give some examples.

The new bill spells out a standard of injury in much clearer and more detailed fashion than did S. 2663. In the original bill, S. 2663, the Secretary of Labor was empowered to carry out an investigation and if necessary implement appropriate relief. The President had the right to disapprove this action. The new bill follows the escape clause more closely and gives the Secretary the responsibility for recommending relief which the President then either approves or disapproves. It also follows the escape clause more closely in that it establishes limits beyond which the Secretary and/or the President cannot go in recommending or implementing relief.

In general, the procedures of the Secretary's investigation in the new bill are more complete and more closely in accord with the basic statutes in this field. The new bill changes the period before which the bill or any directive thereunder would go into effect. Other similar procedural changes have been made which are of minor importance and are of a primarily technical nature.

Mr. President, I want at this time to acknowledge the assistance of and to thank the Senators who have indicated to me their desire to cosponsor this measure, many of whom have made suggestions for changes. I listed the names of the cosponsors to date, and I hope other Senators will feel inclined to join in cosponsorship of this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, some Members of the House of Representatives have indicated to me that they plan to introduce the same bill.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to extend my sincere appreciation to all the Members of Congress I have named and to all of the many others from industry, from labor, and from other places who have so kindly and competently assisted me in the revision of S. 2663, for the introduction of this bill today.

The bill, S. 2882, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.—Sweatshop labor conditions are prohibited by law in the United States. The rapid expansion of American foreign trade in recent years, in effect, permits foreign industries in which wages and working conditions are below American standards to compete with domestic industries in which wages are significantly higher and in which minimum wages and working conditions are set by the laws of the United States and the several States. Many American industries, especially those in which labor costs constitute a high proportion of the total production cost have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a result of such competition. The following procedures are established to provide relief for such American industries.

SEC. 3. PROCEDURES.—(a) Upon the request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress, or upon application of the representative of any domestic industry or employee organization in a domestic industry, or upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") or his designee shall make an investigation of any situation in which it is alleged that the differential in costs, due to the existence of wage rates and working conditions significantly below United States standards, gives foreign manufacturer or producers a competitive advantage over United States manufacturers or producers.

(b) In carrying out an investigation and hearings under the foregoing procedure the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, consider (among other factors): wages and all other forms of remuneration for work performed, labor productivity, production costs and the components thereof, levels of automation, working conditions, legislation or regulations pertaining to working conditions, and living standards in the United States and in the country or countries of origin of the imported article or articles under investigation.

(c) The Secretary shall request the views of the Tariff Commission in writing on relevant trade and international factors in all cases in which he deems such information necessary to the investigatory process under this Act. He may, in addition, request the views of any other interested agency or agencies.

(d) Should the Secretary find that a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured by imports of goods which are produced in foreign countries under wages and working conditions below United States standards, he shall recommend to the President such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies, as he shall deem necessary or proper in each case, but in no event shall such new or additional duties exceed existing rates of duty by 100 per cen-

tum or by the amount of 50 per centum ad valorem, whichever is higher, or shall such new or additional quotas exceed existing quotas by 50 per centum.

(e) Upon receipt of the Secretary's report and recommendations, the President may by order impose such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies (1) as recommended by the Secretary to be necessary to afford relief to the domestic industry, or (2) as are determined by the President to be necessary for such purpose.

(f) The Secretary shall make and publish, with dispatch and in no event more than six months after the request, application, or resolution is made, a report on each request, application or resolution under this Act.

(g) Any order issued pursuant to this Act may be modified, suspended or terminated under the procedures herein established.

(h) The new or additional duties or import quotas imposed by the President or other action taken by him under this Act and any modification, suspension, or termination thereof, shall become effective on such date as he shall specify in his order and shall be treated for administrative purposes as a part of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) The Secretary shall within ninety days after the enactment of this Act promulgate procedural regulations to give effect to the authority conferred upon him hereunder.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, but in any event not later than ninety days after the date of enactment.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, it has just been communicated to me that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wishes to join as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation I have just introduced. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the 20th day of April 1960, as National Urban League Day. Nineteen hundred and sixty marks the 50th anniversary of the founding in New York City of the National Urban League, which is the oldest and largest interracial social agency in the country. It has contributed immeasurably not only to advances in working and living conditions of Negroes, but also to an increasing cooperation among Americans regardless of race, color, or creed. It has been an inspiration for people everywhere who are concerned with problems of race relations and their solution through interracial cooperation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 151) designating the 20th day of April 1960, as National Urban League Day, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks in introducing the joint resolution I present an article dealing with the work of the Urban League, written by Lester B. Granger; as well as a message of congratulations from the President of the United States on the observance of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the National Urban League.

There being no objection, the article and message were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEAMWORK: THE URBAN LEAGUE ANSWER TO THE RACE PROBLEM—THE URBAN LEAGUE, SO SMALL AND UNCOMPLICATED COMPARED TO THE SIZE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE PROBLEM, HAS WORKED OVER 50 YEARS WITH INCREASING EFFECTIVENESS

(By Lester B. Granger)

Essentially, the Urban League is a do-it-yourself operation applied to social and economic problems faced by urban communities with growing intensity as the Negro urban population continues to increase. The do-it-yourself character of the organization lies in the fact that without lecturing, without indicting, and without name-calling, the Urban League has instilled in millions of Americans of different races the desire and energy to do something themselves about cleaning up racial difficulties heaped against their back doors.

The success of the organization has puzzled some who have never quite understood what the league has tried to do. It has elicited the scorn of some who place a low priority on "the educational approach." However, it has brought a sense of fulfillment to uncountable thousands and tens of thousands of Negro families who have walked into better jobs as a result of league effort, moved from hovels into homes and strengthened their appreciation of themselves as individuals and their own importance to the community's well-being.

In tackling this job, the Urban League was, of course, a pioneer; more, it became what one board member has described as "a perpetually curious but satisfying anomaly." From the beginning the league has attacked social problems, the existence of which is often unknown to the average white citizen. It has also defined and served social needs of a Negro minority which that minority's own leadership has sometimes failed to recognize. It has operated in a set of social and economic circumstances as lawless in their way as the familiar western frontier town of TV portraiture. But, unlike the marshal in the TV dramas, the Urban League has had no sixshooter nor even a club. So it has had to develop tools—its own tools—for a special task.

The tools became those of commonsense and intelligent self-interest of cool-headed discussion around the conference table, of indisputable facts backed with persuasive arguments; and the leverage applied by the Urban League became that of specific conscience and the basic desire of the average citizen to be regarded as a good citizen.

And the anomaly of the league's role lies in the fact that though its staff members are generally trained social workers and the organization itself is listed as a social agency, one seldom finds other social agencies tackling the kinds of tasks undertaken by the Urban League.

Further, though the league enrolls the largest and most active body of white and colored volunteers to be found in the field of race relations, it cannot be classed as a mass movement. And though it is criticized by some as being nonmilitant and by others as being overaggressive, actually its educational approach makes criticism inevitable.

Not merely the urban Negro population, but Americans of all races everywhere have collected dividends earned by the Urban League method and leadership. The dividends, which have consisted of solid, steadily enlarging gains in the status and security of the Negro population, spell greater stability for the national economy and enhanced status of the American democracy. For instance, it was the Urban League that in World War I introduced hundreds of northern and southern employers for the first time to the tremendous reservoir of industrial manpower comprised of Negro workers on the South's farms. In the Second World War the league outpaced the New Deal administration in first placing Negroes in assembly line and other production jobs of the war industry. In the postwar period the league played an important role in securing those workers' retention of their jobs.

The Urban League's use of the social survey as a technique in reducing racial tensions and pinpointing their causes was applied to a dozen northern and southern cities threatened with race riots toward the close of World War II. It not only took those cities out of the riot zone, but set them far along the road toward new goals of racial amity and improved Negro health and welfare.

Another League technique has become a distinctive tool as well as product. A national Commerce and Industry Council composed of ranking officers of three dozen of the Nation's most important corporations serves the movement as critic, coach and interpreter in advancing the use of trained Negro workers throughout American industry. An example of this council's influence is the now widespread use of Negro engineers, chemists, and other technicians across the country. In the same way a national Trade Union Advisory Council brings the league closer to the labor movement in a joint effort to uncover for corrective action, by labor leaders or Government, instances of racial discrimination by international or local unions.

Less dramatic than its industrial and labor relations activities, but equally as important, has been the Urban League's role in the health and welfare field. It has served as an interpretive, advisory and prodding influence for the benefit of the whole national structure of public and voluntary agencies.

In the years ahead the Urban League is certain to etch its role more sharply than ever on the attention of the American public. The continued urbanization of the Negro population has meant: (1) spreading problems of segregated housing and slum blight; (2) slum clearance, urban renewal and tenant relocations; (3) smashing of old family patterns and disintegration of social influences; (4) individual disillusionment and frustration; and (5) cynicism and aggressive behavior of weaker personalities. These are all problems so complicated that those who are the direct sufferers are apt to be the least able to understand them. They require resources so widespread and so involved in their relationship that only skilled and experienced leadership can make use of them.

It is this kind of leadership that the Urban League has been building up for 50 years, but needs to multiply several times in order to meet the problem ahead. Such leadership, already welded together in working teams—north, south, east and west in a single organization, has been the inspiration of the Urban League slogan, "American Teamwork Works." It is essential that the Nation see to it that the slogan is made an accurate prophecy in the years immediately ahead.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of the 50th anniversary of the National Urban League.

Our Nation was founded on the concept of liberty and justice for all its citizens. Steady progress has been made in applying this concept in the daily life of America but the need for further work and vigilance remains.

To strengthen the individual and the general welfare of our people we must continue

to advance our traditions of equal opportunity regardless of race, religion, or national origin. Moreover, the progress we make in this field of human rights is closely watched by our neighbors abroad. They look upon it as one measure of success of our form of government.

As the National Urban League champions the cause of equal opportunity, it renders a splendid service to our people and to the hope of freedom around the world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO MEMORY OF WOODROW WILSON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BYRD of Virginia, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GREEN, HART, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, ROBERTSON, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk through January 25, so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, as twenty-eighth President of the United States, won the enduring gratitude of the people of the United States and throughout the world for his farsighted and tireless efforts to achieve a lasting peace, with justice and freedom for all; and

Whereas he so eloquently phrased the principles for which this country stands and provided, with his own high standards of integrity, vision and compassionate goodwill, an inspiration for generations to come: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in Washington, District of Columbia, or in its immediate environs. The Commission shall, in general, decide on the advisability of one of two kinds of memorials: one which would be a monument similar to those which honor Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln; or one which will serve as a building of a functional nature, or, as it is often called, a "living memorial." The Commission shall study, among others, proposals to associate the memorial with the Washington International Center program for international visitors.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Former Presidents of the United States, at their pleasure;

(2) Two persons to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(3) Two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(4) Two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(5) Three members to be appointed by the President of the United States, one from each of the following:

(A) The Woodrow Wilson Foundation;

(B) The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission (now discharged); and

(C) One member of the Department of the Interior, who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative.

(c) The Commission shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not one of the sponsors of the joint resolution which the able Senator has just introduced. I have a policy against cosponsorship. But I wish to be recorded at this time as a supporter of the joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator from Tennessee for his support of the joint resolution authorizing the creation of a committee to make a study of plans to construct a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF CERTAIN CAMPAIGN COSTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, under the previous order, I ask that the names of Senators KENNEDY, MANSFIELD, MORSE, and MURRAY be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 2823, to correct certain abuses in campaign financing, which I introduced on January 14.

I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for another week in order that additional persons desiring to cosponsor this measure may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the names of the additional cosponsors will be added to the bill, and the bill will lie on the desk for another week, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE, PLATTE, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2860) to provide for a highway bridge over the Missouri River west or southwest of Platte, S. Dak., which I introduced on the 19th of January, may have a star print with a minor correction, and that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JURISDICTION OVER AMERICANS EMPLOYED BY, OR ACCOMPANYING, OUR ARMED FORCES OVERSEAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask that his name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 253, to establish a select committee to recommend legislation relating to the jurisdiction over Americans employed by, or accompanying, our Armed Forces overseas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Address delivered by Senator CARLSON before the national convention, Association of Wheat Growers, December 10, 1959.

USES OF OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Tuesday the majority leader inserted in the RECORD a challenging article entitled "The Second Best," written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann. In the article Mr. Lippmann asked whether the drive to reduce the share of the national income spent by the National Government had not also reduced the capacity of the United States to meet the enormous challenges of the decade ahead.

Today Mr. Lippmann has followed that article with another, and equally pertinent, inquiry into the proper uses of our national resources. The article is entitled "A Satisfied Nation." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report, which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies in our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government. This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Then the chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our liberty to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a straw man. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portent doomsday in 1963. But it does portent a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION BILL, S. 2549

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of Senators the fact that hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have been scheduled on the proposed Resources and Conservation Act of 1960—S. 2549. The hearings open tomorrow, Friday, at 2 o'clock, to accommodate certain Governors and other State officials who will be in Washington on other matters. The hearings will resume on Thursday morning, January 28, and will continue on the next day, Friday, January 29.

There is, I know, in the Senate, a keen awareness that the United States is not keeping natural resource programs abreast of the resource needs of the growing population and the expanding economy. This expansion creates rapidly mounting needs for more water, for more forest products, for more recreational lands, and for all the other resources on which we depend. But the efforts of the Federal, State, and local governments, and of private organizations, industries, and individuals, all taken together, do not add up to resource development and conservation programs to match present and future needs. We are headed for shortages of developed resources, and at the same time we are despoiling the country and stripping it of its beauties of forest lands and fishing streams.

The gap between the natural-resource activities that now are going on and those that are needed is recognized in the Senate. Many Senators have spoken to me of their concern with our lack of progress, in spite of the diligent efforts in the Congress and the volume of natural-resource legislation considered in each session. One of the difficulties is that natural-resource programs have not been presented in relation to the rapid rise of population and industrial production. Another difficulty is that resource activities have not been presented as inter-related parts of a coordinated program—which they must be, if they are to succeed.

Based on our experiences, the resources and conservation bill—S. 2549—provides for continuing attention to be provided by the Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers, in the Office of the President, and the Joint Resources and Conservation Committee, in the Congress.

When I introduced the resources and conservation bill—S. 2549—last August, I was gratified to have a very considerable number of other Senators join as cosponsors. This action and the generous statements of the other Senators who are endorsing the bill were most encouraging to me as evidence that my legislative proposal comports with the views of so many of my distinguished colleagues.

Since the introduction of the resources and conservation bill, I have received many expressions from persons outside Congress. They represent a very wide sector of the public, from all walks of life and from all parts of the country. These expressions of endorsement and support for enactment of legislation such as the resources and conservation bill confirm the conviction held by the bill's cosponsors; namely, that the people throughout the country earnestly desire vigorous, comprehensive, and coordinated development and conservation of natural resources.

Many of the communications are from men who are distinguished in public life and have had broad experience in positions of high responsibility. There are also communications from leaders in industry, the heads of labor unions, and distinguished men in the great universities.

These communications are highly significant to me, because they express the judgment of some of the ablest men of our time. In order that other Senators may have the benefit of the views of these leaders in the economic and academic life and in public affairs, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from their communications be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Some of these communications include excellent suggestions for improving the proposed legislation. Additional suggestions undoubtedly will be made by witnesses at the hearings, and I hope to receive some in the comments that I have requested from the executive branch. At the conclusion of the hearings, all of the suggestions will be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and amendments will be made to improve the bill in whatever ways the committee may consider appropriate.

In order that there may be progress in this important field of natural resources, I shall endeavor to report the bill to the Senate in time for consideration and action.

It is my hope that enactment of the resources and conservation bill will be one of the enduring accomplishments of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM RECENT CORRESPONDENCE ON THE RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION BILL (S. 2549)

Seymour Harris, professor of economics, Harvard University:

"In view of the failure of the Government to integrate the various plans for the best use of our natural resources, and in view of the failure to make the most effective use of our resources, I welcome Senate bill 2549, a bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and 30 other Senators on August 20, 1959.

"This proposed legislation is an excellent bill and should contribute greatly to the formulation of an adequate policy which has so far not been available in the area of utilization of natural resources."

David E. Lilienthal, former director of Tennessee Valley Authority:

"The struggle to conserve, develop, and wisely utilize God's gift of natural resources is an unending one, of course. This bill (S. 2549), it seems to me, will provide a mechanism for keeping the facts about this issue current and before the public and the Congress, and therefore promote the cause of conservation to which you have devoted such great efforts during your career in the Senate."

Hugh H. Bennett, former Chief of Soil Conservation Service:

"For one thing—and I feel this is important—without some such expression (as S. 2549) of national policy we are, in my opinion, likely to continue running in the dark as regards the wisest possible use of our natural resources, particularly those in short supply. This relates to physical, biological, and recreational resources more or less alike. Such a policy kept prominently and persistently before the public is sorely needed at this time because of the danger of population growth outrunning the capabilities of our resources.

"I particularly like the wording of that part of the printed bill (lines 24 and 25, page 3, and line 1, page 4) reading: '* * * to analyze and interpret national policy, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 * * *'."

J. D. Zellerbach, chairman of the board, Crown Zellerbach Corp.:

"Certainly the demands of our growing population on our natural resources will multiply in years to come. Unless we take continuous soundings of the situation and develop and conserve our natural resources in such a way that national needs will be satisfactorily met, we could run the serious risk of eventually outstripping the raw materials necessary to keep our national economy growing and dynamic. Indeed, as you point out, with respect to some resources our position is already critical. Consequently, I concur with your position, and I hope that Congress will put your legislative proposal into effect."

George Meany, president, A.F. of L. and CIO:

"Our organization is certainly in sympathy with the intent and purposes of your bill. While we may differ in some details regarding governmental machinery proposed in S. 2549, we would be pleased to testify in support of your objectives at an appropriate time * * *."

League of Women Voters of the United States:

"At a meeting of the national board in September in the statement of national policy contained in S. 2549 and the machinery which it would provide for keeping facts about water up to date was discussed. The board decided that these proposals meet the standards league members agree are necessary for improved procedures in water resource development and management, and that S. 2549 should have league support."

Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor and Senator from New York:

"Senator Murray's bill, S. 2549, proposing a permanent national policy on the conservation, development, and utilization of our forest, soil, water, and mineral resources fills an important gap in the tools of modern government. The rate of operation of our economy surely requires an increasing availability of raw materials of every kind, as well as concerted policies for the conservation and development of the basic sources of such materials.

"The establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Resources and Conservation and the presentation by the President of an annual resources and conservation report will supply the Nation with a much clearer basis for policy formulation in this field than we have had previously.

"America has been blessed with an abundance of natural resources, exceeding those of most nations of the world. During the first three centuries of settlement on this continent, this very abundance led to a widespread waste. The conservation movement was instrumental in bringing this waste to somewhat of a halt. The two Roosevelts, Pinchot, Norris, and other progressive leaders of the past several generations have fostered important conservation policies by which we benefit today. But the time has come for a new and broadened approach toward natural resource management. Senator MURRAY'S bill will do this. I hope that it receives the full support of all citizens and their Representatives and Senators in Congress."

Oscar L. Chapman, former Secretary of the Interior:

"First, let me say that you and your colleagues are to be commended highly upon this proposal (S. 2549). It is long overdue. The void which has existed since the demise of the National Resources Planning Board would be filled by the creation of a council of resources and conservation advisers, such as you propose.

"Certainly, in our defense effort we expect and demand that those charged with the responsibility for the military security of the Nation should plan in a forward looking and imaginative manner. The same demand should be made on behalf of the general national security.

"It seems to me that there can be no argument about the fact that our country will remain strong and a leader among the people of the earth, only so long as we conserve our resources and utilize them in such fashion as to make them provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

"I welcome the basic policy proposed by S. 2549.

"The problems of water, forests, soil and moisture conservation, stream pollution, energy development and conservation and the like, do require—as you point out—'a permanent mechanism in government' to give continuing attention to these subjects. The interim work that has been done, ably in most instances, by the Paley Commission, the Cooke Commission, the Hoover Commission, and others have all been tremendously important and worth while, but each has suffered from a lack of continuity, from the gap between it and the study preceding it, and had no foreseeable relationship to those which might come later.

"Conservation is not a static thing. Our population grows daily and thus our needs expand in all directions. We continue to find and to create new uses for well-known resources. We are each day coming closer to a shorter workweek so that we need more and better facilities to provide for the greater leisure which our people will have coupled with the material resource to utilize that leisure. It is obvious, therefore, that the planning of prudent resource utilization is an ever-changing and progressing activity.

"It is only through a highly skilled agency of Government, working cooperatively with State and local governments and with such private organizations or individuals as can make a contribution to this planning process that we can look forward to the maintenance and enhancement of our national welfare.

"I hope that S. 2549 will be speedily enacted into law."

Dr. Roland Renne, president, Montana State College:

"I am in complete sympathy with the overall objective of your bill (S. 2549), namely, to achieve needed coordination and assure effective promotion of conversation, development, and utilization of natural resources.

"I believe your bill would do much to improve the effective conservation, development, and utilization of our natural resources; and the creation, in the Executive Office of the President, of the Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers should be helpful in getting more effective development programs."

Chad F. Calhoun, vice president, Kaiser Industries Corp.:

"The proposals set forth in S. 2549, introduced by you and 30 other Senators, appear to be a sound approach looking to the future conservation, developments, and use of our great natural resources. The advantages of establishing continuing bodies in the executive and congressional branches of our Government to make long-range policy decisions in this field warrant serious consideration by the Congress. The Paley Commission likewise recognized this need in its report to the President.

"Sound, continuing, expert bodies to appraise, evaluate, and recommend programs and policies relative to our natural resources as proposed by you and the other Senators appears desirable."

Alvin H. Hansen, professor emeritus of economics, Harvard university:

"I heartily endorse your proposal as contained in your bill—'Resources and Conservation Act of 1960.'

"This is an excellent idea and it urgently deserves action by the Congress."

Gordon R. Clapp, former Chairman of the Board, TVA:

"It seemed clear to me that the proposed declaration of policy contained in your bill (S. 2549), the Council of Advisers for the President, and the Joint Committee proposed are long overdue. The accelerated rate of depletion of our raw material resources, the

interruption of concentration upon the important and possible use of the Nation's water resources for power and for potable and industrial water supply, and the continued piecemeal portrayal of limited and special parts of these problems as they are considered by the executive branch or as they reach or originate with the Congress, cannot help but put us as a Nation further and further behind in relation to our growing population and its needs.

"As an interested citizen who has had a special opportunity over many years to take part in the development and conservation of natural resources, I give thanks for the vision and initiative of you and the Senators who have joined with you in the introduction of this legislation."

Michael V. DiSalle, Governor, State of Ohio:

"We have carefully reviewed S. 2459 introduced by you and a number of other Senators. After a careful review of the legislation and a report from our Department of Natural Resources, we have arrived at the conclusion that the legislation would be of great help."

R. V. Bottomly, judge, Montana Supreme Court:

"Your program if enacted into law and properly administered may well be the deciding factor in our Nation's survival.

"In the event your bill (S. 2549) is administered in the interest of the public, it will resurrect and restore in the various departments of Government which deal with conservation, and the educational institutions which train their personnel, that vital spark of dedication to the cause and leadership."

Robert R. Nathan, former deputy director, Office of War Mobilization:

"The purposes which the bill (S. 2549) seeks to accomplish are certainly highly desirable and important. Economic developments over the next decade and generation should bring a sustained and substantial increase in total output and this will necessitate positive measures to conserve and efficiently utilize our natural resources. Otherwise, we will find ourselves in increasing difficulties arising out of the failure to develop and implement positive policies toward these objectives.

"Occasional investigations are useful but they do not serve the purpose adequately of achieving maximum conservation. As you point out in your statement, such commissions and investigations are transitory. What we need is some mechanism for continuity and therefore I think your proposal is most meritorious and warrants widespread support. I do hope you will be most successful and you may be sure of my support and cooperation."

Morris E. Garnsey, professor of economics, University of Colorado:

"It should be a matter of concern to all of us that the United States lacks a national policy on conservation, development and utilization of natural resources. Certainly more people are noticing this failure and are becoming more fearful of its consequences.

"I wish to endorse your proposal (S. 2549) to develop such a policy through a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to the President. As you so correctly pointed out to the Senate in your speech both the Paley report and the Cooke report have lost much of their value because of the lack of effective followup."

Dr. J. P. Linduska, director of Public Relations and Wildlife Management at Remington Farms:

"In my opinion this could well be one of the significant pieces of legislation in our time. I hope you will press for an early enactment.

"Twenty years of dedication to resource management at the Federal level has convinced me that correction is long overdue of our policy of reckless exploitation. I compliment you for your foresight in recognizing our needs over the long pull and in offering a solution as embodied in the bill (S. 2549) which you have introduced."

Paul E. Bruns, chairman, Forestry Department, University of New Hampshire:

"In reference to your speech of August 17 on the Resources and Conservation Act that you introduced, you have and are making an outstanding contribution to the Nation and its future through your efforts in the field of wise resource use, and in this bill as a specific item.

"There is need not only for clear thought on maximum utilization of land as a management function, but in correlation of effort on the part of all agencies in the effort. Certainly your bill is a contribution toward this end."

John J. Craighead, Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Montana State University:

"I believe that the council and the joint committee on resources and conservation can perform a very vital function in seeing that all aspects of resource management get full consideration and that no special interest, either within or without the Government, are able to promote and sustain a narrow shortsighted policy with regard to resource development."

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., director, Twentieth Century Fund:

"I need hardly add that I am glad that you and your colleagues are seeking effective action in this area."

E. J. Workman, director, New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology:

"It is the opinion of the members of this staff that the bill (S. 2549) which you have introduced would make an excellent law."

John H. Cover, director, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Maryland:

"I hope very much that the Congress will respond to your effort at the establishment of an advisory council on resources and resource conservation, and I wish to express our appreciation of your effort."

SENATOR CHURCH AS KEYNOTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 20, 1960, there appeared an article entitled "Senator CHURCH as Keynoter." The article was written by Mr. William S. White.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is one of the bright, young, mature stars in the Democratic constellation. I believe it would be wonderful to have a man of Senator CHURCH's maturity, presence, and ability be the keynoter at the Democratic Convention. I sincerely hope that the many nice things said about Senator CHURCH by Mr. White will be taken into consideration by his colleagues and by the national committee, and that Senator CHURCH will have the honor to represent us in that capacity at the convention.

Senator CHURCH comes from one of the smallest States populationwise, Idaho. But in his 4 years as a Member of the Senate he has made his voice heard. His views are sound and solid, and he has proved himself to be a very distinguished Senator.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article written by Mr. White printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CHURCH AS KEYNOTER—IDAHO DEMOCRAT, A MODERATE LIBERAL, IS TERMED IDEAL FOR CONVENTION JOB

(By William S. White)

One of the smallest of the States in population may well provide the largest and most eloquent voice at the Democratic National Convention next July.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho—at 35 the youngest man in the Senate—is being strongly pushed for keynote speaker and temporary chairman of the convention.

The field of possibilities also numbers Senator EDWIN S. MUSKIE, of Maine and Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin. But on balance, Senator CHURCH seems to have much better than a 1-in-3 chance of selection.

A moderate liberal of the casual western variety, he is representative of the broadest single sector of his party. His "geography" is right. The Democrats need to pay special attention to the West, the fastest growing region of the country and also the fastest growing section of the Democratic Party.

Too, he is perhaps the most widely respected of the young Democrats of the Senate—for general ability, for fairmindedness and, what is very important here, for oratorical powers. Half a generation ago the pros considered oratory to be "making the eagle scream." His eagle does not scream; it speaks, instead, in more muted, more appealing, modern accents.

Finally Senator CHURCH is not committed to any of the Democratic presidental aspirants. Thus he would arouse no acute suspicion that as keynoter he might promote Jones over Brown or Smith or Green.

A keynoter-temporary chairman's task is to deliver the convention first major address and so to lay down the pattern of party policy for the campaign. Once he has done this, a permanent chairman is chosen to preside over the convention. Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, is out in front for this post.

The system of selecting the keynoter is elaborately traditional. Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler will appoint a committee on arrangements. This committee will recommend a keynoter to the convention. The convention will then elect him.

All this seems a dull and dusty business, and sometimes it is just that. This time, however, it will be a good deal more than routine. Because there is so large a field of real Democratic presidential possibilities—half a dozen—the tone taken by the keynoter's speech will have real meaning. What he says cannot actually bind or control whoever is ultimately nominated for President. But it can surely please or greatly embarrass that fortunate fellow.

If Governor Nelson should turn out to be the keynoter he would certainly deliver a call for far-advanced liberalism—a difficult plank for a presidential nominee to walk on unless he himself should be an advanced liberal. Senator MUSKIE, for his part, is a moderate liberal like Senator CHURCH. But Senator MUSKIE is also a Catholic.

An outstanding presidential candidate, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is a Catholic. So is Representative BOGGS. And so is Chairman Butler. Therefore, there is a fairly general tendency not to have a Catholic keynoter as well.

All this has increasingly turned attention to Senator CHURCH. Then there are yet other factors: television's image and the image of youth. The Democrats want an impression of youthful vigor to go out over the TV screens in order to compete with the brisk youthfulness of Vice President NIXON, 47,

the almost inevitable Republican presidential choice. Slim and dark, Senator CHURCH photographs well—and nobody could possibly confuse him with some middle-aged chap. A happy side point is that he is most pleasantly reserved about headline hunting.

The fact is that Senator CHURCH's status in the race for keynoter is an interesting commentary on how politics is changing. A few years ago the young were rarely either seen or heard at a national convention. Now the old boys are still the indispensable men in those famous smoke-filled rooms. But out front they are giving way to the young.

GRAIN STORAGE TESTIMONY BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 12, 13, and 14 of this year, the Special Agricultural Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry commenced hearings on the grain storage operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Witnesses were heard from the grain trade and from the Department of Agriculture.

Only 3 days later, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared on the NBC radio and television program "Meet the Press."

In response to a question concerning grain storage, propounded by Mr. Ned Brooks, moderator of the program, Mr. Benson stated:

> Of course the hearings are not over. You have heard one side. I presume the grain trade will be given an opportunity to be heard and I presume the Department will also.

This is indeed an astounding statement on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, for it can only be interpreted to mean that the Department of Agriculture did not have anyone appear before the Agriculture Subcommittee at its hearings in January.

On January 14, 1960, during the time the subcommittee was in session, testimony was taken from Mr. Raymond J. Pollock, Director of the Grain Division of Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA, and Mr. Robert Hanson, Deputy Director of the Grain Division. They were the day's only two witnesses.

Mr. Pollock was invited to appear before the subcommittee because the storage operations of the USDA are under his Division and under his jurisdiction.

Director Pollock's statements were most interesting in many respects.

First, he declared that the CCC owns bins for grain storage with a capacity of some 958,000,000 bushels, but that, at the present time, these are only 70 percent occupied.

Mr. Pollock further testified that the USDA started a survey last August of the cost of storage of grain in CCC-owned bins, and had further made a cost study survey to determine the cost of grain storage by commercial warehousemen under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement. He stated, however, that the results of these two surveys were not ready yet—and would not be ready for another 75 to 90 days.

The Grain Director testified that some 32 to 33 million bushels of grain is stored in ships of the reserve fleet; also, that he did not know the cost of storing this grain in these Government ships.

He further admitted that he did not know the cost of storing grain in CCC bins, nor did he know the cost of storage for commercial warehousemen under the UGSA.

Mr. Pollock did know how much the Government paid the commercial warehousemen. Whether this was a fair payment or not, he could hardly be expected to know, since the Department did not, until the fall of 1959, undertake a cost study of commercial warehouses.

The Department of Agriculture has, in the last 7 years, spent $2,300 million for commodity storage, and is just now getting around to a cost study. But their lack of knowledge does not seem to have stopped the Department from increasing the storage rates paid to commercial warehouses.

This lack of knowledge on the part of the man in charge of the Government grain storage program is a shocking fact.

Now, it should be remembered that he is acting as chairman of the negotiating sessions, currently under way between the USDA and representatives of the grain trade, called to set a new schedule of storage rates to commence July 1, 1960. This same individual was one of the industry negotiators for the UGSA in 1956, which was the last time this contract was negotiated.

At the previous day's hearings, testimony was given by operators of commercial warehouses, who, by their own figures, were making profits on cost ranging from 50 percent to as high as 167 percent. Nevertheless, the Director of the Grain Division stated he thought the storage rates were fair.

Why this indifference by responsible officials in the USDA for expenditures of the taxpayers' money?

These Agriculture officials further testified that for a period of time, up to March 1, 1959, the CCC was not only failing to utilize all of its own bins for storage of grain, but was actually leasing these bins to commercial warehousemen and others, at a rental rate of 9 cents per bushel. They were then turning around and paying the same warehousemen 16½ cents a bushel for storage of grain in these bins.

The utter futility of this type of operation is well described in an editorial which appeared in the January 18 issue of the Washington News, entitled "Empty Bins." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPTY BINS

> The Agriculture Department is paying privately owned storage companies an average of around 18 cents a bushel to handle surplus crops.
>
> Meanwhile the Government has room for approximately 300 million bushels in its own bins.
>
> Government storage cost—once it owns the storage bins—has been figured at around 3 cents a bushel, instead of the 18 cents it is paying.
>
> Why doesn't the Government use its own bins and save all this money?

Agriculture Secretary Benson points out to his senatorial critics that Congress has ordered him to "utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce" for storage.

We are all for private enterprise, but a regulation requiring the Government to rent from private individuals and companies what it already owns is "nuts"—to the tune of some $40 million or more a year if our figures are correct.

There are, as Secretary Benson notes, many things wrong with the farm program, but there shouldn't be any argument about this. Congress should notify the Secretary promptly to forget about those "usual and customary" facilities and use his own bins.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the responsibility for this costly situation rests not with the farmer, not with the Congress, not with the grain trade, but with the Secretary of Agriculture, who has the sole responsibility for setting grain storage rates.

All of this money is being charged to the farm program. But the sad fact remains that the farmers are getting very, very little of this amount.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is currently engaged in negotiations for a new Uniform Grain Storage Agreement. The importance of these conferences becomes readily apparent when we stop to think that each one cent of the rate for storage set by the UGSA represents an annual expenditure of $25 million to the American taxpayer.

Let us hope, therefore, that at long last, the Department will go into these negotiations properly armed with all of the facts, so that they can diligently work for a contract that is not only fair to the grain trade, but also insures that the country's taxpayers will get full value for each dollar spent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot let this opportunity pass without congratulating the Senator from Missouri for his excellent statement. Also, this may be an appropriate occasion to commend him for the very expert and excellent way in which he is acting as chairman of the subcommittee. This is the kind of investigation in which one is tempted to sensationalize, but the Senator from Missouri has been careful, thoughtful, and fair to all concerned. He has been absolutely sure of his facts before he has spoken; and I think the results of the investigation, in the long run, are going to be of benefit to all the American people, particularly the farmer and taxpayer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin, who, day by day, gives more proof both to his colleagues and the country of his outstanding ability. I express my appreciation to him for his fine cooperation and support in the hearings. As he has well said, we have a problem tied up tight with accounting, ascertaining where the money went. It is a difficult task. We have an able but small staff, supplemented by the fine support of the Comptroller General of the United

States. We want the truth, not the headlines. We intend to continue our work.

A SATISFIED NATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in his column in this morning's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann goes right to the heart of the central weakness of the Eisenhower administration—its failure to ask more from the American people, and the prospect it will ask less because it envisions its mission as simply increasing the country's consumption of consumer goods—in a word, to make a fat nation fatter.

There is no answer to the crying need for more education, for improved public health, for development of our resources for meeting the challenge of the U.S.S.R., in the mind, the heart, and the soul of the American people.

Lippmann bases this indictment on the President's three major reports to this Congress: His state of the Union message, his budget, and his annual economic report.

I ask unanimous consent that this brilliant analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report, which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies on our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government "to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government." This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers."

Then the Chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our "liberty" to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the Administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a strawman. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portend doomsday in 1963. But it does portend a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

Q AWARDS AS A STIMULANT TO BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 6 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few days ago, a distinguished western electronics manufacturer in California told his employees:

We are individually and collectively at war. It is a war against foreign ideology and technology and against our complacency. Aside from preparedness, it is not a war of missiles and nuclear weapons but one of philosophy and production.

Fundamentally, we are engaged in a war of workmanship. It presents us with a challenge that cannot be ignored, for if we rise to it with all our strength we can make the most powerful weapon our country can possess.

Mr. Robert S. Bell, president of the Packard Bell Electronics Corp. in southern California, said his company has begun to establish what he terms a Q award program in its factories to emphasize the need for increased production, quantity, and the necessity for the highest quality attainable in the manufacture of any product. He seeks to enlist the aid of both Government and business in promoting the idea embodied in the slogan "Produce Better—Produce More."

Today, Mr. President, it is my intention for a moment or two to discuss with my colleagues in the Senate the desirability of establishing a Government awards system, similar to the wartime E awards, which would focus attention on achievement in both the quantity and quality of a company's products.

Mr. Bell's statement to his employees referred specifically to the economic competition confronting the American people from the Soviet Union. The nature of that competition is best illustrated by noting that if the Soviet industrial growth rate persists at 8 or 9 percent per year, as now forecast, the gap between our two economies by 1970 will be dangerously narrowed, unless our own industrial growth is increased from its present pace. Mr. Bell's response to this challenge is a very heartening demonstration of faith and confidence in our free, competitive enterprise system. More than that, it is a reaffirmation that our economic system springs from faith in and concern for Americans as individuals. Here is no desire to run from a problem or ignore it. Here is a strong resolve to meet the Communist threat to our way of life head-on by insuring the continuance of a free, healthy, strongly growing economy, unimpaired in its vigor by the ravages of inflation.

Mr. President, America's potential for growth is far greater than that of any other nation at this point in history. We have entered a new decade full of bright and hopeful prospects for the future. First and foremost to all Americans, as it must be to people everywhere, is the overwhelming desire, indeed, the absolute necessity, to achieve a just and lasting peace in this nuclear age. Above all else, this is our great goal, a goal that requires the best and the finest that is in each of us. All other issues pale before the ultimate question of national survival and the honorable preservation of man's freedom. But in our continuous search for a formula by which this objective can be achieved, we must not lose sight of the kind of America we want for the future.

Let us look for a moment to the quantitative challenge ahead of us. There is much that can and must be done. In every large city in the Nation, a large

part of the population still lives in slum areas or areas that are rapidly deteriorating in this direction. Our highway system is behind schedule, and public transportation systems have often lagged behind the needs of our rapidly expanding population.

Both quantitatively and qualitatively there is an urgent need to provide a better education for all our children. At the present time we need 140,000 new classrooms and 195,000 new teachers at the secondary school level. For the specially able and talented, facilities must be available to provide all the higher education they can usefully absorb. The task of meeting these needs, in my opinion, should remain essentially a function of State and local government, but the Federal Government, as, indeed, the President himself has indicated, has a vital interest in the problem, and a vital responsibility in its solution. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is a splendid milestone along the way. Another aspect of a better America must be in the field of decent housing for all our people. Remarkable progress has been made, but much remains to be done, if antiquated structures are to be replaced with new, pleasant living quarters in the next decade. Urban redevelopment is one of the fine Federal undertakings in partnership with State and local governments.

Medical science has made astonishing strides in extending the life-span of our people. It will continue to do so. Qualitatively, medical treatment and research in the United States are the highest in the world. But there is a growing and alarming gap in the ratio between the number of medical doctors and dentists and the rising population. Medical facilities characteristic of the great urban centers are not readily or easily available in rural areas. Greater attention to the needs of these communities should be provided, and this remains one of America's great challenges.

Mr. President, I could augment the range of our quantitative needs far beyond what has been briefly suggested here. But our main focus is on the need to provide greater production of goods and services, at the most reasonable cost consistent with outstanding quality. It is to the business community we as a people, generation after generation, have turned when we think of our wider national efforts to achieve military security and economic progress. It is through effective business organization that America deals with basic economic problems in applying limited resources to unlimited needs. Business is the way we have organized ourselves to carry on economic activity. It is the way we create jobs in America. It is the way employees, managers, investors, and customers are brought together to produce and distribute the things our people want and need. It is also the way millions of Americans have been aided in meeting the problems of personal security through employee-benefit programs. To produce complex weapons for defense in the space age, to supply new and better goods for family living, to increase personal security and to provide opportunity in a thousand ways—our people look first to business, not Government.

The American people rely on some 8 million private businesses for nearly all the work of producing and distributing goods. These businesses include more than 4 million individual proprietorships, corporations, and partnerships, more than 3 million commercial farms and half a million independent professional offices. The dispersal of economic decision making, through these millions of businesses on the production side, and the tens of millions of consumers on the demand side, is a key factor in our economic progress.

A primary objective of Government policy must be to continue to strengthen and to safeguard this unique economic system with its millions of centers of initiative in businesses, farms, and professional offices. This means that the most efficient way to produce the goods Americans want is through reliance on competitive markets and decentralized decision making. It means a government that does not seek to take over the planning of economic activities, a fairminded government whose policies on taxation and on regulatory matters are designed to strengthen our system of fair competition, and to prevent centralized direction of life and livelihood from this city.

Mr. President, Mr. Bell has demonstrated the spirit and heritage of our system in his determination to have American business measure up to the challenge before it. Every segment of our economy, every citizen in our Nation, faces this challenge. "The time has come to stop retreating and start advancing," he said. "In the shooting war we had E awards. Now I think we should have Q awards. Only through quantity can we fight inflation and compete in foreign markets; only through quality can we prevail in any market."

I suggest the desirability of the Department of Commerce preparing a Q awards program to serve as a stimulus to business and industry to "produce better and to produce more" in the interests of a better and stronger America in the world community.

THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT AND BLOCKADE OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the way in which the Arab League boycott and blockade of Israel affects American enterprise as well as American shipping is illustrated by the report that the Navy is including cancellation clauses in oil cargo contracts of American owned tankers. The Military Sea Transport Service in its request for bids has advised tank owners that they will have to foot the bill for extra expenses if their tankers are blacklisted and barred from Arab ports.

This warning in the contract has been pointed out by the Navy to be a matter of "business protection." I should like to point out however that while this is a business decision, the United States is not a business firm. As the leader of the free world, its every action is looked upon in the light of how it advances the cause of peace and justice in our own time. We have insisted on freedom of the seas and we cannot, therefore, condone this interference with American shipping through Suez or by an illegal Arab boycott. At the present time, United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold is in Cairo to emphasize once more to President Nasser of the United Arab Republic that transit through the Suez Canal under international commitments must be free and unobstructed. It is tremendously important that we lend to the Secretary General in his present mission the full weight of our support.

It is a fact that the loan of $56 million recently made to the United Arab Republic by the World Bank for the improvement of the Suez Canal and our offer to help finance the second stage of the Aswan Dam have both been seized upon and publicly proclaimed by the UAR as vindication of its policies. Both Moscow and Cairo are having a propaganda field day at our expense. This may be inevitable but the whole situation calls for a more determined posture by the United States on this issue of free transit through the Suez Canal for all according to international law and President Nasser's commitments than has heretofore been apparent whatever is being said behind the scenes.

I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch in the New York Times, January 21, 1960, headlined "U.S. Contract Aids Boycott of Israel" and the editorial entitled "Moscow and Cairo," also in the New York Times, January 21, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

U.S. CONTRACT AIDS BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

WASHINGTON, January 20.—For nearly 2 years the Navy has virtually foreclosed bidding on oil cargo shipping contracts to U.S.-flag ships that previously did business with Israel.

Navy officials confirmed today that they had included cancellation clauses in contracts with U.S.-flag ships to take into account the Arab boycott of Israel.

They have been warning prospective oil cargo contractors of certain U.S. options should the Arabs refuse to accommodate chartered vessels. In effect, owners of any U.S. ship engaged in business with Israel would be in no position to bid for such a contract.

The provisions of the warning were outlined in a letter December 18 of the Military Sea Transport Service announcing requests for shipping bids for oil cargo movements in January.

Included in the routes for shipments is one designated as Jupiter, which goes through the Suez Canal.

The letter, signed by Comdr. George W. Peterson, Jr., director of the Commercial Water Traffic Division of the Navy and contractor for Military Sea Transport Service shipping contracts, states the following special provisions of the proposed form of charter:

A. In the event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer (the Military Sea Transport Service) shall have the option:

(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port.

(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, conditions of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

(3) To nominate other loading or discharge port or ports."

The letter says further that the owner would be responsible for the expenses incurred should the Navy be forced to exercise its options.

A Navy spokesman explained that the cancellation provisions had been adopted for oil shipping contracts of this nature after an incident December 18, 1957, when the operator-owners of the tanker *National Peace* were refused port facilities to pick up cargo at Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia.

The operator-owners, Pan Cargo Shipping Corp. and National Shipping and Trading Corp. of New York, are now suing the Navy for breach of contract in the southern district court of New York, Navy officials said.

A Navy spokesman emphasized that the form of charter was changed as matter of business protection.

It was pointed out that the contract covered the possibility that such ships not only would be refused port facilities but passage through the Suez Canal as well.

Israel has protested in the United Nations against the exclusion of Israeli ships and cargoes from the Suez Canal by the United Arab Republic. Israeli resentment has been stirred also by the loan granted to Cairo by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for widening the canal.

MOSCOW AND CAIRO

The Soviet Union's decision to finance the second, as well as the first, stage of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt testifies again to the great importance Moscow attaches to the Middle East. It should not be overlooked that the Soviet Union has agreed to this step despite the fact that President Nasser has cracked down hard during the past year on Communists in the United Arab Republic. Moscow is obviously going to use this background to buttress its propaganda about the selfless character of its economic aid and the alleged lack of political strings attached to that aid.

Ignoring propaganda, however, one central point is clear: For the next decade at least, while the two stages of the dam are under construction, the Soviet Union is now assured of close economic ties with the UAR and of having large numbers of its technicians in that country. How the Soviet Union will use the power inherent in these facts remains to be seen. But history warns against the naive assumption that the Soviet Union will always be correct in its use of its economic power relative to the UAR. With each passing year the hopes of the Egyptian people about the benefits to be derived from the Aswan Dam will be rising; and increasing, too, therefore, will be the political leverage of any threat to halt the dam's construction in midpassage.

President Nasser presumably knows the political perils his decisions on the dam may pose for his country. Apparently he believes he can use Soviet generosity for his advantage without paying too high a price. But whether Moscow will use Cairo or Cairo will use Moscow is something that remains to be seen in the decade ahead.

One additional point should not be overlooked: Whatever Moscow's motives in deciding to finance the first two stages of the Aswan Dam, it is making a tangible contribution to the vast problem of meeting the capital investment needs of the underdeveloped nations. Those, like ourselves, who are suspicious of Moscow's motives cannot simply rest with pointing out the possible pitfalls. Rather, we must show by concrete accomplishments that we are aware of the underdeveloped nations' needs and are anxious to help meet those needs to the best of our ability.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. As my colleague knows, I protested the making of the loan by the World Bank, through the Department of State. I recognize that the decision in this matter does not rest only with the United States; there is a board of directors of the World Bank. However, I believe that the making of this loan at this time was a great mistake. I regret that it was made.

The loan having been made, it seems to me there is a very strong obligation on the part of our Government to bring every possible pressure to bear on the United Nations and Mr. Dag Hammarskjold that the latter insist that Mr. Nasser live up to what I understand were the commitments regarding free access to the Suez Canal. His continued action in blocking the canal would be a source of embarrassment, it sems to me, to Dag Hammerskjold. I can only express the hope that the most extreme and profound but also legitimate pressures be brought to bear on Mr. Nasser to see to it that he lives up to international commitments and does not continue to flout international law.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I wish to confirm the fine and high-minded and effective efforts of my colleague in this field. I am delighted that he has joined with me in these remarks.

Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The Senator from New York.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine is being celebrated on January 22. I have suggested that this day be proclaimed Ukrainian Independence Day and last year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20 to this effect. The dream of an independence of the Ukrainian people was short lived because it was swept away by the power of Communist Russia. The Ukrainian people are 40 million strong and they still keep alive the hope that some day they may again be permitted self-determination. That hope exists in their songs, in their literature, in their cultural heritage, and most of all in the spirit of resistance against oppression. I know that they will want to see freedom with peace and equal justice and opportunity for all. We can help to keep that spirit of freedom alive in the hope, which I support, that these efforts will not have been in vain and that the dream of freedom will soon be realized by the justice so much encouraged by the free world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Friday, January 22, marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia. As we remember and commemorate this event, we remain mindful of the fact that once again, Ukrainia is a captive nation, enslaved by the armies of the imperialistic leaders of the Kremlin.

The conscience of the free world cannot forget the 42 million Ukrainians whose love of liberty and freedom forms the basis of their national character. As the largest captive non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, its struggle for freedom and national sovereignty is most important in the court of world opinion.

Today, we hear much of the "spirit of Camp David" and the alleged lessening of the tensions and strains between the free West and the Red Slave Empire of communism.

Yet, I would cite three instances of the Kremlin's cruelty and baseness to our Ukrainian friends during this so-called period of good will.

On October 15, 1959, Khrushchev's agents assassinated in Munich the Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stephan Bandera. His death by cyanide poisoning was attributed by the West German police and all authoritative sources to Moscow agents. His death by poisoning fits the pattern of crime established by the Russian Communists in the murders of Simon Petlurs and Eugene Konovalets in the thirties and twenties respectively. The latter two were also Ukrainian nationalist leaders who were murdered in similar circumstances in Western Europe.

Second, trials of Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists—Bandera's organization—members are being scheduled in western Ukrainia. This represents only a continuation of similar trials that have taken place in 1959. In March 1959, an open political trial in the Volyn oblast of Ukrainia resulted in the execution of five Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists members; in July, an additional five were executed after a similar trial in Stanislaviv, Ukrainia; in September, 30 Ukrainian insurgents were condemned to death after a mass trial.

Third, on December 3, 1959, Radio Lviv, monitored here, announced a "planned resettlement of Lviv region families" to the Crimea and Kazakhstan in central Asia. This trick of "voluntary resettlement" was devised and first used by Khrushchev in 1954 as a weapon against the non-Russian peoples opposing Moscow domination.

These three examples of the Kremlin's suppression of liberty and freedom in the Ukraine are proof that beyond its protestations of peace and good will, the Kremlin unrelentingly continues its rule of force and oppression against the true lovers of freedom and democracy.

The present role of Ukrainians destroys the Soviet fiction of a "united Soviet people," "integrated Soviet military might." Actually, the Soviet Union stands revealed before the moral conscience of the world as an imperialistic empire of captive nations whose citizens are the unwilling slaves of the Soviet. More than 45 percent of its military forces are made up of captive non-Russians; and they constitute a mighty citadel in behalf of the free thoughts and the free spirit of the peoples of the world.

It is my hope and belief that, like the Roman Empire and its mercenary legions, the Soviet Imperialist Empire carries within itself, through the use of the captive nations' natural resources and through the enforced military draft of the citizens of captive nations, the seeds of its inevitable decay and the resurgence of nationalist patriotism in the Ukraine and in other captive peoples.

Today we salute the patriots of Ukrainia, and we join with them in fervent prayers for their return as a free people to the council of nations.

Mr. President, water cannot naturally be made to flow uphill.

Wherever there is fire, by nature there will be smoke.

Wherever there is an action, there will be a reaction.

Whenever a government taxes the people too heavily, they will not pay the taxes.

Whenever a government imposes criminal penalties which are too severe, the juries will not convict.

There will be a reaction to the oppression, the tyranny, and the cruelty of the Soviets, and that reaction will come when dignified and free peoples, including those of the Ukraine, rise and protest, in ridding themselves of the enslavement to which they have been subjected.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my able friend.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, only once in the past 300 years has the Ukraine been able to attain its long-sought goal of freedom and independence. That one occasion was January 22, 1918, when its independence was courageously declared and proclaimed. For the first time since the middle of the 17th century, this nation of some 40 million people had set out to achieve its own destiny. The cherished dreams seemed within reach. It had its own language, traditions, and history. It had its own culture and ideals. It had boundless love for homeland, a fierce desire for political independence, and a proven readiness to sacrifice all for attainment of national goals.

But the promise of January 22, 1918, did not last long; within 2 years the Communist Russians treacherously and ruthlessly suppressed the freedoms of Ukrainia, and forcibly made it a part of the U.S.S.R.

Today—42 years later—the Ukrainians are still under Communist bondage and oppression. Yet today there stubbornly persist among these unfortunate people the love of liberty and the quest for political independence which have been theirs for centuries.

On the anniversary of their declaration of independence, we honor Ukrainian patriotism. That undying national spirit continues to resist the merciless and unrelenting Communist efforts to eradicate the Ukrainian heritage of culture and human aspirations. Their plight is shared by a number of other peoples whose lands are adjacent to the Soviet Union.

In the past year a momentous event for the cause of their national freedoms took place. The U.S. Congress, in expressing the feelings of all Americans, vigorously adopted the Captive Nations Week resolution. It struck a heavy blow at Moscow propaganda. This was clearly proved by the protests and the troubled concern expressed by Premier Khrushchev.

The resolution exposed as fiction the concept—which Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders strive to have the free world accept—and the false notion of monolithic power inherent in the U.S.S.R. Constantly they spoke of a "Soviet nation," "the Soviet people," or "the integrated Soviet military might," in an effort to win acceptance of this illusion.

The fact remains that the U.S.S.R. is a basic empire of captive nations and suppressed peoples. Talk to the contrary denies the truth.

Moscow fears the destruction of this fiction. That is the reason for its vehement protests over adoption of the Captive Nations Week resolution. Official recognition by the United States of the existence of the majority of the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. is a moral blow to the myth of monolithic Soviet power.

It is vital to the defense of the free world that we focus attention on the place and the plight of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. When we are mindful of the captive non-Russians who compose so large a proportion of the Soviet armed forces, as well as the Soviet economic productivity and social structure, we are better apprised of Soviet power and its limitations.

The constant pressure for freedom by over 40 million Ukrainians, the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain, is a realistic deterrent to further Soviet aggression. It also promotes a highly vital part of declared U.S. foreign policy—namely, emancipation of satellite nations, to be achieved, not by the use of force from without, but primarily by the appeal of freedom to the minds of men everywhere.

It is only right and just that one of our foreign policy goals should be the peaceful but unremitting support of all people who seek to regain the freedom deprived them by communism. We are not, and cannot, be reconciled to the captivity of millions by Communist masters; nor do we regard such captivity as a permanent condition.

Communist imperialism divides the house of humanity. In the words of the man who was elected President of the United States 100 years ago, and who later became known as the Great Emancipator, "A House divided against itself cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free."

President Eisenhower has expressed the same conviction:

> There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations, repression of human beings, on a gigantic scale.

To repeat:

Moral responsibility for the human rights and liberties of the captive millions within the Iron Curtain is basic American foreign policy.

The foundation of this policy is the appeal of freedom to the minds of men everywhere.

For the achievement of emancipation, our weapons are, not military in character, but ideological, psychological, political, economic, and diplomatic. However, if these nonmilitary forces are to be fully effective, our military power must be sufficient to neutralize the threat of Communist arms.

Nonetheless, our ultimate weapon remains the inherent desire of all men for freedom.

Our people and other free nations must be alert to any cracks in the empire the Communist are trying to build. We must encourage and foster any weakening of the bonds that tie the satellites to Moscow.

Eventually the spirit of freedom must overpower the force of tyranny in the Soviet Union and China. Only in this way can the peoples of the world be assured of a just and lasting peace. The route is still uncharted. A transition, which perhaps may occur over a long period of time, will eliminate the despised and dangerous features of the Communist regime and its ruthless and total domination of nations and of the individual.

The United States and its fellow nations of the free world should neglect no opportunity to bring about this transition.

The United States is the leader of the nations dedicated to freedom, it must not decline to exert that leadership.

It is in the spirit of this policy and approach that we pay tribute and honor to the valiant Ukrainians, on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of their declaration of independence.

At the same time, we can gratefully note and commend similar stands by other Slavic peoples outside of Russia, among whom are the Poles, the Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Serbs, the Croats, the Slovenians, and the Byelorussians.

Nor should we overlook the non-Slavic nations which, although enslaved, have been fighting so courageously for their liberty.

May the time soon come when the natural yearning for freedom, still felt so thoroughly by these oppressed peoples, will be richly fulfilled.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been very happy to yield, particularly for the eloquent remarks the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has delivered.

It is my expectation to speak later in the day on the same subject. In the meantime, I commend the able Senator from Nebraska for his very forceful statement on it.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] I said

I would have a few words to say today in connection with the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

It is altogether fitting that we mark this date in our minds and in our records. It remains a symbol of the victory of the spirit of free men, beaten down and chained by oppression, yet with the fire of freedom still alive and burning in their hearts. Some 40 million of these silent heroes, enslaved by their Communist overlords, still look prayerfully, hopefully to the day of their ultimate deliverance from this human bondage to which they have been subjected.

These are a people who have never seen the Soviet smile that has recently been abroad in the world. The dark face of Soviet tyranny is the only visage they know, and it has been etched into their hearts by time and suffering. These are a voiceless people, locked in the dungeon of Communist inhumanity, but their very silence has an eloquence that we, their brothers, hear and understand.

We should record not only the undying pledge of our concern and of our support, but also our heartfelt sympathy for our millions of Ukrainian friends who must live this enforced exile from the freedom they love. And let us rededicate ourselves, on this historic day, to the struggle that free men must unceasingly wage, so long as freedom is denied to any of their brothers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to join my good friend from New York in the splendid statement relating to the Ukrainian people, the loss of their freedom, the oppression under which they live in the totalitarian society, and our rededication as an American people and a nation, to the freedom and independence of peoples who long for it and whose great history justifies their claim to it.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during recent weeks there has been much discussion of the benefits which the steelworkers received in their settlement with the steel industry as a result of collective bargaining procedures. There has been a great deal of misconception in many places about this and about the inflationary effects of the settlements, and also with respect to a possible increase in the price of steel, and the great benefits that labor received.

One of our outstanding financial writers and market research specialists of our Nation is Miss Sylvia Porter. She writes a syndicated column for many papers in the country. Yesterday's column by her, published in the Washington Post, is entitled "What Steel Workers Really Got." If I may, Mr. President, I shall read one or two paragraphs of her comments:

(1) The steelworkers did not get a 41-cent wage-benefit package as has been so widely reported, and they didn't get the 39-cent package that has been repeatedly discussed either. They got a 32.8-cent package in wages and benefits spread over 30 months.

(2) The major steel companies did not give away as much as they have been suggesting. The basis for price increases is not nearly as clear as some of the steel industrialists have been claiming.

I do not usually request that columns of this kind be printed in the body of the RECORD, but Miss Porter's article is so important an analysis of the settlement of the strike in the steel industry over wage disputes that I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT STEELWORKERS REALLY GOT

(By Sylvia Porter)

The delicate stability of the economy is being threatened by the misconception and mounting befuddlement concerning what the steelworkers gained in their new contract.

Because of exaggerated notions about the steelworkers' victory, other unions negotiating contracts in coming months may make dangerously exaggerated demands. Because of the spreading "Here goes the price spiral again" psychology, the steel companies may impose price increases that are just now warranted by the costs of the settlement.

VITAL FACTS OUTLINED

Confusion compounded by ignorance can hurt us badly now. It's time some vital facts were put into simple words. Specifically:

1. The steelworkers did not get a 41-cent wage-benefit package as has been so widely reported, and they didn't get the 39-cent package that has been repeatedly discussed either. They got a 32.8-cent package in wages and benefits spread over 30 months.

2. The major steel companies did not give away as much as they have been suggesting. The basis for price increases is not nearly as clear as some of the steel industrialists have been claiming.

3. It is entirely conceivable that rising efficiency of operations in the steel plants between now and 1962 will offset increased labor costs in this period. Signs of this are emerging.

4. When increases in hourly earnings under the major steel company contracts are compared with increases in hourly earnings recently won by other workers, the big steel settlement seems the least "inflationary." The percentage increases in hourly wages are: in steel, 3.75 percent; in the Kaiser settlement, 3.82 percent; in the can industry, 4.5 percent; in the aluminum industry, 5 percent.

5. The steelworkers are getting a wage increase averaging 8.2 cents an hour beginning December 1, 1960—and no cash wage raise before then—another wage raise averaging 7.6 cents an hour on October 1, 1961. These increases are right within the pattern of 1959. The most common wage increases won in negotiations last year were in the 7–9-cent range.

6. The steelworkers' contract says they may get as much as 6 cents in cost-of-living adjustments in the 30-month period. The companies themselves figure the increase is more likely to be six-tenths of a cent than 6 cents. That's because the companies can deduct increases in their insurance costs from cost-of-living increases to which the workers might be entitled—and the companies definitely expect their medical, hospital, and other insurance costs to go up in the period.

7. The steel companies are getting a free ride of a little more than 2 months because the contract isn't retroactive. The can contract was retroactive for 2 and the aluminum contract for 4 months.

BICKERING RECALLED

Much of the befuddlement about the steel contract may be traced to the bickering that began at the very start of negotiations on how costs should be figured. The company wanted to count in every item of expense. The union wanted to figure costs only on the basis of the wage and benefit increases to the employees.

At the end, the union agreed to bargain in the companies' terms of total employment costs—which included such unseen expenses as extra bookkeeping, changes in social-security payments, payroll taxes, etc.

But the key point is that no other major contract is reported in these terms of total employment costs. When the extras not reported in other contracts are eliminated and the contracts are compared on the basis of increases in wages, insurance, pensions, holiday work pay, and the like, here is how the Labor Department estimates the gains:

For the steelworkers, 32.8 cents for 30 months; for the can employees, 34.2 cents for 36 months; for the aluminum workers, 35.08 cents for 30 months; for the Kaiser employees, 20.4 cents for 20 months.

GREAT ISSUES OF 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the New York Herald Tribune, recently published an outstanding series of editorials on problems facing this Congress. These pieces dealt with defense, space, agriculture, education, national emergency labor disputes, and foreign aid. While there may be other important issues before the Congress, these certainly warrant the high rank accorded to them by the Herald Tribune.

No pat solutions are suggested for any of these problems. The analysis of the factors involved, however, is of the highest caliber. There is room for honest disagreement with some of the views expressed in these editorials, but one cannot help being impressed by the thoughtfulness and care with which these views are expressed.

Mr. President, I know that many Senators will be interested in these editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 5, 1960]

THE GREAT ISSUES OF 1960—DEFENSE IS THE BIGGEST QUESTION MARK

The biggest question mark in the budget, the one which causes the gravest concern to administration, Congress, and the general public alike, is defense. This dubious status results from three basic facts:

1. The Defense Establishment is critical to the very life of the Nation. It is an essential tool of diplomacy, a safeguard to vital American interests in the world and if too many wrong assumptions are made in appropriating and spending for defense, it could quite literally mean the obliteration of the American people.

2. No matter how economical the approach, defense costs are high. The $40 billions—give or take a few—allotted to defense by the United States in recent years represents 9 percent of the gross national product; it is more than half of a total Federal budget of less than $80 billions.

3. The baffling aspect of the defense budget stems from the impossibility of providing against every military contingency. Some compromise must be made. And it is

extremely difficult to get two authorities who would agree on the exact ingredients of such a compromise. Moreover, the development of new weapons, the changing pattern of strategy by this country's potential opponents, and shifts in the diplomatic picture can alter, radically, the bases of any program of military spending.

American fundamental strategy is based on the deterrent power of nuclear weapons. That is to say, the United States is assumed to have a capability for delivering a nuclear attack on such a scale that any aggressor would not risk an attack.

So far as the weapons themselves are concerned, there has been little worry over the quantity or quality available to the United States. The problem lies in the delivery of them to their targets and the protection of this country and its allies against nuclear blows leveled by the enemy.

In the brief span of two generations there has been a major revolution in the means of propelling explosives, a revolution which parallels the innovation of atomic and hydrogen weapons themselves. The jet aircraft had barely superseded propeller-driven types for air strikes when it was itself overtaken by the ballistic missile of great range and speed. With this came the atomic submarine, capable of launching missiles.

To keep abreast of such drastic changes in the implements and methods of war adds tremendously to the cost of the Military Establishment. In the 18th century, nations could put by stocks of flintlock rifles and place wooden warships out of commission, confident that they would not be outmoded for generations. When the Soviet Union, in 1954, displayed their new big bombers and the United States launched a crash program to match them, the long-range missile outmoded the program, if not the bombers, within a couple of years.

Ideally, the United States should have missile families in being and in development equal to the best and the most that the Soviet Union could launch. It should have a strategic reserve of jet bombers and fighters, both to supplement the missiles and to supplant them, if wartime performance does not match peacetime experimentation. It should have air-raid shelters, trained civilian defense cadres, warning systems, interceptor devices. The Navy should be able to keep the sealanes open for surface transport, to track down missile-bearing Soviet submarines, to launch attacks from its own carriers and submarines and, with Marines and surface vessels, have the capability of delivering triphibious attacks. The Army should be able to sweep up after a nuclear war, have enough strength and mobility for brushfire wars and at least be ready to expand sufficiently to fight a major war with conventional weapons if, for any reason, nuclear weapons were not employed.

This is the ideal, in the sense that it would provide against nearly all the foreseeable contingencies of modern war. The total would be impossible to achieve or sustain without a staggering dislocation of the economy. In each service there are experts prepared, passionately and with great plausibility, to argue for some special phase of such an overall program. An interesting case, for example, can even be made out for the revival of horsed cavalry. But somehow these claims have to be adjusted; a formula has to be reached, for obtaining the maximum security within practicable budgetary bounds.

This newspaper does not pretend to have such a formula. It is disturbed, as most Americans are disturbed, by the evidences of Soviet superiority in big missiles. But to state the precise portion of the budget which should be allotted to missile development and production requires far more detailed information, both as to American defenses and the Soviet threat, than is available to the public.

What we would insist upon is that the defense of America and the free world is the most important single task of Government. It certainly has not yet been reduced in significance by any diplomatic event; disarmament talk is not yet disarmament fact.

The national economy is sturdy enough to stand a greater strain than is now placed upon it—if that additional burden should be necessary. President Eisenhower has the heavy responsibility of determining, in the last analysis, what our defense demands. He need have no fear, however, that the American people will not bear their share of the responsibility if they are called upon to make greater sacrifices for their own security.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 6, 1960]

SPACE: A RACE WE MUST WIN

Suppose the Soviets landed an expedition on the moon, then declared that the arrival there of any other expedition would be regarded by the missile-armed Soviet Government as an "unfriendly act"—what would we do?

The new Congress should be asking itself this sort of question as it reviews the scope, organization, and priority of the Nation's space program.

Present indications are that unless we quickly and markedly accelerate our own efforts, the Soviets will be first on the moon—and also, despite our dramatic Mercury astronaut program, that the first man in orbit is quite likely to be Russian.

Whether we like it or not, we are in a race—a race we cannot afford to lose.

Conventional military minds may argue that we have our ICBM; that the much greater power represented by, say, the 1.5-million-pound-thrust Saturn project has no immediate military application, and that therefore its development is not of crucial importance in terms of national survival.

But the potential military significance of reconnaissance satellites, space platforms, even moon bases, is only beginning to be explored. Power of the Saturn magnitude, and greater, is needed to hurl aloft the quantity of hardware needed for real space exploration. And operating as it does on the frontiers of knowledge, concerned with the massing and control of vast energies, the venture into space holds the possibility of discoveries the significance of which we can only guess at—and even our guesses will probably fall short of reality.

The space lag could hold a far greater threat to national survival than even the missile lag. We at least have the comfort of alternate deterrents, such as SAC, to set off against Soviet missile power. But against the still unknown threat from future Soviet firsts in space we might have no defense, and not even a good counteroffense.

More than the direct military significance of space, however, is involved in our race to get there.

We live in an age in which diplomacy and propaganda, military, scientific and economic strength all are bound up inextricably together, and in which an anxious world is looking both to us and to the Soviets for leadership.

At the heart of the Soviet Union's drive toward supremacy is its effort to establish an image of the Soviet system as the wave of the future. Spectacular triumphs in space have played a key role—and a highly effective one—in this effort.

If anyone doubts the effect of such triumphs, let him reflect on how the popular image of the Soviet Union has changed in this country since Sputnik I shot aloft, shattering our ill-founded complacency, forcing us at last to recognize the dynamics of Soviet growth.

Our national Space Agency this year has a budget equal to only one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product, while vital space programs have been deliberately delayed for lack of funds. The U.S. space effort is still hamstrung by inadequate financing, by divided authority, by lack of a clear affirmation of national purpose.

From a late start, we have made impressive gains which should not be minimized. But they have still not been enough. We are second, and not even second among equals; we still are getting there—into space—lastest with the leastest.

We can't win unless we start running.

The free world has a right to demand more vigorous leadership than it has gotten from the United States in the competitive conquest of man's ultimate frontier.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 7, 1960]

AGRICULTURE, THE ALBATROSS

Of all the great problems facing Congress and the Nation in 1960, none is so unyielding or misunderstood as agriculture. Money can be considered, crudely, the answer to many of our ills—in education, money to build new schools; in defense, money to create new weapons. But money has proved no more than an eager futility in our public policy toward the farms.

Over the past few years, several billion dollars have been spent annually to raise the farmer's income in the form of price supports and crop and acreage controls. Yet, in the midst of enormous prosperity, the farmer's income has been declining.

In 1960, the Department of Agriculture estimates that it will drop to the lowest level in 18 years. The byproduct of this appalling paradox is almost $9 billion worth of surplus food we can neither sell nor give away, and which towers over the marketplace like a mountainside of snow, ready to engulf it. Worst of all, the present system holds no hope of a way out.

Price supports and income supports (acreage controls, for example) were supposed to help the poor or marginal farmers. Their effect is the opposite. They were supposed to provide security for the farmer in general. Instead, they have pushed him into ever more precarious positions. They have tended to wreck the relationship between agriculture and the rest of the economy. And they have fostered a pitiful waste of resources in terms of land and people.

The rest of us have not benefited either. We pay twice over for our food. We spend half a billion dollars a year just to store the surplus or to dump it abroad, an act which arouses the hostility of friendly nations. We see Congress entangled in the delusions of farm politics. Nor do we get any return for our money in lower retail prices.

The imperative in this situation is to bring farm produce back into a reasonable relationship with its consumers. For this, two things are necessary. The first is to reduce agricultural production to the point at which the farmer can earn a living comparable to the rest of the people. The second is to let agricultural prices reach a level at which the entire output can be sold in the normal way. To retire land, in other words, and to remove price supports.

As to crop reduction, the only solution is the retirement of whole farms—and whole families—from agricultural activity. Land rental would be much cheaper than surplus buying, and its owners could be helped to find other and much more profitable kinds of employment which the economy offers. In this respect, acreage control does no good, for the rest of a farm's land is then made to yield a compensatory increase.

The removal of price supports would keep pace with the reduction of crops. Some supports would be kept available for use in cases where it was clearly in the national interest to promote certain produce, or as insurance against convulsions of weather.

But the practice of letting supports (particularly when based on the absurd parity formula now in use) replace the free market in the setting of prices should be totally done away with. In all this, definite periods of time could be set up; an end would be always in sight.

There are some possibilities in farm policy which Congress ought to consider. Even if it is 1960, and because it is 1960, the time has come for an admission of failure and a resolve to begin again. The obligation to do so falls on Congress, for it is Congress, in response to mistaken convictions about what is good for the farmers, which bears the chief responsibility for the past.

We—and that means the farmers, too—shall be watching and waiting to see what effort is made to remove the albatross of our agricultural policy from the national neck.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 9, 1960]

THE SCHOOLS WE ARE NOT BUILDING

There are few questions on which political leaders of every hue and stripe are so articulately in agreement as the need for more schools.

The population wave of World War II has risen to spill uncalculated thousands of children into our educational system. Hardly a town or city in the country has not been pinched. The classroom shortage is estimated at 140,000, and the crest of the postwar generation has not yet passed.

The remedy, most people agree, is for the Federal Government to suplement the funds of States and municipalities, specifically in regard to school construction, since this represents the least opportunity for Federal interference in the educational process. But after a number of years, and a parade of Federal-aid bills, nothing has yet been done by Congress.

This is largely due to deep disagreement on the method of financing such aid. The administration last year proposed a measure to finance the servicing of bonds issued by communities which wanted to build new schools, provided Federal funds were matched by the States.

The servicing would be stretched over 20 to 30 years. A balanced budget is clearly the object behind this bill, and it has been fiercely criticized by various civic groups as inadequate. It would, however, stimulate the construction of 75,000 classrooms in the next few years.

At the other end of the scale is the Murray-Metcalf bill, which was reported last summer by the House Committee on Education and Labor. This bill would make an outright grant of $4.4 billion to the States for either teachers' salaries or school construction or both. No matching funds would be required.

In between there are a number of compromise measures, combining, in various proportions, outright grants, matching requirements and installment financing through debt service. They are slumbering in congressional committees.

A final attempt at compromise, drafted before Congress reconvened this week, would have kept the administration's two basic conditions, long-range payment and cost sharing with the States, but would have provided for grants over 2 years to particularly needy schools. However, this bill was again termed inadequate by the proponents of immediate and general school aid.

There is something else to the fate of school aid in Congress besides disagreement over financing. This is the profound, although usually hidden, conviction among a number of Representatives and Senators that the Federal Government must never be allowed any control over, or voice in, public education.

Even in the acceptance of funds from Washington for the erection of buildings, these people see a dangerous first step toward Federal dictation of educational policy. Socialism, they tell each other. Bureaucratic intervention. It has even been suggested by some of the supporters of this view that the Federal Government is so burdened by debt that it is better to let the States find the extra money for themselves.

Certainly, local control of education has been a jealously guarded tradition in the United States. Would help in building schools threaten it? Hardly. Experience has shown that when the Federal Government has had responsibility for education, as in defense projects or military bases, there has been no shade of pressure whatsoever.

But even more important, there is no possibility that the money for the vast effort in education which is required can come from anywhere else. The States cannot find it. The municipalities even less.

There must, therefore, be some sort of school-aid bill at this session of Congress. We would prefer a carefully worked out one which did the least damage to the budget to massive grants blindly given out. But the Nation should think first of all of the children who have waited and are still waiting. How much waiting is there yet to come?

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 10, 1960]

WHAT ABOUT THE NEXT STEEL STRIKE?

As soon as the steel settlement was reached last week, there was an immediate tendency to forget that the country had just endured one of the costliest and most damaging strikes in its history.

The black clouds had been lifted from the immediate horizon, and the sky of 1960 opened brightly ahead, dancing with political and economic hope.

In spite of so many grim months when our basic industry was paralyzed, our foreign markets diminished and our whole position of strength affected; in spite of the jeremiads and oratorical gloom; in spite of the eventually inflationary nature of the settlement itself, there seems to be no serious effort envisaged to make sure that such a strike and such a crisis will not be repeated.

The one thing this strike proved, everyone said until last Tuesday, was that we could never afford to have it happen again. Yet how can we prevent it?

There is obviously no great enthusiasm in Congress for legislation which would set forth precise conditions governing cases like this one, whether in terms of compulsory arbitration or amendment of the Taft-Hartley law or limiting the monopoly powers of big labor. Secretary of Labor Mitchell says that a presidential year prevents the proper atmosphere of calm in which such legislation could be attempted. Even the President's state of the Union message, while underlining the problem, offers no forceful remedy.

But the public, which watched the national economy almost fall to its knees, will have to live with the effects of the steel strike and the effects of its settlement.

Vice President NIXON surely obtained as good and noninflationary a compromise as was possible. But even so, it will add $1 billion to the costs of the steel companies over the next 2½ years, and even if steel prices do not rise immediately, they are certain to rise in 6 months or so.

Aside from inflation, the settlement will damage the position of our steel industry and the security of the steelworkers' jobs by pricing our goods even further out of foreign markets and by inviting large-scale importation of cheaper foreign steel. (Right now, foreign steel can be sold in Cleveland for $5 less a ton than steel produced in a Cleveland mill.)

Surely the fear and anxiety which the strike produced across the country created an unparalleled opportunity for Congress to enact measures which would go at least part of the way toward controlling recklessness in basic-industry free bargaining. If the strike had continued after the session reconvened, there would certainly have been some action, however temporary or expedient. But there seems to be little inclination to worry about it until the time for new contract negotiations rolls round.

This is disappointing. What the steel settlement proved, in effect, was that we had no ready recourse to stop a major seizure of economic paralysis. It also proved that the Government had no power definitely to arrest the wage-price spiral.

There should be such recourse and there should be such power if we are to continue to play our role of world leadership successfully.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 12, 1960]

FOREIGN AID: CATALYST FOR DEVELOPMENT

Traditionally foreign aid has a rough time of it in Congress, and the pressures of an election year will make its going no easier in 1960.

But Congress, so attentive to the pleaders for pork barrel projects, farm subsidies, and veterans' benefits, should not underestimate that body of opinion which looks first to the way in which the United States meets the responsibilities of world leadership. To this growing group of voters, the way in which foreign aid bills fare will stand as a crucial test.

The focus of our foreign aid has shifted drastically since the early days of the Marshall plan. No longer is it aimed at lifting industrialized but battered allies (and former enemies) back to their economic feet. This has been achieved, with striking success.

The task today is to bring the economic and social benefits of the 20th century to millions just emerging into nationhood. Twenty new nations have been created in the last 15 years; more stand on the threshold of independence. These are determined, and rightly so, to move forward. And, impatient of the economic gulf that separates them from us, they are determined to move rapidly. It is up to us to see that they have a chance to do so in freedom.

The Soviets stand ready if we fail. The joint challenge to the underdeveloped and to ourselves is to leapfrog history before history leapfrogs us.

Last year Congress whacked $700 million out of the administration's $3.9 billion foreign aid request. This year the administration reportedly plans to ask somewhat more; Congress too should raise its sights.

Foreign aid, of course, buys not only the development in freedom of desperately needy nations. It also contributes heavily to the maintenance of that network of collective security on which the safety of the free world depends. We can't go it alone on defense, and some of our stanchest allies are unable to bear the military burden their strategic position places on them. In such cases it is up to us to share the costs.

Foreign aid is no longer solely a U.S. responsibility. Other industrialized nations, who themselves have returned to economic health with U.S. aid, have an equal responsibility. It is to their credit that they are coming to a general recognition of this, and that there seems a growing readiness to join in a vast cooperative effort to lift the underdeveloped nations to their feet.

But this does not mean the United States can slacken its own effort. The need is not diminishing, but increasing, and for years to come as the pace of development quickens the need can be expected to grow yet greater. So, however, will the resources of the free world that are available to meet that need. For economic development, like the sowing

and reaping of a field and the sowing of others with the harvested grain, eventually provides for itself in increasing abundance.

The critical need in the underdeveloped countries is for long-term credits enabling them to lay the groundwork for a modern economy. And it is we, the industrialized nations of the free world, who have to stand ready to provide these—plus such technical help as may be necessary. This is a responsibility Congress, even in an election year, must meet, and generously.

NEW PROPOSAL TO PREVENT A DEADLOCK IN THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 2 days ago, I received a response to my letter of January 8 to the Secretary of State regarding the Geneva negotiations for a cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

In my letter to Mr. Herter I suggested that the United States attempt to break a possible impasse in the negotiations by proposing a test ban treaty to be carried out in stages. My proposal, which I described to the Senate in a statement on January 11, was that the nuclear powers reach an agreement to end tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space. With respect to tests underground, I suggested that if the scientific problems of detecting nuclear tests underground continue to remain an obstacle to agreement in that environment, the nuclear powers agree to conduct together a series of underground explosions for research purposes.

I point out that the position of the administration seems to be veering more in the direction of an agreement to be offered in stages. The Department's reply states:

> Should it become apparent over the next few weeks that the present Soviet position will not essentially change, then it seems clear that the only alternative, other than a complete break in the negotiations, would be to revert to some type of a phased treaty with more limited obligations in its initial stage.

Furthermore, the position of the Soviet Union itself appears to be shifting. In my speech to the Senate a few days ago, I alluded to specific changes in the Soviet position. In Premier Khrushchev's lengthy speech to the Supreme Soviet on January 14 he concedes "that sometimes modern technical equipment cannot provide absolute certainty that all underground explosions of nuclear weapons can be detected."

Mr. Khrushchev also acknowledges the possibility of the need for further research. He stated in his speech:

> The further development of science will provide the possibility of discovering and establishing all nuclear explosions with absolute accuracy.

I do not necessarily share Mr. Khrushchev's optimism, but I do believe this statement is a recognition by the Soviet leader of the need for further research in the science of detecting nuclear weapons and distinguishing them from earthquakes.

Mr. President, it is not necessary to labor further these points, but I thought that other Senators should have the benefit of seeing the Department's reply to my letter. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the reply published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1960.

The Honorable FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: On behalf of the Secretary, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 8, 1960, and the two-part proposal you offered as a means of avoiding a stalemate at the Geneva test ban negotiations.

Initially, I should like to assure you that the Department fully shares your conviction that everything possible must be done to prevent these negotiations from ending in a deadlock. As you have indicated, they are not only important to the control of worldwide levels of radioactivity, but if a properly controlled agreement can be reached, an important precedent for future disarmament negotiations will have been established.

As you know, the negotiations resumed on January 12. Our delegation has been instructed to continue to explore, at the present session, whether the Soviet position on basic technical issues remains as stated by Soviet scientists in the recent meetings of experts.

Should it become apparent over the next few weeks that the present Soviet position will not essentially change, then it seems clear that the only alternative, other than a complete break in the negotiations, would be to revert to some type of a phased treaty with more limited obligations in its initial stage.

In view of this, consideration is now being given by the Department to the form such a limited agreement might take. One possibility would, of course, be to set forth a treaty generally along the lines of the President's April 13, 1959, proposal to Chairman Khrushchev. This would entail a controlled ban on atmospheric tests while the technical problems associated with control of tests in other environments were being resolved. In addition, a similar ban on high altitude tests might also be incorporated if suitable control provisions can be agreed since, subsequent to April 13, experts from the three negotiating powers reached agreed technical conclusions on control requirements for this testing area.

You will recall that on the same date, Ambassador Wadsworth, in elaborating the U.S. position on a phased agreement, proposed that in connection with such an agreement, joint studies, and research, and negotiations, including such joint experiments as may be deemed useful, should begin immediately. Specifically, his statement was as follows:

"That joint studies, research, and negotiation, including such joint experiments as may be deemed useful, should begin immediately. These would assist us in moving toward the solution of the technical and procedural questions involved in detection and identification of underground tests and tests at very high altitudes. We should pursue these studies and negotiations expeditiously. If it appears that they cannot be readily solved, however, they need not delay the conclusion of the first agreement described above and the establishment of agreed portions of the system. Pending the establishment of the control commission it might prove desirable to assign these responsibilities to the preparatory commission. Upon establishment of the control commission it could, as the Soviet Union has suggested, have responsibility to continue working out unfinished matters relating to the detection system on a technical basis. The control system would be extended and these tests would be prohibited as agreement was reached among us, and the treaty should make appropriate provisions for the phasing of the various elements of the system in order to bring them into effect at the earliest practicable time."

This approach, as you will recognize, is very similar to the two-part proposal you have outlined. In this connection, you may be sure that the various comments you have offered in conjunction with your proposal will be carefully studied as this possible alternative, along with others, is further explored.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank you for the constructive suggestion you have brought to the Department's attention. Your interest in these extremely important negotiations is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

CRASH PROGRAM TO BEAT CANCER—ARTICLE BY HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for the January 1960 issue of Coronet magazine, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has written a most comprehensive and compelling article about the urgent need for a crash program to cope with the terrible menace of cancer. Senator NEUBERGER, who himself has experienced this grim disease, submits to the American people a 5-point program to launch an all-out attack upon a malady which will strike 50 million Americans out of our present population of 173 million. Nobody reading this article can fail to realize the urgent necessity to place human lives first in any legislative consideration of proposals to amplify and extend cancer research—both through private channels and through the National Institutes of Health.

Perhaps the most dramatic feature of Senator NEUBERGER's article is his description of how cobalt radiation saved his own life from the menace of cancer. A great doctor wrote to Senator NEUBERGER that funds which Senator NEUBERGER himself had helped to vote for cancer research were a vital factor in developing the therapy which made possible his own recovery.

I know that all of my colleagues will want to read Senator NEUBERGER's thoughtful article, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Coronet magazine, January 1960]

LET'S BUILD A "CRASH PROGRAM" TO BEAT CANCER

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(When cancer suddenly struck this Senator, he realized gratefully that research, for which he'd voted funds, was saving his life and might save the lives of 45 million other Americans.)

What if we knew, without the slightest doubt, that a foreign foe intended to attack us with nuclear missiles or germ warfare? What if we also knew, with equal certainty, that some 30 million of us would perish in

agony from this assault, while 15 million more would suffer great pain or be permanently maimed?

A menace of these ghastly proportions does imperil 45 million Americans today, although not in the form of hydrogen warheads or lethal gas. It often gives even less warning than these. The name of the menace is "cancer." From the cruel ravages of this disease, two out of every three American families in avery avenue and echelon of society are destined to suffer painfully.

The American Government would spare no effort or expense to repel any military attack that threatened 45 million of us. Our Federal Treasury would be emptied, if necessary, to pay for armaments and weapons. Our vast private wealth and resources would be thrown into the fray.

Yet, despite the terrible threat of cancer, we spend far less on research into its causes and possible cures than we do, for instance, to build half a dozen B–58 bombers. Our annual expenditure for doughnuts more than triples what we spend in search of an answer to the curse of cancer. Nor does our total outlay for lifesaving cancer research compare with what we spend on cigarettes or liquor or radio and television repairs or even chewing gum.

What is the reason for such glaring inequities?

I think I can answer that from my personal experience. It's because we all believe, down deep, that it will never be ourselves who will get cancer. It's always the other fellow. I know. I once had such feelings myself. I don't now, and for a good reason: I am a cancer victim.

I always had intellectual convictions that cancer was a dangerous enemy, and I've spent a good part of my senatorial career successfully fighting for more funds for Government cancer research. But now my feelings about cancer come from my own bitter, personal experience; and it wasn't all bitter, at that. I'm one of the lucky ones. My cancer was caught early—an accident, you might say—I'd gone to my doctor about something else entirely, and he found the growth I'd never noticed. There was no pain, no warning. My doctor's skill was responsible, of course, but it was just luck that I visited him. And it was luck that my cancer, which began in my testicle and had spread to a minor degree to the edges of my lungs, was one of the kind that responds to the new ways of treatment available.

One of my vivid nightmares is to recall the mixture of incredulity and fear which swept over me when our family doctor told me I had cancer. I just could not accept his terrifying words. This just could not be me.

And then, later, as I came out from under the anesthetic, following surgery, the doctors told me that they confidently expected me to recover. While I stared at them in doubt, they explained that my tumor had been diagnosed as a type sensitive to radiation. Further, the doctors added, cobalt and high-voltage X-ray therapy, developed in recent years, could destroy the tiny but potentially lethal metastases which, even then, lurked on the outer edge of each of my lungs.

I can tell you that the cancer victim is frequently the loneliness person in the world. He feels that nothing can help him. Friends, family, doctors, associates all seem without power to check the malignant growth that perils his life. He wishes, desperately and profoundly, for some miraculous cure which will bring a reprieve.

In the weeks and months of radiation therapy which followed, I lay beneath the X-ray cone for a few minutes every weekday and blessed the long line of men and women whose findings in medical research, over the decades, were helping to save my life. Several well-known doctors wrote me letters saying that funds, for which I had voted in the U.S. Senate, had paid for perfecting the very radiation equipment being used in my own treatment. And when such letters came, I could only think in terror of what the outcome might have been for me if such equipment had not been developed.

I recall one dramatic conversation I had with the radiologist treating me, which demonstrated my personal reliance on the results of medical research.

"The spread to the lungs of the type of tumor which you have can be destroyed permanently if an adequate number of roentgens (a measure of X-rays) can be conveyed to the lesions," the doctor had said. Then he added:

"With cobalt or high-voltage X-ray, we know we can deliver to your lungs—safely and tolerably—enough roentgens."

"What if you didn't have these things?" I inquired.

"With the early X-ray equipment we often failed," the doctor said, "because the skin and tissues of the patient were damaged too severely before the necessary dosage could be administered internally."

I wondered what my fate would have been if I had suffered from the same malignancy a few years earlier.

At the recent Senate hearings on appropriations for the National Cancer Institute, our Government-supported research center, Dr. I. S. Ravdin, of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, told a gripping story which filled us all with hope. In the early 1920's, a noted doctor visited the William Pepper Laboratory of Clinical Medicine in Philadelphia and lunched with Dr. Alfred Stengel.

"How is your son Tom?" Dr. Stengel asked his friend.

"I wish young Tom were dead," his friend said, his voice heavy with sorrow. "He has diabetes. He is 13 and yet he isn't any bigger than a normal boy of 6. He can't possibly live and grow up."

Dr. Stengel replied, "Tom, you ought not to talk this way. Next month, next year or the year after, someone has got to come up with a solution for diabetes."

Within 24 hours of that prophetic conversation between the two physicians, the discovery of insulin that could be injected into human beings was announced. It brought life and hope to sufferers from diabetes all over the world. Young Tom was the second patient ever treated with insulin in the United States. Today he is married, has five children of his own and is himself a distinguished doctor. Yet what would have been his destiny if medical researchers had not been delving for years for an answer to diabetes?

My wife Maurine and I visited the Children's Cancer Research Foundation in Boston, where Dr. Sidney Farber and his associates have some 376 children under treatment for cancer, many of them victims of the dreaded cancer of the blood and bone marrow, leukemia. We saw the agonized stare of parents who cannot believe their beloved child suffers from this incurable disease. Yet, these poor little leukemia victims, who used to survive an average of only 3 or 5 months, now live almost 2 years. One boy was kept alive and vigorous for 8 years through chemical agents.

A major breakthrough has not been achieved in leukemia, but researchers are on the frontier of important advances. Dr. Farber believes that the annual screening of some 40,000 chemicals for the treatment of cancer offers the brightest prospect for a startling, new discovery. A universal blood or urine test for cancer is another goal.

But progress depends entirely upon findings in laboratories. Money is needed to train researchers, to build facilities, and furnish grants for their operation. Last year, the American Cancer Society spent over $13 million for cancer research. Much of the remainder of the society's $30 million of voluntary donations went for service to cancer patients, supported the nationwide program of education to acquaint Americans with the danger signals of cancer and to persuade them to have annual physical checkups.

Out of the $75 million budget of the National Cancer Institute, about $68 million went into some phase of research. About $4 million was spent in cancer research through the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund, the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and various pharmaceutical firms. Impressive gains have been made but the blank wall of cancer still stands.

How can we breach that wall?

Most scientists in the vital field of cancer research believe there is a direct relationship between the number of men and women engaged in their work and the time when a cure finally will be found. Listen to Dr. Howard A. Rusk, distinguished medical editor of the New York Times:

"When will the scientific breakthrough come to solve the riddle of cancer? No one knows. What we do know, however, is that the more scientists who are at work on the problem in laboratories all over the world, the greater are the odds for solution and the quicker that solution will come."

And Dr. Lowell T. Coggeshall of the University of Chicago, who retired about a year ago as president of the American Cancer Society, says: "Some people ask in good conscience, 'Isn't there a limit to the funds that could be spent fruitfully on cancer research?' Of course there is a limit, but we have not nearly reached it."

So why not a genuine crash program of cancer research? Why not place half a billion dollars—the cost of 25 B–58 bombers—at the disposal of the National Cancer Institute for grants in a realm where countless lives might be saved? Dr. Leonard Scheele, ex-Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, once told me that half a billion dollars could be used constructively for cancer research. He suggested that the sum be carried over from year to year until fully expended, thus permitting continuity in vital projects which now have only annual duration. "In addition," said Dr. Scheele, "a considerable portion of the amount should be dedicated to the training of new scientists in the health field—just as a major share of our military budget is for the training of fliers, navigators, and other fighting men."

Half a billion dollars may seem like a lot of money per se, but not when we relate it to the lives of 45 million American victims of cancer. It comes down to only slightly more than $10 per life—per irreplaceable human life.

When I speak of a crash program for cancer research, I have in mind the determined Federal action that took place in 1940 after Dr. Albert Einstein had sent his historic letter to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, with its warnings of Nazi experiments in nuclear fission. The all-out crash program to crack the atom followed immediately, with over $2 billion spent through the top-secret Manhattan project. Scientists later claimed that 50 years of research were compressed into 4 or 5 years as a result of this unstinted effort.

Why, then, are we capable of such a crash program when the menace is a foreign foe, but not when it is deadly cells running wild through our own bodies?

Yet even the increase in funds for the National Cancer Institute, from nearly $22 million (in 1955) to $110 million (for this year), has not been accomplished without the most persistent sort of congressional activity. The national administration has refused to recommend budget increases for cancer research despite the fact that illustrious supporters such as Senator Robert A. Taft, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, and Secretary of

State John Foster Dulles all have succumbed to cancer within the last 7 years.

Furthermore, cancer recognizes neither border nor breed nor birth. It can strike down the millionaire on Park Avenue and the tribesman in his Congo hut. Our Government spends more than $3.4 billion a year in foreign aid to strengthen our alliances with other free nations. Yet imagine the worldwide thrill if some scientific breakthrough were to liberate mankind from the terrifying menace of cancer. This is why Senator LISTER HILL has promoted an Institute of International Health, to help place the necessary funds at the disposal of scientists anywhere on earth who can contribute to the control of cancer and other diseases. The sole test would be medical findings rather than national allegiances.

We look back now with pity on the recent era when pneumonia was almost always fatal, when children were struck down from diphtheria and scarlet fever, when infected throats in childhood often meant lethal Bright's disease in later years. What will be the emotions of the next epoch of mankind as it looks back upon our frequent helplessness in the face of cancer? Will it mourn that so many men, women, and children in our era perished needlessly because they lived a little too soon—before the "crash" effort which at last brought cancer to bay?

What ought to be done? I favor a five-point program:

1. The sum of $500 million for the National Cancer Institute, to be distributed in grants for cancer research to any medical school, clinic, hospital, pharmaceutical house, or private physician where a promising lead had been developed.

2. Increased support through private giving to such voluntary groups as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund.

3. Forgiveness of 50 percent of loans under the National Scholarship Act to any medical student or other scientist who will spend at least 5 years in medical research. This should be accompanied by grants to medical schools for the construction of research facilities.

4. The international pooling of medical discoveries through an Institute of International Health, as well as the calling of an International Medical Year in 1960 to parallel the recent International Geophysical Year. Surely the study of a killing disease is as important as the study of rocks, ice, and sea water.

5. Take our Red Cross hospital ships out of mothballs and send them overseas, staffed with American doctors and nurses and sanitary technicians, to help undeveloped nations under our foreign aid program to fight cancer and other diseases. In many less fortunate nations, infant mortality is shockingly high and blindness affects a large segment of the adult population, to some degree. These people would rather keep their babies or have reasonable vision than have their streets paved.

I may be unduly conscious of the urgency of such programs because the results of medical research have saved my life. When we were discussing in the Senate late last June the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, I told my colleagues that I owed my very presence in the marble Chamber to findings sponsored by the National Cancer Institute. The Democratic majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who suffered a massive coronary attack in 1955, declared that he could say the identical thing about discoveries made possible through the research grants program of the National Heart Institute. Because cancer and heart disease recognize no aisle between the political parties, our Republican colleague on the other side of the Chamber, Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, said to Senator JOHNSON and to me:

"If the appropriations for medical research have had any force in bringing about both of those results or either of them, they have surely proved their effectiveness. I shall certainly support this increased amount for medical research."

Will increased expenditures result in finding a cure for cancer? The American Cancer Society points out that earlier diagnosis and advances in treatment have increased the cancer cure rate from one out of every four cancer victims to one in three. To the cancer patient, like myself, such things are more than mere numbers. They are survival—the chance to breathe anew, to walk in the woods, to revel in the affection of family and friends, to see the glories of the sunrise and to drink in the wonders of the starlit night.

I'm happier to be alive than I've ever been. Having cancer has changed all my attitudes, all my values. When you're facing the terrible threat of this foul disease, you suddenly discover what's important. The petty discomforts and irritations that used to bother you disappear; and so do ordinary ambitions and attitudes. I don't think I'll ever cease being grateful to my wife for just being my wife; I know I'll never again consider a piece of legislation primarily on its politically partisan aspects.

As a cancer patient, I want to help others who have suffered or who may suffer this disease. I want to encourage them and their families as I was encouraged and supported by cancer progress. I want more: I want to see us lick this disease the way we've licked the infectious diseases. I sincerely believe the world would be more electrified by a breakthrough in cancer than it was by a rocket landing on the moon. As a U.S. Senator, I'm more convinced than ever that we should economize in any other sphere of government than funds for the research program of the National Cancer Institute—because economy at the expense of human life is the worst extravagance of all.

SCIENTIFIC TESTS ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 3 minutes in addition to the regular allowance during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, at hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I listened with great respect and attention to an outstanding American lawyer who is an eminent authority on the law of the sea. I refer to Mr. Arthur H. Dean, who has just completed, on behalf of this country, and as a special representative of the administration, months of tedious international negotiations which led to the signing of four complex and valuable conventions and a protocol on the law of the sea.

Mr. President, these conventions, as well as numerous others to which this country has adhered at various times throughout its history, have two basic and traditional purposes. They represent attempts to get nations to enter into agreements which safeguard the maximum free usage of the seas to all nations; and, in the interest of all nations, they seek to insure responsible usage of the high seas by any single nation.

Mr. President, I listened to Mr. Dean with admiration and respect. His is a profound knowledge of the traditional policies of the United States with respect to the high seas and the problems which beset their free and responsible usage. That is why I am disturbed by some of his very revealing answers. In the conventions which Mr. Dean was so instrumental in negotiating, every effort is made to protect the right of all nations to use the high seas and the skies above them for commerce, fishing, and other useful purposes. Predatory tendencies by any nation in this connection are curbed, for they are recognized for what they are—namely, a threat to the interest of all in this single greatest common resource of mankind—the high seas. But, Mr. President, while these conventions deal with many dangers to this interest, they are silent on what is now already the greatest threat to this common resource, and is bound to become an even greater threat in the years ahead. That danger is represented by the kind of tests the Russians are at this very moment conducting in the Pacific, and which, I say in all frankness, we, ourselves, have conducted in the past, and are still conducting in both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

To make this point clear, Mr. President, let me read a brief exchange between Mr. Dean and myself, during the course of yesterday's hearings:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have you ever given thought, Mr. Dean, to the very likely probability that within a very few years a considerable number of nations—not just Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—are going to want to use the oceans for the testing of various dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. I think that is a most important question which I sincerely hope that this convention at Geneva is addressing itself to and I sincerely hope there will be an agreement on that matter because I consider it one of the most important, if not the most important, aspects of life that we face today.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think, Mr. Dean, it is going to be a very free sea if a dozen or more nations are blocking off thousands of square miles of it at a time, and putting up "no trespassing" signs of one kind or another?

Mr. DEAN. No, it would not.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, I do not question the value or importance of many of these tests on the high seas to science and to mankind. I doubt that you do, either. They will undoubtedly go on, and it is probably necessary that they go on.

But let me ask you this: Do you not see in the present almost complete national license to use the seas for dangerous, and sometimes destructive, tests, a possibility of a grave challenge to both of our basic concepts of the law of the sea—that is, to the concepts of freedom of the sea and responsible usage of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I do, and that is why I sincerely hope that something along these lines will be done at this——

Senator MANSFIELD. At Geneva?

Mr. DEAN. At Geneva.

So far as I am aware, Mr. President, despite Mr. Dean's sincere hope, no impending conference in Geneva is going to deal with this problem in its full dimension. An impending meeting on further extension of the law of the sea is scheduled to treat only with the questions of the limit of territorial waters and certain fishing rights. And to the Geneva conference on nuclear testing has been referred only the question of banning nuclear tests on the high seas. That is not, as I have suggested, the full dimension of the problem, at all. What is involved here is the regulation of the use of the high seas by any nation—not necessarily the banning of its use—for scientific tests of all kinds which may infringe on the rights of other nations to their free use.

In the exchange at the hearing from which I have just read, one of the most eminent authorities in this entire complex matter of the law of the sea has recognized in unmistakable terms a problem that is a most grave threat to the equal rights of all nations and to world peace. Yet what is the administration's answer to this grave problem? The administration's answer is this: "Since we have used the seas unilaterally for testing, the Russians can do the same thing." Perhaps that is a correct answer under present international law; I have no doubt that it is. But I suggest, Mr. President, that it is no answer at all to the problem.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is not enough for us to say that because we test at will the Russians can test at will on the high seas, and for us then to let the matter drop. Throughout its history, our Nation has had a great stake in the concept of free and responsible usage of the seas, and has played a leading role in upholding it. The stake will grow greater in the future. Since that is the case, we owe it to ourselves, if not to all mankind, to act in a fashion which will preserve this concept against the newest and most dangerous threat to which it has ever been exposed—namely, the threat which is inherent in unrestrained, uninational usage of the high seas for scientific tests of one degree or another of danger or inconvenience to others. We have got to try to get written into international legal doctrine the terms under which any nation may use the high seas for this purpose. We have got to clarify, for example, how close to the shores of other nations these tests can be carried on. As the matter now stands, Mr. President, it is admissible under international law for the Russians to test missiles, not only as they are now doing—a thousand miles off Hawaii—but even within sight of San Francisco, Miami, Honolulu, or Boston. In truth, we might do the same off Vladivostok, insofar as international law is concerned.

Moreover, we have got to try to get written into accepted international legal doctrine some concept of how large an area of the seas may temporarily be reserved by any nation for the purpose of scientific tests. As of now, 1,000, 100,000 or 1 million square miles or more may be blocked off summarily by any nation. And as interpreted by this administration, international law would find this practice perfectly permissible. We also have got to get written into international legal doctrine some provision for compensation for damages which may result to persons, commerce, and so forth, of other nations as a result of the tests conducted by any nation.

The solution of the problem, as I see it, Mr. President, is not to ban scientific tests of a nuclear or any other nature on the high seas. Some of these tests may be of the utmost importance to mankind. The solution of the problem is to control and regulate such tests, with due regard for the rights of all.

Again, I say to this administration that the problem cannot be sloughed off by saying that if we can use the high seas for such tests, so can the Russians. The problem must be faced frankly and in its full dimension. Not only does unbridled usage of the high seas for testing pose a threat to the rights of all nations, it also contains, at worst, a serious potential of accidental conflict, and, at best, a serious potential of hostile provocation which does not serve the cause of peace.

In line with our traditions and with our long-range interests, I believe it is incumbent upon our Nation to take the initiative in dealing with this problem. The place to do so is in the United Nations or some agency thereof. The time to do so is now. The responsibility for doing so rests with this administration; and I hope it will not shirk it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the series of questions asked of Mr. Arthur Dean at yesterday's hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, and his replies to the questions.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the hearing were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, I have been interested in listening to your testimony and I have read the four conventions and the protocol which are now up for ratification by the Senate.

In the convention on the territorial sea and contiguous zones, the preexisting situation prevails, in your opinion, and I quote, wherein you state:

"In our view"—the U.S. view—"the 3-mile limit is and will continue to be an established international law to which we adhere."

You hope for some changes at the next convention but that is your position at the present time?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. And in the convention on the high seas, which refers to navigation, fishing, submarine cables, pipelines, and the freedom to fly over the high seas, a proposal was made by the Soviet Union, I believe, backing nuclear tests on the high seas, and in this attempt it was defeated. And as a result, a separate resolution was passed referring nuclear tests on the high seas to the United Nations General Assembly for appropriate action and is transmitted for the information of the Senate.

It may be noted that the Soviets claim their scheduled missile tests in the Pacific will not involve nuclear energy.

That is out of your testimony, and, of course, what I said previously is in one of the conventions.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, do we have a national tradition of encouraging in international law a very broad concept of freedom of the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we do, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is a very old tradition, is it not, and one which we have maintained with great vigor throughout our entire history?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we have.

Senator MANSFIELD. In line with this tradition, we do not look kindly on nations arbitrarily extending their territorial waters beyond the present 3-mile limit; is that correct?

Mr. DEAN. That is so, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. We ourselves adhere as a general practice to the 3-mile limit in our own territorial waters?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. Generally speaking, we uphold, do we not, the right of any nation to fish the high seas without arbitrary interference from another?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. The same would apply as regards the right of a ship of any nation to navigate the seas for commerce, pleasure, or whatever?

Mr. DEAN. On the high seas; yes, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. High seas.

And the same would apply to planes of any nation flying in the air above the sea, would it not?

Mr. DEAN. Above the high seas; yes, sir. And as I think you know, we have the Chicago convention for all the countries that are parties to that which permits us to traverse their territory.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed.

Now, Mr. Dean, is it not a fact that in addition to the concept of free seas, which we have long held, there is a second tradition of later origin, perhaps, but nonetheless of great significance in international legal doctrine as espoused by the United States. I refer to the concept which complements that of the free use of the seas, the concept of the responsible use of the seas by all nations.

Is that not also a basic principle of the American approach to the law of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, it is.

Senator MANSFIELD. Within that concept, have we not become parties to various fisheries, navigational, piracy, and similar international conventions which, while they may curb the absolute freedom of any nation to the high seas, were designed to safeguard or regulate the usage of the seas and its resources so that the rights of the many nations are thereby protected?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. Would you say that the four conventions which we are now considering safeguard and advance these two complementary concepts of American doctrine on the law of the sea? That is, free usage and responsible usage of the seas by the nations of the world.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir; I think they are a great advance.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, is there anything in these conventions concerning the disposal of radioactive wastes in the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, there is, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. The answer is, yes?

Mr. DEAN. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. Is there anything in these conventions on petroleum pollution?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, there is.

Senator MANSFIELD. These clauses, presumably, are in the treaty because arbitrary actions in this connection by one nation

might damage the rights of others as regards fishing, for example, or navigation; is that not so?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, and also with respect to health.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes.

Is there anything in these conventions about prohibiting the use of the high seas for the testing of nuclear or other dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. No, there is not, Senator. The Soviet Union introduced a resolution which would have—which was twofold. It would have prevented the assembly of naval ships for maneuvers on the high seas, and they also wanted a resolution that it was the sense of the convention that there should not occurr any nuclear tests or explosions on the high seas.

They refused, in exploratory conferences, to include in their resolution any explosions on land, even though the radioactive waste material might fall on the sea.

It seemed to us that since there was going to be this convention convening at Geneva at which there were going to be experts and which was convened for that specific purpose, that the world would be somewhat misled if there were a convention saying that you could not conduct nuclear explosions on the high seas which might fall on land, but there was absolutely nothing in the convention about explosions on land where the radioactive waste might fall on the seas.

Senator MANSFIELD. But the question has been referred to the United Nations General Assembly?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, sir. We sponsored, we worked for a long time with the Indian delegation, and in the State Department bulletin of June 30, 1958—and I also think you have it before you—there was a resolution adopted by the conference with respect to nuclear tests on the high seas, and referred this matter, which expressed a serious and genuine apprehension on the part of many States that nuclear explosions constitute an infringement on the freedom of the seas and referred this matter to the General Assembly and asked that they investigate and report on it. And we also referred to them a resolution on the pollution of the high seas by radioactive materials, and we suggested that this whole matter should be taken up at this convention on disarmament and also on nuclear weapons that is being convened at Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, you are aware that the Russians are blocking off a section of the Pacific, 27,000 square miles, in extent, although I have seen the figure 45,000 square miles used more recently, for use in connection with certain missile tests. We have done the same for even larger areas as regards nuclear tests, I think the figure is 400,000 square miles, in the region around Eniwetok, and we maintain active missile ranges in both the Atlantic and the Pacific.

The British, I believe, have also used sections of the Pacific around Christmas Island, estimated around 900 square miles, for nuclear or similar tests.

Is there anything in these conventions which relates to this sort of testing?

Mr. DEAN. No, there is not.

Senator MANSFIELD. The conventions are concerned with oil pollution and other wastes but not radioactivity?

Mr. DEAN. That is correct.

Senator MANSFIELD. As a layman in these matters, as I am, has it ever occurred to you that tests of nuclear devices and missiles must do very extensive damage to the fishery resources of the high seas?

Mr. DEAN. That is a very definite possibility, Senator, but it seemed to us that that subject ought to be considered in connection with this particular convention on nuclear testing or perhaps the ending of nuclear testing that was convening at Geneva, because they had a whole group of experts who had studied and prepared for that matter, and we did not have, none of the nations had that type of an expert at this convention at Geneva on this convention on the high seas, and as I said earlier, it also seemed to us we would only be dealing with one-half of the subject.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see.

Now, is it not a very serious interference with the freedom to navigate the seas and the air above them when one nation—ourselves or Russia or some other—blocks off many thousands of square miles of the ocean and advises all ships and planes to stay out of the area for a specified period of time?

Mr. DEAN. Well, I do not want to quibble with you, but I believe that the official position of our Government has been that we have not actually blocked people from going there, although we have warned them in there and I believe have actually taken in some respects, have actually arrested people on crews and have taken them into court, but I believe it is the official position of our Government that that is not interference with the freedom of the seas.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Dean, under our present adherence to the 3-mile territorial waters limit, it is conceivable, is it not, that the Russians could test whatever scientific devices they wished, assuming they did no damage, 400, 40, or 4 miles, off San Francisco, Los Angeles, or Ocean City, Md., for that matter? Such tests would not violate present international law?

Mr. DEAN. I do not believe it would violate present international law, but as I think you know, President Eisenhower has been doing his level best to try to get the Soviets to agree with us on the ending of that kind of testing.

Senator MANSFIELD. He has indeed, and he deserves all the credit in the world for it.

Now, presumably, we could do something similar off the Russian Pacific coast?

Mr. DEAN. As a matter of international law, we could.

Senator MANSFIELD. While it might not be prohibited by international law, you would not recommend the practice of testing by the Russians immediately off the American littoral, or vice versa, would you?

Mr. DEAN. No, I would not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have you ever given thought, Mr. DEAN, to the very likely probability that within a very few years a considerable number of nations—not just Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom—are going to want to use the oceans for the testing of various dangerous scientific devices?

Mr. DEAN. I think that is a most important question which I sincerely hope that this convention at Geneva is addressing itself to, and I sincerely hope there will be an agreement on that matter, because I consider it one of the most important, if not the most important, aspects of life that we face today.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think, Mr. Dean, it is going to be a very free sea if a dozen or more nations are blocking off thousands of square miles of it at a time, and putting up no trespassing signs for tests of one kind of another?

Mr. DEAN. No, I would not.

Senator MANSFIELD. Now, Mr. Dean, I do not question the value or importance of many of these tests in the high seas to science and to mankind. I doubt that you do, either. They will undoubtedly go on, and it is probably necessary that they go on.

But let me ask you this: Do you not see at the present almost complete national license to use the seas for dangerous, and sometimes destructive tests, a possibility of a grave challenge to both of our basic concepts of the law of the sea—that is, to the concept of freedom of the sea and responsible usage of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I do, and that is why I sincerely hope that something along these lines will be done at this——

Senator MANSFIELD. At Geneva?

Mr. DEAN. At Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think it is any answer to this problem to say that because we have used the seas for testing, the Russians have any right to do the same?

Mr. DEAN. Well, I believe that is the official position of our Government as of the present time.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is the official position of the Government as enunciated by the President of the United States just a week ago today, last Wednesday.

Do you think that there is a need for an extension of the law of the sea, an additional international convention, perhaps the one you have mentioned in testimony this morning, which, while it would not prohibit scientific tests on the high seas, would establish the conditions under which they might take place and thereby protect the rights of other nations or their nationals which might be damaged by the tests?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, if it were correlated with tests on the land, as I have testified earlier.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think the place to raise this question is in the United Nations or some agency thereof?

Mr. DEAN. I definitely think it should be raised in the United Nations, and I hope it can be raised at Geneva.

Senator MANSFIELD. Geneva, as well.

Do you think the question should be raised as a matter of urgency?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, I think it is a matter of great urgency.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you think that to raise this question and to take the initiative in trying to get an international answer to it would be in accord with our traditional concepts of the law of the sea?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, provided it is correlated with our efforts with respect to all over the world so we would not have it with respect to tests that might take place on the high seas, and no corresponding prohibitions with respect to tests that might take place on land.

Senator MANSFIELD. I see.

Do you think that the long-range interests of this Nation and others would be served by international agreement to regulate the usage of the high seas for scientific tests?

Mr. DEAN. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you know of any reasons why this administration should not take the matter up in the United Nations?

Mr. DEAN. I believe we are taking it up at this convention in Geneva. I think that is a part of this whole convention coming to Geneva on the control of nuclear tests and on disarmament.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, on the basis of your testimony, Mr. Dean, I would assume that you would not be averse to going even further because on the basis of the question raised by the Soviet Union vis-a-vis nuclear testing. I believe it was the consensus of the convention that this matter should be referred to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. DEAN. Yes, we voted a resolution to that effect.

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you know of any reason why this Government should not take—do you think that to advance this matter in the United Nations would be an initiative for peace on our part?

Mr. DEAN. Yes, and it is my understanding that we have advanced it and are advancing it now.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. Dean, I want to thank you for your frank answers to this series of questions, because I think the sooner we get this matter out in the open and try to arrive at a reasonable solution to the difficulties which are evidently going to mount in the years ahead, the better off we, the Soviet Union, and the whole world, for that matter, will be.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR GREEN

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last January 13 many of my Senate colleagues spoke in just tribute and admiration for THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, the venerable Senator from Rhode Island who, much to the sorrow of us all, has decided not to seek another Senate term. As you know, Mr. President, the Senate was involved, at that time, in discussing the Federal Elections Act of 1959 and I was able to pay only scant tribute to my good friend—the esteemed Senator GREEN.

However, I am happy that my own comments have been delayed. I am happy because the delay gave me an opportunity to observe Senator GREEN's reaction to the remarks about him. Speaking of those remarks, the sage Senator said:

> After listening for some time I began to wonder whether or not a great mistake had been made. My mind wandered a little, and I thought of myself as lying in a coffin in front of the dais of the presiding officer, with my colleagues going by dropping a flower or two as they passed.

And—continuing in a more serious vein, he said:

> There is one impression I wish to correct. It should not be assumed that because I had said I would not be a candidate for reelection in the next election, I was retiring from public life. I do not want that impression to get abroad, especially in Rhode Island. I am ready to serve my friends the people—who really are my friends—whenever they feel they need me.

Mr. President, those two remarks illustrate the two qualities which, in my long association and close friendship with Senator GREEN, I have found most inspiring. With these two brief remarks he shows the rare good humor with which he has brightened this Senate and the sense of public service with which he has graced it. Rarely have two such qualities been combined in a single person to the extent they are blended in the personality and character of Senator GREEN.

How often—during the nearly 10 years he and I have served on the Committee on Rules and Administration—how often do I recall his flashing wit? It pierced debates with a perception which went immediately to the heart of the controversy and, at the same time, it cleared the air and, somehow, made our legislative tasks a little easier.

It is impossible, of course, for me to recall the countless number of times when this good man quietly offered himself for a thankless task—a bitter job. His character is such as to make it impossible for him to shirk what he believes to be his duty to the people of Rhode Island and the United States. In every respect he is, as my good friend, William S. White, has written, "a combat soldier, not a talking soldier."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GOVERNOR CLINTON A. CLAUSON OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel entitled "Clauson Was Man of True Honesty," be printed in the body of the RECORD. It relates to our great and beloved Governor who recently passed away.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAUSON WAS MAN OF TRUE HONESTY

"Doc" Clauson was a kindly man who liked people and was in turn liked by them.

He was an outgoing and friendly man who by his nature didn't make personal enemies.

It seems almost out of character that he should have been at the time of his death locked in a bitter battle with his executive council.

It was not strange, however, to those who knew him well, because his fight with the council was a disagreement that involved principles and where principles were involved "Doc" Clauson was not a man to make compromises.

This was evident when he was mayor of Waterville. On one occasion, for example, he put his whole political career on the line when he antagonized a powerful segment of his party in Waterville by his stand on an appointment for which he felt their man was not qualified.

It would have been easy during his year as Governor to have gone along with his executive council on appointments while he concentrated on being the affable chief of state.

But he felt that the council was exceeding its functions in attempting to control appointments that were properly the Governor's to make.

A principle was involved and he was willing to fight them on it, even though it must have been personally taxing on his friendly nature to do so.

But "Doc" Clauson wasn't ever a man afraid of a fight. He got the Democratic nomination for Governor after a fight in which he was opposed by many leaders in his party, especially those of the younger group.

He won election in a contest with a former Republican Governor although most political prognosticators thought he couldn't do it.

Once in office, he surrounded himself with capable people and tackled his job with determination and with a dedication that was typical of him, whatever his task.

On the go throughout his year in office he studied the State's problems and worked constantly to do something about them.

He was a man of character and of true honesty. He was a man who had the ability to be concerned with the problems of other people.

When he went about the State he wasn't just a politician seeking to curry favors and votes. He was a man who genuinely liked other people.

He liked them not just as voters but as human beings and they responded by liking him.

A Waterville man, on the other side of the political fence from "Doc" Clauson, who has known him intimately for years was as shocked as everyone else when he heard the news of his death.

He shook his head and said, "I've never known a finer person." Could there be a finer eulogy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

CONGRESS HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE AID TO AREAS OF CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISTRESS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 8, 1960, the White House made public an exchange of correspondence between the President of the United States and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

I refer to the President's letter in reply to Senator COOPER in which he discussed the present role of the Federal Government in alleviating the conditions of economic distress in areas of chronic unemployment.

The tenor of the President's response to the question addressed him by our distinguished colleague from Kentucky was consistent with the position the present administration has too long maintained. In brief, the President declares that "the benefits resulting from the Federal contribution in surplus labor areas have been widespread and substantial."

In spite of such optimistic Presidential phrasing, and notwithstanding such recent headlines as "Jobs at peak as economy shows rally," the grim facts of large-scale unemployment continue to exist in many areas of our country, and hunger is still the daily lot in many thousands of American homes. The State Legislature of West Virginia is now in one of its most difficult sessions grappling with these problems. But our State and others—and the distressed localities situated within them—cannot be expected to solve all of the far-reaching and vexing problems inherent in this age of extreme technological changes without receiving assistance in some degree from the Federal establishment beyond what the President claims this administration is doing.

SENATE PASSED AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

During the first session of this Congress last year the Senate passed S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, after lengthy consideration. This measure was the product of extensive hearings—some of them in West Virginia.

It was my privilege to be one of the original cosponsors of the bill, and I am glad to see that the dedicated Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is present on the floor as I make these remarks. His leadership in this vital field is appreciated and recognized.

I offered testimony at Beckley and Morgantown in support of that measure when the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee conducted hearings in our State under the direction of my diligent colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. And I participated actively in the debate on the bill in this Chamber and supported it fully on all rollcalls.

Only this morning, Mr. President, members of the West Virginia congressional delegation discussed the need for House action. They are eager to join others, or to lead their colleagues, in bringing the bill to the floor for debate.

During the recent recess, I conducted hearings in West Virginia as a member of the Senate's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. These hearings, held for 3 consecutive days in four different locations, gave added evidence of the tragic conditions in many parts of West Virginia. Other of my colleagues, who are members of that committee, can attest to depressed conditions in numerous areas, because they, too,

conducted hearings in their own and other States, and know full well that prosperity is not spread uniformly over the country.

Perhaps I have done all that lies within my power as a U.S. Senator to help secure passage of the area redevelopment bill. Yet, there remains one further avenue for me to explore and one other course for me to seek to develop in the role of an individual citizen with an abiding interest and concern in the problem.

A CITIZEN'S APPEAL FOR PASSAGE

Therefore, I speak now as a citizen when I assert my right of petition, and I address my petition especially to the House Rules Committee and to all Members of the House of Representatives in urging consideration and passage of S. 722 at the earliest opportunity.

In spite of the economic recovery of last year over much of the country—a fact in which we all rejoice—the conditions to which the provisions of S. 722 are addressed have not been altered. Indeed, in many instances they have worsened. In West Virginia, there has been a general increase during the past year in the number of initial unemployment-compensation claims filed. This adds more distress atop our chronic problem of thousands of permanently unemployed coal miners whose jobs have been liquidated by reason of extensive mine mechanization.

Mr. President, in 1959 in West Virginia we mined approximately 115 million tons of bituminous coal. This figure is somewhat like the figure for 1958, but 10,500 fewer miners were employed in West Virginia in 1959 than were employed in 1958. Yet the tonnage was practically the same.

When I speak of the situation, I want to be specific. A recent survey by the West Virginia Department of Employment Security received in our office for the week ended January 9, 1960, revealed that every one of that agency's 24 offices in the State reported an increase in the number of initial claims filed that week as compared with the number filed during the 2 weeks preceding, with such areas as centrally located Clarksburg showing a 293-percent increase, Moundsville in the northern panhandle, bordering Ohio on the west and Pennsylvania on the east, showing a 250-percent upsurge, and Martinsburg in the extreme eastern panhandle, near both the Maryland and Virginia lines, showing an increase of 203 percent.

This is an alarming spread because, as their locations were described, none of these communities is in the hard-pressed southern West Virginia coal mining region which has long since been recognized as in dire need of assistance. But even in the southern coal mining communities—such as Beckley, Logan, and Welch—where the unemployment rate supposedly had leveled off—the increase in initial claims filed for the same period, as previously stated, has been 99.2 percent, 81.9 percent, and 74.6 percent, respectively. So the situation shows further worsening, even in the chronic areas.

CONSTRUCTION OFF AND HOUSING UNOCCUPIED

At this point it seems appropriate to quote briefly from a communication I received a few days ago from my longtime friend, City Manager Elmer W. Prince, of Morgantown, W. Va. That city is the home of the State university, where much heavy engineering and construction on and near the campus have materially bolstered the economy.

But City Manager Prince wrote in a January 9, 1960, letter to me that—

> the unemployment situation in this area is as critical and may be worse than at this time last year. The State, city, and individuals have been doing their best in this area in attempting to provide employment by new building construction and repair projects.

But he added, which I hope my colleagues in the Senate will bear in mind:

> This construction program has reached its peak and it now appears the program for 1960 and future years will be far below present level. Should there not be a continuance of a heavy construction program, there is little to offer the unemployed for their livelihood in this area. Local industry is reducing its payrolls, the State construction program is being seriously reduced, and the city is unable to continue its heavy program.

Now, Mr. President, I underscore for emphasis this additional significant comment in the Morgantown city manager's letter to our office:

> There are more than 600 dwelling units in the immediate area (of Morgantown) unoccupied and for sale or rent, and the general economic condition is on a sharp downward trend. Some concerted action must be taken before conditions reach a critical point. There appears to be but one answer to the problem and that is for the States and subordinate governmental units and agencies, which are facing economic ills, to obtain financial assistance from the Federal Government for worthwhile and public improvement projects.

Thus, in spite of the President's apparent belief that his administration has spread prosperity uniformly across the country there still remain in West Virginia and other States many islands of chronic unemployment, economic distress, and certainly much poverty.

DOMESTIC SCENE NEEDS ATTENTION, TOO

Now, as a prelude to further remarks concerning the President's responsibilities, I have said before and I repeat that I do not wish to be critical of our Chief Executive's travels in the interest of mutual understanding. In fact, I applaud that mission and the pursuit of it.

On September 12, 1959, in this Chamber, I stated that the exchange of visits between the President of the United States and the Premier of the Soviet Union would involve a certain amount of peril, but I declared that I prefer to stand on the side of promise, rather than to kneel on the side of peril. I say today as I said then: The path to peace is a continuing search. The overriding concern of unnumbered millions of humans calls for forbearance and forthrightness. But we must never cease in our quest.

At this time I do, however, emphasize the need for both a sympathetic and realistic approach by the White House to the domestic matters which are the central theme of this discourse.

I doubt not that if General Eisenhower had spent as much time touring our own underdeveloped and distressed areas as he already has done in Asia and Africa, he would have an awareness of the problems of West Virginia and of other States in the same degree as he seems to have toward those of India and other countries.

Now, I have never been one to declare that I will oppose economic assistance abroad until my claims and appeals for domestic development are met. But surely, in the interests of commonsense and national security, as well as humanitarianism, we must acknowledge our responsibilities to our own people at least as much as to those of Asia and Africa. In fact, I have said—and I declare with renewed emphasis—it is my opinion that for every dollar we make available for assistance abroad we have a double obligation to our fellow citizens in the United States.

But, Mr. President, the most recent contribution of the administration in this field of domestic distress has been another press release from the Department of Commerce. It came to my attention in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette a few days ago.

That newspaper published an article under a Washington dateline stating that Under Secretary of Commerce Philip A. Ray recently declared that the Federal Government already has more than 40 programs "which can be of direct help to communities where pockets of unemployment exist despite the general national prosperity."

PUBLIC RELATIONS OR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY?

The obvious implication to be drawn from the Under Secretary's press release and the President's letter in reply to the inquiry made by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is that the administration is doing all it intends to do, and, further, that what is being done is quite sufficient. This seems to me to be the product of a sense of public relations on the part of the administration rather than a facing up to public responsibility.

There is no doubt about it in my mind, our first obligation is to assure every man the opportunity to maintain his own respect as an individual. This means, before all else, the opportunity to use his strength and skill and intelligence in some form of constructive work and thereby enable him to assume his rightful role as a free man and a provider for his family. No one can gage the dreadful cost in human terms and in the erosion of morale which is brought on by enforced idleness.

We have ample statistics on the loss in gross national product due to chronic unemployment and the recent recession. And I might add in passing that the total cost of S. 722 would be a mere pittance as compared with the cost of the recession of 1958. But who can gage the psychological cost of thousands of skilled men forced into idleness by technological changes? Who can gage the cost in self-respect and the dislocation of family life when men must desert their families so that the wives may claim nonsupport and thereby qualify for public assistance? Yet, these conditions exist even

now as we begin to bask in the glow of the approaching "fabulous sixties"—as the coming decade has been labeled by some persons.

With all of the good will and optimism for peace and prosperity being generated by the administration and party in power these days, I hope it will not be considered unpatriotic if one must occasionally take the Senate floor to ask that there be a sterner look at the inventory of our national needs. At the present time I refer only to this one—the area redevelopment bill—though there are many others which the 86th Congress must face in the coming months.

But the need for this measure—S. 722—is immediate and pressing. The hearings have been held and the testimony has been given before committees in both Houses of the Congress. The bill has been reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The evidence is set down—not only in the written record, but more grimly—in the darkened eyes of men who find no work for willing hands and in the pinched and tightened faces of their wives and hungry children.

Therefore, I ask again in this petition, principally in the role of an individual citizen addressing the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives and the Members of that body:

"Will you, gentlemen and ladies, place S. 722 on the calendar of the House and seek its passage so that it may be presented to the President of the United States for his signature at the earliest possible time?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for this very truthful and frank statement of a great national need. With profits increasing, there is a tendency for the financial writers to think that everything is going well. However, the Senator from West Virginia has reminded us that the so-called distressed areas of the country are still in a very sad plight. What the Senator says about the State of West Virginia could in large part be duplicated about my State of Illinois.

The truth is that the textile industry of the North, the coal-mining industry, and the cutover areas have suffered from high unemployment for a long period of years. This is unemployment which continues at a high level, even when the rest of the country seems to be prosperous.

It is very easy to forget these men and to forget this problem. It is easy to say, when we have a business depression or an acute recession, "This is not the time to act, because we will not bring relief rapidly enough." Then, when conditions improve, people tend to forget and to say that relief is not needed.

The Senator from West Virginia has put us all in his debt by raising this issue. While we in the Senate do not ordinarily like to offer advice to the House of Representatives, the Senator from West Virginia was a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives for many years and is, in a sense, an alumnus of that body, so it is quite proper for him to urge that the Rules Committee report the bill favorably. The bill was reported to the Rules Committee by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and we are confident the bill would be passed by the House were it to receive a rule.

I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia again for what he has done. I think the Senator has helped to move the cause forward very appreciably.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my friend and crusading colleague.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky, who cosponsored the area redevelopment bill and has worked to provide assistance for distressed areas.

Mr. COOPER. First, I want to thank the Senator fom West Virginia for sending me a message today saying he was going to speak upon this subject. The Senator also told me he might comment on an exchange of letters I had with the President of the United States. I may say that I got out of bed to come here, for I have a touch of the flu. I missed the part of the Senator's speech in which he may have referred to the correspondence. I am unaware of what he said about it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I spoke in a very complimentary and sincere manner about the senior Senator's concern for aid to the depressed areas of our country, including Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I do not know what the Senator said about the President's response.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I indicated it was inadequate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I pay my tribute to both Senators from West Virginia and to my good friend the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for all the efforts they have made to render assistance to the depressed areas. I joined with them. I was a cosponsor of the area redevelopment bill which passed the Senate, and which is now pending in the House. I, too, hope the House will take action on that bill. We have worked together also on such matters as the problem of securing a better variety of food for people who are now attempting to live on surplus foods distributed from Government stocks. We have worked together on problems affecting the coal industry. With respect to such objectives, I know that we have been in harmony.

Not long ago I did write the President of the United States, not directly upon the subject of the area redevelopment bill, but in an effort to develop another approach. I should like to comment briefly on that subject. My purpose in writing the President was to find out what the departments of the Government are doing today, under existing programs, to meet the problems of the depressed areas.

I think it is a true statement that the greatest influence on the prosperity of the depressed areas is the general prosperity of the United States. That is a simple and true statement. We are fortunate that there is a high level of prosperity in the country today, which has reached most sections. Nevertheless, despite this high level of prosperity and growth, it is a curious fact that in certain areas there is unemployment. There are people in great need. There are people who are hungry.

My own position has been that that curious contradiction makes it more imperative that those sections which are prosperous, those people who are prosperous, and the country—which as a whole is prosperous—ought to feel a greater sense of obligation to do something for the areas which are not prosperous, and for the people who have fallen in the ditch.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt, if I may do so without breaking the continuity of his remarks?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe that what the Senator is saying is important. I say it in another way. When an erosion takes place within any area or within any State, that erosion certainly has an impact on the contiguous areas, and thus it spreads. So, to have a condition which is unhealthy in any section of our country—and it is widespread in some areas—means an effect which is damaging on the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. The Senator and I have been serving on the committee which was established at the close of the last Congress, the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems. I did not attend all the hearings. But in one hearing which I attended, in the eastern section of Kentucky, I found that there were people in as dire need as during the great depression. I know something about that, because in the years from 1930 to 1938, 3 or 4 years after my return from college, I served as county judge in a county where I heard every day the pleas of people out of work and in need. I have never forgotten that experience. My votes in the Senate on many occasions have been influenced by the facts and conditions I observed at that time.

I now turn to my correspondence with the President. The area redevelopment bill, which I cosponsored together with the Senator from West Virginia, and which I supported in the Senate and still support, nevertheless has not passed. I do not wish to make a political statement, but so long as the President has been brought into the discussion, let me say that it is a fact that this Congress is largely under the control of the Democratic Party, and this bill has not passed the Congress. I will admit that even if it does pass, there may be grave doubt that it will become law. So I tried to approach this problem from a different angle.

I suggested to the President, in my recent exchange of correspondence and in the talk I had with him yesterday, that perhaps a different approach might be taken—one within the powers and competence of the executive department. And I may say that I expect to continue

my talks with members of his staff, and then again with the President. I suggested to the President the creation of what I call a "task force," chiefly to distinguish it from a "study committee." I suggested that such a task force be established by the President, that a man of great stature be placed at the head of this task force, and that the task force be made up of members from various departments and agencies which now have programs which could be increased, enlarged, and made to work more effectively in the depressed areas, both for emergency purposes and for the long range development of these areas.

Let me give a few examples: I suggested that the Department of Labor could be directed to increase the number of its employment offices, and to staff them more adequately. I suggested that a determined effort be made to find out which people in these areas are employable, which people have skills that would enable them to obtain employment now if they were at places having employment to offer. I suggested that funds be made available—and I do not believe a large amount of funds would be required or that new appropriations would have to be made—to transport these people to places where there is a prospect of employment, to see if they can be employed; I also suggested the use of emergency funds, if necessary, to help transport their household goods and their families when jobs were found.

I made a second emergency proposal. This proposal may seem small at a time when everyone is talking about big things, but sometimes it is a small thing that can give immediate help. I suggested that the Department of Agriculture do what was done in depression days, that is, inaugurate a garden program for the depressed areas, so that the people could raise enough garden stuff, as we call it, for their use during the summer and fall, and for canning. Many people in these areas are now living on a few items of surplus food. Certainly gardens would increase the variety of foods available to them. Those are emergency measures.

I believe that even if Congress does pass the area redevelopment bill, the chief purpose of which is to induce industry to come into those areas, and even if the bill is signed by the President, it is not certain that industry will go into these areas. After all, private industry makes its choices largely on the prospect of profit. It may be that even if the bill is enacted into law, private industry might say, "Well, we would rather go into an area where profits are more certain."

So for the long run, I believe it is necessary to work for the fullest development of the existing natural resources of these areas, thereby building up the basic industrial requirements which in time will attract more industry to these regions which are now underdeveloped. Therefore, I thought another function of the task force would be to take effective steps for basic development of the areas. I will mention a few examples of the steps that could be taken.

First, as I go into my own region of eastern Kentucky—and I am sure the Senator finds the same thing true in West Virginia—I sometimes have the feeling that others may consider it an effort to go up those winding, narrow roads. It is not really an effort for me, because I have been up them so often. However, I think that for a stranger to go over these narrow roads might be a considerable effort for him. I believe the Bureau of Public Roads, in conjunction with State highway departments, could go into eastern Kentucky and West Virginia and Pennsylvania and Tennessee and other areas, and lay out at least one great highway providing access to and egress from markets, and that they could begin now to locate that road and set up a time schedule to build it.

Second, Mr. President, we have a program for airport construction. Priorities are set up for the airports in our States. Perhaps the several agencies dealing with airports, in conjunction with State airport agencies, could say that we ought to put an airport in at least one or two of these areas, so that the people could get in and get out, and as a further inducement for industry to locate there.

Third, and very important, nearly every one of these sections needs water resource development. It would be only right, in connection with one of the bills the Congress passes each year for the development of water resources, that a system of priorities be included so that the Corps of Army Engineers could say that at least one great project should be undertaken in each of these areas—in order to provide the water needed by industry and the necessary flood control protection.

I will give a fourth example. Eastern Kentucky is largely dependent upon mining, as the Senator's State of West Virginia is, partly because its great agricultural possibilities have remained untapped. The Department of Agriculture, under the leadership of a task force, with the approval and the sympathy of the President, could increase its program of agricultural development for these counties. It could locate one of its rural development projects in each of these counties, and could also expand its forestry programs.

These are examples of the steps I had in mind, in asking that the great agencies of the Government be directed to make existing programs more effective in these areas, in asking that the powers of the Government be directed toward giving immediate emergency help in the ways I have outlined, and in asking that for the long run a program be begun toward the basic development of what I call the underdeveloped regions of the United States.

I have served 7 years in the Senate—with some intervals—but I have stood in favor of every issue connected with foreign aid. I have stood for it against thousands of letters in opposition to foreign aid which have come to me from my own State. I believe I can say I have stood for foreign aid as faithfully as anyone in the Senate. However, if there are underdeveloped areas in the world, there are also underdeveloped areas in the United States. There is an underdeveloped area in eastern Kentucky. There is an underdeveloped area in West Virginia. There is an underdeveloped area in Pennsylvania. I am sure there are underdeveloped areas in other parts of the United States.

I should like to see our Government begin a purposeful program to develop the underdeveloped areas of the United States.

So I say to my good friend from West Virginia that my correspondence with the President, my meeting with him yesterday, and the talks which I expect to continue to have with him, with his staff and with the agencies of Government, are directed toward setting up a task force—with a competent, outstanding director—to develop existing programs, to give all the emergency aid that can be given, and then to start the basic development of these underdeveloped areas.

The President has shown great sympathy toward those problems, and I am sure that he will continue to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business under the 3-minute limitation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia are in basic agreement. I believe that timidity and delay in facing this problem will no longer suffice. Full-time requirements in this instance cannot be met with part-time attention. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will agree with me that we need a determined attack on this problem. Such action is long overdue.

A 13-POINT PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today in the United States we face a strange paradox. Generally, the United States is experiencing new records of expansion and progress. Unfortunately, all segments of the economy are not sharing proportionately in this growth and prosperity.

The Nation's farmers, for example, despite record production of farm commodities, find that their income has been decreasing in terms of real value.

As yet, there has been no panacea-type solution. In the days ahead, however, Congress will face decisions on a number of programs which, though they may not be a cure-all, will help ease some of the economic problems for the farmer.

Recently, I outlined some of the major programs which, if carried forward, would contribute to resolving some of the problems in agriculture. Recognizably, not one of these provides the overall solution. Nevertheless, the recommendations, if adopted, I believe would make a substantial contribution to brightening the economic outlook of our farmers for the future.

I request unanimous consent to have these points printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The outlook for farm income—down in 1959—regrettably is not too bright for 1960. The Nation cannot afford a serious recession in agriculture—historically the birthplace of depressions—and must take steps to prevent such an economic catastrophe.

The purpose is to provide a healthier farm economy which would benefit the whole Nation.

Unfortunately, the biblical saying that "there is nothing new under the sun" appears to be especially true when it comes to finding new ideas for an over-all solution to the complex problems in agriculture.

However, there are a number of meritorious programs, now under way, which if improved and expanded, can help to brighten the outlook in agriculture.

These include the following:

1. Expanding research to find new ways and means for utilizing farm products. For example, I have recommended the establishment of a dairy research laboratory at Madison, Wis.—to find better ways of processing, distributing, and utilizing dairy and other farm products, as well as finding new markets.

2. Establish a Country Life Commission, as proposed in the Wiley bill, S. 265, to make a long range evaluation of the changing social, economic, and technological revolution in agriculture, together with recommendations to enable the farmer to adjust to the changes.

3. Further expansion and utilization of the rural development program to assist farmers in chronically low-income areas attain a higher standard of living.

4. Strengthen the REA and other coops to better serve the American farmer.

5. Improve the Federal milk marketing order system to better reflect cost of milk production and provide more equitable price to the dairyman—particularly in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Midwest.

6. Expand the opportunities for rural education—including better library services, extension services from local universities, availability of information publications, and generally providing the farmer with more sources of data for improving farm operations.

7. Carry forward and expand, as necessary, the special school milk and school lunch programs—serving constructively to provide an outlet for surplus farm commodities as well as to improve the health of the boys and girls of America.

8. Combat crop, forest, and livestock diseases to reduce losses to farmers.

9. Carry on alert programs to assure healthful milk, meat, and other farm products for consumers through proper utilization of modern chemicals, antibiotics, and other such products used for animal health and crop protection.

10. Carrying forward the conservation reserve of the soil bank for taking cropland out of production—aimed particularly toward reducing the highest stockpiles of surpluses—wheat and corn.

11. Providing the Nation's farmers with better marketing information on the supply-demand balance for milk and other commodities on a long range basis. The purpose would be to permit farmers—insofar as possible—to assume a larger responsibility in voluntarily regulating production and thus work toward supply-demand in the marketplace.

12 Assure a price support level that will not only be of real help to farmers but also work more effectively to create a supply-demand balance of farm commodities.

13. Establish a more effective national food policy—to provide for better utilization of surplus farm commodities to feed hungry people at home, as well as to support our national policies abroad—in a humanitarian as well as a strategic way. The idea is to turn our food resources into assets instead of liabilities.

Today, in agriculture, we face a strange paradox. Although there are mountains of surplus, there still exist people in the United States and other lands who find it necessary to exist on inadequate—and particularly in some less developed countries, starvation—diets.

Fundamentally, then, one of our major problems—reflected in surpluses—is the lack of new ways and means for utilizing these products and the need for better distribution channels.

Congress, I believe, must take a new look at the whole situation. We recognize, of course, that "economic ills" cannot be cured with legislative remedies. Instead, the solution must be based on sound, economic principles. Until a solution is forthcoming, however, the Nation must be alert to prevent a depression in agriculture—the source of our vital resource: food. This, I believe, is in the best interests, not only of the farmer, but of the whole economy.

OPERATION OF RAIL COMMUTER LINES BY CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, yesterday's and today's newspapers carried on their front pages the dramatic story of a new development in mass transportation in one of our great cities, the city of Philadelphia, Pa.

The headline in yesterday's Philadelphia Evening Bulletin reads "Railroads Agree to City's Plan To Operate Commuter Lines."

A headline on the front page of this morning's New York Times reads "Philadelphia To Subsidize Railroads To Help Service."

The headline in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer reads "Two Railroads Adopt City's Commuter Lines Plan."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three newspaper articles may be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1, 2, and 3.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators will be interested in this development. We have known for a long time of the overall problems of our railroads. But those problems are intensified when it comes to considering their commutation services in and around the great metropolitan areas and urban communities.

Back in 1954, when I still had the honor to be the mayor of Philadelphia, an urban traffic and transportation commission was formed of eminent businessmen, including those who head our two great railroads, the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the president of the Reading Railroad; the head of the Philadelphia Transportation Co.; and many others interested in transportation and traffic problems around our cities. The chairman of the commission was Mr. Clifford E. Frishmuth, then the president of the Supplee-Wills Milk Co., which sends its milk trucks around the city every day in the year.

This eminent group made a complete report shortly before my term as mayor expired. It was comprehensive; it was imaginative; it was most helpful.

My successor, Mayor Richardson Dilworth, has taken that report and made an actuality of what was then really a planner's dream. A year and a half ago, with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Railroad, Operation Northwest was started. Under that operation, the city of Philadelphia subsidized suburban rail traffic to a substantial extent, amounting to many hundreds of thousands of dollars. As a result of that subsidy, the railroads dropped their rates, so that one could ride into the city from any place in the outlying areas for 30 cents. Parking facilities were made available at the stations of the railroads, so that commuters from outlying districts could leave their cars and travel into the city by train.

A system of relatively low-cost transfers—in some cases, free transfers—was arranged with the Philadelphia Transportation Co., which operates the buses and streetcars.

Commuter traffic on the railroads rose by more than 20 percent in less than 6 months.

Last year a similar operation, called Operation Northeast, was instituted, with similar satisfactory results.

These pilot projects having succeeded, we now learn of the dramatic agreements to which I have referred, under which long-range plans to implement the business of getting people back on the rails at low, subsidized prices, and getting them to leave their cars in the suburbs so as to speed up traffic on the city streets, has come to fruition.

The major credit for these agreements must go to Philadelphia's dynamic Mayor Richardson Dilworth; but a due measure of credit also must go to those wise and farseeing businessmen, James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph E. Fisher, president of the Reading Railroad, as well as to Douglas Pratt, president of the Philadelphia Transportation Co., and many other businessmen, and to all the labor leaders associated with the unions which operate the trains and trolleys and buses.

A nonprofit corporation is to be formed. It will be subsidized in part by the city. The railroads will turn over their suburban line operations to this corporation, so that the commuter trains can be operated at low cost and without profit, to bring people into the city, as I have indicated.

If this scheme is to be successful, it will require Federal assistance to this nonprofit corporation, so as to enable it to acquire, at low cost and at low interest rates, the modern streamlined, air conditioned, lightweight equipment which is necessary to induce travelers to move in ever greater numbers out of their automobiles and back onto mass transportation facilities.

Mayor Dilworth will be in Washington early next month with a delegation from the city of Philadelphia and the

railroads. He will be talking to many of my colleagues. I hope they will give openminded and considerate attention to his plea, because I myself am confident that this type of operation can be for the benefit not only of the city of Philadelphia, but also for the entire surrounding metropolitan area, which includes five additional Pennsylvania counties and three New Jersey counties.

I believe that this plan may well be one of the land marks in the breakthrough which will help to solve our overall traffic and transportation problems in the great metropolitan areas of our Nation, problems which, unfortunately, have become so acute that they are strangling our cities and destroying the growth of our economy.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Evening Bulletin, Jan. 20, 1960]

RAILROADS AGREE TO CITY'S PLAN TO OPERATE COMMUTER LINES—BERGER WILL SEEK CHARTER TOMORROW

(By Robert J. Eisler)

The Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads have agreed to the city's plan for a nonprofit corporation to operate commuter lines in Philadelphia, it was announced today.

The announcement was made jointly by Mayor Dilworth, James M. Symes, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph A. Fisher, Reading president.

Last week, the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 operating unions, endorsed the proposal and agreed to become a charter member of the corporation.

Dilworth proposed the corporation last July. Negotiations have been going on ever since.

BERGER TO BE COUNSEL

Today's announcement said that City Solicitor David Berger, who will serve as counsel for the corporation, will go into common pleas court tomorrow to seek a charter for the corporation.

It will be known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corporation of Philadelphia, said to be the first such corporation of its kind in the country.

As of now the plan would apply only to lines entirely within the city. Dilworth said he hopes that the suburban governments will join so the plan can be expanded.

Berger said the plan is for the corporation to:

Immediately take over the existing contract between the city and the Reading Railroad for Operation Northeast between Reading Terminal and Fox Chase.

NORTHWEST CONTRACT

Negotiate a new contract with the Pennsylvania and the Reading Railroads for Operation Northwest which covers the Chestnut Hill lines of both railroads.

Attempt to negotiate an agreement with the Pennsylvania for a low-fare commuter program on the Trenton local line between Suburban Station and Torresdale.

Attempt to negotiate similar agreements with the Reading on its Norristown branch between Reading Terminal and the Shawmont station just beyond Manayunk, and with the Pennsy for its commuter trains to Manayunk.

CITY SUBSIDIES

City subsidies paid under the existing agreements have enabled both railroads to reduce fares and provide extra service on Operation Northeast and Operation Northwest.

The agreement for Operation Northeast expires in May, and the current extended agreement for Operation Northwest expires at the end of February.

Getting around to the financial aspects, Berger said the proposed new 1-year agreement for Operation Northwest will guarantee the railroads a minimum income of $1,400,000 and a maximum of $1,525,000.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ALREADY PAID

He said that the city, if necessary, will pay a subsidy not to exceed $325,000, the same amount paid by the city in 1959 under the present agreement.

Berger said that if the revenue should exceed the maximum figure, the money will be placed in a reserve fund by the corporation and used for promoting new business on the two lines.

Berger said that the agreement for Operation Northeast will remain unchanged. It provides for the payment of $105,000 to the Reading for a 33-week period.

He also noted that all the agreements are subject to approval of city council and the council must appropriate the funds to the corporation for payment to the railroads.

FUNDS FOR STAFF

Berger said he also will ask council to appropriate funds for a small staff to manage the corporation and for capital improvement funds to purchase new rolling stock, build a turnaround at Torresdale, and electrify the Fox Chase line of the Reading.

There is now $1.4 million in the city's 1960–61 capital budgets for these purposes.

There will be 15 directors of the new corporation, with the chairman to be named by Mayor Dilworth.

The city will have 11 directors, each railroad will have 1, and the labor unions will have 2 representatives.

HOPE FOR U.S. SUBSIDY

At a press conference following the announcement, Mayor Dilworth said the long-range success of the corporation will depend on whether Federal funds are made available to subsidize mass transportation.

He said that he and mayors of other large cities will join with executives of leading commuter railroads in Washington next month to propose subsidy legislation to the Congress. He predicted "at least a start will be made in the current session of Congress."

The plan for this legislation was developed at a meeting between the mayors and railroad presidents in Denver last December 1.

This legislation would provide long-term, low-interest Government loans for purchase of commuter cars; direct grants and aid to municipal authorities or nonprofit corporations to improve rights of way, stations and parking, and establish a balanced Federal transportation policy covering all fields, including rails, airlines, highways, and ships.

Dilworth said the city was deeply indebted to the railroads and the railroad labor unions for working out this attempt to solve the city's commuter problem.

MORE FOR NORTHWEST

Fisher and Walter W. Patchell, PRR vice president who represented Symes at the conference, both said that the amount guaranteed for operation of Operation Northwest during the first year would not cover their costs.

They said that in future years the guarantee will have to be increased.

"We want to continue these commuter lines but we can no longer compete with other subsidized means of transportation," Fisher said.

Patchell called on the suburban communities benefiting from commuter lines to join the new corporation. Dilworth previously extended a similar invitation to communities outside the city.

FORCE THEIR HANDS

"We think general interest out there (the suburbs) will force their hands," Dilworth broke in. "It seems to me that it is going to affect real estate prices and development, and we hope that sort of pressure will build up.

"They have been conscious of it since the fare reductions here," Fisher added. "It is inevitable that the railroads will either have to get higher fares or Government help if they are to continue to service the suburbs.

"It's bound to come. We have to have more money."

Under the new plan, the corporation will take over all transportation planning from the urban traffic and transportation board, an independent agency which has operated with a professional staff since Mayor Clark's administration.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

PHILADELPHIA TO SUBSIDIZE RAILROADS TO HELP SERVICE

(By Clayton Knowles)

PHILADELPHIA, January 20.—The city, two railroads and railroad labor joined today in announcing a nonprofit corporation that is designed to increase fast rail transportation with the city, help the railroads stay in business and keep automobiles out of the center of the city.

The new agency, which will be known as the Passenger Service Improvement Corporation, will operate at first under a city subsidy exceeding $2 million a year.

It will provide fast, frequent service from outlying points within the city to the center of the city at 30 cents a ride, a reduction from the normal fare. The Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads, acting as contract carriers for the new corporation, will be guaranteed fixed amounts. If the fares do not meet minimum guarantees a city subsidy will make up the difference.

The arrangement, the first of its kind in the Nation, contemplates Federal assistance for the railroads, possibly before the end of the year.

The hope is that legislation will be approved so that the Federal Government will match local contributions at least dollar for dollar, much in the way it now assists localities in urban renewal programs.

"The long-range success of this venture depends on Federal aid—and I think it will be forthcoming," Mayor Richardson Dilworth said.

Joining with the major in announcing the plan were Walter W. Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Joseph A. Fisher, president of the Reading, and Anthony Matz of the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 railroad unions.

The mayor will name 11 directors of the nonprofit corporation, the railroads 2 and the unions 2. Incorporation papers will be filed tomorrow.

The operation of the plan at the outset will be confined to the Philadelphia city limits. But Mayor Dilworth and the rail officials expressed the belief that suburbs in Bucks, Montgomery, and Delaware Counties and possibly even across the Delaware River in New Jersey would ask to come into the operation.

Commuters living in these areas do not benefit from the present plan if they board the train in their hometowns. If they drive to the city limits, however, they can park, take the train, and get the saving.

Under a highly successful test of the program begun in the fall of 1958 many commuters have taken advantage of the service. It is hoped they will bring pressure on their home communities to extend the plan beyond the city limits.

The test also showed that many persons living inside the city were willing to stop driving into the center of the city and use the train instead. Other people gave up the

cheaper, but slower, public transportation system to use the train.

This has added to the railroads' revenues and enabled them to improve service.

The tests were called Operation Northwest and Operation Northeast.

Both operations were subsidized, the first at the rate of $320,000 a year and the second at $105,000. The city assistance just about covered the actual cost to the railroad of the extra service and reduced fares the city demanded.

Operation Northwest, serving the fashionable Chestnut Hill area, has increased rail travel by 20 percent. The number of riders to the more modest Fox Chase section under Operation Northeast rose 200 percent since last fall.

Both routes will be continued under the new arrangement and, in addition, the new corporation will take over two other routes this year. One will be to Torresdale near the Bucks County line on the Pennsylvania's New York division and the other to Manayunk and Shawmont on the Reading's Norristown line generally to the west.

If this can be achieved, 75 miles of railroad within the city limits will be included in the system.

Persons using these lines derive a further benefit in that they can get a transfer to the subway and bus facilities operated by the Philadelphia Transportation Co. for an additional 10 cents. The straight fare on these facilities is 20 cents.

Long-range objectives of the corporation will be the purchase of modern air-conditioned railroad cars, electrifying the Fox Chase line, building more auto-park-and-ride depots around the periphery of the city, and merchandising transportation to attract new riders.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 21, 1960]

TWO RAILROADS ADOPT CITY'S COMMUTER LINES PLAN—BERGER WILL SEEK CHARTER TODAY FOR NONPROFIT AGENCY

A commuter's dream of low cost, frequent service with adequate parking facilities and air-conditioned trains came closer to reality Wednesday when the formation of a nonprofit corporation to run the railroads within the city was announced by Mayor Richardson Dilworth.

The agency, first of its kind in the United States, will be launched formally Thursday when City Solicitor David Berger files incorporation papers in the common pleas court. The organization will be known officially as the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. of Philadelphia.

INDEBTED TO RAILROADS

Its formation was announced jointly by the mayor, Walter W. Patchell, vice president of special services of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and Joseph A. Fisher, president of the Reading.

Dilworth hailed the plan and said its announcement made this an auspicious day for the city. He said he was indebted to the railroads for helping to work out a plan which would go far toward solving Philadelphia's commuter problem.

Under the setup, he added, Philadelphia can look forward to fast, convenient, and inexpensive transportation to midcity.

While the plan initially calls for the absorption of Operations Northeast and Northwest, the corporation also plans the early integration into the new system of the commuter lines operating to Torresdale, Manayunk, and Shawmont.

PARKING FOR AUTOS

The long-range program calls for relocation of existing stations to provide parking for commuters' automobiles, electrification of the Reading's Fox Chase line, and purchase of new equipment, including modern air-conditioned cars.

Suburban communities also will be encouraged to join the corporation and advantages to their residents will be explained by the city.

Berger said the corporation would have no effect on existing relations between the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods, since employees will remain on the payrolls of the railroads.

FIRST YEAR, $1.4 MILLION

The contract, which requires approval of city council, contains the following key provisions:

All fares collected on PSICP trains, revenue from advertising and parking at depots will accrue to the corporation.

Railroads will be reimbursed a minimum of $1,400,000 for the first year by the corporation to cover their cost of Operation Northwest. City council will be asked to appropriate $320,000 of this sum. Total appropriations for both Northwest and Northeast operations will run about $425,000 through 1960.

PSICP will determine train schedules, kinds of equipment, methods of improving service and promotion, among other managerial activities.

NONPROFIT AGENCY

PSICP will represent the city in all transportation matters and will absorb the urban traffic and transportation board, appointed by Dilworth to develop the new transportation program.

Negotiations will begin immediately to bring Torresdale and Manayunk lines under the nonprofit agency's control.

Initial PSICP business will include negotiating a contract to continue and improve Operation Northwest. Also, it will assume management of Operation Northeast, which runs through April, and lay plans for its extension.

FIFTEEN-MEMBER BOARD

The corporation, which will operate independently of the city and railroads, will have a 15-member board of directors. Eleven members, including the chairman, will be named by the mayor.

Each railroad will appoint a member, and the Railway Labor Executives Association, representing 23 railway unions, will appoint two. It will have a paid executive director. The directors will be nonsalaried.

The corporation was proposed last July 8 by Mayor Dilworth and negotiations have been in progress since then.

Last week the Railway Labor Executives Association endorsed the proposal and agreed to become a charter member of the corporation.

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS AVAILABLE

Berger said he hoped to have a detailed contract between the city and railroads ready within a month. He said approximately $5 million was available in the city's 1960–65 capital program for improvement of equipment and purchase of new cars.

Patchell congratulated the city on taking "the lead in moving toward a definite solution of the commuter and mass transportation problem."

He said the problem was one the railroads could not cope with alone and pointed out that commuter lines were disappearing in other cities, notably Boston and New York.

He added that he agreed with the mayor that some form of Federal financial aid would be necessary to guarantee the success of the program.

Fisher said the plan did not solve the railroad's commuter problem, but was a step in the right direction.

BACKGROUND—EVOLUTION OF AN IDEA

The revolutionary concept in commuter travel that became a reality Wednesday with the formation of a nonprofit corporation was first advanced last July 8 by Mayor Richardson Dilworth.

A day later, the Pennsylvania and Reading railroads adopted an official wait-and-see policy, declaring they weren't prepared to give anything away for nothing, and advising, instead, an operating agreement between the city and the railroads.

However, negotiations opened immediately and the climax came when the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. of Philadelphia was born.

During the course of those talks—specifically on September 27—it was learned that the all-inclusive program first proposed by Dilworth had been modified to include only those lines with both terminal points inside the city limits.

When the PSICP was announced Wednesday, other modifications also were included.

Suburban communities will be invited to join the corporation on the basis that their residents will be able to enjoy the advantages of corporation-owned travel routes if they sign up.

The guiding genius of the corporation has been City Solicitor David Berger, who will seek incorporation papers Thursday and who became the agency's first counsel.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], designated as "1–13–60—E," to insert substitutes for certain portions of the bill.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inasmuch as the unfinished business has now been laid before the Senate, will the Senator from New York yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that in yielding for that purpose he will not lose the floor?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement to the Senate. If we are able to complete action on the pending bill today, it is the intention to go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask the acting majority leader a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would it be the plan of the leadership to continue the session into the evening if it appears remotely possible that we can take final action tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not too late into the evening.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for one observation that may be helpful to the acting majority leader and the acting leader of the minority?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. So far as I know, there is remaining the amendment now pending, which is the last amendment which I had expected to offer. There is also an amendment which the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] sent to the desk yesterday. There is another amendment proposed or submitted by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. There are one or two perfecting amendments, one relating only to the fact that I propose to move that the act be cited as the Federal Elections Act of 1960, so that it will have as its effective date the first of January 1961.

Beyond those few matters, I know of nothing else, unless the able junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has some further amendments to offer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is also an amendment at the desk by the equally able other Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. HENNINGS. Oh, yes. I had forgotten about it. That amendment relates to taxation in the financing of campaigns. I am sorry I had forgotten to mention that amendment.

I just mention those matters for the guidance of our colleagues, in the hope that we may complete action on the bill today.

RECENT DEMONSTRATIONS OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice to the chorus of protest from decent people in the United States and abroad against the ugly specter of anti-Semitism which still stalks the earth. We have been rudely reminded of the fact that anti-Semitism is still a living force by the recent demonstrations in West Germany and in other countries, including our own.

It is not my purpose to diagnose the cause of this sickness. Many competent observers are doing that. It is my purpose to acknowledge the fact of the sickness. It is my purpose to deplore and condemn this sinister force.

The United States has grown too small for religious bigotry. The world itself is too small and too interdependent to afford the luxury of bigotry and discrimination.

In a perceptive analysis of these anti-Semitic demonstrations Commonweal magazine maintains that these "eruptions in Western Germany can no longer be described as isolated and inconsequential" and that simple "regret and embarrassment are not adequate responses to the evil thing which is now revealed." I emphatically agree with this.

It is easy to point the finger of blame at Hitler or at the anti-Semitic policies of communism. It is much more difficult, but necessary, to face the fact that our own country is not guiltless. Our guilt may not be as great as the guilt of the Nazis or the Communists, but we must face it. One desecrated synagogue in America is one too many. One flaming cross is one too many. One citizen denied his right to vote because of his color, or for any other reason, is one too many.

The Commonweal puts it this way:

That the Germans are reluctant to accept this horrible burden of guilt is easy to understand. What they cannot bear to look at is a vision of evil which is and must be terrifying. We, too, the non-German peoples of the Western World, have not been eager to look upon it. With our own share of guilt, we have not been eager to examine the obscene thing that was Nazism and ask ourselves how it could come about, among people who read the same books, listen to the same music, went to the same churches, shared with us what we are proud to call the heritage of Western culture.

Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues in this Chamber the editorial, "The Specter of Nazism," which appeared in the January 15, 1960, number of the Commonweal, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commonweal, Jan. 15, 1960]

THE SPECTER OF NAZISM

The eruptions of anti-Semitism in Western Germany can no longer be described as isolated and inconsequential. Unfortunate incidents—caused by irresponsible anti-Semitic elements—demand, perhaps, no more response than the regret and embarrassment which have been expressed over such episodes in the past. But regret and embarrassment are not adequate responses to the evil thing which is now revealed.

Beginning, cruelly, on Christmas Eve, the fever of hatred against Jews flared up first in Cologne, then spread to Berlin, to Nuremberg, to other West German communities; it broke out later in Vienna, in London, in Glasgow, in New York. Its foulness may well be rising to the surface in other places even as these words are being written. What is worse, the official declarations of Chancellor Adenauer's government reveal the familar reluctance to take hold of a painful fact, the familiar expressions of righteousness and virtue, the familiar recourse to charges of anti-Germanism and falsehood on the part of those who speak or write of what is happening in Germany. Even in this country, the outbursts of anti-Semitism in West Germany have been deplored in some quarters chiefly because they make for bad public relations and political problems for an important ally in the cold war against communism.

Anti-Semitism in West Germany, it has been said, is no more significant than anti-Semitism anywhere else, and any relation between anti-Semitic outbreaks in West Germany and a resurgence of Nazism there is angrily denied. Nazism is dead, say the Germans, and need not be referred to.

Unfortunately, neither of these statements is true. Even when it is shameful and frightening, history cannot be denied. That 5 million Jews were murdered by the government of a highly cultured European Christian people is a monstrous, hideous fact, for them and for the rest of the world. That nazism is quite dead becomes every day an increasingly dubious judgment; but, even if it were quite dead, it would still need to be referred to.

Perhaps this is why the evil of anti-Semitism still hangs over our heads: that it has not really been faced. One commentator on the question of anti-Semitism in West Germany reminded his readers of the record-breaking crowds of West Germans who sat stunned through performances of "The Diary of Anne Frank." He did not remind his readers that many of those who were deeply moved by the play nonetheless declared, "I don't believe it." And it has been reported over and over that West German history texts have solved the problems raised by Hitler and World War II by ignoring them. A recent poll of German youth showed an astonishing number who knew (or would admit) of Hitler only that he reduced unemployment, improved roads, accomplished much for Germany, etc. Some half-dozen years ago, a survey taken by the U.S. High Commissioner's Office in Bonn revealed even then that anti-Semitism in West Germany was growing, not declining. A majority of the Germans polled at that time believed that Germans need not feel guilty for what was done to Jews under the Third Reich and need not feel responsible for it.

That Germans are reluctant to accept this horrible burden of guilt is easy to understand. What they cannot bear to look at is a vision of evil which is and must be terrifying. We too, the non-German peoples of the Western World, have not been eager to look upon it. With our own share of guilt, we have not been eager to examine the obscene thing that was nazism and ask ourselves how it could come about, among people who read the same books, listened to the same music, went to the same churches, shared with us what we are proud to call the heritage of Western culture.

Thus, over the years, the poisonous complicity in the pretense that the gas ovens—and worse—were like a bad dream, to be thrust from our minds quickly lest it spoil our waking mood. Thus, over the years, the gradual embracing of a "practical" policy toward West Germany, a policy determined largely by fear of Communism and characterized largely by a "forgive and forget" attitude toward the monstrousness of the Hitler era.

There can be no question of forgiving, of course. It is not for us to forgive. But it is perilous for us to forget. We must remember, as we have not remembered, and so must the German people, as they have not. For only if we admit its existence can we hope to exorcise the evil which took such hold of men. What happened in those terrible decades? How did it happen? Why? These are the questions we must face, German and non-German alike, not for the sake of blame and accusation, but to save ourselves now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that each and every one of us is deeply concerned about these manifestations of bigotry and intolerance. I hope that in every word we utter, in every action of our Nation, of our communities, and of our people as individuals, we will demonstrate our belief in human equality and our respect for peoples of different races, colors, and creeds. I hope that we will always adhere to the great spiritual principle of the fatherhood of God and

of brotherhood of man, and recognize that only in the belief in such principle and the practice thereof is there any chance whatsoever for this great Nation, the United States, to be a world leader, and to be worthy of the respect, trust, and confidence of peoples throughout the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the Economic Report of the President, which has been presented to Congress. This report is more significant for what it fails to say than for what it does say. It glosses over the fact that our economy has since 1956 been virtually standing still.

That is a fact which requires some thoughtful consideration. At a time when we are facing the most unbelievable competition our Nation has ever been confronted with, we find ourselves with an economy which has been limping along, at times stagnant, and all too often out of balance. This is no way for a great free society to challenge the Communist monolithic disciplined, socialist society. It will require more than that if we are to maintain our leadership and our strength.

It is always reassuring to get good news and promises of improvements in our economy, but the American people are entitled to get the hard facts—that our economic growth rate is lagging far behind our capacity for growth—that we are in danger of falling behind the Soviet Union in military and economic power if we continue to let our economy limp along the way it is going.

I might add that the policies of the Government have a great deal to do with the tempo of economic progress or retreat. The policies which have been pursued by the administration, of tight money, high interest rates, hard dollars, tight credit, and failure to effectively enforce the antitrust laws and to promote truly competitive enterprise, have taken their toll.

The fact of the matter is that the United States of America, the richest nation, to be sure, on the face of the earth, has had the lowest rate of economic growth since 1952 of any of the industrialized Western nations; further than that, the lowest of any of the industrialized nations; less than Japan, less than France, less than England, less than Western Germany, less than the Scandinavian countries, less than Belgium and Holland and Italy, and far less, in terms of rate of growth, than the Soviet Union.

I do not really believe that that is a record to be proud of. We have witnessed in recent years a Nation literally having its position of prestige and power and influence eroded away.

I know that only recently the eminent columnist, Walter Lippmann, wrote a column which told this story in the most graphic and meaningful words. He said, in fact, that the President had been presiding over the liquidation of the great power and prestige and influence of the United States in this troubled world. Those are hard words, but I believe I properly paraphrase what Mr. Lippmann said earlier this week. I shall put into the RECORD in a moment, and bring to the attention of the Senate, a second item from this distinguished journalist, columnist, educator, and teacher.

We need to distinguish between the healthy growth of economic muscle and the flabby bloat of inflation.

I have the feeling that sometimes when administration spokesmen refer to the prosperity we enjoy, they are really thinking about a kind of economic biliousness, rather than true economic muscle and economic fiber and bone, which really represent economic strength.

Per capita income in constant dollars has shown virtually no improvement. Farm income actually dropped over $2 billion in the past year alone; the level of unemployment has been rising to higher plateaus—to over 5 percent of the working force at present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has just stated that the per capita income in constant dollars has shown virtually no improvement. Is he referring to this year as compared with last year, or to a longer period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To a longer period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am referring to the years since 1955. I refer, I respectfully say to the Senator from Louisiana, the Presiding Officer, to constant dollars. I am not talking about the dollar figure, but the purchasing power of that dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator recognizes the fact that during that same period of time interest rates have increased to the tune of about $18 billion, he can add to his statement that the per capita income for 90 percent of the people has actually declined.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's observations are, as usual, very meaningful. I know of no man in the Senate who has done a better job of discussing the fiscal policies of this Government presently being pursued than has the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The preceding Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] likewise from time to time has given us the benefit of his opinion and advice on fiscal policy.

Both of these distinguished Senators are members of the Committee on Finance, in which the Senators have an opportunity to study these matters, not in theory, but in practice.

I have not attempted to become an expert in matters of fiscal policy, but I have learned a great deal from the observations of my colleagues. What I have observed and what I have learned has been anything but heartening in terms of the future well-being of this Nation.

I may say to the Presiding Officer that since 1955 the average weekly earnings in constant dollars have risen only 1 percent a year, while consumer prices have increased almost 15 percent.

Interest rates, to which the Presiding Officer has referred, and which determine the cost of buying a home or automobile, and are a very significant factor in every budget, have reached the highest level in 30 years. Every consumer, every taxpayer, is paying more because of this administration's tight money policies.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, the Presiding Officer, and some of his distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Finance will give us again the benefit of their intensive study of these matters relating to interest rates and fiscal and monetary policy. This is a subject matter that needs to be aired and discussed day after day in the Senate.

I am not one of those who believe that interest rates can be static. I am not one of those who believe that we can ignore the forces in the market—demand and supply and pressures on money—but I am one who believes that the Government of the United States, through the policies it pursues affects interest rates, and can either lower them or increase them. The policy of the Government has been to increase them under the notion that by increasing interest rates it could reduce so-called inflation, when one of the largest items in the inflationary bloat of this country—and I repeat, inflationary bloat—is the interest rate factor itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Minnesota would look at the level of interest rates under 20 years of Democratic administration, he would find that during those 20 years the average on new issues of the Federal Government was approximately 1.7 percent. The average on new issues this year will exceed 4.5 percent. In fact, it might go over 5 percent. That is almost three times the average interest rate which existed under 20 years of Democratic administrations. Of course, it will require three times as much tax money to carry the national debt at that high rate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 20 years of Democratic administrations we passed through depression and war and peace and expansion. I should like to add further that interest rates are generally a reflection of the confidence of the money market in the policies of the Government and the general health of the economy. When that confidence seems to be slackening or weakening, the rates go up. It has always been somewhat of a paradox to me that those who manage the money of this country can say, "Vote Republican," and then, after they have said that, proceed to insist upon interest rates upon money which obviously reflect a great element of risk.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield in a minute. I wish also to add that the Senator from Louisiana may recall that in 1953 we had a Secretary of the Treasury by the name of George Humphrey. George Humphrey gained national fame because he was advocating

refinancing the public debt on long-term issues, 30-year bonds. The Senator may recall that at that time the interest rates on those bonds was about 3¼ percent. That was a new high for long-term bonds. Long-term bonds always have a higher rate of interest than short-term bonds.

Nevertheless, only a few weeks ago 181-day notes, that is, a 6 months issue, sold in the market for 5.106, or a little over 5 percent, for 6 months notes, or 181 day notes.

What a far cry this is from the so-called high interest rate that Mr. George Humphrey was talking about in 1953. Then there was concern in the country. I remember that Business Week magazine published an article to the effect that it was all right to slow down the economy, but we must not slam on the brakes and throw ourselves through the windshield. That was at 3¼ percent, Mr. President. I must add that not only have the brakes been slammed on, but the car has been shifted into reverse, at a 5.1 percent interest rate on 181-day notes.

I shall simply complete this statement, and then yield, if I may, to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who always enjoys these discussions, and represents so brilliantly the conservative policies pursued by the administration, the high interest policies which have become the coat-of-arms of the current Republican administration and, I gather, the promise of the future, if the year 1961 should continue these policies of no go, go slow, not now, and veto. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I have said, interest rates determine the cost of buying a home or an automobile. They are a significant factor in any budget. Every consumer, every taxpayer, every investor, every producer, is paying more because of this administration's tight money policies.

The distinguished columnist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, a most perceptive analyst of our national policies, has again accurately pinpointed the dangers of the complacency which appeared in the President's Economic Report.

Mr. Lippmann foresees a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline in the power of the United States. He says:

> I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

This is exactly my criticism of the state of the Union message, the budget message, and the economic report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's thoughtful article, which was published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1960]

A SATISFIED NATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the economic report which has just been transmitted to Congress, the President has completed what was begun in the address on the state of the Union and the message accompanying the budget. He has described our situation as he sees it. He has outlined his program. And he has sketched in his general ideas. All is well in that the Government will ask nothing more of the people, and there is a prospect that it will ask less.

For it is the President's view that the country is secure. It is prosperous. And, insofar as it is challenged by the rise of the Soviet Union, the country can rest assured and tranquil that because of our devotion to individual liberty we are destined to win the competition.

Is all this self-satisfaction justified? Are we entitled to do what these three messages unite in telling us to do? Are we entitled to concentrate our energies on our private affairs, confident that our national interests are secure and well taken care of? For myself, I do not think so. I think the President's satisfaction with our situation is based on a short and a small view of the historic competition in which we are challenged.

His view of the Soviet challenge is short and small because he does not distinguish between private prosperity, measured in the total production of goods and services for private use, and national power, which is measured not only in terms of armaments but also in terms of wealth directed to education, to public health, to the conservation and development of the natural and the manmade resources of this country.

What is happening is that under the leadership of the President we are promoting private prosperity at the expense of national power. As a result, the influence of the United States as a world power is declining. That is why a growing number among us do not share the President's satisfaction and are worried about the future.

Given our situation in the world today, these three messages betray a dangerous complacency. This complacency derives from the deep fallacy of believing that in an era of cold war it should be the policy of the National Government "to reduce the share of the national income which is spent by the Government." This fallacy can best be understood in the light of some testimony given a year ago by the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "As I understand an economy," he said, "its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: To produce things for consumers."

Then the chairman went on to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find that growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being commissioned to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

There precisely is the root of our trouble. Our goal is to maximize consumption. That is a very low national goal, and altogether unworthy of a great Nation which has a great part to play in human affairs. The object of our economy is not to become fat with consumer goods. It is to use the wealth and the power which the economy can produce to support the national purposes which we so frequently proclaim. There is nothing very convincing or inspiring in loving our "liberty" to enjoy consumer goods so much that we cannot afford to educate our children. If we really believe in the ideals and the spiritual aims about which so much is said, we have something else to do besides maximizing the enjoyment of consumer goods.

The most vocal criticism of the current official satisfaction has come from those who believe that we are falling behind in the race of armaments. To this criticism the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, and the Chiefs of Staff are now replying. They are replying to the critics who have oversimplified and overdramatized the situation and are arguing that within a few years the Soviet Union will be able to devastate and knock out this country.

There is no reason to doubt that the administration is right when it replies that the Soviet Union does not have and is not likely to achieve such military supremacy over us that an all-out attack would be undertaken. But Mr. Gates is dealing with a strawman. The soberer criticism is much more formidable. It prophesies no catastrophe. But it says that the rate of the rise of Soviet military capacity in conventional as well as nuclear capability appears to be greater than our own, and that the Soviet Union appears to be administering more efficiently than we do the resources of the new and revolutionary military technology.

That does not portend doomsday in 1963. But it does portend a rise in the world power of the Soviet Union and a corresponding decline of our own. No doubt that will not worry us too much if we can keep our minds fixed on consumer goods.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut for whatever purpose he may desire.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much. First, I am sorry to see him in such an unhappy frame of mind on the state of the Nation's economy, which is bursting at the seams in a new boom which is hard to control. Nevertheless, I sympathize with the Senator for feeling so unhappy about it.

He made two statements to which I should like to direct his attention. First, he said that the low interest rates which obtained during the 20 years of his party's administration reflected confidence in the Government, and that the high interest rates which seem to have obtained in recent years reflect the opposite. I may say to the Senator that interest rates over the years do not reflect confidence in the Government or a lack of confidence in the Government. They do reflect confidence in the economy of the country and reflect demand for money, which is generated by confidence in the country. Since confidence in the country and the whole economy has been at a very high level in recent years, interest rates have been mounting because of the competition for money in the money market. Just as in other markets, when competition for a product or a commodity is in great demand, the price goes up.

The Senator directed attention to a recent offer of the U.S. Government when he said that the Government paid 5.106 percent for money for a given number of days—105 days, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hundred and eighty-one days.

Mr. BUSH. It was 101 days. It was obviously a short-term loan, for a third of a year or less.

It is pretty hard for anyone who has studied the question of Government financing or corporate financing, or any other kind of financing, to escape the conclusion that the only reason why the Government had to pay 5.1 percent for the money was that that was the going rate for short-term money at that time.

If Congress had done what it had an opportunity to do—and I hope may yet do within the next few weeks—namely,

raise the interest rate ceiling so that the Government could finance itself on a long-term basis, then the Government would be taken out of the short-term money market, into which it has been forced by the action of Congress. That is why the short-term money market has gone up. But I say that long-term money would normally bring higher prices than short-term money. However, the reason why it does not is the arbitrary refusal by Congress to let the money market seek its normal level. This, I assert, is strongly adverse to the best interests of the United States.

The Senator is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He is a very able member, for whose views on many things I have great respect, as he knows. But when the International Monetary Fund had its meeting in Washington last September, and the representatives of the International Bank from 68 countries gathered for their annual meeting, there was one thing which absolutely appalled the representatives and the finance ministers who were here from other countries, and the heads of the Central Bank, and that was the refusal by Congress to lift the interest rate ceiling, so that the U.S. Government could be put in the position of doing exactly the very thing which the Senator from Minnesota wants it to do, namely, to pay a reasonable rate of interest for its money. The refusal by Congress to do what every one of those representatives from the 68 countries thought was the normal thing to do was the subject of constant conversation during the period those delegates were here from all over the world.

The result of that, I may say to my able friend, has been to shake, somewhat, the confidence of the financial leaders of those 68 free countries in the credit of the Government of the United States. This is something about which to be concerned, under modern conditions, when our national defense structure and the defense structure of the entire free world depend very heavily upon the credit of the Government of the United States.

I venture to hope that the Senator's party will relent in the position it has taken and will not interfere with the normal management of the Federal debt, but will give the Treasury a chance to use both hands and all the facilities which it should have at its disposal to do this properly, and thus eliminate the inflationary effects inherent in the Government financing its obligations entirely on a short-term basis.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for giving me this opportunity to make these observations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that I certainly did want him to make his observations. As he knows, I have a very high regard for his views. I believe the matter of fiscal and monetary policy is something which requires the discussion and debate which we give to it. I hope we may continue such discussions in an enlightened, unimpassioned, unemotional manner, because this is a very serious matter.

I have said, quite frankly, that I recognize that the interest rate cannot be a static thing. I understand that. I have said, secondly, that I felt the Committee on Finance was equipped by background, training, staff, and constant dealing and working with this problem, to give us some pretty good advice on the matter. As I recall, that committee has not recommended favorably the lifting of the interest rate ceiling.

There are good, solid arguments around that question, and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut has always been a brilliant advocate for his point of view.

I toss this thought out for the purpose of our discussion. My concern leads me to these thoughts: Back in 1953, supposedly, a new policy relating to the financing of the public debt was inaugurated. It is fair to say, I think, that there was no difficulty prior to 1953 in financing the Federal Government. To be sure, there were deficits, but not so many as we have had since 1953, for the comparable period of 7 years.

To be sure, there were heavy pressures on the country; in fact, I can remember very well the campaign of 1952, in which we were told that we had to stop inflation, that we had to put the brakes on.

There has been as much inflation since 1952 as there was from 1949 to 1952, if not more, despite the Korean war. We were under tremendous pressure after World War II with unmet needs, with pent-up savings, which were bursting loose to get into the market for production, distribution, and consumption. It was necessary to rearm the country and to start a foreign aid program. It was necessary to inaugurate the NATO alliance, under which the United States supplied vast amounts of military assistance. We had to fight a war in Korea and to rebuild industries; and we did it at much less cost to the Government, in terms of the rent on money—which is what interest is—than we are doing it through the so-called period of peace and prosperity.

Mr. President, I am saying that if we have peace and prosperity, the financial condition of the country should reflect it.

I do not want the interpretation the Senator from Connecticut made to remain unchallenged.

I did not say that interest rates reflect only the confidence in the Government. I said it alleged and it is stated that interest rates do in part reflect the confidence of the business community and the financial community in the economy and in the policies being pursued by the Government.

Anyone who is a student of international finance knows that in countries where the government is unstable and where the policies being pursued violate all the laws of economics, the bankers and the other groups who are responsible for the management of money charge higher interest rates, in order to take into consideration the increased risks. I understand that, and I am not critical of it.

I am simply saying that a number of paradoxes exist in this case. Our Nation seems to be enjoying a boom, as the Senator from Connecticut has said; yet almost 4 million, or 5 percent, of the working force is unemployed, and our agricultural industry is in the worst depression it has ever experienced since the 1930's. There has been a $2 billion drop in net farm income this year; and in the country there are large numbers of depressed areas.

Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that when I was in his State this year, as one of his many friends, and in the presence of both the senior Senator from West Virginia and the junior Senator from West Virginia, I witnessed the depressed areas and the unemployment in that great State.

I have seen similar conditions in northern Minnesota; in Michigan; in Wichita, Kans.; and in other places.

Mr. President, where is the "unprecedented boom"? The "unprecedented boom" has occurred in the interest rates and in the prices of certain stocks. Of course, under those circumstances, when the persons who buy Government certificates and notes know that if they hold out longer they will be paid higher interest rates, they do hold out, and the interest rates rise and rise.

It is an accepted fact that long-term financing costs more than short-term financing. If short-term financing costs 5 percent, I ask anyone what long-term financing would cost. Long-term financnig has to take into consideration the gyrations of the economy over a long period of time and the drying up of the supply of money for a long period of time. I am not complaining about the fact that long-term financing generally requires higher interest rates, because that is one of the economic facts of life.

All I am saying is that if short-term financing can command 4 percent interest on 90-day bills or notes, which are so current that they are almost like dollar bills, and if 5 percent interest must be paid on 180-day notes, how much interest does any reasonable person think would be required on 30-year bonds? Surely the interest on them would not be less.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It may be of interest for me to point out who will reap the harvest if we continue the present high interest rates. If the average interest rate is doubled, a person who lends his own money will have his income doubled. But if that person owns an insurance company and sells insurance policies based on the theory that Government bonds will pay approximately 1.7 percent interest, if the rate on Government bonds increases to 5 percent, that person's net income will be increased by much more than 100 percent; it may well be increased by 1,000 percent; and that man will be able to keep all of the increase.

An insurance policy is sold on the theory that the premium payments will be invested in Government bonds and

other securities. When the person whose life is insured dies, the insurance company will get the benefit of any increase in the interest rate over the rate on which the policy was based. If the interest rate on invested money rises, for instance, from 1.7 percent to 5 percent, the income of the owner of the insurance company could be increased by more than a thousand of percentage points.

Similarly, when a bank makes a loan, it is lending money on much of which it is paying no interest at all, while paying a relatively small interest rate on the savings accounts of its depositors, and charging a higher rate of interest on the loans it makes. If the interest rate rises, the result is to increase the bank's income; and the bank will enjoy that increased income as a result of the loans it makes with money which belongs to its depositors; yet the expenses of the bank will not have increased, and the bank will enjoy that increased income even though it does not provide additional services for checking account customers and is only obliged to give back a portion of the increase to savings account customers.

Under such circumstances, and particularly when the interest rate on Government bonds increases in the way it has under this administration, certainly the net income of such banks should increase by much more than 100 percent.

Some banks have been engaged in a process of dumping old, long-term bonds, and purchasing other bonds to keep down their tax liabilities on profits. This tends to prevent the full increase in bank profits from showing this, some due to these fictitious losses, but the huge profits exist nevertheless.

Now the administration seeks to saddle that additional debt or the enormous burden of these high-interest rates on the people of the country for a full generation by putting the national debt on a long-term basis before the coming election.

Some people think the large businesses are paying much of the burden of the higher interest rates, when they borrow money. But let us keep in mind the fact that they pass on that burden to the consuming public, in the price of their product which they sell. So that burden of higher interest rates paid by big business is actually borne by the consumers who purchase automobiles, washing machines, deep freezes, homes, or other commodities.

In the case of one who is about to purchase a home, an increase of 3 percentage points in the cost of money or the interest rate on borrowed money means that the cost of the monthly payments on the mortgage on that man's home will have increased by approximately 30 percent. As a result, that increased burden must be borne, not only by all those who purchase homes, but also by all those who rent houses, because under those circumstances the owners of the houses have to charge more rent to the tenants.

The average family pays approximately 25 percent of its income for rent. Certainly the average family in the lower income brackets does. When the rents they pay or when the cost of purchasing homes are increased by 30 percent—for which increase they do not receive any additional services—the eventual result is an increase of approximately 6 percent in the cost of living for those families, in addition to rewarding the insurance companies and the banks for their success in having a Republican in the White House.

It has been stated that it would be irresponsible not to raise the ceiling on the interest rate on Government bonds. Yet during the 20 years of the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, the President used his influence to hold down the average interest rate on new issues of Government bonds to an average of 1.7 percent. On the other hand, with the present administration in office, President Eisenhower has apparently permitted those on Wall Street to raise the interest rates as much as they want to do it; and now an attempt is being made to change the ceiling on the interest rate on Government bonds and permit the increased rate to apply to the long-term Government indebtedness, so the public can be hooked for the next 30 years by this high interest rate program, even though President Eisenhower will be in office for only another year.

So far as I am concerned, I will oppose applying higher interest rates to the long-term Government indebtedness, because I am satisfied that the first Democratic President who enters the White House, following the administration of President Eisenhower will reverse that policy.

The saddling on the public, for the next 30 years, with the proposed higher interest rates cannot be done unless we Democrats permit the Republicans to get away with it.

I am not particularly worried about inflation, unless it does harm to someone or hurts our country. If inflation to the extent of 5 percent were to result in a 10 percent increase in incomes—in other words, a net increase of 5 percent over and above the amount of the inflation—I would be willing to accept inflation to that extent, or a 5 percent increase in the cost of living; and my guess it that then we would be able to provide for larger social security payments and larger welfare payments, and the people would be better off after the proper adjustments had been made. But, on the other hand, if we are going to have inflation without increasing the income of the people over and above the inflation, then I am opposed to it.

In accordance with the Senator's testimony today, I was surprised to find out that in the last 4 years there has been no net increase in the income of the people, unless one wants to count the inflation itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If that is the case, it is a sad thing indeed to have inflation, but not an increase in the amount of income by more than the amount of the inflation. That is a sad condition, I regret to learn.

While I cannot agree with my Republican friends about this matter, I do feel that both sides of the issue should be presented, and I feel the public has a right to vote on it. We should not mislead the public. The public should know that the rank-and-file American today is worse off than he was 4 years ago, on an average, because the American citizens have had imposed upon them a hidden tax in terms of high interest cost. That burden has shifted tens of billions of dollars of income from those best able to pay to those least able to pay. It has been a redistribution of wealth in favor of the rich and against the poor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is one of the most articulate and brilliant spokesmen in this body on this matter, relating to the economic, monetary, and fiscal policies of our Government. I have marveled many times at his grasp of the complexities of these monetary and economic questions and their relevancy to the total economy and justice and well-being of the people.

It is not unusual for me to compliment him on this occasion, because I have done so in the past. We have had disagreements on other matters, but on this question it is a joy always to hear his remarks, and it is an educational experience for the Senate and the American people to have him speak as he does.

Mr. President, I do hope, as the Senator from Louisiana has indicated, that this Congress will not be bludgeoned or frightened into making some change of policy on interest rate ceilings until we have had a chance for a national referendum; namely, an election, because the American people are going to be exposed to an articulate, intelligent, informed, and exacting discussion of what I think is the No. 1 weakness or liability of the Republican administration—its fiscal, monetary, and tax policies.

I have been asked many times what is the issue in this campaign. The Senator from Louisiana has stated it persuasively, brilliantly, and with great vigor. The issue in this campaign is the fiscal and financial and economic policies of our Government as relates between the two political parties and their spokesmen.

I might add, Mr. President, that of all the groups in America that have suffered because of the current economic policies, it is the small businessman on Main Street who is the man least able, in competition with Government and big business, to get hold of the necessary money for the improvement of his plant, for the financing of his programs, and for the management of his capital structure. The independent, small businessman in America has literally been put through the fiscal wringer. Many times he has been able to survive only out of sheer dint of effort, individual capacity, families working together, unbelievable effort extended. But he has not had a fair shake. He has not been given an even break. Every Member of the Senate who has traveled around this country and in his own respective State knows that when an independent businessman seeks to borrow, he pays a higher rate than does the big company that may be in competition with him. He is looked

upon as having less collateral, in the main. He is looked upon as being more of a risk, and therefore pays a higher rate.

The same thing is true, may I add, of the thousands and thousands of farmers. There has been an increase in rates on commodity credit loans, on personal and property loans. Now there is even a desire by the administration to raise the REA interest rates. May I add that will be a hope unfulfilled, an exercise in futility, because I cannot imagine that the Congress of the United States will raise interest rates for rural electric cooperatives, when those cooperatives are nonprofit institutions operated only for the benefit of their members and the economic growth of the communities they serve. It would be a foul blow indeed if the interest rates of those cooperatives were increased to such proportions as to jeopardize their financial and fiscal structure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. May I raise the parliamentary inquiry of the Chair as to what is the business before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to the inquiry of the Senator from New York, the Chair will state that the question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] designated as "1-13-60—E," which would be the inserting of substitutes for certain parts of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Of the so-called clean elections bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

HAS AMERICA LOST ITS WAY?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday, December 27, 1959, there appeared in the editorial section of the Denver Post a long, critical survey of this past decade by Lawrence G. Weiss, a Post editorial writer. He asks in the title, "Has America Lost the Way?" and sums up the essay as an appraisal of the national mood in the decade of the 1950's.

I would especially like to call the attention of this body to the last paragraphs of Mr. Weiss' essay. After reviewing the actions of the past decade, he suggests as our national purpose for the 1960's:

First, to take up once again, with new energy and dedication, the task of building the Nation. That will mean clearing our slums, revitalizing our cities, improving our schools, developing our resources, strengthening our defenses, providing more adequately for our aged and sick, enriching our culture, and enlarging our efforts to secure equal rights for minorities and a fuller measure of freedom.

Second, to carry some portion of the American promise into the world community of nations, particularly into the underdeveloped areas. That will mean recognizing that the world cannot go on for very much longer half starving and half overfed and that the surging populations in the "have not" nations, unless helped, will someday threaten the "haves." It will mean sharing our resources and knowledge more fully than ever before and infusing a greater measure of idealism into our foreign policy.

He emphasizes that one of the tasks of leadership in the coming years will be to awaken the American people to these purposes, and fire their imagination to accomplish them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 27, 1959]

HAS AMERICA LOST THE WAY?—AN APPRAISAL OF THE NATIONAL MOOD IN THE DECADE OF THE 1950'S

(By Lawrence G. Weiss)

In the jubilant springtime at the end of the American Revolution, the Patriot Thomas Paine saw more openings for happiness in the new American Nation than in any other nation in history.

"Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising," he wrote.

"Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm * * * and everything about her wore the mark of honor."

In the same flush of pride and enthusiasm, President Thomas Jefferson spoke of the new America in his first inaugural, as "a rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land * * * advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye."

Paine and Jefferson—and Lewis and Clark watching the buffalo from the banks of the mighty Missouri—were beginning to define the ingredients of the American promise.

The new Nation, as they conceived it, offered a fuller measure of freedom, a greater opportunity for satisfaction and well-being, and a richer supply of space, beauty, joy and excitement than any other nation on earth.

They saw America as something special, a nation marked by destiny for greatness. And they sought to raise a standard here of freedom and enlightened idealism that all mankind might follow.

Their optimism about the future of America has become a part of the American character through the whole course of our history.

Except for rare periods, this has been a hopeful and confident nation, sure of its powers, unwavering in its sense of direction, unafraid of what lies ahead.

"The American people never carry an umbrella," said the late New York Gov. Alfred E. Smith. "They prepare to walk in eternal sunshine."

In the evolution of American self-confidence, the 10-year period that ends at midnight next Thursday may prove to be a significant turning point.

The decade of the 1950's—whatever else may be said about it—has plainly not been a period when this Nation was sure of itself.

This has been the wealthiest decade in American history.

Our people have made more money and bought more things, for cash and credit, than any other people anywhere.

The American promise—insofar as it involves material gain and political freedom—has been fulfilled in this decade to a remarkable degree.

But the 1950's have still been a time of doubt and uncertainty.

A sense of uneasiness and fear has begun to afflict the American spirit.

"In the late fifties," writes the historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., "one senses a spreading anxiety and frustration in our society; a confused, inchoate feeling that things aren't going right."

The diplomat, George Kennan, finds Americans in the 1950's to be "not a bad people or a weak one or even a consciously unhappy one, but an endangered one."

We are, he says, "a people in danger, at least partially, of becoming sluggish intellectually, underdeveloped emotionally * * * filled with an inner restlessness and dissatisfaction, incapable of integrating our full strength * * * dull and uninteresting to others and * * * not terribly interesting to ourselves."

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter considers the people to be "too much absorbed in the mere enjoyment of a prosperous life."

A U.S. Senator, returning from an exploration at the "grassroots," finds that the people "have lost confidence in their Government," are "wrapped up in their own selfish concerns."

"All they care about is cutting taxes," he says. "Many are making more money than they ever did in their lives, but they want to spend it on themselves, not on schools and highways and urban renewal. They are cynical and disillusioned."

The dramatist Arthur Miller writes of a deep moral uneasiness among us, the vast sense of being only tenuously joined to the rest of our fellows.

The economist John K. Galbraith says the concern of the people with luxuries and gadgets in an affluent society has made them callous to the public needs of the community and the Nation.

New national types—the organization man, the man in the gray flannel suit, the commuter, the status seeker, the exurbanite, the other-directed man—are described by writers as products of the tensions of our times.

"The cities of America," says James Reston, of the New York Times, "are full of self-questioning. The pulpits ring with the old incessant questions: Where are we going? What is the purpose of our society?"

Most of the commentators on the national mood detect the absence of a national purpose, the lack of a sense of direction to give cohesion and meaning to American life.

In the decade of the 1940's the national purpose was to win the war and lay the foundation for a fair and durable peace.

In the decade of the 1930's the national purpose was to conquer the depression and raise the living standards of the Nation.

But in the decade of the 1950's, no single, dominant objective captured the attention and the effort of the people.

There are signs at the end of the decade that a new sense of purpose may now be starting to evolve.

"One feels," writes Schlesinger, "that increasing numbers are waiting for a trumpet to sound."

But if the 1960's bring a resurgence of the American spirit—as some thoughtful observers anticipate—it will come in large measure as a reaction to the aimlessness of the last 10 years.

What were the origins of the mood of the 1950's? What were the factors that weakened the traditional American sense of self-confidence and obscured our national purpose?

The major factors appear to be these:

1. THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR ANNIHILATION

On the eve of the 1950's came an announcement by President Truman that Russia had exploded her first atomic bomb. The dream of an American A-bomb monopoly was destroyed forever.

The Nation rapidly began work on a hydrogen weapon, and achieved its first thermonuclear explosion in 1952. But the following year, Russia exploded an H-bomb, too.

Throughout the decade, Americans—in common with human beings everywhere—lived with the danger that a blunder in diplomacy, a rash decision by an irresponsible official, or even an accident could bring on a nuclear struggle that would destroy civilization.

The people were told by experts in 1958 that a nuclear attack on the United States would cause 108 million deaths in the first 60 days and make important parts of Jefferson's "wide and fruitful land" uninhabitable.

Many Americans sought to put the danger from their minds, but a dim awareness of it seemed to persist throughout the Nation. One response was expressed in the song, "Enjoy Yourself, It's Later Than You Think."

Among some, there was a revival of pacificism and a movement for a ban on nuclear testing.

In Geneva the United States began negotiations with Russia to see if a test band agreement—with proper inspection safeguards—was possible.

In 1959, disc jockeys were playing verses of Tom Lehrer:

"There will be no more misery
When the world is our rotisserie * * *
We will all go together when we go
All suffused with an incandescent
glow * * *"

2. THE FIGHTING OF A WAR WE DID NOT WIN

To make clear to the Communists that they could not seize new territory through naked aggression without meeting resistance, the United States led the United Nations into the Korean war in June of 1950.

The North Korean invaders were driven back to the Yalu River. But Chinese Communist troops poured across the border and fought the United States and the United Nations to a stalemate in the vicinity of the 38th parallel.

In 1953 both sides agreed to a truce, and a substantial part of the American force was withdrawn from Korea.

In a nation that had won every war since 1812 and had come to take for granted the idea of American omnipotence, the people found the stalemate in Korea unsettling and difficult to comprehend.

They were further shocked by reports that were issued after the war on the behavior of American troops in Communist prison camps.

Some of our soldiers turned on one another, cooperated with the enemy, made no effort to resist, succumbed to Communist propaganda, and behaved with cruelty and selfishness.

A surprising number died in the camps because they lacked the will to go on living.

A secret Communist intelligence report found that "the American soldier has weak loyalty to his family, his community, his country, his religion, and to his fellow soldier. His concepts of right and wrong are hazy and ill informed. There is little knowledge or understanding, even among U.S. university graduates, of American political history and philosophy."

Taken as a whole, the Korean experience, even though many felt the United States was wise to undertake it and wise to accept a stalemate, had a disturbing effect on American self-assurance.

3. THE SOVIET VICTORY IN THE RACE TO SPACE

Into the 1950's the American people brought the notion of their country's technological supremacy. Above everything else, they felt confident the United States could not be surpassed in technological achievement.

In general, Americans tended to look on the Soviet Union as a nation of peasants, an inefficient, backward nation where scientific progress had been retarded by Communist suppression.

Yet in the fall of 1957 it was the backward Russians, and not the efficient Americans, who overcame the gravity of the earth and put the first satellite into orbit around it.

Since then, the Russians have consistently launched heavier objects than we have and sent them to greater distances.

They have landed a pennant on the moon, made the first photograph of the other side, and sent a rocket to the sun.

More significant, in terms of danger to the United States, they were able to launch their first intercontinental ballistic missile in the same year they launched their sputnik.

Presumably, they can now hit U.S. targets from bases inside the Soviet Union, and most reasonable American defense experts concede that their missile capability is substantially greater than ours.

The picture many people now have is of a Soviet missile landing on the moon precisely in time for Khrushchev's visit to the United States and a U.S. missile exploding on the launching pad.

This Nation has made many achievements in the space field and will doubtless make many more. But Americans are used to being first, not second.

They have been shocked and disturbed. But they have not made it clear whether they are willing to spend the money that is necessary to make the United States first in this field.

4. THE SUCCESSES OF NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

With the death of Joseph Stalin in 1953, a new and less tyrannical era began to unfold inside the Soviet Union. New and less crude tactics began to appear in Soviet foreign policy. And a new and less hateful personality emerged in Nikita Khrushchev.

Khrushchev has embarked on a bold new venture in the history of Soviet policy, based on a claim that he does not plan to communize the world through the old Red techniques of revolution and war.

Instead, he has called for "peaceful coexistence" between Communist and non-Communist states.

In peaceful economic competition, he says, the superiority of the Communist system will soon be evident to the people of all nations and capitalism will be replaced.

With a new approach in his own country and in the world, Khrushchev has scored some impressive progress:

He has eliminated some of the evils of the old Stalinist regime.

He has begun to provide the Soviet people with consumer goods.

He has registered tremendous gains in production and begun to close some of the economic gap between Russia and the United States.

He has offered the world a more amiable and beguiling picture of a Communist dictator than the one presented by the formidable Stalin.

He has visited extensively in underdeveloped areas and launched programs of economic aid and technical assistance to compete with those of the United States.

He has brought his smile and homely manners to the cities of the Western democracies and convinced many hopeful men that a thaw in the cold war is imminent.

Two problems of tremendous magnitude have given Khrushchev trouble:

The first was the revolt of the Hungarian people against their Communist rulers. By resorting to bloody suppression, Khrushchev was forced to forfeit much of the good will he has built up in world opinion. His action in Hungary still keeps the suspicions of free nations everywhere alive and alert.

The second has been the problem of Communist China. The aggressive behavior of this new Red power has tended to undermine the Khrushchev peace offensive. He was apparently unable to stop the Chinese assaults on the borders of India. In company with other nations, Russia may now begin to fear the expansionist forces in the Red Chinese state.

Despite these handicaps, however, Khrushchev's efforts have been largely successful.

The effect in America has been—

To dull the sharp edge of American resistance to the Communist state.

To prove that communism may offer serious competition to capitalism as a system for promoting the rapid economic improvement of underdeveloped areas.

And to contribute to the erosion of U.S. self-confidence.

5. THE LURE OF AN AFFLUENT SOCIETY

In the 1950's, as never before, the genius of American industry exploited the miracle of American technology to produce the most dazzling array of consumer goods the world has ever seen.

In all sizes, colors, models, and shapes, our factories turned out cars and television sets, dishwashers and electric blankets, deep freezes, power mowers, and sterling silver bottle openers.

The genius of American advertising set out to sell these things to the American people, and the high employment at good pay gave the people the money to buy them.

For those who were short on cash, credit was available on easy terms.

In general, Americans succumbed to the lure. They put their money into their houses and their cars and began to shortchange their schools, their cities, and their public responsibilities.

"The family which takes its mauve and cerise, air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour," wrote the Economist Galbraith, "passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts.

"They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals."

Whether the American people have been satisfied with their new possessions, or whether they seek some deeper, less materialistic significance to life is a question not yet answered.

But some signs of discontent have been evident.

"I question," wrote George Kennan, "whether material abundance alone, as we have sought it heretofore and are rapidly coming to know it today, is really bringing us the results we hoped.

"I question whether it is making us a happier—and inwardly a richer—people."

6. THE INFLUENCE OF TELEVISION

In the 1950's, about 45 million American families owned television sets, and the experts say the average set was on more than 5 hours a day.

Americans were becoming a Nation of spectators. Many stayed indoors, missed fresh air and exercise and saw life through a glass darkly.

During the television hours, the average kindergarten child could witness enough crime, violence, terror, and depravity to have frightened even the hardiest of the early American pioneers.

And hour after hour, the television commercials pounded away at American eardrums, frequently offering the viewers what they did not need, or could not afford, or did not want or already had.

"The dominant sound in American ears today," James Reston wrote in the New York Times, "is the endless babble of commercial advertising, interlarded with Elvis Presley and the singing commercials."

The American living room became a showroom for commercial products, a marketplace where the television vendor plied his trade.

All the tricks of an ingenious profession—including occasional deception and plain dishonesty—were used to sell the American viewer in his own home in his own easy chair.

And at some points during the decade, these tricks were used to sell political candidates as well as toothpaste.

In the stream of slick salesmanship that came from the tube, the viewer found it hard to distinguish the good product from the bad. And a certain confusion about values began to develop.

There were many good, constructive TV programs—and much fair, honest advertising. But the bad aspects of television were causing serious concern at the end of the decade, and Congress was searching for remedies.

7. THE EFFECT OF CRIME AND CORRUPTION

Americans were disturbed in the decade of the 1950's not only by the rise of crime, but by the nature of the crimes committed.

The headlines told of brutal thrill killings, perverted violence, senseless vandalism, and crimes that seemed to have no explanation.

Juvenile delinquency was on the rise, and many children—especially in big cities—seemed to be growing up in an environment that made juvenile crime inevitable.

The courts and the reformatories were full of troubled children from troubled families and tough neighborhoods.

Many of their crimes—like an impressive number of crimes by adults—did not appear to be committed for personal gain.

The crime pattern seemed to be a symptom of a sick society.

Even more striking than the crime stories were the exposures of corruption and loose morality among men in the public eye.

The Kefauver committee, in 1951, not only gave most Americans their first look at big-time crooks and racketeers, but linked these men to others who held public office or enjoyed public respect.

In Washington there were scandals involving mink and vicuna coats, deepfreezes, influence peddling, conflicts of interest, and plain dishonesty.

The spotlight of congressional exposure swept on from labor leaders to businessmen, to quiz show contestants, to disc jockeys.

And in 1959, Charles Van Doren, a Columbia University instructor, whose quiz show prowess had made him a symbol of the young American intellectual, was exposed as a liar and a fraud.

A substantial strain of corruption has run through the whole course of American history, but each generation has been shocked anew when the corruption was exposed.

In the late 1950's, Americans seemed to be reacting with cynicism and disgust.

8. THE CHALLENGE TO CIVIL LIBERTIES

The two great civil liberties issues of the decade were McCarthyism and integration.

Joseph R. McCarthy, a Republican Senator from Wisconsin, became the focal point of national attention in the early 1950's when he charged that the State Department, the Army, and other areas of Government and American life harbored card-carrying members of the Communist Party.

While the Nation took time to discover that none of McCarthy's charges had ever been proved, the Senator moved from one field to another, forcing the dismissal of Government employees, browbeating witnesses before his committee, proclaiming guilt by association, disregarding the elementary principles of judicial fairness and mocking the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

By 1954, the Nation had had enough of McCarthy. He was censured by the Senate, and he died a short time later.

But in his prime McCarthy had many supporters. The fact that a large number of people were willing to back him in casting aside American principles of decency and fair procedure caused widespread alarm at home and lowered U.S. prestige abroad.

At one time, the national image included the picture of a growling demagog, backed by a hysterical mob, terrorizing the State Department, the Secretary of the Army, and a collection of Government employees who had associated with the wrong people many years before.

The image was not one that could bolster American pride and self-esteem.

On the integration front, came the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954, upholding the right of Negro schoolchildren to sit in the same public classrooms with whites.

The decision gave new substance to the American promise of equal opportunity for all and the right to the equal protection of the laws.

But the South mounted a mighty offensive against the decision and used every technique of subterfuge and evasion in order to keep from putting it into effect.

Southern leaders launched vicious and sometimes slanderous, attacks against the Court and the Justices, and spoke darkly of "interposing" the sovereignty of the State between the schools and the Federal Government.

But the bitterest opposition to the "law of the land," as the Supreme Court had expounded it, came from southern mobs with stones and sneers and from dynamiters who blew up public schools.

Mobs prevented a Negro girl from enrolling at the University of Alabama, and kept Negroes from entering some elementary and high schools.

The climax came at Little Rock, Ark., in 1957, when President Eisenhower decided to send in U.S. paratroopers to clear the way to Central High School, after the way had been blocked at the instigation of Gov. Orval Faubus.

As the decade wore on, the cause of integration made good progress in the border States, scored successes in Virginia and began a slow infiltration of the Deep South.

But the open defiance of law in some areas—and the bitterness of southern opposition to a principle that lies at the heart of the democratic tradition—left their impact on the national mood.

Throughout the world—inhabited largely by people with colored skins—pictures of the jeering mob at Little Rock were used by the Communists to prove that Americans did not really accept the ideal of equality they preached.

And at home in the United States, a good many serious men were beginning to wonder what had happened to the bright heritage of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson.

Against this background of difficulty and danger, the emergence of a mood of uneasiness and doubt among the American people in the decade of the 1950's is not difficult to understand.

The wonder is that so much was accomplished and so many Americans retained their idealism and led constructive and unselfish lives.

More went to college, more to church, and more traveled abroad. More visited art museums and libraries, and attended concerts and plays.

More took part in community affairs, worked for charities, helped with youth groups, and attempted self-improvement with books and lectures.

For those who yielded to the lure of affluence and turned their backs on the needs and responsibilities of the Nation, the pressures of the last 30 years provided a certain justification.

America had lived with one crisis after another ever since the stockmarket crash of 1929, and a national weariness had set in. The capacity of many people for continuous national involvement had simply been exhausted.

But there now appear to be signs of a new stirring abroad in the land.

Some observers detect a rising dissatisfaction with purely material goals; a quest for a deeper meaning—for a new sense of national direction and a redefinition of the American promise.

After a decade of doubt and discouragement, some Americans are beginning to see the need to move forward again with the vision of Paine and Jefferson.

And the outlines of a revived national purpose are beginning to take shape in the minds of some intellectual leaders.

That purpose, as these men see it, is twofold:

First, to take up once again, with new energy and dedication, the task of building the Nation. That will mean clearing our slums, revitalizing our cities, improving our schools, developing our resources, strengthening our defenses, providing more adequately for our aged and sick, enriching our culture and enlarging our efforts to secure equal rights for minorities and a fuller measure of freedom.

Second, to carry some portion of the American promise into the world community of nations, particularly into the underdeveloped areas. That will mean recognizing that the world cannot go on for very much longer half starving and half overfed and that the surging populations in the "have not" nations, unless helped, will some day threaten the "haves." It will mean sharing our resources and knowledge more fully than ever before and infusing a greater measure of idealism into our foreign policy.

To articulate this purpose—or some other—in a way that will capture the imagination of the American people, will be one of the tasks of leadership in the decade that lies ahead.

The tone of leadership in the 1950's—with its emphasis on moderation, good will, and Government inactivity—will not be adequate for the task.

"It is not true," writes Reston of the Times, "that the American character has been debased. It responds to what it hears. It will respond again to the old echoes still heard among the hills.

"But somebody has to strike the note, clearly and steadily, and appeal to what is best in us instead of what is worst."

America, despite its troubles in the 1950's, is still potentially the mightiest nation on earth.

It has contributed more to the cause of freedom and given more generously of its treasure and substance than any other nation in history.

It may not be, as Woodrow Wilson once called it, "the only idealistic nation in the world," but no other nation has moved on the world scene with the same high purpose.

And no other nation has been able to provide so much material abundance, and so much freedom at the same time.

"I believe that we are lost here in America," wrote the novelist Thomas Wolfe in an earlier period, "but I believe we shall be found * * *.

"I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come. I think the true discovery of our own democracy is still before us.

"And I think that all these things are certain as the morning, as inevitable as noon."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I call for the question on the pending amendments, which were discussed yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CURTIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri some questions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, who was recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois was recognized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator has called up the amendments designated "1–13–60—E," has he not?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to the printed copy of the amendments, on page 2, line 1, the word "Whoever" is used. The language reads:

> Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year—

And so forth. What is the meaning of the word "Whoever," in the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to my able colleague, the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I would interpret it as being susceptible of the definition contained in the laws of the United States of America, the United States Code, as it is generally referred to, Title I, "General Provisions," Chapter 1, "Rules of Construction," reading in part as follows:

> Words denoting number, gender, and so forth.
>
> In determining the meaning of any act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—words importing the singular include and apply to several persons, parties, or things.
>
> The words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

Mr. CURTIS. And it is the intention of the distinguished Senator to offer his amendment in the light of and in conformity with the existing statute?

Mr. HENNINGS. My able friend is exactly correct in that statement.

Mr. CURTIS. This language is pretty broad. It says:

> The words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals.

In other words, it is an all-inclusive term. It includes all entities. I cannot think of any that are left out.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is all-inclusive; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it include a labor organization?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would include any association, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it include the candidate himself?

Mr. HENNINGS. It would not include the candidate himself, as relating to his own expenditures in his own campaign.

Mr. CURTIS. By what language would the candidate be excluded?

Mr. HENNINGS. One must look at provisions in another section of the bill, as well as the language of this amendment.

I have prepared a memorandum in anticipation of discussion on this subject, in response to a question last night by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. As the Senator may remember, the Senator from Tennessee raised the question a short time before the conclusion of the debate last night. There was not sufficient opportunity to respond to it because the Senate passed on to other business.

The Senator from Tennessee apparently raised a question based upon his understanding—if I correctly interpret his question—that the amendment, with its overall limitation of $10,000, applied to a candidate in his own campaign. I think the language of the amendment, taken in its entire context, is quite different from that, and it must be remembered that in other provisions of the bill there is proscribed what a candidate may spend; and, as the Senator is aware, such proscriptions are $50,000 for a Senator and $12,500 for a Representative, plus certain formulas based upon votes or registration, as the Senator is aware.

In other words, we have multiplied by five the present limits in the so-called Corrupt Practices Act, and put such limits in the bill. The proposed amendment makes it a crime to make political contributions or expenditures, directly or indirectly, in excess of $10,000 in the aggregate during any calendar year.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, this amendment would make it a criminal offense for an individual to give $100 to, say, 101 candidates for the House of Representatives, if he chose to do so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I invite the Senator's attention to lines 11 to 15 on page 2 of the amendment. This prohibition applies if the expenditure or contribution is made to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates for any such office or offices or the success of any national political party.

If that committee is engaged in furthering the candidacy of a slate of county candidates, a slate of State candidates, and several Federal candidates, a contribution to such a committee, in its full amount, would be included in determining whether or not someone had reached the limit prescribed in line 3 on page 2.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It is true that in lines 18 and 19 on page 2 we find this language:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

I think the Senate should keep in mind that there may be many groups, including labor organizations, which may not be political committees, but they certainly come under the definition of "whoever," who will be prohibited from spending, in the entire United States, more than $10,000.

At this moment I am not stating whether that is good or bad, but I certainly believe that the Senate should be aware of the meaning of this language, because we are prescribing rather stiff penalties. Violators may be fined up to $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 5 years.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator realizes, this amendment does not apply to political committees in a State which spend more than $2,500.

Mr. CURTIS. It would not apply to them, but it would apply to all other groups. For example, is it the intent of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to prohibit COPE from spending more than $10,000 in the entire United States in a calendar year?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sorry; my attention was distracted.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to prohibit the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO, commonly referred to as COPE, from spending more than $10,000 throughout the United States in any 1 calendar year?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; according to my interpretation the provision would not so apply.

Mr. CURTIS. Why would they be exempt, and upon what premise shall we apply the provision to some and not to others?

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought I said yesterday—and I will repeat it if I failed to do so while the Senator was present—that political committees are specifically exempted by this amendment. However, a provision of the bill does limit political committees which operate in two or more States, under the formula; and intrastate committees, which fall within the definition of a political committee which would have to report, would have no ceiling on contributions or expenditures.

That was provided in the second amendment which we adopted the other

day. As I understand the Senator's question—and I hope I do——

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator regard the Committee on Political Education, referred to as COPE, as a political committee?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I would conclude it was a political committee—COPE, for example.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the bill, then, what is the limit placed upon COPE?

Mr. HENNINGS. Is the Senator discussing the limit within a State?

Mr. CURTIS. No; the overall limit.

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, COPE is a committee, as I understand, which operates in a number of States, and would therefore come within the $12½ million limit, under the formula which is provided in the bill, as the Senator knows.

Mr. CURTIS. If COPE receives its money, all of it or any part of it——

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator will find that at page 18.

Mr. CURTIS. If COPE receives its money in part or in whole from labor organizations, can it lawfully spend any money?

Mr. HENNINGS. Not if it receives money from a labor organization, as such. I believe the Taft-Hartley Act would cover the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. "As such?" What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall try to elucidate that further for the Senator. A labor organization is an organization. Members of a labor organization may, of course, contribute to such organizations as the Senator has indicated, whether they be labor organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, or chambers of commerce, and so forth.

Mr. CURTIS. But if any part of the administrative expenses, the organization expenses, for the creation and formation of COPE, comes from a labor organization—we might use the word "dues" money—can that organization lawfully make a contribution or expenditure?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know, I may say to my good friend, exactly what the bylaws and articles of incorporation of COPE provide. In fact, I have no idea.

Mr. CURTIS. I am referring to the statute.

Mr. HENNINGS. To what is the Senator's question specifically addressed? I want to be sure that I understand him and that we understand each other. I know that the Senator is getting into a matter which may be of great importance. Is he inquiring as to whether a national organization of that character is restricted to $10,000?

Mr. CURTIS. I am asking if it can lawfully make any expenditure if it is a creature of a labor organization and obtains all or part of its running expenses from dues money.

Mr. HENNINGS. As the Senator knows, the question of contributions by so-called labor organizations is well defined in the Taft-Hartley Act, and they are limited in a State at the present time, as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. It is my understanding that a corporation or national bank or labor organization cannot make a political contribution or expenditure. Now the Senator has told me that an organization such as COPE can spend up to $12,500,000. My question is, if COPE is a creature of a labor organization and if it receives all or part of its operating funds—which makes it possible for it to exist as an organization—from it, can it lawfully contribute to a political campaign?

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not COPE an educational political activity organization, too?

Mr. CURTIS. That claim has been made.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know enough about the internal organization of COPE to discuss it.

Mr. CURTIS. There is an abundance of evidence to indicate that they spend money to register voters, which is a very expensive thing for a candidate to do; they spend money to transport people to the polls, which again is a very expensive thing; and they make many expenditures and contributions separate and apart from a direct contribution to a candidate, which cost a great deal of money and influence elections. Therefore, calling it educational does not make it so. It is still politics. Abraham Lincoln once asked a man, "If you call a calf's tail a leg, how many legs does it have?" The man said, "Five." Abraham Lincoln said, "Oh, no; it still has only four legs. Calling a tail a leg does not make it so."

Calling COPE an educational committee, when it is employing hundreds of people and spending thousands of dollars to get people registered and to get them to vote and to get them to vote against the candidates they oppose, does not make it so. It is political activity, and its members so regard it, other people so regard it, and the candidates know it is.

In writing the clean elections bill, the distinguished Senator has spent not days and weeks, but years in the endeavor. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to make it clear and plain that corporations and national banks and labor organizations are not to spend money to elect Federal candidates or defeat Federal candidates.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, my distinguished friend has spoken of some of these matters relating to an organization known as COPE, whose precise activities and purposes, I must confess, are beyond my knowledge, I do not know that it is organized solely for the purpose of bringing people to the polls and getting them to vote a certain way. I assume they probably take some position in these matters. A part of their program, as I understand, becomes a matter for determination by the courts upon the facts as to exactly what it may be. I am not prepared to say. Not knowing what its constitution and bylaws provide, I cannot specifically say, since I have not had any intimate connection with the organization. To the best of my knowledge—what does COPE mean?

Mr. CURTIS. Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO. The distinguished Senator from Missouri says he does not know what is provided in its constitution and bylaws. The distinguished Senator is an able lawyer. Could he write the constitution for a corporation which would result in making it lawful for that corporation to make political expenditures?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know whether I could do that or not. I might be able to do it if I were to find out all the facts relating to the corporation and what the laws of the State were.

Mr. CURTIS. Federal law is rather clear that a corporation cannot do it, that a national bank cannot do it, and that a labor organization cannot do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. The only thing I know or have been told about COPE is that it is a voluntary organization. If, as the Senator has said, it is not, that would be a matter to be determined in some other manner, not here.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose that representatives of several business corporations, by using individuals from different corporations, created a voluntary association, and that that voluntary association spent money to register people, to hold meetings, to circulate literature, to hire people to do personal work, and to take voters to the polls, but that they got their money from the corporate treasury.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is different. That is where the Senator from Nebraska and I would part company. If the Senator would say that all such contributions were made voluntarily by the officers of the corporation, he would have one set of circumstances. If the contributions were made, as COPE, operating within the law, operates through voluntary contributions, it would be the same sort of association as any other group of citizens.

The fact is that COPE happens to represent labor organizations to some degree for these purposes, and I assume from what the Senator says and from my own knowledge of the situation—I do not want to be hypocritical and pretend that I do not know anything about it—it makes contributions, which come from members of unions or persons indentified with the labor movement.

But, again, we get into the business of not going into the union treasury and supplying the funds for COPE, which is violative of the law and violative of the constitutions and bylaws of most of the unions.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose a voluntary association created by corporate executives receives money from the corporation; that they also receive some voluntary contributions from individuals but that they put them into their treasury; that they then proceeded to take the money which came from the corporate

treasuries, and spend it on the holding of meetings and on publicity which is adverse to certain candidates but favorable to others. Suppose they spend that money, which has been obtained from the corporations, to hire precinct workers and to conduct registration programs, but that they call it education. Would that be a violation of law?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think, again, as I have undertaken to say to the Senator in his inquiry, these interpretations are matters for the courts, predicated upon the facts and the law, as are all legal questions. The Senator has indulged in a hypothesis with which I am not certain I can entirely agree, because I am not possessed of all the knowledge which the Senator apparently has with respect to such organizations as COPE.

But I should say that the courts have ruled on this subject; and, as the Senator has indicated, they have not overlooked it nor dismissed it lightly. For example, in 1947 there was a case of the United States against the Congress of Industrial Organizations and others, an appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. I read from the syllabus rather than from the opinion itself, which covers a large number of pages:

> In this case, a labor organization and its president were indicted for violations of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which prohibits contributions or expenditures by corporations and labor organizations in connection with Federal elections. The indictment charged that the labor organization made, and its president consented to, expenditures for the publication of a weekly periodical, in a certain issue of which appeared an article by its president urging members to vote for a particular candidate in a forthcoming congressional election, and that it made expenditures for the publication and distribution of extra copies of that issue in connection with the election; but it did not charge that free copies were distributed to nonsubscribers, nonpurchasers, or persons not entitled to receive copies as members of the union. The district court sustained a motion to dismiss on the ground that the act, so far as it related to expenditures by labor organizations in connection with Federal elections, violated the first amendment of the Federal Constitution. The Government appealed directly to this court under the Criminal Appeals Act.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The interpretation here placed on section 313 is supported by the history, the language, and the purpose of the section, and by the fact that grave doubt as to its constitutionality would arise were it construed as applicable to the acts charged in the indictment.

As the Senator well knows from a reading of the cases, there is a limited interpretation on what is meant by contributions and expenditures. I shall simply say to the Senator, as I undertook to say at the outset, that in many instances, the cases will have to stand upon their own bottoms, with respect to what actually happened; with respect to the collection of funds and the distribution of funds; the sources of the funds; the voluntary nature, if such exists, or, indeed, the involuntary nature, of the contributions; whether the money came from the treasury of the unions or was contributed by the members of the unions, and for what purposes, whether the purpose be educational or primarily political.

I noticed in the newspaper this morning—the Senator from Nebraska also may have noticed it—a reference to a case involving the League of Women Voters. The lower court—Judge Madden—held that the League of Women Voters is a political organization, although I believe both the Senator from Nebraska and I know, having had some experiences with the ladies who are members of that organization, and having appeared before them, as the Senator doubtless has, that they belong to various political faiths but do advocate certain causes or oppose certain legislative matters.

Mr. CURTIS. Was that in respect to the Corrupt Practices Act, or was it a matter of taxes?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was with respect to a matter of taxes. I simply happened to notice an item about it in the newspaper today; I had not read the case.

Mr. CURTIS. I realize that before any prosecution can be successful, the court must inquire into all the facts and circumstances. But I do think Congress owes the public a duty to show the clear intent of what we propose. That is why I think the question should be answered. If an organization such as COPE receives a part of its budget from labor organizations—from dues money—is it the intention of the author of this clean elections bill that that shall be permitted by law or prohibited by law?

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the able Senator that the pending bill, as do all legislative matters, embodies what we believe to be the intent of Congress, and that, if passed, certain interpretations must necessarily be left to the courts.

As the Senator knows from his long experience in the House of Representatives and in this body, the courts are constantly passing upon questions with which the legislative branch has undertaken to deal.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I have read the legislative history concerning the enactment of the statute which prohibits corporations from making political expenditures and contributions. There were two basic reasons for the enactment of that measure. One was that there was objection to having powerful corporations have that much political influence. The second reason was the right of the stockholder not to have his money spent for candidates or for causes in which he did not believe. I think both those reasons apply to labor organizations.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not contradict that statement in any respect; the same applies to labor organizations, just as it applies to corporations.

Mr. CURTIS. I shall try to simplify my question: If an organization receives part of its budget from a labor organization and its dues money—not voluntary contributions, but dues money—can that organization engage in activities which result in the election or defeat of Federal candidates?

Mr. HENNINGS. As I understand the question, it goes to whether a part is received from dues money and a part is received for political education or political purposes—or both?

Mr. CURTIS. No; if part of the budget of COPE comes from labor organizations and if part comes from voluntary contributions, but if the result of the entire effort of that organization is of material help in defeating or in electing Federal candidates, is that a violation of law?

Mr. HENNINGS. That would depend entirely upon the facts in a given case. As to whether the dues are used for educational purposes or whether they are used for actual political work, and to what extent those expenditures can be separated, assuming that the contributions were voluntary, certainly there would be no violation of the law with respect to such contributions.

I cannot assume facts with respect to what organizations—with respect to whose operations I am not privy—are doing, except to do the best I can to answer the Senator's numerous questions in regard to an organization known as COPE.

I have never seen the bylaws or the constitution of that organization. I do not know how it functions—except, in a general sort of way, I understand that it collects voluntary contributions from the members.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the Senator's understanding that that constitutes the entire budget of the organization?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not know that much about it. So far as I am concerned, my knowledge about COPE is a case of first impressions—as in the case of a client who walks into my office. I would not be able to say more about it until I saw what its constitution and its bylaws provide and until I understood more about what its functions are.

We know that the Taft-Hartley Act already contains provisions on that subject; and violations of that act are matters for the courts to determine. That is the best answer I can give to this line of questioning.

For instance, I could not say very much about the detailed operations of the United States Steel Corp. I do not know whether the officers of that corporation make contributions to candidates, or whether they reimburse one another for such contributions, or not. Many corporations are opposed to the making of contributions of one kind or another, inasmuch as contributions may not always be voluntary, and many of them may be subject to coercion, whether express or implied.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sorry that I have arrived in the Chamber a little too late to hear all of the debate between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Nebraska, for I am very much in-

terested in it, inasmuch as it pertains to a field in which I have been interested for some time.

I have refrained from discussing this subject because—for one thing—the Looper case, from Georgia, is now before the U.S. Supreme Court, which will decide whether that activity can be engaged in.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Arizona and I have discussed these matters privately on many occasions; and I appreciate his interest in the debate. I believe he will agree that these matters are for the courts to determine, and that the answers depend upon the rulings of the courts, do they not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree that the matter to which I have just now referred is before the U.S. Supreme Court, which I hope will give its answer shortly.

But I believe my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], was addressing himself to a matter very fundamental to this clean elections law, because under the decision of the Supreme Court which more or less motivated the political actions committees of the several unions, the court's ruling could also be applied to corporations. However, corporations have not generally undertaken the same type of activities that the labor unions have undertaken in this field.

The question which comes to my mind is this: If the Senator, in his attempts to create a modern elections law, allows this loophole to remain open, then I am sure he is in for a lot of devilment about matters that he was hoping to correct.

Let me explain what I mean: The Committee on Political Education does report the voluntary contributions of the funds it receives, and reports in detail how they are distributed to the various States and the various candidates. But no reporting is made of what is spent for educational purposes.

If the Senator from Missouri will listen to me for just a moment——

Mr. HENNINGS. I am listening very carefully to the Senator from Arizona, and I hope I am understanding him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me state some of the activities which are considered educational, and about which the costs are not reported: Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records.

Certainly we cannot correctly say that those activities are nonpolitical and are educational only; actually, they are political to the 9th degree, because of the way the voting records are compiled.

For instance, when we were debating the offshore oil bill, the issue was carried as "raising the cost of oil to the people, and denying educational funds," and so forth, whereas the real issue was States' rights. They twisted those, so that it looked as if a Senator who voted against that bill actually voted against the interests of the working people.

So I think the Senator from Missouri would have to agree that those are political matters.

The next is political training courses; and they do not have to report what they spend on them.

Mr. HENNINGS. Who does not have to report?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Committee on Political Education.

Mr. HENNINGS. It does not report on what it spends on training classes or courses?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It does not report on what it spends on matters which, according to its own definition, come in the category of "educational."

As I said at the outset, that organization does report on funds given directly to candidates; and I am convinced that those funds are voluntarily contributed.

I do not believe this particular organization any longer uses compulsory dues money; but it gets around that difficulty in this way: I have stated that it makes no report in regard to what it spends for political training classes.

Neither does it report on the amounts it spends on getting voters registered. We may debate as to whether the latter is a proper activity, because there is some responsibility to get voters registered.

Next we come to payments to political workers——

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand my friend, the Senator from Arizona, to say that it is his understanding that contributions made to the organization known as COPE are now voluntary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The contributions made to COPE which are, in turn, given to the candidates.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But the funds to which we are referring are those which never are reported on; and we have no idea of their size. I have to assume that they are rather astronomical in size, because of my knowledge of campaign expenditures in a small State such as Arizona.

For instance, they pay election day workers. In our hearings before the Select Committee on Campaigns and Lobbying, a few years ago, we disclosed information—and I think the Senator from Missouri will be interested to know about this—that in one county, alone, in Michigan, such payments were being made at a rate which would equal about $37,000 a day—in that one county. The amount spent for that purpose was approximately that large. All we had to go on was the number of days and the amount spent per day.

They provide automobiles to transport voters to the polls, and the cost of that service is not reported. For instance, I have information about one particular election, in a particular county, in which 100 automobiles were provided for that purpose.

Mr. HENNINGS. If that is true, certainly it is a violation of the present Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator is misinformed on that. We are not sure it is in violation, because the Supreme Court made a decision in the case of United States against CIO, in which it held educational purposes to be a proper function of a labor union. I am not intimately acquainted with the details of the decision, but, as I recall, it was held in connection with a labor newspaper, and the Court held it was proper, and that activity has since continued.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator said I was misinformed. I doubtless am on many things. Does the Senator indicate that I am misinformed as to the nature of the operation of this activity, or the Court decision, or the application of the law?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I meant when the Senator said this is in violation of the present law. I believe if a proper interpretation was placed on this activity, it would be; but the Supreme Court decision has placed a great deal of doubt on it. That is why I am arguing the point which my friend, the Senator, started. Because if labor unions can do it, by the same decision business can also do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then the Senator's complaint is against the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Senator from Arizona has no complaint against the Supreme Court's decision. I think in that particular case the Supreme Court ruled correctly. I do not always agree with the Supreme Court——

Mr. HENNINGS. Nor does the Supreme Court always agree with itself. The Supreme Court has great difficulty in coming to an agreement when we have 5-to-4 decisions.

While I think this discussion is very interesting, and very important, certainly, I am trying to get at what the Senator is seeking from me with respect to it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will allow me to pursue this matter a little bit further——

Mr. HENNINGS. I want to try to answer, to the best of my ability.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I apologize for my remarks not being in the nature of a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is perfectly all right. I do not raise that question at all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted to complete this list of activities that are called educational, which I think are purely political, and which I think, if allowed to continue, can destroy the intent and purpose of the diligent and hard work which my friend from Missouri has put into the bill. For instance, there are no reports of expenses of political committees, and yet there are 20 COPE area conferences in which expenses are paid. The Committee on Political Education is, in my opinion, a political organization, which was formed, in the words of Mr. George Meany, to change the complexion of Congress, when he said, "We will have to go further in the political field." I think the Senator will recall that Mr. Meany said that the emphasis is shifting from collective bargaining to politics when he asserted that the emphasis had shifted from picket lines to the legislative halls.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must confess I do not recall the last statement. I am sure the Senator is correct in quoting him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I realize that the Senator has not devoted his study to this particular subject, because it is outside the field he normally engages in.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say that I have both represented corporations and

have been a mediator in labor disputes. For the most part, in my private practice of law my representation was of corporations.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator should be a vice president.

Mr. HENNINGS. But I do not profess to be an expert in labor law, because I know my law firm subscribes to the corporation clearing house journal with advance sheets on labor disputes. We get that information from the NLRB decisions, various rulings in the districts, and the decisions of the courts relative to those matters. I do not find the field of labor legislation at all simple or easy. I find it, indeed, very difficult and complex.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator allow me to draw up a hypothesis in order to enable him to understand what I am driving at?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have to get down to a particular case that comes to me, in order to undertake to ascertain what the facts are. After ascertaining what the facts are, I search the law and every decision which has been made on the point at issue. Then I undertake to come to some conclusion of the relationship of the facts to the law or the law to the facts. So that to talk about many, many hypothetical cases I find exceedingly difficult, because they do not contain all of the elements and all of the facts that may properly engage counsel's attention in undertaking to represent a client, whether it be a labor union or a corporate enterprise.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I conduct the Senator back over this matter, because I do not think the Senator from Missouri quite grasps what I am trying to get at?

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Corrupt Practices Act provide that corporations and unions cannot participate in political activity. A decision of the Supreme Court put enough cloud over that prohibition to enable labor unions to establish political action committees under the guise of educational committees.

What the Senator from Arizona is trying to put across to the Senator from Missouri is that in the case of the Committee on Political Education alone, we have clearly an organization that is engaging in politics, because I do not see how the Senator from Missouri can come to the conclusion that registration of voters is nonpolitical, that political training courses are nonpolitical, that paying election day workers is not political, that publication of voting records is nonpolitical——

Mr. HENNINGS. I had understood the court had ruled that activity was nonpolitical. Am I informed correctly?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The court has ruled——

Mr. HENNINGS. Which court?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Supreme Court in the CIO case.

Mr. HENNINGS. That the publication of voting records is nonpolitical?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. HENNINGS. I misunderstood.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The publication of labor periodicals does not fall within the meaning of the prohibition of the Taft-Hartley and the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood that. I thought the Senator referred to publications.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Having that Court decision, and having the Taft-Hartley Act and the Corrupt Practices Act, which were intended to exclude unions and corporations from political activity, we now have political activity. All I am trying to do is ascertain from the Senator if he feels this type of political activity should not be recognized, and those contributions should be required to be reported under his bill. That is my whole purpose.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would only say to the Senator, as I can honestly and forthrightly say to anyone who would ask that question, it would depend upon assembling all the facts with relation to it. The Supreme Court of the United States already has passed on the matter——

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Supreme Court has not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator to say, with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act, the Supreme Court had made certain pronouncements.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. The Senator from Arizona cited only one decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. The CIO case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is right, and that pertained to newspapers. There is another case in Michigan that relates to television. It went to the Supreme Court and was remanded to the Supreme Court of Michigan.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator did take a very active interest in the Taft-Hartley law and its application. Of that I am well aware, as we all are. We respect him here in this body.

There are many of these matters in the courts, are there not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is one matter in the court, which will not apply to the activity we are discussing until we interpret whether this action is political or not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think the court is going to determine this matter. I know of no way it can. If the court upholds the Supreme Court of Georgia in the Looper case, and if the court says it is wrong to use union dues money for political purposes, we still have the Supreme Court decision which clouds the whole area and allows political education committees.

If the Senator will allow me, I should like to go a step further.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the Senator goes a step further I should like to reply.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator please let me finish?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have yielded to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator has.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator takes me step by step, and I should like to answer step by step, but if the Senator wants to proceed I shall be happy to proceed in any way pleasing to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to point out to my friend that what the Senator from Arizona sees as a danger in this process, in regard to the Senator's very well drafted and good bill, on which the Senator has worked so long and diligently, is an expansion of this process. Some of the corporations of this country are now beginning to do what has been referred to. Let us assume that the corporations and businesses generally of this country establish their political education committees.

The Senator has been a candidate many times, as I have. We would rather have manpower than money, but somebody has to pay for the manpower, most of the time. This is a way to pay for it, and yet never have to report it. This is a way to publish propaganda for a candidate, and never have to report it. This is a way to provide election tools, and never have to report it.

What will be the end result if both sides of this argument get into this work? Let us say it is management on the one side and labor on the other. We will then find tremendous sums of money being spent for candidates, which sums will never be reported.

That is the whole purpose in the attempt of the junior Senator from Arizona to argue with his good friend, because he thinks the bill should contain something in this field to prevent the destruction of the intent of the whole work.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's solicitude; and I do not say that in any ironical way. I know the Senator is interested in government. From his point of view, he is interested in good government. We all have various ways of approaching what is a common end, and sometimes they are not quite as much at variance as they superficially seem to be.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber in the middle of the colloquy, which I find intensely interesting. For my own enlightenment, I wonder if I correctly understand that the pending amendment is amendment 1–13–60—E?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Which would impose an overall limitation of $10,000 on political contributions by any one individual?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Am I correct in stating that the colloquy which has taken place between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Missouri, interesting and fascinating though it is, is rather irrelevant and immaterial to the question of whether this particular amendment should be agreed to?

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I have tried during the long course of this debate to be available for all questions raised by any Senator, and I have not undertaken to say that any are irrelevant. I fear that

some questions which are asked, when we get down to matters of interpretations of the courts, or hypotheses which may not include all of the facts or assumptions, are difficult to answer.

I understood the Senator from Nebraska to make the assumption that the organization known as COPE subsisted upon funds—if I do not misquote him, and I hope I do not—that were sometimes taken involuntarily or from the union treasury, which is denied, as I understand it, by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator from Arizona did not deny that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator from Arizona to say that he now understands the funds for political activity were not taken from the treasury or the dues, but were voluntarily given. Am I wrong again?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona said he is fairly well convinced that moneys given to candidates are voluntary funds, and that they are reported to the Clerk of the House.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what the Senator did say; the Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What the Senator from Arizona is trying to argue, he believes, is applicable. I disagree with my good friend the Senator from Pennsylvania, who says that it is irrelevant. One might raise the argument that we should talk about this matter any place. One might say that it should go to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have a very deep interest in seeing that the elections in this country are run better and more cleanly. It is not that such action is particularly revolting. I wish that both parties would operate effectively.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did we enjoy the Senator's support on the amendment which related to primary elections?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator did not.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did we enjoy the Senator's support on the amendment relating to the multiplicity of committees within the States?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the Senator did not get my support on that. The Senator knows that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thought I knew it, but I understood the Senator to say that he was interested in perfecting the elections process.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to complete my statement?

Mr. HENNINGS. I wondered whether our philosophies have parted company on all matters thus far, including perhaps this, and I wondered exactly what the learned Senator would suggest about elections, since he has expressed an interest, but the interest seems to be directed, by and large, to labor organizations which, as I understand it, are pretty well covered by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to correct a statement that he made?

Mr. HENNINGS. I want us to join issue, if possible, so that we will understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want to have the RECORD left with the statement which the Senator made, which I am sure was simply an error on his part. I admitted that I was fairly well convinced that the moneys sent to candidates come from voluntary contributions. That did not use to be the case, but I believe such money now comes from voluntary contributions, and I believe it is reported.

I have been going through a list of items which come under "education," which are purely political, which are not reported.

My only point is that when the Senator tries to put a limit on what an individual can contribute, I point out there is no limitation at all on this activity. If the Senator wants to take the usual approach, which is to say, "Well, GOLDWATER is against labor"——

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I have not said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have made this perfectly clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am fearful that corporations will do this, also. When that happens we shall have completely destroyed the intent of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. For example, when corporations pay for membership in chambers of commerce for members of a given corporation, and when certain speakers of given political persuasion or philosophy are invited to speak before chamber of commerce meetings and conventions, and the National Association of Manufacturers convention, and so on, that is, in a sense, educational, is it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is agreeing with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me express just one point of view. It is educational, because people are learning something, whether it be something with which they agree or something with which they may disagree.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator agrees with me, then, that there is a real danger in the approach I have suggested this afternoon. If the labor union movement can do this, business can do it, likewise. I have never been one to say that business does not engage in politics.

I am not going to take more of the Senator's time, because I have heard some of my colleagues say this is irrelevant. I think it is not only not irrelevant, but that it is of great importance.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not said that. I wish to say emphatically to the Senator, whether I think it irrelevant or not I think it is my duty to try to do the best I can to answer questions, which may or may not be relevant, even though I do not always understand precisely the question as it may be put, because questions sometimes contain conclusions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator agree with the junior Senator from Arizona that there is a danger in allowing this activity, which is a complete political activity, to continue and not be reported?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not understand that this is any part of the bill, I will say to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The purpose of the Senator's bill, as I understand it, is to require more complete reporting, to place limits on activities, and to overcome some of the troubles which the study has shown to exist with respect to elections. I am trying to point out, and I am obviously not getting very far with it——

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator is doing very well.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this activity, we have a purely political activity which the Senator has not covered in his bill.

I shall say this once again, and then take my seat. The danger is that businessmen and corporations may follow the same tack; and when they do we might as well tear up the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did the Senator think we inadequately covered primary elections with the primary amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not in agreement with that.

Mr. HENNINGS. But it was adequately covered, was it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not in agreement with the amendment, and I voted against it.

Mr. HENNINGS. But the Senator understood it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. And thought it was adequately covered.

Does the Senator believe that the second amendment, with respect to numerous committees in the States being required to report, was adequately covered?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not see how the Senate could spend the time it has spent on this bill and have anyone say that anything had not been adequately covered.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator to say that we had not adequately covered the matters undertaken to be dealt with in the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. The Senator did not correctly understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then I stand corrected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the preparation of the bill the Senator has overlooked—and I know it was inadvertently overlooked—an area which could create more danger than we are now trying to correct. Here is a clear case of political activity that is never reported to any committee of the Congress or of the State.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator that it was not overlooked. It was deliberately excluded, because it has seemed to me that it has no place in this bill. Every one of these instances must stand upon the facts of the separate cases.

In my practice of law, in trying to understand the law, having been engaged in private practice for a good many years, I have always had to take the position that we must first know all the facts, and then try to understand the law as applied to the facts.

As to providing for every possible contingency in legislation which undertakes to cover election laws, if we did so in

connection with all legislation emanating from the Congress, perhaps there would be very little work for the Supreme Court to do, because we would have to set forth in every bill or resolution specific instances, one after another. I do not know how we can be more specific in this sort of legislation, which is not labor legislation, as my friend well knows, and still attain the primary purpose, which is to prevent contributions of more than $10,000 being made by any one person.

Does the Senator agree with that philosophy, if we can arrive at some agreement? Has he an amendment to offer?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have no amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the Senator has been giving this subject a great deal of study. He has been good enough to illuminate the discourse upon it. Has the Senator any suggestion, except that we do nothing but revert to 1925 and rock along under the old 1925 law, which some of us have felt very strongly is inadequate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator either has not been listening or he has purposely misunderstood the Senator from Arizona. I am merely trying to point out, as I have done many times, an area which I feel should be covered by this bill. There is an amendment——

Mr. HENNINGS. Has the Senator a suggestion?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have been making suggestions as long as I have been on my feet.

Mr. HENNINGS. In what line would the Senator suggest that the language be changed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There is no language in the bill to change. The bill does not refer to this field at all. The Senator would not require union organizations participating in election activities to report. If the Senator wants to be specific, I will ask one question, and then I will let him get on with his work.

Does the Senator feel that paying election-day workers is a political activity?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the courts would probably consider paying election day workers for a specific party or a candidate to be an election activity. That is a matter of first impression.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has been in politics——

Mr. HENNINGS. The subject was never suggested in committee. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who asked a number of questions earlier this afternoon, is the ranking member of the committee. The subject was never suggested as one which should fall within the purview of study by the committee which reported this election bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think I stated earlier the reason——

Mr. HENNINGS. I think the Senator is really talking about labor legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not agree at all.

Mr. HENNINGS. It may impinge upon political activity, because every phase of our national life, in one way or another, is related to political activity.

Mr. GOLDWATER. This activity is prohibited by labor law, yet it is practiced by reason of the cloud cast upon it by the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. If it is prohibited by labor law, is it not covered by labor law?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The law states that such organizations may not engage in political activity. What I am trying to convince the Senator is that the actions of the Committee on Political Education are political. They are merely a way to get around the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. HENNINGS. With respect to political activity, I was not in the Congress at the time the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. I profess no expertness on it. I heard none of the debates. When was it passed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. 1947.

Mr. HENNINGS. It seemed to me that the subject of activity by labor organizations was covered in the act.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Absolutely.

Mr. HENNINGS. Was it not dealt with?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Absolutely. It was covered by reference to the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. Why is it not a matter for the court to pass upon, and why should we encumber an elections bill with further references to labor and labor activities? We have undertaken to define political activity, and we have gone into such matters as relate to the various things that happen in campaigns.

I find myself at a loss to answer the Senator any further, except to say that these things are matters for the courts and the interpretation of the courts. I have done the best I can, with my limited ability, to try to spell out what we mean. I think the courts would probably understand that the legislative history is, and what the Congress intends. There is another branch of the Government, which passes upon some of these questions of fact and of law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I point out that at the outset of this colloquy I stated that I had not entered into the debate and had not prepared amendments because of the existence of a case before the Supreme Court. I would not have engaged in this colloquy had not other Senators discussed the subject. I did not want the RECORD to be left as it was, incomplete; and I feel certain that when the Senator reads the RECORD tomorrow he will better understand what I have been trying to get at. I understand that an amendment will be offered in this field. If it is, I shall speak on that amendment. I had no intention of offering such an amendment, because I did not care to ruffle the waters with the Supreme Court so near.

I hope that I have been able to show the Senator why I have concern in this area and why I feel that if this matter is not covered at this time or the next time, the Senator will come to me and say, "Gosh, my bill turned out to be no good because we did not close this great big loophole that is bigger than the whole field we are talking about."

Mr. HENNINGS. I hope I shall never find myself lacking in candor. If a better bill can be written I would be happy to accept it or accept any part of it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator would.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate the Senator's discussion of the subject, and I know his sincerity. I am not going to use the old cliche about, "We do not always agree on everything" because we do not always agree on everything.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That would be a horrible thing.

Mr. HENNINGS. It would be, would it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It would be.

Mr. HENNINGS. Certainly. We often drape the walls of this Chamber by saying, "I do not always agree with the distinguished and able and learned Senator, but I am now going to say thus and so about him." That is complimentary. I am not going to talk about our not always agreeing. The Supreme Court does not always agree. Lawyers often do not agree when they are on opposite sides of a case. I have been practicing law for 35 years, and I have taught it. I do not pretend to be an especially able lawyer. I have been able to make my living at it, and not as a political lawyer, either. I find the law very difficult. I find the more I read it and experience it, the tougher it gets.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If a lawyer admits that the law is tough, what must he think a layman finds it to be?

Mr. HENNINGS. Then I would recommend he repair immediately to the nearest lawyer and let the lawyer do his worrying for him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Outside of this Chamber I would agree with my friend.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not have any reference to the Senate, of course.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are laymen in the Senate, and they are entitled to express their views. I believe I have expressed mine to the best of my ability. Therefore I will suggest to the Senator that tomorrow, as he reads this colloquy, he pay particular attention to the points of political activity to which I have tried to call attention.

Mr. HENNINGS. I meant nothing personal.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly not.

Mr. HENNINGS. I meant nothing personal about the fact that the Senator from Arizona is not a member of the legal profession.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are times when I am happy about it, and there are times when I am unhappy about it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I might say that he may even be better qualified because he is not a member of the legal profession.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator might be right.

Mr. HENNINGS. Lawyers, together with members of other professions and trades and crafts, have their shortcomings, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Sometimes too many cooks may spoil the soup.

Mr. HENNINGS. Lawyers do not pretend any infallibility or superiority insofar as mental capacity and intellectual ability or the ability to understand and comprehend is concerned.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Having hired several lawyers during my life, I would have to agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to yield to the able junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have listened with appreciation to the colloquy between the able senior Senator from Missouri and the able junior Senator from Arizona. Suffice it to say that if the practices which the junior Senator from Arizona alleges to be political are in fact political activities, and are so determined by the courts, then they are prohibited by law.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Tennessee has stated in one very brief sentence what I have been trying perhaps to extensively but repeatedly to say in answer to many questions. That is exactly the point of this entire discussion. I thank the Senator

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator pardon me for brevity?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe anyone need ever ask to be excused for brevity in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arizona. To return to my earlier statement, the Senator from Arizona has raised some very interesting points, which are worthy of careful attention. These points will also be raised by an amendment to be proposed by the junior Senator from South Carolina. It occurs to me that these points could be discussed and debated if and when that amendment is called up. I shall personally oppose it, because I would rather have that subject left to the courts. However, the colloquy which has just taken place is entirely irrelevant and immaterial to any issue with respect to the pending amendment, which we have now been discussing for the better part of today. I would hope very much that we would be able to bring the amendment to a vote at an early time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do agree. However, I also feel that it would be discourteous and improper, since I have undertaken some responsibility on this bill, to refuse to try to answer questions just because they are irrelevant, as though I were a judge of a court, sitting on high, on a bench in a black robe, saying, "This is irrelevant. We will pass on."

I call for the question on the amendments which are now pending before the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What was the request of the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has called for the question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, without losing the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENNINGS. What is the parliamentary situation, a vote having been requested?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated the question. It is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Illinois has been recognized and he has now yielded to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I submitted an amendment to give civil service employees the right to vote and participate in local and municipal elections. There is some question about the amendment being in order on the pending bill. I have withdrawn it so that I may in the future introduce a separate bill to cover the civil service employees who are domiciled in or residents of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland and in Arlington and Fairfax Counties in Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri. As I understand, before we left the floor last night the pending amendments were offered, and it was my understanding that they were actually in the nature of technical amendments. I believe that the language had been used. I recall discussing them with the distinguished Senator from Missouri. He indicated that they did nothing more than to raise the limit of the contribution from $5,000 to $10,000. I believe there is a little more than that in the amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sorry if I conveyed that impression to the minority leader. There is more than that to the amendments. I may have been referring to the technical amendment, that being number three.

I may have misspoken; in any event, I would not say it is a technical amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I examined the language of the RECORD rather carefully. I noted this statement by the distinguished Senator from Missouri:

> The law under which we are presumably now operating provides a $5,000 limitation. We would provide a limitation of $10,000.

Some words, however, have been added to the existing law, which put this matter in an entirely different light. For instance, existing law speaks only of a contribution to a candidate, but the language of the amendments before us speaks of contributions to "any candidate or candidates." The addition of the last two words very significantly changes the meaning of the amendments, as I understood it. That makes it a general limitation across the board.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Did I understand the Senator to say that words have been added?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are added in the Senator's amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. They appear in the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for his clarification. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The existing law is clear about a contribution to a candidate. The second amendment, on the other hand, speaks about a contribution to a "candidate or candidates." That is quite a different thing.

In addition, the amendment covers "any committee or committees or other organizations engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates."

So what confronts us now, of course, is a broad limitation which goes entirely across the board. In that respect, it is a very substantial departure from existing law.

Of course, I should be more than glad to support an increase from $5,000 to $10,000; but obviously I could not accept the new language which is proposed in the amendment. Therefore, I shall offer an amendment which would modify the amendment of the Senator from Missouri in this respect:

It would strike the words "or expenditures"; the words "or candidates"; the words "or offices"; the words "or committees"; the word "organizations"—in the plural; and also the words "or expenditures."

There is one other modification, and it comes at the very close of the amendment, because the language in lines 18 and 19 is——

Mr. HENNINGS. Was the Senator's last modification on page 2?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are all on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Is the Senator from Illinois offering these amendments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall offer them directly, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking that they be considered en bloc?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so, because I consider them to be either technical or clarifying, even though they go to the substance of the amendment and go to the substance of that portion of the Corrupt Practices Act which is proposed to be amended by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. GORE. What was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair awaits the pleasure of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am undertaking to make the corrections, as the Senator has indicated them, in the body of the bill, since the Senator has only one copy of the amendment and has very graciously supplied it to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will now be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike the words "or expenditures."; on page 2, line 6, strike the words "or candidates"; on page 2, line 7, strike the words "or offices"; on page 2, lines 11–12, strike the words "or committees"; on page 2, line 12, strike the word "organizations" and in lieu thereof insert "organization"; on page 2, lines 18–19, strike the words "or expenditures"; on page 2, line 19, insert after the word "made" the words "to or" and insert after the word "committee" the words "or any other State or local committee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has asked that his amendments be considered en bloc. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments of the Senator from Illinois will be considered en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is scarcely any need for me to labor this matter. We have discussed the general approach on this subject. As the distinguished Senator from Missouri well knows, I am rather allergic to the proposition of any kind of inhibition across the board. This amendment would, of course, impose a $10,000 limitation embracing all candidates, all committees, and all organizations.

There is one other item, and it is the last two lines of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri, which provides as follows:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

If I remember correctly, only the word "contributions" was used in the Corrupt Practices Act. But the word "expenditures" has been added in this case.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For that reason, this is certainly not a technical amendment. This amendment goes to the very heart of the matter.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is not a technical amendment. If I said so, I was referring to a preceding amendment. I am sorry the Senator labored under a misapprehension.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had a misunderstanding and misapprehension of the amendment last night, when it was pressed for action. I may say to the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that he, too, had some concern about it, because the Senator from New York at the time said:

> It is important that in our deliberations we understand fully that this is quite a departure from anything now in the law.

In addition, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] also made an observation with respect to this matter.

I find it impossible to embrace this kind of limitation. It is a matter for Senators to determine whether they want to impose a complete limitation, one which goes all the way across the top of the board.

I have very frequently ventilated my own views and philosophy with respect to the bill. The distinguished Senator from Missouri knows how I feel. It is a matter of deep conviction with me. So I feel impelled to offer these amendments en bloc, in order to make certain that the issue is drawn, so that every Senator will understand what is at present before the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order that the issue be clearly understood as well as clearly drawn, the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Missouri would place a ceiling of $10,000 upon the political contributions of any one individual within any one calendar year. Under that ceiling it would have been possible for a person to contribute $10,000 on December 31, 1959, another $10,000 during the year 1960, and an additional $10,000 on January 1, 1961. His wife could have done likewise. So it would be possible, even under the ceiling proposed by the senior Senator from Missouri, to which the junior Senator from Illinois objects, for a man and wife to contribute $60,000 to political campaigns in the course of 12 months and 2 days.

Under the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader, there would be no ceiling whatsoever. Any person could contribute $60 million, if he had it, and so chose. So I join with the able Senator from Illinois in the desire to draw the issue clear, plain, and simple; and the Senate shall choose.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Illinois has drawn the issue. The Senator from Tennessee, in his customarily cogent and able manner, has delineated the issue. Certainly either we believe in the imposition of limitations on the contributions which individuals may make in connection with attempts to dominate and affect elections, or we do not believe in the imposition of such limitations. The issue is as simple as that.

I, for one, am prepared to vote on the Senator's amendment. Of course, it would destroy the purpose of my amendment and would completely negate what we have undertaken to accomplish by the fourth of these amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is little more that I shall attempt to add to the debate.

Of course I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I cannot engage in astronomical flights of fancy, and talk about $60 million of campaign fund contributions.

However, Mr. President, I do not like to see a dollars-and-cents limitation applied to my interest in a cause which I believe vital to my country or to the perpetuity of the country.

If, as an individual, I feel that the country has been good to me, and that I should be good to it, in return, does my colleague wish to have a dollars-and-cents limitation applied to what I may contribute?

That is not done in regard to the contributions we make to our churches. I often think that, probably within the smallest compass, the greatest guiding philosophy I know of is to be found in the first four words in the motto of the American Legion; those words are "For God and Country."

If I give $10 million to a church in one town, and give a similar amount to a church in a neighboring town, no objection is made; but when one has a genuine interest in campaigns or candidates, there are those who would apply a dollars-and-cents limitation to that person's manifestation of his interest in those subjects, and to the amount of money that a decent citizen who has an abiding interest in the good institutions of his country may spend in behalf of activities of that kind.

I am sensible to the limitations of existing law.

On the other hand, this amendment would provide an across-the-board limitation. As for me, I am not willing to accept it; and I am prepared to vote on this amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has referred to a dollars-and-cents label. By means of this proposed legislation, we are trying to minimize the effect of money expenditures upon candidates and their election.

Is the Senator from Illinois aware that an investigation conducted by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee, showed that 12 prominent families contributed, in the year preceding 1956—or was it in the year 1956?

Mr. GORE. It was in the year 1956.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the year 1956, an overall total of $1,153,735 to candidates and political committees; and that one family alone gave $248,423?

In terms of what my learned friend has said, I would say that family is exceedingly patriotic; and if we are to believe that it is motivated solely by an interest in good government and in education and in the public welfare, then that family is indeed to be commended.

But I must say that I am a little too skeptical to take that position. I do not believe that that amount of money, when contributed by 12 families to a campaign, would tend to do other than have upon the Government officers an undue influence and a pervasive effect which would

not be in the public interest. Regardless of whether that family would so intend those contributions or not, I believe that a contribution of that amount, by only one family, in a national campaign—and, as I have indicated, a total of 12 families made contributions amounting to in excess of $1 million—does incalculable harm to the cause of good government. I believe contributions of that sort are disproportionate to the right of each person in this country to exercise the franchise at the ballot box. I believe contributions in that amount are disproportionate in terms of the right of the average citizen to have a voice in the Government and to be heard by his elected representatives and to have his interests, at least in some measure, considered by them.

But, as I tried to say the other day, I know of none of us who has quite transcended the bounds of human frailty and perhaps does not give a little more consideration to the pleas and the concerns of 12 families who contribute $1,153,000, as against the pleas and the concerns of a poor fellow who contributes only $5. Of course, I hope we are able to rise above that sort of thing, and certainly all of us try to do so.

However, I hope to make it easier to rise above that sort of thing and to have the freedom of the ballot be as untrammeled as possible.

As the Senator has indicated, $60,000 a year is a large amount of money; but it does not include the gifts made by the children—although, as the Senator has indicated, gifts were made by that man and by his wife and by their children. However, at this time I shall not discuss that point further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Missouri, that I was around here when John L. Lewis took out a $495,000 mortgage on the Democratic Party; but I heard no such reaction as the one being expressed today in this Chamber or the one expressed during the preceding days of the debate on the pending bill. I do not quarrel about that; if John L. Lewis felt that investment in the Democratic Party, in behalf of his coal miners, was a good investment in this country, all right.

The Senator from Missouri says contributions totaling $1,200,000, when made by 12 families—or, in other words, an average of $100,000 for each of those families—are wrong.

Well, the Du Ponts threw into the hat; and I remember when John J. Raskob was charged with doing so much in the presidential campaign. But I also remember that a Roosevelt married into the Du Pont family, and not too much was said about that.

I would not attempt to put a dollar limitation on the amount of interest which it would be permissible for John L. Lewis to display. If he thought that that investment by him was a desirable one, in the interest of the coal miners of Illinois, West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the country, I would not decry it.

But I do not want a dollar sign attached to my patriotism or that of anyone else who feels that, because of the goodness of this country, he wishes to do what he can to enable the people of the country better to enjoy the moral climate of sweet freedom.

There may be some who would say, "OK; but $10,000 is the limit."

Mr. President, many of the immigrants who come to this country never had a chance in the old country; but in America they have a chance, and the sky is the limit. Are we to say, "The sky may be the limit as to what you can earn; but when you wish to express your gratitude to our country, by means of donating to candidates who are running for election in various parts of the country, and who express your views and your philosophy, $10,000 is the limit"?

Very well. If that is the Senate's estimate of it, it is all right with me. But I am not going to support a dollar sign on interest in and fidelity to a great country and the things for which it stands. I am ready to vote, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I think that the distinguished minority leader has performed a great service to this body in calling attention to the fact that we have here for consideration a very serious change in existing law. It was referred to last night by the Senator from Missouri as a technical amendment. He has now explained that he had a different amendment in mind. The pending amendment is far from technical. It is very substantial.

I felt last evening that even though I supported this amendment, we should not act hastily and we should have full debate on it. That was the reason why I raised the point at that time in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that this was a new departure. However, I then stated, and I reiterate now, that I do favor this amendment and am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

It seems to me essential that if we are going to pass a clean elections bill, we must put language in it which will limit the total campaign contributions by any individual in any one year. That is the purpose of the pending amendment.

The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Missouri agree that there is a definite difference in philosophy between them. In my judgment, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would remove protective provisions necessary to this act.

If we do not adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, it seems to me that much of the work that has gone before, much of the progress that has been made, both in the bill as reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and in the strengthening amendments which have been offered on the floor, will go for naught.

Without a ceiling on the amount an individual can give for campaigns, we will permit a continuation of duplicity and a look-the-other-way attitude which characterizes the present law. Without the adoption of this amendment, much of the strength of the bill before us will be sapped.

As a practical matter, what the law now says is that, although one cannot give over $5,000 a year for such and such a candidate, he can give $5,000 a year to each of any number of committees which are working for his election. One can give $5,000 here, $5,000 there, and $5,000 some other place. The formula for this is a little bit like the story of the gentleman who was charged with being something other than sober. His defense was that he never could be induced to take more than one drink at a bar on his way home from work. Somebody asked him why, in the light of this laudable one-drink limitation, he unfailingly arrived home in an intoxicated state. "Well," he said, "You would be suprised how many bars there are on the way home."

I do not say $10,000 is the right figure. Maybe it should be $15,000. Maybe it should be $20,000. Maybe it should be $7,500. But if we do not put an overall limitation in the bill, we shall have done only a part of the job. The present statute only invites circumvention. I need not remind my colleagues that this loophole is exploited in just about every Federal election.

I am hopeful the other provisions of the pending bill, including those raising the expenditure ceiling for congressional candidates and increasing the maximum contributions and expenditures by interested political committees, will help put an end to this duplicity. I am not certain that it will but hope the fact that it well might explains my interest in this amendment.

Basically, I share some of the misgivings of the Senator from Illinois about in any way inhibiting the participation of our people in politics and government activity. We must have an informed, alert, and active electorate if our democratic system is to operate at maximum efficiency for the greatest good to the greatest number.

I dislike running the risk of discouraging people from taking an active interest in politics by telling them they can contribute only so much in support of the candidates of their choice. On the other hand, I view with alarm the possibility that under certain circumstances large contributions to needy candidates could compromise that nominee's objectivity. What we are trying to reach is a middle ground between those two points.

As I said, whether this $10,000 limitation is the right one or not, I do not know. I have not heard any better suggestion. I would listen with interest to any amendment which sought to change that figure.

I want to call attention to the fact that back in 1955, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] had another bill before us, Len Hall, who was then chairman of the Republican National Committee, endorsed, in his testimony, the idea of setting a ceiling on individual contributions. Many of us here know Len Hall. I served in the

House with him. I have a very high regard for him. All of us, I feel certain, on both sides of the aisle, respect and admire his political acumen, and his words are worthy of study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KEATING. Some of the Members of the Senate are apparently not interested in the views of Mr. Len Hall. I am going to refer to Mr. Paul Butler in a moment. Perhaps there will be greater interest in his words.

Leonard Hall said in 1955 in his testimony before the Committee on Rules and Administration, on a bill very similar to the one that is now before the Senate, that he was not certain at what amount the ceiling should be set. He said he would rather leave that to the discretion of the committee. He was not sure whether $10,000 was a realistic amount or not, but he definitely favored the principle of placing a ceiling on the amount of total contributions which anyone could make.

On the same day, Mr. Paul Butler, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, testified substantially to the same effect. Mr. Butler said he certainly believed that there should be a limit on the amount any individual can contribute, and that perhaps a limitation on all committees would be reasonable too.

The principle of the amendment we are considering today has had the general blessing of our two major political parties, although I concede that the exact amount of that limitation is the subject of some controversy.

I am pleased, furthermore, to note that the philosophy of this amendment had the backing of an eminent newspaper, the New York Times, in an editorial published the other day, to which the Senator has called attention, in connection with primaries. In this fine editorial the Times called the lack of limits on individual contributions a serious deficiency, and therefore, by implication, at least, backed the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I shall support this bill on final passage. I think it has been greatly improved on the floor. I shall support it with or without this amendment.

However, I feel it will be a much better bill, a much sounder bill, a much more meaningful bill, if the ceiling on the amount any individual can donate is included in the bill. Perhaps it can be said this will make it a tough bill. This may well be so. I happen to feel that is the kind of statute we need and that the American people want. I hope that we will not fail to add this significant amendment to the bill.

Entertaining the views which I do, I must ask that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois be defeated.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in looking at the amendment and the section to which it applies I cannot find that it refers in any way to organizations. Does the Senator recall in the discussions that it was the intent of the amendment or the intent of the proposed legislation to apply this restriction likewise to organizations?

Mr. KEATING. I should be glad to have the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri in this regard. The word "Whoever," in my judgment could mean either an individual or an organization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The word "Whoever," caught my eye. If the Senator from New York and I are correct in our understanding of that word, this would preclude organizations such as the Committee on Political Education from making contributions in excess of $10,000 in one year?

Mr. KEATING. I think the Senator from Arizona should also look at the last sentence.

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

However, any expenditures made by anything other than a political committee I would think would be covered by this wording.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the Senator interpret "political committee" to be confined to the Republican or Democratic committees?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Or the Communist or any other party committee which might exist.

Mr. KEATING. I do not consider the Communist Party to be a political party. I consider that to be an international conspiracy. Since I know the views of the Senator from Arizona, I am sure he will agree with me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do, but unfortunately the Communist Party is recognized on the ballots of some States.

Mr. KEATING. Is it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I did not know that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, it is.

Mr. KEATING. This would not be limited to the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then the language would allow an organization such as a political action committee of a union or of a chamber of commerce, representing business people, to make contributions in excess of $10,000 in one year?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. I am not prepared to say what the court would construe to be a political committee. Certainly a chamber of commerce is not a political committee. A labor union is not a political committee. But labor unions and corporations are precluded from making contributions under other laws.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator was not in the Chamber earlier when I was trying to impress upon our good friend from Missouri that while such is the intent of the law a Supreme Court decision has pretty much clouded that intent, and labor unions now use the interpretation. I suggested that business could do likewise, but I will not go into that further.

Mr. KEATING. I was in the Chamber, occupying the chair at that time. I was very much interested in the colloquy between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Missouri. The reason why the Senator from Arizona thinks I was not in the Chamber is that under the rules of the Senate I was required to be silent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is fortunate that the rules do not extend to the Senator all the time, for it would prevent the edification of all the Members.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that comment by my friend.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wanted it understood that the word "Whoever" would be directed to any person or group. In view of the last sentence on page 2 of the amendment:

> This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

If there were a political action committee or a committee on political education in the labor movement, and, let us say, a committee on political education formed under the National Association of Manufacturers, would it be possible for both management and labor to circumvent what has been the intent of the law, the intent of the Taft-Hartley law and of the Corrupt Practices Act, by contributing in excess of $10,000 a year?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the Senator from Arizona, in my judgment, under the particular wording of the amendment we are now considering, if it were a truly political committee, it would be exempt. There are other laws governing elections contributions, and specifically the Taft-Hartley law, which I would not seek to interpret here. My opinion is that under this amendment anything which is a purely political committee would be exempt.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator further argues that it is not within our province to judge what is a political committee; that that matter should be left to the courts?

Mr. KEATING. I think that we could by amendment more closely define the words, if it were the desire of the Senate to do so. I think the bill is open to further amendment. As the amendment is now worded, my construction of the amendment as worded is that it would exempt from its application anything which a court found to be a political committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I will conclude by saying that the proposed amendments would be much more palatable, I believe, if it applied equally to all sources of money. Its intent I can agree with.

I sat through many of the days of hearing. I do not look on the giver of $10,000 as a great threat to our Government. As one engaged in raising political money I have not found any of them. I am going to look through the committee's book to get some names. I do not think there are enough in the country to do any damage to our country. I do not consider this too serious. I know some contributors, and I know they have nothing but love for their country, and their contributions are motivated by an interest in the philosophy of the person to whom they give money.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Possibly the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] might get at the problem. I hope it will. If we can define what a "political committee" is I think we shall be greatly improving the bill. Inexperienced as I am, I can see many holes in the bill already through which people can crawl if they want to do so. The elimination from this bill of organizations which are purely political but are not interpreted as being political I think is its weakest point.

Mr. KEATING. I recognize this and, as I stated before in the debate, any statute which we write on this subject is going to have holes. We cannot completely cover the fellow who is an avowed crook or who is determined to get around any statute we write, but I believe this bill does represent a substantial step forward, and I believe it will be a further step forward if we adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendments to the amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the second amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 18, page 2, it is proposed to strike the word "not"; at the end of line 19 on page 2, it is proposed to insert the following language: "or by any committee which engages in the following activities: Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records, political training courses, getting workers registered, paying election day workers, providing automobiles to get voters to the polls, political meetings."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall not take long in explanation of the amendment. Earlier in the day, in the colloquy with my friend from Missouri, he asked what specific recommendation I had to make. I had nothing ready at the time. When I discovered the word "Whoever" at the beginning of this section, I felt it might adequately cover the subject we were discussing. However, when I discovered on page 2 of the proposed amendment the exception to political activities, without an understanding of just what a political committee is, I thought it was proper to suggest that we cover the whole field, to be fair.

As the amendment now stands, without the proposed language in it, it would be a very simple thing to keep down to the $10,000 limit, by merely forming a committee on political education in any business or in any labor organization or in any association at all, and by finding a sufficient number of people who could contribute under the $10,000 limit any amount of money could be contributed that could be obtained.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I find some appeal in the amendment. However, can the Senator tell me whether his amendment would include chambers of commerce?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If a chamber of commerce wanted to establish a Committee on Political Education; yes. Under the Senator's understanding of the interpretation of the Supreme Court in United States against United Auto Workers, they could do this. It applies to all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A chamber of commerce does mail out a great deal of voting literature.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; it applies across the board.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that if the Senator wishes to provide for such an amendment—and it has much appeal to me—it should apply to both business and labor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not aiming this amendment specifically at labor, although I recognize that my friends on the other side of the aisle, and many on this side of the aisle also, will say I am. I have made myself perfectly clear across the length and breadth of this country that the activities engaged in by labor unions under the guise of education will be used to a great extent or to an equal extent by the business fraternity. When that day comes, we will not have parties based upon separate philosophies, but parties based upon one basic philosophy, which is economics. Labor and management are interested in one and the same thing. It is money. It is economics. It is anything you want to call it. The participation of unions, and the participation of those who are working for the Constitution or against the Constitution, will all go by the board, and only men who will become beholden to big business or big labor will ever be able to get any substantial backing.

I am not confining my amendment to labor. I use what they are doing as an illustration because under the interpretation of the Supreme Court, business can likewise do it. Committees engaged in compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records come under the amendment. Any committee conducting training classes comes under the amendment. The pay that is used for getting workers registered, and any group that is occupied in getting workers registered other than a group of the two parties, are included. So are election day workers. That is clearly a political activity, and no one needs a Supreme Court decision to know that.

Providing automobiles to get voters to the polling places is political activity. So are political meetings. Any committee which is engaged in that kind of activity I feel should come under the restrictions of the amendment. If that is so, I will be very happy to vote for it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course there is one thing the Senator cannot regulate, and I do not believe any amendment could apply to it, and that is the contribution which can be made by a large newspaper. I believe that under the freedom of the press principle guaranteed in the Constitution we cannot say what a newspaper shall do, regardless of whether it is distributing voting records. I do not believe we would ever be able to regulate that activity. That being the case, it must be apparent to the Senator that no matter how we try to tighten up the bill we cannot overcome the effect of a newspaper, for example, writing an editorial condemning him, for example, and praising his opponent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The case I referred to, United States against United Automobile Workers, applied to that point. The court held that the union was issuing a publication and that it had the right to editorialize in any way it desired. I cannot find any fault with that. I certainly would not want my own company publication restricted to only what I myself wanted to say. It would be a very serious infringement upon freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. So we are not talking about newspapers here. The courts have decided that point. That is what started all this circumvention and the attempt of the Taft-Hartley Act to prohibit labor unions and management from participating in politics.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that every week the New York Times prints the voting records of Members of Congress from Connecticut, New York City, and northern New Jersey. Would the amendment restrict that in any way?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I do not believe we can do that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I fear the Senator from Arizona, in seeking to achieve a certain objective, has run afoul of another. I understand he is now stating that this amendment should apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee and others. Would that not prevent the Arizona Republican Committee from spending more than $10,000 for the reelection of the Senator from Arizona, and likewise the Senator from New York? I fear it would limit the total amount which any political committee could spend to $10,000, which certainly would not be adequate to elect a Senator in New York State, and perhaps in Maine, as the occupant of the chair knows, and possibly in Arizona. So I suggest it might need some amendment in order to prevent all of us from being eliminated from this body, which would be a disaster for the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator allow me to study that a moment? He may have a valid point.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate allow me a moment to consider what the Senator from New York has pointed out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Did the Senator from Illinois want me to yield for any purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I simply did not observe the Senator from Arizona at his desk.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona is rather difficult to find at times.

Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New York has a valid argument. I would modify my amendment to include the word "not" and to change the language as I have just changed it at the desk. May I have it read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike the period following the word "committees" and insert the following: ", but will apply to any committee which engages in any of the following activities: compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records; political training classes; getting workers registered; paying election day workers; providing automobiles to get voters to the polls; and political meetings."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have already proposed all the arguments I have on this question. I thank the Senator from New York for pointing out to me that I would have inadvertently made it possible for either political party to operate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there anything in the amendment which would prohibit a present Member of the Senate from mailing out hundreds of thousands of speeches or letters all over his State at Government expense, and thereby having an advantage over a person not in office who was trying to get into office?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may say, without having studied that particular question, but simply talking off the top of my hat, that a Senator might come under the provisions of this amendment, if it could be shown that he used in excess of $10,000 of franking privilege. I think it would be a very difficult matter to be included in this amendment, but it might be stretched that far. I would not be fearful of that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have served on a special committee with the able junior Senator from Arizona. I know with what deep conscientiousness he moves in this matter. I suggest to him, however, from a cursory reading of his amendment, that he proposes to limit the expenditures of the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee, as well as all other committees which engage in the function which he has described, to $10,000 per annum. I simply do not believe that he wishes to do that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that that would be possible, because the language provides "political committees."

The trouble in the field we are talking about is that we have never had clearly defined what political activity is. I think we have had clearly defined what a political committee is, and I think the national committees of both parties would certainly come within the field in which we are operating, the one with which I am concerned. But we have never had defined in this country, to my knowledge, what political activity is. We as politicians and ordinary citizens know, more or less, what political activity is; but when we get to the law, we do not know what it is. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The activities of the political action committee of one of the labor organizations have been the subject of litigation. If, indeed, the Court determined that those activities were political, then they are prohibited by law.

The clerk has just read the language of the Senator's amendment; and if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask that the language be read again, because I now have the Hennings amendment before me. I have asked for a copy of the Senator's amendment, but it is not in form.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Legible form.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the Goldwater amendment again be read. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Surely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike the period and insert a comma and the following: "but will apply to any committee which engages in the following activities: compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records; political training classes; getting workers registered; paying election day workers; providing automobiles to get voters to the polls; and political meetings."

Mr. GORE. If that is not what the State Democratic campaign committee of Tennessee does, I do not know what it does do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The State Democratic committee in Tennessee is exempt, in my estimation, under the preceding language, which includes political committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to suggest that the national committees engage in precisely the functions described by the amendment of the able Senator. I realize—at least I think I realize—that the Senator from Arizona wants to get at the activities of committees other than political committees; but in attempting to do so, I respectfully suggest that it is my view that he has circumscribed the activities of the national committees of the two political parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is certainly entitled to his interpretation. I do not feel that my amendment would apply to them. I think the original language would have applied to them, had I not followed the suggestion of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and taken another look at it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have just gone to the desk and read the text of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona. I want to see if my understanding is correct. The Senator from Arizona wrote: "but will apply to any committee which engages in the following activities."

Then the sheet was blank.

Then the words: "compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records. Political training classes. Getting workers registered. Paying election-day workers. Providing automobiles to get voters to the polls. Political meetings" were read from the final page of a publication entitled "Nation's Business," issued by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in July 1959. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. I do not think he would expect to find it in any publication of COPE.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand Nation's Business for

July 1959. In a box there is a list beginning, "Compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records," and so on, which the clerk enumerated as a part of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is absolutely correct. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if he believes it is proper for labor to engage in these activities, but not to allow anyone else to engage in them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I am merely trying to identify the source of the Senator's amendment, and to point out that it had not been written out, and that the crucial paragraph was taken verbatim from a report by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I am not condemning the Senator in the slightest.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not share the great dislike of the Senator from Illinois for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

If he wishes to examine the other sources of my amendment, he is perfectly welcome to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wished to establish the fact that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona had not been written out, and that the salient portion of the amendment had been copied from a page in a pamphlet issued in 1959 by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am not particularly ashamed of that source; I have respect for American businessmen. If they write something, and if it is the only source that is available, I am willing to use it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not attempting to condemn the Senator from Arizona; I am merely pointing out the historic origin of that language.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Now that the Senator from Illinois has established it, I am sure he has made a great contribution to the law. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand the Senator's amendment—and I concede in advance that I am about to state an oversimplification of its meaning—it provides that the overall limitation shall not apply to a "political committee."

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. But that it shall apply to any group of people who engage in what is normally considered to be political activity.

The difficulty is that any statute must be construed by the courts; and I am in great doubt as to what the courts beginning with the district courts, and finally arriving at the Supreme Court of the United States—would say was the proper construction or interpretation of this language.

When it is proposed to have this measure provide that the limitation shall not apply to a "political committee," but that it shall apply to a committee which performs a political function, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that the proper interpretation of that language might be very difficult for a court; the court might find the meaning of the language very perplexing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not share the concern of the Senator from New York, although it is quite possible that his legal background may give him some cause for worry about the meaning of the amendment. However, I believe the language of the amendment to be sufficiently clear.

I believe that in the course of the debate we have established what such a provision will apply to and what it will not apply to.

I merely wish to have this measure amended in such a way that it will be applied across the board, rather than have us aim our guns and direct our bullets at only one segment of the American people.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that the Senator from Arizona is perfectly sincere in the expression of that sentiment, and that he wants this measure to apply right across the board, instead of being directed at any particular activities or groups.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. But I must disagree with the Senator from Arizona as to the legal effect of the amendment he proposes to the Hennings amendment. I believe it would be very difficult to arrive at the correct interpretation of the meaning of the amendment, if it were to be amended with the language suggested by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier in the day, in the course of colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I was specifically asked where in the measure I would propose to insert this language. I may say now what I said at that time: I had been of the opinion that this matter would not be discussed during the floor debate on this bill, for there is now before the Supreme Court a case coming from the Georgia courts, which held that the spending of dues money for political purposes was wrong.

If the Supreme Court upholds the decision of the Georgia court, I do not believe that decision will apply to the particular problem I have raised here. Therefore, I have asked that this amendment to the pending amendment be considered.

Now that I have exhausted my argument, at the moment, I am willing to have the vote taken on an amendment to the Hennings amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am quite appreciative of what my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, seeks to accomplish.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must confess that I might have given some encouragement to my learned friend when I asked him what he had to propose; and since then we have had colloquy for a period of one hour and a half.

I shall not discuss this matter further. I have respect for the views of the Senator from Arizona; but I do not agree with him. I believe the amendment has been hastily drafted, and I believe it should not be made a part of the pending measure, even though I fully appreciate the interest of the Senator from Arizona in improving this measure insofar as that may be possible.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was about to ask a question.

In the pending bill, a "political committee" is defined. The amendment the Senator from Missouri proposes would place a new ceiling—one of $10,000—on contributions; but the amendment would except "political committees." That much is clear.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is to say——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not wish to be interrupted until I have completed my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator from California. I realize that he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, I do.

Am I not correct when I say that "political committees," as defined in the pending bill, are excepted?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from California is exactly correct; and he has understood that all along.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then am I correct—I am, am I not—when I say that if I were to contribute $1 million to a political committee, as that term is defined in this bill, I would comply with that provision? Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I am sorry to say the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. KUCHEL. But political committees are excepted; and when they are excepted, it is clear that this measure will not apply to political committees.

Mr. HENNINGS. We have placed a limitation upon the political committees, the national committees, with respect to the parties.

Mr. KUCHEL. But when the Senator's amendment provides that "this subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures by a political committee"——

Mr. CLARK. Those made by a political committee. Those to a political committee are prohibited.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not understand what the distinguished Senator's dilemma is.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have several dilemmas.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am referring to the present one. I thought the Senator from California had a very clear understanding of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator from California will find that the limitation on an individual—namely, a limitation of $5,000, as to any one candidate or committee—would apply, but that if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri were adopted and were enacted into law, it would not be permissible for a person to give an aggregate of $1 million. I believe that is correct. In that

situation there would be a $5,000 ceiling or limitation per candidate or per committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me ask whether the Senator from Missouri agrees as to that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not agree with all of it; no. [Laughter.]

I have been agreeing or disagreeing all afternoon. I hope I understood what the Senator said. Of course, all of us have engaged in extended colloquy.

Let me say that I am prepared to vote on this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer, and send to the desk, a substitute for the Goldwater amendment to the Hennings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska is not now in order; for the reason that it would be in the third degree.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would the substitute proposed by the Senator from Nebraska be in order if I were to withdraw my amendment to the Hennings amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Arizona withdraws his amendment to the Hennings amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be in order as an amendment to the Hennings amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to the Hennings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri has been withdrawn.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 19, of the Hennings amendment, it is proposed to strike out the words "political committee" and to insert "a duly organized local, State, or national committee of a national political party or by a candidate."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, here is what this amendment would do. If the Hennings amendment is to be adopted, fixing a $10,000 total limit on the amount that anyone can contribute—the provision being "Whoever" contributes that amount—the exception provided in the last two lines would be for the candidate himself. Why? Because another section of the bill fixes limits for him.

It would also exempt from the first part of the Hennings amendment a local, State, or national committee of a national political party.

In other words, our duly organized political parties would be subject to the limitations written in the bill, S. 2436. The limitation on what a candidate could expend would be the limitations written into the bill, S. 2436. But, with the exception of our duly organized political parties and the candidates, the $10,000 limitation would apply to anyone. The word in the language of the amendment is "whoever." We have established a record here that that word means everyone. It means a person, a corporation, an association, or any group.

I submit that if we are going to have a $10,000 limitation on the total amount that can be contributed by any giver throughout the whole United States, we should apply it to everybody. Obviously it cannot apply to the candidates, because they are governed by another section. It cannot apply to the political parties, because they are governed by another section.

Let us be fair about this. If we are going to have a $10,000 limitation on the total amount that a donor can give, let us treat everyone alike. Let us treat the chamber of commerce and COPE alike. Let us treat every individual alike.

If we are to put this ceiling into effect, violation of which carries a criminal penalty, let us have it apply across the board.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am not exactly sure that I heard the precise wording of the Senator's amendment. We have in New York State a party called the Liberal Party. That party does not appear in other States. It corrals a considerable number of votes. The Liberal Party did not support me in the last election, but I certainly would not consider it fair to impose a limitation as to contributions on that party which was not imposed on the Republican and Democratic Parties.

I fear that the wording of the Senator's amendment would exempt the Republican and Democratic Parties, which are duly organized units of a national political party, but would not exempt the Liberal Party of New York, which is a recognized party in the State, but is not of a national character.

I would not consider supporting the amendment unless the Liberal Party were properly protected. Perhaps I am in error in my interpretation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from New York has stated the case precisely, and has stated it well. As he has set it forth, it comports entirely with this amendment and with the intentions of those who support it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I seek to modify my amendment by inserting, after the words "a duly organized local, State, or national committee of a national political party" the words, "or of a State political party."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How would this amendment affect an independent candidate who was running independently of any party?

Mr. CURTIS. It would not affect him at all, because the amendment does not apply to candidates. The purpose of this amendment is that, with the exception of candidates and duly organized political parties, a $10,000 limitation shall apply. I think that is fair. I think that is just. If we are going to put a limit on the donors to one political party, we should put a limit on the donors to another political party. If we are going to put a limitation on a donor to a group of candidates, we should put a limitation on the donor to another group of candidates.

It is obvious that this provision should not apply to the duly organized political parties, because they are the vehicles by which the national or State effort can be organized to carry out our system of self-government under a two-party system. Furthermore, we have fixed their limits in the bill. The same is true of candidates. We have determined what the limits are on a candidate's spending.

Now, if we are to put a limit on other donors, and start out with the word "whoever"; let us say that whoever does that shall come under this provision, and not have any exemptions other than those already provided for in a different section of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska probably does meet the objection I voiced a moment ago about the Liberal Party. However, I wish to point out that we have in New York City the Fusion Party, and that party develops quite a few votes in various elections. Indeed, some Republicans—quite a few Republicans—adhere to program of the Fusion Party.

The Fusion Party is not a duly organized unit of either a national party or a State party. It spends vastly more than $10,000. It elected former Mayor La Guardia in New York. The party is made up of some of the finest people in this land, I may say, and I think it would be a very great mistake to inhibit members of that party, and I believe they would be inhibited under this provision. Whereas Democrats, Republicans, and Liberals could spend any amount, the poor Fusion Party would be able to spend only $10,000. It may well be that the next mayor of New York will be a Fusion Party candidate, and unfortunately he would come under the restrictions of this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. It is apparent that the Senator from New York does not favor a $10,000 limitation on a donor. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. I do. I intend to vote for this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Then let us apply it to all donors. A limit is fixed in a separate section for political parties, including State political parties and local and

State committees of State and national parties. A limit is fixed in another section for candidates. Are we going to embark upon a procedure of saying some donors can give without limit, but other donors cannot?

I submit that there are many problems in regard to this proposal, but I think we should do one of two things—we should apply it across the board, or else withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Will the distinguished Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree. That is the very point I am making. I ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether he thinks it would be fair, in the next mayoralty election in the city of New York, to permit the Republicans to collect and spend over $10,000, to permit the Democrats to collect and spend over $10,000, to permit the Liberal Party to collect and spend over $10,000, but to limit the Fusion Party to an expenditure of $10,000? One cannot elect a mayor of New York for $10,000.

Mr. CURTIS. This is a Federal election law. It has nothing to do with the mayor of New York. I wish we could give the Senator some help as to cleaning up the iniquity in that great city, but we are without power to do it or to regulate it. There is nothing we can do to add or detract from the noble efforts of the distinguished Senator from New York to establish purity in the great city of New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It is to establish purity that I am bringing out these very points. It is because we hope in 1961 to be able to elect a Fusion candidate for mayor in New York, and the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska would virtually spell the death knell——

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. KEATING. To the election of the Fusion candidate for mayor.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. KEATING. Because we could not spend over $10,000 if there happened to be some candidate for Congress running at the same time The Fusion candidate for mayor would not be in a fair position, if we made this apply to the Republicans, to the Democrats, and to the Liberals, but not to other political parties which may not be organized under either Federal or State law.

Mr. CURTIS. I submit that the Congress of the United States——

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Nebraska, unwittingly, would prevent us from electing a Fusion candidate for mayor of New York, who might very well at this moment be under the Republican label.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not within the power of the Congress to control expenditures of a candidate for mayor of New York. In fact, I doubt if we can control anybody's expenditures [laughter], but certainly in that city it cannot be done, from a legal standpoint.

The distinguished Senator is not going to contend that the Congress could interfere with a municipal election in that city, is he?

Mr. KEATING. No; but does not the Senator realize if there were a vacancy in Congress and if there were a candidate for Representative in Congress running on the Fusion ticket at the same time the mayoralty election was being held, the Senator's amendment would prohibit the expenditure of more than $10,000 in that campaign? We are directing all of our efforts toward cleaning up New York, and we wish to do it with a Fusion ticket, and the Senator from Nebraska would interfere with our activity.

Mr. CURTIS. No, no; there is not a thing in the world to prevent the people of New York from having a committee to finance the candidate for mayor. Not a thing in the world is involved. I regret that the Senator is trying to impose a limit of $10,000 on some donors and trying to exempt others.

Mr. President, let us vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to the amendments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, "1–20–60—C," which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Missouri and of the Senator from Nebraska, I think we had an agreement earlier in the week that the language which makes it necessary for a candidate to make every reasonable effort to ascertain what committees in the State are, in his cause, spending money, and so forth—which, of course, puts the candidate in the position of having to be a policeman—was offensive language, and should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator. Furthermore, the adoption of the Hennings amendment, as amended, requiring intrastate committees to make a Federal report, makes the language unnecessary.

Mr. HENNINGS. I quite agree with the Senator. That language was put in as a compromise, I will say to the distinguished minority leader, in order to get the bill to the Senate. Some of us disagreed with it at the time.

I am glad the ranking minority member of the committee agrees to having the language eliminated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amendment is at the desk. I have no further discussion of the matter. I offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all language from and including line 14 on page 9 to and including line 9 on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my colleague in regard to this amendment. The bill in its original form imposed upon the candidates the obligation of finding, any place in a State, expenditures made on their behalf. I think there should be a responsibility upon the individuals and upon other groups, but we cannot make a candidate responsible for things he does not know about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since it is so seldom my colleague and I agree, I want to say I appreciate very much what he has done and I want to congratulate him. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment "1–20–60—C" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Candidates for election as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates.

(d) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination, shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount prescribed in subsection (c), above.

On page 13, line 22, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)".

On page 8, line 8, beginning with the comma, strike out down to and including the comma on line 9, page 8.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask the acting majority leader a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it now the program to adjourn for the rest of the day and to be in session tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Missouri will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee and that the

Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has an amendment, as to which he will not spend more than 5 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Forty-five minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Forty-five minutes. We shall be adjourning until tomorrow, I hope, after we finish consideration of this amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to say the amendment offered by our colleague, the very able junior Senator from Tennessee, is completely in harmony with the philosophy and purposes of the bill. It was considered. The only reason it was not embodied in the bill or in one of the amendments is that there was some objection raised in regard to the matter of candidates for the Presidency having to report. However, I see no objection to the amendment other than that, which was rather trivial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there seems to be little possibility that we shall finish our consideration of the bill tonight, since there are at least two more amendments to be considered, I should like to suggest that the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina be read, that the Senator be given time to discuss it, and that no further votes be taken. I suggest we reach an agreement to adjourn tonight to meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that is satisfactory, Mr. *President*, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND and Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the time to ask for the yeas and nays would be after the amendment is stated.

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be glad to call up the amendment at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and the Chair can recognize the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. THURMOND. No; I ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It is in printed form and has been on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. THURMOND is as follows:

On page 14, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) No labor organization shall—

"(1) make a contribution or expenditure for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates, or

"(2) make a contribution to any committee, association, or organization, whether political or nonpolitical in nature, which makes contributions or expenditures for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates,

except a contribution or an expenditure which is made (A) in connection with the publication or distribution of a newspaper or periodical intended for distribution primarily to members of such labor organization or other communication which is primarily limited to such members, or (B) for the purpose of disseminating impartial statements of the issues in the election, primary, convention, or caucus and the position of the labor organization on such issues, or (C) for the purpose of presenting an impartial news program or news documentary through the medium of radio or television, or the presentation of opposing candidates in a panel discussion, debate, or similar type program.

"(b) A labor organization which makes a contribution or expenditure prohibited by subsection (a)—

"(1) shall not thereafter be certified or recognized as the representative of any employees by the National Labor Relations Board or any other department or agency of the Government, or be eligible to file an unfair labor practice charge under section 10(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, or to file with any department or agency of the Government any other charge, complaint, or petition as the representative of or on behalf of any employees, or

"(2) shall not thereafter be entitled to any exemption or benefit under sections 6 and 20 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 17; 29 U.S.C. 52) or the Act of March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), and

"(3) shall not during the taxable year following the year in which such contribution or expenditure is made be exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(c) Any person who accepts any contribution prohibited by subsection (a), and any officer of a labor organization who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the labor organization prohibited by subsection (a), shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, or if the violation was willful shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"(d) As used in this section, the term 'labor organization' means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment or conditions of work."

On page 19, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS AND CORPORATIONS

"SEC. 304. (a) Section 610 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"'Every corporation which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000; and every officer or director of any corporation who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation, and any person who accepts or receives any contributions, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.'

"(b) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks or corporations'

"(c) That portion of the analysis at the head of chapter 29 of title 18 of the United States Code which reads:

"'610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.'"

is amended to read as follows:

"'610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks or corporations.'"

On page 2, in the table of contents, after the item relating to "Sec. 209" insert the following new item:

"SEC. 210. Political contributions by labor organizations."

and redesignate the items relating to sections 210 to 212, inclusive, as 211 to 213, respectively.

On page 2, in the table of contents, after the item relating to "SEC. 209" insert the following new item:

"SEC. 304. Contributions by national banks and corporations."

and redesignate the item relating to section 304 as 305.

Renumber sections 209 to 212, inclusive, as 210 to 213, respectively.

On page 19, line 5, strike out "SEC. 304" and insert "SEC. 305".

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wished to be sure of the understanding which was implied, that there will be no further rollcall votes tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further rollcalls tonight.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intention to complete action on the bill tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was the intention to complete action today, if possible. We shall try to do so tomorrow. However, I cannot promise that we can do so.

Mr. CURTIS. It would be necessary to announce tomorrow that rollcalls would be postponed until Monday. I am not asking that that be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the leadership to complete action on the bill tomorrow. It will be necessary to complete action on two amendments, which I understand are the only ones left for consideration. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I do not know what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] will desire. I assume there will be a yea-and-nay vote on final passage.

I understand also that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment. There will be no further yea-and-nay votes today. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to postpone presentation of his statement on his amendment until tomorrow, or does he wish to present it tonight?

Mr. THURMOND. I would prefer to do it tomorrow.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, we have been hoping for the past 2 or 3 days to achieve the ultimate result of disposing of the pending legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has been most helpful.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the expression of the assistant majority leader, my distinguished colleague.

I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished assistant minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL]. Of course, we cannot control the number of amendments. Speaking for myself, let me say that I have no further amendments to offer. We have considered and agreed to four amendments. I still have perfecting amendments relating to the title of the bill and the effective date.

As the distinguished acting majority leader has suggested, there are four amendments on the desks of Senators left to be disposed of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are three amendments.

Mr. HENNINGS. There are the Long amendment, the Kefauver amendment, and the pending amendment, the Thurmond amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 136TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. THOMAS JONATHAN "STONEWALL" JACKSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I speak in commemoration of the 136th anniversary of the birth of one of the most illustrious sons of West Virginia and of our Nation. On January 21, 1824, Thomas Jonathan Jackson—later known to his troops and to the world as "Stonewall"—was born in Clarksburg, (West) Virginia.

I had a call from friends in the Harrison County seat city expressing the hope that appropriate mention of the anniversary be made today. It is a privilege to especially commend the research and tangible efforts of the Honorable Joseph Z. Terrell and S. J. Birshtein, both of Clarksburg. They, with hundreds of West Virginians, have focused merited attention on Stonewall Jackson.

HIS LIFE IS AN INSPIRATION TO ALL

Though a man of mildness and mercy, the genius of Stonewall Jackson was crystallized in the fiery crucible of war. But today, he is acclaimed first as an American, for though he served a partisan cause with zealous devotion to duty, the moral qualities which infused his acts are those which should inspire all Americans.

His perfect truthfulness, his self-abnegation, his modesty in victory and his courage in defeat, his personal tenderness to his men while maintaining the iron rule of duty—these are but a few of his virtues which were acknowledged by members of both sides of that dreadful conflict. Thus, today it is the spirit of the man which has transcended even the genius of the military strategist.

On May 10, 1863, Stonewall Jackson died from wounds inflicted by his own troops in the confusion surrounding the Battle of Chancellorsville. On May 13, in the Nation's Capital which he had sought to capture, the Daily Chronicle ended its editorial eulogy with the statement that—

> Stonewall Jackson was a great general, a brave soldier, a noble Christian, and a pure man.

On that same day, President Lincoln wrote in appreciation of the soldier who had served the Union with the same devotion and gallantry he later gave to the Confederacy, stating to the editor of the Chronicle that—

> I wish to lose no time in thanking you for the excellent and manly article in the Chronicle on Stonewall Jackson.

FAME OF STONEWALL JACKSON IS UNIVERSAL

Thus, today, we acknowledge the words of the great Victorian military leader, Field Marshall Viscount Wolseley, that—

> The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American.

Today, we are again engaged in conflict, and in a conflict which in its own way is more deadly in its implications than that between the North and the South. We could not now be better served than by the spirit, the firm resolve, and the consciousness of duty of Stonewall Jackson when he wrote that—

> We must think of the living and those who are to come after us and see that, by God's blessing, we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate the recent publication of a book entitled "The Case for the South," which has been written by the very able and distinguished newsman, Col. W. D. Workman, Jr., of Columbia, S.C. This book is the most eloquent and factual account I have read on the South's position in the current controversy over school segregation. It is a book which should be read by all fair and open-minded Americans who are anxious to obtain for their own consideration a true and objective picture of how and why the great majority of southerners feel as they do about preserving separate and equal school facilities for the children of the white and Negro races in their own area.

This book contains facts that have never been able to penetrate the Paper Curtain which has been thrown up by many news media outside southern borders in an effort to hide or distort the strong case for the South. Every southerner should purchase one copy for himself—I too learned some facts from reading the book—and one or more copies to send to friends behind the Paper Curtain.

I know of no person more capable of presenting the case for the South than Bill Workman. Besides possessing a keen insight into the southern mind, Bill Workman is a skilled researcher, a polished writer, a brilliant analyst, and a tireless worker. He has clearly illustrated every one of these high qualities in this great work. For this superb job he merits the gratitude of our Southland, the millions of others who share our views, and all objective-minded Americans who desire only to have the facts, no more and no less.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a news article about this book which appeared in a number of newspapers, a review of the book which appeared in the January 20, 1960, issue of the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, and an editorial from the Charleston Evening Post of the same date.

There being no objection, the article, review, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Evening Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

WORKMAN'S BOOK PRESENTS THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH

In "The Case for the South" William D. Workman, Jr., hammers home a point he considers to be at the heart of the segregation-integration issue, namely, the principle laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1896.

In sanctioning separate but equal facilities, as within the constitutional rights of the States, the high tribunal that year declared: "If the races are to meet upon terms of social equality, it must be the result of natural affinities, a mutual appreciation of each other's merits, and a voluntary consent of the individuals. * * * Legislation is powerless to eradicate racial instincts based upon physical differences, and the attempt to do so can only result in accentuating the difficulties of the present situation."

Mr. Workman predicated his book on the race relations formula which the Court set forth in 1896. "To the extent that the principles laid down in that formula are ignored, repressed, or suppressed, so will the cause of racial amity be retarded," the author states.

Never has the South's case been more articulately presented than in Mr. Workman's book. It is an eloquent plea for sanity in the approach to the problem of adjusting to racial differences, as well as a plea for the rights and powers which the U.S. Constitution specifically reserved to the States. It exposes the falsehoods, the ignorance, and the misunderstanding which enter into the libeling and slandering of this section, and which have misled honest "do-gooders" who have been seduced by the propaganda of malicious agitators and vote-greedy politicians of other sections.

Mr. Workman takes on all comers: the politicians who compete for the support of Negro and other voting blocs in northern cities; the AFL–CIO leaders who are soulmates of the NAACP; the publishers and writers who play up racial incidents in the South while censoring or suppressing news of the even greater number of such incidents in their own areas; the churchmen who would add the Supreme Court's 1954 flat to the Decalogue; the moderates who have done the South and the Nation a disservice "by their failure to reflect the intensity of southern resentment and resistance to integration;" and others who, whether with good or evil intentions, would subject the South to a new era of Reconstruction.

Mr. Workman, it is hardly necessary to say, is kindly disposed toward the Negro, and is concerned over the problem of their progress and their rights. This is evidenced, among other things, by his condemnation of hate organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan. This attitude, in fact, is that of the great majority of southern white people, blind as the outside calumniators may be to that fact. Mr. Workman gives his views as to how that progress can be achieved, through friendly cooperation on the part of the whites. He points out that much of the legislation enacted in the Southern States has been aimed basically at preserving domestic tranquillity as well as racial integrity. "This," he notes, "is especially true in the fields of education and recreation where indiscriminate mingling of the races is bound to bring discord and strife."

Disturbance after disturbance in such integration centers as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Washington testify to that grim fact of life.

The central theme running through Mr. Workman's book is opposition to compulsory racial integration, both as a matter of principle and as unwise and dangerous in practice. The South's pattern of segregation was, as Mr. Workman stresses, upheld by earlier Supreme Court decisions which sanctioned "separate but equal facilities." That principle had for decades been accepted and universally recognized as a fundamental law of the land, only to be arbitrarily overturned by the Warren Court, which sought to demolish the very structure that predecessor courts had been instrumental in erecting.

"The Case for the South" is a thoughtful, fact-packed, trenchant presentation of the South's position. It traces the history of race relations, and discusses the subject in all its aspects—constitutional, political, economic, and social. It will be welcomed by most southerners, and should prove of high educational value to many people in other sections.

It is not likely to enjoy a favorite reception in quarters hostile to the South, but readers whose minds are not sealed in antisouthern prejudice are likely to revise their views. It strikes sharp blows at malice, hypocrisy, and shabby politics. At long last a northern book publishing company has opened presses to an eloquent voice from the South.

COLUMBIA, S.C.—A South Carolina newspaperman, W. D. Workman, Jr., has undertaken the job of presenting "The Case for the South" in a new book due for publication in January.

The 320-page book, portraying the southern view on race relations and States rights, is described by several prominent southerners as a major contribution to an understanding of regional attitudes. Workman, a veteran news correspondent for several newspapers and other publications, terms his book "an effort to explain—to the southerner as well as to the nonsoutherner—why the South holds firm to such time-tested ideals as racial integrity and local self-government."

Commendations of the manuscript have come from such well-known figures as James F. Byrnes, former U.S. Supreme Court Justice and Secretary of State; Senators Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, and Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Gen. Mark W. Clark; Gov. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina; and the Right Reverend Albert S. Thomas, retired bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of South Carolina. Some of their comments follow:

Senator BYRD: "A very fine contribution to understanding the terrible problem that confronts us by reason of the unwarranted and infamous decision of the Supreme Court."

Mr. Byrnes: "Extremists on both sides of this emotional subject of race relations will disapprove some of Mr. Workman's conclusions, but fairminded readers will be impressed by the accuracy of his statement of facts and the tolerance of his opinions. This book should be read by every person interested in the subject."

General Clark: "William D. Workman, Jr., has performed, I think, work of immense value to the Nation in his book, 'The Case for the South.' * * * I think that any fairminded American will derive a better understanding of this problem from reading Mr. Workman's thoughtful analysis."

Governor Hollings: "Both the friends and the enemies of the South should read this volume, and read it carefully. They will be brought closer together by its forthright statement of the South."

Senator RUSSELL: "Without rancor or bitterness and in layman's language, you have presented the South's side of the highly complex and potentially dangerous racial question calmly, fairly, and cogently. Unfortunately, the South's case—by design or otherwise—is so seldom heard in other parts of the country. * * * I believe your book can make an important contribution to a fuller and better understanding of this grave problem, and I recommend it to all Americans—northerners and southerners—who sincerely seek to restore racial and sectional harmony in our Nation."

Senator THURMOND: "'The Case for the South' * * * is the most eloquent and factual account I have read on the South's position in the current controversy over school segregation. * * * Every southerner should purchase one copy for himself and one or more copies to send to friends behind the Paper Curtain."

Bishop Thomas: "Consistent documentation gives this book great strength. * * * I hope the book will be read by the large number of people on whose views depend the maintenance of the vital principles of our civilization."

[From the Charleston Evening Post, Jan. 20, 1960]

SOUTH'S CASE ABLY PRESENTED

Elsewhere in the Evening Post today appears a review of a book which should help bolster the position of the South in opposing and resisting the drive to force racial integration upon this section.

In "The Case for the South" William D. Workman, Jr., forcefully hits at the ignorance, misunderstanding, and malice which separately or in combination characterize the assaults upon this section. He gives the reasons why the great majority of southerners are convinced that segregation is the best approach to the problem of adjusting to racial differences, and why they are determined to do all in their power to resist attempts to smash a social pattern under which whites and Negroes had been making steady progress in their relations.

Mr. Workman discusses the race question in all its aspects, and the publisher rightly characterizes his book as the only thorough work on the subject from the southern standpoint since the Supreme Court in 1954 overturned the law of the land to declare school segregation unconstitutional. Coming from the presses of a New York publisher, it is truly a break in the northern curtain which has been drawn to keep out light on the subject.

Southerners will find in this book a confirmation of what they know and feel. Even those in other sections whose minds have been closed or whose brains have been washed by the liberals and other agitators are likely to be impressed. We recommend this book to all who are concerned over the evil fruits of the compulsory integration drive.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BYRD of Virginia, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, GREEN, HART, HENNINGS, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, KERR, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTY, MCGEE, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, ROBERTSON, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduced a joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 152—authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

I also asked unanimous consent that this bill lie at the table so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor may do so.

The joint resolution, as I shall explain later, does not require the proposed commission to limit its studies to any particular kind of memorial. It does, however, suggest that there are two major alternatives. We could have a nonfunctional monument or we could have a living memorial, possibly a building that would vividly remind visitors of the Nation's 28th President while it serves those visitors in a specific and worthwhile way.

Mr. President, memorials serve a nation best when they help men remember that individual beings like themselves have been called upon to do great things for their fellow citizens and for their Nation. Often it is as important to remember a man's ideas as well as the man himself. We write his words on stone and raise his likeness above us so that all may see. As the people of this Nation once drew strength from the men we honor in our national memorials, so do present and future generations renew their faith in themselves, in the ideas that keep a nation strong, and in the capability of free men to meet future challenges.

Just as the Capitol Building in which we meet has become a symbol of representative government, so have the monuments and public buildings of our Capital City become familiar and important to the many millions of Americans who visit Washington, D.C., or see its scenes in postcards or in photographs. Of all the cities in our Nation, the District of Columbia is the one in which shrines are truly national ones. For 179 million Americans of 50 States, this city is as important as their own hometown or home cities because it is truly theirs. Its beauty, or lack of it, is a reflection on them; its tributes to great men of the past should be strikingly appropriate, constant reminders that no principle is born in a vacuum and that men must struggle within themselves and against outside forces before they can offer the ideas that guide others.

Mr. President, there should be room within the District of Columbia for a major memorial to fix national attention permanently on the greatness of Wilson. Until we have such a memorial in this city of symbols, we shall not have fittingly honored the man who felt that "our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually."

We shall not have done what should be done for the President who—and I borrow the words of Bernard Baruch—called upon men to civilize their own souls.

WILSON AND NATIONAL PURPOSE

In 1960 we often hear from soul searchers who ask whether Americans really have a sense of national purpose. We look ahead to a troubled decade and wonder whether we are as clearheaded as we should be about the policies and principles the United States should follow at home and abroad. Wilson's words remind us, however, that men can guide a nation well when they recognize their duty and are unconfused about their principles.

To Wilson, duty was never distant.

The man who was later to say "America was born to serve mankind" could, as a university professor, call one of his major addresses "Princeton in the Nation's Service." He was even more specific in another speech when, as university president, he said that the university was intended for the service of the country and it would be judged by the standards of the country.

As Governor of New Jersey, Wilson spoke about local government in 1911 at a rally of the Commission League of Trenton, and he was able to find universal principles even in the debate about the affairs of one city in one State.

"We are," said Wilson, "really here discussing a transaction that concerns mankind. If America fails in the making of city government; if she does not know how to solve the problem so that her people will be free, happy, and comfortable, then to whom shall the men of the nations look? I think I feel some of the great spirit of mankind which is abroad, whether we know, and a great meeting like this is one of the items in the great combined struggle of mankind toward the political light America is finding, for America is again taking on the armor of her indomitable perseverance and hope, and we shall again say to her enemies: 'We hold you in contempt; our light is bright and the day is ours to possess.'" And, as he submitted the peace treaty after World War I, President Wilson again saw the way that duty lay: "We cannot turn back. We can only go forward, with lifted eyes and freshened spirit, to follow the vision. It was of this that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in the truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead, and nowhere else."

America has been fortunate to have great men in the President's chair at critical times in history. Few have been so eloquent as Wilson; few could teach—and teach so magnificently—as they achieved so much. In 1960 Wilson is still a prophet; his words are a guide to future greatness and a reminder of work undone.

A SUITABLE MEMORIAL

Mr. President, I have quoted at some length from the rich store of Wilsonian wisdom in order to emphasize that our debt to this man is as great as our affection for him. A memorial would help us express both. The questions are, however, What is a suitable memorial? How shall we go about creating one?

One suggestion was made by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1957. The Commission's final report gave a long list of the many ways in which Americans had remembered Wilson in an observance which had lasted for more than 1 year. New books had been published. Plaques had been installed everywhere—one at the State House in Trenton, for instance. A formal dedication of the Wilson memorial and permanent tomb had taken place at Washington National Cathedral on Veterans' Day, November 11, 1956. A new bridge now under construction across the Potomac will bear Wilson's name.

But the Commission said that more is needed. Its report suggests that: "Congress take such action as may be necessary to assure the erection in Washington of a permanent memorial structure to Woodrow Wilson comparable in beauty, sweep, and grandeur to those already dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. This recommendation is a product of careful consideration on the part of the Commission. It stems from an abiding conviction that Wilson's eminence as scholar, educator, statesman, and world leader, and especially his contributions to the Presidency itself as an institution, place him high on the list of great American Presidents."

The case for such a memorial is a very strong one, so strong that legislation for a monument might well be introduced at this time.

I have also been impressed, however, by other arguments made for a "living memorial"—perhaps a "Woodrow Wilson House" that could combine architectural beauty with a function related to one or several of the great ideas expressed by Wilson.

Within the past few months many Americans have written to me or responded to my questions about the form a suitable memorial could take. I ask unanimous consent to attach to this statement in the RECORD a résumé of their viewpoints. I might say at this time that I shall be happy to turn over copies of that correspondence to the proposed Commission because I believe that invaluable suggestions have been made in many of the letters.

The correspondence has confirmed my growing conviction that it would be presumptuous for one individual to limit the scope of the Commission or attempt to specify what form the memorial should take. As former President Truman says in his letter a memorial to Wilson should be the result of much thought and preparation; it must be worthy of the man.

Accordingly, you will notice that the joint resolution merely mentions the Washington International Center as a potential Woodrow Wilson House, and it does ask the Commission to include the center in its studies; but it does not require the Commission to limit its survey to the center. The center is described in the résumé to be attached to this address. Briefly, however, it serves thousands of Government-sponsored visitors who come to Washington each year. It provides lectures, tours, conversation, and meetings at airports for the visitors. Future growth for the center is now possible; a recent Ford Foundation grant that will permit the center to move to larger quarters.

Such a center might well serve to dramatize Wilson's concern for understanding among all nations; there certainly would be room for a monument to Wilson at such a site. The widow of the late President, Mrs. Edith Bolling Wilson, has indicated that such a center would be very satisfactory to her as a form of memorial.

The Commission, I hope, will give very careful study to this particular proposal.

INTERNATIONAL EFFORT?

Mr. President, Wilson was admired in many other nations, He fought, as we all know, for independence of national groups after World War I; he stirred all men who believed in a "universal dominion of right."

The popularity of Wilson among many peoples was demonstrated often during

the centennial commission observances. In 1956, at Detroit, for instance, eight nationality groups—Armenian, Czech, Estonian, Latvian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, and Slovak—joined together for one tribute to Wilson. Thirteen Asian nations were represented at a memorial dinner in New York City. Wilson exhibits appeared in shop windows of Korea, Hong Kong, Lisbon, Tel Aviv, Buenos Aires, to mention a few.

I recite these facts only to emphasize that the store of international good will for Wilson might well encourage the Commission to decide that global efforts might be made if the Commission recommends that a public fund-raising drive should be organized to finance all or part of the costs of the memorial. Men in many homelands might wish to contribute, for example, to a "Pavilion of all Nations" that could be built as a related structure to a monument or functional building.

No further preamble is needed to stress that the Commission would have a formidable task. To honor Wilson in an appropriate way, we must search our own consciences and our life today to be certain that we understand the concepts he has willed to us in his writings, his speeches, and his deeds. We must be reminded of America as Wilson saw it—as a Nation where men were happy because they were free and free because they were equal, and safe because they did not wish to impose upon one another.

No American—from the South which Wilson knew as a boy and a young man, or from the North which he so well understood and defined in later years—could, in Wilson's eyes, fail to see the vision of this Nation as he saw it.

And—

As Wilson said during his first presidential campaign—

the vision has not changed. The multitude has grown, that welcome multitude that comes from all parts of the world to see a safe place of life and hope in America. And so America will move if she moves forward at all, only with her face to that same sun of promise. Just as soon as she forgets the sun in the heavens, just so soon as she looks so intently upon the road before her and around her that she does not know where it leads, then will she forget where it leads, then will she forget what America was created for: Here light will go out; the nations will grope again in darkness, and they will say: "Where are those who prophesied a day of freedom for us? Where are the lights that we followed? Where is the torch that the runners bore?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that suggestions which have reached me from a great number of great Americans be included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINIONS ON WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

In May of 1959, Senator WILLIAMS announced that he was looking for "good, workable ideas" for the establishment of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington, D.C.

The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission had in 1957 made a strong recommendation for a monument similar in size and beauty to those now honoring Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

A differing viewpoint was expressed, however, by the Honorable Francis B. Sayre, son-in-law of the late President Wilson, in a letter which reached the Senator during the summer months. Dr. Sayre said:

"It seems peculiarly fitting that a U.S. Memorial to Woodrow Wilson should take the form, not of a dead monument of marble or bronze, but of a meeting place in the Nation's Capital where men and women from every country of the world might come together to learn and taste of American ideals of peace and democracy.

"Woodrow Wilson's whole life was spent in the broadening and uplift of men's minds. During his academic life he was constantly teaching his students new ideals of democratic activity in the Nation's service; and in his later work in political and international life again he kept calling men of different races and cultures to a new vision of international peace and brotherhood.

"A true memorial to him must continue to build and inspire, as dead stone cannot do. It must possess the living power to fire men's imaginations and to build true foundations for international understanding.

"A significant beginning has already been made. For the past eight years our Government in its important program for cultural exchange has carefully chosen through our Embassies abroad over 5,000 foreign leaders and workers every year and brought them to America to gain special training and competence, each in his own field of work, and also to gain a better understanding of American ideals and the American way of life.

"To welcome in Washington and give initial direction to incoming groups of grantees, a small but devoted staff of professional workers and many volunteers are carrying on in a modest and quite inadequate international center. Could this project of incalculable importance be given a dignified and fitting memorial building in which the work could be increased and broadened and could the whole undertaking be expanded with congressional backing and approval, such a Woodrow Wilson Memorial would possess matchless possibilities for bringing home to countless people in the world Woodrow Wilson's ideals and vision for world peace.

"Could any congressional project constitute a more fitting memorial to the great American who gave us the first conception of a world united for peace than the building in the Nation's Capital of a Woodrow Wilson House, an international center, such as suggested?"

(A statement giving additional details about the center, and the announcement of a recent Ford Foundation grant to the center, is attached at the end of this résumé.)

Seeking opinions about the appropriateness of a "living memorial" or a nonfunctional monument, Senator WILLIAMS wrote to persons who had served in, or been associated with, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission. He feels that many valuable suggestions were made, and he offers the following excerpts from letters in response to his questions:

President Dwight D. Eisenhower: "Thank you for your September 7 letter concerning suggestions which have been made for a Woodrow Wilson Memorial. My own preference would be for a Woodrow Wilson House rather than a statue, and I would of course be very much in favor of such a thing being done by private subscription. I shall, however, have the matter studied carefully, and you will have a report on it as promptly as possible."

Bryce N. Harlow, Deputy Assistant to the President, later reported, at the President's request: "Preliminary thinking inclines toward the belief that a broadly conceived memorial might primarily serve to honor Woodrow Wilson with a permanent monument available to all the American people while serving at the same time symbolically and usefully as an international exchange center, open to all foreign visitors and to private and public exchange people. Effort on such a scale would require wide public support for its establishment, maintenance and growth.

"Perhaps a procedure as outlined in S.J. Res. 128 recently passed by the Senate, which would establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to James Madison, might be used to study the feasibility of the International Center and of the Centennial Celebration Commission's recommendations.

"The President hopes, of course, that a memorial concept can be developed which will meet the test of public support and practicality and at the same time will serve the widest expressed needs."

Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States: " . . . I am very anxious to see a memorial to Woodrow Wilson erected in Washington that will stand up to those that have already been placed there for former Presidents. . . . I hope you will make a complete survey before you introduce a resolution that will not come out of committee or that will be turned down when it does come out. Woodrow Wilson is among the five or six great Presidents of the United States, and nothing should happen to give descendants of the former isolationists a chance to discredit him."

Felix Frankfurter, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court: "The general direction of my friend Sayre's letter greatly appeals to me. Dean Acheson has talked to me about his correspondence with you on the subject of a Wilson Memorial, and I think his suggestion gives an appealing concreteness to the Sayre idea. Perhaps I ought to reveal to you that I find myself increasingly allergic to the preoccupation with brick and mortar, or rather pretentious stone, in this town. It would not only be singularly appropriate to honor Woodrow Wilson with the embodiment of an idea, but it might even start a much needed emphasis on ideas in our national life instead of the current material emphasis."

William J. Brennan, Jr., Associate Justice of the Supreme Court: "I could not more fully agree that a suitable memorial to Woodrow Wilson in this Capital is particularly fitting. My own preference leans toward the form suggested by Mr. Sayre, primarily because I think it affords an opportunity for carrying forward the noble work which has given him an indelible place in our history. But whatever form the memorial takes, surely there must be a memorial, and I shall be most happy to participate in efforts to that end."

J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia: "Thank you very much for your letter of September 7 and I am very pleased that you are so interested in some sort of fitting memorial to President Wilson. Certainly few men have contributed more to the United States and its people than did President Wilson.

"I feel confident that nearly every Virginian will wish to support any movement to honor the last Virginia President."

Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey: "I heartily endorse the idea of erecting a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

"It seems to me that it would be more in character with the ideals one associates with Woodrow Wilson to have a Woodrow Wilson House along the lines suggested by Mr. Sayre, rather than the more conventional type of monument. After all, Wilson began his career as a teacher. What could be a more fitting tribute to his greatness than a permanent institution dedicated to imparting the principles by which Wilson lived?"

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Senator from Virginia: "* * * I find that my Virginia friends would favor a memorial similar in type to those erected to Lincoln and Jefferson, to be financed by the Federal Government."

BURR P. HARRISON, Representative, Seventh District, Virginia: "* * * With him (Gen. E. W. Opie, chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1956), I raise these questions:

"1. Would such a memorial be of 'similar size and significance' as those to the three other Presidents which in the opening paragraph of your letter you state should be the objective?

"2. Would such a house duplicate and dilute Mrs. Wilson's plan to dedicate the S Street house as a Wilson shrine?

"What hope do you think there might be of persuading the Government to return to the policy of constructing memorials entirely by appropriations from the public purse?"

Adlai E. Stevenson, former Governor of Illinois: "I have given some thought to the suggestion for a Woodrow Wilson memorial and I must say that I was impressed by Francis Sayre's proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House. It strikes me as perhaps being a more appropriate memorial than the usual type of monument and it doesn't appear to me that it would be inconsistent with the recommendations of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission."

Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State: "Thank you for your letter asking for my views on a possible memorial for Woodrow Wilson. As a fellow Jerseyan I naturally have a particular interest in seeing such a project come to fruition.

"While I have not had the opportunity to give the matter a great deal of thought I do believe that a memorial in the form of a 'Woodrow Wilson House,' such as suggested by Francis Sayre, would be both a more fitting and a more practicable objective than a memorial such as that suggested by the Centennial Celebration Commission in 1956. I would also think that a substantial part of the funds could and should come from private sources as in the case of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower Libraries."

Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State: "* * * I am wholly in favor of Dean Sayre's approach—that is, a living institution, not a dead monument. The same question was considered by the trustees or the advisory committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., fund. You can learn all about their thoughts and conclusions from Senator SALTONSTALL and Justice Frankfurter.

"As to the sort of institution which would be best suited, Dean Sayre's suggestion is a good one. Another would be another sort of Woodrow Wilson House, modeled on the Pratt House of the Council on Foreign Relations, in New York, or the Royal Institute of International Relations, Chatham House, 10 St. James's Square, London S.W. 1, or the Institute of Strategic Studies, 18 Adam Street, London W.C. 2.

"This could be an imposing house in the general area of the Capitol, with a good working library for those working on foreign relations matters, a staff producing information papers on matters on which accurate current information on emergent problems is highly desirable—Tibet, Laos, etc., and a large auditorium where foreign visitors could address a serious audience (at present, the Press Club monopolizes this function with less than desirable results).

"People could, for a small fee which would help operating expenses, enjoy library facilities and a preference at functions, purchase of publications, etc.

"This might incorporate, also, some of Mr. Sayre's suggested function, which, standing alone, suggests a sort of YMCA for foreign students, worthy, but of limited appeal."

Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary of the Interior: "The Nation's Capital contains many fine memorials of various types to former Presidents and important and distinguished persons. The Department of the Interior certainly considers them to be an essential and desirable part of the National Capital Parks System. Several methods have been used to develop these memorials. Some of them were accomplished under sponsorship of private and semipublic organizations and foreign countries. Others were handled by special commissions established by Congress. Design and financing also have been accomplished in various ways. There have been extensive design competitions conducted and many times the commission organization in charge of the project has hired outstanding private designers to do the job. Financing has been handled in many ways, such as private donations, fundraising campaigns, foreign participation, and some use of public funds.

"All of the various methods have merit and it is difficult to say which is the best procedure; however, the special commissions established by Congress certainly provided a good means to carry out coordinated plans and design and the successful completion of some of our outstanding memorials.

"Regardless of the approach to develop a memorial, it requires, as you know, an act of Congress to establish memorials in the National Capital. For the most part, past legislation has stipulated that the plans, design, and location of the memorial located on public land must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts.

"We are familiar with the work of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission since Director Wirth was executive officer. The National Park Service worked closely with the Commission in carrying out their activities, including the 1956 report. You quoted one of the report's recommendations for a permanent memorial structure to Woodrow Wilson. We might add that the Commission was very helpful in securing the designation of the new bridge under construction at Jones Point as the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

"We should like to observe that a proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House to provide a place where visitors from abroad could receive an introduction to this Nation is a matter which we believe should be explored with the Department of State. The question of an international fundraising drive might also be considered by that Department.

"The question of memorials in the Nation's Capital requires thorough study and analysis. We certainly believe that you are doing just that and we appreciate the opportunity to comment upon your suggestions."

William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of State: "The Department is in full accord with Mr. Francis B. Sayre, who feels it would be especially appropriate that a memorial to Woodrow Wilson take the form of an International Center designed to introduce visitors from abroad to the American way of life.

"As you know, the Washington International Center of the American Council on Education is performing an extremely vital and valuable orientation service for foreign nationals visiting the United States under the exchange programs of the International Educational Exchange Service and the International Cooperation Administration. As these programs have expanded significantly during the past decade, the Washington International Center has outgrown its original building and is now desperately in need of new quarters.

"The Department would be happy to see the Washington International Center obtain a new location that would allow it to expand its activities to include the many visitors coming under all official exchange programs in addition to the IES and ICA programs presently being served. The success of international exchange programs in terms of the development of mutual understanding depends to a great extent upon the proper orientation of grantees.

"The Department would welcome, therefore, the consideration of an International Center as a memorial to Woodrow Wilson and suggests that, if such a course is decided upon, the program be combined with the Washington International Center's present search for new quarters. I suggest also that the director of the Washington International Center, Dr. Arthur A. Hauck, be consulted as soon as possible concerning the operations and future plans of his organization."

Stephen K. Bailey, professor of political science, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University: "I am completely in accord with the views of Mr. Sayre and Mrs. Edith Bolling Wilson that the most fitting memorial to Woodrow Wilson at present would be a Woodrow Wilson House rather than a permanent memorial structure. I have no doubt that at some appropriate time in the future a permanent memorial will be erected to Woodrow Wilson's memory; but good taste in this type of architecture involves a proper sense of timing as well as nobility and effectiveness in style.

"I should like to go beyond Mr. Sayre's proposal, however. There are literally hundreds of thousands of American visitors to our Nation's Capital each year—in addition to the foreign visitors mentioned in Mr. Sayre's letter. My guess is that the American visitors need quite as much help in understanding the American Government as do visitors from abroad. Wilson was not only a great international leader. He was also a great President of the United States in the domestic field. He was also a great educator.

"With the cooperation of the existing universities in Washington, an extraordinarily effective educational and orientation center might be established for the benefit of all visitors to Washington—a kind of living museum with exhibits, documents, audiovisual presentations, and other instruments of education aimed at helping visitors understand the functions, purposes, and behavior of various branches and units of the Federal establishment. Tourists could not help but come away enriched—and they would have viewed the architecture and the institutions of our Government with a vastly heightened appreciation. For example, if visitors to the Senate gallery at first received a 15–30 minute presentation on the functioning of Congress they would be far less shocked when they see only six Senators on the floor. This is a simple example which could be multiplied almost infinitely.

"Let me conclude by saying that this idea of a living museum is not original with me. A young man named Thomas Hanlon, who lives in Washington, has been trying desperately to interest someone in this kind of facility. His plan was to limit such a living museum to the congressional branch. I see no reason, however, why the idea could not be extended to all parts of the Government.

"As a member of the board of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation I am naturally delighted in your interest in a memorial."

Mrs. Jonathan Bingham, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I like your and Mr. Sayre's thought to expand the Washington International Center into a Woodrow Wilson House.

"I wonder whether there would be a possibility of housing the Woodrow Wilson papers there—thus attracting historians as well as students. As you know, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation is involved in a decade-long project of having these papers collected, indexed, etc."

George M. Cochran, member, Virginia House of Delegates, Chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of 1956–57: "The work of our Commission has been

concluded and our Commission is no longer officially in existence. Consequently, any ideas which I have on the subject of a memorial are my own personal views and have no official sanction.

"It seems to be the consensus of interested persons in this community that a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington should be primarily a memorial structure rather than a building devoted to such useful purposes as office space for international organizations. If some utilitarian purpose can also be achieved with a structure planned and erected primarily as a memorial structure such as the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, there would certainly be no objection to this combination of objectives."

Jonathan Daniels, editor, the News and Observer, Raleigh, N.C.: "If there were to be only one memorial, I would much prefer the suggestion in 1956 by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Committee for the erection of a permanent memorial structure comparable in beauty, sweep, and grandeur to those already dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. It seems to me that this is the kind of memorial which the Federal Government should provide for this great man.

"The proposal for a Woodrow Wilson House as a sort of international center has, of course, much merit, and I naturally am impressed by the feeling of Mr. Sayre, and Mrs. Wilson with regard to this. It seems to me, however, that this type of memorial could be better provided by some semiprivate organization or foundation. I am not impressed by Mr. Sayre's feeling about dead stone. I believe that the beautiful memorials to Jefferson, Lincoln, and Washington cannot be so described."

Harold W. Dodds, president emeritus, Princeton University, N.J.: "* * * From all my study of Woodrow Wilson, I am convinced that Mrs. Wilson is right, and that he would much prefer something similar to a Woodrow Wilson House than a grand memorial.

"However, I do see problems in designing what purposes the memorial should serve and how they should be attained.

"How 'thousands of visitors from abroad each year could receive a memorable introduction to this Nation' calls for constructive planning and continuing financing, which I presume in this case would be subject to congressional appropriations.

"It might be possible to recover from the Library of Congress some Wilson memorabilia, such as awards and medals, etc., which could be the basis for furnishing an exhibition hall.

"Finally, I should not anticipate success in soliciting private contributions, unless a small handful of people can be persuaded to make most substantial personal gifts; and this has not occurred to any extent in any Woodrow Wilson memorial enterprise of which I am aware."

Robert F. Goheen, president, Princeton University, N.J.: "My own judgment is very strongly in favor of the ideas advanced by Dean Sayre. Nothing could be more appropriate than an edifice in which living work is going on in service to the cause of improved international understanding.

"At the same time, it would seem to me that plans should include development of a handsome building and site. I agree with the recommendation of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, at least in this respect, that architecturally the memorial to President Wilson should have a dignity and enduring beauty reflective of his stature."

Roswell L. Gilpatric, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "* * * I would like to endorse the proposal made to you by Mr. Sayre. To my way of thinking, the work of an International Center would be a more appropriate memorial to Woodrow Wilson than the erection of a monument comparable to those dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln."

Ernest A. Gross, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "It strikes me that an international center would be preferable to a monument, but it raises problems of continuing financial support and administration which, of course, are minimized in the case of an architectural memorial.

"In view of the importance of the decision and the long-overdue tribute to one of the greatest Americans, I would like to give the most mature thought to your question.

"Permit me to add that I am delighted with your leadership and sponsorship of the project, which is a service not only to the Nation but to the world."

Dr. Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers, the State university, New Jersey: "I was brought up in a family which thought that Woodrow Wilson was just about the greatest man who ever lived. I therefore am disposed to take this matter of a memorial most seriously.

"I am not as much against a monument as Dr. Sayre seems to be. Certainly both the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial say what they have to say very directly and appropriately. To add the requirement that this memorial should also have a useful purpose, it seems to me, is to divide our intent. It does seem to me that we can erect a memorial to Wilson simply by itself without having to be busy and fussy about continuing his work and his interest.

"I am also not oversold on the subject of a center for international students. International students are all the rage today, and there are many such centers both large and small. If this were a pioneering enterprise, I would go along with it, but I think that this is to throw the name of Wilson into a pot that is already boiling with activity.

"Wilson was the only highly trained intellect who has ever occupied the White House. He was more disciplined than Jefferson, and more of an intellect than Lincoln. He had a long and distinguished career before the war forced him into international complications.

"I suppose that a library is the most appropriate memorial to an intellect. But it is hard to know exactly what that library should contain, particularly in Washington where the Library of Congress inevitably dominates everything."

Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council, member, board of trustees, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "The memorial proposed for Woodrow Wilson in Washington, D.C., impresses me as highly appropriate; indeed I cannot think of a better way of symbolizing the values for which he strove in both educational and international affairs. I offer this comment as a personal opinion and not as a matter that has been considered by members of the Social Science Research Council.

"I cannot comment with any particularity about the Washington International Center. I have a generally favorable impression of its work.

"I think that the time has come to give much more attention to institutional and administrative arrangements for handling international cultural exchange activities. Such contacts are now a necessary and continuing part of our national life and yet much of this work is carried on in improvised and ad hoc fashion. The proposal you have in mind might serve to bring to public attention the scope and importance of exchange programs and provide more dignified and suitable support."

August Heckscher, president, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "Naturally I am interested in your letter of September 7. I do feel most deeply that a memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Nation's Capital is something which this generation should not neglect. Wilson's fame increases with the years, and his standing at the very top of the list of great American Presidents is by now beyond dispute. In the years to come he will, I believe, loom even larger.

"As to the form such a memorial should take, attach great importance to the recommendations of Mr. Sayre, whose devotion to the War President has been so unwavering and whose appreciation of his qualities is perhaps unique among those who today are playing a role in affairs. It does seem to me that a memorial serving the living generation, especially young people in whom Wilson had so great an interest, would be most fitting.

"Perhaps you know that the papers of Woodrow Wilson are now in the process of being edited under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. The Foundation has raised something over $300,000 for this great work, but the total project will cost in the neighborhood of $1 million. It may be that you would want to consider support of this project among the possibilities for a memorial. The Wilson letters and papers form a magnificent collection which thus far have been scattered and largely unavailable to the public and even to historians.

"May only urge that if a building is constructed in Washington it be done in a style which reflects the fact that Mr. Wilson's contribution belongs to the present and the future. I would hate to see a building erected in his memory which speaks only of the past and would not represent the best that this generation can conceive and construct."

Chet Huntley, correspondent, National Broadcasting Co.: "Your letter outlined two possible types of memorial. I counter with the question which your letter anticipated: why not combine the two? Could not an edifice as fine as the Lincoln or Jefferson memorials be erected but which would serve the double purpose of housing the Woodrow Wilson House favored by Mrs. Wilson?"

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: "Personally, I am strongly in favor of a working memorial rather than a purely commemorative one. I know that the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial have come to have a special position in the minds and hearts of American and foreign visitors to Washington. On the other hand, I have the feeling that the same is not true of the Jefferson Memorial, which is a little more difficult to reach. Besides, I have always regretted that Mr. Jefferson, who was, if not the first American functionalist, certainly the second—Franklin being the first—should be honored by what is in essence an empty shell—a kind of ironic fate for the man who devoted his mathematical talents and agricultural interests to perfecting the first scientific plow, and who built in his own home at Monticello one of the most beautifully functional houses that I have ever seen, of whatever period.

"I have the feeling that to Wilson also a building had importance not for what it looked like or symbolized but for what took place in it. He was concerned with substance, not with form.

"To me, therefore, the idea of a Woodrow Wilson House which would have important functions as a meeting place or as a place to receive foreign visitors would be much more in keeping with his own spirit. I am interested to note that Mr. Sayre shares this view.

"There may, of course, be other working memorials under consideration. In any case, I like Mr. Sayre's idea.

"As for fund raising, I should think that it would not be inappropriate to have some public funds, but I feel also that an inter-

national fund-raising drive among peoples throughout the world who admired Wilson should definitely have a part."

Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews: "As you know, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of a committee, set up by the Legislature of New Jersey, to celebrate the centennial of Woodrow Wilson. I have, therefore, given a great deal of thought to this and I think the best way to pay tribute to our 28th President is by the living memorial outlined by Mr. Sayre."

Verbon E. Kemp, executive director, Virginia State Chamber of Commerce: "This matter has not received the official attention of the board of directors of the Virginia State Chamber. We find, however, that there is a strong preference in the Virginia organizations dedicated to the perpetuation of the ideals and policies of President Wilson for a permanent memorial similar to those erected in Washington in memory of Presidents Jefferson and Lincoln.

"However, the living memorial in the form of a Woodrow Wilson House for serving visitors from abroad is appealing. It should offer much of practical value. I am confident that you can count upon the support of Virginia for any memorial to Mr. Wilson, provided that it is in keeping with his stature as one of the greatest Presidents which have served our country.

"It was our privilege to present and dedicate a plaque to Mr. Wilson's memory in Paris last fall. It was placed on the walls of the Palais de Chaillot and the dedicatory ceremonies were arranged and attended by a party of 110 Virginians headed by former Virginia Gov. John S. Battle."

Arthur Krock, columnist, New York Times: "I greatly favor the idea of Dean Sayre for the memorial in Washington to his grandfather, Woodrow Wilson. My only suggestion is that as noble a statue of the President as sculpture can produce be put in a worthy setting either in front of the Woodrow Wilson International Center House or within the edifice, with a location comparable to Lincoln's within his memorial."

Mrs. Henry Goddard Leach, member, board of trustees, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I agree completely with the point of view of Mr. Sayre that there should be a memorial which would contribute to the international exchange of students. It would seem to me exceedingly appropriate for a man of President Wilson's caliber. Such a memorial should, I think, be raised by public and private contributions. Most certainly it would be necessary to have a backlog of public contributions to start with."

Walter Lippmann, columnist, New York Herald Tribune syndicate: "I have no doubt that the best thing to do now is to follow the advice of the Reverend Francis B. Sayre. I heartily endorse it."

Robert J. Matteson, executive director, American Society for Public Administration: "You probably know that Woodrow Wilson was a pioneer in recognizing public administration as a special field of learning and endeavor. His essay on "The Study of Public Administration," published in the Political Science Quarterly, June 1887, clearly foreshadowed numerous developments. Many current doctrines about public administration were first enunciated here. In ASPA, we from time to time take note of Wilson's special contribution to our field.

"This all leads to hearty approval of your plans to memorialize Wilson and to the suggestion that the memorial might in some way recognize his key role in developing the public administration profession. As to type of memorial my personal preference is for something modeled after the international center you and Mr. Sayre have discussed. Our society as an organization does not, however, take positions on legislative and related matters."

E. Walton Opie, publisher, the Staunton (Va.) News Leader; national chairman of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in 1956–7: "The cause you are advocating is a great and commendable one. Keep up the good work and we'll see a noble monument rise to the 28th President. The idea of a combined functional and classic memorial appeals to me increasingly.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss, member, board of directors, Woodrow Wilson Foundation: "I believe that a Woodrow Wilson House where visitors to this country could be briefed on this country and its governmental and other patterns would be a much more live and important type of memorial to Woodrow Wilson."

Arthur Schlesinger, professor, Department of History, Harvard University: "In general a living memorial seems to me a better tribute than a static shrine. Moreover, Mr. Sayre's proposal would not only commemorate the spirit of Wilson but would also serve a vital function in the National Capital. Such a Woodrow Wilson House should, of course, contain facilities for commemoration of particular aspects of Wilson's career."

Senator WILLIAMS has also received other correspondence from persons who offered suggestions individually.

The Reverend Henry J. Davis, pastor of the Dundas Baptist Church in Dundas, Va., said that a Woodrow Wilson Institute or University should be established in Washington, D.C., with the help of Government funds, certain foundation funds, and private donations.

He continued: "I would also suggest that this institute or university be especially designed and planned to enroll advanced and graduate students of government, law, history, and economics. Only students who hold a standard bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree from a recognized college or university would be permitted to enroll as a student—and then, only students of recognized ability. This institute or university would be, then, a graduate and post-graduate institution, attracting the greatest scholars of our country and the world on the faculty in the fields mentioned, and only graduate degrees would be conferred upon students completing their courses leading to the master of arts, doctor of philosophy, and doctor of laws, degrees.

"I believe that such a suggestion would have met with the full favor of the late President, since his heart and life was set on the subjects mentioned—government, law, history, and economics; he himself excelled in all of these studies, especially government and history. I also believe that this suggestion would meet with favor with his widow, Mrs. Wilson; his daughter, Mrs. Sayre, or any other close relatives and friends. I also believe this suggestion would meet with favor all over America and the world, once the full idea is made known in detail."

Among the suggestions received by Senator WILLIAMS before he received the letter from Dr. Sayre were these:

1. A melting pot plaza devoted to an internationalist theme as part of a waterfront redevelopment plan along Maine Avenue between F and L Streets.

2. A permanent place where modern problems of health could be presented to the public, in connection with the Health for Peace Act. A world's showplace for programs to combat health problems.

Senator WILLIAMS also submits the following:

A statement describing the Washington International Center and editorials from the January 15, 1960, edition of the Jersey Journal; and January 4, 1960, edition of the Staunton, (Va.) Leader; and the January 9 edition of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal:

"WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER

"Services and facilities of the Washington International Center, for the past 10 years located at 1720 Rhode Island Avenue NW., will be greatly expanded in the future with the acquisition of a 45-room mansion, Meridian House, as its new headquarters. This was made possible by a Ford Foundation grant of $500,000 to the American Council on Education for the purchase and furnishing of the building at 1630 Crescent Place NW., former home of the late Irwin Laughlin, a distinguished diplomat of the World War I era—Minister to Greece and Ambassador to Spain—from its present owner, Mrs. Hubert W. Chanler, daughter of Mr. Laughlin.

"Within the terms of the grant, an additional $200,000 will be provided to assist other private Washington agencies engaged in exchange program services. Five institutions—private, nonprofit, educational, scientific, and cultural groups—will be involved in the new corporation now being organized to operate the center and coordinate functions in the reception of foreign leaders, scholars and students. They are the American Council on Education, the Governmental Affairs Institute, the Institute of International Education, the Foreign Students Service Council, and the Institute of Contemporary Arts. The three latter groups will have officers in the new center.

"The Washington International Center's program of introduction to the life and customs of the United States was originated 10 years ago by the American Council on Education at the request of the Government. Operated as a council project under contract with the Department of State, the center has received well over 25,000 visitors in the last decade, representing more than 100 countries around the world. For the last several years, as the numbers of visitors coming under ICA and IES programs have steadily increased, the center's quarters have become correspondingly overcrowded. Expansion of the orientation program and allied services to other visitors, as well as easing the present space problems, will be possible in the center's new home.

"Meridian House, a four-story limestone structure built in 1922, was designed by John Russell Pope, architect for the Jefferson Memorial and the National Gallery of Art. It was, of course, planned for a style of gracious living of a bygone era. Yet as a setting typifying American hospitality at its best, it will provide international visitors comfort and space in which center traditions of warm and friendly welcome may continue in a more relaxed atmosphere than has been possible in recent years because of overcrowding. Not least of the advantages offered by the beauty and spaciousness of Meridian House are the surrounding gardens and the terrace with its 50 handsome linden trees.

"The house was described as 'perhaps as fine a piece of work of its kind as this country can show' in an article by Matlack Price in the Architectural Forum for August 1929. The article declared: 'The whole manner of this house, deriving so definitely from the 18th century France of Louis XVI, is grand without being grandiose; impressive without being pompous; rich without being ornate.'

"Research into the source of the name for Meridian House unearthed an interesting little sidelight on history. When the Capital City for the struggling new Nation was in the planning stages nearly 200 years ago, George Washington wanted it laid out in a 10-mile square, diamond shaped in order to encompass the little ports of Alexandria and Georgetown. The north-south meridian line

bisecting the diamond, 77 degrees, 2 minutes, 12½ seconds west of Greenwich, was the basis for 16th Street, running right through the White House. Meridian Hill, Meridian Park, and Meridian House are all reminders of this almost forgotten fact."

"[From the Jersey Journal and Jersey Observer, Jan. 15, 1960]

"A MEMORIAL TO WILSON

"President Eisenhower and former President Truman rarely agree on any public question, and Adlai E. Stevenson has had his differences with both. All three, however, join in favoring a memorial in Washington to Woodrow Wilson. More than 40 other prominent Americans take the same stand, according to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., who advocates a commission to decide what form a memorial should take.

"As the President whose leadership saw us successfully through World War I and created such an enduring institution as the Federal Reserve System, Wilson deserves commemoration. His administration was wrecked on the League of Nations, but if the United States had supported that body it might have headed off the Second World War. Historians, who disagree as often as most people, join in reckoning Wilson among our six foremost Chief Executives.

"The form of the memorial is yet to be determined. Merely another monument would hardly suit. President Eisenhower and Stevenson, according to Senator WILLIAMS, would like a memorial international exchange center for receiving and directing visitors who come to Washington under various exchange programs. Perhaps a more comprehensive creation will be found which would apply to Wilson's domestic achievements as well as to his vision in foreign affairs."

"[From the Staunton (Va.) Leader, Jan. 4, 1960]

"WILSON MEMORIAL PROGRESS

"Yesterday's news release by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey, telling of reaction to the proposal for a major memorial to Woodrow Wilson in the Nation's Capital encourages the belief that Congress may soon take the action necessary to this end. Senator WILLIAMS announced plans to introduce a bill for a memorial to the 28th President within the next few weeks.

"The New Jersey Democrat is following up energetically the recommendation to Congress by the U.S. Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission for a major Wilson memorial in Washington. The Commission envisioned a classic-type memorial comparable to those to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, but Senator WILLIAMS has been impressed by proposals for a living memorial, such as an international center at which Government-sponsored visitors—some 25,000 a year now—would be received.

"Recent announcement of a $500,000 grant to the Washington International Center for spacious quarters does not seem to have reduced Senator WILLIAMS' interest in a Wilson center of some kind as a memorial to Staunton's immortal. He stated that he has an open mind as to the form of memorial, and quoted a number of leaders, including President Eisenhower, as favoring a living, or utilitarian, memorial.

"There is no good reason why the two ideas, classic and functional, could not be acceptably combined to attain a truly noble memorial to the 28th President. In any event, Congress should delay no longer in giving such recognition to the greatness of Woodrow Wilson and offering the inspiration of his ideals and achievements to the millions who visit the Capital. Public funds to this end should be provided, although President Eisenhower is quoted by Senator WILLIAMS as advocating popular subscription.

"Nearly all of the wealthy adherents of Mr. Wilson, especially those who served under him in his great crusades for domestic reforms and international organization for peace and world progress, are dead. Too few living Americans know and appreciate the Wilson leadership to contribute funds sufficient for a memorial of such magnitude that it would inspire study of this, the first American world statesman, and his times. Precedent justifies the use of public funds for a major Woodrow Wilson memorial."

"[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 9, 1960]

"HOW TO TRANSLATE THE WILSON DREAM

"We agree with Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, along with many others, that Woodrow Wilson should have a memorial in Washington. But, please, not the kind of monument of which the National Capital already has enough, even though some of them are majestically beautiful.

"Mr. WILLIAMS is preparing legislation to create a commission to draw up a plan for a Wilson memorial. He adds the recommendation that the commission should specifically consider a suggestion he has heard in many quarters that the memorial take the form of an international center. Here Government-sponsored visitors from many lands, including not merely the VIP's, could be received and hospitably lodged.

"This is an excellent suggestion. Some devout Wilsonians have been thinking in terms of something like the Washington Monument, or the Lincoln or Jefferson memorials. This newspaper happens to be itself a devout Wilsonian, but we also happen to think that Woodrow Wilson's dream could be far better translated than in marble or bronze. The best tribute to his memory in Washington would be a living, continuously useful center of international understanding.

"A monument-type memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt is already being planned, but we still think, as we have said before, that a human-type memorial of a sort that would give practical effect to his ideals would be more appropriate. We think exactly the same thing about the Wilson project."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie at the desk until Monday evening of next week so that other Senators who desire to do so may become cosponsors of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am grateful to the 47 Senators who have already indicated their desire to be cosponsors of the joint resolution, and to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] who, while not a cosponsor of it, has indicated his support of the measure I have offered to create this Commission.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Woodrow Wilson is the supreme example in American public life of the scholar of government being called to assume the post of Chief Executive of his State and the Nation.

The president of Princeton University became the Governor of the great State of New Jersey, the President of the United States, and the founder of the League of Nations.

The National Capital has suitable memorials to Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. I feel it is time to turn our attention to the establishment of one to the memory of the great President of World War I, and it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and others in sponsoring this joint resolution to establish a Commission to formulate the plans.

In the light of international events since his untimely death, Woodrow Wilson appears as a statesman with a clear vision of the future. As he so well saw and so well said, America's great task, as yet unfinished, is to make the world safe for democracy.

His nomination, his election, and his career as President were filled with drama. He was nominated by the Democratic National Convention in Baltimore in 1912 on the 46th ballot. The leading contender, Champ Clark of Missouri, was unable to secure the two-thirds necessary at that time due to the still-loyal following of the thrice-defeated William Jennings Bryan.

And a dramatic and acrimonious split in the Republican Party contributed to Woodrow Wilson's election. When Theodore Roosevelt left the White House, William Howard Taft—father of one of the most influential men ever to sit in this body, the late Robert A. Taft of Ohio—became President. Believing that President Taft had deserted the Roosevelt principles, particularly on the question of conservation of natural resources, he reentered the presidential arena at the head of the Bull Moose Party.

It should be remembered that Wilson's first term was a most fruitful one in the field of domestic legislation and reform. Healthy business competition was stimulated by establishment of the Federal Trade Commission and passage of the Clayton Antitrust Act. The Federal Reserve Act strengthened and stabilized the monetary system. The Underwood tariff lowered schedules, and important advances were made in Latin American relations through cooperation with Argentina, Brazil, and Chile in the settlement of our dispute with Mexico.

He worked unceasingly to keep the United States out of the European war. When he believed this to be impossible—when the Imperial German Government declared unrestricted submarine warfare—he prosecuted the war energetically, but always with the great purpose before him of establishing a lasting peace. He sought to make the sacrifices of his countrymen meaningful in terms of a better world for their descendants.

In regard to the memorial itself, several proposals have been put forth. As Senator WILLIAMS has said, they all deserve careful consideration.

I know that those taking the leadership in this matter have in mind a monument that will compare favorably in scope and grandeur with those we have raised to Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. With this I agree.

It has been suggested also that the memorial might take the form of a functional building—a living memorial

it is being called—a headquarters for an organization related to areas of Wilson's contributions to American and world government.

While this idea might lead to the most suitable memorial to President Wilson, the function to be performed should not overshadow the personality of the President.

One problem in a functional memorial is that it may come to be visited principally by that relatively narrow segment of our people, and of visitors from abroad, who are interested in the function. And that the great majority of those to whom we wish to bring the message of Wilson's ideals and ideas may pass it by.

As I now conceive it, the memorial should be of such form, and offer such access and other facilities, as will assure it a permanent place on the itinerary of those who come to Washington to go sightseeing. Especially I would want to be sure that the hundreds of thousands of young people who visit us every year have forcefully called to their attention this man's dedication to the public service.

I look forward to speedy approval of this joint resolution by the Congress, and wish the commission Godspeed in its work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Utah for his support of the joint efforts in connection with the joint resolution which I introduced earlier today, to create a Commission to study the possibilities in the nature of a memorial to Woodrow Wilson.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, January 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Stephen J. Chrepta, rector of St. Vladimir's Pro-Cathedral and dean of St. Basil's College, Stamford, Conn., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Creator and Redeemer of the world, we glorify Thee and humbly give Thee thanks for the countless blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon us. We thank Thee, in particular, for the freedoms which we enjoy in our beloved United States of America.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, Ruler of the Universe, to graciously look down upon our President and the Members of Congress, that they may advance in all virtues, and continue in health to govern this land for Thy glory and the welfare of its people. Guide and illume them with wisdom in their deliberations. Strengthen them in charity for our people and toward all humanity. Grant that nations recognize in them Thy unselfish instruments of peace and the hope of the oppressed, as embodied in the Captive Nations Week resolution which they enacted.

We pray especially for the Ukrainian and all other enslaved peoples, brutally subjugated by the forces of communism. In particular, we pray for the Ukrainian people who are the first victims, and who have suffered unmercifully four decades of the ruthless liquidations, starvations, and inhuman tortures of this dreadful scourge, which even threatens the peace of the world.

Fortify the faith of Thy Ukrainian children, O Heavenly Father, keep hope burning in their hearts, grant them perseverance during their captivity, alleviate their sufferings, protect them from the guile of their enemies, that all trouble being removed, they may freely serve Thee.

We also implore Thee, O God, the guardian of peace and charity, give our enemies true charity, and grant them remission of their sins. By Thy might deliver us from their snares, so that lasting peace and harmony may again be restored among nations, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Thy Son, who with Thee liveth and reigneth in the unity of the Holy Ghost forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate requests that the House of Representatives return to the Senate the bill (S. 1282) entitled "An act relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat."

STONEWALL JACKSON

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 136th anniversary of the birth of one of history's true geniuses. On January 21, 1824, in Clarksburg, W. Va.—then Virginia—Thomas Jonathan Jackson was born.

In Clarksburg, Harrison County, he was known as Jonathan, but since that warm June day of 1861, at nearby Manassas in Virginia, he has been known and revered as "Stonewall."

It is not my purpose here to review his military feats. It is sufficient to state that his campaigns have been studied by military leaders throughout the world, probably more so than the campaigns of any other great leader.

Two days ago was the anniversary of the birth of another revered military leader of the Confederacy, Gen. Robert E. Lee. It detracts nothing from the reputation of General Lee to point out that without Stonewall Jackson, Lee's military stature would be somewhat less. It was Lee himself who recognized the genius of Jackson who, at the time of the secession of Virginia, was an obscure professor at Virginia Military Institute. In fact, it was a point of Lee's own greatness that he could recognize ability in others and knew how to use that ability to the best possible advantage.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud in Clarksburg and in Harrison County that Stonewall Jackson was born there and spent his boyhood either in Clarksburg or at his grandfather's farm and mill a few miles south. His birthplace still stands in Clarksburg and is appropriately marked. His boyhood home, the farm and mill of his grandfather, is now owned by the State and operates as a State 4-H encampment. Today Jackson's Mill is one of West Virginia's proudest shrines. Several years ago a monument to the great Stonewall Jackson was erected on the grounds of the Harrison County Courthouse in Clarksburg.

In making these anniversary remarks, I would be remiss if I did not pay some tribute to Mr. S. J. Birshtein and Mr. J. Z. Terrell, of Clarksburg, great admirers of Stonewall Jackson, whose tireless efforts have contributed greatly to keeping the memory of this great American alive in the community of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who may desire to comment on the life and character of General Jackson be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a useful privilege to recall on the floor of this House, as we do from time to time, the history of our Nation—its times of trial, its hours of triumph and achievement. It is with particular pride that I associate myself with our distinguished West Virginia colleague [Mr. BAILEY], in marking the anniversary of the birth of Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, who lies in honored rest in Lexington, in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia.

In Lexington, too, stands the only home this great soldier ever owned, and there is Virginia Military Institute—still training men in the science of arms where Stonewall Jackson helped train them prior to the bloody conflict of which we soon shall mark the centenary.

Jackson needs no words of mine to secure his place in history, but his exemplification of qualities which have contributed much to the growth and strength of the United States are well recalled today as we face new trials. He

had faith, courage, resolution, ingenuity, integrity. They served him well, and he spent them willingly in the cause for which his conviction and honor impelled him to fight.

As the centennial of the war in which he was to die nears, there have been some suggestions that we should not be planning to celebrate a conflict. Celebrate, of course, is inappropriate. Wars are crosses to be borne in man's faltering plodding toward eternity. There are lessons to be learned from them, however, and not merely military wisdom to be passed on to succeeding generations of soldiery.

Stonewall Jackson's exercises in the maneuverability of land forces remain classics. He was a soldier who knew his craft, but he was neither a mercenary nor an ambitious opportunist. He hated the carnage of war but he fought with determination and resourcefulness because he had, as had Lee and so many other men of honor and inherent good will, thought the matter through, and found no other recourse for principles strongly held than the desperate one of arms.

We are a nation strong, proud, and free because we have been willing to do the necessary as we saw it, in many times and places, and because honor has had value for us. This we need to remember, if we are to remain strong, proud, and free, and it is in this spirit of national self-examination that we rightfully may recall in public observances the causes, events, and effects of our past conflicts. In this way the national spirit can draw forth new vitality from the experiences of history and the people new courage and resolve from the lives of such authentic heroes of power and sensitivity as Stonewall Jackson.

Under the leadership of Mr. Jay W. Johns, of Charlottesville, Va., the Stonewall Jackson Memorial, Inc., has acquired and is preserving Jackson's home at Lexington. It is building there, through the collection of Jackson possessions, correspondence, photographs, and documents, a center of Jackson study.

With the approaching centennial focusing renewed attention on Jackson's exploits, plans have been going forward for the development, under such nonprofit private auspices, of some of the battlefield sites associated with the campaign in the Valley of Virginia which have not been set aside in the past as Federal or State historical reservations.

It is hoped, too, that electrical maps may be placed at one or more points in the valley to provide visitors to the area with a clearer mental picture of the actions.

In this spirit of serious historical inquiry and solemn reflection, the centennial programs may be developed as useful contributions to the clarification of our past struggles for the information and guidance of new generations.

THE LATE HON. CHARLES HAWKS, JR.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce officially to the House of Representatives the death of the Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr., a former Member of Congress from the Second District of Wisconsin, who died in Philadelphia on January 6, 1960.

A distinguished predecessor of mine, Mr. Hawks served in the 76th Congress. During that time, however, he became well known and well loved for his integrity and dedication to the service of his constituents, his State, and his country. Many of you who knew him personally will receive the news of his passing with a feeling of deep sorrow.

Born to a distinguished Horicon, Wis., family he grew up in a business atmosphere, was trained in business, graduating from the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce, and followed a career of business until the economic and international storms of the thirties and early forties brought him into the political arena.

He served his home county as a county supervisor prior to winning election to Congress in the fall of 1938, and he served his country in Congress during the opening days of the Second World War—a time of change requiring men of courage, determination, and conviction. These he brought with him and these he applied to the tasks at hand.

His ability was quickly recognized with election to four committees and his momentum carried him to national prominence as the national campaign manager for the 1940 presidential aspirations of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

I know that those of you who knew him in Congress will join with me in expressing deepest regrets and sincere sympathy to his mother, his wife, Mrs. Hawks, his son, Charles II, and his daughter, Mrs. Richard Post. It is our hope that they may find some solace in the memory of a son, a husband, and a father whose life was well spent in honored service and in knowing that a host of friends grieve his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my good friend the Honorable Charles Hawks, Jr., a former Member of Congress who represented the Second District of Wisconsin.

We both served as freshmen during the 76th Congress, and I had the privilege of knowing him well. He was a hard worker devoted to serving his constitutents and his country.

I always admired Charlie for his grasp of governmental affairs. This knowledge was readily recognized and after leaving Congress he associated himself with industry, dealing closely with Federal departments. But Charlie continued his interest in public affairs and kept up his very close association with Members of Congress and his former colleagues. I was always grateful for his warm friendship.

Charlie was one of the most loved Members that ever served in the House of Representatives. Personally, I have lost a dear friend and one for whom I had great regard and affection.

Those of you who were fortunate enough to know him, I know join me in expressing sympathy to his mother, devoted wife, Lucille, and their son and daughter.

TRANSFER OF VON BRAUN TEAM TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution which proposes to waive the 60-day waiting period before the President's plan for transferring the Von Braun team from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration can take effect. The transfer would take effect immediately upon the enactment of the joint resolution.

Under section 302(c) of Public Law 85–568, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the President is authorized for a period of 4 years after the date of enactment of this act to transfer appropriate space functions from any other department or agency of the Federal Government to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. According to the law, any transfers made before January 1, 1959, were to be accompanied by a report from the President to the Congress concerning the nature and effect of such transfer. This was to be in the nature of an informational report. No formal action by the Congress was indicated. Under this authority, the President transferred the Vanguard project from the Navy and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory from the Army to NASA.

For transfers of functions to NASA after December 31, 1958, the President is required under the law not only to submit a full and complete report to the Congress setting forth the nature and effect of the proposed transfer, but the proposal is to lie before the Congress for a period of 60 calendar days following the transmittal. The transfer cannot take effect until this 60-day waiting period has elapsed. During such period, if the Congress is opposed to the transfer, it can enact a concurrent resolution

stating its opposition, in which case the transfer plan is killed.

Under the authority just described, the President has transmitted a plan to the Congress proposing transfer of the Development Operations Division—and supporting personnel—directed by Dr. Wernher von Braun, from the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This proposed transfer comes before the Congress during a time of widespread concern that our national programs for space science and exploration are lagging far behind those of Soviet Russia. In view of such concern, I see no disposition on the part of the Congress to oppose the transfer, notwithstanding possible reservations that some Members may have about it.

From one point of view, it could be argued that the transfer of jurisdiction and functions, with all the accompanying administrative, fiscal, and operating adjustments that must be made, may have a disrupting and delaying effect on the performance of the Von Braun team. The fact of the matter is, however, that the Von Braun team has not been allowed to function in the most efficient way. It is an innocent victim of interservice rivalries and inertia and indecision at the Department of Defense level in determining military missions in space.

Had our defense officials—military and civilian—worried less about who was going to do the space job and more about how it was to be done, this country would not be in second place. The Army had resources and know-how to do the space job; what it lacked was a full and clear mandate in space.

Consequently, we are confronted with this situation: To oppose the transfer of the Von Braun team to NASA is to condemn it to continued underutilization because of present restrictions on Army missions; to endorse the transfer incurs the temporary risks of disruption which is an inevitable feature of all major reorganizations but holds forth the promise of a greater and more sustained space effort in the future.

The Von Braun team will not be removed from its present home in the Redstone Arsenal. The arsenal will become, in a sense, a joint operation of Army Ordnance and NASA. The President has assured the Congress in his message of January 14, 1960, transmitting the plan that "every effort will be made to prevent the dislocation or disruption of ongoing missile or space vehicle projects." Also, according to the President's statement, military weapon systems related programs now under development by the Von Braun team will be continued by the Army, which will have the privilege of utilizing the skills of the transferred personnel, as necessary, with reimbursement to NASA for the use of such personnel.

It was contemplated in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 that the President would find it necessary and appropriate to make transfers of space functions to NASA in order to prevent needless duplication and build up that agency as the key Government unit in space science and exploration for peaceful purposes. Since the President has seen fit to exercise the transfer authority delegated by the Congress, we in the Congress should support these transfers unless compelling circumstances dictate otherwise.

The present critical state of affairs, with new evidence coming in almost every day of Soviet Russia's superiority in space activities, is not a time for leisurely debate and overly cautious consideration. The burden of performance in space activities is vested by law in the President and the Administrator of NASA. Any move now is better than no move. We can only hope that the President and the Administrator will follow through in response to what I believe is a national will and a national determination to overcome our lagging efforts in space. In other words, if we have any doubts, we should resolve them in favor of the President's action.

The best way, it seems to me, that the Congress can record its desire that the administration move ahead vigorously in space exploration is to waive the 60-day waiting period during which the transfer plan is to lie before the Congress. That is the purpose of the joint resolution which I have introduced.

Technically, it might be said that the details involved in this transfer require at least 60 days and possibly many more days to be worked out and that therefore the resolution is not needed. More important, I believe, than the technical details of working out the plan is the high purpose that this resolution would serve in signifying to the Nation that the Congress favors speedy action and supports any constructive endeavor of the administration to make up for deficiencies in space programs.

Furthermore, by enacting a waiver resolution, the agencies concerned with giving effect to the transfer will proceed with firmer purpose and more precise steps in the certain knowledge that the Congress endorses, and does not intend to strike down, the transfer plan.

My proposal is not without precedent. I could cite examples of House and Senate action to move ahead the effective dates of reorganization plans submitted by the President. For example, when President Eisenhower submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 proposing to transform the Federal Security Agency into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the plan was to take effect 60 days after transmittal, according to the terms of the enabling legislation. By House Joint Resolution 223, enacted in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the effective date was set ahead to 10 days after enactment of the joint resolution. This was a matter far less urgent than the space function transfer now pending, but the Congress believed it was important to expedite action where agreement on the measure was general.

Nothing will be lost, and something may be gained, by prompt action. If the Congress decides at a later time that other transfers and reorganizations are necessary, which have not been proposed by the President, the Congress can enact legislation on its own. In point of fact, the President has submitted concurrently with the report on the transfer plan, a series of amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 designed to overcome what he now regards as certain deficiencies in the act. The Committee on Science and Astronautics, on which I am privileged to serve will, I assure you, give careful consideration to the amendments proposed by the President.

In the meantime, the prompt enactment of the joint resolution I have proposed will give the President and NASA Administrator Keith Glennan a clear field of action in one specific phase of our national space effort.

There is another useful purpose which this resolution can serve; namely, to express the sense of the Congress that the Von Braun team should remain essentially intact and be permitted to continue its teamwork in the national interest. It may be that continuance of the Von Braun team as a team is implicit in the fact of the transfer. My resolution would make this arrangement explicit through a congressional statement of policy.

Shortly before the President made his first public announcement of the proposed transfer last October, Administrator Glennan called me at my office in Fresno, Calif., and advised me of the President's intention. After a discussion of the matter, I told him that I would be inclined to support the transfer providing that it would not lead to a breakup of the Von Braun team.

Administrator Glennan assured me that the Von Braun team would be left intact, but I believe that this informal assurance, which other Members also may have received, should be translated into a formal expression by the Congress. Consequently, my resolution contains appropriate wording to that effect. While this wording is in the nature of a preamble or a declaration of policy rather than in the resolving clause, which technically is confined to excepting this transfer plan from section 302 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, nevertheless the passage of the resolution and its signature by the President will formally record the administration's promise to do what I believe the Congress wants to be done; namely, to make sure that the Von Braun team will continue to work as a team in furthering the national space effort.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], may I say that there is no legislative program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman expect to secure permission to adjourn from today until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENT FOR DURUM WHEAT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate of the United States:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1282) entitled "An act relating to acreage allotments for Durum wheat."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON BILL, H.R. 9511, TO CANCEL $15 BILLION IN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES REQUESTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several Members of the House have asked me about the status of a bill I introduced to cancel $15 billion of Federal debt obligations now being held by the Federal Reserve System.

The bill is H.R. 9511 and is fully discussed at page 264 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1960.

In order to advise any who may be interested, the correspondence between the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—to which the bill has been referred—and me concerning a hearing on the proposal is inserted herewith.

My letter to the chairman and his reply are as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: January 11, 1960, I introduced H.R. 9511. The object of this letter is to ask you for a hearing on this bill.

If a hearing is granted, it will be appreciated very much, I assure you.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

JANUARY 20, 1960.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have your letter of January 18, asking that hearings be scheduled on your bill, H.R. 9511. I am requesting a report from the Federal Reserve Board on this bill and I will advise you as soon as it is received.

With kind regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

FEATHERBEDDING

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today's column in the New York Times by Arthur Krock is particularly pertinent. Those who worried about the national welfare during the recent steel strike could well take a few minutes to peruse this article.

Last week I was on a nationwide radio program with a Democratic Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who defended featherbedding. It seems to me that the Krock article contains far more logic than any attack that I made on featherbedding. Mr. Krock suggests that union leaders would declare war on the legislator who pressed any of the suggestions that he set forth. Union leaders have already declared war on the Republican Party. Furthermore, I have been told by a number of union presidents that they were out to "get" anyone who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill. The real question is not who is out to get whom or whether it is unwise in an election year to introduce legislation to prohibit monopoly. The question is, Would the American public benefit by labor being subjected to antitrust laws similar to those now applied to business? I think they would and have asked the Legislative Drafting Service to prepare proper legislation to accomplish the tenets set forth in the Krock article.

The column follows:

ON REVOKING THE UNIONS' ANTITRUST IMMUNITIES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Prof. Dudley W. Johnson, of Lehigh University, in a letter on this page of the Times of January 18, questioned whether removing from antitrust laws the special immunity of organized labor would effectively check the unions' monopoly powers to (1) prod inflation by enforced annual wage increases, and (2) halt essential national production by control of the labor supply of nationwide industry. "Those who advocate the further application of antitrust to labor," wrote Professor Johnson, "would be doing a great public service if they would develop the details of such proposals."

This department relayed Professor Johnson's suggestion to several lawyers with great experience in antitrust litigation. The response of one, Joseph W. Burns, of 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City (which included the views of a partner, Blackwell Smith, that are precisely pertinent to the professor's inquiry), are summarized below, with some material quotes.

Burns, agreeing that "the public interest required a curbing of union monopoly power," does not believe "the antitrust laws are the vehicle by which this curbing should be accomplished. * * * What we really want is—

"Not to subject labor unions to these vague, unpredictable antitrust laws—so vague they can mean anything a court wishes them to—but to stop union practices which are against the public interest. * * * There are two separate problems. * * * One is whether legislative curbs should be placed on union economic monopoly power to balance the restrictions placed on business monopoly power. The other is whether legislative curbs are necessary to protect the public interest, regardless of whether the curbs balance restrictions on business."

When Congress, this antitrust lawyer continued, decides "at what point the public interest and convenience require that labor stop asking for more, it can write a law to cover it." Regardless of whether a strike is local or nationwide, in Burns' opinion the basic question is whether labor must give up its right to strike when a strike conflicts with the public interest, just as policemen and firemen have had to do in most States.

This view merely feeds the doubts of the antitrust approach expressed by Johnson. But in a speech several weeks ago to a business advisory group in New York City Blackwell Smith developed the details sought by the professor. "Acts to set up 'unnatural barriers' to trade and 'restrict a free market,'" he told the group, "become illegal automatically if they are used as an expansion device for [industrial] monopoly. * * * [But] matters which are obviously illegal, such as ganging up to put a man out of business, suddenly become legal if done to apply and extend union monopoly power."

Recommending the antitrust approach to the now immune labor monopoly as the only one which really goes to the heart of the matter, Smith suggested these amendments to present law:

1. The first antitrust rule for business is that "no two separate entities can combine or conspire to restrict production or control prices." Extended to labor, this would prevent a combination of all union members in separate plants to shut down an entire industry.

2. The second antitrust rule is that "no limited legal monopoly, such as the utility or the patent monopoly, can be extended to control other activities outside its own strict boundaries." This prevents such a monopoly from "forcing someone to take an unwanted product or service by tying in [these] with the controlled item [the labor supply, for example]." In following that line for unions, "featherbedding would be the first casualty."

3. The third antitrust rule is that no nonlegalized monopoly may use its power "to exclude or foreclose others, restrict production, or control prices." Extended to an industrywide union, the union "could not * * * stop production in a whole line of commerce or an entire area."

These changes in the antitrust laws meet the request for specifications, and they would narrow, not remove, labor's special immunity. However, since the union leaders would declare war on any legislator who pressed such measures, both major political parties will shun them. The attitude that "something must be done to curb the labor monopoly, but not what you suggest," will continue to prevail among lawyers and in Government. This suits the AFL–CIO very well indeed.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we all know what impact the Captive Nations Week resolution made last year upon the Communist dictatorship and upon world opinion. It struck at a great Communist weakness, by underscoring again the falseness of the Communist claims of complete unity and monolithic power.

One of these captive nations is the Ukraine which established itself as a free and independent nation on January 22, 1918. The 42d anniversary of that event will be marked tomorrow.

Tragically, the Ukrainians did not enjoy their liberty for very long. It was soon trampled by a ruthless Russian Communist Army and brought under the tyranny of Moscow. Even today this Communist tyranny continues in the form of executions of Ukrainian freedom fighters and mass deportations to Siberia.

It is clear that the flame of freedom and liberty continues to burn brightly among the more than 40 million Ukrainians. Devotion to the cause of liberty serves as a strong bond between all freedom-loving men throughout the world. On this important Ukrainian anniversary we reaffirm our support of the cause of freedom everywhere until all freedom-loving peoples may one day enjoy the blessings and richness of true liberty.

SURPLUS FARM COMMODITY UTILIZATION

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring to your attention again this legislation on utilization research designed to use more surplus farm commodities in manufacture. In the last session the other body passed S. 690. The House passed the Abernethy bill, H.R. 8639, which I am a sponsor of, on utilization research. The Department of Agriculture has just issued a splendid communication showing the wonderful possibility of using farm surplus in manufacture. I think you will find it on your desk. Please read it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that we can get the other body to accept the House version of our utilization research bill. I hope every Member of the House, as well as the Speaker, will work toward that end because the House version is much superior to the Senate version. As one man said, "In moments of controversy my perception is quite fine. I always see two points of view, the wrong one and mine." Ours is the right version.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture bulletin is as follows:

PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN AGRICULTURAL UTILIZATION RESEARCH REPORTED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 1960.

The effort to find new and wider outlets for farm products as foods and as industrial raw materials moved ahead on many fronts during the past year, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Commercial use of research results expanded in a number of important areas, and promising new results were announced that offer sizable future market opportunities for agricultural commodities. For example:

Wash-and-wear cottons gained wider public acceptance. More than 800,000 bales of cotton are now used annually as a direct result of utilization research in this field. Present cotton wash-and-wear garments represent the culmination of many years of systematic study at USDA's Southern Laboratory, at New Orleans, in cooperation with industry. The published results of these studies constitute most of the world's technical literature on wash-and-wear cottons and provided the technical basis for today's expanding production of these goods.

Use of animal fats in plastics and in livestock feeds continues to increase. USDA's Eastern Laboratory at Philadelphia developed epoxidized oils, which are now going into markets requiring about 40 million pounds of inedible fats each year. The laboratory is also responsible for the development, under contract, of fats as an ingredient of animal feeds, a market that is now consuming about 500 million pounds of fats annually. The most recent research contribution in this field is a compound called vinyl stearate, which provides a superior internal plasticizer for vinyl plastics. A market for at least 100 million pounds a year of this new chemical is expected to develop in the near future.

Dehydrated mashed potatoes are on the market in two forms—granules and flakes—both produced by methods developed through utilization research. About 20 million bushels of potatoes will be used in these products during the coming year, and even larger markets are anticipated in subsequent years.

Dialdehyde starches, a new family of industrial chemicals derived from corn, were put into semicommercial production by two companies during the year. The process for making these chemicals was developed at USDA's Northern Laboratory at Peoria, Ill. Dialdehyde starches have highly promising industrial possibilities for the tanning of leather, for production of paper products with greater wet strength, and for many other uses.

High-amylose corn, which yields starch that is more than 50 percent amylose and has attractive industrial possibilities not open to ordinary starch, is in limited commercial production. This corn and the new uses for the starch it contains is a development of Federal-State-industry research. A quarter of a million pounds of high-amylose starch was made from the 1958 crop of this new corn; acreage was doubled in 1959. The starch is now being evaluated by industry for use in adhesives, films, and paper additives.

Chemicals from turpentine totaling about 2 million pounds are being used as catalysts or initiators in the production of "cold" rubber as a result of research by USDA's Naval Stores Station at Olustee, Fla. About 90 percent of GRS cold-processed synthetic rubber made in this country utilizes turpentine chemicals developed and patented by the station.

Phosphomannan, a new product produced by fermentation of starch, is attracting industrial interest as an adhesive and thickening agent. Some 30 companies are evaluating this material and 4 have already expressed interest in producing it commercially. This recent product of utilization research at the northern laboratory offers another sizable industrial outlet for corn.

Plastic foams made from castor oil are gaining acceptance by industry. Known as urethane foams, they can be produced in rigid or elastic form. About a million pounds of castor oil were used in these products in 1958. Chemists at USDA's Western Laboratory, Albany, Calif., have recently developed methods to give these products better water resistance and shrink resistance, which are expected to expand markets for them.

Other promising recent developments include:

Water-soluble zein, a chemically modified protein of corn, potentially useful in lacquers and printing inks.

A breakthrough in the basic chemistry of wheat gluten, which was previously thought to consist of two proteins but is now known to contain six, each with distinctive properties.

A new antioxidant for alfalfa, which preserves the vitamin A and vitamin E content of dehydrated alfalfa meal for as long as 6 months.

A new cotton card—an attachment for conventional cotton textile machinery—which reduces costs, improves quality, and reduces waste in cotton processing.

A new compound, known as coumestrol, discovered to occur naturally in certain legumes, which exhibits hormone activity similar to that of the synthetic hormone stilbestrol and may provide a basis for improved feed additives.

In basic research on soybean oil, USDA chemists have made this oil radioactive by feeding radioactive carbon to soybean plants during growth. This radioactive tracer technique provides a means for following the mechanism of selective hydrogenation of the oil and will greatly aid in the development of edible soybean oil products of improved physical and nutritional characteristics.

To inform potential users and the general public of the results of utilization research and development, USDA scientists working in this field have, during fiscal year 1959, published 493 research papers in technical journals; obtained 96 new patents; issued 79 licenses for royalty-free use of patents; presented 527 talks before national audiences on their findings; participated in 78 radio and TV broadcasts, and issued 145 press releases describing their work.

In other words, three to four times each day during each of the 365 days of the year, the public was informed of some new contribution of utilization research and development, in the continuing search for new and wider uses for farm products.

Utilization research and development is a major segment of USDA's overall research program, which also includes studies of farm production, marketing, home economics, and forestry.

Funds available for all USDA research have been increased about 100 percent over the past 7 years. Yet because of increased costs, the Department's capacity to do research has actually increased only about 40 percent. The problems facing agriculture still exceed in number and magnitude the current capacity to attack them.

The aim of utilization research and development is to maintain and strengthen traditional markets for the products of agriculture and to create new markets for them. This research is conducted by USDA in 4 main laboratories and 10 smaller ones. It employs about 1,600 people, half of whom are scientists, and is supported by about $16 million in directly appropriated funds. In addition, up to $4 million a year may be spent during the next 5 years for utilization research overseas, supported by foreign currencies derived from the sale abroad of U.S. farm surpluses under Public Law 480.

The emphasis in this work currently is on expanding the use of surplus crops—the

cereal grains, cotton, and vegetable and animal fats and oils. The main effort is on development of industrial uses for these crops, as these uses offer the greatest opportunities for economic use of large volumes of surplus commodities. Research also seeks to lower processing costs for food and feed products, and to develop products that have built-in convenience and are less perishable than those now available.

Worthwhile new uses for farm products must be practical uses. Scientists today can make anything from agricultural products that can be made from other organic raw materials, such as petroleum. But utilization research scientists recognize that they must create from agricultural materials the properties desired in the final product, and that the final product must be able to sell at a competitive price. They are not interested in "one-shot" uses for farm commodities that are not economic—for example, industrial alcohol from grain, when technical feasibility has been demonstrated but economic practicality has not.

Like all research, utilization research is necessarily a continuing job. Research constantly seeks to outmode the products it creates. It must continue to improve the products it has developed and to develop still more satisfactory products to replace them.

The outlook is good for increasing substantially the use of agricultural products. For example, in the case of cereal grain an additional 500 million bushels per year can be used by 1975 if research is able to do its job in the following areas:

One hundred and seventy million bushels for use in paper products. Today about 20 million bushels of grain are used in these products. But if we can modify grains or their starches to endow them with new properties of value in papermaking, improved paper products might be made that would contain as much as 5 percent of cereal grains.

One hundred million bushels for industrial chemicals and other nonfood products. Each year, some 40 million bushels of grain go into such products as surface-active agents, antioxidants, polymers, plasticizers, packaging films, chemicals for metallurgical processing, and many other materials. New chemical products now under development from USDA laboratories offer potential outlets for an additional 100 million bushels.

Fifty million bushels for use in producing biological agents for pest control. Work now under way by USDA scientists indicates that it may be feasible to grow biological agents for control of insects and other farm pests using fermentation techniques with cereals in the nutrient medium. An example is milky spore disease of Japanese beetles, which at present can be produced only on the insects themselves.

Two hundred and fifty million bushels in food products. In the food use of cereals there is opportunity for increased consumption and a need for new cereal food products to encourage it. If we ate the cereal products our nutritionists say would be good for us, the United States by 1970 should consume about 925 million bushels of grain a year as food, instead of the 675 million bushels currently consumed.

Another example is the potential large-volume market for agricultural raw materials in the plastics industry. Use of plastics in our economy is expected to continue expanding by leaps and bounds. Today's total annual consumption of plastics, about 6.6 billion pounds, may well increase to some 10 billion pounds by 1965 to supply demands for such products as packaging and industrial films, molded and extruded products, plastic foams, containers, paints, and synthetic rubber.

Agricultural raw materials are suitable for the manufacture of a multitude of plastic products, if they can be made economically. The vegetable and animal oils, starches, and proteins are good starting materials for plastics production. The aim of utilization research is to place farm-grown materials into as much of this expanding multi-billion-pound market as we can as rapidly as possible.

Research can create expanded markets for farm products. It already has. How many new products and new markets can be developed, and how fast, depends on the size and vigor of the effort devoted to the task.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, January 22, the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence will be observed in ceremonies throughout the country. Commemorated in the hearts of more than 40 million Ukrainians, this day provides us with an opportunity to reaffirm our adherence to the principle of self-determination for all captive nations peoples.

Ukrainian independence was first proclaimed January 22, 1918, following the collapse of the czarist Russian Empire in 1917. Unfortunately, this long-sought freedom lasted only until 1920, when the Ukrainian Republic was overrun by the Communists and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Empire. Despite the ensuing years of tyranny and subjection, the Ukrainian people have kept alive their cherished goal of national freedom and independence.

The courage of the Ukrainian people stands as an inspiration to all liberty-loving people who are dedicated to the preservation and restoration of human freedom everywhere. On this anniversary all Americans join in the prayer that the captive peoples will soon once again be free.

INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to abolish the legal ceiling on bond interest rates at this time is a poor way to turn off the faucet of bank credit from adding its flood of purchasing power to the existing inflationary spiral.

I maintain that the present tightening of credit has been a deliberate man-made effort to drive up interest rates to their present artificial rates, with the cooperation of Wall Street, the bankers, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve Board was organized to aid the fiscal activities of the Government. It has available many weapons, such as open market operations, the discount, and the reserve requirement, to establish interest rates at any level up or down to enable the Government to borrow long-term funds without breaking the interest ceiling.

President Eisenhower has asked for authority to release the control we now have over all the interest rates on long-term Government indebtedness. If this were done, hundreds of millions of dollars in bonds could be issued bearing a 5½- or 5¾-percent interest rate and extending into 20 or 25 years. When Government, through the constitutional right to regulate the value of money, ceases to regulate it by surrendering to the economic royalists, we are then crossing the thin wavering line between liberty and tyranny.

Raising the interest ceiling would take money out of the pockets of a great many of the people in order to find its way back into the pockets of a few. It would decrease the real incomes of all people receiving fixed incomes, and prices would be higher and each dollar would buy less. It will drive up the cost of homes, hospitals, schools, and roads; and the burden of these increased costs would be placed upon the backs of our citizens.

A careful study of the situation reflects that at one time when interest rates were held down, it would have been possible to refinance the long-term debt. It makes me wonder why the administration waited until the interest rate was at the highest point before it asked for the change. It seems to me that there is a fundamental principle of fiscal policy involved in this matter of interest rates that should be met head on with candor and courage, and that the soundest policy to follow would be the retention of the present historical interest ceiling.

PASSENGER TAX SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message for the fiscal year 1961 proposes to extend for another year present excise tax rates. In the same message the President emphasizes that fiscal progress is attainable only if economic growth is not interrupted.

The truth of the matter is that retention of the excise tax on the domestic transportation of persons is inconsistent and in conflict with economic growth both in the transportation industry itself and in those industries that use and depend upon transportation of passengers.

I am convinced that the reduction of the transportation tax from 10 to 5 percent as of June 30, 1960—which was voted in the last session of Congress—must be carried through to its logical conclusion by a complete repeal this session.

I take this position on the basis of three important considerations which, in my opinion, should be controlling.

First of all, there is no question but that this tax tends to depress business and discourage patronage of our domestic transportation facilities. Both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission, in statements by their respective Chairmen, have emphasized that consumption of transportation is elastic and increases with reduced cost. Both Chairmen specifically stated that removal of the tax would result in substantial additional commercial revenue for the air, rail, and surface transportation companies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is self-evident that our airlines, our railroads and our bus companies are vitally dependent upon increased passenger revenues if they are to survive. I read with great interest the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Mr. METCALF and Mr. HERLONG, who proved conclusively that our transportation establishment is at a crossroad.

I firmly believe we cannot afford to jeopardize the economic life of these companies by continuing a tax, an avowed purpose of which was and is to discourage the use of transportation facilities.

Moreover, the brake on business this tax imposes is not confined merely to the transportation companies whose revenues are thereby artificially curtailed. The depressant effect extends to every business that requires or uses our domestic passenger facilities.

A second objection to this tax is that it discriminates unfairly against a number of important classes of people and areas. It discriminates against long haul passengers and areas in this country where average travel distances, due to geographical factors, are great. South Dakota is a good example. Because of the great distances between cities in this region and because there is great reliance on commercial transportation, these passengers pay more taxes to travel than passengers in the East where distances between cities are substantially shorter.

Moreover, the tax discriminates against States that depend on tourism as an important business. Because the tax increases the cost of travel, it acts as a deterrent to tourists traveling, for example, to visit the beautiful Black Hills area of South Dakota and nearby Mount Rushmore.

The tax discriminates against business activities in which travel of personnel is necessary as distinguished from businesses that do not necessitate travel. It discriminates against the transportation of passengers as compared to the transportation of freight, for which Congress has repealed the tax. It discriminates against domestic travel as compared to travel abroad, for which no tax is levied.

One of the most important inequities of this tax is that it discriminates against the lower income brackets. For people in the lower income brackets a 10-percent premium on the right to travel can make the difference between being able to travel or not.

The tax discriminates against our international-flag carriers and handicaps them in their competition with foreign-flag carriers. My distinguished colleague from the State of Florida cited the very appropriate example of a Paris, France, to Dallas, Tex., flight wherein a passenger buying his ticket from a U.S.-flag carrier would be taxed on the portion of the trip within the United States whereas he would not pay the tax if he purchased the ticket from a foreign carrier.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this situation affords the foreign carrier a formidable pricing advantage and I certainly concur with my distinguished colleague that incalculable amounts of revenue are being lost by our international-flag carriers as a result of this tax.

Finally, I believe that when the offsetting factors are subtracted from the gross yield of the transportation tax, it is clear that this tax is an unproductive one. Some of these offsetting factors that reduce the $225 million gross yield are the following:

First. Businesses deduct the dollars spent on the transportation tax from the total on which their income taxes are assessed. This results in approximately $70 million in deductions per year which must be subtracted from the gross yield.

Second. Every dollar of domestic commercial revenue that is discouraged by this deterrent tax reduces the total available for taxation under other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Third. Every dollar of commercial revenue lost by our international U.S. flag carriers by reason of the price handicap imposed on domestic portions of flights abroad similarly reduces the total available for taxation.

Fourth. Every dollar of earned commercial revenue that is discouraged and diverted from the subsidized local service or helicopter industries by reason of this tax must be supplied by Federal subsidy, and offsets the transportation tax yield dollar for dollar.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this tax cannot be justified on fiscal grounds. The truth is it is questionable whether it produces any net revenue, and it is clearly true that whatever the net yield, it cannot justify the discriminatory and depressant features of the tax. I submit that this tax is a potent factor interrupting and impeding this Nation's economic growth, especially the transportation establishment, and that it should be repealed in its entirety this session.

Consequently, I believe the President's recommendation to extend the excise tax on transportation would tend to defeat the purpose we all agree is vital—the uninterrupted growth of our economy. I am hopeful that this session, for the first time, the question of repeal will be permitted to come to the floor for a vote, and I am confident that if it does the tax will be repealed.

REPORT ON RUSSIA BY VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 407 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed ten thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on Russia by Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, United States Navy."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all the language in lines 1 through 6, inclusive, and insert the following—

"*Resolved*, That there shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled 'Report on Russia by Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, United States Navy'. Of these additional hearings, five thousand copies shall be prorated to all Members of the House of Representatives, and five thousand copies shall be made available for the use of the House Committee on Appropriations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR (FEBRUARY 1959)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 408 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed four thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on the International Geophysical Year (February 1959)".

With the following committee amendment:

On line 2 strike out the word "upon" and on line 3 strike out "requisition of the chairman thereof,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACTS ON COMMUNISM: VOLUME 1, THE COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed thirty thousand additional copies of said document of which six thousand shall be for the use of said committee and twenty-four thousand copies

to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to ask the gentleman if these have been cleared with the minority members of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They have been cleared with the minority members of the committee and also with the minority leader.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 10, after the word "Representatives" insert a period and strike out the balance of line 10 and lines 11 and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document the publication entitled "Nomination and Election of the President and Vice President of the United States, Including the Manner of Selecting Delegates to Political Conventions"; and that there be printed an additional fifty thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives, said copies to be prorated to the Members and Resident Commissioner.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of our late colleague in the Congress, and a personal friend of mine whom I admired very much, Senator William Langer, we have lost not only a colorful political figure, but one who had a rare capacity for friendship, and above all, loyalty to the principles and policies that he believed in. I was proud to count Bill Langer among my closest, personal friends. He was a legislator of stalwart independence of thought and action. His courage as a legislator was outstanding and well known to all. Bill Langer was a formidable debater, a legislator and public official of consummate skill and one who served, with great devotion, his constituents and his friends.

Our late friend, Bill Langer, enjoyed a good fight and he was loved and admired by countless of thousands of persons, even by some who did not wholly agree with him because of the fact that he was a fighter. Typical of the way his constituents felt about him was the often quoted remark: "If a farmer complained he had no washer for his wringer, he could depend on his old friend Bill to get it for him." This determined his state of mind in helping others who came to him, particularly the sick, then unemployed, and the underprivileged. The above saying dramatizes a very real trait in Bill Langer's character and this trait was naturally ingrained in him. The more one needed Bill Langer's help, the surer such a person was that he would come to their aid with all the driving force and energy of his great heart and able brain. For Bill Langer was not a fairweather friend. He was the kind of a friend who loved to find an opportunity to give aid when it was really needed.

It was just like him to stay with his late wife, Mrs. Lydia Langer, in her illness all through the bitterly contested campaign of 1958. While he was up for reelection in a hard-fought campaign, he did not make a single campaign speech, staying at the bedside of his wife and stating, "I just won't leave Lydia." This is the kind of love and devotion between husband and wife that is an inspiration and example for all others to follow.

In the passing of Bill Langer, one of the most courageous and distinguished political figures in the legislature of our Nation, has taken the journey into the Great Beyond. Those who knew Bill Langer and the nobility of character that he possessed, will greatly miss him.

To his loved ones left behind, Mrs. McCormack and I extend our deep sympathy to them in the great loss and sorrow. I know that the outstanding life that their late father led, his great courage in the many years that he rendered public service, and his noble outlook of life, will always be a source of consolation to them.

THE CHALLENGE OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, as this Nation confronts the challenge of economic competition with Soviet Russia, it is becoming apparent to more and more Americans that victory or defeat hinges to a large extent upon the degree of responsibility exercised by those who represent labor and management at the pinion of our free economy: the bargaining table.

Clearly, we can fall far behind and lose out in this vital struggle if we, as a Nation, should be so foolish as to forfeit the advantages of our free economic system by continually indulging in prolonged nationwide strikes, inflationary wage settlements, or by refusing to utilize efficiently the technological advances which increase the rate of productivity.

The preservation of free collective bargaining—as well as our free enterprise system itself—depends, I believe, upon a rapid development, in the ranks and leadership of both labor and management, of an enlightened and responsible outlook which takes into account the national interest and the public good.

Now that the steel strike settlement has granted the leaders of management and organized labor a brief reprieve—it should be apparent to them that they must raise their sights a notch toward higher ground. If they do not, someday they could find themselves hanging together on the gallows of government dictation.

The responsible approach of government to the difficult problems we face in this field must be essentially nonpartisan—nonpartisan in the sense that neither labor nor management should receive favored treatment for the sake of political gain or selfish economic advantage. This does not mean that both sides are always equally guilty in every labor dispute. However, it does mean that government bears a solemn, fundamental obligation to hue strictly to policies which are in the overall best interest of the Nation.

Because these considerations are so vital, the people are looking for an answer in this election year to the question: Which party is better able to provide the kind of leadership that is needed in this field?

While I gladly tip my hat to those rugged individuals on the other side of the aisle who have dared at times to rise above partisan pressures; nevertheless the fact remains—as was pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]—that the Democratic Party is seriously and hopelessly divided against itself.

Clearly, the Republican Party—as the party of unity, with democracy within its ranks and a philosophy based upon principle—is the party which is better equipped today to provide the kind of responsible, nonpartisan leadership so essential in this explosive field of labor-management relations.

In considering the relative positions of labor and industry today, it is significant to note that they have gone through somewhat similar cycles of development. Both are now powerful, gigantic economic forces in America. That was not always the case. The credentials of the Republican Party for leadership in this field are underscored by a review of the development cycles of these two economic forces.

THE RISE OF INDUSTRY

When our Constitution was written, industry was an underdog compared to the vast agrarian interests, the plantation owners, and shippers. Alexander Hamilton grasped the importance of encouraging industrial development. He advocated protectionist policies that

paved the way for the rise of industrial capitalism. By the 1890's, however, far from being the underdog in our economy, industry was reaching the monopoly stage.

Unreasonable transportation rates oppressed the farmers. The vast financial power of industrial monopolies stifled the growth of a labor movement. Industrial monopolies moved into the political realm and, in effect, put legislators on their payrolls.

In the face of this situation, Theodore Roosevelt republicanism came to the front and provided an opportunity for the people of America to demonstrate that they, not the captains of industry, were still the boss. Earlier a Republican-controlled Congress, in 1890, had passed the first antitrust law. Theodore Roosevelt and later, William Howard Taft, led a crusade to break up the trusts which had placed special interest above the public good.

Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft did not evaluate industry's relative position by looking in a rearview mirror. Instead, they saw the difference between Hamilton's day when industry was down under, and their day when industry was up on top.

With enactment of the antitrust laws and the enforcement which gradually followed, anguished cries came from some business leaders that the laws, restraints, and enforcement would stifle industrial growth. The opposite was true. The restraints restored freedom and competition in industry at large and improved the general health of our economy.

THE RISE OF LABOR

Now, let us turn to the rise of the labor movement. In many respects, its development parallels that of the earlier rise of industry.

For several reasons, the labor movement in America began in an underdog status. Unions were confronted with the difficult job of proving to the public and prospective members that they supported a free enterprise economy and that they would not become instruments of violence and gangsterism.

Realizing this, important American labor leaders of an earlier day rejected the goal of political power. In building the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, for example, had one objective—the betterment and growth of the laboring man. He refused to set off class conflict. He strongly supported the free enterprise system. And, as to the inside workings of the union, one biographer says that he believed the labor movement should be "a voluntary organization of wage earners with mutual problems and common ideals. He—Gompers—put his faith and trust in voluntary principles and never wavered in that course."

As labor unions grew in membership and economic power, the aims of some labor unions began to change. During the period when the Sherman antitrust law of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1914 were taking privileges and immunities away from business, the labor movement was being granted—and rightly so—some special immunities. But all labor leaders did not exercise the statesmanship of Gompers, and as the 20th century wore on the special immunities of organized labor were soon being abused by some leaders.

Some unions made a mockery of democratic rule. They resorted to various forms of coercion. In some unions, an iron curtain was virtually drawn between the union rank and file and their union leaders.

A comparison is apparent with the earlier rise of industry. In both cases, abuses sprang out of special immunities which each enjoyed in their infant stage.

As the public in earlier decades had demanded business reform, so did the public last year demand labor reform. Just as the Republicans had provided leadership in the movement for business reform, so did Republicans again provide leadership and support in the drive for passage last year of the bipartisan labor reform bill.

SIMILARITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

So, we see a great similarity in the rise of industrial and union power in the United States. For labor and management alike, Republicans have supported and led the fight for remedial reform legislation. Enactment of the Sherman antitrust law, the Taft-Hartley Act, and the labor reform bill of last session all indicate that, when the overall public good is endangered, the people will rise up to assert their will, and that Republicans historically have provided the vehicle for reform in both business and labor.

Looking to the future, union and industry leaders, as partners, must cope realistically with the problems which arise through technological advances. There is no statesmanship in union policies which fight progress through featherbedding and outdated work rules.

At the same time, good management must approach these problems with understanding and patience, and a realization that sometimes work habits cannot be changed overnight.

The union movement and the whole Nation have just as important a stake in the goal of increased production as does industrial management. For it is greater production through cheaper and more efficient means that has brought the majority of our craft union workers into the middle income group in America.

How do we attain increased production which will place more and better goods at lower prices in the hands of more consumers?

By increasing the efficiency of the tools in the hands of the workers. And these tools come into being in a free economy through the investment of funds that have been saved. Yes, tools and industrial jobs come from savings. And, parenthetically, it is important to add that the willingness of people to save depends upon their confidence in the stability of the currency. Their confidence in the stability of the currency is undermined and destroyed when wage-price spirals continually fan the flames of inflation.

Some enlightened labor leaders are becoming concerned over the fact that foreign steel now can be sold in Cleveland $55 per ton cheaper than steel produced right in Cleveland. To meet such foreign competition, union leaders as well as management should be crusading for, not against, better tools, greater plant modernization and increased productivity.

Enlightened union leaders are justifiably concerned about the price of the products produced by their members. In the face of stiff foreign competition, union members are confronted with the grave and real threat of being priced out of their jobs.

THE RECENT STEEL SETTLEMENT

Against that background, I should like to discuss some aspects of the recent steel strike settlement.

It should be clear that if the settlement eventually results in higher steel prices, steel workers as well as consumers will suffer.

Although many people throughout the country are understandably disturbed about the possibility of inflationary effects, there is another side of the steel strike settlement which should not be overlooked. The head of one steel company has put it this way:

> We have been in this wage-price spiral for 20-odd years. You can't stop a great wave dead in its tracks all at one crack. We have made a great effort * * * to stop it. * * *
>
> Now, the settlement, as actually made, gives an advance of about half in the next 3 years of what we have had in the past 3 years. That's a pretty fair step forward.

Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has noted that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from the recent steel settlement will be 3½ to 3¾ percent. In other steel settlements during the postwar period, says Mr. Blough, hourly employment costs have been rising at an average rate of 8 percent a year. It is significant that the postwar trend has been cut in half by the recent settlement.

It is interesting also to compare the average annual increase in employment cost resulting from the recent steel settlement with the increases involved in settlements made in other related industries during 1959:

Aluminum industry, 5.2 percent.

Can industry, 4.5 percent.

Kaiser—steel—3.82 percent.

Steel, 3.75 percent.

Although many people are not satisfied with the terms, the settlement of the steel dispute can be viewed as a constructive achievement for another reason. Whether we like it or not, 1960 is an election year and the political fur is flying.

A resumption of the steel strike would have brought urgent cries for immediate legislative action. Such legislation could not have been considered in an atmosphere of calm, unemotional deliberation. On the contrary, there were understandable fears about the kind of legislation that might have been enacted under such circumstances.

In discussing the considerations and pressures which finally brought about the settlement, one steel executive said this:

The thing that really ended the matter—really what finally made us capitulate—was the politicians in Congress.

The real pressure that developed was the fear of a Democratic Congress and what they would do if they had to meet an emergency. If there was a threat of a resumption of the strike, Congress would be proposing all kinds of laws to prevent it, and these laws would not be the kind that would be carefully considered or thoughtfully discussed. They would be emergency laws passed in order to force a settlement of the strike. It was the fear of that kind of law, as well as the threat of the steel strike being resumed, which most of us thought would do a lasting damage to our employer-employee relations and to the whole country.

Vice President NIXON and Secretary of Labor Mitchell have been subjected in some quarters to charges of political involvement in the steel settlement. Paradoxically, they actually helped to extricate the steel dispute from the mire of politics, in a highly political year. In a real sense, the settlement has given the process of free collective bargaining another chance for survival.

However, in my view, the steel settlement has not lifted from Congress the responsibility to study, in a calm and deliberate manner, the problems involved in nationwide strikes, and to consider possible changes in existing laws.

I believe that one basic principle should underlie consideration of such future legislation: It is sounder and wiser to limit the power of those who violate the public interest than it is to heap on mountains of Government controls. If the Government eventually becomes a price and wage fixer, we may have curbed monopolistic practices in labor and business—but, in so doing, we will have created a gigantic monopoly of Government.

There have been suggestions of laws to create rigid factfinding boards before a strike occurs. There is a real danger that such boards could be quickly turned into political weapons to administer prices and wages. Let us pause and think deeply before rushing to enact such legislation.

Much more commendable for immediate implementation is the suggestion advanced by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union address. He said:

The national interest demands that in the period of industrial peace which has been assured by the new contract, both management and labor make every possible effort to increase efficiency and productivity in the manufacture of steel so that price increases can be avoided. * * *

It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth.

DIFFERENCES IN THE WAYS REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS FACE THE AGE AHEAD

The immediate duty of my party, and of every Member of Congress, is to do his utmost to enlighten the public about the crisis we face in the labor-management field. For if the public is awakened, the special interest groups will also begin to realize that labor as well as the whole Nation benefits through increasing production, maximizing inventive genius and technology, encouraging savings for new investment to create new jobs, providing noninflationary wage increases to put more money into consumer hands, and promoting national growth of a dynamic and creative economy.

Unfortunately, I fear that many of my colleagues in the other party continue to view the future through a rearview mirror, reflecting the depression decade of the thirties. Many Democrats, particularly those who follow the line of the Democratic advisory council, continue to tag themselves as "reactionaries" and "partisans" by standing timidly and fearfully on the threshold of the 1960's. Seemingly, they prefer to spend all their time squabbling over the way the cake is sliced instead of helping to bake a larger cake so everybody can have a bigger slice.

Republicans, on the other hand, believe that we must move with the times and not live in the past.

We believe that our contest with communism depends upon forward-looking statesmanship—from union leaders, from management, from this Congress, and from each political party.

We believe that we can preserve our free enterprise system and continue to promote the prosperity of labor and of all Americans.

In closing, I call upon Republicans and all my colleagues in the Congress to address themselves with renewed vigor and imagination to the call of industrial statesmanship. For, with responsible leadership and faith in a dynamic America, men of good will can advance to new horizons in human understanding and economic progress in the decade of the "soaring sixties."

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted from portions of a recent article by Columnist David Lawrence, which appeared in the January 18 issue of the Washington Star. I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the Washington Star, January 18, 1960]

THE STEEL PACT IN GRAY AREA

(By David Lawrence)

Executives of the various steel companies have been reviewing what really happened in the settlement of the steel strike, and most of them have come to the conclusion that maybe the final agreement reached was not as bad for them as it has been painted.

There is a tendency to agree with what President Eisenhower said about the pressure of circumstances, rather than the pressure of Government, as the paramount influence in bringing about the settlement.

The head of one company put it this way:

"We have been in this wage-price spiral for 20-odd years. You can't stop a great wave of that kind dead in its tracks all at one crack. We've made a great effort in the steel business to try to stop it. We made some mistakes as we went along but, by and large, we tried our best to slow the thing down.

"Now, the settlement, as actually made, gives an advance of about half in the next 3 years of what we've had in the past 3 years. That's a pretty fair step forward. The thing that really ended the matter—really what finally made us capitulate—was the politicians in Congress.

"The real pressure that developed was the fear of a Democratic Congress and what they would do if they had to meet an emergency. If there was a threat of a resumption of the strike, Congress would be proposing all kinds of laws to prevent it, and these laws would not be the kind that would be carefully considered or thoughtfully discussed. They would be emergency laws passed in order to force a settlement of the strike. It was the fear of that kind of law, as well as the threat of the steel strike being resumed, which most of us thought would do a lasting damage to our employer-employee relations and to the whole country. We would have had a difficult time ever getting repeal of the drastic, ill-considered legislation that would have been passed."

The head of another steel company believes the adverse nature of the settlement has been overemphasized. He says:

"No one, of course, could ever say this settlement was a victory for the steel industry, for we did not accomplish our main objectives of a noninflationary settlement and change in work rules which would promote efficiency. Nevertheless, as Mr. Blough, of United States Steel, pointed out, we did reduce the rate of increase in employment costs to about 3¾ percent as compared with an average of 8 percent throughout the postwar period. This is no mean accomplishment. In addition, we alerted the public, including the steelworkers, to the importance of the work-rule issues, and one may hope that this could bring some fruitful results as time goes along.

Some writers contended, for one thing, that if the industry had settled on the union offer of 15 cents an hour prior to the strike, this would have meant 37½ cents for a 30-month period as compared with 41 cents in the actual settlement. The kind of 15-cent-an-hour offer made by the union prior to the strike was the same as the 1956 settlement which resulted in an employment cost of 81 cents an hour for the 3-year period. This is exactly what would have happened had we accepted the original so-called 15-cent offer. The union never counts the related costs of wage increases—for overtime, holiday pay, vacation pay, etc.—nor did they at that time look with favor at any limitation of the cost-of-living clause.

"In addition, some writers painted the picture of the Kaiser settlement as being more favorable than the industry's settlement. This is not true. The Kaiser settlement cost about 5 percent per annum as compared with 3.75 percent for the industry settlement. The Kaiser wage increase becomes effective July 1 as compared with December 1 for the industry. Furthermore, the industry has an offset against the 3-cent cost-of-living clause in excess insurance costs; Kaiser has no such offset. In addition, the industry is settled for an extra year which is in itself an advantage. A settlement which was better than the Kaiser, can industry, aluminum or copper settlements also was quite a remarkable achievement.

"So what am I saying? Simply that this deal was not 'all black' nor 'all white.' It was in the gray area. If those who believe

in this cause keep at it, additional progress can be made with the hope that intelligent people can truly arrest inflation over a reasonable period of time."

Both the foregoing expressions from executives of two important steel companies were spontaneously made, independently of one another, in an informal review of the controversy. It is conceded that, while the industry paid a heavy price in the cost of work interruption, the drawing of public attention to the basic issue of work rules was a gain in a long-range sense for management.

Just what the political gains or losses will be remain yet to be determined. The administration's position is that it acted as an informal mediator and that it made no promises about future legislation and gave no sanction to any agreement on prices. The steel men say privately that each company will have to decide for itself whether or not to increase prices and when such prices would go into effect.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on the statement he has just made. I think he has analyzed the problems extremely well. He has made a valuable contribution not only by analyzing the differences between the two parties in their approach to this subject but also to the general thinking of all of us with respect to the problems that exist.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the gentleman's discussion he has outlined that the Republican Party has since 1890 backed up the antitrust laws. He states the Republican leadership has carried out the enforcement of those laws. Then he made a reference to the relation of labor in connection with the antitrust laws.

The question I want to ask is this: Is it the Republican Party's position that organized labor should now be under antitrust laws?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman has called attention to a subject that is very complex. There are some who believe that all problems in this field could be solved in one swoop simply by subjecting labor unions to the Sherman antitrust law. I do not agree.

I am not saying that labor unions automatically should be brought under the same antitrust laws that apply to business. However, I do believe that some type of reasonable monopoly control, tailored fairly and appropriately to fit labor organizations, should be considered by the Congress along with other legislative proposals which bear on the cause and effect of nationwide strikes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on the excellence of his speech.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

THE CHALLENGE OF ENLARGING ECONOMIC FREEDOM FOR OUR CHILDREN: PART I. THE PERILS TO ECONOMIC FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the opening speech of this series, the chairman of the Republican policy committee noted four qualities which we consider essential for successfully meeting the challenges of the age ahead. Indeed, any party that would go through the 1960's without these qualities would be merely a conspiracy to gain power, a machine devoted to self-serving ends, an organization incapable of meeting the opportunities of the age.

We now shall consider the challenge of preserving—even more of expanding—economic freedom for future Americans. I shall review the economic peril to freedom. The following speech of this series will present a dynamic program for us to roll back this peril, and actually enlarge economic freedom for our children. For a party to comprehend this challenge requires that party to possess the fourth essential quality: It must have a perspective which projects beyond immediacy and temptations to live each day for the political advantages thereof, and sees America as it must be in the year 2000 and beyond.

Today, because of our foreign policies outlined in earlier speeches of this series, no American boys are now fighting with weapons of war to preserve the freedom of our children. But, a fierce decisive war is being waged on another battleground to preserve the freedom of those children. That is the battleground of the American economy. The battle is between two diametrically opposed groups: the one which thinks fiscal responsibility amounts to being miserly with the Federal purse strings, that it is a negative, standpat, hold-the-line approach. The other group is convinced that fiscal irresponsibility is a deadly enemy that can put our children in a harness with no escape, and that continued irresponsibility can so tighten the harness that those children will be defenseless before the Sino-Soviet economic competition.

We Republicans firmly believe that the destruction of freedom by fiscal irresponsibility can occur in two ways:

First. By the vast Federal expenditures which inevitably create new bureaucracy, more federalization, and greater centralization in Washington. The octopuslike growth of such statism sends tentacles into every crevice of American life. By subsidizing activities, it can subsidize ideas, from the top down, as in a totalitarian state.

Second. It can occur because of the mammoth Federal expenditures from an unbalanced budget which undermine the value of the dollar, suck the average American into a whirlpool of inflation and rising taxes. This treats with brutality persons on fixed incomes and pensions and gradually destroys the freedoms of choice and action of each member of every American family—father, son, housewife, and daughter.

This is tyranny.

Strangely enough, we seem to have forgotten that such tyranny is not new to our history. It is as old as the struggle between the Colonies and the Crown when these United States were formed.

The tyranny George III imposed on the Colonies was one of mercantilism—a centrally directed economic system in which London dictated to every colonist, deprived him of freedom, and weighed him down with unjust taxation.

This drove the Colonies to military revolt, just as today bureaucracy, inflation, and high taxes are driving the average American to a sense of frustration—the feeling that his Government is something apart from him.

THE BIRTH OF ECONOMIC TYRANNY IN OUR TIME: THE RATCHET WHEEL

How did an American society which bled in such a valorous overthrow of taxation and bureaucracy in 1776 fall prey again in our day to the same economic forces?

The road back to economic tyranny began during the depression of the 1930's. The Roosevelt administration met the dilemma with short-range expediency for immediate needs. Indeed, those needs were staggering, and much had to be done to take care of the wants of thousands of innocent victims of a financial crisis.

Plainly, some social and fiscal improvements were needed in our capitalistic economy. But many responsible Americans were horrified when they realized New Deal policies were heading us, pell-mell, toward permanent deficit financing and subsidization. In such modified socialism, they saw accumulation of tremendous economic and political power by a Government bureaucracy.

The New Deal started in motion a one-way economic ratchet wheel that has never been stopped.

The teeth of this inflationary ratchet wheel spin against a catch of reckless spending. It can whirl in but one direction—the way of higher prices. It is not reversible. Since the New Deal, it has spun dizzily and continuously on a spoke of economic ruin. Every new click means a higher price. Each revolution produces a debt carryover from one administration to another, from one generation to another. For all time, every turn destroys a part of the dollar.

The inflationary ratchet wheel was started ostensibly to get more money into the hands of the underprivileged. What began as a plan to soak rich Peter to pay poor Paul, however, resulted in soaking Paul to pay Paul. Eventually, the masses of the people who were to have benefited under this plan found themselves in the grip of rising taxation and discouraging inflation.

In applying the inflationary and deficit financing cure to the malady of unemployment, the Roosevelt administration made the illness worse. This is now clearly recognized even by most members

of the other party. I quote from a February 26, 1959, speech of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES]:

But, Mr. Speaker, let us face the fact that the New Deal failed in its second major objective, which was to restore full employment and prosperity to our country. In 1940, more than 8 million Americans were still unemployed; 14½ percent of the working force.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a table documenting the lack of effect of New Deal policies on unemployment:

	Deficit (billions)	Unemployed (millions)	Percentage of unemployment
1931	$0.5	8.0	15.9
1932	2.7	12.1	23.6
1933	2.6	12.8	24.9
1934	3.6	11.3	21.7
1935	2.8	10.6	20.1
1936	4.4	9.0	16.9
1937	2.8	7.7	14.3
1938	1.2	10.4	19.0
1939	3.9	9.5	17.2
1940	3.9	8.1	14.6

War orders beginning in 1939 pulled us out of that depression.

Two other unemployment cures of the New Deal equally failed. First was the cheap money policy, and its corollary, low interest rates. Ironically, from 1933 to 1939 unemployment increased as interest rates were lowered.

Secondly, those administrations encouraged labor leaders to follow monopolistic practices by injecting inflationary wage hikes into the expiring body of economic soundness. Both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations favored a rising wage schedule, regardless of production and its effect on inflation. These escalator clauses, as much as any other single factor, produced an inflexible, irreversible, inflationary pressure. Today, union members have administered wages, rather than competitive wages. The shortsighted worker believes this system of regimentation protects and helps him. But, the longsighted worker knows that eventually it will hurt his prosperity, as well as destroy purchasing power, and his freedom.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations applied similar economics to farm prices. Millions of dollars were poured into a parity system. Prices were maintained at high levels. Uneconomic farmers were subsidized in a type of farming that was not to their best interests. Their products were priced out of the real market, but were maintained by artificial supports financed by other groups in our society.

Today, everyone agrees the farm program is critically sick, that surpluses have become a national headache. Subsequent administrations never can entirely undo the harmful effects of Roosevelt and Truman policies in the field of agriculture.

Here again we pause to consider how important is that fourth quality of a wise political party: The long-range perspective to see beyond immediacy and easy temptations of any particular crisis, any special month or year. Sincerely, I do not believe that either of those two administrations would have inaugurated this tragic farm program, if Scrooge's Ghost of the Future could have let them stand for a moment with us now to see the monster their easy solutions created.

I turn now to specific examples of how this tyranny of deficit financing has oppressed different sectors of our society. And please note that in each case, we Republicans like to think in terms of real disposable income—that is, the real purchasing power from the income of an individual or a family. In other words, the gross national product is not the sole measure of our economic health. The real disposable income, or the family spending and investing money, is a much closer thermometer of the freedom and prosperity of our citizens.

Consider first the tyranny of inflation over the pensioned: What has happened to the real disposable part of a $1,200 pension between 1939 and 1959? The following table which I shall insert reveals that due to inflation, it lost 52.1 percent of its value:

Year	Yearly amount received by pensioner	Purchasing power of the pension
1939	$1,200	$1,200
1953	1,200	623
1959	1,200	575

It is significant to note that the inflation which almost cut the purchasing power of pensions in half during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations was to a large extent arrested during the Eisenhower administration. I believe it would have been totally arrested had the Republicans controlled Congress.

Next, consider the tyranny of inflation over the widow: For years, one head of a family sacrificed to provide for his survivors. His principal provision for his widow was in life insurance—almost $30,000 worth—that he took out in 1929 just before the depression. He had given up many vacations in order to pay up his policy, but he was comforted by the thought that after his death his widow would have few financial worries. When he died in 1953, his $30,000 policy was worth only $19,230 in terms of purchasing power of the dollar when he took out the policy.

Thirdly, consider the tyranny of inflation over the school teacher: Based on nationwide statistics, the average college faculty salary has risen almost three times since 1939. That looks good on the surface. But, when you account for the effects of inflation and taxes, a married faculty member with two children was $47 better off in 1939 than today. So, it would appear that the gigantic spending programs of the previous administrations, which in 10 years caused our dollar to lose half its value, hurt rather than helped our college faculties. There should be a lesson in this for those who seek federalization of education as the way to meet Russian competition.

Lastly, consider the tyranny of taxes and inflation over household spending money: Taxes and inflation have prevented the average American family from increasing its real disposable income as rapidly as our growing economy warranted. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a table showing the tyranny of spenders on an average family:

Year	Average family income in terms of that year's dollars	Minus taxes	Real disposable family income in terms of purchasing power of 1940 dollar
1929	$2,908	$2,821	$2,305
1940	2,247	2,171	2,171
1950	5,195	4,716	2,748
1953	6,147	5,375	2,814
1959	7,328	6,438	3,110

It becomes apparent that between 1940 and 1959 the average family income increased by $5,081 in terms of paycheck figures, but it increased by but $939 between 1940 and 1959 in actual value after accounting for increased taxes and inflation. During a period when the gross national product increased over four and one-half times, the real household spending money had increased considerably less than one time. Why? Because of the legacy of the New-Fair Deal inflationary and tax policies.

Let us account for some of the 1958 money a typical American family receiving $5,000 did not get because of taxes. The Federal income tax took $491, and as an average, other Federal taxes took $147. Then there is the startling figure of the economists—$173—which is the share of the Federal taxes on corporations which is passed on to the consumer in terms of higher prices. Directly, $811 has disappeared from that $5,000 earnings. It has reappeared in Uncle Sam's pocket. This does not take into account the purchasing power lost through inflation.

Of this $811, $38.50 went to support farm prices, $4.12 went to provide rural electricity, $4.99 went to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and $85.56 went to pay the interest on the national debt. So, let us turn to this national debt.

DEBT RESPONSIBILITY

Who is responsible for this debt whose annual interest payments cost that $5,000 breadwinner over $85 a year?

Is it the Executive or the Congress? Treating the executive first, I now request consent to place in the RECORD a table which demonstrates conclusively that since the turn of the century, over 90 percent of our debt increases occurred during Democratic administrations.

(See table A.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The second table I shall insert reflects the spending record of the Congress. During this century, when the opposition has controlled the House of Representatives our national debt has been increased by over 100 percent of our total present debt. During the 26 years the Republicans controlled this body, the debt was reduced.

(See table B.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. My point in including these tables is to show that the other party while in the White House and in control of Congress—whichever approach is used—has had the characteristic of high spending. It has the tendency to downgrade the

importance of fiscal responsibility. I realize that the last three wars have occurred when that party controlled the White House and Congress. These wars did contribute greatly to our staggering national debt. Perhaps the fact that that party was in power when wartimes demanded deficit spending bred in it the habit of peacetime deficit spending, or to put it another way, the short-range crisis viewpoint of all problems.

In any event, much of this high spending during peacetime was done under the guise of kindness to the common man, a kindness, unhappily, which turned into a tyranny over the common man.

We have already seen whom this tyranny oppresses. We took examples of the elderly living on pensions, the widow, the dedicated schoolteacher, and the typical American family that becomes bonded to taxes and rising prices. These were groups especially hurt by the 50 percent decline of the dollar from 1939 to 1949. These are not the millionaires, not the society of the rich. These are the common everyday people that make up this great country.

That leads me to another observation about the second quality we have called essential to a political party being beneficial to the Nation. I refer to a coherent political philosophy based on principle. The political philosophy of the opposition party supposedly has been one of helping the common man. Yet, we see now how the New and Fair Deal philosophy perpetuated beyond the crisis which gave it birth, has boomeranged to hurt the common man. In other words, this philosophy about helping the common man by the economy of deficit spending is a camouflage of true facts.

Will some constructive thinkers accuse us of dwelling too much on the past? Will they say that the depression of 1929 to 1939 was indeed a difficult dilemma, as was the postwar adjustment of 1945–1949? Will they maintain that at least the Democrats tried different solutions, and even if they erred on the side of an expediency that hampered the dynamic forces in our economy, at least we should give them credit for experimenting? At least, should we let the dead bury the dead?

Here is how I answer:

Were this dead past really dead, I would agree not to disturb it. But, as we enter a decade of tremendous promise, that dead past reaches out and clutches at our economic vitals until we realize it is not dead at all. Especially the Democratic advisory council has made an idol out of those past policies of deficit spending, inflation, and subsidization. Apparently it intends to apply them to the decade ahead, if an advisory-council-sponsored President again enters the White House.

The Democratic advisory council still lives in the 1930's. They peer through that rearview mirror and attempt to apply to our prosperous economy the same program of regimentation which started our economic difficulties in the first place. Their methods can steal from our grasp the opportunities of the age ahead. The advisory council's Leon Keyserling has become the economic spokesman of his group and his philosophy is that deficit spending is the road to prosperity.

The Democratic council thus far has been unable to comprehend what made America the greatest producer, the most prosperous Nation in history. The American inventive and productive genius has given us our standard of living. Every American, and especially every worker, has had a direct interest in our industrial capitalism. And it is the duty of government to be continually watchful that industrial monopoly does not destroy that interest of the worker.

At least until recently, the Marxian concept that wages and profits are in conflict has been disbelieved in America. And if it is beginning to be believed now, responsible are the two previous administrations which encouraged union monopoly to demand higher and higher wages even when inflationary, and even when destructive of the creative capital necessary to give the unemployed new jobs.

Yet, the advisory council has no legislative or executive power today. So, the Congress cannot altogether shirk the blame for its attempt to perpetuate these New-Fair Deal policies since the exponents of those bizarre policies departed from the White House and took refuge in the Democratic advisory council.

Since then, this Congress has been controlled by the opposition for nearly 6 years. The spending actions of the majority clearly illustrate another inherent lack in the opposition party. I speak of the lack of unity, the first quality we called essential for the decade ahead.

The other party is the product of political disunity. And ironically, it does win its congressional elections through the use of political disunity, by dividing the people into special interest groups and promising each group whatever it asks. Because it does not have any unifying principle behind the political philosophy, a candidate in the Far West can run on a platform conflicting with that of a candidate in the Deep South, or on the east coast.

In effect, those candidates, when in Congress, can reconcile their differences by each taking what they want from the Treasury. This is government by special interests. The cumulative results of government by special interests, as we noted earlier, is enlarged centralization, and rising prices. Now it reaches proportions where it becomes that economic tyranny we discussed.

There are indeed discerning Democrats who do have strong economic principles which they would not sacrifice and bend for political advantage. Let not my indictment be taken as a mass indictment of everyone in that party. But let my indictment be taken as an indictment of that party as a nationwide party organization. That organization, because of its disunity, cannot possibly stand on one principle, one philosophy, which it can and will serve. Such is its tragedy as it faces the challenges of the age ahead.

Naturally, these conditions of its existence make it impossible to center its attention on the problem of preserving economic freedom for future Americans. And today those disunities make it impossible for it to serve the average American consumer, such as the housewife buying household goods. Rising prices hurt every family in America.

In the subsequent speech of this series the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] will outline ways that Republicans propose to stabilize our economy, so that the consumer and the family will be protected. He will outline ways for economic freedom to be enlarged for all our children.

We Republicans are in a position to carry out this program, because we possess party unity, party philosophy based on principle, party democracy, and party foresight for future generations of Americans.

TABLE A.—*Executive debt responsibility*

[In millions]

	Increase	Reduction
1901–13 (fiscal years 1901–13) Republican		$81
1913–21 (fiscal years 1914–21) Democratic	−$22,463	
1921–33 (fiscal years 1922–33) Republican		1,761
1933–52 (fiscal years 1934–53) Democratic	−239,405	
1953–59 (fiscal years 1954–59) Republican	−19,321	

TABLE B.—*Congressional debt responsibility*

[In millions]

Fiscal years	Majority party responsible in Congress (House)	Debt increase	Debt reduction
1901–11	Republican		$78
1912–19	Democratic	$23,260	
1920–31	Republican		7,898
1932–47	Democratic	238,272	
1948–49	Republican		6,608
1950–53	Democratic	13,078	
1954–55	Republican	7,297	
1956–59	Democratic	12,024	

NOTE.—These tables are compiled by the surplus or deficit of each fiscal year for which the President in table A and the Congress in table B were responsible (although not necessarily in office that year).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the presentation the gentleman has made is one of the most forceful and all inclusive on the question of inflation and deficit spending that I have heard. I think the problem he discussed is the most serious problem facing this country today. Inflation and deficit spending have stirred me to the point where I believe that unless drastic steps are taken by this Congress to reduce spending we are going to be in very serious trouble.

I just wrote to a constituent recently about what happened in France a few weeks ago. You may know that up until a few weeks ago the franc was of little value, but since that time the French people are handling something that they have not seen since their grandfathers' day—a franc which is worth 20 cents, which is what its traditional value should be. But in order to get this they had to turn in 100-franc notes, which

means that inflation had reduced the old currency to 1 percent of its former value.

The point is that if inflation in the United States runs as far as it has in France, the dollar will be worth a penny. That means that 100 paper dollars will be needed to buy one hard American dollar.

This inflation in France has run for 40 years. Ours has gone for about 20 years. So today, if we were to get a hard dollar, we would have to turn in two for one. If we go the way of the French, then we are going to be in the same situation that they had to correct, because they have had to fight the wars that we have, of course, but in addition they have spent a great deal of money that they did not have for many social schemes, wherein they were trying to do something for the so-called common man. As a result, they are in this trouble. They have now corrected it by this great sacrifice on the part of all of their people.

I certainly commend the gentleman, and I hope that his words will ring throughout the country.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for his contribution also. The gentleman is correct when he says there are many lessons we can learn from the French. Another lesson is the effect it has on the country when you have a monopolistic situation between big labor and big business. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], who just preceded me, mentioned this.

The idea of such a monopoly, of course, would be that if big labor wanted a wage increase it would go to big business and big business would give the wage increase, increase prices and in the end the consumer would pay the bill. That happened in France for many years. One of the things which the now President of France, I am sure, is trying to correct is that situation where nobody thought of the consumer at all until it became too late. I certainly hope that here in the United States we will learn that lesson before we find ourselves in the situation economically that the French find their great nation now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the history of many nations of Europe is a sad blending of tragedy and misery, of woes and vicissitudes, but that of the Ukrainians is almost uniformly one of unmitigated and unrelieved suffering. It is almost beyond comprehension how a nation of so many, today numbering some 42 million, could be held down for so long by unwanted alien rulers in their homeland, yet that is a tragic fact in the modern history of the Ukrainian people. Since the middle of the 17th century, this large body of gifted, industrious and gallant people have not been allowed, except for the brief period of 1918–20, to enjoy the fruits of free and independent life in their historic homeland. Through the turns and twists of fortune they have not been the masters of their fate. They have been held down under the unrelenting hand of alien despots. They have endured hardships, privations, misery. They have been ruthlessly oppressed and persecuted for clinging to their national ideals, for dreaming and cherishing their independence and freedom. Yet no oppressive measure, no amount of severe persecution was to force them to abandon and forgo their yearning for freedom. Oppressions and persecutions united the Ukrainians against their foes, and toward the end of the First World War, when the Czarist Russian regime was overthrown, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence and established the Ukrainian Republic.

That was done on January 22, 1918. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian Republic, thus born amid joy and jubilation, was surrounded by powerful and greedy enemies, all eager and anxious to pounce upon the new state. Early in 1920 the Ukrainian Republic was attacked by surging Communist forces. Soon the country was overrun by the Red army; then all Ukrainian opposition was ruthlessly crushed and the Ukraine's independence brought to an end. Since then, for nearly 40 years, the country has been submerged in the vast Soviet Empire. During all that time, the Ukrainians have been suffering under Soviet totalitarianism. Of course, all peoples under Soviet tyranny suffer, but some suffer more than others, and some have suffered for a longer period of time than most. But the 42 million Ukrainians who constitute the second largest ethnic element in the Soviet Union have perhaps suffered more, have sacrificed more, both in the number of victims and in wealth, than any other minority group. They have borne the heavy yoke of the Kremlin longer than any other minority group in the Soviet Union. They have died in concentration camps by the millions. In slave-labor camps, in prisons, in the distant Siberian wilderness, they have been driven to starvation and death. The Soviet regime has been hard and harsh on all nationality groups, but particularly so on the individualistic and independent-spirited Ukrainians. Fortunately, Communist totalitarian dictatorship has not been able to break the spirit of freedom among them. These people have struggled against their oppressors, fought them with all the means at their disposal, even though for taking such a stand they have paid a terrible toll in human lives.

Today the once-prosperous and productive fair Ukraine is a land of the unhappy and the unfortunate, where all its inhabitants are held down and ruthlessly oppressed by the agents of the Kremlin. The whole country is practically sealed off from the free world. There is no trace of freedom. The country is one large prison for its inhabitants, and they all are driven to work under all sorts of hardships and privation for their Soviet overlords. Their most cherished possession is their spirit of freedom. Inhuman Kremlin agents have resorted to every trick, have used every means of torture to deprive the Ukrainians of this priceless possession, but, fortunately, they have not succeeded in their task. Today, even under the most relentless of totalitarian tyrannies, the stout-hearted Ukrainian clings steadfastly to his national ideals and still preserves his fervent love for freedom.

On the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day I am glad to join these liberty-loving Ukrainians in the celebration of their National Independence Day.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has every right to take full pride in the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution last year. As we approach another summit, all Americans should reread this resolution, which is now Public Law 86–90. We should also examine the reasons why Khrushchev was unusually perturbed by this resolution.

Among the captive nations listed in the resolution is Ukraine. On this observance of the 42d anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine it is most fitting to include in my remarks a study made of the resolution and its effects by its originator, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. To my knowledge his article, entitled "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," is the only documented study of this congressional achievement so far. The article appeared in the September 1959 issue of the authoritative East European journal, The Ukrainian Quarterly.

Professor Dobriansky, who is also the national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, analyzes in this study both the resolution and the Presidential proclamation, and traces the immediate consequences of these documents up to Khrushchev's article in foreign affairs. I believe that after carefully reading this study each Member of Congress will be firmly convinced of the necessity to concentrate our efforts on the majority of captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

The indicated article by Dr. Dobriansky from the Ukrainian Quarterly follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by the U.S. Congress last July, is now a vibrant part of living history. Its impact on international events was unmistakably shown by the reaction it produced in Moscow. Many were taken by surprise with this reaction, others viewed it as the expected. The resolution and the Presidential proclamation which is based upon it were immediately subjected to all sorts of analyses.

Some held they were bad; a number favored them but contended that the timing was poor; and many hailed the event in every respect. Most commentators, analysts, and newsmen in this country never really grasped the full meaning and significance of these documents. Worse still, a number of them in their typical haste garbled up the facts leading to the passage of the resolution.

In the judgment of this writer the world has not heard the last of these documents. Their deep importance is yet to be revealed in thought and action. Their influence will still be felt in many quarters of the world. Vested in them are possibilities and prospects which time itself will unravel and cause to be realized. Particularly here in the United States the potential developments suggested by the contents of these documents are so immense and promising that at this time a methodical exposition of all aspects surrounding this subject is clearly necessary. Because of its historical bearing, the subject deserves close documentation and study. An examination of the documents themselves, a description of the background to their realization, a systematic review of the chief events produced by them, and a brief analysis of the subject with an eye to its futural significance would be in order in any such study.

PUBLIC LAW 86–90 AND THE RESOLUTION

To appreciate the total meaning of the resolution, it is obviously a sine qua non for one to read every clause in it. Unfortunately, too many who were quick to comment on it, failed to meet this requisite. Their comments plainly showed this. The resolution is now Public Law 86–90, a law of the land. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania,, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such people through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as 'Captive Nations Week' and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

Since it was this writer who substantively provided and wrote these clauses, in addition to the basic ideas of the resolution itself, he regards the following as the essential ideas of the measure: (1) the unity-in-diversity nature of our own Nation, (2) the farce of peaceful coexistence of nations with an existing Iron Curtain, (3) the belated recognition of the majority of the captive nations in the Soviet Union, (4) the awareness of Rusisan Communist imperialism and colonialism since 1918, and (5) the basic, determining position of the captive nations in our worldwide strategy against Moscow's cold war threat. These are the essential political views in the resolution which are in complete accord with history and provide fundamental guidelines for American foreign policy. In order to interpret accurately the reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's outbursts against the resolution, one must first comprehend perceptively the meaning of these ideas. Nikita the Sanguine, more than anyone else, fully and instinctively understood the pointedness of truth in the resolution and responded accordingly. It not only disturbed his present plans of political-psychological ruse for the American people but also frightened him with its possibilities in the cold war which he has absolutely no intention of ending. For him to end the cold war is like taking a motor out of a car and expecting it to operate.

These fundamental ideas must be borne in mind if any sound analysis is to be made of the resolution. Before one embarks on this analysis, he should draw certain evident comparative observations between the congressional resolution and the ensuing Presidential proclamation. The proclamation that was issued by President Eisenhower contains the following:

"Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

"Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

"Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

"Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

"Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

"Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

"In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1959 and of the Independence of the United States of America the 184th."

Now, a comparison between this document and the preceding one shows instantly the marks of historical devaluation, a supposedly softening tone, and some befogging of the issues and identities. The proclamation was drafted and prepared in the Department of State. By professional bent the Department's members are addicted to diplomatic circumlocution and fringe expressions of the truth that obfuscate calling things by their right names. However, the proclamation had to be alined with the resolution and the latitute for verbal sophistry and obfuscation was in this case somewhat more restricted than is ordinarily the case. Nevertheless, many who read the proclamation without bothering to scan the underlying resolution wound up with the same platitudes and misconceptions about the captive nations. In short, they missed the crucial point of the whole event, including the reasons for Khrushchev's explosion.

It should be evident to the careful reader that certain sloppy and imprecise terms were introduced into the situation by the proclamation. Soviet communism is a meaningless abstraction without any objective foundation. The motivation for its use is the misleading desire not to implicate the Russian people for what Moscow does. Stubborn facts show that the imperialistic and colonial enterprise is peculiarly Russian, but, according to some, we are not to be guided by facts. Woodrow Wilson had no theoretical difficulties in differentiating between German imperialism and the German people and thus designating the first as our clear-cut enemy. Nor had Franklin D. Roosevelt with regard to Italian fascism, German nazism, and Japanese imperialism. Today, we are asked to pursue phantoms rather than be guided by historical experience and properly identify the enemy. The resolution clearly identifies the enemy; the proclamation fails to do this.

Another equally and purposely confusing term is "Soviet-dominated." The undiscriminating reader cannot but leave with the impression that this means dominated by the Soviet Union. If, in the light of the resolution, this point were raised, the Department would defend itself by pointing out the general scope of the proclamation which speaks of captive nations "throughout the world" and alludes to nations "on every continent." Briefly, guarding itself in this manner, it would hold that a meticulous reading of the proclamation would indicate a complete conformity with the resolution since all the captive nations are implied by these inconspicuous phrases. On this score, its defense is invulnerable. The drafters of the proclamation could, moreover, argue that "Soviet-dominated" means dominated by Soviet Russia which, historically, is the case since 1918. In this, too, it squares off with the resolution. Quite plainly, the

letter of the law is met with, but the intention to crystallize the truth differs between the resolution and the proclamation. In the cold war, some fail to realize that tremendous capital gain can be obtained by properly exploiting the truth. Paradoxically, it is usually the same individuals who will protest violently against using the methods employed by the deceiving Russians. A proper exploitation of the truth means to face it squarely, precisely, and unqualifiedly. This, more than anything else, can destroy the deceptive designs of Moscow. The resolution does this, and the result proved it.

In spite of all this, the President deserves our highest praise and compliments in issuing, forthrightly and courageously, this historic proclamation. His defense of the action taken grew bolder as the days went by. There aren't superlatives enough to praise adequately the act of leadership shown by the Congress on an extraordinary bipartisan basis. In years to come, more so than now, the wisdom and vision of this act will be fully comprehended.

THE BACKGROUND TO THE RESOLUTION

The background to the resolution is an interesting one. The idea was conceived a year ago when this writer was on the faculty of the National War College. Then, as now, he was increasingly concerned over the growing indifference in many American circles toward not only the status but also the strategic value of the captive nations. Then, as now, the chief thrust of Russian propaganda was in the direction of obtaining American accession to the vast empire built by the Russian Communists since 1918. When Mr. Khrushchev speaks of "peaceful coexistence," he means nothing more than American acquiescence to the permanent security of his empire. His two-fold purpose in obtaining this guarantee of the territorial integrity of his empire is to gain time for its consolidation, which would come easy with the broken wills of the captive nations, and to secure further his base for cold war operations in the open field of the free world. This situation existed last year as, indeed, it exists today.

In planning any such resolution a ripe condition is necessary. The occasion presented itself with the Russian Communist murder of Imre Nagy. The writer prepared a concurrent resolution on Captive Nations' Days in which he interested Congressman CRETELLA, of Connecticut. Mr. CRETELLA submitted it with a prefaced address on July 2, 1958.[1] Those who now call for a Captive Nations' Year might be reminded that this original resolution was designed to observe the independence and other historic days of the captive nations throughout the year. The aim was to keep the subject of national captivity steadfastly before the American public. When the resolution was considered by the House Judiciary Committee, its chairman broke a tie vote and cast his vote against it. One of the chief reasons given in opposition to the resolution was that it involved too many days of observance. From a psychological point of view, this was a valid objection. Obviously, the alternative was to compress the observance within the span of a week.

This year two occasions arose for a propitious reintroduction of the idea, namely the Geneva Conference and the forthcoming visit of Vice President NIXON to Moscow. Both occasions were sufficiently close to our own Independence Day which carries its own symbolic weight. Making allowances for developments over the past year, the resolution was revised in both form and content but the essential political ideas were preserved. A comparison of the two resolutions will readily show this. The target period was, therefore, the week following the Fourth.

For several reasons the writer sought the cooperation of Senator DOUGLAS but insisted from the start that the measure must be bipartisan. He recommended Senator JAVITS of New York to cosponsor it in the Senate and indicated that a similar bipartisan basis would be formed in the House. The cooperation extended was exemplary and most encouraging. It underwent some changes in style and wording, but the substance throughout remained intact. This writer has even to redress a few of these stylistic changes in order to preserve the meaning of the resolution.

On June 22 Senator DOUGLAS introduced the resolution which became known as Senate Joint Resolution 111.[2] Senator JAVITS, of New York, joined with him. It was originally planned to have the resolution on the table in the Senate for 2 days. However, in order to permit extensive cosponsorship the period was lengthened to a week. In this time the writer employed facilities to inform the majority of Senators of the resolution and this opportunity for their cosponsoring it. In addition, the committee of which he is chairman swung into action to alert all interested organizations and groups of what was transpiring. In the meantime, on June 23, Congressman BENTLEY, of Michigan, introduced a parallel measure in the House, numbered House Joint Resolution 435. By the end of this week in June, the Senate measure was being cosponsored by Senators Moss, Bush, Lausche, Scott, Hartke, Green, Dodd, Humphrey, Hart, Neuberger, Keating, Young of North Dakota, Engle, Curtis, Langer, Morse, and Case of New Jersey.

Once this action was completed, increasing attention was given to it by individuals and groups who communicated with the legislators and expressed their support of the measure. Because of the shortness of time, after the resolution was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, it was decided to amend the observance period to the third week in July. The decision was made to allow time for the preparation of ceremonies in the event that the measure passed the Congress and the President issued a proclamation. Concerning the time coincidence with the NIXON visit, Senator DOUGLAS was perfectly correct in stating that this was unpremeditated. However, as far as this writer was concerned, it really made no difference whether the week would be proclaimed immediately after the Fourth or in the third week. Due to the new elements contained in the resolution, Khrushchev would have exploded before NIXON'S visit as well as during it.

The resolution was unanimously passed by voice vote in the Senate on July 6. In large measure, Senator EASTLAND, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was responsible for this expedition. He cannot be thanked too graciously for his foresight and solid support. On this, the vicious and nonsensical comments on the Senator's role by Walter Lippman, who curiously on one day wrote favorably about the resolution and later strongly opposed it, need not be taken seriously. With the momentum increasing in tempo, the sturdy House majority leader, Congressman MCCORMACK, then entered into the picture to facilitate the passage of the measure in the House. Meanwhile, Congressman FEIGHAN, on July 8, introduced House Joint Resolution 459 to parallel the amended measure of the Senate.[3] The Congressman from Ohio told the House that in our so-called negotiations with Moscow on Berlin and other issues, it is "nothing short of amazing that the subjugation of the captive millions throughout the Communist empire has not even been mentioned."

The role played by Congressman MCCORMACK was crucial to the passage of the resolution in the House. His efforts, too, cannot be praised enough. When he presented it on July 9, he declared that "this is a very important resolution that will have tremendous effect on the minds of men and women everywhere throughout the world who are subjected to Communist dictation and who desire to be free under their own law."[4] Congressman BENTLEY, a sponsor of the resolution, joined with the House majority leader to see its passage through. Congressmen JUDD, WALTER, and others spoke eloquently in favor of its passage. The measure was unanimously passed by voice vote on July 9. Despite the limited comments of some observers, it is difficult to see how any right-thinking American could possibly object to the contents of this resolution. The speed with which it passed Congress in itself attested to the solid contents of the resolution.

As indicated above, on July 17, the President issued his proclamation. Events moved swiftly the following week. Church ceremonies were held in many cities and on July 23, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO stated: "The observance of 'Captive Nations' Week' by the American people has provoked Mr. Khrushchev to more bluster and to still louder threats. This outburst by the Soviet dictator is only a demonstration of the inherent weakness of his sprawling slave empire." At one of the President's news conferences the question was raised as to whether Mr. NIXON had a strike against him before his departure for Moscow. The President answered in part: "Well, no. I wouldn't think of it in that way . . . I don't think there is any specific relationship between the two things."[5] The fact is that there was a very definite relationship. However, it is significant that the following Sunday, the President joined in prayer for the oppressed nations at a Presbyterian Church in Gettysburg, Pa. The minister, Rev. Robert A. MacAskill keyed his sermon to the proclamation and rightly declared: "Communism is doomed. It is doomed because it denies the divine origin of humanity and the authority of God. The verdict is already pronounced."[6]

This writer sent a telegram to the President which in part was referred to by David Lawrence whose column lauded day after day both the resolution and the proclamation.[7] The first paragraph of the message read: "As the originator of the Captive Nations' Week idea and resolution, I cannot adequately express in words our profound gratitude for your well-worded proclamation and also for your personal participation in a prayerful observance of the Week in Gettysburg, Pa." It should be emphasized that Mr. Lawrence was one of the few commentators who grasped the full import of the resolution. His articles make for worthwhile reading on this vital subject. Later, there were others, too, who developed its significance. The following month, for example, George E. Sokolsky wrote an article on "The Captive Nations" in which he said: "Nevertheless, it has been characteristic of Russion history that what the Russians take, they never give up willingly. Russia has been like a rolling snowball, gathering size as it rolled on and on." He rightly observed further "that all Russians smile when they

[1] H. Con. Res. 347, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 104, part 10, page 12989.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, pages 11398–11399.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10, pages 13006–13007.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 10, pages 13116–13117.

[5] Transcript of news conference, UPI, July 22, 1959, No. 1.

[6] The Washington Post, Monday, July 27, 1959, p. 1.

[7] David Lawrence, "U.S. People and Khrushchev," Washington Star, Aug. 6, 1959.

see Americans. It looks more like a belly laugh watching the fools part with their money." [8]

THE MUSCOVITE REACTION

Were the resolution and the proclamation embarrassing to the Vice President? Was this operational move illtimed? Was it an unfair provocation directed at colonial and imperialistic Moscow? These were questions raised when the violent reaction set in from Moscow. To each of these questions, the writer answers in the negative. But before substantiating our answers, it is necessary to review the type of reaction produced by the two historic documents.

The resolution and the proclamation struck as a lightning bolt in Moscow. Khrushchev precipitously decried the resolution and viewed as vague NIXON's aim in coming to Moscow. In Warsaw at the time he rather foolishly railed, "The only enslaved peoples are in the capitalistic countries." [9] The blunt speciousness of this statement is sufficient to indicate the complete bankruptcy of his position. A report from Warsaw that the "proclamation of this week as Captive Nations Week in the United States had hit a raw nerve here" couldn't have been more aptly stated.[10] Radio Moscow screeched and Pravda chimed in with a half-page blast against the United States. Great perturbance was displayed over the "coincidence in the timing" of the proclamation and NIXON's visit. Moscow viewed the resolution as a "new provocative anti-Soviet campaign." One begins to wonder who is hysterical when he reads these cries of pain and Khrushchev's further spasm that this "hysterical campaign" of "petty provocation" proves that "panic-stricken monopolists * * * are losing the faculty of controlling their own actions." [11]

To this writer, such evidences of Russian political behavior are typical and normal. They confirm a historically based interpretation that once the grizzly bear is cornered, he'll howl and bellow but his fear is paralyzing. Peoples and nations who have bordered Russia for centuries, like the Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Georgians and others, know this truth best. Khrushchev's tirade at the Soviet-Polish Friendship Rally in Moscow that Captive Nations Week was a "direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs" is an old Russian technique to deflect any world interest in the imperial and colonial spoils of Moscow.[12] Actually, the affairs of the Soviet Union per se are no more internal than those of a jailer incarcerating independent, innocent citizens. Khrushchev knows this all too well, and he fears it morbidly. In fact, as the UPI dispatch well observed, "At the end of his 40-minute speech, as if unable to get the subject off his mind, Khrushchev returned to the 'enslaved peoples' theme." Truly, the marks of a worried tyrant. Such mouthings as "It would be a good idea if NIXON, who has just landed, would come and have a look at the 'enslaved people' gathered at this stadium," are even politically childish. Indeed, his captive audience may well have been doubly captive.

The profound effectiveness of the resolution and the proclamation is further seen by the Russian puppet opposition to it. The puppet Czech regime, for example, lodged its protest against Captive Nations Week, dubbing it "a new American provocation and a hostile act." [13] Other puppets reacted similarly. Needless to say, puppets could hardly react differently.

Further enlightening evidence of the deep penetration made by the resolution and proclamation was furnished in the NIXON-Khrushchev exchanges. The Bear just kept whining with pain, showing to the world his weakest organs. Before the television cameras, Khrushchev again cried, "I cannot go on without saying it—if you would not take such a decision (Mr. Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Peoples Week) * * * your trip would be excellent." Then the professed atheist blurted, "why this was necessary God only knows. What happened?" [14] The answer to his question is quite obvious. The American people are not as naive as he presumes them to be. The theatrics of controlled cultural exchanges, international cocktail parties, futile talkathons and other superficialities do not blind the American people to the real issues. Without this Captive Nations Week event and its impact, Moscow would have kept on deceiving itself on this score.

The additional exchange at Khrushchev's villa even makes for comical reading. The New Class host suggested that NIXON "take a boat ride on the Moskva River so you can see how our slaves live." [15] To which NIXON (chuckling) said: "Yes, the captives." Later, when they were in the boat, "crowds gathered around and Mr. Khrushchev each time pointed to them and said 'captive people.' They replied, 'No, no, peace and friendship.' * * * Mr. Khrushchev poked Mr. NIXON in the ribs in good humor and said: 'Here are your captives. You can see how happy they are.'" These and other occurrences clearly add up to a troubled mind. The Vice President doubtlessly was aware of the old Potemkin Village trick which Khrushchev played on him with these selected crowds.

So deeply had the resolution-proclamation pierced Moscow's most sensitive chord that lesser lights joined in the Bear's whining chorus. When NIXON met the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Matskevitch, this old MVD functionary immediately launched into the Captive Nations Week subject. "The Soviet people," he exclaimed, "were surprised and alarmed that the Senate passed the captive people's resolution." [16] Of course, there is no real entity such as "the Soviet people" to be alarmed about anything. The alarm was sounded in the Kremlin alone. It is interesting to note, also, that reference to the resolution is in terms of "captive peoples," although the resolution precisely speaks of nations, emphatically including those in the Soviet Union. In the area of foreign consumption, this important distinction is one that Moscow consistently seeks to avoid. About this time, too, Pravda again assailed the United States for the resolution, calling it "a coarse, dirty venture of American imperialists." Also significant is the fact that when NIXON prepared for his Siberian tour, Khrushchev made a flying trip to always restless Ukraine to deliver a self-assuring address.

U.S. REACTION TO THE REACTION

The reaction on the part of some of our officials to this Muscovite reaction appeared to be one of puzzlement. As one report had it, "U.S. officials are somewhat puzzled and slightly annoyed, but also amused, by Soviet irritation over President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week." [17] To this writer, it is not surprising that they were puzzled because very little study and imagination have been exercised by our Government with regard to the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. This, above all, was the new and most vital element in the resolution which stunned Moscow.

At another news conference, the President gave his reaction in response to a question on timing. This reaction is most important for us to note. The President said: "I said frequently that the United States would never believe and never accept the idea that a true peace had been established in the world until every single nation had the right to express its own views about its own destiny, and said the United States would always use whatever peaceful methods were available to it to bring about this opportunity." [18] These are extremely powerful words that deserve every measure of careful implementation in deed, especially, as concerns the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. This can be done with the most minimum of risks of a hot global war.

In the Senate, the most eloquent reaction to the reaction was expressed by Senator KEATING, of New York. "Mr. President," he stated, "the finest testimonial possible to the importance and effectiveness of Captive Nations Week is to be found in the yelps of anguish emanating from Premier Khrushchev and other Red leaders. We have hit the Communists where it hurts them and their blithering rejoinders about interference in their internal affairs merely points up what a tender spot the plight of the enslaved peoples is in their wall of iron." [19] Much of the same was expressed by private American citizens. For example, Francis B. Stevens, formerly with the State Department, wrote in the following vein: "For Mr. NIXON, the trip has been even more revealing. He has seen two very sensitive Soviet nerves exposed, as evidenced by Khrushchev's massive abuse of the American interest in the fate of the captive peoples, within and outside the Soviet Union, and the livid rage of the Soviet press at the U.S. standard of living displayed at the American Exhibition." [20] The Vice President seemed to sense this when, in reply to Matskevitch's troubled observation, he uttered: "We will have differences from time to time. We disagree with your comments on this resolution."

There were a few newspapers, commentators, and others who criticized the resolution-proclamation. Curiously enough, some used the very same spurious points which punctuated the Muscovite reaction. An editorial in the Washington Post, titled "Irritating the Bear," advanced arguments on poor timing, peaceful coexistence, the exclusive alternative of war, and embarrassment to the Vice President.[21] A number of these arguments grace Moscow's propaganda portfolio. Popular reaction in Washington to this writer's reply to the editorial was extremely encouraging and comforting.[22] Another of these few examples was the article by Henry N. Taylor in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. He, like Khrushchev in a recent article, questioned the inclusion of Ukraine, Georgia, and other non-Russian nations in the resolution.[23] Failing to understand the basic importance of this inclusion, not to speak of the purpose of the resolution, the author reveals his own pitiful

[8] These Days . . . "The Captive Nations," Aug. 19, 1959.

[9] The New York Times, July 22, p. 1.

[10] The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 23, 1959.

[11] The Washington Post, July 24, p. A8.

[12] UPI, press dispatch, Moscow, July 23, 1959.

[13] AP, Prague, July 24, 1959.

[14] Reuters, Moscow, July 24, 1959.

[15] AP, Ernest Barcella's notes, Moscow, July 26, 1959.

[16] The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 25, p. A-3.

[17] AP, July 23, 1959.

[18] UPI, Transcript of news conference, July 29, No. 20.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 14060-14061.

[20] U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 10, 1959, p. 39.

[21] The Washington Post, editorial, "Irritating the Bear," July 24, 1959.

[22] The Washington Post, editorial page, July 29, 1959.

[23] Henry N. Taylor, "We Preach: Do Nothing—United States Gives Lipservice," July 27, 1959.

lack of knowledge concerning East European history when he makes the supposedly determining point that these areas were taken over by the Czars, "some as far back as 75 years before Nikolai Lenin." Compared with the popular American reaction to this whole development, these few critical sources stand out like sore thumbs.

THE PURPOSE AND MEANING OF THE RESOLUTION

The above documented review of events demonstrates sufficiently the undeniable impact and effectiveness of the resolution. The timing of the resolution couldn't have been better, though by happenstance the week coincided with NIXON'S visit. Had the observance been 2 weeks before, the Muscovite reaction would have been the same. Pavlov's dog wasn't trained in Russia without purpose. Moreover, the resolution was in no way embarrassing to NIXON. On the contrary, it provided him with a God-sent opportunity which, for reasons of his own, he took only partial advantage of. Spurred by what he witnessed, he did decide to visit the only captive nation of his tour, namely Poland. While in the U.S.S.R., his tour never went beyond the territorial bounds of Russia. It is an open secret that NIXON was not allowed by Moscow to travel in the captive non-Russian countries within the Soviet Union. Had he traveled in Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, one wonders whether the reception wouldn't have surpassed his Polish experience. Moscow didn't take any chances. Should the President finally decide to visit the U.S.S.R. this fall, it will be interesting to see if the same restriction will apply. Then, too, the President himself saw no embarrassment to NIXON. Really, in short, the parties that were embarrassed and showed it angrily were the Muscovite captors.

On the subject of embarrassments, that caused the Rumanian legation here, which was concerned with the Rumanian exposition in New York, or to the Polish Embassy and its fake celebration of the 15th anniversary of the "Manifesto of Independence," our concern couldn't be less. When Czech Russian puppets in the diplomatic colony denounce the resolution-proclamation as "a gratuitous insult," it is abundant enough to know from whom it comes.[24]

Reflecting accurately and impeccably the history of Russian Communist imperialism these past 41 years, the resolution lists those nations as captive which have, directly or indirectly, fallen under the foreign domination of Moscow. Obviously, the basic criterion is the destruction of national independence. In this fundamental sense the Russian nation cannot be construed as captive. There is no doubt that in the sense of a search for surcease from domestic totalitarian tyranny there are many Russian captives. But with equal doubtlessness, they weren't the ones in Khrushchev's packed stadium or on the Moskva River. It goes without saying that we should always hold out to these individual captives the hope for democratic rights and liberties. But the best and most efficacious way to further this hope is by striving to cut the institutional nexus between Russian colonial imperialism and domestic Russian totalitarianism. The one feeds on the other. This nexus has existed for centuries and is the key to Russian imperial power, whether under the Whites or the Reds. About the domestic end of this nexus, one of our commentators couldn't have stated it more effectively when she wrote recently: "One of our problems in dealing with the Soviet Union is that we forget the Russion people's long conditioning to autocratic government and their legacy of ignorance. In 1901, Henry Adams, on his first trip to Russia, wrote of his amazement at the primitiveness and passiveness of the Russian masses. He called them a 10th century people. By now they have leaped across centuries in technical progress, but they have lacked bridges to individual freedom or representative government." Lest we forget, a genuine and nonsentimentalistic friendship with any people presupposes first a true, realistic awareness of their state of being.

With these necessary points in mind, let us see wherein the historical significance of both the resolution and the proclamation lies. For the first time, our Government has taken official cognizance of the tremendously important fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire. By these documents we have shown for the first time that we are fully aware of the captive status of all the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Indeed, for the first time we have faced the fact that the majority of captive nations are in the Soviet Union and Asia. Historically, the nations in Central Europe, such as Poland, Hungary and others, would never have become captive to Russia if other non-Russian nations, like Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan, and others, had not fallen under the imperialist and colonial domination of Soviet Russia. This is a stubborn truth we cannot escape. It is an elemental historical truth that these documents confirm. It is this confirmation that rocked Khrushchev.

Unfamiliar with East European and Central Asian history, many of our commentators interpreted the resolution-proclamation to mean only an observance for the captive nations in Central Europe. Had they bothered to read the documents, they would have understood that our freedom appeal was and is being made to all captive nations. The appeal of freedom does not arbitrarily stop at the borders of the Soviet Union. Those who think so are pursuing an illusion. What American with a sense of justice would deny the opportunity for national freedom and independence to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others? When Khrushchev wails about interference in "internal Soviet affairs," his cries are as specious as when he bellows about our interference in the so-called peoples democracies in Central Europe. For him, when any country comes under Moscow's imperialist and colonial domination, it then becomes an "internal affair." The truth is that affairs concerning national freedom aspirations both within the Soviet Union or any other part of Moscow's far-flung empire are essentially international affairs.

It was not particularly enlightening for some of our Governors who recently visited the Soviet Union to speak of it as a nation. Even those in the Kremlin hesitate to speak in this vein internally. When basic, elementary truths escape us, how much value can be assigned to the conclusions and recommendations made by these touring Governors? It is patently evident that the legalistic facade of the Soviet Union befogged their understanding of the foremost issues within this substrate empire.

Khrushchev recognized the psychological blow that the resolution and proclamation represented. For too long he has boasted of the allegedly rapid strides made by Moscow in economic development, in military prowess, in scientific achievements, in cultural betterment, and the like. He has compared these with those of our Nation. But one need only ask whether these inflated accomplishments would have been possible without the captive resources of Ukraine, Turkestan, Georgia, and other rich non-Russian nations subjugated within the Soviet Union. If the United States were an empire extending itself northward and southward, it would parasitically avail itself of resources that would make our achievements unsurpassable. Fortunately, we are not that kind of a nation. The plain fact is that without the rich resources of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., Russia itself would be a second- or third-rate power.

The well-founded perspective laid down in the resolution and the proclamation truthfully devaluates the boasts and bluff of Khrushchev's comparisons with the real achievements of our Nation. This is what troubles Khrushchev most. On the basis of this historical perspective, the economic, scientific, and other comparisons made between the substrate empire and our Nation are out of real context. Psychologically and politically, it is hardly comforting for Khrushchev and his propaganda apparatus to have the world know that Russia's strength, such as it is, is parasitically built on captive resources both within and outside the Soviet Union. Yet this is the moving truth which we have scarcely tapped. The resolution and the proclamation it called into being have in themselves begun to tap it.

The editorial in the New York Times was only partly correct when it stated that the real purpose of this Captive Nations Week observation, therefore, is to keep the plight of the peoples freshly in our mind.[25] Emphasizing actually the less important aspects of the issue, it continued, "It may help them to know that we have not forgotten them. It ought to help us, in the moral sense, if we continue to remember." All this is true but the greater purpose was to accentuate again the strategic political and military value of all the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union and, necessarily taken as an aggregate. In the cold war, as well as in any hot war, they possess the highest priority on our scale of national interest because their enemy, the imperialism and colonialism of Moscow, is our enemy. Without them, Russia would be small, harmless, and clumsy. Made consistently insecure about its captive millions, Moscow would not push as vigorously its borderland policy in Iraq, Iran, and elsewhere; and such organizations as the Central Treaty Organization, which has replaced the old Baghdad Pact, would not be under the same pressures.[26] Troubleshooters, like Vladimir Y. Semichastny, the defamer of Pasternak, would be sent to areas like Azerbaijan to try to deal with the Moslemic country's bourgeois ideology.[27] Is it Moscow's policy anyway to place Russians in the second secretaryship of the party in the captive non-Russian republics. For our national interest and the goal of world freedom, these and countless other results would manifest Moscow's basic insecurity which we could insure by preventing it from ever thinking that we would accede in any circumstances to the permanent captivity of the over 20 enslaved nations.

Senator JAVITS, of New York, furnished certain appropriate and striking comments on the resolution. He said in the Senate, "Laid bare, communism is seen to be imperialism by force—but with better propaganda technicians."[28] Cutting through all the nonessentials, the Senator struck at the root of the issue by declaring, "We in the West have no fear of such a free expression. Khrushchev can answer this challenge only by allowing free elections under U.N. auspices for self-determination in the captive nations." Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, also put his finger on the basic issue when he observed, "If Mr. Khrushchev says we meddled, then

[24] Fred Theroux, "That 'Captive Nations Week' Has Many Diplomats Puzzled," the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1959, p. C-3.

[25] The New York Times, editorial on "Captive Nations Week," July 20, 1959.

[26] A.P., Ankara, Turkey, Aug. 20, 1959.

[27] The New York Times, Aug. 15, 1959.

[28] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 14063-14064.

my answer to him is that, in my judgment, it is as proper to ask questions of a jailor as to who is in the jail and why they are there." [29]

KHRUSHCHEV'S MANIFESTO IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS JOURNAL

The so-called article by Khrushchev in the advance October issue of Foreign Affairs is more of a Muscovite cold war manifesto than anything else. It abounds with worn-out, trite propaganda generalities which no more deal with the real issues of the struggle than does a Russian lunik. The supposed competition between capitalism and socialism, for example, is no more real than that between capitalism and mercantilism in our day. With unsurprising naivete the editors of this journal afforded the Moscow tyrant an advance medium for his propaganda in preparation for his visit to this country.

Mention is made here of this "article" because it has special pertinence to our subject. Khrushchev offers further excellent confirmation of our thesis on his troubled mind by hammering away again at the captive nations resolution. It is evident that he was preparing to meet questions in this country that will deal with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. His method will be use of the non sequiturs in the "article" and the exhibition of non-Russians whom he was assembling for his entourage. The latter technique will be like the one used by the ten U.S.S.R. writers who visited Washington in August. It was reported then that Alexander B. Chakovsky, editor in chief of the Foreign Literature magazine, complained about the captive nations resolution and "pointedly indicated two or three fellow writers visiting from the Georgian and Lithuanian Soviet Republics as contented representatives of the 'captive nations.'" [30] Khrushchev will try this same old patent-medicine man trick when he will undoubtedly point to the Don Cossack writer, Mikhail A. Sholokhov, as a "contented" Cossack. It wasn't without political purpose that he visited the writer in Cossackia—one of the nations mentioned in the resolution—and invited him on his tour of America. Judging by the names on the official party list, there will be other puppets put on similar display to discredit the captive designation of these non-Russian nations. The deceptive exhibit would "prove" as much as President Eisenhower would if he were to display a Foster or Browder abroad as the personification of communism in America.

In the euphemistic article Khrushchev says, "The authors of the resolution call for the 'liberation' of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain 'Ural area.'" He continues: "This ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation" with which, democratically, he concurs. Then the payoff paragraph: "It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how the authors of this resolution would have reacted if the Parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be 'liberated from American slavery.' Apparently they have never pondered such a question, which is very regrettable. Sometimes comparisons help to understand the essence of a matter." [31]

Comparisons certainly do help to understand and a few here will demonstrate the emptiness of Khrushchev's troubled statements. First, taking the initial statement above, it is as accurate as Khrushchev's, or his writer's, understanding of American history. The resolution does not speak of any Kazakhstan or Turkmenistan; it mentions Turkestan, the whole Moslemic nation which the Russians sought to divide and bury back in the twenties. Also, that certain 'Ural area' is Idel-Ural, also made up of Moslems whom Moscow fears greatly in the event of any upheaval. The second statement is, of course, just spurious identification of the peoples in the Soviet Union with the tyrants.

It is the last statement which is the most illuminating. Some of our leaders in public life have used precisely the same specious argument which Khrushchev makes use of. Texas, Arizona, and California are supposed to be comparable to Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, or any other non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. Implied, too, is the false comparison between our Federal Union and the artificial Soviet Union. Moreover, the unwary reader is supposed to infer that there is no more slavery of these non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union than there is any slavery of these three States in America.

Now, it should first be pointed out that the only type of parliament in Mexico which would come out with such a resolution could only be one similar to the Moscow puppets in Warsaw, Kiev, Peiping, or Budapest. Second, and here again Khrushchev's ghost-writers slipped on U.S. history, Texas, Arizona, and California entered the American Union voluntarily; Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, and the other captive non-Russian nations were conquered by Russian forces and forced into the Soviet Union. Third, our United States is a voluntarily formed Federal Union of States with citizens who consciously identify themselves as American nationals; the Soviet Union is in reality an empire of many nations under the domination of Russian Moscow, with Ukrainians identifying themselves spiritually and consciously as Ukrainians, Georgians as Georgians, Lithuanians as Lithuanians, etc. In terms of national identity, the term "Soviet" is sheer nonsense. Fourth, the native language spoken in Texas or Arizona is the same as in New York or Maryland; the native language in Aremenia is Armenian and is not the same as in Russia, and so with Ukrainian, Georgian, Lithuanian, etc. Fifth, the histories of Texas, Arizona, and California can hardly or seriously be considered as national histories independent of the growing history of the American Nation; the genuinely national histories of Lithuania, Georgia, Ukraine, Turkestan are not only independent of the history of Russia but even precede it by centuries.

In scholarly fashion, one could go on and on with these substantive distinctions which only serve to devastate Khrushchev's call for a comparison. We are not aware of hundreds of thousands of American refugees and escapees in Mexico; but we are fully cognizant of millions of such refugees and escapees from the Soviet Union. Nor are we aware of any independence movement in Texas, Arizona, or California; the evidence of this movement in Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia, and the other captive non-Russian nations is literally mountainous.

Mr. Khrushchev is presently posing as a self-confident competitor, unafraid of ideas and ready to accept any challenge. On this score, we can provide him with a challenge of his life. Let's test this comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and let us say, Ukraine, Lithuania, and the Caucasian nations (Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan), to compare with the area of California. Under U.N. auspices and with strict guarantees safeguarding the outcome, let us put it to a vote whether the natives, i.e., the permanent residents in our three States want to join Mexico, remain in the United States, or be completely independent and Lithuanians in Lithuania, Ukrainian nationals in Ukraine, similarly Georgian-speaking Georgians in Georgia and so forth want to remain in the Soviet Union or have their own independent states. Once the outcome is decided upon, the U.N. is to have complete jurisdiction over the areas in order to permit the steady implementation of the popular decision.

This is just one of numerous interesting challenges which could be thrown at Khrushchev. It is the result of the Captive Nations Resolution. We can have him on the run. Imagination, initiative, courage, and abidance with the truth are the only necessary weapons. His sputniks, luniks, and "missilniks" are all relative "puniks" as compared with these weapons which are available to us for the asking.

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS CAPTIVES

Mr. Speaker, on this, the observance of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, I brought to the attention of our Members the study made on the Captive Nations Week resolution by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. This first study covered developments preceding the passage of the resolution and immediately succeeding it, including the article by Khrushchev last August.

However, since August 1959, Moscow and its puppets have continued to show a very troubled concern about the resolution and its implications. The story of this is presented in a sequel article by Dr. Dobriansky in the December issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Titled "Khrushchev and His Captives," the article is a further documented study of the resolution and its effects.

The contents of this and the previous article by Dr. Dobriansky form a necessary background for our thinking about the forthcoming summit. In terms of our dedication to freedom and the moral and political principles upon which the resolution itself is based, it is plainly unthinkable that a summit agenda would exclude the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union.

The indicated article by Dr. Dobriansky from the Ukrainian Quarterly of December 1959 follows:

KHRUSHCHEV AND HIS CAPTIVES

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

When Khrushchev almost burst a blood vessel or two over the Captive Nations Week resolution last July, the press organs of the world widely publicized the event, and people generally surmised that an extremely sensitive chord in the Russian Communist Empire was struck. About this they couldn't have been more right and more acutely perceptive. Though it is little realized, the ramifications of this resolution extend into every conceivable area—the political, economic, psychological, cultural, scientific, religious, and diplomatic. Extensive captive resources of whatever type, particularly including those in the Soviet Union, can hardly be heralded as a firm foundation for power and growth in any human situation. Khrushchev sensed this instantaneously last summer. But the story did not end there. As far as this writer knows, the press and analysts of the Soviet Union have completely overlooked the additional painful cries of Nikita the Sanguine against this gnawing resolution. In short, they have failed to take note of the real depth of psychopolitical penetration achieved by the congressional passage of the resolution.

It is the aim of this article to cover this uncovered story since last July and also to interpret Khrushchev's continued rantings against the resolution in the light of most recent developments. It will, moreover, furnish some indication of the futural significance of the resolution, now Public Law

[29] Ibid., p. 14105.

[30] The Washington Post, Aug. 17, 1959.

[31] The New York Times, Sept. 3, 1959, p. 4.

86–90, especially in a promising and hot presidential year. This article is, in essence, a necessary sequel to an earlier one which described with considerable documentation the origin, development, and effects of the resolution.[1]

In a way, the fact that the subsequent events pertaining to the resolution have been overlooked suggests in itself the lack of appreciative understanding in this country of the content and meaning of this document. We seem to prefer to spend an inordinate amount of time and resources on economic, military, and other comparisons between ourselves and the Soviet Union which, in most cases, rest on false conceptual premises anyway. Warnings of different threats by Moscow are conjured up almost daily nowadays that the mounting development of a deep political neurosis in this country would certainly be no cause for wonderment. Present trends of confusion and exaggerated thought regarding the Soviet Union and its prodigious power were anticipated by this writer soon after the Mikoyan visit.[2] The acceleration of these trends was also foreseen prior to the arrival of Khrushchev.[3]

The extent to which naive thinking about Moscow's fraudulent peace intentions has been pushed in many sections of our society is a measure of Khrushchev's propaganda victory here. Ingenious remarks recorded daily by the high and the low about Nikita really wanting peace are clearly indicative of our defective understanding of the nature of the struggle. As the writer recently emphasized in an address to the 10th annual meeting of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, "Khrushchev has so effectively administered tranquilizing cold war pills to major sectors of our society that an increasing number of Americans aren't even aware of the great strides made by imperialist Moscow in this perilous phase of the permanent cold war."[4] The marked incursions made by Moscow this year in Latin America, South Asia, and Africa are advances of the most serious import. Indeed, Khrushchev's singular victory of exacting an invitation to this country has in itself produced confusion and doubt here; it has entrenched the power of Khrushchev with new airs of respectability and legitimacy. The freedom hopes of millions of patriots in Moscow's empire have been scalded, while false impressions of Moscow's inflated power have become more widespread among the newly independent nations. Scanning all of this, our most loyal allies situated about the periphery of the Russian Communist empire could not but become increasingly uneasy about our world leadership. This result of Khrushchev's propaganda victory explains the reason for President Eisenhower's decision to visit many of these areas. All of these developments form the backdrop for Khrushchev's aim to extricate the one psychopolitical thorn lodged deeply in his side—the Captive Nations Week resolution.

NIKITA'S CAPTIVE SPECTER

By all evidence, the cardinal objective of Khrushchev's maneuvers and protestations these past 2 years have been the rapid consolidation of Moscow's empire and Western accommodation to it. This is essentially what he means by "peaceful coexistence" and "noninterference in the affairs of others." The fraudulent issue of "communism versus capitalism" is his expedient propaganda deflector, aimed to distract Western attention from the real issue between Russian imperialist slavery and freedom. In these respects, he has realized tremendous progress, but a specter has befallen him, like a black cat crossing his path of progress. Fraught with all sorts of possibilities, the specter of his captives haunts Khrushchev and the mirror of this specter was opportunely presented by our own Congress.

After the July outburst, Khrushchev decided to crack this mirror further with certain observation in his so-called article in the Foreign Affairs periodical. His comments are quite illuminating. He writes:

"You disagree with us? Prove by facts that your system is superior and more efficacious, that it is capable of ensuring a higher degree of prosperity for the people than the socialist system, that under capitalism man can be happier than under socialism. It is impossible to prove this. I have no other explanation for the fact that talk of violently 'rolling back' communism never ceases in the West. Not long ago the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives deemed it proper to pass a resolution calling for the liberation of the Socialist countries allegedly enslaved by communism and, moreover, of a number of union republics constituting part of the Soviet Union. The authors of the resolution call for the liberation of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain Ural area.

"I would not be telling the full truth if I did not say that the adoption of this ill-starred resolution was regarded by the Soviet people as an act of provocation. Personally I agree with this appraisal.

"It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how the authors of this resolution would have reacted if the Parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be liberated from American slavery. Apparently they have never pondered such a question, which is very regrettable. Sometimes comparisons help to understand the essence of a matter."[5]

A concise, critical analysis of these passages is not at all difficult. In raising the points that he does, it is immediately evident that Khrushchev is banking on the unfamiliarity of his American readers with the realities of the Soviet Union. First, the introductory sentences on socialism and capitalism could be easily dispensed with. As mentioned above, a point of argumentative deflection is introduced here with no real bearing on the issue troubling Khrushchev. A complete and thorough politico-economic comparison between the national economy of the United States of America and the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. would lead to a day and night conclusion when it comes to the values of efficacy, prosperity, and happiness. Unfortunately, little work along these realistic lines has been done in this country. It should be noteworthy, nevertheless, for the reader that Khrushchev has to inject the deflector before taking up the resolution.

The second point of critical interest is Khrushchev's own misreading of the resolution or, if he read it correctly, then his dishonesty in the treatment of its contents. The resolution specifically refers to enslavement by Russian Communist aggression, not by the vague and meaningless concept of communism. By this honest specification the resolution is grounded in historical fact, not in philosophical vaguery. Moreover, as concerns the liberation of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., nowhere does the resolution contain any specification of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and even a certain ural area." It does specify the Turkestan nation and Idel-Ural which consists of the Tatars, Bashkirs, and other non-Russian peoples between the Volga and the Urals. As shown in the writer's previous article on the resolution, it was the realistic inclusion of the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union that really caused the Khrushchev explosion in July.[6] In his article Khrushchev attempts a literary derogation of this most vital and basic point of the resolution.

About his telling "the full truth," whereby the mythical "Soviet people" regarded the resolution as an "act of provocation," the informed reader couldn't even extract an eighth of a truth. The note of Khrushchev's humble personal agreement with this imagined consensus is enough to suggest his typical approach toward any truth. But what is most significant in these passages is Khrushchev's use of a spurious argument that is characteristically exploited by anti-Communist Russian emigres and their unwary American friends in the hope of maintaining the territorial integrity of the basic Russian Empire. His implied comparison between Texas, Arizona, and California and comparable areas in the U.S.S.R. is, except for geography, a speciosity which has hoodwinked many Americans. They are no more validly comparable than are the economies of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

During Khrushchev's visit here an attempt was made to challenge him on his misleading point.[7] In fact, at the tea arranged by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the following question was posed by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois:

"In your article in Foreign Affairs, you mistakenly compare Texas, Arizona, and California with certain non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Would you be willing to stage, under U.N. auspices and control, free voting conditions to determine whether the natives of Lithuania, Ukraine, and the Caucasian states want to remain in the U.S.S.R. or be independent states and whether the residents of comparable Arizona, Texas, and California want to remain in the United States or be completely independent states? Let's compete in ideas and action?"[8]

Following the tea meeting, Senator DIRKSEN stated to the press that on this and numerous other questions "Khrushchev took a fifth amendment stand." Indeed, in the very first phase of his visit Khrushchev showed quite plainly that he was not interested in any free intellectual exchange of ideas. Those who opposed his visit had the foresight to warn of this at the time the invitation was extended.

At the third session of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, held on October 31, Khrushchev once again saw fit to tear into the Captive Nations Week resolution. On this point, the official text of his report to this captive audience reads as follows:

"Now times have changed. Even some of the most active exponents of the 'positions of strength' policy see its futility. Only the most belligerent Western politicians cannot make up their mind to discard the old formula. In some places one still hears reverberations of the past. Take, for instance, the much-to-be-regretted decision of the American Congress to hold the so-called 'Captive Nations Week' and to pray for their

---

[1] "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," the Ukrainian Quarterly, September 1959, pp. 206–225.

[2] See "Post Mortems on Operation Mikoyan," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 29, 1959, pp. A5583–A5585.

[3] "The Khrushchev Invitation," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1959, pp. A8137–A8138.

[4] AP and Washington Sunday Star, "Economist Derides Red Peace Goals," Nov. 15, 1959.

[5] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," Foreign Affairs, vol. 38, No. 1, October 1959, pp. 6–7.

[6] Ibid., p. 220.

[7] See "A Comment on the Khrushchev Visit," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 18, 1959, p. A8328.

[8] See for other questions "Khrushchev Denies That Non-Russian Republics Are Independent," the Ukrainian Bulletin, Oct. 1–15, 1959, p. 6.

liberation. In this case words other than 'rolling back' were used, but the gist remained the same, the same appeal for interference in other peoples' affairs.

"So you will see from the policy of 'rolling back' they have switched to praying to the Lord. What can it lead to? If the Western leaders pray to God to liberate the peoples of the Socialist countries, and we, in turn, pray that He should liberate their peoples from capitalist rule, we shall thus put God in a quandary. What decision should He make, after all?" [9]

Here, too, the cardinal objective sought by Khrushchev in the immediate period ahead is evident again. His quasi-cynical remarks about prayers and God do not conceal his sustained concern about "interference in other people's affairs." Such self-insuring interference on our part is in reality, of course, one directed at the widespread Russian interference in and domination of all the captive non-Russian nations. In brief, Khrushchev singles out again the resolution and in the abiding hope that "now times have changed" holds out for us not to interfere with his colonial interference with the lives of the captive peoples. His victory in this fundamental regard would exceed in value all the military might he has now or will have in the future.

NIKITA WOULD BURY THE RESOLUTION

On the basis of all evidence provided here and in the previous article, there can be no doubt that the passage of the resolution by Congress put an uncomfortable crimp in Moscow's cold war operations. A careful reading of Khrushchev's quoted utterances and statements on the subject shows an anxiety to bury the resolution as quickly as possible. For his liking it would be just the last breath of the past, a document firmly buried under heaps of slogans declaring "peace and friendship." The reality he refuses to face is that there are too many Americans who know that the traditional Russian political slogan of peace and friendship has for centuries been used to seduce neighboring non-Russian nations into captivity. There are others who, perhaps depending more on sound logic than historical fact, are aware that in whatever sphere of human existence, peace and friendship are the consequent conditions of justice and freedom, not their cause. The condition of harmony necessarily implied by peace and friendship is logically predicated on the real prevalence of justice and freedom; and these requisite conditions do not prevail in the Russian Communist Empire. These things are known by countless Americans and, despite Khrushchev's wishes, will continue to be forcefully expressed in this country.

However, there are certain realities we must face if we are to thwart Khrushchev's plans to bury the resolution. The passage of the measure last summer disclosed two indisputable facts: one, the acute sensitivity of Moscow about the weakest and yet most vital nerve in its empire and, two, the complete lack of understanding in many sections of our Nation with regard to the content and significance of the resolution. Khrushchev's denunciations of the resolution last July, again in August, and once again in October clearly demonstrate how deeply it penetrated Moscow's cold war armor. Almost needless to repeat, he fears this resolution more than anything else on the politico-psychological front. The chief reason for this is that the law symbolizes enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities.

A point that cannot be too often repeated is that by this resolution our Government has taken, for the first time, official cognizance of the majority of captive non-Russian nations; namely, those held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself. Without the captive Baltic nations, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, the Caucasian nations, Turkestan and others mentioned in the resolution, Russia with its 100 million population and its own resources, could scarcely be called, as the Moscow propaganda machine now does, the greatest power in the world. It would be no more comparable in power to the United States than a reunited Germany would be. From a cold war viewpoint, the development of this inherent weakness in the synthetic state known as the Soviet Union would seriously deflate all the bluster, bluff, and sham of Moscow's supposed economic prowess, military might, scientific achievements, and cultural attainments. Parasitic growth on the basis of captive resources is not exactly alluring in propaganda or otherwise. Khrushchev apparently has the vision to see this; most of us, unfortunately, do not.

Our lack of vision was amply shown last summer. As a matter of fact, the international stir created by the resolution crystallized the low level of our understanding about the Soviet Union and its ersatz political character. In one instance the writer was impelled to take to critical task a grossly unbalanced editorial in one of our leading newspapers.[10] At the time, many reporters, writers, and analysts inquired to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia is located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. But what can one expect when on the highest levels of our Government the U.S.S.R. is referred to as "the Soviet nation" and the different nations within the Soviet Union are arbitrarily and somewhat insularly called "the Soviet people" or "the Soviets." Aside from the historical and demographic untruths of these usages, the very suggestion of a united, integrated, and monolithic power in the U.S.S.R. is not even intelligent from a cold war viewpoint. Moscow couldn't have something better if it were made to order.

Furthermore, in terms of the resolution and the wealth of evidence underlying it, our many economic, military, scientific, and other comparisons between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America are drawn on false premises. The writer demonstrated this for the military in an article on "Basic Misconceptions in U.S. Military Thought on the U.S.S.R." [11] The same criticism applies to our unrealistic economic comparisons. It doesn't even make elementary sense in scientific identification and description to speak of a gross national product for the Soviet Union where both objective reality and legal structure clearly underwrite a multinational arrangement. Moreover, the U.S.S.R., in essence an empire within an empire, is not at all qualitatively comparable to the United States which is a nation-state. The resolution suggests all this and far more. The development of these real implications can pose a tremendous challenge to Moscow, testing quite peaceably numerous professions of the Russian propagandists. Khrushchev actually fears such a test and virtually paralyzes some of us with his coexistence or codestruction propaganda, while at the same time his cold war activities continue undiminished in every quarter of the globe. Worked within a pattern of calculating strategy and tactics, these activities include every conceivable instrument—political, diplomatic, economic, psychological, cultural, scientific, and military. One cannot begin to evaluate the breadth and depth of these activities unless his intellectual approach to Moscow's total activity is an integralist and holistic one. A grasp of the total war being flung upon us is impossible also without a working concept of cold war, which this writer defines as a twilight condition of neither real peace nor hot war, where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. In short, as long practiced by imperialist Russia, a cold war is the very soul and spirit of a hot war with the massive body of military conflict in secondary reserve.

THE PERMANENT RUSSIAN COLD WAR AND THE RESOLUTION

Moscow has reaped impressive cold war successes this past year. Among the most outstanding is the increasing and undiscriminating acceptance of the Muscovite notion of peaceful coexistence. Bamboozled by Russian propaganda on the supposed exclusive alternatives of coexistence or codestruction, many voices in our Nation have clearly warmed up to this essentially cold war notion. The irony of the current situation is that if we are not to be cornered into a hot war, we must face up to the realities of Russia's permanent cold war. Historically, an unparalleled empire was built over five centuries by established cold war techniques. The Russian Communist Empire bases its forward pressures on the selfsame techniques.[12]

A sound theoretical basis for necessary cold war gaming is provided in the Captive Nations Week resolution. With an indispensable apparatus, such as a Freedom Commission, the possibilities suggested by the resolution could be developed peacably and with decisive intent. The second observance of the week next July should be exceedingly ripe for a sober realization of these needs. We cannot stress too strongly that the captive nations throughout the empire, and particularly in the Soviet Union, constitute our most formidable weapon in the period of mutual deterrence.[13] Prayerful observances during the second anniversary of the resolution should occasion such sober thought and reflection throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, during these days of appeasement, during these days when the importance of trade is assuming an ascendency over the importance of morality, during these days when there are positive friendships and hands across the seas, let me point out to you that Khrushchev, welcomed, praised, and honored in this Nation, was the leader of the greatest tyranny, the perpetrator of the greatest crime of genocide with the conspired and planned and deliberate massacre of millions of Ukrainians.

Now this minor deity is honored by the Western Christian World. And I have no better authority than J. Edgar Hoover who said this week that the Communist Party in the United States has never been stronger, never been better organized, never been more effective, never been more united, never been more dedicated than it is today. And, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover attributes that disastrous condition to the inspiration given to these Communists because of the visit of Khrushchev, the "Murderer of the Ukraine."

---

[9] "N. S. Khrushchev's Report to Supreme Soviet," Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Nov. 2, 1959, pp. 1–2.

[10] See "Author of Captive Nations Week Resolution a Virginian," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1959, pp. A8121–A8123.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1959, pp. A5760–A5762.

[12] "Author of Captive Nations' Week Resolution Points Way To Defeat Russian Cold War Strategy and Tactics," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 4, 1959, pp. A7753–A7755.

[13] "An Address on the Vulnerabilities of Russian Communism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 15, 1959, pp. A8253–A8255.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] who served with me as my chairman on the famous Katyn Massacre Committee when we went to Europe and investigated the massacre of 5,000 Polish officers by Soviet Russia.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the statement he has just completed regarding the terrible, inhuman, barbarous onslaught which the communistic Soviet leadership inflicted upon the free people of Ukrainia. I endorse every statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania narrated in reviewing the enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Soviet tyranny. I also commend him for mentioning the visit that Khrushchev, the tyrannical leader of Communist Russia, made to this country. He traveled throughout our land, using every opportunity in public meetings, and at banquets, given in his honor by people of this great free country, to spread his communistic propaganda. I often wonder what the people back in Ukrainia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Rumania, and the Balkan States generally think when they observe the great free Government of America entertaining the man that was the leader of this barbarous, inhuman massacre and instigator of genocide in relation to millions upon millions of Ukrainian people throughout the last 25 to 30 years.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was a member of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee that held hearings not only in this country but in Europe during the 82d Congress and contributed greatly to the success of that committee. That committee held dozens of hearings, both here and across the water; heard approximately 250 witnesses. Every one of those witnesses, without exception, representing all segments of society—labor, industry, religion, people who had been prisoners of war and in slave labor camps of the Soviet Union—in their testimony they told the story of the inhuman, barbarous tyranny that the Soviets had inflicted not only upon Ukraine, but upon other nations in Central Europe.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a great asset in the work of that committee. He devoted a long time to carrying out the work of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank him for reserving 60 minutes today in order to remind the Members of Congress and the people of this great, free land of ours, that the Soviet Union has enslaved millions of people through its tyranny and aggression. We also must remember that at no time have the people of these enslaved nations willingly submitted to the rule of the Soviet Union in spite of the propaganda of Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders who would want the people of the world to believe otherwise. They have been guilty of the most inhuman aggression and enslavement of more people than any set of tyrants in the history of the world. I am referring to Khrushchev and the other leaders, both past and present, of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Indiana. I might say I have just returned from a 2½-month tour of the Far East. I went to Alaska and then visited Korea, Formosa, Japan, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Thailand—all of those great areas of the Pacific. I was there at the time Khrushchev visited here. This Congress adjourned at 6:21 a.m. and at 6:22 a.m. I got out of town because I knew Khrushchev was coming in at 10 a.m. There was much said here to the effect, "Oh, you should not leave town because this guest is coming." I got out of town because of the nature and quality of the guest. Make no mistake about why I left here 1 minute after we adjourned; and many of my colleagues did the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? Can you imagine the hue and cry in the press of this Nation, can you imagine the riotous debate on this floor if, when Harry Truman was President, he had brought Khrushchev to this country and then 6 months after Khrushchev had left J. Edgar Hoover had said that the Communist Party in America was at its strongest and most effective and dangerous because of the Khrushchev visit? Can you imagine what the press, editorially and in every other way, would have done to the then President? And now a conspiracy of silence prevails and Mr. Hoover's statement was buried with the advertisements for patent medicines somewhere over on page 11. Imagine that.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and associate myself with him on the very fine presentation he has delivered here this afternoon for and on behalf of a cause, the cause of freedom for the Ukrainian people. I think it was well done, I think it is timely, and I think it should be continued from year to year until their dream is realized. On Monday next I shall make my own statement on the floor in regard to Ukrainian independence.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to have this contribution from the gentleman from Minnesota. He has always spoken out on this matter, and he helps today.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we solemnly commemorate the 42d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence, and I join with my colleagues and freedom-loving people everywhere in extending greetings and saluting these heroic people of the Ukraine.

As one of the first nations to fall under the tyranny of the Bolshevik imperialists, the Ukrainians suffered the destruction of their churches, mass deportations and purges, man-made famines, and yet they have steadfastly refused to relinquish their national ideals. They have never given up their courage and determination to promote the cause of democracy, and Ukrainia will be recorded in the world's history books as a symbol of the struggle for independence and freedom. The spirit of these gallant Ukrainians will stand as an inspiration to the peoples of the world in their labors for justice and freedom.

In my district I have known many Ukrainians. They have proved excellent citizens and have contributed much to the cultural vigor of our community. Their devotion to our free way of life has enriched our entire country.

On this anniversary of Ukrainian independence, it is only fitting that we pay tribute to these courageous people and extend to them a word of comfort in their struggle for freedom and cultural survival. Let us all hope and pray that their persistence will be rewarded, and they will again become a free and independent people.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from New York of course understands these problems. He is of Slavic ancestry, I am sure. I know how his heart bleeds for any of the oppressed peoples of the middle European countries, because his ancestors suffered through tragedies similar to those to which we have referred today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I, too, join in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his excellent statement.

Mr. Speaker, the illusion which Soviet leaders seek to create about the unity and strength of the nations and peoples within the Soviet sphere does not find a ready audience on this side of the Iron Curtain.

As we mark this 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukrainia, there is ample evidence before the world to show that the crown rests uneasily on the head of those who currently rule the Soviet bloc. The captive nations within this bloc show no willingness to embrace the beliefs and practices of the Communists who are in control.

We in America send our best wishes to the people of Ukrainia on this solemn anniversary.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, wars are among the worst of human follies and blunders, for they bring death to millions of innocent and helpless people and cause the destruction of untold wealth that may never be reproduced and recreated. The First World War was the greatest of such wars up to that time. It caused death and injuries, and misery to millions and tens of millions,

but ironically that world holocaust, destructive and ruinous as it was also ushered in a new era for those tens of millions who had been suffering under detested and despised alien oppressors for centuries. In this respect that war brought happiness and joy to a large number of oppressed nationalities. Many of them attained their freedom and national independence as the result of that war. The Ukrainians were among these, and they proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic on January 22, 1918, exactly 42 years ago.

For almost 300 years the Ukraine had been submerged in the Russian continent, and during all that time autocratic czars had done their worst to suppress and eradicate what we in the West regard as praiseworthy Ukrainian traits: their desire for freedom, their boundless love for their historic homeland, their undying yearning for political independence, and their willingness to sacrifice their all for the attainment of their national goal. And on January 22, 1918, when they proclaimed their independence, they had attained their national goal, and a new day was ushered in for them.

That memorable day is a great, bright landmark in Ukrainian history, and remains as the brightest spot in their modern story. Today it is being celebrated, in due solemnity, as a national holiday. Even though the Republic did not last much more than 2 years, yet that short and happy period has left its unforgettable impression upon all Ukrainians. All of them would like to observe this anniversary, but sad as it is, not all Ukrainians are permitted and privileged to do it. To the 42 million Ukrainians who have suffered, and still suffer, under the regime imposed upon them by Communist tyrants in their homeland that privilege is denied. We in the free world gladly join hands with Ukrainian-Americans on this 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day and echo their genuine sentiment for freedom.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this observance in recognition of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is fitting to remind our people that on January 22, 1918, in the city of Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, a proclamation was issued declaring that the Ukraine was a free and independent Republic. These unfortunate people, 40 million of them, have, of course, been swallowed up against their will by the Soviet Union, and together with other millions of eastern Europeans behind the Iron Curtain, are vassals of a ruthless Communist domination.

These people are still eager for the right of self-determination and self-government. They continue to pray for liberty and the dignity of freedom. Their opposition to Communist rule has continued unabated despite mass deportations and attempts by their Communist masters to destroy their national culture and their passion for independence.

The 42d anniversary of their founding as a free republic is therefore an appropriate occasion for America and the free world to give expression to our sympathy with their aims and objectives to attain their freedom once again. We join heartily in condemnation of the system that has enslaved them and the other unwilling prisoners of communism behind the Iron Curtain.

With the moral support of all freedom-loving nations, it is to be hoped their courage and their aspirations will not diminish and that their desire for liberty will eventually be realized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the gallant Ukrainian people on the occasion of the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, Friday, January 22, 1960.

The people of Ukraine are to be admired for their bravery, and for their high ideals and love of freedom. They have exhibited a solidarity and a determination to regain their liberty in their constant resistance to Communist aggression. I express my fervent hope that the day is not too far distant that the people of the Ukraine and all others now under the domination of the Soviet dictators will again enjoy the freedom that they so deeply desire.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago many millions of people who had been groaning under the heavy yoke of Russian autocracy cast off that oppressive regime and proclaimed their independence. The Ukrainian people were among the first of these people to do this, and they did it amidst jubilation and happiness unknown in the Ukraine for centuries. Then they established their democratic republic and had hoped to enjoy their hard-earned freedom in their historic homeland. Unfortunately that was not to be. The independence they had proclaimed was taken away from them by Communist aggressors late in 1920, treacherously putting an end to all forms of freedom in the Ukraine.

Today for almost 40 years more than 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the barbarous tyranny of Communist totalitarianism. For all the hardships and misery which these courageous people have endured, their undying hope for freedom has been their sole consolation. Today we all devoutly pray, on the observance of their Independence Day, that they soon have their just reward in happiness and peace.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918—42 years ago tomorrow— the people of the Ukraine declared themselves to be a free and independent Republic.

Their freedom and independence have long since fallen under the Soviet Communist hordes, but in the Ukraine, as in so many enslaved nations, there still burns brightly the spirit of liberty. In millions of hearts still lives the dream of a free life in a free world.

As we mark tomorrow the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence it might be well for us to keep in mind that almost half of the population of what we call the Soviet Union consists of captive peoples, ever restless under the Communist dictatorship. The Ukrainians alone represent more than 42 million slaves of the Soviet dictatorship.

I salute the people of the Ukraine for unswerving devotion to the cause of freedom.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, even as the world witnesses and rejoices today in the birth of new nations, rising to freedom and independence, we cannot and must not forget those peoples who, once free, now live under tyrannous oppression. And on January 22 our thoughts and prayers go in particular to the Ukrainian people, who on this day celebrate the 42d anniversary of their cherished—but lost—independence.

After the fall of czarist Russia, the Ukraine was one of the first to proclaim her independence. On March 17, 1917, was established the Ukrainian Central Council—the Rada—which assumed the leadership of a happy people. For the first time in more than 100 years the Ukrainian people had their own political body. On July 29, 1917, the constitution of the Ukraine was drafted, and on January 22, 1918, the Central Rada proclaimed the Ukrainian National Republic, representing the independent and sovereign power of the Ukrainian people.

But the freedom of the Ukrainian people was to be short lived. After a 4-year desperate struggle with the Russian Bolsheviks, the young Republic was brought down by brute force—and the proud and industrious Ukrainian people were once more subjected to foreign rule. Today, under the name of a "Peoples' Democracy," and after a record of mass deportations, forced famines, and other imposed conditions which have shocked the world, the Ukrainian people are bent beneath a yoke which all free men can justly decry.

Despite oppression and suppression, however, the spirit of freedom lives in their hearts and souls. The yearning for liberty has not and cannot be quenched. In very truth, the passion to be free has been only strengthened by the efforts of the Russians, for over 250 years, to suppress the Ukrainian national culture. The importance of the Ukraine cannot be overestimated. Forty-two million strong today, the Ukrainians compose the largest non-Russian group behind the Iron Curtain and represent one-fifth of the total population of the Soviet Union. Stretching from the Black Sea to the Carpathian Mountains, from the Donets Basin and Don River, the Ukraine comprises one of the most fertile and productive areas of the world: productive not only as the breadbasket of the Soviet Union, but even more essential, in industrial products and natural resources.

Small wonder that a relentless effort has been made to integrate the Ukrainian people into a Soviet culture. Small wonder that an equally relentless attempt has been constant for generations to destroy the political independence and personal freedom of a people who have so much to give. Even greater is the wonder, nevertheless, that despite the attempt, despite the suppression, despite, in fact, the ways of oppression to which the people have been subjected, their boundless love for their homeland, their historic yearning for freedom and liberty has not and will not be eradicated.

So on this day we once more pay tribute to the courage of the Ukrainian people and praise the contribution that they have made by precept and example to freedom-loving people around the world. We look forward to the day, with them, when we can rejoice in a world in which all mankind can indeed be free to enjoy self-government and to live in freedom, think in freedom, speak in freedom, act in freedom, worship in freedom, and enjoy every other privilege to which the heart of man aspires.

It would not be fitting on this day of commemoration to omit mention of the worthy contribution made by Americans of Ukrainian descent to the political heritage and culture of our own country. We have profited much from their love of freedom and their devotion to democratic ideals. The fabric of our country is enriched through their heritage and by their participation.

Today, as we once more bear witness to our mutual belief in liberty and justice, we assure the captive Ukrainian people that they have indeed not been forgotten. We extend to them the hand of our friendship as a manifestation, once more, of "the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian proclamation of independence. Each year it has been a custom of the Congress of the United States to note this important day as a tribute to the courage, faith, and steadfastness of the Ukrainian peoples throughout the world and to encourage their continued fight against the Communist philosophy. We, in the United States, who have enjoyed freedom and yet have been able to recognize the atheistic nature of the Communist philosophy, can sympathize more than any other peoples with the people of the Ukraine and can recognize better than most the tremendous and admirable struggle they have maintained throughout the years against their Communist aggressors.

This commemorative ceremony in the Congress of the United States serves as a useful weapon in bringing to the attention of the world the struggles of the 40 million Ukrainians and will, I hope, continue to be a symbol in their hearts of the worthwhile efforts they have made and will continue to make in their struggle for freedom.

I join with all the Members of this House in honoring those who strive valiantly for a freedom which should be theirs and join in the fervent hope that the day will soon come when the Ukrainians will have true independence.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic 42 years ago marks one of the happiest days for freedom-loving Ukrainians, and through the years has remained a memorable bright spot in the Ukraine's long and glorious but unhappy history.

Though the dawning of that period of freedom and independence did not last long—barely 2 years—it will always stand out as a great landmark in the modern annals of that country.

Since the loss again of their freedom in 1920, we know that the Ukrainians have suffered cruel hardships under Soviet totalitarian communism. But we also know that through all this hardship and oppression their cherished ideals of liberty and independence remain steadfast.

We join with Sons of the Ukraine, who have made their homes in America and have contributed to her greatness, in sending our warm greetings to their friends and relatives in the homeland. We add our hopes and prayers that the longed for better life for these 42 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain will eventually be won and enjoyed in full measure.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my colleagues of the House today in calling attention to the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on Friday January 22. As the largest captive nation that is contained within the Soviet Union itself, the plight of Ukraine and of 42 million Ukrainians should be constantly kept in mind by the American people. It is the sincere hope not only of my colleagues in the House and of the entire Membership of the Congress but indeed of all the American people that the inhabitants of the Ukraine will soon again have that blessed right of self-determination from which they have been denied almost since the establishment of their independence in 1918.

It is certainly fitting at this time to refer to the recent tragic death in Munich, Germany, of one of the great Ukrainian patriot leaders, Stefan Bandera. This man died under circumstances which gave the official appearance of suicide but it is the overwhelming conviction of all people of Ukrainian origin, an opinion in which I concur, that he was murdered by Communist agents. My own convictions in this matter are heightened by my personal knowledge of Mr. Bandera's long and valiant struggle against the Communists for the liberation of his homeland. I sincerely hope that his martyrdom to the cause of Ukraine independence will serve as an inspiration to those who remain behind so that his fight will be continued.

If all of us acknowledge, on this 42d anniversary, the justice of the aspirations of the Ukraine for freedom and self-government, I sincerely trust that it will serve as a reminder to the people of that great country that their cause is not forgotten here in the United States of America, the leader of the free nations in the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in observing the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

The young Ukrainian National Republic became one of the first victims of Communist expansion and aggression. It was invaded and crushed in 1920—barely 2 years after it had achieved independence. It has remained enslaved to this very day, in spite of the ironic Soviet claim that Ukraine is "a truly free and sovereign nation," and in spite of the fact that its Communist regime has been represented for a number of years in the United Nations.

The United States has always been sympathetic to the legitimate aspirations of other peoples. We know that the people of Ukraine long for true independence and wish to be rid of their Communist oppressors. This fact is clearly apparent from the long reign of terror imposed upon the people of Ukraine by the Communists who have endeavored to crush the will to resist, and the spirit of freedom, in all of the captive nations.

On this occasion, let us pay tribute to the undaunted spirit of the people of Ukraine, and reaffirm our hope that their wish for freedom and independence may soon be realized.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for nearly four decades the people of Ukraine have been engulfed by the surging and suffocating riptide of Soviet communism. There in their historic homeland they have been subjected to so much hardship and misery, privation and even starvation, that we hear very little else today about Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. But we should remember that these brave and stout-hearted Ukrainians, however oppressed, and at times downhearted they may be, have not given up their fervent desire for freedom and independence. On this 42d anniversary of their Independence Day the least we in this country can do is to assure them that millions of us here hope and devoutly pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of a most solemn day in the history of the world. It is the 42d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence.

Although independence under the declaration of January 22, 1918, was short lived, it is most fitting that we join here today in commemorating that anniversary and paying tribute to the courageous and freedom-loving people of the Ukraine.

It is fitting because the spirit of freedom and independence still burns strongly in the hearts and minds of these brave people. It is a fire that cannot be stamped out by their Communist oppressors. As their Communist oppressors know, the desire and love of freedom of the Ukraine people cannot be stilled or stifled, and I say that independence must not be denied them, even though the road to achievement may be long and hard.

As do the people of the Ukraine, we here in the United States of America look forward to the day when the standard of freedom and independence will fly over their land again. In solemn observation of the declaration of January 22, 1918, may we pray together that this day will not be long in coming. Through our prayers may we also reaffirm our deep and enduring friendship for the people of the Ukraine.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago tomorrow, the Ukrainian National Republic declared her independence after centuries of domination and sub-

jugation under the Mongols and the Russian czars. But that independence was short lived. No sooner were these freedom-loving people enjoying the fruits of liberty than the Soviet Communist leaders eradicated any vestige of the newly won freedom. Read the pages of Ukrainian history and you will find that the years following were filled with unparalleled cruelty and mass extinction that took millions of Ukrainian lives. But the indomitable spirit of these freedom-loving people lives on and it is this spirit that we, on the occasion of the 42d independent anniversary of Ukraine, seek to keep burning.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to pay tribute to the 42 million Ukrainians that comprise the biggest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain.

It is not amiss to ask the reason for the widespread concern Americans, and for that matter all freedom-loving people, have over the Ukrainians. In the words of Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the answer lies in the fact that for the first time, with the passage by this Congress last July of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, we officially recognized the existence of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. The enormous politicopsychological advantages and the leverage this opens up for us are the very thing Moscow fears most.

In her effort to disillusion the world, Moscow claims that the U.S.S.R. is a union of people having the same sentiments and culture. The terms "Soviet nation," "Soviet people," and "integrated Soviet might" are gross perversions of the truth. The Soviet armed forces consist of about 45 percent captive non-Russians. The startling reality is that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of which Premier Khrushchev is the head is a basic empire of captive nations and different peoples. Our unstinted support and understanding of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. destroys this illusion.

It is with this in mind that I join my distinguished colleagues and the American people, particularly the Ukrainian-Americans, in greeting and honoring freedom-inspiring Ukraine in her continuing and unabated struggle to regain that which is rightfully hers. It is the sincere hope of America and the free world that soon Ukraine will join the family of free nations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence. Although it was to last for 2 short years, it marked the only time in modern history that these people were given the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Tomorrow on the 42d anniversary of their independence the Ukrainians still are not free. The Communists have used every imaginable tactic to destroy all vestiges of Ukrainian nationalism. Consequently, there will be little opportunity for them to celebrate the happy occasion of their independence day.

Therefore, it is essential that all Americans join with Ukrainian-Americans in speaking for their speechless friends and relatives abroad. Our statements of concern for their welfare will, I am sure, help them bear the burden of Communist tyranny.

In particular, we should reassure the Ukrainian people that we have not forsaken them; that we have never acquiesced to their bondage; and that we will continue to demand that every nation, no matter how small, has the natural right of self-determination as well as the right to live in an atmosphere of freedom and justice.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, just 42 years ago tomorrow, the people of the Ukraine proclaimed and celebrated their independence from Russia. It is a tragic fact that this independence was short lived, for in 1920 the Red army launched a savage attack, taking over the country for the Communists. Since 1920 the Ukraine has been absorbed into the Soviet Union. But the Russians have not been able to assimilate the people, who have given strong and repeated evidence that their historic dream of national identity still lives.

History records that the Ukrainians achieved and held national freedom from the 9th to the 14th centuries, and again for a brief period in the 17th century.

I am personally acquainted with many Americans of Ukrainian descent who came to the United States to seek peace and freedom. Some of them are neighbors near my ranch in southwestern North Dakota. Many Ukrainian-Americans have relatives still living under Communist domination.

The old Russian Empire was referred to as the prison of nations during World War I. A look at modern Russia, under communism, indicates that the old title still fits the situation.

I am proud today to join with hundreds of thousands who now live in this country and have become loyal American citizens, in celebrating the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic.

It is to be hoped that the day is not too far off when the Ukraine and other countries now behind the Iron Curtain will once again be free.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the 22d of January, a Ukrainian National Council sitting in Kiev proclaimed the independence of the Ukraine. Today we observe that proclamation although the nation formed that day in Kiev is no longer free. The Ukraine National Republic was short lived, its existence forged into nonexistence by the might of the hammer and sickle.

But still, we observe Ukrainian Independence Day. Of course, our observance stems from our belief in freedom, our violent distaste for tyranny, and our honest prayer that the millions of oppressed Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain may regain that freedom which they have been so long denied. But besides demonstrating these facets of our democratic philosophy, this observance performs some extremely necessary functions. Without sounding callous, I would like to mention but a few of these functions.

By this commemoration, we announce to the world that we are not deceived by the fine words and friendly overtures of the U.S.S.R. We assert unequivocally that we are quite aware that the peace for which the Soviet Union expresses her desire, cannot be realized while that power herself remains the "hangman" of the captive nations. Then, too, this observance serves to state firmly that we are not deluded by the Soviet Union's denial of imperialistic designs for we know that living behind the Iron Curtain are millions of Ukrainians who have lost their independence, who were the first to suffer from the Soviet aggression, and who have been and are daily subjected to the tyranny of a government which operates on a single principle—gain power, by any means available.

Through this observance of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, we hope to shake all the people of the free West from their apathy; to jolt them from their comfortable living rooms to active support of the world's oppressed peoples. As we observe, we strongly affirm that the liberation of the captive nations depends upon the effectiveness of the support offered by the citizens of the free nations.

We observe this day, then, for many, many reasons but let us not forget that mainly this observation is a demonstration of our identification with the cause of freedom everywhere. May our words here today, and our actions today and every day be proof to the people of the Ukraine that we respect their courage, acclaim their perseverance and pray for their freedom.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. President, I too wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his statement on the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

The long and turbulent history of the Ukrainian people has had its ups and downs, its ebbs and flows. It is full of glorious deeds and dismal woes. Through it all, however, these brave souls have shown qualities and virtues that elicit admiration and sympathy. Their firm determination to pursue the goals they have set before them, their stubborn tenacity to cling to their national traditions, and their unquenchable yearning for freedom, these fine traits entitle the Ukrainians to a distinct place in the community of free and independent nations. And today, after centuries of struggle for their national goal, and after attaining it for a very brief period of 2 years, if they find themselves unfree in their homeland, that is not through any fault of theirs. Though they number some 42 million, by themselves they could not cope with their more numerous and far more ruthless Communist oppressors. Sad as their unenviable lot has been for the past 40 years under Communist tyranny, on this 42d anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to the people of Ukraine on this day, January 22, 1960, which marks the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

Those brave people and their new born nation were struck down by the Soviet forces almost as soon as they had proclaimed their independence. Ukraine and several other countries which had set up their own independent republics after the revolution were seized by Russian military forces in 1919–20 and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet scheme.

Then began the long uphill struggle to again attain independence which is rightfully theirs, a struggle which was seemingly hopeless during the years, a fight for freedom of the entire Ukrainian people in the subjugated area which will only end when the united independent sovereign Ukrainian State is again reestablished as it was in 1918–19, when the freely expressed will of the Ukrainian people created the democratic and progressive national republic.

Ukrainia was among the first of the nations which Communist Russia, in her mad quest for power shortly after World War I, decided to annex and despite mass deportation, purges, destruction of her churches and industry, she resisted with all her national spirit and moral fiber and will go down in history as an outstanding symbol of courage in the struggle for freedom and independence.

Our hearts go out to those 40 million freedom-loving people who have and will continue, to resist the iron heel of communistic Russia until that glorious day when Ukraine will cease to be a captive nation and will take her place in the sun alongside of other freedom-loving countries of the world.

I also wish to salute the many thousands of Ukrainians in this country who have carried on the fight for freedom of their native land and hope with them that the day is not too far distant when we can all celebrate together their absolute separation from the yoke of communism.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

On January 22, 1918, in the aftermath of the World War, the Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed.

The life of the Republic, as everyone well knows, was pitifully brief. A short 2 years later it became, and remains, a captive nation. The Ukrainian people became the first victims of a menace which was to threaten freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The Ukrainian people are the largest captive non-Russian nation in the Soviet. They have never forgotten their proud history of independence, nor have they forgotten their firm aspirations for freedom.

Although some 40 years have passed since their subjugation, they constitute a persistent source of rebellion which the Soviet cannot, despite gestapo tactics, suppress. The Soviet continues to deport Ukrainians to the Asian interior, and continues to persecute Ukrainian patriots, but somehow the spirit of the Ukrainian people survives. This bloody record is a monument both to the brutality of Soviet oppression and to the intensity of the Ukrainian nation's struggle for freedom.

It is vitally important that we take note of that struggle, and are properly cautioned, in this period of what we are told is a thaw in American-Soviet relations.

On this occasion of the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, we all pay tribute to the persistent courage and fortitude of the Ukrainian people. I join with my friends of Ukrainian descent and with freedom-loving peoples everywhere, in the prayer that the aspirations of the captive Ukrainian people will some day be fulfilled.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is our privilege as free men to honor the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Certain in the knowledge that what we say here will reach the millions of Ukrainians who have been enslaved by Moscow, and encourage them to look forward to the day of their eventual liberation.

The captive nations resolution passed by the Congress last July was heartening, but incomplete.

I believe that we should pass a stronger resolution that will convince the Communists of our unyielding opposition to any recognition, implied or otherwise, of the status quo in the lands presently under Communist domination.

No other people sacrificed so much in defense of their freedom, and that fact has not been lost on Khrushchev and his fellow conspirators. They know that the Ukrainians have never capitulated in spirit and never will.

And so Khrushchev seeks by force and blackmail and guile to have the United States agree to a "settlement" of international problems that will ignore the sovereign rights of the captive peoples of the U.S.S.R.

We shall never be a party to such a betrayal of the captive peoples and of our own conscience.

And when we speak up for the captive peoples, we mean not only those nations that were brutally conquered by Communist force and terror, but the subject peoples within the U.S.S.R. itself.

Forty-two million Ukrainians hunger for freedom, as do the Russian people themselves.

"Uneasy lies the head who wears the crown of Soviet imperialism," knowing that its military power and propaganda and intrigues can never legitimize the tyranny that is the enemy of every decent human aspiration.

On this 42d anniversary of their Independence, we congratulate the Ukrainian people for their unconquerable spirit.

Eventually, aided by the moral support of the free world and by the encouragement of mankind, it will prevail over those who presently hold them in bondage.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have this opportunity to pay tribute again this year to Ukrainia on the 42d anniversary of her independence. God bless her and her good people in her continuing fight for freedom.

Mr. CELLER. I salute the people of the Ukraine on the 42d anniversary of their independence.

We in the United States deeply sympathize with the Ukrainian people and their attempt to lift the Soviet yoke from their necks. Russia holds in thrall captive nations, all yearning to be free, and they should be free. It is only by the pervasiveness of the Russian police state that they remain enslaved. This is one of the tragedies of the age. But the Ukrainian people have the intelligence and the love of freedom which ultimately will triumph, as history has proven again and again.

The free world awaits the day when we can salute the Ukraine as a free and independent sovereign nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the people of the Ukraine achieved what we of the United States obtained 184 years ago—independence and freedom. Tragically, however, the prize which they had sought for centuries was cruelly stolen from them after 2 years of cherished possession, by the Russian Communists who even today still impose their oppressive domination upon these freedom-loving people.

Nearly 40 million Ukrainians, bearing a proud European ancestry, are being subjugated by a Russian dictatorship the like of which the modern world has not seen. The Kremlin, neither knowing nor caring about the background of these oppressed people is carrying on where the czars left off in an attempt to stamp out all national feelings of these brave people—carrying on with increased terrorism that tyrannical yoke. It has done all in its power to eradicate the national ideals that survived centuries of czarist suppression, and it will find no greater success than its predecessors. The brave Ukrainians who have suffered but withstood the oppression of the Communists longer than any people will continue to keep alive within themselves the spirit of independence.

Sadly they are unable to celebrate or even mention this day in their history because of the Communist denial of free speech on the part of any people dominated by them. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that we Americans who share their sentiments of freedom and independence observe this anniversary by proclaiming our recognition of their plight and by voicing the hope that one day they will again be able to live as free human beings under a government in which they have a full share. While enjoying our own freedoms we cannot be complacent and blind ourselves to the restraint imposed by force upon others who aspire to the same kind of independence. Let our American compatriots of Ukrainian ancestry and their families and friends who are still enslaved know that we are conscious of their predicament and that we extend to them our heartfelt hope that they will again secure the blessings of liberty.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, freedom-loving people everywhere will pause today to observe the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, a nation of 42 million people which remains captive and enslaved under communism.

When we adopted the resolution on Captive Nations Week in July 1959, we

struck a hard blow against communism which reverberated throughout the world and found a sympathetic chord in the hearts of many people. All of us recall the violent reaction of the Soviet leaders to this resolution and its effectiveness in molding public opinion. If anything, it showed the uneasiness of the Kremlin concerning its subjugation and domination of captive peoples and lands.

The Ukrainian people is one of the earliest victims of Communist imperialism. Despite their long captivity extending over a period of four decades, the people of the Ukraine do not consider themselves as Russians or as a part of the so-called Soviet nation. They will continue to cling to hopes of freedom and independence of the Ukraine, no matter how long or difficult the road may be.

It remains for us in the free world to keep those hopes alive and vibrant, to show them our sympathetic understanding of their plight, to encourage them not to lose faith in God and in humanity.

On this sad anniversary, we in the United States again declare our warm friendship for the Ukrainian people and our solidarity with their aims and aspirations for the early liberation of their tormented people and their ravaged country. We shall always support their cause for a free and independent Ukraine, and we join them in prayer on this day that their goal will soon be realized.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation dedicated to the tenet that man is a creature of God born to live in freedom, we feel a deep sense of sorrow for the people of the Ukraine on this eve of the 42d anniversary of their independence. It is not without hope that we regard their subjugation. Russian reaction to our Captive Nations resolution has imprinted in the open book of world understanding a dramatic picture of totalitarian fear for the principles expressed in that manifesto. The clique of conquerors in the Kremlin may full well feel fear in the face of these ideals, for like men everywhere the Soviet masters are not immune from conceptions of the rights of man. For centuries have the Russians not tried but failed to strip the Ukraine of its national ideals? And can they help but recall that the Goliath of physical power was no match for the David of human principles? It is with this in mind that we paid tribute to the captive peoples with our resolution and that we will tomorrow salute the people of the Ukraine.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, again we celebrate the anniversary, this the 42d, of Ukrainian national independence. And yet, it would be more realistic to say that it is a symbol that calls to our attention a period of lamentation and mourning for its enshackled and captive people.

In America, where we enjoy all of the God-given freedoms, it is important that we keep alive, by open discussion, the cause of Ukrainian independence. It is their only hope—that we live with them in the memory of their lost freedoms, so that they will keep alive the fires of freedom and continue the struggle to recapture the democratic fundamental principles of liberty.

The flag of azure blue and yellow gold is unfurled all over our land today, by the pioneers of Ukrainian ancestry who contributed so much to the economy and culture of our Nation. It is a reminder of the continuing protest to the American people of the enslavement of the Ukrainian people.

It is becoming a drudge on the honesty of purpose of our foreign policy to accept the servitude of the Ukrainian people without doing something to restore to them their historic claim of freedom as an independent nation in a free world.

We must, in our foreign policy, bring about the dissolution of colonial domination imposed by the Soviet Union over the freedom-loving captured nations of the world. There can be no permanent peace among the nations of the world without freedom.

The United States of America, the youngest of the great nations of the world, enjoying spiritual and economic freedom, must keep other nations free, in order to safeguard its own existence and the great democratic institutions protecting its way of life.

We owe it to the Ukrainian people—they must be free.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, the day of liberation and freedom for which the Ukrainians had worked and struggled for more than 250 years. By the overthrow of Czarist Russia's autocracy they made themselves free and on January 22, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence. For the Ukrainians that event marked the beginning of a new and hopeful era, and they did not realize at the time that the freedom which they had earned was to be taken away from them in a short time. After 2 more years, once more they were swamped by Soviet tyranny.

Unfortunately that has been their unhappy and unenviable lot for almost 40 years. During those four decades they have been suffering under the most oppressive of modern tyrannies. But the brave and stouthearted Ukrainians are carrying on their struggle for freedom, and even under desperate circumstances, they still cling firmly to their unquenchable desire to be free and independent. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day I ardently hope that eventually their desire for freedom will be fulfilled.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the Ukrainian people regained their sovereign right in their historic homeland and proclaimed their independence. The democratic republic that they established was recognized by many sovereign states. The years of 1918–20 were years of great expectations and boundless joy. The Ukrainians were on the road of rebuilding their war-torn country when it was overrun by Russia's Communist troops, and eventually annexed to the Soviet Union's totalitarian empire.

The freedom and independence which the Ukrainians had cherished for more than 250 years thus lasted, after its attainment, for only 2½ years. But the pleasant and happy memories of that short period still linger on with all freedom-loving Ukrainians. On the 42d anniversary of their independence day, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in tribute and in pledge. The tribute is to a great and brave people, to a land rich and fertile. The pledge is to these people and to this land that always will the righteous cause of a free and independent Ukraine be with us a sacred cause. The day is not far removed, Mr. Speaker, when freedom again will come to the Ukraine, and to the hastening of that day we give our prayers and rededicate our efforts.

In the district that I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Ukrainian birth or descent. They are a vital part of the fabric of our district. They have made a tremendous contribution to good and patriotic citizenry in our country in every city and in every State. On an anniversary day that means so much to our fellow Americans of Ukrainian birth or descent, we have an obligation to them, to ourselves, and to the cause of freedom of letting them know that never will we fail them, never will our spirits flag, or our efforts cease until again the Republic of the Ukraine, free and independent, a guardian of liberty and of human dignity, stands proudly among the sovereign nations of the free world.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that all freedom-loving people observe the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine and pay tribute to the resourcefulness and strength of the Ukrainian people. On this memorable occasion we salute the imprisoned millions of the Ukraine and we pray that they will be liberated from the Soviet yoke and regain their rightful position in the family of free nations.

It is appalling that the hardworking and industrious Ukrainians have been so cruelly denied the elemental privileges and amenities of life which should be the birthright of all human beings. It is tragic that, after centuries of suppression by the autocratic czars, the gallant Ukrainians were able to enjoy their national independence for only a few brief years. It was a thrilling event when on January 22, 1918, Ukrainian patriots proclaimed their national independence. Today we mark the anniversary of that declaration of freedom and we mourn that the Ukrainian Republic lasted only 2 brief years. Since 1920 the nation has been under the totalitarian dictatorship of the Kremlin.

It is truly inspiring that the long, dark years of oppression have failed to extinguish the spirit of freedom and independence in these valiant people. Their love of liberty has been strengthened by centuries of struggle and they have maintained their national consciousness even though their beautiful land is now a prison house. The idea of freedom still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of these oppressed people, and they are sustained by faith in their eventual liberation. Let us pledge anew our continued sympathy and support to these captive people and let us hope with them that on future anniversary occasions they will be closer to attaining their noble national goal.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my many colleagues in observance of the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine on January 22. One of the reasons for the unfortunate circumstances under which the brave Ukrainians find themselves today is a lack of appreciation throughout the world of the significance of Ukrainian history and its opposition to Russian Soviet rule.

The Ukrainians are a devout Christian people with a long record of opposition to Communist domination. Forty-two years ago, the people of the Ukraine achieved a long desired goal of independence, but a few years later found it wrested from them by treacherous Communist agents.

Despite the phony statements of Russian Dictator Khrushchev, Ukraine is not a free country of free people but is actually part of the Soviet slave empire, where unrelenting underground activity has been carried on against the Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States, Americans of Ukrainian extraction work hard to remind all of us of the unfortunate conditions in the land of their forefathers and keep alive the hope that the yoke of communism will some day be removed and that the Ukraine nation will permanently take its place among the free nations of the world. It is our fervent hope that their dreams of Ukrainian nationalism be realized.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during most of modern times the Ukraine has been a land of misery and misfortune. For almost 300 years, from the middle of the 17th century down to our own times, Ukrainians have not known freedom in their historic homeland. Only for a brief period, in 1918 to 1920, did they enjoy freedom. Then they proclaimed their national independence, and established their own free, democratic republic. But that period lasted only for 2 years. Toward the end of 1920 the Ukraine was invaded by the Red army; the Ukrainians were overpowered by their ruthless and inveterate adversaries, the country was overrun and occupied, and its inhabitants subjected to Communist tyranny. The democratic Ukrainian Republic was no more, and unhappy Ukrainians were treacherously robbed of their freedom.

For almost four decades some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. But they have not given up their ideals and still treasure personal and national freedom as fervently as ever. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day let us hope they will soon regain their cherished freedom and peace.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the First World War was hailed as a war for democracy and freedom, and the last war is often regarded as one of frustration and dismay. That may not be the way many of us would like to think of these two World Wars, but it must be clear to us why the Ukrainians remember those deadly events only in terms of their freedom and of their servitude under Communist tyranny. The First World War freed them from the clutches of the czarist Russian regime. The national freedom for which they had been struggling continuously for more than 250 years was theirs in 1918. For a little more than 2 years they lived in freedom and insofar as possible under those war-torn conditions, they enjoyed it to the full. But late in 1920, it was snatched away from them by the heartless Russian Communists, and they have not known it ever since.

Throughout the course of the interwar decades the Ukrainians endured the almost unbearable yoke of Communist tyrants. Then in the course of the last war they raised their hopes, and often their voices, for freedom, thinking and hoping that they would have it as their reward at the conclusion of that war. Today we know too well of their disappointment and despair, of their frustration and frightful experience. For almost 40 years they have been suffering under inflexible and ruthless Communist tyranny. On the observance of their independence day let us renew our determination to protect freedom everywhere so that the future may once again bring the realization of freedom to the Ukrainian people.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Unfortunately, however, more than 40 million Ukrainians are virtual captives of the cruel, inhuman, and atheistic Russians. We, as freedom-loving Americans, are deeply conscious of the terrible plight of the brave and wonderful Ukrainian people and their struggle for liberty and independence, which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts.

I particularly wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress that these millions of Ukrainians constitute the largest captive nation behind the Iron Curtain. These millions of our fellow human beings, now under the ruthless heel of their Communist taskmasters, cry out in agony against their oppressors. May I say to them that their great sacrifices, their peerless valor, their legitimate aspirations, and their cries for liberty, justice, and freedom do not go unnoticed nor fall upon deaf ears.

We Americans say to you: Do not despair, keep up your fighting spirit against the unrelenting tyranny of Communist totalitarianism, for we join with you in your cherished hopes and fervent prayers that, in the not too distant future, your beautiful land will become a free and independent nation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, commemorating today the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine not only serves as a reminder to us of the continuous hope for freedom of 42 million Ukrainians in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain but also affords us the opportunity to again urge restoration of freedom to all captive nations.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Ukrainian people throughout the world who are dedicated to the belief that freedom is the right of all nations. It remains for us of the free world to help them sustain their faith in God and humanity, in their own survival, and in their inevitable freedom. Words of encouragement and sympathetic expressions of understanding of their plight will mean a great deal to these people in their dark hours of desperation.

We must remain true to the cause for which these people continue to fight. We also must work diligently in support of freedom everywhere so all freedom-loving people of the captive nations may continue to hope fervently that they may soon enjoy the God-given right of independence with justice which should be the national heritage of all mankind everywhere.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian people regained their freedom by proclaiming their independence and by establishing the Ukrainian Republic. That act, the founding of the democratic Ukrainian Republic, was the culmination, the happy climax, of a long struggle that had its beginning in the mid-17th century when the Ukrainians were brought under the autocratic Russian regime. It is one of the happiest climaxes in the modern history of nations fighting for their freedom, and as such constitutes the brightest page in the history of the Ukrainian people. But the happy period which followed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic did not last long, for the forces of destruction and death, the aggressive Communist Red army troops, were on the march. Late in 1920 they invaded the Ukraine, overran it, treacherously put an end to freedom there, and brought the Ukrainian people under the oppressive Communist totalitarian regime. And for all these years, for almost four decades, they have been held down by their heartless overlords in their historic homeland.

The peoples subjected to the Soviet Union's totalitarian tyranny have suffered for decades, but it is no exaggeration to say that no people, perhaps at no time, have suffered for so long and have sacrificed so much in material wealth and in terms of human life, as have the Ukrainian people under the unspeakable Communist totalitarian dictatorship. The number of those who died because of the manmade, Stalin-administered starvation campaign, is counted in the millions; and many more millions lost their lives in prison camps and in forced labor camps in some forbidding parts of distant Siberia. Thus the price the Ukrainian people have paid for their survival, for their miserable existence, has been frightfully high.

Still, I am happy to say that these brave people have not ceased fighting their oppressors. They still carry on their struggle, ceaselessly and systematically, with all the means at their disposal, in the hope that eventually their righteous cause, the cause of freedom and independence, will win out. On the observance of the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day my best wishes go to these dauntless and courageous souls.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the fair and fertile Ukraine has been the land of the unfortunate and unhappy for centuries. In the course of their modern and recent history the Ukrainian people have suffered under many cruel, auto-

cratic, and oppressive regimes, and their present-day Communist oppressors have been most cruel toward them. Having robbed the Ukrainians of their newly regained freedom, these Communists, godless agents of the Kremlin, have succeeded in enslaving the Ukraine's 42 million innocent and helpless inhabitants. For almost 40 years these people have been held down by the brute force of totalitarian dictatorship. But under unheard-of hardships and privations, and under indescribable misery, their spirit of freedom is not broken, and they still have their fervent desire for freedom. I have no doubt that eventually they will have their reward. On this 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day I extend my wholehearted sympathy to, and best wishes for, these stouthearted people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have waged an uphill fight for their right to freedom and independence. They finally attained their goal 42 years ago by proclaiming, on January 22, 1918, the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic in their historic homeland. Though that budding and promising Republic did not last long and was ruthlessly shattered by Communist forces of destruction 40 years ago, and though since then the Ukrainian people have been subject to the most intolerable of tyrannies in their homeland, still they have not given up hope for their eventual liberation from the clutches of Communist rule. On this 42d anniversary of their independence day I gladly join all Ukrainian Americans and voice the hope that the Ukraine will gain its rightful place among independent and sovereign countries.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 millions of Ukrainians, both here and abroad, observed the 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic, a nation which was established in the latter days of World War I. This status was short lived; only a few short years later they were absorbed by the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union.

There is a Soviet fiction that the Ukraine today is a free Republic, with all the attributes of sovereignty including a diplomatic service, and that she remains in the Soviet system as a matter of choice and free will. This is utterly false. More than 40 million people in the Ukraine share the common desire of the captive and satellite peoples of Eastern Europe for freedom and self-determination.

The history of the Ukrainian people, as we know, reflects the centuries-long struggle of man to attain individual freedom. Three hundred years ago, the Ukraine was an independent state, rich in its culture and thriving in its commerce. Today, despite its enslavement, it is the second largest of the Soviet Republics and the richest in agriculture. Through the intervening years, the Ukrainian people have become familiar with the workings of Russian tyranny and oppression, under which they have suffered greatly.

For 300 years the Ukraine has been submerged in the Russian continent. Only once in the course of three centuries has it had the opportunity to attain the goal as a free republic. That was on January 22, 42 years ago, the day on which the Ukrainian Republic came into existence. That memorable and historic day has become a landmark in modern Ukrainian history, and remains as the brightest spot in the struggle of its people for their national independence and freedom. Since then January 22 has been celebrated annually as a national holiday.

Today, I sincerely hope that the remarks uttered on the floor will be of some small comfort to those millions of captive Europeans. I have faith that the Ukraine, and, indeed, all of the captive nations of Europe and Asia, will once again be free. If history has proved anything, it is that no despot, however cruel, can extinguish the yearning for liberty that dwells in the hearts of men.

This yearning for freedom must be kept alive in our hearts as well as theirs. We can never forget that the infringement of personal liberty in any part of this world constitutes a threat to freedom everywhere. On this day, when we reverently celebrate with Ukrainians the 42d anniversary of the founding of the last Republic, we should reconsecrate ourselves to the spirit to which that Republic—and our own—was born.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 22 is the date that marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. It is a tragic fact, however, that this independence was a short-lived one and that in 1920 the Red Communist army ruthlessly overran and crushed the Ukraine.

Since that date the 42 million Ukrainians have been living in enforced captivity under the heels of their Soviet oppressors. It is indeed sad that in this day and age when the world is moving slowly but steadily toward equal rights for all, that these proud and independent people are still forced to languish under the thumb of their Communist masters. They have been subject to Soviet control longer than any other minority in the Soviet Union. Their people have died by the millions in slave labor camps, in prisons, and in the vast expanses of the Siberian wilderness.

Ever since they assumed control, the Soviet regime has attempted every means possible to crush the spirit of the Ukrainian people. It is a tribute to the spirit of these people that today their love for freedom and liberty shines as brightly as ever.

I am honored to join today in saluting these courageous people and in the spirit of the Captive Nations Week resolution of last July, I join in the fervent prayer that one day soon the liberty-loving Ukrainian people will indeed be properly able to celebrate their national independence day in their own free country.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, whenever freedom is born anywhere on this earth, it should be the pride of freemen to celebrate it. Freedom, like human life, is a precious thing. When it is first born, it must be nourished and protected against its enemies, the harsh realities of power or climate and disease. Often this protection is not enough and the spark of life is extinguished.

Such a tragedy occurred 42 years ago in the Ukraine. When the Czarist empire was in the throes of revolution as World War I ended, the people of the Ukraine established a Republic, in the right of all men created equal to choose their own form of government. The proclamation of an independent, free, and sovereign state was issued by the Rada on January 22, 1918.

While these formalities were in process of expressing the hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people, Soviet Communist forces were already in the process of destroying the efforts of democratic government, as they had betrayed the hopes of the people of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In December 1917, the Russians had broken with the Ukrainian Government and set up a puppet People's Republic. The pattern the world has seen so often since and has noticed repeatedly since the end of World War II was followed in Moscow's support to its henchmen, and the Ukrainian People's Republic in the principle of self-determination.

Then followed months of disorganized warfare. Hunger, typhus, and other diseases swept the Ukraine. Eventually the Communists choked out this young nation and, by 1920, the Communists had subdued the people.

Despite the long years since the Soviet Ukraine was proclaimed, those who cherish liberty have kept alive the memories and liberties that were nurtured for such a short time on Ukrainian soil. Many Americans of Ukrainian descent look to the day when the Ukraine will again be free to control its own destiny. It is fitting that all Americans pause this week to mourn those who have been the victims of oppression and tyranny.

We honor not only the Ukrainian people who are held prisoners in their own homeland, but also those who have sought new lives in new lands, and who actively contribute to the cultural growth of their adopted homes. It is inspiring to witness how these people struggle against the superior might of Communist Russia in a valiant attempt to preserve their national indentity.

The tragedy of that first abortive attempt to establish a sovereign Ukrainian National Republic is past and familiar history, but it shall never be forgotten. Its commemoration persists as the symbol of the indefatigable spirit of all freedom-loving peoples. The Soviet fiction that the Ukraine is today a free republic is a vain and ludicrous attempt to deceive the world.

The American people share the dream that one day the Ukraine will, in fact, be free and independent. Until that day we must encourage, by words and deeds, the ambitions of these valiant people.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have fought valiantly for their unquestioned right to freedom and independence. Their devotion to such a noble and righteous cause is recognized by the whole free world, and perhaps that is one reason why all free peoples, particularly the people of this country, feel so intensely about the sad fate of the Ukrainians in their homeland.

For centuries these sturdy and stouthearted people have struggled, often against forbidding and insurmountable odds, for their freedom. In 1918 they attained their long-cherished national goal: they proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 42 years ago. Then for a brief period of about 2½ years they were free. But the forces of oppression and destruction were lurking around them even then; the bloodthirsty troops of the Red army were on the march. Late in 1920 they invaded the Ukraine, occupied it, and put an end to all forms of freedom there. During almost 40 years of misery and suffering some 42 million Ukrainians have been oppressed and enslaved under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Today, on the observance of Ukrainian Independence Day, the peoples of the free world, and of course we in this country, rededicate ourselves to the responsibilities that are ours as free people.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago the centuries-old hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people were realized, and their national independence had become an accomplished fact. They had proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian Republic on January 22, 1918, and at last, by asserting their inalienable right of self-determination, they had become masters of their fate. Unfortunately that was for a very brief period only, for by the end of 1920 their Republic was no more. They were robbed of their freedom and brought under the heavy heels of Soviet Russia's Communist totalitarianism.

Today, after almost 40 years, some 42 million helpless, innocent, but stouthearted and liberty-loving Ukrainians are suffering under Communist tyranny in their beloved homeland. On the celebration of the 42d anniversary of their Independence Day, I wish to assure them that they have millions of cordial and sympathetic friends in the free world, and, of course, in this country, who hope and pray for their freedom.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, we Americans have always cherished our freedom and have demonstrated on many occasions that we are even prepared, if necessary, to die for that freedom. Because we cherish freedom so much for ourselves we also deeply respect the desire of other peoples to be free, and as a nation we have long since established it as one of our fundamental principles that we are always prepared to support and to defend other countries which are fighting for their freedom.

Today, January 22, commemorates the anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Ukraine, which was created on January 22, 1918, exactly 42 years ago. We know the long struggle which the Ukrainian people put in to win this freedom and to lift from their backs the yoke of Czarist Russian oppression. Time and again the Ukrainian people fought for their independence; and 42 years ago today they believed they had finally achieved it.

Alas, that freedom proved to be all too short lived. In the space of a little more than 2 years the Ukrainian people were once again subjected to tyranny and despotism at the hands of their new Communist oppressors.

However, Mr. Speaker, the fight for freedom on the part of those who long for it and who have once tasted it never dies out. Just as we in this country must forever remain vigilant and strong in order to preserve the freedom which we have succeeded in winning, so the people of the Ukraine have continued over these long years to keep alive in their hearts and minds the ultimate objective of freedom to which they are so strongly committed.

Today all Americans, I know, join with the 42 million Ukrainians who are still under the domination of Communist tyrants, as well as with thousands of Ukrainian Americans, in not only commemorating this anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, but in reaffirming our conviction that as Americans we stand beside these people in their fight for lasting independence and again pledge them our support, with the renewed hope that the day will not be far off when this freedom will truly be achieved.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian nation was born and was welcomed by all freedom-loving people as an independent state. Sadly, the hope that this young Republic would enjoy a prosperous future was shattered when, 2 years after celebrating its birth, the Ukrainian National Republic was destroyed and its people were subjugated by Communist Russia.

It is fitting that we in America take time to reaffirm our spiritual affinity for the brave souls who have kept the hope of Ukrainian freedom alive. It is particularly appropriate that we join with our Ukrainian friends in saluting the memory of Stepan Bandera, leader of the Ukrainian Nationalist Organization who was killed by Communist agents in October of last year. A devoted patriot, Stepan Bandera fought both Nazi and Communist tyranny as these successive waves of oppression washed over his beloved homeland. After the war with Nazi Germany ended, he brought leadership and funds to partisan armies which gallantly fought to carve a free Ukraine out of the confusion at war's end. It was Nikita Khrushchev who was assigned by Stalin to suppress the embattled Ukrainians and, in 1949, he finally succeeded. But Stepan Bandera never abandoned his lifelong dream of an independent Ukrainian state. He continued until his death to devote his whole energy and strength to the cause of liberation for his country and her people.

The fate of the Ukrainian Republic, the subsequent enslavement of the Ukrainian people, and the murder of their leaders should serve as a tragic warning to any nation that would look to Soviet Moscow for friendship. Similarly, the unrelenting struggle of 40 million Ukrainians against Russian domination stands as proof, once again, that the spirit of freedom cannot die even in those areas which have been under the Communist head for more than a generation. It is my sincere hope that the flame of freedom which continues to glow in the hearts of the Ukrainian people shall light a new Ukrainian Independence Day in the not too distant future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine—independence which was hailed by the Ukrainian people as final deliverance from oppressive and cruel Russian domination.

For 300 years the people of Ukraine have steadfastly struggled against tyrannical enslavement. With a limitless love for their homeland, a burning desire for freedom and political independence, and unswerving faith in the ultimate achievement of their goal regardless of how great the sacrifice to attain it, the Ukrainian people have relentlessly sought to end domination of Ukraine by foreign oppressors and to establish their nation as a free and independent state.

The first opportunity to realize their dream of independence came to the people of Ukraine in 1918 at the close of World War I, and on January 22, 1918, Ukrainian leaders proclaimed their national independence.

This marked the formal and official restoration of the independence of the Ukrainian nation.

Freedom, however, could be held only for a brief span of 2 years by the people of Ukraine, and in 1920 Ukraine was attacked by the Russian Communist forces, overrun by the Red army in a fierce and bloody struggle, and incorporated against the will of the Ukrainian people into the Soviet Union.

But the hard-working, industrious, and courageous people of Ukraine have not accepted Russian domination, and the desire for freedom burns bright in their hearts.

The people of the United States join with the people of Ukraine this day and with those of Ukrainian descent in the United States and throughout the world in prayer on this anniversary of the independence of Ukraine for the ultimate liberation of Ukraine from Soviet enslavement.

Forty-two million Ukrainians are held in bondage in the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. The plight of these people is a matter of grave concern to the people of the United States who are dedicated to the principle of individual liberty and national freedom, and to the people of all the nations of the free world.

On this 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine, it is our sincere hope that the day of liberation for the Ukrainian people may be close at hand, and that the independence of Ukraine may be reestablished.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, very frequently throughout the years this House is called upon to observe the anniversary of independence or to celebrate the birthday of the Government of some great people now behind the Iron Curtain.

On Friday, January 22, it will be the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It is a great nation of 42 million people destined to be free by the Almighty, earnestly and ardently desiring freedom in its heart, prepared to protect and foster democratic institutions and freedom of the individual, and yet violently dragged behind the Iron Curtain, its millions of people compelled to live under the oppressive heel of a godless, military dictatorship.

Whatever may be said in the high councils of state, or by those who like smaller nations to be merely pawns in a great international game, the plight of Ukraine, like that of many other nations who have had their liberties cruelly suppressed by the Soviet, must be of greatest concern to every believer in the free way of life.

This great nation, born in freedom, consecrated time and time again by the blood of its sons shed to preserve that freedom, could never under any circumstances, acknowledge that denial of freedom to Ukraine or any other nation desiring it, could be morally, ethically, or politically justified.

The power and terror of modern missilry may deter those who might be disposed to make war. But the Marxist conspiracy, so long as it operates under the principles upon which it is established, and the program which it has set out to follow, insures nothing but an indefinite, uneasy, restless peace.

The theory behind this tactic is that if it is continued long enough and persistently enough, universally enough, that, in time, the forces of democracy will weaken from economic inanition or sheer moral and physical collapse and leave the world to communism. This is one of the tragic fallacies of Marxism.

I could never bring myself to believe that the human race or at least that portion of it committed to free institutions could ever fall so low in moral strength and courage as to surrender the great free heritage which has been responsible for a western civilization based on freedom and for history's most fabulous progress.

Is the fiber of the American people being weakened? Is their morale being undermined by propaganda, by promises of an easy life? I do not believe so. I think that as long as this world lasts there will be Americans—and they will constitute a great majority—who will be willing to fight and die, if necessary, to preserve the fountainhead, principles, and shrines of human liberty that exist here in this great country of ours.

But we must be resolute; we must be determined; we must be more tough-minded in our attitude than ever before. If we follow the tempting pathway of appeasement, we will be lost forever and our great Nation will follow the same course as other great nations and majestic powers of world history which allowed strength, plenty, and abundance to dull their morale and weaken their purpose to preserve their government.

A great scholar wrote me recently and I shall never forget what he said. It is worth repeating here. "I am not worried about the courage of the American people," he said. "I feel that our country's chief danger lies in its own careless heart." This great thinker was right; we cannot afford to be careless in our heart about our freedom. Certainly we must have the courage, come what may, to defend it.

Let us, therefore, pledge to the people of Ukraine, and other subject peoples held captive in cruel bondage, our sincere sympathy for their plight and our desire and intention to do everything in our power to open again for them the pathway to freedom and justice.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, 42 years ago, the Ukrainians established their independence. This day marks a great historic event and although the Ukrainians were able to maintain their national independence for only a short period of time, it is fervently hoped that the day will come when they will regain their freedom. It is fitting that we pause on the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day to observe this great event.

We extend our best wishes to the people of Ukrainia and express the hope that the time will come when they will regain their independence.

Happy and rare is the lot of those nations that can enjoy their national independence for a long unbroken period of time, and still happier are those who did not have to struggle against forbidding odds for its attainment. The Ukrainians, one of the largest ethnic groups in eastern Europe, and among the most sturdy and stouthearted fighters for liberty and freedom, have not been fortunate in this respect. Centuries ago they lost their national independence. They regained it in 1918, only to lose it again in 1920.

For the 42 million Ukrainians who have been suffering under Soviet totalitarian dictatorship for 40 years, and who still long for their freedom, the 2-year happy, but short, period of liberty was the most memorable and unforgettable years in their modern history, for then they enjoyed their freedom in their homeland. Today those of their kinsmen who are fortunate enough to live in the free world celebrate their 42d Independence Day. I am glad to join Ukrainian Americans in the commemoration of this historic and memorable anniversary.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, the history of the people of Ukraine is a long record of a determined struggle for freedom which has won the respect and admiration of liberty loving people in all parts of the world.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917, these people seized their chance to form a national republic. The Bolsheviks in Ukraine were disarmed, and as a consequence of these two acts the Bolshevik government declared war. They set up a puppet government in Kharkiv which did not in any way represent the Ukrainian people, and proceeded to invade their country under the leadership of a Russian in command of a Russian Army. By force of arms as well as the activity of the fifth column, the people of Ukraine were forced to accept Soviet rule.

The Ukraine is still known as the granary of Europe and it contributes more to the Soviet empire than any other country behind the Iron Curtain. Its agricultural production is one of the highest in the world, even though handicapped by inefficient Soviet methods, and it is one of Europe's richest and most highly developed industrial countries. Its coal and metals production amounts to more than 80 percent of the entire Russian output. In addition, it has the best railway system in the U.S.S.R., important oil wells, hydroelectric plants, and is heavily industrialized. The people of Ukraine are thrifty, hard working and highly individualistic, and they have kept up a long and determined resistance to the forced collectivism of the Red regime.

Ukraine has a population of over 40 million people, and is the largest non-Russian country dominated by the Soviets. Its value and importance as a production center cannot be overemphasized, and the spirit of its people in their continuing fight for liberty cannot be too much praised and admired. It stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual destruction of Soviet imperialism. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of free Europe must be assured if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom loving nations is to be impregnable.

The indomitable will of the Ukrainian people to achieve national freedom still survives in undiminished strength, despite the toll of the millions of lives taken by the Russians in purges, mass murders, and manmade famines. Its rich traditions and culture, centuries old, are still alive and continuing to grow, regardless of the attempted destruction of its religion, science, and learning by its Soviet rulers.

Let us do all we can to aid these valiant people in their efforts to throw off the scourge of the Russian regime and its attempts to force them into communism. The strength and power of their unbending determination and passion to become a sovereign, free, and independent nation, deserves all the help and encouragement we can give them.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today many hundreds of millions of people are suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship. In the Soviet Union alone there are more than 200 million who are forced to endure the almost unbearable yoke of the Kremlin tyranny. And among these unfortunate millions the Ukrainians have borne the brunt of Russian communism. These brave and patriotic Ukrainians have known freedom for only a very short time during the last 300-odd years of their history. That was during the years 1918–20.

Before the end of the First World War the czarist autocracy collapsed in Russia, and this startling event afforded the opportunity for the Ukrainians to regain their freedom. They seized upon the occasion and proclaimed their national independence on January 22, 1918. Unfortunately for the Ukrainians, and for their friends everywhere, that independence lasted for only a short time.

In 1920 the country was attacked by the Red Army, was overrun, and the independent Ukraine passed into the pages of history books. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and to this date it remains chained to that union.

There in their homeland 42 million sturdy and stouthearted Ukrainians lead a miserable life. Like prisoners held behind the veritable Iron Curtain, they are deprived of all forms of freedom, and cannot even celebrate their independence day.

We of the free world, and in this great Republic, in celebrating the 42d anniversary of that memorable event, hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago this week the Ukrainian people gained their freedom by proclaiming their independence for the first time after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. This freedom, unfortunately, did not last and does not exist today. We commemorate this anniversary with sadness and sympathy for the plight of those millions of Ukrainian people who today are the victims of Communist expansion and aggression.

It is difficult for us in the United States to realize what this means and to conceive the sufferings the Ukrainian people have endured since their country was so brutally overrun in 1920 by the Red army.

This anniversary serves as a reminder of the fateful enslavement of 40 million Ukrainians, who have kept alive a spirit of freedom and have sustained faith in eventual liberation. The desire for freedom of these and other peoples suppressed by communism cannot be ignored and I have faith that the day will come when they will once again become free and independent. We must try to encourage them to continue their efforts and hopes toward that day. They deserve our encouragement, and it is my hope that the expressions of sympathy on the part of Members of the U.S. Congress this week will serve to strengthen their courage and kindle their hopes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 42 years ago, the people of the Ukraine established the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Since that time there has been little opportunity for rejoicing over the fact of national determination for the despotic rule of the Kremlin has destroyed all semblance of independence.

However, this oppressive yoke of Soviet tyranny has not destroyed the will to be free nor suppressed the ancient yearnings for independence of the Ukrainian people. Bloody massacres, yearly purges, and deportations to Siberia lend mute testimony to the manner in which the Soviets have attempted to stamp out this ferment of freedom.

All people who prize liberty are aware of the sacrifices which make it possible and keep it intact. The Ukrainians, however, in their heartland or wherever in the world they may reside, have lost none of this awareness. The more hopeless their cause has been, the more fiercely determined they have become to restore freedom to their homeland. Their love of liberty for all men has led them to fight for this Nation and for other nations who have sought freedom. Their fight has been continuous and unrelenting. In East Germany, in the slave-labor camps of Siberia and central Asia, Ukrainians joined other non-Russian patriots in attempting to rid themselves of the Communist yoke. Most recently Ukrainian men of the Red army sided with the valiant Hungarians in Budapest to write one of freedom's most glorious chapters.

This proud land, an independent and free state from the 9th to the 14th century and again from the middle of the 17th century to late in the 18th century, has writhed under the oppressor for more than 300 years. Its extensive natural resources have made the Ukraine coveted by its neighbors, and its people have been forced to exploit the fertility of their land to feed their masters. The story of the Ukraine is the first chapter in the long history of Soviet enslavement of free nations.

Although the requirements of a realistic foreign policy prevent the United States from dispatching military forces to drive the Red oppressors from the Ukraine, we can continue to do much to remind these people that their plight is not forgotten. In so doing we can hope, pray, and plan for the day when the Ukrainian people will be free. We salute a people whose representatives have contributed greatly to American life.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian people have always fought for their right to be a free and independent nation. Through the many and long struggles which began more than 300 years ago, they have succeeded in keeping alive their spiritual resiliency, their unquenchable desire for freedom. Without ceaseless and sustained work, without the cheerful willingness of the Ukrainian people to sacrifice their all, they could not have attained their national independence in 1918. Though they lost their well deserved and hard earned independence 2 years later, and though since then, for almost 40 years, they have been suffering under the most cruel tyranny in existence today, yet the lesson which they have learned in the school of adversity is not forgotten. Today they are struggling just as fearlessly and confidently as did their forebears generations ago for their freedom and independence. On this 42d anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Day I wish them all a lightening of their heavy yoke.

May we who are free dedicate ourselves to make the very most of our opportunities, living in harmony with our neighbors and setting for ourselves the highest standards of excellence we can achieve.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, since the National Defense Education Act went into effect a year ago last September, a serious debate on the propriety of the loyalty provisions has been raging among a large segment of our people, particularly in the academic world. The controversy, to my mind, is not so much with respect to the oath of allegiance as the disclaimer requirement in the law, otherwise known as the negative affidavit requirement. Under this requirement every student applying for a student loan must sign a statement, "that he does not believe in any organization that believes in or teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government." Protests against this affidavit have been raised singly or collectively through the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association. They urge the outright repeal of the disclaimer requirement.

The Congress should take serious note that six colleges refused to go into the student loan program because of the requirement. They were: Princeton, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Swarthmore, Mills, and the University of Richmond. Thirteen others withdrew because of it—Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Radcliffe, Antioch, Bennington, Goucher, Oberlin, St. John's, Wilmington (Ohio), Grinnell, Reed, and Sarah Lawrence.

Ten months ago I introduced an amendment to the act designed to eliminate section 1001(f)(1), the repugnant provision of the law. I spoke on the floor in support of this bill. Others have done the same. Unfortunately, these bills gained no progress in the other body. The dire effects of this provision remaining on our statute books prompted President Eisenhower, on the eve of his recent departure abroad, to speak out categorically in favor of the repeal of the disclaimer requirement. In his recent budget message the President called unwarranted this provision. He added that it is, "justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels it is being singled out for this requirement."

In a recent article reprinted from the December 20, 1959, issue of the New York Times magazine, Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, points out that the disclaimer requirement cannot be relied upon either as a safeguard against disloyalty or as a means of inculcating loyalty. I agree with Dr. Griswold when he says that—

> The affidavit cannot create loyalty. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticisms and even doubt. Such loyalty may and usually does have an instinctive base; but if the opportunity to satisfy curiosity and answer criticism is limited, or qualified, or made conditional upon the acceptance of restraints, the instinctive base of loyalty is undermined. The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths of any sort are of little value compared to the devo-

tion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

It is hard enough for professors and students to see why they should be treated differently from any other individuals, groups, professions, or occupations that receive Federal subsidies or loans. It is harder still for them "to appreciate the justice of this when they reflect on the role they are being asked to perform and the manner in which they are being asked to perform it." In this regard, Dr. Griswold says—and I quote him:

In one and the same breath they are told that they are the Nation's first line of defense—and the Nation's poorest security risk. They are called upon to put forth their best effort in the name of national security; yet they alone are obliged to submit to certain qualifications concerning their loyalty.

History teaches us that under the scourge of political and religious test oaths such as this disclaimer requirement our Protestant ancestors emigrated from England to settle in America; that our Catholic ancestors lost their lands and lives; that Puritan dissenters and Quakers went to jail.

Although these things are easily forgotten, colleges and universities, where history is studied and the past ever present, remember them.

Dr. Griswold sums up the position of the colleges and universities as follows:

Underlying this concern with test oaths, in fact underlying the whole position of the colleges and universities in this controversy, is their concern for freedom. For centuries, in Europe as well as in England and America, they have struggled for the right to pursue learning for its own sake without interference by church or state. They have done so not because society owed them this right as a mark of respect or a special privilege, but because they have regarded it as a functional necessity identical with freedom of the press and similar to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the disclaimer requirement is a shackle that binds minds. I wholeheartedly concur in what Dr. Griswold says in this regard, which might well be a warning to all freedom-loving people:

A nation that cannot trust its intellectuals cannot trust itself. A people that is afraid to expose its political and social institutions to the curiosity and criticism of the rising generation is not free; by whatever method it whispers this fear of itself, it shouts its insecurity to the world.

I submit that if security repudiates academic freedom it must take care lest our most valuable resources be subverted. Security which makes this kind of a demand endangers what it attempts to secure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add at the end of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the January 20 edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LOYALTY OATH THAT WE DON'T NEED

The academic community should especially welcome one item in the President's budget message. This was his mention that he is recommending repeal of the affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act's student loan program, under which each applicant for a federally aided loan must sign a statement that he does not believe in * * * any organization that believes in or teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government.

As we have repeatedly argued, this singling out of needy college students as a suspect group whose loyalty must be specially challenged is an affront both to students and colleges. It also sets a dangerous precedent for Federal interference with the educational process. As the President noted, it is "unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community."

Freedom of the academic world from coercive governmental inquiry into private beliefs is a fundamental matter of principle, to which Congress should give its prompt attention.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I desire to commend the gentleman from New York for throwing additional light on this complex issue. While I have taken no position on this issue, I wish to say that the gentleman from New York is one of the most courageous and conscientious Members of this body.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is commemorated the 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. Unfortunately, we cannot observe this day with a feeling of joy but must, instead, with a sadness which befits the plight of the brave Ukrainian people who, with the exception of a brief moment of self-determination in 1918, have remained captives in their own land suffering under the rule and persecutions of their Communist masters.

The Ukraine presents to the world a unique and startling paradox: unique, because it is a captive nation within the U.S.S.R. although described by its Communist rulers as a so-called independent Soviet Socialist Republic and thus, by legal implication, voluntarily bound to a union; startling, because it demonstrates the absurdity of the Communist position which alleges their interest in liberation and in the self-determination of peoples.

History proves that the Ukraine is, by reasons of ethnic, language, and culture, a nation. Throughout the 300 years during which Europe witnessed the growth of nationalism, which is contemporarily resurgent, the Ukrainians under the tyranny of the tsars, foreign rulers, and the Communists, have been and are, forcibly prevented in their many and continued attempts from exercising a national will to achieve the rightful status of a nation. It is a tragedy when it is so glaringly evident that, although all the proper elements of nationality are so deeply ingrained in a people yet, because of alien forces, they are prevented from any manifestation which would give them the freedom which is their right.

The Ukraine is considered the cradle of Christianity in Russia. Kiev, its capital, is called by Russians the "Mother of Cities" and, more important, the holiest of Russian Orthodox shrines are located within its limits. It is difficult to believe, when faced with such irrefutable facts, that a people so culturally and religiously homogeneous would, of their own free will, join a political union of states, even though contiguous, whose peoples differ so markedly. Nor, above all, would people with such strong religious traditions, ally themselves with a so-called popular union whose government by propaganda and coercion is anti-religion and who maintains this as a basic premise of its political philosophy. We must, therefore, include the heroic Ukraine among the captive nations.

To the people of the Ukraine and to their compatriots in the free world who, with them, continue in faith to keep alive the spirit of liberty, let us pledge our support to see that some day the independence of these people shall be a reality.

When we are able to welcome the Ukraine into the world as a free and independent nation, then and only then, shall this day of commemoration have a joyful significance.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

JORDANIAN CONTROL OF ENTRANCE TO JERUSALEM

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month my wife and I were privileged to make a stimulating personal visit to Israel. We were deeply impressed and thrilled to find that this ancient land, whose shores are washed by the Mediterranean Sea, is alive with a youthful, pioneering spirit reminiscent of our own beginnings.

The historic monuments and sights of Israel are awe-inspiring, but far more stirring than geographical and man-made vistas are the spirit and sense of dedication of the people who live in the Holy Land. Disciplined energies and wills are turning desertlands into hospitable and productive acres. Determination and zeal, inspiration and faith, are rebuilding a nation—a stalwart testament to freedom.

I want to report to the Congress today on a highly significant development that occurred during my stay in this democratic bastion of the Middle East.

It arose from my desire to visit the Old City of Jerusalem which lies behind

the borders of Jordan. Not fully aware of the depth of the barriers which I later discovered to be existent, I mentioned it to the U.S. Ambassador, the Honorable Ogden R. Reid, who quite obviously has done a great deal in a short time to understand Israel, its people, and its aims and goals. He assured me of the cooperation of the Embassy to achieve this.

Arrangements were initiated and then I was informed that I would have to answer some queries as to my religious faith. It soon became apparent that Americans of the Jewish faith were included among those not permitted by the Jordanian ban to cross over into the Old City.

I was deeply shocked to learn that such a test, embarrassing as it was to our legation personnel, had been brashly established by the Jordanian authorities as a prerequisite for entry into that traditional shrine of such deep religious significance to the entire world.

The next day while lunching at the magnificant Hias center in the city of Beersheba, I was informed by phone from the American Embassy in Tel Aviv that my request to visit the Old City had been denied. The officials of the Embassy assured me that they had exerted every possible effort—and I am sure that they did—but it was to no avail.

To say that I was outraged is to put it mildly. I was indignant and expressed the determination to demonstrate the ridiculousness of this demeaning barrier to free entry.

I was affronted that such a practice should be followed by a nation with whom America has amicable relations, a nation whose very existence we had helped to preserve in the stormy summer of 1958, and into which we were pouring millions of dollars in grant aid.

My passport did stipulate certain Communist countries into which I was not authorized to travel, but it enumerated no other similarly interdicted nations nor travel prohibitions based on personal religious belief.

The issue was more than just personal; it was far larger than an individual grievance; it was a moral case, a matter of justice, a question of upholding the cherished value of the dignity of man. Here I found myself, an American—regardless of my role as a U.S. Congressman—treated as a second-class person by a so-called friendly nation.

And if this be the case with a U.S. citizen, what of the situation, for instance, with the Jews of Israel who may wish to visit the holy places of their ancient tradition. I subsequently studied the Jordan-Israel General Armistice Agreement and was further revolted at finding that the intent of article VIII thereof provides for "a free movement of traffic on vital roads, including the Bethlehem and Latrun-Jerusalem roads; resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and free access thereto; free access to the holy places and cultural institutions and use of the cemetery on the Mount of Olives."

This agreement, so clearly set out in the armistice, is being malevolently violated. Jews from all nations are denied permission to cross the border. Beyond that the great cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus—the Hebrew University and the Hadassah Hospital—are left isolated, uninhabited, standing majestically yet tragically as reminders of the armistice violations. The library at the university contains half a million valuable books of learning which are rotting, unused on the shelves.

I was infuriated to encounter this blatant disregard for decency and obligation, this insult and affront to the American people, and expressed my intention to speak out about my personal experience as an example upon my return to Congress. I requested our Embassy personnel, through its proper channels, to convey these strong feelings on the subject.

The following day, upon returning to Tel Aviv from a tour to the Sea of Galilee and Nazareth, I received word that the Jordanian authorities had reversed their decision and had approved my visit.

Impressions of that short trip made on Sunday, January 3, were vivid. We toured venerable and sacred religious sites in Old Jerusalem and Bethlehem, places precious to Christians and Jews. We witnessed the desecration that has been visited upon the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. We were sickened to learn that tombstones had been ripped out by Arabs and fashioned into construction materials, and that debris and waste had been callously dumped on the burial ground.

There is no need to go into other memorable impressions of our visit to the Old City. What, I believe, is most significant, is that the trip was made. When word arrived that my request had been approved, I had the choice of foregoing the visit because of the original attitude of the Government of Jordan, or, of determining to go, not only to establish a precedent and uphold the moral principle on which I appealed, but also to demolish a barrier and to carry through the extensive efforts by our Embassy people who had acted with great credit throughout the entire incident.

I believe my trip served to demonstrate the ridiculousness of this degrading barrier. I understand that I am probably the first of my faith, knowingly to the Jordanian officials, to cross into the Old City from Israel since the end of the Arab-Israel war. Jordan apparently relented as a consequence of my strong expression of indignation and protest.

My purpose in thus describing this occurrence to the Members of the House is to indicate the feasibility of a policy of speaking up strongly to the Arab States on other matters. It seems to me that my personal experience has tremendous significance in this respect. True, it may be only one incident but it points up what can be accomplished if we stand up for principle and are not afraid to speak out, if we insist on justice and morality. It reflects what can be accomplished if our spokesmen convey a feeling of firmness, reflecting a determination to see the Middle Eastern nations rid of the divisive issues which have cast a pall over the region for the past 11 years, rather than acquiescence in the continuation of festering sores. This represents to me a reasonable, sensible policy.

Our present policy of attempting to strengthen individual Middle East nations and to buttress them against communism without, at the same time, encouraging and working for the elimination of areas of friction among them, seems to offer thin hope for any really positive results. Certainly, an area cleansed of myopic fears of each state about the intentions of its neighbors would be in a far stronger position to constructively utilize foreign assistance, develop in regional strength and resist communism.

Firmness and fairness on our part in encouraging agreement on the Suez, refugees, and use of water resources, can well pay extensive dividends to world peace and security in the future. My experience may properly offer an example of what might be accomplished.

EXTENSION OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I speak today about my bill, H.R. 9812, which seeks to extend the Library Services Act 5 years. This proposal is simple. It merely changes one word in the initial bill. The initial bill, passed in 1956, authorized the appropriation of $7.5 million a year "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years." This bill inserts the word "nine" in place of the word "four," so that the bill reads "and for each of the nine succeeding fiscal years," and makes other technical changes pertaining to our new States, Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, my reasons for introducing this legislation now are many and important. First, let us look at the history of the initial bill and the reasons for its introduction and adoption.

The Library Services Act was adopted by the Congress after it had been pointed out:

First. That some 26 million Americans living in rural areas had no access to a public library.

Second. That some 50 million other Americans had inadequate library service.

Now this is what the Library Service Act did. It authorized an annual $7.5 million appropriation for 5 years for grants to the States for the extension and improvement of rural public library service.

The dollar amount was believed to be sufficient, when matched by State and local funds, to make a big enough start toward facility improvement and to arouse enough local interest that after 5 years the Federal Government could step out of the picture.

But what happened? In no year yet have we appropriated the full amount authorized. This is the record:

In fiscal 1957, the first year of the program, we appropriated only $2,050,000.

In 1958, we recognized how successful the first year was with limited funds and increased the appropriation to $5 million, still $2,500,000 less than the authorization.

In the next 2 years we did better, appropriating $6 million each year.

But, over the 4-year life of the bill we have appropriated only $19,050,000, less than two-thirds of the amount the initial bill authorized.

Let us see what we have done with this money to see if it has been worth spending. The facts and figures leave no doubt about the improvement of rural libraries. The efforts of State and local areas has been overwhelming and the results have been most gratifying.

In fiscal 1957, the first year of the program's operation, 35 States and Hawaii set up plans and raised State and local funds in order to participate in the program. Today 52 States and territories are participating.

According to a recent Office of Education estimate, State funds appropriated for the improvement and extension of public library service to rural areas have increased more than 54 percent since 1956, and local funds have increased 45 percent.

Now let us look a little closer to see what has happened to help those 26 million persons without libraries and those 50 million with inadequate facilities. Let us see what is going on in the 319 rural counties where no libraries existed.

Here are the Office of Education estimates. Some 30 million of those 76 million persons have new or improved library services. A giant step indeed. But do not forget that much of this service is still not adequate.

More than 1 million persons in rural areas now have library service for the first time. Some 63 counties formerly without any public libraries now are receiving service. The act has meant traveling bookmobiles, increased book supplies, money for salaries for increased staff, money for scholarships and workshops to train additional staff, county and regional library projects, and extensive loan and reference programs.

New bookmobiles have totaled more than 200 bringing books and information to rural people in remote areas. Some 5 million books have been added to cultural resources of rural communities. The hunger for books and information by our people in rural areas has been emphatically demonstrated by the tremendous increases in library usage as a result of these improved services.

Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from some State reports reflecting the results achieved during the first 3 years of the act:

From Idaho:

The attitude toward public library development is wholesome and encouraging. Federal aid is a tremendous stimulant.

From South Carolina:

We see a State becoming clearly aware of what good public library service consists, how much it costs, and its importance to the economic as well as the cultural welfare of the community.

From Hawaii:

We feel particularly fortunate to have the help of Federal-aid funds, because they became available at the same time as the new emphasis on science.

From Oklahoma:

Interest in libraries and library services is increasing each year. Through the funds available under the Library Services Act, we have been able to show the people in Oklahoma what good library service is.

Here is what the law has helped to do in some States:

Utah created a new State library agency and appropriated funds for its support. Arizona voted its first funds to begin a State library. Minnesota and Oregon achieved their first State grant-in-aid program, bringing the total number of States with grants for public libraries to 22.

How better to sum up the meaning of libraries and books than to quote from a 17th-century philosopher:

That weary listlessness which renders life unsupportable to the voluptuous and the indolent is unknown to those who can employ themselves by reading.

I would like to be more specific and tell you what this law has accomplished in my own State of Alabama. Between March 1, 1957, and June 30, 1959—only a little more than 2 years—we were able to accomplish the following: More than 84,000 people are receiving library service who previously had no access to public libraries. More than 462,000 are receiving improved or extended service. With the funds from this act we have been able to purchase 8 new bookmobiles, to hire 48 new staff personnel, to set up 7 new regional libraries and give a large grant to assist the 8th, to spend almost $280,000 for books and cataloging services. We have also been able to establish in-service training programs and workshops to train library personnel.

In terms of stimulating local effort, the act has again been extremely successful in Alabama. The State appropriation has climbed from $116,750 in 1956–57 to $179,695 in 1959–60, an increase of more than 53 percent. One local area formerly without service has purchased a new bookmobile on its own. All over the State new library buildings are being planned and old ones remodeled.

There seems little doubt that the act thus far has accomplished a great deal. But do all these facts and figures indicate that the act needs to be extended? Such informed organizations as the American Library Association and the U.S. Office of Education feel that they do. Miss Germaine Krettek, director of the Washington office of the American Library Association, in appearing before a House subcommittee in April of last year stressed that the goals of the program were not going to be reached within the 5-year period, and later told a Senate subcommittee in June that:

I think it is becoming quite clear, although excellent progress has been made, that the goals are not going to be reached within a 5-year period. * * * You might be interested to know that the American Library Association is on record in favor of extension at this time.

The Office of Education estimates that by the end of fiscal 1961, when the act is due to expire, the job will be only half done. We will have cut the number of people without any service or with only inadequate service from approximately 80 million to approximately 40 million, but this still means that 40 million of our citizens are denied adequate free access to books. It means that hundreds of our schools will be handicapped by the lack of a public library in the area. It means that millions of adults will continue to be deprived of the enjoyment and the information they could obtain from books.

I also wish to point out that it is vital that we pass this extension bill during this session, and do not wait until the law is about to expire. Much valuable planning and preparation time will be lost if the States and local areas are kept up in the air as to whether the bill will be extended beyond June 1961. In order to preserve the continuous forward movement and the continual planning for the future, I feel it is necessary that we vote to extend this bill before we reach the zero hour.

We have spent a lot of time in Congress during the last few years discussing how we can best ensure maximum educational experience for all our citizens—education for this increasingly complex technical age, education to enable them to consider national and world problems and become intelligent citizens and voters. It seems to me indisputable that this act gives us a great deal of education for our dollars. When we have spent the taxpayers' money to establish 161 U.S. information libraries in foreign countries, complete with bookmobiles and traveling bookshelves, on the philosophy that our books will help these people to establish and maintain free and democratic governments, should we not also be concerned with 40 million of our own citizens who have a similar need?

John G. Lorenz, director of the Library Services Branch of the Office of Education and himself a professional librarian, said in the summer of 1958:

The most satisfying experience to me was having it proved that there is this tremendous hunger for books and information. The demand for books in rural areas is much greater than we can meet.

I strongly urge the Congress to extend the Library Services Act for an additional 5 years, so that we can meet this need of our rural citizens.

Clarence Day, Jr., writing the story of the Yale University Press, made this apt observation of the significance of books:

The world of books is the most remarkable creation of man. Nothing else that he builds ever lasts. Monuments fall, nations perish, civilizations grow old and die out.

After an era of darkness new races build others but in the world of books are volumes that live on still as young and fresh as the day they were written, still telling men's hearts of the hearts of men centuries dead.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress I had the privilege and opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress that the present Supreme Court had completely usurped the power of the people and their Congress in the unprecedented decision which violated the 10th amendment wherein the public school systems of the States are reserved exclusively to the States. Neither the Supreme Court nor any other agency of the Federal Government has any authority under the Constitution to tell the States or the people who reside in them how they shall run their schools. This same Court has arrogantly ignored the ninth amendment which reads as follows:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Also, in the session of Congress which adjourned in September, I spoke out against the further destruction of the Constitution when the Court decided in favor of an officer who searched the home of a helpless Negro family in Maryland without a search warrant. This was in absolute violation of the fourth amendment. This was the first such decision since the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

We, as Members of Congress, should operate in defense of the Constitution of the United States. It is fairly evident that the Nation lacks leaders it used to have who would respond on matters of principle. Instead, matters of expediency govern the political fabric of the Nation. The immediate issue is the assumption of authority by the Supreme Court in matters not granted them by the Constitution, and the bluffing, with Presidential help, of an illegal enforcement of illegal measures on the presumption that it is a lawful order of the Court. The split among our people is created by the injection of emotional and sociological issues into a strictly legal matter where the former have no place. The main object of the Communist is to stir up strife among the races, break down States rights, the greatest barrier to the final takeover and the establishment of a Communist-Socialist world government. In other words, it is the move of an outside enemy to soften the Nation for its planned wreckage.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, permit me to include a statement given by me before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on April 15, 1959, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DALE ALFORD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, APRIL 15, 1959

I respectfully wish to submit to this committee the opinion of an American citizen, which, I sincerely believe, represents the opinion of the majority of the people of this country—and we, as Members of Congress, are concerned, or should be concerned, with the opinion of the majority of the people of this country and no other country. This should be above political expediency. Any so-called civil rights measure enacted by this Congress over the laws of the respective States is an absolute violation of States rights. The law of the land is the Constitution of the United States, which derives its authority from the several States.

Proposed civil rights measures violate the ninth amendment, which I quote, as follows:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

These measures would violate the 10th amendment which states that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States respectively, are reserved to the States or to the people."

Any so-called civil rights measures can be likened to a sword with two edges, for where in one instance one edge serves a specific purpose, the opposite edge can be turned against its present wielder.

In our beloved country the people are sovereign. And, make no mistake about it, the people of this country—the majority, if you please—will win this fight and this crusade to preserve their individual liberties as guaranteed them under the Constitution. The opinions of members of the Supreme Court do not make the law of the land; the Constitution is the law of the land. Members of Congress are representatives of the people and it is my duty to uphold and maintain the opinion of the majority of the people of my State.

The Constitution is not plastic, it cannot be molded or twisted to suit the political designs of a few. The Supreme Court's decision is not "the law of the land," even though in a case the Court may soundly define the meaning of particular words of the Constitution. It is the Constitution which remains "the supreme law of the land" (art. VI), while the Court's decisions and orders in the case control only the parties to that case. The Court has no power to make general rules binding upon the people and governments of the States, nor to amend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court's decisions and orders are in conflict with the Constitution, and do not even exist in the eyes of the Constitution; they are null and void, and they must be treated accordingly by all who are loyal to the Constitution, to the Republic (which depends for existence on a stable Constitution), and to the people's inalienable rights. The same is true regarding anti-Constitution acts, orders and pronouncements of other officials, notably Federal judges on lower courts and the President and his subordinates, as well as acts of Congress.

The great moral issue today, therefore, is not segregation versus integration in the schools; it is, instead, the issue of the sovereign people and their Constitution versus defaulting public trustees as oathbreaking usurpers. In other words, shall the people and their State governments defend their constitutional rights, or bow down before an anti-Constitution elite enforcing rule by man? Shall we have limited government and rule by law under the Constitution, or usurpers supreme with unlimited power? Shall the Republic endure, or shall we allow its destruction by the weapon customarily used to this end—usurpation? (See Washington's Farewell Address.)

In the famous Dred Scott case in 1856, the Supreme Court declared that sympathy for the slaves could not justify the Court's saying the Constitution means something different from what it was originally intended to mean by the framers and adopters. Likewise, today, the prohibition against the Federal Government's having power to control education, schools (so as to be able to decree and enforce integration) under the Constitution, as amended—as defined initially by the Supreme Court in this respect—must be upheld. All morality requires this; the moral leaders (such as clergy) and idealists in general, above all others, must support this conclusion. Otherwise they are guilty of debasing the morality and ideals they profess to uphold through subscribing in effect to the antimoral precept that the end justifies the means, which spells intellectual and moral bankruptcy. If any change be needed, as the people see it, they can make it—by amendment.

As to Federal usurpation of power concerning the schools of a State, its government (particularly legislature, with controlling power) must therefore take a firm stand (correcting past errors accordingly) to proclaim that anti-Constitution decisions and orders, judicial and executive, are null and void and will be treated accordingly. We must stop evasive actions and programs designed to get around such null and void decisions and orders, because these are unnecessary and confusing due to implying that these decisions and orders have constitutional validity, which is not true. We must make sure that any proposed remedial amendment of the Constitution expressly asserts that it is merely confirming the States' possession of (not giving anew) power already theirs under the Constitution as amended and as initially defined by the Supreme Court. We must proclaim, and pass binding laws accordingly, that the State and all subordinate governments and all citizens must and will respect the Constitution of the United States and of the State—all officials being sworn to support these Constitutions only and not Federal usurpers (President or Judges or Congress). We must require by law that all officials, from the Governor down, act accordingly in every respect to oppose any Federal troops used by the Federal usurpers as contemplated by the framers and adopters. (See The Federalist, Nos. 28 by Hamilton and 46 by Madison, for instance.) We must oppose any Federal usurpers. (Troops and marshals, too, are sworn to support the Constitution only.) All in defense of these Constitutions, the people's inalienable rights, States rights, posterity's just heritage, the cause of liberty.

Also, I include a quotation from a book, "The Hope of the World," by that great American patriot, Dan Smoot:

We derive no rights or power from the Government. It is vice versa. Government derives its just powers from us the governed. We want it clearly understood, moreover, that the grant of power which we make to Government is very limited. Even though we must delegate to Government enough power to protect all of us from one another, and from possible foreign enemies, we have certain rights which we are not willing to surrender or modify for any purpose whatever. We call these rights unalienable because God, our Creator, endowed us with them; we consider them sacred. Each one of us as an individual, whether rich or poor, weak or strong, has certain rights that God

has given us and that no power on earth can take away, neither Government, nor an organized group, nor an overwhelming majority of the people themselves. Among these sacred rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is the meaning of the American Declaration of Independence.

After winning the independence they had declared, and after writing a Constitution to make the necessary grant of limited power to a Central Government, the Founding Fathers worried about that matter of their sacred and unalienable rights. In the first section of their Constitution, where they granted power to the new Government, they started off by saying, "The powers herein granted." They meant that the Government should have no powers except those specifically listed in the Constitution. But was that sufficiently clear and emphatic? Perhaps not. The Founding Fathers decided to make certainty doubly certain. They wrote a Bill of Rights (the first 10 amendments to their Constitution), not asking the Government for any rights, but specifically listing certain God-given rights and telling Government that it must not, could not, tamper with them.

Congress shall make no law abridging these specific, sacred rights of ours.

That is the meaning of the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"All men are created equal," as recorded in the Declaration of Independence, is not materialism. It is a Christian concept of equality and this concept is spiritual. The Christian concept of equality does not imply material standardization or conformity or the physical leveling of all mankind.

That, instead, is the Communist concept.

To quote further from Dan Smoot:

The major threat to America today is atheistic total socialism-communism. It is a denial of God for the worship of government or the state. It is the worship of all-powerful government as the manmade god which will solve all our problems. To the atheist Socialist-Communist no treatment of an individual is abuse if it is done for the cause. Murder, double-dealing, and lying are all justified if the Socialist-Communist cause is exalted. The individual is nothing; the state is everything.

The so-called cold war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America is not just a rivalry between two nations. It is a conflict between two opposing ideologies, of two irreconcilable faiths. The present Socialist-Communist cause is more than ideology. It is a conspiracy that can neither be appeased nor contained, because it must conquer to survive. All Communist talk about peaceful coexistence and social and material equality is a lie designed to confuse and disarm and conquer. The international conspiracy knows that peaceful coexistence and physical equality are not possible. The Communists will use any method of approach to divide us and to conquer and bury us. This great battle for freedom in which we are engaged is a battle for the hearts and minds and souls of men. We can win, but only if the flame of faith burns in our hearts and minds greater than in the beastly breasts of our enemies. Evolution, not revolution, will preserve good will and understanding between us. Constitutional government and not punitive legislation is the answer.

In America today we do not need new so-called civil rights legislation; we need a new breath of patriotism.

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE APPROPRIATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a few legislative items came before this body at a time when there were comparatively few Members on the floor. Among these was House Resolution 413, authorizing an appropriation, not to exceed $327,000, for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Frankly, since this is a controversial committee and its manner of operation and its actions have created controversy, and I might say confusion, I cannot understand why it was felt necessary to push through the appropriation on a day when legislation was not anticipated. Under these circumstances, any effort to speak in opposition to the appropriation would have meant very little in the final outcome.

If a rollcall had been taken on this matter, I would have voted against the appropriation, because I sincerely believe that the taxpayers' money is not being put to full and fruitful use. The committee's work has not resulted in substantive legislative programs or proposals in the field of internal security, the purpose for which the committee presumably was created.

At a future date in this session, I shall document the fact that the work of the committee has been in hit-and-run endeavors which have made headlines but have not resulted in concrete accomplishments. The abortive foray into California is one of the latest examples. I shall also show, as I attempted to do last session, that other agencies of Government are more effective in handling matters involving our internal security, without fanfare.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MEADER, for 60 minutes, on Monday, next.

Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 30 minutes each on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LEVERING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. DULASKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WIDNALL.

(At the request of Mr. MADDEN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KING of California.

Mr. RODINO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1719. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report covering the rural electric and rural telephone programs of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1720. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1956, entitled 'An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State'"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1721. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1722. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *B Amusement Company, et al.* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 1–54), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 475, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *Edward Gordon, Morton Gordon, John J. Dahill, Esteban Melendez, Jean Garcia, Marie Flynn, Carmen Rodriguez, and 62 Lenox Ave., Incorporated* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 9–55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 273, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1724. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 407. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on Russia by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 408. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of the hearings entitled "Report on the International Geophysical Year (February 1959)"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 449. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 457. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2130. An act to authorize a payment to the Government of Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9801. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase to 40 cents per hour the minimum wage applicable to blind workers and to provide for periodic increases beginning January 1, 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9802. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Commerce from approving plans, specifications, and estimates for a specified portion of a route on the Interstate System in Nevada, and to prohibit further obligation or expenditure of Federal funds in connection with such route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 9803. A bill relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9804. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9805. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to exempt from the requirements relating to understanding the English language the parents of those members of the Armed Forces of the United States who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War I, World War II, or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9806. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements relating to understanding the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9807. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual rated permanently and totally disabled by the Veterans' Administration shall be conclusively deemed to be under a disability for social security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9808. A bill to prohibit agencies of the United States from imposing contractual provisions boycotting vessels trading with Israel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 9809. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to make it unlawful to transport in interstate or foreign commerce any firearm which is intended to be used in a crime of violence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 9811. A bill to authorize the establishment of a national showcase of the arts and sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9812. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9813. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals who are 70 years of age or over and are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9814. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for middle income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9815. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program for needy individuals over retirement age who are not otherwise entitled to benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9816. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9817. A bill to amend section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide special rates of postage for the transmission in the mails of certain official school records of students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9818. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9819. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, or in Hawaii; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 9820. A bill to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, including certain extracts, decoctions, and preparations which (irrespective of their chief use) are suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 9821. A bill to extend for an additional 3 years the period during which certain tanning extracts, including certain extracts, decoctions, and preparations which (irrespective of their chief use) are suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9822. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9823. A bill to provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are 45 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9824. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 9825. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9826. A bill to amend section 204(d) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide special rates of postage for the transmission in the mails of certain official school records of students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9827. A bill authorizing the improvement of Noyo River and Harbor, Calif., in the interest of navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9828. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9829. A bill to provide for equalizing the conditions of competition between domestic industries and foreign industries with

respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 9830. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9831. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to increase the amount of wages entitled to priority to $1,800 and to provide that pension and welfare benefits earned by an employee shall have the same priority as direct wages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 9832. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9833. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations on the construction differential subsidy under such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9834. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 9835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain farmers to make an election with respect to the taxable year in which income from the price support program for upland cotton will be included in their gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9836. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide pensions, and wartime rates of disability or death compensation, in the case of veterans of Mexican border service in 1916 or 1917; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 9837. A bill to further modify the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9838. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9839. A bill to provide additional punishment for corporate officers violating the antitrust laws, and to provide that such officers may be barred for not more than 1 year from serving in such corporate capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 9840. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 9841. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 566. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating January 22 of each year as Ukrainian Independence Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 567. Joint resolution to effect immediately the transfer of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 568. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 574. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 575. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.J. Res. 579. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 580. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 581. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 582. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 464. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 466. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 467. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 468. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 472. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFIN:

H. Con. Res. 473. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 474. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. Con. Res. 475. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 476. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. Con. Res. 478. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. Con. Res. 479. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 480. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 481. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 482. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 483. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 484. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 485. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 486. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 487. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 488. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 489. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 490. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 491. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 492. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 493. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H. Con. Res. 494. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 495. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 496. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 497. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Con. Res. 498. Concurrent resolution expressing the concern and disapproval of Congress at the recent desecration of places of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. Res. 428. Resolution that there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, U.S. Congress, upon requisition of the chairman thereof, not to exceed 1,000 additional copies of the report entitled "Ninth Annual Report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the territory of American Samoa memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact organic legislation establishing a civil government for the territory of American Samoa, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9842. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Mariani and Annunziata Mariani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 9843. A bill for the relief of Jonathan Barnes and his sister, Caroline Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9844. A bill for the relief of John Gelbert (alias Max Theodore Gelbert); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9845. A bill for the relief of Istvan Zsoldos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9846. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Satterfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9847. A bill for the relief of Dwylia McCreight and John T. McCreight, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9848. A bill for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9849. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9850. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9851. A bill for the relief of Helena Farbotko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 9852. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Ayub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9853. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido Victorio Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 9854. A bill for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9855. A bill for the relief of Chien-Min Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9856. A bill for the relief of Sp4c Adriano P. Principe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 9857. A bill for the relief of Sister Myriam (Marta Krzyzowska); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9858. A bill for the relief of Rosemary B. Patmour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9859. A bill for the relief of Hong Do Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

317. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Burns, Martinsville, Ind., and others, relative to requesting favorable consideration of H.R. 1354, a bill designed to restore standard time to the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

318. Also, petition of Thomas F. Coleman, Rexville, N.Y., and others, relative to requesting favorable consideration of H.R. 1354, a bill designed to restore standard time to the Nation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

319. Also, petition of the chairman, executive committee, Socialist Party, Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis., relative to public ownership of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Year in Which We Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be a guest at a banquet of the American Federation of Government Employees at the Willard Hotel last Saturday evening, January 16, celebrating the 77th anniversary of the Federal civil service system.

The Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, was the principal speaker. He delivered a forthright address in which he expressed appreciation for the intelligent, efficient and loyal work of the Government's career employees.

Senator JOHNSON demonstrated an intimate knowledge of our merit system and an appreciation of its good points as well as its shortcomings.

Federal employees and all concerned with preserving and increasing the efficiency of the civil service merit system will be interested in the majority leader's speech which follows:

THE YEAR IN WHICH WE CHOOSE

(Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, American Federation of Government Employees, 77th anniversary of civil service, Washington, D.C., January 16, 1960)

It is always pleasant after a busy week to spend Saturday night with good friends. Then you can say the things you have been wanting to say.

I am happy to have this opportunity to visit with you tonight. I am especially happy because this is an appropriate occasion to take stock and to review some of the fundamentals of our Government in the light of the problems of 1960.

We are here to commemorate the anniversary of civil service. For 77 years—nearly half the life of our Republic—it has been the expressed will of our people that their Government should not be operated in the service of partisans. This is the bedrock on which the basic integrity of the National Government has stood and must continue to stand.

And this is the bedrock on which we, as a nation, need to plant our feet firmly in this year of 1960.

TIME FOR PARTISANSHIP

We live in a land in which we have tried to place things in proper categories. We recognize that there is a place for partisanship and a place in which partisanship is not appropriate.

Our political system is based upon partisan divisions—because our people must have a choice in determining the basic policies of our Government. But partisanship running rampant through the operation of our Government would soon lead to the collapse of the Nation itself.

There was a time when our country could afford the spoils system of parceling out Government jobs. Those were simpler times—an age in which the actual operation of Government was largely a matter of routine.

The victors of partisan strife looked upon the Government and its jobs as the proper reward of success. And they also thought of the Government as an institution which could be used to perpetuate the power of the victors.

TIME FOR CONTINUITY

The Pendleton Act put an end to that era. It dedicated our country to the proposition that our governmental machinery should be in the hands of public servants who held their jobs because they had demonstrated merit and capacity.

The act also brought into our Government the concept of continuity—that the inauguration of a new administration did not mean the complete dismissal of all of those who possessed the necessary knowledge to keep the day-to-day wheels running smoothly.

No one pretends that civil service has worked perfectly. It has its faults—as does any system devised by the mind of man.

But over the decades, it has built up a core of hard working, able, competent people without whom this Nation could not stand in the 20th century.

A HIGH STANDARD

It is fashionable in many quarters to deride the civil servant who works for our Government. It is a popular form of public amusement to consider the civil servant a parasite who is living off the hard-won money of the taxpayer and drawing down lush salaries, for little or no work.

I have been connected with the Federal Government in either the legislative or the executive branch for 30 years. In such a vast and complicated establishment, I have, of course, found loafers and incompetents.

But I have found far more dedicated people; hard-working people; far more selfless people. And I think that the standard of performance required by the civil service is fully as great as that required in any field of human endeavor.

It seems to me that those in the Government who are the legitimate subject of partisan activity owe certain obligations to those who are in the civil service.

UPON THE MERITS

A civil servant has relinquished some of the protections which are enjoyed by those who are engaged in private endeavor. The civil servant has tenure; but he does not have—and cannot have—the right to use collective economic force to set the terms and conditions of his employment. For this reason, those who do have the right and authority to set those terms and conditions have an obligation to lean over backward to be fair. Wages, hours, and working conditions cannot be settled at the table of collective bargaining. They can only be settled on the basis of considering legitimate requests upon their merits.

This I believe Congress will do. I think that regardless of the outcome, you will be given a fair shake of the dice.

But I am not here tonight to talk to you about the problems of civil service. There are more appropriate times and places in which, through your able leadership, you can discuss your specific affairs with the Members of Congress who are expert in this field. I do want to talk to you tonight about problems that affect you all as Americans.

YEAR OF DECISION

This year is a year of election in America. There are choices to make and decisions to take.

But what we choose, we do not choose for ourselves alone. With us, on the way that we go—whatever that way may be—will go the hope and faith of free men everywhere and the prospects of generations still unborn.

The responsibility that rests upon America in this young year is awesome. There should be more of us getting down on our knees right now and fewer of us standing on our right to hold the floor.

The office we are to fill in 1960 is the Presidency of the United States. The man we will elect is not going to be god of the universe or a ruler of the world—but he is going to lead our country for 4 years.

The decision we are going to make will be determined along partisan lines. It is right and proper that we should do so.

But it will not be right and not be proper if we permit ourselves to be so divided by partisanship that 1960 will come to an end with our Nation weaker than it was when the year began.

LEGITIMATE ISSUES

There are many legitimate issues to be submitted to—and discussed fully before—the American people. We are entitled to a frank and searching debate upon our national goals.

We must choose between an America that looks with confidence to an ever-expanding future or an America that shrinks into a bygone past.

We must choose between an America that is preeminent or an America that is second best.

We must choose between an America that can lead the world boldly into the age of space or an America that is content to tag along behind another power.

We must choose between an America that has the initiative in world affairs or an America that merely reacts to the moves of others on the international chessboard.

We must choose between an America that seeks ever higher standards for its people or an America that believes the best that can be done is to hold that which we already have.

CHOICES WE DO NOT HAVE

In the months that lie ahead it is essential that such issues be fully debated. But it is equally essential that we realize

that there are certain choices which we do not have to make.

We do not have to choose between treason and patriotism.

We do not have to choose between bad character and good character.

We do not have to choose between men of ill will and men of good will.

The differences between us are honorable differences of men who disagree over the course that should be followed. They are not the differences between men, some of whom seek to advance and others to subvert our country.

There is ample room for partisanship in discussing the issues of our day. There is no room for partisanship based upon bigotry—bigotry of race, religion, or section. Against this, we must all be united.

TEST OF MATURITY

And we must also realize that the problems of maintaining our strength and our prosperity will not wait upon the November elections. We cannot ignore the gathering storm while we wait for the verdict from the polls. We are in this year to face with our first real test of the Nation's political maturity in the modern world.

The world—both friend and foe—is watching America this year, looking on it not as spectators, but as judges of the processes by which we set the course to which the hopes of so many others are tied.

If ever there was a need for us to show ourselves responsible in the conduct and in the spirit of our democracy, that time is now, as the world is watching us.

We need more than a great mass of statements. We need more than gimmicks that make headlines. We need more than contrived eloquence.

We need the type of responsibility which can resolve our disagreements without tearing the Nation apart in the course of that resolution.

To this end, the civil service is a hard core of the strength of America. It is the continuous demonstration that our Nation can operate effectively even while we are going through the processes that settle our differences.

This is an anniversary of great significance. And I think that we can draw from it tonight a lesson that our Government is a continuing government which will survive the storm and strife and prove forever that reasonable men can govern themselves.

Woodrow Wilson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the other Members of the New Jersey delegation in introducing a bill which looks toward the establishment of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington.

Citizens of New Jersey have a special interest in, and regard for, the man Woodrow Wilson. We consider him New Jersey's adopted son, and the years which he spent in our State, and the great contributions he made during that time, will never be forgotten.

Nor can the Nation forget Woodrow Wilson who, as our 28th President, gave his life, in effect, for the pursuit of world peace. The principles for which he stood, and which in large part he originated, still guide us, today, in our own very similar efforts to achieve a lasting peace, with justice.

I therefore feel it is most fitting that we reflect our gratitude in a permanent memorial to President Wilson. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, to which this bill will be referred, I intend to push for immediate committee support and approval.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today the district which it is my honor to serve in Congress, the 17th of Ohio, was hit by one of the biggest, if not the biggest, floods in its history. I made a hurried flight from Washington to render whatever aid I could to the thousands of men, women, and children literally driven from their homes into the bitter cold by waters on a rampage from the swollen streams. Other parts of Ohio and adjoining States also experienced untold human suffering and material damage from this catastrophe. The American Red Cross reported that a total of $2,424,485.95 in disaster relief alone was spent in the area during the January–February period. Of course, this was only a drop in the bucket compared to the grand total representing lost furniture, fixtures, machinery and equipment, grain, livestock, water systems, roads, dikes, and, in some instances entire homes.

This was indeed a sad story but the greatest tragedy of all lies in the fact that it could have been averted by sensible flood prevention measures.

We are all aware, of course, Mr. Speaker, that flood control is expensive but we also know that floods are infinitely more costly.

I have been charged, on occasion, by those who oppose progress as a spender because of my efforts on behalf of programs for the preservation of the things we hold dear in this Nation. I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that although I am by nature tight with the dollar I have no hesitancy in fighting for programs that insure the future of our people, even if it means I will be labeled a spender for doing so. Of course, no one should tolerate waste or extravagance in any program, even a good one. It seems to me that the real question is how and for what we spend our money that really counts. If the balance sheet of our Government indicates that what we appropriate for builds up the asset side of the ledger in the way of greater security for our people in the form of manageable rivers and streams and in other things we are trying to do, then I think we are on sound ground. It is when our liabilities are allowed to exceed our assets on the books that we find ourselves in trouble.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I have been working tirelessly since taking office a year ago to procure for my district flood control assistance from our Government wherever needed. I am delighted to report that we have had the utmost supports of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of Defense at all times.

Upon our request, the engineers promptly rebuilt the dike at Mount Vernon, Ohio, which had given way to the raging waters of the Kokosing River a year ago. Swift action here prevented on February 10, 1959, a repetition of what happened only a few days earlier on January 21. The corps also responded to the call for help on Dry Creek. Then, too, Federal assistance in the way of funds was extended to Mount Vernon, Newark, and other areas to relieve the costs of rebuilding public facilities on the long road back.

BLACK FORK CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

I am glad to report that at long last the Congress last session approved funds for the completion of the Black Fork channel improvement project below Charles Mill Dam in Richland and Ashland Counties. This achievement in my mind is a real tribute to the hundreds of people who assisted me in many ways with evidence of need as we appeared before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I, and the good people I represent in the 17th Ohio District, are indeed grateful to the House Committee on Public Works which last year approved my request for flood control studies by the Army Engineers on the Licking River system in Licking County, Ohio; on the Clear Fork and Rocky Fork Creek, in Richland County, Ohio; on the extended study of the Kokosing River Basin, Knox County, Ohio; and on Killbuck Creek, in Holmes County, Ohio.

I trust that I will have the continued assistance of all those back home who have heretofore held up my hands in my efforts for flood-control projects and that I can depend on the same sympathetic understanding and support which I have received from my colleagues in the Congress.

Address by Hon. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, to National Convention, Association of Wheat Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the most knowledgeable Members of the U.S. Senate in the field

of agriculture and agricultural problems, and one of the best friends of the farmers, is the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent address which he delivered on December 10, 1959, before the National Convention of the Association of Wheat Growers, at Wichita, Kans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHEAT PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Senator FRANK CARLSON, National Convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers, Wichita, Kans., December 10, 1959)

It is indeed a pleasure to meet with the National Association of Wheat Growers at their 10th annual convention.

I want to tell you, personally, some of the things I told your officers and the Members of the Senate last February when I introduced Senate bill 1484, authorizing your comprehensive wheat stabilization proposals.

At that time I told your officers that, in my judgment, the wheat stabilization program, which they had developed and which was authorized in Senate bill 1484, was by far the most comprehensive and the most equitable proposal for wheat that had been developed in recent years. It was indeed an honor and a pleasure to introduce and support your wheat stabilization program in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I also told the Members of the Senate, at that time, that wheat producers for the past 5 years have recommended giving up the present outmoded program for wheat. I told my fellow Senators that there would be no wheat crisis today if we had had the vision and the wisdom to adopt a domestic parity program for wheat several years ago.

Last year's recordbreaking wheat crop was grown on an acreage 30 percent smaller than in 1949. Wheat yields have moved up from about 14 bushels per harvested acre in the pre-World War II period to 27 bushels in 1958, and 21 bushels in 1959. This is a record achieved by few groups in America. The wheat producers of America are entitled to high honors for this outstanding performance.

The wheat producers of America also are entitled to high honors for the vigorous market development programs which they have under way.

I have been following very closely the work of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association under the direction of my longtime friend, Clifford Hope, and I am indeed proud of the progress that has been made in the short time it has been operating.

Surely no one can say that the wheat growers of America are sitting on their hands waiting for the Government to solve their economic and marketing problems.

I am not one of those who considers the current wheat situation our No. 1 farm problem. I rejoice in the great productive capacity of our wheat producers. I consider it a national asset that we can produce more wheat than is needed for domestic food and for export.

All that is really required at this time is a wheat stabilization plan similar to the provisions of Senate bill 1484 which recognizes the high productive capacity of wheat growers in relation to market outlets available and deals with it in a way which is fair and equitable to wheat producers, to domestic consumers, to feed-grain and livestock producers, and to producers in other exporting countries.

THE BROADER SETTING OF THE WHEAT PROBLEM

I could spend all my allotted time relating our experiences in trying to get fair and equitable wheat legislation passed in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. However, I want to take this opportunity to discuss with you some of the more general problems of agriculture which vitally affect wheat producers. And I want to make a few observations a little later regarding the statesmanship I believe is required on the part of wheat producers and all farm leaders if economic disaster on the farm is to be avoided.

OVERRAPID TECHNICAL ADVANCE

The first broad problem which I want to mention is the overrapid technical advance now going on in agriculture. Farm technological advances are cost reducing and are largely irreversible. They have made possible our great strides in increased efficiency on the farm. Throughout the last 2 decades output per hour of farm labor has increased at a rate equal to two to three times that of the nonfarm worker.

Largely because of great technical advances in agriculture, food costs have been dropped rapidly in relation to nonfarm workers' earnings. A weekly market basket of food for a family of three, which cost 25 percent of the workers' average weekly earnings in 1958, would have cost 35 percent of their weekly earnings 10 years earlier and 41 percent of their earnings 20 years earlier.

And here is a related item that all too often is overlooked by nonfarm people—although Government costs of farm price support programs are higher than they should be, they equal only 5 percent of the money spent for food at retail. If farm program costs had been added to the cost of food in recent years, workers would have spent only 1 percent more of their weekly earnings for food.

The cost of the weekly market basket of food, plus the current record high farm program costs, take a smaller percentage of the average worker's weekly earnings today than would have been required for the food alone 5 or 10 years ago. These are important facts which must be brought to the attention of nonfarm people over and over again.

But the hard, brutal economic facts for farmers of overrapid technical advance may be summed up in this way:

Where unrestrained competition prevails the rate of increase in farm production is dependent primarily on the year-to-year increase in the use of nonfarm inputs and on the adoption of associated new technologies. These in turn depend on the backlog of cost-reducing nonfarm inputs and technologies available for more general adoption, and the educational, advertising, promotional, and credit programs devoted to obtaining their adoption.

Competent agricultural economists tell me that the backlog of cost-reducing technologies, which also are production increasing, are so great at the present time that in the absence of policies for balancing supplies with market outlets available the production of all major farm commodities will continue to expand faster than market outlets for a number of years.

In the absence of Government programs of orderly production and marketing, prices will fall faster that costs can be reduced on both the large and the smaller farms. This too-rapid rate of expanding farm production, in the absence of a realistic general farm program, may well continue, I am told, even though the number of farm-operator families in agriculture drops by one-half or more. There is no assurance that the corrective forces for overrapid technical advance will come into play until much of the agricultural industry has suffered severe financial reverses.

In this connection I call your attention to the often-overlooked importance of the Government farm program in maintaining farm income in recent years. Each year for the past 7 years, $1.5 to $2.5 billion of farm products have been removed from commercial markets by Government loan, storage, and surplus removal operations.

If the supplies diverted to Government storage and disposal, plus the potential supplies held in check by acreage allotments and the soil bank, had been channeled through commercial markets, prices would have been sharply lower than they were. A recent press report indicates that Iowa State University economists conclude that net farm income would have been one-third less for the years 1952–58 in the absence of Government support programs. Another estimate indicates that farm income would have been $4 billion or more lower in most of these years in the absence of existing farm programs.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AGRICULTURE

Another general problem which I want to talk with you about briefly is the disproportionate burden of unemployment and underemployment which agriculture is forced to carry.

W. E. Hendrix, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has been conducting studies of the low-income farm problem for a number of years. His studies indicate that although the number of low-income farm people has declined in the last decade, on a relative basis, incomes for those remaining in agriculture are lower than 10 years ago.

He finds that monopoly elements in the market structure for manufactured products and for nonfarm labor prevent many, who would like to work at the prevailing wage levels, from obtaining jobs. Only in brief periods of rapid economic growth can all those seeking nonfarm employment find jobs. Since agriculture is a highly competitive industry in a larger world where less than fully competitive markets are widespread, agriculture becomes the escape valve for the bulk of the Nation's underemployment.

In the face of this market structure it is a mistake to put it mildly, to believe that a solution to the current farm problem of overrapid technical advance can be found by withdrawing production controls and lowering price supports in the expectation that sufficient farm people will shift to nonfarm jobs to equalize farm and nonfarm incomes.

CONFLICTS IN BELIEFS AND VALUES

Another general problem facing farmers and farm leaders today is the conflicts in beliefs and value judgments which have come to the fore as farm leaders attempt to formulate realistic policies for an overly dynamic agriculture in our largely industrialized society.

The cultural beliefs and values which we hold today in the rural communities have been transmitted to us from earlier less-industrialized societies. The technological revolution sweeping rural America is uprooting these older personal beliefs and values just as ruthlessly as it is uprooting long-established production and marketing practices.

However, personal value judgments and beliefs play a greater role in slowing social and economic change in the rural community than in the urban community, for in the urban community the key decisions are usually taken by a few officers and the corporations. In the rural communities each farm family has an equal voice.

Technical advance poses a dilemma for the conscience of farm people by placing in opposition their desire for equity or economic justice which may involve collective action to achieve orderly production and marketing, and their love of proprietary freedom.

Not all of our premachine age values and judgments must be junked. But our older creeds must be subjected to careful and searching inquiries. To what kind of a life do we aspire in the rural communities in this machine age? To what extent are our older creeds applicable in modern life?

The sharpest value conflicts generated by our highly productive farms and limited markets is a clash between the deep-seated desire for economic justice, and the equally deep-seated desire for proprietary freedom. All of us would prefer more—rather than less—individual freedom in our farming operations. All of us would prefer to do away with price support and production controls if farm prices and farm income would not fall to disastrously low levels.

I am confident that if we will reexamine our premachine cultural and value judgments in the light of the economic facts of the machine age, we can arrive at wider visions as to their essential meanings and we can eliminate many of the conflicts which now prevent community cooperation on a realistic farm program.

THE WHEAT VERSUS THE FEED-GRAIN PROBLEM

With this very brief explanation of some of the more general and deep-seated problems faced by all farmers, I want to turn once again to your primary interest, wheat.

As I said earlier, I do not look upon the wheat problem as the number one farm problem. Wheat has been made a political football—the whipping boy for those who do not know the nature of the farm problem. I recognize, however, that the present wheat program is not adapted to present day conditions. Increases in Government surplus stocks are still continuing and Government costs are far higher than they should be.

I am in favor of moving as rapidly as we can to replace this outmoded program with a comprehensive wheat stabilization plan. But I want to call your attention to the feed-grain problem which makes the wheat problem seem insignificant by comparison.

On September 30, 1959, the Commodity Credit Corporation had 1,200,116,000 bushels of wheat under loan and in inventory. This is a large quantity of wheat. But the Commodity Credit Corporation at that time also had under loan and in inventory 1,921,763,000 bushels of feed grains.

I ask, why have Government stocks of wheat been singled out as the number one farm problem when feed-grain stocks are 50 percent greater than the wheat stocks? I simply cannot understand why wheat has been made the whipping boy when the feed-grain surplus situation, as of today, is far more serious.

A possible explanation might be that improvement is expected in the feed-grain situation in the year ahead. Actually, however, the technical staff in the Department of Agriculture estimates that the carryover stocks of wheat at the end of this season will be increased by 2 to 3 million tons as a result of the 1959 crop being larger than available market outlets, while the carryover stocks of feed grains will be increased by 12 to 13 million tons as a result of the 1959 record feed-grain crops.

Unless there is a change in feed-grain legislation in the next session of Congress there is no doubt in my mind that the 1960 crop of feed grains will again add substantially to Government surplus stocks. As compared with the feed-grain situation, wheat simply is not the problem it is made out to be.

I personally believe that we should pass legislation in the next session of Congress which will deal realistically with both feed grains and wheat. And I believe wheat producers will have to join with the feed-grain producers in the development of a comprehensive program covering both wheat and feed grains if impending economic disaster for both groups is to be avoided.

However, I see little merit in engaging in acrimonious debate in an attempt to modernize the wheat program while ignoring the more serious feed-grain problem.

A MEANS OF IMPROVING FUTURE FARM PROGRAMS

I would like to turn now to a matter which has been on my mind a good deal lately.

In recent months I often have been appalled by the great divergence of opinion among farm leaders regarding the accomplishments of past programs, the nature of the current economic problems facing farmers and the probable economic effects of alternative Government programs. This need not continue. We have a fine, competent technical staff in the Department of Agriculture. We now have the largest staffs on record in the land-grant colleges.

There is no good reason why a larger part of this talent should not be devoted to providing the basic facts needed for a better understanding of farm programs and their accomplishments. In my opinion, if we could more nearly agree on the relevant economic facts we could rather quickly agree on desirable changes in farm price-support legislation.

It has been suggested that perhaps in future general legislation substantial administrative discretion and flexibility should be permitted for meeting the changing problems in a complex industry. The administrative discretion might be subject to periodic review, however, by providing for an annual accounting of the administrator to the farm groups and to Congress. This annual accounting might take the form of a report to farm and trade organizations covering:

1. The price and income goals for the year just closed.

2. The extent to which the goals were achieved and the contribution of the Government programs to the achievements recorded.

3. The cost to the Government of the operating programs.

4. The proposed price and income goals for the year ahead.

5. Proposed changes (within limits of existing legislation) in the operating programs to more fully achieve the goals.

The Federal Extension Service, for the past 34 years, has been holding highly useful annual economic outlook conferences which are attended by agricultural economists from the land-grant colleges and from the allied industries.

Perhaps what we need, to achieve a better understanding and a better administration of farm programs, is a rather formal annual review of farm program accomplishments at a set of meetings comparable with the national economic outlook meetings.

I am told that the British have a formal annual review of their price-support programs each February. This review is preceded by several weeks of meetings and consultations between the technical staffs of the various Government agencies dealing with food and agriculture and the national farm organizations. These meetings and consultations at the technical staff level result in general agreement as to the relevant facts regarding the price-support programs.

This British procedure seems to me to be wholly desirable and a practice which we could well emulate. The occasion of a formal annual review might also be an appropriate time for the Department of Agriculture to receive suggestions from the farm organizations and the trade groups for improvements in the program in the year ahead. The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, would be free to accept or reject such suggestions.

As I see it, however, an annual review procedure along these lines would go a long way toward providing an agreed set of facts, thus eliminating much of the needless controversy which exists today.

It would force the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff to make a realistic appraisal of both his administrative activities and his recommendations for changes.

Finally, I believe it would provide Congress with the necessary facts to more fully evaluate proposals for changes in farm programs.

In closing let me remind you that it was Senator Capper who secured the passage of the Capper-Volstead Cooperative Marketing Act in the early 1920's as a first attack on the problem of orderly marketing of farm products. The first national legislation, having as its objective the stabilization of farm prices, was passed in 1929 with the active support of President Hoover. President Hoover's first Chairman of the Federal Farm Board's Alexander Legge, the former president of the International Harvester Co., conducted a wide-ranging educational program on the need for production controls for the basic commodities, which was an important factor in the later success of the agricultural adjustment programs of the 1930's.

And I am now looking forward hopefully to the not-far-distant future when we can again reach a wide agreement on the facts relating to agriculture. When we do reach such an agreement on the facts, we can again build an effective program which will prevent further sharp declines in farm income, reverse the current buildup in Government surplus stocks, and reduce Government farm program costs.

Retirement of Hon. Gordon Canfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, there are many satisfactions and pleasures to be derived from service in this great body. There are times, however, when we are deeply saddened. Some of these occasions arise when a friend departs from this earthly life. There are other sad occasions when a Member with whom we have been closely associated announces his voluntary retirement.

One of these moments of deep regret occurred recently when I was informed that my good friend, the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, announced that he would retire at the conclusion of his present term, after a distinguished service of 20 years as a Member of the House.

GORDON CANFIELD entered the House well equipped by experience for the outstanding services he has performed. He had been secretary for 17 years previously to the Honorable George Seger, of New Jersey, whom he succeeded in Congress. It was with keen satisfaction that I watched his progress. There has never been a more diligent, more conscientious Member of this body. He was completely dedicated and devoted to the service of his district, the State of New Jersey, and the Nation. He worked so arduously and

with such disregard of his own welfare that his health suffered. He could stay on and take it easier, but it is not in his character to accept a lighter burden. His sense of responsibility is so deeply rooted within him, he would feel obliged to give his job all the energy he possesses, and this might further endanger his health.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has rendered outstanding service to the Nation and to the House. To me, personally, he has been a very close associate and a most loyal friend. His departure from our ranks will be a great loss to the country, to his constituents, and to the House. We will all miss him and none more than I.

That his retirement is genuinely regretted by all is evident from the following editorial published this week by the American Post, the only Jewish news weekly in northern New Jersey:

A GOOD MAN RETIRES

The decision of Congressman GORDON CANFIELD to retire from his official duties was greeted by all his friends with a deep feeling of regret. We can truly understand the sincere motives which prompted him to take the step. Nobody, but one in similar circumstances, can fully realize the strain which comes to a man in public life who is imbued with the noblest sense of civic responsibility, who takes to heart all the problems, either of the myriad of individuals who come to him for help, advice, and guidance, as well as the weighty domestic issues of the Nation, and its relationship vis-a-vis the whole world. There is a valid reason why GORDON CANFIELD is loved by all citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, or even political persuasion. Because he was prompted not by political or partisan prejudices, but because he represented the true statesman and public servant. Every candidate for office makes a promise to serve the people. But GORDON did not have to make such promises. He showed by deed that he was a genuine humanitarian, and that he could serve his party best by being good to all. He exemplified in creed and deed the highest conception of all faiths, expressed in the Biblical doctrine: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

We salute GORDON CANFIELD for his unselfish service to his people, and trust ever to cherish his warm friendship. We feel confident that his retirement does not mean complete isolation from the affairs of mankind. While he has earned his Sabbath after 37 years of devoted labors, we feel that his benign influence will still be felt in service to his fellow man, unhampered by the tedium of official duties. We extend our blessings to him and his beloved family for years of contentment, happiness, and good health.

A Memorial to the Memory of Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined with many other Representatives in introducing a bill authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

True recognition of the great abilities and service of President Woodrow Wilson is clearly shown by the sponsorship of the resolution which completely crosses party lines.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., who has introduced this resolution on the Senate side with many cosponsors, has received a number of suggestions for a fitting memorial.

It is my own hope that when a Commission is created and plans formulated, that a living memorial, such as suggested by the Reverend Francis Sayre, son-in-law of Woodrow Wilson, would be the truest recognition of the great contribution made by President Woodrow Wilson.

President Eisenhower has also indicated that his own belief would be for a Woodrow Wilson House, rather than a statue and that he would favor the fund to be raised by private subscription. Knowing of the great interest in this proposal throughout the United States it would certainly appear that the accumulation of necessary funds for such a project would be no serious problem.

It is my hope that prompt congressional action can be obtained on this resolution.

Let's Take America Off the Hook on the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is the expressed intent of our agricultural program to limit or provide methods for the limitation of the total quantity of certain products and certain commodities. A better definition of featherbedding cannot be found elsewhere than in the legislative findings on the various crops now benefiting from this Government dole system.

It is the expressed intent of the law to encourage producers to underplant their allotments for more than a year, to allow the land to remain idle throughout the contract period—not less than 3 years—and not to harvest any crop from the acreage and not to graze any acreage. The U.S. Government agrees to make annual payments to the producers for fulfilling these "nots." Agriculture is the only business wherein idleness is not only encouraged, but is compensated for legally.

We city people are paying the price for this boondoggling featherbedding because our consumer prices are pegged to an artificial standard that has no rhyme or reason. To follow this subsidy to its logical conclusion, why should not city people be allowed to put their backyard lawns into the soil conservation program and receive annual payments for performing certain "nots"? And why should not cities receive soil bank payments for the acreage devoted to parks and playgrounds?

The farmers of our Nation, because of this subsidy program, are in the public opinion doghouse, and sweeping the dirt under the rug or whitewashing the absolute failure of the program will not get them out of it. The public patience is exhausted and they will not tolerate a continuation of the present program indefinitely until it collapses of its own weight, and takes our country with it. Individual rights are being violated when one segment of our economy freeloads on another.

The farm subsidy system is the dole system, no matter by what fancy or justification it is promoted. It is nothing more than taking money from one group of taxpayers to purchase things it does not want or need, to cause these same taxpayers to pay more for food and agricultural commodities. The next thing farmers will want is the Government to drill each of them an oil well behind each barn to provide them with cradle to grave economy security.

The economic monstrosity of the agricultural support programs have now become sacred, solid, and perpetual. The programs have been in effect for 20 years with the result of staggering surpluses, and backbreaking costs to the taxpayers. Let us take America off the hook on the farm program.

Legislation To Remove Inequities in the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today which I would like to discuss briefly. They will remove inequities in the social security program and, I believe, improve it. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I am, quite naturally, extremely interested in any legislation designed to modernize this great program. Identical legislation is being introduced in the Senate today by Senator VANCE HARTKE, a member of the Senate Finance Committee.

This legislation will—

First. Remove the present $1,200 limitation on earned income with respect to individuals receiving benefits.

Second. Provide earlier retirement at reduced benefits for men at age 62 and for women at age 60.

Third. Eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits.

Fourth. Provide a special tax credit against social security taxes to employers who employ individuals who are more than 45 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will remove inequities in the social security program which experience has shown us are unwise and unfair.

EARNINGS LIMITATION

Present law forbids a person receiving social security benefits from earning more than $1,200 a year. He may receive unlimited amounts of money from dividends and annuities and still receive a social security check each month. The absurdity of this is, I believe, apparent. We are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need the protection offered by the social security program.

This legislation calls for the complete removal of the income limitation. Since this will involve an annual cost of almost $3 billion, it will be necessary to have this matter thoroughly considered by the proper committees of the Senate and House. I believe a comprehensive study will indicate the feasibility of doing this immediately. If for fiscal reasons it cannot be done immediately, a temporary adjustment should be made raising the present ceiling to a more realistic and reasonable figure.

EARLIER RETIREMENT

Present retirement age under the social security program is 65, except that a woman may retire at age 62 with reduced benefits. I would like to see these requirements lowered to age 60 for women and age 62 for men, if they so desire. This would be optional and at reduced benefits.

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Present law requires that a person be 50 years of age, and totally and permanently disabled, before he can qualify for disability benefits. If an individual is fully paid up and becomes totally and permanently disabled, I feel that he should be able to receive disability benefits at any age. I can think of no reason why a person at age 50 is more entitled to receive disability benefits than a person at a lower age.

HIRE THE ELDERLY

We are all aware, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulty which individuals over the age of 45 are experiencing in finding employment. While I say hire the elderly, we cannot, of course, say that an individual as young as 45 is old. But they are old in terms of finding employment. Something must be done to encourage the employment of these individuals. One thought which has come to my mind as a possible inducement is a special tax credit equal to one-half percent of the wage with respect to which the social security tax is imposed on employees over the age of 45. This credit will be given to the employer hiring or employing an individual over the age of 45. I believe this would encourage the hiring of the elderly. It is at least worthy of consideration.

I earnestly hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will schedule hearings on these amendments to the social security program at an early date. This is not a matter which we should continue to neglect.

The Late Peter D. Henderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 21, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when word reached Capitol Hill last Monday of the sudden death at West Palm Beach, Fla., on January 16, of Peter D. Henderson, first director of the gymnasium for Members of the House of Representatives, a pall of gloom settled over many offices in the Senate and House whose personnel had come to know and esteem the genial Scotch-American who fought as a doughboy in the American Army in the First World War.

Pete, as he was affectionately called by scores of Members of the House and Senate whom he met and served personally during his 15 years as director of the House gymnasium, was equally well known by employees in all departments of the House of Representatives. His friendly disposition was not reserved for officialdom but was known to be one of his outstanding characteristics by employees at every level.

At this point I wish to call attention to the obituary notice that appeared in the January 19 issue of the Washington Evening Star which I wish to include at the conclusion of this tribute of love and respect for one of the finest men ever employed on Capitol Hill.

After his retirement Pete made return visits annually to Washington in the spring and summer, returning to his Florida home to spend the winter months. On these annual visits he always made it a point to call at my office and those of many other Members where he knew he was certain of a royal "welcome home."

The last time I saw Pete was in October 1959 when he came to my office to discuss an article he was writing, incorporating many of his experiences during his 15 years of employment as gym director. At that time he repeated his appreciation of my statement upon entering naval service in 1941 when I alluded to the fact that I owed my fine physical condition to the benefits derived from daily activities under his direction at the House gym. During the 18 years following the statement he never forgot its utterance as he told me that along with similar complimentary remarks by several other Members such commendations were a source of recollection of his days on the Hill which gave him great pleasure in his retirement years.

In tendering this tribute of respect and esteem for my good friend, Pete Henderson, I would be remiss in appraising his many fine qualities were I to neglect to mention the great love and devotion he shared with his beloved wife, Ellen Cavanaugh Henderson, who survives him. Pete and Ellen were in the fullest sense true partners and inseparable companions traveling at home and abroad on various occasions. Together they were examples of a typical American couple capable of radiating sunshine and spreading cheer as they traversed life's highway. When the Angel of Death invaded their home the genuine sorrow expressed and the beautiful tributes tendered to the memory of the deceased husband were indicative of the indelible impression his life made on those who were privileged to know and love him.

It is my sincere wish in expressing deepest sympathy to Ellen Henderson that Almighty God will give her added strength to bear the great sorrow that has befallen her in the death of her beloved husband. It is hoped that the exemplary life of Pete Henderson when reflected upon by his loved ones will prove a source of consolation in the knowledge that he was highly respected and greatly esteemed by his fellow man.

Finally, it is my fervent prayer that God will have mercy on the soul of my departed friend and grant him eternal rest.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Evening Star, referred to above, follows:

PETER HENDERSON DIES—DIRECTED HOUSE GYM

Peter D. Henderson, first director of the gymnasium for the House of Representatives, died Saturday in West Palm Beach, Fla., after a heart attack and an emergency operation.

Mr. Henderson was gym director for the House when the new office building opened in 1933. He served 15 years there before his retirement.

He helped win additional space from House planners to add a half-court gym floor to the original steam bath layout. The space is used for handball, volley ball, and individual exercise. His reputation was made when he invented the congressional game of "paddle ball," the easy way to play handball on Capitol Hill.

DEFENDED PRACTICE

Generally considered an easy-tempered man, Mr. Henderson saw red when articles suggested Members of Congress were living the life of Romans when they tried to take care of their health in the gym.

A magazine once printed a picture of a Congressman in a steam bath and captioned it "Asleep in the Deep."

"These aren't Roman baths," Mr. Henderson exploded, "They're places where a Member can relax right and keep himself fit."

Among the politicians who took physical fitness seriously and joined in the workouts were Vice President Henry A. Wallace and Representative RICHARD M. NIXON.

LEARNED AUTO TRADE

Born in Scotland, Mr. Henderson took to the sea as a youth. His goal was America. He learned the automobile trade, and worked in Paterson, N.J.; Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and Santa Fe, N. Mex.

When World War I broke out he joined the American Army and fought as a sergeant. He was attending officers' training school when the armistice came.

After his retirement, Mr. Henderson and his wife spent winters in Florida and summers in Washington.

He leaves his wife, the former Ellen M. Cavanaugh, of Washington.

Funeral arrangements, which are being handled by the James T. Ryan Funeral Home, are incomplete.

Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all the earth, in the baffling problems which knock for solution upon our hearts and minds, make us more and more aware that the field is the whole world. Enlarge the area of our sensitive sympathy until we hear and feel the heartbeats of human need and the kinship of brotherhood around the wide earth.

Make room in our hearts for the teeming multitudes with their terrible needs and their pleas for help—men and women in faraway places, and of all races; little children whom hunger is despoiling of joy and wonder, but who are sharers of our common humanity. In all our plenty and ease, take away our callousness, and stretch out the horizons of our vision.

We ask it in the name of Him we own as Lord of all, whose heart was ever moved with compassion. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 449. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" and to provide for the printing of additional copies; and

H. Con. Res. 457. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 449) to print as a House document the publication "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" and to provide for the printing of additional copies, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume 1, The Communist Ideology" prepared by the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, be printed as a House document; and that there be printed thirty thousand additional copies of said document of which six thousand shall be for the use of said committee and twenty-four thousand copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 457) to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document the publication entitled "Nomination and Election of the President and Vice President of the United States, Including the Manner of Selecting Delegates to Political National Conventions"; and that there be printed an additional fifty thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives, said copies to be prorated to the Members and Resident Commissioner.

FUNERAL SERVICES FOR MR. AND MRS. THOMAS C. CAPEHART

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, funeral services for Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Capehart, son and daughter-in-law of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], will be held on Monday morning at 10:30 o'clock, at the First Presbyterian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEATH OF SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW OF SENATOR CAPEHART

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I regret that I was not on the floor yesterday when my colleagues expressed their sympathy because of the unfortunate death of the son and daughter-in-law of our beloved colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I knew this young man, and I had a great feeling for him. I wish to join my colleagues in their expressions of yesterday.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in that respect, I should like to ask the Chair to require observance of the 3-minute limitation today, and not allow any extensions of time beyond that limitation, during the morning hour. I would have to object to any such extensions, because several of our colleagues have engagements which they must meet.

Therefore, in the interest of expediting the legislative work of the Senate, I hope it will soon be possible for the Senate to resume consideration of the unfinished business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REVIEW OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of financial assistance activities of the Small Business Administration, December 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMEASUREMENT OF SMALL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to create six additional judgeships in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the report on the need for six additional judges for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, dated December 31, 1959, prepared by the Committee on Courts of Superior Jurisdiction of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, has concluded that there is a threatened breakdown in the administration of justice in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York because of an insufficient number of judges to handle the increasing volume of business of that court; and

Whereas the bar is deeply concerned over the serious situation disclosed by the report and believes it is imperative that this problem be met through the prompt creation of additional judgeships for that court before a breakdown occurs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the Bar of the City of New York urges the Congress of the United States to enact, at the earliest practicable date, legislation to create six additional judgeships in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York; and it is further

Resolved, That this association should join with other bar groups to take all steps possible to that end.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. Res. 208. Resolution authorizing the employment by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of an additional clerk (Rept. No. 1036); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 209. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the postal service (Rept. No. 1037); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "REHABILITATION OF THE DISABLED IN 37 COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD" (S. REPT. NO. 1038)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, and Senate Resolution 42, 86th Congress, I submit a report made by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

The report is entitled "Rehabilitation of the Disabled in 37 Countries of the World."

The report is the eighth in a series under our International Health Study. Its publication was authorized at a meeting of the Committee on Government Operations on January 18, 1960.

The report represents a summary compiled by the staff in cooperation with executive agencies and private authorities. It describes the status of programs for the handicapped in the United States and in three dozen other lands. The report enumerates both official and private programs on the domestic scene and in the field of international technical assistance. It contains a summary of my personal observations, based on the many facts which have been compiled in the course of our review.

Authority for preparation of the report is based on the resolutions earlier referred to, as well as on the standing jurisdiction of the committee.

Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that the Committee on Government Operations shall, among other duties, consider matters relating to—

(D) studying intergovernmental relationships between * * * the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

One such relationship concerns respective programs of technical assistance which may help train rehabilitation experts and/or launch pilot projects. Among international organizations rendering such limited assistance are the United Nations and the World Health Organization.

In addition, there have been some comparatively few, related activities by the United Nations Childrens' Fund, the International Labor Organization, and the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—of all of which the United States is a member.

Of course, the most expert single source in all the world for information and work of this nature is our competent Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is OVR, together with certain expert private authorities, which cooperated invaluably with our staff in preparing this report.

The report, it should be noted, is for the purpose of providing a factual framework for any future conclusions which the subcommittee may wish to present.

Publication of this report is not intended to present policy commitments by the subcommittee or by the full committee at the present time. Rather it is designed to inform the Senate and our people as to the nature and extent of present programs, some of which as specified may involve directly or indirectly the use of U.S. tax dollars and/or the voluntary contributions of private American citizens.

I ask that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

REPORT ENTITLED "ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS" (S. REPT. NO. 1039)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 43, 86th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report entitled "Annual Report of the Committee on Government Operations," made by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and ask that the report be printed.

During the past year, the subcommittee investigations and hearings concerned the operations of various governmental agencies, which included the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Post Office Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the General Services Administration, the District of Columbia Office of Civil Defense, and the International Cooperation Administration.

Executive hearings were held concerning the administration of U.S. foreign aid programs in Bolivia. In 1953 the United States began sending heavy quantities of emergency shipments, much of which was food, to that country. Since that date, we have given Bolivia approximately $137 million in various forms of aid. Much information concerning waste and inefficiency was developed.

These hearings disclosed that, as a result of loose administration, an inadequate U.S. mission staff, difficulties in recruitment of personnel, and a dearth of administrative ability among Bolivian officials, heavy losses, in the neighborhood of several million dollars, were sustained in connection with the U.S. aid programs in Bolivia.

These involved losses of nearly $2 million alone in foods and fibers, and an undetermined amount of losses in machinery, fertilizer, and gasoline, in heavily congested ports and in transit to Bolivia; losses of over $1 million worth of machinery and equipment which could not be accounted for; losses in the disposal of excess equipment and equipment unsuitable for local use; and losses of commodities improperly maintained or warehoused.

In addition, expenditures of millions of dollars and millions of local currency were countenanced by U.S. officials in connection with the financing of various joint projects—some abandoned, discontinued, or diverted to other uses—which were not subjected to adequate and objective preliminary technical evaluation or were not reviewed in terms of changing economic conditions while in development.

ICA's failure to provide a mission controller when needed, to institute records of accountability promptly, to provide a ports, transportation, and warehousing technician, to institute timely end-use audits, and to take prompt action as recommended by internal audit reports were some of the reasons for the inefficient operation of the program. The present director of the mission in Bolivia is attempting to correct the many irregularities that existed.

Hearings were held concerning the state of readiness of the Civil Defense organization in the District of Columbia. It was ascertained that hundreds of thousands of copies of various official publications had been in civil defense headquarters for many years without being distributed. They had no survival plan. They had no evacuation routes posted. A survey by the Federal civil defense organization showed that the warning system was only 30 percent effective in densely populated areas. It was ascertained that many experts in various fields, such as radiation, who were employed by the Federal Government were not being utilized on a temporary basis by the District of Columbia in matters of civil defense.

Public hearings were held in connection with Senate bill 550, which was introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, cosponsored by me. It was disclosed that there are many types of fraudulent schemes in operation throughout the United States, one of the largest of which is loans to small businessmen who are in need of funds. These businessmen pay an advance fee to these firms, after numerous misrepresentations, and, thereafter, ascertain that they will not secure the loan. This type of fraud has resulted in the operators becoming enriched of $25 to $50 million annually.

Other schemes highlighted include vanity publishers, who prey upon elderly and handicapped people; hair growers, who falsely claim that hair can be restored to baldheaded men; skip tracing, a deceptive means used in the location of delinquent debtors; common ailments, such as cancer, rheumatism, and arthritis, and the misrepresentations that permanent cures are available; scare tactics, utilized by many salesmen in the sale of their products; work-at-home schemes, where many housewives are defrauded; easy-to-win contests, where each winner receives credit on the purchase of items which are exorbitantly priced; and vending machines, which

are sold to individuals based on fraudulent representations.

The bill was not reported to the floor of the Senate, because, under presently existing penal legislation, the U.S. Post Office Department has hundreds of investigations pending in many of the categories mentioned above, and have been successful in obtaining many convictions.

The subcommittee was able to save $2,015,981 when, as a result of our inquiry, the Navy's aviation supply office at Philadelphia canceled existing contracts of a highly technical nature involving spare parts requirements.

Inquiry concerning transportation of household effects by the Department of State for its personnel being sent overseas has resulted in that agency putting into effect a new system. It is anticipated that the resultant savings will be approximately $200,000 a year.

Throughout the year, the subcommittee was responsible for corrective action being taken in a number of Federal agencies, such as the General Services Administration and the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, which are detailed in this report.

Because of my required attendance at the hearings of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON was acting chairman for most of these hearings.

On January 30, 1957, the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field was created by the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 74. It was continued pursuant to Senate Resolution 221, dated January 29, 1958, and Senate Resolution 44, dated February 2, 1959. During the past 3 years, a large portion of the staff of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has been on loan to this select committee. Although the professional staff of the subcommittee consists of 11 men, 6 of them have been assigned and utilized by the aforementioned select committee during the 3 years of its existence. In addition, one clerk from this subcommittee was loaned to the select committee and two clerks worked jointly for both committees.

The appropriation for this subcommittee during the past year was $220,000. Of this amount, $27,000 was expended for purposes of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and $79,000 is unexpended and will be returned to the Treasury of the United States. The attainments of the subcommittee, as revealed in this annual report, therefore, cost $114,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Postmaster General;

Bert B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice John M. McKibbin; and

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same treatment for prepaid dues income received by a nonprofit motor club as is provided for prepaid subscription income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Dr. William Medway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 2885. A bill to establish an Office of Coal Research within the Department of the Interior and to provide for and encourage research to determine improved means of producing and utilizing coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2886. A bill for the relief of Nikolija Lazic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2887. A bill for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of Mesrop Samoian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2889. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be required to have a majority of their trustees citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2890. A bill to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to establish an Interdepartmental Committee on Utilization of Surplus Farm Commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an Office of Coal Research within the Department of Interior, to promote new and improved means of producing and using coal.

We passed a good coal research bill last year, but the President ignored the urgent needs of the coal industry, and vetoed the bill on the stated ground that the research commission called for in the bill should have been under the direction of the Secretary of Interior, and should not be an independent agency.

Accordingly, my bill would establish a new Office of Coal Research in the Interior Department. Substance, not form, is the important thing. We must create without further delay the finest research and development program modern science will permit, to aid the employees and employers in the great, but ailing, coal industry. I am convinced that my bill has the best chance of gaining widespread approval of all necessary parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until the close of business next Monday, for the purpose of soliciting additional sponsors

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 2885) to establish an Office of Coal Research within the Department of the Interior, and to provide for and encourage research to determine improved means of producing and utilizing coal, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS FOR PROTECTION OF WAR VICTIMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Acting Secretary of State in a letter to the Vice President of January 14, 1960, and I am introducing the bill in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments. This bill is identical to one which the Senate passed in 1957, but which failed to receive attention in the House of Representatives.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Acting Secretary of State to the Vice President with regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2890) to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 706 of chapter 33, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 706. Protective emblems under the Geneva Conventions

"(a) Whoever wears or displays the sign of the Red Cross or any insignia in colorable imitation thereof for the fraudulent purpose of inducing the belief that he is a member of or an agent for the American National Red Cross; or

"Whoever, whether a corporation, association or person, other than a person authorized by the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, including the American National Red Cross and its duly authorized employees and agents, the medical units and establishments of the armed forces of the United States and their duly authorized personnel, chaplains attached to the armed forces of the United States, the Red Cross Societies of neutral countries and the international Red Cross organizations and their duly authorized personnel, uses the emblem of the Greek red cross on a white ground, or any sign or insignia in colorable imitation thereof or the words 'Red Cross' or 'Geneva Cross' or any combination of these words—

shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"This subsection shall not make unlawful the use of such emblem, sign or insignia (1) to mark civilian hospitals, convoys of vehicles, hospital trains, ships and aircraft carrying wounded, infirm or sick civilians, or medical personnel and equipment, when permitted under regulations and orders which the President is hereby authorized to issue in accordance with Articles 18, 21, and 22 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12, 1949; (2) to mark ambulances and the location of first-aid stations when permitted under regulations and orders which the President is hereby authorized to issue in accordance with Article 44 of the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field of August 12, 1949; or (3) on armlets to identify the personnel of civilian hospitals where permitted under regulations and orders which the President is hereby authorized to issue in accordance with Article 20 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12, 1949.

"This subsection shall not make unlawful such use of any such emblem, sign, insignia or words for the same purpose and for the same class of goods as was lawful on the date of enactment of this title: *Provided*, That such use shall not extend to the placing of the Red Cross emblem, sign or insignia upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings or other structures, or upon the ground, except as otherwise permitted by this subsection or by the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949.

"(b) Whoever, whether a corporation, association, or person, other than a person authorized by the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, uses the emblem of the red crescent on a white ground or a red lion and sun on a white ground, or any sign or insignia in colorable imitation thereof—

shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"This subsection shall not be deemed to prohibit a corporation, association or person that actually used such emblem, sign or insignia prior to February 2, 1956, from continuing such use for the same purpose and for the same class of goods: *Provided*, That such use shall not extend to the placing of the emblems described in this subsection upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings or other structures, or upon the ground, except as otherwise permitted by this subsection or by the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949.

"(c) Whoever, whether a corporation, association or person, following a proclamation by the President in time of war or national emergency that application of this subsection is necessary, shall use in such location and size as to be recognizable from the air, whether by visual or photographic means, the letters 'PW' or 'PG' for any purpose except marking the location of a prisoner of war camp, or the letters 'IC' for any purpose except marking the location of an internment camp, or any other marking, sign, emblem or insignia agreed upon by the United States and any other country and proclaimed by the President for marking the location of such camps—

shall, unless such use or placing conforms to such regulations as may have been issued under authority of the President, be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1960.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The United States, on August 2, 1955, following favorable Senate consideration, ratified the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949. These conventions came into force for the United States on February 2, 1956.

In its report (Ex. Rept. No. 9, U.S. Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., June 22, 1955) the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reviewed the background and testimony regarding the prohibitions respecting use of the Red Cross emblem contemplated under articles 53 and 54 of the Convention for the Amelioration of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, and concluded as follows:

"Because of the facts which have been set forth above, the committee, after extended consultation with the executive departments concerned, the American National Red Cross, and representatives of the pre-1905 users, considers that a reservation should be adopted which would relieve the United States of any obligation to disturb continued enjoyment of any use of the emblem which was lawful under domestic law in the United States at the time of ratifying the convention. Such a use would be one lawfully begun prior to January 5, 1905, and permitted to continue under the act of January 5, 1905, the act of June 23, 1910, and subsequent Federal legislation, subject, of course, to extinction by abandonment at any time.

"Moreover, the protection of the national interest—and especially the interest of wounded and sick—requires that such a reservation be qualified so as to express the acceptance by the United States of an obligation to enact legislation prohibiting any use of the emblem on aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings, or other structures, or upon the ground, except as authorized under the terms of the conventions.

"Accordingly, the committee, in reporting the convention to the Senate, recommends that the resolution giving its advice and consent to ratification, include the following reservation:

"'The United States, in ratifying the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, does so with the reservation that irrespective of any provision or provisions in said convention to the contrary, nothing contained therein shall make unlawful or obligate the United States of America to make unlawful, any use or right of use within the United States of America and its territories and possessions of the Red Cross emblem, sign, insignia, or words as was lawful by reason of domestic law and a use begun prior to January 5, 1905, provided such use by pre-1905 users does not extend to the placing of the Red Cross emblem, sign, or insignia upon aircraft, vessels, vehicles, buildings or other structures, or upon the ground.'"

This reservation was unanimously approved by the Senate, and the United States ratified the convention subject to this reservation.

In the same report, the Foreign Relations Committee took note of certain other provisions relating to emblems or markings that give rise to a need for legislative implementation. Specifically, the committee observed that—

"Under article 38 of the Convention on Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, certain countries are permitted to use, in place of the red cross, the red crescent or the red lion and sun on a white ground. While article 53 also forbids commercial use of these distinctive signs, without effect on rights acquired through prior use, no legislation restricts the use of such emblems in the United States. For this reason it will be necessary to make appropriate changes in title 18, section 706, of the United States Code.

"Similarly, as already noted, the 1949 conventions for the first time authorize the use of the Red Cross emblem by the International Red Cross and its personnel (art. 44, Wounded and Sick Convention), civilian hospitals and personnel engaged in their administration, and convoys of vehicles, hospital trains, and aircraft carrying wounded and sick civilians (arts. 18–22, Civilians Convention). Further amendment of title 18, section 706, of the United States Code would seem necessary to anticipate these uses."

In addition to protecting usage of the Red Cross and other emblems as mentioned above, the proposed legislation would protect the marking of prisoner-of-war camps and internment camps in time of war or national emergency. Subsection (c) of the bill would prohibit the use in such times of the letters "PW," "PG," "IC," or any other marking, sign, emblem, or insignia agreed upon by the United States and any other country in such location and size as to be recognizable from the air, whether by visual or photographic means, for any purpose except marking the location of a prisoner-of-war camp or internment camp. The restrictions on such use in time of war or national emergency would implement article 23 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War of August 12, 1949, and article 83 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of August 12, 1949. Such protection of prisoners is considered a desirable safeguard of these victims of war. It is also believed that enactment by the Congress of this provision could stimulate other countries into enacting similar legislation, thus enhancing the internationally beneficial protections contained in these articles of the Geneva conventions.

Accordingly, there is submitted for your consideration and favorable action a draft bill to give effect to certain obligations of

the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating the use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes. The scope and effect of this draft bill is clearly stated in the foregoing passages from the Report of the Foreign Relations Committee and in the preceding paragraph hereof.

The draft bill herewith submitted is identical to S. 1779, which passed the Senate on August 5, 1957, 85th Congress, 1st session. S. 1779 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on August 6, 1957, but that committee took no action upon it. In its report to accompany S. 1779 (Rept. No. 772, U.S. Senate, 85th Cong., 1st sess., July 30, 1957), the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declared:

"Enactment of the present bill is necessary to enable the United States to honor important commitments which were undertaken by our Government when the Geneva Conventions of 1949 were ratified."

In implementing the obligations just referred to, it may be noted that the draft bill uses the phrase "colorable imitation" in preference to "colored in imitation" in section 706, title 18, United States Code, "Colorable imitation" appears to be the term which has come commonly to be used in trademark law in connection with similarity of marks and appears, for example, in connection with infringement of trademarks at sections 1114(1) and 1127 (definition) of title 15, United States Code. It is intended, in achieving consistency in terminology, to make clear the original legislative meaning, which in the present context would include any imitation so resembling a protected emblem as to be likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the resubmission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

LIVINGSTON T. MERCHANT,
Acting Secretary.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SURPLUS FARM COMMODITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for establishing an Interdepartmental Committee on Utilization of Surplus Farm Commodities.

The committee would be comprised of the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, or their designees, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and representatives of any other agencies of the executive branch, or other qualified persons the President may designate.

The purpose would be to carry out more effective utilization of the surplus farm commodities at home and abroad.

Today the Nation has on hand $9.5 billion worth of surpluses. Unfortunately, the existence of these surpluses serves to depress farm income and thus indirectly adversely affects the whole economy.

Too, the cost of storing such surpluses costs the American taxpayer over $1 million a day.

Paradoxically, we find that there are still people in this country existing on substandard nutritional levels. Around the globe, too, it is estimated that about one-half of the 2.7 billion people in the world are undernourished, and almost one-third live on inadequate diets.

The creation of a more effective program for utilizing these valuable resources—making them an asset instead of a liability—offers rich rewards of economic, political, strategic, as well as humanitarian values.

We recognize, of course, that our mountainous stockpiles of surplus are not likely to disappear with a wave of a magic wand.

However, the establishment of the Committee, I believe, would help to ascertain that each of the departments of the Government would be utilizing surpluses as fully as possible, domestically, as well as in support of our economic programs abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks. In addition, I request that the joint resolution lie on the table for a period of 1 week to allow Senators who may so desire to join in co-sponsoring this proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 153) to establish an Interdepartmental Committee on Utilization of Surplus Farm Commodities, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government, in the operation of price support and other agricultural programs, has accumulated stocks of surplus agricultural commodities having a value of approximately $9.5 billion; and

Whereas the cost to the American taxpayer of storing these stocks of surplus agricultural commodities amounts to more than $1 million per day; and

Whereas the existence of such surpluses serves to depress farm income and thus to affect directly or indirectly the economy of the Nation; and

Whereas there are still people in the United States existing on substandard nutritional levels; and

Whereas about one-half of the 2.7 billion people in the world are estimated to be undernourished; and

Whereas the utilization of surplus foods at home and abroad to a moderate degree have been utilized to promote economic stability in American agriculture, expand international trade in agricultural commodities, encourage the economic development of friendly countries, promote the collective strengths of the free world; and

Whereas the creation of better programs for utilization of such resources offers rich rewards of economic, political, strategic—as well as humanitarian—values; and

Whereas such uses would bring about a more rapid reduction of our stocks of such commodities, and at the same time derive the greatest possible benefits therefrom: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government an agency to be known as the Interdepartmental Committee on Utilization of Surplus Farm Commodities (hereafter referred to as the Committee) which shall consist of the following (or their designees):

(1) The Secretary of State;

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture;

(3) The Secretary of Commerce;

(4) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(5) The Director of the International Cooperation Administration; and

(6) Representatives from any other agencies in the executive branch, or other qualified persons, as the President shall deem advisable.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to make a continuing study for the purpose of ascertaining new ways and means of utilizing surplus farm commodities to fulfill humanitarian needs, to aid peoples subsisting on inadequate diets at home and abroad, and to implement and support our foreign economic policies, and for the purpose of coordinating the activities of the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in carrying out programs involving the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall terminate at the expiration of three (3) years after the date of approval of this joint resolution; or at such earlier date as the President, because of the disappearance of surpluses, may determine that the need for such a Committee no longer exists.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY WORKERS AND THEIR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 20, 1960, the names of Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, NEUBERGER, and YARBOROUGH were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, on January 20, 1960:

S. 2864. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; and

S. 2865. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT OF 1960—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced Senate bill 2882, entitled "The Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1960." I asked that the bill lie on the table for cosponsorship.

The distinguished and able junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has indicated to me that he desires to become a cosponsor, and I ask that his name be added to the list of cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. I want to express my appreciation to the Senator for this very gratifying indication of his support of the measure.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON EXAMINATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release announcing that the Committee on

Foreign Relations will hold its first public hearing in connection with its examination of U.S. foreign policy which was authorized by the Senate late in the 2d session of the 85th Congress be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, announced today that on January 28 at 10:30 a.m. in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, the committee will hold its first public hearing in connection with its examination of U.S. foreign policy which was authorized by the Senate late in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The principal witnesses will be Mr. E. Finley Carter, president of the Stanford Research Institute, and Mr. Wallace Brode, science adviser to the Department of State.

The hearing to be held next Thursday will deal with a study entitled "Possible Nonmilitary Scientific Developments and Their Potential Impact on Foreign Policy Problems of the United States." This study is one in a series of 15 studies which were prepared at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It explores prospective scientific developments of the next decade and their potential impact on foreign policy problems of the United States. It also explores the possibility of making more positive use of science and technology to help meet foreign policy problems.

In connection with its study of U.S. foreign policy, the Committee on Foreign Relations concluded 12 research contracts calling for 14 studies. One other study, that completed by the Council on Foreign Relations of New York on the "Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy," was done without charge to the committee. The completed studies in the U.S. foreign policy area generally, in the order of their issuance, are as follows:

1. "Worldwide and Domestic Economic Problems and Their Impact on the Foreign Policy of the United States," by the Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research, Inc., Arlington, Va. Published as committee print August 1959.

2. "Possible Nonmilitary Scientific Developments and Their Potential Impact on Foreign Policy Problems of the United States," by the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif. Published as committee print September 1959.

3. "U.S. Foreign Policy in Western Europe," by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. Published as committee print October 15, 1959.

4. "U.S. Foreign Policy in Africa," by the Program of African Studies of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. Published as committee print October 23, 1959.

5. "U.S. Foreign Policy in Asia," by Conlon Associates, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif. Published as committee print November 1, 1959.

6. "Operational Aspects of U.S. Foreign Policy," by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y. Published as committee print November 11, 1959.

7. "Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy," by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, N.Y. Published as committee print November 25, 1959.

8. "Developments in Military Technology and Their Impact on U.S. Strategy and Foreign Policy," by the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, the Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C. Published as committee print December 6, 1959.

9. "Formulation and Administration of U.S. Foreign Policy," by the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. Published as committee print January 13, 1960.

10. "Principal Ideological Conflicts, Variations Thereon, Their Manifestations, and Their Present and Potential Impact on the Foreign Policy of the United States," by the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. Published as committee print January 17, 1960.

Studies not yet published are:

"Foreign Policy Implications for the United States of Economic and Social Conditions in Lesser Developed and Uncommitted Countries," by the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

"U.S. Foreign Policy in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe," by the Russian Institute, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

"U.S. Foreign Policy in the Near East," by the Institute of Mediterranean Affairs, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Senator FULBRIGHT said: "Despite the fact that the areas to be covered in these studies have been specified with care and the committee has emphasized many, many times that the studies are in no way binding upon committee members, from time to time individuals who have read these reports have thought they represent the views of the members of the committee.

"I take this occasion to emphasize that the studies which are received will supply the committee with background material for consideration in preparing a final report to the Senate. The committee is, of course, free to accept or to reject the findings and recommendations of the organizations and institutions submitting studies. It is the function of the committee to evaluate the studies which are submitted. The purpose of holding public hearings on these studies is to receive testimony from all interested parties prior to the preparation of a final report. In that way it will be possible for the committee to test the soundness of the findings and recommendations in these studies before reaching its own conclusions and submitting its final report to the Senate.

"In addition, I wish to emphasize that the committee is approaching this assignment in a nonpartisan manner, endeavoring to avoid transitory issues and to concentrate on the fundamental forces at work within and without the United States which must be understood if our foreign policy is to serve the Nation."

The Committee on Foreign Relations also expects to hold hearings on February 11 on a study entitled "Worldwide and Domestic Economic Problems and Their Impact on the Foreign Policy of the United States," prepared by the Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research, Inc. All interested parties wishing to present testimony in connection with the committee's hearings on its studies of U.S. foreign policy should contact the chief clerk of the committee without delay.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

Statement by him giving notice of a preview by the National Park Service of the Old Stone House at 3051 M Street, in Georgetown.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Address delivered by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, at special convocation at East Texas Baptist College, Marshall, Tex., October 6, 1959.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Address entitled "A Crusade for Decency," delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson in Salt Lake City, Utah, on October 11, 1959.

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on my own behalf, and under the 3-minute limitation, I now seek recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on occasion I have addressed the Senate regarding what I consider to be the deplorable conditions which exist on the Indian reservations in Montana and elsewhere in the West. I have felt, and I continue to feel, that a great deal of this situation is due to the inflexible policies and attitude of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. My opinion has not been altered, and I continue to feel that there is a very serious need for alteration of our Federal Indian policy.

One of the finest things that has been done in the field of journalism, insofar as the Indians are concerned, is a series of 12 articles that have been published in the Denver Post. They were written by Robert W. Fenwick. He has done an extremely fine job, and the articles show a tremendous insight into this problem.

I wish to call to my colleagues' attention two paragraphs from a letter I received from Mr. Fenwick; they give an example of his grasp of the situation:

First, there is a vivid need for a uniform policy in the handling of Indian welfare and general assistance. Second, but not less important by any measure, I'm convinced that we should halt the sale of allotted lands at least long enough to appraise the long-range effects of such sales.

I'd also recommend that we stop talking about termination of Federal trusteeship, and concentrate on the problems which we hope will be resolved simply by ignoring them.

I am especially interested in these articles because they are devoted largely to the Indians of Montana. In our State, we have seven different reservations, each with its many and different problems. I commend this series of articles to my colleagues here in the Senate; and I wish to say to my good friends the Senators from Colorado (Mr. CARROLL and Mr. ALLOTT), that in Robert W. Fenwick they have an extremely talented journalist serving the Denver area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of 12 articles published in the Denver Post between January 3 and January 15, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 3, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—"PLACE OF SORROWS" REVEALS A STORY OF MISERY FOR INDIANS

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

"In Billings, Mont., there is a hill. In Sioux it is called 'Place of Many Sorrows.' There a child dies every week. A wife dies too young. A man—he is old and sad at 30, and the sick are too many."

Thus did the letter and the story begin. That was 5 weeks and 3,500 miles ago.

Laboriously printed in ink on the back side of a Government form, the letter was eloquent in its very simplicity, a classic of sincerity enhanced by its scrambled grammar and misspelled words.

The author was obviously an Indian. Of the Place of Many Sorrows, he continued:

"The dead songs are singed there till a tall man runs from his shack, from all his family and he drinks to not hear. Now he sits, drunk so much he cannot walk and too sad to not sing them same hard songs.

"He cannot get away. There is no place to go. These men, these people, all are Indians who have sold there land."

He was writing about America's dispossessed, the confused and ill-advised Indians who sold their birthright when they sold their land, often for a pittance. Deprived of their only means of making a living, deprived even of a place to live, they have moved to the cities. There they have found shelter, of sorts, in festering shacktown slums.

"Now the Indians sit on the White Man neck and the White Man is sadden because of this," the letter went on. "We are both sad for only grief has come to us both because of sale.

"Soon, if this goes on, all Indians must come to town. What town want one more Place of Many Sorrows? Who will fight this thing? What man is so brave?

"If all Indians come to town it costs town plenty of money each year. It costs for schools and the relief money and for more public hospitals. I think maybe for more police and bigger jails, too, and teachers.

"Now something must be done. Who will do it?"

That anonymous letterwriter's prayer became my assignment 5 weeks ago. I traveled Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Montana. I covered reservations, the poverty-ridden "pup towns" on the reservations and the sordid, gaudy, blood-and-wine-soaked skid rows of border towns.

I interviewed scores of Indians and their tribal leaders, Government officials, priests and ministers at missions, hospitals and community centers for Indians; talked to Congressmen, ranchers, businessmen, law-enforcement officers, social workers, and ordinary citizens exposed to Indian influences.

I was shocked by what I heard and saw: Unbelievable drunken orgies paid for with relief moneys; poverty, disease, filth, and overcrowding; uninhibited lovemaking in public; young Indian girls in prostitution; widespread illegitimacy subsidized by welfare funds; degeneracy, lawlessness, murder.

I found not one, but three "Places of Many Sorrows," poverty pits where a tall man watches helplessly as his last hope flickers and turns to ashes of lifelong despair.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 3, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—VAST LANDS DISSIPATED, SIOUX INDIANS EXIST IN SQUALOR

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Land is a precious thing. It gains in value with each and every birth in this 20th century population explosion.

You think of this and ponder its meaning as you drive eastward along U.S. Highway 20 through the northwestern rim of Nebraska's panhandle.

Here the land billows and swells in ocean-like expanse as far as the eye can see. Your car whisks you through comfortable little towns and communities built upon and prospering from the vast, unending wheatfields and grass-rich rangelands.

Along the way you see spacious, well-kept homes, bright and smiling under fresh coats of paint. There are small but efficient markets, shops, the machinery-jumbled lots of farm implement dealers, sturdy little banks dealing in the commerce of the area.

Just north of this highway, in South Dakota, lie the sprawling Rosebud and Pine Ridge Reservations of the populous Sioux. The reservations contribute generously to the business life of many communities along U.S. 20. But strangely, most of business comes from non-Indians—whites who have purchased Indian lands within the reservation and have consolidated them into highly productive ranches.

Once the Sioux Nation owned all this land. During the first half of the 19th century the Sioux occupied a tremendous acreage including all of what became Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and parts of Montana and Wyoming.

Sioux occupancy and use of the land was contested, however, by the Cheyenne, Arapaho, Crow, Assiniboine, Gros-Ventre, Mandan, and Arrickaras Tribes. Indian wars ensued.

NATION DIVIDED

In 1851 the United States negotiated a treaty and the Sioux Tribe was granted the territory ranging from the Black Hills of South Dakota eastward over an area extending from the Platte to the Missouri Rivers.

By successive Executive orders this great empire was whittled down through the years and eventually, by order of March 2, 1889, the great Sioux Nation was divided into separate reservations—the Rosebud, Pine Ridge, Standing Rock, Cheyenne River, Lower Brule, and Crow Creek.

The story of the Sioux is typical of what happened to many other reservations of the West. Additional lands were ceded to the Government in 1901. In all, 382,000 acres were cut from the Rosebud Reservation.

LANDS ALLOTTED

Then in 1889, allotments of land were made to individual Indians. Heads of families were allotted 320 acres each of agricultural land, orphans and adults over 18, each received 160 acres, and each child 80 acres.

If the land was grazing land, twice as much was allotted. In all, 8,602 allotments were made covering 1,869,463 acres of Rosebud Reservation land.

Government records show that as of June 30, 1959, the Rosebud Sioux had only 575,486 acres of allotted land remaining. The rest, 1,293,977 acres, had been patented, sold, exchanged, donated, or otherwise disposed of.

Of unallotted land or land owned by the tribe, there were 374,648 acres this year. The Government owns an additional 39,245 acres. The total reservation stands at 989,279 acres, quite a comedown from the original bulk of the mighty Sioux Nation.

MONEY SQUANDERED

What becomes of Indians who sell their allotted land?

Many have taken the money and gone to other parts of the country to work at the white man's jobs.

Others, however, have dropped their sale money in one wild spree and settled down as squatters wherever they could. That's the scene on the north side of Highway 20—up into South Dakota.

There, in contrast to the evidences of productivity on lands formerly owned by the Sioux, the Indian lives in abject poverty.

There is little difference in the land. Indeed, much of the land to the north is better for grazing because it is just outside the sand hill country characteristic of northwestern Nebraska.

SQUALID HUTS

But the scene is different—and repetitious. The former landlords exist in squalid huts strewn around and about with an amazing miscellany of junk that may include everything from tin cans, rusted automobile parts, and castoff clothing to pieces of rotting lumber and old fence wire.

Out in back stands the universal privy, teetering in the wind, door banging and seldom used if there are no strangers around.

Over this dismal terrain there usually ranges a pack of a half dozen or more hungry dogs, scavengers, which must at least be credited with maintaining a modest degree of sanitation about the premises.

Two or more families may occupy one of these tar-paper shacks. Here is an atmosphere redolent with foul odors, the family or families sleep, cook, eat, treat their many illnesses, and multiply in numbers.

Some members of the family may work when there is seasonal employment. Not infrequently the sole support for all occupants of the hut is the unmarried mother of numerous illegitimate children who receives a bounty from the Government for each of her offspring in the form of a check from Aid to Dependent Children.

ONE WILD NIGHT

Also not infrequently, this check is cashed at the skid row bar of a nearby, off-reservation town and the sum blown in one glorious night of drinking and fighting. The spree most often ends in the local jail and, upon release, the drinkers return to their shack, empty handed and sick, hoping to receive some sort of additional welfare assistance.

It isn't a pretty scene from any angle. And if you drive far enough north off U.S. 20 you'll soon come to a conclusion that the once great American Indian whom we had hoped to transform into the great Indian American, is no longer a heroic figure posed in tribal regalia against a western skyline and idolized by Boy Scouts all over the world.

There are exceptions, and we'll meet them along the way, but by and large the Indian who remains in our northern areas has become a wretched figure, stripped of pride, steeped in poverty, beset by disease and motivated by ambition only to acquire the most fundamental necessities of life plus heaps of firewater.

He poses a serious community problem in many towns not far from the reservations. He goes there seeking work and a new way of life. All too often he finds only disillusionment, joblessness without welfare assistance, and housing frequently worse than his pitiful shack on the reservation.

But after all, when he sells his land he must go somewhere.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 4, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—ODD PERSONALTY OF INJUN JOE NOT EASILY UNDERSTOOD

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

By your standards, Injun Joe appears to be a rather odd individual. He may be an improvident soul and a poor judge of values. But he possesses an earthy sense of humor despite his stoicism. He loves a good joke even if it's on him. And by his standards, you appear to be an oddity, too.

Perhaps that's why he loves to put his family in the old battered pickup, if he has a pickup, throw some blankets and some jerky (dried deer) in the back end, and drive to town. Valentine, Nebr., is one of his favorite haunts.

Sometimes all he wants to do is stand around. He'll lean for hours against a street lamp support and watch the strange doings of his white brothers. Maybe he'll get drunk if he has the money.

You wonder what goes on in his mind. Does he wonder, perhaps, that much of Valentine's prosperity is a joke on him? Or does he regard it as a joke on you? Injun Joe may suffer from myriad ails, but ulcers is not one of them.

Valentine, on U.S. 20 in the northern part of Nebraska's panhandle, is a bustling, modern cowtown of 3,000-plus population. It boasts one of the biggest and most active livestock markets in the region.

Does Injun Joe ever ponder the fact that much of the plump stock sold in Valentine's sales rings comes from ranches built by non-Indians on lands that the Indians practically gave away?

Perhaps he does, and perhaps that's why he gets lousy drunk and perhaps that's why

Sheriff George Welker estimates that 80 percent of his jail and law enforcement costs are attributable to Indians.

Injun Joe is a problem to Valentine. The problem is worse now, says Sheriff Welker, because Injun Joe can legally buy liquor. And the white man's firewater is bad medicine for Injun Joe.

A few years ago Valentine had another problem. It had a "teepee town." It was another of those "Places of Many Sorrows" referred to by the anonymous letterwriter who sparked this series of articles.

Destitute Sioux tribesmen from the Rosebud and other reservations of South Dakota came to Valentine. Some sought employment. Some were content to exist on public handouts or the prosperity of their Indian brothers.

This willingness to share is one of the most frequently overlooked complexes in the Indian personality. Failure to understand this one fundamental fact in the Indian makeup has caused more than a file full of well-intended programs to fall flat.

Almost universally, the Indian believes that he is obligated to share whatever he has with any other member of the tribe, particularly if that tribesman is related to him.

Thus it is understandable that when one Indian makes some financial gains and builds a better house, his destitute relatives may move in on him with their youngsters and dogs. This custom could hardly be considered conducive to greater initiative. It explains why 32 persons spent the winter of 1958–59 in one house in Great Falls, Mont.

FRIENDS, RELATIVES MOVE IN

So Injun Joe had moved to Valentine and was living it up in a tent? The word got around. His friends and relatives came to Valentine to share their brother's new-found contentment and good fortune. Valentine's teepee town grew.

Valentine bought the property out from under the Indians, told them to seek other quarters, and offered to help them relocate. This constituted charity, however, and it perhaps offended the Indian's strange sense of pride.

He'll accept welfare handouts—because the Government treaties promised him rations and other benefits. That's not considered charity. Those treaties were made long ago, but, while he may deny it, the Indian remembers promises made and he expects them to be kept.

He may deny this, too, but until recent times the great majority of Indians were hamstrung in their efforts to get ahead by a feeling that they still were defeated prisoners of war, free to move about, but prisoners nevertheless.

These complexes in the Indian personality must be understood before any program for their betterment can be undertaken with assurance of success.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 4, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—CASH PRODS INDIAN LAND SALES

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

From Valentine, Nebr., a good surfaced highway leads northward 33 miles to Mission, S. Dak., a town within the Rosebud Indian Reservation.

The highway traverses fine grazing lands dotted by impressive ranch buildings. Although this is "Indian country," most of the prospering ranchers are non-Indians or persons with little Indian blood.

These fertile acres were parceled out to individual Sioux tribesmen when the Rosebud Indian Reservation first was founded. Little of it remains in their hands.

Originally all Indian lands were held in trust by the Government because the Indians were considered incompetent to handle their own affairs But the General Allotment Act of 1887 destroyed the trusteeship and permitted the issuance of fee patents to Indians considered able to administer their own affairs.

In the years following, American Indians lost 88 million acres of their most valuable lands. The Sioux were no exceptions. Land-hungry settlers with ready cash, and now and then a jug of firewater to smooth the deal, bought Indian land at bargain prices. The Indian was the loser.

Congress restored trusteeship in 1934 with the Indian Reorganization Act. But in 1953 a House concurrent resolution expressed the desire not only to end trusteeship but to withdraw from all Indian affairs.

It soon appeared that the Federal Government was going to rush to the nearest exit and get out of the Indian business entirely. The red man would be left to shift for himself as best he could. But termination of trusteeship meant also the end of tax exemptions for Indian lands, and that could spell ruin.

POLITICAL BRAKES

It was this one aspect of the problem that caused Indians and their friends to apply political brakes on the trend.

After you've traveled the road to Mission and have seen the flourishing ranches operated by non-Indians, you wonder why it is that the Indians would want to sell their property.

It's a complex problem and it extends from the Sioux to the Northern Cheyenne and beyond to the Blackfeet and on throughout the Rocky Mountain Empire to every Indian reservation with allotted lands.

To understand it, you have to back up a bit. First, it must be realized that we actually don't know what an Indian is. He's never been defined legally. He's been described for one purpose or another, but even Webster seems evasive, content to call the Indian an aboriginal of the continent.

Because of this, allotted lands may be owned by many heirs, descendants of varying Indian blood content. Each, however, holds title to whatever allotted lands may remain in possession of the family. The share may be fractional, but it is there just the same.

Most of the tracts allotted to Indians are so small that they won't support one family, much less a dozen or two. So the lands are usually rented to one big operator, usually a non-Indian, and the rent collected by the Government which distributes it to the respective owners.

MAY RECEIVE PENNIES

It is not uncommon for an Indian landlord to receive a check for a few pennies as his share of rental income. At best, the average income check is insufficient to support a family.

Untrained for most kinds of work, the Indian finds himself forced to depend on welfare assistance, or seasonal work at meager pay, for subsistence.

Under these circumstances, the offer of cash payment for his land seems like an inviting proposition. So he sells, quickly dissipates the money, and finds himself worse off than before.

You wonder why an Indian gets drunk?

Once he owned a continent. He was run into a corner, and the corner gets smaller and smaller with each inevitable land sale. Where does he go from here? To bigger and bigger relief rolls, more shacks, deeper poverty.

Oh, we've tried to do something for the people whose land we took. Down through the years we've spent something more than $2 billion on them. We've provided health service, given rations, launched innumerable programs.

But a look at the life on reservations today—and off them—seems to indicate we've made precious little progress during our 100 years of stewardship over the affairs of our aboriginals.

WATER FACTOR

There is another reason Indians sell their land. One purchaser may acquire a key tract and thus break up a ranch unit by becoming the owner of the only water. The property that remains becomes worthless. He can then buy that land for a song.

He may make a purchase that hampers access to an Indian's property. That, too, becomes worthless. He can then acquire that.

Sometimes an Indian landowner of considerable holdings will sell the entire place. He's the one you hear about who blows his wad in one grand ball that may last from a weekend to a month or two.

When he goes broke, he "goes back to the blanket," asks his tribe to help him. You'll meet an instance of this in a subsequent article.

Not all Indians are failures, however. You'll hear it said around the reservations that when an Indian's blood is diluted by more than one-half, he becomes aggressive, competitive, energetic, and he forges ahead.

One of these is Claude Lamoureaux, whose ranch is just outside the town of Mission.

Lamoureaux had a crew spraying some of his Hereford cattle when I drove onto his place. Incidentally, he doesn't rent a sprayer. He owns it.

He dropped his work at once, shook hands, and said, "Come into the house. I want you to meet the wife—Hattie."

On the way through the spacious and well-constructed corrals, Lamoureaux pointed out some of his splendid quarter horses. Just beyond the horse corral was a fine barn and a roomy, comfortable house for Lamoureaux's foreman and ranch hands.

MODEL RANCH

It was a model ranch and a model home surrounded by lawn, shaded by trees. Inside, after introductions, Lamoureaux whipped off his left boot, sat down to his electric organ and exclaimed, "You're going to listen to me play if I have to lock the door. I'm trying to get over bashfulness. Had this organ only 6 months, but I love it."

We toured the Lamoureaux ranch, saw hundreds of fat cattle and calves lazing around windmill well pumps surrounded by rich, tall grass. Lamoureaux was proud of his livestock, proud of his wells, proud of his sheds, and proud of his hay.

Before we left with a promise to meet again at the National Western Stock Show in January, Lamoureaux confided that he was one-eighth Sioux Indian.

"And I never in my life bought an acre of land from a squaw," he said with a laugh.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 5, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—"GRIPE SESSIONS" FOR INDIANS OFFER LITTLE AID HOPE

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Although the results are sometimes questionable, at least one policy in our dealings with the Indian has remained unchanged down through history. Congress sees to it that the Indian has occasional opportunity to voice his complaints.

One of these congressional gripe sessions took place a few weeks ago at the headquarters of the Rosebud (S. Dak.) Indian Reservation. The meeting was held in the American Legion Hall and the crowd, both inside the small frame building and out, resembled any other gathering of ranch people from Wagon Mound, N. Mex., to Cut Bank, Mont.

Representative JAMES HALEY, Democrat, of Florida, chairman of the House Subcommit-

tee on Indian Affairs, presided. One by one, members of the Sioux tribe stood and uttered the same timeworn expressions of dissatisfaction with their plight.

Outside, a pickup drove up. An Indian rolled down the cab window, stuck his head out and shouted, "What's going on in there?"

"Congress has moved from Washington to Rosebud," someone yelled back.

When the laughter subsided, an elder tribesman in black hat observed gravely, "You can always tell when an election year is coming up."

These were sincere tribesmen, soberly and intelligently concerned with the problems of their people. Many spoke eloquently to the committee of visiting Congressmen.

Their words underscored a report of the Indian Health Division of the Public Health Service that "the poorest, sickest, and least educated" of all American racial groups are the Indians.

It was obvious, however, that the Sioux had little confidence any good would come from their appeals for a program of assistance. There may be good reason, too. For one thing, no one seemed able to agree on what form such assistance should take.

But the pattern for a program of self-help could be found on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation farther north. Here there is a glimmer of hope for the Indian.

William Red Bird, tribal council vice chairman, reported on it recently before the fifth annual conference on Indian affairs sponsored by the Institute of Indian Studies at the University of South Dakota.

Red Bird said the program began in 1956 with a $10 million fund realized from flood-damage payments. Half the money was set aside by the tribal council for rehabilitation.

Thirty-two students were sent to college last year. An adult education program was established. Fifty-seven Indians participated. Some were set up in cattle raising. Each of the participating families started with 100 head of cattle and a $10,000 cash loan.

Seventy-two modern homes were built on the Cheyenne River Reservation. Thirty more were built at Eagle Butte, S. Dak., for elderly Indians. Five business enterprises were financed for tribesmen.

"We [the tribe] are rich in lands," said Red Bird, "but we are poor in money. So we are trying our best to get our people to support themselves. Sometimes we think we cannot solve our problems, but sometimes we do."

In all, the tribal council has issued 4,156 head of cattle to individuals, and there now are 22,000 head of Indian-owned cattle on the reservation, compared with 13,771 non-Indian-owned cattle.

Vernon G. Collins, of Gregory, S. Dak., a fullblood Sioux employed as a special officer for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, summed up the Indian problem in this fashion:

"Indian people must quit being dependent upon somebody else for everything. They must learn to live in this modern world and to do things for themselves. They must learn to use their lands and to work with their white neighbors in towns and cities.

"If they work hard, try to improve themselves, and learn to mingle with whites, they will be accepted. And the best way to bring these things about is to put Indian children in schools with white children. Then they'll learn to compete. Then they'll get ahead."

Geography circumvents this intermingling, however, and the fact remains that the Indian is not getting ahead.

To what extent he is lagging behind and what causes this backwardness will be developed later in this series of articles. To understand it, you may have to be able to read some at times indistinct smoke signals on the Indian horizon.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 5, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—INDIAN HOPES TO SURVIVE WHITE "FOLLY"

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

The unreconstructed reservation Sioux believes his paleface brother is not long for this earth. Long before perfection of nuclear weapons, the strangely gifted Uwipi medicine men of the Sioux tribe were telling their followers that the white transgressors would destroy themselves by some act of folly.

After that, the buffalo is to return. The Indian will then be free to resume his normal way of life.

Graham Holmes, superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, theorizes that this belief may explain the widely prevalent attitude of resignation among many Indian tribes.

The Indian knows, according to Holmes, that his "powers of survival" are greater than those of the white man and that they would carry him through disaster that might wipe out more civilized races. So he's content to sit and wait.

Then, too, there is something in the Indian's ancient religions that tells him this life is only a transitional period between the beginning and the final life in the Happy Hunting Ground. This mundane existence, the creed contends, is so fleeting it is foolish to try for more than a bare existence.

MANY CONVERSIONS

It is true that a great many solid and lasting conversions have been made among Indians to Christian faiths. It is equally true that a great many of these so-called converts hedge their religious bets by playing along with both sides—the ancient beliefs and the white man's church.

Thus the supine posture of so many American Indians. Thus the halfhearted plodding along behind their more aggressive leaders who sit in the tribal councils and formulate plans for the advancement of their people.

Does the increased tempo of sales of allotted Indian lands to non-Indians work to the disadvantage of the Indians?

Holmes says there are two answers to the question. "Yes" and "No."

Some allotted tracts are too small to be of value. However, many of these tracts can be bought at Government-supervised land sales by the tribe and put to work for the best interests of the entire tribe.

A great many Indians wouldn't improve their land or try to wrench an existence out of their acres if they owned the best soil in the Nation. Again the attitude of resignation, which so closely resembles sheer shiftlessness, comes into focus.

Whatever the cause, the distressing fact remains that the Nation is spending somewhere in the neighborhood of $425,000 a day of State and Federal funds in direct services to Indians and getting extremely poor long-range results.

Moreover, there is an abundance of evidence on every hand that this sum is woefully inadequate insofar as welfare assistance is concerned. And there is equally abundant indication that the need and the cost will mount with each passing year.

OUTLAY FOR INDIANS

The total annual outlay for services to Indians as reported to the House Insular Affairs Committee a year ago was in excess of $154 million. It is undoubtedly greater this year and it undoubtedly will be greater next year.

Progress has passed the Indian by—left him standing in his moccasins 50 years behind the rest of the Nation. He has little hope of ever catching up unless some new approach to his problem is devised.

The story of his backwardness, as contained in official reports, is nothing less than appalling.

While a decrease was noted in welfare requirements on the Cheyenne River Reservation during the report period 1949–56, the superintendent there said, "There is a continuation of lack of general education and failure to assimilate modern culture due to isolation and racial culture. Dependency has become traditional."

Elsewhere in South Dakota, where 30,000 Indians live, the Lower Brule Reservation reported the failure several years ago of a tribal cattle enterprise because of a price drop. Since World War II "there has been a gradual increase, both of general and public assistance."

From the Crow Creek Reservation came a report that there is a "hard core" of relief cases who are "poor credit risks."

Invocation of the vagrancy provision in the law-and-order code of the reservation was being considered for persons "who can work and will not leave the reservation to do so."

The Sisseton Indian Reservation of North Dakota and South Dakota reported wide fluctuations in relief caseloads. A Government report observed:

"The men are unable to support their families because they can do only unskilled labor and often are not interested in steady employment or cannot keep a steady job because of personal inadequacy, irresponsibility, or alcoholism. There is also a lack of employment opportunities."

SURPLUS FOOD

On the Rosebud Reservation practically all residents depend to some extent upon surplus food commodities during the winter months:

"In the past 20 years there has been a gradual increase in public assistance and a decrease in Bureau of Indian Affairs general assistance. There is a lack of realization by the Indians that personal and social problems can be solved more by them than by anybody else. They do not seem to realize that things can be changed. Rural slums, the defeatist attitude, lack of job opportunities, and lack of effective local government could be improved if they were methodically attacked."

On the Pine Ridge and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, figures compiled for the House Insular Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Indian Affairs showed increases in welfare requirements.

At Pine Ridge, where there are 1,900 families, 925 were reported dependent upon general assistance in varying degrees from one-quarter to complete dependency.

Standing Rock reported 608 families with 528 of them dependent upon assistance. Four hundred of these were in the three-quarter to complete dependency category.

It's the same picture of poverty, malnutrition, overcrowding, broken homes, illegitimacy, and sickness throughout most of the Indian country. With it all goes a higher crime rate, juvenile delinquency, degeneracy.

Within recent months a survey group made up of church and Government people in South Dakota studied the impact on communities and reservations of the existing trend in Indian sociology, and it came up with this one statement on law and order:

"In this field we find serious developments giving rise to grave concern on the part of Indians and non-Indians in many communities. Due to the very complicated regulations governing the jurisdiction of county, State, and tribal law-enforcement officers, some very serious problems are growing.

LAW BREAKDOWN

"In some instances communities are facing all but complete breakdown in law and order. In some instances county and city law enforcement officers are without jurisdiction,

and many of the Indians involved are expressing strong convictions that such situations should be rectified."

This conceivably could account for the unofficial report that within recent months there have been five unsolved murders either on or near the Sioux Reservation country of southern South Dakota.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 7, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—TIME AND PROGRESS PASS THESE INDIANS BY

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Westward out of Mission, S. Dak., you speed along U.S. 18, past the turnoff to the Rosebud Indian Reservation headquarters, into the pine-grown ridges of low mountain country, then suddenly downhill to the crossing of the Little White River.

A red cross on the map at this point indicates a change from central standard time to mountain standard time. Actually the change in time here is very significant.

For the several score ill-clad, ill-housed, and ill-fed people who live here, it is still 50 years ago. Time and progress have passed them by. They are among the poorest Sioux tribesmen on the reservation.

These are a shy people who suffer in silence, resent intrusion by strangers, flinch at the sight of a camera, and largely refuse to talk on less than a weeks-long acquaintance.

Many of them find escape from their miseries in the peyote rites of the Native American Church or, when they can afford it, in the white man's firewater.

Peyote makes a man's dreams come alive in vivid technicolor. For one night at least, he who drinks deeply of peyote tea experiences the tingling joys of release to another world of heavenly visions and unimaginable pleasure far beyond the Indian's lot on earth

Firewater makes a man forget. Unfortunately, both have much the same aftereffects if indulged in too generously.

If you stop at the tiny By-the-Way store operated just across the river fork by Harry Berogan and his wife, Lizzie, you may meet a tall, handsome youth named Black Lance.

He will not talk to you. He will only grin good-naturedly, accept the candy you offer him, and make a stuttering sound with his mouth. Black Lance has a speech impediment.

Another boy in another community might be spared a lifetime of embarrassment in a case of this nature. Speech impediments can be corrected by trained technicians. But not Black Lance.

He is condemned by circumstance, isolation, and a compounded lack of self-confidence to live out his days hiding from strangers or standing in painful silence, one foot planted on the other in awkward withdrawal.

If you talk long enough with Berogan you may meet—let us call her Bethel.

It was cold and windy the day I met her. She was carrying her baby boy, a warmly dressed little fellow about 16 or 18 months old. Bethel wore a thin cotton dress and a light sweater. She obviously was pregnant.

At first she regarded me coldly but warmed when Berogan introduced us, and I handed her youngster a fistful of candy which he eagerly accepted. He withdrew and let out a tearful bawl, however, when I sought to pat him on the shoulder.

Bethel's brown parchment face cracked into a smile that revealed a yellow set of broken teeth in need of repair.

I wondered how the woman could chew her food. But Berogan assured me that mush and beans and Government surplus cheese and dry milk could be managed without teeth.

This, then, was the picture at the Little White River. Off in the distance from Berogan's store were the modest homes and the little shacks of the Sioux.

In back of one, a family wash fluttered on the line. At another, a woman swept the yard. At yet another, a woman chopped kindling for a fire.

Atop the roof of the house nearest to the store stood a towering television aerial. Contradiction is the story of the Indian.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 6, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—PROGRAM OF SELF-HELP CAN EASE SIOUX HARDSHIPS

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

From the crossing of the Little White River on the Rosebud Indian Reservation of South Dakota, you continue westward on U.S. 18 and soon cross into the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, second largest in the Nation.

The Oglala Sioux who live here number 12,300. Their average monthly income is less than $100 per family. And most of that is in the form of public assistance.

The scene is monotonously repetitious of what you saw on the Rosebud—grassy hills in great swales and bulges, little ranch homes, some fairly prosperous, some extremely modest. And the wind—always the wind—the wind that pushes and jerks you around and hurls sand in your face and sends tumbleweeds dancing across the road.

It's a cold, hard, unrelenting winter wind that punishes the Sioux country. It rips and tears at the flimsy huts and whips snow through the cracks. Its companion is familiar to the Sioux—hardship.

SELF-HELP PROGRAM

Yet here you'll find something heart warming. It is a projected program of self-help.

Tribal leaders have done the groundwork for a tepee village with which to bid for the tourist trade. It would be authentic, from the handmade Indian goods in the "trading post" to the genuine Indians themselves. In time, the project would include motels, Indian ceremonial dances for entertainment of visitors, good restaurants, possibly a museum.

Back in the late 1940's when the Navajos were in possibly more desperate circumstances than the Sioux, they sat in council, discussed their plight and subsequently entered the motel and store business, set up a sawmill and other tribal projects. Today those projects are paying dividends in both profits and tribal employment.

JOB FOR DELINQUENTS

The Sioux project would be Indian owned, Indian operated. Properly managed, it should prove to be a beneficial investment.

Initial construction work would be done by impressed crews of the reservation's plentiful juvenile delinquents. The tribe would help finance the undertaking with tribal funds. Private investment may be considered.

The Oglala Sioux wisely reason that if cowboys can capitalize on being cowboys, Indians can capitalize on being Indians.

Goodness knows it is high time the Oglala Sioux did something to help themselves. Their once vast Pine Ridge Indian Reservation is rapidly diminishing. Thousands of acres of individually owned allotted land are being sold to non-Indians each year.

In the 12-month period ending April 30, 1958, South Dakota's Department of Revenue reported alienation of 24,324 acres of Pine Ridge land in 137 tracts. (That's an area one-half the size of Denver.)

This, of course, makes South Dakota happy. Once Indian title to the land is removed, it becomes taxable.

Pine Ridge Superintendent Towle initiated a study a year ago of the cause and effects of Indian land sales. It was learned that "much of the individual allotted interests (in the lands) are in the hands of the older generations," Towle's preliminary report stated.

"These older people are more interested in making use of the land-sale proceeds while they are alive rather than to have the benefits pass on to their heirs."

FOR CONSUMER GOODS

The study also disclosed that funds realized by Indians from the sale of their lands were being spent on consumer goods, such as food, clothing, and used cars.

"Only a small portion of land-sale funds are being used for permanent betterment, such as building new homes, purchasing more suitable lands, or in the establishment of an enterprise that might result in a livelihood or a better standard of living," the report added.

The report could have added that much of the money is squandered even more frivolously in the border town skidrows.

So much for the effect. What prompts Indians to rush into the market with their allotted lands when fee patents are granted? Towle largely blames old-age assistance liens.

In a report prepared in response to a questionnaire sent out by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Towle appended a detailed and revealing explanation of "the effects of old-age assistance on the Indian's desire to sell trust lands."

TREATY RECALLED

To paraphrase the report, Towle said it originally agreed with the Indians through treaty, that the United States would provide for all elderly Indians in perpetuity, with no strings attached. But under social security, the Government can now take their lands in repayment.

For years, Congress recognized the treaty promises as a special obligation on the Government. Appropriations were made regularly to assist States which had programs for caring for Indian aged.

At first, grants were made to aged Indians in the form of provisions. Later, financial assistance was substituted.

Then in 1935, Congress passed the Social Security Act and the Bureau of Indian Affairs no longer doled out Federal aid to old Indians. Social security took over care of the Indian aged.

But the act contained a provision that enabled the administering States to recover the amount of aid extended from the estates of beneficiaries of old age assistance. Liens could be placed against all income from such estates and, in many Indian cases, would be in force 20 years or more.

The Indians objected that this collection system was in violation of their treaties. It naturally followed in Indian logic that if a man had no estate which the Government could tap for repayment—if he sold his allotted land—he could spend both the land sale proceeds and the old age assistance.

Thus began the boom in sales of individually owned Indian allotted land.

It was either resort to this practice or simply forgo desperately needed assistance. The Indian took the former course.

GAINING SUPPORT

You won't be in Indian country very long, and you won't talk to many Indians about it until you'll hear over and over again that this "repayment of treaty grants" is the most cruel device yet employed to wrest Indian lands from the Indians.

It should be noted, too, that the Indian is winning considerable support for his contention.

Towle's report showed how land sales can snowball to avalanche proportions.

It was estimated that 149 "key tracts" totaling 32,519 acres of Pine Ridge land had been sold in years past. One effect of the

sale of these key tracts, the report said, "has been to handicap Indian cattle operators to such an extent that these operators either have had to liquidate their holdings or go to the expense of moving their entire ranches to other areas.

"Another effect has been to reduce values of surrounding or adjacent lands by lessening competition where key tracts control use of adjacent land."

It might be observed that the final effect well may be destruction of the reservation's usefulness to the Indians. In that event, Rapid City, S. Dak., and other towns in the reservation country can expect their "Place of Many Sorrows" to gain population.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 7, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—INDIAN SLUM POSES BIG PROBLEM TO RAPID CITY

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Just outside the handsomely modern metropolis of Rapid City, S. Dak., there is a junk-strewn, shack-grown hill. You'll find it strangely silent.

In the words of Indians who may tell you about it, the hill is another "Place of Many Sorrows."

It has its counterpart in many other regions inhabited by Indians. Here are the ever-present ills, disease and want. This is Rapid City's Indian slum area euphemistically known as the "Sioux addition."

Here, in neglect that is sometimes criminal, are raised succeeding generations of the hill's inhabitants. Here a father too often drinks up the family's relief check. Here it often happens that a young Indian girl is introduced into prostitution.

This is a dump heap where we dispose of the reminders of our tragic failure in the management of Indian affairs.

A few years ago a similar Indian village flourished in the very heart of Rapid City on the marshy banks of a small stream below the railroad tracks, almost in the shadow of the sumptuous hotel that recently became the Sheraton-Johnson.

Indians came to Rapid City to revel in the bright lights and sometimes to seek jobs. Too frequently, however, the jobs were abandoned after the first pay check and a round of drunken nights.

Some were Indians who had sold their allotted lands and had become homeless. Some were just wanderers. Population of the slum area varied then as it does now, from a few dozen families to several hundred individuals. Eventually the settlement was moved to the hill.

Police Chief W. K. Armstrong, a vigorous administrator, estimates that Rapid City's Indian population is from 4,000 to 6,000 at all times and he shudders at what it could be under a Government policy of reservation termination.

The problem is big enough already. Detective Capt. Ralph Johnson says 75 percent of the city jail's drunks are Indians. Although they are responsible for comparatively few felonies, Indians—a fraction of the city's population of around 40,000—comprise the biggest law enforcement problem.

Johnson says the city's troubles with Indians have been compounded by legalizing firewater for them and by the recent influx of a minority that has been preying on young Indian girls.

Most of this new group, Johnson says, are transient males, young men looking for opportunities and a new way of life after release from military service.

Some gravitate to the poverty rows, both within and outside the city and are thus brought into contact with impressionable and easily swayed young Indian girls with no means of support. Introducing them into prostitution is easily accomplished.

"We've even found cases where these men talk unmarried Indian mothers into sharing their Aid to Dependent Children checks with them," Johnson says. "We've had cases where they've taken the whole checks away from these young unmarried mothers and have forced them into prostitution.

"We work hard on these cases. We catch most of them before they get too far along. But it is shocking—especially when you remember that not many years ago Indian morals were high and Indian women were respected for it. Liquor, bad influences and their poor economic lot are responsible.

"I don't know what could be done about it on a big scale."

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 7, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—AID CENTERS OFFER INDIAN HEALTH, CRAFT COUNSELING PROGRAMS

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

There still are those who believe the only good Indian is a dead one. There are also the "do-gooders" who cry "Lo, the poor red man," and who would cater to his every whimsical fancy.

In other wigwams there are those who fold their hands and hope the Indian problem will resolve itself or simply go away. Then there are those realistic souls who continue to chip away at the flinty edges of the problem and at the same time minister modestly to the most urgent cases.

Fortunately, for both the Indian and non-Indian, Rapid City, S. Dak., had a wealth of humanitarians. Two of the most outstanding are Rev. Father Peter Price, a Jesuit priest, director of the Mother Butler Center, and the Reverend Percy J. Tibbets, a Congregational minister who runs the Community Service Center.

Asked jokingly if the two denominations worked in competition to help Indians, the Reverend Mr. Tibbets smiled and said: "No, we work in cooperation."

Reservation-born and reared, the Reverend Mr. Tibbets is a fullblood Sioux. His wife, Emma, is also a fullblood Sioux.

He came to Rapid City to help rehabilitate Indians there. He found the problem quicker than he bargained for. No one would rent him a house. Finally he managed to rent a small place and began a community center from which he could operate.

RECREATION PROGRAMS

Now, 10 years later, he has a fairly spacious, two-story cement-block building where he lives, conducts religious services, operates a small clinic, and counsels with his clients.

He has 18 young Indians enrolled in a typing class; 15 studying leathercraft; 18 in cooking and sewing classes; 120 in the 4-H Club, and 250 signed up in the Black Hills Council of American Indians.

Both Rev. M. Tibbets and Father Price conduct youth recreation programs, and frequent rummage sales to help finance their projects. Businessmen and civic and religious groups in Rapid City help generously.

Father Price has a more elaborate layout and Tibbets envies him his gymnasium. The Mother Butler Center, named for a nun famous for her charity and for founding the Mary Mount College, New York, maintains a program of activities comparable to that of the other center and, in addition, runs a modern, well-appointed home for Indian girls.

The place is spotless, offers private rooms for $1 a night, and board and room for $16 a week. A girl staying there can study typing, cooking, sewing, all-around housekeeping, and receive other aids and advantages under the guidance of the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, one of the few civilian orders of nuns.

The home can accommodate 16 girls. But it is strangely devoid of customers. Father Price attributes the lack of patronage to objection by the girls to a requirement that they be in by 10 p.m.

Over in the main building, separate from the girls' home, Sister Nora Mulhern runs a clinic stocked liberally with serums, antibiotics, and other pharmaceutical needs.

BROGUE A HELP

Sister Nora is straight from the heather hills and perhaps it is her persuasive Scotch brogue that accounts for her success in wheedling medical supplies from laboratories and other sources.

She's a graduate nurse from both Scotch and American colleges and also a member of the Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

Last year she dispensed 3 polio shots each to 106 Indians, 2 shots to an additional 74, and 1 shot each to another 40. She'd given antirabies to 5 Indian youngsters bitten by dogs and cared for 2,500 patients, one-third of them children.

She's called upon to treat all sorts of ills from the contagious to the invited.

One sentence in her report to Bishop William T. McCarthy, founder of the Mother Butler Center, is revealing. It dealt with the wide variety of cases. It said:

"Sometimes I'm called upon to treat lacerations which I suspect were received in a fracas in a bar. And a guy (so being treated) can't understand why a nurse can't suture."

Father Price, a tall, shy individual, originally from Nebraska, has instituted another phase of help to the Indians. It is a credit union which now boasts $4,000 operating capital. Although the collector, George Iron Cloud, is optimistic about recoveries on loans, Father Price is skeptical.

"Indians," he said, "are notoriously poor credit risks. They like to get it when they need it, but they hate to pay it back."

It was a chilly Sunday afternoon when I interviewed Father Price and the Reverend Mr. Tibbets. All the Indians had vanished after services—all except a boy with an infected eye and an older man who had fallen from his cot and had struck his head a sharp blow on the base of a stove. Each received treatment at one or the other of the two centers.

The Reverend Mr. Tibbets delayed his departure on a trip to one of the reservations so he could talk for the interview. He rubbed his face in deep reflection.

"How would I sum up the problem of the Indian? I think, frankly, it is one of overdependence upon the Government.

"The Indian must be taught to help himself. He must build self-reliance. He must have a place to call home. Home is very important to the Indian. When he has none, he develops a strong inferiority complex.

"He hasn't had the advantages of environment to help him in his need to learn to live the white man's way. The Negro copied from the environment into which he was born—or thrust. But it was essentially a white man's environment.

"An Indian says, 'I'm an Indian, so I can't do what the white man does.'

"The Indian must be taught to think for himself. He needs closer association with the white influence. And he must make up his mind about what he wants to do. When he does, we should help him.

CAN'T STAND DRINK

"Until that time the Indian will continue to have an inferiority complex and he will seek to drown it in alcohol. And he can't drink."

Why can't an Indian drink and handle it like most whites? I wondered too, and I asked a doctor.

Later on I asked a former Navy pharmacist who is part Alaskan Indian and part Filipino and now is working in Great Falls, Mont. You'll meet him later on and you'll like him.

The doctor explained that there is no reason, organic or chemical, why an Indian gets lousy drunk when he drinks. It's

simply that he has fewer inhibitions and fewer restraints. When he drinks, he goes at it with a warwhoop.

The pharmacist had a good answer, too. The average American has been conditioned to alcohol through centuries of European ancestry. His body has become accustomed to it through heredity. The Indian hasn't—and he can't take it.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 8, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—U.S. LAND MOVES CONFUSE, STYMIE CHEYENNES

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Shadows grow long and dense in the rolling plains country. And the shadow of need that darkens the land of the South Dakota Sioux extends finger-like westward to the hunting grounds of the Northern Cheyennes in Montana.

You leave the Black Hills of South Dakota with the rising sun and follow that shadow over a northwesterly course, cross a tiny corner of Wyoming, and within 3 hours you're in the low-lying, pine-grown mountains of the former allies of the Sioux.

It's like flying backward in time.

It was in this sector that is now the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, that Lt. Col. George A. Custer and his cavalry command spent their last night on earth before riding to the Little Big Horn and death.

Compared with most other reservations, the Northern Cheyenne is small—roughly 28 square miles. Some 2,300 members of the tribe live here. Three hundred or more live off the reservation.

But the smallness of the reservation does not minimize its problems. Instead, they are multiplied and aggravated by geography, primitivism, the general rural economic squeeze of the mid-20th century, and some of the most deplorable official bullheadedness since the Custer debacle that fateful summer of 1876.

That date in history was the beginning of the Northern Cheyennes' lament. They joined the Sioux in the Custer massacre. It was their last victory.

In time they were cornered, subdued, and taken as prisoners of war to Fort Reno, Okla., where it was planned to colonize them with the Southern Cheyennes.

Then, even as now, the U.S. Government underestimated the fierce love of the Northern Cheyennes for their home country. The Indians rebelled. Many were killed trying to escape.

At last, however, about 60 of them, led by Little Wolf, broke away. In a stark and difficult terrain, they braved death by freezing, starvation, sickness, and constant attack, and they fought their way home.

Throughout this long and arduous ordeal, the Sutai medicine men of the tribe carried along a revered object—the "sacred hat" which remains enshrined Indian fashion to this day in the back country of the reservation.

Few white men have ever seen it. Custer was one who did, and he was warned by the Sutai seer against the fate which befell him.

By succession, the sacred hat and its shrine are in the custody now of another Sutai medicine man, Henry Little Coyote. Together, as you will see later, they provide a strange and interesting insight into the problems of the Indian.

Despite possession of their protective medicine, however, the Northern Cheyennes were recaptured upon returning home, and in 1884 the Government established their present reservation.

The Cheyennes developed a livestock economy owned in common. They never asked the Government to allot their lands. But in 1927, the Government did. It created a crazy-quilt patchwork of property holdings that defied successful operation, confused the Indians and opened the way to liquidation of some of the reservation's most valuable lands.

Thus far the tribe has slowed the liquidation by meeting the white buyers' top bids and acquiring the land for the tribe as a whole.

But there was one instance in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs tied up $40,000 of tribal money in red tape and thus prevented the tribe from bidding on key tracts.

Now there are new threats to security of the Northern Cheyennes. One key tract threatens to provoke more land sales, and there are two other factors—oil and firewater.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 10, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—NORTHERN CHEYENNES ENGAGED IN TWO "WARS"

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

From the time the buffalo dominated the Plains, the Northern Cheyenne Indian tribe has been feared and respected as one of the most warlike in the West. They would fight at the drop of a feathered coup stick—and they are engaged in two "wars" right now.

One is on a broad field extending northward from Colorado's Arkansas River to the North Platte River of Wyoming and Nebraska, and westward from a point well inside western Kansas to the Continental Divide.

This vast area, which includes Denver, Colorado Springs, and other important towns and cities, was once the hunting ground of the Northern Cheyennes. For 8 years now, the Cheyennes have skirmished with the Indian Claims Commission seeking payment for these lands and minerals which were ceded to the whites by various treaties.

But in another "war" while they fight for millions of acres, the Northern Cheyennes are being flanked by an acre-by-acre conquest of their little reservation.

Headquarters for their "wars" is in the small agency town of Lame Deer, Mont., near the northern border of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation.

Lame Deer's main street is bisected at one end by State Highway 8. At one end of the street are a couple of stores, a cafe, a hotel and service station. Across the highway, northward, are the Government buildings and the one-story frame office of the tribe.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

The scene contrasts sharply with that of 50 years ago. No more do the squaws carry papooses on their backs. The men no longer pad along the street in moccasins. Indeed, it is difficult to find a woman who knows how to make moccasins.

Taste in women's clothing runs from the modern skirts or suits to a design copied from the dresses of the cavalry officers' wives of years ago. The men prefer cowboy boots, jeans, and western hats.

Yet there is something primitive here, something reminiscent of the days when women chopped wood and men hunted or fought. Here as elsewhere in Indian country, there are many contradictions, much conflict.

Many women still do chop wood and carry water. But you'll also find some of them participating in a study of home sanitation and talking of forming a women's club similar to those on some other reservations.

In the tribal headquarters you'll find spirited leaders of the tribe working and planning to preserve their reservation and improve the lot of their fellow tribesmen.

SEVENTY-FIVE TO EIGHTY PERCENT

These leaders, members of the tribal council, were in session when I arrived at Lame Deer. The meeting was taking place in a room in the basement of the tribe's headquarters. Perhaps 75 or 80 were in attendance.

Save for the pronounced Indian features and skin coloring of the tribal representatives, the informal dress and here and there a handsome set of tied braids, the gathering resembled that of any other group of American councilmen.

At the rear of the room a tall young man was urging adoption of a resolution to approve a cooperative campaign for tuberculosis control with the State of Montana. He spoke eloquently in both English and the sonorous language of the Northern Cheyennes. The resolution was adopted with a chorus of assenting grunts.

During a lull in the meeting I introduced myself to the young man who had been talking. His name was musical, typical—Melvin Wounded Eye.

We shook hands and talked. Then he stood, addressed Tribal Vice Chairman Willy Hollow Breast who presided at a desk in the front of the room, and introduced me in both English and Cheyenne. Hollow Breast acknowledged the introduction with a raised hand "Hau." Then he invited me to tell the council the nature of my business.

As I spoke, the tribal secretary took notes. Wounded Eye interpreted. When I had finished, the council pledged its cooperation to see that I received the information I sought. We shook hands all around.

Next morning we held our first meeting in the tribal headquarters. Present were Council Chairman John Wooden Legs, Wounded Eye, Henry Coup Cane, Rufus Wallowing, and Hollow Breast, among others.

Wounded Eye and Coup Cane are veterans of the war in the South Pacific. Both are vigorous and effective leaders in the tribe's drive toward a better culture.

Thus far, they said, they have managed to hold their reservation fairly intact despite Government-supervised sales of allotted Indian lands. Of 445,736 acres, approximately 6,000 have been sold. In 1959, 2,399 acres went up for sale. The Cheyennes matched the bids of the whites and thus retained ownership in commonalty.

OTHER SALES

Other sales may be in the offing. There's talk of oil in the northwest corner of the reservation, and white men are seeking to buy in there, Hollow Breast said.

"With the cooperation of the reservation's Government officers and with the help of lots of liquor to help talk the Indians (landowners) into selling, they might get that land, too," Hollow Breast continued. "But we are hoping to stop them."

Their plan was contained in a letter to Miss LaVerne Madigan, executive director of the Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc., New York. The letter said in part:

"Our land is more than a reservation to us Northern Cheyennes. Our land is the home of our people, and that is why our grandfathers broke out of prison in Oklahoma and died and starved and froze and fought all the way back to this good place.

WANT TO HOLD LAND

"We want to hold every foot of our land. We do not want one foot of it sold out of Northern Cheyenne ownership.

"Once our land belonged to the whole tribe and no Cheyenne could sell away a piece of it. That was good. Then the land was allotted. Every Cheyenne was given a piece of it. Today, we children of those Cheyennes are very poor, and God will forgive us for selling our pieces of our homeland to buy food and clothes.

"But it is not good for our people to do that. When they have eaten the food and worn out the clothes or spent the money childishly, they live right here among us on relief and a part of our community is gone forever.

"Soon * * * more acres will go up for sale, and other lands will follow, and we are asking the Bureau of Indian Affairs to

lend us $500,000 from the Indian Revolving Loan Fund so that we can keep pace.

REVOLVING FUND

"The Revolving Fund will be empty until Congress appropriates money for it, and we Northern Cheyennes are only one of many tribes that have applied for land purchase loans.

"The loan we need may be a long time coming, and half our reservation may be sold while we wait. The borrowed money, even after we receive it, will not be enough to buy all of the allotted Cheyenne lands, and we may face a hard future in which we will be borrowing and repaying at interest for years to save our homeland, without a penny to help our people live better lives.

"We will do that if we have to. But there is a better way."

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 10, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—LAWS ENCROACH ON INDIAN'S LOVE OF HOMELAND

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

There are some things the white man does not share in common with many of his redskin brothers, the Indians. Prominent among these are a taste for puppy soup and jerk meat; confidence in the curative powers of the medicine man, and a belief that tinkering with nature invites the wrath of the Great Spirit.

Conversely, an Indian wouldn't give a war whoop for hors d'oeuvres or a fingerbowl, and he wouldn't be caught scalped at a cocktail party.

He's a practical soul. When he eats, he eats to satisfy his hunger. When he drinks, he drinks to get drunk.

There are exceptions, of course, and there is much to be said in behalf of dried jerky made from deer meat. But on one common ground Indians and non-Indians meet in agreement—love of home country.

It is this love of homeland which inspired the Northern Cheyenne tribesmen to escape from Oklahoma in the late 1880's and fight their way back north. And it is the same devotion that motivates them today in advancement of a plan to stop the sale of allotted lands on their reservation in southern Montana.

Soon the Northern Cheyennes intend to present to Congress a petition asking for an "unallotment" program for the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation.

Government-supervised sales of individually owned allotted lands on the reservation have alarmed tribal leaders. They say the sellers too often squander money received from such sales, then return to the reservation to live on relief and become burdens.

The program the Northern Cheyenne propose would continue 50 years.

"During that time there would be a moratorium on all land sales except to the tribe," Tribal Chairman John Wooden Legs wrote in a letter of explanation to the Association on American Indian Affairs. "The tribe would be required to purchase all land offered for sale and at the appraised value at the time of sale.

"The land would be purchased by the tribe out of annual, unborrowed income (from land leases, minerals, and sales of timber or other tribal enterprises). The amount of land to be purchased each year would be on a 50-year basis.

"The right of Northern Cheyennes to sell their land out of Cheyenne ownership is not acknowledged by the tribe, but the right of the individual to sell would not be violated because the tribe would be obligated to buy."

It seems to be a fair proposal designed to keep the reservation intact and to preserve the security for all members of the tribe. It also is the hub of a contemplated program of resource development founded on coal, oil, and lumber.

But if the past is any criterion for the future, the Northern Cheyennes have little to hope for. A coal mining undertaking several years ago reportedly was halted on Government orders with no explanation.

Prior to one Government-supervised land sale, the tribe sold cattle to raise $40,000 with which to match the bids of the whites. The money was tied up in Washington for an "audit."

Representative LEE METCALF and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs to release the money in time for the sale. Then the tribe requested that the sale be postponed. Neither request was honored.

An attempt by tribal leaders and a Catholic mission on the reservation to secure leases for expansion of a small plastics industry at Lame Deer, Mont., has been snarled for months by "procedure."

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 10, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—400 INDIAN FAMILIES OUT OF 450 GET WELFARE RELIEF

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Except for his high cheekbones, the slight slant of his dark eyes and his black, sometimes matted hair, Robert Fighting Bear appears little different from any other American boy.

Robert is 2 years old now and he achieved that age against terrific odds. The odds against his living to be 1 year old were twice that of the average infant born in the United States. Should he survive babyhood, Robert Fighting Bear can look forward to a life expectancy of 40 years compared with 62 for the other children of the Nation.

Statistic Fighting Bear is a Northern Cheyenne Indian. He lives with his parents in a little log cabin in the reservation village of Birney, Mont., population about 125.

When he becomes older he may be a big help to his parents. He can then pack wood and he can carry water from the community's one source of supply, a trickling artesian well that runs from a pipe into an iron trough shared by Birney's dwellers and dogs alike.

If the Fighting Bear family is like most other residents of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Robert's parents probably will spend some time this winter living on relief money.

Statistics show that of the reservation's 450 or more families, only 50 are entirely self-supporting. Of the 400 relief client families, 50 are one-fourth dependent on welfare assistance; 200 are one-half dependent, and 180 are dependent to the extent of three-quarters or more.

This is a sad state of affairs, indeed, for a tribe whose total assets are reckoned at more than $7½ million, with family assets averaging $6,200. It speaks strongly of underdevelopment.

Seriousness of the relief situation of the Northern Cheyennes was accented by the report several months ago by Supt. Don Y. Jensen. He said the Bureau of Indian Affairs took over administration of general assistance in 1940.

During the war years the case load dropped. But in the postwar period payments of social security aids and general assistance have quadrupled.

"This tribe," Jensen reported, "lives primarily in a relief economy and has over one-fourth million dollars each year in grants.

"These Indians are very conservative and belong to the Peyote organization which they call the Native American Church. The Peyote group members do not expect to seek employment or live primarily off the reservation.

RELOCATION SLOW

"Relocation has been proceeding at a snail's pace."

Tribal chairman John Wooden Legs will tell you the Government's effort to relocate Indians in cities around the Nation "has failed 100 percent so far as the Northern Cheyennes are concerned. All our people who have left to find jobs in the cities have returned to the reservation."

You wonder why anyone would elect to return to the poverty and squalor of the Northern Cheyenne Reservation as you drive through the little communities. Admittedly there is something attractive about the countryside and obviously it could be productive.

On the visit to Birney in company with Melvin Wounded Eye, Willy Hollow Breast, Henry Coup Cane and others of the Northern Cheyenne tribal council, we passed one small ranch home that bore every evidence of efficiency and a degree of prosperity.

The owner, I learned, was an Indian woman married to a white man who was managing to "whack" out a fairly good living off the land.

A few miles farther on we stopped in Birney, a typical Indian village dotted by outhouses and old automobiles. There is no store in the community. Shopping must be done in one of the other towns, several miles distant.

BLOOD AT THE WELL

A dark splotch of blood beside the little water well testified that hunting had been good recently. Women of the village were hanging jerk meat on poles to dry in the sun.

As we watched, a middleaged Indian woman emerged from one of the low-built log huts, walked to her outhouse but didn't enter. Instead, she sought a position to one side of the little facility and, with no show of embarrassment, relieved herself in plain sight of our group.

Then, without further ado, she stood and walked back to the log cabin.

The tribal council members shouted friendly greetings to the Birney residents, joked and laughed and wished there were a better water supply.

I wanted two children to pose in a photograph of the town's one water well. One of the men in our party persuaded a mother to allow two of her youngsters to serve as models.

Then she spent 30 minutes grooming and scrubbing them and changing their clothes.

The sun ball was dipping westward and the wind that blew had begun to take on a sharper edge when Hollow Breast decided to pay me one of the tribe's highest honors—a visit to the shrine of the "Sacred Hat."

It was only a short drive through dry washes and over hills and past the spot where a motion picture company shot a sequence for a western movie years ago. It was based on the Custer massacre, and many of the great-grandsons of the Cheyenne warriors who took part in it—some who were in our entourage—were in the movie.

They enjoyed their role, they said, but complained that they were required to sit for hours on horseback, dressed only in breechcloths, and they sunburned terribly.

Henry Little Coyote, the Sutai medicine man, and Sitting Man, his companion, had a good fire going when we arrived at the shrine of the "Sacred Hat." Sitting Man, 86 and blind, is revered as the tribe's oldest man, a mark of great respect among most Indians.

The tribal councilmen conferred briefly with Little Coyote, an emaciated, almost venerable figure. His Sutai forebears undoubtedly wore buckskins, but Little Coyote was dressed in moccasins, jeans, and a western shirt. His head was wrapped in a cloth head band from the back of which hung two hair braids tied with colored cloth strips.

DECLINES CIGARETTE

He excused himself and walked down a path. Sitting Man conversed in the tongue of his people and declined a cigarette. An

interpreter explained that Sitting Man believed in neither smoking nor drinking.

"When a man drinks, he becomes another man," he declared, emphasizing his statement with hand signs. "He goes crazy."

Presently we followed Little Coyote. The shrine proved to be a canvas tepee partly concealed from view by a low, encircling hillside. We tossed our hats on the tepee stakes and entered. No one spoke.

Hollow Breast knelt on one knee. We sat crosslegged on a strip of carpet on the ground, directly opposite Little Coyote who sat similarly on a couch also on the ground. At the head of the couch, apparently attached to a cross-like support, was the Sacred Hat. It was never revealed. It is shown only to tribal leaders once each 50 years.

History of the Sacred Hat, I was told, is lost in antiquity. Later I learned that the origin of the Sutai medicine men likewise is buried in the dim past and that they are a strange and gifted race of great honor.

We spoke in turn to Little Coyote who stared, trance-like, straight ahead. His translated words to me were that he hoped my mission was successful and that I could help bring about better understanding of the Indian's way of life and his problems. Then he said he was sure I'd have a pleasant trip.

That night I had my first flat tire of the entire junket.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 11, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—MISSION IN MONTANA PROVIDES JOBS, EDUCATION FOR INDIANS

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Ashland, Mont., once was described by an eastern writer as perhaps the only town in the United States that enjoys the unique distinction of having no law and a two-story privy.

Since then, however, time has wrought some changes in the tiny community on the eastern border of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation. A deputy sheriff now enforces the law as best he can in Ashland, and the strange, offset structure which once was attached to the rear of a two-story frame hotel, has tumbled over. The hotel, itself, has long been deserted.

It stands today on Ashland's one street like a hollow shell, windows shattered, floors strewn with broken bottles, a rickety outside stairway clinging to one side.

One of Ashland's residents said the town had long considered tearing down the old building but ventured a guess it would "make the younger Indians mighty mad.

"When they come in here during the summer and get tanked up, they sometimes use that place for love-making. Some of the others don't care for that much privacy."

BAR CROWD SMALL

I saw what he meant that very night. It had been some time since welfare checks had been distributed among the Indians, and the crowd in the bar consequently was small.

A cluster of tribesmen held forth at the lower end of the bar. Some cowpunchers and a traveling salesman drank and talked at the other end. A jukebox blared.

On the dance floor at the rear of the tavern, a young Indian in soiled work shirt and blue jeans, and an Indian girl who was similarly dressed, were vigorously engaged in what passed for dancing.

With the girl clutched to him, the youth lurched and stomped about the dance floor with the ponderous movements of a grizzly. When the music stopped, they staggered out the back door and into the shadows.

It is a scene duplicated nightly in reservation border towns from one end of the Indian country to the other. When relief checks are received or when some lucky tribesman cashes a sizable land sale check, the boisterous bottle belting and lovemaking assume louder and even grander proportions.

FORTUNES SQUANDERED

Indians have squandered fortunes in a few days on the skid rows of some of the larger cities and in the smaller but no less sordid pup towns that rim the reservations with temptation.

A few miles from Ashland, however, the St. Labre Catholic Mission continues undismayed to whack away at the Indian problem through education of the young and by engaging in an unusual project for a religious institution—an industry.

The Reverend Father Emmett Hoffmann, a Capuchin Franciscan monk, directs the 76-year-old mission. This year 266 Indian boys and girls are enrolled in the elementary and high schools. Ten full-time teachers, seven of them nuns, are employed.

Also employed in fairly well-paying jobs provided by the mission are 120 adults, 95 of them Indians. Most of them work in Father Hoffmann's "plastic doll plant," a moccasin-strap operation which not only makes jobs but gives the mission its principal source of income.

Five years ago Father Hoffmann conceived the idea for the industry. He contracted with an eastern plastics firm for unassembled, unpainted parts for a small Indian doll which he named "Johnny Walks Last."

Then he set up an assembly line, hired Indian men and women to put the pieces together and paint on the hair, eyes, and lips. He created a sort of boiler-room operation which produced a huge mailing list. Then he completed the circle by establishing a packaging and mailing department.

That first year one-half million dolls were mailed, each with a solicitation for a donation. Last year one million dolls of a new design were mailed.

The return mail 1 year ago brought in $250,000 above costs, in all more than $800,000.

Father Hoffmann expanded the mission's charity program of direct relief to the Northern Cheyennes. He established a trade school. It teaches adults welding, woodworking, typing, and home economics.

Then, looking toward his dream of someday establishing an Indian college, he launched an ambitious construction program which includes a huge, modern cafeteria for his Indian boys and girls, a new dormitory and other facilities.

More jobs for Indians were created by the construction program and jobs for Indians is Father Hoffmann's idea of a solution to the Indian problem.

"These Indians are skillful with their hands," he said. "They work fast and with dexterity. They enjoy working and when they earn their money instead of having it given to them, they appreciate it more. Also, a tired Indian is more likely to go home at night than he is to drop in at the bar and get drunk.

COULD LICK PROBLEM

"If we could get industry on the reservation, we could lick the Indian problem in one generation."

Another branch of the plastics operation is at Lame Deer, Mont., on the northern edge of the reservation. It is run by a nonprofit organization which has been at loggerheads for months with reservation superintendent Don Y. Jensen over a proposed lease for expansion of the project. Until the lease is approved, the plant must continue on a limited scale.

Jensen disclaims responsibility for holding up the lease and says the organization has been tardy in supplying information requested despite the exchange of numerous memoranda.

At Billings, Mont., it was learned from Percy E. Melis, area director for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that the information desired concerned salaries and production costs which the nonprofit organization regards as confidential.

Officers of the organization and many members of the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council blame Jensen, whether justly or not, for most of the reservation's problems including the sales of allotted lands.

WORKS BY THE BOOK

Jensen, who came to the reservation from a similar assignment at Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota 2 years ago, replies he is running the reservation "according to the book."

The job of reservation superintendent is not easy. For one thing the Indians are not schooled in modern business practices. Too, they are inclined to procrastinate.

Jensen explained the whys and wherefores of the single source of water for a community of about 125 Indians at Birney, Mont. He said the tribe received a donation of $1,000 for a well there several months ago from Arrow, Inc., a nonprofit, nationwide Indian welfare organization.

The tribe appropriated several thousand dollars for a well-drilling program but thus far has done little or nothing about it, he said.

Regardless of the Indian's wishes or his own, for that matter, Jensen must hew to policy set by higher ups in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And almost without exception, persons interviewed on the reservation seem convinced that policy now is aimed at termination of trust protection now enjoyed by the Indians, to oppose establishment of industry on the reservations, and eventually to compel as many Indians as possible to leave the reservation.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 12, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—MISUNDERSTOOD INDIAN OFTEN A HARD WORKER

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Possibly we've treated the Indian too long as a mere statistic and not as the perplexed human he actually is. At least that was my impression as I left the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation to cross the land of the Crows and continue northward to Blackfoot country.

Could it be that we expect too much of these too-frequently-benighted tribesmen? Or don't we demand enough of them? You'll wonder about this after an extended visit with the Northern Cheyennes.

These are a simple, almost childish people for the most part, content to accept and live on the white man's gratuities, reluctant to interfere with nature, friendly and trusting, a people who love home, whether it has a dirt floor or not, and who see no good reason to leave it.

Although there are many outstanding exceptions among the Indians, ambition as the white man knows it is not a universal characteristic.

Yet they are restless, unhappy with their plight. They know something is wrong but they don't know what it is or what to do about it.

INDIANS WORK HARD

The Indian is a stranger in his own land. He's a hard worker when he has an assigned task, or a goal in mind. Maybe he wants to buy a horse, a saddle or a gun.

He'll slave until he saves enough money to get what he has in mind. Then he'll quit. The women seem to have a greater tenacity in this respect. One employer said the labor turnover rate for men runs as high as 1,000 percent. Women stay on the job.

Lyman Brewster, a rancher who used to lease grazing land from the Northern Chey-

ennes, told this anecdote to provide an insight into the thinking of some of the more backward Indians:

A few years ago an unusually heavy blizzard swept the reservation. Cattle were stranded without feed. So the Air Force put a haylift into operation and flew emergency feed to the livestock.

This hay-from-heaven was considered a truly great wonder by the Indians.

New year, Brewster continued, many Indian ranchers didn't bother to raise hay. They thought that surely the white man's airplanes would return if the stock needed feeding.

The complexities of leasing land when so many heirs are involved finally provoked Brewster into quitting ranching. He moved to Billings, Mont., and now is selling ranches.

Willy Hollow Breast, vice chairman of the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council and one of the best informed Indians in Montana, is aware of the shortcomings of his people. He favors holding the reservation intact, so the tribe can operate a corporate cattle raising enterprise.

Money from this venture, he believes, might enable the tribe to send many of their young children to white schools. According to Hollow Breast, an early association with whites is highly desirable. He knows that young impressions last a long time.

Proof of the value of such association can be found on the Crow Indian Reservation, which adjoins the Northern Cheyenne. The average Crow Indian is visibly more generally adapted to the white man's ways.

His reservation is on a main highway, just north of Sheridan, Wyo., and south of Billings, Mont. The thriving city of Hardin, Mont., is only a few minutes' drive from Crow Agency.

The Crows are related to the Sioux. But a Government booklet on them says they broke away from the ancestral group and settled in the valleys of the Yellowstone and Big Horn Rivers in northern Wyoming and southeastern Montana long before the coming of the white man.

At one time long ago they were an agricultural people, but with the change to the buffalo economy, greater stress was laid on military valor. Personal gain, the booklet says, and the accumulation of private wealth still means little to the Crows.

Yet the Crows are generally further advanced than many of the northern tribes. They more frequently make good employees, enjoy vigorous and enlightened leadership, and share to a degree in the general good fortunes of their region.

They are retarded in school, however, because most children speak no English when they enter school.

Approximately 3,000 Crows live on the reservation which is several times larger than that of the northern Cheyennes. About 800 live elsewhere. Years ago thet Crows warred with many neighboring tribes over hunting grounds and readily joined U.S. military forces to fight the enemies of the Crows.

In return for this they were generously rewarded in the Laramie Treaty in 1851 with a reservation of 38,531,174 acres in Montana and Wyoming Territories. By 1868, however, the second Laramie Treaty was signed and the white man reneged on his original promise. The reservation was cut to 9 million acres.

Subsequent cessions to whites, the Government, the Northern Pacific Railroad, the State of Montana, and land sales reduced the reservation to 1,727,201 acres of trust land.

By and large, however, the Crows have done fairly well. They adapt readily to the agricultural and livestock economy but their living standards are still low.

Construction of Yellowtail Dam, for which the tribe was voted $2.5 million of Federal funds for 7,000 acres to be inundated by reservoir, may afford unequaled opportunities for employment.

Undoubtedly it will bring in considerably more wampum for the skid row bars of Billings' South Side, where the test of a man's sobriety frequently seems to be his ability to crawl to the bar, hoist himself up and offer cash.

In some of the noisier joints which advertise "Skid Row Champagne, two bits," there seem to be only one or two simple rules: All fights are quickly ended and no person is served if he or she is lying on the floor. It should be added that some of the establishments forfeit considerable trade because of this one restriction.

On the one night I toured the bars on Billings' South Side I counted eight drunks who fell to the floor at one time or another; was solicited by three fairly young Indian girls and counted two dozen patrons who were helplessly drunk.

PLACE OF SORROWS

Early in this series of articles, a letter from an anonymous writer was printed. In it he told of a "Place of Many Sorrows" in Billings. I found no such place, unless it was the slum area on the south side of the tracks, inhabited by Indians and a mixture of bloods drawn together by the common bonds of poverty, depravity and companionship in misery.

No one knew of an all-Indian village such as the one at Great Falls, Mont., known as "Hill 57." That was the next destination. From there came the story of Heartbreak Hill, the end of the trail for many a once-proud Indian.

From there also came the story of a courageous group of civic-minded citizens and religious leaders, crusading for a better way of life for the Indian. It proved to be a story of hope and rescue.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 13, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—"HILL 57" TYPIFIES INDIAN SQUALOR AT GREAT FALLS

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

The towering smokestack of a sprawling smelter dominates the skyline of Montana's leading metropolis, Great Falls. Its crown commands a sweeping view. It looks over endless miles of rich agriculture, down into the city's bustling business streets and on hosts of handsome homes in expanding residential sections. It's a scene of prosperity in a growing western city.

If you could look from the top of the stack you'd see a big Air Force base, extensive railroad yards and the broad Missouri River.

In the middle of the river you probably would notice a small, uninhabited island. It was the site of the last sun dance put on by the Indians in the Great Falls area in 1914.

Yet this is still big Indian country. Southeast of Great Falls lies the Northern Cheyenne and Crow Indian Reservations on the Wyoming-Montana border. Northeast toward North Dakota are the Rocky Boy, Fort Belknap, and Fort Peck Reservations. Northwest, on the Canadian border, is the Blackfeet Reservation and to the west is the reservation of the Flatheads.

The on-reservation population of Montana is 27,500. But not all Indians live on reservations.

Three miles west of the smelter, almost at the edge of a modern housing development, is infamous "Hill 57." It's an Indian village. Its shocking filth, poverty, and degradation already have commanded national notice.

A short distance back toward the smelter plant and overlooking acres of new, modern homes, is "Mount Royal," another Indian village. Its residents regard themselves a notch higher on the social scale than their Hill 57 neighbors, possibly because their homes have wood flooring.

Of the two, Hill 57 is the more populous. It likewise is the more awesome trasherie. Its outstanding features are the frail huts, the battered hulks of abandoned cars, the ever-present outhouses, a hand pump which is the sole water supply for the entire community and an almost unbelievable sea of junk resembling a city rubbish disposal

Here in the two communities, in the midst of rusting and rotting discards, live 260 persons, 159 of whom are children under 17.

The census figure was obtained last spring by the Friends of Hill 57, a civic group of Great Falls citizens. Overcrowding is serious enough in spring and summer, but when winter comes and jobs are precious, the population rises above 350, and suffering becomes tragically acute.

The shacks are poor protection against the Arctic blasts of the Montana winter. Respiratory illnesses mount. The cry for relief grows louder.

Two winters ago, one family lived in a tiny log shed that had been used for years as a stable. Their floor was the dried accumulation of manure. A wood fire in a tub in the middle of the stable provided heat.

A spring thaw sent a small flood through the stable and down the hill through the house of a neighbor Indian family. Later, the water froze, turned the floors of both homes to ice. One Indian girl froze her feet. Another suffered leg injuries when she slipped on the ice, barefooted, and fell.

In one of the larger houses last winter, 32 persons shared accommodations and meager food supplies. On the Rocky Boy Reservation, one oldtimer was reported to be living in a chicken coop. Privation is not limited to off-reservation Indians.

The winter of 1957 brought tragedy. Some boys picked up old battery boxes and burned them for fuel. One died. The others were hospitalized for lead poisoning.

Violent death visited the hill early in the winter of 1959. An Indian whom officers said had been drinking, returned home and found his pregnant wife packing to leave him. He told officers he jabbed a broken bottle into her abdomen. She died on the littered floor of their shack in sight of her children.

Hospital attendants said she might have been saved had there been a telephone in the neighborhood.

A poignant sequel to the tragedy took place in Havre, Mont. An eye-witness told of being in a hotel some months ago when the hotel manager ran downstairs and exclaimed that a baby had just died upstairs. The man had called for a doctor, but he had not arrived in time.

It was an Indian baby, 4 to 5 months old. There were three other children in the room. They had been cold and hungry and the hotel man had given them shelter.

Their mother was the woman who died on the floor of the shack on Hill 57.

Grim and stark, indeed, is the picture of Indian life in Montana. Surprisingly, it grows worse the further you look. And you get a really good look through the findings of the friends of Hill 57.

Nucleus of the relief efforts of the good citizens of Great Falls is a self-appointed work force. Chief among these are Sister Providencia, Mrs. James Moriarty, Max Gubatayao, and Richard A. Charles. In one way or another they represent the Cascade County Community Council.

SISTER OF CHARITY

Sister Providencia, a member of the Sisters of Charity of Providence, is professor of sociology at the College of Great Falls. She calls her work with the Indians of Hill 57 and Mount Royal her "Dust Bin Project." She once was described by a Montana Congressman as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on the American Indian.

Mrs. Moriarty, wife of a prominent Great Falls businessman, can always be depended upon to find sources of emergency aid to the Indians. She once came to the rescue with a truck to haul wood after Hill 57 had been without fuel in winter weather for 2 weeks.

Gubatayao is a pharmacist at Columbus Hospital and a tireless worker for the Indians. His understanding runs deep. He is Filipino and part Alaska Tlingit Indian. Shortly after his discharge from the Navy, Gubatayao met Charles, a semiretired veteran of the Army and Air Force, at Seattle, Wash.

UNDER CLINICAL STUDY

They found a mutual interest in Indian problems. Gubatayao persuaded Charles to move to Great Falls. And their coworkers have put the residents of Hill 57 under a finely focused clinical study.

Most of the hill dwellers are Cree or Chippewa although there are a few Blackfeet and transients from other tribes. Some were chased out of Canada years ago. The Crees have been booted about from place to place for years, have been moved four times around Great Falls and burned out once by aggravated whites.

They make meager livings picking rocks off cultivated fields or work in crop harvests and at picking cans off the city dump for reprocessing.

The researchers learned that 7 families, totaling 36 persons, lived in 1-room shacks; 29 families of 172 persons lived in 2-room houses; only 4 families of 33 persons occupied 3-room houses, and 2 families totaling 19 persons resided in 4-room houses.

Seventy-six percent of Hill 57 residents had lived thusly 10 years or longer.

Some originally were on reservations. Some sold their land and became homeless. They've stayed homeless. They're not easily assimilated into the white culture. They don't fit and nobody wants them.

Once the Government bought land near Great Falls for an Indian housing project. When whites objected, the project fell through. The land was sold after 1950 and the money spent on the Rocky Boy Reservation.

They found 62 percent of the hill's people getting various types of Government assistance, 24 men with seasonal work and only 8 employed the year around. One father of 13 children under the age 8, had no job, no relief, and no food.

Only 39 percent of the children attended school.

Some other statistics were even more appalling.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 14, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—U.S. BUREAU APPARENTLY WOULD END TRUSTEESHIP

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Every indication throughout Indian country points to an apparent determination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to terminate Federal trusteeship in Indian matters and to scatter unprepared, near-primitive tribesmen upon the charities and institutions of American communities.

The attitude seems to be "We haven't been able to resolve the Indian problem in nearly 100 years of stewardship. So let the Indian take care of himself."

Alarmed observers close to the heart of the Indian problem in Montana say that Indians are being compelled by a combination of inadequate supervision, inadequate opportunity, inadequate relief, and the inadequacy of the Indian, himself, to sell their land for food.

Sister Providencia, Catholic nun and professor of sociology at the College of Great Falls, Mont., recognized as one of the foremost authorities on Indians, says this wholesale dispersal of tribes threatens western communities with economic chaos and possible ruin.

In Montana, the Government-supervised sales of individually owned Indian allotted lands has reached enormous proportions. In January a year ago the Blackfeet Tribal Council asked the Government to halt the sale of lands because "within 5 years there won't be enough land left to organize economical grazing units or even for Indian-owned livestock on the reservation."

During the same month at Poplar, Mont., bids were opened for the eighth time on one parcel of Indian lands. This, according to a newspaper account, was because only 12 of 30 bids received were at or above the appraised value. The bids averaged $25.82 an acre. The acreage totaled 14,064.

Sister Providencia has figures to show that 80,000 acres have been sold on the Fort Peck Reservation alone "due to want."

A few months ago, Representative LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, told the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the seriousness of removal of the Indian land base. He quoted from a report and memorandum from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, one of the Indians' best friends.

The report said the Indian is losing his land at a potentially disastrous rate. During the period from 1953 to 1957, 1,790,649 acres went out of Indian trust status. This total was more than twice the amount (804,763 acres) which was removed from trust during the preceding 5-year period, from 1948 to 1952.

"A total of 3,307,217 acres was removed from individual Indian trust during the 10-year period from 1948 through 1957, including lands which were sold to the tribes and which presumably remained in trust status.

"Tribal trust land increased by 1,213,307 acres during the 10-year period. However, the study shows that neither sales to the tribes nor takings for public purposes were major causes for the loss of Indian trust land."

Again the question arises: What becomes of Indians who sell their lands?

One Blackfeet tribesman squandered $40,000 in a few months. He returned to the reservation with his family begging tribal assistance. Another reportedly went through $80,000 in similar fashion. These are exceptional cases—only so far as dollar volume is concerned. Most land sales net only a few dollars to a few thousand dollars.

Admittedly not all the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., are tribesmen who have sold their land in recent years or months. But their circumstances, their confusion, their unwillingness or inability to adapt to modern culture are typical of the average.

Sister Providencia's intensive studies have revealed some arresting side effects of Indian displacement. Tops on the list are "an alarming number of young people who are manifesting personality disorganization—truancy, delinquency, alcoholism, paranoid or schizophrenic demonstrations."

She said there are instances where schoolchildren have reported to class in a drunken stupor because their fathers ordered the youngsters to drink with them. They didn't want to drink alone.

While there are encouraging exceptions, to be sure, the pattern of degeneration seems to recur too frequently to be denied. The Indian leaves the reservation for whatever reason. Eventually he gravitates to the skid rows and the slums, where living conditions are usually worse than the substandard levels of the reservation.

Principal product of these slum areas is a costly human waste, morally, physically, mentally, and taxwise, a waste of resources.

Representative METCALF and Sister Providencia have compiled separate charts in this area of thought which can be described as nothing less than startling.

ONE-FIFTIETH OF POPULATION

These show that while Montana's 27,400 Indians make up only one-fiftieth of the State's population, they comprise one-third of the inmates of the State Industrial School, one-fourth of the inmates of the Home of the Good Shepherd, one-third of the inmates of the Montana Orphans' Home, and almost two-thirds of the enrollment of the Vocational School for Girls.

The office of the warden of the Montana State Prison counts 18 percent of convicts as either all Indian or part Indian, and that doesn't include those of less than one-fourth Indian blood.

Indians account for more than 4 percent of old-age assistance, 26 percent of aid to dependent children, almost 14 percent of the aid to needy blind, and 8 percent of aid to the disabled.

In the child-welfare services field, 19.2 percent of the children on the rolls are Indians.

"If we are to measure the success of the Bureau's program by this yardstick," Representative METCALF said in a prepared statement to the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, "it is a complete and utter failure."

Yet, despite this lopsided Indian dependency one way or another upon the public purse, the cry is for even more assistance.

Sister Providencia obtained statistical material only a few days ago from agencies at the State capital in Helena, which disclosed that both tribal and county general assistance are cut off in some instances during periods of great need when the Federal Government distributes surplus foods to Indians.

During such periods the county or the tribe on the Blackfeet and Fort Peck reservations "have arrangements to provide a token welfare payment. The average payment per person, 1956–59, 75 cents a week."

SUPPLEMENT TO FOOD

The payment supplements surplus foods for some people from November 15 to April 15 or May 1. For September the surplus foods were as follows: 10 pounds of flour per person; 1 package of powdered milk; 1 package of powdered eggs, and 5 pounds of rice.

Of 1,200 Indians on the Rocky Boy Reservation, 842 were reported on surplus commodities during September.

Any attempt to report on the general assistance and other relief programs of the bureau, the counties, the States and whatever other agencies may be involved, is almost impossible. The Blackfeet tribal council, for instance, tries to help from tribal funds. Whoever else chips in is difficult to determine, so confused are reports on the subject.

However, Representative METCALF in his previously mentioned statement, brought out an interesting sidelight on assistance administration. He read into the report an exchange of letters between Iliff McKay, secretary of the Blackfeet Tribal Council, and various agencies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerning a reported $40,000 set aside for assistance on the Blackfeet.

At last, METCALF reported, "we finally traced $38,000" of it. Iliff's correspondence began apparently on November 18, 1958, with an inquiry to Reinholt Brust, assistant BIA area director, Billings, Mont. An accounting of the $38,000 expenditure for general assistance was requested.

Iliff was referred from one department within the agency to another. In the end his persistent inquiring brought a reply from Area Director Percy E. Melis, according to METCALF'S copies of the correspondence, which gave this explanation of what happened to the $38,000:

"Branch of Welfare at the Blackfeet Agency had approximately $38,000 available in fiscal 1958 for salaries, operating expenses, and child welfare (mainly boarding home care). Because of two vacancies in the branch for nearly 6 months * * * expendi-

tures totaled approximately $18,000 and are listed as follows:

"Equipment, $523.64; child welfare, $7,707.77; other welfare services, $69.01; salaries, $8,274.91; travel and motor expenses, $408.11; other expenses, $1,683.08."

Less than half the $18,000 went for assistance. More than half went for administrative expenses.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 15, 1960]

AMERICA'S LOST PEOPLE—U.S. EFFORTS TO AID INDIAN CLUMSY AND COSTLY

(By Robert W. Fenwick)

Where do we stand today with relation to the so-called "Indian problem"? There's a simple answer to the question that seems to sum up effectively:

We stand mired in almost precisely the same moccasin tracks of nearly 75 years ago. Somewhere we missed the trail—and at overwhelming expense in wasted funds and both natural and human resources.

We have failed miserably to raise the economic and cultural standards of Indians generally, at least throughout most of the West.

SOME PROGRESS

Admittedly, some progress has been made. And there are encouraging indications that even more may be achieved. But even progress sometimes compounds the Indian problems which beset both the Red Man and our country. For example:

Some effective blows have been struck in the arena of health. In 1940, 115 of each 1,000 Indians born alive died in infancy. This has been cut to 58 deaths in each 1,000 births.

Deaths by tuberculosis have been reduced dramatically—by 40 percent. The tuberculosis incidence rate has been chopped 25 percent. All this in 4 years.

A grave disparity between health conditions for Indians and non-Indians still exists. Yet Indian health has improved measurably.

All this has added up to a population resurgence for our "vanishing race." The division of Indian health of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, reports that the Indian birth rate since 1950 is outstripping that for the rest of the U.S. population.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND IN 24 STATES

Census estimates are that there are now 350,000 Indians living in 24 States having Federal Indian reservations—most of them in the Rocky Mountain empire.

This increase in population amounts to 100,000 since 1890. It puts the Indian in the predicament of a man whose feet are swelling while his shoes shrink. As the Indian family grows bigger and bigger, the reservation home grows smaller and smaller. His land-based security is dwindling because of national policy and the vicissitudes of complex, modern economics which put the squeeze on the small landowner.

There are now more than 300 Indian-occupied land areas in the Nation (excluding Alaska) which are under Federal trusteeship. They range from a few acres to the great Navajo Reservation topping more than 15 million acres.

Before the allotment of 1887, Indian lands totaled 137,724,570 acres, all tribally owned. By 1934 that figure had shrunk to 52,142,935 acres of which 17,622,700 were individually owned.

Some lands were ceded to the Government, some disposed of for other reasons. Now today, the principal threat to the reservation is the mounting sales of individually owned allotted lands.

COST FANTASTIC

The entire situation adds up to more Indians on public assistance, more Indians who require greater numbers of Federal employees to help cope with their problems—at fantastic cost.

On June 30, 1959, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had 11,477 employees. A report by the U.S. Bureau of Health's Indian Division a year earlier listed 4,520 employees. The total Federal employees devoting their full time to the Indians therefore adds up to just 3 short of 16,000—a figure undoubtedly surpassed by now.

This amounts to 1 Federal employee in just the 2 services for each 21 Indians. And on the Indian family pattern that would be 1 hired man for each 4 families.

On the same grand scale, a city the size of Denver conceivably would have in excess of 20,000 public employees.

It must be allowed in fairness, however, that the reservations are widely separated, their requirements considerably different, and that a few of the 11,477 BIA employees are occupied with Indian problems in Alaska which does not figure in the population figure used here. That may pull down the employee-per-Indian average a little—but only a little at best.

Nevertheless, to project the pattern of public dependency a bit further, it must be understood that the employees listed as working for the Heatlh Service and the Bureau do not include another army of Federal workers engaged in other services.

These agencies also serving Indians run a long and expensive list. Included are the Indian Claims Commission; Lands Division of the Department of Justice which represents the Government in civil litigation pertaining to Indians; the Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution; the Indian unit, interior section, National Archives, and Records Services; Indian Claims Section of the General Accounting Office.

The Department of the Treasury handles Indian tribal funds and the Library of Congress does research on Indian matters for Congress.

Also not included on the visible payroll are untold numbers of other Federal and State employees administering Social Security and other public assistance, teachers not employed in BIA schools but whose salaries are paid at least in part by BIA funds, and undoubtedly others.

The cost of these services has never been ascertained because it would require more time than could be afforded by the House committee which reported on the question in 1958. That by the committee's own admission.

This much is on the record: In fiscal 1920 the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was $11,286,000; 1930, $18,879,000; 1940, $42,609,000; 1950, $67,470,000; 1960, $115,467,000.

HEALTH BUDGET EXTRA

And it should be noted that the 1960 appropriation figure does not include a separate appropriation of $50,287,000 for the U.S. Public Health Service which assumed medical care of Indians July 1, 1955. Prior to that, health costs were included in the BIA appropriation.

Thus it would seem with even the simplest arithmetic that the Indian is a luxury we can hardly afford. It likewise would appear that we've not only lost the trail; we've forfeited considerable cash along the way.

This is not the end of the drain on the public purse. Wherever Indians accumulate in sizable numbers, new problems are born. In Great Falls, Mont., for example, Ben P. Broderick, credit manager of Columbus Hospital reported recently to the division of Indian health on an alarming increase in charity cases among Indians. He said it put a threatening burden on the hospital's resources.

Great Falls' two hospitals, Columbus and Deaconess, he said, learned from a study that 18 Indian patients currently were paying on their own bills; the Blackfeet Tribal Council had assumed responsibility for 24; the Polio Foundation and other private groups were sponsoring 11; Cascade County was paying for 18; and the Public Health Service for 23 patients from reservations. That's only one area far removed from the reservations.

Police Chief Anthony Coppens of Great Falls attributes 60 percent of the city's jail maintenance costs to Indians who don't live within Great Falls. The situation has grown gradually worse since Indians have been given the legal right to drink, he added.

GEOGRAPHY NO FACTOR

The pattern differs little with geography. In Gallup, N. Mex., a few weeks ago, the police committee issued a public appeal for support of a proposal to hire police sufficient for a city of 35,000. Gallup's actual population is around 13,000. The need for additional police is attributed to the large transient Indian population.

Cooperation with the Navajo Tribal Council, a new police code for offenses, and a special records section were urged to help curb drunkenness, reduce the slaughter on the highways, and make it possible for police to make adequate investigations of suspected murder cases.

"The practice of not thoroughly investigating the causes of various deaths," said a report by the Gallup Board of Trustees, "has caused Gallup considerable embarrassment."

Extra law-enforcement officers hired, and many of those already on the payrolls of scores of off-reservation communities, can also be added to the armies engaged in services either to or because of Indians.

There are other hosts of citizens in the service of the Indians—unrewarded workers in the free schools and missions of various religions, hundreds engaged in charitable enterprises everywhere, and the volunteer and salaried workers of such organizations as Arrow, Inc., and the Association of American Indian Affairs headed by inexhaustible Oliver LaFarge, the New Mexico champion of Indian betterment.

SOME BRIGHT SPOTS

There are bright spots in the picture, too. A proposed point 4 program of Federal, self-help assistance to Indians on a reservation-by-reservation basis adjusted to varying needs, holds excellent promise.

Various groups and prominent individuals in Montana and North Dakota are winning support for a plan to employ Indian youths in national forests on a program similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression era.

Indians in Nebraska have a program called "We Shake Hands" which is accomplishing great things with backing of the Association of American Indian Affairs.

Alcoholics Anonymous has won toeholds in some areas of wanton intoxication and is working hard in others.

There is evidence of rebellion among many Indian women against the backwardness of their people although at times this evidence takes a sordid turn as it did on Hill 57 at Great Falls, Mont., a few months ago. There, according to hospital officials, a wave of abortions broke out. Women induced the abortions by banging their bodies with automobile doors. In some reservation areas, however, women's clubs and study groups are being formed.

In many centers where the Relocation Service is trying to settle reservation Indians, such as Denver, considerable good influence is being exerted in the field of integration by local groups of Indians and their non-Indian friends. In Denver it's the White Buffalo Council.

EXPENSIVE EDUCATION

They are succeeding in wresting a measure of success from the relocation program which has not been a glittering triumph by any measure except that it provides a form of education, expensive education at that.

For instance it is a little farfetched for even a Government agency to expect an Indian hay hand to graduate to a factory job overnight. And it is too much to expect an Indian woman whose domestic experience has consisted of sweeping a dirt floor and curing jerk meat, to take a job as maid in a modern urban home.

By nature, by training, by intuition, by religion, by birth, the average fullblooded Indian is still largely primitive. He cannot be expected in a few generations to effect a transition from a buffalo-hunting culture to an atomic age economy. But until he does, he'll continue to be a public problem and an almost indissoluble one at that.

Right now there seems to be no unified plan of attack on that problem. Our national policy toward the Indian has vacillated from one of absolute Government paternalism to abrupt termination of all responsibility in Indian affairs.

CHAOTIC CONFUSION

Our approach to the Indian problem seems to change with each new national administration. The result has been confusion bordering on chaos in the handling of Indian matters from Washington down through the unwieldy area offices to the actual reservation site of policy execution.

I'm convinced that most Government workers in the Indian service are conscientiously striving to do the best they can and that they are devoted to the Government's declared purpose to improve the cultural and economic lot of the American Indian.

But the entire program obviously lacks direction. For one thing there is a lack of basic agricultural backgrounding on the part of the very officials who deal directly with these fundamentally agrarian peoples.

And we have lost sight of the simple fact that the human being with whom we are working must advance first from the primitive to rustic before he can be catapulted into the role of a strap-hanging commuter on a city transportation system.

In summation I'd like to use two quotations:

A commission charged with reporting on Indian conditions nearly 100 years ago concluded its report to the President with the words of Thomas Jefferson: "I fear for my country when I remember that God is just."

And Secretary of War Edwin McMasters Stanton, under President Lincoln:

"The Government never reforms an evil until the people demand it. Tell the good bishop that when he reaches the heart of the American people, the Indians will be saved."

THE JAPANESE TREATY AND OUR FUTURE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, several years ago it was my pleasure to to be present as a congressional observer, in San Francisco, at the signing of this country's treaty of peace with Japan.

This week it was again my pleasure to witness the signing of a document linking the United States and Japan. I refer to the treaty of mutual cooperation and security. In the words of Japanese Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi, this was a "truly significant occasion."

In an article appearing in the January 21 edition of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. Constantine Brown discussed the merits of the treaty, as well as some of the problems we shall face in our future relations with Japan. I think Mr. Brown's outstanding analysis of the situation is worthy of the attention of every Member of this body; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Hopes for United States-Japanese Treaty," be printed as part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 21, 1960]

HOPES FOR UNITED STATES-JAPANESE TREATY—FUTURE THREAT TO ACCORD SEEN FROM REDS AND FASCIST FACTIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

With inadequate supplies and no hope of reinforcements, the American-Filipino forces in January 1942, were fighting a hopeless battle against the strong invading forces of Japan. Manila was in the latter's hands. General MacArthur—who has now "faded away"—was preparing to put up a final but useless resistance at Corregidor. Any American who had said in those days that the two nations, bitter enemies, would sign within a few years a treaty of permanent amity and alliance would have been put away as "a mental case."

Japan's Prime Minister, Nobusuke Kishi, once jailed by us as a war criminal but now the factual head of state, since the Emperor is constitutionally a mere figurehead, pledged last Tuesday Japan's full cooperation with its former enemy and victor in all military and economic fields. We have been granted bases in Japan for our Armed Forces as well as the cooperation of the Nipponese military power, when these may be needed.

Of course, at present the Japanese military establishment is negligible. But its potential, taking into account its population and its traditions as warriors, is great. So is the industrial potential. The treaty signed in an impressive ceremony in the East Room of the White House provided absolute equality between the two signatory powers.

We have undertaken never to use the facilities accorded us by the Japanese Government of its own free will, without prior consultation and consent by Tokyo. Japan and the United States have agreed to join their own efforts with those of the other free nations of the world to help underdeveloped countries. This is regarded as good business by the Japanese industrialists and may serve the purpose of eventually achieving the greater Asia program which failed so lamentably when force was used in the years preceding the defeat in 1945.

There is no doubt whatsoever in the minds of our policymakers and of those who have known the activities of the Japanese Premier, that Mr. Kishi is sincere in his views that the future of Japan must be intimately linked with that of the United States and the rest of the free world. Mr. Kishi has not been lying on a bed of roses ever since he came to power in 1957. He has had to fight not only political opportunism, which is more rampant in Japan than in many Western countries, but also the growing power of the Communist agitators and infiltrators who have vowed not to rest until their country joins the U.S.S.R.-Red China bloc.

His position will remain unassailable as long as Japan continues to be as prosperous as she is at present. But those who are keeping tabs on the affairs of the island empire are skeptical as to whether in the event the prosperity cycle comes to an end the Japanese people themselves will want to live up to the terms of the American-Japanese treaty signed this week.

Under the pressure of public opinion, Mr. Kishi had to give his tacit approval to an exchange of cultural and commercial missions with Peiping. The relatively small but highly vocal and energetic Communist Party, supported openly or surreptitiously by the various Socialist factions, is bitterly opposed to the alliance with the United States.

Many moderates fear, because of the power of the Soviet Union and China, as well as their proximity to the Japanese shores, that this alliance might threaten the welfare and security of Japan. And, what is more important, the Japanese people themselves do not seem to have forgotten the crushing military defeat at our hands as well as the occupation of their homeland by American military forces. We are still being denounced by Mr. Kishi's opponents for having handed over the Kuriles and Sakhalin to the Russians.

It is not easy to wipe the nationalist slate clean only a few years after their national pride had been so severely injured. Japan had never been defeated before 1945. The opponents of Mr. Kishi are taking advantage of this sentiment and may be able to exploit it when the opportunity occurs.

The words of Mr. Kishi, "This truly significant occasion (the signature of the alliance) is a happy augury for the future," were unquestionably sincere and in good faith. But the question is being asked by those who are conversant with the political trends in Japan whether they represent also the intimate feelings of the Japanese masses themselves.

There was before World War II a far-seeing group of political men in Japan who were convinced that a war with the United States would be fatal. This group was swept aside by the warlords who had been lured by the Nazi-Communist infiltrators in the highest position in Tokyo. History has a nasty habit of repeating itself.

NO SURRENDER ECONOMICALLY TO SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are fully conscious of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's promise to bury us. He has explained this in terms of economic warfare. This is a conflict he means to win by any method he can find.

As an example of this new type of warfare and the Communist leader's desire to build on our know-how and our materials, we find that a group of American companies have sold to Russia a multimillion-dollar complex of textile machinery.

The representatives of Soviet Russia first approached the chemical industries. In a letter to the President on June 2, 1958, Premier Khrushchev proposed to buy $100 million in chemical plants, processes, and technologies.

Mr. President, it is heartening to know that the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, in polling its members, found them turning down the offer flat.

The chemical industry is a must with Communist Russia, for in that country that industry is rated one-fourth to one-third of our own industry; and to catch up would take years.

All this is brought out in an article by Holmes Alexander, of the McNaught Syndicate, Inc., published in the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader.

Because of its great importance in this economic warfare declared on us, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD, for the information of all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Jan. 14, 1960]

NO SURRENDER—ECONOMICALLY?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Internationally speaking, pursuit of the White Dove has become what chasing the Bluebird used to be. But these fine-feathered creatures never get captured. The achievement of peace, like that of happiness, occurs only in legends.

This melancholy truism strikes the New Year reporter in an odd but prophetic fashion. At the White House and State Department you can hear peace talk. At the Defense Department you can hear of cut budgets and disarmament. But at the Commerce Department, of all places, you hear war.

Of all places? No, on second thought, commerce is where you would expect to get the truest pitch these days. There is a war on—but it's an economic war. It is a conflict through which the Sino-Soviet bloc intends to win world domination without much bloodshed and at little risk, since the Communist bloc has all to gain and little to lose.

Your reporter obliquely came upon these facts which have been unchanged by all the Red whistling for the White Dove. A consortium of American companies has sold a multimillion dollar complex of textile machinery to Russia. It seemed a good subject for a background column. Did this pre-Christmas sale presage other deals to come? With the lifting of the steel strike, are we about to ride an export boom of products for which Russia will pay cash? Has the spirit of Camp David descended upon the market place, so that now we can dispose of our surpluses to a former enemy in the cold war?

In each instance, the answer is a scoffing negative. Commerce Secretary Mueller is less of a no-trade man than ex-Secretary Strauss, but the policy still stands—no trade in strategic goods. It gladdened this capitalistic heart to find that on at least one toughly contested sector of the economic war front—American industry is passing the word to American Government: You can't do business with communism.

This commendable example is the $25 billion 1959 chemical business. It is an industry which appears to be more adamant toward Russian trade blandishments than other industries, and even more adamant than many top Federal officials.

The reasons can be confidently set forth. It was, first and specifically, to the chemical industry that Khrushchev first offered a big deal. The Soviet boss, in a letter to Eisenhower on June 2, 1958, proposed to buy $100 million of chemical plants, processes, and technologies. The Manufacturing Chemists' Association polled its member companies which, to their everlasting credit, spurned the offer and urged the President, the Secretary of Commerce and all Western allies to give the same rejection to similar Red proposals. Spokesmen for the industry today feel just as strongly opposed as ever to trading their know-how for any conceivable amount of money or promises.

And why so big "No"? Well, here we come to the central fact of the economic war of the 1960's. It is this—the Russians are not industrially ahead of this country. Despite their missiles and space vehicles, which are the result of cramming sessions and crash programs, the Russian technology is far behind American and Western production and quality.

In industrial chemistry, which is a "must" matter, Russian capacity is rated one-fourth to one-third that of the United States. Given time, the Russians may catch us in chemistry. But it is calculated that, at a minimum, the Russians must expend 10,000 man-years to close this crucial gap. In different terms, Russia, to achieve the chemical industry goals set by Premier Khrushchev, would have to take 1,400 top technicians from other duties and work them for 7 years.

Conceivably, Khrushchev may do this. In military production, in consumer goods, in world trade, in the exploitation of the enormous petroleum potential, Russia needs equal-to-our chemical skills, perhaps more than anything else. There is only one way in which Khrushchev may be spared the big outlay man-year costs. That way is for him to get prototype chemical plants from the United States or our Western allies.

The Russian boss would like to do this by purchase or theft. The proffered $100 million would be a grab. On the record, the Russians would not hesitate to steal secret formulas or to swipe American patents and copyrights. But for the United States to permit either the purchase or the theft of such valuable properties would be equivalent to losing—by surrender or lack of vigilance—one of the biggest battles of the economic war.

The American motto for 1960 ought to be hung, like the old frontiersman's rifle and powder horn, over the hearth. It should read: "There's still a war on, brother."

SAFETY IN THE AIR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the course of the proceedings in this Chamber yesterday, the following suggestion was made:

> Perhaps the administration should consider halting all air traffic for a few days, for an exhaustive check.

Mr. President, that is not the answer to this problem.

I should like to read some statistics which I have compiled in regard to airline travel. They prove that to stop airline travel for an hour or a day or a week would not prevent air accidents.

U.S. trunk and local service airlines carry 144,000 passengers every day, right now. Eighty-five million passenger-miles are flown every day. The airlines make 8,800 takeoffs every day. Stuart Tipton made the statement that CAB records show a continuing decrease in the air travel fatality rate—from 2.45 fatalities per 100 million passenger-miles for 5 years 1940–44, to a low of 0.5 for period from 1950 to 1959. In the last 20 years the scheduled airlines have carried almost 500 million passengers.

Mr. President, in order to contrast that rate with the rates for other forms of transportation, let me point out that the National Safey Council figures show that 37,200 persons were killed on the highways of America last year, and that 24,200 of those fatalities occurred in passenger automobiles and taxicabs, at a rate of 2.3 fatalities per 100 million passenger-miles.

Mind you, Mr. President, the fatality rate for travel on the airways is only 0.5 per 100 million passenger-miles, as contrasted to that rate of 2.3 per 100 million passenger-miles in connection with travel by automobiles and taxicabs. Certainly we would not suggest that every person in the United States stop driving his automobile for 2 days, in order to stop accidents. Although that would stop accidents, it would also stop the country.

The total U.S. airlines industry—domestic and international—had 124 fatalities, and a rate of 0.39. Motor buses had 120, and a rate of 0.24; for railroad passenger trains, the preliminary figure is 61 fatalities, and a rate of 0.26. CAB testimony shows that the airline fatality rate—domestic and international—for 1959 is 0.68.

Mr. President, I submit those figures to back up my longheld contention that today a person who travels by airplane is safer than one who travels by any other form of transportation, unless it be when a person walks down a dark alley in the daylight, and even that is dangerous.

Mr. President, on yesterday, in criticizing the administration, this question was asked: "Why does not the administration determine why it is that the Military Air Transport Service was able, last year, to operate what is called the world's largest airline without a single fatality."

Mr. President, having raised the question about MATS, I call attention to the fact that General Quesada, who is the head of the Federal Aviation Agency, is trying to put into effect rules that MATS now has. The reason why MATS operates so safely is that it has excellently trained crews. I do not by that statement intend to downgrade the pilots of the airlines, because I have great faith in them. But MATS maintains constant schooling, checking, surveillance of flights, and constant checking to make sure pilots are able to handle all modern equipment. Again I do not reflect on airline pilots, because, as I said before, I have great faith in them.

General Quesada has been criticized for regulatory steps which have been taken by the Agency in the first year, as follows:

First. Air carrier flight crew training programs have been required to be submitted to the Agency for our approval.

Second. Qualification requirements have been raised for copilots serving on air carrier aircraft, and periodic checks of their competency required similar in many respects to those required for pilots in command.

Third. Improved and modernized medical standards for airman certification have been adopted.

Fourth. Upper age limitation of 60 years has been established for pilots serving in air carrier transportation.

Fifth. The skill and experience standards for certification of private and commercial pilots have been raised.

Sixth. Air carriers have been required to have airborne radar installed in transport category aircraft for weather surveillance purposes.

Seventh. Reasonable limitations have been imposed on the consumption of alcoholic beverages by passengers on air carrier flights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in my remarks the details of these points I have made which General Quesada has been pushing.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Each air carrier must obtain approval of its training program by the Federal Aviation Agency.

2. More comprehensive training must be given to air carrier copilots.

3. Proficiency checks must be given to air carrier copilots who serve as second in command by the FAA or by a designated check pilot of the air carrier. These proficiency checks must be given once each 12 months.

The new regulations will become effective on January 1, 1961. The 13-month period will permit the air carriers sufficient time to obtain approval of their training programs and to qualify their copilots under the new training and proficiency requirements. The air carriers are required to submit their training programs to the FAA for approval by May 1, 1960.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Air carrier training programs

Air carriers were previously given full control over their training program subject to inspection by FAA. Under this plan, FAA officials said, some carriers prepared and administered excellent training programs. Others, however, in the opinion of the FAA, did not achieve the minimum safety objectives sought by the training requirements of the civil air regulations.

Accordingly, the new regulations specify each air carrier is required to obtain FAA approval of its training program and any subsequent changes.

The new regulations do not alter the responsibility which each air carrier has at present for the preparation and administration of its training program.

Qualification of copilots

Prior to these new regulations, the air carriers were required to certify that their copilots had received instruction during initial flight training in landings and takeoffs and emergency procedures in each type aircraft they operated. This stipulation still holds.

The new regulations require additional initial training and practice in the following maneuvers and procedures in each type of airplane to be flown by the copilot in scheduled operations:

Taxiing; takeoffs and landings; climbs and climbing turns; slow flight; approach to stall; engine shutdown and restart; takeoff and landing with simulated engine failure; conduct of flight under simulated instrument conditions, including instrument approach at least down to circling approach minimum and missed approach procedures.

The copilot must also receive initial training and be proficient in the conduct of flight under simulated instrument conditions, utilizing all types of navigational facilities and the letdown procedures used in normal operations. Except for those approach procedures for which the lowest minimums are approved, all other letdown procedures may be given in a synthetic trainer (simulator) which contains the radio equipment and instruments necessary to simulate other navigational and letdown procedures approved for use by the air carrier.

Proficiency checks for copilots

The FAA said the previous system in which the pilot in command checks the copilot during daily operations is not adequate for assuring continued copilot proficiency.

Copilots must, under the new ruling, be given proficiency checks by an FAA or designated company check pilot. This flight check shall include a proficiency demonstration in flight maneuvers plus an oral or written equipment examination. Copilots will be given this proficiency flight check once every 12 months.

Qualifications for second in command in three-pilot crews

In the case of a three-pilot crew, previous regulations required the second in command to have the same airline transport pilot certificate and the rating for the aircraft held by the pilot in command. The new regulation adds to this requirement the stipulation that the second pilot in command must fulfill the same initial training requirements required of the pilot in command.

Proficiency checks for second in command in crews of three or more pilots

The new regulations require that proficiency checks shall be given by an FAA or company-designated check pilot. These proficiency checks must be the same as those given the pilot in command and must be given once every 12 months.

The amendment to part 29 of the Civil Air Regulations, "Physical Standards for Airmen," becomes effective October 15, 1959.

The disqualifying medical conditions which are spelled out in the new revision include: diabetes mellitus requiring insulin; coronary artery disease; a history of psychosis or certain other mental or nervous diseases including behavior disorders, chronic alcoholism, drug addiction, or epilepsy.

Dr. James Goddard, FAA, Civil Air Surgeon, said the number of persons who will be disqualified under the amended regulation is expected to be very small, since the policy over the years has been to deny medical certificates to persons with such defects.

The amendment applies to all three classes of medical certificates.

Latest available statistics which are based on calendar year 1957, indicate that only six-tenths of 1 percent of the 226,390 applicants for all 3 classes of medical certificates have been denied certification for medical conditions. Only three-tenths of 1 percent of the applicants were denied certificates because of diabetic, cardiovascular, or nervous and mental deficiencies.

It is anticipated that there will be little change in these statistics, since the manner in which the standards are administered will continue to be the same as they were prior to the revision. Medical progress, however, may reveal additional cases of persons with these defects in the future, through improved methods of identifying such cases. The advantage of the amendment is that the specific listing of the disqualifying physical conditions permits the Office of the Civil Air Surgeon to have a more effective administrative system for handling medical certification.

The notice of the proposed revision of the Physical Standards for Airmen (pt. 29 of the Civil Air Regulations) was published in the Federal Register, March 21, 1959, and circulated to interested parties for comment.

All of the views expressed were carefully considered with particular weight given to comments received from doctors and medical associations. As a result of the comments, one of the modifications made in the amendment concerned the proposal to eliminate the "limited medical certificate." In lieu of this, the amendment now specifies that the Civil Air Surgeon may issue a medical certificate to persons not meeting certain of the medical standards providing he has demonstrated ability to carry out pilot activities under usual and emergency conditions. This provision, however, does not apply to the diabetic, coronary artery disease, or nervous and mental diseases.

The FAA believes that because of the progressive deterioration of both physiological and psychological functions which normally occur with age, allowing pilots in this age group to remain in command of aircraft carrying up to 165 passengers at speeds of 550 miles per hour would be a hazard to safety in air carrier operations. These deteriorations result in significant medical defects.

The Federal Aviation Agency regulation is based on medical facts that clearly establish that sudden incapacitation due primarily to heart attack and strokes resulting from such defects become significantly more frequent in any group reaching age 60, and such attacks cannot be predicted on an individual basis by prior medical examinations. The hazards are further increased in the case of air carriers on scheduled airlines by the fact that older pilots fly the bigger and faster jets, carrying more passengers over greater distances, and into and over most heavily populated cities.

Other conditions which result from aging, and which were considered, relate to loss of ability to perform highly skilled tasks rapidly, to resist fatigue, to maintain physical stamina to unlearn or discard old techniques, and to apply the rapid judgment needed in changing and emergency situations.

In amending the Civil Air Regulations to require that "no individual who had reached his 60th birthday shall be utilized or serve as a pilot on any aircraft while engaged in air carrier operations," the Agency acted in conformance with the responsibility given to the Administrator by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 that, "In prescribing standards, rules, and regulations * * * the Administrator shall give full consideration to the duty resting upon air carriers to perform their services with the highest possible degree of safety in the public interest * * *" and that, "The Administrator shall exercise and perform his powers and duties under this act in such a manner as will best tend to reduce or eliminate the possibility of, or recurrence of, accidents in air transportation."

The regulation will take effect March 15, 1960.

This regulation does not, however, apply to pilots of small aircraft who operate under part 42, covering irregular air carrier operations. Such a regulation will be the subject of further study by the Agency, and will be presented as a proposal if considered necessary.

A study of the comments received by the FAA as a result of the proposed rulemaking indicated that the amendment requiring airline pilots to make the transition to turbojets prior to age 55, was the only item which warranted a public hearing, since the purpose of such a hearing is to provide an opportunity to obtain information over and above that which can be secured by written comments. Accordingly, a public hearing on this proposal only has been scheduled for 10 a.m., eastern standard time, on January 7, 1960, at FAA headquarters, 1711 New York Avenue NW.

The proposals to establish these age requirements were published in the Federal Register on June 27 as proposed amendments to parts 40, 41, and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations and were circulated to interested persons for comment at that time. (Those who wished to express their views on the proposed regulations had 90 days in which to do so.) All comments received on the draft proposals were carefully evaluated before the Agency made its final decision.

Requests for a public hearing on the age 60 portion of the proposal indicated no issue not already considered, nor any items not already covered by written comments.

Arguments were advanced both in favor of and opposition to the proposal. The Air Transport Association representing the major air carriers was in favor of the age-60 regulation, the Air Line Pilots Association was strongly opposed and recommended that pilot fitness should be made on an individual basis with no age qualification.

In rejecting the latter as an inadequate safety standard, the FAA considered the inability of present-day medical science to predict in advance on an individual selective basis such sudden incapacitating occurrences as heart attacks or strokes, even where exceptional medical care and examination programs exist.

Under the new regulations contained in amendments to part 20 of the Civil Air Regulations, all commercial pilots will be required to have a minimum of 10 hours of instrument flight instruction. They must also demonstrate their ability to manually control their aircraft solely by the use of instruments and must demonstrate a cross-country planned flight.

Private pilots will be required to have dual instruction in the basic control of the aircraft by the use of instruments; demonstate emergency manual capability in attitude control simulating the loss of visual reference during flight. In addition, both commercial and private pilots must be familiar with and demonstrate the use of radio for communications and navigation in cross-country flying. The new regulations do not affect pilots who already meet the new requirements.

FAA officials said the number of fatal accidents clearly indicates the need for higher private pilot qualifications. During 1958, private pilots were involved in a total of 272 major accidents in which 345 pilots and passengers were killed and 155 seriously injured. Of these accidents, 120 or 44 percent resulted from inability to cope with emergencies which developed primarily en route. A total of 125 or 46 percent resulted from fundamental weaknesses in pilot judgment or technique.

The new instrument requirements are also necessitated by the advent of new aircraft which permit flights of considerable distance in a matter of a few hours. This new capability, officials said, brings about exposure to variable and unanticipated visibility conditions.

FAA officials emphasized that the instrument training required by the new rule conveys no instrument flying privileges. To engage in instrument operations, a pilot must hold an instrument rating and the airplane must be equipped for IFR operations as prescribed by part 43 of the Civil Air Regulations.

FAA officials said the announced changes constitute part of the new safety program designed to improve pilot competency standards. Additional revisions of the Civil Air Regulations to further implement the safety program are under consideration.

The amendments are in substantial agreement with those published as proposed rulemaking on April 18, 1958, by the Civil Aeronautics Board. They will be effective March 16, 1960. The interim period will permit those affected to take the necessary training to be certificated under the new requirements.

The most recent study on general (nonair carrier) aviation's safety and accident rate show there was a total of 4,135 accidents last year. These resulted in 640 fatalities. A total of 741 aircraft were destroyed and more than 3,000 were substantially damaged.

The Government study titled "General Aviation Accidents (Non-Air Carrier)" is available without charge from the Federal Aviation Agency, Office of Public Affairs, Washington 25, D.C.

AIRBORNE WEATHER RADAR EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR AIRPLANES CARRYING PASSENGERS

In a notice of rulemaking published in the Federal Register (24 F.R. 5847) and circulated as Draft Release No. 59–10, dated July 15, 1959, the Federal Aviation Agency proposed to amend parts 40, 41, and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations to require airborne weather radar to be installed on all aircraft certificated under the transport category rules and carrying passengers. Operationally, it was proposed to require that such radar equipment be in operation for all IFR flights, and for night VFR flights when thunderstorms or severe weather conditions were forecast for the flight plan route during the time of flight.

In commenting upon the draft release, the Air Line Pilots Association was strongly in favor of the proposal and recommended its extension to all large aircraft engaged in air transportation.

Comments from representatives of the scheduled trunkline carriers recognized the desirability of having airborne weather radar on aircraft but opposed the mandatory requirement of such equipment by regulation.

Comments from local service air carriers, or their representatives, were generally opposed to any requirement for radar equipment on airplanes certificated in the nontransport category or for airplanes such as the DC–4 or C–46 certificated in the transport category, which are the type of airplanes being used by such air carriers.

As stated in the draft release, a recent survey of air carrier aircraft accidents for the calendar years 1950 through 1958 has indicated the importance of airborne weather radar as a safety measure in preventing aircraft accidents during certain severe weather conditions. The value of airborne weather radar as an aid to the safety of flight is further supported by the fact that a considerable number of air carrier airplanes are presently equipped with such radar and provisions have been made for the installation of such equipment on practically all new transport-type airplanes. It is considered particularly significant that at least one large air carrier presently has its entire fleet of airplanes fully equipped with airborne weather radar and during a 2-year period has not experienced a single passenger or crew injury or any appreciable airplane damage due to thunderstorms or hail. Moreover, the air carrier has completed a high percentage of scheduled trips. As experience has indicated, radar equipment contributes to greater safety in passenger operations, since it facilitates the early detection and location by the pilot of certain areas of severe turbulence and enables him to avoid such areas or to take such other action as may be necessary in the interest of safety.

In view of the foregoing, the Administrator has concluded that, in the interest of safety, approved airborne weather radar should be made a required item of equipment at the earliest practicable date for transport category airplanes used in passenger operations under the provisions of parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations, with the exception of Curtiss-Wright C–46 airplanes. The C–46 has been specifically exempted since it was not originally certificated under transport category rules. The notice of proposed rulemaking did not make this point clear.

The draft release proposed to allow 6 months for the procurement and installation of required radar equipment. However, in consideration of comments received and upon further investigation, the problems associated with the procurement and installation of the airborne radar equipment reasonably appear to require a longer period of time for the industry to comply with this regulation. The airlines have stated that the installation of the airborne radar equipment requires approximately 1,450 hours per airplane and some airplanes may require more time because of necessary modifications. Also, the manufacturers may not be able to furnish the total number of airborne radar units for all airplanes within the proposed 6-month period. These problems, together with the problems associated with the scheduling of airplanes for maintenance and overhaul, as well as for the installation of airborne radar equipment, have been considered in establishing the time allowed for the industry to meet this regulation. Upon these considerations the Administrator has determined that except for turbine-powered airplanes, a greater period of time should be allowed for the orderly procurement and installation of required equipment in order to avoid imposing any undue hardship upon operators of airplanes who are subject to this regulation. Accordingly, July 1, 1960, has been established as the date after which approved airborne weather radar will become required equipment for all turbine-powered airplanes used in the carriage of passengers under the provisions of parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations. Since all turbine-powered aircraft subject to this regulation are, with very few exceptions, now equipped or are scheduled to be equipped with airborne weather radar prior to July 1, 1960, it appears that this compliance date will provide an adequate period of time to procure the required equipment and install it in those few remaining turbine-powered aircraft. January 1, 1961, has been established as the compliance date for certain other transport category airplanes specified in section 1(b) and used in passenger operations. Since approximately 80 percent of such airplanes used in passenger operations already have radar equipment installed, it appears that the January 1, 1961, compliance date will provide the operators with an adequate period of time to procure the required equipment and install it in the balance of such airplanes. After January 1, 1962, approved airborne weather radar will be required equipment for the remaining airplanes certificated under the transport category rules, except for Curtiss-Wright C–46 airplanes, and used in passenger operations under parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations.

For the information of the operators, a note has been added to section 1(c) to indicate some of the transport category airplanes in current use which will have to have such equipment by January 1, 1962.

Technical Standard Order C–63, adopted by the Administrator, effective December 1, 1959 (24 F.R. 9262), contains the minimum performance standards for the approval of airborne weather radar equipment required by this regulation. Under the provisions of this technical standard order, airborne weather radar equipment approved prior to the effective date of that order will also be approved for installation under this regulation.

To provide for the accomplishment of an orderly installation of the required airborne weather radar equipment, each operator conducting passenger operations under the provisions of parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations is required by section 2 of this regulation to establish a schedule for the progressive completion of such radar installations on its transport category airplanes on or before the dates specified therein. On or before July 1, 1960, a copy of the schedule required by paragraph (a) of section 2 shall be submitted to an authorized representative of the administrator, together with a list of any airplanes the operator intends to discontinue using in the carriage of passengers prior to the date on which radar equipment must be installed.

Equipment requirements for dispatch and continuation of flight are described in section 3 of this regulation. Draft Release 59–10 proposed to require the radar equipment to be in operation for all IFR operations, and for night VFR operations when thunderstorms or severe weather conditions were forecast for the flight plan route during the time of flight. However, in the light of comments received, it appears that the original proposal would be unreasonably restrictive. Accordingly, the original proposal

has been modified so as to bring the dispatch rule into accord with the capabilities of the radar equipment required to be installed. Thus, the dispatching rule prescribed herein provides that no airplane subject to this regulation shall be dispatched under IFR or night VFR conditions when current weather reports indicate that thunderstorms, or other potentially hazardous weather conditions detectable by airborne weather radar, may reasonably be expected to be encountered along the route to be flown, unless the approved airborne weather radar equipment is in a satisfactory operating condition. Should such equipment become inoperative en route, the airplane must be operated in accordance with the instructions and procedures specified in the operations manual for such occurrence. It should be noted that these dispatch and en route rules will apply after March 31, 1960, to all transport category airplanes subject to this regulation that have approved airborne weather radar equipment installed even though such equipment is not required to be installed until a later date. It should also be noted that approval of the instructions and procedures for the continuation of flight, in the event the radar equipment becomes inoperative en route, will be required at such time as the particular aircraft is required to have approved airborne weather radar equipment installed. In order to permit adequate time for the review of such instructions and procedures the operator should submit them to the assigned air carrier inspector at least 30 days prior to the required approval date. In this regard, the Federal Aviation Agency expects all air carrier aircraft not equipped with airborne weather radar to be operated strictly in accordance with procedures specified in the air carrier's operations manual, when there is a possibility of encountering potentially hazardous weather conditions.

Section 4 expressly exempts from the provisions of this regulation airplanes used for the carriage of passengers solely within the States of Alaska and Hawaii. These operations have been excluded because thunderstorms and other potentially hazardous meteorological conditions detectable by radar rarely occur in those areas. The language of section 4 also makes it clear that the provisions of this regulation are not intended to be applicable to a transport category airplane during the conduct of a bona fide all-cargo, training, test, or ferry flight.

It will be noted that helicopters have not been made subject to this regulation. Upon further consideration of the original proposal, the Administrator has concluded that the installation of radar equipment is not a necessary safety requirement for helicopters at this time. Finally, attention is directed to the fact that large nontransport category airplanes presently being used in passenger service have been omitted from the list of airplanes subject to this regulation, as for example, C–46, DC–3, and L–18 type airplanes. However, the Federal Aviation Agency will continue to give active consideration to the necessity of requiring approved radar equipment to be installed on such airplanes.

This special regulation is being promulgated in lieu of individual amendments to parts 40, 41, and 42 of the Civil Air Regulations because such a regulation is considered the most expedient method of implementing the original proposal.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this regulation (24 F.R. 5847), and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

In consideration of the foregoing, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency hereby makes and promulgates the following special civil air regulation:

1. Airborne weather radar equipment requirement: After the dates specified, the following transport category airplanes shall not be used for the carriage of passengers under the provisions of parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations, unless approved airborne weather radar equipment is installed in such airplanes:

(a) July 1, 1960, for all turbine-powered airplanes certificated under the transport category rules.

(b) January 1, 1961, for the airplane types listed below:

Douglas DC–7 series.
Douglas DC–6 series.
Lockheed 1049 and 1649 series.

(c) January 1, 1962, for all airplanes certificated under the transport category rules, except C–46 type airplanes.

Note: Airplanes subject to the provisions of paragraph (c) of this section include, but are not limited to, the following types: Boeing 377; Convair 240, 340, and 440; Lockheed 049 and 749; and Martin 202 and 404; and Douglas DC–4.

2. Schedule for installation of equipment: (a) Each operator conducting passenger operations under the provisions of parts 40, 41, or 42 of the Civil Air Regulations with transport category airplanes on which airborne weather is not installed, shall establish a schedule for the progressive completion of such radar installations, in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this regulation. The schedule shall provide for the completion of all required radar installations on or before the dates specified in section 1 of this regulation, and the completion of at least 40 percent of the required installations on or before the following dates:

(1) August 1, 1960, for airplanes of the types specified in section 1(b), and

(2) February 1, 1961, for airplanes of the type specified in section 1(c).

(b) On or before July 1, 1960, a copy of the schedule required by paragraph (a) of this section shall be submitted to an authorized representative of the Administrator, together with a list of any airplanes the operator intends to discontinue using in the carriage of passengers prior to the date on which radar equipment must be installed.

3. Requirement for dispatch and continuance of flight: After March 31, 1960, all transport category airplanes having approved airborne weather radar installed shall be operated in accordance with the following rules when used in passenger operations under parts 40, 41, or 42:

(a) Dispatch: No airplane shall be dispatched (or flight of an airplane started under the provisions of pt. 42) under IFR or night VFR conditions when current weather reports indicate thunderstorms, or other potentially hazardous weather conditions which can be detected by airborne weather radar, may reasonably be expected to be encountered along the route to be flown, unless approved airborne weather radar equipment is installed in the airplane and is in a satisfactory operating condition.

(b) En route: In the event the airborne weather radar becomes inoperative en route, the airplane shall be operated in acordance with the instructions and procedures specified in the operations manual for such occurrence. After the date specified by section 1 of this regulation for the mandatory installation of approved airborne weather radar on the type of airplane involved, such instructions and procedures shall meet with the approval of an authorized representative of the Administrator.

4. Exceptions: The provisions of this regulation shall not apply to those airplanes used solely within the States of Alaska or Hawaii, or during all-cargo, training, test, or ferry flights.

5. Effective date: Except as otherwise specified, this regulation shall become effective February 15, 1960 (secs. 313(a), 601, 604, 605; 72 Stat. 752, 775, 778; 49 U.S.C. 1354, 1421, 1424, 1425).

E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

Issued in Washington, D.C., January 7, 1960.

DRINKING AND SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

A notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the Federal Register July 3, 1959 (24 F.R. 5424), and circulated to the industry as Draft Release 59–7, dated July 3, 1959, which proposed to amend part 40 by adding a new section 40.371 to prohibit (1) the drinking of any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft unless the beverage has been served by the air carrier operating the aircraft, and (2) the serving by the air carrier of such beverage to any person who is or who appears to be intoxicated.

A large number of comments were received from individuals, air carriers, and other industry representatives. These comments ranged from opposition to hearty endorsement of the proposal, including suggestions that it did not go far enough and that all drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft should be prohibited. Many of the comments were motivated by moral, religious, or social considerations, as well as safety.

The Federal Aviation Agency, when it proposed the rule, did so only after careful investigation and study. The Agency's responsibility is only for the air safety considerations and not for the social or moral aspects. The study and investigations which preceded the notice of proposed rulemaking were largely conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, one of the predecessor agencies of the Federal Aviation Agency. The result indicated that there was no factual information, nor any specific occurrences sufficient to establish a safety hazard arising from the serving of alcoholic beverages by the air carrier to passengers aboard air carrier aircraft. The instances which were revealed tended to show that the occasional difficulties experienced had been caused either by passengers who had consumed a considerable quantity of alcoholic beverages prior to boarding the plane, or by those who drank from their own bottles during the course of the flight. This conclusion has been emphasized and verified by many of the comments received from the air carriers affected.

In addition to being confined to the safety aspects of this problem, the proposal was designed to regulate only so far as was necessary to meet safety requirements. It proposed to interfere as little as possible with the personal freedom of passengers and at the same time to prevent abuses that could possibly create a hazardous situation. It was for this reason that the proposed rule did not prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages, but sought to subject it to reasonable control. It is a generally accepted fact that flat prohibition has not proven successful in preventing consumption of alcoholic beverages. In this type of situation, it might even work adversely, since passengers who wish to drink might either do so to excess in advance of the flight, knowing that they could not obtain a drink aboard an aircraft, or would be encouraged to engage in surreptitious drinking from their own supply after boarding.

Some of the carriers and individuals who commented apparently misconstrued the intent of the proposed regulation insofar as they interpreted it as prohibiting passengers from bringing their own liquor aboard an aircraft. This was not our intention. The restriction proposed is against the consumption of alcoholic beverages unless they are

served to the passengers by the air carriers. So construed, this would permit persons to bring liquor aboard and have it served to them by the air carrier, if the air carrier wishes to provide such service. Some of the comments received from individuals made the point that they were accustomed to having a drink before a meal, or that they required or desired some liquor for medicinal reasons or to contribute to their peace of mind while flying. The rule as proposed and adopted herein would permit a carrier to develop its own policies in this regard so that it might accommodate the varying needs of its passengers, and at the same time prevent any safety hazard.

There was also some misapprehension as to the extent of the carrier's and its personnel's responsibility for enforcing this regulation. Some apparently thought that the crewmembers would be required to restrain physically a passenger who wished to consume drinks that were not served to him by the carrier, and they foresaw difficulties with discharging such a responsibility. This regulation would impose no such responsibility on the flight crewmembers. This regulation, like all other regulations adopted by the Agency, would be enforced through the various enforcement processes of the Agency. It is expected of the carriers that they would advise their passengers of the restriction in such a regulation and make suitable reports to the Agency of any known violations. The only time it would be expected that a crewmember would be required to take direct action would be when such action is required for the safety of the flight. This is no greater burden than that now on the crewmembers to do whatever is necessary for the safety of the aircraft and the persons aboard it.

Several comments were made pointing out that the proposed rule prohibited an air carrier from serving an alcoholic beverage to any person if such person is or appears to be intoxicated. It was pointed out that a person might not appear to be intoxicated when, in fact, he or she was, and those commenting did not feel that it was proper to impose responsibility for this type of judgment. With this the Agency agrees and the words "is or" will be stricken from the proposed regulation, so that the carrier and its personnel may rely on the appearance of the passenger in determining whether or not to serve him or her alcoholic beverages. Two of the carriers proposed that action on the proposed regulation be delayed to permit the air carrier industry to develop a code which would control the amount and time of serving alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft. The Agency is strongly in favor of any such voluntary agreements that can be reached among the carriers. To the extent that they are in effect and complied with, they would clearly contribute to decreasing any safety hazard arising from the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft. On the other hand, a code of this kind could not reach the principal problem involved—that of uncontrolled consumption by a passenger of his own liquor supply. Therefore, the adoption of a code, while extremely helpful, would not meet the entire problem. The adoption of this regulation will not in any way inhibit the industry from adopting their own code, and in fact such a move would be viewed with favor by this Agency.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this regulation and due consideration has been given to all relevant matter presented.

In consideration of the foregoing, part 40 of the Civil Air Regulations (14 CFR part 40) is hereby amended by adding a new section 40.371 to read as follows:

"Section 40.371. Drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages:

"(a) No person shall drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft unless such beverage has been served to him by the air carrier operating the aircraft.

"(b) No air carrier shall serve any alcoholic beverage to any person aboard an air carrier aircraft if such person appears to be intoxicated."

This amendment shall become effective on March 10, 1960 (secs. 313(a), 601; 72 Stat. 752, 775; 49 U.S.C. 1354, 1421).

E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on January 6, 1960.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in brief conclusion, as long as we have machines and men operate them, we are going to have accidents. We have human nature to contend with. I do not care what machine it is, whether it is an airplane, truck, or tractor; if a man is in that machine there are going to be accidents.

I commend the airlines. I commend all flying for the remarkable safety record it has achieved over the years. I have been an air pilot for 30 years, and I can point out the lackadaisical way our air traffic rules have been enforced. In 30 years I have never been asked to show my license or instrument ticket showing I am proficient to fly on instruments when I file instrument flight plans. I have many friends who fly on instruments, but, nevertheless, have never been asked to show their instrument tickets. I have never been asked to show my medical certificate. I am just one of several thousand pilots, and I have never been asked in 30 years to show these tickets or certificates—and not asking for them is a violation of the rules. I think it is high time that a man like General Quesada enforces rules that are working in the military, and in so doing greater safety in the airlines will be achieved.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what the Senator from Arizona has just said needs saying in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; and, equally important, it needs saying throughout the country. The able Senator from Arizona is a pilot. He is a general in the Air Force. He has an interest in safety of aviation and flying which you do, Mr. President, and I do, and the people of the Nation do.

Just how did General Quesada come into the service as a civilian in the Government of the United States? He came in when as a result of tragic air crashes 2 years and more ago, the Congress finally enacted legislation setting up just such an air traffic safety responsibility and give it to one man, who would serve the cause of safety in aviation in all the skies over America. The President of the United States signed the new legislation into law and searched this country over for a man with sufficient experience and competence and fairness and intestinal fortitude to take the newly created position and enforce the safety law that Congress laid down. He chose General Quesada, who, to his infinite credit, unselfishly relinquished his commission as a general in the U.S. Air Force, after magnificent and patriotic and dedicated service in World War II, to take this new responsibility and discharge it with distinction and with a dedication to bring maximum safety, under all the circumstances to the air traveling public.

The Senator from Arizona has said what needed saying, Mr. President. The Government and the people of this Nation want safety when they fly and they are going to get it because of the painstaking devotion to duty which a civilian, Mr. Quesada, is demonstrating in the discharge of his responsibilities.

I congratulate my friend the Senator from Arizona.

During the course of Mr. GOLDWATER's remarks,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from Arizona, under the 3-minute limitation applicable to the morning hour, has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask that notwithstanding the 3-minute limitation, I may conclude my remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must object. Instead, I hope the Senator from Arizona will speak on another subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has sat here, day after day, when the remarks of other Senators in the morning hour have exceeded the 3-minute limitation, and has not objected. During recent days I have spoken on only a few subjects, and I have limited my remarks as much as possible. I have sat here and listened to 20- and 30-minute speeches on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The request was made in good faith, to try to expedite the business of the Senate. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have just as much desire to expedite the business of the Senate as has the Senator from Montana. I am glad the Senator from Montana withdrew his objection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this colloquy appear at the end of my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by Bryson Rash from station WRC–TV, relating to recent airplane crashes.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. The airline industry at the moment is taking a most undeserved and unjustified beating in the important field of public opinion. This sorry state of affairs has come about because of unfortunate accidents completely beyond the control of the companies operating in this dynamic field of mass transportation, by air. The fact of the matter is that you are much safer in a plane in flight than in a mad dash across a busy intersection in any metropolitan area in the Nation. You must remember that the bombing of an airliner is madness—the same kind of madness which always exists any place, any time. Since 1938 there have been just three cases of bombings of airliners in the United States, one not yet proved. In that time 500 million, a half billion, passengers have been carried by air. Your chances, percentagewise, of getting killed from such madness is 0.000000147. But what can be done about even this minute figure? Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of

Oklahoma, is holding hearings toward that goal. Thus far the suggestions which he favors are these:

Give the Federal Government legal authority to retain the bodies of victims of air crashes and their luggage until a proper investigation can be completed. Permit the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enter each case immediately rather than await a request by other authorities.

Extend the unjust enrichment laws of some States to transportation in interstate commerce.

And finally, extend the time period or eliminate entirely insurance payments for suicide, thus eliminating the profit motive if there is such a thing in self-destruction. And if you think this madness is profitable, here are the cold facts in the cases of those who have tried bombing airliners—two were executed for the crime and two died in the crash. Not 1 penny of insurance was paid to those who perpetrated the outrage.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, today, January 22, 1960, marks the 42d anniversary of the proclamation by a national council at Kiev declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. The independence of the Ukraine, so proudly proclaimed in 1918, was short lived. In 1920, the Communists brutally subjugated the Ukraine, and that country has been dominated by the Kremlin ever since.

The two decades following the Russian revolution will be recorded as one of the blackest periods in the history of mankind because of the crimes which were perpetrated by the Bolsheviks upon the Ukraine and other independent states.

The record shows that the people of the Ukraine are still being oppressed by the leaders of communism. The record also shows that the spirit of freedom still exists in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. They have never given up hope of regaining their sovereignty.

On this anniversary date of the declaration of Ukrainian independence, the free world should rededicate itself to the eventual peaceful liberation of the Ukrainian people, and all other freedom-loving peoples, from the domination of communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., be printed in the RECORD following this statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 13, 1960.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: You will agree, I'm sure, the Captive Nations Week resolution last July was quite revealing. This obviously was not the first time we Americans bespoke the freedom of the captive nations. Yet this one event struck Khrushchev in an unprecedented way. Every month since then, Moscow has shown its troubled concern over this resolution and its effects.

As we request you to join with us in observing the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on Friday, January 22, we also ask you to ponder the meaning of the above developments. Why this deep Moscow concern? The answer lies in the fact that for the first time we officially recognized the existence of the majority of captive nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. The enormous politico-psychological advantages and leverage this opens up for us are the very thing Moscow fears most.

Contrary to the fictions of a "Soviet nation," "Soviet people," a "Soviet GNP," and "integrated Soviet military might," the U.S.S.R. is a basic empire of captive nations and different peoples, with a gross imperial product and armed forces consisting of about 45 percent captive non-Russians. The illusion of monolithic power in all these aspects is what Moscow wants us to believe in: support and understanding of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. destroys this illusion.

The continuous pressure for freedom by 42 million Ukrainians is not something to be overlooked. This is the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. Even Janus-faced Khrushchev often has to appease this pressure by calling Ukraine "a truly free and sovereign nation;" while in this very period of "the spirit of Camp David," his agents murdered a Ukrainian patriotic leader in Munich, new trials of Ukrainian freedom fighters are scheduled in western Ukraine, and under an economic guise, mass deportations of Ukrainians to central Asia are being conducted.

On this 42d anniversary, your message in Congress and to freedom-aspiring Ukraine will, indeed, be a message in our own national interest. All for the advance of freedom will appreciate greatly its good purpose.

Sincerely yours,
LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all peoples have their aspirations and ideals, and the noblest of these is the desire for freedom and independence. Though not all peoples attain that dearly cherished goal, yet they all are willing, when unfree and held down by oppressive forces, to work for its attainment. At times centuries of ceaseless effort and endurance of all kinds of suffering unfortunately do not attain the desired reward. Scarcely less unfortunate are those who, after regaining their freedom, are forced to surrender it to brute overpowering force. That certainly is the case of the Ukrainian people.

For some 250 years Ukrainians lived under the oppressive Czarist regime of Russia, and all that time they tried to regain their freedom. The opportunity came toward the end of the First World War, and on January 22 of 1918 they proclaimed their independence. They hardly had time to put their homes in order when the country was overrun and then incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then some 42 million Ukrainians have been suffering under the Soviet dictatorship. Today, after 40 years, it is difficult to foresee their future, but as long as they cling to their ideals of freedom and independence, they may be sure there their sacrifices and sufferings have not been in vain. I am indeed glad to echo their fine patriotic and freedom-loving sentiments on the 42d anniversary of their independence day.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, today American citizens of Ukrainian descent commemorate the 42d anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. It is only fitting that we—in Congress—call public attention to this anniversary—and recognition to the present-day sufferings of the Ukrainian people.

The story of Ukrainian valor is well known—and so is the harshness of present-day life in Ukraine—the life of 42 million freedom-loving men, women, and children under the yoke of an alien Communist dictatorship.

But are we sure that we shall remember this story in the years to come? Are we certain that the so-called spirit of Camp David—the promise of better relations between us and the U.S.S.R.—will not dull our memory of the peoples that are threatened with extinction of their national life under the totalitarian power of the Soviet state?

We all want peace, but we also want freedom—freedom not only for ourselves but for all people, wherever they may live, whatever language they may speak.

Let us then use this occasion of the anniversary of that short-lived, yet glorious, independence of Ukraine to remind ourselves here in these United States that lasting peace cannot be ours unless justice shall be brought to the captive peoples—to Ukraine—and to all the others.

Peace and justice are indivisible, here as everywhere else, on the face of this earth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on this 42d anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian nation, Ukrainians can only celebrate the anniversary of an unfortunately short-lived independence. This day nevertheless is a highly significant reminder to all of us that there still exists a deep and unquenched desire for freedom and independence among important national groups within the Soviet Union, as well as within those nations now subjugated as Soviet satellites.

As have other Members of this Senate, I have received the provocative letter from Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., which clearly underscores the importance to the world political situation of this restive nation within the Soviet Union. It is most appropriate that we consider its contents today, and I commend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for inserting the letter into the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Americans and citizens of free nations everywhere have a special reason for remembering January 22 of every year. It is the anniversary day of the Independence of the Ukraine. In 1960, the 42d such anniversary is to be observed.

As we all know, the Ukraine is the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. Forty-two million Ukrainians seek the freedom that was theirs too briefly after their independence day more than four decades ago.

These anniversaries of captive peoples are of great importance not only to those peoples but to all who believe that freedom will be the ultimate state of man if all men work for it. I would like to add this brief statement to those already made this year, and I ask unani-

mous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. President, Americans and citizens of free nations everywhere have a special reason for remembering January 22 of every year. It is the anniversary day of the independence of Ukraine. In 1960, the 42d such anniversary is to be observed.

As well all know, the Ukraine is the largest captive non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain. Forty-two million Ukrainians seek the freedom that was theirs too briefly after their independence day more than four decades ago.

These anniversaries of captive peoples are of great importance not only to these peoples but all who believe that freedom will be the ultimate state of man if all men work for it. I would like to add this brief statement to those already made this year, and I ask unanimous consent.

ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH INSURRECTION OF 1863

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is a date of major importance in the history of Polish nationalism. On January 22, 1863, Polish patriots led an insurrection against Russian control. This insurrection failed, with the result that Poland was directly incorporated into the Russian Empire and the Polish people were ruthlessly punished and suppressed under Russian domination.

The event has special significance to the world today, when Poland is once again under the domination of a Russian-oriented Communist imperialism. The recent history of the Polish people has been an unhappy story of control by neighboring imperialistic powers. But political subjugation has always seemed to enhance the spiritual and intellectual independence of the liberty-loving Polish people. Today the press repeatedly reports manifestations of this fact within present-day Poland. It is clearly the presence of Soviet might that maintains a regime which is daily losing less of the confidence and sympathy of the Polish people.

This fact calls for careful and enlightened policy on the part of this country toward Poland and other captive nations. Today's anniversary is an appropriate occasion for the U.S. Government to reassure the people of Poland and the fine loyal Polish Americans of our own country that our policy continues to have as a fundamental goal the achievement of peace with freedom in the world, with the right of free democratic self-government for all the nations of the world.

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of my colleague, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish insurrection on January 22, 1863.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We commemorate the 97th anniversary of one of the most heroic yet tragic chapters in the history of the brave Polish nation.

At the same time that America was engaged in the great Civil War, to bring freedom to all Americans, the Polish people revolted against the brutal oppression of the Russian czarist government and waged a heroic but futile struggle for freedom.

To my mind, the special significance of this historic struggle lies in its parallel to the present Communist domination of the brave Polish people. The philosophy of atheistic communism is completely foreign to Poland. Poles have for the past thousand years been a people determined to maintain the utmost possible personal liberties and have built their nation and culture on a deep-rooted religious foundation. At the present time, the traditional religious faith of the Polish people is pitted against the materialistic onslaughts of the false ideology of a Communist puppet government. Supported by Soviet bayonets, it rules Poland, but the hearts and minds of her people look forward to the day when they can once again enjoy the blessings that political freedom gives.

Throughout the entire 19th century, the Polish people suffered as a result of the partition of their country, but resisted all attempts to eliminate traces of their national culture and heritage. I am confident that their steadfast faith and perseverance is providing them with the necessary strength to resist present day Soviet domination.

The Polish uprising of 1863 ended in a military defeat; however, it was a demonstration of the intense national spirit of the Polish people and their determination to achieve freedom at all cost. This freedom finally came following World War I, when the Polish nation arose from the ashes of wartime devastation.

The tragic consequences of the Yalta Conference, when the wartime American President blindly betrayed the free peoples now behind the Iron Curtain are known to all.

The people in Poland cannot commemorate on January 22 the anniversary of their struggle for independence, so many years ago. However, to once again fly the banner of freedom is their most cherished goal.

Nations, just as individuals, are endowed with faith. We salute the brave Polish people now suffering under Communist tyranny, knowing that their steadfast faith will one day reward them with the previous gifts of freedom that they deserve to possess.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain: Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, and those nations entirely irradicated by Soviet expansion; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which are suffering the same tragic fate that is Poland's. Our words of appreciation and encouragement must, at all times, go out to those people as well.

I take this opportunity in directing these remarks to the Members of Congress to remind them of the sad plight of the people in Poland today and to remind those people of our constant interest, sympathetic understanding, and our faith in the ultimate freedom of all mankind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

INTEREST RATES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on January 21, Britain raised its official bank interest rate from 4 percent to 5 percent. This rate is somewhat comparable to our Federal Reserve discount rate in that it is a basic rate. Other rates in this country and Britain range upward from the basic rate.

I am apprehensive that this action on the part of Great Britain will be used as another excuse by the Federal Reserve System to push up our own interest rates even further by raising our already high discount rate.

It would be unfortunate if the United States and Britain should wage an economic war by each alternately raising interest rates as a means of solving the balance of payments problem of either nation. Instead of solving the problem, such action will in some respects aggravate it. Last fall the United States had a higher interest rate structure than did any major banking country with the exception of Canada and West Germany. Now Britain apparently wishes to top us. Some financial circles in the United States now feel the United States should move again and top Great Britain.

If this were just a matter of international bankers playing leapfrog, I would not be so concerned. When translated into domestic terms, however, this action would mean that every farmer, every small businessman, every home purchaser, every automobile purchaser, indeed, every consumer who buys anything on credit, must pay the price—a high price. It would mean an increase in the cost of living.

This is one of the questions which the Senate will want to examine in detail when it is asked to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds. I bring this subject up now so that it can be given thoughtful consideration by all concerned, and to express my apprehension over the possible action of the Federal Reserve Board in the future.

PRICING POLICIES OF DRUG INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee is presently holding hearings involving the drug industry and generally the whole question of administered prices. The first brace of hearings was held the second week of December. I was not present at the time, but I did cause the staff to make a very careful analysis of the entire transcript. The news articles and headlines that I saw in the press were absolutely fantastic and incredible.

Yesterday morning, when we resumed the hearings, I felt duty bound, in duty to my conscience, to straighten out the record notwithstanding that it was in contravention of the opinion held by the chairman of the committee.

The substance of what I said in committee and in the hearing I have reduced to a written text, and by way of fortification there are quite a number of editorials from newspapers in different parts of the country. I would have this whole matter appear in the body of the RECORD. I would prefer not to presume on the time of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks appear in the body of the RECORD, with the enclosures.

There being no objection, the statement and newspaper comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

DRUGS AND HEADLINES

On December 7, 1959, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly began hearings on the pricing policies of the ethical drug industry. The first witness was Mr. Francis C. Brown, president of Schering Corp., an ethical drug manufacturer. Shortly after Mr. Brown completed his testimony, the chief economist of the subcommittee introduced an exhibit into the record which seemed calculated to make headlines and front-page stories. This was done by alleging that the Schering Corp. was marking up its products from 1,118 percent to 7,079 percent, when the fact was that Schering was operating on a 12- to 16-percent profit after taxes. Mr. President, the exhibit on its face was misleading, because it excluded the necessary expenditures of doing business under usual accounting practices accepted by the Internal Revenue Service by virtue of the income-tax laws of our Nation. By excluding these expenditures, the chief economist used a computed cost figure of $1.57 in relation to the selling price of $17.90 for 100 tablets of prednisolone, when it was evident from the financial statement of Schering Corp. that proper allocated costs, namely, cost of production, research, selling, and distribution, administrative, and taxes, were $15.03 rather than the computed costs of $1.57. Had the proper costs been allocated, a profit of 16 percent after taxes, or a markup of 33 percent before taxes, would have resulted, which is the true picture. Mr. President, the result of all this was the glaring and misleading headlines and front-page stories of 1,000 percent to 10,000 percent profit by drug manufacturers, when the facts show that there was 12 to 16 percent profit after taxes for these drug manufacturers. Let us examine the transcript of the testimony of December 7 to prove the point. On page 50 of the transcript of the testimony, volume 1, Monday, December 7, 1959, the chief counsel stated that they had devised an exhibit that he wanted the chief economist to explain. After the exhibit was explained, Mr. Brown was asked to give his viewpoint, and he stated as follows on page 55 of the transcript:

"Mr. BROWN. Now, if we were simply doing the things that you have described in this piece of paper, it would seem to me that your question would be pertinent; but, as I have described in my statement, we are doing a great many more things, such as informational work, the pioneering work which we did in the preparations of these compounds, and which we continue to do as the company which originated them, and, moreover, the supporting of the distribution system which we have built up over the years at considerable expense and the maintenance of the research which we are endeavoring to do to push back the medical horizons for the future. These are just as much a part of our costs as wastage in production and tableting and bottling."

Under questioning, Mr. Brown stated that expenses of doing business included costs of production, selling and distribution, research, administrative expenses, taxes, plant maintenance and depreciation, and all of the necessary costs that normally go into the operation of any business under proper accounting practices. However, Mr. Brown's explanation was ignored by the staff who insisted upon stating that there was a markup of 1,118 percent to 7,079 percent on Schering products. Mr. Brown countered as follows on page 60:

"Mr. BROWN. If I may be permitted to do so I would like to say that I consider this not to be the proper relationship because it does not include the expenses of doing business which I have outlined."

No matter how careful Mr. Brown was in his explanation of the necessary expenses that went into the operation of his business which indicated that his company was operating on a 12 percent to 16 percent profit after taxes, the members of the staff persistently referred to the exhibit introduced by the chief economist to reemphasize the grossly erroneous markup of 1,118 percent to 7,079 percent on the three products of Schering. Chairman KEFAUVER noted that Schering Corp. only manufactured five products and that he found none that Schering made a less profit than Schering made on prednisolone. (See pp. 107–108). How then can these high percentages of over 1,000 percent possibly be relevant to the profit schedule of Schering (or any other drug manufacturer) if the records of the Schering Corp. show that Schering Corp. operated at a profit of 16 percent on sales after taxes. If the staff's theory of 1,118 percent to 7,079 percent markup were correct then Schering Corp. profits would have been over 1,000 percent rather than the established 12 percent to 16 percent profit on sales after taxes. At the proper time I shall submit my individual or minority views if a report of these hearings is submitted. I don't want to fully discuss the evidence nor the issues raised at the hearings at this time, since the hearings are not completed. However, I want to raise my voice in opposition to the practices and procedures followed by staff experts in the hearings held December 7 to 12, where staff resorted to exhibits and testimony which told a misleading story and grossly misrepresented the profit percentage of the three drug manufacturers. Mr. Francis C. Brown, of Schering; Mr. John Connor, of Merck; and Dr. E. Gifford Upjohn, of Upjohn Co., clearly stated their cost-price picture, which reflected a mark-up profit of 12 percent to 16 percent. Mr. Blackman, of Premo Co., a smaller competitor, on page 1025, stated that the expenditures of these companies were legitimate although he complained of their selling and distribution expenditures.

But the best evidence of the fallacy of the 1,118 percent markup by the drug manufacturers was Chairman KEFAUVER'S own statement on page 112 when he said: "Mr. Brown, what I can't understand is that small companies buy the same thing from Vroussel (for 11 cents) and sell it for $2 to $3, you sell it for $8."

Mr. Brown explained the differential in expenditures but that is not the point I wish to make here. Mr. President, Senator KEFAUVER should realize that the 11 cents cost into the $2 price by small companies is 18.2 times or, 1,820 percent markup, and the 11 cents cost into the $3 price by small companies is 27.3 times markup or 2,730 percent markup. On this product Senator KEFAUVER has apparently approved the 2,730 percent markup by the small company while he and his staff experts have condemned Schering Corp., Merck Co., and Upjohn Co. for a 1,118 percent or more markup. The answer is clear. Neither the large nor the small drug manufacturers can be accused of such tremendously high markup because in every case the high markup is meaningless since it is caused by the failure to include all of the necessary expense of doing business as have been enumerated previously. When those necessary business expenses have been considered and allocated properly against the price of the product or products, then you will arrive at the markup percentage of approximately 33 percent before taxes which varies from company to company.

What makes my complaint significant is, not only the harm done to the Senate by introduction of misleading exhibits and explanations by staff, but the impact on the people who must buy these wonder or miracle drugs. Imagine how they must feel in reading a misleading headline stating that drug manufacturers make a 7,079 percent profit on the drug that they must have to ease their pain when in all reality Senator KEFAUVER admitted to Senator WILEY on the last day of the hearings that the drug manufacturers were making 16 percent profit after taxes. (See pp. 1283 to 1290 of the transcript.) Senator WILEY, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, condemned the use of "asinine high percentages" through exhibits when staff knew they were misleading. Also, of great significance, is the distortion in the minds of the press and the public what markup on products means. If this practice continues, how will the farmer feel if only his cost of the seed should be used against the price he sells his wheat, cotton, produce, etc. Let's examine the small bakeries that serve our many towns and cities if their markup was the price of 2½-cent wheat against an 18-cent loaf of bread or 725 percent markup; or a small canner of peas whose original cost of peas is 3.1 cents as against a 21.2 cents for price he receives for a can of peas or 700 percent markup; or fertilizer manufactured in Tennessee and elsewhere which is sold for $30 a ton and the cost of raw material zero which means an unlimited percent markup; or manufacturers of shirts that sell for $3.94 when cost of cotton was 28 cents or 1,400 percent markup. Why, the Congress would be deluged with letters from small and large businessmen for such trickery. On top of that the public would lose faith in our Congress. Is such techniques to get a few headlines and front page stories worth the damage to the reputation of Congress? Our Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has scheduled other hearings on drugs. Before such hearings begin I shall expect from the chairman a clarification on the record of these misconceptions brought on by the chief economist's exhibits and explanations which he continued to use every day of the hearings although cautioned time and time again.

For the information of Congress, I am submitting certain newspaper editorials from all sections of the country to show how critical its editors have been of certain aspects of the ethical drug hearings.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Dec. 10, 1959]

THE PRICE OF DRUGS

A Senate subcommittee is inquiring into the prices charged for prescription drugs. Senator KEFAUVER and his colleagues of the committee are studying two questions: (1) Are the drug houses making exorbitant profits by gouging the sick? and (2) if the answer is yes, are they able to do this because they are violating the antitrust laws or because these laws, as they stand, do not give the public adequate protection?

Everyone knows that many of the new drugs are not cheap. These days you can expect to pay as much to cure a girl of pneumonia as to take her to dinner and the theater. There is therefore something for Mr. KEFAUVER and his colleagues to investigate and we wish them good hunting.

But we hope that they will not become so obsessed with the costliness of drugs that they fail to hear both sides of the story. It is a good deal more important that the girl get well than that she get well for $1.50. Her life is worth a $25 drugstore bill. If the result of this investigation should be to discourage research by the drug houses, Mr. KEFAUVER and his colleagues will have on their consciences many thousands of needless deaths and many millions of hours of avoidable suffering.

Of course, all the research into new drugs is not the work of the pharmaceutical houses. All progress in this field does not depend upon them, but they have made contribu-

tions of great importance to the discovery of new remedies and methods of manufacture.

We hope, therefore, that Mr. KEFAUVER gives them an ample opportunity to tell their side, particularly as they have a stirring story to tell.

Research is expensive; the usual estimate is that this year the drug industry is laying out $200 million in the hope that from this large expenditure in the laboratories some useful discoveries will come.

There is no guarantee that any return will be reaped and no certainty that if something is discovered, some better remedy will not replace it long before the original cost is recovered. In considering the price of prescription drugs, the risks taken by the manufacturer cannot be left out of account.

Last September, John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., one of the leading drug manufacturers, spoke in Chicago before the American Association of Medical Clinics. He told the story of a 17-year research project that contributed to an understanding of how the kidneys work and produced two useful drugs, one of them for the relief of gout and another of great value in eliminating excess fluids from the tissues and reducing high blood pressure. The concluding paragraphs of Mr. Connor's speech are worth quoting:

"Nikita Khrushchev, Anastas Mikoyan, and other Soviet leaders have been going up and down our land telling everyone who would listen that communism will supplant capitalism as capitalism supplanted feudalism. They say communism can do a better job of organizing the productive resources of society.

"I challenge them. Specifically, I challenge Soviet communism to do a better job than U.S. capitalism of discovering, developing, producing, and distributing new and effective drugs to alleviate the diseases that plague mankind.

"I will even give the Soviets a 10-year handicap for this peaceful competition. If their pharmaceutical industry, including its research, is doing a better job for the Soviet people by 1969 than we did for ours in 1959, we shall declare them the victors. In this peaceful competition there will be no victim except disease.

"In the 42 years since their October revolution, Soviet science and technology have been unable to come up with a single major drug discovery. Every one of them has come from the West.

"Communism is still pirating the results of our research instead of developing its own. The Russian bureaucratic machinery for producing these copies creaks along at a miserably slow rate. Its distribution system is snarled up with redtape and recurring shortages. The Soviet pharmaceutical industry today is a showpiece for the inefficiency of communism.

"In contrast, I submit a spectacular demonstration of efficiency in a democratic environment. This efficiency was not the result of force, fear, or totalitarian control; it was due entirely to the willing collaboration of freemen and free institutions working together to discover, to produce, and to use new weapons of life for the common good of mankind."

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Dec. 12, 1959]

THE DRUG INQUIRY

Senator KEFAUVER seems to have a facility for getting more headlines out of his investigations than most any other congressional rival in the field. His 1950–51 crime series catapulted him into national prominence, an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952, and finally landed him on his party's ticket as candidate for the Vice Presidency in 1956.

As head of the Senate Judiciary Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. KEFAUVER'S interest has ranged from baseball, football, and other professional team sports, to administered prices, particularly in the steel industry. All of these are popular subjects. But none is calculated to yield anything like the mileage inherent in drug prices which is the Senator's current preoccupation.

Practically everybody has a lifetime intimacy with medicines and their cost. The committee's charges of astronomical markups in drug prices—some as high as 7,000 percent—have captured page 1 headlines and voters' attention.

Thus far the investigation has developed charges that put large drug manufacturers on the defensive. Monopolistic practices, price-rigging, and other illegal procedures are legitimate fields of inquiry. But how the companies conduct their business, so long as it is legally operated, is hardly Government business unless, of course, Congress intends to go into the manufacture and sale of drugs.

Furthermore, Senator KEFAUVER is on the wrong side of the street if he thinks the high cost of pharmaceutical research and promotion—or any other industrial research for that matter—should be financed out of capital and not out of earnings. At its best, research is a big risk and it would be unfair to expect a publicly owned corporation to gamble with new capital.

Still, there's no getting around the fact that the prices of some of the wonder drugs are sky high. The committee would serve a useful purpose if its questioning could result in a price level that would be fair both to drug manufacturer and public.

But politics and pursuit of headlines must be subordinated if discovery of new ways to cure disease and prolong health are not to be impeded or even discouraged. Too many owe too much—perhaps their lives—to pharmaceutical research.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Dec. 12, 1959]

THE PRICE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

On the first day of his subcommittee's investigation of the wholesale price of prescription drugs, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER created headlines that read: "7,000 Percent Markup in Drugs." This was in reference to one particular drug deal. It certainly is not typical of the entire pharmaceutical industry as evidence later in the week brought out.

Representatives of the industry conceded that it is relatively profitable but asserted that it deserves to be. We find no reason to criticize this attitude. There is a great deal of difference between a profitable enterprise and a profiteering enterprise. Although it is possible to cite individual instances in which prices seem to be out of line—the same drug may be priced high in one circumstance and low in another—we find no evidence that the industry as a whole is profiteering and gouging the American public. On the contrary, in recent years it has distinguished itself through its research for making great contributions to the control and care of illness and disease.

There is hardly a family that has not benefited in recent years through some of the so-called wonder drugs that have been developed by the working of the free enterprise pharmaceutical industry. A study by Dan Rennick, editor of the American Druggist, shows that at least 78 percent of all drugs prescribed today were not even in existence 10 years ago. It is ironic that Senator KEFAUVER protests the cost of drugs for elderly people although some of them are still alive because of the new drugs.

Certainly an effort should be made to keep the price of drugs at a reasonable level. But unless Senator KEFAUVER wishes to suggest that the pharmaceutical industry be nationalized, the price of drugs must have some relation to the cost of developing and producing them. It is far better to rely on the working of our competitive free enterprise system to produce the best at lowest cost in drugs as it does in other areas of consumer needs. And, according to Rennick's study, the price of prescriptions is in line with average cost of other things.

For example, the average prescription in 1939 cost $1.11—1 hour and 45 minutes of work for the average wage earner. Today it is $3.08—1 hour and 27 minutes of work. In the 8 years from January 1952 through November 1959 there were 3,548 price changes in lists printed every 2 weeks in the druggists' magazine. Of these, 1,226 were up but 2,322 were down.

Prices go down in the drug field as competition intensifies, as mass production takes over and as manufacturing techniques improve. This is true of most American manufactured goods. In measuring the cost of drugs, expensive research costs must be taken into consideration.

A corollary of Senator KEFAUVER'S investigation should be the good the industry has done as well as the prices it charges. The Senator should keep his investigation in perspective even though this might not give him as much limelight.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Dec. 9, 1959]

ON THE PRICE OF MEDICINE: WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW

If there has ever been a congressional inquiry which started out on the premise that there's a lot we don't know and we want to find out, we can't recall it. The standard approach appears to be: "We know the answers; all we need are facts to match."

Unfortunately for the drug industry and the public, the Senate investigation into drug prices appears to be cast in the classic mold. The probers seem already convinced that prices are unconscionably high; their predilections show in the glee with which they hop upon the spread between the material cost of a pill and its retail price—a comparison which, taken alone, ignores all kinds of pertinent factors.

The spread is, in some cases, startling. It may or may not be too much, in any given case. The public interest will best be served by an earnest attempt to find out, not by assuming the answer at the outset and defying the industry to prove otherwise.

There are valid questions this probe can answer if its masters have the will to do so: How long, on the average, must a drug firm charge a premium price on a new product to recoup its development cost, in view of the industry's mercurial rate of technological change—which can render a product obsolete overnight?

How much is a company entitled to make on a product developed by somebody else, to which it adds only its own brand name and salesmanship? How much of the industry's high marketing costs stem from legitimate work to acquaint doctors with the uses of a new product, and how much from simple plugging of one brand over its competitors?

What is a valid standard of comparison between the company which spends great sums to insure wide distribution—and therefore availability—of its products, and the firm which spends little on marketing and satisfies itself with a small and cozy market, based upon the marketing efforts of others?

What is a reasonable profit margin for the drug industry, not in terms of a dozen unrelated fields, but in terms of its own peculiar risks and opportunities?

These and many others are questions worth asking. From the past history of congressional probes and the premiere performance of this one, we cannot confidently expect the answers. We can only hope for them.

[From the Morgantown (W. Va.) Post, Dec. 8, 1959]

DON'T FOOL US

A Senate antitrust subcommittee, headed by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, heard testimony yesterday that a pharmaceutical manufacturer makes a pill for 1.6 cents, sells it wholesale at 17.9 cents, and suggests that the retailer sell it at 29.8 cents.

Looks pretty bad, doesn't it? Especially since the pill is said to be effective for those suffering from arthritis and asthma, many of whom may be short of cash to buy so expensive a medicine.

But there may be more to this than appears on the surface. How did the manufacturer know that this pill, derived from cortisone, is effective as an arthritis-asthma medicine? And once having made the discovery, what steps did the manufacturer have to take to establish that unknown side effects would not be worse than the ailment sought to be cured or relieved?

Staff investigators of the Senate subcommittee said that their figures (which they obtained from the manufacturer) included the costs of preparing and bottling the pills, but not of marketing them. Apparently they did not include either the cost of the research which went into the development of this pill and the testing which had to be carried out before it could safely be put on the market.

And yet it must be a matter of common knowledge that research for new medicines can be very expensive. Look at the money being spent every year on innumerable research projects related to cancer, heart disease, and other intractable human ailments. It runs into the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars every year. Of course, most of this money is not being spent by the pharmaceutical industry; it is coming from public appropriations and from grants made by voluntary health organizations. This same thing was true of the Salk vaccine for polio. If the pharmaceutical industry had had to include in its price for Salk vaccine a charge for the development costs met by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and other voluntary agencies the selling price might have been almost prohibitive.

Well, the best pharmaceutical companies have their own research departments which they support with their own funds. A good deal of what they spend on such research is money that goes down the drain. No researcher can be sure that he is going to come up with something useful. Much research, in fact, is certain to end in a blind alley, but may and often does have value by eliminating possibilities.

We do not know how much money the Schering Corp. spent in developing Neticortelone, the medicine mentioned in the Senate subcommittee testimony yesterday. But it surely must have spent something, and to eliminate that cost factor is unfair and misleading.

Then there is the matter of marketing, which the Senate subcommittee's investigators specifically eliminated from their cost figures. Once a pharmaceutical company has developed and perfected a new medicine of proved efficacy, a demand does not immediately and spontaneously develop for that medicine. The manufacturer must make the medical profession aware of the development of this new medicine and must satisfy the profession that it can safely and effectively be used. This marketing process (if you want to call it that) can also cost quite a bit of money. The pharmaceutical companies have representatives called detail men who call upon physicians and furnish them information (and free samples). They must give evidence to back up their claims. It might well be that a pill costing only 1.6 cents would require an even larger expenditure to bring it to the awareness and acceptance of the physicians who alone may prescribe it for their patients.

If the pharmaceutical industry is engaging in shady practices, the Senate subcommittee has a duty to bring those practices to the public's attention. But it also has a duty not to mislead the public and not to discourage the research from which the better treatment of human ailments can come.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) News, Dec. 9, 1959]

NO END IN SIGHT TO PROBES

Enough has been developed in the new and sensational investigation into drug prices to permit sensible comment.

The nub of the probe, launched by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, is that the American public is being clobbered by the prices charged by drug makers and reflected in the retail prices charged by drugstores.

We do not for a moment consider that it is within the province of the unit, headed up by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, to harry the drug manufacturers because of what they charge in wholesaling their wares.

No one as yet in this capitalistic democracy has established what is a fair markup. If Congress has in its head the notion of legislating on what percentage of profits is reasonable, then this is a step toward socialism of the most remarkable and unprecedented order.

How much shall a manufacturer charge for his goods and products and how much money shall be make? No one can say whether it should be 1 percent or 1,000 percent. The very same imbroglio developed during the thirties, during the depression, and no minds were able to deduce what the profit margin should be. Is there a moralism involved? Perhaps. But who shall set the moral rate of profit?

In essence, despite the lurid headlines, the Senate unit is charging the drug makers with combining in restraint of trade and for charging the very same prices for the very same drugs and pills.

If so, this is a matter for the Justice Department and Attorney General Rogers. It is not a subject for a probe and an inquisition that furnishes headlines. There is the Sherman Antitrust Act that can be brought into play and there are endless precedents which have been erected during the past 5 years during the course of proceedings of antitrust actions more of which were filed during the period than during the preceding two decades.

If drugs and pills are high it is because they are resultant from highly expensive research that made them possible in the first place. Research is a devourer of money.

Then, too, many drugs and pills are perishable and if local doctors do not prescribe them for one reason or another, then they must sit on the shelf of the druggist who has to take a loss simply because he cannot dispose of them. He is caught in the middle between the traffic of the doctor who does not prescribe and the obligation to store them on his shelves.

As is true of many congressional probes, there is a tendency to blow off to the press and to the public on facts that are slender and do not quite tell the complete story.

We are not in any way disparaging the fact that drugs are expensive. All health measures are expensive especially during a period of inflation. But the Senate committee is wasting lots of money and time and energy that should be a Justice Department bailiwick, if there are any grounds for an antitrust action.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Dec. 16, 1959]

A PLACE FOR CAUTION

When congressional investigations turned up malpractice in the labor movement, a wave of public resentment swept a bill through Congress to correct the situation. Now another congressional inquiry is seeking evidence of wrongdoing, this time in the drug industry. Again the public blood pressure is running high. But in this instance great caution must be exercised, lest the Nation's constitutional well-being, as well as its physical health, be placed in peril.

The people are justified in their outrage at the thought that price fixing or other unethical practices might be responsible in part for the zooming cost of medicines and prescriptions used to counteract human suffering. If this sort of thing has been going on, something assuredly ought to be done about it. But findings published thus far do not clearly establish that it has. As some drug industry spokesmen have pointed out, much of what has been described in the inquiry as excess profits has gone into research that has produced many new cures and remedies. Few people would wish to see this progress interrupted. Should subsequent evidence appear to justify Federal action, however, caution still would be most important as regards the type of action to be taken.

In the labor case, new legislation was needed, since there was no law under which the necessary reforms could have been effected. This is in contrast with the fact that there are antitrust and antimonopoly laws that could be invoked to put a stop to price fixing or other practices in violation of statutes designed to preserve business competition. That would entail court action, though, and not legislative action. Especially to be avoided are new laws that would put drug pricing in Government hands, as one Senator has proposed.

Were the public, swept blindly along by its emotions, to allow the passage of such laws, it would for certain be doing away with competition in the drug industry. Not only that, it would be permitting a dangerous precedent for future moves to establish Federal control over private industries.

[From the Salina (Kans.) Journal, Dec. 15, 1959]

PROFIT A NAUGHTY WORD

Now it is the manufacturers of ethical drugs who are under the spotlight of a congressional committee. They are charged with having marked up the price of a certain pill 7,000 percent above the cost. The impression is conveyed that the public is being milked through the introduction of new drugs.

But these investigators, like so many congressional committees, are going further than that. Whether their charges of financial excesses are soundly based or not, through their questions and statements they suggest that profits in themselves are somehow reprehensible.

This idea may be appealing to those on the bottom rungs of the economic ladder and may win their votes for those who expound it. It is, however, about as un-American as an idea can get.

This country was developed on the profit motive; profits which today it has become fashionable to term "excessive" were essential to create the capital pools without which further development would have been impossible. Our system, even our Government, is based on profits. They are the source of indispensable income taxes. But the investigators ignore all that.

Listening to these congressional committees, a visitor from abroad would gain the impression that American profits are not without honor save in their own country.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Mirror]

REMEMBER THE FABLE

The trial of the portion of the drug industry which deals in so-called ethical

pharmaceuticals, generally those that must be prescribed by a physician, was recessed Saturday before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman.

So far the testimony has generated some heat, some light, and some demands for Government control or laws.

The companies involved admit profits are high (though they can fluctuate greatly) but they point out also that the industry spends more for research than any other and that the new drugs, developed within the last two or three decades have helped to add 10 years to the average life span.

These contributions of the industry to the well-being of the Nation must be balanced against the allegations of profiteering and price fixing. So it is just as well that hearings will not be renewed until after the first of the year. There will be time to weigh the facts and determine what congressional action, if any, is needed.

The life-preserving drugs should be available at prices that are fair and that those in want of them can afford to pay.

But the industry should not be the object of punitive, hastily framed legislation.

The high costs of research (more than $190 million will be spent in 1960) must be taken into consideration.

In the correction of any evils which may exist, it will be pertinent to remember the fable of the goose that laid the golden eggs. Let's not kill the goose.

[From the Kingsport (Tenn.) Times, Dec. 14, 1959]

INVESTIGATING DRUG COMPANIES

The present investigation into the drug industry seeks to show that somebody is making unconscionable profits from the drugs that are often a matter of life and death to the public. And that is not all. There are charges that someone is foisting off on the people drugs that, far from being beneficial, are positively harmful to health. How much of this is justified, we do not know. But we all know that the net result will be to shake public confidence in the drugs that the doctors prescribe, in the doctors, and in the hospitals where the drugs are dispensed. This is not good.

When a doctor or reputable pharmacist goes on the witness stand and denounces the use of certain drugs, it is not the place of a layman to call him a crackpot or a publicity seeker. But it is the business of the layman to weigh the value of that individual opinion against the opinion of others. We do know that the medical profession leans over backward to prevent the marketing of a drug until it has been tested and retested and the preponderance of evidence is all in favor of its use. But we also know that there are always individuals of a singular cast of mind who refuse to go along with the majority, no matter how great that majority. And the layman who is not entitled to an opinion of his own must conclude that it is safer to follow the preponderance of opinion than the lone wolf.

We know that some medical men have pet ideas. We have heard a doctor say that adults should not drink sweet milk. We have heard a doctor say that white wheat bread is bad. So it is not too surprising that there is some opinion that looks askance at the new drugs. But we cannot help but feel that on the whole, the tests that new drugs are put through before they are given the stamp of approval is as much guarantee of safety as we can get. There must always be the margin for human error.

When it comes to the question of pricing drugs, anyone who has had a prescription filled knows that the prices are very high. Are they higher than they need be? Is someone making abnormal profits? We have seen figures quoted indicating a fantastic change from the cost of production to the price the patient pays. There is a question about the figure used as the cost of production.

We are all aware of the fact that every company making special drugs or other scientific materials must maintain great laboratories with very expensive equipment and employing many technicians constantly doing experimental work. Much of this work is not productive of positive results. Not every experiment pays off. Not every young scientist can say "Eureka."

But the things that are produced for commercial development must absorb all the costs that the first is put to. So the real cost of production on any given drug is not as easy to place as it might seem. The cost of research may be greater.

It would appear that whether the price is out of line with cost can best be discovered by the books of the company rather than by comparison of figures that may be less than complete. The Government has access to the books of the companies for audit. This dramatic investigation is hardly necessary.

In any case it is hard to see what the Government can do even if the prices are higher than we think is fair. No one is going to suggest that the Government fix prices, are they?

In this connection it is noticed that recently the courts threw out the Government's case of price fixing against some of the drug companies. The judge decided that the Government did not have enough evidence to warrant giving the case to the jury.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Dec. 14, 1959]

THE PRICE OF PILLS

If the Senate investigation of drug prices can help the public know what are proper considerations in determining such prices, a service will be done. And if the effect of the hearings is to insure that the manufacturers and sellers of drugs keep within the bounds of fair prices, that will be an even greater service.

It is too soon to judge any drug firms on the basis of information presented so far. Some of the markups cited sound fantastic—but it is well known that some of the costs behind the development and production of drugs may also be sometimes fantastic.

In a speech given last September John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., said: "The pharmaceutical industry is one in which the profit motive works quite effectively for the benefit of the consumer. We grow and prosper almost directly in relation to the number of new, needed, and effective discoveries that come from our laboratories."

The number of drugs available to cure Americans' ills is multiplying rapidly. Of the 4,000 or so now in use in this country, 90 percent have been developed in the last 10 years. The industry spent $170 million on research alone in 1958. As a result, we have today all sorts of new wonder drugs which are saving lives, or at least alleviating pain—and measured against the effect, who is to question the price? Yet to persons dependent upon frequent, continuing doses of expensive medicine, the cost can become a serious problem.

Competition is keen among the drug manufacturers—but competition in itself raises questions for the skeptics. Does the lure of high profits make the high-priced development especially worth while? And shouldn't competition, as in many other fields, ultimately bring lower prices for the public? A recent upsurge in competition from foreign sources has the American producers concerned. A curious public wonders why some Japanese drugs are selling for less in the United States than in Japan, and why some American pills can be bought for less in certain South American countries than in the United States.

What the customers want is simply effective, dependable drugs at a fair price. They expect the producers and retailers to make a reasonable profit. They want the manufacturers to make enough to permit competent research and development of new remedies—but they don't expect this cost to serve as an excuse for high prices on countless items which can be produced at low cost. And they wish they had some way of knowing when the drug bills they pay are proper and justified and when they are out of line.

The investigation of Senator KEFAUVER'S committee should at least illuminate the subject.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Dec. 14, 1959]

TWO SIDES TO IT

In the midst of the flood of adverse publicity against the Nation's big drug firms now flowing out of the senatorial investigation at Washington, it is in order, perhaps, to caution the public about jumping at conclusions too soon. These investigations, it is true, may produce some factual data to sustain the general conviction that drug prices are too high. If so, it is to be hoped, proper steps can be taken to alleviate the situation for the public.

At the same time there can be no discounting of the fact that the large drug companies have made a big contribution to the cause of medical research. In recent years the pharmaceutical firms have contributed more than $20 million to medical and pharmacy schools, hospitals and institutions, and for scholarships and fellowships. Outright grants amounted to more than $5 million and contracts for special research projects totaled almost $2 million. These figures represent findings in a partial survey only and it is true probably that a more thorough and intensive survey would bring these totals to a much higher figure.

Some companies, it has been pointed out, have spent as much as $5 million in their own laboratories on the development of a single drug before it was offered for public use. One firm, Modern Medicine said in its Washington news column, spent $30 million on one drug alone before the first prescription for it was written.

These facts, which may or may not receive full publicity in the Washington hearings, should be fully considered before arriving at any conclusions about the evils ascribed to the drug companies.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune, Dec. 17, 1959]

STATE SAVES BY BIDS ON DRUGS

The fact that Government hospitals can buy drugs at prices well below those paid by the general public has been brought out by the Senate committee investigating drug prices. The justification for giving special discounts to Federal, State, and county hospitals which buy in large quantities is obvious. The expense to drug firms in dealing with these institutions is much less than for most of their business.

Iowa institutions under the board of control buy drugs in many cases at prices lower than wholesalers pay the drug firms. The board of control has general contracts with some 50 drug firms, which for the most part allow generous discounts. The contract with one typical major firm allows the Iowa institutions to buy drugs 51 percent below what druggists pay wholesalers for the same items.

These contracts enable each institution to order drugs as its needs arise. The institutions are expected to check the catalog of each firm and order from the firm with the lowest price. Catalog prices vary widely. A random check of five catalogs showed prices on aspirin ranging from 90 cents to $2.16 for the same quantity.

The board of control can buy cheaper still by having its central purchasing office negotiate special contracts with drug firms or by inviting firms to bid competitively. One firm with a catalog price of 75 cents for a vial of penicillin—which includes the State's discount—offered to supply the same item for 25 cents when asked to bid. Another firm with a catalog price of $3.39 for a quantity of phenobarbital cut its asking price to $2.10 when it submitted a competitive bid.

Testimony at the Senate hearing has shown that prices for a drug vary greatly, depending on whether the drug is ordered by its generic name or its brand name. The larger Iowa board of control institutions, which have full-time pharmacists, attempt to buy by generic name. The purchasing office of the board also asks for bids by generic name.

Drug purchases account for most of the board of control's annual $750,000 bill for medical supplies. Theoretically, the way to make these funds go farthest is to buy all drugs by generic name on a competitive bid basis. However the largest single drug item purchased—tranquilizing drugs—is marketed only on a brand name basis. Some physicians also have strong preference for particular brand name drugs and distrust the quality of products from lesser-known firms. As a result only about 5 percent of the drug items purchased currently are bought on a competitive bid basis.

Senate committee testimony and Iowa experience show there is considerable give in drug prices. Since this is true, it would seem desirable to buy as much as practical by competitive bidding, without, of course, making any compromise on quality of the drugs.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Dec. 19, 1959]

RESEARCH IS CLOSELY TIED TO DRUG PROFITS

It seems to us that the investigation of pharmaceutical manufacturers' profits is on the order of a tempest in a teapot, conducted in a manner which appeals more to prejudice than to reason. While some drug prices may seem excessive, it must be remembered that many factors determine their cost.

William Graham, chairman of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and president of Baxter Laboratories, which has a large plant in Mississippi at Cleveland, made a statement on television last Sunday which explains a great deal.

If pharmaceutical firms cannot make a satisfactory profit, he said, there is no incentive for them to carry on research for new products. People everywhere will suffer if drug research is limited and jeopardized by Government intervention.

He said profits range from 6 to 16 percent of sales and his own firm has annual sales of $30 million of which some 6 percent is profit. About $1,500,000 is spent on research. The industry as a whole spends $190 million a year for research.

In modern pharmacy, much overhead is devoted to uncertainties, including research. Some products developed at enormous cost are outdated even before they can be put on the market.

There is no question but that the United States excels in the production and distribution of new and wonderful drugs beneficial to all humanity. We could never enjoy this leadership if margins of profits had been so limited that research was handicapped. Adequate incentive is essential if medical progress is to continue.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) Arkansas Democrat, Dec. 19, 1959]

PHILANTHROPY IN MENTAL HEALTH

The Arkansas Mental Health Association's telegram commending Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's investigation of the wholesale price of certain drugs may inadvertently have left a public impression that the State doesn't appreciate the philanthropy of pharmaceutical houses that manufacture tranquilizers.

This telegram, which was revised from the original resolution that State papers published, pointed to the difficulty of low-income families who need to buy tranquilizers regularly for a member. When the drugs can't be obtained, the patient has to go back to a hospital, and again becomes a public charge. But most any heavy drug bill is beyond the means of a poor family these days. Tranquilizers are just a part of a very big health-economic problem, national in scope.

Manufacturers of tranquilizers probably have made tremendous profits but in fairness to them, their benefactions should be recognized. For instance, Smith, Kline, French of Philadelphia, maker of chloropromazine, one of the main drugs of this group, reduced prices as the demand zoomed. Out of profits the company set up a foundation for psychiatric research and education.

Entirely at its own expense the foundation made a movie for hospitals and medical schools to use in training psychiatric nurses. The film has been shown in the Arkansas State Hospital and numerous other institutions and nowhere does the picture plug chloropromazine.

This foundation conducted studies of remotivation of mental patients. Then it sent a team to State hospitals, including our own, to train ward attendants in technique. The company product wasn't pushed.

[From the Nashua (N.H.) Telegraph, Dec. 21, 1959]

TWO SIDES

A flood of adverse publicity against the Nation's drug firms has flowed out of the senatorial investigation at Washington. Perhaps the public should be cautioned, however, about jumping at conclusions too quickly.

These investigations may, by producing factual data, sustain the general conviction that drug prices are too high. If this occurs, it is to be hoped that proper steps can be taken to alleviate the situation for the public.

There can be no discounting of the fact, however, that the big drug companies have made a large contribution to the cause of medical research. In recent years, pharmaceutical firms have contributed more than $20 million to medical and pharmacy schools, hospitals, and institutions, and for fellowships and scholarships.

Outright grants amounted to more than $5 million and contracts for special research projects totaled about $2 million.

Some companies, it has been pointed out, have spent as much as $5 million in their own laboratories on the development of a single drug before it was offered for public use. One firm, Modern Medicine said in its Washington News column, spent $30 million on one drug alone before the first prescription for it was written.

These facts should be fully considered before any conclusion is arrived at concerning the evils of the drug companies.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Dec. 11, 1959]

ARE DRUGS TOO EXPENSIVE?

Anyone who purchases drugs today knows they cost a lot of money, and a first impression is to conclude that drug manufacturers are making more profit than they should. Perhaps they are—that is what the Senate subcommittee is trying to find out.

But it should be borne in mind by the Senate investigators that a great deal of money has been spent in developing these drugs; that not all of the research turns out a safe, salable product, and that if new drugs are to be developed research must go on constantly.

Perhaps the best way for the average man to determine whether the drugs he buys are worth what it costs him, is to imagine what might happen to loved ones and friends if such drugs were unavailable. Fifty dollars might seem like an exorbitant price to pay for some particular course of pills, but if the pills saved the life of someone who probably would have died without them, you'd consider the pills the greatest of bargains.

It would be a tragic thing if the investigation caused drug manufacturers to say: "OK, we've had it. We'll cut out any further research and get along with what we've developed. If we don't have to spend more money for research we can drastically reduce the price of what we've got."

Just as patients have to pay for the expensive education of a physician or surgeon, so users of pills have to pay for the research that produced the pills, and the distribution system that makes them available to the public. It is unfair to assume that the chemicals which go into pills constitute their entire cost, and that the cost to purchasers should be based on this alone.

Whether the markup is too high is properly debatable; it would appear that in many cases it is. But the drug industry, which this year will spend $194 million in search of new and better medicines, certainly has a right to its day in court.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald, Dec. 10, 1959]

PRICE OF DRUGS

Senate investigators reported recently that a major drug manufacturer produced a new medicine for 1.6 cents a tablet, set a wholesale price of 17.9 cents (a markup of 1,118 percent), and suggested a rental price of 29.8 cents.

The markup represents quite a spread but the drugmaker contends that it is not excessive. A company spokesman says that actual production cost is only one of many factors which have to be considered in setting a price. Among them are selling and distribution costs, research, and many items peculiar to the industry such as informational activity on new drugs and trailblazing work to keep a flow of products constantly under development.

Along that line, we wonder how many expensive failures the drug firm had in trying to develop helpful new products for each success it had. Another question involves how long a newly developed product lasts before it is replaced by a still newer and better product.

Such things certainly should have an important bearing on what a drugmaker gets for his product as well as the actual cost of making a pill once the long process of development is out of the way.

We aren't in any position to say whether or not the price of drugs, as has been contended, is too high. Maybe by law or other means government could force a reduced markup. Such a result might save the consumer money on the price of drugs, but it might also tend to discourage drugmakers from supplying the public with new and better drugs.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Dec. 10, 1959]

THE DRUG PROBE

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's subcommittee investigating drug prices has gotten off to a start with some pretty tricky business that has successfully captured national attention but seems to be highly and purposely misleading.

A subcommittee staff economist came up with the contention that it cost one drug manufacturer $1.57 to make a bottle of

arthritic pills called Prednisolene that was sold at $17.90. This, the staff economist reported with a note of triumph, was a markup of 1,118 percent.

This also was a phony claim.

If the staff economist tried to get away with such a distorted picture in advertising, the Federal Trade Commission or somebody else would be on him post haste. The Kefauver subcommittee headline seeker (and achiever) had neglected to put into his price comparison other vital cost factors such as production, marketing, administration, research, royalty and taxes. The company figured these and other costs in and claimed the alleged 1,118 percent markup dissolved down to a "reasonable" profit of 12.3 percent. That's quite a difference; somebody's badly wrong.

Perhaps the prices of some drugs are too high, but the subcommittee won't find the answers and help solve the problem if it uses rigged figures. It is possible that some may consider such things, though not accurate, to be good politics.

Undoubtedly, there are many people who have difficulty paying for the drugs they need. There are people who have trouble paying for food, clothing, and rent. The average American spends $34 a year for tobacco, $55 a year on liquor—compared to $12 a year on drugs. We haven't heard of a subcommittee investigating tobacco and liquor pricing.

No industry, no operation—private, nonprofit or governmental—can be assumed not to have any shortcomings or bad practices or faults. Look into any, and some lack of efficiency or unsound policies will be found. In the drug industry, for example, maybe it would be difficult to explain how an American manufacturer making vitamins can sell his product in South America for $2.63 while the same size bottle costs $4.88 in the United States. But whatever the explanation, whether it is a good one or a bad one, doesn't justify the distortion typified by the subcommittee staff economist's mythical 1,118 percent markup.

Sick people don't like being sick. They much prefer to be well. They don't feel good and complaint is normal. And it's no pleasure to spend money on medicine when everyone would rather feel fine and spend the money on more enjoyable things. But we'd really complain if no miracle drugs existed. The major reason there are high-priced drugs—and low-priced ones, too—to treat so many modern ills is that the drug industry in recent years has become the miracle industry, producing a variety of compounds for relief and cure of ills that formerly were simply suffered as chronic discomforts, or which led to death.

Research has made these new drugs possible. Research costs money. The drug manufacturers could have avoided any Kefauver probe if they had simply stuck to making aspirin tablets and rubbing alcohol, perhaps competing only by debating which aspirin dissolves faster. But we'd be in bad shape if the drug industry had not undertaken costly research.

One company spent $2 million trying to produce a synthetic penicillin, a major lifesaving drug. It failed; the $2 million went down the drain. And about that time another company, also spending lots on research, succeeded. Where do the millions for research come from? They must come from sales of already developed drugs. Cut the prices down to a bare minimum and you cut research down to a bare minimum. Then you have no new miracle drugs to relieve suffering and prolong life.

Yes, but the manufacturers not only make a profit but pass drugs along with suggested prices to druggists of 33⅓-percent markup, it is claimed. Does that mean every druggist is making a killing? Last year 30 percent of the Nation's 56,000 druggists went into the red because of high operating costs.

A major probe distortion comes from the unfair pinpointing of the price of a single drug, suggesting it is typical. Markups vary for good reason. The only true picture comes from an across-the-board survey of drug manufacturers' entire operations.

There's no question that Americans are getting the best in drug developments and service that they or any people have ever gotten in seeking to determine whether the costs for this service are in line or too high, let's keep our feet on the ground and look at facts, not politically inspired fancies.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News, Dec. 10, 1959]

EXCESSIVE DRUG PROFITS?

High drug prices and high drug profits are a prime target of Chairman KEFAUVER'S Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in its investigation just opened. The Senator no doubt hopes to spotlight sensational facts which will shock the public and lead for a demand that Congress do something. Already there has been testimony that the wholesale price of a wonder drug for painful and crippling arthritis went up more than 1,000 percent, while the wholesale price of one hormone rose by 7,079 percent.

Such factfinding is good if it makes the public or the legislators go behind the facts and do hard thinking about the conflicting philosophies and principles involved. A drug manufacturer testified to the subcommittee, for instance, that his firm's profits are justified because they provide money for research which will produce other wonder drugs, Salk vaccines, and so on. "The consumers of today," he said, "must contribute to the benefits which the future will bring."

They must indeed. There would be no progress in the world if each generation evaded its responsibility to the future. But the question in each case is how this responsibility should be met. In our mixed economy we try a little of everything. Medical research is supported partly by Government funds raised by taxes, partly by funds raised in drives by nonprofit organizations, partly by various philanthropic donations (tax-deductible), and partly by plowing profits of drug companies back into research to develop new drugs on which new profits can be made to be plowed back into new research.

Should we apply the term "excessive" to these profits? How much profit is legitimate, and how much is too much? Isn't free enterprise entitled to charge all the traffic will bear, especially when it takes some of its profits and spends them on humanitarian research?

To questions like these, Americans would return a wide variety of answers. Merely asking them demands thinking about basic philosophy from a people who prefer the pragmatic approach (and are proud of it). But we suspect that most pragmatists would say, off the cuff, that profits of 1,000 percent and up are too high. If the pragmatist has arthritis, lives on a pension, and has been charged $29.83 for 100 prednisolone tablets that cost the manufacturer $1.57 to make, he is bound to think so.

But if profits are reduced, drug manufacturers can spend less on research, and the next generation may have fewer wonder drugs. If research is to be adequate under those circumstances, the Government will have to support more of it with tax money. Pragmatists won't like that, either.

But the Kefauver investigation should make us think more about the alternatives involved, and that will be a good thing.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News, Dec. 10, 1959]

DIGGING FOR SCANDAL IN THE DRUG FIELD

It appears that the fifty-niners of the political mining camps have discovered that there are votes in them-thar scandals. The scandal now alleged by a new Kefauver investigating committee is that the Schering Corp. has made a profit of 7,079 percent on a new drug combination which it recently marketed. The News is inclined to suspect a charge like that because of its sheer dimensions.

The Schering Corp. has been in business since 1935. It has just under 4 million shares of common stock of $1 par value, with a relatively small amount of preferred stock. The book value of the common stock was recently estimated at $12.34 per share. Market price has been around $1.75. Dividends paid ranged from 13 cents paid in 1952 to a current rate of $1.40 a share. Earnings for 1958 were reported as $3.06 a share.

This does not read like a get-rich-quick enterprise—certainly not on a scale of 7,079 percent profits. It is fair to assume that for each wonder drug developed, there are 10,000 experiments which have to be washed down the laboratory drain. Somebody pays for 10,000 failures previous to the 10,001st experiment which produces.

The most patent, the most dangerous, and most prevalent markup in American life today is the political markup. What men like ESTES KEFAUVER cost the taxpayer, compared to what the Kefauvers are worth to the taxpayers, would probably be much more than 7,079 percent.

THE 12-POINT AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM PROPOSED BY THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM MISSOURI

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, day before yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri introduced a bill with which I judge he hopes to settle all of agriculture's ills at one stroke. I should like to think this worthy objective were possible of such immediate accomplishment, and I should like further to believe that the Senator from this great farm State has the solution in his 12-point package.

The two chief standards one must apply to judge the worth of such a bill are, it seems to me, its workability and its cost.

What I ask my colleague, therefore, is how much will it cost?

I would agree wholeheartedly with the Senator when he says that immediate positive action is essential. I would welcome positive action today, say, on wheat and conservation reserve legislation.

The administration sought without success in the last session to get immediate positive action on wheat, which is in the deepest trouble of all. What we got, however, was delayed negative action.

We have $3.5 billions tied up in wheat alone. It will go up under the present program. I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri would agree that the present wheat program is badly out of joint and could use some immediate positive action.

I would agree further with the Senator that our present program is a failure. Everyone from the President on down does not dispute that. The administration has certainly bent every effort to change this program. The resistance to all positive proposals for immediate action has come from the majority side of the aisle.

I agree with the Senator's comment that "overproduction has built up huge

surpluses." I wonder if the Senator would now agree with me as to the reason for the overproduction? I think we could stipulate farmer efficiency and unusually good weather and improved technology. Would the Senator then agree that price fixing by Government plus loopholes were further reasons?

Certainly I agree with his charge to the Congress that "it is essential that the Congress act—and act now." I would add that it is lamentable Congress has not acted long since.

The Senator laments that there has been no change of policy on the part of the administration. This is indeed a compliment. The administration truly has held to the course of insisting on a constructive, sound, and realistic price support policy. It has never deviated. What is needed here is not a change in policy but a change in program. Herein lies the failure. Only Congress has the power to change the program.

Before commenting on the 12-point program as such, I wish to point out that a number of these points are already part of the administration program. This pays the administration the highest form of flattery—imitation. I am sure the Senator recognizes this, especially since he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Now to the 12 points.

First. The first of the Senator's points deals with the disposition of our surpluses. He states that "these surpluses have not been used to any real advantage either at home or abroad."

The administration has a food-use policy which provides the best diets Americans have ever had and also has provided more food for the needy abroad than ever before in our history. Americans today have available the most wholesome, nutritious, and varied food supply in the history of any nation. Furthermore, no nation has ever been so generous with its abundance as has the United States. Our war against hunger has shown great results. It is the only war we want to be engaged in.

Since Public Law 480 program was authorized in 1954, U.S. surplus agricultural commodities having export market value of more than $4 billion have been programed for export to 37 friendly countries, plus about 8 billions of pounds donated to the needy of 91 countries. The record is abundantly clear as to the constructive use of these surpluses abroad. I would appreciate hearing what specific additional ways the surpluses can be used to advantage.

Last fiscal year almost 2 billion pounds of U.S. surplus foods were donated to the school lunch, welfare institutions, and the needy of the United States. During the first half of 1959, for example, about one person out of nine received some surplus foods donated by the Government.

Second. His program would establish a national reserve stockpile of food items for use in event of enemy attack and place them under the Office of Civilian Defense Mobilization. Competent studies by career people made as to the desirability of stockpiling food reserves for use in case of enemy attack have indicated that such a program of any magnitude is not desirable because of the perishability aspects, the difficulty of assuring safe stocks, and so forth.

Third. His program would make another attempt to stop the surplus buildup by bringing production into balance with national food and fiber needs. The administration has constantly urged the Congress to adopt changes in basic farm legislation which would permit bringing production into balance with needs. Experience has shown that such attempts under present legislation by means of control and regimentation of farmers has completely failed.

Fourth. His program would establish farmer advisory and administration committees of bona fide farmers so as to have more practical farm programs. We already have such committees of "bona fide" farmers.

Fifth. This point of tailoring individual commodity programs to conditions affecting that commodity is rather vague. The Secretary of Agriculture already has some authority within this area. For example, the milk marketing orders and other marketing agreement and order programs which are operating successfully. The administration has continuously requested legislation which would permit more authority with which to adapt programs to better fit the needs.

Sixth. His program requires the preparation of a true parity price formula. "Prior to adoption of such a formula," the Senator states, "price goals are established at 90 percent of the present parity formula."

One can only conclude from this that the Senator is calling for a program based on 90 percent of untrue parity.

The parity principle is one of long standing. However, parity price formula has been used in many instances for purposes for which it was not originally conceived or designed. Use of the parity price formula was not intended for price support purposes, and it has very serious limitations. I am glad that my colleague now recognizes this. Why continue in use a formula which the Senator agrees gives an untrue answer? Ninety percent of untrue is still untrue.

Seventh. Finally the Senator concludes by endorsing a program which is a product of this administration and which is the first realistic attempt by Government to give sound help to low-income farmers who represent almost 60 percent of the farm population.

The rural development program now going forward is proving to be a very satisfactory means of helping the low-income farmers. This should be expanded, but there is no need to create a new agency to deal with this problem as the Senator advocates.

It is interesting to note that press accounts describe this as a "catchall" bill with little chance of passage. I do not know what it is trying to "catch." It is a pointless 12-point program, in which the sound suggestions have long since been pioneered by this administration and the unsound proposals long since rejected.

TOBACCO INTERESTS OPPOSE ATTEMPTS TO PROVIDE INFORMATION CONCERNING CANCER AND CIGARETTES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the activities of certain tobacco interests to discredit medical findings of a causal relationship between cigarettes and lung cancer may well be recorded in history books as an outstanding example of unenlightened self-interest operating to the public detriment.

I wish today to bring to the attention of future chroniclers of the annals of human health a most revealing sample of the astonishing attitude exhibited by some in this industry.

The following item is taken in its entirety from the July 10, 1959, issue of the magazine Tobacco, the International Weekly of Industry and Science:

> Here's something new the cigarette industry must face: New York City's Bureau of Public Health Education has completed a program to deter schoolchildren and teenagers from smoking. Dr. Morey R. Fields, director of the bureau, says the drive will also include education on the harmful effects of narcotics and alcohol. Miss Mary Fitzgerald, associate director of health education of the board of education, said the program would seek to chiefly impress boys and girls between 11 and 13 years of age. Support will be had from the parent and teacher associations, youth organizations, city agencies with youth programs, and the tobacco industry. The topics of talks to the children, said Dr. Fields, will be informative "of the relationship between smoking and lung cancer and cardiac involvement" and how smoking is linked to such illnesses as Buerger's disease and gangrene.
>
> The disturbing factor about the New York City school antismoking educational drive is that other cities might follow. It might deter all children from ever becoming smokers. However, for some 300 years antitobacco crusaders have loudly predicted dire consequences for tobacco users. Yet, despite these warnings, per capita consumption has steadily increased. The industry is currently doing its largest sales volume in history, and undoubtedly enjoying its most profitable period.

Mr. President, I wish to reread two sentences from this amazing statement. Again, I quote:

> The disturbing factor about the New York City school antismoking educational drive is that other cities might follow. It might deter all children from ever becoming smokers.

Mr. President, first, I want to point out to the magazine Tobacco that numerous cities have had in operation for some time a program such as that announced in New York. One such city happens to be my own home of Portland, Oreg. As a prophet, I think Tobacco magazine will prove quite accurate. In view of the increasingly large mass of evidence regarding the positive relationship between cancer and cigarettes being brought to the public attention by the U.S. Public Health Service and private researchers, I am confident that many other cities will consider adoption of such educational programs for their youth.

"RECRUITMENT" DROP SHOWN

I believe that Tobacco magazine is also correct in its assertion that these pro-

grams may have the effect of deterring children from smoking cigarettes. A recent issue of Consumer Reports states that in Portland a year-long survey of 21,980 students showed that educational programs regarding smoking dropped the net "recruitment" rate from 13 to 7.7 percent among boys and from 6.4 to 2.1 percent among girls.

What is truly incredible about the comment of Tobacco magazine with respect to these programs is its implicit thesis that it is disturbing to find that American youth may be more concerned with their health than they are with acquiring the nebulous symbols of social status with which cigarette advertising attempts to secure their patronage.

Cigarette advertising is distinguished by its efforts to associate its product with symbols which will appeal to youth. Athletic prowess is associated with smoking by full-page four-color pictures of prominent sports stars holding their favorite cigarette. The glamour of Hollywood is utilized by portraying sophisticated screen celebrities smoking a cigarette. Popularity of a television gun slinger is employed by showing him perched on the corral rail holding a pack of some he-man brand.

INDUSTRY EXHIBITS CYNICISM

"Today's adolescents are tomorrow's addicts," is the theme which threads through all cigarette advertising. Yet despite its cynical manipulation of symbols in an effort to boost sales figures, some tobacco interests have the temerity to criticize efforts to present another view of cigarette smoking.

One can almost picture the counterpart of these tobacco spokesmen at the time of Pasteur's discovery of the relationship between fermentation in liquids and the growth of bacteria, a discovery which resulted in the development of pasteurization of milk and is today regarded as a giant forward step in the battle to better protect human health.

"The disturbing factor about Dr. Pasteur's finding is that other people may find out," this advertising ancestor would say, "it might deter all people from drinking raw milk."

CHILDREN ENTITLED TO FACTS

Mr. President, American children should have an opportunity to learn the facts about the potential dangers to human health involved in cigarette smoking. Once they have such information, then they will be in a position to make a wise voluntary decision as to whether or not they wish to smoke. There is evidence to indicate that children given such an opportunity, more frequently elect not to smoke than those who do not receive such an advantage. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the January issue of Consumer Reports reporting on the results of educational programs regarding smoking.

Mr. President, I have introduced legislation to provide Federal grants to States to assist them in informing and educating children in schools with respect to the harmful effects of tobacco, alcohol, and other potentially deleterious consumables. The number of my bill is S. 1394.

PROOF MAY BE TOO LATE

I think that our children are entitled to have made available to them accurate medical information about cigarettes and cancer. A recent survey of doctors in Massachusetts showed that more than 93 percent of the physicians polled advocated an educational campaign to warn teenagers.

As Surg. Gen. Leroy Burney said recently:

In protection of human health * * * absolute proof often comes late. To wait for it is to invite disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the end of my remarks a press release issued by the Surgeon General this fall as part of the Public Health Service's continuing effort to inform the public of the facts about cancer and cigarettes; an editorial from the Bulletin of Cancer Progress, published by the American Cancer Association, commenting on tobacco industry attempts to discourage acceptance of scientific evidence concerning this relationship; and an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Tobacco Propaganda."

There being no objection, the article, press release, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Consumer Reports, January 1960]

AND THOSE WHO DON'T

(By Harold Aaron, M.D.)

There has been a heartening slowdown in the rate at which high school students begin to smoke when they are exposed to educational campaigns. In Portland, Oreg., a year-long survey of 21,980 students showed that antismoking education dropped the net recruitment rate from 13 to 7.7 percent among the boys and from 6.4 to 2.1 percent among the girls. As Daniel Horn, Ph.D., of the American Cancer Society, explained to the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association last fall, this may seem like small progress; but if it were carried out cumulatively for 4 years, it would mean 20 percent of the high school students who otherwise would become regular smokers by graduation time would not do so. In Jacksonville, Fla., Dr. Paul A. Mori, chief radiologist at Baptist Memorial Hospital, says, "We've reached some 20,000 students." The New York City schools are planning their own program.

Do physicians themselves give up smoking? A 5-year followup study of the smoking habits of Massachusetts doctors now has been completed. In 1954, 34 percent of them were not smoking; the percentage has risen to 44.5 percent. Only 38.5 percent of the smokers now smoke cigarettes, though 52 percent did in 1954 (17 percent now smoke only cigars or a pipe). About half the current cigarette smokers use less than a pack a day. The over-a-pack-a-day smokers have dropped by more than 40 percent. Asked about an educational campaign to warn teenagers, more than 93 percent of the doctors advocated it.

PRESS RELEASE OF NOVEMBER 27, 1959, BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Unless the use of tobacco can be made safe, the individual's risk of lung cancer can be reduced best by the elimination of smoking," Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, concludes in an article appearing in the current (November 28) issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

In the article, which is titled "Smoking and Lung Cancer, a Statement of the Public Health Service," the Surgeon General states: "The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological (causative) factor in the increase of lung cancer."

The statement, which was made available in Washington today, contains an extensive review of leading studies made in recent years on the relationship between smoking and lung cancer. The studies cited are both in support of and against the hypothesis that smoking is a principal causative factor in the rising death rate from lung cancer in the United States and other parts of the world.

Dr. John D. Porterfield, Acting Surgeon General in Dr. Burney's absence from the country, said that the Service, in submitting the article for publication in the Journal of the American Medical Association and in releasing it simultaneously to the public, was following an established policy of making fully available to the medical and health professions all the facts on the smoking and lung cancer question as rapidly as they are developed.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming said: "I heartily endorsed this policy and commended the Service for assembling the data and making public its own conclusions. Both physicians and the public should welcome the views of the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service on the subject."

The Service has also concluded, according to the article, that the following statements are also supported by present evidence:

1. Cigarette smoking particularly is associated with an increased chance of developing lung cancer.

2. Stopping cigarette smoking even after long exposure is beneficial.

3. No method of treating tobacco or filtering the smoke has been demonstrated to be effective in materially reducing or eliminating the hazard of lung cancer.

4. The nonsmoker has a lower incidence of lung cancer than the smoker in all controlled studies, whether in rural areas, urban regions, industrial occupations, or by sex.

5. Individuals who have never smoked at all (cigarettes, cigars, or pipe) have the best chance of escaping lung cancer.

The article presents the criticisms leveled at the proponents of the smoking and lung cancer relationship by dissenting scientists. A number of investigators, the article points out, have suggested that "increased volumes of automobile exhaust fumes and industrial vapors polluting the air are to a great part responsible for the causation of lung cancer. The possibility that there are other factors yet unknown also has been suggested."

"Since carcinoma of the lung is also a disease of nonsmokers," the statement says, "it is evident that factors other than tobacco contribute to its etiology."

The Surgeon General points out that studies of smoking habits "have not accounted adequately for the variation in death rates between men and women."

"The Service," Dr. Porterfield said, "is distributing reprints of the article to members of the medical and public health profession."

The bibliography which accompanies the article consists of 81 citations and includes reference to the work of research scientists both in the United States and abroad.

[From the Bulletin of Cancer Progress, March–April 1958]

AFTER THE DELAYING ACTION A TRIP TO CANOSSA

When military defeat is inevitable the commander orders a delaying action, never decisive or victorious, to cover a withdrawal—euphemism for retreat and defeat.

Dr. Little, scientific director of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee, is executing an ordered delaying action in the cigarette-lung cancer controversy, which he refers to as a "battle."

This tactical maneuver, which is apparently agreeable to the other members of his scientific advisory board, is to deny repeatedly the validity of the many authoritative reports indicating by accepted epidemiological, experimental, and pathological studies that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer; to prevent or delay, and to neutralize in this country any widespread public education, like that now being promoted in England, that would hurt sales of cigarettes; to mislead the public into believing that no change in smoking habits is indicated from the existing statistical and pathological evidence, nor will be until "direct experimental evidence" is at hand; and to convince the trusting, tobacco-consuming public of the industry's eleemosynary, "lasting interest in people's health."

With human lives at stake, smoking cannot be considered as innocent until proved guilty, but must stand guilty, on the evidence until proved innocent.

Presumably, the chairman, his board, and their sponsors would engage the medical profession and the public in "calm deliberation" for the next 40 or 50 years, when such direct evidence could be available from a human guinea-pig experiment set up today. As a scientist he knows such a direct-evidence experiment is impossible, and he utilizes its impossibility for continuing productive, long-term delay. Success of this strategy is reflected in the continued increase in cigarette sales—an indication of the public's need for the facts. It will be interesting to follow the tobacco industry's response to the invitation of the Federal Trade Commission to cooperate in developing uniform specifications for testing cigarette smoke for tars and nicotine "to end confusion arising from widely varying tests conducted privately by the companies."

Most scientists closest to the total evidence now agree that cigarette smoking is a highly significant cause in the majority of cases of lung cancer.

The immediate duty of the physician, of the educator, of the parent, and of the governmental and voluntary health agencies is obvious—a concerted educational attack that will rout the formidable force executing the delaying action and speed its spokesman on his prophesied, inevitable, penitential "trip to Canossa."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 7, 1960]

TOBACCO PROPAGANDA

What is ethical advertising? Certainly it is not the kind practiced by much of the American tobacco industry. Through misleading claims, campaigns to encourage teenage smokers, and attacks on warnings about tobacco, the industry is out to sell cigarettes, no matter what.

In appeal to the teenager and beginning smoker half a dozen companies each claim their brand to be lowest in tar and nicotine. In the meantime the industry's public relations organization, Tobacco Institute, Inc., seeking to meet anticigarette campaigns in the schools, has boosted its budget this year for protobacco propaganda in counterattack.

Picturing smoking as a necessary activity "of the good American way of life," the industry tries to make all nonsmokers and opponents of smoking appear as killjoys. It seeks to create a picture of "a strong, sadistic bluenose element that is forever puritanically dead set against anyone else's taking an innocent enjoyment or pleasure in anything-at-all."

Added to the danger in the tobacco industry's effort to educate the teenager to smoke is its additional attempt to bar from the public information unfavorable to cigarettes. Consumer Reports, quoting Advertising Age, tells of one incident where "serious complaints from cigarette advertisers" forced the removal of an advertisement of the Reader's Digest from New York commuter trains. (The Digest has been prominent in reporting factual studies of cigarettes.)

A New York Times report quotes an advertising executive: "If I think that some anticigarette copy would make (major cigarette advertisers) unhappy with me, I have to think twice about accepting it."

Such tactics violate basic American concepts of freedom. The Federal Trade Commission is beginning to move against misleading tobacco advertising. It should also tackle coercive use of tobacco money-power to suppress advertising. And every group devoted to the public welfare should become aroused to resist more militantly both subtle and blatant aggressions by the tobacco pushers.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the history of the United States emphasizes the fact that as our population increases so does the need to conserve our natural resources.

National awareness of this fact has been aroused in several ways dating back to colonial days, but especially to the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt and the great work of Gifford Pinchot and others.

If a need existed sufficient to inspire those great men and citizens of that era, even greater need exists today. The burden of tomorrow's conservation will rest, as it always does, upon today's children.

Thus, schoolwork directed toward that objective should receive appropriate attention, and I am convinced that it does in a majority of our public schools.

Occasionally, however, a group of students exhibits unusual interest in conservation and produces an outstanding school conservation project or exhibit.

I have just received such a piece of work from the McCoy Elementary School at Aztec, N. Mex., the county seat of San Juan County, one of the Nation's richest in undeveloped natural resources.

Guided by Curn C. Harvey, the students of that school published a special edition of their school publication, the Aztec Siren, and attracted guest articles by Interior Secretary Fred Seaton and Mr. Marshall D. Dana, first president of the National Reclamation Association. A number of other writers on conservation also contributed.

I wish it were possible for all Senators to examine the work these children performed. The artwork, the text, the several colors, the time devoted to this special editor of the Siren are of a nature to make all Americans proud.

Recognizing limitations upon insertions into the RECORD, I am not going to ask that the text of this publication be reproduced here. The artwork and the colors would not appear and they are an essential part of this special edition.

However, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of a letter I have received from Mr. Harvey, in which he describes the enthusiasm the project aroused in the Aztec students, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sending you a copy of our special edition of the Aztec Siren because I know that it deals with a subject close to your heart—conservation of natural resources. And I also know that it is a problem of vital concern to the Congress of the United States.

This special edition grew out of an interest of the school boys and girls and their parents. As you know, the entire economy of New Mexico and especially of sections such as San Juan County is entirely dependent upon wise use of resources. In studying the topic, we found many instances in which New Mexico has led the way in the wise use of natural resources.

You will note that the date on this special edition is January 1960. It will be released at the end of the second week in January when we present an assembly program on conservation. The reason the paper is finished so long in advance is that once the boys and girls dug into the subject they became so absorbed in it that there was no stopping them. Talk about a good science project, study of our natural resources and how they should be used positively can't be beat.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the first session of this Congress the Senate approved a bill dealing with depressed areas. The bill contained roughy $389 million in grants and loans, and is presently pending in the House of Representatives.

A great deal has been said about depressed areas, and I caught the overtones of some remarks on the Senate floor yesterday. In that connection I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which comes from the Marion Daily Republican in southern Illinois, in the very heart of what is alleged to be the depressed area in our State.

This enterprising newspaper undertook to query six banks in six different communities in this one county and, lo and behold, notwithstanding the tag of "depressed area," the bank deposits in those six banks since last year have increased $3.9 million and total assets have increased by $4.3 million. That very properly inspires the question, Mr. President, how does one raise bank deposits in six small country banks, so to speak, by $3.9 million in a single year if the area is depressed?

So I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD, along with my observations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS TERRIBLE "DEPRESSED AREA"(?)

Senator DOUGLAS and Congressman KENNETH GRAY, both Democrats and both candidates for reelection, have been telling the

world that we live in a "depressed area" with terrible unemployment problems.

An examination of the deposits of the six banks in Williamson County will give the lie to such reports. In 1 year—just 12 months—the deposits of the six county banks have grown by $3,949,298.49.

The total assets have grown in the same 12 months from $33,558,090.54 to $37,891,146.04, or a total of $4,333,055.50. These are not figures taken from thin air, but taken from their reports to the State banking examiners. They can be verified and are as follows:

	Deposits	Total assets	Deposits	Total assets	Increase in assets
The Bank of Marion	$9,937,692.13	$11,443,891.13	$9,463,058.52	$10,828,672.55	$615,218.58
Bank of Egypt	4,297,273.29	4,720,880.00	3,731,897.90	4,096,130.82	624,749.18
Carterville State & Savings Bank	2,851,774.06	3,222,893.29	2,555,009.74	2,891,291.23	331,602.16
Johnston City State Bank	2,322,406.83	2,514,519.46	2,201,491.28	2,376,681.46	137,838.00
The Bank of Herrin	11,268,464.91	12,345,511.84	9,572,898.08	10,554,019.93	1,891,491.91
Herrin Security Bank	3,371,762.33	3,643,450.32	2,575,719.54	2,811,294.55	832,155.77
Total	34,049,373.55	37,891,146.04	30,100,075.06	33,558,090.54	4,333,055.50
Increase in total deposits in 1 year					3,949,298.49
Increase in total assets in 1 year					4,333,055.50

Senator DOUGLAS and Congressman GRAY will you now please put away your vote-getting campaign by telling the world we are depressed and have thousands of unemployed? You cannot live in a depressed community and have your bank assets grow $4⅓ million in 1 year.

The Chicago Tribune, in speaking of Senator DOUGLAS' efforts to damage the economy of southern Illinois through calling us depressed said "he will change his tune as soon as he discovers southern Illinois resents his efforts to make it a community of beggars."

INVITATIONS SENT OUT FOR THE 1964 NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to announce this morning that yesterday the Secretary of State, in the name of the President of the United States, sent to the Ambassadors of all foreign nations represented in this country an invitation to participate in the 1964 New York World's Fair.

The invitation keynotes the theme of the fair, "Peace through understanding," and outlines the process whereby New York City was recommended by the Presidential Commission on a World Fair. The Commisison's report and recommendations were accepted by the President on October 29, 1959. Secretary Herter's invitation quoted from this report and cited the great and mounting enthusiasm in this country for a dynamic and far-reaching cultural, economic, and scientific expression of America's stature in the world of 1964.

Mr. President, I am confident that the 1964 fair will inspire a full and free sharing of ideas among all the nations of the world. I am extremely proud that New York City, as the home of the United Nations, and a great trade and cultural center, has been selected for this high honor.

The 1964 World's Fair is a long way off. The die has now been cast with the sending out of invitations to the nations of the world. I am hopeful that participation of foreign nations in this fair will be extensive. I am hopeful that the newly independent nations of the world will take this opportunity to show us their accomplishments and tell us of their objectives. I am hopeful, too, that the nations of Europe and of the Soviet bloc will come forth to affirm their desire for increased international understanding and cooperation in all fields of endeavor.

Mr. President, I salute all of the men and women of the great city of New York who have worked long and hard for the 1964 World's Fair. Their job is by no means over. It is just beginning. The Secretary's invitation marks a beginning and a challenge—a challenge to fulfill the aims of all of us for a most successful and worthwhile American World's Fair in 1964.

Mr. President, I ask at this time that a sample copy of the invitation to foreign governments to participate in the New York 1964 World's Fair be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the copy of the invitation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to Their Excellencies and Messieurs the Chiefs of Mission and has the honor to transmit from the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, an invitation to take an active part in the 1964 World's Fair to be held at New York, N.Y., in that year in celebration of the tercentenary anniversary of the city of New York, and to encourage and assist their commercial, industrial, trade, educational, artistic, and other cultural groups to participate in this fair.

The 1964 World's Fair at New York has adopted as its theme, "Peace Through Understanding," and is sponsored as an event of primary international significance. Although held under private auspices, it enjoys the support and cooperation of the governments of the State of New York and the city of New York, as well as prominent business, civic, industrial, trade, and labor organizations having national and international ties of great importance.

The selection of the city of New York as the location for the 1964 World's Fair was recommended by a Presidential Commission in a report approved by the President of the United States of America on October 29, 1959. This report included the following statements:

"In recent years the United States, through all levels of our public and private life, has participated in many great fairs in various parts of the world. * * * A world's fair in an American city would typify our continuing efforts to cooperate with other peoples in peaceful pursuits of mutual benefit. It would provide a fitting occasion to welcome to our country visitors and participants from all over the world to mingle with our people in an atmosphere of good will and cultural enjoyment. It would encourage constructive trade and competition and contribute to economic development and the cause of peace.

"We recommend that this exposition should be held in New York during 1964. We believe that New York, as a symbol of freedom to millions of immigrants and others, * * * and as one of the world's outstanding centers of culture, finance, trade, and industry fully measures up to the highest standards for the holding of such a fair. * * * New York, of all American cities, is the best qualified to accomplish the monumental effort required."

For these reasons, and also because 1964 will mark the 15th anniversary of New York as the permanent home of the United Nations, the Department of State favors the holding of such an important international exposition and hopes that as many nations as possible will be represented at the 1964 World's Fair at New York.

The General Regulations of the New York World's Fair will be made available at the earliest opportunity. Correspondence and inquiries concerning the New York World's Fair should be addressed to the New York World's Fair 1964 Corp., Empire State Building, New York 1, N.Y.

The Secretary of State takes pleasure in bringing to your attention the recommendation of Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, that there be maximum participation by foreign nations and their nationals in the 1964 World's Fair to be programed and executed by the city of New York and would be grateful if each Chief of Mission would forward this information to his government.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
WASHINGTON, *January 21, 1960.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask that a copy of the letter from Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York City, accompanying the Secretary's invitation, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1959.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to extend to your government a formal invitation to participate in a World's Fair to be held in the city of New York to celebrate its tercentenary anniversary in the year 1964.

The holding of this fair has been approved by the President of the United States on the recommendation of a Special Presidential Commission appointed by him which, under date of October 29, 1959, recommended to the President of the United States that the holding of an international exposition of the first category in the city of New York in 1964 should be supported by the Federal Government and which Commission further recommended that "New York City, of all American cities, is best qualified to accomplish the monumental effort required."

The President of the United States also approved the recommendations of the Presidential Commission to assist in obtaining maximum participation by foreign nations in the New York City 1964 World's Fair.

I would like to express our sincere wish that the commercial, industrial, and trade organizations in your country might also exhibit at the 1964 New York World's Fair and that your Government will assist them in arranging for their participation.

This 1964 New York World's Fair has taken for its theme, the significant words, "Peace Through Understanding" and it is our hope that the exhibitors, both governmental and private, will demonstrate to the millions of visitors to the fair, the interdependence of all nations and people to the end that through this 1964 New York World's Fair, all who visit it will carry away with them a deeper understanding of each of the nations of the world—an understanding that will help to promote that peace sought by all peoples everywhere.

The occasion for this fair, our tercentenary anniversary, enables me to call to your attention the close ties between New York City

and the nations of the world. In these 300 years, through our city have come millions of immigrants, who have brought to this Nation the culture and national backgrounds of every nation on earth. These immigrants, by their later citizenship in the United States have created ties with all nations that have and will ever be a major influence in the mutual good will between our great country and yours. Our great city has been the host to the leaders of other nations, and time and time again has, we hope, supplied living proof that peoples of many national origins, race, color, and creed can live together in peace and harmony.

I believe that the 1964 New York World's Fair to be held in honor of this anniversary will truly be an event of international importance. In 1964, it will have been 25 years since last the nations of the world met in our city to exchange cultural, commercial, and industrial ideas. Then we called that World Fair, "The World of Tomorrow." When one considers the strides that have been made since that time, the new discoveries and industries that were then undreamed of—atomic power, television, cybernetics—it is not difficult to picture the wonders that this 1964 New York World's Fair will reveal.

The city of New York is, I believe, a most desirable place for the holding of this world's fair. The site of the previous fair held in the United States in the year 1939 is admirably adapted and has been made available for the 1964 New York World's Fair. This location, at Flushing Meadow, was originally prepared at a cost in excess of $26 million—and has been preserved as a park during the years since 1939. In addition, since the establishment of the United Nations Headquarters in New York City, our city has become increasingly important in international affairs; and is, we hope you will agree, the leading center of trade and commerce in the world today. It is the largest city on this continent and possesses more facilities for housing, transporting, feeding and entertaining visitors than any other city in the United States.

This fair has the full support of all segments of business, industry, and culture of the city and State and the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, has pledged the full support of the State of New York to this exposition and has joined in our request that the Federal Government transmit this invitation to your Government.

Detailed information about the 1964 New York World's Fair will be communicated to you by the fair's management.

Most respectfully,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor.

RECENT EVENTS IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recent events in Cuba are cause for concern of all people who are interested in the progress, cooperation, and strength of the Western Hemisphere. It appears that Premier Castro's personal vendetta against the world and particularly his anti-American policies have reached the point of no return.

Historically, a bridge of friendship has always joined Cuba with the U.S. mainland. It is not our wish to have that bridge disappear and to see Cuba emerge as an aircraft carrier off our shores, operating as enemy rather than friend, and menacing the peace and the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, the wholly arbitrary acts of the Castro government in its assumption of rights to control of American-owned lands and businesses constitute an affront both to established treaties and contracts and to the dignity of the United States.

In my view, it is high time for a massive reappraisal of American policies toward Cuba. Admittedly, this is a thorny task, involving as it does intertwining economic interests and close bonds of friendship between the two countries.

The present emergency suggests strongly the need for warranted counter action in the form of legislation giving the President the authority to revise the terms and conditions of the Sugar Act in such a manner as to bring home to the Castro regime the economic facts of life that bear heavily upon the stability of the Cuban Government.

Furthermore, the state of affairs in Cuba remains not only a threat to our national interests, but also a source of concern with respect to the broad international interests of the Americas. Cuba, in its present posture of enmity and defiance, stands as a cloud on ill omen that may well spread its pernicious influence into other Latin-American nations. This situation raises the question as to whether the times may not already be here to make a critical appraisal of the need for a reevaluation of the Monroe Doctrine, and a possible rewriting of it in terms of threats to hemispheric defense and solidarity from within. The cancer of communism must not be allowed to grow in this hemisphere. The overthrow of Dictator Batista was hailed by all as a triumph of democratic forces in Cuba. It now becomes apparent that the so-called revolution is merely a reorientation of dictatorships, with consequences perhaps even more menacing, even more far reaching.

If Premier Castro insists on being the Pecks bad boy of international politics, the pressure of the world community—either through the good offices of the U.S. Government, the Organization of American States, or the United Nations, must be brought to bear on him. Immature and misguided acts by a dictator basking in the self-delusion of his own infallibility should not be allowed to interfere with the harmony and friendly relations of all our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere.

It is my fervent hope that the course of events may transform Cuba into the land it has been, the land its citizens surely want it to be: the home of a free people, the home of a traditional friend and neighbor of the United States.

THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first let me say that in all my experience in this body this is the first time I have ever seen the majority leader or acting majority leader presiding over the Senate. I congratulate the acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] upon his rise to such eminent heights. I hope we shall not take undue advantage of him while he is in a position in which he cannot talk for the next few minutes. [Laughter.]

This morning, in the New York Times dated Friday, January 22, there is an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, on the editorial page, which I believe is one of the most objective and realistic articles I have seen on the problems which face us from the psychological point of view, and from the point of view of the people of our country as a whole.

The article is critical of the administration in one sense, and it is critical of the party of which the majority leader is a member in another sense. But essentially it points out the fact that underlying the entire picture is the psychology of the American people. To change that psychology, if it is necessary to change it, becomes the responsibility of all parties—the President's party as well as the Democratic Party.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Krock printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, because I feel that it is exceedingly important.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRUE BILL THAT NEEDS TO BE BROADENED
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—There is sound basis for the criticism that the President's messages to Congress this year stress the production of private possessions, which could be spared, over national needs, which must be supplied if the United States is to attain and keep the power level required to effect its proclaimed objectives and the security of its system. But the indictment will have to be broadened to include all those responsible, if a sense of urgency is to replace the Nation's sybaritic psychology.

To point out that the President and his administration alone cannot change this economic, social and political psychology of the American people is not to excuse or condone their boast of its material products. The same would be true if the Republican Party alined itself solidly behind such an effort at correction. Unless the principal leaders of the Democratic Party, their political allies among the special interest pressure groups, and the financiers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs of private luxury goods fully cooperate to this end with a President, Republican or Democrat, the productive emphasis of the Nation on private possessions will continue until reversed by a bitter common experience of disaster. And where is the public man who reveals the courage to make the demand on all those responsible, and specify the exactions they would have to fulfill?

If, for example, the national revenues are to produce the additional funds required for better education, closer competition with Soviet Russia in missiles and so on, higher taxes must immediately be levied. But how many politicians, labor leaders, and spokesmen of special interest groups are urging this on an adequate scale in this year of a presidential election? If taxes are to be increased sufficient to these vital purposes, which of these groups is also demanding that the tax structure be at the same time made equitable so that the drain of greater levies will not be imposed on those already taxed toward the point of confiscation and penalized for ability and success?

Prolonged strikes in essential industry, in pursuit of an ever-ascending wage scale beyond a compensating rise in productivity, are a constant threat to any form of the economy, however it may be downgraded from consumer goods production. But neither this Republican administration nor the Democratic Party—certainly no labor leader—has ventured to champion any effective curbs on the monopoly power of organized labor and sustains the threat.

Many who criticize the administration for its concept of prosperity as primarily a rising flow of consumer goods are advocates of a planned economy. Inevitably politicians employ this system to dispense the larger earnings of one community to pay for the better education, and so forth, in others which learned under the New Deal that Washington could be relied on to subsidize local neglect of private and public obligations. But these particular critics, precisely like the special-interest blocs, refuse to accept the lesson of experience that the President could not achieve the benefits of the changed psychology they are urging except under the free enterprise system for which they would substitute a form of collectivism.

This would be the substitute, because these advocates of a planned economy, like the others who lay all the blame on the administration for its concept of prosperity and security, are urging that Federal funds be supplied for the better local education, slum clearance and the rest, which are being subordinated to consumer-goods production. And the teaching of human experience is that with the growth of Federal financing of local obligations Central Government direction grows in direct proportion.

One fundamental cause of the suffusion of the economy with luxury goods is the artificial stimulation of consumption by high-pressure advertising and easy installment buying. But, when this has the inevitable result of individual debt and default, the political community demands lower interest rates and easier money. And, since to reduce both sources of lopsided production would mean at least temporary unemployment, the leaders of labor become the principal champions of artificial stimulations.

The administration certainly has followed the trend toward more and more consumer production of articles in a time when the trend should be reversed. But the same indictment can be made of its political opposition and pressure-group allies.

INDUSTRIAL PERSONNEL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on June 30, 1959, the Supreme Court in its decision in Greene against McElroy struck down the industrial personnel security program on the ground that neither the President nor Congress had authorized the Secretary of Defense to deprive a person of his job in a proceeding in which he was not afforded the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination of his accusers. In presenting the opinion of the Court, Chief Justice Warren said, in part:

> Certain principles have remained relatively immutable in our jurisprudence. One of these is that where governmental action seriously injures an individual, and the reasonableness of the action depends on factfindings, the evidence used to prove the Government's case must be disclosed to the individual so that he has an opportunity to show that it is untrue. While this is important in the case of documentary evidence, it is even more important where the evidence consists of the testimony of individuals whose memory might be faulty or who, in fact, might be perjurers or persons motivated by malice, vindictiveness, intolerance, prejudice, or jealousy. We have formalized these protections in the requirements of confrontation and cross-examination. They have ancient roots. They find expression in the sixth amendment which provides that in all criminal cases the accused shall enjoy the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him.
>
> This Court has been zealous to protect these rights from erosion. It has spoken out not only in criminal cases, but also in all types of cases where administrative and regulatory actions were under scrutiny. Nor, as it has been pointed out, has Congress ignored these fundamental requirements in enacting regulatory legislation.

On the day of the Court's decision, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I scheduled hearings to consider methods which would assure due process of law and fair hearing procedures in loyalty-security programs, including the industrial personnel security program. An invitation was extended to the Secretary of Defense and to the Attorney General to appear before the subcommittee and present their views.

The subcommittee heard two witnesses on July 7, 1959, and expected to continue with the hearing of testimony from the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General. The Attorney General declined the invitation in a reply which suggested that the problem was primarily that of the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense also declined an appearance until the matter could be given further study and the position of the executive branch established. The letter concluded with the statement that—

> Upon the establishment of an executive branch position I shall communicate with you further.

Since that time there have been several reports in the newspapers that the industrial security program would be dealt with through an Executive order. I have had additional correspondence with the Secretary of Defense regarding these reports, and on September 22, 1959, received the assurance from the Department's General Counsel, J. Vincent Burke, Jr., that—

> You may be sure that upon the establishment of an executive branch position we will communicate with you further.

A few days ago another such report of an impending Executive order reestablishing the industrial personnel security program, appeared in the New York Times of January 17, 1960. This news story, written by Anthony Lewis, spells out in considerable detail the provisions of the Executive order which is expected to be issued within the next few weeks.

My reason for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time is that though the administration has apparently arrived at a well-developed position on the industrial personnel security program, it has not informed the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, though such information was assured in a letter signed by the present Secretary of Defense and again in a letter from the Department's General Counsel.

There is of course no obligation on the executive branch to consult with the Senate on the issuance of an Executive order. However, should the Senate wish to consider legislation on an industrial security program it is entitled to an opinion from the executive agency—in this case the Department of Defense—which might be designated to administer the program.

There is a further matter of concern. While the Supreme Court did not rule on the constitutionality of a program which denied full confrontation and an opportunity to cross-examine accusing parties, the language of the opinion indicated clearly that should such procedures be reinstated by Executive order or by statute, the Court would apparently not hesitate to rule on the constitutional question. Justice Clark, the single dissenter in the Greene case, observed in his opinion:

> While the Court disclaims deciding this constitutional question, no one reading the opinion will doubt that the explicit language of its broad sweep speaks in prophecy.

The proposed Executive order reported to be in circulation in several executive departments apparently provides exceptions to the rule of full confrontation. One exception applies to regularly established confidential informants. Another applies to casual informants—neighbors, acquaintances, the corner grocery clerk, and similar persons who have no connection whatever with our intelligence agencies or the FBI. According to the news report, the head of a department or his "special designee" could rule that statements from such casual informants could be accepted as evidence without the charged person being given an opportunity to confront and cross-examine his accuser. Exceptions to the rule of confrontation could be made administratively on such vague grounds as "good and sufficient cause."

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights began its operations in 1955 and first concerned itself with the administration of the loyalty-security program as it related to constitutional rights. A number of the cases heard were subsequently adjudicated by the courts and serve to illustrate the dangers of administrative procedures which are vaguely defined and careless of the safeguards of constitutional law.

If the executive branch proposes to deal with the industrial personnel security program administratively, it will do well to avoid its earlier mistakes and to heed the admonition of the Court in the Greene case which makes this action necessary. The Court stated:

> Without explicit action by lawmakers, decisions of great constitutional import and effect would be relegated by default to administrators who, under our system of government, are not endowed with authority to decide them.

It would indeed be unfortunate if the executive branch should institute a new program which invited a new round of litigation in which the Supreme Court would be required to finally resolve the constitutional issue.

I have written the Secretary of Defense again requesting that he appear before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to present the position of the executive branch on this serious problem. I sincerely hope that he will accept the invitation and that we may look forward to a program which promotes the national security and also safeguards our cherished constitutional liberties.

Mr. President, I invite attention to well-written articles discussing these problems, "The Right of Confrontation," by Robert B. McKay, professor of law,

New York University, published in the Washington University Law Quarterly, volume 1959, No. 2; and "Nonconfrontation in Security Cases: The Greene Decision," by Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., attorney in some of these cases, published in the Virginia Law Review, 1959, volume 45, No. 7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks at this place in the RECORD the article above referred to by Anthony Lewis, printed in the January 17, 1960, New York Times; New York Times editorial published the following day; article by Peter Kihss entitled "Hearing Is Urged on Security Code—Workers Defense Unit Also Asks That Judges Rule on Denials of Confrontation," published in the New York Times January 18, 1960; editorial entitled "No Place for a Detour," published in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, January 20, 1960; and an exchange of correspondence on the subject between the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and the Departments of Defense and Justice, from January 30, 1959, through January 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1960]

DEFENSE WORKERS TO GET NEW RIGHT IN SECURITY CASES—ADMINISTRATION STUDIES DRAFT OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER ON CONFRONTING ACCUSERS

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—The administration will soon set up a new industrial security program making significant concessions to the principle that suspects should be able to confront their accusers.

The existing program, covering defense plant workers, was struck down by the Supreme Court last June 29. The Court held that neither Congress nor the President had authorized a system in which informants' names were kept secret.

Administration lawyers have been struggling since then to write an Executive order that would satisfy the Court's demand for fair procedures—and at the same time satisfy investigative agencies' fears about disclosure of their secrets.

The White House is now circulating a draft order among interested agencies—the Defense, Justice and State Departments, Atomic Energy Commission, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ORDER EXPECTED SOON

President Eisenhower is likely to issue the order within a few weeks.

The draft order makes it the general rule that anyone charged under the industrial security program shall have the right to cross-examine any source of information against him. Two specific exceptions are made to the general assumption.

First, the name of a genuine confidential informant—such as a Federal Bureau of Investigation informant inside the Communist Party—may be withheld from the accused individual under certain circumstances.

The head of the department supplying the information would personally have to certify that the source is a confidential informant who has been engaged in obtaining intelligence information for the Government, and that to disclose his identity would be substantially harmful to the national interest.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ROLE

If an FBI report were involved, for example, such a certification would have to be made by the head of the Justice Department, the Attorney General. No department head would be allowed to delegate this job of certifying genuine confidential informants.

Second, provision is made for the use in special circumstances of statements made by so-called casual informants, such as neighbors of the accused individual, without their being available for cross-examination.

The head of the department handling the security case, or his "special designee," would have to determine that such a source of information could not appear in person because of "death, severe illness, or some other good and sufficient cause."

Further, there would have to be a determination that failure to receive the statement from this casual informant would be "substantially harmful to the national security."

Finally, in any case where cross-examination of a casual informant was denied, only the head of the department involved could make a final decision to deny the accused man security clearance. And the department head would be required to consider, in deciding the case, the suspect's lack of opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses.

A number of lawyers within the Government regard those two exceptions as too broad—especially the power to keep casual informants secret for an undefined "good and sufficient cause." Other provisions of the draft order are being criticized as too open to unfair administration.

Nevertheless, the whole approach of the draft is a sharp change in what has been the consistent policy of all Government security programs over the last dozen years.

The presumption has been that the accused individual had no right to know his accusers' names or cross-examine them. Security officials have had no obligation to come forward with live witnesses; in many hearings the Government has produced no witnesses, relying wholly on undisclosed statements.

Under the proposed new industrial security program, the situation would be psychologically reversed.

The presumption would be that the hearing board or official making the decision would see and hear only what the accused individual sees and hears—as in a judicial trial. The burden would be on security officials to show some special reason for changing that presumption.

The draft, as now written, does not contain a flat statement of this presumption—that decisions shall be based on the open hearing record, with the specific exceptions provided. Some lawyers considering the proposal feel strongly that it should have such a statement of policy.

Another section of the proposed Executive order that has given rise to some confusion and concern deals with the use of classified documents in security proceedings. Though it does not say so, investigative reports may be included.

The draft says that the head of the department concerned, or his special designee, may permit the use of such documents without the accused individual's seeing them if they are relevant and if failure to admit them would be substantially harmful to the national security.

Furthermore, the accused is to be given a summary of the document as complete as security considerations permit. And if such a document is admitted, only the department head itself could make a final decision against the individual security clearance.

What confuses and concerns the critics of this provision is the thought that it may be inconsistent with the two relatively carefully defined exceptions allowing the use of informants' statements without cross-examination.

If a hearing board is given carte blanche to see the complete investigative report on an individual, it will undoubtedly read a number of unidentified adverse comments on him. The critics feel that the drafters of the new program did not intend such a result but that they should make their intention clearer.

The draft order would retain the present standard that clearance may be given only when clearly consistent with the national security.

THREE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND CLEARED

About 3,500,000 defense-plant workers have been cleared to date under the industrial security program. The number denied clearance has been running as a tiny fraction of those cleared.

In the year 1958, for example, 49 persons were denied clearance after formal hearings. Forty-three dropped their application for clearance after receiving a statement of charges.

The Defense Department has a central screening board here that decides whether to bring formal charges against anyone. Since the Supreme Court's decision last June, cases have kept coming into the board.

The screening board has cleared all persons as to whom adverse information did not justify formal charges. It has had about 100 cases in which it thought charges should be filed, but it has done nothing about those pending new legal authority for the program.

About 100 persons have been left in limbo as a result. A man may have applied for clearance last July, for example, and not received any answer. All these cases will presumably be acted upon as soon as the President issues the new Executive order.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1960]

THE RIGHT OF CONFRONTATION

The sixth amendment states that "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to be confronted with the witnesses against him." Proceedings under the so-called industrial security program, involving some 3½ million defense workers, are not criminal prosecutions, yet under them an accused or suspected person may lose his job and his reputation. The Supreme Court dealt with this issue last June, but confined itself to the decision that neither Congress nor President had authorized industrial security proceedings lacking the constitutional safeguard.

As Anthony Lewis reported to this newspaper yesterday, the administration is now trying to draft an Executive order that will meet the situation this created. This order would make "significant concessions to the principle that suspects should be able to confront their accusers." There are, however, disquieting exceptions. It is proposed that the names of confidential informants—a term which seems to include gossiping neighbors as well as authorized FBI agents—may be withheld if a designated official thinks it would be "substantially harmful to the national interest" to disclose them.

The proposed Executive order is still apparently in the formative stage. Those who are mulling it over may well ask themselves which is the more important to our security: the eternal rights and liberties that characterize a free country or the convenience of a few transient officials.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1960]

HEARING IS URGED ON SECURITY CODE—WORKERS DEFENSE UNIT ALSO ASKS THAT JUDGES RULE ON DENIALS OF CONFRONTATION

(By Peter Kihss)

President Eisenhower was urged yesterday to provide for public hearings on new regulations for the industrial security program before an Executive order is formally pro-

mulgated. The program covers perhaps 3 million defense plant workers.

The Workers Defense League here also proposed that a Federal judge rule on each case in which an accused was denied the right to confront a witness or examine a document.

Under a reported new Government plan, a department head would certify any denial of confrontation as substantially harmful to the national interest or security.

SEES "SERIOUS EFFORT"

In asking for hearings, the 24-year-old legal aid group said the draft of the new program, as reported in the New York Times yesterday, appears to be a serious effort to comply with the spirit as well as the language of the Supreme Court decision, which last June struck down an earlier program.

The Court held that neither the President nor Congress had authorized a denial of confrontation.

In a letter, Vera Rony, national secretary, and Carl Rachlin, general counsel, said the league had long been active in the security field, and was devoted both to constitutional safeguards of due process and the requirements of national security.

The league proposal would have a judge, on application of an accused, decide whether confrontation or examination of a document would be injurious to the national interest.

"In the event that the judge ruled that no such damage would follow," they went on, "the Government would either permit confrontation or withdraw its complaint. If, alternatively, the judge rules that the Government is justified in denying confrontation, the hearing would proceed in its normal course."

They compared this with examination before trial in civil lawsuits. Its value, they said, would be that the decision on confrontation "would be taken out of the hands of Government officials whose complete objectivity may be open to question."

In a separate comment, Stanley Faulkner, of 9 East 40th Street, who estimated he had been counsel in more than 100 security risk cases under various programs, said the reported new program falls far short.

The sources of evidence, Mr. Faulkner said, should be made available to an accused. He declared that security to our country is not achieved by protecting informants from cross-examination, and under such protection depriving people of their constitutional rights.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 20, 1960]

NO PLACE FOR A DETOUR

The U.S. Constitution says that "in all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall be confronted with the witnesses against him." This right to confrontation was a factor in the case of the $18,000-a-year Maryland industrialist, William Lewis Greene, who was discharged from his executive position by his company after his security clearance was removed by the Defense Department. His company was engaged almost solely in Navy contract work. Greene took his case to the Supreme Court where he won, 8 to 1, last June. Chief Justice Warren, speaking for the majority, said that neither Congress by statute nor the President by Executive order had authorized the Defense Department's procedure of withholding a man's accusers yet at the same time depriving him of his employment.

Now comes word that the administration is preparing an Executive order, in which the Justice and Defense Departments and all other interested agencies would join, to cover such cases as the Greene case. Presumably in some form it would seek to preserve the power to invoke security procedures without permitting the accused to confront his accusers.

We hope Attorney General Rogers will be very sure of each step he takes in this matter. There is not the slightest showing, so far as we have seen, that the Greene decision has placed the national security in jeopardy. If the handling of defense contracts has been embarrassed, that has not been demonstrated either.

Let us not forget the words of Chief Justice Warren in the Greene decision. Declaring that "certain principles remain relatively immutable in our jurisprudence," he said that one of these is that "where governmental action seriously injures an individual, and the reasonableness of the action depends on factfindings, the evidence used to provide the Government's case must be disclosed to the individual so he has an opportunity to show that it is untrue. While this is important in documentary evidence, it is even more important where the evidence consists of the testimony of individuals whose memory might be faulty or who, in fact might be perjurers or persons motivated by malice, vindictiveness, intolerance, prejudice, or jealousy. We have formalized these protections in the requirements of confrontation and cross-examination."

If any attack is to be made on the Greene decision, let it be straightforward, with full opportunity for congressional and public debate. A tricky order would look mighty small when set beside the Supreme Court's sound and wholly reasonable Greene decision.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
January 21, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The attached news article by Anthony Lewis, from the January 17, 1960, New York Times, reporting that an Executive order reestablishing the industrial personnel security program will soon be issued, has just come to my attention. It has been my understanding from earlier correspondence with the Secretary of Defense that such action would not be taken before the Secretary's views had been given to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

On June 30, 1959, I extended an invitation to your predecessor, the Honorable Neil H. McElroy, to appear before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to present the Secretary's views on methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under the industrial personnel security program, in keeping with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Greene case which invalidated that program.

The invitation was declined in a communication signed by yourself, dated July 10, 1959, suggesting that further study of the problem was needed before a position of the executive branch could be established. On that occasion you stated: "Upon the establishment of an executive branch position, I shall communicate with you further regarding such an appearance."

In subsequent correspondence, prompted by other reports in the newspapers that an Executive order reestablishing the industrial security program was imminent, this commitment to inform the subcommittee of the executive branch position was repeated.

The subcommittee would still like to hear the Secretary of Defense on this matter before an Executive order is issued. I am sure that a mutually convenient date can be arranged. Considering the grave constitutional issues involved in this matter, which are of profound interest to the Congress as well as the executive branch, I sincerely hope that you will accept this invitation to appear before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

I would appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1959.

Mr. CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, Jr.,
Chief Counsel and Staff Director,
Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights,
Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. SLAYMAN: This refers to your letter of October 26, 1959, with respect to action to be taken by the Government as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Greene case. I have reviewed the previous correspondence between the subcommittee and the Department of Defense and I believe it has been indicated that the executive branch as a whole has had under consideration since the issuance of that decision appropriate action to bring the industrial security program into consonance with the decision of the Court.

Both the possible issuance of an Executive order and the submission of proposed legislation to the Congress have been under consideration, but no final decision with respect to these has been made. I am sure you are aware that the decision to issue an Executive order is that of the President. In addition, any recommendation for legislation submitted by any branch of the executive department can be made only with the approval of the President, usually provided through the medium of the Bureau of the Budget. These decisions are, of course, not within the purview of the Department of Defense or of this office.

We will be pleased to receive copies of the subcommittee hearings of July 2 as soon as these are available. We have previously obtained copies of the statements of the witnesses which we have studied with interest.

Sincerely yours,

J. VINCENT BURKE, Jr.

OCTOBER 26, 1959.

Hon. J. VINCENT BURKE, Jr.,
General Counsel, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURKE: I am taking the liberty of writing you in connection with your letter dated September 22, 1959, which was a reply to the letter addressed to the Secretary of Defense dated September 12, 1959, by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, concerning hearing procedures under the industrial personnel security program.

I believe there is apprehension that hearing procedures will be established by Executive order for an industrial personnel security review program without legislative authorization because of a statement made on the floor of the House on Friday, September 11, 1959.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 15, p. 19123:

"RELATING TO SECURITY PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO DEFENSE CONTRACTORS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

"Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

"The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

"There was no objection.

"Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been scheduled under suspension of the rules H.R. 8121. I have just been informed that the matter involved in this bill will be treated with administratively, and therefore I wish to announce that there will be no motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill."

Seantor HENNINGS is expected to return within a few weeks and I merely wish to remind you that the Senate Constitutional

Rights Subcommittee wanted to be able to receive the views of the Department of Defense and, if necessary, the Department of Justice, before any industrial personnel security review program is established. As soon as a printed record of the public hearing held by the subcommittee on July 2, 1959—shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court decision in the *Greene* case—is available, we shall be happy to send you immediately as many copies as you desire.

Your continuing cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, JR.,
Chief Counsel and Staff Director.

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of September 12, 1959, with regard to the problem of establishing hearing procedures under the industrial security program of the Departmnet of Defense to meet the pronouncements of the Supreme Court in the Greene case.

The effect of the Greene case upon the future operation of the industrial security program has been the subject of study not only by this Department but by the executive branch of the Government as a whole. We are not aware of the source of the story in the Washington Evening Star of September 11, which you enclosed. I am informed that a decision with respect to this matter has not in fact been made.

You may be sure that upon the establishment of an executive branch position we will communicate with you further.

Sincerely yours,

J. VINCENT BURKE, Jr.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

The Honorable NEIL H. MCELROY,
The Secretary of Defense, the Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On June 30, 1959, and again on July 13, 1959, I wrote you a letter inviting you to appear before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to present the views of the Department of Defense concerning methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under the Federal loyalty security programs, particularly the industrial personnel security program.

On July 10, 1959, Deputy Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates replied to my initial letter, stating that the Department of Defense, together with other interested agencies of the Government, were engaged in an intensive study of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Greene case to determine its significance and effect on the future operations of the industrial security program. Secretary Gates stated that until such time as that study was completed, it would be inappropriate for any Department of Defense official to testify before this subcommittee, but that upon the establishment of an executive branch position he would communicate further with me regarding such an appearance.

In the light of Secretary Gates' letter, and a letter of similar import sent to me on July 16 by George W. Vaughan, assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs, it was highly disturbing to read in the Friday, September 11, edition of the Washington Evening Star a news dispatch reporting that the White House intends to issue an Executive order in the near future dealing with the industrial personnel security program. I trust that this news dispatch was in error, and that no such definitive action formalizing procedures in the industrial personnel security program will be taken before the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has the opportunity to hear the testimony of appropriate Government officials, including representatives from the Department of Defense.

I shall appreciate hearing from you immediately whether the study of the Greene decision referred to in Secretary Gates' letter has been completed, and if so, when it would be convenient for you and other appropriate officials of the Department of Defense to testify before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: This refers to your letter of July 13, 1959, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, indicating the desire of the committee to commence hearings on July 29.

As was indicated in this Department's letter of July 10, 1959, the Greene decision is being studied by the Department and by other interested agencies; and consideration is being given to whether the administration should make recommendations for legislation, and to any other steps which should be taken. I do not know at this time whether such studies will have been completed by July 29. The nature of the problem is covered in the Greene case opinion. Until a proposed solution is determined within the executive branch, there is, of course, little which a witness could contribute to the committee's study.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. VAUGHAN,
Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

JULY 13, 1959.

The Honorable NEIL H. MCELROY,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, in response to my letter to you dated June 30, 1959.

In my letter to you of June 30, inviting you to appear before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee to present your views on methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under Federal loyalty-security programs, particularly the industrial personnel security programs, I did not mention any specific date when the subcommittee would prefer to hear your testimony since I wanted to afford you the greatest possible leeway and convenience in fitting such an appearance into your schedule.

Since writing that letter, however, I have heard reports that as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Greene v. McElroy* the administration is considering the issuance of an Executive order covering, among other things, hearing procedures under the industrial personnel security program.

In view of the grave constitutional rights questions dealing with confrontation and cross-examination raised in the majority opinion in the Greene case, I think it is highly important, before any action is taken, either in the form of legislation or Executive order, to formulate new rules or authorization for the industrial personnel security program, that this subcommittee have the opportunity to hear the testimony of appropriate Government officials.

Accordingly, I have scheduled a hearing by the subcommittee for the morning of Wednesday, July 29, to hear your views as Secretary of Defense.

I hope that this date is convenient for you.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in regard to your letter of July 13 suggesting that I testify before your subcommittee on July 28, regarding the Supreme Court's decision in *Greene* v. *McElroy*. The administration has studied that decision and is considering what legislative recommendations, if any, to make as a result of it. It is also considering what action to take in the event it is decided that legislation is not advisable.

The industrial security program, as you know, is under the direct supervision of the Defense Department. The opinions in the Greene case set forth the nature and extent of the legal problems involved so that there is little or nothing that could be added by way of testimony in that regard at the present time.

Because there is little of a constructive or helpful nature which a representative of the Department of Justice could provide by testimony now it would be appreciated if any decision as to such testimony could be postponed at this time.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

JULY 13, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
The Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In my letter to you of June 30, inviting you to appear before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee to present your views on methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under Federal loyalty-security programs, particularly the industrial personnel security programs, I did not mention any specific date when the subcommittee would prefer to hear your testimony since I wanted to afford you the greatest possible leeway and convenience in fitting such an appearance into your schedule.

Since writing that letter, however, I have heard reports that, as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Greene* v. *McElroy*, the administration is considering the issuance of an Executive order covering, among other things, hearing procedures under the industrial personnel security program.

In view of the grave constitutional rights questions dealing with confrontation and cross-examination raised in the majority opinion in the Greene case, I think it is highly important, before any action is taken, either in the form of legislation or Executive order, to formulate new rules or authorization for the industrial personnel security program, that this subcommittee have the opportunity to hear the testimony of appropriate Government officials.

Accordingly, I have scheduled a hearing by the subcommittee for the morning of Tuesday, July 28, to hear your views as chief legal officer of the Government.

I hope that this date is convenient for you.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 10, 1959.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Your letter of June 30, 1959, inviting Mr. McElroy to present the views of the Department of Defense to your subcommittee concerning the methods for obtaining due process of law in hear-

ing procedures under the Federal loyalty-security programs is appreciated.

Since the Greene decision on June 29, the Department of Defense, together with other interested agencies of the Government, have been engaged in an intensive study of the decision to determine its significance and effect on the future operations of the industrial security program. Until such time as that study has been completed and a position of the executive branch established, I believe it would be inappropriate for any Department of Defense witness to testify before your subcommittee.

Upon the establishment of an executive branch position I shall communicate with you further regarding such an appearance.

Sincerely yours.

THOMAS S. GATES,
Deputy.

JUNE 30, 1959.

The Honorable NEIL H. MCELROY,
The Secretary of Defense,
The Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to invite you, as an interested Government official, to appear before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and present your views on methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under Federal loyalty-security programs, with particular reference to an industrial personnel security program.

For your convenience, I am enclosing copies of statements dated May 25, and June 25, 1959. As you will note, our first hearing will be held Thursday morning, July 2, 1959.

When would you prefer to testify?

I look forward to hearing from you about this matter in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
The Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is to invite you, as an interested Government official, to appear before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and present your views on methods of obtaining due process of law in hearing procedures under Federal loyalty-security programs, with particular reference to an industrial personnel security program.

I would also be interested in receiving your views on the use today of the "Attorney General's List" of proscribed organizations—how the list is compiled, how names of organizations are added to the list, how names are removed, and who uses the list for what purposes.

For your convenience, I am enclosing copies of statements dated May 25 and June 25, 1959. As you will note, our first hearing will be held Thursday morning, July 2, 1959.

When would you prefer to testify?

I look forward to hearing from you about this matter in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman.

NECESSITY FOR A NEW LOOK AT THE UNITED STATES-CUBAN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the difficulties arising out of the changeover in the government of Cuba—with its new policies and attitude toward the United States—requires, I believe, a new look at U.S. policy.

The United States, I believe, has a great stake in assuring good relations on a mutually beneficial basis with Cuba.

By experience, however, it has become increasingly evident that the changeover in governments of Cuba—accompanied by a revision of Cuban policy—has created new and difficult problems between the two countries.

Currently, for example, we face decisions on first, what action to take in relation to the sugar trade with Cuba—that is, whether to raise or lower the sugar quotas; and second, how best to protect—and obtain adequate compensation for—expropriated U.S. properties and investments in Cuba.

As I understand it, Ambassador Bonsal is coming back to Washington for further conferences on the situation.

In view of the criticalness of the situation—as well as the state of flux that exists—I believe the Congress should favorably consider any request by the President—as standardbearer of our foreign policy—for authority to raise or lower sugar quotas, if such acts best serve our national interests.

Unfortunately, there have been dissident voices which, by sometimes extreme criticism, have made more difficult the carrying on of what should be good, friendly relations between the two countries.

However, the situation will not be solved by blasts and counterblasts. Rather, the crisis requires calm, cool thinking, aimed toward finding constructive, and acceptable agreements to the differences.

Basically, we, in the United States, respect the rights of the Cuban people to pursue, by self-determination, their nationalistic goals. This concept is in complete accord with our own history. Despite the "wave of criticism," I have every confidence that there exists between the Cuban people and the citizens of the United States a strong bond of friendship, of mutual respect, and a desire for a better climate of relationships.

As a nation which has undergone the "trial-and-error process" in achieving our goals as a nation, the United States should appreciate—and attempt to patiently understand—the difficulties confronting the Cubans. At the same time, however, it is essential that efforts be made to protect U.S. interests and investments which are significant, not only to the American people, but also have been important to the Cuban economy.

I believe, therefore, that the United States should take a new look at its Cuban policy, to see what can be done to avert a real estrangement of the two Governments, to iron out the difficulties, and to improve relationships for the mutual benefit of the two nations.

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET WILL NOT FULFILL BENSON PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last year the Congress had presented to it a "program for the national forests." I take some personal pride in having joined with others in the Congress in urging over the last few years that this be done.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Benson's letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A report entitled "Program for the National Forests" is transmitted herewith for information of the Congress and appropriate reference.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in February 1953 called attention to the vast importance to this Nation, now and in the future, of our soil and water, our forests and minerals, and our wildlife resources. He indicated the need for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development.

On July 31, 1953, the President supplemented that message by sending to the Congress a special message relative to a program designed to conserve and improve the Nation's natural resources.

In referring to the national forests administered by this Department and to other public lands, the President stated in that special message that the Federal Government has a responsibility to manage wisely those public lands and forests under its jurisdiction necessary in the interest of the public as a whole. Important values exist in these lands for forest and mineral products, grazing, fish, and wildlife, and for recreation. Moreover, it is imperative to the welfare of thousands of communities and millions of acres of irrigated land that such lands be managed to protect the water supply and water quality which comes from them. In their utilization of these lands, the people are entitled to expect that their timber, minerals, streams and water supply, wildlife and recreational values should be safeguarded, improved and made available not only for this but for future generations. At the same time public lands should be made available for their best use under conditions that promote stability for communities and individuals and encourage full development of the resources involved.

Accordingly, provisions for a marked increase in management activities on the national forests have been made in recent years. These Federal properties have been substantially improved. The flow of values stemming from them has markedly increased. Our management experience clearly dictated the need for still more intensive development and management.

As a result, in 1956 I asked the Forest Service to develop a long-range conservation program for national-forest resources. The first result of this request was a 5-year program, "Operation Outdoors"; the second is the enclosed "Program for the National Forests."

This conservation program embraces all the renewable resources of the national-forest system—water, timber, recreation, forage, and wildlife habitat. It includes both long-range objectives and interim proposals. The program provides for the continued, orderly use and development of the renewable resources of these Federal lands in accordance with the basic conservation principles of sustained yield and multiple use. What is done in the next 10 to 15 years will largely determine whether these vastly important public lands will contribute by the year 2000 their fair share to a greatly expanded national economy.

The national forests are widely scattered throughout the United States, occurring in all but 10 States and in Puerto Rico. They are of direct benefit to millions of people. From them are derived an impressive portion of the Nation's supply of meat, fiber, shelter, water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic purposes, hydroelectric power, feed for livestock and wildlife, and outdoor recreation.

These national forests belong to all American citizens. Their resources and services are available for use by everyone. In recent years the use of these lands has been increasing steadily. Demands are now such that a comprehensive program for the orderly growth of development and management activities is of demonstrated urgency. Our rapidly growing population and expanding economy indicate mounting and competitive pressures for national-forest resources.

Legislative authorities for the recommended program are generally adequate. Supplemental legislation will be proposed as the need arises. Appropriation requests to implement the program will be submitted to the Congress in future years in connection with budget presentations after due consideration of the overall fiscal needs and resources of the Federal Government.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. MURRAY. This letter stresses the imperative need for action now.

On May 18, 1959, Senator HAYDEN held a unique open meeting of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which was attended by 17 Senators. The Members of this body know that this is a real testimonial to the importance given the national forests and conservation.

I attended that meeting, and I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point key statements made by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With your permission I would like to introduce the people from the Forest Service here with me. On my left is Dr. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service; Mr. Cliff, Assistant Chief of National Forest Resource Management; Dr. Harper, Assistant Chief, in charge of Forest Research; and Mr. Crafts, Assistant Chief, in charge of Program Building and Legislation.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss with you the program for the national forests which was recently submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The program is based on the experience of the Department of Agriculture in over 50 years of managing the extensive and valuable Federal lands which make up the national forests. These lands are located in 39 States and Puerto Rico. They comprise 181 million acres grouped into 148 national forests.

LAND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

In addition, the Forest Service administers some 65 land-utilization projects totaling over 4.5 million acres in 27 States. They are administered under the same general multiple-use and sustained-yield objectives as are the national forests.

During most of the history of the national forests they have been remote, difficult of access, and, until recent years, not greatly used. Costs of management and protection were relatively small. The revenues produced were of little significance. Management was predominantly custodial. This is no longer true.

Now they are readily accessible or can be made so. A rapidly growing demand for forest products, higher yield of useful materials through more complete utilization, modern roadbuilding equipment, and better logging methods, a growing population seeking more and more outdoor recreation, and growing demands for water—all of these things result in progressively greater use of the national forests.

The job of national forest management is no longer custodial. On the contrary, it is to provide sustained yield of all the multiple-use values of these lands up to the optimum obtainable. To do this in response to present and foreseeable demand means intensive management. It means greater expenditures for all facets of management including research. It means greater revenue. It means a continuing increase in all economic returns which come from productive forest properties.

BASIS FOR FUTURE EXPANSION OF PROGRAM

Why is full development of the national forests needed? It is to respond to the Nation's economic development and population growth; to accommodate the swing to outdoor recreation; to utilize our timber and water resources more effectively; and because it is necessary to plan a long time ahead in order to grow timber and manipulate other natural resources to meet future needs.

We should not develop one resource and lag behind in another. It would be unwise to intensify timber management and harvesting practices and fail to adequately develop recreational facilities. True multiple use requires that intensified development and utilization progress at an orderly and coordinated pace among all resources—a balanced program of development.

As Mr. McArdle will tell you later, activities are now out of balance in some respects. So the program calls for much greater intensification of some activities than others in order to reestablish this necessary balance.

Now to mention a few of the many benefits of the program. There will be a substantial increase in direct financial revenues to the Treasury. But probably a much greater overall benefit will be the secondary and intangible values.

The greatest overall benefit will be that national-forest resources—in keeping with population growth and public need for values obtainable from them—will yield their maximum good to the American people.

Many of the activities proposed for the short-term program will not immediately produce their greatest returns. Such measures as roadbuilding, tree planting, range reseeding, water conservation, research, and recreation proposed for the initial period are geared not only to short-term needs but also to the longer range objectives.

DIRECT FINANCIAL REVENUES

Direct financial revenues will double by the end of the interim program to an estimated $210 million annually. The major part of this will be from the sale of timber which should by the year 2000 reach 21 billion board feet of sawtimber worth $350 million a year at 1958 prices.

National forest lands, forage, and timber have an estimated current capital value of over $7 billion. This will increase by at least a full billion dollars as a result of improvements under the short-term program.

An estimated 60 percent more people will derive their livelihood from harvesting, processing, hauling, and merchandising national-forest timber and derived products than at the present time. It is estimated that every dollar of stumpage will be worth $20 by the time it reaches the ultimate consumer. The consumer value of the increase in timber sales will be some $3.7 billion.

The 130 million recreation visits estimated by 1969 will put into trade channels approximately a billion dollars' worth of expenditures for sporting equipment, transportation, licensing, lodging, and other items.

No realistic dollar value can be placed on water from the national forests. Water is already the most precious commodity in the West and will remain so. Water-conservation programs on the national forests will improve soil stabilization, result in more regular streamflow, enhance water quality, and foster the infiltration of water into underground storage. This means that the need will be less for the construction of surface reservoirs, settling basins, and other costly water-construction works.

There is no measurement to express the worth of the recreational value provided for millions of people by the national forests. Nor can there be any assessment in dollars of the lives saved, damage prevented, and resources preserved by better accessibility, prevention of fires and floods, and suppression of epidemic pests.

Mr. MURRAY. On the cost of the program, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD part of the statement of the Chief of the Forest Service, Dr. McArdle.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In round figures and in oversimplified terms, it can be said that the program would require increased costs of about $40 million for each of the first 5 years, then leveling off at about $321 million for most of the remaining short-term period.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a colloquy from that hearing between myself and departmental witnesses.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTICIPATED NATIONWIDE BENEFITS

Senator MURRAY. I was wondering if this program was not put into effect, what would be the loss suffered by the Nation?

Mr. MCARDLE. While Mr. Peterson was making his statement, he indicated some of the benefits that would be achieved. To answer your question very briefly, if the program were not put into effect, those benefits that he listed would not be achieved. For example, we would not be doing on the national forests the things that we need to do to improve the quality of water and to increase the quantity of the water yield. And you saw on the chart these national forests are located where most of the water is born. If the program is not put into effect, we will not achieve a cut of 21 billion board feet of timber. And the Treasury will lose the income that would thereby be derived.

If the program is not put into effect, we will not be able to take care of in any reasonably adequate fashion the many millions of recreational visitors. That will mean that some areas perhaps will have to be closed because of the need for sanitation protection or for protection from fire. I think I could go on at great length. But in brief——

PRIORITY OF PROJECTS

Senator MURRAY. If Congress allowed you only half the money you are seeking, which projects would you give priority to?

Mr. MCARDLE. I think I would want a little time to answer a question as important as that one.

But just speaking off the cuff, as I am sure you will understand I am doing now, I think that I would give more attention to the tree planting and timber stand improvement operations that have been lacking for so long. I would try to get caught up on meeting our recreational needs.

And I think that I would try to give more attention than we have been able to give for watershed management, particularly in the control of soil erosion.

Senator MURRAY. If the total program is carried out, of course, it would be of great benefit to the Nation as a whole, would it not?

Mr. MCARDLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PETERSON. Senator MURRAY, there is another aspect to the question which you put with respect to what might happen if this program is not carried out. And that is the impact upon private forest lands as a result of the growing use of forest products of all kinds.

Undoubtedly those private lands would be put under greater pressure to supply additional forest products and thereby the management of those lands might not be as good as it would otherwise be if the national forests should reach full productivity within a reasonable time. I think the impact of this program if carried out, on the private lands of the country, is of some consideration in respect to the program also.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you.

Mr. MURRAY. I left this hearing with the distinct impression that all concerned in the executive branch were in enthusiastic support of this program. I watched the press coverage and found universal support for rapid implementation of this conservation work.

Consultation with a number of Senators further reassured me and we got behind the Appropriations Committee in full support of Senator HAYDEN's plan to advance the date for starting this conservation work by putting $27 million of the needed funds in for fiscal year 1960.

We were all disappointed when the Bureau of the Budget declined to agree with this position, but we were gratified when the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses finally provided in all a $10.9 million increase for 1960.

I ask unanimous consent that table 1 be printed in the RECORD, showing the budget action for fiscal year 1960, and the balance needed to implement the national forest program in fiscal year 1961. This table shows that a $33 million increase is required.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Forest Service budget requirements for 1961 based on national forest program*

Appropriation	Administration's request, 1960	Appropriated by Congress, 1960	Budget estimate required for 1961, if national forest program fully implemented	Increase required over 1960
Forest protection and utilization:				
Forest land management:				
National forest protection and management:				
Timber resource management:				
Sales administration and management	$16,320,000	$17,820,000	$18,320,000	$500,000
Reforestation and stand improvement	3,015,000	3,215,000	5,515,000	2,300,000
Recreation-public use	8,500,000	9,300,000	15,500,000	6,200,000
Wildlife habitat management	805,000	905,000	1,805,000	900,000
Range resource management:				
Management	1,670,000	1,670,000	2,170,000	500,000
Revegetation	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,850,000	350,000
Improvements	1,600,000	1,600,000	2,000,000	400,000
Soil and water management	1,370,000	1,370,000	2,370,000	1,000,000
Mineral claims, leases, and other land uses	3,385,000	3,485,000	4,385,000	900,000
Ranger district management	7,384,000	7,384,000	7,584,000	200,000
Land utilization projects	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,750,000	350,000
Forest fire protection	12,335,000	12,635,000	14,410,000	1,775,000
Structural improvements for fire and general purposes (construction and maintenance)	8,250,000	8,250,000	10,625,000	2,375,000
Subtotal, national forest protection and management	67,534,000	70,534,000	88,284,000	17,750,000
Less: "Cooperative range improvements"	700,000	700,000	700,000	
Net, national forest protection and management	66,834,000	69,834,000	87,584,000	17,750,000
Fighting forest fires	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	None
Insect and disease control:				
White pine blister rust control	3,253,700	3,253,700	3,253,700	None
Other pest control	2,628,100	3,628,100	4,128,100	500,000
Subtotal, insect and disease control	5,881,800	6,881,800	7,381,800	500,000
Acquisition of lands, Weeks Act	100,000	100,000	100,000	None
Total, forest land management	77,815,800	81,815,800	100,065,800	18,250,000
Forest roads and trails:				
Forest roads and trails	24,000,000	28,000,000	[1] 35,600,000	7,600,000
Less: Amount in excess of authorization			[1] 5,600,000	5,600,000
Net amount under authorization limitation	[2] 24,000,000	[3] 28,000,000	30,000,000	2,000,000
Purchase access roads		[4] 1,000,000	[4] 5,000,000	4,000,000
10-percent fund [5]	10,400,000	11,800,000	13,600,000	1,800,000
Total, road program [6]	34,400,000	40,800,000	48,600,000	7,800,000
Forest protection and utilization:				
Forest research:				
Forest and range management research	6,880,000	7,104,000	8,691,600	1,587,600
Forest protection research	2,440,000	2,650,000	3,290,000	640,000
Forest products utilization research	2,794,400	2,835,400	3,829,700	994,300
Forest resources research	1,912,000	1,937,000	2,215,100	278,100
Subtotal, research program	14,026,400	14,526,400	18,026,400	3,500,000
Forest research construction			2,500,000	2,500,000
Total, forest research	14,026,400	14,526,400	20,526,400	6,000,000
Acquisition of lands for Superior National Forest			1,000,000	1,000,000

[1] Program need based on 1960 budget estimate of $24,000,000, plus $11,600,000 for 1st year of national forest program is $35,600,000. This is $5,600,000 more than the $30,000,000 authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

[2] Reflects $24,000,000 contract authorization.

[3] Action by Congress permitted use of full $30,000,000 authorization, cash provided, $28,000,000.

[4] New fund added by Congress in fiscal year 1960 to permit purchase or condemnation of existing roads. If total road is acquired, private timber to pay fair share for hauling over the road. If partial share is acquired, payment will be in proportion to Government timber. The $5,000,000 represents amount passed by Senate in fiscal year 1960 based on need list submitted by Department of Agriculture on request of Committee on Appropriations.

[5] This 10 percent of prior year national forest receipts available for forest roads and trails.

[6] Distribution of program total by functions:

	Fiscal year 1960	Possible for fiscal year 1961
Construction	$29,400,000	$32,600,000
Maintenance	10,400,000	11,000,000
Purchase of roads	1,000,000	5,000,000
Total	40,800,000	48,600,000

TABLE 1.—*Forest Service budget requirements for 1961 based on national forest program*—Continued

Appropriation	Administration's request, 1960	Appropriated by Congress, 1960	Budget estimate required for 1961, if national forest program fully implemented	Increase required over 1960
Forest Protection and Utilization:				
State and private forestry cooperation:				
Cooperation in forest fire control	$10,085,000	$10,085,000	$10,085,000	None
Cooperation in forest tree planting	[7] 290,000	290,000	290,000	None
Cooperation in forest management and processing	1,542,000	1,542,000	1,542,000	None
General forestry assistance	410,800	410,800	410,800	None
Total, State and private forestry cooperation	12,327,800	12,327,800	12,327,800	None
Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest	50,000	50,000	None	−50,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts [8]	10,000	10,000	10,000	None
Cooperative range improvements [8]	700,000	700,000	700,000	None
Grand total	139,330,000	150,230,000	183,230,000	33,000,000

[7] 1958 appropriation was $1,308,000.

[8] Appropriation of receipts.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD table 2 showing the fiscal year 1961 budget request for the Forest Service.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 2.—*Budget estimates, fiscal year 1961, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service*

[President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal year 1961, showing the amounts appropriated for 1960, and the amounts included in the 1961 budget]

Appropriation item and projects	Appropriated for 1960 (revised base)[1] (1)	Increases and decreases for 1961				Total proposed in 1961 budget (6)
		Health benefit (2)	Program (3)	Transfer to GSA [2] (4)	Total (5)	
Forest protection and utilization:						
Forest land management:						
National forest protection and management:						
Timber resource management:						
Sales administration and management	$19,215,000	+$155,000	+$805,000		+$960,000	$20,175,000
Reforestation and stand improvement	3,455,000	+10,000			+10,000	3,465,000
Recreation-public use	10,173,000	+55,000	+4,602,000		+4,657,000	14,830,000
Wildlife habitat management	1,259,000	+11,000			+11,000	1,270,000
Range resource management:						
Management	2,973,000	+27,000			+27,000	3,000,000
Revegetation	1,595,000	+5,000			+5,000	1,600,000
Improvements	1,960,000	+5,000			+5,000	1,965,000
Soil and water management	1,603,000	+12,000			+12,000	1,615,000
Mineral claims, leases, and other land uses	4,332,000	+37,900			+37,900	4,369,900
Land utilization projects	1,117,000	+8,000			+8,000	1,125,000
Forest fire protection	13,973,000	+71,000	+301,000		+372,000	14,345,000
Structural improvements for fire and general purposes (construction and maintenance)	8,879,000	+17,100	+350,000	−$146,100	+221,000	9,100,000
Total, national forest protection and management	70,534,000	+414,000	+6,058,000	−146,100	+6,325,900	76,859,900
Deduct amount advanced from "Cooperative range improvements"	−700,000					−700,000
Appropriated under "National forest protection and management" item	69,834,000	+414,000	+6,058,000	−146,100	+6,325,900	76,159,900
Fighting forest fires	[3] 5,000,000	[5,000]			[5,000]	5,000,000
Insect and disease control:						
White pine blister rust control	3,253,700	+11,100			+11,100	3,264,800
Other pest control	3,628,100	+6,900			+6,900	3,635,000
Subtotal, insect and disease control	6,881,800	+18,000			+18,000	6,899,800
Acquisition of lands (Weeks Act)	100,000					100,000
Total, forest land management	81,815,800	+432,000	+6,058,000	−146,100	+6,343,900	88,159,700
Forest research:						
Forest and range management research	7,104,000	+44,500	+301,400	−95,300	+250,600	7,354,600
Forest protection research:						
Forest fire research	835,000	+5,000	+75,355	−10,355	+70,000	905,000
Forest insect research	995,000	+6,000	+60,280	−12,280	+54,000	1,049,000
Forest disease research	820,000	+5,000	+65,310	−10,310	+60,000	880,000
Subtotal, Forest protection research	2,650,000	+16,000	+200,945	−32,945	+184,000	2,834,000
Forest products utilization research	[4] 2,854,400	+18,000	+251,155	−20,155	+249,000	3,103,400
Forest resources research:						
Forest survey	1,490,000	+10,000		−10,000		1,490,000
Economics research	447,000	+2,500	+100,500		+103,000	550,000
Subtotal, forest resources research	1,937,000	+12,500	+100,500	−10,000	+103,000	2,040,000
Forest research construction			+1,000,000		+1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, forest research	[4] 14,545,400	+91,000	+1,854,000	−158,400	+1,786,600	16,332,000
State and private forestry cooperation:						
Cooperation in forest fire control	10,085,000	+2,500			+2,500	10,087,500
Cooperation in forest tree planting	290,000	+1,000			+1,000	291,000
Cooperation in forest management and processing	1,542,000	+1,000			+1,000	1,543,000
General forestry assistance	410,800	+2,500			+2,500	413,300
Total, State and private forestry cooperation	12,327,800	+7,000			+7,000	12,334,800
Total, forest protection and utilization	108,689,000	+530,000	+7,912,000	−304,500	+8,137,500	116,826,500

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Budget estimates, fiscal year 1961, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service*—Continued

[President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal year 1961, showing the amounts appropriated for 1960, and the amounts included in the 1961 budget]

Appropriation item and projects	Appropriated for 1960 (revised base)[1]	Increases and decreases for 1961				Total proposed in 1961 budget
		Health benefit	Program	Transfer to GSA[2]	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Forest roads and trails:[3]						
Construction	$29,460,000	[$20,000]	+$3,680,000	----------	+$3,680,000	$33,140,000
Maintenance	10,400,000	[100,000]	+100,000	----------	+100,000	10,500,000
Total	39,860,000	[120,000]	+3,780,000	----------	+3,780,000	43,640,000
Transfer from "Roads and trails for States" (10 percent)	−11,860,000	----------	−1,780,000	----------	−1,780,000	−13,640,000
Appropriated for forest roads and trails	28,000,000	[120,000]	+2,000,000	----------	+2,000,000	30,000,000
Access roads (new appropriation for purchase of roads)	1,000,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	10,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	10,000
Acquisition of lands for Superior National Forest	----------	[150]	+1,000,000	----------	+1,000,000	1,000,000
Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest	50,000	----------	−50,000	----------	−50,000	----------
Acquisition of lands, Klamath Indians[4]	----------	----------	----------	----------	(5)	(5)
Cooperative range improvement	700,000	----------	----------	----------	----------	700,000
Total, regular funds	138,449,000	+530,000	+10,862,000	−304,500	+11,087,500	149,536,500

[1] Proposed adjustments in the functional project structure for the national forest protection and management activity of the forest land management subappropriation. The purpose of these adjustments, as shown below, is to (a) eliminate the functional account "Ranger district management" and distribute the amount previously budgeted for this purpose to other program functions remaining in the "National forest protection and management" activity, and (b) transfer $283,000 from the "Land utilization projects" function to other national forest protection and management functions for administration of about 300,000 acres of title III, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands which have been transferred to national forest status by Executive Order 10851 and Proclamation 3326, dated Nov. 27, 1959, and Executive Order 10844, dated Oct. 9, 1959.

Project item	1960 appropriation adjusted	Distribution of ranger district management	Transfer of land utilization projects funds	Totals in proposed revision
Timber resource management:				
(a) Sales administration and management	$17,820,000	$1,300,000	$95,000	$19,215,000
(b) Reforestation and stand improvement	3,215,000	240,000	----------	3,455,000
Recreation-public use	9,300,000	845,000	28,000	10,173,000
Wildlife habitat management	905,000	345,000	9,000	1,259,900
Range resource management:				
(a) Management	1,670,000	1,300,000	3,000	2,973,000
(b) Revegetation	1,500,000	95,000	----------	1,595,000
(c) Improvements	1,600,000	340,000	20,000	1,960,000
Soil and water management	1,370,000	230,000	3,000	1,603,000
Mineral claims, leases, and other land uses	3,485,000	844,000	3,000	4,332,000
Ranger district management	7,384,000	−7,384,000	----------	----------
Land utilization projects	1,400,000	----------	−283,000	1,117,000
Forest fire protection	12,635,000	1,305,000	33,000	13,973,000
Structural improvements for fire and general purposes	8,250,000	540,000	89,000	8,879,000
Subtotal	70,534,000	----------	----------	70,534,000
Deduct amount advanced from "Cooperative range improvements"	−700,000	----------	----------	−700,000
Total, national forest protection and management	69,834,000	----------	----------	69,834,000

[2] Decrease of $304,500 due to providing a direct appropriation to the General Services Administration for certain leasing costs previously paid from the "forest protection and utilization" appropriation.

[3] A supplemental estimate of $21,500,000 for fighting forest fires in fiscal year 1960 is proposed for later transmission.

[4] Includes comparative transfer of $19,000 from "Salaries and expenses, Library, Agriculture."

[5] Amounts shown are not obligations but appropriations or cash requirements to liquidate obligations. The appropriation of $28,000,000 for fiscal year 1960 and $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1961 permits obligating the full $30,000,000 authorized for each of these years. Accordingly the obligations for 1960 will be $2,000,000 greater than the appropriation but for 1961 obligations and appropriation are the same. Following is the comparison between 1960 and 1961 on an obligation basis:

	1960	1961	Increase or decrese
Construction	$31,460,000	$33,140,000	+$1,680,000
Maintenance	10,400,000	10,500,000	+100,000
Total	51,860,000	43,640,000	+1,780,000
Deduct "roads and trails for States" (10-percent fund)	−11,860,000	−13,640,000	−1,780,000
Net obligations from appropriated funds	30,000,000	30,000,000	----------

[6] This relates to the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe in Oregon (68 Stat. 718; 72 Stat. 816). There is no firm basis for estimating the cost for acquisition of Klamath Indian lands which are not sold to private parties. Accordingly, funds for this liability have been provided in a Budget Bureau "Reserve for contingencies" for the 1961 budget estimates.

INDEX TO APPROPRIATION ITEMS IN PRINTED BUDGET

NOTE.—Amounts shown in the printed budget for all activities under each appropriation represents costs (goods and services received and used). Therefore the amounts in the printed budget will not always agree with amounts in the above summary which are based on obligations, except for forest roads and trails which is on a cash basis (see footnote 5 above). However, the amounts shown in the printed budget for appropriation are on the basis of authority to incur obligations.

Appropriations

	Page reference
Regular items:	
Forest protection and utilization:	
Forest land management	373–375
Forest research	
State and private forestry cooperation	
Forest roads and trails	375–376
Access roads	376
Acquisition of lands for Superior National Forest	376–377
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special Acts	377
Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest	377
Cooperative range improvements	377–378
Assistance to States for tree planting	378
General provisions (language)	378
Other items:	
Permanent authorizations:	
Expenses, brush disposal	378–379
Other Forest Service permanent appropriations	379
Working capital fund	379–380
Advances and reimbursements	380–381
Proposed for later transmission (supplemental)	381
Trust funds	872

Mr. MURRAY. The President's budget request is $20,132,500 below the required amount. This is a great disappointment. It became even greater when I studied the budget and saw how few of the key items the Chief of the Forest Service listed as vital were increased. Dr. McArdle and Secretary Peterson apparently thought last year that tree planting, watershed management, soil erosion, and recreation needed more attention, but of these items only recreation was increased.

The document by Secretary Benson and the testimony by Assistant Secretary Peterson and Chief Forester McArdle give eloquent support to the need for this vital work.

The warm words of last spring are now frozen, cold and lifeless, in a stillborn budget that was conceived without either the hope or promise for a better tomorrow.

The conservation and immediate budgetary questions are secondary to the responsibility we have to coming generations. Will we pass on tc our successors the treeless mountains we created, the eroded range that we destroyed, the muddied streams that we permitted?

Our resource balance is in debt. This debt exceeds any dollar debt attributed to our Federal Government. Its reduction far transcends the importance of jingling dollars and imagining we have a magical surplus.

I hope that this Congress will rise to its responsibilities and provide for adequate public resource management.

I close asking unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD table 3, a comparison of Forest Service appropriation increases in the President's budget for 1961 with increases suggested for the program for the national forests.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of Forest Service appropriation increases in President's budget for 1961 (table 2) with increases suggested for the program for the national forests (table 1)*

Appropriation or fund	Increases provided in President's budget				Difference between increase shown in table 1 and increase in the President's budget (table 2)				Brief description of uses
	Amount	Breakdown of amounts in col. 2 [1]			Amount	Breakdown of amounts in col. 6 [1]			
		Personal services		Contracting		Personal services		Contracting	
		Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Forest protection and utilization: Forest land management:									
National forest protection and management:									
Timber resource management:									
Sales administration and management.	$960,000	105.8	$529,100	$128,800	[2] −$460,000				
Reforestation and stand improvement.	10,000				+2,290,000	175	$586,000	$1,290,000	Tree planting on nonproductive forest land, work on established plantations, pruning or thinning of established sapling and pole stands, rodent control, and physical improvements related to tree seedling production.
Recreation-public use	4,657,000	413.8	1,656,000	1,372,100	+1,543,000	48	195,000	1,000,000	Rehabilitation of existing family camp and picnic units and construction of new units.
Wildlife habitat management	11,000				+889,000	70	371,000	400,000	Administration and advance cooperation with State fish and game departments and wildlife habitat improvement projects including reseeding and restoration of depleted game ranges, openings in dense brush fields, and water developments.
Range resource management:									
Management	27,000				+473,000	71	355,000		Range allotment analysis and management plans for joint ranger-permittee cooperation in the application of on-the-ground management.
Revegetation	5,000				+345,000	12	48,000	175,000	Revegetation of deteriorated rangeland.
Improvements	5,000				+395,000	50	200,000	95,000	Construction of water developments and range management fences.
Soil and water management	12,000				+988,000	74	398,000	406,000	Stabilization of eroding lands including old roads, and gully and channel control; soil surveys; and determining the effects of resources uses and management practices on the usefulness of water resources.
Mineral claims, leases and other land uses.	37,900				[3] +1,062,100	130	690,000		Survey and marking of national forest boundaries, administration of special use permits, land status records, land classification, land exchanges to consolidate national forest ownerships, and other miscellaneous land uses including mineral resources.
Land utilization projects	8,000				+342,000	28	112,000	120,000	Management and development of land utilization lands including range revegetation and range improvements.
Forest fire protection	372,000	22.8	116,130	85,000	+1,403,000	99	504,000	100,000	Strengthening of fire control organization, including intensification of aerial operations, stronger manning of fire suppression crews, lengthening employment season of key fire positions, and extension of fire prevention patrols.
Structural improvements for fire and general purposes (construction and maintenance).	221,000	35.0	150,000	60,000	+2,154,000	35	175,000	1,800,000	Construction of administrative and fire control structural improvements, such as housing units, lookout towers, and service and storage buildings, and maintenance of existing improvements.
Subtotal, national forest protection and management.	6,325,900	577.4	2,451,230	1,645,900	+11,424,100	792	3,634,000	5,386,000	
Insect and disease control:									
White pine blister rust control	11,100				−11,100				
Other pest control	6,900				+493,100	40	200,000	65,000	Control of forest insects and diseases, including detection of outbreaks and evaluation of their seriousness and need for control.
Subtotal, insect and disease control.	18,000				+482,000	40	200,000	65,000	
Total, forest land management	6,343,900	577.4	2,451,230	1,645,900	+11,906,100	832	3,834,000	5,451,000	
Forest roads and trails:									
Forest roads and trails	2,000,000			2,000,000					
Purchase access roads					+4,000,000			4,000,000	Purchase of full or partial interest in existing roads or rights-of-way for access to national forest areas.
10-percent fund	1,780,000			1,780,000	+20,000			20,000	
Total road program	3,780,000			3,780,000	+4,020,000			4,020,000	

[1] The sum of dollars shown for "Personal services and contracting" will not equal amounts shown in cols. 2 and 6 since expenses related to salaries are not shown on the table.

[2] The amount of $960,000 in the President's budget is larger than the $500,000 shown in table furnished by Congressman METCALF.

[3] Includes $200,000 shown in table attached to letter of Dec. 31, 1959, for "Ranger district management." The "Ranger district management" item has been transferred to other functions in the 1961 estimates.

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of Forest Service appropriation increases in President's budget for 1961 (table 2) with increases suggested for the program for the national forests (table 1)*—Continued

Appropriation or fund	Increases provided in President's budget				Difference between increase shown in table 1 and increase in the President's budget (table 2)				Brief description of uses
	Amount	Breakdown of amounts in col. 2 [1]			Amount	Breakdown of amounts in col. 6 [1]			
		Personal services		Contracting		Personal services		Contracting	
		Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Forest protection and utilization: Forest research:									
Forest and range management research.	$250,600	22.9	$128,430	$28,900	+$1,337,000	138	$870,000	$119,000	Research for improving the quality and quantity of water yields, improved methods of regenerating and managing commercially desirable timber stands, development of improved trees, and improving wildlife habitat, grazing practices and recreation management in harmony with other uses of forest land.
Forest protection research	184,000	16.9	94,600	21,300	+456,000	44	279,000	40,000	Research on biological control of forest insects and diseases, and improve control methods for pests; strengthen research on fire control.
Forest products utilization research	249,000	22.8	135,000	28,800	+745,300	70	446,000	66,000	Forest products utilization research aimed at fuller use of harvested timber and expanded utilization of the poorer quality trees, little used species, and timber residues on the national forests.
Forest resources research	103,000	9.4	52,600	12,000	+175,100	19	119,000	16,000	Research to develop log and tree grades and to improve marketing practices for timber species on western, southern, and eastern national forests; provide criteria for determining quality yield of lumber and other products from logs and trees of all classes, and to improve market outlets for the little used species and low quality timber.
Subtotal, research program	786,600	72.0	410,630	91,000	+2,713,400	271	1,714,000	241,000	
Forest research construction	1,000,000	------	----------	1,000,000	+1,500,000	------	----------	1,500,000	Construction of office-laboratories and related facilities.
Total, forest research	1,786,600	72.0	410,630	1,091,000	+4,213,400	271	1,714,000	1,741,000	
Acquisition of lands for Superior National Forest.	1,000,000	3.0	21,200	976,200	----------	------	----------	----------	
Forest protection and utilization: State and private forestry cooperation:									
Cooperation in forest fire control	2,500	------	----------	----------	−2,500	------	----------	----------	
Cooperation in forest tree planting	1,000	------	----------	----------	−1,000	------	----------	----------	
Cooperation in forest management and processing.	1,000	------	----------	----------	−1,000	------	----------	----------	
General forestry assistance	2,500	------	----------	----------	−2,500	------	----------	----------	
Total, State and private forestry cooperation.	7,000	------	----------	----------	−7,000	------	----------	----------	
Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest.	−50,000	------	----------	−50,000	----------	------	----------	----------	
Grand total	12,867,500	652.4	2,883,060	7,443,100	20,132,500	1,103	5,548,000	11,212,000	

[1] The sum of dollars shown for "Personal services and contracting" will not equal amounts shown in cols. 2 and 6 since expenses related to salaries are not shown on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. I call attention to the fact that over half of the deficiency can be supplied without even adding substantially to Federal employment.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to permit the Chair, as a Member of the Senate, and not as the presiding officer, to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me again?

Mr. THURMOND. I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express the hope that the attachés of the Senate on both sides of the aisle will call Senators who are not in attendance and inform them that we may have a vote shortly, and that this will be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I desire to modify my amendments identified as "1-19-60-F" in the following manner: On page 4, line 3, I propose to delete the period and the quotation mark, and insert after the word "work" a comma and the words "or any committee, agent, or designee of such organization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modification will be made.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the amendments I have offered would amend the present law which prohibits corporations and labor unions from making political contributions and expenditures.

At the present time, section 610 of title 18 prohibits corporations and labor unions from making political contributions or expenditures in connection with a Federal election. The language of the

section is in terms of a blanket prohibition. However, because of the interpretation given the statute by the Supreme Court in two cases in recent years, several types of political expenditures have been held to be without the prohibition of the statute, and considerable doubt exists as to whether other types of activity are within or without its reach. It is the purpose of the proposed amendment to clarify the present situation as to the limitations on political activity which the Congress intends to be placed.

Mr. President, the effect of the amendments I have offered would be to prohibit all political contributions of labor unions and corporations with three specific exceptions: First, the amendments would in no way affect the right of labor unions and corporations to communicate with the members or stockholders through the medium of a union newspaper or house organ, so long as its distribution was limited primarily to the members or stockholders concerned; advocating the election of a particular candidate or slate of candidates through this medium would not be curtailed in any manner; second, the amendment protects the alleged constitutional right of labor unions and corporations to discuss the issues of the campaign impartially and to declare their position on such issues; third, the amendment specifically guarantees the right of labor unions and corporations to sponsor news programs and programs in which the opposing candidates are presented on a panel discussion, debate, or similar type program. To explain the amendment in the terms of a hypothetical example, Mr. President, it prevents a labor union or a corporation from spending money to influence the public at large to vote for candidate A instead of candidate B. There are three sanctions imposed on labor unions which commit violations: First, noncertification by the National Labor Relations Board and inability to file an unfair labor practice charge; second, removal of any exemption from the antitrust laws; and, third, loss of tax exemption for 1 year following the violation. For a violation by a corporation, there is imposed a $10,000 fine. In addition, a fine of $1,000 and imprisonment for 1 year, or both, is imposed on any person who receives any contribution prohibited by the amendment and on any officer or director who consents to any contribution or expenditure prohibited.

Mr. President, the forerunner of the present section of the United States Code which prohibits political expenditures or contributions by labor unions and corporations was first enacted in 1907. An appreciation of the circumstances which raised this problem is necessary, and an understanding of it is essential for a consideration of the amendment which I have offered.

The great concentration of wealth which followed the industrial expansion in the United States in the post-War Between the States era had profound effects on the American economy. The impact of abuses resulting from this concentration of wealth in the control of industrialists gradually made itself felt by a rising tide of reform protest in the last decade of the 19th century. The Sherman Antitrust Act was in response to the threat to economic freedom created by enormous industrial combines. The income tax law of 1894 reflected congressional concern over the growing disparity of income between the many and the few.

In this latter decade of the 19th century, there was a growing popular feeling that the large aggregations of capital were unduly influencing politics, an influence not stopping short of corruption. The prosperity of the times was great, but the wealth was gravitating rapidly into the hands of a small portion of the population. The power of wealth threatened to undermine the political integrity of the Nation. This is best demonstrated by the multiplicity of States which passed laws in the 1890's requiring candidates for office and their political committees to make public the sources and amounts of contributions to their campaign funds and the recipients and amounts of their campaign expenditures. The theory of these laws was not unlike that which fostered the approach of the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill to prevent abuses in the labor union movement, namely, that the spotlight of reporting and publicity tend to discourage unethical practices. The purpose was to discourage corporations from making political contributions, thereby ending their control over party policies. However, the futility of this approach to the problem was soon realized. As early as 1894 the 1st session of the 59th Congress was urged to prohibit political contributions by corporations altogether. I quote from the hearings before the House Committee on Elections:

> The idea is to prevent * * * the great railroad companies, the great insurance companies, the great telephone companies, the great aggregations of wealth from using their corporate funds, directly or indirectly, to send members of the legislature to these halls in order to vote for their protection and the advancement of their interests as against those of the public. It strikes at a constantly growing evil which has done more to shake the confidence of the plain people of small means of this country in our political institutions than any other practice which has ever obtained since the foundation of our Government. And I believe that the time has come when something ought to be done to put a check to the giving of $50,000 or $100,000 by a great corporation toward political purposes upon the understanding that a debt is created from a political party to it.

Mr. President, concern over the size and source of campaign funds was one of the vital issues in the presidential campaign of 1904. Popular sentiment for Federal action to purge national politics of the pernicious influence of huge campaign contributions was crystallizing. President Theodore Roosevelt, in his annual message to Congress on December 5, 1905, recommended that:

> All contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law; directors should not be permitted to use stockholders' money for such purposes; and moreover, a prohibition of this kind would be, as far as it went, an effective method of stopping the evils aimed at in corrupt practices acts.

The wisdom of this recommendation was becoming more and more apparent. It was contrary to the primary purpose of the existence of the corporations to allow executive officers and directors to use moneys in support of political candidates or platforms. Whether the contribution was made for the purpose of supporting political views or with the desire to obtain protection for the corporation, it was wholly unjustifiable. In the first instance, executive officers were seeking to impose their political views upon a constituency of divergent convictions, and in the other they were guilty of a serious offense against public morals.

In this first decade of the twentieth century, corporations were frank in their admission that the contributions were made upon the expectation that candidates thus aided in their election would support the interests of those companies.

The public demand for a reform bill was about to reach a crescendo.

In 1906, Mr. President, the Committee on Elections of the House of Representatives began considering a number of proposals designed to cleanse the political process. There were numerous groups which advocated a Federal publicity bill, feeling that the light of revelation would curb the most flagrant abuses of purchases of influence. One of the strongest advocates of reform legislation was the president of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, who is known as the father of the American labor movement. His testimony before the House committee on the publicity bill is as follows:

> Whether this bill meets all of the needs may be questioned; that is open to discussion; but the necessity for some law upon the subject is patent to every man who hopes for the maintenance of the institutions under which we live. It is doubtful to my mind if the contributions and expenditures of vast sums of money in the nominations and elections for our public offices can continue to increase without endangering the endurance of our Republic in its purity and in its essence. * * * If the interests of any people are threatened by corruption in our public life or corruption in elections, surely it must of necessity be those, that large class of people, whom we for convenience term the "wageworkers."
>
> I am not in a mood, and never am, to indulge in denunciations or criticism, but it does come to me sometimes that one of the reasons for the absence of legislation of a liberal or sympathetic or just character, so far as it affects the interest of the wage-earners of America, can be fairly well traced with the growth of the corruption funds and the influences that are in operation during elections and campaigns. * * * I am under the impression that the patience of the American workingman is about exhausted.
>
> If we are really determined that our elections shall be free from the power of money and its lavish use and expenditure without an accounting to the conscience and the judgment of the people of America, we will have to pass some measure of this kind.

In his annual message to the Congress in 1906, President Roosevelt listed as the

first item of congressional business a law prohibiting political contributions by corporations.

In 1907 the forerunner of the present statute which purports to prohibit political contributions and expenditures by both labor unions and corporations was passed. The language of that prototype section was:

> That it shall be unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any laws of Congress, to make a money contribution in connection with any election to any political office. It shall also be unlawful for any corporation whatever to make a money contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Representative in Congress is to be voted for or any election by any State legislature of a U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, the purpose of this original section was not merely to prevent the subversion of the integrity of the electoral process. The basic underlying philosophy was to sustain the active, alert responsibility of the individual citizen in a democracy for the wise conduct of government. Individual initiative was being lost in the face of huge aggregations of wealth; and the political segment had begun to cater to corporate interests, to the detriment of the population as a whole. Accountability to the individual voter had become a thing of the past.

The act of 1907 was the first concrete manifestation of a continuing congressional concern for elections "free from the power of money."

In 1910 Congress responded to the public demand for further curbs on the political power of wealth by enacting a publicity law that required committees operating to influence the results of congressional elections in two or more States to report all contributions and disbursements and to identify contributors and recipients of substantial sums. That law also required persons who spent more than $50 annually for the purpose of influencing congressional elections in more than one State to report those expenditures if they were not made through a political committee. At the next session that act was extended to require all candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives to make detailed reports with respect to both nominating and election campaigns. The amendment also placed maximum limits on the amounts that congressional candidates could spend in seeking nomination and election, and forbade them from promising employment for the purpose of obtaining support. And in 1918, Congress made it unlawful either to offer or to solicit anything of value, to influence voting.

In 1925, Congress made a comprehensive revision of existing legislation concerning elections, and enacted the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. The forerunner of the present section 610 of title 18, prohibiting political contributions by corporations, was strengthened by expanding the definition of "contribution," and by penalizing the recipient of any forbidden contribution, as well as the contributor.

Mr. President, the political potentialities of wealth were further restricted in 1940, when Congress made it unlawful for any political committee to receive contributions of more than $3 million or to make expenditures of more than that amount in any calendar year. The same act made it unlawful "for any person, directly or indirectly, to make contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000, during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election, to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office" or any committee supporting such a candidate. The term "person" was defined to include any committee, association, organization, or other group of persons. The author of the amendment, in offering it on the floor of the Senate, made the following observation:

> We all know that money is the chief source of corruption. We all know that large contributions to political campaigns not only put the political party under obligation to the large contributors, who demand pay in the way of legislation, but we also know that large sums of money are used for the purpose of conducting expensive campaigns through the newspapers and over the radio; in the publication of all sorts of literature, true and untrue; and for the purpose of paying the expenses of campaigners sent out into the country to spread propaganda, both true and untrue.

Mr. President, as all of us are aware, World War II precipitated an unprecedented economic mobilization and enormously stimulated the power of organized labor, and soon aroused outside its ranks a consciousness of its power. This concentration of power was emphasized each time workers conducted strikes during the period when the Nation was engaged in the greatest conflict the world has ever known. Thus there was a growing realization that, just as the great corporations had made huge political contributions to influence governmental action or inaction, whether consciously or unconsciously, the powerful unions were pursuing a similar course, and with the same untoward consequences for the democratic process. It was for this reason that the Corrupt Practices Act was extended to include labor organizations, when Congress, in 1943, passed the Smith-Connally Act to secure defense production against work stoppages.

Public opinion toward labor unions was undergoing a change. Since the inception of the organized labor movement, privileges and immunities granted to labor unions have created instruments of almost uncontrolled power. These include, first, immunity under the antitrust laws; second, practically full immunity to injunctions in the Federal courts; third, immunity from taxation; fourth, power to compel employees to join unions, as a condition of employment; fifth, right to represent all of the employees as exclusive bargaining agent, even if only a bare majority has selected the union as such agent; sixth, power to compel employers to bargain collectively; seventh, although not required to be incorporated, their members are free from the liability for the debts of the union, unlike the members of other unincorporated associations; eighth, unions are not liable for the acts of their individual members, in contrast to other types of unincorporated associations.

And thus, during World War II, it became apparent that the infant labor movement which had been nutured by beneficial legislation and public opinion, reached its maturity and had come of age. As a result of the demonstrations of labor power in the form of wartime strikes, the public came to the conclusion that labor unions, as public institutions, should be granted the same rights, and no greater rights, than any other public group. The detrimental effect that concentrations of wealth had on elections ignore the source, for an association of individuals—whether they be a labor union or a corporation—expect and sometimes demand consideration by the beneficiaries of their contributions which not infrequently is harmful to the general public interest. It was a realization of this fact that led Congress to place labor unions on exactly the same basis, insofar as their financial activities were concerned, as corporations had been on for many years.

Despite the wartime application of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act to labor organizations, some unions continued to make enormous financial outlays. The Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations played a vigorous role in the national elections of 1944. However, the Senate's Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures did not find a violation of the Corrupt Practices Act by the PAC, for it had limited its activity to "expenditures" on behalf of candidates, and had not made direct contributions to their campaign funds. It became quite obvious, Mr. President, that the statute was woefully inadequate to prevent labor union political fiscal activity if it was to be subjected to such a narrow construction. The detriment to the electoral process was as great in the case of an expenditure on behalf of a particular candidate as a direct contribution to his campaign fund. In both cases the responsibility of the individual citizen in the democratic system of elections was diminished and the beneficence of the organization expending the money was a potential factor in legislative determination. It was apparently for this reason that concern was growing over the possibility of emasculation of the statutory policy through a narrow construction of contributions.

In 1945 the House Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures in the 1946 elections urged that the prohibition on political contributions be extended to cover political expenditures on behalf of a candidate as well, and noted the futility of a law which prohibited the direct contribution to a candidate and yet permitted the expenditure of large sums in his behalf.

Mr. President, the Congress realized the necessity of protecting the political process from what it deemed to be the corroding effect of concentrations of wealth. The prohibition of political contributions by labor unions contained in

the Smith-Connally Act was made permanent in 1947 by the Taft-Hartley Act. In addition, the section was extended to proscribe "expenditures" as well as "contributions," and the coverage was expanded to include Federal primaries and nominating conventions. And thus the present section became law when the Congress overrode the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley law.

The section has been before the Supreme Court on two occasions, Mr. President. In *United States* v. *Congress of Industrial Organizations* (335 U.S. 106), a 1948 decision of the Court, it was held that the section did not prevent a labor union from distributing a regularly published union newspaper to its members, although it contained an editorial urging all members of the union to vote for a certain candidate. In the course of the opinion, the Court said that "if section 313 were construed to prohibit the publication, by corporations and unions in the regular course of conducting their affairs, of periodicals advising their members, stockholders or customers of danger or advantage to their interests from the adoption of measures, or the election to office of men espousing such measures, the gravest doubt would arise in our minds as to its constitutionality." Noting its responsibility to construe a statute so as to avoid giving it an unconstitutional interpretation if possible, and the apparent intention of the Congress, as indicated by the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill, the Court held that the advocacy of a candidate "within the family," so to speak was consistent with the act.

Certain observations by the Supreme Court in the CIO case gave rise to the belief that so long as the funds for political expenditures were not drawn from the general treasury of the union, partisan political activity could be engaged in by the labor organization. Existing and subsequently created political "educational" committees of the labor unions thereby circumvented the intent of the statute, and have continued to do so until the present time. The political activities of these organizations has been justified on the ground that the funds are the result of voluntary contributions of the individual union members, freely given, and with full knowledge of the purposes for which they are to be spent. However, such has not been the case, Mr. President. The individual union member has no assurance that his so-called voluntary contribution will not be used to advance the caues of a candidate to whom he is violently opposed. There have been innumerable instances in which the national union has expended money on behalf of a candidate whose ideology and political philosophy bear no reasonable resemblance to those of a substantial number, and in many cases, a majority of rank and file union members. On June 16 of last year, Mr. President, during the debate on the Potter amendment to the labor reform bill, I cited many instances in which the dues of working people had been contributed to causes with no regard to their desires. One such instance precipitated the case of Allen against the Southern Railway System in the State of North Carolina last year. A group of employees of the Southern Railway, objecting to union shop contracts, had brought suit in the superior court at Charlotte charging that section 2 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. sec. 152) was unconstitutional because it permits union shop agreements in violation of the North Carolina right-to-work law. The employees also contended that assessments had been made against them as individuals and the proceeds of those assessments used for lobbying and political purposes. Such use of assessments, they contended, were not only an infringement or impairment of first amendment rights but also in violation of the Act itself, which contemplates that assessments may be made only for collective bargaining purposes. The jury in the Allen case returned answers in response to several questions which had been submitted by the Court. The Court asked "Do the defendant unions use dues and fees which they collect from railroad employees in support or opposition to legislation which is not reasonably necessary or related to collective bargaining?" The jury answered the question in the affirmative. In response to the question whether the expenditures were necessarily or reasonably related to collective bargaining, the jury said "No."

Forcing ideological conformity by the expenditure of union dues and alleged "voluntary payments" collected through the structure of the union raises serious questions of constitutional law, Mr. President. The voluntariness of collections for political purposes by labor organizations, coupled with the expenditures in support of candidates and platforms advocating principles, policies, programs, and activities to which a substantial number of union members do not subscribe, should be in contravention of the first or fifth amendment to the Constitution. This position was urged in the case of Railway Employees' Department against Hanson, in 1956, but the Supreme Court reserved judgment on the question.

The question of labor union political spending has been raised again by a decision of the Georgia Supreme Court in the so-called Looper case. It involves a group of railroad employees who refuse to pay union dues under a compulsory union membership contract because part of the money is spent to support political candidates and views with which the employees do not agree. The court held that a union shop contract requiring membership in the union is invalid where part of the dues is used for political purposes.

With 80 percent of unionized employees working under union shop contracts, the decision, if upheld, could force unions to give up compulsory union membership contracts or curtail their political spending.

Many reasons have been advanced for curtailing or prohibiting expenditures by both labor unions and corporations, Mr. President. To my mind, however, the most compelling is the basic philosophy of our form of Government. The foundation of the democratic system is constructed on the premise that the individual citizen will maintain his responsibility in the electoral process and that an accumulation of this responsibility culminating in the exercise of the right to vote will result in a legislative process designed to serve the people as a whole. Large aggregations of wealth in the control of a few interfere with this process. This was recognized at the turn of the century, when Congress in its wisdom decided that the expenditure of such sums by corporations had a deleterious effect on the electoral process. It was recognized by Samuel Gompers, known as the father of the American labor movement, who believed that labor unions, like corporations, should stay out of politics. This equality of treatment with respect to unions and corporations expending funds to support candidates for political office was instituted in 1943 with the passage of the Smith-Connally Act, and again in 1947 in the Taft-Hartley Act. However, the prohibition on labor unions has been circumvented by the formulation of separate political vehicles, and the power now wielded by labor in the political field is practically unfettered. These organizations presently spend millions of dollars in violation of the intent of the present statute prohibiting political expenditures by both labor unions and corporations. No information is available on exactly how much unions are presently spending, for no reports are required of local and State organizations expending sums within State boundaries, nor what the unions spend out of dues funds for so-called political education. Reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives indicate that labor organizations spent $1,828,777, but the figure covers only what was spent out of voluntary contributions raised or spent in more than one State for direct political action.

The size of organized labor has grown from a low of 2,500,000 members and an annual income of $30 million to $40 million in 1932 to 17,500,000 members and an annual income of $650 million in 1957.

The strength of labor unions in the political field is indicated by the statement of AFL–CIO President George Meany that "we have not changed the complexion of Congress enough; we will have to go further in the political field."

Mr. President, on that point I should like to quote a column written by one of the greatest writers in America today, David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star in the fall of 1959. It is entitled "Carey Letter and Lewis' Views," and the subhead is "Former CIO Chief Quoted on 'Quid Pro Quo' for Political Contributions":

CAREY LETTER AND LEWIS' VIEWS—FORMER CIO CHIEF QUOTED ON "QUID PRO QUO" FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

(By David Lawrence)

When the labor union bosses raise money to contribute to the campaigns of Members of Congress, must those who are elected disregard their personal convictions on the merits of proposed laws and do the bidding of the groups that furnished the funds? This issue seems to have been projected by James B. Carey, one of the top leaders of the AFL–CIO, whose recent letter to Members of Congress has caused a stir. He expresses grati-

tude to those who voted as labor wanted and wrote in bitter sarcasm to those who, having accepted campaign contributions from labor interests, voted against their wishes on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Carey threatens reprisals at the ballot box, and apparently the labor unions will withhold contributions next time from those Members of Congress who refused to consider a campaign contribution as a bribe.

There is nothing unusual about Mr. Carey's letters to Members of Congress. He should not be criticized as being alone in his viewpoint. For what he has written is in line with CIO policy for years. Indeed, John L. Lewis, while active in the CIO, was characteristically frank about the meaning of a contribution from laboring men to the campaigns of candidates for office.

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, having accepted big contributions from labor unions for his 1936 campaign, said in the midst of a strike in 1937 something that the labor union leaders didn't like, Mr. Lewis declared publicly:

"It ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table and who has been sheltered in labor's house to curse with equal fervor and fine impartiality both labor and its adversaries when they become locked in deadly embrace."

In a biography of Mr. Lewis written by Saul D. Alinsky and published in 1949 by G. P. Putnam & Sons, the author tells of an interview with the labor leader during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Lewis is quoted as having said:

"Everybody says I want my pound of flesh, that I gave Mr. Roosevelt $500,000 for his 1936 campaign, and I want quid pro quo. The United Mine Workers and the CIO have paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation that we have gotten.

"We have the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act cost us many dollars in contributions which the United Mine Workers have made to the Roosevelt administration with the explicit understanding of a quid pro quo for labor. These contributions far exceed the notions held by the general public or the press. Is anyone fool enough to believe for one instant that we gave this money to Roosevelt because we were spellbound by his voice? It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three-quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the $500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price, but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money.

"Certainly there was a quid pro quo—the right for labor to organize. But there was more than that. The sums we spent in 1936 were not only cash contributions that were made to the Democratic Party, but also were money expended in terms of salaries for organizers and other personnel who worked full time organizing and electioneering for Roosevelt. Radio time purchased, billboards, handbills, literature, and all other paraphernalia that are part and parcel of the process of being elected President of the United States didn't come gratis."

The same interview reveals that in 1938 when the tensions between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had eased off somewhat and the Democratic President was trying in primary contests to purge certain Southern Democratic Senators who happened also to be antilabor, the United Mine Workers' chief rendered a helping hand. Again Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Saul Alinsky book as follows:

"Where did the money come from that Franklin D. Roosevelt siphoned into those Southern States to try to bolster up the fight against the anti-New Deal Senators? Where did the money come from?

"I'll tell you where it came from. Right here, from the coffers of the United Mine Workers of America. It came by request of the President of the United States through one of his trusted aides. You tell this to the President, and if he questions it, and I'm certain that he will not, you may inform the President that I am perfectly willing to name names and sums, chapter and verse, to satisfy any slight amnesia that there might be on this particular issue.

"You ask me for gratitude in terms of an administration that we have literally poured our life's blood into supporting. You wonder that I do not express the feeling that one should have for a great champion of labor. I say that labor's champion has to a large extent here been a bought and paid for proposition. There is nothing we should be grateful for when we paid cash on the barrelhead at the price demanded for it."

So the philosophy of the money raisers in labor's ranks hasn't changed much in the 20 years since John L. Lewis spoke. In the 1958 congressional campaign when the labor unions boasted that a majority of the House of Representatives was elected through their help, the Federal records show a relatively small sum was contributed. Big amounts were, however, donated largely to State organizations which do not come under the Federal laws requiring the reporting of contributions. It is estimated that labor raised approximately $10 million. Much of it was spent to uphold laws compelling workers to forgo their civil rights and join unions.

Mr. President, the Congress of 1907, which prohibited political contributions by corporations, was not confronted with the innumerable, well-organized, and effective political organizations which today seek to impose the will of labor leaders on the Congress. There is the Nonpartisan League of the United Mine Workers. Railroad brotherhoods carry on their political activities through the Railway Labor's Political League. Numerous national unions have their own political organizations. These include: Amalgamated Clothing Workers Political Education Committee, International Typographical Union Political Committee, Textile Workers Union Political Fund, Trainmen's Political Education League, United Automobile Workers Political Action Committee, United Brotherhood of Carpenters Nonpartisan Political Committee, United Steelworkers of America voluntary political action fund, and the Upholsterers' International Union Trades Campaign Committee.

The best known, largest and most effective labor political organization, however, Mr. President, is the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO—a merger of the old CIO Political Action Committee and the AFL Labor's League for Political Education.

The COPE organization—Committee on Political Education—covers the entire country and operates through a committee which includes the secretary-treasurers of 30 international unions. An administrative committee composed of the 29-member AFL–CIO executive council and the presidents of 15 unions not represented on the council.

There are more than 400 COPE organizations operating in congressional districts, counties, or cities.

It is at once apparent, Mr. President, that with the interlocking officers of labor unions and the labor political committees, the same objections exist to the political expenditures of the numerous political committees as moved the Congress in 1943, and again in 1947, to prohibit political expenditures by the labor unions themselves. The corrupting influence of huge aggregations of wealth is the same, whether it be in the control of labor leaders, corporate officers and directors, or so-called political education committees.

The influence of the individual citizen and the will of the people as a whole is diminished to no smaller degree when the gigantic pressure group and lobbyist is an organization composed of identical officers and methods of collection as the principal labor organization. As far as the evils sought to be corrected are concerned it matters not whether the expending organization is the General Motors Corp., the AFL–CIO, or the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO. In any event, the result is the same.

Mr. President, the proponents of the amendment on primaries have eloquently expressed their heart-felt desire for clean elections untainted by the corruption which accompanies large contributions and expenditures. If indeed there is a bona-fide desire to preserve the election process for the individual voter, this amendment will be adopted. If we would rid the election process of the evil that accompanies the use of large concentrations of wealth in elections, we must effectively close all loop-holes in the Corrupt Practices Act. There must be no privileged group in the field of campaign contributions and expenditures. The American people will not be deceived—they can measure our sincerity by the action on this amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am happy to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from South Carolina has offered an amendment which, if it is adopted, will make the pending bill a clean elections bill in fact. If it is not adopted I believe the name will be only a sham. I also believe that the people of the United States will, in that case, look correctly to those who voted against the amendment and wonder why.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. The language of the Senator's language on page 1, line 8, reads:

> 2. Make a contribution to any committee, association, or organization, whether political or nonpolitical in nature, which makes contributions or expenditures for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates.

Is it the Senator's intention that the language cover political associations which might be formed by business associations?

Mr. THURMOND. It certainly is. It is the intention of the amendment to embrace any partisan political association or committee formed by a corporation, as well as by a labor union. The Senator from South Carolina has no desire to punish corporations. He has no desire to punish labor unions. He feels

that the tremendous concentration of wealth in corporations or labor unions, used in elections, can corrupt elections, and therefore should be curbed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it the Senator's intention that the language which I have quoted from his amendment should also cover political organizations such as the Committee on Political Education?

Mr. THURMOND. It is the intention of the amendment to cover the Committee on Political Education. I might say, further, that my amendment would prohibit political contributions of labor unions and corporations, with three specific exceptions. I wish to make those clear: First, the amendment would in no way affect the right of labor unions and corporations to communicate with the members or stockholders through the medium of a union newspaper or house organ, so long as its distribution was limited primarily to the members or stockholders concerned; second, the amendment protects the alleged constitutional right of labor unions and corporations to discuss the issues of the campaign impartially and to declare their position on such issues; third, the amendment specifically guarantees the right of labor unions and corporations to sponsor news programs and programs in which the opposing candidates are presented on a panel discussion, debate, or similar type program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wished to make that clear. I thank the Senator for his answer. It needs to be made clear, because there seems to be a great misunderstanding about the operations of a committee like COPE. Does the Senator agree with the junior Senator from Arizona that under the Supreme Court decision in United States against United Auto Workers the business fraternity or business organizations and corporations may also organize committees such as labor has organized?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from South Carolina is of the opinion that business organizations and corporations could organize committees similar to COPE, just as labor unions have done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator agree further with the junior Senator from Arizona that the threat of this happening is one of the gravest threats to our constitutional Republic which faces us? I say that for this reason. If we wind up in this country within the next few years with a gigantic political operation operating on the one hand with funds derived from unions, and, on the other, a gigantic organization operating politically with funds which have come from corporations, where will a candidate who wishes to run on the old fashioned Jeffersonian or Lincolnian principles be able to get any money? Will a candidate not have to be beholden, and openly beholden, either to the management side or the labor side, whose principles will be exactly the same—economic? Would the Senator from South Carolina agree?

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator from South Carolina is in accord with the opinion expressed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona. If it reaches that point, a candidate who could stand any chance of being elected would have to be beholden to the tremendous power and wealth of corporations or unions. Therefore, an independent candidate who wished to represent the public at large would be precluded from any chance of election.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to establish a little legislative history, because yesterday the debate established very clearly that there is a broad misunderstanding of what constitutes political activities by one of these committees. Yesterday, during the course of my efforts to convince the chairman of the committee that this should be met in the bill, I read a list of political activities of the Committee on Political Education. I will read those again: compiling, publishing, and distributing voting records; political training classes; getting workers registered; paying election day workers; providing automobiles to get voters to the polls; political meetings.

Nevertheless, there are many Members of the Senate who do not understand that that constitutes political activity.

I read that yesterday from a publication issued by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. One of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, was much annoyed by the fact that I have confidence in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. So, to be bipartisan, so to speak, in this matter, I wish to read from "How To Win—A Handbook for Political Education," published by AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education. By the way, it is one of the finest books of its type ever written, and I urge everyone in politics to get a copy of it, because it tells exactly how to win. I wish to read this to back up the Senator's contention that the Committee on Political Education is not educational at all; it is a political committee.

For instance, I refer to one chapter: "How To Get the Best Man or Woman Elected." Will the Senator from South Carolina agree that that is political? "How To Get the Best Man or Woman Elected" is the title of one chapter.

Mr. THURMOND. It would certainly appear that that was the purpose in writing the book and publishing it. It was not put out for general information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator will agree that the purpose of how to get the best man or woman elected would certainly be political.

Mr. THURMOND. It would be political, in the opinion of the Senator from South Carolina. The best man or woman elected would be the man or woman who would conform to the wishes of the group which put out that book.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me read what COPE itself says. I have been trying to establish in this body for a long time that COPE, and other committees like it, which can be formed, function according to the interpretation of the Supreme Court, which, in my opinion, has invalidated the intent of the Taft-Hartley Act as it refers to political contributions by unions and corporations. I find the best evidence that it has by this statement:

> COPE's role in election campaigns:
> Chances are the election campaign—be it for county dogcatcher or U.S. Senator—is organized by the political party of the candidate your COPE has endorsed.

How any reasonable person can assume, after reading that, that COPE, or committees organized like it, are organized only to educate people, is beyond me. They admit that they endorse candidates. They admit that they endorse political parties. If one reads further through the book, he will see headings on how to form a campaign committee—"Research," "Publicity," "Speakers' Bureaus," "Campaign Managers." They tell what to do, and give all the little details, such as to list every precinct, to be realistic, and so on.

This is a well-written book on how to win elections. Yet there are Senators and Members of the House who maintain stanchly that there is nothing wrong with this practice; that it has no bad influence on American politics.

We have before us a bill which is traveling under the name of a "clean elections" bill; yet the chairman of the committee which prepared the bill is not able to show that there is a threat to our elections if such organizations are allowed to continue to operate without a requirement for reporting.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has just given the finest explanation of this type of organizational work I have ever heard. He pointed out very cogently that it is contended that it is unfair to prohibit the contribution of money by one group of people, but that it is perfectly all right to have money contributed in any amounts by the other side.

I know there is not a Senator who would not rather have an organization like this working for him than all the money he could put together. Money does not win elections; it is the people who work for the candidates who win elections. That is why labor has been so successful. If either political party worked as hard to elect the persons they wanted to elect, the political parties would be much better off. It is men and women who win elections, not money.

Mr. President, I point out that COPE, according to its own language, is a political organization. I know that in my last election campaign COPE sent people into Arizona from outside the State to try to defeat me. I was somewhat amazed the other day to hear stated an amendment which would restrict money from going across State lines, but which said nothing about people. Hundreds of persons were sent into my State of Arizona from Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, and California, for one reason only: to "get GOLDWATER," because they did not happen to agree with me. I think the people of my own State can say better whether they want to "get GOLDWATER" or "keep GOLDWATER." I am happy with their decision.

Mr. President, we are talking about something which is very, very vital. I

cannot see how we can, with any conscience, call this a clean elections bill; how we can go before the people and say, "Oh, we have cleaned up elections. You do not need to worry about money influencing candidates any more. We have taken care of that."

We cannot say that if we leave in the bill a loophole as large as the one we are now discussing. This is a tremendous loophole. We do not know what a committee like COPE spends. We have no way of making estimates.

I observe on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I served under his guidance on the Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying. We were trying to examine into the matter of costs. We learned that in one county in Michigan money was being spent at the rate of approximately $37,000 a day for people to work in an election. It was not a Federal election; it was a local election.

If money in such amounts is being contributed across the country, in addition to the cost of publishing handbooks for political education and the cost of preparing millions of pieces of paper for mailing, I would hesitate even to guess what must be spent by this organization on politics, but it is not in the neighborhood of $10,000, $100,000, or $1 million; I think it is much more than that.

The time has come for the American people to know how much money is being spent by one organization in this country on politics.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that I am just as violently opposed to corporations being in politics as I am to labor unions being in politics. I am happy that the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina adequately and completely includes both groups.

One more comment at this point. It has a bearing on the subject, because it shows how strong and powerful labor organizations have become. In the last election in California, there was a proposal on the ballot for a so-called right-to-work law. Two men who were members of the International Association of Machinists took a stand contrary to the union's stand. The union had taken a stand against that bill. These two men spoke for the bill. They were dismissed from the union because of disloyalty.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious situation. I have before me an editorial published in last night's Washington Star which states:

> A California judge has ruled that it is a mark of disloyalty for a union member to speak out in opposition to his union's position on a political matter.

In other words, we are now seeing power exerted to destroy the constitutional rights of men and women in this country. I believe one of the roots of that power certainly stems from the organization we have been discussing.

I say to the Senator from South Carolina that the same thing could happen if business got into the field of politics. I am fearful that business will do so, because business cannot stand still and allow labor to attack the free enterprise system in the Halls of Congress. Business is being forced into the position of taking a part in politics. I think we ought to prevent both business and the labor movement from doing so.

If the Senator from South Carolina does not object, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Punishing Free Speech," published in last night's Evening Star, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. THURMOND. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUNISHING FREE SPEECH

A California judge has ruled that it is a mark of disloyalty for a union member to speak out in opposition to his union's position on a political matter.

In 1958 the International Union of Machinists was against California's right-to-work proposal. Two members campaigned for the proposal, however, and in turn were expelled by the union. They sued for reinstatement and damages, but the judge ruled against them. He said that by taking a public stand in opposition to the union's position on the issue they were guilty of conduct unbecoming a member and of disloyalty to the union.

This decision will be appealed, as it should be. For if it were to stand it would mean that no union member could safely speak his mind in any matter in which he opposed the official union position. In other words, a union member would have to surrender his right of free speech or be expelled. And expulsion from a union might mean that the worker would lose his job.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me. As a fellow American, I thank him for performing a long needed service in suggesting a remedy for this disease which exists in this country.

Mr. THURMOND. The junior Senator from South Carolina wishes to commend the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and to state that he is in accord with the Senator.

I feel that the junior Senator from Arizona is one of the great men in this country, one of the ablest Senators who has ever sat in the Senate. It is a pleasure to me personally to have the Senator from Arizona express the views he has stated.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I, too, wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his work on the bill and for offering his amendments.

The vote on these amendments will be the test of whether the Senate desires to have a clean elections bill enacted into law, because these are the ones that strike at the widespread abuses.

So, Mr. President, I expect to support the amendments of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield further, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Arizona in regard to his recent remarks.

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator from Arizona referred to the amount of money spent by COPE, and estimated it to be a great sum. Does he believe that amount has been raised by voluntary contributions?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, I do not believe it has been raised by voluntary contributions; I do not believe that organization can raise that much in that way.

I do believe—and I said so on yesterday—that the money which COPE gives to a candidate or to a committee for a candidate is now raised voluntarily. I do not want to state at this time the amount used in that connection, because I do not have the figure at my fingertips.

But the money used to operate the mechanism known as COPE comes right out of union dues money.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I also thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska for his fine work in this field, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

In my opinion these amendments constitute class legislation of the first order. I believe they would make less than first-class citizens of 16 million Americans who not only are members of labor unions but also are members of consumer groups, educational groups, ethnic groups, religious groups, economic groups, political groups, and many others; but just because they happen to be—in addition to belonging to the other groups I have mentioned—members of organized labor, they would be treated, under these amendments, as I understand them, as less than first-class Americans.

Mr. President, regardless of how much validity there may be in their interest in Government because of their membership in any other kinds of organization, the fact that they now belong to a labor organization—and even though their membership in it might be incidental to their interest in the other groups to which they belong—would, under the provisions of these amendments, cause them to be denied first-class citizenship.

Mr. President, I hope these amendments will be rejected, for I believe they constitute class legislation of the first order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to state that I shall vote against these amendments, for the same reason that led me to vote against the bill of rights to the Taft-Hartley Act which was submitted

by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and which we subsequently refined and made into an instrument of law for which it was possible for the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body to vote.

Mr. President, I make that statement because of the fact that the problems I find involved in connection with these amendments are legal ones, and relate to due process.

I believe that in our anxiety to act in accordance with what we feel should be the will of the people in regard to a matter of this character, we must not overlook the fundamental rights of individuals. Hence, Mr. President, I compare the situation which now confronts us with the situation which faced us in connection with the highly desirable bill of rights question, which I think we resolved very wisely.

Mr. President, I shall be specific in connection with this matter, for I have very great regard for the proponent of these amendments.

In the first place, let us make clear that labor organizations are specifically included under section 610 of the Taft-Hartley Act, and it already is illegal for a labor union to make a political contribution.

However, these amendments seek to confine the activities of labor unions to political activities within the unions. That is really the fundamental purpose of the amendments; otherwise, there would be no point to them. They also would tighten up somewhat the penalty; but I do not believe that is their main purpose. Their main purpose, in my opinion, is to determine what a union may do in respect to its own members, with regard to funds to be used in dealing with political questions, political issues, or political candidates.

On that point I am concerned with two things. First there are items of definition which are contained in this amendment—and let us remember that a violation would be a criminal act—which I think jeopardizes, because they are not precise enough, the question of due process, or possibly the question of constitutionality.

I should like to call the attention of my colleague to the use of the word "impartial." Again, as I said, the amendment is designed to deal with intraunion affairs and intraunion activities with respect to the union's own candidates.

I point out that the application of the word "impartial"—that is, an impartial statement of the issues in the election and an impartial news program, which is called for in the amendment—leaves me in great doubt as to whether we could expect any jury to decide any criminal statute on the basis of whether a particular statement on a highly controversial political issue is impartial or whether the presenting of a news program is impartial.

I have appeared on labor union news programs, such as the one Mr. Edwards has. I do not know whether they were impartial. I was on it, and so was a Democratic Party Senator. I do not know whether that made it impartial, because often we agree.

So, for those reasons, because I think it is designed to prevent intraunion activity, and because I have great doubt whether it ought to be prevented, and also because the standards are hardly those that can be administered with due process in a criminal statute, I think the amendment is unwise.

There is another point to which I should also like to call attention. It is said the same rules are made applicable to corporations as are made applicable to unions. I have read the amendment very carefully. I do not find, with respect to corporations, there are these specific provisions as to whether they may or may not publish or whether they may or may not distribute. If there were doubt about whether statements of issues in news programs would be considered impartial, I would oppose it on that ground, because I feel many corporations are beginning to become interested in political affairs, and they ought to have the right to comment on them, so long as they do not run afoul of the contributions restriction.

In the statewide election, both for attorney general and the Senate, I was opposed by the trade unions. Nevertheless, I am interested in trying to see that when justice is administered it is administered in a fair way. I am sure my friend has that thought in mind.

It is for the reasons I have given in the analysis I have made that I oppose the amendment.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from New York. I should like to ask the Senator if this is not an attempt really to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, which covers this subject pretty well.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. If it were felt that the Detroit case had made a loophole in this whole scheme of legislative control which is against the public interest, I would certainly join with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is the senior Republican on the committee, in seeking a review in the committee, by hearings, of an overhauling of section 610. I think that would be entirely germane and proper way it should be handled, if we found it needed to be done.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree it is more desirable than doing it in the way now suggested.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Michigan and I may find ourselves on opposite sides on many questions, but I think we agree that is the better way to do it.

Mr. McNAMARA. I find myself frequently in opposition to distinguished attorneys.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, before the able Senator from New York leaves the Chamber, if he so intends, I should like to propound to him a question. I understood him to say, in the context of his very ably presented discussion of the amendment, that he believed there might be some question relating to constitutionality. Does the Senator think that this amendment of section 610 of the United States Code might transgress the provisions of the first amendment relating to free speech?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to rest on my original concept, namely, that it raises the question, certainly in the ways I have mentioned. This is not the final way to deal with it. There should be an opportunity to go into the issue of amendment of the Taft-Hartley law. Because it does raise that question, I feel it would be the final and concluding point which would induce me to vote against the amendment. I feel this is not the final shot at the question. There is doubt of its constitutionality. I would not say it is unconstitutional. It raises a question in my mind. Therefore, for the reasons I have stated, I would vote against the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I inquire if the Senator does not think, being a diligent member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, this is the sort of legislation that should be considered and studied by that committee, and that it does not properly have its place in an elections bill which has as its primary design regulation of reporting and contributing in political campaigns?

Mr. JAVITS. Well, the great Senate can do anything it wants to whenever it wants to. I do feel, considering the legislative scheme which has been followed in reference to the matter, and considering the questions which this amendment raises, that would be the preferable way to approach the question. I would join the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is the senior Republican member on the committee, and who is apparently in favor of the amendment, in seeking a proper exploration of the matter.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may point out to the Senator that on January 13, when I made my opening statement with respect to this proposed legislation, I said this. My remarks appear on page 392 of the RECORD of that date:

> I * * * remind Senators that the present bill does not deal with this provision of Taft-Hartley. I know full well that this statute and even the soundness of its underlying principles have been questioned and debated. Nevertheless, the issues raised have not been sufficiently investigated, and it is certainly my confirmed conviction that any legislation touching section 610 would be at this point premature. The administration of this statute by the courts has, up to now, satisfactorily resolved the controversies involved.

I think the amendment has no proper place at this stage of the proceedings, when the Senate has made substantial and constructive progress on a bill to regulate Federal elections. I have tried to make some analysis of the provisions to which my very good friend from South Carolina has adverted, such as the discriminatory treatments of certain labor organizations, like COPE. Such discriminatory treatment distorts the facts that were developed in congressional investigations; and I especially refer to the investigation by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in 1956, under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

This investigation established beyond any reasonable doubt that labor organizations and corporations follow the same legal practices in the matter of participation in political campaigns. I would refer any who might desire further discussion of this to page 24 of the report of that committee.

Aside from that, I should like to say that none of the clean elections bills reported since 1955 from the Committee on Rules and Administration contains any reference to the Taft-Hartley provision, 610 U.S.C. 18. All of these bills have as their primary purpose the safeguarding of publicity in Federal elections, and bringing up limitations on expenditures to realistic limits.

These questions were fully investigated by different congressional committees, and, in my opinion, Mr. President, the time has arrived, perhaps, for well-considered legislation in this field.

The Taft-Hartley provision, however, as I am sure Senators know, deals with an entirely separate field—an outstanding field, I will say, which affects the economy and the political situation of the entire country. I do not believe that such matters of large compass and scope should be dealt with by amendments on the Senate floor.

The question raised by the able Senator from South Carolina was never presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the ranking minority member, the able Senator from Nebraska, never raised the question during our discussion of this proposed legislation. I think it would be unseemly and unfortunate if the Senate were to try to legislate on the floor of the Senate on a serious matter such as this.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the able assistant majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with what the Senator from Missouri has said. This matter was not discussed in the committee, and it is something which should be considered upon its own merits. We should not attempt to pass such provisions based upon discussion on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator, who is a longstanding member of the committee, is of that opinion. This matter is entirely too far-reaching and too serious in its impact upon the people of this country for us to undertake to amend a clean elections bill in this fashion.

For the time being, we have the Taft-Hartley provision, which, to my mind, is strict enough to cover any situation and to suppress any malpractice. However that may be, we know that several cases have arisen under this provision, and several times the question of its validity was presented to the U.S. Supreme Court. In the course of these cases it developed that serious questions may be involved in this sweeping prohibiting provision of the Taft-Hartley statute. This process of judicial construction of the statute has just begun. Last night the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] very aptly stated that he would not suggest any amendments to the new elections bill becaues a new case is pending before the Supreme Court, which is a case that squarely presents the issue of constitutional validity of the Taft-Hartley provision.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate in its wisdom will reject the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak in opposition to the amendments.

First, before I comment on certain provisions of the amendments, I submit that I do not think the bill now pending is a proper legislative vehicle for the consideration of the subject matter of the amendments now pending, when we look at the amendments from the standpoint of their obviously intended purposes.

Mr. President, if these amendments are at any time going to be considered by the Senate, they should go through hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. A report should be made by that committee, because basically these are amendments which seek to regulate the activities of unions. These amendments have not been before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As a member of that committee, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that he can count on me to urge that the amendments be considered by the committee in connection with amendments to labor legislation, and to urge that a hearing be given for consideration of the subject.

I think we make a great mistake today, Mr. President, in attempting to incorporate in a clean elections bill a proposal which would have very widespread effects upon the activities of American unionism in the field of political education and activity.

So, I raise my first objection from the standpoint of legislative procedure. I think the objection to bringing the matter to the Senate without hearings having been conducted before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is enough to cause postponement of any action on the proposal.

Second, Mr. President, these amendments raise a very important question of public policy on which honest and sincere men can have differences of opinion, as we do.

This proposal is obviously one which seeks to further restrict and further limit the activity of American trade unionism in American politics. I hold to the view that it is in the interest of sound public policy, in the interest of our democratic system of government, to have more rather than less political activity on the part of trade unions; and I hold to the same point of view in regard to chambers of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other employer groups.

I am always at a loss to understand why, in a democracy, we should seek to restrict the acitivities of organizations of free men and women who have organized into trade unions or into business associations, and who seek to carry the point of view of those organizations on legislative issues to a free people. What are we afraid of?

When we think what is happening to the control of media of information, when we think of the expense that is involved in political activity on the part of a candidate for Federal office, in the field of radio, television, and newspaper advertisement, we had better face up to the fact that unless organized groups of citizens at the grassroots level, such as unions, farm organizations, chambers of commerce, and other types of organizations, proceed to carry out what I call their responsibilities of citizenship statesmanship, we may find ourselves living in a democracy only in form, not in substance, because political opinion will be, in effect, so controlled by the media of information beyond the availability of the candidate who is without funds that we shall weaken democracy rather than strengthen it.

I am always a little amused at the opposition of conservative elements in our country to the activity of workers banded together in a trade union, in a political campaign. Perhaps what we need is a reinstitution of a thoroughgoing investigation of what is happening in political techniques. It would be rather interesting, in such an investigation, to discover the subterfuges which American industry uses in order to funnel into political campaigns funds to support candidates to their liking.

It always seems preferable to me to adopt a straightforward legislative procedure, one which places the cards on top of the table. If anyone has stood for a full public disclosure of procedures affecting the public's business, it has been the Senator from Oregon. For years I have advocated greater activity by business and labor groups in politics. All I ask is that there be a full disclosure of their activities. What happens under the election system we now have is that some very interesting subterfuges are adopted by people in all types of organizations in order to get around what has been, at best, a very weak Corrupt Practices Act.

It is not difficult to raise the salary of an officer of a corporation with the undisclosed understanding that he personally will contribute to certain political campaigns. It is not difficult for business expense accounts to be rigged in order to be of assistance to political campaigns, both election campaigns and legislative campaigns. It is not difficult for leaders of industry to accomplish their purposes.

Very little attention is being paid to the tactics used by industry, but a trade union is fair game. So we already have restrictions in the Taft-Hartley law on

unions in politics, to which I shall always be proud to point, by way of opposition to such restrictions in 1947 on the floor of the Senate, when I led the fight against that nefarious antilabor law.

I think we should face up to the issue here today—first, as to whether or not this is the proper legislative vehicle by which to enact legislation on the subject matter of the Thurmond amendment; second, if it is decided that it is—and I hope it will not be—let us come to grips with the substance of the proposal itself.

What the Thurmond amendments apparently do is to take the present section of law which prohibits labor unions and corporations both from making direct contributions to political candidates and reenact the same provisions for corporations, while treating unions separately, and applying much more far-reaching restrictions to them.

In other words, the language in the section headed "Contributions by National Banks and Corporations" appears to me to be the same as under existing law. It is further my understanding that the only new restrictions are found in the language under the heading "Political Contributions by Labor Organizations," where we have some interesting new restrictions. It seems to me that this language does not relate to corporations.

What is really proposed is simply to further limit unions, but not industry, in carrying out what I consider to be a great responsibility of the labor movement, and that is to take an active interest in the legislative process of our democracy.

Why should not a trade union, satisfied that a certain legislative program or proposal made in the Halls of Congress would not be in the interest of free working men and women, proceed, by a majority vote of the union, to make that issue an item of the business of the union, and try to defeat the measure? One of the purposes of a union is to seek to protect the economic interests of the members of the union. If a piece of proposed legislation, in the opinion of a majority of the union, would be detrimental to the interest of members of the union, what is wrong, in a free society, with their proceeding, by means of the application of the majority vote principle, to make that issue a legislative issue, and carry the fight to the American public? We should have more such activity rather than less.

So I move into another phase of that point. Suppose the members of a union are satisfied that a candidate for office stands for a legislative program detrimental to the welfare of free men and women organized into trade unions. Why should they not, as a union policy, proceed to make that a political issue and carry it to the public, and let the public decide at the ballot box?

We talk a great deal about one thing to adopt procedures that will make unions more democratic, yet we are presented with a proposal this afternoon which seeks to prevent them from following democratic procedures in connection with what I consider to be their obligations of citizenship statesmanship.

I oppose the amendments because of what I think are their clear underlying purpose, namely, further to strengthen the restrictions upon political activity on the part of unions.

NEW RESTRICTIONS AIMED ONLY AT LABOR

Next, I point out that under these amendments, the restrictions on corporations refer only to contributions or expenditures in connection with any election to any political office. However, the restriction upon unions refers to a contribution or expenditure for the purpose of influencing an election.

There is quite a difference.

Where would this language leave the new campaign of the National Chamber of Commerce to get young businessmen active in political affairs, its "political participation program," a campaign for which the Chamber is sending out a great deal of literature advising them how to participate in political decisions and organize political clubs and activities?

I am all for this campaign. It is a healthy thing in a democracy. I would place no restrictions on these business groups organizing such political organizations. It gets them out into the open. I am for getting labor organizations, farm organizations, cooperative organizations, and other organizations, which we know in fact participate actively, seeking to influence legislation and seeking to influence candidates of their own choosing, out into the open. I believe it would be healthy for democracy.

The way to keep it healthiest is to recognize its political reality, to put it on top of the table and require a full disclosure of their activities, full disclosure of the money they spend and for whom and to whom, and not try to adopt a prohibition against the activity at all. To do that is to be confronted—human beings being what they are—with the resort to subterfuge and a device of indirection, to carry on what they consider to be vital to their economic survival, in some instances.

TREATMENT OF ANTIPUBLIC-POWER CAMPAIGNS UNCLEAR

Also, where would these amendments leave the antipublic-power advertising of the private utilities? The private power companies have several associations which prepare advertising material for them, in opposition to public power projects. It has been estimated by the Federal Power Commission that some $2 million was spent in 1957 to place these ads in national magazines.

But beyond that, they send their material to individual power companies to be placed in local papers, and it is estimated that since 1940 these individual corporations have spent some $100 million for these ads. Does the amendment apply to either expenditure? In other words, unions would not be permitted to make expenditures to influence elections, but corporations and unincorporated trade associations would. Is that true?

Well, Mr. President, I have had to battle this matter of private utilities using funds to carry on an anti-public-power program, to carry on an expensive program in opposition to the position I have taken all through my public life in my belief that multipurpose power dams should belong to the people, and should be built by the people, and that the profits should flow into the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of all people; that the water of the rivers belong to the people of this country and that when they are used to run the generators of multipurpose dams they ought to have the profits from that water flow directly into the Treasury of the United States, to pay not only for the nonreimbursable cost of a multipurpose dam but also, as I testified this morning, in a statement which I filed with the committee in support of the basin account program, pay for other public need purposes, such as reclamation.

As the RECORD will show, the two Senators from Oregon, in the law that was adopted some years ago, established the first precedent for the basin account principle in the so-called Crooked River reclamation project in the State of Oregon, to be paid for in part by power revenues earned at the Dalles Dam at The Dalles, Oreg., a Federal dam.

The private utilities do not like it, and they have been spending a great amount of money in magazines and newspapers of this country in trying to carry on a campaign against that program. Certainly these amendments would not stop them, although the ads undoubtedly are intended to influence both legislation and elections. Yet similar activity by unions is proposed to be prohibited.

Of course, the Internal Revenue Service has recently reiterated that certain private utility advertising in opposition to public power projects may not be deducted as a business expense. That makes it pretty obvious that it is an expenditure to influence the public. Its rule states that the Bureau will not approve deductions as expense items of money spent "to promote or defeat or to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation—even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business."

As I read the amendments—and again this shows the need for a hearing on it and an opportunity to get the pros and cons before the committee, and to have evidence presented—I am fairly certain they would not apply to the private utilities but that they would apply to trade unions.

I think it is unfair. I think it is discriminatory. I have no objection—let me make this clear to the private utilities—to their running their ads, but I do object to their deducting the cost of those ads as a business expense, and including it in their rate bases. They are political expenditures, in essence.

That is what it adds up to. Every time they run those ads, it is a political contribution to every Member of Congress and every individual running for a seat in the House of Representatives or for a seat in the Senate who likewise is opposed to multipurpose dams belonging to the people of the United States. It

is a legislative and election campaign being carried on. Is it fair to permit private utilities to do that but not permit trade unions to present their point of view against legislation, and in effect, against candidates?

UNEQUAL TREATMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Third, it seems to me that the amendments provide that no contributions may be made by a union to an organization "whether political or nonpolitical in nature which makes contributions or expenditures for the purpose of influencing an election," with certain exceptions for distribution of "impartial statements" of issues to its members, and presentation of "an impartial news program on radio or television."

But, Mr. President, in the face of the realities of American politics, when a campaign is on, what is necessary on the part of a trade union, when it knows or feels that a piece of proposed legislation, supported by some activity, is going to be detrimental to its economic interest, to carry the facts to the voters, because they are going to decide the issue in the election? I am satisfied that under the amendments the union could not do it.

Yet the amendments do not seem in any way to restrict corporations or trade associations from making contributions to other nonprofit groups like the National Association of Manufacturers or a chamber of commerce or private utility associations, which in turn spend money to influence legislation and elections.

I am in doubt that the amendments restrict it. It is further evidence as to why I think we ought to have hearings on them, and further evidence as to why I believe witnesses ought to be called before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to testify in regard to the subject matter, rather than, in effect, turn the Senate into a Committee of the Whole, with individual Senators who speak on the amendment the only witnesses called.

In committee hearings, witnesses can be heard on the pros and cons, and can be subject to cross-examination of counsel for the committee and by the members of the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete my statement first; then I shall be glad to yield. One Senator called me this morning and asked about references I have made to the Public Affairs Institute, a research group in Washington that has been a great help to many of us in the Senate. I have publicly given credit to this group time and time again for the great research help it has been to me in the past. It is headed by a very able research director, Mr. Dewey Anderson. Some of its financing comes from some of the unions of the country. Those of us in the liberal group in the Senate do not have research facilities of an extensive nature.

We do not have the backing of the research facilities of the Government departments—and, of course, the most effective lobby in Washington happens to be the Government departments downtown, with their large staffs of researchers. We need the help of such an organization as that headed by Dewey Anderson. As I have said to Mr. Anderson time and time again, the test is whether their research stands the analysis of being factual, subject to successful cross-examination.

Here again, as I did in Cleveland the other day, when I spoke to the convention of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, I wish to express my public appreciation for the assistance I have received from the Public Affairs Institute. But I have doubts in regard to the effect of this amendment upon the work of that institute, in view of the source of some of its financial backing. I have doubts as to whether that institute might find itself placed under the restrictions of this amendment. I think we ought to have testimony on that point. I think we ought to have witnesses before us to discuss the operations of that institute and the extent, if any, to which this amendment might apply to it, although it in no way participates in elections.

I do not think we ought to proceed to adopt the amendment today without giving the people who might be affected by the amendment, whether they are aided by unions or corporations, their day in court, or, at least affording them an opportunity to come in and present their points of view as to the effects of the amendment on their operations.

RAISES QUESTION WHETHER ALL POLITICAL EDUCATION INFLUENCES ELECTIONS

It seems to me that this amendment, in effect, deals with the problem of money which is spent to lobby and to influence specific legislation, as well as to influence elections as such. Therefore, I think it is better, as I said in the beginning, to deal with this matter in a separate bill, rather than to have it connected with the clean elections bill. Otherwise, it seems to me, it would be necessary to distinguish between money spent to influence legislation and money spent to influence elections.

I know that many Members of the Senate do not share my point of view—yet—as to the importance of having various groups in our country, such as labor unions, chambers of commerce, farm groups, and cooperatives, participate more, rather than less, in American political life. But I would feel bad if I thought I did not have at least majority support for the proposition that when it comes to passing upon an amendment as broad in its scope and as broad in its implications as this amendment, we should not do so until it first was submitted to the full legislative procedure of the Senate, which calls for committee hearings, for witnesses, for cross-examination, and a final report by the committee. Therefore, on that procedural ground I would be willing to rest my case; but I offer, in addition, the objections to their apparent inequity which I have made to the amendments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the thinking of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in reference to the so-called procedural consideration of the pending amendment. It seems to me, as the Senator has so well said, that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should be the proper forum for a complete study of the provisions of the amendment. It seems to me, further, that the amendment relates more appropriately to the Taft-Hartley Act. It is implied, at least insofar as I have been able to ascertain from listening to the debate, and a study of the language of Senator THURMOND's proposal, that the amendment is discriminatory.

I feel, without reflecting upon the effort of my friend from South Carolina—a man for whom I have high personal esteem—that the proper procedure is as suggested by the Senator from Oregon. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I can assure him that I would join and I am certain other Senators would join with us, in seeing to it that a matter of this nature be accorded careful attention by that committee. Hearings should be conducted and witnesses should be heard—not only from labor but other groups which could be affected.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that the pending amendment is too technical and involved to be considered hastily in this Chamber in this manner without benefit of committee study and recommendation. These are far-reaching implications.

Neither, in my opinion, is there reason to write into this measure further straitjacketing provisions which would be directed principally at organized labor, a segment of our society which already has had placed upon it by this Congress a stringent reporting and disclosure procedure.

Unless and until an amendment of the type and scope of the pending one proposed by the Senator from South Carolina has had careful consideration by an appropriate committee I will oppose it.

Mr. MORSE. I am always glad when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] shares my point of view on any proposed legislation. I thank him for supporting me on this question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am impelled to say, at this time, a word or two which I have been waiting during the course of the debate to submit regarding the bill, and what I shall say is equally applicable to the pending amendments.

Emotionally—and we are all subject to the emotional appeals of those who have been our friends and those who have been our opponents—I would be impelled to vote for these amendments because they are offered by my dear friend, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], for whom I have a deep affection and because, philosophically and ideologically, I have found myself in accord with him more frequently than not.

Emotionally, I might wish to support the amendments, because certainly I am one Senator who will receive no credit whatsoever from the leaders of organized labor for any vote I might cast in

this body which would appear to be favorable to them. It was only a week or two ago that the leaders of some labor unions from my State came to my office. We had a most pleasant conversation concerning the pending legislation. They expressed their feelings and went on their way. Then when I opened my mail, I found three letters from their organizations gratuitously warning me that under no circumstances could they ever support me for reelection, and reminding me that they never had supported me for election.

In spite of these things, I do not feel that I can support the amendments, or the bill itself in its present form.

My own State of New Hampshire has a Corrupt Practices Act which is vastly more rigid, restrictive, and inclusive than anything which has been presented either in the bill or in any amendment offered on the floor. I do not believe that anything which could be enacted by Congress would place any new limits on any candidate or any election in my State. The bill will not have a personal effect on me and I can approach it without prejudice.

I have consistently voted against every amendment which has been offered to the bill which would curtail in any way, shape, or manner the privilege and the freedom of any American to support and to contribute to the support of the party or the candidates of his choice, so long as what he did was done openly and above the table.

After voting against the amendments I have previously opposed, I would be highly inconsistent if I were to vote in favor of these amendments, which—although in a sense they have the same general purpose—are leveled at someone else.

Mr. President, it is my deep-seated conviction that if we wish to make a contribution to "clean elections"—to use that rather abused term—we should pass a measure which will require complete reporting, and thus turn the merciless light of publicity upon every cent contributed by any person, anywhere, to any candidate or any party in any State of the Union, insofar as the United States Constitution permits the Congress to legislate in that field. I believe we should stop at that point. When we try to fix the ground rules in regard to how much can be contributed, or whether contributions can be used across State lines, or whether the funds contributed can be used only by committees which operate within a State, or whether they can be used by committees whose operations are interstate in character, we find ourselves involved in conflicts with State statutes, bogged down in trying to legislate on the Senate floor and in danger of making no headway at all.

In an earlier campaign for election to a seat in the United States Senate Mr. President, I discovered that under a Federal law, I had certain privileges which presumably superseded the State law. But I also discovered that if I violated the State law, my name could be removed from the ballot, regardless of what the Federal law said. Of course, I think most Members of this body will agree with me when I say that in running for election to the U.S. Senate, it would be a decided handicap if the candidate's name were not printed on the ballot. So, regardless of what the court might later have decided as to whether the Federal law superseded the State law, my colleagues may be sure that I did what any person of average commonsense would do under those circumstances: I complied completely with the State statute. As it now stands, this bill will create a multitude of conflicts with State election laws all over the Nation.

Mr. President, I probably shall not be able to vote for the passage of this so-called clean elections bill in its present form—even though the term "clean elections" may be bandied about this Chamber until it sounds and resounds, and until those on the streets get the idea that Senators who vote for the bill are in favor of purity, and that Senators who vote against the bill are opposed to purity.

Mr. President, when the final vote is taken on this bill, I shall find myself unable to vote for it if it goes much beyond the matter of requiring the full, complete, and frank disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to my distinguished friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is saying is, in effect, the criticism which I have leveled at this so-called "clean elections bill."

If we are going to have reporting—and I agree that there should be reporting—then let us have complete reporting.

The object of the Thurmond amendments, as I understand them, is to clarify the question of whether committees such as the Committee on Political Education are political-action committees.

On yesterday, I tried to assemble language which would provide for this; but, unfortunately, I was unable to do so.

When we are talking about the Committee on Political Education, I might remind my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that that committee engages in the following activities: compiling and publishing voting records, conducting political training courses, getting voters registered, providing election-day workers, providing automobiles to take voters to the polls, and holding political meetings.

The Senator from New Hampshire knows, as do all other Senators, that to engage in those activities costs money. We have no idea how much those activities by that committee cost, because the committee does not report on the cost of those activities. But, although this committee ostensibly operates for educational purposes, actually it is probably the most political committee in the United States. Yet this bill would not in any way require that committee to report.

Previously I said that my fear, in connection with this field, is that today the trend in business and management corporations is toward the establishment of identical committees, and that that trend will continue and will grow. In that event, some day we shall find this situation getting out of hand, when we have, on one side of the political arena, management, and, on the other side of the political arena, labor, with both of them standing on the same principle of economics—namely, the public be damned.

Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to make one other observation—and I can well understand his deep feeling in connection with this matter—I shall state that I only wish he could help the Senate provide for complete reporting.

But as the bill now stands, it is a phony "clean elections bill" because by no means does it require the reporting of all political expenditures in this country.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his courtesy in yielding to me, Mr. President.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Arizona, knows that I am in complete accord with his views as to the necessity of laying down ground rules with regard to campaign contributions made by so-called education committees of labor, and I am also in favor of laying down ground rules in regard to campaign contributions made by all other groups.

If the amendments of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] required, first, rigid reporting, and, second, applied to everyone and every organization, even though such requirements might be redundant, I might vote for the pending amendments, even in connection with this bill.

But, Mr. President, I say to my friend, the Senator from Arizona that, first, I cannot vote for the final passage of a bill which would plunge us into the field of primaries and would go up that area and a host of others to Federal control and to conflicts with State laws; and, second, although I feel deeply and strongly about the necessity of seeing to it that organizations representing organized labor are no longer permitted to have, in supporting candidates and supporting parties, privileges that other organizations do not have, yet I am constrained to believe that the problems which exist in that field—which I believe must be met head on—should be the subject of careful hearings, careful consideration, and well-thought-out legislation which will apply to everyone alike.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I intended to consume. But I merely wished to make these points crystal clear, and to reiterate that I wish we could pass a bill which did not plunge into all these collateral issues, and I wish that we would not pass a bill which has been patched together on the floor of the Senate. Instead, I wish the Senate would pass a bill which would permit the States to be free to go into such situations which need to be gone into, under their own corrupt practices acts; and I wish we would pass a bill which would not hamper the States or interfere with the actions of the States in these other fields.

I wish very much that we would pass a bill which simply would confine itself to the necessity, the obligation, and the Federal requirement of absolute, complete reporting and publicity both before and after elections, as regards every contribution made—directly or indirectly—by anyone, anywhere, to any candidate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about the amendments, because I intend to vote against them, but I should like to declare my reasons for voting against them.

I believe that the basic principle of contributions by unions or corporations is wrong. I think they should be prohibited, because I do not believe that leaders of business organizations or labor organizations, or any other type of organizations, which have as their constituent members citizens of the United States—sometimes in very large numbers—should be permitted to give away the money of those members without their consent or against their will, which is frequently done.

There is no evidence at all that in labor unions of considerable size the members all think one way or that there do not exist very large minorities who would oppose contributions that are sometimes made by the leaders toward one party or another.

The principle behind such a prohibition is one which I have always felt is a sound one. I believe, therefore, contributions by unions and by corporations should be prohibited, because permitting such contributions violates the principle that a citizen should be able to have his money used to support any candidate or political issue he himself favors.

However, I believe that the pending amendments go too far and are inequitable and unfair to the rank-and-file members of labor unions, inasmuch as on page 2, subsection (b), line 17, prescribes certain penalties which a labor organization must endure if it contributes funds of the union in an election campaign.

This provision appears to suggest that a violation is to be determined by administrative action, that no action of the court is needed to determine it. If it were determined by administrative action, the members of a union would lose all of their rights before the National Labor Relations Board, even though many members of the union were opposed to the very action taken by their leaders.

It seems to me that is a highly inequitable penalty to be imposed, especially when one contrasts it with penalties against corporations to be found later in the bill. In that case the stockholders of corporations would not lose any rights at all, but the officers and directors of the corporation would be subject to fine, imprisonment, or both, which I think is a suitable penalty for that particular offense.

If the penalties were to be made parallel, it would seem the officers, directors, and trustees of a union would be the ones who would be penalized for using the funds of labor union members in violation of their wishes or in violation of the law—if unions are prohibited by law from contributing money, as I thought they were—but it appears from court decisions that funds for education are exempt from the law. This holding has been interpreted by many union leaders as giving them almost unlimited freedom to use funds for political action, whether the members of unions like it or not.

So, because I think this provision of the amendments is quite discriminatory and unfair, I shall have to oppose the amendments for the reasons which I have attempted to outline.

I repeat, however, in closing, I believe the principle is wrong.

I listened to my good friend from Oregon, who espoused taking off the wraps all the way around. I do not agree with that, because it puts the leaders in a position of contributing money of members who may have an entirely different point of view from that the leaders have, thus violating the rights of citizenship of the union members. While I believe in the principle of the prohibition of contributions by unions and corporations to election campaigns, I shall oppose the amendments as not coming to grips with the situation fairly and equitably.

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished Senator from New York is recognized as a good lawyer.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my friend. That was sometimes open to question during my practice of law by both my own friends and those on the opposite side, but I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That certainly has been my experience in serving with the Senator, both as a distinguished Member of the Senate, and Member of the House of Representatives. I always found that he was held in a high degree of esteem as a good lawyer—although I did not rise primarily for the purpose of complimenting the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. But when I am paid such a compliment, I always fear what is coming next.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My primary intent was not to compliment the Senator, but simply to buttress an opinion by the reply I expect to get from the Senator when I ask him a question I desire to propound.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the provision in the amendments relating to contributions by national banks and corporations, it would appear to be clear that no national bank or corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress could make a contribution or expenditure, and so forth. I do not know to what extent this is a repetition of existing law, but, in any event, since this describes a condition under which a national bank or corporation organized by authority of any law passed by Congress could be brought to court and charged with a violation of law, would it be fair to say this would establish a condition for a national bank which might apply to a State-chartered bank?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think so, because of the wording further down in section 304, lines 14 and 15, where it is provided that any corporation whatsoever is prohibited from making a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice-presidential electors or a Senator or a Representative in Congress are to be voted for. This provision does make a distinction.

By provision of the bill, which I think is not a change from national law, national banks are prohibited from making a contribution in connection with any primary election or caucus or convention held to select candidates, meaning both candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives; and any corporation whatsoever, which would include State banks, is prohibited from making contributions or expenditures in connection not only with the election of a Senator or Representative, but also presidential and vice-presidential electors. There is a distinction, but I believe that a State bank would run afoul of the latter part of the language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a corporation?

Mr. KEATING. As a corporation. There are a few private banking institutions left in this country now, where an individual or a group of individuals do business as a partnership as a private bank in a State, and are allowed to do so. I believe a few of those still exist. They would not be under the prohibition of this language, in my judgment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the Senator's opinion in the matter. His logic appeals to me. Not having before me the present statute, I was not exactly sure wherein the proposed language differed from the present law.

Mr. KEATING. I think the principal difference, and perhaps the only difference, is the raising of the fine for violation from $5,000 to $10,000. I suppose that is a recognition of the fact that when the statute was enacted the dollar was worth more than it is today, and if a corporation were fined $5,000 then a comparable figure might be $10,000 now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be able to state my objections to these amendments well within the so-called 5-minute rule under which I became so accustomed to speak in the House of Representatives, but from which with such great facility I am learning how to depart in this body.

Mr. President, my objections to these amendments are threefold.

First, I feel strongly that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should review this proposal. This matter deals with the labor field. It does not seem to me it properly comes within the province of the Committee on Rules and Administration. It was never considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration. While I would be the first to concede the great abilities of the members of the Committee on Rules and

Administration, equal in every respect to those of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel it would be proper to have this matter reviewed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare before bringing it to the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say to the Senator that a member of the committee staff listened to our earlier colloquy and he now points out to me that in the amended section 304, to which we were previously directing our remarks, the language proposed by the amendment drops out the phrase "or any labor organization," that appearing at two or three points in the present statute, which would place it in the same category as a national bank or any corporation when it comes to Federal offices. The obvious reason for that is that the Senator, in offering his amendments, has set up a separate section to deal with labor organizations and, therefore, has removed them from this section.

Mr. KEATING. I will say he not only deals with them adequately but he deals with them rather sternly and rather fully, in the first part of the proposal.

My second objection to the amendments is simply that they would do at least two things of sweeping importance. I feel that before we enact them the representatives of organized labor and the representatives of corporations and national banks should have an opportunity to be heard before any committee which reports such a bill.

The effect of section 209(a)(2), which prohibits the making of a contribution by a labor organization to any committee, whether political or nonpolitical in nature, for the purpose of influencing an election or a primary, political convention, or caucus held to select candidates, by its terms would be to outlaw the Committee on Political Education of the AFL–CIO.

The Committee on Political Education in the seven times I have happened to be a candidate for Federal office has consistently supported my opponent, but I do not think that the answer is to outlaw this organization. I believe the way to meet that problem is to conduct ourselves by our votes and in other manner as Federal representatives in such a way that we make an appeal to the great men and women of this country who cast their votes, even though we may not be able to satisfy the leaders of organized labor that we are friendly to them. I would not be adverse to being able to convince the leaders of that fact, but I certainly do not feel that the proper manner of meeting the problem is by outlawing this organization which has been built up, which is the express purpose of subsection (2) of this section.

Conversely, with regard to corporations, we raise the fine which they might suffer for running afoul of the statute from $5,000 to $10,000. I apprehend that they might have objections, and representatives of corporations should certainly have every opportunity to present their objections before we enact such a provision.

Finally, my third reason for opposing this proposal is that I have serious doubts about the constitutionality of parts of it. On the second page, among the expenditures which we would permit are expenditures "for the purpose of disseminating impartial statements of the issues in the election, primary, convention, or caucus and the position of the labor organization on such issues."

I suppose that all of us who have had information disseminated which is adverse to our own position would be inclined to think it was scarcely impartial. We usually do not think anyone who so vigorously opposes us is impartial. He would be impartial if he were on our side, if he thinks the same way we do.

After saying that one who disseminates a partial statement or a one-sided statement of the issue runs contrary to the statute, then it is provided that any officer who consents to that or permits it is punishable by a fine of $1,000, or, if it is willful, $10,000, and he also can be thrown in the "clink."

Mr. President, those are penal provisions relating to the determination of whether a statement issued is partial or impartial. I would think that it might very well run afoul of the first amendment relating to freedom of speech and of the press, and it might also contravene the due process clause. I have serious doubts that we can sit here and say we are going to send somebody to jail because he disseminates a one-sided statement of the issues in Congress, or makes attacks upon Members of Congress.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I feel constrained to vote against the amendments. I hope they will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I believe that my amendments are perfectly clear. The points which have been raised against them, I think, are entirely without merit. Many amendments have been considered in connection with this bill that did not come before the committee. Such a thing frequently happens in connection with bills considered by the Senate.

The amendments are not unfair amendments. They apply to corporations, and they apply to labor unions. The bill is a very important measure aimed at stopping the power of money in controlling elections in this country. But inasmuch as the principal opposition to the amendments centers around the point that it has not been considered in committee, I will withdraw my amendments and introduce a separate bill, which can be referred to the committee and receive full consideration.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. I now withdraw my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina withdraws his amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment which is not controversial. I have had some discussion with the chairman of the committee about it. It relates to the last section of the bill, with respect to the effective date of the bill if it should be enacted into law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may we have a little quiet? This amendment is not printed, and it is important that we be able to hear the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language in the bill now would make the bill effective as of January 1, 1960. It was not necessary to modify that date so as to bring it in line with the calendar. My amendment merely provides that titles I, II, and III, shall take effect on January 1, 1961, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to that date. So it would not have retroactive effect. "But nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of the enactment of this Act."

So my amendment would do three things. First, it would make the act effective on January 1, 1961. It would make it inapplicable to such things as contributions and expenditures which occurred prior to the effective date; and, third, it would relieve no candidate from his responsibility for making the necessary filings under existing law.

This amendment was arrived at in consultation with the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I understand that it is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1960."

On page 19, it is proposed to strike lines 10 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 401. Titles I and II and the amendments made by title III shall take effect on January 1, 1961, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I had a similar amendment prepared several days ago, relating to the effective date of the act and the other language appearing in the amendment which the distinguished minority leader is offering on behalf of himself and me. We have discussed it, and we are in complete agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, lines 14 and 15, and lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to strike the words "or anything of value" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or any other personal or real property."

On page 6, line 6, following the word "cash," it is proposed to insert the words "and other real and personal property other than office fixtures and supplies."

On page 16, lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to strike the words "or anything of value" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or any other personal or real property."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I address my remarks particularly to my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. If there is any objection I shall not press this amendment. However, I felt in duty bound to direct attention to the fact that in the definition of contributions are included gifts, subscriptions, loans, advances, deposits of money, or anything of value. Some years ago a rather interesting question arose in connection with a congressional race. There were donated services. There were people who typed letters. Even members of the Representative's staff went home to help him. Those are services; but who shall say that a service is not a thing of value?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It was even claimed here yesterday that a speech by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, made in behalf of a candidate in some other State, might be a thing of value. No one claimed it to be except the Senator, but it was asserted here that it would be a thing of value. I rise to say that it would be a thing of value. But I think perhaps those words are open to some objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the reason for offering the words "or any real or personal property" in place of the term "anything of value." The amendment provides a rather tangible and precise definition.

An accountant may donate his services. They represent a thing of value. An advisory committee may go into a campaign and donate its services. But those services are a thing of value. The definition can be spelled out in many forms. In a very close election, in connection with which this question might arise, who knows what the court interpretation might be?

Mr. KEATING Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is the intention of the committee, when it speaks of anything of value, that it means something of real or tangible form. That is the reason for the additional words.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly individuals volunteer to do things. That is an exercise not only of their political rights, but their responsibilities. But suppose that some group were to hire 100 or 200 people to work for 30 days prior to an election, as has been done by certain groups, including COPE and others. What would be the effect of the Senator's amendment on that situation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If it is a donated service, a voluntary service——

Mr. CURTIS. No; it is not a donated service. A political organization, or an organization prohibited from taking part in politics, hires 100 people and pays them daily wages and expenses to go out and work in a political campaign for a month before the election. Does the Senator's amendment take that out of the definition of a contribution or expenditure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment might very conceivably take it out; except, of course, that it is a hired service, and for the hired service there would be either an express contract or an implied contract that puts it on an entirely different basis. What I have in mind, of course, are the strictly voluntary services which so often are offered in a campaign and which can be defined as something of value.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Would it be fair for the legislative history to show that what the distinguished Senator from Illinois is attempting to remove from the definition of expenditure or contribution is the rendering of voluntary services, and that if someone is paid wages for the purpose of doing campaign work the wages shall be regarded as a contribution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, directly in point with the Senator's observation, we leave in the bill the language which says "and includes a contract, promise, or agreement whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution." Whether that comes within the illustration the Senator cites, I do not know, although I would rather gather it does.

Mr. CURTIS. I spoke at a political meeting in Lansing, Mich., an election or two ago, at a hotel. I was sought out by certain members of a labor union who were displeased because their dues money was being used to support certain activities. It happened to be for a Democratic candidate. They brought to me a copy of the minutes of a meeting. I photostated the minutes. I have the photostat. The Attorney General has it also. I do not know what he is doing with it, but he has it. Those minutes recite that they were hiring a certain number of people—I believe it was 100—for 1 month before the election, to do campaigning. This was done by an organization prohibited from engaging in politics. They were providing paid manpower. What I am afraid of is that the Senator's amendment will be construed to mean that providing paid manpower does not come within the purview of an expenditure or a contribution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I am not satisfied with the words "anything of value." I should like to propose a suggestion which perhaps might be of interest to the Senator from Illinois. I have doubts abouts the words "anything of value." I do not believe they are precise enough. I would anticipate that it would be a matter of at least a week or 10 days, and perhaps longer, before the bill would be considered in the House. I wonder if it would not be better to have us devote some study to the matter and give the staff a chance to study the language of this section. I would suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he might withdraw his amendment, with the understanding that through the staff of the committee and in conference, consideration be given to the very point he has made.

Personally I entertain some doubt about the precision of the words "anything of value." I certainly want to do nothing that will interfere with the Senator from New Hampshire speaking anywhere he would like to speak in behalf of anyone.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sorry that I was divested during part of the colloquy between the able minority leader and the junior Senator from New York. I would hope that, since this matter relates to verbiage which has not been presented heretofore, except that the Senator did mention something to me about it last night, that the Senator might be content with striking "anything of value" without setting forth anything with reference to real or personal property, so that the language would be subject to interpretation upon the facts as to whether anything of value had been contributed, or whether the services were actually paid for or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the distinguished Senator from Missouri wishes to offer those words, I shall be glad to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I, accordingly, offer the amendment. At lines 14 and 15, on page 3, I propose an amendment to strike out the words "or anything of value." Does that satisfy the Senator's purposes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois is withdrawn. The Senator from Missouri offers his amendment as he has stated it.

Mr. KEATING. I wonder if the complete elimination of those words takes care of a situation of the kind related

by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], with relation to the hiring of workers to do a great deal of work for a congressional candidate. The words "gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money" would be left in the bill if we struck out the words "anything of value."

My initial impression is that that would go further than we intend to go. I think we should include within the definition of a contribution a situation such as was referred to by the Senator from Nebraska.

I would appreciate it if the Senator from Nebraska would address himself to that point, because, as I say, we are bringing this up on the floor for the first time. There is always some hazard when we try to legislate in this manner. If that is satisfactory to the Senator from Nebraska, I would not be inclined to press my objection. However, I do think he has raised a very legitimate case and we ought to try to come to grips with it. "Anything of value" was written into the bill for a purpose. I address myself to the Senator from Nebraska and ask him whether he thinks the complete elimination of the words "anything of value" would inhibit or prohibit the type of thing which he had in mind.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know how to answer the Senator's question. Certainly any expenditure, regardless of its end result or how it is manifested, should be included.

Mr. KEATING. If we are to strike out the words "anything of value," perhaps we should include the reference to an express or implied contract, or words to that effect, which the Senator from Illinois had in his original amendment. I am not sure that striking out the words "anything of value" does what we want to do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if we strike out the words "anything of value," will it be a violation of law for a corporation to give a candidate $10,000 in postage stamps?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; that is a gift.

Mr. KEATING. I would think that would be a gift.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is covered under the general definition of "including a gift."

Mr. KEATING. In order to make some legislative history, is it the opinion of the Senator from Missouri that, with the words "anything of value" stricken out, it is intended to include within the term "gift" the furnishing of substantial services for hire, other than voluntary?

Mr. HENNINGS. If those services are paid for, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. The language of the bill is:

> The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value.

If one makes a gift of a postage stamp, that is something of value.

Mr. HENNINGS. "Or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution."

Mr. CURTIS. But it is a gift or a transfer of money. Strike out "anything of value," and the language is confined to money.

Mr. HENNINGS. That depends on what the Senator means by "money." Does the Senator mean cash?

Mr. CURTIS. It is in the bill reported by the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. If we strike that, it will mean one thing. As I understand, the bill reads "includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement."

Mr. CURTIS. But if we strike out "anything of value," nothing is left but money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield. I am not quite certain what we are trying to do, except to clutter up the language of what we thought was to be the last 10 minutes of the consideration of the bill. I do not think all this discussion goes to any essential point or factor of the proposed legislation, really, either way. If we say "anything of value," it will certainly be for the courts to interpret the nature of the services which are of value. I should assume that the language would require that those services be paid for.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I fear that the Senator from Nebraska may have a point by raising the question of the punctuation. The language reads: "gift, comma, subscription, comma, loan, comma, advance, comma, or deposit, comma, of money."

That, as I understand it, makes "money" modified by "gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit."

If we strike out the comma following the word "deposit," the phrase will simply be "deposit of money."

Thereby, it would be open to the interpretation which the Senator from Missouri has suggested, that if services are supplied, then they come within the word "gift." Therefore, I offer as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri the removal of the comma after the word "gift" on line 19. But in offering my amendment, I renew my suggestion that the most appropriate and orderly way to deal with this question would be other than on the Senate floor, and in a conference. But if we are to legislate here, I think this comma might rise up to haunt us if it is left in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should be perfectly willing, in the interest of trying to preserve some unanimity of thought and providing some degree of continuity of the discussion, to strike the commas. I do not think it will make any difference.

Mr. KEATING. It is one comma.

Mr. HENNINGS. To my untutored mind, we are now quibbling about words which are, in the last analysis, susceptible of interpretation. When we talk about "anything of value," I should assume that the holding of any court would be that services paid for would be something of value. I would not say that certain voluntary services would be something of value.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the question now before the Senate the proposed amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that a sole and single comma be eliminated from the bill on page 3, commencing on line 13, and more particularly the comma which is before the word "of" on line 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment of the Senator from New York will have to be considered after the Senate has acted on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, because the two amendments deal with different portions of the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Who has the floor?

Mr. KEATING. Has the Senator from California yielded to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Missouri has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Missouri has the floor, but that the Senator from Missouri yielded to the Senator from California.

Mr. HENNINGS. I yielded for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield for any purpose which would help to clarify language which has been in the act since 1925.

Mr. KUCHEL. My mind runs back to my freshman year in law school. I was enrolled in a class on contracts. I remember that my very scholarly law school professor in the class on contracts drummed into our ears that it was necessary to have a quid pro quo to create a valid and enforceable contract in the State from which I come, but that the quid pro quo could be anything of value no matter how little; indeed he said it could be ever so slight, even a single peppercorn.

I suggest that if we start now, here on the floor chopping up this section of the bill, after the words "of money, or anything of value," we might add, "even a peppercorn."

I remember another phrase from law school days; I am certain that the distinguished Presiding Officer will remember it too. It is the phrase "reductio ad absurdum." I suggest its relevance to the present debate in the Senate.

It seems to me that when we have a bill which uses the rather plainly understandable English word, "contribution," and goes on to enumerate some of the things it includes, we ought to consider

that any reasonable-minded person or court ought to understand what a contribution is. When the bill says it includes certain specific things, it is simply by way of classification; it does not in any fashion limit its meaning; it does not exclude what, to a reasonable man, the Anglo-Saxon word "contribution" means.

I know what a contribution in a political campaign is. So do you, Mr. President. So do all Senators. I reported my contributions in my political campaigns for the Senate. So did you, each of you. They are on file in the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

I respectfully suggest that the time has come when, perhaps, we should not continue to waste time, to quibble over a poor, little, single comma; perhaps we should get along with the bill, so that some of us can devote the rest of the afternoon to other matters which we deem important.

Mr. HENNINGS. I can only say "amen" to the exceedingly sensible, illuminating, happily succinct, direct remarks of the distinguished acting minority leader.

Since we are talking about commas, at this stage of the proceedings, and discussing the meaning of certain words, I again point out that this is all well set forth in the old Corrupt Practices Act. This matter has been passed upon time and again. It is verbiage which appeals to the minds of reasonable men and is easily understood.

I regret that we find ourselves enmeshed in what now seems to be a purely legalistic discussion of something which, as I see it, has no real relevance whatsoever to the bill.

If we have to strike anything—and I would prefer not to strike anything—but if we have to strike anything, I will withdraw the amendment.

We might strike "anything of value," because preceding that the language is "gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit," and then "transfer of funds." But I cannot, for the life of me, understand how it makes any difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Commas have their place in the scheme of things. Some years ago a comma was omitted from a tariff bill between the words "fruit" and "trees." That cost the Federal Government a tidy sum in losses, for without that comma the tariff applied to fruit trees, but not to fruit and trees. So it can be seen that commas have a place in the universe.

As I have said, I do not care to press the amendment, but I do want to have some legislative history made.

Mr. President, a very scholarly treatise which I read some years ago in the Harvard Law Review began in this fashion:

> Congressional intent is a fiction; there is no such thing as congressional intent. Congressional intent is what the courts say it is.

So, Mr. President, in a close race, under a criminal statute the meaning of that provision might very well be ventilated; and then the use of the comma or the failure to use the comma, and the use or the failure to use those words, and the provisions included or the provisions excluded, would take on some real significance for some fellow citizens.

Mr. President, we have made the legislative history, and I am quite prepared to vote on this amendment. If some Senators wish to vote to eliminate that portion of the bill, that is their privilege. But I wish to be very, very sure that the whole story has been told and that the issue has been raised on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I did not mean to belittle or demean in the least the suggestion which was made by my friend, the Senator from Illinois, nor, as one who has tried to understand the law, at least in some of its aspects, did I mean to say that at times a comma is not vastly important.

But, Mr. President, honestly I do not believe we would improve upon this proposed legislation if we were now to make substitutions in the language or changes in the wording or if we were now to strike out certain commas or certain words.

I would be willing to strike out some; but if that were to be done, we would get into difficulties in regard to other interpretations, which, so far as I know, have not been given consideration by those who have studied this field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let us proceed to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to strike out the words "or anything of value."

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri is withdrawn.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, is not another amendment pending at this time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understood that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was withdrawn; and the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is in order.

Mr. KEATING. Is not there pending an amendment to strike out a comma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment would not have then been in order, because there was then before the Senate an amendment, offered by the Senator from Missouri, to the language appearing on page 3, in line 14; and the amendment referred to by the Senator from New York applied to a different portion of the same page of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I not have the floor? Or has the Chair recognized another Senator, to permit another Senator to discuss my amendment before I can even have my amendment read by the clerk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York rose to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. My parliamentary inquiry is whether any question was raised about the amendment to strike out the comma, at the time when that amendment was offered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I decline to yield. I do not have to yield for that purpose, if I have the floor; and I had the floor, and I called up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; and the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will, upon his request, be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

STATE PRIMARIES

SEC. 213. No person's name shall appear on a ballot or voting machine in any general election for a seat in the United States Senate or House of Representatives unless that person has been nominated in a primary election in which all registered or otherwise properly qualified members of his party shall have had an opportunity to vote: *Provided, however,* That such conditions shall not apply to names written by the hand of the voter: *And provided further,* That the regular nomination by primary election shall not be necessary for a candidate for Senator or Congressman whose party did not receive more than 10 per centum of the votes cast in the previous senatorial or congressional election for the office to which he aspires.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, for the purpose of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if it is understood that in yielding for that purpose he will not lose the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I modify my amendment on page 2, by striking out the word "Congressman" and inserting the word "Representative."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if my amendment is adopted, I believe it will be the most significant portion of the entire bill.

This amendment is in the great liberal tradition of those who favored adoption of the constitutional amendment which provides for the popular election of Senators, instead of the previous election of Senators by the State legislatures.

The Senate will recall that the 17th amendment, adopted in 1913, provides that Senators shall be elected by the people of the States. But, Mr. President, unfortunately, in some respects the real, true intent of the popular election of Senators amendment, adopted as part of a great liberal movement early in the

20th century, never became fully effective, because in certain States there existed the so-called caucus system or the convention system, whereby certain party bosses were in position to deny the people an opportunity to express themselves, and primaries were not held.

Wisely, 47 of the 50 States have abolished the caucus system or the convention system in connection with elections to all major Federal offices—in other words, in connection with elections of Members of the House of Representatives, Senators, and Governors. As a result, the people of those States are able to make themselves heard.

But, unfortunately, the march of progress, at least in certain respects, has not reached three of the States. One of those States—and it is the most populous in the Nation—is the great State of New York, where any Senator or Representative can be chosen by convention, which may be subject to the control of the party bosses or the Governor, or subject to the control of various and sundry persons—which in many cases works out differently from the way the people want it.

We have seen from the newspapers how even a young man like Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., son of a former Governor, son of a fourtime President of the United States, was denied the opportunity to run for Governor, and denied the opportunity to submit himself to the people of his State, by a convention.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Is the Senator from Louisiana attempting to deny the States the *right of selecting* candidates in the manner which they prescribe, rather than by Federal legislation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am trying to guarantee the people of the States the right to elect candidates of their choice, the most qualified men, and make them their Representatives and Senators.

Mr. FREAR. That is not the way I understood what the Senator just said. He was criticizing several States which have the convention system of selecting nominees for office. To me, that is a State's right. I think the States ought to retain that right. I am a bit amazed that the Senator from Louisiana is taking this position in opposition to that practice.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad the Senator has brought up that question in the debate. I believe I am going to persuade the Senator, before I conclude my 15-minute talk, that this is in line with a great liberal principle and does no violence to the historic principle of State rights.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder what the situation would be under a law such as we have in my State. We have a primary law, but it is provided that if there are enough candidates running so that no one of them gets 35 percent of the votes, then the choice of who will be the nominee rests with the State convention. There is first a primary, but, instead of there being a runoff, if nobody gets 35 percent of the votes, then the selection of the nominee goes to the State convention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was not familiar with the South Dakota system, and doubt that this amendment would disturb it. This proposal merely requires that a person must have submitted himself in a primary in which there is had an opportunity to run and to have the party vote for a candidate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my own case, the first time I was nominated for Congress, I ran in a primary, and there were four of us running. We were pretty well bunched. Nobody got 35 percent of the votes. The selection of the nominee went to the State convention. State conventions are held to select constitutional officers such as the State treasurer. Governors are nominated in the primaries, and unless they get 35 percent of the vote, as is true of every candidate for Member of Congress, the selection goes to the State convention. I received my nomination at the convention, after I had run in the primary, where nobody received 35 percent of the vote. The language of the amendment states, "Unless one has been nominated in the primary." I ran in the primary, but I got the nomination at the convention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not know the South Dakota system existed. It never occurred to me that a candidate could receive the greatest number of votes of the people and yet the convention could pick another person. That would have been unfortunate for the Senator from Wisconsin, who had the party bosses against him, but the people for him. The caucus or convention could advise the people, "We don't care how you voted. This is the man whose name will go on the ballot."

I do not care to modify my amendment, but if the Senator from South Dakota will prepare an amendment to prevent that undemocratic practice in the State of South Dakota, I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would not say the practice is so undemocratic. It is the practice not only in the State of South Dakota; I know Iowa has a law that provides a certain percentage of the votes must be obtained or the nomination goes further.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret that such a situation exists in South Dakota. I thought the New York system was bad enough, but the South Dakota system seems to be worse. There the caucus may reverse the judgment of the people of the State. How do Senators like that? One man may have received 34 percent of the votes, another man 2 percent, another man 1 percent, and the caucus can select the man who got the 1 percent. How do Senators like that? I did not know that system existed. Here is a book on government in front of me that failed to apprise me of that fact.

That would appear to be a most undemocratic procedure—one of these closed-room conventions, smoke-filled rooms, where politicians can meet and reverse the judgment of the people in an election, where everybody had a right to vote. I must say that is worse than I thought existed anywhere in the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the Senator is not going to get in the position of casting reflection on another State, because if so, I shall have to invoke the rule, if he says my State is a horrible example. The practice in South Dakota is similar to that in other States where they do not get 35 percent or a certain percent of the votes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I want it clearly understood that if I read a history of party caucuses or conventions it does not mean I have disrespect for the States, because most of those States have corrected those practices.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to be permitted here to say that the practice in my State is undemocratic or that the practice in any other State is undemocratic. I resent any such implication.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wishes to make a point merely because I referred to an undemocratic practice, where the will of the people is reversed by a party caucus, he has a right to make an objection, and he can have me put in my seat, and I hope the Senate will then permit me to proceed in order and point out the history of these caucuses. I did not bring up South Dakota; the Senator did.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know I did——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not yield at this time. I wish to go further, and then I will yield to the Senator if he wants to discuss the South Dakota practices further.

First let me direct myself to the question of constitutionality. This amendment is about the only thing that has been offered on the bill which is clearly constitutional. Back in the olden days we had a Supreme Court which ruled that the Federal Government could not regulate a primary election. But, with the passage of time and with new judges being appointed and different pressures and situations existing, that decision was reversed. Nowadays the Court holds that the Federal Government can regulate primaries. Even though the Court has so ruled, I am not here to quarrel with it. I am arguing for the constitutionality of my amendment to require that the will of the people be respected. I am safe in relying on the old rulings.

Let me read from the Constitution. This is what it says.

Article I, section 4, reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Of course, that section referred to the days when Senators were elected by

State legislatures, which practice the people reversed subsequently by adoption of the 17th amendment.

Clearly the Congress had a right to select the time for the election of Senators and Representatives; Congress had the right to fix the time and the manner in which an election shall be held. That is the old law. As the law goes, the Federal Government can control the time and circumstances under which the election of Representatives and Senators shall be conducted.

Mr. President, I have yet to see any person who has read that section or looked at any of the decisions who would contest that this is clearly constitutional. It comes within section 4 of article I of the Constitution. It is clearly in the spirit of the 17th amendment. In fact, this amendment is necessary to make the spirit of the 17th amendment fully effective.

Look at that South Dakota situation, where the people can have an election of Senators or Representatives and the caucus can meet to reverse the judgment of the people. This would make the 17th amendment truly meaningful, because it would mean the caucuses could not meet to reverse the judgment of the people. Furthermore, a major party caucus could not select a candidate without referring the matter to the people.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to a few of the evils which I would seek to outlaw. I shall read from a book on government entitled "American Politics and the Party System," written by Bone.

Most of the weaknesses of the convention system in the 19th century were due to their unrepresentative composition and undemocratic organization and procedure. A basic part of any convention system is the choice of delegates to the convention. If the convention is to be subject to popular control, the basis of representation in that body is a matter of real importance. The unit of representation and apportionment of delegates is left to the party committees so that when delegate districts are drawn up by the party there is a tendency to resort to gerrymandering in favor of the faction in power. Many "packed" and unrepresentative conventions resulted from party gerrymandering.

Character of delegates: In practice, delegates were chosen to various town, district, or county conventions by a town meeting or caucus of party voters; the county and district conventions in turn selected delegates to the State, and later national, conventions.

Further on it says:

As always, the independent voters were not well organized and were often ineffective in the meetings called to select delegates. On the other hand, the factional and machine leaders were well organized and successfully chose either themselves or their own men as delegates to attend the convention. All too frequently the "best" persons failed to participate in the selection of delegates.

Let me make it clear I am not making an invidious reference to the State of Illinois when I read the next paragraph. I praise that great State for correcting the kind of thing to which I am going to refer:

The breakdown of the process of choosing delegates was shown in the low estate of the composition of the Cook County, Ill., convention in 1896. Of its unwieldy body of 723 delegates, over 150 either had criminal records or had been tried for crimes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think, upon investigation, the Senator will find that was a Republican convention. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask Senators to listen to this, Mr. President:

Of its unwieldy body of 723 delegates, over 150 either had criminal records or had been tried for crimes, 148 were political employees, and over one-third were saloonkeepers.

Mr. KUCHEL. They must have been Democrats.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I continue to read:

Conventions of this quality were easily dominated by corrupt bosses and the many delegates owing their jobs to the machine were expected to take orders. Underworld elements were in a position, through their men in the convention, to influence the choice of nominees. The buying and selling of places in the convention also was not unknown.

Not only was the composition of the conventions a mark against the device, but the procedures and behavior of those bodies themselves were even worse. Careful deliberations frequently gave way to indecorum, commotion, and emotion. The hidden managers prepared in advance both the organization and the agenda of the convention. Robert M. La Follette described one convention in these words:

"Away in some retired room behind locked doors the masters of the machine sit in quiet conference. They have issued their orders to those in nominal control. The program of the convention is all prepared. The temporary and permanent chairmen have been elected in advance. * * * These men have been selected by masters of the machine with considerate judgment. There will be no mistakes made. Men designated in advance will be recognized by the chairman for all important motions at the right time. All troublesome points of order will be decided in the right way."

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, I think it is well to point out that it was the great founder of the Progressive Party, who found, unfortunately, it necessary to leave the Republican Party in order to pursue his convictions, was picked by Senators as one of the greatest Senators of all time. His picture is in the Senate reception room to prove it—many of us attended that great ceremony—and honored the man who abolished that kind of corrupt machine control in his State of Wisconsin.

It was a wonderful thing he did. Where would that present great senior Senator from Wisconsin be if Bob La Follette had not done so? I can recall all too well when the machine in Wisconsin announced that ALEXANDER WILEY was no longer acceptable. Unfortunately for the machine, the people did not agree with that. They themselves had an opportunity, thanks to Bob La Follette, Sr., to go to the polls to make their will felt, and they refused to throw out a great U.S. Senator merely because the party "bosses" did not want him. Was it not a wonderful thing that we had such democracy? Thank the merciful Lord for Bob La Follette, who did this in Wisconsin.

Now all States but three have now abolished this system, with the qualified exemptions referred to here.

In addition to the need to correct evil I argue that it is morally proper to require what the great majority of States have already done.

Mr. President, we have been seeing this body make its decisions, under the leadership of that great junior Senator from New York, who has stayed on the floor religiously. I do not believe the Senator has left the Chamber for more than 30 seconds during the last week, even for so much as to get himself a sandwich.

The Senator desires to regulate the primary elections. I must say he made a diligent effort in that regard. Shortly after the elections last November I read in the newspapers that the Senator said he would go to the South to view the conditions, just like Eisenhower said he would go to Korea to study the conditions, so that he could regulate them better. And he did. He kept his word, like Eisenhower. I admire him and praise him for it.

How can one regulate well unless one knows from practical experience about that which he would regulate? The great Senator from New York—an intelligent, able, brilliant, experienced man—and I speak of the junior Senator from New York, though both of the Senators are great Senators—apparently did not realize that he would never be successful in regulating southern primaries the way he would like to do unless he had practical experience in running in primaries.

The Senator from New York quite correctly said he was not picked in a smoke-filled room. No. Nelson Rockefeller does not smoke. There were only two people in the room, he and Nelson Rockefeller. His statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Wednesday. Nelson Rockefeller called him in and said, "Would you not like to run on the Republican ticket?" and he said, "I think I would." Nelson said, "Fine. I will send word down to the convention, and if they will go along with me"—do Senators think there is any doubt that they would go along with Nelson Rockefeller—"if they will go along with me, you will be on the ticket." And he said, "Fine."

On the other hand, the Democrats have not always been satisfied with the procedures. A young man like Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who wanted to offer himself for Governor of his State, ran into problems. Could he do that? No. Carmine DeSapio would not let him.

Why should we not let the people decide? That same young man, the son of the former Governor, the son of a four time elected President, from New York, wanted to offer himself for Congress, but he had to go out and walk the streets as an independent candidate, to get his name on the ballot as an independent.

He, as one of the most successful men in running the hard way, knew only too well it was hopeless to try the same thing in regard to the governorship or in regard to being a U.S. Senator. So he had to lose his opportunity to at least run for the job.

Mr. President, I want to call only one more witness for my amendment. I

want to call one of the greatest witnesses I believe anybody could call, one of the most famous of all people:

Judge not, that ye be not judged.
For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.
And why beholdest thou the mote—

Mr. President, for those who may not be Bible readers, let me say that this mote means a mere speck of dust, not a cinder. It is only a mere speck of dust.

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I remember that passage, it did not say that one should not behold the beam in his neighbor's eye merely because one might have a mote in his own eye.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me read the rest of the passage, and I believe we can get together on it.

Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye?
Thou hypocrite—

I am not referring to any Senator at this point. I am just quoting Jesus [laughter]—

first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Ought not one to cast out both the mote from one's own eye and the beam from his brother's eye?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I could not agree with the Senator more. Here we have a bill to regulate primaries. My amendment would provide that the regulator be regulated by his own regulation. What makes better sense, if we are to regulate primaries, to require that there be such elections, and let the will of the people be heard?

I believe this amendment would be very significant in guaranteeing free, honest elections. I am emphasizing the word "elections." How can we have free and honest elections if there are no elections at all?

Some time ago someone whom I always regarded as a party boss said that he never stole any ballots. I always had the impression that the person never stole an individual ballot, because he preferred to switch whole boxes of ballots. That particular individual had even a more effective tactic. He would file a lawsuit to take the candidate's name off the ballot, and occasionally such a suit might be successful.

Which is worse—to steal a dozen or 100 ballots, or to steal a whole election by taking a man's name off the ballot? That is in effect what happens in the caucuses. That is what Congress thought it was outlawing when it passed the 17th amendment and the States ratified it to make it effective.

Why should we not guarantee democratic procedures? If we are to say that one's own mother may not contribute a certain amount of money to his campaign fund, why not take one further step and guarantee democratic procedures which do not exist today?

We can do so merely by pursuing the spirit which was intended when the Congress voted and the people of the Nation agreed to require that Senators be elected by the people.

I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Long amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

And provided further, That no person's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that any duly qualified voter has been denied equal opportunity to register and vote.

THE OLD STONE HOUSE IN GEORGETOWN

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for an announcement before the firing starts?

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Florida, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. President, I am pleased that so many Senators are present. I invite the attention of Senators and of the people of Washington generally to the fact that quite a notable occasion will occur tomorrow afternoon from 3 to 6 o'clock when the National Capital Parks Administration will open for a preview the Old Stone House, in the 3000 block of M Street, NW., in Georgetown.

Many Senators in the Chamber were here when the authorization legislation was passed in the 81st Congress to acquire and preserve this historic edifice. I was happy to have an opportunity to join in that effort. Many Senators now present were here when we provided the appropriation for the restoration work, which I believe was in 1955.

This old house is probably the only pre-Revolutionary house standing in the District of Columbia within its original walls. It was built in 1764, of what is called field stone, that is, stone picked up in the fields and placed skillfully by the masons of that period in the walls in various shapes and sizes, but all fitted together very neatly.

The National Capital Parks Administration has done a fine job of restoration of the interior and of acquisition of furniture and equipment of the period from 1760 to 1810.

I am sure that everyone will enjoy going to look at this fine old building, restored as it is, remembering that it is even older than the Senate of the United States. It is older than this Republic. It is older than the ancient arguments on home rule, because it took its shape first in Old Georgetown, a small village standing on the bank of the Potomac, before the freedom of this Republic was won, and before anyone dreamed that this site would be the Capital of our country, and in many respects the Capital of the free world.

I believe Senators will find this house most interesting. I think this is a proper occasion to compliment the Citizens' Associations of the Georgetown area, which, for many years, have assiduously supported this effort, which comes to fruition tomorrow.

I wished to make this announcement for the RECORD. I hope I shall see many of our colleagues and friends present tomorrow enjoying this fine old building.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from New York will yield to me in order that I may make an observation or two with respect to the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Louisiana and myself, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield on that condition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not sure whether the burden that was thrown on the reporter during the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and myself was within the capabilities of any reporter. Of course, we have extraordinary reporters; but in view of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana and I were both talking at the same time, I am not sure that the RECORD will be clear as to a few facts.

Therefore, I think I should make a few statements with respect to the South Dakota law and the general situation in which States have primaries, and have a requirement that if no one in the primary receives a certain substantial proportion of the vote therein, the choice shall be made by a State convention.

I yield to no one in my respect for the 17th amendment, which provided for direct election of U.S. Senators by the people of the States from which they are chosen.

I believe in the direct election of Senators. I believe in the primary law. My State of South Dakota was one of the pioneer States in establishing the primary as a method of selecting candidates for major offices, to wit, the Governor and Federal offices.

At one time we had a law in South Dakota which was known as the Richards' primary law. It was a transitional law. First it was provided that there would be a convention. If the people were not satisfied with the results of the convention, by petition or by resolution of the county committee, they could then enter candidates in a primary, and the result of the primary would overrule the convention. That had certain practical difficulties of ap-

plication which eventually led our State, which was one of the pioneers in adopting primary laws, to provide that we would have the primary come first in nominating candidates for Governor and for the Senate and the House.

However, it was provided that if no one received as much as 35 percent of the vote in the primary, then the selection from among those who were candidates in the primary should be made by majority vote at the State convention. That is the law today.

Mr. WILEY. For the nomination, or election?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the nomination, not for the election. As I said, the first nomination that I received for the House of Representatives was in a primary where there were four candidates. In that primary none of the four candidates received as much as 35 percent of the votes. So the duty of nominating the candidate went to the State party convention, and there I was honored by receiving a majority for the nomination.

Two years later there were six candidates in the primary. At that time, I received 40 percent of the vote, and there was no convention. Thereafter in six subsequent elections I had no primary contest, until I ran for the Senate.

Here again I entered a primary, and there were only two candidates and I was fortunate enough to receive a majority of the votes cast.

We have had other contests in which no one received 35 percent in the primary and the nomination was completed by the convention. I recall that the distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, Representative Lovre, was first nominated at the convention which followed a primary as in the primary no one had received 35 percent of the vote.

Two or three times we have had close contests in nominating the candidate for Governor. In one contest there were five candidates, none of whom received 35 percent of the vote. Therefore the nominating of the candidate went to the convention, and the convention completed the nominating process. However, the convention is always limited to voting for those who had been candidates at the primary.

I therefore disagree with the assumption by the Senator from Louisiana that the will of the people was overruled. The people had an opportunity in the primary to express themselves. Under the law of the State any candidate whom the people give as much as 35 percent of the vote, or the one who receives the most above 35 percent, would be nominated, without any further action.

And South Dakota is not alone in having the 35 percent primary rule. I am under the impression that Iowa and other States have a similar plan to require a substantial vote in a primary and then use the convention to avoid expensive repeat runoffs, but limiting the convention to those who have shown substantial popular support in a primary. The Long amendment would upset the State's right in such instances.

I should like to make just one other observation. The 17th amendment to the U.S. Constitution itself, which provided for the direct election of Senators by popular vote, contains this provision with respect to vacancies:

> *Provided,* That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointment until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

Certainly no one will contend that the 17th amendment, which provides for the election of Senators by the vote of the people, was designed in any respect to defeat the will of the people. It was intended to give the people the right to express themselves. It was recognized that in connection with vacancies it may be the practical thing to let legislatures provide for filling vacancies by appointment until the people fill them by election, as the legislature might direct.

So, it is to be noted that in the 17th amendment itself, the right is accorded to the State to determine the manner of dealing with a marginal situation. In the same spirit, it would seem that the legislatures should have the right to use party conventions if none of the candidates receive as much as 35 percent.

In my State, the party's vote in the primary, and in other States which have the 35-percent rule, the legislature has merely provided that where the people do not arrive at a substantial vote for one of the candidates, one of them can get the nomination at the subsequent convention.

I have made these remarks in order to keep the record straight. It is not an undemocratic method. It is based on the primary in the first instance. If 35 percent of the people in South Dakota agree upon a candidate, that person is nominated.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding so that I could make this statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thought we had set this matter at rest the other day when the distinguished Senator from Louisiana had the same amendment on the floor. It is still before us, with only the change of a word. The Senator from Louisiana offered his reasons, which were set forth at full in the previous debate. I am rather astonished that a stanch supporter of States rights, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is known to be, would offer an amendment which would have the effect of saying to the voters of every State how they shall nominate their candidates for Senator or Representative in Congress. However, surprises are not new in this Chamber, and the departure of the Senator from Louisiana from the time-honored practice of supporting States rights measures is entirely within his province and perfectly proper.

I do feel very strongly, however, that if a majority of the Members of the Senate wish to amend the existing statute in the respect suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, and desire to establish for every State the manner in which it shall nominate their candidates, it is certainly entirely in keeping with the wording of the Senator's amendment to provide that anyone who is found by a Federal court to have secured his nomination by reason of duly qualified voters having been denied the opportunity to register and vote, should not be eligible to hold his office.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Louisiana has said that his amendment is in harmony with section 4, article I, of the Constitution. I should like to ask the Senator from New York how he can harmonize his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana with section 5, article I, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides:

> Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

I should like to ask the Senator how he can reconcile his amendment, which purports to give that power to the Federal courts, with this provision of the Constitution.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to respond to the question of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment which I have offered provides that no one shall be qualified to serve in this Chamber whose election has been obtained by reason of the fact that he was nominated in a nominating convention or in a primary in which duly qualified voters were denied the opportunity to vote. There is nothing in the Constitution, in my judgment, which requires that that question be passed upon in each and every instance. We have the power within this body to provide that no one shall serve here who has been nominated in a primary—and eventually elected—in which duly qualified voters were denied an equal opportunity with other duly qualified voters to register and to vote.

It is a fact—and I say it in entire compliance with the rules, and with no disparagement of any particular State—that the Civil Rights Commission has made findings that there are certain areas in our country where certain qualified voters have been denied the opportunity to register and to vote. That is a finding of fact which they have made after extensive hearings, and is based upon sworn testimony.

I was not there; I have no personal knowledge of the matter. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] provides in his amendment in chief that in the primary, which he seeks to force upon every State, "all registered or otherwise properly qualified members of his party," meaning the nominee's party, "shall have had an opportunity to vote."

I very much hope that the Senator from Louisiana will be prepared to accept my amendment to his amendment. It seems so inherently fair. It is so clear on its face that everyone who is qualified to vote in this country should be permitted to vote.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he would be prepared to accept

my amendment; and if he would not, then I ask that his amendment be rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe there is not even a copy of the amendment which the Senator from New York has offered and which I hold in my hand. This is the original, written in longhand by the Senator from New York. It reads:

And provided further, That no person's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that any duly qualified voter has been denied equal opportunity to register and vote.

The Senator from New York provides in his amendment that if one person, for any reason whatsoever, was denied an opportunity to register for a primary election, that primary election would not be valid. How ridiculous can one get? That is unconstitutional in a half dozen different ways.

The Constitution provides that the States shall determine the qualifications of the voters. The Senator's amendment violates that provision of the Constitution, and it violates the provision that each House of Congress shall be the judge of the elections and qualifications of its own Members.

I must say that I am disappointed in the civil rights amendment which the Senator from New York is attempting to write; that he could not write one which had more merit to recommend it.

His amendment provides, in effect, that if one person—anybody—for any reason whatever, has been denied an equal opportunity to register and vote in an election, that election shall be invalid.

A person could be denied the equal opportunity to register and vote merely by virtue of the fact that he lived further away from the courthouse. That is how ridiculous the amendment is. I observed that the Senator from New York did not attempt to meet with any considerable effort whatever, except by a brief reference to it, the fundamental argument I made about the soundness of my amendment. The amendment which I have offered is clearly constitutional in pursuance of the 17th amendment and in pursuance of section 4 of article I of the Constitution. My amendment follows the democratic procedure which has been recognized and has been established and is in accordance with the trend in which this Nation has been moving throughout the years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true, under a strict interpretation of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, that if a person 11 years old were refused the opportunity to register in a State, the nomination would not be valid?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The language reads:

And provided further, That no person's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that any duly qualified voter has been denied equal opportunity to register and vote.

If a taxicab in which a voter was riding was late because of a flat tire or a traffic accident, or for any other reason, and the voter could not be delivered to the polling place for the primary election, the election would not be valid.

My amendment is directed to the general election and provides that Congress shall make the regulations. Congress does that. Congress provides the time, the date, and various other rules pertaining to the Federal election laws.

The 17th amendment provides that Senators shall be elected by the people. My proposal is made in complete pursuance of the 17th amendment.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York is probably the least logical of all the civil rights measures I have heard suggested.

It has been agreed that there will be a civil rights bill before Congress. I did not agree to it, but the majority leader has said that it will be called up about February 15. We will have an opportunity to consider matters of this sort and will have an opportunity to vote on them. It has been agreed by both parties that that will be the case.

So, Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on my amendment as I have offered it, and I propose to move that the amendment to my amendment be tabled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Louisiana contend that the great State of New York, having 4 million or more voters, does not have any primary elections at all?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. None whatever for Senator, Representative, or Governor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Do I correctly understand the Senator to mean that three or four persons speak for 4 million?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The party holds what is called a party convention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But is not that convention controlled, sometimes, by 3 or 4 persons?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; oftentimes it is controlled by a handful of persons. I should imagine that the Governor has power in most instances to determine pretty well who will be selected for statewide offices by his party. Carmine DeSapio also has much power in the Democratic Party in New York, and this might somewhat reduce the Governor's power in this respect when a Democratic Governor occupies the executive mansion in Albany.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Then, do I understand correctly that the Senator from New York is criticizing the primaries in the Southern States, when New York does not have any primaries at all?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; he would seek to regulate our primaries, although New York State itself does not have any primaries.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that the Senator from New York is criticizing us on the theory that somewhere in the South a colored man's right to vote in a primary might be denied, whereas in the State of New York such a right is denied not only to colored folks but to white folks and everybody else?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Everybody. The Senator from New York seeks to regulate our primary elections. He says he wants to regulate how much a person can spend and the terms and conditions under which persons can run in the primaries.

Then when someone says, "All right; if that is fair, you run your primary as we do," the Senator from New York says, "I want it to be agreed that if any person is denied an equal opportunity with everybody else to register and vote, the primary will be invalid."

That shows how little the Senator knows about regulating primaries. Nobody would ever know whether a primary was valid until he had waited for months to see if a lawsuit would be instituted by someone who would say he had been denied the opportunity to vote. Only in that way could it be determined whether a primary was valid.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall withhold my motion to lay on the table the Keating amendment to my amendment until I make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the call of the roll is in process.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it is his intention, if the order for the call of the roll is rescinded, to move that my amendment to his amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would propose to do that in due course; yes.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Senator from Louisiana permit me to speak for about 2 minutes——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is out of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I object to the request that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; and the call of the roll will be continued.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield for 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 2 minutes in my own right, following completion of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for the time being I withhold my motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York to my amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state the point of order.

Mr. ALLOTT. The point of order is that I have not heard unanimous consent given to the request to rescind the order for the call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York made the request; and there was no objection, and the order for the call of the roll was rescinded.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair for that information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I merely wish to make abundantly clear—and I shall take less than 2 minutes to do so—that I am opposed to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana. I shall vote against that amendment, either with or without the amendment which I have sought to have attached to it, because I believe the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana violates the principle that each State shall determine in what manner the people of that State shall nominate candidates for election to the House of Representatives or the Senate.

However, Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is to be adopted, then by all means I believe the Senate should attach to it some protection of the right of every qualified citizen to vote, so that all qualified citizens will have an equal opportunity to vote.

My amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is offered for the purpose of giving the Senate an opportunity to decide whether that determination will be made here.

Mr. President, I realize fully that the hearings which have been begun in the Committee on Rules and Administration should be completed, and I also realize fully that the issue of giving further protection to the right to vote will be before us on February 15.

However, that question is before us at this time, by virtue of the action taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who has brought the issue before the Senate by means of the submission of his amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we are to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, I believe we must meet this issue now.

I very much hope that at this time, before the Senate proceeds to vote on the pending amendment, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will reach the same conclusion that he reached earlier in this debate—namely, that his amendment should be withdrawn.

However, Mr. President, if the Senate is to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, then I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from New York has submitted to my amendment was drawn up hastily, obviously, for it is written in ink on the bottom of my printed amendment.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York to my amendment reads as follows:

And provided further, That no person's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that any duly qualified voter has been denied equal opportunity to register and vote.

Let us apply the effect of the proposed amendment to every State in the Union. Not a Senator here or any Member of the House of Representatives would know whether he had won the primary election or not, because who on earth would know whether a single person in his State had been denied an equal opportunity to vote? It does not tell how he had to be denied that right. He could be denied the right because he had had a flat tire on the way to the polls. He could be denied it because he had sent for a taxicab, but the taxicab driver had gone to the wrong house. He could be denied it because he had been in the hospital. He could be denied it for any one of 50,000 reasons.

As I pointed out previously, this matter is clearly unconstitutional, for half a dozen reasons I could give. There is no reason for going into them. This is only an attempt to divert and to avoid a vote on the true purpose of the amendment, which is whether we should stand by the 17th amendment, whether we should vote for the right of the people to select their Representatives and Senators, to have primaries, and to prevent the political bosses from selecting the major party candidates.

My proposal is clearly constitutional. It is clearly in pursuance of the articles of the Constitution. It is clearly in pursuance of the 17th amendment.

I think the Senator should withdraw the amendment to the amendment as I did when I withdrew my amendment and permitted the Hennings-Keating amendment to be voted upon, so that my amendment can be voted on its merits.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move to table the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, before he makes his motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator yield for just a single question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withhold my motion long enough to answer the question of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How would the distinguished Senator from Louisiana say that his amendment would deal with a vacancy, when the 17th amendment, to which he alludes, provides that the legislature of any State may empower the executive to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by elections as the legislature may direct? How could we insure having primary elections in the event of a vacancy, without violating the 17th amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All the Senator has to do is read the amendment. All it provides is that no person's name shall appear on a ballot or a voting machine in any general election unless the person has been nominated in a primary election. It has nothing to do with an appointment by the Governor.

Mr. President, I now renew the motion to table the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I withhold my motion.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have been trying to get the floor for about an hour and a half now, in an attempt to discuss this matter. If it is necessary, I shall at least ask unanimous consent to have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator referring to my amendment or to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. ALLOTT. I refer both to the Senator's amendment and to the amendment to the amendment.

Is the Senator from Louisiana aware of the situation in Colorado and the method by which we select Senators and Representatives in the State of Colorado?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. I imagine Colorado has a primary system, however, because most of the States do.

Mr. ALLOTT. In the State of Colorado we have a primary system which is a combination, actually, of the convention system and the primary system. Anyone who has been a member of either a major political party or a political party for 1 year prior to the time of the convention may go into the convention, and if he or she receives 20 percent of the vote in that convention, whether it is to a county, judicial, legislative, senatorial, or State office, or whatever the office is, he or she is enabled to go on the primary ticket. The primary election is held the second Tuesday in September, and anyone who receives 20 percent of the vote of the regular party convention—assembly, as we call it—and that fact is accepted by the secretary of state, then goes in the primary election.

I am opposed to the Senator's amendment, but I would first ask him whether or not, in his opinion, his amendment includes the State of Colorado.

In other words, to paraphrase my question for the Senator, does the primary in the State of Colorado, under the circumstances I have enumerated, in his opinion, comply with the use of primaries as the Senator has defined it in his amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not have the practice of the State of Colorado in mind, and therefore I cannot tell the Senator with certainty whether the amendment covers it. If the Senator from Colorado would like to offer any clarifying language to permit the Colorado practice to be continued, it would be satisfactory with me.

What the Senator from Colorado is saying is that if a person gets 20 percent of the votes in the party system, that person can then have his name put on the ballot and run against someone who may have received 75 percent of the votes in the convention?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that is a fair proposal. If my amendment would outlaw the Colorado practice, I would not insist upon that result. Perhaps the insertion of a word or two in the amendment could accomplish the Senator's objective.

However, we do not have to decide that point at this moment, because we are dealing with the amendment to the amendment. While we are voting on the motion to table, perhaps we can get together and work it out.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am addressing myself especially to the able and diligent Senator from Louisiana, who has taken great interest in this proposed legislation and has addressed himself to it during the course of its progress through this body. I would like to, if I am not presumptuous in so doing, most respectfully, and in friendly spirit, urge the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to yield on this point and to withdraw this matter of controversy from this bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from Missouri is trying to get to a vote on this amendment, I am not going to yield to him at this time, and I do not believe I am going to yield on it at all.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have no amendment pending——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the amendment I have here is more significant and important than anything in this bill. I would like a vote on mine. Everybody else has had a vote on his amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I complete my statement? What I say is not in any spirit of anxiety. The Senator has stated I am anxious to get a vote. I think many of us think it is highly desirable to get to a vote. I am fully appreciative of the Senator's right to have a vote on his amendment.

This is a bill relating to campaign contributions and expenditures. I believe appropriate legislation relating to this matter might be offered by the Senator at some other time. We can get into endless and, I think, unprofitable debate, now that we have come near the conclusion of action on this bill, by offering one amendment after another, none of which were submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and none of which have been the subject of study by that committee.

In the interest of orderly procedure I have made this plea to the Senator. I have already been assured it will be of no avail. Having made it, I shall not further express myself on the subject, except to express the wish, which I think is the consensus, perhaps, of the Members of this body, that we get down to the business of voting on the bill or to the third reading of the bill, at least, whether we vote tonight or not, so that we can dispose of an elections bill.

There are many other matters, such as amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and its provisions, which have been offered and subsequently withdrawn by those offering them. I appreciate the spirit in which Senators have done that, because they have recognized the relevance of certain amendments. I make no point of technical germaneness, of course, but there is such a matter as relevance, and there is such a matter as conducting this body in an orderly procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I have the floor, I want to make it clear that the junior Senator from Louisiana has been around here since Congress met. I have not told anybody when we would meet or when we would not meet. I have accommodated myself to all other Senators. I have waited until I am the second from the last Senator to offer an amendment. I have only one amendment. I have let everybody else go first.

It does seem to me that a Senator has a right, in good conscience, if he has waited until every other Senator has offered his amendment, to take enough time for the consideration of the one I am offering. It is said that everyone is getting tired—"We are tired of hearing everybody else, so we ask you to withdraw your amendment."

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears that we cannot finish consideration of the bill tonight, or even get to the third reading of the bill. Since consideration of this amendment and the amendment to it may take considerable time, and in view of the fact that to the best of my knowledge there is only one other amendment to be offered, the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], which I understand will not require much time, and in view of the fact that many Senators already have left and others have commitments to attend to, I was wondering if it would be agreeable to set aside for the time being the proposals by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New York, to take up the Kefauver amendment, and, on its disposition, recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday. I should like to make that in the form of a unanimous-consent request, because that is the only way the action can be taken. I make such a request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. How long will it take for consideration of the Kefauver amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand it will take 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I am wary of "5 minutes" in the Senate. In justice to this new amendment it should have adequate time and attention which it is evident that the earlier amendments are not going to be able to get under the conditions prevailing at this hour.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can assure the Senator that it will not take me more than 5 minutes. I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may want to make brief statements.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Crusade for Decency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 22, 1960

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address given on October 11, 1959, in Salt Lake City, Utah, by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before the general conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Secretary Benson is an apostle of the Latter-day Saints—Mormon—Church, and was speaking on this occasion as a member of the governing body of the church, and not in his official capacity as member of the President's Cabinet.

The comments of Secretary Benson are very timely inasmuch as Congress will be considering legislation during this session to strengthen existing laws regarding the dissemination of pornographic literature.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRUSADE FOR DECENCY

(Address by Elder Ezra Taft Benson, apostle of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, given at general conference of the church held in Salt Lake City, October 11, 1959)

We live in a choice land. But we live in a time of anxiety—a time when the basic concepts and values of a free society, which we cherish, are being seriously challenged. This challenge is not only from godless, imperial communism abroad, but also from dangerous ideologies and practices here at home.

It is true that outwardly everything seems prosperous. More people are working at higher wages and enjoying a better standard of living than ever before in the history of our country. More of our people are enjoying travel, cultural, and educational opportunities than any time in our history. New churches are being erected at a rapid rate, and an increasing number of people are church-affiliated. Our Nation is at peace.

All these things should give a feeling of stability, inner assurance, and a sense of satisfaction, but they do not seem to do so. Discontent among our people, nationwide, seems to be high. We view with alarm the ever-raising level of public and private debt and the threat of inflation. We note with fear the increase in crime, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, drug addiction, and sex offenses.

We pay lip service to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution without realizing what they are and the danger of ignoring them. We demand more and more of Government, so Government grows larger all the while, marking the stampede away from personal responsibility which occurs at all levels of life. We passively contribute to the spirit and demoralizing philosophy of something for nothing.

Because sin is rampant and increasing, I make bold enough to call this Nation to repentance. Only through righteousness is there safety for our beloved country. There is no other way.

Today I speak out against one of the insidious and rapidly increasing threats against our young people.

As a church we have always placed great emphasis on youth. Our young men, if worthy, receive the priesthood at 12 years of age. We enlist a higher percentage of our young boys in scouting than any other group. We have a comprehensive program, combining Sunday school, primary, M.I.A., priesthood activities, and weekday seminary classes, to guide the activities of our youth, instill within them a testimony of the Gospel, and help them to grow up to be good citizens and faithful members of the church. Yes, we recognize full well that our boys and girls, our young men and women, are our greatest asset. They are our hope.

The youth of today are the trustees of the future. Sooner than we think the leadership of the church and the future of our country will rest in their hands. It is our grave obligation to help prepare American youth to be worthy trustees, to help them fit themselves for their coming responsibilities. This is the obligation of every adult citizen.

We have confidence in our youth, yes. But we know they face troubled times. They are beset by man temptations—temptations, which, if not new, are certainly more blatant, more prevalent, than ever before.

We know how important it is for our youth to possess clear minds in healthy clean bodies. "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord." Moral purity is an eternal principle. The Spirit of God "cannot dwell in an unclean tabernacle." Purity is life-giving; impurity is deadly. God's holy laws cannot be broken with impunity. Great nations have fallen when they became morally corrupt, because the sins of immorality left their people scarred and misshapen creatures who were unable to face the challenge of their time.

I speak about one aspect of this question of morality which affects all our youth. There are forces at work in this country today which are victimizing many thousands of our youth, undermining their moral fiber, poisoning their minds. There is being spread about in this land a veritable flood of obscene photographs, movie films for private showings, filthy books, and so-called comics that drip with depravity and obscenity.

Every day some 200,000 circulars are flooding our cities and towns, seeking to sell obscenity and filth to the American people. It is a $500 million a year business and growing fast. The sales volume of mail-order obscenity has doubled in the last 5 years.

Who are the targets of this drive? Three-fourths of these circulars are sent to our youth. Our schoolchildren are the targets, our boys and girls, particularly between the ages of 11 and 16.

The U.S. Post Office Department estimates that between 700,000 and 1,000,000 children in American homes will receive unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature through the mails this year.

Our boys and girls need not have shown any interest in this vile stuff. It is thrust into their hands by racketeers who go to great lengths to get the names of our children. They buy mailing lists from standard sources. They get names from high school yearbooks and classbooks. They set up fake business fronts. A boy sends away for a model airplane, a baseball bat, a toy automobile, a stamp collection, often advertising at bargain prices—and the muck merchant has his name and address on his list.

Then the solicitations begin.

The smut dealers last year mailed out an estimated 50 million sales circulars under the protection of first class mail. Some of these circulars are in the form of pseudo personal letters in girl's handwriting, signed with a girl's name.

The smut dealers go further. They even seek to involve our youth as salesmen of their trash. One scheme is to sell our youngsters playing cards decorated with lewd pictures for perhaps $3 per deck—to be resold at 25 cents or 50 cents per card.

Many children fall into the trap of ordering obscene material. Traffic with children is a major and growing part of the filth merchants' business.

Postal inspectors in New York City recently raided one dealer in pornography. They confiscated 17 tons of highly obscene printed and filmed materials. They found mailing lists containing the names of thousands of high school graduates taken from high school yearbooks.

Some parents are almost frantic because of their inability to keep this unwanted material out of their homes. A mother in a midwestern State writes to the Post Office Department as follows:

"Enclosed you will find the filth that has been sent to my son for the past year. He is 14. Think what this could do to him, and how many other innocent boys and girls he could corrupt by passing this literature on to them. Can't you do something to stop it?"

Another parent in the East writes:

"Ads like this come to my minor son at the rate of one or two a week."

A lawyer tells how his son answered an innocuous appearing ad in a national magazine and received a batch of obscene pictures and an order blank for more. His name is on the mailing list and nearly every week an ad for pornographic material comes in the mail. The lawyer says, "My wife and I are beside ourselves as to how to stop this flood of mail."

Now, what are the effects of this material on our youth?

Juvenile delinquency has become a blot on our country. Gangs roam the streets of some of our big cities. Arrests of juveniles for major crimes rose about 10 percent last year. Authorities have observed on repeated occasions that the obscenity racket is a prime contributor to the increase in juvenile delinquency.

FBI figures show that more boys of 18 and 19 are now committing the heinous crime of rape, then males in any other age group. The percentage of convictions of boys under 20 has grown substantially in recent years.

Now of course some people will argue that many children exposed to these pictures and books never become delinquent. This argument has no merit at all. Your child may be exposed to tuberculosis or polio and never contract either disease. In this a reason for deliberately exposing children to infection? Of course not.

It is true that people go wrong for many reasons. Children become delinquent in part because of such factors as broken homes, drinking parents, indifferent parents, and

bad companions. But the wish is father of the deed. Thought precedes action. We cannot help but be influenced by what we read and what we see. A dirty book, a filthy picture, may be the trigger that sets off a terrible crime.

Reports from police chiefs and sheriffs indicate the tieup. Here are typical statements from city officials in Massachusetts, Colorado, and Pennsylvania:

"Teenager criminally assaults 16-year-old girl. Search of his room revealed 50 pornographic pictures beneath his mattress."

"Student molesting two teenage girls found to have pornographic literature in glove compartment of his car."

Let me quote from a report of a Senate subcommittee that has studied this problem. The report says in part:

"There is a peculiar resemblance to narcotics addiction in exposure of juveniles to pornography. There is the same pattern of progression. Once initiated into a knowledge of the unnatural, the impressionable young mind with the insatiable curiosity characteristic of those reaching for maturity inevitably hunts for something stronger, something with more jolt, something imparting a greater thrill.

"The dealer in pornography is actually aware of this progressive facet; his array of material to feed this growing hunger is carefully geared to the successive stages. Like the peddler of narcotics, his only interest is to insure that his customers are hooked. He knows that once they are hooked they will continue to pay and pay."

These are some of the direct results of the smut campaign. There are indirect results, too. Our children, our wives, our friends, may be the horrified victims of criminals who are triggered by obscene materials.

Well, what is the response of the smut publishers and dealers to these facts?

Their attitude is summed up in some such sentiment as this: My job is to make a dollar, not to look out for unstable children or adults. No wonder J. Edgar Hoover has said:

"The activities of the muck merchants are national in scope. Your child can easily become one of their victims."

What are we going to do about it? Shall we fold our arms, shake our heads dismally, and do nothing?

Shall we permit organized crime to continue and extend the obscenity racket—already a half billion dollar a year business—and make it really big and immeasurably more vicious?

Shall we allow more and more of our children to be victimized, allow them to be hooked by this menace to clean and right living, this threat to moral purity?

Shall we sit by and watch sex crimes grow and grow in number and violence?

Shall we permit these cheap peddlers of filth to undermine the moral fiber of our youth, the moral strength of our Nation?

I believe I know what our pioneer forefathers would have answered to these questions.

And I think I know what you and other responsible citizens will answer. They would have said, as we say today: "Forbid it, Almighty God. We shall not sit by any longer. We shall act in defense of decency and order and in the name of our country."

Our Government is striking with all the weapons it possesses against the obscenity menace. Until last year, purveyors of filth had to be prosecuted at the point from which they mailed their smut. This was a severe handicap to prosecution. Courts, notably in Los Angeles and New York, where the great bulk of the mail order business in obscenity originates, handed down soft rulings on obscenity. Few offenders were convicted and these usually paid a small fine and began operating again.

Legislation passed by Congress last year has now made it possible to prosecute where the mail is received.

The first case prosecuted under the new law was in Boise, Idaho. A man and his wife, who were mailing extremely obscene material from the west coast, were given 10 years in jail, plus a heavy fine.

A Virginia man and his wife dealing in obscenity were sentenced to a year in the Federal penitentiary and fined $2,000. In Louisiana, two more dealers in filth were given a year and 18 months in jail respectively.

This is a good start. But it is only a start.

If Government is to make full use of the new legislation, it needs and must have the cooperation of all our citizens and especially of all our parents.

The privacy of the mail is a basic American right. It will not be violated. The Post Office cannot open first-class mail even if it is certain the envelope contains obscene materials. The Post Office can act only if parents supply the evidence after the mail has been delivered. Here is what we as parents can do, what we must do:

1. If mail coming to your home is obscene, or solicits the sale of obscene materials: save all the material, including the covering envelope; put it promptly in the hands of the local postmaster either personally or by mail.

2. Do not wait for this danger to strike your home. Join with other parents, teachers, local law enforcement officers and civic groups in drawing public attention to the menace of this traffic in filth.

3. Work closely with teachers in your community to detect obscene materials in the possession of children and to determine the origin of such material.

4. Join with other parents and teachers in making a special effort to impress upon the community the fact that even children who are never exposed to the obscene material may be victimized by sex criminals.

5. Cooperate with the schools in taking positive, long-range steps to help children develop wholesome interests in good literature and art—making it readily available to them at home, in the classroom, through literary and library clubs, and through student groups.

6. Help civic groups bring about the establishment of a decent literature committee, broadly representative of the interested civic organizations in the community.

7. Get local judges, law enforcement officers, and representatives of the police force to talk before civic groups telling what they, as guardians of the community's laws, know of the relationship between the traffic in obscene literature and juvenile delinquency and sex crimes.

We must defend our youth, in the interests of this Nation which God has blessed above all others. We must rise to this task, stand up and be counted on the side of decency. We must show by our lives and actions that we possess the virtues that made America great.

There will be those who will cry censorship and suppressing of freedom of information. To these people there does not seem to be any difference between liberty and license—but there is a real difference. It is not a denial of liberty to forbid the sale of narcotics or alcohol to children, and neither is it a denial of liberty to ban the distribution of filthy, obscene, character destroying materials.

There has developed in this country, I am sorry to say, a species of so-called broadmindedness which tolerates anything and everything. It is high time right-thinking citizens showed they are fed up with such false broadmindedness. I for one fail to see where this so-called tolerance of evil has made society any better or individuals any happier. We cannot steer a safe course without a compass. We cannot build an enduring society except on principles of righteousness.

As Dr. Daniel A. Poling recently wrote in the Christian Herald, "it's time for a new crusade," a crusade for decency.

The youth of the church and of America deserve that we parents live up to our responsibilities in this regard.

Many centuries ago, a celebrated Roman matron, Cornelia, was asked by an acquaintance to display her jewels. Cornelia called to her children to step forward. "These are my jewels," she said.

The youth of the church and of America are our jewels. Let us prize them as they deserve. A clean America will be a strong America, a secure America, a prosperous America, a peaceful America, a free America, an America that will continue to merit God's blessings in the future as it has in the past.

God grant it may be so, I humbly pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

Address by Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas, at East Texas Baptist College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 22, 1960

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last October I had the great honor of participating in ceremonies at East Texas Baptist College in Marshall, Tex., honoring our distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

It was a moving occasion, and the highlight of the ceremonies was the address by Representative PATMAN. In it he expressed some of the ideas and principles that have guided him during his long and distinguished career of public service.

I commend this able address to all my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, delivered at the special convocation at East Texas Baptist College of Marshall, Tex., on October 6, 1959, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WRIGHT PATMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TO EAST TEXAS BAPTIST COLLEGE, MARSHALL TEX., SPECIAL CONVOCATION, OCTOBER 6, 1959

President Bruce, trustees of East Texas Baptist College, members of the faculty, distinguished guests and alumna, you have been most kind and generous.

I can think of no greater honor that could come to any man than to be singled out as having made an effort on behalf of his fellow

man which this great educational institution considers to be worthy of its notice and commendation.

It would be difficult to know how to reply to the extremely kind personal remarks that have been made here today.

It is not difficult, however, to know what to say to the teachers and the administrators of this great college. You have remained close enough to the sweep of history to know that, whatever doubts may have been raised by new and threatening physical forces, the humanizing principles of liberal education are still civilization's brightest and best hope.

About 30 years ago H. G. Wells wrote: "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

He was not speaking of education in the sense of training more technicians and specialists to harness new and more powerful physical forces, though, of course, civilization badly needs more specialized training too—more scientists and technicians of all kinds. He was observing—as one must when reflecting upon the course of human history—that the race is between mankind's rapidly accumulating knowledge about the physical universe and his learning how to organize his society and better govern himself. He was talking about education in the liberal sense—education which forms the cultural bridge between the past and present and links the specialists of our own day into a common bond for civilization's advancement.

Few educated people doubt that the great problem of our age is to obtain more liberally educated people—people who have learned how to join together in voluntary associations to define and extend the common good. The problem of our age is not so much to extend further the frontiers of science, to discover new physical laws, but to bring about better law and order in the human society. In short, our problem is better government at all levels of human association, whether we happen to call the governing unit a government, an association, the United Nations, or just the family.

Making this commonplace observation does not mean that I share a view sometimes expressed that civilization is on the downgrade, or that we are witnessing an all-around moral decline.

They say that when you get to the point where you think the country is going to the dogs, that is a sign of old age. And they also say that being an incurable optimist about the future of mankind is a sign of muddleheadedness.

Admitting only to mature optimism, I would have to say that the progress in man's ability to govern himself which I have been able to observe has been marked with some notable advances.

Consider, for example, that discussions of scientific truths, and even conflicts of scientific truths, now observe very high moral standards. This achievement must be ranked among the priceless human freedoms. It has become almost unthinkable that any question in the realm of physics or biology would be answered by appeals to political authority. It is unthinkable that a scientist would try to establish a thesis by deliberate fraud, or that a scientific finding would be censored or distorted by the newspapers and other commercial media of communication. This has not always been so.

Nor does it explain this advancement in the scientific fields to say that science is especially concerned with discovering the truth and, therefore, it is only natural to be extremely careful of the truth in matters of science. Men are seeking to find the truth in other fields, no less so than in science.

The explanation, I think, is to be found in two developments.

First, the people who make up the scientific professions are educated, almost without exception, not merely in techniques, but in the origins of their science and its contributions to the human culture. Being educated people, they are well aware of the long struggles that were waged to win freedom for scientific investigation and expression, and are no less zealous of this freedom than of the science itself.

Second, I would attribute the high moral standards being observed in the scientific fields to the voluntary associations that are the governing bodies of the people working in these fields. These associations would most certainly frown upon fraud, misrepresentation, and the like, if such were used in describing scientific matters.

Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if our civilization were advanced to the point that discussions and controversies over political truths observed moral standards as high as those observed in scientific controversies?

Perhaps there has been progress in this direction, though I am not sure of it. The slambang assertion and the flamboyant claim have largely died out. But they have largely been replaced by the more subtle techniques of mass propaganda. So it may be that here improvement has been in form, while in substance there has been retrogression. Yet, I have no doubt, if I may be so bold as to make a forecast, that there will come a day when both politicians and those responsible for the machinery of mass opinionmaking will be as careful to distinguish between truth and innuendo, between hope and fact, as are the scientists.

As to the very difficult field of relationships, among nations, there have been some recent and unmistakable advances in man's ability to govern himself. We have now, in the United Nations, an organization for bringing the peoples of the world together in common support of common causes—most particularly to resolve differences by peaceable means. True, the United Nations has not lived up to the high hopes that many first held for it. But at least the nations of the world have found it possible to remain in association for orderly discussion of their common problems and their individual differences. Even this was not possible only a generation ago, despite the horrible lesson of the First World War.

Within my own lifetime there have also been quite notable advances in our country in recognizing and fulfilling our responsibilities for the common good on the national scale. There was time, within my memory, when it was widely believed that the people of this country could not, and should not, be mutually responsible for their common economic good. When I first went to Washington, the prevailing view then was that the economic condition of the people was a matter of no proper concern of the Federal Government. The great ebbs and tides of the business cycle were regarded as the workings of a mysterious force, almost sacred, not to be meddled with or controlled by the collective intelligence of people. Yet within a decade such beliefs and superstitions were discarded and a newly recognized responsibility for intelligent control of the economic climate was embraced. Indeed, following the last great war, we wrote this newly found responsibility for the common economic good into statute, declaring our national policy to be that of using all the plans, programs and agencies of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

To assure each man a job, no. To tell any man what his job shall be, how he shall try to satisfy his instinct for workmanship, no. But to an assured general prosperity, yes. To pledge opportunity for earning a livelihood, yes. To pledge economic freedom—meaning that each man shall have a wide and practical choice of ways in which to earn his livelihood, also yes. These thing we now recognize to be our responsibility on a national scale.

We have not acquired the best techniques for accomplishing these objectives as rapidly as we might like. And what may be more serious, responsible officials of government have not seemed to hold steadfastly to the objectives themselves. But this is to be expected. In human progress, some faltering steps seem always to follow a long forward step. But I do not see in this any fatal rhythm of history. Notable progress toward economic freedom has been achieved, and few people are so thoughtless as to entertain notions of abandoning this progress.

So much for the recent advances, as I see them, in our ability to govern ourselves.

At all levels of government—national, international, and so on—there seems to have been some advancement, and at least no serious retrogression, in all cases except one. But as I see it, the most important governing unit of all has been, and is now, undergoing a serious breakdown. I am referring to the individual family, which has, of course, been the basic unit of government in our civilization for as long as we have had a civilization.

Indeed, the family is an integral part of our religious heritage, and considering the values which are at stake, it is a wonder that our whole society does not cultivate and nourish this unit of government above all.

Yet we are today witnessing premature separations and splitups of so many families, and with such consequences, that we are witnessing in our own time a partial return to barbarism. It would be difficult to imagine any development more productive of present cruelty or more threatening to civilization's future.

There seem to be almost countless instances where grandparents—the old folks—have been separated from the family and set apart to spend their declining years in lonely surroundings and conditions of essential uselessness. Furthermore, these people are frequently being separated from their families at the very time their families most need the stabilizing influence, the wisdom, experience, and, in short, the whole cultural heritage which is theirs to hand down. And they are being separated from their families at the very time that they, too, are most in need of an opportunity to be of service to their families.

In almost countless instances, too, young children and teenagers are being turned into the streets, with little guidance, with hardly an introduction to our cultural heritage, and left to try to work out a culture and a moral code in association with other dispossessed children. This is most disturbing.

If I may be so bold as to suggest causes, I believe that there are two factors at work contributing to the breakdown of so many units of family government.

First, too many people are forgetting the ancient truths while learning new dogmas.

We are, as a nation, too often neglecting the Lord's commandments while seeking moral guidance from psychological theories.

If I have correctly learned from my very wise and very wonderful pastor, Dr. Coggin, then I am right in thinking that when the Lord gave Moses the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother." He meant this commandment was to be taught to his children and his children's children for all time, and not just until such time as a Dr. Spock or a Dr. Gesnell might present added things that children should be taught.

A second cause of this wide-scale breakdown of family government seems to be,

without question, that so many families are being split up because the younger people especially in the farm and smalltown areas of the country, such as ours, are being forced to migrate over long distances to find economic opportunity.

Thus, I believe, we must take prompt steps to expand economic opportunities here at home for the young people—and for the older people, too, as for that matter. It is not enough that the Federal Government does its part to maintain a general prosperity in the Nation. We must work through all of our associations—at the regional, State and local levels—and form new associations if need be, to see that economic opportunities are expanded.

This suggestion involves no new principle. In practice, it would be a renewal of our traditions of neighborliness. In the old days, when the country was young, our grandfathers gathered to help newlyweds clear a patch of land and establish a homestead. And they helped new settlers in similar ways, by all pitching in to build a barn and helping to plant the first crop. Both our State and Federal Governments also helped expand economic opportunities, such as by helping build the railroads to open new frontiers for settlement.

As I see it, we must today apply the same kind of group effort and shoulder the same kind of community responsibilities to expand the new forms of economic opportunity as they exist, or can be made to exist.

Nature has smiled on us and on the region in which we live. Our five talents are our bountiful land, our equitable climate, our pure water, our good people, and the unique community spirit which we have inherited.

Fortunately, our parents and grandparents have left us all these resources in good repair. The land is none the poorer for having provided sustenance for many offsprings. The water is still plentiful, and we are taking steps to conserve it. Our people have better education, plus the same stout hearts and willing hands.

We have good markets and growing markets here in our own area; and we have some of the basic industrial materials we need, not the least of which are iron and steel. We are close to favorable energy sources, especially natural gas and oil. Our transportation is on the whole good, and someday we will have, in addition, water transportation.

Providing more economic opportunity here at home will mean finding ways to bring about more industry to use our resources. Admittedly, attracting industrial settlers today is somewhat more difficult than attracting farm settlers in generations gone by. Traditions of neighborliness are different. Farmers have never regarded other farmers as competitors. It has never been the custom of farmers to discourage others from farming, nor to withhold information as to how others might produce more by better methods. Not so among industrial and commercial rivals.

Witness the fact that when efforts were being made to establish the Lone Star works—first the iron works and then later the steel works, which now comprise the Lone Star Steel Co.—these efforts were met with both discouraging advice and outright resistance. In fact, if we had not been so fortunate as to have the guiding genius of Mr. E. B. Germany in helping to establish a steel industry here in our area, our success might have been retarded for another generation.

We were told, among other things, that we could not make steel in this area because our people did not know how to make steel and that they could not learn for a generation to make steel as good or as skillfully as workers in the great steel centers. As it turned out however, our people did learn very quickly how to make steel, and to make the best steel, and they learned with the help of only a few imported workers and technicians. This achievement is a tribute to the native abilities of our people, both to produce and to manage large enterprises. Such achievements can be repeated.

One of our economic problems today is that we are losing farm population very rapidly. Productivity on the farm, that is to say, actual farm output per man-hour of work is increasing at a phenomenal rate. The technicians figure it at about 8 percent a year, which is several times the productivity increase in industry. We are still going through another technical revolution in farming. More mechanization, more fertilizer, more miraculous chemicals to control insects, fungus diseases, and so on, more plant hormones, new plant and animal breeds, and in all-around advancement in understanding and controlling the life processes of plants and farm animals.

All this means that a smaller and smaller percentage of the population is needed on the farm to turn out all of the food and fiber required by the whole country, plus much of that required abroad.

And, of course, farm people are not the only people who are moving away. We are also losing population from the towns and villages—people from the families who have performed the service, trade, and professional functions for the farmers. I do not mean that we are losing population in an absolute sense; of course not. But failing to provide for the normal growth of an area means an economic drain on the whole area.

And what is much more important, the whole Nation is losing the benefit of family government as a result of premature separation of family groups. The Nation is losing in moral fiber by reason of its irrational cruelty to its older people, and by reason of its turning its younger people into a generation of juvenile delinquents.

We need have no fear that the graduates of East Texas Baptist College will ever become juvenile delinquents—or adult delinquents either, for that matter. By the time the young people have completed their education here, they have drawn a large measure of wisdom from the great teachers, past and present. They have been made acquainted with our cultural and religious heritage sufficiently well to be able to mark their own guideposts when they leave here. But what about the children set loose to mark their own guideposts who are not so fortunate as to have the kind of education and training that young people receive here?

I happen to share the belief that there is no such thing as a basically bad boy—or a basically bad girl either. It is a belief which has received considerable support from some of the recent studies of juvenile delinquency.

Specialists who have made quite serious and competent investigations now report that what seems to us highly nonconformist conduct on the part of the juvenile delinquent is actually highly conformist conduct as related to the rules and ethics which have grown up within the juvenile gang. The youthful delinquent, we are told, is in reality guided by public opinion, but by a public opinion of small society that has somehow gotten out of the main stream of opinion in developing its ideas as to what is proper and improper conduct.

Since mankind has been given the means of accumulating knowledge over the whole span of the human experience, we might wonder why it is that some people seem to expect that each individual child might become civilized by some kind of divine intercession, rather than by education and training.

I do not suggest that all of the ideas and customs which have been embodied in the ethical codes of the past, or even in the best body of religious thought, were necessarily correct and suitable for all times. Obviously, many were not. And no doubt some of the ideas in our best body of ethics today will be changed with time and experience. That changes will be made is not so important as how they will be made, and this, I think, is the main significance of the family unit in our civilization.

Revisions to the ethical and moral codes are best made in a society of liberally educated individuals, living together under family government. In this kind of society revisions to the moral code will be made in the light of accumulated human experience and religious wisdom. In this kind of society the test of the ethical and moral code is not how well it accommodates individual, selfish interest, but how well it contributes to the continued well-being and happiness of the family.

The Old Stone House in Georgetown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 22, 1960

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on Saturday afternoon, January 23, 1960, there will occur an event of unique significance in the long and cherished history of the District of Columbia. I refer to a showing by the National Park Service of the Old Stone House at 3051 M Street, in Georgetown.

Through the interest and generosity of several Georgetown citizens, period furniture of the 18th century has been loaned for this building. On the following day, Sunday, the restored structure will be officially opened to the public, and there will be no charge for admissions.

The Old Stone House has many traditions, Mr. President, many of them legendary. In 1934 an architectural survey determined conclusively that it was built between the years 1764 and 1766, which makes it the oldest known house in the District of Columbia. When this fact became known, interest immediately began to generate. The 2d session of the 81st Congress held hearings on H.R. 7722 and testimony brought out the fact of the age of the prerevolutionary building and the fact that it had witnessed many events in the Nation's Capital stamped it with inescapable historical value.

On September 25, 1950, Public Law 836 gave the United States title to the building and the Department of the Interior was authorized to administer it and exhibit it as a public museum.

Since that time architectural restoration has been completed, and we have an attraction that is bound to add to the many charms of Georgetown and the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1960

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, to whom all hearts are open and from whom no human secrets are hid, save us from the fallacy of using what we call prayer to build, with comfortable phrases, a shelter around our own shortcomings.

As from a world rife with sham and deceit we turn to Thee, God of all truth, let us be solemnly conscious that all pretense is unavailing when we talk with Thee.

As chosen leaders of the Nation in a time of challenge and peril, give Thy servants here the fidelity, the candor, and the courage to warn this wayward generation that the road of safety, comfort, and repose is the straight path to the loss of the precious birthright bequeathed to us by those who endured hardness and spurned ease that we might live in freedom.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 22, 1960, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. NEUBERGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement of the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour for the introduction of memorials, bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and that there be a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INQUIRY REGARDING YEAS AND NAYS ON UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on Calendar No. 571, S. 2436, the so-called clean elections bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have not yet been ordered on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions, dated October 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary," and the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care," for the fiscal year 1960, have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Jerome C. Mietchen, of Ogden, Utah, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, relating to flood control work on the Mokelumne River, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION OF FAIRLINGTON METHODIST CHURCH, ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the official board of the Fairlington Methodist Church, of Alexandria, Va., endorsing the "Visit the United States of America" program.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has proclaimed 1960 as "Visit the United States of America Year," and has thereby extended a cordial invitation to the people of the world to visit our country; and

Whereas travel is an important element in the development of greater international understanding and thus tends to promote world peace; and

Whereas visitors from other lands have traditionally found in the United States a friendly welcome from a people whose primary concern is for peaceful accomplishments in their economic, social, and cultural life; and

Whereas the members of this church are desirous of sharing with our world neighbors the spiritual as well as the material satisfactions which we enjoy in our everyday lives;

Therefore, the official board of the Fairlington Methodist Church endorses the "visit the United States of America" program as an opportunity to demonstrate the transcendent quality of the Christian principles which are the very fabric of our Nation, and urges its members to examine ways in which they, individually and collectively, can use this opportunity to strengthen the bonds of friendship between our country and the international community of nations, and in so doing to make this world a better place in which to live.

To implement this resolution, the official board recommends that leaders of various organizations within the church familiarize themselves with the 1960 program and discuss within their respective groups specific ways by which they may participate, especially in hospitality phases of the program to insure the proper reception of visitors from abroad to this area.

Further, it is recommended that copies of this resolution be transmitted to all churches of this district in the hope that they will initiate similar activities.

RESOLUTION OF THE NASSAU COUNTY AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Nassau County, N.Y., American Legion, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a veterans hospital for Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Nassau County now has a population in excess of 1,700,000; and

Whereas there are at present many veterans who are unemployed or working on reduced salaries, who cannot afford to pay for medical and hospital treatment at private hospitals, although they need hospitalization; and

Whereas said veterans must, therefore, be treated as charity cases; and

Whereas the present nonveteran hospitals are very overcrowded; and

Whereas the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of New York, and the county executive of Nassau County have all expressed the need to have more public works started to take up the slack in employment; and

Whereas Nassau County and Suffolk County veterans find it extremely difficult to gain admittance to the presently available veterans hospitals due to the congestion and heavy demands thereon; and

Whereas the Suffolk County American Legion organization is on record by resolution, calling for the erection of an addition to the Northport Hospital for veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nassau County American Legion organization go on record as favoring the establishment of a veterans hospital for Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 2779. A bill relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va. (Rept. No. 1040).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 7588. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties for purposes of the personal holding company tax (Rept. No. 1041).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution proposing observance of week beginning January 31, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week (Rept. No. 1042).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 2891. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available under such acts to persons holding leasehold interests in lands in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2892. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Hatta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2893. A bill to permit weekly publications to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2894. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Great Salt Lake National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2895. A bill to provide for the regulation of finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia; to provide the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with additional authority to carry out the purposes of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to authorize the said Commissioners to impose certain requirements on persons licensed under the said act of July 1, 1902; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2896. A bill for the relief of Miss Sofie E. Evansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2897. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (by request):

S. 2898. A bill to establish the Oregon Coast National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2899. A bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2900. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose lands were acquired by the United States in connection with the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir in South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2901. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2902. A bill for the relief of Leo Shoenholz, Tobias Kaplan, the Kroger Co., and Cleveland State Bank, all of Cleveland, Miss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 2903. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2904. A bill for the relief of Dr. Steven S. Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2905. A bill to provide for a credit or deduction against Federal income taxes for certain political contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF UNEMPLOYMENT SELECTED READINGS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 256), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems one thousand additional copies of the unemployment selected readings prepared by that committee.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF STUDIES IN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 257), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems three thousand additional copies of the studies in unemployment prepared by that committee.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS HELD BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 258), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems two thousand additional copies of the hearings held by that committee concerning unemployment problems in Indiana.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RELATIVE WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE U.S.A."

Mr. MOSS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 259), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.," consisting of a joint subcommittee report and staff studies of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs three thousand seven hundred additional copies of such Senate document.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RELATIVE WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE U.S.S.R. AND THE U.S.A.," WITH ILLUSTRATIONS

Mr. MOSS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 260), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.," consisting of a joint subcommittee report and staff studies of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works three thousand seven hundred additional copies of such Senate document.

LONG-TERM LOANS TO CERTAIN FARMERS IN HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

which would make available long-term Government loans to farmers in Hawaii who farm on leased land.

This bill is designed to meet a unique situation in Hawaii which does not exist in the other 49 States. Because of the widespread prevalence of leaseholds in Hawaii, farmers there have been unable to qualify for farmownership loans and farm housing loans. This bill would correct this inequity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2891) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available under such acts to persons holding leasehold interests in lands in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, during adjournment, I had the pleasure of conducting hearings on two of the specific coastal areas to be set aside in the so-called save-our-shorelines bill—Cape Cod in Massachusetts and Padre Island in Texas. I was very much impressed with the magnificence and charm of these areas, and came back to Washington, D.C., with the deep conviction that they must be preserved both for the wonder and enjoyment of this generation, and those to come after us.

There exists, however, in the State of Utah a shoreline area that is more unique than anything I saw this fall. I am referring to the shoreline of the Great Salt Lake.

I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill today to set aside certain areas and shorelines of the Great Salt Lake as a national park.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2894) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Great Salt Lake National Park in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Great Salt Lake is perhaps the best known of the many natural wonders of Utah. This vast inland sea is the only thing of its kind in the Western Hemisphere. Americans everywhere are intrigued by the lake and want to see it.

In the hope that we might find an attractive access to Great Salt Lake, I asked the National Park Service to make a survey of the area, which they did last summer. Their survey included the entire lake and the surrounding shoreline, as well as the south, east, and north shores of Antelope Island. Among the conclusions the Park Service reached were these:

First. Great Salt Lake illustrates outstandingly significant scientific values worthy of preservation and interpretation by either the Federal or State Government.

Second. No existing area in the national park system duplicates to any substantial extent the significant values of Great Salt Lake.

Third. The north end of Antelope Island was the most impressive site on the lake visited.

Fourth. The proper development of Great Salt Lake is an extremely complex matter of concern to all levels of government as well as to corporate and private interests.

The report also points out that many of the problems which must be solved are the responsibility of local municipalities and industrial concerns. The bill I am introducing today will facilitate hearings on these problems.

In one respect I disagree heartily with the National Park Service report. It indicates a lack of local interest in developing the lake and its shorelines. The interest is there—it is only that the problems are complex, and there is need for a rallying point.

Great Salt Lake and its shoreline are both unusual and infinitely worth saving. A few more years and it will be too late. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune of January 11, which makes a far more eloquent case than I could for the preservation of one of the best-known natural phenomenons of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A save-our-shorelines bill, designating 10 specific coastal areas for national park administration, is expected to be the object of a major drive in the new Congress.

The original plan is modest, including Cape Cod and other Atlantic coast strips plus some additional remnants of unspoiled shoreline on the Pacific, gulf, and Great Lakes coasts.

We believe the Great Salt Lake should be given national park recognition and protection. This world-famous inland dead sea, with salt content as high as 28 percent, is one of the unique attractions in America. Its scientific, historical, and recreational importance have long been recognized but it has been allowed to deteriorate to an ugly cesspool.

Last spring, Senator Moss, of Utah, asked the National Park Service to study the potentialities of Great Salt Lake, and a team of experts spent considerable time reconnoitering the area. In a recent report, the Park Service said the lake has significant scientific values worthy of preservation and interpretation. No existing area in the national park system duplicates these values, the report said.

The report stated, however, that there was no evidence of any substantial public support for including Great Salt Lake in the National Park Service.

This matter should be promptly corrected. An unspoiled strip of shoreline needs to be given official protection while there is still time. From present indications, the Utah State Park Commission, now engaged in an ambitious program throughout the State, cannot afford this undertaking.

National Park Service experts believe a national monument would be adequate to tell the Great Salt Lake story and suggest Antelope Island as a logical site. The rugged, mostly barren island, 15½ miles long and 5½ miles wide, with a total acreage of 23,175, is connected with the mainland by a rough road. It is owned privately by the Island Improvement and Ranching Co. and four other interests and is used mainly for grazing. Obtaining the island for public use and preservation at a reasonable price is the first consideration.

Gently sloping beaches ideal for recreation exist on the north and west shores. A national monument here would supplement a project planned by the Utah State Park Commission for facilities on the lake's south shore. The old Saltair resort was given the State commission about a year ago but funds are lacking so far for any more than maintaining the property. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers soon will begin a survey to determine the feasibility of rebuilding the old Salt Lake County boat harbor nearby and of dredging that part of the lake.

Great Salt Lake also is tremendously important commercially and these values should not be damaged.

The flexible rules of a State park would not interfere with normal industrial undertakings on the south shore.

Meanwhile, the feasibility of protecting in its natural State all of Antelope Island certainly should be thoroughly studied. Recently the commissioners of Davis County, which embraces the island, took steps to zone it. All projects involving the island depend on halting the practice of dumping raw sewage from Salt Lake City and other communities into the area. Plans are progressing on these long-needed sanitation programs.

The save-our-shorelines program has met with local opposition in some areas because of commercial and residential developments in suggested park areas. This plus the increasing national demand for expanded outdoor recreational facilities emphasize the need to set aside a small area on Great Salt Lake for public information and enjoyment before commercial exploitation blocks the way. Let's get busy.

LIMITATIONS ON USED-CAR DEALERS AND AUTO FINANCE COMPANIES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill designed to provide needed protection for the District of Columbia's car-buying public who have been the target the last several years of a teamplay by certain unscrupulous used-car dealers and finance companies.

A pattern of growth complaints about the unethical practices of this small minority of District used-car dealers and some fly-by-night finance companies has resulted in this proposed legislation.

It is apparent that the laws of the District do not meet the fair business standards imposed by other States to curb these sharp practices whereby every last dollar is sought to be pried from low-income families, and others who patronize the used-car lots.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have examined this matter at considerable length and have proposed the curbs set forth in this bill.

The proposed legislation will fix a fair ceiling on finance charges which may be made for motor vehicles sold on a time-installment basis. It further will give to the Commissioners of the District authority they do not now have to regulate

more effectively the conduct of persons engaged in the business of selling motor vehicles. This bill will require bonds of persons engaged in the business of selling motor vehicles and those engaged in financing the sale of motor vehicles. Presently, only licenses are required.

I can promise that the Committee on the District of Columbia will schedule early hearings on this proposed legislation.

I believe strongly that the unsuspecting public must be protected from the fast-talking salesmen who prey on the service men and women particularly, and the public in general. This proposed legislation will impose curbs that are long overdue to the Nation's Capital City.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2895) to provide for the regulation of finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia; to provide the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with additional authority to carry out the purposes of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to authorize the said Commissioners to impose certain requirements on persons licensed under the said act of July 1, 1902; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REMOVAL OF DISABILITY PAYMENTS AGE LIMIT UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill removing the 50-year age limit for persons receiving disability payments under the Social Security Act and permitting the payment of such benefits from the beginning of an individual's disability.

An identical bill has been introduced in the House by Representative OSTERTAG, of New York. A very similar bill has also been introduced by my successor in the House, Representative WEIS. Other New York State Representatives who have introduced bills on this subject are: Messrs. FINO, DOLLINGER, and HOLTZMAN. Many other Members of both the Senate and House have introduced proposed legislation along these lines.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that Congress will thoroughly examine and evaluate the social security program during the present session of Congress. It is apparent to a great many Americans that measures such as the removal of the disability age limit are urgently needed to improve and update Federal programs for the assistance of aged, disabled, and needy persons in our Nation.

Mr. President, there is no reason that a person should have to wait until he is 50 years old before he can qualify for disability relief under the social security program. Such relief should begin when it is needed most; namely, immediately upon determination that a person who has been paying into the social security trust fund has become totally or permanently disabled. This to me is the only fair and just approach to the overwhelming human problems involved in a person being injured or becoming so seriously ill as to prevent him from pursuing his regular line of work.

Mr. President, in introducing this bill today, I add my voice to those calling for fairer and better treatment of the disabled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2897) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraph (B) of section 223(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "has attained the age of fifty and".

(b) The last sentence of section 223(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 2. (a) Subparagraph (C) of section 223(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "while under a disability (as defined in subsection (c)(2)" after "benefits".

(b) Subparagraph (D) of section 223(a)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(D) has been under such disability throughout a period of at least six consecutive calendar months, or dies as a direct result of such disability,".

(c) Section 223(a)(1) of such Act is further amended by striking out "beginning with the first month after his waiting period (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) in which he becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "beginning with the first month in which he satisfies subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C)".

(d) Section 223(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "in the first month of his waiting period" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the first month in which he is under the disability described in paragraph (1)(C)".

(e) Section 223(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows paragraph (2).

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, or based upon the wages and self-employment income of an individual entitled to such benefits, for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

OREGON COAST NATIONAL SHORELINE RECREATION AREA

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has been forwarded to me by the Governor of the State of Oregon, dealing with a proposed national shoreline recreation area in the general vicinity of the famous Oregon Dunes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2898) to establish the Oregon Coast National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I originally sponsored proposed legislation for such a park on March 25, 1959. That bill was S. 1526. On May 20, 1959, I introduced S. 2010 at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, to authorize three seacoast national parks in the United States, to be chosen administratively by the Secretary.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, and his State natural resources committee then criticized, at considerable length, my original proposals dealing with the national shoreline park on the Oregon coast. On October 26, 1959, I introduced a modified bill, which I had prepared with the assistance of the National Park Service and which represented a vigorous effort by me to meet many of the criticisms voiced by Governor Hatfield and his associates.

SOME FEATURES DISTURBING

On January 18, 1960, I received from the Governor a bill prepared by him and his committee. This bill contains a great many of the provisions, almost word for word, which I had included in my amended Oregon shoreline park bill October 26, 1959. The Governor's bill also contains a considerable number of rather drastic departures from my bill. Despite this fact, it is the bill sent to me by Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, which I am introducing by request in the Senate today. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate Senate committee, so that hearings may be scheduled and departmental and administrative views obtained.

I wish to note that, in accordance with the Governor's suggestion, there is included in the bill a legal description of the park and the Sea Lion Caves stating the exterior boundaries of each area. These are the boundaries suggested following congressional hearings in Oregon and referred to in my revised park bill of October 26, 1959. Located within the periphery of the park would be Umpqua Lighthouse State Park and that area to the south bordered by U.S. Highway 101 and Tenmile Creek, together with Tahkenitch Lake to the north. The addition of the legal descriptions was the only change made in the Governor's draft.

Candidly, Mr. President, there are some features of Governor Hatfield's bill which disturb me. I think it would be better if he and his associates had not included them. Yet I also fully realize that the legislative process is one of compromise, cooperation, and mutual agreement. I am aware of the difficulties involved in establishing a new national park in a State where the Governor of that State is hostile to such a development. In my opinion, Oregon's magnificent and scenic seacoast merits the national shoreline park which has

been proposed by the National Parks Advisory Board in the Oregon Dunes, within the general vicinity of the communities of Florence and Reedsport.

DIFFERENCES AND DISTINCTIONS CITED

I think the best way to get that park is for Governor Hatfield and me to reach all possible agreement on the details of the legislation authorizing such a national park. Many years from now the important and essential thing will be the existence of a great national park along America's most majestic shoreline; it will not be what politician salved his vanity or pride by feuding with another politician over whether or not the park should be established. My goal is not political warfare; it is to bring Oregon its first new national park since Crater Lake was set aside in 1902.

In this speech of introduction I am going to cite the principal differences and distinctions between the bill sent to me by Governor Hatfield and the revised Oregon Shoreline National Park bill which I presented to the Governor last October 26, 1959. However, before I do this, I again want to emphasize that there are many major features of my bill which are contained without substantial change in Governor Hatfield's bill.

Obviously, this bill will be dispatched by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY] to the Department of the Interior for a rpeort and comments. It is my firm intention to accept whatever changes made by the Governor and his natural resources committee that are likewise acceptable to the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. What they accept I will accept. I believe this is a fair and nonpartisan attitude on my part, Mr. President.

WILL SUPPORT PARK SERVICE JUDGMENT

If the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service should find some of the Governor's changes unacceptable from the standpoint of basic national park policies, then I have every confidence and hope that Governor Hatfield will join with me in acceding to the wishes of this great conservation agency which must administer any park which is created by Congress.

In his budget message submitted last week, President Eisenhower recommended the establishment of three new shoreline national parks to be chosen administratively as provided for in the bill S. 2010, which I have introduced at the request of the administration. In other words, the President of the United States would rely completely on the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior and his advisers in deciding which three seashore realms would be formed into parks. I likewise have faith in the ability of the Interior Department to pass upon the details of the legislation which I am introducing today at the behest of the Governor of Oregon. I again wish to reiterate that what details the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service find acceptable in this bill, will be acceptable to me also; if there are any features or provisions which these agencies determine to be unwise, then I also will be disposed to conform to their judgment, because I realize that, without departmental support, any new national shoreline park in Oregon would be highly unlikely to be authorized.

RESERVATIONS OUTLINED

Mr. President, I would like now to outline briefly those features of Governor Hatfield's bill which cause me particular concern.

Section 2(c), providing that "there shall be no further extension of the Oregon Coast National Seashore Recreation Area except for the concurrence of the Oregon Legislative Assembly and the Governor of Oregon" would take traditional authority away from the Congress of the United States and vest it in the Legislature and the Governor of the State of Oregon. It seems doubtful that a Congress of the United States would so restrict the action of future Congresses. It may not even be constitutional.

Section 3(a) would eliminate the provision contained in my modified bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into exchange agreements in order to acquire land for the seashore park.

I had included such a provision originally so that an equivalent amount of BLM cutover forestland might be exchanged for the 10,600-acre tree farm of the Crown Zellerbach Timber Co. along Tahkenitch Lake.

While I do not necessarily approve of such exchanges as a general rule, I felt it was justified in this situation so as not to jeopardize any of the log supply which makes possible the sizable employment and economic activity at the West Linn, Oreg., pulp and paper mill of the Crown Zellerbach Co. I regret that Governor Hatfield did not see fit to retain this exchange authority in the legislation.

DIVIDED JURISDICTION TROUBLESOME

Section 5 concerning the use of water resources within the proposed Oregon Coast National Seashore Recreation Area—as well as section 9 concerning wildlife within the proposed area—appear to establish divided or dual jurisdiction as between the Secretary of the Interior and the State.

There is reason to question the wisdom of dividing jurisdiction over important resources in the proposed area when the purpose of the act is "to effect a coordinated method of conserving and developing for the benefit, inspiration, and uses of the public certain ocean shoreline, sand dunes, forested areas, fresh water lakes and recreational facilities, the combination of which comprises a total recreation area of scenic, scientific, recreational and historic significance."

Section 6 of the Governor's bill would authorize payments in lieu of taxes for lands acquired in fee by the U.S. Government for a period of 25 years, using a descending scale after the first 5 years. While this is generally similar to the solution of the problem of payments in lieu of taxes authorized by the Congress when Jackson Hole was added to Grand Teton National Park, the Bureau of the Budget under this administration is known to be opposed to it as a general practice.

Accordingly, the better part of wisdom might well be to reduce the authorization for payments in lieu of taxes to a period of 3 years for lands acquired in fee by the Government of the United States, as proposed in my bill drafted after the Senate hearings at Reedsport and Eugene last September.

I am, of course, fully in sympathy with adequate compensation for loss of taxes to cushion the changeover from private to public use of the proposed recreational area. Such a cushion, I believe, would be provided adequately by the provision for payments in lieu of taxes for a period of 3 years after private properties are acquired in fee.

TIES SECRETARY'S HANDS

Section 7 would tie the Secretary of the Interior's hands in the conservation and management of the proposed national seashore recreation area by binding him to "the present program planned by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service" for the stabilization of the moving dunes.

The present program of dune stabilization has been formulated with other uses of the area as the objective. It seems questionable whether, in view of the stated objectives of the national seashore recreation area, the Secretary's hands should be tied in such manner that he would be prevented from formulating a program of dune stabilization that would best fit the purposes of the proposed national seashore recreation area and its relationship to adjacent communities.

We might provide for consultation with the Soil Conservation Service, and the Secretary of the Interior ought to have reasonable latitude in drawing up a program for dunes stabilization.

PARK SERVICE ANALYSIS AUTHORITATIVE

This, Mr. President, summarizes some of the reservations which I have about the Governor's bill. However, I believe the basic determination should be made by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service, whose officials have had long experience in the establishment and operation of national parks.

The first national park was set aside in 1872. It was Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming. If the Oregon National Seashore Recreation Area is created it will be the 181st unit of the national park system. This means that a vast body of experience exists for determining operating policies of the National Park Service. I am quite willing to abide by the judgment of those who possess this experience. I feel certain that Governor Hatfield will likewise trust the judgment of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service.

I again want to repeat that whatever in the Governor's bill is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and his associates will be acceptable to me. Conversely, I want to follow any recommendations which they might make for reasonable changes in that bill.

Mr. President, in the January 1960 issue of American Forests magazine there appeared an excellent discussion by William B. Morse of my proposal for creation of a national seashore recreation area among the Oregon Dunes. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with an editorial entitled "Seashore Parks" and a column on winter recreation on the Oregon coast, both from the Oregon Statesman of Salem; an editorial entitled "New Elements in Sand Dunes Issue" from the Oregon Journal of Portland; and an editorial from the Astorian Evening Budget headed "New Hope for Dunes Project." These thoughtful editorials are commended to my colleagues of the Senate and the House, who are the ultimate arbiters on this proposed legislation so vital to Oregon and to the Nation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From American Forests, January 1960]

THE OREGON DUNES

(By William B. Morse)

The lines are forming on a proposal to create a national seashore in the Oregon Dunes area. Proponents, including Senator NEUBERGER and the late Robert Sawyer, claim these dunes are superior to Cape Cod's. However, opposition to a new Federal installation has already been voiced by Governor Hatfield, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Peterson, and others. This article presents the story as seen by the Oregon representative of the Wildlife Management Institute.

The State of Oregon has been blessed with 312 miles of seacoast, considered by many people to include some of the most beautiful ocean frontage in the world. There are only four other States with a longer coastline, nevertheless the proposal to dedicate a 23-mile strip as a national seashore area has created a hornet's nest of opposition within the State.

The American Forestry Association should have a vital interest in the proposed Oregon Dunes. It is similar to the Atlantic seashore areas supported by the association, and also involves national forest and private tree farmlands within the overall boundaries.

Opponents of the dunes national seashore area have been extremely active; proponents, as yet unorganized, have not joined the battle for publicity. The project area is complex, as are the issues. It is difficult to strip emotional factors from consideration and look at the fundamentals involved; however, it can be done. It must be done to view the area in perspective, or at least in the perspective of what is most desirable for the long-range benefit of all the people.

The National Park Service published results of a privately financed survey early last year in a comprehensive volume called the "Pacific Coast Recreation Area Survey." The report classified four areas on the entire west coast as possessing unique qualities of national significance, one each in Washington and Oregon, and two in California. Soon after publication of this report, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER introduced S. 1526 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire not more than 35,000 acres in the Oregon Dunes-Sea Lion Caves as a national seashore recreation area. Since then, two more Senate bills have been introduced, S. 2010, the administration bill authorizing three areas and naming one of them; and S. 2460 naming and authorizing 10 seashore areas, including the Oregon Dunes-Sea Lion Caves.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has ordered two public hearings in Oregon on the Oregon Dunes proposal in early October. These hearings will provide an opportunity for all interested people to submit their views for the records and will make public that factual information vitally needed to properly assess the proposal for a national seashore.

That is the legislative situation for the Oregon Dunes. What, then, of the land? The 23 miles of coastline involved are located between the mouths of the Siuslaw and Umpqua Rivers. That section of the Oregon coast is characterized by easily eroded sandstones, and, as a result, large quantities of sand have been formed. For thousands of years, these sands have blown in shifting dunes, creating lakes, killing vegetation, and forming new vegetated areas and lakes. The dunes present an unexcelled example of nature's battle for individual survival, but some species do survive, and the forested areas on the east of the active dunes grow on ancient stabilized dunes. Geologically, the western coast is rising, and some of the older stabilized dunes reach a height of 450 feet above sea level.

There are three distinct land forms within the study area. The ocean front is a wide, fine-textured sandy beach. Inland is a large desertlike expanse of moving sand, swept by the wind into dunes, and farthest from the sea are the ancient dunes, now forest covered.

Many lakes are found on the area, but three are large enough to be significant: 130-acre Cleowox; Woahink, about 800 acres; and 3,200-acre Siltcoos Lake. The latter two are located east of Highway 101 and are the major protrusion of the study area to the east. The remainder of the project lies between the highway and the ocean, averaging only 1½ miles in width.

Land cover, use, and ownerships are best listed in tabular form:

TABLE 1.—*Landownership*

Owners:	Acres
United States	13,115
State	522
County	320
Private	14,863
Lakes	4,250
Total	33,070

TABLE 2.—*Land cover and use*

Category:	Acres
Sand	14,000
Water	4,250
Agriculture	420
Recreation	672
Forest lands	13,728
Total	33,070

These figures do not include the area of the Sea Lion Caves which will be discussed later.

The land owned by the United States is of special interest as it includes 11,260 acres of the Siuslaw National Forest.

Much of the land classified as timberland has been cut over and now is covered by brush, reproduction, and immature second growth. An estimated 1,600 acres of uncut commercial timberland remain in the area, a substantial portion of which is on lands near Siltcoos and Woahink Lakes that have been subdivided for homesites. The largest single private timberland ownership is in a Crown Zellerbach Corp. tree farm, and involves about 3,000 acres.

The two larger lakes provide mixed fishing for warm-water species, and sea runs of cutthroat trout, steelhead, and silver salmon. Waterfowl utilize all the lakes in the area during the fall and winter months. Barley and grasses are planted for waterfowl food under a cooperative State-Federal project north of the Siltcoos Lake outlet.

The 522 acres owned by the State of Oregon are all in Jesse M. Honeyman State Park. This park contains Cleowax Lake, portions of the Woahink Lake, timber, beautiful rhododendrons, and striking sand dunes. The unique combination and intensive development make it one of the finest parks in the Oregon system. The stature of Honeyman Park is well shown by the increase in use from 222,687 visits in 1955 to 344,256 visits in 1957.

The Forest Service management plan for lands within the proposed seashore lists recreation as the primary use. Timber harvest will be confined to salvage of head and dying timber. Present forest recreation developments include three forest camps and one Girl Scout camp. An estimated 107,000 visits were made to these units in 1958. New Forest Service developments proposed include enlarging one camp, constructing five more camps, and building seven miles of road for beach and recreational access. Access to the beach and the dunes area is difficult. Parking space on the highway is restricted, and the only good roads into the dunes area are at Siltcoos Forest Camp and at Honeyman Park.

In general, the attitudes of residents in the two closest towns to the proposed Dunes seashore are worlds apart. People living in Reedsport on the south end are generally favorable, while some from the town of Florence at the north end are actively opposed. Leadership in Reedsport is favorable. William M. Tugman, in an editorial in the Port Umpqua Courier, June 11, 1958, said, "There is every reason to believe that the national seashore will bring millions of tourists to this area the year around, that it will provide a balance to our economy we cannot achieve any other way. It will put an end to many real estate promotions and speculations. Over a period of time, which we will not live to see, it will restore to this area much of its primitive beauty and glory. * * * The national seashore will not make everybody rich. But if it provides a balance to our economy, it will reduce some of the staggering poverty that exists in all our communities today."

Some leaders in Florence take the opposite tack and are unalterably opposed to the project. Much of the opposition stems from residents within the study area who are concerned with losing their homes. Most newspapers in Oregon, however, editorially support a national seashore.

Charges and countercharges have filled the air. Park Service officials on the original survey have been accused of snooping almost to the point of being "Peeping Toms." All such charges have contributed to creation of an emotional climate which may require years to correct. Some level heads prevail, and it is worth noting that the Courty Court of Douglas County, where 40 percent of the seashore is located, has approved the project by resolution. The county park boards of both Douglas and Lane Counties have done likewise. The entire area is located in these counties. The State of Oregon has yielded to local pressure, sidestepped the issue, and withheld decision pending further information.

There is little question that the Oregon Dunes are magnificent. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute says, "In my opinion, it is the finest dune area in North America."

Most of the opponents recognize that development of the dunes themselves would be desirable. It is the lake area to the east, location of residences and business, that is controversial. The Park Service says there must be space for camp grounds, picnic areas, and water-type recreation in the project. The present boundaries will give a good cross section of the entire ecology from beach to ancient dunes.

Much of the present trouble stems from lack of information. The boundaries set up now are only boundaries of a recommended study area. Until some legislation authorizes the Park Service to make a detailed and complete survey, they will not know where the final boundary of a national seashore should be. A great deal of the opposition would not exist if a final recommendation for the Dunes seashore boundary could have been made initially. The Park Service has some economic studies under way and boundaries of the study area have been changed, but this information has not yet been released.

One great advantage to be gained by a national seashore is money. Conservative estimates by the Park Service indicate that in the long run, a national seashore would bring twice as much money into the immediate area as would use of the existing resources without a national seashore. Some conservationists, author included, believe the seashore would add at least $40 million per year in increased tourist business to the entire Oregon coast. Recreation development can bring immense amounts of money to an area. Douglas County's Salmon Harbor Park, just south of the dunes area, brought an additional $2 million into the immediate area last year. Proponents point out that if a small regional development can do this, a large national area would accomplish much more.

Residents of the area fear loss of tax revenues, particularly local school taxes. Every group in favor of the seashore would help secure amendments to any pending legislation providing for Federal payment to local taxing districts of money in lieu of taxes, such payments to be on a diminishing basis for a stated term of years. As payments decreased, the local tax base would increase by construction of tourist-serving businesses near the area. Precedent exists for this in the Grand Teton National Park.

Local residents feel that their homes will be condemned and confiscated. This belief still persists in spite of assurances by the Park Service that they rarely condemn real property, and, in many cases, they can make life tenure agreements to allow the people to use their homes rent free for life.

Another criticism is that dune stabilization programs will cease and rolling dunes will inundate the entire area. Again, the Park Service has promised to protect river harbors, lakes, campgrounds, and the major highways. After all, much of that part of the coast consists of ancient dunes, so dunes, moving and stabilized, are a geological process.

Forestry and timber production are a basis for other criticisms of the project. The timber on the homesite and State park areas is, and will continue to be, unavailable. Forest Service land produces little merchantable timber and because it is now classed as a recreation area, will contribute little toward regional timber production. That leaves the lands in the Crown-Zellerbach Tree Farm, most of which are at least 70 and 80 years from another harvest. Crown-Zellerbach is opposed to the project and believes that any additional park development should be undertaken by the State. These lands are rough and presently have limited scenic values, although they do border the south end of Siltcoos Lake. Some proponents feel that the bulk of this tree farmland could be excluded from the project, although it might be necessary to acquire a buffer strip along the lake for scenic purposes. A few small tracts of other commercial timberlands are in or adjacent to the study area, but their small size will cause little impact on the regional wood-using industries.

The Forest Service has not officially released their views of the project. It is likely that they will oppose placing any of their land in the project. They have done a good job of recreational development and hope to do a better one in the future.

The Sea Lion Caves portion of the dunes project has been noncontroversial. This 180-acre unit is located 6 miles north of Florence and is not contiguous with the large Oregon Dunes unit. The caves are large, natural, seaswept caverns in a rocky promontory and are of national significance as the only known mainland rookery of Stellar's sea lion. The caves are privately developed as a tourist business. No one, including the owners, has objected to the proposal to include the caves in a national seashore. The State game commission feels that any recognition given sea lions will make it more difficult to control their numbers in spots where they feed on salmon. Some Oregon fishermen have long blamed sea lions for decimating salmon runs and have been vociferous in demands for control measures. Overfishing, pollution, dams, and destruction of spawning areas kill countless salmon, but it is convenient to blame much of it on the sea lions.

The concept of a national seashore is new, but national parks are familiar to all. It is difficult for many people in Oregon to understand the great difference between the two. There are many recreational uses that may be permitted on the national seashore, although prohibited in a national park. The State may be allowed to manage fishing and waterfowl hunting on a seashore. Boating, water skiing, and beach buggies can all be permitted on a seashore. The seashore emphasis is on recreation, not on preservation as in the national parks.

There has been some question as to the future of Honeyman State Park if a national seashore is established. The Park Service says it could remain under State operation if the State desired. It would be illogical to have two park agencies operating in one area, and Oregon would be wise to turn the park over to the Dunes National Seashore if it is established and spend their operational money on another coastal park.

A most important element of the dunes problem is water. Industrial development in coastal Oregon has been handicapped by lack of water, particularly in the late summer when river flows are low. It has been known for many years that dry looking sand dunes store vast amounts of rain water; European cities have tapped this source for many years. Federal experiments showed high water potential in Oregon's sand dunes several years ago, and recent tests by an electric company were so successful that a new pulp and paper mill will be constructed about 20 miles south of the proposed seashore and will secure the necessary industrial water solely from dunes.

The water potential on the Oregon Dunes is seldom mentioned by opponents, but is always in the background. Many people agree with the Oregon Journal, which said editorially on July 15, 1959: "* * * The Florence area dunes have tremendous value for recreational purposes probably outweighing what worth they might have as an industrial water supply. Nobody knows, for instance, what effect the pumping of water from these dunes would have on adjacent fresh water lakes, which are prime recreational attractions."

The leader of the dunes opposition organization, called the Western Lane County Taxpayers Association, has described his group as a very fluid organization. This is an apt description; an observer or investigator gains an impression that one of the real issues behind their opposition to the dunes is like their organization—fluid. The fluid is potential water development, and the devil take lake levels and recreation.

Those are the major valid criticisms of the Oregon Dunes seashore. Why should an area like this be proposed where there is already much Federal land and some recreational development? Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER says of the Oregon dunes, "Within a comparatively brief span of years, our Nation's population will soar to the 300 million mark. We cannot afford to delay decisions which ultimately must be made to preserve unique secenic areas for the recreation and enjoyment of our citizens. The dunes area of the Oregon seacoast is one section of America's shoreline which is worthy of national recognition and preservation. This is the objective of the legislation I have introduced to establish the Oregon Dunes and Sean Lion Caves national seashore area. Its exact boundaries and the portions of adjacent land, water, and forest areas which should be included can only be determined after thorough study and review. One step in such determination occurred last fall when the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, of which I am a member, held congressional hearings in the immediate vicinity of the proposed park development. I hope that this will lead to early action giving park status to the Oregon Dunes so that citizens of Oregon and the entire Nation can share in the benefits."

Other proponents also believe that the area possesses such unique and magnificent attractions of national significance that it could be best developed, operated, and interpreted by the National Park Service. They believe that it will be of financial benefit to the State and of cultural benefit to the Nation if an Oregon Dunes National Seashore is established. The agencies developing and managing the lands now have done a fine job, but the Oregon Dunes are worthy of a coordinated development by one agency, rather than a piecemeal development by many. These same conservationists know that every national park and national seashore was established against strong local opposition, and every one has been an economic asset to the surrounding area and a cultural asset to the Nation.

WINTER AT THE COAST

[From the Salem Oregon Statesman, Jan. 15, 1960]

The Oregon coast saves some of its choicest secrets to reveal to those who visit the shore in the winter.

Those who saw the new year in at our section of the beach in Lincoln County were treated to pounding waves which left long lines of foam for children to kick their way through at the high water mark.

The spouting horns at Depoe Bay and Boiler Bay were gathering points for hundreds of brightly clad beachcombers, willing to take a ducking in chilly spray for the privilege of getting close to the source.

Winter's high tides alter the landscape and seascape so that summertime visitors hardly recognize some of the coast. They fill every corner of Siletz Bay with water, crowding in on the low-lying houses at Cutler City.

The waves at Taft cross the bar and pound against the seawall of rocks next to the streets of the city. The long line of logs which normally divides that beach into hundreds of little picnic spots bob resignedly in Siletz Bay waiting to be thrown into different abstract patterns along the sand for next summer's visitors.

Further down the coast, the waves surge through the mouth of the Devil's Punch Bowl at Otter Rock. The summer tourist who has looked into that yawning hole on a dozen different occasions finally sees the swirling waters about which he heard others talk.

With a steady wind blowing from the west, the glass ball hunters are out in full force. As early as one gets to the beach in the morning, there is always one or two sets of footprints ahead on the sand. Back they come, early birds, stick in hand, poking into each pile of drifting sand, eyes on the lookout for that glint of green which betrays the hidden glass float.

For those who were willing to risk a climb on ice-coated rocks, the waves put on a

splendid show of violence over the new year's holiday. The sun was warm enough in midday to permit sitting on the beach or rocks to watch the display. Schools of whales frolicked offshore, although the usual clusters of fishing boats were absent.

The wintertime recreational uses of the coast will increase as people come to recognize that sunshine isn't much harder to find there in the winter than in the summer, and in many ways it is even more enjoyable in the off season.

[From the Oregon Statesman, Jan. 20, 1960]

SEASHORE PARKS

President Eisenhower threw his support behind the Interior bill to establish three seashore recreational areas. While he does not specify locations for the three it is known that the National Park Service is favorably disposed toward the Oregon Dunes as one choice. The President in his budget message declared these areas "would be of national significance because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational advantages and other public values."

The Interior bill was introduced by Senator NEUBERGER at the last session. He also introduced a bill to establish the Oregon dunes as a national seashore recreational area. The latter measure has been undergoing revision in an attempt to satisfy Oregon's committee on natural resources. It is still uncertain whether this bill will be pressed or support centered on the Interior bill which leaves the selection of areas to an administrative agency.

It looks as though the country will get three seashore parks, and one of them may be on the Oregon coast.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Jan. 21, 1960]

NEW ELEMENTS IN SAND DUNES ISSUE

One can be both encouraged and confused by recent events in relation to the proposal for creation of a national seashore recreation area in the dunes of the Oregon coast.

Encouragement comes in the offering of a bill by Governor Hatfield's committee on natural resources for the establishment of such a park but with certain safeguards for the State and the people of the area. The committee had previously voiced strong opposition to proposals of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and Representative CHARLES O. PORTER.

But the new bill is not an extreme departure from a compromise measure prepared last fall by Senator NEUBERGER, and the Senator now says that he will attempt to go along with every provision of Governor Hatfield's bill which is consistent with traditional National Park Service policy. Representative PORTER says he is encouraged by the State committee's action and believes that it forms the basis of compromise legislation which can be passed.

Perhaps the most startling development is the endorsement of the Hatfield bill by leaders of the Florence area fight against previous sand dune legislation. If this produces something which the Western Lane County Taxpayers Association, NEUBERGER and PORTER can all support, a modern miracle will have been performed.

A new element in the whole picture was the recent endorsement by President Eisenhower of the previous Department of Interior bill, which had been introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, authorizing the establishment of three national seashores and empowering the Park Service to select the three by administrative action. At this stage, the Park Service favors this approach and is opposed to specific legislation on any particular park.

But there is considerable sentiment in Congress against this method. It seems likely that specific legislation will be presented on individual parks, including the Oregon Dunes. The Park Service may have to accept this approach. On the other hand, if Congress should authorize three parks without naming them, NEUBERGER is confident that the Oregon Dunes would be one of the three and that the Park Service would give the utmost consideration to providing the safeguards wanted by State and local interests.

The whole situation is in such a state of flux that nobody can predict what will develop. But the spirit of compromise which has permitted contending forces in Oregon to get together has enhanced Oregon's prospect of having a park.

The chances that three such areas will be established, whether through the one piece of legislation or through separate bills, are good. Oregon is in competition with other States in this matter. Whether we succeed may depend on how well we state our case in the future.

And we ought to speak from an attitude, not that we will grudgingly do the National Park Service a favor, but that we will gladly accept something which will prove to be of great value to our State, as well as the Nation.

[From the Astorian Evening Budget, Jan. 21, 1960]

NEW HOPE FOR DUNES PROJECT

President Eisenhower's endorsement of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore project, coupled with a reversal of opinion by Gov. Mark Hatfield who now looks favorably upon the plan, certainly seem to enhance the prospects for a development that last week appeared moribund.

This project seems to have merit. It provides Federal participation to supplement the efforts of the State in providing more and improved attractions for tourists on the Oregon coast.

The local opposition has seemed shortsighted and the State administration's chilly attitude toward it has been hard to understand.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN HEALTH BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES OF AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to employees of county agricultural, stabilization, and conservation committees.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate is familiar with the vital work carried out by these employees. The exacting task of administering our complex, and many times confusing, farm programs falls on the shoulders of these dedicated employees. Their responsibilities are great and their compensation is small. Although they are paid almost entirely with Federal funds, they are not considered as Federal workers for purposes of employee-benefit programs.

These conscientious public servants work side by side with regular civil-service employees, who enjoy all the standard privileges and benefits accorded Federal workers. It is difficult for ASC employees to understand why they are treated as unwanted stepchildren for benefit purposes. Recognition of their contributions to the farmers of this country is long overdue. This bill would extend only one of the standard civil-service benefits to ASC employees. I realize this matter was considered by the Senate committee last year and was rejected because of supposed difficulties in administering a health program for ASC employees. I am confident that suitable means can be found to eliminate this objection. I hope the Department of Agriculture and the Civil Service Commission will consider this bill with a positive approach rather than come up with a reiteration of their previous unsubstantial objections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2899) to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1960—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MURRAY, LONG of Hawaii, NEUBERGER, MANSFIELD, MORSE, CHAVEZ, BYRD of West Virginia, MOSS, MARTIN, KEFAUVER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JACKSON, McGEE, GRUENING, MAGNUSON, KERR, HUMPHREY, HENNINGS, RANDOLPH, CHURCH, MUSKIE, and MONRONEY, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by us jointly, to Senate bill 8, the education bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is twofold: First, to include among the permissible uses of Federal funds aid to teachers' salaries, if the States elect to so use the funds; secondly, to increase the amount of the authorized appropriation from half a billion dollars to $25 for each child of school age, which for the first year would total $1.1 billion, and to authorize the aid for an indefinite period rather than for 2 years only.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief digest of these amendments may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DIGEST OF THE TEACHERS' SALARY AMENDMENTS TO S. 8 TO BE OFFERED BY SENATOR CLARK AND OTHERS

The amendments would make the following changes in S. 8:

1. Increase the authorization from $500 million a year to $25 per child of school age, which amounts to $1.1 billion during the next fiscal year.

2. Authorize the aid for an indefinite period rather than for a 2-year term.

3. Authorize the States to use the Federal and either for school construction or for teachers' salaries, with each State's having freedom of choice as to the proportion it would devote to each purpose.

Other provisions of S. 8—including the prohibition against Federal control, the maintenance-of-effort provisions, and the equalization formula—would be applied to the grants authorized in the amendment just as they would to those authorized in the bill. The requirement in S. 8 that Federal funds be matched is adapted to conform to the broader purposes of the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in connection with these amendments, I ask unanimous consent to have a series of quotations from statements by President Eisenhower, by Secretary Flemming, by the Committee for the White House Conference on Education, by Commissioner of Education Derthick, by the Public Affairs Institute, by the Educational Policies Commission, by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and by the Rockefeller Bros. Fund appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. These authorities all stress the importance of raising teachers' salaries in order to improve the standard of education in the United States.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Eisenhower, commenting on report of Science Advisory Committee: "One subject discussed in the report warrants special emphasis—the importance of raising the standard of our teachers in their communities. Higher salaries are a first requirement." (May 24, 1959.)

Committee for the White House Conference on Education: "We recommend that greater inducements of all kinds be offered to attract and retain enough good teachers. * * * Practical steps must be taken to change the concept of teaching as an impoverished occupation. Teaching must be made a financially comfortable profession. * * * Present salary schedules have the effect of discouraging many able people from entering the profession. * * * Salary schedules and preparation courses should be reexamined and changed where necessary to make the teaching profession more attractive to the most able young men and women." (April 1956.)

Secretary Flemming:

"DOUBLING TEACHERS' PAY IS URGED BY FLEMMING

"Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Flemming today called for doubling teachers' salaries as a reasonable national goal." (Washington Star, Feb. 10, 1959.)

"I think the most serious weakness in our total educational system today is our salary structure. I don't care whether you are talking about elementary or secondary education, or whether you are talking about higher education. I think that as a nation we should be ashamed of the compensation that we pay those who are willing to serve us in what is certainly one of the most important areas in which people can serve the society of today." (November 1958.)

Commissioner of Education Derthick on the Soviet educational system: "We saw no evidence of any teacher shortage. Teacher workloads and other working conditions are advantageous. Teacher prestige is high. Salaries are at the levels of those of doctors and engineers * * * Only the best are chosen to teach—one out of six who apply."

"What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular; we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education. Our major reaction, therefore, is one of astonishment * * * at the extent to which this seems to have been accomplished."

Study by F. J. Seidner for the Public Affairs Institute: "The average income of teachers is far below that of most other professional persons. Only the income of clergymen, librarians, and dietitians is less. It is lower than the average income of all employees in manufacturing as well as the average income of all the civilian employees of the Federal Government. It is only slightly higher than the average income of all persons working for wages or salaries.

"Beginning salaries offered teachers are also far below those paid to college graduates in other fields. Graduates in teaching could expect an average starting salary of $3,650 in 1958. Average beginning salaries paid college graduates—both men and women—in all fields was $4,758, over $1,000 more. For graduates with a scientific background starting salaries averaged well over $5,000. With differences of this magnitude, the prevailing shortage of teachers becomes easier to understand. * * * And Dr. Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said recently that a 100 percent increase in teachers' salaries within the next 5 or 10 years was a reasonable national goal."

Educational Policies Commission: "Every major study of the status of American education tells the same story of neglect. It is a story of crises in education, of teachers poorly paid and in inadequate numbers, of poor communities struggling to pay mounting school bills, of classroom shortages. * * * These problems are not entirely monetary, but lack of money is the major element. * * *

"The conclusion is inescapable that hundreds of thousands of American children at every level of education are denied competent teaching.

"The highest single priority, therefore, in responding to the contemporary challenge to American education is the recruitment, education, and retention in the profession of qualified teachers. * * *

"At the minimum, expenditures on education should be doubled within a decade, as proposed by the White House Conference on Education. Realistic programs which will bring about such levels of spending should be developed without further delay.

"Called for are important increases in teachers' salaries, in school construction and equipment, in financial assistance to students and prospective teachers."

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: "The teaching profession is slowly withering away."

Report of the Rockefeller Bros. Fund: "The root problem of the teaching profession remains financial. * * * Until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profession to attract its full share of the available range of talents. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the sum and substance of these quotations is that, in terms of priorities, teachers' salaries should head the list in determining what should be done first to rehabilitate our educational system; school construction should come second; and scholarships and fellowships should come third.

In my judgment, and in the judgment of many of the educational leaders of our country, we in the Congress have the cart before the horse. We have already passed the national defense education bill, with the elaborate provision for student loans and fellowships—which is fine. It is now proposed that we pass the school-construction bill. That is fine, too. But the highest priority of all should be for aid to teachers' salaries, and it is this inadequacy which my amendment attempts to remedy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter written on January 7 by the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, January 7, 1960.

Dr. WILLIAM G. CARR,
Executive Secretary, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. CARR: I have reviewed the statement of the National Education Association on Federal support for education proposals. This statement agrees with the perspective we have regarding education needs in our Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

World demands and national needs have moved us from the concept that we are investing in education for the future, to the realization that we must invest in education for national survival now. This requires a full utilization of our financial potential, which precludes an unbalanced situation of strong local and State support for education and weak Federal support.

In the process of striving for national survival, we do not want to lose the democratic principles that make our cause worth the sacrifice and effort. Therefore, we must devise a manner of Federal participation in shoring up the education framework without jeopardizing local control and determination of policy.

Since the principles of the Murray-Metcalf bill support our requirements, I endorse the National Education Association's fight on its behalf and will lend my help whenever possible.

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this letter places Governor Lawrence squarely behind the effort to provide Federal aid for teachers' salaries, as was originally proposed in the Murray-Metcalf bill, which he endorses.

There is a current shortage of 195,000 teachers, as reported by Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick. This is an increase of some 8 or 9 percent over the teacher shortage of a year ago.

We will not be able to attract and retain a sufficient number of teachers to meet the needs of a growing population—and certainly not a sufficient number with the training and competence that are needed—unless we pay salaries which signify our recognition of their worth to our society.

To pass a bill which is limited only to construction would be to close our eyes to the true scope and nature of the problem of financing education which faces our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ASSISTANCE IN CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HART, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

REGULATION OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD UNDER INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BARTLETT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1508) to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes. This amendment, if adopted, would carry out the program suggested some time ago by the President's Advisory Council on International Travel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MAXIMUM RATES OF PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR EMPLOYEES TRAVELING ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on January 14, I submitted an amendment to be proposed to the bill (H.R. 5196) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business and for other purposes.

The purpose of this amendment was to increase the maximum rate of compensation for the use of private automobiles from 10 to 12 cents per mile for U.S. marshals and their deputies.

Since I submitted this amendment, it has come to my attention that other personnel of the judicial system, including Federal judges and other personnel, are paid under regulations of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

In order to insure that these court personnel, including the judges, court clerks, probation officers, employees of the administrative office, and similar personnel, shall receive the benefits of the bill H.R. 5196, I submit an amendment to this bill, which directs the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to put into effect such regulations as he may deem necessary to give the increases provided by the bill to this class of court personnel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 22, 1960, the name of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2885) to establish an Office of Coal Research within the Department of the Interior, and to provide for and encourage research to determine improved means of producing and utilizing coal, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. DOUGLAS) on January 22, 1960.

PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO MEMORY OF WOODROW WILSON—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 21, 1960, the name of Mr. CHURCH was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on January 21, 1960.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

"IF COEXISTENCE FAILS"—(S. DOC. NO. 78)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has written an outstanding analysis of our cold war position with relation to the Soviet Union. Under the title of "If Coexistence Fails" this notable study of one of the most important issues of our time has been printed in the Quarterly Journal of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. This is an excellent publication but of somewhat limited distribution. I am confident that the great amount of research which has gone into Senator DODD's study, the keen insight he has brought to the subject, and the clear and incisive language in which he has couched his article, make it a matter of great interest to all the Members of the Senate, as well as something of lasting historical value. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this article by the Senator from Connecticut may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina, in Statuary Hall, the Capitol, on the 153d birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is no limit to the number of forces which motivate and put in motion humanity's forward march. Many are the aspirations and ideals of man, differing under different climes and in different ages, that drive him on, keep him going, in his eternal quest for a better life. Among all these forces and factors, among all spiritual aspirations, the spirit of freedom has a place by itself, holding perhaps the highest of all positions. We are often told that the human being is differentiated from all other living beings by his capacity and ability to think. To that one may add also his insatiable desire for freedom, for that, too, sets him apart from all other living creatures. And we consider his willingness to sacrifice his all for the attainment of that supremely noble goal as one of his finest virtues.

The Ukrainian people have possessed many fine virtues throughout their long and turbulent history, and they have clung to them steadfastly. During most of their modern history, they have suffered under alien rulers. During the times of their oppression, their sole spiritual sustenance has been their unwavering hope for freedom. Both under the autocratic czars of Russia, and under the tyrannical Communists of the Soviet Union, they have shown this characteristic tenacity, and thereby they have merited our admiration. The Communist totalitarian regime in the Ukraine has been, and I am afraid still is, terribly cruel toward these helpless and innocent Ukrainians. In the not too distance past, when there was no cold war and, therefore, no thawing or relaxation of the existing relations between the free West and Communist East, they suffered under Stalin's heartless agents. Since the end of the last war, and especially since Stalin's death, we hear much of freedom, of relaxations, of peaceful coexistence and brotherly love, all these soothing expressions emanating from the Kremlin. To what extent and in what degree the oppressed Ukrainians have benefited from such moves, by the Soviet regime, it is difficult to say. Unfortunately, and for good reason, we cannot vouch for everything we hear about the way things are in that proletarian paradise. We can only hope that a part of the good of what we hear is true, and in that we all rejoice. We ardently pray that the unbroken spirit of freedom of the Ukrainian people will live in their unfree land, and that eventually they will once more regain their rights. That is my cordial message to the Ukrainians on their 42d independence day.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last Friday, January 22, marked the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. At a time when the many unresolved issues of conflict between the Soviet Union and

the West are to be reexamined at the highest level, it is important that we not overlook the history and aspirations of such freedom-loving people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, as it appeared in the Ukrainian Bulletin of December 1–15, 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA TO THE UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE MATTER OF INTENSIFIED ATTACKS OF MOSCOW ON UKRAINIAN LIFE

The free world can permit itself to conduct a hot or a cold war with Moscow, or live with it in peaceful coexistence, inasmuch as it has freedom and can avail itself of it accordingly. Its sole solicitude is the safeguard of its freedom against Russian aggression. But the enslaved Ukrainian people are compelled to live in a state of permanent struggle with Moscow, a life or death struggle. This protracted struggle can end either in full victory over the aggressor, which victory would restore freedom and independence to Ukraine, or in capitulation, which would mean the inevitable destruction of the Ukrainian people. If the Ukrainian people want to avoid destruction, they must continue their struggle for the national liberation until full victory is attained.

There can be no compromise in this struggle, inasmuch as the slightest retreat or the slightest manifestation of submission or agreement to coexistence in slavery will only strengthen the Russian enslaver and further the encouragement to aggression.

This maxim is well known to Moscow and it never can forget it. By its policies of ruses and deceit it tries to lull the vigilance of the Ukrainian people and to weaken their moral strength, and at the same time to strengthen its positions by mendacious promises of easing the regime and by suggesting the hope of a better life to be attained by peaceful development. On the other hand, Moscow at the same time systematically prepares and effectuates heavy blows against those Ukrainian forces which strive for independence.

Moscow conducts its planned and cruel attacks, directed at destroying the leading elite of the Ukrainian people, not only on the land occupied by it, but also on the territory of the free world, where Ukrainian political exiles live. Moscow is destroying the Ukrainian people on the occupied territory of Ukraine by mass famines, in concentration camps, in prisons and by deportations to Siberia and to virgin lands, and outside its own borders by man hunts and assassinations. In the 18th century Russian Czarist agents kidnaped from Hamburg, Germany, Andrew Voynarovsky, great adherent of Mazepa and one of the first Ukrainian political exiles. From the bullets of a Russian agent Simon Petlura, supreme commander and head of the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic, perished on a street of Paris; and on a street in Rotterdam Col. Eugene Konovalets, leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and commander of the Ukrainian Military Organization, was killed by a bomb planted on his person by a Soviet agent. Just recently, while the Russian enslavers were propagating their peaceful intentions to the world, Moscow committed a heinous crime: It assassinated Stepan Bandera, head of the Supreme Council of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

By its terroristic acts against Ukrainian patriots both in Ukraine and in the free world Moscow proves to us that it knows no respite in its march toward the destruction of the Ukrainian nation. Therefore, there should be no respite in the struggle of the Ukrainian people for liberation from the Russian yoke.

Against strengthening attacks by the enemy on every sector of life, we must respond by strengthening and solidifying our reaction, by strengthening and solidifying our work for the liberation of Ukraine.

Let us intensify the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people by our moral and material support of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in all its activities, as well as by our own initiative.

The heroic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, sanctified by the death of its first commander, Gen. Taras Chuprynka, and thousands of officers and men who fell in the struggle, the revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian underground and the indestructible resistance of the Ukrainian people under various forms against the Russian invader, attest to the dignified stand of the Ukrainian people in the native land.

Let all Ukrainian emigration, as a unit and as individual members, prove that we stand honorably in a united front of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people.

Our firmness, unity, activity, and durability—constitute our best reply to the enemy for his stealthy and sneaking murderous attacks.

AIR SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, late last week, I called attention of this body to the steadily worsening record of safety on our airways. As I pointed to the rising toll of crashes and mechanical failures of this new year and the year just ended, I suggested that bold steps might be considered. Among these steps, I listed comparing the methods used by airlines with excellent safety records, including MATS, with those of lines which have had less good records. I still feel that the administration should give serious consideration to grounding all planes for a few days while making an exhaustive check of equipment, crews, and methods. I know that all Americans will understand that we think in terms of lives rather than dollars.

Since then there have been no new crashes. But there have been at least four incidents of mechanical failures on domestic airships which forced these ships to undertake emergency landings.

The distinguished and well-informed chairman of our Aviation Subcommittee, while continuing hearings on the crash whose cause may have been a bomb, has suggested that concentration on jets has resulted in neglect of piston airplanes. A reporter for the Washington Daily News has written that equipment to prevent fires resulting from airplane accidents could now be in use except for the fact that no one seemed to push for safer airplanes.

An agency of our Government, the FAA, has the vital mission in this field. Its Administrator has been silent. The entire administration has been silent.

Are our airplanes safe? Do all carriers operating in this country follow the rules of common sense, safety, and the FAA? Are our airports safe? Is the latest safety equipment in use? Is everything possible being done to insure the safety of the public using the airplanes? Do we need more inspectors? New regulations?

I think these are fair questions. I think these questions and, perhaps, others are on the minds and lips of many Americans. I wish the administration would give us the answers. I wish the FAA Administrator would assure us that all equipment is safe.

Over the weekend, I read with interest that Deputy Administrator Pyle said a check is being made of older planes to see if there is credence to Senator MONRONEY's suggestion that these are being neglected in favor of jets. Mr. Pyle also told a television audience that, within 5 years, major airports would be equipped with the most modern electric and electronic equipment for safety.

This recalled to me the comments made after I had spoken of the need for more air safety. The great and learned colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], told us he agreed with my sentiments and that he knew we would provide whatever money was needed to save lives.

Last year, we had an excellent airport modernization bill before this body. I was pleased to have joined with Senator MONRONEY in its sponsorship. Yet, we were forced to scale it down because the President had sent word he would veto it in its original form.

I hope Mr. Pyle or the President or General Quesada will now tell us whether appropriations could speed up the modernization of airport equipment. Are our airports as safe as possible? Must we wait 5 years to make the installations the FAA apparently believes we need?

I hope that the administration will give us these answers, the assurances that the public demands. I hope the heads of the FAA will advise our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in complete frankness the state of our airports and airlines and airplanes. If Congress can help, we should be told how. I am sure that every Member of Congress will support safety programs and not put dollars before lives. I am sure the airlines and airplane manufacturer will.

Flying has become a virtual necessity in this day and age. We Senators fly to keep engagements as often as any group in the country. Fortunately most of our airlines have posted excellent safety records. I believe we should be told by the people responsible in this Government whether things could be safer and why we are seeing our safety record getting steadily worse.

This is not a matter of fixing blame. It is an attempt to do what needs to be done now to prevent further useless accidents and deaths. While we are doing so we can help set at ease the minds of those of us who must travel by air.

SUPPORT FOR OPTIMISTIC PICTURE OF U.S. DEFENSES

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am sure there are some who want to believe there is a missile gap and who do not want to believe Secretary Gates was doing his duty and was talking perfectly sincerely when he testified, as he did last week, before the Senate Committee on Armed Services and elsewhere. However, I am

sure even those who would recognize that Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, is one of the outstanding critics of our military posture, one of the best informed, and most able writers on military subjects.

Accordingly, for the information of all who doubt and for the information of those who do not doubt but who may need some fortification in their thinking, I ask unanimous consent that two articles written by Hanson W. Baldwin, which were published in the New York Times of January 22 and 23, 1960, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks. The first one is entitled "The 'Missile Gap,' I" with a subtitle "Hardheaded Appraisals Support Gates in Optimistic Picture of U.S. Defenses." The second is entitled "Data on Missiles Support Optimism Over U.S. Defenses," with a substitute of "American Weapons Prove Accuracy—Soviet Might Is Found Exaggerated."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1960]

THE "MISSILE GAP," I—HARDHEADED APPRAISALS SUPPORT GATES IN OPTIMISTIC PICTURE OF U.S. DEFENSES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Moscow's claim yesterday of a one-and-a-quarter-mile circular error in a 7,766-mile rocket flight caused raised eyebrows but no excitement in the Pentagon.

The first of a number of Russian missile shots into a new impact area in the central Pacific, whether or not it was as accurate and as successful as the Russians asserted, is unlikely to influnce materially the vigorous and aggressive presentation of the administration's defense policies just initiated.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant, tipped the administration's hand in their opening testimony in Congress this week.

Their composite testimony totaled, in the opinion of some Congressmen, the rosiest picture of the U.S. defense posture presented to Congress for a long time. "The balance of military power is still heavily in our favor," Secretary Gates said. Even a Soviet surprise attack with all available missiles could not eliminate our nuclear retailiatory capability.

THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. Gates even cast considerable doubt on what has come by dint of constant repetition to be accepted as a fact by many in the Nation: A missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in the next few years. He indicated that if the Russians produced intercontinental ballistic missiles at our present maximum estimate of their potential capabilities they might have moderate numerical superiority in the next 3 years. But the United States has many other nuclear weapons systems, which, collectively, tip the balance of deterrent power heavily in our favor.

This is an election year. The Democratic opposition is already attempting to make a campaign issue out of the deficiencies in our military posture and is emphasizing particularly the alleged missile gap. The Republican administration, on the other hand, has been aroused and stung by the opposition attacks. The President, in particular, is known to have been greatly angered by the criticisms voiced in "The Uncertain Trumpet," a book recently published by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, who completed 4 years as Army Chief of Staff last June. The President's mood, particularly about defense matters, is typified by his recent heated response to a somewhat pointed news conference question about defense:

"I've spent my life in this and I know more about it than almost anybody I think in the country."

Is, then, Mr. Gates' testimony rhetoric, the opening guns of the defense in an election year; or is it solidly based on factual appraisal?

A COMPOUND ANSWER

The answer to this question is almost certainly compound. Mr. Gates has too much integrity—he is a public servant who is no politician and owes no man anything—to give other than his honest opinion. But he is aware, as is the White House, that the Pentagon case has not been put skillfully or forcefully in the past.

The administration feels that the public image of relative American weakness that has been created—partly by Communist propaganda, partly by undoubted Communist achievements, partly by the special pleading of the individual services, partly by opposition criticism, partly by inept administration presentations of our strength—is grossly exaggerated. Mr. Gates, therefore, is certainly determined to put his best foot forward, not only for domestic political reasons but also because he is keenly aware that a strategic deterrent is no stronger than the enemy thinks it is.

But at the same time his optimistic statements are based on hardheaded comparative appraisals of our own and of Soviet strength. The Secretary spoke of new intelligence estimates of Soviet missile strength, which he described as "very significant."

These estimates were not made public, but in an explanatory conference later, the Secretary got onto slippery ground when he admitted that the new estimates took into account what the Russians intended to do in missile production, rather than, as in the past, merely estimating their capabilities.

In the intelligence field this issue of intentions versus capabilities is one of the oldest of pitfalls, and many experts have come a cropper by trying, in effect, to read the enemy's mind.

Nevertheless, the new intelligence reports do include an estimate of current Soviet long-range missile strength and of current Soviet missile production that, in comparison with our own current status, is by no means discouraging.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1960]

DATA ON MISSILES SUPPORT OPTIMISM OVER U.S. DEFENSE—AMERICAN WEAPONS PROVE ACCURACY—SOVIET MIGHT IS FOUND EXAGGERATED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The factual, rather than the political, motivation for the administration's new public relations policy of aggressive optimism about the Nation's defense posture has some firm foundations.

Our own missiles have demonstrated amazing accuracy, and widely published reports of tremendous Soviet missile strength are not supported by substantiated intelligence information. Here are some of the reasons for the newly expressed optimism:

Despite reports of 100 or more Soviet missile bases, there is still solid factual proof of only two long-range missile-launching sites—those long used by the Soviet Union for its test launchings at Kapustin Yar, near Stalingrad, and Tyuratam, near the Aral Sea.

Until this week's 7,762-mile rocket shot from Tyuratam to an impact area in the Central Pacific, only one Soviet missile had been tracked to a full 5,000-mile flight to land in the Northern Pacific. All the rest of the long-range shots—and there have not been many—have impacted in the Sea of Okhotsk or near Kylucki, the Soviet impact area on the Kamchatka Peninsula, a distance of 4,300 miles from Kapustin Yar and 3,850 miles from Tyuratam.

PROBABLE CIRCULAR ERROR

The approximate probably circular error of these Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles has been estimated as possibly 7 to 10 miles, a much greater error than the Soviets claimed this week for their 7,762-mile shot.

It is quite possible that their new and more powerful rocket now incorporates an improved inertial guidance system that permits greater accuracy. On the other hand a CEP (circular error probable) for any weapons system cannot be determined except as an average of numerous flights.

The average circular error of the Atlas D missile, which is now being delivered to the Air Force as an operational missile, has been for the last eight 5,000-mile range shots considerably less than half of the 2-mile error the President revealed in his state of the Union message. The D-missile, with radio-inertial guidance, has demonstrated phenomenal accuracy, sufficient if it can be continued to destroy any point target (as well as an area target, like a city).

The Atlas E, scheduled for first flight shortly after midsummer, is a "bird" that will have complete inertial guidance as well as a lighter engine and longer range. This means that a whole salvo of 9 or 10 missiles can be fired simultaneously from the same base, whereas the radio-inertial system, because of possible mutual interference by radio transmissions, is limited to about 3 simultaneous firings from 1 base.

The new E-missile may not develop the same accuracy as the current model and it must be stressed that all the firing, except one performed by a Strategic Air Command crew at Vandenberg Air Force Base on the Pacific coast, were by experienced missileers down an instrumented range at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Nevertheless, U.S. missile experts are confident that the problem of accuracy with the ICBM has been solved and available facts indicate we are equal to or ahead of the Russians in this field.

The Navy's Polaris missile, designed for launching from submerged submarines, registered equally phenomenal accurracy in one recent flight (with guidance equipment installed) of more than 900 miles. (The full 1,200-mile-range missile has not yet been tested and none has yet been fired from a submarine.) It landed almost on top of the target, in fact almost within the length of a city block from bulls-eye.

There is some evidence to suggest that the Soviet air defense system is not so effective as it had once been credited with being. The Hound Dog missile, now operational, launched from B–52 bombers in flight, adds considerably to the problems of the defense. To the admitted U.S. superiority in manned bomber strength, has now been added the first small nucleus of intermediate range and intercontinental range ballistic missiles.

All this collectively adds up to a reassuring reappraisal of present U.S. deterrent strength relative to that of the Soviet Union and to a short-term future that appears to be less black than had been painted in many quarters.

Many officers agree with the statement by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., that "there is no deterrent gap" and is not likely to be one within the foreseeable future.

Others go further and say they doubt that a missile gap, a Soviet superiority in numbers of long-range missiles, will, in reality, develop. There is, however, no unanimity on this point. Most officers from all services are worried about the long-term future and would like to see our calculated risks today and tomorrow reduced.

More funds for defense and a reallocation of the defense budget are urged by many.

THE BOND INTEREST CEILING

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, another favorite subject in this Chamber is the interest rate ceiling. I invite the attention of Senators who are seriously interested in this matter—and everyone should be—to an article published last week in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, entitled "Flaws in the Ceiling," with a subtitle "Congress Should Stop Tinkering With Interest Rates." This article is a very able argument for the President's request that the interest rate ceiling be lifted on the long-term Treasury bonds.

I also invite attention to an article which was published in Time magazine, January 25, 1960, entitled "The Treasury Squeeze," and subtitled "The Bond Interest Ceiling Is Too Low." This article in turn shows the fallacy of the policy of Congress in refusing to yield on the question of the interest rate ceiling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, Jan. 18, 1960]

FLAWS IN THE CEILING—CONGRESS SHOULD STOP TINKERING WITH INTEREST RATES

On an ordinary business day, commercial banks in New York City are models of efficient decorum, where interest compounds quietly among the IBM machines and occasional masked bandits pass polite withdrawal slips to tellers. Early last week, however, their dignified premises resembled nothing so much as a bargain basement. From near and far an astonishing number of small investors, many of them less than expert in the arcane ways of high finance, came flocking to Wall Street. The lure: a new offering of 1-year Treasury bills, the yield on which, so rumor had it, was likely to exceed 5 percent. Despite its widespread lack of know-how—shared, evidently, by a few embarrassed bankers—the public did not go away emptyhanded. On the contrary, out of a total issue of $1.5 billion, small buyers accounted for an unprecedented $350 million.

In view of the great debate over interest rates which has burst out again in Washington, the episode cited above is vastly revealing. Despite cogent and repeated pleas by the administration, Congress in its wisdom has refused to raise the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Treasury bonds. In so doing the lawmakers, to judge by their oratory, have sought to keep a tight lid on money rates generally. If this in fact has been their aim—to some skeptics the whole issue smacks less of theoretical economics than of so-called practical politics—they plainly have missed the mark. Instead of lowering rates, the absurd restraint has served instead to raise them, especially at the short end of the yield curve, to the highest level in a generation. Thereby it also has wreaked havoc with thrift institutions, which have lost depositors and deposits, as well as diverted the flow of savings away from home finance, housing, and other traditional channels. Far from furthering the national interest, political intrusion in the money market, as in so many others, has done it harm.

The trouble began last spring, when interest rates, spurred by a record-breaking demand for funds, climbed to heights not scaled since the twenties. Under the Liberty Loan Act of World War I, the Treasury is prohibited from paying more than 4¼ percent on any security maturing in over 5 years (there is no ceiling on short-term issues). When this obsolete provision suddenly loomed as a threat to its financing operations, the Department, backed by the Federal Reserve, urged Congress to rescind it. The defiant lawmakers, however, smarting from a series of political defeats, chose instead to keep it on the books. Last week the President renewed the fight. In a special message to Capitol Hill, the first of the new session, he urged "the removal of this archaic restriction on flexible debt management." Failure to do so in the past, he added, has led to an unduly rapid increase in short-term debt, pushed borrowing costs to the highest level in decades, and in other ways worked against the Nation's welfare.

Mr. Eisenhower did not bother to document his charges, nor did he have to. The evidence is all too plain. Since July, the hard-pressed Treasury, effectively barred from access to medium- and long-term funds, has been compelled to cram some $36 billion of borrowing into the short end of the market. As a consequence, yields on 90-day bills have spurted to over 4¾ percent. An offering of 4-year, 10-month notes, subsequently christened the "magic 5s," gave investors a 5 percent return. Last week, as noted, a special issue of 1-year bills was sold at a discount rate of 5.07 percent, a figure comparable to simple interest of over 5¼ percent. Thus, by seeking to keep an artificially low ceiling on long-term interest rates, Congress merely has succeeded in pushing short-term rates through the roof.

By and large, the results of this misguided policy have not been happy. To be sure, some good, though plainly unintended on Capitol Hill, has come of it. A number of private investors have enjoyed a windfall, and the market for Government securities, once confined largely to institutions, has gained in depth and breadth. Within the past 12 months alone, to illustrate, individual holdings of marketable U.S. issues seem to have risen by a whopping $9 billion, to an alltime peak. Such unexpected gains, however, fail to outweigh the untoward effects. To begin with, the distortion of the yield curve has played hob with commercial banking. Instead of depositing liquid assets with the banks, corporate treasurers have tended to invest them in high-yield, short-term issues, which are the nearest thing to cash. Hence, tight money has been made still tighter and bank liquidity, none too plentiful at best, has been placed under greater strain.

Hardest hit of all have been the Nation's thrift institutions. In order to pay for their acquisitions of Treasury notes and bills, many buyers simply have drawn on their savings. In October, for example, when the "magic 5s" went on sale, U.S. savings banks, which usually report a substantial gain in assets in the month, actually showed a sharp decline. Last week's offering of bills gave them a similar jolt. Even the fast-growing savings and loan associations have been hurt. Savings banks and savings and loans, of course, are leading sources of mortgage credit, and, in turn, prime movers in home construction. The loss of deposits which they already have suffered, and the fear of further losses—"We are living under a sword of Damocles," complained one savings bank president—cannot fail to curtail the supply of home finance and impair the prospects for housing.

In sum, Congress has set in motion stresses and strains which, 6 months ago, it scarcely could have imagined. Whether the lawmakers will have the candor to admit their mistake and mend their ways remains to be seen; at the moment, the outlook is none too hopeful. However it may be resolved, the silly affair, while certainly damaging to U.S. finances and prestige, has not been a total loss. The Nation has been given an object lesson in roughshod partisan politics. Equally instructive, it has had a chance to observe the deplorable results of Government meddling in the marketplace. Long after the interest rate ceiling has been scrapped, these lessons may endure.

[From Time Magazine, Jan. 25, 1960]

THE TREASURY SQUEEZE—THE BOND INTEREST CEILING IS TOO LOW

The biggest demagogic campaign issue of 1960 revolves around the U.S. Treasury and the mandatory 4¼ percent interest ceiling on all Government bonds of 5 years or longer. Last year President Eisenhower asked Congress to remove the limitation, imposed in 1918, and Congress turned him down. Last week Ike asked again, and once more a Democratic Congress seems determined to make political capital out of an economic problem.

Every economist agrees that the U.S. Treasury is in a tough spot to refund Government issues that are constantly coming due. With top-grade corporate issues bringing more than 5 percent, the Treasury cannot sell long-term bonds limited to a 4¼-percent ceiling. The Treasury is forced to get its money by short-term issues, has to keep going to the market to raise cash, thus disrupting short-term borrowing for business and helping to drive up rates.

Nevertheless, a loud and powerful group of Congressmen, including Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Texas Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, refuses to grant the Treasury any relief, crying that interest rates are already too high. "The only inflation we have today," says PATMAN, with more emotion than economic reason "is inflation caused by high interest." The critics blame the Treasury for the rising cost of servicing the Nation's debt, argue that any further boost in interest rates would cost the taxpayers additional billions. They argue that if the Treasury wants to sell long-term bonds, it has the power to (1) sell them at a discount to increase the effective yield without changing the historic 4¼ percent coupon, or (2) ask the Federal Reserve to support the Goverment bond market as it did prior to 1951. (In 1953 the Federal Reserve decided to buy only relative short term notes and bills). Says DOUGLAS: "The abandonment of the bills only policy would add another weapon [to use] to help prevent economic fluctuations."

Against such adamant Democrats stand most economists and monetary experts, including such Democrats as House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS. The plain fact, as they are well aware, is that a boost in Treasury long-term rates is probably the most effective way of holding overall interest rates down. By borrowing exclusively in the short-term market, which is the area where business gets its money for temporary or seasonal needs such as carrying inventories or financing sales, the Treasury has sopped up much of the money normally available. The scramble for the remainder has driven up short-term rates, eventually also forced up long-term borrowing costs.

So competitive is the short-term market that the Treasury's newest 91-day bill sells for nearly 4.6 percent. The effect of short-term borrowing, according to Government estimates, has been to drive overall interest rates up one-half percent in a year, and cost the Government an extra $700 million to carry its debt. The cost to private borrowers has run into the billions, is growing so worrisome that even housebuilders, who once opposed raising the ceiling, are now having serious second thoughts. The Treasury's medium-term magic 5 of last fall drew some $200 million out of New York savings banks alone, money that ordinarily would have gone for mortgages.

The problem is getting worse with each passing month. It is true, as some Congressmen say, that no long-term debt comes due for 10 months. But there will be almost

$80 billion in short- and medium-term borrowing. By November of 1961, so much debt will drop down into the 1-year-and-under category that the figure will top $92 billion, up from $81 billion in December 1959, in itself equal to the alltime record. The Government's only recourse will be more short-term financing, probably at higher rates.

Administration economists are dead set against trying to sell long-term bonds by gimmicks, meaning discounts, or by trying to force the Federal Reserve to support the market. They argue that this is simply funny-money financing. By supporting Treasury bonds, the Federal would, in effect, be pumping money into the economy, would lose control over the monetary system, and take the United States down the road to real inflation. Says Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin: "The world now knows that, as the night follows the day, inflation follows any effort to keep interest rates low through money creation."

The best argument against keeping the historic 4¼-percent interest ceiling is that it has not kept interest rates down. The best argument for removing the ceiling is that it will give the Treasury enough flexibility to lessen its reliance on the short-term market. By taking the pressure off these rates, the United States will have a good chance of stopping the rise in interest and the squeeze on money that, historically, has almost always ushered in a recession.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, January 26 marks the 80th anniversary of the birth of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, a great general and a great American. MacArthur was born on January 26, 1880, in Little Rock, Ark., where his father, Arthur MacArthur, at that time a captain in the Army, was stationed. Although he has spent little time in Wisconsin, he is considered a native son by that State. His Scottish-born grandfather, Arthur MacArthur, who arrived in Milwaukee in 1849, was elected Lieutenant Governor on the Democratic ticket and later served 5 days as Governor in 1856. Douglas MacArthur's father, also named Arthur MacArthur, joined a Wisconsin regiment in the Civil War, became a colonel, and was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Later he fought in the Indian wars in the West and Southwest, and participated in the Philippine campaigns. He advanced to become Chief of Staff and the 11th lieutenant general in Army history.

Following in his father's footsteps, young Douglas chose a military career. He entered the U.S. Military Academy on June 13, 1899. Graduating on June 13, 1903, with a scholastic average of 98.14, the highest ever achieved by a cadet, he was commissioned a second lieutenant of engineers.

It seems prophetic that MacArthur's first assignment was in the Philippines. In October 1905, after a year in California, he was detailed as an aide to his father, the American military observer in Tokyo. Next came a year as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt until August 1907. During the 10 years following, there were assignments to Milwaukee, Fort Leavenworth, the Canal Zone, Washington, and Vera Cruz.

When the United States entered World War I, 37-year-old Maj. Douglas MacArthur was a staff officer. Together with Newton D. Baker, the Secretary of War, he conceived the idea of the famous Rainbow (42d) Division, composed of National Guard units from 26 States and the District of Columbia. As chief of staff to the division commander, Maj. Gen. William A. Mann, and later to his successor, Maj. Gen. Charles T. Menoher, MacArthur was largely responsible for the organization and training of the division. In August 1917 he was promoted to a colonelcy in the infantry in the National Army, and in October he arrived in France with his division. He was with the division through all the fighting and his record for gallantry was conspicuous. Twice wounded and twice gassed, he refused to be sent to the hospital. Despite illness and wounds he kept going. He was promoted to brigadier general on June 26, 1918, and "actually commanded," an official report said, "larger bodies of troops on the battleline than any other officer in our Army, with, in each instance, conspicuous success." He was given command of the 84th Brigade, and for a brief period at the close of the war he commanded the entire division.

Back in the United States after the war, MacArthur spent 3 years as Superintendent of the Academy at West Point, winning a bitter fight against those who sought, in the interest of economy, first to abolish the Academy and then to reduce its term to 2 years. He also fought the entrenched and reactionary Academic Board and succeeded in liberalizing and modernizing the curriculum to include a full collegiate education.

The 3 years spent in Philippine commands, from 1922 to 1925, contributed to his understanding of the islands which was to prove so valuable in World War II.

In November 1930 he became the seventh Chief of the General Staff. His efforts for preparedness in this post caused him to be regarded, in a time of pacifism, as a warmonger and a militarist. Acting on orders of the President to evict the "Bonus Marchers" from Washington, he accomplished the assignment without firing a shot and without serious injury to soldiers or civilians. Sympathy for the ragged veterans resulted in widespread feeling against MacArthur, but unpopularity never caused him to swerve from his duty.

Most of MacArthur's term as Chief of Staff—1930–35—was spent trying to make Congress understand that the United States could not afford to strip itself entirely of military power. He proceeded to the modernization and mechanization of our Armed Forces and reorganized them on the four-Army plan.

At the conclusion of his term as Chief of Staff he became head of a military mission to the Philippines to draft a 10-year defense plan which the National Assembly enacted into law. Two years later he retired from the U.S. Army and accepted the position of field marshal of the Philippine forces. Although his critics derided the title, the Filipinos were inspired to patriotic fervor by the thought of having a field marshal at the head of their little army.

The clouds of war were gathering. MacArthur was recalled to active service as a major general in July 1941; he was advanced to temporary lieutenant general the next day, and to temporary general 11 days after Pearl Harbor. He was given command of the U.S. forces in the Far East. But those forces were pitifully small and planes and torpedo boats were not forthcoming in any quantity; the fighting on Bataan could be only a delaying action. In March 1942, under orders from the President, MacArthur with his family and staff officers escaped to Australia. From Australia under his brilliant leadership, his forces invaded New Guinea, New Britain, New Georgia, and Bougainville. At last in October 1944 began the liberation of the Philippines. He had returned as he had promised.

Advanced in December 1944 to the new five-star rank, MacArthur was named to command all U.S. Army forces in the Pacific, and also six Marine divisions.

Following the Japanese surrender, MacArthur served in Japan as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. His execution of a program for the enactment of widespread legal reforms and the establishment of constitutional government has attracted universal respect and admiration.

When North Korean forces invaded the South Korean Republic on June 25, 1950, MacArthur was given command of U.S. and U.N. forces with orders to repel the invaders. His grasp of military strategy was again demonstrated by the conception and execution of the landing at Inchon, which led to a precipitate retreat of the North Koreans.

On April 11, 1951, General MacArthur was dismissed by President Truman from his United Nations, Allied, and American commands in the Far East.

How well I remember the thunderous ovation he received when he returned to address a joint session of Congress, an ovation which registered the unalloyed confidence of Congress in their great soldier despite the strange and inexplicable action of the Commander in Chief.

I remember also his appearance before the Senate Committee and how eloquently the transcript spoke of his wide grasp of the problem before this country.

Even more vividly I remember the reception and ovation he received in the city of Chicago and the unrestrained acclaim he received from his fellow citizens.

He was not merely a great soldier but also a great philosopher; he was not merely a great commander but also a great statesman. It will be a long, long time before his contribution to the cause of freedom and the success of American arms will fade from the memories of his fellow citizens.

NOMINATION OF JAMES DURFEE TO BE JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning I had the unfortunate duty of opposing the nomination of James Durfee, a man from my own State of Wisconsin, to be a judge of the Court of Claims. I made this decision with great reluctance, after very careful consideration. I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Judiciary Committee this morning be printed in the

RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY REGARDING THE NOMINATION OF JAMES DURFEE FOR THE COURT OF CLAIMS, JANUARY 21, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the confirmation of James Durfee to be a judge of the Court of Claims. I do so with reluctance and deep regret.

SUPPORT FOR DURFEE

Mr. Durfee is a Wisconsin man. He served as a district attorney and practiced law in my State for some 25 years. He has also served as chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. He has been a very popular man throughout our State. This is not only evident in his election as head of the Wisconsin American Legion, but in the many friends of his throughout our State in both political parties who have written and talked to me urging his confirmation. Some have even traveled to Washington from Wisconsin for this purpose.

Two months ago I was in Mr. Durfee's hometown of Antigo, Wis. I spoke at the high school, and talked informally with well over a hundred citizens of Mr. Durfee's hometown, including the fine newspaper editor of the Antigo Daily and a number of prominent businessmen and lawyers. Mr. Durfee is as popular in his hometown as any man I know. And the nominee is an honored man in our State. Our great university in Milwaukee, Wis., selected Mr. Durfee 3 years ago as alumnus of the year in recognition of his service in government.

Support for James Durfee is not confined to Wisconsin. I have had more visits and phone calls in connection with this nomination than with any other matter I have dealt with since I came to the Senate. I have had delegations of airline executives who have had an opportunity to observe the nominee's administration of the Civil Aeronautics Board at firsthand call on me and plead for his confirmation. National leaders from both parties have talked to me to ask I approve and support him.

REASON FOR OPPOSITION

In spite of all this I have decided that I must oppose James Durfee for this nomination for two reasons. First, I believe his qualifications for the position for which he has been nominated are at best minimal, and fall far below the standard established by the men who now serve on the court. Secondly, I oppose the nominee because his conduct as Chairman of the CAB shows a lack of the judicial behavior that is essential for the proper performance of the duties of the office to which he has been nominated.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE COURT OF CLAIMS

It has been said that as a matter of history the growth in power of the Supreme Court and the respect in which it is held by the people has been due largely to the legal ability and the force of character of the men who have composed that Court. This is particularly true of the Court of Claims. It is my understanding that there have been some 38 judges who have served on this court since its establishment in 1855. Almost all of the men who have been appointed to this court have before their appointment demonstrated competence relevant to the kind of work they would do on the court—on the bench, in Congress, or at the bar.

A man who has been a member of the Court of Claims bar for over 30 years recently wrote me in part as follows:

"The largest and most technical civil cases in America are decided in the Court of Claims. Individual suits against the United States sometimes involve millions of dollars. They are brought by railroads, aircraft companies manufacturing war planes and missiles, etc. A judge of the court should have an extensive background in this work. Tax refund cases, government contracts, employee pay cases, etc., require the highest degree of experience and legal skill.

"You cannot expect the lawyers who actually practice in the court to come forward on this matter at this late date and express their views. That would be putting one's neck on the block in case Durfee was confirmed. The District of Columbia bar, of course, has more lawyers who practice in the court than all the rest of the country put together. It has consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee. It did propose through its Court of Claims Committee the names of three competent and experienced lawyers to the Attorney General."

DURFEE AND THE DISTRICT BAR ASSOCIATION

On Monday, January 18, a member of the committee from the District of Columbia Bar Association on relations with the Court of Claims, called with the following information:

When Judge Littleton, who had an extensive tax background, retired, leaving the vacancy to which Durfee has been named, the bar association committee on relations with the Court of Claims considered the best possible replacement for the judge and submitted three names to the Attorney General. Mr. Durfee was not among the three named. The three named were a Commissioner of the Court of Claims, and two local lawyers, one with great experience in tax cases before the Court of Claims and the Tax Court of the United States, and the other experienced in claims involving Government contracts. Both practice before the Court of Claims.

The bar association committee on the Court of Claims is composed of 20 members, 15 of whom are private practitioners before the court and 5 are members of the staff of the Justice Department's Civil Division who defend these cases before the court. So the vote for the three nominees was a vote by lawyers on both sides of the fence.

An official of the Court of Claims stated that at least three-fourths of the court's work is in the field of tax law and Government contracts, including the Federal wage cases, which are treated as implied contracts. These include disability and retirement pay for military personnel and retirement and overtime compensation for civilian employees.

It is the general consensus of the knowledgeable practitioners before the court—and a large number of them have called me, some as recently as this morning—that Durfee is just not qualified for this job.

RESPONSIBILITY OF COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the dimensions of the responsibility of the Court of Claims. For the year ended October 3, 1959, the Court of Claims had disposed of 2,636 cases.

Amount of money claimed was $402,137,897.30.

Judgment for the plaintiffs totaled $11,434,127.65.

Amount of above judgments carrying interest—$1,881,929.45.

Judgments on defendant's counterclaims amounted to $535,889.78.

The tax cases handled by the court are all for refunds on almost any kind of tax—personal income, corporation, transportation, documentary stamp, excess profits, excise, etc.

Some of the larger money cases for the year were:

Plaintiff	Amount claimed	Amount awarded or disposition	Claim
Hingham Management Corp	$6,000,000.00	Case dismissed	Contract for lease of certain facilities, Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard, Hingham, Mass., Navy Department.
Todd Shipyard Corp	2,617,401.18	$2,575,641.38 (stipulated judgment, with interest).	Refund of income and excess profits tax.
Idaho Maryland Mines Corp	5,021,799.00	Case dismissed	Compensation for property taken, WPB.
Homestake Mining Co	10,777,448.01	do	Do.
Empire Star Mines Co., Ltd	5,386,822.02	do	Requisitioning of gold mine by closure and suspension of operations pursuant to order L-208, WPB.
U.S. Smelting, Refining, & Mining Co	11,900,000.00	do	Do.
Clare Shove (and 5 other parties)	15,000,000.00	do	Do.
Mabel N. Scott (and 3 other parties)	10,000,000.00	do	Do.
Otilia Acensi (and 87 other parties)	9,089,329.67	do	Contract for supplies furnished to guerrilla forces, Philippine Islands.
American Cyanamid Co	1,689,625.82	do	Refund of excess profits tax.
Western Contracting Corp	1,144,535.00	$225,000	Contract for construction, etc., Department of the Army.
Enterprise Railway Equipment Co	587,681.52	$561,760.10 (with interest)	Refund of income tax.
Radio Patents Corp. (and 4 other parties)	10,000,000.00	Case dismissed	Infringement of patent, Army.
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc	7,050,468.00	do	Refund of manufacturers' excise taxes.
General Motors Corp	8,507,624.08	do	Do.
M. Meads	4,216,852.25	$1,405.65	Requisition of sawmill, Department of the Army.
Bulova Watch Co., Inc	732,134.71	$520,049.95 (with interest)	Refund of income and excess profits tax.
Mella Alvina Hoover	15,000,000.00	Case dismissed	Compensatory relief and pecuniary damages.
Burnham Chemical Co	44,711,028.00	Case dismissed; counterclaim dismissed	Losses and resonable profits, and damages.
Westinghouse Electric Corp	3,737,677.62	Case dismissed	Refund of manufacturers' excise taxes.
Chrysler Corp	5,344,864.48	do	Do.
Jose K. Lapus	2,448,596.00	do	Property requisitioned, Department of the Army.
Henry M. and Murray W. Garsson	18,500,000.00	do	Compensation for use of manufacturing methods, designs, process, and engineering developments of war materials, War.
Mississippi Valley Generating Co	3,543,778.45	$1,867,545.56	Dixon-Yates power contract, AEC.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy RR. Co	21,008,304.42	Case dismissed	Refund of income and excess profits tax.

From report submitted to Congress on Jan. 6, 1960, by the clerk of the Court of Claims on all judgments rendered by the court for the year ended Oct. 3, 1959.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the fairest standard for evaluating Mr. Durfee's qualifications is to compare them with those of the men who now serve on the court and the retired judge, the Honorable Benjamin H. Littleton, whom Mr. Durfee has been nominated to succeed.

Here are brief résumés of their biographies:

Marvin Jones, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims

Born near Valley View, Tex.

Received bachelor of arts degree from Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex., in 1905.

Received bachelor of laws degree from the University of Texas in 1907.

Admitted to the Texas bar in 1907; practiced at Amarillo.

Was appointed chairman of the board of legal examiners for the seventh supreme judicial district of Texas in 1913.

Elected to the 65th through 76th Congresses (1917–41), 18th Congressional District.

Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture from December 1931 to November 1940.

Appointed judge of the U.S. Court of Claims April 9, 1940.

Confirmed by Senate April 10, 1940.

Assumed duties November 20, 1940, after resigning from the House of Representatives.

On leave from January 1943 to July 1945: January 1943–June 29, 1943, adviser and assistant to James Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization; May 18–June 3, 1943, President, United Nations Conferences on Food and Agriculture, Hot Springs, Va.; member, President's War Mobilization Committee; June 29, 1943–July 1, 1945, Administrator, U.S. War Food Administration.

Resumed duties as judge of Court of Claims.

Appointed chief judge of Court of Claims July 10, 1947.

Joseph Warren Madden, associate judge, U.S. Court of Claims

Born at Damascus, Ill., January 17, 1890.

Received bachelor of arts degree from the University of Illinois in 1911.

Received doctor of jurisprudence degree from the University of Chicago in 1914.

Admitted to the bar of Illinois in 1914; bar of Ohio, 1918; bar of West Virginia, 1922; bar of Pennsylvania, 1927.

Professor of law at the University of Oklahoma, 1914–16.

Practiced law in Rockford, Ill., 1916–17.

Special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, 1920.

Professor of law at Ohio State University, 1917–21.

Dean of the Law School, West Virginia University, 1921–27.

Professor of law, University of Pittsburgh, 1927–37.

Visiting professor of law at the University of Chicago, North Carolina, Cornell, Stanford, Yale, and Vanderbilt Universities.

Practiced law in Illinois and part time in Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

Assisted West Virginia Revision and Codification Commission in revising property statutes, 1925.

Adviser on property and torts to the American Law Institute since 1934.

Member of the Governor's commission (Pennsylvania) on private policing in industry in Pennsylvania, 1933–34.

Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, 1935–40.

Commissioned judge, Court of Claims, January 8, 1941.

Went to Germany in July 1945 and served as associate director of the legal division and in 1946 as director of the legal division and legal adviser to the U.S. Military governor and the deputy military governor, office of military government for Germany.

Awarded Medal of Freedom in 1947 for work with military government for Germany.

Returned to Court of Claims in July 1946.

Was exchange legal specialist, Germany, the summer of 1953.

Coauthor of a casebook on property.

Author of a treatise on domestic relations and a casebook on domestic relations.

Samuel Estill Whitaker, associate judge, U.S. Court of Claims

Born in Winchester, Tenn., September 25, 1886.

Student at Winchester (Tenn.) Normal College, 1902–5; University of Virginia, 1905–6.

Bachelor of law, University of Chattanooga, 1909.

Admitted to the Tennessee bar in 1909 and practiced in Chattanooga until outbreak of World War I.

Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice, 1919–20.

Attorney, Bureau of Internal Revenue, 1920.

Private practice in Chattanooga from 1921–37.

City attorney, Chattanooga, 1923.

Mayor of Riverview, Tenn., 1925–29.

Employed from time to time as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, 1933–37.

Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1937–39.

Appointed judge, U.S. Court of Claims, July 13, 1939.

Don Nelson Laramore, associate judge, U.S. Court of Claims

Born at Hamlet, Ind., December 22, 1906.

Admitted to law practice in Indiana April 18, 1931.

Judge pro tempore, 44th Judicial Circuit of Indiana, 1942–44.

Elected judge, 44th Judicial Circuit of Indiana, November 1944 and November 1950.

Commissioned judge, U.S. Court of Claims, March 17, 1954.

Benjamin H. Littleton, retired judge of the Court of Claims, whose vacancy James Durfee has been nominated to fill

Born in Weatherford, Tex., in 1889.

Educated in the public schools of Tennessee.

Received bachelor of law degree from Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1914.

Admitted to the Tennessee bar in 1914 and practiced law at Nashville.

Appointed assistant U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee in 1918 (1918–21).

Appointed special attorney, Treasury Department, in 1921.

Appointed a member of the U.S. Board of Tax Appeals,[1] July 16, 1924, for 2 years.

Reappointed June 6, 1926, for a term of 10 years.

Elected Chairman of the Board in April 1927.

Reelected Chairman in April 1929.

Commissioned judge of the Court of Claims on November 6, 1929.

---

[1] Now called the Tax Court of the United States.

(NOTE.—The present Tax Court of the United States was formerly the U.S. Board of Tax Appeals. The Board was created by the Revenue Act of 1924 and continued by the Revenue Act of 1926, the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The change in name to the Tax Court was made by the Revenue Act of 1942.)

To summarize the qualifications of these men to serve as judges on a court that is concerned with claims against the Government and particularly with immensely large tax claims, these men have the following qualifications:

Judge Laramore had served for 12 years as a judge on the bench in the 44th judicial circuit of Indiana prior to his appointment.

Judge Jones had served as chairman of the board of legal examiners in a judicial district in his State and had devoted some 24 years of his life to the Congress of the United States including 9 years as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Judge Whitaker had prepared for the Court of Claims by serving as an attorney of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and in turn as an attorney in the Department of Justice, as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States and finally for 2 years as Assistant Attorney General of the United States.

Judge Madden's experience for the Court of Claims included special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, professorships of law at the great Universities of Oklahoma, Ohio State, West Virginia, and Pittsburgh, as well as visiting professorships at the Universities of Chicago, North Carolina, Cornell, Stanford, Yale, and Vanderbilt. He had been an adviser on property and torts to the American Law Institute and coauthor of a casebook on property.

Judge Littleton who would be replaced by Mr. Durfee had served as assistant U.S. attorney in Tennessee, a special attorney in the Treasury Department, a member of the Board of Tax Appeals (now known as the Tax Court) for 5 years and chairman of the court for the last 2½ years of his term.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that each of these men had had a far broader and deeper and more relevant experience to qualify them for the Court of Claims than Mr. Durfee whose background and experience has been confined to the practice of law in Wisconsin (with no evidence of substantial experience in any kind of Government claim work), and service on two regulatory commissions, one State and one national, neither one of which provided a single day's experience or training in the kind of complex, highly technical work that would immediately confront Mr. Durfee on the Court of Claims. Mr. Durfee has had no visible experience in any of the three areas which have been the classic background for this important court. He has not served in Congress. He has not served as a judge on the bench. He has not had any substantial experience in handling claims cases of any kind either for the public or for the Government.

RECORD OF JUDICIAL BEHAVIOR OF NOMINEE

It might be said that as Chairman of the CAB, Mr. Durfee has enjoyed a kind of judicial experience. The CAB is a quasi-judicial agency, of course. It has judicial as well as rulemaking and administrative functions. The behavior of the nominee in his judicial role is for this reason particularly pertinent to his qualifications for this nomination.

Mr. Chairman, there are three incidents which are the most troublesome to me in the consideration of this nomination. Each of these incidents constitute a serious demerit in the fitness of the nominee for the Court of Claims. In each incident it is the contrast between the behavior of the nominee and the judicial code of the organization which he served as chairman which disturbed me. For this reason I call the careful attention of the committee to the "Principles of Practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board," sometimes called the code of ethics. I present herewith the pertinent regulations in full, from which I will read the sections

that pertain especially to judicial conduct and the behavior of the nominee:

"REGULATIONS, SERIAL NO. PR-10—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, WASHINGTON, D.C.—PROCEDURAL REGULATIONS, PART 300

"(Effective, March 30, 1951; adopted, March 27, 1951)

"Principles of practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board

"Although the standards and principles which usually govern the proceedings of judicial bodies have always been applicable to the Board in the conduct of its quasi-judicial functions, the Board has not previously reduced to written form those principles of practice by which the Board and the persons appearing before it should be governed. In December of 1950 the Board requested a representative committee of industry counsel established as the Civil Aeronautics Board Advisory Committee on Practices and Procedures to assist and to advise it in formulating procedures and practices with respect to proceedings before the Board. As an initial phase in its activity, a statement of rules of conduct which will serve as a guide for all parties and the Board and its staff in relation to proceedings before the Board has been recommended by the Committee and as modified is being adopted and promulgated by the Board as a guide to all parties in relation to matters pending before the Board.

"In consideration of the foregoing the Civil Aeronautics Board hereby makes and promulgates a new part 300 to the Board's procedural regulations to read as follows, effective March 30, 1951:

"'Part 300. Principles of practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board

"'300.0 Applicability of part: The principles of practice set out herein to the extent applicable shall govern the relationships between the Board, its staff, and all other persons.

"'300.1 Judicial standards of practice: In many respects the functions of the Board are similar to those of a court and parties to cases before it and those who represent such parties are expected to conduct themselves with honor and dignity. By the same token, the members of the Board, and those of its employees who participate with the Board members in the determination of cases upon a record, are expected to conduct themselves with the same fidelity to standards of propriety that characterize a court and its staff. The standing and effectiveness of the Board are in direct relation to its observance, that of its staff, and the parties and attorneys appearing before it, of the highest standards of judicial and professional ethics.

"'300.2 Hearing cases—Improper influence: It is essential in cases to be determined after notice and hearing and upon a record that the Board's judicial character be recognized and protected. In such cases—

"'(a) It is improper that there be any private communication on the merits of the case to a member of the Board or its staff or to the examiner in the case by any person, either in private or public life, unless provided for by law.

"'(b) It is likewise improper that there be any private communication on the merits of the case to a member of the Board or to the examiner in the case by any members of the Board's staff who participate in the hearing as witnesses or as counsel.

"'(c) It is improper that there be any effort by any person interested in the case to sway the judgment of the Board by attempting to bring pressure or influence to bear upon the members of the Board or its staff, or that such person or any member of the Board's staff, directly or indirectly, give statements to the press or radio, by paid advertisements or otherwise, designed to influence the Board's judgment in the case.

"'300.3 Conciseness of presentation: Persons practicing before the Board should endeavor to present their cases in concise form avoiding cumulative and repetitious evidence, since the members of the Board participating in the decision of a case, after notice and hearing and upon a record, must familiarize themselves with the evidence in the record and with the arguments made on behalf of the parties orally and in written briefs, and must base their decision solely on the record.

"'300.4 Unusual hospitality: It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted.

"'300.5 Attorney-client relationship: Persons practicing or appearing before the Board, whether or not members of the bar, should have due regard for the standards of professional conduct applicable to the lawyer-client relationship and to the relationship between a lawyer and a judicial tribunal.

"'(a) The nontechnical nature of the Board's procedure calls for special adherence, by practitioners, to scrupulous standards of fairness, candor, and consideration for the rights of others in the pleadings filed, evidence submitted, conduct of the hearing, and briefs and arguments made. In appearing for a client, the practitioner thereby vouches on his honor that in his opinion the client's cause is one proper for determination, and in presenting pleadings and offering evidence he represents that the same are not offered for unwarranted delay and that in his opinion the content thereof is not misleading. Nor should he indulge in offensive personalities, unseemly wrangling, or intemperate accusations or characterizations.

"'(b) A practitioner, moreover, should advise his client to observe the law according to his conscientious belief as to its permissible meaning and should use his best efforts to restrain his client from improprieties in dealing with the Board or its staff. If a client persists in such improprieties, the practitioner should terminate their relationship.

"'300.6 Violations: The Board may disqualify and deny temporarily or permanently, the privilege of appearing or practicing before it in any way to any person who is found after hearing by the Board to have engaged in unethical or improper professional conduct. Violation of any of the foregoing principles shall be deemed to be such conduct.'

"(Secs. 205(a), 1001, 52 Stat. 984, 1017; 49 U.S.C. 425(a), 641.)

"By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"M. C. MULLIGAN,
"Secretary."

INCIDENTS INVOLVING CODE OF ETHICS BY MR. DURFEE

Now, Mr. Chairman, there had been reports in the press that Mr. Durfee while Chairman of the CAB had accepted hospitality from airlines which had cases pending before his Board. The charge was further made in the press that in this alleged action, Mr. Durfee had violated the code of ethics, as the press put it—the regulations—which I have just finished reading.

In order to determine whether these press accounts were true or false, I wrote directly to the head of each airline which had allegedly entertained Mr. Durfee when he was the Chairman of the CAB.

Pinehurst, N.C.—October 19–21, 1956

I shall present my replies from these airlines in chronological order. The first letter is from Mr. L. C. Burwell, Jr., who was vice president of the Flying Tiger Airlines during the period October 19 to 21, 1956, when Chairman Durfee is alleged to have been the guest of Flying Tiger and Overseas National Airlines at a golfing party at Pinehurst, N.C.

Here is the letter, in toto. I shall read pertinent parts of the letter.

DECEMBER 4, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I apologize for not answering your letter of November 25 until today, but I was away from the office practically all week. I am glad of the opportunity to set the record straight with regard to the Pinehurst golfing party, since there has been a considerable amount of rumor and distortion about this in the press.

When the reporter for the Capital Times called me, he implied that his paper was anxious to correct certain derogatory rumors relative to Mr. Durfee's participation. This was a misrepresentation on his part because his article as it came out was extremely antagonistic and not factual.

At the time of this outing I was vice president of the Flying Tigers. I did not associate with Overseas National Airways until July 1, 1957. My home is at Pinehurst, and I am a Democrat. I am a colonel in the Air Force Reserve and have been personally extremely interested in airpower, and officially concerned with the role of the Military Air Transport Service in the general air transportation scheme of things.

The Flying Tiger line, at that time, operated a business amounting to about $6 million a season in transatlantic commercial charters. The two largest competitors in this business were Pan American and, potentially, Overseas National. However, there was one thing on which the management of these three companies could agree, and that was a plan to curtail the competition of MATS in moving routine line haul traffic that rightly should go by commercial air carrier.

I conceived the idea of a golfing weekend and of inviting not only airline officials, but persons in the Government who represented both sides of the argument, plus the Chairman of the CAB and the Federal Communications Commission, whom we wished to persuade to our point of view, but only with advocates for both sides on hand.

We invited, in addition to those that did attend, Lieutenant General Smith, commander of MATS (who sent his alternate, General Wilson); General Twining, Chief of Air Staff; and Senator Symington. Neither of these could come. However, we did have Mr. Frank Pace, formerly Secretary of the Army; Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American, and one of its directors, Mr. Mark McKee; Col. Hammar Denny, member of the CAB; Mr. Eugene Zuckert, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; and several others who are not important at this time. Mr. Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Line, and I were there as well as Mr. George Tompkins, president of Overseas National. In order to avoid any appearance of impropriety, I asked Mr. Tompkins if he wished to share the cost and be cohost, which he agreed to do.

As many of the guests as I could accommodate stayed at my house. All of the guests were from time to time entertained at my house. This was entirely at my personal expense. Those who were accommodated at the Carolina Hotel had their bills paid by the two airlines. The transportation was by rail, and this was paid by the two airlines, using a chartered pullman car. There never was but one outing so that the reference to similar excursions being paid alternately is incorrect. The costs were borne jointly on a 50–50 basis.

Now answering your questions specifically:

1. Mr. Durfee was present.

2. The two airlines bore the costs jointly and the approximate figure per person was $85.

3. Mr. Durfee, to my knowledge, has not accepted any other hospitality, service, or any other consideration from either the Flying Tiger Line or Overseas National Airways.

I would like to add that in addition to the golf and good fellowship, we had serious, and I believe fruitful, discussions as to possible ways and means of allocating logically and fairly certain airlift missions of MATS to the civil industry. When I invited Mr. Durfee, I pointed out that under the act Congress had charged him with the responsibility of fostering the growth of civil aviation and here was a good chance for him to strike a blow for freedom.

We got far more accomplished in 2½ days than we had in the past 2½ years, or would have gotten in the next 2½ years through uncoordinated random efforts. The CAB, MATS, and the airlines, I believe, saw each other's positions clearly and without prejudice. I think much good has come out of the meeting.

I hope this answers your questions.

Sincerely,

L. C. BURWELL, Jr.

I would call particular attention of the committee to two sections of this letter which I will read in connection with the regulations or code of ethics of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to section 300.4 of the Principles of Practice of the CAB which reads and I quote:

"300.4. Unusual hospitality: It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted."

On this point I refer the committee to the following statement in the Burwell letter on the Pinehurst outing and I quote:

"In order to avoid any appearance of impropriety, I asked Mr. Tompkins (that's George Tompkins, president of Overseas National) if he wished to share the cost and be cohost, which he agreed to do.)

"As many of the guests as I could accommodate stayed at my house. All of the guests were from time to time entertained at my house. This was entirely my personal expense. Those who were accommodated at the Carolina Hotel had their bills paid by the two airlines. The transportation was by rail and this was paid by the two airlines, using a chartered pullman car."

And a little later in the Burwell letter, I quote:

"Now answering your questions specifically:

"1. Mr. Durfee was present.

"2. The two airlines bore the costs jointly and the approximate figure per person was $85.

"3. Mr. Durfee, to my knowledge, has not accepted any other hospitality, service, or any other consideration from either Flying Tiger Line or Overseas National Airways."

Did this constitute a violation of section 300.4?

In the first place, there is no question that both Flying Tiger and Overseas National were deeply interested in the business of the Board, before, during, and after this outing.

I call attention to the following applications of Flying Tiger and Overseas National pending on October 19, 20, and 21, 1956, which I received yesterday from the CAB:

TIGERS

"Docket 6893, temporary exemption: transport ships crew from Lisbon to Baltimore for Mystic Steamship Co.

"Docket 8255, temporary exemption: 4 round trip charter, American Legion Post from Frankfort to New York.

OVERSEAS NATIONAL

"Dockets 4233, 5302, 5303, 5304, applications for various atuhorities in the Large Irregular air carrier case, which involved supplemental air carriers the scope of their operations and the type of authorization to be issued.

"Docket 8056, United States to various points in Europe, route application.

"Docket 7838, temporary exemption: From certain tariff filing provisions in connection with military charters (later dismissed as moot.)"

In the second place there is no question that hospitality was offered by these interested persons and no question that it was accepted. The only question remaining is: The reference in 300.4 to "unusual" as the description of the kind of hospitality that is forbidden. I ask the committee to consider what type of entertainment might be considered unusual if this were not. Is there one man in a thousand who would not consider it unusual hospitality if he were taken on a golfing outing to Pinehurst, N.C., in a chartered pullman car for 2½ days of golfing and entertainment? Frankly, I think I've enjoyed my share of entertainment, but I can recall no occasion in my life where the entertainment was as unusual as this weekend. My own opinion is that this was a direct and flagrant violation of section 300.4 of the CAB Code of Ethics.

Mexico City incident

The second letter I received in reply to my inquiry concerning the conduct of the nominee was from Mr. Eddie Rickenbacker, chairman of the board of Eastern Airlines. I will submit the letter in toto and then read pertinent parts of the letter as they seem to relate to Principles of Practice of the CAB, section 300.4, "Unusual Hospitality," which I repeat provides:

"It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted."

Now let me say that on August 14, 1957, the CAB, headed by Mr. Durfee had approved the award of a nonstop route from New York to Mexico City for Eastern Airlines. On September 13, 1957, Pan American Airlines petitioned the CAB to reconsider the allocation of the route to Eastern. From September 15, 1957, to September 18, 1957, Mr. Durfee was alleged to be the guest of Eastern Airlines on a special trip to Mexico City and back. On October 23, the CAB upheld the award of the route ot Eastern Airlines and denied the petition of Pan American.

Let me also add for the record that on September 30, 1957 (the nearest date to the alleged trip for which statistics were available), there were no less than 76 applications by Eastern Airlines pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board according to information recently furnished me by the CAB, as follows:

"Docket 7375, service to Puerto Rico case.

"Docket 4842, service to Puerto Rico case.

"Docket 7759, service to Puerto Rico case.

"Docket 4096, reopened Charleston-Columbus.

"Docket 8239, St. Louis-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 8240, St. Louis-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 2396, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7286, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7287, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7288, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7289, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7290, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7291, Great Lakes- Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7292, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7529, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 8207, Dallas to the West case.

"Docket 3207, Chicago-Twin Cities case.

"Docket 8726, enforcement proceeding.

"Docket 3406, southeastern area local service.

"Docket 5255, southeastern area local service.

"Docket 7146, southeastern area local service.

"Docket 8147, southeastern area local service.

"Docket 8481, southeastern area local service.

"Docket 3151, Eavansville, Ind.-Minneapolis/St. Paul, via intermediates.

"Docket 3624, Nonstop, Richmond or points north; points west of San Antonio.

"Docket 3986, Chicago-Minneapolis/St. Paul; St. Louis-Tulsa, etc.

"Docket 4090, consolidate routes 5 and 6 and part of route 10.

"Docket 4092, remove restriction of Columbia and Charleston, S.C., on route 6.

"Docket 4278, more flexible operation on cargo flights on routes 5, 6, 10, and 47.

"Docket 4931, extend route 6 from Roanoke to Chicago (severed from docket 4837).

"Docket 5973, St. Louis, Mo.-Kansas City, Mo.

"Docket 6052, New York-San Francisco/Oakland, via intermediates.

"Docket 6053, Fort Worth-San Francisco/Oakland, via Albuquerque, Phoenix, Los Angeles.

"Docket 6054, Washington-San Francisco/Oakland, via Cincinnati, Indianapolis, etc.

"Docket 6055, San Francisco/Oakland-New York; New Orleans-Detroit.

"Docket 6722, remove restriction from route 5 re service to Raleigh, Durham.

"Docket 6829, intermediates between a proposed Houston-Dallas route (severed from docket 4144).

"Docket 6833, Oklahoma City, San Francisco-Oakland (severed from docket 6056).

"Docket 6834, Memphis-Chicago; Memphis-Kansas City, etc. (severed from docket 6057).

"Docket 7153, Miami-Dallas and El Paso; Birmingham-Dallas.

"Docket 7293, extension route 10: Chicago-Seattle, via intermediates.

"Docket 7294, extension route 10: St. Louis-San Francisco; Chicago-San Francisco.

"Docket 7295, extension route 10: Chicago-Seattle, San Diego, and San Francisco.

"Docket 7452, delete restriction on Pittsburgh-Akron, Cleveland, Detroit service.

"Docket 7453, Washington-Minneapolis/St. Paul, via Pittsburgh, Cleveland, etc.

"Docket 7499, Birmingham-San Antonio, via intermediates (severed from docket 7286).

"Docket 7500, Pittsburgh-New York/Newark/Detroit-Minneapolis/St. Paul (severed, docket 7287).

"Docket 7501, New York/Newark-Pittsburgh (severed from docket 7288).

"Docket 7502, New Orleans-Louisville; Houston-Louisville (severed from docket 7289).

"Docket 7503, Atlanta-Lexington/Frankfort; Detroit-Minneapolis/St. Paul (severed from docket 7290).

"Docket 7504, Birmingham-San Antonio, via intermediates (severed from docket 7291).

"Docket 7505, Chicago-Seattle, via intermediates (severed from docket 7292).

"Docket 7779, New Orleans, La.-Louisville and Chicago, Ill. (severed from docket 7529).

"Docket 8274, Cleveland, Ohio-Syracuse, N.Y., via Buffalo and Rochester, N.Y.

"Docket 8275, Syracuse, N.Y.-Cincinnati, Ohio, via Pittsburgh, Columbus, Dayton.

"Docket 8276, New York, N.Y.-Cincinnati, Ohio, via Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

"Docket 8277, Washington, D.C.-Pittsburgh, Pa.

"Docket 8278, Pittsburgh, Pa.-Buffalo, N.Y.

"Docket 8528, Atlanta-Dallas/Fort Worth; Chattanooga-Dallas/Fort Worth.

"Docket 8529, Chattanooga-Memphis, via Huntsville and Muscle Shoals.

"Docket 8653, Rockford, Ill. and Rochester, Minn. (on Chicago-Twin Cities route) (3207).

"Docket 8870, Remove certain restrictions on routes 5 and 10; etc. (from 3406).

"Docket 2055, New York-Montreal and Quebec.

"Docket 3825, Miami/Tampa-Bogotá; Miami-Caracas, New Orleans-Bogotá; etc.

"Docket 5925, Extend routes 6 and 10 to West End, Grand Bahama, B.W.I.

"Docket 6605, Boston and New York-Mexico City.

"Docket 7250, Pittsburgh-Toronto; Pittsburgh-Buffalo-Toronto.

"Docket 7365, Miami-Nassau; New Orleans-Nassau, via Miami; (severed from docket 6717).

"Docket 8926, consolidate routes 5 and 6 with FAM-33 (Bermuda route).

"Docket 8581, Hugh Knowlton.

"Docket 9035, nonstop; Ottawa-Patrick Henry Field; Patrick Henry Field-Washington.

"Docket 4287, suspend Capital's route 51, Washington-Rocky Mountain via Richmond.

"Docket 6591, complaint re resort's tariff on Miami stopovers.

"Docket 7154, petition for investigation re southern transcontinental interchange.

"Docket 7155, petition for investigation re southeast-southwest interchange.

"Docket 8268, night-coach fares."

If ever an airline had an interest in the business of the CAB in September of 1957 it would seem to be Eastern.

Here is the Rickenbacker letter:

EASTERN AIR LINES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., December 21, 1959.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have received your letter of November 25, 1959, addressed to our vice president, Robert Ramspeck, and we are happy to give you the information requested concerning the participation of Mr. James R. Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, on the ceremonial preinaugural flight conducted by Eastern Air Lines between New York and Mexico City, September 15–18, 1957.

In order to answer the specific questions you asked, we requested, and your office kindly supplied, copies of the articles you referred to, as published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., under the dates of March 31 and April 30, 1958.

The following are the facts:

1. The ceremonial introduction of new international air services has long been an accepted tradition between the countries and the airlines involved.

Representatives of the Government, including officials responsible for aviation, are customarily honored guests on these important get-acquainted occasions.

In this case, the successful conclusion, after nearly 11 years of effort, of the first bilateral air agreement between the United States and Mexico, was of unusual interest on both sides of the border. It made possible the first direct U.S. air services between New York and Washington and the capital city of Mexico over the New York-Mexico City direct route which, until September 1957, had been monopolized by a government-owned European-flag airline.

This final check flight over the new route, preparatory to inauguration of regularly scheduled service, therefore, presented an exceptional opportunity for aviation officials of both countries to meet and exchange views, to make proper response to the invitation to attend the President of Mexico's official reception, and to encourage, through press and other public channels, a better understanding of the common interests of both countries.

2. There was nothing unusual about the program carried out by Eastern Air Lines. The food and beverage service on the preinaugural flight was identical with the standard set for the subsequently established regular service on this route and is competitive with the paralleling continental service of Air France.

3. All details of the preinaugural program and the list of invited guests were publicly announced, in advance, in Washington and Mexico City and the information was publicized throughout the United States and Mexico.

4. The schedule of the flight was as follows:

Southbound, September 15, 1957: Leave New York, 10 a.m., e.d.t.; arrive Washington, 11:03 a.m., e.d.t.; leave Washington, 11:30 a.m., e.d.t.; arrive Mexico City, 4:15 p.m., c.s.t.

Northbound, September 18, 1957: Leave Mexico City, 11 a.m., c.s.t.; arrive New Orleans, 2 p.m., c.s.t.; leave New Orleans, 3 p.m., c.s.t.; arrive Washington, 8:20 p.m., e.d.t.; leave Washington, 8:50 p.m., e.d.t.; arrive New York, 9:48 p.m., e.d.t.

5. The program of entertainment for the preinaugural guests from the United States was purposely limited in order to enable them to devote maximum time to informal activities with their official counterparts in Mexico.

6. The trip to Acapulco (where President Eisenhower and President Lopez Mateos subsequently met) was at the invitation of Mexico's former President Miguel Aleman. Aeronaves de Mexico (now owned and operated by the Government of Mexico), which was designated to operate the reciprocal service on the Mexico-New York route, was the participating host. There were no hotel accommodations required in Acapulco.

The 1-day trip was scheduled to allow for sightseeing and a luncheon at the home of Mr. Aleman. The party was to return to Mexico City at 5 p.m. the same day, to attend a dinner given in their honor by the national airline of Mexico, Aeronaves.

Due to inclement weather, the trip to Acapulco was canceled and a sightseeing trip around Mexico City and outlying areas was substituted.

7. The preinaugural party was accomomodated at the Hotel Del Prado in downtown Mexico City.

8. For more than 13 years Eastern Air Lines has maintained, in Mexico City, the largest and best located city ticket office of any U.S.-flag airline, located on the plaza of the corner of Reforma and Morelos Avenues. It also has one of the major locations at the airport terminals.

9. On July 18–21, Eastern also operated preinaugural flight over the New Orleans-Mexico City route. This route was certificated to Eastern by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the President in 1946, but, until conclusion of the bilateral air agreement with Mexico in 1957, could not be implemented.

The purpose of this New Orleans introductory program was to introduce, to Mexico, civic and other representatives of the principal cities to be served on this route.

A guest list of those who participated on these flights is also attached.

10. The personal expenses, paid by Eastern Air Lines, were limited to individual hotel accommodations and the nominal charge for continental breakfasts which are served in the rooms, according to custom.

11. Attached are documents, publicly distributed at the time these flights were being planned and carried out, including the flight schedule, itinerary, and list of guests.

The only other occasion on which Eastern Air Lines was host to Mr. Durfee was during an introductory program for the first Golden Falcon-type Douglas DC–7B aircraft. This consisted of a 45-minute luncheon flight, circling Washington. Members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and some 55 members of the staff were guests on this educational flight, one of a series conducted in the principal cities of the eastern half of the United States.

If there is any further information you desire, we would be most happy to try to locate it for you.

Sincerely,

E. V. RICKENBACKER,
Chairman of the Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the first place, Mr. Rickenbacker confirms the fact that Mr. Durfee did take the flight. In the second place, Mr. Rickenbacker asserts that Mr. Durfee was the guest of Eastern Air Lines. He says that Eastern provided food and beverage service which he describes as "identical with the standard set for the subsequently established regular service" on the route and Rickenbacker says it's no better than Air France continental service. Rickenbacker says there's nothing unusual about the program in this sense. He also points out that the entire program was publicly announced throughout the country, and says the entertainment was deliberately limited to enable guests from the United States to devote maximum time to informal activities with their official counterparts in Mexico.

Mr. Rickenbacker also said and I quote:

"The personal expenses, paid by Eastern Air Lines, were limited to individual hotel accommodations and the nominal charge for continental breakfasts which are served in the rooms, according to custom."

Mr. Rickenbacker did not answer my request for the approximate value of this trip. Unaccounted for, at the least, were air transportation and several items listed in the itinerary, such as reception and cocktails, Sunday evening, September 15 at the Del Prado Hotel, where the group stayed; cocktails and luncheon in the chandelier room of the Del Prado the following day where the party reviewed the Independence Day parade; and later the same day, from 9:30 to midnight dinner and entertainment at El Rancho del Artista.

An industry source told me that the excursion cost Eastern Air Lines in his opinion $2,000 per person or $110,000. Even if the cost was only half this much, a 4-day excursion to Mexico City and back on Eastern Air Lines with cocktail parties, midnight dinners and entertainment, would be considered by most persons as unusual entertainment. Certainly any judge of any court would consider such entertainment by any litigant to be unusual at the least. And I remind the committee that if the code of ethics of the CAB serves any purpose at all it is to place the Board of the CAB in a judicial posture.

For these reasons the Mexico City trip constitutes in my judgment a second flagrant violation of the CAB code of ethics by Mr. Durfee. To construe it any other way would make the code of ethics a pious and ridiculous affirmation that in fact limits no one in any sense. It would mean the code of ethics is a meaningless mockery.

Rome, Italy, incident

The third letter I received in reply to my inquiry concerning the conduct of the nominee was from Mr. Charles S. Thomas, president of Trans World Airlines. Once again I refer to the CAB code of ethics and the section which provides, and I repeat:

"It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the

Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted."

Did TWA have any interest in the business of the CAB during the period October 2 through 6, 1957, when Mr. Durfee is alleged along with his wife to have been the guest of TWA on a 4-day trip to Rome, Italy?

The CAB has informed me that as of September 30, 1957, the nearest date to the Rome trip for which figures are available, the TWA had 15 applications pending before the CAB, 5 of which were regarded as of major importance. I submit the list of applications which TWA had pending at the CAB on September 30, 1957:

"Docket 5065, Transpacific Certificate Renewal case, docket No. 5031 et al. (deferred portion).

"Docket 7378, transfer Cincinnati-Detroit route.

"Docket 8216, TWA versus Northwest—Capital's family fare plan.

"Docket 7209, Seven States Area case.

"Docket 8997, complaint re Southwest's EX-2, CAB 15; PR-4, CAB 43; PF-5, CAB 44.

"Docket 7831, St. Louis-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 7268, Great Lakes-Southeast Service case.

"Docket 8235, control of TWA and Northeast by Howard Hughes.

"Docket 7157, extend route 2: Albuquerque-Houston, via Fort Worth and Dallas.

"Docket 8061, Hughes Tool Co. and TWA.

"Docket 7703, eliminate restriction on route 2 re Las Vegas-Los Angeles.

"Docket 7797, Las Vegas on segment 5 of route 2; Las Vegas-Phoenix service.

"Docket 7957, remove restriction, Los Angeles-San Francisco/Oakland service on route 2.

"Docket 3473, include Kuwait between Basra and Dhahran.

"Docket 4546, include Madrid, Spain on international route."

Certainly TWA qualifies as a concern which had an obvious and vital interest in the business of the Board.

Secondly, did Mr. Durfee in fact accept unusual hospitality from TWA during the period?

I submit for the committee's information the letter in toto from the president of TWA, Mr. Thomas.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES,
New York, N.Y., December 1, 1959.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S.Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: In reply to your letter of November 25, TWA was host on a 4-day trip to Rome in October 1957, to approximately 100 Americans who were representative of their many respective fields, which included education, religion, the arts, sciences, sports, business, government, and finance. The purpose of the trip was a meeting in Rome with their counterparts from European nations in furtherance of the President's people-to-people program.

As TWA's contribution to the program, our company helped to ararnge the Rome meetings and transported representatives under International Air Transport Association authority as part of our polar route and our New York-Rome nonstop inaugural flights.

Mr. and Mrs. James Durfee were guests on one of these flights and Mr. Durfee was an honored guest on the dais at the people-to-people dinner of all nations as a representative of American civil aviation. The dinner and preceding people-to-people meetings were attended by representatives from all over Europe, particularly NATO countries, and it was the consensus that the meetings made a positive contribution to the cause of better understanding between the United States and nations abroad.

Three groups—one each from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and New York—departed from the United States on October 2 and arrived in Rome on October 3. They departed from Rome for the United States on October 6.

Mr. and Mrs. Durfee were in the group departing from New York. The cost of their transportation, if paid for at 1957 fare levels, would have been $1,776. The approximate cost of their accommodations in Rome was $100.

In reply to the second part of your question, Mr. Durfee, to the best of my knowledge, has not accepted any hospitality, services or other consideration of value from TWA.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. THOMAS.

In this letter Mr. Thomas flatly asserts that Mr. and Mrs. James Durfee were guests on a New York to Rome round trip flight. He also writes and I quote:

"The cost of their transportation, if paid for at 1957 levels, would have been $1,776. The approximate cost of their accommodations in Rome was $100."

Did the chairman of the CAB—Mr. Durfee—accept hospitality from this airline which had such a massive interest in the business of the CAB?

The answer of course is "Yes," on the testimony of the president of TWA.

Was this hospitality "unusual"?

Mr. Chairman, any time anyone will provide a trip from New York City to Rome and return for any man and his wife with $25 a day hotel room in Rome for 4 days, that hospitality would be unusual for the most jaded millionaire.

Is there any lawyer anywhere who wouldn't call such hospitality "unusual" for a judge who enjoyed it at the expense of a litigant before his court?

Once again, Mr. Chairman, the nominee for the Court of Claims flagrantly violated the code of ethics of the agency he served as the responsible chief. Any contrary view must assume that there is nothing unusual about hospitality that would fly a man and his wife half way around the world and back.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I must oppose Mr. Durfee for two principal reasons.

First, he wholly lacks the technical training and experience required for a court that annually passes on hundreds of millions of dollars of claims against the Government. He has no congressional experience, no tax nor Government-claim experience, no actual judicial experience. As compared to the high technical qualifications of the man he would succeed and the present judges of the Court of Claims, Mr. Durfee is just not adequately qualified.

Secondly, in the only Federal quasi-judicial experience Mr. Durfee has enjoyed, he has on three distinct occasions flagrantly violated the code of ethics of the agency which he himself heads. On every one of these occasions it is clear: first, that he accepted "unusual" hospitality; and second, that the hospitality was provided by persons who had an intense and obvious pecuniary interest in the business of the Civil Aeronautics Board, his agency.

It is true of course that on every one of the three occasions cited at length above, there was an apparent public purpose of sorts. The trip to North Carolina was to lend the authority of the head of the CAB to achieve a more cooperative relationship between MATS and the commercial airlines. The trip to Mexico was a ceremonial inaugural flight to encourage "a better understanding of the common interests of both countries." The purpose of the Rome trip, another ceremonial inaugural flight, was to advance the "people to people" program for greater international understanding.

It can be argued that these are all laudable purposes designed to advance the public interests. And the participation of the head of the CAB in such good ends should be encouraged and praised rather than castigated.

But who determined that the head of the CAB should lend the prestige and authority of his position to these purposes? The answer of course is that it was certain commercial airlines that have an intense and pecuniary interest in the business of the CAB. On no occasion was there any sanction in law, congressional resolution, or any other public action for achieving these laudable purposes by commercial airline hospitality for the head of the CAB.

This is a free country. Any group of men can decide to advance any worthwhile purpose they desire. But it is good public policy for a judicial officer to lend his office to such a group for a public purpose determined by them, if the group are litigants before the official at the time and if in the process they entertain him? I think not. Is it justification for violation of the explicitly stated code of ethics of the office he serves for such a public official to accept the kind of hospitality we have described at length above to help such litigants achieve ends they deem laudable? My answer is "No."

Is there any possible justification in "good motives" for the action of Mr. Durfee in accepting this entertainment?

The answer to this is apparent when we ask: What did the airlines spend their money for when they entertained Mr. Durfee? Did Flying Tiger fundamentally want greater freedom for civil aviation and smoother working relations with MATS, or did they want MATS routes so they could make bigger profits while cultivating the Chairman of CAB, the Board that determines the allocation of routes? My answer is frankly that they wanted all three. The CAB Chairman while unusually entertained enabled them to achieve all three.

Did Eastern want better "understanding between Mexico and the United States" or a slick promotional job to increase the air traffic on their new run so that they could improve profits and entertain and win better acquaintance with Jim Durfee, the head of the CAB, in the process? The answer again is "Yes" three times and the "unusually" entertained CAB Chairman helped them achieve it.

Finally, did TWA want to advance the President's people-to-people program or did it want to curry a little better relationship with the head of the CAB and increase profits by letting the world know about their new New York-Rome nonstop flight?

Once again, they probably wanted all of these things and the nominee for judge of the Claims Court helped them achieve all of them.

If this hospitality does not redound to the profit of the airline it would be interesting to know how the corporate officers of TWA and Eastern Airlines justify those costs.

Finally, let me say that I feel sure that the nominee did not look at these entertainment occasions as coldbloodedly as I have described them. I presume he was chiefly interested in the public purpose on all these occasions. But is there any man who can doubt what realistically happened? Can any man tell me what the purpose of the "unusual hospitality" clause of the CAB Code of Ethics is if it isn't to prevent exactly what I have described? And is there any doubt in anyone's mind that a judge—and certainly a judge on the Court of Claims—who is intelligent enough and realistic enough to serve the public should recognize this?

Mr. Durfee is not being prosecuted for removal from office. He is not being disciplined for misconduct. He is being considered for elevation to a judicial position

that has been graced and is now graced by eminent jurists: a lifetime appointment at $25,500 a year to the Court of Claims.

The President, would-be-Presidents, and Senators today make impassioned speeches decrying the sagging moral fiber of too many of the American people. Such practices as radio and TV disk jockey payola and rigged TV shows, for instance, have shocked our moral sensibilities. But let us not forget that disk jockeys and quiz-show participants were not entrusted by their Government with responsibility for their conduct. They are not enjoined with a specific and direct code of ethics. And yet guilty disk jockeys have been fired and subjected to a lifetime blackball by their industry. Rigged quiz show participants are in disgrace.

Today's nominee has been entrusted by his Government with a heavy responsibility. He has been enjoined by an explicit code of ethics. He has violated that ethical code. What has been the consequence for him? It has been elevation, subject to the approval of the Senate, to a very high lifetime judicial office.

Approval by this committee is a moral issue. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is my sad duty as Senator from Wisconsin to ask that the nomination of Mr. James Durfee to the Court of Claims not be confirmed. I want to make it clear that in good conscience I cannot say that the nominee is "personally obnoxious" to me. I have absolutely no personal antipathy toward Mr. Durfee and indeed no reason to have any. I oppose him solely for the reasons I have stated above.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries an excellent editorial pleading for this Congress to consider an adequate Federal aid for education bill. The Post pleads for this Congress to pay its debt to the future of our country by acting where the administration has shown it will not act, to do something significant and decisive about the shortage of teachers and classrooms. This teacher and classroom gap is more serious to America's future than the missile gap.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNTAIN OF YOUTH

The Senate's Democrats, in caucus assembled on Wednesday, are reported to have expressed strong sentiment for a broad Federal aid to education bill—including aid for teacher salaries, college classrooms and school construction. "There is nothing more vital to America and nothing more important," Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON told reporters, "than passage of education legislation." If the Democrats really believe this—and there is good reason for them to believe it since it happens to be incontrovertibly true—they ought to act on it. They could devote themselves to no more useful—and no more politically profitable—issue in this presidential election year.

The public schools of this Nation suffer today from a shortage of 132,400 classrooms. The number of pupils enrolled in excess of normal classroom capacity rose from 1,850,000 in the fall of 1958 to 1,883,000 this fall. These figures are taken from a statement by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a Republican administration. "We have made very little progress over the years," Mr. Flemming said, "in dealing with the huge backlog of need for classrooms which developed during the war years, when school construction was virtually at a standstill." A press release issued simultaneously by the Commissioner of Education, also a Republican, says that "State departments of education reported in the survey that 98,800 full-time teachers have not met full certification standards for teaching. This total is an increase of 5,900 or 6.3 percent over that of last year."

But it is now perfectly apparent that the Republican administration which recognizes and presents this problem is not going to do anything to solve it. The President's school aid proposal is so meager, so niggardly, so inadequate as to amount to no more than an empty, mocking gesture in the school crisis. "The administration has been up and down the hill on this issue," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY told newsmen, "but never in the schoolhouse. This is the time to put them on the line." He is abundantly right. Perhaps, as Senator FULBRIGHT predicted, the President would veto any real school bill passed by Congress. The Democrats could choose no firmer, more advantageous ground on which to take their stand.

For all Americans are touched by the public schools. All Americans can see their decay. All Americans can understand that the schools are the essential source of the Nation's security and strength—that the quality of the schools today will determine the quality of scientific and industrial and political performance in the United States a decade hence. All Americans know that from the earliest days of this Republic, the public schools have been its fountain of youth. And they will not choose to let that fountain run dry.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NAME CALLING DURING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Washington Sunday Star of January 24, 1960, appears the following headline: "Top Democrats Join in Attack on NIXON."

The subhead is: "Two Thousand Five Hundred Hear Seven Hopefuls and Truman."

That is quite a favorite indoor sport in the political arena. Everyone fully understands that that is a part of the American tradition. The fact that we shoot at the other side and they shoot at us is an accepted technique.

I am reminded a little of the uninitiated bombardier who landed in Korea. On his first mission, when the antiaircraft guns first shot at the plane and flak began to tear through the fuselage, this boy, not only bewildered, but frightened to tears, turned to a grizzled old sergeant and said, "Sarge, they are shooting at us." The old sergeant said, "Yes; they are allowed to."

So there is plenty of shooting. But it seems to me that there are limits beyond which the shooting should not go in a political war.

I read a paragraph from the article in the Sunday Star, written by feature writer David S. Broder, of the Star staff, as reported on the front page of the Sunday edition of the Star:

The assembled Democrats cheered happily as various speakers assailed the Vice President as a "juvenile delinquent," "a slicker," and "a man about whom too many questions remain to be answered."

Mr. President, perhaps that is a manifestation of an inferiority complex. Some people manifest that complex by wearing loud neckties. The beatniks satisfy their inferiority complex by going around in dirty underwear, unshaven, reading poetry that no one understands, and carrying on in an amazingly crass fashion.

Then, of course, there are some who register their inferiority complex by dipping into Roget's Thesaurus to find what other terms they can use as they assail someone who is a contender for public office.

I think it is a great testimony to the Vice President that he does not shoot back in kind, and stoop to such procedures.

In my second campaign for Congress I took an oath that I would not mention my opponent from that day on. I think, as I go back and examine the history, I did not mention him. I let him saw his own wood, carry his own water, and peddle his own merchandise. I have never sought to downgrade a man on the other side of the fence in terms that were not printable on every possible occasion.

If this is a preview of what we are to have in the 1960 campaign, we might as well know it first as last. I have a leather-bound copy of Roget's Thesaurus, and I shall dust off all the favorite synonyms; perhaps we shall do some swapping on that basis. However, I think the kind of nomenclature used is uncalled for. I believe that if such a term as "a juvenile delinquent" is meant to be applicable to the Vice President of the United States, then indeed we have fallen from grace in our political decorum, and it is about time to take a little inventory.

Thank God, the Vice President is a man of stability, character, and restraint. He does not employ terms of that kind in a campaign.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to support the remarks of the minority leader. I was shocked to read in the press yesterday accounts of the dinner to which the minority leader has referred, and the language which was used in discussing the Vice President of the United States.

Certainly, in recent years no man has ever carried our flag into foreign countries, under greater difficulties, and at times great danger, than has Vice President NIXON. He has earned the respect and admiration of Americans all over the United States, and of other free peoples throughout the world.

To speak of him in the terms which were applied to him at the Democratic dinner last Saturday night, I believe, is a disgraceful performance. It reminded me to some extent of a group of little schoolboys who meet after school to

think up names to call the captain of the opposing team when he appears on the athletic field. The whole picture had some very juvenile aspects of its own.

I believe that this kind of performance and this kind of name calling applied to a man in high public office who has demonstrated his patriotism, his ability, and his willingness to run great risks in serving the people of the United States is a thoroughly disgraceful procedure, and I am very glad to have the opportunity to add my remarks to those of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I do not have the right to yield. If I may have unanimous consent to do so, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BUSH. If I may do so, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not in any way endorse any criticism of the Vice President. I had nothing to do with making any of the speeches referred to.

Does the Senator not recall that on other occasions important persons have been criticized? For example, a distinguished lady representative from the great State of Connecticut who was nominated to be our Ambassador to Brazil. She was criticized because she had once suggested that a former Democratic President lied the country into war. Many of us felt that that type of thing should be considered along with many other things said in campaigns, in which perhaps everyone overstates his position somewhat in the heat of the campaign.

After all, this dinner was regarded as something of a kickoff dinner for the presidential campaign.

Mr. BUSH. Nothing the Senator from Louisiana has said changes in the slightest the view which I have previously expressed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not have much to say on this question, except to observe that what has been said will no doubt make others feel they will have plenty of time in which to answer it. I rather think that what is complained of now will be very mild, indeed, compared with what will be said by the time the campaign is over. So we need not get excited about it at this time, because we will find that many more names, and stronger names, will be called before the campaign is over. I recall, Mr. President, that we have had some names called in past campaigns, and that is true on both sides of the aisle. I am sure the coming campaign will be carried on in the same way. Perhaps the name calling was caused by something that had been said before, which led up to the name calling. Perhaps those who did the name calling had a good reason for calling names. Perhaps that happened at the meeting on Saturday evening. I was not present. I am not defending anyone. However, I do feel that during the coming campaign other names will be called. Let us remember, also, that this is not necessarily a party speaking, but, rather, individuals speaking. We will find, during the approaching campaign, that many individuals throughout the United States will be calling their political opponents all kinds of names. That will be true of candidates of the Republican Party and of the Democratic Party. Therefore, I do not believe we should become too excited.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the minority leader and the Senator from Connecticut at this time in expressing regret at the remarks which were made concerning our Vice President. Although I very much regret those remarks, I cannot join my colleagues in their concern as to their effect.

The fact is, as I read those remarks in yesterday's newspaper, I was reminded of a story I heard a few years ago about a farmer who had an old mule. The mule had outlived its usefulness and generally was unpleasant to have around the farm. The farmer kept putting off disposing of the mule. He always intended to do something about it but kept putting off the action.

Also on the farm the farmer had an old well which he had been promising to fill in. His wife one day insisted that he could no longer put off filling up this well but must do so as soon as possible.

The farmer got the idea that he could do both jobs at one time, fill in the well and dispose of the mule. He led the mule to the well, and got on its blind side, gave it a shove, and the mule landed about 40 feet down the well. The farmer then rounded up all his friends, and they all began shoveling dirt down the well. As the dirt was shoveled it landed on the old mule's back. The old mule in the well just kept shaking his back and stepping on top of the dirt, and finally he walked out of the well safely.

All I can say to my friends on the other side of the aisle is that if they will keep on shoveling dirt, Vice President NIXON will walk into the White House in 1960. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that what I am about to say may follow the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, what candidates for high office may say at a big political rally is, to a degree, excusable. One does not get very many cheers from the faithful by dealing with issues; he gets great cheers from those who are dedicated to one philosophy only by calling the opponent names. We can expect much of that kind of conduct. The course was charted by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee on a nationwide television program a couple of weeks ago, when he said that this campaign would be the roughest in history, that all attacks would be centered on Vice President NIXON, that there was much in his past which would be dredged up, and so forth and so on.

We will hear much of that kind of talk, but in my judgment none of those things can be made to stick. They will not stick. Our distinguished Vice President will emerge on top. The story related by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is, indeed, very pointed.

It is significant that on the same day those candidates for high office were taking the low road, the distinguished Vice President was taking the high road and was dealing with one of the great issues which face our country. On the day of the debacle at the Sheraton Park Hotel, the Vice President released a very interesting letter to Mr. Alexander F. Jones, known to many of us as "Casey" Jones, of Syracuse, N.Y. Mr. Jones is the executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal and is widely known as an independent thinker and writer.

In his letter, the Vice President set forth in some detail his views on the recent steel dispute and his ideas as to possible future action. Because his vigorous and helpful participation in the settlement of the steel impasse was so successful, the comments of the Vice President deserve the close attention of every Member of Congress. The Vice President, in cooperation with Secretary of Labor Mitchell, performed a great service in getting the parties together and in working out an agreeable solution.

I noted with particular interest the Vice President's call for legislation to deal with future national emergencies resulting from labor-management disputes. I suggest that it might be appropriate for some of those who excoriate the Vice President so severely on the basis of personalities to join him in the effort to promote such legislation. I agree wholeheartedly with the Vice President's view that we should not simply sit back now that the steel situation has been cleared up, and wait for another crisis. In my judgment, Congress has a solemn obligation to come to grips with this problem and to provide the President with flexible and workable means for helping to settle future labor-management disputes.

Certainly, the Vice President's expertise must be recognized by all of us. I am hopeful that his feeling that legislation is needed will be heeded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's interesting letter to Mr. Jones be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, January 21, 1960.

Mr. ALEXANDER F. JONES,
Executive Editor,
Syracuse Herald-Journal,
Syracuse, N.Y.

DEAR CASEY: I greatly appreciated your letter of January 5 and particularly the candor and frankness with which you discussed the steel settlement.

I realize that a number of questions have been raised as to the settlement and the role that Secretary Mitchell and I played with regard to it. I think perhaps the best way to answer those questions is to review the

factors which led to our mediation efforts and the alternatives which confronted us.

As you will recall, just before the President left on his trip abroad, he said in his television address to the Nation: "It is up to labor and management * * * to adjust responsibly and equitably their differences * * * what great news it would be if, during the course of this journey, I should receive word of a settlement of this steel controversy that is fair to the workers, fair to management and above all fair to the American people."

The first question the Secretary and I undertook to explore was whether the President's expressed desire for a settlement could be realized without some new mediation action on our part. Our preliminary discussions with representatives of both sides convinced us that there was no chance whatever for a settlement unless some new initiative was undertaken to bring them together.

We, therefore, asked Mr. Blough and other top management representatives and Mr. McDonald and other representatives of the union whether they wished us to attempt to mediate the dispute. While both sides indicated that they did not feel there was too much hope that they could reach a negotiated settlement, they agreed that such a procedure was worth trying and that they would cooperate to the extent possible. This was the origin of the meetings which took place in my home in which Secretary Mitchell, Mr. Blough, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Goldberg, and I participated.

At the beginning of these negotiations, the possibilities of settlement seemed hopeless. The companies' offer was for a wage-benefit package which the companies estimated would add 31 cents to their costs over a period of 30 months. In addition, the companies asked for revision of section 2B of the contract so that management would have more control over local work practices which they felt was essential for increased efficiency.

The union completely opposed any changes in the work practices provision of the contract. On the economic side, Mr. McDonald at our first meeting bluntly stated, "I cannot settle with the steel companies for less than the amount that I received from Can and Aluminum without a strike." I think it is important at this point to recall that our negotiations began the week that he had completed his negotiation of the Aluminum contract. And the companies' computation of what McDonald contended was the Can and Aluminum pattern was an increased wage-benefit cost of 52 cents for 30 months.

In other words, at the beginning of the negotiations, the companies were offering a 31-cent increase over 30 months as against 52 cents demanded by the union and the parties were in complete disagreement on the local work practices issue. During our first few meetings we made very little progress. At a meeting in my home 2 days before Christmas, the negotiations reached a point where both sides refused to move any further in the direction of an agreement and there seemed to be a hopeless deadlock.

It was at that point that the Secretary and I talked to Mr. Blough and Mr. McDonald separately and asked whether they thought it might be useful if we were to consult individually with each party and recommend an amount in between their two positions which each would be completely free to accept or reject if he saw fit.

Both agreed that this course of action might be helpful and after 2 days of intense negotiations and discussions and consultation with the President, we recommended the figure of 41 cents which both the union and management voluntarily accepted. As far as the work practices issue was concerned, the best that we were able to get the union to agree was to set up a study commission with a neutral chairman.

I realize that a number of questions have been raised as to why we recommended the amount that we did. I think the answers to those questions can be found when we examine the bargaining position of each party.

Mr. McDonald came to these negotiations in a stronger position than the companies. He had just won from Aluminum and Can without a strike higher settlements than the one he eventually agreed to accept with the steel companies. Polls that he had taken (and incidentally, the polls the companies had taken substantiated his claims in this respect) indicated that the union members would vote down the companies' last offer by a majority of over 90 percent. He also believed that if the dispute were not settled and had to be sent to the Congress by the President he would do better in a Congress heavily dominated by Members elected with union support in an election year than would the companies. Considering the strong bargaining position of the union, their agreement to a settlement which was less than the pattern that they had been able to negotiate with Can and Aluminum was, in my opinion, a major achievement.

Looking at the settlement from the standpoint of the companies, no one questions but that they agreed to an amount which was greater than they thought could be absorbed by increased worker productivity, though it is entirely conceivable that the rising efficiency between now and 1962 could offset the increase in labor costs during this period. In addition, the companies failed to win substantial concessions on the work rules issue. But company representatives have pointed out some of these positive factors which led them to agree to the recommended settlement.

1. The amount they settled for was lower than any offer they had been able to get from the union during the course of their negotiations up to that time.

2. It was less than one-half of the postwar pattern in wage-benefit increases in the steel industry. For example, in the last steel contract the wage-benefit increase was 81 cents for 3 years as compared with 41 cents for 30 months on this occasion.

3. As Conrad Cooper, the chief negotiator for the companies, has stated, the amount of this settlement was 30 percent less in company costs than would have been the case had the Can, Aluminum, and Kaiser patterns been applied to steel. In other words, this settlement rather than setting off a new pattern of higher wage increases was actually lower than the pattern in wage settlements already established in 1959 and checked, rather than increased, the so-called ripple of increased wage costs.

4. The cost-of-living escalator provision, which had resulted in a 17-cent wage increase over the 3 years of the previous contract, was finally limited in this contract to a maximum of 6 cents over 30 months. In addition, it is provided that if the insurance costs which the company has assumed under the contract prove to be greater than the amount estimated, the excess costs will be deducted from any cost-of-living increases which may have accrued.

A basic question which many have raised is whether a better result in the end would have been achieved had the Secretary and I not offered our good offices for mediation of the dispute at this time. This, of course, is a matter of judgment on which there can be an honest disagreement of opinion. I can only indicate my own appraisal as to what would have happened had we not acted as we did.

In my opinion, the price the union would have insisted upon would inevitably have gone up rather than down. It seems only logical to conclude that after the union had won an overwhelming victory rejecting the companies' last offer they would have insisted on an even higher settlement than they accepted at the present time. I also believe that if the parties had failed to agree after the union rejected the companies' last offer and the President, as required by law, had submitted the dispute to Congress any Government-imposed settlement that the Congress would have brought about through compulsory arbitration, plant seizure, or some other Government device, would have been higher than the one agreed upon at this point.

I recognize that there are those who have suggested that it would have been better in the long run to allow the issue to go to the Congress so that the Congress could meet head on the whole question of too much power in the hands of the union as well as management. I can only say that any objective observer would have to agree that there could be nothing more irresponsible than to place before the Congress in an election year the complicated and potentially explosive issue of labor-management relations.

In my opinion, the result would not only have been a Government-imposed settlement of this dispute but a real possibility of the enactment of permanent legislation which would have provided for some form of Government-imposed compulsory arbitration in all major labor disputes. I don't need to tell you that Government arbitration means Government wage fixing and that Government wage fixing inevitably means Government price fixing. Once we get into this vicious circle not only collective bargaining but the productive private enterprise system, as we know it, is doomed.

I would be the last to contend that there could not be honest differences of opinion as to the wisdom of the course of action the Secretary and I followed in mediating this dispute. But after weighing all the factors involved, we concluded that our failure to do everything possible to bring about a voluntary settlement at this time would have been highly detrimental to the public interest.

As chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, I am acutely aware of the dangers of inflation which can arise from wage increases that consistently exceed increases in productivity. But on the plus side it should be noted that while the wage-benefit increase was greater than the companies wanted to pay, this was the first contract since the war in which the increase was such that the companies did not find it necessary to increase prices at the time the contract went into force. Whether price increases can be avoided in the future will depend to a great extent upon how the union and the companies carry out the President's injunction in his state of the Union message that "the national interest demands that in the period of industrial peace which has been assured by the new contract, both management and labor make every possible effort to increase efficiency and productivity in the manufacture of steel so that price increases can be avoided."

Incidentally, I believe that one of the constructive results of the long fight the companies made on the work-rule issue was that it focused nationwide attention on the critical necessity of increasing our efficiency and productivity if we are to maintain our competitive position in the world.

As I told the representatives of the major companies and the union at a dinner in my home after the settlement, the people of the country will not tolerate another massive struggle of this type in the steel industry. Their interest, as well as that of the country at large, will be at stake as they explore every possible means of increasing productivity, reducing costs, and improving relations between union and management during the period of this contract.

For my part, I intend to continue my studies of this problem with a view to determining what legislative action might be taken which would provide better protection for the public interest in the settlement of labor-management disputes and at the same time not impair the basic strength of our private enterprise economy.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

THANKS, MR. VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, people in all parts of the Nation breathed a sigh of relief when the long and costly steel strike was settled. We have the Vice President and the Secretary of Labor to thank for bringing together the opposing sides so that free collective bargaining could be resumed toward the end of settling the strike.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the San Diego Union which thanks Vice President NIXON, as well as a column by Mr. David Lawrence which clarifies some of the provisions of the strike settlement, and, finally, a column by Mr. John M. Cummings in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial and columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 5, 1960]

A BURDEN LIFTED—THANKS, MR. VICE PRESIDENT

With powerful leverage by Vice President NIXON and Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell, the burden of the longest steel strike in the Nation's history has been lifted from the back of the economy. The Nation marches into the new decade relieved and confident it can master the economic and defense challenges that lie ahead.

The acceptance of Mr. NIXON's formula for settling the strike brought an orderly and harmonious conclusion to a dispute that has defied the best efforts of arbiters since May. The fact that the settlement was achieved voluntarily indicated that when free collective bargaining is prosecuted in good faith no labor-management issue is too big to resolve.

The offices of Mr. NIXON and Mr. Mitchell were instrumental in accentuating the positive in the negotiations. As Mr. Mitchell pointed out yesterday, the differences between the parties had narrowed to a point the Government-recommended settlement was accepted voluntarily.

The agreement, when ratified by the USW membership as expected, will give the workers an estimated 39 to 40 cents an hour increase in pay and benefits over the next 30 months. It is estimated that the steel industry's costs will increase by $600 million a year.

In the compromise nailed down by Mr. NIXON the union won more wage increase than management had been willing to give. But this concession was balanced off by the union's agreement to submit the acrimonious work rules issue to a union-management committee. This was recognition that the issue needs a thorough airing, and it was a major concession on the USW's part.

It had not been determined whether the settlement will result in steel price increases. However, it is noteworthy that Mr. NIXON acted in his capacity as chairman of the President's Cabinet Committee for Price Stability and Economic Growth, Mr. NIXON hardly would author a settlement that contributed to the very thing—inflation—that this committee is fighting.

Every corner of our land will feel the relief stemming from the settlement of the steel strike. Individual workers, cities, States, and the Federal Government are out from under a crushing burden that threatened to flatten them and their pocketbooks.

Mr. NIXON's stature as a national leader, already great, is further enhanced. He put the economy back on the track and restored labor peace with tact and skill. Those who benefit from his efforts—and that includes everybody—have reason to remember and to say, "Thanks, Mr. Vice President."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 18, 1960]

THE STEEL PACT IN "GRAY AREA"—EXECUTIVES OF TWO MAJOR FIRMS AGREE STRIKE SETTLEMENT WAS NOT "ALL BLACK"

(By David Lawrence)

Executives of the various steel companies have been reviewing what really happened in the settlement of the steel strike, and most of them have come to the conclusion that maybe the final agreement reached was not as bad for them as it has been painted.

There is a tendency to agree with what President Eisenhower said about the pressure of circumstances, rather than the pressure of Government, as the paramount influence in bringing about the settlement.

The head of one company put it this way:

"We have been in this wage-price spiral for 20-odd years. You can't stop a great wave of that kind dead in its tracks all at one crack. We've made a great effort in the steel business to try to stop it. We made some mistakes as we went along but, by and large, we tried our best to slow the thing down.

"Now, the settlement, as actually made, gives an advance of about half in the next 3 years of what we've had in the past 3 years. That's a pretty fair step forward. The thing that really ended the matter—really what finally made us capitulate—was the politicians in Congress.

"The real pressure that developed was the fear of a Democratic Congress and what they would do if they had to meet an emergency. If there was a threat of a resumption of the strike, Congress would be proposing all kinds of laws to prevent it, and these laws would not be the kind that would be carefully considered or thoughtfully discussed. They would be emergency laws passed in order to force a settlement of the strike. It was the fear of that kind of law, as well as the threat of the steel strike being resumed, which most of us thought would do a lasting damage to our employer-employee relations and to the whole country. We would have had a difficult time ever getting repeal of the drastic, ill-considered legislation that would have been passed."

The head of another steel company believes the adverse nature of the settlement has been overemphasized. He says:

No one, of course, could ever say this settlement was a victory for the steel industry, for we did not accomplish our main objectives of a noninflationary settlement and change in work rules which would promote efficiency. Nevertheless, as Mr. Blough of United States Steel pointed out, we did reduce the rate of increase in employment costs to about 3¾ percent as compared with an average of 8 percent throughout the postwar period. This is no mean accomplishment. In addition, we alerted the public, including the steelworkers, to the importance of the work-rule issues, and one may hope that this could bring some fruitful results as time goes along.

Some writers contended, for one thing, that if the industry had settled on the union offer of 15 cents an hour prior to the strike, this would have meant 37½ cents for a 30-month period as compared with 41 cents in the actual settlement. The kind of 15-cent-an-hour offer made by the union prior to the strike was the same as the 1956 settlement which resulted in an employment cost of 81 cents an hour for the 3-year period. This is exactly what would have happened had we accepted the original so-called 15-cent offer. The union never counts the related costs of wage increases for overtime, holiday pay, vacation pay, and so forth—nor did they at that time look with favor at any limitation of the cost-of-living clause.

"In addition, some writers painted the picture of the Kaiser settlement as being more favorable than the industry settlement. This is not true. The Kaiser settlement cost about 5 percent per annum as compared with 3.75 percent for the industry settlement. The Kaiser wage increase becomes effective July 1 as compared with December 1 for the industry. Furthermore, the industry has an offset against the 3-cent cost-of-living clause in excess insurance costs; Kaiser has no such offset. In addition, the industry is settled for an extra year which is in itself an advantage. A settlement which was better than the Kaiser, can industry, aluminum or copper settlements also was quite a remarkable achievement.

"So what am I saying? Simply that this deal was not 'all black' nor 'all white.' It was in the gray area. If those who believe in this cause keep at it, additional progress can be made with the hope that intelligent people can truly arrest inflation over a reasonable period of time."

Both the foregoing expressions from executives of two important steel companies were spontaneously made, independently of one another, in an informal review of the controversy. It is conceded that, while the industry paid a heavy price in the cost of work interruption, the drawing of public attention to the basic issue of work rules was a gain in a long-range sense for management.

Just what the political gains or losses will be remain yet to be determined. The administration's position is that it acted as an informal mediator and that it made no promises about future legislation and gave no sanction to any agreement on prices. The steelmen say privately that each company will have to decide for itself whether or not to increase prices and when such prices would go into effect.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 24, 1960]

PRESIDENT'S PRESTIGE, POPULARITY INCREASE

(By John M. Cummings)

President Eisenhower enters on the last year of his second and final term with his popularity undiminished, his prestige unmarred, and fully confident in his mission of peace.

He has weathered serious illness, brushed off political opposition. Mr. Eisenhower has a firmer hold on the hearts of his countrymen than at any other time in his 7 White House years. He is stronger than his own Republican Party as the returns of two presidential elections testify.

The "loyal opposition," or Democratic Party, hesitates to come to grips with this man who openly professes his unfamiliarity with the devious ways of politics. In marking the seventh anniversary of the Eisenhower administration the other day, Democrats joined with Republicans in the Senate in singing the praises of the President.

Some observers see President Eisenhower's great popularity as resembling that enjoyed by former President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the height of the New Deal. There is, however, a significant difference.

In the Roosevelt heyday the President enjoyed the support of a strongly Democratic Congress, a Congress of his own party. During most of the Eisenhower regime the Congress has also been Democratic, while the President himself is a Republican.

In this connection the Weekly Review of the Times (of London) recently observed:

"There is a theory that after 6 years of divided government Americans are coming to regard the Presidency as something apart from partisan politics and are prepared to return a Republican to the White House and Democrats to Congress as a regular thing. But this is yet to be proved."

Most Americans, we believe, will disagree with this theory. They feel progress in Government is best assured when the President—be he Republican or Democrat—and the Congress are of the same political faith.

In the opinion of the London publication, President Eisenhower, termed "an exception to many rules," has strongly affected the personality and the politics of Vice President NIXON.

"What is self evident," says the Times, "is that Mr. NIXON has succeeded in transforming the idea which the public had of him and that he has identified himself, under Mr. Eisenhower, with the passionate longing of Americans for peace."

This seems to lend support to the new Nixon idea, a rainy-day brainstorm of the more superficial Washington commentators forced by the inclemency of the weather to forego their late afternoon foraging in the cocktail lounges of the Capital.

Mr. NIXON, destined to be nominated as President Eisenhower's successor at the coming Republican National Convention, has improved over the years as a campaigner.

As the running mate of Mr. Eisenhower in two campaigns, Mr. NIXON fought hard and consistently. The Vice President was never known as a punch puller; he was never distinguished as the champion of the pillow fighters or of the cream-puff heavers. He is a fighter, an aggressive fighter, one who goes into combat as if he meant it.

Fighters don't last very long if they become lax in their training and fail to show improvement. President Eisenhower, trained in the art of war, knows a fighter when he sees one. Which helps to an understanding of why he said of NIXON: "He's my boy."

There has been some intimation of late that the President, at the proper time, will take the stump in behalf of Mr. NIXON. This is to be expected from a man who appreciates how NIXON stepped into the breach at critical periods when the President really needed assistance.

The only President to claim Pennsylvania as his home since the day of James Buchanan goes into his last year in office admired and revered by Republicans and Democrats alike. It may be left to history to determine whether he belongs among the greats of the White House. Certainly no man has done more to advance the cause of world peace.

Under the 22d amendment to the Constitution, a President is limited to two terms. Ike has had it. When he retires a year hence our much-traveled President, our apostle of peace, will carry with him the well done of Americans regardless of party.

THE ROSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleague to a discussion which has been proceeding about the rose, a flower in which the people of my State take great pride, a pride which is shared by many Members of the Senate who love beautiful flowers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article in Parade magazine of January 24, 1960, entitled "The Nation Picks a Flower," which shows that the rose, which is the State flower of the State of New York, in a nationwide poll of more than a million citizens, obtained two-thirds of the vote. The details of the vote are recorded in the article. I am very pleased to be able to submit this article for the RECORD showing the finding of the popularity of the rose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION PICKS A FLOWER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—At left (illustration not printed in RECORD) is the flower that Americans apparently love best—the rose. In a nationwide poll of more than a million petal-loving citizens, florists learned that the rose was a 2 to 1 favorite over its nearest rival, the carnation.

Below are the complete results of the poll, announced exclusively in Parade. Tomorrow these official returns will be handed over to congressional committees, which for some time have been raising a tempest in a hothouse over a thorny issue: our national flower.

It seems we have none, a national blot we share with Russia. Last year nine flowers were nominated in Congress, but none ever got out of the ground. Trying to be helpful, the Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association put ballot boxes in 11,000 florist shops, then listed 20 flowers on the ballots, including the nine suggested in Congress. There also was write-in space for personal favorites.

The rose won in a landslide, getting more than two-thirds of the votes. Only one State, Colorado, was out of step, going carnation.

Reason for the rose's popularity, said voters in Waynesboro, Va., are fourfold: Everyone knows a rose when he sees one; roses are easy to care for; they stand for purity; they grow everywhere.

News of the victory will delight at least two rose-picking Senators. Pennsylvania's HUGH SCOTT has stoutly contended that the rose is "a solid tradition in America." Using softer tactics to influence votes, Maine's MARGARET CHASE SMITH simply wears a rose corsage every day.

With the people apparently agreeing with these two Senators, the big question in Washington now is: Will Uncle Sam soon sport a rose in his buttonhole?

Voting in flower race

1. Rose	386,841
2. Carnation	171,591
3. Chrysanthemum	75,729
4. Lily-of-the-valley	60,033
5. Orchid	46,681
6. Tulip	31,639
7. Gladiolus	30,569
8. Camellia	27,560
9. Black-eyed-susan	22,248
10. Mountain-laurel	20,840
11. Geranium	17,177
12. Magnolia	16,871
13. Goldenrod	16,831
14. Rhododendron	16,678
15. Daffodil	16,675
16. Peony	15,887
17. Shasta daisy	14,542
18. Grass	13,614
19. Corn tassel	12,788
20. Marigold	10,741
21. All others	30,093
Total votes	1,055,629

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join my colleague from New York in expressing gratification over the selection of the rose as being by far the most popular flower in our country. The rose, according to the poll referred to by my colleague, received 386,000 votes. The next flower in popularity, the carnation, received 171,000 votes. None of the other flowers came anywhere near the vote for the rose, the rose receiving about 38 percent of the total vote cast.

The result of the poll demonstrates overwhelmingly that the rose is a flower Americans love best. Over two-thirds of the votes went to this finest of all flowers, and that vote provides added evidence of the desirability of selecting the rose as our national flower.

The solid vote for the rose comes as no surprise to me. For years I have advocated its designation as our national flower symbol, because I feel it embodies the fragrance, beauty, and identity with America which should characterize the national flower.

Furthermore, the rose is one of the finest products of my State of New York, where the best of all roses are grown. I am confident that the results of this poll will add greater impetus to the forces working for the rose's selection as the national flower.

I appreciate my colleague yielding to me at this point.

Mr. JAVITS. All of us in New York are honored by the fact that this beautiful flower is grown particularly in the area from which my colleague comes, and which he represented in Congress as a Representative—Rochester, N.Y. He and I had some pictures taken in connection with our advocating the rose as our national flower.

It is gratifying to both of us that the American people have given the rose this vote of popularity.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from New York.

GRAND STREET BOYS RECOGNIZE DEDICATED TEACHERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the discussion of ways and means to aid our schools and teachers, not enough attention is being given to the role of civic organizations in supplementing the services provided by the local, State, and Federal Governments.

The need for providing incentives leading to an increase in teacher's salaries, which is one of the features of the school construction bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and myself, is recognized in another fashion by the Grand Street Boys' Association and Foundation of New York, of which I have the honor to be a member. I am a member of that organization in the full meaning of the word, because that is where I was born—that is my origin. The president of that fine organization for many years was Judge Jonah B. Goldstein, a very distinguished New Yorker and one time candidate for mayor of the city of New York.

This is one of the most noteworthy local organizations in New York City, and its tribute to the dedicated school

teachers of that city should be widely recognized. I call attention to the fact that the organization has given 100 awards to teachers, each of whom received an illuminated scroll, and 10 of whom were awarded, in addition, a prize of $500 each.

This is a noteworthy example of what citizens can do in recognizing the high calling of the profession of teaching, which we want to see not only better paid but also ennobled by citizen recognition.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Dedicated Teachers," published in the New York Times of January 18, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATED TEACHERS

The Grand Street Boys' Association and Foundation has called fresh attention to the thousands of dedicated teachers in our New York City school system, men and women who work far beyond the call of duty, who through wise and friendly guidance inspire their pupils and who successfully mold the character of the youngsters who will be the voting citizens of tomorrow.

A committee of 35 prominent retired and active educators carefully screened more than 1,000 nominations made by principals, assistant superintendents, faculty councils, parent-teacher organizations, alumni associations, and community leaders. One hundred were selected to receive an illuminated dedicated teacher scroll, and in addition 10 of these were awarded a prize of $500 each.

This expression of appreciation, we are told, should not be interpreted as a substitute for adequate increases in the salary schedules of our teachers. In fact, the Grand Street Boys' Association and Foundation looks upon this project as a starting signal for a general campaign in which all citizens will participate in an effort to improve our schools by providing attractive salaries for our teachers. This will not only help solve the serious problems of our teacher recruitment program, but will also assure us that the effectiveness, the spirit and the morale of our 40,000 New York City instructors will bear the hallmark of the dedicated teacher.

RACIAL BIAS IN UNIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a very remarkable development in the labor union field which has resulted in the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who recently met in convention, eliminating discrimination on grounds of race or color. It has erased from its charter, its organization, and its operation this racial ban.

This action comes following considerable debate on this subject at the annual convention of AFL–CIO. At that time a pledge was made that great efforts would be undertaken to bring about this advance in trade unionism. It has resulted in this action by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I am delighted to see that this has been accomplished. In that connection I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Racial Bias in Unions" published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACIAL BIAS IN UNIONS

The erasure of the color line from the constitution of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, by the overwhelming vote of the delegates to its recent convention, deserves unqualified applause. It marked a notable step forward in the efforts of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations to wipe out race discrimination, for the brotherhood had been admitted to the federation on condition that this action be taken. But this step also raises the question of how far the federation still has to go.

There can be no question as to its commitment to racial equality in its own ranks. Its constitution pledges it to encourage all workers without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin to share in the full benefits of union organization. And its civil rights department is dedicated to redeeming that pledge.

Great advances have been made in that direction—many beginning long before the merger of the AFL and CIO. A conspicuous measure of that progress is the fact that there were bars to Negro membership in the constitutions of 26 AFL affiliates 20 years ago, while only 1 remains—in that of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. Positive guarantees of racial equality are common in union constitutions and bylaws.

But there are still wide divergencies from these principles in the practices of local unions, largely in the building trades. Some locals go so far as to refuse admission to colored applicants—especially serious where jobs themselves depend on union membership. There is also wide exclusion of Negroes from apprentice training programs, which has the same effect.

During the past 2 years the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has made a special effort to prod the AFL–CIO into taking more aggressive action to limit these practices. But the federation has been hampered by a lack of punitive power, except for expulsion, which it is increasingly reluctant to use. And persuasion takes time, especially when deep-rooted customs are involved. Undoubtedly, however, more pressures could be applied. The need for them should be given high priority at the meeting of the federation's executive council next month.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

A LOSS FOR JIM CROW—TRAINMEN'S VOTE TO SCRAP RACIAL BAR SHOULD EASE FRICTION IN AFL–CIO

(By A. H. Raskin)

The merged labor federation has just scored its most dramatic breakthrough in its fight to eliminate racial discrimination in its affiliated unions. The victory took the form of an overwhelming decision by a special convention of the 200,000-member Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to scrap the color bar in its constitution. The action should do much to temper the bitterness that erupted in a floor fight over the race issue at the biennial convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations in San Francisco last September.

The debate had left in the minds of many Negro workers doubts about the sincerity of the federation's desire to wipe out Jim Crow rules and to give meaningful expression to the antibias guarantees embodied in the merger compact 4 years ago.

The unhappiest aspect of the bitter exchange was that it created the outward appearance of a rift over principle between the two men who had been most conspicuous in the implementation of the no-discrimination drive. They were George Meany, the federation's president, and A. Philip Randolph, its only Negro vice president.

DIFFERENCES OVER SPEED

Actually their differences have never been over which way the federation should go, but over how fast its progress should be and how much pressure it should exert to make it faster. One of their specific points of disagreement at San Francisco was whether the parent organization should set a 6-month deadline for action by the trainmen to erase their whites-only clause. Mr. Randolph said "Yes"; Mr. Meany said "No." Mr. Meany's view prevailed.

The topheavy vote by which the brotherhood's convention put its constitution in line with the federation's policies of racial equality vindicated Mr. Meany's belief that more could be accomplished by moral suasion than by using the big stick of an expulsion ultimatum.

He labored quietly, but with typical bluntness, to make certain that the constitutional issue would be put before delegates to the special convention, which had been called primarily to deal with problems raised by the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

He reinforced his behind-the-scenes activity with a telegram to the convention, urging that the brotherhood's basic law be brought into compliance with the general labor ban against racial discrimination. Yesterday, his wish fulfilled, he sent another telegram, in which he said:

"True trade union brotherhood knows no racial distinction—a fact which your brotherhood has now underscored. The trade union movement cannot and will not rest until the civil rights battle hase been won."

NAACP PRAISES MOVE

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which has been sharply critical of the federation's performance in the civil rights field, also registered its gratification.

Roy Wilkins, the association's executive secretary, called the action a heartening reaffirmation of the American principle of equal opportunity for all.

He expressed hope that the decision would spur laggard unions to move forward in ending bias.

The National Urban League and the National Labor Service of the American Jewish Committee urged business organizations to match labor's zeal in promoting fair employment practices.

The trainmen's move leaves only one federation affiliate, the 87,000-member Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, with a constitutional wall against the admission of Negroes. This contrasts with 26 unions in the AFL alone that had such keep-out clauses in 1940 when Mr. Meany first went to Washington as the federation's secretary-treasurer.

However, it is fanciful to pretend that the mere setting right of constitutional language has opened union gates to Negroes everywhere. There are many union locals, especially in the building trades, that are as opposed to integration as any member of the White Citizens Council.

At its midwinter meeting in Miami Beach next month the federation high command intends to strengthen the enforcement machinery that is designed to back up its standing committee on civil rights. Whenever the compliance efforts of the regular committee prove unavailing, a special committee of AFL–CIO vice presidents will be appointed to demand that discrimination cease.

No one expects labor to achieve perfection in this field overnight. The same problems, real and imagined, that block headway in education, housing and most other aspects

of community life operate to retard union leaders and rank-and-file members. But Mr. Meany has given new proof that he and his associates are dedicated to the proposition that bias must go.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in this connection I wish to say that we have been told—those of us who are fighting so hard for civil rights legislation—"just give education a chance, and it will do the job. Don't try to pass laws." I point out to those who advocate that position that it is a fine position if something happens, but that it is a very bad position if nothing happens. Here is a perfect example of that.

No one seeks to pass laws about this matter because it is obviously an action being taken which is consonant with the safeguards of the Constitution. This encourages us to feel that measures of self-regulation and self-discipline in terms of the Constitution will be observed. But when there is a flouting of the law, as there has been in many areas, such as that relating to desegregation in the public schools, and when citizens are denied the right to vote—and there has been a finding by a Federal Commission composed half of Southerners and half of Northerners that citizens are being denied the right to vote—what are we to do but to pass legislation?

I think this is an object lesson to those who would have us take some other course, because it enables us to show a record of performance in compliance with the Constitution. I think we should all realize that there is very much more to these arguments than appears to be the case.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE C. G. WELLINGTON

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, Mr. C. G. Wellington, one of the most important contributors to American journalism, died last week. Mr. Wellington, better known as "Pete" to the Nation's reporters and editors, was executive editor of the Kansas City Star. He was a newspaperman's newspaperman—a friend of mine of many years. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials dealing with Mr. Wellington be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia Missourian, Jan. 22, 1960]

LIFE OF TALENT, TRUTH

American journalism lost one of its really great men last Wednesday when C. G. Wellington, for many years an editor of the Kansas City Star, died suddenly of a coronary occlusion. He would have been 70 years old in about 2 months. He had been city editor, managing editor, and executive editor of the Star; but it was as night editor from 1925 to 1942 that he left his greatest impress on the paper.

"Pete" Wellington did more than anyone else in his generation to maintain the tradition of the Kansas City Star as a paper interested in the man on the street, in the common life of its readers, in the small incidents—amusing, pathetic, entertaining—which go to make up the lowly history of our streets, our homes, our everyday living. These are what we sometimes call "human interest" stories—stories that are interesting not because they deal with so-called "important" events and personages, but because they give back to us bits of our own ordinary life.

"Pete's" activity in this kind of journalism was not limited to setting his reporters on the search for such stories and hunting them out, but he was determined that they should be written simply and effectively. It is easy to overwrite such material, to sentimentalize, to sensationalize. "Pete" taught his boys the values of simplicity, directness, and brevity. That is the reason that Hemingway (to cite but one famous Wellington trainee) has always acknowledged generously the help he received from the great editor during his short term as a Star reporter.

The Star owes much to the work of "Pete" Wellington, and so do the paper's hundreds of thousands of readers throughout the Middle West for the last 40 years.

[From the Kansas City Times, Jan. 22, 1960]

C. G. WELLINGTON

To more than a generation of newspapermen C. G. Wellington has been known as one of the great technicians of his profession. Quiet of manner, unerringly considerate of people who worked under him, he kept up a constant pressure for top performance.

His professional life was a continuous drive for perfection. Of course he knew that in the massive, fast-moving production of a metropolitan newspaper there could never be absolute perfection. Few persons outside a newspaper office could have any conception of the task. As executive editor, Pete Wellington headed a day-and-night operation in which 12 separate editions roll off the presses every day. It requires assembling and evaluating news ranging from the danger spots of the world to a human interest episode on Charlotte Street. Many stores must be rushed to the copydesk a few lines at a time as they are written. Through the many departments and features the operation covers the full range of human activity.

Pete Wellington presided over this operation with an apparent calm and a constant vigil. In this he worked through many people in Kansas City and in the bureaus at the State capitals and Washington. Far more than most staff members realized, he followed their individual work. He maintained a close association with many of the reporters for the press services and other agencies who covered the world.

To some newcomers, perhaps, his quiet and reserved manner was interpreted as aloofness, which was far from his real nature. Persons who knew him realized that Pete Wellington was deeply concerned for the welfare of all the people in the Star operation. He wanted to hear about individual problems. He recognized that in a large organization talent varies widely and he went to strenuous lengths to find the work that would bring out the best in each person.

In the production of the Star, Mr. Wellington was the man in the background. Of course he was known intimately to a very large number of personal friends. But the city as a whole seldom heard his name. He was an editor, not a writer. He was the man behind the bylines of many fine reporters and thousands of stories. He seldom made speeches and was seldom found in the spotlight. The nerve center of his world ranging news interest was at his own desk.

The Wellington reputation as a perfectionist was made as assistant city editor and city editor, jobs that put him in the closest direct contact with reporters and copy readers. He was known for the high standards of Star style that have become familiar to many newspapers. But his conception of fine writing went much deeper than anything that could be specified in a style book.

Ernest Hemingway credits him with bringing a concept of flexible narrative writing to a profession that was then tied to a cut-and-dried dogma of leads and secondary leads. From afar he could sense the drama of a big story. But in his book the fundamental was absolute integrity of facts. A sloppy piece of reporting called for an item-by-item grilling that many a seasoned newspaperman can remember even to this day.

Wellington was a newspaperman's newspaperman. Through his leadership in national professional associations he had friends in the key posts of hundreds of papers. For him a convention of editors was like old home week. And from the delightful visits with friends he brought home a wide range of ideas.

Friendships were extremely important to the exacting Pete Wellington, friendships and his closely knit family. Those of us at the Star, especially, realize that we have lost an extremely warmhearted and devoted friend. We are confident that the professional standards of excellence set by him have left an imprint on "The Star" that will last for many years.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has held hearings in widely separated sections of the country during the past year.

Our job, as defined by Congress, is to visit communities and inquire into local programs and problems in the delinquency field in order to determine the national scope of juvenile misbehavior and suggest areas in which action by the Federal Government may be required.

I might say that we have yet to visit a community in which the presence of our committee was not welcomed by the press, by public officials, by professional personnel working in the delinquency field and by citizens alarmed at the ever-rising tide of juvenile misbehavior and crime.

Examples of this local concern with the national problem of juvenile delinquency are to be seen in two newspaper editorials—one from the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, entitled "How United States Can Help," and the other from the Wilmington (N.C.) Star, entitled "Juvenile Crime Is Everyone's Business." I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Sept. 24, 1959]

HOW UNITED STATES CAN HELP

The image of rampant juvenile crime, which the Senate Committee on Delinquency saw in its first New York hearing, clearly established that local and State authorities will need Federal help to fight teenage terrorism.

How can the Federal Government help New York City and every other American community plagued by juvenile hoodlumism?

The answer lies in two areas: (1) the allocation of sufficient funds to insure establishment of necessary work camps and detention facilities; (2) enactment of effective

Federal legislation to outlaw the interstate traffic in lethal weapons.

Obviously an action program is needed. Such a program, looking to a utilization of the Federal resources, should embrace:

The process of setting up youth work camps, operated on semimilitary lines, could be greatly speeded up if the Government ceded some of the many camp sites it has available to New York State and local authorities. These camps would permit the authorities to weed out the hard core young hoodlums and remove them from circulation. Thus, more effort could be given to reclaiming the salvageable remaining delinquent groups.

Uniform Federal legislation is necessary to dry up the source of firearms, daggers, stilettos and other dangerous weapons now easily available to teenage killers. New York City, according to Supreme Court Justice John E. Cone, has become the dumping ground of vast shipments of foreign weapons of all types because of loopholes in existing weapons laws.

The United States could cede presently vacant Ellis Island, with its numerous buildings, to the city for use as a boys town. This would provide desperately needed custodial facilities. At present, convicted offenders are frequently sent home because there is no place left for them in corrective institutions.

The war on the international and national traffic in narcotics must be stepped up. As Mayor Wagner pointed out, the tie between narcotics and juvenile crimes becomes stronger each day.

Consideration should be given to enactment of more realistic child labor laws to permit youngsters to work rather than being forced to remain in school for which they have no aptitude or interest.

Undoubtedly, there are many other areas where the Federal Government can be of tremendous help in trying to stamp out juvenile gang terrorism.

The assistance of the Government would ease the strain on local and State finances caused by a mobilization of forces to cope with the outbreak of teenage warfare.

Such an action on the part of the Federal Government would in a way be a repayment of some of the $15 billion which the citizens of New York contribute annually to the U.S. Treasury.

Such funds, if wisely expended, could return enormous dividends by saving some of our presently wayward youths from themselves.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Star, Sept. 22, 1959]

JUVENILE CRIME IS EVERYONE'S BUSINESS

A casual observer may think Congress is stepping beyond its bounds in beginning a series of nationwide hearings on juvenile gangs in New York, scene of recent widespread teenage violence, tomorrow.

But that, we believe, is not the case.

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS (Democrat of Missouri) chairman of the Senate committee, explained the situation well when he said "this is not a problem unique to New York City. It transcends State and even national boundaries. He cited cities other than New York which have reported youthful violence and added, "The past decade has seen a sharply yearly rise in unprovoked attacks by juveniles, especially of the 'rat-pack' or gang-type assaults."

This committee, if it fulfills its responsibility, will give official recognition to a type of crime that, so far, has been recorded only in police records and the daily newspapers. It deserves that recognition. The problem simply is too large to ignore on the national level. This is a move against terrorism. What Congress can do about it remains to be seen. But this much can be expected from the committee—an overall picture of the ugly situation with possibly definite recommendations for its correction. In fact, it would be far better if Congress did not attempt any legislation but leave that step to the States and localities. After all, this is a local problem and successful solutions may vary in keeping with the peculiarities of the situation.

Meanwhile, it is logical to expect that any community, including Wilmington, may benefit from the congressional findings. At the least, the fact Congress has made this problem its business emphasizes it should be of concern to every law-abiding citizen, here, or elsewhere.

EDUCATION—INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senate soon will begin debate on legislation affecting our educational system. Much has been said about the educational needs of our Nation. Statistics from my own State of Indiana indicate that Indiana has a serious shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers. This situation exists throughout the Nation. As we begin discussing this problem I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a good expression of one of the major prevailing viewpoints. This was made in a speech by one of the members of the Indiana delegation to Congress, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS of the Third Congressional District. In a speech at the seventh annual National Conference on Federal Legislation of the National Education Association in Washington last month, Congressman BRADEMAS discussed this problem ably and intelligently. It deserves the serious attention of Members of the Senate. It is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1960, on pages 717–718.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still conducting morning business.

Is there further morning business?

THE BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, one of the most important questions facing this country today is whether or not the Federal budget should be balanced. My own unequivocal answer is "Yes." Last week, as a part of a personal campaign to emphasize the need of balancing the budget, I mailed to thousands of Marylanders a questionnaire entitled "The Battle of the Budget." The letter asked each constituent to indicate whether he would increase or decrease the basic items of the Federal budget, estimated for the coming fiscal year at $84 billion. My purpose was twofold: To stimulate a general interest and understanding of how tax funds are spent, and to use the results in my fight to hold back Government spending, for I am confident that the people of Maryland and the entire country understand that if a nation spends more than it has, it risks bankruptcy and disaster.

It has since occurred to me, Mr. President, that a more general dissemination of the questionnaire might be helpful, and so I ask unanimous consent to have "The Battle of the Budget" inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, extending an invitation to everyone who reads it to send his answer to me. It is my firm conviction that this battle is everyone's fight.

There being no objection, the questionnaire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER PRESENTS THE BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

As a taxpayer who pays—I invite you to join me in the battle of the budget. There is but one rule—the basic law of economics—to avoid economic ruin, keep your expenses within your income. As a nation of individual, if you spend more than you have, you risk bankruptcy and disaster.

Below are the basic budget items and amounts the President recommends be spent to meet our Nation's needs, and yet achieve a balanced Federal budget for the coming year. What items would you decrease or increase?

Basic budget items	President's recommended expenditure in billions	Your suggested expenditure in billions
Defense:		
Army	$9.4	
Navy	11.7	
Air Force	18.6	
Missiles ($3,500,000,000 included in the above 3 items)		
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1.3	
Military assistance to friendly foreign nations	1.8	
Atomic energy	2.7	
Stockpiling and defense production expansion	.1	
Foreign aid	2.2	
Space exploration	.6	
Commerce and housing:		
Public housing and community development	.4	
Business aids, regulation, and postal service	1.7	
Agriculture:		
Price supports	4.0	
Other programs	1.6	
Natural resources:		
River development and public power	1.4	
Conservation	.5	
Labor and welfare:		
Payments to needy and unemployed persons	2.1	
School lunch and vocational training programs	.4	
Health, education, scientific and medical research	2.1	
Veterans benefits	5.5	
Interest on public debt of $290,000,000,000 (a "must" item)	9.5	$9.5
General Government expenses	2.0	
Allowance for contingencies	.2	
(Surplus revenue available for debt or tax reduction)	(4.2)	
Total	84.0	

To meet these expenditures, the Government is expected to collect about $84 billion in taxes. If the total of your suggested expenditures is not more than $84 billion, you have won the battle of the budget.

But the real victory lies in taxpayers like yourself maintaining a general understanding of how our tax funds are spent. In detail, the Federal budget is incredibly complex. It is more than 1,000 pages long. Congress will require many months of study before deciding upon next year's expenditures. However, this complexity should not discour-

age taxpayers from a more general interest in budget affairs nor obscure the desperate need for a balanced budget. This is why every American should concern himself with the Federal budget and why I have sent you this letter.

Furthermore, as your Senator, your views on Government spending, high taxes, and inflation as reflected by your suggested expenditures will be of considerable value to me as Congress examines the Federal budget and new spending proposals.

So, may I respectively urge you to join the battle of the budget and return this "scorecard" to me. Remember, every Federal tax dollar is partly your own.

(Name)

(Address)

JOHN M. BUTLER,
U.S. Senator, Maryland.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment on page 1, line 2, by striking out the word "No," and inserting this language:

Except in the cases of elections held to fill vacancies, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, without his losing the right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No Senator has the floor at the present time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in accordance with the memorandum, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That no candidate's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that any otherwise qualified person was denied the right to register or vote in the primary on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have asked that copies of the amendment be placed on the desks of Senators. It is in effect the same as the amendment I offered shortly before we concluded our business on Friday. It effectuates the purposes which I had in mind more accurately, and does follow the language of the 15th amendment in precise terms.

I concede, Mr. President, that my original amendment, which was written on the floor, was inspired by the very moving speech made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in support of his amendment to require all candidates for the Senate and for the House of Representatives to be nominated by a primary. In his speech the Senator spoke very eloquently about the need for extension of the suffrage, in the "great liberal tradition." He described as "undemocratic" any system in which a political convention can reverse the judgment of the people in an election "where everybody had a right to vote," and he concluded with a question, which I should like to quote, "Why should we not guarantee democratic procedures?" I think no one could help being moved by such a stirring appeal as that made by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I know the deep conviction with which the Senator from Louisiana speaks on this subject. I have only recently reviewed the discussion of the voting problems in Louisiana, which appears in the report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. I am sure the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana has also read the report.

I sensed, in listening to the Senator's brilliant advocacy of his amendment, a keen awareness on his part of the problems discussed in the report of the Civil Rights Commission. I interpreted the Senator's amendment as an attempt to deal with these problems wherever they might exist in the Union, including the great State of New York.

In an effort to strengthen the Senator's proposal by the addition of a sanction for violating its proscriptions, I offered my own perfecting amendment. I had hoped the Senator would welcome my amendment but apparently he is not willing to accept it as an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. President, it may be that some Members of the Senate are unaware of the discussion in the report of the Civil Rights Commission which has bestirred this interest in guaranteeing elections under "democratic procedures," to use the words of my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

It seems, according to the report, that there are four parishes in Louisiana in which voting-age Negroes far outnumber voting-age whites. Those are the parishes of East Carroll, Madison, Tensas, and West Feliciana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to know if the Senator from New York knows that the junior Senator from Louisiana was one to take the attitude in Louisiana that all qualified persons are entitled to vote. In those parishes to which the Senator from New York makes reference, most of the parish officials met and unanimously signed a declaration condemning the junior Senator from Louisiana for his position.

Furthermore, I want the Senator to know what the situation will be under his proposed amendment, assuming that the candidate runs for election and is denied the benefit of having the votes of those people who would otherwise vote for him.

If such a person were successful, notwithstanding the fact that many people who would like to vote for him did not have that privilege, he would nevertheless not have the benefit of being elected, under the Senator's amendment, even though those people would have voted for him had they had the opportunity.

Mr. KEATING. In the first place, in answer to the distinguished Senator, I commend the Senator without reserve for the fine attitude which he took with reference to the revelations in these four parishes. The Senator's reiteration of the right of every qualified voter to vote is highly commendable. I cannot praise him enough for that assertion and the reassertion of it here on the floor today. It is to insure that right that my amendment is proposed.

I cannot see why the amendment would be objectionable, if it will insure what the Senator from Louisiana has so vigorously fought for and as to which he has taken issue with the people in these very parishes.

What the Civil Rights Commission found was that not a single Negro has been registered to vote in any one of these four parishes.

When the Commission attempted to inquire into this situation, what was the result? The Commission was met immediately with a demand from the counsel for the joint legislative committee of the Louisiana Legislature that the Commission disclose the names of the Louisiana citizens who had complained. It seems this State official wanted to restore democratic procedures in Louisiana by presenting the complainants' names to a grand jury so that they could be charged with perjury and duly prosecuted by the Louisiana authorities. Is there any wonder that after an experience like that even as firm a believer in States rights as the Senator from Louisiana calls upon the Federal Government, as he does by his amendment, to protect democratic procedures in elections?

The Civil Rights Commission has thus far been stymied in its efforts to hold public hearings in Louisiana. However, the Commission's field investigations indicated three major tactics of voting denial in Louisiana, which are worth recounting here.

First, an effective bar to Negro registration is the so-called voucher requirement exacted by registrars, under which the registrar requires that each prospective registrant obtain two registered voters to swear to his identity. Since no Negroes are registered in four parishes, and since no white person, with only one exception, indicated in the Commission's report, would vouch for a prospective Negro registrant, prospective registrants are rather effectively discouraged.

The second method is by preliminary questioning on the part of the registrars. This has become very widespread since the initiation of a campaign by the joint legislative committee of the Louisiana Legislature in December 1958 to reduce Negro regstration in Louisiana from 130,000 to 13,000 out of 481,000 eligibles.

A typical tactic in this preliminary examination is to ask the applicant for registration to explain the meaning of the clause in the Louisiana constitution which reads as follows:

> The legislature shall provide by law for change of venue in civil and criminal cases.

That would be rather hard for anyone other than a lawyer to explain, and would be hard for many of the voters in this county to explain.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. KEATING. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish my sentence.

There is another clause about which applicants are asked, according to the report. They are asked to interpret the clause which reads:

> Proscription shall not run against the State in any civil matter.

That, likewise, might be difficult even for lawyers to explain, as a basis for obtaining the right to vote.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the attempt to which he refers, to disenfranchise 126,000 Negroes, occurred about 18 months ago, and continued for a period of 7 or 8 months, and that there are still about 139,000 Negroes registered, notwithstanding the effort by some persons to reduce the number of Negroes registered to 13,000?

Mr. KEATING. As I pointed out, this occurrence took place in December 1958, and I hope the situation has been corrected to some degree since that time. But I shall point out in a moment that in another case representations were made to our committee by the Attorney General of Louisiana—never by the Senator from Louisiana—which were not borne out when further investigation was made. I shall deal with that question in a moment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is talking about reducing the number from 130,000 to 17,000. I suspect he will find that the number registered now is greater than it was at the time to which the Senator refers.

Mr. KEATING. I hope so, because the Commission found that there were 481,000 who were eligible.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator refers to 481,000 who were eligible. Does he mean that that number are eligible, all factors being considered?

Mr. KEATING. Four hundred and eighty-one thousand were deemed eligible by the Commission on Civil Rights, made up of the six men to whom reference has been made. I am sure the Senator feels, as I do, that they are distinguished citizens.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can the Senator tell us the percentage of white voters deemed eligible who are registered?

Mr. KEATING. I cannot do that, but I am sure that there is a greater percentage of white eligible voters who do vote than of Negro voters.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will concede, will he not, that in Louisiana, and in many other States, a substantial number of white persons eligible to vote simply have not gone to the trouble to register and qualify?

Mr. KEATING. There is no question about it, and it is a national shame. I believe that in our last Presidential election only 60 percent of the eligible voters voted. That is regrettable. There is no question that that is true.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say, by way of preface, that no one has been more diligent in the furtherance of a clean elections bill which has as its primary objective reporting, limitations, and full public disclosure of contributions, than has the distinguished Senator from New York.

The able Senator from New York is aware that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported the bill, which has been amended, and which is sought to be further amended.

The bill has as its primary objective the things I have mentioned. The Senator is also aware that for several days last past hearings have been held, which will continue until February 5, on the so-called Federal registrars bill, and that the civil rights issue will be drawn in the Senate on February 15, less than a month hence.

Bearing in mind that all Senators who have supported the registrar bill have a keen interest—indeed, an overriding interest—in the primary purposes of this elections bill, which is a reporting bill, a disclosure bill, and a limitations bill, does the Senator not believe that at this time he could withhold his discussion of civil rights? I think the Senator need have no question as to my views upon that subject. That question could be brought before the Senate in connection with civil rights legislation.

This is not a civil rights bill, any more than I think—most lamentably—the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to require primaries relates to the two basic issues of the bill.

I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is a sweeping measure. Bearing in mind, of course, that democratic government has its foundation in free elections of the people's representatives, I believe that, as a matter of broad principle, any proposal which extends and builds up the application of elections is substantially good.

In the past few days, as I have tried to point out, we have almost reached the point of final passage of the bill. A number of amendments have been offered, many of which have been withdrawn. They were not directed to the subject matter of the pending legislation.

On Friday last the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] demonstrated that the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana would raise innumerable questions as to its effect on various State laws. I do not believe that these issues are so simple as they appear to be on the surface. Neither of the questions now presented was suggested to the committee when the bill was under consideration there.

I am glad the Senator from Louisiana voted for one of the amendments, the so-called reporting amendment, relating to the many committees which it has been possible heretofore to set up within the limits of a State. I think it would be most unfortunate if we should continue the discussion of the bill by constantly offering amendment after amendment which bears no relation, really, to the essence of the bill, any more than to the purposes of the bill.

The Senate has voted, by two record votes, by a very satisfactory majority, that it wants intrastate committees included, and that it wants primaries included—primaries, as defined in the bill, also to include caucuses and conventions.

This is not a bill designed to compel the various States to proceed in a given manner with respect to their own conduct of elections. Now we find ourselves off on the civil rights issue, which I had hoped might be properly debated—and I am sure it will be thoroughly and extensively debated—following the 15th of February.

I make these suggestions, I hope, without presumption, but in all good spirit. If the bill can be voted upon by the Senate as an elections bill, stripped of extraneous matters which do not relate to the heart and soul and purposes of the proposed legislation, we shall all be better off. The other questions could be reached in some other way, at some other time.

I think it is very distressing that, after almost 2 weeks of discussion and voting on various amendments, we should be faced with a situation in which amendment after amendment is offered and debated. I do not mean to say that Senators do not have the right to offer amendments. However, if we are to have a cascade of amendments upon all manner of subjects and questions which could be raised in connection with some phase of an election, we may encounter greater difficulty than I presently anticipate in

the House of Representatives. I know that we have very strong support in the House of Representatives for the pending legislation. Many Members of the House have so expressed themselves to me, without any solicitation on my part.

I entreat Senators to bear in mind that this bill is the product of a great deal of work and consideration, and that undertaking to write legislation of this importance on the floor of the Senate is not in the interest of good legislation. We might have another amendment, and another so-called retaliatory amendment offered, ad infinitum, far into the night, far into the week, and far into the Lord only knows where.

Civil rights is one question to be considered. I believe that the question of the States proceeding as they decide to proceed under their electoral procedures is another sort of question. The bill does not set forth electoral procedures. It sets forth reporting procedures. It sets forth limitations, under the amendment which has been adopted; and it sets forth what a candidate may do with respect to his own expenditures, and other matters which are germane.

I recognize that in the Senate no point of germaneness can properly be raised and upheld by the Chair. But I find it very disappointing that we are now going so far afield in connection with all these matters which have not heretofore been considered. We may find ourselves in a state of exceedingly great confusion if we go beyond the point where the essential elements of the bill agreed to by the process of amendments relate only to the strengthening of the 1925 Corrupt Practices Act and the extension of that act. That was my primary purpose in the bill of 1955, the bill of 1957, and the pending bill which was intended to have been acted upon in 1959.

I hope Senators may find it in their judgments and consciences a matter of consideration, if we really wish to pass the basic and fundamental measure which is before the Senate at this time.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me. He has been exceedingly interested in this proposed legislation and has been exceedingly diligent with respect to it. I would say the same certainly of the Senator from Louisiana.

I do not undertake in any way to sit in judgment upon the consciences or the inclinations of Senators with respect to the offering of amendments. That is not my province and not my intention.

I believe the membership of the Senate is ready to vote upon the heart and soul of the pending bill as it now lies before us. We have had amendments proposed relating to extraneous matters, such as labor and various inhibitory and extensive applications of the bill. Many of them have been withdrawn, and I am very grateful to the proponents of those amendments who have done so.

I hope—and I know many other Members of the Senate also hope—that we may, within the confines of free and unlimited debate, as is the right of every Senator, to come to some termination of the proposed legislation before us, and not to wander so far afield that we will be unable to recognize exactly what it is we are trying to say at the end of the period of discussion and the adoption or failure of adoption of the several amendments here proposed. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. In reply to the rather extensive question of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I would say that I share to a very great degree the views the Senator has expressed. I recognize a civil rights debate, so-called, will take place on the floor starting February 15.

I said on Friday evening—and I renew the statement now—that I am perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment provided the Senator from Louisiana withdraws his amendment. I do not believe the Senator from Louisiana, when he attempts to impose upon all States a specific method of nominating candidates, is keeping within the primary purpose of the pending bill, which is to place a limit on expenditures in elections and primaries and to provide reporting procedures. That is the essential purpose of the bill.

We now have before us an amendment which provides that every State must hold primaries to select their candidates. A few States do not hold primaries for candidates either for Members of the House or the Senate, or both. All my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana provides is that every qualified person shall have the right to vote in the primaries which he wants to require. If we are to require States to hold primaries, then I believe the States should be required to permit all qualified persons to vote.

I differ in one particular with the implications of the Senator from Missouri. My amendment involves a question of civil rights, but it is by no means a civil rights measure. It is only one facet of it. It is one of the protections which we should afford to every qualified voter in this country. It does not open up by any means the whole field of civil rights legislation; it does not guarantee our citizens the equal protection of the laws in many other areas, which, I hope, before this session of Congress adjourns, we will take care of. In light of the fact that the Senator from Louisiana is disinclined to withdraw his amendment and desires to press it, which is entirely his right and privilege, I believe we should deal with the entire implications of this subject.

I have just finished describing the second method used in the State of Louisiana for disenfranchising Negro voters.

The third method of disenfranchising Negroes is by massive challenges under the auspices of the White Citizens Councils.

One of the most common bases for such challenges was alleged errors in spelling on the application forms, although some of the challengers seemed to have a little trouble with their own spelling, since they spelled the word "s-p-i-l-l-i-n-g." These challenges were timed so that it would be impossible to obtain relief in time to vote in the next election.

Mr. President, is it any wonder that the Senator from Louisiana is shocked and dismayed by the absence of democratic procedures in Federal elections? Who can help but be shocked and dismayed by these conditions? I would be shocked and dismayed if any Senator was unshocked and undismayed by such revelations.

Of course, there are some of us in this body to whom the Commission's findings are not exactly revelations. I remember well a colloquy I had with the attorney general of Louisiana in 1957 when he was a witness before the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I was then a member. He was asked about a purge of thousands of registered Negro voters in Ouachita Parish in Louisiana in 1956 at the behest of the white citizens councils. He assured the committee that this was an isolated incident, expressed his own regret at its occurrence, and in answer to a question from me stated that 99 percent of the persons involved had been restored to the rolls. When these facts were checked by the Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice, it was reported to the committee that the purge was widespread, and in specific reference to the situation in Ouachita Parish, that over 3,000 out of a total of 4,000 registered Negroes were prevented from voting in the general elections as a result of the purge. This same attorney general by State law serves as counsel for the State registrars. Is it any wonder these conditions still persist in this State?

Mr. President, now that I have acknowledged the inspiration for my amendment, I want to make it clear that I am perfectly willing to withhold discussion of the problem of democratic procedures in elections until the date of February 15 previously announced for this purpose. If the Senator from Louisiana is unable to restrain his desire for electoral reform until that date, however, then I see no reason for not dealing with the issue he has raised in the most effective way possible and that is all my amendment seeks to do.

There was some talk in this Chamber on Friday of hypocrisy. I do not want to deal with motives in this debate, only with facts. And anyone who will face the facts will admit, first, that the two-party system in New York guarantees greater political choice to the electorate of that State than any direct primary does to the electorate of a one-party State; second, that the elimination of discrimination on account of race and color in elections is the most important step the Congress can take in guaranteeing democratic procedures in Federal elections; third, as indicated by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that this whole subject is unrelated to the Corrupt Practices Act, which is the pending business; and finally, that, if we are going to have forced primaries in each State of the Union, then we should see to it that every qualified voter is accorded the right to vote in those primaries.

I would be happy to join in the request of the Senator from Louisiana that he withdraw his amendment, so that I may withdraw my own amendment. If he is unwilling to do so, then I shall be forced to ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had prepared a memorandum with regard to the amendment which was offered on the

floor on Friday, pointing out several things which demonstrated the complete ridiculousness of it. Some of the obviously ridiculous things in it have now been eliminated.

For example, the amendment offered on Friday would have caused an entire primary election to be invalidated in any of the States which hold them—that does not include New York, but includes 47 other States—if a person had failed to vote because there was a snowstorm. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from New York would have thrown out the entire election because an act of God had prevented someone from going to the polls.

The Senator from New York has now more or less corrected that situation by pinpointing his amendment on the race question, which I assumed he would do over the weekend, once he discovered that he had failed to pinpoint his proposal on the race question. But now he has pinpointed his amendment more on the race issue.

Even so, the memorandum to which I have made reference contains several points which are equally valid to show how ridiculous the proposal of the Senator from New York remains. For example, the Senator from New York had said that if one qualified person had been denied the right to register or to vote, an entire primary election would be thrown out. Now he pinpoints his amendment on race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has been criticized in a resolution signed by practically every official in every parish in Louisiana where no Negroes are registered because he has said that Negroes have the right to vote. Those officials got together and signed a resolution stating that the junior Senator from Louisiana was not representing his people because he took the attitude that Negroes do have that right.

If an election were held in Louisiana without Negroes voting in those parishes, and if the junior Senator from Louisiana should be elected notwithstanding that fact, and even if it were established that those people would have voted for him had they been accorded the opportunity, nevertheless he would be denied the privilege of having his name on the general election ballot.

Moreover, the amendment of the Senator from New York overlooks the fact that even if we pass a so-called Civil Rights Act providing that the Federal Government should take over the registration and attempt to regulate the procedures thereunder, if the Federal agency might not be successful in seeing to it that every colored person who was qualified had an opportunity to register and to vote. If the Federal registrar should fail to do that, if he should fail to make certain that someone who was entitled to vote was on the rolls, then the entire election would have to be thrown out regardless of how those people voted. The election would be void even if the disenfranchised voter would have voted for the same result as occurred in the election.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator did not mean to imply that there was anything in my amendment about a Federal registrar, did he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. KEATING. My amendment leaves it to a Federal court to determine the question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; but I have no doubt whatever that when a proposal is offered to set aside State registration procedures in favor of a Federal registrar, the Senator from New York will vote for it.

Mr. KEATING. I have not proposed that we set aside State election machinery. To that I would be opposed. The Federal registrar would supersede the State election machinery in a State election only when the State machinery broke down or failed to function. Only under those circumstances would the Federal registrar function.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. All I am saying is that if the Senator included everything recommended by the Civil Rights Commission, including the so-called Federal registrar proposal, and if the Federal registrar should fail to register someone who was qualified to vote, then the whole election would have to be thrown out, regardless of whom the person might have voted.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield for a question.

Mr. HENNINGS. With the Senator's indulgence, I should like to refer to both his amendment and to that of the Senator from New York. Irrespective of any attempted influence by the candidate, or by any of his agents or others, under the language of the amendment of the Senator from New York, a man could be nominated, but if one person, otherwise qualified, was denied the right to vote because of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude, the nomination would be invalid. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. That would not be constitutional.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No; it would not be.

Mr. HENNINGS. Now we come to the Senator's amendment. The Senator is a firm believer in States rights.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will yield as soon as I have finished.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator disposes of these things rather cursorily.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not want to dispose of them cursorily, because obviously there has been no desire to consider these amendments cursorily during the past several days. So I am certain that none of them will be disposed of very quickly.

I do not know whether the amendment offered this morning by the Senator from New York has been changed from his amendment which was under consideration on Friday.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment I offered this morning differs from the one which was offered last week.

Mr. HENNINGS. The one offered today reads:

And provided further, That no candidate's nomination in a primary election shall be valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction—

I presume that could be a Federal district court, sitting in that capacity, irrespective of other appellate jurisdictions, such as the court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States, and a judgment by that tribunal of the first instance would, of course, be controlling.

Now we come to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. There are various laws in the different States which regulate the process of nomination. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that we should as a matter of legislative policy reach into the State of Louisiana, for example, and say that Louisiana is not entitled to have runoff primaries? Would the Senator say that one primary election shall be sufficient, and that it shall be determining as to which nominees shall appear on the ballot in the general election?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It had never occurred to me that the Federal Government should seek to require primaries by legislation until an amendment was agreed to on the floor of the Senate to regulate primaries.

This is a bill which, in its present form—and the Senator himself was a sponsor of an amendment which made it such—regulates primary elections. It seems to me that it is putting the cart before the horse to try to regulate primary elections without first requiring that primary elections shall be held.

The Senator from Missouri asked about the constitutionality of the Keating amendment. I think most of the difficulty could be corrected by a modifying amendment; therefore, I make no particular point of it. However, article I, section 5, of the Constitution provides:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

It would be my judgment that that in itself would prohibit a Federal court from taking jurisdiction of a primary election.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator for yielding. I simply point out the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves when we try to legislate by amendments offered on the floor of the Senate, and which I am sorry to say seem to bear certain patent defects.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall be willing to vote on the amendment in short order, and then in short order to vote on the amendment I have offered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield so that I may answer the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Missouri rather cursorily said that this amendment is unconstitutional. I should like to know what provision of the Constitution the Senator from Missouri thinks this amendment violates.

It has been drawn to come expressly within the provisions of the 15th amendment.

My reply to the Senator from Louisiana is that it is true that we are the judges of the qualifications of our own Members. We, by this amendment, will continue to be the judges of the qualifications of our Members.

We would, in turn, after such an election had been held, have to apply the amendment to each specific instance. But there is nothing in this amendment, which, in my judgment, violates the provision of the Constitution to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from New York will find a number of cases which hold that the courts will not take jurisdiction of election cases, because of the constitutional provision that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

Mr. KEATING. That is true. I am familiar with those cases. I served several times on the House of Representatives committee which conducts investigations of elections under the present state of the law. If this amendment were written into the law, in my judgment, the court would then take jurisdiction of only such cases as came within its terms.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that the particular defect of the Senator's amendment could be eliminated by modifications to achieve the same effect. But the earlier studies I have made indicate this his amendment is not subject to correction so long as it is in the form in which it is: First, on the basis that this is an attempt to justify a denial to all people of the right to vote, merely because one person has been denied the right to vote, notwithstanding the fact that that one person might have voted the same way as the prevailing majority, had he had the opportunity to vote.

The 15th amendment itself guarantees to all persons the right to vote. It provides that they shall not be denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. By virtue of that provision, the so-called white primaries in the Southern States have been declared unconstitutional. By virtue of that same provision, colored people barred from the rolls have been ordered restored to the rolls. A Federal court in New Orleans, La., recently ordered a number of persons restored to the rolls, after their names had been removed because they had been challenged. This was done on the basis that they had been discriminated against.

In addition to this, the Senator from New York stated on the floor last Friday:

> I am opposed to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana. I shall vote against that amendment, either with or without the amendment which I have sought to have attached to it.

So does the amendment offered by the Senator from New York represent a sincere attempt to benefit those who might have been discriminated against in the election proceeding. Oh, no. It is not an effort to assure their right to vote. This is apparently merely an attempt to have withdrawn an amendment which would give members of all races, in the most populous States of the Union, the right to choose who their nominees shall be, rather than have them chosen by party machinery, or by politicians of the major parties.

Here is an amendment I have proposed to protect all minorities and all majorities, and give them an opportunity to vote. They have that right, and it is protected by the 15th amendment, to which I have made reference. Furthermore, there is to come before the Senate a civil rights bill, in which attempts will be made to make sure everybody will have an opportunity to vote by sending into certain areas Federal registrars who will see to it that everyone will enjoy the right to register and vote. The Senate will vote on it.

But I say that if we are to regulate primaries, the first thing we should provide for is to make sure that the people have the right to see that a candidate of their choice is selected. Forty-seven out of the fifty States have that system.

We have heard of undemocratic practices in other States. For example, it has been contended that the South Dakota procedure should be permitted. What is that procedure? We are told that if, in an election for Representative, and I assume for Senator, less than 35 percent vote for the leading candidate, that man's name can be taken off the ballot and he can be denied the opportunity for nomination in favor of someone who may have received only 1 percent of the votes.

How would that apply to the great State of Louisiana? We recently had the election of a Governor. The high man received about 33 percent of the votes. The second man received 26 percent. The third man had 19 percent, and so on down. It went down to a number of candidates who had less than 1 percent. If the procedure which is in effect in South Dakota had existed in Louisiana, then the democratic governing body—which is elected by the people, by the way—could have picked any one of those 10 candidates and put him on the ballot as the Democratic nominee, notwithstanding the will of the people as expressed for the high man and the second man.

My amendment does not require second elections or runoffs. The States can use high-man systems if they desire. The amendment I have proposed applies only to Federal officers; it does not apply to State officers. It requires that in Federal elections there shall be an election in primaries if it happens that one of the major parties is involved. I have provided that that does not have to take place if one has received less than 10 percent of the votes in previous elections. I would be willing to provide 20 percent. In some States that may apply to the Democratic Party or Republican Party. Certainly, the Republican Party may in the South get 10 percent, or even 20 or 25 percent. But certainly, insofar as the nomination is concerned, it means one of two persons is going to be selected.

It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana, and I am sure it seems to others, that the election system should let the people speak for themselves in determining who the candidate shall be.

I believe the amendment I have offered has great merit, because it embodies the way 47 of the States have decided the election should take place. The argument that it is more democratic to select party nominees for the office of Senator or Representative by those who represent the Republican or Democratic Party is completely without reason.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Let me make one minor correction. In the State of New York, candidates for Representatives in the House are now selected in primaries. Candidates for the Senate are chosen at a convention, the delegates to which are elected. There is that distinction. I wanted to clear the record on that point.

The Senator has challenged my statement in which I said that I would vote for this amendment to the amendment, but would vote against the Long amendment, whether or not it had this amendment attached, as a lack—I know he did not mean it as such—of sincerity on my part in offering my amendment to his amendment. I consider that there is no inconsistency whatever in my position. I feel that the effort of the Senator from Louisiana to impose a primary system and to supplant the State legislatures in prescribing how a candidate shall be chosen is an invasion of the rights of the States to determine their own method of electing their public officials.

However, I would say that if that amendment is to be adopted, then really we should provide that every qualified person shall have the right to vote and that none shall be denied the right to vote because of discrimination on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

I would vote for that language in a civil rights bill. I think it should be in the law of our land. But I recognize that there are other methods more orderly than this of incorporating such a provision in our law. I am offering it at this time only because, if we are to adopt the Long amendment, then certainly this simple amendment should be added to it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I seek the floor only for one purpose, of attempting, as a matter of duty, to make it clear that the pending bill is not a civil rights measure. I think the Senator from New York and the Senator from Louisiana have made it clear that in the case of the Senator from Louisiana, he is seeking to make the primary system applicable to all States as long as primaries are going to be regulated by this proposed law. In the case of the Senator from New York, he says that if we are going to make primaries universal, they should be made so to the extent of including the right of everybody to vote in them.

I agree with the junior Senator from New York, and say that I shall vote for his amendment to the amendment, but shall vote against the Long amendment

even if the amendment to it should be adopted. I say that because some idea has gotten abroad that a civil rights bill is being attached to the pending bill. I do not believe anyone is looking at this bill as a civil rights bill, nor does anyone have any desire to introduce into this bill the Federal registrars proposal, which I as well as others advocate, to secure the right to vote, in view of the disclosure of the very deplorable conditions which have been set forth by the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. President, what presents itself is one of the situations we meet in parliamentary experience. Mine is no greater or less than that of other Members, but legislative bodies have a handy way of dealing with this problem.

I will say to my friend from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that I sympathize with him in his effort to have this amendment withdrawn—I, too, would hope to have it withdrawn—but it does not seem probable or even possible. However, I know that the Senate in its wisdom will dispose of this particular matter. I think it would be a great mistake to have the proposal touch a civil rights bill. I think it would be unfair. I think those opposed to civil rights legislation do not consider me a friend of their position, but I think very sincerely it would be unfair to have this civil rights matter touch this bill. I hope it will not happen.

Finally, on the issue of primaries, I will say to my friend from Louisiana, I have no particular preconception of whether a primary system is better than our system in New York. As a matter of fact, as the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has pointed out, we do have primaries for Members of the House of Representatives and presidential electors within each congressional district. As a matter of fact, when I ran for office in 1956, at the convention candidates for the House were chosen by primaries in the congressional districts. They are survivors of a primary. Everybody knows what functions they will perform when they are elected. They might even qualify within the definition of the Senator's amendment, if our legislature chose to call such processes primaries.

Nevertheless, laying that point aside, I think what the Senator from Missouri is trying to do, because of varying State laws or the question of morality in parts of the country, due to the problem of contributions, is to have the Congress do its duty according to article I, section 4 of the Constitution, and to amend or alter regulations otherwise made by the States.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues that on the issue of universal primaries no such case has been made. Therefore, no matter how we may feel about States rights, we are responsible. Sixty percent of us in this body are lawyers. We do not want to go into an area where there has been no proof, no demonstrable case made, that the Federal Government should impose its power.

I can understand the logician's position in terms of what we passed, and now of what the Senator from Louisiana says we should add to it. That same logic extends, with the greatest sincerity, to my very distinguished and learned colleague from New York.

All of this leads me to two propositions. First, no case has been made with respect to Federal intervention in respect to ordering universal primaries. Secondly, I do not think it is to the interest of anybody—and it is certainly not to the interest of the country—to have this matter touch off the civil rights debate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator not think a service would be done in regard to the clean elections bill if both amendments were withdrawn?

Mr. JAVITS. I said that earlier, before my dear friend, with whom I have had many spirited debates on this subject, came into the Chamber. I said exactly that. I think all of us have in a way agreed on that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Rhode Island, and other Senators in expressing the hope that both of the proposed amendments will be withdrawn.

First, I should like to address myself for a moment to the position taken by my learned friends from New York, the gist of which is that theirs is not a civil rights amendment. We know perfectly well that this amendment is not addressed to the general elections because it is sought to be limited to the primaries. That means, of course, it is limited to the States in which the primaries are the elections.

I have not heard any expression of passion upon the part of my friends as to protecting the civil rights of even the lowliest single voter in their State in the general elections. It is rather evident that the Senators are adopting a procedure which is well known on the floor of the Senate, as well as in military life, which is that the best defense is a good offense. They have evidently taken over that position in offering the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend yield to me on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the Senator is entitled to an explanation as to why the amendment is limited to primaries. That is the limitation in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, to which this is an amendment. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana relates only to primaries, and therefore this amendment also is so limited.

I would of course contend that the same rule should apply in general elections as in primaries, but the injection of the primaries into the picture was not the work of the Senator from New York, but was the work of the Senator from Louisiana, whose amendment is drawn only to that point.

In the light of what has been said here, I renew my complete willingness to withdraw my amendment provided the Senator from Louisiana is willing to withdraw his.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if we are to take at face value the statement of my learned friend from New York—and I am sure we shall—it means that if his amendment is agreed to and is attached to the amendment as it relates to primaries, he will immediately offer an amendment, if he is to be logical, which will apply to general elections. I am sure the Senator is going to be logical, because the Senator from New York is always logical, and I compliment him upon that fact.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate those fine compliments. They are what I would expect from the generous Senator from Florida. However, I think it would be very illogical at this point, as has been indicated, to go further into the civil rights field.

The junior Senator from New York never stated that this particular amendment did not relate to civil rights. It does relate to civil rights. I say that affirmatively. However, it is limited only to the confines of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall not offer such an amendment in regard to the bill, nor do I think it would be appropriate in regard to this proposed legislation to deal with civil rights generally or civil rights in general elections.

So, logical or illogical, I shall not do that, much as I contend that the same rules which apply in primaries should apply in general elections.

I think the proper time to deal with the subject of general elections is on or about February 15, when we consider the bill dealing with civil rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I correctly understand, this bill does deal with general elections. The primary matter was injected on the floor. My learned friend must admit, I think, since he now states that the same degree of protection in the civil rights field should be allowed with reference to general elections as is allowed in the case of primary elections, if he is going to be logical at all that we must assume that if his amendment is agreed to and if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] as amended is agreed to, it would then be his very clear duty to offer the same amendment as applicable to the general elections.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my friend yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield gladly.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the effort of my good friend and generous colleague to point out my duties in this regard. Advice from him is always welcome. He is sound. He is constructive. He is, I believe, my good friend, and I really sincerely appreciate his guidance. But I shall not offer an amendment relating to general elections. I do not consider I am violating my duty in that regard. I do not think that we should get into a general civil rights debate on this particular bill. I think it would be harmful to what the Senator from Missouri is seeking to accomplish, and what many of the rest of us are seeking to accomplish.

I think so long as we have before us the Long amendment we are more or less required to assure that all the

people have an equal opportunity to vote in the primaries he seeks to force on us all over the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from New York. I think it becomes increasingly apparent that the Senator is following the tactic which is always permissible, that the best defense is a stern offense. I say that he is a good strategist and a good tactician.

Mr. PASTORE rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator from Rhode Island wish to have me yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New York, through the distinguished Senator from Florida, if I may.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island without losing my right to the floor, in order that the Senator may address a question to the Senator from New York, and that the Senator from New York may answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I correctly understand that in any case where we have the process of the primary, if in one instance an individual were to be denied the right to cast a ballot in the primary because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, immediately the candidate himself would lose the nomination?

Mr. KEATING. In the event that such was determined by a Federal court, the candidate who was nominated would be held to have been invalidly nominated.

The question has been raised in the debate whether this body or the other body would have a further opportunity to pass on that question. I believe under the terms of the Constitution they would. If that person sought his seat again, we would vote on that in one of the bodies.

However, this amendment would apply to one person being denied the right to vote. If that is considered to be too stringent, I would be perfectly willing to accept any reasonable amendment which the Senator from Rhode Island would care to suggest. The number suggested in the report of the Civil Rights Commission, for some reason, was 9. I do not know why the Commission picked the number 9. Perhaps it should be 9, or 2, or 3, or some other number.

The wording here, in all candor, would apply if one person were found by the court to have been denied the right to vote on that ground.

Mr. PASTORE. I desire to make a further point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield further.

Mr. PASTORE. This is a negative way of approaching a very important subject. The Senator from Rhode Island wants it clearly understood that under ordinary circumstances he would be in favor of voting for civil rights, as the distinguished Senator from New York well knows.

Mr. KEATING. I am well aware of that, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. But I could not possibly in good conscience vote for an amendment such as this. First of all, it is unduly punitive as against an individual—a candidate—who exercises no discretion one way or the other, and who can be completely without fault.

Let us assume that we have a primary system in the State of New York, which of course we do not have, but which we do have in Rhode Island.

Mr. KEATING. We have some primaries in New York.

Mr. PASTORE. I know, but they are not held for the office of Senator.

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us assume that the distinguished Senator has gotten together the proper number of qualified signatures and has become eligible as a candidate, and a well-qualified candidate in the primary. If some one individual in some precinct in New York is denied the right to vote because of his race, does the Senator think the candidate ought to lose the nomination because of that fact? That is what the amendment would provide.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. It seems to me in order to cure one little injustice we would be doing a tremendously greater injustice.

Mr. KEATING. As I have said, it may be the number should be enlarged. I debated whether we should use the figure of "nine" instead of "one," or some other figure. My conclusion was that the amendment would then be attacked on the theory that we were allowing a little discrimination but did not want any widespread discrimination. I do not stand for that principle.

However, if it would be helpful to the adoption of the amendment to change "any qualified person" to "two or more" or "five or more" or "nine or more," I would say that would have my approval.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the objection I have. The objection is made to the principle, not to the number.

I think a man who is a candidate and who deports himself honorably and does not do anything to encourage the denial of the right to vote to an individual because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude should not be punished because such denial occurs.

I would be against the incident occurring at all, as the Senator well knows, but one thing which I do not like in regard to the amendment is that it might be characterized as being a frivolous one. I am not getting into the question of motives at all. I know how the Senator from New York feels about civil rights. When the Senator is ready to fight for civil rights he will have the Senator from Rhode Island standing by him shoulder to shoulder to fight for the same cause. But I do not think we should do anything which might label our cause as a frivolous one. I am afraid that is what this amendment would do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Rhode Island is a stanch supporter of meaningful civil rights legislation. My amendment is offered, and must be read, in conjunction with the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], which seeks to impose primaries on every State of the Union. If we are to have them, it is my conviction that everyone qualified should have the right to vote, and not be denied the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator from New York through making his response?

Mr. KEATING. I am through.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island has entered upon a subject which I was about to discuss briefly, but I thank him for having started so well to discuss it. I wish to go a little further into it.

There are several lawyers in this body who have had experience in election contest cases. I know a little about them myself.

I know that one of the fundamental rules in election contest cases is that one must show that a sufficient number of persons were deprived of the right to vote to have changed the result of the election. Furthermore, in my State, one must show that if they had not been deprived of the right to vote, they would have voted in a way which would have changed the result of the election. I think that is rather fundamental law, generally accepted all over the Nation, because it would be extremely idle for a court to go into an election contest in which the contest was over such a handful of votes that it could not possibly have changed the result of the election.

Let us go to the State of New York, for example, which has primaries in connection with elections to the House of Representatives. Under the terms of the pending amendment, if it should become law, a candidate in the Republican primary in a certain congressional district who had a majority of 30,000 over his opponent could be eliminated by the disqualification of 1 voter, as found by the court, regardless of whether that voter would have voted for the candidate who won or for the candidate who lost. On the very face of it, that situation shows how completely unsound, from any practical legal standpoint, this amendment would be.

I do not believe that we need to blame anyone for that fact, but I think we can all see that this amendment is based upon the understandable desire of our friend the Senator from New York, who was nominated without benefit of primary, to offer a sterling defense to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana by offering a good offense against it—whether sound or not, a good sturdy offense against it.

I hope the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York will not be favorably received, because on the very face of it, if adopted, it would put the Senate in a rather ridiculous position, in view of the established law in connection with election contests, and in view of the absence of any requirement in the amendment that a sufficient

number of persons must have been disqualified to have changed the result of the election, and that if they had been allowed to vote they would have voted in such a way as to have actually changed the result.

I do not expect to speak again on this question. I wish to make it clear that although I greatly sympathize with the Senator from Louisiana in offering his amendment because I feel, as he does, that it was very unwise to bring primaries into the bill, and I shall vote against the bill because that amendment has been brought in, I think he would be asking those of us who have very sturdily opposed the inclusion of primaries and the inclusion of Federal control over State and county political committees to reverse ourselves and run at high speed in the opposite direction by taking the position that we would force States which, in their own judgment, in part or in whole—in the case of New York it has been only in part—have not adopted the primary system, to adopt such a system.

I soberly and seriously request both Senators to withdraw these amendments, so that we may get on with the vote on the bill. Let me make it very clear that I shall not vote for the bill with the provision now engrafted upon it on the floor of the Senate, after a committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] had decided otherwise in committee, and after the bill had been reported as applicable to general elections alone. Because of the forensic eloquence of the Senator from Missouri, and for other reasons beyond my comprehension, the committee has reversed itself and the Senate has reversed the committee. All I can say, in the most friendly way, is that the Senator from Missouri has proved to be a vastly more powerful leader on the floor of the Senate than he was able to be in his committee, because his committee did not make this particular elections bill applicable to primaries.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of allowing me to defend the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The vote in the committee, I point out, was 5 to 4. So the vote in the committee was very close. Personally I am delighted that the Senate agreed with the 4 rather than with the 5. But the vote in the committee was by no means one-sided.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that the Senator barely lost in his committee, by a vote of 5 to 4, and that on the floor of the Senate he prevailed by a vote of 50 to 39.

The point I am making is still the same. The Senator from Missouri has been very much more effective on the floor of the Senate than he was in the committee. I bow to his effectiveness, eloquence, and persuasiveness, and to his ability to get done the job of inclusion of the primary amendments on the floor of the Senate, though I very seriously question the wisdom of that course, not only with reference to the philosophy of including the primary elections, but also with reference to the opportunity to obtain beneficial legislation which is needed.

I am one of those who believe that we must modernize the Corrupt Practices Act, and make it realistic, and that it is in the interest of all the public that that be done. I believe all of us can now see how hopeless it is to expect the House to take up and pass a bill with primaries included.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation on behalf of those who are especially interested in this proposed legislation. Some of us have been at this task for 7 long years.

I would be the first to disclaim that the result of the vote in connection with the primary amendment was due to any superior ability of my own, or any forensic attributes.

As the Senator from Florida has well indicated, we lawyers have a phrase in the trial of cases which applies to arguments. As we know, argument before a jury must be predicated only upon the evidence. However, if counsel on one side or the other goes beyond the evidence, in many States and many jurisdictions the courts have held that retaliatory argument is permissible, even though it goes beyond the bounds of the evidence, and may even be improper argument.

I do not wish in any respect to condemn anyone. I think it would be flagellating a dead horse to say that I am for civil rights. I happen to have been chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings for 3 months last year. I am now chairman of a committee which is holding hearings in connection with Federal registrar legislation.

The statement may be made that a vote for or against this amendment is a vote for or against civil rights. Of course, it has no bearing upon civil rights legislation. In my judgment, with all due respect, and with kindness and appreciation to my friends from New York, it has no bearing upon the essential purposes of this legislation, and, indeed, might tend to jeopardize its effectiveness and its ultimate enactment by the House of Representatives.

I am not especially sanguine about what the House may do, nor am I discouraged. I have read many editorials and pronouncements by learned soothsayers and clairvoyants, to the effect that the primary amendment, the amendment relating to the requirement that all committees in a State must report what they receive and spend, and the amendment relating to individual contributions, were all doomed to failure and defeat. I do not hold that view. I believe that the people of the country, through this legislation, will have an increased sense of reliance upon the integrity and the wisdom of this body.

I believe that the votes taken in the Senate were not the result, as the Senator from Florida has very graciously suggested, of any ability or talent which I have, and which I often feel I indeed lack. I believe that the Senate reflected the will of the country.

There has been a great deal of labor in connection with this bill, and in connection with successive bills which I have undertaken to present, and which have been reported to the Senate, in 1955, 1957, and again in 1959.

As we stand on this floor, we are being judged by the country and by our people, as to the extent to which we want to do the right thing, and the extent to which we are willing to regulate ourselves—indeed, the extent to which we are willing to have the spotlight of merciless publicity shine with respect to what goes on behind the scenes.

Let me say, parenthetically, that it is my conviction that one of the reasons why only 60 percent of the American people entitled to vote in the country do vote is that they feel that politics is a dirty business, that it is none of their business, and that the big boys in the backroom handle the money bags and control the nominations and, indeed, the elections.

Many a voter has said to me—and I daresay has said to other Members of this body as well—"What is the use of my voting? My vote does not count for anything." I believe that passing the pending bill will send word to the people of the country that their votes will count for something and that their modest contributions will mean something.

There are those who contribute large amounts of money. Money in itself is not an evil thing, but money controlled in secret by subterranean methods and by devious means, which are resorted to by many candidates who would like to be honest, must be dealt with, so that the American people will be encouraged to a fuller and more complete participation in our great system of Government by the people, and so that we may continue to live under a republican form of government as expressed by the will of the people.

We have heard it said often in the Senate, "Why do we not stand up and be counted on these matters," and thereby not give anyone an opportunity to say, "Oh, well, I did not vote for the clean, full-disclosure elections bill because I did not like this amendment or that amendment, which had something to do with civil rights or caucuses or conventions."

There are many escape hatches in these matters. It has been asked why we keep these means of egress available to those who would for one reason or another not like to face up to these questions. I do not indicate any lack of sincerity on their part or any lack of integrity on the part of those who believe we should revert to the essence of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, except that we should raise the limitations on expenditures to more realistic figures.

At a time when America occupies a position of great importance in the world and in the preservation of free institutions, indeed a position of primacy in the free world, as Mr. Churchill once said in one of his great addresses, "With primacy goes responsibility."

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will assume its responsibility

and speak upon these issues in a clear and unmistakable voice, so the country may know that the Senate has done its duty as it sees it. I am not disturbed by discussions about whether the House will vote for the primary provision of the pending bill, any more than I am disturbed—as many have been disturbed—by the many Cassandras and prophets of disaster, who have said this cannot possibly work, or that cannot possibly happen, or cannot be done.

Mr. President, it can be done. I believe that by the grace of the people of America and the Senate and the House, acting in the fullest measure in their capacity as the elected representatives of the people, it will be done. I know of no reason that we should not face up to this problem, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendments and come forth with a bill which embodies those things upon which the Senate has come to agreement, and not be diverted day after day by motions which, in my opinion, after many years of work and study of election contests do not relate to the business at hand. I say that after having been on the subcommittee for 6 years and chairman of it for 3 years, and having had great experience with the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, here we are with an opportunity to do something. I hope we will not be profligate and destroy the opportunity by beclouding the issue and cluttering up the bill, and thereby possibly leading to its ultimate defeat because a number of Senators for the first time have presented certain amendments. It would be a great tragedy if that were to happen, and a great reflection upon the Senate.

The other matters will be dealt with properly at another time by the Senate, and dealt with under the proper legislative scheduling.

I have nothing further to say about the amendments, except to express the hope that we may proceed to a conclusion of the consideration of the proposed legislation and keep it intact, insofar as we can, as an elections reporting and elections limitation measure.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE AMBASSADOR OF VENEZUELA AND MEMBERS OF THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF VENEZUELA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a number of us who are members of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs had the privilege and pleasure of visiting our sister Republic of Venezuela during the period of the congressional adjournment. We had the opportunity to visit the Parliament of Venezuela and the pleasure of lunching with the President of Venezuela and his Cabinet. We came away from Venezuela convinced that we ought to increase parliamentary exchanges between the Congress of the United States and the parliaments of Latin America.

Today we are honored to have as our guests on the floor of the Senate men who have the privileges of the floor under our parliamentary procedure. First, I wish to introduce a man known to us, the distinguished Ambassador from Venezuela, who is a very able representative of his country, the Honorable Dr. Marcus Falcon-Briceno. [Applause, Senators rising.]

We also have with us three Members of the Chamber of Deputies of the Venezuelan Parliament. We have with us the whip of the Chamber of Deputies. Under their procedure he is known as the Republican Democratic whip of the Venezuelan House, Dr. Juan B. Moretti. [Applause, Senators rising.]

We also have with us another Member of the Chamber of Deputies, Dr. Hens Silva Torres, Republican Democratic Union Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Venezuela. [Applause, Senators rising.]

We also have with us a great educator and author in the field of labor relations, Dr. Aristides Calvani, Social Christian Party Member of the Chamber of Deputies of Venezuela.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say that I am particularly honored and privileged to be able to introduce these three members of the House of Deputies of Venezuela because they are all professors, as well as politicians. This shows that "eggheads" have their place in Venezuela as well as in the United States. I am particularly honored to be able to invite these three great educators from Venezuela to the Senate, both in their capacities as members of the Chamber of Deputies of Venezuela and in their capacities as great teachers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we certainly concur in the felicitous sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and we join in extending the hand of welcome and fellowship to this distinguished delegation from our sister Republic in Latin America.

The more often these exchanges take place, the more frequently we put into effect the people-to-people relations, and the greater the understanding between our countries.

Venezuela means much to the United States, and the United States means much to Venezuela. The exchanges of products and commodities in which they are interested and in which we are interested mean, of course, that there ought to be closer ties and closer associations. So I join my distinguished friend from Oregon in extending the hand of welcome to this distinguished delegation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois in welcoming our guests from Venezuela to the Senate Chamber. It was my privilege in November to be a guest of our Venezuelan friends in their own country. During my visit my admiration for the people of Venezuela, the officials of the Venezuelan Government, and for the way they do business, was greatly enhanced.

It has been said that the three visitors from Venezuela today are all professors and are also Members of the Chamber of Deputies. I learned in Venezuela that not only the Members of the Chamber of Deputies, but members of the Cabinet, as well, teach classes in the university. I think it might perhaps be a good idea to apply that rule to the Members of the Senate. But I warn Senators that the classes in the university start at 7 o'clock in the morning. I am not certain how many volunteers we would get among our own Members to rise and start teaching at 7 o'clock in the morning, and then, after the classes were finished, to do the work of the Senate.

We certainly are very glad to have our friends from Venezuela visit us. As the Senator from Illinois has said, it is only through the exchanges of visits and getting acquainted with one another that we can understand and solve our problems satisfactorily. I hope the visit by our friends from Venezuela will be the first of many such visits which they and legislators from other countries will make to us in the United States.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am considerably impressed by the argument advanced by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] about the stringent nature of the pending amendment. As I explained in answer to his inquiry, it was debatable in my mind whether the nomination of a candidate should be invalidated by a finding of a Federal court that a qualified person had been denied the right to register or to vote in a primary because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

I concluded at the time that the charge might well be leveled that the amendment permitted a certain amount of discrimination, and provided that a few persons could be denied the right to vote on this ground, but not very many. I felt that that was permitting a small amount of discrimination and could be criticized as indicating a lack of conformity with the principles for which the author of the amendment has always stood.

The discussion, however, has convinced me that it would add to the merit of the amendment, and would probably result in support of it by a larger number of Senators if the words in the fourth line of the amendment were changed from the present words, "that any otherwise qualified person was denied the right," to "that otherwise qualified persons have been systematically denied the right," and I so modify my amendment.

I send the amendment to the desk as a modification of the previous amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. KEATING further modifies his amendment to read as follows:

And provided further, That no candidate's nomination in a primary election shall be

valid if it shall be determined by a Federal court of competent jurisdiction that otherwise qualified persons have been systematically denied the right to register or vote in the primary on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I refer the Senate to the report of the Civil Rights Commission, which indicates many areas where there has been such a systematic denial of the right to register or vote. Under my modification the nomination of any person will not be held invalid unless there is systematic discrimination within the State affected. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote on the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] would like to have a division on this amendment.

I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not see the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Does the majority whip [Mr. MANSFIELD] know whether it is agreeable to the minority leader to withdraw the call for a quorum?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know, but I imagine it would be, because it was agreeable to him on the last amendment, and I imagine it would be on this, too. I have had no word that he would object.

Mr. JAVITS. May we continue for about 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that debate is not in order during a quorum call.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the clerk be kind enough to continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The call of the roll was resumed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is printed and identified as "1-20-60—A."

First I modify my amendment, on page 1, line 4, by inserting the word "second" after the word "no"; striking out the word "reports" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "report"; and inserting the word "on" after the word "report"; and, in line 7, by striking out the word "reports" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "report"; and by striking out the word "for" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "before."

I ask that the clerk read the amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, as modified, will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 8, line 20, after the word "date" to insert a semicolon and the following: "except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary".

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. In order to undertake to try to clarify just what the able Senator from Texas has in mind, I should like to inquire whether he has accepted the suggestion that, in line 4, there be no requirement for a second report on the first primary. Is that the effect of the modification made by the interlineation?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. The suggestion of the senior Senator from Missouri has been accepted, and the proposed amendment, as read by the clerk, has been accepted by me as a sponsor of the amendment, and that is the form in which the amendment is now offered.

Mr. HENNINGS. That was my understanding. I thank the Senator.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment refers to a situation where the State provides for a runoff primary and where the second primary takes place on the 43d day after the first primary or within a shorter period of time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. The purpose of this amendment is to cover those States which have two primaries and where less than 40 days elapse between the first primary and the second primary. I believe that is the situation in every State in the American Union which has a second primary.

Under the bill which is now pending before the Senate there is a provision requiring the accurate reporting of expenditures, which in the case of the first primary must be filed 40 days afterward.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In case there is a second primary, the provision requires that the report be complete as of the 10th day next preceding the date of the election and as of the 40th day following such election. So under the bill as drawn, without the amendment, there would be a conflict. There would be a period of time which would be covered by three different reports. The candidate filing the reports, and those who contributed for him, would be in peril as to the report which carried the contributions.

The purpose of the amendment is to remove the conflict and the hiatus, and not to require a final report covering the same period of time for both the first primary and the second primary.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to ask the Senator one or two other questions.

Is it the sole purpose of the amendment to drop, under the circumstances, the report due on the 40th day after the first primary, when a second primary is held?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. And the amendment does not otherwise affect any reporting dates fixed by the bill?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is the purpose of it. It would not otherwise affect the requirements of the main bill, but it would drop the requirement for the report after the first primary, because no State in the American Union has a second primary which is not as close as 40 days to the first primary.

Mr. HENNINGS. Precisely. With the Senator's indulgence, Mr. President, I believe the junior Senator from Texas has made a very meritorious suggestion. I think it would improve the reporting provisions of the bill, as to the States in which there are two primaries. It would indeed seem to be a hardship on a successful candidate of a first primary to file an overlapping report, in effect, on a runoff primary. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. By this change, Mr. President, the disclosure provisions of the bill will be only enhanced and improved upon, because the data will thereafter appear in a consolidated form.

Therefore, Mr. President, I for one shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and I ask other Senators to do likewise.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would be the situation where the runoff is settled in a convention?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. This amendment does not apply to conventions. This amendment applies to States which have two primaries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand that is true of this amendment, but since the primary amendment relates to either primaries or conventions the reporting requirements apply to either one.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is my understanding that the reporting requirements apply to the conventions as well as to the primaries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We have the same problem with respect to the time element for the convention, when the runoff is taken care of by the convention. I raise the question to make the suggestion to the able Senator from Missouri that the staff might give study to the matter, and, if some modification needs to be worked, when the bill goes to conference with the other House some language can be developed to fit the situation.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the able Senator from South Dakota for his observation. I am sure that will be done.

This would not apply at present to caucuses or conventions. I think that matter bears study.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A similar problem could arise.

Mr. HENNINGS. The problem could arise.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his acceptance of the amendment. With such a thorough understanding of the amendment it was natural the Senator would accept it.

By removing the requirement for conflicting reporting we will clarify the bill, and make it more workable, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the States which have the first and second primaries, the runoff primaries, since that list will clarify the discussion of the amendment.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARIES BY STATES

Alabama: May 3; runoff, May 29.
Florida: May 3; runoff, May 24.
Idaho: June 7; runoff, June 28.
Louisiana: August 27; runoff, October 1.
Mississippi: August 23; runoff, September 13.
North Carolina: May 28; runoff, June 25.
Oklahoma: July 5; runoff, July 26.
South Carolina: June 14; runoff, June 28.
Texas: May 7; runoff, June 4.
Virginia: July 12; runoff, August 16.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments 1-13-60—F and ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the RECORD, rather than read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER's amendments are as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, after "SEC. 304. Publication or distribution of election materials"

insert the following:

"TITLE IV—INCOME TAX CREDIT OR DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 401. Income Tax Credit.

"SEC. 402. Income Tax Deduction."

On page 2, in the table of contents, retitle "Title IV" as "Title V"; renumber "Sec. 401" to "Sec. 501" and amend it to read:

"SEC. 501. Effective dates of titles I–III";

and add a new section 502 to the table of contents, as follows:

"SEC. 502. Effective date of title IV."

On page 19, between lines 7 and 8 insert the following:

"TITLE IV—INCOME TAX CREDIT OR DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"Income tax credit

"SEC. 401. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 38 as 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"'SEC. 38. Contribution to Candidates for Elective Federal Office.

"'(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, an amount equal to one-half of the political contributions (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made by such individual within the taxable year.

"'(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"'(1) AMOUNT.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed $10 for any taxable year.

"'(2) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax exempt interest), and section 37 (relating to retirement income).

"'(3) VERIFICATION.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be allowed, with respect to any political contribution, only if such political contribution is verified in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"'(c) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this section, the term "political contribution" means a contribution or gift to—

"'(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"'(2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual or individuals described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual or individuals.

"'(d) ELECTION TO TAKE DEDUCTION IN LIEU OF CREDIT.—This section shall not apply in the case of any taxpayer who, for the taxable year, elects to take the deduction provided by section 217 (relating to deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office). Such election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"'(e) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"'For disallowance of credit to estates and trust, see section 642(a)(4).'

"(b) The table of sections to part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 38. Overpayments of tax.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'SEC. 38. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"'SEC. 39. Overpayments of tax.'

"(c) Section 642(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax for estates and trusts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(4) POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the credit against tax for political contributions to candidates for elective Federal office provided by section 38.'

"Income tax deduction

"SEC. 402. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"'SEC. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"'(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction any political contribution (as defined in subsection (c)) payment of which is made by such individual within the taxable year.

"'(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"'(1) AMOUNT.—The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $100 for any taxable year.

"'(2) VERIFICATION.—The deduction under subsection (a) shall be allowed, with respect to any political contribution, only if such political contribution is verified in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"'(c) DEFINITION OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this section, the term "political contribution" means a contribution or gift to—

"'(1) an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives) in a general or special election, in a primary election, or in a convention of a political party, for use by such individual to further his candidacy for any such office; or

"'(2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual or individuals described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual or individuals.

"'(d) ELECTION TO TAKE CREDIT IN LIEU OF DEDUCTION.—This section shall not apply in the case of any taxpayer who, for the taxable year, elects to take the credit against tax provided by section 38 (relating to credit against tax for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office). Such election shall be made in such manner and at such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations.

"'CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For disallowance of deduction to estates and trusts, see section 642(i).'

"(b) The table of sections to part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 217. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 217. Contributions to candidates for elective Federal office.

"'Sec. 218. Cross references.'

"(c) Section 642 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for credits and deductions for estates and trusts) is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j) and by inserting after subsection (h) a new subsection as follows:

"'(i) POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office provided by section 217.'"

On page 19, line 8, renumber title IV as title V.

On page 19, line 10, renumber section 401 as section 501.

On page 19, after line 15, add the following new section 502:

"SEC. 502. The amendments made by title IV shall apply only to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to contributions or gifts made on or after such date."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] have similar amendments pending, with the same purpose in mind as the amendments which I have called up. The Senators have stated to me that they will not call up their amendments, but that they join in support of and in cosponsorship of the amendments now before the Senate. I thank the Senators for their consideration, for their help, and for their support of the amendments.

Mr. President, these amendments would add a new title and would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for an income-tax credit of up to $10 or an income-tax deduction of up to $100 for contributions to political campaigns.

This provision is not new. It is identical with title IV of S. 2150 of the 85th Congress, which was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but which, unfortunately, was permitted to die on the Senate Calendar. I do not know whether the income-tax provisions were omitted from S. 2436, as reported, through oversight or design, but I believe they constitute one of the most valuable features which has been suggested in connection with improving our election laws.

Of course, the basic purpose of my amendments is to encourage small contributions to political campaigns and to discourage reliance upon large contributions. If adopted, they will greatly broaden the base of financial support for persons seeking Federal office. Naturally, this would increase the interest of the people in Federal elections.

Although the amendments look rather complicated, they are, in fact, rather simple in basic structure: Every taxpayer will be given a choice of a tax credit of not more than $10 or a tax deduction of not more than $100, but not both. To get the maximum tax credit of $10, contributions of at least $20 would have to be made, as the credit is given for only one-half the amount of contributions; this feature would appeal to the smaller contributors and especially to those in the lower tax bracket. Larger contributors, and especially those in higher brackets, would probably elect the $100 deduction, rather than the credit. However, both alternatives are designed to increase the numbers of those contributing to political campaigns and to reduce the necessary present reliance of candidates upon "big money" contributors.

The effect of this amendment would be that the Federal Government would pay part of the cost of campaigns—I stress the phrase "part of." This provision does not go as far as some would like in having the Government underwrite our Federal election costs. It does go part way. If incorporated in the bill, it will make our democracy more democratic and our federally elected officials less dependent on a relative handful of big contributors.

Mr. President, there are two matters concerning the amendment which I wish to reemphasize. First, only one credit or one deduction in any taxable year will be allowed. If Taxpayer Smith contributed to a Presidential or congressional campaign he could get only one credit of $10 or one deduction of $100. He could not make a contribution to a number of campaigns and get a separate credit for each one of them.

The second point is that this proposal is applicable only as set forth in the "definition of a political contribution," namely to—

> An individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives).

This does not apply, it will thus be seen, to campaigns for State or local office.

Frequently we hear reports with respect to large contributions, and the necessity for a greater interest in elections and campaigns, through a system which would make it possible for people of small means to make small contributions. This plan is being tried now—and I believe successfully—in the States of Minnesota and California, where deductions are allowed.

I have been asked several questions as to what the cost might be to the Treasury if this amendment were adopted. Frankly, I will say that it is quite impossible to estimate the cost, with any degree of accuracy. I do not know how many contributors there would be to national election campaigns for President, Vice President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. I suppose a figure of 2 million contributors might be high. If we assume 2 million contributors, all of whom contribute at least $20, and all of whom elect to take a $10 tax credit, that would amount to $20 million. If many of the contributors were in the higher tax brackets, and if they elected to take a deduction of $100, that would mean that they would be getting a reduction of, say, $50 in their income tax—depending of course on many variables in their tax bill. In any event, I believe that the money spent would be very much worth while from the standpoint of cleaner elections and a greater interest in elections.

Many years ago Theodore Roosevelt advocated that the Federal Government take care of most of the cost of elections. Other students of politics and government have made similar recommendations. This proposal is only a small step forward, but I think it would be very helpful in broadening the base of contributions, and in relieving candidates from the necessity of being forced to rely so heavily upon very large contributions.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very much in sympathy with the philosophy and general principles which the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee has embodied in his amendment.

The Senator will remember, of course, that the provision granting tax deductions for political contributions was a part of the bill which I introduced, and which was reported to the Senate in 1957.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I stated a little while ago, my amendment is a verbatim restatement of the Senator's proposal.

Mr. HENNINGS. The reason why I left it out, or did not undertake to offer the provision as an amendment to be incorporated in the pending bill, was, among other things, that there had been some question about whether such a provision should originate in the Senate, or whether it must originate in the House, it being a matter relating to the revenue. But I believe that the Senator's amendment would be a step in the right direction.

Although the general subject matter may require further study, we all know that at present a relatively small percentage of our total population contributes to political campaigns. Certainly it would be very desirable to broaden the base of political financing, and let smaller contributions take the place of large amounts contributed by a relatively few people.

I think we must hopefully look forward to the time when financing campaigns will be a part of the important business of every citizen.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who has made such an outstanding record of achievement in guiding this bill through the legislative process. I hope that, in line with his thinking with respect to the tax provision, he will accept my amendment.

As to the constitutionality, or the question whether this proposal involves the raising of revenue and should originate in the House of Representatives, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has a lengthy brief on that question, a copy of which I have seen.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would not raise that question at this time. We are now down to the final amendment. I am not acting in any spirit of haste, or of suggesting any lack of consideration. I believe that the Senator's amendment might properly go to conference, and there be disposed of. I ask that that action be taken.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President——

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has some observations in this connection.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I point out that this amendment has not received consideration by any committee. I was informed on the floor the other day by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], that it had not been brought up in the committee, and had not received the consideration of the committee.

Nor has it received the consideration of the Committee on Finance. The rules of the House specifically provide that revenue amendments may be offered only to revenue bills. That is the policy which has been followed in the Senate.

There is no estimate of loss of revenue. The Treasury has not been consulted with respect to this proposal. I can see some merit in an amendment of this character, but I do not believe that we should now enact a new deduction which might apply to 2 million, 3 million, 5 million, or 10 million people. No one knows to how many people it would apply. The loss might be far greater than the Senator from Tennessee has suggested.

Two methods of making deductions are provided. One is a credit of $10; or second, in lieu of that credit, a deduction of $100. If the taxpayer should be in the 50-percent bracket, that would mean a savings of $50.

I believe that the amendment is loosely drawn as to the various committees which could receive this fund, and the deduction allowed the donor. The language on page 6, line 13, is:

> (2) a committee acting in behalf of an individual or individuals described in paragraph (1), for use by such committee to further the candidacy of such individual or individuals.

There are hundreds of political committees. There are committees in the precincts, in the counties, in the cities, and in the States. In addition, there are national committees.

I submit that the clause relating to where the contributions can be made, and the provision relating to tax deductions, are very loosely drawn and could be greatly abused.

Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate Committee on Finance would be glad to give full consideration to this proposal, should it be taken up in an orderly way, namely, by amending a revenue bill which had already passed the House, but I shall have to protest against the adoption of this amendment now, even though the chairman of the committee is willing to take it to conference.

I hope very much that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what my senior colleague from Virginia has said about a tax amendment on any bill originating in the Senate. It was my privilege to serve for 10 years on the House Ways and Means Committee, and I believe I know pretty well the attitude of that committee about any tax provision coming from the Senate. If it is a straight tax bill, it will not even be taken from the Speaker's desk. If the proposal is a part of some other bill, it is referred to the tax committee, where either it is eliminated or the bill is not considered at all.

The Constitution gives to the House the exclusive right to originate tax legislation, and the House is very jealous in preserving that constitutional right. It even goes beyond that point, and, by virtue of precedent, the House initiates all regular appropriation bills. There is no provision in the Constitution to that effect, but the House has originated such measures for a number of years, and the Senate has concurred. That custom is pretty well fixed.

From my personal standpoint, any amendment which would assure defeat of the bill in the House would be pleasing to me. I had intended to support the bill as it came from the committee. However, I believe that the States have done a good job in regulating their own primaries. I do not see anything to be gained, and much to be lost, by injecting Federal control into our primaries. Therefore I do not intend to support the bill.

I wish to make it clear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance has put us on notice that the House will not accept a tax provision in any bill which comes from the Senate, because we do not have constitutional jurisdiction to originate tax measures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the able Senator from Tennessee, and commend him for offering it. I am delighted that my good friend from Missouri is prepared to take it to conference.

The evil at which we seek to strike through this bill is the use of big money to influence elections and to influence the actions of successful candidates after they take office.

As the bill originally came from the committee, it did nothing to strike at that evil. Through the able, persistent, and patient efforts of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the bill has been molded into such form that it will make a measurable contribution toward banishing the evil of big money in Federal elections.

Mr. President, there is no Senator who does not know that elections cost money. They cost great sums of money, and they cost more money every day. It is unfortunate, but it is true. In my judgment, the cost of elections should be, and one day will be, curtailed by requiring those who have a license to use the airways to give free television and free radio time for political purposes during election campaigns. We are not ready to require that yet. However, if we are to take the big money out of elections, we must put small money in its place. We have had campaigns of "Dollars for Democrats" and our friends on the other side, I know, have had campaigns to get contributions from Republicans in small amounts.

There does not seem to be the necessary incentive to get the amounts of little money which are needed to compensate for the cost of elections and make it unnecessary to get the big money which will buy, in many instances, the result of the election, and unduly influence the actions of a candidate after he takes office.

The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would be an inducement for little money to come in and take the place of the big money. This, in my judgment, is the way to make a real contribution toward correcting the present evil.

It has been said that the Senate has no right to add a so-called tax amendment to an election bill. I shall be followed by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has had considerable research made on this subject, and who, I am sure, will convince those who will carefully listen to his argument, that the constitutional objection is not sound.

It has also been said that the House will not accept an amendment which deals with tax matters, if it is initiated in the Senate. I yield to no man in my respect for the other body. However, I believe we have a primary obligation to uphold the constitutional rights and powers and duties of the Senate.

If we think it wise to adopt this amendment, I do not believe we should take the position that the other body will not go along, and that, therefore, we should not act. I do not have the slightest doubt, if the pending amendment is adopted and the bill is taken to conference, that the able chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] will do his best to see to it that it is kept in the final bill. I have too much regard for the integrity and the desire to maintain the constitutional principles of every Member of the House than to believe that they would attempt to usurp a constitutional right or authority which is not theirs.

Again I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for offering his amendment and the distinguished Senator from Missouri for approving it. I am happy to have the opportunity to join them. I again commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who knows more about the bill than all the rest of us put together, for his willingness to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania for what he has said about the argument I will make on the subject of the Constitution of the United States. I wish it were within my capacity to make a brilliant argument about the Constitution. Suffice to say

that I have taken up this matter with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and I have received from them a memorandum on the subject under date of July 21, 1959. I shall ask unanimous consent that it appear in full in the RECORD, but first I should like to read one paragraph from it:

Four cases have been cited by Dr. Corwin in support of his position that bills for purposes other than raising revenue, which incidentally create revenue, are not included in the limitation placed upon Senate action by clause 1, section 7, article I.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum furnished to me by the Legislative Reference Service be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., July 21, 1959.

To: Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: When a proposal affecting revenue is incidental to the legislation to which it is attached, it can be initiated in the Senate.

You ask whether the title IV which you propose to submit as an amendment to the Senate's Federal elections bill is open to a point of order on the ground it would constitute the origination of a revenue bill in violation of the Constitution, article I, section 7:

"All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

Your inquiry is carefully limited to the proposition that "if a proposal affecting revenue is incidental to the legislation to which it is attached, it can be initiated in the Senate."

Dr. Corwin, writing in the Constitution of the United States Annotated (1953), says that: "Only bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the word are comprehended by the phrase 'all bills for raising revenue'; bills for other purposes, which incidentally create revenue, are not included." For this statement he cites "Story on the Constitution," volume I, section 880. Justice Story illustrates his point as follows: "No one supposes that a bill to sell any of the public lands, or to sell public stock, is a bill to raise revenue, in the sense of the Constitution. Much less would a bill be so deemed which merely regulated the value of foreign or domestic coins, or authorized a discharge of insolvent debtors upon assignments of their estates to the United States, giving a priority of payment to the United States in cases of insolvency, although all of them might incidentally bring revenue into the Treasury."

Four cases have been cited by Dr. Corwin in support of his position that bills for purposes other than raising revenue, which incidentally create revenue, are not included in the limitation placed upon Senate action by clause 1, section 7, article I.

In *Twin City* v. *Nebraska*, 167 U.S. 196 (1896), it was argued that section 41 of the National Banking Act of 1864 (R.S. sec. 5214) imposing taxes upon the average amount of notes in circulation of a banking association, was a revenue law. And because the section had originated in the Senate as an amendment to the bill passed by the House, the tax was unconstitutional and void.

Mr. Justice Harlan, speaking for the Court, said:

"It is sufficient in the present case to say that an act of Congress providing a national currency secured by a pledge of bonds of the United States, and which in the furtherance of that object, and also to meet the expenses attending the execution of the act, imposed a tax on the notes in circulation of the banking associations organized under the statute, is clearly not a revenue bill which the Constitution declares must originate in the House of Representatives.

"Mr. Justice Story has well said that the practical construction of the Constitution and the history of the origin of the constitutional provision in question proves that revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue. (1 Story on Constitution sec. 880.) The main purpose that Congress had in view was to provide a national currency based upon U.S. bonds, and to that end it was deemed wise to impose the tax in question. The tax was a means for effectually accomplishing the great object of giving to the people a currency that would rest, primarily, upon the honor of the United States, and be available in every part of the country. There was no purpose by the act or by any of its provisions to raise revenue to be applied in meeting the expenses or obligations of the Government."

In *Millard* v. *Roberts* (202 U.S. 429), the Court held, on the authority of Twin City Bank case, that the acts of Congress of February 12, 1901 (31 Stat. 767, 774), and February 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 909), for eliminating grade crossings of railways, and erection of a union station in the District of Columbia, were not unconstitutional as bills for raising revenue which originated in the Senate, by virtue of provisions for the taxation of property in the District of Columbia to pay the cost. "Whatever taxes are imposed are but means to the purposes provided by the act."

In *Flint* v. *Stone Tracy Co.* (220 U.S. 107), the "corporation tax cases," the constitutionality of section 38 of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. c. 6, 11, 112–117), was challenged as originating in the Senate in violation of clause 1, section 7, article I of the Constitution. But Mr. Justice Day, speaking for the Court, said:

"The tariff bill, of which the section under consideration is a part, originated in the House of Representatives and was there a general bill for the collection of revenue. As originally introduced, it contained a plan of inheritance taxation. In the Senate the proposed tax was removed from the bill, and the corporation tax, in a measure, substituted therefor. The bill having properly originated in the House, we perceive no reason in the constitutional provision relied upon why it may not be amended in the Senate in the manner which it was in this case. The amendment was germane to the subject matter of the bill and not beyond the power of the Senate to propose" (cit. supra, p. 143).

Rainey v. *United States* (232 U.S. 310), came to the Supreme Court on writs of error. It was contended that error was committed in not deciding that section 37 of the Tariff Act of 1909 was not void "as it is a bill for raising revenue, and it originated in the Senate and not in the House of Representatives, in contravention of article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States." To dispose of this point the Supreme Court adopted and approved the following declaration of the court below:

"I am also satisfied that the section in question is not void as a bill for raising revenue originating in the Senate and not in the House of Representatives. It appears that the section was proposed by the Senate as an amendment to a bill for raising revenue which originated in the House. That is sufficient having become an enrolled and duly authenticated act of Congress, it is not for this Court to determine whether the amendment was or was not outside the purposes of the original bill" (cit. supra, p. 317).

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, greater minds than mine by far will undoubtedly argue the point when the bill reaches the House, and also when it reaches conference. However, I have sought expressions of opinion on this issue from the leaders of our two great political parties, and on July 31 I addressed identical letters to Mr. Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and to our colleague, the Senator from Kentucky, THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee. I asked their opinion on the proposal to provide a $10 tax credit for political contributions, so that contributions by average citizens of relatively small or modest means to support the parties or candidates of their choice may be encouraged.

On August 12, 1959, I received a reply from Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I shall not read the letter in full, but Mr. Butler stated his support of either allowing a taxpayer to deduct $100 from his income tax, or to take a $10 tax credit from the tax which he pays to the Treasury.

Our colleague the Senator from Kentucky, the Honorable THRUSTON MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, said he was opposed to a tax credit, and said so in no uncertain terms. However, in concluding the letter to me, he said as follows:

It would be my suggestion that we explore the possibilities of allowing a modest campaign contribution to a political party or candidate to be treated as a charitable deduction, as now treated under the Internal Revenue Code.

In other words, Mr. President, here we have the national political leaders of both our great major parties on record in favor of some form of the proposal submitted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and accepted by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, who had managed the bill with such distinction on the floor of the Senate. The chairman of the Democratic National Committee has endorsed either a $100 tax deduction of a $10 tax credit. The chairman of the Republican National Committee has suggested that we explore the possibility of a tax deduction to be treated in much the same manner as charitable deductions are treated, in an effort to encourage wider dissemination of financial support to the great political parties of this country and to the men and women running for office.

I should like to say that this proposal is somewhat in the general vein and theme of that voiced in 1907 by President Theodore Roosevelt. In that bygone day, before radio and television costs were added to the cost of running for office, he cited the need for liberating candidates from the yoke of excessive expenditures for campaign purposes. He further proposed that the Federal Government underwrite campaigns for the Presidency and for the Senate and for the House of Representatives.

If we adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, as the Senator from Missouri has forthrightly suggested we do, we will be putting into law, at least as proposed by the Senate, the living reality of Theodore Roosevelt's proposal to use modest sums in the Federal Treasury to encourage men and women everywhere in America, whether they be rich or poor, to contribute financially to the support of those who seek to represent them in government.

I ask unanimous consent that my letters to the Honorable Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and to the Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, and the reply of Mr. Butler of August 12, 1959, and the reply of Mr. MORTON of August 11, 1959, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 31, 1959.

Hon. PAUL M. BUTLER,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: During the 1956–57 hearings on political activities, lobbying and campaign contributions conducted by Senator MCCLELLAN, you indicated your support for enactment of an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code which would provide a tax credit of up to $10 for political contributions, to encourage participation by individuals in political activity and broaden the base of financial support for political candidates, thus leaving them less indebted to "fat cats."

I have long felt that such an amendment would be an excellent idea. In 1956 I offered legislation to accomplish this. I plan to resubmit my proposal again this year.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could provide me with a statement of your views on the desirability of implementing the idea of a tax credit. Endorsement by you as chairman of the Democratic National Committee would be most helpful in development of enthusiasm in this plan, which has drawn the support of many thoughtful students of government—including yourself—in the past. I have also written to THRUSTON MORTON in a similar vein. It seems to me that this is a reform which both parties should support.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: Thank you for your letter requesting my views on your proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit of up to $10 for political contributions.

As you know, I have strongly advocated and supported all efforts to broaden the case of contributions to our political parties. This includes the national drive by the American Heritage Foundation in cooperation with the advertising council conducted in the 1956 presidential campaign to encourage small contributions from ordinary citizens. I am hopeful this drive will be conducted again this year.

Also, I have supported bills introduced in the 85th Congress to encourage political contributions by taxpayers by allowing them to deduct contributions of up to $100 to political parties or candidates, or, in the alternative, to allow an outright tax credit for political donations of up to $10.

Your proposed amendment would encourage ordinary citizens to contribute to the political party of their choice. It has my wholehearted support, since I firmly believe that an appeal to individuals for small contributions is the healthiest way to raise money for our political parties in a democracy.

I wish you success in your efforts.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

PAUL M. BUTLER.

JULY 31, 1959.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Chairman, Republican National Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR THRUSTON: During the 1956–57 hearings on political activities, lobbying and campaign contributions conducted by Senator MCCLELLAN, the then chairman of the Republican National Committee, Leonard Hall, indicated that he favored in principle some form of tax incentive to encourage participation by individuals in political activity and broaden the base of financial support for political candidates. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, expressed a similar view.

I have long believed that amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit of up to $10 for political contributions would be a highly beneficial thing in aiding us to reach the two goals cited above. In 1956 I offered legislation to accomplish this. I plan to resubmit my proposal, as an amendment to appropriate legislation, again this year.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could inform me of your views, as national chairman, on the desirability of implementing the idea of a tax credit. Endorsement in principle of the credit—which, unlike the deduction, treats all taxpayers alike—would be most helpful in development of enthusiasm for the plan, which has drawn the support of many thoughtful students of government. I have also written Paul Butler in a similar vein. It seems to me that this is a reform which both parties should support.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: This is in response to your letter of July 31, dealing with political campaign contributions. You specifically asked my comments concerning an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit of up to $10 for political contributions.

First, let me say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of encouraging participation by individuals in political activity and broadening the base of financial support for political parties and candidates. I have read the testimony given by my predecessor, the Honorable Leonard Hall, in 1956 before a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures in the House of Representatives. This committee was created pursuant to House Resolution 483, 84th Congress. Hearings took place on December 17, 18, and 19, 1956.

As to your specific suggestion, I do not believe that a political contribution, even limited to $10, should be treated as a direct tax credit. Were it so treated, I don't think it would generate individual interest in political activity. Almost anyone would be willing to sign a paper and transfer $10 of his tax payment to the political party of his choice. It seems to me that this would result in merely transferring the cost of political campaigns to the Federal Treasury. Both major political parties, through State and local committees, could raise all the money they would ever need from this source, especially if employers were required to put in a checkoff or payroll deduction system. Furthermore, if such a plan were adopted, the Red Cross, the Cancer Fund, the Community Chest, the Heart Fund, and others would soon be asking for the same treatment. I think that charitable gifts should embody some sacrifice on the part of the giver, and the same theory should apply to political contributions. I think if the individual has some vested interest in the party of his choice, such as a modest contribution, he will take a greater interest in political activity and more effectively discharge the responsibilities of citizenship.

It would be my suggestion that we explore the possibilities of allowing a modest campaign contribution to a political party or candidate to be treated as a charitable deduction, as now treated under the Internal Revenue Code.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,

THRUSTON B. MORTON.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, I wish to say that here we have the leaders of both of our great political parties on record as being sympathetic to one form or another of the proposal contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to express my agreement with the Senator. When I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I had the honor to vote with the chairman on the proposal for the reasons which have already been cited. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We welcome the support of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment presented by the senior Senator from Tennessee. I commend him highly for it, and I associate myself with the very lucid explanation which the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has made and with the additional explanation which has been brought to our attention by my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

We are dealing with a very important amendment. It would accomplish a great deal. I shall not waste the time of the Senate to amplify what has already been said by my friend from Pennsylvania. However, I am hopeful that the Senate will vote to adopt the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I take it that after a tax return has been prepared under the amendment and after the taxpayer has made a certification that he has contributed $100, for example, in the form required by the Internal Revenue Service, he makes the deduction. It seems to me that under that kind of operation what is actually happening is that the Federal Government is supporting a national campaign, whether on one side of the aisle or on the other.

If we are going that far and take that first step, why not give serious consideration to the bill which has been here for some time, and have the Federal Government, through a direct appropriation, appropriate the expenses of any political campaign?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at this point.

The other point I should like to mention is this: The amendment contains a definition of political contribution as follows:

For purposes of this section, the term political contribution means a contribution or gift to an individual whose name is presented for election as President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, an elector for President or Vice President of the United States, a Member of the Senate, or a Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate to the House of Representatives).

Mr. President, the Communist Party has not yet been outlawed in the United States, so far as I know, and they can get on the ballot if they desire. Therefore, a man could make a deduction from his income tax and, if he likes, and if that is his disposition, he could support a Communist candidate for the Presidency.

That, in my judgment, becomes an anomaly, if I have ever seen one—the idea of snitching money owed to Uncle Sam, only because Congress says so in a bill, in support of a candidate who under normal circumstances, whether by violence or otherwise, would seek to undo and to modify or even destroy, our whole system of government. I simply cannot understand that idea.

Mr. CLARK. I may say, in response to the first question asked by the Senator from Illinois, that the reason we do not want at this time to go all the way toward having the Federal Government pay the entire cost of an election is that we are sincerely interested in balancing the budget. We would like to have a surplus available to pay on the reduction of the national debt. We would not want to impose this entire cost on Uncle Sam. We do think a modest contribution from the taxes of the small taxpayer might well be credited against a desire to make a little money available for tax purposes to help us run clean elections.

The second comment of the Senator from Illinois, about the Communist Party, is certainly not worthy of any reply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it will be only a little while until the Senator from Pennsylvania, probably with others, will raise his voice in this Chamber for all sorts of causes which require money. It will be said, "Oh, it is only a little for aid to education; for juvenile delinquency"; for this, that, and the other purpose.

If we are going to be consistent, why spend a little money upon a political campaign, when money is in short supply, so far as the Treasury is concerned, and we can use conveniently every nickel which the revenue statutes will produce for causes which are infinitely more worthy.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I merely wish to emphasize the point which the Senator from Illinois has made, namely, that this proposal would, in fact, transfer, in my opinion, to the Federal Treasury the cost of our political campaigns. If this amendment were adopted, there would be no trouble even about getting a check-off system among large employers, so that they could deduct $10 from the wages of all employees and withhold it from them. The money thus deducted from the wages of each employee could be transferred to the treasury of the political party of his choice.

Under the statutory limit at present I think the three national committees in each party—the senatorial, congressional, and national committees—are shooting at an amount in the area of $7 million. That means that 700,000 good Democrats or good Republicans, who are at present having their taxes withheld by their employers, could say, "Certainly; you can take $10 from Uncle Sam and pay it to my party."

So in effect we would be transferring the cost of the election to the taxpayers.

I think there would be great merit in permitting a limited deduction, the same as we permit limited deductions for charitable contributions, with a limitation of $100, or $50; I do not know what the amount should be. That might be open to some debate. I think that if a person is giving to his party—either party; the party of his choice—there should be a little pain connected with it, just as there is when we give to our church, our hospital, or to any other civic endeavor. I think what we are trying to do in the two political parties is to get greater participation from the grassroots. We should let the people feel, "I am a part of this party." It will hurt a little to give $2 or $3, but the people who contribute will take a greater interest in their parties.

If they are merely to be checked off by the payroll clerk, I do not believe there would be great interest in the two political parties at the grassroots, the interest which we need if the parties are to survive. I think we should consider the question of transferring the cost of Federal elections from the large corporations directly to the taxpayers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is just a beginning, a step. Another step will come sometime later; and in a little while, there will be a bill such as was before the House of Representatives years ago, a bill which provided a $10 credit if a person certified that he had voted in the last general election. If we are to do that, why not throw in 3 acres and a mule and make the bribe just as effective as we can?

I prefer the system which prevails in Australia, where a person is fined if he does not do his duty as a citizen by going to the polls and voting. But that will be the next step. So in a little while, all of the money will conveniently come out of the Federal Treasury. This is but a beginning on that road.

I sincerely hope that this amendment will be roundly defeated. I cannot concur in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] that this amendment can be taken to conference. That might be all right; but I would rather have a vote on it here and now. We are entitled to have a vote on it, to see what the sentiment of the Senate is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, together with the Senator from Missouri I have supported the earlier amendments to the bill because we want to get a good, working bill. However, I do not think the amendment being offered here on the floor should be adopted. I join the chairman of the Finance Committee in asking the Senator from Tennessee to let the amendment be referred to our committee, in order that it may be properly studied. I do not say there is not some merit to what is being sought to be accomplished, but I think we must be very careful when we move into this field when the net effect of our action would be to let the Federal Government underwrite political campaigns.

I do not for a moment question the sincerity of the Senator from Tennessee in trying to get a good bill, but I should like to remind him of the experience we had with our tax laws some years ago. In 1951 or 1952, we found, much to the dismay and disgust, I may say, of many Members of the Senate, that there had already been devised a scheme to finance the political campaigns out of the Federal Treasury by an indirect method. At that time there had been three or four large contributions made to the Democratic campaign fund. One contributor gave about $300,000, and another about $400,000. They went to the Treasury Department and got a special ruling whereby their contributions were classified as special business deductions, which made the contributions not only exempt from gift taxes but also classified them as deductions for tax purposes. There was not one Member of the Senate who defended that ruling. There was not one Member of the Senate who said that it had been the original intent of the law to include such contributions. Nevertheless, that ruling was given by the Treasury Department, and it had the effect of financing a large part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

I do not for a moment suggest that this amendment is intended to reinstate this section of the law so as to make such action again possible.

But I am not at all certain from reading the amendment that it could not be done. The present law specifically states that under no circumstances can any contribution to a political party ever be treated as a deduction for income tax purposes.

That provision is now very specific, but this amendment would amend that section of the law. Those earlier political rulings had the effect of having the 1948 Democratic campaign financed to a large extent by the Federal Treasury. That was the first time since the enactment of the income tax law in 1913 that such an effort had been made by either political party, and we want to be sure it is the last. I want to make certain that we do not tamper with the law so as to permit again such gross abuses by giving taxpayers an opportunity to claim: "You have repealed that section."

I think the members and the staff of our committee should be given an oppor-

tunity to examine this proposal. If, after we have examined it we find that it does not open any loopholes, it can then be considered on its merits.

I repeat: I am making this request as one who, together with the Senator from Missouri, has supported the earlier amendments, and I fully intend to support the bill on its final passage. I think the Senate should pass a good bill, a bill which will help to clean up elections, but let us be sure that in doing this we do not open an even worse loophole.

Mr. President, those rulings were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29, 1952, along with my statement outlining how they had been obtained.

Mr. President, I do ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks another statement which I made during that same period describing how our tax laws were being used to give favorable rulings to taxpayers who, in turn, were agreeing to make contributions to the Democratic Party.

If a clean election bill is passed, are we going to make it possible for persons to approach an executive in the Government with the offer of a contribution to a political party, in turn for a favorable tax ruling, and then give him a tax deduction in return for his contribution to the party? Certainly we do not want to open up Pandora's box. Speaking for myself, I want to examine this amendment more carefully before I vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on August 4. 1953, Mr. Welburn Mayock, an attorney in Washington, D.C., was testifying before the Kean subcommittee. At that time the Kean committee was investigating the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In his testimony of that date Mr. Mayock explained how in 1948, while serving as the chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, he had entered into an agreement with Mr. William S. Lasdon, Katonah, N.Y., whereby he was to obtain for Mr. Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case.

In return for obtaining this favorable ruling which would save nearly $7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a $65,000 cash fee with the understanding that $30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Mayock without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer but solely in his capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee then contacted Mr. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question.

Mr. Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable decision upon this same question by the Treasury Department.

After this tax-fix scheme had been arranged and after Mr. Mayock had collected his $65,000 fee, he was confronted with the problem of how to get the $30,000 into the Democratic campaign fund without obviously violating the Hatch Act. (The Hatch Act prohibits contributions to a political campaign in excess of $5,000 by any one individual.)

However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for $65,000 the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates.

Accordingly, as Mr. Mayock explained it, he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash. In this manner he siphoned this $30,000 of "hot money" into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee.

While freely admitting all of the above transactions during his testimony before the Kean subcommittee under date of August 4, 1953, Mr. Mayock flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political campaign. Each time the committee pressed him for the names of these individuals Mr. Mayock replied, "That I am going to refuse to answer."

Since Mr. Mayock was reluctant to publish the names of the individuals who exchanged their personal checks payable to the national committee for an equivalent amount of this "tax-fix fee," I shall read that list to the Senate along with a breakdown of the amount handled by each individual plus the dates of the transactions.

Date	Name and address	Amount
Oct. 13, 1948	Democratic County Central Committee, William H. Malone, chairman, 955 Mills Tower, San Francisco.	$10,000
Oct. 14, 1948	Harold A. Berliner, 10 Crown Ter., San Francisco	5,000
Do	William J. Mahaney, 2412 Russ Bldg., San Francisco.	5,000
Oct. 18, 1948	Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill St., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Ave., Los Angeles	2,500
Do	William B. Peeler, 7133 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood	2,500
Do	Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Ave., Hollywood	2,500
Total		30,000

This was not the only time that the Treasury Department, under the New Deal administration resorted to the issuance of questionable rulings for the purpose of financing the 1948 political campaign.

On April 29, 1952, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of a series of political rulings which had been issued by the Treasury Department while Mr. John W. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury, wherein Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, Winston-Salem, N.C., Mr. Marshall Field, and Mr. David A. Schulte, both of New York City, were permitted to charge off as bad business debts their approximately $400,000 contributions to the 1948 Democratic campaign.

Since incorporating those rulings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have discovered that this same Mr. Welburn Mayock was one of the prime factors behind those rulings.

On December 27, 1948, Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent Mr. Reynolds or the others involved but solely in his official capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, held a conference with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, General Counsel of the Treasury Department. At that meeting they discussed the Richard W. Reynolds case which involved a $300,000 contribution to the Democratic Party, as a party case and arranged for the issuance of a favorable ruling allowing him to write off this contribution as a bad business loan.

As further evidence of the callousness of the political regime then in power we find that the Treasury Department even permitted Mr. Mayock to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income tax returns only $17,500 of this $65,000 fee collected from Mr. Lasdon. Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the $30,000 which he set aside for the Democratic National Committee. He deducted from the gross fee another $17,500 solely upon his claim that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon, 275 Central Park West, New York City, and Mr. Louis Markus, 9445 86th Road, Woodhaven, Long Island, as their share of the tax-fix payoff.

This latter deduction was allowed notwithstanding the fact that when both Mr. Markus and Mr. Solomon testified under oath (August 5, 1953) before the Kean subcommittee, they emphatically denied that they had received any of this fee, and accordingly they had paid no taxes on their alleged share.

But the mere fact that no one was paying any tax on this $17,500 in controversy did not in the least bother the Treasury Department. They merely placed it in the same category as the $30,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee and allowed everybody to write it off their tax returns.

This procedure of issuing favorable Treasury rulings in exchange for contributions to a political party was extremely costly to the American taxpayers from two angles:

First, the granting of these favorable rulings which apparently would not otherwise have been extended resulted in a substantial loss in revenue.

Second, the issuance of these rulings had the indirect effect of financing a part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

The disclosure of these transactions was a shock to the American people and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party were just as indignant as were the members of the Republican Party to find that certain high officials in that administration had stooped to such low tactics for the purpose of financing a political campaign.

Even after publishing the additional list of names of those involved in this deal there are still many questions left unanswered in this case, and I suggest that both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department reexamine the conflicting testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in August 1953.

For instance, the conflict of testimony wherein Mr. Mayock under oath told the committee that he paid $8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon and Mr. Louis Marcus and their testimony on the following day emphatically denying this statement obviously is the basis of a perjury charge.

The statute of limitations may have expired on violations of the corrupt practices act in 1948, but it has not expired on any possible perjury charges resulting from testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in 1953, nor has it expired upon the ability of the Treasury Department to collect back taxes due on the erroneous deduction of the $30,000 fee to the Democratic National Committee as well as the controversial $17,500 referred to above.

Grand juries are now in session at both Omaha and St. Louis, and their work should shed additional light upon the scandal-ridden tax bureau of that era.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 19, 1955]

MAYOCK GETS CLEARANCE IN TAX CASE

LOS ANGELES, May 18.—A Federal grand jury today cleared Welburn Mayock, former general counsel of the Democratic National Committee, in an income tax case.

The jury returned a no bill, or declination to indict. U.S. Attorney Laughlin E. Waters said a complaint issued last April 4 would be dismissed immediately.

The complaint, issued at the time because the statute of limitations was running out, alleged that Mayock evaded $25,716 in taxes due on income of himself and his wife for 1948.

Mayock, a Washington and Los Angeles attorney, returned from the Capital and appeared voluntarily before the grand jury.

He told newsmen the Government was "persecuting" him, the case having been the subject of previous congressional committee and FBI investigation since 1952.

Mayock said the case stemmed from a payment of $65,000 before the 1952 campaign by a New York financier, William S. Lasdon. Mayock said $30,000 of this sum went to the Democratic national campaign fund, and Mayock and two other men divided the remainder as fees for some income tax work they did for Lasdon. Mayock said he listed the $17,000 he received in this deal in his tax return.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my remarks are intended as a response to the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the chairman of the Republican National Committee. He undertook to favor a tax deduction. He was opposed to a tax credit. One of the great merits of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is that it favors the rich and the poor alike. It makes no distinction between a very wealthy contributor and a very small contributor, in overall, broad terms.

On March 6, 1956, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who has long been a student of elections, made a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he pointed out how much of a $100 tax deduction, a deduction to be treated the same as a charitable deduction, would be paid by the United States Government, and how much would be paid by the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table illustrating these figures may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Illustration of proposed income tax deduction for $100 political contributions

[Applied to 1952 elections, estimated 1951 figures]

Highest applicable income tax rate (percent)	Net taxable income bracket	Taxpayer's share of deductible $100 campaign contribution	Government's share of deductible $100 campaign contribution	Number of taxpayers filing return by income brackets	Percentage of taxpayers filing return by income brackets	Collections from income-tax payers, by income brackets	Percentage of total collections from income-tax payers
	Total			*Thousands* [1] 84,000.0	100.00	*Millions* $22,372.7	100.0
0	None, but income exceeds $600	$100.00	0	[1] 17,639.3	21.00	0	0
20.4	0 to $2,000	69.60	$20.40	56,919.6	67.76	8,938.6	40.0
22.4	$2,000 to $4,000	77.60	22.40	6,389.4	7.61	3,585.4	16.0
27.0	$4,000 to $6,000	73.00	27.00	1,458.3	1.74	1,558.4	7.0
30.0	$6,000 to $8,000	70.00	30.00	504.8	.60	852.0	3.8
35.0	$8,000 to $10,000	65.00	35.00	329.8	.39	750.2	3.4
39.0	$10,000 to $12,000	61.00	39.00	223.2	.27	680.6	3.0
43.0	$12,000 to $14,000	57.00	43.00	112.3	.14	441.9	2.0
48.0	$14,000 to $16,000	52.00	48.00	83.6	.10	399.2	1.8
51.0	$16,000 to $18,000	49.00	51.00	50.4	.06	282.7	1.3
54.0	$18,000 to $20,000	46.00	54.00	61.3	.07	404.6	1.8
57.0	$20,000 to $22,000	43.00	57.00	44.5	.05	346.1	1.5
61.0	$22,000 to $26,000	39.00	61.00	55.9	.07	541.5	2.4
63.0	$26,000 to $32,000	37.00	63.00	47.7	.06	618.9	2.8
66.0	$32,000 to $38,000	34.00	66.00	22.7	.03	387.9	1.7
69.0	$38,000 to $44,000	31.00	69.00	13.0	.02	268.7	1.2
73.0	$44,000 to $50,000	27.00	73.00	13.5	.02	350.7	1.6
75.0	$50,000 to $60,000	25.00	75.00	5.8	.01	171.2	.8
78.0	$60,000 to $70,000	22.00	78.00	9.2	.01	338.2	1.5
82.0	$70,000 to $80,000	18.00	82.00	4.0	[2]	179.7	.8
84.0	$80,000 to $90,000	18600	84.00	3.1	[2]	165.0	.7
87.0	$90,000 to $100,000	13.00	87.00	2.2	[2]	144.0	.6
89.0	$100,000 to $150,000	11.00	89.00	3.5	[2]	286.5	1.3
90.0	$150,000 to $200,000	10.00	90.00	1.7	[2]	223.4	1.0
91.0	$200,000 plus	9.00	91.00	1.2	[2]	457.3	2.0

[1] Approximate. [2] Less than 0.01 percent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the critical thing, to my way of thinking, is this: If one has a net taxable income of between $2,000 and $4,000, and he makes a $100 contribution, and he claims a deduction as though it were a charitable contribution, he will pay $76.60, and the Government will pay $20.40. If, however, one is so fortunate as to have an income of $200,000 a year or more and makes the same $100 contribution, he will pay $9 and Uncle Sam will pay $91. I think it quite clear why my friend from Kentucky favors the deduction and opposes the tax credit.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I do not favor that at all. I am willing to let it stay as it is. The way the Senator is talking, nobody gets the credit.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. I do not want the implication left that nobody is getting anything at the present time. Would the Senator agree that if this proposal is enacted, sooner or later, whether it is the poor or the rich taxpayer, the Treasury of the United States will be paying the costs of campaigns?

Mr. CLARK. No. It will be paying a substantial part; not all of it.

Mr. MORTON. I think I could raise our part for our side, and I think my opposite number on the other side also could.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is indeed very skillful, and I honor him for his ability.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Kentucky is here, I wonder if he can give us any estimate as to the number of contributors. The Democratic Party would not be within his province, I take it, but does he have any expert knowledge of or estimate as to the number of Republican contributors to the Presidential, Vice Presidential, Senate, and House races?

Mr. MORTON. I do not think I could give even an educated guess, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I think the figures as to the number of contributions which come in to the Democratic or Republican National Committees are available. What someone may give in a certain county in the Senator's State or mine, in the interest of the Senator's candidacy or mine, $10 here, $5 there, on the county level, I do not think there is any way of estimating.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think there is, either, unless it would be by experience; but some persons I talked to said they did not think there were more than 500,000 contributors. Under the terms defined under this proposal, if there were 500,000, and that number should be doubled by virtue of tax credit, on the tax credit side it would cost only $10 million. I think the tax deduction might cost $5 million more. But that is not a great amount, considering the advantages that would be derived.

Mr. MORTON. If the Senator will yield, I can indicate to him that in the past 90 days, as a result of the direct mail campaign which we have used in our headquarters, we have had about, I think it is, 14,000 contributions, the average being somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 each. That is merely to the one national committee.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee that the amendment provides, "a committee acting in behalf of an individual or individuals."

There are any number of such committees. For a long time, years ago, I was chairman of the Democratic State Committee. There are county committees, precinct committees, and all kinds of committees. It would simply be impossible to get reports from these committees as to what they do with the money. The amendment does not say "political committees." It says a committee acting on behalf of an individual. An individual could appoint his own committee, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought it was made clear that the provision, which refers to an amount equal to one-half of the political contribution, as defined in subsection (c), applies only to Presidential, Vice Presidential, Senatorial, House Member, or Delegate campaigns. A committee in a State might be a committee for support of a candidate for the Senate or the House or both. It might be a committee for support of a candi-

date for President or for Senator or both, or there might be a single treasury.

I think it is clear: There can be only one deduction or one credit, regardless of how the contribution may have been divided between committees.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If the Senator will refer to page 6, line 13, he will find it there stated that these donations can be made to a committee acting in behalf of an individual or individuals. In a national election, every State will have committees formed to aid candidates for President, Senator, perhaps, and Representatives. Each of these, under the amendment, will be a committee that receives these donations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is the way campaigns are handled. There will be a committee for support of a candidate for President, for Senator, and so forth; but it is made clear, on page 2, that the credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not exceed $10 for any taxable year.

As to a deduction for any taxable year, that is also made clear on page 5, line 18, wherein it is stated:

> The deduction under subsection (a) shall not exceed $100 for any taxable year.

So only one contribution could be made for which a deduction could be taken. It could not be made to all the committees to which the Senator has referred. A person could make the contributions, but he could not get the tax credit.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Does the Senator think all these committees are going to report, if an individual can appoint a committee, and there are committees in the precincts, counties, or throughout the State? There could be two or three hundred committees supporting one candidate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think that under the bill as now proposed there will be better reporting. If somebody is contributing to the Communist Party, we will find out who he is, because he will have to make a report of it. Furthermore, it is the same as giving $10 to the Red Cross. If there is any question about it, when the Internal Revenue representative calls on the person making the claim, he must present a receipt or canceled check.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That requirement is not in this amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That requirement applies to all deductions and all credits.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and ask for a division on my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very sympathetic to the objective of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee. It could do much to stimulate contributions to political parties, broaden the base of their support, and increase nationwide interest in politics. These are worthy goals.

However, the pending bill is not a tax measure, and that is the fatal flaw of this amendment. The pending bill deals with reports and limitations on elections. It is not a revenue measure.

Mr. President, I have for years advocated giving a tax deduction for traveling expenses of working people going to and from work. I am the sponsor of a bill to grant deductions to disabled veterans who commute to work. We allow considerable deductions now for the traveling expenses of businessmen, and I think a strong case can be made for them. We should do the same for a person who is required to commute to and from work every day.

In addition, I have been very much interested in a tax deduction for premiums paid on voluntary health insurance. I have introduced a bill to achieve that goal. Rather than foist a Government system of forced health insurance on us, I favor trying to stimulate a greater interest among people in taking voluntary health insurance. My tax deduction would serve as just such a stimulant, and I hope someday to get some action on it.

In other words, there are many laudable purposes for which a tax deduction and tax credit could properly be made. I do not think a contribution to a political party perhaps stands as high as some of the others, although, if our fiscal situation were such that we could afford to do it, I would be much more in sympathy with the objectives sought by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives. I know with what jealousy the House Ways and Means Committee looks upon the initiation of tax legislation. There are still in my mind serious constitutional questions about amendments of this kind. But even if those be swept aside, if this amendment falls within the confines of our Constitution, this bill if adopted, will still be completely unpalatable on the House side. It would run into much more opposition because of this amendment, Mr. President, than any other amendment that has been offered here.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this proposal has not been considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We should not hastily infringe on their jurisdiction either.

The appropriate committees in both bodies should have an opportunity to hear expert testimony on this proposal and to weigh it in the light of our overall tax structure. Until that is done, I do not think we should take up this idea.

I cannot understand how some Senators who opposed an amendment which simply gave everyone an equal right to vote would favor an amendment such as this tax legislation, initiated in the Senate of the United States, contrary to a well established principle.

It seems to me it would be hasty, unwise, and not in the interest of the Constitution and of orderly legislation for us to enact this amendment, much as we may favor the objectives which it seeks to accomplish. Therefore, I am opposed to it and shall vote against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration a question in connection with these amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware mean the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Since the Senator from Missouri is not here at the moment, I might ask the question of the Senator who has offered the amendments.

I see that the Senator from Missouri is now present, and I address my question to him. Under existing law, the taxpayer can deduct 10 percent of his income, up to $1,000, without making any itemization of his contributions. He is allowed that amount automatically. If he takes this $10 credit as proposed in this amendment, will he then have to itemize the deductions? What effect will these amendment have? The law now specifically provides that he may claim 10 percent of his income or up to $1,000 as a deduction, or more if the contributions are itemized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Credit does not have any effect on deductions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The average taxpayer is already allowed a deduction of 10 percent of his income, or he can claim in excess of 10 percent provided he itemizes his deductions. I ask the question because I know the overwhelming majority of the smaller income individuals do not itemize their deductions.

On the form 1040 there is an automatic credit for that deduction. What effect will the amendments have?

Perhaps the Senator has an answer. Personally I think we are making a mistake trying to legislate on such matters here on the floor.

I wonder if the chairman of the committee can answer that question.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator from Delaware, with the indulgence of the Senator from Tennessee, it was because of these various matters, such as those raised by the senior Senator from Virginia and by the Senator from Delaware, that I forebore undertaking to offer this proposal as an amendment, or to incorporate it as any portion of the bill.

I think perhaps the philosophy of the amendments is admirable. Undoubtedly it is.

I think the other questions which relate to the matter are quite serious. I think this is a matter which should go to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and should be there considered because of its revenue implications. They are more than implications; they are revenue provisions.

The whole matter troubled me. I hoped to keep some of these matters out of the bill. I did not want to discourage the Senator from Tennessee from offering the amendments. I told him perhaps the matter might be taken to conference. I have had no success in persuading other Senators not to offer the amendments or not to support them.

I have indicated that I am in support of the amendment, but I think it presents a serious hazard with regard to the bill itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I raise this question: The Senator from Tennessee has presented the amendments,

but I am sure he would not want to change the present tax law in this connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator has talked about somebody making big campaign contributions in 1948 and getting a tax ruling in that regard. I do not know what the Senator is talking about, but it has no application to this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This has no application to my previous remarks. That is correct. This is a separate question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Secondly, as to the credit, I understand at the present time a person can take a deduction without itemization up to 10 percent. I suppose if the amount were within that allocation the person would not have to itemize it. If it ran over the amount he would have to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have great respect, has said he "supposes." He is the author of the amendments. Do they so provide? I do not think we can pass laws based upon supposition. We do not want to take away a tax exemption which the people already have. I simply ask the question: Did the Senator consider this point in offering the amendments?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my understanding that the amendments were drafted by officials of the Treasury Department for the Committee on Rules and Administration in the 85th Congress.

I did discuss that matter, although frankly I will say I am not an expert on tax law. My best judgment is what I have just stated. If the amount runs above the allowable deduction a person would have to itemize, and if it were within the allowable deduction he would not have to.

In regard to the matter of tax law originating in the House of Representatives——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The point I am making is a very simple one. Let us say that a man has a $3,000 income and has been taking a 10-percent deduction, or $300. Perhaps he has made contributions of only $100 or $150. Under the existing law such a man can get credit for $300. Then this $10 credit would not bring him in excess of the $300 but if it means he must itemize it he will lose money. Therefore, unless he had contributed the maximum of 10 percent and could so show, he would get no credit under the amendment, because the law very clearly states, as I understand it, that one may take credit up to 10 percent without itemization, or not to exceed $1,000.

Many people no doubt do not contribute the full 10 percent; they may contribute only 5 percent.

In such a case what happens?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. That 10 percent is for charitable contributions and other authorized deductions. This has nothing to do with charity. This is an added public responsibility, for which a person is given a $10 credit.

The 10 percent about which the Senator has been talking is in lieu of stating deductions or charitable contributions. A person may take a 10-percent deduction. That may go as high as $1,000. However, if there is a hospital bill which runs up into another $1,000, even with the 10-percent rule one can take the medical deduction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is substantially correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is a deduction for sickness. This deduction would be in addition to the 10 percent, and it would be allowed for the purpose of public participation in the cleaning up of elections and the avoiding of all the bad publicity resulting from "big money" in election campaigns.

Why should we complicate this matter? We are either for it or against it. The fact of the matter is that this is a credit of up to $10, or a deduction of $100 over all, for 1 taxable year, and has nothing to do with charitable contributions. The 10 percent the Senator has been talking about is a deduction authorization in lieu of itemizing charitable contributions and other deductible items.

That is how simple this matter is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is an excellent explanation. The question I ask is, Is the Senator sure this is what the amendment will do?

Mr. PASTORE. That is the answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Where is it so provided in the amendment? I know that is what the Senator intends to do. I am simply asking, Where in the pending amendments is that separated?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I accept the legislative history as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator not know enough about his own amendments to tell me where to find it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The amendments would not amend the general law. They would only add another deduction a person could take, like the medical deduction. I do not think we have to rewrite the entire law on deductions in order to provide a new deduction. At least, the good people from the Treasury Department who drafted this provision for the committee did not think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator ought to be very sure of what he is doing, and I am not so sure he is.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have a word to say on the question of whether this matter should come from the House of Representatives.

Article I, section 7, of the Constitution provides:

> All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has read what Dr. Corwin in his fine work, "The Constitution of the United States," says, and he cites quite a number of cases on that point. The cases are to the effect that if the tax matter is incidental to another larger purpose, an amendment can be added in the Senate, notwithstanding the fact that it is a tax matter.

Furthermore, this is not an amendment for the purpose of raising revenues. The Supreme Court has always said that the term should be strictly applied, and that if it were simply a method of getting revenue or decreasing revenue for some laudatory purpose it would be allowed. The Supreme Court has not passed on this particular matter, but it has stated that for an incidental purpose it is not necessary that the provision originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on which a division has been requested.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from South Dakota does not pose at all as a constitutional expert, but he does know that the attitude of the Members of the House of Representatives who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means is a very jealous one with respect to the constitutional provision with regard to the origination of bills which deal with revenue.

I recall rather distinctly that when we were working on the highway financing bill, we were told we must not seek to originate any revenue provisions in regard to that proposed legislation if we wanted the House to receive it or to consider it.

Furthermore, it was pointed out to us that there was an act—I think it related to the Cotton Futures Act—which the Supreme Court had held to be unconstitutional because the Senate bill carried a provision relating to revenue. It was said that such a bill would have to originate in the House of Representatives.

I recall on another occasion when I sought to take care of a very minor matter dealing with the District of Columbia, as to the payment of a long-standing bill to some employees under the OPS, or the OPA, the House had a field day, for we had provided that as much as $15,000, or something less than $15,000, should be available to pay the salaries, which had been unpaid for a long time.

Regardless of the merits of this provision—and I think the provision does have some merit, and I think on its merit one might find some reason for supporting such a provision—I think it would be unwise, if we want this proposed legislation to become effective, to try to put such a provision in the pending bill.

It is true that the House Committee on Administration or the House Committee on Rules might report a bill with a House number, striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the text of whatever we do here, but I have no hope at all that the House would receive and pass the bill with a Senate

number if the bill originated something dealing with revenue as clearly as this provision does. Therefore, I think it would be unwise and damaging to the purposes of this bill if we were to adopt the amendment which is proposed at this time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hesitated at the beginning to speak in regard to this amendment, but I am more or less impelled to say a word or two.

I really think this is an exercise in futility. I do not believe anything is going to happen to this amendment even if it is taken to conference, but I am glad it was brought up, Mr. President, because it emphasizes the very heart of the problem which confronts us with regard to the clean elections bill.

Everyone knows that the thing which leads to corruption of the election laws is so-called big money. The important question is, How shall we encourage the little people to make the contributions they would like to make and we would like to have them make? Many people would like to give $10 or $20, and that is the most they could afford.

All we are trying to say is that if we want to clean up the election laws and eliminate corruption and abuse, especially the vast expenditures of money at campaign time for very expensive campaigns, we must do something to encourage the little fellow to make a reasonable contribution. This amendment may not be the way. I do not know how much money is involved, but I am glad the question arose. I do not care what happens in the House. We cannot prognosticate that far. I have heard it said, "Let us include the primary amendment." Someone else says, "It will not survive in the House." Later the same man will make the opposite argument, as we have heard here this afternoon.

The time has come to give serious thought to the best way of cleaning up the mess caused by tremendously large contributions which are leading to an evil in our election process.

I do not know what will happen. Perhaps the best thing would be to withdraw the amendment. However, it will serve to put the country on notice. I have no doubt that it will not survive in the House, for one reason or another. I am very happy that the question arose, because in my opinion, if we want fair elections, we must make them more democratic. We must make it possible for more people to participate. Unless we do something of this kind to interest people in elections, I am afraid the entire effort will be a dismal failure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendments were rejected.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which he has prepared in opposition to the bill, and which he previously had given me to place in the RECORD for him in his absence. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on final passage.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

I cannot in good conscience bring myself to vote for a bill that, I think, is, first, a violation of States rights and, second, a measure that clearly overlooks the greatest single source of political spending today in its reporting requirements. I voted against the inclusion of the requirement for primary reporting because I do not feel that a man is a candidate for Federal office until he is nominated, and I further feel that the fact that most States require primary reporting, as does my State of Arizona, is sufficient to satisfy those who want to know where the money comes from and in what amount.

I tried on the floor of the Senate to explain to the chairman of the committee the reasons why I feel political action committees, such as COPE, would come under this law, but I was unable to convince him or a sufficient number of my colleagues to insure this would come about.

There is no question that section 610 of the Taft-Hartley Act makes it illegal for a labor union or a corporation to make political contributions, but there is not a man on this floor who in all honesty can say that COPE and similar organizations in business do not make political contributions, and in the case of COPE these contributions are astronomical. The bill makes it possible for these committees to continue to operate against what, to me, is the clear intent of the existing law, and I was hopeful that something could be done in this bill to take care of this, but it has not, so I must agree with other Members of this body that a study into the whole field would be proper. As ranking minority member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I will give this suggestion our study and report to the body at a later date. In fact, I think it is high time that the Congress looks into the whole subject of the power vested in the labor movement, and I have before the Senate at the present time a resolution calling for the establishment of a select committee to make such a study, and if those colleagues of mine who have indicated a desire for such a study will support the resolution, it is possible the leadership will create such a committee.

Since some union leaders are now assuming a role of political leadership and exercise a power greater in many instances than elected officials or top functionaries of the political parties, it seems time to examine with care the origins of such power. They have proven at National Democrat Conventions that they can veto nominations to the national ticket, and can also name alternate candidates. They have also taken advantage of the grassroots void created by civil service reform of the patronage system, and have moved into the Democrat Party with a new grassroots machine, a new-style political patronage machine owned and operated by a few union officials and paid for by the diversion of union dues from their proper uses.

In a word, the power is illegitimate right down through the operation. These union leaders are assuming the responsibilities and power of political leaders, responsibilities and power never granted to them by their union constituents or by the public; and they are exercising this power by the illegitimate use of union dues for political purposes, union dues granted by the members for the furtherance of their economic welfare, and not for politics.

The power of these men cannot be reached by the voters. They cannot be voted out of office because they do not derive their power from any public election. They cannot be reached by the voters. Their constituents are the union members.

Nor is their political leadership the basis on which they are tested for reelection to union office. Even the union members cannot reach this political power.

Such a threatened usurpation of political power was thought to exist on the part of corporation heads at the turn of the century. Some irresponsible financiers and corporation heads certainly did make ruthless use of assets which belonged to their stockholders, putting funds behind candidates and parties not necessarily supported by these stockholders.

On the recommendation of a Republican President, a law was passed in 1907 by a Republican Congress outlawing such use of corporate funds for political purposes. Since then, it has remained illegal to use corporate funds in Federal elections. The States quickly followed with laws banning corporate funds in State elections.

Fifty years ago, it was the question of the illegitimate exercise of political power by corporation barons; now, 50 years later, it is the labor barons who are abusing the public in this same way but on a scale unimaginable 50 years ago. It is my firm opinion that we must have new legislation to restrict the political activities of the unions, and immediate action by the Department of Justice to apply existing law with a determination and allocation of legal personnel comparable to that expended on the monopoly problem. Only Congress and the judiciary are now powerful enough to resist and turn back an illegitimate power drive of such magnitude. Already this power has reached so far that corrective action by Congress in the near future seems unlikely.

It was a task the liberals willingly undertook in 1907 to curb such a threat then coming from some corporation heads; it remains very instructive to observe how the evangelical liberals confront the same threat coming now from the union leaders.

I have always found very puzzling the view that curbing of irresponsible political power in giant corporations is "liberal" but the curbing of irresponsible political power in giant labor unions is "reactionary." It is my plan to inquire into the meaning of this matter from some of my learned colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make such changes in section, subsection, and paragraph numbers and letters, and cross references thereto, as may be necessary to the proper numbering and lettering of the bill; also that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make the proper amendments to the table of contents, to make the table conform to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I believe a brief statement should be made with respect to the change in the effective date of the bill.

The bill was reported as the Elections Act of 1959. There has been some slight misunderstanding expressed in several quarters over the change in the effective date of the bill. It appears that this change in date has been interpreted by some—I hope not many—to be for the specific purpose of excluding the forthcoming elections of 1960 from being covered by the bill. While it is true that this will be the result, that is not the reason for the change.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on July 23, 1959, and, as reported, it would become effective on January 1, 1960. However, the bill was not scheduled for consideration by the Senate until after that date. Should the bill now pass the Senate, it will be sent to the House for consideration, where several weeks of consideration by the House may be required, even if the House Committee on Administration is able to begin consideration of the bill immediately.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the minority leader. I am undertaking to explain the amendment which he and I offered the other day relating to the effective date of the bill. He may have something to add.

Many States hold their primary elections early this year. Illinois and New Jersey have primaries in April. Many States have primaries in May. Because of this many candidates and committees have already received contributions and made expenditures.

It would be grossly unfair to require reports of these past transactions as the bill would require if the effective date of January 1, 1960, was left in the bill. It would also be impossible to make the law effective as of the date of passage because the reports of political committees are based on the calendar year, that is, the reports must cover the period from January 1 to the date of the report.

The bill, therefore, cannot be made effective until January 1, 1961. Any other effective day would make it apply to periods prior to its enactment.

Committees that operate only within the boundaries of a State have never reported to the Federal Government before; however, under the terms of the bill, as amended, they will have to report contributions received and expenditures made throughout the year. It would be unjust to require them to make reports of such transactions which occurred prior to enactment.

The limitation on expenditures imposed on political committees which operate in two or more States, and the $10,000 overall limitation on contributions are applicable to the calendar year, January 1 to December 31. These provisions provide for criminal penalties, and as we all know, the Constitution prohibits legislation which will make an activity which has already occurred a crime. Therefore, if the provisions of this bill are to be effective, they cannot be put in force until January 1, 1961.

Many of us are sorry that Congress did not reach the consideration of this bill in 1959 so it would apply to the forthcoming elections, but since it has come before us only now, it cannot be effective until 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Victory for Reform," published in the Washington Post of January 23, 1960; also an editorial entitled "An Echo From History," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 22, 1960. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial was written by my very good friend, Irving Dilliard.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 23, 1960]

VICTORY FOR REFORM

Senator HENNINGS has surprised nearly everyone—probably including himself—by winning broad and significant improvements in the diluted clean elections bill reported by the Senate Rules Committee. The Senate's agreement to extend Federal regulation of campaign spending to primary elections was perhaps the most heartening from a political viewpoint, in the light of stout opposition by Southern Democrats and their conservative Republican allies. This step alone could make the limitations on spending meaningful in "one-party States." A gain of less sweeping importance but nonetheless an important reform was the approval of the overall $10,000 limitation on individual campaign contributions, on which there is now no effective limit.

Of broadest significance was the Senate's acceptance of the major Hennings proposal that political committees anywhere, regardless of the scope of their operations, must report all spending in excess of $2,500 in behalf of any candidates for Federal office. Under present law, and under the committee's bill, there are no reporting requirements for the State and local committees which, it is estimated, account for perhaps 75 percent of all campaign spending.

Speaker RAYBURN, asked about the Senate action, not surprisingly threw cold water on Federal regulation of primaries, which he has always opposed. Apparently this provision would be the focal point of opposition to election law reform in the House, where action remains unlikely this year—a prospect that lessens the import of the Senate decision to postpone the effective date of the new requirements beyond this year's elections. The somewhat cynical suggestion that the Senate toughened the clean elections bill in the expectation that it would get nowhere in the House falls short of a realistic appraisal of what Mr. HENNINGS has accomplished, however. Whatever the motives of individual Senators who have supported the Hennings amendments, they have built a fire that Members of the House cannot easily extinguish. The country might have remained unstirred by a total failure of Congress to address itself to this important subject. It will not lightly accept House refusal to carry forward the excellent work now accomplished in the Senate.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 22, 1960]

AN ECHO FROM HISTORY

The first Senate rollcall in the 86th Congress 2d session, is one that has history stamped all over it. By the surprising generous vote of 50 to 39, the progressive Democrats, joined by the progressive Republicans and aided by a substantial number of recruits, have adopted the Hennings-Keating amendment to include nominating primaries under Federal election spending controls.

This was a step of far-reaching political consequence. To appreciate its importance it is necessary to turn the calendar back more than 40 years to 1918.

That is the year of the bitterly fought race between Henry Ford, automobile manufacturer, and Truman H. Newberry, financier and businessman, for the Republican nomination for Senator from Michigan. The results were so close that a recount was ordered. It showed Newberry winning by a scant 4,300 votes.

But the primary had been marked by lavish spending, particularly on the part of the Newberry forces. The estimates went up close to $1 million, which was many times over the allowance in the Federal Corrupt Practices Acts of 1910 and 1911. Newberry and 16 fellow Republicans were convicted in 1920 of conspiracy to violate the law. He was fined $10,000 and sentenced to serve 2 years in the Federal penitentiary.

The convictions were taken to the Supreme Court, which decided by a narrow split in 1920—although none too clearly—that a primary was not an essential part of an election as that term was understood by framers of the Constitution. Thus freed of the prosecution, Newberry took his seat in 1922, but only after a 46 to 41 vote of his colleagues. The Supreme Court decision and the vote to admit Newberry to the Senate were so hotly criticized over the country that the embattled Senator served less than a year in office. He resigned November 19, 1922, and the Governor of Michigan appointed to succeed him James Couzens, who became an outstanding Senator.

Such is the historical background of the Senate's vote to approve the Hennings-Keating amendment. Democrats, including those paired and announced, supported the amendment 40 to 24, while Republicans opposed it 18 to 16. Since primaries regularly decide many election contests, especially in southern States, a renewed effort to exempt them from spending controls can be expected. We hope that the lines will hold firm in the Senate, and that the House can be persuaded to go along. It is high time that the country corrected the Newberry decision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at the close of the debate on the bill, and after the amendments have been acted upon, I should like to take a moment or two to make as clear as possible, in broad generalities, the reasons why I shall vote against the bill.

In the first place, I believe it starts with the creation of a false impression in the minds of the people. It was denominated—for what reason I do not know—a "clean elections" bill. In my view it would do nothing to clean up the evils which have heretofore existed in connection with elections. I do not believe the bill would add anything to the sanctity or security of elections.

On the contrary, because of certain amendments which have been adopted on the floor during the debate, it opens the gate further to the misuse by cer-

tain people of the power which they possess to influence and control elections with money which they do not own or possess, but which they divert from other purposes in order to control elections in the way they would like to see them go. I refer to the labor bosses. The bill would do nothing to curb the procedure by which labor bosses can take the money of union members and use it contrary to the opinions and wishes of many union members, in influencing and controlling elections.

So far as I am personally concerned, or so far as candidates for office in my State are concerned, it makes little difference whether the bill is passed or whether the law remains the same as it has been heretofore. In my State, as a rule, we spend comparatively little money on election campaigns. It is almost unheard of in my State that election workers are hired or paid for. The idea of spending hundreds of thousands of dollars upon a political election, statewide or otherwise, in my State, is simply unknown.

Mr. President, we have an accounting procedure in my State which I believe to be completely adequate. I have no objection, and I am sure other candidates in my State have no objection, to the filing of reports of contributions, so as to make a clear exposition of the amounts received and spent.

Therefore, so far as elections in my State are concerned, the pending bill will not change the situation one iota. However, we have seen from time to time representatives of certain groups come into my State, subsidized and paid for by moneys which were not originally contributed for political purposes, and attempt, through coercion and otherwise, to influence elections. We have seen in my State money come in from certain organizations and groups who have claimed to be exempt from control, and would still be exempt under the bill, and we have seen that money come in by the thousands of dollars, in green cash bills, and diverted to political channels in my State for the purpose of controlling elections. This bill will do nothing at all to correct that evil. The same persons who have been performing in that manner in the past in my State will continue to perform in the same manner in the future if the bill is enacted.

I said at the outset that the pending bill has been, in my view, mistakenly denominated—for what reason I do not know—as a clean elections bill. I do not say that it is a dirty elections bill. However I say that the term "clean elections bill" is a misnomer, because it will mislead the public into thinking that we have done something to correct the major evils which we all know exist.

I for one will not vote for the bill, when I believe it not only utterly fails to reach the evils we would like to reach in connection with elections, but also, in my judgment, completely fools many of the people of the country into thinking that it is a corrective measure. It is not in any degree. It does not reach those things we would like to reach. I believe the passage of the bill will create a misconception and will fool people for at least a time into thinking that we have done something we have not done.

Mr. President, I will not lend my vote to that kind of business in the Senate. I am not going to lend my support to it, in spite of the fact, as I say, it would be very easy to vote for the bill, I presume, because it does not affect my State one way or another. We are not particularly concerned, because it does not do anything to clean up the situation which has existed interstate. In my State we have no objection to reporting, and we have no objection to thorough reporting. We have a limitation on expenditures, and we have a limitation on the use of money. As it stands today, the law can be circumvented in my State, as is the case in every other State in the Union; and the way the law will stand if the bill is passed, the same circumvention can occur.

Therefore I cannot go before the public in my State and say we now have passed a clean elections bill, when I do not believe any such thing. I believe an examination of it will show that to be the fact. I think the bill will, in effect, if passed, prevent a great many honorable, zealous people who would like to see good public officials elected to office, from contributing, in many instances, of their substance to see that that is done. It will do nothing to prevent the corruptionists and those who would seek to direct elections for ulterior purposes from carrying on in the same way as in the past. I, therefore, wish to make it clear that I cannot support a bill which I believe to be a subterfuge in connection with all the civic, political, and human rights we are entitled to exercise in free elections.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I expected to vote for the pending bill in the form in which it came from the committee. However, it has been amended so as to confer upon the Federal Government the power to regulate primaries. In my opinion one of the most tragic things that is happening to this country today is the continuing centralization of power in Washington.

I have not yet contracted Potomac fever. I still believe that the people of the States have enough intelligence and enough character to regulate the conduct of primaries and conventions and caucuses, as they have done since 1789. I see no reason for changing the rule, which has been in operation since the foundation of this Republic. Since the primary amendment has been incorporated in the bill, I cannot vote for the bill. This is true because I believe that the continuing centralization of power in Washington imports tragedy for this Nation.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which considered the bill in committee in the first session of the 86th Congress. Bringing primaries under the provisions of the bill was killed in committee. The bill as reported by the committee did not contain such a provision. The amendment has been added. I cannot support it as the bill now stands, and I shall vote against it.

North Carolina has good election laws to regulate primaries and elections. I believe it would be a reflection upon the honor and integrity of North Carolina to say that the Federal Government must come to North Carolina to regulate primaries in North Carolina. Therefore, I am opposed to the bill with the primary election section contained in it, as it now stands.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate, but I believe that at this point it might be well to summarize precisely what the bill in its present form will do. I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Missouri to correct me if I am in error.

Mr. President, it would apply to both general elections and primaries, and would become effective on the first of January 1961. It does not, however, relieve any candidate from making a report and filing it under the existing Corrupt Practices Act.

Second, with respect to expenditure limits, candidates could spend one of three amounts: Either $50,000 or 20 cents for the first million voters in the last general election, plus 10 cents for each voter over that number; or 20 cents for each of the first million registered voters, and 10 cents for all voters over 1 million.

In the case of candidates for President and Vice President, in a general election, they could spend 20 cents for each voter in the last general election, but in the primary they could spend only one-half of that amount. In the case of national committees, all of them could spend an amount equal to 20 cents per voter for the number of voters in the last general election.

With respect to the contribution limitation, there is an across-the-board limitation of $10,000 per person.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him on one point he has mentioned, before he gets away from it, I should like to say that it is not "all" committees, but each of the committees.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true. I meant each committee. I was probably using "all" in the same sense. With respect to contributions, the across-the-board limitation is $10,000. I am reminded of a senatorial campaign, when I went to an advertising agency. I had noticed a beautiful illuminated sign on top of a building. I said to the manager of the agency, "What would that cost a month?" He said, "It would cost $1,500 for 30 days."

So we would limit the contribution by an individual, who, because his country has been good to him, might wish to contribute infinitely more, to a sum equivalent to the cost of seven illuminated billboards. He can give as much as he likes to his church. He can give as much as he likes to his lodge. He can give as much as he likes to his country club. However, when it comes to his country and he wants to help to elect to public

office people who will represent his point of view, we say the limit is $10,000.

The next item is with respect to reports. From here on out, every candidate ought to be a bookkeeper, a detective, an accountant with a CPA degree, and a flair for politics, all rolled into one. There will have to be four reports in the case of every committee, large or small, national, State, or local, if in the case of such committee as much as $2,500 of the funds available is expended for a national candidate.

The report embraces, roughly, nine different categories of information.

Then there comes the problem of evaluating the services of money raisers, clerks, accountants, typists, and ghost writers, and everything else which goes along with a campaign. There will be three places in which to file these reports: with the Senate, with the House, and with the appropriate U.S. district court. Interestingly enough, these reports will have to remain on file for a period of 6 years. That is the equivalent of three terms in the House of Representatives. So if a Member of the House is elected in November 1960, then for the equivalent of three full terms that report will be on file and open for inspection.

With respect to the committees, in every case they will have to make apportionments and allocations to show how much the sheriff received of the committee funds, how much was devoted to the Governor, how much to the auditor of public accounts, how much to the State treasurer, how much to the Representative, and how much to the Senator, to determine whether or not the amounts for a Federal officer, paid out of the committee till, amounted to $2,500.

In the case of individuals, so far as reports are concerned, the limit is $100. When an individual contributes $100 or more in any calendar year in two or more States, that individual, as I read the bill, must make four reports. It will take a little bit of doing before we get through.

The effect of the bill, as I measure it, with respect to committees, is this: Obviously, it will be necessary to determine whether the Senator or the Representative received $2,500 from any committee; if so, then, of course, a report must be made.

Penalties are provided. This is a criminal statute. I can readily imagine that humble people, who have been an essential part of the working political organism of the country, on the advice of counsel, if they go to see counsel, will back off and refuse to serve as treasurer of a county committee because they do not know exactly when, where, or how to make reports, or when they might be headed for the jail. In addition to this, all the State reports will have to be made.

With respect to out-of-State contributors, a contributor from out of a State, contributing in another State, would obviously have to make a report. As I read it, a man who has his own fiscal means will be the one who derives the big advantage from a bill like this.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is my understanding correct that, if a citizen is requested to serve on one of the committees, he will serve at his peril? That is, in the event some report is not filed, will he be subjected to a $5,000 fine and a penitentiary term if he is guilty of dereliction in connection with the filing of one of the reports?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me put it in this form: Whether it be in a county in Illinois or a parish in Louisiana, let us suppose a man has served as precinct committeeman for a long time. The county committee meets within 30 days after the primary election. They organize. They select a chairman, a vice chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer. Suppose they want to honor a fine old chap who has been lugging in the votes and doing his duty as a citizen. They make him treasurer of the committee. Either he or some clerk will have to make the report.

County committees normally do not have the personnel whom they can keep on their payroll in order to make reports. So the treasurer of the committee becomes responsibile for the report. If as much as $2,500 from the county committee till was spent for the election of a Senator or a Representative, that gives the matter a Federal character. Then a report has to be made in a number of places.

So the treasurer will begin to back off a little. He will say, as would a treasurer in Louisiana—certainly it would be the case in Illinois—"Well, now, I don't understand all this abstruse business. I guess I will have to go and get myself a lawyer." Then he begins to speculate about it, goes home, and talks to his wife.

His wife may say, "John, if I were you, I just wouldn't do it. I would go down to the next meeting of the county committee and resign."

Mr. President, Aristotle said that man is a political animal. He is. He thinks politically. All people do. I am not going to be one to take the political animal and put him in a straitjacket, because politics is not only politics in this country; it is diversion and recreation and society, as well, in so many areas. So we will be making it rather difficult and rather confusing.

The point I make is simply this: The man who has his own means is the fellow who does not have to worry about expenses. Assume 4 million votes will be cast in the State of Illinois. That is 20 cents for the first million, or $200,000; 10 cents for the next 3 million, $300,000. That is $500,000 which a candidate can spend. A man having his own financial means will have that amount to spend, and he can spend it out of his own pocket.

Mr. President, where do you think a humble citizen like me would get off, who has to go forth and tap everybody he possibly can in order to get a little money with which to buy television time at $100 a minute; to buy radio time; to buy newspaper space at $8 a running column? The deal favors the man having his own means, because he has the money to spend; and the bill says: "This is the amount you can spend." If he has the money, and if he is interested enough in coming to the Senate or the House of Representatives, let Senators tell me if we are not today putting a premium on a great big, fat bankroll as a qualification for holding Federal public office in the United States. It stands to reason that such a person is the one who will benefit.

Then I must point out, again, that this is a criminal statute. Penalties are provided for its violation. A fine and imprisonment are provided for. So Senators can see what will happen.

The candidate will have to be like Pooh Bah, in the Mikado. He will have to be the Lord Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Prime Minister, the Lord High Executioner, and everybody else. The candidate will have to be a pretty good bookkeeper; he will have to keep account of the $10,000 limit. If anyone wants to give him a little money, he will have to know how much has gone to other committees. Then he will have to go around and say to the boys, "I can't ask you for $100, because if I do, and if you send a little money over to Bill Jones, BOURKE HICKENLOOPER's friend in Iowa, you will have to make four reports. So I'll tell you what to do. Just give me $99."

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I had not expected to take part, in the Senate, today, in a lengthy debate on the bill, which, come Wednesday, will have been under consideration for 2 weeks. I think Senators are well aware that many arguments can be made on both sides of the bill, including the amendments.

The Senator from Illinois paints a rather distressing view in his picture of a humble citizen who might serve as treasurer of a political committee. The Senator is aware, I am sure, that the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 imposes criminal penalties.

The Senator cannot quite have it both ways. He said a man who loves his country cannot contribute more than $10,000 a year. Thereafter, he says that campaign costs are exceedingly high, but that a man, his wife, and eldest son could contribute much more than $10,000, considering all the assets and means of some families and groups in this country.

I do not want to get into a discussion of the rather extreme conclusions which I believe have been postulated by the Senator's speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does that make any difference with respect to what is in the bill?

Mr. HENNINGS. No. The Senator from Illinois was not for the bill at the outset; I would scarcely expect him to be for it now.

May I ask the Senator from Illinois whether, campaign costs having now reached the astronomical figures he has suggested, from his having investigated

the cost of a neon sign—I believe that that was the sort of sign he considered—he would be in favor of our attempting to raise the archaic, obsolete limits prescribed by the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will make the Senator from Missouri a deal. I will offer an amendment to take only those items which raise the expenditure total for a candidate, and are in the existing Corrupt Practices Act, and stop right there. I will take away all the provisions about reports, if my friend will accept that proposal.

Mr. HENNINGS. I regret exceedingly that I cannot speak for the Senate. I regret that I am offered only a Hobson's choice. I think it is lamentable that the Senator did not project his deal during the consideration of the amendments.

However the deal might have been regarded, the Senator knows what the Senate has done with the amendments which have been accepted by the Senate and with others which have been voted upon, and I am sure that while the Senator can make a ludicrous case about many, many fine people being taken off to jail for some violations, the Senator is aware which penalties are provided. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 likewise provided penalties. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 provided for more reports by committees than this bill provides. This bill requires semiannual reports; the Corrupt Practices Act required quarterly reports. There are many, many other points I could make, but I shall not detain the Senate further.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must close with two observations. First, the Senator from Missouri mentioned that a man can give $10,000; his wife can give $10,000; his children can give $10,000. Of course, everybody knows that would be in the nature of a subterfuge, and that family would be investigated by a Senate investigating committee.

If the Senator wants choice reading, I refer him to the book by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], written after making an investigation. I had the pleasure of going over it last night. I am going to keep it as a memento and keepsake, because I may receive $10,000, but ultimately it will be spun out before some Senate investigating committee ere we get through.

The other point I wanted to make was this. I have been on this floor every day. I have been on the floor all the time while these amendments have been under consideration. My friend from Missouri, I am sure, will not contend that the minority leader was lacking in diligence in pursuing this bill, because certain amendments which were offered by him were adopted, and he knows how the Senate disposed of other amendments. But if my friend will make with me the same deal that he made with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on the tax amendment, and say, "We will take it to conference," I suggest the striking out of everything except the increase in expenditure allowances, and then I shall be able to vote for the bill.

I have made my case, and I am prepared for the vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota was under the impression there were a few matters in the bill that changed existing law. For the RECORD, I should like to ask one or two questions of the Senator from Missouri.

In the committee report on the bill, I read, on page 4, the following:

> S. 2436 shares with the existing law its basic theories and its remedies. Still there is some difference in the emphasis on certain aspects of disclosure. While the existing law establishes the principle of public disclosure on the national level, S. 2436 lays special stress on the availability of information as to campaign financing not only on the national, but also on the local level.

I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri his opinion, and the opinion of the committee in reporting the bill, as to whether making reports available on the local level would be a salutary improvement of the election process.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad the Senator from South Dakota has asked the question. We have undertaken to say, during the course of the discussion of this bill, that reports on the local level—I think it might be a better phrase to say in the neighborhod area, and that would apply to any State official authorized by law to accept reports—would tend to a greater dissemination and understanding of just who is contributing, what expenditures are being made, and in what amounts. That certainly is the purpose of the provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I read further, on page 5 of the committee report, this statement:

> Existing law, despite its professed philosophy that corrupt election practices can be cured or prevented by full disclosure of campaign financing, fails to provide for a wide dissemination of reports dealing with campaign contributions and expenditures. According to present law these reports are to be filed with the Clerk of the House, and by senatorial candidates also with the Secretary of the Senate. [See par. 9.3.2.1 below.] It is obvious that in these circumstances only through the media of the press can the public at large be sufficiently informed about the sources and the volume of campaign financing. At present, only the representatives of the press have easy access to campaign reports filed with the mentioned officers of the Congress. Even so, the existing law fails to require that these officers permit the copying of reports by modern mechanical means. At present, in fact, it happens that even committees of the Senate are not allowed, without special permission of the Speaker of the House, to have these reports photostated.

As I understand, the bill before the Senate requires the filing of these reports with the nearest district court, or, in the event State law designates some State official to receive reports of this nature, they may be filed with him. Is that correct?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is exactly correct, and the purposes are self-evident.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was it the opinion of the committee and the chairman of the committee reporting the bill that the making of reports available at the local level would improve the climate under which elections would be conducted?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was thought, I will say to the learned Senator, that having the reports available in the area where the candidate lives, filing them with either the district court or the State officer, would enable the press and others interested, including the opponents of one candidate or the other, to have access to the reports at home, in the State, for the purpose of the legitimate use of the reports in presenting them to the people, so that the people might know.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in my experience, when one lives in a State that is some distance from Washington, when one is busy with a campaign it is very difficult for him to determine in advance of the election whether the reports which were filed in advance of the election with the officers of Congress had any particular significance that would have any bearing upon the election. We have traditionally gotten those reports 2 or 3 days after they were filed, when the election was in its last days, and no opportunity for an analytic study of them was available. I had thought, and I have been supporting the bill under the impression, that the filing of reports within the State, at the local level, would be of material assistance to candidates in knowing what was going on with respect to the financing of the opposition.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has well stated the purpose of the provision relating to which he has inquired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is one other section of the bill which I had been under the impression was of some value, and that was the requirement about transfers from one political committee or candidate to another.

I noted, at page 10 of the committee report, the statement that reports by political committees shall contain:

> (4) Name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds;
>
> * * * * *
>
> (8) Name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds.

That requirement is provided by this bill and is not a provision of the existing law.

Is it a fact that the bill does make these changes, cited as section 202(a) (4) and (8), relating to reports filed by political committees of transfer of funds?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator's support of this bill has been exceedingly helpful, and his able analysis of these provisions is again correct to philosophy, foundation, and ultimate effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator of the opinion that the requirements for the reporting of transfer of funds both by a committee that has transferred them and the requirement that the name and address of the committee and candidate to whom the funds may be transferred also will have a salutary effect upon the conduct of elections?

Mr. HENNINGS. I think it is beyond cavil that it will, and that is one of the objectives we desire to accomplish.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Because of these changes and also because I think the provisions which update the law with respect to the cost of elections are definite improvements over the present law, I intend to vote for the bill. In South Dakota I do not think we have been running close to the maximum in past elections, but I recognize that in larger States a realistic look at the situation does involve some updating, if one may call it that, within the permissive limits of contributions and expenditures.

For that reason, as well as for the reason that the changes which I have indicated will be for the better in making for healthier and sounder elections, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly shall not detain the Senate at length. I have tried to follow the course of this bill. I am amazed that the Senate of the United States would pass this bill at a time when very few Members actually know what is in the bill in its present form. No copy of the bill as amended is available, whereby one can make a final study or analysis of it, unless it be in the hands of the chairman of the committee, who has certainly rendered fine service in handling the bill. I have no criticism of him. But it is a fact which should be noted for the record that, so far as the Senator from Mississippi has been able to ascertain, there is available no copy of this bill in its amended form that can be had so as to make a comparison or study of the bill with the present law or with the original bill.

I have a memorandum I prepared in regard to the original bill, as reported by the committee, and virtually every point noted about the bill, as originally presented to the Senate, is now out of date and incorrect, reversed in one way or the other by the floor amendments.

I am further amazed, Mr. President, to observe that 99 men and one lady, representing States of the United States, come to the Senate Chamber and, by one vote—by one sweep of the pen, so to speak—block out and obliterate a large part of the election laws of the respective States. I refer particularly to the primary election laws.

I do not think anyone has any complaint about those laws in my State. I know they are very strict, so strict that a U.S. Senator has to travel 2,000 miles to go home to vote. We do not have an absentee ballot provision in our election law, because that opens up avenues of abuse. The laws are rigidly followed and they are protected and respected. I know it is a matter of honor in my State for one to be chosen as an election manager. I have not heard of much money being spent there in any election.

Members of the Senate are elected from States at large to represent the States as such, and it is simply inconceivable to me, Mr. President, with all defense to them, that a majority would come forward and with one sweep wipe out State election laws to such an extent as has been done.

I was looking at a map of the United States today. There are more than 3,000 counties. Those are the great training grounds for citizenship, which make our large Nation distinctive from almost any other major nation in the world. We have more than 3,000 counties. Each of those counties is represented in a so-called upper branch and a so-called lower branch in one of 50 State legislatures.

How can we assume that we have the collective wisdom of this Nation with reference to the election laws in precincts, in counties, and in States? How could our vision be so superior? How could our judgment be so superior to that of all these other men and women, in 50 legislatures representing more than 3,000 counties, as we try to work out a sound, sane, practical program for regulating, controlling, and conducting elections in those precincts.

With all deference, I submit that the bill should be defeated, or referred to the committee for further work on the subject which needs some attention, as to the amounts of expenditures.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, lest the remarks of my distinguished friend, colleague and neighbor, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], leads someone to think that some unusual course has been followed with respect to this bill, I respectfully suggest that it has followed the course of all proposed legislation. Every amendment which has been agreed to has been stated and is printed in the RECORD. The bill now before the Senate in its amended form is discernible to all who have followed the amendments.

I do not claim that this is a perfect bill. I regret that it is not more stringent. I am particularly regretful that its effective date has been postponed.

But it is a start, Mr. President. It is a start—and a good start. I hope the other body will improve it. I hope that at a later time, before another election in 1962, we shall have an opportunity to strengthen the law further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business. I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent on official business for the Latin America Trade Study Mission as chairman of the Latin America Trade Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is absent on official business attending the christening of a U.S. naval vessel.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. DWORSHAK) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced: yeas 59, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—59

Aiken	Gore	Mansfield
Allott	Green	Martin
Anderson	Gruening	Monroney
Bartlett	Hart	Morse
Bible	Hartke	Morton
Brunsdale	Hayden	Moss
Bush	Hennings	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Muskie
Cannon	Javits	Neuberger
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Carroll	Keating	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Scott
Chavez	Lausche	Smith
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Cooper	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Douglas	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Frear	Magnuson	

NAYS—22

Bennett	Fulbright	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Sparkman
Butler	Hill	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Talmadge
Cotton	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Jordan	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McClellan	
Ervin	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—19

Beall	Goldwater	Randolph
Capehart	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Church	Jackson	Schoeppel
Curtis	Kennedy	Smathers
Dworshak	Kerr	Symington
Ellender	Murray	
Engle	O'Mahoney	

So the bill, S. 2436, was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act of 1960."

TITLE I—TABLE OF CONTENTS AND DEFINITIONS

Table of contents

SEC. 101. This Act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

Table of contents

Title I—Table of Contents and Definitions
Sec. 101. Table of contents.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Title II—Campaign Practices
Sec. 201. Organization of political committees.
Sec. 202. Reports by political committees.
Sec. 203. Reports by others than political committees.
Sec. 204. Reports by candidates.
Sec. 205. Formal requirements on filing reports and statements.
Sec. 206. Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.
Sec. 207. Duties of clerks of United States district courts.
Sec. 208. Limitations upon amount of expenditures.
Sec. 209. General penalties for violations.
Sec. 210. Expenses of election contests.
Sec. 211. Effect on State laws.
Sec. 212. Partial invalidity.
Sec. 213. Repealing clause.
Title III—Amendments to Criminal Code
Sec. 301. Definitions.
Sec. 302. Overall limitation on financial aid to candidates or political committees and prohibition of certain purchases.
Sec. 303. Maximum contributions to and expenditures by interstate political committees.
Sec. 304. Publication or distribution of election materials.
Title IV—Effective Date
Sec. 401. Effective date.

Definitions

SEC. 102. As used in this title and title II, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise—

(1) The term "election" includes a general, special, or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

(2) The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

(3) The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the election of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

(4) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

(5) The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

(6) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons; and

(7) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

TITLE II—CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

Organization of political committees

SEC. 201. (a) Every political committee shall have a chairman and a treasurer. No contribution shall be accepted, and no expenditure made, by or on behalf of a political committee for the purpose of influencing an election until such chairman and treasurer have been chosen. No expenditure shall be made for or on behalf of a political committee without the authorization of its chairman or treasurer.

(b) Every person who receives a contribution for a political committee shall, on demand of the treasurer, and in any event within five days after the receipt of such contribution, render to the treasurer a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution, and the date on which received. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to see to it that all contributions received by or for a committee shall be kept separate from any personal funds and deposited in a special account.

(c) It shall be the duty of the treasurer of a political committee to keep a detailed and exact account of—

(1) all contributions made to or for such committee;

(2) the name and address of every person making any such contribution, and the date thereof;

(3) all expenditures made by or on behalf of such committee; and

(4) the name and address of every person to whom any such expenditure is made, and the date thereof.

(d) It shall be the duty of the treasurer to obtain and keep a receipted bill, stating the particulars, for every expenditure by or on behalf of a political committee exceeding $100 in amount. The treasurer shall preserve all receipted bills and accounts required to be kept by this section for a period of two years from the date of the filing of the statement containing such items.

Reports by political committees

SEC. 202. (a) The treasurer of a political committee shall file reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on forms to be prescribed by him, and shall transmit a copy of such reports (except as provided in section 207 (b)) to the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which the principal office of the committee is located. Such reports shall be filed, complete as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, and as of the tenth day next preceding the date on which an election is to be held, and as of the thirtieth day following an election, with respect to which contributions were received or expenditures made by such committee. In each instance reports shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date as above provided. Each report shall contain—

(1) the amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period;

(2) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution to or for such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount or value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, together with the amount and date of such contribution; and for the purposes of this paragraph the term "contribution", as used herein, shall not include transfers of funds to or from political committees or candidates;

(3) the total sum of individual contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (2);

(4) the name and address of each political committee or candidate from which the committee received any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers;

(5) the total sum of all contributions made to or for such committee during the calendar year;

(6) the name and address of each person to whom an expenditure has been made by such committee in one or more items of the aggregate amount of value, within the calendar year, of $100 or more, and the amount, date, and purpose of such expenditure;

(7) the total sum of all expenditures made by such committee, during the calendar year and not stated under paragraph (6);

(8) the name and address of each political committee or candidate to which the committee made any transfer of funds, together with the amounts and dates of all such transfers; and

(9) the total sum of expenditures made by such committee during the calendar year.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative during the calendar year to which they relate, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) The report required to be filed as of December 31 shall cover the entire calendar year.

(d) In the case of political committees supporting candidates for President, Vice President, or Senator, a copy of the report filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives under subsection (a) shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

(e) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) of this section shall also contain a list of the names of candidates in whose behalf contributions were received or expenditures made. In the case of political committees supporting more than one candidate (and State and local candidates), the amount of the total expenditures allocable to each candidate—

(1) shall be in the same ratio as expenditures on behalf of each candidate for printing and advertising, radio time, and television time bears to the total of such expenditures, or

(2) where no expenditures were made for Federal candidates for any of such purposes there shall be charged to each Federal candidate an amount equal to the full expenditure divided by the total number of candidates, Federal and State;

except that expenditures specifically designated for an individual candidate shall be charged to such candidate.

(f) Whenever any report is filed by the treasurer of any political committee pursuant to subsection (a), such treasurer at the same time shall transmit a true and correct copy of such report to each candidate on whose behalf such report reflects any contribution received, or any expenditure made, by such political committee.

Reports by others than political committees

SEC. 203. Every person (other than those filing reports pursuant to section 202) who makes an expenditure in one or more items aggregating $100 or more within a calendar year, other than by contribution to a political committee, for the purpose of influencing, in two or more States, election of candidates, shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, an itemized detailed report of such expenditures in the same manner as

required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 202, and shall file a copy thereof (subject to the provisions of section 207(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court for the district in which such expenditures are made, and in the case of any expenditure in support of a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator, shall file a copy of the report with the Secretary of the Senate.

Reports by candidates

SEC. 204. (a) Every candidate shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, on a form to be prescribed by him, reports of receipts and expenditures and shall transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate if a candidate for Senator, and (except as provided in section 207(b)) to the clerk of the U.S. district court for the district in which the candidate resides. Such reports shall be complete as of the 10th day next preceding the date on which an election for the office for which he is a candidate is to be held, and as of the fortieth day following such election, and in each instance shall be filed not later than the third day following the reporting date; except that where a candidate in order to qualify for the general election must run in two successive primaries in one party no second report on the first primary will be required for those candidates participating in the second primary if reports filed for the second primary are cumulative and supplementary of the report filed before the first primary. Such reports shall contain a correct and itemized detailed report of contributions received and expenditures made by him in aid or support of his candidacy for election, or for the purpose of influencing the result of the election, in the same manner as required of the treasurer of a political committee by section 202, including amounts expended from his own funds.

(b) The reports required to be filed by subsection (a) shall be cumulative, but where there has been no change in an item reported in a previous report, only the amount need be carried forward.

(c) Every candidate shall enclose with his first report a statement, based upon the records of the proper State official, giving the total number of votes cast for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks (or the number of persons registered to vote), in the election required to be used as a basis for the computation under section 208(b)(2).

Formal requirements on filing reports and statements

SEC. 205. The reports and statements required by this title to be filed by a candidate, a treasurer of a political committee, or by any other person, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the copies thereof required to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and (subject to the provisions of section 207(b)) with the clerk of the United States district court—

(1) shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report or statement, taken before any officer authorized to administer oaths;

(2) shall be deemed properly filed when delivered to the specified recipient, or when deposited in an established post office within the prescribed time, duly stamped, registered, and properly addressed, but in the event it is not received, a duplicate of such report or statement shall be promptly filed upon notice of its nonreceipt by the officer with whom it is required to be filed; and

(3) a copy shall be preserved by the person filing it for a period of one year from the date of filing.

Duties of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate

SEC. 206. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Representatives and of the Secretary of the Senate—

(1) to preserve the reports and statements filed under this title for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(2) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for such inspection within twenty-four hours of their receipt by them; and

(4) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

Duties of clerks of United States district courts

SEC. 207. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerks of United States district courts—

(1) to receive and maintain in an orderly manner all reports and statements required by this Act to be filed with such clerks;

(2) to maintain such reports and statements for public inspection for a period of six years from the date of receipt;

(3) to make such reports and statements available for public inspection during regular office hours;

(4) to make available for public inspection each report and statement within twenty-four hours of its receipt; and

(5) to permit copying of any such report or statement by hand or by duplicating machine, as requested by any person, at the expense of such person.

(b) In States where the secretary of state or other State official is authorized to perform the duties specified in this section, the filing of reports and statements under this title shall be with such State official in lieu of the filing with the clerk of the United States district court.

Limitations upon amount of expenditures

SEC. 208. (a) A candidate for Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of the amount which he may lawfully make under the provisions of this title.

(b) A candidate, in his campaign for election (treating primaries, nominating conventions, caucuses, and special and general elections as separate for the purposes of this limitation), may make expenditures up to—

(1) the sum of $50,000 if a candidate for Senator or Representative at Large, or the sum of $12,500 if a candidate for Representative or Resident Commissioner; or

(2) in the case of an election other than a caucus or nominating convention an amount equal to the higher of the following:

(A)(i) the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number, not in excess of one million, of votes cast in the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, plus (ii) the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such votes in excess of one million; or

(B)(i) the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the total number, not in excess of one million, of persons registered to vote in the general election for the office which the candidate seeks, plus (ii) the amount obtained by multiplying 10 cents by the total number of such persons in excess of one million.

(c) Candidates for elections as President and Vice President who are nominees of a political party, in their campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. For the purpose of the limitation prescribed in this subsection, there shall be included the expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates.

(d) A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President, in his campaign for such nomination, shall not make expenditures in an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount prescribed in subsection (c), above.

(e) Money expended by a candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides, or expended for his necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses, or for stationery, postage, writing, or printing (other than for use on billboards or in newspapers), for distributing letters, circulars, or posters, or for telegraph or telephone service, shall not be included in determining whether his expenditures have exceeded the sum fixed by paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (b) as the limit of campaign expenses of a candidate.

General penalties for violations

SEC. 209. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this title shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned not more than two years.

Expenses of election contests

SEC. 210. This Act shall not limit or affect the right of any person to make contributions or expenditures for proper legal expenses in contesting the results of an election.

Effect on State laws

SEC. 211. This Act shall not be construed to annul, or to exempt any candidate from complying with, the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates, unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this Act: *Provided*, That the limitations on expenditures prescribed in section 208 shall supersede any such limitations prescribed in State laws which differ therefrom.

Partial invalidity

SEC. 212. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Repealing clause

SEC. 213. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and all other Acts or parts of Acts inconsistent herewith are repealed.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE

Definitions

SEC. 301. Section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 591. Definitions

"When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 608, 609, 610, and 612 of this title—

"(1) The term 'election' includes a general, special or primary election, including a preferential primary, and a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates;

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual whose name is presented at an election for nomination for, or election as, President or Vice President, or Senator or Representative in, or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is nominated or elected;

"(3) The term 'political committee' includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures in an aggregate amount exceeding $2,500 in any calendar year for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence in any manner whatsoever the elec-

tion of a candidate or candidates or presidential or vice presidential electors;

"(4) The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make a contribution;

"(5) The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, or transfer of funds between committees, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforcible, to make an expenditure;

"(6) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

"(7) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, and the District of Columbia."

Overall limitation on financial aid to candidates or political committees and prohibition of certain purchases

SEC. 302. Section 608 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 608. (a) Whoever, directly or indirectly, makes contributions or expenditures in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or for election, for any or all of the following purposes—

"(1) to or on behalf of any candidate or candidates for an elective Federal office or offices, including the offices of President and Vice President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or

"(2) to or on behalf of any committee or committees or other organizations engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate or candidates for any such office or offices or the success of any national political party, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"This subsection shall not apply to contributions or expenditures made by a political committee.

"(b) Whoever purchases any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles of any kind or description, the proceeds of which, or any portion thereof, directly or indirectly inures to the benefit of or for any candidate or any political committee shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall not apply to the purchase and sale by candidates and committees of campaign pins, buttons, and similar materials for prices not exceeding $5 per article: *And provided further,* That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the purchase from any political committee of any goods, commodities, advertising, or articles sold by such political committees on a nonprofit basis, nor shall it interfere with the usual and known business, trade, or profession of any candidate.

"(c) In all cases of violations of this section by any person other than an individual, any officer, director, or managing head thereof who consents to such violation, shall be punished as herein provided."

Maximum contributions to and expenditures by interstate political committees

SEC. 303. The first paragraph of section 609 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"No political committee operating in two or more States shall receive contributions or make expenditures in any calendar year in amounts greater than the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the highest number of voters casting votes for all candidates for the office of presidential elector in any one of the last three elections for that office."

Publication or distribution of election materials

SEC. 304. Section 612 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word "names" wherever it appears therein the words "and addresses".

TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

Effective date

SEC. 401. Titles I and II and the amendments made by title III shall take effect on January 1, 1961, except that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to contributions and expenditures made prior to such date; but nothing in this Act shall relieve any person from filing any statements or reports required under the law in force prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ECONOMIC REGULATION OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 430, Senate bill 1508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1508) to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the first paragraph of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes", approved March 12, 1914 (38 Stat. 305), as amended (48 U.S.C. 301), is amended to read as follows:

"That the President of the United States is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to adopt and use a name by which to designate the railroad or railroads and properties to be located, owned, acquired, or operated under the authority of this Act; to employ such officers, agents, or agencies, in his discretion, as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this Act; to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any or all of the duties imposed upon him by the terms of this Act; to detail and require any officer or officers in the Engineer Corps in the Army or Navy to perform service under this Act; to fix the compensation of all officers, agents, or employees appointed or designated by him; to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the State of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate one thousand miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska, and with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska, and the settlement of the public lands therein, and so as to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, transportation of troops, arms, munitions of war, the mails, and for other governmental and public uses, and for the transportation of passengers and property; to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate, with the necessary branch lines, feeders, sidings, switches, and spurs; to purchase or otherwise acquire all real and personal property necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; to exercise the power of eminent domain in acquiring property for such use, which use is hereby declared to be a public use, by condemnation in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force there; to acquire rights of way, terminal grounds, and all other rights; to purchase or otherwise acquire all necessary equipment for the construction and operation of such railroad or railroads; to build or otherwise acquire docks, wharves, terminal facilities, and all structures needed for the equipment and operation of such railroad or railroads; to establish, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property; to receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property, and to perform generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad; to make and establish rules and regulations for the control and operation of said railroad or railroads: *Provided,* That effective one hundred and eighty days after the enactment of this proviso, and thereafter, the operation of the said railroad or railroads and the facilities and equipment thereof shall be subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and related Acts, including the Acts of March 2, 1893; March 2, 1903, and April 14, 1910, known as the Safety Appliance Acts (45 U.S.C., secs. 1–16); the Act of May 6, 1910, known as the Accident Reports Act (45 U.S.C., secs. 38–43); the Acts of February 17, 1911, and March 4, 1915, known as the Boiler Inspection Acts (45 U.S.C., secs. 22–34); the Act of March 4, 1907, known as the Hours of Service Act (45 U.S.C., secs 61–64); the Act of April 22, 1908, known as the Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C., secs. 51–60); title I of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C., secs. 151–163); and the Act known as the Explosives and Combustibles Act (18 U.S.C., secs. 831–835), and to the provisions of any applicable statutes regulating intrastate transportation enacted by the State of Alaska, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such railroad or railroads and facilities were privately owned and operated, except that approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not be required for any extension of such railroad or railroads or for the issuance of securities, and except further that in carrying out its duties under section 20 of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, the Commission shall consider the needs of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to provisions of law with respect to the accounting, auditing, financial reporting, and budgetary requirements of such railroad or railroads, so long as such railroad or railroads continue to be wholly owned and operated by the United States. No free pass or free or reduced rate or fare transportation shall be given except as permitted by the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act. The President is empowered and authorized in his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease

of such railroad or railroads shall be for a longer period than twenty years and no other lease authorized in this Act shall be for a longer period than fifty-five years, or in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress. If the said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority given under this Act, they shall be operated by the lessee under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate commerce laws. The President also is empowered and authorized to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire upon such terms as he may deem proper, any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him, but the price to be paid in case of purchase shall in no case exceed the actual physical value of the railroad. The President also is empowered and authorized to make contracts or agreements with any railroad or steamship company or vessel owner for joint transportation of passengers or property over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel, and to make such other contracts as may be necessary to carry out any of the purposes of this Act; to utilize, in carrying on the work herein provided for, any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama, and the successors to the Isthmian Canal Commission are authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this Act."

SEC. 2. The Act of April 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 239), relating to free transportation on the Alaska Railroad, is hereby repealed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Senators are present in goodly numbers, I should like to ask the majority leader about the calendar of business of tomorrow and the ensuing days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Oregon has not been recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If I may be recognized, I wish to make a very brief statement. I do not wish to detain the Senate.

It is planned to consider Order No. 430, Senate bill 1508, tomorrow. I am informed that there will be very little time consumed in discussing that bill.

It is expected that the Senate will take up Order No. 819, Senate bill 694, a bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems. An announcement has been made previously with respect to this bill.

It is expected that the Senate will consider Calendar No. 559, Senate Joint Resolution 39, a constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives. Amendments are expected to be offered to the joint resolution.

I do not know that these measures will necessarily be taken up in the order mentioned, but they have all been cleared.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, there is a possibility that Senate Joint Resolution 39, Calendar No. 559, the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], may be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is very likely. That is the plan.

CONNECTICUT'S GIFT TO ITS NAMESAKE IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate District Committee, I was especially interested to learn about a meaningful and symbolic event that took place in Washington last month, the success of which was due in large measure to the vision and initiative of our esteemed colleague, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

I have reference to the Christmas tree presentation and lighting ceremonies held in Dupont Circle on December 3 by the Connecticut Avenue Association, during which a live fir Christmas tree was presented by Mrs. Dodd, in the absence of the Senator who had arranged for the tree to be given as a permanent memorial to the Connecticut Avenue Association from the State of Connecticut "in recognition of the outstanding public service projects sponsored by its namesake in the Nation's Capital."

This memorable occasion, attended by many dignitaries, featured a beautiful and inspiring rendition of Christmas carols by the St. Matthew's Cathedral Choir. It also marked the beginning of a 3-week drive by the association to help provide a brighter Christmas for the 1,700 mentally handicapped and problem youngsters at the Children's Center, a District of Columbia Public Welfare Institution located at Laurel, Md. Mrs. Dodd and her 11-year-old son, Nicky, were the first to give a gift to the association's Open House for the Children's Center. The success of the endeavors undertaken by the Connecticut Avenue Association in sponsoring this drive has been warmly attested to by Miss Winifred Thompson, superintendent of the center, and I believe that this humanitarian project should not go unnoticed.

At the ceremonies on December 3, Mrs. Dodd made the presentation of the tree, on behalf of her husband and the State of Connecticut. Her excellent remarks on that occasion deserve attention and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PERMANENT REMINDER OF CONNECTICUT

Monsignor Cartwright, Dr. Elson, Mrs. Fistere, honored guests, members and friends of the Connecticut Avenue Association, I should like to convey my husband's sincere regrets at being unable to be here with you today to participate in these ceremonies. He has asked me to present this statement in his behalf.

It is an honor for me to be here representing the people of Connecticut, and I am especially delighted to see Mrs. Connole and the members of the Connecticut State Society here today, actively participating in the support of the Connecticut Avenue Association's drive for needed Christmas gifts for the youngsters at the Children's Center.

I would like to thank Mr. Morris Rosenbloom, your executive vice president, for his many kindnesses and assistance in arranging for this presentation. I know he has played a leading role in fostering the many good works of your association.

Although I know that Connecticut has presented your association with a Christmas tree last year, we are particularly pleased to provide now this live fir tree from our State as a permanent memorial to the association.

I understand that 1960 will mark the 25th anniversary of the incorporation of the Connecticut Avenue Association as a business and civic group in our Nation's Capital. During the years that my husband and I have lived in Washington, we have been impressed by your efforts in behalf of civic improvements.

It is, therefore, a matter of pleasure to me that the Connecticut namesake in our Nation's Capital receive this permanent reminder of our State. This tree, though today small in stature, will grow through the years as your association has grown in significance over this quarter century.

And now, Mrs. Fistere, on behalf of our State, may I present you this fir tree with the warmth and affection of the people of Connecticut.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the presentation of this symbolic Christmas tree proved of interest to many residents of Metropolitan Washington. The beneficiaries were not limited to the more than 100 members of this civic-business association, nor to their families and employees, nor to the members of the Connecticut State Society who gave this project their full support. The beneficiaries included a large segment of the citizenry of this area, who received a warm inner glow from viewing the handsome tree that remained lit throughout the holiday season and served as a source of inspiration at this important spiritual period of the year.

I make reference to this civic event for several reasons. First, because I think it represents a good example of the type of project that can and should be conducted along similar lines by other communities throughout the United States. Second, because I wish to call attention to the dedicated spirit that characterized the work of the association members in their 3-week campaign on behalf of the youngsters at the Children's Center. Third, because I wish to commend Senator DODD for playing such an instrumental role in making this project possible.

During the number of years that I have spent in Washington, I have been well aware of the contributions made in the public interest by the Connecticut

Avenue Association and I am glad to have the opportunity of joining with Senator and Mrs. Dodd in acknowledging this work publicly. As the annual meeting of the association takes place this evening, January 26, and marks the 25th anniversary of the incorporation of this outstanding civic-business group, I want to take this occasion to extend my hearty congratulations to President Ethel Fistere and the members of this association for the work they perform on behalf of this community. I wish to congratulate them on their past accomplishments—for their Red Cross blood donor drives; for their efforts on behalf of Hungarian relief, the United Givers Fund, the worship in the church of your choice campaign and numerous other worthy causes. I hope that their achievements in recent years serve as a spur to even greater accomplishment in the days ahead. In particular, at this time, I am pleased to have an opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the notable event that took place here last month during the Christmas season—one which was so symbolic of the bountiful good will that exists between Americans who, though separated by many miles, are responsive to each other when significant humanitarian endeavors become the spiritual meeting ground.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to extend my gratitude and thanks to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the very gracious remarks he has made about Mrs. Dodd and me and the Connecticut State Society. I did not know that he was going to make the remarks until only a few minutes ago. It is typical of the warm heart and consideration of the Senator. I am personally grateful to him, and I know Mrs. Dodd is, as is also the Connecticut Avenue Association.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE OREGON ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently Mr. Elmer Peterson, president of the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts, brought to my attention certain resolutions passed by the association at the 11th annual meeting in Salem, Oreg. Because the resolutions discuss important national legislation, I feel that it is most appropriate for me to bring them to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 3

The Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Salem, November 4–6, 1959, determined that—

Whereas the local landowners, Federal, State, and local agencies and organizations, and the Siuslaw SCD have a coordinated plan and program in operation to stabilize and develop the drifting sand dunes in the proposed national sand dunes seashore recreational area; and

Whereas failure to stabilize the dune area will destroy the recreational attraction and value of the area in the form of fresh water lakes, streams, forests, farms, existing park facilities, and Federal and State highways; and

Whereas the present plan and program being coordinated through the Siuslaw SCD is a combined effort of Federal, State, local and private organizations and individuals working together in common cause on multiple use development of the area for the good of the greatest number of people for all time; and

Whereas private money and resources are presently being utilized in this multiple use development and conservation of the area; and

Whereas the area is already well developed for recreational use including Federal, State, and county facilities; and

Whereas much of the area involved is in public lands and now available for the use of all through the existing coordinated plan; and

Whereas the beaches of Oregon have been declared by law to be a State highway and available to the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts actively oppose the bill in its present form for the establishment of a national sand dunes seashore recreational area in the vicinity of Florence and Reedsport, Oreg.

RESOLUTION 4

The Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Salem, November 4–6, 1959, determined that—

Whereas certain groups are advocating and urging the Congress through Senate bill 1123 to convert large areas of public lands into wilderness areas, devoid of all facilities except limited fire protection; and

Whereas such wilderness areas, if created, would interfere with orderly programs of land and watershed management and development and in which public land users may share in the costs of such development; and

Whereas such wilderness areas would negate the multiple use concept of public lands management by impairing grazing use, lumbering, and mining, and would prohibit the use of such lands for transportation purposes and transmission line rights-of-way; and

Whereas these so-called wilderness areas, because of their inaccessibility and lack of facilities, would neither be available nor suitable for recreational use by the average person but would be reserved for only a small minority of the American public who profess a need for large areas of uninhabited wild lands for their pleasures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts be opposed to the enactment of legislation which would create wilderness areas, and recommends legislative action be taken to attain full use of the public lands for watershed management, grazing use, recreation, and such other benefits which may accrue from multiple use of such lands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 5

The Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Salem, November 4–6, 1959, determined that—

Whereas the Southern Umatilla SCD is sponsor of the application for planning assistance to bring the Tutuilla Watershed within the provisions of the Small Watersheds Act, the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts is aware of a condition in regard to the Indian-owned land and regulations pertaining to this land, which might well hamper, if not prevent it, as well as adjacent non-Indian land, from receiving the benefits of such a program; and

Whereas the Tutuilla watershed covers approximately 40,000 acres of farm-and-rangeland of which approximately 58 percent is non-Indian and the balance Indian-owned; and

Whereas it would be impossible to apply any plan for works of improvement without including all lands because of the checkerboard pattern of this land; and

Whereas the indian land stands to benefit in proportion to other land as a result of this proposed watershed project, but because of its peculiar nature it could well be denied benefits which could accrue were it not Indian-owned; and

Whereas all farmers owning or operating land in the watershed have indicated an interest in the project; farmers operating 33,664 acres of land having signed a formal application requesting planning assistance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Association of Soil Conservation Districts support legislation in the Congress of the United States which would permit Indian-owned land in trust to the U.S. Government to be legally included within watershed districts under the Small Watersheds Act, and thereby receive all benefits which would accrue were it not Indian land.

RESOLUTION 6

The Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual meeting held in Salem, November 4–6, 1959, determined that—

Whereas the needs expressed by the soil conservation districts for additional soil and water research have been given recognition; and

Whereas a group composed of spokesmen for (a) the Oregon, Washington, and Idaho Associations of Soil Conservation Districts; (b) the Oregon, Washington, and Idaho Wheat Growers Associations; and (c) the Oregon, Washington, and Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, meeting in Pendleton, Oreg., March 19, 1959, affirmed their stand by resolution to support the Facility Needs—Soil and Water Conservation Research Report as set forth on pp. 128–129; and

Whereas the United States Senate has seen fit to publish this report in full as Senate Document No. 59, 86th Congress, 1st session: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts go on record as supporting Senate Document No. 59, 86th Congress, 1st session, which recommends the establishment of certain soil and water research field stations and laboratories for the Pacific Northwest.

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration is an agency which commands solid support among the citizens of Oregon.

It is true to say that this one agency alone has done more to transform our farms than almost any other single factor. An excellent summary of the current status of the REA appeared in the January 1960 issue of Northwest Ruralite, under the byline of Henry Alderman, its editor.

Mr. Alderman is particularly well qualified to discuss this subject since for many years he was closely associated

with the work of a sister agency, the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-ONE AND NINE-TENTHS KILOWATT-HOURS

(By Henry Alderman)

Electric systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration connected 131,500 new consumers during fiscal 1959, now serve 4,654,000 homes, farms and other rural establishments.

REA has 987 active electric borrowers; 983 of them are consumer owned. REA has made electric loans to 24 profit power companies, totaling $20,067,200. Four of the power companies are active borrowers at this time.

Rural electric systems serve consumers in every State except Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Hawaii.

More than 96 percent of America's farms are now electrified, compared with 10 percent when REA was established in 1935. More than half are served by REA borrowers.

NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

Rural electric systems are locally owned, controlled, and operated by the people they serve. Members elect directors, who establish system policy.

REA, a Federal agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, serves only as a banker for the systems. It does not generate or distribute electric power.

Funds for REA loans are annually authorized by Congress. Loans are repaid over a 35-year period with interest at 2.

Rural electric systems provide service on an "area coverage" basis, even in the most sparsely settled areas. The systems average just over three consumers per mile of line. A comparable national average for the profit power companies is not available, but reports indicate they average more than 30 consumers per mile of line.

The rural electric systems are voluntarily associated in State, regional and national service organizations. Nine hundred fifty-eight systems are members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The sysems, usually through State associations, publish 28 monthly consumer magazines with a total circulation of more than 2½ million.

FINANCIAL RECORD

REA has approved loans totaling $3.9 billion for rural electric service.

As of October 31, 1959, REA borrowers had repaid $805 million in principal, and $388 million in interest. Of the principal payments, $149 million had been paid in advance of the due date. Only a fraction of 1 percent of repayment due was in arrears more than 30 days.

The net worth of the systems totaled $515 million in December 1958—16.6 percent of total assets. This wes an increase of 1.7 percent over 1957.

Operating revenues for the systems amounted to $563 million for 1958, an increase of 8 percent over 1957. Net margins totaled $75 million, an increase of 9 percent over 1957. Forty-five systems had deficit net margins in 1958, and 166 failed to make debt service—REA's standard for judging the financial health of its borrowers.

PURPOSE OF LOANS

The bulk of REA loans are now made for system improvements and generation and transmission facilities. In fiscal 1959, 17.3 percent of loan funds were for generation, 19.2 percent for transmission, 26.3 percent for system improvements, 35.4 percent for new distribution facilities, and 1.8 percent for consumer wiring, plumbing, and equipment financing.

RETAIL POWER SALES

The rural electric systems sold 21.9 billion kilowatt-hours in 1958. Average monthly residential consumption per consumer was 311 kilowatt-hours, an increase of 10 percent over 1957.

The average cost per kilowatt-hour for residential rural electric consumers in 1958 was 2.65 cents. The average monthly residential power bill was $8.23.

WHOLESALE POWER SUPPLY

The wholesale power requirements of rural electric systems are doubling about every 5 years.

Rural electric systems generated 3.4 billion kilowatt-hours in fiscal 1958, and purchased 19.9 billion kilowatt-hours.

Of their wholesale power purchases in fiscal 1958, the systems bought 9.1 billion kilowatt-hours (39.1 percent) from profit power companies at an average cost of 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. They bought 10.8 billion kilowatt-hours (46.5 percent) from Federal and other public suppliers.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST ACCOUNT BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have submitted a statement before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in continued support of my position in favor of the basin account approach and payment for reclamation projects out of profits to be derived from the great multipurpose dams. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement I made before the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST ACCOUNT BILL, S. 1388, JANUARY 22, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank the subcommittee for this opportunity to present my views on behalf of maximum development of one of the richest resources we hold in trust for Americans of today and of future generations—our heritage of fertile lands of the arid and semiarid regions of the Pacific Northwest.

For years I have taken the position that the enormous hydroelectric power developed in the waters of the Columbia River Basin should, in part, be put to work in assuring irrigation development of rich lands that lie unproductive until touched by the magic of water. This idea was inherent in the magnificent Grand Coulee Dam project, which, over the years, has demonstrated that low-cost power and enormous irrigation benefits can go hand-in-hand through proper development of a great multipurpose damsite.

In recent years I have applied the same principle to projects less vast than Grand Coulee, but which nevertheless are important to the economy of the Pacific Northwest. One of these is the Crooked River reclamation project near Prineville in central Oregon. I cosponsored the Crooked River authorization bill, S. 3101, which became law in August 1956. An important feature of this law makes a portion of the cost of the Crooked River project payable from surplus revenues of the Dalles Dam project.

More recently, I introduced the bill, S. 2195 of the 86th Congress, which would authorize the construction of the Dalles Federal reclamation project. Under this bill, construction costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay, are to be obtained from a reclamation fund created through net power revenues derived from the sale of power from the Dalles Dam project.

I joined as a cosponsor of S. 1388, the so-called Pacific Northwest account bill, because I believe the time is at hand for working out an orderly and sensible plan whereby reasonable amounts taken from net power revenues of Federal multipurpose projects in the Columbia River Basin may be applied toward bringing into production in future years the farm lands that will be so urgently needed by coming generations. If we do not take appropriate action now, we will guarantee the production of sagebrush on these lands instead of essential foods and fibers. Our generation, I am sure, has more foresight than to permit these lands to lie waste when the means is at hand to put them to work for humanity.

Arid and semiarid lands of this type cannot be developed by farmers on their own resources. They need assistance. The giving of such assistance through reasonable plans to be worked out by the Federal Government can be classified, beyond a doubt, as action taken in the general public interest. I am satisfied that the large majority of people of the Pacific Northwest who have studied this problem are in agreement that these lands should not be permitted to lie waste and should be put into production in the reasonably foreseeable future to meet the growing needs of our rapidly expanding population. We agree as to the need; the only area of disagreement is that relating to the method whereby these lands may be reclaimed in the public interest.

I was happy to cosponsor S. 1388 because it offers a plan. I shall not attempt to give the subcommittee the technical details of the plan because the subcommittee will have the privilege of hearing from those who have expert knowledge of the subject. Present in the hearing room this morning are residents of Oregon who are outstanding in their work on behalf of reclamation and their knowledge of the program envisaged by S. 1388. I refer to Mr. LaSelle E. Coles, president of the National Reclamation Association; Mr. Carlos Randolph, manager, North Unit Irrigation District, Madras, Oreg.; and Mr. Paul House, manager, Owyhee Irrigation District, Myssa, Oreg. These gentlemen have devoted many years in fostering and advancing the interest of reclamation within the State of Oregon, and are eminently qualified to discuss the merits of S. 1388. In addition, you will hear from officials of the Bureau of Reclamation who have studied this legislative proposal in great detail. I urge the subcommittee's very serious consideration of the testimony to be supplied by these witnesses.

In general, the bill under consideration would make possible the use of excess power revenues to assist farmers in repaying the costs of reclamation development. Designated Federal power projects within the Columbia River Basin would be considered as a unit under a Federal accounting system and excess power revenues from these projects would be available to assist farmers in repaying the costs of irrigation projects which are beyond their ability to repay in the normal 50-year period. The program is not an innovation. For example, basin accounts were set up prior to the development of the Missouri River Basin project and the Upper Colorado River Basin project.

I am aware of the fact that S. 1388 is opposed by some in the Pacific Northwest, but I believe that the opposition is not directed against the general policy of assistance to irrigation development by the use of power revenues; rather it seems to

me that the opposition relates to the method whereby S. 1388 endeavors to achieve its objective. For example, Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association of Vancouver, Wash., has indicated that the interest component should be used for irrigation subsidy instead of the plan contained in S. 1388. I know that Mr. Norwood will give the subcommittee the benefit of his thoroughly considered views on this important topic.

The subject of this hearing is one of great complexity to the average person. It seems to me that the subcommittee can do an important job in the interest of resource development of the Pacific Northwest by its careful analysis of the factual information to be supplied at today's hearing. After weighing all facets of the problem, I am satisfied that the members of this subcommittee will provide us with a workable and reasonable plan whereby the Pacific Northwest's great contribution to our Nation through the production of power at multipurpose damsites may be applied systematically and reasonably toward bringing into production arid lands that would otherwise be of little service to humanity.

It might be well to note on this occasion that if Hells Canyon had been developed as a Federal project, a portion of its benefits would have been available for assisting the irrigation projects in the area. The private utility dams which have been built to thwart public development of Hells Canyon obviously will not provide any assistance to irrigation. This is a lesson which supporters of the basin account approach should bear in mind in connection with future development of resources of the Pacific Northwest.

UNFAIR EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the Benton County Herald of my State entitled "Unfair Excise Taxes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFAIR EXCISE TAXES

How temporary can a tax be, especially after it has been levied for over 15 years? We are speaking of the excise taxes on rail, plane, and bus passenger fares, which have been 10 percent. Also unfair is the 10-percent excise tax on local telephone service.

Some time ago the Senate voted to repeal these taxes, but the House refused to go along. Under a compromise agreement, not yet adopted, the passenger travel tax is to be reduced to 5 percent and the telephone tax is to be retained at 10 percent.

The travel tax came into being in World War II when transportation facilities were overloaded through troop movements and the Government wished to discourage unnecessary civilian travel. A decade and more has passed, and the railroads, airlines, and bus companies have plenty of capacity. The tax is not needed for the purpose it was intended, and in fact hinders the carriers who are the backbone of U.S. transportation in their competition with the private automobile.

Equally unfair is the telephone tax, which also hinders telephone expansion and takes more money out of users' pockets. With the present service there is no way the unfair telephone tax can be justified.

As the Oregonian pointed out in an editorial on this attempt to repeal these wartime excise taxes, "The episode certainly proves one point. There is no such thing as a temporary tax. Once you get into them, they stick like flypaper."

The only solution is to avoid letting such taxes be levied if at all possible—and if not, to demand their removal. This can be accomplished if enough voters care enough to show Congress they mean it. Just a little more letterwriting to our Congressmen might have persuaded the House to go along with the Senate's action.

THE LABOR LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by one of the greatest labor statesmen, Mr. George M. Harrison of the Railway Clerks, in which he comments on the recently passed labor law.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor, Jan. 16, 1960]

SEES ALL UNITED STATES SUFFERING FROM ANTILABOR LAW

CINCINNATI, January 11.—All America, as well as the union movement, will suffer from the drastic Landrum-Griffin labor control law, Pres. George M. Harrison of the Railway Clerks declared here in an interview given to the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

The interview was with James Feldman, labor reporter for that press chain, who asked Harrison to appraise the past decade and preview the next one. The clerks' chief did so, acutely and pungently.

He stressed that the Landrum-Griffin Act may turn the coming decade into "a period of industrial unrest and rule by demagogs."

Because of the Landrum-Griffin law, he added, "the entire character of the union movement will change during the decade to the disadvantage of the people, the country, and industry."

LICENSE TO MALCONTENTS

Calling the law an indefensible invasion of the rights of union members to run their own organizations, Harrison predicted that it would weaken trade union leadership because it "gives a license to irresponsible demagogs and malcontents to subvert the operation of unions."

Recalling the hectic days of labor-management relations of 25 years ago when the sitdown strike and picket line violence was the rule of the day, he said that the Government and industry kept demanding "responsible union leadership."

"Well, we've given it to them," he declared. "We've trained people, we've sent them to school, we revamped our unions and we've given them responsibility, but now they are going right back to the days when the man who can get on a barn and yell the loudest will be the man with the following."

Harrison said labor would survive the 1960's despite all the roadblocks thrown in its way, but that industry would suffer because it seemed bent on fomenting mob rule.

"The trouble," he said, "is that some leaders of industry are so blinded by their hatred of the labor movement that they are incapable of seeing that they are injuring themselves."

Looking back over the fifties, Harrison noted that both management and labor have sharpened their capabilities of dealing with one another. Both have hired professionals to take care of special fields; both have recruited more skilled people, and both have learned something from each other.

OBLIGATION OF UNION LEADERS

He said that the modern labor leader must not battle blindly, but must take into account such things as the economic condition of his industry, the country, and even international affairs.

Speaking of industry during the fifties, Harrison said "there is an unhealthy concentration of industry into the hands of too few corporations." He said that "controlled pricing," whereby huge industries create artificial shortages and set their own price levels, and tremendous, unwarranted profits have led to inflation.

"Inflationary profits of industry are running at a rate that the economy just cannot sustain," Harrison added. In addition to price inflation, they are also causing inflation in interest rates because huge stock profits are taking money out of the market that should be available for lending.

Harrison was also asked about the possibility of a railroad strike.

"My own judgment," he replied, "is that there will not be a strike and that we will be able to settle our problems through the machinery provided for under the Railway Labor Act."

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of State was quoted as saying at a conference on American-Cuban relations that he was "worried about the situation."

As late as yesterday, the Secretary of State huddled with the American Ambassador to Cuba, who had been recalled for a special conference on problems arising in that nation.

Mr. President, it is time the State Department became worried over conditions in Cuba and elsewhere in Latin America. My only regret is that officials in the State Department have waited so long to become alarmed and so long to become worried. I was worried in 1957 over problems in Latin America, and I made a special report on Communist activity in Latin American affairs which was printed as a Senate document by the Judiciary Committee. This report brought to the attention of officials conditions existing at that time, but some of the ultraliberal publications of the Nation, supported by semiofficial reports supposedly representing our State Department's views at that time, belittled any concern over Communist activity in Latin America.

Mr. President, Fidel Castro, who still claims not to be a Communist, in my opinion is more dangerous than a Communist, for he is doing the work of Communists for Communists under the cloak of being a liberator for freedom.

He is like a wolf in sheep's clothing. The people of Cuba have not had any free elections, as they were promised. The agrarian land reform program has turned into a program of Communist confiscation of private property, and instead of bettering Cuba's foreign relations and her economy, Castro has worsened them on every front. His actions last week were below the dignity of diplomatic relations and could only be called acts of a desperate dictator who is fearful of losing control of his position as leader of people.

The U.S. Government has always been a close friend of Cuba. It was the United States that wrested Cuba away from Spanish yoke and gave that country its first taste of freedom. Through the years the American Government has seen fit to pay a premium price for Cuban sugar. While we could have bought sugar at a much lower price, we have

through the years, to help Cuba's economy, insisted upon giving that nation a differential for her sugar. At every turn we have attempted to help Cuba.

The actions of Castro against the U.S. Government and against citizens of the United States, both physical and economical, would normally border on what the diplomatic corps would call acts of aggression. Certainly if a European foreign power had treated the United States, its citizens, and its properties as Cuba has done, it would be a matter of international concern.

The State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., of Sunday, January 24, in an editorial entitled "Step to Isolation," clearly stated that Castro's present foreign policy is one that will lead Cuba into isolationism and bankruptcy.

An editorial which appeared in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., of Saturday, January 23, in clear-cut language described the outrages of Castro against the United States, Spain, and against individuals, newspapermen, and property holders. The News and Courier boldly paints for us the true picture that communism is at work in Cuba and may spread from that island to other places.

In my opinion, we need bolder action from the United States toward Cuba to put that nation in line and to safeguard freedom. As the News and Courier says, "One way or another, communism must be barred from the New World." Sometimes it is easier to deal directly with open communism than it is with deceptive communism such as we have in Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials from the State of January 24 and the News and Courier of January 23 be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Jan. 24, 1960]

STEP TO ISOLATION

Fidel Castro has taken one more step to isolation on the end of a limb by insulting away the Ambassadors from the United States and Cuba's mother country, Spain.

We have never been able to see much caliber to Senor Castro, so could never feel that his rise to power could mean any great and permanent improvement to the people of the island. His subsequent actions have continuously and eloquently vertified this doubt.

Being a weak nation at best it should be fundamentally observable to any but the most obtuse that friendship among the family of free nations is necessary for Cuba's progress. Since coming to power Castro's foreign policy has been one of antagonism, hate, and robbery of property owned by nations that have befriended his country.

Having taken over a not too strong house, Castro seems to be bent on weakening it further and as far as possible, though he probably lacks the perception to realize what he is doing.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 23, 1960]

BOLDER U.S. ACTION ON CUBA REQUIRED TO SAFEGUARD FREEDOM FROM CASTRO

In rallying the Cuban mob, Fidel Castro is goading the United States ever more surely toward decisive action. Unwilling though our Government may be, it cannot put off indefinitely adopting firmer means of curbing the bearded dictator.

If Washington continues to do nothing, a people's republic soon will be in full bloom 100 miles off the Florida coast and a new staging area for Soviet power will take shape.

Polite treatment of Castro has not made him act respectably. American property has been seized. U.S. citizens have been put in jail. Castro has rejected friendship with the country that liberated Cuba in 1898. He has joined the Communist bloc in the United Nations. The direction in which he is leading must not be misinterpreted.

The latest outrageous act, an abusive speech against the Spanish Ambassador to Cuba, was not without design. Cuban middle and upper classes have strong emotional ties to Spain. They regard Spain with the same kind of affection that many Americans feel for England. By striking at Spain, Castro would discredit moderate elements in Cuba. If he can link Spain, which is disliked by Latin America's leftwing intellectuals, with Washington, he will have gained another point in his propaganda war against the United States.

The Associated Press reports that U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal now believes a new policy is needed with respect to Cuba. If he suggests a crackdown on Castro, it is unlikely the State Department will endorse his recommendations. The State Department has a long history of resisting bold measures against world communism. Such firmness as exists in U.S. policies comes from the Defense Department.

The American press has changed its tune on Castro. Influential newspapers such as the Washington Post and the Chicago Daily News, once strongly pro-Castro, now condemn him. The public is getting into a frame of mind for action against the Cuban dictatorship.

Though the State Department in 1934 signed away the specific right to intervene in Cuba, the Monroe Doctrine is still the Nation's basic guide for this hemisphere. This 137-year-old document established a permanent U.S. policy of barring European powers from taking over Latin American governments. While European Communists are not in direct control of Cuba, Castro's lieutenants are leftists who follow the international Communist line. Thus the United States has a doctrinal basis for intervention.

But what sort of action should the United States take in Cuba? The answer, in our judgment, is whatever may be necessary. If Americans will do what's necessary to hold a string of little islands 5 miles off the mainland of China, they should not lack for boldness in Cuba.

The first logical step to restore freedom in Cuba is to withhold the sugar subsidy, which Castro's government needs to prop up the economy. Next could come withdrawal of U.S. recognition, an embargo on trade, and support of a free Cuba movement in the United States.

Beyond this is the possibility of direct United States military intervention, should revolt occur. As in Lebanon, the United States would have to go in quickly and get out just as fast.

If the U.S. Government could act in Lebanon, which is across the world, it could act in Cuba at its own doorstep. All that's necessary is for the public to get adjusted to the idea. Military intervention may seem too drastic at the moment, but we believe the public is ready for initial steps. If these are successful, it may not be necessary to send Marines to Cuba.

One way or another, communism must be barred from the New World.

THE DISMANTLING OF THE ERA OF TERROR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Mr. Thomas E. Murray is one of the ablest engineers in the United States. He is also one of the most public spirited citizens. For a number of years he was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Since his departure from that body he has devoted a great deal of time and attention to the problem of the proper use of atomic energy and the best policy the U.S. Government can adopt.

On December 9, 1959, he read an extraordinary paper before the Institute of World Affairs, in Pasadena, Calif. The paper is entitled "The Dismantling of the Era of Terror."

In his paper, Mr. Murray proposes that an international agency be set up to supervise the destruction of American and Russian megaton weapons; that the destruction be done on a matching basis, weapon for equal weapon; and that the process be continued until its political purpose is achieved.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the remarks of Mr. Murray be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISMANTLING OF THE ERA OF TERROR

(Remarks prepared by Thomas E. Murray, consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for delivery before Institute of World Affairs, Huntington-Sheraton Hotel, Pasadena, Calif., December 9, 1959)

On August 29, 1949, when the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic device, a new era began in the long history of the relations between politics and force. During the ensuing decade the pace of political and technological change has been so swift that men are now begining to say that we have reached the end of the era that began in 1949.

One general judgment of the era is becoming increasingly common. We now realize that the immense drive to arm the United States with nuclear weapons and delivery systems has not been guided and controlled by a clear and practical national purpose. In particular, five criticisms are gaining currency.

First, our armament effort has been wrongly subject to the domination of technology. We have failed to submit technological possibilities to the criterion of military and political usefulness. Second, the result has been an emphasis on the strategy of unlimited war, as exhibited in the concept of massive retaliation. Third, the further result has been a complete divorce between military strategy and political aims. Our dominant military strategy and its supporting arms look to the release of unlimited power, whereas our political aims, whatever they may be, are certainly not unlimited. Fourth, and again in consequence, in the very midst of the enormous power struggle now going on in the world arena, our foreign policies lack the necessary support of force. Our military strength has degenerated into a mere capacity to wreak unlimited nuclear violence, which is politically useless; and this very capacity inhibits us from the use of limited force, which may be politically necessary. Fifth, this whole disorderly structure of policy stands under the final peril, which is a lack of moral sanction. It is against the dictates of reason that mili-

tary strategy should accept the control of technology. Politics, not technology, is the rightful master of military doctrine. It is also against the dictates of reason that the use of force, which may be the necessary instrument of justice, should suffer moral degradation and become a sheer exercise in violence, which can serve no moral or political purposes.

These five criticisms are entirely valid. If I may say so, I had made them myself before their validity began to be commonly recognized. Taken together, they demonstrate the instant need for a new design of American policy, guided by a new vision of the public purpose of America.

The danger at the moment is that American disarmament policies during the decade to come will be characterized by the same confusions that have marked our armament policies in the decade that is past. We swung into action on armament without stopping to put right order in our thought. We have already swung into action on disarmament without stopping to correct the disorders of thought that have already proved so pernicious and will prove pernicious again.

The first problem then is to define the public purpose of America in the field of disarmament. The basis of definition must be the essential distinction between violence and force. This is a political distinction, based on a moral premise. By violence I mean the use of military power in such an extensive, indiscriminating, or even unlimited, measure and manner that its use becomes inept and useless for the rational purposes of politics, which are always limited. By force I mean the use of power in such a limited measure and in such a discriminating manner that its use becomes an apt instrument for the achievement of legitimate political goals. The release of violence is irrational and therefore immoral but the use of force, as thus defined can be rightful, depending on the political rationality and moral rightness of the particular purposes for which it is used.

The past decade has been an era of terror because over it has hung the threat of violence—uncontrolled, unlimited, both politically and morally absurd. Our immediate and urgent purpose, therefore, must be to effect an orderly dismantling of the era of terror, by dissipating this threat of violence. This negative purpose must be allied with the more positive purpose of effecting the orderly construction of a new era. One cannot give it a name or fully describe it. But its essential characteristic must be the reinstatement of force as an instrument for the basic political purpose that is indicated in the American Constitution, namely to establish justice.

Given the nature of man, the art of international politics cannot dispense with the use, or at least the threat, of force, any more than human society can dispense with law, which requires force to back it up. On the other hand, international politics perishes as an art if power is allowed to suffer moral degradation and become mere violence, which is destructive of the very idea of force and of law too.

This statement of the twofold national purpose of America immediately serves to make it clear that nuclear tests are not the primary or most important issue. The past decade has not been the era of terror because it has been an era of tests. The current moratorium on all tests has done nothing to banish the threat of violence. This threat derives from the escape of nuclear technology from the control of military doctrine and political purpose. Here the primary issue appears. Technology does not know the difference between violence and force. Left to itself, without the control of higher policy, it has tended to enlarge our capacity to wreak violence, not to use force. Government, however, is supposed to know this essential political and moral distinction. And it is the duty of Government, by political decision, to make the implications of the distinction binding both on the deliberations of the military strategist and on the experiments of the technological expert.

The primary issue therefore is a reform of thought, to be expressed in political decisions. Moreover, it is not difficult to discern the direction that political decision must take, if it is to rectify its own past errors and retrieve its own past failures. The disorders of policy in the past decade have left as their fateful legacy a great and ever growing stockpile of weapons of violence—megaton weapons whose destructive capacity is unlimited, if used in the numbers required by the current strategy of massive retaliation. We must assume that the Soviet stockpile matches our own. The sheer existence of these stockpiles is the proximate reason why the past decade has been an era of terror. These stockpiles have created their own strategy, which is that of war of annihilation. And the threat of annihilation has in turn created the terror.

It follows in all logic that the era of terror will not be dismantled until these megaton stockpiles are themselves dismantled. This is the immediate issue presented for political decision. The decision does not fall to the strategist or to the technologist. It falls squarely within the province of politics; for it is an issue that concerns the public purpose of the United States. The making of this decision by Government is the very condition for the restoration of politics to its rightful place of primacy in the structure of American policy. There is no other way in which the present rupture between political purpose and military strategy can be healed in its depths.

I should like, first, to present in general outline the form that this political decision should take, and then construct the argument, pro and con.

My suggestion has two parts. First, that an international agency be constituted and located on neutral territory and empowered to supervise the systematic destruction of the megaton weapons in the American and Soviet stockpiles. Second, that the destruction be done on a matching basis, weapon for equal weapon. The United States will hand over to the international agency one megaton weapon, beginning in the highest range; the Soviet Union will in turn hand over one weapon of the same size. Experts in the agency will be able to estimate, within a small percentage of error, whether the weapons are equal in their yield. The "hardware" of the weapons will then be destroyed in some public fashion. Their content of highly enriched fissionable material will be put at the disposal of the appropriate international authority for peaceful uses. This matching of weapons, one for one, will continue. The process has a political purpose—to end the era of terror, to banish the threat of violence, to redeem force from its moral degradation and its political absurdity. The process will therefore continue until this political purpose, under a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, has been achieved.

Considerable detail ought to be added to this proposal; but the presentation of its substance is sufficient for the purposes of immediate public debate. I shall undertake to make the case for it.

In the first place, this proposal takes far more realistic account of the needs of national security than does current American disarmament policy. Our present policy was announced at the London Conference of 1956, and it has not been changed. It calls for nuclear disarmament: first, by the cessation of all nuclear tests; second, by the stoppage of the flow of fissionable material into weapons; third, by the total destruction of all existing nuclear stockpiles. This proposal clearly illustrates our fatal habit of divorcing political and military policies. For political reasons we declared a moratorium on all tests, despite the fact that military reasons demanded certain kinds of tests. These tests would develop what I have called the third generation of weapons. They would be carried out underground and give us new types of much needed limited weapons, defensive and offensive, which could be used in discriminating fashion. Moreover, the other parts of the proposal, if carried out, would be fatal to any rational concept of American military strength. The program would strip us, not only of the capacity for unlimited and useless nuclear violence, but also of the most useful and necessary capacity to use limited nuclear force.

It is true that the carrying out of the present program was made contingent on the establishment of international inspection and controls. However, in the matter of tests it is clear to informed people that an adequate and effective inspection system, which would detect tests even down to 5 or 10 kilotons, is for the present not a definite scientific possibility, and it is also, for the foreseeable future, a political impossibility. An adequate and effective system would have to consist of thousands of stations, equipped with devices not yet invented; this is the scientific problem. Many hundreds of these stations would have to be on Soviet and Red Chinese territory; this is the political impossibility.

Moreover, the stoppage of all nuclear production and the total destruction of existing stockpiles—stand even farther beyond the possibility of control for scientific and political reasons. Therefore, the first argument for my new proposal lies in the need to find a safe alternative to the extremely risky and altogether unrealistic policy to which we are presently committed.

In the second place, the new proposal goes to the heart of the issue. It is the sinister stockpiles of megaton weapons, and the strategies of annihilation built on them, which give off the fumes of terror that today are poisoning the international atmosphere. The terror has to be attacked at its source, which is the bilateral and balancing power of the United States and the Soviet Union to wreck the fabric of civilization in a matter of hours. These pools of potentially unlimited violence must be drained and dried. All other issues are secondary to this.

In the third place, this proposal is practical. It should be possible to negotiate an agreement on it between ourselves and the Soviet Union, the only two necessary partners to such an agreement. The single indispensable condition of agreement exists, namely, self-interest, hard and cold self-interest, the common and coincident self-interest of both parties. It is as much in the interests of the Soviet Union as it is in ours to avoid the ultimate catastrophe in which the era of terror may culminate, if it is not deliberately brought to an end. No national interest, American or Russian, is served by maintaining and increasing a stockpile of weapons of violence that are utterly useless for any political purpose, Russian or American. The political absurdity of unlimited nuclear violence—reciprocally acknowledged—this is the basic fact on which, as on solid ground, an agreement can be based. In the course of their rivalry for megaton armament the United States and the U.S.S.R. have both been driven into an absurd situation. There is a common interest in putting an end to it.

Moreover, the proposal is practical for another reason. It avoids the political stone

wall into which other American proposals have always run. This stone wall is set up by the Soviet concept of absolute national sovereignty which forbids honest and effective international inspection of Soviet territory. A new formula has to be found to establish the principle of international control. The proposal I am discussing contains this new formula. It does not call for inspection of Soviet territory.

In the fourth place, this new proposal will inevitably find favor in the court of world opinion. This is what the nations really want—that the United States should take the lead in bringing them out from under the shadow of possible annihilation. The Soviet Union could not refuse to follow this lead without incurring the political punishment of the disfavor of the nations. Moreover, by making this proposal the United States would finally assume the initiative in the problem of disarmament. In all negotiations the party that defines the issue has already gained the initiative. We lost it by giving way under pressure and allowing the Soviet Union to define, as the primary issue in disarmament, the cessation of all tests. This was a grave mistake on many counts. We shall rectify it, and gather the initiative into our own hands, only if we ourselves define the real issue that rightfully claims primacy. This primary issue is the stockpiled capacity for unlimited violence.

In the fifth place, if megaton means of wreaking violence were thus gradually to be destroyed by mutual agreement, the threat of violence would cease to be of use as an instrument of international politics. It would be absurd for a nation to begin surrendering its weapons of terror, and at the same time go on brandishing the threat of their use. Nuclear blackmail would be at an end. The international atmosphere would be considerably cleared.

In the sixth place, the essential distinction between the cold war and the era of terror would begin to be realized. The cold war had begun before the era of terror set in; it will continue after the terror is ended. Basically, the cold war is a crisis in civilization. The contest is between opposed conceptions of the nature of man, his role in history, and his relation to the State. This ideological conflict has carried over into the field of politics; and its economic dimension is continually growing. During the era of terror it has also acquired a military dimension of altogether swollen proportions. Until this military dimension is cut down to proper size, the real issues in the cold war will be obscured.

In particular, it is absolutely necessary to remove from the cold war the issue of sheer physical survival. This issue has done nothing but darken counsel, paralyze purpose, and confuse policy. The issue is fundamentally false; survival should never be an issue in political struggles or even in war. But a nightmarish sort of reality attaches to the issue of survival because of the megaton stockpiles whose use would imperil the survival of everybody. Until these weapons are destroyed, the issue of survival will continue to distract the mind of America from its real job. The public purpose of America in opposing world communism will remain blurred, undefined to ourselves, to the Soviet Union, and to all the world.

In the seventh place, a most salutary effect would be produced on American strategic thought. At least since 1953 it has stood under the hypnotic influence of megaton technology. Its focus has been fixed on the strategy of annihilation. The concept of massive retaliation has held it in deadly thrall. The spell can only be broken by the political decision to enforce the primacy of politics and to begin an orderly surrender of weapons that are politically useless. This decision would compel the military strategist to take new thought. There could at last take place a movement toward increased flexibility in strategic thinking, toward a revival of the traditional principle that the aim of a general is the will of the opposing commander, not the butchery of his forces, still less the total destruction of his country and the indiscriminate slaughter of its civilian population. Thus military doctrine would find its way to rightful relation with political aims. The fatal rupture would come to an end. And with this change in strategy from emphasis on inept violence to emphasis on apt force the technology of weapons would at last be brought under proper rule and restraint. The tail of technology would cease to fly the kite of strategy.

In the eighth place, a step would be taken toward the positive goal of American disarmament policy. The distant goal, still far over the horizon of the future, is the gradual transfer of the right to use arms and to produce nuclear arms, to some new kind of international authority. A small step toward this goal would be taken by establishing an international agency empowered to supervise the destruction of weapons of violence. This assignment is very limited. But the new agency would embody the essential principle of international control of nuclear armament. The principle would have been publicly recognized in the face of the nations and extensions of it would gradually become possible.

In the ninth place, a considerable amount of highly enriched fissionable material would become available, presumably to the International Atomic Energy Agency, for peaceful purposes particularly for the development of industrial nuclear power. This fact would give a tremendous and badly needed impulse to the whole program of atoms for peace. This development would have important consequences both in the improvement of international relations as well as in the advance of economic progress.

Here then are the reasons in favor of the proposal. What are the reasons against it? There are only two.

First, it will be said that an agreement to match the Soviet Union in the destruction of weapons of violence would impair the military strength of the United States.

This objection rests on a false concept of strength. I do not consider it strength on our part to consent to the current degradation of force into violence. On the contrary, it is weakness. Surely, it is moral weakness. It is a failure of the moral intelligence to understand what is going on, or a want of moral courage to stop this process of corruption. It is also political weakness. It is a failure of the political intelligence to see the absurdity of violence, and to see also the rational necessity of force, for the purposes of politics. Moreover, unless this process of moral degradation is checked by the courage of political decision, the result will be to continue and increase our military weakness, the weakness of a nuclear establishment whose political uselessness grows more and more apparent, and the weakness of a technology whose resources of power are exploited without purpose, because they lack due military and political direction.

It is becoming apparent today that we have been pursuing an illusion of strength along a dead-end road, the same dead-end road into which technology turned military doctrine in 1953, when the hydrogen bomb assumed control of strategy. Since that day our nuclear superiority has been lost. A balance of nuclear power has been established. In this new situation the strategy of ultimate deterrence plus massive retaliation and the megaton stockpile which supports this strategy have lost whatever value, both military and political, they may once have had in the past day of our nuclear superiority.

The conclusion is that we ought now to make some political use of this stockpile since it has been a military liability. Self-interest presently dictates that we trade in our great weapons of violence, one for one, with the Soviet Union doing the same, as a political deal with a political purpose. This act of self-interest would also be an act of the moral conscience of America and a declaration of our civilized public purpose. We would give witness in action that we shall not abdicate the right uses of force, but that we do abjure the senseless uses of violence, because we understand that politics needs force, but morals condemn violence.

The second objection raises the ultimate question: Would the proposed action invite massive Soviet aggression and open the United States to defeat and destruction? Would not the Soviet Union "cheat on" the agreement in order to gain nuclear superiority in megaton weapons, and then would it not, at some given moment, launch a total attack on the United States?

This possibility cannot be absolutely excluded. Here is the irreducible risk. No policy can take account of every single future possibility. Policy directs itself to what is likely to happen, not to what may possibly happen. Risks must always be calculated. On any fair calculation the risk involved in my proposal is minimal. Certainly it is far less serious than the risk involved in the present American disarmament proposal.

It has to be remembered that the distinction between force and violence, which I am urging as the basic premise of American policy, does in fact constitute the basic premise of Soviet policy. In contrast communism is not committed to the political ineptitude of unlimited violence. The Communist purpose is always to use apt force, whenever it is useful or necessary. Here lies the real risk for the United States. Force is forever the servant of Communist policies. It will be used not only on the defensive occasion but also to further the success of the offensive move.

Therefore the United States must always expect from the Soviet Union the threat, and the use of apt force in support of declared policies. This, I repeat, is the real risk, the ever present likelihood—in fact, the certainty—to which American policy must address itself. This risk was disregarded by the sweeping three-part disarmament policy set by the United States in 1956. My proposal takes it fully into account.

For the rest, there remains the outside possibility, the unlikely contingency, the tenuous risk that no disarmament policy, however ingenious, can absolutely exclude. Might it not happen that, at some future and undetermined date, in a conjectural situation of possible Communist nuclear superiority, the Soviet Union might conceivably threaten the use of total nuclear violence, for no very clear or predictable political purpose? Who could possibly answer this question? This is not the kind of guesswork on which present American policy ought to be based. For my part, I cherish the confident hope that, if such a threat of violence were ever to be made, the United States would be secure enough in other forms of valid nuclear strength, to have the courage simply to defy it.

Let us, however, come back from speculations about the unforeseeable future to the certain and seen realities of the present. The existent fact is that the real invitation to military helplessness and political defeat before the advancing forces of communism is being issued by the present rigidity of the American posture, both political and military, that refuses to make the essential distinction between apt force and inept violence. The enforcement of this distinction points the only way to security, both for ourselves and for all the world.

I do not, of course, maintain that it will be easy to negotiate in detail the precise and concrete meaning of this distinction as applied to nuclear stockpiles. But I do main-

tain that this is the cardinal issue that needs to be negotiated. I further maintain that the necessary premise of negotiation exists. It is a matter of self-interest to both parties to agree to the distinction itself and to strike a further agreement to negotiate its practical meaning. Success in the negotiations is not assured. But at least success is a more genuine possibility and a more instant necessity in this area than anywhere else.

Nor need we fear that the guidance of Divine Providence will be lacking to us as we thus set to work to dismantle the Era of Terror, which has grown increasingly offensive to the moral conscience. The redemption of mankind from the dominion of terror is not alien to the intentions of God.

FACTS ABOUT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Propeller Club of the United States is a nationwide, one might even say a worldwide, organization of shipping, exporting, industry, and professional people banded together for the specific purpose of promoting and supporting an American merchant marine and allied industries adequate to meet the requirements of national security and of the economic welfare of the United States.

Each year the Propeller Club conducts an American Merchant Marine Conference as part of its program of public relations, education, and good will among exporters, importers, and the public generally. Its 33d annual conference, held in Detroit this past October, very properly was devoted largely to problems of the country's "Fourth Seacoast," the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As an introduction to its recently published record of resolutions adopted at this 33d annual convention, there is presented a brief summarization of "Facts You Should Know About the American Merchant Marine." This summary is so impressive, and so deserving of widespread public attention and study, that I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

WHAT IT IS

It is an American industry of substantial size, operating about 1,000 ships of various types in ocean trades and 5,000 vessels in lakes and rivers, providing over one-half million jobs in vessel operations, ship construction and repair, port services and supplies, fuel oil, insurance, longshore and seafarer wages, etc.; providing about $2 billion in payrolls annually.

ROLE OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AS A CUSTOMER OF U.S. BUSINESS

It spends with American business concerns about $800 million per year in goods and services.

Its food bill, for foodstuffs purchased entirely from United States companies, for feeding passengers and crew members is $75 million annually.

It gives $75 million in business to other American companies each year for ship supplies.

American insurance companies enjoy $72 million in insurance premiums from American shipping; oil companies $168 million in fuel oil and other petroleum product sales; and shipyards $99 million in repairs.

It will spend $3 billion in the next few years for ocean vessels alone in the greatest shipbuilding program in its peacetime history. All of these expenditures will be made in American shipyards.

HOW THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE SERVES THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Besides being a great first-rate customer of American business and employer of American industrial workers, the American merchant marine serves a vital role in keeping the wheels of American industry turning.

It provides the only reliable transportation medium for the $32 billion annual import-export business of the United States on which an additional 4½ million Americans rely for their jobs.

It is the only insurance in times of stress or emergency that our American exports can move to their foreign markets.

This means safe, reliable transport for a quarter of our cotton; a third of our wheat; one-half of our entire rice crop; a quarter of all tobacco raised in the United States; the equivalent of 100 percent of all of the agricultural products of 1 acre out of 10 in the United States.

It guarantees to the industry of the United States, because by law it must serve U.S. trade, that the flow of essential imported raw materials will not stop, and paralyzes our mills and factories. It guarantees transport to our consumption centers of the world's raw materials, such as manganese, bauxite, lead, tin, nickel, natural rubber, and other essential metals and ores whose primary source is often overseas and without which we could not even produce steel; could not operate the factories of the Nation and could not adequately prepare for defense.

Its domestic oceangoing fleet of modern vessels, serving the intercoastal and coastwise trade, serves American industry in two important ways.

It offers the largest single transport container, in which goods can be handled on certain routes at a lesser cost than by any other medium.

It provides an effective stabilizing force on land transport rates in the basic commodities without which our industry would be burdened with excessive costs.

Its great fleet of river and lake vessels, both self-propelled and towing types, provides a transport system for finished goods and raw bulk commodities in quantities and at rates impossible through any other medium. In the case of many bulk cargoes, these vessels and the transport system they constitute make possible the very industries they serve.

American flag tanker vessels provide the crude and refined petroleum products which are essential to every industrial operation on the American scene.

WHAT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE COSTS

Contrary to generally accepted views, the American merchant marine does not cost the American taxpayer "one red cent," according to Mr. Clarence G. Morse, Federal Maritime Administrator and Chairman, Federal Maritime Board.

It received many millions in harbor and navigation project appropriations, but returned on an average of $1.50 for each $1 spent for such projects in economic benefits to the industries and communities along our rivers, lakes, and coastlines.

It received $449 million in operating subsidies (one-fourth of our ocean fleet only) from 1946 to 1955, and paid back into the U.S. Treasury $422 million in taxes.

Millions in additional taxes were realized out of its purchases of supplies, foodstuffs, fuel oil, new ships, port services, and the myriads of other items bought from American business to run a modern American merchant fleet.

DEATH OF SENATOR LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee held on January 11, 1960, it was unanimously agreed to draw up a resolution expressing the sorrow of each of the members at the passing of Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, who inaugurated the subcommittee and served as its first chairman. The resolution was to make note of Senator Langer's monumental achievements in the Senate generally and in the subcommittee in particular.

I was directed, as chairman, to place the resolution in the permanent records of the subcommittee and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was also directed to send a copy of the resolution to each of Senator Langer's four daughters: Mrs. Cornelia Noland, 3326 Quesada Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Mrs. J. Peter Schaeffer, 7 Hunter Lane, Rye, N.Y.; Mrs. D. King Irwin, Lees Hill Road, New Vernon, N.J.; and Mrs. Franklin Gokey, Box 1959, Fargo, N. Dak.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Senator William Langer had a long and distinguished record in the service of his country and its people, respectively, at attorney general and twice Governor of North Dakota and as U.S. Senator from that State since his election in 1940; and

Whereas Senator William Langer, as chairman of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953–54, inaugurated the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and served as its first chairman; and

Whereas Senator William Langer's record of achievement as chairman of said Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee was instrumental in fostering the subcommittee as one of the permanent subcommittees of the Senate Judiciary Committee; and

Whereas Senator William Langer has continued through the years since 1953 to participate actively in the investigations and hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and has brought great credit to the efforts and accomplishments of said subcommittee; and

Whereas Senator William Langer has long been recognized as a great champion of the small business people and the efforts of Congress to curb monopoly and monopolistic power and control over the destinies of man and business; and

Whereas Senator Langer's concern over the problems of the poor and the oppressed were reflected in all walks of life and his door was open to one and all who needed a sympathetic ear; and

Whereas the members of the subcommittee have for these many years relied on Senator William Langer's great wisdom and enthusiasm in combating any spreading of monopoly in the United States of America; and

Whereas the members of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee were deeply grieved by the sudden passing of their beloved colleague and friend on November 8, 1959, while Congress was adjourned; and

Whereas the members of this subcommittee will miss Senator William Langer's wise counsel and rare humor in hearings and meetings of the subcommittee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the U.S. Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on this the 11th day of January 1960, That they are deeply grieved by the sudden loss of their friend and colleague, Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, and that said loss will be genuinely felt for many years to come by those who knew, loved and worked with him and by the many people who profited by his dedication to our free enterprise system and the antitrust laws; and further

Resolved, That this resolution be signed by each subcommittee member and placed in the permanent records of the subcommittee and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to his four daughters.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
U.S. Senator, Chairman.
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
U.S. Senator.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senator.
PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senator.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senator.
ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the amendment to the clean elections bill, which was passed this afternoon, allowing a small deduction or credit for campaign contributions to Federal elections, was not agreed to.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the text of which is the same as that of the amendment which was rejected this afternoon. I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Finance for consideration. I have been told by members of that committee that they would consider it in due course.

I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] wish to be added as cosponors of the measure. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 day in order to allow them and other Senators to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 2905) to provide for a credit or deduction against Federal income taxes for certain political contributions, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

The Scriptures command us to "Live as free men; yet without using our freedom as a pretext for evil; but live as servants of God" (I Peter 2: 16).

Let us pray: Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honor and the praise of men and of angels: for Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy will they were, and were created.

Father of truth and of justice, of Thine infinite goodness and wisdom, direct, we pray Thee, the hearts of these who hear authority in our Nation, strengthen them with the power of Thy Holy Spirit; protect them from the snares of the enemy and the pride of power; and grant that rulers and people may with one mind serve Thee our God and King through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, 1960, was read and approved.

RICKOVER DESERVES THE PRESIDENT'S EAR

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration's ostrichlike reaction to reality was dramatized again Sunday evening in a televised interview with Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover on "Meet the Press."

James Reston, of the New York Times, asked Admiral Rickover if any important official of the Eisenhower administration had ever asked him to give his views on the American educational crisis. The admiral's reply was a soft, sad "No, sir."

On numerous occasions, the father of the atomic submarine has spoken and written with wisdom and insight on the grave problems facing our educational system. His views have been discussed and debated across the land. But the Eisenhower administration is not even interested enough to pick up the telephone and invite him over for a discussion of probably our gravest national problem.

President Eisenhower and his education advisers apparently are content to keep their heads buried deeply in the sands of material prosperity—as the President did in his recent state of the Union message.

All is well, said the President in his state of the Union message. Prosperity and happiness are pursuing our people at an unprecedented pace, he said. And, above all else, our educational system does not need what he called a "Federal hypodermic."

But not only our children but the security and vitality of our country will be stuck—with a woefully inadequate educational system—if this Congress fails to enact a genuine program of Federal aid to education, such as the Murray-Metcalf bill.

On "Meet the Press," Admiral Rickover warned that a stronger educational system, buttressed with Federal assistance, was our Nation's most urgent need and our first line of defense. He also indicated that Pentagon appropriations actually might be cut 20 to 30 percent and the savings invested in education. National defense probably would be strengthened by such a move, Admiral Rickover said, by thinning the bureaucratic layers which are strangling our defense program.

I announced before this session began that I would not vote another penny for arms spending until a genuine program of Federal aid to education is enacted. If necessary, I would favor diverting a billion dollars a year from our defense budget to improve our schools because, as Admiral Rickover pointed out, education is the foundation of our national security in the future.

In this era of both international tension and unparalleled international opportunity, education has become a national problem that demands national solutions. No longer should the tired cry of States rights—which often turn out to be States wrongs, as Adlai Stevenson has pointed out—lull us into ignoring this Nation's educational crisis.

Only the Federal Government has the resources and the efficient taxing techniques to rescue our local school systems from a fate far worse than the bogeyman of Federal control—the mediocrity fostered by an inadequate local investment in education.

Our States and communities vary widely in their ability and effort to support public schools. But the industrial States, which are able and willing to spend generous sums on public education, suffer from inability of their less fortunate cousins to finance adequate schools in this age of mobility. Poorly educated citizens of the less fortunate States migrate to the more prosperous ones in search of work, bringing with them the crippling handicaps of inadequate education. And our national welfare and security cannot stop at State boundaries. Today, probably more than ever before, we are "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Let us look at my State of West Virginia. Only 14 States add more basic wealth to the Nation's economy than does West Virginia. But in 1958, West Virginia ranked 35th in family buying income and 42d in school expenditures per pupil. Why this great gap between West Virginia's contribution to the national economy and the social and economic dividends my State realizes from its tremendous contribution?

West Virginia, like many other States, is not getting its fair share of the tax yield from the wealth it produces. The

State's production goes out in tank, coal, and flat cars. Few finished products, which carry a high ratio of local and State taxes that can be passed on to the residents of other States, are manufactured in West Virginia. But when West Virginians buy these finished products, they are helping finance the school systems of more industrialized States.

Both in the interest of fairplay and national progress, West Virginia and the many States sharing its tax plight desperately need and deserve Federal aid to education. In this way they could receive their fair share of the national tax yield and make even greater contributions to the growth of these United States.

For these reasons and the urgent ones cited by Admiral Rickover, this Congress must yank the Eisenhower administration's head out of the sand into the hot glare of reality by enacting a genuine program of Federal aid to education. Our national survival is at stake.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DISCHARGE PETITION—A RELIABLE POLITICAL DIVINING ROD

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, from ancient times people have used divining rods to discover that which is hidden beneath the surface.

For years believers in civil rights have looked for a reliable divining rod which would point unerringly to the real attitude on civil rights, hidden beneath political party platforms.

Both Republican and Democratic platforms have proclaimed support for civil rights.

Which party's claim is real—which party's claim is spurious?

On September 8, 1959, I took the floor of the House to predict that the political affiliations of the signers of the civil rights discharge petition would be our divining rod—would tell us whether or not there was an unholy alliance at work—would tell us whether support for the administration's tough labor bill—was purchased only in return for an agreement to block civil rights—would demonstrate that those who clamored loudest for a so-called bill of rights for labor would refuse to protect the genuine, Constitution-rooted civil rights of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the question has been answered.

On Friday, January 22, 1960, the New York Times, a reliable paper, provided us with a reliable divining rod.

The Times reported that, as of adjournment the previous day, 175 Members, or 40 percent of the membership of the House, had signed the civil rights discharge petition.

Significantly, the Times report showed that 145 Democrats, or more than one-half of the total Democratic membership, had signed the petition whereas only 30 Republicans, or not even one-fifth of the Republican membership, had signed it.

In my speech last September I recognized that because of years of tradition and deeply embedded patterns of social thought, plus the facts if practical politics that very few, if any Members from the South of either party would sign the petition.

On that date I made the confident prediction that a vast majority of Democratic Members from the North and West would sign the petition.

If we take the New York Times report and exclude from it members of both parties from the South the figures are even more revealing. Over 80 percent of the Democrats from the Northern, Western, and border States signed the petition. Barely 21 percent of the Republicans from these areas signed the petition.

In the delegation from my State, Pennsylvania, 93 percent of the Democratic members signed the petition, as compared with 14 percent of the Republicans.

Put another way, 15 out of 16 Pennsylvania Democrats placed themselves solidly in favor of civil rights, while only 2 out of 14 Republicans have thus far acted to bring the petition to the floor.

What has been the position of the leadership of both parties in Congress? The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, has traditionally opposed discharge petitions. This year, breaking with tradition, the Speaker has privately and publicly urged Members to sign the petition.

In the other body, the Senate majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, has announced that if the House has not acted on civil rights by February 15, 1960, he would bring it before the Senate, even if he had to do so by attaching civil rights as a rider to other legislation.

On the other side of the aisle, the Republican leadership, which has demonstrated its ability to achieve party unity, has maintained massive indifference to this legislation, even though it is substantially the civil rights program that the administration purports to support. House Republican leaders say that they are against discharge petitions because they do not believe in circumventing House rules. In commenting on this reasoning, the New York Times in an editorial published today said:

> To put it bluntly, those explanations are lame. It can hardly be circumventing House rules to sign a discharge petition when the rules provide for such a petition.

Last September I said that if a majority of Republicans from the North and West do not sign the petition the American people will be entitled to draw one of two conclusions—either, first, the Republican Party, despite protestations to the contrary, is really opposed to civil rights legislation, or second, the Republican Party in a shabby deal, has bargained away any effective support it might otherwise have given civil rights this year as part of the price of obtaining support for the administration's tough labor bill.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that only a pitiful minority of Republican Members have signed the petition gives us reliable political divining rod on civil rights. As the New York Times editorial today said that failure of the Republicans to act "can only give credence to charges of a deal between House Republicans and southern Democrats."

I think it is a case of hypocrisy on civil rights, where the old coalition has exacted its price.

WHO WILL PAY THAT PRICE?

Primarily it will be the millions of Negroes in America, the very people we are supposed to be trying to help.

The Negro will pay it as he continues to be denied the opportunity for an adequate education. He will pay it again as he continues to be denied his right to vote and, along with millions of Americans in other minority groups, he will pay it through continued discrimination in employment based on race, creed, and national origin.

Another group who will pay the price for the coalition's handiwork will be those Americans who have seen the synagogues and temples of their faith bombed in senseless acts of violence which Federal authorities cannot now prosecute or prevent as efficiently as would be the case were a strong anti-bombing law now on the statute books.

No new purpose would be accomplished here by listing these bombings or recalling the dishonor roll of the places where mob violence has closed schools. These events are already inscribed indelibly upon the conscience of America and in the minds of other people whom we must face daily in the conduct of world affairs.

These things have created a false impression of America for, in reality, our national history, despite occasional regressions, has been one of progress toward wider enjoyment by more and more of our citizens of those civil rights without which there can be no real life of freedom.

Billions of dollars in foreign aid cannot hide that false impression.

The worldwide impression of America is, or should be, the Nation in which all men are born equal.

No petty political deals should be permitted to cloud that fundamental belief of all Americans.

As I did before I now again urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sign the civil rights discharge petition so that all the world will know that America has not fallen victim to cynical government-by-coalition but that we of all nations are taking world leadership in demonstrating the brothership of man.

THE VOTE ON THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced House Joint Resolution 141 which would make the rose our national flower. Mr. BECKWORTH, of Texas, and several Members of the other body have also introduced measures for the same purpose.

Certainly no argument is needed for the proposition that the flower which is chosen the national flower of the United States should be one which has the approval and wide acceptance of the people of our Nation.

We now have convincing evidence that a broad section of the American public wishes to have Congress declare that the rose is to be, in fact, our national flower.

During last October, Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association, a nationwide organization of florists who send floral orders by wire, undertook to assist the Congress by determining the true state of public opinion on this point—which has been under discussion for a number of years.

Through its national network of more than 11,000 member shops, FTD conducted in October a unique national flower election. The association went to considerable expense and trouble in preparing for this election. Special ballots and ballot boxes were prepared and placed in all member shops, and the results were later tabulated by a firm of certified public accountants.

I voted in this election in my home district, as I am sure many of you did in your own home districts.

In this election, the results of which are being officially announced to Congress today, 1,055,629 persons voted in the national flower election, including schoolchildren, garden clubs, and hundreds of thousands of flower loving home garden enthusiasts.

The result is exactly what I had expected.

The rose ran far in front of the other 19 flowers listed on the official ballot, which included 8 other flowers proposed for the national flower in bills now before Congress.

I am submitting the official results, as attested by the auditors, and ask that they be made a part of the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

LYBRAND, ROSS BROS. & MONTGOMERY,
December 2, 1959.

FLORISTS' TELEGRAPH DELIVERY ASSOCIATION,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR SIRS: The tabulation of votes cast in the national flower election, organized and directed by the Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association during the period from October 1, 1959, to October 31, 1959, was conducted under our supervision. This tabulation included all valid ballots delivered to our office through November 23, 1959.

We report the vote results by flower to be as follows:

Position, flower, and vote	
1. Rose	386,841
2. Carnation	171,591
3. Chrysanthemum	75,729
4. Lily-of-the-valley	60,033
5. Orchid	46,681
6. Tulip	31,639
7. Gladiolus	30,569
8. Camellia	27,560
9. Black-eyed-susan	22,249
10. Mountain-laurel	20,840
11. Geranium	17,177
12. Magnolia	16,871
13. Goldenrod	16,831
14. Rhododendron	16,678
15. Daffodil	16,675
16. Peony	15,887
17. Shasta daisy	14,542
18. Grass	13,614
19. Corn tassel	12,788
20. Marigold	10,741
21. All others	30,093
Total valid votes	1,055,629

Very truly yours,
LYBRAND, ROSS BROS. & MONTGOMERY,
Certified Public Accountants.

Because this accounting of national flower election returns may not be immediately available to all of the Members, I feel obliged to say that the rose polled more than one-third of a million votes, more than twice the number of its nearest competitor. For the highest three, the votes ran as follows:

No. 1, the rose, 386,841.

No. 2, the carnation, 171,591.

No. 3, the chrysanthemum, 75,729.

Next in order came the lily-of-the-valley, the orchid, the tulip, the gladiolus, the camellia, the black-eyed-susan, the mountain-laurel, the geranium, the magnolia, the goldenrod, the rhododendron, the daffodil, the peony, the shasta daisy, grass, the corn tassel, and the marigold.

A few votes for other flowers were cast in a write-in blank provided on the ballot, but no separate count of these votes is available.

I am particularly pleased to announce the sweping victory of the rose in this truly national election, conducted by the Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association, because it is the first broad expression of public sentiment in the 50 States of the United States and the District of Columbia. I am informed that flower lovers, including children, who are among the truest of flower lovers, welcomed this opportunity to tell us, the elected representatives of the people, how we should settle this historic controversy.

Naturally, only Congress can make the final decision. But FTDA has given us valuable information on which to base that decision. I believe that the decision should be made in the near future. We have, as I have said, a clear mandate from the people provided us through the mechanism of this unusual and spirited floral election campaign.

In light of the victory of the rose in the national flower election, I stand confident that its chances of becoming our national flower have been greatly enhanced.

THE LATE ALBERT ENGEL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1960.

MRS. ALBERT J. ENGEL, Sr.,
Lake City, Mich.

DEAR MRS. ENGEL: I want you to know that my heart grieves with you and the State of Michigan, as well as the country, in the passing of your wonderful husband, the Honorable Albert J. Engel.

I well remember and enjoyed so much meeting you both when you first came to Washington. You were both so fine, and added so much to the Washington life. It was a pleasure and a privilege for me to work with your husband during his term of office, and it was while serving with him on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, that I first admired his amazing capacity for work and enthusiasm. He was constantly working for measures that would help the country, and was most successful in everything he undertook. His life was an American life, beginning modestly and going step by step to finer and greater success and prosperity. He has a worthy successor in Mr. ROBERT GRIFFIN, who is such a close friend and law school classmate of your splendid son, Albert J. Engel, Jr., for whom I know you both have great pride.

I extend to you my deepest, most understanding sympathy, and may God bless and comfort you and your family in your great loss.

Deeply sincerely,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR UNIONS

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the steel strike and its ultimate settlement has again brought to the attention of the general public the political and economic power of the under regulated, tax exempt, specially privileged international labor unions. The McClellan committee investigation vividly brought forth and displayed the arrogance of the Hoffas and other international labor bosses in their treatment of their own members but the steel strike settlement again points up the necessity of regulating labor's monopoly power in order to protect the general public interest. The industrywide bargaining power of international unions can shut down hundreds of businesses from coast to coast. Jimmy Hoffa can, by making six or eight phone calls, tie up truck transportation throughout the United States. The general public is not fully aware of this fact—that the power, the arrogance, and many times corruption found in the international labor bosses—stems directly from monopoly.

If we try to point out the fact that part of monopolistic power of the union boss gives them control over individuals we are immediately castigated and pointed out as one who is the enemy of the man who labors and as one who is trying to destroy unions. Any power that is derived from a monopoly either by businessmen or union bosses soon be-

comes corrupt and can easily destroy freedom of the individual.

With such autocratic power it is easy for corrupt monopolists to tie up, stop, or curtail the necessities of modern society, such as communications, transportation, light, and heat. This power is uppermost in many people's minds, hence they are demanding that this monopolistic power of international labor bosses be curtailed—the same as they demanded the monopolistic power of the industrial giants was curtailed by legislation many years ago.

There are two factors in this monopoly power of the international union bosses that need correction—the union shop and industrywide bargaining concept. The monopoly power over men is the right of a union to sign a union shop contract with management—under which every person employed must join the union within 30 days. The right-to-work laws passed in 18 of the States makes such a contract illegal.

This labor monopoly power has grown up because of an indifferent public opinion. Few people realize that the so-called labor laws have been used by selfish union bosses to gain personal, social, economic, and vast political power. These bosses in their talks with the men in their unions always are careful to point out the absolute necessity for political power in order to achieve their legislative demands.

In many cases, union bosses use a sly approach and call their political organization an educational league. They thought this would give them a high sounding title as well as exemption from certain election laws. It is apparent that both objectives were successful. No one at all familiar with the political life of the past 20 years would deny the political power of the labor unions over legislative, executive and even judicial offices.

Some unions have a provision in their constitution that a member may be expelled from a union for "unbecoming conduct." In order to show just how powerful some unions have become and how their power is used, here is an item as copied from a Washington paper:

LOS ANGELES, January 19.—A judge has decided that advocating a right-to-work law was unbecoming conduct on the part of two union members and warranted their expulsion.

The ruling yesterday by Superior Judge Jesse J. Frampton denied damages sought by Cecil C. Mitchell and John Mulgrew from the International Association of Machinists. They asked $50,000 each.

The two, Lockheed aircraft employees, were expelled from the union for advocating passage of a measure in the November 1958 State election that would have prohibited making union membership a condition of employment.

Suggest that you reread that item and then ask this question: "How could this happen in America?" The answer is easily found because of political power of labor bosses. This political monopolistic power of the union bosses is the most dangerous of all present-day attempts to lead us down the road to a welfare state and a planned economy for the benefit of the labor dictators—which, of course, would be known as a Socialist labor government. It is a very simple plan—in order to control or govern the economic life of our country all you have to do is to control political power. The union bosses like to point out and have said "that a worker is a member of an economic society when he takes a job—the union is the organization or government of this society." The above statement was made before the Supreme Court of the United States by a labor union lawyer.

The greatest fallacy in the thinking of the union bosses is this, they do not understand that the establishment of compulsory union membership by law over free men—men who have to join a union in order to provide for their families—will in the long run destroy the unions or lead to a dictatorship. There is a lot of difference between the happiness and willingness of a volunteer organization and the oppressive servitude as practiced by the Jimmy Hoffas and others who have the power-drunk boss complex. So long as labor bosses have the power to use the brutal force of monopolistic power—the general public and private enterprise will see many dark days ahead.

For the reasons set forth above I again have introduced a bill, just as I have in the last two Congresses—a bill to compel the labor unions to come under the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, which forbids unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes.

In my opinion the enactment of such a law would be one of the most effective ways of protecting the public interest in the labor-management relations field and would cure many of the evils now existing in collective bargaining between labor and management because after all the problem is simply curbing the political and economic power of one segment of our economic life.

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of yesterday carried the following editorial:

THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

While we are still far enough distant from election day to have a certain amount of perspective, it may be useful to ask ourselves what the function of an American President is, and what differences an election may make. We must not fall under the illusion that when we choose a President we are choosing the total political future for 4 years or more. We aren't doing anything of the sort. What we are doing is to influence the nature of an institution that we may call the executive branch.

The executive branch is what its name implies. It is not a person. Persons can and do put their stamp upon it, so that an Eisenhower administration is quite different from a Truman administration, but we cannot treat an election as an incantation.

No one supposed, when the Constitution was presented to the people, that the President would have the powers he now possesses. No one could foresee the time when the Federal Government would absorb something like 20 percent of the total national income. It took a long time for the Government as a whole, and for the President as a part of the Government, to grow to large proportions. McKinley, at the turn of the century, had a personal staff of 8 or 10 and a small flock of stenographers and typists. Today the institution known as the Executive Office of the President, which is quite distinct from the several executive departments, requires 19 pages in the U.S. Government Organization Manual and includes in the immediate Presidential staff about 400 persons.

The result is, of course, that many decisions that are nominally made by the President are actually made by other persons and accepted by him because he trusts those persons.

Nevertheless, the President must make some major decisions. In time of war these decisions can be shattering, as when President Truman ordered that the atomic bomb be dropped on two Japanese cities. Even in time of peace we expect the President, as the ultimate source of executive power, to intervene in major strikes and other domestic crises and to set monetary, economic, and diplomatic programs.

These ultimate and unavoidable responsibilities may be more than any man who is not a supreme political genius should be asked to bear. Men do grow to the stature of the office, but we cannot expect miracles. We are in danger if we let the President become a father symbol for us. Even while we support our favorite candidate in this year's race for the White House, we should remember that if there is no greatness in the body of the people, the Nation cannot be saved by any imaginable greatness in the White House.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a group of dedicated Americans will assemble in New York City to help their old chief, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, observe his 80th birthday. The men who will be present will be the old staff who assisted in the return of freedom to so many of the Asiatic countries.

While only a few will attend this annual reunion, countless millions of Americans will be present in spirit.

No man ever gave a greater thrill to the world than Douglas MacArthur in his liberation of so many of the Asiatic countries that had been overcome by the Japanese, and finally his triumphal entrance into Tokyo itself. Military students will never forget his strategy, his skill, and his success.

America has produced many outstanding military men, but none ever surpassed Douglas MacArthur. He stands out as one of the military geniuses of American history.

One has but to visit Japan or any other Asiatic country to observe the esteem and regard in which he is held.

When I think of the hundreds of millions of dollars we spend annually in propaganda, much of it in Asia, I cannot help but think how much more good-will

could be created by a simple visit of the old soldier to scenes of his former triumphs.

May I offer to the general, whose true friendship I appreciate, my warmest birthday greetings and express the hope which I am sure millions share that he will continue to enjoy good health and deserved blessings.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I concur fully in what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said about General MacArthur. No military man has ever done more for his country than General MacArthur. His genius has put Japan where she is today—our strongest ally. His vision and foresight number him among the world's foremost statesmen. Truly a prophet in his own day.

On the 19th of January I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 462 extending to General MacArthur the thanks of the Congress. I hope we will get this resolution passed at this session, giving him the thanks of a grateful country. So far this country has given him exactly nothing. I congratulate him on his 80th birthday. May God bless him. May he not be a prophet in his own country without honor.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], praising Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and I consider it a privilege and a pleasure to associate myself with everything he has said.

A native son of Little Rock, General MacArthur enjoys the esteemed admiration and affection of all of the people of Arkansas. In my own humble opinion, he not only is one of the greatest generals of all times but also one of the greatest Americans of all times.

I feel it is altogether fitting and proper that the esteem with which this noble American is regarded be voiced here on this floor today and be spread in the RECORD so that all the world may know:

Gen. Douglas MacArthur is one prophet who is honored not only in his own hometown but throughout this land of ours and throughout all those areas of the world which are better off today because he came their way.

I salute this great and distinguished "old soldier" who, in the minds and hearts of millions, will never never, fade away.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 22d day of January is an important day in the annals of the history of the world. It marks the 42d anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of the act of union by which Western Ukraine was joined with the Ukrainian National Republic which took place in 1918 and 1919, respectively.

These two dates mark the expression by Ukrainians of the same ideals held by the Americans. The independence which was accomplished by the Ukrainians was a union in spirit of Ukrainians and Americans. Unfortunately, this achievement was obliterated by the force of the continually growing menace to the democracies throughout the world. The Ukrainian nation was but one instance of a people enchained by the godless materialistic Goliath called international communism, but the spirit of hope of Ukrainians lives on and one day justice and truth will end most triumph.

The continuous pressure for freedom by the Ukrainians is something that we cannot afford to overlook. This is the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R.

I join with those who today honor the Ukrainian nation and express the hope and confidence that they will eventually regain their lost freedom and independence.

GAS AND GERM WARFARE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last September I discussed on this floor the efforts of certain segments of the Defense Department to have the United States change its basic position in regard to the use of gas and germ warfare. That position has long been that only if an enemy used these weapons against us in wartime would we employ them ourselves.

I introduced in September House Concurrent Resolution 433, which would reassert the traditional American position against first use of these weapons. This I did because I believe the moral position of the United States requires that we not use such weapons unless others use them first. The Army's position, in recent months, has been that these weapons are more humane than others. I doubted that belief, and my doubt has been amply confirmed by analysis of some of the kinds of materials with which the various chemical and biological services are working.

These agents are sufficiently dangerous that, from military research into biological and chemical weapons, three deaths have resulted. There has been a total of 715 cases of illness and injury, of varying intensities. I shall describe below the various categories of these cases.

I should make it clear at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my interest in this matter is simply to show the kinds of agents being used. I do not believe that research in this field should be stopped, so long as other nations have the capability of developing these weapons. I am glad that such research has been so surrounded with safety measures, as I understand it has. The elaborate safety measures, in fact, only bear out my contention that these agents can be best described as deadly, rather than humane.

On January 12, 1960, I directed a series of questions concerning the numbers of illnesses and deaths to Mr. John E. Jackson, Director of Atomic, Biological, and Chemical Warfare in the Defense Department. On January 20, Mr. Jackson replied. I shall list below my question concerning illnesses and deaths and his replies:

Question 1. Without regard to or mention of the agent involved, have any deaths occurred as a result of research in chemical warfare? (Here only the agents, not the fact of death, could be of interest to a foreign power.) If there have been deaths, how many?

Answer. Since 1950, only one death has occurred as a result of contact with chemical agents in our research and development program. This resulted from an accident which occurred during the development of a flame thrower. No deaths have occurred from research on toxicological chemicals.

Question 2. Without regard to the specific agents involved, have any illnesses or injuries resulted from research into chemical warfare? If so what was the total number of such injuries or illnesses?

Answer. The number of illnesses and injuries that have occurred since 1950 as a result of occupational exposures in our chemical warfare program are shown below. We have broken these down into two categories showing the number of individuals with minor (or "no lost time") and "lost time," cases.

No lost time	432
Lost time	32
Total	464

Question 3. Without regard to the agents involved, have any deaths occurred as a result of research in biological warfare, and if so, how many?

Answer. There have been two occupational deaths since 1950 resulting from our biological warfare research program. I believe this to be an excellent safety record in view of the frontier areas of research involved, and the fact that it is necessary to investigate all manner of infectious micro-organisms and viruses. This record is all the more outstanding when we consider that during the past 10 years 12 deaths have been reported among the technicians and scientists handling small monkeys needed by pharmaceutical companies for the research and production of poliomyelitis vaccine. It should be noted that many discoveries by the Chemical Corps have contributed to protecting, through the development of vaccines and other means, those working in biological and chemical research laboratories.

Question 4. Without regard to the specific agents involved, what is the total number of illnesses resulting from research into biological warfare?

Answer. A total of 251 cases of occupational illness have occurred as a result of

our biological research and development program since 1950:

Minor to moderate illness (characterized by flu or grippe symptoms)	228
Severe illnesses (symptoms of a relatively more severe nature than the above category)	23
Total	251

Question 5. In biological warfare, a number of cases of illnesses have already been published, with reference to the particular agents. These include anthrax, Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis, brucellosis, human glanders, tularemia, psittacosis, Q-fever, shigellosis, and plague. With reference to these agents only, since these any foreign powers knows have been worked on, what, for each disease, have been the total number of cases and the total number of deaths? If any case has involved a combination of diseases, please note that fact.

Answer. The information requested in question 5 is classified, as such a compilation might reveal the character of the effort being placed on the various agents in our program. The information requested relative to combinations of diseases is classified for the same reasons. In most instances the mere fact that a particular agent is of interest is not classified, while data that might reveal the relative amount of effort being placed on it are classified.

Question 6. We are informed that about 30 percent of the diseases resulting from biological-war research have not been published, but that is only because no one has yet written these cases up, not because the national security would be damaged by publication. What are the details of these cases?

Answer. In reply to question 6, some cases have been published in the unclassified literature on the basis that the information would be of value to the scientific community. Copies of these articles have been furnished to your office. We are continually reviewing our data to determine whether or not it would be of value to the scientific community to publish other cases. The determining factor in this activity is whether the information we have accumulated will contribute to the advancement of scientific knowledge without unduly revealing our military program. The ratio of published to total number of clinical cases in this field is a classified figure, on the basis that it might reveal the character and extent of the effort in our program.

Aside from these cases, totaled without regard to kind of illness by Mr. Jackson, there are a number of cases, some before and some after 1950, which have been reported in various medical journals. These were 1 case of plague, reported in the U.S. Public Health Service's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report for November 28, 1959; 60 cases of acute brucellosis, reported in the March 1959 American Medical Association Archives of Internal Medicine; 62 cases of tularemia, reported in the March 1959 Annals of Internal Medicine; 12 cases of psittacosis, reported in a paper at the American Trudeau Society meetings in May 1959; 27 cases of Q fever, reported in a paper at the American Trudeau Society meetings in May 1959; 14 cases of Venezuela equine encephalomyelitis, reported in the August 21, 1954, Journal of the American Medical Association; 6 cases of human glanders, reported in the January 1947 Annals of Internal Medicine; 25 cases of anthrax, reported in the August 3, 1946, Journal of the American Medical Association; 6 cases of shigellosis—bacillary dysentry—reported in the April 24, 1954, Journal of the American Medical Association.

The two deaths resulting from biological research, one in November 1951, and the other in July 1958, were from acute onsets of anthrax. The 1951 patient was a bacteriologist for the Army. He evidently caught the disease from accidental dispersion of anthrax after a laboratory experiment, and died 3 days later. Presumably, the work with anthrax was still secret, so the bacteriologist's death certificate listed bronchial pneumonia as the cause of death.

In 1958, anthrax was caught by an electrician in the town of Frederick who changed light bulbs on the base at Fort Detrick. Six days after the onset of the disease, he died. His death certificate listed myocardial failure due to visceral anthrax as the cause.

In raising this whole matter, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that my intention is to show that agents of chemical and biological warfare are not humane. As I said I have no doubt that safety precautions at the various installations are excellent, as they need to be in the presence of such deadly materials. And I am further convinced that, so long as there is no effective international agreement that would eliminate these weapons, we must continue to do research on them.

But that does not mean we should decide to use these dread weapons first. To uphold our moral position before the world and for ourselves, we should state our formal national policy, to use these weapons only if we are forced to do so by their being used against us. To that end, I again urge the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 433.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join with my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in saying "Happy birthday" and expressing our appreciation to Gen. Douglas MacArthur upon his 80th birthday.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that I should be delighted to vote for his resolution expressing the thanks of the Congress of the United States to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that it could be treated as a privileged resolution and that it could be passed today.

Over these many eventful years I have had the great pleasure of working with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, both here in Washington and elsewhere. I knew of his wise counsel and cooperation long before I became a Member of Congress.

In national affairs as well as world affairs, never have I known a man better informed. His wide knowledge of civil as well as military matters always command respect. It is one of the great joys of my life that I have had the privilege of knowing and benefiting from the wisdom of General MacArthur. Everyone in America and in many lands even to this day and far into the future benefit and are helped by his advice.

No honor is too great for him. I believe his beloved country, through the Congress, should award him a special medal of appreciation. May the good Lord shower his choicest blessings upon him and his family for what he has given to America and to the world.

THE CHALLENGE OF ENLARGING ECONOMIC FREEDOM FOR OUR CHILDREN: PART II—THE FIVE POTENTIALS TO ROLL BACK THE ECONOMIC PERILS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 1 hour:

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth speech of our series on how the Republican Party is suited to meet the challenge of modern times. I wish to continue the discussion begun by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] on the challenge of preserving and enlarging economic freedom for our children.

The gentleman from Arizona outlined the real perils which have arisen to threaten not only the growth of that freedom but its very existence. As his talk progressed, it became apparent how the lack of the four basic qualifications for an effective political organization—the qualifications which make up the theme of this series of speeches—in the party then in control of the country gave rise to these perils

These four qualifications are first, a basic degree of unity; second, a belief in principle over expediency; third, democracy within its own organization; fourth, a sense of responsibilty toward the future.

I believe a discussion of the attitudes of the two parties upon the subject of the Federal Government's responsibilities in setting forth the economic goals of our society and of its necessary role in seeking to attain these goals, will reveal that the Republican Party possesses the four qualifications needed to meet the challenge of the future and that the other party lacks them.

Just recently the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee had occasion to set forth their views, which I believe coincide with the views of the Republican Party, on the Nation's economic objectives. These views show considerable contrast to those expressed by the Democratic members of the committee in their report. The Democratic members report shows disunity in thought, which I believe stems from the disunity of the divergent and conflicting interests they seek to represent. This report shows a constant appeal to expediency over principle—indeed, a failure to give more than lipservice to certain principles basic to our people and way of life. It shows a lack of democracy in its own organization, in the very preparation of the views they

sought to express. Finally, by an undue emphasis on the present and the past and on purely material goals their report shows a lack of sense of responsibility toward the future.

I am quoting the Republican expression of views on the Nation's economic objectives:

The majority reduces our economic goals to three: Economic growth, high and stable employment, and stability in the general level of prices. Certainly, these are important goals which we all seek. But, is this an exhaustive list? Surely it is not. There are other important economic goals, and if these are not also made explicit, we think it is impossible to establish priorities and resolve conflicts.

Virtually all countries and economic systems share these three major goals. The really significant differences among economic systems arise out of the interactions of these goals with other goals. Fundamentally, it is our great regard for and realization of the goal of economic freedom that distinguishes the structure and performance of the American economy from that of the Soviet.

At the minimum a list of major economic goals should include: Economic freedom, economic efficiency, economic stability (both price level and employment), economic growth, and economic security. Some of these additional goals are implicitly adopted by the majority in discussion, but we cannot have the very clear concept of objectives which they call for if the list is incomplete and the relationships among the goals—the circumstances under which they conflict with or complement each other—are never carefully explored.

Economic freedom is an end in itself, one which Americans very highly prize.

Economic freedom means economic opportunity for the individual as a seller of his services and output, and also as a buyer in markets responsive to his wants. It allows individuals with initiative, imagination, and faith in their own ideas to break out of the rut of tradition into new and more productive endeavors. Economic freedom, with its challenging opportunities and its built-in disciplines, is a powerful instrument for promoting economic growth, efficiency, and welfare. But because of risks, frictions, and imperfections in the economic structure, economic freedom may at times conflict temporarily with economic stability and economic security.

Economic efficiency means that our productive resources are allocated among competing uses, both private and public, so as to produce the greatest output of the right things at lowest cost. Maintenance of economic efficiency requires that the economy be very flexible, capable of adapting promptly and smoothly to changing consumer, business, and public demands. It means that public and private consumption and investment reflect the true preferences of the people in light of the relative scarcities involved. This important objective is not explicit in any of the three goals which the majority set forth as all-embracing.

We want our economy to be efficient, whether we grow at a slow rate or a fast one. Economic efficiency complements growth because as it improves we get more output from a given set of resources and because meaningful, sustainable growth requires the same kind of flexibility and resource mobility that promote efficiency. Efficiency in some ways complements stability; no one would argue that mass unemployment makes for an efficient economy. In some ways, economic efficiency does conflict with stability and with security. The way to reconcile these objectives is to work toward improving the responsiveness of the economic system and the enlargement of economic opportunity for all.

Economic growth, economic freedom, and economic efficiency tend to reinforce each other. But economic growth typically involves changes with effects unevenly distributed. It rarely is to be had for free—it upsets the status quo, it disrupts and bankrupts, it makes obsolete existing skills and capital assets. Growth may then conflict to some degree with stability and security, though in the long run it enables us to strengthen economic security.

Stability and security go together in many respects. Increased stability of employment provides those willing and able to work with an increased security in steady incomes. Society can attempt to provide security by preventing economic change or adjustment to it, but this can be and often has been a terribly costly and temporary route to security, clearly one which is detrimental to the objectives both of growth and of efficiency. Excessive concern with either stability or security can jeopardize economic freedom, efficiency, and growth. To pretend otherwise is to delude ourselves.

Given our present knowledge about economic processes, and assuming no dramatic improvement in the adequacy and timeliness of the flow of data on which policy must be based, it seems fair to say that the rate at which we can improve the overall performance of our economy will depend heavily upon our ability to increase the competitiveness of our markets, raise the mobility of labor, and reduce price rigidities.

In view of the heavy current concern about growth, we wish that the majority had made one point unmistakably clear: Growth which is promoted by means which erode freedom and efficiency is likely to produce only "ersatz" growth. Whatever the numbers and rates may seem to show, force-fed growth will tend to distort the economic structure and lessen its capacity to satisfy our private and public wants and needs. Economic growth is meaningful only as it provides us with more of what we most want, both as individuals and as citizens vitally concerned with the security of our Nation and of the free world. It is interesting to speculate about what the Russian economic growth rate would be if we were able to measure Russian output in terms of the values put on it by the Russian people. Clearly, the figures would fare poorly in a comparison with those derived from official sources, based of course on administrative valuations.

Our basic point is that the goals of economic policy are far more complex than the majority report suggests. Our dissatisfaction is not with what the majority says about the importance of our national economic objectives—by and large we agree. Our dissatisfaction is with what they do not say. The section might more properly be entitled "All This and Heaven Too," for it leaves the ridiculous impression that perfection is easily and costlessly attainable. This is not a balanced and nourishing diet for anyone to set before the American people—and we regret that it was served by the majority of the Joint Economic Committee.

In essence the Democratic Party views the road ahead through a rearview mirror reflecting the depression decade when it had full political power. To this day that party will not face up to the fact that it was World War II, not the policies of the New Deal, that put an end to the depression. Indeed, in its analysis of post World War II problems, the Democratic Party constantly shows a strange inability to distinguish between an economy based upon peace and an economy based upon war. Throughout all of its criticisms of Republican economic policy from 1953 to the present it quite ignores the most important economic fact of the period—that we shifted from war to peace in June 1953. A party that cannot, or at least refuses to, distinguish between the economic behavior and policies appropriate to a war economy from those of a peacetime economy cannot be said to have much regard for principle or any real sense of responsibility toward the future.

The Democratic Party approach toward the peril of inflation also demonstrates its disunity. One segment of the party, I am happy to state, fully realizes, and acts upon this realization, that constant Federal deficits create a powerful inflationary force. Yet another segment of the party is looking right now at the administration's 1961 budget surplus of $4.2 billion as an invitation to promote further Federal expenditures. Indeed, some of the basic disunity in the Democratic Party stems from its belief in expediency over principle in the area of Federal expenditures. The party seems willing to reflect the views of any special interest or minority group that desires to spend Federal funds providing it will organize for political action. It is this patchwork quilt of diverse interests that the Democrat Party puts forward as the image of the common man. Actually the common man is robbed as a child, as an adult, and as an elder citizen. He and his children after him are robbed through policies originating in this crazy patchwork substitute for a real liberalism.

The very group that looks upon budget surpluses in times of prosperity as an invitation for more spending rather than for retiring some of the Federal debt is the same group that cries out against tight money and decries the cost to the citizen of the financing of the Federal debt. There is only one basic answer to tight money and high interest rates, that is to cut down on the demand for money. The Federal debt constitutes the greatest demand in the money market today. The Federal Government is competing against every business firm and every consumer who wants to finance a home, a car, or a washing machine, or an education. It is the size of the Federal debt that is the greatest cause of tight money and high interest rates. Those who really are opposed to tight money and high interest rates, and the Republican Party is, can show it by cutting down on Federal expenditures and by creating budget surpluses for debt retirement whenever possible. The Democratic Party, as a party, has demonstrated its complete disunity and leadership incapacity on this important issue.

The Republican Party does possess the four qualifications of a modern political party, so it is able to offer for the decade ahead a coherent, unified forward-looking economic philosophy, which is not a mere camouflage for special interests and which can be supported in spirit and in truth with legislative votes under our White House leadership.

This positive Republican approach rests upon the conviction that inflation is not only unnecessary, but is evil, unjust, and a process which undermines existing rights and security gained by

our countrymen. Furthermore, we believe that our competition with Russia, whatever the form it may take, certainly demands that we not forfeit our freedoms in meeting it. In fact, it demands that we endeavor to expand and root ever more firmly the freedoms we now have, while by this example encouraging the rest of the world to seek social forms with freedom as a basic value. But freedom must be solidly founded on a base of collective responsibility and practical self-discipline. The battle for a sound dollar is thus a necessary part of any struggle for sound freedoms in this country and in the free world.

We believe the Federal Government has an important responsibility in promoting our national growth and in increasing our individual disposable incomes. But this responsibility is not as superficial as the Democratic advisory council visualizes it. It must be properly balanced with the responsibilities of State and local governments and, above all, with the responsibilities of the private sector of our economy.

That responsibility includes protecting and promoting the function of the free market as the primary place in which economic decisions are made. Restrictive and inflationary monopolies of business or unions, inflexible Government straitjackets, archaic and unjustified subsidies, unsound monetary policies must not be permitted to destroy the fundamental workings of our free enterprise system. To meet this responsibility Government must avoid treating all the problems of our day as emergencies requiring hasty, ill-considered and self-defeating actions and counteractions. Continued deficit financing in prosperity which has arbitrarily robbed real family income throughout this country, must be eschewed.

First. The first potential to enlarged economic freedom and prosperity for our children is wise budget management.

Ideally, the budget should be balanced each fiscal year, regardless of the national economy. The difficulty in obtaining the ideal is that revenues, at fixed tax rates, automatically decline when business activity declines. At the same time, built-in Government spending rises. To reduce spending or to increase tax rates at such a time would be unwise, and would not balance the budget of that given year, anyway, because of the delayed and perverse effects of those changes.

Practically, then, we strive for balance within cycles in American economic activity rather than within cycles in the calendar. During strong business activity, normal spending programs and tax rates should produce sizable surpluses. During recessions, maintenance of the same spending programs and tax rates automatically generate deficits which would stimulate recovery.

The deadly enemies of this balanced economic cycle are those politicians who in recession would enact spending programs that do not automatically contract during periods of prosperity. The economic sin of the New Deal was not that it resorted, in a time of deepest depression, to deficit financing. It was that it inaugurated spending programs that could only spiral upward. It was that its philosophy aimed our economy toward permanent deficit financing, or, in other words, toward a permanent depression climate.

The economic sin of the recent Democratic-controlled Congresses has not been so much in unbalancing the yearly appropriations part of the budget. It has been in the enactment of built-in spending programs, outside of the appropriations process, which would require a President, say in 1962, to request so may billions for programs set up by law by Congresses long since dead. The ultimate in demagoguery would be for the enactors of that legislation to then accuse whoever is President in 1962 of being the spender. And yet, during the last session of Congress, some of the opposition leaders tried to exercise just that exact type of demagoguery in respect to the results now showing up of actions taken by preceding Congresses under their leadership.

Indeed, it will continue to be possible in the decade of the 1960's for politicians to damage the economic health of our Nation without ever being called to task for their damage.

I think the Republicans are challenged to do their utmost to enlighten the people about these economic facts. For I fear that throughout this decade, the disunified condition of the other party, giving rise to the rule of vast special interests, will demonize that party again and again to destroy the balanced budget. Many responsible Democratic leaders will realize the tragedy of what is happening, but the devilish division that possesses that party will make it impossible for them to prevent the tragedy. Thus, the only safeguard of the public economy becomes an enlightened public.

The President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth has wisely noted that obtaining a balance within the cycles of American economic activity "does require a high level of economic understanding on the part of the public and of resolution on the part of their elected representatives and officials."

To us Republicans, this becomes an economic challenge and a major responsibility.

Second. The second potential we propose to use to preserve and enlarge economic freedom for our children is sound monetary management.

A fundamental plank in sound monetary management is the maintenance of the integrity and nonpartisan position of the independent Federal Reserve System. That system should remain outside year-to-year politics, so that momentary partisan consideration will not move its judgment about credit and money policies. An effective administration of the Federal Reserve System demands freedom and flexibility to act quickly in response to changing economic rather than political conditions.

The Republican Party will not retreat in its fight against those leaders of the opposition who would subvert the position of that system and make it their political handmaiden.

In the decade we now enter, it would be most tragic if, in the guise of promoting low interest rates, any legislation was passed which would coerce the Federal Reserve System into adopting a policy of loose money to make Treasury borrowing easier. Current attempts by Democrats to produce depression level interest rates in an era of prosperity signify that their economic intellects are on the level of the 1930's and 1940's, not the 1960's. It would be a high blunder to repeat the policy of the Democratic administration from 1946 to 1951, which inflated the money supply and consequently fanned rising prices. Abnormally low interest rates are not worth the cost of abnormally high prices in every sector of the economy. Again it must be stated that the most effective way to have lower interest rates is to lower the Federal debt. The very people who promote the Federal expenditures in excess of Federal revenues are the very ones arguing hardest for cheap money.

Moreover, proper money management aims at economic growth that is sustainable, and will not artificially balloon out only to burst. When business activity is strong and rising, an easy money policy would merely encourage the type of spending that could not be matched by an expansion in real output of goods or services, which would therefore be inflationary. When business activity is weak and lagging, on the other hand, easier money becomes appropriate to increase spending to levels required for maximum sustainable economic growth.

We see it as vitally important that the Federal Reserve and both political parties during the 1960's become capable of seeing the economic picture with long-range vision. I note again my fears that the opposition will not be able to see or to act in light of that unified picture, because of its basic lack of party unity.

Third. Another economic potential for preserving and enlarging economic freedom for our children is sound debt management.

An increasing dilemma in this decade will arise from the shorter and shorter maturity on Federal debt issues, resulting simply from the passage of time. This in itself will have inflationary implications. And with increasing frequency the Treasury will be forced to enter the market.

Plainly, the short-term maturities of a large part of the present debt already constitute a dangerous inflationary peril. By increasing liquidity, they increase the velocity of money. Those short-term issues of the Treasury can cause the Federal Reserve to delay action when it is needed to deter inflationary influences on the economy at large. Short-term issues are much more difficult to administer and they are more subject to the upturns and downturns of economic cycles, whereas long-term financing affords a stability which transcends these cycles.

The inevitable shortening of the debt will become worsened—indeed it is being worsened each month that passes—if the Treasury is forced by the statutory limit on long-term bond interest rates to continue to borrow in the short-term money market where it has no interest ceiling

to restrict it. Should the opposition party succeed in blocking the recommendation to eliminate that limit through this decade, by 1970 every family in America would reap an inflationary whirlwind. During the last session of Congress, the opposition did block reform legislation in this field, under the guise of holding down interest rates and saving the taxpayer money. As a result, the rates on Treasury short-term bonds soared over 5 percent by January 1, 1960. So, no money was saved for the taxpayer after all. And the goddess of inflation received new food in the form of short-term issues and the people who wanted to buy autos and small businesses which wanted to expand had to pay higher interest rates or in many instances were forced to do without short-term credit because the Federal Government had usurped it.

A principal goal of Republican economic policy will continue to be that of converting greater portions of our debt into long- instead of short-term inflationary issues. A second goal of Republican economic policy will continue to be to save the taxpayer outlay for financing the debt by reducing the debt.

Before leaving these three particular economic potentials, let me emphasize that all three influence the total impact of Federal financial management. This the Truman administration did not comprehend. Consequently, its rigid long-term bond interest rate policies were an undue burden on its monetary policies and helped to cut the purchasing power of the dollar in half. A proper balance of the burdens is essential.

Fourth. A fourth economic potential to preserve and enlarge economic freedom for our children is the enlargement of the incentive system in America.

Traditionally, the productive vitality of the United States was nurtured on a boundless variety of incentives. To meet a Russian competition spurred on by the abandoning of many traditional communistic doctrines and the adopting of much of the incentive systems of private enterprise, the Democratic advisory council advocates our abandoning many of the features of the incentive system of private enterprise and adopting the very type of centralized programing and spending which Russia is abandoning because it kills incentives. What upside down thinking is this? In contrast, the Republicans want to restore our entire incentive system which has been already cut into by the legislation adopted through Democratic administrations.

The inherent economic advantage we possess over communism or any totalitarian type of government is that these forms of government can never duplicate our traditional incentive program and still remain totalitarian. For the chief pillar of that incentive program has been the profit system, the opportunity for risk, enterprise, and reward, with the marketplace determining the outcome rather than arbitrary decisions by groups of political bureaucrats or industrial oligopolists.

In the United States, if all business and professional enterprises are added together, the total of so-called economic teams of individuals is over 8 million. Each team has its own unique contribution to make. By accommodating itself to the market, it is spurred on to increasingly productive efforts. The search for profits has always been the greatest generating force for research and development which produces cumulative economic growth. It is from realized profits that sound sustainable economic expansion comes.

But this expansion has been greatly inhibited by an antiquated, unbalanced and unfair tax system. Wise reform of the corporate tax structure would both create more jobs and increase Federal revenues by promoting new investments. Wise reform of personal income taxes would stimulate untold individual creativity throughout the Nation.

It is a curious tragedy that President Roosevelt, beginning with his famous "soak the rich" speeches in 1935 and 1936, created an image that the New Deal tax policies would hurt the rich and help the poor. Actually, these restrictive tax policies merely made it more difficult for the poor, regardless of their work, effort, and ingenuity, to rise to the affluence of those of inherited wealth. Such shortsighted policies tightened rather than dissolved the barriers between the two economic groups. Strange as it may seem, the wealthy classes of the 1880's or the 1910's were a much more fluid, democratic class, where literally most of its members had earned their own way, than the wealthy classes have ever been since the New-Fair-Deal personal income tax laws.

In this decade, we must totally revise our tax system, so that enterprise, hard work, and imagination will again receive its reward, so that those in the lower and middle income brackets will have just as much right to be a millionaire as the man who inherits a million dollars.

Fifth. A fifth potential to enlarge freedom and prosperity for our children is aimed at restoring the mobility of capital and labor in our society.

This is closely related to recreating the incentive system. An economy based on profit motive is often conceived of as cruel, because profit involves sharp competition, and in competition somebody loses.

That system is cruel wherein there is no mobility in capital and labor. This indeed describes the feudal society of the Dark Ages. Mobility is the saving grace which makes the weeding out of inefficient enterprise good and healthful, instead of cruel and damaging to the individuals who must lose in the process. It means that unprofitable labor and capital, by the loss system, is forced—for its own good—into more profitable activity and investment. A cloying sentimentality has been behind much of the New Deal programs to subsidize and protect the "little man." Actually these policies result in making men little and weak instead of encouraging them to grow and to live up to their own capacities. Far from helping the little man, these policies have hurt him in his personal pursuit of happiness and in curtailing the increasingly beneficial part he could play as a member of his society. Nor has this exchange of his freedom for a promised security given him any real security.

Unfortunately, this mobility can and has been partially destroyed. We have seen how our tax system has destroyed part of it.

Compulsion through the arrival of the robber baron prototype in labor unions has destroyed another part. Many employees have become the subjects of robber baron controlled union monopoly to which they must bow. The employer finds that wage policies of the unions often deprive him of flexibility and frequently cut into his funds for reinvestment with which he creates new jobs. All too often, unions respond to a decline in employment in a poorly subsisting business or in an increasingly technological business by demanding shorter hours for the same pay. Other unions bar new workers with more ability from industry, and practice featherbedding and forced employment.

The robber baron type in business was checked by Republican sponsored legislation in the late 1800's and early 1900's. However, we still must perfect our antitrust legislation to be certain that the marketplace remains free to make fair economic decisions. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom for the robber baron type still exists to muscle in wherever he can.

It must be emphasized, particularly as certain Democratic leaders seem to be trying to promote a public mood for playing the numbers game with economic growth rates, that economic growth does not come free. Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that growth in itself as it is measured today in gross national product is to a large extent meaningless. Gross national product measures include economic extravagances, economic errors, and sheer waste and calls changes in this total growth. Yet it fails to fully measure as growth efforts and capital spent in education, vocational training, research and development, and other areas which mean much more to future sound growth than probably anything else. Furthermore, growth rates do not accurately represent a society's productive capacity. A society builds its capital plant and its citizens learn their productive skills over a period of many years. The business organizations which put capital and human skills together, the third factor in productive capacity, often require decades to establish. It is productivity capacity which is the real test of a nation's economic strength, not a specially selected short span of years of growth rates. Indeed, the smaller the productive capacity one starts with as a base the more phenomenal the growth rates in the early years appear to be. As a society matures and becomes strong in productive capacity, its growth rate more than anything reflects its reactions to its needs of the day and less and less relates to its creation of new productive capacity. Russia, on the other hand, with a relatively small productive capacity, still uses a good bit of the productive capacity she inherited from the czars, particularly housing, and its

capacity is still so small in relation to its needs and so much of it is obsolete that its growth rate reflects very little a response to the needs of the day but very heavily its addition to its productive plant. In spite of this, her growth rate is behind that of the United States for any comparable period of development and she will remain far behind the United States of America in productive capacity throughout the 20th century.

Rapid technological growth means increased frictional unemployment. In other words, as new technologies are developed old skills become obsolete. The very people who presently seem so entranced about the subject of economic growth are the very ones who are complaining the loudest about the problems we have which have resulted primarily from the technological changes behind a rapid rate of growth. What do these Democratic leaders think has caused the grave unemployment and underemployment in the rural areas? It has been the extraordinary technological growth in American agriculture which has made obsolete, uncompetitive, and unneeded the skills of the old 40-acre farmer. The Republicans seek to meet the human problems that this rapid economic growth has created, but in doing so we know we must face up to the fact that it is rapid economic growth that has largely created the problem. Do we indeed want more rapid economic growth in the agricultural sector of our society? Or wouldn't we do better to stimulate growth in some other section where it is needed and where we might find jobs for the displaced?

In the area of cost-of-living problems we must also recognize that rapid technological growth creates increased costs. These costs are real costs, not inflation or unfair profits, these costs result from making obsolete machines and tools and skills, from purchasing new machines and tools, from training for the new skills, and from money invested in extensive research and development which lies behind most technological growth.

Yet again, the very people who are entranced with this question of more rapid economic growth are the ones who are stirring up the people over the cost-of-living increases that occur as a result of it. What sort of areas am I talking about? Take the field of health. Never in the history of the world has there been such a rapid advancement in the control of sickness and disease, in the increasing of the human life expectancy, in the cutting down of absenteeism for health reasons as in the United States in the past few decades. Parenthetically I might state that this rapid growth is only partially measured by the economic measuring sticks we have available and so is largely not included in the United States of America growth figures.

The costs in the health field are real costs and they have gone up considerably. Yet, as I have said, those who keep crying for more growth are the very ones who are castigating those who are responsible for this rapid growth in health because of the costs involved. Certainly, human problems have arisen from increased costs in the health field resulting from this very rapid technological growth. But instead of cursing our blessings, let us meet the problems.

Strangely enough, those who would curse the costs resulting from the very rapid technological growth in the health field are the very ones who want to have the Federal Government stimulate the growth in this area even more. Is it not fair to ask them if they are prepared to cope with the problems that further rapid advancement will bring inasmuch as we have still not met the problems already existing in this area?

These are some of the economic potentials we must understand and meet if our children are to know real freedom of choice and opportunity.

I think the report of the Republican National Committee on program and progress succinctly expresses what the Republican economic philosophy proposes:

> Lift the ceiling over personal opportunity; strengthen the floor over the pit of personal disaster.

Perhaps historians will find new parallels to the story of a President, not a candidate for reelection, and of Republican Members of House and Senate, outnumbered nearly 2 to 1, who battled courageously and vigorously for the best interests of every family man and mother who want to see their children inherit economic freedom, to be able to save some money, and to be free from fiscal dictation. In fighting these battles we Republicans have learned to develop and cherish the qualifications that make us the party for the future.

THE PARTY QUALIFIED TO MEET THE CHALLENGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALLECK. First, I want to commend my colleagues for the great diligence they have been showing in this series of talks to set forth our basic philosophies, spelling them out in detail, so that thoughtful people may know exactly where we stand. I might say that already I have had many people who have been reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tell me they are heartened and much encouraged by what they have read.

It is a matter of real gratification to me that these younger Members who have preceded me in this series have shown this vigor and this initiative pointing up the issues of the day.

I have felt for a long time, and have said so publicly on many occasions, that Republicans need to do a better job of selling the people on their record of accomplishments for the country and their record of adherence to sound principles.

Getting any story across is never easy; it is a job that requires many voices, and I congratulate my colleagues for the presentations they have made during the past week and earlier today.

For my part I appreciate having been invited to take part in these discussions and am proud to associate myself with those who have made such effective arguments for the Republican cause.

At the outset of our speech series on party differences 2 weeks ago, the able chairman of the Republican policy committee, the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], asked:

> Are the two major political parties in this country qualified to meet successfully the challenges of the sixties?

In seeking an answer, we have examined the challenge of preserving peace through justice, the challenge of maturing labor-management relations, and the challenge of enlarging economic freedom for our children. Within the next 10 years we also will face many other tests. But these three furnish us the means of analyzing the different ways that each of our political parties respond to demanding situations. From this the voting public can predict what to expect in the future from each party.

The very survival of our Nation—and the free world—will depend upon that well-informed public.

In the opening speech the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] discussed the obligations of political parties. If they are to be more than a conspiracy to gain power, more than a machine to serve special interests, they must strive for party unity, party principle, party democracy, and party concern for future generations. Lacking these, any political party, regardless of how fine may be some of its leaders and members, cannot fulfill the public demand for real leadership in the new age ahead.

If either of those parties fails to be constituted so that it can meet and discuss issues candidly, then the two-party process is frustrated. The voter has no choice. The future of the country is endangered by the threat of power politics, of bossism, of special interest groups.

Since the chairman of the Republican policy committee analyzed the four qualifications of our party, I now have the duty of analyzing the other party.

What does the first qualification—unity—demand of the other party? That there be no dissension? Certainly not. But it demands that the dissension not be over fundamentally opposing issues which can never be reconciled. It demands that that party not dissipate its leadership on party strife and bickering. For a party really divided against itself may stand, but it stands at the expense of the general public.

Some say that the Democrat feuds merely hurt the Democrats and help the Republicans. In the first place, it is not the Democrats who are hurt. It is the entire Nation that is hurt. And, in the second place, it is not the Republicans who are helped. For out of each fight springs an attempt to restore party peace by blurring, compromising, and watering down the issues over which they fought. That evasion hardens the task of the Republicans to convey the real issues to the people who will be going to the polls.

In this decade we now enter, political parties must have unity of purpose within themselves if they are to transmit purpose to a nation challenged by communism. Especially does this unity become essential in foreign policy.

The second speech of this series outlined how the Democratic advisory council has promoted a line of disunity in our foreign policy and hindered our sense of purpose.

The fourth speech of our series outlined the ill effects of party disunity in the field of labor-management relations. The labor-management policies of the other party during the last session of Congress were riddled with disunity. The discerning Democrats joined in with Republicans to support the only bipartisan bill offered. But, as a party, the opposition was incapable of meeting the challenge.

The same story repeats itself in the economic field, as the fifth and sixth speeches of the series demonstrated. The other party is incapable of uniting on economic policy.

Now, what about the second qualification for a party—a forward-looking political philosophy based on principle?

Each speech of this series, whether in the field of foreign policy, labor management, or economics, has strained to find a real Democrat philosophy based on consistent principle. If only we could have found that, we could have compared our principles with their principles. But what we found was much expediency, many generalities, but no consistency of principle.

So let us take a close look at some of these glib Democratic generalities, which we might better call "gliberalities."

Since the 1930's, we have heard the "gliberality" that the philosophy of the other party is one of helping the common man. This "gliberality" rings high-sounding notes. The fifth speech reviewed in great detail how the deficit spending approach of the other party has turned into a Frankenstein monster stealing from the so-called common man's pocketbook. The economic policies of the other party have led to increasing hardship for the pensioned senior citizens, the widows, the school teachers, and in fact, for the entire household of the average American family.

Let us examine another "gliberality." At the December meeting of the Democratic advisory council, there was much talk about its so-called liberal philosophy.

What do they mean by liberal? Why do they not define it? Freedom-loving liberals like Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams raised the cry of despotism against George III and his policies of high taxation and increased centralization. But the advisory council and the liberal wing of that party in the House supports programs which would advance high taxation and increased centralization.

The first great liberal President, Thomas Jefferson, warned against deficit financing in these words:

> The earth belongs always to the living generation. * * * Neither the representatives of a nation, nor the whole nation itself assembled, can validly engage debts beyond what they must pay in their own time.

The Democrat Party should be blushing at Jefferson's words. The fifth speech in our series carefully documented the fact that how, during this century, Democrat administrations had added deficits equaling over 90 percent of our national debt. That speech also documented how Democrat-controlled Congresses have added deficits equaling our entire national debt today. Yet there is no letup in the clamor in the ranks of Democrats for more and bigger spending programs.

We cannot discover a concrete Democratic philosophy on economic, or governmental, or foreign policy because there is no basic principle for that philosophy.

One last point about Democratic Party "gliberalities." The publications of that party propagandized that they can look ahead, adapt to new ideas, meet changing situations.

Yet, there is perhaps one predominant fact that has emerged from the discussions of this speech series. Those Democrats are not looking forward. They are looking backward. By their policies and their conduct, they have dubbed themselves the reactionaries. Both in foreign and domestic policy, they have become a large size, super-deluxe Mr. Reactive. They react. They cannot act. They respond with the hackneyed solutions of the 1930's and the 1940's. They cannot initiate a philosophy for the 1960's and the 1970's.

Now I turn to the third essential qualification for a political party—democracy within party ranks.

How is policy made in the opposition party? Who knows?

The opening speech of this series explained how Republican policy was formulated by our policy committee which furnishes geographical representation from the entire country. The opposition party in the House has no policy committee. It has ignored a major recommendation in the 1946 reorganization of Congress.

Of course, in 1956 the Democratic advisory council was created to advise Democrats in Congress on policy. We have seen how that organization is not really representative. In fact, the Democratic National Committee has carefully seen to it that no Democrat Representative in this House is on the main body of that advisory council. The advisory council proposes to tell Democrats in this body how to vote, without ever hearing their viewpoints. Is that democratic? Do most Democrats really want to have policy dictated by an organization in downtown, instead of formulated on Capitol Hill by a congressional policy committee geographically composed?

Disunity inevitably denies the other party the opportunity to become a truly Democratic Party. Constantly jockeying for power are its special interest groups, or its special geographical groups.

But this process of power politics denies the weaker groups any representation at all. The voice of the party minorities is silenced.

That lopsided representation becomes apparent even in the organization of committees in this Congress. The nationwide farm program is controlled by legislation in the House and Senate. Today, the Midwest is being subjected to the bitter fruits of unsound farm policies that began decades ago. But where are the home districts of the ranking eight Members of the opposition on the House Agriculture Committee? North Carolina, Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Virginia. In other words, the cotton and tobacco interests are represented, but not the farmers of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Iowa.

Compare this geographical concentration of power with the distribution of the other side of the committee. The first eight Republican Members represent States in this order: Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Maine, Utah, Kansas, California, Minnesota. That is balanced representation. As in the operation of the Republican policy committee, representation is for the best interests of all, and not the special interests of any.

I have taken a bit of ribbing for using the term "Democrat Party." I have a good reason for doing this. The "democrat" with the small "d" is being driven out of the Democratic Party. That party is not truly representative of the hopes, aspirations, and wishes of the people who vote its ticket. The voter who wants to be represented must vote the Republican ticket.

Now to the fourth qualification of a political party—long-range vision toward future generations.

Again and again our speech series has brought out Democratic characteristics of responding with splintered vision, with one-sided viewpoints, with crisis and crash solutions, with accumulated expediency. The last administration had its view so fixed on Europe in the late 1940's that it allowed the Communists to outflank us in the Far East.

Today most congressional Democrats have their view so fixed on the spending part of the budget that they forget the revenue part.

Indeed, these short-range viewpoints are confusing.

They stand up to a Russian threat one time, then retreat before the threat the next time. Be tough over Berlin, but give up the outer defenses of Formosa. Proclaim the faith of a balanced budget one day, advocate spending programs which would make that balance impossible the next. Criticize the present administration for routine appropriations requests necessitated by Democratic spending legislation a few years back, and yet legislate more built-in spending for 1962.

Plainly, this type of party inconsistency can lead us into a deadly collision with the perils of this new decade.

In all four of the qualifications for a political party, the other party has disqualified itself. Without unity, without consistent principle, without internal democracy, without long-range vision, no wonder it seeks a shelter in a preference for security over freedom. Since it parades under false colors of its abandoned heritages, no wonder it is mired in negativism and turns back from the new worlds of human relations ahead.

The other party is confused and bewildered. The precious qualities which we possess, the other party is denied. No simple act of their party leadership

can cure the malady, so deep has become their split personality. This means that heavy demands for meeting the challenges ahead are slowly but surely being transferred to our shoulders. And if in our Republican political health, in our political capabilities for real statesmanship in foreign and domestic policy, we fail through apathy or through inability to get our Republican message across, then we are deeply to blame.

During these next 10 years we must never rest from the duty of bringing maximum public discussion upon these real issues of our survival, and of presenting the Republican message.

And what is that message?

It says that while men and parties may cry for peace, the only real and lasting peace comes with justice and freedom. And this type of peace can be achieved only through a leadership which sees the Sino-Soviet peril as a whole and not in parts.

That leadership must marshal all the forces of our free society to dissolve that peril. Our foreign policy must be consistent, and disallow the type of miscalculations which produced the Korean war, and which, in the future, could produce nuclear holocaust.

We must maintain an effective, flexible military deterrent system which employs a secure, retaliatory capacity to respond in just the right measure to make aggression unprofitable.

And we must maintain the strength of this system through sacrifice and not through robbing our economic defenses. For a strong, free, rapidly growing American economy is the very foundation stone upon which our survival in protracted competition with communism depends.

We must maintain and improve our collective security and solidarity throughout the free world.

We must encourage the dynamic forces of science and technology, and we must never allow central dictation and control to kill basic educational or basic research processes.

We must disavow cheap materialism or socialism which could destroy the fiber of our psychological, moral, and spiritual resources. We must support the leadership inaugurated by the President and Vice President to approach the peoples of the captive societies, so that they will exert pressures upward to obtain more freedom.

Not one, but all of these potentials of our free society must be used in this summons to preserve peace with justice and freedom.

Then there is our message about labor-management relations. Both labor and management leaders represent startling economic power. Any political party that seeks to protect either special interest at the expense of all the people is betraying the country.

Republicans led in antimonopoly legislation against business at the turn of the century. Republicans led in reform legislation to protect rank and file of unions last year. Republicans oppose measures of the opposition which would curtail the dynamic forces of industry through Government price fixing. Republicans opposed Truman's efforts to draft railroad union members into the Army in 1946. Ours is the only party truly bipartisan in these crucial matters.

Our Republican message also speaks about preserving economic freedom for our children. Policies of the opposition begun during the depression decade and carried on by Congress have burdened the average American family with a national indebtedness. Its product has been a steadily increased cost of living and high taxes. They have increasingly robbed the real take-home pay, the spending and investing money, of the typical family.

The first big weapon for preserving freedom lies in the sound management of our budget, our money, and our debt. When political leadership in prosperous times promotes legislation which turns surpluses into deficits, our children are being punished with debt. When such leadership tries to subvert the independent judgment of the Federal Reserve into false monetary management, our children are being cheated with a cheapened dollar. Those who successfully oppose measures for long-term financing of our national debt are punishing our children with economic instability in their old age. For prosperity with stable prices can only spring from proper budget, monetary, and debt management.

We need to restore the incentive system to America. The New and Fair Deal taxation concepts which have kept the poor poor, and not allowed them to move into the class of those who have inherited wealth, must be abolished. Creativity must be allowed to find its rewards. The mobility of capital and labor must be restored, and not frozen by systems of Federal regulations, monopolistic practices in labor and industry, and subsidy programs that enforce the abnormal. For only so will our children and their children really know the land of the free.

In a few days we will be observing the birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln. It was almost a century ago when he said:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trials through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation. * * *
>
> The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion.
>
> We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves.

May we Republicans disenthrall ourselves with attitudes that old ways of expressing ourselves are good enough. We must become missionaries of our messages of enlarging freedom at home and abroad. We must vigilantly avoid being misrepresented. We must carry our story to every American home. We must take our message to the marketplace of ideas throughout our land. We must force public debate about the real alternatives of our national policy. And may even those who disagree with us be compelled to say that our political party used its unique qualifications to meet and not to escape the trials of our time.

For the age of promise which lies ahead belongs to those who earnestly seek the promise in the creativity of freedom, and in the strength of justice.

A REASON FOR CONFUSION ABOUT THE GOP

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Indiana described the Democrats today as "confused and bewildered," he certainly described the inevitable reaction of many Democrats who have been following this series of Republican policy committee speeches.

When anybody describes the Republican Party as a "party of unity," he is certain to create some confusion among House Members who recall vividly the bitter and divisive battle for GOP leadership in this body—a battle which still reverberates around the corridors, now and then.

When anybody describes the Republican Party as a "party of principle," he is sure to lead to some confusion among American voters who are still puzzled by such Madison Avenue terms as "dynamic conservatism" and "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek"—to mention only a couple of the "consistent principles" for which the GOP has contended loudly in recent years.

When there is talk by Republican leaders about "internal democracy," the confusion mounts. That is one that is sure to confuse even some Republicans—including one named Governor Rockefeller, in New York. Any resemblance to "internal democracy" in the forthcoming GOP presidential convention is likely to be, as they say in the movies, "purely coincidental."

But the claim that is certain to compound universal confusion is that high-flying assertion about "long-range vision" in the GOP. Long-range vision in the present Republican Party? Where in the world can it be found?—a confused America is sure to ask. Do you find it in our space program, where we are far behind? Do you find it in our missile program, on any nonpolitical authority? Do you find it in conservation of our resources, in education, in housing?

In search of some explanation for this curious collection of claims on behalf of the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, I finally located this gem of political advice in a well-known address on the subject of "Fundamentals of Campaign Organization."

The author, unless a very reliable authority is in error, was a California political expert named Chotiner, who reportedly has been a great help to some of our colleagues in past campaigns.

"May I suggest that where you have weaknesses in your candidate, you should take advantage of it," advised Mr. Chotiner.

The candidate in this instance, of course, would be the Republican Party—and the weaknesses of that party under its present leadership are matters of common knowledge and matters of recent record. They include a bitter disunity on the congressional leadership issue, an attitude on political principle under Madison Avenue guidance that can charitably be described as casual, a brand of internal democracy that is often a mockery of the term, and a blind and absolute absence of long-range vision on many important national issues.

On these points, it will no doubt be said, I may be a little prejudiced as a Democrat.

So, I submit, is the distinguished minority leader, whose hard-hitting attack on an obvious collection of strawmen might even be mistaken by some as an opening barrage in a campaign for Vice President.

As a candidate for that office, on his own party's ticket, our distinguished Indiana colleague undoubtedly has many qualifications—and many in this body are sure to wish him well.

One thing is sure, he has learned his Chotiner.

POSTAL INSPECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] addressed this House on the subject of the so-called peepholes in the post offices. His remarks may be found on pages 662 and 663 of the RECORD. I notified the gentleman of my intention to refer to his remarks, and I am pleased to see that he is on the floor.

In discussing this subject I want to be meticulously accurate both as to the facts and as to the implications of my statements.

I want to be completely fair to the Postmaster General of the United States and to the officials and members of the U.S. Postal Inspection Service—who, by the way, deserve better treatment in this House than shoddy and totally unsubstantiated accusations of "vicious," "gestapo-like," "big brother," "un-American spy activities," all of which were terms used by the gentleman from West Virginia.

I want to point out that both the American people and that vastly overwhelming majority of honest Federal employees who constitute the personnel of the U.S. Postal Service have a stake in the inspection system and the issue here under discussion.

Finally, I hope in these remarks to contribute to the fuller understanding on the part of Members of this House as to the necessary uses and the rigidly prohibited abuses of this so-called peephole or lookout system.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the gentleman from West Virginia with complete kindness and respect—certainly with much more kindness and respect than he referred to the Postmaster General and to other postal officials when he said:

> I suggest that Postmaster General Summerfield may want to place signs so all post office employees can see them, and the signs might read: "Big Brother Arthur is watching you."

Earlier in his remarks the gentleman from West Virginia had indicated the import of this "big brother" reference, because he said:

> Mr. Speaker, you remember that terrifying book by George Orwell, entitled "Nineteen Eighty-Four."
>
> Last week I was shocked to discover that in the post offices of this country, 1984 is already here.

I think this last-quoted statement clearly indicates what happened and explains why the gentleman from West Virginia came to the floor of this House full of what he believed was righteous wrath over what he had just discovered and over what he impulsively believed to be a new, wicked, and abominable practice.

Now I want to go even a step further in being fair and kind to the gentleman from West Virginia—and at the same time be completely frank and honest about the matter.

If the gentleman from West Virginia is in the least bit embarrassed about the lateness of his discovery of this practice in the postal service, perhaps a frank acknowledgment on my part will moderate his embarrassment. I was not only a Member of Congress but, of all things, a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, before I discovered the existence of the lookout or observation gallery system in the post offices.

Moreover, and I am baring my own innermost thoughts to the gentleman and this House on this matter, I must acknowledge that I at first reacted somewhat critically to the practice. I claim no superior virtue when I add that I did not instantly voice my feelings but instead asked a great many questions about the whys and wherefores, the reasons and the restrictions, with regard to this feature of the postal inspection system. The simple truth is, I will say to my colleague, this is the first time I have ever acknowledged to anyone that my first and impulsive reactions had, to say the least, been one of skepticism.

I would not want to believe that the gentleman from West Virginia spoke as he did last Monday for any other season than the same instinctive reaction which prompted my own initial skepticism. And so I can say, for my own part, as the bishop said when he saw the felon being led away to be hanged, "There, but for the Grace of God, go I."

Now, let us get into the subject itself.

I want to quote a statement made by a high postal official regarding this observation gallery system:

> I do not like to think that any of the clerks in our service should be kept righteous through fear, but clerks should understand the possibility of their apprehension when they make missteps from the strict path of honesty. The purposes of the observation galleries should be explained to them.
>
> While I am on this subject I might say that observation galleries, lookout galleries, or catwalks, or whatever you may call them, are used for but one purpose and one purpose only, that is the apprehension of thieves. They are not used by postmaster or supervisors or anyone else to determine whether or not clerks are loitering or doing anything else they should not be doing. That would be a suspecting supervision which I for one will not tolerate either from lookout galleries or by any other means. They are not used for the apprehension of thieves until it is first ascertained that the number of losses in the mails chargeable to a certain office make it apparent that someone is stealing. And then only when it is ascertained that the losses have narrowed themselves down to a comparatively small section of the office. No honest man needs to fear a lookout gallery. Their purpose is to protect honest men.

Now this statement was made in an address before the national convention of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. It was made by Chief Postal Inspector K. P. Aldrich. It was made in September 1939. It reflected official policy and regulations of the Post Office Department then in force. And when that statement was made the Postmaster General of the United States was the greatly respected Hon. James A. Farley.

Is it therefore to be suggested that Jim Farley, as he was and still is affectionately known, was sponsoring and promoting, or permitting to be sponsored or tolerated in the Post Office Department, a vicious, un-American spy activity patterned after the Gestapo—the Gestapo which was that very year at the peak of its wicked and wholly nefarious activities?

Or is it to be suggested that Jim Farley was tolerating or approving practices in the Post Office Department which, unwittingly, anticipated and predated the Big Brother of 1984 philosophy and tactics then not yet even envisioned by George Orwell?

I don't think so—and neither, I am sure, does the gentleman from West Virginia.

The truth of the matter is, of course, that the use of observation galleries and of lookouts for the detection of suspected criminals who are violating the sanctity and the secrecy of the mails, is a practice of very long standing. Indeed, I have not been able to determine the date of its origins. I am told that the U.S. Postal Inspection Service is the oldest investigative agency in the Government, and that the charge to provide for the safety and security of the mails by all necessary means was imposed upon the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, by the Continental Congress.

As to the history of the observation galleries, I am further advised, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who serves so ably as chairman of the Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee could doubtless verify this bit of history, that the Old Post Office Building at Richmond, Va.—used during the period of the Confederacy as the Treasury Building—is so equipped.

As to the general use of this system in more recent times, I ask permission to insert at this point in the RECORD instructions regarding control of lookout galleries issued by Hon. Walter Myers, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, November 3, 1943. The Honorable

Frank C. Walker was Postmaster General at that time:

TO POSTMASTERS AT FEDERAL BUILDINGS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT:

Section 57 of "Instructions and Suggestions for Postmasters in the Operation of Public Buildings" is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 57. Lookout galleries: (1) Lookout galleries are to be kept free from dust and ready for immediate use at all times.

"(2) It is especially important that the louver slats and sills under same be kept clean. Exit doors must not be blocked with furniture or other equipment.

"(3) This work should be assigned to certain employees, who are to be held responsible for the proper care of the same. The lookouts should be cleaned on the first Monday of each month, and the employees should be admitted on that day only. When this day falls on a holiday the lookout should be cleaned on the following business day.

"(4) Post office inspectors, postmasters, and superintendents at stations or branches located in Federal buildings are the only officials who should have keys to the entrance doors to the lookouts. The key in the custody of the postmaster (or superintendent) should be kept in his safe, vault, or in the key cabinet under lock, where it will not be accessible to unauthorized persons.

"(5) Requests for lookout keys should be directed to the inspector in charge of the division in which the building is located."

This amendment should be inserted in your copy of the Book of Instructions.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER MYERS,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

In that connection I should call attention to a paragraph from the 1937 edition of "Instructions to Postmasters on the Maintenance and Care of Federal Buildings." This paragraph, found in section 57, states:

Only postal inspectors in the discharge of criminal work are authorized to use lookout galleries.

Also, I insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from 1947 House Appropriation Subcommittee hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill, page 509:

Mr. LUDLOW. Is there a lookout in every large post office?

Mr. DORAN. Yes; there is a lookout post in every Federal building; in the ones that have been built in the last 25 years, I am sure they each have a lookout. Some of the older ones where they have been remodeled, are not so good, but all of the new ones have lookouts.

Mr. LUDLOW. That has been the means of discovering a good many violations?

Mr. DORAN. We have no other way in many of these places except to place an inspector on the job, and it is a job the inspectors do not like very much and you can imagine what going into a place like that and staying for hours means, but there is no other way to protect the public.

Mr. LUDLOW. Do they have regular hours or tours of duty?

Mr. DORAN. The inspectors?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. DORAN. No.

Mr. LUDLOW. Just whenever they have occasion for such work?

Mr. DORAN. There are men in the post office who are assigned to work with the inspector, and they sometimes are called depredation assistants, in the large cities only. They spend a considerable amount of their time. But it is unfair to ask a man to spend more than 2 hours in one of those places, because, in the first place, the dust that has accumulated is enough to impair their health, and in the second place they have to stand in a cramped position, and at other times some of them have to kneel down to observe what is going on.

We do not use that method until we are satisfied that there is a thief operating at a particular place, then we go to work on him.

DEPREDATIONS BY EMPLOYEES

Mr. LUDLOW. What you refer to as depredation is the stealing of valuables from the mail, checks and money?

Mr. DORAN. As a rule, they are small amounts, that are stolen from organizations that are in the habit of getting contributions for various things. I do not like to admit it, but the fact is they steal from the Red Cross and from drives for infantile paralysis, and from the cancer contributions, and things of that kind. That is the safest kind of mail, because very often people will just put a few dollars in an envelope; they do not have a check on it; and many of these organizations do not make any acknowledgment; that is true especially of the relief organizations, and there are times when they get a lot of money.

In these hearings Chief Inspector Doran, of the Post Office Department, stated that—

There is a lookout post in every Federal building * * * that have been built in the last 25 years.

He stressed that—

We do not use that method until we are satisfied that there is a thief operating at a particular place, then we go to work on him.

And he cited types of thievery from the mails which were most frequently encountered. That, I repeat, was in 1947 when the Postmaster General was either Hon. Robert E. Hannegan or Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, who himself came to that Cabinet post as a career man in the postal service.

Now as to the present practice and regulations: Section 622.524 of the current Post Manual governs use of observation galleries, the rigid control of keys, and the responsibility of postmasters and all others to report any unauthorized use of the facilities. Observance of the requirements of this cited section is periodically examined by postal inspectors.

Furthermore, a part of the indoctrination of newly appointed post office employees, adopted under the present Postmaster General in 1953, is that of emphasizing the absolute sanctity of the seal on mail matter and the serious penalties they apply for violation of that sanctity. Incident to this indoctrination, employees regularly are informed of the lookout facilities and of the use made of them by inspectors when necessary to aid in the detection of theft or violation of the secrecy of the mails.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to digress for a moment from the matter of the bare rules and regulations governing this system and offer a few observations about some of the deeper implications—both of this technique for safeguarding the secrecy and security of the mails and implications of the unfortunate and highly intemperate attack on this technique. In that connection, let me point out that the gentleman from West Virginia did not limit his criticism to alleged abuses of the observation gallery system—and about those alleged abuses I will say more a little later. He did not limit himself to criticism of alleged abuses but specifically attacked the system in relation to the safeguarding of the sanctity and security of the mails.

He said—and objected—that, and I quote his words:

Snooping postal inspectors * * * spy on postal workers * * * to see that they do not steal anything.

Even that is not an accurate statement as to the legitimate use which is made of the observation gallery. I am advised that the use of the gallery may properly be resorted to only when there is strong reason to believe—or when there is positive knowledge—that the mails are being pilfered. Generally, I am told, it is done when suspicions have narrowed down to a particular area of the postal operations or of the actual work floor.

So the real purpose is not, as was slurringly implied by the gentleman from West Virginia, "to see that they do not steal anything"—as though it were a general and shotgun surveillance of all employees arbitrarily and maliciously exercised—but it is instead for the purpose of detecting the source of known or strongly suspected thievery and to apprehend the offender on a basis and with evidence that will stand up in a criminal trial.

In this connection I wish to recall one particular statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia last Monday:

These peephole facilities * * * do not accomplish anything that tight supervision could not cure.

I challenge that statement as a matter of elemental commonsense, as a practical consideration. Does the gentleman mean to imply that normal supervisory methods—even those of tight supervision—are always adequate to detect and apprehend a sneak thief or a criminal pilferer of the mails? Certainly he does not believe that normal supervision should involve the drastic stringency sometimes necessary to apprehend such a thief? I am sure the gentleman did not actually realize the import of what he was saying.

I hope the House will indulge me as I offer a few further observations on this point—which is actually the crux of the whole matter.

Unfortunately we live in a world in which there are dishonest people, individuals who deliberately betray a trust, people who disregard the rights of others, people who by their own wrongdoing bring innocent persons under wrongful suspicion, and, perhaps worst of all, people who invoke for their own unworthy benefit and to the limit of their unscrupulous ability and to the limit of legal technicalities the very safeguards created by the Constitution and the Government to protect the innocent and to protect the rights of individuals and of society generally.

Are these enemies of the genuine rights of individuals and of society to be permitted to continue their criminal depredations unchecked and without effective challenge by the lawful forces of society?

Of course not, and I am sure the gentleman from West Virginia would be the first to subscribe to that answer.

Then, inevitably, comes the whole problem and philosophy of criminal detection and methods incident thereto.

I need not labor the point that those guilty of the criminal depredations do not knowingly advertise their activities and do not knowingly cooperate in their own apprehension.

I must apologize for pointing out the obvious—yet it appears to be necessary to do so.

Of course the confusion—and it can indeed be a very honest confusion—arises from a further consideration.

The very same regard for individual human rights which properly prompts us to look to Government for the safeguarding of those rights and the rights of society, including the secrecy and the security of the mails, also prompts a deep-rooted and very valid detestation of spying and snooping of the big brother, Gestapo variety.

That detestation, that aversion, is something that I hope we as Americans will never lose.

It is a built-in part of our concept of decency, fairplay, honorable conduct, and justice.

But—and this is the point I am making—the right of immunity and freedom from spying and snooping cannot extend to those persons who, through depredations of their own, have violated the rights of individuals or of society and have thereby deprived themselves of the normal safeguards against what is so glibly and mistakenly branded with those terms of approbrium.

Of course that opens the further complex area of still another principle of American justice and jurisprudence, to wit, the concept that a person is innocent until proven guilty and the requirement that probable cause be shown before a person may be apprehended, indicted, or bound over for criminal trial.

I am somewhat abashed at my own immodesty—as one who cannot remotely claim to be learned in the law or even a member of the bar—in discussing this matter.

But the right of investigation, of detection, and of apprehension on reasonable grounds of belief that a specific person has indeed committed a specific crime is—and must ever remain—an essential part of the processes of justice and of protection of the rights of individuals and of society.

That is an absolute, practical necessity.

So the whole matter boils down to this proposition—that the very concern for and effort to safeguard the rights of the individual and of society which we all cherish so greatly makes necessary, on occasion, the employment of the very methods of surveillance and detection here under discussion.

That becomes not only a necessity, but a very special obligation in connection with positions of special and great public trust and responsibility.

Such a position of public trust and responsibility is peculiarly exemplified in terms of employment in the U.S. postal service

To smear as spying, snooping, un-American activity, Gestapo tactics, and 1984–big brother methods the necessary, lawful actions for safeguarding of that trust and the secrecy and security of the U.S. mails against the depredations of a small minority is something which I am sure every responsible Member of this House—including the gentleman from West Virginia—would, at least on sober second thought, indignantly repudiate.

I am sure they would do so all the more when they realize that at stake in this secrecy and security of the mails are not only the personal communications of private citizens and the monetary and other items of immense property value, but also confidential and classified materials pertaining to the security of the United States.

Certainly in the postal service, even more than in many of the departments of Government outside of the Defense Establishment—and I believe the principle applies to all departments of Government—it is a tragic mistake to equate employment in the Government service with that of employment in any private enterprise. Those vested with the responsibilities of Government service bear the public trust for all citizens, for all private enterprise, and for all that we cherish in our country.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the employees in the postal service share this high and proud view of their own positions of responsibility and public trust—and do not want any other view held.

In that connection I include at this point a letter from a veteran postal employee published in the Los Angeles Times of October 21, 1959, answering an earlier letter from a disgruntled former employee whose line of argument was generally similar to that of the gentleman from West Virginia:

INVIOLATE MAIL

I read the Wadell letter on post office surveillance. I have been in the Los Angeles Post Office for nearly 24 years and can truthfully say that this is the first time I have heard of anyone resigning because of this so-called surveillance.

It is my opinion that if an employee is doing his job as it should be done he need not fear any observance of his work. One of the things stressed in the orientation of new employees in the post office is the inviolability of the U.S. mails. Those in charge undoubtedly feel that a certain amount of observance is necessary to see that this inviolability isn't being broken.

MERLE A. GRAY.

LOS ANGELES.

Now I come to a completely different phase of the brief but enormously damaging address given by the gentleman from West Virginia.

In his remarks last Monday he makes numerous charges that the gallery observation—or if you please, peephole—system is being used, among other things—and these are direct quotations—"to spy on postal workers to try to find them loafing"; "misused to spy on union meetings, and to embarrass postal employees in matters which should remain personal"; and "so they can look and listen in on union meetings if held in the post office."

The only thing approaching substantiation of these sweeping and very grave charges—and I do not regard it as substantiation in any way—is the following statement:

The editor of the Ravenswood News, Phil Fourney, in denouncing this practice, reported that a postal inspector in Ravenswood boasted "they often spend 18 hours or more in their peephole area observing activities of postal employees."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from West Virginia has any proof whatsoever of these charges or of the existence of these practices, at Ravenswood, W. Va., or anywhere else in the postal system; or if any person, in the postal service or out of it, has any proof or any reasonable grounds for believing that such practices and abuses are occurring, he has not only the right but the most solemn duty to bring that to the attention of the highest postal authorities, to the attention of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or to the attention of his own Member of Congress.

Let me add, for any value that it has to the cause of evenhanded justice, that I will, as a Member of Congress and as member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, cooperate in any appropriate way and to the limit of my ability to the end that any abuses of this character are ended and the offenders or condoners of such practices are properly dealt with, if there is proof of such malfeasance or misfeasance within the postal service. Without having formally consulted the committee, I think I can confidently state that it would take the same position.

What is passing strange to me is that the gentleman from West Virginia, who is so violently repelled by legitimate, stringently supervised methods to detect wrongdoers who commit serious depredations against the U.S. mails, does not seem to be in the least bit repelled by the practice of indulging in the most blanket sort of unsubstantiated charges against the members of the U.S. Postal Inspection Service. Indeed he has joined in that practice.

Members of the Postal Inspection Service, I would respectfully remind the gentleman from West Virginia, are also human beings; they are also Americans; they are also employees of the postal service, and they are also entitled to have produced proof of the indiscriminate, damning, and reckless accusations he has made against them.

This business of fairness, decency, and justice should work both ways. Let us see to it that it does work both ways hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I enclose following my remarks a statement of the Post Office Department regarding costs of the observation galleries about which the gentleman from West Virginia also complained.

The statement follows:

Obviously a dollar value cannot be placed upon the protection of the private papers and communications of the American public which are entrusted to the mails. It is obvious that the American public would seriously criticize any attempt to do so, and would take the position that whatever is required to protect the U.S. mails is the responsibility of the Post Office Department and the Government generally.

However, the allegation that millions of dollars are being spent on observation galleries is not supported by the facts. Actually, observation galleries represent considerably less than 5 percent of the initial construction costs, and the first cost is the final cost. The relatively small amount of time to clean the galleries is insignificant.

In this connection it is important to point out that prior to 1954 only one type of observation gallery was constructed in Federal buildings. It was known as the hanging-type gallery and was suspended from the ceiling. This gallery was constructed in all post offices employing a given number of persons. In 1954 the Chief Inspector assigned an inspector to collaborate with the Department's construction engineers with a view to possibly reducing the cost of expensive galleries. The result was the development of a substantially less expensive gallery which has been found suitable in certain types of buildings. Also the specifications on doors were reviewed and additional savings were effected. Further, a less expensive and adequate floor covering was developed and placed in use. In addition, a revision was made upward of the minimum number of employees and thus less galleries are being constructed than has been true over the years under formerly used specifications. Finally, a new type observation unit to be installed in the observation galleries was designed by a postal inspector and became standard equipment in 1953.

I also include the following editorial from the Natchitoches (La.) Enterprise of December 10, 1959, calling attention to an open house to display the new annex of the post office and its new facilities:

It's really quite an outfit, the postal service. Not long ago we mentioned in a news story that the Natchitoches Post Office has "hidey holes" where postal inspectors may observe and overhear all that goes on in any corner and any cranny of the local post office. We were bemused when we heard several people who had read this mumble about "Gestapo methods."

The Gestapo was an organization that was terribly hated because it preyed upon private citizens expressing their private convictions in private. The postal inspector is a man who watches the way in which public servants execute a public trust and his principal preoccupation is the precise opposite of the function of a Gestapo agent. It is his business to protect the private citizen, not only from theft, but from prying—and from being in any way deprived of the complete freedom of the mail: the freedom to express his private convictions in absolute private.

The postal employee is frankly told when he is hired that someone is watching him always. He is told not only that he may at any time be watched while he is working in the post office, but that any man he sees on the streets may be a postal inspector * * * and that he is always in the eyes of his employers, the public. It is to the everlasting credit of the postal service that the men it employs are, with fabulously few exceptions, men who—so to speak—bear watching.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia who very courteously asked me previously if I would do so at the end of my speech.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan in informing me that he was going to deliver his address today.

I have not had the opportunity to analyze the gentleman's speech. I want to accord him the full chance to get unrestricted coverage on what he has said. Others would counsel that it is necessary to come back with a strong statement which will make the same newspapers, but I have confidence that truth will win out.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give up in this fight to see that our thousands of hard-working postal employees and the American people are given a fair and even break.

I have scores of letters from postal workers, and even from supervisors and postal inspectors in various parts of the country. I will say that the facts are on my side so I have no fear.

Last Monday I wrote a letter to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. As of this time, I have received no answer nor even an acknowledgment.

During the period when I was working for the executive branch we used to have a rule that all congressional letters should be answered within 24 hours. We also had an inflexible rule that if a full answer could not be given within that time, at least the letter's receipt should be acknowledged within 24 hours.

It is about 2 miles down to the Post Office Department, so perhaps the letter which I mailed last Monday has not yet reached the Post Office Department or the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be fair to the Postmaster General. I do not want to say the letter is neglected on his desk. I can only conclude the letter has not reached him. I hope that through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he may read the letter I wrote him.

Mr. Speaker, the letter addressed to Mr. Summerfield to which I referred is as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

Hon. ARTHUR F. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL SUMMERFIELD: While attending the dedication of a new post office at Ravenswood, W. Va., recently, I was very disturbed to note the construction of a special corridor and peepholes, as well as one-way glass panels to allow postal inspectors to watch employees at work, where they eat lunch and even in the restrooms.

I realize that this system has been prevalent for many years in larger post offices throughout the country, but I do not believe this excuses the invasion of personal privacy nor the insult to the individual employee.

I would be interested in learning the specific amount of money required for the construction of these special corridors and peephole facilities.

I would also like to have your statement on the number of post offices in which these facilities are installed, the type of information secured, the justification for such procedures and your own personal estimate of the future validity of these procedures.

Do you honestly believe that the amount of money saved, and the possible deterrent through operation of these procedures justifies both the expenditures and the serious effect upon employee morale?

Sincerely,

KEN HECHLER.

In this letter I asked the Postmaster General to give me facts and figures on this peephole system, why it was used, how many post offices it was used in, what the cost is and what the results were.

Mr. Speaker, up to the time I came to the floor I had received neither an acknowledgment nor an answer to the letter which I wrote to the Postmaster General.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman from West Virginia say he wants to be fair to the Postmaster General. I welcome that change in attitude on his part. I observe the gentleman said he did not want to speak today because it would compete with my coverage—by which I assume he means news coverage. I want to say to the House that while the postal service and the inspection service are entitled to at least the same coverage that was given to the gentleman's remarks, my interest is not in newspaper headlines but in defending the postal service and its ability to meet its responsibilities to the American people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made in response to what I consider to be an unwarranted attack upon the Postmaster General of the United States. I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan knows whether the editor of the Ravenswood News, who quotes a Federal inspector as saying that often inspectors spend 18 hours or more in a peephole area observing the activities of postal employees; I wonder if this editor or if the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], if he cares to respond, will tell the House whether he or this editor previously complained to the Post Office Department?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Before I yield, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, when he asked that question, I assume he is asking whether the gentleman from West Virginia made inquiry before making the statement on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Yes; I will say to my friend from Iowa. I called up the Chief of the Inspection Service in the Post Office Department, who was out of town. I talked to his assistant prior to making my remarks on the floor. I also dispatched a letter to Postmaster General Summerfield. I do not know what happened to the letter. You know, we used to have a rule when I worked downtown that all letters from Members of Congress be acknowledged within 24 hours. But, it is now 7 days and I have gotten no acknowledgment from this request for

information which I sent to the Postmaster General. I wonder if the postal service has broken down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is evading the question for which I am trying to get an answer. Did this statement appear in the Ravenswood News as an editorial? How was it handled in this newspaper, and when?

Mr. HECHLER. I will be glad to insert in the RECORD the editorial statement from the Ravenswood News. I will supply it for the RECORD for publication. I will have the date, and I will be glad to supply it for the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us the approximate date when it appeared?

Mr. HECHLER. This appeared approximately 10 days ago, I will say to my friend from Iowa.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the January 14, 1960, issue of the Ravenswood News, Ravenswood, W. Va.:

RURAL ROUTE—GESTAPO METHODS PREVAIL AT OUR NEW POST OFFICE

(By Phil Fourney)

The dedication was a pleasant affair. Weather couldn't have been more perfect for a January afternoon. And, for this, the Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce took—and was given—credit.

It seemed, though, that there was one sour note as local patrons inspected the new facility. They noted that parking facilities had not been completed, due to a lack of funds, and that there is no telephone in the post office. Yet they saw the elaborate peephole system in use.

This peephole system smacks of gestapo methods and bureaucratic waste. The post office has a corridor built along one side and through the middle of the mailing room. Entrance to the corridor is through a private door from the outside—the keys to which only Postmaster Blackburn and postal inspectors have. Blackburn is not permitted to use the key, nor to enter the peephole area, except in case of emergency.

Postal investigators come to town, enter the peephole area through their own private door, and observe the actions of postal employees without detection. A series of one-way glass panes enable the inspectors to view activities throughout the post office—even in the men's restroom—without detection. So that the postal inspector may enter the building and remain there unnoticed, there's even a private restroom in that area for the inspector.

The one-way glass panes he looks through enable him to observe the men's restroom, and the employees' dining area. The inspector can see all movements in the working area of the post office—with the exception of Blackburn's private office.

Since it isn't proper to observe activities in the ladies' restroom, there are no peepholes provided. But this room is kept locked, so that unauthorized personnel are refused entry.

The idea behind this elaborate peephole system is twofold: First, to catch crooked employees in the act of stealing and, second, to confuse the employees so they'll never know when their actions are being observed.

We overheard a fellow—who said he was a postal inspector—tell a local visitor that often they spend 18 hours or more in their peephole area observing activities of local employees.

We appreciate honesty, and we like the feeling of knowing our mail isn't tampered with. But we certainly have no use for the methods used, nor for the expense incurred.

A private industry would be blackballed for using such gestapo methods to detect dishonest behavior of its employees. We certainly can't condone the practice by the U.S. Government in Ravenswood.

And we'd much rather they'd used that money to install a telephone—or to complete the paving around the building.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman made no complaint to the Post Office Department at that time?

Mr. HECHLER. I made my complaint both by telephone and by letter to the Post Office Department, I will say to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought you said you wrote last Monday after you made your statement on the floor of the House.

Mr. HECHLER. No. I wrote before I made the statement and I also made a phone call before making the statement and made a complaint to the Post Office Department at that time, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I think the timing is important. I would like to, sometime, get it settled. I doubt whether we will this afternoon. Let me ask this question: Former Postmaster General Donaldson, whom the gentleman from Michigan referred to a little while ago in his statement, came from the inspection service of the Post Office Department, did he not?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is my understanding. I know he was in the postal service, and it is my understanding he came from the inspection service.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman from West Virginia has pitched this on a political basis, former Postmaster General Donaldson was a Democrat, was he not?

Mr. JOHANSEN. He was, at least, a Democratic appointee, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. A career Post Office Department officer. He came out of the career service in the Post Office Department.

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And at no time did former Postmaster General Donaldson eliminate the use of the observation galleries, did he?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The fact of the matter is that the regulations governing their use and the definition of the purpose of that use were actually strengthened under the administration of Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Since this has been pitched on a political basis by the gentleman from West Virginia, there were many post offices of the first class built during the thirties; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And all of the first-class post offices, or I assume practically all of them, contain these observation galleries that were constructed within them when they were built under a Democrat administration; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHANSEN. There was testimony, as I mentioned in my prepared remarks, by Mr. Doran before the Subcommittee on Appropriations in 1947, that there is a lookout post in every Federal building built in the last 25 years.

Mr. GROSS. So that if these are snooping galleries, it was the Democrats who put the snooping galleries in the post offices.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Iowa, I have not in any way based my comments today on partisan political considerations. I base them solely on what I regard as the interest of the postal service, and I endeavored in my remarks to commend the contributions of the great Postmasters General of both parties to the preservation and improvement of that service.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. For 6½ years before coming to the Congress I had the privilege of serving as postmaster, and I served in one of those buildings built by the Democratic administration, in my hometown; we had lookouts and peepholes, both.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course, the gentleman did.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. And I worked under them. And, as I sat here and listened to this discussion today, I hope that a copy of all of this colloquy, the former, this one and the ones that follow, will be mailed to the clerks and the postal carriers and the postmasters throughout the United States.

I say that because I can imagine that they will really get a bang out of this, out of reading all this discussion that is being had on the floor of the House about peepholes and lookouts in post offices; because, in the first place, it does not disturb the average postal employee very much. As a matter of fact, during the 6½ years I was postmaster I think I was the only person who got into the lookout in my office. I went there to inspect it, to see if it had been cleaned.

If the gentleman will permit, I should like to express one more opinion on this subject. I think, without being critical, but being generous, really, the entire discussion is superfluous. I do not think the lookouts or peepholes in post offices serve the slightest purpose because I do not believe there are enough crooks in the postal service to demand the use of such an instrument. I do not think they are used very often. I think the expense of building them far exceeds the value that they perform for the postal service because I do not believe we have that many crooks in the postal service of the United States of America.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, in order to keep the record straight, I will say in response to the gentleman's remarks that, as post-

master, he was acting within the regulations when he went there to inspect the gallery, because the regulations so provide. He was acting entirely properly. However, I must differ with the gentleman.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If I had not known I was acting properly, I would not have said I was there.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am sure I could go further than the gentleman has gone and say that if he had not known it was proper he would not have done it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. As to the matter of cost and the matter of its importance, under permission to include extraneous matter in my speech, I have a statement from the Post Office Department regarding very major reductions in cost through a modification of the type of construction in the newer post offices.

I wish I could agree with the gentleman in what he has just said. Certainly no one is implying that there is any more than a minority and a very small, an infinitesimal minority of people who require this sort of treatment. Unfortunately, the seriousness, the gravity of a violation of the sanctity of the mails is not to be measured solely or even primarily by the number of such offenses.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I want to agree with the gentleman thoroughly on that score. Nothing is more important to the postal service, in my opinion, than the sanctity of the mails. And we are proud of the fact that when we seal a letter and drop it in a postal box we know, here in America, that the only person who will see that will be the one to whom it is addressed or someone named at his discretion. That is one of the most important parts of our mail service. However, in stating what I did, I am of the opinion that this really time-worn practice of lookouts is outmoded, because the average employee going into the postal service at the present time is so much under surveillance by his own fellow employees who have also this deep-seated desire to observe the sanctity of the mails, that this business of having an individual look at him through a lookout, in my opinion, is unimportant.

Every employee of the Post Office Department is a postal inspector in his own right because he is so proud of the institution for which he works that he is going to see that the sanctity of our mail is continuously preserved. I believe this is the thing which has made the Post Office Department the one Department of our Government that is performing day after day a dollar's worth of service for every dollar we pay out for it. I am happy to have had the privilege to learn this through personal experience.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to have on record the expression of his views. Of course, whether or not we agree in every detail, the important fact is that the basis on which he rests those views is quite different from the basis on which the views were expressed by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I did not get into the colloquy to express an opinion on the statement of either the gentleman who now has the floor or that of the gentleman from West Virginia because I did not have the privilege of reading the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia and was not on the floor when he made them. I just wanted to say a word about the postal employees and about the way the postal service is carried on in this particular instance, without taking any sort of interest in the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman in any case for his remarks.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week I announced that I would introduce bills designed to provide encouragement and help for small business engaged in the distribution of food, petroleum, petroleum products, and motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies. We who are members of the House Small Business Committee are well aware of the need for legislation to help small business.

As you will recall, on March 17, 1959, when I announced the program for Subcommittee No. 5, I stated that it was the intent and purpose of the subcommittee to review the trade relations and trade practices in the sale of petroleum and automotive accessories, including tires and batteries, for the purpose of determining whether improvement had been made and whether the improvement had provided small business firms with the benefits and opportunities to which they were entitled. Also, it was announced at that time that Subcommittee No. 5 would include in its program an investigation, hearings, and study of alleged unfair competitive trade practices in the field of food distribution. We noted that in that connection it had been alleged that monopolistic and unfair trade practices were becoming matters of great concern to those who cherish and fight for a free and competitive enterprise, and present a threat to those things needed for the growth and survival of a healthy small business community.

We noted that the Federal Trade Commission had stated that "there have developed tendencies to concentration of economic power, to collusive price action, and to unfair competitive methods." In that connection, Hon. John W. Gwynne, then Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, in announcing that the Federal Trade Commission would study the situation said:

> We want to know why the industry is getting so tough for the smaller operator. * * * The trend seems to be to eliminate the small man entirely.

With this backdrop, Subcommittee No. 5 first turned its attention to small business problems in food distribution. We learned that although the FTC has had under way for a considerable period of time an economic study of small business problems in the food industry, that study did not include an investigation of pricing practices, trade practices involving private labels, price discriminations, integration practices, financing of small business, and the economic significance of the concentration of economic power in food distribution. We were told that the Trade Commission was undertaking some specific cases involving these problems. However, those cases have in their sights only the specific practices allegedly carried on by those few corporations named as respondents in the cases. Therefore, industrywide treatment of problems stemming from these particular matters has not, and perhaps cannot, be undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission.

In view of these circumstances, these matters appropriately have become matters of concern, study, investigation, and hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee. Hence, we directed our attention to these things when we commenced hearings on small business problems in the food industry in Washington, D.C., last June 22. Before we concluded that series of 8 days of hearings on July 9, we had heard from witnesses of every segment of the food industry.

We heard from the chainstores and the co-ops, from the frozen food people and the poultrymen, from the wholesalers and retailers, and from the farmers. The Government agencies gave us facts on how many retail grocery stores there are and how much money we spend in them. From all of this information we have a broad picture of small business problems in food distribution.

Among small business problems in food distribution presented to the subcommittee during the course of its Washington, D.C., hearings were those involving the following subjects:

First. The effect of concentration of economic power in food retailing.

Second. The effect of integrating retailing and manufacturing in the food industry.

Third. The need for grading of livestock and livestock products.

Fourth. The effect of mergers in the food industry.

Fifth. The problem of private brands against advertised brands.

Sixth. The contest for shelf space in retail food stores.

Seventh. The problem of small businessmen in their efforts to secure shopping center locations.

Eighth. The practice of loss leader selling.

Ninth. Advertising allowances.

Tenth. Price discrimination in the sale of oat flour.

Eleventh. Price spreads and consumer interests.

Twelfth. The effect of a few large chain food retailers in making their purchases of canned fruits and vegetables through west coast buying offices located on or near California Street, San Francisco, and alleged abuses incident to the so-called California Street buying.

Therefore, we accomplished the purpose of the Washington hearings to put these problems in their proper perspective. Then we moved on to San Francisco where we held 6 days of hearings—and then to Denver, Colo., for 2 more days of hearings. In all, we have heard almost 100 witnesses and have built up a record of almost 1,400 printed pages on small business problems in the food industry.

Out of this mass of information emerged the showing of need for legislation to help small business in dealing with some of these problems. For example, in the course of our hearings in Washington, we found that approximately 40 percent of all markets for preserves and jellies have been captured by large chain retailers who are either producing their supplies or have made special long-term arrangements for their supplies. In the face of these facts, small independent producers and packers of jams, jellies, and preserves are under severe handicaps in their efforts to survive.

During the course of our hearings in San Francisco, we were told that a few buyers or large chain food retailers with offices on or near California Street, San Francisco, were buying 80 percent of the annual output of canned fruits and vegetables produced in that section of the country. Incidentally, California produces almost 50 percent of the national output. We were told that these few buyers for the large chain food retailers are utilizing their combined economic power in such a way as to result in the destruction of countless independent business enterprises.

Our Denver hearings disclosed that large chain food retailers are getting into the production, preparation, and distribution of meat food products. Large food retailers have captured a substantial portion of the total retail market of meat food products. Proceeding from that vantage position, they are integrating backward into the processing, slaughtering, and even the feeding of cattle.

Representatives of small meatpackers, feed lot operators, ranchers, and many other businesses testified that the practices of large food retailers in integrating the retailing with the feeding, slaughtering, and packing of meat food products, are destroying small and independent business enterprises and competitive markets for those products. In that connection, it was pointed out that the strongest argument now being put forward by the large packers for relief from the provisions of the meat packing decree of 1920 is the fact that the large food retailers are integrating backward into the meat packing business. In that connection, I stated on the record during the course of our hearings in Denver that "If the basic and fundamental principles which brought about that consent decree were sound, and we must believe they were sound—they remained in operation for many many years, and were therefore in the public interest—it would seem to me a poor excuse to upset them simply because someone else in the other direction was going forward to accomplish the same thing. And my question would be, would it be unreasonable to think that should the 1920 consent decree be reversed, or be obliterated, that there would also be the great danger that that would be the opening door for an amalgamation of the chainstore and the large packer to accomplish exactly what was prohibited in 1920?"

In addition to distribution problems in the food industry, Subcommittee No. 5 also addressed itself to the problems existing in the petroleum industry.

Heretofore, in the 84th and 85th Congresses, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee investigated and studied the problems of small business and the distribution of petroleum products and automotive parts and accessories, including tires and batteries. In the course of the investigations and studies, much useful information was developed regarding trade relations between the major oil companies and independent service station operators. It was disclosed that in these trade relations unfair trade practices had been used, including the practice of price discriminations and franchise terms, which operated against the survival and growth of independent service stations. During the 84th Congress, through our House report—House Report No. 1423—recommendations were made for improvement in these matters.

In following the intents and purposes we announced March 17, 1959, the subcommittee caused an extensive questionnaire to be prepared by the staff, and mailed on June 12, 1959, to those in the segments of the industry who could supply the subcommittee with information about the conditions and the practices in the distribution of petroleum and automotive accessories, including tires and batteries. The information received in response to those questionnaires clearly indicated that while there had been some improvement, there was room for considerable improvement and the need for additional information was clearly evident.

On December 9, 10, and 11, 1959, hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 5 in Washington, D.C., on distribution practices in the petroleum industry. The hearings were confined primarly to practices in the distribution of TBA—tires, batteries, and accessories—and other related automotive products handled by retail gasoline station dealers and by the independent wholesalers of those products.

There were 28 witnesses from 19 States. All sections of the country were represented by the witnesses. These witnesses, all of whom testified under oath, were independent wholesalers of TBA products, gasoline station dealers and association representatives of both of these segments of the industry. The record of the hearings is replete with instances in which, through the threat of lease cancellation or other economic pressures, the independent service station operator is coerced into exclusive dealing. One witness alone listed 15 such instances. The evidence indicated that there is a general pattern throughout the country that most of the major oil companies bring pressure to bear on the service station operators to compel them to handle specific products which are sponsored by the major oil companies and on which the major oil companies receive some compensation, usually in the form of an override commission. This does not only have a tremendous adverse economic impact on the independent service station operator, but also deprives the independent automotive parts and TBA wholesalers of their fair proportion of a competitive market.

When we consider that the yearly rate of turnover of gasoline station operators is 39 percent, the highest of any retail business—when we consider that over 200,000 service station operators in the nation may be affected by this economic problem—when we consider that there are 16,000 automotive parts wholesalers and distributors in the nation—when we consider that the vast majority of these are small, independent businessmen who only ask for their right to meet their competitors in a fair and open market, then we realize that it is a matter which must be faced now.

It is evident from the record of our 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1959 hearings that although much lipservice is given to the problem, the major oil companies either will not or cannot correct the situation. The old cry by these companies that it is not their policy to intimidate or coerce the independent service station operators, that they instruct their officials and employees at all levels that these service station operators are independent businessmen and may handle any products they desire, is expected to resound as often as before. But the record does not substantiate this. It also has been suggested in the past and will perhaps be suggested again that a part of the testimony received by the subcommittee concerning the alleged coercive tactics of the major oil companies was indirect testimony containing much hearsay evidence. This may be partially true since the record indicates that the service station operator, who is at the mercy of the major oil companies, hesitates to testify because of fear of retaliation. But not only is the record filled with sworn affidavits concerning these alleged practices, but one independent small service station operator submitted a tape recording of a conversation between the service station operator and the major oil company salesman who advised him that he must remove all competitive products not sponsored by the oil company from his shelves before his lease could be renewed. This same service station operator presented a film which was shown to the

committee which depicted the same instance. This is evidence that cannot be refuted and cannot be overlooked.

In brief, the apparent continued widespread use of intimidation and coercion in the sale of TBA and petroleum products, and the pricing tactics of the major oil companies, appear more than sufficient to justify the introduction of legislation designed to relieve small business concerns from these undue pressures and unfair practices and to remove from their shoulders the yoke of the tremendous economic power wielded by the major oil companies.

In view of these facts and circumstances, I am today proceeding to introduce several bills designed to meet these problems.

Three of these bills specifically relate to small business problems in the distribution of petroleum, petroleum products and motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies. The first one would provide a new antitrust law. Its objective is the divorcement of retail sales of gasoline and petroleum products from the control of the persons, partners, and corporations engaged in the production, sale, and distribution of gasoline and other petroleum products at wholesale.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by providing that on and after January 1, 1964, no producer or affiliate who sells gasoline or other petroleum products or motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies in interstate commerce at wholesale shall sell such products at retail or directly or indirectly as an agent or any manufacturer or distributor of motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories or supplies. The bill does not prohibit a producer or affiliate from continuing to sell gasoline or petroleum products at retail unless it is selling such products at wholesale.

Moreover, the bill would not prohibit a producer from continuing the ownership of retail gasoline stations even though such producer is engaged in the sale of gasoline and petroleum products at wholesale providing that its gasoline retail stations before January 1, 1964, are under leases to independent businessmen. In these situations the oil company producer would, under the terms of the bill, be permitted to continue the ownership and operation of the retail station under such lease arrangements until the lease arrangements are terminated. Even then the oil company would be entitled to continue the ownership and operation of any such retail station in the event that the operator lessee and the oil company mutually agreed for the termination of the lease agreement and the substitution of another operator as a lessee. The death of the operator prior to the termination of the sublease would leave the oil company lessor free to continue the ownership and subleasing of the retail gasoline station to a successor operator lessee.

Other provisions of the bill provide a $50,000 penalty and prison term for not more than 1 year for violations and that the provisions of the bill shall be construed as a part of the antitrust laws, thus paving the way for small businessmen to sue for triple damages for violations.

The second bill also provides for a new antitrust law. Its objective is to prevent producing and refining oil companies selling gasoline at wholesale from acting as agents for manufacturers and distributors in selling motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, or supplies to operators of retail gasoline stations.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by making it unlawful for any producer or affiliate who sells gasoline or other petroleum products at wholesale to act directly or indirectly as an agent for or to receive directly or indirectly any commission, compensation, or payment because of the sale of any product of any manufacturer or distributor of motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, or supplies.

There is included the penalty provision of $50,000 or imprisonment of 1 year or both for violations. A further provision makes the provisions of this bill part of the antitrust laws providing for private litigation in the form of triple damage suits. Except for the latter, this bill is almost a duplicate of the provisions contained in a bill, H.R. 428, I introduced in the 85th Congress.

The third bill would amend and supplement the Federal Trade Commission Act for the purpose of securing close and constant supervision by the Federal Trade Commission over leases between oil companies and operators of retail gasoline stations and the performance under such leases.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by requiring that every lease, entered into by a producer, refiner, or importer of petroleum or petroleum products, providing for the operation of a retail gasoline station to be filed with the Federal Trade Commission within 30 days of the date of its execution. It also provides that additional information must be filed by the parties to any such lease regarding performance thereunder. The failure to file any of this information with the Federal Trade Commission would subject the parties to a penalty of $100 per day for each day the failure to file continued. The Federal Trade Commission, by the terms of the bill, would be empowered to investigate the contracts and leases and performance thereunder from time to time.

The requirements of this bill are quite similar to the requirements of the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, Public Law 126, 65th Congress, approved April 10, 1918. It will be recalled that the Export Trade Act requires that every export trade association agreement be filed with the Federal Trade Commission and that supplementary reports relating thereto be filed from time to time as required by the Commission. The bill I am introducing contains similar requirements regarding leases entered into by producers, refiners, or importers of petroleum products providing for the operation of retail gasoline stations.

The fourth bill I am introducing today provides for a strengthening of our antimerger laws. It would help small business not only in the food industry, the petroleum industry, and in the distribution of motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies, but also would help those in other areas of our economy where the merger movement is sweeping away competition and creating monopolies. The representatives of many small businessmen have urged that our antimerger laws be strengthened.

This objective would be accomplished by amending section 7 of the Clayton Act—the antimerger provision—so as to require any corporation having capital surplus and undivided profits in the aggregate of more than $10 million from acquiring the capital stock or facilities of any person engaged in or affecting interstate commerce without first notifying the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission. Even then the merger could not take place for a period of 30 days following such notification. Moreover, the merger would be further delayed if within that 30-day period the Attorney General or the Federal Trade Commission should act to require the filing of additional factual information about the merger. A further delay in the merger would be required following the submittal of that factual information for a period of 60 days. At the conclusion of that period the merger would be free to proceed unless the Attorney General or the Federal Trade Commission had in the meantime filed proceedings charging that the merger as consummated would be in violation of the antitrust laws. In that event, the merger would not be permitted to proceed until the litigation would be brought to a conclusion.

A concluding provision of the bill would authorize the Federal Trade Commission, with the approval of the Attorney General, to exempt by rule any proposed merger from the notice and filing provisions of this bill if the Federal Trade Commission should find that the proposed acquisition would not have the effect of substantially lessening competition nor substantially affect the ownership or control of the company whose facilities are to be acquired.

The fifth bill I am presenting would divorce the retail sale and distribution of livestock products and meat food products from the slaughter, preparation, and wholesale sale and distribution of such products.

The bill would accomplish this purpose through an amendment to the Packers and Stockyard Act of 1921 so as to make it unlawful for any packer or any other person engaged in the business of manufacturing or preparing livestock products or in the wholesale marketing of meats, meat food products, livestock products, and so forth—when such person, during the immediately preceding calendar year, enjoyed gross sales of more than $10 million—to engage in the business of selling at retail any such products.

In addition, the bill would amend the Packers and Stockyard Act of 1921 by making it unlawful for any person—whose purchases of livestock in commerce during the preceding calendar year totaled more than $1 million—to buy or—for any person whose sales of

livestock in commerce during the preceding calendar year totaled more than $100,000—sell livestock in commerce for the purpose of slaughter except, first, at a stockyard, or second, at a market conducted openly and publicly in the same manner as stockyards are required to be conducted under this title.

Penalty provisions for violations include a $50,000 fine or imprisonment of 1 year, or both.

The sixth bill I am introducing today would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act. The objective of this bill is to divorce retail sale and distribution of food and grocery store business from the business of manufacturing, processing, and preparation of food and related merchandise normally offered for sale through retail food stores.

The bill would accomplish this objective by making it unlawful for anyone engaged in the retail sale of merchandise in any more than one market area through food or grocery stores to engage in the manufacturing, processing, or preparation of any such merchandise. This would be done through an amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The amendment would make it unlawful and an unfair act and practice in commerce within the meaning of section 5 of this act, for any person, partnership, or corporation engaged in the retail sale of merchandise, or the distribution for retail sale of merchandise, in or affecting commerce, to engage in the manufacturing, processing, or preparation of any such merchandise, where the effect of integrating the retailing of such merchandise with such manufacturing, processing, or preparation may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the majority members of the House Small Business Committee have informed me that they endorse these bills in principle. Some of the minority members have reserved judgment until further inspection of the bills. All of our colleagues, whether or not they are members of the House Small Business Committee, are invited to join in sponsoring and supporting these bills to help small business.

SLUM CLEARANCE

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the President's reasons for twice vetoing the omnibus housing bill of last session was the amount of money made available to clear up slums and renew our cities. That bill contained a very modest amount of $1.5 billion and was only signed when this was reduced to $650 million. The original figure was inadequate, but the final figure which the President accepted was still more so.

Careful thinking on the cost of slums to the people of the United States is in order. Then we can see how much of an error the President has made in failing to make this an important issue during this year.

James W. Follin, while serving as Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner, said in a speech before the University of Michigan School of Public Health:

> An Eastern city, in 1 year, received $108 more in per capita revenue from good residential areas than it spent there, but its slums cost $88 more per person than they yielded. In one Southern city, slum areas contributed only 5.5 percent of the city's property taxes, but required 53 percent of the city's health, police, fire, and other service facilities.

One expert estimates it costs local government in the average city about $60 per person to service its entire citizenry each year. The cost of servicing slum areas zooms to $140 per year per capita.

It has been estimated that cities like Cleveland, Buffalo, St. Louis, and Boston are each pouring $7 million to $8 million per year into slum areas.

The cost of some 20 million Americans living in slums conservatively figured in dollar value runs about $2 billion annually.

Over and above this we are incapable of measuring the loss through crime, delinquency, disease, loss of hope and character by the people who live in these areas.

Let us take a tract of some 5,000 dwelling units which has become a slum whose value for taxation has been reduced to about $1,000 per unit. The cost of buying and clearing an average slum unit should run about $6,000 per unit and the cost of renewal of such area of 5,000 units would cost the taxpayers about $30 million.

This is not money down the drain. When the land is cleared it will be the property of the city to be sold to developers for rebuilding.

When the land has been rebuilt it will certainly have regained its tax valuation of $30 million, approximately what its value was previous to the time it became a slum.

It will have appreciated in value some $25 million.

The city will have eliminated an annual loss in cost of services furnished over income derived of about $1.3 million.

Previous to renewal, tax income from the area averages about $30 per unit, or $150,000. Expenditures in the area probably ran about 10 times this to furnish police, fire, garbage and sewage service in addition to health and other municipal services for a total of about $1,500,000. The deficit previous to redevelopment for services of this area probably ran about $1,350,000.

Washington, D.C., is a splendid case in point and reports its slum-clearance program in the renewal area in the southwest should offer a tax boost of from $451,000 to $3,430,000. The gain related to all other renewal projects in the city gives a net gain of $7 million annually, an amount sufficient to amortize the whole renewal program cost in 10 years.

This is why urban renewal is so vitally needed across the country by cities like Detroit.

We in the city of Detroit can anticipate some rich rewards from the $6,250,000 to be spent for urban renewal during the next year and the $1,825,000 last year and $1,280,000 spent the previous year, but the needs of our city are vastly greater than the amount that we have spent and the only place these funds can come from is from the Federal Government.

Some statistics on municipal growth in this country are striking proof of this.

Long-term indebtedness of the 14 largest cities in this country averaged $168 per capita in 1950 and $254 in 1956, a 50-percent increase in 6 years. Slum deficits play a large part in the financial troubles of our cities and make urban renewal even less possible to our cities.

Failure for this Congress to act on urban renewal as vigorously as the needs of the country demand will only result in still more slums springing from slums to the detriment of the population of our whole country.

AMERICAN MILITARY POWER

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I had the opportunity to be present when Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., filled in members of our committee on the present status of our national defense. A good deal of comment has appeared in the press in recent days with regard to what the Secretary has recently been saying about our Nation's military posture, as well as some things which I do not believe he did say. Not all of those who have commented, unfortunately, have had the opportunity to hear the Secretary's able presentation at first hand.

I want to take this opportunity to say that while I agree with Secretary Gates we must never become complacent and must continue to work hard to maintain our military strength. I do believe on the basis of his presentation that we are in a better position today than we were a year ago, and I believe that Secretary Gates and General Twining are handling their difficult assignments with sincerity and ability.

The comments which they have recently made with regard to our improved relative position are not based on any effort to read the Russian mind, as has been alleged in some quarters. Rather they have been based upon a further refinement of information available to us. Surely, for those in command of our military services not to utilize the best and latest information available to them would be not only foolish but extremely dangerous.

I believe there are many urgent tasks which lie ahead for the Members of this Congress in this session in seeing to it that our military posture is kept at its

fullest possible peak. But I believe that this responsibility can and should be discharged without resorting to some of the more extreme statements on this subject which have recently made their appearance in the press.

In that connection, a very fair and very sound statement of the Secretary's position as presented to our committee and the status of American military power was recently presented in an editorial which appeared in the Albany Times Union of January 24. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith that editorial:

KEEP IT THAT WAY

Some mighty heartening news has come from Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "Mighty" seems to be the right word.

On the basis of revised intelligence estimates, Secretary Gates and General Twining told the Senate Armed Services Committee that our nuclear forces of all types, when matched against Soviet nuclear strength, "represent a clear balance in our favor."

This is impressive because (1) Secretary Gates and General Twining are military experts, (2) they have access to top-drawer information, (3) they have the experience and knowledge to assess it, and (4) their jobs impose on them the obligation to give our country the best defense posture possible.

Detailed testimony to support their belief was taken in closed session—as of course it should have been. But it was sufficient to bring from acknowledgeable and cool-headed Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia Democrat and chairman of the Senate committee, the comment that "It was encouraging."

Two notes of caution.

Both Secretary Gates and General Twining conceded the Russians probably have greater numbers of long-range missiles than we. It should be our business to close this gap.

On a more general level, we Americans seem to have a tendency to relax into complacency when things look encouraging, and in this case the temptation to do so may be greater because a lot of us have done a lot of worrying.

We cannot afford complacency if we are going to keep "a clear balance in our favor" and we had better work hard to keep it.

We cannot afford complacency under any circumstances in defending ourselves against, or dealing with, communism.

AS I SEE IT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on various subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith two articles by Mr. E. B. Germany, president of the Lone Star Steel Co., which is located in the district that I have the honor to represent. Eugene Germany is one of our finest and best citizens; he has made the Lone Star Steel Co. a success. It means a lot to the Gulf Southwest and the entire Nation. Without Eugene Germany we would not have this wonderful plant along with the benefits and opportunities it brings to the people of our area.

Mr. Germany edits a column each week in 18 newspapers in the area of Lone Star Steel's plant under the title, "The Way I See It." Articles which appeared under this heading December 17, 1959, and December 23, 1959, were handed to me today by a prominent constituent with the request that they be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are as follows:

THE DEATH OF MR. FREEDOM

(By E. B. Germany, president, Lone Star Steel Co., Dallas, Tex.)

PART I

Mr. Freedom was born on July 4, 1776. His birth certificate was the Declaration of Independence. From birth, he often struggled against great odds, and on several occasions it seemed he might not survive vicious attacks from within and without his country.

Mr. Freedom's first brush with adversity of importance occurred at Valley Forge, where as a mere babe, his blood stained the white snows. Only the superhuman efforts of a small, poorly equipped, half-frozen band of patriots led by the immortal George Washington staved off the ravages of cold and hunger to keep alive the faint beat of Mr. Freedom's heart. With the coming of spring, Mr. Freedom grew stronger, and it was not long until he was able to walk proudly, head erect, shoulders back, a brawling young giant capable of holding his own in any kind of fight.

As the years wore on, violence came to Mr. Freedom with increasing intensity. He fought valiantly during the great conflict between the States, and his blood drenched the battlefields of Bull Run, Shiloh, Missionary Ridge, the Wilderness, Gettysburg, and finally, it was at Appomattox courthouse that there was reached a meeting of minds between two of Mr. Freedom's stanchest supporters, U. S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, and in this settlement of a bitter feud, Mr. Freedom walked from the field of conquest and defense with honor, dignity and respect.

The Spanish-American War left its mark upon the face of this scarred veteran, but here as before, a great American—Teddy Roosevelt—threw the weight of his daring and courage into the melee, and at the end, Mr. Freedom was victorious.

Mr. Freedom's brilliant career was less than a score of years into the 1900's when the first of two great worldwide conflicts drew him into action that produced Chateau Thierry, Battle of the Marne, the Argonne Forest, and others. Afoot, Mr. Freedom was a mud-sloshing doughboy that recognized no man as his peer. In the air, he was a spectacular daredevil cutting and slashing at the vaunted Knights of Baron von Richthofen, and afloat, not even the salt-crusted Briton could match the fury of his attack against the U-boats and the mighty dreadnaughts of the Imperial German Navy. At the end, at Versailles, Mr. Freedom stood as proudly as ever, glorious in victory, gracious and forgiving to them who fought him.

The second worldwide conflagration not only drew Mr. Freedom into action, but virtually disarmed him at one and the same time. It was on that fateful December morning in 1941, that Mr. Freedom was knocked to his knees by a sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, and then for months on end, he reeled like a drunken sailor as he struggled to rise against a relentless, savage, and capable enemy. Mr. Freedom fought valiantly around the globe. His blood seeped the sands at Salerno, and those in his company fell by the thousands at Bataan, Guadalcanal, Guam, in the jungles of India, high over the Hump, at Dunkirk, Battle of the Bulge. His men knew the fatal scream of a kamikaze pilot riding his own death bomb into eternity, and Mr. Freedom's boys knew all of the horror, the cruelty, the suffering of full-blown global warfare. And yet—at the end, Mr. Freedom stood erectly on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* and watched war lords of the East hand over their swords.

In Germany, he saw the forces of Nazi aggression disintegrate before the onslaught of his men.

Mr. Freedom was respected the world over for his generosity and sympathy toward those not endowed with the rich heritage that had been his since 1776. For more than 180 years, Mr. Freedom had endured against all types of slavery, against the ideological "isms" that lead away from the dignity of man and to the dungeons of captivity.

Mr. Freedom helped build the greatest civilization known to mankind, and it was largely through his presence that his country was able to develop an economy unsurpassed anywhere. Under his watchful eye, free enterprise gave Mr. Freedom's countrymen the righest standard of living ever enjoyed by any nation at any time. Under him, men had freedom of speech, the right to worship as they pleased, the right to own personal property, the right to work. Men had a voice in the making of rules and regulations under which they would share Mr. Freedom's way of life, and when some erred, even they were guaranteed the right of trial by jury.

In the light of all these accomplishments, the death of Mr. Freedom in a relatively insignificant Minnesota town is the more impressive for its lack of the grand setting. In no global war was Mr. Freedom slain, nor was there a volley of musketry, nor heavy cannonading, nor fiery aerial dogfight to dress the stage for Mr. Freedom's demise. He went to his death without warning and without fanfare. His death warrant was the scratch of pen, his requiem the sound of armed might confiscating private property with gestapo tactics instead of upholding the laws Mr. Freedom promulgated and had protected since 1776.

The deceased leaves upward of 200 million relatives who live in abject fear lest they, too, be sacrificed without warning upon the altar of politics, not policy.

Next: part II, White Cross at Albert Lea, or Murderer in Minnesota.

PART II

As this is written, three Federal judges study the events leading to the death of Mr. Freedom. Here are the salient facts in the case:

On September 1, 1959, a labor contract between the Wilson Packing Co. and the United Packinghouse Workers terminated. The workers continued to work at the Albert Lea, Minn., plant without a contract. Negotiations between the company and the union were broken off on October 29, 1959, when the union members refused to work a 9-hour day. After a few days, Wilson notified the strikers that they would be replaced if they did not return to their jobs. On November 1, 1959, the plant resumed operations with nonunion employees. Violence occurred, and the Governor of Minnesota sent in the National Guard to restore order. The 200 National Guardsmen accomplished this result by simply shutting down the plant. Wilson went to court in an effort to prohibit continued seizure of the plant by the Governor and the National Guard.

It is only coincidental that the name of the Governor who issued the order is Freeman, that the name of the county in which the Wilson plant is located is Freeborn. It is not a coincidence that the name of the victim is Mr. Freedom. In padlocking the Wilson plant, Mr. Freedom was executed through loss of his right to own property, his right to work, and his right to protection from the lawless. Free enterprise was sacrificed on the altar of politics—not policy, not

the law of the land, not the Constitution of the United States of America, which had been Mr. Freedom's birth certificate for close on to two centuries.

After the guardsmen, armed with fixed bayonets and guns, locked the plant gates, union strikers were quoted as saying "it makes a beautiful picket line, doesn't it?"

In considering this flagrant disregard for the constitutional rights of the American worker and an American business, it should be emphasized that the merits of the strike are of no consequence. The union acted within its right to strike. The company acted within its right to operate the plant with replacements. To this point, there can be no criticism of either union or plant. Beyond this point, however, regard for law and order broke down, and given the stamp of approval by the Governor of Minnesota, armed soldiers moved in to accomplish the aims and objectives of lawbreakers who should have been arrested instead of supported.

What could have been Governor Freeman's thinking when he padlocked the Wilson plant? He simply said he did it to prevent bloodshed. What law did Wilson violate to warrant punishment? Will the Governor say that to prevent bloodshed we should knuckle under to the Communists? Will the Governor say that to prevent bank holdups, in which people may be wounded or killed, we should close our banks? Isn't it true, Governor, that you accede to the thought that if one man throws a rock into a store window he doesn't like, that man should be arrested and punished, but that if a mob of 300 throws rocks in violation of the law, they should not be arrested simply because they constitute a large group? Did you, Governor, think about politics instead of policy when you closed this plant? Did you think about union votes instead of the rights of the many individuals who chose to work and to earn an honest day's wages in jobs that were quit by the strikers?

Perhaps Governor Freeman didn't know about a Supreme Court ruling down a few days ago. In this case, Quaker State Refining Co. closed its plant after a labor contract ran out without a new agreement being reached. The union charged the Quaker State company with an illegal lockout. The Labor Board held for the union, and now, the Supreme Court upholds the union.

What about Albert Lea, Minn., a relatively unknown little city of 13,500 population, where an American business firm sought to operate, even as the Labor Board and the Supreme Court held in the Quaker State case, after a contract ran out?

Is the union going to charge Wilson Packing Co. with an illegal lockout or is Governor Freeman going to be charged or will the National Guard become the defendant? Is a Governor of any State acting within his lawful rights when he uses soldiers to quell a riot if stopping the violence means winking at the violators while eliminating the constitutional rights of others?

Why, Governor Freeman, didn't you padlock those who threw the rocks? Why did you penalize those who got hit by the rocks and who violated no law? Why, Governor, did you permit the death of Mr. Freedom on the sacrificial cross of politics instead of standing for principle and policy and thereby enhancing Mr. Freedom's chances for being with us for a good many years to come?

I do not believe that the working men and women of this great country of ours support armed intervention in matters of this kind. I think they feel that free bargaining is the only answer to maintaining the free enterprise system. If on occasions, emotions run high and some violence occurs, there are legal ways of handling those who run afoul of the law. But soldiers to close a plant and deprive men of the right to work just because some union members got mad and refused to follow the "No Violence" orders of their leaders, never.

That's the way I see it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 60 minutes on Wednesday next.

Mr. COHELAN, for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, on Thursday next, for 1 hour.

Mr. PUCINSKI, on February 1, for 1 hour.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour, on February 8, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky), for 30 minutes, on January 27, and for 30 minutes, on February 3.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. IRWIN and to include a letter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter from President Eisenhower.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. HALPERN.

(At the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. JOHNSON of California.

Mr. QUIGLEY.

Mr. ALGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Mutual Security Act of 1958, chapter IV, section 401(a), requires the Committee on House Administration to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, within 10 legislative days after receipt, the consolidated report of each committee of the House using foreign currencies—counterpart funds—during the preceding year. Accordingly, there is shown herein, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated reports of the Committees on Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, Un-American Activities, and Veterans' Affairs:

COUNTERPART FUNDS

JANUARY 11, 1960.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between January 1, 1959, and December 31, 1959

No counterpart funds authorized for expenditure in any country.

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

JANUARY 11, 1960.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between January 1, 1959, and December 31, 1959

No counterpart funds were expended.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JANUARY 11, 1960.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES

Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1959

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
France	Franc	54 460	110.50	82 535	168.05	198 700	406.50	34,300	70.00	16,885	34.45	386,880	789.50
Germany	D Mark	5,016	1,254.00	92	22.00	260	62.00	34	8.00	214	53.00	5,616	1,399.00
Italy	Lire			77,653	124.50	69,225	111.50	29,125	45.00	26,244	42.00	202,000	323.00
Japan	Yen	1,710	4.75			16,615	46.15	2,880	8.00	5,795	16.10	27,000	75.00
Republic of the Philippines	Peso	4.50	2.25	100	50.00	98.80	49.40	21.10	10.55	35.60	17.80	260.00	130.00
Total			1,371.50		364.55		675.55		141.55		163.35		2,716.50

OLIN E. TEAGUE, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 12, 1960.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES

Foreign currency and U.S. dollar equivalents expended between Apr. 3 and 14, inclusive

Country	Name of currency	Transportation		Lodging		Meals		Gratuities		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Foreign currency	U.S. dollars
Italy	Lire	23,598	38.00	24,840	40.00	39,744	64.00	12,482	20.10	23,536	37.90	124,200	200.00
Switzerland	S. francs	85	19.80	115	26.75	204	47.45	61	14.20	35	8.15	500	116.35
France	Fr. francs	26,460	54.00	43,855	89.50	47,040	96.00	17,199	35.10	12,446	25.40	150,000	300.00

FRANCIS E. WALTER, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1725. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Los Angeles, Calif., August 30 to September 4, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1726. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for October 1959 of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1727. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Treasury Department for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary" and the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "Inpatient care;" for the fiscal year 1960, have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 465. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Thirteenth Report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 459. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty, with amendment (Rept. No. 1225); referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to Europe (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2849. A bill for the relief of Oscar A. LaBranche; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Spero; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7226. A bill for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Bond; with amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9443. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel B. Morgan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9444. A bill for the relief of Hsiao-li Lindsay (nee Li-Hsiao-li); with amendment (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 9860. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9861. A bill to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 9862. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 9863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to provide for a temporary decrease in the depletion allowance for oil and gas wells and for the transfer of the proceeds of such decrease to the highway trust fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9864. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 9865. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9866. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9867. A bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honeybees; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9868. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 9869. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 9870. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying and to preserve copyright protection for creators of artistic works in which copyright subsists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 9871. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9872. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9873. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9874. A bill to organize the Department of Defense and to provide for the administration thereof; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 9875. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9876. A bill to provide for the regulation of finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia; to provide the Commissioners of the

District of Columbia with additional authority to carry out the purposes of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to authorize the said Commissioners to impose certain requirements on persons licensed under the said act of July 1, 1902; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9877. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to make a study and report to the Congress of devices and procedures for the protection of persons and property from injury or damage resulting from destructive devices or substances placed on aircraft operated in interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 9878. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 9879. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9880. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported limes, grapefruit, lemons, mandarines, all types of oranges, including temples, tangerines, murcotts, and tangeloes, dried figs, fig paste, sliced dried figs, shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made entirely of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9881. A bill to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9882. A bill to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 9883. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9884. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Mexico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 9885. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62, to permit full benefits thereunder (when based upon attainment of retirement age) to be paid to women at age 62 and reduced benefits to be paid to women at age 60, to eliminate the limitation with respect to the amount which individuals may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 in order to be eligible for disability benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9886. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9887. A bill to amend section 6(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the retirement of employees engaged in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of violations of the criminal laws of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 9888. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 62 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 9889. A bill to eliminate the mandatory requirements for penalty charges on short paid mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9890. A bill to make permanent the temporary increases in rates of basic salary provided for employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9891. A bill to amend section 502(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 536); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9892. A bill to restore the size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from Alaska and Hawaii which existed prior to their admission as States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9893. A bill to strengthen public policy and law providing for independent competitive enterprise in the marketing of gasoline and other petroleum products, motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9894. A bill relating to certain practices in the distribution of motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies which tend to cause destructive and unfair methods of competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9895. A bill to strengthen free competitive enterprise in the marketing of gasoline and other petroleum products, motor-vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies by providing for filing of certain contracts and reports with the Federal Trade Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R 9896. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to provide for prior notification and suspension of certain acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the marketing of livestock, livestock products, and for other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9898. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit vertical integration in the food industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9899. A bill to amend sections 502(d) and 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to approval of certain bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H.R. 9900. A bill to provide that labor organizations shall be subject to the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 9901. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 with respect to the proration of quotas in the case of Cuba; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.J. Res. 583. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H. Con. Res. 499. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 500. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 501. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecration of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. Con. Res. 502. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should grant no further tariff reductions and that a joint investigation should be conducted through the State, Commerce, and Treasury Departments to determine the extent and effect of limitations other than tariffs imposed by foreign countries on U.S. exports and the extent to which these limitations are removed in the next 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legisture of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending Hon. Marcellus Graeme Boss, secretary of Guam, for the statesmanlike manner in which he has fulfilled his responsibilities and duties as such secretary and as Acting Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing the sincere thanks and gratitude of the people of Guam to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, for spending their valuable time in Guam during the month of November 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9902. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9903. A bill for the relief of Maria Domenica Donata Taddeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 9904. A bill for the relief of Andrew T. Durbin and Mildred Durbin, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9905. A bill for the relief of Nicolas James Deoudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9906. A bill for the relief of Miss Franca Buttazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 9907. A bill for the relief of Florante M. Dulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 9908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sha-Kay Saemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 9909. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filemena Elapre Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 9910. A bill for the relief of Georgios Dastamanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9911. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wong Ship Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9912. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kikue Yamamoto Leghorn and her minor son, Yuichiro Yamamoto Leghorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9913. A bill for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

320. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hugh Latimer, president, Academy for Independent Studies, Chicago, Ill., relative to the freedom and peace statements signed by all American Catholic bishops, and requesting that it be incorporated as a resolution of the Congress signifying our faith in God and the freedom He has granted; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

321. Also, petition of the city and county clerk, city and county of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to protesting the plan of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to establish and to use an impact area in the central Pacific Ocean for the testing of rockets and missiles, and urging that the plans be abandoned, or the impact area be relocated; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

322. Also, petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance against Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Representative GORDON SCHERER, and Staff Director Richard Arens of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of the Birth of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 23, the senior Senator from South Carolina delivered a stirring address in Statuary Hall commemorating the 153d anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, general of the Confederacy.

Senator JOHNSTON, the able chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, was invited to deliver this address by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and I commend the UDC in their choice of a speaker.

Senator JOHNSTON is an outspoken defender of the rights of States, and one who carries on today in our mutual struggle to preserve in our Nation the principles to which Lee dedicated his life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address by Senator JOHNSTON be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON COMMEMORATING THE 153D BIRTHDAY OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE IN STATUARY HALL, THE CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 23, 1960

Madam President and Daughters of the Confederacy, one approaches a discussion of the life of Robert E. Lee in an audience of this character with a feeling of great satisfaction and deep reverence. To again be honored with your invitation is a source of no little personal gratification to me.

Robert E. Lee was a direct descendent of the famous Lee family which played such a prominent part among the Founding Fathers of our Nation. Richard Henry Lee, one of his uncles, as a Delegate from Virginia, signed the Declaration of Independence and also the Articles of Confederation. In fact, Richard Henry Lee was the author of the resolution at the Virginia Convention which resulted in the Articles of Confederation.

Robert E. Lee's father was the distinguished Revolutionary War hero, Henry Lee, a bosom friend of George Washington. His father is better known as "Light Horse Harry" because of his extraordinary exploits during the Revolution. As a consequence of this service, Lee's father became a major general in the U.S. Army. He later served as Governor of Virginia and as a Member of Congress. The Congress selected Lee's father to deliver their eulogy to George Washington upon the latter's death. It was he who was the author of the time-honored reference to Washington as the man "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

The distinguished ancestry of Lee stood him in good stead both as a southerner and as an American. He is now loved by men of good will in both the North and the South.

Theodore Roosevelt had as one of his aides Col. Fitzhugh Lee, a nephew of General Lee. President Roosevelt remarked about the general as follows:

"This Nation is big enough to revere the name of Robert E. Lee without sectional distinctions. He is no longer southern; he is American, and he belongs to the Nation, not to the South alone."

As a southerner, I am proud to acknowledge a debt to Mr. Roosevelt for the use of those words. It gives us heart to know that out of the blood and sorrow and suffering of war has come, at last, a healthy, mutual respect—yea, admiration—for the man on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line.

It is a trait of our race well to be glorified that we possess the inherent and cardinal virtues of forgiveness and forgetfulness.

There is a noble page in our history we will not forget. That was the last sad encounter between General Lee and General Grant at Appomattox. Lee, the highborn knight, the flower of chivalry, and the best the South could produce, met Grant, the plain man of the plain people of Ohio. Lee was there—in the words the Daughters of the Confederacy engraved on the stone marking the spot of surrender, which say:

"Here on Sunday, April 9, 1865, after 4 years of heroic struggle in defense of principles believed fundamental to the existence of our Government, Lee surrendered 9,000 men, the remnants of an army unconquered in spirit, to 118,000 men under Grant."

From the pen of a Union officer who accompanied General Grant to General Lee's headquarters on the day of surrender, we have a moving account of what transpired on that fateful day. Grant, upon entering General Lee's room, extended his hand, saying, "General Lee." The two shook hands cordially. The conversation started with General Grant saying, "I met you once before, General Lee, while we were serving in Mexico." "Yes," replied General Lee, "I know I met you on that occasion and I have often thought of it."

After a brief reminiscence of the Mexican campaign, in which General Grant was a captain and General Lee a colonel, General Lee requested General Grant to write out the surrender terms. After admiring the handsome uniform and sword worn by General Lee, General Grant said it would be an act of humiliation to require the officers and men to surrender their swords and side arms or their personal baggage and horses.

General Lee upon reading the terms of surrender was greatly relieved when he read the passage permitting his men to retain their horses and baggage. He said with a warmth of feeling:

"This will have a very happy effect on my men."

As General Lee left his office and mounted his famous Traveler, General Grant moved toward him and saluted. Returning the salute, General Lee left in a slow trot to break the sad news to the brave men under his command. It is said that General Grant sent an order to the Union soldiers that no salutes be fired by them, for, he said:

"The war is over; the rebels are our countrymen again; and the best sign of rejoicing after victory will be to abstain from all demonstrations in the field."

In this brief talk, ladies, which you were gracious enough to invite me to give, I shall not attempt to even give in summary a career and life so crowded with momentous historical events. The life and heritage of the man so overshadow all description that one would be presumptuous to feel otherwise. I am confident that you need little introduction to the subject matter.

Robert E. Lee was born January 19, 1807, at Stratford, the stately Lee Mansion in Westmoreland County. His background on his father's and mother's side was illustrious. His army service tempered the aristocracy of his birth. He never claimed preference or prerogative of birth or name. There was a cast to his mind, an elevation of spirit and a loftiness of thought which gave him a

wholesomeness of spirit and action. He was drawn to the right as the needle is to a magnet. He never had to meditate on the truth; he spoke it by nature. Unconsciously, he set up as his life's model his father's distinguished friend, the illustrious George Washington. Lee followed that example as an humble aristocrat in thought, word, act, and deed.

Shortly after General Lee's death, a most distinguished Southern Senator, in an address before the Southern Historical Society, said:

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward Heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices. He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile. He was Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Archilles."

Lee was a military genius. He graduated from West Point, second in his class, at the age of 18 years. No one need labor the point of his military excellence. His record equals history's greatest. Distinguished historians, professional military men, as well as laymen, vie with one another in their praise of his military achievements.

The late James Ford Rhodes, the scholar and historian from Ohio, said of Lee:

"Drawing from a knightly race all their virtues, he had inherited none of their vices. Honest, sincere, simple, magnanimous, forbearing, refined, courteous, yet dignified and proud, never lacking self-command, he was in all respects a true man."

When the War Between the States became evident, Lee was offered the command of the Union forces. He resigned his U.S. Army commission and said:

"With all my devotion to the Union, and the feeling of loyalty and devotion as an American citizen, I have not been able to make up my mind to raise my hand against my relatives, my children, and my home."

We cannot know the agony of spirit which he must have suffered in his decision to leave the Union and remain with those on his native soil of Virginia. He must have paced the broad pillared veranda of Arlington House struggling with soul and mind as he saw the Capitol's dome. We must recognize in that hour of trial one of the finest products of the American way of life. As the years go by, surely we shall see in larger measure that such a life cannot be judged in a partisan measure or tone. All shall come to look upon him as the English now look upon Washington.

Sir Frederick Maurice, an English major general, said of General Lee:

"As he rode along lines, hundreds of his devoted veterans pressed around the noble chief, trying to take his hand, touch his person, or even lay hands on his horse, thus exhibiting for him their great affection. The general then, with head bare and tears flowing freely down his manly cheeks, bade adieu to his army. In a few words he told his brave men who had been so true in arms to return to their homes and become worthy citizens."

Such was part of the farewell to the army of the South. It is said that when Lee returned to Richmond after the surrender, the people flocked to cheer him. He was received with great acclaim by men and women alike. The record, the character of the man, had placed him forever in the hearts of his comrades and his people irrespective of war's misfortunes.

The integrity, humility, and devotion to duty of General Lee are among his great characteristics. Many have appraised his service after the war to be more important than his direction of the South during that struggle. He returned to his wrecked and prostrate homeland. By precept and example he called his fellow citizens to duty to their State and Nation. Among other things, he said:

"I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life."

General Lee accepted the presidency of Washington College at Washington, Va., which had been almost totally demolished by the ravages of war. Cheerfully, resolutely and with determination he set about his appointed task of building the character and educating the men privileged to attend the college which now bears his name along with that of Washington.

Lee's greatness is exemplified in his farewell message to his troops. That also becomes a good note on which to end this discourse. The great General we all love and respect so much said:

"After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them; but, feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest, I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. By the terms of the agreement, officers and men can return to their homes and remain there until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection. With an increasing devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

Federal Lamb Grading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter to the editor of the Washington Post which appeared in that paper on January 13, 1960. It was written by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. I commend it to your reading, because it contains some sound advice on an important subject. It is good food for thought. The letter follows:

UNGRADED LAMB

Your January 9 editorial on lamb grading is worth some comment. I imagine all of us feel the need for proper quality standards of all food products. In this day and age, the individual is helpless to do the job himself.

However, it may as well be noted that such standards, unintentionally, of course, are very frequently of no help and may actually harm the consumer. In the case of lamb, prime grades now require prescribed amounts of fat along the back-lining of the animal.

This surplusage must be paid for by the consumer thought it is of no possible use to anyone. To feed the lamb up to grade requires keeping past its prime, into the second year. This is not young lamb at all. So, as a result of lamb grading we pay added costs which serve no purpose, and we lose out in flavor, and delectability.

This general thesis can be extended to other agricultural products. It is easy to see the imposition of unnecessarily high grading standards as an instrument of monopoly and high price structure. The farmer takes the rap because his good product is turned down at the plant unloading dock as below standard.

Witness what is happening in the fruit industry, peaches, apples, pears. Consumers share the costs of this restrictive wastefulness with the farmer; only the middleman gains.

This is the other side of the grading coin. As our society becomes wealthier and feels it can afford restrictive practices which are wasteful, we do not seem to comprehend that the added costs are ours.

CLEM MILLER.

Our Farmer Can Now See a Ray of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, on November 16, last, I wrote President Eisenhower recommending the soil bank withdrawal plan, as explained in my remarks to the House on January 7, at which time I said I would send the plan to many Americans in all walks of life, which I did, and I am now pleased to report that the response and support of that plan has been most encouraging, from Members of Congress and nationwide.

I have just received the following letter from President Eisenhower:

JANUARY 22, 1960.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: I have your recent letter regarding the soil bank withdrawal plan, which has been given serious study here. CHARLIE HOEVEN is also interested in this general approach.

A number of people in the executive branch are working actively on this proposal; a position on it will be firmed up shortly. The plan as you have outlined it is quite clear and is well understood and I appreciate your constructive interest.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

D.E.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, we can now at least see a ray of hope for our farmers for the first time during the past several years—for if this plan is made law,

to pay liberally in kind for effectively reducing production of the costly price depressing surpluses, of not only corn and wheat, but also of cotton and tobacco, it will reduce the surpluses to normal size in about 2 years and will tend almost immediately to stabilize all farm prices on a higher profitable level without added cost to our taxpayers, farmers themselves being substantial taxpayers.

Now we can only hope that President Eisenhower will urge—yes, even demand—that this plan be enacted into law, just as he recommended in his farm speech to Congress on January 9, 1956.

Crisis of the Commuter Railroads: No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the commuter railroad conditions in the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut, which I represent in this House, and those of other metropolitan areas have reached the critical point. Dwindling passenger traffic has resulted in shrinking revenues for the commuter railroads which in turn invite disaster while further worsening traffic and financial problems of our major cities. The importance of rail commuter service to a strong economy, to national defense, and to our security warrant the attention of the Congress to problems of the commuter railroads. To help focus attention on these problems, I shall submit a series of articles, statements, and other matter bearing upon the subject. Pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD, a letter published in the Ridgefield (Conn.) Press of January 21, 1960:

REPRESENTATIVE IRWIN REVIEWS COMMUTER PROBLEMS

To the Editors:

I appeal to you as readers of this paper to let me know your views on the New Haven Railroad commuter service problems.

You know the difficulties, indeed you have to live with them. What you want, need, and deserve from the commuter service has deteriorated and nobody knows it better than you.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut live some of the most talented people in the country. They have proven this in countless business successes and I want to call on them. They can provide invaluable help and insight into the commuter issue to supplement findings from my personal studies and inspections of the railroad's operations.

The overall problem is simple to state: How do you transport some 35,000 persons to New York City in the morning and return them at night with safety and on time. This isn't being done.

A look at highway travel as an alternative emphasizes that it must be done.

To carry the 35,000 commuters, say with car pools of four in a car, would take 8,750 cars—a bumper-to-bumper line from Bridgeport to Greenwich, about 28 miles. Imagine what would take place in Westchester and picture the scene at the New York bridges? Go a step further into the city—traffic experts estimate conservatively it would take more than 50 acres to park the 8,750 cars. Where do you find 50 acres in the middle of New York or near the middle of the city?

Railroad commuter transportation is the only way to do the job.

Now, in my studies of the commuter issue, I have come upon some startling facts. Take the commuter service breakdowns. Railroad officials frankly admitted to me that the trains don't get proper maintenance. For this, they said, every car should have a thorough renovation every 6 years. Motors, running gear, electrical equipment, interior fixtures, seats, windows, and so forth would be inspected and repaired or replaced if necessary * * *.

But the passenger deficit eats up funds, leaving nothing for proper maintenance work, the New Haven authorities claimed. They added that proper maintenance hasn't been given in the past and isn't being given now.

What are the results? You commuters know what the lack of proper care has done to interiors of the cars. The railroad officials confirmed what you have undoubtedly believed—that the breakdowns occur largely because of poor maintenance. For example, it isn't uncommon in bad weather for water to leak into electrical equipment because of bad gaskets and cause short circuits and stall trains. Gaskets, the train officials said, would be inspected and kept in good condition had the trains been getting the 6-year renovation work.

Failure to provide the work has had a cumulative effect. The authorities told me the renovation jobs would normally cost $10,000 per car. Now, they say, it would cost $66,200 for each motorcar and $52,700 for each without a motor to put them in top-notch shape. They said it would be necessary to "remanufacture" the cars.

The New Haven's 100 new stainless steel cars, purchased in 1954, wouldn't need remanufacture but are due this year, under normal circumstances, for the 6-year renovation work. It doesn't look like this will be done.

Breakdowns, in addition to causing distress by resulting in delays, are serious hazards. I cannot overemphasize this. The railroad people at New Haven contend that they aren't hazards. I ask you, what is a breakdown on tracks crowded during the peak commuter hours?

The railroad has installed certain safety devices in its control towers to regulate switches and signal lights. They also have devices to indicate the position of trains in the vicinity of the switches.

But the switches are not automatic. In addition, there are no speedometers in the multiple-unit cars. One engineer told me experience must serve as the engineer's speedometer. I believe there is too much room for human error to regard breakdowns, especially during busy periods, as anything but hazards to safety.

The recent accident at Rowayton proves the point. It was caused by a human error—the engineer of a train coming to the aid of another that had stalled was misinformed by a dispatcher, so the Public Utilities Commission said, as to the location of the stalled train and the result was an accident. It could have been far more serious.

The conditions on the New Haven have an obviously bad effect on morale of the employees. They appear to have little or no interest in promoting the railroad. I believe that better conditions—and some places where the employees work are very depressing—contribute to morale improvement and see employees do a better job.

Railroad management has told us its commuter line deficit wouldn't be anywhere near as bad if taxes weren't so high. This can't be disputed. Last year, for example, the New Haven paid some $10 million in taxes, mostly to New York. About $600,000 of this went to Connecticut in earnings taxes on passenger operations, the management has pointed out, an amount equal to the cost of giving 60 cars the 6-year renovations.

Whether New York, with its tremendous financial problems, could be of much help in the way of tax relief, if any at all, remains to be answered. Tax relief, admittedly however, isn't the only answer.

Fare increases which might be justified in some instances won't put operations back in the black and reportedly tend to drive away commuters—if the increases are applied without improvements in trains and services or even a guarantee that conditions won't get even worse.

There is also a question of equitable taxation—other forms of transportation don't bear proportionately equal tax loads. These other means of transportation also enjoy enormous amounts of financial aid, from local governments and the Federal Government.

The commuter railroad problem won't be answered by massive grants of Federal aid alone. A Federal transportation policy covering the commuter lines is essential.

Railroads are private businesses that must make profits to survive—and they are here to stay. They will increase in importance with the growth of our cities and suburban areas. Answers to the commuter service problems must be keyed to a long-range program for orderly development of good economic mass transportation systems which include highways, air facilities and other means of travel.

Representative DONALD J. IRWIN.

WASHINGTON, *January 15.*

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as time marches on, great men take their rightful places in the nonpartisan pages of history. In the heat of controversy, our greatest leaders have been subjected to ill-tempered abuse. Years later, in the calm, when a man's true role in history is analyzed, we can properly evaluate his contributions to his country. It is with this thought in mind that I call your attention to the 80th birthday of one of the greatest Americans of all time, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

A decade ago, he was subject to removal from his command by the ill-advised action of the then President of the United States. General MacArthur was, in fact, punished because he maintained a belief that victory was essential for the protection and integrity of our country. Since we can now look back at that turbulent period, in a quiet and analytical manner, it is apparent that General MacArthur was completely correct in his position, and that the Nation suffered irreparable harm as a result of his being removed from military command.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to salute this truly outstanding American on his 80th birthday and to remind him

that the Nation will be forever grateful for his lifetime of service in defense of his country and the cherished ideals he so steadfastly maintained.

Danger Points to Public Power in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Senator CLAIR ENGLE before the Electric Consumers Information Committee Legislative Workshop, Monday, January 18, 1960:

You and I have been working together toward a common goal for a good many years—so I am glad to have this opportunity to appear before the Electric Consumers Information Committee. I want to talk to you a little about electric utility policies and politics. We both know these subjects rather well. I hope that I can add something to your already extensive information on these subjects.

I am glad that this legislative workshop is working in the interest of the consumer. The consumer is the least represented element in our society today. Under this administration, which took over as a businessman's administration, the consumer has been pretty well ignored. The private power companies of America picture the consumer as a downtrodden taxpayer who is systematically being forced to pay two power bills—his own and that of the fellow who gets power from public projects. We know that the consumer is not only a taxpayer but also a ratepayer. He pays the rates set by the utility—a fact which the private utilities choose to ignore and which this administration has not yet discovered.

In the kind of environment we have had in recent years, it is particularly important that the Electric Consumers Information Committee be more active and vigilant than ever. The groups that support your organization are entitled to special commendation. I speak particularly of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, headed by my former colleague in the House of Representatives, Clyde T. Ellis. The American Public Power Association, with Alex Radin, has done fine work. The AFL–CIO has recognized a legitimate interest in the welfare of the consumer. The Farmers Union and the National Grange, as farm organizations, have taken more than ordinary interest in consumer affairs. The Northwest Public Power Association is active and vigorous as was the Hell's Canyon Association during the difficult struggle for that project.

It is necessary for these organizations to keep on the statute books a public power policy that is beneficial to the power consumers of America. These power policies have not received the support of this administration. Congress has been deluged with proposals to water down the laws that make power cheaper throughout the land. Whenever possible the administration of existing laws has been distorted to impair the established national power policy as imbedded in the statute books. So far, none of these laws have been repealed. Sometimes they haven't been executed as they should. But they are still on the books. A Federal Power Commission has been appointed that does not agree with the power policy written by the Congress. The present Federal Power Commission is not interested particularly in protecting the consumer. The Bureau of the Budget has taken a stranglehold on new projects. Federal public power development has been either completely stopped or delayed because the officials in this administration are not in favor of public power.

This will be an active and busy session of Congress. We will have to be adjourned by July 1 or thereabouts to attend the national conventions. In the rush of getting through the appropriation bills and major legislation demands by the administration, it will be necessary for all the electric consumer organizations to be especially alert that some proposal adversely affecting their interest does not get by undetected. There are some matters that will be of particular importance. I will mention them.

First, we may again be faced with a proposal in one form or another involving the so-called "partnership" program advocated by this administration. You will recall that this proposal took specific form first on the Trinity River project in California. Just to refresh your memory: The administration proposed that a private power company be permitted to build the powerhouses on an otherwise completely federally financed project. This would accomplish economy, in the mind of the administration, by saving the cost of the powerhouses to the Federal Government. It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize that the consumers would pay for the powerhouses in any case. In the end, the private power company instead of the Federal Government would own the powerhouses, and the consumer would pay nearly twice as much for the power. This is a costly way of avoiding creeping or crawling socialism.

Last session we defeated the partnership program when the House Interior Subcommittee tabled the bills which would have put it into effect. Congress then proceeded to appropriate $2,400,000 to start Federal construction of the powerhouses. But this isn't enough to firmly nail down the proposition. We will need at least $20 million more for fiscal 1960 to really get these powerhouses beyond the planning and design stage. A California newspaper last week quoted a vice president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. as saying: "Our faith in the partnership concept of water and power development is undiminished. We intend to continue our advocacy of this principle on Federal, State, and local projects within our territory of service * * *."

This indicates that the power company hasn't given up. Some effort may be made this year to block the Trinity funds for the powerhouses. Accordingly I welcome the continued attention of your membership to this particular issue.

Another question directly involving public power to the consumer is the proposal to build an intertie line between the Columbia River powerplants and the Central Valley project in California. These are two Federal power systems. This administration now proposes to tie them together with a private line built by a private power company. This scheme, of course, will make the private power company the tollkeeper. A contract was prepared last year to put the proposal into effect, but we stopped it. I am not sure how long it will stay stopped. It is our belief that a Federal line should interconnect the two Federal systems. Power that cannot be used in the Central Valley system or by preference customers can be wholesaled to the private power company on the same basis that nonfirm power from the Central Valley project itself is now sold to the private power company. Let me emphasize that this proposal would not divert power from the Columbia River system for which that system has any need or use, but would provide revenue to that system for kilowatts now going to waste. For the preference customers in California a Federal construction of the intertie is the only method by which their preference can be preserved. In 1951—the 82d Congress—I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal intertie between the Columbia River and the California Central system. The private utilities fought it tooth and nail. Now they are for it, provided they can do it. The economic justification of this intertie has never been in question. The only issue has been whether or not the Federal Government would be permitted to interconnect those two systems. The private utilities defeated legislation to permit that to be done. Now they are for it, provided they can do it. I doubt that the President would sign legislation providing for a Federal intertie. The best we can hope for is to prevent the execution of a contract which permits it to be done by private utilities until after the first of next year—when I hope we will again have a Democratic President.

Third, we want to make sure that none of the pending proposals to wreck the REA achieve the status of law as a part of the last will and testament of the dying Eisenhower administration. The REA can be economized into oblivion by hoisting the interest rates on REA loans or driving the cooperatives toward high-priced money markets of Wall Street. This is clear from the Republican program embodied in legislation pending before Congress. I refer specifically to S. 133 and H.R. 797, among others. At the present time neither of these bills has gotten out of committee, and I hope we keep them there. I suggest that you read the editorial entitled "REA and Tight-Money Policy" in the January issue of Rural Electrification. It points out that the drive to raise REA interest rates is a part of a carefully planned administration tight-money policy. The editorial concludes: "As inflation medicine, this policy is poison." There is growing pressure on public power agencies to make them accept higher interest rates. That pressure will be increased during this session of Congress.

The purpose of these administrative and legislative actions is to reverse the national power policy laid down in the REA Act and other Federal legislation. That policy provides for the lowest possible rates for power produced at public dams consistent with the repayment of the cost of the project. It has, further, historically provided a preference to public power for cities, municipalities, public agencies, and irrigation districts. We have not forgotten that when the President was called to give an example of socialism he named the TVA. The Administration has clearly been alined with the private power companies during the past 7 years. This year may be their last chance to get in their licks.

As part and parcel of the effort to cut back public power development, we have been faced consistently in recent years with a no-new-starts policy. This has been dressed up as an economy measure. The projects which produce Federal public power have been special victims of this no-new-starts policy. We authorized some 32 projects last session by overriding the veto of the President of the United States. I am not sure, however, how fast they are going to start because the Bureau of the Budget can impound the money appropriated to build these projects. Some of the more controversial new starts have not as yet been able to get underway.

For example, Yellowtail Dam on the Big Horn River was authorized in 1944 as part of the Missouri Basin program. Congress has repeatedly confirmed its decision with reference to the need for this project. Each and every year for the past 7 years this administration has found new reasons for not

going forward. The people of Montana and Wyoming need this project, both for its water and for its power.

There are a great number of authorized smaller Missouri Basin projects which would yield power but have not been started by this administration—and will not be started unless continuous pressure is exercised.

The seven Colorado River States have a vital interest in the power to be developed in the Upper Colorado River storage project. This administration inherited that project from its predecessor—fully engineered and ready for authorization. The Congress authorized this project under reclamation law, including public transmission lines. Now, as soon as the project is underway private utilities are prepared to help the administration economize and save some money. In this case the economy consists of turning over the public power to the private utility companies who would provide the transmission lines. Here again, as in the Columbia River situation, this power would in the process be freed of the preference clause and would be subject to distribution by a private power company.

In summary, we are fighting a defensive battle in Congress and with the administration to retain what we have in the public power policy of this Nation for the benefit of the consumer.

The executive branch has teamed up with the private utility and the banks to make it tough on every phase of public power. Power producing projects have been the victim of the no-new-starts program. Money has been tightened up on REA cooperatives—and the interest rates have been raised. The so-called partnership has been actively pushed to take the Federal Government out of power production at federally built projects. The power preference for public agencies has been challenged in national advertising by the private power lobby—with the cost of the advertising written off as a business expense. The President described TVA as the best example of creeping socialism—and this attitude has permeated his whole administration. This was the most direct and powerful assault on the electric consumer in the past 30 years.

On the whole, we have sustained the attack rather well. We have lost no major legislative battles—no laws have been repealed. Some have been watered down. We have been hurt, but not ruined.

We can fight 1 more year. We will be vigilant and active in defense of the interests of the electric power consumers. And we can look forward after 8 long hard years to a new administration that will support and implement the 50 years of Federal legislation beneficial to the electric power consumers of America.

Forty-second Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 was the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian independence in the 20th century. It is, however, far more than just a solemn commemoration for a latter-day event. It justly is emblematic of the solidarity and dedication of a people who had established their own government and society on the rich western steppes when Europe was still in the Dark Ages, centuries before William the Conqueror commanded his armies to cross the channel and assault the Saxon strongholds in England.

The Ukrainian struggle for independence and self-determination today springs from the ages-old tradition of a proud people who have never relinquished their dream despite decades of suppression and adversity.

Those of us who are free call out to you who are in bondage, "Do not despair. We are striving to create a world where justice and peace shall prevail, when once again we shall welcome you as brothers in the legions of the free."

Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, October 7 of last year TelePrompTer Corp. conducted for the Department of the Army an experimental closed-circuit television auction of surplus Department of Defense materials. The results of this auction are worthy of the attention of this House as this system may offer one way of improving the return to the Government on the sales of its surplus materials. The Department of Defense alone has some $26.7 billion in salable surplus property, according to the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the 1960 Department of Defense appropriation bills, and an increase of return, however small—even 1 or 2 cents on the dollar—on this property would be of real economic significance.

This auction was conducted simultaneously in six cities, with bidders in each city competing not only with one another but with those in the other cities. Goods for sale were being offered from three locations, making a nine-station circuit to serve this sale. The obvious advantage of this system is that it permits a larger number of potential buyers to enter the bidding for the goods on sale, it expands the market and thereby the competition for these goods.

Goods of an acquisition cost of $2,614,000 were sold in this auction for $534,556, a return of 20.5 cents on the dollar. The overall average for Defense Department surplus sales is in the range of 3 to 5 cents; an estimate of the materials in this sale, including heavy machinery, clothing, and marine engines and machinery, put their likely maximum return at 15 cents. The auction ran for over 8 hours without interruption for technical failure.

As a member of the newly-created Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, I find these figures quite interesting. This one experiment, of course, does not prove this as the way in which to dispose of all surplus property, but it does justify further experimentation with it. I would also raise the point that this process might better be turned over to the General Services Administration which, with its experience in the field and its charged responsibility in disposal of surplus Government property, would be best qualified to make use of it.

In connection with the last statement, I would like to enter a portion of a letter of evaluation of this sale written to me by the Honorable Franklin Floete, the Administrator of the General Services Administration:

DEAR MR. CURTIS:* * * The subject sale was conducted by the Department of the Army as an experiment designed to test the effectiveness of this medium in DOD surplus selling. The sale was planned as a departure from traditional, conventional Government sales methods, with a view toward attracting new buyers through a mechanic to broaden market appeal. General Services Administration personnel observed the sale at all property and selling locations.

The contractual services rendered by the TelePrompTer Corp. were efficient and in keeping with good professional standards. It should be reported that the attendance of 479 buyers distributed between 6 viewing locations was less than anticipated, but was adequate to produce spirited intercity competition among bidders. The sale provided valid experience concerning the types of property suited and the geographical and market considerations which are involved in televised selling.

A preliminary evaluation of the test indicates that the application of television to sales of Government property must be limited to select situations. Additional testing may be required before a reliable, conclusive evaluation can be completed.

One important consideration in planning future uses of televised broadcasts is the heavy cost attending the transmission service and equipment.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as is my practice every Monday, I put my newsletter in the RECORD so that my colleagues as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may know my views if they are so disposed.

The budget message is of great interest to all of us. For my part, I decided to write the President a letter of commendation well deserved, as my newsletter for this week:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, JANUARY 23, 1960

THE PRESIDENT:
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Good for you. Having studied your budget message, I feel compelled to write you this letter. Moreover, I believe that a majority of Dallas citizens would join me in these thoughts. Undoubtedly numberless others throughout the land feel the same.

Yours is no easy task. We all know that. Presenting and preparing a year's budget for our National Government is tough, but hardly more so than a long list of difficult things that, by law, we require you as President to do. On top of the all important military expenses, there are countless Government functions that must be paid for.

Besides recommending action, you have to assemble, from all branches of Government, estimates of what it will cost to carry out the laws Congress has passed. Congress may than accept or ignore your recommendations, but the chances are that you will be blamed for any inaction by Congress, as often as not by the very Congressmen responsible. Worse yet, many of our people simply do not understand the respective functions of the Congress and the President.

In addition to the necessary expenses, there are endless numbers of costly pet projects that Congressmen, pressure groups, and individual citizens think are needed right now. It's easy for any of us to lose sight of basic objectives and the overall picture. You, of course, must not. It's easy for some to figure that the other fellow's needs are not so important as their own. Easy too, to demand some particular, even worthwhile, spending project—"after all, it doesn't cost much"—without fitting that demand into the whole nationwide framework. In fact, it would probably be hard for many people to realize just how much restraint, self-discipline, and willpower it takes to withstand the pressures for greater spending when preparing the budget. Maybe, over the years, that's why the Government often spends more than it takes in.

Well, we of Dallas, want to compliment you and to encourage you in the statesmanlike attitude toward spending shown by your budget message. You have offered us a balanced budget. You have suggested that we pay down the debt, tipping our hats to our children who will inherit it. You ask us to look forward to the possibility of a tax cut, if we follow this responsible course you have charted.

To do this, you have chosen to delay your request for some of the money for Federal building that is under way throughout the Nation. So, the shoe is pinching us in Dallas. We have high hopes for our Federal building conceived and based on sound economic principles. We expected speedy construction. Now it will be delayed since no money is provided in the current budget, beyond buying the site and preparation of plans, which are going ahead full speed.

Perhaps it would be expected by some, even demanded, that we now solicit you to include the funds necessary for immediate construction of this building, justified by persuasive arguments. It would be easy to forget the national picture and just demand this admittedly worthwhile project.

However, sober consideration and understanding of Federal spending is not new to the people of Dallas. We have on other occasions declined to request Federal aid when we might have had it under the law. From time to time, as a Representative, I have voted, in the name of Dallas people, against boondoggle bills, even when it meant voting against some Dallas project included in a bill. We were prepared then and are now to be self-disciplined and responsible in our attitude toward Federal spending.

It is possible that in this moment of history, under your leadership, responsible people everywhere will rally around your sensible economic course. We, in Dallas, hope so. Surely, it is not too much to ask that we delay some construction, however worthwhile, to accomplish the objectives of sound fiscal policy. We know that it is time we got our house in order. We must not spend more than we take in. We must cut our debt. We should reduce the tax burden on our people.

We cherish our freedoms as dearly as any generation of Americans ever did and we know to what degree they may hinge on our maintaining a sound dollar. Hence, we demand only what we have a right to demand—sound money management.

In a larger sense some may even feel, as I do, that we are at a turning point in history. We should count the blessings of a free society and turn decisively and resolutely away from the false charms of a regimented planned economy resulting from crushing taxation and the big spending that occasions it.

We're behind you and want you to stand firm while we face up to the economic facts of life. Thank you, Mr. President.

Sincerely,

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Gettysburg—Heritage or Horror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 25, 1960

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like the privilege of inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot of last Thursday, January 21, in which the need for cooperation among all Americans in both their private and public capacity, and at all levels of local, State, and National governments is stressed if our national shrines are to be preserved from commercial desecration. This editorial highlights the recently formed Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, an organization of private citizens constituted to bend its collective efforts to save the Gettysburg battlefield from the fate of unrestrained commercialization.

The editorial also raises the question about what the State government in Pennsylvania, and the local Adams County and the Cumberland Township officials are doing to protect the battlefield site. The editorial follows:

PRIVATE-PUBLIC TEAMWORK NEEDED TO SAVE SHRINES

In 1958, more than 20 million persons visited historical shrines maintained by the National Park Service. They went to see the battlefields and other places that have figured in the remarkable development of a raw, new world into a powerful, respected nation.

In a shocking number of cases what they see are cheap souvenir stands and housing subdivisions crowding right up to the edge of Government-owned land.

Pennsylvanians need go no farther than Gettysburg to see the process at work. If any spot in America should be treated as sacred soil it should be this place where one of the most decisive and bloody battles in our history was fought; where Lincoln uttered his few words that have become a classic article of faith in democracy. Yet the main highway through the battlefield is lined with motels and souvenir shops. Tracts all about the national park stand in danger of becoming "tourist traps."

Whose duty is it to protect our historical shrines from commercial encroachment? Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, says it should be a joint venture by Federal, State, and local governments with private organizations and individuals chipping in.

As far as Gettysburg is concerned, this appears to be the only way that the battlefield can be protected adequately. The last session of Congress came through with a $450,000 appropriation to buy land but tied up the funds with the stipulation they be used only to get property that has already been commercialized.

The Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association has come into being to help fill the gap left by this rather shortsighted Federal legislation. It has incorporated for the purpose of raising funds to buy land in danger of commercialization. Already several thousand persons have sent contributions to the organization's headquarters in Gettysburg.

The Federal Government and private individuals are doing something toward preserving Gettysburg. What about the State government? And officials of Adams County and the townships about Gettysburg? It would seem that both the Commonwealth and the local officials have a strong duty to protect the area. Airtight zoning laws by the localities and cooperative purchases of land by the State would plug up the gaps.

As the National Park Service points out in a recent bulletin, more and more people are discovering history. The growing numbers of visitors to places such as Gettysburg is a big reason for the threat of commercialization. It would be tragic if this rise in the public's appreciation of a rich American heritage should become blunted by quick-buck artists.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to insert my testimony given today before the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, in which I think I point out that all of these local officials are at least making an effort to solve the problems which exist at Gettysburg. I believe, Mr. Speaker, my testimony makes it quite clear that we are still a considerable distance from a solution but as of the moment, I do believe that everybody involved deserves a big A for effort.

It's been my experience that when I am in the Gettysburg area I am asked "Why doesn't Congress do something about the battlefield?" And when I am in the Congress I find myself being asked "But isn't the problem at Gettysburg a local one?" I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if preserving the Gettysburg battlefield as a sacred shrine is a national problem it is one that cannot be solved by the Congress or the National Park Service without the full and complete cooperation of all of the local governmental units as well as the local citizenry. By the same token, if the preservation of the Gettysburg battlefield is, in fact, a local problem, it is a problem that cannot be solved by the efforts of the local citizenry and the local governmental officials without the help and cooperation of the National Park Service and the Congress.

In the interest of solving this problem rather than placing the blame for a lack of a solution, I join with the editorial writer in urging private and public teamwork until a satisfactory answer is finally reached.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY THE HONORABLE JAMES M. QUIGLEY, DEMOCRAT, PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION FOR 1961 BEFORE THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1960

Mr. KIRWAN, members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify on the Interior Department, and more specifically the National Park Service, appropriation for fiscal 1961.

Quite specifically, I am here to speak about the Gettysburg National Park which, as many of you know, is located in my district. I think perhaps the best service I can perform is to bring this subcommittee up to date concerning what has happened at Gettysburg since last year.

Without trying to open any old wounds or expressing my own opinion, which varies somewhat with my next statement, let me point out that a minor furor was raised in the Gettysburg area when, last year, Congress as much as said that Gettysburg should protect its own future with zoning and that Adams County, in which the battlefield lies, could help preserve the Nation's shrine by preserving its own holdings there.

Once the understandable disappointment over lack of immediate Federal funds disappeared, Gettysburg and its friends began to work, slowly but in earnest. The second battle of Gettysburg which started with skirmishes in the public press settled down to a serious long-range attack of the problem on four separate fronts. Those attacks are local action with planning and zoning, nationwide action with a privately sponsored fund-raising campaign, executive action in the form of a proposed land exchange and, I hope, further congressional action with appropriations.

Surveying the battlefield front by front, let me tell you about the status of zoning first. Admittedly, as of this moment Gettysburg and the adjacent jurisdictions are still some distance from passing an effective zoning ordinance as stipulated by Congress last year in giving an appropriation for the battlefield. Legally it takes time to set up an effective plan for the future, but I would like this committee to know that the steps have been started. A temporary setback ordinance has been passed by Cumberland Township, which encompasses approximately 95 percent of the battlefield. The enactment of this ordinance was in the nature of a hold-the-line action.

The Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania has begun work under a contract approved by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. A comprehensive growth plan for the future will be presented to Cumberland Township in the near future, a plan which I feel certain will contain protection for the battlefield.

Now let me say that I think Gettysburg, which incidentally has its own planning commission, and Cumberland Township, and perhaps Adams County, will eventually all enact planning and zoning laws. They will do this not because of the battlefield, nor because Congress would like them to do so, but because people generally are beginning to realize that planning for the future is the only way to protect their own investments and provide for an orderly development of their communities.

The second front is actually under the command of a military man. It is a front which has received the least publicity thus far and may in the long run do the most good. This is the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association whose president is Maj. William M. Haller, currently stationed at Fort Meade. This group was founded last August and incorporated last month with its nucleus among students of the Civil War. This group has already raised a sizeable amount of money and its forthcoming national campaign should raise a great deal more. Its sole aim is to preserve the battlefield in the best way possible, aiding either with money or land donated to the National Park Service. Here is a group of dedicated citizens who are in the forefront of urging congressional action, yet at the same time they are putting their money where their mail is by following up their letters to their Congressmen with their own donations to the Battlefield Preservation Association.

Then, within the Park Service itself, I'm happy to report that there is in the process of formulation a possible exchange of some historically less valuable property presently owned by the Federal Government for some historically very valuable property owned by Adams County. Just to digress here a moment, may I insert into the record of these hearings the county commissioners' statement of their dilemma in which they find themselves unable to legally donate their land to the Government, much as they possibly might like to do so. I might add they have a further dilemma in that they also have hopes of gaining some money from land sales to help pay for their new and much-needed county home for the aged. And this is where a land swap might help out a great deal. Further, it would satisfy one of the congressional complaints that the Park Service has enough land already. However, I must point out that there is just a limited amount of land that is suitable for swapping and for this reason I would not suggest that a land swap is the full and easy answer to the problem.

The commissioners have thus far been patient, and in their way cooperative men. They have delayed their final actions as long as possible. But this year they must either swap or sell or give up the idea of a new county home. This is why I sincerely hope that the idea of a land swap may be approved soon. And approvals aplenty it will take—like congressional and county court action after the Park Service and the commissioners agree.

On the fourth front I can only hope that you gentlemen will respond to the needs of history and a growing appreciation of the Civil War.

Last year when Congress set aside $450,000 for this purpose it said the money could be used at Gettysburg and Manassas provided they met the stipulations of the Congress. Unfortunately for Gettysburg, Manassas has enacted what is considered to be an effective county zoning ordinance which the Park Service is urging them to make even stronger. Thus there is the probability that all of the money may be used there, for it is in keeping with both the spirit and the letter of the law.

Gettysburg is moving in that direction, successfully, I think on three fronts. I sincerely trust that you gentlemen will provide the fourth front by giving the Park Service the necessary money so that the Federal Government can do its fair share in this worthwhile public effort.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1960

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we come each with manifold needs. But our greatest need is of Thee.

Lift us, we beseech Thee, above the immediate which so hems us in, and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities.

As Thy servants and the servants of the people of this good land, in this temple of democracy save us from any perversion of power that has not Thee in awe.

In this day of destiny for us and for the world make us worthy of our high calling as keepers of the sacred flame.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 25, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959—POSITION OF SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the floor when the vote on S. 2436, the bill to amend the election laws, was taken. I was inadvertently recorded as being opposed to passage of the bill.

Mr. President, if I had been present and voting I would have voted in favor of S. 2436.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 261) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE—MINORITY, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1043)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee I submit the report on employment, growth, and price levels, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 of the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, I point out that the report is based on a very thorough study of the whole economic situation as well as the specific issues of full employment, adequate growth, and the stability of price levels. We held hearings on more than 40 days and examined more than 100 witnesses, whose testimony and submitted views comprised approximately 3,700 pages printed in some 13 volumes.

We also authorized, under the direction of Dr. Otto Eckstein, 23 special studies which are either completed now or will come from the Government Printing Office by the end of this month.

The staff members prepared completely on their own initiative and direction, without any prompting on economic matters by the chairman, a staff report of more than 400 pages, which was submitted some weeks ago and has been printed.

This report is the final report of the committee, together with minority views.

My own judgment may be somewhat biased in this matter. We have lived within our appropriations. I think that no comparable public body, or private body, for that matter, has accomplished so much in this field in so short a time with so small an expenditure of funds. Paraphrasing Winston Churchill, I think I can say in the economic world never have so few done so much for so many.

Mr. President, we were very fortunate in having an extremely able staff. Most of the members of the permanent staff were transferred to the special study. I refer particularly to Dr. James Knowles and Mr. Norman Ture. We also had the very able administrative services of Mr. John Lehman.

Furthermore, we formed a special staff headed by one of the most brilliant economists in the country, Dr. Otto Eckstein, an associate professor of economics at Harvard University. We were able to obtain the services of Dr. Warren Smith, a professor of economics of the University of Michigan; of Dr. John H. Kareken, from the University of Minnesota; of Dr. Harold M. Levinson, from the University of Michigan; and of Dr. Padraic Frucht, formerly with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and previous to that time on the staff of Lawrence College.

We also had further members of the special staff, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the list of the men and the qualifications of the major members of such staff.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Otto Eckstein, an associate professor of economics at Harvard University, received his A.B. degree from Princeton in 1951, and then completed his A.M. (1952) and Ph.D. (1955) at Harvard University. His major interest as an economist has been in the fields of public finance and econometrics. Among his published works are: "Input-Output Economics—Its Nature and Use" in Economic Activity Analysis, edited by O. Morgenstern, 1954; "Trends in Public Expenditures in the Next Decade," Committee for Economic Development, April 1959; and for the Joint Economic Committee, "Inflation, the Price-Wage Spiral, and Economic Growth."

Dr. Warren Smith, professor of economics, University of Michigan, author of numerous articles on monetary problems and one of the foremost scholars in his field. Graduate of University of Michigan; Ph.D., University of Michigan.

Dr. John H. Kareken, a monetary economist, is on leave from the School of Business Administration, University of Minnesota. He was born in Buffalo, N.Y., in 1929 and holds a B.A. degree from the University of Buffalo. He received a doctorate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he also taught. Since September 1956 he has been associate professor of economics at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Kareken has written widely in the field of monetary policy.

Dr. Harold M. Levinson is on leave from the University of Michigan where he is associate professor of economics in the department of economics. He has specialized in the field of labor economics and is the author or coauthor of several books in that field, including "Unionism, Wage Trends, and Income Distributions," and "Labor Relations and Productivity in the Building Trades." Dr. Levinson also served as price analyst with the Office of Price Administration. He was born in 1919 in Boston, Mass., and is a graduate of the University of Michigan from which he received a M.B.A. in 1942 and a Ph.D. in 1950. He has been at the University of Michigan since 1945.

Dr. Padraic Frucht will cover the international economic aspects of the study as well as being assigned as special economist for the minority. Dr. Frucht was born in 1921 and graduated from Brown University in 1947. He received a Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1956 and comes to the study staff from the research staff of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Previous to that he was assistant professor of economics at Lawrence College in Appleton, Wis. His additional fields of specialization are industrial organization, price and allocation theory, and monetary theory and policy.

Assistant economists: Thomas Wilson and Michael Brower, Harvard Graduate School.

Junior economists: George Bleile, Northwestern University Graduate School; Charles Warden, Georgetown University Graduate School.

From the permanent staff: The clerk of the committee, John Lehman, will serve as administrative officer for the study. James Knowles will serve as special economic counsel, with particular responsibility for advance planning, the organization of hearings, and liaison with committee members; Norman Ture, fiscal economist, with the permanent staff.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with this report the list of the hearings, study papers, and reports prepared in connection with this general study.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEARINGS, STUDY PAPERS, AND REPORTS PREPARED UNDER STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS

REPORTS

"Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," December 1959. $1.50.[2]

"Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," Report of the Joint Economic Committee, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, 86th Congress, 1st session; January 1960.

HEARINGS

"Part 1: The American Economy, Problems and Prospects," March 1959.[1]

"Part 2: Historical and Comparative Rates of Production, Productivity, and Prices," May 1959. $2.[2]

"Part 3: Historical and Comparative Rates of Labor Force, Employment and Unemployment," June 1959. 35 cents.[2]

"Part 4: Influence on Prices of Changes in the Effective Supply of Money," July 1959. 75 cents.[2]

"Part 5: International Influences on the American Economy," September 1959. 50 cents.[2]

"Part 6A: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations," September 1959. $1.25.[2]

---

[1] Part 1 is out of print.

[2] Available only from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

"Part 6B: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations," November 1959. 75 cents.[2]

"Part 6C: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations," replies to questions on monetary policy, and other materials, November 1959. 65 cents.[2]

"Part 7: The Effect of Monopolistic Quasi-Monopolistic Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," November 1959. $1.25.[2]

"Part 8: The Effect of Increases in Wages, Salaries, and the Prices of Personal Services, Together With Union and Professional Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," November 1959. 75 cents.[2]

"Part 9A: Constructive Suggestions for Reconciling and Simultaneously Obtaining the Three Objectives of Maximum Employment, an Adequate Rate of Growth, and Substantial Stability of the Price Level," December 1959. 70 cents.[2]

"Part 9B." Same title as 9A. Materials submitted by 12 organizations at the invitation of the Joint Economic Committee, December 1959. 45 cents.[2]

"Part 10. Additional Materials Submitted for the Record," in press, January 1960.

STUDY PAPERS

"No. 1: Recent Inflation in the United States," by Charles L. Schultze, September 1959.[2]

"No. 2: Steel and the Postwar Inflation," by Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm, November 1959. 25 cents.

"No. 3: An Analysis of the Inflation in Machinery Prices," by Thomas A. Wilson, November 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 2.)

"No. 4: Analysis of the Rising Costs of Public Education," by Werner Z. Hirsch, November 1959. 30 cents.

"No. 5: Trends in the Supply and Demand of Medical Care," by Markley Roberts, November 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 4.)

"No. 6: The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment, by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 1959. 25 cents.

No. 7: The Incidence of Inflation: Or Who Gets Hurt?" by Seymour E. Harris, November 1959. 45 cents.

"No. 8: Protection Against Inflation," by H. S. Houthakker, November 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 7.)

"No. 9: The Share of Wages and Salaries in Manufacturing Income, 1947–1956," by Alfred H. Conrad, November 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 7.)

"No. 10: Potential Public Policies to Deal With Inflation Caused by Market Power," by Emmette S. Redford, December 1959. 25 cents.

"No. 11: A Brief Interpretive Survey of Wage-Price Problems in Europe," by Mark Leiserson, December 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 10.)

"No. 12: The Low Income Population and Economic Growth," by Robert J. Lampman, December 1959. 25 cents.

"No. 13: The Adequacy of Resources for Economic Growth in the United States," by Joseph L. Fisher and Edward Boorstein, December 1959. (Included with Study Paper No. 12.)

"No. 14: Financial Aspects of Postwar Economic Developments in the United States," by John Gurley, in press, January 1960.

"No. 15: Profits, Profit Markups, and Productivity: An Examination of Corporate Behavior Since 1947," by Edwin Kuh, in press, January 1960.

"No. 16: International Effects of U.S. Economic Policy," by Edward M. Bernstein, January 1960. 30 cents.

"No. 17: Prices and Costs in Manufacturing Industries," by Charles L. Schultze and Joseph L. Tryon, January 1960. 20 cents.

"No. 18: National Security and the American Economy in the 1960's," by Henry Rowen, in press, January 1960.

"No. 19: Debt Management in the United States," by Warren L. Smith, in press, January 1960.

"No. 20: The Potential Economic Growth of the United States," by James W. Knowles, in press, January 1960.

"No. 21: Postwar Inflation," by Harold M. Levinson, in press, January 1960.

"No. 22: An Evaluation of Anti-Trust Policy: Its Relations to Economic Growth, Full Employment, and Prices," by Theodore J. Kreps, in press, January 1960.

"No. 23: Unemployment in Surplus Labor Market Areas," by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in press, January 1960.

[2] Available only from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the members of the committee, both the majority and minority members, for the cooperation which they showed in the conduct of the hearings.

I also wish to say that the minority members were allowed to name a member of the special staff, who was in a sense their special representative.

I do not know the political affiliations of a single member of the special staff. No question about this was ever asked by me, at least.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know the staff members are loyal Americans and men who stand well in their profession. They did an honest, conscientious job, without fear or favor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me upon the same subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should be glad to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Senator from New York that the Senator from Illinois has a half minute remaining. If the Senator from New York wishes to be recognized in his own right, he will have 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Joint Economic Committee. This monumental study, concerning which we have come to different conclusions, but without rancor, represents, on the one hand, rather a triumph of handling by the chairman, who presided over very complicated hearings with the greatest of tact, accommodation to the minority, judiciousness, and desire to bring out all the facts.

I join my dear friend and colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I hope Members will read this study. This is the anatomy of the economy of our country and of our country's place in the economy of the world. I think it is absolutely essential information for every Senator. I hope the report will not merely be filed away. It is short, snappy, and full of important facts. It is not discursive at all. I think it constitutes a great tribute to the fine chairmanship of our colleague from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may have an additional minute by unanimous consent, I thank my colleague for his words of praise. They are very sweet.

In particular, I am grateful for his statement that I presided with tact, because I think this is not commonly regarded as one of the virtues which I possess. So these words, in particular, please me very much.

The Senator from New York made a magnificent contribution to the work of this committee, as he does in connection with everything with which he is associated.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the report be printed, with illustrations, together with minority, supplemental, and additional views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have examined the report of the Joint Economic Committee and I commend it to my colleagues and to the Presiding Officer and to the country. The great debate now under way with respect to the monetary policy has a meaning for every American citizen. Its outcome has a particular meaning, and will have a great influence on the cost of living. I feel the Joint Committee has performed a commendable function, has made a diligent study, and has rendered a competent report.

Although I do not find myself in full agreement with all aspects of the recommendation, I do commend it to the careful examination of every Member of this body. I wish to congratulate the members of the committee upon the service which they have performed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2906. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2907. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Borsa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2908. A bill to amend section 307 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for a study to be conducted of the advisability and practicability of the establishment of a Point Four Youth Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2909. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file

adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska", approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); and

S. 2910. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Jesse Lee Caudill of Palmer, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2911. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize additional loans for college housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 2912. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 with respect to the amount of loans permitted to be made in any State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2913. A bill authorizing bank protection and channel maintenance of the Sacramento River, Calif., in the interest of flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 2914. A bill to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 2915. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, home nursing service, and diagnostic outpatient hospital services for persons eligible for old-age, survivors and disability insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2916. A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 261) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the common defense; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, REPORT ON COLD WEATHER AGRICULTURE

Mr. GRUENING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 262); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report prepared by the Science and Technology Division of the Library of Congress on cold weather agriculture and that there be printed two thousand additional copies for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLUMBUS BEND PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project on the Colorado River in Texas.

The Columbus Bend project calls for the construction of the seventh dam in the system of the Lower Colorado River Authority which has harnessed floods of the Colorado and made them serve the people of Texas and the Nation.

I am proud of what we have done in Texas in recent years to conserve and develop the resources of our rivers. But I am particularly proud of what has been done on the Colorado River.

When I represented the 10th Congressional District of Texas in the House of Representatives, I worked hard to get Texas and the Federal Government working together on this lower Colorado project. And I am proud to say that today the six dams of the Lower Colorado River Authority and their related facilities represent a model for development of a basin's water resources.

The new dam authorized to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation under this bill would be a valuable addition to the Lower Colorado River Authority system. It will be located downstream from the existing dams, and in addition to controlling inflows below these dams, it will capture water which is released in the production of hydroelectric power upstream. It will provide 180,000 acre-feet of conservation storage and will yield even in the dryest years between 100,000 and 125,000 acre-feet of water for municipal and industrial use which would otherwise be wasted in the Gulf of Mexico.

The Columbus Bend project has been under study by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Lower Colorado River Authority for several years. I understand that a report on the project will made to Congress in a few weeks, but the study has progressed far enough to demonstrate clearly that this will be an extremely worthwhile project for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake.

I want to make clear that though Federal funds will be used in the construction of this dam, much of the cost of the preliminary investigation was paid for by the Lower Colorado River Authority, and all of the money which the Federal Government will expend in this project will be reimbursed by the LCRA, except the relatively small amount allocated to fish and wildlife benefits.

The report of the Bureau of Reclamation will show the Columbus Bend project to be an excellent investment for the Federal Government. And I know that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will give this project its favorable consideration at an early date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2906) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

POINT 4 YOUTH CORPS: AN OPPORTUNITY TO STIMULATE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a study of the advisability and practicability of establishing a Point 4 Youth Corps to train young men and women for service throughout the world in U.S. technical cooperation programs.

My bill is identical to a measure introduced January 14, 1960, by Representative HENRY REUSS of Wisconsin. I think Representative REUSS' idea is a good one. I am pleased to introduce a companion bill today.

Mr. President, this bill would have the President conduct the study through a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation within 1 year.

Objectives of the corps to be considered by the organization conducting the study would be: First, to make additional technical manpower available to carry out economic, medical, educational, and community development programs in underdeveloped friendly foreign countries; Second, to assist in broadening the understanding by the peoples of other nations of the ideals and aspirations of Americans; and third, to offer our young people an opportunity to serve their country in a stimulating way, while broadening their understanding of the problems facing other peoples and nations.

Points to be covered by such a study would include the type of projects which might be appropriate; the role of private organizations; whether service in the corps should be considered as satisfying military service obligations; conditions of employment; training and orientation; requirements for acceptance; administration of the corps; and coordination with existing technical cooperation programs.

Mr. President, Representative REUSS' suggestion represents both a challenge to youth and a possible aid to more effective foreign policy implementation.

Growth of underdeveloped nations is one of the most exciting stories of our time. In Asia and Africa and Latin America there are many important tasks which could utilize the minds and muscle of American young people.

And as Representative REUSS has pointed out—

> The peoples of the developing countries need economic assistance, but even more they can profit from exposure to the ideas of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Young Americans who are willing to help with an irrigation project, with digging a

village well, with setting up a rural school, could be one of our best ways for creating such a picture of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2908) to amend section 307 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for a study to be conducted of the advisability and practicability of the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF HOUSING ACT OF 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an additional $250 million in loans for construction of college and student nurse-intern housing. The program presently has exhausted for college housing virtually all but $5 million held as a minimum reserve fund, with approximately $144 million in applications pending. Under the bill, $25 million would be earmarked for nurse-intern housing, and another $25 million for related facilities, out of the total $250 million provided.

In addition, I am introducing a second bill, for myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]—and I am sure my colleague will wish to add a word to what I am saying at this time—to amend the Housing Act of 1950 to raise to 12½ percent the maximum amount of college housing loans permitted to be made in any one State, as compared with the present provision of a 10 percent limit on total loan funds available to institutions desiring to build new dormitory or related facilities. New York State, which educates approximately 12½ percent of all U.S. college and graduate students, and California, which has more than 10 percent of such students, have both reached that 10 percent limitation on construction loan funds; and in the case of New York, the backlog of unmet loan applications is more than $10 million for college and student nurses' housing.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation—both the bill introduced by me alone and the bill introduced by me and my colleague [Mr. KEATING]—represents the absolute minimum which is required to meet an emergency situation as the college dormitory and student nurse-intern federally aided housing construction program is facing termination despite the fact that college enrollment figures are soaring and the need for additional facilities is growing still more rapidly.

By 1970, U.S. college and university enrollment is expected to almost double—expanding from today's 3,500,000 students to between 6 million and 7 million 10 years from now. Today there are 850,000 students living in college and university housing facilities. By 1970, 114 percent more—an additional 960,000 students—will seek accommodations on U.S. campuses. If we are to minimize what in any event may result in the severe straining of existing facilities for living and study space, cafeterias and student unions, this Federal college housing loan program cannot be scrapped. It must not be terminated now in this critical era when American youth must equip itself to meet the demands of U.S. world leadership and the challenge of the space age. Only new loan funds made available promptly can help keep college doors wide and properly open in the years ahead.

Since the beginning of this program in 1950, $1,175 million has been authorized of which $1,158,000 has been approved, committed, or reserved. To date, with repayments that have come in, $27 million is left; $22 million of that has been reserved for new housing facilities for nurses and interns, and the remaining $5 million represent a contingency fund. From 1955 through 1958, applications were processed at the rate of $250 million annually.

The popularity of this Federal college housing loan program has been enormous, and its desirability has been recognized by the administration, which asks for its continuance as part of a new program to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am cosponsor of the enabling legislation, but at the same time, stopgap legislation is urgently required to meet the tremendous backlog of pending applications fast approaching $150 million.

At the same time, it is equally important that we scale the total amount of loan funds available to institutions in one State far more realistically than the present 10 percent limitation permits. Right now, New York colleges and universities educate one student out of every nine attending such institutions in the United States, although our State is eligible to receive only $1 out of every 10. Thus, this limitation does not take into account the heavier-than-average higher education load carried by New York institutions, nor does it allow for the fact that construction costs for the type of facilities provided under the program run 20 percent higher in my State, figuring out to $5,700 per student rather than the $4,700 average per student in the United States. To me, these are conclusive facts in support of the second bill introduced today to increase the 10 percent limit to 12½ percent, as is presently the case with authorizations under the Federal urban renewal program.

Among the outstanding New York educational institutions with applications pending for housing loans but for which there is no available money right now are Albany Law School and Albany Medical College, Ithaca College, Syracuse University, Cazenovia Junior College, Julliard School of Music, New York City, Keuka College, Montefiore Hospital of the Bronx, and Maimonides Hospital of Brooklyn. Others who have advised me about the value of this program and urged support for its continuance include: Rosary Hill College in Buffalo, the University of the State of New York, Long Island University, Brooklyn College, and Cornell University. These institutions and scores more in other parts of the country will benefit substantially if Congress moves swiftly to bolster through new authorization the all-important college housing and nurse-intern housing program.

Obviously, the allocation which is made now, of only 10 percent to each State, is inadequate to enable us to do the job which, in the highest national interest, must be done.

Mr. President, I introduce the two bills, for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that the bills may be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2911. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 to authorize additional loans for college housing, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended as follows.

(a) By striking out "$1,175,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,425,000,000";

(b) By striking out "$125,000,000" in the first proviso relating to other educational facilities and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000,000"; and

(c) By striking out "$50,000,000" in the second proviso relating to hospitals and inserting in lieu thereof "$75,000,000".

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 2912. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1950 with respect to the amount of loans permitted to be made in any State.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 403 of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "10" and inserting in lieu thereof "12½".

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to cosponsor the bill just introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to amend section 403 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, by providing that the existing limitation on the proportion of Federal college housing loan funds available to higher educational institutions within any one State be increased from 10 percent to 12.5 percent.

This proposal was prompted by the fact that current provisions of the Housing Act of 1950 prevent my own State of New York from receiving its fair share of Federal college housing grant-in-aid funds.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the overall difficulties experienced by my State as a consequence of its not getting a fair share of total Federal grant-in-aid funds. To illustrate the dilemma which New York faces, the taxpayers of New York State pay $2.95 in taxes to the Federal Government for every dollar received in aid from Uncle Sam. I am extremely interested in seeing positive and direct action taken to give my State a fairer break. The bill

which Senator JAVITS and I have introduced today constitutes a concrete step by which fairer treatment can be accorded to my State and other States which are similarly "shortchanged" by the Federal Government.

In the field of higher education, the most recent enrollment figures reported by the U.S. Office of Education show that fall 1959 degree-credit enrollment in New York institutions of higher education exceeds 10 percent of the total enrollment figure for the Continental United States. In other words, it is clear that under present law New York is not eligible to receive its equitable share of Federal college housing loan funds because of the legal limitation on the amount which may be borrowed for dormitories by higher educational institutions within any one State.

There are now more than 120 public and private institutions of higher education in my State. Mr. Charles A. Brind, counsel to the University of the State of New York, has recently informed me that "in the light of the need of New York State—which has over 100 colleges, plus 19 units of the State University—the amount of money allocated to New York State and available to these institutions, with the 10 percent limitation, is exceedingly low."

Mr. President, projections of future university growth in New York State make it absolutely clear that the existing 10 percent limitation is not reasonable. Tremendous growth is anticipated in college and university enrollments in New York State. A recent study—"Needs and Facilities in Higher Education in New York State," published by the University of the State of New York and the State department of education in 1957—indicates that undergraduate enrollments in 4-year colleges alone will increase from the 141,000 in 1955 to a predicted 297,000 in 1970. Moreover, estimates reported by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School show that New York is one of nine States which will experience a 50- to 75-percent increase in its college age population between 1958 and 1973.

Mr. President, the 10-percent limit was adopted in 1950. It is clear that the steady rise in the number of students in institutions of higher education in my State has outgrown this 10-year-old provision in the law. In this context, I urge that the Congress consider this proposed amendment favorably because it would insure an equitable share of loan funds to larger States, especially those such as New York State in which expanding institutions of higher education are confronted with tremendous problems in the way of providing adequate college housing.

INSURANCE OF OLDER CITIZENS AGAINST HOSPITAL AND NURSING COSTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance for our older citizens against the burdens imposed by hospital and nursing costs.

In recent years there has been a dramatic change in the age distribution and composition of our population. In 1900, influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and typhoid still took a high toll. Public sanitation was rare, nutrition was inadequate, and the medical science we know today was in its infancy. A baby girl born in the United States could expect to live 48 years. Today she can expect to live to the age of 73.

Today almost 10 percent of our population—16 million people—are over the age of 65. Forty percent of these are over 75—and the proportion of our population in these older age brackets continues to grow at an accelerated rate.

Only 3 million of these people are employed. And despite many efforts to modernize and improve our social security system—efforts we have reason to be proud of—the average social security benefit is still only $72 a month. If we include income from every source available, it reaches less than $20 a week for three out of every five of these citizens. Four out of five receive less than $40 per week.

No matter how they retrench—no matter how many comforts they had learned to expect which they do without—no matter how many expenses they reduce, it is obvious that the later years of too many of our older citizens will be attended by hardship. The hardship becomes despair when they are faced with illness and the necessity for meeting medical expenses. No matter how drastically their standard of living is cut back they still cannot reduce the demand for essential health care. Ironically, it is just when their income is lowest that their medical expenses become highest. They are most threatened by the costs of serious illness when their earning capacity is exhausted.

This is the time of life when they are most susceptible to chronic illness and long-term crippling and disabling diseases. In recent years, over 600,000 people age 65 or more died annually of arteriosclerosis, hypertension and related cardiovascular diseases. Each year over 135,000 people over 65 are the victims of cancer. Each year some 300,000 are totally disabled as a result of rheumatic diseases.

This is the time of life when the need for health care rises sharply. Even excluding those who are in institutions, people over 65 suffer twice as frequently from chronic sickness as those under 65—they spend 2½ times as many days restricted to their beds—they are forced to limit their activities due to illness six times as often. The magnitude of this problem and the gravity of its effect is indicated by the fact that although their average income is less than $1,000 per year, one out of six spends over $500 for medical care.

A person who has left the active labor force no longer has the benefit of wage increases which can help keep pace with the cost of living. But he still must feel the effect of these increases. Of all these costs, the one which has soared highest, the one which is most inflexible, and the one over which we have the least control is the cost of medical care. In the third quarter of 1959 the composite cost of living was 25 percent above the 1947–49 base period. Medical care, however, was up 52 percent. And hospital room rates were up 110 percent.

Mr. President, the treatment of its older citizens is said by anthropologists to be one of the most basic tests of how civilized a society or nation has become. The bill I offer should help us pass that test.

Although social security legislation, private pension plans, the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, and the recently enacted Federal housing program have all taken tentative steps toward honoring our obligations, we owe our older citizens much more. This bill would help them meet their most serious health needs.

Proposals to provide health benefits for our older citizens have been before us since 1942. We are particularly indebted to Representative AIME FORAND, who has long led the battle for such legislation. In 1958, and again last year, hearings were held in the other body upon the bill he introduced.

Two years ago I asked the staff of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to undertake a comprehensive study of the problems and needs of our older citizens. Last year a special subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, and on which I served as vice chairman, held hearings and will soon file a report dealing with these matters.

But there are obvious deficiencies in our provision for medical assistance to our older citizens that need not wait for a formal report. The hearings demonstrated—although no demonstration was needed—that we have too long ignored the grave medical problems of our older citizens. Studies and commissions and White House conferences will not alleviate this hardship or calm this distress.

The bill I introduce utilizes a mechanism already available. It will assure complete coverage. It permits us to take advantage of experience we have already acquired in providing benefits to our older citizens. It requires no appropriation from the General Treasury and it permits each beneficiary to maintain his self-respect. The program will be financed on the basis of sound insurance principles, under which the beneficiaries of the program pay for it themselves.

The bill does not impose an intolerable financial burden upon anyone and it does not intrude Government regulation upon the private relationship between doctor and patient.

In return for premiums in the form of slightly increased contribution rates under the Social Security Act the bill gives our older citizens the assurance that:

First. They may have up to 90 days of hospital care per year.

Second. In addition, or in place of hospital care, they will be entitled to the skilled services of a nurse, either in a nursing home or in their own home. The combined hospitalization, nursing home, and home nursing service could equal 120 days of combined care. However, 1½ days of nursing home service would count as only 1 day of "combined care" and two home nursing visits would count as only 1 day of "combined care." This should relieve the pressure upon our hospital facilities by offering an incentive for treatment at home.

Third. As outpatients, they will have available to them diagnostic services. Such necessary but expensive hospital services as X-rays, electrocardiograms, laboratory tests, and other diagnostic procedures will be available without the necessity for hospitalization. This, too, should help reduce the temptation to hospitalization.

Fourth. If disabled, they would also be covered.

The procedure for seeking these benefits is patterned after that followed under the many voluntary health insurance plans now in effect. An eligibile person would be admitted to the hospital or nursing home or receive home care or diagnostic benefits by direction of his physician. Payments would be made from the Social Security Trust Fund, and the program would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In effect, every member of the social security system would receive paid-up health insurance for life in return for a small increase in his contribution rates.

Few people deny the urgency of the need for this medical care. But there are some who prefer to rely upon voluntary health insurance policies. Unfortunately, voluntary health insurance has not and cannot do the job. Although our insurance companies have made a mighty effort, and have enrolled an impressive number of Americans, it is extremely unlikely that they can reach our older citizens. The difficulties which confront both the insurance companies and our older citizens have proved insurmountable. At one time the insurance companies feared that the cost of benefits to our older citizens would be prohibitive, and they both restricted the type of risk and set the premium at high levels. Since then substantial progress has been made. However, it remains a basic economic fact that no program for health insurance for the aged can be effective unless:

First. All persons at all age levels are enrolled so that the premiums can be paid during the long period of youthful good health.

Second. The benefits are sufficient to pay the entire cost of hospitalization and nursing services.

Third. There is some provision for diagnostic services to encourage preventive medicine.

No voluntary health insurance plan can accomplish these objectives.

The very competition between insurance companies tends to either exclude older people or limit their protection. If benefits are restricted the very purpose of the insurance is defeated.

There are those who suggest that we start by building up the rights of those who are still relatively young and abandon those who are already in the older categories. This heartless doctrine is offensive to both the basic premise of our social security system and our status as a great democratic country. The suggestion that each person should assume his own responsibility for his later years was answered poignantly by one witness during the hearings, who pointed out that "it is impossible for a wage earner to put away enough in a lifetime to pay for 6 months in a hospital."

I agree that we must maintain the highest standards of family responsibility and personal thrift. But I am concerned about the futility of imposing on any person or any family an unwarranted, unpredictable, and often unmanageable burden that could easily be borne by an insurance arrangement—insurance that is spread over the working lifetime of each individual.

Mr. President, the time is long past when there was any question about the need for this legislation. This bill addresses itself to a limited and modest objective. It is practical and the aged and disabled people of our Nation have a right to expect its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF KENNEDY BILL TO PROVIDE INSURANCE AGAINST COSTS OF HOSPITAL AND NURSING CARE

I. The bill contains findings of fact and a declaration of purpose: Congress finds that the present old-age and survivors insurance benefits are inadequate for our older citizens and that it is in the interest of the general welfare for financial burdens resulting from hospitalization and nursing services of our older citizens to be relieved through old-age and survivors insurance.

II. Eligibility for insurance: Any person is eligible for hospitalization and nursing insurance who is entitled to monthly benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, including those entitled to disability benefits.

III. Payments for hospital services are limited to the first 90 days of hospitalization in any 12-month period. Payments for nursing home or home nursing services are made if the individual is transferred to the nursing home or to his home from the hospital, or from the nursing home to his home, and if the services are for an illness or condition associated with that for which he received hospital services. The combined hospitalization, nursing home, and home nursing services cannot exceed 120 days. However, 1½ days of nursing home service would be counted as 1 day for this purpose, and two home nursing visits are counted as 1 day for this purpose.

IV. Hospital services are defined to include drugs and appliances furnished by the hospital, laboratory services, ambulance services, use of operating room, staff services, bed and board.

V. Nursing home services include nursing care, related medical and personal services, and bed and board in a home operated in connection with the hospital or in which nursing care and medical care are prescribed by or performed under the direction of persons licensed to practice medicine in the State.

VI. Home nursing service is defined to mean professional nursing care furnished by a community-sponsored nursing service, under the direction of a doctor, or practical nurses under the direction of a community-sponsored nursing agency.

VII. Diagnostic outpatient services mean hospital services furnished to an individual as an outpatient for a diagnosis of illness or injury.

VIII. Every person entitled to benefits under the act is given completely free choice of the hospital, nursing home, home nursing, or diagnostic outpatient hospital service he chooses.

IX. Agreements may be made between any hospital, nursing home or nursing agency and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for providing these services. The amount of payments under the agreement is determined on the basis of the reasonable cost incurred or, in the case of a nursing agency, the fee for all patients receiving like services. The agreement shall preclude the hospital, nursing home or nursing agency from requiring additional payments from individuals.

X. No supervision or control over details of the administration or operation, or over the selection, tenure or compensation of personnel shall be exercised by the Government.

XI. All information concerning an individual obtained from him by any physician, dentist, nurse, hospital, nursing home, or any other person, is confidential. Any violation of this provision is a misdemeanor punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

XII. Provision is made for not duplicating any of the benefits under this act and benefits received under workmen's compensation.

XIII. In administering this act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish a National Advisory Health Council consisting of the Commissioner of Social Security and eight others. Four of the eight shall be from fields pertaining to hospitals and health activities and the other four shall represent consumers. This Council shall advise the Secretary in the administration of the act.

XIV. In carrying out the act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of private nonprofit organizations which either represent qualified providers of hospital or nursing services or operate voluntary insurance plans.

XV. The Internal Revenue Code is amended to provide for an increase in the taxes of self-employed individuals of three-eighths of 1 percent, an increase in taxes upon employees of one-fourth of 1 percent, and an increase upon the taxes of employers of one-fourth of 1 percent of wages.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2915) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, home nursing service and diagnostic outpatient hospital services for persons eligible for old-age, survivors and disability insurance benefits and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is this the Forand bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. No. This bill deals with the problem of medical care for the aged. It is somewhat different from the Forand bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMEASUREMENT OF SMALL VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2916) to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
January 19, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes."

The bill is the result of a study conducted jointly by the Bureau of Customs and the U.S. Coast Guard. It would amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes and related laws so as to substitute for the present complicated and costly method of tonnage measurement a system which permits the assignment of tonnages from a table on the basis of overall length and breadth in the case of self-propelled vessels of under 500 gross tons and non-self-propelled vessels of less than 1,000 gross tons.

Enactment of the bill is essential to eliminate the highly artificial and detailed admeasurement of small vessels which encourages distortion of tonnage outturns to such an extent that in many cases, gross tonnage bears little relation to the concept of vessel size which that tonnage is intended to represent under the vessel safety laws. The legislation also will benefit small vessel owners by removing the present restrictions on vessel design and, for the first time, permit them to order a vessel built to the needs of a particular trade or service on the basis of a predetermined, nontechnical assignment of tonnage.

Of material benefit to the Customs Service is the anticipated annual savings of $175,000 now expended for admeasurement services for which the Government receives no reimbursement or equivalent tax return.

A memorandum is attached setting forth the details of the proposed bill and the conditions it is intended to correct.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on June 17, 1959, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduced a bill (S. 2201) to amend section 601 of title 33, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities." I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] be added as a cosponsor of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER CONCERNING 17TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A. (S. DOC. NO. 80)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's recent statement concerning the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A. which was held in New York City from December 10 to 13, 1959. Mr. Hoover's evaluation was submitted to the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws.

Of particular significance, I feel, is Mr. Hoover's finding—

that the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans. In one convention discussion, for example, it was stated that, as a result of Khrushchev's visit, the American people have open minds toward socialism.

Mr. Hoover told the subcommittee that "the 17th national convention is being hailed by the Communists themselves as a great milestone in the party's history in the United States." He said that, thanks to the new infusion of morale stemming from Mr. Khrushchev's visit, factional divisions had been eliminated and the party had been converted into a solidly unified force—a "hard-hitting mobile weapon against free American Government"—under the veteran Moscow Communist, Gus Hall.

Mr. President, I feel that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's statement deserves the widest possible readership, and particularly by American legislators and those responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statement be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 79)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on January 5, 1960, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, transmitted to the President of the Senate the third annual report of the Department on the status of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as required by section 6 of the authorizing act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105). I request unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying report be printed as a Senate document, together with my statement to the Senate today in connection with the Colorado River storage project status and program, especially with respect to the proposed power marketing area, the cost of power, and the planning for the backbone power transmission system with particular recognition of the interests of the power preference customers under the reclamation law and coordination of Colorado River and power operations.

I also request unanimous consent that a report to the Congress by the Comptroller General on his audit of the upper Colorado River basin water resources development program, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, fiscal years 1957–59, together with illustrations, be printed as an appendix to the third annual report of the Interior Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I desire to make a statement supplementing my request to have the third annual report of the Department of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project printed as a Senate document. These annual reports are required by the authorizing act. The first annual report was printed as Senate Document No. 77, 85th Congress. A supplement was printed as Senate Document No. 96. These reports dealt primarily with the hydrologic basis for financial and operating studies. The second annual report was printed as Senate Document No. 8, 86th Congress.

Before calling attention to salient features of the third annual report, which will become Senate Document No. 79, 86th Congress, 2d session, I present to the Senate a phase of a problem relating to the Colorado storage project, which is vital to the financial and economic phases of the development.

URGENCY OF SETTING UP POWER MARKETING AREA

This point relates to the urgency for the Secretary of the Interior to define the power marketing area for the Colorado River storage project. Preliminary discussions of backbone transmission line layouts have been held by the Bureau of Reclamation with the Upper Colorado Preference Customers Committee, representing electric cooperatives, REA's, municipalities and other nonprofit power users in New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Arizona.

Mr. Norton Davis, of my State of New Mexico, is a leader of this organization and has brought the subject to my attention.

Since the nonprofit power organizations will have preference in the purchase of power from the producing units of the project, it is imperative that they know Interior's ideas as to the marketing area, and the cost of power from the upper Colorado system, as well as coordination of river and power operations in the upper and lower basins.

The Bureau of Reclamation has submitted a preliminary outline of a back-

bone transmission line that would link the power-producing units of Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Curecanti and provide for interconnections with the Davis Dam-Parker-Davis Dam system in the lower Colorado area. Just how the system envisaged by Reclamation's preliminary outline would meet the needs of the preference customers over a period of 20 years or more will depend on the marketing area which we are urging the Secretary of the Interior to define without delay. Indications are the preference customers will be able to substantiate claims to all firm power to be produced at the upper Colorado project units.

The cost of the power at the bus bar and load centers, based on allocations of construction outlays attributable to this purpose, is, of course, a consideration of equal importance.

Following the presentation of Reclamation's preliminary outline the major privately owned utilities in the area submitted a comprehensive outline of a power transmission grid that would link their systems with the upper Colorado project powerplants. This grid would extend through the States of Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming and be linked with systems in Idaho and Montana. It also contemplates interconnection with the potential Four Corners coal-fired power development by the Arizona Public Service Co. and perhaps other utilities on the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico and Arizona.

The cost of power at the bus bars of the major producing plants of the Colorado River storage system—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Curecanti—is quite important. The transmission costs likewise are a vital consideration, not only to the Government but to the preference customers and the consumers.

Overall, the cost of power should cover returns adequate to amortize the Federal investment. When the costs are calculated, the net revenues over and above operating and maintenance costs, will provide funds as aid to irrigation in the development of the participating projects in the upper Colorado area.

I am writing the Secretary of the Interior urging that he expedite his decision fixing the marketing area of the upper Colorado River power system, as well as forecasts of the cost of power at the bus bar and delivered at load centers. The federally owned backbone transmission grid is authorized by the Upper Colorado River Project Act and was contemplated by the Congress when the measure was passed.

Full protection must be given requirements of preference power customers under the reclamation law. The financial aspects attendant on the Federal transmission grid as an additional revenue producer to aid irrigation in the Upper Basin is, of course, a vital consideration to those of us who have aided in sponsoring the development.

ANALYSIS OF THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

I request unanimous consent to include in my remarks an analysis of that part of the President's budget relating to the Colorado River storage project and of the third annual report of the Secretary of the Interior on the project, as required by law.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction on Glen Canyon Dam, the key structure of the Colorado River project, was halted on July 6, 1959, by a strike which continued until January 4, 1960, when an agreement permitted the recall of workers. The prime contractor for the dam construction was ahead of schedule when the strike was called, but the cessation of work absorbed all of the time leeway and more. It is the hope of the supporters of the project that the lost time may be made up so that Glen Canyon Dam, with its 900,000 kilowatt powerplant will be in operation on schedule. The program for filling Glen Canyon Reservoir is yet to be finally resolved without interfering with power production at Hoover and other downstream installations.

We urge the Secretary of the Interior to keep close tabs on the Glen Canyon construction and related schedules to insure completion of the installation as planned.

The report shows that the construction of Flaming Gorge Dam, in Utah, is behind schedule, but that work on Navajo Dam, in New Mexico, is slightly ahead of schedule.

Preliminary construction started on the Paonia participating project in Colorado, and a contract for the construction of Stanaker Dam, Vernal Unit, Utah, was awarded. Definite plan reports were completed on Seedskadee (Wyo.), and South Fork (Colo.) participating units. The report avoids any mention of the Hammond project, New Mexico, for which initial construction funds were appropriated for fiscal year 1960. The 1961 budget provides $1,280,000 for the Hammond project.

BUDGET PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the President's budget for fiscal year 1961 provides a total of $89,600,000—including an unobligated balance of $18 million—for the Colorado River storage project in fiscal year 1961, including two new starts—Curecanti, Colo., storage unit and Florida participating project. If approved by the Congress, this amount will bring the total appropriations for the project to $189,821,000, or about 25 percent of the authorized appropriations for construction of $760 million.

The new construction funds in the fiscal year 1961 budget, in addition to $1,280,000 for the Hammond project in New Mexico, included: $12 million for the Navajo Dam unit; $62,690,000 for Glen Canyon; $18,411,673 for Flaming Gorge; $536,287 for transmission line studies; $970,098 for advance planning of participating units; $2,287,000 for the Vernal unit, Utah; $1,017,956 for the Florida project, Colorado; $1,040,536 for the Paonia project, Colorado; $3,975,956 for Seedskade, Wyo.; $1,444,000 for Smith Fork project, Colorado; and $1,863,626 for Curecanti Dam, Colo., a new start.

Included in the allocation to Glen Canyon construction is $3,500,000 for work to protect Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

Those of us in the Senate who have supported the Colorado River storage project trust the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation will present justifications to the Appropriations Committees which will support the budget recommendations.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

I also asked unanimous consent that as an appendix to the third annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, there be printed a report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of his audit of the Upper Colorado River Basin water resources development program, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, fiscal years 1957–59. The Comptroller General's report presents many valuable observations and comments on the Upper Colorado River development and attendant problems that speak for themselves. The comments of the Federal Power Commission included in the Comptroller General's report are especially pertinent in the light of the river operations and related power phases of the Upper Colorado River development and its relation to the Lower Colorado River operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert Cutler, of Massachusetts, to be an Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs;

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Tyler Thompson, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iceland;

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Arab Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen;

Ward P. Allen, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the foreign and diplomatic service; and

Dennis A. Fitzgerald, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip McCallum to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., to be Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this nomination was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. After it was on the calendar, one Senator asked that it be held up until he could be present and until he could get certain information he desired. The Senator did not communicate with me, because I was not in town, but he has communicated with the staff, and has told them he has received the information he desired, and that it is agreeable to him to have the Gates nomination considered.

I know Mr. Gates, and have respect and regard for him, and wish him well in this new assignment, and so informed him prior to the consideration of the nomination by the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James H. Douglas to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I congratulate the President on the elevation of Mr. Douglas to the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense. He had a distinguished record as Secretary of the Air Force. I am delighted he has agreed to accept the increased responsibility of Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to say, with respect to all these nominations, I hold the nominees in high esteem. I concur in the estimate of the majority leader as to their talent, capacity, and dedication to public service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dudley C. Sharp to be Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some representations were made concerning Mr. Sharp's nomination, which we carefully considered. Some questions were raised. The Armed Services Committee gave careful thought to the qualifications of Mr. Sharp, and reported the nomination favorably, and I am pleased the Senate is about to act on his nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry appointments in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for appointments in the Army be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that those nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of line officers in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Post Office Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President I make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph V. Charyk to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read nominations in the Army and the Air Force placed on the Vice President's desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GIFT TO SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY BY MR. SAMUEL I. NEWHOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a very extraordinary example of public-spirited action on the part of a private citizen in the State of New York. I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues in connection with the need for Federal loans to help higher education meet the challenges of our times. I believe it is most pertinent to point out that we in New York State are proud to have great, public-spirited private citizens who are also contributing mightily to this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two articles from the New York Times of today, describing the magnificent gift made to Syracuse University by Mr. Samuel I. Newhouse, a leading American newspaper publisher and the owner of radio and TV stations, who himself was the son of a Russian immigrant family.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYRACUSE U. GETS JOURNALISM FUND—S. I. NEWHOUSE CONTRIBUTES $2 MILLION TO BUILD CENTER OF COMMUNICATIONS ARTS

Syracuse University disclosed plans yesterday to establish what it described as the world's largest center for the study of journalism, television and other media of mass communication.

The education and research center will be founded with an initial gift of $2 million from Samuel I. Newhouse, the publisher, and his wife. It will be on an 8-acre communications quadrangle adjoining Syracuse's main campus.

"Whatever funds are necessary to complete the center will be provided," Mr. Newhouse said in a statement at his home, 730 Park Avenue.

Mr. Newhouse, who is 64 years old, the owner of 14 newspapers, Condé Nast Publications, and a number of television and radio stations, said he hoped to see the center, which will bear his name, completed within his lifetime.

In any event, Mr. Newhouse added, the center will be the first project of a philanthropic foundation that he and Mrs. Newhouse established in 1935. "Upon my death, the foundation will receive 90 percent of my estate, well in excess of $100 million," Mr. Newhouse said.

SCHOOL TO BE EXPANDED

Half of the center's initial endowment will be used for the construction and operation of the first unit for a school of journalism building and associated activities. This will represent an expansion of the university's 25-year-old school of journalism, which is headed by Dean Wesley Clark.

The other half will be used to finance instructional programs and provide fellowships for graduate work, research in mass media and opportunities for midcareer study by practicing professionals.

Dr. William P. Tolley, the university's chancellor, said:

"While the first unit will provide facilities for the school of journalism, other buildings will be added subsequently for educational television and the whole complex of communications programs in radio-television, audio-visual education, speech, reading, information services, communications research and scholarly publishing.

"The combination of these facilities and the availability of funds for their operation will permit the center to achieve an interdisciplinary and coordinated approach to education and research in the several mass media of far-reaching potential importance.

NEW APPROACH SEEN

"By encouraging the closest relations with the social sciences and humanities and strongly emphasizing graduate work and specialized services for the industry, we hope to develop educational programs in mass media which are fundamental, philosophic and public policy oriented than the current education efforts in these fields."

The chancellor added: "We see in the Newhouse Communications Center a new approach to the study of mass media. The aim is to achieve more distinguished and more responsible academic programs in the communications field."

Frank P. Piskor, the university's academic vice president, will direct a year-long study of curriculum reorganization, staffing and the physical planning required for the expanded center.

The completion of plans and the actual construction of the journalism building is expected to take 2 years.

PUBLISHER WITH A CURE

The restless 5-foot, 3-inch son of Russian immigrant parents, Samuel I. Newhouse has amassed more than $150 million as a doctor of an uncommon sort.

For 38 years, Mr. Newhouse, who donated $2 million this week to Syracuse University, has specialized in buying financially sick newspapers and curing them, sometimes merging them. His medicine works, judging by his ownership of 14 newspapers, composing the third largest newspaper group in the country, and an assortment of magazines, television, and radio stations.

At the age of 64, looking youthful despite chronic insomnia, still bustling on a stopwatch schedule, Mr. Newhouse continues to shop for newspapers.

"I'm having too much fun to quit," he says.

The Newhouse formula for putting a newspaper ledger in the black consists of chopping costs hard and perking up advertising, circulation and mechanical operations while leaving editorial matters to local management.

PAPERS OPPOSED

In Syracuse, two of the Newhouse newspapers—the Herald-Journal, which has backed the Democratic Party, and the Post-Standard, of Republican sympathies—have attacked each other editorially. Mr. Newhouse is a registered Democrat.

In conversation, Mr. Newhouse displays a gentle manner. But in business, "S.I." (he says the I. is just an initial) can be tough. He has not backed off from long, costly labor strife when he has felt that a union was blocking the most efficient operation of one of his newspapers.

Born in New York City, eldest of eight children, Mr. Newhouse went to work at the age of 12 for a lawyer, Herman Lazarus, who sent the youngster on his career 4 years later with the order: "Sammy, go and look after the paper."

A self-styled "brash kid," the young Newhouse took over the ailing Bayonne Times, of which Mr. Lazarus was majority stockholder, and soon turned it into a profitable venture.

He studied in high school, passed his bar examination and, at the age of 26, bought his first newspaper, the Staten Island Advance, for $98,000. Thirty-three years later, he purchased the Birmingham News and its radio and television stations for $18,642,000.

In addition to his Syracuse newspapers, Mr. Newhouse also owns the Jersey Journal, the Newark Star-Ledger, the Long Island Press, the Long Island Star-Journal, the Harrisburg Patriot, and the News in Pennsylvania, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Portland Oregonian, and the Huntsville Times in Alabama. Of his 14 newspapers, 12 were losing money when Mr. Newhouse bought them.

With his newspaper properties flourishing, Mr. Newhouse inquired about a year ago if the Curtis Publishing Co., the leader in the magazine field, was for sale. The answer was no, but Mr. Newhouse did not give up his intention to expand into magazine publishing.

OFFICE ON THE RUN

Mr. Newhouse and his wife, Mitzi, live in a 12-room Park Avenue duplex, but it is hard to say just where Mr. Newhouse's office is. Indefatigably on the move by train and air and in his telephone-equipped black Cadillac, Mr. Newhouse works mainly out of an old, battered briefcase.

He has something of an office at the Newark Star-Ledger, where he shares a pool secretary. Reputed to have an encyclopedic knowledge of the newspaper field, Mr. Newhouse is well known for quick telephoned decisions.

Mr. Newhouse says he has drawn up a will that will keep his newspaper empire intact after his death.

"I don't want any outside interest, such as some banker, dictating how the papers should be run," he declares.

SONS TO KEEP CONTROL

The newspapers will be bequeathed to a philanthropic foundation free of inheritance tax. Mr. Newhouse's two sons, Samuel I., Jr., 32 years old, who is in charge of the Newark Star-Ledger, and Donald Edward, 30, who heads the Jersey Journal, will retain control through the possession of the only voting stock. Mr. Newhouse said this stock would consist of only about 10 shares, and his sons will have to depend on their salaries for their income.

"They will have jobs; if they don't do their jobs well, they will be out of luck," he said.

Mr. Newhouse said he had earmarked 10 percent of his estate for his wife, whom he described as "my heavyweight." (She is 5 feet tall and weighs 74 pounds.) When Mrs. Newhouse married the publisher in 1924, she gave up her school studies in fashion designing. Last year, she was back in the fashion world. Her husband bought Condé Nast Publications, publisher of Vogue, Glamour, and other magazines, and then rounded out these new interests by acquiring Street & Smith Publications. Mrs. Newhouse is on the board of directors of Condé Nast.

Mr. Newhouse, who relaxes at the theater and opera, is off this week on another of his diversions. He will fly to Europe on a holiday and will join Mrs. Newhouse, who is viewing the Paris fashion collections with the Condé Nast editors.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this kind of benefaction is something which our country uniquely enjoys. The gift of $2 million, plus additional funds as they may be needed, will be used to found the world's largest center for the study of journalism, television, and other forms of mass communication.

Mr. Newhouse, who I have the honor to say is a personal friend of mine, is thus donating the fruits of his labor in this field to the future education of young people wishing to enter the field of journalism, thereby assuring a higher quality of production of this essential element of American freedom, which forms a vital segment of every citizen's life.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that 90 percent of Mr. Newhouse's estate, according to this morning's announcement—his estate being a large one—will go to a foundation established by him, and the first project of this foundation will be the further support of the School of Journalism at Syracuse University.

Mr. Newhouse is thus acting in the finest American tradition of private philanthropy, which is now supporting higher education at the rate of more than $400 million a year, of which American corporations contribute more than one-third.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that this amount of money barely begins to scratch the surface of the potential of the tax deductible sums of money which could be devoted to education, and I hope that corporations will take a lesson from Sam Newhouse and will themselves be more munificent, as they should be, in their support of higher education.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MacARTHUR ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we observe the 80th birthday anniversary of one of the great soldier-citizens in our country's history, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In recognition of his 80th anniversary—which in General MacArthur indicates not age, but ever greater virility, strength, and courage—we, as a people, extend heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for many more years of health and service to his country, to which he has devoted his life.

In the annals of history, the outstanding deeds and services of Douglas MacArthur will be emblazoned also by the kind of indomitable spirit of leadership and commandership which have characterized the service of the great general.

We in Wisconsin are particularly proud to consider Douglas MacArthur a native son, among the many greats who have come from our Badger State.

As commander in chief of the Far East Command and supreme commander of the Allied Powers during World War II, General MacArthur and the forces under him, through their brilliant military operations, wrote inspiring chapters in the history of freedom and the liberation of people.

In civilian life, too, Douglas MacArthur has maintained his traditional, strong, independent mode of thinking and judgment that so characterized his military career.

Throughout his lifetime, General MacArthur has succeeded to many posts of high command, borne responsibilities that would have depressed the shoulders of lesser men, and received a great many honors, recognitions, distinctions, and awards for his outstanding services.

Of even greater value, however, is the undying gratitude in the hearts of people around the globe for the services of this great general in war and in peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have a brief résumé of the military career and accomplishments of General MacArthur, prepared by the Department of Defense, printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Douglas MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., January 26, 1880. He entered the U.S. Military Academy on June 13, 1899; graduated at the head of his class on June 11, 1903; and was commissioned a second lieutenant of engineers.

Shortly after he was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy, he sailed for the Philippine Islands. Here he engaged in engineering duties, including construction work at Guimaras Island until October 1904. Upon his return to the United States, he served at San Francisco with the California Debris Commission and as Assistant and Acting Chief Engineering Officer, Pacific Division, until October 1905. He was then ordered to Tokyo where he served as aide to his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, until September 15, 1906. While on this detail he was given a confidential mission which took him to many countries throughout Asia.

Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to duty with the 2d Battalion of Engineers at Washington Barracks, D.C., and, in addition served as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt until August 1907. In February 1908, he was graduated from the Engineer School of Application. He then served as assistant engineer at Milwaukee, Wis. In April 1908, he joined Company K, 3d Battalion of Engineers at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Here he served as company officer and also as an instructor in the Mounted Service School and the Army Service School. His 4-year tour at Fort Leavenworth was interrupted by periods of service at San Antonio, Tex., and in the Panama Canal Zone.

He was assigned to duty in the Office of the Chief of Engineers from 1912 until April 1913; as Superintendent of State, War and Navy Building, until November 1913; and as a member of the General Staff Corps until September 1917. From April until September 1914, he accompanied our expedition to Vera Cruz as a member of the general staff.

He conceived the idea of the Rainbow (42d) Division and as Chief of Staff helped direct its organization and training. He arrived with this division in France, October 1917, and served with it until August 1918, in the Vancouleure, La Franche, and Rolamont Training Areas; in the Luneville, Baccaret, Esperance-Souain Sectors; in the Champagne-Marne defensive; and in the Aisne-Marne Offensive. He commanded the 84th Infantry Brigade in the St. Mihiel, Essey and Pannes, Woevre, Meuse-Argonne, and Sedan Offensives. He then commanded the 42d Division until November 1918 and served in the Army of Occupation in Germany until 1919.

Upon his return to the United States, he served in the Office of the Chief of Staff, Washington, D.C., until June 1919. He was Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy to June 1922, during which time he modernized the courses in military training.

From West Point he was sent to the Philippine Islands where he served at Headquarters Philippine Department until November 1922, in command of the District of Manila until June 1923, and in command of the 23d Infantry Brigade at Fort William McKinley to January 1925. Returning to the United States, he commanded the Fourth Corps Area, Atlanta, Ga., to July 1925; and the Third Corps Area, Baltimore, Md., to September 1928. He was selected President of the 1928 American Olympic team which he took to Amsterdam, Holland.

In 1928, he returned to the Philippines where he served 2 years as department commander. Upon his arrival in the United States in September 1930, he commanded the Ninth Corps Area, San Francisco, to October 1930, when he became Chief of Staff of the Army. Funds for national defense were at a low ebb. He first saved the skeleton Army from the economy wave, then modernized it. He set up the four Army and Corps Area organizations, and the GHQ Air Force. The basic blueprints of manpower procurement and industrial mobilization were developed under his direction.

Upon completion of his duty as Chief of Staff in October 1935, he was appointed Military Advisor to the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines. He inaugurated a long-range military training program financed by the Philippine Government. His 10-year plan was based upon universal military service.

As conditions in the Orient became critical, on July 26, 1941, he was designated Commanding General, U.S. Army Forces in the Far East. His command included the Philippine Department and the forces of the Commonwealth government which were inducted into the U.S. Army. When he took over this command the Philippine Department consisted of 18,000 American and Philippine Scout troops. There were ample Filipino reservists but their period of training had not been completed.

The stubborn defense of the Philippine-American forces on Bataan threw Japanese conquest plans out of gear and gained valuable time for the defense of Australia.

In March 1942, President Roosevelt ordered General MacArthur from Corregidor to Australia for the purpose of organizing and leading rescue forces back for the liberation of the Philippines. On April 18, 1942, he was made supreme commander of the Southwest Pacific area and a meager force of Australians and Americans.

With insufficient forces to justify aggressive action, he decided to defend Australia, first by blocking the Japanese advance in New Guinea and then by assuming the offensive. In heavy fighting the enemy was stopped at Gona in December 1942.

The next year General MacArthur assumed the offensive and pierced the strong enemy outer perimeter, between Wewak and Rabaul, by securing the Vitiaz Straits.

Seizure of the Admiralty Islands by a coup de main, February 29, 1944, marked the end of a great swinging move pivoting on New Guinea which had been the basic purpose of operations initiated June 29, 1943, when the Southwest Pacific and South Pacific areas were united under General MacArthur's command. Possession of the Admiralties relieved his supply line from the

threat of flank attack from the east and enabled him to change the axis of his advance from north to west. In the Solomons and Bismarcks a strong enemy had been isolated and bypassed.

The way was now open for a shore-to-shore advance to the northwest along the land mass of New Guinea. On April 22, Hollandia, 500 miles west of the Vitiaz Straits, was occupied. The enemy was completely surprised; our losses negligible. The operation threw a loop of envelopment around the enemy's 18th Army which was dispersed along the New Guinea coast east of Hollandia. Throughout the campaign the enemy had lost 110,000 men and the remainder of his original strength of a quarter of a million was bypassed and became strategically unimportant. By the last of July 1944, General MacArthur had occupied key positions along the entire New Guinea coast with campaigns at Wadke, Sarmi, Biak, Noemfoor, Opmarai and Sansapor.

Occupation of Morotai, 300 miles south of the Philippines, on September 15, penetrated the Halmahera-Philippine line and imperiled enemy conquests in the East Indies by the threat of envelopment and air attack.

General MacArthur's landing on Leyte on October 20, pierced the center of the enemy's strategic defensive line which extended from Japan through Formosa, the Philippines, the East Indies, Singapore and Burma. Both enemy flanks thus created were vulnerable to envelopment to the north and to the south. The so-called Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere was cut in two and the conquered empire to the south occupied by half a million troops, was severed from Japan proper. Fully realizing the importance of Leyte, the enemy reinforced to the limit of his ability and with his air, land, and sea forces made suicide attempts to dislodge General MacArthur from the island. This supreme effort of the enemy failed. His fleet and air arm suffered major defeat and his land forces were annihilated.

On December 15, sites for air bases and naval facilities were occupied on Mindoro which would support Luzon operations and insure domination of enemy sea and air routes in the South China Sea. From Leyte a corridor had been driven from east to west which cut the Philippine-Archipelago in two.

Luzon was invaded on January 9, 1945. The enemy expected a landing, south of Manila. Consequently the Lingayen Gulf landing north of Manila was practically unopposed. This placed American troops in rear of the enemy's main forces, cut his reinforcement and supply lines, and closed his avenue of escape.

By February a great converging movement on Manila was under way. The XI Corps which landed unopposed was driving east from Zambales Coast. The 11th Airborne Division of the 8th Army, which landed without losses on the west coast of Batanges February 1, was moving rapidly north toward Manila. The 6th Army had occupied the entire Central Plain of Luzon and its 37th Infantry and 1st Cavalry Divisions were fighting their way into the outskirts of north Manila.

On February 3, 1945, in a wide envelopment from the east, elements of the 1st Cavalry Division entered Manila, seized Santo Tomas and Bilibid Prison and liberated thousands of internees and prisoners of war. After desperate fighting, Manila was finally liberated on February 23.

By the end of February, Corregidor and Bataan had been occupied.

In March, a vigorous campaign was launched in the Visayans. Palawan, Zamboanga, Panay, Cebu, and Negros were occupied in quick succession. Seizure of the Sulu Archipelago in early April made Tawi Tawi available as a great strategic airbase from which the enemy empire lifeline to the south was within easy air range. By the 21st of April, General MacArthur's control of the entire Visayan group was complete. On the 19th of April, from a surprise landing at Malabang and Parang in western Mindanao, 8th Army units fought their way eastward in a 2-week overland march which brought them to the outskirts of Davao.

In a collateral drive on Borneo, supported by Allied naval and air units, Australian forces occupied Tarakan May 3, Brunei Bay June 10, and Balikpapan July 1. Possession of these objectives made available sources of oil and other needed war materials and completed General MacArthur's tactical control of the entire Southwest Pacific area.

On the 5th of July, General MacArthur declared his Philippine campaign closed. It had been a campaign characterized by great economy in the lives of his men and heavy destruction of the enemy. Twenty-three enemy divisions, or equivalents, had been annihilated, and more than 400,000 Japanese had been killed. Of the Philippine campaign, General MacArthur announced:

Working in complete unison the three services inflicted the greatest disaster ever sustained by Japanese arms.

The objects of the campaign were as follows:

1. To penetrate and pierce the enemy's center so as to divide him into north and south, his homeland to the north, his captured Pacific possession to the south. Each half could then be enveloped and attacked in turn.

2. The acquisition of a great land, sea, and air base for future operations both to the north and to the south comparable to the British Islands in its use as a base for Allied operations from the west against Germany.

3. The establishment of a great strangulating air and sea blockade between Japan and the conquered possessions in the Pacific to the south so as to prevent raw materials being sent to the north and supply or reinforcement to the south.

4. The liberation of the Philippines with the consequent collapse of the enemy's imperial concept of a greater east Asia coprosperity sphere and the reintroduction of democracy in the Far East.

5. The liberation of our captured officers and men and of internees held in the Philippines.

6. A crippling blow to the Japanese Army, Navy, and Air Force.

All of these purposes were accomplished.

On April 6, 1945, General MacArthur was named Commanding General, U.S. Army Forces in the Pacific. Three months later his Okinawa-based Air Force had launched air strikes against Japan itself. On August 14, 1945, President Truman announced the appointment of General MacArthur as Supreme Allied Commander to receive the Japanese surrender and command the occupation forces in addition to his duties as commander of the U.S. Army Forces in the Pacific. In January 1947, he was designated Commander in Chief of the Far East Command, retaining his position as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan.

On July 25, 1950, a month after the North Korean Communists had invaded South Korea, General MacArthur assumed command of the United Nations Command in the Far East, organized to direct United Nations Forces in the defense of South Korea.

General MacArthur was relieved as commander of the United Nations Command in the Far East, Commander in Chief of the Far East Command, and Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in Japan by President Truman on April 11, 1951. He then returned to the United States, arriving in San Francisco April 17.

DECORATIONS

Thanks of the House of Representatives, the Senate, the Philippine National Assembly, the Philippine Congress, and the Australian Government have been expressed to General MacArthur for his part in liberating the Philippine Islands during World War II.

He has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Service Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, Silver Star with six Oak Leaf Clusters, the Purple Heart with one Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Distinguished Flying Cross.

His foreign decorations include the Philippine Medal of Valor, Distinguished Service Star, Defense Medal, and Liberation Medal; British Knight Grand Cross of the Bath; French Grand Officer, Legion of Honor Fourragere, and Croix de Guerre with four Palms; Belgian Commander Order of Crown; Netherlands Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords (Military Division); Italian War Cross and Grand Corden Order of the Crown; Polish Grand Croix Polonia Restituta and Virtutae Militaire; Hungarian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Czechoslovakian Grand Cross Order of White Lion; Yugoslavian Grand Cross Order of Military Merit; Mexican Grand Cross of Military Merit; Ecuadorian First Class Decoration Abdon Calderon, and Greek Medal of Valor.

Following are the citations for his American military awards:

Medal of Honor: "For conspicuous leadership in preparing the Philippine Islands to resist conquest, for gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action against invading Japanese forces, and for the heroic conduct of defensive and offensive operations on the Bataan Peninsula. He mobilized, trained, and led an army which has received world acclaim for its gallant defense against a tremendous superiority of enemy forces in men and arms. His utter disregard of personal danger under heavy fire and aerial bombardment, his calm judgment in each crisis, inspired his troops, galvanized the spirit of resistance of the Filipino people, and confirmed the faith of the American people in their Armed Forces."

Distinguished Service Cross: "For heroism in the Salient du Feys, France, March 9, 1918. When Company D, 168th Infantry, was under severe attack in the Salient du Feys, he voluntarily joined it, upon finding that he could do so without interfering with his normal duties, and by his coolness and conspicuous courage aided materially in its success."

Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross: "As Brigade Commander, General MacArthur personally led his men and by the skillful maneuvering of his brigade made possible the capture of Hills 288, 242, and the Cote de Chatilon, October 14, 15, and 16, 1918. He displayed indomitable resolution and great courage in rallying broken lines and in reforming attacks thereby making victory possible. On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature."

Distinguished Service Medal: "He served with credit as Chief of Staff of the 24th Division in the operations at Chalons and at the Chateau Thierry Salient. In command of the 84th Infantry Brigade he showed himself to be a brilliant commander of skill and judgment. Later he served with distinction as commanding general of the 42d Division."

First Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "As Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States since November 21, 1930, he has performed his many important and exacting duties with signal success. He devised and developed the four-army organization of our land forces; he conceived and established the General Headquarters Air Force, thus immeasurably increasing the effectiveness of our air defenses; he initiated a comprehensive program of modernization

in the Army's tactics, equipment, training, and organization. In addition, the professional counsel and assistance he has continuously rendered to the President, to the Secretary of War, and to the Congress have been distinguished by such logic, vision, and accuracy as to contribute markedly to the formulation of sound defense policies and the enactment of progressive laws for promoting the Nation's security."

Second Oak Leaf Cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "For exceptionally distinguished service as Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in the Southwest Pacific since March 1942. Under extremely difficult conditions of terrain, climate, and limited forces and material, he expelled the enemy from eastern New Guinea, secured lodgments on the Island of New Britain, gave strategical direction to coordinated operations resulting in the conquest of the New Georgia group and the establishment of the U.S. Army and Navy Forces on Bougainville Island. He had inflicted heavy losses on the enemy and established his forces in positions highly favorable for the construction of offensive operations."

Third oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "As Supreme Commander of Allied Air, Ground, and Sea Forces in the southwest Pacific, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur planned and personally directed the campaigns which resulted in the liberations of the Philippine Islands. Strongly entrenched and superior enemy forces were overwhelmed and completely destroyed in a series of decisive operations exploiting U.S. air and sea superiority, coupled with the resolute and courageous fighting of the ground forces. The immediate result of the campaign was control of the China Sea, the isolation of Japanese forces in Burma, Malaya, and Indochina and the termination of coastwise traffic supporting the Japanese armies in central and south China.

"The liberation of the Philippines began with the landings on Leyte on October 20 in which complete strategical surprise was achieved. After bitter fighting under most difficult conditions of weather and terrain, General MacArthur destroyed the Japanese forces which included the noted 1st Division of the Kwantung army. Again surprising the enemy, General MacArthur moved his forces boldly up the western coast of the main Philippine Island and effected a landing on the shores of Lingayen Gulf on January 9, 1945. The flawless execution of this hazardous amphibious approach and landing so disorganized the enemy that in a series of deep thrusts Manila was liberated on February 25. The fortress of Corregidor fell soon afterward in a brilliantly conceived and directed combined land, sea, and air operation. By the end of June only isolated groups of the enemy remained on Luzon.

"While the U.S. 6th Army was so engaged, Eighth Army units cleared the enemy from the southern islands in a series of amphibious operations. By July 4 organized resistance had terminated, completing the liberation of the Philippine Islands and the 17 million inhabitants from Japanese domination. More than 300,000 dead and 7,000 prisoners were lost by the enemy, our casualties in killed, wounded, and missing totaling 60,628. Seventeen of our divisions had opposed and defeated 23 enemy divisions. The Air, Ground, and Naval Forces worked in complete unison to inflict this crushing disaster on the Japanese Army."

For his services in Korea, General MacArthur was awarded the fourth oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal and the Distinguished Flying Cross. The citations follow:

Fourth oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal: "For distinguished service to the peoples of the United States and the Republic of Korea, and to the peoples of all free nations. Having been designated as the first field commander of United Nations armed forces, and directed, in the common interest, to repel an armed attack upon the Republic of Korea and to restore international peace and security in the area, he has given these forces conspicuously brilliant and courageous leadership and discerning judgment of the highest order. Having been compelled to commit his troops to combat under extremely adverse conditions and against heavy odds in order to gain the time so imperatively needed for the buildup of his forces for the counteroffensive, he has so inspired his command by his vision, his judgment, his indomitable will and his unshakable faith, that it has set a shining example of gallantry and tenacity in defense and of audacity in attack matched by but few operations in military history."

Distinguished Flying Cross: "For outstanding heroism and extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flights during the period June 29 to October 20, 1950. On June 29, General MacArthur made a flight to Suwom, Korea, during which his aircraft was subject to effective interception by hostile air action. Another friendly aircraft in the area was attacked and destroyed by enemy air immediately prior to General MacArthur's landing, and the Suwom airstrip itself was bombed and strafed during the course of his visit. On July 27 he made a flight to Taegu, Korea, during which his aircraft was again subject to hostile air interception and at which time the ground situation in the immediate area was most precarious. On September 29, General MacArthur made a flight to Kimpo, Korea, again under conditions presenting the threat of hostile air interception and while the Kimpo Airport itself was subject to hostile ground fire. On October 20, he made a flight to the Sukohon-Sunchon area of Korea in order to observe and supervise the paradrop of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team. During this entire operation his aircraft was subject to attack by enemy aircraft known to be based at Sinuiju."

The following degrees have been conferred upon General MacArthur:

Doctor of science: Norwich University; Pennsylvania Military College, 1928.

Doctor of laws: University of Maryland, 1923; Western Maryland College, 1929; University of Pittsburgh, 1932; University of Philippines, 1938; University of Wisconsin, 1942; and University of Queensland, Australia, 1945.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to the grade of first lieutenant on April 23 1904; to captain on February 27, 1911; to major on December 11, 1915; to colonel of infantry, National Army, on August 5, 1917; to brigadier general, National Army, on June 26, 1918; to brigadier general, Regular Army, on January 20, 1920; to major general on January 17, 1925. He was appointed Chief of Staff, with the rank of general on November 21, 1930. On October 1, 1935, after serving nearly 5 years as Chief of Staff, he reverted to his permanent rank of major general. In 1936, President Quezon appointed him Field Marshal, Philippine Army. He retired from the U.S. Army with the rank of general on December 31, 1937, but was recalled to active duty as a major general on July 26, 1941, and was promoted to lieutenant general (temporary) on July 27, 1941. He was promoted to the grade of general (temporary) on December 18, 1941, and to General of the Army on December 18, 1944.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, today is the 80th birthday anniversary of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. I am happy to join with his friends throughout the Nation in extending to him congratulations upon reaching this milestone in life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "MacArthur at 80," which was published yesterday in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR AT 80

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur had his harsh critics as well as his vociferous supporters during his brilliant military career. But on one point, there was never any question.

"On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature," read the citation as then Brigadier General MacArthur received the oak leaf cluster to his Distinguished Service Cross in World War I.

Deeds of courage—moral as well as physical—will no doubt be much in the conversation Tuesday as the self-styled "old soldier" sits down with former comrades in arms at his 80th birthday observance. At 80, this ranking officer of all branches of U.S. military services looks back on a career the memory of which simply does not allow him to fade away.

MacArthur graduated from West Point in 1903 with the highest scholastic average achieved there in a quarter of a century. For 2 years he was military aide to President Theodore Roosevelt. Then came World War I, in which he was wounded and gassed, but in which he was successively, the youngest brigadier general of his time, the youngest major general, the youngest division commander.

After the war, he became the youngest superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy, and, at 50, the youngest officer ever appointed Army Chief of Staff.

Possibly the most decorated officer in U.S. history, he holds the Congressional Medal of Honor (for Bataan), three Distinguished Service Crosses, and seven silver stars, in addition to many other decorations, domestic and foreign.

MacArthur was recalled from the retired list in July 1941, 5 months before Pearl Harbor, and made commander of all the Armed Forces of the Far East. There followed Corregidor, the escape by submarine from Bataan, eventually the long island-hopping campaign back to the Philippines as Supreme Commander in the Pacific.

After receiving the Japanese surrender, he served as virtually an American proconsul in Japan. He was Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in the Pacific and later commander in chief of United Nations Forces in the Korean fighting until relieved of his command by President Truman on April 11, 1951.

History still hasn't pronounced its final verdict on that hotly-debated controversy between MacArthur and Truman on the conduct of the Korean war. Without question, the general was insubordinate; without question, the supremacy of civilian control of policy matters had to be established. But whether or not MacArthur's appeal for vigorous action to end the fighting would have involved us, as Joint Chief of Staff Bradley said, "in the wrong war, at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy," still is not really known. Russia's mushrooming military strength since that time makes one wonder if perhaps MacArthur wasn't right.

Right or not in that instance, he was an officer of brilliance and dedication, whose name still evokes memories of heroic, if grim, days. We wish him well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to take note of the birthday today of one of our Nation's great soldiers, General of the Army Douglas A. MacArthur. General MacArthur's more than 50 years of dedicated military service have earned for him the gratitude of all the American people.

To many of us he symbolizes the finest qualities of military ability and devotion to country. His patriotsm is of the kind we like to hold up to our children as something to be emulated.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur has richly earned his place in American history and the history of the world. He has equally earned an eternal place in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of those people all over the world who benefited from his military skill.

May he enjoy many more years of fruitful and rewarding work, secure in the knowledge that a grateful Nation has recognized and applauded his great services to it.

NOMINATION OF HON. JAMES R. DURFEE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, subcommittee hearings have been concluded in relation to the nomination of Hon. James R. Durfee to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Yesterday the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] submitted for the RECORD the statement which he made at the hearing. I have been requested to introduce into the RECORD the statement by Hon. James R. Durfee, as he gave it this morning before the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES R. DURFEE TO SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, JANUARY 26, 1960

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to Senator PROXMIRE's statement with interest. I have known of his outspoken and announced intent to oppose my confirmation to the U.S. Court of Claims by the Senate and of certain charges which he stated he was investigating.

Not until yesterday, however, did I know the basis for his opposition. While I would have preferred to have more time to prepare a reply, I shall not plead surprise. Since the adjournment of the hearing yesterday, I have had the time to prepare a written statement which I now offer for the RECORD.

First, Senator PROXMIRE bases his opposition to my nomination because of my lack of legal qualifications. The committee has already placed in the RECORD communications from the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association, also from prominent members of the bench and bar from my home State of Wisconsin, recommending my judicial qualifications, character, and integrity for the U.S. Court of Claims.

To substantiate his opposition to my judicial qualifications, Senator PROXMIRE has offered a communication from an unidentified member of the Court of Claims bar as follows:

"A man who has been a member of the Court of Claims bar for over 30 years recently wrote me in part as follows:

" 'The largest and most technical civil cases in America are decided in the Court of Claims. Individual suits against the United States sometimes involve millions of dollars. They are brought by railroads, aircraft companies manufacturing warplanes and missiles, etc. A judge of the court should have an extensive background in this work. Tax refund cases, Government contracts, employee pay cases, etc., require the highest degree of experience and legal skill.

" 'You cannot expect the lawyers who actually practice in the court to come forward on this matter at this late date and express their views. That would be putting one's neck on the block in case Durfee was confirmed. The District of Columbia bar, of course, has more lawyers who practice in the court than all the rest of the country put together. It has consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee. It did propose through its Court of of Claims Committee the names of three competent and experienced lawyers to the Attorney General.'

"I might add that the District of Columbia bar includes those who serve both sides in cases before the court—both claimants and the Government."

Upon hearing and reading Senator PROXMIRE's statement as to this unidentified communication that "it—the District of Columbia bar) has consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee," I sent a written inquiry about this statement by messenger to the president of the District of Columbia bar yesterday afternoon after the recess. I offer a copy of my letter to him for the record.

He replied by written communication, dated yesterday, and I offer a copy of his reply for the record. It reads as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1960.

Hon. JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DURFEE: I have your letter of January 25 in which you quote certain statements made on the morning of January 25 by Senator PROXMIRE to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which was considering the confirmation of your nomination to the U.S. Court of Claims. You quote Senator PROXMIRE as quoting from a letter from one described to be a member of the bar of the Court of Claims in which it appears that it was stated that the "District of Columbia bar * * * has consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee." You ask me as president of the District of Columbia bar whether the District of Columbia bar has "consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee"?

I must assume that the term "D.C. Bar" is referring to the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. According to the bylaws of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, the judicial selection committee is the sole organ of the association that is clothed with the authority and charged with the duty of selecting the names of persons to be recommended by the association for appointment to judicial office and of opposing the appointment to such office of any persons not qualified therefor. As president of the Bar Association, I can state that the judicial selection committee has neither recommended nor opposed any person for the present vacancy on the Court of Claims. Therefore, it is incorrect to state that the Bar Association has "consistently refused to endorse" you or anyone else for the present vacancy on the Court of Claims.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK A. BALLARD,
President.

I have no doubt that Senator PROXMIRE accepted the statement that the District of Columbia bar "has consistently refused to endorse Mr. Durfee" in good faith, even though it now appears that the statement was clearly erroneous.

I might rest my case as to judicial qualifications on the firm recommendations of the standing committee on judiciary of the American Bar Association, and the recommendations of the bench and bar of my own home State now before this committee.

Senator PROXMIRE next calls attention, on pages 2 and 3 of his statement, to the responsibility of the Court of Claims and the large amounts of money involved in its judgments, as much as about $45 million in one case (which was dismissed). If this is one of his criteria for judicial qualifications, may I point out that in just one case before the Board—the New York-Miami Route case decided in 1956—the annual gross revenue to the two carriers then operating this route was likewise about $45 million. The decision in such a case—and there are many more like it—involves judicial analysis of highly technical, complex questions of law and fact.

Finally, after asserting a complete lack of judicial experience as it affects my qualifications, the Senator turns to another tack:

"It might be said that as Chairman of the CAB, Mr. Durfee has enjoyed a kind of judicial experience. The CAB is a quasi-judicial agency of course. It has judicial as well as rulemaking and administrative functions. The behavior of the nominee in his judicial role is for this reason particularly pertinent to his qualifications for this nomination."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is at least inconsistent to first attempt to knock down my judicial experience, and then set it up again in a 16-page analysis entitled "Record of Judicial Behaviour of Nominee."

Senator PROXMIRE has next addressed himself to three charges of allegedly improper conduct involving three free trips which I took. He has stated that on each of these trips, I violated the code of ethics of the CAB.

I first wish to make it clear that my participation in these flights is not something unearthed by Senator PROXMIRE's investigation.

In the first place, my participation in the two inaugural flights, along with other members of the Board and its staff, was announced by press releases issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board and carried widely in the press.

Second, while there was no formal publicity concerning the Pinehurst trip, the trip was covered by at least one national magazine, Sports Illustrated, with a full-page photograph of all present.

Third, on October 3, 1957, the chairman of the Special Subcommittee of the House on Legislative Oversight, investigating the independent regulatory agencies, asked the members of the agencies to submit an itemized list of all gifts, honorariums, loans, payments, free transportation, vacation entertainment, hotel or other accommodations.

I replied on October 14, 1957 in complete detail, as requested. Included in my statement were the three trips referred to by the Senator. My statement has been a matter of record with the House Committee on Legislative Oversight since October 1957.

Shortly after I filed this statement on trips and gifts with the House committee in October 1957 I was advised of an opinion by the Comptroller General on "Inaugural Flights" requested by the House Oversight Committee which was contrary to a previous opinion of our General Counsel. The Board wrote to the Comptroller on March 19, 1958, and expressed concern as to whether his opinion was intended to encompass certain practices surrounding inaugural flights of air carriers subject to regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board. These flights had been participated in by members and employees of the Board, along with Members of the Congress and other representatives of the Government, representatives of foreign governments, the press and other dignitaries, for the past 20 years.

The Comptroller General replied to our communication on May 20, 1958, and I now offer a copy of his opinion for the record. This opinion has never been publicized as was the earlier one, though it is a matter of public record.

You will note that while in the previous opinion to the House committee the Comptroller unequivocally stated that the practice of free transportation on inaugural flights "is prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 1914," in the opinion to the CAB, the final page, he concluded: "We have no authority to make a binding determination as to the proper interpretation of this statute. Therefore, any contrary construction of our rule in this area is and should be regarded as incorrect."

The Comptroller General continued: "From the standpoint of the audit functions of this office I have no reason to question your determination as to the continued official nature of the flights mentioned or the participation therein by officials of the CAB, or their wives, under the circumstances related. While, in my opinion, such action would not be a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1914, that is, as stated above, a matter for final determination by the Attorney General or the courts."

As I have mentioned, participation in inaugural flights has been continuously and officially approved by the Board since 1940. The airlines involved are required to file a list with CAB of all guest passengers on such flights. They are not permitted to charge any guest on an inaugural flight as this is not construed to be "air transportation" within the meaning of the Federal Aviation Act.

A breakdown of these guest passenger lists over this period of time establishes that a total of 1,184 people have participated and are classified as follows:

	Officials	Family
CAB members	23	4
CAB staff	71	13
Senators and Congressmen	56	7
Congressional staff	7	1
Other Federal officials	90	11
State and local officials	206	31
Foreign officials	245	37
News media	376	6
	1,074	110
Total	1,184	
Total flights, 120		

While I and the other members of the Board have been invited to participate in international inaugural flights by both U.S. and foreign air carriers at least 50 times in the past 4 years, I have participated in only the 2 international inaugural flights referred to above. This was not because I felt there was any question of impropriety involved, but because I felt that my primary responsibility as Chairman and administrative head of this agency was to stay home and "keep the store."

In point of fact, the very Board that in 1951 adopted the code of ethics as to "unusual hospitality," to which Senator PROXMIRE has referred, made it clear that Board participation in inaugural flights was not acceptance of the "unusual hospitality" prescribed by the code. I refer to a letter dated October 11, 1951, from the then Chairman of the Board to the Associate General Counsel of the Board:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1951.
(Reference No. B-45; reference No. B-1)

To: Associate General Counsel.
From: Chairman.
Subject: Braniff Airways' inaugural flight to Sao Paulo, Brazil.

You and your wife have been designated by the Board as the official representatives of the Board on the inaugural flight of Braniff Airways to Sao Paulo, Brazil, departing Miami on October 12, 1951. Since it is understood that Braniff Airways will pay the expenses of the official inaugural flight group and since you and your wife are the representatives of the Board, the Board considers that section 300.4 of the Procedural Regulations is not applicable to the transportation on Braniff Airways which is involved or to the expenses of yourself and wife during such time as you are part of such group.

DONALD W. NYROP.

Mr. Chairman, I offer a copy of this letter for the record. Since this was the first Board participation in an inaugural flight following the adoption of the Board's code of ethics in 1951, it certainly demonstrates the consistent interpretation by the Board of its code of ethics as applied to inaugural flights.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that this explanation of the background of inaugural flights has established that they are not "unusual" hospitality, but on the contrary, have been considered by the Board and the others who participated as "usual" hospitality, in accordance with long accepted standards.

Maybe we ought to look a little further and see why these many successive members of the Board, over the past 20 years, have approved this common practice, which has also the approval of the Comptroller General.

We in the regulatory field are sometimes told that we should at all times maintain the same judicial aloofness from the industry which we regulate as judges do from litigants. As to matters involved in adjudication following hearings on the record, this is correct. But the Board is not entirely a court. It is also a quasi-legislative body, with powers to make, as well as judge, law in aviation, within the rulemaking limits delegated to it by Congress. In defining these powers of the Board, Congress at the outset directs the Board to encourage and develop an air transportation system properly adapted to meet the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. In essence, we are directed to promote aviation. There are those who criticize these dual quasi-legislative—quasi-judicial functions of the Board as imposing inconsistent standards of ethical conduct, but that is the law under which the Board operates.

Generally speaking, the courts construe and apply the statutory law as Congress writes it in arriving at their judgments. Courts are not expected to promote or develop aviation or any other business. The Board is not only expected to do this: it is directed and required to do it by Congress. We certainly do not go about this promotion and development of aviation in the aloof atmosphere of a court or the strict isolation of a judge's chambers. We work with this industry every day to encourage and develop aviation. That's a very important part of the job that Congress has directed us to do.

As an example, let us consider the promotion and development of U.S. international air commerce. We and the State Department negotiate and bargain for international air routes with foreign countries. In this bargaining process, we consult constantly with our own international carriers, since we are, in a sense, then, acting as their negotiators, not their judges. When the bargaining is over and we have a bilateral air agreement with another country, our designated carrier or carriers are authorized to fly an inaugural round-trip flight over the routes involved, and this authority may be extended to a new type of service. The other country concerned usually grants the same inaugural flight authority to its carriers. The airline invites the guests which usually include U.S. Government officials, foreign government officials, Members of Congress, city and State officials, airline officials, both United States and foreign, and members of the press.

These inaugural flights are intended to promote international good will and cooperation with the foreign countries involved and to develop and encourage U.S. air travel as directed by Congress. These flights are widely publicized both at home and abroad. The arrival in the other country of destination is commonly marked by diplomatic ceremonies, receptions, banquets, and other entertainment by the airlines and governments of both countries. Usually, the members of the Board and staff participating in the flight will take this excellent opportunity to confer further with the aviation authorities of the other country to encourage and develop future air commerce.

For example, I refer to the case of the TWA New York to Rome inaugural nonstop on October 2, 1957, when in addition to meetings of the people-to-people organzation in Rome, another Board member and I and a member of our staff, together with representatives of the State Department twice conferred at length with the Italian Ministry of Aviation and other top Italian aviation officials. We discussed informally the then pending consultations for revision of our bilateral air agreement with the Italian Government, in the interests of our country and both our certificated international carriers to Italy—TWA and Pan American.

The Eastern inaugural nonstop New York to Mexico City on September 15, 1957, as General Adams said yesterday, marked the beginning of a new and better era in our international aviation relations with Mexico. For 10 years we have been vainly trying to get the Mexican Government to give foreign air carrier permits to all of the U.S. carriers holding a certificated authority to operate routes from the United States to Mexico. We had just obtained four new nonstop routes from the United States to Mexico City for a 2-year period. We were desirous of continuing this improved relationship with Mexico. The members of the Board present conferred with the Mexican Minister of Transport and other high Mexican aviation officials with this objective. We participated in several official receptions, dinners and other entertainment furnished by both the Mexican and U.S. officials and airlines. I believe that by this exchange of social amenities and conferences, we did accomplish substantial improvement in our international aviation relations with Mexico, not just for Eastern Airlines but for all our U.S. carriers to Mexico.

This long-established practice of inaugural flights has been recognized for its great promotional value to U.S. aviation and international relations by the press, by the Congress, and by the Board.

As to the trip to Pinehurst, this was a weekend golfing trip as a guest of L. C. Burwell, vice president of Flying Tigers, who resides in Pinehurst, and one of its principal competitors, Overseas National Airways. Also present was Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American, another principal competitor, particularly in the business of transporting passengers and cargo by contract with the Military Air Transport Service and other defense establishments. When the invitation was tendered by Mr. Burwell, I was advised that representatives of these competitive airlines would be present, and also representatives of the Military Air Transport Service, including General Wilson, deputy commander. One of the reasons the trip was organized, as explained to me, was to afford an opportunity for a congenial get-together with representatives of the defense establishments concerned and some of the airlines principally concerned with the MATS civil airlines problem. The carriers and the Board were trying to get a larger allocation of mili-

tary airlift for all eligible commercial air carriers. This is an objective which, while it lies completely outside the quasi-judicial responsibilities of the Board, does rest well within our responsibility under the Federal Aviation Act to foster and encourage civil and commercial aviation. I have participated in at least 10 or 15 conferences with defense officials and others over the past 4 years for this same purpose—one just last week—and I have testified before committees of Congress as to our efforts in this direction. Congressional committees have repeatedly endorsed the Board's objectives and successful efforts to get more commercial airlift business from the Department of Defense and the Military Air Transport Service.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that I have established that the three trips with which Senator PROXMIRE is concerned do not constitute the acceptance of "unusual hospitality" as proscribed by section 300.4 of the Board's Code of Ethics and as construed by the Board for the past 20 years.

May I now refer to another basis of Senator PROXMIRE's objections? He has called attention to applications for air carrier authority and other proceedings pending before the Board by the air carriers involved in the three trips. Listed in his statement are 2 then pending applications by Flying Tiger and 6 by Overseas National, the hosts on the 1956 trip to Pinehurst; 76 then pending applications by Eastern, the host on the trip to Mexico City, and 15 then pending applications by TWA, the host on the trip to Rome.

Senator PROXMIRE has not pursued this matter further in his statement. He has not attempted to assert that in the final disposition of any of these pending applications, I was improperly influenced to extend any favoritism or bias in favor of the airlines who were hosts on the three trips as to any particular pending case. It is readily apparent that this would be difficult to attempt, for example, with the 76 then pending applications by Eastern for route authority. Since the Senator has not attempted to show that I was in fact improperly influenced in any one of these pending cases by participation in any of these three trips, I shall not attempt any unnecessary rebuttal or further analysis of these cases.

I have referred to the complete statement as to free trips, gifts, entertainment, etc., which I filed with the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight in response to the questionnaire which was addressed to all members of the six regulatory agencies being investigated by the committee. I listed in that statement in October 1957 the three trips to which Senator PROXMIRE has referred. Later I testified before the committee and its counsel on four separate occasions: on October 17, 1957; January 27, 1958; November 24 and 25, 1958; and finally, on June 15, 1959. I was questioned at length about practically every phase of the Board's operations, and particularly about ex parte communications and the Board's association with the aviation industry.

The record of my testimony will establish that at no time was I ever questioned on this matter of free trips and there is no reference thereto in the interim report of the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, dated April 8, 1958, or its final report, dated January 3, 1959.

Mr. Chairman, this hearing marks for me the culmination of about 10 years in regulation of business in the public interest.

As to the almost 6 years I spent as member and chairman of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, I can find no better summary than the statement of Senator PROXMIRE, who was then, I believe, in the Wisconsin Legislature. He is quoted on January 6 of this year in the Wisconsin newspaper which has been his principal informant, as saying of me, "He did a competent job while he served as a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission." For this statement, I thank the Senator, and I am sure that he really meant it in good faith

Since April 1956—almost 4 years—I have been a Member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Since October 1957 the Board and five other principal Federal regulatory agencies have been under extensive investigation by the House Committee on Legislative Oversight of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have testified four times before this committee, the last time on June 15, 1959. As recently as November 20 of last year, I testified before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Senator CARROLL which was also engaged in an investigation of the practices and procedures of the Board and the five other regulatory agencies. During 1958–59 I have testified for a total of 15 times before 9 different committees of the House and the Senate. Not once over these past 4 years has there been any question raised before any of these committees of the House and the Senate as to the propriety or impartiality of my judicial conduct with the airlines regulated by the Board, until yesterday before this Committee by Senator PROXMIRE.

Mr. Chairman, I have been proud of this record of 10 years of highly difficult and demanding service in the public interest. I am still proud of it, and proud to submit it to your judgment.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD my statement opposing the nomination of the present Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Hon. James R. Durfee, to be a member of the U.S. Court of Claims. Mr. Durfee is from Antigo, Wis. I oppose his nomination very vigorously. At the same time I commend my senior colleague [Mr. WILEY] for having earlier today presented for printing in the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Durfee this morning before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish to say to my colleagues in the Senate that, as a matter of fact, it was my intention to do exactly as the senior Senator from Wisconsin has done, and I had prepared my remarks to effect this.

I think that in all fairness the testimony of Mr. Durfee should be printed in the RECORD. While in my opinion it was a masterful presentation, I still very vigorously and very strongly oppose approval of his nomination by the Senate, and intend to do so when it is reached on the calendar. However, I believe Mr. Durfee has made the best possible case for himself in his testimony before the committee.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGES IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I urge the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and all my other colleagues, to press for early Senate passage of the omnibus judgeship bill, Senate bill 2673, and ask for favorable consideration of the amendment submitted by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, to increase the number of judges authorized, so that we may have three new judges in the eastern district of Pennsylvania and two in the western district.

We must not let it be said that the Democratic 86th Congress failed to pass the legislation necessary to place justice in the Federal district courts on a current basis again. I share the hope and expectation of my party colleagues in Congress that the next administration will be a Democratic one, but I think we would be doing a disservice to the country if we put off action this year on the judgeship bill on the basis of that expectation.

We are dispensing a poor brand of justice when we make litigants and witnesses wait more than a year after the dispute comes to issue before trial. Unless Congress acts without further delay we will be guilty of denying to our constituents the constitutional guarantee of speedy public trials.

I ask unanimous consent that two memorandums, prepared for me by Mr. Will Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics in the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. They set forth the crying need for additional judges in both the western and eastern districts of Pennsylvania, and some very persuasive statistics in support of his contention.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Two judges were provided for this district by the Judicial Code of 1911 and a third, authorized as temporary by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 837), was made permanent by the act of August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 659). A fourth judgeship, authorized as temporary by the act of August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), was made permanent by the act of August 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 562) and two additional judgeships, one on a temporary basis, were provided by the act of February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 8). From August 7, 1946, to May 31, 1955, the district enjoyed the partial services of a roving judge appointed to serve all three districts in the State, but on the latter date the roving judgeship expired and the judge holding that position succeeded to a vacancy in the middle district. The western district now has six judgeships, one of which is temporary. Court is held at Pittsburgh and Erie.

Following the addition of two judgeships in 1954, the number of civil cases filed continued to increase and the court continued to lose ground for the next 4 years with an increase in the backlog of 658 cases, or 43 percent.

The record of the civil cases filed, terminated and pending for the 4 years was as follows:

Civil cases commenced, terminated, and pending, fiscal years 1955 through 1958

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1955	1,197	1,039	1,701
1956	1,287	1,166	1,822
1957	1,241	1,045	2,018
1958	1,311	1,128	2,201

This is a record of increasing filings, a static number of terminations and a constantly increasing backlog. The result has been a median interval of more than 2½ years from filing to trial in 1958, compared with a national median of only 1 year.

A significant change occurred in 1959. The number of civil cases filed dropped from 1,311 to 961, largely as a result of the jurisdiction statute of July 25, 1958, and the cases disposed of increased from 1,128 to 1,359, the net result being a decrease of almost 400 in pending cases.

The figures for the year are as follows:

Fiscal year 1959:

Commenced	961
Terminated	1,359
Pending June 30	1,803

During the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, July 1–December 31, 1959, civil cases filed have begun to increase again. But with the help of some visiting judges the number of cases disposed of has also increased so that the number of pending civil cases decreased during the 6-month period. At the end of December they were 24 percent less than a year earlier. The figures for the civil cases for this period are as follows:

1st 6 months, fiscal year 1960:

Pending July 1	1,803
Filed	489
Terminated	626
Pending Dec. 31	1,666

Even with this gratifying result, the court faces a formidable load of pending cases, a large number of which—estimated at from 400 to 450—will eventually reach trial.

The marked improvement in the situation of this district stems principally from three factors:

1. The installation and implementation of a system of pretrial procedure, which sets a time for the completion of discovery and other preliminary matters, and assures that each pretried case is ready for trial.

2. The adoption of a practice of empaneling standby juries which are always ready for instant use in any courtroom as soon as a jury in a case being tried is sent out to deliberate. This means a continuous calendar of trials with practically no calendar breakdowns and a maximum use of the judges' trial time.

3. A program of visiting judges which has provided much needed assistance during jury terms.

Chief Judge Wallace Gourley and his court deserve credit for their industry and the enthusiasm with which they are making a success of these methods of improved court administration.

The fact remains, however, that the court is still far from up to date in its work. The jury cases tried this fall were mostly from 30 months to 3 years old. Nonjury cases are assigned after issue has been joined and each judge handles his own nonjury cases separately. Generally speaking, these dockets are relatively current and nonjury cases, for the most part, can be tried within 6 months of filing.

A report from the clerk on November 19, 1959, shows the following number of civil cases at Pittsburgh pending over 6 months.

Jury cases over 6 months

1. Not at issue	12
2. Inactive for some reason: waiting decision of another court, parties or lawyers ill, or good reason for continuance	4
3. Cases on trial, tried, awaiting decision or in process of settlement	29
4. Awaiting trial:	
(a) Antitrust	11
(b) F.L.S.A. (Fair Labor Standards Act)	1
(c) Tax	11
(d) Patent	1
(e) Land Condemnation (not usually tried to a jury)	116
(f) F.E.L.A. (injuries to railroad employees)	342
(g) Negligence	536
(h) Contract (diversity)	45
(i) Other	13

Nonjury cases over 6 months

1. Not at issue	0
2. Inactive for some reason—waiting decision of another court—parties or lawyers ill or good reason for continuance	2
3. Cases on trial, tried, awaiting decision or in process of settlement	16
4. Awaiting trial:	
(a) Antitrust	1
(b) F.L.S.A.	5
(c) Tax	25
(d) Patent	9
(e) Land condemnation	1
(f) F.E.L.A.	3
(g) Negligence	10
(h) Contract (diversity)	25
(i) Other	34

Out of a total of 1,252 cases over 6 months old—jury and nonjury—over 70 percent were either suits by railroad employees for injuries under the Federal Employers' Liability Act or other negligence suits.

The following table shows pending civil cases as of June 30, 1959, by age and nature of suit:

Nature of suit	Total	Less than 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 years and over
Total	1,803	361	261	612	389	115	34	31
U.S. cases, total	328	79	34	65	69	45	16	20
Private cases, total	1,475	282	227	547	320	70	18	11
Federal question:								
Fair Labor Standards Act	5	1		3				1
Employers' Liability Act	442	61	48	195	114	20	2	2
Jones Act (injuries to seamen)	59	11	19	19	4	4	1	1
Patent	11	4		4	1		1	1
Antitrust laws	18	1	3	7	4	3		
Labor-Management Relations Act	13	8	2	2		1		
Other Federal question	27	10	6	6	2		1	2
Diversity of citizenship:								
Contract	134	21	25	40	31	8	6	3
Personal injury, negligence	697	135	114	256	155	32	5	
Other diversity	27	8	4	8	4	2	1	
Admiralty	42	22	6	7	5		1	1

It is apparent from this table that there are many old cases on the docket of this court and that the great majority of the cases are personal-injury suits for damages.

Court is held at Erie twice a year, but the docket there is light and cases which are ready can always be tried during the regular terms of court.

The criminal docket in this district is not heavy and the criminal cases, speaking generally, are not the subject of extended delay.

The Judicial Conference last March recommended that the present temporary judgeship be made permanent and two more judgeships be added.

Respectfully submitted.

WILL SHAFROTH,
Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

JANUARY 20, 1960.

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

There are eight judgeships presently authorized for the eastern district of Pennsylvania compared with four judges at the beginning of 1940. A fifth judgeship on a temporary basis, created in 1940, was made permanent in 1946, two additional judgeships were created in 1949, and one more in 1954. In September 1952 the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended two additional judgeships for the district, one of which was provided by the act of February 10, 1954. The Conference immediately renewed the recommendation for a ninth judgeship and since that time has asked that two more judgeships be created for the district, bringing the total recommendations of the Conference for new judgeships to three, in addition to the eight now in existence. The service of a roving judge was lost to the district in 1955 when Judge Follmer who served three districts became a judge of the middle district. The principal place of holding court in the district is the city of Philadelphia, one of the largest centers of population in the country, and the district also embraces the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area which is also very heavily populated.

The business of the district increased rapidly from 1948 to 1958. During that decade, civil cases filed annually rose from 1,489 to 2,487 and private civil cases, which on the average take much more time than Government cases, from 1,087 to 2,116, virtually doubling. Two judgeships were added in 1949 and one in 1954, but the pending civil caseload also doubled as the court, because of the increasing incoming load and some extended lapses due to delays in filling vacancies was unable to keep up with its workload. The pending civil caseload of 4,141 on June 30, 1958, was the second largest in the country for comparable districts and amounted to more than 500 per judge compared with a national average of 270 per judge.

Civil cases filed during the fiscal year 1959 were 11 percent less than during the previous year as a result of the jurisdictional statute passed on July 25, 1958, raising the jurisdictional amount in diversity of citizenship and some Federal question cases and making other changes which curtailed jurisdiction. As a consequence, the court terminated more cases than were filed as is shown by the following:

Civil cases filed, fiscal year 1959	2,001
Civil cases terminated	2,160
Civil cases pending at end of year	3,992

The pending civil caseload on June 30, 1959, was 499 per judge compared with the national average of 250.

The median time from filing to disposition, from filing to trial, and from issue to trial for the last 3 years has been as follows:

Median time intervals elapsing in civil cases tried

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Months from filing to disposition		Months from filing to trial		Months from issue to trail	
		Pennsylvania (eastern)	National median	Pennsylvania (eastern)	National median	Pennsylvania (eastern)	National median
1957	211	28.0	14.2	26.3	12.3	23.4	9.0
1958	200	26.0	13.9	24.1	11.9	22.8	8.9
1959	196	26.7	15.3	25.0	13.3	23.2	10.3

It is obvious that the district continues to lag far behind the national median in the time required for getting cases to trial, and the delay is far longer than is desirable for a prompt dispatch of judicial business. As of last June it was requiring 23 months from trial order to trial in jury cases and 20 months in nonjury cases.

During the past 6 months there has been an increase of 7 percent in the number of civil cases filed, and in the months of November and December the increase exceeded 15 percent.

The comparison of the first 6 months of this fiscal year with last was as follows:

	Pending, July 1	Filed	Terminated	Pending, Dec. 31
1st 6 months fiscal year 1959	4,141	991	936	4,196
1st 6 months fiscal year 1960	3,992	1,059	1,017	4,034
Percent change	−4	+7	+9	−4

While pending cases were reduced by 162 in the year ending December 31, 1959, they still exceeded 4,000 and were larger than in any other comparable district except the southern district of New York. Despite the decrease in civil cases filed last year, the caseload per judge of cases filed was 251 compared with the national average of 215, and an additional increase appears inevitable this year. The cases pending on June 30, 1959, included many antitrust and patent cases.

Cases pending, eastern district of Pennsylvania, June 30, 1959

Total	3,992
U.S. plaintiff	246
Land condemnation	36
Fair Labor Standards Act	20
Other enforcement	16
Food and Drug Act	19
Other forfeitures and penalties	14
Negotiable instruments	26
Other	115
U.S. defendant	202
Review, enjoin Federal agencies	16
Habeas corpus	2
Federal Tort Claims Act	42
Tax suits	77
Other	65
Federal question	994
Copyright (injuries)	9
Employers' Liability Act (to railroad employees)	333
Fair Labor Standards Act	16
Habeas corpus	7
Jones Act (injuries to seamen)	408
Miller Act	6
Patent	59
Antitrust	58
Other	98
Diversity of citizenship	2,052
Insurance contracts	74
Other contracts	245
Real property	28
Personal injuries (motor vehicles)	1,008
Personal injuries (other)	626
Other	71
Admiralty	498

The criminal calendars in this district are kept up to date and the number of criminal cases is not large although there are some long trials. In 1959 there were 312 criminal cases filed resulting in a total of 59 criminal trials.

The present high caseload, the long delays in the calendars, and the difficulty and complexity of much of the litigation are the reasons for the recommendation of the Judicial Conference at its March 1959 session of three additional judgeships for this district.

Statistical tables concerning the business of the district are attached.

Respectfully submitted.

WILL SHAFROTH,
Chief Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

JANUARY 20, 1960.

THE DEFENSE DEBATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, amidst all the charges and countercharges concerning our Defense Establishment, the recent testimony of Gen. Nathan F. Twining before the House Defense Appropriation Subcommittee is most instructive. General Twining, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, speaks with authority and with all the information at his fingertips. That is more than can be said for many of his critics.

General Twining and Secretary of Defense Gates have recently made clear their informed opinion that our country, along with the free world as a whole, is stronger militarily than the Soviet Union, and that we will continue to be superior to the Communists in this field.

It should be emphasized that none of our military leaders is preaching complacency. None of them says we can rest on our oars. To the contrary, our military men have stressed that proposed military programs must go forward vigorously. They have merely stated their informed opinion that the funds proposed for these tasks in the President's budget are sufficient to do the overall job. That is the responsibility of these military experts and we should all recognize that fact.

The view of Secretary Gates, General Twining, and others is that we must remember the overall view of our military capabilities and must not be misled by those who weep and wail about single aspects of our Defense Establishment. It is true, of course, that we must be concerned when any part of our military program lags, and steps must be taken to speed those projects along.

But the important quotient—which many of the self-styled armchair strategists have conveniently overlooked or misunderstood—is our deterrent might as a whole. Our retaliatory power gives us a clear edge over the Soviets. The rocking-chair corporals who are so quick to criticize have so entangled themselves in the trees that they have lost sight of the forest. It is an understandable but grievously shortsighted mistake.

It is particularly ironic to hear all this criticism coming from Members of Congress who last year refused to give the President and his military advisers the funds they asked for. They cannot have it both ways, and the sooner that fact is faced up to and the lure of partisanship is overcome, the better it will be for the welfare of our Nation and our standing in the eyes of the world.

I have no doubt that the American people are ready and willing to make all the sacrifices necessary to keep our Nation strong and secure. But they want the facts. They do not want to be "kidded" about our defense capabilities. They should not be misled by carping critics bent on personal advancement.

Mr. President, I do not object to constructive criticism and scrutiny of our defense setup, but I do most emphatically object to making a political football out of our Nation's security. Discussion of our Military Establishment, like comment on our foreign policies, is sound and healthy, but only if it is done in a constructive way.

For my part, I intend to continue to be guided in my actions and my votes by the real needs of our Defense Establishment and by testimony of the President and military experts who really know what they are talking about. I intend to continue to be guided by my confidence that the American people will respond to whatever is needed of them. They need not be bamboozled by distortion and innuendo. I hope more people will recognize these facts. I hope the days ahead will bring more reason and light, and less partisan tomfoolery to this whole subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from General Twining's testimony before the House committee, as reprinted in the Washington Post of January 24, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWINING TESTIMONY CRITICAL OF THOSE WHO DEGRADE UNITED STATES

General TWINING. Today we hear and read a tremendous volume of material comparing the strength of the United States and

the free world with that of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc.

All too often the writers and commentators are inclined to degrade the capabilities of the American people and the peoples of the free world. At the same time, the efforts of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc are reported in glowing terms.

The plain and unadulterated truth of the matter is that the moral, military, physical, and economic strengths of our people and of our allies have been adequate to resist and deter Communist aggression. I am confident that this will continue to be the case.

We cannot, however, in this day of exploding worldwide competition on all fronts, be content to maintain the status quo. We must also realize that the preservation of our freedom in the years ahead may require greater sacrifices from us than those made by Americans who have walked before us.

Our Nation is not defenseless. Our Nation is not populated by a people who are ready to knuckle under to a rocket-rattling dictatorship. I am quite certain that the American people will fight with all weapons available in the national arsenal, should such a fight be required to preserve our freedom and that of our allies.

Mr. MAHON. Now it is obvious to me that in this presentation you have had in mind some of the critical things which have been said with respect to the capability of the United States and the Department of Defense. You have had in mind, I think, various columns in the press and statements made by various political and nonpolitical figures. I think we are all interested in one thing, and that is facing up to the truth and to the facts of life from the standpoint of national defense.

General Twining, you spoke very feelingly about our defense capabilities. While you have not said so, I had the feeling as you spoke—and most of your discussion was off the record—that probably you feared that the United States was being sold short in the eyes of the American people and in the eyes of the world with respect to our military prowess.

What is your feeling about that?

General TWINING. We are in a position now, as you say, when we can annihilate each other. We must not let that ever happen. That is why we are having all of this business going on—disarmament and all that. The only way we can deal with this fellow is not to tell him how deficient we are today; we are prone to do this at times, because it gets us more money. It is the democratic system and I am not bucking it, but I think it is very dangerous.

We have great strength, we are a powerful country, and I do not think we should downgrade our capabilities as a nation to the Russians. That is what gives me cause for concern—this downgrading of our capability. It looks like we are going to get licked every day. I am afraid that the public will become frightened some day. It sometimes appears to me that there is an element in the country that thinks, "Gentlemen, we better be Red than dead." It is a serious thing.

My point is, let us not downgrade our capability at a time when we are entering upon negotiations which may lead to peace and disarmament. We want to deal from strength. We have terrific strength in the military and in our country. We know what we have. We do not know what he had, although I believe that our intelligence system is improving all the time.

I did not mean to be complacent at all. I am still concerned by the same possibilities that you are, that an enemy might some day launch an attack and that would be awful. We would take a lot of losses in our population and we would have to strike back and do the same thing to him. I do not think it is going to happen.

Mr. MAHON. You have confirmed to me your feeling that you are deeply disturbed by the possibility that we might convince the opponents that we do not have the fighting strength which you feel we have.

General TWINING. That is right. If he thinks we are not confident of our national capability he may assume that there is an open gate for him. Similarly, we should not build up in our own people this lack of confidence in our national capability.

Mr. MAHON. You do not feel, I assume, that the American people would be in any way disposed to knuckle under to the rattling of missiles as a result of this controversy over the relative strength of the people of the two countries?

General TWINING. Not at the moment, but I am afraid that such an attitude could be generated or could be building up if our Nation is portrayed continually as second best.

(Later in the testimony, General Twining made an additional observation after furnishing the committee a declassified version of part of his off-the-record testimony concluding with the statement that he did not believe any nation possesses the ability to destroy the United States, or attack it, without receiving unacceptable damage in return.)

General TWINING. All I am trying to do is the right thing in this defense business. You cannot afford to go overboard either way, too strong or too weak. People have to know the truth about what we have. Let them make up their minds.

SPEEDING THE MAIL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the ever-increasing volume of mail in the United States requires the constant effort on the part of the Post Office Department and the Congress to encourage and to develop programs that will modernize the Department, in order, first, to speed the handling of the mail, and second, to reduce the financial cost of the Department to our citizens.

During recent years, under the direction of Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, great progress has been made in modernizing our postal operations.

The Postmaster General foresees an expenditure of $2 billion in the next 4 years for modernizing the postal operations.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I was impressed by an article written by John C. Perham, which appeared in the January 11 issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly.

In view of the excellent study made by the writer, I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEEDING THE MAIL—U.S. INDUSTRY IS HELPING THE POST OFFICE TO MECHANIZE

(By John C. Perham)

In the Christmas season of recent memory, the American people outdid themselves in many ways. Besides attending church in greater numbers than ever before and ringing up record retail sales, they sent each other more cards, letters, and packages than in any previous year. Volume of Christmas mail, says the Post Office Department, ran some 4 percent above the not inconsiderable total of a year earlier. To get all the deliveries made by December 25, the men in blue had to divert 40 million pieces of surface mail to the airlines, and press into use every other available bit of equipment.

The massive job, however, was made somewhat less burdensome by the Department's ability to muster more modern machinery than ever before to handle it. For the first time, to illustrate, the Post Office had the help of a giant mechanical sorter, the first American-made equipment of its kind. The semiautomatic machine, built by Burroughs Corp. and installed in a post office at Detroit, sorts letters a dozen times faster than it can be done by hand.

In recent months, too, the Post Office has taken some other impressive steps toward renovating its long-obsolete plant and equipment. Its 40-man Office of Research and Engineering, set up 5 years ago to help mechanize operations, has completed the basic industrial engineering for more than a score of futuristic post offices throughout the country. On 11 of these, construction already is under way. The Department also has effected a major mechanization of 6 of its facilities and is working on 11 more. In Providence, it has commissioned International Telephone & Telegraph Co. to build the first wholly mechanized post office in America. Meanwhile, it is negotiating with Food Machinery & Chemical Co. for construction of a still more advanced experimental installation at Oakland, Calif.

For the next 4 years, Mr. Summerfield and his lieutenants foresee outlays of no less than $2 billion for further modernization. They hope to enlist $1.5 billion of private capital for the construction of 12,000 new post offices. These buildings would be equipped, and certain major Government-owned post offices mechanized, with $500 million of Federal funds—Congress willing. For a great many U.S. companies, public and private, big and small—and especially those in the business-machine, materials-handling and communications industries—the project opens up an inviting, if highly competitive, opportunity, for sale of a wide array of up-to-the-minute equipment. For the Post Office, if its hopes are realized, it will mean lower costs and improved working conditions. For the public, it should mean faster and more efficient mail service.

The progress already achieved is highlighted by a brief look at the situation that prevailed just a few years ago. When Mr. Summerfield took office in 1953, the U.S. postal system already was the largest and most complex in the world. Its 41,000 post offices, and 19,000 vehicles were handling some 1,200,000 parcels and 50 billion other pieces of mail a year. Its 510,000 employees exceeded the number on any private payroll in the United States except that of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Department was taking in more than $2 billion a year in revenues.

Unhappily, the postal system also was one of the most antiquated in the world. Since 1938, Congress had appropriated no funds for construction of a single new facility. In its myriad operations, including culling letters from other mail, facing letters in the right direction for cancellation, sorting and dispatching, the Department was relying on methods and equipment devised for the most part in the days of Ben Franklin. Only the year before, Mr. Summerfield's predecessor had reported: "Many phases of mail-handling operations inherently depend upon the eye, the brain, the hand and the foot, and as yet no robot has been invented to learn schemes, decipher addresses, or sort and effect the delivery of mail."

No one today belittles the difficulty of developing a machine to read addresses, or to handle a product-mix as varied in size, shape, weight, color, texture, and rigidity as mail and parcel post. But in 1952 no one in the United States even was trying to invent a mail robot. The Post Office research staff consisted of three men, none an engineer. Neither the Department nor Con-

gress was interested in doing anything fundamental to stem the mounting complaints of poor service. Although European engineers had been working for decades on improved mail handling, there was no U.S. machine—even in the blueprint stage—which could do any of the basic mail-handling chores.

Not until 1958, in fact, did Congress formally recognize the need for modernizing the creaking system. Even then, it refused to earmark special funds for the purpose, recommending instead that the Post Office continue as best it could the preliminary engineering that had been under way for 5 years on a shoestring basis. The following year, however, when Mr. Summerfield requested $88.5 million for modernization and mechanization, he actually got $80 million. In the current fiscal year, for the first time, he has the funds to get the program rolling.

Meanwhile, the volume of mail has mounted so rapidly that mechanization is now the only alternative to postal paralysis. During the latest fiscal year, the Post Office handled 20 percent more mail than it did in 1953, with about 7 percent more employees—that is, some 550,000 persons will process 61 billion pieces, plus 1 billion parcels. Because volume is determined by population and prosperity, there is no end in sight to the enormous year-to-year increases. Furthermore, manual methods grow increasingly costly. In fiscal 1958, the postal deficit, largely because of wage increases, reached a record $890 million.

The mechanization program is aimed primarily at the mass operations involved in processing mail within post office buildings. It reaches out, however, to include all repetitive operations, wherever they occur. Thus it also covers such incidental, but time-consuming, activities as making change, dispensing stamps, tying knots and making up the payroll, as well as moving mail between work stations, accounting for money orders, making local deliveries and encouraging self-service. On all these fronts, progress is being made.

Some minor mechanization was accomplished quickly, either because it involved only standard machines or small outlays or promised large and immediate savings. As early as 1954, for instance, Mr. Summerfield was able to put automatic cashiers and stamp dispensers behind postal wickets in big cities. At about the same time, privately owned B. H. Bunn Co. of Chicago modified its twine-tying machines, designed to handle commercial packages, to cope with bundles of letters. Also in 1954 the Post Office mechanized payroll and other records with International Business Machines equipment.

In internal transportation, the job was more specialized. Here the Department's engineers themselves took a hand. The most urgent task was to replace all portable equipment which required manual effort to push, pull, lift, carry or store letters. The engineers came up with a conveyor system of power and gravity rollers known as "Mail Flo." Stacked from the floor in four levels, Mail Flo conveyors carry trays of letters from culling to sorting areas and from one manual sorting station to another. The trays are routed automatically by signal cards on their sides, which contact sensing devices. These, in turn, activate switches which divert the trays to the desired destinations.

The first production of Mail Flo Systems was done by privately owned Rapid Standards Co. of Grand Rapids, which subcontracted the control equipment to Control, Design & Fabricating Co. of Detroit, also privately owned. The first such system was installed in Detroit late in 1956; by mid-1960, 16 post offices will have them.

Mechanization of money orders has been going on for 6 years. The first stage, now completed, involved the accounting procedures. After a series of tests, the Post Office settled on an I.B.M. system, replacing paper order forms with three-part punch cards which provide a money order, a Post Office record, and a receipt for the applicant.

These cards eliminate the former application form. Now the customer fills out the money order itself, except for the amount, thus reducing issuing time by about 40 percent. The Department's record and the paid money order eventually are shipped to a money order center at Kansas City, where I.B.M. equipment does the once-tedious job of reconciliation and auditing.

Mr. Summerfield set up the punchcard system in expectation of also mechanizing the issuing of money orders. Development work on punch machines for this job has been going on and 11 companies currently are delivering prototypes. They include Standard Register Co. of Dayton; A. Kimball Co., subsidiary of United Shoe Machinery; Burroughs Corp.; and International Postal Supply, acquired last summer by Friden, Inc., of San Leandro, Calif. Wade S. Plummer, Director of the Department's Office of Research and Engineering, says that "large orders probably will be placed before summer."

Other inviting targets for modernization are involved in local deliveries. Here the now-familiar red-white-and-blue paint job on Department vehicles, which replaced the traditional olive drab, symbolizes a new approach more than paint deep. Studies had revealed that the Department was operating an uneconomic variety of vehicles, many of them overengineered for the job. It also was using too many foot carriers. As a result of these revelations, the Department decided to standardize its vehicles and to develop new lightweight ones. In the process, it doubled its fleet, to 36,000 vehicles. The newer ones, along with specially designed bicycles and caddy carts, have been used to speed deliveries in the suburbs and to motorize carrier service in the city.

For the Post Office, General Motors' Chevrolet Division, Chrysler's Dodge Division, and International Harvester's Metropolitan Body Division have produced 3,765 ¾- and ½-ton trucks with righthand drives. These are for use in suburbia, where each truck saves about three-quarters of an hour a day because the driver need not leave it to reach the mailboxes.

The vehicle program also has included the development and production of Mailsters, glorified three-wheel motorcycles of a quarter-ton each. Main supplier has been Cushman Motor Works, Inc., since 1957 a subsidiary of Outboard Marine Corp. of Waukegan, Ill. Last summer, in pleading with Congress for funds to buy 4,900 new 2-cylinder models at approximately $1,000 apiece, Post Office spokesmen testified that each of the 5,700 1-cylinder Mailsters then in use had saved the Department a dollar a day, as compared to foot-carrier service, thus paying for themselves in 3 years.

Meanwhile, the Post Office is joining in the march toward self-service. Most familiar example is the use of duplicate mailboxes or coporative mail racks for presorting of mail by the customer, by local or out-of-town destinations. Assisting in self-service, too, are a variety of vending machines. The Post Office has contracted for the development of models ranging from stamp dispensers which are able to make change to complete customer-operated postal substations. International Postal Supply, for instance, received a contract to develop a stamp and postal card dispenser, now being evaluated in the Department's new Washington, D.C., test laboratory.

Privately owned Electric Vendors, Inc., of Minneapolis, one of the leaders in the field, has produced 1,500 change-making stamp machines and currently is negotiating an order for 1,000 more. It also has developed another vender which offers three denominations of stamps, two sizes of stamped envelopes, writing paper, books of stamps, postal cards, and sheets of stamps, makes change, and contains letter drops. The Post Office has ordered 20 of these machines, designed for use in railroad stations and air terminals.

The earliest contender in vending machines was Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., which for more than 40 years has been turning out postage meters for use by U.S. business. Back in 1939, Pitney-Bowes offered the Department a coin-operated public postage meter called the Mail-O-Mat, which stamps a letter for any amount from 1 cent to 33 cents, cancels it, makes change and automatically deposits the letter in a mail drop.

At first, the Department felt there was no way for the machine to pay for itself. Now, however, on the theory that full-value vending machines will provide both added convenience and labor savings, the Post Office is showing active interest. On a larger scale, both Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. and the Post Office laboratory have developed substations for round-the-clock suburban operation.

In its own physical handling of mail, the Department faces even more pressing problems—among them the sorting and dispatching of parcel post. Sorting involves facing the package so the address can be read, and assembling it with others of like destination. The packages then must be tied in sacks, stored and dispatched to trucks. Traditionally, the work has involved much lifting, throwing and dumping.

Privately owned Nelson Greller & Associates of Hyattsville, Md., working under Department contract, came up with the first parcel sorter, which was installed in the Baltimore post office in 1956. This accomplished a lot—made 21 separations, reduced the floor space required for sorting, increased productivity, and so on—but not quite enough.

Several other companies now are taking up the challenge. Jervis B. Webb has installed in the Washington post office a parcel sorter which permits pushbutton dispatching to 32 destinations.

Another newcomer in this field is Aerojet-General of Azusa, Calif., a subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber. The company's Atlantic Division, acquired as Ordnance Engineering Corp. in 1956, specializes in automation, and now is completing the design of a parcel sorting system for the Cleveland post office. This installation, according to Dr. John Atanasoff, head of the division, will mechanize more of the parcel post operation than any existing system. The Department also is looking at parcel sorters developed for railroad use by Stewart-Warner of Chicago, and privately owned Alvey-Ferguson Co. of Cincinnati.

Once parcels are sorted and sacked, they must be stored, however briefly, before being assembled by truckload. Fortunately, today's monumental post office buildings, otherwise the bane of the Department, provide in their upper reaches the space required for overhead conveyors to help with such storage.

In 1955 Mechanical Handling Systems, Inc., of Detroit put its engineers to work to adapt overhead conveyors, developed for processing industries, to post office use. In 1957, it installed a monorail conveyor for sacks in the main Chicago post office. More recently, it has completed a $1.5 million conveyor system in Washington, D.C., and now it is finishing a $3 million job in Chicago. Mechanical Handling's system provides pushbutton dispatching to several storage areas and pushbutton callout of the sacks in loading sequence. (This business, however, hardly has made the company prosperous. It lost money both in 1958 and in the first half of 1959.)

Other competitors are such privately owned companies as Alvey-Ferguson, Jervis B. Webb, Rapid Standards Co. of Grand Rapids and C. F. Butz Engineering of Boston. General Electric, Cutler-Hammer, Binks Manufacturing Co. of Chicago, and several small privately owned concerns produce control equipment for the parcel-handling sorters and conveyors.

Obviously, Mr. Summerfield's most important job, and the most difficult, is processing letters. First step is to cull them from the mass of thick envelopes, small packages, and other assorted shapes and sizes of mail. Attempts at mechanization here date back to 1953. More recently, Emerson Radio & Phonograph's Emerson Research Corp. has developed a culling machine of tremendous capacity.

At the moment, however, the Department appears to favor a smaller machine, designed by American Machine & Foundry Co. of New York under Government contract. Completed early in 1959, it separates letters and cards from bulkier mail at the rate of 30,000 pieces an hour. Post Office engineers now are modifying the prototype, which cost roughly $20,000.

The Post Office also is looking closely at a culler developed in Europe by I.T. & T.'s German subsidiary, Standard Elektrik Lorenz, A.G. This machine was tested in 1958 at the West Berlin post office and similar equipment was installed last July in Washington. An improved model will go into the post office which I.T. & T. is building at Providence.

The second stage in processing letters is to face and cancel them. "It is our intention," Mr. Plummer says, "to develop a machine * * * which will take the clean letter mail product from a culling machine at a rate of approximately 30,000 pieces an hour, determine the position of the stamp on the envelope, perform a cancellation and face and stack the output. Progress in the development of this equipment has been particularly successful and most major technical problems have been solved."

American Machine & Foundry and I.T. & T.'s German subsidiary both have built facer-cancelers for use with their respective cullers. Pitney-Bowes, however, appears to lead the field. In 1956 the company decided, as part of its diversification program, to broaden its line of mail-handling equipment, which then consisted primarily of canceling and postage metering machines. Its research led it to Werkspoor, N.V. of Amsterdam, makers of railroad, packaging, and drilling equipment and also of mail-handling machines. One of the latter had been shown at the New York World's Fair in 1939. The companies agreed to join in working on mail equipment and Pitney-Bowes became Werkspoor's U.S. agent.

One of their first projects was development of a facer-canceler, which they undertook without benefit of Government contract. By 1957 their machine was far enough along for testing in the Stamford post office, and a year later the Department ordered 25 more, which now are operating in Washington, Detroit, Philadelphia, and other large cities. Last October it signed a $2.25 million contract for 75 of an improved model. This was the Post Office's first volume order for basic mail-handling equipment.

The Pitney-Bowes facer-canceler, like I.T. & T.'s, handles approximately 30,000 pieces an hour. Both machines, using optical scanners, determine the position of the stamp by the contrast between its color and that of the envelope. This method, however, has its drawbacks, because the scanners can be fooled by a trademark or by an envelope much the same color as the stamp. The Post Office consequently is searching for a way to give stamps a foolproof identification. One of the companies reportedly at work here is Nuclear-Chicago Corp. of Chicago, which specializes in the design and manufacture of instruments to detect radioactive materials and use them for control purposes. Both the Post Office and the company refuse to discuss the latter's $250,000 postal assignment.

The third step in processing letters, and a key one, is sorting. This area has seen the greatest advances of all. For more than 2 years, the Department has been studying two European letter sorters installed in the Washington, D.C., area.

The first of these machines brought to the United States was the Transorma, developed by Werkspoor in the mid-1930's. This was bought by the Brazilian and Argentinean Governments in the early 1940's, and installed by Pitney-Bowes in the Silver Spring, Md., post office in May 1957, at a cost of $117,000. The Transorma has 5 keyboards, at which 5 operators can sort 15,000 letters an hour.

The second sorter, a six-operator machine, was installed in the Washington post office in 1958 at a cost of $170,000. It was produced by I.T. & T's Belgian subsidiary, Bell Telephone Manufacturing Co., which had begun work on it shortly after World War II at the invitation of the Belgian Government. The first unit was installed in a post office in Antwerp in 1951. Since then, others have been put in there, at Brussels and in Israel. Bell currently is negotiating for 4 more for Ghent and Liege, building a pilot installation for Cairo and 11 units for the Providence, R.I., project. The Bell machine sorts about 18,000 letters an hour.

Years before it began examining foreign machines, the Post Office had begun work, with the Bureau of Standards, on a letter sorter designed specifically for U.S. needs. Subsequently it asked Rabinow Engineering Co. of Takoma Park, Md., a privately owned firm headed by a former Bureau of Standards engineer, to develop the design elements and principle of operation for a sorting machine.

In July 1958, the Department turned over the Rabinow designs to Burroughs Corp. for production engineering and manufacture of 10 machines for a total of $1.8 million. A month later, the Post Office awarded Pitney-Bowes the $1.5 million job of improving the basic Rabinow design and building a multiple-unit machine. Burroughs' first sorter went into operation in Detroit in October, as the star of a postal-machine show opened amid fanfare by Postmaster General Summerfield and Burroughs President Ray E. Eppert. The first Pitney-Bowes sorter is being tested in that company's laboratory, and the larger model is scheduled for delivery in April.

These U.S.-made machines, each manned by 12 operators, can sort 36,000 letters an hour to nearly 300 destinations. Once faced and stacked, they are fed automatically into reading position for the operator before moving on to the conveyor. The operator reads the address and punches the keyboard, activating a mechanism which releases the letter from the conveyor when it reaches the point of transfer to the desired destination bin. These machines, even now, cost less than half as much per operator-station as the European ones. Among the companies doing preliminary work on their own for this market are U.S. Industries' Robodyne Division; Aerojet-General's Atlantic Division; and I.B.M.

The limiting factor in all today's sorters is the operator needed to read addresses. Consequently, the Department has tried printing a code in magnetic ink on each envelope, which could be read by machine. U.S.I.'s Robodyne Division has developed a prototype code-printing machine, now on a standby basis, and the Bureau of Standards is working on a universal code for magnetic reading or other application.

The Post Office also has been attacking the reading problem directly. It is working on a machine that will automatically read the address on, and sort, letter mail. Carrying on this work for the Department is Intelligent Machines Research Corp., of Arlington, Va., acquired early in 1959 by Farrington Manufacturing Co., of Needham, Mass.

I.M.R.'s founder, David H. Shephard, now a Farrington vice president, shortly after World War II invented an optical scanner which can read numbers and printed words and punch corresponding holes in a card or transfer the data to tape. The machine, which requires no special ink or paper, has been in commercial production since 1958. More than a score now are in use for processing dividend and travelers' checks, subscriptions, credit card invoices, and the like.

Capacity of the address reader I.M.R. has been developing for the Department gradually has been raised until it now can recognize 13 capital letters and 17 in lowercase. This degree of sophistication enables it to handle the 20 post office names selected for the research project. Says Mr. Plummer: "The machine theoretically can process 75 percent of all letter-sized mail having typed or printed addresses."

In October, the Department awarded Farrington a contract to develop an advanced, transistorized machine capable of reading 10,000 letters per hour and sorting to 40 destinations. The new contract also calls for research into the reading of handwritten addresses. Meanwhile, the Post Office is working on equipment to cull typed and printed envelopes from those with handwritten addresses—yet another illustration of the unfolding complexities of postal mechanization.

As the elements of a mechanized mail system are developed, one by one, the need is increasingly urgent to put them together under optimum conditions, as a guide to expanding their use. A continuing experiment to furnish just such information is the $20 million post office, Project Turnkey, which I.T. & T. is building at Providence.

The company was a logical candidate for the job since it can furnish more of the basic paraphernalia—culler, facer-canceler, and sorter—than anyone else. The Department will own the equipment, but I.T. & T. is financing the construction of the building and will be the landlord.

The Providence project is under the jurisdiction of Intelex Systems, Inc., a subsidiary which markets in the United States products made by I.T. & T. affiliates aboard. According to project manager E. H. Roorback, I.T. & T. expects to sell foreign-made equipment to the Post Office in only experimental quantities. Although details remain to be worked out, Mr. Roorback says there's no doubt that the company will begin production of mail-handling equipment in the United States.

The major operating equipment for Project Turnkey will be supplied by Intelex. The 11 letter sorters, costing about $100,000 apiece, are due to arrive from Antwerp in the spring. Many other suppliers, however, are working on subcontracts. Jervis B. Webb, for one, will install a $500,000 parcel sorting and conveying system.

On this project, Intelex is attempting to make use of the latest industrial developments. Thus, the company hopes to design a container suitable for trucks, railroad cars, and planes and one which large commercial mailers will be able to load themselves.

The new post office will have a daily capacity of 2 million pieces of mail and parcel post. It will handle all mail to and from Providence and is expected incidentally to improve service for more than 100 other post offices in southern New England. The building, which will share a 14-acre site with a heliport, is now about half done, and scheduled for completion later this year.

In constrast, Food Machinery & Chemical's Project Gateway post office at Oakland, Calif., is in the very early stages. So far, the concept has been developed, but not the ma-

chinery. According to H. A. Oldenkamp, manager of the company's central engineering laboratories, one objective is to reduce the number of mail handlings from 10 to 2. Although final contracts have not been signed, Mr. Plummer looks for a working post office by 1964.

Even the latter venture is only an intermediate stage in the pursuit of radically new methods to speed the mails and reduce costs. Although the Post Office once delivered mail by Regulus, it is not now working on either guided missiles or satellites as message carriers. It is, however, busy on facsimile transmission of letters.

Since early last year, it has been testing a facsimile line between Washington and the west coast, using standard slow-speed channels. Late in the fall it began tests on high-speed microwave facsimile transmission between Washington and Detroit. Mr. Plummer seems confident that this speed mail eventually will turn out to be fabulous. It promises to make Mr. Summerfield's aim of next-day delivery between any two U.S. cities a reality. Moreover, according to one preliminary estimate, coast-to-coast operation will cost less than a quarter as much as airmail does today.

Last July, the Department awarded a $140,000 research contract for facsimile to I.T. & T. Until recently, certain segments of industry reportedly hesitated to work with the Post Office in this field, because they feared Federal incursions into their territory. The Department now has reassured them on that score, and has been able to enlist the aid of the whole communications industry and its suppliers. I.T. & T., meanwhile, acknowledges that it is working with privately owned A. B. Dick Co. of Chicago, Stewart-Warner and Electronic Communications, Inc., of St. Petersburg.

On every front, then, the Post Office and U.S. industry are cooperating in efforts to shift to machines more of the burden of carrying today's mounting volume of mail. Clearly, the Department still has a long way to go to achieve efficiency comparable to that of many a private enterprise. Moreover, it can't attain that goal without continuing support from Congress. Nonetheless, the steps already taken, within post office buildings and without, augur further improvements in service to the public. For many a firm specializing in business machines, materials handling or communications, the post office should be an inviting market for a long time to come.

THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Governor of California, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, delivered a thought-provoking and dynamic statement on the importance of national resources development, with particular reference to the bill, which is now before the committee, S. 2549.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING S. 2549 BY HON. EDMUND G. BROWN, GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 26, 1960

I wish to express my sincere thanks to your committee for this opportunity to appear before you. I especially am grateful for the honor and courtesy you have bestowed upon me by convening at this time to hear my statement.

The members of this committee are keenly aware of the importance of full resource development to the welfare of our Nation. An inventory and program for national resource development becomes increasingly necessary with the addition of our two newest States and their different types and abundance of natural resources.

This bill provides the method for coordinating information and policies which can lead to a sound and positive approach to the development of our natural resources. As I have already written Senator MURRAY, population is multiplying beyond any earlier estimates, our needs for food, water, and other natural resources are spiraling. Nothing on the domestic scene is of greater importance to future generations of Americans than sound policies and effective programs to make use of our multitudinous natural resources, land, water, energy, air, minerals, forests, and fisheries.

To illustrate by 1950 in comparison to 1900 the American people were taking from the earth 2½ times more bituminous coal, 3½ times more iron ore, 4 times more zinc, 26 times more natural gas, and 30 times more crude oil. Since 1900, the total withdrawal of water has doubled about every 25 years.

Perhaps it will be helpful if I defer for a few minutes some comments on the importance of this legislation to the people of the entire Nation and speak more specifically about the West and the West's role in the future of our country. This is the geographic area that offers the elbowroom for population and economic expansion. Its proper development is vital to our survival as a world power.

I have spent my entire life in the West and I have witnessed what has been, and still continues to be, perhaps the greatest mass migration of human beings in history. The West has been able to absorb this tremendous influx of new residents not only because of its vast expanse of virgin lands but also because of enlightened Federal investment in its natural resources during the 1930's and 1940's.

However, especially in the years since 1952, the Federal administration's perspective of the national necessity for westward expansion appears to have become dim and distorted. Preoccupation with budget balancing and an almost servile eagerness to bend to the will of selfish interests has been substituted for vision and courage. The pioneer has been replaced by the budgeteer. High interest rates have become more important than high dams.

The development of the West—a great storehouse of natural resources—is a challenge and opportunity for the entire Nation. America's booming population demands more space for economic expansion, for living area, and for recreation. Just space itself is an increasingly precious and scarce resource for human existence in this age of mounting urban density, air pollution, and traffic congestion.

Already the country's expanding population is spreading over the wide reach of the West. The census of our 11 Western States is growing at almost twice the rate of that of the rest of the country. And this is just the beginning.

Failure by the Federal Government to recognize and prepare more fully for this irrepressible westward movement could have disastrous economic and social effects on every section of the Nation. Preparing the West for the vast new populace certain to rise there is essential for a nation whose population is expected to soar to 370 million within just 50 years. There can be no relief from that situation if the basic development of the West is allowed to stagnate for lack of resource programs. In the East, the South, and Midwest, it would mean increasingly overcrowded urban areas and an ultimate ceiling on national development.

Fortunately, this need not happen. Federal investment in the water resources of the 11 Western States will pay huge dividends in terms of ample living space, agricultural land, and industrial expansion capable of sustaining an ever-growing citizenry. All of that will help provide and spread the revenue base for the public services necessary for our increasingly complex society. Federal investment in the devolpment of our water resources will also pay off by providing flood control which would save countless lives and prevent untold millions of dollars in property damage. Finally, it will stimulate to a tremendous degree a booming recreation industry that is contributing substantially to our national economy and can do so far more in the age of shorter working hours which lies ahead.

It is simply good business for the Federal Government to recognize and invest in the vast potential of the West in the interest of the entire national economy. A study based on Federal internal revenue collections reveals that farmers and townspeople on and in the vicinity of Western reclamation projects paid $340 million in income taxes during the 1958 fiscal year. A very sizable share of those payments came from nonfarm residents whose occupations stemmed from irrigation farming activities. Federal taxes from those areas alone have totaled $3½ billion since 1940, 11 percent more than was spent for project construction since the start of the reclamation program in 1902. These tax payments are in addition to regular project repayments which return, in the form of water and power revenues, 92 percent of the funds expended for reclamation projects.

The benefits of western development are manifest for the entire Nation in private as well as public ways. Thus a growing and prosperous West provides a constantly expanding and more lucrative market for eastern industries. The $53 billion market of the Western States was three times the export market of the United States in 1956.

For example, the turbines, the generators, the complex electrical equipment necessary for western waterpower projects spell jobs, prosperity, and a broader tax base in Schenectady, N.Y.; Gary, Ind.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and other eastern and midwestern manufacturing centers.

Similar benefits also will accrue to the entire Nation as a result of informed and intelligent development of fish and wildlife programs, the proper use of our vast forests and rangelands and national and regional parks throughout America.

Important as this legislation is to the West, it is even more important to the entire Nation. It is essential if we are to meet the needs of our people during the next 50 years. They will not be met by the shortsighted policies of the past 7 years. Full employment of our people in the years ahead demands full employment of our natural resources.

And may I at this point commend your committee, Senator MURRAY, for the farsighted attitude you have taken not only toward the development of our own Nation's natural resources, but also in studying the relative rate of progress of the United States and other countries in resource development.

I have in mind particularly the recent intensive study made by your committee and the Public Works Committee of the Senate of the water resource development programs of the Soviet Union. I would venture the prediction that, in the long run, the rate of development of our natural resources and of our productive capacity could have more effect on the standing of the United States among the nations of the world than our

progress in missile development, for our storehouse of natural resources and our ability to use these resources wisely provide the real foundation for the strength and continued vigor of our Nation.

We should bear in mind, too, that the so-called undeveloped nations of the world—nations which in most cases are not yet committed to the East or the West—may be more impressed by the manner and rate of development of our natural resources than our armed might.

So I commend your committee and the Public Works Committee for your study of the Russian program of water resource development. I have read your subcommittee's report with great interest, yet also with great concern. It is most disturbing and disheartening to learn that the Russians' present rate of growth in electric power capacity is faster than that of the United States. It is deplorable, too, to learn that the Russians have built bigger dams, bigger turbines, and longer and higher voltage transmission lines than we have.

For many years we took pride in the fact that Grand Coulee was the world's largest dam. Today, a Russian dam already in operation has relegated Grand Coulee to the No. 2 position, and soon another Russian dam will lower Grand Coulee to the third position.

It is significant that much of the Russians' progress and the slippage in our program have taken place during the period when our administration has expounded the backward-looking, unproductive "no new starts" policy—a policy which the administration has seen fit to reverse only this year as the elections approach. While the Russians, on their side of the Bering Sea, have proceeded with vigor in building massive dams and water resource projects, we have just begun, under the prodding of a Democratic Congress, to plan the giant Rampart Canyon project on our side of the Bering Sea in Alaska.

In the past we have not needed the example of the Russians or any other nation to think in big terms and act in big terms. I do not believe we need such examples today. The challenge is clearly here, if we but face up to it. In our great and expansive West, different time zones and different river flow conditions make obvious the need for interconnections of our regional power systems. We need extra high voltage transmission systems which will be operated on a common carrier principle to transmit power generated by both public and private power utilities. Such long-distance transmission lines would not only make possible more effective utilization of our water resources, but also would provide for the best development and use of our fossil fuels. Yet, in the face of this crying need for giant transmission facilities, a recent report of the Bonneville Power Administration calls for a completely inadequate interconnection between the great Northwest and northern California systems.

I am convinced that the people of the West and the people of the Nation will not be satisfied with such myopic planning—planning that does not show faith in our future. This week, therefore, I am ordering the employment by the State of California of a consulting engineering firm to make a study of plans for a truly adequate extra high voltage transmission interconnection between the Bonneville Power and Central Valley systems. I am hopeful that other affected States will join in such a study. I want to emphasize that I am in complete agreement with our neighbors in the Pacific Northwest that in building any tieline between our regions, first rights to any usable power should remain in the region of origin for use by both public and private agencies.

The need for planning and building high voltage regional interconnections in the West—and, in fact, the entire country—is but one example of the need for the bill which is being discussed before your committee today.

To summarize, Senate bill 2549 gives promise that future Federal resource programs will receive the national attention they deserve and it holds out the promise that resource development programs will be devised on a scale and scope that the Nation's welfare demands.

In closing I call your attention to this advice inscribed on the wall behind the Speaker's chair in the House of Representatives:

"Let us develop the resources of this land; call forth its powers; build up its institutions; promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET FOR HEALTH INADEQUATE: HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS CUT $60 MILLION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, the distinguished medical editor of the New York Times, wrote an excellent article for the New York Times of January 24, 1960, assaying President Dwight D. Eisenhower's proposed budget for health.

Dr. Rusk points out that at first glance, the $255 million increase the President asked Congress to appropriate to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the current fiscal year would be sufficient to meet the needs of our growing population and our expanding Federal health, educational, and welfare services.

However, on close scrutiny of the proposed budget for health, Dr. Rusk concludes that this assumption is not accurate:

First, Congress last year voted $3,466 million or $296 million more than the President requested. Added to this is $21 million in supplemental appropriation requests by the administration for the current year, making a total of $3,486,961,000.

Thus the funds requested by the President for the coming fiscal year are actually $56 million less than the combined appropriations and requested supplemental for the current year.

Mr. President, one of the primary changes in requested appropriations for major programs within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the appropriation for hospital construction grants. Despite outstanding achievements made since the inauguration of the Hill-Burton program on August 13, 1946, President Eisenhower has recommended that this program be cut by $60 million.

HILL-BURTON FUNDS IMPORTANT TO OREGON

The Hill-Burton program administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been very successful in my State of Oregon. Since the inception of the program, 67 projects have been approved for a total cost of $49.9 million of which the Federal share is $12.2 million. Upon completion, 3,044 beds and 10 health units will have been made possible under the Hill-Burton program in Oregon as of December 31, 1959. Towns in Oregon with a population less than 2,000 in the 1950 census, such as Bandon, John Day, Florence, Gold Beach, Heppner, and Enterprise, have been able to build the hospitals and medical facilities the people in their communities and surrounding areas needed which they might not otherwise have been able to finance. The hospital construction program has been, and still is, very vital to my State in general, and the individual communities particularly. This same program has been equally effective in our other States.

APPLICANTS BEAR MAJOR PORTION OF COST

Mr. President, applicants in Oregon have financed $37.7 million of the total cost of $49.9 million allocated for 67 projects in Oregon. Residents of our State have, thus, borne the major share of the cost of this program. The applicants' share in Oregon was 76 percent and the Federal share of the cost was only 24 percent.

If Congress were to accept the President's recommendation of a $60 million reduction, it would mean a substantial decrease in construction of needed general, mental, and tuberculosis hospitals, as well as nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment facilities, chronic disease, and rehabilitation facilities. The Federal contribution often means the difference between initiating a project or not initiating it. Thus, elimination of these funds would drop construction by far more than $60 million.

Mr. President, in view of the existing need and the many local applications to participate in this program—a desire to cooperate with the Federal Government even though they must provide a far greater share of the cost—it is my strong conviction that Congress must do the same this year that it has done the previous 2 years and increase the $125 million the President has recommended to a far more realistic figure. Last year the administration recommended only $101,200,000 for Federal grants for hospital construction. Congress, however, was able to increase the amount to $185 million. As in previous years, the great demands for additional hospital and medical facilities of our Nation must be adequately met, and this cannot be done under the appropriation recommended by President Eisenhower for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, appearing in the January 24, 1960, New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the summary of approved projects under the Hill-Burton program in Oregon, together with the names of the projects approved in Oregon under the Hill-Burton program, both of which were prepared by the division of hospital and medical facilities of the Public Health Service at my request, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1960]

THE BUDGET FOR HEALTH—PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR MORE FUNDS ASSAYED AND SHORTCOMINGS ARE FOUND

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

In his budget message for fiscal 1961, President Eisenhower asked Congress to appro-

priate to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare $255 million more than he had requested for the current fiscal year. The amount is $3,431 million, compared with the $3,176 million requested last year.

At first glance, it would seem that an apparent increase of more than a quarter of a billion dollars would be sufficient to meet the needs of our growing population and our concepts of expanding Federal health, educational, and welfare services.

Close scrutiny of the 70 pages of fine print of the budget devoted to the Department, however, shows that this assumption is not accurate.

First, Congress last year voted $3,466 million, or $296 million more than the President requested. Added to this is $21 million in supplemental appropriation requests by the administration for the current year, making a total of $3,486,961,000.

CHANGES ARE NOTED

Thus the funds requested by the President for the coming fiscal year are actually $56 million less than the combined appropriations and requested supplementals for the current year.

The primary changes in requested appropriations for major programs within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are:

Implementation of the National Defense Education Act, an increase of $11,300,000.

Vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped, up $4,833,000.

Environmental health activities, including research and training in radiological health and air and water pollution, up $6,116,000.

Grants to the States to assist needy aged, blind, and disabled persons and dependent children, up $39,500,000.

Construction grants for construction of waste-treatment facilities, down $25 million.

Hospital construction grants, down $60 million.

Health-research construction grants, down $5 million.

Assistance for schools in federally affected areas, down $4,007,000.

Direct Federal construction, down $13,765.

Completely eliminated in the new budget is the current $1 million appropriation for grants to schools of public health.

Based on past experience, there are two major items concerning health in which Congress will probably not agree with the President. These are appropriations for hospital construction and for the National Institutes of Health.

Last year the President recommended $101,200,000 for Federal grants for hospital construction. Congress, however, increased the amount to $185 million. It is quite probable it will be of the same mind this year and will increase the $125 million the President has recommended. This is what happened the last 2 years.

Identical action was taken by Congress on the appropriation for the National Institutes of Health. A year ago President Eisenhower recommended that the appropriation remain the same as the previous year, $294 million, but Congress increased it to $400 million, the largest increase ever made in 1 year for medical research and training.

There are two new programs recommended in the President's budget that are comparatively small in cost, but of great importance. An appropriation of $700,000 is recommended for cooperative research in the welfare field. This is a sound recommendation. During the coming fiscal year more than $2 billion in Federal funds will be spent to provide assistance to the needy, yet we actually know little about the causes of financial dependency and the best methods of reducing it. This new research effort to determine such facts makes good commonsense.

The second new program is an appropriation of $4,694,000 to support scientific activities and research in health, education, and welfare in foreign countries. Such research would be financed with foreign currency, commonly called counterpart funds, owned by the United States as the result of sales of surplus agricultural products.

The President recommended that $3,707,000 be allocated to the National Institutes of Health and $930,000 to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for this purpose. This recommendation is most practical.

AID TO NEW KNOWLEDGE

The funds to be used cannot be taken from the countries of their origin under our agreements with them. They are also in excess of the normal requirements of the United States.

With good planning, however, they can be used to great advantage in developing new knowledge that will be of value not only in the nations concerned but also in many other parts of the world, including the United States.

SUMMARY OF APPROVED PROJECTS UNDER THE HILL-BURTON PROGRAM IN OREGON AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1959

Program to date: Since the inception of the program, 67 projects have been approved for a total cost of $49.9 million of which the Federal share is $12.2 million. Upon completion, 3,044 beds and 10 health units will be provided as follows:

Category	Beds
General	2,136
Mental	480
TB	130
Nursing home	298

Category:	
Diagnostic and treatment centers	3
Rehabilitation facility	1
Public health centers	6

Status of approved projects

	Number of projects	Estimated total cost	Approved Federal share
In operation	49	$33,261,486	$8,515,077
Under construction	8	11,269,237	1,879,222
Initially approved	10	5,451,119	1,842,350
Total	67	49,981,842	12,236,649

Allotments for hospital and medical facilities construction

Fiscal year	Part C—Hospitals	Part G—Medical facilities [1]				Total available	Fiscal year	Part C—Hospitals	Part G—Medical facilities [1]				Total available
		Diagnostic or treatment facilities	Chronic disease facilities	Rehabilitation facilities	Nursing homes				Diagnostic or treatment facilities	Chronic disease facilities	Rehabilitation facilities	Nursing homes	
1948	$460,361					$460,361	1957	$905,993	$21,000		$50,000	$229,000	$1,205,993
1949	534,815					534,815	1958	938,042			50,000	250,000	1,238,042
1950	1,544,418					1,544,418	1959	1,441,017			93,658	293,658	1,828,333
1951	871,797					871,797	1960	1,496,656	100,000	$100,000	97,351	97,351	1,891,358
1952	577,949					577,949							
1953	528,592					528,592	Total available						13,153,951
1954	552,083					552,083	Obligated						12,236,649
1955	644,128	$100,000			$150,000	894,128	Unobligated						917,302
1956	776,082	26,357			223,643	1,026,082							
1													

[1] As adjusted by transfer.

Projects approved in Oregon under the Hill-Burton program as of Dec. 31, 1959

IN OPERATION

Location	Name of facility	Total cost	Federal share	Location	Name of facility	Total cost	Federal share
Albany	Albany General Hospital	$430,631	$86,268	Heppner	Pioneer Memorial Hospital	$236,159	$78,720
Bend	St. Charles Memorial Hospital	928,904	309,635	Do	do	133,537	34,234
Do	do	341,583	100,000	Hermiston	Hermiston Community Hospital	450,000	127,074
Burns	Harney County Hospital	321,122	106,374	Hood River	Hood River Memorial Hospital	582,575	175,000
Corvallis	Good Samaritan Hospital	266,800	88,933	Lebanon	Lebanon Community Hospital	671,120	193,667
Do	do	323,758	76,622	Do	Lebanon Community Nursing Home	240,215	79,043
Cottage Grove	Cottage Grove Hospital	308,515	102,505	Medford	Rogue Valley Memorial Hospital	2,838,484	563,960
Enterprise	Wallowa Memorial Hospital	301,169	100,390	Newport	Pacific Communities Hospital	281,615	91,401
Eugene	Sacred Heart General Hospital	1,500,000	500,000	Do	do	56,383	18,258
Do	City County Public Health Center	204,035	65,220	North Bend	Keizer Memorial Hospital	237,239	45,000
Florence	Western Lane District Hospital	290,708	96,903	Do	Mercy Nursing Home	1,557,771	433,563
Gold Beach	Curry General Hospital	140,441	45,272	Do	Keizer Memorial Hospital	147,662	46,400
Do	do	38,994	12,998	Ontario	Holy Rosary Hospital	1,020,331	331,000

Projects approved in Oregon under the Hill-Burton program as of Dec. 31, 1959—Continued

IN OPERATION

Location	Name of facility	Total cost	Federal share	Location	Name of facility	Total cost	Federal share
Pendleton	Eastern Oregon State Mental Hospital	$1,069,008	$14,669	Portland	University of Oregon Diagnostic & Treatment Center.	$237,094	$70,329
Portland	Emanuel Hospital	2,166,173	418,884				
Do	Good Samaritan Hospital	2,242,400	729,000	Do	Womans Convalescent Home	149,619	67,698
Do	Oregon State Laboratory	2,358,414	87,012	Roseburg	Douglas Community Hospital	569,946	181,664
Do	Holladay Park Hospital	1,037,775	325,150	Do	Mercy Hospital	415,823	138,608
Do	Multnomah County Health Center	346,122	77,351	Salem	Oregon State Mental Hospital	779,410	259,803
Do	St. Vincent's Hospital	1,256,988	307,553	Do	Salem General Hospital	1,006,119	307,821
Do	University of Oregon Diagnostic & Treatment Center.	362,941	56,028	Do	Salem Memorial Hospital	344,913	89,466
				Do	do	736,429	178,641
Do	Portland Osteopathic Hospital	902,239	222,842	Springfield	McKenzie-Willamette Hospital	497,445	155,100
Do	University of Oregon Diagnostic & Treatment Center.	59,452	19,558	St. Helens	Columbia District Hospital	590,219	148,343
				Stayton	Santiam Memorial Hospital	374,156	124,719
Do	Mount St. Joseph's Nursing Home	713,132	235,000	Tillamook	Tillamook County Hospital	1,185,918	391,398

UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Bandon	Southern Coos General Hospital	$345,510	$105,000	Prineville	Crook County Nursing Home	$174,000	$87,000
John Day	Blue Mountain Hospital	549,707	170,600	Salem	Salem General Hospital	58,475	12,967
Ontario	Presbyterian Nursing Home	308,406	143,580	The Dalles	The Dalles General Hospital	1,224,729	400,000
Portland	Emanuel Hospital School of Nursing	1,204,684	219,075	Wilsonville	F. H. Dammasch State Mental Hospital	7,403,726	741,000

INITIALLY APPROVED

Ashland	Ashland General Hospital	$495,520	$157,173	Portland	Physicians & Surgeons Hospital	$1,209,718	$396,083
Coquille	Coos County Health Center	31,998	10,666	Do	Multnomah County Health Center	32,781	10,927
Cottage Grove	Cottage Grove Nursing Home	91,000	45,500	Do	Portland Rehabilitation Center	87,400	40,200
Hillsboro	Tuality Community Hospital	405,002	133,334	Toledo	Lincoln Hospital District Nursing Home.	216,100	101,800
Oregon City	Willamette Falls Community Hospital	1,040,000	346,667				
Pendleton	St. Anthony Hospital	1,841,600	600,000				

Sources: Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Public Health Service, Washington, D.C.

THE MISSILE PROGRAM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times is widely recognized as one of this Nation's most impartial, keen-minded, analytical observers of military affairs.

Last week Mr. Baldwin wrote three carefully reasoned, perceptive articles on defense matters which deserve the attention of every Senator—indeed, every thoughtful American.

His article on "The Defense Budget," appearing in the Times for January 21, 1960, sets forth in brief terms the great strength and versatility of the forces we will maintain in the year ahead.

A series of two articles on our missile programs is particularly informative and timely in view of the Russians' long-range shot into the central Pacific last week.

Mr. Baldwin, a Pulitzer prizewinner widely respected for the correctness and completeness of his reporting, notes in some detail the amazing accuracy of our own long-range missiles. I was particularly impressed with the fact, clearly noted in both of these articles, that the United States has developed an overall missile defense in great depth. We are in no way dependent upon any single missile.

Mr. Baldwin supports this conclusion by reporting in some detail not only on our ballistic missile program, but also on the several other nuclear weapons systems we have in being or advanced stages of development which together give us a strong deterrent force.

Chief among these are the Hound Dog missile, now operational with our B–52 bombers, and the Navy's Polaris missile, which is developing great reliability and what Mr. Baldwin terms "phenomenal accuracy."

From this two-part, highly objective appraisal of our missile position vis-a-vis that of Russia there emerges a total pattern of great strength, versatility, and depth in the Defense Department's several missile programs. Mr. Baldwin has performed a valuable service by reminding us that one spectacular shot into the mid-Pacific does not tip the scales of our missile achievement one iota. He has made a significant contribution to our consideration of the Nation's actual position in the field of missile readiness by presenting in brief, factual form an analysis of the several elements of our existing strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baldwin's three articles "The Defense Budget" of January 21, "The Missile Gap" of January 22, and "Data on Missiles Support Optimism Over U.S. Defenses" of January 23, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1960]

THE MISSILE GAP—HARDHEADED APPRAISALS SUPPORT GATES IN OPTIMISTIC PICTURE OF U.S. DEFENSES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Moscow's claim yesterday of a 1¼-mile circular error in a 7,766-mile rocket flight caused raised eyebrows but no excitement in the Pentagon.

The first of a number of Russian missile shots into a new impact area in the central Pacific, whether or not it was as accurate and as successful as the Russians asserted, is unlikely to influence materially the vigorous and aggressive presentation of the administration's defense policies just initiated.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Under Secretary of State Livingston T. Merchant tipped the administration's hand in their opening testimony in Congress this week.

Their composite testimony totaled, in the opinion of some Congressmen, the rosiest picture of the U.S. defense posture presented to Congress for a long time. The balance of military power is still "heavily in our favor," Secretary Gates said. Even a Soviet surprise attack with all available missiles could not eliminate our nuclear retaliatory capability.

THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. Gates even cast considerable doubt on what has come by dint of constant repetition to be accepted as a fact by many in the Nation: a missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in the next few years. He indicated that if the Russians produced intercontinental ballistic missiles at our present maximum estimate of their potential capabilities they might have a "moderate numerical superiority" in the next 3 years. But the United States has many other nuclear weapons systems, which, collectively, tip the balance of deterrent power "heavily in our favor."

This is an election year. The Democratic opposition is already attempting to make a campaign issue out of the deficiencies in our military posture and is emphasizing particularly the alleged "missile gap." The Republican administration, on the other hand, has been aroused and stung by the opposition attacks. The President, in particular, is known to have been greatly angered by the criticisms voiced in "The Uncertain Trumpet," a book recently published by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, who completed 4 years as Army Chief of Staff last June. The President's mood, particularly about defense matters, is typified by his recent heated response to a somewhat pointed news conference question about defense:

"I've spent my life in this, and I know more about it than almost anybody I think in the country."

Is, then, Mr. Gates' testimony rhetoric, the opening guns of the defense in an election year; or is it solidly based on factual appraisal?

A COMPOUND ANSWER

The answer to this question is almost certainly compound. Mr. Gates has too much integrity—he is a public servant who

is no politician and owes no man anything—to give other than his honest opinion. But he is aware, as is the White House, that the Pentagon case has not been put skillfully or forcefully in the past.

The administration feels that the public image of relative American weakness that has been created—partly by Communist propaganda, partly by undoubted Communist achievements, partly by the special pleading of the individual services, partly by opposition criticism, partly by inept administration presentations of our strength—is grossly exaggerated. Mr. Gates, therefore, is certainly determined to put his best foot forward, not only for domestic political reasons but also because he is keenly aware that a strategic deterrent is no stronger than the enemy thinks it is.

But at the same time his optimistic statements are based on hard-headed comparative appraisals of our own and of Soviet strength. The Secretary spoke of new intelligence estimates of Soviet missile strength, which he described as "very significant."

These estimates were not made public, but in an explanatory conference later the Secretary got onto slippery ground when he admitted that the new estimates took into account what the Russians intended to do in missile production, rather than, as in the past, merely estimating their capabilities.

In the intelligence field this issue of intentions versus capabilities is one of the oldest of pitfalls, and many experts have come a cropper by trying, in effect, to read the enemy's mind.

Nevertheless, the new intelligence reports do include an estimate of current Soviet long-range missile strength and of current Soviet missile production that, in comparison with our own current status, is by no means discouraging.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1960]

DATA ON MISSILES SUPPORT OPTIMISM OVER U.S. DEFENSE—AMERICAN WEAPONS PROVE ACCURACY—SOVIET MIGHT IS FOUND EXAGGERATED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The factual, rather than the political, motivation for the administration's new public relations policy of aggressive optimism about the Nation's defense posture has some firm foundations.

Our own missiles have demonstrated amazing accuracy, and widely published reports of tremendous Soviet missile strength are not supported by substantiated intelligence information. Here are some of the reasons for the newly expressed optimism:

Despite reports of 100 or more Soviet missile bases, there is still solid factual proof of only two long-range missile-launching sites—those long used by the Soviet Union for its test launchings at Kapustin Yar, near Stalingrad, and Tyuratam, near the Aral Sea.

Until this week's 7,762-mile rocket shot from Tyuratam to an impact area in the central Pacific, only one Soviet missile has been tracked to a full 5,000-mile flight to land in the northern Pacific. All the rest of the long-range shots—and there have not been many—have impacted in the sea of Okhotsk or near Kylucki, the Soviet impact area on the Kamchatka Peninsula, a distance of 4,300 miles from Kapustin Yar and 3,850 miles from Tyuratam.

PROBABLE CIRCULAR ERROR

The approximate probable circular error of these Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles has been estimated as possibly 7 to 10 miles, a much greater error than the Soviets claimed this week for their 7,762-mile shot.

It is quite possible that their new and more powerful rocket now incorporates an improved inertial guidance system that permits greater accuracy. On the other hand a "C.E.P." (circular error probable) for any weapons system cannot be determined except as an average of numerous flights.

The average circular error of the Atlas D missile, which is now being delivered to the Air Force as an operational missile, has been for the last eight 5,000-mile range shots considerably less than half of the 2-mile error the President revealed in his state of the Union message. The D missile, with radio-inertial guidance, has demonstrated phenomenal accuracy, sufficient if it can be continued to destroy any point target (as well as an area target, like a city).

The Atlas E, scheduled for first flight shortly after midsummer, is a "bird" that will have complete inertial guidance as well as a lighter engine and longer range. This means that a whole salvo of 9 or 10 missiles can be fired simultaneously from the same base, whereas the radio-inertial system, because of possible mutual interference by radio transmissions, is limited to about three simultaneous firings from one base.

The new E missile may not develop the same accuracy as the current model and it must be stressed that all the firings, except one performed by a Strategic Air Command crew at Vandenberg Air Force Base on the Pacific coast, were by experienced "missileers" down an instrumented range at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Nevertheless, U.S. missile experts are confident that the problem of accuracy with the ICBM has been solved and available facts indicate we are equal to or ahead of the Russians in this field.

The Navy's Polaris missile, designed for launching from submerged submarines, registered equally phenomenal accuracy in one recent flight (with guidance equipment installed) of more than 900 miles. (The full 1,200-mile-range missile has not yet been tested and none has yet been fired from a submarine.) It landed almost on top of the target, in fact almost within the length of a city block from bullseye.

There is some evidence to suggest that the Soviet air defense system is not so effective as it had once been credited with being. The Hound Dog missile, now operational, launched from B–52 bombers in flight, adds considerably to the problems of the defense. To the admitted U.S. superiority in manned bomber strength, has now been added the first small nucleus of intermediate range and intercontinental range ballistic missiles.

All this collectively adds up to a reassuring reappraisal of present U.S. deterrent strength relative to that of the Soviet Union and to a short-term future that appears to be less black than had been painted in many quarters.

Many officers agree with the statement by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., that "there is no deterrent gap" and is not likely to be one within the foreseeable future.

Others go further and say they doubt that a "missile gap," a Soviet superiority in numbers of long-range missiles, will, in reality, develop. There is, however, no unanimity on this point. Most officers from all services are worried about the long-term future and would like to see our calculated risks today and tomorrow reduced.

More funds for defense and a reallocation of the defense budget are urged by many.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1960]

THE DEFENSE BUDGET—SLIGHT BUT SIGNIFICANT CHANGES NOTED IN AMOUNTS EACH SERVICE WILL GET

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Funds for a standby air alert for the Strategic Air Command, more intercontinental ballistic missiles, and a cut in Air Force and Navy personnel and piloted planes were proposed Monday in the President's defense budget.

There were no sharp surprises in the 1961 budget; most of the changes, cuts and strength figures had been forecast, some of them months ago. The defense section of the President's budget message was confident in tone. There was no recognition of the so-called missile gap, either present or impending.

The trend of the Eisenhower administration toward a reduction in numbers of men and operating units continues in the 1961 estimates.

But the percentages of the defense dollar that go to the various services shift slightly but perhaps significantly for the first time since the new look was adopted in President Eisenhower's first term.

The Air Force proportion of new obligational authority is slightly reduced, the Navy's slightly increased. About 23½ percent of the new funds requested is earmarked for the Army, almost 30 percent for the Navy and Marines, almost 44 percent for the Air Force and the remainder for the Department of Defense.

In actual estimated expenditures, as contrasted to new obligational authority, there is little shift from last year. The total funds requested, $40,577 million in new obligational authority, maintain the level budget concept of the administration.

The budget makes no mention of a cut in personnel. Actually, however, the Navy's strength at the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1960, is to be 619,000 men, 11,000 fewer than the 630,000 that had been scheduled for the end of the current 1960 fiscal year. Similarly, the Air Force goes down from a prior scheduled 845,000 to 825,000. Actually, most of these cuts have already been absorbed during the current fiscal year. The Navy's most recent strength figures totaled less than 617,000 men; the Air Force numbers about 832,000. Army and Marine strength will remain the same, with total Armed Forces of about 2,489,000 men and women.

The Navy will operate some 43 fewer ships, and its active aircraft inventory will be sharply reduced from an originally planned 9,200 planes on June 30, 1960, to about 8,348 on June 30, 1961.

The Air Force comes down from a planned 102 wings on June 30, 1960, to 91 on June 30, 1961, and drops from an originally planned total of 19,982 planes to 18,885 for the same dates. Actually, some of these cuts have also been absorbed during the current year.

The Army retains 14 divisions, adds 1 infantry battle group, 1 missile command, and 9 antiaircraft missile battalions. The Marines remain at 175,000 strength, with 3 divisions and 3 air wings.

The reduction in the number of the Strategic Air Command's wings from 40 to 38 is partly compensated for by new planes and more missiles. The increase in the number of ballistic missiles is modest and had long been tentatively planned—once the first of our ICBM family, the Atlas, had proved its accuracy.

Seventy more of the giant ocean-spanning rockets are now programed, bringing to 27 squadrons, 10 missiles to a squadron, the total now scheduled with funds provided from prior years, the current year, and the 1961 budget.

The present "mix" calls for 14 Titan and 13 Atlas squadrons, but this is subject to change.

The Navy gets a somewhat larger shipbuilding program than had been expected, with 3 more Polaris missile submarines included and funds for long-lead-time items for another 3, bringing the grand total now programed to 15.

The President's budget message took little note of the major criticisms of the administration's defense policies. The budget was not increased; in new obligational authority it was slightly decreased.

It was not reallocated to any major degree either as between the services or between offense and defense.

Two among many controversial items that are sure to produce a lot of oratory on Capitol Hill are the reduction of the Air Force's supersonic B–70 bomber program to two prototypes and the request for funds to construct a conventionally powered, rather than a nuclear-powered, aircraft carrier. Both were dictated in considerable part by budget considerations; both are likely to evoke opposition.

Congress may vote funds for more missiles, as it did last year, and certainly in an election year each major item of the defense budget will receive close scrutiny. But when the tumult and the shouting dies, the approved budget will probably differ only slightly in final totals from yesterday's Presidential recommendations.

ADDRESS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH BY EX-SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the genuine problems confronting America in the 1960's is the proper development of children and youth. All of us are concerned over rising levels of juvenile delinquency, which has attained disturbing proportions. Yet we know that the youth of our country is sound today, as it has always been sound throughout our eventful history.

But many grave problems face our youth in this modern era—lack of adequate housing, crowded schools, slums and all that they imply, dope addiction, alcoholism, and many other pitfalls.

One of the thoughtful students of this urgent and critical situation is our former colleague from the State of New York, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, who has not only served in the Senate but was also Lieutenant Governor and Governor of that great State. His experience is vast.

On January 14, 1960, ex-Senator Lehman addressed himself to this question when he spoke before the general convention session of the National Retail Merchants Association at their 49th annual convention. I should particularly like to call attention to the eight specific problems listed by Senator Lehman in his challenging and informative address. They are as follows:

First. Many of the Nation's classrooms are overcrowded.

Second. There is a shortage of many teachers.

Third. Some students who have ability drop out before finishing high school.

Fourth. Opportunities for some children are blocked because of discrimination.

Fifth. Many children still live in slums.

Sixth. Some youths have physical handicaps which could have been prevented or can be cured.

Seventh. About one-fourth of all the children in the Nation live in families with very low incomes.

Eighth. Over a million youths are apprehended by the police every year for the kind of conduct roughly termed "juvenile delinquency."

The speech by former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Mr. President, is so pertinent a discussion of many of the questions which we are considering in this 2d session of the 86th Congress, that I ask unanimous consent that his address entitled "Creative Opportunities for Children and Youth" be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREATIVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

(Address of the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, at the general convention session of the National Retail Merchants Association's 49th annual convention, Terrace Ballroom, Hotel Statler, New York City, Thursday, January 14, 1960)

I deeply appreciate the opportunity extended to me by Mr. Nathan Gold, your president, and Mr. Alfred C. Thompson, your president-elect, to participate in this very significant session.

This year is the golden anniversary of the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Let me say first that these conferences have a historical base. In the early 1900's people became alarmed about the plight of widows and orphans and the children of families with disabled husbands. Such children were being taken away and placed in orphanages or in similar institutions. It was estimated that 143,000 children were torn away from their parents for reasons of poverty alone and sent to live in institutions. This situation became so alarming that in 1909 President Theodore Roosevelt called a White House conference to consider the plight of dependent children. In issuing his call, he said: "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent, compelling reasons. Surely poverty alone should not disrupt homes."

This conference had several results. First, a Mother's Pension Act was passed in 1911 which, together, with the Workmen's Compensation Act, became the first social insurance measures adopted in the United States. Second, the U.S. Children's Bureau was created to help promote and protect the interests of children and their mothers. Third, the Child Welfare League of America, a federation of child care agencies, was formed to help raise and maintain standards of care for agencies sheltering needy, neglected and dependent children who were living away from their own homes. Fourth, the White House Conference became an established custom, taking place every 10 years with representatives of children's groups, religious agencies, civic leaders, educators, and others interested in the welfare of children, assembling in Washington under White House sponsorship.

There have been five such conferences held under White House auspices. The one to be held in March of this year will be the sixth. Over the many years has come one clear and simple conclusion from these conferences:

It is of course trite to say that our greatest asset—our most valuable national resource—is the children and youth of our Nation. There can be no question of that.

The Conference theme for 1960 is "To Promote Opportunities for Children and Youth To Realize Their Full Potential for a Creative Life in Freedom and Dignity."

This report will be based on:

1. Study and understanding of (a) the values and ideals of our society; (b) the effects on the development of children and youth of the rapid changes in this country and the world; and (c) how family, religion, the arts, government, community organizations and services such as health, education, and welfare, and the behavior of adults in their interactions with children and youth deter or enable individual fulfillment and constructive service to humanity.

2. Examination of the degree of achievement of previous White House Conference goals and recommendations.

3. Determination of the action that individuals, organizations, and local, State, and National Government can take to implement conference purposes.

You are to be congratulated on your wholehearted acceptance of the objectives of the White House Conference on Children and Youth. I am delighted to know that the board of directors of the sales promotion division will urge retail stores throughout the country to implement the results of the Conference at the local level.

This is a vital and important public service you are undertaking. Too many times in the past the attitudes of some industrialists and merchants has been that the business of business is only business. But local retail merchants, almost better than anyone else, come to know the many problems that people and communities face in the process of everyday living.

And retail merchants also know from firsthand experience that they should help in whatever ways they can to make their communities, their States, their country, a better place in which to live so that every child can grow, and come to enjoy the pursuits of liberty and happiness.

There is no more rewarding experience in my opinion than helping to make it possible in every way we know, for children to grow up and make the maximum use of their abilities. In my career as Governor of New York and as a U.S. Senator, I have felt an understandable pride at the part I took in making it possible for children, youth and families to have an opportunity to obtain better housing, better health services, better recreational facilities and better educational opportunities.

I believe all of us—in private and public life, in business and in government—wish, for the sake of our own sense of self-worth and in order to repay in some part the debt we owe society, to contribute our services in trying to make a better world for our children and our children's children.

While I have a tremendous pride in what we have done in our Nation for our children and youth, there are still vast gaps in our services for children and youth:

Many of the Nation's classrooms are overcrowded.

There is a shortage of many teachers.

Some students who have ability drop out before finishing high school.

Opportunities for some children are blocked because of discrimination.

Many children still live in slums.

Some youths have physical handicaps which could have been prevented or can be cured.

About one-fourth of all of the children in the Nation live in families with very low incomes.

Over a million youths are apprehended by the police every year for the kind of conduct roughly termed "juvenile delinquency."

These are hard, real facts.

If I had more time I could continue with additional findings of official agencies which describe a series of other needs of children and youth warranting your attention, and each of your members will begin to focus. Find out what your local needs are and begin to help work with others on them. Become members of the boards of your local agencies and see for yourselves at firsthand what the problems are and what needs to be done. Take an active role yourself in local public and voluntary groups. Support your public agencies that are concerned with children and youth and help them adapt to changing community needs.

One of the very important areas in which your association can help is with respect to work experience opportunities for young boys in your communities. We need to enlist the support of enlightened employers to permit more young people to hold part-time jobs in offices and stores, after school, on Saturdays, and during vacations. Under appropriate safeguards, young boys can learn good work habits, develop a sense of responsibility, and gain some idea of their future vocational aptitudes. This means that employers would have to make a little extra effort to make the work experience meaningful. But such experience, I believe, would pay great dividends. It would help in the fight against juvenile delinquency. It would help prevent future dependency. It might reduce the number of school dropouts. It is a suggestion which I hope your members will explore along with other groups in each community.

During my service as Senator I was chairman of a Senate committee which gave careful study to the problem of juvenile delinquency in the United States. We heard testimony from many groups interested in this matter. I was appalled at the vast amount of conversation on the subject, but the lack of any real action to try and solve the problem. It was—and still is—a topic like the weather. I found many responsible businessmen, parents, and citizens who wanted to discuss it and grumble about it, but very few people felt they could do anything specific about it.

But something can be done about juvenile delinquency. After many months of diligent effort our committee reported out a bill on the subject to make a start in a nationwide campaign against juvenile delinquency.

My bill authorized the establishment of a National Council on Juvenile Delinquency to be composed of outstanding men and women concerned with this problem. They were to make recommendations to formulate a national program and policy to combat delinquency. The bill also authorized funds to strengthen existing local and State programs, to encourage local demonstration projects, research and training of personnel.

It was not a grandiose program, it was not a cureall; but it was a solid step forward which would have helped to set us on a road to meet the challenge of juvenile delinquency.

As my last official legislative act in the Senate I was successful in getting the bill passed by that body. However, the bill has never passed the House of Representatives. Lack of community support is probably a key factor in the apathy over this legislation. You can help overcome this apathy.

Here is a vital area for your association to look into. Juvenile delinquency legislation is not a partisan political issue. Juvenile delinquency affects fathers and mothers, irrespective of their political beliefs. It hits families with low incomes, middle incomes, and, yes, even those with high incomes. It affects families in the slums and in the suburbs. It is a dread disease that knows no class, race or social status.

One of the most puzzling developments among young people is the vandalism which frequently occurs. Most vandalism seems so senseless and wasteful to each of us when we read the evening paper. But sociological studies have shown that such acts have a definite purpose to the delinquents who commit them. It has been found that they express a deep-seated hostility toward the community. Chaotic and conflict-ridden neighborhoods and slums breed much of the vandalism.

There is something you can do about this in your communities.

We are spending millions of dollars to find the causes of cancer, heart disease, and other ailments. Yet, we spend practically nothing to discover the factors causing juvenile delinquency or to develop successful ways of overcoming it. This is penny wise and pound foolish.

Juvenile delinquency should be more than a happy hunting ground for the headline-hunters. Every so often some public official, or would-be public official, gets into the newspapers with a proposal to cure juvenile delinquency by getting tough or by getting soft; by beating the juvenile delinquents or by beating the parents, or both; by equipping policemen with longer clubs; by treating all juvenile delinquents as though they had the measles, or by putting them all into jail. These are but a few of the prescriptions I have read in recent weeks. I suppose there is a germ of truth in all of these ideas, although certainly none of them provides the answer to the problem.

The trouble is that the problem itself is not clearly understood. Most of all, it needs experimental study and extensive experience through compassionate work with children and youth, by trained experts. Surely the answer is not just more policemen equipped with heavier clubs. These are our children we are talking about—your children and mine. We need to bring to bear upon this problem every resource that we have and can mobilize. Not only the Federal Government, but every unit of government in the Nation—and every force in the community—needs to do what it can. This is truly a community problem.

But not enough is yet known about what we can do. Certainly, however, it is clear and generally acknowledged that Federal leadership is required, and some Federal money. The past failure of Congress to enact legislation making it possible for a start to be made toward finding a solution to this grave and growing problem is one of the most reprehensible failures of which the Congress and the administration can be charged. Those responsible for this failure in the past have assumed an intolerable responsibility.

This year the administration and the Congress must be separately and collectively held to account on this matter. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that Congress will give serious consideration this year to juvenile delinquency legislation. I hope that the legislation will go at least as far as the legislation I proposed several years ago, and which the Senate approved at that time. I hope that funds will also be allocated to the National Institute of Mental Health and to the Children's Bureau for research, demonstration projects, and training of personnel in this area. It is imperative that we begin to make a nationwide attack on this problem. We need your cooperation in this effort.

Another vital area in which you can help is to arouse public opinion to the need of amending the social security law to provide that all needy children be eligible for assistance. I think we have fenced the aid to dependent children in with so many restrictions that we have lost sight of its fine and basic purpose—to help needy children in their own homes so that none need suffer that ultimate deprivation, loss of home and family.

To accomplish this, the aid to dependent children provisions must be broadened, liberalized and humanized so that every needy child is found qualified to receive help. Let us give that help without too many strings attached. For those strings today are hurting not only our children, but the entire community.

The National Retail Merchants Association can make a valuable contribution by encouraging its membership to work not only at the local, but at the State and national levels on the many problems affecting children and youth. The White House Conferences on Children have been a great stimulus to activities on behalf of children and youth. But the problems facing youth are not simply problems which can be taken up only once every 10 years. They are an ever-present challenge, day in, day out. I would hope you would include on the agenda of your association's work, as a permanent concern, the needs of all children and youth.

A dynamic society such as ours faces many serious challenges in the years ahead. Because of vast technological advances, our future generations must have much more intensive technical proficiency than any previous generation. We are living in a world of tremendous change. These changes require knowledge and understanding among all our citizenry. It means we must have an intelligent, able, healthy body of men and women. This means we will have to spend much more for education, health, and welfare in the future. And that will mean more money out of our pocketbooks into the public treasury.

The growing number of children in our Nation will place many burdens upon local communities that will raise continued pleas for State and national financial aid and leadership. To understand these needs and these trends will be important. You can help in this very important endeavor.

Our Nation must have the creative spirit, the abilities, the vigor and resourcefulness which comes from youth. It must help them to become good citizens, good parents, and good leaders for the future. Whatever it costs us in taxes to accomplish these purposes, it is a good investment. That is how I urge you to look at the money we must spend on the education, health, and welfare of our children and youth. The funds required are not simply ordinary expenditures; they are an investment in your future in our Nation's future.

Fifty years ago, when President Theodore Roosevelt called the first White House Conference on children, he said: "No child should be deprived of home life because of poverty"; and he added, "The interests of the Nation are involved in the welfare of this army of children no less than in our great material affairs."

This statement is still well worth pondering. There are those who think of America's greatness solely as its material accomplishments. But this is only part of the story. Our concern must be for the value of each individual, for family life, for the creative potentialities in every person.

I would like to repeat the theme for the conference this year: "To promote opportunities for children and youth to realize their full potential for a creative life in freedom and dignity."

I believe that these statements form an excellent basis for the National Retail Merchants Association to develop a nationwide program. I hope you will help activate every community in which you have a member to take a greater interest in its children and youth. I hope you will participate in every State in the Nation in the planning for the services for children and youth that are needed in the coming decade. And I trust you will not forget that your interest, your attention, your activity, must also be focused on legislation, appropriations, and programs at the national level, too.

I look forward to learning about the progress of your important work. I know each of you and the Nation will be richer for your interest and your efforts on behalf of children and youth.

A NATION'S CONCERN: WATER

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, probably the best informed writer on resources problems in the United States today is Roscoe Fleming, author-columnist for the Denver Post, and contributor to many other publications.

On December 14, the Christian Science Monitor published an article on water resources by Mr. Fleming which is the finest popular summary of our situation in regard to this resource which I have seen.

The article is especially fine because the author gives the public a concept of the importance of the work being done by our Select Committee on National Water Resources, and a further understanding of the potential value of S. 2549, the Resources and Conservation Act of 1960, on which the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is starting hearings this week.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fleming's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 14, 1959]

A NATION'S CONCERN: WATER

(By Roscoe Fleming)

(By 1980 the United States could be a water-shy nation if proper forethought, planning, and action are not taken to stop waste, pollution, and other misuses of this valuable resource. A warning is sounded here in unmistakable terms.)

DENVER.—One of the United States greatest resource problems and greatest opportunities are alike embraced in one word—water. Many communities are feeling water shortages for the first time. The humid East is beginning to experience the pinch that the dry West has had to live with from the beginning. And the 250 million or more Americans of 1980 will need usable water in huge new drafts, for new uses and thirsty industries. The Nation's needs for fresh water have doubled each quarter century. And the pace grows faster.

Water is the resource necessary to develop all others, so the country must provide usable water in advance of all other resource development. And since the prime duty of each generation is to provide for the next, this generation's children will judge it in some degree by what shall have been done in this realm. From this standpoint there is already a water emergency, even though most communities still have what they need, most of the time.

Says H. L. Nace of the U.S. Geological Survey: "We have been using, misusing, polluting, and generally wasting water as if there would never be a tomorrow. It must be managed with the understanding that there will be a tomorrow, and a very long one, we hope."

Many communities are already seeing the door of opportunity slowly closed in their faces, for lack of this one resource. But those with a large, sure supply of fresh water lose no opportunity to brag of it as first among all their attractions for new industry.

PUBLIC SEEMS UNCONCERNED

Yet most water discussion seems confined to people already concerned with it, and mostly on the technical level, as happened at the most recent National Reclamation Association convention in Denver. The general public largely refuses to become concerned—as long as water comes out of the taps.

As a people, Americans have been spoiled. They get worked up about water only when the well runs dry or conversely, in time of flood. For one thing, most of their ancestors came from a humid environment. And water has traditionally been so plentiful and cheap that people in the United States have grown to expect thrifty management of it as a matter of course, and tend to think that water, like air, should be free or almost so.

Most city dwellers pay only 5 to 8 cents a ton for this prime necessity of life, delivered, purified, and always on tap in their homes. At this rate the householder can fill the hot-water tank in his basement for a penny or less. Yet water managers sadly know that the public reacts automatically and violently to any suggestion of higher water rates.

Paradoxically, where water is less plentiful, as in the reclamation West, it may come even cheaper. The average irrigation farmer pays about a penny for a thousand gallons, or more than 4 tons, delivered all the way from the mountains to nourish his crops. If he has to pay more, he grumbles that he cannot make a living at the high cost of water. This is quite often true.

The big fact about the U.S. water supply is that nature still provides much more than the Nation could consume, but that with present means only a small fraction of it can be utilized. Most water is still "wild," captured in the hills like an animal, leashed, and led to where it is put to work.

The weather, which supplies the water, wavers erratically in time between drought and cloudburst. In space also, the supply varies from less than 5 inches yearly in some areas, to more than 100 in others. The continental United States as a whole has an average of about 30 inches of precipitation, but its western half gets about half as much as its eastern one.

In a normal year about 5 billion acre-feet of water falls, or 5.5 trillion tons (an acre-foot contains 325,851 gallons). The United States still actually uses only about 10 percent of this, or 3 inches out of 30. So, what is there to worry about?

ATMOSPHERE RECLAIMS MUCH

Well, for one thing, about 3.5 billion acre-feet, or 70 percent, goes back into the atmosphere by evaporation, transpiration, or sublimation—the latter meaning return to the air from the frozen form, not even pausing to melt.

The remaining 30 percent or 9 inches of precipitation becomes runoff, from which man dips for his needs. But so far he is dipping only about one-third—the rest is so distant from where he needs it, or is otherwise so unavailable, that it costs more than it's worth.

However, precipitation and runoff are not the only potential sources. It has been raining on this continent for billions of years, and much water has remained—both underground and on the surface. The region around the Great Lakes is so soaked with glacial melt that the Great Lakes themselves hold nearly one-fifth of the planet's fresh surface waters, or 5,500 cubic miles.

Then Americans build dams as industriously as beavers. About 2 million man-made reservoirs, large and small, now dot the Nation's surface. The 1,300 largest contain 278 million acre-feet alone; and the whole grading down in size to farm ponds and even to swimming pools, contain 300 million acre-feet or more. If all were thrown together, these would constitute a mighty new lake almost as large in area as Lake Michigan.

This dam building will go on apace, but according to U.S. Geological Survey experts, it gets more expensive in each basin in proportion to the amount of water usefully stored, until at last it will become uneconomical in all basins. Even now, the United States pays in terms of water lost to evaporation from such artificial reservoirs alone at least 33 million acre-feet yearly.

Underground—not just in the soil around the roots of plants, but farther down—there is even more water, many billion acre-feet of it. But for much of it the cost of pumping is again prohibitive; and much of it is so mineralized it can't be used without treatment. This is true of much surface water also.

Again, as to this ground water, it has taken nature many thousand years to store it, while this Nation can by comparison use it all up in a flash. It is a mine, not a renewable resource. The people of Madison, Wis., for example, drink water that fell as rain about the time of Jesus. In some areas this slowly accumulated supply has already been pumped out, so that people are beginning to have to pack up and move on.

The problem is also economic. Much of the fresh water supply, even in the driest regions like the Southwest, is still to be developed and will come only slowly into use as water becomes more precious and more worth development. Undoubtedly the populace will continue to use up surface waters until, in the words of one veteran conservationist, "few American rivers will live to reach the sea." Actually, a trickle will always reach the sea, but in most instances only enough to carry off the trash.

DISTRIBUTION NOT ANSWER

Can complete distribution of surface water solve the problem? No, for as Mr. Nace also points out, "This would require so complicated and fabulously expensive a system of transbasin diversions as to be impracticable." It would also bring on new water wars, since nothing arouses the people of a major basin like the suggestion that they should share its waters with others, even though they themselves have plenty for now. There is always a tomorrow, you know.

The largest potential source of fresh water, the one most easily and cheaply developed, lies in stopping waste of the available supply in such menial tasks as carrying off our sewage and industrial detritus.

Much waste is so commonplace as to be overlooked. One dripping faucet can waste a bathtub full of water daily. A large city, suffering from drought, found that nearly 10 percent of its precious supply was going through air-conditioning apparatus, then running off down the sewer. A recycling regulation fixed that. A backyard swimming pool may use up more water during a season than the family uses for all other purposes; and the garbage disposal units now installed in millions of American homes are water-wasters.

Always Americans have sought the nearest stream to rid themselves of wastes, and do so still. In 1956 the Public Health Service was empowered to proceed against pollution of interstate streams. Its first major acts were to move against two cities of nearly 100,000 persons each, which are still dumping raw sewage into the communal river. And new types of waste, chemical and atomic, are constantly developing.

Yet scarcely any man-polluted waters are as expensive to redeem as sea water, despite all the excitement about converting the latter.

The Public Health Service has said that $5 billion would permit a good beginning at cleaning up our polluted rivers. Present grant-in-aid Federal appropriations are at $50 million yearly. And there is argument over continuing to appropriate that much.

Water can also be saved, more largely in the West, by reducing seepage; by eliminating water-wasting plants like the tamarisk, the manna plant of the Bible, now spread over millions of Western acres, and by cutting down evaporation. A general Western yardstick is that only about half the water in the reservoir actually reaches the crops. Even then, it is likely to be carelessly used.

CHEMICAL RETARDS PROCESS

Evaporation control is promising, particularly by using hexadecanol, the chemical which spreads over a water surface only one molecule thick, but can retard evaporation greatly. Application is so cheap that even a very partial efficiency will pay. As water grows in value, so will this practice spread.

When all such ways of saving water have been exhausted, however, there still remains the possibility of increasing the absolute supply.

Some means of doing this include:

Cutting forests selectively, as on the western mountains, permitting to reach the ground snow that otherwise remains up on the evergreen branches by billions of tons and softly and silently vanishes away in the first Chinook wind of spring. Experimentally, such cutting has proven able to increase runoff by nearly one-third.

Making snow reservoirs by covering huge mountain drifts, or crevasses packed with snow, with some substance that will slow down melting and evaporation. Plain sawdust works well.

Seeding the clouds to increase rainfall. In mountainous country at least, this could apparently increase precipitation 10 to 15 percent if pursued consistently year round. Nothing is more needed than a several year complete program of seeding research to cover a whole river basin. And again, this method is so cheap in terms of extra water produced, that its use is bound to increase as water grows more precious.

Finally, freshening salty water. This is already being done in many places where water is most scarce. For one example, Coalinga, Calif., a town of 6,000 persons, now freshens all its water for drinking from local brackish sources, rather than shipping in fresh water 45 miles by tank car.

Ultimately—as again is already being done in many places—this will mean tapping the greatest waterhole of all, the 314 million cubic miles of ocean, a prospect toward which an elaborate Federal program now is being carried out.

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton confidently predicts that this technique will ultimately free mankind from total dependence on nature's casual supply of fresh water.

Dovetailing into all these ways of saving, reclaiming, and claiming water are, of course, advances in knowledge of weather and climate to enable the Nation better to gage and to space possible supply ahead of time.

COOPERATIVE WILL LACKING

But do all these ways and means together mean easy and rapid conquest of the Nation's—and the world's—total water problem?

By no means. For perhaps the most stubborn obstacle of all is the inflexibility of human institutions, made more inflexible by the failure of men to work together, and their propensity even to work against each other, in respect to water supply.

Ever since the old hollow-log water main days in Boston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, water supply has been jealously regarded as a local project, and communities have reached out taproots and fought for water, much as plants contend for it underground.

Thousands of public and private organizations even today contend for the available supply. Each group in turn thinks it should have first call—and often falls into an unrealistic resistance to any change or sharing whatsoever.

Marion Clawson, of Resources for the Future, notes what he calls an obsession of westerners to expand irrigated farming with water that may actually be much more needed for expanding cities or industries. And this is only one example.

Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon, the White House aid for resource development, studied the Trinity River Basin in Texas and found more than 50 agencies claiming priority to use of its waters—even while Houston, in the next basin, is laying plans to tap the Trinity across the divide.

Most basins of any size have even more than 50 such agencies. Plenitude of water seems to have little effect. If the biggest such regional feud is over the insufficient waters of the Colorado River in the Nation's driest corner, the next biggest is around the Great Lakes, whose 16.5 billion acre-feet would surely seem to provide enough for all.

But, however local agencies may fight among themselves, they unite against what they call Federal domination. They welcome Federal money, but not overall control, or even Federal guidance. Associate Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy told the Reclamation Association at Denver:

"I sometimes see a tendency to seek so many safeguards by negative action, and so much concern about Government interference with your operations, that it has a tendency to stalemate any progress on new works. * * * There are too many groups striving first to serve their own localized interests."

REPORTS OF LITTLE AVAIL

The need for a national water policy becomes more evident all the time, but the reports of a half-dozen national commissions, unanimous on that point, have fallen on sterile soil. Local water people seem to listen for a moment, then go on fighting. Such has been the fate of two Hoover Commission reports, that of the President's Materials Policy Commission of 1952, a water resources commission created by Mr. Truman, and others of less scope.

Students of politics note, however, that all these were creatures of the executive branch, with Congress represented scantily if at all—which may be one reason they were largely ignored in the lawmaking body. Also, the staff director of the latest and perhaps the most promising such body points out that each prior one, in effect, dwelt only on one phase. So says Theodore Schad, of a Senate select committee chosen from among the membership of four committees that each deal largely with water. Mr. Schad thinks this inquiry will be by far the most thorough ever made. The committee will hear from all 50 States, from all Federal and many regional and local agencies having to do with water, and from a score of other groups. Its findings will be studied and summarized in depth by a task force from resources for the future.

And behind it looms the possibility of an even wider inquiry into all U.S. resources of which, as has been seen, water is the one common denominator. This is one object of a bill sponsored by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, with 27 cosigners. If Congress itself gets deeply involved on its own motion in these huge and most-needed inquiries, perhaps the United States will start getting somewhere at last in the national solution of resource problems that daily grow more demanding.

NARCOTICS AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, for several months now, the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has been inquiring into the problem of narcotics and marijuana use among our country's teenagers. To date, we have concentrated primarily on the source of supply for illicit drugs with particular emphasis on illicit smuggling along the United States-Mexican border.

Last Friday and again this morning, we questioned witnesses from the Department of Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics and Bureau of Customs on Federal law enforcement in the narcotics field.

Unfortunately, too many of our citizens tend to think that the illicit narcotics traffic across our southwestern border affects only those States sitting on the border or located a short distance away.

This is not the case. Illicit narcotics have a way of traveling fast and far to fill the demand of addicts. The narcotics menace to our boys and girls has been recognized as a major factor in juvenile crime in cities all over the country.

At hearings in New York City last September when we investigated the acute juvenile gang problem existing there, both Mayor Wagner and Police Commissioner Kennedy urged more intensive Federal effort in stopping the narcotics traffic.

Our committee held 2 weeks of hearings in California last fall during which we were repeatedly told of the narcotics danger confronting our youth.

Public officials and individuals from the border States have told us of the near crisis caused by dope smuggling through their cities.

The nationwide concern over this problem is easily discernible by reading editorial comment from all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two of these editorials—one from the Houston (Tex.) Post, entitled "Narcotics Big Factor in Juvenile Crime"; and one from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, entitled "Juvenile Delinquency Factors"—be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Sept. 25, 1959]

NARCOTICS BIG FACTOR IN JUVENILE CRIME

If anyone knows about juvenile crime it should be the mayor of New York, whose city has been ravaged by youth gang wars in recent months. It may be assumed that Mayor Robert F. Wagner spoke advisedly, at least as to his own jurisdiction, in telling the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency that narcotics, as a factor in teenage crime, is an increasing problem. He thought the most important role the Federal Government can play in attacking the criminal aspects of our youth problem is that of combating narcotic traffic.

This subcommittee has begun a series of hearings in cities over the country. It probably will hear much the same kind of testimony that a similar group heard a few years ago, or perhaps more. After receiving the previous committee's report, Congress passed a tough antinarcotics bill. The Government has an army of agents watching the main points of entry where dope is smuggled into the United States. They may be doing a good job, but apparently there are not enough of them to cover thoroughly the Nation's borders.

The Federal narcotics law is stringent. About the only way the Federal Government can strengthen the attack would be to tighten up enforcement. But surely the drug evil, even though it may be growing, is not the only major cause of the spreading lawless spirit among youngsters with its attendant increase of teen-age-killings. The New York gang fights have been waged between organized bands of beatniks from various slum districts. The city government, stung by criticism from different quarters, has finally been aroused to launch a determined cleanup, with promised police reinforcements.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has suggested Federal legislation for more effective control of

sale of dangerous weapons in interstate commerce, Federal aid for youth work camps, tighter control of narcotics traffic, Federal aid for treating narcotics addicts, and special grants for research in juvenile delinquency.

These proposals merit full consideration as emergency measures. At the same time, there is room for stronger law enforcement in most if not all cities. If the new Senate committee investigation does no more than spur local and State authorities to renewed efforts to curb juvenile crime and delinquency, it will have been well worth while.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Sept. 25, 1959]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY FACTORS

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee Investigating Juvenile Delinquency is quoted to the effect that the decision to begin in New York City was not intended to attract undue attention to New York City's siege of young gang terror. The problem with which the Senate investigators are concerned is a national one.

Major crime with the juvenile delinquency complexion is creating crises in other big cities. The New York City mayor told the investigating Senators that, despite the recent sensational publicity, his community ranks 18th among the larger cities in major crimes perpetrated by juveniles.

The Senate subcommittee is commissioned to determine what, if anything, might be done by the Federal Government. As a witness in the opening hearing the New York City mayor stated that the Federal Government has heavy responsibility.

He emphasized the illegal narcotics traffic relationship with the increase in more serious crimes on the juvenile level. "(Illegal drug) importation and distribution in the United States," he said, "is big time crime, well financed, well organized, and certainly beyond the police powers of any city or State."

This is true. The Federal Government should deal with it.

Impliedly, some new Federal legislation is needed. The Senate subcommittee is likely to recommend this.

Aside from the narcotics problem, Uncle Same may have incentive to act in support of the States and cities as they strive to curb juvenile delinquency and reverse the major crime trend among the younger Americans.

In New York City, the mayor said, there is increasing effort to prevent development of juvenile delinquents into major criminals. "We have not abandoned these youths, these teenagers," he told the U.S. Senators, "nor will we until by their own acts they become criminals. Then they are, and will continue to be, treated like any other criminals."

Prevention is still most important. In cases where prevention isn't effective the young major criminals should not be dealt with softly because of their age.

AUTO MANUFACTURERS PLAN POLLUTION PROTECTION FOR CALIFORNIANS: WHY NOT FOR THE REST OF US?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I noted with keen interest recent press reports that beginning with model year 1961, auto manufacturers intend to install on all new cars offered for sale in California an inexpensive device which will lower substantially the amount of unburned hydrocarbons which automobiles emit through their exhaust system.

According to researchers at General Motors, the new discovery will permit a reduction of about 40 percent in unburned hydrocarbons released into the atmosphere by motor passenger vehicles.

This is good news. Surg. Gen. Leroy Burney has reported the belief of the U.S. Public Health Service that air pollution is a casual factor in lung cancer. Motor vehicle exhaust fumes containing unburned hydrocarbons and noxious gases are recognized as the major contributing factor to air pollution in urban areas.

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE REST?

But what about the rest of us? Why have auto manufacturers chosen to discriminate against non-Californians? What about those of us who by choice or necessity are not residents of the Golden State? Why should not the health-protecting advantages of this new device be extended to those living in Portland, New York, and Miami, as well as San Francisco, Sacramento, and Los Angeles?

Los Angeles has perhaps experienced unique difficulties with air pollution. But my own hometown of Portland, Oreg., faces severe air pollution problems. So does Seattle, Wash. So does Washington, D.C. Why should these cities receive less consideration by the auto manufacturers than the town of Weed, Calif., with a population of 3,403 persons living in a rural atmosphere?

Furthermore, do the auto manufacturers believe that motor passenger vehicles sold in California never leave California or that vehicles not sold in the State never enter California?

The California country is no longer isolated from the rest of the Nation by the rugged mountains that border it on the east nor the broad Pacific which constitutes its western boundary. Each year millions of tourists spread exhaust fumes from one end of the State to the other. An estimated 3.5 million persons—sightseers, businessmen, new residents—drove their cars across the State line into California last year.

POLLUTION A NATIONAL PROBLEM

California's population increased by about 4 million in the last decade, a 37.5-percent rise. According to national averages, one in three of these new residents owned an automobile. The problem of auto air pollution is a national one and cannot be confined within State boundaries.

I suggest that the auto manufacturers give us all a break, and provide this new antismog device on all new models. Americans living in the other 49 States have no more desire to contract lung cancer than their counterpart in California.

I have written to L. L. Colbert, president of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, suggesting that car producers install on all 1961 models the inexpensive device which they propose to attach to models offered for sale in California. I trust that they will reconsider and provide for other citizens the same protection which the people of California have apparently secured.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press news story reporting the AMA announcement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1960]

NEW DEVICE CUTS DOWN CAR FUMES

DETROIT, January 14.—Four General Motors research men told in detail tonight how they found, almost by accident, a way to cut by about 40 percent the amount of unburned hydrocarbons which automobiles send into the air.

Health authorities, particularly in California, believe that when hydrocarbons are mixed in the atmosphere they contribute substantially to the harmful properties of smog.

Demands for some method of eliminating or severely cutting back the amount of hydrocarbons emitted by cars have led researchers to concentrate on exhaust fumes.

The GM researchers—Paul A. Bennett, Marvin W. Jackson, Chester J. Murphy, and Richard A. Randall—in a paper for the annual meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers, said they found vapors coming directly from the crankcase of a car are virtually as important to the overall problem as exhaust pipe gases.

They said they came upon this while trying to develop an engine performance test for evaluating crankcase lubricants.

The researchers came up with an inexpensive system of piping and valves which feeds the crankcase gases back into the engine at a point below the carburetor.

The Automotive Manufacturers Association, which coordinate industry research, has announced that manufacturers would install the devices on all new cars offered for sale in California not later than the start of the 1961 model year.

ITHACA COLLEGE, ITHACA PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the outstanding institutions which will benefit from the proposed legislation on college loans—and, incidentally, the present Presiding Officer [Mr. CLARK] is a great advocate of this program—which I have introduced today would be Ithaca College, a small New York State liberal arts college which has worked out and is introducing a new concept in higher education designed to meet great challenge to our educational system posed by the urgent necessity for our expanding youthful population to achieve the best and the highest kind of learning.

In order to meet higher costs, rising enrollments, and the faculty shortage Ithaca College is introducing a plan whereby it hopes by intensified, cohesive study during the first 3 years to offer senior courses at a higher than usual college level; and by reducing the number of course offerings to save faculty manpower and increase teachers' salaries, using the teachers to maximum advantage upon subjects of highest priority.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article on this subject entitled "Education in Review."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1959]

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—COLLEGE TREND IS TOWARD FEWER COURSES AND A TIGHTER CURRICULUM

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"How many books do you have in your library?" asked the high school senior during his college admission interview. The dean said that there were about 350,000 volumes. The young man looked up disapprovingly and pointed out that another college, he had been told, had 4 million books. The dean smiled and replied: "When you've finished the 350,000 we'll see whether we can get you some more."

Actually, the numbers-minded student was using much the same yardstick that many colleges have been applying when relating academic greatness too closely to the number of courses listed in the catalog. It is partly a matter of institutional pride, partly the result of academic competition. When colleges, except perhaps for a few of the top names, had to recruit students, they often worried about keeping up with their rival academic Joneses. They were aided and abetted by research-minded faculty specialists, each jealously guarding his special course—no matter how few students were taking it.

The important new trend is in the opposite direction. For several years, critics of fragmentation have been speaking out against the self-service curriculum.

RUML'S MEMO

In his book "Memo to a College Trustee," Beardsley Ruml this year wrote: "This tendency to increase the number of courses was called enrichment and was considered a good idea. More recently such increase has been called proliferation and is no longer believed to be as good an idea as it once was."

The new direction, which parallels a trend in high school reform, is toward a combination of a more carefully mapped out undergraduate program, a deepening of the content of general education, combined with a more direct lead-in to specialized work, an attempt to permit at least some students to speed up or intensify their efforts and greater insistence on independent work.

In recent years, there have been advance hints of this trend—as when Amherst revised its curriculum in 1947 and introduced a stiff required program for the first 2 years. This included a special mathematics-physics course and a tough descriptive writing course, followed in the sophomore year by an all-college course in "Problems of American Democracy" which demands intensive independent and group study. Colgate University at about the same time introduced a core curriculum leading to a sequence of courses in "American Ideals and Institutions in Their World Setting." Columbia College, which had been pioneering as early as 1937 with "Contemporary Civilization," toughened that course.

This year, the University of Pittsburgh switched gears by putting itself on a new trimester plan which will enable some students to begin their professional studies about a year earlier.

The list could be extended, but the pattern is clear. This week, pushing the trend further, Ithaca College, in Ithaca, N.Y., announced an experiment in modern higher education. It lists frankly the debits of the earlier competitive era.

ITHACA'S PLAN

Higher education, says Howard I. Dillingham, president of the college, has been criticized for "lack of economy, insufficient preparation of students for advanced work in graduate and professional fields, and the gradual and continuing fragmentation of individual disciplines to the point that the scholar has frequently become a specialist who knows more and more about less and less."

The Ithaca plan points out that elective offerings during a student's undergraduate years are often so scattered that he comes to graduate school with insufficient preparation in both general education and the basic knowledge in his major field. "Some colleges with fewer than 1,500 students, for example, offer as many as 40 biology courses," the report says; this may lead an undergraduate majoring in biology into concentrated specialization in plant physiology while leaving gaps in his basic knowledge of the field. The graduate school must fill those gaps.

Ithaca College bluntly attributes some of these failings to interdepartmental rivalries which, for example, make the government and history departments argue over which shall teach international relations, with the result that both end up giving practically the same course. It describes as window dressing the introduction of courses in the earlier days of competition for students. And it concludes that the resultant curriculum has become too expensive to handle and that too much valuable energy is thus diverted to an economic struggle for survival.

REQUIRED COURSES

The Ithaca plan, to counter this trend, will require all students in each of these special areas—science, social science, and the humanities—to take a required curriculum, covering general education plus the basic knowledge of the special area, during their first 3 years. This is followed by a concentration in the special field of interest during the fourth year.

Thus, all science students (with a slight variation for physicists) will study the same essential courses in biology, chemistry, and mathematics, plus 1 year each of Western civilization, literature, American history, and philosophy. They also must complete a second college-level year of a foreign language, after having completed 2 years of language study in high school. Actually, it may be questioned whether the plan's language requirements are not kept too low, in view of the increasing demand for linguistic ability among scientists. In their fourth year, the science students will have the option to specialize in their field.

All the nonscience students will be required to take a closely related 3-year sweep of world history, literature and philosophy, reinforced by such additional required courses as economic theory, the history of political thought and comparative government. On the science side, the nonscience students are to get only 1 year of biology, and it might be asked whether this is enough. The fourth-year option, partly tutorial and partly seminar, will be in the special fields such as history, government, economics, literature, philosophy, or foreign languages.

THE TARGETS

All students will be required to take an expository writing course in which students would learn to work with content based upon their other courses. Students will be assigned extensive summer reading.

The Ithaca plan aims at goals which have become new targets of American higher education:

(1) It hopes, by intensified, cohesive study during the first 3 years, to offer senior courses at a higher-than-usual level.

(2) By reducing the number of course offerings, it will save faculty manpower, increase faculty salaries, and use teachers to better advantage.

In higher education, as in most human endeavor, there is, of course, a tendency to make a virtue of necessity. The catalogs of two decades ago showed good educational reasons why the elective system, with a wealth of courses to choose from, was an escape from the educational straitjacket. The pendulum swung to the extremes deplored in the Ithaca report. Now it is swinging back. It is, of course, important to guard against new extremes—just as it is important to keep in mind that Ithaca is speaking for, and about, the small college of 1,500 students—not the university which can support a greater choice of courses without watering-down quality.

But the trend toward depth rather than fragmentation is sound, even though dollar and enrollment pressures gave birth to it. Institutions, like people, often do their best thinking under the pressure of necessity.

THE LATE ADM. ROSS T. McINTIRE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the recent death of Adm. Ross T. McIntire, the first Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, 1947–54, recalls the start of the Nation's program to meet employment problems faced by handicapped persons, including a quarter of a million World War II disabled veterans.

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, retired, who succeeded Dr. McIntire as Chairman of the President's Committee, said:

Ross McIntire was the bone and sinew of the President's Committee from its beginning. In his quiet but forceful way he engineered the foundations of the program that today has captured the imagination of millions. He was not only a great Navy surgeon general and a great leader of the American Red Cross blood program, but he was a great American and an inspiration to all privileged to work with him.

Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC, retired, now Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, praised Dr. McIntire as a person who helped the handicapped to be understood and a man who gave the Committee a very high degree of leadership.

General Erskine was Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, from which the Committee originated.

Robert Ramspeck, vice president of Eastern Airlines, a former Vice Chairman of the President's Committee, said:

During one early period when Dr. McIntire was Chairman of the President's Committee, it was my privilege to work very closely with him after he had named me Vice Chairman, and Chairman of the Executive Committee.

I came to know and appreciate his deep interest and feeling for the problems of the handicapped and to appreciate how much of his time, talents, and energy he put into the program.

Dr. McIntire was Cochairman of the People-to-People Committee for the Handicapped and had presided at a committee meeting the Friday before his death.

Edward L. Keenan, now Chief of Manpower for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, former Deputy Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, and

former Chairman of the early Federal Interagency Committee on the Handicapped said:

In the old days when this Committee was first getting started, Dr. McIntire was a tremendous help. He brought people into the Committee from outside to give it prestige.

Perhaps an example of Dr. McIntire's grasp of the problem was contained in an address he made before the annual meeting, November 4, 1948, when he said:

Our job is to find ways and means to channel from these organizations that you set up in private industry * * * means of rehabilitation and the training and preparation of men and women for employment.

This Committee must find positive means of providing the channels that will not only promise a man a job but get him one.

Born in Salem, Oreg., in 1889, Dr. McIntire received his medical degree from Willamette University Medical School—now the University of Oregon—in 1912. He was commissioned as assistant surgeon in 1917 and became chief of the Navy's Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, with rank of rear admiral in 1938. He served as Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy throughout World War II and was directly responsible for the planning and practical application of the vast program of medical care and supply for the Navy and Marine Corps during the war.

He was awarded the three stars of a vice admiral in 1944, 2 years before his retirement.

Admiral McIntire also served as personal physician to the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

After his retirement from the Navy, he was national director of the American Red Cross blood program for several years.

He served the final years of his life as executive director of the International College of Surgeons, an organization with 13,000 members representing 64 nations. Under Admiral McIntire's leadership the college continued to play a major role in many of the exciting surgical and medical developments of recent years. Under Admiral McIntire the college continued to be a valuable instrument for helping to extend the gift of better health and longer life to many peoples in underdeveloped areas of the world.

When Admiral McIntire was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery a Navy chaplain in a simple funeral oration said that words could not do full justice to the life of Ross McIntire, but rather that he would charge the audience with the kind of message the admiral would want to give:

If you would honor me, carry on the work in which we have been engaged, you who minister to the body and to the mind.

Admiral McIntire was my good friend and his death is a personal loss to me. But more than this, Admiral McIntire's death is a loss to our entire Nation for he was a dedicated public servant through many years of war and peace and he was ever the champion of medical care and better health for all our people.

His dedicated life and distinguished service to humanity stand as a challenge and an inspiration to men of science and to men of good will everywhere.

"I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY"—ESSAY BY TOM CASTEN, OF WINDSOR, COLO.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a young man from Windsor, Colo., put forth some excellent and stimulating thoughts in his prize-winning State entry in the 1959–60 "Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters. He is Tom Casten, 17 years old, a student at Windsor High School. Next month his entry will be judged along with contest winners from the other 49 States.

His community and State have added reason to be proud of Tom, as he is one of the 50 outstanding Boy Scouts and Explorers representing the various States who will participate in ceremonies honoring the golden anniversary of Scouting, in Washington early in February.

I ask unanimous consent to have his essay, "I Speak for Democracy," printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Tom Casten, Windsor, Colo.)

Seventeen years ago a baby boy took his first look at the world. Now, this same boy is giving you his ideas on the subject of democracy. Seventeen years certainly isn't a very long time to formulate a strong opinion about something as abstract and complex as a system of government. But wait, you do not know what has caused these opinions to form. In 17 years, this boy has never been deprived of food, shelter, or security—the three basic wants of man. Yes, I am this boy, and I do have opinions about my Government. That is why I speak for democracy.

But why should I tell you about democracy? Most of you have had more than 17 years to learn about it. Everybody knows of the advantages of this system—or do they?

Does everyone appreciate the freedom involved when he buys an issue of some paper? Does everyone know how fortunate he is to be able to read the words of some editor, who is sounding off, because the city he lives in says that he must put a leash on his dog?

Does everyone realize how fortunate he is in being allowed to choose his own religion?

How about the treatment he will receive if he is accused of breaking a law? Does everyone appreciate this freedom?

I could continue with similar questions, but each would be answered with, "Sure, I already know about that." But what if I asked, "Are you ready to die for democracy?" The answer might still be yes. My dad and my uncles, along with several million other men were on the battlefield prepared to die defending democracy.

But I don't ask you to die: I ask more. I ask you to live for democracy. I ask you to be among the people who compose and control our democracy.

I don't speak in order to show you the benefits of our system. You can see them for yourself. Rather, I would ask you to look at these benefits, think about them, and then dedicate yourself to retaining them. I ask you to be proud of this system and proud to say to everyone, "It's good."

The world is made up of many different people, some intelligent and thoughtful, some with rich ideas, some selfish and some rather thoughtless. If you do not speak for democracy, the selfish and the thoughtless people, who never shut up, will be heard. Democracy will reflect the image of the people who control it. I ask you to live for democracy, so that this image will be a good one, ever improving. Any one of us will do very little, but collectively, we will keep our wonderful system. I want this system to stay intact and grow, because I have lived 17 happy years, and I would like to live 70 more. But there is more involved than personal enjoyment.

Someday, another boy will be born; many boys and girls will be born; one may even bear my name. But it makes no difference. I want this boy to be able to enjoy life the same way I am able to enjoy life. I want him to be allowed to drive a car, to hunt and fish, to worship as he pleases, to have food and shelter, and security, and most important, to be allowed to express his ideas freely. This is why I speak for democracy.

ECONOMIC REGULATION OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, has the business of the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1508) to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill before the Senate is in the form of a committee amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the bill S. 1508 amends the legislation which created the Alaska Railroad so as to provide that 180 days after the enactment of the bill the Alaska Railroad shall be made subject to part I, pertaining to the regulation of railroads, of the Interstate Commerce Act and related acts, including the Safety Appliance Acts, the Boiler Inspection Act, the Employer Liability Act, and others.

In addition, the bill provides that applicable statutes regulating intrastate transportation enacted by the State of Alaska shall apply to the Alaska Railroad as though privately owned.

The bill is tailored to fit the Alaska Railroad by excepting from the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission the necessity for approval by that body of any extension of the railroad or approval of the issuance of securities by the railroad.

Furthermore, the Interstate Commerce Commission is admonished in

establishing accounting requirements for the Alaska Railroad to consider the needs of other named Government agencies.

The free pass provisions of the present law are proposed to be superseded by the free pass provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

It is my belief that the passage of the proposed legislation will bring more consistency to the regulatory pattern of transportation in Alaska. At present, motor carriers, water lines, and others engaged in interstate and foreign commerce in surface transportation are subject to ICC regulation. It is only simple justice that the Alaska Railroad should be given the same measure of regulation as the privately owned carriers which are engaged in serving Alaska and with which the Alaska Railroad competes. The Interstate Commerce Commission is suited for the job of regulation through its long experience in the field.

Quite recently the Alaska Railroad announced a freight rate increase. Only this morning I received a letter from Under Secretary of the Interior Bennett, which said in part:

> We are told that if the railroad were subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, it is virtually certain, if not altogether certain, that no public hearing would be scheduled.

After receiving that letter, I called the Interstate Commerce Commission, talked with a member of that agency, and was informed that since approximately 70,000 requests for rate changes come before the ICC annually, naturally public hearings are not held with respect to an overwhelming majority of such requests. But further, and more pertinently, I was informed that if a public hearing were demanded in the case of the Alaska Railroad, for example, by the State government, it is highly unlikely—altogether improbable, in fact—that the ICC would not accede to such a request.

In this connection, I believe that the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Fred Seaton, has recognized the public interest by agreeing to hold a public hearing in Alaska, or perhaps more than one hearing, before the increase is made effective. In this regard, I should say that he is more mindful of the economy of Alaska than was the Federal Maritime Board in its recent action concerning ocean freight rates.

Mr. President, minority views were filed on the bill under consideration. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks a statement which gives the arguments against the bill and also gives my reply.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARGUMENTS AND ANSWERS TO THESE ARGUMENTS AGAINST REGULATION, UNDER S. 1508, OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The arguments against regulation and the answers to the arguments are given in sequence below:

A. Arguments in opposition to regulation advanced by the Department of the Interior:

1. Argument: The Alaska Railroad is operated as a public service in much the same manner as a municipally owned electric plant and consequently does not require regulation.

Answer: The comparison of the operation of the Alaska Railroad to that of the municipally owned electric plant is particularly inept and inaccurate. A municipally owned plant is controlled locally and not by interests several thousands of miles away. The Alaska Railroad is, in fact, subject to absentee control by the Secretary of the Interior located in Washington. Further evidence that the Alaska Railroad is not controlled locally in the same manner as a municipally owned electric plant is demonstrated in the Anchorage hearings on October 24, 1959, in which the General Manager of the Alaska Railroad stated that he was not aware that a general rate increase was being planned. A rate increase was announced Christmas Eve to be effective January 25, 1960. The following colloquy from the record demonstrates this point:

Page 109:

"Senator BARTLETT. Now, is any consideration being given now as to a general rate increase?

"Mr. MANLEY. No, sir."

Page 112:

"Senator BARTLETT. So your situation, then, is that even with this loss of oil revenue, your operating revenues are in a satisfactory state, even though not as high as you would desire; and that you foresee no need in—if the future is as the recent past—for a general rate increase?

"Mr. ANDERSON. That's my idea; yes, Mr. Senator.

"Senator BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Anderson."

The Manager of the Alaska Railroad on January 22, 1960, stated that the proposed increases were indefinitely postponed, and that hearings would be held in Alaska on the increases. No date has as yet been set for the hearings.

2. Argument: Rates are already as low as management can make them while still covering costs and under the terms of S. 1508, Alaska Railroad rates may be pushed higher with serious harm to the development of Alaska's resources, particularly if a fair return on investment is to be achieved.

Answer: It has not been proven but only stated to be the opinion of the management of the Alaska Railroad that rates are as low as management can make them and still cover costs of operation and that to push rates higher would cause serious harm to the development of Alaska. Regulation of rates involves not only the absolute level of the rates but the distribution of the costs of transportation by establishing rates to apply among the various items of freight and localities. In other words, rate relationships as between ports, between inland destination, and between items of traffic, are often as important as the absolute level of freight charges in dollars and cents. These matters are for an experienced regulatory body to handle that takes into account not only the welfare of the Alaska Railroad but the general public interest including the interests of other forms of transportation competing with the Alaska Railroad. It should be reiterated that there is nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act that would require a fair return on the investment of the Alaska Railroad. Such a requirement was placed in the law by the Transportation Act of 1920 but was deleted from the law by the Emergency Transportation Act of 1933.

3. Argument: That higher rates on the Alaska Railroad might cause diversion of traffic to other transportation media, thus penalizing shippers without improving the railroad's net margin over costs.

Answer: It is true that higher rates generally cause diversion of traffic to competitors, causing the shippers who continue to ship with the transportation agency having the higher rates to bear a greater proportion of the cost through the rates they pay. In view of this simple economic fact, it is both amazing and alarming that the Secretary of the Interior did not hold public hearings in order to ascertain what effect the increase in railroad rates, announced to become effective January 25, 1960, would have on the Alaska Railroad and shippers using it. If the ICC had had jurisdiction, public hearings would have been held to make a record on which the economic effect on both the shippers and the railroad could be determined. It is gratifying to learn that shortly before it became effective the increase was suspended and announcement was made of a public hearing on the subject at a time to be announced later.

4. Argument: That the present system of fixing rates on the Alaska Railroad through the administrative control of the Interior Department has provided shippers with a reasonable rate structure and has assisted in the development of Alaska; consequently, the shippers and the general public would not be benefited by imposing on the Alaska Railroad the additional expense involved in dealing with a regulatory agency, unless a need for regulation by an outside agency can be shown.

Answer: It is only within the opinion of the Interior Department that the administrative control exercised by the Department of the Interior in Washington has provided shippers with reasonable rates. It should be reiterated that rate relationships as between forms of traffic and localities are technical matters that can be handled adequately only by an experienced regulatory body. The Department of the Interior does not have the expertise for regulating rates that ICC has gained because of its function in the regulatory field since 1887.

In other words, the Secretary of the Interior is a member of the executive branch of the Government with numerous custodial and other related functions in the area in which he operates. The Secretary's duties are different from those required of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission is expert in regulatory matters which require hearing, careful weighing of the evidence, and decisions that take into account the various provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act designed to foster fair treatment for carriers and the public alike. The Secretary of the Interior is, at present, in his regulation of the Alaska Railroad, not bound by such laws. The claim of additional expense to Interior to deal with a regulatory agency is not convincing. If the Secretary of Interior is giving adequate attention to regulation at this time, the expense involved would be lessened by having this function taken over by an outside regulatory agency.

5. Argument: That if regulation by an outside agency is to be considered, Interior recommends that—no legislation be enacted unless it also specifies definite ratemaking standards to guide the regulatory process. * * * If legislation should be enacted, we recommend that Congress determine the ratemaking standards and make no delegation of authority to the ratemaking body other than the power to apply such standards.

Answer: The Interstate Commerce Act establishes legislative standards to cover the entire regulatory process including ratemaking. Part I of the act is specifically designed for regulation of railroads and contains not only ratemaking standards but general standards to be followed by the Commission in order to protect the public interest. In regard to the argument of Interior that a fair return would be required on the Government investment in the Alaska Railroad, the ICC has stated that such a return would not be required under ICC interpretation of the present law. However, to insure that the promotional aspects of the Alaska Railroad

and its service to the military shall be given due consideration in establishing the general level of rates, and to insure that the private shipper in Alaska will not have to assume a disproportionate share of this burden, an appropriate amendment to S. 1508 is being offered.

6. Argument: That because of its statutory direction to support the Alaska Military Establishment, the railroad is not free to operate in the manner normally contemplated for regulated industries.

Answer: It is true that the railroad service required for the military is not always the same as that rendered to private industry. The regulated railroads of the United States, however, render service to the Military Establishment under the Interstate Commerce Act without requiring any special dispensation for the military other than section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act that allows the Defense Department to receive free or reduced rates from railroads without regard to the regulatory process. There is no reason why the Interstate Commerce Act, which imposes few restraints on the actual physical operation of the railroads, cannot be applied to the Alaska Railroad as well. Any operations required for the benefit of the military would not be hindered by that law.

7. Argument: That S. 1508 might force an unintended change in the railroad's accounting system which would involve additional cost.

Answer: Conferences were held with both the Interstate Commerce Committee and the General Accounting Office, the groups concerned with prescribing standards for the accounting system of the Alaska Railroad. It was ascertained that both groups wanted exclusive authority to establish such regulations. It was also established that the uniform system of accounts required by the Interstate Commerce Commission could be adjusted to meet the requirements of the General Accounting Office. Accordingly, authority to prescribe accounting standards was given the ICC with an amendment to the original bill that admonishes the Commission to take into account the needs of other named Government agencies in establishing accounting standards for Alaska Railroad.

B. The minority views on S. 1508 embody the following objections to regulation of Alaska Railroad:

1. Objection: We are not opposed on principle to outside regulation of the Alaska Railroad, provided a need for such regulation can be shown. However, no case has been made to show the necessity of such outside regulation. In any case, the railroad is immediately under the administrative direction of the Secretary of the Interior. If any complaints against railroad practices or policies should be found to have merit, changes or corrections can be most easily made by administrative action of the Secretary, without the interposition of an outside agency. By this means, the conflict of jurisdiction and policy over the railroad which is inherent in the bill can be avoided.

Answer: This argument against regulations assumes that the Alaska Railroad is best regulated without public hearings, without shippers being afforded a chance to be represented by counsel, and that administrative action in private by the Secretary of Interior is superior to the time-honored method of action after hearing those with differences of opinion as to the proper regulatory action to be taken. In the case of the recent proposed rate increase, to be effective January 25, 1960, no arrangements were made initially to hear complaints in order that changes or corrections can be most easily made by administrative action of the Secretary without the interposition of an outside agency. Afterward the Secretary of Interior, upon request, instructed the Manager of the Alaska Railroad to postpone indefinitely the proposed increases and to hold hearings in Alaska.

2. Objection: We do not believe as a matter of principle that the Federal Government should accept State regulation of the most fundamental aspects of the operation of any Federal agency. It is no disrespect to any State to point out that State and Federal objectives may conflict. The railroad is owned by the Federal Government. It represents a substantial investment. Its operational costs, maintenance, and improvements must ultimately be met from the Federal Treasury through appropriations, if they cannot be met out of railroad revenues. If State regulation should result in thrusting losses or other burdens on the railroad, the Federal Treasury would ultimately suffer the loss.

Answer: Alaska is now a State in the United States and should have the authority of all such sovereign States. Included in that authority should be the power to regulate intrastate freight rates. In these days of frequent assertions that States rights should not be impaired, it should be a relatively simple matter to give the State of Alaska regulatory authority over the intrastate rates that shippers must pay on the Alaska Railroad. There are ample safeguards in the Interstate Commerce Act that would protect the Federal Treasury from extensive losses or burdens imposed by intrastate rates prescribed by the State of Alaska for the Alaska Railroad. This safeguard is contained in the requirement that the ICC has jurisdiction over and must declare unlawful intrastate rates that impose undue burdens on interstate commerce. This provision serves to allow ICC to require States to increase their intrastate rates to adequate levels when the rates are so low as to require the interstate shipper to pay more than a fair share of the transportation costs.

3. Objection: Only 10 to 20 percent of the traffic of the railroad is interstate within the meaning of the Interstate Commerce Act. In a letter to Senator MAGNUSON of February 11, 1957, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission said: "In our opinion, economic regulation would not be a success if 50 percent or more of the traffic is to be exempt." On the basis of this advice, ICC regulation of interstate traffic on the railroad would be a meaningless gesture.

Answer: The ICC in a subsequent letter to Senator MAGNUSON, dated June 16, 1959, answers this objection. The letter indicates that the general manager of the Alaska Railroad, in attempting to show that very little Alaska Railroad traffic would be subject to ICC regulation, stated that "approximately 90 percent tonnagewise—80 percent revenuewise—of the traffic of the Alaska Railroad moves on local billing." The minority apparently jumped to the conclusion that because of traffic moved on local billing that it was bound to move in intrastate commerce and be free from ICC regulation under this bill. As pointed out in the ICC letter, the fact of local billing does not necessarily indicate that a shipment moves in intrastate commerce. The courts have held on this point that the original intention in moving the traffic determines whether or not it is to be considered interstate commerce.

In order that the record may adequately disclose the ICC's position on this point, I intend at the proper time to ask for inclusion in the RECORD of the letter of June 16, 1959, to Chairman MAGNUSON from the Honorable Kenneth H. Tuggle, of ICC.

4. Objection: The bill contains no standards or statement of objectives to guide the Interstate Commerce Commission in its regulatory function in any way. The Department in its report requested Congress, if the bill were to be considered favorably, to set forth such standards, but the committee declined the challenge.

Answer: The Interstate Commerce Act is composed of standards and objectives to guide the ICC in its regulatory function. In addition, S. 1508 makes the necessary adjustments in the act to allow it to apply properly to the Alaska Railroad by providing that there be no restriction on securities issued by the railroad nor restrictions on its authority to expand its lines. A further adjustment is being offered in the form of an amendment to insure that the ICC will take into account the promotional and military aspects of the railroad's operations in order that private shippers will not have to pay unduly high rates to subsidize such activities. As has been pointed out, the Interstate Commerce Act does not require a fair return on a fair value of the Alaska Railroad's property. It should be emphasized that until the standards of the Interstate Commerce Act can be applied to the Alaska Railroad by ICC, rate increases may be made by the Secretary of the Interior without notice or hearing.

5. Objection: The minority maintains that the Railroad Labor Act gives employees the right to strike, and that the right to strike against the Federal Government should not be granted to groups of its employees.

Answer: The amendment offered by Senator SCHOEPPEL, dated July 8, 1959, is acceptable, and provides: "On page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike out 'Title I of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C., secs. 151–163);'."

6. Objection: The minority states that solution of the peculiar regulatory problems presented by the Alaska Railroad is not easy and that a thorough study of the rates by all transportation agencies, both within Alaska and between Alaska and the old States should be made.

Answer: Solution of the regulatory problems of the Alaska Railroad should be solved by referring them to a competent regulatory body. A thorough study of the rates of the Alaska Railroad should be made by such an expert regulatory body in preference to action by a study group that is stalling for time, a technique frequently used in Washington to delay decisions on important problems in the last few years.

7. Objection: We know of no substantial complaint against the present mode of regulation of the railroad, via the administrative authority of the Secretary of the Interior. The railroad is a public service agency. The Secretary, its supervisor, is a public servant. We have no evidence that any complaints against railroad practices have been neglected by the Secretary.

Answer: Had the minority sent a member to Alaska to hear the testimony concerning the regulation of Alaska transportation rates last October and November, they would have found that there are substantial complaints. For instance, the port of Valdez is being throttled by the rates established by the Secretary of the Interior on the Alaska Railroad. While complaints are made, many others would probably be made if there were not a general fear of retaliation by the Alaska Railroad. The Secretary may be a fine public servant but his background and the laws under which he operates do not qualify him to be a regulator of railroads.

8. Objection: Since the Alaska Railroad is a major factor in the transportation network of the new State, and since most of its traffic cannot in any case be brought within the regulatory framework of the ICC, it may be that the most acceptable solution to this unusual problem would be to rely upon the Secretary to enforce upon his subordinate agency compliance with policy direction from Congress and tariff adjustment procedures which parallel ICC requirements even more closely than they do now.

Answer: It has not been proved that most of the traffic of the Alaska Railroad cannot be brought within the regulatory frame of the Interstate Commerce Act. As for the

proposal for having the procedures of the Secretary of the Interior closely parallel those of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to give more satisfactory regulation, it should be pointed out that the procedures should be those of the ICC and should be administered by the Commission. It is noteworthy that during the House committee hearings on this same legislation, a Department of Interior witness suggested that the ICC give advisory opinions to the Secretary of the Interior which he could accept or not. This admission of the need for regulation is constructive. There is no need to have advisory opinions by the Commission. Final opinions by an ICC having jurisdiction in the usual way would be more satisfactory.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that the objection against having one Government agency regulate another is without merit. The Interstate Commerce Commission regulated successfully the Federal Barge Lines, a Government owned operation, for many years. The Maritime Commission regulates Government ships in regard to rates, and the parcel post rates of the Post Office Department are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it was also stated, and generally agreed to, as I recall, that the ICC regulations would not be appropriate if more than 50 percent of the railroad's traffic were intrastate in character. A witness for the Alaska railroad stated that approximately 90 percent, tonnagewise, and 80 percent, revenuewise, of the traffic of the Alaska Railroad moves on local billing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated June 16, 1959, written to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], by the Honorable Kenneth H. Tuggle, at that time the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in which answer is given to the contention that more than 50 percent of the railroad's business is intrastate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 15, 1959.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: During the hearings before your committee in May 1959 on the three Alaska transportation bills recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission (S. 1507, S. 1508, and S. 1509), opposition to S. 1508, which would subject the Alaska Railroad to the Interstate Commerce Act, was advanced by Mr. R. H. Anderson, general manager of the railroad.

At page 160 of the transcript, in the paragraph numbered 3, Mr. Anderson expressed doubt that the proposed bill would achieve its apparent purpose insofar as the Alaska Railroad is concerned. In attempting to show that very little railroad traffic would be subject to ICC regulation, he stated that "approximately 90 percent tonnagewise—80 percent revenuewise—of the traffic of the Alaska Railroad moves on local billing."

We agreed with this witness as to the intrastate nature of the movement of coal and some petroleum. We recognize also that military traffic might fall under section 22 of the act. We do not question the accuracy of his statements respecting the proportion of traffic now moving under local billing, but we submit that the fact of local billing does not necessarily indicate that a shipment moves in intrastate commerce.

Of the total 400,000 to 500,000 tons of dry cargo passing through Alaskan ports, it is estimated that as much as 80 percent, or 300,000 to 400,000 tons of this traffic, may be subject to regulation. Some of this through traffic would move inland by trucks, but a large part would be handled by the Alaska Railroad. Moreover, a large part of that tonnage would fall within the manufacturers and miscellaneous group. This is largely high rated, profitable traffic for which there is strong competition between rail and motor carriers. A similar situation would likely prevail in some degree for the tonnage classified as forwarder traffic. We do not believe the Commission will be able effectively to fulfill its existing obligation to regulate motor carriers and freight forwarders unless the railroad, too, is subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

The tables following show by commodity groups the relative importance of the commercial traffic handled by the Alaska Railroad in terms of volume and of revenue. It will be noted that the manufactures and miscellaneous group accounts for about 60 percent of the tonnage for each of the years shown. The revenue furnished by this group was in a range from 82.8 percent of the total revenue from commercial traffic in 1955 to 73.8 percent in 1958. In 1958, forwarder traffic produced 6.8 percent of the tonnage and 11.2 percent of the revenue.

The Alaska Railroad rail line carload revenue freight traffic by commodity groups, as percents of total commercial freight revenue tons, 1954–58

Item	Percent				
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Products of agriculture	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.6
Animals and products	.1	.1	.1	.1	(1)
Products of mines	33.0	34.4	33.3	28.1	30.3
Products of forests	6.1	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.1
Manufactures and miscellaneous	59.8	60.5	59.8	61.2	59.2
Forwarder	-----	.3	2.2	6.1	6.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.

The Alaska Railroad rail line carload revenue by commodity groups, as percents of total revenue from commercial traffic, 1954–58

Item	Percent				
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Products of agriculture	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.0
Animals and products	.3	.1	.2	.2	.1
Products of mines	12.5	11.3	11.8	8.7	10.2
Products of forests	5.8	3.6	4.6	4.8	3.7
Manufactures and miscellaneous	79.9	82.8	78.2	75.0	73.8
Forwarder	-----	1.0	3.8	10.3	11.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Department of the Interior, "Reports of the Alaska Railroad."

At page 161, in paragraph No. 4, Mr. Anderson quotes from a letter dated February 11, 1957, addressed to you by the then Chairman of the ICC, as follows: "In our opinion, economic regulation would not be a success if 50 percent or more of the traffic is to be exempt." This statement was based on conditions obtaining prior to statehood, and was followed by a reference to our proposal that the privilege of reduced rates for Government shipments on traffic to, from, and within Alaska except in time of war or other national emergency be eliminated. It was based on the assumption that section 22 rates were being negotiated at levels substantially below those for commercial traffic, and that military and other exempt traffic would continue to constitute more than 50 percent of the total. It was also made at a time when we had recommended that the Congress substantially amend section 22.

As we pointed out on page 45 of the transcript of the present hearings, our proposals at this time are aimed at regulating surface transportation with respect to Alaska in the same manner it is now regulated in the other States, and we indicated our understanding that rates being negotiated by Defense officials, currently controlling the major portion of Government traffic in Alaska, are not at depressed levels, but on the contrary have served as a pattern for civilian freight rate levels for all modes of carriers.

As military traffic to and from Alaska is not being carried at depressed rate levels, the application of section 22 should not interfere with effective regulation of commercial traffic. The volume of military traffic, moreover, is decreasing. This is indicated by the fact that from the level of 1954 the waterborne traffic carried by military transport had declined 23 percent by 1957 and 43 percent by 1958.

We appreciate this opportunity to supplement the record in support of S. 1508. If we have failed to cover any point on which you need our further comments, we shall be glad to give it our immediate attention.

Respectfully submitted.

KENNETH H. TUGGLE,
Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, along the same line, I should like to offer a further statement on the matter, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this connection, I have read several Supreme Court and U.S. court of appeals decisions bearing upon the problem. It appears to me an opinion by the U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit, on December 19, 1951, *Wycoff Company, Inc.* v. *Public Service Commission of Utah et al.*, 195 F. 2d 252, states the law that is being followed at the present time. A portion of this decision is set out below:

"The legal principles which guide us in determining whether an intrastate shipment is, in fact, such or is a continuing part of an interstate shipment are clear and well defined. The difficulty as always comes when we seek to apply them to a given state of facts. As stated by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Erie R. Co.*, 280 U.S. 98, 50 S. Ct. 51, 53, 74 L. Ed. 187, 'the nature of the shipment is not dependent upon the question when or to whom the title passes * * *' or whether 'the transaction is initiated or completed under a local bill of lading which is wholly intrastate, * * *' nor yet 'by the fact that there may be a detention before or after the shipment on the local bill of lading.' If there is a continuing intent that the goods shall be transported until they reach a designated place, the entire transportation is a continuing one, notwithstanding that there may be a temporary stoppage en route for a particular purpose. In *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Co.*, 317 U.S. 564, 63 S. Ct. 332, 335, 87 L. Ed. 460, the Supreme Court reaffirmed these principles in the following language: 'If the halt in the movement of the goods is a convenient intermediate step in the process of getting them to their final destinations, they remain "in commerce" until they reach those points.' "

In other words, the cases appear to clearly hold that although there may be a temporary stoppage of goods en route to a particular place, if there is the intention of the parties that the goods shall be transported until they reach a designated place, then the entire transaction is tied together, and would be considered as interstate commerce.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated. It is designated "1–25–60—B."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the committee amendment been agreed to?

Mr. BARTLETT. No. I am offering an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. This amendment is to the committee amendment?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment on page 8 and on page 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska desire to have the amendment read in its entirety?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, Mr. President.

Mr. BARTLETT's amendment to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 8, strike out lines 16 through 25, inclusive, and on page 9, strike out lines 1 and 2, and through the words "United States" in line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "except that so long as such railroad or railroads continue to be both wholly owned and operated by the United States of America or by one of its departments, corporations, or agencies: (1) the Interstate Commerce Commission in determining the lawfulness of rates or charges maintained, or from time to time proposed to be maintained, by such railroad or railroads, shall give due consideration, among other things, to the national public purposes which to a substantial extent prompted the construction, expansion, maintenance, and improvement thereof, with particular reference to the requirements of the national defense, as well as promotion and development of natural resources, and shall to the extent warranted by the facts recognize for valuation and cost-finding purposes a segregation of both capital investment and operating expenses which are found to be solely attributable to such national public purposes, distinguishing them from normal railroad common carrier investment and operational expenses; nor shall such rates and charges be deemed to be unlawful solely because they fail to yield sufficient revenues to cover any amounts for taxes not actually required by law to be paid or provide a return on capital investment; (2) approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not be required for any extension of such railroad or railroads or for the issuance of securities; and (3) that in carrying out its duties under section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, the Commission shall consider the needs of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to provisions of law with respect to the accounting, auditing, financial reporting, and budgetary requirements of such railroad or railroads."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is unavoidably detained. There is at the desk an amendment by him, identified as "7–8–59—B," which I offer on his behalf and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 8, lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to strike out "title I of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C., secs. 151–163);".

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is no objection to this amendment and that it is to be accepted by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The understanding of the Senator from Maryland is correct, and the committee accepts the amendment which has been proposed to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks prepared by my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] in connection with this amendment to the committee amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

I rise to speak in opposition to S. 1508, a bill which would apply the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to the Alaska Railroad.

I am opposed to passage of this legislation for several reasons. I followed the hearings closely during the past session of Congress.

From a study of the hearings on a previous bill, S. 1448, I could discern no sentiment whatever among the various segments of the transportation industry in favor of enactment of that legislation. I do not believe that the transportation picture has changed materially since that time. While it is true that statehood poses many new problems for the new State of Alaska, I do not believe that regulation of the Alaska Railroad by the Interstate Commerce Commission is one of the pressing problems confronting the new State.

According to information which I have received, only 10 percent by volume or 20 percent by revenue of the railroad's traffic would fall under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission as interstate commerce. The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission wrote to Senator MAGNUSON on February 11, 1959, as follows: "In our opinion economic regulation would not be a success if 50 percent or more of the traffic is to be exempt."

The present legislation would vest in the Interstate Commerce Commission control of only a small percentage of the railroad's traffic. I personally cannot see, and I believe the Department of Interior estimates will bear me out, that the percentage of traffic defined as "interstate" will increase to 50 percent in the foreseeable future.

I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to the agency comments which have been included in Senate Report No. 435. Particular attention should be given to a letter submitted to our committee by the Department of the Interior on May 7, 1959. You will note that the then Acting Secretary of the Interior, Elmer F. Bennett, stated:

"The Alaskan Railroad is a federally owned transportation artery, extending a distance of 470 miles (main line) from the port cities of Seward and Whittier through Anchorage, its headquarters, to Fairbanks. There are four short branches. The railroad was constructed under authority of the 1914 legislation cited above, and was completed in 1923. For many years it has been operated under the direction of this department.

"The purpose of this operation is not to earn a profit, or a return on the Government's investment, but rather to perform a public service in assisting in the development of Alaska. Therefore, the railroad has generally not been run in strict accordance with all the financial considerations proper to a privately owned railroad, where such financial objectives conflicted with the developmental purposes for which the railroad was built.

"The railroad has energetically sought to pare down costs to the lowest practicable level, and also to develop new industry which would generate revenue-producing traffic. By these and other means it has been able to show a small net margin of revenue over costs (including depreciation) during each of the past 6 years. Simultaneously, the railroad has deliberately refrained from increasing the charges for its services to the point that would have been necessary to earn a substantial return on investment. On the contrary, freight and passenger rates have been systematically kept down to levels just sufficient to cover costs.

"In short, the Alaska Railroad has been and is operated after the manner of a municipally owned electric plant, which aims to provide the best possible service at the lowest possible rates. Such municipally owned electric plants and other publicly owned utilities are not commonly subjected to rate control by outside regulatory commissions in this country, since by the terms of their mandates they are already engaged in serving the public interest, and there is no necessity for regulation to protect the public. S. 1508 fails to take cognizance of this sharp distinction, well recognized in American practice, between publicly owned facilities operated solely in the interest of the consumer or in this case the shipper and traveler, and privately owned facilities which are properly entitled to a fair return on the investment of their stockholders."

I agree with the Interior Department's view because I cannot see the need for Interstate Commerce Commission regulation of Alaska Railroad rates. As indicated, rates are already as low as the management of the railroad can make them and still cover its costs. I can only foresee, as a result of regulation of the railroad, increased rates being paid by the citizens of Alaska for goods carried by the railroad for its customers.

I have long held the opinion that the Alaska Railroad has been efficiently operated, rendering good service, and that it carries its national defense role very well.

Although I am a believer in regulation of transportation in the ordinary case, I find good reasons to oppose regulation of the Alaska Railroad as provided in S. 1508. First, one Federal agency should not be placed under another Federal agency for regulatory purposes. Second, I believe that it is both unnecessary and unwise for a Federal agency to be placed under State regulation. Yet that is precisely the result of an amendment adopted by the committee to S. 1508. Under the language as written into the bill, permission would be given to the State of Alaska to regulate intrastate operations of the Alaska Railroad with the same authority that other States regulate privately owned railroads. The new State of Alaska could assume control over every aspect of the railroad's intrastate operations, including the rates on a major portion of its traffic. By such regulation the State could thus control the railroad's financial condi-

tion and earning ability. It is entirely possible that the State, through its rate policy, could inflict operating losses on the railroad. In such a situation the Federal Government would be helpless to control it.

It is my view that responsible legislating on our part would call for exemption of a Federal agency from the control of a State government. In reaching this conclusion, among several reasons, I place great emphasis upon the fact that an enormous function of the railroad is to give logistic support to our Nation's military and air bases located in Alaska.

In such a situation as I have already discussed—the weakening of the railroad by State control and unwise regulation or policies—our national defense might suffer.

From my years of experience I believe I know how rate cases are handled. In every instance there is a desire on the part of private carriers to earn a fair return on their invested capital. In the case of the Alaska Railroad, the management has endeavored to make a marginal profit which would merely cover its costs and provide for some small measure of improvements and betterments. I am certain that the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and various managers of the Alaska Railroad have kept in mind the various goals set forth in the enabling act. A principal one is to "aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and the settlement of the public land therein."

The committee has not endeavored to set up any special rules for treatment of the Alaska Railroad if regulation should come. It would not seem to me to be equitable to attempt to establish a rate basis on the entire investment of capital in the present facilities of the railroad. From my knowledge of its operations, the railroad appears to have had many millions of dollars spent on it because of its national defense role in Alaska. To date, the railroad has not been required by the Congress to earn and return to the Treasury interest on its investment. Under such a policy, it is understandable that rates have been kept at the lowest practicable level.

In the event that the railroad should be forced to establish a pattern of rates which would permit a return to the Treasury of a fixed rate of return on its capital investment, then I can foresee only increased rates in store for the State's shippers and consumers will pay increased prices because of these higher rates. According to the Department of the Interior, if such a course of action should become necessary, the amount of the overall general rate increase would be at least 20 percent.

The Department of the Interior asked the committee to write into the bill "definite ratemaking standards to guide the regulatory process." As reported from the committee, S. 1508 does not contain any such ratemaking standards. In my opinion, it is a matter of congressional policy as to whether or not the railroad's rates should be set at levels to earn a fair return for the Federal Government. I believe the bill is deficient in this important respect. I am informed that the railroad would be reluctant to change its low-rate policy without a direct congressional mandate. The Interstate Commerce Commission should not be asked to "read the mind" of Congress and to propose a rate policy under a bill which sets no standards for the Commission to apply in this particular case.

In my opinion, the Railway Labor Act should not be applied to the Alaska Railroad. As introduced, S. 1508 said little or nothing about labor relations although the Railway Labor Act automatically covers carriers subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act. A committee amendment has now been proposed to make it even more clear that the railroad is subject to the Railway Labor Act.

The Railway Labor Act was written in the light of labor relations as they were found to exist on privately owned carriers. It is based upon the existence of the right to strike but seeks to channel disputes through mediation, arbitration or "emergency board" fact-finding processes, in the hope that the right to strike will not be invoked. Alaska Railroad employees could not participate in the final step of this procedure, namely, the establishment of an emergency board, without making a threat to effect a serious interruption in interstate commerce. The committee amendment would therefore seem to contravene for the Alaska Railroad, the general prohibition against strikes by Federal employees.

The Railway Labor Act's provisions are manifestly inappropriate for a Government-operated facility.

The Alaska Railroad has long been a pioneer among Federal agencies, in its good working relationships with its employees. Most employees are union members, and the railroad recognizes and regularly bargains with union representatives, in the setting of wages and other matters. A wage pattern has been established under which Alaska Railroad employees receive stateside wages plus a cost-of-living differential more than sufficient to compensate for the actual difference in cost of living in Alaska, plus fringe benefits which are enjoyed by the employees of no other railroad in the country.

Under the provisions of S. 1508 the Alaska Railroad would be subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act under which the Interstate Commerce Commission could require the Alaska Railroad to use a uniform system of accounts such as any other class carrier would be required to maintain. At the present time, the Alaska Railroad maintains accounting principles and standards prescribed by the General Accounting Office and the railroad is subject to an annual audit by GAO.

Under S. 1508, conflicting requirements could be imposed with respect to accounting practices. The railroad's accounting is a modern business type and it is apparent that the changeover would impose additional costs, be wasteful and expensive and would undoubtedly hamper the administrative efficiency of the railroad.

I think the Department of the Interior has done a very good job of regulating the Alaska Railroad through the administrative control exercised by the Secretary of the Interior. Its operations are guided by the public interest. It has no motive other than to provide good service at low rates. The appropriate committees of the Congress have admonished the railroad officials on numerous occasions not to incur operating deficits. Rates have been set at the lowest practicable levels consistent with these instructions. To my mind there has been shown no need for regulation by any outside agency to protect the shipper from excessive rates. It is my understanding that no charges have been sustained that the Alaska Railroad engages in unfair practices or operates in a manner that would not be permitted to a private carrier under Interstate Commerce Commission regulation. I am informed that very few complaints have ever come to the Secretary of the Interior regarding railroad practices. I do not believe that the Secretary would condone competitive practices which are unfair or which would be considered violations of proper ratemaking or service standards.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD at this point statements relating to the capital investment of the Alaska Railroad, the defense mission of the railroad, labor relations of the Alaska Railroad, and proposed terminal charge increase by the Alaska Railroad. These are matters which should be considered as a part of the legislative history of S. 1508.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The Alaska Railroad was constructed under the authority of the act of March 12, 1914, which authorized the President to select a route or routes connecting the navigable waters of interior Alaska and one or more coalfields with an open water port or ports on the southern coast of Alaska, and authorized an appropriation of $35 million for that purpose. In 1919 the original $35 million authorization was exhausted, and additional sums were authorized. During and after World War II additional facilities were constructed, and since that war an extensive program of rehabilitating the entire line has been carried out. Total appropriations by the Federal Government to June 30, 1958 have amounted to slightly more than $169 million. Additional funds for improvements and betterments have been expended by the railroad during recent years from retained earnings.

The railroad capital account shows an aggregate proprietary interest of the United States, as of June 30, 1958, of $132 million including invested and donated capital and retained earnings of the railroad. On the asset side total assets on that date were given as $135 million broken down as follows:

Current assets	$16,000,000
Land	90,000
Buildings (depreciated value)	8,443,000
Other structures and facilities (depreciated value)	70,401,000
Equipment (depreciated value)	18,238,000
Nonoperating property (depreciated value)	5,620,000
Additions and betterments in progress	15,591,000
Property awaiting disposal	26,000
All other assets and debits	1,578,000

Much of the cost of construction of Alaska Railroad facilities has been due directly to military requirements. Of the four branches, two, the Whittier and Eielson branches, were built for the direct service of military requirements; the other two, Matanuska and Healy, were built to tap coalfields of which the military are the predominant customer.

After the branch to the southern port of Whittier had been built during World War II, the railroad should, on purely economic grounds, have discontinued its service to the other southern port of Seward. However, it was the military decision that two southern gateways to the railbelt should be maintained in operating condition at all times; therefore, the railroad at great expense rehabilitated the Seward-Portage line and constructed a new modern dock at Seward.

In like manner the railroad has had to invest in rolling stock and other facilities far beyond purely civilian requirements in order to serve national defense. For example, the railroad recently advised the congressional appropriations committees that it proposed to purchase a rotary car dumper at a cost of about $110,000. The dumper was justified on the grounds of estimates of sharply increased tonnages of coal shipments resulting from the new military installation at Clear.

DEFENSE MISSION—THE ALASKA RAILROAD

In enacting the Organic Act of the Alaska Railroad in 1914, the Congress gave the railroad two missions: first, the settlement and development of Alaska, and, second, national defense, the "transportation of coal

for the Army and Navy, transportation of troops, arms, munitions of war." The defense value of the railroad was dramatically brought home during World War II when Alaska became a key strategic area.

The major defense installations of Alaska, Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and Ladd and Eielson Air Force Bases, as well as the Clear missile site now under construction, are made possible and served by the railroad. Approximately 58 percent of tonnage movements and 42 percent of revenues are from direct Army shipments, without attempting to compute how much additional tonnage is indirectly related to the defense mission.

The defense importance of the Alaska Railroad has been consistently recognized by the Congress. For example, in 1948 the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported in reference to the railroad's rehabilitation program:

"From examination made by the committee it is apparent that there will be no diminution in traffic owing to the tonnage proposed to be handled for defense purposes. This is of sufficient quantity to require extensive rehabilitation of the property, and probably additional equipment will be required beyond that now being received as surplus. The maintenance of the defense establishment will continue to require coal from Healy into the Tanana area and from Matanuska into Anchorage. This can be carried practically only by rail. On such ground the current program appears warranted" (H. Rept. No. 1272, 80th Cong., 2d sess.).

Similarly the seventh report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 82d Congress, 1st session (committee print), stated:

"Because the principal supply centers for the Army and Air Force are located at Fort Richardson, the railroad plays a most important part in the planning of the movement of military supplies. Practically all of the transportation over this railroad is northbound both for military and commercial use."

The subcommittee added that "the Alaska Railroad is required to operate many nonprofit-producing services, most of which are due to military requirements."

One of the more notable of many defense features of the railroad is the recent rehabilitation of the Seward-Portage section of line and the construction of new dock facilities at Seward.

At present, the railroad must for military reasons operate two southern terminals on the coast of the Gulf of Alaska, Whittier and Seward, although either port would be entirely adequate to handle the entire volume of freight to and from the railbelt. Of the two, Whittier, a modern port constructed by the military during World War II, with a tide-water route approximately 52 miles shorter than the route from Seward inland, offers the railroad distinct operational advantages.

At the end of World War II the railroad proposed to use Whittier as its principal port and to abandon Seward when the Seward-Anchorage highway was completed. However, with the outbreak of the Korean conflict, the military determined that two year-round rail ports were necessary for the defense of Alaska. Whittier now serves as the exclusive military rail port and the railroad was forced to rehabilitate the Seward-Portage section of the main line and to rebuild the port dock facilities. The Congress appropriated more than $13 million for this purpose.

In 1952 Assistant Secretary of the Army Karl Bendetsen appeared before the House Appropriations Committee in support of the Department of the Interior's request for funds for the Seward dock and the Seward-Portage rehabilitation. Assistant Secretary Bendetsen, speaking of the use of both Whittier and Seward, said: "Taking into account that current and projected peacetime requirements of the civilian and the military would utilize both links and the fact that mobilization needs would also require them, we feel that this constitutes a wise investment in national security."

At the same hearing the commander in chief, Alaska command, Lt. Gen. W. E. Kepner, stated:

"I am of the firm opinion that the abandonment of a major rail line now in existence in Alaska is extremely hazardous. There is no practical alternative to rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad line between Seward and Portage and the providing of adequate dock facilities at Seward that can meet the strategic requirements imposed by the magnitude of the Alaskan defense effort.

"Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Alaska Railroad line between Seward and Portage be rehabilitated, with adequate dock facilities at Seward, so that the railroad may continue to take advantage of the existing labor market and community facilities at Seward; and further, that military operation of the port of Whittier be continued."

The Alaska Railroad is vital to the conduct of the defense mission in Alaska, both in peace and war. Its operations, and in fact the construction of its physical facilities, have been closely keyed to defense needs during peacetime. In the event of active hostilities, the railroad would of course direct all its energies and the use of all its facilities to the primary purpose of supplying the needs of the military.

Labor Relations on the Alaska Railroad

For many years the Alaska Railroad has been a leader, among Government agencies, in recognizing and dealing with union representatives representing its employees. Wages, working rules, and the like are generally arrived at so far as possible through the give-and-take of collective bargaining. When agreements cannot be reached in this manner at the local level, in some cases the disputes have been referred to higher headquarters. Through this general method agreements have been reached from time to time with most of the same unions representing railroadmen on stateside privately owned railroads.

It is not to be denied that disputes have arisen which have proved difficult to settle, and where extremely prolonged negotiations have occurred. For example, a wage dispute with the operating unions is currently before the Secretary on appeal, and a final settlement has not yet been agreed upon. A recent wage dispute with the nonoperating unions was finally referred to a board of arbitration for decision, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Although the railroad management did not agree with the majority decision of the board of arbitration, the Secretary of the Interior did approve the board's award.

The general wage scale on the Alaska Railroad is based fundamentally on the wage scale of the Northern Pacific Railway, with an appropriate differential to allow for the highest cost of living in the railbelt of Alaska. Views differ as to the extent of this difference in the cost of living. The board of arbitration referred to above apparently concluded that the difference amounted to approximately 37 percent.

Wage rates on the Alaska Railroad are actually set in many cases at considerably more than 37 percent higher than the rates for comparable jobs on the Northern Pacific. As a result of the arbitration award referred to above, wages for nonoperating employees average about 45 percent higher than for comparable stateside jobs. As to operating employees, a recent (May 3, 1959) departmental order set these wages at levels of not less than 37 percent higher than the Northern Pacific rate for each job, with the rate for some jobs running higher.

When these wage scales are actually applied in practice, the compensation received by many of the men has been exceedingly generous. Following is a tabulation showing the pay actually received by a number of the operating employees during 1958, compared with the annual salaries of the highest-paid managerial employees of the railroad:

Wage employees:	
P. J. Funkhouser, trainman	$14,658
J. L. Decicco, engineman	14,291
J. N. Smith, engineman	13,839
V. T. Pierelee, engineman	13,753
O. H. Nichols, trainman	13,377
Executive employees:	
General manager	22,000
Assistant general manager	15,375
Comptroller	14,100
Superintendent of operations	14,100
Chief engineer	13,500
Chief mechanical officer	13,500
Assistant to general manager	13,500
General traffic manager	12,500
Personnel officer	12,000
Assistant comptroller	12,000
Assistant chief engineer	12,000
Master mechanic	12,000

In addition to the wage scales described above, Alaska Railroad employees receive fringe benefits generally greater than those received by employees of privately owned railroads in the old States. Among these benefits are:

Civil service retirement rights, which are generally more generous than under the Railroad Retirement System;

Annual leave accruing at the rate of 13 to 26 days per annum, compared with leave of generally 5 to 15 days per annum for stateside railroads; and

Group life insurance, of which the Alaska Railroad pays one-third of the cost, a fringe benefit frequently lacking on stateside railroads.

In summary, wage employees of the Alaska Railroad receive higher wages (even after allowing for the higher cost of living in Alaska), more fringe benefits, and at least equal rights (other than the right to strike), when compared with any other railroad wage employees under the American flag, or anywhere else in the world.

Proposed Terminal Charge Increase by the Alaska Railroad

On December 24, 1959, the Alaska Railroad announced a proposed increase, effective January 25, 1960, in the terminal charge increment in its through tariffs between west coast ports and inland points on the railroad. The proposed increases would have amounted to 5 cents per 100 pounds for carload freight, and 10 cents per hundred pounds on less than carload freight.

The effective date of these proposed increases has now been postponed indefinitely, on the basis of protests by members of the Alaska congressional delegation, and the railroad has announced plans for a hearing in Anchorage, with an ICC examiner if possible, before any further action is taken. However, the background information as to why the railroad considers such increases are necessary is of interest.

By its notice of December 24 the railroad gave the same 30 days statutory notice which would have been required if it had been under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The proposed increase was not general but applied only to the (approximately) 15 percent of the railroad's tonnage that moves across the dock at Seward for inland Alaska Railroad destinations.

The local tariffs of the railroad were not to be changed. It happens that most of the railroad's freight, such as coal, oil, and ce-

ment, moves at local rates from Seward or Whittier, and was not affected by the proposed increase.

The proposed increases, as stated above, were in reality terminal charge increases which were included in through rates between west coast ports and inland Alaska rail points. Terminal work at Seward for the railroad is performed by the Northern Stevedoring & Handling Corp. under contract. This contract requires the railroad to reimburse the contractor for increased costs by reason of longshore wage increases. Under this contract the railroad's longshore payments to Northern Stevedoring & Handling Corp. have been raised several times. The latest increase occurred in October 1959, and was particularly large because the longshore wage differential over Seattle was at that time increased from 25 to 30 percent.

The Alaska Railroad is not run for profit. It would absorb increased longshore costs if it could do so without the danger of becoming a deficit operation. The increase was proposed because, in the judgment of the general manager, these costs could not be absorbed. The probable cost to shippers of the proposed increase would amount to about $150,000. Even with this increase there would be no guarantee that a deficit could be avoided for the current fiscal year.

It is important to recognize that the Federal Government has invested in the neighborhood of $175 million in the Alaska Railroad and has never asked or received a single dollar of interest on this investment. If ever any small surplus occurs on a year's operations for the railroad, it is merely a surplus over out-of-pocket costs, never a return on the Federal Government investment.

Under normal ICC rules a proposed increase of this sort would receive almost automatic Interstate Commerce Commission approval, if the railroad could show that the increase was necessary for the purpose of recouping the railroad for a reasonable share of the increases in its out-of-pocket costs for longshoring, including those caused by the last longshore wage settlement. It is hoped that the hearing to be held will develop the facts fully, so that a prompt decision may be reached on the merits of the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I should say that the committee amendment initially agreed to is designed for one particular purpose. Objection was made to this bill, during its consideration by the committee, on the ground that Alaska Railroad freight rates would be raised, and very measurably, if the ordinary practices of the Interstate Commerce Commission were applied.

This amendment is designed to remove any necessity for such application, because it does two things. In the first place, it spells out, as a matter of legislative determination, the fact that the ICC shall take into account, in respect to rates, the prime purpose of the Alaska Railroad in promoting the economic development of Alaska. Likewise, it takes into account the military importance of the area served by the Alaska Railroad. So that the objection that, if the Interstate Commerce Commission has regulatory jurisdiction of the Alaska Railroad, its rates will be almost automatically increased, is no longer valid. That need not happen, and will not happen unless rates are to be increased for normal reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, for many years America has been told that she is mortgaging her future. We are told exactly what each child born into these United States will have hanging over his head as his share of the national debt.

We are not told, however—significantly, we are not told in the same stories—what assets our unborn descendants will have to balance this liability. If we are really concerned about their future, it is far more important to know that the minerals, the farmland, the forests—above all, the water—that they will need will be available.

Our great financial institutions have tremendous liabilities. They could not be big otherwise. They also have tremendous assets. And it is to determine the question of what we Americans as a Nation have in the way of our most important assets—our natural resources—that this proposed legislation has been drawn.

On almost every other subject we have endless statistics to guide our actions, public and private, in the economic field. But on this question, nobody now reports to the people whether we are gaining or losing in relation to requirements for natural resources, or whether the foreseeable requirements of the Nation 10 and 20 years hence can be supplied on a sustained yield basis.

Throughout our national history, too many Americans have had a tendency to hold the belief that we have everything, and plenty of it. Consequently, we have been wasteful and prodigal in the exploitation of our land, forests, minerals, and water. Despite the efforts of many dedicated people, we find ourselves face to face with the absolute fact that the resources we have been heedlessly exploiting are not limitless. We have had droughts and water shortages, mineral deposits have been exhausted, land has been laid waste by floods and erosion, timber supplies have become strained. In short, every thinking person must be aware to some degree that while America is still a land of plenty, gifted by nature, there is a limit, finite and inexorable, to the fundamental basis of our strength, our natural resources.

We need to establish a permanent mechanism for the study and development of comprehensive programs for the protection and utilization of all natural resources, including soil, water, timber, grazing land, fisheries, wildlife, and recreational, scenic, and scientific values. S. 2549, the proposed Resources and Conservation Act of 1960, would provide the mechanism we need for such an appraisal.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY] is now conducting hearings on S. 2549, of which he is the author, and of which I have the privilege of being one of the original cosponsors.

The hearings will provide the Senate with comments and suggestions from all sections of the Nation and from all sectors of economic life. I am confident that the testimony will bring to our attention important considerations and suggestions which will improve the effectiveness of the measure.

In my service with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Committee on Public Works I have been impressed by the valuable information and suggestions that have come from testimony at hearings. I have observed that, along with the usually excellent technical reports on pending legislation that the committees receive from the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the other Government agencies, important additional information is brought out by local witnesses at hearings. After all, this is only natural, because the people who live with problems, who are vitally concerned in how they will be solved, frequently have an insight into them and a gift for analysis and solution which technical men cannot match.

I had such an experience in a striking way during the past fall. The Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], honored me and my State of Utah by holding one of its hearings in Salt Lake City. It was an excellent hearing and an enlightening one.

The point that I wish to make is that the testimony on Utah's specific water problems was developed entirely by local Utah witnesses. By prearrangement of the chairman, all of the testimony of the Federal water experts will be presented directly to the select committee in Washington, thus affording the maximum time for the local people.

At that hearing, in addition to the Governor, who made a masterful statement in a field in which he is an authority, the witnesses included a number of representatives of water-user organizations, county officials, businessmen's groups, chambers of commerce, and other citizen groups. There were some 25 witnesses, and more than 250 people at the hearing. Let me emphasize that this was not a hearing devoted to building some new project in the State, which is the type that customarily brings out a large number of proponents. This was a hearing about the long-range problem of planning for Utah's resource development and conservation, and how

to meet the requirements of the 50 percent population growth which we must expect in the not-too-distant future. Testimony covered a very wide range of subjects because resource development and conservation touch almost every aspect of agriculture, business, industry, and Government affairs.

At this point, I want to pay special recognition to a group of exceptionally well-informed and hard-working citizens who confirm my convictions about the need for the Resources and Conservation bill. I refer to the League of Women Voters. Recommendations from the league carry weight because they are based on intensive study of the facts and the issues, and because the organization is scrupulous in maintaining objective non-partisan approaches to the questions.

The League of Women Voters of the United States, as well as the Utah League, has endorsed the Resources and Conservation bill, and supports its early enactment. At the Utah hearing, the league testimony was presented by its State president, Mrs. Paul B. Porter, whom I want to compliment for a remarkably able statement.

I have discussed this Salt Lake City hearing—and it is typical of the other select committee hearings which were held in all sections of the country—because it is impressive evidence that our citizens, farmers, businessmen, professional men, and others have a perspective and grasp of the overall problems of managing natural resources in relation to the impending great increase in population and industry. These hearings demonstrated to me that this is a real and present concern to the people we represent, and it is a problem which so far has not been approached on an overall basis by the technical staffs in the Government.

It is manifestly unfair to criticize Government agencies because they have not engaged in the kind of overall resource planning which is needed now. Each of the agencies has been assigned a specialized and limited mission—flood control, or soil conservation, or forest resources, or reclamation, or range management, or wildlife, to name a few.

As a result of this restricted approach by each of the agencies and departments, no single group puts all of the separate pieces together to see where we are coming out. To repeat: Nobody reports to the people whether we are gaining or losing in relation to requirements for natural resources, or whether the foreseeable requirements of the Nation 10 and 20 years hence can be supplied on a sustained yield basis. These are the questions that underlie the testimony at the hearings this fall.

One problem which needs analysis, for example, is what tempo should be set for reclamation development. My State of Utah, and all of the other Western States, are dependent upon a sustained program of water resource development because water storage and regulation is the basis of our agriculture, commerce, industry, and even the very life of our communities, both rural and metropolitan. The current slowdown of reclamation development could cut off our economic life, and could turn us into a backward area of the Nation.

We are told that reclamation has been slowed down because we already have a surplus of agricultural production and reclamation would aggravate the surplus. This is directly contrary to the facts, but it seems to be given credence. The crops raised on irrigated lands are not the ones in surplus. The Department of Agriculture reports that we must continue to support developments which will put more water on land if we are to prevent food and fiber shortages for the growing population and industry. The production from about 3½ million acres of additional irrigated land is needed in the West to meet the requirements of 1980. And in order to have those lands in production by 1980, we must start very soon on the construction of the projects which make reclamation and irrigation possible. Unfortunately, there now is no place in the Government where facts like this are analyzed and acted upon.

It is startling to realize that producing enough food to sustain our expanding population will mean converting some 75 million acres of forest lands into cropland and pastures. This would have a very serious impact on timber supplies—almost one-third of the growth on all commercial forest lands would be lost—and would result in a serious curtailment of the important recreational uses of forest areas. Are we wise therefore, in curtailing reclamation developments which could prevent the necessity of turning a good deal of the acreage of forests into cropland later on?

As I have pointed out, at the present time there is no place in the Government where this problem is recognized, and no one charged with supplying well-founded answers. However, under the Resources and Conservation bill S. 2549, this responsibility would fall to the Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers and to the Joint Committee on Resources and Conservation. How will the proposed Resources and Conservation Act operate?

The President will submit to the Congress each year a resources and conservation report. This report will set forth the condition of the Nation's natural resources with particular reference to multiple purpose use; trends in their management and utilization; the adequacy of available natural resources to meet the Nation's needs; a review of all conservation programs and activities and their anticipated effects; and a program for implementing the national policy, including suggested legislation.

The President may supplement this report with additional reports or suggestions for legislation concerned with natural resources conservation and development at any time.

Assisting the President in the preparation of the report will be a three-member Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, appointed by the President with senatorial approval. These advisers are to be qualified by training, experience, and accomplishments to analyze and interpret natural resource policy and to formulate recommendations.

The Council may utilize whatever sources of information, services, and facilities, public or private, which may be available either through cooperation or by employment of its own staff.

The annual report of the President to the Congress is to be referred to a Joint Committee on Resources and Conservation. This is to consist of eight Members of each legislative body, reflecting the political complexion of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

This committee will make a continuing study of the President's report and means of coordinating programs in furtherance of national policy. By May 1 of each year the committee will file a report with the Senate and with the House of Representatives, which can be used as a guide for the various congressional committees dealing with natural resources. Supplementary reports and recommendations may be made by the joint committee whenever desirable.

The act will enable the Federal Government to develop a consolidated, well-informed, well-coordinated program which can be revised and updated as circumstances may warrant.

The approach taken by the resources and conservation bill is one which has been used very effectively in economic and financial matters. The Employment Act of 1946, which also was authored by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], established a Council of Economic Advisors in the office of the President, and a Joint Economic Committee in the Congress. Each year they make a current appraisal of economic and financial conditions and recommend to the President and to the Congress what legislation is needed in the fields of business, employment, and finance. For 12 years, these annual appraisals and recommendations have been of great value to the Government and to the people at large. Leading economists feel that this committee's appraisals have been of decided benefit in dealing with recessions, inflation, and unemployment.

In the same way, and by similar methods, the resources and conservation bill would give us the tools to bring natural resources in balance with the needs for forest products, agricultural products, minerals, and recreation. For the first time in the Nation's history it would be possible to determine exactly what we possess; what will be needed in the future; and the necessary programs of development and conservation required to maintain our present strength at its peak and yet insure the continued strength of our Nation far into the future.

We have learned from experience with the Employment Act that this is a good method. We know that an understanding of our national aims in the conservation of our natural resources is urgently needed. I am convinced that we should move ahead by early enactment of the resources and conservation bill.

NASSER'S BLACKMAIL MUST BE REPUDIATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Secretary General Hammarskjold of the

United Nations has been attempting to find the key that will prevail upon President Nasser to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping.

It is hoped that Secretary General Hammarskjold's efforts have the full support of our Government. Assurances to this effect were given by Francis O. Wilcox, our Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, on December 29, 1959.

Since then the silence from the administration has been deafening. This despite the fact that President Eisenhower told the American people on February 20, 1957, that "Egypt bound itself to free and open transit through the Suez Canal without discrimination."

This administration still asserts its support of free and unrestricted use of the Suez Canal. Yet it was noticeably silent, too, when the World Bank approved a $56 million loan to the United Arab Republic for widening of the canal.

It is inconceivable to me that the World Bank would grant this assistance to a nation which has continually flouted the basic principles of the United Nations for the administration of the Suez Canal.

Although the World Bank is not an agency of the U.S. Government, we are the largest contributor to it. I assert that the State Department should have brought all possible pressure against the making of this loan.

Since the Suez incident in 1956, we have been extremely generous in our aid to and support of President Nasser and the United Arab Republic.

Through the good offices of the United Nations we advanced $5 million for the reconstruction of the Suez Canal.

Last year alone our Government approved the sale of $105 million of agricultural commodities in exchange for local currency, most of which will be loaned back for industrial development.

During the last fiscal year we gave over $10 million in technical and economic assistance.

Mr. President, it is right that we show this concern for the economic well-being of the Middle East. Perhaps the only means by which we can attain some sort of reasonable stability in this area is by the economic betterment of its teeming, hopelessly poverty-stricken masses.

President Truman had the vision and the foresight to see this blighted land as the flowering area it once was in ancient times. He forsaw, but did not have the time or support to implement his vision, that only with a higher living standard, education, communications, and development of its latent waterpower could this area become a productive, stable element in the free community of nations. We have—unfortunately after the Communists first made tremendous inroads—taken the first steps in this direction.

In spite of this, Mr. President, Nasser continues his violent harangues against Israel in a reckless display of belligerency.

This fact alone could not be great cause for alarm. It is the usual course that dictators and demagogues resort to when their position is threatened or when they feel the need to bolster their prestige.

His incredible misrepresentation and re-writing of the Suez incident and Sinai Campaign of 1956 by itself is harmless enough. His ridiculous assertion that the poverty-stricken United Arab Republic will soon be making its own guns, tanks, and airplanes is hardly cause for alarm. His bellicose statements are of little meaning with a United Nations Force between Egypt and Israel coupled with the fact that Nasser himself knows from experience that his forces are no match for Israel.

However, President Nasser's continued further interference with Israeli cargoes is cause for alarm and calls for positive affirmative action on the part of the United States.

There is no need for me here to go into the crystal-clear provisions of the 1888 Constantinople Convention which guarantee free access to the Suez Canal for all nations. Nor shall I dwell on the repeated declarations of the United Nations condemning the ban on Israeli transit by Egyptian authorities. This is all well known.

It is tragic enough that the free world has continually allowed him to ban Israel's ships from the canal. However, he at least has, since 1957, permitted non-Israeli ships to carry Israeli cargoes through the canal.

Now he bans any ship carrying cargoes registered in the name of Israeli owners. From a practical viewpoint, this requirement will create havoc in Israel's commercial relations with other nations and their businessmen. It is almost impossible to maintain normal commercial relations under these conditions.

Apart from practical considerations, there is a serious moral issue involved because of our previous commitments. In February 1957 President Eisenhower assured Israel that if she would withdraw her forces from the Sinai Peninsula, the society of nations would guarantee her free access to the Suez Canal.

Israel withdrew, and her cargoes, though not her shipping, were allowed to pass unmolested. Are we now to renege on our assurance to this tiny bastion of democracy in the Middle East? Are we again going to allow Nasser to blackmail us into allowing him to violate all principles of international law and order?

I assert that to do so would be a stain on our Nation's honor as well as a tragic diplomatic blunder.

We and the United Nations must no longer wink at President Nasser's defiance, at his impounding of Israeli cargoes, at his broken pledges.

Is this how we buy a dictatorship's friendship, by silent acquiescence? I hope not.

Must we betray the friendly state of Israel for the uncertain affections of the dictator, President Nasser?

While we remain silent, President Nasser coolly blackmails us with one of the oldest games in international affairs. He says, "If I can't get it from you, I'll get it elsewhere."

And we all know what he means by "elsewhere." He refers to the Soviet Union.

I am informed that only recently, Cairo radio had the effrontery to warn the United States not to try to block the world bank loan for Suez Canal improvement. It threatened to turn for aid "elsewhere" if we did.

Our silence only encourages such outrages. We must make it clear to Nasser that we will not be bluffed.

Mr. President, it is time for the President to use the full power of his office in bringing this matter to the attention of the United Nations and in urging that body to insist that the United Arab Republic adhere to international law.

It is not the time to reward with a $56 million loan, furnished in great part by American taxpayers, a Nation that has backed down on its treaty commitments and has violated and continues to violate the principles of the United Nations and the commitment to officials of this Nation and of the United Nations.

It seems to me fantastic that the World Bank should even consider making a $56 million loan to Nasser's United Arab Republic, so-called, at this time. The discriminatory policies of the United Arab Republic are intolerable to those of us who are citizens of the free world. If we allow the discriminatory and violent policies of Nasser to continue against Israel, then we in America have no right to object to violations of international law by larger and stronger powers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 694, Calendar No. 819.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1959".

FINDINGS AND POLICIES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that juvenile delinquency diminishes the strength and vitality of the people

of our Nation; that such delinquency is increasing in both urban and rural communities; and that its prevention, control, and treatment require intensive efforts on the part of private and governmental interests.

(b) The policy of the Federal Government shall be to assist in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

TITLE I—DEMONSTRATION AND STUDY PROJECTS

SEC. 101. (a) For the purpose of demonstrating and developing improved methods, including methods for the training of personnel, for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sum, not to exceed $5,000,000, as the Congress may determine.

(b) The sums appropriated under this title shall be available for grants or contracts to carry out projects for demonstrations and studies which, in the judgment of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the discovery, the development, or the evaluation or demonstration of the effectiveness, of techniques and practices, including techniques and practices for the training of personnel, for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The Secretary may make such grants to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning or research: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate. He may enter into contracts for such projects with public or private organizations or agencies or with any individuals.

(c) Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE II—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary shall make studies, investigations, and reports with respect to matters relating to the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, including the effectiveness of programs carried out under this Act, cooperate with and render technical assistance to States and municipalities and other public and private agencies in such matters, and provide short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to juvenile delinquency.

(b) The Secretary shall, in connection with all grants and contracts provided for in title I, collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate information and materials for agencies and personnel engaged in programs concerning juvenile delinquency.

TITLE III—NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and twelve members appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Secretary. The appointed members of the Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to juvenile delinquency or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with juvenile delinquency. The Council shall advise the Secretary on the administration of this Act.

(b) Before any grant or contract is made under title I, the Council shall review the project involved and shall submit its recommendation thereon to the Secretary. The Council may also recommend to the Secretary projects initiated by it. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters relating to this Act for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

(c) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law the Secretary may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

(d)(1) Any member of the Council is hereby exempted with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 381, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) shall not extend—

(A) to the receipt of payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(B) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make regulations governing the administration of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall include in his annual report a full report of the administration of this Act.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the Act.

(d) The term "State" in this Act includes the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate, cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and me, and reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is a modest proposal for a start, through a national approach, toward the solution of the problem of juvenile delinquency. It proposes a limited amount of Federal aid for communities, States, institutions, and organizations which are doing pilot work, the results of which may be useful to the entire Nation.

The bill comprises four titles. The first title authorizes an annual appropriation of not to exceed $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, for the purpose of demonstrating and developing improved methods for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized by the bill to make such grants to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning or research, provided that the Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate.

Title II of the bill provides that the Secretary shall make studies, investigations, and reports; render technical assistance to States, municipalities, and other public and private agencies; and provide short-term training and instruction in technical matters. The Secretary is also directed to collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate information and materials for agencies and personnel engaged in programs concerning juvenile delinquency.

The third title of the bill provides for the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Secretary on the administration of the act. It provides that before any grant or contract may be made under title I, the Council shall review the project involved, and submit its recommendation thereon to the Secretary.

The fourth title, covering miscellaneous subjects, provides among other things for a full annual report to be made by the Secretary on the administration of the act. This title also defines the term "State" to include the District of Columbia, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

The bill was the subject of extensive hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I had the honor to be the chairman. The hearings have been printed, and a copy is on the desk of each Senator. Four hundred and five pages of testimony were taken on 5 separate days last spring. To me, they establish beyond a peradventure of doubt that the bill is badly needed; that juvenile delinquency is increasing; that our States, municipalities, and counties have not been able adequately to cope with it; that modest Federal assistance is needed in order to help out in a bad situation.

Let me cite a few statistics in support of these statements. One out of every two cities having a population of 10,000 or more in the United States has no special police officers assigned to work relating to juveniles. One hundred thousand children are held in jail each year when they should be in other types of institutions. They are children who have been guilty of some form or other of juvenile delinquency. Five out of every ten counties in the Nation have no juvenile probation service. Six out of every ten juvenile probation officers have no social work training. Three out of every ten State training schools have no staff social workers. Four out of every ten State training schools have no staff psychologists.

Juvenile delinquency has been increasing throughout the country during recent years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some statistics compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and contained in a publication entitled "Uniform Crime Reports, United States, 1958 Edition," which was issued on September 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rate of major crimes per 100,000 population in metropolitan areas.

(Definition of major crimes: murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny over $50, auto theft.)

[Per 100,000]

Chicago metropolitan area	943.5
Philadelphia metropolitan area (includes Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia Counties, Pa.; Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester Counties, N.J.)	916.8
New York, N.Y., metropolitan area	1,145.3
St. Louis, Mo., metropolitan area	1,634.5
Los Angeles, Calif., metropolitan area	2,507.6
Washington, D.C., metropolitan area (includes Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties, Va., Montgomery County, Md.)	981.5
Atlanta, Ga., metropolitan area	1,336.1
Birmingham, Ala., metropolitan area	1,212.2
Columbia, S.C., metropolitan area	1,365.2

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, these statistics indicate very clearly that juvenile delinquency is not merely a problem which exists in the slums of our northern cities; it is also a rural problem. It is, if anything, more prevalent in other sections of the country than it is in the greater metropolitan areas.

I have cited these figures simply to show that delinquency and crime are not the problem of any one area; the problem is nationwide. I believe the time has come to deal with the problem on a national scale.

Senators will want to know the position taken on the bill by the administration. I am happy to say that in a letter dated May 1, 1959, which appears on page 6 and the following pages of the committee report, the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concludes a thoughtful discussion of the problem with the statement:

In the light of such considerations, it appears that the approach of conferring authority to make special project grants for research and demonstrations, as in S. 694 or S. 765, or for training, as in S. 766, is to be preferred at this time over the more comprehensive authorizations in the other bills.

The last paragraph of the letter reads:

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and another letter addressed to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], signed by Mr. Phillip S. Hughes, of the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, and which appears on page 8 of the report, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1959.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your requests for reports on S. 694, S. 765, S. 766, S. 1090, S. 1091, and S. 1341, bills to authorize Federal assistance for a limited number of years in the control of juvenile delinquency.

S. 694 and S. 765 would authorize Federal grants to States and certain public or nonprofit organizations for developing or demonstrating methods for juvenile delinquency control which are of national or more-than-one-State significance. S. 766 would authorize Federal project grants for training of personnel for work in this field. S. 1090, titles V through IX of S. 1091, and S. 1341 would authorize, in addition to such project grants, formula grants to States to strengthen and improve local juvenile delinquency control programs.

There is an undoubted need for a concerted attack on the mounting problem of juvenile delinquency. For the ninth consecutive year (1948–57), juvenile delinquency cases have continued to rise. The increase in the number of these cases coming before juvenile courts during this period was almost five times greater than the increase in the child population of juvenile court age (10–17).

Even if juvenile delinquency remains fixed at the 1957 rate, the number of juvenile delinquency cases may be expected to increase by 140,000 in 1962 and by 205,000 in 1965 simply because of the known increase in the number of children 10 to 17 years that will occur by these years. The States are already falling further and further behind in dealing with this problem.

One important area requiring greater emphasis and encouragement concerns the development of new techniques and practices leading to a solution of this problem. For many years States and communities have relied mainly on two measures of rehabilitation of delinquent youth—namely, probation service in the community or care in an institution. It has long been known that juvenile delinquency is caused by many factors. A wide variety of treatment measures are needed. Yet only a small beginning has been made in developing comprehensive programs for the care and treatment of delinquent youth. In a few places new measures are being tried, such as central reception and classification centers, group therapy, and street group workers for working with neighborhood gangs. However, much more experimentation and study are needed in the development of other measures, as well as the evaluation of the effectiveness of present measures.

There is also abundant evidence of the need for training of personnel. Most of the personnel already employed in serving delinquent youth lack the necessary training to enable them to do an effective job of rehabilitating these youth; only 1 out of 10 juvenile probation officers has completed social work training, while more than 4 out of 10 lack a college degree and are not even eligible for professional training. There is also need for developing a reservoir of trained personnel to enable expanding existing services; for example, about one-half of the counties in the United States have no probation services at all for delinquent youth. Finally, training courses need to be made widely available if there is to be any significant increase in the numbers of persons trained.

While the need for the development of improved techniques and practices of juvenile delinquency control and the need for training of personnel can be met in important measure by nationally directed efforts, the focal points of any successful attack on the problem must be the States and the communities. States and communities need to be helped and encouraged to strengthen and improve their juvenile delinquency programs through evaluation of their present activities, development, and demonstration of new or improved techniques, provision of needed training to State and local personnel, and more effective coordination between the many public and voluntary agencies working in this field.

We are in accord with the objectives of all of these bills of enabling the Federal Government to give greater assistance and leadership in coping with juvenile delinquency. While the Federal Government could make a significant contribution through each of the approaches suggested by the bills—project grants for research and development of improved techniques, project grants for training, and formula grants to States for strengthening State and local programs—the rate at which the Federal Government should proceed and the amount of funds it should devote to any of these approaches during any particular year must necessarily be determined in the broad context of all national needs. In the light of such considerations, it appears that the approach of conferring authority to make special project grants for research and demonstrations, as in S. 694 or S. 765, or for training, as in S. 766, is to be preferred at this time over the more comprehensive authorizations in the other bills.

Should the committee decide to report out one of these bills, we would appreciate an opportunity to offer suggestions for technical improvements.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON,
Acting Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1959.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your requests for reports on S. 694, S. 765, S. 766, S. 1090, S. 1091, and S. 1341, bills to authorize Federal assistance for a limited number of years in the control of juvenile delinquency.

S. 694 and S. 765 would authorize Federal grants to States and certain public or nonprofit organizations for developing or demonstrating methods for juvenile delinquency control which are of national or more than one State significance. S. 766 would authorize Federal project grants for training of personnel for work in this field, S. 1090, titles V through IX of S. 1091, and S. 1341 would authorize, in addition to such project grants, formula grants to States to strengthen and improve local juvenile delinquency control programs.

The unfortunate consequences of juvenile delinquency are self-evident. Similarly, there is no question about the desirability of programs to reduce juvenile delinquency. However, at present only a small beginning has been made in developing programs whose effectiveness has been tested and proved. In addition, thoughtful consideration must be given to the sound and appropriate balance between Federal, State, and local responsibilities and to the overall Federal budgetary considerations.

In the circumstances, the Bureau of the Budget believes that first consideration should be given to research and demonstrations, such as are contemplated in S. 694 or S. 765. Such research and demonstrations, by evaluating existing methods and developing new techniques for juvenile delinquency control, would provide a much-needed base for strengthening of our national effort in this field. However, we would recommend against formula grants to States to strengthen and improve local juvenile delinquency programs, as in S. 1090, S. 1091, and S. 1341 at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative References.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I prefer to complete my brief statement, which will take only 3 or 4 minutes more; then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when we began to consider the bill in committee, we were confronted with the fact that the bill as initially sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and me did not contain any specific provision for training. The overwhelming weight of the evidence in the testimony before us satisfied me that training was at least as important as demonstration projects and the collection and dissemination of information, if not more so. At that time we were hopeful that we could get the bill through the Senate and the House before the end of the last session of Congress, but we had advice from our friends in the other body that it would be easier to achieve that result if we did not add a training provision. So, unfortunately, we were unable to embody such a provision in the bill.

Obviously we are confronted with a different situation now at the opening of the 2d session. For that reason, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], an amendment which will add a new title II, Training of Personnel. The new title proposed is identical to the training title contained in the bill reported by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee last summer. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$5,000,000" and substitute therefor "$2,500,000".

On page 8, after line 9, insert a new title II and renumber subsequent titles and sections accordingly:

TITLE II—TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of training personnel, employed or preparing for employment in programs for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sum, not to exceed $2,500,000, as the Congress may determine.

(b) Sums appropriated under this title shall be available for grants or contracts to carry out programs for the training of such personnel, which in the judgment of the Secretary hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Such programs may include the development of courses, fellowships and traineeships, with such stipends and allowances including travel and subsistence expenses as the Secretary may determine to be necessary. The Secretary may make such grants to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate. He may enter into contracts for such programs with public or private organizations or agencies or with individuals.

(c) Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

On page 8, line 21, and on page 9, line 17, after "title I", insert "and title II".

On page 9, line 18, after the word "project", add "or program", and on page 9, line 20, after the word "projects", add "or programs".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, when we came to vote on the bill in the full committee, there were two objections to the bill as originally proposed. The reasons for the objection to the bill were set forth in an eloquent dissent by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. His dissent was based largely on the ground that the training section had been deleted from the bill.

The supplemental views of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who wanted a more comprehensive measure, were also based largely, although not entirely, on the fact that there was no training provision in the bill.

I have had occasion in the last few days to ask the clerk of the committee to poll the members of the committee on the question whether they would now approve of the addition of a training section amendment, and they have indicated in substantial unanimity, on the Democratic side, that they would favor such an amendment. It is for that reason that I have offered it.

I am conscious of the fact that two members of the committee who did not choose to file minority views did indicate their objections to the bill. I am certain that if they still feel now as they did then, they will advise us of their reasons at this time. But the bill with the training amendment in it, has the overwhelming support of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I hope it will be passed speedily by the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall yield first to the Senator from Ohio; then to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that if this measure is adopted, it will constitute the entrance by the Federal Government into active participation in the fight against juvenile delinquency?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. It is hoped that a juvenile delinquency bureau or agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be able to do substantially the same work in this field as the Children's Bureau has done for so long and so successfully as a part of that department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I further understand that what has been proposed is merely a beginning of what is contemplated to become participation by the Federal Government?

Mr. CLARK. I would hope that the Senator is not correct in what I assume are the implications of his remarks. I, for one, would never want to see the Federal Government become very deeply involved in operations in this field. I think it is primarily a local responsibility, with some State overtones. However, I believe the Federal Government is in a far better position than any State or locality to do the moderate things which are called for in the bill and which will cost only a modest amount of money. Those things are: To help finance, on a grant-in-aid basis, with some matching funds or services, special demonstration projects to test theories for the handling of juvenile delinquency; to collect, evaluate, and disseminate information, so that the juvenile authorities in the Senator's State of Ohio and elsewhere can know the latest achievements—if any—in my State; and furthermore, to make it possible to start a training program, so that over the course of the years we may be able to have some really qualified personnel working this area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In dealing with the training program, does the Senator from Pennsylvania mean that the Federal Government would begin carrying the expense of training social workers, policemen, probation officers, psychoanalysts, psychiatrists, and others, to fight juvenile delinquency?

Mr. CLARK. I think the best way to answer the Senator's question is to read from the text of the amendment which I have just offered, which calls for an authorization for the expenditure of $2,500,000, and then states:

Sums appropriated under this title shall be available for grants or contracts to carry out programs for the training of such personnel, which in the judgment of the Secretary hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Such programs may include the development of courses, fellowships, and traineeships, with such stipends and allowances, including travel and subsistence expenses as the Secretary may determine to be necessary. The Secretary may make such grants to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, it is the concept of this bill that our present universities and other institutions of teaching have not been adequate in the development of social workers, trained police officers, trained parole officers, trained judges, and other services which have a relationship to the fight against juvenile delinquency?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I think that is true, and that statement is certainly justified on the basis of my own personal experience in this regard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to hear the Senator's view on this question. I take it that we have about 55 million families in our country.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator says so, I will agree with him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think there are about three members to each family, and there is a total population of about 165 million. We have our schoolteachers, rabbis, ministers, and priests. We have our social workers, police officers, judges, sheriffs. Is it the view of the Senator from Pennsylvania that if this great army of people who are entrusted with the development of the moral character of our youth have not been able to do the job, the Senate of the United States will be able to do it by trying to perform a function that belongs to the segments indicated and to local and State governments?

Mr. CLARK. No; I would not agree with the Senator in that regard. If the Senator was present at the beginning of my exposition of this bill, he will recall the shocking government statistics which I read indicating the serious lack of personnel qualified to prevent, control, and treat juvenile delinquency.

I am sure he would agree with me, because he has wide experience with this general subject, that it is really shocking to see how really few qualified persons are working in this area. I would call these statistics to his attention, and I hope he has read them, because I feel that they prove the desperate need for more trained personnel. If the Senator would take the time to pursue the hearings which were held on this bill, and read the statements of distinguished gentlemen from the States of Washington, Oregon, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, and other States, I am sure his fine and analytical mind would be persuaded that these persons were not talking anything but straight common sense. The facts are clear.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I heard the Senator's statement from the very beginning, but I wish to point out that if we are to indulge the hope of curbing the increase in juvenile delinquency, it will not be adequate to start treating the child after he has been spoiled, but the efforts must be directed toward the moral fiber of adults, who rather universally influence the actions of juveniles and who set the examples that debase the character of our youth.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my friend that I, of course, agree with everything he has said with such fervor, eloquence, and obvious sincerity. Clearly, the place where the most effective work can be done is in the homes, the schools, and the churches; but the work has not been done sufficiently, and juvenile delinquency has been an increasing problem, which must be met if we are to carry out our legislative responsibilities. I should merely like to add this comment: While I agree with everything the Senator has said, what he has said, in and of itself, is not going to cure the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Pennsylvania has described the scarcity of what I would call trained social workers, trained policemen, trained psychoanalysists, trained psychiatrists, and, I suppose, trained parents; but may I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if there is not a similar scarcity in practically every category of workers and professional people in our country? There is not an adequate number of teachers or an adequate number in many other professional categories. The only profession in which there is an adequate number is the field of law. We have too many lawyers.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with my friend. He and I are lawyers, and perhaps we are in surplus.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How would the Senator proceed with the $5 million a year to develop a sufficient number of adequately trained policemen, judges, and the other categories I have mentioned?

Mr. CLARK. In the first place, let me say the $5 million would make an extremely limited contribution to finding the answer to the very serious problem which my friend has mentioned, but I cannot answer the question any better than I did a moment ago by reading to the Senator the provisions of the amendment with respect to training, and add, with respect to demonstration projects, that there appeared before our committee, in the course of the testimony, I would say 15, at least, and probably 25, representatives of institutions, private and public, who were desperately anxious to conduct demonstration projects, for which they could not get local, municipal, or State funds.

In my judgment, having heard what they wanted to do, there was not one of them who did not feel that demonstration projects would have a substantial benefit in determining how to deal with this serious problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have a deep concern about this problem. I have studied it for practically 29 years, from the first time I appeared as a judge in a court, and I know the significance of the problem. But I should like to hear the Senator's opinion as to whether or not, if the U.S. Congress began putting its finger vigorously and in every possible way upon the exploiters and the crooks who are setting a bad example for our youth, we would not be achieving more. I now speak of payola, radio deceit, labor racketeers, exploiters in the sale of drugs.

Every day we read in the newspapers descriptions of those who rob the public. When we see the little fellow standing at the corner, deprived of some of the things of life that he wants, we can well understand why he embarks on a delinquent way of life. My point is that we are trying to treat the symptom without getting to the cause.

Mr. CLARK. I think there is much truth in what my friend has said. I hope he will not leave the Chamber before I have an opportunity to comment on what he has said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I am staying.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me this problem is similar to many national and international problems. It has to be attacked on all fronts at once. What the Senator has said about payola is correct. What he has said about crooks and thieves having a bad influence on juveniles is correct. Merely to state the problems, however, is not enough. It is not enough to preach sermons in church. It is not enough to say to a parent, "You should put your child on your knee and say, 'Oh, be a good boy, Johnny,'" or to say to a teacher that she should tell him, "Be a good boy." We have been trying that for generations, and the situation is growing worse. I say this is merely another approach to a solution of a serious national problem. The approach outlined in the bill was recommended to us by so able and sincere a man as John C. Davenport, commanding officer of the Juvenile Bureau, Cincinnati Police Division. I commend the statement of Officer Davenport, which appears on page 24 of the hearings. I am sure the Senator from Ohio will read that statement with an open mind, and I have no doubt it will be as convincing to him as it was to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I read that statement. Mr. Davenport pointed out that there are now 14 agencies in Cincinnati dealing with the juvenile delinquency problem and, that a certain group had achieved a rather remarkable result as compared with the failure of another group.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I shall read from page 27 of the hearings:

> Senator CLARK. Is there any indication in your community of a lack of trained personnel?
>
> Mr. DAVENPORT. Definitely.
>
> Many of these boys I have mentioned are financial burdens on their family, coming from this group that is having a hard struggle the way it is, and money I think, is becoming increasingly important, as a way of life for boys when they reach the adolescent age.
>
> If this type of youth is not provided some way in which they can make an honest dollar they are often inclined to be less particular in how they get money.

Then he went on to endorse the bill which we are debating on the floor today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that Mr. Davenport endorsed the bill on the basis of a question put by the Senator from Pennsylvania, in which the Senator from Pennsylvania asked, in effect, "Do you have adequate money in Cincinnati to do this job on your own, or do you need money from the Federal Government?" The answer was, "We have done a limited job, but we could do a better job if we were provided with more money."

Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, reduced to its essence, the bill is the beginning of the Federal Government providing money to local and State governments to do the job of providing personnel and training personnel to fight the juvenile delinquency evil?

Mr. CLARK. To a limited extent, and to a substantially lesser extent than we have already done in the field of housing, of urban renewal, of hospitals, of health, of all the other things to which I know my good friend from Ohio so seriously objects.

I honor the Senator for his position. There is an ideological difference between the Senator from Ohio and me, and between the Senator and those of us on this side of the aisle who are constantly supporting those programs. I honor my friend for his views. I simply happen to disagree with him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is not a substantial ideological difference. My view is that the problem has to be fought. It should be fought by getting at the causes, and not by treating the symptoms. It should be fought primarily by those agencies which from time immemorial have been responsible for the guidance of youth and the development of moral character. I have grave doubt about the Federal Government arrogating to itself the final judgment that it will be able to solve this problem merely by pumping money into a program of training, and so forth.

Mr. CLARK. I think my friend has—I am sure inadvertently—quite distorted the purpose of the bill. The Federal Government is arrogating nothing to itself, except its ability to give a modest amount of money to local, State, and private agencies who are struggling desperately to treat not the symptoms, but the cause, of the disease and who are running out of money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, the Senator from Pennsylvania is of the opinion that the Federal Government is financially in a better position to do the job than Cincinnati, or the State of Ohio, or Philadelphia, or the State of Pennsylvania, or other local and State governments?

Mr. CLARK. No, I think no such thing. I am sure the Senator would not want to put words in my mouth. I know he does not.

What I think is that this resembles many other Federal programs. Some programs are many years old, such as the famous Hill-Burton hospital program, which has been on the books since the early days when the distinguished Senator from Alabama came to the Senate. There are other programs, such as those for urban renewal and housing. Like those programs, this calls for a coordinated attack at all levels of government—first local, then State, then Federal.

I will say to my friend again, as I am afraid I have said before in friendly disagreement many times, that in my judgment, the Federal income tax provides a fairer allocation of money for these things than any system of real estate taxes; or wage taxes, which are not graduated; or sales taxes, which bear unduly heavily on the poor. I, for one, am confident that the small amount of Federal money which we are proposing to put into this program can more justly, more equitably, and more fairly be raised at the Federal level than in Philadelphia, or Cincinnati, or Columbus, or Cleveland, Ohio.

I do not want to see the real estate taxes in our cities go any higher. We have to deal with juvenile delinquency. The cities are being bled pretty nearly white, trying to do the job now. Rather than raise the real estate taxes of the Senator from Ohio and my own, I would rather see raised the income taxes of the Senator and myself. I hope we will not come to that, either.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania and I are in agreement as to what ought to be done to cure the fiscal problem confronting the Federal Government.

Mr. CLARK. I think we are, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to state what is the Senator's position and mine, as I believe it to be.

Mr. CLARK. We should close those loopholes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We should quit delaying the paying of our obligations and placing them upon the shoulders of our children and our children's children. We should carry our obligations ourselves, if we contemplate spending the money.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with my friend.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The probability is that I will go along with this measure.

Mr. CLARK. This is indeed good news.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fear I have is that this will merely be the beginning of the development of a gigantic new Federal program under which we will try to do a thing which properly belongs to other agencies.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say I shall stand shoulder to shoulder with my friend from Ohio to prevent that from coming to pass.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now yield to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my able and distinguished friend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. My remarks on this matter will be relatively brief.

First, I should like to commend both the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the able and learned Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for having sponsored the bill and for having been instrumental in getting the support of the other members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and bringing the bill before the Senate for consideration.

I had the honor of joining with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in cosponsoring the amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to add the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], an able and diligent member of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of the Committee of the Judiciary, who has taken a very active part in its hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary for the past 3 years, and as a member of the same subcommittee for the 3 previous years, I have been exposed over those years to the problems relating to juvenile delinquency. Moreover, through various phases of my own activity and work before I was elected to the Senate, I have been exposed to the problem and its effect on the United States.

The reports of the subcommittee for the past 3 years have continually warned the Congress of the threat to our Nation posed by an ever-increasing rise in juvenile crime which, is as we have found from coast to coast, permeating every stratum of our society.

For the 10th straight year, Mr. President, the United States has experienced an increase in juvenile crime. Never before in the history of our Nation has there been such a persistent rise in antisocial behavior by young people. In this decade of delinquency—for lack of a better, more comprehensive or perhaps more accurately descriptive term—we find appearances by young children before the juvenile court for delinquency increased more than 2½ times. This figure becomes all the more startling when we realize that the child population in this age group increased by only one-third.

Recent studies and hearings of the subcommittee have revealed a series of shocking facts respecting the delinquency problem in the United States. For the past year for which we have complete figures, the year 1958, there was a total of 700,000 appearances in our juvenile courts by children and youths in the age group of 10 through 17.

There were apprehended by the police, an estimated 1,800,000 youths under the statutory denomination and limitation of delinquency. Now there are approximately 2 million children in our country in the 10- to 17-year-age group who have a record of one or more adjudications before juvenile courts, which means that 20 percent, or one in five, of our adolescent male population has appeared before a juvenile court.

I may say parenthetically that we have this morning continued, in the city of Washington, the second of a series of hearings relating to the use of narcotics and marijuana. The foundation for these hearings was laid by hearings held on the west coast during the adjournment of Congress, in the month of November.

These conditions are shocking and distressing beyond belief. When I talk about these things, I do not speak from the standpoint of an expert. I am suspicious of experts in this field, because it is so vastly complex and so unfathonable in so many of its aspects that I think anyone pretending to a complete expertness, or suggesting that there is a panacea, by the same measure displays a quantum of ignorance upon this whole subject.

If we only hold the rate of increase of delinquent acts at the level experienced in 1958, we can look forward to the disheartening fact that there will be 800,000 juveniles appearing before the courts in 1965, and more than 900,000—almost 1 million—by 1970.

In this statement I am talking about those who appear before courts. I am not speaking of the ones who are not apprehended. I am not discussing the cases which are adjusted by the juvenile police squads and other law-enforcement officers before they reach a court. I am speaking, of course, of cases which are docketed, or where there is an appearance before the courts.

I spent a number of years of my life as a felony prosecutor. I found, in a large city, a metropolitan area of almost 2 million—and later I was district attorney of that city, after 6 years of court room trial experience—that in case after case, as we pulled out what we called the pink card, the record card, there was a juvenile record, a record that the young man, or in some cases, unhappily, young woman, who was charged with a felony, a penitentiary offense, had been in and out of juvenile courts repeatedly, time after time, year after year.

At the end of this long road of misfortune and misdoing, they arrived in a court having jurisdiction over felonies, where, in many cases, there was little choice but to recommend to the court that they be sent to penal institutions—and by that I mean penitentiaries, so-called "big houses."

If the rate increases at the same pace at which it has increased during the past 10 years—and there seems to be no indication that it will deviate too greatly—we can expect more than 1 million children to appear before the courts in 1965, and more than 1.4 million by 1970.

As was pointed out in the last report of the committee—and I am glad to note the presence in the Chamber of the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has taken a very active part in the work of this subcommittee—these figures represent known or recorded juvenile delinquents in our society. Under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who preceded me in the chairmanship, inquiries were made into many phases of this problem. I was a member of the subcommittee under his chairmanship. I consider membership on this subcommittee as important as my membership on any of the 15 committees or subcommittees upon which I serve in the Senate. We developed many distressing facts which pointed to a severe crisis in our national life, as a result of young men and young women violating laws. I am not talking about peccadilloes and minor offenses. I speak of crime committed by young people.

We held hearings on juvenile gangs in New York, at the close of the session of Congress last fall, at the request of the judges and the Mayor of New York. The Governor of New York appeared as a witness. The authorities in New York do not believe that this is a problem which should be taken lightly.

The authorities in Philadelphia, where we held hearings, do not consider this situation a minor problem. The able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has been so effective in bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate, sat with the committee. The Governor of Pennsylvania thought the hearing was of sufficient importance to justify his coming from Harrisburg to attend the hearing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish publicly to state the admiration which I have expressed privately to the Senator from Missouri on previous occasions for the effective work which he has been doing in this field for many years.

I recall very well the hearing in Philadelphia at which he presided. At that hearing extremely valuable testimony was adduced, which was of great help to us, although taken by another committee, in connection with the preparation of the pending bill.

The Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and many other Members of this body—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] perhaps as much as anyone else—were toilers in this vineyard while I was still in short pants. I approach this problem very much as a Johnny-come-lately.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I do not believe that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Tennessee, and my friend the senior Senator from Alabama would like to appear as venerable ancients, in this or any other respect, in comparison with the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has been the mayor of a great city. In Chicago, Mayor Daly thought the problem was of sufficient importance to justify him in coming before the committee and testifying. Public officials of New York asked the committee to come to New York, not merely to look into the subject of gangs, but gang murders, felonies, and assaults. The conditions which exist in this and many other large cities are such that it is not safe for law-abiding people, or anyone else, to walk the streets at night in many places in a community, for they may be set upon, plundered, sometimes mutilated, feloniously assaulted, or, indeed, murdered. This is no problem involving merely social workers and psychiatrists, valuable as their services may be at times. This is a stark fact confronting the American people.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to clarify the record by pointing out that we in the Middle Atlantic States wear "plus fours" longer than those in many other sections of the country, and take to shorts more quickly. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. I believe that in some sections of the country if we took to shorts we might have to take to the hills at the same time. [Laughter.] I am sure the Senator's disclosure will be duly noted. He may note his exception.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. I hope it will be duly noted. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. We know that there is, what has been termed a great mother lode of maladjustment which has never been detected by formal law enforcement agencies or other delinquency fighting groups. This larger group of hidden youth law violators commits thousands of delinquent acts which are never detected. I need only to refer to the offense of vandalism, and its annual cost, to substantiate this statement and illustrate graphically the tremendous scope of the picture of delinquency.

I happen also to be chairman of the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries. As such I visit many of these institutions. For 3 days during the Christmas vacation I was in Alderson, W. Va., where I saw some of the young and older women who have been sent to that institution. I saw the manner in which that institution was conducted. In fact, Mr. Bennett, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, with whom I have worked very closely, because he is an exceedingly fine and able career man in this field, said it was the first time in his experience that he had seen a Member of the Senate stand in the receiving line for 3 hours and shake hands with every inmate of a penal institution, which Mr. Bennett and I did.

I have seen the State prisons. I have spent months, in total, since I have been on the Prisons Subcommittee, seeing the ravages, the end product, of all the things we are talking about, which require preventive measures, not punitive measures. Unhappily, under our present halting progress toward what we might call civilization in this world, we must apply punitive measures, because we have not yet found the key which might be applied to prevent the rising and alarming increase in this character of offenses.

I see the senior Senator from New York on his feet, and I am glad to yield to him. He, too, has taken part in our hearings. He knows that the Governor of the State of New York appointed a special task force to go into this subject. The Governor of New York thought the subject sufficiently important to come from Albany to tell about his problems in this field. Many other governors, mayors, police chiefs, and officials having to do with this perplexing, this distressing, and this enormously important problem have appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me. I shall qualify myself by stating that not only have I been very much interested in this problem ever since I was a Member of the House of Representatives, but when I was attorney general of New York we established a temporary State commission on youth and delinquency, which I had caused to be organized, and which issued a report which, in my opinion, is a landmark on this subject. I shall speak about the subject in my own time later. However, because I have such great regard and affection for the able Senator from Missouri and for his services in this field, and because I had the honor to appear before the subcommittee at the hearing which he conducted, I should like to ask him a question.

The argument will be made during the debate that this is not a problem in which the Nation should intervene; that this is a State problem, that it is a municipal problem, but that it is not a field

in which we should pass Federal legislation. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether, based upon all his experience, he does not agree with me that the significance of this proposed legislation is that the problem is not only national, but is international. It is national because it is getting beyond the capability of the States and municipalities to handle, and international because the report that we cannot control our own children is giving our country a bad name throughout the world.

It is as simple as that. It is a national problem, and I am perfectly willing to debate it upon that basis. The Nation ought to take a hand in solving the problem. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his view on that point.

Mr. HENNINGS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the senior Senator from New York. He made a very substantial contribution to our hearings.

The fact is inescapable that the problem has become national in scope. That is evidenced by the fact that local officials have said they do need the things the Federal Government can furnish them to deal with this many-faceted problem, and that the States themselves do not consider this purely a local or State problem. As a former distinguished attorney general of the largest State in the Union, I should like to ask the able Senator from New York whether he, with his experience as attorney general, does not think that New York, as well as other States of the Union, needs help?

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly do. That is the reason why our Governor testified. That is why I testified. I say we do, for this reason: Many of the crimes referred to are in the Federal establishment. For example, the stealing of automobiles brings youngsters into the Federal courts. Many of these young people are confined in Federal institutions. There is a tremendous amount of brainpower and skill applied to the treatment of this situation, throughout the country, not only in New York City or in New York State. It is a very difficult and extremely elusive problem. The deprivations which are caused are not confined to New York. I am sure that there are juvenile delinquents in Vermont and New Hampshire and Connecticut and Massachusetts and in other States, who perform their acts in New York, and vice versa.

It is high time we did something about it.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator has put his finger on the point. The conditions are as he has described them. For example, a motor vehicle theft involves a violation of a Federal law if it involves the interstate transportation of the stolen motor car. We are talking also about matters relating to narcotics and marijuana, matters relating to runaway children, and matters relating to innumerable things I could mention. They transcend the boundary lines of States, and they have reached the stature of creating a national problem about which the Nation must do something, and it must continue working to do something toward its solution.

The argument could be made, "Why study this subject so long?" We have been studying other subjects a long time in this country. There are many problems we have undertaken to solve, and in connection with which we have found that merely passing laws did not solve them. There are many persons, such as judges and prosecutors and chiefs of police and juvenile officers in police departments, and youth boards who, both in unofficial and official capacities, think this business is not to be met merely by handwringing and saying, "Ain't it awful." They believe in getting down and taking their coats off and doing something about it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. This is our responsibility. I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the former chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my distinguished colleague. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment of which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is the chief sponsor, and of which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], is a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I speak for this amendment with conviction and vigor. As a former chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have heard firsthand about this most distressing problem confronting our people. The hearings conducted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] have shown the problem is increasing. Senator HENNINGS is doing a splendid job as chairman of the committee and I commend him most highly.

I have introduced a number of bills in previous sessions which call for a broad national approach to the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. This problem has been increasing steadily for the past 10 years. It is one of the most serious major problems in the United States and few communities have escaped the impact of its continuing national rise.

With the increased mobility of population, the expansion of suburban areas, and more transportation, among other trends, juvenile delinquency can no longer be thought of as being confined within the boundaries of neighborhoods, local communities, or even States. Rural and urban areas, alike, are confronted with the problem. It has become in cases almost a virus, spreading through the youth of our country, reaching out to infect and injure our very heritage. Its effects are violence, disrespect for human values and property values, and a most dangerous weakening of moral structures.

It has ever been the case that our future as a nation lies from year to year in the hands of the young teenager. As her or she stands on the threshold of maturity, ready to take over the responsibilities of government, business, or the professions, an answer must be found to this virus and to the threats it implies.

Mr. President, I have been chief sponsor or cosponsor of a number of bills which I feel most seriously would go a long way toward solving this growing and dangerous problem. I regret that the Congress has not seen fit yet to pass legislation of this nature. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will, at this session, come to grips with the juvenile delinquency problem by giving our people these proposed measures so that we can begin to make up for the time we have lost in trying to combat the problem.

S. 765 and S. 766, on which I was a cosponsor, went to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. S. 765 called for Federal funds to set up juvenile delinquency demonstration and study projects. S. 766 called for Federal funds to provide trained personnel who could work in this field.

The committee reported out a clean bill—S. 694—which provides for $5 million a year for 5 years to implement demonstration and study projects such as those called for in S. 765. But S. 694 contains no provisions for the training of personnel.

The amendment now before the Senate would correct that deficiency in S. 694, without calling for any more money.

Arthur H. Bernstone, the chief counsel of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate, has provided a concise analysis of this bill and the proposed amendment. I ask unanimous consent that this analysis be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like also to pay special tribute here to the diligent work of my able colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], in this most important field.

I also desire to commend highly my distinguished colleagues the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for their continued effort and knowledge in this field. S. 694 is their bill.

The problem is of mutual concern and interest to all of us who have tried so hard for so long to provide some answers to it. I feel that every Member of the Senate recognizes the urgency and seriousness of the problem, and the need for the pending legislation.

I ask my colleagues to support S. 694 and the amendment, and join with those of us who propose it, so that both may go through by a unanimous vote.

EXHIBIT 1

MAJOR PROVISION OF UNAMENDED S. 694

The major provision of S. 694 authorizes Congress to appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years not more than $5 million for juvenile delinquency demonstration and study projects. This money would be distributed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to States, municipalities, and public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning or research.

HOW UNAMENDED S. 694 WOULD BE APPLIED

Some typical projects for which this money might be used are projects centered around (1) youth employment studies to discover the effects of intense efforts of a community to find jobs for idle juveniles: (2) studies of juvenile gang activities and the directing of gang energies toward useful

ends; (3) studies of the effects of intensive psychiatric treatment of juvenile offenders; (4) studies of the effectiveness of group therapy of juvenile delinquents; (5) studies of the effects on juvenile delinquency of intensive recreation programs within a community; (6) studies of the effectiveness of intensive probation services within a juvenile court; and (7) studies of the effect of intensive work in hospitals for the rehabilitation of juvenile narcotic users.

NEED FOR AND COST OF AMENDMENT TO S. 694

Wherever our subcommittee has held hearings, almost invariably we have heard of the great need for trained personnel in the juvenile delinquency field. It is imperative that Federal leadership and aid be given for this. The proposed amendment to S. 694 authorizes Congress to appropriate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years not more than $2,500,000. It also reduces the sum provided for those years for demonstration and study projects mentioned above from $5 million to $2,500,000. Thus, the amendment costs no extra money.

HOW AMENDMENT WOULD BE APPLIED

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would supervise the distribution of this money for training. The money could go to States, municipalities, and public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning. It could be used for developing courses, fellowships and traineeships. The aforementioned courses could be taught in universities or elsewhere. This amendment provides that the Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate. Personnel trained might work in all areas of juvenile delinquency, such as, for example, juvenile courts, juvenile correctional institutions, welfare agencies supervising foster home placement of juvenile delinquents, youth guidance centers, and police forces.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether the amendment provides any additional money, or merely divides the $5 million which is to be authorized between projects and training of personnel for the handling of juvenile problems.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is precisely correct. However, I do not believe the amount is sufficient.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think so either.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is merely a drop in the bucket compared with the needs of the problem.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. First I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the former chairman of the investigating subcommittee and also the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] for the very fine and effective and devoted work they have done and are now doing in connection with this very grave problem.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my good friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I should like to call attention to the fact that the expenditure of $5 million has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. I would also like to call attention to one or two excerpts from the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Elliot L. Richardson, who was speaking at the time for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, of course, speaking for the administration. Secretary Richardson declared:

Obviously, however, more can and must be done to help these thousands of boys and girls in our society whom we have classified as "delinquent" when society, in some way, has failed.

Then Secretary Richardson said:

You have already referred, Mr. Chairman, to the report which we have just filed with you on legislation pending before this subcommittee.

That was the report which carried the approval of the Bureau of the Budget for the sum of $5 million.

Mr. Richardson added:

And I would like to refer to that only to make clear for the record that we—

Meaning the Department—

are in accord with the objective of all the bills pending before this subcommittee which would enable the Federal Government to give greater assistance and leadership in coping with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Then Mr. Richardson said:

I think, Mr. Chairman, a great deal is summed up in the word "leadership" in this connection, and that a Federal agency, simply by virtue of its situation, is in a better position to give impetus to the kind of collation of existing data as well as stimulus to the support of new investigations that you refer to.

He referred there to the investigations needed to help solve this problem. Then Mr. Richardson went on to say—and this goes right to the Clark amendment as well as to the bill itself:

If we were writing our own ticket in this, given $5 million I think our probable reaction would be to include some money in each of the areas of research to develop new knowledge, the demonstration of knowledge, and of training.

That is exactly what the Senator from Pennsylvania, in the bill and the amendment, proposes to do. Mr. Richardson then went further and said:

I think within whatever limits seem necessary to the committee and to the Congress, it would be desirable to have a substantial degree of flexibility.

In other words, flexibility to do just what is proposed here—to give to the department the flexibility to attack the problem, and to make the most effective attack possible with the funds given.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Alabama saw fit to incorporate that statement in the RECORD and to make his observations with respect to it. I could cite a number of illustrations of what is happening. We read about them in the newspapers every day. Perhaps we do not pay too much attention to them until they strike close to home, as they frequently do.

Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz, of New York, testifying before the committee in February 1959, said:

We have got to bear in mind that we are not dealing with the same kind of kids that we dealt with 20 and 25 years ago. We are dealing with a precocious, hardened kid.

The judge then went on to describe the murder of an innocent citizen by a 17-year-old hoodlum who rang his doorbell in a holdup attempt.

In July of 1959, Mr. Robert Taber of the Philadelphia Board of Education told the subcommittee:

It is with a sense of urgency that I appear before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate to give testimony concerning juvenile delinquency. Since I appeared before your committee last, the problem has become increasingly acute. Innocent persons continue to become the victims of violent and murderous attacks committed by juveniles who are emotionally disturbed or whose minds and behavior are distorted.

During the late summer of 1959, the gang problem reached crisis proportions. The people of New York City, and indeed of the Nation, were shocked into an awareness of the seriousness of predatory juvenile gangs when in an 8-day period four young children were killed as a result of gang conflicts. At the behest of New York City officials and an invitation from a U.S. Representative, the subcommittee went to that city to hear the mayor tell us that his city was faced with an "epidemic of crime committed by teenagers."

Although the problem of gangs as outlined in New York is primarily a community one, like other juvenile delinquent behavior, it is not peculiar to any one locale. The subcommittee's files are filled with reports which show conclusively that this problem permeates all levels of our youth population, rural as well as urban, so-called better neighborhoods as well as slums, majority groups as well as minority groups.

I could go on, but I think the point has been made. The States until now have apparently been unable to cope with this ever-increasing juvenile delinquency rate. I feel that by now it has been made abundantly clear that Federal leadership and Federal moneys are required by the States if we are to decrease this appalling rise in juvenile crime which has now been going on unabated for 10 years.

Now, what kind of help is necessary? At hearings held throughout the country during the last 6 years, I have been firmly convinced that one of the major ingredients to be found lacking in every part of the United States in terms of an all-inclusive, effective delinquency program is the tremendous lack of trained personnel in this field. It was with a great degree of sadness that the members of the subcommittee saw one of the major portions of our delinquency program introduced in the 86th Congress eliminated from congressional consideration last year. I refer to that portion of our program which would have provided Federal moneys to aid the States in the training of personnel. This deletion was in spite of the fact that no other aspect of the delinquency problem transcends this major need. I was very much pleased to learn that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had reconsidered and that a majority of the committee decided that such an amendment as we now have before us is necessary, for this is the only way in which

the Federal Government can maintain its share of the responsibility for developing adequate delinquency fighting machinery.

Witness after witness before our committee, in every part of the Nation, pointed to the shortage of trained people as the major roadblock to local efforts to handle the problem of juvenile crime.

The specific amendment we have under consideration, I feel, would give impetus to the States to employ trained personnel in treatment services. This is highly desirable. We on the subcommittee have seen firsthand the damage that is done, the wastage of human lives that follows when youngsters in trouble with the law are handed on from one untrained worker to another.

I may quote, for the interest of the Senate and for the approval of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a statement by Hon. Donald E. Long, of Portland, Oreg., who represents the feelings of a good many judges in the United States. He told the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that, in his opinion, the training provisions of any Federal legislation were most important to meet the needs of the present generation.

Judge Long pointed out that of the 3,000 juvenile courts in the United States, many of them have county judges, and only half of the counties in our country that are dealing with delinquents have even minimal probation services.

The judge stated further that a study by the National Probation and Parole Association indicated a need for 15,000 probation officers dealing with the problems of juveniles. Yet at the time of the study there were only 2,100 probation officers dealing with children alone and 3,400 serving both children and adults. What makes matters even worse, only 1 out of 10 of these probation officers had completed any type of training for the job. In addition, 4 out of 10 lack a college degree. When this occurs, we compound the seriousness of an already bad situation.

In the opinion of Judge Long—

> Many of them [the probation officers] were qualified, but it is staggering that they had not the skills and the training that they should have * * * in dealing with the behavior problems of the children coming to the various juvenile courts.

It is for this reason the judge concluded that—

> Priority first should be given to a training program to assist the volunteer organizations, to assist the States and local communities in providing, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an efficient program of training.

From another part of the country, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Delinquency heard in Philadelphia from Dr. E. Preston Sharp, executive director of the Youth Study Center and one of the outstanding authorities in the field of delinquency, who stated:

> There are training schools and institutions for the rehabilitation of delinquent children, and one of the most difficult tasks is the training of persons who work with and live with the children. We have to go out on the street and select them on the basis of personality adjustment and background and give them a couple of days of orientation and put them to work.

It is inconceivable to me that these situations can be allowed to continue in this Nation. I have, and I hope every Member of the Senate has, become painfully aware of the confusion and evil the result from this paucity of trained workers in the delinquency field. From an analysis of recent waves of violence in New York, it appears certain that the major contributing factor was a tremendous shortage of available personnel to meet a problem that all authoritative persons knew was approaching rapidly.

Mr. President, I know this is a disheartening picture I am painting, but I feel compelled to do so. With knowledge of these facts, I am certain the Congress will act.

Former Senator Herbert Lehman, who was chairman of a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which worked so hard to put a juvenile program through Congress, but to no avail, said within the last several days:

> The past failure of Congress to enact legislation making it possible for a start to be made toward finding a solution to this grave and growing problem is one of the most reprehensible failures of which the Congress and the administration can be charged. Those responsible for this failure in the past has assumed an intolerable responsibility.

I point out that my remarks today not only go to the need for the amendment to S. 694, but for the entire bill. The special projects section of this bill will insure us greater success in preventing delinquency. For example, many cities have the desire to inaugurate programs directed at the so-called hard-to-reach youth. These are oftentimes the gang youth whose main emphasis is the destruction of life, limb, and property, and whose main form of recreation is the gang fight or "rumble" with its attendant annual death toll. The head of one such program already in operation in the city of New York told the committee that their street club workers working directly with gangs reported 425 pending "rumbles" to the police and averted 192 possible killings.

With such dramatic results, I can think of no greater purpose to which our special projects bill could be put to use than for the development and refinement of similar programs in other cities with regard to this problem.

In conclusion, it must be emphasized that the pending amendment calls for the expenditure of no additional funds. The pending bill provides $5 million a year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and $5 million a year for each of the succeeding 4 years for juvenile delinquency control projects. The amendment would divide this sum between such projects and the training of personnel. This is a minimal, token sum to be asked from the Congress of the United States for the children of our Nation.

As I have pointed out in my remarks, and as I pointed out last year and in many preceding years, there is a desperate need for not only new programs and projects to prevent and control delinquency—as provided for in S. 694—but there is this desperate need for trained people who can work in our probation departments, in our social work agencies, in our rehabilitative institutions, our clinics, our police departments, and in all the other crucial institutions. Unless Congress supplies the added support of the Federal Government, it will have failed to do its part in our efforts to reduce appreciably our annual loss of children to this ravaging social disease called delinquency.

Mr. President, with a knowledge of the facts, I believe Congress in its wisdom and in its high sense of the performance of its duty will act. Having had many, many years of observation of the work in this field, I certainly subscribe to the effort which is being made to combat this great problem.

I again compliment my colleagues who are members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the great and able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and others, who have enabled us to present this matter today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his great help and comments.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I hold in my hand a booklet prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which deals with the subject matter which will be before the White House Conference on Children and Youth. That Conference, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri knows, will be held in March of this year.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; as the distinguished Senator from Alabama knows, the Conference is a national event.

Mr. HILL. Yes; this year's Conference will mark the golden anniversary of the White House Conference on Children and Youth. This booklet has been prepared for this Conference.

The honorary Chairman of the Conference is, of course, the President of the United States. The honorary Vice Chairman is the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. A number of other distinguished persons also serve as vice chairmen.

The booklet contains a foreword by the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, who is Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and is chairman of the Federal Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth. On page 24 of the booklet, Mr. Flemming makes this statement:

> Juvenile delinquency in the United States, as measured by the number of delinquency cases handled by juvenile courts, increased in 1958 for the 10th consecutive year. In that year, the Children's Bureau estimates that 470,000 delinquency cases (excluding traffic violations) were handled by the courts—an increase of 7 percent over 1957,

Mr. Flemming, in the booklet prepared for the Conference continues by saying:

> The services that have been set up to help delinquent children are far from adequate. In the first place, there are not enough of them. And in the second place, those that are available do not have enough sufficiently well-trained workers to provide the kind of service that is needed.

This pamphlet, which was prepared, as I have said, under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the golden anniversary of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, reveals many distressing facts about juvenile delinquency and the compulsion of the need for action in this matter.

I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my friend, the Senator from Alabama, who is well versed in this field, as he is in so many others, for his contribution to this discussion.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is an old adage derived from no less authority than the Bible itself to the effect that the love of money is the root of all evil. Although extremely broad in its context, this adage, while possibly a slight exaggeration, has a sound basis in human experience. It is much sounder, indeed, than the somewhat similar sounding adage which apparently is gaining favor as the motto of the United States Congress. I refer, of course, to the apparent assumption in recent years that money is the cure of all evil.

In recent years, programs have been proposed which would utilize the all-powerful dollar to solve the problems of agriculture, race relations, education and foreign policy—just to name a few; in fact, the Congress has attempted to solve all problems with money whether they be National, Statewide, or local. With the proposal for a Juvenile Delinquency Act, however, we have reached the absurdity of attempting to substitute money for parental responsibility and guidance.

The fact that juvenile delinquency has increased materially in the postwar years is substantiated beyond doubt by authenticated crime reports. The recent newspaper articles on juvenile crime are alarming and a source of continuing distress to me and, I am sure, to the overwhelming majority of Americans. Were there to be any sound reason for belief that money, or the studies to be secured thereby, could contribute to the solution of problems which foster juvenile delinquency, I would think that the sum authorized to be appropriated in this bill was unconscionably inadequate. It further occurs to me that were it possible for money to provide a solution, the State and local authorities, in whose field of jurisdiction this question resides exclusively, would long since have found the ways and means to provide sufficient funds for this purpose. Certainly the local and State officials, being so much closer to the problem than we, could be no more immune to the feelings of alarm caused by the shadow which juvenile delinquency has cast on our society. It is not a problem, however, which prevails only in the United States; but if news sources are to be believed, it is one of increasing importance to almost every industrialized nation of the world. The widespread existence of the problem, however, in the United States, no more makes it a matter for national legislation than does its worldwide existence make it a matter for regulation or treaty through the United Nations. No matter how farflung the existence of juvenile delinquency, it remains a problem that can be solved only in the home and the church and the school, with the assistance and cooperation of the local community.

Many of those who have had experience with those to whom we commonly refer as delinquents are of the belief that a child's personality is formed almost beyond change within the first 3 years of its life. During this formative period there is no substitute for a mother's tender loving care and a father's firm guidance. The presence or absence of parental responsibility in this period is primarily a moral question and can be solved only by moral forces. There is no supreme intelligence at the national level, nor are there sufficient financial resources within the United States, as wealthy as our Nation is, which can make a substantial difference in the exercise and fulfillment of parental responsibility.

Surely we could not conscientiously believe that studies at the national level could contribute materially to the solution of problems which promote juvenile delinquency any more than studies at the national level could solve other moral problems which have existed in our society. The only purpose which will be served by the passage of a Juvenile Delinquency Act would be to lessen the acceptance of those to whom it really belongs. Let us deceive neither ourselves nor attempt to deceive the public. Our best contribution to the prevention of juvenile delinquency can be through the example we, as public figures, set in our public and private lives, and such an example is not promoted by the exhibition to the public of the belief that money is the cure of all evils, even juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States contains the fields of jurisdiction which were delegated to the United States by the States. The National Government has jurisdiction only in those fields which have been delegated to it by the States under the Constitution. The field of juvenile delinquency has never been delegated to the National Government by the States. It was not delegated when the Constitution was written in 1787, and it has not been delegated by any amendment to the Constitution since that time. Therefore, the Government has no jurisdiction within the field of juvenile delinquency.

Juvenile delinquency is a matter, first, for the home and the church and the school, and then the local community; and certainly if we are going to bring government into it, the State government and not the National Government, should be the instrumentality to assist the local communities in seeking a solution to this problem.

There is no authority whatever under the Constitution for the Federal Government to enter into the field of juvenile delinquency; and I think it is a great mistake for us to be going into new fields that require additional expenditures at the very time when the survival of our Nation is at stake from threats by Communist forces. It is my opinion that we would do well in this country if we concentrated on national defense in order to provide for our very survival, first and foremost, without going into new fields, and we should be eliminating certain expenditures in the nondefense field, in order to provide more adequately for the national defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak very briefly on the amendment to the bill. I first wish to extend my very sincere thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and to the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

In regard to this issue these two statesmen have demonstrated that they are interested only in finding for themselves the answer to the question, "What are the facts?" The position they have taken on this amendment is clear evidence that they have satisfied themselves about the facts and are lending their great leadership in the Senate to support what, in my opinion, is now a well-rounded juvenile delinquency aid bill. I stressed the word "aid," Mr. President, for reasons which I shall bring out momentarily.

First, as to the amendment, it represents a consistent position of mine which I advocated shortly after the start of the hearings on this matter, and I happen to be a member of the subcommittee that had jurisdiction over it. It is a position which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will recognize as one which I aggressively put forward.

Upon the conclusion of the first 2 days of hearings, I sensed that the testimony had not pointed up the need for training personnel in the handling of juvenile delinquency problems—there were too many policemen and probation officers struggling with a problem they were not equipped to understand; too many areas in our country where nobody was assigned to alleviate this social phenomena.

For this reason I asked the chairman for the privilege of an additional day of hearing to cover the training item. I prevailed upon a citizen of Oregon who also happens to be an authority in this field to make a trip to Washington in order to get his advice on this matter. Judge Donald E. Long, whose biographical sketch can be found at page 210 of the hearings, has been for 20 years the presiding judge of the Court of Domestic Relations and Juvenile Court of Portland, Oreg.

With his testimony and that of others, I think it is fair to say that the case for training became crystal clear. The result was that in the executive session of the subcommittee, we marked up a bill which included training as well as demonstration projects.

Prof. John R. Ellingston, representing the Minnesota Legislative Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, Adult Crime, and Correction, presented compelling testimony, along with Judge Long, in support of a training program amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the testimony given before our committee by both Judge Long and Professor Ellingston, setting forth their views on the bill and their emphasis of the need for a training program.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD E. LONG, JUDGE, MULTNOMAH COUNTY COURTHOUSE, PORTLAND, OREG.

JUDGE LONG. A number of years ago, I think it was 20 years ago, I prepared an annual report on juvenile delinquency, and entitled it, "Understanding Delinquency." And after 22 years in dealing with behavior problems in children I would now entitle my annual report, "Trying To Understand Juvenile Delinquency."

I want to say at the outset, in my opinion there is no dramatic solution to the problems of youth. I do believe firmly that the Federal Government needs to exert some leadership to the various States and communities in pointing out ways of developing techniques, demonstration pilots, to see whether or not with the most skilled people we have now in our community we can arrive at some better way of treating the behavior problems of children.

Now, I have considered the bills before the Senate and also the bills that are in the House, Representative GREEN, of Oregon, her bill; and Mr. ELLIOTT'S bill, of Alabama; your bill; the bill of Mr. JAVITS; and Mr. HENNINGS' and others, and have come to the conclusion that both have merit, that both approaches have merit.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt you long enough to say, I do not know whether you knew it or not, but the subcommittee in the House has made some changes, largely, although not entirely, technical in nature in the Elliott bill, which is more or less identical with the Hill-Clark bill, and is reporting it out to the full committee.

Mrs. GREEN, from your State, is not in agreement with that and wants a somewhat more ambitious program and this should perhaps be background for you in further testimony.

Judge LONG. Yes, thank you.

In my opinion the training provision in the Green bill and in the other Senate bills is much more important than the provisions of providing for development of techniques and demonstrations. We have a severe lack of qualified personnel in the United States dealing with these problems. We need to do something about the need.

We have 3,000 juvenile courts in the United States, many of them county judges. Half of all the counties in the United States that are dealing with juvenile delinquency have no probation services whatsoever.

There was a study made by the National Probation and Parole Association several years ago and I think they have previously testified that there is a need for some 15,000 probation officers dealing with these problems and assisting juvenile courts.

At that time we only had in the United States 2,100 probation officers dealing with children alone, 3,400 serving both juveniles and adults. Out of this number only 1 out of 10 completed his social work training. Many of them were qualified but it is staggering that they had not the skills and training that they should have in my opinion in dealing with the behavior problems of the children coming to the various juvenile courts.

And that is the reason, I feel, that priority first should be given to a training program to assist the volunteer organizations to assist the States and local communities in providing under HEW an efficient program of training.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt you there to lead your mind into this field, and perhaps to some extent to be the Devil's advocate.

I think we would all admit the validity of the factual statement which you have made. There is an alarming shortage of qualified people within this field.

My query is to what extent will a bill at the Federal level authorizing the expenditure of a modest amount of money be effective in overcoming this situation? In other words, would we be treating the symptom instead of the disease? And is not the disease the fact that there is a shortage, in many an area in our American life, of qualified personnel—of which this field of social service work in juvenile delinquency is only one, that in a measurable degree that is due to the fact that our system of awards and punishments across the whole board of the selection of careers is a very ineffective and inefficient one?

A good deal of this has to do with compensation, but not all of it. We tend to reward on a very high level bright young men and women who go into advertising. We tend to penalize those who go into social work or teaching, perhaps even politics, not only in terms of monetary award, but in terms of prestige, status. A colored television engineer is held up to high praise. A social worker is thought of as a do-gooder. A politician is a fool on a stump, making a speech.

Is it going to help much in getting more people into the field of juvenile delinquency to appropriate a few million dollars for training at the Federal level?

Judge LONG. I feel that when we once reach the point of trained and skilled workers in juvenile courts, and I am speaking entirely for the juvenile court programs—I think in every area dealing with behavior, I will just leave the juvenile court for a moment—I am fairly convinced that we need to meet the need of adequate staffs throughout the United States in order to meet these problems.

However, I do want to make a point of one thing, and that is that I think there has been a great lag and we need to do a great deal more, and that is in the school social worker program. I think until we are able to reach the child, even a preschool child, and the children in their early grades in school where they have been aggressive, having been indulged, and find them with adequate school staffing of school social workers to go into the home and help the inadequate parent and disturbed parent and help the child that we can have all the demonstrations and techniques in the world, spend $10 million or $15 million a year, we are not going to reduce juvenile delinquency substantially until we try to treat the roots, until we get down to the children.

I did want to make that point, that I am not talking only of a juvenile court case. We had 600,000 cases reported several years ago and it is predicted that by 1965 we will have a million boys and girls referred to the juvenile courts and we must meet their problems adequately.

Senator CLARK. I thoroughly agree with you.

I am only pointing out that before you can train you have to recruit. And I would like to get your thinking as to how we could recruit more and better individuals, young people, as they come out of our schools and colleges into this desperately undermanned profession.

Judge LONG. I think we will have to set up some scholarships, have to help many of these young people that are interested in our field so they will be able to go on to schools. I think that is one way to do it.

I think we are going to have to help States in setting up training institutes to get a lot of these people who do not have the qualifications, briefly, but to get them stimulated and interested in the field.

Senator CLARK. Do you have in your mind any distinction between the level at which this work should be done? I mean how much of this can be done at the local level, how much at the State? To what extent does the Federal Government have a legitimate interest in this field? You know from your experience on the Hill that once you say the words "States rights" around here, a valiant band rallies around that flank and talks about Federal bureaucracies.

Judge LONG. I think it is primarily the State's responsibility and community's responsibility. However, the States and communities are not assuming their responsibility and they need the leadership of the Federal Government. I think they should participate wherever possible.

Senator CLARK. Those who disagree with you would say that that leadership should come from the grassroots of the people to force their State governments to make an effort. My own experience has been that they rarely do.

Judge LONG. My experience has been that it does not come up from the grassroots. You have got to interpret to the grassroots the need and when the people have had it interpreted they will go forward.

Senator CLARK. I am not sure my friend from Oregon would entirely agree with that.

Judge LONG. I know the time is limited and this subject is inexhaustible.

Senator CLARK. You take your time. We brought you all the way across the country to hear what you think. You take plenty of time.

Judge LONG. May I just leave the juvenile court for a minute and get into the police departments and sheriffs' departments in the United States, where we need specialized separate units dealing with children, because they are the ones that have the first contact with the delinquent boy or the delinquent girl.

Senator CLARK. Do you have such a division in Portland?

Judge LONG. Yes; we do.

Senator CLARK. Does it work pretty well?

Judge LONG. It works well. We have good liaison between the court and the juvenile division. They understand the philosophy of the juvenile court and we try to help them and have inservice training with them.

Half of the middle-sized communities in the United States have no such juvenile divisions and one-fourth of all communities under 10,000 people have nothing at all.

So I think we need a well-planned program under the direction of training police officers and sheriffs' officers in the techniques of handling juveniles. I think that is very important.

Now, we go further in another area of detention, not only detention in our juvenile homes but detention in our schools, State schools.

Last year alone we had over 100,000 boys—mostly boys—and girls, held in jails through-

out the United States and any number of other facilities where they were held were totally inadequate.

We need to do a lot in the training field of correctional institutions, boys' and girls' schools; they are terrifically lagging in qualified personnel. Very few of them have psychologists, full time or part time; to get psychiatric help you usually have to go to the State hospital and those are the things I think that we need to emphasize and focus our attention on under a centralized program of direction.

Senator CLARK. Judge, if you had your way, would you confine Federal assistance to training, or would you also authorize the support of research pilot projects?

Judge LONG. Senator CLARK, if I had my way and had $5 million a year, to be realistic I would spend $4 million in training and I would spend $1 million in developing of techniques and demonstration.

Senator CLARK. That is a very candid answer.

With respect to that $4 million, do you think its expenditure should require matching funds from States or localities?

Judge LONG. I would like to see matching funds. I am not too optimistic that many of our States would match funds.

Senator CLARK. There has been some testimoney here to the effect that, using the analogy of Federal housing legislation, we should bypass the States and deal directly with the local communities as in the case of urban renewal. A matching is required of one-third at the local level. Two-thirds is paid by the Federal Government.

There are those who have testified before this committee that one cannot expect many of the States to move into this field of matching funds. The suggestion has been made that rural control of the legislatures tends to make them not particularly sympathetic to this problem even though there is an awful lot of rural delinquency.

Do you have any views on that?

Judge LONG. Yes; I do. That worries me. I would prefer that the local communities, like your urban renewal which we have now in Portland, Oreg., a rather large project there, where the city and county are participating, that southwestern and southeastern and eastern and western Oregon are not interested in.

What concerns me is that we may be able to get some of the larger communities to participate, possibly not on a State level but what are we going to do with all these rural areas where they have no services whatsoever? That I think is where we need to give real leadership. And that is where we cannot expect participation on the part of the State.

Senator CLARK. Is it your view, and I realize this must be an empirical judgment, but is it your view that on a per capita basis there is just as much delinquency on the farm as there is in the city slum?

Judge LONG. I think the studies indicate, and while I live in an urban district, that there are substantially as many behavior problems in the rural as in the urban areas.

Senator CLARK. This is certainly not the American current view, because we have been brought up to believe that life on the farm is healthy in what is called the American way of life, that that tended to turn out normal and well-adjusted youngsters, whereas those who grew up in what are referred to as the ghettos of our big cities were in an environmental condition where it was difficult for them to develop normally, that the major problem was in the slum districts. I take it you do not agree with that?

Judge LONG. No; I do not. When I was growing up we did not have juvenile courts to amount to anything, and yet I recall quite a bit of delinquency as we would term it today. We did not have the automobiles, which I think has been a great contributing factor in taking the children away from the homes. Where the mother used to be able to go out to the back porch and call them, now they are 50 miles away. We have many more such exposures we did not have then.

I would say we need to strengthen our child guidance clinics. We have child guidance clinics in my community; I think you have yours in Philadelphia. They are inadequately staffed and cannot take care of the emotional problems of children and these are the potential delinquents that come to the juvenile courts later on. In my own community we could have a staff twice as large and not meet our needs.

We need more family counseling agencies. We have to deal with the parents. When you are trying to direct the thinking of the child and improve the child's attitudes you have to work with the parents to try to get them to do a better job and gain in strength.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt you, because unfortunately I have to go to another committee meeting and hope to get back. Senator MORSE will continue the hearing in my absence.

Do you feel from your experience that there is enough known about the art of treating juvenile delinquents so an adequate training program can go forward and be relatively successful without much further research in determining just how these children should be handled?

Judge LONG. Yes; I do. I feel that in developing new techniques, if we are going to be able to come out with some new techniques, a demonstration project is a long-term program; we will not do it in 2 or 5 or 10 years.

Senator CLARK. As I understand it, you think we should make a start?

Judge LONG. Yes.

Senator CLARK. And the major emphasis should be on training?

Judge LONG. Yes. We will take a group, whatever you agree upon, what you are going to develop, with psychiatric, psychological, psychiatric social workers, in a small group of boys who are severely disturbed and work with them to keep them from going to the penitentiary. I do not know how badly damaged they are. Only time will tell what the outcome of the project will be. I feel, as I said a moment ago, that the training program should have priority.

Senator CLARK. Thank you, Judge.

The record will show that Senator MORSE will take the chair at this point.

Senator MORSE. Judge Long, I want you to proceed in your own way until you present your testimony in chief and then I have a series of questions I want you to answer for the record. I want you to take all the time you want in order to make your case.

Judge LONG. In an attempt to conserve time I have covered the subject quite well together with my statement which is in the record.

I would like to say, referring back to the statement that will be in the record, that I had prepared that as a member of the Advisory Council of Judges to the National Probation and Parole Association. We have worked on these problems for some 7 years under foundation money.

At the recent meeting in New Orleans, I led the discussion not on the Senate bills, because they were not before us, but on H.R. 772, Representative GREEN's bill, and H.R. 3404, Mr. ELLIOTT's bill.

We had at this meeting in New Orleans the outstanding judges, juvenile court judges, in the United States, such as Judge Alexander, of Toledo, and I will not name them because they are all in the record. There were 16 of us.

They approved of the bills; however, they stated that positively and by unanimous vote that the training of personnel was much preferable and should have priority.

Senator MORSE. May I interrupt at that point? When it appeared that you might not be able to come and testify this morning you wrote to the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, under date of May 28, a letter in which you discussed the meeting of the Advisory Council of Judges to the National Probation and Parole Association, which you have just referred to.

That letter I think is so pertinent to our discussion this morning that I would like to have your permission to put your letter into the record. It includes the letter that was written to you and signed by I. Richard Perlman, chief of juvenile delinquency statistics section, program analysis branch of the division of research.

Do you have any objection to that being in the record?

Mr. LONG. None at all.

Senator MORSE. I would like to have that in the record.

(The letter follows:)

CIRCUIT COURT OF OREGON,
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
Portland, Oreg., May 28, 1959.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May I thank you for inviting me to give testimony on pending juvenile delinquency bills (S. 694, S. 765, S. 766, S. 1090 and S. 1341) at a public hearing beginning Thursday, June 4. Due to my previous commitments and the shortness of time I will not be able personally to be present to testify. However, I would like to make a few observations.

When the Advisory Council of Judges to the National Probation and Parole Association held its meeting in New Orleans on April 18 and 19, 1959, bills H.R. 772 and H.R. 3464 were on the agenda for study and discussion by the juvenile and domestic relations courts section. Members present were:

Paul W. Alexander (chairman), division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Toledo, Ohio.

Walter H. Beckham, juvenile and domestic relations court, Miami, Fla.

Charles O. Betts, district court, county courthouse, Austin, Tex.

Leo B. Blessing, juvenile court, parish of Orleans, New Orleans, La.

John J. Connelly, Boston juvenile court, Boston, Mass.

Harold N. Fields, Marion County juvenile court, Indianapolis, Ind.

Thomas D. Gill, juvenile court for the State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

Theodore B. Knudson, district court of Minnesota, family court division, Minneapolis, Minn.

Donald E. Long, circuit court of Oregon, courthouse, Portland, Oreg.

William B. McKesson, district attorney, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif. (former Los Angeles juvenile court).

Frank W. Nicholas, division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Dayton, Ohio.

Donald A. Odell, juvenile court, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Monroe J. Paxman, juvenile court, Provo, Utah.

Joe W. Sanders, family court for the parish of East Baton Rouge, Baton Rouge, La.

W. W. Woolfolk, Fulton County juvenile court, Atlanta, Ga.

Victor B. Wylegala, Erie County children's court, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dorothy Young, juvenile court of Tulsa County, Tulsa, Okla.

After a full discussion, the judges unanimously adopted a motion in support of both bills recognizing the great need for Federal leadership and assistance to help the States

and local communities strengthen their services and methods for controlling and treating juvenile delinquency. The discussion brought out the unanimous opinions that the two greatest needs for Federal assistance are for training of personnel and for research. For this reason the motion favored the provisions of H.R. 772, which specifically include grants for training personnel as well as for special projects.

The above-named judges did not have before them for consideration the above-numbered bills. I shall make no effort to evaluate the relative merits of the Senate measures except to comment on one feature contained in several of the bills and that is to state unequivocally that one of the most acute needs in meeting the problem is the development of qualified, skilled, and professionally trained personnel to work on a National, State, and local level for the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency.

The committee will undoubtedly be interested in the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
"CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
"Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.

"Hon. DONALD E. LONG,
"Judge, Domestic Relations Department, Fourth Judicial District, Circuit Court of Oregon, Portland, Oreg.

"DEAR JUDGE LONG: Mr. Sheridan has asked me to respond to your request for information that would indicate the need for training of personnel in the juvenile correctional field. While complete data are not available to show the full extent of need, the following statements will offer some clues:

"POLICE SERVICES

"The police deal with more delinquents or potential delinquents than any other agency. Furthermore, the police are usually the delinquent child's first contact with authority. Because of this crucial position, it has been generally accepted that every member of the police department should have some special training in the handling of juveniles and that there be in each police department a separate unit having highly specialized responsibilities for the department's handling of juveniles. When the establishment of such a unit is not practicable, the specialized responsibility should be lodged with one or more officers.

"While most of the large urban communities have established specialized units for improving police services with juveniles, only about one-half of the middle-sized communities and only about one-fourth of communities under 10,000 population have established such units.

"While all police officers should have some special training for handling juveniles, those assigned to the specialized responsibilities need to have an even more intensive specialized training. This can usually be obtained at institutes specifically designed for this purpose, such as the Delinquency Control Institute of the University of Southern California. An alternative would be a carefully designed inservice training program operated within the police department itself.

"JUVENILE PROBATION SERVICES

"Juvenile courts can carry out their specialized judicial function only if a well-trained, competent probation staff is available to them. Once an adjudication is made, the court depends on the probation officer for information upon which to base its disposition, taking into consideration the needs of the child and the community. These abilities and skills require training—a 2-year course of graduate study in a school of social work, according to the National Probation and Parole Association, the Children's Bureau, and the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

"At present, there is a serious deficiency in both quantity and quality of probation staff. Only about one-half of all the counties in the country have probation services available for juveniles. Testimony in 1954 by a spokesman for the National Probation and Parole Association to the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency indicated that at that time we needed 15,000 full-time juvenile probation officers. Yet, in 1957, there were roughly only 2,100 local probation officers serving juveniles only and an additional 3,400 serving juveniles and adults.

"The urgency for training of probation staff is very evident when we realize that of the presently employed probation officers, only 1 out of 10 has completed his social work training. More than 4 out of 10 lack a college degree, a requisite to admission to a school of social work. Thus, a training program must not only produce qualified staff where they are lacking but it must work toward raising the standards of the present unqualified staff.

"DETENTION CARE

"Adequate detention programs appropriately staffed should be available to provide a constructive experience to all children requiring care in secure custody pending disposition by specialized courts.

"While no valid count exists regarding the availability or quality of staff of detention homes, we do know that many of the specialized facilities in which children are detained are inadequately staffed. Furthermore, we know that roughly 100,000 children are being held in jail annually and an unknown additional number held in inappropriate facilities such as training schools, etc. Trained personnel are lacking for existing facilities and will be in even shorter supply if and when adequate specialized facilities for detaining delinquent children and youth become available.

"INSTITUTIONAL CARE

"Institutional care programs require a variety of trained staff to carry out their functions of treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. As with detention care programs, institutional programs are understaffed and they are overcrowded. Almost half of the State training schools are operating beyond their capacity. Half of them care for more than 150 children (the maximum size generally recommended). Six out of ten of our State training schools do not have a staff psychiatrist either full or part time: 4 out of 10 have no full- or part-time psychologist on their staff; 3 out of 10 do not even have a full- or part-time social worker. These are the clinical staff essential to the proper functioning of an institution. In addition, many of the institutions have poorly prepared cottage parents and other types of nonclinical personnel. Many lack sufficient numbers of this kind of staff.

"Finally, the comments made above regarding probation officers apply to parole or aftercare workers. The same training and skills are necessary and serious shortages exist. It is hardly possible for an institution to do more than give a child a good start. This work is negated without proper postinstitutional planning and supervision.

"The above deficiencies in quality and quantity in staff personnel represent the present situation. If delinquency continues to increase at the same pace as it has for the past decade, then the shortages will be even more acute.

"The implications of these shortages for a program of staff training are many. First, the types of professional personnel needed (social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists) are those that are already in short supply in all types of programs. Secondly, the present state of affairs (overcrowded conditions, overworked staff, lack of necessary auxiliary services, remoteness from professional stimulation), discourages professional personnel from entering the correctional field. Any program for training of personnel for corrections must, therefore, recruit prospective candidates into the field and provide the appropriate professional training needed. Many people believe that the situation can be helped by making funds available for (1) stipends to encourage students to enter the field and secure their professional training and (2) enabling already overburdened professional schools to expand their facilities. In addition nonclinical personnel working in the corrections field must be trained to carry out their functions appropriately. This requires intensive inservice training programs, carefully planned and organized.

"I hope this information will be of some assistance to you. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to write me.

"Sincerely yours,

"I. RICHARD PERLMAN,
"Chief, Juvenile Delinquency Statistics Section, Program Analysis Branch, Division of Research."

Thanking the committee for the privilege of commenting on the Senate bills, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONALD E. LONG,
Presiding Judge, Court of Domestic Relations.

Senator MORSE. And then I would like to say this further:

It deals with the problem that faces this subcommittee and will subsequently face the full committee.

The Senate once passed a bill sponsored by Senator Lehman, of which I was proud to be a supporter. The Lehman bill in my judgment faced up to the totality of this problem, faced up to the serious nature of the growing cancer of juvenile delinquency in our body politic, suggested what the experts at that time thought was a reasonably adequate program for a start of an attack on juvenile delinquency as far as Federal contribution and participations were concerned.

Now we have before us a choice of bills, one a broader bill that would deal with training and research about which you have been testifying, and the other a much more limited bill, sponsored by two great Senators, Senator CLARK and Senator HILL, but certainly a bill not nearly as broad as the Lehman bill formerly passed by the Senate.

Now, this choice is one of the difficult problems that confronts each Senator in the legislative process.

Do you vote for something that you know is inadequate? Do you do so, knowing that even its authors are perfectly honest and frank to say it is not as good as they would like to have it, but which they think there is some political chance of getting passed, and which, to the extent of its provisions, will do some good? Or do you hold fast to what you consider to be at least the minimum program that ought to be adopted? Some call it the choice between half a loaf and no bread at all.

My record shows it is very difficult to get me to go for half a loaf, because I usually find it but a figure of speech. I usually find you do not even get a crumb, but only a cellulose wrapping that is not edible.

We are going to have quite a debate in this committee on this choice.

I will finally vote for anything that will do some good, but I will hope that those of us that believe we ought to be voting for more than is contained in the Hill-Clark bill will be sufficiently persuasive so that we can at least persuade the Senate to go as far as we went in the Lehman bill, because time has passed and the Lehman bill is none too adequate for today.

I want you to keep that in mind as you and Professor Ellingston testify here this morning because we need help and lots of help on the facts and we will have to make the legislative political decisions.

In the long run, under our system of checks and balances, I cannot as a Senator ever vote for legislation that I think is less than adequate to meet the need of people on the basis of any argument that if I insist on voting for more I am going to get vetoed. We have got our democratic procedures for handling that kind of problem in American life.

Nor am I going to be moved very much by the fact that because we are engaged in a great drive to balance the budget that I must put a dollar sign on American boys and girls. I do not intend to. Because I know they are the greatest wealth we have. The real wealth of America is to be found in those boys and girls. The survival of America in the long run—and this is no platitude but a statement of cold reality—depends on the kind of boys and girls we have and the training we give them.

What would be a reasonable program in the light of our juvenile delinquency needs for adoption in 1959? That is the program I am going to vote for. If I am beaten on that program and am forced to vote for a lesser program, I will vote for that. I am frank to tell my colleagues that. Some people say you should not say that; you should say you will vote against the lesser program. If it is still the program that will do some good, I will still vote for it. If it is a program that will do harm I will vote against it.

I think you and Professor Ellingston should, as it were, sit in my seat as a Senator a moment and see some of the problems of legislative decisions you have to meet when you have the kind of choices that are going to be presented in this committee.

I voted, for example, against men that are just as sincere in their point of view on civil rights as I am but I voted against them in 1957. I was the only northern Democrat that voted against them in 1957. Why? Because I felt that the civil rights bill in 1957 did not have enough good in it to advance the cause of civil rights but would have the effect of throwing back civil rights for years; therefore, I said it is better to take our defeat today and wait for the dawn of a better day than to vote for a piece of legislation that in my judgment will so postpone an adequate program that it is better that we do nothing in 1957.

Unless it can be shown to me that the final bill that comes out of this committee is a definite step forward and will not have the effect of throwing a future program of juvenile delinquency back a good many years, I will not vote for it.

I have spoken long enough. It would not be fair to you and to Professor Ellingston if you did not know that there is this very honest difference of opinion on this committee. I am very much of the opinion that the great need in the field of juvenile delinquency is qualified trained help—qualified trained personnel.

It seems to me that another showcase in the form of some research home or research institute is not nearly as important as getting some people that can help. The judges, the probation officers, these public servants that are fulfilling a great public program with inadequate help in the field of juvenile delinquency.

Well, Judge, I wanted you to know what our problem is legislativewise and whatever you want to say now that will be of help to Senator CLARK and to me. I think on this one Senator CLARK and I are going to end up together in voting for something, but I hope it will be a stronger bill than the Hill-Clark bill is in its present form.

Judge LONG. I certainly enjoyed, Senator MORSE, your observations and comments because they are in agreement with my thinking.

I am not unmindful of the legislative problems on the Hill. I am in favor of attempting to develop techniques and having demonstration pilots but I have not been convinced as yet that there is going to be any result coming out of demonstration projects in less than 5 to 10 years that will be helpful to the judges throughout the United States.

Dr. Tyler has been working on a project at Stanford University for 5 years under foundation money and has been trying to come up with something as to why children behave the way they do, and he is going to go on for another 5 years and see what can come out of it.

And that is why, in all fairness to my own conscience and thinking, I must reiterate that as between the two approaches we had better spend our money on training. However, I would like to see several well-organized demonstration projects that should not be too costly, to see whether or not they are going to be able to come up with something which will be helpful to the courts and to the communities in dealing with the thinking and behavior of children.

I think I must say that and I will trust that something will come out of it. And in agreement, if they are unable to appropriate any money for training, then I am not so rigid as to believe, because I have not the whole loaf, that we should not then make some effort to develop techniques and have a few demonstration projects.

Thank you, Senator Morse. You have been very kind to me in allowing so much time this morning.

Senator MORSE. I appreciate very much what you said.

It has been said, Judge, that training grants should not be made because the people trained do not stay in the field. Is it true, first, generally; secondly is it true, particularly, with probation officers and police officers?

Judge LONG. There may be some merit—that people on a training program will leave the court and go to other related agencies. I can give you a concrete example: We had a very excellent person handling emotionally disturbed children in our court. She went to the School of Social Work at the University of Washington, got her master's, and now she is a school-social worker in the school district.

I am not concerned about that. She is still dealing with children and, probably, in that position will prevent some of the children from coming into the juvenile court later on.

I think some will have advancements, but I think most of the people who are trained will at least stay within the area of their training whether they come back to the court or not.

Senator MORSE. Would it be an accurate observation to say that any money spent in the training of these people would be repaid to society in that they would at least stay in the field long enough, or in allied fields long enough, so that the money will be well spent?

Judge LONG. I certainly believe so; yes. Most of the scholarships for training do have an agreement with them that they will at least come back to the agency that provides for the training for a period of a year, anyway.

Senator MORSE. I have in my hand the report of the Senate, No. 61, of the 84th Congress, and I turn to pages 102 and 103. I want to read statements contained on those two pages and then ask you if you agree in whole or in part with these statements.

Page 102 of the report says:

"To break through this kind of stalemate, the Federal Government must launch a three-pronged attack. It must provide increased consultation or technical aid, it must give assistance in attracting and training personnel, and finally, it must temporarily provide the risk capital needed for local organizations and agencies to launch and demonstrate the value of new services and programs."

On page 103:

"The training of greater numbers of qualified personnel to staff prevention and treatment agencies means both expanding certain training programs and the launching of new ones. Schools of social work, law schools, sociology and psychology departments, all provide training which partially prepares people for work in the delinquency field. Almost without exception, however, the training offered needs to be supplemented in terms of content and, in some instances, in methodology to qualify personnel for certain functions within the field.

"For still other positions such as that of institutional house parents or, in the vast majority of States, of juvenile police officers, there are no resources for training. Many institutions and police departments attempt to provide some on-the-job training and orientation, and although such training is valuable, it is no substitute for the intensive and comprehensive training needed for persons charged with the crucial task of protecting and rehabilitating children in trouble.

"To remove the bottleneck to improving the Nation's attack upon juvenile delinquency imposed by the lack of trained and qualified personnel to man its defenses, the subcommittee recommends the establishment of a program to be administered by the Children's Bureau under which grants would be made to States, selected educational institutions, and students to extend, establish, and further the training of personnel for work in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency."

What I am reading from really is the report in support of the Lehman bill.

Judge LONG. I am in agreement with it.

Senator MORSE. I have gone over these hearings very carefully and I have found nothing in them yet to justify changing my position from when the Lehman bill was before us.

Now, the question has been raised about the matching funds for training funds. It is true, is it not, that a considerable percentage of trained personnel in this field does migrate from State to State, does not stay permanently in one State?

Judge LONG. Yes; I do not think in great numbers, but it is true that some do go where they have advancements, from one State to another.

Senator MORSE. If a State has funds and hears that there is a great juvenile delinquency worker in New York and that they might be able to persuade him or her to come to their State, they try to do it; do they not?

Judge LONG. That is right, that does happen, certainly.

Senator MORSE. Of course, the matter of juvenile delinquency does not recognize State boundaries.

Judge LONG. Should not.

Senator MORSE. It is a national problem.

Judge LONG. I have a feeling Congress could even appropriate a larger amount than these bills provide. I think most of them offer a 5- or 6- or 7-year period which would be $45 million in that period of time. As you compare that with our total budget in the United States, it is only a pittance and we will, in dollars, as the years go by, have qualified workers dealing with these problems and save the communities and the States and Federal Government many more times than what they spend.

Senator MORSE. I am sure that is true.

Is it true, Judge Long, that there are some States where there are no special facilities for social work training?

Judge LONG. The last legislature in our own State has at last created an act permitting the establishment of a school of social work to be located in Portland, Oreg. They made a survey and there are 240 social workers without graduate training who are willing to sign up immediately this school opens its doors.

Senator MORSE. I think that is wonderful. I want to congratulate you.

I just want to say that if that bill passed, Judge Long was part of the force behind it.

Judge LONG. I supported it but a very strong committee, with a lot of help from Mrs. Catlin, did the work before the legislature.

Senator MORSE. Generally speaking, what training facilities are available for house parents, that is, persons in charge of cottages in training schools?

Judge LONG. Of course, the record cannot see me smile.

One of our great weaknesses.

Senator MORSE. We do not have a training program for them generally speaking, do we?

Judge LONG. No. What little training there is, is in service. They are pretty difficult kids.

In our Oregon school, and I think most of them are comparable, they try to do a pretty good job, but they do not have the qualifications I would like to see them have. They need real training, a program of in-service training.

In the detention area where we have our own inservice training program with group workers who take care of the boys that are in detention, several of our very best juvenile court counselors have been elevated from the detention area where they were group workers, due to the fact that we had some well-trained people on our staff to give them the training.

I think throughout the United States in boys' schools and even girls' schools they need a lot more trained skilled workers.

Senator MORSE. I am glad you stressed that; these so-called house parents in training centers are, for the period of detention, the foster parents of these boys and girls, and these foster parents need specialized training.

Just recently here in the District of Columbia we have had what adds up to a scandal in regard to the lack of training that existed in regard to these people. We do not pay enough to get highly qualified persons and we do not have the training programs in order to qualify them.

Judge, if there is no trained probation officer available to a judge who performs the work that you perform, is it not true that the judge then has the choice of either permitting the child to remain at home, unsupervised, or sending him to a training school?

Judge LONG. That is true in many jurisdictions throughout the United States. There have been many boys who have been sent to even our own training school, I regret to say, from smaller communities because there is no program for them there and they should never have been there.

I do feel that in many counties such as we have in the Western States, that the welfare departments with trained child welfare workers can be of great assistance to the juvenile court judges in giving protective services for children.

I returned a week ago from San Francisco in participating in a discussion of protective services for children which points up that they could be of help while we are developing trained counselors as we prefer to call them, so we get away from the connotation of police officers, since we are dealing with children, to have the welfare workers who are trained to step in and help the courts where they possibly can. We are trying to develop that program now in many States.

Also, may I say for the record that I feel that what we need to do more, and that is under our welfare programs, but it does relate to the improvement of the family life, we need homemaker services. We need people who are qualified to go into the home to improve the standards of many people in the interest of the children.

You would be surprised how many people there are that are really inadequate in some respects, but they are people and my experience has been that they are sincere, and they will accept help, that they just do not know. For someone to go in who is qualified to tell them about certain habits and training will be helpful to their training so that when their boy goes to school the boy next to him will not move away because he has not had a bath for a couple of weeks.

I know Miss Jewett, administrator of public welfare in Oregon, is very much interested in it but the money has never been available, so I think we must be giving more thought to helping in family life.

Senator MORSE. I agree. For the last 2½ years as chairman of another subcommittee of the Senate I have been conducting hearings on the youth of the District of Columbia that have become known as hungry children hearings, but they go far beyond the question of just getting food for hungry children.

Our hearings showed a shocking number of little boys and girls in the District of Columbia that actually had no food source at all except garbage cans and what they picked up from food that was thrown away by others. Some had no known parents.

This, in the Capital, not only of the Nation, but in a real sense the capital of the world; it was a pretty shocking investigation. People would not believe it at first but we documented it and it resulted in making accessible additional quantities of surplus food.

But that led to the problem of who would prepare food, because just delivering the food even to the homes where there were parents did not mean that the children were going to get it, or it did not mean that it was going to be cooked so it would be nutritious.

One of the things we ran into is the great need of the social worker you have testified about to go into many of these homes and teach the mothers how to prepare the food.

Judge LONG. That is right.

Senator MORSE. How to make a home. It is not so easy for those of us who live at our level of society to appreciate fully the many children that have to live in homes where there is not even an understanding of how to prepare the food. That is another reason why I am so glad that you are stressing this matter of training of social workers to get into the homes and help these mothers.

I had asked you about the difficult problem that confronts many juvenile judges, they do not have the social work probation officer assistance they need and they have to make a choice of letting a child stay in a home that has proven inadequately supervised or going to a training school and it is pretty clear that many of our training schools do not graduate law-abiding future citizens. A good probation officer or social worker assisting a juvenile judge can help supervise a number of delinquent children, can he not?

Judge LONG. Oh, yes.

Senator MORSE. In terms of the cost of sending that same number of children to a training school or hiring a probation worker that we know could do at least as much good for the child as the training school can, is the cost ratio very much in favor of hiring the probation officer or social worker, as far as the taxpayer is concerned?

Judge LONG. Much lower, Senator MORSE. They are so much less costly to, say of 50 boys on probation, some of our staffs, however, and probation officers have a larger caseload. We try to hold it down to 50. Thirty, where they are severely emotionally disturbed children is a big caseload. And it saves us a great amount of money to be able to redirect the thinking of these children and make them law abiding than to have them go down to our schools where they stay for 6 months to a year and then they are released on parole and where there are not enough well-qualified parole officers that take care of these boys when they are released from the boys schools so they do not have the support that they need and too often they have committed another offense and are back in the training school again.

So that is an area I have not mentioned, but they just need a lot of qualified parole officers in dealing with these children after they are released from the boys school to see if we can prevent them from going on into the penitentiary.

Senator MORSE. One final question: Is it true that there are a great many counties throughout the United States that did not have a single child welfare worker of the type that you have just been testifying about?

Judge LONG. That is true. There are many, hundreds of counties that do not have any assistance whatsoever.

Senator MORSE. Well, on that one I will be willing to rest my case. I rest it with this observation. If it is true that there are hundreds and hundreds of counties throughout the United States that do not have a single worker to assist the courts in the field of juvenile delinquency, you cannot for this reason justify the resulting human waste of a single boy or girl who could be saved for the ranks of good citizenship. That is why I think the training program which you testified to is so much more important than to spend a lot of money adding to research, important as that is. I think your testimony that out of $5 million, you would spend about $4 million for training and $1 million for further research is the sentence in your testimony that I am willing to emphasize.

Judge, thank you very much. I will see to it that your testimony here this morning receives all of the attention that I can possibly give to it.

Judge LONG. Thank you, Senator Morse, and may I thank the committee for the privilege of making a few observations due to my experience in the field and I do trust that I have made at least a slight contribution.

Senator MORSE. You have been very helpful.

It is now my privilege to call Prof. John R. Ellingston to the witness chair.

Mr. Ellingston represents the Minnesota Legislative Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, Adult Crime, and Corrections, and the Law School of the University of Minnesota, concerning proposals for Federal legislation on juvenile delinquency.

I want you to proceed in your own way. I will give you all the time you want, Professor Ellingston.

I have before me a prepared statement by you, setting forth your qualifications that I have already referred to.

I will put the full statement in the record at this point. It is your privilege either to read it or summarize it, to follow any course you wish to.

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. ELLINGSTON, REPRESENTING THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMISSION ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, ADULT CRIME, AND CORRECTIONS, AND THE LAW SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, CONCERNING PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, you are extremely gracious. I welcome the chance to discuss this problem because in Minnesota in 1953 at the university we set up a training project in delinquency controls, and I have a personal interest in describing what we have done and in urging similar action in other States.

I would be very glad to have my prepared statement inserted in record.

(The full statement of Mr. Ellingston follows:)

"STATEMENT OF JOHN R. ELLINGSTON, REPRESENTING THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMISSION ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, ADULT CRIME, AND CORRECTIONS, AND THE LAW SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, CONCERNING PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am professor of criminal law administration and director of the training project in delinquency control at the University of Minnesota, and also executive secretary of Minnesota's Legislative Interim Commission on Juvenile Delinquency, Adult Crime, and Corrections, and I represent here both the interim commission and the law school.

"The legislative interim commission, under the chairmanship first of Representative Joseph Prifel, Jr., and later of Senator Daniel S. Feidt, has been working for 4 years to increase understanding of the problem of delinquency in Minnesota, and to improve State and local services for its control. Illustrative of the commission's achievements is the passage of a bill in the recent legislative session providing sufficient qualified probation service to every juvenile court in the State. This is but one of many pieces of constructive legislation in delinquency control and corrections which led the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune on May 3 to make the following editorial comments: 'In fact, some professionals in these fields are now saying that this legislature may go down in history as the greatest of all—as far as these areas are concerned.' I submit copies of the commission's two major reports, 'Antisocial Behavior and Its Control in Minnesota,' and 'Safer Driving by Juveniles in Minnesota.'

"The law school is interested in the bills you are considering because it believes that more effective control of delinquency and crime depends at bottom on education and training. Accordingly, in 1953, under the leadership of the former dean, Maynard E. Pirsig, it launched a training program in delinquency control aimed to reach not only law students, but graduate students in social work, sociology and psychology, undergraduates aiming at subprofessional careers in delinquency control, and finally personnel actively working in the delinquency control field, particularly police officers and probation officers. This project, which is universitywide and has the support of the university administration, is sponsored by the following committee:

"Maynard E. Pirsig, professor, law school, chairman.

"Marcia Edwards, professor and associate dean, college of education.

"John R. Ellingston, professor of criminal law administration, law school, executive secretary.

"Dale Harris, professor and director, institute of child welfare.

"Donald W. Hastings, professor and head, psychiatry and neurology, medical school.

"John C. Kidneigh, professor and director, school of social work.

"Gisela Konopka, professor, social work (social group work).

"William B. Lockhart, dean, law school.

"Elio D. Monachesi, professor and chairman, sociology.

"Julius M. Nolte, dean, extension division.

"George B. Vold, professor, sociology (criminology).

"Robert D. Wirt, assistant professor, psychology, child welfare, and psychiatry and neurology.

"Gilbert Wrenn, professor, educational psychology.

"Since I shall urge passage of all three proposals before this committee, namely, to provide Federal aid for the training of personnel in the delinquency control field, Federal aid in support of demonstration projects, and Federal aid in support of ongoing programs, I should perhaps qualify myself by saying that in addition to participation in the activites descrbed above, I have been working full time in the delinquency control field since 1940. For 13 years before going to the University of Minnesota I was in charge of the American Law Institute's youth authority program, which has served as the basis for legislation in eight States and the Federal Government, and has influenced legislation and programs in many other States. I have written extensively in the field, including a book, 'Protecting Our Children From Criminal Careers,' and book length reports on prisons and parole in Maryland and on Maryland's services and facilities for delinquent children and youthful offenders.

"Significance of the delinquent problem

"Why should the Federal Government move massively into the field of delinquency control? How should it move? To answer these questions wisely it would seem to me that this committee and the Congress must see the enormous problem that lies behind and beyond the usually quoted statistics. It is not enough to know that the proportion of children aged 10 through 17 appearing before juvenile courts on charges of delinquency in the United States has jumped from 1.26 out of each 100 children in 1948 to 2.35 out of every 100 children in 1957. It is not enough to know that the increase in the number of children coming before the juvenile courts outran the increase in the population of juvenile court age almost five times during these 9 years.

"The California Youth Authority has recently given us a glimpse of how much more extensive may be the misbehavior and restlessness of youth than these juvenile court figures would indicate—a glimpse that challenges belief. The authority reports that during 1957 arrests of boys aged 17 totaled 35.7 percent of California's total population of boys of that age. Arrests of 16-year-olds and 15-year-olds were not much behind. Allowing for repeaters—that is, youth arrested more than once—the authority reported that about 26 percent of the State's 17-year-old boys were arrested in 1957. Approximately 5.6 percent of all arrests in the 15-, 16-, and 17-year-old groups were for major crimes; the remaining 25.8 percent were for minor offenses such as truancy and petty theft. Traffic law violations were not included in these figures. Perhaps we are just deceiving ourselves when we take comfort in the fact that only 2 or 3 percent of our children become recognized delinquents.

"Modern scientific insights, to say nothing of the figures quoted above, will no longer permit us to brush off delinquency as the inevitable behavior of an evil or moronic segment of the human species, an order of beings lower than the rest of us. Rather we are forced to see delinquency as a phenomenon to which every child is liable and for which society as a whole is primarily responsible. What raises today's extensive delinquency to the rating of a No. 1 social problem is that it reflects and reveals grave weaknesses in our society and its institutions. To these weaknesses all our children are exposed and vast numbers suffer from them, though to a less perceptible extent than do the identified delinquents. That is why, as I see it, today's juvenile delinquency demands the attention of and large-scale action by the Congress.

"A broad concept of the causes of today's delinquency

"To talk about the weaknesses of social institutions without being specific is mere rhetoric. To relate those weaknesses to delinquent behavior demands some discussion of the complicated problem of causation. Difficult as the subject is, it seems to me that those of us making recommendations to this committee and the committee itself in deciding on action must come to some agreement on the causes of delinquency. Until we do, we are flying blind.

"For centuries the Western World operated on the belief that everyone knew the difference between right and wrong and that if anyone did wrong and broke the law, it was because he willfully chose to do evil. That belief underlies our criminal law and its reliance on punishment. Related to this concept was the idea that delinquents and criminals differed from the rest of us in being "born bad." Over the last century people have fixed on one single factor or another to explain all the misbehavior of the age—feeblemindedness, poverty, unemployment, slums, gangs, drinking, broken homes, malfunctioning glands, lack of playgrounds, failure to punish children. Recently major blame has been thrown on crime and horror comics, movies, and television programs—many of which are, heaven knows, inexcusable.

"The danger of fixing upon any single cause as the explanation of all delinquency is that it encourages us to sidestep our responsibilities. If crime comics are the cause of current juvenile delinquency, then obviously all we have to do to stop delinquency is to get rid of crime comics; if the cause is alcohol, enforce prohibition; or lack of playgrounds, furnish them. Meanwhile we can shut our eyes to the really difficult and complicated task of delinquency control.

"I would not want to be understood as suggesting that none of the factors I have mentioned make any contribution to the causation of delinquency. Certainly the concept that certain children are born delinquent just will not stand up under scientific testing. But several other factors mentioned do play definite roles in the causation picture. However, these are secondary roles. They may act as triggers of particular delinquent acts, but the guns had to be loaded before the triggers could have any effect.

"Rarely is there a simple explanation of serious or chronic misbehavior by a particular child, except, perhaps, for the infrequent instances of brain lesion resulting from disease or accident. Rather the causes are multiple and interwoven over a long period of time. They combine differently for each child. Yet, despite their multiplicity and complexity, the psychological and environmental causes of delinquency can be reduced to ultimate factors that can be comprehended and used as guides to action.

"To understand today's peak load of juvenile delinquency, we have to grasp two broad but crucial facts. The first is that children have to grow up emotionally just as they have to grow up physically and mentally, and that failure to grow up emotionally predisposes them to antisocial behavior. The second fact is that industrialization and the machine have destroyed many of the automatic aids to emotional maturing of children with consequent increase in the proportion of children who become delinquent.

"Every Child Is Born a Little Savage

"Studies of chronically delinquent children reveal the same basic predisposing factors reappearing in case after case. The one almost universal predisposing factor may be defined as emotionally immaturity or warping, resulting from unsatisfactory human relations in the child's formative early years. It must be remembered that no infant is born a finished product. On the contrary, every baby starts life as a little savage. He is equipped among other things with organs and muscles over which he has no control, with an urge for self-preservation, with aggressive drives, and emotions like anger, fear, and love over which likewise he has practically no control. He is completely selfish and self-centered. He wants what he wants

when he wants it—his bottle, his mother's attention, his playmate's toy, his uncle's watch. Deny those wants and he seethes with rage and aggression which could be murderous were he not so helpless. He is dirty, he has no manners, no shame, no respect for persons or property, no conscience, no morals, no knowledge, no skills.

"What I am saying, of course, is that all children, not just certain children, are born delinquent. If permitted to continue in the self-centered world of his infancy, giving free rein to his impulsive actions to satisfy his wants, every child would grow up a criminal—a thief, a killer, a rapist. And in the process of growing up, it is normal for every child to be dirty, to fight, to grab or steal, to tear things apart and smear the walls, to talk back, to disobey, to evade. Moreover, it may give us a truer perspective on delinquency if we remind ourselves that man never shakes off the primitive impulses so manifest in infancy. Hostility, stimulated by frustration, seems to lie very near the surface in us all, ready to erupt in the varieties of violence that make the daily headlines.

"How Society Teaches Self-Control

"In order to survive, every society, from the most primitive to the most complex, demands of its children some self-control of the emotions and actions. Each society seeks to shape the child's attitudes and behavior in its particular image. To this end, every society depends largely on authority expressed through various pressures. It depends on the presure of physical realities, such as the fire, the knife, the stairway which the child must learn to respect if he does not want to get hurt. It depends on the pressure of the competing needs of brothers and sisters, neighbors and schoolfellows. It depends upon the rules and sanctions imposed by parents, schools, custom, laws, police, and courts.

"Every child needs, from infancy on, wise and continuous discipline. He needs and wants to have limits set beyond which he cannot go. But too much authority, whether expressed in constant rebukes, regimentation of the child's life, or in harsh and frequent whippings, builds up hate, resentment, and a sense of guilt. To be effective, authority must be supplemented by the satisfaction of the child's basic emotional needs. First and most important is the need for emotional security, the assurance that he belongs, that he is loved and wanted. The infant gets this from being fondled and sheltered and warmed as he naturally is when fed at his mother's breast. As he grows older, this sense of security is nurtured by belonging—to the family, to the neighborhood, to the gang, to the church, the club, the union, and so on. Few of us can endure isolation or ostracism from our kind.

"A second basic emotional need is for adequacy, for being competent at least at some one activity, for which the child gets recognition and praise and gains the crucial sense of being useful. To appreciate what a sense of competence and the garland of approval mean to a child, adults need only look frankly at the striving for superiority and recognition that motivates their own daily lives and at the hunger with which they swallow appreciation and flattery. A third emotional need is for new experience, for adventure and excitement. And a fourth is the increasing need for independence as the child advances toward manhood.

"Mechanism of the Civilizing Process

"It is largely through satisfying these basic emotional needs that a society persuades its children to give up immediate satisfaction of their desires, to exercise some self-control, and to conform to its standards; in other words, to avoid delinquent behavior. We can see the mechanism at work in good parent-child relationships all around us. The child's need to belong, to be loved and approved, is just as insistent as his need for food. Children have died for lack of love. In effect, wise parents offer the child this love and approval in exchange for giving up his infantile habits and sources of pleasure. Gradually, in fits and starts, with many lapses, he accepts the frustrations of weaning, of toilet training, of respect for the property of others, of nonaggression, of the endless "don'ts" of these early years, first because he is afraid of losing his parents' love and later because he wants to be like them. Children become what they are largely through identification with someone they love and admire. Soon the child develops his own control mechanism, his conscience, to govern his behavior according to the beliefs, values, and attitudes he has adopted from those he admires.

"Such is the kind of background that leads most of our adolescents to reject delinquent behavior.

"On the other hand, we can also see the failure of the civilizing mechanism, where instead of love and approval and consistent discipline, and respect for his individuality, the child experiences from his parents only the slap and scream of silent hostility or constant criticism, or indifference, or unpredictable swings between harshness and laxness. Such a child has no incentive to want to control his primitive instincts or his aggressions. He is likely to be cruel, quarrelsome, destructive, defiant, selfish, jealous, showing little feeling of remorse or guilt. If brutality in his early years clamps down on his every effort to let out some of the hostility within him, the time may come when his bottled-up hostility will explode in torturing a dog or cat, in hurting other children, in setting fire to the school building, in theft, rape, or murder. Such is the background of some of the children whose atrocious behavior makes the headlines.

"Automatic Aids to Growth

"Our children grow up in family emotional climates that run the gamut of those described above. However, the home cannot do everything. Relationships and experiences outside it influence the child's development and may push him toward or protect him from antisocial behavior. This brings us to the second crucial fact—that industrialization has destroyed many of the automatic aids to the emotional maturing of our children, while increasing the pressures upon them.

"In preindustrial and especially in preautomobile America, as among most primitive peoples, children grew up in and had their basic emotional needs met by the tribe or the neighborhood rather than by the parents alone. To a large extent, life centered in the home, the church, and the school in relatively stable neighborhoods. A child might grow to manhood without getting 10 miles away from his birthplace. The family was likely to be a clan of many members. If the parents were missing, brutal, indifferent, or for some reason failed to meet a child's emotional needs, he might well get guidance and satisfaction from grandma or Aunt Mabel, or the neighbor lady next door, or the minister, priest, or teacher. The self-contained neighborhood, like the tribe, gave the child support and imposed powerful controls on his behavior.

"As for other basic needs, the typical youngster—boy or girl—was from early years a useful hand on the farm, or in the family shop, or in the home. He got a sense of competence, usefulness, and growing independence even as he learned a vocation. He was busy. His days were full. He fitted into life by living, and learned by the sweat of his body that things have value. To satisfy his need for excitement and new experience untamed country surrounded even the big cities. The rebels and the violent could always escape to the frontier.

"While such neighborhoods bred no little angels, they did tend to hold their children's behavior within whatever limits each neighborhood set. Often those limits in respect to fighting, Halloween pranks, raiding orchards, drinking, and sexual behavior were pretty flexible. But the children who grew up in them were not stamped as delinquents.

"Industrialization's Effects on Children

"Think for a moment how all this has changed. Industrialization, mechanization, mobility, urbanization, and teeming populations have transformed the conditions of life and multiplied the problems of adjustment for children. The clan family has disappeared. Grandma is retired in Florida and Aunt Mabel has a well-paid Government job in Washington—or Japan.

"Father Has Lost His Role in the Home

"More subtle and vastly more harmful in its effects on children is the gradual easing of father out of the home and out of close contact with his children. So serious is this effect of industrialization that I should like to quote the professional judgment of a psychiatrist, Dr. Doris Milman, of New York City, a judgment based upon years of experience with children from any economic levels:

" 'Probably the single most important influence on young people today is the fact that the home is almost exclusively dominated by the mother. Father is away from home all day—and frequently evenings, too—with the result that virtually the entire function of bringing up children is left to mother. The father has lost status in the home, and no matter how effective and successful he may be in business or socially, his children generally see him in a rather passive and not very sharply defined role. It is the mother who dominates in almost every case, and in some instances the father has abdicated almost completely.'

"According to Dr. Milman, the most severe result of this trend is in the extent to which it accentuates effeminate tendencies in boys. Even where there are no such drastic results, however, its effect is felt on most 'normal' children. Boys do not see a strong father after whom to pattern themselves. They cannot identify with their mothers. As a result they tend to be passive about almost everything. They do not want to work too hard, or to worry, particularly since they have no strong feeling about their future role in life. Insofar as girls are concerned, since they tend to pattern themselves after their mothers, they are likely to perpetuate the dominant role of the mother.

"Those who work with seriously delinquent boys know how frequently and in how many different ways lack of a satisfactory father image and relationship contributes to their antisocial behavior.

"The Breakdown of the Neighborhood

"Scarcely less than the family in its influence on children, the neighborhood has suffered from the effects of industrialization. In fact, the automobile has obliterated the self-contained neighborhood and, by enabling youth on the farm as well as in the cities to seek recreation in the anonymity of distance, has practically ended the neighborhood's control over children's behavior.

"This is a worldwide phenomenon. A United Nations report released in 1955 found a 'frightening' increase in juvenile delinquency throughout the world, and stated that there 'seems to be a definite relationship between industrialization and juvenile delinquency.' A Turkish official visiting the United States in 1954 to study our programs for the control of juvenile delinquency stated that until the recent widespread industrialization of the predominantly village life of his country, Turkey had so little juvenile delinquency that the language had no word for this phenomenon. He told the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency: 'In the past, the child was protected and guided by the pattern of village

life, which was also a kind of family society * * *. Everybody knew everybody else and felt a responsibility for what any child did. With modernization that sense of responsibility broke down.'

"I do not think it is widely realized how grave is the loss of the neighborhood in its effect upon our children, our culture, and the socialization of all of us. The link that joins each of us to the world and to the rest of mankind has always been the tribe, the neighborhood. It has provided the arena in which we grow, learn, work, play, worship, fall in love and marry, in which, however, humble our job, we feel that we have meaning and influence, that we are wanted and respected.

"Children Are Isolated From Adults

"For many, the neighborhood link is now broken. The neighbor next door is a stranger. Though there are millions more of us than ever before, and we live more closely packed together, our children are orphaned from the adult world as never before. And they have lost thereby the models for imitation, the masters to teach them an infinite variety of skills, the deep satisfaction of their sense of belonging if their parents fail to satisfy this need—and the neighborhood control over their behavior.

"Depriving children of the security and control that throughout history they got automatically from growing up in the constant shadow of adults, we drive them increasingly to depend on their peers, in gangs and groups whose members are all equally immature and insecure. In his book, 'The Shook-Up Generation,' Harrison Salisbury analyzes the demoralization of youngsters left to themselves in our impersonal society.

"To turn for a moment from boys in trouble to girls in trouble, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports a 30-percent increase since 1949 in illegitimate births among girls aged 15 or younger. It has been demonstrated over and over again that many teenage girls enter into sexual experience not from precocious appetite but from the need to feel wanted and loved and important. One of the pregnant girls quoted in a Minneapolis Sunday Tribune article said: 'I didn't like the heavy petting, but it was the thing to do.' Another said bitterly: 'I felt I wasn't important to mom because she didn't care when I got home.' Where parents and other adults satisfy the need for security and affection, children do not turn to tragic substitutes.

"No Chores, No Jobs

"I have time to list but one other effect of industrialization on the social structure which contributes to today's delinquency and works harm on perhaps most of our children. Along with the loss of contact with parents and adults, many of our children and youth have lost the opportunity to be useful and to learn automatically skills and vocations. Electric lights, stoves, and washers, oil and gas furnaces, vacuum cleaners, prepared food, and what not, have done away with the daily chores of carrying out the ashes, beating the rugs, stringing beans—even of sewing, cooking, and mowing the lawn. In too many homes today's youngster feels himself unneeded, superfluous, a kind of toy. Everything is given him, he earns or makes nothing, and as a result many appreciate nothing. Boys and girls no longer grow into a vocation in the family business or trade. Thanks to galloping mechanization of industry, commerce, and agriculture, it is getting harder to obtain the part-time and summer jobs that can give them pocket money, self-respect and contentment, good work habits, a sense of responsibility, respect for materials, and vocational skills.

"What Is Happening to Children

"In view of such deprivations and frustration of children and their basic needs (and I have cited but a few of many), it is perhaps no wonder that some of our adolescents drift into gangs, break school windows and street lights, race souped-up cars, experiment with liquor, drugs, and mass sex parties, steal, destroy, and even kill. 'The more the drive toward life is thwarted, the stronger is the drive toward destruction,' writes one psychologist.

"So much for the children driven into overt delinquency by the weaknesses in our social structure. As one last reminder of the toll paid to these social defects by many other children in weakened character and poorer citizenship, I refer you to a report with which the committee is undoubtedly familiar, the Kinkead report of the Army investigation into loss of morale among our servicemen in the Korean war. One speaker quoted in that report of Maj. Clarence L. Anderson, a doctor who was himself a prisoner from 1950 to the end of the war and who received the Distinguished Service Cross for rounding up the American wounded at Unsan Battle, for care of them, and for refusing to leave them, though it meant his own capture. I quote from Dr. Anderson: 'It is a sad fact, but it is a fact, that the men who were captured in large groups early in the war often became unmanageable. They refused to obey orders, and they cursed and sometimes struck officers who tried to enforce orders. Naturally, the chaos was encouraged by the Communists, who told the captives immediately after they were taken that rank no longer existed among them, that they were all equal as simple prisoners of war released from capitalist bondage. At first, the badly wounded suffered most. On the marches back from the line to the temporary holding camps, casualties on litters were often callously abandoned beside the road. Able-bodied prisoners refused to carry them, even when their officers commanded them to do so. If a Communist guard ordered a litter shouldered, our men obeyed; otherwise the wounded were left to die. On the march, in the temporary camps, and in the permanent ones, the strong regularly took food from the weak. There was no discipline to prevent it. Many men were sick, and these men, instead of being helped and nursed by the others, were ignored, or worse. Dysentery was common, and it made some men too weak to walk. On winter nights, helpless men with dysentery were rolled outside the huts by their comrades, and left to die in the cold.'

"Mr. Kinkead writes that what struck Major Anderson most forcibly was the almost universal inability of the prisoners to adjust to a primitive situation. 'They lacked the old Yankee resourcefulness,' he said. 'This was partly—but only partly, I believe—the result of the psychic shock of being captured. It was also, I think, the result of some new failure in the childhood and adolescent training of our young men—a new softness.'

"A program to reduce delinquent behavior

"Perhaps a summary of the points I have sought to make so far will suggest the kind of program which we must attempt if we are to bring delinquency under control.

"(1) Every infant is born at the social level of the savage, absorbed in self-preservation, with capacities for love but also for hate, fear, anger, cruelty, and violence over which he has no control.

"(2) The effective tool to aid the child to acquire some degree of control over his selfishness and his emotions and drives is person-to-person relationships with parents and other adults.

"(3) The extent of self-control learned, that is, the degree of civilized behavior attained, depends upon the degree to which the child's relationships with parents and other adults meet his needs for love and belonging, competence, recognition, independence, and so on.

"(4) In primitive and preindustrial societies children grew up in constant contact with all adults, including parents, relatives of the clan family, and members of the tribe or neighborhood. While there were plenty of emotionally warped individuals, children's behavior conformed pretty much to whatever standards the community set. Many basic needs of children, such as emotional security, were satisfied by the clan family or tribe or neighborhood. The sense of competence or usefulness was satisfied by the daily necessity to carry out household tasks. Today the traditional father-child and adult-child relationships have largely disappeared. So have such automatic aids to growth as universal chores. Industrialization, mechanization, mobility, and urbanization have undermined or destroyed these and many other indispensable aids to humanizing and civilizing of children.

"(5) Cast largely on their own inadequate resources in a crowded, impersonal, tense, demoralized and despiritualized world that doesn't need them, many children have failed to grow out of the delinquent behavior natural to infancy, or they have fallen back into such behavior; there is terrifying evidence that many other children appear to have suffered some character deterioration.

"Adult-Child Relationships Renewed

"To handle so vast a problem which to some degree affects every child, nothing less than a reestablishment of satisfactory father-child and adult-child relationships can hope to be effective. We have to bring our children back into the real life of the whole community and under the constant influence and guidance of adults. More services to children, particularly delinquent and disturbed children, which constitute the solution so far proposed, are not the whole answer. Of course we need more services, and particularly better services, as I shall urge later on, but neither parents nor the rest of us adults can buy nor delegate the main job of the physical, emotional, intellectual, vocational, moral, and spiritual education of the next generation. Basically and inescapably, such education is a job in person-to-person relationships between all adults and all children.

"Of course, society and its complicated industrial structure are not going to reverse themselves or go backward to the preindustrial age of self-contained neighborhoods. We have to find new ways and means of reestablishing father-child relationships and paternal authority over children and of renewing contact between the neighborhood adults and the neighborhood children. How this shall be done rests in large part on future discoveries, but, lest you think it a pipedream, I cite to you the Chicago area projects as one already demonstrated method of accomplishing this result. Furthermore, I suggest that industrialization, which has banished adult-child relationships, today offers to restore them, and even to enrich them, through the new leisure time which automation makes possible for fathers and mothers as well as their children.

"The First Necessity Is Education

"However, people have to find the answers largely for themselves. They will do so if they understand what is happening to their children and why. Therefore, the first responsibility of government at any level is education. We need to overcome our culture's almost universal psychological illiteracy. While we have recognized the need for physical and intellectual education, and to a lesser degree the need for moral and spiritual education, we have been unaware of the necessity for and the nature of emotional growth. Surely nothing less than ignorance of the fact that a boy needs close identification with a father figure to develop his masculinity could have permitted the

father under the pressure of industrialization to drift out of the home and largely out of the life of his children.

"Task No. 1, then, for those interested in the better control of delinquency through prevention and rehabilitation is to extend education in the A B C's of human motivation and behavior. The primary job is to remedy man's almost universal psychological illiteracy. Once that is widely accepted, we can have faith that parents' and the adults' world generally will find ways of adjusting the system to meet the universal emotional needs of children.

"How do we go about this staggering task of universal education? Surely the first requisite is leadership, and I ask you gentlemen whether in any field leadership can produce greater benefits for our Nation. Next, the responsibility and opportunity of the schools to inject the A B C's of behavior into the stream of common thought is tremendous. But before they can do that, every teacher needs to be as well trained in the dynamics of human behavior and in the nature of emotional growth as he or she is in physical or academic education.

"Train First Personnel Working With Delinquents

"Fortunately and realistically, there is another large group of people whose need for education in human motivation and behavior is immediate and urgent, and who, once educated, can provide a leaven to spread understanding throughout our society. I mean all those whose jobs in one way or another give them control over delinquent children—policemen, probation officers, judges, county attorneys, visiting teachers, a variety of welfare workers, recreation leaders, training-school staffs, parole agents, visiting nurses. Since most chronic delinquency and other maladjustment stems from a failure in person-to-person relationships, treatment and rehabilitation has to be a function of person-to-person relationships. People are all-important in rehabilitation. Consequently, the selection and training of all personnel who deal with delinquent children becomes indispensable to rehabilitation and prevention. Only as each of them gets some understanding of themselves and of the forces that make them behave as they do are they likely to be effective in changing the attitudes and behavior of delinquent children. This is the group with which education in the dynamics of human behavior must begin. To stimulate and facilitate the teaching of this group seems to me to offer the greatest opportunity in this area to the Congress.

"Minnesota's Training Program

"Believing that such training is primarily a responsibility of universities, the University of Minnesota in 1953 launched a training project in delinquency control with four main purposes:

"(1) To introduce all law students to modern philosophy and procedures in the administration of the criminal law, especially as it affects juveniles, and to bring law students together with students of the behavioral sciences in joint exploration of common problems.

"(2) To attract and train college students for work, professional and nonprofessional, in delinquency control through development of an undergraduate interdepartmental major in delinquency control. I may say that this major is now beginning to provide probation and parole officers, detention-home workers, and even welfare workers to help meet the demand in Minnesota.

"(3) To provide in-service training to personnel now administering the criminal law and delinquency control services. Most important step in this area was the establishment in 1956 of an annual juvenile officers institute, a 10-week period of intensive training of police and probation officers for work with children.

"(4) Cooperation with State and local agencies in the delinquency control field.

"Let me give just one illustration of what this kind of training of people actually working in the field can do. One police officer who attended the juvenile officers institute was initially extremely skeptical of any concepts of treatment that might be inconsistent with 'cracking down' on children. After 5 weeks of the course he told me: 'I begin to get the point, Mr. Ellingston. Now my problem is to educate my department.' A year later he wrote the institute: 'There are so many ways that the juvenile institute has helped me in my work, community, and even in my home dealing with my own children that I couldn't even start to list all the help it has given me.' On graduation, this officer enlisted his neighbors in the organization of a varied leisure-time activities program for his and their children. This program has now become community wide, with a full-time paid staff in addition to the parent volunteers.

"Federal Aid Needed for Training

"Minnesota needs to expand its program to give intensive training to many other groups, such as juvenile court judges and training school personnel. Since every person working with children in trouble needs training in human behavior, it would seem that every State should have available training programs similar to that in Minnesota. Federal aid could vastly stimulate the establishment of such programs. In our own State it is highly doubtful whether we would carry on the juvenile officer institute without aid from the Ford Foundation, particularly as the institute trains officers from a dozen States other than Minnesota. In our delinquency control project we need stipends for students in the undergraduate major to maintain them while they get working experience in training schools during the summer vacations.

"I believe that the biggest returns from any investment by Congress in the delinquency control field will come from aid to training personnel.

"Aid for Demonstration and Ongoing Projects

"The need for and the opportunities in aid to demonstration projects and aid to ongoing projects is surely such as to justify Federal assistance. As for demonstration projects, I believe that every State would benefit from seeing an attack on the so-called hard core families, such as the family centered project carried on in St. Paul, or from seeing how a program like the Chicago area projects can stimulate the residents of rundown neighborhoods to revive their sense of neighborhood responsibility in action.

"As to ongoing projects, all American communities, urban or rural, lack some, and some lack all, of the essential treatment and prevention services, even the public ones, such as a probation officer or a visiting teacher. Few of them are adequately staffed in terms of number and qualification of personnel. As a result many juvenile courts and probation departments, for example, are treatment agencies in name only. Aid in carefully selected areas might serve as a demonstration to the rest of the State concerned.

"Need for Youth Conservation Camps

"In closing, I should like to suggest one additional area of major importance in which I believe the Federal Government can make a major contribution to the physical and spiritual health of many of our children, including the reduction of delinquency, as well as to the conservation of our natural resources. This is an area in which, if the Federal Government does not move, little or nothing will be accomplished.

"Unemployed youths under 20 years of age in Minnesota numbered 14,000 last February. There has been some improvement since, but less for this age group than for adult workers. The investigations of our interim commission indicated that this high volume of unemployment among Minnesota youth reflects a deeper and more lasting phenomenon than the recent economic recession. Police and settlement house workers in the big cities and juvenile judges throughout the State reported in 1956 that jobs for youth were increasingly scarce and that this scarcity contributed not only to delinquency but to the building up a body of embittered and frustrated young citizens, crippled vocationally, emotionally, and spiritually.

"This is another product of the accelerating industrial revolution which progressively reduces the workweek from 48 to 40 to 35 hours and cuts the number of traditional jobs available to those young people who, in our choreless economy, have no special talents or training.

"The Minnesota Legislature felt this problem to be so serious and lasting that each house created in February emergency committees to investigate the possibilities of a youth development camp program in Minnesota. I submit for the record copies of the reports of these emergency committees, which were the same for each house. These reports state in part: 'While many new programs to provide constructive work opportunities for youth will undoubtedly be developed, the protection of our natural resources in soil, water, forest, and wildlife combines endless work opportunities with immense social and economic benefits.'

"Citing the immense value of the Civilian Conservation Corps to Minnesota as well as to the rest of the Nation, the committees recommended and the legislature memorialized the Congress urging it to enact into law S. 812, the bill introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and several of his colleagues, including members of this committee, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps comprising 150,000 young men. Such a step, I believe, would fit into the type of constructive long-range planning for youth which I have been urging in this statement.

"May I express to this committee the appreciation of the groups which I represent for the conscientious and responsible approach you have taken over a period of years in seeking ways to protect children and youth."

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I would like, because this is a subject about which it seems to me there is much talk and perhaps little understanding, to suggest that delinquency involves not just "those kids over there"; that the problem is not simply the number of children that appear in juvenile courts.

The percentages appearing in juvenile courts have risen from 1.26 out of every 100 children aged 10 through 17 in 1948 to 2.35 in 1957. This is bad enough, but this does not begin to suggest the magnitude nor the implications of the problem.

The California Youth Authority last year released figures which I think will astonish you. They are hard to believe. The authority pointed out that during 1957 arrests of boys aged 17 totaled 35.7 percent of the total California population of boys of this age. These arrests did not include traffic cases; these were excluded. Allowing for repeaters—that is the number of boys that were arrested twice or more in a year—26 percent were arrested.

And the 15- and 16-year olds were nearly as bad, the total of all three age groups being 25.8 percent.

In terms of the seriousness of the offenses for which they were arrested, 5.6 percent of the arrests were for the eight major crimes which the FBI lists in its annual reports, and 25 percent were for lesser crimes, such as truancy, incorrigibility, petty theft, and so on.

Now, are we to suppose that these vast numbers of youngsters suddenly made up

their minds to break the law, to be "bad"? Well, of course, to ask the question is to answer it. These kinds do not simply choose to be bad. Their behavior reflects something new in our society. It seems to me that the behavioral problem that we face in the United States at this time reflects weaknesses in our social institutions, weaknesses in the social structure, to which every youngster is exposed. This is why the problem is of major concern to everyone and to the Congress. Perhaps I can demonstrate what I mean.

If we are to relate weaknesses of the social structure or of our institutions to delinquency, we have to discuss causation of delinquency. Everybody thinks he knows why delinquents are delinquent, that it is due to alcoholism, or to the fact that the old man has ceased to take his children out to the woodshed, or to lack of playgrounds or to poverty, or TV, or crime comics.

Many of these factors have some relationships but they certainly are not in any sense the cause of delinquency and it hurts our program, obstructs public action in the field, to say that any one thing is the cause, for example, failure of fathers to punish their children sufficiently. If this is the cause, then we need only get every father out whipping the tar out of junior and this ends the problem. Of course, this is not so. To say that it is permits us to evade the profoundly difficult social engineering which we have to undertake if we are going to effectively reduce delinquency.

What are the basic causative factors? No one who has worked in the field intensively for 20 years as I have, would be foolish enough to say that it is easy to explain the causation of delinquency. The combination of causes varies for every youngster, but I believe there are basic modern social conditions and basic universal psychological factors, which we can undertsand, and which underlie all of today's delinquency, except perhaps that of the youngster with the brain lesion because of disease or accident.

There are two basic facts: The first is that every youngster has to grow up emotionally as well as intellectually, physically, and socially and that failure to grow up emotionally predisposes him to delinquent behavior. The second fact is that industrialization and the machine have eliminated many of the automatic aids to emotional growth, which had been traditional throughout history.

These are the two factors: One, the necessity for emotional growth; two, the fact that the changes in our society have eliminated automatic aids to that emotional growth.

I would like to read a short paragraph from my statement:

"It must be remembered that no infant is born a finished product. On the contrary, every baby starts life as a little savage. He is equipped among other things with organs and muscles over which he has no control, with an urge for self-preservation, with aggressive drives, and emotions like anger, fear, and love, over which likewise he has practically no control. He is completely selfish and self-centered. He wants what we wants when he wants it—his bottle, his mother's attention, his playmate's toy, his uncle's watch. Deny those wants and he seethes with rage and aggression which would be murderous were he not so helpless. He is dirty, he has no manners, no shame, no respect for persons or property, no conscience, no morals, no knowledge, no skills."

I am describing all newborn infants here. I am sure the description is accurate because of my observations of my own children and grandchildren. All babies start out with infinite capacity for love, but also for hate, anger, envy, aggression, and so on. The instinctive, primitive behavior of all chidren when frustrated is delinquent behavior. Since frustration is continuous and inevitable from the moment of birth on, children have to be led out of this instinctive antisocial behavior.

The effective means of leading youngsters out of completely self-centered and delinquent behavior are intelligent use of authority coupled with satisfaction of their basic emotional needs. These are the need for love, for emotional security, for belonging; the need for feelings of competence, adequacy and for recognition; the need for new experience; and the need for increasing independence. These are perhaps the basic emotional needs which, if met, encourage a youngster to give up gradually and slowly—it is a difficult process for every child—to give up his selfish and aggressive behavior little by little, and to develop his conscience so that he eventually controls himself.

He will do this in response to effective meeting of these basic needs, particularly the need for love, the need to feel wanted. This is true of all youngsters and must have been true through most of human history. The youngster who makes the headlines, who kills old men wantonly whom he does not even know, the boys that lead the gangs in the big city slums, these boys are likely to be the sort of youngsters who have not had basic love in the home, do not belong, have been rejected, who have had no encouragement to overcome this instinctively selfish behavior, to gain self-control.

What I want to bring out is that these emotional needs are typical of all humanity, they are typical of humanity in the past, they are typical of humanity today, and in the future. The emotional needs have not changed, but the world in which those needs are met has been transformed. The change in the situation today as compared with 20 years ago, 50 years ago, with the preautomobile era, particularly, is the change in the environment in which youngsters grow up. This change I think explains today's increase in delinquent behavior.

The home cannot do everything. The family cannot do the whole job. These institutions do not exist in a vacuum. They are products of their society.

Prior to the automobile there were plenty of adults who had never been 10 miles away from the place in which they were born. The community, the neighborhood, was a self-contained unit in which the family and the school and the church really did provide the totality of life for the children. The clan-family—not only the parents, the mothers and fathers—but the grandparents and aunts and uncles and cousins—all exercised influence and control over the youngster and helped meet his emotional needs.

The same thing was true of the neighborhood. The neighborhood was a replica of the tribe. Youngsters grew up in the neighborhood. The lady next door might feel just as much responsibility for the behavior of the youngster as his own parents.

Vocational training was an automatic thing because every child had to chop wood, fill the lamps, beat rugs, cook, carry out the ashes, feed the chickens, and all the other chores that were essential to the daily survival of the family. These chores led to a lot of rebellion when a youngster wanted to play baseball, but they gave him tremendous psychological satisfaction because he meant something to his family and society. At the same time they taught him habits of work, skills, and respect for things.

Now all this has changed. Industrialization has eliminated the clan family and very largely broken down the neighborhood. The controls of the neighborhood over its children are gone because John can get in his car and drive to where he is unknown and do things that he would never do where he is known. In the preautomobile days, if the parents were missing or ineffectual, there might be an aunt or a neighbor to meet a youngster's needs. Now, these people are nonexistent. If there is a grandmother she lives in Florida and the aunt lives here in Washington, or in Japan with a Government job.

One even more serious loss in terms of helping a youngster to satisfy his emotional needs and of controlling his behavior is the father's gradual moving out of the home over the last half century. Because this is so serious I want to read what a psychiatrist in New York, Dr. Milman, who has worked with children of all economic levels for many years, has said about it.

"Probably the single most important influence on young people today is the fact that the home is almost exclusively dominated by the mother. Father is away from home all day—and frequently evenings too—with the result that virtually the entire function of bringing up children is left to mother. The father has lost status in the home, and no matter how effective and successful he may be in business or socially, his children generally see him in a rather passive and not very sharply defined role. It is the mother who dominates in almost every case, and in some instances the father has abdicated almost completely."

Then she goes on to say:

"The most severe result of this trend is in the extent to which it accentuates effeminate tendencies in boys. Even where there are no such drastic results, however, its effect is felt on most normal children. Boys do not see a strong father after whom to pattern themselves. They cannot identify with their mothers. As a result they tend to be passive about almost everything. They do not want to work too hard, or to worry, particularly since they have no strong feeling about their future role in life. Insofar as girls are concerned, since they tend to pattern themselves after their mothers, they are likely to perpetuate the dominant role of the mother."

This is a factor which anybody who works with boys in training schools recognizes to be a very real one. I once served as a house parent in a training school in Minnesota. Every boy in my cottage—and there were 53 of them whose records I knew intimately—had a basic problem of unsatisfactory relationships with one or both parents. Very often the father was the weak unsatisfactory character in one way or another and the behavior of the boys in various ways were reflections of that unsatisfactory relationship.

I said earlier that this problem extends far beyond the recognized delinquent. To support that statement, I want to read to you from a report I am sure, Senator, you are intimately familiar with. That is the Kinkead report on the breakdown of morale among our soldiers who were taken prisoners in Korea. This is the U.S. Army report which Kinkead has summarized.

One speaker quoted in that report is Maj. Clarence L. Anderson, a doctor who was himself a prisoner from 1950 to the end of the war and who received the Distinguished Service Cross for rounding up the American wounded at Unsan Battle, for care of them, and for refusing to leave them, though it meant his own capture. I quote from Dr. Anderson:

"It is a sad fact, but it is a fact, that the men who were captured in large groups early in the war often became unmanageable. They refused to obey orders, and they cursed and sometimes struck officers who tried to enforce orders. Naturally, the chaos was encouraged by the Communists, who told the captives immediately after they were taken that rank no longer existed among them—that they were all equal as simple prisoners of war released from capitalist bondage. At first, the badly wounded suffered most. On the marches back from the line to the temporary holding camps, casualties on litters were often callously abandoned beside the road. Able-bodied prisoners refused to carry them, even when their officers commanded

them to do so. If a Communist guard ordered a litter shouldered, our men obeyed; otherwise the wounded were left to die. On the march, in the temporary camps, and in the permanent ones, the strong regularly took food from the weak."

These were American soldiers. These were not delinquents.

"There was no discipline to prevent it. Many men were sick, and these men, instead of being helped and nursed by the others, were ignored, or worse. Dysentery was common, and it made some men too weak to walk. On winter nights, helpless men with dysentery were rolled outside the huts by their comrades, and left to die in the cold."

Mr. Kinkead writes that what struck Major Anderson most forcibly was the almost universal inability of the prisoners to adjust to a primitive situation. "They lacked the old Yankee resourcefulness," he said. "This was partly—but only partly, I believe—the result of the psychic shock of being captured. It was also, I think, the result of some new failure in the childhood and adolescent training of our young men—a new softness."

I read this to emphasize what I am absolutely certain is true, that what we call delinquency is the overt reaction of a limited portion of our youngsters to weaknesses in our society which affect all youngsters, and I think this demonstrates it.

In addition to the loss of the father from the home we have broken down the neighborhood. Scarcely less than the family in its influence on children, the neighborhood has suffered from the effects of industrialization. In fact, the automobile has obliterated the self-contained neighborhood and, by enabling youth on the farm as well as in the cities to seek recreation in the anonymity of distance, has practically ended the neighborhood's control over children's behavior.

This is a worldwide phenomenon. A United Nations report released in 1955 found a frightening increase in juvenile delinquency throughout the world, and stated that there "seems to be a definite relationship between industrialization and juvenile delinquency." A Turkish official visiting the United States in 1954 to study our programs for the control of juvenile delinquency stated that until the recent widespread industrialization of the predominantly village life of his country, Turkey had so little juvenile delinquency that the language had no word for this phenomenon. He told the U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency:

"In the past, the child was protected and guided by the pattern of village life, which was also a kind of family society * * *. Everybody knew everybody else and felt a responsibility for what any child did. With modernization that sense of responsibility broke down."

This is a perfect description of what has happened in American society. Every youngster to some degree is affected by this lack of interest and lack of supervision.

Senator MORSE. May I interrupt to supplement that by saying when I was in India in 1957, I talked to some of the Indian judges and many of the lawyers and observed some of the court proceedings. I was surprised at the number of judges that commented to me about their concern as to what was happening to the youth in India in the big cities.

Now, if there is any society that is based on the village pattern and the neighborhood pattern it is the Indian society and yet they were pointing out how this was breaking down in larger cities, Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay, Madras, and other cities, confronting them with an increase in juvenile delinquency that heretofore had not existed.

And I think you are quite right when you point out this is a worldwide pattern.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Indeed it is, sir.

For many youngsters and for many adults, of course, the neighborhood link is now broken. The neighbor next door is a stranger. Though there are millions more of us than ever before and we live more closely packed together, our children are orphaned from the adult world as never before. They have lost thereby the models for imitation, the masters to teach them an infinite variety of skills, the deep satisfaction of their sense of belonging, and neighborhood control over their behavior.

This seems to me to be a problem of such seriousness, in the light of the whole history of humanity prior to the automobile, that I wonder that there has not been fuller recognition of what the loss of the neighborhood means. You remember the Greek polis, or city, state. That social and political organization explains why Athens was so magnificent a civilization. Every one participated in every aspect of city life through the polis. In this rich and full life children grew up. In our own preautomobile culture, children were constantly under the shadow of adults because of the neighborhood. Today, the neighborhood has largely disappeared. Youngsters are pushed off on their own age group, all immature and inadequate. They are not capable of making wise decisions. Not only do too many of them lack the guidance and control of the father and even of the mother, but they do not have the neighborhood adults—the grocer, the smith, the carpenter, the tavernkeeper, the minister or priest—under whose shadow they can grow up and from whom they can acquire the skills, the ideas, the values which together constitute the culture.

In the destruction of close adult-child relationships, we have broken the major link for the transmission of our culture.

I have time for just one more of the major effects of industrialization on the social structure which contributes to delinquency—there are many others of course—namely the loss of automatic vocational training through daily chores. Electric lights, stoves, and washers, oil and gas furnaces, vacuum cleaners, prepared food, and what not have done away with the daily chores of housekeeping. Nobody is born with skills, nobody is born with a sense of responsibility, these things are learned. But we have taken away the major tool to teach these things, the automatic tool, evolved inevitability, because in order to survive man had to use every tool that was available. Children could perform indispensable chores so they learned skills, habits of work, respect for materials, and self-respect automatically.

I would not agree there is as much delinquency in the rural areas as in the slums, but there is a great deal and it is partly a reflection of this same problem.

In view of such deprivations and frustration of children and their basic needs—and I have cited but a few of many—it is perhaps no wonder that some of our adolescents drift into gangs, break school windows and street lights, race souped-up cars, experiment with liquor, drugs, and mass sex parties, steal, destroy, and even kill. "The more the drive toward life is thwarted, the stronger is the drive toward destruction," writes one psychologist.

And if anybody questions that statement let him look inside himself. Again I say that the recognized delinquent is not someone different from us. He is ourselves subjected to pressures that were greater than those we were subjected to and with less supports than we enjoyed. Furthermore, none of us, no matter how long we live, get wholly rid of the hostility and violence that lie beneath the surface of each of us ready to break out in the violence that fills the headlines every day—violence in connection with strikes, schools, housing, elections, and what not.

Let us not deceive ourselves that the delinquent is someone apart and inferior.

I believe, then, that to understand today's delinquency, we need to understand these two fundamental facts: That every child needs to grow out of delinquent behavior by giving up emotionally; and that industrialization has, without our realizing it, deprived us of several automatic aids to emotional maturing. This permits us to see the problem in perspective, to see that vastly more is involved than getting rid of crime comics, for example, or even of restoring the woodshed.

In the light of this broader perspective, how are we going to reduce delinquency? The traditional approach has been to suggest more services. It has been said to this committee, "let us have demonstration projects."

I strongly believe in more and better services and in demonstration projects. But how can demonstration projects hope to change the attitudes and understandings of all adults and all parents with respect to the needs of the children which they are failing to meet? Demonstration projects, will not do this. It seems to me that at bottom the answer to the delinquency problem—and I wrote this 10 years ago—is education, education first of all of everybody, the elimination of our well-nigh universal psychological illiteracy.

We have understood that youngsters have to grow up physically and mentally, have to be aided to grow up in these ways, that they have to grow up socially and morally and spiritually, though we are forgetting these latter necessities.

But we have never realized that children have to grow up emotionally and that they need aid in this, in the development of self-control through the satisfaction of their basic emotional needs.

It seems to me, leaving aside the spiritual and moral problem which underlies all else and is related to the things I am talking about here, that if we are going to be concerned about doing something constructive and large scale, long range, in the reduction of delinquency, our first responsibility is education to reduce the psychological illiteracy of our people.

How do we go about this staggering task of universal education? The first need is leadership. People that have positions of influence and power have to stand up and tell our people what the score is, what our industrial society is unwittingly doing to harm our youngsters. This has not been said, though the most influential voices in the country should be saying it.

Secondly, of course, the role of the schools in the psychological education of our people is obvious. If we could get our teachers to understand why they themselves behave as they do we would be well on our way. Self-understanding is the only door to understanding of others or to teaching others to understand themselves.

This is why training teachers, particularly those in kindergarten and the early grades, in the ABC's of human motivation and behavior is so urgently needed. This will not be easy; it takes more than words and lectures. This learning is a matter of emotional growth. But words can help a great deal, and if people learn the words, after a while they may suddenly understand what drives them to behave as they do and so what are the needs and motivations of others.

If we can get our teachers to understand something about human behavior then these insights would be more surely transmitted to the new generation than in any other way.

Realistically and in terms of what this committee is interested in and what Con-

gress might do at this time, it seems to me that the education of one particular group offers a tremendous opportunity. I refer, of course, to the many people who work with children in trouble. They are police officers, probation officers, juvenile court judges, county attorneys, institutional staff of all kinds, detention home staff, parole officers, they are welfare workers in many categories, they are visiting nurses. The value, the effectiveness of all these people depends largely upon how well they understand why a youngster gets out of line, why he behaves that way, and consequently what the constructive way of handling him is. Understanding does not mean they are going to change him in every instance, but their chances of contributing to a change in his attitude and behavior will be vastly greater if they have some understanding of his behavior.

These are the people that we can begin with, these are the people that need education most urgently, and for whom training will pay the biggest dividends in the reduction of delinquency.

In 1953, we set up our delinquency control project at the University of Minnesota. In 1956, we launched our training program for police and probation officers working with youngsters. The juvenile officers' institute runs for 10 weeks every summer. It involves 210 hours of classroom work and 10 days of field work. Officers come from all over the State, small departments and big departments; they have come from North Dakota, Wisconsin, Texas, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and North Carolina. We copied our institute from the delinquency control institute at the University of Southern California. I understand there is a third institute at the University of Arizona.

To give you an illustration of what this training can mean, one officer, the only one who wore a uniform, came in with a very belligerent expression. It seemed obvious that he was there to remind us that molly-coddling kids was no answer, telling us, "You have to be tough." After 3 weeks he stopped wearing his uniforms. After 5 weeks he said, "Mr. Ellingston, I begin to get the point and now my problem is to educate my department."

I am talking about the value of practical training in why kids behave as they do, how you control them constructively, how you treat them, how police officers should interview youngsters, how to work with other community agencies to control delinquency and to prevent it, what the legal aspects of the problem are. We also have a course on public speaking because these are the people that have to get up and tell the community, the church groups, the service clubs, the PTA's, how to do this job, what is involved in it.

A year after our officer graduated he wrote us to say:

"I can't begin to tell you how much good the juvenile officers institute did me, not only in my work and with my department, but in my own home, with my children."

He also informed us that when he graduated from the course he went home and called together his neighbors, the parents of the children his children played with, and persuaded them to share with him in supervising leisure time activities for their children.

The parents ran the program as volunteers for 2 years. By that time their project had extended to the whole town so they hired professional staff full time to run it with the continued volunteer help of fathers and mothers.

This illustrates what you can do by giving people of good will some understanding of human behavior, of the problems of children in our society, and of the responsibilities of every adult and every parent in meeting them.

This is where I think our education should begin. It should begin with police officers, with probation and parole agents, institutional personnel and the other frontline staff working with children in trouble.

With respect to probation and parole officers, as late as 10 years ago we had hardly any trained officers in the State. Now the probation departments in Minneapolis and St. Paul are professionally staffed and of high quality, and there are several probation and parole agents who are graduates of schools of social work in the State service. However, the need for probation officers far outruns the supply of social work M.A.'s so we have had to develop other types of training.

In 1955, the Minnesota Legislature set up an interim commission on juvenile delinquency, adult crime, and corrections, of which I happen to be the executive secretary. The commission was continued in 1957 and seems likely to be continued again this year.

As a result of its investigation of the total problem, the commission concluded that sufficient trained probation officers to serve every juvenile court in Minnesota are indispensable to help reduce delinquency. On its recommendation, the legislature despite its economy-mindedness appropriated $671,000 for a statewide probation program. This may be "peanuts" in Washington, but is tremendous to us. The act requires that every new officer hired must have passed the State civil service examination.

This is a tie-in between training and practical application. The State is authorized to hire 15 new probation-parole agents I and 7 agents II or supervisors. It seems likely that 10 of the new parole agents I will attend the juvenile officers institute for training this summer. If they do, they will go out on the job with a good deal more skill and understanding than they would otherwise have.

Senator MORSE. I am familiar with those two pamphlets to which you have referred and without objection I would like to have them filed with the committee, not part of the record, but as exhibits for our file so they will be available for us in executive committee discussions.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. What we would like to do at the university in connection with this Juvenile Officers Institute—and we could run this without Ford Foundation aid; the Ford people came out in 1957, paid half the costs, now they pay the total cost of that program because they think it valuable—is to include not only probation and parole agents with the police officers, but also juvenile court judges and county attorneys. No judge would need a 10-week course, but we believe they could use 2 weeks very intensive training at the university on behavior, on court operations, on relations with other agencies, etc.

We should like also to train welfare workers who around the State have inevitably to do with delinquent children. Very few of them have social work M.A.'s. We can give them training in several weeks which would make them a lot more efficient and more valuable than they are.

This seems to be the fruitful approach to help to meet this immense social problem that affects all children. Incidentally, I would like to make one point: Service by itself is not worth a hoot. You cannot do anything for anybody. The only thing of value is to help others to do something for themselves, to help them solve their own problems.

We have to get away from this concept of just pouring out services as such. We have to find ways of revitalizing neighborhoods, the plain citizens are helped and guided into serving their own kids and the neighborhood kids and in so doing suddenly discover that theirs is a neighborhood and they have revitalized the values that have been lost through industrialization.

So this type of training that I am talking of in relation to the Juvenile Officers Institute seems to me to be the crucial type of training. Sure, we have to have professionals and qualified people to do demonstration projects, but it is vastly more important to have every police department have somebody with training to handle little Johnny around the corner. So with the probation officer and the institutional people who have practically no training, these are the people we have to start with. Then demonstration projects are perfectly sound.

For 13 years I was in charge of the youth authority program for the American Law Institute. We set it up in California and many other States and here in the Federal Government, and I think it is a very good thing. But the longer I worked on that project, the more doubtful I became of the wisdom of setting up youth authorities without personnel. They were not available.

What is the good of a project, sound as it may be, unless you have people that can administer it?

We are not going to get M.A.'s, we do not want M.A.'s for many of these positions. An M.A. as a cottage parent in a training school is a waste of time and would probably have the wrong approach. The cottage parent should have understanding of himself and therefore of the children, of how to handle the kids. Some people cannot learn that if they live to be a hundred, but the great majority can. This we have discovered in practical work. This is where training should begin, and I do not think that anything else that the Government could do would be worth 10 cents if it fails to help provide the people who can do these jobs. May I say that Federal aid for demonstration projects alone will make so little impact on the immense problem that it may foreclose future Federal action to aid training of personnel. The tendency may be to say that Federal funds are wasted in the effort to control delinquency.

A demonstration, presumably, is of a program that you want adopted all through your State. If it is going to be so adopted there have to be people locally who understand the problem and who can be taught to administer the demonstrated project.

There is no slick answer, there is no short cut, there is no demonstration that is going to find the total answer to this universal social problem. Therefore, the thing to do is to get across to the greatest possible number of people working daily with children, the basic understandings of antisocial behavior and how to change it.

I am all for demonstration projects, provided I know what the demonstration projects are. It is very easy to say, "Here is some Federal money and would it not be nice if we had this little project." And a lot of professional people get together and cook up something of interest to them but which doesn't contribute much of anything to help a community reduce delinquency.

To select projects wisely, I believe we have to understand the nature of this problem and its cause, then we can decide how well the project hits at the core of the problem. We have to have perspective.

Thirdly, as Judge Long quite rightly pointed out, no State has enough essential services—police, probation, and the rest, to work with children who are already delinquent, to say nothing of effective preventive services. Ongoing projects everywhere need aid. Also they need trained staff. A new probation service is set up. Someone says, "Well, now, we have a probation department and the situation is just as bad as it was before we had that probation office." Why? The probation officer is an ex-deputy sheriff and does not know the first thing about the problem. This sets back the whole concept of treatment. There has to be education.

Senator MORSE. I have these two questions I would like to ask, based upon our earlier conversation this morning.

Earlier this morning Senator CLARK raised the point in regard to how much, after all, should the States do about these matters, and I think we shared the point of view that the States should do all they possibly can.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Pushed to the very limit; yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Is it your opinion that the Federal Government also has a share of responsibility in regard to facing this problem?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Sir, it seems to me as I have tried to analyze it, that this is really the No. 1 national problem, more so than the atomic bomb. Despite all the platitudinous repetition, our youngsters are our future, and the only way we can be destroyed is from inside. This Korean story indicates there are grave weaknesses in our social structure. The Federal Government has got to move into this field. Weaknesses in the social structure affect every youngster, so you move on delinquency in a broad attack because it helps control and improve institutions and situations from which all youngsters suffer.

Senator MORSE. Just roughly, what would be your division of funds in the hypothetical situation that Senator CLARK put this morning? Out of $5 million of Federal money, we will say that might be made available, how much of it would you spend for training and how much would you spend for research?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Sir, I would answer that very much as Judge Long did, that at the very minimum there should be 4 to 1; there should be a minimum of $4 million for the type of training I am talking about, not demonstration projects, but pushing universities to do those things. I would personally see the whole $5 million there, but there is real value to demonstration projects properly done and related to training, so 4 to 1 at the very minimum. There should be at least $4 million for training out of $5 million.

Senator MORSE. Having heard your entire testimony, I want to thank you very much for what I think will prove to be, along with Judge Long's testimony this morning, a very, very valuable contribution to our executive discussions.

Senator CLARK. First, let me address my expression of thanks to you, Senator MORSE, for being chairman while I was called to two other committee meetings.

I have leafed through your testimony and heard the last part of it, Mr. Ellingston. I would like to share the commendation which Senator MORSE has given you for being an extremely helpful and useful witness.

I have a few specific questions I would like to ask you which I do not think will detain you long.

I note with interest the statistics which you cite in the first part of your prepared statement and they tend to agree with some testimony which I thought was shocking, and perhaps inaccurate, when given from the representative of Big Brothers Association at a hearing last week.

It was then testified that approximately 20 percent of the male population of this country would have been arrested by the time they are 18. That seemed to me to be a highly extravagant statement, but as I look at the figures in your statement, it seems to me maybe they are right.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Would have been arrested?

Senator CLARK. Would have been arrested by the time they reach their 18th birthday.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Of course, if you include traffic, surely. And I would guess that—California, of course, has a very difficult problem, as you know.

This is the production of our industrialization and mobility. It is all focused in California, so their situation is without question more difficult than that of any other State.

Senator CLARK. I am happy to hear it intimated that young Californians are worse than young Pennsylvanians.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I do not think they are. I think the situation there may be one which would push the young Californian into an obvious position which the young Pennsylvanian might be in without being recognized.

Senator CLARK. In a lighter vein, you do not have any figures on Texas?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. The famous Porterfield study on Texas college students—you are familiar with that?

Senator CLARK. No; I am not.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. While I do not have the figures at hand, the study was made of some 300 college students in Texas. Taking the offenses for which youngsters in juvenile court in this particular city had been arraigned that year, everything up to homicide, the study found that every college student had been guilty of some of the offenses for which kids were in juvenile court at some time in their career, including homicide. Every college student that was included in this category had been involved in 1, and some even as many as 10, of these offenses for which kids were in juvenile court.

Senator CLARK. I would like your comment on the statistic which encourages so many people, and had encouraged me until we had these hearings—that the overwhelming proportion of our youth are fine and upstanding boys and girls and that no more than 2 or 3 percent of the total of our youth are problems in the delinquency area. This, I suppose, is a little deceptive, is it not?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Yes, indeed. Figures for juvenile court appear——

Senator CLARK. Let me rephrase that. Referring to your prepared statement, I wonder if you could reconcile the figures to the effect that 2.35 out of every 100 children in 1957 appeared before juvenile courts with the statements which I referred to earlier that the percentage of delinquency among our youth is far higher than that statistic standing by itself would indicate.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Sir, it is understood, of course, that the youngster gets to juvenile court usually only after he has been in very serious behavior or repeated behavior in most instances. There are exceptions.

So that 2.35 of all our youngsters in this age group in juvenile court reflects a vastly larger number of youngsters who have been arrested or not arrested. For example, a youngster in school steals money. A good visiting teacher will try to work this out, not with the police but with the family and the child, so you get a vastly greater proportion of youngsters involved in the behavior for which only some youngsters are arrested.

Senator CLARK. Not only that but these figures are not cumulative, just year by year, and any one individual might not have come before the court in one year and might the next.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. A study was made by Peter Lejins, at the University of Maryland, and his findings were that instead of 2 or 3 percent having juvenile court appearances, it ran up to 8 or 9 percent of a particular age group, considering the total period for which they were eligible for juvenile court hearings.

Senator CLARK. Let me shift to another subject—that is, to get your opinion unless you have already expressed it. If you have, say so, and I will read it in the record, as to whether any Federal legislation should require matching funds from (a) the State, or (b) the local unit of government, or (c) the private institution, as a condition for grant.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Sir, I have not been asked that question. Initially I would say "No," provided the aids are carefully granted with this perspective of the problem in mind. I think that there are several universities which could develop a program such as Minnesota's, but which could not get a penny from their State legislatures until they had demonstrated the soundness and value of the project. If the Federal Government would make it possible for 3 or 4 years to operate a police officers' training school, for example, then the local people might take over. I think this has happened in our State. I think this year we could have gotten money for the J.O.I. because of its success over the last few years. We could not have in 1955.

Senator CLARK. How about the suggestion that your university, for example, could obtain the matching funds from a foundation grant. You said you had Ford Foundation money. If we could make the Federal Government money go twice as far, this would be desirable.

The argument has been made that you cannot expect the legislatures to put up the money. On the other hand, in an allied field of urban renewal, we have been able to find localities to put up some of the money. Perhaps this would be true for some of the larger cities if you acquired a grant—money from them as well as from the Federal Government. What is your opinion on that?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I am convinced there should be a minimum amount of handout—localities should do the job as much as possible. I believe, in some areas Federal aid might be based on matching funds, but I believe in other areas and other projects you would not get the project launched unless you prove its soundness.

Let me give you an illustration of what I mean: In Wisconsin in the 1930's there were no such personnel as county social workers, so the Federal Government provided funds which made it possible to send a trained social worker to one of the rural counties in Wisconsin. The county supervisors said, "Nuts, this is free; we will let her stay as long as the Federal money lasts." Then the social worker turned up a family of 12 living in a one-room hut in a dirt cellar, both sexes sleeping in rags on the floor. People had known this family was in trouble, but a little publicity like this and the county commissioners said, "We need this sort of help." So they hired the worker permanently. But had you said to the county, "We will pay half of the social worker's salary if you pay half," you would not have gotten to first base.

Senator CLARK. I am pursuing the subject because Senator MORSE and I, and our colleagues on this committee, are going to be met on the floor of the Senate, if not in committee itself, witn the claim that localities and States are loafing on the job, that localities and States will say the thing is to lie down too, and get the Federal Government to pick up the tab; that we, in Congress, should not encourage this trend, but force the States and localities to pay their share.

Then at that point you get into the old argument as to whether the Federal system of taxation is progressing or regressing. You find there are a number of local areas that are not progressing as they should, but you find a number that cannot do what they should. And this is true in areas of my Commonwealth.

We have so much chronic unemployment in some local districts, that they are pretty much exhausted and in other ends of the State we have richer areas that are doing well, but could do better.

We have some kind of State equalization program but it is not as effective as it should be.

I do not know that what I said calls for any comment from you, but maybe you want to say a word.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. With respect, for example, to the training program in which I am par-

ticularly interested, would it be feasible for the Federal Government to launch a university project such as ours if it thought this makes sense, and guarantee it for 3 to 5 years with a definite understanding at the end of that time Federal aid is going to stop? If you had a really successful program, public support would insure that the local legislature would step in. This may not be realistic, but it is a way of getting more programs than you are going to get if you depend on matching funds.

Then, is it possible for the Federal Government to make grants varied by States and projects—by State and community with respect to local or State participation? Could the Federal Government give a hundred percent to one area which might be a distress area and 50 percent to another for a comparable project?

Senator CLARK. These are interesting suggestions which I think we would want to consider, and I would not want to make a categorical answer at this time. But thank you very much for the thought.

Now, to move to another area, I gather that you agree with Judge Long that training should have the first priority; and perhaps you spelled out to the extent you think desirable the kind of training you have in mind.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I hope I did, sir.

Senator CLARK. I would not go further on that.

Now, you have mentioned the Youth Conservation Corps and that legislation is not before this subcommittee. It is, however, pending and I am on that subcommittee, although not the chairman of it.

We are looking forward to marking up the bill tomorrow, and then it will come before the full committee where Senator MORSE and I both serve.

I am wondering how you would react to this dilemma which confronts us over there: There is an apparent conflict between the thought of conservation and bringing youth into a conservation corps which will improve our national forests and forests, our State lands and the like, give an opportunity to young people who have perhaps been unable to seek employment; to get a job during the summer, perhaps, or, if they are out of school and have no job, to get a job the year round. That is one objection.

The other is to have a definite emphasis on taking young people with records of delinquency into the corps and to make it primarily a welfare project as distinguished from a conservation project.

Then the question arises, Can you do both within the same system? I would like your thinking on that.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Sir, I would be heartily and flatfootedly against a separate facility for so-called delinquent kids. I keep trying to get across that delinquent kids are no different from your kids and mine; that the CCC had plenty of youngsters who had gotten into trouble because they did not have a penny in their pockets, and they did splendidly. They were not sent there as delinquents; they were kids who needed jobs. These are the kids who are hurt worst, the fringe kids, the 16- or 17-year-old who does not have any special skill—the school dropout.

We had, as I pointed out in this statement, 14,000 Minnesota youngsters under 20 looking for jobs and without work last March. A lot of those kids are in trouble, or will be in trouble, because they do not have jobs. I would not send them up there as delinquents. I would give these kids the thing they most need—a job of work.

Senator CLARK. If you were in charge of re-creating policies for a youth conservation corps, what would be the basic principles on which you would re-create membership in the corps?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. First, need for work—the fact that he cannot get jobs elsewhere. Two, his physical condition; he has to be able to do this kind of work. And, three, in terms of his behavior, if he had been a homosexual or a murderer, or something of that sort—sure I would say he is not for a conservation camp. But if he had been a burglar or thief or gotten into trouble related to the fact that he was on the loose and had no job, I would make no bones about taking him. I would not want it to be an institution for delinquents, but I would not keep the youngster out just because he had been in trouble; and I would want other kids that did not have any record.

Senator CLARK. On this I would agree and I think everybody else would, too. You come down to this problem of legislation. Is it desirable to try to spell out in the act, principles, standards, percentages, or should it be just left to the recruiting agent for each particular camp or each particular project to try to strike an appropriate and happy medium in terms of the local need, or is there a point at which you get so high a percentage of delinquents in the group that you prejudice the success and future of the other members of the group, so that in a sense Gresham's law takes over?

This is something I have had considerable experience with, myself in connection with integrated housing and this is perhaps a sad comment to make, but you can successfully integrate housing projects in my experience if the percentage of minority groups in any particular project is held somewhere between the 35- to 50-percent level. If you get above that, it would not work because nobody else will go into the project.

Now, this is perhaps un-American, it is perhaps unjust, but it is there and you have to deal with it. How would you comment on that?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I would—speaking off the cuff, sir, without having given it due thought, of course—I would hesitate to have a bill spell out that no more than x percent shall have delinquency records. I would want to have it set up for the double purpose for providing indispensable employment of the most valuable kind to youngsters who do not have it, and to do the conservation work that goes with it. I would hope that any intelligent administrative agency would have discussion with Members of the Congress who are most interested, would work out an intelligent set of recruiting principles and procedures. Anybody administering one of these programs does not want it to fail, and some people would say we do not want anybody with a record. This is precisely what I hope would not be permitted.

Senator CLARK. It might in your judgment be desirable to write such a prohibition into the act, or not?

Mr. ELLINGSTON. I would think not. I am sure that the CCC legislation did not spell out standards with respect to the delinquents.

Senator CLARK. No; it did not but in those days we were not as aware of delinquency problems as we are today.

Mr. ELLINGSTON. Senator CLARK, this winter the Minnesota Legislature set up two emergency committees because the problem of employment in our States for the youngster is so serious, a House and a Senate committee, and I would like to turn over a report on them to you.

Senator CLARK. They may be filed with the record, for the information of the committee but not incorporated in the record.

(The report was retained in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. ELLINGSTON. These committees dealt with this very problem. We had a meeting of the committee members and public officials and others concerned about unemployment for youth. The question of admitting boys with a record to CCC camps came up. One participant asked, "Would you want your children to be in the camp with delinquent kids?" I suppose the answer would be to cite the Porterfield Study referred to above.

What is delinquency and who are delinquents? You do not want a homosexual or a murderer in a camp with your boy, but he is very likely not to be very different from the boy who has been caught for car theft or burglary or malicious mischief.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much, Professor.

Senator MORSE, do you have any further questions?

Senator MORSE. No.

Senator CLARK. Thank you very much.

Judge Long, thank you very much.

Your testimony has been most interesting and helpful.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the full committee I was unable to prevail and became thereby a dissenting member when the vote came to report the bill. My views are set forth as minority views in the committee report which accompanies the bill.

Mr. President, because so many of the arguments I would otherwise make this afternoon I have already made in my dissenting views, I ask unanimous consent that my minority views may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my speech.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

In consideration of S. 694, both at the hearings, and during executive session, I had been most hopeful that the bill would provide a well-rounded program which would like up to the promise of the bill's purpose, to provide the beginnings of a solution to the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

The bill as reported, however, authorizes the expenditure of $5 million, not for the important purpose of training personnel so urgently needed, but for demonstration and study projects, together with the publication of materials for those interested in this field. I will, of course, concede that the bill as reported represents a step in the direction of Federal leadership that must be taken in coping with a national problem of ever-growing dimensions. I think, however, that the testimony of the witnesses, the experience of the Congress itself, and the realities of what is happening in many localities in the country, strongly demonstrate that the bill does something for what is less urgent, and does nothing for the exceedingly important problem of training.

In the 84th Congress, the Senate passed the Lehman bill, which would have provided the kind of program which I advocate. In Senate Report No. 61 of the 84th Congress at page 103 is the following quotation:

"The training of greater numbers of qualified personnel to staff prevention and treatment agencies means both expanding certain training programs and the launching of new ones. Schools of social work, law schools, sociology, and psychology departments, all provide training which partially prepares people for work in the delinquency field. Almost without exception, however, the training offered needs to be supplemented in terms of content and, in some instances, in methodology to qualify personnel for certain functions within the field.

"For still other positions such as that of institutional house parents or, in the vast majority of States, of juvenile police officers, there are no resources for training. Many institutions and police departments attempt to provide some on-the-job training and orientation, and although such training is valuable, it is no substitute for the intensive

and comprehensive training needed for persons charged with the crucial task of protecting and rehabilitating children in trouble.

"To remove the bottleneck to improving the Nation's attack upon juvenile delinquency imposed by the lack of trained and qualified personnel to man its defenses, the subcommittee recommends the establishment of a program to be administered by the Children's Bureau under which grants would be made to States, selected educational institutions, and students to extend, establish, and further the training of personnel for work in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency."

I think this excerpt speaks for itself, and is as true today as it was then.

At the hearings, nearly all of the witnesses made reference to the fact that there was a serious need for trained personnel. While projects will be helpful, it will require trained people to man such projects. On the last day of the hearings the committee was honored by two witnesses who had special qualifications in the field of juvenile delinquency. The first was the Honorable Donald E. Long, presiding judge of the court of domestic relations and juvenile court in Portland, Oreg., and a man whose public service demonstrates his authority to speak on this problem. Judge Long made the following statements:

"In my opinion the training provision in the Green bill and in the other Senate bills is much more important than the provisions of providing for development of techniques and demonstrations. We have a severe lack of qualified personnel in the United States dealing with these problems. We need to do something about the need. If I had my way and had $5 million a year, to be realistic I would spend $4 million in training and I would spend $1 million in developing of techniques and demonstration."

The second of these eminent experts was John R. Ellingston, professor of criminal law administration at the University of Minnesota and director of the training program in delinquency control at that university. Professor Ellingston has been most active throughout the country in his field. He made the point that after teaching parents and teachers about the whys of children's behavior "there is another large group of people whose need for education in human motivation and behavior is immediate and urgent and who, once educated, can provide a leaven to spread understanding throughout our society. I mean all those jobs in one way or another give them control over delinquent children—policemen, probation officers, judges, county training school staffs, parole agents, visiting nurses. Since most chronic delinquency and other maladjustment stems from a failure in person-to-person relationships, treatment and rehabilitation has to be a function of person-to-person relationships. People are all important in rehabilitation. Consequently, the selection and training of all personnel who deal with delinquent children becomes indispensable to rehabilitation and prevention. Only as each of them gets understanding of themselves and of the forces that make them behave as they do are they likely to be effective in changing the attitudes and behavior of delinquent children. This is the group with which education in the dynamics of human behavior must begin. To stimulate and facilitate the teaching of this group seems to me to offer the greatest opportunity in this area to the Congress."

I asked Professor Ellingston if he had the $5 million contemplated by this bill how he would spend it. His answer was as follows:

"Sir, I would answer that very much as Judge Long did, that at the very minimum there should be 4 to 1; there should be a minimum of $4 million for the type of training I am talking about, not demonstration projects, but pushing universities to do those things. I would personally see the whole $5 million there, but there is real value to demonstration projects properly done and related to training, so 4 to 1 at the very minimum. There should be at least $4 million for training out of $5 million."

On April 18, 1959, the advisory council of judges to the National Probation and Parole Association held its meeting in New Orleans. The several bills before the Congress were on the agenda for study and discussion by the council. This discussion brought out the unanimous opinions that the two greatest needs for Federal assistance are for training of personnel and for research. It was, however, the unanimous vote of those in attendance that the training of personnel was the most preferable and, therefore, should have priority. The 16 judges who participated in this discussion included the following top authorities in the juvenile field:

Paul W. Alexander (chairman), division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Toledo, Ohio.

Walter H. Beckhan, juvenile and domestic relations court, Miami, Fla.

Charles O. Betts, district court, county courthouse, Austin, Tex.

Leo B. Blessing, juvenile court, parish of Orleans, New Orleans, La.

John J. Connelly, Boston juvenile court, Boston, Mass.

Harold N. Fields, Marion County juvenile court, Indianapolis, Ind.

Thomas D. Gill, juvenile court for the State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

Theodore B. Knudson, district court of Minnesota, family court division, Minneapolis, Minn.

Donald E. Long, circuit court of Oregon, courthouse, Portland, Oreg.

William B. McKesson, district attorney, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Frank W. Nicholas, division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Dayton, Ohio.

Donald A. Odell, juvenile court, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Monroe J. Paxman, juvenile court, Provo, Utah.

Joe W. Sanders, family court for the parish of East Baton Rouge, Baton Rouge, La.

W. W. Woolfolk, Fulton County juvenile court, Atlanta, Ga.

Victor B. Wylegala, Erie County children's court, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dorothy Young, juvenile court of Tulsa County, Tulsa, Okla.

I have examined the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Education and Labor in the House of Representatives held during March of 1959. These hearings also effectively demonstrate the need of training. I consider that the points made by the questioning of Congresswoman EDITH GREEN during those hearings are irrefutable. In many counties in the United States with serious juvenile delinquency problems, there is not a single parole officer, policeman, or social worker with knowledge or training in the juvenile delinquency field, and most States have no training facilities whatsoever in this field.

I think one point needs to be made so that the reason for my dissent is clear; if it were true, as my colleagues in favor of the bill believe, that this bill was a beginning of Federal leadership, I would vote in favor of the bill even though it was not everything I believed necessary. But I do not think this is a beginning; I think instead that passing this bill will lull the public into a false sense of believing that the Federal Government will have accomplished something, when in fact the need for training will be left to an uncertain future.

For these reasons, briefly set forth, I, therefore, find myself unable in good conscience to support a program for which the necessary foundation is being neglected.

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these views support my amendment, which is drawn in substantially the same language as that found in the bill reported by the subcommittee. I am pleased to support the amendment.

Mr. President, I again congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for their decision to recommend to the Senate at this time the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

I listened with great interest this afternoon to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] when he discussed the matter of Federal participation in the program.

I desire to make two points, Mr. President.

First, this is an aid program. It is really a pilot project program. This is a program of assistance to the States and to the municipalities. This is not a program which by the broadest stretch of the imagination entails any plans by the Federal Government to take over the juvenile delinquency problems of the country. However, it is a program whereby the Federal Government will step in, project by project as approved by the council which is to be set up under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to consider specific training project proposals which will come to the council from the various States or municipalities. It is a program designed to assist in demonstrating to the rest of the country the kind of training program which ought to be developed at the local level so as to provide the trained personnel necessary to prevent juvenile crime, in the first place, and to rehabilitate the wayward, in the second place. We need to keep that in mind. It is consistent with a good many of our Federal assistance or aid programs.

Second, I wish to point out, as the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] indicated, that there is a Federal responsibility in this field. However, until we pursue a study of the types of crimes which are committed by juvenile delinquents we cannot fully understand the extent to which there is a Federal interest, because much of their malbehavior takes the form of violations of Federal law. Some of these are the most heinous of crimes committed by youngsters, and the Federal Government does have a jurisdiction or responsibility in connection with them.

Therefore, I think a responsibility to assist the States and the municipalities with the kind of a pilot project program to which I referred does exist.

Mr. President, I was very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] said in respect to his views as to Ohio's interests, for example. I should like to invite attention to the fact that on April 18, 1959, the advisory council of judges to the National Probation and Parole Association held its meeting in New Orleans. The several bills before the Congress were on the agenda for study and discussion by the council. This discussion brought out the unanimous opinions that the two greatest needs for Federal assistance are for

training of personnel and for research. It was, however, the unanimous vote of those in attendance that the training of personnel was the most preferable and, therefore, should have priority.

The 16 judges who participated in this discussion included the top authorities in the juvenile field in America I shall mention. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio take note of the fact that Paul W. Alexander was the chairman of this group. He is the judge of the Division of Domestic Relations and Juvenile Court, Court of Common Pleas, Toledo, Ohio. The chairman of this group of distinguished judges of America, which held this conference and submitted a unanimous recommendation that the training program should be given priority, was a distinguished judge from the State of Ohio. Among those who participated was Walter H. Beckham, juvenile and domestic relations court, Miami, Fla.

I shall read the names of others, because Senators will find among them a good many southern judges, who recognize the national responsibility, the Federal responsibility, in this field. These judges made a unanimous recommendation that a training program should be given priority.

Charles O. Betts, district court, county courthouse, Austin, Tex.

Leo B. Blessing, juvenile court, parish of Orleans, New Orleans, La.

John J. Connelly, Boston juvenile court, Boston, Mass.

Harold N. Fields, Marion County juvenile court, Indianapolis, Ind.

Thomas D. Gill, Juvenile Court for the State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

Theodore B. Knudson, District Court of Minnesota, family court division, Minneapolis, Minn.

Donald E. Long, Circuit Court of Oregon, Courthouse, Portland, Oreg.

William B. McKesson, district attorney, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Frank W. Nicholas, division of domestic relations and juvenile court, court of common pleas, Dayton, Ohio.

That is a second Ohio judge who concurred in the recommendation in support of giving priority consideration to a training program.

Donald A. Odell, juvenile court, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

Monroe J. Paxman, juvenile court, Provo, Utah.

Joe W. Sanders, family court for the parish of East Baton Rouge, Baton Rouge, La.

W. W. Woolfolk, Fulton County juvenile court, Atlanta, Ga.

Victor B. Wylegala, Erie County children's court, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dorothy Young, juvenile court of Tulsa County, Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in reading the list of judges, read the name of Judge Charles O. Betts, district court county courthouse, Austin, Tex.

Under the laws of our State and of that county the district judges are automatically members of the juvenile court of that county. I was once associated very closely with Judge Betts in a governmental activity there. I was once a district judge of that county and a member of the juvenile court.

Since Judge Betts' name was read, I wish to pay tribute to his fine judicial ability and to his great interest in the problem of juvenile delinquency. Judge Betts spent over 12 years of work and effort on that problem. He has put forth great energy and research in regard to it. He is one of the dedicated and devoted men of our area. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for mentioning Judge Betts' name in this connection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas very much for the contribution he has made to my discussion. The Senator has pointed up a fact which I wish to reemphasize; namely, I have presented to the Senate, in this list of juvenile judges, a group from the South, from the North, from the East, and from the West—from all sections of our country—who are recognized as experts in this field, as persons who are highly qualified by professional training, experience, and knowledge to make a recommendation to the people of the country as to the steps which should be taken at least to try to alleviate the very serious juvenile crime problem which confronts us.

As a lawyer by training, I know the importance of following where the experts lead. When the experts can substantiate their findings and their recommendations by a reference to the evidence and to the facts, they should be followed. One only has to take a look at the records of our hearings, one only has to look at the voluminous writings in the field of juvenile delinquency, to know that the experts are correct. Therefore, it seems to me that the Senate of the United States should let the facts prevail when it acts on the amendment. The facts are on the side of the amendment.

I make one last point, Mr. President. We have an obligation to the children and to the parents of the children and to the rest of our citizenry who are affected by their misbehavior, to do what we can cooperatively with the States and the municipalities to try to find ways of solving the serious problem of juvenile delinquency which confronts us.

Mr. President, the argument I now make has some weakness, and I offer it only because I think it also has some application.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that there is a relatively small amount of money proposed in the bill by way of Federal assistance to the States and to the municipalities in a program of juvenile delinquency control. A total of $5 million is provided, and only a part of it is to be spent for a training program under the amendment. But let the record be clear, that under the foreign aid program we are appropriating for several countries much more than this sum, by way of assistance to those countries in solving their social problems and their problems of crime control.

I think the American people have a right to ask the Congress of the United States the question, "Do we not also have an obligation to come to the assistance of our own people with at least this relatively small amount of money?"

This money will be used to set up what I call the pilot plant training programs in the field of juvenile delinquency, which will be of great assistance to the States and to the municipalities in subsequently developing their own programs for the training of personnel necessary to handle their juvenile delinquency problems. It is a sound amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania a question. First, I desire to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his able presentation of the pending amendment, and to concur in the recommendation which he makes, that training be included in the bill. Let me inquire whether or not it is too late for my name to be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is the author of the amendment. I suppose it is too late to have the Senator's name printed on the amendment, but it is not too late for the record to be perfectly clear that this very worthwhile assistance from Texas is coming to the cosponsors of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Texas may be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania for permitting me to join in sponsoring his amendment. I think it is one of the most important and worthwhile amendments I have heard at this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what the pending bill does is first to establish a Federal policy. When we establish a Federal policy, it means "from here on out." I once saw a fellow in the calaboose in my town. It was a warm day, and the doors were open, with the exception of the bars. He saw me striding by, and he said, "Hi." I said, "Hi; how are you? What are you in here for?" He said, "I don't know."

I said, "How long are you in there for?" He said, "From now on."

If we venture into this field, we shall be there from now on, because very definitely the language of the bill would establish a Federal policy.

There is a finding stated in the bill:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that juvenile delinquency diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation.

Then we find the following:

The policy of the Federal Government shall be to assist in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

It does not say the policy for today or tomorrow. It does not say the policy for a year or 5 years. It says:

The policy of the Federal Government shall be to assist in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Anyone who has had experience in this field knows that when this venture is made, it will snowball, as all such programs do, and it will be here from now on.

Secondly, this is a 5-year program. It would call for not to exceed $5 million a year, or a total of $25 million; and there is no question in my mind that the $25 million would be expended, even though the language is "not to exceed $5 million, as Congress shall determine."

Then the purposes of the program are stated—first, to develop improved methods; second, training techniques; third, prevention, control, and treatment; fourth, grants or contracts.

Such grants or contracts may be made to States or cities, public and private nonprofit agencies, schools, and so forth. The only matching provision is to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate. The Secretary may not require any matching at all in connection with a program of this kind, or he may require matching in part. So this could be a completely Federal program if the States were rather reluctant and refused to advance any money for this purpose.

Finally, the bill would establish a council of 12 to pass on projects, and also initiate projects. So the advisory council of 12 would not only approve projects, but it could come forward with projects of its own.

I am free to admit that juvenile delinquency is a problem. There has been testimony on that point before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and we have had testimony before a Judiciary Subcommittee for the past 6 years. That committee is still being continued. At present there is pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration a request for $150,000 for a continuation of the work of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary.

It seems to me that this whole business is frightfully vague, and certainly amorphous. If I must adduce any testimony, I take it from the committee report. One of the witnesses was Clifford J. Campbell, representing the American Municipal Association. The majority report quotes him, and I read the quotation into the RECORD, as follows:

We believe there are untapped resources of ingenuity deserving encouragement, as do many already pioneered innovations.

That is very fine language, but frightfully vague.

Mr. Campbell continues:

We believe they merit not only encouragement but close examination, careful testing, and evaluation, from which process we may confidently expect emergence of fruitful results deserving of dissemination and emulation.

That sounds very beautiful, but it is still in the domain of vagueness.

Mr. Campbell continues:

Thus we believe the Federal Government can, by such a step as Senate bill 694 contemplates, help add to the arsenal of all cities and local communities tried and tested weapons for the war against juvenile crime, which is, even more importantly, a battle for salvation of souls and minds and bodies of our young people, our most priceless national resource.

No one can quarrel with that. They are the priceless resources of our country, and they should be conserved. But our problem is how effectively to conserve them, without establishing another policy or another program of such far-reaching dimensions that, in due course, from it will spring another flowering bureaucracy, which must extend its functions, its duties, and its authority from the Nation's Capital into the 50 States and their respective communities.

If I need cite further testimony on this subject, I refer to the majority report again. Among the witnesses was Mr. Ralph Whelan, commissioner of youth services, New York City, and a board member of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. This is what Mr. Whelan said:

We have come a long way in developing skills for working with children, families, and communities who recognize their problems, who seek help and are willing to participate in planning for themselves. I must reiterate the fact, however, that we know too little at this point in relation to what kind of skills and training are necessary to meet the needs of those who present the most serious problems in the community in relation to delinquency and crime among youth, and yet do not seek help on a voluntary basis.

I think that is very fine. I can subscribe to that rather wonderful philosophic sentiment, but here, of course, we are dealing with methods. The question is, Should we go back to the communities where this problem really exists, rather than establish another institution of Government that will snowball and grow?

The majority report is candid enough to put its finger upon the real case for juvenile delinquency, as to methods and locale, and where the effective job must be done. On page 4 of the report there is this very succinct summation of what I think is the approach:

The front line of defense in meeting the problem of juvenile delinquency is the local community, for troubled youth must be reached in person—in their homes, their churches, their schools.

That is the heart of the problem. This is a personal problem. We are dealing with flesh and blood, and we must deal with it at the grassroots level, in the homes, in the churches, and in the schools.

Now comes a proposal that the long arm of the Federal Government reach in, ostensibly with money, for a 5-year period, but with studies, and the annexation of experts in order to develop a program, if they can. That looks pretty much like a fishing expedition.

However, I make the point that a 5-year fishing expedition for techniques, at a cost of not to exceed $25 million, which will snowball and become a part of Federal policy, and from here on will become at once a very expensive venture and a very expensive expedition for what it is likely to accomplish.

I make the further point that of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee—some 20 in number—15 were from 9 States. What about the other States? Were they not interested? Were they not sufficiently interested to send representatives here to testify on juvenile delinquency problems? Have they solved them at their own level? Have they done the job in that field? Where were they? Five of the witnesses came from the State of New York?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator should bear in mind, however, that some of the witnesses, represented large groups of experts in this field, from various juvenile delinquency associations and crime commissions and State organizations which have worked for years and years in this case. So, Mr. President, while I agree with the Senator on his statistics, I should say that the statistics are subject to the interpretation that I now state and to the application which I suggest; namely, that those witnesses represented a large body of opinion in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I am quite sensible of that fact. However, I say that the States themselves, through their own spokesmen, if they had that kind of interest, would have had someone appear before the subcommittee. The fact is that 15 of the 20 witnesses came from 9 States. I am content to let the figures stand and speak for themselves, because in my judgment they are quite eloquent.

I make another point. The bill contains no allocation of funds. To be sure, the amendment which was approved a short time ago divides the fund in half, as between projects and training. However, what I say about the allocation of funds is that all the funds are to be expended within the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He can put as much in one State as he likes, and as much or as little in another State as he likes. Normally and in nearly every case where projects of this kind are authorized, there is always some kind of formula for allocation, some kind of guarantee that there will be a fair and equitable distribution of funds. Such a provision does not appear in this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator from Illinois means to imply that the decision will be made entirely by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, acting without reference to

anyone else. The procedure will provide for the establishment of a council.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that.

Mr. MORSE. The council will be very representative of the workers in this field. Projects will be presented to the council, and the council will make recommendations. I believe we can take judicial notice of the fact that no Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will act in a vacuum. He will clearly follow the recommendations of the council.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no inhibition on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare contained in the bill as to whether he has the authority to make an allocation, because the language in the very first title of the bill states:

> The Secretary may make such grants to States and municipalities and to other public and private nonprofit agencies, including institutions of higher learning and research.

It requires no matching. It merely refers to "grant recipient" and provides:

> The Secretary shall require each grant recipient to contribute money, facilities, or services to the extent the Secretary deems appropriate.

The Secretary may deem that no grant of money is appropriate, that no matching and no supplying of facilities are appropriate.

If that is the case, then we have no matching at all in the bill. Previously, most of these programs have always provided for a matching basis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the very fact that the bill does not so provide is a strong point in its favor, and is to be commended, because there could be such a serious juvenile delinquency problem in a certain area where there is a lack of funds, that this discretionary power ought to exist, so that the Secretary can step into the picture and provide some assistance.

I wish to stress the point that the bill does provide that the Secretary shall have the advantage of the suggestions and recommendations of experts in this field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We might just as well nail that down now as later. The bill provides:

> Before any grant or contract is made under title I, the council shall review the project involved and shall submit its recommendation thereon to the Secretary.

It does not inhibit the Secretary from making the decision. In fact, the decision is reposed in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The council can make its recommendation, and at that point the recommendation ends.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I have tried to point out, that the council will pass on the individual projects. The council will make its recommendations to the Secretary. I have said before, as I believe the RECORD will show, in effect, that I am perfectly well satisfied that no Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will fly in the face of recommendations which have been supported by the council. The council will be of great assistance. We know when this kind of procedure is adopted, the Secretary's opinion will have to be fully justified before he will veto the recommendation of the council.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I only know from experience that when in the past we have set up programs of this kind it has always been the policy of Congress to nail them down and to provide for an equitable distribution of the funds. Under this bill, however, it is discretionary. The power of the council is only recommendatory. As a result, here is what could be a $25 million fund over a 5-year period, very vague as to projects, with nothing definite, and in the nature of a fishing expedition for what it is thought might come from an approach of this kind.

The fact of the matter is there have been programs in this field for quite a long time.

First of all, there is the Russell Sage Foundation. It issued a report the other day. It entered the entire delinquency field, including the training of personnel.

Then there is the Ford Foundation. In 1958 the foundation made awards totaling $1,700,000. In 1959 it made awards totaling $1,800,000. There is a variety of schools and institutions which have worked in this field.

Then I point out, of course, that the American Academy of Political and Social Science has done some work in this area and has called attention to various projects which have been in being. There is one in Illinois, known as the Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research. There is also the Chicago area project. There was the behavior research fund. Then there was the south central youth program, which was initiated in Minneapolis, Minn. The interesting thing about the latter program is that the financing of the project was in itself an unusual example of joint community effort. The money came from local foundations: the community chest, women's clubs, the junior chamber of commerce, and a group of women employees in one of the largest industries of the city.

That city, of course, was Minneapolis, Minn.

Other programs were covered and evaluated by the academy, including a work camp program for potential delinquents, in Newark, N.J.; delinquency prevention through improved parent-child relations; a project for all-day neighborhood schools in New York City; the effectiveness of a boys' club in reducing delinquency in Louisville, Ky.; and projects relating to preventive work with street-corner groups in Boston and Chicago.

All these projects were financed without Federal assistance. So let it not be said that a great deal of work has not been done in this field.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Committee on the Judiciary, in its first regular meeting has approved $150,000 for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, to continue its study. The chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration is also the chairman of the subcommittee which investigates juvenile delinquency problems. All he has to do is to consult with himself in order to approve the expenditure of $150,000, and then this work will go on.

The interesting thing about that is that the program has been in being for nearly 7 years. I remember when it was created by the Committee on the Judiciary in 1953. The very distinguished former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson, was the ranking minority member on that committee. When it was created, we said it was to "conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States." The subcommittee was named, and for 6 years hearings have been held on such subjects as institutions for rehabilitation and treatment, interstate adoption practices, forestry camps, runaway children, and narcotic addicts.

Reports have been prepared on various special problems affecting juvenile delinquency, including youth employment, comic books, television, motion pictures, and pornography. Thus far, the subcommittee has spent $730,000 on these investigations, together with the pending request for $150,000 for the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

How far are we to go in this matter? I am not insensible of the problem, but I say that the committee was right when it said that the front line of defense against juvenile delinquency is back at the grassroots, in the homes, in the churches, and in the schools.

I propose to keep this thing within due bounds, so that it does not get out of hand. To that effect, I submit amendments. I shall ask unanimous consent to submit the amendments en bloc; and if the Senator from Pennsylvania has a copy of the bill before him and will follow me for a moment, I will tell him what the amendments are.

On page 7, line 10, I propose to strike out "a year" and insert in lieu thereof "years"—in the plural—so that the phrase will read "fiscal years."

I propose to change the date to "June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962." That, Mr. President, would make this a 2-year program instead of a 5-year program. I propose to strike out in line 11 "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000," and strike out the rest of line 12.

The net result of my amendment would be to make the program a 2-year program at a cost of $1 million a year.

I think that is enough for an exploratory effort such as this. Then, if we are on the wrong track, and if it appears that this is going to be a snowballing program, on which large sums of money will have to be expended in the future, we will have the time in which to draw back before we get into difficulties.

I have seen programs of this kind grow, and I would not be surprised, if the bill is enacted into law or in the form in which it appears today, that in the years to come we could count on this developing into a vast program which, in

my considered judgment, knowing how expenditures grow under the gentle nurturings of Congress, may well reach $100 million in due course.

I therefore submit the amendments and ask that they be stated. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc. I think it is clear now to all that my proposal would make this a 2-year program and would reduce the amount from $5 million to $1 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 7, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "year" and insert in lieu thereof "years" and to strike out "1960" and insert "1961, and June 30, 1962."

To strike out all of line 11; on line 12 to strike out "$5,000,000, as the Congress may determine" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope the amendments will be rejected. To cut down the program to 2 years, and to reduce the amount involved to $1 million, would curtail the program and would to a great extent emasculate the bill.

The interesting thing for Senators to note, I believe, is that the amount of $5 million was fixed by the committee when the bill was reported, with the thought that this sum would be satisfactory to both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget. It is a fact that the Bureau of the Budget raises no objection to an appropriation in this amount and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has favored this sum. Therefore, the influential agencies of the Eisenhower administration support the amount of money in the bill. I hope the amendments will be rejected.

Mr. President, I wonder if I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for a moment, to ask him whether he would withhold his request for recognition until we can have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I shall speak to the amendment, I should like to be recognized.

I understood the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would seek recognition. At this time I do not see him in the Chamber. If he comes in, I will, of course, yield to him. But I do not wish to forgo an opportunity in which to speak to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

(Mr. JAVITS addressed the Senate on the subject of United States-Cuban relations. On his request and by unanimous consent, his remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following the debate on the juvenile delinquency bill.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I address myself now to the amendment offered by the leader on the minority side [Mr. DIRKSEN], with which amendment I am not in agreement. I feel, with deep sincerity, we should let the bill pass as it has been amended. I think it is the minimal approach we can take to this national problem.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than 6 or 7 minutes to explain why. I have actually acted as the law enforcement officer of the largest State of the Union and have personally dealt with this problem. It is not a local problem; it is a national problem.

Some people always have an idea that juvenile delinquency is a problem which is confined only to the large cities, and it is especially to those that I would like to point out that the increase in juvenile delinquency has not been confined to New York City or to any other urban area. Nationally, for example, juvenile delinquency has risen 8 percent faster in nonurban than in urban areas since 1948.

Secondly, what we are proposing today is minuscule. Five million dollars a year is a fraction of what New York alone spends in dealing with the problem. When we take into consideration the amounts spent by all the States, that amount is meaningless in terms of actual money.

What the bill does represent—and this is important—is an effort on the part of the U.S. Government, with an expenditure of a minimal amount of money, to lend its leadership in dealing with the juvenile delinquency problem.

Let it be understood that this amount represents only an acknowledgment by the United States that it is a national problem, involving participation by the United States, on a minimal basis, in order to lend the whole issue the dignity, the prestige, and the facilities which represent the Federal Government. I believe very deeply the bill is absolutely essential if the States or the Nation are in any way to get on top of the problem.

I understand very clearly that the first line of defense is in the homes, the schools, and the churches; but again this is a matter of tens of thousands, and perhaps even millions, of people, and not only $5 million, but hundreds of millions of dollars for this frontline of defense, and by this bill we are seeking a method of operating.

Secondly, to say there have been reports by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency is not an answer. Those reports are not actual working in the field in connection with laboratory experiments which can be made available to everybody in the United States; and what is proposed by this bill is actual field experiments.

I will give to you, Mr. President, and to the Senate a specific instance to indicate why there is no other way unless the U.S. Government does it. The first is the element of Federal crime and interstate activity, which is one of the typical examples of what goes on in this whole field. In other words, it is not merely the money the Federal Government will spend; it is the fact that the facilities of the Federal Government in the field of narcotics, the FBI, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Interior Department, the State Department—every Department of Government—will be made available to the States. What this bill does is to take the Federal Government into the field.

Secondly, and very importantly, a great many of these crimes are tried in the Federal courts, because many crimes against Federal law are involved. I point out that one of the main problems of juvenile delinquency—and again I refer to my own experience in law enforcement—is that of recidivism, which is the constant repetition of offenses.

When we speak in terms of a million arrests, we are not speaking in terms of 1 million young people. We are speaking in terms of a million times offenders are arrested. That is the geometric progression in crime which is causing a problem which is inundating us. It is a national disgrace which, as we all know, is availed of in Moscow, Peiping, and a dozen other countries, to show that this is a lawless country where parents cannot control their children.

What can the Federal Government do with the $5 million but lend its prestige, dignity, and facilities to the solving of this problem? First and foremost, the Federal Government can deal with preventing the occurrence in an unparalleled way of recidivism—which is the repetition of crimes—because the Federal Government has many agencies on which it can call, and also because of its experience in the Federal courts.

I have previously suggested the idea of defenders for youth in the Federal courts. Many of these young people lose their respect for the law, and, indeed, for organized society, because they are not properly represented in court when they are charged with crime. Also, there is a lack of adequately trained probation officers, caseworkers, and other persons to look after the cases which already exist; and that fact contributes to the problem of recidivism. And so in this one field a tremendous contribution can be made by the Federal Government.

Then there is the problem of narcotics addiction, which is a serious problem for young people. There are practically no facilities for treating young addicts. We tried one in the State of New York. It is very meager in terms of its effect and in terms of coverage which we can give. Narcotics is peculiarly a problem within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Then there is the problem of the hard-core families, that is, families in which there are difficulties in parental responsibility, and which are the seedbed for a tremendous amount of juvenile delinquency. It is estimated that in New York City as few as 20,000 families are responsible for more than 50 percent of the juvenile delinquency which occurs in New York City. Here is an acute problem to the solution of which the Federal Government can enormously contribute, because the Federal Government is heavily in the welfare field and in the field of taking care of dependent children and the fields which impinge upon the technique of care and the amount of care which is utilized for hard-core families.

Finally, Mr. President, there is the matter of advance detection. Here again there is the tremendous machinery of which the Federal Government can avail itself in experiments, such as the National Institutes of Health, which can

be markedly beneficial and can make a major contribution to the science in the field of anticipating crime in those of tender years.

Mr. President, why is $1 million for 2 years inadequate? Even for a token program, when one considers the overhead and the time lag in getting such a program into operation, the $1 million will have been spent and the 2 years will have gone.

I know the amendment has behind it the laudable intentions of my leader, and I regret to oppose my colleague, who I know has sincere intentions. But I respectfully submit that the result of adoption of his amendment would be to eliminate the program entirely, because any minimal program, no matter how small or inadequate, will take $1 million in overhead cost and will take a minimum of 1 or 2 years to get off the ground. The $5 million provided in the bill and the 5-year period provided already cut the program to a minimum, and a further reduction will either make it a laughing stock or kill it altogether.

If the Senator sincerely believes that the Federal Government can exercise some beneficial influence in lending its prestige, dignity, and facilities to this field, then I think at the minimum the Senate should pass this bill.

Mr. President, I do not think we have adequately emphasized the coordinating activity of the Federal Government and the experience it has had in many States. By getting the Federal Government into the field with its established machinery, we get the benefit of coordinated activities which have been and are taking place in many States.

I hope the Senate in its wisdom will pass the bill as we have amended it and will reject—and I say this regretfully—the amendment which has been proposed by the minority leader to cut the period of time to 2 years and the amount of money to $1 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I rise in support of this important piece of proposed legislation which would provide assistance in training of personnel and development of projects to combat juvenile delinquency.

When I was home in Colorado a few months ago literally hundreds of people talked to me about the problems which are being raised by juvenile delinquency. The interest of the public has been stimulated among church groups, educational groups, and PTA groups.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the department of welfare, city and county of Denver, written by the director, Miss Charline J. Berkins, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE,
CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., March 19, 1959.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: We were very pleased to receive your letter of February 7 enclosing a statement regarding the bills introduced into our Congress which will help combat juvenile delinquency. We are also very proud to have someone from Colorado on the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency which we, of course, consider a very important one.

We certainly give you full support regarding the bills you have mentioned in your statement. As a matter of fact, we have just received a brochure regarding the "juvenile delinquency control projects" bill (Hill-Clark bill, S. 694, and Elliott bill, H.R. 3464). We wish to suggest your support of this bill, also. We, too, are convinced that more must be done at the local level to deal in an increasingly effective way with young people who are in conflict with the law and in the prevention of delinquency through service to families while children are young. Perhaps one of the greatest benefits of the program suggested by this bill would be the help to get localities started in coping with the problem of delinquency, stepping up the program in localities where a beginning has taken place, and then disseminating the information about the results of these projects.

However, SENATOR CARROLL, in order to accomplish what we all desire—the control of and the prevention of juvenile delinquency—we must have trained personnel in much greater numbers. A revision was made in the Social Security Act allowing for training and research, but it is my understanding that at no time has an appropriation been made for this. You will find this revision in the Social Security Act in section 705 of the compilation of social security laws through December 31, 1956, which is Senate Document 156; or, you can find the same reference under the title of "Training Grants for Public Welfare Personnel," H.R. 7225, 2d session in Public Law 880, chapter 836, 84th Congress.

Any assistance that you can give us in obtaining stipend funds for the graduate training of child welfare and public assistance workers and others who will be dealing directly with these young people and their families will be greatly appreciated. This would be a great step toward the control of and prevention of delinquency.

As you may know, the county departments of welfare in Colorado are charged with the responsibility of providing care and service to neglected and dependent children and to those in danger of becoming delinquent. In carrying out this charge, our work is with parents who have neglected their children, with parents who wish to place their children for adoption, with adoptive parents who are childless and who want families, with foster parents who give temporary care to these children, and with young children and with teenagers who are on the verge of trouble with the law and who frequently have a distorted view of life because of their own deprivation. These are the children who will become delinquents in the legal sense of the word if they do not receive experiences that are constructive and have loving family relationships. Working with families and children such as these is the opportunity for preventing delinquency.

It is a sad commentary, however, that there are fewer trained child welfare workers in the departments of public welfare in Colorado today than there were some years ago. Through funds from the Children's Bureau, the State Department of Public Welfare in Colorado has only four stipends annually for graduate training for social workers. The Denver Department of Welfare receives one of these annually to grant to one of our employees interested in child welfare, but we could use more. Many more trained personnel are needed to do this kind of preventive work, and we believe that this is what is truly meant by juvenile delinquency control. We hope that you will find a way to provide increased funds for the training of these essential personnel.

Sincerely yours,
Miss CHARLINE J. BIRKINS,
Director.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, one of the sentences in this letter reads:

However, Senator CARROLL, in order to accomplish what we all desire—the control of and the prevention of juvenile delinquency—we must have trained personnel in much greater numbers.

Mr. President, I share the viewpoint of those who submitted minority views on a bill that we ought to emphasize to a greater degree the necessity for trained personnel. We understand we cannot achieve these things all at once, so I am going to support the bill, because it has now been modified by the Clark amendment, which I cosponsored. This amendment provides $2.5 million for the type of training called for by the city and county of Denver.

In our State we find growing interest in the question of what to do about juvenile delinquents. How are we going to treat them?

Mr. President, I am a member of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary. We held hearings in Los Angeles. We heard from the chief of police of Los Angeles and from the sheriff of Los Angeles County; from narcotics agents, from youth workers, from various interested persons.

Everywhere I went I found a great interest in the problem. People are saying, "What are we going to do about this?"

In Colorado I met with Catholic home and family leaders and other church groups, educational organizations, and law enforcement agencies.

Throughout the country there is fear expressed that we will not do anything at the Federal level, and that we must do something about getting trained personnel.

I am realistic enough to know that with the amount of money which is to be provided we are not going to be able to accomplish much at the outset, but I think it will be a beginning. I think we will have to move ahead faster in the future. We will recognize this is only a beginning.

I repeat, everywhere I have gone, every person with whom I have talked has expressed a gnawing fear about the problems of juvenile delinquency. In Colorado my staff held extended meetings with authorities on juvenile delinquency, including Judge Philip Gilliam and Mr. Melvin Hull who conduct the Denver

Juvenile Hall, which has an international reputation as an outstanding juvenile institution. All of these people want our help.

In order to demonstrate that this is no small problem, I should like to quote at this point, Mr. President, a portion of a recent editorial from the Rocky Mountain News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, which discusses the institutional needs of Colorado in dealing with juvenile offenders. The editorial leads off with this pertinent remark: "Colorado faces a major crisis in its war against juvenile delinquency."

Mr. President, there is another letter I should like to have printed in the RECORD. It is addressed to me, written by Doris K. Nelson, Chairman, Juvenile Protection, Colorado Congress of Parents and Teachers. In her letter she says:

I urge you to support in any way you can, the juvenile delinquency bills providing grants to the States for strengthening and improving programs related to Juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I urge you to support in any way you can, the juvenile delinquency bills providing grants to the States for strengthening and improving programs related to juvenile delinquency.

Such legislation would be of inestimable value in our State, as Colorado, at this time, has no single agency responsible for planning and coordinating services for children; therefore, we have no constructive planning for the prevention of delinquency or the disposition of delinquents.

Study and effort has been made to establish separate juvenile courts and to improve Colorado children's laws. I believe this would be intensified under a program set up with the aid of these grants.

Colorado communities should be shown the need for special juvenile police and probation officers but training courses must be available for them as well as all other personnel dealing with children and youth. This would be possible under the provisions of the bills.

Thanking you for any effort you may make in behalf of Colorado and the Nation's young people, I am,

Yours truly,

DORIS K. NELSON,
Chairman, Juvenile Protection, Colorado Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, at this time I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and my colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] not only for their great interest but for their great leadership in presenting the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to express my own deep appreciation for the very valuable assistance which the Senator from Colorado has given us in connection with the progress of this bill to date, which I hope is progress to passage. I should like to pay my testimony to the valuable work the Senator from Colorado has done in the field of juvenile delinquency in connection with his membership on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I commend the chairman of the important Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], for the fine work he has done. He has held hearings not only in New York but also in Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, and other places. He has demonstrated great interest in this subject. The Senator from Missouri made an excellent statement on the floor today.

I see the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is present in the Chamber. I read the Senator's minority views. I agree with him 100 percent that we are merely scratching the surface and the emphasis should be more and more upon training, although I am in favor of the so-called demonstrative techniques also. We need them in Colorado. We need them in the Nation.

All sections of my State and all sections of the West are interested in this problem. It is a problem which does not affect solely the populous areas of Philadelphia and New York. It has been shown, as a result of a research program conducted by the Library of Congress, that juvenile delinquency is spilling over from the metropolitan areas to the so-called suburban areas.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope there will be no real opposition to the bill. This proposed legislation is long overdue. It is time for us to do something about the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the rising tide of crimes and misdemeanors committed by youthful offenders throughout our Nation. All of us are concerned—and properly so—about the causes, motivations, and cures for the blight of juvenile delinquency.

It is a problem of no small dimensions. Gang warfare has turned sections of some of our cities into bloody battlegrounds. Mischief has turned to murder. Petty thievery and worse crimes have become commonplace among teenagers.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has reported that some 130 of our young people under the age of 18 were arrested during 1958 for murder and nonaccidental killing. For the past 5 years, arrests of young people in the same age group have increased about 10 percent each year, while arrests of those over 18 have increased 1 percent each year.

All of us must remember, of course, that the great majority of our teenagers are upright, honest, and useful citizens. They are the kind of young people of whom we can be proud. But they are being given a black eye by their contemporaries who stray from the straight and narrow. Although juvenile delinquency is the exception rather than the rule, its shocking percentage of incidence must command the energies and attention of all the American people.

This phenomenon is not limited to any one group of States nor to any one political or geographical division. Like an epidemic, juvenile delinquency has spread in city and town, slum and suburb. It is at its worst, of course, in the larger urban centers. The courts in our communities reported over half a million cases involving youthful delinquents during 1957. If the rate continues to increase as it has since 1948, we can expect something over a million such appearances before our courts during 1965 and by 1970—a scant 10 years—we can expect nearly a million and a half such cases in our courts.

Mr. President, these are statistics which must shock and dismay all Americans.

Of course, the alarming increase in youthful crime and delinquency has not gone unheeded nor unattended. A variety of experts and laymen have delved into the causes of this continued upsurge of teenage lawlessness and they have pursued means for its control and cure. The concern and interest of churchmen and sociologists, scientists and social workers, police and government officials, as well as many private organizations, has created a growing public awareness of the mortal and moral dangers inherent in the present trend.

These same interested citizens have devised and developed vigorous and often successful community programs for guiding their children to maturity as responsible citizens rather than lawless ruffians or hardened criminals.

There has been a healthy and realistic understanding on the part of all concerned that crime and delinquency are primarily local problems to be solved at the local level. In the extensive hearings held by the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, most witnesses in localities across the country testified that much of the progress toward curbing delinquency can and will be made at the local level by citizens in their own communities.

Mr. President, any legislation dealing with juvenile delinquency is of particular importance to a Senator from New York. My State contains the Nation's largest city, a city which in recent months has made headlines with outbreaks of teenage terrorism which have shocked the Nation and, indeed, the world. Although juvenile crime is in no sense unique to the city of New York, the type of youthful lawlessness found there is representative of the worst in sporadic violence to be found in our communities. We are all appalled by the organized murder and terrorism of gang members whose motive for murder is that "we like to see them drop." Faced with such senseless and sadistic acts, we need not only immediate action but plans for long-term methods and projects for the effective control and eventual cure of youthful delinquency.

The city of New York, like other cities faced with this problem, has launched programs to control juvenile crime.

Extra police forces have been concentrated in danger areas, headway has been made to relieve the jam of juvenile cases in the courts, the city's work-camp program has been under review, certain weapons have been outlawed, and both private and governmental groups have organized to work with multiproblem families. There has been a concerted effort to assess and strengthen all community resources in the great battle.

Some of these measures will be effective as long-term methods to stem the tide of youthful crime. Others, however, are immediate firefighting methods improvised along the frontlines. In this respect, it is gratifying to note the speed with which Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has come to the aid of embattled New York City officials in their endeavors to formulate not only immediate controls, but also long-term answers which are essential for any effective program in this field.

Through conferences implemented by the State's interdepartmental task force on youth and juvenile delinquency, a concrete program of city-State cooperation and action has been formulated in my State. The Governor's program involves specific means by which the State can complement the efforts of New York City and other communities without impinging upon the more immediate responsibilities of local officials. Thus, he has left to the cities the task of apprehending and punishing delinquents while the State concentrates on longer range matters.

Governor Rockefeller has offered a broad program including the expansion of work camps which can help both in terms of prevention of juvenile delinquency and rehabilitation of offenders. As a result of extensive research, the Governor's task force has recently recommended other measures which are calculated to prevent youthful lawlessness and curb it at its source. Among the suggestions are the expansion of youth institutions, the establishment of new services, such as Youth Opportunity Centers for youngsters in danger of becoming delinquent, and a general broadening and improvement of probation and parole services. Such State leadership and action will be of great assistance to the city fathers of Manhattan and yet will not trespass on their areas of special responsibility. Indeed, Governor Rockefeller's program to combat juvenile delinquency is typical of the thoughtful, forward-looking administration he is giving the Empire State.

Another example of effective cooperation between State and local governments in meeting the challenge of youth in trouble is the program now in practice in the State of California. An integral part of this program is the California Youth Authority. Established in 1941, with a board composed of six members appointed by the Governor, the California Youth Authority assists local government units in dealing with youthful offenders. This authority has pioneered in a new approach to the correction of juvenile delinquency and it has now broadened its efforts into the preventive field, hoping to devise methods of reaching young people before they run afoul of the law. The California Youth Authority has also recently initiated a new division of research. Some of the areas planned for research are measuring the parole performance of wards, studying the efficacy of psychiatric treatment, and investigating whether a closer ratio of staff to wards will increase chances of rehabilitation. Thus California is another example of a specific line of attack based on State and local cooperation.

Mr. President, New York and California, among other States, are demonstrating how State and local officials can work together toward the solution of juvenile delinquency problems. Together they have planned and initiated programs which promise effective and enlightened action to curb and cure youngsters gone wrong. I believe particularly that the example in New York of State and local cooperation can serve as an excellent model for other State leaders as they seek solutions for their own juvenile problems.

I agree entirely with what has been said here to the effect that the best place, and the primary place, to fight juvenile delinquency is in the home, in the church, and in the school. After all, family guidance, religious teaching, and general education are the ultimate weapons which must be used in the effort to curb such lawlessness.

Mr. President, it is now time for the resources and powers of the Federal Government to be brought reasonably and effectively into this fight. While it is true there are presently some programs by means of which the Federal Government assists the States in this field, we need to coordinate and broaden these activities so that the talents of the National Government can be most soundly utilized.

I support the measure before us because it provides a first step toward such a plan of reasonable cooperation. The provisions in S. 694 for carrying out various projects that are substantial enough to help solve juvenile delinquency in many areas and in the country as a whole seem certain to reward us with the techniques and practices leading to the solution of our juvenile delinquency problems.

In supporting this measure, I should like to emphasize my opinion that the activities it promotes should deal directly and actively with these problems rather than indulging in mere theory. It has been my observation that sometimes the professionals who become involved in the study of these problems seem to become so enmeshed and entangled in theory that they come up with few practical results. We must never confuse coddling with realistic efforts to rehabilitate. And we must not be overly soft when dealing with hardened teenage criminals.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the Federal Government can be of tremendous assistance in the development of comprehensive programs for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. By means of the grants provided for in title I of this bill, much progress can be made toward this goal. It is important to note that the grants to be provided in this bill will be supplemented by contributions by the recipients to the extent determined fair by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The technical-assistance provisions of title II should be most helpful in providing a clearinghouse for the latest information on research findings, techniques, programs, and other data which can be shared by the wide variety of groups, individuals, and levels of government working to prevent, control, and cure the problem of juvenile delinquency. This section takes cognizance of the fact that all concerned should have the benefit of the experience of others in the field if we are to find the most effective and meaningful means of attack and solution.

Finally, the National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency, to be established under title III of this bill, can serve as a spearhead, brain trust, and coordinating body of experts to help the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare carry out the provisions of this bill. This group can imaginatively and vigorously explore the many exciting possibilities of S. 694 in terms of finding solutions to the challenge of young people gone wrong.

In general, Mr. President, I believe that S. 694 can be an effective measure because throughout it recognizes that the principal point of successful attack on this problem must be in our States and localities. But it is also based on the fact that States and communities need to be encouraged and helped with new ideas and information as they pursue various projects in the field.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe that S. 694 represents a sound investment in this country and in our most vital resource. It is true, of course, that we must punish—and punish severely—young and hardened criminals. It is true that we must apply immediate measures of control to meet present emergencies. But if we are to find any permanent solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency, I believe it is imperative that we get at the root causes of youthful crime and delinquency.

Our approach must be realistic and farsighted. It must be sustained and nationwide. This is a task which should command the energies, talents, and ingenuity of our finest minds, and a task in which the Federal Government can and must play an important part.

I am confident that we have made a good start and are on the right track with S. 694. It is a step in the right direction and assures a vigorous but proper role by the Federal Government in assisting localities to wipe out this blight. I therefore urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 694) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 694 was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNITED STATES-CUBAN RELATIONS—STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND SECRETARY OF STATE

During the debate on the so-called juvenile delinquency bill,

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before I speak to the matter of the bill and the amendment, I call the attention of the Senate to another matter which has just appeared on the news ticker, and which is of such importance that I think we should all know about it.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have just issued a statement on the subject of United States-Cuban relations. It is, in my view, a statement of such wisdom and of such understanding of the international position of the United States as to be well worth the attention of every Senator.

The President and the Secretary of State, while maintaining fully the dignity and strength of our great country, have at the same time not allowed themselves to be rushed into precipitate threats or injunctions for strong action, which the United States can always take very effectively—and which, indeed, we may with far more sadness than anger have to take, but which, nevertheless, we will do most reluctantly—have made a statement which demonstrates the calm and noble spirit which is our country, and in a manner of which I think we must all be proud.

The President has made five points with respect to United States-Cuban relations. He said:

The U.S. Government adheres strictly to the policy of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, including Cuba.

This is in accordance with the good neighbor policy of the United States with respect to Latin American countries.

In this connection, I am delighted to see in the Chamber the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The President of the United States then said:

Second, the U.S. Government has consistently endeavored to prevent illegal acts in territory under its jurisdiction directed against other governments.

Again, that is a noble expression of the good neighbor policy.

In effect, he has said to Cuba, "Tell us who is invading your territory or launching against you illegal acts from the United States, and we will take the necessary action, while we ourselves try to find out at one and the same time."

Third, the President protested against the tendency of the spokesman of the Cuban Government, including Dr. Castro, the Prime Minister, "to create the illusion of aggressive acts and conspiratorial activities aimed at the Cuban Government and attributed to U.S. officials or agencies."

This, Mr. President, is the dignity of our country, speaking through the President. The President continued:

Fourth, the U.S. Government, of course, recognizes the right of the Cuban Government and people in the exercise of their national sovereignty to undertake those social, economic, and political reforms which, with due regard to their obligations under international law, they may think desirable.

In other words, the President is saying that we will not interfere, and we do not make it a policy to interfere.

In his fifth point, the President points out that under Cuban law as well as under international law we simply cannot proceed without any consideration for those principles which we are all sworn to uphold in the interest of the people, especially the principles of liberty and the right to hold property, particularly as they affect citizens of our own country; and he states our determination that these principles shall be observed.

The President closes on this note:

I should like only to add that the United States Government has confidence in the ability of the Cuban people to recognize and defeat the intrigues of international communism which are aimed at destroying democratic institutions in Cuba and the traditional and mutually beneficial friendship between the Cuban and American peoples.

I shall, of course, yield in a moment to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is a leader in this field. First, however, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the entire text of the statement by the President on United States-Cuban relations be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Text of statement on United States-Cuban relations:

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and I have been giving careful consideration to the problem of relations between the Governments of the United States and Cuba. Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal, who is currently in Washington, shared in our discussions.

We have been, for many months, deeply concerned and perplexed at the steady deterioration of those relations reflected especially by recent public statements by Prime Minister Castro, of Cuba, as well as by statements in official publicity organs of the Cuban Government. These statements contain unwarranted attacks on our Government and on our leading officials. These attacks involve serious charges none of which, however, has been the subject of formal representations by the Government of Cuba to our Government. We believe these charges to be totally unfounded.

We have prepared a restatement of our policy toward Cuba, a country with whose people the people of the United States have enjoyed and expect to continue to enjoy a firm and mutually beneficial friendship.

The U.S. Government adheres strictly to the policy of nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, including Cuba. This policy is incorporated in our treaty commitments as a member of the Organization of American States.

Second, the U.S. Government has consistently endeavored to prevent illegal acts in the territory under its jurisdiction directed against other governments. The U.S. law enforcement agencies have been increasingly successful in the prevention of such acts. The U.S. record in this respect compares very favorably with that of Cuba from whose territory a number of invasions directed against other countries have departed during the past year, in several cases attended with serious loss of life and property damage in the territory of those other countries. The U.S. authorities will continue to enforce U.S. laws, including those which reflect commitments under inter-American treaties, and hope that other governments will act similarly. Our Government has repeatedly indicated that it will welcome any information from the Cuban Government, or from other governments, regarding incidents occurring within their jurisdiction or notice which would be of assistance to our law enforcement agencies in this respect.

Third, the U.S. Government views with increasing concern the tendency of spokesmen of the Cuban Government, including Prime Minister Castro, to create the illusion of aggressive acts and conspiratorial activities aimed at the Cuban Government and attributed to U.S. officials or agencies. The promotion of unfounded illusions of this kind can hardly facilitate the development, in the real interests of the two peoples, of relations of understanding and confidence between their governments. The U.S. Government regrets that its earnest efforts over the past year to establish the basis for such understanding and confidence have not been reciprocated.

Fourth, the U.S. Government, of course, recognizes the right of the Cuban Government and people in the exercise of their national sovereignty to undertake those social, economic, and political reforms which, with due regard to their obligations under international law, they may think desirable. This position has frequently been stated and it reflects a real understanding of and sympathy with the ideals and aspirations of the Cuban people. Similarly, the U.S. Government and people will continue to assert and to defend, in the exercise of their own sovereignty, their legitimate interests.

Fifth, the U.S. Government believes that its citizens have made constructive contributions to the economies of other countries by means of their investments and their work in those countries, and that such contributions, taking into account changing conditions, can remain on a mutually satisfactory basis. The U.S. Government will continue to bring to the attention of the Cuban Government any instances in which the rights of its citizens under Cuban law and under international law have been disregarded, and in which redress under Cuban law is apparently unavailable or denied. In this connection it is the hope of the U.S. Government that differences of opinion between the two governments in matters recognized under international law as subject to diplomatic negotiations will be resolved through such negotiations. In the event that disagreements between the two governments concerning this matter should persist, it would be the intention of the U.S. Government to seek solutions through other appropriate international procedures.

The above points seem to me to furnish reasonable basis for a workable and satisfactory relationship between our two sovereign countries. I should like only to add that the U. S. Government has confidence in the ability of the Cuban people to recognize and defeat the intrigues of international communism which are aimed at destroying democratic institutions in Cuba and the traditional and mutually beneficial friendship between the Cuban and American peoples.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out that this is a noble statement, issued in the finest spirit of bipartisanship. We can all be proud of it. The President bespeaks the dignity of our great country with respect to a small country. He bespeaks our respect for the people of that small country and their government, so long as it is their government,

and points out that we will adhere strictly to what is correct for us; that strength is to be utilized only where nothing else will suffice; but that we certainly intend to exhaust every avenue of the cooperation—indeed, the affection—which the American people have for the Cuban people, to bring about the justice which should dominate the relations between our two countries and our two peoples.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the Senator from New York in commending the President and the Secretary of State for the very fine statement which has been released by the White House today on the United States-Cuban relations. I was advised of it earlier by a representative of the State Department.

I think the President and the Secretary of State deserve the high praise of Congress and the American people for the statesmanship portrayed by the paper.

What it says in essence, really, is that, consistent with our historic policy, we do not believe in following a course of action which will work hardship upon a people because problems have arisen between their leaders of government and the United States. There is no question that there is a great reservoir of good will on the part of the people of the United States toward the people of Cuba.

So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, this is a problem of diplomacy. It is a problem of diplomatic negotiation. It is a problem of official conversations between the representatives of our Government, who under the Constitution of the United States have the responsibility for the administration of foreign affairs, and the leaders of the Cuban Government.

I say most respectfully that I hope future statements will be made by the President and the Secretary of State, and not by members of the American military. I think it was most unfortunate that the other day Admiral Burke made the statement he did concerning what American policy would be in connection with the American naval base in Cuba.

I say, most respectfully, it does not happen to fall within his province. That happens to be a matter of foreign policy, upon the basis of which the President and the Vice President should be the ones on which to make a statement, and not the top brass in the military. All too often, Mr. President, the top brass of the military issue statements from to time, which amount to military statements, that ought not to come from them, but, when they are in the field of foreign policy, from the President or the Secretary of State.

I am very happy the Senator from New York, able student that he is of American-Latin American relations, made the statement he has made on the floor of the Senate, and I wish to associate myself with it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks on Cuban-American relations may follow the debate on the so-called juvenile delinquency bill, so that there may be some continuity in the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MACK CHARLES PARKER LYNCHING CASE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier this month a Federal grand jury failed to return an indictment in the Mack Charles Parker case. As I see it, this underlines in no uncertain terms the inadequacy of Federal law and Federal law enforcement to deal with lynchings.

The Nation, indeed the world, was shocked and saddened when a new chapter of lynch law was written in Poplarville, Miss., last April, the Parker case. Immediately following that violence, I checked and found no proposal for Federal antilynching law had been introduced in the Senate in this Congress. I then introduced S. 1848. At the time of introducing S. 1848, I acknowledged that we all hoped those responsible for this crime would be quickly brought to justice.

The press reported, and I was given assurances, that the Governor of Mississippi was proceeding with full power of his office to undertake a vigorous State investigation; that at the request of the Governor the Department of Justice, through the FBI and others of its branches, was giving full cooperation in the case.

From the first days of that intense public and official concern, the story led sadly through a chain of events which week by week lessens the chances that the individuals responsible for lynching Mack Charles Parker will be apprehended and brought to account for their crime.

A recounting of these events seems to me important at this time, and not for the purpose of pointing a finger at any one region of the Nation, because the problems of which I speak are basically not those of any single State or region. A review is important because a chronology of the events may illustrate where justice failed in this case, and illustrate remedial steps that need to be taken, both by Congress and by the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Some of the documents, newspaper reports, statements and comments on this case I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. Briefly, I refer to a few of them.

Following the investigation by the FBI, a full report of its findings was turned over to the Governor of Mississippi, and the New York Herald Tribune headlined the story: "FBI Names Lynchers in Mississippi; Case Solved; Left Up to Governor Coleman."

Only a few days before this headline, the Department of Justice issued a press statement which resulted in headlines such as those in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of May 25, "Rogers Reports Lynchers Broke No Federal Law."

The Justice Department's release stated in part:

> Attorney General William P. Rogers has announced that the FBI was directed today to turn over to Gov. J. P. Coleman, at Jackson, Miss., a summary of information relative to facts and evidence obtained during the FBI's investigation of the abduction and murder of Mack Charles Parker. This action on the part of the Justice Department was based upon a ruling that FBI investigation had clearly established that the persons responsible for the death of Parker had not violated the Federal kidnaping statute, and no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained.

No special grand jury was called to consider the FBI evidence. Months elapsed—April to October 1959—before the regularly scheduled grand jury of the county of Pearl River convened. No indictments were returned by this grand jury, and responsible news sources reported the case had not even been presented to the grand jury.

This failure to return an indictment under State law brought the charge of "travesty of justice" from the Attorney General, and a sudden discussion of the possible needs for new Federal laws in the area. The Attorney General, at his news conference in November 1959, was quoted as saying that the Department of Justice initially did not prosecute the case because the crime of murder was "more appropriate for a State to handle under our Federal system."

Notwithstanding these public announcements which gave the clear impression there had been no Federal crime, the U.S. attorney in Jackson, Miss., was instructed to present the case to a Federal grand jury after the State failed to return an indictment. This the U.S. attorney did, and on January 14, 1960, the Federal grand jury announced that it had found no basis for a Federal prosecution in the lynching of Mack Charles Parker.

The New York Times reported:

> The decision appeared to come as a surprise to defense lawyers retained by the men under investigation in the slaying. One attorney, who asked that he not be identified, said "we had five names" of persons against whom action had been expected. Bonding arrangements already had been made for them, according to the attorney.

Here, Mr. President, we have a chain of events that leads us nowhere. And, unless the Congress sees in the Mack Charles Parker case a lesson, and builds into our laws and their administration explicit ways effectively to undertake prosecution for the crime of lynching, the next sad instance may result in equally regrettable consequences.

It was for this reason that I introduced S. 1848 some 10 months ago. To date, despite requests to the Department of Justice, no report on this bill, or others dealing with this problem introduced subsequently, has been forthcoming from the Department of Justice.

I ask that the exchange of correspondence I have had with the Attorney General and the Department of Justice on this case be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks; also, I should like to include excerpts from remarks I made on April 30, 1959, in

connection with the introduction of S. 1848.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is vitally important, it would seem to me, that we study the point-by-point developments and decisions in the handling of the Parker case by the Federal Government. The sequence of events, as I understand it, raises many questions. For example, by whom and upon what evidence was the "ruling" announced May 25 by the Department of Justice that "no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained."

It is for this reason that I wrote the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, on January 15, 1960, suggesting a thorough study of this case by his subcommittee. Such a study, I believe, would permit us to develop far better perspective as to the real failings of the law and administration of justice reflected by the events of the Parker case. Such a study would better prepare the Congress for the consideration of additional Federal legislation such as that proposed in S. 1848. With this study and, hopefully, the long-promised Department of Justice reports on these antilynching bills, we should take action to improve our Federal laws to prosecute effectively those who, with no understanding of the law, take it into their own hands. Surely the dead-end in the Parker case is the best evidence of need of Federal law to insure against repetition, if not of the crime, of the escape of the criminals. The Parker case is not a murder mystery to be solved—apparently the FBI has the names, place, and time—it is a national problem to be met.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD the letter I addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights; a Department of Justice release dated May 25, 1959; editorials dealing with the Mack Charles Parker case; and newspaper articles dealing with the same case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 3, 4, 5, and 6.)

EXHIBIT 1

JUNE 10, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: We now find ourselves, as I read the press reports of your Department's conclusions, in the position which we discussed and realized might be reached when I phoned you a short time after the Poplarville incident. Incidentally, I meant to send you the remarks I made shortly thereafter upon introducing an antilynching bill, and enclose a copy herewith.

I wonder if I might now inquire as to your thoughts with regard to the need for additional Federal law to permit Federal prosecution of crimes such as that committed in Poplarville? Is it your feeling that the exploration of ways to provide additional Federal legislation would now be profitable? However, perhaps I misread the press release from the Department of Justice issued on May 25, 1959, setting forth the reasons for Federal withdrawal, and in effect should read from its contents that the Department is taking the position that there may well have been a violation of sections 241 and 242 of the Federal code, but that Federal prosecution was rejected because of the probability that no conviction could be obtained.

Whatever comments you might like to share with me on these observations would be welcome. Frankly, I am disturbed by the general turn which this case has taken: the "end of the road" so far as Federal law is concerned; almost a half year wait for State action. While I am willing to assume the good faith of all parties involved in pursuing the prosecution of those responsible for this crime, I cannot help but feel that before this case is closed, it may well present a particularly clear example of the need for clarification and strengthening of present Federal law.

With every best wish.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1959.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: This will refer to your letter of June 10, 1959, addressed to the Attorney General, enclosing a copy of your remarks in introducing S. 1848, an antilynching bill, and commenting about the application of the Federal criminal laws to the Mack Charles Parker case in Mississippi.

Apropos of the Department's press release of May 25, 1959, to which you referred, it was concluded, based on the results of the extensive and thorough FBI investigation of the Parker matter, there were no felony offenses involved, including violation of 18 United States Code, 241, upon which to predicate prosecution in a Federal court.

We appreciated receiving a copy of your remarks made in introducing S. 1848. The Department plans to submit its views on this proposed legislation in the near future.

Sincerely,

MALCOLM R. WILKEY,
Assistant Attorney General.

NOVEMBER 24, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Your recent remarks, as reported in the press, would indicate that the Department of Justice is giving some consideration to recommending additional Federal legislation to strengthen the Government's hand in dealing with lynching cases.

As one member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, it would be most helpful to me, and I am sure to a number of my colleagues, if such proposals as the Department of Justice may recommend were available to the committee when Congress reconvenes in January. A recent check indicates that the Department of Justice has given the committee no report on S. 1848, which I introduced on this subject last April.

Your assistance in expediting a report on this bill would also be appreciated.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1959.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Attorney General has asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of November 24, in which you request that the Department of Justice expedite its report on your bill, S. 1848, "To declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes."

In his news conference of November 17, to which you refer, the Attorney General stated that the failure of State law enforcement officers in Mississippi even to present the facts of the Mack Charles Parker murder case to the State grand jury has prompted renewed study by the Department of Justice of the need for additional criminal legislation in the civil rights field. The form the solution should take is now under intensive study in the Department. Necessarily, until completion of that study the Department is not in a position to issue a report on S. 1848 or related legislation.

As the most recent public statements of the Attorney General make clear, the Department of Justice has a continuing and keen interest in all legislative proposals in this area. We will, of course, keep you informed of any proposals of the Department which relate to the subject matter of S. 1848.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. CALHOUN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

EXHIBIT 2

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR HART ON S. 1848

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill on a subject that is not new to the Congress. According to the Library of Congress, more than 200 bills dealing with the same subject have been introduced since 1900. In checking the status of bills before this Congress, however, I was surprised to find that no proposed legislation on this subject has as yet been introduced in the Senate during this session, although four bills on the subject are now before the House of Representatives. The House, in fact, has passed proposed legislation on this subject five times since 1937.

I refer, Mr. President, to proposed legislation dealing with the question of Federal responsibility in cases in which physical violence resulting in great bodily injury or death has been committed against any person because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, or against any person who is either suspected of, or is in custody for committing, a criminal offense.

Admittedly, Mr. President, I made this check because of the incident in Poplarville, Miss., last week. I should like to comment briefly on that incident, so that no one will misunderstand my intentions in placing this bill before the Senate.

Mob violence is a horrible thing. Dragging a man from a jail; inflicting brutal injury, possibly death; denying anyone a fair trial; taking the law into private hands—these are unconscionable things. Few Americans anywhere condone them. I am informed that Governor Coleman of Mississippi, responded immediately, when informed of the incident, ordered a vigorous State investigation, and, within 18 minutes, had asked for assistance from the FBI. Not all local officials in some of the sections given to "finger pointing" have acted as promptly or as strongly in the face of mob violence. I know that every Member of the Senate joins me in the hope that those responsible will quickly be brought to justice. Thus, while this recent incident has reopened the question of how we are best to prevent mobs from running over local officers of the law, I want to make it clear that it is not greatly different from some of the incidents involving mob action when Negro families have moved into new neighborhoods in Michigan. The same violation of constitutional guarantees providing for the equal protection of the laws may be involved. Basic motivations, I am sure, are the same.

I am, therefore, Mr. President, introducing this bill in the hope that it may provide an

additional way to strengthen cooperation between the Federal law enforcement agencies and those of our individual State. Governor Coleman and the local law enforcement officials of Mississippi have taken an important step toward building that cooperation. Attorney General Rogers has assured me that his department is receiving and giving every assistance. At the very least, I believe that we here in the Senate should seek constructive ways to broaden the legal tools available to both State and Federal officials. We have come a long way in the right direction from the outbreaks in the 1930's and that worst hour, on the 19th day of June 1943, in Detroit, Mich., without the help of the bill I am now introducing.

It may be that this bill is not the best answer. If some better suggestions are forthcoming, I shall welcome the chance to support them. But I cannot, in good conscience, agree with those who may now suggest that the case has been made for no congressional action. We need every means of prevention that we can find.

EXHIBIT 3

JANUARY 15, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate

MY DEAR SENATOR: The report that no indictment was returned by the Federal grand jury in the Mack Charles Parker case has caused me to review the activities of the Department of Justice in the investigation and attempted prosecution of this case.

There are several statements and documents which I believe justify a thorough study by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee to ascertain the background and sequence of these events. A study might well look into question such as: (1) On what grounds did the Department of Justice first enter the case? (2) What was the background of the Department of Justice's press release of May 25, 1959? (3) Why was the impression given that there were no Federal offenses involved when the investigative material was turned over to the State officials? (4) When the State grand jury was not presented with the case, why at this late date did the Attorney General call this a "travesty of justice" and then order it to be presented to a Federal grand jury?

In considering this proposal you may find the enclosed material, including a letter I received from the Department of Justice on July 28, 1959, quite useful.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

EXHIBIT 4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1959.

Attorney General William P. Rogers has announced that the FBI was directed today to turn over to Gov. J. P. Coleman, at Jackson, Miss., a summary of information relative to facts and evidence obtained during the FBI's investigation of the abduction and murder of Mack Charles Parker. This action on the part of the Justice Department was based upon a ruling that FBI investigations had clearly established that the persons responsible for the death of Parker had not violated the Federal kidnaping statute, and no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained.

According to Director J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI was ordered into this case on the morning of April 25, 1959, shortly after the abduction of Parker from the Pearl River County Courthouse jail in Poplarville, Miss. On May 4, 1959, Parker's body was recovered on the Mississippi side of the Pearl River near Bogalusa, La., by FBI agents and Mississippi highway patrolmen.

Mr. Hoover stated that during its intensive investigation which has just been completed the FBI interviewed scores of persons and examined numerous items of physical evidence. The report by the FBI has been given the Governor of Mississippi in order that a determination can be made as to violations of State laws, he said.

Mr. Hoover expressed appreciation for the cooperation give the FBI by Governor Coleman, the Mississippi highway patrol, and other responsible citizens. He said that the services of the FBI Laboratory, as well as its Fingerprint Identification Division and all other FBI facilities, are fully available to Mississippi authorities in the event additional assistance is needed for prosecution of State violations in the Parker case.

The FBI Director also stated that FBI personnel, including scientific experts of the FBI Laboratory, would be available to testify should the case be tried in State court.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 6, 1959]

LYNCHING AND THE LAW

What, if anything, can Uncle Sam do about lynchings—and about the failure of State governments to prevent or punish them? Fortunately this ugly form of mob violence has been extremely rare in recent years. When it occurs, however, and when, as in Poplarville, Miss., a grand jury refuses even to consider the available evidence against those who were responsible for it, the conscience of the country is outraged. The FBI conducted an exhaustive investigation of the case and made a complete report on it; the U.S. attorney in the area told local authorities the FBI agents were ready and willing to testify before the grand jury. But the report was not considered, and no FBI men were called. Attorney General Rogers characterized it as "a flagrant and calculated miscarriage of justice."

As a result of the Poplarville lynching, the Attorney General said that the Department of Justice is "studying the need for some new criminal statute in the civil rights field." It seems unlikely that this will take the form of a Federal antilynching law. Such legislation was proposed in a variety of forms during the 1930's when lynching was much more common. But lynching cannot constitutionally be made a Federal crime unless officers of a State, acting under color of law, are participants in it. Civil rights statutes banning such State violation of the 14th amendment have been on the books since the 1870's. They will no doubt be invoked before the Federal grand jury which is to look into the Poplarville case in January. But they were never intended to deal with so atrocious a crime as lynching, and the penalties they provide are altogether inadequate.

The key to the punishment of lynching must be found in the development of local sentiment that wants lynching punished. Without such sentiment, Federal juries are as likely as county juries to condone it. And the key to development of such sentiment, we are convinced, lies in enabling Negroes to vote. Wherever Negroes vote in appreciable numbers, their civil rights are respected. Wherever, in other words, their support must be solicited by candidates for local election, they will be able to command—and they will receive—the respect which is the due of American citizens.

Now, the right to vote is a right of American citizenship guaranteed by the 15th amendment and indubitably subject to the protection of the Federal Government. There is no doubt that the Department of Justice has authority to act in this field—authority to turn the key and open the door to Negro voting. If additional legislation is needed to make the right to vote meaningful, there is no doubt that Congress can constitutionally enact it. We surmise and hope that the Department's "study" is in this direction and that it will act with the utmost vigor.

While supremacists can hardly have it both ways if they invoke the Constitution to forbid Federal action against lynching, they cannot disregard the constitutional responsibility to protect voting rights. Full realization of these rights will mean at least the emancipation not of the Negro alone, but of the South itself.

[From the New York Times of Jan. 7, 1960]

BAD NEWS FROM MISSISSIPPI

The refusal of a grand jury to return an indictment would normally end the matter. Under our system of law, one does not lightly criticize a grand jury's decision to indict, or not to indict; for it is to the grand jury, and not to the public, that the evidence based on investigation by the law-enforcement authorities is duly presented.

However, enough is publicly known about the Mack Charles Parker lynching in Poplarville, Miss., last April to warrant a sense of shock and outrage that the Federal grand jury in Biloxi has failed to bring in an indictment against the kidnapers and murderers of the young Negro truckdriver who had been charged with the rape of a white woman. After the lynching, the Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted what the Attorney General of the United States described as "one of the most complete investigations I've ever seen." The FBI produced a long and detailed report, which—though it has not been and cannot be made public—is understood to have included names of participants in the lynching. Our own correspondent reports that "details of the lynching and the names of those involved were common knowledge" in the area.

In what Attorney General Rogers rightly called "a travesty on justice" a county grand jury last November failed to take action in the case; and now a Federal grand jury of 20 whites and 1 Negro—also local residents, of course—has done the same. * * * deeply affects our international position. The repercussions will be felt in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, for months and years.

What to do about it? Unfortunately, there isn't much that can be done. The Parker case emphasizes the need for Federal antilynching legislation. It also suggests that the Civil Rights Commission undertake its contemplated inquiry into the administration of justice in respect to civil rights, something that the Parker case shows to be in serious jeopardy in Mississippi.

[From Commonweal, Jan. 15, 1960]

CIVIL RIGHTS IN 1960

The problem of achieving an effective civil rights program will be one of the great domestic issues of 1960. Even if this were not an election year, the President and Congress would feel the growing pressure to increase present efforts and to strengthen present laws. But it is an election year, and the question of civil rights will inevitably become an intensely charged political issue. Each potential candidate for the Presidency will be called upon to answer various questions: Are present laws and programs sufficient? Should they be revised or reconstructed? What positive recommendations can be made?

In the face of this inescapable challenge, the disposition of the case of Mack Charles Parker will have telling effect. While awaiting trial for rape last April, Mack Parker was placed in a small jail in Poplarville, Miss. But in the night a group of white men broke into the jail, dragged him resisting to their cars, shot him twice through the chest and fed his body to the river. Although the FBI launched a large-scale investigation and was prepared to submit

abundant evidence, the county grand jury called no FBI witness, asked to see no reports, and returned no indictment. The case, apparently, was closed on this cynical note. This lynching would join other lynchings which were briefly noted and soon forgotten.

Attorney General William P. Rogers, however, calling such a procedure a travesty, asked for a particular study of the situation, and the Justice Department requested a Federal grand jury investigation. If a majority of the 23 Mississippians on the Federal grand jury panel decide that civil rights were violated, the Justice Department will be able to enter the case and to offer as evidence what is, apparently, acknowledged fact in the Mississippi community. For there seems to be little mystery about how and when Mack Parker was lynched or even about the identity of many people who were involved.

In the case of Mack Parker, it is not then a mystery but a problem that faces the southern community, the Federal Government and the Nation. It is the key problem to any meaningful civil rights program: How is justice to be administered under law in communities where prejudice allows the citizens to be indifferent to or contemptuous of civilized standards of justice? The difficulties under which the Justice Department is operating are clear from the fact that it felt called upon to reenter a case from which it had previously withdrawn and that the Attorney General justified this action by referring to laws of the Reconstruction Era whose constitutionality has been questioned.

Even if the Justice Department is effective in this case, the travesty of justice offered by the county grand jury cannot be forgotten. And if the Justice Department proves ineffective, even those most blinded by prejudice must acknowledge, even if they protest, the need for a more effective civil rights program.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 28, 1959]

FBI Names Lynchers to Mississippi—Case Solved, Left Up to Governor Coleman

Washington, May 27. — Government sources said today the FBI has solved the Mack Charles Parker lynching and named the participants in evidence turned over to Mississippi Gov. J. P. Coleman.

According to this report, the list was accompanied by proof of the identities of the masked men who went into the Pearl River County jail at Poplarville, Miss., in the early morning of April 25 and dragged the 23-year-old Negro feet first to their waiting cars.

Parker, who was on the eve of trial on a charge of raping a pregnant white woman, was found dead on the Mississippi side of the Pearl River May 4. He had been shot twice.

Today's Chicago Tribune reported an FBI solution of the case, quoting "informed sources on Capitol Hill." The newspaper said 10 men were named in the list turned over to Governor Coleman. New Orleans television station WDSU–TV said earlier that the FBI report implicated at least 18 persons.

The FBI which sent 40 agents into the area immediately after Parker's abduction, announced 2 days ago its investigation showed no Federal law violation. A major factor was the lack of any evidence a State line had been crossed. The body was in the swamps opposite Bogalusa, La., but there was nothing to indicate the abductors had crossed into that State.

In announcing its withdrawal, the FBI said its extensive evidence was being turned over to Governor Coleman for any action the State might desire to take. Governor Coleman has stated the evidence will be submitted to the next regular grand jury convening in Pearl River County in November.

According to Government sources, the FBI investigation developed this evidence:

Parker was due to face trial on April 27. A week before that date, there was talk around Poplarville about the possibility of trouble developing around the jail, where he was locked up, without guards, with other prisoners. Local authorities decided, however, that there was no good reason to take him elsewhere because it appeared unlikely any violence would develop.

On the night of April 24 there was an outdoor meeting in the yard of a farmhouse outside Poplarville which attracted a large attendance, and in which local indignation over the raping of the white woman was aired.

The meeting convened after 9 o'clock. When it broke up shortly after midnight, many of those in attendance got in their cars and drove back to their homes. Another group, reported to have numbered less than 10, put on masks and headed for Poplarville.

They arrived in the early morning hours of April 25 and got into the sheriff's office, where they obtained the keys to the jail cells from a cabinet. Parker was seized after his cell had been unlocked with one of these keys.

It was reported that most of the indignation voiced at the farmhouse conspiracy meeting was based on the prospect that Parker's Negro attorney would cross-examine the pregnant white woman when the Parker trial was convened on Monday. The most outspoken participants were represented as having said they would not stand for this.

In Jackson, Governor Coleman, preparing to leave for Washington to testify against civil rights legislation, declined to comment on request by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for a special grand jury to act on the FBI lynching report.

From New York, the NAACP had telegraphed: "The possibility is that information which would justify the issuance of true bills is ready for presentation."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 25, 1959]

Rogers Reports Lynchers Broke No Federal Law

Washington, May 2.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation has clearly established that there was no violation of Federal law by the persons responsible for the lynching of Mack Charles Parker at Poplarville, Miss., Attorney General William P. Rogers announced today.

Rogers said the FBI had been directed to turn over to Gov. J. P. Coleman a summary of all facts and evidence obtained by Federal agents in their investigation of the kidnaping and murder of the 23-year-old Negro accused of raping a pregnant white woman.

Rogers said in a statement that the FBI report would be given to Governor Coleman so that he may determine any violation of State laws.

Gov. J. P. Coleman said he would present evidence gathered by the agents to the next session of the Pearl River County grand jury which meets in November at Poplarville.

The Justice Department announcement did not give details of information gathered in the case, but indicated it would include the names of those the FBI considers prime suspects.

Parker was dragged screaming from the Pearl River County jail by a mob of masked men on April 25. He was scheduled to go on trial the following day on charges of raping the woman while her 4-year-old daughter looked on.

FINDING OF BODY

Parker's body, shot twice, was found on the Mississippi side of the Pear River near Bogalusa, La., last May 4 by FBI agents and Mississippi highway patrolmen.

The Department of Justice was in effect withdrawing from the case today. Rogers said the Department had "clearly established that the persons responsible for the death of Parker had not violated the Federal kidnaping statutes, and no other Federal prosecution could be maintained."

In order to establish violation of the Lindbergh kidnaping act, the Department would have had to prove that Parker's body had been carried across a State line.

The only other law under which the Federal Government could have acted in this case would have been a violation of Parker's civil rights by persons acting "under color of law." This means someone in an official capacity such as local authorities, acting in collusion with the lynching mob.

FORTY AGENTS SENT IN

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover sent about 40 agents to Poplarville April 25, shortly after Parker's abduction.

Hoover said that during the FBI intensive investigation agents interviewed scores of persons and examined numerous items of physical evidence.

FBI agents, it was learned, ended their investigation in gathering evidence early last week. The evidence was turned over to the Department's lawyers to determine whether a Federal crime had been committed. After sifting through the facts, Rogers ruled that there had been no Federal crime.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 4, 1959]

Grand Jury Quits Seemingly Without Considering Parker Lynching Case

Poplarville, Miss., Nov. 3 (UPI)—An all-white Pearl River County grand jury finished its investigations today and apparently declined to indict anyone for the lynching of Mack Charles Parker.

A usually reliable source said the 18-member grand jury had finished its consideration of criminal bills of indictment and would submit a report Thursday.

The grand jury did not call any of the more than 60 Federal Bureau of Investigation agents who took part in a month-long investigation of the Parker lynching last spring.

Because the grand jury acts in secret, officials would not tell newsmen even when it would reconvene.

The FBI withdrew from the case after the Justice Department reported it failed to find that any Federal laws had been violated. But the FBI submitted to Gov. J. P. Coleman a detailed 378-page report which named nearly a score of men as suspects.

Parker, a 23-year-old Negro accused of raping a pregnant white woman on a country road last February, was dragged from a jail cell here April 25 by a mob of masked, gloved white men who beat him, shot him and threw his body in the Pearl River.

It was understood that the grand jury did not receive the FBI report which Coleman turned over to the district attorney and Pearl River County prosecutor.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 6, 1959]

U.S. Jury To Sift Parker Lynching—Justice Department To Act as Panel in Mississippi, Ignores Case at Session

(By Anthony Lewis)

Washington, November 5.—The Justice Department said tonight that it would convene a Federal grand jury in Mississippi to consider the lynching of Mack Charles Parker.

The action came quickly after a Mississippi State grand jury had ignored the case in its deliberations. The jury adjourned today, according to reports, without considering a 378-page report on the lynching by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Acting Attorney General, Lawrence E. Walsh, made the announcement tonight. He made clear that the Justice Department

was back in the case because there was now no reason to defer to State rights.

Parker, a 23-year-old Negro charged with the rape of a white woman, was dragged from a jail in Poplarville, Miss., on the night of last April 24. Witnesses said he had been abducted by 15 to 20 masked men.

FOUND IN RIVER

FBI agents found his body 9 days later in the Pearl River. He had been shot twice.

The FBI carried out an intensive inquiry, sending as many as 60 men at a time to the Poplarville area. Though its findings have never been published, there were credible reports in Mississippi that the Bureau had identified the masked lynchers.

Last May 25, the Justice Department said that it was withdrawing from the case. It gave two main reasons for the withdrawal:

1. The FBI had clearly established that the persons responsible for the death of Parker had not violated the Federal kidnaping statute.

2. No other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained.

The second reason evidently referred to the two criminal civil rights statutes remaining from the post-Civil War period.

One of these provides a maximum 10-year jail sentence and $5,000 fine for persons conspiring to deprive someone of his civil rights. Lawyers regard its constitutionality as questionable if it is applied to actions by private persons rather than State officials.

The other statute is directed at persons acting under color of law—officials—who deprive another of his constitutional rights. The maximum penalty is a year in prison and a $1,000 fine.

One of the unknown factors in the Parker case is whether any official joined or helped the lynch mob. If so, it is believed that either of these two Federal statutes could be used constitutionally.

Mr. Walsh did not comment tonight on whether either of the two reasons given for withdrawing from the case last May had changed.

He said that the Justice Department had dropped out last May "so there would be no possible interference with a prosecution for State crimes, which then seemed simpler and more effective as vehicles of successful law enforcement."

"There is now no reason why Federal proceedings may not resume," Mr. Walsh said.

He said the Federal investigation of the lynching would be resumed. And he directed the U.S. attorney for the southern district of Mississippi, Robert E. Hauberg, to take the necessary steps toward presenting evidence before a grand jury.

Under the Constitution and Federal law, the grand jury will be composed of Mississippi citizens. Any persons it indicts will be tried by a locally drawn Federal petit jury.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Nov. 18, 1959]

UNITED STATES DENOUNCES LYNCHING INACTION

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General William P. Rogers, Tuesday, denounced Mississippi's handling of the Mack Parker lynching as a travesty on justice. He said the case may lead to proposals for new civil-rights legislation.

He told a press conference that he was considering a new criminal statute that would let the Federal Government move in more strongly when States refuse to act in racial crimes.

Such a proposal, if made by President Eisenhower, would mark a distinctly new approach for his administration. He and his attorneys have consistently played down criminal remedies in the civil-rights field.

Parker, a 23-year-old Negro charged with the rape of a white woman, was dragged from a jail in Poplarville, Miss., last April by a band of masked men.

Nine days later, agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation found his body in the Pearl River. He had beeen shot twice.

The FBI spent $80,000 investigating the case, Rogers said, and carried out "one of the most complete investigations I've ever seen conducted."

The Justice Department turned the report over to Mississippi officials and, last May, said it would not itself prosecute. Rogers said that was because the Department thought murder was a crime more appropriate for a State to handle under our Federal system.

Early this month, a Mississippi grand jury considered the case. Rogers said the Justice Department had written the grand jury and local officials offering to produce FBI agents to testify and to bring evidence, including fingerprints.

Not one FBI witness was called, and the grand jury adjourned without taking any action on the Parker case.

"You talk about States rights," Rogers said. "I believe in States rights too. But there are also State responsibilities.

"It seems clear to me that if a State doesn't believe in the administration of justice, to the extent of not even calling witnesses in a case like the Poplarville case, then the Federal Government must consider something else."

Rogers said the Mississippi officials' failure to act was as "flagrant and calculated a miscarriage of justice as I know of."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1959]

FEDERAL ACTION SET IN LYNCHING

The Justice Department today was preparing to seek Federal court action against the lynchers of Mack Charles Parker.

Acting Atty. Gen. Lawrence E. Walsh announced that the U.S. attorney in Jackson, Miss., has been told to take steps toward presenting the case to a Federal grand jury.

Parker, a 23-year-old Lumberton (Miss.) Negro indicted for raping a white expectant mother in a stalled car, was dragged from his cell last April. His body was found later in a river 20 miles away.

Initial Mississippi reaction to the newest Federal move was hostile. Judge Sebe Dale, in whose court the Pearl River County grand jury made its report, said he didn't think the Justice Department had a chance to get an indictment.

"They seem hellbent to punish us about everything that comes up," Judge Dale said. "They want to carry it to the last degree."

The decision to enter the case marked a sharp reversal for the Department. Apparently it would attempt to proceed under the civil rights laws. After a month-long investigation by the FBI last May, Justice Department officials admitted there had been no evidence of violation of the Federal kidnaping law because the lynchers apparently had not crossed a State line.

The FBI report was turned over to Mississippi. The 378-page report, which reportedly identified the men involved, was not considered by the local grand jury.

District Attorney Vernon Broom labeled the report hearsay. The grand jury could have it if it desired, he said. The 18-man jury, reporting yesterday, did not hand down any indictment in the case.

"From the standpoint of citizenship and law enforcement," the grand jury said, "our county compares favorably with any in the entire world."

In Jackson, Gov. J. P. Coleman and Attorney General Joe Patterson had no comment on the Justice Department's announcement.

District Attorney Broom said he also had no comment, but he added:

"It seems like a strange paradox to me that when a respectable woman of Mississippi is attacked on a lonely highway, the press showed little interest in it.

"Then when something happens to the rapist, the press raises an endless clamor."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1960]

LYNCHING OF MISSISSIPPI NEGRO GOES TO U.S. GRAND JURY TODAY

(By Claude Sitton)

BILOXI, MISS., January 3.—Federal grand jury investigation into the lynching of Mack Charles Parker, a Negro, will open here tomorrow amid growing national pressure for new civil rights legislation.

A panel of 23 Mississippians will be chosen to decide whether the evidence in the case warrants indictment for civil rights violations. If 12 or more find that it does the resulting trial will enable the Justice Department to bring out the full details of the crime.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation prepared a 318-page report on the case after a month's inquiry. This document has been kept secret, but details of the lynching are common knowledge in the area.

Acording to the story accepted here, 11 white men dragged Parker from the jail in Poplarville, Miss., last April and killed him with two shots through the chest.

The Federal grand jury investigation was requested by the Justice Department after a grand jury in Pearl River County did not return an indictment last November in Parker's murder.

Attorney General William P. Rogers said at the time that the county grand jury had called no FBI witnesses. And county officials said that jurors had not asked to see the Federal agents' report.

Mr. Rogers termed the handling of the lynching a "travesty on justice." He said he thought that disclosure of the evidence would shock the Nation.

If a trial should result from the new investigation, it would immediately precede or coincide with congressional consideration of new civil rights legislation, which will almost certainly include an antilynching bill. Debate is scheduled to start in the Senate about February 15.

Poplarville residents told a visitor last week that the names of the chief suspects and the details of the lynching had been common gossip in that county seat for some time. Inquiries there and among officials and others elsewhere in the State with a knowledge of the case produced a detailed account of events surrounding Parker's death.

The lynching, according to these sources, was carried out by seven white men from Pearl River County, about 1 a.m., on Saturday, April 25. It took place only 2 days before the victim was to have stood trial for the alleged rape of a young white mother who was pregnant.

Parker, a slight youth of 23, was a pulpwood truckdriver and cutter. He lived at Lumberton, 13 miles north of Poplarville.

Officials said he had no police record but had received a dishonorable discharge from the Army following two convictions for misappropriation of Government property.

Parker's two attorneys were Negroes. The prospect that they would cross-examine the white mother in open court on her accusations against Parker was said to have aroused intense bitterness.

VOIDING OF VERDICT FEARED

Some persons in the county realized that Parker might be freed by a Federal court even if convicted in the local court. State law requires that the jurors be drawn from voting rolls. And there were no Negro voters in the county.

A short time earlier, the United States Supreme Court had voided the conviction of a Negro in Carroll County, Miss., on the

ground that members of his race had been systematically excluded from jury service.

Two days before the lynching, the editor of the Picayune Item, a weekly newspaper in the southern tip of Pearl River County, attacked the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The editor, Chance H. Cole, criticized the association for having obtained Negro attorneys to defend Parker. He then said:

"The vicious, violent treatment meted out to this white, Forrest County housewife, helpless as she was to defend herself, is enough to make any American's blood boil. We have never believed in mob violence, but if M. C. Parker is found guilty of this crime no treatment is too bad for him or those who would attempt to get him out of it.

But Parker, as it turned out, would never have a chance to be found guilty or innocent.

As the full moon rose over the pine fields and pastures of the Pearl River Valley the night of April 24, cars began to arrive at an unpainted farmhouse 6 miles from Poplarville. Soon there were 35 men or more, it was said.

HUSBAND REFUSES TO JOIN

Two of the men drove 36 miles to Hattiesburg to invite the husband of the alleged rape victim to join them. He refused.

His wife, who had moved south from upstate New York while a child, told newsmen after the lynching that Parker should have received a trial. She said she had no objection to being questioned by the Negro attorneys.

But this was the point most discussed by the men as they milled around in the hard-packed clay yard of the house. Many said they feared that someone would attack the lawyers in the courtroom. The decision was made to "take the nigger out of jail."

Paper slips, some blank and some marked, were placed in a container and shaken around.

Those who drew the marked slips went to the jail, the others went home, not knowing who the lynchers would be.

As was the usual practice, no guard was stationed at the combination courthouse and jail. Entry was simple, once three of the men had obtained the keys through a contact.

The filing cabinet in Sheriff W. O. Moody's office, where the keys were kept, showed the marks of repeated hammering the next day. But the lock had apparently not been broken.

Informants said that the number of men who entered the jail that night had never been established. Some grew afraid at the last minute and fled.

REPORTED MASKED

Parker's fellow prisoners said that nine men disguised in masks and gloves had clattered up the stairway at the rear of the second floor courtroom and into the cell block. One held a pistol. Others brandished clubs.

After a brief scuffle, Parker was dragged struggling and screaming down the stairway. His captors clubbed him on the head repeatedly. His head bounced off the steel treads like "a ping pong ball," it was said. A trail of bloody handprints was left behind as he clawed frantically at the steps.

Four men tossed Parker into the back seat of a four-door sedan, jumped into the car and drove off. Three others followed in another automobile.

The cars raced southward through the tung tree orchards toward the Pearl River, the boundary between Mississippi and Louisiana. They stopped just short of the bridge over the muddy river which was swollen by spring rains.

Parker was pulled from the car and dumped on the ground. Two shots through the chest ended his life.

FRIGHTENED BY HEADLIGHTS

The men picked up Parker's body to throw it over the railing. But the headlights of a car approaching from the Louisiana side of the bridge frightened them.

They threw the body into the automobile and drove away. It is thought that they crossed the bridge into Louisiana and turned around at a livestock inspection station. Driving back into Mississippi, they dropped the body into the river on the downstream side of the bridge.

By Saturday afternoon, R. W. Bachman, special agent in charge of the New Orleans office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a number of agents had arrived in Poplarville. Gov. J. P. Coleman dispatched Bill Hood, Mississippi highway patrol chief, and one-quarter of the patrol's force to the scene.

Justice Department officials said the investigation that followed was one of the most intensive in the FBI's history and cost about $80,000.

One of those questioned by the FBI was J. P. Walker, a former deputy sheriff who operates an automobile body shop in Picayune. He was quoted as criticizing such an expenditure and the investigation into the death of "that Negro, who wasn't worth two bits."

Among others questioned were J. Florin Lee, a missionary Baptist preacher from the Poplarville area, and his son, J. F. Lee, Jr., a Poplarville automobile mechanic.

FBI AGENTS CRITICIZED

The family of Arthur Smith, a resident of nearby McNeill, complained that he had been harassed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A physician accused the agents of having interrogated another McNeill man, Christopher C. Reyer, so intensely that it had caused him to have a nervous breakdown.

Jewel H. Alford, of Poplarville, deputy and jailer and brother-in-law of Sheriff Moody, was also questioned repeatedly in the investigation.

Residents of the town seemed less critical last week of the FBI's activities in the case. One local official, who declined use of his name, said there had been no basis for the criticism in the first place.

Nine days after Parker was dragged from the jail, his body was found lodged in a brushfall on the river's edge. Identification was made through fingerprint records.

On May 25, the Federal Government withdrew from the case, saying that no Federal law had been violated. The punishment of crimes such as murder is left to the States by the Constitution.

U.S. PROSECUTION BARRED

Attorney General Rogers said it had been "clearly established" that the mob had not violated the Federal kidnaping act, apparently because it had not crossed the State line before killing Parker. He also said that "no other successful Federal prosecution could be maintained."

The report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation report was turned over to Governor Coleman, who subsequently gave it to Vernon Broome, circuit prosecutor. J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI Director, announced that agents would be available to testify "should the case be tried in a State court."

An 18-member grand jury was impaneled on November 2 by Circuit Judge Sebe Dale in Poplarville. In his charge, to the jury, the judge said that recent Supreme Court decisions might have been responsible for the lynching.

He referred to the Court as "that board of sociology, sitting in Washington, garbed in judicial robes."

Three days later the grand jurors went home without action in the Parker case. They had declined to hear FBI agents, who had offered to appear without being subpenaed.

Prosecutor Broome and County Attorney William H. Stewart indicated that the panel had made no request for the FBI report.

"I have an idea the Nation may look down on Mississippi justice now," said Judge Dale. "But I'm not apologizing."

JURY'S ACTION SUPPORTED

Those questioned in Poplarville last week said that residents generally agreed with the grand jury's course. They pointed out that there would have been practically no chance of convicting Parker's murderers had they been indicted. A trial, they contended, would only have embarrassed the community.

"You couldn't convict the guilty parties if you had a sound film of the lynching," said one official. He also asserted that not 1 person out of 100 in the town had realized the national implications of the case and not 1 out of 1,000 would care anyway.

There is regret over the lynching because of its effect on the town's reputation, according to Murphy Weir, editor of the Weekly Democrat. He said that most residents had believed Parker deserved a trial, although there was no sympathy for him.

More typical of the area's race relations, according to Mr. Weir, was the recent celebration of a Negro couple's 50th wedding anniversary. He said that more than 100 whites had attended an open house for them.

U.S. POSITION REVERSED

On the day that the local grand jury adjourned, the Justice Department announced that it would reenter the case. Attorney General Rogers made it clear later that this reversal of the Department's previous position had resulted from Mississippi's handling of the case.

"It was as flagrant and calculated a miscarriage of justice as I know of," he asserted.

Mr. Rogers also said that any prosecutions would be brought under one of two criminal statutes in the civil rights field, which were written into law during the Reconstruction era.

The first provides a maximum prison term of 10 years and a $5,000 fine for those involved in a conspiracy to deprive someone of his civil rights. The second imposes a year's imprisonment and a $1,000 fine on State officials found guilty of such a violation.

Lawyers question the constitutionality of the first statute when applied to private persons rather than officials.

INVESTIGATION PLANNED

An investigation of at least 2 weeks is expected to begin tomorrow after District Judge Sidney C. Mize empanels the grand jury. Some of the witnesses, who include the prime suspects in the lynching, have not been ordered to appear until January 15.

The Justice Department's determination to press the case is underscored by the sending of two of its lawyers from Washington, Ben Brooks and William A. Kehoe, to assist U.S. Attorney Robert E. Hauberg.

A refusal by the Federal grand jury to indict, observers contend, would provide striking support for those in the Justice Department who argue that new civil rights laws are needed.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1960]

U.S. JURY REFUSES LYNCH INDICTMENT

(By Claude Sitton)

BILOXI, MISS., January 14.—A grand jury announced today that it had found no basis for a Federal prosecution in the lynching of Mack Charles Parker, a Negro.

The panel of 1 Negro and 20 white residents of south Mississippi said they could not return indictments on the evidence presented by the Government.

The decision appeared to come as a surprise to defense lawyers retained by the men under investigation in the slaying.

One attorney, who asked that he not be identified, said "we had five names" of persons against whom action had been expected. Bonding arrangements already had been made for them, according to the attorney.

It marked a second failure to indict in the kidnaping and slaying of the 23-year-old truckdriver. He was taken from the jail at Poplarville, Miss., last April 25. Parker had been scheduled for trial 2 days later on a charge of raping a pregnant, white housewife.

A Pearl River County grand jury adjourned last November without taking action in the case, although details of the lynching and the names of those involved were common knowledge in that area.

This demonstration of the Federal Government's inability to bring Parker's murderers to justice was regarded as giving support to advocates of stronger civil rights legislation. An antilynching measure already has been introduced at this session of Congress.

The Federal grand jury was empaneled here January 4 as a result of action by Attorney General William P. Rogers. He termed Mississippi's handling of the case "a travesty on justice."

Officials of the Justice Department sought indictments on the ground that two civil rights statutes passed during the Reconstruction period had been violated. Prosecution for murder is left to the States under the Constitution.

Thirty-two witnesses, including some of the prime suspects, appeared before the jury. Most of the Pearl River County residents refused to answer questions on grounds of possible self-incrimination, it was said.

Testimony also was given by Federal Bureau of Investigation agents. The agency prepared a voluminous report on its month-long inquiry into the lynching. This was understood to include the names of the participants.

Government attorneys completed their case Tuesday and the grand jury began voting yesterday. Twelve affirmative votes would have been necessary for indictment.

Members of the panel filed into the second floor courtroom of the new Federal building here shortly after 10 a.m. to make their presentment to District Judge Sidney C. Mize.

The foreman, Charles P. Long, of Gulfport, said the jurors had heard all evidence the Government wished to offer and had made a careful study of the case.

"We are unable to arrive at any true bill," he told Judge Mize.

Mr. Long then said that the jurors felt that they could have never arrived at a true bill on the evidence that was presented.

The panel was thanked by the judge for "the very thorough way in which you have investigated this matter." In charging the jury, he had said that the question of a Federal violation appeared to hinge on whether a sheriff or deputy had knowingly permitted the mob to take Parker from the jail.

A defense attorney, Stanford E. Morse, Sr., of Gulfport, praised the grand jury after court was adjourned.

"Good work, Charlie," he said to Mr. Long.

The two Justice Department attorneys sent from Washington to assist U.S. Attorney Robert E. Hauberg in presenting the case declined to comment. They are Ben Brooks and William A. Kehoe.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the very able Senator from Michigan for a very fine and clear statement. At the time the hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary I was present and interrogated Governor Coleman of Mississippi, when he testified on the so-called civil rights legislation. During that hearing I quoted the statutes involved for the benefit of both the record and the Governor of Mississippi. At that time I wondered why the FBI had turned the reports over to the Governor. I pointed out that the law in Mississippi was similar to the law in Colorado. There were judicial districts in the States and elected district attorneys. I pointed out that normally it is the district attorney who enforces the law, not the Governor of the State. That is true in Mississippi. Nonetheless, the FBI had turned the reports over to the Governor, with action not being taken until November—until after the election, I suspect.

The point was made by me at the time of the hearing—and immediately after the hearing I issued a statement about it—that I disagreed with the Attorney General, and said that there were statutes under which the suspects could be investigated and prosecuted and convicted if the evidence warranted such action. I cited the two statutes in question. Months later the Federal grand jury investigated under the two statutes I had mentioned. I suspect that there was a reason for not moving ahead.

Of course, those statutes are not so severe, from the standpoint of penalty, as a statute relating to murder. I must confess, also, that I would rather see, where there is a clear case of murder—and there was no question about that in this case—that the perpetrators of the murder be prosecuted under the murder statute rather than under some other statute which provides a lesser penalty. However, the Senator from Michigan has put his finger on a vital point, the question of national morality.

A very serious, tragic crime might be committed. It might be known who the defendants are; yet nothing can be done about it. This raises the question, What can be done under an antilynching statute?

Almost 25 years ago, when I was a young man, I was seated in the gallery of this Chamber and heard a great debate on the necessity, at that time, for an antilynching statute. The people had been led to believe down through the years—and I suspect there was some measure of truth in the statement—that lynchings had abated.

But in Mississippi there is a peculiar situation. I have not had the opportunity to read all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, but this whole matter relates to the question of the right to vote in Mississippi. I think the record will bear me out that Governor Coleman testified that one could be seated on a jury only if he was a qualified male elector. One could be a qualified male elector in that county only if he was privileged to register to vote. In that county there was not one Negro on the rolls.

Mr. HART. That is the impression I have developed from a reading of the reports of the case.

Mr. CARROLL. This has been some months ago, but, if my memory is accurate, when I addressed to Governor Coleman the question whether the name of any Negro appeared on the rolls, his answer was, "No." In fairness to him, he did say, however, that Negroes were not deliberately excluded; he said they simply did not register. I have forgotten the exact figures, but I believe the population of that particular county was more than 50 percent Negro.

The fact remains, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, there cannot be a systematic exclusion of American citizens from a jury by reason of race, religion, or, I may add, color.

How could a jury have been selected to try this man? I think the charge against that particular defendant was one of forcible rape. How could he have been tried? He did not have a jury, under our American system of criminal jurisprudence, which could properly hear his case, because in that county Negroes were not permitted to become qualified electors; and not having become electors, they could not become jurors. Therefore, the case fell under the constitutional rule of systematic exclusion, and he could not have been properly tried under the American system of criminal law.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there is an interesting development in the use of the Constitution of this country when the subject of an antilynching bill is proposed in Congress. Throughout the years, this kind of bill has been before Congress many times. Always the argument is made that the Constitution prevents the Federal Government from enacting this kind of legislation. Those who oppose such legislation invoke the Constitution of the United States as their reason for opposition.

Yet the Senator from Colorado has just cited an instance which is not an isolated one. Regrettably, in that one county, the people persistently ignore the constitutional obligation to afford every adult the opportunity to vote. They would have it both ways, in a sense.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the Senator's remarks. Let us assume that years ago Congress had passed an antilynching statute similar to the one now proposed by the Senator from Michigan. Would not the defendants in this case now be subject to indictment?

Mr. HART. My answer, of course, would be "Yes."

Mr. CARROLL. Would not the Federal Government be confronted with the situation which confronts it in the case of other statutes? I do not say this to harass the Senator from Michigan, but would such persons not have to be indicted by a Federal grand jury?

Mr. HART. Indeed, they would. As the Senator from Colorado has suggested, I believe we have an obligation which, in the eyes of the world, we will fail to meet unless we put on the books a statute which declares that this kind

of crime is more than murder. This is a crime which involves individuals who go, in the dead of night, to a man's home and yank him out of it by violence.

Second, in putting on the Federal books a prohibition against such conduct and applying sanctions to those who would do it, I can only hope that by establishing it as a Federal crime, the Federal officials will aggressively prosecute and that, hopefully, a jury will return a verdict which the facts warrant.

Mr. CARROLL. The second proposition which the Senator from Michigan outlines is to me a very compelling and logical one. When the terrible crime of which we have spoken occurred, there was great indecision, I assume, on the part of the Attorney General of the United States and the Department of Justice as to whether they could prosecute under existing law.

Mr. HART. That is very clear from some exhibits I have introduced.

Mr. CARROLL. If at that time we had a clear statute covering the Mississippi situation, one that all State officers and all citizens could understand, that if a citizen were lynched, either by citizens alone or with the complicity of law enforcement authorities, then those responsible would be subject to a conspiracy statute and to a substantive statute for the lynching itself, if they were parties to it. There could be no question then. The authorities would be able to act without hesitation. Everybody would understand what the law was. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HART. That is the second reason which I think should compel us seriously to consider and, I hope, pass such a bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Even if there were such a statute, under the situation which developed in Mississippi, as I read the newspaper reports of the case as they emanated from that area, I doubt whether a Federal grand jury would have indicted under the statute.

What might have happened, had there been such a statute, was that perhaps the State enforcement officials themselves would have been a little more apprehensive as to what was taking place.

This brings us back to the fundamental question which we shall have to meet here in a week or two, the basic question which has been coming up every year, and which has come up with even more significance this year: that American citizens must be guaranteed the right to vote and to participate in our political system; the right to choose representatives; the right to participate in the jury system and all the other political rights to which American citizens are entitled, including, I may say, the right to trial by a jury of their peers. They cannot be afforded such trials unless they are given the full-fledged privilege and right to vote.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for his excellent comments. Under the circumstances I desire to study further his antilynching bill. I should be very happy and privileged to associate myself with him in the sponsorship of the bill which he is now discussing. I believe I was a cosponsor of a similar bill with the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. In any event, I recall the great encouragement which the junior Senator from Colorado gave to me at the time I was considering the introduction of the bill. One is not happy in introducing such a bill; and my remarks, as they appeared when I introduced it, acknowledged that this might be regarded as singling out and pointing a finger at one region because of a recent highly emotional incident. At that time I made the point that such an incident could happen anywhere in the country, because similar incidents have happened in many places.

While the constitutional violation may not be the same, the basic motivation is. It happens when a Negro family seeks to move into a white neighborhood in Michigan, and there is violence. This is not peculiar or unique to any section. Regrettably, it is an aspect of human nature which the world which we seek to influence, and to whom we assert a claim to moral leadership, must view very dimly. For these and many other reasons, I hope that this last example, this last chapter, in the lynch book will trigger the enactment of Federal legislation against lynching. I do not know whether it will. I suppose that what will happen is that every time there is one of these incidents, it will be hoped by some that it will be the last; and by others that it will be the last and that it will not trigger action.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator has raised a good point. This is not a question of pointing a finger at a particular State simply because we happened to mention Mississippi. I think Governor Coleman, who testified before our committee, is a very able lawyer. We commended him for his forthright expression of what the law of Mississippi is and how the judicial system there works.

I may say to the Senator from Michigan that in the past few months, since the Mississippi case, right in my own State of Colorado, the Colorado Supreme Court threw out a criminal case in northern Colorado, in a rich agricultural area, because it held that there was a systematic exclusion of Spanish-American citizens in the selection of a jury. So it is not a question of only one area. The principle of constitutional law applies to every area. The question is, Do we need further legislation, whether it is an antilynching statute or otherwise? Do we need stronger statutes so we can let citizens in each State and the law enforcement officers of the United States know that persons cannot break into jails and take the law into their own hands by disposing of a person who is charged with a crime? Is this a matter for Federal legislation under the Constitution? I think it is.

Mr. HART. I thank the junior Senator from Colorado. As he spoke, whether consciously or not, he must have had in mind a very persuasive memorandum of the law which was filed with the Judiciary Committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, subscribed to by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the late great Senator from North Dakota, Senator Langer, making this very point in terms of constitutional justification for such action.

Again I thank the junior Senator from Colorado. He has pointed to that which underlies protection in this field against physical violence by self-appointed executors of the law. We in Congress should do everything we can, within our constitutional right, to protect the privileges and immunities of citizens including the opportunity to vote, in every section of the country. I think the Senator from Colorado has put his finger on the key that unlocks the door. If I read the wire service statements correctly, it is not that which the Attorney General would have us believe. It is not to ignore the bill introduced by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], which undertake to do precisely what the President's Civil Rights Commission proposed, namely, authorize temporary Federal registrars, and thus assure the opportunity of citizens to vote.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I had no knowledge that the able junior Senator from Michigan was going to speak on this subject this afternoon. I am sort of speaking off the cuff. I think I can say, without any equivocation, that if there had been American Negroes registered in the county in Mississippi to which reference has been made, if the qualified male electors could have voted and if they had been on the jury list in that county in Mississippi, whose name I have forgotten——

Mr. HART. Pearl River.

Mr. CARROLL. Pearl River County. Had there been qualified male electors on the jury list, I have a strong conviction that the lynching would not have taken place.

Mr. HART. So do I.

Mr. CARROLL. If my recollection serves me correctly, when the defendant was arraigned, his counsel raised the constitutional question of systematic exclusion from the jury list. Not having permitted these persons to register to vote and be on the jury list, and fearing the case would be nullified by the systematic exclusion rule, I think the community, in its anger, not knowing what to do, decided to take the law in its own hands. This is a breakdown of the democratic process. Some people got together and took the law into their own hands because there was no law which could touch them, because of the weakness and defect in the democratic process.

I thank the Senator from Michigan. I shall not interfere with his presentation further. I think it is fine. It has stimulated my thinking on this subject.

I close with this one observation. If the Attorney General of the United States, the head of the Department of Justice, is very confused as to what the law is, one can realize the confusion which may exist in the various States as to whether action by Federal offi-

cials constitutes a violation of a statute. Whether we do it with an anti-lynching statute or not, we have got to strengthen the Federal laws to see to it that there is a protection of a person's right to a fair and speedy trial.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Colorado and welcome the opportunity to benefit from the leadership he has given in this whole field in his role as a member of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

His comment that he did not have word that I intended to make this speech is correct. Last night, however, I did send copies of these remarks to the distinguished Senators from Mississippi, in view of the comments which of necessity would be made with respect to that great State.

Mr. CARROLL. The reason why I made that observation is that I wanted the RECORD to show that this discussion is entirely impromptu and extemporaneous. I appreciate the Senator's discussing this matter. I know of his great interest in such legislation. In other words, there was nothing calculated about our discussion.

Mr. HART. Very likely the grammar and continuity will reflect that it is unrehearsed.

Mr. CARROLL. I hope the reporters will make some corrections.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between my distinguished friends from Michigan and Colorado. I want to express my gratification that the Attorney General today, after conference with the President, has taken the initiative in urging action to further protect the voting rights of our citizens. This leadership on the part of the President and the Attorney General should prove to be an important stimulant to effective action in this field.

The administration's proposal for U.S. referees is in many respects not so far reaching as the recommendations for the appointment of temporary Federal registrars. Certainly it is a step in the right direction. I will urge that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which is now considering a number of Federal registrar bills and is calling witnesses before it, immediately add the proposal for U.S. referees to its agenda.

The proposal as drafted by the Attorney General and presented this afternoon is worded in such a manner that it would normally, if introduced in the Senate, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, since it amends the Civil Rights Act of 1957. However, that is a matter of phraseology, and it does deal with voting rights and does seek to strengthen the assurance of voting rights to all citizens, and could appropriately be incorporated in a bill to be reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, if it should determine, in its wisdom, that that is the proper course.

Personally, I shall favor whichever procedure appears to me, after hearings, to promise the most effective relief to Americans who are being denied their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

The advantage of an administrative remedy through the appointment of Federal registrars is that it is generally more expeditious since judicial relief in voting cases, while vital, and now provided for in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is often slow, cumbersome, and costly.

On the other hand, the administration's proposal has the advantage—a very distinct advantage—of being applicable to voting as well as registration, and is more closely related, it must be admitted, to the existing framework for prosecuting such matters.

The Federal registrar plan, which I favor—and I am not seriously concerned about the unconstitutionality question which has been claimed with regard to it—is applicable only to registration.

In other words, it could be asked, after we got them registered, where do we go from there? In any event, I hope it will be the subject of full hearings.

I trust the Attorney General or his representative will appear before our committee to express his views on it. I commend the President and the Attorney General for the action they have taken today. I know that their support of legislation to deal with this problem will greatly strengthen the hand of those of us in Congress who are determined to press for meaningful civil rights legislation during this session.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT WEEK

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1072, Senate Concurrent Resolution 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) proposing observance of week beginning January 31, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand this is one of the customary resolutions in encouragement of a very worthy objective. I understand it is sponsored by the leadership on both sides of the aisle and that there is no objection to its being agreed to immediately. I believe the acting minority leader will agree with me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the resolution, included in the committee report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 31 through February 6, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week, and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

STATEMENT

A similar resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, was agreed to by the Senate of the United States on January 20, 1959, and agreed to in the House of Representatives on January 21, 1959.

Junior Achievement, Inc., is a nationwide, nonprofit organization which was organized in 1942 to provide high school students with the opportunity to learn American business methods by actually organizing and operating their own businesses under the sponsorship of local business corporations.

Students who are members of the Junior Achievement learn-by-doing business enterprise are advised by employees of the sponsoring firms. Junior Achievers are recruited in public and parochial high schools throughout the country with the cooperation of school authorities. The Junior Achievers meet and work in business centers maintained and supervised by Junior Achievement in communities from coast to coast. The members of Junior Achievement companies decide on the products they will produce and sell. They elect their own teenage officers and capitalize their own ventures through the sale of stock at 50 cents a share to parents, relatives, friends, neighbors, and themselves. The average capitalization is $100 per Junior Achievement company.

These teenage members buy raw materials, set up production lines, and manufacture products. From Boston to San Diego, from September to May, they are busy casting, molding, joining, polishing, binding, everything from lamps to oven mitts to bookends to hand soap. When they are not working on production lines, they are pounding pavements selling. When these Junior Achievers sell their products, they also sell the entire junior achievement program, for only in selling the program can they succeed in selling their stock and products. It is in this dual process of selling the idea to make the sale that the teenagers become ambassadors extraordinary of their private enterprise economy.

At the end of the junior achievement program year in May, each company publishes complete financial reports. At this time also dividends are paid to stockholders and many a company manages to pay 10 percent on the share, an impressive yield in any market.

Since its beginning in 1942, this program of junior achievement has spread from a few small areas in the northeast region of the country into a national organization in 95 communities from coast to coast.

This organization numbers more than 30,500 teenagers and operates more than 2,000 miniature corporations operating in over 95 communities throughout the United States.

The committee deems it appropriate that the week of January 31 through February 6, 1960, be designated as National Junior Achievement Week, thus calling to the attention of the citizens of this country the worthwhile program undertaken by thousands of high school pupils who are gaining a growing understanding of the privileges

and duties of citizenship and are being better prepared to assume the responsibilities of community leadership through this program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 81, without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 31, 1960, through February 6, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week and urging all citizens of our country to salute the activities of Junior Achievers and their volunteer adult advisers through appropriate ceremonies.

The preamble was agreed to.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 559, Senate Joint Resolution 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call up the amendments I have at the desk, which I ask to have stated and made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after the quotation marks, it is proposed to insert "SECTION 1.".

On page 2, line 8, to strike out the quotation marks.

At the end of the resolution, to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

The Congress shall have power to enforce this section by appropriate legislation.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives and relating to qualifications for voting in Federal elections.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have received word from the leadership that the action just taken is agreeable to both sides; namely, that the pending joint resolution be made the unfinished business, and that my amendment be the pending question.

I do not intend to discuss my amendment tonight, or at any time until after the author of the joint resolution itself [Mr. KEFAUVER] and Senators who may care to support the joint resolution or to oppose it have had full and reasonable opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there is no further business to come before the Senate today. I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1960:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1969. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Harold R. Tyler, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice W. Wilson White, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Warner Hodges, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice Millsaps Fitzhugh, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

George C. Harrison, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice John T. Williams, term expired.

Herbert E. Patrick, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice John O. Anderson, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1960:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense.

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, O15968, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) to be general.

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, O15004, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be lieutenant general.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129.

Brig. Gen. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071.

Brig. Gen. Horace Freeman Bigelow, O18775.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, O17775.

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, O18245.

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, O17619.

Brig. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072.

Brig. Gen. Albert Watson 2d, O18105.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, O29844.
Col. Wallace Hawn Brucker, O18793.
Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812.
Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003.
Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., O19109.
Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067.
Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103.
Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213.
Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282.
Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077.
Col. Charles Edwin Rust, O299965.
Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526.
Col. James Richard Winn., O19491.
Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407.
Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535.
Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, O30271.
Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380.
Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553.
Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822.
Col. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965.

NOMINATIONS CONSIDERED FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The following appointments which had been favorably reported and placed on the Vice President's desk were considered, and

On request by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Resolved, That the Senate advise and consent to appointment of the following-named persons to the offices named agreeably to their respective nominations

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes and others.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Manual J. Asensio, 324A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank in-

dicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, 592A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, 23161A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The nominations of John S. Flint and other officers, which were reported favorably and placed on the Vice President's desk, were considered and,

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, it was

Resolved, That the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of the said persons to the offices named agreeably to their respective nominations.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officer for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the President nominates him for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy, to be admiral.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy, to be admiral.

Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy, to be admiral.

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, they were nominated for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, they were nominated for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.[1]

Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy.[1]

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Ephraim P. Holmes	Robert L. Moore, Jr.
John T. Hayward	Frank L. Johnson
Vernon T. Lowrance	Lot Ensey
Charles C. Kirkpatrick	Denys W. Knoll
Alfred G. Ward	John W. Ailes III
James M. Farrin, Jr.	Robert J. Stroh
George H. Wales	James W. Davis
Edward J. O'Donnell	Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
Andrew M. Jackson, Jr.	Joseph C. Clifton
Kleber S. Masterson	Allan L. Reed
Marshall E. Dornin	Ernest C. Holtzworth
Robert M. Reynolds	Ray C. Needham
Lloyd M. Mustin	Jack S. Dorsey
Francis D. Foley	Frank B. Miller
Ignatius J. Galantin	Raymond N. Sharp
Thomas H. Moorer	Emmet O'Beirne
Frederick V. H. Hilles	Edward E. Colestock
Alexander S. Heyward, Jr.	Elonzo B. Grantham, Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

James L. Holland	Cecil L. Andrews

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admirals

Howard F. Kuehl	James S. Dietz
Joseph M. Lyle	

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admirals

Eugene J. Peltier	Norman J. Drustrup
Henry G. Clark	James R. Davis

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Alvan Fisher	John W. McElroy
Herman Reich	Richard O. Patterson
John E. Harlin	Victor Hicks
Arthur A. de la Houssaye	

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Joseph S. Barr	Robert A. Ross
William L. Rogers	Wendell G. Scott
Francis J. Braceland	

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be rear admiral

William E. Collins

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

Edwin N. Blackwood

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

William M. Burns

MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Alan Shapley	James P. Berkeley
Robert B. Luckey	Donald M. Weller
Arthur F. Binney	Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Thomas G. Ennis	Charles H. Hayes
Carson A. Roberts	

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps., to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the first day of January 1960.[1]

MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier generals

Alpha L. Bowser	Frank C. Tharin
Harvey C. Tschirgi	Robert E. Cushman, Jr.
Avery R. Kier	Richard G. Weeds
Sidney S. Wade	Lewis J. Fields
James M. Masters, Sr	Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.
Ralph K. Rottet	Paul R. Tyler
Samuel R. Shaw	
John P. Condon	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier general

James E. Horwath, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major general

William W. Stickney[1]

To be brigadier generals

George E. Tomlinson[1]	William H. Klenke, Jr.[1]
John L. Winston[1]	Harry N. Lyon[1]
Charles O. Clark[1]	

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

Bert B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. O. Garfield Beckstrand II, associate pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty, everlasting God, Creator of all mankind, bestower of all good gifts unto Thy children, and protector of all who labor and seek Thy righteousness, still the problems, burdens, and anxieties of this day as we pause quietly and reverently before Thee.

Deepen within us that sense of Thy presence. Let Thy holy spirit breathe into our hearts pure and holy desires. Let Thy truth inform our minds. Help us to be reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, and generous in the protection of weakness. Give us courage to put right before interest, others before self, principles above reputation, and Thy way before our desires.

Bless these distinguished leaders of Government who guide the destiny of our Nation. Give them strength and wisdom to carry out the mandates of their office to Thy glory, in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2436. An act to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business

[1] Ad interim appointment issued.

[1] Ad interim appointment issued.

[1] Ad interim appointment issued.

in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if it is true that the Committee on the Judiciary has a bill that they are anxious to bring before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to object to the request? If so, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have only reserved the right to object, and I will not object, because I think that is the prerogative of the majority leadership to schedule legislation; but I am simply calling attention to the fact that I understood that that is so.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is it that the gentleman understands?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That the Committee on the Judiciary had a bill they were anxious to get before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman take the position that we should bring up the civil-rights bill under the Calendar Wednesday procedure?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. My personal position on that is "Yes."

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman amazes me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Massachusetts would explain to the House why that would not be a proper procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. All that is necessary to bring the bill before the House under a procedure whereby the House can work its full will on this important legislation is to get 219 signatures on the discharge petition and bring the bill up under that procedure, or for the Committee on Rules to report out a rule and bring it up under a rule.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All I can say is that the proceeding under the Calendar Wednesday rule would permit this bill to be brought out tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not believe that the gentleman is creating any misconceptions about this matter, certainly, in the minds of the Members of the House or in the minds of people throughout the country who are interested. The proposal also has been made that the bill can be brought up by the leadership under suspension of the rules. Of course, that would require a two-thirds vote and, of course, it would be a calculated risk that a responsible leadership would be aware of and realize the danger in such a procedure. Secondly, no amendments under such a procedure could be offered to the bill. Certainly, a bill of this kind ought to be brought up under a procedure whereby Members may offer amendments. As the gentleman well knows, many Members are interested and many people are interested in the offering of an amendment in connection with the voters registrar's provision. Many Members feel that such a provision should be a part of the bill, so that those who advance suspension of the rules to bring this up know that is not the proper way to bring this bill up in the House. And the same thing applies to Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will explain to the House why Calendar Wednesday is not a proper device within the rules of the House to bring this up——

Mr. McCORMACK. Calendar Wednesday, on occasion, is a very important device to have, but on a bill of this kind the gentleman knows you have got to dispose of the bill in a day, and if you do not dispose of the bill on Calendar Wednesday it does not go over until next Calendar Wednesday. The gentleman understands that. The last controversial bill on Calendar Wednesday we had ran until about 5 o'clock the following morning.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If it is important enough there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we can get the bill out under a rule or a discharge petition, that provides for orderly debate and orderly conduct in the House, the gentleman knows that under Calendar Wednesday in connection with any bill of a controversial nature the House becomes chaotic.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know that. I do not think the gentleman does either.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says he does not know that? The gentleman amazes me. I have profound respect for my friend.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have respect for the gentleman and I know he has respect for me.

Mr. McCORMACK. But on this matter I say to the gentleman that I know he is doing a little probing but he is not fooling anybody.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I took the floor last week to discuss the issue with particular reference to Calendar Wednesday. I think we should have a debate on the subject of whether Calendar Wednesday is not a proper device, because I do not like this position that we seem to be placed in on our side of the aisle that we are the ones that are dragging our feet in connection with this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are 11 or 12 committees ahead of the Judiciary Committee. When the gentleman says it can get on the floor tomorrow, I am sorry for the uncomfortable political position he is in.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, no.

Will the gentleman answer this question? Have any of the other committees bills that are ready? The gentleman says there is no other business for the rest of this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know of anyone who supports civil rights legislation outside of Congress that at this time of year wants to take the calculated risk of bringing up the civil rights bill on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said anyone of responsibility outside of Congress. Certainly the officials of all the fine organizations of America, the colored race, and others who are interested do not want it brought up.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now, wait a moment. We are not told by other people how we do things. I think we in Congress figure that out for ourselves if we are responsible.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman is suggesting in January a course of action that would result in legislative chaos.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. All you have to do is to have the Rules Committee report out a rule and we can bring it up. The gentleman knows that rule will either be reported out in reasonable time or a discharge petition will be signed. I know how many signatures have been signed, but I cannot announce it, under the rules.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Somebody announced it for the press.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. But before the Judiciary Committee would have the right, 11 or 12 other committees could be called. If the gentleman is going to object, I will withdraw my request. I would not put the gentleman to the burden of objecting. If the gentleman is going to object, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. If the gentleman pleases——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, feeling the way he does, ought to object. Certainly the gentleman is a Member of Congress; he cannot get around the smoke screen that he is a Republican Member. You will not offend me as majority leader if you object. If you do I will sit down with a smile on my face.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. The only point I am making, and I hope it is quite clear, is that the gentleman takes the floor as the majority leader and asks that the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with. That is an indication to the membership of the House that we are not to take this matter up under the Calendar Wednesday procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is not saying that at all.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If that is the position of the leadership I want to make it very plain.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has his responsibility if he argues that we should bring up a bill of this kind under the Calendar Wednesday procedure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do argue that this bill can and should be brought up under Calendar Wednesday, but I withdraw my reservation of objection inasmuch as the leadership of the House must be ready to use Calendar Wednesday. There would be no point to having Calendar Wednesday if the majority leader and I presume the chairman of the Judiciary Committee are not prepared to make use of it. Obviously they are not prepared to use it, otherwise we could have Calendar Wednesday tomorrow and take up the civil rights bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF PRESS GALLERY

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 429

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That, effective February 1, 1960, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of an Assistant Superintendent in the House Periodical Press Gallery, at the basic salary of $2,580 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. LAMB INDUSTRY FACES CRITICAL TIMES

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today, in San Antonio, Tex., the Nation's woolgrowers are meeting in national convention. One of the major topics before that meeting will be lamb prices, and the four points which affect those prices. The National Woolgrowers Association has prepared a report, entitled "What Makes Lamb Price," which I believe is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

As this study so dramatically illustrates, there are four phases of the lamb-price situation in the United States which are creating major problems in the American lamb industry.

First is the growing price spread of the retailers. This is graphically shown by the charts of gross income and marginal trends in the lamb business. In studying the chart on annual averages, I found that in 1956 the producer received $22.05 for his product, while in 1959 he received $21.95. Thus, between 1956 and 1959 the grower's prices actually declined, but in that period of time the retail price of a lamb carcass went from $27.25 to $31.63, or a gain of more than 16 percent. Obviously, the grower is getting none of these price increases—the middleman is getting it all.

Second, the lamb supply trends chart reveals how the middlemen are increasingly bringing in outside lamb, or manipulating by bulk pressure in a market like New York City, to further break the price to the producer.

The third point is that buying power is so concentrated that the producer is at the mercy of the middleman. When three packers handle more than one-half of the slaughter, and when 15 packers do almost 75 percent of the slaughter, then this concentration of buying power obviously works against the interest of the producer. Such concentration of buying power, in this and other industries, is a matter I believe should be thoroughly looked into by Congress, in the interests of both producers and consumers.

Fourth is the import situation—certainly, Congress should take a look into this. In 1956, 1.3 million pounds of lamb and mutton were imported into the United States, and during the first 9 months of 1959, imports had jumped to 48.8 million pounds. The impact of this increase in imports on the domestic industry is obvious.

It is very apparent that the answer to the problem of the everwidening spread between retail prices and the prices paid to growers will only be found in appropriate congressional action.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur is one of the greatest military commanders in world history. With only a fraction of American manpower, money, and equipment, he and his gallant men crushed the Empire of Japan. MacArthur was supposed to fight only a holding action in the South Pacific until reinforcements from Europe, after the defeat of Germany and Italy, arrived. The vast proportion of U.S. manpower and industrial output was hurled at Germany and impotent Italy. A Germany greatly weakened by the attrition of her armies and air force in Communist Russia.

Final victory in Europe was won in May 1945. In the Pacific, General MacArthur faced a Japan potentially more powerful than all of Europe combined. Japan in 1942 was flushed with overwhelming victory on land, sea, and in the air. She had access to oil, rubber, aluminum, and controlled almost a billion people. Her army, navy, and air force were at peak strength. General MacArthur, rather than wait for Germany's defeat, embarked upon a brilliant strategy. By skillful application of land, sea, and air power, MacArthur bypassed vast enemy-controlled areas and destroyed the military power of Japan even before the surrender of Germany. General MacArthur by his genius saved the American people thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, last week I referred to General MacArthur's contribution to freedom as occupation commander in Japan and commander of our Armed Forces during the Korean war. Mr. Speaker, on this, General MacArthur's 80th birthday, I join with his family and friends in wishing for him the happiest birthday of all.

THE HENNINGS CLEAN ELECTIONS BILL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the other body struck a note of high statesmanship yesterday when, by an overwhelming vote, it passed the Hennings clean elections bill. In my opinion, nothing has done more to put a cloud of distrust over politics and politicians than our antiquated and unrealistic election laws. It should surprise no one that Members of Congress have forfeited public esteem by their failure to modernize the model T Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

In the interim our entire way of life and methods of campaigning for public office have been drastically altered, and surely the time has come when Congress must provide new legislation which will insure open elections and the fullest possible disclosure of the funds used by candidates in their campaigns.

The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and I have collaborated during the last three Congresses in an attempt to secure a realistic rewrite of our Corrupt Practices Act. Later today I expect to introduce—with one major modification—the bill passed by the other body.

This change would eliminate the provision which provides for Federal regulation of primary elections and State conventions. Although it is my personal conviction that primaries and State conventions should be regulated, I recognize there is strong opposition in this body to such controls, and I have deleted this controversial section in order to facilitate favorable action on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will rise to the challenge presented to us yesterday by our sister institution and pass a clean elections bill before we adjourn.

STEEL SETTLEMENT

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members of Congress were interested in the letter from Vice President NIXON to Alexander F. Jones, executive editor of the Syracuse Herald-Journal, relative to the role that NIXON and Secretary Mitchell played in the recent steel setlement.

For my part, I find it fascinating that Mr. NIXON should justify his role on the basis that Congress, in dealing with labor-management relations, would be politically irresponsible in an election year.

Mr. NIXON writes:

I can only say that any objective observer would have to agree that there could be nothing more irresponsible than to place before the Congress in an election year the complicated and potentially explosive issue of labor-management relations.

By implication, Mr. Speaker, we are asked to believe that there was absolutely nothing political about the Vice President interjecting himself into the steel dispute, absolutely nothing political about the settlement terms which he proposed, absolutely nothing political about the fact that the steel companies have indicated quite clearly that they will postpone steel price increases until after the presidential election this November.

With Mr. NIXON an avowed candidate for the presidency of the United States, I can hardly believe that the Vice President is as objective and politically responsible as he would have the Nation believe. On the contrary, on the basis of past performance, I think that it is much more plausible that Mr. NIXON's role in the steel settlement was calculated quite shrewdly and deliberately to win the gratitude of steelworkers, and at the same stroke to forestall any congressional consideration which might focus public attention on Senators KENNEDY, JOHNSON of Texas, SYMINGTON, and HUMPHREY—four leading Democratic candidates for the Presidency.

On the basis of steel profits in recent years, together with increased labor productivity, there is no question but that the steelworkers were entitled to a substantial increase. But neither is there any question as to the tremendous inflationary pressure which will be generated by the settlement coerced from the steel companies and so gleefully accepted by the union.

In his letter, NIXON himself says that the companies agreed to an amount which was "greater than they thought could be absorbed by increased worker productivity." This sentiment has since been repeated by officials of most of the major steel companies. Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, the plot is to ambush the American public with higher steel prices sometime after the November election. This, in turn, is certain to set off a wage-price spiral throughout every sector of our industrial economy.

And yet we are asked to swallow Mr. NIXON's brazen assertion that Congress cannot be trusted to act in a responsible manner in an election year.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF H.R. 9870

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 9870, "A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying and to preserve copyright protection for creators of artistic works in which copyright subsists." This bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This legislation would safeguard designs which are originated by the person creating such designs much in the same manner as is now provided by existing law and would provide for continued protection of copyright in the event proposed legislation to limit and restrict copyright and registered design should be enacted.

The existing law of the United States provides that copyright in newspaper features, pictures, strip cartoons, drawings, television and motion picture films and other works is fully protected for a period of 28 years, with a renewable period of 28 years, or 56 years total.

Under the present law, a copyright is not lost, diminished or adversely affected—*Mazer* v. *Stein* (1954), 347 U.S. 201, 98 L. Ed. 630, 74 S. Ct. 460—provided a copyright owner uses his protected work industrially, commercially, or on useful articles—whether two or three dimensional. Full and complete copyright protection is given to the copyright owner, irrespective of the use to which he puts his copyright work.

Certain other legislation pending before the House Judiciary Committee—H.R. 9525—provides that a copyright owner, using his work industrially, commercially, or on useful articles, would lose his protection in that field unless he obtained design registration under the proposed act. If he obtained design registration under that act, a copyright owner would be afforded only a 5-year protection period on the registered design, and the totality of basic copyright protection would be seriously impaired.

If legislation is enacted which would provide for the protection of ornamental and commercial designs, legitimate copyright interests should not be unfairly penalized. The protection now afforded under present copyright law ought not to be lost, impaired, restricted, or diminished.

The measure which I have introduced in the House of Representatives primarily provides continued protection of copyright to the full extent now provided under the law of the United States in the event registered commercial design legislation should be enacted.

H.R. 9870 provides a 5-year term of protection plus the right to two renewable terms of 5 years each for registered designs. It further provides that a copyright owner has the right to choose to come under the proposed Registered Designs Act if he chooses; but unless he should elect to diminish the protection and term afforded by it by voluntarily registering under the provisions of the Registered Designs Act, his full copyright protection remains intact and inviolate.

Some other countries provide protection under design registration laws for a 5-year period plus two renewable terms of 5 years each. If Congress enacts registered design legislation, American nationals should not be placed in a less advantageous position than foreign nationals.

H.R. 9870 provides protection for commercial interests concerned only in short-term and limited protection for ornamental designs without unfairly or unjustly injuring or adversely affecting copyright interests which are satisfied with the full protection and term now afforded copyrights under the existing law of the United States.

The present protection afforded by our copyright laws to legitimate copyright interests should not be upset or diminished. H.R. 9870 justly and fairly provides for registered commercial designs without prejudice, injury, or hurt to copyright owners.

FOREIGN SERVICE REPORTS IMPROVEMENT IN LANGUAGE TRAINING AND SKILLS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day of rapidly expanding diplomatic relationships appropriate foreign language training becomes increasingly important for the men and women who represent us abroad. As more and more nations gain their independence, the need for linguistically competent Foreign Service personnel becomes ever greater.

Last year, the Congress demonstrated its concern in this matter by making available more funds for language training alone than were devoted to all types of training 5 years earlier. As a result of this new emphasis, remarkable improvement has been made by the Foreign Service in foreign language competence during the last year.

According to the results of proficiency tests given to more than 1,450 Foreign Service Officers, some 83.5 percent were found to have a working knowledge of at least 1 of more than 50 different languages. Of these, 24.7 percent rate a specialist or bilingual knowledge, 35.4 percent have achieved the professional level of proficiency, while 25 percent demonstrated a working knowledge of a second language. Less than 17 percent were found to be without a speaking knowledge of any foreign language.

During the next 5 years it is planned to provide 500 officers with full-time intensive language training for a period of from 8 to 24 months, with particular emphasis on the critical languages of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Eastern Europe. Together with those already trained and now in training, this number should provide the Foreign Service with a corps of competent officers prepared to meet the needs of U.S. diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the Department of State and the Foreign Service for their energetic language training programs. As their progress is well summarized in an article entitled "Language Training and Skills" in the Foreign Service News Letter of January 15, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

LANGUAGE TRAINING AND SKILLS

The results of the first 15 months' operation of the mandatory language testing

program indicate that 83.5 percent of the officers tested have at least a working knowledge of at least one of the more than 50 different foreign languages spoken by officers in the Foreign Service. Since the inception of the program in August 1958, a little over 40 percent of the Foreign Service Officer Corps have been tested for language proficiency by the Testing Branch of the Foreign Service Institute or at one of the institute's oversea schools. As may be seen from the chart on the following page, 24.7 percent of those tested have a specialist or bilingual knowledge; an additional 35.4 percent have achieved the professional level of proficiency (S–3); and only 16.5 percent have less than a working knowledge of any foreign language.

Also, recently completed surveys of officers stationed in German-speaking countries and in Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America show that all but 15.5 percent have been trained or have the professional use level (S–3) of the language of their posts of assignment. As a result of this accomplishment, the schools in Mexico City and in Frankfurt am Main, which were organized several years ago to correct the language deficiencies then existing, have fulfilled their function. In the future, intensive language training for these areas will be offered in Washington prior to the departure of personnel to posts abroad if they do not already have a command of the language of the country to which they are assigned. The fact that over 40 percent of all Foreign Service officer positions are in Washington provides the opportunity for training at minimum cost to the taxpayer since no travel or per diem expense is entailed.

Over the past 4 years, increased emphasis on foreign language training and on the expanded training programs has enabled the Department of State to make marked progress toward meeting its foreign language requirements. For example, in fiscal year 1960, as in fiscal year 1959, more funds are being devoted to language training alone than were spent on all types of training in fiscal year 1955. Progress made to date indicates that by fiscal year 1963 the Department will attain the practical goal of having 85 percent to 90 percent of its officers reach at least the professional use level (S–3) in one or more foreign languages.

At the same time, further effort is being made to develop specialists in the critical though less widely used languages of Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Africa. During the next 5 years, with a continuing budgetary support of these programs at not less than the current fiscal level, the Department plans to assign approximately 500 officers to full-time intensive training for a period of from 8 to 24 months in the languages of these areas. This number, together with those already trained and now in training, will provide the Service with a corps of officers having a knowledge of less widely known languages sufficient to meet the Department's currently anticipated requirements.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee today completed its special "Study of Employment, Growth, and Price Levels" by filing the final committee report. The committee had been concerned with the performance of the American economy. The recessions, unemployment, and the relatively slow growth, occurring together with continued inflation, raised serious questions about the adequacy of public policy.

Senate Resolution 13 established the study and provided for an appropriation of $200,000 and for a report to be filed by January 31, 1960. The study began with a first set of hearings on the problems and prospects of the American economy, at which four distinguished Americans, holding a wide range of views, testified. The late Professor Slichter was the initial witness, followed by Dean Neil Jacoby, formerly of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, by Mr. Leon Keyserling, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman, and by Mr. Marriner Eccles, former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Early in April the committee selected Dr. Otto Eckstein of Harvard University as technical director of the study. Dr. Eckstein proceeded to recruit a basic professional staff consisting of three senior and four junior economists; several members of the permanent staff were assigned to the study, Mr. John Lehman as administrative officer, Mr. James Knowles as special economic counsel, and Mr. Norman Ture in a research capacity. Temporary research assistants and secretarial personnel were also added. The technical director was given a free hand in selecting his staff with the exception of one senior economist who was chosen by the minority and served as minority adviser. Dr. Padraic P. Frucht, formerly of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, served in that role.

The temporary research staff was recruited from various universities, including Harvard University, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, and Georgetown University. Early in June, at the end of the academic year, the temporary staff assumed its duties, collected various factual materials, and began a series of research projects designed to permit an analysis of the historical record and to discover policies that would promote the objectives of the study.

In addition to the internal staff work, 19 outside studies, dealing with particular aspects of the problems were commissioned. In commissioning these papers, the technical director sought out the best qualified people who were available for the work. The committee was very fortunate in getting the cooperation of outstanding scholars. Several of the papers, including "Study Paper No. 1," by Charles L. Schultze, were immediately recognized by professional economists everywhere as among the most important contributions to our understanding of inflation and growth made since World War II.

The committee also held nine sets of hearings at which almost 100 witnesses were heard. On every topic, the committee heard a wide and balanced range of views. In each instance, the committee endeavored to obtain the testimony of the best qualified experts in the field. It submitted a series of questions on monetary policy and debt management to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to dealers in Treasury securities, and published their comprehensive answers. The committee also invited the constructive suggestions of 12 organizations for reconciling the three objectives of employment, growth, and price level stability. Finally, as part of the hearings record, suggestions and comments sent in by individuals were published.

On July 30, 1959, the full committee met to consider the plan of research for the study. This outline, which is appended at the end of my remarks, called for detailed analysis of the economic effects of various economic policies, particularly in recent history. Monetary policy, fiscal policy, debt management and U.S. foreign economic policy were to be given particular attention. After thorough discussion, the committee voted unanimously to approve the plan of research. The committee was kept informed at every stage of the project.

Beginning in September, the committee published the first of the study papers prepared by outside consultants and by the staff. Thirteen of these papers have been published and the remaining ten will be made public within a week.

Besides providing general staff assistance for the hearings, the study staff engaged in a detailed analysis of the historical record. The findings of the staff appeared in the form of a 500-page staff report, a document which is the responsibility of the technical director. This report was prepared without intervention by the committee in any form. No member of the committee saw the report prior to its publication. The committee felt that its own deliberations would be best assisted by freely permiting the staff to reach its own conclusions and to have the staff prepare a set of recommendations. The Joint Economic Committee has steadily pursued the policy of seeking out the best available expert evidence, and to come to its own conclusions after having been exposed to the views of the experts.

The testimony of the witnesses, contained in the 3,500 pages of hearing record, the 23 special study papers, the answers to the committee questionnaire provided by the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System and Government bond dealers, and the comprehensive staff report together constitute the most thorough examination of the problems of

employment, economic growth, and the behavior of the price level that has been undertaken in the United States since World War II. On the basis of all these materials, the committee then prepared its own report.

The full list of studies, hearings, and the resolution which authorized the study and the plan of research are appended at the end of these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to read into the RECORD the conclusions of the majority of the study. It seems to me it is very important that we have in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a coordinated approach to the background of this study and to the major recommendations; and then at the conclusion of that reading into the RECORD I propose to read some testimony which occurred before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of which I am the chairman, by Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, dealing with the comparative growth rates of the United States and the Soviet Union.

But here are the conclusions, very briefly, of the majority in this year-long study, with all the exhaustive effort that went into it, on the basis of staff work and preparation. I commend this to the attention of all Members as I commend all of the document which is the committee report.

The majority has a set of views. There are supplemental views by one Member of the majority. The minority has a set of views. There are two supplemental views by Members of the minority. And I particularly commend to the attention of the Members the supplemental views of a distinguished gentleman of the other body, a Member of the minority, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has approached this matter, I believe, in an objective and at the same time discreet fashion, and who comes up with what is to me the fundamental problem that faces this country with regard to the performance of its economy. That is the very clear threat that is at hand from the Soviet Union in terms of economic competition. But the conclusions of the majority, in my judgment, represent the first real, fresh approach which has been made to the problem of the American economy, an approach which is realistic, an approach which involves the accomplishment of several objectives which will be very difficult of accomplishment but which are fundamental—and I say this in all seriousness—to the long-range survival of the United States and the free world.

The conclusions, in brief, are as follows:

In general, the fundamental conclusions about our economy to which we come on the basis of the study are:

1. It is possible with proper policies to achieve a high and sustained rate of economic growth, relatively full employment, without creeping or galloping inflation.

2. Under the present policies followed by the administration, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Congress, we would have to choose between growth equal to our potential, on the one hand, or price level stability, on the other.

3. Our future growth will depend on what we do now. If we pursue policies which will foster growth, the economy could grow at a rate of approximately 4.5 percent a year over the next 15 years. This is in sharp contrast to the rate of 2.3 percent of the last 6 years. These are amounts large enough to spell the differences between a rapid or slow increase in our standards of living and between meeting our public responsibilities at home and abroad fully or stintingly. We do not desire growth merely for its own sake. We need it to raise our standards of living, to meet our growing public responsibilities, and to improve our military position.

In fact, if we grow at 4.5 percent per year between now and 1975 instead of at a rate of 2.5 percent, the gross national product in 1975 would be $971 billion or $258 billion greater than it would be at a 2.5 percent growth rate.

If we grow at 4.5 percent, the gross national product in 1975 would be $139 billion greater in that year alone than if we grow at only 3.5 percent.

The cumulative amounts which we would gain from a growth rate of 4.5 percent per year in this period, instead of 2.5 percent or 3.5 percent, are staggering.

4. In order to get a rate of growth close to our potential, we must reduce the inflationary bias of the economy so that we will not have to choose between growth, on the one hand, or stable prices on the other. We must then pursue programs of growth. To grow at a high rate without inflation we must do the following:

(a) Make sure that final money demand for goods and services grows at a rate equal to the increase in the potential supply of them.

(b) Reduce the instability which still troubles the economy. There is nothing inevitable about the periodic recessions with which we have been plagued. While perfect stability will never be achieved in a dynamic economy, the frequency of recessions and their severity can be reduced.

(c) Improve the structure of the economy by reducing concentrations of market power and by increasing the mobility of resources.

(d) Increase the growth of the productive capability of the economy by investment in public and private capital, by raising the productivity of the labor force, and by improving the mobility of resources.

5. Our inadequate economic policies have contributed a good deal to the difficulties of recent years. Since the end of the 1954 recession, public policy has been concentrated primarily on curbing inflation. This has been done on the mistaken assumption that such policy will automatically promote economic growth. The policies used assume that the inflation of recent years was caused by generally excessive money demand. Our studies find that the real sources of inflation primarily lie elsewhere. In fact, money demand fell short of the potential output of the economy during most of the period, and the general restraints on demand imposed by public policies unduly retarded the growth in output and in employment without preventing price increases.

6. However, we also find that policies designed to promote growth will not automatically prevent inflation. While high output serves to raise productivity, a high rate of growth requires high levels of monetary demand. It is impossible to manage the increase in money demand, particularly with present policy tools, without having some of that demand hit industries in which output is pressing upon capacity. This would result in inflationary strains. The sheer promotion of total output without regard to composition may therefore very well result in strong inflationary pressures.

7. Concentrations of market power partially contributed to the inflation of recent years. Antitrust and similar policies designed to improve the competitiveness of the economy are important in reducing this source of inflationary strain but cannot be relied on exclusively for preventing increases in the general level of prices. Improved monetary and fiscal policies must also share in restraining inflation.

POLICIES

In general, the policies that would reduce instability, make our labor force more productive at full employment levels, increase our capital and use it more fully, and maintain our scientific advance, include:

1. Monetary and fiscal policies that permit money demand to grow in line with supply.

2. Measures to reduce the instability of output, especially the management of our defense orders in such a manner that they do not cause serious instability in the economy.

3. Greater reliance on fiscal policy so that monetary policy will not have to carry so much of the burden to achieve any desired restraint on total money demand. This means that we should aim for higher budget surpluses during periods of prosperity and a lower level of interest rates than have been achieved in recent years.

4. A comprehensive program for promoting the productivity of the labor force, for technical progress, and for facilitating the introduction of new technology. This program should:

(a) Provide Federal aid to education, without Federal control, particularly for those States with a large school-age population and poor financial resources.

(b) Provide a national scholarship program.

(c) Strengthen Federal programs of medical research and of vocational rehabilitation.

(d) Strengthen the private and public apprenticeship programs.

(e) Continue and increase support of scientific research, especially basic research, even in the event that the strictly military needs for advancement in science diminish.

(f) Set up national productivity centers for raising productivity in the low-wage, low-productivity industries and services in the economy.

(g) Encourage those institutions of collective bargaining that allow for the introduction of new technology and which promote an equitable sharing of the inevitable social costs of technological change.

(h) Provide unemployment benefits and retraining for workers laid off because of technological change, with benefits related to seniority.

(i) Establish special programs for the rehabilitation of depressed areas.

In addition, we should:

5. Reorder the priorities in Federal Government expenditures to place greater emphasis on those activities which contribute to growth, such as education, research and health programs, and reduce subsidies for agriculture and business, and prune wasteful Government activities.

6. Reform the Federal tax system to make it fairer, less obstructive to economic growth, and more productive of revenue.

7. Revise monetary policy so that we may have a growth in the money supply in line with the growth in total output and increase the effectiveness of monetary action.

8. Put greater reliance, to the extent possible, on selective policies which will curb excess demands in certain industries without causing general unemployment.

9. Carry out a more vigorous and more effective antitrust policy and, first, attempt

to restrain groups that possess market power by voluntary methods and, second, take whatever steps in the way of hearings and factfinding that may prove necessary.

10. Reduce tariffs gradually.

11. Revise our farm policy, including more research to find new uses for farm products.

12. Improve our foreign trade position.

Briefly and in conclusion, it is perfectly possible to concentrate one's major effort on the problem of full employment both from the point of view of its economic impact and also from a social, humanitarian view of what excessive unemployment does to millions of individuals. It is equally possible to make an excellent argument that stability is the most important economic problem that confronts us.

I happen to have been preoccupied for 6 years with the significance in international competition of the problem of growth. A number of years ago my subcommittee, then called the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, began to explore through the Legislative Reference Service the facts as to the comparative rates of growth of the Soviet Union and the United States. This last fall we had full dress hearings, in which our first witness was the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Allen Dulles. In his testimony, which I should like to read in part, Mr. Dulles made the following statement:

Furthermore, in reviewing the various studies of Western scholars, I have been struck by the substantial agreement on the rate of industrial growth achieved by the Soviet Union over the period since 1950. The range of estimates is from 9 to 10.5 percent a year.

* * * * *

Virtually all Western measurements point to this conclusion—that Soviet industrial production has been growing at a rate at least twice as rapidly as that of the United States since 1950.

We estimate the growth of the Soviet GNP during the present decade, or a little short of a decade, 1950–58, to have been at an annual average rate of about 7 percent measured in constant prices. Estimates by others for similar time periods range from a low of 6 percent to a high of 9 percent. The degree of agreement is perhaps even closer than this range would indicate since these other estimates I have mentioned have varying initial and terminal dates within the decade. The conclusion, then, is that Soviet GNP has also been growing twice as rapidly as that of the United States over the past 8 years.

Mr. Dulles concluded his statement before the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee as follows, and I suspect this is one of the most important statements made by anybody in the Congress or from the executive branch in a very long time because in it there is very clearly presented to all of us and to the American people the kind of hard choices we are going to have to make in the use to which we put the product of our economy.

Mr. Dulles concluded:

And now, Mr. Chairman, to summarize and conclude this rather long statement:

1. The Communists are not about to inherit the world economically. But while we debunk the distortions of their propaganda, we should frankly face up to the very sobering implications of the Soviet economic program and the striking progress they have made over the last decade.

2. The fulfillment of the present Soviet 7-year plan is a major goal of Soviet policy. Khrushchev and the Kremlin leaders are committed to it and will allocate every available resource to fulfill it. The present indications are—

And this is very important—

that Khrushchev desires a period of coexistence in which to reach the objectives of this plan.

3. Future economic gains will also provide the goods and the services needed to further expand Soviet military power, if they choose so to use it, and to carry forward the penetration of the uncommitted and the underdeveloped nations of the free world. These gains will also permit the Soviet to further assist in the rapid economic growth of the Kremlin's eastern ally, Communist China, if Soviet policy considerations dictate such a course.

4. If the Soviet industrial growth rate persists at 8 or 9 percent per annum over the next decade, as is forecast, the gap between our two economies by 1970 will be dangerously narrowed unless our own industrial growth rate is substantially increased from the present pace.

5. The major thrust—

And this is the most important conclusion—

of Soviet economic development and its high technological skills and resources are directed toward specialized industrial, military, and national power goals. A major thrust of our economy is directed into the production of the consumer-type goods and services which add little to the sinews of our national strength. Hence, neither the size of our respective gross national products nor of our respective industrial productions is a true yardstick of our relative national power positions.

The uses to which economic resources are directed largely determine the measure of national power.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that every Member of the Congress and every member of the executive branch of our Government and every citizen of the United States would read and think and ponder on those words of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

GENERAL OUTLINE OF STUDY, JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS, JULY 30, 1959

The following outline indicates the major problems to which the study addresses itself and the work being done on them.

I. EMPLOYMENT

Three facets of the employment problem are being analyzed:

A. the determinants of the total size of the labor force;

B. the variations in employment caused by recessions, and the sources of instability which remain in the economic system;

C. structural unemployment—a major study, in terms of particular frictions, industries, areas, age brackets, and other characteristics, by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

II. ECONOMIC GROWTH

A. The significance of economic growth for the attainment of national objectives will be shown.

B. There will be a detailed analysis of the historical record, particularly since World War II, looking at different sectors of the economy and seeking the determinants of this historical growth.

C. The determinants of growth will be studied, including: the rate of investment, the size, training, skill, and productivity of the labor force, the resource base, the role of research and development, adequate provision of the requisite public services, and the effect of recessions on growth.

III. PRICES

A. Several empirical studies of the inflation of the last decade are underway. These studies seek to penetrate below the levels of broad economic aggregates, to examine the inflation in terms of the problem areas. Analyses include price and wage movements by industry, price changes of services, rising costs of Federal, State, and local governments and the identification of particular bottlenecks that have occurred. The role of prices in our changing international trade position is also being explored.

B. Studies of price and wage policies are being prepared, exploring the economic and administrative experience in foreign countries and in the United States.

IV. POLICIES TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES

Several studies are being made to see how different policies serve to promote the objectives of the Employment Act. These studies contain the historical background and the available evidence on the general economic effects of the policies; the implications of alternative combinations of policies will also be explored. Monetary policies, fiscal policies, debt management, and U.S. foreign economic policies will be given particular attention.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Economic Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, as authorized by the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of and investigation into the problems of providing maximum employment and an adequate rate of economic growth, as well as maintaining price stability and preventing inflation, including, among others, the following subjects:

(1) Historical and comparative rates of unemployment, production, and prices;

(2) Inflation and deflation caused by increases and decreases in the effective supply of money and credit and the effects of these and of interest rates on growth, employment, and economic stability;

(3) The effect of monopolistic and quasi-monopolistic practices upon prices, profits, production, and employment;

(4) The effect of increases in wages, salaries, and the prices of personal services, together with union and professional practices, upon prices, profits, production, and employment;

(5) The effect of governmental expenditures, taxation, and budgetary surpluses and deficits and of monetary and debt management policies upon price levels, production, and employment;

(6) International influences affecting prices, production, trade, and employment; and

(7) Constructive suggestions for reconciling and simultaneously obtaining the three objectives of maximum employment, an adequate rate of growth, and substantial stability of the price level.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized through January 31, 1960 (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, or organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable; and (2) to hold such hearing to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under

the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the joint committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall from time to time report its findings and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives and shall make its final report at the earliest practicable date but not later than January 31, 1960.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the joint committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $200,000, through January 31, 1960, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

HEARINGS, STUDY PAPERS, AND REPORTS PREPARED UNDER STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS

REPORTS

"Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," December 1959.

"Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," report of the Joint Economic Committee, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, 86th Congress, 1st session, January 1960.

HEARINGS

"Part 1: The American Economy, Problems and Prospects," March 1959.

"Part 2: Historical and Comparative Rates of Production, Productivity, and Prices," May 1959.

"Part 3: Historical and Comparative Rates of Labor Force, Employment and Unemployment," June 1959.

"Part 4: Influence on Prices of Changes in the Effective Supply of Money," July 1959.

"Part 5: International Influences on the American Economy," September 1959.

"Part 6A: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations," September 1959.

"Part 6B: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations," November 1959.

"Part 6C: Government's Management of Its Monetary, Fiscal, and Debt Operations, Replies to Questions on Monetary Policy, and other materials," November 1959.

"Part 7: The Effect of Monopolistic and Quasi-Monopolistic Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," November 1959.

"Part 8: The Effect of Increases in Wages, Salaries, and the Prices of Personal Services, Together With Union and Professional Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," November 1959.

"Part 9A: Constructive Suggestions for Reconciling and Simultaneously Obtaining the Three Objectives of Maximum Employment, an Adequate Rate of Growth, and Substantial Stability of the Price Level," December 1959.

"Part 9B: Constructive Suggestions for Reconciling and Simultaneously Obtaining the Three Objectives of Maximum Employment, an Adequate Rate of Growth, and Substantial Stability of the Price Level," materials submitted by 12 organizations at the invitation of the Joint Economic Committee, December 1959.

"Part 10: Additional Materials Submitted for the Record," in press, January 1959.

STUDY PAPERS

"No. 1: Recent Inflation in the United States," by Charles L. Schultze, September 1959.

"No. 2: Steel and Postwar Inflation," by Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm, November 1959.

"No. 3: An Analysis of the Inflation in Machinery Prices," by Thomas A. Wilson, November 1959.

"No. 4: Analysis of the Rising Costs of Public Education," by Werner Z. Hirsch, November 1959.

"No. 5: Trends in the Supply and Demand of Medical Care," by Markley Roberts, November 1959.

"No. 6: The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment," by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 1959.

"No. 7: The Incidence of Inflation: Or Who Gets Hurt?" by Seymour E. Harris, November 1959.

"No. 8: Protection Against Inflation," by H. S. Houthakker; November 1959.

"No. 9: The Share of Wages and Salaries in Manufacturing Income, 1947–56," by Alfred H. Conrad; November 1959.

"No. 10: Potential Public Policies to Deal with Inflation Caused by Market Power," by Emmette S. Redford; December 1959.

"No. 11: A Brief Interpretive Survey of Wage-Price Problems in Europe," by Mark Leiserson; December 1959.

"No. 12: The Low Income Population and Economic Growth," by Robert J. Lampman; December 1959.

"No. 13: The Adequacy of Resources for Economic Growth in the United States," by Joseph L. Fisher and Edward Boorstein; December 1959.

"No. 14: Financial Aspects of Postwar Economic Developments in the United States," by John Gurley; on press, January 1960.

"No. 15: Profits, Profits Markups, and Productivity: An Examination of Corporate Behavior Since 1947," by Edwin Kuh; in press, January 1960.

"No. 16: International Effects of U.S. Economic Policy," by Edward M. Bernstein; in press, January 1960.

"No. 17: Prices and Costs in Manufacturing Industries," by Joseph L. Tryon and Charles L. Schultze; in press, January 1960.

"No. 18: National Security and the American Economy in the 1960's," by Henry Rowen; in press, January 1960.

"No. 19: Debt Management in the United States," by Warren L. Smith; in press, January 1960.

"No. 20: The Potential Economic Growth of the United States," by James W. Knowles; in press, January 1960.

"No. 21: The Postwar Inflation," by Harold M. Levinson; in press, January 1960.

"No. 22: An Evaluation of Anti-Trust Policy: Its Relation to Economic Growth, Full Employment, and Prices," by Theodore J. Kreps; in press, January 1960.

"No. 23: Unemployment in Surplus Labor Market Areas," by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; in press, January 1960.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COFFIN. I commend the gentleman for initiating a discussion of this most important report. I think a discussion could be started in no better way than by pinpointing for us the crucial problems of our time. I would like to ask whether or not my understanding is correct, that in arriving at the conclusion that the growth of which we are capable in the period ahead, stated in the report as being in the order of 4½ percent a year, the assumptions did not involve any spectacular conditions? That is, this is a prediction of the capability of our economy, given certain policies, but not assuming any massive intervention by the Government as far as either industry or labor is concerned?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is correct. That is the conclusion of a majority of the report. It is also the conclusion of a number of witnesses who appeared before the committee. I might mention only one distinguished economist, who made available to us the results of the study made independently by the National Planning Association. They arrived at the conclusion that without any massive changes, but with somewhat different policy approaches, that it is the capability of the American economy to grow at a rate of more than 4 percent. Our majority report is a packaging of many policies that are more realistic in our view than any heretofore proposed and which rely on all the weapons available to us instead of perhaps just one or two. The core of the recommendation of the majority is what is said about fiscal policy and taxes. I particularly have in mind that tax reform is perhaps the main issue by which we will find the solution.

Mr. COFFIN. I thank the gentleman. I think he has made a real contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If I am correct in the assumption that one of the struggles of our day is the struggle of the backward nations of the world, does the gentleman now express his concern that the rate of growth which the Soviet group shows is so far above our national rate of growth that we may fail to excite favorable interest among the poorer nations?

Mr. BOLLING. There is no question about it. This is one of the most important problems involved in this question. We are living in a world in which there are hundreds of millions of people who have aspirations to have nothing more complicated than enough to eat and to wear and to have some medical attention, a relief program from a disaster. Those are people in the underdeveloped, poverty-stricken areas of the world. They are looking for methods to achieve a solution to give them some kind of decency in living. Inevitably, they are going to compare the two economic systems. If the Soviet and Chinese Communists are able to say, "We are the system you need to follow, because we accomplish your objective much faster than do the capitalist nations," then it is possible that this will be a great propaganda weapon for the Communists. It seems to me that this in itself justifies a great deal of attention to the problem of growth in this country, aside from the very clear social benefits that would accrue to the people of the United States in the process.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to pursue that a bit further. One of the questions often put to us is, Can we afford to be concerned about the rate of growth in other countries? If I read the evidence of the committee and understand the issue correctly, am I right in believing that our most satisfactory economic relations are with the nations which have the highest income?

Mr. BOLLING. There is no question about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Therefore, as we make whatever contribution we can to the improvement of the welfare of what are now undeveloped nations, are we not improving their capacity and improving our own markets in those countries?

Mr. BOLLING. There is no legitimate argument against that point of view.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, even if we are doing them a favor by making whatever investment or any assistance that we may be able to make in raising their growth rate we are at the same time really making a long-term investment in the wealth of America economically.

Mr. BOLLING. I think there is no question about that. Personally, I prefer to emphasize the fact that we are doing it because we should be doing it; but there is no question that the end result is advantageous to ourselves as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I share the gentleman's thinking completely. I think we should discuss these things, but these goals should be pursued in terms of their own intrinsic merit and not merely because there is some selfish gain to be had in the bargain. When I raised the argument I recognized the gentleman himself had this deep concern for his fellow humans.

My own feeling is that the peace of the world is best assured by reducing the tensions, the hunger and poverty in the rest of the world, and economic developments will, of itself, add to our own economic well-being even as it will reduce tensions that make for wars and unrest in the world.

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

BREAKING NEW GROUND IN POLITICAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, before continuing to discuss the Joint Economic Committee Study on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the January 9, 1960, issue of Business Week relating to the work of our highly competent staff:

TO STOP INFLATION

The settlement in steel—and the inflationary worries it raises—give fresh point to the staff report on employment, growth, and price levels, prepared by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress under the direction of Otto Eckstein (Business Week, January 2, 1960, p. 61).

The Eckstein study (and the steel settlement) should bury once and for all the notion that inflation is basically a simple phenomenon that can be explained by the old saw about too much money chasing too few goods. Excess demand may cause some inflations, but the Eckstein report offers evidence that recent U.S. inflation has been caused, not by excess demand, but by a combination of unstable output, the power of big business and big labor, and continuous upcreep in the prices of services.

Attacking this kind of inflation, as the administration has done, with the present set of policy tools—with heaviest emphasis on general monetary policy—has been, according to the Eckstein report, the major cause for the slowdown in growth—a slowdown that, even so, did not produce price stability. At the same time, the Eckstein report slashes at those Democrats whose favorite theorist is Leon Keyserling, who believe that promoting faster growth will suffice to halt inflation.

The Eckstein report, instead, recommends using an arsenal of weapons designed to hit the specific causes of the type of inflation we have been suffering. To deal with instability of production—caused by huge shifts in demand upon particular sectors—the report recommends selective controls, especially consumer credit controls, that hit the area of disturbance, rather than a different sector, as general controls are likely to do. To attack power over prices, the report favors a vigorous antitrust program and a steady reduction in tariffs. For long-run growth, the report makes as its single most important recommendation heavier Federal investment in education.

On all these measures, the Eckstein report is clearly not going to be the last word. The merits of some of its specific proposals are highly debatable. But Eckstein and his staff deserve a vote of thanks for providing a work of analysis which should raise the level of debate on this most crucial economic problem of our time.

It is to try to live up to the Business Week expectation of a high "level of debate on this most crucial economic problem of our time" that I make these remarks.

There is nothing wrong with a debate on subjects so vital as those encompassed by the study of price stability, full employment, and growth just completed by the Joint Economic Committee. Indeed, the study would have been futile if it did not stimulate controversy and the vigorous contention of ideas. But it would be equally futile if the battle were waged under ancient banners, with the same old war cries, weapons, tactics, and objectives. It would be as ludicrous an exhibition as diagnosing symptoms by references to ancient texts on humors, when the electron microscope is available.

It is the purpose of my remarks to indicate where, in the study, new ground was broken and some overworked sacred cows were ploughed under. Some of the cows used to graze in Democratic pastures; others, in Republican ranges.

To gain the full benefit of the hearings, separate studies, and staff report, it is vital for the Congress—on both sides of the aisle—to realize that knowledge must constantly expand to catch up with truth. This means that many of us, to make constructive contributions in this area, must part company with some old ideas which have served us well, and perhaps too long.

In charting the new depths reached by the economic bathysphere, I shall try to substantiate my remarks with references to the hearings, study papers, or the staff report.

The study of employment, growth, and price levels plowed new ground in three general areas: First, the analysis of inflation; second, the analysis of economic growth, particularly in the short-run; and third, the effectiveness of various policies in promoting stable prices in economic growth.

The study found that the simple views which had been used to characterize the relationships between growth and prices were quite inadequate, and did not provide a reasonable scientific basis for the design of possible policies—"Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," page XXI and following. In particular, the study rejected three views:

The first is the simple notion that a vigorous anti-inflation campaign, in the form of very tight money and stringent budgets would automatically promote economic growth. This theory assumes that all inflation is due to a general excess of demand over supply; that is, too much money chasing too few goods, that prices and wages are very flexible, so that any restriction of demand anywhere will affect prices generally, and that resources move freely and quickly from industries and regions where they are in excess to industries where they are in shortage. In fact, the economy has many rigidities, and unless fiscal and monetary policies designed to keep demand in check have a direct impact on the prices which are rising, only a high level of unemployment and of idle capacity will lead to stable prices. Thus, present policies have in fact left us with the dilemma of either having high employment and growth, at the cost of inflation, or having stable prices with unemployment and slow growth.

Second. The study rejected the theory that the promotion of economic growth would halt inflation. This theory argues that rising output leads to increasing productivity, and that the rate of increase of wages is constant. Therefore, it is argued that the increase in output drives down unit labor costs. The study rejected this theory because it was found that the rate of wage increase would also be greater if output rose more and that policies designed to stimulate output would have some of their effect on industries in which demand was outrunning supply. Thus, the study rejected this easy route, just as it did the first.

Third. The study rejected the view that inflation is wholly caused by monopoly power, and that all that was required to get stable prices was to attack concentrations of monopoly power. It was found that monopoly did play a role in inflation, but that it was far from the whole story.

These three theories, which had dominated the stage of the discussions prior to the study, all have in common a simplicity, and very simple policy implications. None of them suggests that the choices ahead of us are difficult and that only the highest degree of wisdom and ingenuity will give us economic policies that will reconcile adequate growth and stable prices. The study, with the limitations of time, of resources, and of the inevitable imperfections of our knowledge about the economic system, offers no simple guaranteed recipes. But through its analyses of the workings of the economy, particularly the processes of inflation and growth, and through the many policies which are either recommended or suggested for further study, it has moved the level of debate on to more realistic ground and improved our chances for achieving a satisfactory level of performance for the American economy.

ANALYSIS OF INFLATION

The inflations of 1945–48 and 1950–51 have been generally understood and were clearly due to war and its aftermath. The large stocks of liquid assets at the end of World War II and the backlogs of demands of consumer durables and housing led to general excess demands which drove up prices. From 1951 to 1955, prices were quite relatively stable but in the subsequent years the economy experienced creeping inflation. Since economic growth was relatively slow, unemployment, even in good times, was in excess of 4 percent. These price increases were both puzzling and alarming, and led some observers to the belief that some creeping inflation was inevitable. The study analyzed this inflation in detail and reached the following major conclusions:

First. The inflation was very concentrated in relatively few sectors—see study papers No. 1, "Recent Inflation in the United States," by Charles L. Schultze; No. 2, "Steel and the Postwar Inflation," by Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm; No. 3, "An Analysis of the Inflation in Machinery Prices," by Thomas A. Wilson; No. 5, "Trends in the Supply and Demand of Medical Care," by Markley Roberts; No. 17, "Prices and Costs in Manufacturing Industries," by Charles L. Shultze and Joseph L. Tryon; and No. 21, "Postwar Inflation," by Harold M. Levinson; and "Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," chapter 5.

In many industries, prices were stable. The exceptions, which accounted for most of the increases in the price indexes, were steel, machinery, commercial construction and services, including the cost of government.

Second. To a large extent, these price increases were a byproduct of the instability of output in this period—see study paper No. 3, "Analysis of the Inflation in Machinery Prices," by Thomas A. Wilson. The climb in machinery prices occurred when orders for the industries' product ran far in excess of production during the capital goods boom of 1955–57. Similarly, the increase in costs of commercial construction took place as a result of the capital goods boom.

The pattern of wage increases, which helped to drive up unit labor costs over several years, was determined by the key wage bargains in autos and steel in 1955 and early 1956. These long-term contracts were signed on the basis of the very rapid and large rise of corporation profits in 1955, which were caused by the rapid recovery from the recession, facilitated by a rapid expansion of consumer credit.

Third. The exercise of market power also contributed to the inflation of recent years—for a discussion of the effect of market power on the rate of growth and the need for competition, see hearings, part 7, "The Effect of Monopolistic and Quasi-Monopolistic Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," testimony of Hines, Martin, page 2001; Bicks, page 2100; Markham, page 2120; and Duesenberry, pages 2324–2328. A detailed analysis of price and behavior in the steel industry revealed that prices and wages in this industry rose far more than in other industries, despite the fact that the demand for steel products was not particularly favorable. Steel is a particularly important commodity because it enters as a cost into many other products. Had steel prices behaved like other industrial prices, the finished goods prices of wholesalers would have risen by one-third less for 1953 to 1958. This extraordinary behavior must in part be attributed to the market power possessed jointly by management and labor in the steel industry.

Fourth. Among consumer prices, services played much the largest role—see study paper No. 2, "Steel and the Postwar Inflation," by Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm. The cost of medical care—particularly the hospital care component—has risen enormously because of shortages of personnel and of hospital facilities in the face of a rapidly rising demand associated with higher incomes and with increased coverage of medical insurance. The prices of services using unskilled labor have risen even though the wages of unskilled workers have generally risen less than the average. This is because productivity has risen so much less than elsewhere.

These last three factors account for most of the inflation since 1955.

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE SHORT RUN

The study investigated in some detail the causes for the low growth rate of output of the last 6 years. Growth has been at a rate of 2½ percent or less, a rate well below our long-run average, and far below the potential growth of which the economy is capable. These were the reasons that were found for this slowdown—see study paper No. 15, "Profits, Profit Markups, and Productivity; An Examination of Corporate Behavior Since 1947," by Edwin Kuh, and "Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," chapter 3:

First. At the end of the Korean war, the demand for goods and services of Government fell and provided the happy opportunity for the expansion of output for public and private civil purposes. However, the total demand for goods and services was not allowed to grow at a rate equal to the growth of supply of the economy. The blame for this inadequate growth of demand cannot be placed solely on monetary policy or on fiscal policy. It is the total result of economic policies which must be judged, and the evidence clearly points to the fact that capacity increased substantially more than output.

Second. Growth was also retarded by the two recessions, which accounted for more than one-third of the period of slow growth. A dynamic economy cannot be expected to grow without fluctuation, but the instability of recent years was in part unnecessary and the fault of economic policy. In each instance, as in the recession of 1949, sudden changes in the orders of the Federal Government, particularly for defense, played an important contributory role to the downturns. Further, in the case of the recession of 1958, the failure of demand to grow in line with capacity hastened the end of the capital goods boom and intensified the decline of fixed investment.

Third. The output of goods-producing industries of the economy increased at a very low rate. At the same time, the output of services rose more. The entire increase of the labor force since 1953 was absorbed by the service industries and by Government, most of it in the low-wage, low-productivity portions of the service industries.

To some extent, this shift to services was inevitable. The decline in Government defense purchases was particularly concentrated in goods-producing industries. Also, with the backlogs of demand for consumer durables disappearing, households inevitably shifted some of their expenditures to services. The rising fraction of the population which is either of school age or over 65 also reinforces this trend.

However, the failure of purchasing power to grow played a crucial role in this development. The demand for durable goods is heavily dependent on the increase in per capita purchasing power. In recent years, real purchasing power has risen very slowly, cutting into potential consumer purchases of goods. Government demands for goods were kept in check by tight budgeting policies. Investment demands for goods were kept down by monetary policies that limited residential construction and by the total economic policy which made the capital goods boom of 1956–57 come to a premature end. If the economy is to grow at a rate equal to its potential, we must manage our economic affairs better.

Fourth. The productivity of some industries, particularly manufacturing, increased very little, especially from 1955 to 1957, because of the failure of output to grow.

ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE LONG RUN

In the second and third set of hearings, the committee had the benefit of surveys of the factual knowledge on this subject from several of the most outstanding authorities in this field. Further hearings, particularly about policies for long-run growth, were held as part of the parts 7, 8, and 9 of the hearings. Several study papers were also devoted to this subject—see study papers Nos. 13 and 20. The staff report integrated and summarized these findings, and drew up a set of recommendations designed to promote a long-run rate of growth. These findings can be summarized as follows—see "Staff Report on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," XXIII.

First. No economy can match the record of growth of the American economy over the past 120 years.

Second. More than half of the historical growth is accounted for by improvements in the quality of our labor force and by technological progress, with only the remainder due to the increase in sheer quantity of labor and capital.

Third. The abundance of our natural resources which has been a great stimulant to our past growth, promises to

remain adequate in the foreseeable future. There will be some special resource problems, but the general outlook is favorable.

Fourth. Throughout our history, economic growth has been interrupted by recessions. In these periods, it was demand rather than supply of goods and services which determined output.

The following policies are recommended to raise our long-term rate of growth—see staff report, page 55. For testimony on the contribution of education to long-term growth, see "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," part 9A, testimony of Witnesses Musgrave, Baumol, Gordon, and Heller; and part 7, testimony of Witness Power.

First. To assure continued improvement in the quality of our labor force, a program of Federal aid to education is proposed.

Second. The Federal Government should do whatever it can to encourage the acquisition of skills through various apprenticeship programs.

Third. The process of technological change, an important factor in rising productivity, must be facilitated—"Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," part 8, see Witnesses Dunlop, pages 2471–2; Anderson, part 6, page 2163; Stieber, part 8, pages 2606–7. Those institutions of collective bargaining which facilitate the introduction of new techniques must be strengthened. National productivity centers, designed to raise productivity in the low-wage, low-productivity industries should be set up. The unemployment insurance system should make particular provision for workers laid off by technological change—see staff report, pages 57–59; "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," especially testimony of Witnesses Taylor, Stieber, Dunlop, Chamberlain, part 8.

Fourth. Special programs to rehabilitate depressed areas must be instituted both as a matter of justice and to assure the utilization of the labor and resources of these areas—see "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," testimony of Witnesses Eccles, page 201; Gordon, page 2963; Stieber, page 2611; Chamberlain, pages 2704–7; Taft and Schultz, page 2711.

Fifth. Federal support of scientific research, which amounts to more than half of all the funds now being used, must be continued, even in the unlikely event that military needs for research diminish—see staff report, pages 60–62, testimony of Hamberg, part 7.

Sixth. The competitive structure of the economy must continue to be strengthened—see hearings, part 7, "The Effect of Monopolistic and Quasi-Monopolistic Practices Upon Prices, Profits, Production, and Employment," and staff report, chapter 9. A strengthened national program for the United States Employment Service and other measures will improve the functioning of our product and our labor markets.

Seventh. Monetary and fiscal policies which help to determine the level of demand in the economy must be managed in such a way that purchasing power grows in line with the economy's capability to supply increasing quantities of output—Smithies, part 7, "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," and study paper No. 1, "Recent Inflation in the United States," by Charles L. Schultze.

FISCAL POLICY

Besides hearing the views of at least a dozen witnesses on problems of fiscal policy, the staff made a detailed analysis of the historical performance of fiscal policy since World War II. The staff study concluded that while some of the hopes held out for fiscal policy at the end of World War II were realized, others were not. The automatic stabilizers which dampened the effects of recession were effective. They reduced the decline in consumer purchasing power to less than one-half the declines in output, but they provided no impetus to recovery by themselves. Discretionary fiscal policy, on the other hand, has in fact been very little used. Discretionary changes in taxes, which are the most powerful single antirecession and anti-inflation policy, have been used only once in the entire postwar period, the increase in tax rates during the Korean war. At other times, tax changes enacted for other reasons have proved helpful, but it was luck rather than policy design to which the credit must be given. Variations in public expenditures, which have been used in recession have generally had a rather slow impact, too slow to make them a reliable stabilizer—see "Staff Report, Minority and Other Views," page 20.

The single most important new finding of the study in the area of fiscal policy is the destabilizing effect of sudden changes in defense orders—see staff report, chapter 8, page 2123. In each of the three postwar recessions, a sudden decline in defense orders helped to trigger recession. In the recession of 1954, it was the primary cause. These changes in defense orders have partly been carried out for economic reasons and to that extent were clearly a case of perverse policy. The study does not suggest that defense orders should be managed in a countercyclical way. We should procure what is necessary for our national security but when defense orders are either suddenly cut or increased, other offsetting actions must be taken. The Defense Department is too important a customer of the economy for the Government to ignore its effect on the level of activity. The committee recommends that extensive statistical work be undertaken to put ourselves in a position to evaluate economic effects of defense spending and to take appropriate policy actions. These findings and recommendations are particularly of significance now that at least some slight possibility of disarmament has appeared. The economy does not need the stimulus of military spending for prosperity, but the transition must be managed skillfully. If we do not do better than we have done in the last 12 years, we shall needlessly stumble into recession should disarmament come.

The use of fiscal policy to contain demand in periods of prosperity has declined over the postwar period—see hearings, part 9A, testimony of Heller, pages 2994–2996. The surpluses have become smaller, forcing greater reliance on monetary policy. The failure of fiscal policy to play a larger role in good times has been a contributing factor to the weakness in the performance of the economy, the relatively slow growth coinciding with rising prices. The decline in budget surpluses was partly caused by the deterioration of our budgeting standards. While budget balancing was made the central tenet of fiscal policy in good times, the budget itself contained less and less of the total Government expenditures, as the use of trust funds, sales of assets and other devices were used to achieve the semblance of budget balances.

The following policies are recommended with reference to fiscal policy:

First. The study recommends that greater reliance be placed on fiscal policy in the future—see "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," testimony of Heller, 9A, pages 2995 and following pages; Martin, 60, pages 1763–1764; Anderson, 60, pages 1719–1770—that is, that bigger surpluses be run in good times, and that prompt but clearly temporary tax changes be enacted when the signs of recession become clear.

Second. Greater reliance on fiscal policy will require that our Federal tax structure be improved. The study relied on the comprehensive investigation of the Ways and Means Committee for policy recommendations to reform the Federal tax structure. I cannot stress too much the importance of painstaking and objective analysis of the valuable data accumulated by this committee.

MONETARY POLICY AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

The committee held extensive hearings on the problems of monetary policy and debt management. Witnesses included the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, as well as leading executives of the insurance and banking industries, and dealers in Government securities. In addition, a number of academic experts dealt with these problems. The staff report contains an analysis both of the historical record of monetary policy as well as of its impact on various parts of the economy.

The major conclusions of the study are these:

A. MONETARY POLICY

First. Increasing reliance has been placed on monetary policy, especially since 1953. The progressively tighter money has raised interest rates to the highest level in 25 years—see staff report, chapter 9, page 341; "Minority and Other Views," page 30.

Second. The Federal Reserve System has relied almost exclusively on general credit controls, primarily on changes in commercial bank reserves by means of open market operations in short-term Treasury securities, and by means of changes in reserve requirements.

Third. The effect of monetary policy on total demand occurs only after considerable passage of time. In the boom of 1955–57, monetary policy was tightened too late but even in the present boom when money was tightened very

early in the recovery, the effects on spending were delayed. Therefore, these delays which are inevitable under present techniques severely limit the effectiveness of monetary policy.

Fourth. The impact of general credit controls on the economy is in fact highly selective—see testimony of Witnesses Smithies and Schultze, part 7, "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels." Much the greatest impact falls in residential construction. In addition, small business and State and local governments are influenced. Investment in plant equipment and in inventories by large firms and consumer credit appear to be relatively immune.

Fifth. Monetary policy had only a limited effect in containing the inflation of recent years—see "Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," pages 2163, 2166, 2193, 2219, 2439–2240, part 7. The effect of monetary policy in the capital-goods boom was small. It has little or no influence on the rise in service prices, nor does it operate directly on the concentrations of market power which added to the inflation. Had monetary policy been much looser, no doubt the inflation would have been worse. A higher level of total money income would have meant a slightly greater rise in service prices and perhaps even in the price and wage rises of concentrated industries. But the very heavy reliance on monetary policy meant that the anti-inflation campaign could not hope to succeed in stabilizing prices. At the same time, the attempt to reduce demand and fight inflation by monetary policy alone did have serious adverse effects on the economic growth of the country.

To make monetary policy more effective, the study concluded that standby consumer credit regulation be added to the arsenal of the consumer credit of the monetary authorities and that serious investigation be made to see what can be done to smooth the violent fluctuations in plant and equipment expenditures. In addition, the study recommended that the Federal Reserve System assume responsibility for all sectors of the credit market, both short and long term, and that it abandon its doctrinaire policy of confining its operations generally to open market purchases and sales of short-term Treasury securities—see staff report, chapter 9, pages 394–408; also hearings, part 7, pages 2220–2221, and 2439; part 9A, pages 2766, 2962, and 2998; and part 9B, pages 3070 and 3109–3110.

B. DEBT MANAGEMENT

First. The potential contribution of debt management to stabilization policy is relatively small—staff report, chapter 9, especially pages 424–428. See also forthcoming study paper No. 19, "Debt Management in the United States," by Warren L. Smith. Since debt management only affects the maturity structure of the public held debt, the total size of the debt being determined by fiscal policy, its economic effects depend wholly upon the change of the liquidity position of the economy. There is no scientific evidence that these effects are substantial. Nevertheless, it is important that the debt be managed consistent with economic objectives and in a way which does not interfere with other policies. In practical terms, this means today that the Treasury should seek to lengthen the debt, primarily to increase the effectiveness of monetary policy. It should lengthen the debt at minimum interest costs in order to keep the budget cost to the taxpayer as low as possible. The study concluded that it was not feasible to run a countercyclical debt management policy, but rather that under present circumstances the Treasury should seek to sell long-term securities whenever the opportunity presents itself, consistent with stabilization objectives, and at reasonable interest costs.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POSITION

The committee held extensive hearings on our foreign economic position last June—"Hearings on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels," part 5, "International Influences on the American Economy." These hearings were the occasion for leading experts in international economics to marshal their views on the changed position of the United States in the world economy. In addition, an extensive study paper—see forthcoming study paper No. 16, "International Effects of U.S. Economic Policy," by Edward M. Bernstein—and internal staff work—see staff report, especially chapter 11, "U.S. Position in the World Economy"—was devoted to this problem. The study concluded:

First. The United States does have to consider its balance of payments more seriously than it has in the past, but no emergency measures are required which would go counter to our long-run foreign policy.

Second. The deterioration in our balance payments position is not due to the general increases in our price levels, which rose less than those of most other countries. The exports of some specific commodities, however, such as steel and autos, did suffer from higher prices.

Third. The steps which should be taken now include:

(a) Encouragement of greater participation by Western Europe in programs of mutual security and development aid, in line with their much improved economic welfare.

(b) Strengthening of the international institutions to improve the world system of liquidity.

(c) Discriminations against other imports, particularly in the form of quotas should be removed at a rapid rate.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that if we but take off the blinders of long-held pet theories and prejudices, and make full and intelligent use of the data and findings of this study, we shall find new and useful tools to help us achieve the threefold objective of reasonable growth, full employment, and price stability. The answer lies not in simplicity but in complexity, not in rigidity but in a variety of flexible policies; not in dogma but in workable solutions for specific problems.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Maine has made a most eloquent recital, may I say, of the recommendations and the conclusions of the Joint Economic Committee and, of course, those recommendations were so voluminous it would be virtually impossible for anyone just exposed to them for the first time on the floor this afternoon to completely digest them. I wonder if the gentleman could turn it around and tell us just what would remain of our free economy if the Congress were to adopt all of those recommendations. It seems to me that if we were to accept all of the recommendations presented by the committee we would have no flexibility left in our economy at all. Our free economy as we have known it for a hundred years would completely disappear. It would be managed from the initial concept down to the very end.

Mr. COFFIN. If that were the fact I would share the gentleman's concern, but my whole theme has been to show how this report discarded many of the theories that have shackled both parties in the past. I think when the gentleman has a chance to study the staff report and the committee report he will find that in many areas there are recommendations for fewer controls than hitherto have been recommended. For example, in the field of taxation and fiscal policy we recommend things I am sure the gentleman would agree with. We recommended that in the field of antimonopoly a great deal more needs to be done.

Let me test the gentleman. We say that we should revise the U.S. Unemployment Service. This involves, we will say, more money for a Federal agency, but the effect of this is not to impose rigidity or indirection on the economy; the effect is to make available to the taxpayer, the laborer in New Jersey or New England, information that there is an opportunity for employment in Arizona or California; and thus, in effect, make possible the basic posture of a more flexible economy than we have ever had.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman has picked out probably the one aspect of his whole presentation as far as unemployment is concerned, that I might agree with. If I understood the gentleman correctly he selected a number of separate categories and he made an observation to this effect, that in order to have a lesser impact on our total employment if the budgetary item for the Defense Establishment were suddenly cut off that they should have another Federal program instantly available so it could absorb those items. So that the impact would be less on our economy. If that is not more of a managed economy I would not know how to describe it.

Mr. COFFIN. The gentleman should have in mind the type of thing I mean. This is one of the big findings of the study; that is, the tremendous impact of a sudden cutting off of defense orders, the economic problems we face when defense orders are terminated very quickly. We say that when the need passes, they should be terminated. We do not make the proposal that we should continue to buy because it will keep up employment. We say we are left with excess productive capacity, with a lot of supply potential, and in order to prevent

the cutting off of defense orders from having an adverse effect on our economy, we should take other measures. What other measures? I am not referring to make-work proposals, I am not referring to leaf-raking or unnecessary projects. But at that juncture in our economy it might be well for the Congress and the administration to go along with tax cuts. Why? To stimulate the demand for the capacity that is released. A tax cut is intervention, yes, but it is not the intervention of the kind the gentleman mentions.

In other words, I may say to the gentleman that I do not expect him to concur with everything in here, but I do think there are many things we can agree on. We have to examine the facts and the specific proposals. I think we can agree on the fact that the principle of having a wide arsenal of weapons that are surgeon's scalpels rather than sledgehammers should appeal to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. When the gentleman refers to arsenal of weapons, I presume he is referring to the economic impetus. Is that correct?

Mr. COFFIN. Yes.

Mr. AVERY. I can agree with that. The gentleman is saying, in effect, we should increase our gross national product. On that item the gentleman and I have no controversy.

Mr. COFFIN. I think the gentleman would agree with us on some others of these proposals.

Mr. AVERY. I will be very interested in making a personal study of the gentleman's report.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Would the gentleman agree that if the recommendations of the majority in the report of the Joint Economic Committee were adopted by this country, there would not only be greater economic freedom, as, for example, by the jettisoning of the restrictive "bills only" policy of the Federal Reserve System, but we would have a far greater approach to maximum employment, maximum growth, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power?

Mr. COFFIN. This certainly is my deep hope, that this does lead us to greater freedom in achieving it. I think that is the philosophy of us on the majority side at least. I believe all of us are more sophisticated, and we should be more sophisticated, this study having been made, than we have ever before been. We know you cannot legislate increased productivity and business stability and full employment. You have to utilize to the utmost the free forces of the markets. Sometimes you have to create conditions within which the market can operate as it should operate. Our ultimate objective is not too far removed from that of the gentleman from Kansas who just posed his questions of me. It is my feeling that the genius of the staff study and of the committee report is that it looks toward the future to these three goals, realizing you cannot arrive at them in any simple way, realizing you have to have an atmosphere of freedom, and that sometimes you have to counteract certain antifreedom influences in order to create conditions under which these institutions will operate effectively.

This is a long way of saying "Yes" to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague for the very exhaustive report which he has made which reflects a great deal of attention and consideration on his part, as he always displays when subjects of major interest and importance are at stake. I wonder if, generally speaking, it could not be said that what this report does is to outline a program of action when, as, and if it is indicated that there may be some deterioration in our economic picture, rather than waiting until this sag has occurred and then proceeding on the theory that nature should take its course. In other words, you and your associates on the committee are advocating, as I see it, that the Congress should make plans now to meet any emergency that may arise either suddenly or over a long period of time, to take up the sag in our economy by positive action through programs, that will be in the best interest of the welfare of this Nation?

Mr. COFFIN. I would agree with the gentleman and thank him for his summarizing part of our objective. I would go further, however, and say that I would strike from the gentleman's question "when, as, and if a sag has occurred." I think we are deeply concerned, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] outlined in his remarks earlier, that our present rate of growth in the world in which we live is a dangerous condition and an unnecessary condition, so we say that action is required. We know that action is required now and we also say in the event of sharp booms or sharp recessions we should have available other instruments to use at those times. But, even now we need action.

Mr. OLIVER. I thank the gentleman for that amendment to my remarks, and I take the opportunity again to commend him for the very scholarly study which he and his associates have made of this problem. I certainly want to identify myself with what he has said.

Mr. COFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

CLEAN ELECTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, earlier today my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], introduced a clean elections bill, basically similar to that just passed in the other body, with one major modification. Mr. UDALL's bill does not contain the provisions which the other body has accepted in regard to primary elections. My colleague has indicated that his belief, that primary elections should be covered, has not wavered, but that he hopes his bill will expedite consideration of this issue by the House.

As a member of the Committee on House Administration, which has jurisdiction over election law, I feel that it is time—and past time—the House came to grips with the issues posed by the clean election bills. The question of covering primaries is, of course, a controversial one. Like my friend from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], I feel that primaries ought to be covered. Like him, I recognize that this question may well impede passage of this legislation in the House. However, I have decided to introduce a bill identical to that passed yesterday by the other body. With the introduction of Mr. UDALL's bill, and my own, the House Administration Committee will have before it the question of "clean elections" in all its phases. I hope that the committee will now turn to this issue, and that the 86th Congress will not adjourn without having given to the people of the United States some assurance that the election of Federal officials will be conducted under 1960 ground rules, in place of the 1925 rules now in force.

FULL EMPLOYMENT, A 4.5 PERCENT GROWTH RATE, AND NO INFLATION: HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow after the far-ranging panorama of the Joint Economic Committee report given by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], and the delightful mercy killing of some sacred cows given by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN].

I should like to address myself more briefly, perhaps, to some of the highlights of the Joint Economic Committee report. I think the totality of recommendations has been well set forth in the RECORD. I would like to take up some of the recommendations that are likely to produce a clash of debate in the months to come.

This can be called a partisan report, and a partisan minority view, in the sense that all of the majority Members in both bodies concurred in the majority opinion, with the exception of the Senator from Arkansas [Senator FULBRIGHT], who inserted a footnote on page 61 disclosing that he had not been able to take part in the report. Similarly, all of the minority Members in both bodies concurred in the minority report, so members of the press and the public who want to get at the kernel of the economic disagreement between the two great parties of this country can get at it by reading the report.

I am going to suggest that there are some seven major recommendations in

the majority portion of the report where there is a clearcut difference between the majority and the minority.

No. 1: The whole notion of growth, the idea that our economy can and must grow at a rate of around 4.5 percent a year, and that the goals of maximum employment, maximum production, maximum growth, and maximum dollar stability can and must be attained at the same time. On page 16 of the report it is set forth:

> Our economy can grow at a rate as high as 4.5 percent per year without changing our economic system in any fundamental way.

The minority report does not really come to grips with this. I read it in vain to gather any notion whether the minority believes that such a rate of growth as 4.5 percent is possible or desirable, and I searched in vain for any hint on how to attain it.

No. 2 concerns the great priorities of our national needs. These are set forth very well on page 24 of the report, and range through a better defense program, an improved foreign-aid program, Federal aid to education, medical care, hospitals and medical schools, natural resource conservation, and area redevelopment.

No. 3 is that fiscal policy should be upgraded and monetary policy deemphasized in our national economic policy. This should be done, says the majority, very largely by the plugging of some of the more outrageous loopholes in the Federal tax structure. On pages 22 to 24 of the report are set forth the specifics of some of these loopholes.

It is recommended that there be provision for withholding on interest and dividend payments; that employee expense accounts be rigorously limited; that capital gains exemptions be restricted to true capital gains; that the percentage depletion allowance in the extractive industries be reduced; that numerous preferential provisions in the estate and gift tax be eliminated; and so on, and so on.

The minority report, by its silence on these, seems to give its consent to the present policy of the administration that these loopholes are not loopholes at all, but instead are worthy parts of the tax structure.

No. 4 concerns monetary policy. Here the Democrats, surveying the record of the Federal Reserve System and the administration in the last year, in which the money supply of this Nation has been increased hardly at all, not even one percentage point—here the majority says that a reasonable rate of increase over the years ought to be on the order of 3 percent a year.

And indeed, if we are going to have an increase in gross national product of 4.5 percent a year, it should at least take an increase of 3 percent in the money supply to keep the wheels lubricated.

Here, again, the minority takes issue with the majority position.

No. 5. The fifth great proposition forwarded by the majority report has to do with administered prices. The House Committee on Government Operations last June reported out favorably the Clark-Reuss bill, H.R. 6263, under which in pace setting, concentrated industries such as steel the President is authorized and directed, whenever there is in the offing a price or associated wage increase which would seriously threaten economic stability, to convene a fact-finding board to study the matter, and make public recommendations regarding the justification and desirability of such proposed increases. H.R. 6263 is now pending before the House Committee on Rules.

It is a pleasure to read, on page 53 and page 54 of the Joint Economic Committee report, that this voluntary method of addressing the public interest to the administered-price problem has been adopted by the Joint Economic Committee's majority. At the bottom of page 53 it is stated:

> There is a need, at least on a standby basis, for a fact-finding procedure in key price, and associated wage, increases which seriously threaten economic stablity, to be invoked at the discretion of the President, and to result in the issuance of a report and recommendations regarding the justification and desirablity of such proposed increases.

The minority report takes issue with this. Happily, one member of the minority, Senator JAVITS, apparently disagrees with his minority colleagues, because in his separate opinion, particularly at pages 141 and 142, he says very clearly:

> While the devices employed to restrain inflation may vary from time to time, the least the Government can do is to lend its fact-finding facilities and its good offices, to bring about a feeling of restraint in price rises by presentation of the facts themselves.

A Daniel come to judgment. I am delighted Senator JAVITS has expressed himself as opposed to the policy of the administration and in favor of the principle, at least, of the Clark-Reuss bill.

No. 6 of the major majority recommendations has to do with debt management. There the majority report very clearly calls for the immediate abandonment of the bills-only policy of the Federal Reserve. It calls for the abandonment of the present method of the Federal Reserve, when it wishes to expand the money supply, of using mainly the method of reductions in reserve requirements. Instead, it directs the Federal Reserve to rely on open-market operations for expanding the money supply. As has been said many times before, the abandonment of these bankrupt Federal Reserve policies would mean millions and ultimately billions of dollars of savings for the taxpayers.

It must be a peculiar source of satisfaction to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who introduced just these two propositions in the so-called Metcalf amendment last summer to the administration's request for lifting the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on U.S. bonds, that he now has the uniform backing of the entire majority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

I well remember the barrage of villification that the gentleman from Montana was subjected to by the administration last summer—how he was accused of being an engineer of inflation—a lover of funny money—a holder of a union card in the monetary printing press establishment. It will be a little more difficult, I suggest, for Secretary Anderson or Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin or President Eisenhower and the others who have been pushing this line to say that the entire membership on the majority side of the Joint Economic Committee deserves that kind of epithet. I think the wisdom and the foresight of the gentleman from Montana has been very convincingly demonstrated.

No. 7. The last recommendation which seems to me especially significant is that recommendation, again on page 34 of the majority report, calling for standby power to regulate consumer credit.

The administration's main monetary position is that there is a great excess of demand today, and hence the tight money policy is necessary to flight inflation. If this were true, certainly the first thing the administration should do is to ask for standby controls over consumer credit, so that that aspect of the demand for credit which has least to do with growth, which has least to do with building new plants and equipment, with building new schools and highways, should be the first to be curtailed.

Curtailment of credit would harm the economy the least in the field of consumer credit expenditures. Yet the administration refuses to take a position on consumer credit regulation. And when the Federal Reserve was asked by the Joint Economic Committee to say "Aye, yes or no—should this country have standby consumer credit controls?" The Federal Reserve once again pussyfooted and said, "Well, we cannot say. Let us just leave it to the Congress."

So here again you have another real area of disagreement between the majority and the minority.

It may be interesting to refer to the reason given at the end of the minority report, on page 90, for the disheartening and negative nature of the minority's conclusions. You can search the minority report in vain for any constructive suggestions as to how to have full employment and maximum growth without inflation. Here is what the minority has to say, on page 90 of the report, to explain this dreary negativism:

> We regret that these minority views have necessarily been confined to comments, many of a negative nature, on the majority report. We should have preferred to provide some useful guidelines to economic policy. Indeed, as we stated earlier, we would have preferred to join in a unanimous report of that character. In the light of the shortcomings of both the staff report and the majority report, as well as the limitations of time, however, our statement had to take the form that it has.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the minority as well as the majority had a year or more to ponder the state of the Nation's economy, and to come up with some constructive suggestions. The Nation will read this report with interest, and with full awareness that both the majority and the minority had the same time to compose their reports.

Then the people will ask: Which is the side which is constructively trying to grapple with the great questions of our national economic policy?

It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the minority dissents from the main,

proposals that the majority makes in this report. It is not surprising because the minority's own administration in the White House is taking a line at the present moment diametrically opposed to what the majority is advocating.

In the President's annual economic message there is no setting up of economic goals, no statement of a growth rate of 4½ percent, 3 percent, or 2 percent, or any other kind of growth rate that this country ought to have.

In the state of the Union message and the budget message we get a complete disregard of the great priorities of national need. Defense is shortchanged on the ground that while Russia seems to have a great deal, it may be they will not use it, so perhaps it will not be necessary for us to match them.

Our great international responsibilities are given the back of the budget hand, with the comment that those foreigners should help each other.

Our cities, that have asked for bread, have received a stone; a stone composed in equal parts of high interest rates, which makes it impossible for cities to borrow to build schools and streets and sewers, and of a retrenchment in vitally needed aids to local communities. No effort is made to plug tax loopholes.

Objection to the Clark-Reuss bill continues. They are against it.

The "bills only" policy is pursued with vigor by the Federal Reserve. We can contemplate the shambles they have made of debt management by this policy. U.S. obligations today are selling at 80 cents on the dollar now.

In direct violation of the will of Congress, the Federal Reserve is currently engaged in doing just what Congress told them not to do; namely, it is up to its old tricks of reducing reserve requirements, then selling many of its portfolio U.S. securities, to the great hurt and detriment of the long-suffering U.S. taxpayer.

And when it comes to taking a good hard look at the need for standby credit controls, the administration is AWOL on that national issue, too.

So here is a document which, by reason of the minority's failure to go along with the recommendations of the majority, has become a partisan document. Frankly, I do not see anything particularly wrong or un-American about having a good debate about the economic issues of our time.

Let the American people and the American press all study the majority and minority reports on employment, stability, and growth. Let them compare the constructive suggestions of the majority for breaking out into new ground. Let them compare these constructive suggestions with the negative and crabbed attitude of the minority report.

I believe the debate will be a good thing for the American people.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I want to commend the last three speakers for the very statesmanlike programs for economic growth they have proposed, and for their analysis of this report.

I want especially to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS]. He is the real author of the so-called Metcalf amendment.

I think it should be noted that while the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Missouri who were the previous speakers had a footnote on page 36 of the report, there is no real conflict between the position that was taken by me and some of my colleagues in the committee, and the position they took there, or the position taken by the majority of the committee. When the matter of increasing interest rates above the 4¼-percent statutory level came to the committee we said that if we had proper debt management we felt that the "bills only" policy, a better program for purchase of long-term bonds in periods of low interest and all these other questions that are brought out so well in this report, that if we had such a policy, the question of the debt ceiling would be merely an academic question. So there is no real conflict.

In the matter of the ceiling and interest rates and other basic reforms the resolution pending in the Banking and Currency Committee says exactly the same thing, that if we have proper fiscal debt management we can have a low interest rate on long-term maturities to the betterment of the economic system and structure of our country.

I commend these gentlemen for bringing this out and I call special attention to it, and I want to say that my amendment is merely a modification of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] that is pending at this time in the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Montana; and I would point out that my reading of the Coffin-Bolling footnote which appears, by the way, on page 36 rather than page 34 of the report, is precisely that of the gentleman from Montana. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] say in that footnote that they "take the position of not objecting to removal of the 4½-percent ceiling if accompanied by the initiation of other basic reforms."

That is my position completely, and always has been; indeed I would not only merely not object to the removal of the 4¼-percent ceiling if it is accompanied by these basic reforms that are set forth in the report, but I heartily applaud its removal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to congratulate all three of the speakers who reported on the work of the Joint Economic Committee this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, in 1946 when the act was passed it was assumed that the Council of Economic Advisers of the President would submit to the Congress the economic message, and that then the Joint Economic Committee on the Economic Report would reply. This year the timing was such that it might seem that this is what happened. The Economic Report of the President was transmitted to the Congress on January 20, but those who know are driven to the conclusion that the function of the Council of Economic Advisers is being better performed by the staff and the Committee on the Joint Economic Report than by the executive agency which we have created. I merely state this as a development, but I am at least grateful that my colleagues in the Congress and the staff which they employ have seen fit to give to the Congress and to the American people a very sober, a very thoughtful, a very conscientious, and a very constructive program.

In opening the debate on this question a week ago, I said that the issues presented in this document must be fairly discussed, including wage and price pressures. I welcome the inclusion in this document of the recommendation to the Treasury regarding callable features of long-term bonds.

I also commend the committee's decision to recommend against a raise in the 4¼-percent ceiling until other constructive steps are taken to change our policies. It seems to me that the 4¼ percent may indeed be unnecessary in a well-ordered monetary, credit, and fiscal policy.

It seems to me that the Joint Economic Committee has pointed out in what ways that policy is not now well ordered. It, therefore, seems that the Congress was correct last summer, and would be correct today, in endorsing the committee's position in saying that until the administration has changed its economic policies, we would be wise to refuse a request for a raise in the interest rate ceiling.

I would appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin on that point.

Mr. REUSS. I am glad that the gentleman from Colorado raised the question of the staff report, the larger volume which was such a great help in preparing the majority report. It gives me an opportunity to pay my tribute to the committee staff, which, in my opinion, performed a most objective, workmanlike, and thoroughly professional study which will be read for years to come by serious students of economic affairs.

I wish that the minority in their report, on page 91, had not said as they did:

> The minority feels that this study will not be complete unless a good staff report is first put together.

That seems to me a rather churlish reward to these men for the time they put in on this report. I hope that the six members of the minority who signed that will see fit to edit out that statement, because I do not think they meant to suggest that the staff report is not a good report or is not helpful.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that there are some areas of disagreement in this report, and I want to announce that these

areas of disagreement will certainly be brought into sharp focus in the near future by those who believe differently than the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not being an expert in this field but simply having in mind some basic facts and truths, I do wish to ask a question or two.

The gentleman decries the fact that we have these tax loopholes. He mentioned quite a few, and he was quite critical of the administration because these tax holes were not plugged. Unless I am wrong, I believe that these will take legislation to correct. I am wondering if the Committee on Ways and Means, which will probably have jurisdiction over most of these that he mentioned, if not all of them, will bring legislation to the floor, and that with the 2-to-1 majority of members of the gentleman's party you should be able to make a correction, rather than slough off the blame to ones who cannot do anything about it.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has not correctly appraised the position of the Congress. If he would spend a little time studying it, he would find that when you put together the members of the gentleman's party and certain members of my own party there is a coalition which is effectively able to stymie the progress of legislation through this body. The point, it seems to me, is that you do not get legislation to plug loopholes through Congress unless the administration is willing to take the lead in asking for it.

Just to take one example, the oil depletion allowance loophole. It is perfectly true that a minority of Members on the Democratic side support the oil depletion allowance. It is equally true that a majority of Members on the Republican side support that particular tax loophole. Until and unless the administration is willing to come forward and propose a program to partially plug that loophole, you are not going to have any progress. I would like to point out that the two preceding administrations, that of the late Mr. Roosevelt and that of Mr. Truman, did time after time propose the plugging of the oil depletion loophole. This Republican administration, which has been in power for the last 8 years, has never proposed such a plugging. I suggest that that is the reason why most of these loopholes are still making of our tax structure a sieve instead of a system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On the point mentioned, that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman had recommended this matter relative to the depletion allowance, was any legislative action taken on their recommendations?

Mr. REUSS. No. The same political configuration which prevents that today existed then. But, this much is clear. You are never going to get the plugging of these loopholes unless you have in the White House an administration with the courage of its convictions, which is willing to go down the line and use such powers as it has over its members to get these loopholes plugged.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I admire the position taken by some in connection with their recommendations for plugging these loopholes, but even those liberals in your own party—regardless of the position taken by the administration—ought to have the courage to do those things that you believe to be right and just, and let the chips fall where they may. In other words, it would be logical to assume then that your leadership shies away from the possibility of any executive action, therefore not assuming the responsibility which evidently the people of this country have placed in them. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. REUSS. I would be very glad to comment. The people on this side of the aisle have repeatedly, in committee, on the floor, and in whatever forum was available to them, attempted to plug the loopholes mentioned in the Joint Economic Committee majority report. They have been voted down.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I interrupt? Have these matters of loopholes which you have enumerated come out of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. REUSS. Typically not. Typically not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And your feeling is that this Republican-southern Democratic—I suppose you are referring to them—coalition is responsible for this?

Mr. REUSS. I did not use the geographical term which the gentleman used. I simply said a minority of Members on this side frequently make common cause with the majority of Members on the Republican side. It is not entirely a geographical marriage, but it is a marriage which has worked very well over the years. The gentleman, I suspect, is thoroughly familiar with it. One of the ways in which the effect of the marriage in preventing tax reform is going to be stopped is by an administration which will come forward and tell the Congress and the American people what a good tax system would be like. Until that happens I do not anticipate that any reform is going to be possible.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would you go so far as to say this: Regardless of the administration, you will always have a division on your side of the aisle between the so-called southerners and the northerners; so that regardless of who is in the White House, if the southerners would pick up a few Members over here, you would never get these things done that you advocate, because you did not get them done under those circumstances when your party had control of the White House. So it would indicate to me that it is impossible for you on your side of the aisle to assert legislative responsibility.

Mr. REUSS. No; I do not say that for a moment. I hold in my hand a document which is the great turning point of the new economics, because in this Joint Economic Committee report, which we have been discussing, there is unanimity among the Democrats on all of these points which you have mentioned. And we have Democrats on this committee from Illinois and Alabama, Wyoming and Massachusetts, Missouri and Maine, Louisiana, Wisconsin, and Texas.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will permit, if you have that unanimity, that is grand from the gentleman's position, and I should expect then that he would be able to get all of these legislative recommendations through the Congress.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I think the probable timeable will be, first, a full debate on the issues presented by this Joint Economic Committee report for the next few months, making clear the issues on which all the Democrats were on one side and all the Republicans were opposed; then the submission of this issue to the arbitrament of the voters in the election next November; and then, there is likely to be in power in the White House an administration which will supply the missing element of leadership. Then we can go forward toward full employment and necessary national growth and do it all without the destructive inflation which the administration has visited upon us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I remind the gentleman that his party under President Roosevelt and President Truman were in power and I presume that they gave vigorous leadership and still they could not get these things through that the gentleman has been talking about in his presentation here today.

Mr. REUSS. As the very able address of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. COFFIN] made clear, what is set forth in the Joint Economic Committee majority report is for the 1960's. These are new approaches. The lumber and the cobwebs of the other years have been thrust aside. We are not going to be led into false analogies and bootless arguments about F.D.R. and Mr. Truman. What we are concerned with is how we can produce the full employment and national growth without inflation necessary to carry out our responsibilities in the last 40 years of the 20th century.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman has been here longer than I. He says in this report they are throwing out the cobwebs, et cetera. I would presume that during the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman similiar economic situations were brought forth with similar impact that would compare to the one you have today.

Mr. REUSS. If I may answer that, you did not have the problem then. Then you had an administration which was dedicated to reasonable interest rates, so the economy could grow; to a sensible management of the national debt so that it would not become the shambles that it is today; to a concerted policy of full employment. Most of these problems were academic then, although the one mentioned, the oil depletion allowance I grant you, was a problem then as it is now.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wanted to go on to another thing that has some bearing on the question of interest rates. The gentleman mentioned in his address a week ago and again today the "bankrupt" Federal Reserve policies. As the gentleman knows the Federal Reserve System is a creature of the Congress, and as I reminded him last week, and I should like to say again, if there is something about the Federal Reserve System

that it would take legislation to correct, instead of being continually critical, I would presume that he and the proper committee of the Congress would bring before the Congress the necessary legislation and with their 2-to-1 majority, one could expect that it would pass.

Mr. REUSS. There the gentleman goes again with his textbook view of the political realities. We should get together sometime and talk this over.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. May I inquire whether the report, which I have not had the privilege as yet of reading, deals at all with the question of reciprocal trade, tariffs, or embargoes?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, it does. On pages 59 to 61 there are some things said about America's changing position in the world economy. I will read for the gentleman what happens to be the last paragraph of the report, which has something to do with this. It is on page 61. Very briefly, it states:

> The United States should maintain its policy of striving for a system of multilateral world trade, without restrictions and discriminations. We should reduce our own tariffs in exchange for tariff concessions from other countries. We should also use our influence and leadership to encourage the newly emerging regional economic blocks to become means of trade liberalization rather than discrimination.

I know the gentleman will not like that very much, but he asked me, and it is my painful duty to inform him.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted the gentleman has given us that information. The gentleman is correct, I do not agree with it. However, I am glad he has given it to us because it gives us more subjects for debate on this very important question as time goes on.

THE STABILITY OF OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to plead the cause of a stable economy. There is a growing number of my colleagues on both sides of the center aisle who are convinced that we can have no stability in our economy so long as we have an imbalance of trade in excess of $4 billion a year.

Today during my presentation I intend to offer a concurrent resolution which will be joined in by some 25 or 30 Members, equally divided as to political affiliation. The concurrent resolution, which I shall read into the RECORD at this time, would declare it to be the sense of Congress that with respect to the 20-percent reduction in import duties authorized in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, which has not been applied, there be no further cuts in our import duties for the next few years, that is, the life of the trade agreements, and that our delegates to the international agreement on trade and tariffs be instructed to see to it that other nations signatory to the trade agreement clear their obstructions and restrictions on the importation of American exports.

At this time I should like to read the resolution and offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

Whereas the 85th Congress passed the trade agreements extension bill in August 1958, authorizing the President within a four-year period to reduce existing customs duties up to 20 per centum; and

Whereas an international conference held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will be convened in the autumn of 1960 and continue into 1961; and

Whereas the executive branch of the Government, pursuant to the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-686), is engaged in the preparation of a list of products upon which the United States will be prepared to offer further duty reductions, up to 20 per centum, at such international conference; and

Whereas profound changes in the international competitive standing of United States producers have occurred since the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958; and

Whereas imports have increased sharply since the passage of said Act while exports have declined, thus contributing to the mounting deficits incurred by the United States in the total foreign account, which in 1958 attained the magnitude of $3,400,000,000 and an estimated $4,000,000,000 or more in 1959; and

Whereas the gold outflow in partial satisfaction of these deficits since January 1958 has exceeded $3,500,000,000, while the stock of gold at Fort Knox has fallen to a level of $19,500,000,000 against which foreign claims of more than $18,000,000,000 are outstanding, approximately $16,000,000,000 of which could be withdrawn on demand; and

Whereas prevention of a disastrous outflow of gold to foreign countries adds to the pressure on the Treasury Department to offer higher interest rates on its current and future borrowings, thus adding to the outlay for interest on the national debt, the interest service on which has already reached the level of $9,600,000,000 annually and bids fair to rise appreciably, thus adding to the national budget additional billions of dollars of fixed charges; and

Whereas imports as a whole in 1959 rose approximately 22 per centum compared with 1958, while those from the industrial countries rose more sharply, notably 54 per centum from Japan in the first nine months of 1959 compared with the same period in 1958 and 43 per centum from Europe during the same period, thus reflecting the sharpened competitive advantage that has been gained by other industrial countries over the United States; and

Whereas the United States has moved from the position of a leading export nation in a number of items that are products of mass production and therefore the output of our most advanced industries technologically, among them being automobiles, steel, sewing machines, and typewriters, thus reflecting the startling loss of technological leadership by the United States to other countries that enjoy a wage differential in comparison with this country; and

Whereas numerous domestic manufacturers have in the past 2 years made arrangements to manufacture abroad as a means of gaining lower production costs and enabling them to supply foreign markets from abroad rather than from the United States and in some instances to ship into the United States from branches established abroad, thus reducing opportunities for employment of American workers, and foreclosing American suppliers of materials and parts to domestic industry, and small American companies that lack the capital resources to invest in foreign facilities from participating in the economic growth represented by such use of United States capital, thereby producing the total effect of shrinking American industrial power and diminishing tax revenues at a time when the cold-war costs of the Federal Government are mounting; and

Whereas the shrinkage of United States exports would be much more severe than has in fact been registered but for the extensive subsidization of certain crop exports, notably raw cotton and wheat; and

Whereas such subsidization as a means of stimulating exports adds to the burden on the Treasury and thus cannot be looked to for correction of the deficit position of our total foreign account; and

Whereas the productivity of labor in other industrial countries has taken a notable leap, stimulated in great degree by some $25 billion in modern machinery and equipment shipped abroad by the United States during the past seven years, thus increasing the competitive advantage of foreign producers, particularly in the absence of any significant increase in foreign wage rates compared with those prevailing in this country; and

Whereas American industry may expect increasingly sharp and distressing competition from abroad because of the generally weaker bargaining powers of foreign labor unions compared with those of this country, thus offering no hope of any closing of the cost differential between foreign and domestic producers in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas this competition, already severe and capturing progressively larger shares of our home market for numerous products, will create grave problems of survival for some of our industries and of maintaining in such industries an American scale of wages and the enjoyment of an American standard of living for their workers, even without further tariff reductions by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:

(1) That the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1960 and 1961, notwithstanding the authorization contained in Public Law 85-686, known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958; and

(2) That the Executive Branch of the Government should conduct an investigation either through the State Department or as the President may otherwise direct to determine and report to the Congress the significance, extent and effect of the limitations other than tariffs imposed by foreign countries on exports from the United States and the extent to which such limitations are removed during the course of the next two years either as a result of the activities presently being pursued by the State Department or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been introduced not only by myself but by a number of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The feeling among us is unanimous that nothing could be less timely and ill advised than further tariff reductions by this country under present circumstances.

I understand that the executive branch is now preparing a long list of products on which the United States will be prepared to reduce the tariff up to 20 percent. It is anticipated that this list will be published possibly within the next 2 months.

Coming on top of the import onslaught that has already made a growing number of our industries groggy, this further inducement to imports will draw over them a pall of gloom and despair.

We should not forget that we not only have reduced our tariffs by some 80 percent in the last quarter century but have become exposed to rougher competition than ever before in the past few years. As the resolution says, we have shipped tens of billions of dollars of modern machinery overseas under foreign aid and as commercial exports. Not only that, we have financed the building of modern plants abroad. Beyond that we have shown our production methods and techniques to thousands of productivity teams from foreign countries. As a result of these actions and operations many foreign plants today have machinery as modern as the machinery in many plants here and more modern than some.

The sharp increase in imports from Japan and Europe in the past 2 years has reflected the wide competitive advantage that they have gained over us. Their productivity is up sharply in many lines but their wages still lag very far behind ours; and there is no reason for believing that this gap will be narrowed appreciably. Foreign labor is not as effective as labor in this country in gaining wage increases. Our own wages are not standing still and it would require a faster and higher climb by foreign wages than here, to put the other countries on a more nearly equal competitive footing than is now the case; and such a trend is not a very likely possibility.

The resolution itself details the principal reasons why further tariff cutting would be an act bordering on hostility to American industry and labor. I wish to turn at this point to some particular aspects of the American competitive and financial position in our total foreign account.

Mr. Speaker, it has only recently come to be known how serious this situation is. The press of this country has failed badly in enlightening the public on this very serious matter. Only in the past 6 months or so has it become known that while in 1959 we were running a deficit in the magnitude of $4 billion in our total foreign account we had in 1958 incurred one of $3.4 billion, and that with the exception of 1957, which was greatly influenced by the Suez crisis of 1956, we have had a deficit each year since 1950.

This means that we have been giving out more internationally than we have been taking in. This growing deficit has shown up in two respects:

First. Our gold has been flowing out in satisfaction of a part of the deficits. The Fort Knox gold stock is down to about $19.5 billion from approximately $25 billion. We have lost $3.5 billion in gold in the past 2 years.

Second. Foreign claims of $18 billion have accumulated in the form of short- and long-term paper. Of this $18 billion, $16 billion represent callable claims against the $19.5 billion of gold still remaining in Fort Knox. This would leave some $3.5 billion in gold as reserves against our currency, or much less than the legal requirement.

Now, it is not expected that a run on our gold will start although the basic conditions for a run are there. When foreign countries and foreign interests have a claim of $16 billion against our reserves of $19.5 billion in gold the potential of a run exists even if the run does not materialize.

Recently gold withdrawals by other countries have slowed to a lower rate of outflow. Why? Is it because the balance has changed? The answer is "No"; the balance has not been reversed. Our imports are still high and our exports are still down. Our foreign and military aid are still flowing at a high rate. American tourist expenditures of dollars abroad are at record levels. Our foreign investments are also still moving in high volume. Obviously no reversal in the balance has taken place. The adverse factors are still on the scene.

If the balance has not been reversed why have gold withdrawals slowed down?

It is for one reason, and that is the higher interest rate being paid by our Treasury Department. While this slowdown in outflow represents a salutary effect there is also an adverse one. The higher interest rate is adding daily to the total interest the taxpayer of this country has to shoulder on the national debt. In other words, as a while back the interest on our national debt was in the magnitude of $7 billion, it is now $9.6 billion, and will soon rise to $10, $11, $12 billion and on up as our Federal bonds mature and have to be refinanced.

Not long ago Secretary Anderson found it necessary to offer 5 percent for short-term money. If the whole national debt of $290 billion were financed at that rate the annual interest would be $14.5 billion.

We see then that the only way we can keep our gold from draining away is through high interest rates. The foreign holders of claims are then willing to leave the bonds here for the interest they draw. Unfortunately, as already said, these higher rates increase the burden of the Treasury; and we are getting nowhere in solving the problem. The higher interest in fact aggravates rather than solves the problem, since it increases the burden.

Much the same situation faces us in our efforts to increase exports. The high costs prevailing in this country have made it more difficult for us to sell to other countries. Wages, I understand, have risen faster in some countries than in the United States since 1954 but they have not kept up with the increase in productivity in many of the industries in foreign countries that have installed modern machinery.

Our efforts to stimulate exports consist largely in further subsidization. Our cotton exports are supposed to spurt during the 1959–60 crop year because we have increased the export subsidy from 6 cents to 8 cents per pound. This 8-cent subsidy will cost us $240 million this year if we export 6 million bales of cotton, and the Treasury will pick up the check. Wheat exports are also heavily subsidized. The subsidy is about 65 cents per bushel or 30 to 35 percent of the value. Beyond that we subsidize other farm products exports by selling under Public Law 480 and taking foreign currencies in payment.

But for these subsidies and foreign-aid shipments our exports of merchandise would be well below our imports. This fact reflects the real position in which the United States stands competitively.

These subsidies, of course, all devolve on the Treasury.

The upshot is that we are on the run. We can keep our gold only by buying our way through in the form of higher interest rates on U.S. obligations, thus increasing the burden of the Treasury. We can increase our agricultural exports principally by further subsidization, thus once more loading further burdens on the Treasury.

How much longer can we continue in this direction without facing the facts of life?

Instead of facing the facts we are even now drawing up a long bargaining list for the next tariff-cutting conference in Geneva. We will be offering further tariff cuts up to 20 percent on numerous items on which the tariff has already been cut, in some cases as much as 75 percent.

The whole proposal of going into another tariff-reduction program is preposterous at this time. We would be walking in exactly the opposite direction from what is called for by the facts.

When will we grow up to the point where we determine our own policies in accordance with the needs of the country rather than taking our cue from weak-kneed diplomats who seem to be eternally unable to bring other countries to see our needs? It seems that the spokesmen of other countries had no difficulty in the postwar years in laying the needs of their countries before us in such a way that we recognized and approved their protective measures when they imposed them. Today we, in turn, need to adopt some protective measures. Where are our diplomats who can explain our needs to other countries in language as clear and compelling as their spokesmen used in convincing us?

On the contrary, we hear more and more that since other countries are eliminating some of their import restrictions we should rush in and take down more of what we have left of barriers against low-cost imports from abroad, to show our heartfelt appreciation, if nothing else.

Such an attitude overlooks completely the fact that the other countries maintained their barriers as long as they needed them, and that they will reimpose them when, as and if they find them again desirable. It was by dint of such protection that these countries were able to regain their feet. Why should they then despise the restrictions that served them so well?

Of course, all these countries denounce protectionism, for our consumption. This denunciation is one of their best exports. It has certainly succeeded in bringing us to dance to their music. Let us not forget that while they reviled protectionism as a principle or a philosophy, they nevertheless made full use of it while it suited them. While malign-

ing protectionism for foreign consumption they silently honored it at home.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to me that this country is in no position to offer to open yet wider our doors to imports. In the three quarters ended September 1959 our imports from Japan climbed by 54 percent compared with the same period in 1958, while those from Europe rose 43 percent.

Does this record, in all seriousness and in all good sense, look as if we should make further tariff reductions? It seems to me that we are being hopelessly blind to propose such a step. We should keep in mind that it was 2 years ago that the 1958 Trade bill was first sent to Congress. Much water has passed under the bridge since that time. What is very clear now was then no more than something on the far horizon. Why should we not take our bearings from today's reality rather than yesterday's appearance?

I strongly urge adoption of the resolution. I think it is imperative that we be guided by the overwhelming evidence of this country's weak international competitive position and that we avoid action that would only make it worse rather than improving it. I now turn to those of my colleagues who are joining me in support of the resolution.

I yield at this time to my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my colleague's yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have not always agreed with my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] as we have stood across the aisle from each other in this body. Today, however, I find myself in complete agreement with him. I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 462 the same concurrent resolution that he has introduced.

It seems to me that we in the Congress should recognize changes in underlying conditions such as those that have become obvious since mid-1958 when the last Trade Agreements Extension Act was passed; and rather than going through with something that does not fit the present situation we should recognize the changes that have occurred and act accordingly.

In 1958 we authorized, we did not issue a mandate—we authorized the President to cut existing tariff rates another 20 percent in new trade agreements. That authorization has now outlived its day.

As has already been so ably pointed out by others, the present situation of the United States in our foreign dealings was not clear 18 months ago. To be sure, many of us issued warnings at that time; but the facts as they have since been given grudgingly to the public, were still debatable at that time. Those who thought that American industrial know-how and technological leadership held us proof against any really damaging foreign competition could still hold their ground.

Since that time incontrovertible evidence of a very basic shift has come to light. The concurrent resolution that I have introduced in its preamble itself mentions these changes. One of the surest proofs of the changed conditions, however, is found in the turnabout of some of our leading mass production industries.

In the past it was always said that domestic industries that cannot compete with imports must be inefficient. That this was not true and was a libel on some of our finest industries is beside the point. The economists with almost one voice shouted that industries that could not meet foreign competition by that very fact convicted themselves of incompetence, uneconomic operation, and inefficiency in general. If such industries fell by the board it would be a good thing for the economy, they implied or stated explicitly.

The real backbone of the American economy lay in the mass production industries—those giants that were in the forefront of technology and had the moving production line, interchangeable parts, and so forth. Automation was the great god of industrial efficiency. That was the economists' gospel.

Throughout this bootless debate it was claimed, with seemingly blind insistence, that low foreign wages meant nothing so far as harmful competition was concerned. We were so much more productive than our backward friends abroad that we had nothing to worry about so long as we were efficient. The steel industry, the automobile industry, the packinghouses, the business machine manufacturers, the electrical appliance and the rubber industries, and other similar leaders of American industry were constantly cited as proof that low foreign wages meant little or nothing competitively.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITENER. I want to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], for the introduction of this concurrent resolution. I noted, however, in the reference to our major industries that no reference is made to the great textile industry in which I am so vitally interested. I am sure it is an oversight and that somewhere along the line it will be mentioned by name, because it is a greatly burdened industry.

I want to concur in what has just been said with reference to these new industrial competitors who are moving on the scene. Just this week in talking to one of the textile people in my district I was told that on his desk he had a sample of 20 singles carded and 40 two-ply combed yarn which came from Portugal or Spain, I am not sure which, which had been offered to him at 80 cents a pound, which was substantially less than the cost of production of that yarn in our area.

I was further told by this gentleman that a big textile manufacturing company in my neighboring State of South Carolina had recently purchased a quarter of a million pounds of this yarn at a price substantially below the domestic production cost.

It seems to me that the textile industry and the jobs of approximately 230,000 people in the State of North Carolina, and I may say the greater number of those are in my congressional district, are being placed upon the chopping block, so to speak. Unless through this resolution and other efforts which have been continuing on the part of so many, including the two gentlemen from West Virginia and others in this Chamber, at the present time, we face a return to the levels that we had many years ago when this country became dependent upon imports from other countries in some basic commodities. This cuts across the board not only in industry but in agriculture. I think it is encouraging to see that some leaders in agriculture and some leaders in the steel and automobile industries are now coming around to the view which we consider to be essential in the preservation of our domestic industry and our domestic agriculture.

I commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], and my equally capable friend from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], for the contribution they have made to this fight which I consider to be a battle for the jobs of our working people of the country and the fight for the preservation of the economy of this country upon which the entire world is resting at this time.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and I assure him that if he had stayed with me a few minutes longer I would have certainly indicated that great industry he is so much interested in as a part of my remarks.

Well, a new day has dawned. After 25 years the facts of foreign competition have broken through the barrier of economic theory and propaganda.

Now that other countries have gained a great technological advance as a result of installations of a vast amount of modern machinery, our mass production industries have become as vulnerable to imports as were the so-called backward industries in this country in the past. The latter were those, such as glassware and pottery, in which a large element of hand operations were and are still present in the manufacturing process.

Now the relatively low wages abroad have been given greater competitive effect through the greater productivity achieved through extensive mechanization. Steel, which has been on an export basis for many years, has reversed its trend and we have been on a net import basis for more than a year. The tide began turning nearly 2 years ago. With automobiles the story has been much the same, not distorted by a strike. We were the great automobile exporters of the world. Now we are the great importers. Our imports in point of units now exceed our exports 5 or 6 to 1. We have lost our leadership to our backward brethren who so long lacked the great know-how, of which we thought we had a monopoly.

In the case of typewriters we have again reversed direction. We were the world's leading exporters. Today we are net importers of typewriters. Sewing machines reversed themselves 10 years ago. We have only one producing company left. The other remaining one of

consequence went out of business over a year ago as a domestic manufacturer and became an importer. Singer Sewing Machine Co., the only one left as a producer of any significance, is abandoning more of its home production and will rely more on its foreign plants, particularly in the cheaper lines.

In the electronic field, in cameras, and other lines in which mass production has long been characteristic, imports are driving domestic producers before them. More and more of the domestic manufacturers of these products are either licensing foreign producers or undertaking manufacturing abroad.

If lower wages in other countries did not confer a distinct competitive advantage we may be sure that our mass producers would not go abroad as a means of competing with foreign manufacturers.

Yet even today we find eminent economists minimizing the effect of foreign competition. They say we should sell more energetically. This may be good advice; but harder selling will not sell raw cotton abroad when our price is 8 cents higher per pound than the world market, as has been pointed out here today. Nor will harder selling dispose of more wheat abroad when our price is 60 cents per bushel above the world price.

Why does anyone think that our higher prices are confined to cotton and wheat? Obviously they extend also to prices of manufactured products. When our manufacturers of generators, turbines, and other equipment bid against foreign manufacturers it is a common experience to find themselves underbid from 30 to 40 percent by their foreign rivals. This margin is about the same as the differential in cotton and wheat prices compared with the world price on these crops.

When the Secretary of the Treasury announced that the proceeds of the Development Loan Fund must be spent in the United States so far as possible the Washington Post deplored this step editorially. It stated that if India, for example, one of the beneficiaries of the Loan Fund, were forced to spend the proceeds of loans under the Fund in the United States the money would have 40 percent less purchasing power than it would were India free to purchase on the world market. This was a measure of the degree to which the Washington Post found us to be overpriced, not in farm products, but in other materials, machinery, and equipment.

Regardless then of economic theory, all the facts, buttressed by everyday experience, point to the untenable competitive situation in which American producers and manufacturers find themselves. Not to recognize this condition would be ostrichlike behavior unworthy of our intelligence. Not only would we gain nothing by it, we would invite ultimate economic disaster. There are those who seem to think that because all our economic indexes are high and pointing upward, we have nothing at all to worry about, least of all, foreign import competition. This is a most shortsighted if not a tragic mistake. The most powerful giant can bleed to death if he bleeds long enough or fast enough. We have been bleeding for years. Since 1950 we have been running a deficit in our overall foreign account, with the exception of 1957. This was slow bleeding until 2 years ago when the stream became broader and deeper. We fell behind 7.5 billion in the 2-year period 1958 and 1959. Our imports rose while our exports either fell or stood still.

Others have pointed out how sharply imports from Japan and Europe have risen. Most of these increases consisted of sharply competitive imports, that is, finished or semifinished manufactures. But for the broad competitive advantage enjoyed by these foreign manufacturers, a condition that is powerful enough to attract a rising flood of American investments outgoing from this country, no such sharp rises in sales to the United States could have occurred.

Let us keep in mind that we have already reduced our tariffs very drastically since 1934, about 80 percent on the average. Now for the first time have foreign countries come into a position to test these tariff reductions; and the results are anything but reassuring to American industry. The outlook for any industry that sees imports capturing, first 5 percent of the domestic market, then 10, 15, and 20 percent; and yet not deterred, but going up to 25, 30, 40 percent or higher, is gloomy to say the least.

Where will the expansion in our domestic economy come from if more and more industries come to face such an outlook; and that is precisely what is happening. Yet we need the expansion; and not merely in service and distribution trades, but in production, if we are to absorb the estimated million new workers that will soon be looking for new jobs each year. We need expansion in production also to remain strong as an industrial nation. This alone will assure our bearing up against the Communist economic onslaught.

Aside from the changes already mentioned or which have been detailed elsewhere, we should not overlook the significance of the rise of the Common Market and the European Free Trade Association in Europe. These are the harbingers of greater mass production and therefore yet cheaper production in Europe in the years to come.

Already our market is wide open to European and Asiatic production. Those countries need no lowering of barriers by us to penetrate our market at will. We will be more realistic if we do as those countries did when they were in trouble. They regulated imports with the most effective instrumentalities known to man. When they thought that imports would harm them or drain their reserves, they cut them back at will and asked no questions.

This observation has already been made on the floor, but it cannot be repeated too often. Europe and Japan saved themselves by resort to very stiff protective measures. Oh, sure, they said the worst things about protectionism for our benefit. Are we to be so stupid as to do what they say we should rather than doing what they did while preaching the opposite? Protectionism cannot be so bad if it brought the countries that resorted to it back to life and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly convinced that this is no time for the United States to venture into any further tariff reductions, and I believe that we should so advise the President. He was merely authorized to do something 18 months ago. He was not ordered by law to do so. The conditions having changed so radically since the authorization as to throw the suggested action into question, we would be ill advised indeed to proceed in that manner. I urge all my colleagues to back the concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], for taking this time today in order that we might present here the feelings of so many areas of the country in support of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his courtesy in allowing me to enter this discussion for a few minutes.

CRUCIAL PERIOD

Mr. Speaker, during these important and all too limited days, it becomes increasingly more important for all of us to take a good long look at what is going on in the world around us. It has been said by one of Khrushchev's predecessors that "England will expand itself out of existance, and the United States will spend itself into oblivion." Every day those of us on the scene here in Washington see the gathering clouds hovering over our American way of life.

While not discounting the importance of labor-management relations, and the increasing tempo of our economic system, one must acknowledge our weakness in a field of much greater importance at this time in our history. We are committed by our leaders to a program of world assistance. This program was started on the high plane of compassionate consideration for human beings living in a troubled world. America was to be the good samaritan to all of the oppressed, the ill-kept, ill-clothed, and ill-housed peoples of the earth. This we do not oppose from a humanitarian viewpoint.

For many years our aid and succor was taken in kind. We were the saviors of the poorer peoples, wherever they happened to live. In the beginning, the wealth, the corporations, the bankers and sophisticates all opposed this program. Now, these groups have all embraced not only the humble beginning, but are clamoring for more, more aid, more help, more guidance and more intervention into every country on the face of the earth. Meanwhile, here at home, we find ourselves being fed the propaganda of cheaper labor, more production, and less privileges for the working class.

Ever since man discovered the wheel and found out he could pay someone to push it for him, there has been a consuming ambition to own the wheels and to pay as little as possible to have some-

one push it. This is true all over the world. Every country is seeking production and the cheaper, the better. Any 8-year-old kid can tell you that production is worthless unless the products are consumed.

What happens when we have helped every country produce more than they can consume after they have sold all they can to our American consumer? Remember one thing and do not forget it—every time a Japanese radio is sold in America, an American radio is left in the stockroom. Our stockrooms are pretty full right now. Inventories of American business are estimated to be about $87 billion compared to $25 billion in the thirties. That is not half the story, the inventories of the American consumer are so fantastically high that to even venture a guess at the figure would be idiotic. A wise man once said, "About 25 percent of the United States is covered by forest and the rest by mortgages."

We have within our congressional prerogatives the tools to work out a solution. We will not do it because, in the main, we have perverted our principles. We have set aside peoples and peace and are pushing for profits and property.

The whole foreign aid, reciprocal trade, and defense spending program is based upon profits, propaganda and political expediency. It is interesting to note some figures that prove this statement: Foreign aid during the trying and critical war years amounted to $59.8 billion. Foreign aid from 1946 to 1959—up to March—amounted to $140 billion. This does not count the $20 billion of interest or the $80 billion we have spent in military establishments, maintaining our troops and purchases by our Government in foreign countries. Added up—this amounts to over $240 billion since the war against our total national debt of $290 billion. In the face of these figures, not discounting the need for some of the expenditures, but just trying to make two and two equal four—how can any person in their right mind blame American labor, the American farmer, or the small businessman for the ridiculous plight we find ourselves in today.

Here we are—with the greatest production facilities in the world urging every country in the world to get into production against us. No one minds other countries producing for themselves and gearing their way of life to their own ability to sustain it. It does, however, become an impossible situation with the theorists, the political fakers and profiteers when they urge taking money from the pockets of American workers to build factories to produce goods to sell to American workers which we produce in surplus and which they produce at wage levels which do not allow these foreign workers to buy the products of American workers.

One of the reasons for our present economic dilemma comes from overexpansion of production facilities in our own country. You can imagine what happens to the same dilemma when we help other countries build facilities to produce what we already overproduce. Let us look at steel production. We have built up our production facilities to produce over 150 million tons a year. We can produce all the steel the whole world can consume. In the face of this established fact, we have built or helped to build plants all over the world.

In doing this, we were motivated—we hope—by the high ideals of helping our neighbors. We seemed to forget, however, that no steel can be sold unless people have the money to buy it. If we produce more than we can buy and we help our friendly competitors to produce without demanding that they pay their workers enough to buy what they produce, the only place they can sell is in our market, to our workers, who then reduce their purchases of our own products thereby creating unemployment, while industry demands cheaper and greater production in the hope of recapturing the markets we have given away. In this way, we have become the suckers for giving the succor. It has often been said that the fault lies in underconsumption, not in overproduction. However, unless the producers get enough income to buy up production and services that will in turn make income to buy up production, how in heaven's name can consumption keep up with production.

Without the benefit of being an expert, let us take a simple little everyday example. If a plant produces 100 cars a day, selling for $2,000 each, with 2,000 workers at $20 a day, that plant is putting $40,000 a day into the buying market and puts $200,000 worth of product into the selling market. If this same plant produces the same number of cars by automation—sells them for $1,500 while only employing 1,000 workers at $20 a day, we find that there is only $20,000 going into the buying market, while putting $150,000 worth of product into the selling market. In other words, the purchase ability of production labor has been cut 50 percent while the products they produce has only been cut 25 percent. This case is not nearly as bad as the many like situations that have come up in recent years and are now starting to come to the front in most of our automated plants. Actually, the argument that by producing for less—more goods will be sold and more jobs created is true only if buying power at the basic production plant is maintained. Of course, this can be argued out by the long-hair experts, who will come up with a conclusion that this example is all wrong. But, the facts remain, if you do not have the money, you cannot buy unless you buy without intending to pay for it.

This holds true in the relationship between trade and economic prosperity. If a nation trades on a dollar balance without considering the production payroll balance, it will go broke. The argument has been advanced by the international profiteers that if we sell a dollar's worth and buy a dollar's worth, everybody will be making money. That is as silly as trading a horse for a rabbit and then selling the meat retail. When we sell raw goods, machinery, powerplants, and buy back the finished consumer goods made from these items we are trading a horse for a rabbit in the marketplace and on the production line. How silly can we get when we consider a sale of $100,000 worth of raw cotton to Japan as an even trade for $100,000 worth of shirts, socks, and skivvies?

Frankly, it is not a question of high or low tariffs; it is a question of high or low standards. If Japanese workers received the same pay as Americans and paid the same taxes; if Japanese industry had the same laws to abide by, paid the same taxes, the same cost of living with social and welfare costs being equal, and profits subject to the same restrictions and charges as our American standard, they would not be able to undersell us and would have to depend upon their own consumption for basic prosperity. The great thinkers say that is what the future holds for all of us—equal pay, equal opportunities, and, above all, equal standards of living. OK; we will buy that. However, where do we finally rest our laurels—at the low standard of Japan and other competing countries or at the level Americans believe their right? Now, when we all reach the same standard, whom do we sell to and whom do we buy from? If a Ford made here sells for as much in every other country and every other country makes Fords, why do we have to ship or trade with other countries? The same holds true for shirts, socks, and skivvies.

In plain words, we are making deals, buying facilities, leasing and licensing manufacturing rights to produce everything, everywhere. When we have reached the saturation point in our market by buying up goods from other countries we can produce here, and the other markets do not buy any of our production, what happens to their own production as well as our own? Basically, we have to control, whether we like it or not, the production of production facilities.

If we can produce 10 million autos and can consume only 8 million, why should the facilities be expanded to produce 15 million while at the same time we reduce the number of potential buyers by automated production facilities to where we can produce 1½ times as much goods with one-half as many workers?

The best example of this kind of poor management can be seen in our agricultural surplus. We started out trying to help the farmer by buying up his surplus. In less than 8 years we have come from zero to about $10 billion worth of surplus farm goods which cost over $1 billion a year just to store. Facts show that only a small percentage of farmers are doing this overproduction. You may think this ought to awaken the long-hairs, but it has not. They are now promoting the plan to buy up surplus production of manufacturing plants. This, then, is the plan. Buy up surplus farm foods, give it away to Europe and Asia. Buy up surplus production of steel, cars, and so forth, and give the surplus away to underprivileged countries.

Of course, they argue that we only have to give it away until the underprivileged countries get enough money, material, and know-how from our country to produce enough goods so that they can sell it to the American people so they can get enough dollar credits to buy additional machinery, from the other countries we put on their feet before,

and whose competition put us into the surplus commodities business in the first place.

As one of the outstanding examples of the stupidity of our own position in the matter of export-import trade balances and their relationship to international good will, the experience of the coal producers of this country ought to be a lesson for even the most rampant internationalist.

It has been argued by those who have favored the elimination of all tariff barriers that by so doing we influence other countries into the same and that in the end, the exchange of free entry goods will benefit the producing nations such as the United States. To bring this about, it has been argued too that we have to reduce, or curtail wages, put in automation, and thereby reduce the cost of American-made goods and that if we did sell it, we would be able to sell in world markets strictly on the basis of price consideration.

The one industry in the United States that, through cooperation and understanding between the producers and the union, have been able to produce at a cost that has made it the cheapest selling product of its kind in the entire world—I am speaking of coal, both bituminous and anthracite. In regard to bituminous, there are many countries in the world that produce bituminous coal; however, none of them are able to produce it at a price anywhere near that which American producers can put it on the market. In regards to anthracite coal, there are only two known major deposits of this mineral—one in the United States and the other in Russia. Since we are talking about our NATO friends and allies, we can assume that the Russian supply would not be a deterrent to the purchase of American anthracite because the whole scheme of things behind the foreign and economic aid programs is that we are in a combine with friends who are not purchasing from Russia.

Let us get back then to the real issue—the exportation of soft coal, or bituminous coal as it is known in the market. In the President's Economic Report, presented to Congress January 20, this year, on page 34, the President had this to say about coal:

> Coal exports, despite the price advantage favoring the United States, met increasing obstacles because of the oversupply of coal in Europe.

This simple statement only tells part of the story. The real reason that coal exports dropped to the low point that it is now is because the main importing country, West Germany, imposed a tariff upon coal of 4.78 a ton which is even greater than the price of coal in the American market. Why was this done? It was done to protect the West German coal producers against the importation of coal from outside the country that could be sold in the country at a rate less than the production cost in West Germany. Now, if our friendly ally, which incidentally was a defeated nation in World War II, and is now enjoying the greatest prosperity in its entire history, can put up barriers against the importation of the one American product that can undersell their local domestic producers, then how can any American stand up in defense of a program that allows the importation of goods from every country in the world that we produce in surplus in this country on the grounds that they can be sold cheaper to the American people. The reason in coal is proof positive—that every nation except the United States protects its own home economy first—takes care of its friends second.

It is my firm conviction that unless we take another look and reevaluate our position in world trade from the standpoint of what is good for America, we will be headed into that oblivion promised us by the Russian Communist leader.

No man should be elected President who will continue this idiotic program that will not only bankrupt us financially, but will defeat us militarily.

If this kind of logic and thinking is reactionary then the Lord help us liberals. We will soon get to the point where we will not have anything to give but our words and by this time we have given enough to choke an elephant, let alone a donkey.

Further, Mr. Speaker, last September 9 I listed for the information of Congress a report on ships and cargoes entering U.S. ports with the products of foreign industry. Many of my colleagues registered amazement at the vast tonnages that were being unloaded in a single day at American seaports.

At this time I should like to remind you that there has been no ebbing whatsoever of the tides that move foreign-produced commodities into the markets of this country. Hour after hour, day after day, week after week, month after month, the big freighters and tankers are rolling into ports on the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Gulf, and the St. Lawrence with a miscellany of goods that cast ever-extending shadows over the employment opportunities of our miners, railroad workers, and factory personnel.

The threat to American industry and labor started off with an invasion of fuel markets and such manufacturing areas as handmade glass, pottery, ceramics, clothes pins, and other products whose individual personnel rolls may be small but which represent traditional American enterprise. As tariffs dropped, the toll of business victims took in a much wider range, with mass-production industries eventually succumbing and being forced to locate their own plants in lands of cheap labor.

The effects of import competition are now so widespread that no section of the country has assurance that its economy will be able to stand up against the idiotic policies granting preference to foreign producers over domestic industry and labor. The extent of the damage is typified by the evidence presented here today by my colleagues from all areas of the Nation.

Today I shall confine my remarks to what has taken place in the congressional district I represent as a consequence of the legislative surrender to the executive department the authority to regulate international commerce.

First came foreign residual oil. With the mounting seas of this fuel, mine after mine in western Pennsylvania had to close, with workers automatically relegated to relief rolls. Railroad freight traffic was simultaneously cut back as foreign oil knocked coal out of east coast utilities and industrial plants. When I visit mining camps, our discouraged citizenry invariably ask me about the chances of getting back to work. I cannot tell them that the situation is hopeless and that they should clear out and move into areas of more vigorous economic activity. To advise these Americans to resign themselves to a fate brought about by the stupidity of dreamy diplomats would be a reflection upon the integrity of the U.S. Government. Furthermore, any great exodus of trained mineworkers could lead to national catastrophe, in that the services of these experienced men will be needed desperately if and when an emergency develops.

Railroaders are in a parallel category. With coal traffic off, rail employment drops proportionately. But if the enemy should strike suddenly and coal is required to replace the foreign oil upon which we have come to rely but which would not be available in a period of hostility, the railroad trainman and maintenance man would be as important to survival as any other individual in the military effort. Two world wars have proved beyond contradiction that coal and railroads are ingredients of survival in universal conflicts.

So our idle workers must stand by, waiting patiently for a reversal of the foreign trade policies that have deprived them of their jobs.

We also have large manufacturers of electrical generating equipment in our district. Their employees have for a long time wondered about the logic of a program that admits foreign products to displace identical made-in-America equipment. Our glassworkers cannot understand why they are without full-time employment while European products flood domestic markets. And a score of other industries strive desperately to hold on in the face of mounting imports of competitive products.

I will say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who has carried on a relentless battle to save American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition, that the proposed resolution is not going to answer our problem. It is not going to put our people back to work. But I am supporting this resolution because I feel that it will also serve as a message to the State Department that Congress will no longer tolerate the devious practices which put our home industries in a hopeless position in international competition. Through this resolution we are notifying the responsible officeholders that we want to stop the practice of placing diplomatic expediency above the welfare of our country. We are going on record as opposing further tariff reductions, and inherent in this resolution is a determination to remedy the policies that give foreign-made products precedence in our home markets.

We are proud of our high wage scales, our standards of living. We refuse to

permit them to be depressed in order to attempt to meet production costs of countries where income of labor groups is bare subsistence. The resolution which we offer today is advance notice that Congress has reaffirmed its determination to act in the interest of the American people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a few recent figures on foreign trade trends and their cumulative effect upon our U.S. economy:

FOREIGN TRADE BRIEFS

Thirty thousand steel jobs: Drastic changes in import/export trade in iron and steel mill products have cost Americans the equivalent of 30,000 jobs in the steel industry, wrote A. H. Fetherolf, senior editor of Steelways.

"And the economic loss to domestic wage earners does not stop here. The sale of more than 430,000 foreign cars in the United States last year, for instance, meant fewer jobs not only in steel but in our automotive and fabricating industries.

"How many other jobs were lost due to iron and steel imported—and the decline of the industry's exports—in the form of machine tools, farm machinery, sewing machines and a host of other products is a moot question. But clearly the answer evokes few cheers over here."

Electronic products: U.S. imports of Jap electronic products in first half of 1959 ($22 million), surpassed entire total for 1958 and tripled 1957 ($7.5 million). United States appears prime foreign target for Jap's booming industry, absorbing 34 percent of her electronic exports in 1956, 39 percent in 1957, 46 percent in 1958, and over 50 percent first-half 1959.

Import-impact on domestic manufacturers of transistor (a U.S. invention) radios was immediate: in 1957, United States made 20 such radios to every Jap import; but in 1958, United States made only three to their one, a rapid, 2-year Jap advance from 5 to 25 percent into American market where imports underprice U.S. unit by two-thirds. (Electronic Industries Association.)

Pottery: President Wheatley, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, attacked AFL–CIO resolution on foreign trade on grounds it does not go far enough to protect pottery industry; 7,500 workers dropped by dissolved firms in last 10 years, he said. (Since 1954, one-third of pottery companies displaced by imports—NWC.)

Umbrellas: Umbrella frame manufactures, reduced by imports from six to three companies since 1954, renew plea for industry-saving tariffs in open letter to President. Similar appeal rejected in 1958 when Japs had 60 percent of U.S. market. Higher 1959 import trend indicates U.S. manufacturers may salvage only 25 percent of own market this year.

Coal: In 1947, U.S. miners delivered record 631 million tons of bituminous coal from earth to customer. In 1949, low-priced residual fuel oil imports, a residue byproduct of oil refinement, shouldered into American market with 75 million barrels. Bituminous coal production dropped off next 2 years by 193 million tons; since 1950, 1.3 billion barrels poured through ports here displacing the energy equivalent of 310 million tons of U.S. coal as well as idling numerous miners.

Cotton: Exports of U.S. cotton manufactures dropped from 954,000 bales equivalent to 539,000 while imports increased from 38,000 to 273,000 over last 10 years. Differential of net exports over imports cut from 917,000 to 266,000 resulting in net loss to domestic mills of 651,000 bales equivalent. Foreign competition maneuvered United States from net exporter to net importer of cotton end products.

Hosiery: U.S. hosiery exports dropped 38.6 percent first 7 months of 1959 over same period 1958 or from 1,788,639 dozen pairs at $7.4 million to 1,098,551 dozen pairs at $4.6 million.

"Our export market suffers a slow and painful death," W. F. Williamson, president of National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, told the nationwide committee.

Foreign productivity teams (continued from issue No. 4): A U.S. tool steel company, urged by ICA, conducted an Asiatic productivity team through its plants, understanding that the team was subsequently to develop a foreign subsidiary operation for the parent firm. However, negotiations were soon dropped at the other end. They now produce similar tool steel, utilizing their newly acquired know-how to underbid and undersell the host company over here.

But another steel official, faced by a camera-laden team at his plant, told the ICA representative. It took us 35 years to develop our special processes and we do not intend to blow the whole operation in 35 minutes.

Do U.S. productivity costs offset low foreign wages? A U.S. firm which makes pumps both here and abroad says "No." It cost them but one-third the U.S. costs to produce the same machine there. In addition, costs in their foreign facilities dropped 5 percent while parent plant's increased 50 percent during same 5-year period.

Committee activities: September 25, Miami: O. R. Strackbein attacks demolition squad of State Department for undoing work of Congress' Tariff Commission (Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association); September 28, Hot Springs, W. Va.: Strackbein calls for restoration of congressional authority in foreign trade and cautioned delegates that injurious economic fallout from trade agreements will be as lethal to many of our domestic industries as strontium 90 if a brake is not applied (Machine Knife Association); October 7, Washington: Strackbein testifies before U.S. Tariff Commission in opposition to compensatory tariff cuts on glass mirrors and books on grounds "legal authority is lacking for this process of double economic jeopardy proposed to be perpetrated against innocent industrial and labor bystanders."

Leather gloves: "Sharing a market is one consideration; but to dominate it completely * * * is not justified." Of the two U.S. leather glove producing areas, New York City has discontinued domestic production while Fulton County, N.Y., producers have been whittled from 184 firms to 56.

"The growth of imports is almost in direct proportion to our losses * * * and every 30 or 40 thousand dozen increase means the loss of several small plants or one large one." (Petition of Leather Glove Manufacturers Association.) Clothing union, supporting petition, said cutters' membership dropped from 701 to 289 due chiefly to imports.

Free-trade shoes: Says chairman of a New England shoe company: "Sure, all this free trade may be great for international relations. * * * But how do I explain that to several hundred of my employees who were waiting for a midyear bonus and got termination notices instead?" (Think, November 1959.)

Hides: While imports of cattlehides were 377 percent higher first half 1959 over same for 1958, U.S. net hide exports steadily dropped from 6.3 million pieces in 1957; to 5 million in 1958; to 1959 estimate of 2.7 million—lowest since 1953. (Schnitzer, Department of Commerce.)

Woolen and worsted fabric: Imports up 850 percent since 1947, helping liquidate over 100,000 U.S. jobs; closing hundreds of mills; reducing domestic output almost 50 percent.

Terry woven towel: Imports from Hong Kong increased from 160,000 pieces first half 1958 to 2 million, same period 1959. British colony of commerce also doing land office business here in other categories: wearing apparel (except shirts) up 167 percent—from $6 million to $16 for same periods.

Silk fabric: Imports from Japan jumped from 13 million square yards to 51 between 1954–58, while U.S. silk woven fabric production dropped from 50 to 32 million square yards during same period.

U.S. imports: First 10 months 1959 now 12.4 billion, a 19 percent jump over same in 1958.

Meat import record: Total U.S. meat imports of 1 billion pounds in 1959 will break record. Six Australian ships alone brought 40 million pounds beef here—more than one-half of all slaughter here under Federal inspection in June. (G. Reid, Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association.)

United States-New Zealand price gap: So great that current study underway by New Zealand Meat Board to air-ship meat to United States at three times sea cost.

Bikes: "The Kress stores sell a German-made bicycle for $39.95 that gives the appearance of an American * * * which sells for $78.95. It is difficult to convince customers that this wide difference in price can possibly be justified by a difference in quality or for any other reason. Consequently, the imports have caused us to lose many sales." (Tulsa bicycle shop owner.)

Chemicals: One and one-tenth million pounds of phathalic anhydride imports first-half 1959 were triple 1958 total. "An unusual situation for United States, traditionally a large exporter of this chemical," says Chemical Week.

Steel bars: "The Japanese purchase American scrap, haul it back to their mills in the Orient, manufacture it into finished products, reship it back across the Pacific, and still undersell American producers by as much as $29 a ton, for example, on reinforcing bars." (R. Blough, in U.S. News & World Report.)

Soviet pig iron: Arrived Buffalo at $49 a ton (including duty) contrast with United States at $66.

Typewriters—Knock-out, buy-out: Foreign competition now elevated to gradual level as Olivetti, big Italian business machine manufacturer, which helped knock out Underwood's markets, now buys out controlling interest in U.S. firm. Competitive strategy calls for Italian company to push foreign products—under Underwood label—through ready-made distribution network of 700 U.S. salesmen, 1,200 servicemen, and over 500 agents.

Italian-United States trade: Imports from Italy up 47 percent ($141 million to $208) first 7 months 1959 over same for 1958; U.S. exports to Italy down 26 percent ($304 to $225 million) for similar periods. Result: Italy's U.S. trade deficit cut almost 90 percent or $163 to $17 million.

Committee activities: Committee directors, at annual board meeting, called for U.S. withdrawal from further tariff-cutting commitments at GATT's meeting in 1960. Chairman of board, "another tariff cutting conference is out of focus with competitive realities and would represent an economic misstep of the utmost gravity."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since the 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act a year and a half ago, our trade position in the world has come to be recognized for what it is, namely, a highly vulnerable posture in the face of rising import competition.

We have had a deficit in our foreign account annually since 1950 with the exception of 1957. Beginning with 1958 this deficit began to reach serious proportions, that is, $3.4 billion. In 1959, the year just closed, the deficit was yet greater, or some $4 billion.

During the first 9 months of 1959 our imports from Europe increased 43 percent compared with the same period in 1958. Imports from Japan increased still more steeply, or 54 percent. These are startling increases indeed. Needless to say, most of these imports compete sharply with our own production.

We do not have to look far for the reasons. For one thing we have lowered our tariff over 75 percent in the past 25 years. The effects of these reductions would have been felt much sooner had we not been protected by war and postwar conditions. That such a deep cut in our tariff was a monumental error is now coming to be obvious.

Beyond the sharp tariff reductions that have been made several other factors have contributed to our difficulties. Our foreign industrial competitors have gained greatly in productivity during the past 5 or 6 years. From the United States alone they imported over $20 billion worth of modern machinery, a good part of it in the form of foreign aid. Altogether in the past 12 years they have imported from us over $30 billion in machinery, much of it under the Marshall plan.

Their production techniques were also improved as a result of visits through our plants by thousands of foreign productivity teams. Is it any wonder that these countries can now outproduce us, outsell us, and take markets away from us almost at will.

While their wages have risen more rapidly than ours in the past 5 years, according to such statistics as there are, our wage rise began shortly after World War II and was quite far along before foreign wages started their climb. It stands to reason that foreign productivity has risen faster than foreign wages. This fact accounts for the greater competitive capacity of a number of foreign countries today.

If this were not the case, then how could it come about that even the mass-production industries in this country, those with the highest productivity per man-hour, have seen their exports shrink while imports soared? The automobile industry is one. The steel industry is another. We are now on a net import basis in both of these industries. The typewriter industry is yet another. For the first time in history we are importing more typewriters than we are exporting.

We can no longer say that we can outproduce other countries even in our most advanced industries. We are vulnerable and becoming more vulnerable across a broad and ever-widening front. Electronics, athletic goods, copper and brass goods, fishing tackle, candy, flower bulbs, and many other lines are coming under heavy attack. Textiles have long been bothered.

Our prices are high because of high wages, high profits, high employment, price-supported agriculture, social security, obligatory collective bargaining; but above all because of the heavy expenditures of World War II, and the high defense budgets since 1950. These have given us a heavy debt and a heavy tax burden; and these come out as higher production costs in all lines.

We have willingly helped many other countries back onto their feet. While they were down we condoned the highly restrictive trade practices to which they resorted, in the form of import quotas, import licensing systems, exchange controls, and so forth. We recognized their needs in this respect. Their diplomats were able to convince us of the gravity of their situation; and we listened to them.

In recent times it has become obvious that some of these foreign countries are now in a position to relax some of their import restrictions. England, in particular, has already taken some concrete steps in this direction. France and West Germany have made some moves toward liberalizing their import quotas. Japan has promised to take action next year.

These are significant developments.

However, some very strange interpretations have been placed on them. Immediately the free-trade enthusiasts threw their hats in the air and said, "Now that our friends are liberalizing their trade controls we must reduce our barriers as a gesture of appreciation and goodwill."

Such maudlin sentiment has no place in our trade relations with other countries.

Let us keep two things in mind and we will be able to think more clearly.

First. The European countries and Japan established strict import controls when they needed them. They did not ask us whether they might do so. They did tell us why they needed them; but the national need was the final consideration and indeed the only question.

Second. These controls succeeded in their purpose. It was by their use that these nations were able to rise from the depths. Of course, our aid contributed a great deal; but yet if the import restrictions had been bad for these countries, the phenomenal rise toward prosperity that they have experienced could not have occurred.

Very well, the import restrictions were helpful to the economically disrupted countries. By use of the controls they were able to rebuild their monetary reserves and to approach convertibility of currency with confidence.

If we look at our own position of today we may get an idea. Our total foreign account, including, beside merchandise exports and imports, such items as foreign investments, tourist expenditures, and military and foreign aid, is now badly out of balance. Recently our commercial imports from Japan outran our commercial exports. We have lost some $3.5 billion in gold since January 1958. The Fort Knox gold supply is down from the $25 billion level to $19.5 billion; and other countries own most of this reserve. Should they exercise their claims—something that is not expected—we would have left insufficient funds to cover the legal reserve requirements for our paper currency.

This is not a cause for alarm or panic but it is cause indeed for concern and for corrective action.

We should have the good sense that these other countries exhibited when they protected themselves as they needed protection. We should use import quotas and increased tariffs in those instances in which imports are rising too rapidly and capturing fast rising percentages of our home market. We should improve the investment climate here at home so that our manufacturers would not be tempted to go overseas for their expansion. Scores of them are doing this now and many have already done so in the past. Others are studying the possibilities and making up their minds right now.

I think it is imperative that we give these industries and producers the assurances that other countries were able to give their industries, namely, that the home market will be protected according to its needs, so that import-vulnerable industries may be assured of a market for their products. This is all the more urgent since our foreign markets have either been shrinking or standing virtually still. Already we are subsidizing heavily to maintain our exports. This, of course, helps little but adds to the woes of the Secretary of the Treasury because the subsidy bills are sent to him and he must pay them.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it becomes unthinkable that we should go into another tariff-cutting conference later this year. The law authorizing the President to enter into further trade agreements and to reduce tariffs another 20 percent was passed a year and a half ago. That was before the present position of this country had become so clearly defined. The great rise in imports had not reached a crest. Indeed it possibly has not yet done so. The decline in our exports had not yet become so deeply set; and foreign productivity had not yet reached its present magnitude.

We should reassess our position and should take our cue from present realities rather than from those of 18 months ago. As matters stand today the very idea of further tariff reductions is at odds with the facts of our position, and should be so recognized.

I think that Congress should so express itself. If we do not, the Department of State, which carries on the negotiations, will feel free to make further cuts in tariffs that are already too low. We in Congress represent the people back home. We have the responsibility of bringing their needs to those in the executive branch who are not elected but appointed to carry out existing policies.

It is up to us to reflect the changing conditions and circumstances as they affect the people of this country. We cannot expect the State Department to share our concern about those who send us here. That Department is in touch with

foreign countries and the representatives of foreign interests. If we do not speak for the people back home, they are left without a voice. For that reason I feel that it is incumbent on us here in Congress to make our views known.

It would perhaps be better to repeal the authorization of the further 20 percent tariff reduction; but it might be argued with some merit that this would be a more drastic step than is necessary. For that reason, for the time being at least, I think it would be more appropriate for Congress simply to make known its sentiment.

I strongly urge that the resolution be brought to the floor and adopted.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from West Virginia—CLEVELAND M. BAILEY—and others who have introduced this resolution, a concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

During my years of congressional service I have not supported legislation relating to reciprocal trade. I was apprehensive lest such complications referred to by other speakers would arise, leaving us unable to cope with them effectively owing to our support of the general agreements on tariffs and trade.

Industries in Maine's Third Congressional District are considerably disturbed over the adverse effects prompted by imports of foreign commodities, and there is no question but that such imports have a marked negative influence on the Maine economy. Agriculture, boots and shoes, wood turning, and fisheries—these are some of the industries that stand to be adversely affected by increased foreign imports as a consequence of lowered tariff rates.

I have today introduced this concurrent resolution in behalf of these many small industries in Maine's Third Congressional District, being happy to join with others who have introduced this identical resolution.

I urge the support of my colleagues for this concurrent resolution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for a very fine statement and for bringing forward the resolution in which I join him.

I agree with him that this is no time to make further tariff reductions. The position of this country today in its foreign competitive standing calls not for further tariff cuts, but for measures of protection that will prevent particular industries and agricultural producers from being driven progressively out of the home market by imports.

The situation today is less reassuring than it was 2 years ago when the present Trade Agreements Act was sent to Congress. The Congress authorized the President to reduce existing tariffs as much as 20 percent. At that time the trade deficits that the United States was to experience in its foreign transactions in 1958 and 1959 had not yet become a reality. In fact, in 1957 we did not have a deficit but a small surplus. There was not as evident a condition then in 1958 as there is today, calling for caution and prudence in tariff negotiations.

In 1958, as has already been said on the floor this afternoon, we fell $3.4 billion short in covering our international outgo. In 1959 we fell behind even more, or about $4 billion. This makes about $7.5 billion in 2 years.

There are those who say that this trend will be reversed and that signs of a change have already appeared.

I wish to address myself particularly to the agricultural aspects of this question. I can tell you that I see no ray of hope on the horizon in exports of farm products. On the contrary there is every likelihood of more and more imports.

A great deal has already been made of the increase in raw cotton exports during the present fiscal year. If this is the best example that can be found by the free-trade element of the hoped-for upsurge in farm exports, they are indeed hard up.

The fact is that our cotton exports had fallen to a low level in the fiscal year 1958–59. They fell to 3,129,000 bales from 5,666,000 bales in the preceding fiscal year, 1957–58.

We must go back to 1956 if we want the whole picture. Exports had dropped to a low point of 2,214,000 bales in that year from a level of a little over 5 million bales during the years 1950–52. This decline resulted from the lower world cotton prices compared with prices in this country.

Then we began subsidizing our raw cotton exports at 6 cents per pound. In 1957 exports jumped to 7,598,000 bales, a figure three times as high as 1956. This was a short-lived spurt for in 1958 (calendar year) exports dropped to 5,717,000 bales. This was followed by a slide to the figure mentioned above, that is, 3,129,000 bales during the fiscal year 1958–59.

On August 1, 1959, the export subsidy was raised from 6 percent per pound to 8 cents; and exports have again responded. However, the more we export, the more it will cost the Treasury. Should exports rise to 6 million bales, the subsidy would amount to $240 million. Such increase in exports should not be counted as evidence that our total trade deficit is declining. If we can increase our exports only by subsidizing to the extent of 30 to 35 percent of the world price, we can hardly gain comfort from our international competitive position.

The story of wheat is much the same. Our export subsidy bridges the gap between the domestic support price and the world price. This gap amounts to some 60 to 65 cents per bushel at the present time. Yet, in spite of this, our exports of wheat have declined. In 1956 we exported 410 million bushels of wheat; 414 million bushels in 1957. During fiscal year 1957–58 the exports dropped to 322 million bushels and then rose to 360 million bushels in the 1958–59 fiscal year, still well below the 1956 and 1957 figures. The subsidy at 60 cents per bushel would amount to $144 million for 1958–59. Again, I want to point out that this subsidized sale cannot rightly be counted as part of our exports. Our trade deficit is actually wider by that much more than the official export figures show.

Aside from the cotton and wheat subsidies which amount to nearly $400 million per year at present, a large part of our agricultural exports are sold for foreign currencies under Public Law 480. The proceeds of these so-called sales are generally used as aid to foreign countries in the form of counterpart funds which must be spent within the country itself.

During the fiscal year 1958–59 our agricultural exports moved to the extent of 56.7 percent either under our Government subsidy or as sales for foreign currency. Only 43.3 percent of our agricultural exports were sold for dollars in private commercial unsubsidized transactions.

It is clear from what has already been said that we can hardly look to agricultural exports as a source of overcoming the deficit in our foreign account. The price differential between our producers and those of foreign countries seems to range from 30 to 40 percent in favor of the foreign. This does not augur well for any great expansion in our exports of farm products except as foreign crop failures or famines may create an extraordinary demand or as we increase the export subsidies.

When we read the bulletins from the Department of Agriculture, we note the curious emphasis on exports, such as runs through the expressions of all the executive departments of the Government that have a hand in our foreign trade. All of them emphasize the value of exports to our economy, often in highly exaggerated form. In the bulletin entitled "Foreign Agricultural Trade" issued by the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1958–59, dated November 1959, is found the following propagandistic statement:

> High-level agricultural exports are vital to U.S. agriculture as an important part of the Nation's economy. Last year's exports represented the output of 41 million acres, or 1 out of every 8 harvested. This was equivalent to 32 million long tons of cargo—enough to fill 800,000 freight cars and 3,600 ships. In moving these exports, an average of 10 ships weighed anchor each day.

Now what was the purpose of this commentary? Is it the function of the Department of Agriculture to beat the drums for the merchant marine of this country and to support the trade agreements program in reports issued at public expense?

Why do these reports, to be fair, not also point out how many millions of acres are not put into cultivation or utilized as grassland because of imports? Calculations such as these are carefully avoided. How many acres could be

turned into cane and beet sugar if imports were limited more sharply? If beef and lamb and live cattle imports were eliminated, what acreage could be added to our grazing land? How many thousands of acres of feed crops would be required to fatten this beef, mutton, and pork? It has been estimated that 1959 meat imports passed the billion pound mark. Fresh or frozen beef and veal alone during the first 9 months of 1959 exceeded 500 million pounds. In 1958 we imported 39,769 head of sheep and lambs, Lamb—slaughtered—imports have also risen spectacularly. In 1958 we also imported 1,152,407 head of cattle and the carcass equivalent of 909,049 head, or a total of 2,061,456 head.

If we should run through all the agricultural imports and reduce them to acreage as the Department of Agriculture seeks to do with respect to agricultural exports we would find, I am sure, that the acreage needed to produce the imports would be materially greater than that needed for exports.

During the fiscal year 1958–59 our agricultural exports amounted to $3.7 billion, or 22 percent of our total exports, while agricultural imports amounted to $4.0 billion or 29 percent of our total imports.

It is a well-known fact, as already amply demonstrated, that our prices are from 30 to 40 percent higher than foreign prices in the case of cotton and wheat. This differential, we may be sure, extends to other products as well.

Therefore, from simple arithmetic we can conclude that our agricultural imports of $4 billion would be greater in point of quantity by some 30 to 40 percent than an equal dollar value of exports. Our exports of agricultural products, however, amounted, not to $4 billion but to $3.7 billion.

It would seem safe to say then that if our exports of agricultural products represented the output of 41 million acres, our agricultural imports represented the output of something like 60 million acres. Oddly enough, no bulletin of the Department of Agriculture ever carries speculative calculations along these lines. Why?

Mr. Speaker, all the evidence points to the untenable position of this country in foreign competition with respect to our most important export crops and also with respect to other agricultural items such as wool, lamb, beef, cattle and many others. Certainly there is no call for any tariff cutting in this field. It must be obvious that we are actually in need of some restrictions on such imports as are hurting different domestic agricultural products. Besides beef, lamb, pork, and other animal products and grains, such as barley, oats, and rye, where we have actually imported more bushels during the past 10 years than we have in storage today, we have many specialty products such as fruits and vegetables, nuts, figs, garlic, dates, flower bulbs, and so forth, which are also adversely affected by imports.

I am in hearty support of the resolution of the gentleman from West Virginia, which I have also introduced as evidence of my interest and concern. I call on the Ways and Means Committee to hold early hearings and urge all who have a stake in the domestic economy that is adversely affected by imports to lend their vigorous support.

I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia on his remarks this afternoon on the subject of the growing damage of foreign imports on our domestic economy. This subject is of particular concern in the Eighth Ohio District which I represent.

Within the last few months I have received correspondence from a wiremill in my district, officials of which tell me that wire can now be imported from European sources and laid on the docks in Cleveland at much less cost than it can be produced 100 miles away. Not long ago a porcelain insulation factory lost a bid to a Japanese company which I am sorry to say was a Government order and this domestic firm lost the bid simply because of the inability to compete with low-cost Japanese production. Another similar instance was called to my attention by a small manufacturing company in my district which lost a bid on electrical equipment to an Austrian firm for the same reason. As a result of this I introduced H.R. 8345 which if passed into law would protect small business bids on Government projects from foreign bids submitted at much lower prices due to prevailing low wages in foreign countries.

Last summer my attention was called to a serious condition in the plumbing industry which is suffering from low-cost foreign competition. I do not wish to take time to discuss in detail how this industry is suffering but I did introduce a bill, H.R. 9272, which curbs imports in an attempt to help this injured industry.

These are only isolated examples of the problem which the gentleman from West Virginia is discussing. I think it is time that this issue should be discussed and am glad that the gentleman from West Virginia saw fit to provide this opportunity for a full discussion in the House.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his remarks and support.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for making it possible for me at this time to participate in this discussion concerning this very vital issue which is so important to the economy of this Nation, to the industry of the Nation and to the workers in the industries of America. I would be derelict indeed if I did not take this opportunity to make a few remarks about the impact of the low-cost, low-wage imports upon the economy of my own State.

This serious impact, Mr. Speaker, has been felt in the textile industry where Maine has lost thousands of jobs. This, in turn, has developed the areas of chronic unemployment where we, once, had economically healthy and thriving communities. It has caused untold anxiety among the thousands who have been forced into involuntary unemployment after years of dedicated and conscientious labor in the textile industry which was, at one time, the leading basic industry of our State. It has caused families to move away from Maine and reestablish themselves in other work in other parts of America.

Mr. Speaker, America has already been critically damaged by the unfair low-wage, low-cost production of the Orient. It was only a few years ago that Biddeford-Saco textiles and its wages stimulated the entire southwestern area of Maine with its great economic contribution from hard-working employees of unexcelled skill busily engaged in an exceptionally healthy industry.

Then, the floodgates of imports on a cost basis with which it is impossible for American standards to compete were permitted to open. From this time, we have been fighting a losing battle. It is true that we have a portion of our textile industry still at work and surviving. For this we are indeed most grateful to a labor force which has been extremely cooperative and to a management which has been efficient and willing to keep modernized.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are worried now because of new threats. The administration under permissive authority to negotiate is already engaged in discussions which could very well lead to further reductions in tariff duties and to further removal of import quotas. This should not be allowed. This House should adopt the concurrent resolution which together with several other Members, I have introduced, today, declaring it to be the sense of Congress that we should not lower our tariffs further at this time.

We have only to understand that Hong Kong is rapidly developing into a more serious threat, if that be possible, than was Japan, before its Government agreed to voluntary export control which did, at least, slow down the increase of low-wage, low-cost competition for our American working men and women.

Japan now considers Hong Kong to be her finishing factory in the export of cotton goods to America. Spinning, weaving, and finishing factories are now established and working briskly in Hong Kong to make the consolidated production from spinning to sewing within the territory of Hong Kong for export to the United States.

In Hong Kong today, there are many refugees from Red China and many of them have established factories there as the last place of their investment. It is interesting to note that this is a British colony and that there is an annual profit of some $400 million for the United Kingdom interests from these under-standard operations with which our people are becoming increasingly in competition. Much of this production uses American produced cotton. It is also noticeable that American traders are making very positive investment activities in Hong Kong.

How much more can American labor and industry take of this type of unfair and unmatchable competition? This is no time, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, to nego-

tiate further liberal reductions and advantages for this competition.

Also, while I am discussing the impact of foreign imports on our Maine economy, I certainly would be remiss in my responsibility if I did not here record the value of the shoe industry in Maine and the threat from foreign imports of footwear which is causing us to shudder as we realize what happened to our textile industry.

The 1957 census of Maine manufactures shows leather and leather products as being in the top position in employment—20,996—in our State while in gross wages this industry held the second spot of all Maine industries with payrolls of $59,394,711.

The threat which is posed again by low-wage, low-cost imports of footwear from foreign sources, including the Orient, becomes manifest when we compare imports for 1959 contrasted with 1958 over a 10 months' period, in both instances, total of all footwear imports in 1959 was 57,083,000 pairs at a value of $57,083,000 while in 1958 there were 37,475,000 with value of $34,110,000. The trend against us is obvious.

In the words of President A. W. Berkowitz, of the Songo Shoe Manufacturing Corp., of Portland, Maine, in a letter to me, recently:

"We do not want to be lulled to sleep as the textile manufacturers were, with low priced imports from foreign countries with substandard wages."

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to be lulled to sleep with this siren song of those who would destroy American jobs by substituting the low living standards of these unfortunate areas of the world for the high living standards which the American way of life has made possible.

Therefore, I have introduced this concurrent resolution and shall support it with the utmost of my energy and capacity. America needs to take account of stock in this vital problem of foreign competition. Now is the time to call a halt to further reductions in the tariff and import quota protection for our people.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and flattered to join with my distinguished, able, and astute colleague from West Virginia in introducing this timely concurrent resolution. This is one of the greatest issues before the American people today, in my opinion; and if we lower these tariffs any further and take additional steps toward completing free trade, it could well destroy this Nation within 10 years, particularly the standards that we have built up for our working people in the industries of this country. This may be an attempt to circumvent and undermine all of the great wage-and-hour legislation, as well as fringe benefits, that this Congress over more than 50 years has fought so hard for and passed for the benefit of the American people of these United States.

I hope that the Committee on Rules, one of whom, distinguished and able, is presiding over this body today, will consider this concurrent resolution favorably and report it to the House.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia again for his unceasing and untiring efforts over the years on behalf of industry and the working people of America.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding to me so that I might express just a few of my own thoughts on this subject which we have discussed so many times.

First, let me say and point out again, as the gentleman well knows, the matter of the Constitution of the United States is involved in this matter. The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives and the Congress shall set the tariff imports. For this reason we have been violating, in my opinion, the provisions of the Constitution over a period of years.

What is the situation? I am delighted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who spoke just a few minutes ago and who is still present on the floor, said what he did because he, in many cases, is a great representative of labor. I am also delighted to see many of the labor groups of the country beginning to realize the dangers of foreign importations to American jobs.

Under the reciprocal trade agreements as they have existed in the past, we have been exporting American jobs, taking jobs away from American workers. I would have you come into my congressional district and see the crumbling walls of a great industry, the watch industry. Come to my district where you can see the crumbling walls of the pottery industry, the glass industry, and other industries that are being threatened out there.

One of the interesting things, Mr. Speaker, is the fact there is now some complaint in Japan because of low-cost imports. On the island of Taiwan they are now manufacturing electric fans at the specifications of the great companies in this country at about 50 percent of what they can be manufactured in Japan. They are doing it with child labor. I believe the great labor unions will join with us in fighting against child labor and the produce of child labor coming into the markets of this country.

I am delighted that they are now joining with us. It is not only a question, Mr. Speaker, of the exporting of American jobs, but it seems to me when we do this we export American industry as well, that by these American industries going out of the country we prevent profits and the development of plants which would create more jobs for the coming generations. I think that is important.

I should like to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, a matter in this same category that disturbs me very much. This House not long ago appropriated money, out of friendship, to build a new bridge in Panama, for which the American taxpayers are going to pay over $20 million to build this great steel span across the Panama Canal. Mr. Speaker, the lowest bid for the construction of that bridge contemplates the use of steel made in Europe, but the American taxpayers, the steelworkers who have been paying their taxes year in and year out, are going to contribute to the buying of steel abroad to build that bridge. How silly can we be? And, the difference? Mr. Speaker, it is about $20,000, but it is the lowest bid, they say. What will the taxes be that the steelworkers pay into the Treasury of the United States from their wages in making that steel? What will the taxes be to the carriers shipping that steel to New Orleans for shipment? It would run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. So, it is not the lowest and the best. I hope this House will go on record that whenever we build bridges and other structures of that type, that we will do it with the products of American industry, because that is the only way we can survive.

May I, in conclusion, simply say this, and I will have more to say about it in a day or two. This is the week that we will recognize and pay tribute to William McKinley. I hear many people get up on this floor and say that McKinley was the father of reciprocal trade. Well, he was. But, they were true reciprocal trade agreements, where there was some reciprocity. The present agreements have no reciprocity. They are one-way streets. Sometimes when I speak about representing the same district that William McKinley did in this Congress, people sort of shy away from me as though there was something wrong. "You go to the right of McKinley," they say. Let me say this to you. He suffered defeat in this House standing upon his principle for the protection of the American workingman, which later made him President of the United States. And, along that line, may I also say to those who casually like to dig at us a little bit about William McKinley, that when he was Governor of Ohio he recommended to the legislature and signed the first bill in any State of the Union which provided protection to a workingman who joined a union. McKinley offered and signed the legislation that made it a crime to discriminate against a man because he belonged to a union.

Well, that is only incidental, Mr. Speaker, and again I compliment the gentleman from West Virginia. I hope I may be here with him to continue this fight, for I think it is most important. I congratulate him on taking the lead year in and year out in connection with this very important matter.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I agree completely with the observations that have been made about the forthcoming GATT tariff conferences. I do not believe that the United States is in a position to grant further tariff reductions at this time.

It was ridiculous in the first place to believe that we could go on forever cutting our tariffs when it was already obvious that in many lines of products we could be and have been badly undersold by other countries. In my own State of Washington, we have been thus undersold on fish, plywood, crabmeat, fresh and frozen trout, flower bulbs, lumber, and other items for years. Already our tariff has been cut beyond the peril point. That was also true of scores of other products in other parts of the country.

Today our average tariff is only 20 percent of what it was when we first began reducing duties 25 years ago. That is to say our tariff on the average is down 80 percent. We have gone a long way toward complete dismantling of our so-called tariff wall.

Many of us have said time and again as successive tariff cuts were being made in one international conference after another that our tariff had already been cut far enough, that war and postwar conditions had hidden the effects of these cuts. Very few people paid attention to these warnings. Now for the first time other countries have come into a position to take full advantage of our low tariff and they are doing so.

When imports from Japan could increase 54 percent from one year to another as they did in the first 9 months of 1959 compared with the same period in 1958 it must be clear that they have a virtually unobstructed access to our market. During that same period imports from Europe increased 43 percent. Do these experiences indicate that we need to reduce our tariff any further in order to stimulate imports?

Mr. Speaker, the present Trade Agreements Extension Act was passed about 18 months ago. It was actually sent to Congress 2 years ago. One of the principal reasons for asking further tariff-cutting power was laid to the setting up of the Common Market in Europe. Apparently we were to be placed in the position of buying fair treatment all over again. It was said that we might be discriminated against by the European countries if we could not offer them additional concessions. This is the same as saying that we cannot trust those countries to stand by their previous commitments, all of which we paid for by sharp tariff reductions. One of the very cornerstones of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is nondiscrimination. This principle has been advertised as one of the great virtues of GATT. Why should we then have to grant further concessions to avoid discrimination against us? The Common Market countries are all members of GATT. Are we to fall victims to blackmail? Do we have to buy fair treatment?

Not only that, but only now are other countries beginning to make some serious moves to take off some of the restrictions other than tariffs by which they have been regulating their imports. For years the tariff concessions that those countries granted us were almost completely nullified by the imposition of exchange controls, import licenses, quotas, and even embargoes. Now that those countries have recovered and built up monetary reserves, thanks in great part to the use of these restrictions and our aid, they are showing a willingness to lift some of the restrictions; that is, now that they no longer need them.

Let me say that I for one did not blame them for using restrictions when they needed them. I think the value of import restrictions to the extent that they are needed has been demonstrated by the countries that used them. Those countries might still be in financial straits if they had not placed stringent restrictions on imports. Also we can be sure that they will put back any restrictions that they may regard as necessary when they again feel the need of doing so; and they will not bother to ask our leave.

Mr. Speaker, the question raised by these observations is: Why should we not have the same unquestioned right to take care of ourselves as have these other countries?

Today we find ourselves in an untenable international competitive position. That we are badly overpriced in most lines in relation to other countries has become obvious on many sides. In agricultural products such as wheat and cotton we find it necessary to subsidize by about 35 percent in order to export. In those instances where foreign bidders seek public contracts from our Government and enter the bidding contest our manufacturers usually find themselves underbid anywhere from 30 to 40 percent. Recently when it was ruled that development loans granted other countries must be spent in this country an outcry went up on the grounds that if the funds from such loans had to be spent in this country they would go only 50 to 60 percent as far as they would if the purchases could be made in other countries. This was an open admission, made by those who steadfastly deny that we are priced out of foreign markets, that we are indeed outpriced.

Under these circumstances we should not only not make further tariff reductions but should take the steps that may be necessary to prevent many of our industries from destruction. In case after case under present tariff rates we have seen imports start at a small figure and in a few years' time capture 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 percent of our market. In some instances imports have not gone beyond 10 or 20 percent of the market. This halting of imports is usually attributable to shortage of the foreign supply. For example, I am sure that if an adequate supply of crabmeat were available in Japan or Russia they could run our industry out of the market. Her competitive margin is such that our producers stand no chance in competition. The same observation applies to other items.

We can be sure that if the countries that are now relaxing their import restrictions found themselves in the same competitive situation such as our industries in the face of foreign costs of production they would use import restrictions without the least concern about what our reaction might be. Their diplomacy would make clear to us their imperative need and we would listen, as we have listened in the past.

Those who say that we would invite retaliation from other countries if we imposed restrictions on imports confess either that our diplomacy is faulty and far below that of other countries or that other countries are so devoid of principle that they would retaliate against us when we take measures such as they themselves have become accustomed to through long usage. If such countries did indeed resort to retaliation under these circumstances, our diplomacy would have shown itself to be weak indeed; or the other countries could not be regarded as worthy friends.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that now for the first time have other countries come into a position to test our tariff cuts. By this I mean that up to now those countries over the past 25 years have either been in a depression, preparing for war, actually engaged in highly destructive war, or making recovery from war. Now they are recovered and are in a position to compete as never before. We face a situation that has no counterpart in the past.

Under these circumstances we find ourselves with our tariffs down, far down, and our hands tied by membership in GATT. Today we are sitting ducks to be disposed of competitively at the pleasure of countries that for the first time are our match technologically in many lines while still enjoying the competitive benefits of very low wages compared with our own.

This whole matter becomes a question of the competence and integrity of those who conduct our foreign relations. There is evidence on all sides, becoming daily more obvious, that the United States faces a competitive situation that is new to us in several vital aspects. As I have just said, we are no longer alone in the field of industrial know-how. We have willingly given to other countries our production methods, our mass production techniques, and much else that previously provided insulation against low foreign wages, at least in those of our industries that were in the lead industrially. Many of our industries, especially those in which mechanization had not advanced as far as in others, have long had great difficulty in competing with imports. Now we find even our most advanced industries helpless in the face of the new competitive realities. This is because foreign wages have lagged behind the rising foreign productivity.

We all know that many billions of dollars' worth of the best machinery and equipment that we have produced in this country is now also operating in other countries. It would be a dull person indeed who could not discern what this means in the face of lagging wages abroad. I daresay that many foreign companies have increased their output per man-hour several times over as a result of this new machinery while their wages have gone up in much lesser proportion. That is why the automobile and steel industries now for the first time feel the bite of foreign competition. That is also why so many of our companies are seeking oversea production facilities. They are losing foreign mar-

kets, and even their home market and seek to recoup by opening up abroad.

Everyone in the business world who is up against the guns of foreign competition knows this. The outlook for a reversal of this situation is not bright. Foreign wages are not about to catch up with ours even if foreign productivity succeeds in doing so. This is what our diplomacy should tell other countries.

To me the combination of circumstances we face is simple enough and calls for a relatively simple answer. All we have to do is to take a leaf from the successful policy of our foreign competitors. We may be sure that the last thing they would do under our circumstances would be what we now propose to do in Geneva, namely, make further tariff reductions. The idea is not in American interests.

I strongly urge adoption of the concurrent resolution as expressive of the good sense of Congress.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a widespread interest in the resolution submitted by our most able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] relative to the trade agreements extension bill, providing that the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming negotiations and for an investigation as to the extent and effect of limitations other than tariffs imposed by foreign countries on exports from the United States.

The resolution itself now pending before us is admirably descriptive of the serious economic situation that confronts this country as the result, in large measure, of the operation of the reciprocal trade treaties. American workers, indeed, the entire American people, have been alarmed by the sharp increase in imports and the decline in exports and the resultant mounting deficits incurred by the United States in the total foreign account, which was $3.4 billion in 1958 and an estimated $4 billion in 1959.

In order to satisfy these deficits it has been necessary, of course, for this Nation to tap our gold reserves and thus produce a gold outflow of several billion dollars at a time when our gold stock at Fort Knox is reduced to $19.5 billion with about $18 billion in foreign claims against it, $16 billion of which could be withdrawn on demand.

As the resolution points out, gold outflow to foreign countries augments the pressure on the Treasury to offer higher interest rates on current and future borrowings, greatly increasing the annual national outlay for interest on the national debt so that the United States currently is paying about $10 billion in interest. Both these figures and the latest figures on increase of imports are very disturbing to thoughtful citizens who are surveying economic developments and foreign trade with great concern. It is clear that, as many of us have feared, we are being flooded with imports both from the East and from the West and this is not only harmful to our domestic industries and employment here, but is also very harmful to our foreign markets. In the broadest sense, it is clear that there has been a migration of American industrial machinery, technology, skills, and know-how financed by the foreign aid program which has resulted in the creation of sharp, destructive, foreign competition in the form of goods coming in under the trade treaties and products of many kinds competitive with our own which are moving in world trade.

It is clear that these developments are threatening the prosperity of many basic American industries—automobiles, steel, sewing machines, typewriters, and others—and reducing employment opportunities for American workers as well as business for American producers that, in effect, is also to diminish American industrial power and substantially decrease tax revenues at a time when the national budget is rising in order to meet defense and security needs and to carry on essential functions of government.

It is true, as the resolution states, that efforts have been made to cut down the shrinkage of U.S. exports by subsidizing the exports of cotton, wheat, and some other products. Admittedly, this is a very unsound approach to these difficult economic problems and in the long run can be of no lasting value in correcting the present deficit position of our total foreign account. On the whole, as a product of certain American policies of foreign aid and trade and so-called economic stabilization, we have reaped for ourselves nothing but steadily increasing destructive competition from abroad with a prospect of unemployment and diminished standards for American workers since it could never be denied that there is any prospect of closing the wage and production cost differential between foreign and domestic products in the foreseeable future.

However, as I have stated so many times, our great Nation is desirous of conducting profitable and constructive foreign trade and commerce with all nations of good will that mean to do business with us on a mutually advantageous basis, but it is quite another thing, I submit, to finance the expansion and growth of foreign competitive units and then open wide the trade doors of our Nation to steadily increasing quantities of competitive goods produced by cheap labor under conditions which in this Nation would be considered to be substandard.

I am a strong supporter of this resolution and I hope it will be adopted by the Congress. It is moderate in tone and effect and merely seeks to take necessary action to prevent further diminution of our valuable gold supply and to reappraise the impact of current trade policies with a view to introducing into these policies a more realistic regard and consideration for all the interest and needs of American workers and American industries and the general prosperity of the Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues who have already spoken to urge support of the legislation which we have joined in introducing. Whatever one may feel from a theoretic or philosophical point of view about the subject of world trade, it seems clear to me that the present is no time to talk about any further reduction of our own tariffs and the encouragement of a still greater disproportion of imports to exports in our system.

I have the honor, Mr. Speaker, to represent a district which has been extremely hard hit economically, to a large extent because of the growing volume of imports from low-wage areas abroad. As a result of these imports my congressional district is one which has the dubious distinction of having been listed as an area of very serious unemployment. In fact, just a few weeks ago the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the other body paid a visit to my home city of Schenectady and there held hearings on this subject. The evidence presented before that committee, as I discussed at some length on the floor of this House on January 13, indicated the extent to which foreign imports had contributed to our unemployment situation. A representative of the General Electric Co., for example, testified that 1,000 jobs were lost to Schenectady for a full year because of contracts for turbine production which had been placed last year, mainly by Government agencies, in foreign countries rather than in Schenectady. Just last week the women's leather glove industry, which is located in my district in Fulton County, was afforded a hearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission to appeal for immediate relief under the provisions of the so-called escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

This problem of foreign competition, which has long been felt by industries like the glove industry and the carpet industry in my district, is today beginning to be felt severely, as I have indicated, by such major and widespread industries as the heavy electrical equipment manufacturing industry, the automobile industry, and the steel industry.

I am not opposed to foreign trade, of course, and I recognize the importance of such trade both for our own economy and for the role that it plays in contributing to our common alliance against communism. But I honestly cannot believe we have a responsibility to carry on this trade without any regard whatsoever for its impact on our own industries and on our own people's jobs. It is a relatively simple thing to export American capital abroad. Unfortunately, when we export capital we find we are also exporting employment, employment we can ill afford to share.

And so I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a thoroughgoing study is needed of the overall impact of foreign trade on our domestic economy, particularly in those

areas most severely hit by unemployment. Certainly this study should be made before any further reductions are even considered in our own tariff structure. Indeed, as our concurrent resolution provides, the subject should not even be discussed until those restrictions which now limit American exports going abroad are removed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will speedily adopt this resolution.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has performed a valuable public service by his timely and enlightening discussion of our competitive situation in certain areas of foreign trade.

The gentleman has discussed a subject that calls for the application of prudence and commensense. That is, the plight of domestic industries should be taken into account when our Government undertakes the reduction of tariffs on competitive commodities from low-cost foreign products.

There appears to be much logic in the suggestion that the State Department seriously consider freezing all tariff rates until the dust settles, and the effect imports in vast quantities is having on domestic industries. Then, it would seem, any changes should be selective and applied where the minimum of damage would result, while at the same time allowing for a proper amount of incentive for an abundance of international trade.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed and I know that other Members of the House have been deeply disturbed by recent events in the neighboring country of Cuba. Nobody in this body can afford to ignore the insulting treatment given to our President, to our Ambassador, and, indeed, to the entire people of the United States by the present Castro regime, as related by Secretary of State Herter in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 21.

I have a most sympathetic and affectionate regard for the Cuban people. I have the same regard for our other neighbors in Latin America. I have observed during the past year how these nations have refrained from criticism of the tolerance we have displayed in the face of the most insulting provocations. They have been patient and confident that, sooner or later, in line with our traditional policy of noninterference in the affairs of other nations, we should find an equitable way to handle this young man, who takes upon himself the license of acting without regard to international law or, in fact, to the laws of his own country.

I am not taking the floor, however, solely to discuss Mr. Castro. I ask the attention of Members of this distinguished body to a fundamental economic problem underlying our relationships with all of our Latin American neighbors. This is the problem of sound sugar legislation and specifically of the role which neighboring Latin American countries should properly play in supplying the sugar needs of the United States.

Our Sugar Act in its present basic form has been in existence for the past 25 years. It has been the custom of the Congress to review the operation of the act periodically and to amend it in the light of changing conditions. According to the custom we have followed, this periodic review should have taken place during the year 1959. Certain distortions in the law had developed, some unforeseen, some due to economic changes, but all required rectification if the producers and consumers of sugar in the United States were to continue to benefit from the legislation.

In spite of this we did not review nor amend the act because some of the changes required for the benefit of our own sugar economy would have resulted in a reduction in the Cuban sugar quota. I think it would be a travesty, Mr. Speaker, if we failed now to follow our time-tested custom to amend this law simply because of the advent of a viciously anti-American Government in Cuba.

At the present time domestic sources supply only approximately 53 percent of the sugar requirements of the United States. This means that almost one-half of our sugar supply must come from foreign sources. Of the 47 percent of our sugar requirements supplied by foreign countries over 70 percent is supplied by one of these countries, that is Cuba. Of all sugar supplied by our neighbors in this hemisphere, more than 92 percent is supplied by Cuba. We are importing this year 3,391,000 tons of sugar from Latin America. Of this total, the quotas of seven countries amount to only 271,000 tons, while Cuba's amounts to 3,120,000 tons.

This monopoly has resulted and must result in higher sugar prices for U.S. consumers. Our Department of Agriculture, in its bulletin dated September 3, 1959, stated that the U.S. price of refined sugar was the highest since 1920. Those who managed to secure a stranglehold over such a large segment of the U.S. sugar supply were in a position to dictate prices and, in effect, to tax the American housewife.

For example, if a U.S. refinery has a need for raw sugar, which is not readily available from domestic sources, there should be some element of competition for that sale. Instead, we find that virtually all of the foreign supply available to our east and gulf coasts is locked up in the hands of one country. This in turn means that our refiners and consequently our consumers are in effect at the mercy of that supplying country for their sugar needs. We either pay their price or we do not get the sugar when we want it. That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that even if the vicious political attacks against the United States by the present leader of the Cuban Government had not taken place, common sense and sound economics would demand a more sensible distribution of foreign sugar supply.

Lest there be some among you who believe that our consumers must continue to depend on this monopoly, it is time that this shibboleth be destroyed once and for all. I quote from an article in the New York Times of January 23, 1960:

> The United States would have little difficulty meeting any temporary shortage because of the large surpluses in other countries. These surpluses are estimated as follows: Mexico, 500,000 tons; Philippines, 300,000; Dominican Republic, 174,000; Peru, 90,000; Argentina, 250,000; Taiwan, 140,000; and Brazil, 1,220,000.

The Latin American countries mentioned in this article have surpluses totaling 2,234,000 tons. In addition, these same countries are filling quotas in the less attractive world market which amount to 1,677,000 tons. There is therefore available to the United States at this moment in friendly Latin American countries anxious to supply our requirements, 3,900,000 tons of sugar in comparison with the 1960 Cuban quota of 3,120,000 tons, an excess of 780,000 tons. Furthermore, the total sugar production of these countries is well in excess of Cuba's, which is a guarantee of their ability to continue supplying our market.

The higher price paid by our market would be a boon to these countries whose economies at this moment are suffering from the low prices they are receiving for most of their exports. Is this not a situation which calls for rectification? Should we go on subsidizing our enemies while our friends stand by patiently waiting for equitable treatment?

A very few of my colleagues are counseling delay. They say it would be wiser to avoid draping the bearded frame of Mr. Castro with the cloak of martyrdom. But I say to you that the real martyrs to the cause of our delaying tactics are our other Latin American neighbors. We have no right to use them as pawns in a game. We are playing with their economic rights and resources in the hope of placating an anti-American dictator.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should take Mr. Castro at his word. If he disdains to accept as a sugar quota what the Congress deems best for the proper operation of the sugar economy of the United States, let him ship his sugar to the rest of the world where he will find the markets left open by our friends, who are willing and anxious to accept the judgment of the Congress.

It is clear to me that when sound economics demand a destruction of the Cuban monopoly for the benefit of the American housewife then a preservation of the Cuban quota as it is today would constitute a reward for creating a political furor and would be an acquiescence on the part of the United States to a type of political blackmail. It is our traditional doctrine, in which I concur, that we should avoid interference in the affairs of any other nation. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that a preservation of

the status quo would constitute interference in favor of Mr. Castro and against the interests of our Latin American friends who are willing and able to supply sugar to the United States competitively and at reasonable prices and whose supplies are as accessible to us as Cuba's.

The very distinguished Secretary of State is reported to have suggested that it would perhaps be advisable for Congress to delegate to the executive branch the authority to manipulate sugar quotas in order that the executive might have more flexibility in dealing with a situation such as we are presently faced with in Cuba. I have a very high regard and great respect for our able Secretary of State. I respectfully suggest, however, that in this situation he has chosen the wrong remedy.

As one who has had occasion to be concerned with sugar legislation for some time, may I say that in my opinion a statute which delegates to the executive authority to change sugar quotas among foreign suppliers would result, not in flexibility but in virtual paralysis. At the present time, if the Congress faces squarely up to the situation in Cuba and makes a sensible reduction in the Cuban share of the U.S. market, it may make Castro unhappy. But I can assure the Members of this honorable body that if the executive department should attempt to shift quotas among Latin American countries, for the purpose of furthering negotiations with Mr. Castro, we would have many disappointed friends. It would be virtually impossible for the executive, which is responsible for continuing day-to-day relations with our foreign suppliers, to arbitrate the competing quota claims and equities among them. As a net result, the executive will find that it is able to do nothing. Moreover, even if it could be done successfully, it would result in chaotic conditions in the industry from the managerial point of view, since suppliers would not know what they were called upon to supply from time to time.

The only realistic thing to do is to advise producers, both foreign and domestic, as to what their quotas would be over the next 4 years, as we have always done in the past. If this entails a cut in the Cuban share, in the interest of sound legislation, and, indeed, sound legislation does so require, the United States is certainly big enough to face up to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that prompt consideration should be given to new sugar legislation, to extend over a 4-year period which will accomplish the following basic objectives:

First. To continue to encourage normal, healthy evolution of the domestic sugar industry of the United States.

Second. As regards the foreign component of our U.S. sugar supply, to develop a 4-year program which will: (a) Achieve a more balanced division of the foreign portion of the U.S. sugar supply in order to more fully insure that at all times there will be some measure of competition in filling the requirements of U.S. consumers; (b) decrease our dependence for sugar supply upon any single country to a level where failure of such supply could not have deleterious effects upon the U.S. economy; and (c) stimulate the foreign trade of the United States by increasing our imports from those Latin American countries which desire to buy our products.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a time for action and not pussyfooting. The issue is clear, the problem is here, and the time for action is now.

MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current controversy about the more realistic appraisals of the military programs of the Soviets now being made by the Department of Defense, I think we should examine some of the appraisals of the past.

In the 7 years that I have served on the Armed Services Committee it has been my privilege to sit in on a number of secret briefings on Soviet military strength. The Soviet strength was always projected in term of "capabilities" rather than in terms of "probabilities." Their total productive and operating capability for secret weapons was always used to compare with our own known planned capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that our defense planners can make just as serious errors in planning military programs based on the enemies' capabilities as they can make by basing it on the enemies' intentions. For example, we were told several years ago that the Soviet capability for submarines would indicate over 1,000 submarines operating by 1959. This figure is far above what we now know to be their actual operating submarine fleet.

Two years later we were told about the Russian long-range bombers, which had at that time made a few prototype flights. We were told the Russians had a capability of several hundred long-range bombers in operation by 1960. This has not proved accurate. Few such bombers are operating today.

At other times we have been told what the IOC, or initial operating capability, of various missiles would be at a given date in the future. In most instances the capability does not become a reality. In other words, capability is not a magic word. It can be misleading.

It seems to me that the decision of Secretary Gates and the National Intelligence Board in basing our plans on Soviet probabilities rather than capabilities gives us a better chance of realistically countering and surpassing enemy weapons of all types.

In all cases a constant reappraisal of the enemies' probable operating plans and our own plans must be made. As new and more accurate intelligence becomes available to us we must obviously adjust our own military plans.

The important thing is that we remain ahead of the enemy in total military strength. His problem in competing with us is far greater than ours. He has two-thirds of the globe for a target which means that enemy bases that could operate against him must be knocked out quickly or he must expect devastating retaliation. On the other hand we have a target half as large as his. Theoretically, with twice the targets he would have to be twice as strong as we are to have an even break in the event of an overall conflict. As it stands the ratio of military strength is actually the reverse and we are far stronger than he in overall deterrent strength. I am confident he will never match us as long as we continue to devote the intelligent attention to the problem now evidenced by those responsible for our defense posture.

SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, January 11, I received with regret the advice that my colleague in the Congress, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, had chosen not to seek reelection to the Senate on the expiration of his term this year. At the time this news reached me I know I experienced the same emotion which must have touched the hearts and minds of all our fellow citizens. Rhode Island without THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN as its vigorous spokesman—the Democratic Party and the U.S. Senate without Senator GREEN in its active councils—presents a prospect which is difficult to accept without a tinge of genuine sorrow and a sense of keen loss.

I ask indulgence to speak for a moment in what may seem a partisan vein. But it is one altogether fitting and appropriate in discussing the life and times of this great public figure.

The name of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has been inevitably linked with the Democratic Party in Rhode Island since he first pledged his full energies to it more than a half century ago. Since that time his name has become a hallmark of progressive and enlightened government, both there and on the national scene.

While his devotion to sound and just principles of social justice has placed him on a plateau high above narrow partisan criticism, he always made it plain that it was as a member of the Democratic Party that he proceeded to consider and act on legislative matters presented for his judgment and decision.

I cannot help but recall that he steadfastly stood with the Democratic Party during the succession of years when there was little hope of outstanding success to its members in Rhode Island. Long before he tasted the sweet fruits of victory, he drank deeply of the bitter waters of defeat. Through this travail of many years he persevered. He never faltered or waivered in his dedication to the principles of Government

handed down by Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson. His reward was at last forthcoming in 1932 when he became our Governor and his political destiny has continued with brilliant success ever since. He stood by the side of his good friend, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and was steadfastly devoted to the leadership of Harry S. Truman, both of whom regarded him as one of their most stalwart supporters and advisors in the Congress. I truly believe that all of us in the Democratic Party have been the beneficiaries of the decades of toil and sacrifice of THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and his early associates who kept our banner high in many an adversity. In my personal book of great Americans I inscribe his name with the foremost.

However, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is too great a man to attempt to describe in terms of a particular State or a particular party. Because history will substantiate, I am sure, that his mind and energies were primarily directed to aiding and assisting the average man and woman, of whatever political creed, in all parts of our vast and complex union of States. For the past 23 years here in the Congress this has been his mission. It is for this very reason that on January 13, on the floor of the Senate, he received the most eloquent tribute ever paid to an individual Member in my recollection. Little wonder that I take some reflected pride in the fact that this man—a citizen of the Nation, a man of world affairs—is a product of my State and of my party.

The record of Senator GREEN amply demonstrates that he had no love of power, as such, despite the entrustment of so much of it to him for many years. This was remarkably demonstrated last year when he voluntarily relinquished the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee—an almost unprecedented action. He has had a higher ambition—to serve his country well. And in this he has succeeded. So that by consistently exerting his great and learned talents in the cause of justice and mankind, he has achieved a remarkable reputation. And, as Shakespeare once said, "The purest treasure mortal times afford is spotless reputation." A former Speaker of this House, Champ Clark, once aptly commented that some public men are bigger than their reputations, some smaller than their reputations, some equal to their reputations. I am sure all will agree that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is one of those rare public men who are bigger than their reputations.

In conclusion let me say that I have had the good fortune to work with Senator GREEN in numerous campaigns, to serve with him in 20 sessions of the Congress, during which time I have had the benefit of his wise and educated advice and his invaluable assistance. It is my hope and expectation that he will continue to render public service, in some capacity commensurate with his personal wishes, in the years ahead. He has enriched the times in which he has lived and the men with whom he has associated. He leaves a political heritage to us second to none in the annals of American Government.

To him I wish the blessings of continued health and many years in which to enjoy the rich rewards that God has given him.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MONTOYA, for 10 minutes, on Wednesday.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. FLYNN, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. VAN ZANDT, for 10 minutes, on January 28.

Mr. BOW, for 2 hours, on tomorrow.

Mr. LEVERING (at the request of Mr. METCALF), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. BOWLES (at the request of Mr. METCALF), for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARING.

Mr. SILER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON on the subject of "LIFO—The Last in and First Out Method of Inventory Accounting."

Mr. CAHILL.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MACK of Washington.

(At the request of Mr. METCALF, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DINGELL in three instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. DENT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2436. An act to revise the Federal election laws to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 12, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	$8,160.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	7,489.74
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	6,440.69
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	5,110.80
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	4,397.46
Pauline E. Graves	do	4,171.44
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,284.43
Alicia F. Shoemaker	do	4,028.57
Gladys N. Ondarcho	do	3,719.28
Haywood W. Taylor	do	2,645.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	1,787.49
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 31, 1959	4,005.15
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	5,792.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	44,207.36

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$8,209.08
Paul M. Wilson	do	8,209.08
Samuel W. Crosby	Staff assistant	8,143.68
Carson W. Culp	do	8,143.68
Jay B. Howe	do	7,980.18
Ross P. Pope	do	7,980.18
Robert M. Moyer	do	7,980.18
Frank Sanders	do	7,489.74
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	7,489.74
Robert P. Williams	Editor	6,754.08
Aubrey A. Gunnels	Staff assistant	6,427.08
Robert L. Michaels	do	6,263.58
Kelly Campbell	do	5,854.86
James D. Burris	do	5,691.42
G. Homer Skarin	do	5,527.92
Earl C. Silsby	do	5,241.84
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,284.42
Francis G. Merrill	Staff assistant	4,190.22
Samuel R. Preston	do	3,577.98
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	3,012.78
Kenneth A. Meade	do	2,918.58
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	1,976.58
George S. Green	Clerk to minority	7,489.74
Lucille K. Brand	Clerk-stenographer	2,871.48
Phyllis N. Troy	do	2,871.48
June R. Austin	do	2,871.48
William J. Neary	do	2,871.48
Jeanne C. Smith	do	2,871.48
Catherine D. Norrell	do	2,871.48
Viola W. Grubbs	do	2,871.48

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Donald L. Bernard	Clerk-stenographer	$2,871.48
Rosalind E. McGovern	do	2,871.48
Rose Marie Kline	do	2,871.48
Mary Lucy Walker	do	2,871.48
Ruth R. Hollowell	do	2,588.88
Sharon Wells	do	2,871.48
Silas Taber	do	2,871.48
Sarah C. Caldwell	do	1,690.98
Margie H. Trew	do	2,871.48
Josephine Birdsall	do	2,871.48
Frank Mentillo	do	2,588.88
Alice Beach	do	1,914.32
John Henry Murphy	do	894.36
Sarah Rutz	do	2,683.08
Elinor L. Malaney	do	2,871.48
Robert Dunkel	do	2,298.70
Maxine E. Koch	do	1,914.32
Alfred E. Andersen	do	1,064.32
Sandra S. Sonner	do	862.96

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959 $205,281.10

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959 205,281.10

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Jenkins	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$6,590.58
Joseph K. Ponder	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	6,672.30
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	2,965.68
Helen C. Parrish	do	2,588.88
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	4,500.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Agriculture, Department of:		
Dowling, Daniel P.	Investigator	$2,208.54
Gross, William J.	do	3,975.20
Robinson, Benjamin F.	do	3,525.20
Air Force, Department of:		
Curren, Phillip J.	do	2,789.92
Gardner, G. C., Jr.	do	952.00
Zipp, John E.	do	2,370.48
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Ager, Magne O.	do	4,087.06
Trent, Floyd P.	do	3,732.89
Civil Service Commission:		
Delavigne, Dorsey H.	do	3,043.74
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bolz, Charles	do	6,200.32
Chisholm, Leslie B. Jr.	do	5,617.92
Cogan, Joseph P.	do	5,641.28
Delavigne, Kenneth T.	do	6,103.68
Emery, Thomas J.	do	3,666.80
Giovannetti, Carlton A.	do	3,837.92
Hair, Harold H.	Investigator	$5,136.80
Hayden, Albert C. Jr.	do	6,219.84
Hayes, Edward Joseph.	do	4,361.60
Holcombe, Robert L.	do	4,170.24
Hosker, Arthur E.	do	5,461.20
Ivy, Coy M.	do	1,702.40
Leen, Maurice P.	do	2,681.28
Love, Warren, L.	do	5,976.96
McEllece, Richard F.	do	4,313.92
McGuinn, Martin J.	do	3,260.16
Martinson, Walter C.	do	3,329.28
Murphy, Peter J., Jr.	do	4,472.00
Nugent, James E.	do	161.28
O'Brien, Allan R.	do	5,317.60
Retirement Fund		7,675.29
Roth, Peter G.	Investigator	2,219.52
Snyder, Milton L.	do	5,976.96
Swanson, Harold C.	do	2,059.20
Tonis, Robert	do	2,490.40
Tucker, George R.	do	6,103.68
Turner, Paul A.	do	3,329.28
Watkins, Harold D.	do	4,346.56
Whitwam, Eugene W.	do	2,849.60
Wood, H. Branch	do	6,103.68
Woolf, Richard M.	do	5,158.40
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Robbins, Leslie F.	do	1,490.44
Interior, Department of the:		
Edwards, Percy L.	do	4,439.57
Miller, Donald H.	do	4,395.32
National Bureau of Standards, State, Department of:		1,760.27
Fee, William E., Jr.	Investigator	4,671.52
Tennessee Valley Authority:		
Cowser, Joyce W.	do	3,897.74
Veterans' Administration:		
Rowsey, John J.	do	2,908.09
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		67,907.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $500,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959 277,417.02

Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959 277,417.02

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959 222,582.98

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JANUARY 4, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$8,209.08
John R. Blandford	Counsel	8,184.54
Philip W. Kelleher	do	8,184.54
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	6,754.08
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary.	$4,268.78
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	4,268.78
L. Louise Ellis	do	4,213.83
Marie M. Abbott	do	3,508.87
M. Jane Binger	do	3,209.00
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,265.52

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 19 AND 20, 86TH CONG.

John J. Courtney	Special counsel	$8,209.08
Lloyd Kuhn	Staff assistant	4,416.30
William H. Sandweg	Assistant counsel	5,972.70
William S. Messersmith.	Staff Assistant (July 1 to Aug. 31, 1959).	1,104.74
William V. Redmann	do	1,505.08
Albert Ledgard	Staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Aug. 30, 1959).	1,159.98
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	3,625.08
Jane Wheelahan	do	2,965.68
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	2,871.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $150,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 25,776.60

Amount expended from July 1959 to January 1960 39,291.41

Total amount expended from January 1959 to January 1960 65,068.01

Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1960 84,931.99

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JANUARY 1, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and general counsel.	$8,209.08
John E. Barriere	Majority staff member.	8,209.08
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member.	8,209.08
Robert R. Poston	Counsel	8,209.08
Helen E. Long	Deputy clerk	4,841.10
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk	4,841.10
John M. Devlin	Editor	6,672.30
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman.	5,609.64
Ferol Davis	Secretary to minority member (deceased Aug. 17, 1959).	588.48

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 81, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Kenneth W. Burrows	Economist	$6,920.28
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,300.06
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Housing economist	8,209.08
Alberta Masumian	Secretary	3,752.22
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,020.92
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	3,752.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures $105,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 29,859.40

Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	$34,545.35
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	64,404.75
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	40,595.25

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JANUARY 14, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$8,143.68
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	7,489.74
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	5,527.92
George W. McCown	Research analyst, assistant clerk.	4,472.82
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk	5,020.92
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	4,435.13
Dixon D. Davis	do	3,147.06
Ann L. Puryear	do	3,625.08
Ellen Coxeter	Stenographer	2,494.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,826.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	2,568.07
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	7,257.93

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JANUARY 12, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell C. Derrickson	Acting clerk	$8,160.00
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel	8,160.00
Charles T. Lane	Assistant general counsel.	8,160.00
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority clerk	8,160.00
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,643.92
Ida S. Miller	do	3,643.92
Katherine T. Ferebee	do	3,643.92
Jeanne E. Thomson	Assistant clerk (minority).	3,643.92
Gladys M. Rafter	Assistant clerk	3,643.92
James B. Weils	Assistant clerk (Sept. 1 to Oct. 10, 1959).	809.76
John D. Bell	Editor (July 1 to Nov. 23, 1959).	6,892.91
Mary P. Allen	Subcommittee clerk	3,502.62
Charles H. Backstrom	Assistant director for subcommittee (July 1 to Sept. 30, 1959).	6,335.57
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel for subcommittee.	6,263.58
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	$1,253.64
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	4,953.48
W. Wilson Young	Legal counsel for subcommittee.	6,263.58
Russell H. Riggs	Subcommittee clerk (July 1 to Sept. 16, 1959).	2,085.13
Harry V. Barnard	Research assistant for subcommittee.	4,001.82
Olive M. Gibbons	Stenographer for subcommittee.	3,003.36
John T. Hallahan	Assistant director for administration for subcommittee (July 1 to July 17, 1959).	519.76
Margaret Mahoney	Stenographer for subcommittee (Sept. 17 to Nov. 30, 1959).	1,029.44
Alice Hartman	Assistant to the director for subcommittee (Aug. 27 to Dec. 31, 1959).	3,100.74
Elizabeth W. Adams	Stenographer for subcommittee (Dec. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959).	417.34
Dr. John Messick	Assistant to the director for subcommittee (Nov. 23 to Dec. 31, 1959).	1,372.36
Colie Williamson	Field investigator for subcommittee (Dec. 13 to Dec. 31, 1959).	400.18

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$160,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	40,569.98
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	73,976.98
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, to Dec. 31, 1959	114,546.96
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	45,453.04

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 8, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$8,209.08
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	8,115.06
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	8,115.06
Franklin J. Schupp	do	7,538.76
Dumond Peck Hill [1]	do	2,734.41
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	5,854.86
Winifred G. Osborne	Staff assistant	5,527.92
Helen C. Mattas	do	5,142.30
Myrtie M. Melvin	do	5,020.92
Helen L. Hashagen	do	5,020.92
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	4,930.98
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	3,662.76

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,169.26
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	$32,113.19
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	34,282.45
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	115,717.55

[1] Resigned Sept. 3, 1959.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JANUARY 15, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Full committee	$3,978.81
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	48,749.23
Military Operations Subcommittee	43,679.91
Government Activities Subcommittee	27,368.22
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	19,972.30
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	35,117.33
Special Donable Property Subcommittee	19,738.69
Special Government Information Subcommittee	33,990.25
Salaries, Full Committee, July 1-Dec. 31, 1959:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	8,209.08
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	7,609.08
James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel	8,153.22
Martha C. Roland, staff member	6,602.82
J. Robert Brown, staff member	6,263.58
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,397.46
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	3,728.70
Patricia Maheux, staff member	3,719.28
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff	7,489.74
J. P. Carlson, minority counsel	6,884.82
Expenses July 1-Dec. 31, 1959:	
Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery supplies—full committee and subcommittees, total	3,978.81
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	6,672.30
Phineas Indritz, counsel	6,602.82
Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel	6,602.82
Victor G. Rosenblum, consultant	2,310.00
David Glick, associate counsel	5,446.20
Arthur Perlman, investigator	6,251.34
Lawrence P. Redmond, clerk	4,143.18
Earle J. Wade, statistical clerk	4,143.18
Irene Manning, stenographer	3,389.58
Expenses	3,187.81
Total	48,749.23
Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:	
Herbert Roback, staff administrator	8,209.08
Carey Brewer, senior defense specialist	6,263.58
Earl J. Morgan, chief investigator	6,263.58
John Paul Rigely, investigator	4,966.98
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,190.22
Douglas G. Dahlin, legal analyst	3,907.68
Richard Ravitch, legal analyst (July 1-Sept. 30, 1959)	1,803.12
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,719.28
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer	3,719.28
Expenses	637.11
Total	43,679.91
Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:	
Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator	7,162.74
James McInnes Henderson, counsel	6,676.38
John E. Moore, investigator	5,503.38
L. Russell Harding II, investigator	3,003.36
Irma Reel, clerk	3,300.06
Expenses	1,722.30
Total	27,368.22
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, counsel	6,345.36
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	6,304.50
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,351.48
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	2,965.68
Expenses	1,005.28
Total	19,972.30

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:	
John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel	$7,200.00
Maurice J. Mountain, consultant	611.67
Richard P. Bray, Jr., counsel	6,876.66
Miles Q. Romney, counsel	5,854.86
Walton Woods, investigator	6,181.86
Phyllis Seymour, clerk	3,719.28
Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer	3,146.23
Expenses	1,526.77
Total	35,117.33
Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff administrator	7,489.74
John W. McGarry, counsel	2,723.33
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer	3,342.48
Barbara McLaughlin, clerk-typist	1,803.00
Clara K. Armstrong, minority clerk-stenographer	3,356.58
Expenses	1,023.56
Total	19,738.69
Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	7,489.74
John J. Mitchell, chief counsel	7,367.10
Paul Southwick, professional staff member (July 1-Dec. 21, 1959)	5,756.26
Harry S. Weidberg, assistant counsel	5,170.36
Helen Beasley, stenographer	3,719.28
Catherine Hartke, stenographer	3,719.28
Expenses	768.23
Total	33,990.25
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	640,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	227,106.65
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1959	227,106.65
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	232,594.74
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	180,298.61

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1959.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$8,209.07
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,081.02
John F. Haley	do	5,020.91
Mary F. Stolle	do	3,342.48

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$20,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,080.68
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	12,088.17
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	17,168.85
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	2,831.15

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Tota gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Engineering consultant and professional staff director.	$7,530.60
T. Richard Witmer.	Counsel	7,244.52
John L. Taylor	Territorial and Indian consultant.	7,244.52
Karl S. Landstrom	Minerals and lands consultant.	7,066.71
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	6,263.61
Laura A. Moran	Assistant chief clerk	4,237.38
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	3,483.78
Marion J. Gummelt	do	3,236.50
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	3,196.46
Penelope P. Harvison.	do	3,196.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,928.08
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	[1] 36,924.79
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	40,852.87
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	19,147.13

[1] Includes $814.15 paid Paul M. Tyler, special consultant, and $3,444.45 paid Robert J. Hunter, special consultant.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 7, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$8,160.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	6,508.80
Marcella Fencl	Assistant clerk	3,954.78
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	5,773.14
Joanne Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,389.58
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,389.58
Mary Ryan	do	3,389.58
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,342.48
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,160.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	8,160.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	8,160.00
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant.	8,160.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 56 and H. Res 136, amended:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	3,295.38
Angus L. MacLean	Staff assistant	6,018.36
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	3,295.38

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Lishman	Chief counsel	$8,160.02
Beverly M. Coleman	Principal attorney	7,501.99
Julius Eanet	Attorney	6,664.13
Oliver Eastland	do	7,162.76
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	do	5,101.84
Mary Louise Ramsey	do	6,876.66
Hugh M. Hall, Jr.	Research specialist	4,851.38
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	7,501.99
Raymond W. Martin, Jr.	Special assistant	4,096.05
Lurlene Wilbert	Executive secretary	3,625.06
Dolores K. Dougherty	Stenographer-clerk	3,295.37
Jane Peigler	do	3,295.37
Blanche R. Plant	do	3,295.37
Herman Clay Beasley	Chief clerk	6,664.13
Inge H. Barton	Clerical assistant	2,918.57
Carolyn Terrell	Clerical assistant (from July 23, 1959).	2,594.29
Richard N. Goodwin	Special consultant (resigned Dec. 5, 1959).	4,005.51
James P. Kelly	Investigator (from Sept. 15, 1959).	3,501.19
Harold Ranstad	Investigator (from Sept. 17, 1959).	3,792.04
Edward M. Jones	Investigator (from Sept. 23, 1959).	3,251.11
Mary Casey	Clerical assistant (from Nov. 1, 1959).	983.84
Thelma Page	do	983.84
Jack Marshall Stark	Minority counsel	7,501.99
Dorothy B. Hass	Secretary to minority counsel (resigned Sept. 7, 1959).	1,235.77
Mary Belle Osborne	Secretary to minority counsel (from Sept. 8, 1959).	2,059.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$475,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	72,977.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	148,429.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1959	221,407.12
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	253,592.88

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 15, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$8,209.08
William R. Foley	General counsel	8,209.08
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	8,209.08
Walter R. Lee	do	8,209.08
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	6,100.14
William H. Crabtree	Associate counsel	6,263.58
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	3,530.88
Anne J. Berger	do	5,020.92
Frances F. Christy	do	4,814.21
James G. Cline	Assistant counsel	5,020.29
Mary Dematteis	Clerical staff (to Sept. 30).	2,541.93
Helen Goldsmith	Clerical staff	4,378.62
Velma Smedley	do	5,020.92

Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1959	$18,122.30
Appropriation, 1960 Legislative Appropriation Act	150,000.00
Total	168,122.30
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	63,127.27
Balance Dec. 31, 1959	104,995.03
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1959	92,287.58
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	0
Balance Dec. 31, 1959	92,287.58
C. Revisions of the laws 1959:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1959	101.73
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	98.34
Balance Dec. 31, 1959 (return to Treasury)	3.39
D. Revision of the laws 1960:	
Appropriation, 1960 Legislative Appropriation Act	18,150.00
Expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	8,262.98
Balance Dec. 31, 1959	9,887.02

SALARIES PAID JULY 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1959, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 27 AND H. RES. 92, 86TH CONG.

Employee	Position	Salary
Leonard Appel	Assistant counsel	$6,263.58
Gertrude C. Burak	Clerk-typist	4,190.22
Jane C. Caldwell	do	2,887.18
Roberta E. Eisenberg	Clerk-stenographer	3,530.88
Alexander E. Finger	Assistant counsel	5,814.92
Herbert Fuchs	do	6,263.58
Constance E. Glagola	Clerk-typist	653.41
Kenneth R. Harkins	Counsel	7,980.18
R. Frederick Jett	Assistant counsel	5,854.86
Michael Kelemonick	Clerk	3,154.08
Alba L. Kidd	Clerk-stenographer	333.40
Herbert N. Maletz	Counsel	7,980.18
Elizabeth G. Meekins	Clerk-stenographer	3,530.88
Howard A. Nanes	Clerk	89.53
Richard C. Peet	Associate counsel	5,527.92
Mary Pat Shea	Clerk-stenographer	2,494.68
Julian H. Siagman	Assistant counsel	6,263.58
Agnes Sue Sullivan	Clerk-stenographer	1,110.91
Jerrold Walden	Associate counsel	2,360.35
Stephen L. Williams	Messenger	1,931.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures for period July 1 through Dec. 31, 1959	78,215.78
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	121,784.22

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 25, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$8,160.00
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	7,653.24
Robert H. Cowen	do	7,653.24
William B. Winfield	Chief clerk	7,081.02
Frances Still	Assistant clerk	4,679.22
Ruth E. Brookshire	do	3,719.28
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	3,719.28
Edith W. Gordon	do	3,719.28
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	4,253.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,571.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	21,710.88
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	37,282.28
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	37,717.72

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JANUARY 8, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$8,209.08
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	7,857.60
Henry C. Cassell	Clerk (July 1-7, inclusive).	291.27
Bun Benton Bray, Jr.	Professional staff member.	7,101.48
Clarence R. Jauchem	do	7,101.48
John B. Price	Assistant clerk	4,190.22
Lillian L. Hopkins	do	4,096.08
Lucy K. Daley	do	3,907.68
Elsie E. Thornton	Secretary	3,106.98
Blanche M. Simons	do	3,106.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,353.81
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	29,687.16
Total amount expended from Jan. 29 to Dec. 31, 1959	42,040.97
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	32,959.03

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 14, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Margaret R. Belter	Staff director	$8,209.08
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	8,209.08
Robert F. McConnell	Counsel	8,160.00
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	8,209.08
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	6,536.06
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,190.22
Helen A. Thompson	do	5,318.27
Dorothy A. Beam	do	4,190.22
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	5,854.88
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	2,306.28
Investigating staff:		
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	2,212.08
Agnes M. GaNun	Clerk-stenographer	3,323.64
Marshall L. Gerber	Subcommittee clerk	3,805.85
Investigating staff—Continued		
Mary W. Porter	Clerk-stenographer	$3,719.28
Jerome N. Sonosky	Subcommittee clerk	4,793.97
Jack D. Warren	do	3,436.66
John A. O'Connor	do	4,567.02
Miriam S. Allison	do	2,283.51
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	4,369.01
Sherman S. Willse	Investigator	3,272.29
John P. Constandy	Associate counsel	3,653.75
George H. Martin	Administrative assistant (appointed Dec. 12, 1959).	295.00
Lena K. Heck	Clerk-stenographer	1,506.95
Perry B. House	Subcommittee clerk (Sept. 1-26, 1959).	659.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	22,779.80
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	56,368.15
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	79,147.95
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	45,852.05

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 6, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
T. M. Carruthers	Clerk, standing committee.	$6,263.58
Sarah G. Billingsley	Assistant clerk	3,907.68
Jane W. Snader	Minority clerk	4,567.02

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

JANUARY 7, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$8,209.08
Charles S. Sheldon II	Technical director	8,209.08
Spencer M. Beresford	Special counsel	8,209.08
Philip B. Yeager	Special consultant	8,209.08
Mary L. Myron	Secretary	2,862.04
Jane J. Zetty	do	3,380.16
Mary Ann Robert	do	2,986.06
Emily Dodson	do	3,403.68

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	$7,714.56
Richard P. Hines	do	6,664.14
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Counsel	7,394.40
C. Otis Finch	Assistant clerk	3,248.28
Eva F. Lopez	Secretary	2,986.06
Eunice A. Walker	do	2,986.06
Jean Cameron	Secretary (July 1 to Oct. 31, 1959).	2,353.92
Joseph A. Moran	Legal consultant (July 1-13, 1959).	481.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	39,381.02
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	43,370.41
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 1959	82,751.43
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	217,248.57

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 7, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	$6,754.08
Richard Arens	Staff director	8,209.08
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	5,282.70
Thelma S. Michalowski.	Secretary to investigators.	4,359.78
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer	3,625.08
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to counsel	4,359.78
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Counsel	8,209.08
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference service.	5,323.56
Lorraine N. Veley	Clerk-stenographer	3,436.68
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	6,590.58
Investigating committee:		
Beatrice B. Baldwin.	Clerk-typist	2,494.68
Patrice Mahon Baurkot.	Clerk-stenographer (resigned July 15, 1959).	207.89
Frank J. Bonora	Investigator (resigned Dec. 31, 1959).	4,661.22
Raymond T. Collins.	Investigator	4,661.22
William A. Cook	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 4, 1959).	719.53
Patricia R. Crovato.	Research clerk	2,099.04
Jonna Lynne Cullen.	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 31, 1959).	674.56
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	3,460.20
Barbara Harriet Edelschein.	Editor	2,965.68
Elizabeth L. Edinger.	do	3,436.68
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,306.28
Paul C. Gerhart	Investigator (resigned Nov. 30, 1959).	3,727.35
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	4,284.42
Robert Henry Goldsborough.	Investigator (appointed Oct. 15, 1959).	1,272.06
Kathleen Hagenbuch.	Clerk-stenographer (appointed July 1, 1959).	3,154.08
Investigating committee—Con.		
Lillian E. Howard	Research analyst	$4,048.98
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	6,672.30
Lois Marion Kahl	Clerk-stenographer	2,254.44
Maura Patricia Kelly.	Research analyst	2,758.44
Olive M. King	Editor	4,143.18
Stephen Vincent Kopunek.	Clerk-typist	2,584.14
Morris J. Lent	Clerk-typist (resigned Aug. 15, 1959).	461.46
Fulton Lewis III	Research analyst (appointed Nov. 1, 1959).	968.14
Gwendolyn L. Lewis.	Administrative assistant.	5,282.70
Judith Livingstone	Clerk-typist (resigned Sept. 11, 1959).	798.23
William Margetich	Investigator	3,213.74
Francis J. McNamara.	Research consultant	6,100.14
Vincent J. Messina	Research clerk (resigned Sept. 22, 1959).	1,007.73
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst	2,513.52
Maureen Phillips Ontrich.	do	2,814.96
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,306.28
Katherine Phillips	Switchboard operator.	2,376.90
Josephine S. Randolph.	Research clerk	2,683.08
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	5,446.20
Hilda C. Schoenek	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Sept. 8, 1959).	1,164.29
Doris P Shaw	Information analyst	2,513.52
Lela Mae Stiles	do	2,814.96
Joseph T. Timony	Clerk-typist	2,023.68
Eleanor Ann Tehan	Clerk-stenographer	2,758.44
Geraldine M. Unangst	Clerk-stenographer (appointed July 6, 1959).	1,967.47
Vera L. Watts	Clerk-stenographer	3,191.76
Billie Wheeler	do	1,845.84
George C. Williams	Investigator (resigned Nov. 21, 1959).	4,810.45
Regina McCall Wilt.	Clerk-typist	1,888.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$327,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	147,334.18
Amount expended from July 1, 1959, to Jan. 1, 1960	152,820.49
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Jan. 1, 1960	300,154.67
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1960	26,845.33

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 13, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$8,192.72
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	8,192.72
Harold A. L. Lawrence.	Professional aide to minority (P).	8,192.72
Standing committee staff—Continued		
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aide (P).	$7,162.74
George W. Fisher	Clerk	8,192.72
Ida Rowan	Administrative aide (minority).	7,489.74
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	5,854.86
Helen A. Biondi	do	4,800.60
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	4,001.82
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	3,860.58
Investigative staff:		
Mark L. Davis	Clerk-messenger	674.56
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	5,854.86
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	2,904.42
Frank N. Ikard, Jr.	Supply clerk	327.86
Jean Johnson	Clerk-stenographer	2,904.42
William T. McDonald, Jr.	Clerk-typist	823.39
Paul H. Smiley	Investigator	3,480.30
Richard G. O'Brien	Clerk-messenger	337.28
David Potter	do	337.28
John B. Smith	Investigator	2,510.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$110,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	26,446.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	32,246.42
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	58,692.94
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	51,307.06

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 7, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Full committee:	
Irwin, Leo H., chief counsel (C)	$8,209.08
Martin, Thomas A., minority counsel (P)	8,209.08
Martin, John M., Jr., assistant chief counsel (P)	8,061.96
Brannon, Gerard M., professional assistant (P)	8,061.96
Dring, James F., professional assistant (P) (to Aug. 2, 1959)	1,277.00
Conkling, Raymond F., professional assistant (P) (from Nov. 1, 1959)	2,278.60
Brannock, Virginia, staff assistant (C)	3,978.30
Butler, Virginia, staff assistant (C)	4,077.18
Burd, Sybil D., staff assistant (C)	3,978.30
Donovan, Frances E., staff assistant (C)	3,978.30
Kagan, Grace, staff assistant (C)	4,077.18
Kendall, June, staff assistant (C)	4,413.18
Pestell, Margaretta, staff assistant (C)	3,139.92
Russell, Frances, staff assistant (C)	5,142.30
Taylor, Susan, staff assistant (C)	4,930.98
Wade, Irene, staff assistant (C)	4,077.18
Greene, Hughlon, clerk-messenger	2,692.50
Little, Walter B., clerk-messenger	2,692.50
Expenses	37,173.89
Subcommittee on Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy, Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman:	
Akins, Mildred, staff assistant (C)	3,493.20
Rashish, Myer, economist	7,162.74
Expenses	599.53
Total	11,255.47
Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman:	
Ruth, Elizabeth, staff assistant (C)	3,860.58
Sonnett, Eileen, staff assistant (C)	3,059.88
Wells, William E., staff assistant (C) (from Sept. 21, 1959)	1,396.36
Expenses	29.40
Total	8,346.22

Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws, Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, chairman:	
Arner, Fred B., attorney (P) (to Oct. 31, 1959)	$4,284.72
MacMillin, Jacqueline, staff assistant (C) (from Aug. 15, 1959)	2,311.91
Expenses	3,704.80
Total	10,301.43
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,871.63
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	67,077.01
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	77,948.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	222,051.36

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JANUARY 15, 1960.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, to December 31, 1959, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	$8,143.68
Everette MacIntyre	General counsel	8,143.68
Wm. Summers Johnson.	Chief economist	7,489.74
Victor P. Dalmas	Adviser to minority members.	7,489.74
Irving Maness	Assistant counsel	7,489.74
Justinus Gould	do	6,713.16
Richard L. Mitchell	do	5,933.90
J. Brooks A. Robertson.	Analyst	5,002.93
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,110.18
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	4,110.18
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst	3,766.38
Margaret Fallon Palmer.	do	3,625.08
Ann Gibson	do	3,138.65
Emma Jane Hicks	do	3,138.65
Florence D. Brown	Secretary for minority.	3,352.94
Dorothy F. Councill	Stenographer	3,267.12
Barbara W. McConnell.	do	3,059.88
Anna A. Holovach	do	2,951.52
Frances F. Crane	do	2,800.80
Ruth I. Matthews	do	2,629.64
Jean W. Fender	do	2,486.78
Rose Marie Sanders	do	2,099.72
Lois E. Allison	Economist	1,840.13
Judith Lazarus	Research assistant	741.42
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	651.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$260,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	101,550.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1959	121,969.91
Total amount expended from Jan. 4 to Dec. 31, 1959	223,520.46
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1959	36,479.54

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1728. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, relative to submitting an amended report to a report transmitted in a letter dated January 12, 1960, relating to Lease No. GS-07B-3989, pertaining to Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Okla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of selected activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the upper Colorado River Basin for the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 25th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1731. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 9914. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be the Comptroller of the Currency or a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or members of their staff; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9915. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 9916. A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9917. A bill to give effect to the convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Havana, August 15, 1958; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9918. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9919. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9920. A bill to amend section 309 (a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9921. A bill to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9922. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif., to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9923. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9924. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 9925. A bill to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend section 322 of the Public Health Service Act to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9927. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9928. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9929. A bill to adjust Indian and non-Indian land use areas in the vicinity of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 9930. A bill to further modify the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9931. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the placement of recording devices in certain aircraft as an aid to air accident investigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9932. A bill to authorize the use of air carriers to facilitate the expeditious transportation of mail to and from Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 9933. A bill to authorize an extension of time for final proof under the desert land laws under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9934. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9935. A bill to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Torres-Martinez Reservation, in Riverside County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 9936. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 9937. A bill authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at La Belle Point at the confluence of the Arkansas and Poteau Rivers, Fort Smith, Ark.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9938. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in

Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 9939. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of earnings individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9940. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal office building in Cleveland, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 9941. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of "disability"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 9942. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and personal property to the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9943. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9944. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9945. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 9946. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a proper relationship between wheat, corn, grain sorghum, and other feeds on a proper feed-unit basis, to bring supply and demand into balance, and to assist American agriculture in essential adjustment during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962, and to provide for a permanent farm program thereafter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 9947. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a proper relationship between wheat, corn, grain, sorghum, and other feeds on a proper feed-unit basis, to bring supply and demand into balance, and to assist American agriculture in essential adjustment during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962, and to provide for a permanent farm program thereafter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 9948. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9949. A bill to permit the use, for civil defense purposes, of certain property in Kanawha County, W. Va., heretofore conveyed by the United States to the West Virginia Board of Health for public health purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 9950. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9951. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.R. 9952. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9953. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 9954. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 9955. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate the period beginning on February 7, 1960, and ending on February 14, 1960, as Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 586. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction of the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial in the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Con. Res. 504. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 505. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. representatives to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to support the pending resolutions condemning recent manifestations of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 506. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent acts of desecration and anti-Semitism abroad, and requesting the President to take action with respect thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Con. Res. 507. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Con. Res. 508. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 510. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 511. Concurrent resolution to recognize Burnside, Ky., as the home of the first American Boy Scout troop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 514. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 516. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the foregoing tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. Con. Res. 517. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 518. Concurrent resolution expressing it to be the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the

United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 522. Concurrent resolution expressing the intent that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. Con. Res. 523. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 524. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Con. Res. 525. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9956. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Holzer Carr (also known as Irmgard Treder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 9957. A bill for the relief of Mary Cooke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 9958. A bill for the relief of Brooklyn Steel Warehouse Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9959. A bill for the relief of Chang Ho Nien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 9960. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9961. A bill for the relief of Sarolta Mendel Takacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9962. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giamei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 9963. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 9964. A bill for the relief of Gianfrancesco Cipriani D'Altorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9965. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9966. A bill to authorize the award posthumously of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9967. A bill to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais approximately 0.36 acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9968. A bill for the relief of Alda Palmerini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LIFO (H.R. 6014)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months a great deal of interest has been shown in my bill, H.R. 6014, which would ameliorate the impact of inventory depletion caused by shortages resulting from labor disputes in the case of taxpayers using the LIFO—last-in, first-out—method of inventory accounting.

For the benefit of my colleagues I want to give you an explanation of this bill, showing what it purports to accomplish.

My sponsorship of this legislation early last spring was based on my concern over the possible impact that a prolonged steel strike might have on fabricators of steel who utilize the LIFO inventory method. The purpose of my legislation is to permit such individuals to avoid the tax impact that would otherwise occur where the taxpayer has had to liquidate his LIFO inventories because of inability to obtain additional inventory caused by a labor dispute or threat or imminence thereof.

LIFO is a method of identifying inventory items in the taxpayer's closing inventory for the purpose of determining the cost of goods sold. Under the LIFO method, the last inventory additions are the first items included in the cost of goods sold. In a period of rising prices, the cost of goods sold tends to be higher and taxable income lower under LIFO than would be the case if the FIFO—first-in, first-out—method were used. If, however, a LIFO taxpayer is unable to replace inventory, then to the extent of the liquidation his base stock is depleted and his cost of goods sold will reflect an amount less than the cost of replacement. The effect will be to increase his taxable income over the amount that would properly reflect replacement cost.

H.R. 6014 would alleviate the consequence of the inventory liquidation of base stock because of shortages that are induced by labor disputes affecting suppliers of inventory to the taxpayer.

The bill would provide an election to the taxpayer to treat as if he had in the year of liquidation replaced the inventory, which he does, in fact, replace within the 2 succeeding years. The taxpayer would be able to treat the costs of inventory replacement incurred in the subsequent 2 years as if they had been incurred in the year of liquidation. This has the effect of decreasing taxable income for the year of liquidation in the same manner as would have occurred if the reduction in inventory had not occurred.

If a partial or a complete replacement is accomplished within the 2-year period, the taxable income of the taxpayer for the year of inventory liquidation shall be decreased by an amount equal to the excess of the aggregate replacement cost over the aggregate cost of the opening inventory of the year of liquidation. An increase in tax liability would occur if the opening inventory cost exceeded the aggregate replacement cost. Provision is made that interest shall not apply to deficiencies and overpayments resulting from the operation of this bill.

As introduced, this legislation would be effective with respect to inventory liquidations occurring in taxable years ending after December 31, 1958.

Election Campaign Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon the Senate passed a commendable piece of legislation which if agreed to by the House will vastly improve the outmoded and inadequate laws which now control election campaign spending and reporting.

The underlying principles of this legislation are no different than those upon which previous laws regulating Federal elections are based, that is, that there should be certain limitations on the amount of money spent or contributed in election campaigns and, secondly, that such expenditures and all contributions should be reported. The proposed bill is simply an extension of the bases of existing law, enacted in 1925, and is formulated in language realistic to the changes which time has wrought in our economic life. It is generally recognized that the existing law displays serious shortcomings. Some have developed with the pasage of time and are due to changes in the cost of services and the rise of prices. Present allowable campaign spending by candidates for

congressional offices as well as current limitations on contributions and expenditures of political committees is understandable in terms of price levels as they existed 35 years ago. Since then economic conditions of the country have changed to such a degree that the limitations in existing law can no longer be considered realistic.

In another regard, one which this bill seeks to cure, the reporting requirements under existing law are at the same time too onerous and not sufficiently specific. Existing law, despite its professed philosophy that corrupt election practices can be cured or prevented by full disclosure of campaign financing, fails to provide for a wide dissemination of reports dealing with campaign contributions and expenditures. Only through the media of the press can the public be informed as to the sources and volume of campaign financing.

Without going laboriously into the technicalities of the proposed legislation, I would merely point out that if enacted there would for the first time be a limit on the amount an individual may contribute for political purposes; it would raise the campaign ceilings in both Houses of Congress and increase the amount which our national political committees may expend to direct presidential campaigns. It contains a provision that campaign financial statements be filed not only with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House but also with the clerk of the Federal district court thereby disseminating such information on a local level. In short, this legislation, which I earnestly hope will meet with equal success in the House, will vastly improve the election machinery to provide fuller participation and greater publicity and inhibit other excesses in the legislative process.

The New President of NAREB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. C. Armel Nutter is being installed as the president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards to serve during the year 1960.

I am proud that Mr. Nutter is a resident of the State of New Jersey and an outstanding member of the Camden County and the New Jersey State board of realtors. I have personally known Mr. Nutter for the past 20 years and can understand why he was selected to lead approximately 66,000 realtors of the United States of America. He has been a leader in his field in New Jersey and throughout the country for the past quarter of a century. A glance at his background indicates the firm foundation upon which his ultimate success was established.

He was born in Milford, Del., November 13, 1900. He graduated from the University of Delaware in 1923 and attended Temple University Law School and South Jersey Law School where he specialized in real estate law. He was president of the Camden Real Estate Board in 1936; president of the New Jersey Association of Realtors in 1941; regional vice president of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America in 1947; president of the Philadelphia Mortgage Bankers Association in 1949, and international president of the Society of Residential Appraisers in 1959. During the past 25 years he also served on every important committee of the Camden County Board of Realtors, New Jersey Association of Real Estate Boards, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Philadelphia Mortgage Bankers Association and Society of Residential Appraisers. He has served in almost every elected capacity on these various real estate boards. In addition to these activities he found time in 1953 to act as chairman of the annual drive for the benefit of Cooper Hospital in Camden, N.J., and to serve as president of the board of trustees of the Moorestown Methodist Church in 1956.

Mr. Nutter is a 32d degree Mason, being a member of the Excelsior Consistory of Collingswood, N.J. He is likewise a member of the Crescent Temple of Trenton, N.J., and the Union League of Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Nutter is married and resides with his family in Moorestown, N.J.

His achievement in being elected president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards is evidence of his ability, industry and enthusiasm. It is also a reflection of the esteem in which he is held by his fellow realtors throughout the country and demonstrates the personality, reputation and character of the man. He has brought honor, not only to himself and his family, but to his native State. The National Association of Real Estate Boards is to be commended for their selection of such an outstanding president.

On behalf of all the residents of the first district of New Jersey, I wish him continued success in his new office.

What Is the Truth About Lindbergh?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic heroes in American life is Charles A. Lindbergh. His contribution to aviation science and his example of personal courage will always be remembered and honored. But like many another who departed from his narrow field of competence, Colonel Lindbergh committed great blunders or worse when he ventured into the field of politics and international diplomacy.

Beginning with his acceptance of the German Air Medal from the Nazi General Goering, continuing thereafter in his propaganda work for the America First Committee, and culminating in his 1941 nationwide radio broadcast in which he threatened that American Jews would suffer if they continued to work against the Nazi danger, Colonel Lindbergh's career was a pathetically unheroic one. We do not have to believe what the German Ambassador to this country said about Lindbergh's contributions to German propaganda efforts here to conclude sadly that Lindbergh was woefully out of step with his countrymen and with the best interests of America during this period. The facts are on the public record.

But the other day—from a most roundabout source in the ultraconservative magazine, National Review—an opposite viewpoint appeared, attributed to the former American military attaché in our Berlin Embassy, Col. Truman Smith, now retired. According to Smith, Colonel Lindbergh did not want the Nazi medal and was surprised when General Goering suddenly produced it at a private dinner given by the American Ambassador. Again, according to Smith, Lindbergh had come to Germany at the request of Army Intelligence to see if he could discover vital information about the growing German Air Force and to help persuade Goering to accept a plan to permit Jewish emigration from Germany.

Lindbergh himself is silent. Is this an attempt to rewrite history, to change the record as it was known to American public figures and historians for almost a generation? Or, is it a newly unearthed fact? If it is a fact, I will be among the first to give it due weight and publicity even though it cannot, of course, change the record of Colonel Lindbergh's propaganda activities for the America First Committee. If it is a fact, we should all be delighted to credit Colonel Lindbergh with this civic and humanitarian act.

I hope, therefore, that the State Department and the Army will give us now an authoritative and balanced statement on this new development since I am advised that authentic documents are in their possession.

Forty-second Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last week was the 42d commemoration of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence. This occasion has not gone unnoticed. Wherever free men gather they have marked this anniversary in their minds and hearts for that time when there

will be a complete resurgence of freedom in those areas of the world where the spirit and the acts of men are fettered by authoritarian or totalitarian governments.

In the United States we must renew our efforts at home and abroad to encourage dignity and freedom among men no matter where they may be.

Increased Tobacco Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that under current market conditions of burley tobacco and under the supply situation for this crop, as we know it to prevail right now, there could well be an increase in the tobacco allotments all over the country where burley tobacco is produced.

But in order for this good achievement to mean the most for those worst off, I have proposed that two-thirds of this suggested increase be given to the smaller or semirural industrial areas where burley tobacco is now produced and where there is 10 percent or more of the labor forces unemployed. In other words, my bill would give every grower some increase and would give every depression area grower still more increase. Everyone wants to help economically depressed areas but no one seems willing to do anything to help them. My bill, H.R. 9745, would help tobacco growers and would alleviate conditions in depressed areas, all in one legislative effort. It might aid the general economy in most of the following small industrial areas of our Nation now suffering from unemployment.

Maryland, two minor areas.
North Carolina, two minor areas.
Virginia, one minor area.
West Virginia, eight minor areas.
Kentucky, seven minor areas.
Tennessee, one minor area.

On January 20, 1960, I sent Secretary of Agriculture Benson a copy of my bill and asked him to consider it and approve it, if possible. My letter to him is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1960.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: Enclosed is a copy of my own burley tobacco allotment bill for 1960, same being H.R. 9745, introduced by me on January 19, 1960, which I would like very much for you, your Tobacco Division, and your Department to consider. And I would fervently hope that this bill, or one similar thereto, might have the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

My bill would grant a 15-percent increase in burley tobacco allotments, but in practical effect the increase would only amount to about 5 percent because most of the increase would go to the least of tobacco producing areas, those located in some of the economically depressed, labor surplus counties of minor industrial importance in our Nation. I myself represent one of these areas, the Eighth Congressional District of Kentucky, where we have much unemployment and labor surplus with just a few small tobacco bases in most of our counties.

My bill would be a double-barreled benediction because it would recognize the current disappearance of burley tobacco supplies and the high market prices of tobacco by—

1. Giving some increase, not less than 5 percent, to all burley growers everywhere so that they all might share somewhat in the fortunate circumstances of this crop's present status; and by

2. Giving special recognition and consideration to tobacco's poor relations in depressed areas of our country, where the maximum economic needs of our American citizenship prevail right now.

Our President and his administration have heretofore been recorded in favor of depressed areas legislation. My bill would accomplish something in that very area of legislative effort and this would help the entire economy in certain counties of Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and possibly other States where burley tobacco is produced in a small way.

According to statistics at hand, applying to the period of November 1959 the following burley tobacco growing States had 10 percent or more of available labor forces unemployed in minor or small industrial areas, viz:

Maryland, two minor areas.
North Carolina, two minor areas.
Virginia, one minor area.
West Virginia, eight minor areas.
Kentucky, seven minor areas.
Tennessee, one minor area.

Undoubtedly some of those small industrial areas of economic depression in West Virginia and possibly in other States would have no burley tobacco production whatever at the present time. The intent of my bill would not be to add any territory whatever to presently existing burley tobacco places of production but would be to help all presently existing territories some and the economically depressed territories still more. "Blessed is he that considered the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble." Psalms 41.

With all good wishes and thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Yours truly,

EUGENE SILER,
Member of Congress, Eighth District of Kentucky.

It would certainly be pleasing to me if other House Members from economically depressed, burley tobacco areas would introduce bills similar to mine and then lend a hand toward getting some legislation of this type enacted.

A Bill To Authorize the Award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing my bill, H.R. 5089 of the 85th, to award the Congressional Medal of Honor to the four chaplains who gave their lives in the sinking of the *Dorchester*.

These brave men of God—Chaplain George Fox, Chaplain Alexander Goode, Chaplain Clark Poling, Chaplain John Washington—displayed faith and courage of a kind which will always remain a challenge and an inspiration to every American.

Their sacrifice was not only one far above and beyond the call of duty; it was a lesson in the essential brotherhood of Americans and the unity of our separate faiths.

The award of the Congressional Medal of Honor can add nothing to the nobility of their act, or to the greatness of their sublime sacrifice.

But surely this is the least which Congress can do in recognition of this example of selfless devotion to God and country.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, no action was taken on this bill in the 85th Congress. I ask the House to act on this bill now as a fitting and proper tribute to the heroes of the *Dorchester*.

Baring Reveals 1958 Highway Spending Binge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of my speech that was recently broadcast in the Reno, Nev., area relating to the 1958 highway spending binge. The speech follows:

BARING REVEALS 1958 HIGHWAY SPENDING BINGE

Friends and citizens of Reno, I have been invited to address you on a subject of vital interest to not only you who are concerned with the routing of the Interstate Highway through or around your city, but to all of the people of this country who have been taxed to support the most gigantic program ever undertaken by our State and Federal Governments or, for that matter, by the governments of any country in the world.

I refer, of course, to the construction of the Interstate Highway System under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, implemented by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. The integrity of our Federal Government has already been impaired by reckless highway spending. Back in 1954 it was estimated the Interstate System basically would cost $23 billion. This estimate was revised to $27.6 billion in 1955. Now the program has been revised and the estimate raised to $39.9 billion to complete 40,000 miles in the System.

Several months ago a special committee of the House of Representatives was formed and authorized to investigate the Nation's highway program. The committee hired Walter May, former FBI agent, as its top counsel. It also hired Carmine Bellino, John Konstanty and Sherman Willse. You may recall these names. They were the investigators who produced sensational evidence before the Senate Rackets Committee. The committee was appointed by House Public Works Chairman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, Dem-

ocrat, of New York, in the wake of bitter House dissension over passage of the one-cent-a-gallon increase in the gasoline tax. I might say here that the President has announced he will demand an additional one-cent-a-gallon hike in gasoline tax at this session of Congress.

During 1958, in the name of recession, Federal spenders abandoned the highway pay-as-we-go policy and gorged themselves on authorizations and allocations, knowing full well they were exceeding the ability of the trust fund to meet the bills. In a plea to the Secretary of Commerce, under a provision of the Highway Act which requires that the Secretary make a new estimate of the Federal highway program situation in all its aspects and report its findings and recommendations to the Congress immediately after it convened in January of 1961, Senator BYRD described our present situation as the morning after the 1959 binge. He said that: "No one involved with the suspension of the highway pay-as-we-go policy or the exploitation of the suspension can escape blame for what was done * * *. Our great highway programs were never before precipitated into such an inexcusable mess. The trust fund was broke and the integrity of the Federal Government was impaired. State highway programs all over the country were seriously disrupted and threatened with chaos." Senator BYRD is Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and he wrote Secretary Mueller in his official capacity.

Those, ladies and gentlemen, were his exact words, but he said more. He said: "It would be unfortunate if some States, seeking more Federal dollars for less State money, yielded to the temptation to divert their funds from 50–50 ABC roads to 90–10 interstate projects. Do you remember when the Bureau of Public Roads rejected the plan submitted by Huston Mills, as then head of the State highway department, because it could not support the department's request for 90–10 Federal assistance to build railway underpasses? Do you remember Mr. Mill's public statement that followed? It was to the effect that there was more than one way to skin a cat and that these underpasses would be built with funds diverted from the primary and secondary road systems. Let me again read the Senator's quotation, "It would be unfortunate if some States, seeking more Federal dollars for less State money, yielded to the temptation to divert their funds from 50–50 ABC roads to 90–10 interstate projects."

The Senator reminded Secretary Mueller that rights-of-way acquisition costs are proving to be a tremendous item, running to billions of dollars, in the Interstate program. The temptation to grab land, hike prices, and profiteer is inherent in such a multibillion-dollar, multiyear, 90–10 program. And there is the possibility of collusion and fraud, he said.

There is a growing feeling of concern throughout the Nation because of the reckless spending of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. Members of Congress share this concern and as a Member of Congress I, too, am very much concerned. No one person is responsible for the curtailment of highway construction in Nevada. No one person is responsible for the curtailment of highway construction in every State in the United States. The slowdown came possibly as the result of trying to anticipate requirements too far in advance and the building of whole systems too fast on borrowed money. The barrel was empty, and in order to meet the crisis Congress had to enact legislation to temporarily divert funds from our general revenue to the highway trust fund and to temporarily increase our gasoline tax.

The program will continue and Nevada will receive its fair share of Federal money to complete its segment of the Interstate System. There has never been a time that highway construction could not have moved forward in Nevada, linking urban areas over undisputed sections. There is no legitimate reason why a disputed section of highway through the Reno area, less than 20 miles in length, should hold up construction of the entire highway system across Nevada. I think it is quite significant that this section involved the acquisition of some $30 million worth of property, boosting the entire cost of the section to close to $50 million.

In its column "Heard Around City Hall," the New York World-Telegram and Sun said: "Robert Moses' $2 billion block-busting highway program for New York City may become the prime target of a Federal investigation now being made into the Nation's huge Interstate highway program. President Eisenhower himself said this week he was concerned over growing complaints that the nationwide program was shot through with waste and that too much money was being spent for highways within cities rather than for linking those cities."

Have I been wrong in charging reckless Federal spending? Let me read you from Secretary Mueller's reply to Senator BYRD. He says: "The events of the past year have taught many of us a great deal about highway problems, and have shown us the need for more thoughtful consideration of the fundamental background of highway policy. * * * During the past year, as you have observed, our main problem was to get out from under the chaos resulting from the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1958, an act which suspended provision for 'pay-as-you-go' financing and which raised authorizations for highway aid far beyond the revenue capacity of the highway trust fund." He went on to say: "We cannot afford to allow another such highway crisis. To avoid another such affair we must bend every effort to improve the direction of highway policy and to revamp the entire system of financial management.

As you know, I have been critical of the Bureau of Public Roads in their highhanded methods. I charged the Bureau with influence peddling in connection with the Verdi Route J selection. This charge was definitely supported by the Blatnik investigating committee. Now listen to what the Secretary had to say on the subject: "It cannot as in former years, be considered exclusively the affair of one committee in each House, or of one bureau in the executive branch. Highways and Federal highway expenditures touch the fiscal policy of the Nation in a major way, they touch the basic formulation of budgets and appropriations, and they affect our national transportation policy as well as our whole manner of national living. * * * In the administration, highway policy has claimed an increasing share of the attention of the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, the White House staff, and the President himself."

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, the job was too big for the Bureau of Public Roads and it bogged down under its own weight. I am proud that I have been able to represent the expressed interests of some 85 percent of the people of Reno in their opposition to the Third Street routing. You, who stood firm in your opposition to such flagrant and unwarranted expenditure of millions of dollars for elaborate geometric highway design over your city, are to be congratulated. You and other people all over the United States are primarily responsible for bringing these matters to the attention of the Congress and even to the President. It is because of your efforts that the Secretary of Commerce now admits that highway policy cannot be formulated by a single bureau, but rather it is the concern of the entire Department as well as the Bureau of the Budget, Treasury Department, and the White House.

The Department of Justice has informed me that highway violations have to its knowledge occurred in Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, and Texas. Criminal prosecutions are pending in these States which involve allegations of fraud and conspiracy. Senator BYRD pointed out to the Secretary of Commerce that: "Witnesses took the fifth amendment more than 200 times in Senate hearings on landgrabbing on only a few projects in one State."

I fervently hope that the special committee of the Committee on Public Works will make a complete and thorough investigation of the entire highway program which will result in the fulfillment of a sensible Interstate Highway System moving traffic between urban areas as intended.

I hope there will be an investigation of the Bureau of Public Roads from stem to stern, and that controls will be placed on that Bureau to limit any recurrence of the 1958 fiasco.

I am hopeful that the Bureau's 1958 approvals of elaborate geometric interchange designs and expensive superstructure planning will be reviewed and that within the overall efficiency program Third Street selection of the Interstate System in the Reno area will be killed forevermore.

Don't Sell America Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, an interesting news dispatch from Moscow, Russia, appeared on the front page of the New York Times recently.

This Russian dispatch said that the Soviet Government had given an unnamed U.S. automobile dealer a franchise for the distribution during the next 2 years of 10,000 Russian-manufactured Moskvich automobiles. The Moskvich is a four-cylinder, four-passenger car that sells in Russia for 25,000 rubles—$6,250. If anything like that price is asked for the Moskvich in the United States, it probably will obtain few buyers here.

The Times Moscow dispatch went on to say that the Moskvich factory is now producing 70,000 cars a year and that this production represents more than half of all the passenger automobiles produced in Russia. In short, Russia's present production of passenger automobiles, according to the Times dispatch, is less than 140,000 cars a year. American automobile factories, with an annual production of more than 6 million cars, are producing as many passenger automobiles in 48 hours as Russia produced in an entire year.

Many engineers are required to design and constantly improve American automobiles and to invent the many parts that go into them. It requires many more engineers to invent, design, and produce the great variety of machine tools necessary to manufacture the 6 million American cars a year and the parts that go into them. Great numbers of other engineers and chemists also are needed to design and build the highways

on which these automobiles operate and the highgrade fuels that assure their efficient operation. Multitudes of mechanics are needed to keep the Nation's present 60 million automobiles in repair and in operation.

The automotive industry and its allied industries are not the only ones in which the United States is ahead of the Russians in the production of peacetime goods. We outproduce them manyfold in radios, television sets, telephones, in electrical goods of all kinds and in housing and the manufacture and use of modern farm tools and machines of all kinds. All of these industries require engineers, inventors, and scientists to maintain them at peak production and to ever expand the production of peacetime consumer goods for the American people.

Comparatively, Russia employs few engineers, inventors, scientists, and chemists in these peacetime fields. She employs most of her engineers, scientists, and technicians in war efforts. In this field Russia from time to time makes some spectacular achievements.

These few spectacular achievements, however, do not justify claims of political orators and writers that are heard and read from time to time that Russia has more and better engineers, more and better scientists, and a better educational system than the United States.

The vast numbers of American scientists, engineers, and inventors engaged in producing civilian goods are not lost to the American defense effort. In World War II and again in the Korean war it was demonstrated that plants and the skilled manpower of engineers, chemists, and inventors engaged in peacetime production could be quickly and effectively diverted and transferred to defense efforts when and wherever necessary. In World War I the United States in the making of defense weapons not only equipped its own millions of fighting men but also supplied a large part of the weapons, planes, tanks, and other fighting equipment used by our allies.

A few spectacular achievements by the Russians is no reason for anyone to sell America short.

Michigan Day, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today is Michigan Day. She was admitted to the Union 123 years ago today. On January 26, 1837, Michigan became the 26th State. It is fitting indeed that we should pause and take note of this anniversary. For since that date in 1837 the State of Michigan has risen to become one of the truly great States in this Nation.

Michigan takes her name from two Indian words "Michi-gama" meaning great water or large lake. This is quite apt since Michigan—bordered as she is by four of the five Great Lakes—has the greatest supply of fresh water of any of the 50 States. There are over 11,000 inland lakes and more than 36,000 miles of streams in Michigan.

Michigan is the largest State east of the Mississippi. In 1834 when the legislature petitioned Congress for permission to form a State, the Michigan Territory included the present States of Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and part of Dakota. Michigan's Upper Peninsula alone is presently equal in size to Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts combined.

Michigan has grown tremendously in population also. At the time of her entry as a State the population was just over 87,000. In 1870 the population passed the million mark. Increasing steadily it reached the 2 million mark in 1890, 3 million in 1920, and over 5 million in 1940. The Federal census of 1950 placed the population at 6,372,009, the seventh largest of all the States.

Industry, agriculture and the tourist trade are the three pillars upon which rests the economy of Michigan. During World War II, the magnificent performance of Michigan's automotive industry earned for our State the title of "Arsenal of Democracy." Michigan continues today to be one of the foremost producers of military vehicular equipment and also is in the forefront of the vast new developments and rapid expansion in the manufacture of ballistic missiles.

The automotive industry, however, is only one among many in which Michigan is a leader. On the basis of value added by manufacture, Michigan also ranks first in boatbuilding, output of internal combustion engines, mobile homes, steel springs, hardware, industrial patterns, special dies and tools, and conveyors. Michigan is also known far and wide as an outstanding producer of furniture, breakfast foods, drugs and chemicals, sporting and athletic goods, steel, salt, and paper products.

Diversification of industry has proceeded at such a pace that of 453 industries classified by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Michigan has 369 or 81 percent of the total.

Michigan is well endowed with natural resources. She is noted for her limestone. Michigan is first in production of salt, gypsum and marl. The Lower Peninsula has extensive quantities of sand and gravel. Michigan's splendid highways are built of her own native materials.

The mention of highways brings to mind Michigan's wonderful record with respect to traffic safety. Michigan is high up among the States with the highest traffic volume, yet she has the second lowest number of traffic fatilities per 100 million miles traveled. In addition to industry, Michigan is a top-notch agricultural State. Michigan's agriculture brings in more than $730 million each year. Michigan's Lower Peninsula raises 97 percent of the Nation's crop of navy beans. Beans may be baked in Boston, but they are raised in Michigan. One of the finest fruit belts in the Nation is located in the western part of the State, along Lake Michigan. The State's commercial crop of apples, nearly 12 million bushels of them, last year put Michigan in third place in apple growing. Peaches, pears, and cultivated blueberries from Michigan are relished throughout the country. Michigan is first in production of tomatoes and cucumbers. Many other vegetables—onions, snap beans, carrots, and celery—are grown in Michigan. In all, 44 different fruit and vegetable crops are raised commercially in Michigan.

It is obvious that the great State of Michigan is well deserving of an eminent place among her sister States. With such an abundance of resources and diversity of commercial activity we are proud to say that Michigan's economy is gaining year after year. Michigan approaches the seventh decade of this century with confidence and optimism. It is with considerable pride that I call the attention of this body to this—Michigan Day, 1960.

Address by Hon. John H. Dent Before Jeannette Rotary Club, November 30, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one of our colleagues gets a special note of appreciation from his constituency and especially from his own hometown.

Recently, our colleague, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, of the 21st District of Pennsylvania, addressed his local Rotary Club, November 30, 1959.

The following excerpts from the Rotary Spokesman is a credit to our colleague and it is with personal pride and pleasure that I submit with the excerpt a copy of his address before this group of local business and civic leaders:

[From the Rotary Spokesman, Jeannette, Pa., Dec. 7, 1959]

All members in attendance last Monday agreed that we can be inordinately proud of our own JOHNNY DENT, who has not only been our own to the town but has been our own in Rotary until the meeting days and makeups got too much for him. Congressman JOHN H. DENT gave not only a masterful address (copies, too, in mimeographed form) to the club last Monday but showed a grasp of this international monetary system that is short of miraculous. With his many activities, miles of traveling, office routine, days in Congress, and multitudinous duties in connection with his office, it is a wonder that he maintains any kind of mental equilibrium and emotional stability. But he does it. And in so doing is the same affable, energetic, JOHNNY that makes Westmoreland proud to have him in Washington. Our thanks to Al Condo for tying him down for us.

The address follows:

CONGRESSMAN DENT'S SPEECH TO THE JEANNETTE ROTARY CLUB, NOVEMBER 30, 1959

My subject tonight will be relative to our financial weakness in the field of international finance. The word "blackmail"

has come to be used in many different phases of our daily lives. For instance, the labor reform bill was passed by the frequent and ofttimes unrelated use of the word "blackmail" when talking about picketing. It has become the one word that describes pressure applied with a threat of bodily injury, loss of personal reputation, political defeat and in the relationships between nations it has virtually become about the only word that can describe some of our international diplomacy and foreign policy.

It does not take an expert to realize that something is wrong when countries scattered all over the world are scenes for riots and demonstrations against Americans and in some cases our flag is spat and trampled upon. Let us not delude ourselves into a position of false security by the talk of double dealing diplomats.

Our problem is one of an unwillingness on the part of leaders to recognize the need for a complete review of our international position, a reappraisal of our reciprocal trades program and a very searching look at our mutual and foreign aid program.

When I first called for action along these lines in my first month as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I was scoffed at and even ridiculed by many persons and periodicals. It is interesting to note the change and the demand now by national periodicals, editorial writers and even the President, for a reappraisal of our positions on trade and aid. When I first offered my amendment to make the Buy American Act operative I received such an overwhelming defeat that I started to doubt my own conclusions and opinions. However, in the last session it took all the power of the leadership of both sides, Republicans and Democrats, to defeat my amendment and then only by a few votes.

I mention this because recently I attended a meeting of western Pennsylvania Members of Congress with both parties represented. The subject of conversation during the entire afternoon was the question of foreign trade and aid, and in particular the flight of the American gold reserve. For your information, I want to give you a quick analysis of our precarious financial position and some of the suggestions made by men considered to be leaders and thinkers in both our economic as well as our political activities.

It is too much to expect to cover the whole picture of the past 30 years, but sufficient to say that there was a very demanding need for the Marshall plan of foreign aid in the beginning and the only trouble with our situation is that we failed to make a turn in the road when the road signs called for a reappraisal of our program at least 6 years ago. When the Marshall plan was proposed it was intended as a means of stopping the spread of communism by helping our allies and friends to rehabilitate to the level of their economy as it was in the latter part of 1939. Long ago our help passed this goal and we are now embarked upon a program of establishing in practically every country an economy to not only match our own, but actually to surpass us in some fields. We are stretched out so thinly that our military presence in some countries has become a bone of contention rather than an assurance of security.

Our financial position can best point up our weakness because of its dramatic threat of catastrophy. Let us look at our 10-year history of U.S. gold on a short-term position. In 1949, we had a gold reserve of $24.4 billion with a short-term claim on foreign countries of $800 million and a short-term liability to foreign countries of $5.9 billion. This left us a net worth in gold reserve of $19.3 billion. At the end of June 1959 we had a Treasury reserve of gold of $19.7 billion with claims in our favor of $2.4 billion and a liability against us of $15.7 billion. This left us a reserve net worth of $6.5 billion.

This is even worse today because we are losing our reserve at the rate of $4 billion annually right now. If a run is made on our Treasury by foreign claimholders, we find ourselves in a serious difficulty because Congress long ago established a reserve ratio to be maintained by the Treasury which calls for $11.8 billion in order to keep our present dollar volume sound and protected by gold reserve. This means we would be short $5.3 billion, or, in plain words, bankrupt.

In fact, as of June 30, certificates representing beneficial ownership of $19.4 billion of this gold were held by Federal Reserve banks. This was $7.9 billion in excess of minimum requirements of 25 percent required by law against such liabilities. This in itself shows the worst financial picture this Nation has ever been in during our lifetime.

The main reason the foreign claims have not been exercised is because this country has raised its interest rate to the highest in history on short-term borrowing. They, therefore, are content to leave their claims and collect the heavy interest (tax free in this country) while still holding a first mortgage on our gold reserve. This, then, is one of the forms of blackmail on an international scale.

We, the taxpayers of America, have to pay high interest in order to keep the foreign claimants from calling for payment of their mortgage. One wonders how much of this money used by these foreign countries to create these claims in the first place come from the American taxpayers by granting foreign aid, preferential treatment in reciprocal trades, and American investments in foreign production factilities.

It is a recognized fact that unless we do something drastic our bankers cannot lower interest rates, our Government cannot lower short-term interest rates because of the blackmail threat of foreign claims to start a run on our Treasury reserve. The $5.3 billion question then is this: What can we do? Frankly, no single person knows the answers, but here are a few suggestions proposed by various groups and individuals.

Stop the outflow of gold to foreign countries by—

(a) Limiting the amounts of American money travelers, tourists, and businessmen can take out of our country.

(b) Making all purchases by foreign stationed American troops and personnel subject to made-in-America orders and even so far as limiting amounts they are given out of their salaries and pay checks to spend for foreign goods.

(c) Making it mandatory that our own military buy all-American supplies, etc.

(d) Limiting all financial aid to all countries and giving only goods and services as mutual and foreign aid.

(e) Reevaluating our trade agreements to allow domestic industry protection at least in the amount represented by taxes and Government-imposed payroll costs on American goods.

(f) Having Congress remove any requirement of gold reserve to back up our own Federal Reserve bank notes.

(g) Increasing the price of gold from $35 to $70 an ounce. (In anticipation of this move Canada and England have put gold bar certificate stock on the market, and a cleanup of billions will be made by the holders of these gold bar certificates.)

(h) Puting into effect drastic restrictions on the American economic front by limiting profits, stopping all wage increases, and increasing production of trade goods.

These are the most prominent suggestions; however, there are many more. Personally, I feel that these moves appear to be an admission of panic thinking, and not, as a whole, a program that can be instituted with any degree of confidence. Time does not permit an analysis of each suggestion, but with your kind indulgence I would like to give a hurried comment on some of the issues involved.

Suggestions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) would immediately be put under the heading of "Foreign Policy" since the spending and giving of American money have been the main plank in our platform in our foreign relations program. Castro's actions in Cuba and Egypt's action on the Suez Canal are just a few of the examples of what happens when we refuse or curtail our money aid to our friends.

Again we are faced with a form of blackmail in that when we try to curtail our aid the door is opened wide (by invitation) to Communist Russia. This, then, is a tread-easy path if we attempt to follow it.

Suggestion F would create a situation where Congress and the people would lose all control on the amount of paper money the Federal Reserve System could put into the market because any other restrictive covenant would still be a brake and this solution requires elimination of any reserve.

Suggestion G would not be a very satisfactory answer because nothing would stop the claimant nations from increasing their money price and, in fact, would bring on the very thing we are trying to avoid, a run on our Treasury.

Suggestion H speaks for itself. To stop all economic increases in this country would jeopardize our way of life, our national debt service and particularly our world prestige.

All in all, Congress and the people have serious and threatening problems that require immediate attention.

Standing pat because of the national elections next year may be the most dangerous move ever made by our Nation. For fear of being called isolationists, protectionists, and high tariff advocates, many of our powerful voices have been stilled over these past eventful years.

The time has come to face facts and to forget personal ambitions and personal and corporate profits derived from foreign trade and investments. Our financial dilemma can be traced strictly to the balance of trade, foreign aid, military grants, loans, and importations of goods and services which we produce in surplus.

Following this is a hypothetical transaction, indicative of what has been happening all over the world and the direct cause of much of our present crisis in gold. No business in the United States could stay solvent if it treated its competitors in this manner.

I have not touched upon the long-term position simply because no living person can guarantee the obligations of foreign countries to the United States on long-term credits.

Would you guarantee the moneys owed the United States by Cuba at this moment? In this area we are like a football team that goes into the game a 20-point favorite because it looks good on paper, but loses the game.

My friends, I am sorry time and patience will not allow me to continue this all important subject, but one thing is sure. This Nation will have to reevaluate its own economy, determine what standard we want to live under and make up our minds that other countries will have to do the same.

It is one thing to help the family of a friend, relative, or neighbor in an emergency, but an entirely different picture when you take "them to raise."

Incidentally, this poses a question. If you had limited aid to give, to whom would you give it—a friend, a relative, or a neighbor? Think about it a while.

In closing, let me quote something Abraham Lincoln once said: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Thank you for listening.

HYPOTHETICAL TRANSACTION

The U.S. Government makes a grant of $3 million to a foreign government to enable it to undertake a specific $3 million project in its own country. The grant is effectuated by the U.S. Treasury's giving the foreign government a check for $3 million drawn on the Treasury's account at some Federal Reserve bank. The foreign government deposits this check in its own central bank, giving that bank a balance of $3 million in U.S. funds.

The project requires the importation of $2 million of materials and equipment from the United States and the use of domestic labor and materials costing the equivalent of $1 million. In making payment through its central bank for the imported materials and equipment, the foreign government uses up $2 million of the U.S. funds that it turned over to the central bank. The central bank invests the remaining $1 million of U.S. funds in short-term U.S. Government securities. (They pay their domestic bills with their own currency.)

In paying for domestic labor and materials costing the equivalent of $1 million, the foreign government draws checks on its central bank payable in domestic money, and through such disbursements exhausts its balance at the bank derived from the U.S. grant.

Such checks are deposited by the recipients in domestic commercial banks and then are redeposited by such commercial banks in the central bank, increasing the commercial banks' deposits in the central bank by the equivalent of $1 million.

Upon completion of these transactions:

(1) The foreign central bank holds $1 million short-term U.S. Government securities which can quickly be translated into a claim on U.S. gold;

(2) the foreign central bank's reserves inclusive of such potential claim on U.S. gold have been increased by $1 million;

(3) the liabilities of the foreign central bank in the form of deposits of domestic commercial banks have been increased by the equivalent of $1 million; and

(4) the ratio of the foreign central banks' total reserves to total liabilities has been strengthened (assuming that it previously was less than 100 percent).

The essence of the entire transaction, as between the United States and the foreign country, is that the United States gave the foreign country $2 million materials and equipment and a claim on $1 million gold.

Dent Demands Facts on Foreign Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes one wonders how far we can go in underselling the importance of maintaining our own economic defenses as well as our military.

Russia and the communistic threat seems to have made this country into a punch-drunk fighter shadowboxing the sound of every bell, or even worse, a cringing coward who dodges every feint and anticipated punch and forgets to throw a few of his own.

All one has to do is read our own papers and business magazines to find out that all is not well in our economy.

The following release by me followed a story in Business Week which covered the subject matter contained therein:

DENT DEMANDS FACTS ON FOREIGN BIDS

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, today called upon the Bureau of Reclamation to disclose facts in the bid controversy between English-Electric, England, and Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton, United States of America for eight hydroturbines for Glen Canyon Dam, a Federal project.

DENT claims that this case points up the ridiculous and idiotic position in which this Government has placed American producers and American workers because of the interpretation of the Buy American Act by this administration.

Here are the facts outlined by DENT: The English bid, $6,214,552; the American bid, $6,392,000. Although the President has cut the buy American 25 percent differential down to 6 percent, the American company met this unrealistic differential and was in line for the work.

The English company has protested and won a 45-day delay in the granting of the award on the grounds that the American company is producing more than 50 percent of the costs of the equipment in a foreign country (Belgium). The English argue that under this arrangement the American company is denied the protection of the Buy American Act.

The controversy began over which figure is right, the British or the American.

DENT further explained that the real issue is not that an English company can tell our Government where to buy, but goes deeper.

The American company was forced to go to a foreign supplier in order to even come close in the bids by the ridiculous operation of our Federal purchase plan.

If the product were wholly manufactured in the United States, the American company would be so far out that the British company would have had no competition for the bid.

DENT said that the problem posed is this—Do we quit bidding American products? Do we buy all the component parts in foreign countries and still claim "buy American protection"? Do we stop kidding ourselves and get back to American fundamentals, or do we quit kidding the foreign countries about the meaning of buy American legislation.

"As a Congressman, and as a citizen taxpayer," said DENT, "I want to know and it's about time the American people, especially the American workers, businessmen and particularly Members of Congress know, what's going on in our Government."

I will not elaborate on this particular case because the record contains my many presentations on this subject. I will say, however, in passing, that sooner or later this subject of American investment abroad, American aid to other competitive nations, American home economy, and social security amendments will be the major issue in our political arena. We cannot continue with the kind of idiotic thinking that seems to start from nowhere and aims to go to the same place.

In this regard, listen to this little item out of one of the leading American newspaper's business section, telling American manufacturers that there are many fine locations for their plants in Europe. It goes on to show where the locations are that offer the least costs of operation because of lowest wages. It further goes on to say that they can sell not only in the European trade bloc, but can undersell their own plants here in America.

How then do we help our economy by taking American money, investing it in Europe and Asia, hiring foreign labor, selling to our former customers as well as shipping back into the United States the same goods we manufacture here in surplus?

Recently, a notice came out about the Japanese building a watch factory in India. However, when you read the details, you find that the Japs are building a plant for the Indian Government to operate. Further, they are being paid for building it and for providing the technical assistance. Of course, we do it differently, we not only give them the money but we even allow them to buy the construction needs somewhere else and then give them a free market here in America for their products. We not only help private enterprise abroad, but we also help governments to get into business to compete with us.

One question seems unanswerable. How can an American watch manufacturer pay taxes, dividends, wages, and local civic charges and compete against monopoly government-owned, non-tax-paying plants abroad?

One example of this is Volkswagen, owned and operated by the West German Government. Here is a little story of how we get suckered in by our friends: The United States refused to allow American pipe producers to sell Russia 12,000 miles of pipe for an oil pipeline on the grounds of security, and so forth. The West German Government sold Russia the pipe from plants rehabilitated by American foreign aid and American taxpayers' dollars. The Germans take 100,000 Russian-made automobiles as part of the payment. The German Government took the Russian-made cars, sold them through the Volkswagen distribution system and released 100,000 Volkswagens for sale outside of Germany mostly in the United States. We not only lost the pipe order, but in the end we probably paid for most of it.

Another angle that this administration seems to overlook is its blind opposition to area development, high interest rates and refusal to amend the Social Security Act by lowering age limits and increasing benefits, both medical and minimums. In the face of this attitude, it is strange to see the President demanding more economic aid for foreign countries when these same countries are doing exactly what he refuses to do here in America and in many cases doing it with our money.

West Germany, for instance, has set up a special tax and development aid for so-called distressed and underdeveloped industrial areas and communities in Germany. The President and our own chamber of commerce oppose this program for Americans, but both support vigorously the billions for foreign countries.

Belgium: This is really a dandy setup. Belgium has also set up a special set of help moves for its own underdeveloped industrial areas and one of the concessions is that these communities can borrow money at an interest as low as 1 percent. Imagine this—when your com-

munity and mine cannot get money without paying the exorbitant high interest rate demanded by this administration who are even now demanding that Congress lift the ceiling on interest rates on long-term bonds to an unrestricted amount.

Where do the Belgians get the money they loan? Much of the money used by these nations comes from the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, foreign economic aid, the technical assistance program, the Export-Import Bank, the Development Fund—United States completely—Special United Nations Fund, the new Inter American Development Fund for Latin American countries only, and, of course, the new IDA under the World Bank.

This will make it possible to loan money to India and other so-named underdeveloped countries on "soft" loans, loans that can be paid back in the "soft," hardly negotiable funds of the countries getting the money.

The United States starts this one off with over $320 million and also this will give us a chance to spend the accumulated funds under Public Law 480, which is the soft money, that the countries now owe us and which we cannot take out of their country, owed us in payment for farm products, and so forth, but we can spend it by loaning it back to them, or giving it to other needy nations to build production machinery for industrial goods.

One thing I want to call to your attention is that the new Fund will be able to loan money where the World Bank is restricted by law and cannot do it. I will quote from the Washington Post of February 1 to give you an authentic position and not one prejudiced by political partisanship:

> World Bank officials said yesterday a deliberately "broad latitude" will be used in granting loans to the underdeveloped nations. Some may be free of interest, some long-term, some repayable wholly in "soft" currency.
>
> Individual nations will not be required to stand as guarantors for loans made to borrowers within their borders, such as is true now for World Bank loans, and IDA, unlike the World Bank, will be able to loan money for such projects as community water supplies, sanitation, and housing developments.
>
> One item in the IDA charter is of particular interest to the United States. It permits a member nation to contribute "soft" currency in addition to its own "hard" currency quota. This means that the United States will be able to put to use the huge accumulations of Public Law 480 funds, which may total $5 billion this year. These funds are the repayments in "soft" currency which underdeveloped countries have made for U.S. surplus crop shipments.

Now to keep the record straight, the "surplus farm products" they are talking about were paid for by American taxpayers; and if in the end we get no payments for them, then why did we not just give them away in the first place, and stop all the added costs, and so forth, that we are still paying.

You will also note that this administration and business organizations such as the national chamber of commerce claim that it is inflationary to spend money for public facilities in urban redevelopment, housing, and for other area needs, but it is OK for others to spend our money to do the same thing.

This is only part of the picture. For instance, the arguments against social security benefits for medical and hospital care here in America are advanced by the same promoters of giving our American aid to countries that have complete socialized medicine as part of their system of government.

We further find the President opposing aid to education for student housing under a loan program while promoting student housing and aid to education in other countries.

Recently Campbell Soups announced the plans for a large canning plant in Mexico—Business Week—"because farm produce is cheaper, construction and labor costs are the lowest, and they can still sell through their established American outlets."

We are paying for surplus farm products, the American farmers' income is lower than it has been for years, we have surplus labor, surplus farms, but that does not seem to matter to the kind of profit-seeking internationalism we are now practicing in this country.

This, Mr. Speaker, is only a scratch on the surface of this economic as well as military problem. I am personally convinced that just as we are admitted to be second to Russia on missiles, if we do not stop our "ducking at every swing," we will be knocked out of the economic war not because we were hit, but because we wore ourselves out.

Statement of Principles on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1960

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Civil Defense Committee of the Governor's Conference met with the President at the White House to discuss some of the civil defense problems now facing our country. It is my understanding that this conference was arranged at the request of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, who has sponsored a civil defense program in the State of New York that would require individual home and apartment house owners to pay for the construction of fallout shielding.

Governor Rockefeller and I have exchanged views on this matter, and in a previous address to the House I commented on this proposal at some length, pointing out the serious shortcomings which I believe to be inherent in this approach to the large and complex problem of building a realistic civil defense program in this country.

Last October I had the privilege of meeting with the Civil Defense Committee of the Governors' Conference in Chicago, at which time I presented my own views concerning the civil defense needs of the Nation.

At this time I should like to present to the House a statement of principles on civil defense which I submitted to the President on January 12, 1960, which sets forth the main objectives to be sought in a national civil defense effort and points up the important relationship between civil defense preparedness and negotiations for a successful general disarmament agreement.

At the conclusion of this statement, I am attaching copies of my correspondence with Governor Rockefeller and my letter of January 12, 1960, to the President.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON CIVIL DEFENSE SUBMITTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD

The prime objective of our declared military policy is to deter Soviet aggression, either against the United States or against our allies, by posing the threat of massive nuclear retaliation against the Soviet homeland. It is said that such a threat offers the best hope of preventing either direct aggression against the United States or extremely provocative actions that might also lead to war.

Two key assumptions underlying this nuclear deterrence policy are (1) that the United States would be able to survive a surprise attack and strike back with forces sufficient to cripple the Soviet Union; and (2) that the United States would be willing to accept the consequences of attacking the Soviet Union in response to a Soviet attack against one or more of our allies.

Basic to either of these assumptions is the ability to survive a nuclear attack launched by the Soviet Union; in the first instance a surprise attack, in the second a retaliatory blow, or counter-attack. If it becomes apparent to the Soviet leaders that the United States could not survive such an attack, there is great danger that our threat of massive nuclear retaliation might be discounted or otherwise misunderstood and thereby fail to deter aggressive action on the part of the Soviet Union.

In other words, if the Soviet Union calculated either that a surprise attack would render the United States incapable of effectively retaliating or that the United States would not be willing to accept the probable destructiveness of a Soviet counter-blow, and thus would not massively retaliate in the event of provocative Soviet action, it follows that the nuclear deterrence policy would not necessarily deter aggressive Soviet actions.

Thus it can be seen that preparations designed to enable the United States to withstand and survive the effects of a possible nuclear attack have a direct bearing on our nuclear deterrence policy. Such preparations not only improve our defensive posture, but they also tend to reinforce and make more meaningful our offensive power in that the use of such power becomes feasible—or at least is not incredible—under certain defined circumstances.

Nonmilitary defense, or civil defense, preparations also serve to reduce the risks inherent in any possible disarmament program and thus may represent the key to successful negotiation of a workable general disarmament agreement. To the extent that civil defense can reduce the effects of a possible enemy attack, it would tend to reduce the advantage any opposing nation might hope to achieve through secret, undetected offensive military forces. At the same time, each

nation could develop a substantial degree of protection without creating a threat to the security of any other nation.

It thus would seem practical to gear a phased disarmament program to a civil defense program designed to offset each successive reduction of armaments with added increments of civil defense preparedness.

International inspection of armaments could follow the same pattern, beginning with limited coverage of critical areas and gradually extending to the type of coverage considered essential to permanent arms control and inspection.

Viewed from this standpoint, the following principles concerning civil defense in the United States can be set forth:

1. Large-scale civil defense preparedness is essential to national security and to any safe progress in military disarmament. Such preparedness would provide a degree of personal protection which would serve to "insure" our peoples' lives against the risk of cheating by an enemy power during a period of disarmament and thereafter.

2. A meaningful civil defense program must encompass, on a national scale, all the preattack preparations required to minimize loss of life and to insure the post-attack availability of resources necessary for national recovery.

3. Responsibility for developing such a program rests with the Federal Government as a part of its constitutional duty of providing for the national defense.

4. The States and localities should be called upon to provide maximum assistance to Federal authorities in developing a workable national master plan and in the use of State and local resources, including governmental institutions and personnel, for civil defense emergency and postattack recovery operations.

5. The roles and missions of the Nation's Armed Forces should be recast to encompass a predetermined role in the civil defense field. Such a role should be planned for clearly defined relationships and integrated action with regional and local civil defense and disaster programs.

6. The first task of national civil defense is to provide protection for the American people from the devastating immediate hazards of nuclear war. Shelter protection from fallout, emergency stocks of basic subsistence supplies, and radiological monitoring equipment are essential for the entire population. Blast protection and protected communications and control facilities should be developed in key areas to insure the continuity of essential governmental operations and to minimize the number of possible blast casualties.

7. The second most important task of civil defense is to provide a basic framework for the postattack recovery of the Nation. This task should be performed concurrently with the protective function and should include measures to insure the availability of material resources in the immediate postattack period for the long-term recovery effort. Standby legislation should be enacted to provide for the necessary economic and industrial control authority and administrative structure, and a Federal stockpile of basic survival and recovery resources should be created and positioned in properly dispersed or protected storage.

8. An effective civil defense as outlined above would make the risks inherent in disarmament more acceptable. Civil defense preparedness should be built up in phases geared to each step in the reduction of our military forces.

9. In the event agreement on arms reduction and control is achieved, a portion of the funds ordinarily earmarked for military purposes should be applied to civil defense needs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1959.

Hon. NELSON ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York,
The Governor's Office,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR NELSON: Your personal note transmitting a copy of the report on civil defense was appreciated. I believe you have performed a real public service in sponsoring the civil defense study in New York State and in making public its findings and recommendations. As you know, I have felt very keenly for a long time that the people must be fully informed about the facts of nuclear radiation and the implications of nuclear war for the survival of our country and indeed of all mankind.

In my congressional work as chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, and as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have tried to make public, through investigations and hearings, as many of these facts as possible. Our basic studies and investigations in civil defense, I truly believe, have set the groundwork for a national reappraisal of the tasks that lie ahead in protecting the people and affording a means for national survival in the event of nuclear war. The 1956 report of the Military Operations Subcommitee exposed the fallacy of evacuation as a national civil defense measure and recommended a national shelter building program, the need for which has been recognized by many distinguished study groups, including the Rockefeller special studies project in 1958.

A basic tenet of our 1956 and succeeding reports is the obligation of the Federal Government to provide for civil defense as a part of its broad constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense. I do not think this premise can be challenged in the face of the terrible and widespread damage that would result from a nuclear attack, and that is why I am concerned about the possible meaning and effect of your State civil defense report.

Assuming the New York State Legislature were to give effect to the recommendations in your report, I see little hope that other States would follow suit. Consequently, there would be no uniform national legislation in this vital area. In an address to the U.S. House of Representatives on July 15, 1959, I took the liberty of suggesting there is little chance of legislative action in your State.

More important is the question whether it is fair to compel private citizens to take action for their own defense against nuclear attack when the Federal Government has not even begun to acknowledge its responsibilities in this area. I do not discuss here the legal or constitutional questions posed by a program of compulsory shelter protection for individuals and property owners. The problem is too large, the tasks too complicated, the time too short for us to expect that a nationwide shelter system ultimately can be achieved by State and individual action in the manner proposed in your report.

Of course, as the Governor of a great State, you are proposing a course of action within the sphere of your responsibilities. With that no one can quarrel, and indeed you are to be commended for asserting responsibilities where others have been laggard.

The value of your report, as I see it, lies in drawing national attention once more to the civil defense problem; and you have been an eloquent spokesman on this subject which has little popular or political appeal but which is crucial to the Nation's welfare. I hope the report will serve the further valuable purpose of alerting the Federal Government to its responsibilities and will not be used as a pretext by those who would relieve themselves of burdensome and costly tasks by attempting to transfer responsibilities to the States or to individual citizens.

I voice these thoughts frankly because of my deep concern. They are not intended in any way to disparage your great public service for civil defense.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N.Y., August 25, 1959.

The Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHET: Please forgive the delay in replying to your thoughtful letter about the report of the special task force on radioactive fallout. I appreciate very much having your observations which I know will be of considerable interest to the committee presently working on the project.

I do, indeed, feel this course of action is within the sphere of my responsibility for the protection of the lives and health of the people of the State of New York. It is this realization that has prompted my interest, my concern, and my action.

It is encouraging to have your comments. Your extensive familiarity with so vital a topic and your total awareness to the danger make your comments all the more meaningful to me.

For your information, enclosed is a copy of the resolution on fallout, unanimously adopted by the Governors at the recent conference in Puerto Rico.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

NELSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In view of the White House-sponsored Conference on Civil Defense, which I understand was arranged at the request of Governor Rockefeller, I take the liberty of enclosing an exchange of correspondence between Governor Rockefeller and myself on his civil defense proposals for the State of New York. My letter to Governor Rockefeller of July 27, 1959, you will note, is critical of his proposals while commending him for his attention to this vitally important subject.

On the basis of extended studies of civil defense and the effects of nuclear radiation, conducted by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on both of which I serve, I am convinced that civil defense demands an acceptance of responsibility and an allocation of resources by the Federal Government in far greater measure than has heretofore been evidenced.

As you prepare for the so-called summit meetings, in which disarmament undoubtedly will be a crucial topic of discussion, I hope you will consider this point: That progress in disarmament does not obviate the need for civil defense. In fact, the need for civil defense grows greater because it is the only ultimate insurance against enemy cheating.

The enclosed statement of principles on civil defense outlines this and other points which may be of help to the conferees meeting with you on January 25.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee.